

BACONIANA



Handwritten text, possibly a date or reference number, located in the top left corner.





JANUARY, 1905

BACONIANA

A QUARTERLY MAGAZINE



CONTENTS

	PAGE
Christopher Marlowe	5
Education at the Universities	19
"Shakespeare's Books"	27
Medicine and the Drama	35
Mr. Pitt-Lewis's "Outline"	47
The Genesis of the Plays	51
Bacon in the Sonnets	58
Notes, Queries, and Correspondence ...	61

LONDON

GAY & BIRD

22 BEDFORD STREET

Cases for Binding
can be had of
the Publishers

The Bacon Society.

(INCORPORATED.)

THE objects of the Society are expressed in the Memorandum of Association to be :—

1. To encourage the study of the works of Francis Bacon as philosopher, lawyer, statesman and poet ; also his character, genius, and life ; his influence on his own and succeeding times, and the tendencies and results of his writings.
2. To encourage the general study of the evidence in favour of Francis Bacon's authorship of the plays commonly ascribed to Shakespeare, and to investigate his connection with other works of the Elizabethan period.

The annual subscription of Members, who are entitled to vote at the Society's business meetings, is one guinea ; that of Associates is half-a-guinea.

The Society's Library and Rooms are at 11, Hart Street, London, W.C. (close to the British Museum), where the Secretary attends daily, and from 3 to 5 o'clock will be happy to supply further information.

VOL. III. THIRD SERIES

BACONIANA

A Quarterly Magazine



LONDON
GAY & BIRD
22 BEDFORD STREET W.C.

1905

“Therefore we shall make our judgment upon the things themselves as they give light one to another and, as we can, dig Truth out of the mine.”

—FRANCIS BACON.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Christopher Marlowe	5
Education at the Universities	19
"Shakespeare's Books"	27
Medicine and the Drama	35
Mr. Pitt-Lewis's "Outline"	47
The Genesis of the Plays	51
Bacon in the Sonnets	58
Notes, Queries, and Correspondence	61
Errors and Anachronisms	69
The Creators of Modern English	74
The Advancement of Knowledge	86
"The Arte of English Poesie"	95
A Duologue	104
Bacon's Scrivenery	107
"Great Englishmen of the Sixteenth Century"	112
Notes, Queries, and Correspondence	125
The Charges against Lord St. Alban	133
Literal Translation of the Manes Verulamiani	140
Appleton Morgan	152
The Bi-literal Cipher in "Henry VII."	158
"Henry VII." A Report on the Cipher... ..	163
The Parnassus Trilogy... ..	178
Honorificabilitudinitatibus	185
Shakespeare's Story of His Life	187
Notes, Queries, and Correspondence	190
Proposal for a Shakespeare Statue	197
Bacon's New Method	198
The Bi-literal Cipher	204
The Anatomy of Melancholy	210
Stotsenburg's "Impartial Study"	221
The Parnassus Trilogy (continued)	229
Entertainment at Elvetham	237
Manes Verulamiani (continued)... ..	242
Notes, Queries, and Correspondence	253

INDEX.

	PAGE		PAGE
"Accost, Sir Andrew, Accost!"	64	Kindersley, D. J.	158
Advancement of Knowledge	86	Leith, A. A.	104
<i>Anatomy of Melancholy</i>	210	Lee, Sidney	66, 112
Appleton Morgan	152	<i>Manes Verulamiani</i>	140, 242
<i>Arte of English Poesie</i>	95	Marlowe, Christopher	5
Austin, Alfred	197	Matthew, Sir Tobie	62
"B.A. with a Horn Added"	127	"Meanest of Mankind"	256
Bacon Weed	132	Medicine and the Drama	35
Bacon in the Sonnets	58	<i>New English Dictionary</i>	195
Bacon and Cheltenham	256	Notes, Queries, and Correspondence,	61, 125, 190, 233
Bacon's New Method	198	<i>Noteworthy Opinions: Reed</i>	191
Bacon's Scrivener	107	Parnassus Trilogy	178, 229
Bayley, Harold	35, 74, 221	Pitt-Lewis's <i>Outline</i>	47, 130, 105
Begley, Rev. Walter	254	Pott, Mrs. Henry	86
Bi-literal Cipher in Henry VII.	158, 204	"Porcupine, The Fretful"	190
Bompas, George Cox	163, 253	<i>Promus, Date of</i>	192
'Boston Ideas'	65	Ravensburg	61
Charges against Lord St. Alban	133	Rebus Signatures	65
Collins, J. Churton	193	Ruskin on Bacon	65
Creators of Modern English	74	Shakespeare Statue	127, 197
Cunningham, Granville C.	163	<i>Shakespeare's Books</i>	27
Duologue, A	104	<i>Shakespeare's Story of His Life</i>	187
Education at the Universities	19	<i>Shakespeare, Wm., His Family and Friends</i>	64
Entertainment at Elvetham	237	Spedding's Sonnet	125
Errors and Anachronisms	69	Stotsenbrng's <i>Impartial Study</i>	221
Gallup, Elizabeth Wells	204	Stronach, George	58, 112, 185
Garnett, Dr. Richard	66	Sutton, W. A.	89, 140, 242
Genesis of the Plays	51	Theobald, R. M.	5, 152, 178, 229
<i>Great Englishmen of the 16th Century</i>	112	Theobald, W.	27, 210
Henry VII. Report on the Cipher	183	<i>Titus Andronicus</i>	128
<i>Honorificabilitudinitatibus</i>	185, 195, 255	Tolstoi and Shakespeare	253
James, George	51	Woodward, Parker	47, 95, 133, 187, 198
J.R. of Gray's Inn	237		
Jonson, Ben	67, 128, 193		

BACONIANA.

VOL. III. *Third Series.* JANUARY, 1905. No. 9.

CHRISTOPHER MARLOWE *

IF proof were needed that the whole method of Elizabethan criticism requires revision, nothing could be found better fitted to supply such proof than Mr. Ingram's work on Marlowe. In many respects it is a commendable book; there is much patient research shewn in the production of a multitude of small—and, I must add, very small—facts about persons and places and genealogies; and if this kind of scholarship is a proof of learning, Mr. Ingram is a very learned man. Indeed, it is worthy of remark that the credit of high rank in this field does not seem to depend on poetic insight, or even grasp of historic fact, or large views of the aims and purposes of literary creation; there is no broad philosophy or deep human wisdom in it. If a critic knows Ben Jonson well, or a multitude of small books that are almost forgotten and deservedly neglected, if he is well posted in allusions and skilful in the deciphering of old manuscripts, he is a most superior person, standing head and shoulders above the level of less ambitious students, who toil in the same field, but are destitute of these mystic endowments.

Yet, we may ask—What is the outcome of all these

* "Christopher Marlowe, and His Associates," by John H. Ingram. London: Grant Richards, 1904. 12/6.

highly prized accomplishments? A very good illustration of this is presented in Mr. Ingram's volume. If we are to do justice to Marlowe, and approach *Tamburlaine*, and *Hero and Leander* with proper critical credentials, we must carefully observe that his great grandfather was a tanner, who left directions in his will that a certain crucifix belonging to Holy Cross Church should be well gilt; that Marlowe's mother was the daughter of the Rev. Christopher Arthur; that John Marlowe, the poet's father, was a shoemaker, and became a duly recognised citizen on the payment of four shillings and a penny—which must of course be written "iiii. s. id.;"—etc., etc. I do not for one moment wish to undervalue these small details; they supply local colouring, and give vivacity and picturesque quality to the narrative in which they are incorporated; they supply slight but significant indications of the social environments and habits of the inhabitants of towns, villages and cities. They are the stock-in-trade of the historical novelist. But they are not personal history; they are not the windows through which we may peep into a poet's soul. A critic may be plentifully endowed with such facts as these, and yet unconscious of the interior significance of a work of art which has some remote outside relation to them; he may be only on the same level as the setter who follows a sportsman, who can point to the game but has no power to shoot it: and his appreciation of his subject may be as musty and dusty and innutritious as the parchments which furnish him with his minute facts.

There is another characteristic commonly associated with this Dryasdust fancy for parchments—the propensity to fill in all the lacunæ of history or biography by unlimited guessing and copious speculations. Mr. Ingram is a most industrious guesser. His conjectures and fancies are ample and sometimes amusing. We

are told, for instance, how young Marlowe gathered folklore from the town and country people of his neighbourhood; how he frequented the Mystery plays, which had an important share in the formation of his intellect; we are told his thoughts as he listened to these dramas, and that he was most deeply impressed by the semi-theological plays, in which sins and virtues were personified, and the personages of the Christian Hierarchy brought on the stage for his contemplation. We are informed, to our astonishment, that Marlowe by his school associations acquired that indefinite air of education and courtesy proper to the children of the educated classes. We are even told of the lad's "quaint humour" and "studious eccentricities of temper" which hurt his mother's feelings. Mr. Ingram ought to have told us whether she whipped him, or condoned the eccentricities. We are invited to picture the mother of young Kit busy with preparations for his journey to London and Cambridge. We see his linen, his cloak, bag, his shirts and shirt-bands, his girdle and knife. We follow him to London and watch his visits of inspection to its most prominent sights. And then, when he has finished his University course, and settled in London, we are informed that he never was an actor, but a man of letters, who wrote plays, which speedily became so popular as to make Marlowe famous and prosperous. The city rings with applause; he gains entrance to the best society, he is present at the wit-combats conjured up by Fuller's imagination, (which in Mr. Ingram's pages become historical); he joins in these debates, reads a paper for discussion! visits Sir Walter Raleigh and Chapman, and is intimate with their friends and companions. All the scandals and traditions of his blasphemy and Atheism and loose living are dismissed as baseless fictions, and his death, with its unsavoury circumstances, was the result of pure

accident on which no moral comment is possible. Now all this is very entertaining, but it is simply fiction and not fact—fiction founded, if you please, more or less remotely, on fact, but still fiction and nothing else; just as historical as *Ivanhoe* or *Friar Tuck*, or if preferred, the *Richard the First* whose figure is painted on the same canvas. How can Mr. Ingram know, for instance, that the *Miracle* plays had any great share in Marlowe's education? Wandering players would not visit the same town more than once or twice in the course of several years; as we know from a little work privately published by Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps giving details of the Itineraries of Shakspeare's Company. Mr. Ingram for the most part states all these so-called facts without giving any authority; and in one case what he calls the "records of a contemporary" turns out to be a nineteenth century contemporary—his own contemporary, not Marlowe's at all—not even an Englishman, but a Russian whose book was published in 1881! Here is the authority for the literary assemblies at Raleigh's house, and Marlowe's share in their debates! This is queer history indeed! Mr. Ingram's descriptions of town life, college life, and city life are doubtless true and interesting so far as they go; but there is nothing in them personal to Marlowe; they might equally well be put into a chapter of the life of many other more or less eminent men of his time; they are just as appropriate to Bishop Boyle, Harvey, Raleigh, or Harriott as to Marlowe, and Mr. Ingram makes no serious attempt to fix his ideal pictures on any real person, but assumes their application to Marlowe, who is simply a lay figure dressed in Elizabethan garments, and Mr. Ingram's sole merit is that he is a skilful *costumier*. In reading his pages we are reminded of the wag who one day stopped and planted his gaze on the stone lion, without outstretched tail, which was

placed on the top of the Northumberland House Gateway ; and when a crowd of passers-by, as their manner is, joined in his gaze, murmured, as if to himself, "Good heavens! it wags its tail!" repeating the exclamation till a number of the bystanders echoed, "So it does, by Jove!" Then the wag walked on, quietly laughing at the illusions which he had conjured up. Mr. Ingram plays a similar trick with the British public, and doubtless most of his readers will not detect the practical joke, but will accept his pictures as drawn from life. He seems himself to be caught in his own trap and believes his own inventions ; for, not in jest but in sober earnest, he points to a motionless figure as if it were moving, and has not sufficient perception of reality to grin at his own fantasies. It is decidedly funny ; but we may not laugh too rudely. Let Browning describe the situation :

"God forbid I should find you ridiculous !

Go on ! you shall no more move my gravity
Than, when I see boys ride a cock-horse,
I find it in my heart to embarrass them
By hinting that their stick's a mock horse,
And they really carry what they say carries them."

It is not, however, true to assume that University men were as a rule scholars or gentlemen. The discussion on Education in Elizabethan times contained in another paper in this number of *BACONIANA* proves that they were a rough set, including a large proportion of idle, ignorant, beer-drinking men, fond of high jinks and vulgar sports, finding little or no profit by their residence in the University, and able to obtain a degree and yet remain ignorant, rude and disorderly. Mr. Ingram, without the least proof, so far as Marlowe is concerned, assumes the contrary, and claims for Marlowe all the characteristics which are associated with Uni-

versity graduation of the present day ; and this is a very important support of his claim of authorship.

There are not wanting most significant indications that the poems and plays attributed to Marlowe cannot be entirely his—in some cases cannot be his at all. It speaks strongly for Mr. Ingram's bias as a biographer that *not one of these indications is alluded to* ; not one of the difficulties which they suggest is fairly discussed ; most of them, and the greatest of them, (as I will show), are entirely ignored. Mr. Ingram speaks of Marlowe's notoriety and popularity as if it were a well-ascertained fact. In a fine specimen of graphic quasi-historic descriptive writing, quite in the Macaulay vein, he tells us that "the sensation which the production of *Tamburlaine* made was, till then, unparalleled. It was a new excitement, arousing admiration from some, but from others nothing save envy, hatred, and malice." Neither by quotation, nor by reference does he inform us how he came to know of this "unparalleled sensation," which is as incredible as it is unhistoric. He seems to think that *Faustus* and *Tamburlaine*, and *Hero and Leander* sprang by a single leap into the literary eminence which they now possess ; he antedates their appreciation by two or three hundred years. All the anomalies attaching to such instantaneous renown are apparently unsuspected. And even if these poems and plays were at once recognised as productions of the highest genius, there is not an atom of proof that Marlowe was identified as that genius. Not a single piece bearing his name was published during his lifetime. No complete collection of his works appeared till Robinson's edition was issued in 1826. Before Marlowe's death, only *Tamburlaine*, in two parts, had been published,—anonymously ; all the rest are posthumous. Mr. Ingram does indeed give—he could not but give—the dates of publication of these works, but

he has no explanation to offer, none seems to him to be needed, of all the perplexities arising out of these anonymous and posthumous publications. The evidence of title pages and publishers' dedications and prefaces is all sufficient for him, while every well-informed Elizabethan student knows that nothing is more open to suspicion and challenge.

The difficulties connected with Marlowe's authorship are by no means confined to title pages. Mr. Ingram must know, for instance, that *Faustus*, as we have it, cannot have been written by Marlowe. Let me succinctly state the reasons for this opinion. Marlowe died in 1593. *Faustus* was entered at Stationers' Hall in 1601, and published in 1604. A new edition, slightly altered (let that pass), was published in 1609. But in 1616 another edition appeared, and this was enlarged to half as much again; many of the scenes were re-cast or re-written; new characters were introduced, and new incidents. Mr. William Theobald has analyzed these changes, as Mr. Ingram ought to have done, as anyone may do. He finds twenty-eight characters in the 1604 edition, besides Devils, Spirits, Friars, Attendants and Chorus. The 1616 edition has thirty-seven characters besides Cardinals, Monks, Friars, Soldiers, Servants and Chorus. The Cardinal Lorraine of 1604 is left out in 1616. Robin, the hostler, becomes a Clown, and the Knight becomes Benvolio. New characters in 1616 are Raymond King of Hungary, the Duke of Saxony, Bruno, a Carter, Hostess, and three Soldiers. The play is enlarged from eighteen and a-half to twenty-six pages of modern printing. Will it be believed that Mr. Ingram takes not the smallest notice of all these hard facts?—unless, indeed, he alludes to them as "degrading interpellations," or corruptions, which they are not, and it is idle to attempt to dispose of them in this summary manner. The new matter is of the same quality as the old, and

is evidently by the same workman: and that workman certainly was *not* Marlowe. For instance, what could Marlowe know about the persecutions of Bruno, which did not occur till eight or nine years after his death? How could he refer to Dr. Lopez, who did not become known to the public till 1594? Such passages as these are constantly, and reasonably, used by Shakespearean critics to find limiting dates for the plays in which they appear. The allusion to the return of Essex from Ireland, for instance, shews that, as the Clarendon Editor says, "it must have been acted between March 27 and September 28, 1599." Similarly, the Bruno and Lopez allusions in *Faustus* shew that it could not have been written earlier than 1594, or even 1600. What right has Mr. Ingram absolutely to neglect all these facts? No capable or impartial biographer of Marlowe could possibly pass them over, and for so well-informed a writer as Mr. Ingram to leave them unnoticed is a literary offence of such magnitude as baffles comment. We need only say, but this we must say, that *suppressio veri* is usually associated with *suggestio falsi*, and that *mala fides* is within speaking distance of both.

The reasons for this extraordinary biographical cookery are not far to seek. Mr. Ingram knows that these difficulties could not be investigated without a discussion of the Shakespearean authorship of Marlowe, and this would necessarily involve a further extension, in which the theory of Bacon's hand in both must be considered. Now all commentary on Marlowe coming from Baconian sources is entirely ignored in the text of this book. The very extended, and probably almost complete bibliography appended, gives a list of over 140 books or articles in which Marlowe is concerned. And only two works in support of the Baconian origin, one by Edwin Bormann, and the other by Count Vitzthum

von Eckstadt, are enumerated, with a brief intimation as to the former, that it is intended to prove "that the author of *Novum Organum* wrote the works attributed to Shakspeare and Marlowe." There is no reference to the two or three pamphlets on this subject by Mr. William Theobald, nor to the elaborate discussion on *Edward II.*, occupying seventy-three pages of my own "Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light," which had appeared in a less extended form in the "Bacon Journal." Surely this is not fair treatment, either of his own subject or of the literature connected with it. Mr. Ingram mutilates his biography, and abridges his bibliography, in order, apparently, to exclude a distasteful topic which would distort or destroy some of his own conclusions.

Mr. Ingram must know that, even from his own point of view, the Shakespearian authorship of Marlowe is more than hinted at, and cannot be dismissed as an unsupported and unsound speculation. So impossible is it to keep Shakespeare out of Marlowe, that Mr. Ingram himself is driven to the monstrous absurdity of—not speculating or surmising, but almost asserting—that "From time to time the two poets seem to be seen in *Henry the Sixth* face to face, speaking through their *dramatis personæ*. Shakespeare appears as Winchester, the haughty, conservative prelate, whilst Marlowe assumes the rôle of Gloucester, the people's beloved Lord Protector. Cannot the voices of the two poets be heard in this dialogue?" And then he quotes the first fifty lines of *1 Henry VI.*, III. i., in which five speeches are given to Winchester, and four to Gloucester, *i.e.*, out of these fifty consecutive lines, twenty-six are supposed to be written by Shakspeare and twenty-four by Marlowe! Did'st ever hear of anything in authorship so entirely absurd and impossible? Such a co-partnership assuredly never existed either in nature

or art, unless the monstrosity of the Siamese twins can be reproduced in literature. Elsewhere Mr. Ingram quotes a passage from Shakespeare's *Henry the Sixth*, as one in which Marlowe "reverts to the felicity of sovereignty"; i.e., repeats in different language what he had before written in *Tamburlaine*, so that the identification of Shakespeare and Marlowe is assumed in his own pages. The absolute identity of style between Shakespeare and Marlowe, which is noticed by many critics, cannot be ignored even by Mr. Ingram, but he explains it by a purely gratuitous and baseless theory of co-operation. Marlowe, he says, "subjected his mind and style to Shakespeare's," and that before any Shakespeare book had been published—and, after a long quotation from 3 *Henry VI.*, which is more indisputably Shakespearean than 1 *Henry VI.*, he adds, "If that be not Marlowe's work, it only proves that Shakespeare followed in his footsteps." So that we have alternately Shakespeare following Marlowe, and Marlowe following Shakespeare—Man and Master alternately changing places. Never was there such a complete *reductio ad absurdum*.

Mr. Ingram agrees with Mr. Richard Simpson that "the very structure of *Edward II.* seems to bear witness to the counsel and aid of Shakespeare;" and he himself immediately adds, "Marlowe's reflections in this drama are sometimes so Shakespearean in tone and temper that one is frequently prompted to think he must have been dipping his pen" (a safe and non-compromising metaphor!) "into the inkhorn of the young man from Warwickshire. There is the ring of Shakespeare in these words of fiery young Mortimer, the prototype of the still more fiery Hotspur:"—then follows sixteen lines from *Edward II.*, I. iv. 402—417. He continues,—“and again in the advice of the crafty younger Spenser to Baldock, tutor of the ‘King’s

Neice,'"—and quotes *Edward II.*, II. i. 31—43. "All this" Mr. Ingram assures us, "is quite foreign to Marlowe's customary "spiritual tone." . . . Does not the sign-manual of Shakespeare appear in such similes as these?—

"The shepherd, nipt with biting winter's rage,
Frolics not more to see the painted spring,
Than I do to behold your Majesty."*

Mr. Ingram is thus perpetually giving Marlowe away and then taking him back,—dismissing Shakespeare and then recalling him. Now if the admitted identity in "tone and temper" between Shakespeare and Marlowe in *Edward II.* is connected with the actual identities in thought and expression, amount to about 130 instances,—and if to this be added some ninety words of rare occurrence common to the two,—and then if we add a number of other characteristic forms of phraseology, such as the use of *over* words (*e.g.*, overbase, over-pierced, over-watched, etc.); the promotion to poetic service of very commonplace words, such as suck, mewed, Jack,—the similar style of echoing retort or repartee,—the use of either wonder, or the winds, at the entrance of a scene,—and if to all these we add the eight or ten instances in which the dramatic situation in *Edward II.* anticipates similar situations in Shakespeare,—by the time half of these comparisons are brought to view, the question which Mr. Ingram

* Compare,

"Where biting cold would never let grass grow."
—2 *Henry VI.*, III. ii. 337.

"Barren winter with his wrathful nipping cold."
—*Ib.*, II. iv. 3.

"Welcome hither as is the spring to the earth."
—*Winter's Tale*, V. i. 151.

"Paint the meadows with delight."
—*Love's Labour's Lost*, V. ii. 905.

habitually shirks becomes urgent, and we are forced to question whether these multitudinous points of similarity do not pass the limits of dual authorship, and force upon us the question of identity. All the comparisons produced by Mr. Ingram to prove co-operation are better arguments for identity. Mr. Ingram evidently perceives that it is a necessity for his standpoint that the three *Henry VI.* plays should be given over to Marlowe. For if they are Shakespeare's so also must be the *Contention* and the *True Tragedy*, which are evidently early drafts of 2 *Henry VI.* and 3 *Henry VI.* But Marlowe must have these, or else his hold on all the rest of the poems and plays attributed to him is loosened. Now there can be no reasonable doubt as to the "Shakespearean" (to use the current and non-compromising phraseology) authorship of the second and third numbers of this Trilogy; and the authority of the 1623 Folio seems conclusive as to the authorship of them all. This will never do! Accordingly the authority of the Folio must be questioned; as Mr. Ingram says, "The 1623 Folio was evidently hastily and carelessly edited, and must not be too rigidly believed in." Then, down goes another inconvenient authority!—"Whilst the Volume by Francis Meres is so fanciful, so reliant upon humour, and wilfully imaginative, that none of the assertions, unless corroborated by unimpeachable authority, may be accepted"; he is simply a dealer in "fantastic fooleries." And so the whole foundation of Shakespeare evidence is undermined, and we are thrown back upon our own,—or rather Mr. Ingram's—internal consciousness. Here is chaos, confusion, utter bewilderment and desolation! It seems to me that the only rescue from this critical rioting and destructiveness,—this raging literary phrenesis,—is a frank admission that the question must be approached in a different way, and that, among other

devices, we must appeal to Francis Bacon to shed his light on these dark places, and lift the floundering critics out of their quandary.

For aught that we are concerned Mr. Ingram is welcome to all that he proves, or wishes to prove about Marlowe in his private and personal character. I do not think he is quite successful in rebutting the charges of Atheism and heresy brought against him. The traditions are somewhat plentiful and unanimous. It is, however, somewhat surprising that he should find some reason for suspecting the documents quoted by Professor Boas and reproduced by him in facsimile, in the fact that the Latin quotations are written in an italicized writing, different from the rest. Here also Mr. Ingram nibbles at co-partnership, which seems to be his hobby. No one who has had even a slight experience in deciphering Elizabethan script can be ignorant of the fact that nearly all Latin quotations are thus written, contrasting strongly with the adjacent calligraphy. Instances of this abound in the Northumberland House MSS. reproduced in collotype by the patient industry of Mr. Burgoyne. It seems unquestionable that in Elizabethan times a double script was current, something like that which remains in German writing now. Men of education could write in the ordinary character as well as the Italian. Shakspeare, if he could write at all, wrote the former only. Bacon wrote in both. Whether Marlowe was a blasphemer and a rake or not is not of any great importance now, and we might, without affecting in one way or another the question of authorship, give him the benefit of Mr. Ingram's doubts. But why should we dismiss all the traditions that point to loose living and blasphemous speech? Mr. Ingram simply settles the question by wholesale incredulity and discrediting of witnesses. One of the most trustworthy witnesses, who must have had reason and evidence for

his representations, is the poet of *Parnassus*. When these dramas were written one or two of the works attributed to Marlowe had been published with his name, and doubtless the poet did not care to dispute their authorship, even if he knew all about it. Accordingly he puts into the mouth of *Judicio* the following *signalement* of Marlowe :—

“ Marlowe was happy in his buskind muse,
Alas ! Unhappy in his life and end.
Pity it is that wit so ill should dwell,
Wit lent from heaven, but vices sent from hell.”

This witness is disbelieved for no good reason that we can discover, as well as Gabriel Harvey, Greene, Meres, Kyd ;—all are similarly dealt with. Dyce was more judicial. He weighed evidence, instead of summarily accepting or neglecting it according as it suited his foregone conclusions. His summary is as follows :—

“ How far the poet's free thinking was really carried, I do not pretend to determine. I certainly feel that probability is outraged in several of the statements of Bame, who appears to have had a quarrel with Marlowe, and who, it must not be forgotten, was afterwards hanged at Tyburn ; and I can readily believe that the Puritans would not stick at misrepresentation in speaking of a man whose writings had so greatly contributed to exalt the stage. But when I see that the author of *The Returne from Parnassus*, whom no one will suspect of fanaticism, has painted Marlowe in the darkest colours, while at the same time he bestows a high encomium on his genius ; and, above all, when I remember that, before either Bame or the Puritans had come forward as his accusers, the dying Greene had borne unequivocal testimony against him to the very same effect,—it is not easy for me to resist the conviction that Marlowe's impiety was more confirmed and daring than Wartom and others have been willing to allow.”

Marlowe seems to have had some kind of acquaintance with some of the distinguished men of his time ;

such as Sir Francis Walsingham and Chapman, if we may rely on the doubtful evidence of publishers' prefaces and dedications, perhaps also Raleigh and Harriott. That he knew William Shakspeare there is no proof,—and if he did he could not gain any valuable assistance from the unlettered playwright. But during his life he was *not* distinguished. It was not an unnatural circumstance for a University man, fairly well educated, and belonging to a respectable Canterbury family, to associate with men of the same class in London or elsewhere. But there is no proof that he was an author, except in name, and on title pages of posthumous date.

R. M. THEOBALD.

EDUCATION AT THE UNIVERSITIES

THE author of the recently published biography of Marlowe does not appear to appreciate that a college education in the XVIth century was not then equivalent to what it is now. The casual reader is left to infer that the Universities were wells of erudition and that matriculation was the hall mark of a gentleman and a scholar. Was this so? It is somewhat surprising to learn that it was the exception rather than the rule for the better classes to give their sons a college education. "It was thought enough," says a contemporary (quoted in Goadby's *England of Shakespeare*), "for a nobleman's son to wind their horn, carry their hawk fair and leave study and learning to mean people"; a statement endorsed by the fact that the great majority of college students were "ragged clerks," labourers' sons and such like. Mullinger, in his "History of Cambridge University," Vol. II., p. 399, states that, "Intermingling with a certain small

minority of scions of noble houses and country squires we find the sons of poor parsons, yeomen, husbandmen, tailors, shoemakers, carpenters, innkeepers, tallow chandlers, bakers, vintners, blacksmiths, curriers, ostlers, labourers, and others, whose humble origin may be inferred from the fact that they are described merely as 'plebeians.'"

This assertion awakes a vague questioning as to whether, what Ben Jonson terms "the green and soggy multitude" must not have been in reality a highly educated and a cultured class. The suggestion will raise a smile. As a matter of fact, instead of being elevated by the bathing which they received at wisdom's font, the rabble, by which the Universities were swamped, seem to have run riot and to have dragged down learning to their own melancholy level. Brawls and disturbances between the authorities and the students were of frequent occurrence.

Mullinger leads one to suppose that it was a traditional custom at the University of Cambridge for students to ignore study.

"It was only when some lecturer of more than ordinary reputation, like Albericus, appeared, that his fame, and perhaps the novelty of the subject, attracted more than one or two listeners. . . . We learn, on authority which can hardly be called in question, that the schools still usually presented the same deserted aspect as in the days when Walter Haddon and Dr. Caius uttered their pathetic remonstrances and laments, that to ignore the ordinary lectures of the professors had become by this time a tradition in the college."*

"At the University of Cambridge," says the miserable Greene, "I light among wags as lewd as myself, with whom I consumed the flower of my youth."

* "History of Cambridge," Vol. II., p. 426.

The average student here and on the continent, seems to have been, not unfairly, characterised by a contemporary professor who describes him as one who "cares nought for wisdom, for acquirements, for the studies which dignify human life, for the Churches' weal or for politics. He is all for buffooneries, idleness, loitering, drinking, lechery, boxing, wounding, killing." * It appears from the State papers of the time that in one year (1570) the students of Trinity College, Cambridge, consumed two thousand two hundred and fifty barrels of beer.† If these thirsty drinkers proved but untoward scholars, it must be conceded that much of the blame rested with their teachers. "Whereas they make one schollar, they marre ten," averred Peacham, who describes one country specimen as whipping his boys on a cold morning "for no other purpose than to get himself a heate." ‡

Giordano Bruno, who visited Oxford in 1582-4, avers that the pedantry of its scholars, their ignorance and arrogance, conjoined with the rudeness of their demeanour, would have tried the patience of a Job.§

Contemporary observers depict the Universities, not as flourishing homes of learning and virtue, but as "abodes of discontent and brawling."

Walter Travers, a fellow of Trinity, describes the colleges as, "the haunts of drones, the abodes of sloth and luxury (lasciviousness), monasteries whose inmates yawn and snore, rather than colleges of students, trees not merely sterile but diffusing a deadly miasma all around." ||

Mr. Andrew Lang informs us that, in the time of Elizabeth, Oxford was "so illiterate that she could not even provide a University preacher!" ¶

* "History of Cambridge," Vol. II., p. 434.

† "The England of Shakespeare," Goadby, p. 73.

‡ Ibid., p. 99. § See Mullinger, Vol. II., p. 284. || Ibid., p. 263.

¶ "Oxford," p. 101.

"The Universities," says Goadby, "did little or nothing to instruct in natural philosophy, either for the want of the men to teach, or the means to pay them."^{*}

Not only in natural philosophy, but in every other branch of knowledge, a state of affairs existed, so difficult for a modern mind to realise, that we shall, as far as possible, give the facts in the words of our authorities.

Towards the close of the sixteenth century the sole exponent of Hebrew, at Cambridge, was a poverty-stricken Jew, who earned a precarious livelihood by giving private instruction, "probably," says Mullinger, "in the rudiments of the language." At Oxford, another poor Jew was similarly licensed to teach rudiments. Circumstances compelled the Cambridge Jew, whose name was Ferdinand, to leave the University. "Among those," observes Mullinger, "who deplored his departure, was William Eyre, a learned fellow of Emanuel, who, writing to Ussher (afterwards the Archbishop) observes that, '*While Ferdinand remained,*' there existed 'a slight hope' that 'by his means, a certain knowledge of the language might be kept alive at the University.'"

"If Hebrew," continues Mullinger, "was yet so much neglected (at least in our own University) we can hardly be surprised to find that the study of Greek was equally on the wane. When John Bois entered at St. James' College in 1580, the knowledge of the language in the former house of Ascham and Cheke had become almost extinct."

By the efforts of one bright particular star, the study was to some extent revived, "but for the last forty years of the century, it had but few cultivators." After citing four examples of conspicuous scholars, Mullinger observes, "If to these instances we add the

^{*} "England of Shakespeare," p. 103.

well-known attainments of Aylmer and perhaps one or two others, we shall have before us the chief names which serve to prove that a knowledge of Greek at Cambridge, at the period of which we are treating, was not wholly extinct. 'One's industry,' wrote Casaubon to Camerarius in 1594, 'is sadly damped by the reflection how Greek is now neglected and despised. Looking to posterity or the next generation, what motive has one for devotion to study?'"*

In view of these facts we can only accept with considerable reserve the statement quoted by Mr. Ingram, that, "In their conversation with each other, except during the hours of relaxation, the students were required to use either Latin, or Greek, or Hebrew" (p. 69).

As a proof of Marlowe's perseverance and ability we are told that he obtained his B.A. degree in 1584, and in 1587 the higher distinction of M.A., "which could not have been acquired even in those days without much hard study" (p. 90).

This does not accord with the evidence of Strype that, "The University giveth degrees and honours to the unlearned, and the Church is filled with ignorant ministers, being for the most part poor scholars"†; nor with Mullinger's statement that the requirements for the attainment of M.A. had become limited to the keeping of one or two acts and the composition of a single declamation" (Vol. II., p. 414).

At the age of fifteen, Francis Bacon entreated to be removed from Cambridge, as he had acquired everything the University had to teach!

All testimony tends to shew that in the age of Shakespeare the Universities, so far from being depositories of all science and all learning, had fallen to

* "History of Cambridge," Vol. II., p. 420.

† Quoted in Mullinger, Vol. II., p. 284.

be mere elementary and badly conducted schools, wanting, as Peter Martyr said, in loyalty, in faith, in teachers, and even in any hope for learning.

The easiest means to attain distinction were theology and disputation. These two subjects, conceived in a narrow and intolerant spirit, absorbed the best brain power of the country. Mullinger states that the Universities "came to be regarded as little more than seminaries for the education of the Clergy of the Established Church."

To how deep a degradation this priesthood had fallen was discussed in a previous number of *Baconiana* (No. 6, p. 77).

The future career of the rabble, who mainly constituted the student class, is ominously foreshadowed by the fact that the Poor Law of 1572, aiming at the suppression of the beggars and vagrants who swarmed over the face of the country, included in the term vagabond, "scholars of the Universities begging without license from the University authorities."* This in all probability, is the reason why Travers characterised the Colleges as trees not merely sterile but diffusing deadly miasma around. They seem to have been a germinating ground for the spirit of disputation which fruited in the religious evils of the time and is manifest to-day in the variety of sects by which Christendom is divided.

It is mentioned by Defoe that in his lifetime, thirty thousand stout fellows were ready and anxious to lay down their lives for "No Popery," not knowing for a certainty whether Popery was a man or a horse. If we imagine in an earlier and more ignorant period the effect of a fractionally educated rabble equipped with a beggar's license and dispersed over the length and breadth of the land, to shout their shibboleths at

* "Social England," Trail, Vol. III., p. 756.

“Propheesyings” and such like disorderly gatherings, it will go far to explain the ferocities of witch-finding and the excesses which fouled the name of religion. This inference is confirmed by a passage put into the mouth of *George Pyeboard* in the *psuedo-Shakespearean* play *The Puritan*, Act 1, Scene 2 (1607). George Pyeboard is unquestionably George Peele, a baker's pieboard still being sometimes called a peel (*paelle* Fr. *instrument de pâtissier*).

“The multiplicity of scholars, hatch'd and nourish'd in the idle calms of peace, makes them, like fishes, one devour another; and the community of learning has so played upon affections, that thereby almost religion is come about to phantasy and discredited by being too much spoken of, in so many and mean mouths. I myself, being a scholar and a graduate, have no other comfort by my learning but the affectation of my words, to know how, scholar-like, to name what I want; and can call myself a beggar both in Greek and Latin. And therefore not to cog with peace, I'll not be afraid to say, 'tis a great breeder, but a barren nourisher; a great getter of children, which must either be thieves or rich men, knaves or beggars.”

Gloomy evidence to a similar effect is furnished on this subject by the anonymous comedy *The Return from Parnassus*. As Professor Arber observes:—

“This Satirical Drama seems to have been composed by the wits and scholars of Cambridge, where it was acted at the opening of the last century. The design of it was, to expose the vices and follies of the rich in those days, and to show that little attention was paid by that class of men to the learned and ingenious.

“Several Students, of various capacities and dispositions, leave the University in hopes of advancing their fortunes in the metropolis. One of them attempts to recommend himself by his publications; another, to

procure a benefice by paying his court to a young spark, named Amoretto, with whom he had been intimate at College; two others endeavour to gain a subsistence by successively appearing as physicians, actors, and musicians: but the Man of Genius is disregarded, and at last prosecuted for his productions; the benefice is sold to an illiterate Clown; and in the end, three of the scholars are compelled to submit to a voluntary exile, another returns to Cambridge as poor as when he left it; and the other two, finding that neither their medicines nor their music would support them, resolve to turn shepherds, and to spend the rest of their days on the Kentish Downs."

In Act IV., Scene 5, the players Burbage and Kemp are introduced, and make overtures to the students to throw in their lot with the players.

"Is it not better," says Kemp, "to make a foole of the world as I have done, than to be fooled of the world, as you schollers are? But be merry, my lads, you have happened upon the most excellent vocation in the world for money: they come North and South to bring it to our playhouse, and for honours, who of more report, then *Dick Burbage* and *Will. Kempe*, he is not counted a Gentleman, that knowes not *Dick Burbage* and *Wil Kempe*, there's not a country wench than can dance Sellingers Round but can talke of *Dick Burbage* and *Will Kempe*."

The students contemptuously repudiate the proposition :—

"And must the basest trade yeeld us reliefe?
Must we be practis'd to those leaden spouts,
That nought downe vent but what they do receive?"

Yet, eventually, two of them by stress of necessity become wandering fiddlers. They solilique as follows:

" Better it is mongst filders to be chiefe,
 Then at plaiers trencher beg reliefe.
 But ist not strange this mimick apes should prize
 Unhappy Schollers at a hireling rate.
 Vile world, that lifts them up to hye degree,
 And treades us downe in groveling misery.
 England affordes those glorious vagabonds,
 'That carried earst their fardels on their backes,
 Coursers to ride on through the gazing streetes,
 Sooping it in their glaring Salten sutes,
 And Pages to attend their maisterships :
 With mouthing words that better wits have framed."

Whether Marlowe ultimately became a "leaden spout" or one of the better wits who framed words for the stagers' "mouthing" is elsewhere discussed.

"SHAKESPEARE'S BOOKS." *

THIS book somewhat narrowly escapes meeting a distinct want, inasmuch as the subject whereof it treats has as yet received neither the amount of, nor sort of attention which its importance deserves. It affords evidence of much reading and research, and is almost completely free from those truculent amenities of language which so disfigure, not to say disgrace, the writings of too many of the "Shakespearean" school. The work is prefaced by a table of contents and a Synopsis very useful to the general reader, and is furnished as well with a good index.

The subject matter of Mr. Anders' book has already been partly covered by the pretentious work of Paul Stapfer in 1880, whose title, *Shakespeare and "Classical*

* "A Dissertation on Shakespeare's Reading and the Immediate Sources of His Works," by H. R. D. Anders, B.A. (Univ. of the Cape of Good Hope, Ph.D. Berlin Univ.). Berlin, Publisher and printer, George Reimer, 1904, 10/-

Antiquity," is so miserably supported by its contents. That work is divided into 25 chapters, the fourth chapter of which alone deals in reality with Shakespeare's classical acquirements, to the extent of 34 pages out of a total of 483. Nothing of this sort can be laid to the charge of Mr. Anders, who is, moreover, a little more generous than Paul Stapfer, who would deny "Shakespeare" any knowledge of Greek, or Latin either, save perhaps Lily's Grammar and a few school books. Mr. Anders confines Shakespeare's knowledge of Greek to the following authors: Plutarch (as translated by North); Homer (perhaps through Chapman or Arthur Hall); Josephus (directly or indirectly); Heliodorus (translation by Thomas Underdowne, of the "Aethiopica"); and Marianus, who would appear to have been the source of the last two sonnets (pp. 40—44), and who was Latined in 1529.

As regards Latin, our author clearly feels himself on firmer ground, as after enumerating Lily's Grammar, Æsop's Fables, Mantuanus, Cæsar, and Cicero, he adds, "It is my purpose to show that Ovid, a favourite with Shakespeare, was known to him both in the original and in the English translation" (p. 21).

Mr. Anders might with perfect safety have expressed himself more strongly with respect to "Shakespeare's" acquaintance with the works of Ovid, as the plays contain not only numerous references (over 70) covering the whole fifteen books of the *Metamorphoses*, but another 24 references at least, derived from the *Tristia*, *Heroides*, *Amores*, *Epistolæ*, *Fasti*, *Ars Amatoria*, and the *Ibis*. Mr. Anders then goes on and adds Horace, Plautus, Seneca, Livy, Lucan and Juvenal to the list of authors with whom "Shakespeare" was acquainted. But Mr. Anders' summing up of the question on page 39 cannot pass without remark. "I have made no attempt at drawing a hard and fast line

between school-classics and Roman authors whom 'Shakespeare' may have perused in later life."

Here is *contraband* matter attempting to run the blockade of the "Historic Muse" and no mistake! What means this allusion to the literary studies of "Shakespeare's" "later life"? After his retirement to the fragrant vicinity of the kitchen-middens of his native village, there is not the slightest historical evidence that "Shakespeare" ever handled a book unless it was one of Accounts or a Ledger. There is no evidence whatever that Shakespeare in "later life" ever opened a book for improvement or pleasure. Considering, then, the deep erudition of the author of the plays (embracing as we now know some one hundred and thirty Greek and Latin authors), this account of "Shakespeare's" reading cannot be considered satisfactory; indeed, it must be condemned as careless and superficial. Take Juvenal, for instance, who has allotted to him five lines on page 38, and a single parallel quoted from Warburton; Sat. X. 188. Now Juvenal happens to be a favourite author with "Shakespeare," as the twenty-six parallelisms here given from sixteen plays sufficiently prove, the Satire and verse in each case being here quoted.*

For this very imperfect account of the classical element in the plays, Mr. Anders has made some amends by the elaborate investigation he has carried out in the remainder of the field of Shakespeare biblio-

* *Merchant of Venice*, III., 73; XV., 65. *Hamlet*, III., 100; IX., 67. *The Winter's Tale*, X., 340. *As You Like It*, X., 325 and 331; VI., 278. *Troilus and Cressida*, XV., 163; XV., 134. *Coriolanus*, XIII., 180; VIII., 272. *Antony and Cleopatra*, VIII., 171; X., 349 and 365. *Richard II.*, IX., 67. *Much Ado About Nothing*, XV., 131. *Measure for Measure*, V., 131; VI., 23. *Timon of Athens*, X., 85. *Merry Wives*, XI. 21; XIV., 47. *All's Well*, X., 41.

graphy, which merits all praise. There yet remains a charge of a different description which cannot be passed over unnoticed, which is, the unwarrantable manner Mr. Anders permits himself to speak of one, who in qualities of heart, no less than mind, was far superior to most men of either his own or any succeeding generation.

On page 291, after asserting that Shakespeare was "the child of his age and as such held crude notions," he continues, "Nor was Bacon in advance of his time. *He preached experimentation but he did not practise it.*" What is to be said of so wild, so untrue, so gratuitous a slander as this? Of course Bacon had other things to do, as Mr. Anders knows, than to be *always* engaged in "experimentation," but the above words can only be palliated on the score of complete ignorance of the man he presumes to write about and attempts to belittle. The writer of such a description of Bacon, can hardly be credited with having ever read the "*Sylva Sylvarum*," or Bacon's "Physiological Remains," wherein are recorded his many careful experiments on the specific gravity of various bodies and the chemical reactions resulting from the mixture of various substances. It is, moreover, a charge flagrantly inapplicable to the man who sacrificed his life (as the event proved) to his devotion in the cause of that experimentation which he is sneeringly charged with never practising! All this is very indefensible, though not altogether novel, to the literature written by the adherents of the orthodox view, with whom nothing is too absurd, too contradictory, too petty to advance for the purpose of discrediting Baconians or their theory.

To return now to a brief consideration of the contents of Mr. Anders' book, which want of space precludes doing justice to:—Chapter I., "Shakespeare and the Classics." This, as may be gathered from previous

remarks, is perhaps the least satisfactory part of the book, partly from the author not being able to claim any wide acquaintance with classical authors. At p. 28, Mr. Anders betrays his "small Latin" by his confusing the sense of the words "vivax" (long lived), and "vividus," where he translates Ovid's words "vivacis que jecur cervi" by "liver of a live stag," and uses the words "entrails of *the* wolf" for Ovid's periphrase for the "were-wolf," which amounts to mutilating Ovid, not translating him.

" Inque virum soliti vultus mutare ferinos
ambigui prosecta lupi." Met. VII., 270.

"And parts, severed from that non-descript wolf, which is wont to change its bestial features for those of a man." That is a "wer-wolf," "man-wolf," or "loup-garou," not entrails of "the" ordinary wolf.

Chapter II.—"Modern Continental Literature." This chapter deals with the acquirements of Shakespeare in French, Italian and Spanish! With regard to French the author confesses his joy at being able to conclude that "Shakespeare" was acquainted with the language, mainly it would seem from the expressed opinion of Professor Dr. Tobler, of Berlin.

With respect to Italian, Mr. Anders, in words indicating a certain amount of incertitude, says (p. 59), "We are neither in position to assert positively, nor able to deny with certainty, that Shakespeare was master of the Italian language." This is very lame; the obvious evidence that the author knew Italian is that plots were drawn from Italian novels not translated.

In an amusing note on page 54, "What can you expect of a man, though a Kreisgerichtsrat (as Stedfeld was), who cannot spell the poet's name?" the author seems to forget that Mr. Sidney Lee, that dazzling cynosure of Shakespearean Literature, has committed

a far worse offence, where in his "Life," he spells the name of the poet in a way not adopted by any of the poet's family.

Chapter III.—"The English non-dramatic Polite Literature." This chapter is full of interesting matter. Touching the Sonnets, Mr. Anders wisely declines to hazard any opinion of his own, but quotes somewhat copiously at p. 102 the conclusion arrived at by Mr. Sidney Lee, whose views are too well known to readers of BACONIANA, and too justly estimated by them at their proper value, to merit reproduction.

At page 108 we are told, "Of Francis Bacon I have not been able to discover any traces in Shakespeare's works." That Mr. Anders should not have been able to discover "*any traces*" in Shakespeare of Bacon, is one of the most remarkable confessions in his book, and it is certainly a pity that he had not read Mr. R. M. Theobald's "Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light," where he might have found them as "thick as blackberries;" or Mr. Edwin Reed's "Bacon and Shakespeare," in which 885 parallelisms are recorded. The name of Bacon, in fact, appears to have been introduced on p. 108, for the sole reason of serving as a peg on which to hang an eulogium of Mr. Sidney Lee. There is a note on this page, "From the Baconians we learn how *not* to reason. This is some good, though a negative one." This is a curious admission of a weak point with Shakespeareans, the skill they display in dispensing with *the use of argument*, however erroneous the suggestion of the source whence the useful trick was (we are told) acquired. There are, however, in fairness it must be admitted, few if any similar attempts at this sort of wit, throughout the volume.

Chapter IV. deals with the "English Drama," and contains the author's opinions of the plays of Marlowe, which are of the inevitable sort, from his monocular

type of vision. The very first words almost, on p. 120, that Marlowe was one "with whom Shakespeare came into *immediate contact* and from whom he received influences the most profound and enduring," is absolutely devoid of any historic foundation. "Immediate contact" can here only mean personal intercourse. Of course there is not the slightest proof of anything of the sort. The links between the works of Marlowe and the plays written by "Shakespeare" are innumerable, but for this, Baconians have a very simple explanation, other than a purely hypothetical one, of personal intercourse. Why does not our author inform his readers that no play of Marlowe was published under his name during his lifetime? Why does he not inform us that *immediately* on his violent death (involving intestacy), the plays of Marlowe began to appear with his name, and that the "Jew of Malta" was not published till forty years after that event? Surely the eagle-eyed race of Shakespearean critics should have some explanation for so strange a fact! At page 126 the play of *Doctor Faustus* is unblushingly introduced without a single word respecting the proof it contains, which renders its accepted authorship impossible. Or are we to consider a note on p. 126 a sufficient allusion to the existence of such proof? "The plays have come down to us in a corrupt state." Let us here examine the sort of "corruption" which this play exhibits.

Act III., Scene 1. Bruno is led in chains.

Marlowe died in 1593, but it was not till 1598 that Bruno was arrested in Venice, and ultimately burned alive in 1600. If the note on page 127 really alludes to these difficulties, it is absurd to call them corruptions of the text. The curious mystery, however, connected with this and other plays of Marlowe is always left severely alone, and all discussion of the question eschewed by Editors and Critics for no other reason

that I can suggest, except the convincing proofs thereby afforded of the Baconian authorship of the works of "Marlowe," and the fact that Marlowe was Bacon's first "mask." One other specimen I will add of the sort of difficulty which Mr. Anders flatters himself he has got rid of by curtly slurring it over as "corrupt." "The first edition of this play appeared in 1604, eleven years after the death of its reputed author! This edition contains twenty-eight characters, besides Devils, Spirits, Friars, Attendants, and Chorus. A subsequent edition in 1616 contains no less than thirty-seven characters, besides Cardinals, Bishops, Monks, Friars, Soldiers, Servants and Chorus, and these alterations and additions were made, be it remembered, twenty-three years after the reputed author's death! The characters in the 1604 edition changed or omitted in that of 1616 are, *the Cardinal of Lorraine*, omitted; *Robin the ostler*, changed to *Robin the clown*; *the Knight*, changed to *Benvolio*. The new characters introduced into the 1616 edition are, *Raymond, King of Hungary*; *the Duke of Saxony*; *Bruno*; *Carter*; *Hostess*; and three soldiers, or eight characters in all, and the play is enlarged from eighteen and a half pages to twenty-six (of modern printing), and all this twenty-three years after the author's death. This is the sort of difficulty which Mr. Anders imagines he can evade by babbling about a corrupt text.

But to proceed. Chapter V. deals with "Popular Literature, embracing Romances, Ballads, Popular Tales, Tunes, and the like. In this chapter there is a good deal of interesting matter, and we suspect it was a favourite with its author; but it is strange that he should have felt any doubt in the case he quotes in p. 158." What Arthur the Hostesse, in *Henry V.*, Act II., 3, 10, "He's in Arthur's bosom," is thinking of, it would be unsafe to say." Any school-boy would

have said, could have answered the question, as it is answered, strangely enough in a note at the bottom of the page. At page 192 Mr. Anders says Mr. Furnival printed a coarse poem, for private circulation "in order to avoid possible annoyance from any cantankerous puritan." It is not, however, to be supposed that in these days Mr. Furnival is in dread of any puritans, however "cantankerous." Chapter VI. deals with the "Bible and Prayer-book;" and Chapter VII. with "Shakespeare's Earth and Heaven," neither of which call for particular comment. In conclusion, I can recommend "Shakespeare's Books" to the reader, who is already possessed of some knowledge of the Bacon-Shakespeare question. The book is packed with information, though opinionative and one-sided to a degree. The faults which it displays should not, however, be permitted to deprive it of the praise it has in other respects rightly earned.

W. THEOBALD.

MEDICINE AND THE DRAMA

"THE earlier dramatists," says the historian J. R. Green, "were for the most part poor and reckless in their poverty; wild livers, defiant of law or common fame, in revolt against the usages and religion of their day, 'atheists' in general repute, 'holding Moses for a juggler, haunting the brothel and the alehouse and dying starved or in tavern brawls.'"

It is clear from internal evidence that these phenomenal men must have wandered systematically from the alehouses to the Hall of the Barber-surgeons, where alone could they have acquired the medical knowledge which they possessed.

Shirley, Ford, and Beaumont and Fletcher jest

negligently about the *pericranium*; Spenser, Shakespeare, and Porter allude to the *brainpan*; Shakespeare, Beaumont and Fletcher to the *pia mater*; Massinger to the *cerebrum* and the *cutis*. Middleton writes familiarly of *chilis*, *spinal medul*, *emunctories* and *ginglymus*. He makes one of his characters observe, "I find his body *cacochymic*."

"How shall I do to satisfy *colon*?" asks Massinger in *The Unnatural Combat* (I. 1). "What trick have you to satisfy *colon*?" enquires Heywood in *Maid of the West* (II. 4). Middleton in *The Chaste Maid of Cheapside* (II. 2) considers that "the *colon* of a gentleman should be fulfilled with answerable food," and Webster in *Sir Thomas Wyatt* exclaims, "O *colon* cries out most tyrannically, the little gut hath no mercy."

That the contemned dramatists should have been adepts in physiology is little less marvellous than that four of them should simultaneously have seized upon the *colon*—an obscure portion of the intestines—as a jape within the reach of the egregious crowd. According to Dr. Murray, until Massinger revived it in 1622, the word had not been used in England since 1541. Its meaning would not improbably perplex nine-tenths of an educated audience at the present day.

Whatsoever may have been their method of acquirement, it is certain that the dramatists display an acquaintance with medicine so unusual, so extensive that it must have been level with, if not in advance of, the highest knowledge of their time.

The science of Therapeutics was very much on a par with Learning and Religion. Even the elements of true Medicine cannot be said to have been in existence until 1628, the date of the publication of Harvey's epoch-making discovery of the circulation of the blood. So benighted was the general state of the profession that a bald statement of the facts almost lays one open to the suspicion of exaggeration.

By Parliamentary License the Company of the Barber-surgeons possessed the sole right of teaching physiology, with the privilege of dissecting human bodies—limited to those of four criminals annually. This monopoly was so rigorously enforced that as late as 1714 a surgeon who had ventured to practise dissection on his own account was prosecuted and compelled to desist.

It was the *métier* of the Barber-surgeons, ranked by Bacon with "butchers and such base mechanical persons," to *let blood*; a function they fulfilled with such whole hearted sincerity that it brought down upon them a Parliamentary Injunction to prevent the pollution of the roadways.

A grade higher than the Barber-surgeon stood the Apothecary. His needy shop garnished with empty boxes is described in *Romeo and Juliet*. The proprietor is represented as a starveling in tattered weeds and overwhelming brows.

Around these two main classes stretched a chaotic wilderness of chirurgeons, alchemists, herbalists, charlatans, redeemed at rare intervals by an isolated genius like Harvey. Men of science were, oftener than not, alchemists; apothecaries were extensive dealers in charms and philtres; poisoning was better understood than healing.

The Chronicler of Abbot Jocelin de Brakelond observes naively that, "The physicians came about him and sorely tormented him, but they healed him not." If they prescribed anything at all similar to the palliatives of their Elizabethan descendants, life to de Brakelond cannot have been a boon. Dr. Hall, M.A., the son-in-law of William Shakespeare, in his book *Select Observations on English Bodies, or Cures both Empericall and Historicall performed upon very eminent persons in desperate Diseases*, prescribes powdered human

skull and human fat ; tonics of earth worms and snails, solution of goose excrements, frog spawn water, and swallows' nests.

Among other recognised remedies in vogue were, pills made from the skull of a man that had been hanged ; the powder of a mummy ; " oil of scorpions ; " " blood of dragons," and the various entrails of wild animals. Dr. Andrew Boorde—from whom it is said we derive the term " Merry Andrew "—recommended his patients to wipe their faces daily with a scarlet cloth, and to wash them not oftener than once a week. It was supposed that tumours were curable by being stroked with a dead man's hand. For the ague, chips from a hangman's tree were esteemed an excellent specific. Children were treated for rickets by being passed head downwards through a cloven tree, recovering as the tree healed. There is an allusion to this practice in White's " Natural History of Selborne."

" In a farm-yard near the middle of this village stands, at this day (1776) a row of pollard ashes, which, by the seams and long cicatrices down their sides, manifestly show that in former times they have been cleft asunder. These trees, when young and flexible, were severed and held open by wedges, while ruptured children stripped naked were pushed through the apertures, under a persuasion that by such a process the poor babes would be cured of their infirmity. As soon as the operation was over, the tree in the suffering part was plastered with loam, and carefully swathed up. If the parts coalesced and soldered together, as usually fell out where the feat was performed with any adroitness at all, the party was cured ; but where the cleft continued to gape, the operation, it was supposed, would prove ineffectual."

It would be erroneous to suppose that these puerilities were countenanced merely by the lower class physicians. If anything, the specialists of the period display an ignorance more marvellous than the rank and file. Sir Theodore Mayern, born in 1573 and regarded as the greatest doctor of his day, numbering among his

patients Henry IV. and Louis XIII. of France, and James I., Charles I., and Charles II. of England, relied upon pulverised human bones and "raspings of a human skull unburied." His balsam of bats (recommended for hypochondriacal persons) included among its ingredients, adders, bats, sucking whelps, earth-worms, hogs' grease, the marrow of a stag, and the thighbone of an ox. For a child suffering from nervousness, the prescription of Dr. William Bulleyn, a famous physician akin to the Queen, was, "a smal yonge mouse, rosted." Even as late as the reign of King William and Mary we read of "crabs eyes," and "the juice of thirty hogsllice at six o'clock at night" being administered by the *élite* of the profession to the royal patient. Next day, however, King William "looked very well and was cheerful!"

Rational medicine may be said to have been born about a century and a-half ago; abroad the condition of the profession was probably inferior to that in London. For many years prior to 1684, the French Academy mustered only one solitary anatomist. In Spain the circulation of the blood was denied for a hundred and fifty years after Harvey's discovery! It is unnecessary to quote passages, but the dramatists were up to date in their knowledge of the to-and-fro-to-the-heart movement of the blood through veins and arteries.

In addition to their knowledge of Physiology and Anatomy, the "catterpillars of the Commonwealth" exhibit a wide acquaintance with the properties of drugs. In contrast to remedies then current, they display the modern spirit of Homeopathy. Note, for example, their ideas upon aconite, or as Shakespeare, Webster, Middleton, and the unknown author of *Lochrine* professionally term it *aconitum*. Webster in *Appius and Virginia* says:—

"Observe this rule, *one ill must cure another*
As aconitum a strong poison brings
A present cure against all serpents stings.

So also, Ben Jonson in *Sejanus* (iii. 3).

"I have heard that aconite
Being timely taken hath a healing might
Against the scorpions stroke : the proof we'll give
That whilst two poisons wrestle, we may live."

With academic, almost pedantic accuracy they describe hair and whiskers as excrements, employing the term in its strictly classical meaning, "*outgrowth*."

"O heavens, she comes accompanied with a child
Whose chin bears no impression of manhood
Not a hair, not an excrement."—Kyd (*Soliman* i. 3), 1599.

"The barber's snip snap of dexterity hath moved off the
excrements of slovenry."—Ford (*Fancies* v. 2).

"Hair and nails . . . are excrements."
—Bacon (*Sylva Sylvarum*), 1627.

"Hair . . . is so plentiful an excrement."
—Shakespeare (*Comedy of Errors* ii. 2), 1623.

"Thus dally with my excrement, with my mustachio."
—Shakespeare (*Love's Labour Lost* v. 1), 1598.

The dramatic use of the word "pleurisy," or as it is generally spelt in modern editions, "plurisy," is peculiar, in every case it being misused apparently for "plethora." Its first employment is credited to Shakespeare, Professor Skeat considering it as "evidently formed as if from Latin *pluri*, crude form of *plus*; more by an extraordinary confusion with pleurisy."* I am, however, inclined to think that the word has crept into our language by a mistake. Tourneur in 1611 distinctly writes *pleurisie*. Greene in 1599 also obviously uses the word with a medical meaning.

* "Etymological Dictionary."

"Wounds must be cured when they be fresh and green,
And pleurisies when they begin to breed
With little care are driven away with speed."

—Greene (*Alphonsus*), 1599.

"Goodness, growing to a pleurisy ; (?)^o dies."

—Shakespeare (*Hamlet* iv. 7), 1603.

"Those too many excellencies that feed
Your pride, turn to a plurisy and kill
That which should nourish virtue."

—Beaumont and Fletcher (*Custom of Country* ii. 2), 1628—1647.

"Thy plurisie of goodness is thy ill
Thy virtues, vices, and thy humble lowness
Far worse than stubborn sullenness and pride."

—Massinger (*Unnatural Combat* iv. 1), 1639.

"Increased to such a pleurisie of lust."

—Tourneur (*Atheists Tragedy* iii. 1), 1611.

"The pluresie of people."—Anon (*Two Noble Kinsmen* v. 1), 1634.

In their ideas upon the cause and maintenance of life, the dramatists are on the same plane as Bacon, who, as he himself said, had been "puddering in physic" all his life, and was able, according to his contemporaries, to "outcant a London chirurgeon."

A witty example of the dramatic powers of outcantiing is to be found in "The Fair Quarrel" of Thomas Middleton, a writer described by Ben Jonson as "a base fellow."

Act IV., Scene 2.—A chamber in the Colonel's house. The Colonel discovered lying on a couch, several of his friends watching him ; as the Surgeon is going out, the Colonel's Sister enters.

^o How Shakespeare spells it in the quartos of *Hamlet* I have not had the opportunity of ascertaining. The passage was omitted in the folio, and only occurred in the quartos. *Plurisie* was sometimes the mode of spelling the disease ; see *The Garden of Health*.—Langham, 1633.

Col.'s Sist.—"O my most worthy brother, thy hard fate 'twas—
Come hither, honest surgeon, and deal faithfully
With a distressed virgin : what hope is there ?"

Surg.—"Hope? *Chilis*^o was 'scaped miraculously, lady."

Col.'s Sist.—"What's that, sir ?"

Surg.—"Cava vena : I care but little for his wound i' the
oesophag, not thus much, trust me ; but when they
come to diaphragma once, the small intestines,
or the spinal medul, or i' the roots of the
emunctories of the noble parts, then straight I
fear a syncope."

Col.'s Sist.—"Alas, I'm ne'er the better for this answer !"

Surg.—"Now I must tell you his principal dolour lies i'
the region of the liver, and there's both inflam-
mation and tumefaction feared; marry, I made him
a quadrangular plumation, where I used sanguis
draconis, by my faith, with powders incarnative,
which I tempered with oil of hypericon, and
other liquors mundificative."

Col.'s Sist.—"Pox a' your mundies figitives ! I would they were
all fired !"

Surg.—"But I purpose, lady, to make another experiment
at next dressing with a sarcotic medicament made
of iris of Florence ; thus, mastic, calaphena,
opoponax, sacrocolla."†

Col.'s Sist.—"Sacro-haltar ! what comfort is i' this to a poor
gentlewoman ? Pray tell me in plain terms what
you think of him.

Surg.—"Marry, in plain terms I know not what to say to
him ; the wound, I can assure you, inclines to
paralim, and I find his body cacochymic : being
then in fear of fever and inflammation, I nourish
him altogether with viands refrigerative, and
give for potion the juice of savicola dissolved
with water cerifolium : I could do no more, lady,
if his best ginglymus‡ were dissevered." [Exit.

• *i.e.*, the *vena cava*, the largest vein in the body.

† A Persian gum. ‡ Joint.

A subject which seems rarely to have been absent from the dramatic mind is the peculiarly unpleasant one of ulcers and imposthumations; the poets never tire of harping on this repulsive and essentially prosaic theme. They dwell upon detail with the unktion of medical students, but never in any instance is stroking with a dead man's hand recommended.

"That same former fatal wound of his
 . . . was not thoroughly healed
 But closely rankled under th' orifice.

* * * * *

But yet the cause and root of all his ill
 Inward corruption and infected sin
 Nor purged, nor healed, behind remained still
 And festering sore did rankle yet within.

* * * * *

. . . all mine entrails flow with pois'nous gore
 And th' ulcer groweth daily more and more."

—Spenser (*Fairy Queen* iv. 2, i. x., and iii. 2), 1590.

"Let me see the wound.

This herb will stay the current, being bound
 Fast to the orifice, and this, restrain
 Ulcers and swellings and such inward pain
 As the cold air hath forced into the sore.
 This, to draw forth such putrefying gore
 As inward falls."

—Fletcher (*Faithful Shepherdess* iv. 2), 1610.

["He that turneth the humours back and maketh the wound bleed inwards endangereth malign ulcers and pernicious imposthumations."—Bacon (*Essay: Sedition*), 1627.]

The medical aspect of this subject seems to have engrossed the mind of Francis Bacon to such an unhealthy extent that we find him writing to the king and attributing an attack of headache to "an imposthumation."

"It hath pleased God for these three days past to visit me with such extremity of headache . . . that I thought verily it had

been an imposthumentation. And the little physick that I have told me, that either it must grow to a congelation and so to a lethargy or break and so to a mortal fever or sudden death."—Bacon (*Letter to King James*), 1621.

Not only do we find Bacon and the dramatists enlarging upon the medical aspect, but the subject seems to have possessed such fascination that we find them persistently employing it as a metaphor.

"'Madam,' said I, 'how wisely and aptly can you speak and discern of physick ministered to the body and consider not that there is the like occasion of physick ministered to the mind . . . You have drawn the humour sufficiently, and therefore it were more than time, and it were but for doubt of mortifying or exulcerating, that you did apply and minister strength and comfort unto him.'"—Bacon (*Apology concerning Essex*), 1603.

"What a damned imposthume is a woman's will. Can nothing break it?"—Webster (*White Devil* iv. 1), 1612.

"He would prove a rare firking satyrist
And draw the core forth of imposthumented sin."

—Marston (*Antonio and Mellida* iii. 3), 1602.

"Well, well, seeing the wound that *bleedeth inwardly* is most dangerous, that fyre kept close burneth most furious, that ye oven dammed up, baketh soonest, that *sores having no vent fester secretly*, it is hyghe tyme to unfolde my secret love to my secret friend."—Lyly (*Euphues*), Arber, 63, 1578—1580.

In his English Grammar we find Ben Jonson quoting from Sir John Cheke:—

"Sedition is an aposteam, which, when it breaketh inwardly, putteth the State in great danger of recovery; and corrupteth the whole Commonwealth with the rotten fury, that it hath putrified with."

With minds evidently predisposed, Bacon and the dramatists seized eagerly upon this State metaphor.

"Take away liberty of Parliament, the griefs of the subject will bleed inwards; sharp and eager humours will not evaporate,

and then they must exulcerate, and so may endanger the sovereignty itself."—Bacon (*Speech*), 1610.

"The people are up ! . . .
What's the imposthume that swells them now ?
Ulcers of realms !"

Middleton (*Mayor of Queenboro'* ii. 3), 1661.

"My lord, my lord, you wrong not yourself only but your whole State to suffer such ulcers as these to gather head in your Court."—Chapman (*Monsieur d'Olive* v. 1), 1606.

"The ulcers of an honest State, spite weavers
That live on poison only like swoln spiders."
Beaumont and Fletcher (*Wild Goose Chase* iii. 1), 1621.

"Have we maladies, and such imposthumes as Phantaste is, grow in our palace? We must lance these sores, or all will putrefy."—Ben Jonson (*Cynthia's Revels* v. 3), 1600.

"Thou insolent imposthume !"

—Beaumont and Fletcher (*Island Princess* i. 3), 1621—1647.

"We are here to search the wounds of the realm and not to skin them over."—Bacon (*Speech on Subsidy*), 1593.

"Noble gentleman? A tumour, an imposthume he is, Madam."
—Chapman (*Widow's Tears* i. 2), 1612.

"I have thought a cure for this great State imposthume. What? To lance it."—Shirley (*Traitor* ii. 1), 1635.

Raking over antiquity, Lyly, in *Euphues*, finds and revives an imposthume anecdote.

"For as he that stroke Jason on the stomacke to kill him, brake his imposthume with ye blow, wherby he cured him: so oftentimes it fareth with those that deale maliciously, who in steed of a sword apply a salve, and thinking to be one's Priest, they become his Phisition."—Lyly (*Euphues*), Arber, p. 330, 1578—1580.

In Bacon's *Promus* MS. we find him jotting down a note of this—

"The launching (lancing) of ye imposthume by him that intended murder."—Bacon (*Promus*), 1594.

In 1623 the story re-appears in a dramatic form.

"He is speechless, Sir, and we do find his wound
 So festered near the vitals all our art
 By warm drinks cannot clear th' imposthumation,
 And he's so weak to make incision
 By the orifex were present death to him.
 . . . (*He is stabbed by an assassin*).

* * * * *

Ha! Come hither, note a strange accident.
 His steel has lighted in the former wound
 And made free passage for the congeal'd blood.
 Observe in what abundance it delivers
 The putrefaction."

—Webster (*Devil's Law Case* iii. 2), 1623.

I have, I think, quoted sufficient examples of this theme. Was it a thought so deep, a conceit so alluring, that it was thus tossed from poet to poet and transferred successively from one great mind to another? Were the dramatists satisfied and content thus to play the sedulous ape to each other? A similar question must be frequently asked in connection with other subjects equally *outrés*.

In passing, it is noteworthy that, when roused to choler, the dramatists seem usually to have had *diseases* uppermost in their minds. "The *red plague* rid you," says Caliban; Prospero retorts, "I'll rack thee with old *cramps*; fill all thy bones with *aches*." As a matter of fact, the poets seem to have had almost the whole gamut of human afflictions on their tongue-tips. See, for instance, Ford's *Broken Heart* (ii. 3, 1633), "*Aches, Convulsions, Imposthumes, Rheums, Gouts, Palsies, clog thy bones!*"

Speaking generally, the Elizabethan drama is redolent of physic. Whether there be any connection between this fact and the first "agreement" of the Rosicrucian Fraternity, "To cure the sick *gratis*,"* I cannot tell.

HAROLD BAYLEY.

* See "Real Hist. of Rosicrucians," Waite, p. 73.

MR. PITT-LEWIS'S "OUTLINE."

WE cordially welcome another active worker in the Baconian ranks. "The Shakespeare Story, an Outline," by Mr. Pitt-Lewis, K.C., is bound to be of good use in awakening the interest of a newer circle of readers in the subject of the authorship of the plays ascribed to Shakspeare. We happen to know that it has already done so.

But we dissent from his suggestion that the Baconian case is like the parts of an engine in need of being put together. Much has been done in this direction already. The three works of Mr. Reed, for instance. Mr. Pitt-Lewis indeed shews by footnotes that his case is largely helped by perusal of the books of that writer, and of Mr. Theobald, Mr. Bompas, Lord Penzance, Judge Webb, and others. While there can be many advantages in a book of evidence, such as is proposed by Mr. Pitt-Lewis, it is to be regretted that his preliminary "Outline," coming with the *imprimatur* of the editor of *Taylor on Evidence*, should shew so many signs of haste. Printer's errors abound, and are only partly corrected by the *corrigenda*. This may be explained by the footnote on page 106, but the occasion for hurry is not apparent. We accept the author's invitation to point out errors and inaccuracies. It would be imprudent to leave the duty to those whose first desire is to discredit us. Proceeding, therefore, to instances, there is no evidence that Lady Bacon was instrumental in obtaining the miniature which was painted of Francis Bacon, nor that he was recalled from France by the death of Sir Nicholas (he returned with dispatches), nor that the latter left money, which Francis shared as one of his next of kin. The money story is gossip retailed by Rawley. The queen provided for Francis (see his letter to Burleigh,

October, 1580). The evidence (namely, his own letters) is not that Francis determined to go to the Bar, but that he rather objected to it. The queen did not present Francis with a "Lodge at Twickenham." He had been resident there several years under Edward Bacon's lease, before the queen granted him the reversion. Sir Francis Knowllys is a very doubtful Sir Toby Belch; the book he held on the occasion referred to was not Latin but Aretine. Bacon's sources of income, after 1621, are not a subject of doubt (page 20). The *probability* is that Bacon was often in direct communication with actors (page 23). Greene, Christopher Marlowe, and Shaksper, were all actors. See the entry in Bacon's "Transportata," "To see Mr. Chr. on Wednesday concerning my new inventions." Chr. may be Christopher, or possibly short for Chaksper. Francis was clever enough not to need the "diplomacy" of Anthony (page 34). There is no proof of the proposed arrangement with Shaksper. It was natural that after the death of Greene and Marlowe, Bacon should employ some other person as mask. The notion of ministering to the mind diseased, is to be found in Spenser, long before *Macbeth* (page 51). Where did Mr. Pitt-Lewis obtain his explanation of the masque of the Indian boy? (page 71). It is not in Dixon as stated. Where is the proof that Tobie Matthew was in England when he wrote the "most prodigious wit" letter? (page 78). What is the meaning of the *genuine* Shakespeare plays? (page 82). Many others (not to mention *Pericles*) have internal evidence of the same authorship. What is the authority for stating that Ben Jonson was *notoriously* one of Bacon's "good pens"? (page 83). Why burden a book by the editor of *Taylor on Evidence* with the Southampton gift tradition, or, in fact, any other tradition, when there are plenty of good *facts* to work with? Neither the Lucy tradition, nor the

drinking traditions concerning Shaksper, have any claim to be considered as evidence. Many of the points outlined by Mr. Lewis, in favour of Baconian authorship, have been well dealt with by previous writers. Still, a book putting these and the new discoveries by Mr. Lewis in a strictly legal form and evidential order will be of excellent service. There is no *proof* that Shaksper was a drunkard, and any argument based upon the attitude of the writer of the plays towards drunkenness, has no evidential value. The argument that the plays were given an Italianate garb through the influence of Anthony Bacon, between 1593 and 1601, is not strong. Most things were Italianate in London long before this. As Mr. Ordish (in *Shakespeare's London*) has shewn with regard to the plays of the period, "It was the customary attuned to the romance of the distant." Moreover the Italianate *Comedy of Errors*, *Romeo and Juliet*, and *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, appeared before, and *Othello* after, the period in question. *The Taming of a Shrew* was another Italianate play performed before this period, though printed in 1594.

It is curious that the revision of this play has in its Introduction, almost the only Warwickshire local colour to be found in the Shakspeare plays. Following just after the first use of the Shaksper mask in the 1593 *Venus and Adonis*, it seems to indicate a measure of precaution—an effort to more closely identify the new actor mask with the plays.

The Shake-scene theory of Mr. Pitt-Lewis will not strengthen his "Evidence." The notion of *Shake* combined with *speare* was as old as the *Shepherds Calendar* of 1579.

If Mr. Pitt-Lewis can, as he states at page 24, fully sketch the life of Robert Greene, he will be more successful than Dyce, Grosart, and others who have

essayed the task. There is no evidence of his coming to London, in 1583, nor that he was in Denmark in 1585. We do not agree with the "upstart crow" inference. There is no evidence that Shaksper attempted to mislead anybody at this date, 1592. No plays are anywhere attributed to him until 1598. If this be the whole argument of the "Evidence" it runs risk of breaking down—a matter to be deplored, as it might give pause to those who were otherwise disposed to accept our views. The probabilities are that Francis read the Hamlet story contained in Belleforest's *Histoires Tragiques*, 1571, while he was in France, and that he wrote the first draft of *Hamlet* about 1584. It was played by Lord Leicester's men in the spring of 1585, before the queen at Oxford, was also played on the Continent by the same players when Leicester took them over in August, 1585, and was referred to by Nash, in 1589.

We have criticised freely and frankly, as Mr. Lewis wished that we should do. To shrink from this would be no compliment to him. Accuracy, so far as it be possible to attain to it, is the life breath of the enquiry upon which we are mutually engaged. Mr. Pitt-Lewis will appreciate that those whom by his "Evidence" he may hope to convince will be the better influenced if he avoid watering his Evidence with weak or doubtful solutions, which had far better be threshed out, in the first instance, in the pages of some magazine. When we are reinforced by the strong fighting of an expert on the value and relevancy of various classes of evidence, we hope to have him at his best.

P. W.

THE GENESIS OF THE PLAYS.

AN endeavour to solve the origin of the Plays and Sonnets would take us to the year 1579, when a young man named Stephen Gosson (who for three years had been writing poetry and plays), gave up his calling, recanted his former opinions, and in a pamphlet called the "School of Abuse" condemned in unsparing terms, and in a wholesale manner both Poets and Poesy. Strangely enough this man, heading his attack "Poets, pipers, players, jesters, and such like caterpillars of a commonwealth," dedicated the pamphlet to Sir Philip Sidney. But while Sidney was universally regarded as a perfect example of courtesy, noble virtues, and deep religious feelings, yet he was himself a poet of no mean order, and a generous friend and patron of poets. This indiscriminate attack upon all poets, and doubtless the fact that Gosson had dedicated the pamphlet to him, caused Sidney to vindicate Poesy and Poets from so sweeping an attack, and in his "Apologie for Poetrie," a wonderful contribution to English literature, he laid down maxims, rules, principles, and figures which Bacon uses both in his acknowledged prose writings, and in the plays. Indeed the germ, and essential principle of the *Wisdom of the Ancients* may be traced to Sidney's *Apologie*, and it would be a difficult matter to overrate the tremendous bearing that this book had upon the production and construction of the Plays.

Sidney shows that "the Philosophers of Greece durst not for a long time appear to the world, but under the mask of Poets." Francis Bacon years afterwards expanded this truth, and others bearing on it, declaring in the preface of the *Wisdom of the Ancients*, that even in his day it was necessary to adopt the same mask, and teach by metaphor, allegory, and allusion. In the play of

As You Like It he openly adopts the rôle of the fool or clown to teach under this cover his mighty lessons. The very name of the piece reveals his aim and method to teach people in the manner "*As They Prefer It*," or "*As You Like It*."

In his "Apologie," Sidney shows that Poetry has ever been "the first light giver to ignorance," and we shall try and trace Bacon taking up this idea, working out the principle, and weaving it into his secret work.

In the development of his argument Sidney holds that:—

"Poesy is a counterfeiting or figuring forth, to speak metaphorically a speaking picture, with this end to teach and delight," and instances as right poets

"those who move men to take that goodness in hand, which without delight they would fly, as from a stranger."

Passing on, he maintains the final end of poetry is:—

"to lead and draw us to as high a perfection as our degenerate souls, made worse by their clay lodgings, can be capable of."

This beautiful figure is reproduced in the "*Merchant of Venice*," Act V., Sc. I.

"Such harmony is in immortal souls ;
But while this muddy vesture of decay
Doth grossly close it in, we cannot hear it."

Sidney goes on to compare the Poet with the Philosopher and the Historian, and demonstrates how the "Poet surpasses all (bating comparison with the Divine), for the one giveth the precept, the other the example; but the peerless Poet performs both: for whatsoever the philosopher saith, shall be done, he giveth a perfect picture of it by someone, by whom he pre-supposeth it was done," and he finishes his comparison by saying:—

"For conclusion I say the philosopher teacheth, but he teacheth obscurely, so as the learned only can understand him; that is to say, he teacheth them that are already taught. But the poet is the food for the tenderest stomachs, the poet is indeed the right popular philosopher."

From the comparison of the Poet with the historian and the philosopher, Sidney proceeds to show the Poet to be the Monarch of all human sciences. Here we would ask close attention to this beautiful passage that Bacon uses and paraphrases into his own prose and verse.

"For he doth not only show the way, but giveth so sweet a prospect into the way, as will entice any man to enter into it; nay he doth, as if your journey should lie through a fair vineyard, at the very first give you a cluster of grapes, that full of that taste you may long to pass farther. He beginneth not with obscure divinations which must blur the margin with interpretations and load the memory with doubtfulness, but he cometh to you with words set in delightful proportion, either accompanied with, or prepared for the well enchanting skill of music; and with a tale which holdeth children from play, and old men from the chimney corner; and, pretending no more, doth intend the winning of the mind from wickedness to virtue; even as the child is often brought to take most wholesome things by hiding them in such others as have a pleasant taste."

Reviewing first the influence in his prose, in the Hermit's Speech, Bacon says:—

"The gardens of love wherein he now playeth himself are fresh to-day and fading to-morrow, as the sun comforts them or is turned from them. But the garden of the muses keep the privilege of the golden age, they ever flourish and are in league with time. . . . Yea in some cliff it leadeth the eye beyond the horizon of time, and giveth no obscure divinations of times to come."

Note the influence of the later lines of the paragraph, on the well-known passage in *Love's Labour Lost*.

“Which his fair tongue—conceits expositor—
 Delivers in such apt and gracious words,
 That aged ears play truant at his tales,
 And younger hearings are quite ravished ;
 So sweet and voluble is his discourse.”

Returning to Sidney's argument, that men are glad to hear the tales of Hercules, Achilles, Corus, and Æneas, and learn from them the right description of wisdom, valour, and justice, we find him saying :—

“Truly I have known men, that even with reading Amadis de Gaule which wanteth much of a perfect poesy, have found their hearts moved to the exercise of courtesy, liberality, and especially courage. For even those hard hearted evil men who think virtue a school name, and know no other good but ‘indulgere genio,’ and therefore despise the austere admonitions of the philosopher, and feel not the inward reason they stand upon ; yet will be content to be delighted, which is all the goodfellow poet seems to promise, and so steal to see the form of goodness, which seen, they cannot but love, ere themselves be aware, as if they took a medicine of cherries.”

This philosophic view of the power and utility of allegory and poesy to insensibly subdue the savage and brutal mind, Bacon uses and develops in his *Wisdom of the Ancients* for the learned and grave, while in the Plays he wars against vices, evils, and brutal manners, by means of allegory and metaphor.

Sidney proceeds to clench his argument by instancing the power of the poet's work.

“Infinite proofs of the strange effects of this poetical invention might be alleged ; only two shall serve, which are so often remembered as I think all men know them. The one is of Menenius Agrippa, who, when the whole people of Rome had resolutely divided themselves from the senate, with apparent show of utter ruin, though he were, for that time, an excellent orator, came not among them upon trust, either of figurative speeches, or cunning insinuations, much less with far-fetched maxims of philosophy, which, especially if they were Platonic,

they must have learned geometry before they could have conceived ; but forsooth he behaveth himself like a homely and familiar poet. He telleth them a tale, that there was a time when all the parts of the body made a mutinous conspiracy against the belly, which they thought devoured the fruits of each others labour ; they concluded they would let so unprofitable a spender starve. In the end, to be short (for the tale is notorious, and as notorious that it was a tale) with punishing the belly they plagued themselves. This applied by him wrought such effect in the people, as I never read that only words brought forth ; but then so sudden and so good an alteration, for upon reasonable conditions a perfect reconcilment ensued."

Bacon, in his character of unseen and unknown perpetrator of the spirit, thought, and methods of working of his model, in numbers of instances in the plays, not only works out Sidney's ideas, but actually repeats his illustrations. For instance in *Coriolanus*, is to be found Sidney's example.

MENENIUS AGRIPPA :

"Either you must
Confess yourselves wondrous malicious,
Or be accused of folly. I shall tell you
A pretty tale, it may be you have heard it ;
But since it serves my purpose, I will venture
To scale 't a little more.

2nd CITIZEN :

Well
I'll hear it ; but you must not think
To fob off our disgrace with a tale :
But and 't please you, deliver.

MENENIUS AGRIPPA :

There was a time when all the bodie's members
Rebelled against the belly ; thus accused it :
That only like a gulf it did remain
I' the midst o th' body idle and inactive
Still cupboarding the viand never bearing
Like labour with the rest. . . .

2nd CITIZEN :

Well sir, what answer made the belly ?

MENENIUS AGRIPPA :

Note me this good friend ;
 Your most grave belly was deliberate
 Not rash like his accusers, and thus answered.
 True is it my incorporate friends quoth he
 That I receive the general food at first,
 Which you do live upon : and fit it is ;
 Because I am the store house and the shop
 Of the whole body : But if you do remember,
 I send it through the rivers of your blood,
 Even to the court, the heart, to the seat of the brain,
 And through the cranks and offices of man :
 The strongest nerves, and small inferior veins,
 From me receive that natural competency
 Whereby they live." Act I., Sc. 1.^o

Passing over a number of interesting features in Sidney's "Apologie," we find him expressing his opinions as to the reason why Poesy had fallen into such disrepute, contempt and baseness, as to justify the strictures of Gosson. Briefly he gives the reason ; "because no encouragement was given to the learned," and "England had become a hard stepmother," inferring that it was the discouraging influence of court, that had produced this barbarous declension in taste.

"Sweet poesy ! that anciently had Kings, Emperors, Senators, great Captains, such as David, Adrian, Sophocles, Germanicus, not only to favour poets, but to be poets ; and of our nearer times can present for her patrons, a Robert King of Sicily ; the great King Francis of France ; King James of Scotland ; such cardinals as Bembus and Bembiana ; such famous preachers and teachers as Beza and Melancthon ; so learned philosophers as Frascatorious and Scaliger ; so great orators as Pontanus and Muretus ; so piercing wits as George Buchanan ; so grave councillors as that Hopital of France. That poesy thus embraced in all other places should only find in our time a hard welcome in England. I think the very earth laments it, and therefore decks our soil

^o Bacon could of course have drawn this from the same source as Sidney, viz: Plutarch.

with fewer laurels than it was accustomed. For heretofore poets have in England also flourished ; and which is to be noted, even in those times when the trumpet of Mars did sound loudest. And now that an over faint quietness should seem to strew the the house for poets, they are almost in as good reputation as the mountebanks in Venice. . . . Upon this, necessarily followeth that base men with servile wits undertake it, who think it enough if they can be rewarded of the printer; and so as Epaminondas is said with the honour of his virtue, to have made an office by his exercising it, which before was contemptible, to become highly respected ; so these men, no more but setting their names to it, by their own disgracefulness, disgrace the most graceful poesy."

The *Apologie for Poetrie* by Sidney is, we believe, one of the most inspiring causes of the construction and edifice of the plays, built on the broad sound basis of the uplifting of men, the enlarging the horizon of the mind, the extending the empire of man, and the advancement of learning and culture. This noble pamphlet was written in 1581, and passed in manuscript among the writer's friends. His death (a national calamity), occurring in 1586, and his known request that his works should not be printed, determined Bacon, we believe, to embody doctrines so harmonising with his own in the only popular form common to the time. Consequently not long after the death of Sidney we find the unknown, unseen Poet-philosopher quietly issuing anonymously works intended by him, while amusing and fascinating the people, to lift out of the dust of contempt and reproach, the school of English Poesy ; with the still higher and primary aim, the emancipation of the human mind from the fetters hindering its progress.

GEORGE JAMES.

BACON IN THE SONNETS

I SUBMIT two parallel passages from Bacon and Shakespeare which appear to have escaped notice.

Bacon.

"The monuments of wit survive the monuments of power; the verses of the poet endure without a syllable lost, while states and empires pass many periods."

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

Shakespeare.

"Not marble, nor the gilded monuments
Of princes, shall outlive this powerful rhyme;
But you shall shine more bright in these contents
Than unswept stone, besmear'd with sluttish time.
When wasteful war shall statues overturn,
And broils root out the work of masonry."

"Since brass nor stone, nor earth, nor boundless sea,
But *sad mortality* o'er-sways their power."

It will be recollected that in the Dedication of *The Advancement of Learning* to the king Bacon writes:—

"This attribute of your Majesty deserveth to be expressed, not only in the fame and admiration of the present time, nor in the history and the tradition of the ages succeeding, but also in some solid work, fixed memorial, and immortal monument."

This is worthy of comparison with Shakespeare's,

"And thou in this shalt find thy monument,
When tyrants' crest and tombs of brass are spent,"

and:—

"Your praise shall still find room
Even in the eyes of all posterity
That wear this world out to the ending doom."

We have it on the authority of Bacon himself that he once wrote a Sonnet to the Queen endeavouring to reconcile her to Essex. This sonnet has been lost. I was recently asked if a single Sonnet of those attributed to Shakspeare could be fitted into the circumstances of Bacon's life. I at once instanced Sonnet 57, which reads :

“Being your slave, what should I do but tend
 Upon the hours and times of your desire ?
 I have no precious time at all to spend,
 Nor services to do, till you require.
 Nor dare I chide the world-without-end hour
 Whilst I, my sovereign, watch the clock for you,
 Nor think the bitterness of absence sour
 When you have bid your servant once adieu ;
 Nor dare I question with my jealous thought
 Where you may be, or your affairs suppose,
 But, like a sad slave, stay and think of nought
 Save, where you are how happy you make those.
 So true a fool is love that in your will,
 Though you do anything, he thinks no ill.”

It seems to me that no historian has ever drawn with truer pen the predominant characteristics of Elizabeth than the writer of this Sonnet. Every line fits into Bacon's circumstances. During the Queen's reign, all that Bacon obtained was the unpaid office of Queen's Counsel, in which position he was her “slave,” ever at her beck and call. If your readers desire a commentary on this Sonnet, I suggest a perusal of the sixth section of *Francis Bacon: An Account of his Life and Works*, by Edwin A. Abbott, entitled “Bacon Suing.” Here we read :—

“Whether the cause was bashfulness or pride, the mistrust of his uncle Burghley, the jealousy of his cousin Cecil, or the Queen's doubts of his stability for business, something stood in the way of Bacon's suit for place” (pp. 33, 34).

Then Dr. Abbott shows how Bacon's petitions for

advancement were treated by Elizabeth with continual refusals, enough to evoke the lines addressed to her in this Sonnet. Bacon's life at court at this time was monotonous, unoccupied and insecure, but the hope of preferment—an ambition to shine as a great statesman and a great lawyer—rendered it endurable.

In the succeeding Sonnet, 58, where could we have a better description of Bacon's circumstances, when he accepts submissively all the humiliation and abasement to which he is subjected as an attendant at court? The Sonnet runs :

“That God forbid that made me first your slave,
 I should in thought control your times of pleasure,
 Or at your hand th' account of hours to crave,
 Being your vassal, bound to stay your leisure !
 O, let me suffer, being at your beck,
 Th' imprison'd absence of your liberty ;
 And patience, tame to sufferance, bide each check,
 Without accusing you of injury.
 Be where you list, your charter is so strong,
 That you yourself may privilege your time
 To what you will ; to you it doth belong
 Yourself to pardon of self-doing crime.
 I am to wait, though waiting so be hell ;
 Not blame your pleasure, be it ill or well.”

I would ask any believer in the Shakspearean authorship of the Sonnets to “fit” the two I have quoted into the life of the man of Stratford more effectively than they can be done into the life of Bacon, and at the same time to explain how a common player and erst-while butcher came to give forth this wail in Sonnet III :

“O, for my sake do you with Fortune chide,
 The guilty goddess of my harmful deeds,
 That did not better for my life provide
 Than public means which public manners breeds.
 Thence comes it that my name receives a brand ;

And almost thence my nature is subdu'd
To what it works in, like the dyer's hand."

I am strongly of belief that here we have no confession from the butcher's boy who had nothing to complain of with regard to his position as actor and money-maker at the Globe, and who, as Pope said,

"For gain, not glory, winged his roving flight,
And grew immortal, in his own despite ;"

but the confession of Bacon—the proto-type of his own *Timon of Athens*—a misanthrope, whose impecuniosity forced him to adopt the writing of plays, a despised profession, as a partial means of livelihood.

GEORGE STRONACH.

NOTES, QUERIES, AND CORRESPONDENCE.

Ravenspurg

I N *Lost England: the story of our submerged coasts*,* there is given a most interesting account of the once flourishing port of Ravenspurg. It was here that Bolingbroke first set foot on his return from France.

The banish'd Bolingbroke repeals himself,
And with uplifted arms is safe arriv'd
At Ravenspurg. (Richard II., Act. II., Sc. 2.)

Shakespeare makes many allusions to the place which, it may be news to some, is now submerged under the waters of the Humber.

When we reflect on the illustrious figure played in British History by Ravenspurg, which was the starting

* Beccles Wilson. Newnes, 1s.

point of three successful revolutions, it is surprising that so little is known of it.

In 1355 a storm destroyed one of the principal burial-grounds, necessitating the transference of the dead bodies to a neighbouring parish. In 1357 the tides are said to have risen higher by four feet than previously. It was in 1399 that Bolingbroke, with a gorgeous retinue, made his historic landing.

In 1471, Edward IV., having fled the country, re-landed at Ravenspur, whence he marched to Barnet.

“The sound of the trumpets and drums, and the marching men of Edward’s army had scarce died away in the ears of the burgesses ere the angry sea began to finish the fell work it had commenced a century before. Not only Ravenspur, but such other towns and villages as had not yet suffered from the ‘rage and surgies’ of the ocean, saw their own doom in the advancing tide.

“All information as to the precise date of the final destruction of Ravenspur, as a seaport, is probably lost. Some record may, however, remain among the archives of Government, or in the hands of some private land-owner, but, if so, it has not yet been made public. My own conclusions point to its having been submerged about 1530.”

“The Conversion of Sir Tobie Matthew”*

PRESSURE of space, has, we regret, prevented our earlier notice of this book. The following extract will stimulate a zest for better acquaintance with Bacon’s *Alter Ego* :—

“The plague was then hot in London, and yet it was in no power of mine to get released from that prison for any time, though I offered great security for return-

* Burns & Oates, Limited, cr. 8vo., 178 pp.

ing to make myself prisoner upon all warnings. But my Lord of Canterbury Bancroft's zeal (if it were not rather somewhat else) was so great that it would not give way at that time. Yet Sir Francis Bacon, my noble and true friend, was so very earnest with many of the great ones, to get me leave to wait upon him with my keeper as often as he should desire it, that at length he made the Bishop more flexible, and obtained that kind of liberty for me. I was informed afterwards that he got it with the less difficulty by promising that he would deal earnestly with me about my return to Protestant religion; but, for my part, I was not of the plot. It is true that now and then he would be speaking some little thing to me of that kind; but he was quickly and very easily to be answered; for he was in very truth (with being a kind of a monster both of wit and knowledge also in other things) such a poor kind of creature in all those which were questionable about religion, that my wonder takes away all my words. I remember that once he talked to me of the invisible Church, and of Elias, who was the only prophet, and the only true worshipper of God of his time, and I know not what more of that kind. Now, I could not upon that occasion but turn a little quick upon him, and say: 'Jesus, sir! Are you but there yet? And are you gotten no further yet than to the objection of Elias, and the like? I much wonder to find such a doubt in you as this, which hath been answered a thousand times, and no man replies upon our answers; but they are fully still as fresh with the same objection as if still they were in the first day of their dreams.' He was then very much pricked, and told me with more feeling than ordinary, that my wonder was rather a wonder of ignorance and pride than a show, either of any good desire to be instructed in his religion, or of any great ability to uphold mine own, for that we all could not

tell how to make any good answer to that one objection. We seldom met after upon such arguments, but I passed my time with him in much gust, for there was not such company in the whole world."

Bacon was apparently stronger in charity than disputation. He was as contemptuous of plodders at *ergo*, as he was probably indifferent to the exact number of angels who could stand on the point of a needle—a problem greatly exercising theologians and logicians.

"William Shakespeare, His Family and Friends"*

UNDER this title has been recently published an interesting series of papers by the late Mr. Elton, Q.C., a learned lawyer and antiquary, materials for a more elaborate work, which he did not live to complete. Mr. Andrew Lang prefaces it with a pleasant biographical sketch of the kindly and accomplished author.

The book contains a collection of various information relating to William Shakspeare, his family, his surroundings, and his contemporaries; and many passages in the plays are illustrated from old customs.

Pilgrims to Stratford will regret that Mr. Elton does not admit the identity of Anne Hathaway with Agnes Hathaway, daughter of Richard Hathaway of Shottery, which Halliwell-Phillipps thought probable.

"Accost, Sir Andrew, Accost!"

TWELFTH NIGHT, ACT I., SCENE II.

Sir Toby Belch.

"Accost, Sir Andrew, accost!"

Sir Andrew Aguecheek.

"What's that?"

° John Murray, 12s. 6d.

Sir Toby Belch.
Maria.
Aguccheek.

"My neice's chambermaid."
 "My name is Mary, Sir."
 "Good Mistress Mary Accost."

Miss Alicia A. Leith points out that the foregoing passage has some derivation from Culpeper's *English Physician Enlarged*.

"Cost-Mary, or Ale Cost, or Balsam Herb is a wonderful help to all sorts of day Agues."

Rebus Signatures

A CORRESPONDENT draws our attention to architectural signatures existing in Peterbro and Canterbury Cathedrals. At Peterbro, the designer has interwoven a small church and a barrel—his name was *Kirk-tun*. At Canterbury, the visitor may see a gilded stone let into the roofwork, signifying *gold stone*—the name of the designer.

Doubtless there are many more similar instances, additional proof—if any were needed—of the estimation in which these childish conceits were held by men of gravity.

Ruskin on Bacon

"GOD'S first creature, which was Light.' You know whose words those are—the words of the wisest of Englishmen."

Crown of Wild Olive.

"Boston Ideas"

A PERIODICAL published in Boston, U.S.A., comments as follows on Mr. R. M. Theobald's brochure, *The Ethics of Criticism*:—

"Mr. Collins is a prominent reviewer and teacher, with a reputation for literary ability; but it seems that the unwarrantable manner in which he has dealt with their (Baconians) works and others of a kindred nature are of themselves sufficient to destroy whatever effort he might make in any direction in the future, until his *amende honorable* is forthcoming.

"When one who plumes himself on being a public critic has had pointed out to him in a most commendable spirit wrong conclusions, which he deliberately refuses to correct, he deserves to be put in the public pillory and openly condemned. And the higher his position, the greater need of punishment."

The writer continues:—

"Talk about 'monomania,' 'sanity,' etc., there is nothing in the long line of literary discussion since the revival of learning that is so abnormal—off its base—that can equal the extremism, the vituperation, defamation, and polished ruffianism, as illustrated by certain leading pro-Shakesporean advocates in their discussion of the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy."

English Literature

THE work upon which Dr. Garnett's Muse has lately been employed has now come forth.* It takes the form of what Ben Jonson would have termed "something they call a play." Here is an extract:

Sixth Scholar.

"Dear master, did you ever kill a pig?"

Shakespeare.

"Aye, boy, and thou dost mind me that, when once
A daughter of swart Egypt scanned my palm,
This was the sibyl's rede. Beware of bacon.
Dark speech! which the far future shall unriddle."

Mr. Lee Sits Corrected

WE are glad to see that Mr. Lee is expunging some of his errors.

"At the time of his death in 1616 there had been printed in quarto seven editions of his *Venus and Adonis* (1593, 1594, 1596,

o "William Shakespeare: Pedagogue and Poacher." A Drama, by Richard Garnett. 3s. 6d. net. London: John Lane.

1599, 1600 and two in 1602), and five editions of his *Lucrece* (1594, 1598, 1600, 1607, 1616).”—*Life of Shakespeare*, Lee. 1st to 4th edition (1898-9).

“I find also that Mr. Lee has no better acquaintance with the quartos . . . Mr. Lee ought to have known that only the first two editions of *Venus and Adonis*, and only the first edition of *Lucrece* were ‘printed in quarto.’”—*A Critic Criticised*, Stronach (1904).

“At his death in 1616 there had been printed seven editions of *Venus and Adonis* (1593 and 1594 in quarto, 1596, 1599, 1600, and two in 1602, all in small octavo), and five editions of *Lucrece* (1594 in quarto, 1598, 1600, 1607 and 1616, in small octavo).”—*Life of Shakespeare*, Lee. Hampstead edition (1904).

“Baconiana”

READERS are invited to exert their influence to extend the circulation of *Baconiana*. In addition to forming a link between Baconians in various parts of the world, and keeping them abreast with the latest aspects of the controversy, the magazine affords a fund of information on the Elizabethan period, and is of interest to all thoughtful people.

The commencement of the present volume is an appropriate time to bring the publication more into notice.

Ben Jonson

TO THE EDITOR OF “BACONIANA.”

SIR,—Can you or any of your readers give me information in regard to this question?

I have frequently seen it stated that about 1620-23, Ben Jonson was a private secretary to Lord Bacon, or one of his “good pens.” What is the definite authority for this statement? I fail to find it in Spedding, or, under the caption of Ben Jonson, in N. D. B.

ISAAC HULL PLATT.

Wallingford, Pennsylvania, Nov. 4, 1904.

A Hamlet Amendment

TO THE EDITOR OF “BACONIANA.”

SIR,—Referring to note on page 135, April number, “A Hamlet Amendment,” I would say that in the Staunton repro-

duction of the first folio the word in Polonius' speech referred to is *vilde*, not *viled*; so also in the textual notes of the Cambridge Edition and Furness's Variorum. *Vilde* is the old spelling for *vile*, frequent throughout Shakespeare. Of course there is no question about the meaning of *filed*. It occurs in the sense referred to in *L. L. L.*, V., 1, 12: "His tongue filed, his eye ambitious." But this does seem to apply to the passage in *Hamlet*. "Beautified Ophelia" certainly is a vile phrase, and suggests the use of paint and cosmetics, which Shakespeare held in such abhorrence.

ISAAC HULL PLATT.

Wallingford, Pennsylvania, Nov. 4, 1904.

The Begetter of the Sonnets

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

THE begetter of the first 26 Sonnets I take to be young Cavendish, who afterwards became Baron Hardwick and Duke of Devonshire. In 1608 his father, on the recommendation of the Principal of Magdalene Hall, engaged Tom Hobbes to be his tutor and companion. He married in the same year the daughter of Lord Bruce of Kinloss. The King made the match and dowered the bride, a child of 12 years. They had no establishment for some years. From then to 1610 Cavendish and his companion, Hobbes, devoted themselves to hunting, and hawking, and other amusements, Hobbes negotiating loans and mortgages, borrowing wherever he could, that he might gratify the expensive tastes of his young master; they were about the same age. The Sonnets were said to be circulated before the small quarto of 1609 were published. Bacon must have been acquainted with this youth; he is said to have been the means of Hobbes being introduced to Bacon.

Yours faithfully,

JOSEPH BROWN.

Dec. 6, 1904.

P.S.—See *Hobbes*, by George Robertson.

The Fable of Orpheus

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—In *De Sapia Veterum*, Bacon claims that the fable of Orpheus has *never been well interpreted*, and then proceeds to put forward his own deep and rich exposition. A year earlier he wrote to King James, mentioning this same fable, observing that *it was anciently interpreted*, etc., etc. Can any of your readers tell me whether there is an ancient interpretation similar to Bacon's anywhere to be found, or whether this expression of his is merely a modest figure of speech?

Yours faithfully,

H. B.

APRIL, 1905

BACONIANA

A QUARTERLY MAGAZINE



CONTENTS

	PAGE
Errors and Anachronisms	69
The Creators of Modern English	74
The Advancement of Knowledge	86
“The Arte of English Poesie”	95
A Duologue	104
Bacon’s Scrivenery	107
“Great Englishmen of the Sixteenth Century”	112
Notes, Queries, and Correspondence ...	125

LONDON

GAY & BIRD

22 BEDFORD STREET

Cases for Books
can be had
of the Publishers

The Bacon Society.

(INCORPORATED.)

THE objects of the Society are expressed in the Memorandum of Association to be :—

1. To encourage the study of the works of Francis Bacon as philosopher, lawyer, statesman and poet ; also his character, genius, and life ; his influence on his own and succeeding times, and the tendencies and results of his writings.
2. To encourage the general study of the evidence in favour of Francis Bacon's authorship of the plays commonly ascribed to Shakespeare, and to investigate his connection with other works of the Elizabethan period.

The annual subscription of Members, who are entitled to vote at the Society's business meetings, is one guinea ; that of Associates is half-a-guinea.

The Society's Library and Rooms are at 11, Hart Street, London, W.C. (close to the British Museum), where the Secretary attends daily, and from 3 to 5 o'clock will be happy to supply further information.

BACONIANA.

VOL. III. *Third Series.* APRIL, 1905. No. 10.

ERRORS AND ANACHRONISMS.

AMONG the numerous mistakes which Bacon has made in his classical quotations, caused by his habit of trusting to his memory without "verifying his references" (one of the most important principles of literary conduct), there is a very remarkable instance, which I do not remember ever to have seen criticised. It occurs in the Sixth book of the *De Augmentis*, chap. IV., and is thus translated by Spedding:—"It will not be amiss to observe, also, that even mean faculties, when they fall into great men or great matters, sometimes work great and important effects. Of this I will adduce a memorable example, the rather because the Jesuits appear not to despise this kind of discipline; therein judging (as I think) well. It is a thing, indeed, if practised professionally, of low repute; but if it be made a part of discipline it is of excellent use. I mean stage-playing—an art which strengthens the memory, regulates the tone and effect of the voice and pronunciation, teaches a decent carriage of the countenance and gesture, gives not a little assurance, and accustoms young men to bear being looked at. The example which I shall give, taken from Tacitus, is that of one Vibulenus, formerly an actor, then a soldier in the Pannonian legions. This man had, at the death

of Augustus, raised a mutiny, whereupon Blæsus, the lieutenant, committed some of the mutineers to prison. The soldiers, however, broke in and let them out; whereupon Vibulenus, getting up to speak, began thus: 'These poor innocent wretches you have restored to light and life; but who shall restore life to my brother, or my brother to me? whom being sent in message from the legions of Germany to treat of the common cause, this man has murdered last night by some of his swordsmen, whom he keeps and arms for the execution of soldiers. Answer, Blæsus, where have you thrown his body? Enemies themselves deny not burial. When with kisses and tears I shall have satiated my grief, command me also to be slain beside him; only let these, my fellows, seeing we are put to death for no crime, but because we consulted for the good of the legions, have leave to bury us.' With which words he excited such excessive jealousy and alarm that, had it not shortly afterwards appeared that nothing of the sort had happened—nay, that he had never had a brother—the soldiers would hardly have kept their hands off the Prefect; but the fact was that he played the whole thing as if it had been a piece on the stage" (Works, IV., p. 496.)

Tacitus nowhere says that Vibulenus was, or had been, an actor. This is all that he says of his antecedents: "*Vibulenus quidam gregarius miles*, one Vibulenus, a common soldier," and then he gives the speech and its tremendous effect on the mutineers (Annals, I., 22, 23). He concludes the whole incident thus:—"Had it not been quickly ascertained that no corpse was found and that the slaves under torture had denied the execution, and that he never had a brother, they would have gone near murdering the legate."

Bacon confounded Vibulenus with another ring-leader, named Percennius, of whom Tacitus says, in

chap. XVI. :—" *Erat in castris Percennius quidam, dux olim theatralium operarum dein gregarius miles, procaz lingua et miscere cætus histrionali studio doctus,*" which may be translated: There was in the camp one Percennius, formerly a leader of one of the theatrical parties of hired applauders, afterwards a common soldier, noted for his impudence, and, through his experience of exciting enthusiasm for actors, an adept at stirring up a crowd. Here, again, it will be remarked that even Percennius is not said to have been an actor, but merely a theatrical agent for hiring people to applaud certain actors, in which, also, he was the leader.

This amazing misrepresentation of facts, recorded by one of the Latin authors he most affected, is but a striking example of one of Bacon's characteristics. For accuracy of detail he had no care. In the best known of his writings, the *Essays*, carelessness of detail is a very frequent and prominent feature, notwithstanding that he took such pains in elaborating, increasing, and re-publishing them so frequently.

Spedding proposes as an explanation of Bacon's inaccuracies in quotation the words of Dr. Rawley, his chaplain and literary executor: "I have often observed, and so have other men of great account, that if he had occasion to repeat another man's words after him, he had an use and faculty to dress them in better vestments and apparel than they had before, so that the author should find his own speech much amended, and yet the substance of it still retained; as if it had been natural to him to use good forms—as Ovid spake of his faculty of versifying—

Et quod tentabam scribere, versus erat."

On this passage Spedding comments as follows: "This is probably the true explanation of a habit of Bacon's,

which seems at first sight a fault, and, perhaps, sometimes is—and of which a great many instances have been pointed out by Mr. Ellis—a habit of inaccurate quotation. In quoting an author's words, especially where he quotes them merely by way of voucher for his own remark, or in acknowledgment of the source whence he derived it, or to suggest an allusion which may give a better effect to it, he very often quotes inaccurately. Sometimes, no doubt, this was unintentional, the fault of his memory; but more frequently, I suspect, it was done deliberately, for the sake of presenting the substance in a better form, or a form better suited to the particular occasion. In citing the evidence of witnesses, on the contrary, in support of a narrative statement or an argument upon matter of fact, he is always very careful" (Works, I., p. 13).

This wonderful power of Bacon's of repeating substantially what any others had said in conversation in so attractive and improved a form has been insisted on as an undoubted proof of his surpassing dramatic genius. There is no doubt but that for the unprejudiced and competent inquirer, everything in Shakespeare and everything in Bacon suggest or imply their being one and the same unparalleled individual.

Dr. Johnson, in the preface to his edition of Shakespeare, says: "He had no regard to distinction of time or place, but gives to one age or nation without scruple the customs, institutions and opinions of another at the expense, not only of likelihood, but of possibility. These faults Pope has endeavoured, with more zeal than judgment, to transfer to his imagined interpolators. We need not wonder to find Hector quoting Aristotle when we see the loves of Theseus and Hyppolyta combined with the Gothic mythology of fairies. Shakespeare, indeed, was not the only violator of chronology, for in the same age Sidney, who wanted not the advantages

of learning, has in his *Arcadia* confounded the pastoral with the feudal times, the days of innocence, quiet and security with those of turbulence, violence and adventure."

These anachronisms have been often urged as proof that the plays could not have been written by Bacon, but must have been the work of an unscholarly man of genius. It is surprising that this objection should be made by men of letters, seeing that George Steevens (1736—1800), in his edition of Shakespeare, in the notes to *Twelfth Night** and *2 Henry VI.*, had pointed out that Shakespeare's incongruities of historical circumstances were far outdone by contemporary writers. Thus Lodge, in his *True Tragedie of Marius and Sylla* (1594), speaks of the *Razors of Palermo* and *St. Paul's Steeple*, and has introduced a *Frenchman* named *Don Pedro*, who, in consideration of receiving *forty crowns*, undertakes to poison *Marius*. Stanyhurst, the translator of four books of Virgil (1582), compares Choræbus to a *Bedlamite*, says that Priam girded on his sword *Morglay*, and makes Dido tell Æneas that she would have been contented to have become the mother of a *Cockney*. In the tragedy of *Herod and Antipater*, by Gervase Markham and William Sampson, who were both scholars, is the following:—
 "Though *cannons* roar, yet you must not be deaf."
 Spenser mentions *cloth* made at Lincoln during the ideal reign of King Arthur, and has adorned a castle of the same period "with cloth of *Arras* or of *Tours*." Chaucer introduces *gums* in the time of Anthony and Cleopatra, and Salvator Rosa places a *cannon* at the entrance of Holofernes' tent.†

"I undertake," said Schlegel, "to prove that Shakespeare's anachronisms are for the most part committed

* *T.N.* Act V. Sc. 1. ; *2 Henry VI.* Act IV. Sc. 7.

† "The Poems and Plays of William Shakspeare." London : Scott and Webster. 1833.

purposely and after great consideration. It was frequently of importance to him to bring the subject exhibited, from the background of time, quite near to us." *

Bacon, in the *De Augmentis*, enunciates the principle which explains these seeming absurdities. The thirteenth chapter of the second book begins thus: "I now come to poesy, which is a part of learning in measure of words for the most part restrained, but in all other points extremely free and licensed; and therefore (as I said at first) it is referred to the imagination, which may at pleasure make unlawful matches and divorces of things."

WILLIAM A. SUTTON.

THE CREATORS OF MODERN ENGLISH.

IT is impossible to study the Elizabethan drama without being struck by the Protean versatility of its authors. In swift and dizzying rotation their poetic souls seem to have been metamorphosed into those of Physicians, Divines, Musicians, Courtiers, Florists, Kings, Scientists, Philosophers, Lawyers, and Philologists. They themselves seem to have realised their Protean characteristics, and references to the fable are numerous:—

"I have as many shapes as Proteus had."

—Anon. (*Sir John Oldcastle* I. 2), 1600.

"I can add colors to the chameleon,
Change shapes with Proteus for advantages."

—Shakespeare (3 *Henry VI.* III. 2) 1592

* Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature, 1840, vol. II. p. 123

"Proteus ever changed shapes until he was straitened and held fast."—Bacon (*Advancement of Learning*), 1605.

"He then devised himself how to disguise,
For by his mighty science he could take
As many forms and shapes in seeming wise
As ever Proteus to himself could make."

—Spenser (*Fairy Queen* I. ii. 10), 1590.

"He wandered in the world in strange array . . .
Disguised in thousand shapes that none might him bewray."

—*Ibid.* (III. 6)

"I will play the changeling,
I'll change myself into a thousand shapes
To court our brave spectators ; I'll change my postures
Into a thousand different variations
To draw even ladies' eyes to follow mine.
I'll change my voice into a thousand tones
'To chain attention : not a changeling, father ?
None but myself shall play the changeling."

—Middleton (*Spanish Gypsy* II. 1), 1653.

"Oh the miserable
Condition of a prince who, though he vary
More shapes than Proteus in his mind and manners,
He cannot win an universal suffrage
From the many-headed monster multitude."

—Massinger (*Emperor of the East* II. 1), 1631—1632.

It is in their rôle of "great philologues" that they now claim attention.

In the time immediately prior to the advent of the dramatists the English language was a slighted, poor, inexpressive and unseemly thing. Finding it an inefficient means of expression the dramatists deliberately constructed a new one.

At that time Englishmen had to pick up their mother tongue as best they could. "The first English Grammar was not published until 1586. Little, if any, English was taught even in the lower classes of the Grammar schools, and this fact accounts for the

wonderful varieties in spelling proper names common to the period. When there is scarcity of writing and printing, language is unsettled and variable."* Macaulay, describing an English county gentleman of William III.'s time, observes :—

" His language and pronunciation were such as we should now expect to have only from the most ignorant clowns. His oaths, coarse jests and scurrilous terms of abuse were uttered with the broadest accents of his province."

One hundred years earlier, when language was even more unformed, the surrounding speech must have struck the ear almost as strangely as a foreign tongue.

In Mrs. Everett Greene's *Letters of Illustrious Ladies* there is quoted an epistle from Elizabeth, Duchess of Norfolk, to her brother, Lord Stafford. It runs :—

" Brorder I pra you to ssand me my ness dorety by kaas I kno har kon dessess se sal not lake hass long hass I leffe and he wold be hord by me at hor haless I kyng he be hone kyne tha ffaless drab and kouk and nat ben I hade hadehar to my couffert."

Mrs. Green appends the following key as the best rendering she can offer :—

" Brother, I pray you to send me my niece Dorothy, because I know her conditions—she shall not lack as long as I live, an you would be heard by me at (all), or else I think you be own kin to the false drab and cook : had it not been. I had had her to my comfort." †

This is an extreme instance, but there is little doubt that the spelling, pronunciation and grammar of the Elizabethan gentry were very uncouth. The speech of the illiterate lower orders must have been many degrees more discordant, reading and writing being accomplishments practically beyond their ken.

* Goadby, *The England of Shakespeare*, p. 101.

† † Extracted from *Social England*, Traill, Vol. III., pp. 244—246.

The playhouse frequenters were almost, if not entirely, "vagrant persons, masterless men, thieves, horse-stealers, whoremongers, cozeners, coneycatchers, contrivers of treason and other idle and dangerous persons." In *The Roaring Girl*, Middleton has preserved a specimen of their uncouth jargon:—

Trapdoor.—"Ben mort, shall you and I heave a bough, mill a ken, or nip a bung, and then we'll couch a hog's-head under the ruffmans, and there you shall wap with me, and I'll niggle with you."

Moll.—"Out, you damned impudent rascal!"

Trap.—"Cut benar whids, and hold your fambles and your stamps."

L. Noland.—"Nay, nay, Moll, why art thou angry? what was his gibberish?"

Moll.—"Marry, this, my lord, says he: 'Ben mort,' good wench, 'shall you and I heave a bough, mil a ken, or nip a bung?' shall you and I rob a house or cut a purse?"

Moll.—"Come, you rogue, sing with me."

SONG.

By *Moll* and *Tearcal*.

"A gage of ben rom-bouse
 In a bousing ken of Rom-ville,
 Is benar than a caster,
 Peck, pennam, lap, or popler,
 Which we mill in deuse a vile.
 O I wud lib all the lightmans,
 O I wud lib all the darkmans
 By the salomon, under the ruffmans,
 By the salomon, in the hartmans,
 And scour the queer cramp ring,
 And couch till a palliard docked my dell,
 So my bousy nab might skew rom-bouse well.
 Avast to the pad, let us bing;
 Avast to the pad, let us bing."

All.—"Fine knaves, i' faith!"

J. Dapper.—"The grating of ten new cart-wheels, and the grunting of five hundred hogs coming from Rumford market, cannot make a worse noise than this canting language does in my ears."

Burns, coming from the plough, uttered his inspirations in a dialect familiar to his auditors. So also the West Country poet, William Barnes, and others too numerous to mention; but the Elizabethan dramatists, though for the most part *canaille* writing for the patronage of *canaille*, voiced their poetry in pure and academic English.

It is not nowadays an every-day occurrence for an actor to be able to write a good play, still less usual for him to be able to express himself in poetic form. Probably the "gay boys lewd and vain," on whose favour the Elizabethan playwright subsisted, would have been equally if not better pleased by a knock-about farce, or a Morrice dance by Kemp. It seems, however, to have been *de rigueur* that the Elizabethan hacks should write in swinging blank verse and spin their drumming decasyllables from their own brains.

The publication, now in progress under the auspices of the Philological Society, of Dr. Murray's *New English Dictionary* renders it possible to say with approximate accuracy how much of the English language we owe to the fellowship of great spirits under consideration. *The New English Dictionary* is a Registry where may be found recorded the birthday and parent, so far as known, of every English word now or ever in use. An examination of this work will, therefore, enable anyone by the Law of Average to arrive at an approximate estimate of the number of words coined in certain periods by certain writers. The analysis of a sequence of 143 pages, equal to 429

columns, selected at random, yielded so incredible a result that I thought it desirable to examine further. My first investigation having by chance fallen upon a group of words including the Latin prefix *Ex*, I decided to examine a further sequence of 143 pages which should include the Greek prefix *Ge*. No author coins from a tongue with which he is not sufficiently familiar to *think* in, and Greek being "neglected and despised," I thought it probable that few words from this source were likely to have come into being during the Elizabethan era. This reasoning having proved correct, it will, I think, be sufficiently approximate to strike an average between the Latin and Greek groups, from which average we can arrive with sufficient accuracy to the probable total aggregate. As it will be many years before the publication of Dr. Murray's great undertaking is completed, it is necessary, for the time being, to be content with merely a rough total.

The Editor informs me that the work when finished will occupy between 15,000 and 16,000 folio pages, each containing three columns. It will, therefore, be well upon the safe side to assume that each sequence of 143 pages represents one-hundredth part of the entire work. Calculating on this basis, we are indebted to the poet Shakespeare for enriching our tongue with the astonishing total of 9,450 newly-coined words.* Our obligations to other contemporary play-wrights, and to the philosophers, Francis Bacon and Thomas Browne, are as follows:—

° It is questionable whether Shakespeare has not been credited by Dr. Murray with a larger total than he is entitled to. Mr. George Stronach has pointed out many instances of words wrongly attributed to Shakespeare, but owing, in reality, to his contemporary, Bacon. The fact that there is a Shakespeare Concordance has in all probability influenced the attribution of many words to Shakespeare which Dr. Murray's readers might on severer search have found elsewhere.

Creators of Modern English

Bacon	1,950
Browne	2,850
Beaumont and Fletcher...	975
Chapman	1,500
Dekker	350
Day	50
Ford	200
Field	—
Greene	800
Heywood	350
Jonson	1,350
Kyd	—
Lodge	100
Lyly	350
Marlowe	525
Marston	650
Massinger	475
Middleton	300
Nash	1,350
Peele	150
Porter	100
Rowley	150
Shirley	150
Spenser	1,200
Tourneur	50
					<hr/>
					15,925
Add Shakespeare...	9,450
					<hr/>
					Total, 25,375
					<hr/>

Although the totals attributed to the various philologists differ in quantity, the figures quoted must be considered in comparison to the amount of literature from which they are extracted. Thus regarded, Tourneur's modest 50 words is on a par with the

2,000 of the more prolific Bacon, Tourneur's being found merely in two plays.

Viewed thus, Sir Thomas Browne's total remains even more extraordinary than it already appears.

Sir John Evans, in his Introduction to *Hydriotaphia*, observes, "The language in which most of Browne's writings are composed is very peculiar, and, in some respects, un-English. The intense Latinity of his style is almost everywhere apparent, and, indeed, anyone comparing the Latin version of the *Religio Medici* with the English, would feel inclined to pronounce the former the original, and the latter a too literal translation. Dr. Johnson says with regard to Sir Thomas Browne's style, that it is 'a tissue of many languages; a mixture of heterogeneous words brought together from distant regions, with terms originally appropriated to one art and drawn by violence into the service of another. But his innovations are sometimes pleasing, and his temerities happy.' Sir Thomas Browne says of himself, in the *Religio Medici*: 'For my own part, besides the jargon and *patois* of several provinces, I understand no less than six languages.'"

The erudition and Latinity of Sir Thomas Browne are matters of every-day note. As an illustration of his fondness for Latin coinages, a recent reviewer quoted the following passage from *Christian Morals*:—

"The Compage of all Physical Truths is not so closely jointed but opposition may find intrusion, nor always so closely maintained as not to suffer attrition. Many Positions seem quodlibetically constituted, and, like a Delphian Blade, will cut on both sides. Some Truths seem almost Falshoods, and some Falshoods almost Truths; wherein Falshood and Truth seem almost æquilibriumly stated, and but a few grains of distinction to bear down the ballance."

Great and admitted as were Browne's capacities in diction, the actors could without effort have given

points to him. Compare, for instance, the following passage from Webster's *White Devil* III. 1., 1612.

"Most *literated* judges, please your Lordships so to *connive* your judgements to the view of this debauched and *diversivolent* woman, who such a black *concatenation* of mischief hath *effected* that to *extirp* the memory of it must be the *consummation* of her and her *projections*."

The love of word-making seems at times to have attained the proportions of a disease. Not infrequently we find the dramatists revelling in mere verbal fireworks.

"My leg is not altogether unpropitiously shaped. There's a word—'unpropitiously'!

"So help me your sweet bounty you have the most graceful presence, applausive elocuty, amazing volubility, polished adornation, delicious affability."

Marston (*Antonio and Mellida*, part I., IV. 2), 1602.

It was a common device to introduce a new word, supported and expounded by a synonym; at other times we find that upon some novelty making its introductory bow, special attention was directed to its excellence. Thus:—

"He is too peregrinate, as I may call it
[*Nathaniel draws out his table-book.*]

A most singular and choice epithet."

Shakespeare (*Love's Labour Lost* V. 1) 1588.

"I scorn to retort the obtuse jest of a fool.

[*Balurdo draws out his writing-tables and writes.*]

Relort and *obtuse*, good words, very good words."

Marston (*Antonio and Mellida*, pt. II., I. 3), 1602.

"Here's most amorous weather.

Amorous weather!

Is not amorous a good word?"

Middleton (*Roaring Girl* V. 1), 1611.

As a coiner and connoisseur of language, Bacon was

pre-eminently conspicuous. When a young lawyer, it was noted by a contemporary that "a marked feature of the new pleader was the unusual words wherewith he had spangled his speech."

In the *Promus* we perceive Bacon apparently in the very act of word-making. Jotted down we note *real*, *brazed*, *peradventure*. Next to another entry, *uprouse*, stands the crucible of its creation, *abedd—rose you—owt bed*.

Bacon and the dramatists were great artists in the elegancies of speech. Folio III of the *Promus* is endorsed "Formularies and Elegancies." It no doubt forms part of one of those collections by way of "provision or preparatory store for the furniture of speech and readiness of elocution," which Bacon recommends in *The Advancement of Learning*. In this MS. we perceive the great Word Artist in his workshop. As Dr. Abbott observes, the world ought not willingly to let die so courtly a compliment as entry No. 1196.

"I have not said all my prayers till I have bid you good-morrow,"

or so graceful an epistolary conclusion as entry No. 1398.

"Wishing you all happiness, and myself opportunity to do you service."

Not only the fabric of modern language, but many of our common and every-day salutations, seem to have first come into existence at this period. Dr. Murray credits the earliest printed appearance of *Good-bye*, as a form of address at parting, to Shakespeare. We see it in process of evolution as follows:—

1588. "I thank your worship. God be wy you!"

—Shakespeare (*Love's Labour's Lost* III. 1).

1591. "God b'uy my lord!"

—*Ibid.* (1 *Henry VI.* III. 2).

1600. "Gallants, God buoye all!"

—Heywood (2 *Edward IV.*).

1607. "Farewell, God b'y you Mistress!"

—Middleton (*Roaring Girl*).

In his essay, *Of Travel*, Bacon writes, "When a traveller returns home let him . . . prick in some flowers of that he hath learned abroad into the customs of his own country." In the *Promus* we find him thus at work striving to embellish the English tongue and engraft elegancies of foreign extraction. Dr. Abbott comments upon his efforts as follows:—

"Independently of other interests, many of the notes in the *Promus* are valuable as illustrating how Bacon's all-pervasive method of thought influenced him, even in the merest trifles. *Analogy* is always in his mind. If you can say 'good-morrow,' why should you not also say 'good-dawning' (entry 1206)? If you can anglicise some French words, why not others? Why not say 'good-swoear' (*sic.* entry 1190) for 'good-night,' and 'good-matens' (1192) for 'good-morning'? Instead of 'twilight,' why not substitute 'vice-light' (entry 1420)? Instead of 'impudent,' how much more forcible is 'brazed' (entry 1418)! On the lines of this suggestive principle Francis Bacon pursues his experimental path, whether the experiments be small or great—sowing, as Nature sows, superfluous seeds, in order that out of the conflict the strongest may prevail. For before we laugh at Bacon for his abortive word-experiments, we had better wait for the issue of Dr. Murray's great dictionary which will tell us to how many of these experiments we are indebted for words now current in our language.

"Many interesting philological, or literary, questions will be raised by the publication of the *Promus*. The phrase 'good-dawning,' for example, just mentioned, is found only once in Shakespeare, put into the mouth of

the affected Oswald (*Lear* II. 2, 1), 'Good-dawning to thee, friend.' The quartos are so perplexed by this strange phrase that they alter 'dawning' into 'even,' although a little farther on Kent welcomes the 'comfortable beams' of the rising sun. Obviously, 'dawning' is right; but did the phrase suggest itself independently to Bacon and Shakespeare? Or did Bacon make it current among Court circles, and was it picked up by Shakespeare afterwards? Or did Bacon jot down this particular phrase, not from analogy, but from hearing it in the Court? Here, again, we must wait for Dr. Murray's dictionary to help us."

Unfortunately, Dr. Murray's readers seem to have missed *good-dawning*. The expression is unnoted in the dictionary.

In creating strange words and giving them currency by weaving them into familiar dialogue, the dramatists well knew on how momentous a task they were employed. It would be quite wrong to imagine that the poets' vocabularies were fortuitous or dropped unconsciously from their pens. Nash asserts that he was compelled to resort to boisterous compound words in order to compensate for the great defect of the English tongue, which "of all languages most swarmeth with the single money of monosyllables."*

In this "cleansing of our language from barbarism" and substitution of classicisms and exotics it has been shown how prodigious a share each dramatist bore. In the *quality* of the coinage I confess myself unable to detect any appreciable distinction between the efforts of the actors on the one hand and of the philosophers on the other. In his *Apology for Actors* (1612) Heywood legitimately glories that "the English tongue, the most harsh, uneven, broken and mixed language in the world,

° See "Dictionary of National Biography." Vol. 40, p. 108.

now fashioned by the dramatic art, had grown to a most perfect language."

Whether this new and wonderful creation was appreciated by the theatrical scum, History has not recorded. If, in Caliban, Shakespeare has drawn the wild beast monster multitude, the words of Prospero may, as Mrs. Pott recently suggested, have a new and unexpected meaning.

"I pitied thee,
Took pains to make thee speak, taught thee each hour
One thing or other. When thou didst not, savage,
Know thine own meaning, but wouldst gabble like
A thing most brutish, I endow'd thy purposes
With words that made them known."
Caliban.—"You taught me language ; and my profit on't
Is, I know how to curse ! The red plague rid you
For learning me your language !"

HAROLD BAYLEY.

THE ADVANCEMENT OF KNOW- LEDGE.

"LET IT BE INQUIRED."

IN reviewing what had been done and what left undone for the *Increase and Advancement of Learning*, Bacon assumes as indisputable that the greatest and most difficult works are overcome by three things: (1) by ample reward; (2) by prudence and soundness of direction; (3) by co-operation or conjunction of labours.

Of these, the second, *i.e.*, "the pointing out and setting forth of the straight and ready way to the thing which is to be done, must be placed first." In short, having clearly resolved upon our object, we must secure

that the methods by which we attempt to reach that object are right and direct.*

Bacon points out how rarely men *originate inquiries*; and that the difficulty in bringing forward a new discovery, or in perfecting and making it current, is "not so much in the matter or subject, as it is *in the crossness and indisposition of the mind of man to think any such thing*, to will, or to resolve it. . . . In which sort of things it is the manner of men, first to wonder that any such thing should be possible, and after it is found out to wonder again how the world should miss it so long."†

In enumerating many "impediments" to the advance of learning, he notes, "the over-much credit which has been given unto authors in making them *dictators*, that their words should stand, and not counsellors, to give advice." The damage received by sciences from this cause is "infinite"; it is "the principal cause that hath kept them low, at a stay, without growth or advancement."‡

"How long," he says, "shall we let a few received authors stand up like Hercules' columns, beyond which there shall be no sailing or discovery in science?" and *in those who have pretended to knowledge*, "what hurt has been done by the affectation of professors, and the distraction of such as are no professors." He laments that men had so little "combined their wits," or "induced search"; that every man worked in his own way, or going no farther than his guide, so that there was *no advance*; but "in the descent and continuance of wits and labours," the succession was usually a mere "handing on of the weakest and most popular opinions, the writers adorning rather than adding to the general stock of knowledge; or if any addition were made, it was rather

* De Aug. ii. Sped. iv. 284. † Interpn. Nat. Sped. iii. 324.

‡ Advt. L. i. Sped. iii. 289.

"a refining of a part than an increase of the whole,"* and he quotes Scripture as to how a man may *wander out of the way*, "*rounding up and down*," † so that, progressing only in a circle, he makes no advance.

Fellow students, I earnestly exhort you to weigh and consider these, and many like words, of the great *Bacon*. Daily experience demonstrates their accuracy, and when applied to our own researches into the facts concerning our great master and his works, they seem to be nothing short of prophetic.

Now if it be true that impediments to the knowledge of *Bacon* are the same which he found opposing new discoveries or original inquiries in his own day, surely we should combine, as evidently he and his collaborators combined, to remove these obstacles, and to make sure that we all work towards one common object, by a straight and direct road ; not "*rounding up and down*" in a circular groove.

Our object, surely, is to discover *Bacon*, to track his life, his aims, his achievements, and the vast debts which we all owe to him. Finding many deficiencies in knowledge concerning our poet-philosopher, I made, many years ago, a table, or list, of such deficiencies (a table which has, unhappily, had to be continually enlarged). I now print the chief items, in the hope (may it not be a vain hope) that others will combine to complete some of my imperfect efforts, or may originate further discoveries and researches. Let me add, for the encouragement of those who will bring diligence and perseverance to this entrancing inquiry, that their labour cannot be lost. "*All dial lines lead to the centre*," and if we only set a firm grasp upon the great chain which links all *Bacon's* works, it matters not where we begin in *Baconian* research, we shall be led from link to link, forwards, upwards, until "*from Homer's chair*" we find

* *Interpn. Nat. Sped.* iii. 231. † *Interpn. Nat. Sped.* iii. 232.

ourselves at "the foot of Jupiter's throne"; for the science, learning, poetry, theology, and all beneficent enterprises inaugurated in the age from 1570 to 1670 will be found to have their root or culmination in the great unknown—"Francis Bacon."

Let it be Inquired.

(1) *Historical.*

- a. Who was *Bacon*?
- b. Who were his parents? and where was he born?
- c. What contemporary records are there of these particulars, and of his childhood, youth, and college education?
- d. Of his travels in the suite of Sir Amyas Paulet, his consequent visits to the French towns mentioned in *1 Henry, VI.*, and of his stay at Bordeaux with Anthony Bacon and Michel de Montaigne?
- e. What is known of his travels at this time in Spain and Italy; and again later? Especially, did he not visit Venice (and there establish a paper-mill), Padua, and Rome? What was his connection with Wittenberg and other places in Germany and Holland?
- f. Why is his residence at Canonbury Tower ignored in all his biographies? What did he there? Did Prince Henry and others there hold secret conclaves? Did he thence organise and conduct his Secret Society, and supervise the production of the *Shakespeare Plays*, for which the properties were stored in the gateway of the Priory of St. John's, Clerkenwell, near at hand?
- g. Where was he married? After 1626 what became of his wife?
- h. When and where did *Bacon* die? (at least four different places are named by his biographers). Who saw him die? Who were present at his

- funeral? Who made any record of these facts? Where was he buried? (Certainly *not* at St. Michael's).
- i. Why has no comment been made by biographers on the thirty-two remarkable and instructive *Elegies* or *Eulogies* — the *Manes Verulamiani* (printed in Latin in the *Harleian Miscellanies*—translated and published *BACONIANA New Series, October, 1896, to October, 1897*)!?
 - j. Did *Bacon* really die in 1626? Did he not *die to the world*, to which, in two or three little poems (one in his own writing), he bids “farewell”? Did he then retire in 1626?—whither?—travelling again?—living in the Isle of Man? Withdrawing finally to some hermitage or religious house, where he passed the rest of his life under the name of Pater X, and in full possession of his faculties, revising and enlarging his former works, and writing others, chiefly poetical and theological?
 - k. Was X a sign for the “unknown quantity”—the Saltire Cross, arms alike of St. Andrew and of St. Alban?—Was it also the -|- of the Rose Cross turned sideways? Was it the sign of the microcosm, or the mind as “the little world of man”? Was it the sign of light or knowledge, containing in its parts the letters LVX?
 - l. Did *Bacon* die at the age of the “Rosicrucian Father”—106?
 - m. Who were his friends? In what special ways did they assist him? What claims had any of them to rank as authors, originators, or discoverers? (Immense research is here required into the MS. collections, letters, etc., which connect themselves with *Bacon*. See especially the Tenison, Gibson, Carew, Wharton, and Manners-Sutton MSS. in

Lambeth Palace Library, and the Harleian, Cotton, Pembroke, Finch-Hatton, Rawley, Hatfield, and other collections at the British Museum. Also the mysterious "Douce Collection," part of which (unless it has been spirited away) is in the British Museum, and part in the Bodleian Library. Likewise the "sealed bag" of Queen Elizabeth's letters said to be at the Record Office.

- n. The feigned, compound, or ambiguous "Biographies" of *Bacon's* friends and helpers should be carefully examined. They seem to be ingenious interweavings of the warp of one Life with the woof of another.
- o. Similarly of the disguised portraits of "authors," "discoverers," "philosophers," "poets," etc., a subject already broached, but not followed up.
- p. Why are not the busts and medals of *Bacon*, which exist screened from public view, and sometimes with difficulty to be seen, engraved and thoroughly displayed and made familiar to the world in general? What is the influence, who are the agents in a method of gentle but firm suppression of which Baconian researchers are now fully aware?
- q. Was "Bacon" no more *Bacon* than he was *Shakespeare*, and was not the true family name of Sir Nicholas, *Becon* or *Beacon*, and not "Bacon," this being a pseudonym adopted on account of certain facilities which the word offered to cryptographic writers in their numerical ciphers—and also because of the infinite number of puns, quibbles, allusions, and jests which can be contrived by means of this name?
- r. Who then were to benefit or be informed by means of these devices? Was "Bacon," indeed, the head centre of a vast secret society? Was the

upper section of this society first created? Was the lower section merely *mechanical* in its operation? That is to say, were the higher grades (whether they are to be called Rosicrucians or Masons) of this Invisible Brotherhood, the literary, scientific, philosophical and religious section, the *head* or *mind* of the brotherhood, and the lower section, the *hands* or executors, such as printers, designers, publishers, amanuenses, etc.

We were happily relieved from one controversy by the publication, in the *Journal of the Quatuor Coronati*, of Dr. Wynn Westcott's address to a Lodge of Masons, when he plainly (and to the apparent annoyance of some) asserted the common origin of the Rose Cross Fraternity with the Masons, who seem to inquire little into their own pedigree and history. All questions as to the existence of secret means of communication by ciphers, signs, symbols, marks, jargon, ambiguities, etc. (such as we find in all *old* Baconian books, and even, less conspicuously, in such books at the present time), are hereby ended, or rendered comprehensible. I have the less hesitation or compunction in speaking of these things, knowing that the highest in this beneficent society regret the obligation to secrecy under which they labour, and that they would gladly see the truth shine forth.

(2). *Bacon's Aims and Aspirations.*

- a. Was not his ultimate aim the inauguration of another golden age; a perfect restoration and reformation of learning; a new birth of philosophy, science, and works for the benefit of the human race throughout the wide world and in the future ages?
- b. Was not this to culminate in the Mingling of Earth and Heaven; the marriage of Truth and Beauty (as shadowed in the sonnets); of things material

with things spiritual; of Nature and Art, Science and Poetry?

- c. And further; was it not his supreme hope and effort to draw together the opposed and too often warring Churches, and by degrees to produce, first a wide and tolerant spirit in the religious world, and in the end, "*unity*," though not uniformity?

(3). *Work achieved.—Literary.*

- a. This section is too large for our present space;* it demands a close philological investigation of the vocabulary, turns of speech, Promus notes, grammatical peculiarities, tricks of style, and especially of the wonderfully figurative and allusive language, the identities of quotations, opinions, sentiments, antitheses, and so forth, in every book which comes under discussion.
- b. Inquire whether *Bacon* and *Shakespeare* be not *key works* to all "the rest." Is not *Bacon* a map or chart guiding the inquirer to all the learning and sciences which the author declared that he had taken to be his province? Does he not help us to the methodical arrangement of the multitudinous researches, or inquisitions, experiments, and studies which he undertook in every known department of science?
- c. Is it not discernible by the combined aid of *Bacon* and *Shakespeare* that the author practically *made our present English*, and (I think) mightily added to and adorned the languages of Continental countries? Where he did not develop or perfect his idea, did he not at least, "chalk successors their way"?
- d. Did he not make the first translations of many of

* See BACONIANA, April, 1896, iv. 70.

the classics—Homer, Plutarch, Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Tacitus, and others?

- e. Did he systematically take mere fragments of works, enlarge, complete, and publish them (*e.g.*, the works of *Roger Bacon*, of Thomas à Kempis, St. Augustin, etc.) as original works by the accredited authors?

Many more such questions force themselves upon the Baconian student—inquiries upon which space does not allow me to enter, but only to suggest: Of the true history of printing and paper-making; ciphers, anagrams and the secret marks perceptible in books from the 16th to the 20th centuries; of the first news-letters or newspapers; the first dictionaries, books of reference, and collections; of old libraries and other foundations, charitable and scientific, dramatic, literary, and theological; of concealed collections, garbled indexes, and so forth.

It is now plain that the answers to all our doubts and questionings are known to certain persons in our great libraries and colleges; and that, when we fail, in this particular study, to obtain direct and convincing answers to straightforward questions, the matter in hand is worthy of pursuit, and the obstacles placed through no ill will, but in compliance with "obligations" (now I think, *anachronisms*) imposed by the Grand Master himself.

C. M. POTT.

“THE ARTE OF ENGLISH POESIE.”

IN 1589 the above work was published by Richard Field, with a dedication to Lord Burleigh dated 28th May.

In 1722 was first printed a curious MS. by one Edmund Bolton, probably written in 1620, containing a passage stating that the fame was that the *Arte* was the work of one of Queen Elizabeth's Gentlemen Pensioners—Puttenham.

The ascription to Puttenham therefore rests merely on a rumour noted thirty-one and published one hundred and thirty-three years after the date of the work.

Dr. Garnett and Mr. E. Gosse, writing of English literature of the period, say “the *Arte* is attributed, on by no means exclusive authority, to one of two brothers Puttenham,” and add, “We must acknowledge grave doubts whether it can rightly be attributed to either.”

The “Dictionary of National Biography” shows that these brothers were frequently in prison; the known age of one of them does not fit with the personal statements in the book, and the other is not recorded to have been abroad.

Mr. Sidney Lee, alluding to the author, says: “He was the first English writer who attempted philosophical criticism of literature. Mr. Gilchrist, an earlier critic, expressed the opinion that the *Arte* was intrinsically one of the most valuable books of the age of Elizabeth.

The work being so important and its authorship still an open question, I may be excused for suggesting another likely author.

The date of writing of the *Arte* is, according to the opinion of Mr. Arber, about the year 1585.

In 1584 Vantroullier, the Edinburgh printer, had

published for King James of Scotland "A Treatise of the Airt of Scottis Poesie." On its title page was the printer's trade mark and motto, "Anchora Spei."

My theory is that Queen Elizabeth, in a spirit of royal emulation, thereupon thought well to show what she and her literary assistants could do. Francis at that date was greatly in the Queen's confidence. In 1582 he had written for her a monograph on the state of affairs on the Continent. In 1585 he was M.P. and made some marvellously brilliant speeches. He also wrote to the Queen a long and careful memorandum on State affairs and the question of her personal safety.

It is very odd to find a penniless younger son of Nicholas Bacon taking, before he is barely twenty-five, such a prominent part in the affairs of his sovereign, of whose purse he was a pensioner. Both Francis and the Queen were poets and expert linguists, and the *Arte* gave an opportunity to the Queen to publish her verses and recollections, which could not well be given in print in any other way. At the same time it enabled Francis to expound the rules of poetry, which he had studied. Says the author in Book III., chapter 25, "We have in our humble conceit sufficiently performed our promise or rather dutie to your Majestie in the description of this arte." Upon this point a few words in Bacon's Apology concerning Essex are instructive. "Her Majesty taking a liking to my pen . . . and likewise upon some other declarations which in former times, by her appointment, I put in writing, commanded me to pen that book."

Mr. Arber points out that the *Arte*, although probably begun in 1585, was not altered and amended until 1589, when it was printed by Vantroullier's son-in-law, Richard Field, under, curiously enough, the same trade mark, "Anchora Spei," which by this date had doubtless passed into the latter's possession.

Bacon, writing years afterwards to King James, refers to “your Majesty’s Royal promise (which to me is *Anchora Spei*).”

The composition of the *Arte* having been decided upon by these distinguished persons, the next characteristic precaution would be to shroud the authorship under such a veil as could not with any certainty be pierced.

The author remarks that, “The good Poet or maker ought to dissemble his arte.” Compare this with Bacon’s *Essays*, “He who would be secret must be a dissembler in some degree.”

We may therefore expect to meet with a number of statements purposed to throw people off the scent, combined with others which may be true in substance and fact.

With this precaution well in mind, there is much *prima facie* evidence pointing to Francis as the author.

It is also quite likely that Francis wrote the verses entitled the *Partheniades*, which the author states he presented to the Queen on a certain New Year’s day. One of the verses alludes to “twenty years ago” of Her Majesty’s reign. The usually assigned date is New Year’s day, 1579, when Francis was probably in England, but the phrase would perhaps more correctly indicate the year 1578. Francis came from France about 20th March, 1578-9, but according to Rawley’s *Life*, he visited England in 1578, before his final return. It would be at this time that his miniature, bearing date 1578, was painted by Hilliard, the Queen’s Court Limner. Again, who amongst the Queen’s courtiers, skilled as a poet, better answers the description of one who had spent his youth amid foreign Courts (Francis was there from September, 1576), who was closely intimate with Lord Burghley and Sir Nicholas Bacon, and who (according to Hazlewood) quotes frequently from Quintillian, the favourite author with Sir Nicholas?

Again, though treated as Francis was by the Bacon family with much distinction, Sir Nicholas, although a very rich man, carefully prepared his will a few weeks before his death, but left nothing to Francis, who, it will be seen by the latter's letter to Burleigh of 18th October, 1580, was eventually provided by the Queen herself with the means to live. Francis no doubt became a gentleman pensioner of the Court. No acknowledged poet of the period answers to the description the writer of the *Arte* gives of himself.

It will no doubt be objected that Bacon could have had no personal knowledge of Queen Mary or Edward VI., nor could he have been present at the banquet in Brussels in honour of the Earl of Arundel, nor at Spain in the reign of Charles IX. Nor was he educated at Oxford. On the other hand, had these experiences, no doubt gathered from others and with permission, entered as the writer's own, his anonymity would have been absolutely gone, since by the admissions the actual author could have been readily traced and identified.

"He who would be secret must be a dissembler in some degree." This dissembling may be less than appears if it should turn out, as I suspect, that some of the incidents occurred to, and were interpolated by, Queen Elizabeth herself.

The following is suspicious of royalty:—"The eclogue Elpine which *we* made, being but eighteen years old, to King Edward, a Prince of great hope."

Elizabeth was eighteen in September, 1551, while her brother Edward was king. The epitaph on Sir John Throgmorton may be another interpolation by her Majesty; Sir John was judge of the Palatine Court of her Duchy of Chester. He died in 1580. Her close intimacy with the Throgmortons is also shown by the letter of Paulet to Burleigh in September, 1576, which states that he is taking to Paris with him a son of Sir

Nicholas Throgmorton (brother of Sir John) at the recommendation of Her Majesty, and therefore he could not refuse him. Sir John was knighted by the Queen at Kenilworth. His wife, according to the lists of New Year's gifts, was at Court in 1578 and 1579.

Passing to the internal evidence of mannerisms and style, I first draw attention to the dedication of the book to Lord Burghley, nominally the work of the printer.

Compare:—

“Bestowing upon your Lordship the first vewe of this mine impression.”

with:—

‘The first heir of my invention’

occurring in the dedication to *Venus and Adonis*, also published by Field in 1593.

Then contrast this concluding passage in the *Arte*:—

“I presume so much upon your Majestie's most mild and gracious judgment, *howsoever you conceive of myne abilitie to any better or greater service*, that yet in this attempt ye will allow of my loyall and good intent, always endeavouring to do your Majesty the best and greatest of these services I can,”

with a passage in a letter written years later by Bacon to King James:—

“I hope and wish at least that this which I have written may be of some use to your Majesty. . . . At the least it is the effect of my care and poor abilitie, which if in me be any, it is given me to no other end but faithfully to serve your Majesty.”

I have italicised some words in the former passage. We know that in 1592, when he wrote to Burleigh, Bacon was openly begging for office of some kind. “I

ever bare a mind (in some middle place that I could discharge) to serve her Majesty." "Place of any reasonable countenance doth bring commandment of more wits than of man's own, which is the thing I greatly affect."

Internal evidence also shews that the work, probably begun in 1585, was altered and added to even up to 1589. The practice of altering and adding was common to Bacon's acknowledged works. "I alter ever when I add, so that nothing is finished until all be finished" (Bacon to Tobie Matthew).

Internal evidence shews the writer to have been a barrister of such familiarity with law and pleading as we should expect Francis to have attained at this period, 1585-9. In the last year he was made a Reader of his Inn. Below are some illustrations from the *Arte* of this proficiency in law.

"And this figure is much used by our English pleaders in the Star Chamber and Chancery, which they call to confess and avoid."

"It serveth many times to great purpose to prevent our adversaries' arguments and take upon us to know before what our judge, or adversary, or hearer thinketh."

"It is also very many times used for a good pollicie in pleading."

"As he that in a litigious case for land would prove it, not the adversaries, but his clients."

"No man can say its his by heirship, nor by legacie or testator's device, nor that it came by purchase or engage, nor from his Prince for any good service."

"This man deserves to be endited of petty larceny for pilfering other men's devices from them and converting them to his own use."

Compare Bacon's remarks to Elizabeth in Apothegms concerning Heywood. "No, madam, for treason I cannot deliver opinion that there is any, but for

felony very many. Because he had stolen so many of his sentences and conceits out of Cornelius Tacitus.”

Bacon's love of the art of persuasion (which he was fond of illustrating with the story of the unresisted invasion of Italy, where the conqueror came with chalk in his hands to mark up lodging places for his soldiers rather than with arms to force their way) seems also a characteristic of the writer of the *Arte*.

In *The Wisdom of the Ancients*, 1609, he writes:—
 “The fable of Orpheus, though trite and common, has never been well interpreted.” Then he explains, “Orpheus' music is of two sorts . . . the first may fitly be applied to natural philosophy, the second to moral or *civil* discipline . . . by *persuasion* and *eloquence*; insinuating the love of virtue, equity and concord in the minds of men, draws multitudes of men to a Society, makes them subject to laws, obedient to government.”

In the grounds of Gorhambury, Bacon erected a statute to Orpheus inscribed “Philosophy Personified.”

In his discourse on the Plantation of Ireland, 1608, he stated, “That Orpheus, by the virtue of the sweetness of his harp, did call and *assemble* the beasts and birds of their nature, *wild and savage*, to stand about him as in a theatre,” which he explained to imply the reducing and plantation of kingdoms when people of barbarous manners are brought to give ear to the wisdom of laws and governments.

The passage in the *Arte* relating to Orpheus is at the beginning of Book I, chapter 3. After referring to sweet and *eloquent persuasion*, he proceeds, “And Orpheus *assembled* the wilde beastes to come in heards to harken to his musicke and by that means made them tame, implying thereby how, by his discreet and wholesome lessons, uttered in harmonie and with melodious instruments, he brought the *rude and savage* people to a more *civil* and *orderly life*.”

Internal evidence shews the writer of the *Arte*, like Bacon and the writer of the Shakespeare plays, to be fond of introducing new and unaccustomed words. In Book III., chapter 4, before proceeding to discuss a number of novel words used by him, the writer of the *Arte* says, "And peradventure the writer hereof be in that behalfe no lesse faultie then any other, using many strange and unaccustomed wordes and borrowed from other languages."

I will next give a few parallelisms between the *Arte* (A) and the writings of Bacon (B) and Shakespeare (S):—

A.—"Every man's stile is for the most part according to the matter and subject."

B.—"Style is as the subject matter."

A.—"He cannot lightly do amiss if he have besides a special regard to all the circumstances of the person, place, time, cause, and purpose he hath in hand."

B.—"It is good to vary and suit speeches with the present occasions and to have a moderation in all our speeches especially in jesting of religion, state, great persons, etc."

S.—"He must observe their moods on whom he jests
The quality of persons and the time."

A.—"And maketh now and then very vice go for a formal virtue."

S.—"There is no vice so simple but assumes
Some mark of virtue on his outward parts."

A.—"But now because our Maker or Poet is to play many parts and not one alone."

S.—"And one man in his time plays many parts."

Love in its two aspects are treated much alike by the writer of the *Arte* and by Bacon.

A.—"For love there is no frailtie in flesh and blood

as excusable as it, no comfort or discomfort greater than the good and bad success thereof, nothing more natural to man, nothing of more force to vanquish his will and to inveigle his judgment.”

B.—“Love is a pure gain and advancement in nature, it is not a good by comparison but a true good; it is not an ease of pain but a true purchase of pleasures.”

“It checks with business and troubleth men’s fortunes and maketh men that they can no ways be true to their own ends.”

I have now presented what I think to be a fair *prima facie* case for ascribing to Francis Bacon the authorship of *The Arte of English Poesie*.

In seeking to add another work to the long list now ascribed to the authorship of *Lord St. Alban*, it may be objected that it was impossible for one man to have accomplished so much. I ask those objectors to bear in mind that his acknowledged writings only fill six octavo volumes. Compare this with the productions of Dumas, or the 290 volumes accredited to Maurice Iokai, the Hungarian.

Should any reader desire to read the *Arte* (Arber reprints) it can be obtained from A. Constable and Co., for a small price. The *Arte* shows that its writer was easily familiar with all the technicalities of prose and verse. It is consistent with Bacon’s methods that he should have sought to instruct his nation in an art of which he was a master, though concealed.

PARKER WOODWARD.

A DUOLOGUE

BETWEEN AN ENQUIRER AND LORD SAINT ALBAN.

Enquirer.—Why does Shakespeare in *Cymbeline* say, “Winking Mary-buds begin to ope their golden eyes”?

Lord St. Alban.—“Some flowers have respect to the sunne by opening and shutting. Mary-Golds, tulippas, pimpernel, and, indeed, most flowers do open and spread their leaves abroad when the sun shineth serene and fair.”—*Natural History*.

Enquirer.—Yes, when “Phœbus ’gins arise.” Well, can you explain why Macbeth at his Banquet says, “Now, good digestion wait on appetite, and health on both”?

Lord St. Alban.—Because “The appetite is the spur of the digestion.” “For the preservation of health the stomach should be in good appetite; because appetite promotes digestion.”—*A delineation of the particular History of Life and Death*.

Enquirer.—Please tell me why Iago in *Othello* says, “He that filches from me my good name, robs me of that which not enriches him, and makes me poor indeed,” and “Good name in man and woman is the immediate jewel of their soul.”

Lord St. Alban.—“Men’s souls are more precious than their bodies, and are their GOOD NAMES.”—*Ibid*.

Enquirer.—Can you make it clear why the First Senator in *Coriolanus* says, “Leave us to cure this cause”? It is a curious expression to use.

Lord St. Alban.—“It is in vain to CURE the accidents of a disease except the CAUSE be found and removed.”—*Letter to Buckingham*.

Enquirer.—May I ask why in *A Winter’s Tale* Shake-

speare says, "Hot lavender, mint, etc., are given to men of middle age"?

Lord St. Alban.—"After a man is come to his middle age heat consumeth the spirits."—*Natural History.*

Enquirer.—But do you ever speak of hot herbs?

Lord St. Alban.—"Certain herbs, and those hot ones, as Lavender, Sage, Hyssop."—*Natural History.*

Enquirer.—Hamlet tells Polonius that the actor "holds the Mirror up to Nature," and is "the Chronicle of the Time." Is he?

Lord St. Alban.—"History is of three kinds, the first we call Chronicles, it representeth a TIME."—*Advancement of Learning.*

Enquirer.—A History of a TIME is a Chronicle, but is a play a History?

Lord St. Alban.—"Representative* (Poesy) is as a visible History, and is an image of actions as if they were present, as History is of actions in Nature, as they are, that is, past."—*Ibid.*

Enquirer.—The Chorus in *Henry V.* says much the same. He asks to be admitted Chorus "to this History." Can you tell me why the "Wooden O, or Globe," was given that title? in which he asks "to cram the very casques that did affright the air at Agincourt."

Lord St. Alban.—"It is the perfect law of Enquiry of Truth, that nothing be in the GLOBE of Matter which should not be likewise in the GLOBE of CRYSTAL or Form. That . . . there be not anything in being and action which should not be drawn and collected into contemplation and Doctrine."—*Ibid.*

* George Newnes' edition of the "Advancement of Learning," in the *Contents* prints this word "*Dramatical.*" Mr. Edwin Reed, p. 136 of "Francis Bacon or Shake-speare?" gives the line thus: "*Dramatica est veluti historia spectabilis.*"

Enquirer.—Do you mean that the Globe Theatre was a reflecting Crystal in which, held up to nature, men's actions and hearts were seen?

Lord St. Alban.—“The precept that I conceive to be most summary is to obtain that window that Momus did require—to look into the frame of men's hearts—not only of persons but of actions, what are on foot, how they are conducted, and how they import.”—*Ibid.*

Enquirer.—And have you done this?

Lord St. Alban.—“Thus, I have made, as it were, a small GLOBE of the Intellectual world—the good, if any be, is due to the fat of the sacrifice, to be incensed to the honour first, of the Divine Majesty.”—*Ibid.*

Enquirer.—Explain, please, why the Chorus desires a “Kingdom for a Stage, princes to act, and monarchs to behold the swelling scene.”

Lord St. Alban.—“This GLOBE which seems to us a dark and shady body is in view of God as a crystal. So unto Princes and States,—the natures and dispositions of the people, their conditions, and necessities, their factions and combinations, their animosities and discontents, ought to be in great part clear and transparent. . . . In Governors toward the governed, all things ought, as far as frailty of man permitteth, to be manifest and revealed.”—*Ibid.*

Enquirer.—What is your opinion of the stage as a means of education?

Lord St. Alban.—“The action of the Theatre, though modern States esteem it but ludicrous unless it be satirical and biting, was carefully watched by the ancients that it might improve mankind in virtue; and indeed many wise men and great philosophers have thought it to the mind as the bow to the fiddle.”—*Ibid.*

ALICIA A. LEITH.

BACON'S SCRIVENERY.

I N the preceding issue of *BACONIANA* a correspondent enquired who was the authority for the assertion that Ben Jonson was one of Bacon's "good pens." Apparently it was Dr. Wm. Rawley—the Lord Chancellor's "first and last chaplain."

In "*Remains now set forth by him under the title of Baconiana*," Archbishop Tenison relates that the Latin translation of Bacon's *Essays* "was a work performed by diverse hands; by those of Dr. Hackett (late Bishop of Lichfield), Mr. Benjamin Johnson (the learned and judicious poet), and others whose names I once heard from Dr. Rawley, but I cannot now recall them."

It is a pity the Archbishop's memory failed him. The names of Bacon's "good pens which forsake me now" would now-a-days be of profound interest.

At the foot of folio 109 of his *Promus* notes, Bacon wrote *The Law at Twickenham for mery tales*. This is, apparently, a reference to the Scrivenery and its staff of skilled penmen maintained by Francis and his brother Anthony. It is believed that this scriptorium was originally started in Gray's Inn, but removed to the privacy of Twickenham in order to escape the meddlesome attentions of the Scriveners' Company, which held a rigorous monopoly within the jurisdiction of the city. It seems to have been used for literary purposes, and for the ciphery and deciphery of political documents. In the correspondence of Anthony and Francis Bacon allusions to both purposes are fairly frequent. Thus a political agent, Standen, writes, sending his travels in Turkey, Italy and Spain, "Nothing too high in price for you," out of which, and the Zibaldone MS., Anthony is to copy what he likes. If Standen discovers a lost manuscript (his discourse on the Spanish State) Anthony shall have it. Morgan

Colman, an English correspondent, writes in September, 1592, that he is feeding himself with his papers, which he trusts will deliver fruit well pleasing to Anthony.*

In 1594-5 we find Francis writing to Anthony from "Twickenham Park this 25th of January."

"I have here an idle pen or two, specially one that was cozened, thinking to have got some money this term. I pray you send me somewhat else for them to write out beside your Irish collection, which is almost done. There is a collection of Dr. James (Dean of Christchurch) of foreign States largeliest of Flanders, which though it be no great matter, yet I would be glad to have it."

In 1596 Essex sends by his Secretary Cuffe "a true relation of the action at Cadiz," Cuffe writing to Anthony,

"The original you are to keep, because my Lord charged me to turn either the whole or the sum of it into French, and to cause it to be sent to some good personage in these parts under a false name or anonymously."

In 1601 or thereabouts Francis writes to Anthony,

"Good brother; I send you the supplication which Mr. Topcliffe lent me. It is curiously written and worth the writing out for the art, though the argument be bad. But it is lent me but for two or three days. So God keep you."

This literary Bureau seems to have been in full swing for many years. In 1623 Bacon wrote to his friend Tobie Matthew:

"My labours are now most set to have those works which I had formerly published . . . well translated into Latin by the help of some good pens which forsake me not."

We have little information as to the "good pens," but as we have seen, according to Archbishop Tenison,

* Birch I. 85.

Ben Jonson was one of the group. Others were Hobbes, the philosopher, and Thomas Bushell. Aubrey writes that the Lord Chancellor Bacon loved to converse with Hobbes. "He assisted his Lordship in translating several of his Essays into Latin. . . . His Lordship was a very contemplative person, and was wont to contemplate in his delicious walks at Gorhambury and dictate to Mr. Bushell or some other of his gentlemen that attended him with ink and paper ready to set down presently his thoughts."*

Peter Boëner records of his master that he "seldom saw him take up a book. He only ordered his chaplain (William Rawley) and me to look in such and such an author for a certain place, and then he dictated to us early in the morning what he had invented and composed during the night."†

The relations between Bacon and his bodyguard of scribes and shorthand writers seem to have been of the most intimate and affectionate character. Spedding states that the MS. of *Filum Labyrinthi* is endorsed at the top of the first page in Bacon's handwriting with the words AD FILIOS, while the reverential admiration of the "sons" for their philosopher and friend evinces itself in exalted eulogy.

There is reason to believe that a manuscript executed at Bacon's Scrivenery is now in existence. The document in question was discovered in the year 1867, among some manuscripts at Northumberland House, Charing Cross, and is now at Alnwick Castle, in the possession of the Duke of Northumberland. This has been recently edited and sumptuously reproduced in *facsimile* by Mr. Fr. J. Burgoyne. By the industry of Mr. T. le Marchant Douse,‡ the handwriting has been identified

* Life of Hobbes. Aubrey. Vol. II., pt. 2, p. 602.

† Spedding. Vol. XIV., p. 566.

‡ "The Northumberland Manuscript," by T. le Marchant Douse. London. 1904.

as that of John Davies, of Hereford, a professional scrivener and the most skilful penman of his time. His profession was to copy documents for his various employers, and also to give instruction in the art of penmanship. He was also a scholar, educated at Oxford University, and the writer of numerous sonnets. One of these is addressed, "To the royall, ingenious and all-learned Knight, Sr Francis Bacon."

"Thy bounty and the Beauty of thy Witt
 Comprised in Lists of Law and learned Arts,
 Each making thee for great Employment fitt
 Which now thou hast, (though short of thy deserts)
 Compells my pen to let fall shining Inke
 And to bedew the Baies that deck thy Front ;
 And to thy health in Helicon to drinke
 As to her Bellamour the Muse is wont :
 For, thou dost her embozom ; and, dost vse
 Her company for sport twixt grave affaires :
 So vtterest Law the liuelyer through thy Muse.
 And for that all thy Notes are sweetest Aires ;
 My Muse thus notes thy worth in ev'ry Linc,
 With yncke which thus she sugers ; so, to shine."

From this, as Mr. Douse observes, it seems that Bacon had recently made him a present in money, or more probably had paid him lavishly for some assistance.

Apart, however, from the evidence of this sonnet, the contents of the MS. point to the conclusion that Davies must at some time have been in Bacon's employment. Six out of the nine pieces which the MS. contains are transcripts of Bacon's unpublished work, to which an outsider would scarcely have had access. The outer sheet forms an Index or Table of Contents, and, although the page has been scribbled over and damaged severely by fire and dust, the following titles can still be read upon it :—

Mr. ffrancis Bacon.
 Of tribute or giving what is dew.

The praise of the worthiest vertue.
 The praise of the worthiest affection.
 The praise of the worthiest power.
 The praise of the worthiest person.

Philipp against Monsieur.
 Earle of Arundell's letter to the Queen.
 Speeches for my Lord of Essex at the tylt.
 A speach for my Lord of Sussex, tilt.
 Leycester's Commonwealth. Incerto autore.
 Orations at Graie's Inne revells.
 Qucene's Mate
 By Mr. ffrancis Bacon.
 Essaies by the same author.
 Rychard the second.
 Rychard the third.
 Asmund and Cornelia.
 Ile of dogs frmnt.

In addition to this List of Contents, the page has been scribbled over either by some writer "for trial of his pens or for experiments in handwriting." The repetition of the name "*William Shakespeare*," the line from *Lucrece* ("revealing day through every crany peepes"), and the enumeration of *Richard II.* and *Richard III.*, led to the inference that the transcriber was employed upon copying these works of Shakespeare. As, when published, they were obtainable for a few pence, it seems irrational to imagine that anyone would go to the trouble and expense of making manuscript copies of them. If they were not published, how came one of Bacon's secretaries in possession of the MSS.?

In addition to the works of Shakespeare, we find enumerated on this interesting outer cover, *Asmund and Cornelia*, believed to be a lost drama, and "*Ile of Dogs frmnt* (fragment), by *Thomas Nashe inferior plaiers*."

Players, as Dyce states, seldom ventured to approach the houses of the aristocracy, and plays were "hardly regarded as literature." Milton, after mentioning that

men in highest dignity have laboured not a little to be thought able to compose a tragedy, and that Seneca, the philosopher, is by some thought the author of those tragedies that go under another's name, concludes, "this is mentioned to vindicate Tragedy from the small esteem, *or rather infamy*, which in the account of many it undergoes at this day."*

How comes it that we find the infamous works of Shakespeare and other "inferior" dramatists apparently engaging the attention of Francis Bacon?

"GREAT ENGLISHMEN OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY."

THIS is Mr. Lee's latest work, and it shows, better than anything he has yet written, his inveterate animosity to Bacon. He tells us that "An illogical tendency has of late years developed in undisciplined minds to detect in Bacon and Shakespeare a single personality. One has heard of brains which, when subjected to certain excitements, cause their possessors to see double—to see two objects when only one is in view; but it is equally proof of unstable intellectual balance which leads a man or woman to see single—to see one individuality when they are in the presence of two individualities, each definite and distinct. The intellect of both Shakespeare and Bacon may well be termed miraculous. The facts of biography may be unable to account for the emergence of the one or the other, but they can prove convincingly that no two great minds of a single era *pursued literary paths more widely dissevered*. To assume, without an iota of sound evidence, that both Shakespeare's and Bacon's intellect

* Intro. to *Samson Agonistes*.

were (*sic*) housed in a single brain is unreal mockery. *It is an irresponsibly fantastic dream which lies outside the limits of reason.*"

It will be my endeavour to show Mr. Lee, in the course of this article, that he is entirely wrong in promulgating such an argument. It is not the first occasion on which Mr. Lee has described Baconians in similar language. He has varied his expressions in this instance for American consumption, and his variation is as untrue as it is impertinent.

Has Mr. Lee ever read a word of Bacon beyond the *Essays*? According to him there is not the smallest resemblance between Bacon and Shakespeare. He is a Shakspearean, and yet seems singularly unacquainted with the *Commentaries* of Gervinus, of whom Furnivall said:—"What strikes me most in Gervinus is his breadth of culture, his rightness and calmness of judgment, his fairness in looking at both sides of a question, his noble, earnest purpose, his resolve to get at the deepest meaning of his author, and his reverence and love for Shakespeare." And again, "The profound and generous *Commentaries* of Gervinus . . . is still the only book known to me that comes near the true treatment and the dignity of its subject, or can be put into the hands of the student who wants to know the mind of Shakespeare."

Gervinus institutes the following close comparison between Bacon and Shakespeare, contemporaries, in their course of thought, their attitude towards life, and their views of its movements, as revealed in their works:—

"Scarcely can anything be said of Shakespeare's position generally with regard to mediæval poetry which does not also bear upon the position of the renovator, Bacon, with regard to mediæval philosophy. Neither knew nor mentioned the other. . . . Just as Shakespeare went from instance to instance in his judgment

of moral actions, and never founded a law on single experience, so did Bacon in natural science avoid leaping from one experience of the senses to general principles; he spoke of this with blame, as anticipating nature; and Shakespeare, in the same way, would have called the conventionalities in the poetry of the southern races an anticipation of human nature. In the scholastic science of the Middle Ages, as in the chivalric poetry of the Romantic period, approbation and not truth was sought for, and with one accord Shakespeare's poetry and Bacon's science were *equally opposed* to this. As Shakespeare balanced the one-sided errors of the imagination by reason, reality, and nature, so Bacon led philosophy away from the one-sided errors of reason to experience; both, with one stroke, renovated the two branches of science and poetry by this renewed bond with nature; both, disregarding all by-ways, staked everything upon this 'victory in the race between art and nature.' Just as Bacon, with his new philosophy, is linked with the natural science of Greece and Rome, and then with the latter period of philosophy in western Europe, so Shakespeare's drama stands in relation to the comedies of Plautus, and to the stage of his own day; between the two lay a vast wilderness of time, as unfruitful for the drama as for philosophy. . . . Bacon felt himself quite an original in that which was his peculiar merit, and so was Shakespeare: the one in the method of science he had laid down, and in his suggestions for its execution, the other in the poetical works he had executed, and in the suggestions of their new law. . . . Shakespeare despised the million, and Bacon feared the applause of the multitude. Both are alike in the rare impartiality with which they avoided everything one-sided. Both have an equal hatred of sects and parties. . . . Both, therefore, are equally free from prejudices, and from astrological superstition in dreams

and omens. . . . From Bacon's example it seems clear that Shakespeare left religious matters unnoticed on the same grounds as himself, and took the path of morality in worldly things; in both, this has been equally misconstrued, and Le Maistre has proved Bacon's lack of Christianity, as Birch has done that of Shakespeare. . . . Neither stooped before authorities, and an injustice similar to that which Bacon committed against Aristotle, Shakespeare perhaps has done to Homer. As Shakespeare was often involuntarily philosophical in his profoundness, Bacon was not seldom surprised into the imagination of the poet. Just as Bacon insisted throughout generally and dispassionately upon the practical use of philosophy, so Shakespeare's poetry aimed throughout at bearing upon the moral life. Bacon himself was of the same opinion; he was not far from declaring history to be the best teacher of politics, and *poetry the best instructor in morals*. Both were alike deeply moved by the picture of a ruling Nemesis, whom they saw, grand and powerful, striding through history and life. . . . In Bacon's works we find a multitude of moral sayings and maxims of experience from which the most striking mottoes might be drawn for every Shakespearean play; aye, for every one of his principal characters . . . testifying to a remarkable harmony in their mutual comprehension of human nature. Both, in their systems of morality rendering homage to Aristotle, whose ethics Shakespeare, from a passage in *Troilus*, may have read, arrived at the same end as he did—that virtue lies in a just medium between two extremes. Shakespeare would also have agreed with him in this, that Bacon declared excess to be the fault of youth, as defect is of age; he accounted 'defect the worst, because excess contains some sparks of magnanimity, and, like a bird, claims kindred of the heavens, while defect, only like a base worm, crawls upon the earth!'

In these maxims lie at once, as it were, the whole theory of Shakespeare's dramatic forms and of his moral philosophy."

Yet Mr. Sidney Lee declares that there is no affinity between Shakespeare and Bacon !

Kuno Fischer may also give Mr. Lee some further intelligence when he writes:—

"The want of ability to take an historical survey of the world is to be found alike in Bacon and Shakespeare, together with many excellences likewise *common to them both*. . . . Both possessed to an eminent degree that faculty for a knowledge of human nature that at once pre-supposes and calls forth an interest in practical life and historical reality. To this interest corresponds the stage, on which the Roman characters moved ; and here Bacon and Shakespeare met, brought together by a common interest in these objects, and the attempt to depict and copy them. This point of agreement, more than any other argument, explains their affinity. . . . Is not the inexhaustible theme of Shakespeare's poetry the history and course of human passion? In the treatment of this especial theme is not Shakespeare the greatest of all poets—nay, is he not unique among them all? *And it is this very theme that is proposed by Bacon as the chief problem of moral philosophy*. . . . Bacon desires nothing less than a natural history of the passions—*the very thing that Shakespeare has produced*. . . . With a few felicitous touches, Bacon sketched the characters of Julius and Augustus Cæsar, *and his view of both was similar to that of Shakespeare*."

Then follows a comparison of the treatment of the character of Cæsar by Bacon and Shakespeare, showing absolute identity in the estimate of his character and actions. Fischer concludes his chapter with this statement:—

“It is very characteristic that among human passions Bacon best understands avarice and ambition, and least understands love, which he ranks very low. Love was as foreign to his nature as lyrical poetry; but in one single instance he perceived its tragical importance, and this very case was developed by Shakespeare into a tragedy. ‘You may observe,’ says Bacon, ‘that amongst all the great and worthy persons, there is not one that hath 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 Antonio.’ He has already said that love is ‘sometimes like a siren, sometimes like a fury,’ and it may be truly observed with respect to Cleopatra, as conceived by Shakespeare, that she appears to Mark Antony in both these capacities.”

Here, however, with regard to love, Kuno Fischer is wrong, as he judges Bacon’s opinion of love solely from his essay *Of Love*. But Bacon’s and Shakespeare’s ideas on the “tender passion” were exactly similar, and were expressed almost in the same language. Here is one proof of this assertion:—

Bacon, about the year 1592, wrote a device for Essex, called *A Conference of Pleasure*, which has been edited from the “Northumberland House Manuscript” by Spedding, Douse, and Burgoyne. About this same year, Shakespeare wrote his first play, *Love’s Labour’s Lost*, and I shall give Bacon’s ideas of love in parallel columns with those of Shakespeare, extracted from these two works.

SHAKESPEARE (circa 1591-2).

BACON (circa 1591-2).

“Love gives to every power a double power.”

“Love gives the mind power to exceed itself.”

“Love is first learned in a woman’s eyes.”

“The eye, where love beginneth.”

SHAKESPEARE (circa 1591-2)
—continued.

"Is not *love* a *Hercules*?"

"*Love* . . . with the *motion* of
all elements."

"But for my *love* . . . where
nothing wants that want
itself doth seek."

"They here stand martyrs,
slain in Cupid's wars."

BACON (circa 1591-2)
—continued.

"What fortune can be such a
Hercules (as *love*)?" (see
infra).

"*Love* is the *motion* that ani-
mateth all things."

"When we want *nothing*, there
is the reason and the
opportunity and the spring
of *love*."

"Lovers never thought their
profession sufficiently
graced till they had com-
pared it to a *warfare*."

For these parallels I am indebted to my friend, Mr. Edwin Reed. Bacon's *Device*, written fourteen years before his marriage, contains the following significant passages, disproving the statement that "Bacon knew nothing about love":—

"My praise shall be dedicated to the *happiest state of mind, to the noblest affection*. I shall teach lovers to love, that have all this while loved by *rote*. I shall give them the alphabet of love.

"Let no man fear the yoke of fortune that's in the yoke of love. What fortune can be such a *Hercules* as shall be able to overcome two?"

"Assuredly no person ever saw at any time the mind of another but in love. *Love is the only passion that opens the heart. If not the highest, it is the sweetest affection of all others.*

"When one foreseeth, withal, that to his many griefs cannot be added solitude, but that he shall have a partner to bear them, this quieteth the mind."

When Bacon penned these passages in *A Conference of Pleasure* he was unmarried. His *Essay, Of Love*,

was written six years *after* his marriage, so that his bachelor ideas may have experienced a change in the interval, and it is certain that they did.

But Gervinus and Fischer are not the only authorities who bring Bacon and Shakespeare into the same *galère*. Mr. Churton Collins, who detests Baconians and all their ways, has the courage to write :—

“ With *as precise a hand as Bacon*, does he (Shakespeare) sunder the celestial from the terrestrial kingdom, the things of earth from the things of heaven.”

Next we have the testimony of Professor Fowler :—

“ Hence, perhaps, it is that there is no author, unless it be Shakespeare, who is so easily remembered and so frequently quoted (as Bacon).”

While the *Edinburgh Review* once testified :—

“ Bacon is almost Shakespeare in philosophic garb, so resplendent is his *imagination*, and so versatile his genius ” (1854).

Even Professor Masson, who will not have Bacon at any price, declares :—

“ It is as if into a mind poetical in *form* there had been poured all the *matter* that existed in the mind of his (Shakespeare's) contemporary, Bacon. In Shakespeare's plays we have thought, history, exposition, philosophy, all within the round of the poet. The only difference between him and Bacon sometimes is that Bacon writes an essay, and calls it his own, while Shakespeare writes a similar essay, and puts it into the mouth of a Ulysses or a Polonius ” (*Wordsworth and other Essays*, p. 242).

Professor Blackie says :—

“ Bacon's similes, for their aptness and their vivid-

ness, are of the kind of which Shakespeare might have been proud."

Gerald Massey says:—"The philosophical writings of Bacon are suffused and saturated with Shakespeare's thought. . . . These *likenesses in thought and expression* are mainly limited to these two contemporaries. It may also be admitted that one must have copied the other. The fact is reasonably certain, and ought to be treated with courtesy."

In his work entitled *Literary Influence in British History*, the Hon. A. S. G. Canning writes:—

"Bacon, in frequent allusion to classic writers, as well as in cautious avoidance of religious controversy, so prevalent in his time, resembles Shakespeare on this exciting subject. Both these great Englishmen wrote for all religious divisions of their fellow-countrymen, and therefore attack neither 'popery' nor 'heresy.' . . . Like Shakespeare, Bacon had higher objects in view than to increase or maintain the prejudices of fellow-Christians against each other."

In spite of all this, however, there is no resemblance between Bacon and Shakespeare, according to Mr. Sidney Lee. Truly, there is no man so blind as the man who will not see—the man who abuses disbelievers in the theory that the Shakespeare of the plays was the Shaksper of Stratford, who, according to Taine, "lent money, and cut a good figure in this world. Strange close; one which at first sight resembles more that of a shop-keeper than of a poet"—the man of whose life, as it is commonly related, Richard Grant White says:—

"We hunger, and we receive these husks; we open our mouths for *food*, and we break our teeth against these *stones*."

Mr. Lee says:—

“At times he (Bacon) tried to turn a stanza. The results are unworthy of notice. Bacon’s acknowledged attempts at formal poetry are uncouth and lumbering; they attest *congenital unfitness* for that mode of expression.”

Spedding thought differently when he wrote:—“The heroic couplet could hardly do its work better in the hands of Dryden,” and “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. Had it taken the ordinary direction, *I have little doubt that it would have carried him to a place among the great poets.*” This is from a man who had read every word that Bacon ever published. Yet Mr. Lee asserts that “The great poet’s *faculty of imagination*, which is mainly the fruit of emotion, was denied Bacon.” Fancy any sane man denying Bacon the “faculty of imagination!” A certain critic named Macaulay once wrote “The *poetical faculty* was great in Bacon’s mind,” and “No *imagination* was ever at once so strong, and so thoroughly subjugated.” Even Gervinus holds that “Bacon was not seldom surprised into *the imagination of the poet.*”

I would like to enlarge on the other unmitigated nonsense Mr. Lee writes about Bacon in connection with poetry if I had the space; but I afford him some enlightenment on the subject in the March number of *The Fortnightly Review* in a long-delayed article, entitled *Was Bacon a Poet?*

Mr. Lee shows himself lamentably ignorant of Bacon’s life when he maintains, “The number of works that Bacon claimed to have penned, when combined with the occupations of his professional career, so filled up every nook and cranny of his adult time that on no showing was leisure available for the conquest of vast fields of poetry and drama.” Is Mr. Lee not aware of

the fact that till 1605, the year of the publication of *The Advancement of Learning*, all that Bacon had published, I do not say written, with the exception of a few legal tracts, consisted of ten small essays; that up to 1607, when he became Solicitor-General, he had ample leisure for literary work; that during this period of comparative inactivity five-sixths of the Shakespeare plays had been written and produced; and that none of the dramas were written after Bacon became Attorney-General in 1613, the last being *The Tempest*, ascribed to that year by Tieck as a masque composed to celebrate the marriage of Princess Elizabeth? Why does Mr. Lee not devote a little more attention to the facts and dates of Bacon's life?

As with Bacon's "poetry," Mr. Lee will have nothing to do with Bacon's "scientific research." This is what he says on the subject:—

"It is *doubtful* whether Bacon, despite his *intuitive* grasp of scientific principle, had any *genuine aptitude* for the practical work of *scientific research*."

Mr. Lee is a great believer in "intuition" having provided Shakspeare with all his legal and other knowledge; so we are not surprised to hear that "Bacon's *intuition* enabled him to *strike out* a *few* shrewd scientific *observations* that anticipated researches of the future. He described heat as a mode of motion, and light as requiring time for its transmission; of the atomic theory he had, too, a *shadowy glimpse*. He even *vaguely suggested* some valuable mechanical devices which are now in vogue. In a description of instruments for the transference of sound he foreshadowed the invention of speaking-tubes and telephones; and he died, as we have seen, in an endeavour [a successful endeavour] to test a perfectly accurate theory of refrigeration." How generous this treatment meted out by Mr. Lee to the

founder of the Royal Society! And the Bacon anticipations all were achieved by "intuition!" Bacon also discovered the compressibility of water (anticipating Canton and Oersted), the means of obtaining wires of extreme fineness (anticipating Wollaston), the influence of the moon on the tides, the causes of colour (anticipating Newton), and showed that the motions of the planets are due to the magnetic attraction of the *cælum stellatum* — all, *probably* by "intuition." Bacon, however, I believe, obtained his scientific knowledge by study and experiment. Mr. Lee asserts that both Bacon and Shakspeare got their scientific knowledge by "intuition," which, according to Cowden Clarke, "taught him (Shaksper) many secrets of Nature as yet unpromulgated by science to the world, as well as many of those known only to adepts in their several branches of science;" by "the study of the infinite book of Nature," according to Halliwell-Phillipps; and by "heaven-sent inspiration," according to Sir Theodore Martin. Fancy "intuition" and "heaven-sent inspiration" ever providing a man with the knowledge displayed in the works of Shakespeare! These ideas may suit Mr. Lee's disciples, but they will fail to obtain many supporters among men of science. For a refutation of the opinions of Macaulay and Mr. Lee on Bacon as a scientist, I would refer to my articles in *BACONIANA*, January, 1903, and July, 1904, especially pages 153-4 of the latter communication.

Further comment is unnecessary on Mr. Lee's other perverse opinions of Bacon—of his conduct in "the practical affairs of life," of his extravagance, his "perfidy," his money-borrowing, of his "practice of deceit," of his "tricks and subterfuges, dissimulation, evasion," of his "unparalleled faith in himself," of his "blind self-confidence," of his "breaches of eternal moral laws," etc. Sufficient for the multitude is the

dictum of Mr. Lee that in certain respects "Bacon stands forth as a pitiable failure." Poor Bacon! He never expected to be described as "a pitiable failure."

Contrast this verdict, with that of Bacon's friend, Sir Tobie Matthew:—

"He was a man most sweet in his conversation and ways, grave in his judgments, splendid in his expenses, a friend unalterable to his friends, an enemy to no man, a most hearty indefatigable servant to the king, and a most earnest lover of the public, having all the thoughts of that large heart of his set upon adorning the age in which he lived, and benefiting as far as possible the whole human race. It is not his greatness that I admire, but his virtue; it is not the favours I have received from him, infinite though they be, that have thus enthralled and enchained my heart; but his whole life and character, which are such that, if he were of an inferior condition, I could not honour him the less, and if he were my enemy, I could not the less love and endeavour to serve him."

This is the true Bacon, though not the Bacon of Mr. Sidney Lee, who in his latest effort has fairly outdone Macaulay in his virulence.

Mr. Lee's chapters on *Shakespeare's Career* and *Foreign Influences on Shakespeare* are reserved for future criticism in BACONIANA. Meanwhile, let Mr. Lee look up his copy of *Gervinus*.

GEORGE STRONACH.

NOTES, QUERIES, AND CORRESPONDENCE.

Spedding's Sonnet.

A CORRESPONDENT draws our attention to the following interesting passages from the *Autobiography* of Henry Taylor, pp. 236—238 :—

“In Spedding, who seemed to us in the Colonial Office the most mild and imperturbable of men, the detractors of Lord Bacon had awakened a passion of indignation the capability for which even those who knew him more than superficially could scarcely have believed to be lying hidden in his heart. In the course of a search amongst old papers, I have come upon a sonnet and a letter, in which the passion finds a language to express itself both in prose and verse. The letter speaks of the sonnet :—‘ It sprang out of a very strong emotion that used to visit me from time to time, and from the occasional agitation of which I am not yet secure. And the emotion is roused as often as I consider what kind of creatures they are who so complacently take it for granted that they are nobler beings than Bacon—being, as I believe, the beggarliest souls that have been gifted with the faculty of expressing themselves—insomuch that if the administration of the divine judgments were deputed to me for half an hour, I think I would employ it in making the scales fall from their eyes, and letting them see and understand Bacon as he was, and themselves as they are. The contemplation of the two for half an hour would at least leave them speechless. My only doubt is whether any power whatever could enable them to understand either his greatness or their own littleness without making them over again quite new, which would be more trouble than

they are worth. Well, then, if this is what ought to be done, why is it not done? Why are these people permitted to go on strutting and moralising and making the angels weep, when a sudden gift of insight into themselves would make them go and hide out of the way? I can think of no likelier reason than that Bacon himself would be sorry that any of those who were once his fellow-creatures should suffer such a punishment on his account. And it was to relieve myself from the pressure of this thought (which, as you may see, is apt to put me out of my proprieties) by shutting it up in a sonnet that I began. . . .'

"And then he proceeds to say how he conceives that he had ended in a failure. But the truth is that from beginning to end the sonnet is one of Miltonic force and fervour, and here it is :

'When I have heard sleek worldlings quote thy name
 And sigh o'er great parts gone in evil ways,
 And thank the God they serve on Sabbath days
 That they are not as thou, meek Verulam,
 Then have I marvelled that the searching flame
 Lingered in God's uplifted hand, which lays
 The filmed bosom bare to its own gaze
 And makes men die with horror of their shame :
 But when I thought how humbly thou didst walk
 On earth,—how kiss that merciless rod,—I said
 Surely 'twas thy prevailing voice that prayed
 For patience with those men and their rash talk,
 Because they knew thy deeds but not thy heart,
 And who knows partly can but judge in part.'

Current Literature

THE March Number of the *Fortnightly Review* contains an article from the pen of Mr. George Stronach, entitled: "Was Bacon a Poet?" In the *New Ireland Review* (March) the Rev. W. A. Sutton has a paper on "Bacon and Modern Language Bankruptcy."

The Shakespeare Memorial

THE conflict of ideas as to the form which this should take seems to be considerably hampering the Committee. The *Morning Post* of March 10th has the following note on the subject:—

"There is one way of celebrating the fame of Shakespeare which commends itself to a few of his admirers. It is the appointment of a Royal Commission or other properly constituted tribunal to dispose once and for all of the Baconian heresy. If, for instance, Mr. George Stronach were appointed to lay the case for Bacon before such a tribunal and Mr. Sidney Lee was appointed to reply to it, each side producing its evidence, and no evidence being admitted which would not be allowed in a court of law, and if the commissioners were as impartial and well qualified as those who sat in the Parnell and Beck inquiries, the recurring attempt to prove that the author of the *Novum Organum* and of certain metrical versions of psalms also wrote the love scenes in *Romeo and Juliet*, the woodland scenes of *As You Like It*, and the rest of Shakespeare, might be for ever avoided. It is merely a suggestion."

"BA with a Horn Added"

DR. PLATT has some interesting papers in the *American Conservator*, from one of which we quote:—

"Page [*Molli*] What is Ab speld backward with the horn on his head?"

"Pedagogue [*Holofernes*] Ba, *puericia* with a horne added.

"Page [*Molli*] Ba most seely Sheepe, with a horne: you heare his learning.

"Holofernes' reply does not seem to be a very satisfactory answer to the conundrum, and I doubt if I should have guessed it if the hint had not been dropped in a letter which was sent to me by my friend, the late Dr. Bucke, from Mr. A. Anscombe, suggesting that the horn might refer to some mark of abbreviation. I take this occasion to thank Mr. Anscombe—never having had opportunity of doing so before—for his very suggestive hint, for I soon found that a horn-shaped mark at the beginning of a word—on the head—in Elizabethan writing and printing, stood for the syllable *con*; thus C lave=conclave. Any dictionary of printing will verify this statement. Then Ab with the horn on its head is C ab and backward it is, as I have shown in 'New Shakespeareana,' baC =Bacon. "Coincidences" seem to be galling one another's kibes."

A Find

IN the house of a country woman in Sweden a copy of the 1594 quarto edition of *Titus Andronicus* has recently come to light. This was the first edition. It was known to have been published, but no extant copy was believed to be in existence.

Ben Johnson

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

I FIND authority for Ben Jonson doing translating for Bacon in Tenison's Introduction to *BACONIANA*, p. 60, but I want to know if he was actually a member of Bacon's household. In Spedding's "Letters and Life," Vol. VI, p. 336, there is a list of the household in 1618, and "Mr. Johnson" is in it as "Chief Gentleman Usher." Could that be Ben? I do not know exactly what the functions of a "Chief Gentleman Usher" would be, but I suppose if Bacon wanted a man near him for confidential work that designation would be as good as any other. In the same volume, p. 328, there is an account of Bacon's receipts and disbursements from June 24th to September 29th, 1618, including this item: "July 27th, to Mr. Johnson by your Lp order for his son, and his son's tutor at Eton, £4 8s od." Did Ben have a son at Eton in 1618? He had a son, born probably about 1603-6.

ISAAC HULL PLATT.

The Problem of the Shakespeare Plays

MR. BOMPAS will be glad to present a copy of this book to those Members and Associates of the Bacon Society who do not already possess it.

The Noted Weed

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

I HAVE been reading the new work of Judge J. H. Stotsenburg, entitled "An Impartial Study of the Shakespeare Title" (516 pp., 1904. J. P. Morton & Co., Louisville, Kentucky, U.S.A.). While perusing the so-called Shakespeare sonnet 76, which is copied in that book, I came to line 7, which reads: "That every word doth almost tell my name," and concluded that I would try and see if I

could find the name of some writer of that period. In a very short time I discovered the name of "Bacon," but I do not succeed in finding the name of Shake-speare, or Shagsper, or Sidney, or Raleigh, or the name of any other person who has been suggested as the author of the sonnets.

I quote the first eight lines of sonnet 76. The cypher letters are printed in capitals.

" Why is my verse so Barren of new pride,
 So far from variation or quick change ?
 Why, with the time, do I not glance Aside
 To new-found methods and to Compounds strange ?
 Why write I still all One, ever the same,
 And keep invention in a Noted weed
 That every word doth almost tell my name,
 Showing their Birth, ANd where they did prOCeed ?"

The cipher used by Bacon in the above was a very simple one, being a kind of an acrostic. In this cipher Bacon makes *three* the basis of the cipher ; the first letter "b" begins the *sixth* (a multiple of *three*) word, the next letter "a" is in the third line, and is the first letter of the *ninth* (again a multiple of *three*) word ; the following letters, "c," "o," "n," are each the first letter of the *sixth* word in their respective lines. In the fourth line, Bacon compounded the word "new-found," so as to make the "c" appear in its correct place as the first letter of the *sixth* word of that line. In the eighth line the name is again found ; in that line one half of the cipher word is found by reading from left to right, and the balance by reading from right to left, similar to portions of some of Bacon's ciphers which are explained in some of his later works.

I would call the attention of the readers of BACONIANA to this book by Judge Stotsenburg ; it completes the argument commenced by W. H. Edwards in his excellent work, "Shaksper not Shakespeare" (507 pp., 1900. R. Clarke & Co., Cincinnati, Ohio, U.S.A.), who proved conclusively that Wm. Shaksper († 1564-1616), or Shagsper (as his name ought always to be written and spelled by all Baconians, for it was so spelled in the marriage bond of November, 1582, practically the earliest and most authentic written mention of his name), of Stratford, could not write. Mr. Edwards concludes his part of the argument, which was to thoroughly prove that Wm. Shagsper did not and could not write the plays, poems, sonnets, etc., that were written between 1579 and 1623, and that appeared under the name of Will Shake-speare ; Mr. Stotsenburg continues the argument by suggesting the origin of the plays, and to what extent Bacon improved and added to them.

R. A. SMITH.

War Department, Washington, D.C., U.S.A., February 4, 1905.

Mr. Pitt-Lewis's "Outline"

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—I have read with interest the article in BACONIANA for January last on the above subject. May I be allowed to supplement it by asking a few questions and offering some further criticism?

(1) Mr. Pitt-Lewis (p. 78) says that the *Return from Parnassus* was originally written in Greek by Jonson; that this play was performed at Cambridge in December, 1601, and "translated out of the Greek into plain English" in 1616. May I ask on what evidence Mr. Pitt-Lewis bases this statement? It is strange indeed that neither Professor Arber nor Mr. Macray mention the Greek original or the Jonsonian authorship!

(2) At page 47, Mr. Pitt-Lewis tells us that Jonson had been a member of Cambridge University. Jonson held an honorary degree at that University, but that he was never there as a student can, I think, be clearly proved.

(3) Where is "Capell College, Cambridge," which is said to possess the anonymous 1591 edition of *King John* (p. 37)?

(4) At page 29, Mr. Pitt-Lewis speaks of the "Mousetrap incident, in which, under pretence of seeking for a mouse behind the tapestry, Hamlet runs his sword through the man concealed there"; whereas it is, of course, the Play of Act III. which is "the Mouse-trap," and it is "a rat" which Hamlet afterwards pretends to stab behind the arras.

(5) At page 52, Mr. Pitt-Lewis repeats Judge Webb's unfortunate mistake about the "noted weed." A glance at the context is sufficient to show that this cannot bear the suggested meaning.

(6) At page 36, Mr. Pitt-Lewis writes, "The subject matter of *Venus and Adonis* was to advise a rich and amorous young lord, in terms of familiar freedom, to marry and beget an heir." The writer, surely, meant to allude not to *Venus and Adonis*, but to the "Procreation Sonnets."

(7) On the same page (36), Mr. Pitt-Lewis tells us of the head-piece to the First Folio, which contained an etching that "depicted a man behind a mask throwing a 'spear' at Ignorance. I can find no such man behind a mask in the Folio head-piece.

I submit the above queries and criticism (and more might be added) in no unfriendly spirit, but in the cause of that accuracy which (as the article referred to well says) "is the life-breath of the enquiry upon which we are engaged."

Yours faithfully, CANTAB.

P.S.—On reflection, I presume "Capell College, Cambridge," is a mistake for "The Capell Collection in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge."

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—Your correspondent "Cantab" has, I think, quite overlooked the object of my little "Outline." This merely seeks to set out, in a very small space, the details of what will appear in full in a large and more serious work which I am contemplating.

1. My larger book will give reference to the exact pages of the learned and most classical writer which appear to me to contain the authority I rely upon.

2. Ben Jonson was, beyond question, a very excellent classical scholar, and he, as undoubtedly, had the degrees both of Cambridge, his own *alma mater*, and of Oxford also—the latter doubtless as a compliment to his vast and well-known learning. The knowledge of the college he was a member of in Cambridge University is perfectly well-known; and so it also is how Jonson got there, and when and why he was taken away from the University. I, therefore, cannot accept "Cantab's" rather dogmatic assumption that Jonson was "never there a student." I will cite the very old authorities to the contrary in my forthcoming book when produced.

3. If "Cantab" turns to page lxxviii. of Judge Willis's published *Lecture*—the price of which is only two shillings—he will there find the information he wishes as to "Capell College." This college, I may add, is not so called now.

4. The history of the "Mousetrap" scene in *Hamlet* requires too much explanation to set out here. In this case I trust "Cantab" will be patient, and await my larger book to learn at detail.

5. "Cantab" appears quite assured on the point named. Therefore, pages of argument would fail to convince him. If he cares to read this question he can find the attack on Judge Webb in the *National Review* for July, 1892; and the Judge's reply in the following number of the *Review*.

6. If "Cantab" will permit it, I shall still prefer to refer to *Venus and Adonis*. This subject is more conveniently discussed in my larger book than argued here at the length it will require given to it.

7. The larger book, when subscribed to, will give the reference "Cantab" would like.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

G. PITT-LEWIS.

The Bacon Society (Incorporated)

At the Annual General Meeting of the Bacon Society, held at Hart Street, Bloomsbury, on February 6th, 1905, the President, Mr. Francis Fearon, in the chair, the following officers were elected :—

President : Mr. G. C. Bompas. *Vice-President* : Mr. Granville C. Cunningham. *Council* : Mr. W. T. Smedley, Mr. A. P. Sinnett, Mr. Parker Woodward, Mr. Fleming Fulcher. *Hon. Treasurer* : Mr. Francis Fearon. *Hon. Secretary* : Mr. Harold Bayley.

The Society has made arrangements for a series of drawing-room meetings, the first of which will be held on March 29th, at the house of Mr. Granville C. Cunningham.

At the Sesame Club, on March 8th, Mr. A. P. Sinnett gave an address to a crowded audience in favour of the proposition that the weight of evidence is in favour of Francis Bacon being the author of the Shakespeare plays. Miss Beatrice Forbes Robertson read a paper in support of the Shakespearean authorship.

The Biliteral Cipher

AS BACONIANA claims to keep its readers "abreast with the latest aspects of the controversy" (January, 1905, p. 67), may I enquire of the Editor, or some responsible correspondent, what is the present attitude of that Magazine to the charge of plagiarism from Pope, brought by Mr. Marston against Mrs. Gallup. This charge of plagiarism has nothing to do with the cipher in *Henry VII.*, which a Committee is understood to be dealing with, and I cannot in my present unenlightened state reconcile the claim above made (p. 67) with the absolute suppression of all mention of so crucial a question for some three years or so!

W. THEOBALD.

Ilfracombe, January, 1905.

[In the following issue we hope to publish the results of the Bacon Society's investigations.—ED. BACONIANA.]

Bacon Weed

THERE is a plant mentioned in Funk's Dictionary, which reminds me of Shakespeare's line :—

"Why write I still, all one, ever the same
And keep invention in a noted weed
Shewing their birth, and where they did proceed?"

It is called the *Bacon Weed*. Its provincial name is *Pig-weed*, and its Latin name is *Chiropodium Album*. Is it a kind of grass? Spear grass? Will any botanist tell me?

A. A. L.

JULY, 1905

BACONIANA

A QUARTERLY MAGAZINE



CONTENTS

	PAGE
The Charges Against Lord St. Alban ...	133
Literal Translation of the "Manes Verulamiani."—I.	140
Appleton Morgan	152
The Bi-Literal Cipher in "Henry VII." ...	158
"Henry VII." A Report on the Cipher ...	163
The Parnassus Trilogy	178
Honorificabilitudinitatibus	185
"Shakespeare's Story of His Life" ...	187
Notes, Queries, and Correspondence ...	190

LONDON

GAY & BIRD

22 BEDFORD STREET

Cases for E
can be ha
the Publi

The Bacon Society.

(INCORPORATED.)

THE objects of the Society are expressed in the Memorandum of Association to be:—

1. To encourage the study of the works of Francis Bacon as philosopher, lawyer, statesman and poet; also his character, genius, and life; his influence on his own and succeeding times, and the tendencies and results of his writings.
2. To encourage the general study of the evidence in favour of Francis Bacon's authorship of the plays commonly ascribed to Shakespeare, and to investigate his connection with other works of the Elizabethan period.

The annual subscription of Members, who are entitled to vote at the Society's business meetings, is one guinea; that of Associates is half-a-guinea.

The Society's Library and Rooms are at 11, Hart Street, London, W.C. (close to the British Museum), where the Secretary attends daily, and from 3 to 5 o'clock will be happy to supply further information.

BACONIANA.

VOL. III. *Third Series.* JULY, 1905.

No. II.

THE CHARGES AGAINST LORD ST. ALBAN

MR. SPEDDING, in "Evenings with a Reviewer," writes:—

"I think that Bacon was guilty of corruption, that he had not the means of clearing himself, that the sentence pronounced against him, though severe, was not unjust, that his act moreover was not only in law indefensible, but in morals culpable, and more culpable in him than it would have been in any other man, that he had in short allowed himself to do that which he knew ought not to be done. To this extent he pleaded guilty, and I plead guilty for him and so much of Macaulay's reasoning as pretends to establish no more than this I will let pass unquestioned."

Yet with all his great ability, his life devotion to Francis Bacon and intense admiration of him, it is possible that Mr. Spedding, not being a lawyer, did not understand the true attitude of Lord St. Alban towards the accusations with which he was assailed.

The appointment of Bacon as Lord Keeper, dated 30th March, 1617, fixed the salary of the office, as accustomed, at £892 15s., with an allowance for wine and £16 for sealing wax (see Montagu).

On 7th May following he rode in state to Westminster, apparelled in a gown of purple satin, to open the Law Courts for the term. He was accompanied by a large and brilliant cortege.

Settling actively to work he cleared off all arrears of causes by the end of June. But the business of Chancery grew, and what with his advisory political work, his literary pursuits, and the large general business that fell to the Lord Chancellor for attention, he had "a load, would sink a navy." The decrees and orders during his second year totalled 9,181.

He does not appear to have attempted to stop the usage common to his predecessors and colleagues of accepting gifts from suitors. That it was a tolerated practice of the period even Lord Macaulay admits. How otherwise would Sir John Montagu have paid Buckingham, the Prime Minister, £20,000 for the position of Lord Chief Justice, the legal salary of which was £224 19s.? Payments to secure Court, Ministerial, and Legal favours, were common. The money gifts to Queen Elizabeth every New Year are chronicled in the public accounts. King James I., according to the diary of Judge Whitelock, was not above accepting £4,000 from Yelverton on the latter becoming Solicitor-General. "Men's acts," says Bacon, "are after as they have been accustomed."

The Lord Chancellor continued in office until March, 1621—a period of four years. In February of that year a Parliament was summoned, and to the House of Commons were elected many members who represented a deep-seated discontent with the Government.

That the House of Commons' complaint of many public abuses should have been adroitly diverted by Coke (then a private member) into a special attack upon the Lord Chancellor was to have been expected. They were old rivals in love and public affairs. Bacon held

the office to which Coke had aspired. Coke married the lady both had courted in 1597. The marriage proved unhappy and the parties separated. In 1620 Bacon had actively championed Lady Coke in a struggle with her husband for the control of their only daughter, and was able to write to King James, "I can prevail more with the mother than any other man."

Starting with the complaints on 15th March by two suitors that, having respectively paid the Lord Chancellor £100 and £400 through the hands and on the advice of their Counsel (eminent courtiers and Members of Parliament) judgments were *not* given in their favour, Bacon soon found, to use the words of Mr. Spedding, that he had to encounter "a raging House of Commons with Coke at their head." The hue and cry once raised developed into an indecorous race. Committee appointed 15th March (Stephens) reported to the House the same day. Reported again 17th March. Accusation drawn up 19th March. Same date Lord St. Alban wrote asking opportunity to answer. Then an adjournment for Easter until 19th April. By that date the personal accusations had grown to twenty-seven. Bacon saw there was no chance of a fair trial. To his man Bushell he confided, "I see my approaching ruin; there is no hope of mercy in a multitude." To another servant, who said it was time to look about him, he replied, "I do not look about me, but above me."

Now that the storm was upon him *he decided to bend before it*. Writing on 20th April to the House of Lords he chose to make one only justification, that of Job, "I have not hid my sins as did Adam nor concealed my faults in my bosom." "It resteth, therefore, that without fig-leaves I do ingenuously confess and acknowledge that, having understood the particulars of the charge, not formally from the House but enough to inform my conscience and my memory, I find matter

sufficient and full both to move me to desert my defence and to move your Lordships to condemn and censure me."

Being required by the Lords to deal severally and particularly with the charges against him he complied in writing on 25th April. It is noticeable how careful he is twice to put in a general plea of guilty to corruption. Yet his particular answers to the twenty-seven charges personal to him only accord with his previous and subsequent assertions that he had never entered into a corrupt bargain to pervert justice, and that he had always decided the suits before him upon their merits—and their merits alone. Bacon was a greater man than his accusers, greater than his judges. He knew that they intended to convict and overthrow him, right or wrong. *His only safety lay in making a complete oblation and submission.* Opposition would have cost him his life—a life ended before his great plans for the amelioration of his nation and human kind generally had been completed.

Hence his consummate care to enter the general pleas of guilt which his particular answers did not bear out. Indeed, the charges when dealt with in detail do not stand examination. Before a commission of judges of the present day they would fall to pieces. Three persons only came forward to formulate charges. The rest were trumped up on the enumeration of a clerk whom the Chancellor had discharged for misconduct. One of the "offences" proved to be the acceptance of an agreed fee for conducting an important commercial negotiation. Three others were borrowings from persons who had been suitors. Two concerned gifts never accepted. Three proved to have been the receipt of arbitration fees on public company arbitrations ordered by the King. Thirteen others were the receipt of gifts after—mostly long after—suit ended. Two were the acceptance of gifts

pending suit, strictly so-called, though virtually ended ; another was a New Year's present. So much for twenty-five of the charges. The only two cases of importance which remain were Aubrey's accusation of his accepting £100 pending suit, and Lady Wharton's as to his acceptance of £300 from her pending suit. The former's charge had originally raised the whole outcry, yet in both cases the money was handed over openly before witnesses, and in the former with the concurrence of persons of high social standing. These simple litigants thought that their gifts would purchase decisions in their favour and were enraged to find they were mistaken !

Bacon pleaded guilty to corruption. That was not his true offence. The gifts were indeed very useful to him. He was living a life of grandeur at York House, the centre of great activities. Courtiers, explorers, merchants, and literary men were in constant communication with him. The Thames watermen were busy with the many visitors who had to be conveyed to the Water Gate of York House. All this meant money, and his ordinary means were scanty. He manifestly availed himself against his better judgment of the doubtful sources of revenue then current. He may have thought the end justified the means. Nevertheless, he could not charge himself (to use his own words) with "the troubled fountain of a corrupt heart in a depraved habit of *taking rewards to pervert justice*, however I may be frail and partake of the abuses of the times."

Lord St. Alban knew himself to be a just judge. Not one of his thousands of judgments, decrees and orders, was ever appealed from or set aside. But he saw plainly that he was to be offered up as the scapegoat for the bad practice of men of his day in accepting fees and gifts to supplement their scanty pay. The practices, however harmless where a strong

and just judge was concerned, were to his knowledge inexcusable *per se*, and while submitting as a matter of prudence to be convicted of offences of which he was not guilty, it is clear he was satisfied that his conduct could not be freed from serious blame.

Writing in May to Buckingham, the Prime Minister, who, during Bacon's Chancellorship, had pestered him with letters advocating the suits of his various friends, he said, "And howsoever I acknowledge the sentence just, and for reformation sake fit, (I was) the justest Chancellor that hath been in the five changes since Sir Nicholas Bacon's time.

In a cipher memorandum in the handwriting of his secretary, found long after his death, Bacon sums up the matter thus :—

"I was the justest judge that was in England these fifty years. But it was the justest censure in Parliament that was these two thousand years."

His mental sufferings were grievously acute. He recorded them in his plays. Listen, for instance, to the piteous lines from "*Henry VIII.*," first printed in the folio of 1623—

"My high blown pride at length broke under me,
And now has left me, weary and old with service,
To the mercy of a rough wind that must for ever hide me."

Listen again to the lines of that beautiful verse in "*As You Like It*," also first printed in the 1623 folio—

"Blow, blow, thou winter wind,
Thou art not so unkind
As man's ingratitude ;
Thy tooth is not so keen,
Because thou art not seen,
Although thy breath be rude."

From his essay of "*Great Place*" it is apparent he

had long ago noticed the mischief caused by gifts. One of his suggested remedies was "to binde the hands of suitors also from offering."

In the same essay of "*Great Place*" he says, "The standing is slippery, and the regress is either a downfall or an eclipse." There are, happily, signs which point to the passing of the long eclipse and the restoration of this most distinguished man to the good fame on which he laid so much store.

The rough wind will not for ever hide him. Macaulay's false judgment is beginning to be found out by others besides Mr. Spedding. The late Lord Acton was satisfied that he was "grossly, basely unfair" (Letter to Miss Gladstone). From another source (Vol. II., page 96, Autobiography of Moncure Conway) we learn that the fell slander uttered by the other detractor, Pope, in his line, "the wisest, brightest, meanest of mankind," was held by Thomas Carlyle to be worthless, in-as-much as the qualities and defects named were impossible in the same individual. Lord St. Alban was "frail and partook of the abuses of the times," but he was not corrupt.

How he must have loved that particular year (1617) when he was, during King James' absence in Scotland, the *de facto* ruler of England!

"But there is that within my spirit saith
That I was formed to govern other men
Wisely and boldly, as befitteth kings."

In his adversity we learn that his "fear went with his greatness." He had at last the consolation of a peaceful and contented mind and enjoyed the remainder of his days in happy and congenial work.

This trait of his character (though to me a natural one) inspired Mr. Spedding to write the fine appreciation of Lord St. Alban, with which I conclude:—

"Had he not fallen, or had he fallen upon a future less desolate in its outward conditions, I should never have known how great and how invincible a thing intrinsic goodness really is."

PARKER WOODWARD.

LITERAL TRANSLATION OF THE
"MANES VERULAMIANI"

No. I.

I HAVE undertaken to supply a literal translation with notes of the poems known as *Manes Verulamiani*—The Verulamian Shades. This is the title prefixed to them in Blackbourne's edition of Bacon's Works (London, 1730). Dr. Cantor published a reprint of them at Halle, in 1897, taken from the "Harleian Miscellany," Vol. X., p. 287, "a collection of scarce, curious, and entertaining pamphlets," among which these form "a tract of very rare occurrence, consisting of seventeen leaves." This in its turn was a reprint of the original pamphlet printed in 1626—the year of Bacon's death—by John Haviland. I have followed the Latin text therein given. There are several obscurities in the text. Scholars will differ as to their interpretation. The poems nevertheless are full proof that a large number of contemporaneous scholars, fellows of the Universities and members of the Inns of Court, knew Bacon to be a supreme poet. In the fourth poem he gets credit for uniting philosophy to the drama, for restoring philosophy through comedy and tragedy. Other equally amazing titles to literary fame are also lavished on him in many places throughout the series.

In this attempt of mine at translating and elucidating these extraordinary elegies I am deeply indebted to the articles contributed by Mrs. Pott chiefly, but also by Dr. Cantor and others to *BACONIANA* (1896—98). Indeed, but for these articles, I never would have taken up the subject. I am also under great obligations to Mr. W. Theobald for revising my version and even placing at my service his own. There is plenty of room for difference of opinion here and there, but, on the whole, there can be no doubt of the general drift and extreme value of these pieces connected with the Bacon-Shakespeare question.

I ought also to mention that through the kindness of Mr. G. Stronach I have been able to profit by the translation of these poems by Mr. E. K. Rand, of Harvard University, printed by him for private circulation, Boston, 1904. As this translation is not generally available, it has been thought advisable to proceed with the present version, which was begun under the impression that no complete and literal translation had been yet published.

MEMORIÆ
 HONORATISSIMI DOMINI
 FRANCISCI
 BARONIS DE VERULAMIO
 VICE-COMITIS SANCTI ALBANI
 SACRUM

—
 LONDINI
 IN OFFICINA JOANNIS HAVILAND.
 MDCXXVI.

LECTORI S.

Quod præcipuum sibi duxit honoratissimus Dominus meus Vice-Comes Sancti Albani, academiis et viris literatoribus ut cordi esset, id (credo) obtinuit; quandoquidem insignia hæc amoris et mæstitiæ monumenta indicant, quantum amissio ejus eorundum cordi doleat. Neque vero parca manu symbolum hoc conjecerunt in eum musæ; (plurimos enim, eosque optimos versus apud me contineo); sed quia ipse mole non delectabatur, molem haud magnam extrusi. Satis etiam sit, ista veluti fundamenta præsentis sæculi nomine jecisse; fabricam (puto) hanc exornabit et amplificabit unumquodque sæculum; cuinam autem sæculo ultimam manum imponere datum sit, id Deo tantum et fati manifestum.

G. RAWLEY, S.T.D.

I.

DEPLORATIO OBITUS OMNIA DOCTISSIMI ET CLARISSIMI VIRI D. FRANCISCI BACON S. ALBANENSIS.

Albani plorate lares, tuque optime martyr,
 Fata Verulamii non temeranda senis.

SACRED
TO THE MEMORY OF
THE RIGHT HONOURABLE LORD,
FRANCIS BARON VERULAM, VISCOUNT ST. ALBANS.

— — —
LONDON:
AT THE PRESS OF JOHN HAVILAND.
1626.
— — —

TO THE READER GREETING.

What my Lord the Right Honourable Viscount St. Albans valued most, that he should be dear to seats of learning and to men of letters, that (I believe) he has secured; since these tokens of love and memorials of sorrow prove how much his loss grieves their heart. And indeed with no stinted hand have the Muses bestowed on him this emblem; (for very many poems, and the best too, I withhold from publication); but since he himself delighted not in quantity, no great quantity have I put forth. Moreover, let it suffice to have laid, as it were, these foundations in the name of the present age; this fabric (I think) every age will embellish and enlarge; but to what age it is given to put the last touch, that is known to God only and the fates.

W. RAWLEY, S.T.D.

I

LAMENT FOR THE DEATH OF THE ALL-LEARNED AND
RENOWNED MAN LORD FRANCIS BACON OF
ST. ALBANS.

Bewail ye guardian spirits of St. Albans, and thou most holy martyr, the death not to be profaned of the

Optime martyr et in veteres i tu quoque luctus,
Cui nil post dirum tristius amphibalum. (1)

2.

BACONI OPERA LITERARIA VOCANTUR AD
ROGUM.

Instauratio magna; dicta acute (2);
Augmentum geminum scientiarum,
Et scriptum patrie et dein Latine
Auctu multiplici, profunda vitæ
Mortisque historia, ut lita anne lota
Rivo nectaris Atticive mellis!
Henricus neque Septimus tacetor;
Et quidquid venerum politiorum, et
Si quid præterii inscius libellum
Quos magni peperit vigor Baconi.
Plus novum oedecumata musa musis,
Omnes funebribus subite flammis,
Et lucem date liquidam parenti;
Non sunt sæcula digna quæ fruantur
Vobis, ah Domino (ah nefas) preempto.

S. COLLINS, R.C.P.

3.

IN OBITUM INCOMPARABILIS FRANCISCI VICECOMITIS
SANCTI ALBANI, BARONIS VERULAMII.

Dum longi lentique gemis sub pondere morbi
Atque hæret dubio tabida vita pede;
Quid voluit prudens fatum jam sentio tandem:
Constat, Aprile uno te potuisse mori:
Ut flos hinc lacrymis, illinc Philomela querelis
Deducant linguæ funera sola tuæ.

GEORGIUS HERBERT.

ancient of Verulam. Holy Martyr, do thou also betake thyself even to the old wailings, thou to whom nothing is sadder since the fateful (change of) raiment. (1)

2.

THE LITERARY WORKS OF BACON ARE SUMMONED
TO THE PYRE.

The Great Instauration; stimulating aphorisms (2); the twofold Advancement of the Sciences, written both in English and then in Latin with manifold increase; the profound History of Life and Death, how suffused with (or is it bathed in?) a stream of nectar or Attic honey! Neither let Henry the Seventh be passed over in silence; and whatever there is of more refined beauties, and any smaller works I may have omitted in my ignorance, which the power of great Bacon brought forth, a muse more rare than the nine muses, all enter ye the funeral fires, and give bright light to your Sire. The ages are not worthy to enjoy you, now alas! that your Lord, oh shocking! has perished.

S. COLLINS, R.C.P.

3.

ON THE DEATH OF THE PEERLESS FRANCIS,
VISCOUNT ST. ALBANS, BARON VERULAM.

While you groan under the weight of a long and slow disease, and languishing life holds on with lingering step, what foreseeing fate had in view, I now at length perceive. It is evident that in April alone you could have died: in order that on the one hand the tearful flower and on the other the nightingale might celebrate the only obsequies of your tongue.

GEORGE HERBERT.

4.

IN OBITUM HONORATISSIMI VIRI AC DOMINI, D. FRANCISCI DE VERULAMIO, VICECOMITIS SANCTI ALBANI, NUPERI ANGLIÆ CANCELLARII.

Adhuc superbis insolente purpura
 Feretri rapinis inelytos in tot viros
 Sterile tribunal ? (3) cilicio dicas diem,
 Saccumquæ totam facito luxuriam fori.
 A Themide (4) libra nec geratur pensilis,
 Sed urna, prægravis urna Verulamii.
 Expendat. Eheu ! Ephorus haud lancem premit,
 Sed Areopagus (5) ; nec minor tantus sophos,
 Quam porticus bracchata. (6) Nam vester scholæ,
 Gemiscit axis, tanta dum moles ruit.
 Orbis soluta cardo litterarii,
 Ubi studio coluit togam et trabeam pari.
 Qualis per umbras ditis Eurydice vagans
 Palpare gestiit Orphæum, quali Orphæus,
 Saliente tandem (vix prius crispa) Styge,
 Alite fibras lyræ titillavit manu ;
 Talis plicata philologwn ænigmatis
 Petiit Baconum vindicem, tali manu
 Lactata cristas extulit philosophia :
 Humique soccis reptitantem comicis
 Non proprio ardelionibus molimine
 Sarsit, sed instauravit. Hinc politius
 Surgit cothurno celsiore, et organo
 Stagirita virbius reviviscit novo. (7)
 Calpen superbo Abylamque vincit remige
 Phœbi Columbus, artibus novis novum
 Daturus orbem ; promovet conamina
 Juvenilis ardor, usque ad invidiam trucem
 Fati minacis. Quis senex vel Hannibal,
 Oculi superstitis timens caliginem,
 Signis suburram ventilat victricibus ? (8)

4.

ON THE DEATH OF THE RIGHT HONOURABLE LORD
FRANCIS OF VERULAM, VISCOUNT ST. ALBANS,
LATE CHANCELLOR OF ENGLAND.

Do you yet arrayed in proud purple exult over so many renowned men with the spoils of the bier, O barren tribunal? (3). Proclaim a day for hair-cloth, turn all the luxury of the Forum into sack-cloth, let not the pendent balance be borne by Themis, (4) but the urn, the ponderous urn of Verulam. Let her weigh. Alas! it is not an Ephorus presses down the scale, but the Areopagus (5); nor is so great a sage less than the foreign Porch. (6) For your axis groans, ye schools, as the mighty mass crashes down. The pole of the literary globe is dislocated, where with equal earnestness he adorned the garb of a citizen and the robe of state. As Eurydice wandering through the shades of Dis longed to caress Orpheus, so did Philosophy entangled in the subtleties of Schoolmen seek Bacon as a deliverer, with such winged hand as Orpheus lightly touched the lyre's strings, the Styx before scarce ruffled now at last bounding, with like hand stroked Philosophy raised high her crest; nor did he with workmanship of fussy meddlers patch, but he renovated her walking lowly in the shoes of Comedy. After that more elaborately he rises on the loftier tragic buskin, and the Stagirite (like) Virbius comes to life again in the *Novum Organum*. (7) The Columbus of Apollo with his lordly crew passes beyond the Pillars of Hercules in order to bestow a new world and new arts; youthful ardour advances his efforts even to the harsh envy of menacing fate. What ancient or what Hannibal fearing blindness of his remaining eye agitates (winnows) the Subura with his victorious standards (companies)? (8) What mighty Milo enrages the oaks, when gibbous old age weighs

Quis Milo multus quercubus bilem movet,
 Senecta tauro gibba cum gravior premit ? (9)
 Dum noster heros traderet scientias
 Æternitati, prorsus expeditior
 Sui sepulchri comperitur artifex.
 Placida videtur ecstasis speculatio,
 Qua mens tueri volucris idæas boni
 In lacteos properat Olympi tramites.
 His immoratur sedibus domestica,
 Peregrina propriis. Redit. Joculariter
 Fugax ; vagatur rursus, et rursus redit. (10)
 Furtiva tandem serio, se substrahit
 Totam ; gementi, morbido cadaveri
 Sic desuescit anima, sic jubet mori.
 Agite lugubres musæ, et a Libani jugis
 Cumulate thura. Sydus in pyram illius
 Scintillet omne ; scelus sit accendi rogam
 Rogum Prometheo culinari foco.
 Et si qua forte ludat in cineres sacros
 Aura petulantior, fugamque suadeat,
 Tunc flete ; lacrymis in amplexus ruent
 Globuli sequaces. Denuo fundamine
 Ergastuli everso radicitus tui
 Evehere fælix anima, Jacobum pete,
 Ostende, et illuc civicam fidem sequi.
 E tripode juris, dictites oracula
 Themidos alumnis. Sic (beati cælites)
 Astræa pristino fruatur vindice,
 Vel cum Bacono rursus Astræam date.

R. P.

more heavily than the ox? (9) While our demi-god transmitted sciences to all ages to come, he is found to be the altogether too premature constructor of his own tomb. His philosophic thinking seems tranquil ecstasy, whereby his mind wings its way through the galaxy of the heavens to contemplate the ideas of the good. There it abides as in its home, a stranger in its own. It returns. Playfully coy again it roams, and again returns. (10) At last in earnest secretly it wholly withdraws; thus the spirit gets disused to the groaning, sickly, dead body, thus bids it die. Come, mourning Muses, gather frankincense from the heights of Libanus. Let every star emit a spark into his pyre; be it sacrilege that the kingly pile should be kindled for Prometheus from a kitchen fire. And if perchance some mischievous breeze should frolic amid the sacred ashes and try to scatter them, then weep; the sequent teardrops will rush to mutual embraces. Once more, go forth, happy soul, the foundation of your prison being utterly destroyed, seek James, prove that even thither a subject's loyalty follows. From the tripod of law go on uttering oracles for the disciples of Themis. Thus, blessed inhabitants of heaven, let Astræa enjoy her champion of old, or with Bacon give back Astræa.

R. P.

NOTES.

(1) St. Alban (A.D. 303) was martyred through having changed clothes with a priest—his friend—whose name was Amphibalus. Amphibalus also means a cloak, *vestis exterior*. There is therefore a play upon the word here.

(2) The *Novum Organum* appeared in 1620 under the title of *Inlauratio Magna*. It is written in aphorisms. *Dicta acute* therefore describes briefly the first work on the list; others which follow are similarly treated.

(3) The House of Lords.

(4) Goddess of law, custom and equity, represented carrying scales.

(5) That is, not a single judge, but the whole Supreme Court. The Areopagus of Athens was sometimes called 'Ἡ ἄνω βουλή, "The Upper House." Cicero writes to Atticus: "*Senatus Ἄρειος πύργος*, the Senate is an Areopagus" (ad. Att., I. 14).

(6) Literally, *trousered Porch*. All the nations around the Greeks and Romans were represented *braccatæ*. Seneca was a Spaniard. Stoic philosopher, statesman, writer of tragedies and brilliant man of letters, he was condemned to death by Nero, who put to death other stoics too. In fact, under the Claudian and Flavian emperors and Senate, the stoics had a bad time. Hence it seems that the allusion in the text is to these, and especially to Seneca.

(7) Aristotle, like Bacon, had "taken all knowledge for his province." He called his logic the *organon*—that is, the instrument of reason for demonstration. Hippolytus restored to life by Æsculapius was worshipped in Italy under the name of Virbius. In this passage the grammatical concordance is not clear—*e.g.*, whether *reptilantem* refers to philosophy or to Bacon, and consequently what the subject of the verbs following is. However, apart even from other considerations which would enable us to settle the matter, the parallelism of the complex simile requires the interpretation given. In any case the ultimate meaning is the same, *viz.*, that philosophy was renovated by Bacon in the guise of the drama. All the Shakespeare plays are saturated with Bacon's science, learning and wisdom.

(8) I will make some suggestions to interpret this enigma. In the first place, it is enough for a comparison that some striking feature should be some way common to both members. *Omnis*

comparatio claudicat—every comparison halts. Every schoolboy knows that Hannibal lost an eye soon after invading Italy. When he marched his army—always victorious in the field—to the very walls of Rome, great panic there was the result, especially in the Subura, the most crowded quarter. Near the Subura ran the *Argiletum*, a street mostly occupied by the booksellers. *Ventilare* means to fan, to agitate, to winnow, in a special manner the last. Bacon's eye referred to here means (I suggest) “the poet's eye in a fine frenzy rolling,” and, by a common figure of speech, the products of that eye; so that “his surviving (*superstitis*) eye” would mean such of his plays as survived, for he had been writing plays since his youth, and had allowed multitudes of them to perish. We are told not one in fifty of the Elizabethan plays have probably come down to us. Even his surviving plays were winnowed—that is, the thirty-six plays of the folio were selected by him to represent his wisdom and philosophy, and when the news got abroad that Shakespeare's plays were to be published, and when Ben Jonson and others (“good pens which desert me not”) busied themselves in collecting copies and in entering them where necessary at Stationers' Hall, thereby securing and notifying copyright or its equivalent (see Webb's “Mystery of William Shakespeare,” p. 261), the Subura of London, inhabited by actors, playwrights, booksellers (pirates several of them), &c., was much agitated.

(9) The elegist in this couplet implies that Bacon had tried to do away with certain rooted abuses; but one of them (judges taking gifts, not necessarily bribes, from suitors) had caught him by the hands in his old age and left him a prey to his enemies. Milo, of Crotona, the most famous athlete of antiquity, carried an ox on his shoulders and ate it afterwards in one day. In his old age, trying to rive a partly split oak, it closed on his hands, and so he perished by wild beasts. *Mullus* looks like a misprint for *inullus*, unavenged or unvindicated.

(10) Bacon used to keep himself very retired at times. His friends complained that they could not gain access to him. His own expression was that he was keeping state. Spedding tells us that, amazingly frank as he is in the letters and documents he has left regarding his life generally, yet he never admits us to his fireside. His private life remains a mystery.

WILLIAM A. SUTTON.

APPLETON MORGAN

(A SOMEWHAT PERSONAL NARRATIVE.)

DOCTOR JAMES APPLETON MORGAN—commonly called Appleton Morgan—is a personage of no small interest to Baconians. As a spokesman for all of us I may offer him our hearty congratulations on the honours lately conferred upon him, when, on the Shakespearean Saint's day, April 23—this being the twentieth anniversary of the New York Shakespeare Society, of which he is President and Founder—a silver loving-cup and a banquet were dedicated to him—a festive function honourable alike to the company and their guest. It is this circumstance that brings him again to our notice.

To Baconians, Appleton Morgan is best known by his ingenious, brilliant book, published in 1881, entitled, "The Shakespearean Myth:—William Shakespeare and Circumstantial Evidence." In this masterly volume the negative side of our case was conclusively proved by absolutely unanswerable argument. And although the Baconian alternative—the positive side—was not fully endorsed, it was well stated, and few readers would resist the conclusion that the author was a convinced Baconian. However, ten years afterwards, in 1891, another volume appeared from his pen, "Shakespeare in Fact and Criticism"; and, although it contained nothing to neutralise the force of the earlier volume, yet the effect of it was to shew that the author wished to eat his own words, and found them difficult of digestion—he was still professedly a Shakespearean, in the usual sense of the term. For him the Stratford gentleman was such an interesting person that it was worth while to write an elaborate discussion of the question which is the heading of one of his chapters,

"Have we a Shakspere among us?" *i.e.*, are any of his lineal descendents living in America? If so, let us know all about them; let them shine in the reflected light of their illustrious ancestor. (N.B.—Is not this a typical specimen of Shakespearean research!) To me (to *us*, I might say, but it is necessary just here to speak personally), at the time this seemed monstrous nonsense, and I expressed my contempt of it, and of the general *volte face* character of the volume, pretty plainly in the Bacon Journal. The book was a mystery, and so it still is—and so also is its author. For Appleton Morgan still seems to hold those two self-contradictory opinions. And yet he is, I feel persuaded, a genuine Baconian, and not even he himself can convince me to the contrary. In plenty of public and private utterances Appleton Morgan shews not only that the Shakespere creed is a baseless fiction, but that the Baconian is the necessary alternative. And accordingly we must not trouble ourselves with insoluble personal problems, but take him as he is. And he is worth having with or without his paradoxes: besides being extremely clever and well informed, he is a most genial and generous-hearted man, and I wish I could unsay the hard things I wrote about him—but I cannot. So I must in my turn be paradoxical and say, "You are a Shakespearean Baconian, a monstrous inconsistency; but—a man and a brother, and withal thy faults we love thee still!" I have especial reason for this friendly attached detachment, or detached attachment; for after the stern castigation given in the Bacon Journal I never expected a civil word from him again. Yet, soon after the publication of my "Studies," I received from him the following letter (he will excuse my breach of copy-right in publishing it):—

"SIR,—Will you permit a forgotten acquaintance, and an old anti-Shakespearean protagonist, and a gentleman

whom you once honoured by describing him as 'bowing himself down in the house of Rimmon,' to say that he has spent a delightful evening over your 'Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light.' You complain, dear sir, that the orthodox say that the Baconians are 'half-educated,' 'half-baked,' 'idiots,' 'fools,' 'lunatics,' etc., etc.; that they are abusive and scurrilous. ° Now, my dear Sir, did you ever hear of a person abusing or slandering his inferiors, or those whom he considers so? I am getting to be a rather old party, and may not live to see its fulfilment; but I will venture to register a prophecy, viz., The time will come when Shakespeareans will claim that they always knew that Bacon wrote 'Shakespeare'; that they only pretended the contrary to draw out the facts; and—just as the late Lord Beaconsfield fought the Reform Bill with all his power until he was ready to bring it in himself—that they were waiting their own entire convenience, and incidentally amusing themselves with the poor Baconians. With sincere regard, believe me, etc."

As to this delicious prophecy may we not say, "which thing is a parable, and Appleton Morgan is the interpretation thereof." This unexpected and most gratifying letter led to some very friendly correspondence, and we exchanged portraits. On the back of his cabinet-sized 'counterfeit presentment,' he wrote, "R. M. Theobald, Esq., from his gentle enemy, Appleton Morgan.

"'As Peace should still her wheaten garland wear
And stand a comma 'twixt their amities.'—*Bacon*."

My own portrait was similarly flanked by the motto,

"Non idem dicere, sed idem spectare, debemus."—*Bacon*.

In a subsequent letter he writes:—

"In the eleven years since you wrote me the House of

*I do not know where Dr. Morgan found these literary sweetmeats; certainly not in my book. They are true reports, but I have never condescended to quote them; I have only rebuked them in general terms.

Rimmon letter ° I have been trying with all my might and main to believe that Shaksperc wrote the Shakespeare plays—every word of them. And, unlike the man of our town, who was wondrous wise, I have been unable to scratch my eyes in again. I can't find Shaksperc in the plays at all. I can't hear a line or read a line without the mental comment, 'Did Shaksperc of Stratford, etc., etc., etc., ever say that?' And yet I believe thoroughly in Shakespeare, and you people must reconcile me with myself if you can. If not judge me as you see fit."

Except for the "*As yet*," I also might say "I believe thoroughly in Shakespeare." But taking the whole collection, published and unpublished, I do not remember ever to have met with a more extraordinary specimen of paradox—it is a literary ballet dance, a whirling waltz of a most nimble contortionist—balancing himself on one toe and alternately facing and backing his onlookers. He may say he is a Shakespearean *and* a Baconian as well—as an Anarchist may profess to be also a Conservative—but we have no judgment to pass upon him; we simply give up the enigma and, taking him as he is, are quite content with moral if not intellectual accommodations.

Recently Appleton Morgan held a debate with Dr. Isaac Hull Platt on the Baconian theory, Appleton Morgan taking the Shaksperc side. I never read a stronger or more ingenious statement of the case for

° The phrase was not in a letter, but in the review of his book published in the Bacon Journal. It may be well to quote the passage :—"We expect soon to hear of Mr. Morgan, arm-in-arm with Mr. Furnivall, mooning amongst the Stratford and Charlote meadows, trying to study Shakespeare by watching the cows 'whisking their tails' in those consecrated pastures. We leave Mr. Morgan in the custody of his masters, bowing his manly front in the House of Rimmon. Whatever genuflections and incense he may choose to offer at this discredited shrine does not in the least concern us."

William Shakspeare, a more typical illustration of the frequent fact that the most forcible representation of a case may be given by an opponent. For the defence is evidently a piece of special pleading, such as an accomplished lawyer (which Appleton Morgan is) might offer in defence of a prisoner whom he knew to be guilty.

As the President of the New York Shakespeare Society Appleton Morgan might be supposed to belong to the Shakspeare Camp; but he expressly, in his after-dinner speech, claimed entire liberty of thought for all members of the Society, and that Baconian belief is no obstacle to membership — nor to Presidency, I may add. The speech is interesting, like everything from the pen or tongue of Appleton Morgan, and the readers of *BACONIANA* will be glad to possess it. The account of the Dinner in the *New York Evening Post* of April 27th, 1905, which has been sent to me, says:—

“In the course of his reply, Dr. Morgan said:—Our precept, ‘In brief, sir, study what you most affect,’ taken together with our impulse first of all to be catholic, was meant to admit anybody who came to us for loving study of the dates and environment and biography of William Shakspeare, and of the history of the text of the plays and poems of William Shakspeare, and also to welcome whatever individual views he might have, so that with us he could study what he himself ‘did most affect.’ If he was of opinion that William Shakespeare was a pseudonym for Queen Elizabeth, or for Lord Bacon, well—he would be lonesome, but he would find that belief quite optional, and he would be welcome to be one of us. We would not dismiss a poor Baconian into outer darkness. Baconians, with all their deficiencies, do, at least, know how to read and write, and they know how to be a woeful thorn in the flesh to us, too; they are far too well informed for us plodding Shakespeareans.

“They have read too many books, have constructed too many brilliant paradoxes, ask us altogether too many troublesome questions; and while we orthodox people are plodding

doggedly along, repeating what Rowe and Pope and Warburton and Theobald and Malone told us to say a hundred years ago, these clever infidels and heretics are burning the midnight oil and digging away at German and Spanish and all other Continental preserves, and studying Elizabethan, and even prior fields, and are lying in wait to floor us with what they find there. And then, too, let us forgive the sin of him that loveth much, and never forget that Baconians are devout worshippers of the text we call (and which they also call, by the way) Shakespeare, and that the whole basic hypothesis and building of their heterodoxy is that the plays are too splendid and too massive to be the product of even a darling of the gods, whose actual biography they cannot bring within planetary space of the literature he has christened his."

This is not the language of an opponent, nor even of a disbeliever, tolerant, but hostile. It may be spoken by a Janus bifrons, but his best smiles are on the Baconian side of his face. He cannot escape detection—the evidence of his finger-prints proves his identity—and we need not doubt that he is as genuine a Baconian as the best of us. As such let us receive him and give him our friendship and admiration. He may masquerade as a Shakespearean Esau, but his voice has the true ring of a Baconian Jacob; it does not matter whether his hand is shaggy or smooth, we cannot mistake the tones of his voice.

R. M. THEOBALD.

THE BI-LITERAL CIPHER IN
HENRY VII.

IT has been suggested to me that I should give some of the results of my examination of Mrs. Wells Gallup's work on Bacon's *Henry VII.* I was not in England when Mrs. Gallup's MSS. arrived from America, in the early part of 1904. On my return to London in June of that year, I heard that two or three members of our Society had been trying to work the cipher, but on comparing notes found that the various copies of the 1622 edition did not agree in some of the forms of the italic letters. Only one member seemed inclined to devote the time and patience to investigate the matter at all thoroughly. That member, I understand, with much patience devoted *one whole week* to the study of the italic letters. His very able report against the cipher made me wish to look into the matter still more thoroughly myself. This may appear presumptuous, as I was not one of the committee appointed to enquire into the subject. But I had had the advantage of many conversations with Mrs. Gallup, when she first presented her work to the public five years ago, and saw her and her sister, Miss Wells, at work on a book they found in my house not before deciphered by them. I was busy with other literary work during the summer of 1904, but in the autumn made up my mind to send my own copy of the 1622 edition of *Henry VII.* to the Howard Publishing Company, in America, for examination. I was anxious to know if it was a safe copy on which I might commence my work. It was returned to me by Mr. Moore in January, 1905, with one or two pencilled corrections written by Mrs. Gallup in the margin. Mrs. Gallup, in her letter to me, said, "Your copy and ours are the

same, except in a very few places." In that letter, and in others since, she answered several of my questions, and they have materially helped me. I worked diligently for three months, often eight and ten hours a day.

My studies have been confined to the first fifty pages only of the medium italic type. I find in these fifty pages 10,058 italic letters. Of these, 1,319 are capitals. For the present I shall confine my remarks to the capitals only. In these fifty pages only twenty-two letters of the alphabet are used. I have completed my studies on thirteen of these letters. They represent 704 letters used for the two founts; and with very few exceptions I find them correctly so used in Mrs. Gallup's MSS. sent to us for examination. I have not yet completed my studies on the remaining nine letters of the alphabet, representing 615 letters. I am, however, finding the majority of these correctly used also. I am a slow worker, but each day's work is bringing out better results on these nine more difficult letters. I give below a table of all the letters in the order in which I found them easiest to read, with the columns of figures divided into "a's" and "b's."

	Totals.	"a"	"b"
<i>A.</i> ...	61	25	36
<i>E.</i> ...	78	58	20
<i>I. J.</i> ...	51	49	2
<i>M.</i> ...	49	41	8
<i>N.</i> ...	42	32	10
<i>U. V.</i> ...	11	9	2
<i>O.</i> ...	13	2	11
<i>P.</i> ...	163	119	44
<i>R.</i> ...	41	8	33
<i>S.</i> ...	93	62	31
<i>W.</i> ...	19	11	8
<i>T.</i> ...	70	39	31
<i>Y.</i> ...	13	7	6
<i>K.</i> ...	71	37	34
<i>L.</i> ...	68	46	22

The Bi-Literal Cipher

		Totals.		"a"		"b"
<i>F.</i>	...	78	...	47	...	31
<i>B.</i>	...	99	...	65	...	34
<i>D.</i>	...	74	...	47	...	27
<i>H.</i>	...	24	...	12	...	12
<i>O.</i>	...	24	...	17	...	7
<i>G.</i>	...	25	...	18	...	7
<i>C.</i>	...	152	...	100	...	52
		<hr/>		<hr/>		<hr/>
		1,319		851		468

It was suggested to me, by a member who disliked the facts revealed in the cipher story, that even if I found the 1,319 capitals correctly used, that would not be sufficient to prove the existence of the cipher, unless I could also find that the small letters were correctly used by Mrs. Gallup. This made me leave the capitals for a time. I have since studied all the small letters of the medium italic type in those first fifty pages. But as they represent 8,739 letters, for the present I can only say I have finished my studies on three of the letters, namely, "k," "p," "w," and with only one or two exceptions I find them correctly used.

If my figures are correct, and I am prepared for the severest examination on these facts, can it be chance that those letters are correctly used in Mrs. Gallup's MSS.?

I would like to say here, that were it actually the case that only two forms of letters are used, the deciphering of over 10,000 letters would have been a comparatively easy work. But in some of the letters there are many variations, and these again must be paired. And yet in all these pairings there is system and order, and a method in all the seeming madness.

My work would have progressed much more rapidly had two or three others worked with me. For those who have the leisure and much patience I can recommend this interesting study. I am willing and in a

position to give them many short cuts, and they, in their turn, could, I have no doubt, help to finish the work I have commenced, that is, simply to verify the working of Mrs. Gallup's MSS. on this *Henry VII.* Those Baconians who have never very seriously tried to work at the cipher, and are more concerned in refusing to accept the rather unpleasant historical facts revealed, I would ask to suspend their judgment, and to allow others, who may be honestly and seriously trying to arrive at the truth, still to be allowed to examine the work submitted by Mrs. Gallup at the request of some of the members of our Society. The more I, as an amateur, study this technical part of our work, the more convinced I feel that Bacon did use his famous bi-literal cipher in his own prose history of *Henry VII.* A new discovery has been placed before us, and by experts; why should we discredit their labours, and refuse to give an equal amount of time and patience in examining their work?

I would like here to bring forward some curious facts connected with the printing of the 1622 edition of *Henry VII.* I have before me six copies—one belonging to Mrs. Pott, another to Mrs. Payne, and four of my own. Mrs. Payne's copy is similar to the copy collated for me by Mrs. Gallup. Mrs. Pott's copy has many differences in it—not in the words and matter, but in the use of the two founts of the italic type. Two of my own copies are similar to Mrs. Pott's copy. My fourth copy, again, is quite different to all the others. Why should there be these differences in the various copies of the same edition? Why should type once set up have been altered? And, when altered, why should these changes be carried through with system and order in other copies? Before closing this paper, I would like to remind Baconians that Bacon, in writing to Tobie Mathew in 1609, uses these words: "I have sent you some copies of my book of the *Advancement*

which you desired ; and a little work of my recreation which you desired not. My *Instauration* I reserve for our conference ; it sleeps not. Those works of the *alphabet* are in my opinion of less use to you now than at Paris. . . . But in regard that some friends of yours have still insisted here, I send them to you, and for my part I value your own reading more than your publishing them to others" (Spedding, vol. iv., p. 134). Spedding, in criticising this letter, says, "What these 'Works of the Alphabet' may have been I cannot guess, unless they related to Bacon's cipher." Spedding then proceeds again to explain this cipher.

Archbishop Tenison in 1679 was evidently aware that Bacon had used his Bi-literal Cipher in the 1623 folio of the "*De Augmentis*," for he especially recommends that "accurate" edition to those who wish to understand the Lord Bacon's Cipher (BACONIANA, 1679, p. 28). I myself have very little doubt but that Tenison used the same cipher all through his BACONIANA. I only wish I were an expert, and could decipher what he says.

D. J. KINDERSLEY.



THOUGH all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth, so Truth be in the field, we do injuriously to misdoubt her strength ; let her and falsehood grapple ; who ever knew truth put to scorn in a free and open encounter ?—*Milton*.



George Cox Bompas.

Born April 1st, 1827, Died May 23rd, 1905.

HENRY VII.

REPORT ON CIPHER.

The recent death of Mr. George C. Bompas, the revered President of the Bacon Society, has left a blank among us that will be very difficult to fill. The work that he did in helping to lift the veil that envelopes Bacon's life and writings was conspicuously strong and sound, and the clearness with which he has indicated the many incongruities of the Shakspearian theory of the authorship of the plays will always make his work memorable.

The last work which he was engaged on was a consideration of the Bacon cipher, and he left behind him a paper dealing with it. The cipher did not appeal to Mr. Bompas. What to some minds in this respect seemed reasonable, probable, and even convincing, to him appeared unreasonable and incredible. With his usual thoroughness in such matters he has laid bare his thoughts to the very roots.

It has been considered best, from respect to the memory of so eminent a friend as was Mr. Bompas, to publish the paper as he wrote it. At the same time it is felt that if he had lived to discuss his paper with members of the Bacon Council—as would have been the case in ordinary circumstances before publication—facts that he had overlooked might have enabled him to modify some of his statements; and it is felt, further, that to publish his paper without comment, coming with all the added weight as from the President, would be ungracious to those members of the Society who differ from Mr. Bompas on the question of the cipher, and are strenuously engaged on the work of its elucidation.

Therefore, in order to bridge over the division between the two courses above shown, I have been asked to add a few notes to some parts of Mr. Bompas' paper that would modify the conclusion to which his argument would lead. In fulfilling this task, I hope that my readers will realise how difficult it is of satisfactory performance, and make allowance for those places where it falls short of satisfaction.

GRANVILLE C. CUNINGHAM.

BEFORE examining the cipher itself a preliminary difficulty must be considered, namely, the variation in the copies. It appears that the copies of *Henry VII.*, which have been examined, do not exactly correspond, though of the same edition and date. In some of these copies, not including that used by the decipherer, an 's' is added to the word "Highnesse" at the end of the Epistle Dedicatorie, and in some of the copies, not including that so used, the name "Elizabeth" in the fourth line from the bottom of page 3 is in Roman instead of Italic type. These changes, or either one of them, would suffice to throw out of gear the whole of the subsequent cipher, producing gibberish.* The form of many of the capitals also differs in the different copies. Each such change would alter a group letter and change or destroy a cipher word. Mr. Cuninghams copy differs widely from the others; many pages have evidently been set up afresh.

These facts present a dilemma. Either each different copy contains a different cipher story, which is absurd, or the decipherer happened by chance to light on the only correct copy, which is equally absurd.

The same difficulty exists with regard to the First Folio. The variations in the different copies are incon-

*It is easily shewn that the Italic letters enfolding the cipher might be largely changed, and yet the cipher story remain unaffected. For instance, the contraction "ha" might be used for "have." Now the use of "ha" for "have" would dispense with ten Italic letters, and these would be used for the first two letters of the word which followed after "ha" in the cipher story, and would thus change the succeeding Italic letters completely. Therefore, in the various copies of the 1622 edition of *Henry VII.* that have different Italic letters it is impossible *a priori* to say whether the cipher story is the same, or differs in each. I have no doubt that this trick was used with the intention of throwing dust in the eyes of spies.

sistent with the existence in it of a connected cipher story.

The prefatory matter, chiefly Italic, is bound up in different order in different copies.

For example, in the Baroness Burdett-Coutts' copy, from which Halliwell Phillipps' reduced copy is taken, the Epistle Dedicatorie and Address to various Readers are followed by—(1) Ben Jonson's poem, (2) Hugh Holland, (3) Digges and I. M., (4) Names of Players, (5) Catalogue.

In the Duke of Devonshire's copy, from which the recent Clarendon Press facsimile is taken, after the Epistle and Address come (1) The Poems of Digges and I. M., (2) The Names of Players, (3) Ben Jonson, (4) Hugh Holland, (5) Catalogue.

The printers' marks appear to show that these prefaces were printed, as they came to hand, separately from the succeeding text and from one another.*

The order of the plays is irregular. *Troilus and Cressida* does not appear in the catalogue, but seems to have come to hand during the printing, and is inserted before *Coriolanus*, without paging, except on three pages. In some copies *Winter's Tale* precedes *Coriolanus*.

Numerous mistakes both in Roman and Italic type also negative the existence of a cipher, which requires strictest accuracy.

The headlines in Italics of the last two pages of the

*The change in the order of printing of various parts of the folio only increases the difficulty of deciphering, but does not prevent it; and probably the changes were made for that very reason. In deciphering it has been found that the story breaks off at the end of one book, and then is continued in another without the smallest hint being given to connect the two, and to me this seems not otherwise than might be expected. “Mistakes,” as they are called, in pagination sometimes give the clue to the correct path for the decipherer to follow.

Two Gentlemen of Verona are misprinted *The Merry Wives of Windsor*.

Many of the errors of paging and some in the text, including some Italic names, were corrected in the later copies. The sheets which were worked before correction were not destroyed; they were bound up indifferently with other sheets that had been revised.

Mr. Sidney Lee fully discusses the subject in his Introduction to the Clarendon Press facsimile, and states that "This casual method of correction was common to other books and to the Shakespeare Quartos, so that few copies of a single edition are identical. But the variations among different copies of the First Folio are more numerous than those among copies belonging to the same edition of any other known book of the day."

It appears therefore that the First Folio, instead of being, as alleged, a wonderfully elaborate construction, containing throughout a word cipher, a biliteral cipher, and numerous concealed plays, was in fact most carelessly and irregularly put together, and that no cipher story can really exist in the First Folio.

The *De Augmentis* is involved in peculiar difficulty. Upon this book Bacon mainly rested his philosophic fame. It was published in London in 1623 and in Paris in 1624.

If Bacon had really committed to this book the secrets of his life, the disclosure of which would endanger his position and even his life, he would surely not have placed in the same book the key, open to all the world. He would doubtless have confided the key to his friends, with careful instructions to unlock the mystery 50 or 100 years after his death. If there were such a cipher story in *De Augmentis*, with the key open on its face, Bacon was by his own egregious folly ex-

posed for the last three years of his life to the imminent peril of disclosure of his secrets. This is not credible.*

But, further, the two editions of 1623 and 1624 do not agree. The Paris edition was inaccurate; the distinctive forms in the key are given less accurately and the text of the examples following the key is inaccurate, “parati” being substituted for “pauci” in the twelfth line, which, unless corrected, throws out the cipher for the following four lines.

Yet this Paris edition was the one on which Mrs. Gallup worked, and its inaccuracy was no obstacle to her cipher story.

When Mrs. Gallup came to London, and the inaccuracy of the 1624 edition was pointed out,† she examined the 1623 edition at the British Museum and

* Bacon had to take this risk. The secret was too dangerous for any man to unfold. Even 50 or 100 years after his death the disclosing of the secret *might* have had most serious consequences in political affairs, and to be possessed of such a secret and make it known might very easily have rendered the possessor amenable to condign punishment. Archbishop Tenison probably knew the secret, so probably did Rawley, and Ben Johnson, but none dared make it known. The difficult position that Bacon was in was this—that unless all his labour was to be lost, and his secret for ever buried, he *must* make the key public (veiling it and shrouding it as carefully as possible), and trust to the quick wit of some person to understand its use. If the secret were too carefully veiled it would never be found; if too clearly shewn it would be over-quickly unravelled, and between these two lay Bacon's difficulty. Perhaps the key was given as well to the secret Rosicrucian Society.

† Mrs. Gallup herself pointed out that the Paris edition (which she had deciphered) differed from the London edition in the Italics, and drew the inference that the London edition contained a different story. It has not yet been deciphered. There was never any question about the “inaccuracy” of the edition. I think it is quite credible that the two editions may contain different stories, though, for the reasons given on p. 1, this does not *necessarily* follow from the Italics being different.

found the London type so different from the Paris type that she declared that the London edition contained quite a different story!

Is this credible? That Bacon wrote out and marked letter by letter a second copy of *De Augmentis*, with a different cipher story (with which we have not yet been enlightened) and had it published in Paris, and, careless of his own safety, published the key to all the world in both editions?

The plain inference is that the cipher and cipher story are imaginary, and this is confirmed by examination of *Henry VII.*, now submitted as a test case.

There are two essentials to a genuine biliteral cipher: 1. Two complete distinct alphabets. 2. Strict adherence to their use. To use Bacon's words, "You must have ready at hand a bi-formed alphabet which may represent all the letters of the common alphabet, as well capitall letters as the smaller characters in a double forme" (*De Augmentis*, Wats' Translation, 1640). The necessity of strict use goes without saying. Every misuse *pro tanto* defeats the cipher and misleads the decipherer.*

These two conditions are fulfilled in the examples given by Bacon in the *De Augmentis*, published in London in 1623. The question to be determined is whether they are satisfied in the present case.

There do not appear to be two complete distinct

* These canons here laid down are not such as would be used by one desiring to make the cipher difficult of deciphering, as I conceive must have been Bacon's object. If there were always two complete distinct alphabets, and strict adherence to their use, deciphering would be an easy—and a too easy—matter. Far from this being the case, those who have deciphered find obstructions and difficulties constantly interposed, and these can only be overcome by much intelligent perseverance. Bacon indicated how the cipher could be used, and then devised means to make it as difficult as possible, within the limits of possibility.

alphabets. An examination of the first sixty pages appears to show the following results :—

Five of the capital letters, A, E, I, M and N, have two distinct forms correctly used for ‘a’ and ‘b’ in both the smaller and larger types with, in all, about seven exceptions.

Q and U have also two forms correctly used, but occur only twelve times each.

In A and I and U the use is reversed in the smaller and larger type.

G has two forms in the larger type, correctly used; but only one form in the smaller type used in it, therefore, both for ‘a’ and ‘b.’

P and R, on the contrary, have two forms in the smaller type correctly used, with two exceptions; but, in the larger type, one form for ‘a’ and ‘b.’

C has two forms, long and short; and Y has two forms, small and large, which might therefore be used to distinguish ‘a’ from ‘b,’ but they are used indifferently for both.

T has one distinct form of Roman type, but sloping, always used for ‘b,’ and three slightly varying forms, which seem used indifferently for ‘a’ and ‘b.’

Eight letters, B, D, F, H, K, L, O, S, appear to have only one form, used indifferently for ‘a’ and ‘b.’

The small letters appear generally indistinguishable, except the long and short ‘s’ and the three forms of ‘u’ and ‘v.’

If in the eight capitals last named, or in the small letters, there are microscopic differences, they would, I believe, be insufficient to prevent the letters being used indifferently for ‘a’ or ‘b’ without detection. Mrs. Gallup asserts there are such differences clear to her and used correctly, but this rests only on her assertion. Although the key is known and the alleged differences explained, I believe no one on this side of the Atlantic

has been able to decipher a single complete sentence except by guesswork.*

If this is a correct appreciation of the facts, the cipher used is a very incomplete one, and differs widely from Bacon's complete biliteral cipher. It will presently be shown that such an incomplete cipher is practically a nullity.

With regard to the second condition, if it appeared that the clear distinctions between the letters which constituted the cipher were disregarded, and that the letters, either capital or small, were used indiscriminately as 'a' or 'b,' this would negative the existence of the cipher.

In the early editions of Mrs. Gallup's books two complete alphabets of distinct type were given as those by which she was enabled to decipher from the *Novum Organum*, and a facsimile was given of the first portion of the book for comparison and a cipher transcript. But on comparison of the alphabets with the facsimile and transcript, the letters appeared to be in many cases incorrectly used.

In the typical alphabet two quite distinct forms of the capital A are given for font 'a' and font 'b.' In the first two pages of the facsimile the capital A occurs twelve times, all in the form 'a,' but of these three are called and used for 'b.'

Two forms of C are given, but in the first page of the facsimile C occurs four times. The three first resemble 'a,' but are called 'b'; the last resembles 'b,' but is called 'a.'

E is given in two quite distinct types for fonts 'a'

* Mrs. Pott also has deciphered a portion of *Henry VII.* and passages from various books not entered upon by Mrs. Gallup, and her deciphering was published in *BACONIANA* for Sept., 1899. But the work is extremely difficult and absorbing and not such as can easily be continued.

and ‘b.’ In page 1 E occurs five times in form ‘a,’ yet one is called ‘b.’

N occurs three times in the two first pages, all in the form of the ‘b’ font, yet all are called ‘a.’

U is given in two quite distinct forms for ‘a’ and ‘b’ and both forms occur in page 3, but both are called ‘a.’

The same arbitrary practice appeared to prevail in the use of the small letters which are practically indistinguishable. A convenient example may be found in the word “immiscere” (page 4, line 6), which contains each of the letters ‘i,’ ‘m,’ ‘e,’ twice. The letters of each pair seem indistinguishable, but, in each case, one of the pair is called ‘a,’ the other ‘b.’

These and other irregularities threw doubt on the reality of the cipher, and went far to negative its existence. After they were pointed out the alphabets were omitted in later editions. Why were the alphabets suppressed if, in fact, they had revealed the cipher? If they had not, the cipher is an illusion.

The example now submitted for scrutiny as a test of the genuineness of the cipher appears to be more carefully prepared. It would indeed be strange if, in an example submitted as a test case, such obvious faults as the misplacing of plainly distinct capitals were allowed to appear; and the manuscript shows signs of revision.

It should be observed, moreover, that while *Henry VII.* appears to contain only seven capital letters in complete double form, the *Novum Organum* was said by Mrs. Gallup to contain the whole alphabet for both small and large type in double form. The First Folio will be found to contain at least fifteen capital letters in double form. This may account for the fewer faults detected in the present example of the cipher, and possibly for the selection of this book as a test of the

correctness of the cipher; seven letters being more easily adjusted than fifteen or twenty-four.*

But the apparently correct use (with a few exceptions) of seven letters, or a partially consistent use of ten, affords but slender proof of the genuineness of the cipher. None at all if, as appears to be the case, the remaining capitals and small letters are used indiscriminately; for every letter not having a double form, appropriately used, is a witness against the cipher.

With but little trouble a cipher limited to seven or ten letters may be constructed so as to produce *any desired result*.

Each page of the larger Italics in *Henry VII.* contains about 850 letters. In each page one of the distinct capitals occurs about fourteen times, or once out of every sixty letters. All that is required is that one out of every sixty letters should be marked 'a' or 'b' as required. As the biliteral cipher contains 'a' twice as often as 'b,' the probability is two to one that if 'a' is required an 'a' will present itself without any trouble. If not, or if 'b' is required and is not there, a very slight change will produce the required letter; for each letter of the text, be it remembered, is only one of a group of five letters required to produce one letter of the transcript.

If 'b' is required instead of 'a,' and it is the first letter of the group, any of the eight groups of the cipher beginning with 'b,' viz., 's' to 'z,' may be substituted. If it is the last letter of the group you

* Mrs. Kindersley has found that all the capital letters used in medium Italic type in the first 50 pages of *Henry VII.* (1622 Ed.) are in double form. There are only 22, X and Z not appearing as capitals. So far she has checked 13 of these letters with Mrs. Gallup's deciphering, and in the 704 letters they represent, finds only 14 instances in which she fails to corroborate Mrs. Gallup's use of them.

have a choice of eleven letters, whose group begins with ‘a,’ to fit into the transcript.

To show that anything can be read into such a cipher, take the first two lines of “The Lay of the Last Minstrel,” containing, with the first letter of the third line, sixty letters. In this, one capital would have to be marked ‘a’ or ‘b’ as required. But to make it six times more difficult, let all the six capitals be marked alternately ‘a’ and ‘b.’ The lines may be interpreted in either of the ways shown below:—

	a		b		a	
	Thefe	astwa	sover	inBra	nksom	eTowe r
1.	aaaba	abaaa	abbba	aabbb	aabaa	baaaa a
	C	I	P	H	E	R x
2.	aaaaa	abbaa	aaaaa	babaa	aabab	baabb a
	A	N x	A	W	F	U
	b	a				b
	Andt	heLad	yhadg	oneto	herse	cretb owerH er
1.	baaa	baaab	baabb	aaaaa	ababa	abaaa aaabb
	I	S x	V	A	L	I D x
2.	babab	ababa	aabbb	abbab	aaaaa	babab abba
	L	L x	H	O	A	X x O x

To fit in one letter in sixty is not therefore difficult, and this is not sufficient proof of the genuineness of the cipher. Nor does the identification of an occasional letter with the ‘a’ or ‘b’ type exercise appreciable control on the output.

Another illustration may be given showing also that the cipher transcript has been revised.

In the cipher extract from *Henry VII.* given in Mrs. Gallup’s book (page 137, line 2) occur these words, “acco’. It is a subtly planned cipher.” The words in the text now sent are, “acco’t. It is a subtly planned ciphe’.” A ‘t’ is added to the first word and an ‘r’ dropped from the last, both terms containing twenty-eight letters, which represent twenty-eight

groups of five letters, or 140 letters in the text of *Henry VII.*, pages 29 and 30. These 140 letters are: "e Treasure Dower Designe Maiestic Royall England The Historie of the Raigne of Counsellis Quiver King Conjunction Neece Neece crowne Earle Lincolne Partie Lords Alm."

It happens that in these 140 letters there are five distinct capitals, viz., M, E, N, N, E, and in the present text they are consistently rendered except the last E, which should be 'a' instead of 'b.'

The text as originally given shows three capitals wrong—M, E, N. The revision reduces the errors from three to one, but fifteen capitals and over forty small letters have their ascription changed from 'a' to 'b,' or *vice versa*.

It is not easy to reconcile such changes with a genuine cipher. If fifty-five letters out of 140 can be changed at will from 'a' to 'b' or 'b' to 'a' the alleged cipher is plainly illusory.

Other differences in the text will be found at pages 38 and 39. At page 38 'i' is introduced in the new text. At page 39 "some portio' o'" is now substituted for "a portio' of" in the original text, adding two letters.

It does not appear how the added letters are now revealed by the cipher. Their insertion or omission must change the whole of the subsequent cipher and negative its reality. For in these three instances changes are made in obvious disregard of any cipher. This leads to the next point, which is to ascertain if, in fact, the other capitals and the small letters are dealt with indiscriminately as 'a' or 'b.' If so, there is no real cipher.

Digraphs, or double letters, may first be considered. These being cast in one piece of metal cannot belong to two different fonts, yet they are constantly so

interpreted. If it is suggested that they may represent two letters without reference to font, they should at least always represent the same letters, but they are not so used.

A convenient example will be found at page 39, where the word “Sanctuarie” occurs eight times within a few lines. The digraph ‘ct’ is used four times for ‘aa,’ once for ‘bb,’ twice for ‘ba,’ and once for ‘ab.’

So in the first six pages the digraph ‘st’ is used once for ‘bb,’ twice for ‘aa,’ four times for ‘ab,’ and twice for ‘ba.’

In the same pages the digraph ‘ll’ is used thrice for ‘aa,’ once for ‘bb,’ and eight times for ‘ba.’ The digraph ‘ff,’ ‘ss,’ and ‘sh,’ are in like manner used indiscriminately for ‘a’ or ‘b.’ The digraphs form about one-ninth of the text. If the alleged cipher is disregarded in one-ninth of the text, what reason is there to suppose it is observed in the other eight-ninths?

The digraphs, therefore, afford cogent evidence against the existence of a real cipher.

A convenient mode of testing whether the other capitals and the small letters are assigned to the ‘a’ and ‘b’ types by any rule, may be to take from the headings of the first twenty-one pages the words “The Historie” and “King the Seventh,” and see how they are interpreted. These headings can be most easily compared, and with exception of the T they appear to be identical in type, and the transcription should correspond. The T’s are all of the same character, but it may be observed that the top stroke of some, as on pages 2 and 8, is a little longer than others, as on pages 4 and 6. If this is a distinction it is disregarded. The four T’s on pages 2, 4, 6 and 8 are alike called ‘b.’ There seems no difference between pages 8 and 10, yet these are called ‘b’ and ‘a’; page 12 has a short top

unlike 8 and 10, but is called 'a.' This, however, is the transcription :—

THE HISTORIE.		KING THE SEVENTH.	
PAGE.		PAGE.	
2.	baa baabaaaa	3.	abab aab abaabba
4.	baa baaaaaaa	5.	bbab aaa babaaab
6.	bba aaabaaba	7.	abab aab abaabba
8.	bab baabaaaa	9.	baab aaa babaaba
10.	aaa baabaaaa	11.	aaab baa aaabbab
12.	aaa aaaabaaa	13.	baab aaa aaabaab
14.	aab aaaaabaa	15.	abab aab abaabba
16.	baa baaaaaaa	17.	baab aaa babbaab
18.	aaa baabaaaa	19.	abba bba aaabaab
20.	bba aaabaaaa	21.	aabb bab aababab

The transcription differs in every page, and appears to show that these letters are assigned to the 'a' and 'b' types by no rule, but the will of the decipherer.

An examination of the deciphering of *Henry VII.*, offered for scrutiny, appears therefore to show that seven of the capital letters are plainly distinguishable, and these, with a few exceptions, are used consistently with the alleged cipher, and four other capitals are consistently used in one type but not in the other; but that the other capitals and the small letters are used without rule, as is shown by the changes in the text, and by the examples of the digraphs and of the headings.

The existence of the cipher, therefore, appears not proven. There appears to be no evidence in support of it beyond Mrs. Gallup's assertion, and this does not appear to agree with her practice or to be consistent with the evidence of other people's perceptions. There appears no reason why other people should surrender the evidence of their senses, which can be raised to any required acuteness by aid of magnifiers, and which

negative the existence of any such small consistent and reliable distinctions as asserted by Mrs. Gallup.

There are many other difficulties in the way of accepting the cipher as real.

The cipher is said to be taken from forty-four different books, published at various dates from 1590 to 1635, printed probably by twenty or more different printers.

The differences in type are said to be in part so minute as to be recognisable only after long study and with the aid of a magnifier. Were all the printers supplied with magnifiers? It has been suggested, in order to dispense with magnifiers, that possibly the types were marked with two marks, and the manuscripts marked under each letter, to enable the printers to work. Apart from the labour, and the difficulty of getting the printers to work this system accurately, how could secrecy be preserved? Every printer and printer's man would know these forty-four books contained cipher secrets, and in 1623 the key was published to all the world in the *De Augmentis*.

Is it likely also that Bacon would commit State secrets to a cipher which could only be discovered with a magnifier, and whose distinctions are so minute, and therefore uncertain, as to be capable of being read in any number of different ways?

That the cipher flatly contradicts Bacon's authentic statements is not denied. If it is a question of credibility between Francis Bacon and Mrs. Gallup the Bacon Society should prefer Francis Bacon.

GEORGE COX BOMPAS.

THE PARNASSUS TRILOGY*

THE complete trilogy of the Parnassus plays has now been before the world nearly thirty years, and we are no nearer to a conclusion as to their origin and purpose; yet they are crowded with hints and suggestions applicable to the various problems connected with the Elizabethan drama, and especially to Shakespeare. Shakespeare, indeed, is almost constantly in evidence in the second and third of these plays. The authorship of plays, the fortunes of scholars, their ideals contrasted with their realities, their social position compared with that of actors, the special merits of a great number of contemporary poets,—these are the chief topics of most of the acts and scenes; and in all these particulars William Shakespeare the poet, and the poems attributed to him, are either directly or indirectly dwelt upon. Scholars find that the road to Parnassus is the road to beggary and contempt. The prizes due to learning are given to Ignorance and Stupidity. Actors are “leaden spouts, that nought do vent but that which they receive.” These “painted asses” are seated in “chairs of dignity,” while the unsuccessful scholar is reduced to menial occupations. I do not think it will be easy to find any head for whom these various caps are better fitted than that of William Shakspeare. Surely this is his very portrait. Studioso, the Cambridge scholar, speaks:—

“Fair fell good Orpheus, that would rather be
 King of a molehill than a Keysar’s slave:
 Better it is ’mongst fiddlers to be chief,
 Than at a player’s trencher beg relief.
 But is’t not strange these mimic apes should prize
 Unhappy scholars at a hireling rate?”

* *The Return from Parnassus*. Anon. Temple Dramatists. (J. M. Dent and Co., 1s. 6d.)

Vile world that lifts them up to high degree
 And treads us down in grovelling misery,
 England affords those glorious vagabonds,
 That carried erst their fardels on their backs,
 Coursers to ride on through the gazing streets,
 Sooping it in their glaring satin suits,
 And pages to attend their masterships :
 With mouthing words that better wits have framed
 They purchase lands, and now esquires are named."

—3 *Par.*, V. i.

These plays show high poetic merit ; they are full of inexhaustible wit and character painting ; they abound in classic allusions and even quotations. The poet was evidently quite familiar with French ; there is a good deal of law jargon in his writing—in fact we find all the leading characteristics of the Shakespearean drama, while resemblances and parallels in thought and phrase turn up not only in every page, but many times in most pages. In the first hundred lines of the first play there are no less than thirty passages which recall about fifty parallel passages in Shakespeare, and in complex fashion these give their support to the Baconian theory ; for we have—

1st. Almost positive proof that Bacon wrote a good deal of the poetry.

2nd. Equally positive proof that "Shakespeare" did.

3rd. Equally positive proof that both were occupied with the same passages.

We can only find room for typical instances of all these. The most striking is the following. Bacon in his *Advancement* thus writes :—

"Herein the invention of one of the late poets is proper, and doth well enrich the ancient fiction. For he feigneth that at the end of the thread or web of every man's life there was a little medal containing the person's name, and that Time waited upon the shears, and as soon as the thread was cut, caught the medals

and carried them to the river of Lethe; and about the banks there were many birds flying up and down, that would get the medals and carry them in their beak a little while, and then let them fall into the river. Only there were a few swans, which, if they got a name, would carry it to a temple where it was consecrate."—*Works* IV. 307.

The same "invention" appears in the third Parnassus play, IV. 3:—

"Fond world that ne'er thinks on that aged man,
That Ariosto's old swift-paced man,
Whose name is Time, who ever lins to run,
Loaden with bundles of decayed names,
The which in Lethe's lake he doth entomb,
Save only those which swan-like scholars take
And do deliver from that greedy lake."

Curiously enough the Clarendon Editor, as well as Mr. Ellis, naming Ariosto as the "late poet," says that Mr. Singer was the first to point out the source of this reference! being unaware that the name Ariosto was already given in the old play. The fact that Bacon and the Parnassus poet both hit upon the same obscure passage is not a little remarkable.

Almost equally striking is the definition of a scholar given by the Page in the same play (II. 6): "Nay, maister, let me define a mere scholar. I heard a Courtier once define a mere scholar to be *animal scabiosum*—that is, a living creature that is troubled with the itch." In Bacon's *Advancement* (*Works* III. 426) the same definition is quoted: "Socrates saying that the Sophist's felicity was the felicity of one that had the itch, who did nothing but itch and scratch."

The three groups of writings all meet in the following curious passage. Bacon's chapter, in the *History of Life and Death*, on the Inteneration of bodies that have been dried (V. 230), says: "Leather boots grown hard and stiff with age are softened by being greased with tallow

before the fire," etc. Leonatus, servant to Consili-
odorus, recounting the merits of his father, says: "Oh!
he was a wise man! he could give such fine rules con-
cerning the liquoring of boots for the holding out of
water" (2 *Par.*, I. 1). The same accomplishment is
referred to in 1 *Henry, IV.* II. i.: "What! the
commonwealth their boots? Will she hold out
water in foul way? She will, she will; justice hath
liquored her." And Falstaff (*Merry Wives*, iv. 5):
"They would melt me out of my fat drop by drop, and
liquor fishermen's boots with me."

The poet, who contrasts the anticipations of scholars
with their actual experiences, uses the same language as
Bacon:—

"The two ways of Contemplation are not unlike the two ways
of action already spoken of by the ancients; the one plain and
smooth in the beginning and in the end impassable; the other
rough and troublesome in the entrance, but after a while fair and
even."—*Works* III. 293.

In *The Conference of Pleasure* he says of love:—

"It is not like the virtues which by a steep and cragged way
conduct us to a plain, and are hard taskmasters at first, and after
give an honourable hire."

In the Parnassus play Philomusus speaks of tracing

"This rough, this harsh, this craggy way
That leadeth unto fair Parnassus hill."

Studioso also is journeying, he says, "through this
craggy isle, this harsh, rough way." The same
description of the craggy way is repeated in three
other passages.

Bacon's very remarkable ideas about hope, as a use-
less and enfeebling sentiment, appear frequently in
Shakespeare. With some contempt Hotspur's sanguine
temper is described:—

“Who lined himself with hope,
Eating the air on promise of supply.”

—2 *Henry, IV.* I. iii. 27.

The same unusual view is found in 1 *Par.*, V. 1: “I fed so long upon hope till I had almost starved.”

Bacon’s (and Shakespeare’s) repeated allusion to sunshine as shining equally on the fairest and the foulest objects—in a castle or on a cesspool—is put into the mouth of Ingenioso, who speaks of his patron as “a churl who thinks it enough for his favour like a sun to shine on the dunghill of learning.”

The loud reverberations of an empty vessel is alluded to in Shakespeare as in Bacon, and in the second Parnassus play. Bacon, in his letter to Rutland, says: “God knows they have gotten little who have only this discoursing gift; for though, like empty casks, they sound loud enough when a man knocks on their outside, yet, if you pierce into them, you shall find them full of nothing but wind.” In *Henry V.*, IV. iv., Pistol is similarly portrayed: “I did never know so full a voice issue from so empty a heart; but the saying is true, ‘The empty vessel makes the greatest noise.’” And in the Parnassus play the proverb is quoted again: “Even as an empty barrel soundeth most, as they say.”

The two heroes of the Parnassus plays are referred to as two *individuum vagum*. Bacon so also describes himself, speaking to the King of the successive steps of his rising: “You found me of the learned Counsel extraordinary, without patent or fee,—a kind of *individuum vagum*.”

Stercutio, soliciting a living for his son, Immerito, praises his many gifts, and as “one that hath taken all his learning on his own head” (3 *Par.*, II. 4). This looks like an echo of Bacon’s claim for himself: “I have taken all knowledge to be my province.”

The traces of Shakespeare's hand are too numerous to be fully set forth; they must sooner or later appear when these plays are published with Notes and Elucidations. Some idea of the abundance of these may be formed by quoting a few lines, and interpolating them with Shakespeare comparisons. Take the opening lines of the first play:—

"Now, Philomusus, do your beardless years.

A beardless boy."—*John*, V. i. 69.

"Every beardless vain comparative."—*1 Henry IV.*, III. ii. 66.

"Your fair young spring-time, and your budded youth.

Young budding virgin, fair and fresh and sweet."

—*Taming of the Shrew*, IV. v. 37.

"In this new spring of time."—*Richard II.*, V. ii. 50, etc.

"Urge me to advise your young untutored thought.

"Untutor'd lad, thou art too malapert."—*3 Henry VI.*, V. v. 32.

Also see *2 Henry VI.*, III. ii. 213.

"She might think me some untutored youth."

—*Sonnet* 138.

"My untutored lines."—*Dedic. to Lucrece.*

"And give gray-bearded counsel to your age.

Love, which grey beards call divine."

—*3 Henry VI.*, V. vi. 81.

"Unto an old man's speech one minute give.

Who many years have schooled how to live,

To an advising tongue one half hour lend:

Whatsoever I speak experience hath penned.

Well! I am schooled."—*1 Henry IV.*, III. i. 190.

(And cf. *Richard II.*, II. i. 1—30.)

"Perhaps this tongue, this mind interpreter.

His fair tongue, conceit's expositor."

—*Love's Labour's Lost*, II. i. 72.

"Shall never more borrow your listening ear.

Lend me your ears."—*Julius Cæsar*, III. iii. 78.

The Parnassus Trilogy

"My corpse shall lie within some senseless urn.

Lay these bones in an unworthy urn."

—Henry V., I. ii. 228.

"Some little grave my ashes shall enclose.

My large kingdom for a little grave—

A little, little grave, an obscure grave."

—Richard II., III. iii. 153.

"My winged soul 'gins scorn this slimy jail,

And thinks upon a purer mansion ;

My winged soul."—2 Henry VI., III. iii. 16.

"Thy gallant spirit . . . here did scorn the earth."

—Romeo and Juliet, III. i. 123.

"Eld summons me to appear at Pluto's court.

Among the shady troops of acry ghosts.

When you come to Pluto's region."

Titus Andronicus, IV. iii. 13.

"I'll therefore counsel you while I have time,

For fear your fair youth wither in her prime.

The lovely April of her prime."

—Sonnet 3.

"Losing his verdure even in the prime."

—Two Gentlemen of Verona, I. i. 49.

"Take good advice from him who loves you well,

Plain dealing needs not Rhetoric's tinkling bell.

Honest plain words best pierce the ear of grief."

—Love's Labour's Lost, V. ii. 763.

"Fie, painted Rhetoric ! O, she needs it not."

—Ibid., IV. iii. 239.

"When they have devised

What strained touches Rhetoric can lend,

Thou, truly fair, wert truly sympathysed

In true plain words, by thy true telling friend."

—Sonnet 82.

(To be concluded.)

R. M. THEOBALD.

HONORIFICABILITUDINITATIBUS

I N *Love's Labour's Lost*, the earliest of the Shakespearean dramas, this word appears, and for some years past it has been maintained, on the authority of Dr. Platt, that in it an anagram is to be found showing that Bacon was the author of the plays. It is surely time that this supposition should be knocked on the head.

A variation of the word in the form "Honorificabilitudine" is found on the cover of the Northumberland House manuscript; Dr. Platt's contention is that this infolds the words: *Initio hi ludi Fr. Bacone* (In the beginning these plays from Fr. Bacon), and that the anagram in this form not being considered satisfactory, another was inserted in *Love's Labour's Lost*, which can be construed into *Hi ludi, tuiti sibi Fr. Bacone nati*. We are informed that "thus we have before us the making of the word by Bacon," and that "the case seems to be complete." The suggestion is an instance of ingenious "Labour Lost."

Bacon did not make the word. In the form in which it appears in *Love's Labour's Lost* (1589-92) it is to be found in a volume published at St. Andrews in 1548 or 1549, entitled, *The Complaynt of Scotland*, attributed to Sir John Inglis by some and to Wedderburn by others. This volume, which is of extreme rarity, and was dedicated to Queen Mary, was re-printed in Edinburgh in 1801. In the "Prolog" to the reader, the author, in railing at the common use of long and out-of-the-way words by "diverse translatours and copilaris (compilers) in ald tymes," gives as examples "Hermes quilk pat in his verkis this lang tailit vordis conturbabatur, constan-tropolitani, innumerabilibus, sollicitudinibus. There was ane othir that writ in his verkis, gaudet *honorificabilitudinitatibus*," etc. This appeared years before either

Bacon or Shakspeare was born, so the word was not invented by either one or other of them.

But the word is even older than *The Complaynt of Scotland*, for in the form "honorificabilitudino" it is to be found in a Charter of 1187, and in the form "honorificabilitudinitas" in the *De Gestis Henrici VII.* of Albertino Mussato (1261-1330).

"Honorificabilitudinitate" is also to be found in the Italian translation of Dante's *De Vulgari Eloquentia* in 1529, and the Latin original in 1577, and it is also included in the *Magnæ Derivationes* of Uguccone da Pisa, the standard Latin dictionary in Dante's time, as well as in the *Catholicon* of Giovanni da Genova, one of the earliest of printed books.

If the Latin of the anagram extracted from the word as it appears in *Love's Labour's Lost* is to be considered an ordinary specimen of Bacon's proficience in Byron's "soft bastard Latin," then I am not surprised that Ben Jonson was engaged to translate the great Chancellor's works from English into that language. Here is a better Latin anagram if Dr. Platt will accept it: *Ubi Italicus ibi Danti honor fit* (Where there is an Italian there honour is paid to Dante).

It is a curious fact that immediately after the first publication of *Love's Labour's Lost* in 1598, Thomas Nash used the same "lang tailit" vord in the same form, in his *Lenten Stuffle*, 1599, and Marston did likewise in his *Dutch Courtezan*, 1605.

My purpose is to show that this suggested anagram is simply a mare's nest, and not deserving a moment's consideration.

GEORGE STRONACH.

"SHAKESPEARE'S STORY OF HIS LIFE"

THIS is a recent publication by Mr. C. Creighton, M.D. (London: Grant Richards). It contains much that bewilders, much that gives food for thought. It is conceived upon right lines—the chronological study of contemporary Elizabethan literature and biography. But in our opinion it fails, and this largely through the adoption of an unsound hypothesis. Dr. Creighton leaps and bounds to his conclusions across huge gaps of difficulties. In elucidation of this we will discuss one chapter—the sixth. We have not space for more. In this chapter the author proves to his own satisfaction that Barnabe Barnes, a minor poet, 1569—1609, was Shakespeare's literary devil! He states that his evidence is "constructive," which seems to us an appropriate definition.

His first construction is to assume that the "W. S." by whom *Lochrine*, 1595, was "set foorth overseene and corrected," was Shakspere. Most Shakesperian critics reject this theory on the intelligible grounds that he might have been expected to have made a better job of it. Then because (on the strength of Nash's doubtful delineation of Barnabe's personal appearance and conduct) Dr. Creighton thinks Don Armado in *Love's Labour's Lost* a caricature of Barnes, he also thinks he sees in Strumbo, a character in *Lochrine*, another sly cut at Barnes effected by W. S. while editing *Lochrine* for the press. Dr. Creighton believes one of the lines given to Strumbo to be a refined travesty of the figure of speech used in one of the sonnets written by Barnes in 1593, whilst he was in an erotic and irreverent phase. When once these premises have captured our understanding the rest is easy. Barnes wrote *Lochrine*. Dr.

Creighton's sequiter is, that as *Titus Andronicus*, *Henry VI.*, first part, *Selimus*, *Pericles*, and *King Leir* are much after the class and style of *Lochrine*, ergo Barnes wrote them also, and as some of them are afterwards claimed by Shakespeare, ergo Barnes was his literary devil.—Q.E.D.

Dr. Creighton confirms himself in his theory that Barnes wrote *King Leir* because it was not printed until 1605, and three of its characters express pious sentiments, and pious sentiments happen to be distinctive of Barnes in his second phase—the reverent—shown in his *Centurie of Spiritual Sonnets*, published 1595. Evidently :—

"The devil was sick, the devil a monk was he."

But *King Leir* was entered on the register in May, 1594, and probably soon afterwards printed (though no quarto of this date appears to be extant). If so, Barnabe must have been capable of changing his phase with the celerity of the devil of our quotation.

The key-stone of this wonderful arch of "constructive" evidence is, however, the assumption that Barnes is depicted and ridiculed in the character of Don Adriano de Armado of the play *Love's Labour's Lost*, produced before the Queen at Christmas, 1597.

Why a dramatist should employ as his devil a person he held in such contempt is not easy to comprehend. The fact that he caricatured him would support the inference that he was not in his service. Had Dr. Creighton established a close parity of style between *Lochrine* and the other mentioned plays and the known works of Barnes, his argument could be followed. But this he entirely fails to do. He relies on the construction that "W. S." was Shakespeare, Barnes Don Armado, and therefore Strumbo; therefore the literary devil who wrote *Lochrine*, and therefore the author of other plays in that style.

Dr. Creighton is most probably wrong in thinking that Don Adriano de Armado was a hit at Barnes. One of the speeches in *Love’s Labour’s Lost* begins:—

“Our court you know is haunted
With a refined traveller of Spain.”

In the same play Holofernes describes Armado as “too peregrinate.” Nathaniel remarks, “A most singular and choice epithet.” Why was this epithet so pertinent? A little pamphlet by Mr. James supplies the best explanation. England was visited in 1593 by Don Antonio de Perez, a Spanish nobleman and courtier, who seems to have quartered himself upon the English Court and the hospitality of both Bacon and Essex. In 1594 he wrote his *Relaciones*, under the assumed name of Raphael Peregrino, and presented copies to the Queen, to Essex and other courtiers. His style was stilted and extravagant. In 1596 he turned up again at the English Court, and doubtless proved himself a considerable bore. “Too peregrinate” would be a choice epithet to apply to Peregrino.

Is not the “literary devil” constructive evidence a trifle “too peregrinate” also? Certainly it is not strengthened by assuming that Barnes wrote the *Il Candido* sonnets prefixed to Florio’s *World of Wordes*, 1598, as the play preceded the book, so that any pleasantry in *Love’s Labour’s Lost* at the expense of the sonnets has no evidential value. Comparisons would at the best only point to the probability that one and the same person wrote the sonnets and the play; possibly a “concealed poet” was the writer, who, according to Florio, “loved better to be a poet than to be accounted one.”

PARKER WOODWARD.

NOTES, QUERIES, AND CORRESPONDENCE

The Fretful Porcupine

THE following paragraph appeared in *T.P.'s Weekly*, April 21st, 1905 :—

"THE FRETFUL PORCUPINE." — Mr. R. N. Green-Armytage (Temple, E.C.) writes : In Roscoe's translation of the "Memoirs of Benvenuto Cellini," newly re-published in the Unit Library, there will be found, on page 298, a poem written by that eccentric genius during his imprisonment in 1539. In this poem the following lines occur :

"My hair with horror bristling on my head,
Like quills upon the fretful porcupine."

These lines, with their unique simile, practically re-appear in "Hamlet," Act 1, Scene 5. The coincidence, if it be one, is very remarkable ; yet I have not seen any reference thereto in any of the recent commentaries on Shakespeare. I may mention that Roscoe's translation claims to be faithful to the Italian original. Cellini died in 1570—that is to say, some thirty years before "Hamlet" was written. The main question would therefore seem to be, "Was any part of the Italian Goldsmith's Autobiography published in England prior to the putting forth of 'Hamlet,' or can it be shown that Shakespeare was familiar with the original Italian poem?" So striking is the seeming plagiarism that I am constrained to submit the problem of its elucidation to your readers.

T.P.'s readers have not yet submitted the desired elucidation.

Recent Publications

MR. EDWIN REED has published, through Messrs. Gay and Bird, under the title of "Noteworthy Opinions" (6s.), a collection of comments on the Shakespeare-Bacon controversy. Mr. Reed has included not only those views favourable to Baconians, but some very much the reverse, and here the literary historian will find enshrined the many disgraceful utterances of prominent Shakespeareans. The index seems to be somewhat incomplete; we notice, for instance, that Dr. Furnivall's dicta, though included in the body of the book, are not indexed.

From Mr. A. Siegle, Langham Place, W., we have received "The Quintessence of the Shakespeare Secret" (6d.). This brochure somewhat belies its hopeful title. It is not a quintessence but rather an outline of Mr. Edwin Bormann's aspect of the subject. The writer concludes: "For the sake of brevity I have adduced only the main points of an external nature; further details and countless intrinsic reasons are to be found in the writings of Edwin Bormann." Then follows a list of the writings of Edwin Bormann—and of nobody else! But with all due respect to Mr. Bormann, *there are others*, and the complete omission of any allusion to their works in a pamphlet intended as a guide to elementary readers is an exhibition of literary arrogance.

Bacon Society Meetings

ON June 15th the last of the present series of Drawing Room Meetings held under the auspices of the Bacon Society took place at the house of Mrs. Smedley, the lecturer being Mr. Granville C. Cunningham. The speakers at preceding meetings, held

at the houses of Mrs. Cunningham, Miss Soutter, and Miss Leith, were Mr. A. P. Sinnett, Mr. Fleming Fulcher, and Miss Alicia A. Leith. It is intended to resume these meetings in the autumn, and those who will be kind enough to lend their drawing-rooms for the purpose are invited to communicate with the Hon. Sec. at No. 11, Hart Street.

On July 8th, at 2.30, at the Empress Rooms, Kensington, Mr. Harold Bayley will address the Federated Congress of the Theosophical Society, under the Presidency of Mrs. Besant, on "Francis Bacon and the New Atlantis."

The Date of Sir Francis Bacon's "Promus"

A CONTRIBUTOR having raised a question as to the dates of the *Promus* being subsequent to the appearance of some of the Plays, Mrs. Pott writes :

You seem to think that I have said somewhere that "the first page of the *Promus* shows that it was begun on December 5th, 1594." I cannot find that I said or wrote so, although I pointed out that the most eminent of Lord Bacon's biographers *did* say so, and certainly a group of Notes is headed with that date; but that group is, I think, the one endorsed "Formularies and Elegancies," and is numbered Fol. 111. The first folio (as arranged in the British Museum) is Folio 83. Folio 111 is short. It is the one which I call the *Romco and Juliet* Notes, having seventeen entries which recur in that play. It contains only 36 very brief notes, chiefly morning and evening salutations, and is written in the *latest* of three forms of handwriting used by the writer of these notes. I regard this group as the *first* in the *last* group of notes, ending with folio 128, and this on the evidence only of the three handwritings.

1.—The first handwriting which I know of Francis "Bacon," is the free *old* English style, partaking of the German caligraphy, and this is seen in the folios placed first in the collection. It does not hence follow that they *were* the first, for he often reverted in later life to this free hand; and it is the writing in marginal, or extra notes in his much later collection of Private Memoranda—a little vellum book called "Transportata."

2.—But when he was still a mere lad he was, we know, sent abroad, and then he began to adopt the more compact writing

of the French and Italians. At first he wrote this, large and round, like a copy-book. This is the writing of folios 130—132, all *French proverbs*, a collection I suppose made abroad, and afterwards published with additions, by one of his "helpers"—Camden—under the title of "Outlandish Proverbs."

3.—About his 30th year (or earlier) he seems altogether to have adopted the fine and useful neat italic writing of folios 111—128, which I am disposed to regard as the *last* of this *Promus* series—some of the other notes being, I think, certainly as early as 1580 or 1582.

Mr. Churton Collins and Ben Jonson's Aid to Bacon

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIR,—In the scholarly and elegant essay by Mr. Churton Collins, which he calls "The Bacon-Shakespeare Mania," in his "Studies in Shakespeare," he denounces the believers in the Baconian theory in unmeasured terms as a set of ignorant fools or maniacs, and cites their views as an illustration of Bacon's saying that: "Like as many substances in nature which are solid do putrefy and corrupt into worms, so it the property of good and sound knowledge to putrefy and dissolve into a number of subtle, idle, unwholesome, and (as I may term them) vermiculate questions, which have indeed a kind of quickness and life of spirit, but no soundness of matter or goodness of quality."

I find this on page 351: "Equally unwarrantable and baseless are Dr. Webb's assertions about the relations between Ben Jonson and Bacon. 'It is probable,' he says, 'that Jonson assisted Bacon in the preparation of the *Novum Organum*.' It is improbable, and in the highest degree improbable, that Ben Jonson had anything to do with the *Novum Organum*. . . . There is not a particle of evidence that Jonson gave the smallest assistance to Bacon in translating any of his works into Latin." To which is appended this footnote: "Probably the explanation is given by Tenison, BACONIANA, p. 25, namely, that Bacon had assistance in the translation, re-writing, or, at least, carefully revising it himself. The only translator named is Herbert. Hobbes is also said to have assisted him" (sic).

As a matter of fact, Herbert's name is not mentioned on p. 25; but this is immaterial, because on p. 24 occurs this:

"And knowing that this Work was desired beyond the seas and being also aware that Books written in a modern Language, which receiveth much change in a few years, were out of use; he caus'd that part of it which he had written in *English* to be translated into the *Latine* Tongue by Mr. *Herbert*, and some others, who were esteemed Masters in the *Roman* Eloquence."

I will now quote from p. 60 of the same work, Tenison's introduction to BACONIANA:

"To those *Apophthegms* may be referred these now published, the *Essays or Counsels Civil and Moral*, though a By-work also, do yet make up a Book of greater weight by far, than the *Apophthegms*: And coming home to Men's Business and Bosoms, his Lordship entertain'd this persuasion concerning them, that the *Latine Volume might last as long as Books should last*. His Lordship wrote them in the *English Tongue*, and enlarged them as Occasion serv'd, and at last added to them, the *Colours of Good and Evil*, which are likewise found in his Book *De Augmentis*. The *Latin Translation* of them was a Work performed by divers Hands: by those of Doctor *Hacket* (late Bishop of *Lichfield*), Mr. *Benjamin Johnson* (the learned and judicious Poet) and some others, whose names I once heard from Dr. Rawley; but I cannot now recal them."

Comment is unnecessary, especially as Mr. Collins has announced, at the close of his debate with Dr. Theobald, that the subject is distasteful to him.

ISAAC HULL PLATT.

Mr. Pitt-Lewis's "Outline"

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—I have to thank Mr. Pitt-Lewis for having so kindly sent answers to my questions. I shall await with eager interest his demonstration that the *Parnassus* trilogy was originally written in Greek by Ben Jonson. I think that Mr. Lewis will have some difficulty in showing that Jonson was ever a student at Cambridge. It is true that Fuller says he was at St. John's, and that Aubrey says he was at Trinity. Both are untrustworthy authorities, and both cannot be right. I am confident that both are wrong. Neither Trinity nor St. John's knows anything of him as a student. Jonson himself told Drummond that he was "taken from school and put to a trade," and that the degree which he possessed at each University was "by their favour, not his study." It is incredible that a man like Jonson, if he had been a student at Cambridge, would have made no allusion to the fact either to Drummond or in his voluminous writings. No, it was to Westminster—to "Camden, most reverend head"—that he owed his learning.

I am much obliged to Mr. Pitt-Lewis for referring me to Judge Willis's lecture, which I have possessed since its publication and concerning which I have had a word or two to say in print. But Judge Willis says nothing, either at page lxxviii. or anywhere else, about "Capell College, Cambridge," though he clearly shows how Mr. Pitt-Lewis came to be misled. True he refers to "Capell Coll., Camb.," but this means not "Capell Col-

lege," but the "Capell Collection." Capell, of St. Catherine's Hall, in the year 1779 gave his very valuable collection to Trinity College, Cambridge, and it is now preserved in the library of that College. "This College," says Mr. Pitt-Lewis of his imaginary Capell, "is not so-called now"! There never was such a College! If Mr. Pitt-Lewis is wise he will avoid this mistake in the large work which he is contemplating.

Yours faithfully, CANTAB.

"The New English Dictionary" Again

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—Some time ago you allowed me to show in BACONIANA the injustice meted out to Bacon by the editor of "The New English Dictionary" in quoting Shakespeare and not Bacon for uses of certain words. May I offer you another flagrant example of the treatment?

In part of the P. instalment recently issued, I find under PARTICULARITY, in the sense of "a particular case or instance," that the first use of the word is ascribed to Shakespeare—"1593, 2 *Henry VI.*, V. ii. 44—'Now let the general Trumpet blow his blast, Particularities, and pettie sounds To cease.'" Dr. Murray, the editor, can only instance one other use of this obsolete word with the same signification, giving Manwood as his authority (1598).

To show that Bacon's writings have been neglected by the readers for the "New English Dictionary" (it is declared, "on historical principles"), it may interest you to know that in the year (1594) following that of the Shakespearean use (1593) Bacon used the word in the same sense in a letter from Gray's Inn to Mr. Young, where he speaks of "the particularities of the abuse."

It is surely high time that the Editor of the "N. E. D." should divert a small portion of his attention from the Shakespeare Concordance to the Letters of Bacon. *Verb. sap.*

GEORGE STRONACH.

Honorificabilitudine

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—With reference to the Notes in the April and July numbers of BACONIANA, I have "*Io, Barclaii Argenio, Editio novissima Cum Clave, hoc est nominum propriorum elucidatione hactenus nondum edita.*

"*Lugd. Bat. Ex officina Elzeviriana Anno MDCXXVII.*"

On the inside of cover at the end of the book is written in plain large letters of old handwriting, "Abraham Issacku and Jacobu Honorificabilitudinitatibusque." This variant of the famous long word in *Love's Labour's Lost* and the Northumberland MS. may be nothing more than an attempt by combination to make up an even longer word consisting of 30 letters. Whether it has any significance when found in Barclay's *Argenio* may be worth consideration.

J. R., of Gray's Inn.

De Shakespeare Nostrat

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—The paragraph in Ben Jonson's *Discoveries*, "De Shakespeare Nostrat: Augustus in Hat" is well known to your contributors. But can one of them refer me to any classic author in whose writings the statement that Augustus said of Haterius "Sufflaminandus erat," may be found? I have failed to find the saying in the *Annals of Tacitus* and in other likely places.

J. R., of Gray's Inn.

A PORTRAIT and BIOGRAPHY of the late Mr. George Cox Bompas will appear in the next number.

OCTOBER, 1905

BACONIANA

A QUARTERLY MAGAZINE



CONTENTS

	PAGE
Portrait of the late Mr. G. C. Bompas ...	
Bacon's New Method	198
The Bi-Literal Cipher	204
Observations on the Authorship of "The Anatomy of Melancholy"	210
Judge Stotsenburg's "Impartial Study" ...	221
The Parnassus Trilogy	229
The Entertainment of Queen Elizabeth at Elvetham, 1591	237
Literal Translation of the "Manes Verulamiani."—II.	242
Notes, Queries, and Correspondence ...	253

LONDON

GAY & BIRD

22 BEDFORD STREET

Cases for B
can be had
the Publi

The Bacon Society.

(INCORPORATED.)

THE objects of the Society are expressed in the Memorandum of Association to be :—

1. To encourage the study of the works of Francis Bacon as philosopher, lawyer, statesman and poet ; also his character, genius, and life ; his influence on his own and succeeding times, and the tendencies and results of his writings.
2. To encourage the general study of the evidence in favour of Francis Bacon's authorship of the plays commonly ascribed to Shakespeare, and to investigate his connection with other works of the Elizabethan period.

The annual subscription of Members, who are entitled to vote at the Society's business meetings, is one guinea ; that of Associates is half-a-guinea.

The Society's Library and Rooms are at 11, Hart Street, London, W.C. (close to the British Museum), where the Secretary attends daily, and from 3 to 5 o'clock will be happy to supply further information.

BACONIANA.

VOL. III. *Third Series.* OCTOBER, 1905. No. 12.

ON THE PROPOSAL TO ERECT A STATUE TO SHAKESPEARE IN LONDON

WHY should we lodge in marble or in bronze
Spirits more vast than earth, or sea, or sky?
Wiser the silent worshipper who cons
Their page for Wisdom that will never die.
Unto the favourites of the passing hour
Erect the statue and unveil the bust,
Whereon contemptuous Time will slowly shower
Oblivion's refuse and neglectful dust.
The Monarchs of the Mind, self-sceptered Kings,
Need no memento to transmit their name :
Throned on their thoughts and high imaginings,
They are the Lords, not servitors, of Fame.
Raise pedestals to perishable stuff ;
Gods for themselves are monument enough.

ALFRED AUSTIN.

From the *National Review*.

BACON'S NEW METHOD

WRITING to King James in October, 1620, about the *Novum Organum* then being published, Bacon stated that the work "in what colours soever it may be set forth is no more but a new logic teaching to invent and judge by induction."

At a later date, possibly 1625, writing to Father Fulgentio, he stated, "After these (works) shall follow the *Organum Novum*, to which a second part is to be added which I have already comprised and measured in the idea of it." This letter should be read. *

Mr. Ellis, who joined with Mr. Spedding in editing Bacon's works, remarks anent the *Novum Organum*, "However this may be it is certain that an attempt to determine what his method taken as a whole was, or would have been, must necessarily involve a conjectural or hypothetical element." Again, "It becomes impossible to justify or to understand Bacon's assertion that his method was absolutely new. . . . It need not be remarked that induction in itself was no novelty at all. The nature of the art of induction is as clearly stated by Aristotle as by any other writer. Bacon's design was surely much larger than it would thus appear to have been."

The *Novum Organum* was, therefore, to be in two parts, and in what colours soever it might be set forth it was (1) to teach men to invent, and (2) judge by induction. Let us see whether Bacon anywhere shews how men are to be taught to invent (to originate).

In *The Wisdom of the Ancients* Bacon explains his favourite fable of Orpheus as representing the image of Philosophy, "which busies herself about human objects,

* Spedding has, "I have already compassed and planned it out in my mind." The Latin is: "*Quam tamen animo jam complexus et metitus sum.*"

and by persuasion and eloquence insinuating the love of virtue, equity, and concord in the minds of man draws multitudes of people to a society, makes them subject to laws, obedient to government, and forgetful of their unbridled affections, whilst they give ear to precepts, and submit themselves to discipline."

Philosophy, therefore, according to Bacon operates by *persuasion* and *insinuation*. In the *Advancement of Learning* (printed 1605) we are told: "*Men generally taste well knowledges drenched in flesh and blood, civil history, morality, policy, about which men's affections, praises, fortunes do turn, and are conversant. . . .* Again, if the affections in themselves were pliant and obedient to reason it were true there should be no great use of *persuasion* and *insinuation* to the will. . . . Another precept is that the mind is brought to anything better, and with more sweetness and happiness, if that whereunto you pretend be not first in the intention . . . impressions may be strongly made when the mind is influenced by passion."

But it is in *Filum Labyrinthi*, a tract addressed in the MS. *ad filios* (in which he gave to his assistants the thread by which the labyrinth might be successfully entered and quitted), that we have the nearest approach to a full revelation of his methods. This tract was found among Bacon's MSS. at his death. To quote from it: "For this object he (Bacon) is preparing a work on nature which may destroy errors *with the least harshness, and enter the senses of mankind without violence; which would be easier from his not bearing himself as a leader, but bringing and scattering light from nature herself* so that there may be no future need for a leader. . . . We ought to consider that the *importunity of teaching doth ever by right belong to the impertinences of things. . . .* But now which (thou wilt say) is that legitimate mode? . . . Dismiss all art and circumstances,

exhibit the matter naked to us, that we may be enabled to use our judgment. And would that you were in a condition, dearest son, to admit of this being done. Thinkest thou that when all the accesses and motions of all minds are besieged and obstructed by the obscurest idols, deeply rooted and branded in, the smooth and polished areas present themselves in the true and native rays of things? *A new method must be entered upon by which we glide into minds the most obstructed. . . .* In this universal insanity we must use moderation. . . . It has a certain inherent and innate power of conciliating belief, and repelling the injuries of time so that *knowledge thus delivered* like a plant full of life's freshness may spread daily and grow to maturity . . . that it will set apart for itself, and as it were, adopt a legitimate reader. And *whether I shall have accomplished all this or not I appeal to future time.*"

Further on is written :—

"Wherefore, duly meditating and contemplating the state both of nature and mind, we find the avenues to men's understandings harder of access than to things themselves, and the *labour of communicating* not much lighter than of excogitating; and therefore, *which is almost a new feature in the intellectual world*, we obey the humour of the time, and *play the nurse both with our own thoughts and those of others*. For every hollow idol is dethroned by skill, insinuation, and regular approaches. . . . Wherefore we return to this assertion, that the labour commenced by us (doubtless Bacon and his literary and playwriting staff) in paving the way, so far from being superfluous, is truly too little for difficulties so considerable."

Why was it only *almost* a new feature in the intellectual world? The *Filum Labyrinthi* answers this :—

“He thought also that knowledge is uttered to men in a form as if everything were finished . . . whereas antiquity used to deliver the knowledge which the mind of man hath gathered in *observations, aphorisms, or short and dispersed sentences, or small tractates of some parts that they had diligently meditated and laboured*, which did invite men both to ponder that which was invented, and to add and to supply further.”

Probably enough has now been quoted to indicate that the “almost new” feature, or method, which Bacon elaborated was not so much the inductive system of reasoning (although that was a prominent part) *as the insinuation of knowledges*, a method once in use with the ancients in which the real is masked by the seeming object.

Over what period of years Bacon practised his great plan of playing the nurse both with his own thoughts and those of others is hardly the subject of this article. But the sowing of the seed was evidently a most extensive business, as Mr. Harold Bayley's recent researches, shortly to be published, should make apparent.

The plays and other light literature in which the good things of knowledge were scattered with a lavish hand were, to my mind, the works of the Alphabet (*i.e.*, the A B C of his system of education) to which Bacon alludes in his letters to Toby Mathew.

I agree with Mr. Fearon that the passage in a later letter to Mathew was a mere concealed way of telling Mathew that he, Bacon, was “putting the Alphabet in a frame,” *viz.*, preparing a selection of the well-stuffed and garnished plays for Folio production as the second part of his *Novum Organum*.

If this view is right, it follows that *it was absolutely part of the system that his authorship should be concealed.*

Disclosure could not be made until many, many years after Bacon's death, so as to give the method long and patient trial.

"To speak the truth of myself," said Bacon, "I have often wittingly and willingly neglected the glory of my own name and learning (if any such thing be), both in the works I now publish and in those I contrive for hereafter, whilst I study to advance the good and profit of mankind" (Book 7, Chap. I., *Advancement of Learning*).

Directly men were aware that the main purpose of the published plays was not so much to entertain them as to put them to school, the New Method was certain to become a failure. Long and patient trial of the system could alone attain success. To disclose the author was to reveal the schoolmaster, whose work would then be resented and ignored as an impertinence by those for whom it was most fit.

Few will deny the "salting" to be found in the Folio Shakespeare.

The Hon. Judge Stotsenburg, in his recent clever book, asks:—

"Was there in England a concealed poet who wrote or revised the plays in part or all, or who inserted in all or part of them the magnificent and sparkling gems culled and gathered from art, from nature, from history, from philosophy, from science, and from ancient lore, which have always captivated and enchanted the reading world?"*

The late Mr. G. C. Bompas wrote:—

"In all subjects treated of by Bacon, the human body, sound and light, heat and cold, germination and petrification, the history of winds, astronomy, meteorology and witchcraft, the plays and prose works closely

* "An Impartial Study of the Shakespeare title."

correspond, and both exhibit a learning up to the time of the age."*

It is hardly necessary to show how fully this "scattering of light" has been accomplished. Books have been written on the various "knowledges" contained in the Folio alone. For observations as to the Law of the plays go to Lord Campbell, for Biblical references to Wadsworth, Surgery and Medicine to Bucknill, Geology to Fullom, Natural History and Entomology to Patterson, Emblems to Green, Sports to Madden, Delineations of the Passions to Donnelly, Bradley, and others, Folk-lore, Proverbs, Natural Phenomena, Customs and many other interesting things to Dyer. We know the use made in it of Holinshed's Histories, of Plutarch, Pliny, Du Bartas, Montaigne, and classical authors generally. After nearly three hundred years we can report that Bacon's New Method has prospered and borne fruit. The brimstone has been so cleverly mixed with the treacle that the compound has been gulped down with universal satisfaction. Moreover, Bacon always enjoyed a jest, and would have laughed consumedly to know that some of the most ardent and accomplished partakers of his brimstone and treacle, to wit, the faculty of *ad literam* critics, *have swallowed the label as well!*

Bacon has met the reward of the misunderstood. Though "in a despised weed" he sought "the good of all men" he, to-day, possesses only the suffrages of a few. His "New Method" has been a world-wide benefit, but not a personal success.

PARKER WOODWARD.

* "Problem of the Shakespear Plays."

THE BI-LITERAL CIPHER

A REPLY TO THE REPORT OF MR. BOMPAS

I AM grateful for the opportunity to reply to the article of the late Mr. Bompas in the July number of *BACONIANA*.

I am also grateful to Mr. Cuninghame for his prefatory remarks and footnotes, and I wish to say that his regret is my own as well, that Mr. Bompas did not discuss the paper with members of the Society better advised than was he, and that the MS. of the article had not been submitted to me while Mr. Bompas was still with us, or at least before publication, for some, if not all, the erroneous conclusions drawn could have been dissipated before they took form. The explanations would have given that gentleman and his readers a more comprehensive view, a different view point, and greater light upon the subject.

It is rare that an article appearing in public print carries upon analysis its own evidences of error, and in the next preceding pages finds so complete a refutation as does this in the article of Mrs. Kindersley.

In his opening statement Mr. Bompas says: "The copies of *Henry VII.* which have been examined do not exactly correspond. . . . The form of many of the capitals also differs in the different copies. . . . Mr. Cuninghame's copy differs widely from the others. . . . Either each copy contains a different cipher story, which is absurd, or the decipherer happened by chance to light on the only correct copy, which is equally absurd." Then Mr. Bompas proceeds to build an argument upon the fact that the copy of my MS., furnished to the Society, did not correspond with some copy of *Henry VII.* with which he compared it, concluding, therefore, that the cipher system must be a myth, and Mrs. Gallup a visionary or a fraud.

Any comparison to establish the correctness of my work must be made either with the copy I used or one identical with it. That Mr. Bompas used some copy *not* identical, but one printed differently, is substantiated by Mrs. Kindersley, whose three months' work on an identical copy—as against one week Mr. Bompas spent on a different printing—resulted in her verification of nearly all the letters studied. It is still more forcibly proved by the table of headings Mr. Bompas prints, the Italics in which do not all correspond in the different forms with the book I used. It therefore follows that the entire argument, from pages 169 to and including part of 176, so far as relates to *Henry VII.*, is founded upon a false premise and falls to the ground.

Mr. Bompas says, "Either each copy contains a different cipher, which is absurd," &c.

On the contrary, that is just what occurs in unlike copies. Those widely differing belong to different editions, although published in the same year, as I have found to be true, and stated in my article in *BACONIANA* published in 1901. Two issues of the *Treatise of Melancholy* appeared in 1586 with differing Italic printing. I have deciphered both. One ends with an incomplete cipher word, which is completed in the other where the narrative is continued, and the book ends with the signature of Bacon on the last page. I have also found that in two editions of Bacon's acknowledged works one had the cipher and one had not. The peculiar Italicizing and the same forms of letters were in both. In one the arrangement of the letters followed the cipher system, in the other no amount of study could make them "read." Bacon refers in the cipher to some false and surreptitious copies issued without his authority.

The differences in print of *Henry VII.* first came to light, apparently, through the comparisons made with

my MS. in London, and the report of it was a great surprise to me. Mrs. Kindersley was kind enough to send me one of her copies, and, as before stated, this was found to be identical with the one I used except that three or four typographical errors in her copy were corrected in mine, and one in mine did not occur in hers, but in no case was a verbal change made and only one orthographical.

About the same time it chanced that a copy of the work—a recent importation from London—was sent me from Chicago for examination. This I found quite different in the use of Italics. I did not decipher the work, but became convinced that it either contained another cipher story, or was one of the “false and surreptitious copies” before referred to.

In addition to the criticism of *Henry VII.*, Mr. Bompas refers to some typographical errors making slight differences in our own editions of the Bi-Literal Cipher, and to the examples in the editions of *De Augustis* of 1623 and 1624.

I have to admit there are some printer's errors in my book that escaped the closest proof reading, much to my regret. The proof reading was extremely difficult because of the care required to keep the unusual spelling and occasional abbreviations. Some errors were corrected in the third edition. Mr. Bompas found two or three—probably not all. I have had no opportunity to note the errata in a later publication. I can, however, make the broad assertion that in no single instance has any of these slight technical errors changed the meaning of a phrase, or made it obscure, or been of sufficient importance to affect in the least the overwhelming evidences of the existence of the system of cipher and the correctness of its deciphering.

Manifest errors occurred in the text of the old books, which were corrected in the deciphering, but they were

so few and so evident as to prove rather than to disprove the system. They occur mostly in long groups, as in the example of the cipher in *De Augmentis*, occasionally a short group of four letters, once in a while a wrong font letter, but the meaning of the context was always sufficiently clear in itself to correct the error. I cannot better illustrate this than by quoting from my "Replies to Criticisms," issued in pamphlet form, but which has not appeared in public print. The explanation covers explicitly a number of points raised by Mr. Bompas, and being an analysis of Bacon's own illustration of the cipher in the 1624 *De Augmentis*, has the weight of the author's own methods of correction, and the suggestion, at least, that the errors were purposely made to educate the decipherer as to what would be encountered in the books; also the manner of overcoming the difficulties as they should arise.

"In the 1624 edition the second *i* in *officio* is changed by the law of tied letters; the second *u* in *nunquam* has position or angle of inclination, to make it an 'a fount' letter; *q* in *conquiesti* is from the wrong fount, and the *u* has features of both founts but is clear in one distinctive difference—the width at the top; the *q* in *quia* is reversed by a mark; the *a*'s in the first *causa* are formed like 'b fount' letters but are taller; the *q* of *quos* is from the wrong fount; the second *a* in *aderas* is reversed, being a tied letter; *l* in *velint* is from the wrong fount, also the *p* of *parati*, the *l* of *calumniam* and the *l* of *religione*.

"In line twelve '*pauci sunt*' in 1623 ed. is '*parati sunt*' in the 1624 ed. The correct grouping is *ntqui velin tquip ratis untom nesad*, the first *a* in '*parati*' must be omitted to read *diutius* according to the Spartan dispatch. Otherwise the groups would be *arati suntomnesa*. The *m* and *n* are both 'b fount,' thus bringing

two *b*'s at the beginning of this last group, indicating at once a mistake, for no letter in the bi-literal alphabet begins with two *b*'s, and wherever encountered may be known to indicate either a wrong fount letter or a wrong grouping. It is one of the guards against error. To continue the groups after the one last given several would be found to commence with *bb*, and the resulting letters would not 'read.'

"Here, too, is an example of diphthongs, digraphs, and double letters, which are troublesome to 'A Correspondent.' The diphthong *æ* of 'cæteris,' the digraph *ct* in *perfectare*, and the double *ff*'s and *pp*'s are shown as separate letters and must be treated as such in deciphering Italics.

"A very important feature, that most seem to forget, is that ciphers are made to hide things, not to make them plain or easy to decipher. They are constructed to be misleading, mysterious, and purposely made difficult except to those possessing the key. Seekers after knowledge through them must not abandon the hunt upon encountering the first difficulty, improbability, inaccuracy, or stumbling block set for their confusion."

The article says: "The plain inference is that the cipher and cipher story are imaginary."

Well, this is at least complimentary, but I doubt whether Mr. Bompas stopped to think what that statement would mean with all that it implies. I do not think he would, on reflection, give me credit for a genius so broad, for it would be equal to the production of the plays themselves.

Were I the possessor of an imagination so boundless, I would certainly not have spent it upon a production foredoomed to be unpopular, or have subjected myself to the strain upon nerves and eyesight of six years' hard study of old books and their typographical peculiarities

for a Baconian cloak to hide the brilliancy of that imagination. Yet if the material for the three hundred and ninety pages of my book were not found in cipher in the old originals, then it must be the conception of my own brain. First, the plot of each story worked out; the account of Bacon's discovery of his parentage; the variations from historic records; the death of Amy Robsart; the tragedy of Essex, and that of Mary, Queen of Scots, and other scraps of added history; the love of Bacon for Margaret, and all the rest. All this thought out, in diction, much of it, of the highest order, in the old English spelling and phraseology of the 16th century and fitted with such nice exactness to the Italic letters of the old books, "separated into groups of five"—letters that even the sceptics admit the capitals at least agree with the alleged system—the study of months in the British Museum; the explanations and demonstrations to numberless people—all to hide a genius so magnificent! In the language of Mr. Bompas, "Absurd!" And yet, I repeat, if not cipher it must be my own production.

It is useless to discuss the probability of Bacon's committing State secrets to such a cipher. It is not a time to ask the question, "Is it likely?" *The cipher is there*, and it only remains to master its intricacies and search out what it has to reveal.

ELIZABETH WELLS GALLUP.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE AUTHOR-
SHIP OF *THE ANATOMY OF*
MELANCHOLY

AS some doubts have lately been cast on the right of Robert Burton to be regarded as the author of this remarkable book, it seems worth while, in considering the question, to apply the method advocated by Bacon when Queen Elizabeth was so anxious to discover the author of that treasonable pamphlet of Hayward. The Queen had some thoughts of subjecting the object of her suspicions to the rack, but Bacon argued that a man's style of writing was sufficient to disclose his identity, and Democritus, junior, held precisely the same opinion, as, in his address to the reader, he says: "It is most true, '*stylus virum arguit,*' our style bewraies us, and as hunters find their game by the trace, so is a man's genius described by his workes" (p. 9). The edition of *The Anatomy* used by me in this paper is the fourth, dated 1632, supplemented by Shilleto's reprint of the sixth, dated 1651.

The first question which obtrudes itself on anyone entering on a critical examination of *The Anatomy* is, why the five editions of the work published in Burton's lifetime, together with the sixth edition, revised by the author and published after Burton's death, should all of them bear the name of Democritus, junior, on the title-page? As for the ridiculous story of Burton, the Oxford bookworm, amusing himself with laughing at the "bargees" on the river, in imitation of the behaviour of Democritus at the haven of Abdera (A. H. Bullen's introduction to Shilleto's edition, p. 12), we may treat the statement for what it is worth. Of Burton's personal life we scarcely know more than we do of Shaksper's, and we are constrained to eke

out our scanty knowledge of the man by collecting and recording the scrappy myths which have come down to us, but which are of themselves of no authority, and similarly (as is the case of “Shakespeare”) we sedulously and lovingly portray the man Burton from his works, or those vulgarly accepted as such.

Now, there are two reasons for the current belief in Burton’s authorship of *The Anatomy* which have satisfied generations of critics and editors, neither of which is, to say the least of it, above grave suspicion! There is first the fact that, although in the opening pages of the book the author tenaciously maintains his right to assume the title of Democritus, junior, “*or whom thou wilt to be the author*; I would not willingly be knowne” (p. 1), yet on p. 6 he introduces the significant words, “*Experto crede ROBERTO*,” and further on, at p. 16 of his address to the reader, the name of his “elder brother,” William, author of “A Description of Lecestershire,” and later on in the body of the work mentions his father’s seat at Lindley (p. 399), his mother’s name, Dorothy Burton (p. 400), his brother Ralph (p. 570), and his brother George (p. 705). What consistency is there in this, in the case of a man who from the first ostentatiously sets out with the declared intention of concealing his identity under a feigned name? If this declared intention is honest, the writer must be either a fool himself, or believe that none but fools will ever become his readers. Either supposition is equally absurd. The whole thing is so incongruous, not to say mysterious, that I confidently reject the idea that the slightest reliance can be placed on what Democritus, junior, directly or indirectly, says of himself, either when he ostentatiously conceals his personal identity, or when, here and there he seems inadvertently (as it were) to forget to do so.

The first five editions were published in Burton’s

lifetime, and are all set up separately, the first in 8vo, the rest in folio, and the various editions are paged as follows :—

1621. Address to Reader 72, Part I. 277, Part II. 211, Part III. 295. Total, 855 pages.
 1624. Address to Reader 64, Part I. 188, Part II. 144, Part III. 225. Total, 621 pages.
 1628. Address to Reader 77, Part I. 208, Part II. 166, Part III. 272. Total, 723 pages.
 1632. Address to Reader 78, Part I. 218, Part II. 189, Part III. 315. Total, 800 pages.
 1638. Address to Reader 78, Part I. 218, Part II. 184, Part III. 321. Total, 801 pages.

Now, there is no valid reason why, when in each edition the pages and types were all set up anew, that the *nom de plume* of Democritus, junior, should not have been dropped after the first edition, had any real intention existed of the author assuming his real name as indicated on certain fly-leaves appended to the first edition; but no change in this respect was made in any of the editions published in his lifetime. As an additional proof how the types were re-set from time to time, take the remarkable sentence which leads up to the name of Burton. In the first edition this stands "*Experto crede Roberto.*" In the next three editions it stands "Experto crede ROBERTO." In the fifth it stands "*Experto crede ROBERTO*"; while in the sixth edition it reverts to the italics of the first, "*Experto crede Roberto.*"

I regard, therefore, the seeming slips of the pen in mentioning the author's relatives, while writing under a feigned name, as an extremely clever ruse on the writer's part to strengthen his real *incognito* and divert suspicion, by setting curious readers on a very palpable but entirely wrong scent. So much for the first reason, which has indissolubly linked Burton's name with *The Anatomy*.

The second reason is no less obscure and unsatisfactory than the first. On the title-page of the first edition, in the Bodleian Library, is a pencil note after the name of Democritus, junior, as follows: “Rob. Burton, see page 790.” But, disregarding the separately-paged address to the reader, there are only 783 numbered pages, on the last of which occurs the word “Finis” (that celebrated author of all books), and on the blank overleaf—which *would* have formed page 784—is printed a passage from Augustine. This concludes the book; but, bound up after it, comes six unnumbered pages, containing an “Epilogue,” so termed on its first and last pages, but incorrectly described by A. H. Bullen as an “Apollogetical Index,”* which it certainly is not, (Shilletto’s edition, Introduction X.), followed by a page of *Errata*. This “Epilogue” is entitled—

“The Conclusion of the Author to the Reader,” is signed Robert Burton, and commences thus—

“The last section shall be mine, to cut the strings of *Democritus’* visor, to unmaske and show him as he is,” and is, in support of the fiction of its emanating from Burton, dated “From my studie in Christ Church, Oxford, December 5th, 1620.” O, clever Democritus! But these six unnumbered pages are of no authority, and give no clue to when or by whom they were interpolated at the end of the book. There existed no difficulty in numbering them consecutively with the preceding pages, and they re-appear, moreover, in no subsequent edition; nor does the ostensible object they were written to effect—to “unmaske” Democritus “and show him as he is”—appear to be carried out, or attempted to be carried out, as we might have inferred would have been the case. The mysterious epilogue,

* Perhaps a slip of the pen for “Appendix.”

therefore, bound up at the end of the first Oxford edition, appears to me to possess no validity in determining the real author. But if these two reasons for concluding Burton to be the author are unsatisfactory, where shall we look for others, unless in the style of the book itself? As soon as we undertake an analysis of this sort, Burton's claims disappear like a mirage.

In his Address to the Reader, Democritus makes the following statement: "If that severe doome of *Synesius* be true, *It is a greater offence to steal men's labours than their clothes*, what shall become of most writers? I hold up my hand at the Barre amongst others, and am guiltie of *Fellonie* in this kind, *habes confitentem reum*, I am content to be pressed with the rest."—Democritus to the Reader, p. 6.

But this sort of "Fellonie," consisting in appropriating the labours of others without acknowledgment, is just the one offence of which Democritus, junior, cannot be accused. No writer ever made more copious use of his predecessors' labours than he, or was more scrupulous to give the reference to the original writers from whom he borrowed. It is with perfect truth that he says in another place—

"Floriferis ut apes in saltibus omnia libant.

"I have laboriously collected this *Cento* of diverse Writers, and that *sine injuriâ*, I have wronged no Authors, but given every man his owne, which *Hierom* so much commends in *Nepotian*, he stole not whole verses, pages, tracts, as some do now adaaies, concealing their Authors' names, but still said this was *Cyprians*, that *Lactantius*, that *Hilarius*, so said *Minutius Felix*, so *Victorinus*, thus far *Arnobius*: I cite and quote mine Authors" (page 8). What becomes then of this "Fellonie" of which, on page 6, Democritus stands falsely self-accused, and of which, on page 8, he truthfully ex-

culpates himself? To me, bearing much collateral evidence in mind, the explanation of this flagrant contradiction is that the accusation partakes of the nature of a “palinode” and confession of the sins, in this particular, of Bacon, who, in his posthumously published work, *Sylva Sylvarum*, was a notorious offender. It was Burton’s *alter ego*, Bacon, who was vicariously doing penance, and confessing his guilt under the mask of Democritus, junior! For example, it was Bacon who was constantly making use of such phrases, “It is reported,” “It is delivered by some,” “It has been set down by one of the ancients,” thereby defrauding the original authors of their due recognition, or, as Synesius phrases it, “stealing their clothes.”

At page 60 of the Address to the Reader, Democritus, junior, writes: “I will yet to satisfie and please myselfe, make an *Utopia* of mine owne, a new *Atlantis*, a poetical commonwealth of mine owne, in which I will freely domineere, build citties, make lawes, statutes, as I list myselfe.” Now this was written before the *New Atlantis* of Bacon was published, though this is not conclusive that a man like Burton might not have seen a work of Bacon in MSS. Then I regard it as a master stroke in support of the idea of Burton being the author of *The Anatomy*, the introduction parenthetically of thanks to the noble patrons of Burton, “The Lord Berkley,” and “The Right Honourable Lady Francis Countesse Dowager of Exeter”; and I hold it as a fact that the biographical sketch he gives of himself on the same page is far truer of the great Chancellor than of the Oxford recluse!

“I was once so mad as to bussell abroad and seeke about for preferment, tyre myselfe and trouble all my friends, sed nihil labor tantus profecit, nam dum alios amicorum mors avocat, aliis ignotus sum, his invisus, alii large promittunt, intercedunt illi mecum solliciti, hi

vanâ ope lactant, dum alios ambio, hos capto, illis innoresco, aetas perit, anni defluunt, amici fatigantur, ego deferor, et jam mundi taesus, humanaeque satur infidelitatis acquiesco" (page 354).

Then, again, consider the terms of the monumental inscription placed on Burton's tomb. Translated into English it runs thus:—

"Here lies Democritus junior, a man known to few, unknown to fewer."

Now the paradoxical expression of "known to few, unknown to fewer," if true of any man, was undoubtedly truer of the great Chancellor than of the learned book-worm and recluse of Christ Church.

We have yet to learn the circumstances attending the erection of this monument, as well as the relations subsisting between Burton and Bacon. If both were brethren of the Rosy-cross, some difficulties would be removed, and while there is sufficient proof that the relations between Bacon and Shaksper were of a business character, the relations between Bacon and Burton were, we may infer, literary and philosophic, and suggestive, perhaps, of something analogous to the dual authorship of the present day. Burton's opinion of the Rosy-cross was clearly a high one (Address to the Reader, page 59).

I will now notice a few coincidences of thought which the pages of Democritus, junior, display with passages in Bacon and Shakespeare.

1. The opening sentences of Democritus, junior, "Primum si noluerò, non respondebo, quis coarcturus est? I am a free man borne and may chuse whether I will tell, who can compel me?" (Address to Reader, page 1) strongly recall Falstaff's declaration that he will not answer on compulsion, the idea being derived from Seneca's *Apotheosis Divi Claudii*.

2. The saying of “*Atticus, suam quisque Sponsam, mihi meam*, let every man enjoy his spouse” (page 40), is clearly suggestive of the words of Marcus: “*Suum cuique* is our Roman justice. This Prince in justice seizeth but his own” (*Titus Andronicus* I. ii. 217).

3. The antipathy between the Vine and the Cabbage, (page 46) is also dwelt on in Bacon’s *Sylva Sylvarum*, (p. 480).

4. “As Silius was served by Tiberius” (page 36). This refers to the warning addressed by Ventidius to Silius in Antony and Cleopatra: “For learn this, Silius, better to leave undone than by our deed acquire too high a fame” (III. i. 13).

5. “In a word, every man for his owne ends. Our *summum bonum* is commodity” (page 36). This passage strongly recalls the words of the Bastard:—

“That smooth-faced gentleman, tickling Commodity,
Commodity the bias of the world.”

—*King John* II. ii. 274.

6. “He hath done no more than what gentlemen usually do” (page 35). How this recalls Falstaff’s idea of the obligations of a respectable life!

“I was as virtuously given as a Gentleman need to be. Virtuous enough.”—*King Henry IV.* Part I. III. iii. 13.

7. Democritus writes: “When *Rhodes* was besieged, *fossae urbis cadaveribus repletae sunt*, the ditches were full of dead carcasses; and as when the said *Solyman* great *Turke* beleagred *Vienna*, they lay levell with the toppe of the wals” (p. 30). How this recalls the stirring adjuration of King Henry to his troops:

“Once more unto the breach, dear friends, once more;
Or close the wall up with our English dead.”

—*King Henry V.* III. i. 1.

All these instances are from the Address to the Reader

at the commencement of the book, but may be indefinitely multiplied. Democritus, junior, in mere literary honesty, was clearly of a more tender conscience than Bacon, as, for example, it is known beyond question that Bacon availed himself of translations from the Greek, but it is Burton who confesses doing the same. "Greek authors, Plato, Plutarch, Athenaeus, I have cited out of their interpreters, because the original was not so ready" (p. 14).

Burton confesses what Bacon leaves posterity to discover for itself. It only remains to advert briefly to a marked peculiarity in the style of both Bacon and Burton, that is, inaccuracy of quotation, generally due to trusting to memory without having recourse to the text. A Pindaric fault. This is so generally known and admitted as regards Bacon, that I need not dwell on it in his case, but Burton I consider was equally careless, and Mr. A. H. Bullen admits as much where, at the close of his Introduction to Shilleto's edition, he says, "Burton often quoted *Memoriter* and many of his references are inexact" (page xxx.).

First we have to deal with inaccuracies which may be merely press errors. In the Address to the Reader, *e.g.*, we find the following, which may be of this class.

Page 20. Insanienti for Insanientis (*Horace Carm.* I. xxxiv. 2).

Page 28. Daturi for Datturos (*Horace Carm.* III. vi. 47).

More numerous, however, are those instances clearly due to careless quotation.

Page 11. Non ego ventosae venor suffragia plebis (*Horace Epistle* I. xix. 37).

Here venor and plebis are transposed.

Page 22. Variis illudit partibus omnes (*Horace Satires* II. iii. 50).

- Here the word “omnes” is an interpolation not in the text.
- Page 78. “*Aliquando*” bonus (*Horace Ars Poetica*).
“*Aliquando*” used for *quandoque*.
- Page 75. “*Ad summum sapiens*” (*Horace Epistles I. i. 108*).
The words should be *Praecipueque sanus*.
- Page 29. *Unius ob noxam “furias que”* (*Virgil Aeneid I. 41*).
The text has “*et furias.*”
- Page 66. *En leges “ipsi”* (*Juvenal II. 31*).
The text has “*atque ipsis.*”
- Page 31. *Quis furor, o “Cives”* (*Lucan. Pharsalia, VII. 95*).
Cives should be “*caeci.*”
- Page 39. “*Haec*” *sani esse hominis, “quis” sanus juret Orestes* (*Persius III. 118*).
Here “*haec*” is used for *non*, and “*quis*” for *non*.
- Page 11. “*Quae fuerant*” (*Ovid. Ex. Ponto. I. v. 15*).
The words are “*Qui feci.*”
- Page 77. “*Jam*” *quoque* (*Ovid. Fasti VI. 307*).
“*Jam*” should be *nunc*; and so on *ad infinitum*.

Another class of deviations from the text may be regarded as paraphrases rather than errors of memory, as for example—

- Page 34. *Hic arcentur haereditatibus liberi.*
A paraphrase of the description of Crotona,
“*In hac urbe nemo liberos tollit*” (*Petronius Satires, 116*).

Then again, as an example of Baconian echoes which reverberate through the pages of Burton, the following may be quoted, where Bacon in the *Advancement of Learning* enunciates his opinion of the complete man-

ner in which theology had been studied in his day. "In this part, touching the exposition of the Scriptures, I can report no deficiency." What Burton says on this subject, glancing at physics, is a mere echo of the above.

"Not that I prefer it before Divinity, which I do acknowledge to be the Queene of Professions, and to which all the rest are as Handmaids, but that in Divinity I saw no such great need" (page 14).

In conclusion, I would urge everyone interested in *The Anatomy* to study the learned and interesting papers on that work by Professor Bensley, of Adelaide, commencing in *Notes and Queries* for 1903, and I will draw attention to an error I do not think has been noticed by him. In the Index of Shilleto's edition, St. Ambrose is alone quoted "passim," from which I infer that the Editor did not differentiate Ambrose of Alexandria, who befriended Origen (page 12), from Ambrose, Bishop of Mediolanum, who died a century later, the Ambrose of the Index, passim!

W. THEOBALD.

Ilfracombe, 1905.

JUDGE STOTSENBURG'S *IMPARTIAL STUDY*

THE publication of Judge Stotsenburg's *IMPARTIAL STUDY OF THE SHAKESPEARE TITLE** diverts a stream of fresh facts into the Shakespeare-Bacon controversy. This is well, for as Milton says of Truth, "If her waters flow not in a perpetual progression, they sicken into a muddy pool of conformity and tradition."

The conclusion to which Judge Stotsenburg arrives is that the Shakespeare plays were not the work of a single author, but of a syndicate of the poets Dekker, Drayton, Munday, Chettle, Heywood, Webster, Middleton, Porter, and others, and that in this syndicate Bacon held the position of polisher and reconstructor; "a conclusion that forces itself upon my mind," says the author, "because, first, I believe that Bacon, if he originated the plays, would have observed the unities, and, secondly, because his philosophical views and his peculiarities are interwoven in some of them."

From the evidence which Judge Stotsenburg presents it is apparent either that other writers had a hand in "Shakespeare," or (for his arguments cut both ways, although the author does not appear to contemplate it), Shakespeare had some responsibility for the writings of the lesser dramatists. "The reader," says the Judge, "has the facts before him on which to form his own conclusions." Were we to form our judgment solely on the facts presented in the work under discussion we should certainly arrive at Judge Stotsenburg's conclusions, but there is a far larger group of facts which have been left unnoted and which materially affect the points at issue. In the first place, Judge Stotsenburg falls into the com-

* Gay and Bird. 10/6 net.

222 Judge Stotsenburg's "Impartial Study"

mon error that London, in the reign of Elizabeth, was teeming with great poets and scholars. If this really were so, all we can say is that contemporaries were extraordinarily blind to the grace and intellectuality of their surroundings.

"O ever shameful, O most shameless times!" exclaims Drummond.

"Save that suns light we see, of good hear tell,
This earth we court so much were very hell."

Corresponding in verse with his friends, William Jeffreys and George Sandys, Michael Drayton asks hopelessly,

"What canst thou look or hope for from his pen
Who lives with beasts though in the shape of men?"

So barren and depraved were his surroundings that he considered—

"This very time wherein we two now live
Shall in the compass wound the Muses more
Than all the old English ignorance before."

According to the testimony of those then living, London was utterly smothered under a pall of Cimmerian darkness. Learning was at such an ebb that the mere capacity to read and write entitled the possessors to the privileges of "Benefit of Clergy." We are constantly confronted with laments at the inhuman dearth of noble natures, and that "Noble minds live, orphan-like, forlorn." "What hapless hap had I," exclaims Drummond, "now to be born in these unhappy times, and dying days." "To tell my countries shame," says Michael Drayton, "I not delight, but do bemoan it."

Of all branches of letters, Poetry seems to have been most particularly in disrepute. "Few nowadays," says Massinger, "dare express themselves a friend to

unbefriended poetry." According to Drayton, she was followed with such fell despite—

"That she must hence, she may no longer stay,
The dreary Fates prefixed have the day
Of her departnre which is now come on,
And they command her straitways to begone.

That bestial herd so hotly her pursue,
And to her succour there be very few,
Nay, none at all, her wrongs that will redress,
But she must wander in the wilderness."

Judge Stotsenburg gives his readers no hint of this barbarous ignorance of the times, but asks them to believe that what Drayton dubs

"These feverous dog days, blest by no record
But to be everlastingly abhorred,"

were so poetically prolific a time that "Shakespeares" were springing up in every street and pressing forward to the succour of distressed Poesy.

Judge Stotsenburg produces many parallel passages between the works of Shakespeare and the minor poets, from which he argues that these writers all had a hand in the "Shakespeare" group of plays, but he appears to be unaware that there is a far larger collection of parallels between those poets and Bacon. Would he deduce from this fact that the dramatists wrote the works of Bacon? He cannot have it both ways, and an argument which holds good in one case must hold good in another.

Lest it be supposed that we are writing at random we will briefly take the case of Dekker, one of the first names on Judge Stotsenburg's list of collaborating poets.

The life of Dekker is somewhat bald in incident, but we have perhaps more information about him than of many of his contemporaries. The name of "Mr.

Dickers" appears in "Henslowe's Diary," under date 8th January, 1597, in connection with a loan of 20s. A week later occurs a second entry noting another disbursement. A third and ominous entry reads, "Lent unto the companey, the 4 of february 1598, to discharge Mr. Dicker owt of the cownter in the powltrei, the some of fortie shillings." The misadventures of Mr. Dicker do not seem to have ceased on his release, Oldys informing us that from 1613 to 1616 he was again in goal.

Let us turn from the tribulations of poor Thomas Dekker to his writings.

These are singularly charming and reflect no traces of the squalid and uncongenial atmosphere in which their author seems to have habitually lived. The opening of *The Bellman of London** is a stately example of Dekker's prose:—

"Entering into a contemplation of the changes of time; how all things that are under the moone are as variable as her lookes are: how goodness grows crooked, and hath almost lost her shape: how Virtue goes poorly, and is not regarded: how Villainy jets in silks, and (like a God) adored: And when I consider how all the pleasures of life are but as childrens dreames, how all the glories of the world are but as artificial fireworks, that keep a blazing for a time, and yet die in stinking smoakes: and how all the labors of man are like the toiling of the winds, which strive to cast up heapes of dust, that in the end are not worth the gathering. Then, even then, doe I grow wearie of myselfe: then am I neither in love with the beautie of the sunne, neither stand I gazing at the dancing of the starres: I neither wonder at the stately measure of the cloudes, the nimble galliards of the water,

* "The Bellman of London" and some other of Dekker's pamphlets have recently been published in Messrs. J. M. Dent and Co's. delightful Temple Classics; enterprise on the part of the publishers which, if only for its own sake, all Baconians should support. A selected few of Dekker's plays are obtainable in the Mermaid series published by T. F. Unwin.

nor the wanton trippings of the wind. Nor am I delighted when the earth dresses up her head with flowers; I wish myself a beast because men are so bad that beasts excel them in goodness."

The parallels between Dekker and Shakespeare are multitudinous, and it is not our present purpose to add to those that Judge Stotsenburg has pointed out. We wish rather to draw attention to the curious kinship of ideas between Bacon, the philosopher, and Dekker, the wastrel.

In *Lanthorn and Candlelight*, Dekker appeals to his readers—"To my owne Nation"—to co-operate with him in levying war against certain wild and barbarous rebels that were up in open arms against the tranquility of the public weal.

"Howsoever it be strucke, or whosoever gives the first blow, the victorie depends upon the vallor of you that are the winges to the Bellman's army; for which conquest he is in hope you will valiantly fight, sithence the quarrel is against the head of monstrous abuses, and the blowes which you must give are in defence of Law, Justice, Order, Ceremony, Religion, Peace, and that honorable title of Goodness.

"St. George! I see the two armies moove forward and beholde the Bellman himselfe first chargeth upon the face of the enemy. Thus:"

Then he proceeds to open his attack.

Now Bacon considered that *he* was a bellman, if not the bellman himself, and *he* also was trying to get together the wits of his own nation. Dekker's pamphlet was published in 1608, but in 1606 Bacon wrote to Salisbury, "I shall content myself to awake better spirits, like a bellringer; which is first up to call others to church"; and in 1607 he wrote to Dr. Playfer: "Since I have taken upon me to ring a bell to call other wits together (which is the meanest office), it cannot but be consonant with my desire to have that bell heard

as far as may be." In the *Gull's Horn Book* (1609), Dekker writes :

"I will sail boldly and desperately along the shore of the Ile of Guls and . . . make a true discovery of their wild (yet *habitable*) Country."

Compare Bacon in the *Advancement of Learning*, Book 9 :

"And now we have with a small bark, such as we were able to set out, sailed about the universal circumference, as well of the old as the new world of Sciences, with how prosperous winds and course we leave to posterity to judge."

Bacon concludes his *Advancement of Learning* by a recapitulation of the deficiencies of knowledge, which he describes as "The Coast of the New Intellectual World." In Book 9 he concludes :

"We have finished our small globe of the intellectual world with all the exactness we could, marking out and describing those parts of it which we find either not constantly *inhabited*, or *not sufficiently cultivated*."

So again writes Dekker :

"In this black shore of mischief have I sailed along and been a faithfull discoverer of all the creeks, rocks, gulfs, and quicksands in and about it."

We are told by Rawley that Bacon frequently complained of the mean and unworthy work which devolved upon his overburdened shoulders. "To speak the truth of myself," says Bacon, "I have often wittingly and willingly neglected the glory of mine own Name, and Learning (if any such thing be), both in the works I now publish, and in those I contrive for hereafter ; whilst I study to advance the good and profit of mankind. And I, that have deserved perchance to be an Architect in Philosophy and Sciences, am made a workman and a labourer, and at length anything else whatsoever ;

seeing I sustain and work out myself many things that must needs be done; and others out of a natural disdain, shift off and refuse to do" (*Advancement of Learning*, Book vii., chap. I.). So also we find Dekker making the same weary-minded complaint of the meanness of his self-imposed toil :

"How long shall I sail upon these godless waters? Is it not time to get to shore? Is it not fit that I should now sound a retreat and not weary my pen in the execution of such base and barbarous-minded catiffs? What a battle have I undertaken? and with what an ignoble enemy? to contend with whom is an act inglorious, and to conquer whom, (but that they are open and professed foes to the Republic, to honesty, to civility and to all humanity) were as much dishonour as by them to be overcome" (*Bellman of London*).

When we descend from broad policy to detail and vocabulary we again find that Bacon and Dekker are unanimous; not only does Dekker reproduce the ideas of Bacon's private correspondence, but he also employs the philosopher's peculiar and unpoetic metaphors.

For instance, in his Essay "Of Sedition," Bacon writes:

"Money is like *muck*, no good except it be *spread*."

In Part II. of *The Honest Whore*, Dekker involves this idea thus:

"As for your *money* . . . I have heard what your worship is,
An excellent *dunghill* cock to *scatter* all abroad."

(Act II., sc. 1) 1630.

To ulcers and imposthumes, and the lancing of them, Dekker was as partial as was Bacon.

"Hair and nails," says Bacon, "are excrements" (*Sylva Sylvarum*, 1627).

In the *Gull's Horn Book*, Dekker writes: "that excrement which they violently clip away from the heads of young men." "The Spaniards," says Bacon in *De*

Augmentis Scientiarum, "dislike thin letters, and change them immediately into those of a middle tone." In accordance with this knowledge he alters the common English spelling of Madrid and writes Madrill (*Obs. on a Libel: Spedding*, Vol. I. p. 194). It is rather surprising to find Dekker in *Match Me in London* (I., 1631) similarly substituting Madrill.

We could extend these identities, but space will not permit. Sufficient have been noted to justify our assertion that there is evidence connecting Dekker and Bacon. To be consistent, Judge Stotsenburg should, therefore, argue that Dekker had a hand in Bacon, which is as absurd as to assume that the planets give light to the sun. Doubtless there was some bond of connection between the two men, but whether Dekker were anything more than one of Bacon's stage go-betweens is, to say the least, doubtful.

It is generally agreed amongst Baconians that much of the work produced in the name of "Shakespeare" was collaborated by certain minor poets, in the sense that they executed a considerable portion of the first drafting, and, probably, the whole of the transcribing; but that "Shakespeare" was a noun signifying nothing, Bacon merely a reviser, and the real authors poets who published their best under another's name and their hack work under their own is inconsistent with human nature.

An Impartial Study of the Shakespeare Title is an agreeably written and informing book. We advise our readers to accept and chew over the author's facts, but suspend judgment upon his theories.

HAROLD BAYLEY.

THE PARNASSUS TRILOGY

(Continued from page 184).

"Father, what'er your loving tongue shall utter,
I'll drink your words with an attentive ear.
With mine eyes I'll drink the words you send."

—*Cymbeline*, I. i. 100.

"My ears have not yet drunk a hundred words."

—*Romeo and Juliet*, II. ii. 58.

"Take the cork out of thy mouth that I may drink thy tidings."—*As You Like It*, III. ii. 213.

"Age in his speech a majesty doth bear."

—Compare *Richard II.*, II. i. 1—18.

"I love to hear love play the orator;

The king—prettily, methought—did play the orator."

—*1 Henry VI.*, III. i. 175.

"I'll play the orator as well as Nestor."

—*3 Henry VI.*, III. iii. 188.

"Play the" is frequently found in Bacon and Shakespeare:—

"Young men's advice can bear but little sway;

Counsel comes kindly from a head that's grey."

—*Cf. Richard II.*, II. i. 1—6.

"What wisdom many winters have begot,

Time's midwifery at length shall bring to light.

I have a young conception in my brain:

Be you my time to bring it to some shape."

—*Troilus and Cressida*, I. iii. 312.

Bacon speaks of his work as a child of Time rather than of Wit. *Novum Organum*, Dedication and 1, 78. He speaks also of the "miscarriages of Time." Preface to *Novum Organum*, Op. IV. 15. *Nec temporis partus nec abortus extant in fastis*; and he constantly speaks of wisdom, science, intellect, as analogous to generation and the functions of reproduction. The extended

employment of this metaphor in works of imagination is apparently pointed to in some *Promus* notes—e.g., 1,412, *The son of somewhat*; and the twice-repeated note, *Et justificata est sapientia a filiis suis* (Nos. 249 and 346).

This is a specimen of the Baconian and Shakespearean hints that may be picked up in the first thirty-five lines of the first play. It is evident that the limits of this paper will not allow me to point out the hundreds of such correspondences that run through the plays. In truth a Baconian or Shakespearean air or flavour pervades the whole; the two are blended, the Baconian and Shakespearean impression alternately or concurrently presenting itself. The wit, with its overflowing, inexhaustible abundance, its sparkling brightness, reminds one of the Falstaff scenes. The Nurse's humour in *Romeo and Juliet*, with her reiteration of small details to assist memory, is exactly reproduced in Leonarde, the carrier (2 *Par.* I. 2); and Simson, the Innkeeper, like the Nurse, interiards his discourse with *as they say* (2 *Par.* II. 1). What Professor Meiklejohn refers to when he remarks that "there is no limit to Shakespeare's power of calling names," is most characteristically illustrated in Ingenioso's denunciation of his stingy patron (2 *Par.* I. i. 280—290). The Baconian antithesis reappears in every page. Bacon's characteristic way of using the word *Nay* as a formula for continuance—the first word in a sentence—is frequent. Bacon's love of learning and sympathy with students—his earnest desire that scholars should be encouraged and their labour suitably rewarded—are indeed the ruling motives of the whole trilogy.

The Parnassus poet is saturated with classical knowledge, and, as these plays were intended for use at the University, he need not disguise his Latinity. In 2 *Henry IV.*, I. i. 47, we have the expression, "He seemed in running to devour the way." Shakespeare,

of course, says nothing about the derivation of this phrase, and none of his commentators have even given us any information on the subject, or suspected that there was any to give. But the Parnassus poet, when he uses it, confesses his obligation to Catullus (a very favourite author with Shakespeare):—

“Associate yourselves with studious youths,
That, as *Catullus saith*, devours the way
That leads to Parnassus, where content doth dwell.”

—1 *Par.*, I. 96.

The line in Catullus, Ode 35, is:—

“Quare si sapiet viam vorabit.”

In a well-known passage of *Henry V.*, I. i. 28, the young King is described by the Archbishop as having cast aside his wild courses.

“Consideration like an angel came,
And whipp'd the offending Adam out of him,
Leaving his body as a paradise
To envelope and contain celestial spirits.”

Juliet has the same idea, but she inverts it in the irony of her grief:—

“O Nature, what hadst thou to do in hell,
When thou didst bower the spirit of a friend
In mortal paradise of such sweet flesh.”

—*Romco and Juliet*, III. ii. 80.

And the same fancy is hidden in the lines:—

“O what a mansion have those vices got
Which for their habitation chose out thee.”

—Sonnet 95.

So Ingenioso, loading his fantastical patron with flattery, says:—

“Great reason the Muses should flutter about your immortal head, since your body is nothing but a fair inn of fairer guests that dwell therein.”—2 *Par.*, III. i. 1, 986.

Bacon's characteristic idea—that "The truth of being and of knowing is all one. . . . The mind is the man, and knowledge is the mind; . . . knowledge is a double of that which is,"—is applied to fanciful uses by Shakespeare :—

"When ourselves we see in ladies' eyes,
Do we not likewise see our learning there ?"

—*Love's Labour's Lost*, IV. iii. 316.

The same fanciful use of Bacon's philosophy is made in these plays :—

"True learning dwells in her fair beauteous face."

—I Par., 391.

which is the central philosophic idea in *Love's Labour's Lost*.

We know that Giordano Bruno's writings had been studied by Shakespeare. A very remarkable and poetical fancy of the old Italian heretic and martyr was spoken in reference to English women : "They are on earth what stars are above" (See *Nineteenth Century*, July, 1889, p. 109). Bruno's influence was predominant when *Romeo and Juliet* was written ; accordingly Capulet, inviting Paris to his feast, promises him—

"At my poor house, look to behold this night
Earth-treading stars that make dark heaven light."

Romeo and Juliet, I. ii. 25.

About the same time these plays were written, and accordingly Philomusus has the same pretty fancy :—

"Here are so many pure bright shining stars
That Cynthias want their fair Endymions."

—I Par., 446.

And Amoroso, tempting the scholar by the attractions of love, says :—

"Then shall you have the choice of earthly stars
That shine on earth as Cynthia in her skye."

—*Ibid.*, 492.

The following speech has more than one Baconianism :—

“What we present I must needs confess is but slubbered invention. But if your wisdom observe the circumstance, your kindness will pardon the substance.”—3 *Par.*, Prologue I. 21.

1. The antithetical style is quite in Bacon's manner.
 2. Bacon speaks of “slubbering on the lute” (*Works* VII. 103). 3. And there is a *Promus* note (1,365): “Matter of circumstance, not of substance”; a favourite antithesis with Bacon: “That which I after spake in difference was but in circumstance of time and manner, which methinks should be no great matter” (Letter to Burleigh, *Life* 362). The same antithesis is so well known in Shakespeare that I need not quote (see *Romeo and Juliet*, II. v. 30, 31; *Measure for Measure*, IV. ii. 108; *Midsummer Night's Dream*, V. i. 91, etc.).

A favourite dramatical situation with Shakespeare is one in which one character calls out a number of names in succession, while another makes comments on each as it is pronounced. Thus, in the *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, V. i. 2, Lucetta asks her mistress Julia to repeat the names of her would-be lovers, while she adds her censure of them as each name is repeated :—

“Please you repeat their names: I'll show my mind,
 According to my shallow simple skill.”

Precisely the same situation occurs in the *Merchant of Venice*, I. ii., when Portia comments on the names as her maid Nerissa pronounces them :—

“I pray thee overname them, and as thou namest them
 I will describe them.”

So *Ingenioso* and *Judicio* pass judgment on a number of poets :—

Judicio.—"Read the names."

Ingenioso.—"So I will if thou wilt help me to censure them."

—3 *Par.*, I. ii. 1, 207.

And the names follow, one by one, with a comment on each—in all these three cases.

When *Studioso* tells his friend,

"He doubles grief that comments on a woe."

—3 *Par.*, III. 5, l. 1, 432.

we are reminded of

"Sorrow flouted at is double death."

—*Titus Andronicus*, III. i. 246.

And again—

"To mourn a mischief that is past and gone

Is the next way to draw new mischief on."

—*Othello*, I. iii. 204.

Another characteristic of these plays which is often found in Shakespeare is that of capping rhymes—each alternate speaker giving a line in rhyme with that which precedes. One example will make this clear:—

Studioso.—"Scholars must frame to live at a low sail."

Philomusus.—"Ill-sailing where there blows no happy gale."

Stud.—"Our ship is ruined, all her tackling rent."

Phil.—"And all her gaudy furniture is spent."

Stud.—"Tears be the waves whereon her ruins bide,"

Phil.—"And sighs the wind that wastes her broken side."

Stud.—"Mischief the Pilot is, the ship to steer,"

Phil.—"And Woe the passenger this ship doth bear."

Stud.—"Come, *Philomusus*, let us break this chat,"

Phil.—"And break my heart: oh would I could break that."

Stud.—"Let's learn to act that Tragic part we have."

Phil.—"Would I were silent actor in my grave."

—3 *Par.*, IV. iii. (end).

Tears as waves, and sighs as wind, are frequently found in Shakespeare (see *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, II. iii. 58; *Antony and Cleopatra*, I. ii. 153; *Romeo and*

Juliet, III. v. 131; 3 *Henry VI.*, V. iv. 1—36; *Venus and Adonis*, V. i. 965; and in a very Shakespearean poem in *England's Helicon*, claimed by Mr. Gerald Massey as Shakespeare's for this among other reasons).

Similar rhyme-capping dialogues may be found in 1 *Par.*, I. i. 118—131; 2 *Par.*, II. i. 622—631; 3 *Par.*, I. iv. 1, 404—420, III. v. 1, 1,469—1,480.

A similar dramatic contrivance is seen in the following :—

King.—"How well he's read, to reason against reading!"

Dumain.—"Proceeded well, to stop all good proceeding."

Long.—"He weeds the corn, and still lets go the weeding."

Biron.—"The spring is near when green geese are abreeding."

See also *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, I. ii. 12—32; *Love's Labour's Lost*, II. i. 190—200, IV. iii. 266—288; *Ibid.*, I. i. 94; *Comedy of Errors*, II. i. 10—15, 26—32; *Midsummer Night's Dream*, I. i, 194—201; 1 *Henry VI.*, IV. v. 18—21, 34—47.

That Bacon made a special study of this device is indicated by a *Promus* note, 1,033: *Alterius dicetis; amant alterna Camoenæ* (said of couplets made by two rivals alternately).

These plays have been hitherto a sort of *individuum vagum*, as Bacon might say, and the guesses after authorship have been also of the vague quality—skipping aimlessly and helplessly from one Elizabethan play-writer to another. Yet it seems to me that the identification is neither difficult nor doubtful. The hall-mark of Shakespeare is here—a signature that is unique in literature—and the traces of his imperial hand are so abundant that, as the prophet says (and Bacon also), *He that runneth by may read it*; and, quoting the prophet more accurately than Bacon does, *He that readeth it may run*; for he will more swiftly and more confidently reach a standpoint where the large

and fruitful literary field enclosed by Bacon and Shakespeare can be apprehended under the new lights and inexhaustible material for interpretation, which Bacon's writings supply.

An edition of the third Parnassus play has just appeared in the Temple Classics, edited by Mr. Oliphant Smeaton. This is in some respects a valuable edition; it is learned, and gives careful explanation of archaic and technical terms. But the resemblances between Shakespeare and the corresponding passages in the Parnassus plays is scarcely noticed; one or two feeble and unimportant instances are cited, but the most striking are entirely neglected. And, needless to say, Bacon is boycotted; these Shakespearean editors habitually banish him from their notes. Not even the reference to Ariosto is noticed, nor the *animal scabiosum*. Mr. Smeaton's notes are often carelessly printed; there are seven errors in the references supplied for Act II., Scene i., and in some cases it is quite impossible to verify the references—for instance, III. v. 19: "It's time to sleep within our hollow graves." (Cf. *Richard III.*, IV. i. 94.) The passage referred to has nothing to do with the case. And so also in II. i. 79. In the Introduction the plot and the characters are minutely described; but there is not the least attempt to interpret the real purposes of the play. These plays have yet to be edited. It is useless to seek for any impartial editing from Shakespeareans; it can only be done by emancipated critics.

R. M. THEOBALD.

THE ENTERTAINMENT OF QUEEN ELIZABETH AT ELVETHAM, 1591

ARE any works of "Shakespeare" extant which have not yet been attributed to him although they are in the light of day? In Nichol's *Progresses of Queen Elizabeth*, Vol. III., Ed. 1823, the Author sets out at page 101 a tract, printed by John Wolfe, 1591, describing "The Honorable Entertainment given to the Quene's Majestie, in Progresse, at Elvetham in Hampshire, by the Right Hon'ble the Earle of Hertford, 1591." After a precise statement of the preparations made for it—which were great—the arrival of the Queen on the 20th day of September, Monday, is described. When she was more than half-way between the Park gate and the house, "a poet saluted her with a Latine Oration, in heroicall verse; I mean *veridicus vates*, a soothsaying poet, nothing inferior for truth, and little for delivery of his mind, to an ordinarie Orator" He was "booted, to betoken that hee was *vates cothurnatus*, and not a loose or lowe creeping prophet, as poets are interpreted by some idle or envious ignorants. This poet's Boy offered him a cushion at his first kneeling to her Majestie; but he refused it, saying as followeth:—

"The Poet to his Boy offering him a cushion.

'Non jam pulvillis opus est, sed corde sereno:

Nam plusquam solitis istic advolvimur aris."

The Poet's "Speech to her Majestie" follows. This is in sixty-four lines of Latin hexameters, after which the writer of the tract proceeds, "Because all our Cuntreymen are not Latinists, I thinke it not amisse to set this downe in English, that all may bee indifferently partakers of the Poet's meaning," and he gives a translation in blank verse, beginning,

“ Now let us use no cushions, but faire hearts :
For now we kneel to more than usual Saints.”

A certain turn of phrase, even in these two lines, directed the attention of the present writer to the speech and the rest of the verse in the Entertainment, from which some passages may be cited as samples. For instance, in the opening speech the poet says to the Queen :

“ Behold, on thee how each thing sweetly smiles,
To see thy brightnes glad our hemisphære :
Night only envies : whome fair stars doe crosse :
All other creatures strive to shewe their joyes.
The crooked-winding kid trips ore the lawnes ;
The milk-white heafer wantons with the bull ;
The trees shew pleasure with their quivering leaves,
The meadow with new grasse, the vine with grapes,
The running brookes with sweet and silver sound.
Thee, thee (sweet Princes), heav'n and earth and fluds,
And plants, and beasts salute with one accord.”

After the oration is a song in rhyme, which is set out with other songs praising the Queen, at page 66 of the same volume, and is there signed “Thomas Watson.” But this article is concerned with the blank verse only.

In the second day's entertainment there is an elaborate device, and Nereus, swimming forward with Triton, delivers an oration and bears a gift. He introduces himself and his sea god,

. . . . “ And with me came gould-breasted India,
Who, daunted at your sight, leapt to the shoare,
And sprinkling endless treasure on this Ile,
Left me this jewell to present your Grace,
For hym that under you doth hold this place.
See where her ship remaines, whose silke-woven takling
Is turned to twigs, and threefold mast to trees,
Receiving life from verdure of your lookes ;
(For what cannot your gracious looks effect ?)

. . . . And in this barke, which gods hale neare the shore,
Whitefooted Thetis sends her musicke maydes,
To please Elisaes eares with harmony."

Passing over a pretty song "sung dialogue wise, everie fourth verse answered with two Echoes," we come to an oration of Sylvanus.

"Sylvanus comes from out the leavy groves,
To honor her whom all the world adores,
Faire Cinthia, whom no sooner Nature fram'd,
And dect with Fortunes and with Vertues dower,
But straight admiring what her skill had wrought,
She broake the mould ; that never sunne might see
The like to Albion's Quene for excellence."

An oration of Neæra in blank verse follows, and the "Three Men's Song, sung the third morning under hir Majestie's Gallerie Window," which is in rhyme, and is known to have been composed by Nicholas Breton. After it blank verse—the spech of the Fairy Quene to hir Majestie.

"I that abide in places underground,
Aureola, the Quene of Fairyland,
That every night in rings of painted flowers
Turne round and carrell out Elisaes name :
Hearing that Nereus and the Sylvane gods
Have lately welcomde your Imperiall Grace,
Oapened the earth with this enchanting wand,
To doe my duety to your Majesty
And humbly to salute you with this chaplet,
Given me by Auberon, the Fairy King."

After this spech the Fairy Queen and her maids danced about the garden singing a song very complimentary to "Elisa." "This spectacle and musicke so delighted hir Majesty, that she commanded to heare it sung and to be danced three times over" Within an hour she departed. "It was a most extreame rain and yet it pleased hir Majesty to behold and hear the

whole action." Nereus, Sylvanus, the Graces and Hours lamented her leaving, and "the poet" made her a short oration, from which a verse may be extracted.

"See where those Graces and those Hours of Heaven
Which at thy coming sung triumphall songs,
And smoothed the way, and strewed it with sweet flowers
Now, if they durst, would stop it with greene bowes,
Least of thine absence the years pride decay :
For how can Summer stay, when Sunne departs ?"

After this, as she passed through the Park gate, there was a consort of musicians hidden in a bower, to whose playing a ditty of "Come again" was sung, "with excellent division by two that were cunning."

The writer has not had an opportunity of referring to the tract itself, but from the transcript of it in Nichol's *Progresse*, no hint as to its authorship or the identity of "the poet" can be got. Both the prose description and the blank verse are remarkable for their style.

It is unnecessary to point out to the readers of *BACONIANA* that the verse is poetry, or to expatiate on its quality. It is all eulogy of Elizabeth. Let it be compared with the vast quantity of adulatory verse addressed to her which is still extant, and it will be found superior. Further, if the question were asked of any chance group of educated persons, "Who wrote this blank verse?" can we doubt that the majority would say, "Shakespeare"? And it would be amusing to watch the efforts of the authorities in the literary world to demonstrate that he did not; for, of course, they would try. An experiment with their foot-rule failing them, the critics would probably declare, "these verses have never been previously attributed to Shakespeare," therefore they cannot be by him. Well, then, who else wrote them? To what other poet could be ascribed such lines as—

"The *crooked-winding* kid trips on the lawns." . . .

"The trees *shew pleasure with their quivering leaves*,"

or the melodious cadence of

"The running brookes with sweet and silver sound,"

or the fine epithets, "*gold-breasted*" India, "*White-footed Thetis* sends her *music maids*," or the idea, plagiarised two centuries afterwards, of Nature, "straight admiring what her skill had wrought *she broke the mould*"; or the exquisite compliment, "For how can Summer stay when Sun departs?"

There has been of late years much examination of Elizabethan verse, and surely some of the examiners can suggest an author for this! Perhaps among the Hertford family papers there may be a clue to him. Pending some suggestions from the orthodox, let us point out that the entertainment at Elvetham was in the long vacation of 1591, and an adept at revels, devices and conferences of pleasure was then disengaged from law. Moreover, as he dined in the Hall of his Inn of Court during the terms immediately preceding and succeeding that vacation, his health does not seem to have been so indifferent as it was in the following year, when he had to refuse Lady Hoby's invitation to attend the Queen at her Progress to Bisham, where, by the way, an entertainment of a decidedly inferior kind to that at Elvetham was presented to her.

J. R., of Gray's Inn.

LITERAL TRANSLATION OF THE
 "MANES VERULAMIANI"

(Continued from page 151).

5.

MEMORIÆ MERITISQUE HONORATISSIMI D. FRANCISCI
 D. VERULAMII, VICE-COMITIS SANCTI ALBANI.

LUGETE fletu turbulenta flumina,
 Sub calce nata Pegasi,
 Rivoque nigrum vix trahente pulverem
 Limo profana currite. (1)
 Viridisque Daphnes decidens ramis honos
 Arescat infælicibus.
 Quorum Camænæ laureas inutiles
 Mæsti colatis hortuli?
 Quin vos severis stipitem bipennibus
 Vanæ secatis arboris!
 Vivos reliquit, cui solebat unico
 Coronam ferre lauream,
 Divum potitus arce Verulamius
 Coronâ fulget aureâ:
 Supraque cæli terminos sedens amat
 Stellas videre cernuus:
 Sophiam qui sede cælitum reconditam
 Invidit immortalibus,
 Aggressus orbi redditam cultu novo
 Mortalibus reducere:
 Quo nemo terras incolens majoribus
 Donis pollebat ingeni:
 Nec ullus æquè graviter superstitem
 Themis maritat Palladi.
 Adductus istis, dum vigebat, artibus
 Aonidum sacer chorus,
 In laude totam fudit eloquentiam,
 Nihil reliquit fletibus.

POSUI WILHELMUS BOSWELL.

5.

TO THE MEMORY AND MERITS OF THE RIGHT
HONOURABLE LORD FRANCIS, LORD VERULAM
AND VISCOUNT ST. ALBANS.

WAIL with weeping turbulent streams sprung from beneath the hoof of Pegasus, and ye streams profane flow muddily with your current scarce dragging along the black dust. (1) And let the foliage of verdant Daphne falling from the hapless branches wither. Wherefore, ye Muses, would you cultivate the useless laurels of your sad garden? Nay, with stern axes cut down the trunk of the worthless tree. He hath left the living, whom alone it was wont to bear the laurel crown for. Verulam reigning in the citadel of the gods shines with a golden crown; and enthroned above the bounds of the sky he loves with face towards earth to view the stars; who grudged the immortals that wisdom should be confined to the abode of the blessed, undertaking to bring it back and restore it to mortals by a new cult. Than whom no inhabitant of earth was master of greater intellectual gifts: nor does any survivor so skilfully unite Themis and Pallas. While he flourished the sacred choir of the Muses influenced by these arts poured forth all their eloquence in his praise, (and) left none for wailings.

I, WILLIAM BOSWELL,
have laid (this offering on the tomb).

6.

IN OBITUM HONORITISSIMI DOMINI
FRANCISCI BACONII, MAGNI NUPER TOTIUS ANGLIÆ
CANCELLARII, &C.

Andax exemplum quo mens humana feratur
Et sæcli vindex ingeniose tui,
Dum senio macras recoquis fæliciter artes,
Subtrahis et prisco libera colla jugo,
Quo deflenda modo veniunt tua funera ? quales
Exposcunt lacrymas, quid sibi fata volunt ?
An timuit natura parens ne nuda jaceret,
Detraxit vestem dum tua dextra sacram ?
Ignotique oculis rerum patuere recessus,
Fugit et aspectum rimula nulla tuum ?
An vero, antiquis olim data sponsa maritis,
Conjugis amplexum respuit illa novi ?
An tandem, damnosa piis atque invida captis,
Corripuit vitæ fila (trahenda) tuæ ?
Sic ultra vitreum Siculus ne pergeret orbem
Privati cecidit militis ense senex.
Tuque tuos manes (2) ideo (Francisce) tulisti,
Ne non tentandum perficeretur opus.

7.

IN EUNDEM.

Sunt qui defuncti vivant in marmore, et ævum
Annosis credant postibus omne suum :
Ære micant alii, aut fulvo spectantur in auro,
Et dum se ludunt, ludere fata putant.
Altèra pars hominum, numerosa prole superstes,
Cum Niobe (3) magnos temnit iniqua deos ;
At tua cælatis hæret nec fama columnis,
Nec tumulo legitur, siste viator iter :

6.

ON THE DEATH OF THE RIGHT HONOURABLE LORD
FRANCIS BACON, LATE LORD CHANCELLOR OF
ALL ENGLAND.

Daring example of how far the human mind may reach to, while you rejuvenate successfully the arts worn out with age, and extricate and free necks from the yoke of antiquity, in what way to be mourned does your funeral approach? What tears are demanded, what mean the fates? Did their mother Nature fear she should lie all bare, while your hand drew away her sacred robe? while, too, the unknown recesses of things were exposed to sight and no nook escaped your ken? or was it that, having been of old espoused to consorts of past ages, she has rejected the embrace of a modern lord? or, finally, baneful and envious towards humane enterprises has she snapped the thread of your life, which ought to have been prolonged? Thus, lest Archimedes should soar beyond the crystal sphere, he fell by the sword of a legionary. And you, O Francis, have therefore met your doom, (2) lest the work, which should not have been essayed, should be completed.

7

TO THE SAME.

Some there are though dead live in marble, and trust all their duration to long lasting columns; others shine in bronze, or are beheld in yellow gold, and deceiving themselves think they deceive the fates. Another division of men surviving in a numerous offspring, like Niobe (3) irreverent, despise the mighty gods; but your fame adheres not to sculptured columns, nor is read on the tomb (with) “Stay, traveller, your steps”; if any

Siqua patrem proles referat, non corporis illa est,
 Sed quasi de cerebro nata Minerva Jovis :
 Prima tibi virtus monumenta perennia præstat,
 Altera, nec citius corruiura, libri :
 Tertia nobilitas ; ducant jam fata triumphos,
 Quæ (Francisce) tui nil nisi corpus habent.
 Utraque pars melior, mens et bona fama supersunt,
 Non tanti ut redimas vile cadaver habes.

T. VINCENT, T.C.

8.

IN OBITUM NOBILISSIMI DOMINI FRANCISCI
 BARONIS VERULAMII, &C.

Visa mihi pridem nec in uno vivere possee
 Tot bona sunt, unquam nec potuisse mori ;
 Queis, quasi syderibus cælum, tua vita refulsit,
 Et quæ sunt fatum cuncta secuta tuum ;
 Ingenium, et largo procurrens flumine lingua,
 Philosophi pariter, juridicique decus.
 Nunc video potuisse quidem ; sed parcite amici,
 Hic si non redeat, nec reditura puto.

I. VINCENT, T.C.

9.

IN OBITUM ILLUSTRISSIMI CLARISSIMIQUE HEROIS,
 DOMINI FRANCISCI BACONI, BARONIS DE VERU-
 LAMIO, *θρηνηδία*.

Musæ fundite nunc aquas perennes
 In threnos, lacrymasque Apollo fundat
 Quas vel Castalium tenet fluentum :
 Nam Letho neque convenire tanto
 Possint nænia parva, nec coronent

progeny recalls their sire, not of the body is it, but born, so to speak, of the brain, as Minerva from Jove's : first your virtue provides you with an everlasting monument, your books another not soon to collapse, a third your nobility ; let the fates now celebrate their triumphs, who have nothing yours, Francis, but your corpse. Your mind and good report the better parts survive ; you have nothing of so little value as to ransom the vile body withal.

T. VINCENT, Trinity College.

8.

ON THE DEATH OF THE MOST NOBLE LORD FRANCIS,
BARON VERULAM, &C.

Formerly so many good parts seemed to me impossible either to co-exist in one, or ever to have died ; with these, as the heavens with stars, your life was replendent, and all have followed you to the grave. Genius and eloquence flowing with mighty stream, the ornament equally of the philosopher and the judge. Now I see such things could be ; but friends refrain, if he returns not, neither will they I ween.

I. VINCENT, Trin. Col.

9.

A THRENODY ON THE DEATH OF THE MOST ILLUSTRIOUS AND RENOWNED PERSONAGE, SIR FRANCIS BACON, BARON VERULAM.

Muses, now pour forth your perennial waters in lamentations, and let Apollo shed tears (plentiful as the water) which even the Castalian stream contains ; for neither would meagre dirges befit so great a loss, nor our moderate drops the mighty monument. The

Immensa hæc modicæ sepulchra guttæ :
 Nervus ingenii, medulli suadæ
 Dicendique Tagus (4), reconditarum
 Et gemma pretiosa literarum
 Fatis concidit, (heu trium sororum
 Dura stamina) nobilis Baconus.
 O quam te memorem Bacone summe
 Nostro carmine ! et illa gloriosa
 Cunctorum monumenta seculorum,
 Excusa ingenio tuo, et Minerva !
 Quam doctis, elegantibus, profundis,
 Instauration magna, plena rebus !
 Quanto lumine tineas sophorum
 Dispellit veterum tenebricosas
 Ex chao procreans novam σοφίαν :
 Sic ipse Deus inditum sepulchro
 Corpus restituet manu potenti :
 Ergo non moreris (Bacone) nam te
 A morte, et tenebris, et a sepulchro,
 Instauration magna vindicabit.

R. C., T.C.

IO.

IN OBITUM

HONORATISSIMI BARONIS VERULAMIENSIS, &c.

En iterum auditur (certe instauration magna est !)
 Stellata camera fulgidus ore Bacon :
 Nunc vere albatus, iudex purissimus audit ;
 Cui stola (Christe) tuo sanguine tincta datur.
 Integer ut fiat, prius exiit ipse seipsum :
 Terra, habeas corpus ; (dixit) et astra petit.
 Sic, sic, Astræam sequitur prænobilis umbra,
 Et Verulam verum nunc sine nube videt.

very nerve of genius, the marrow of persuasion, the golden stream of eloquence (4), the precious gem of concealed literature (5), the noble Bacon (ah! the relentless warp of the three sisters) has fallen by the fates. O how am I in verse like mine to commemorate you, sublime Bacon! and those glorious memorials of all the ages composed by your genius and by Minerva. With what learned, beautiful, profound matters the Great Instauration is full! With what light does it scatter the darksome moths of the ancient sages! creating from chaos a new wisdom: thus God Himself will with potent hand restore the body laid in the tomb; therefore you do not die (O Bacon!) for the Great Instauration will liberate you from death and darkness and the grave.

R. C., T.C.

IO.

ON THE DEATH OF THE RIGHT HONOURABLE
BARON VERULAM, &C.

Lo! again is heard (surely a great restoration) Bacon with shining countenance in the starry vault (Star Chamber): now truly robed in white, a spotless judge he listens; to whom, O Christ, a robe dyed in Thy blood is given. To become whole he first put off himself. Earth, said he, receive my body; then he sought the stars. Thus, thus, the glorious spirit follows Astræa, and now beholds all cloudless the true Verulam.

II.

DE CONNUBIO ROSARUM.

Septimus Henricus non cere et marmore vivit;
 Vivit at in chartis (magne Baconæ) tuis. (6)
 Junge duas (Henricæ) rosas; dat mille Baconus;
 Quot verba in libro, tot reor esse rosas.

T. P.

I2.

IN OBITUM NOBILISSIMI DOCTISSIMIQUE VIRI DOM.
 FRAN. BACONIS, BARONIS VERULAMIENSIS, &C.

Sic cadit Aonii rarissima gloria cætus?
 Et placet Aoniis credere semen agris?
 Frangantur calami, dirumpanturque libelli,
 Hoc possiut tetricæ si modo jure deæ.
 Heu quæ linqua silet, quæ jam facundia cessat,
 Quo fugit ingenii nectar et esca tui?
 Quomodo musarum nobis contingit alumnis
 Ut caderet nostri præses Apollo chori? (7)
 Si nil cura fides, labor, aut vigilantia possint,
 Sique feret rapidas, de tribus una, manus?
 Cur nos multa brevi nobis proponimus ævo?
 Cur putri excutimus scripta sepulta situ?
 Scilicet ut dignos aliorum a morte labores
 Dum rapimus nos Mores in sua jura trahat.
 Quid tamen incassum nil proficientia fundo
 Verba? quis optabit te reticente, loqui?
 Nemo tuam spargat violis fragrantibus urnam,
 Nec tibi pyramidum mole sepulchra locet;
 Nam tua conservant operosa volumina famam,
 Hoc satis, hæc prohibent te monumenta mori.

WILLIAMS.

II.

ON THE MARRIAGE OF THE ROSES.

The seventh Henry lives not in bronze and marble ;
but in your pages great Bacon he lives (6). Unite the
two roses Henry; Bacon gives a thousand ; as many
words in his book, so many roses I ween.

T. P.

12.

ON THE DEATH OF THE MOST NOBLE AND LEARNED
LORD FRANCIS BACON, BARON VERULAM, &C.

Is it thus falls the rarest glory of the Aonian band?
and do we decree to entrust seed to the Aonian fields?
Break pens, and tear up writings, if the dire goddesses
may justly act so. Alas! what a tongue is mute! what
eloquence ceases! Whither have departed the nectar
and ambrosia of your genius? How has it happened to
us, the disciples of the Muses, that Apollo, the leader of
our choir, should die? (7) If earnestness, loyalty, toil
or watchfulness avail nought, and if one of the three
(fates) shall put forth her ravening hands, why do we
propose many undertakings to ourselves in our brief
span? Why do we ransack MSS. covered with
mouldering dust? Forsooth! for death to drag us to
his realm, while we force from death the worthy
labours of others. Yet, why do I vainly pour forth
profitless words? Who will wish to speak, you being
silent? Let no one scatter fragrant violets on your
urn, nor rear your sepulchre with the vastness of
pyramids; for your laboured tomes preserve your
fame. This suffices; these memorials will not let you
die.

WILLIAMS.

NOTES.

1. I think in these couplets the sacred streams of Pegasus and profane streams are called upon to mourn in different ways. However, better scholars do not think so. They make *profana* equivalent to *profanata*, and translate: "Lament, ye streams, which, born beneath the hoofs of Pegasus, are now turbid with weeping, and run distained with mud in a stream barely sufficing to carry its load of black soil." So Mr. W. Theobald.

2. Cf. *Quisque suos patimur manes*, we all undergo our penal sufferings (*Æn.*, vi. 743).

3. Niobe was so proud of her numerous children that she despised Latona, mother of Diana and Apollo, who therefore slew her children. Niobe herself was changed by Jupiter into a stone.

4. The metre, a spondee, a dactyl and three trochees require Tagus to be taken for the river famous for its golden sand. The first syllable is long in the Greek word signifying commander, otherwise an excellent rendering.

5. If the writer wished to allude to Bacon's reference to himself as a "concealed poet," the phrase, *reconditarum et gemma pretiosa literarum*, answers the purpose very well. "Recondite literature" will do too.

6. Alluding to the concluding words in Bacon's "History of Henry VII.": "So that he dwelleth more richly dead, in the monument of his tomb, than he did alive at Richmond, or any of his palaces. I could wish he did the like in this monument of his fame" (*Works VII.*, p. 245).

7. Here Bacon is identified with Apollo, the god of poetry and music and leader of the choir of the Muses. Of the nine Muses, seven were expressly goddesses of poetry and every kind of song and music, the remaining two—Clio and Urania—were goddesses of history and astronomy respectively.

NOTES, QUERIES, AND CORRESPONDENCE

George Cox Bompas

MR. BOMPAS, who died on the 23rd of May, 1905, after a long illness, was the son of the late Mr. Sergeant Bompas and was born on the 1st of April, 1827. Educated privately, he was admitted as a solicitor in 1850 and continued to practice until the end of 1903.

He was a Fellow of the Royal Astronomical Society, the Royal Geographical Society, the Geological Society of London, the Paleontographical Society, and a Member of the Victoria Institute.

As a Member, and latterly President, of the Bacon Society, he took a great interest in the question of the authorship of the "Shakespeare" plays, and in 1902 published a small volume, entitled *The Problem of the Shakespeare Plays*, which epitomised the evidence in favour of the attribution of the plays to Lord Bacon. To the last he did not accept the various Cipher theories which have from time to time been put forward.

Tolstoi and Shakespeare

ADMIRERS of Tolstoi will read with regret the following remarks with which he is credited by the author of "The Downfall of Russia" (p. 314) :—

"If people were capable of approaching Shakespeare impartially, they would lose their unreasonable reverence for this writer. He is crude, immoral, a toady to the great, an arrogant despiser of the small, a slanderer of the common people. He lacks good taste in his

jests, is unjust in his sympathies, ignoble, intoxicated with the acquaintance with which a few aristocrats honoured him. Even his art is over-estimated, for in every case the best comes from his predecessors or his sources. But people are quite blind."

The Ladies' Guild of Francis St. Alban

ON the initiative of Mrs. Pott this Guild has been formed with the object of assisting in ventilating and spreading abroad, by the circulation of books and by afternoon meetings, the questions and researches which engage the attention of the Bacon Society. Ladies wishing to join the Guild, or to obtain further information, are requested to send their names and addresses to the Hon. Sec., Miss Ord, 56, Longridge Road, Earls Court, S.W.

Rev. Walter Begley

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

A NEW and important contribution to the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy is now in the press, and will be shortly issued by Messrs. Gay and Bird. The general title is "Bacon's Nova Resuscitatio." It is in three parts: (1) The Resuscitatio; (2) Exit Shakspere; (3) Enter Bacon. The author is that learned and accomplished scholar and bibliophile, Rev. Walter Begley, editor and translator of Milton's "Nova Solyma," and author of "Is it Shakespeare?" This, alas! is the last literary production of the author, for he is fatally ill, and will, probably, before these words reach the reader, have already joined the great majority. His illness is most tragic and pathetic. Early this year he was attacked by ophthalmia, with persistent nasal hæmorrhage. This was evidently occasioned by malignant disease of the orbits and nasal passages; and the disease has pursued its fatal course, producing first blindness, and then gradually undermining the vital forces by exhausting and almost uncontrollable hæmorrhage. Alas that Milton's latest representative should inherit Milton's calamity!

Another work on Cabalistic and Latin Anagrams—a work of curious research—is also in the press : a sequel to two other books recently published by the same author, “*Biblia Cabalistica*” and “*Biblia Anagrammatica*.”

The duty of superintending the printing of the Baconian book has been undertaken by Mr. R. M. Theobald. At present we may be content with this simple announcement. Mr. Begley's new facts and arguments are of a very startling kind, and will bring the controversy into relation with many other books and persons of the Elizabethan age. R. M. T.

Honorificabilitudinitatibus

TO THE EDITOR OF “*BACONIANA*.”

THE Latin of the well-known anagram contained in the above word has been often called in question. It is, nevertheless, grammatically correct, and quite good enough for its (supposed) purpose. It runs thus:—*Hi ludi sibi tuii Fr. Bacono nati*, these plays guarded by themselves originated from Fr. Bacon.

Ludi alone is sometimes used by classical writers for *ludi scenici*, theatrical representations.

Sibi is dative of the agent after the passive verb, especially the passive participle.

Tuii is the participle of the deponent verb *tueor* used passively. This word is what causes most difficulty. The past participles of many deponent verbs may be used passively as well as actively. *Tueor*, however, is not among those commonly given in the grammars. But it is used itself as a passive verb by several Latin writers, e.g., Varro, Vitruvius and the jurists Papinianus and Gaius. Varro, the most distinguished, was a friend and contemporary of Cicero, and called by Quintilian *Romanorum omnium eruditissimus*. He has in his treatise *De Lingua Latina*:—“*Ibi sacra fiunt ac tuentur*” (l. 6, c. ii.), and, again, in *De Re Rustica*:—“*Majores nostri . . . in bello ab his tuebantur*” (l. 3, c. i.).

Bacon had an immense knowledge of Latin writers of all periods, though by no means a perfect scholar. If he concocted the anagram he would have known that *tuii* “would serve.” The long word infolding the anagram existed, as Mr. Stronach has proved, ages before Bacon's time ; but Bacon, who was an expert at anagrams and all kinds of cryptic writing, would see what strange truths it could be made to tell of himself, and so by inserting it where he did in *Love's Labours Lost*, with hints and suggestions for its elucidation, he made use of a device for claiming literary or scientific property quite common in former times. This is what Dr. Platt maintains, both in previous writings and in his recent work, “*Bacon Cryptograms in Shakespeare*,” and I think he is right. W. A. S.

The "Meanest" of Mankind

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

IN his *Impartial Study of the Shakespeare Title*, Judge Stotsenburg writes:—"Believing as I do that Pope's familiar lines are exactly descriptive of the wise and learned Bacon, I would have much preferred, as author of the poem, the sly, waggish, and gifted Drayton" (p. 513). The misinterpreted epigram of Pope may be better understood if looked at in the light of Bacon's own words: "Our *meanness* attempteth great things" (Tenison's *Baconiana*, p. 199).

A. A. LEITH.

Bacon and Cheltenham

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

THE accompanying letter may interest your readers. I came across it at the Cheltenham Public Library. A. A. LEITH.

"The copy of my Lord Chancellor's Letter to Mrs. Badger.

"AFTER my hearty comendacons. Whereas you are tyed by Covent. with me to find 2 fit and discreet Chaplains, and 2 Deacons, Bread and Wyne and other necessities for the Churches and Parishioners of Cheltenham and Charleton, and to perform all other things which on my part are to be done by virtue of the Lease granted unto me by Queen Eliz., I am informed by the Peticon of the inhabitants of the sd. Parishes, that you have notwithstanding, defrauded them, not only of the 2 Deacons, Bread and Wyne, other necessities that you ought by the Covent. to provide at your owne charge, but also have deprived them of the spiritual food of their souls, allowing yerely unto two Curates x lbs a year. Although you have given me cause to call you to accompt, for breach of your Covent. by a legal proceeding, yet have I thought good at this time to admonish you thereof, and to require you presently to reform the said abuses, by allowing unto 2 such discreet Chaplains as shall be no'inated by his Majestie or his Highness assigns 40 lb yearly unto either of them, and duely to perform covenant of the said Lease, so as there be no further cause of complaint in that behalf against you. So expecting your conformity herein, without delay, I bid you farewell.

"From Yorke House, the 19 Nov., 1620

"Your loving friend,

"FRA. VERULAM."

From John Goding's *History of Cheltenham* (1863).







