









BACONIANA

A Quarterly Magazine



LONDON
GAY & BIRD
12 & 13 HENRIETTA STREET, W.C.

1908

“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

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
The Bacon Society	5, 203
The Beginning of the Doubts	7
Was "Shakespeare" ever Abroad?	16
Summer's Honey Breath	24
Justice Shallow	33
An Interesting Letter to Young Francis Bacon	40
Das Klassische in Hamlet	43
Sonnets XXIII., XXVI.	45
The 1622 Edition of Henry VII.	49
Obituary	60
The Jew of Malta	63
Letter by Sir Thomas Bodley	75
Was Bacon ever Abroad? Whon and Where?	82
Bacon's Travels	92
Shakespeare and Venice	96
The Grave's Tiring-Room	114, 155, 238
"The Misfortunes of Arthur"	121
The Latest from the States	125
Dr. Anders' Challenge and the Response	135, 178, 253
Poetry the Diversion of Shakespeare's Youth	141
Dr. Faustus	145
A Few Interrogatories	166
Dr. Appleton Morgan Interviewed	169
Notes on the Merry Wives of Windsor	205
The Canonbury Inscription	215
The Schoole of Abuse, 1579	220
Shakespeare and Italy	227
Are there Traces of Bacon in <i>Much Ado About Nothing</i> ?	232
Classical Knowledge in Shakespeare	237
Of Great Place, by Shakespeare and Bacon	243
The Origin of the Witches in Macbeth	247
Cardinal Wolsey, 249. Doctor Butts, 250. Doctor Caius	251
John Churton Collins: An Appreciation... ..	259
Signs of the Times	264
Notes and Queries	55, 135, 198, 256
Correspondence	50, 129, 191, 266



INDEX TO NAMES.

	PAGE		PAGE
Abbott, Dr. E. A. ...	181	Burgundy, Duke of ...	184
Agrippa, H. Cornelius ...	140	Bushell, Thomas ...	208
Albano, Petrus de ...	151	Butts, Dr. ...	250
Alessandro, Professor ...	129	Byron, Lord ...	8, 128
Alleyn, Edward ...	239		
Amadis ...	15	Caius, Dr. ...	251
Anders, Dr. H. R. D. 135, 171,		Caldcott, H. Stratford ...	60
178, 192, 243, 253,	256	Campbell, Lord ...	40, 82
Andrew, Bishop ...	142	Carleton, Bishop ...	67, 68
Aristotle ...	15, 182,	Carleton, Dudley ...	37, 248
Aspinall, Alexander ...	187	Carpenter, B. Frank ...	135, 178
		Cecil, Robert, Sir ...	67, 235
Bacon, Lady Anne 151, 250, 252		Chandos, Baron ...	207, 213
Bacon, Anthony 64, 70, 86		Chaucer ...	197
Bacon, Miss Delia ...	10, 51	Chester, Robert ...	154
Bacon, Captain Francis ...	54	Clarke, Cowdon ...	85
Bacon, Sir Edmund ...	251	Cocks, Thomas ...	206
Bacon, Edward ...	71	Cohn, Albert ...	43, 192
Bacon, Sir Nicholas 85, 86,		Collier, J. Payne ...	121, 166
130, 134, 251		Collins, J. Churton 50, 180,	192, 250
Bacon, Roger ...	152		
Bancroft, Bishop ...	94	Colville, Rev. F. Leigh ...	35
Bannister, Rev. A. T. ...	137	Compton, Lord W. ...	212
Barante, Brugière de... ...	184	Constable, Sir John ...	61
Baranzano, Domine R. ...	196	Cook, William ...	214
Barnham, Alice ...	61	Corson, Professor Hiram 125,	193
Baynes, Professor ...	171, 260	Coryat, Thomas ...	108, 229
Beaumont, Francis ...	266	Crawford, Charles ...	50
Begley, Rev. Walter ...	72, 86	Crook, C. W. ...	188
Birch, Thomas ...	87, 124		
Birch, Dr. ...	142	Daniel, Samuel ...	166
Bodley, Sir Thomas 40, 75,		Dante ...	117
83, 93, 130, 194,	248	Dekker, Thomas ...	167
Boloyne, Anne ...	20	Dennis, John ...	250
Bompas, G. C. ...	76, 222	Disraeli, B. ...	8
Brandt ...	70	Dixon, Hepworth ...	40
Brown, C. Armitage 17, 18,	105	Don, Antonio ...	67
Brown, Basil ...	137	Donnelly, Ignatius ...	176
Brown, Horatio F. ...	96, 227	Douce, Francis ...	132
Bruno, Giordano ...	152	Drake, Nathan ...	45
Bryant, George ...	22	Drayton, Michael ...	166, 187
Brydges, Giles... ...	207	Droeslout, Martin ...	197
Bullen, A. H. ...	148		
Burghley, Lord ...	67, 233	Elizabeth, Queen 67, 80, 134	
Burgoyne, Frank J. ...	258	160, 194	
Burn, Major E. P. ...	194	Elze, Carl ... 16, 20, 105,	108

	PAGE		PAGE
Emerson, Ralph Waldo	51, 59	Heron, Giles	211
Emerson, J. Moody 198	Heywood, Thomas	63, 71, 150
Empedocles 31	Hicks, Baptist	205, 207
Engel, Dr. 253	Higgins, Richard	87
Essex, Earl of	68, 242	Holmes, Nathaniel	176
d'Este, Isabella 229	Holzer, Gust. 101, 164, 255,	257
		Hunsden, Lord	212
Falkland, Lord 142		
Farmer, Richard	50, 247, 250, 260	James I.	117, 158, 247
		Jameson, Dr.	8
Field, Richard 185	Johnson, Richard	231
Fitzwilliam, Sir W. 250	Johnson, Dr. S.	21, 211
Fleetwood, Sir W. 235	Jones, Sir William	28
Fletcher, John 266	Jones, Edward... ..	87
Florio, John 138	Jonson, Ben 45, 48, 127, 131,	195, 197, 211, 226, 230, 267
Fonsgrive, Prof. Georges	... 195	Jusserand, M.	56
Forman, Simon 245		
Foxe, John 34	Kean, Charles	16
Fulbecke, William 122	Kemp, Peter	233
Furness, H. H.	128, 132	Kemp, William	22, 232
Furnivall, Dr. F. J. 11, 23, 56,	85, 88, 192	Kempe, Robert	233
		Kindersley, Mrs.	49
Gallup, Mrs.	50, 156	Kipling, Rudyard	21
Garnett, Dr.	20, 22, 190	Kittridge, Professor	174
Garrick, David 121	Knight, Charles	17
Gervinus, Prof. 8, 11, 12, 16,	190	Kyd, Thomas	50, 222
Gildon, Charles 259		
Gladstone, W. E. 188	Latimer, Bishop	35
Goldsmith, O. 213	Lee, Sidney 20, 21, 22, 34, 55,	66, 69, 84, 87, 91, 188, 192
Gosson, Stephen 220	Leicester, Earl 22, 67, 130, 134, 206	129, 207
Greene, Robert 29	L'Estissac, Monsicur	129, 207
Green, J. R. 188	Lopez, Dr.	65
Greenwood, G. C. 187, 192, 264	192, 201	Lowell, Russell	260
Greg, W. W. 192, 201	Lucy, Sir Thomas	33, 83, 186, 209
Greville, Fulke 35, 150, 186,	212		
Grote, George 31	Lyly, John	50
Grüter, Isaac	75, 197		
Guise, Duc de 63	Macaulay, Lord	121
Guylforde, Sir R. 220	Machiavelli, Niccolo... ..	70
		Madden, Hon. D. H.	127
Halliwell-Phillipps, J. 17,	51, 56, 186, 194	Maguin, Dr.	260
		Mallet, D.	40, 195
Hall, Dr. John 187	Malone, Edmond 105, 247, 260	64, 71, 146, 154
Hanmer, Sir Thomas 105	Marlow, Chris. 64, 71, 146, 154	148
Harrison, Rev. W. A. 70	Marston, John... ..	148
Hart, Col. Joseph C. ...	7, 193	Mary Queen of Scots	234
Harvey, Gabriel 221	Mathew, Sir Tobie	195
Harwood, Mrs. Septimus	... 192	Meautys, Sir Thomas	87
Hathaway, Ann	168, 187	Meier, Dr. Konrad	43
Hawthorne, Nathaniel	11, 58	Meigs, Return Jonathan	... 193
Hazlett, W. 122	Molancthon, Philip	44
Herbert, Sir William 96	Mercs, Francis	105
Henry of Navarre	89, 92, 184		

	PAGE		PAGE
Meyer, Edward ...	70	Sidney, Philip, 35, 134, 143, 186, 223	
Molloy, Charles ...	52	Smith, W. H. ...	11, 17, 131
Montague, Basil ...	40	Sohmers, J. ...	185, 192, 253, 256
Montaigne ...	196	Southampton, Earl of, 57, 198, 259	
Montonayor, George de ...	105	Spedding, James ...	40, 118
Morgan, Dr. Apploton, 5, 50, 135, 166, 169, 192, 233		Spenser, Edmund ...	134
Morgan, Lady ...	19	Spencer, Herbert ...	32
Moryson, Fynes ...	94, 109, 229	Spencer, Sir Richard ...	210
Mulgrave, Dr....	21	Standen, Sir Anthony ...	87
Nash, Thomas ...	50	Stapfer, Professor ...	84
Naunton, Sir Robert... ..	223	Stefansson, Herr ...	95
Neal, Bishop ...	142	Stevens, George ...	189
Nelson, Johu ...	218	Stewart, Helen Hinton ...	191
Ochino, Fra Bernardino ...	151	Stone, Sir Benjamin ...	217
Pagnano, Carlo ...	228	Stopes, Mrs. C. ...	83, 132, 185
Palmerston, Lord ...	130	Stotsenburg, John H. ...	50
Pasquil ...	92	Sullivan, Sir Edward... ..	227
Patericke, Simon ...	70	Theobald, L. ...	106, 260, 262
Paulet, Sir Amias ...	40, 82, 85	Theobald, R. M. ...	43, 75, 262
Payne, Mrs. ...	203	Torkington, Sir R. ...	229
Peele, George ...	154	Trovisano, Nicolò ...	229
Perey, Sir Charles ...	37, 205	Trott, Nicholas ...	122
Perez, Antonio ...	89	Tschamer ...	20
Perron, Cardinal ...	143	'Tydney, Edmund ...	211
Phelps, Judge ...	183	Valdes, Juan and A. de ...	150
Platt, Dr. I. Hull ...	135	Vasari ...	19
Plessis, Comte de ...	254	Vautrollier, Thomas ...	185
Plutarch ...	27	Upton, John ...	105, 260
Pollard, Alfred ...	201	Wainwright, Dr. J. W. ...	198
Pope, Thomas ...	22	Waller, Edmund ...	141
Pott, Mrs. C. M. ...	173, 253	Waller, Robert ...	141
Pozzo, Cassiano Dal ...	139	Walsingham, Sir F., 67, 92, 207, 223, 234	
Puttenham ...	50, 186	Walter, Major James... ..	246
Raleigh, Professor W. ...	171	Ward, Professor A. W. ...	63
Rawley, William ...	52	Watson ...	92
Reed, Edwin, 75, 105, 137, 184, 191, 243, 252		Wake, Sir Isaac ...	247
Roberti, Ercole ...	229	Webb, Judge ...	190, 202
Roe, J. E. ...	238	Whateley, Anna ...	168
Romano, Giulio ...	19, 128	White, R. Grant ...	20, 51
Sand, George ...	20	Whitgift, John... ..	94, 251
Sandys, George ...	182	Wolsey, Cardinal ...	249
Sansoverino, Roberto ...	228	Wood, Anthony ...	247
Schreiner, Olive ...	60	Woodward, Parker ...	50
Shallow, Justice ...	205	Wootton, Sir Thomas ...	87
		Wyman, W. H....	58
		Wyndham, George ...	131

INDEX TO SUBJECTS.

PAGE	PAGE
Accademia dei Lincei, Bacon's	Novor Too Late (Greeno) ... 50
Non-election to ... 138	New Shakspeareana ... 55, 135
Anthony and Cleopatra ... 128	Novum Organum ... 115
As You Like It ... 23	Obituary ... 60
Bacon Society... 5, 58, 140	Othello ... 87, 100
Bacon-Shakespeare Controversy (beginning of) ... 11	Padua ... 113
Bacon: Was he ever Abroad? 82	Pandosta ... 30
<i>Blackwood's Magazine</i> , November, 1865 ... 131	Pasquill's Apology ... 94
Bohemia... 19, 128	Passionate Shepherd... 64
Christian Ethics (Fulbeeko) 122	Pericles... 24
Cogitata et Visa ... 75	Phoenix and the Turtle ... 31
Comedy of Errors ... 21, 90	Pierce Pennilesse ... 94
Cornelia (Kyd) ... 95	Poetaster ... 45 sq.
Cymbeline ... 24	Prognostication, A ... 94
Denmark ... 22	Resuscitatio ... 52
Diana in Love... 105	Romance of Yachting ... 8
Diary of Master William	Romeo and Juliet ... 66
Silence ... 50, 127	Shakespeare as a Prose
Dobbin, Old Gobbo's filhorse, 100, 107	Writer ... 260
Dr. Faustus ... 65	Shakespeare-Bacon ... 139
Doge of Venice ... 101	Shakespeare's Books (Anders) 135
Ephomera Critica ... 261	Shakespeare Manuscripts ... 57
England's Helicon ... 64	Shakespeare and the Modern
Euphues the Peripatetician ... 50	Stage (Lec) ... 55
Faerie Queen ... 92, 134	Shakespeare Problem Re-
Felix and Philomena, Hist. of 105	stated... 264
First Fruits (Florio)... 138	Shakespeare and Venice ... 96
Florence ... 101 sq.	Shakespeare: Was he ever
Francesco's Fortunes ... 93	Abroad ... 16
Grave's Tiring-Room ... 114	Signori di Notte ... 112
Hamlet ... 43, 69, 95	Sirens or Pleasures, The
Henry IV. ... 33	(Bacon) ... 115
Henry VII. (1622 edition) ... 49	Sonnets ... 45, 114 sq.
<i>Hereford Times</i> Controversy 137	Stratford Grammar School ... 127
Histoire Naturelle ... 129	Studies in Shakespeare ... 259
Hurrikan ... 25	Sylva Sylvarum ... 91
Jew of Malta ... 63 sq.	Tabulæ Inveniendi ... 75
King Lear ... 132	Taming of the Shrew 18, 107, 113
L'Italia alla fine del Secolo	Tempest, The ... 21, 24
XVI. ... 129	Thankfull Remembrance of
Love's Labour's Lost 44, 82 sq., 131	God's Mercy ... 67
Macbeth ... 123	Twelfth Night... 58
Mantua ... 100 sq.	Two Gentlemen of Verona
Merchant of Venice 16 sq., 66 sq., 93, 95	... 19, 100 sq.
Merry Wives of Windsor 33, 133	Use of the Law ... 90
Milan ... 19, 100 sq.	Venetian Traghetto ... 108
Misfortunes of Arthur, The 121	Venice ... 17 sq., 93, 96 sq., 131
Montaigne's Travels... 129	Venus and Adonis ... 45
	Verona ... 19, 100 sq.
	Winter's Tale ... 24 sq.
	Wisdom of the Ancients ... 118

BACONIANA.

VOL. VI. *Third Series.* JANUARY, 1908. No. 21.

THE BACON SOCIETY.

THE beginning of a new year or of a new volume seems to encourage a spell of introspection. It is more than twenty-two years since the first number of the "Journal of the Bacon Society" appeared and nearly sixteen years since it adopted the title of BACONIANA. The pages bear evidence of much valuable work on the part of the members in what, as a correspondent points out, Dr. Appleton Morgan has described as "the higher criticism of Shakespeare." There are contributions which approach the question of the authorship from many points of view; odd facts are brought to light; theories are propounded with different degrees of probability, but all of them assist in arriving at an intelligent solution of this vexed question. The results of careful and painstaking research abound. But interesting and valuable as are these contributions, a perusal of them affords no evidence of combined or systematic effort directed to the attainment of a particular object.

It was in 1903, on the incorporation of the Society, that a scheme for its work was drawn up, and it must be admitted that but little has so far been done towards its accomplishment; yet a determined attempt to carry out that scheme would justify the existence of the

Society. Its complete fulfilment would produce one of the most important and valuable contributions to English literature that the country possesses. It is a work of national importance. There have been obstacles in the way of progress. Perhaps the most important of these is lack of funds. Useful as may be the work of voluntary researchers, it is only from the labours of stipendiary workers directed from one centre that satisfactory results can be relied upon. But such services cannot be obtained without ample funds.

Again, the collecting of books needs not only the judgment and discrimination of the officers of the Society, but a balance at the bank to provide for payment of the booksellers' accounts. The publication of *BACONIANA* has so far taxed the resources of the Treasurer as to leave little margin for the equipment of the library or the examination of records.

Still, some progress has been made. The shelves in the library, which at one time were filled by volumes lent by two of the founders of the Society, are now being re-filled by books, the property of the Society. The complete record of all the editions published to date of Bacon's acknowledged works, and of all information available with reference to them, is in an advanced state; and although the Society has not collected statistics as to the extent and points of coincidence in the vocabularies of Bacon, Shakespeare and other authors, the late Editor of *BACONIANA* has produced in "The Shakespeare Symphony" an important instalment towards this end.

The Council are determined that the forthcoming year shall be more prolific in results. A re-arrangement of the library and offices has taken place, and it is hoped that the members will avail themselves of the increased facilities afforded for obtaining information. A valuable collection of books is being brought together

and every week will see some addition to their number. Communications will be sent to each member, inviting assistance in the various departments of work to be undertaken.

Before the completed scheme before referred to can be carried out it is imperative that there should be a large increase in the membership. At the next Annual Meeting this point will receive special consideration. In the meantime the Honorary Secretary will gladly welcome the names of any ladies or gentlemen who are known to take an interest in the objects of the Society.

THE BEGINNING OF THE DOUBTS.

AT the risk of going over ground which has been trodden bare, it may not be amiss to draw attention to what is probably the most remarkable contribution bearing on the authorship of the Shake-speare plays. It is the more remarkable because it never appears to have entered into the mind of the writer that, in pointing out the fact that in knowledge, in intellect, in sympathies and in prejudices, Bacon and Shakespeare were the counterpart of each other, he was building up a series of arguments so strong that they afford to any impartial seeker after truth presumptive evidence that the two names represent one and the same colossal mind.

It will be remembered that the first known publication questioning the right of Shakspeare to the authorship of the Shakesperian dramas was an article styled "The Ancient Lethe" in "The Romance of Yachting ; Voyage the First," written by Colonel Joseph C. Hart and published by Harper and Brothers, of New York,

in 1848.* Hart was a lawyer, journalist and yachtsman, and colonel in the National Guard. "The Romance of Yachting" is a gossip account of a voyage to Spain, in which are introduced discussions on various topics in a free-and-easy style. The chapter in which doubt is raised as to the authorship is supposed to be written on the banks of the Guadelete — the ancient Lethe. Colonel Hart argues that the facts known in the life of Shakespeare, so far as they *are* known, are incompatible

* Mr. George Stronach on reading this article sent the following note :—

Colonel Hart's book, published in 1848, was, unfortunately, anticipated in 1837 by Disraeli's *Venetia*, where, in chap. vi., Lord Cadurcis (meant for Lord Byron) is made to say : "And who is Shakespeare? We know of him as much as we do of Homer. Did he write half the plays attributed to him? Did he ever write a single whole play? I doubt it. He appears to me to have been an inspired adapter for the theatres, which were then not as good as barns. I take him to have been a botcher-up of old plays. His popularity is of modern date; and it may not last; it would have surprised him marvellously. Heaven knows, at present, all that bears his name is alike admired, and a regular Shakespearian falls into ecstasies with trash which deserves a niche in *The Dunciad*. For my part, I abhor your *irregular* geniuses, and I love to listen to the little nightingale of Twickenham." Good! This is certainly the first mention of the doubt of the *Shakespearian* [Stratford] authorship of the plays in English literature; and to that arch-plagiarist, Beaconsfield, the first doubt is to be attributed. Beaconsfield knew "the man."

It may interest readers of *BACONIANA* to know that the author of the article in *Chambers' Edinburgh Journal* of August 7, 1852, entitled, *Who Wrote Shakespeare?* was an Edinburgh medical man, Dr. Jameson, the father of "Dr. Jim," of "South African Raid" notoriety.

I am glad to see a reference given to Gervinus's *Commentaries*, where numerous comparisons are made between Bacon and Shakespeare. May I refer your readers to a paper which I wrote on this subject in *BACONIANA* (Vol. III., Third Series, pp. 113—116). I was amazed at the comparison made by Gervinus

with the authorship. He suggests no other author. The following passages occur:—

“Alas, Shakespeare! Lethe is upon thee! But if it drown thee, it will give up and work the resurrection of *better men and more worthy*. Thou hast had thy century; they are about to have theirs.”

“He was not the mate of the literary characters of his day,

between Bacon’s *prose* and Shakespeare’s *verse*. To me it was a revelation; and I have been studying the works of both authors for a few years.—GEORGE STRONACH.

The foregoing extract from Venetia is an amplification of a passage in Medwin’s “Conversations of Lord Byron,” published in 1824. The chapter from which it is taken is dated January, 1822. Byron says, “Shakespeare had many advantages; he was an actor by profession and knew all the tricks of the trade. Yet he had little fame in his day; see what Jonson and his contemporaries said of him. Besides, how few of what are called Shakespeare’s plays are exclusively so! and how, at this distance of time, and lost as so many works of that period are, can we really separate what really is from what is not his own?” And further on in the same conversation he says: “Shakespeare’s comedies are quite out of date; many of them are insufferable to read, much more to see. They are gross food, only fit for an English or German palate; they are indigestible to the French and Italians, the politest people in the world. One can hardly find ten lines together without some gross violation of taste or decency. What do you think of Bottom in *Midsummer’s Night Dream*? or of Troilus and Cressida *passim*?”

Neither Lord Byron nor Disraeli goes further than to cast doubt as to whether Shakespeare wrote the whole of the plays attributed to him. The strongest doubt is contained in the words in Venetia, “Did he ever write a single whole play? I doubt it.” Both Lord Byron and Lord Cadurcis speak in a deprecatory manner of the plays. But Colonel Hart takes up a very different standpoint. He says, “*The enquiry will be, Who were the able literary men who wrote the dramas imputed to him?*” and again, “*but they (the plays) should not be assigned to Shakespeare alone, if at all.*”—EDITOR “BACONIANA.”

and none knew it better than himself. It is a fraud upon the world to thrust his surreptitious fame upon us. He had none that was worthy of being transmitted. The inquiry will be, *Who were the able literary men who wrote the dramas imputed to him?* The plays themselves, or rather a small portion of them, will live as long as English literature is regarded as worth pursuit. The authorship of the plays is no otherwise material to us than as a matter of curiosity, and to enable us to render exact justice; but they should not be assigned to Shakespeare alone, if at all."

It was written of Hart that "he was quite proud of writing that chapter as to Shakespeare, and declared that in time his views must become accepted."

In *Chambers' Edinburgh Journal* of August 7th, 1852, appeared an article, "Who Wrote Shakespeare?" The argument is contained in the following extract:—

"May not William Shakespeare—the cautious, calculating man, careless of fame and intent only on money-making—have found in some furthest garret, overlooking the silent highway of the Thames, some pale, wasted student, with a brow as lofty and as ample as his own, who had written the *Wars of the Roses*, and who, with eyes of genius gleaming through despair, was about, like Chatterton, to spend his last copper coin upon some cheap and speedy mode of death? What was to hinder William Shakespeare from reading, appreciating and purchasing these dramas, and thereafter keeping his poet, as Mrs. Packwood did?"

"Well, reader, how like you our hypothesis? We confess we do not like it ourselves; but we humbly think it is at least as plausible as most of what is contained in the many bulky volumes written to connect the man William Shakespeare with the poet of *Hamlet*. We repeat, there is nothing recorded in his everyday life that connects the two, except the fact of his selling the poems and realising the proceeds, and their being afterwards published with his name attached; and the statements of Ben Jonson, which, however, are quite compatible with his being in the secret."

It was not until January, 1856, that an article written by Miss Delia Bacon, whilst staying at St. Albans

during a visit to England, appeared in *Putnam's Monthly* on "William Shakespeare and his Plays." This was the commencement of the "Bacon-Shakespeare" controversy. But in this article Miss Bacon only suggests the theory, and that not directly, but by inference. In 1857 appeared her work, "The Philosophy of the Plays of Shakespeare Unfolded," with a preface by Nathaniel Hawthorne. In this volume she boldly advances the theory, not from the historical side of the question—that was reserved for a volume never published—but on the ground that the plays contained a system of philosophy identical with that which was put forward in Lord Bacon's acknowledged works.

In September, 1856, was published as a pamphlet Mr. William Henry Smith's letter to Lord Ellesmere, under the title of "Was Lord Bacon the Author of Shakespeare's Plays?" Mr. Smith claimed that he had held these opinions for twenty years previously and had not, prior to the publication of his letter, seen Miss Bacon's article in *Putnam's Monthly*.

The first doubt on the authorship of the plays was cast in 1848; the first suggestion that Lord Bacon was concerned was made in 1856.

Dr. G. G. Gervinus, Professor at Heidelberg, published in 1849 his work, "Shakespeare Commentaries."

In the Prospectus of "The New Shakespeare Society," written in 1873 by Dr. F. J. Furnivall, he says:—

"The profound and generous 'Commentaries' of Gervinus—an honour to a German to have written, a pleasure to an Englishman to read—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."

In the index to the English translation, under the name of Bacon, appears the number of one page, 848,

but the book abounds with references to Bacon, and in the copy in the Bacon Society's library upwards of thirty references have already been added. From the Preface to the last chapter Gervinus appears to have Bacon continually suggested to him by the thoughts and words of Shakespeare.

In the Preface, after speaking of the value accruing to German literature by naturalizing Shakespeare "even at the risk of casting our own poets still further in the shade," he says :—

"A similar benefit would it be to our intellectual life if his famed contemporary, Bacon, were revived in a suitable manner, in order to counterbalance the idealistic philosophy of Germany. For both these, the poet as well as the philosopher, having looked deeply into the history and politics of their people, stand upon the level ground of reality, notwithstanding the high art of the one and the speculative notions of the other. By the healthfulness of their own mind they influence the healthfulness of others, while in their most ideal and most abstract representations they aim at a preparation for life *as it is*—for *that* life which forms the exclusive subject of all political action."

Space will not permit the reproduction of the references which Gervinus is constantly making to Bacon's writings to explain Shakespeare's words; they occur constantly. It is, however, in the chapter on "His Age," written prior to 1849, that the old Professor pours out the results of a profound study of the writings attributed to both men, and although portions have appeared in a previous number, no apology is necessary for their reproduction here :—

"Judge then how natural it was that England, if not the birth-place of the drama, should be that of dramatic legislature. Yet even this instance of favourable concentration is not the last. Both in philosophy and poetry everything conspired, as it were, throughout this prosperous period, in favour of two great minds, Shakespeare and Bacon; all competitors vanished from their side, and they could give forth laws for art and science which it is incumbent even upon present ages to fulfil. As the revived

philosophy, which in the former century in Germany was divided among many, but in England at that time was the possession of a single man, so poetry also found one exclusive heir, compared with whom those later born could claim but little.

“That Shakespeare’s appearance upon a soil so admirably prepared was neither marvellous nor accidental is evidenced even by the corresponding appearance of such a contemporary as Bacon. 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, although Bacon was almost called upon to have done so in his remarks upon the theatre of his day. It may be presumed that Shakespeare liked Bacon but little, if he knew his writings and life; that he liked not his ostentation, which, without on the whole interfering with his modesty, recurred too often in many instances; that he liked not the fault-finding which his ill-health might have caused, nor the narrow-mindedness with which he pronounced the histrionic art to be infamous, although he allowed that the ancients regarded the drama as a school for virtue; nor the theoretic precepts of worldly wisdom which he gave forth; nor, lastly, the practical career which he lived. Before his mind, however, if he had fathomed it, he must have bent in reverence. For just as Shakespeare was an interpreter of the secrets of history and of human nature, Bacon was an interpreter of lifeless nature. 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, dis-

regarding 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 there lay a vast wilderness of time, as unfruitful for the drama as for philosophy. But while they thus led back to nature, Bacon was yet as little of an empiric, in the common sense, as Shakespeare was a poet of nature. Bacon prophesied that if hereafter his commendation of experience should prevail, great danger to science would arise from the other extreme, and Shakespeare even in his own day could perceive the same with respect to his poetry; Bacon, therefore, insisted on the closest union between experience and reason, just as Shakespeare effected that between reality and imagination. While they thus bid adieu to the formalities of ancient art and science, Shakespeare to conceits and taffeta-phrases, Bacon to logic and syllogisms, yet at times it occurred that the one fell back into the subtleties of the old school, and the other into the constrained wit of the Italian style. 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. Bacon, looking back to the waymarks he had left for others, said with pride that his words required a century for their demonstration and several for their execution; and so too it has demanded two centuries to understand Shakespeare, but very little has ever been executed in his sense. And at the same time we have mentioned what deep modesty was interwoven in both with their self-reliance, so that the words which Bacon liked to quote hold good for the two works:— 'The kingdom of God cometh not with observation.' Both reached this height from the one starting point, that Shakespeare despised the million, and Bacon feared with Phocion the applause of the multitude. Both are alike in the rare impartiality with which they avoided everything one-sided; in Bacon we find, indeed, youthful exercises in which he endeavoured in severe contrasts to contemplate a series of things from two points of view. Both, therefore, have an equal

hatred of sects and parties; Bacon of sophists and dogmatic philosophers, Shakespeare of Puritans and zealots. Both, therefore, are equally free from prejudices, and from astrological superstition in dreams and omens. Bacon says of the alchemists and magicians in natural science that they stand in similar relation to true knowledge as the deeds of Amadis to those of Cæsar, and so does Shakespeare's true poetry stand in relation to the fantastic romance of Amadis. Just as Bacon banished religion from science, so did Shakespeare from art; and when the former complained that the teachers of religion were against natural philosophy, they were equally against the stage. 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. Shakespeare would, perhaps, have looked down just as contemptuously on the ancients and their arts as Bacon did on their philosophy and natural science, and both on the same grounds; they boasted of the greater age of the world, of more enlarged knowledge of heaven, earth, and mankind. Neither stooped before authorities, and an injustice similar to that which Bacon committed against Aristotle, Shakespeare *perhaps* has done to Homer. In both a similar combination of different mental powers was at work; and as Shakespeare was often involuntarily philosophical in his profoundness, Bacon was not seldom surprised into the imagination of the poet. Just as Bacon, although he declared knowledge in itself to be much more valuable than the use of invention, insisted throughout generally and dispassionately upon the practical use of philosophy, so Shakespeare's poetry, independent as was his sense of art, 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, dragging the mightiest and most prosperous as a sacrifice to her altar, as the victims of their own inward nature and destiny. 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 Shakespearian play, aye, for every one of his principal characters (we have already brought forward not a few proofs of this), 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."

WAS "SHAKSPERE" EVER ABROAD?

THE idea that Shakspeare (the Stratford man) had ever been abroad was never entertained till modern critics came to see that there was much in the plays with which only a continental visit could have supplied him.

Modern commentators insist upon the dramatist's residence abroad at some time of his career, especially on a visit to Denmark, the scene of his greatest play, *Hamlet*. The subject is one of much literary interest, and one which has never been thoroughly investigated except, perhaps, by Carl Elze, after Gervinus, the greatest of Shakespearian critics.

Fifty years ago, when I was a boy at school, my dear old father took me to an Edinburgh theatre (it was the sixpenny gallery) to see Charles Kean as "Shylock" in *The Merchant of Venice*. On the way home I asked "the guv" if the author of the play had ever been in Venice, where the scene was laid. He replied, "Read

it up, my boy; I cannot tell you." I read it up, and the first book I read was a little work by "William Henry Smith, Esq.," entitled *Bacon and Shakespeare*, published in the year 1857.

Smith was one of the forerunners of the Baconian theory, and his arguments at the time rather impressed me, one of them being a criticism by *The Athenæum* (then a leading literary weekly) of his letter to Lord Ellesmere in the preceding year, in which it was stated by the journal, "The most striking difficulty, perhaps, lies in the descriptions (in the plays) of foreign scenes, particularly of Italian scenes, and of sea-life, interwoven with the texts of the plays—descriptions so numerous and so marvellously accurate that it is almost impossible to believe that they were written by a man who lived in London and Stratford, who never left this island, and who saw the world only from a stroller's booth. Every reader of the plays has felt this difficulty, and theories have been formed of imaginary Shakespeare travels, in order to account for the minute local truth and the prevalence of local colour. It is not easy to conceive *The Merchant of Venice* as coming from the brain of one who had never strolled on the Rialto, or sunned himself on the slopes of Monte Bello. Without warrant of any sort, beyond the internal evidence of the play, Mr. Brown and Mr. Halliwell have boldly adopted the theory of an Italian journey; though when and where it could have been performed, in the course of a life so brief and busy as Shakespeare's was between his marriage and his retirement from the stage, is a mystery not more perplexing than the local knowledge it would serve to explain."

This was a good plea in the pre-Baconian days, and it assuredly had some argument in its favour.

There are many reasons to believe that the writer of the plays had visited Italy. In a note, says Charles Knight, upon the passage:—

"Unto the transit to the common ferry
Which trades to Venice,"

"If Shakspeare had been at Venice (which from the extraordinary keeping of the play, appears the most natural supposition), he must surely have had some situation in his eye as Belmont. There is a common ferry at two places—Fusina and Mestre."

In the same play the poet says :—

"This night, methinks, is but the daylight sick,
It looks a little paler : 'tis a day
Such as the day is when the sun is hid ;"

whereupon Knight remarks :

"The light of the moon and stars in Italy is almost as yellow as the sunlight in England . . . Two hours after sunset, on the night of a new moon, we have seen so far over the lagunes that the light seemed only a paler day—'a little paler.'" How did "the Stratford man" get this information ?

Then Brown, the author of *Shakespeare's Autobiographical Plays*, strenuously maintained the opinion that Shakespeare must have visited Italy, for the reason that "His descriptions of Italian scenes and manners are more minute and accurate than if he had derived his information wholly from books."

Charles Knight, again, in his reference to *The Taming of the Shrew*, says, "It is difficult for those who have explored the city of Padua to resist the persuasion that the poet himself had been one of the travellers who had come from afar to look upon its seats of learning, if not to partake of its 'ingenious studies.' There is a pure Paduan atmosphere hanging about this play."

The scene of *The Taming of the Shrew* is laid in Italy. The names of the characters are chosen with a

perfect knowledge of the Italian language, especially those of Biondello for the fair-haired youth, while Curtis was either the name of the actor or a corruption of Cortese, as Escalus is of Della Scala.

The introduction, where Padua is called the "nursery of arts," and Lombardy "the pleasant garden of great Italy," is so true to nature that it might have been penned by an Italian.

In regard to the household furniture, and the other garnishing of old Gremio's house, it has been shown by Lady Morgan that every article mentioned in the play has been seen by her in the palaces of Venice, Genoa, and Florence. The whole drama is saturated with Italian characteristics, which only an Italian or a visitor to Italy could have been acquainted with.

Another fact is indisputable. The author of the plays could read Italian or, as an alternative, knew Italy at first hand. In *A Winter's Tale* he describes Giulio Romano as a great *sculptor*. In the days of Shakespeare, Romano was known as a *painter* and architect—not as a *sculptor*. Vasari, however, in 1550, described him as a sculptor, and again in 1568—on both occasions—in *Italian*, not in *English*. Either Shakespeare must have studied Vasari in the original Italian, or had been in Mantua and seen Romano's sculptured works. There is no way of getting out of this dilemma.

But then, it may be asked, if the author of the plays was so well acquainted with Northern Italy, how does he come to connect Verona and Milan by a water-way in *The Two Gentlemen*, and make "the egregious geographical blunder" of ascribing a port to Bohemia in *A Winter's Tale*? But, was it a blunder?

But Shakespeare knew more than his modern critics. In his day there was no *sea* communication between Verona and Milan, but there was *canal* communication, as Northern Italy was then "intersected by canals;"

and under Ottokar the kingdom of Bohemia stretched from the Baltic to the Adriatic—it had *ports* on both sides (Freeman's *Hist. Geog. of Europe*). This is confirmed by George Sand, Tschamer, and Karl Elze; so that the writer of the plays seems to have been further "abroad" than some people give him credit for—at least he was so far abroad as Northern Italy.

According to Mr. Sidney Lee, however, "It is almost impossible that he (Shakespeare) could have gathered his knowledge of Northern Italy from personal observation. He doubtless owed all to the verbal reports of travelled friends or to books, the contents of which he had a rare power of assimilating and vitalising."

It would be interesting to know the names of the books referred to by Mr. Lee.

So much for the dramatist's visitation of Italy. What about his voyages by sea? The late Dr. Garnett held that Shakespeare went "on a confidential errand" to Germany and returned "by way of Venice." The purpose and occasion of this "confidential errand" have never been revealed. It is not mentioned by Mr. Lee in his "Life of Shakespeare." Mr. Lee may have overlooked it, however.

Dr. Garnett supplemented his information about the "confidential errand" by stating that "Nothing could so well fit in with the long voyage which he certainly must have made at some time or other of his life." When was the voyage made? Did Shakspere ever look on the sea? There is no record of the occasion. And if the writer of the play was never in sight of the sea, how does it come about, as Richard Grant White writes, "In *Henry VIII.*, describing the outburst of admiration and loyalty of the multitude at sight of Anne Boleyn, he says, as if he had spent his life on shipboard,

" ' Such a noise arose
As the shrouds make at sea in a stiff tempest ;
As loud, and as many tunes.' "

In *The Tempest* we have directions as to the management of a ship that no sailor can take exception to ; and Lord Mulgrave says :—" Shakespeare's technical knowledge of seamanship must have been the result of the most accurate personal observation, or, what is perhaps more difficult, of the power of combining and applying the information derived from others." Remember, no books had at the time been published on the subject. Then Dr. Johnson declares :—" His naval dialogue is, perhaps, the first example of sailors' language exhibited on the stage," and a great naval authority has held that, " The boatswain in *The Tempest* delivers himself in the true vernacular of the fore-castle."

Another typically nautical play is *The Merchant of Venice*, where accurate sailors' expressions are put into the mouths of Salanio and Salarino. *A Comedy of Errors* is also full of nautical allusions and sea words, all of which would be understood and recognised as true sailors' talk by a seaman of the present day.

Did Shakespeare see the sea, or did he realise the life and language of a sailor, as Mr. Sidney Lee maintains, by " force of his imagination ? "

No sailor, however, can ever catch Shakespeare tripping. It has been said that Kipling has so assimilated technical knowledge of various kinds that he might pass for a soldier, sailor, and engineer in one. But Kipling has had, in the course of his voyages and travels, full acquaintance with the lives of soldiers, sailors, and engineers, an acquaintance to which Shakspere, the man of Stratford, could not pretend. And yet it is easy for a sailor to catch Kipling napping. Was it possible for Shakspere, with his known sur-

roundings, to become so fully conversant with nautical language?

I now come to Shakspere's supposititious journey to Denmark and Germany; and over this there is a little discrepancy between the opinions of Dr. Garnett and Mr. Sidney Lee.

Dr. Garnett maintained:—"The year 1585 is that in which Shakespeare disappears from observation. Leicester was the great lord of his part of the country, to whose protection he would naturally have recourse. A band of youths from Warwickshire (?) did, we know, follow Leicester, and few Warwickshire youths can have had more cogent reasons (? associated with poaching, possibly) for making one of their number than William Shakespeare . . . Leicester took a company of actors with him to the Low countries, and Shakespeare may have been of the number of it, but it is quite as likely that he served in some other capacity" (holding horses, probably, at the stage door).

Mr. Lee cautiously remarks:—

"The suggestion that Shakespeare joined, at the end of 1585, a band of youths of the district in serving in the Low countries under the Earl of Leicester is based on an obvious confusion between him and others of his name."

What Mr. Lee refers to is evidently the story that there was sent home to Leicester's wife a letter which was mis-delivered, by the hand of the actor in the Low countries, known as "Will, my Lord of Leicester's jesting player." We have the names of the principal actors in the Leicester Company—William Kemp (the original "Dogberry" in *Much Ado*, and "Peter" in *Romeo and Juliet*), George Bryant, and Thomas Pope; but, unfortunately for Dr. Garnett, the name of Shakspere is not found in the Low Countries' programme. The

"Will, my Lord of Leicester's jesting player," could only by a huge stretch of imagination be made to apply to Shakspeare, who, as a "ghost," could not be considered a "jesting player."

"William Kemp"—the Elizabethan comedian—was certainly a member of Leicester's troupe; and I have yet to learn that "William Shakspeare" was the "jesting player" referred to in the letter, as we know that Shakspeare's characters were the "Ghost" in *Hamlet* and "Adam" in *As You Like it*. Not much scope here for a "jesting player!"—is there?

Dr. Garnett says:—"At this time Shakespere was in Germany and Denmark with Leicester's company of players;" and Dr. Furnivall declares that Shakspeare, at this period of his career, "could then have been taking his M.A. degree." Did he take it? And where?

In the next number of BACONIANA I hope to discuss the question—*Was Bacon ever abroad? When and where?* It will make an interesting article. I shall try to make it so.

GEORGE STRONACH.

SUMMER'S HONEY BREATH.

I N a recent paper* I sought to show that Imogen, "a piece of tender air," was, as the name implies, a piece of the author's thought which in Sonnet 45 he styles "slight air." I also sought to show that air is equivalent to music, *i.e.*, poesy, and I found significance in the statement that "Posthumous anchors upon Imogen;" also in Posthumous' ejaculation, "Hang there like fruit, my soul."

In the present paper I shall discuss Perdita. That the four plays (*Pericles*, *Cymbeline*, *Winter's Tale* and *Tempest*) are related was noted long ago. Their exact relation has, perhaps, not been accurately defined. There is something strikingly obvious in the common motive of these four late plays, and it seems legitimate to conjecture that there must have been a purpose in thus playing upon a common theme. The argument advanced in regard to Imogen does not seem far-fetched, or, if it does, it may seem less so if we find that the same argument may be made with reference to the other plays, or any of them. I think an examination of the *Winter's Tale* will result in the identical deductions that were made in the case of *Cymbeline*. I think also that the remark is true of *Pericles* and the *Tempest*. The analogies of groundwork and episode in the plays are obvious. Even identities of thought and expression are preserved. Of course the treatment is varied, but a common thread runs through them all. The insistent note of the unique, glorious thing of great value that is lost but in the end restored is too obvious to be overlooked. In three plays it is a daughter, in the fourth a kingdom, though even in the fourth a daughter figures, as peerless as the others. The extravagant terms of

praise applied to this creature recall the Sonnets, and the similarity of characterization suggests design—"unparalleled," "nonpareil," "paragon," "peerless," "phœnix;" the words occur with damnable, or at least suspicious, iteration, and we begin to feel that there must be a family likeness among creatures which require the same words to describe them. I said in my former paper that I thought there was a very close resemblance between these unique ladies, and that they were nearly related to the author of the plays. If I had any success in exhibiting Imogen as a piece of the author's thought, I hope here to discover Perdita in the same character.

To make the point plain, I will repeat in a word what I before said at some length. Imogen is a "piece of tender air" (Sonnet 45). We call a tune an air. We call a poet a singer. Imogen stands for imagination; hence soul, genius, mind. The terms are derived from Greek and Latin roots, signifying air (spirare, anima, anemos, psyche, ghost, gust). God breathed into Adam a living soul. The soul in death expires in a breath and is figured as a butterfly floating away (Psyche). The poets are "inspired." The Indian god of creation was Hurrikan, "a great wind." Cupid (=Creator, because in the myth love combined the warring elements of chaos) was "born of the winds." The Muses "breathed" into Hesiod "divine words" and he sung a "lovely song." Imogen, then, a "piece of tender air," was, in fact, music, that is, poesy, and she was lost, cast out, like the other divine creatures of the plays.

Now take Perdita. The first thing that strikes us (after the central fact of her being lost) is her parentage. She was the daughter of Harmony (Hermione). We are told that Harmonia represented the chain of created beings, that is, Nature. As I before stated, whatever

is nature is important in Shakespeare. In the myth harmony and nature are synonymous. Before the world was created there was only chaos or discord. The warring elements were brought into order by the power of love, resulting in what we call creation. Hermione is an extremely significant name, as it stands equally for Nature and Music. If, therefore, we are to suppose that Perdita stands for the author's poesy, the descent begins well on the mother's side. Posthumous, who "anchors upon Imogen" and desires his *soul* to "hang there like fruit," was born of Leo (Leonatus). Leo is the sun—that is, Apollo—and Apollo was the god of music and the patron of poetry. Perdita was the daughter of Leontes (=Apollo). So that, to take the allegory, she was the offspring of Music and Harmony. Surely a legitimate descent for Poesy.

As the name implies, Perdita is lost. Let us consider the name *Winter's Tale*. What is the *Winter's Tale*? It is simply the story of the lost summer, which in its different aspects constituted the basic myth of the old world. Around it the old mysteries centred. The myth had many variants, but all had to do with the same theme—the changes of the seasons. Men saw the bright summer fade in the gloom of winter and out of this built up the beautiful fables that have come down to us.

All the gods and goddesses are finally resolvable into one "or, at most, two." The "bright gods" stood for summer, the "dark gods" for winter. Together they represent the mysterious duo-unity which we see in Nature and without which nothing could exist. Hence the old formula that "all things come of strife and desire" and the fable of Chaos and Love. We call it variously the Nature Myth, the Creation Myth, the Sun Myth. It is the stem from

which *burgeons* all of mythology. The myriad fables of the gods and goddesses are but the foliage and efflorescence of this central trunk. The myth is protean, as is proper in a nature myth. It pays little attention to "unities" or even to sex. Here and there is some attempt at order, though not very successful or long sustained. Thus we are told that there were twelve gods—Jupiter, Neptunus, Mercurius, Mars, Venus, Diana, Ceres, Minerva, Vesta, Juno, Vulcanus, Apollo. All these, in fact, represent one and the same thing.

The constant confusion of sex and identity which we find in mythology renders hopeless any attempt to introduce order among the gods. Plutarch's essay on Isis and Osiris may serve for illustration. Here the same god appears variously as father, mother, brother, sister, wife and husband. In the "Life of Crassus" Plutarch says: "Here (at Hierapolis) he met with the first ill omen from that goddess whom some call Venus, others Juno, others Nature, or the cause that produces out of moisture the first principles and seeds of all things and gives mankind their earliest knowledge of all that is good for them." In the "Golden Ass of Apuleius" Lucius invokes Isis as "Queen of Heaven, whether thou art the genial Ceres, the prime parent of fruits, who joyous at the discovery of thy daughter didst banish the savage nutriment of the acorn, and pointing out a better food dost now till the Eleusinian soil: or whether thou art the celestial Venus who in the first origin of things didst associate the different sexes through the creation of mutual love and art worshipped in the sea-girt shrine of Paphos: or whether thou art the sister of Phœbus, who by relieving the pangs of women in travail by soothing remedies hast brought into the world multitudes innumerable and art now venerated in the far-famed shrines of

Ephesus: or whether thou art Proserpine, who, wandering over many a grove art propitiated by various modes of worship, by whatever name and under whatever form it is lawful to invoke thee." In response to this invocation the goddess appears and thus proclaims herself: "I, who am Nature, the parent of all things, the mistress of all the elements, the primordial offspring of Time, the supreme among the divinities, the queen of departed spirits, the first of the celestial and the uniform manifestation of the gods and goddesses, who govern by my nod the luminous heights of Heaven, the salubrious breezes of the ocean, and the anguished, silent realms of the shades below, whose one sole divinity the whole orb of the earth venerates under a manifold form, with different rites, and under a variety of appellations." A writer says: "Adonis is only another name for Dionysos, and as he is Polyonymous, the many-named, so Adonis is Erbuleus, the wise counselor, the Dikeros, the two-horned, nourisher of all the vital power of the world, male and female, or, as Shelley says, a sexless thing." The same writer says: "Isis and Osiris were all the gods of the Pagans; for as Osiris was Jupiter, Bacchus, Pluto, &c., so Isis was Ceres, Juno, Terra, Proserpine, &c., in fine, all the goddesses, whence she was denominated Myrionymia, the goddess with a thousand names." Sir William Jones says: "We must not be surprised at finding, on a close examination, that the characters of all the Pagan deities, male and female, melt into each other, and at last into one, or two; for it seems a well-founded opinion that the whole crowd of gods and goddesses were only the powers of nature and principally those of the sun, expressed in a variety of ways."

It is easy to see how the changes of the seasons became the basis of the ancient mysteries. The death

of the summer was followed by a resurrection in spring. The spiritual bearings of these phenomena are obvious. As the mysterious rotting of the seed in earth gave rise to new life, so the rotting of the body in the grave was fraught with hope of a life to come. The analogies were so natural and evident that they were adopted by all the Old World and have even come down to our own time. Generally, the bright gods were worshipped, but these same gods, as the sun declined in the ecliptic, descended to the shades and were there worshipped under other names. The forms of the myth are various, but the general story is that of a youth, a maiden, or a god, who is slain and goes to the shades but is afterwards restored. All symbolize the lost summer, which is brought back to earth as the sun ascends the "upper hemisphere" (Macrobius, Prichard, &c.). A writer on the subject says: "It is a well-known fact intimately connected with the different religions of Greece and Asia Minor that during the times of the harvest in autumn, and again in the season of sowing, in spring, the shepherds, the vintagers, and the people in general were accustomed to observe certain sacred festivals—the autumnal sad, the vernal joyous. These undoubtedly grew out of the deep sympathy between man and nature, over the decay and disappearance, the revival and return of vegetation." The myth appears variously in the stories of Ceres and Proserpine, Cupid and Psyche, Venus and Adonis, Cybele and Atis, Baldur and Hermod, Isis and Osiris, Ishtar and Hea, Salambo and Tammuz. All symbolize the disappearance or loss of the summer. The *Winter's Tale* is, therefore, the story of the lost summer.

Why did Shakespeare select this title for a play? What was there in the story that appealed to him? The play is supposed to have been suggested by Greene's

"Pandosto," and Baconian writers have found significance in Greene's title-page: "Pandosto: the Triumph of Time, wherein is discovered by a pleasant history, that although by the means of sinister fortune, Truth may be concealed, yet by Time, in spite of fortune, is most manifestly revealed. . . . *Temporis filia veritas.*" Undoubtedly this is significant. It is also significant that the lost one in the play is the daughter of Apollo and Harmony, or of Nature.*

Time, as Chorus, tells us that he "makes and unfolds error," and that his "news will be known when 'tis brought forth" (IV. i, 2 and 27). But how are we to connect the idea of the myth—the lost summer—with Perdita; in other words, with the poet's art? The answer to this, I think, is simple and obvious. We need only turn to the Sonnets to find the summer and its significance. The author's art is there figured for all time in vernal imagery:—

"How shall Summer's honey breath hold out
Against the wrackful siege of battering days?" (45)

"Never resting Time leads Summer on
To hideous winter,
Then, were not Summer's distillation left." (5)

"Making no Summer of another's green." (68)

"Yet not the lays of birds, nor the sweet smell,
Could make me any Summer's story tell." (98)

"Ere you were born was beauty's Summer dead." (104)

"Thy eternal Summer shall not fade." (18) †

If Imogen, a "piece of tender air," stands for the author's art, genius, or thought, Perdita, the lost summer, may stand for that which is figured in the Sonnets as "Summer's honey breath."

The minor analogies of the plays need not be dwelt

* "Great Nature, like his ancestry;" "Nature carved thee for her seal," &c.

† See Sonnets 5, 6, 18, 54, 56, 65, 68, 73, 97, 98, 102, 104.

upon, as they are sufficiently obvious. One point, however, may be noted. The "daughter" in each of the plays is of illustrious descent. Marina's derivation was from ancestors who stood equivalent with mighty kings, but "time hath rooted out my parentage and to the world and awkward casualties bound me in servitude" (V. 1, 85). Perdita is "too noble for this place," and "nothing she seems or does but smacks of something greater than herself." I find significance in this. Considering the condition of the stage in Bacon's time, I can understand how, if he wrote the plays, he might feel the imputation they lay under of being considered the work of a common player. In such circumstances it is natural that he would insist upon their more worthy origin. There is also significance in Apollo's oracle that "Leontes shall not have an heir till his lost child be found."

A word remains to be said. It may be supposed that I bear down too hard upon the mythologic theory, that I attach too much weight to it. To those who may be of this opinion I can only say, Read the writers of the period. Read Peele, Spenser, Drayton, Drummond, Sidney, or any of the rest. Read Shakespeare. Read the "Phoenix and the Turtle," where an allegory, "sung to deep ears," is couched in solar symbology. The fact is, the Elizabethan writers were steeped in mythology. Mr. Grote says, "Myths were the sole mental stock of the early Greeks." The old classics were almost the sole mental pabulum of Shakespeare's time. Mythologic allegories were not the exception but the rule, and it requires a somewhat competent knowledge of mythology to read with intelligence the writers of that age.

C. G. HORNOR.

NOTE.—In thinking of the suggestions advanced in the above paper, I will confess that I have a tendency

to regard them as fanciful or even trivial. I am sufficiently sceptical. Although I have read Baconian literature for years, I am not a Baconian, simply because I regard the evidence as insufficient, and after each new argument I return with the Scotch verdict—"not proven." In spite of this, the facts remain. The *Winter's Tale* is an allegory of the lost summer. Except upon some such theory I see no propriety in the title at all. Taking the mere story of the play, why should it be called a *Winter's Tale*? I can see no reason. The symbology of the play is surely what I have represented it to be. Leo is certainly the symbol of the sun, as every reader knows, and as anyone may verify by turning to the almanac, where it stands to this day as the sign of August in the zodiac. Hermione is certainly Harmonia, or Harmony. She was the daughter of Mars and Venus—in other words, of "strife and desire," or Chaos and Love, that is, Nature, or Creation. The myth is perfectly well known, as is also the Heraclitic formula quoted. The meaning of the myth is perfectly plain. Everyone at all versed in philosophy knows that the myth has a valid metaphysical basis which has been accepted as fundamental by every thinker from Empedocles to Herbert Spencer. The sun myth has no doubt been overworked, but it still has plenty of vitality. On the scientific side it holds its own ("We are all souls of fire and children of the sun"—Helmholtz), and, even on the religious side, it is not at all a bad religion. Eliminating the merely emotional and accidental—a large elision—and regarding religion as an attempt by man to account for his condition in life on earth, candour compels the admission that there is one organic concept common to Egypt, India and Greece, and which, however illogical, is the basis of our own religion. I mean the emergence of the soul in matter and its release, or the fall of man and the re-

demption, as the Bible has it. I think it is good religion, although, perhaps, not very good philosophy. This, however, is not the point. The myth *does* afford Shakespeare a title. The meaning of the myth is what I say. The symbology is solar. Leo, the sun, stands for Apollo. Apollo is the god of music and poetry. Hermione means harmony, music, also nature. Perdita, the lost one, is the offspring of these two personifications. The *Tale* is the story of the lost summer, and in the Sonnets the poet's art is figured under this name. The argument may seem trivial, but in the face of these facts what are we to say?—
C. G. H.

JUSTICE SHALLOW.

ALL orthodox believers in, or easy-going acceptors of, the traditional authorship of the "Shakespeare" plays, seem to be convinced that the diverting picture of the above-named worthy as drawn in the second part of *King Henry IV.* and in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, is but a satirical holding up to ridicule, under another name, of Sir Thomas Lucy, of Charlecote, in revenge for that magistrate's treatment of the supposed author's supposed deer-stealing in his supposed park. It is amusing, however, when one comes to examine it, upon what slight—one might say "shallow"—grounds such a surmise is based. For there seems nothing in the character of the Warwickshire magnate or in the circumstances of his life, so far as we know anything of them, to warrant the picture which the playwright has drawn of him, if picture of him it is intended to be. For what is that picture? It is one of a pompous idiot—a shallow, insignificant country Justice—puffed up with family pride, as

ignorant as he is self-important, and with lofty pretensions of having been a roaring blade in his youth, etc. Now, we know very little, it is true, of the life and character of Sir Thomas Lucy, but that little is so utterly unlike the above picture that it seems impossible to believe that he could have been the original of it. Of course, it will be said that the sketch is a caricature, let who will be the original. That no doubt is so, for the artist was drawing for the gallery, who like bold outlines. But even in caricature there should be an element of artistic truth, and there seems positively none in this case. For, judging from what we can learn of the Knight of Charlecote, everything tends to show that his character was not the ideal but the very antithesis of the one here drawn of him. Proud, it is safe to say, he was; and rightly so, of his long and honourable descent, but his pride would be just of that kind most likely to keep him free from the petty vanity and conceit of his supposed likeness. There would be no need for him to assert his right to heraldic distinction—a right hereditary in his family for generations. Then he would probably be the last person in the world to boast of his early peccadillos, even if he had had any, for after the strictest sect of our religion he had been brought up a Puritan. Even Mr. Sidney Lee, who still thinks him the proto-type of Shallow, admits that. From the year 1545, when he was thirteen years old, he had for his tutor John Foxe, the martyrologist, who, expelled from his tutorship at Oxford, found refuge at Charlecote, and “remained there till his pupil no longer needed instruction.” In 1552, when twenty years of age, he succeeded to the family’s large Warwickshire estates, and there is no suspicion of his ever having had the experience—good or bad—of life, wild or serious, about the Inns of Court, familiarity with which was the weak boast of his supposed pen-pictures.

His life from that time seems to have been that of a dignified and reputable country gentleman, regularly, and, as far as we know, efficiently, performing his duties as a Justice of the Peace and a Commissioner of Musters for the county. He also "lived on good terms" (as Mr. Lee admits) with the neighbouring gentry, including the learned and fastidious poet and man of letters, Fulke Greville. Fancy the prototype of Shallow—the "starved justice," the "vice's dogger," liar and rake of the plays—tolerated in the refined company of the biographer and friend of Sidney!

The Rev. Frederick Leigh Colville places—and rightly—Sir Thomas Lucy amongst the "worthies of Warwickshire," though he is wrong in identifying him—the dates forbid it—with the Sir Thomas of the same name of whom Bishop Latimer wrote, "There be too few such gentlemen in the king's realm." But it may be doubted, from all we can gather of "Shakespeare's knight," whether he was not equally deserving of the eulogium.

But besides being a Justice of the Peace and in many other ways a local magnate of distinction, Sir Thomas was a knight of the shire for Warwickshire, representing that county in Parliament in the important session of 1584—5, and in 1586 was one of those entrusted with the onerous duty of conducting Mary Queen of Scots to Fotheringay. Fancy the prototype of the Clement's Inn roysterer, the "Sir Dagonet in Arthur's show," taking part in such proceeding!

There is, indeed, nothing in the presentment of Shallow in the plays to connect him in any way with the sober knight of Warwickshire, except the well-known heraldic jocularities and a reference to a deer-stealing incident, and these, I think, disappear on close examination. For, though the satirist blazons the shallow coat with the *lines* of Charlecote, he endows it

with a "dozen," not three, the peculiar distinction of the latter. Then, as to the deer-stealing incident, if Shallow is to represent Lucy in the play, to be consistent, the deer-stealer should be the Stratford youth, or someone clearly personifying him. But who is it to whom the fictitious Shallow addresses the charge, "You have beaten my men, killed my deer, and broke open my lodge?" Why, not to anyone who would by any possibility suggest to the audience of those days the young Stratford depredator, but to Sir John Falstaff, the fat knight, the very last figure, one would suppose, under which anyone would look for the "gentle Shakespeare!"

So far I have made no allusion to the fact that the fictitious Shallow hails not from Warwickshire but Gloucestershire. Surely, if he is to represent the Knight of Charlecote, that is extraordinary. Of course, it may be said—perhaps has been said—that this geographical change of scene is of set purpose—done as a blind to make the reference to the original not too pointed. But that, it seems to me, would be to defeat the whole object of the scene, if that were to show up and bring into ridicule the Warwickshire *bête noire*. What would be the use of so disguising the intended object of the satire that no one not provided with the powerful glasses of modern Shakespearean critics could recognise its individuality?

Then there are other differences which, I think, would have been avoided if the intention of the Play-writer was to identify the Warwickshire with the Gloucestershire Justice. It was necessary, of course, if any disguise was needed, to make some change of surname, and Shallow for Lucy would serve very well if the latter were the sort of person he really (as we have seen) was *not*. But why a change of Christian name? Why was not the supposed presentment "Thomas"

and not (as he was emphatically) *Robert*? And why was the Warwickshire knight (*Miles*) transformed into a Gloucestershire squire (*Armiger*)? Why was all this disguise adopted, only too calculated, as I have suggested, to defeat the very object supposed to be in view? Truly, I see no answer to these questions but one, and that is that the connection between the fictitious Shallow and the real Lucy is a purely imaginary one, based on that series of assumptions which forms the beginning, middle and end of the whole "orthodox" theory of the genesis of the great Shakespearean plays.

But was there any contemporary notion that Shallow meant Lucy? Is there any evidence of such a fact? I, for one, can find no particle. On the other hand I think there is some evidence to the contrary; that is to say, that Shallow did *not* mean Lucy. I do not know whether it has ever been referred to before in the course of Baconian controversy, but in the "Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1598—1601," p. 502, there is a letter from Sir Charles Percy (the "Sir" is queried, but there can be no doubt that it is he) to Mr. Carlington (Dudley Carleton?) which, I think, throws some clear light on this point. It runs thus:—

"I am so pestered with country business that I cannot come to London. If I stay here long you will find me so dull that I shall be taken for Justice Silence or Justice Shallow; therefore take pity of me and send me news from time to time, the knowledge of which, though perhaps it will not exempt me from the position of a Justice Shallow at London, yet will make me pass for a very sufficient gentleman in Gloucestershire. If I do not always answer, pray do not desist from your charitable office, that place being so fruitful and here so barren that it will make my head ache for invention. Direct your letters to the Three Cups in Bread Street, where I have taken orders for sending them down.

You need not forbear sending news hither in respect of their staleness, for I assure you they will be very new here."

Now the writer of this, Sir Charles Percy, was closely connected with the Lucy family, and his arms are quartered with theirs on his tombstone at Dumbleton, whence this letter is dated. Would he, I would ask, have written so jocularly of Masters Silence and Shallow if, under the name of the latter, he was aware that an honoured relative was at that time (it was just after the first publication of the plays) being held up to ridicule? Plainly he had no suspicion of such a thing, and if not he—so greedy a seeker after news and in communication with one so capable of supplying it—who then? Surely not the "man in the street" or the mixed audiences of those days who flocked to Bankside or Blackfriars to laugh at the butt of the railleries of the fat knight and who did not care who were the characters represented so long as they were amusing.

But if Shallow were not Lucy whom did he represent? In my humble opinion we have not far to go to find the original. Amongst the "armigeri" and "generosi" who flocked to the Inns of Court and Chancery from country places, nominally to pick up a "bit of law," but in reality to see a "bit of London life," which should magnify their importance in the eyes of their neighbours on their return, there were probably many "Shallows," and, if so, who so likely to take a note of them as that keenest of observers, Francis Bacon, who for the best part of his life lived surrounded by them, and who included in his *Omne Scibite*, the study of humanity in all its phases. Doubtless from amongst these he selected "Robert Shallow, of Clements' Inn and the County of Gloucester, Esquire" (he had, perhaps, seen many such entries on the Registers of his Inn) as a particularly fit subject for one

of the purposes he had in view in the play he had on hand—the satyrizing, that is to say, of the weakness of the Country Bench—and drew him from life, just as in another place he drew “Dogberry,” to call attention to the shortcomings of the country police of the day.

This I take to have been the genesis of Shallow, a striking exemplification, amongst a thousand others, of Bacon’s professed method of using the stage for educating men’s minds to virtue; in other words, of “moralizing in motley.”

The prototype of Shallow would, we may conceive, be well known to the wits of the Inns of Court and be recognised by them in his stage dress. Is it not conceivable also that Sir Charles Percy, who was one of them, and who wrote the letter given above, may have come upon him “down Dumbleton way?” There is something in the way that letter reads which suggests a suspicion of it.

JOHN HUTCHINSON, M. T. Library.

AN INTERESTING LETTER TO YOUNG FRANCIS BACON.

THE following letter, written by Sir Thomas Bodley to Francis Bacon whilst the latter was travelling in France, is No. ccxxxii. of "Reliquiæ Bodleianæ." It is not mentioned by Mallet, Montague, Dixon, Spedding, or any of Bacon's biographers. Yet it is of great interest, for it shows that young Bacon was ill-provided with funds, and the curious may wonder how it came about that his cousin, Sir Thomas Bodley, was supplying his needs. According to Spedding, Sir Amias Paulet landed at Calais on the 25th of September, 1576, and Bacon was in Paris in February, 1578-9, and left for England on the 20th of March in that year. So Bacon was at Orleans on the 19th October, 1577, and the letter was addressed to him in France after the following 18th of December.

MY DEAR COUSIN,—According to your request in your letter (dated the 19th October at Orleans, I received here the 18th of December), I have sent you by your merchant £30 (the thirty is written thus 301) sterling for your present supply, and had sent you a greater sum, but that my extraordinary charge this year *hath utterly unfurnished me*. And now, cousin, though I will be no *severe* exactor of the account, either of your money or time, yet for the love I bear you, I am very desirous, both to satisfy myself, and your friends how you prosper in your travels, and how you find yourself bettered thereby, either in knowledge of God, or of the world; the rather, because the Days you have already spent abroad, are now both sufficient to give you Light, how to fix yourself and end with counsel, and accordingly to shape your course constantly unto it. Besides, it is a vulgar scandal unto the travellers, that few return more religious (narrow, *editor*) than they went forth; wherein both my Hope and Request is to you, that your principal care be to hold your Foundation, and to make no other use of informing your self in the corruptions and superstitions of other nations, than only

thereby to engage your own heart more firmly to the Truth. You live indeed in a country of two several professions, and you shall return a Novice, if you be not able to give an account of the Ordinances, strength, and progress of each, in Reputation, and Party, and how both are supported, ballanced and managed by the state, as being the contrary humours, in the Temper of Predominancy whercof, the Health or Disease of that Body doth consist. These things you will observe, not only as an *Englishman*, whom it may concern, to what interest his country may expect in the consciences of their Neighbours ; but also, as a Christian, to consider both the beauties and blemishes, the hopes and dangers of the *church* in all places. Now for the world, I know it *too* well, to persuade you to dive into the practices thereof ; rather stand upon your own guard, against all that attempt you there unto, or may practise upon you in your Conscience, Reputation, or your Purse. Resolve, no Man is wise or safe, but he that is honest : And let this Persuasion turn your studies and observations from the Complement and Impostures of the debased age, to more real grounds of wisdom, gathered out of the story of Times past, and out of the government of the present state. Your guide to this, is the knowledge of the country and the people among whom ye live ; For the country though you cannot see all places, yet if, as you pass along, you enquire carefully, and further help yourself with Books that are written of the cosmography of those parts, you shall sufficiently gather the strength, Riches, Traffick, Havens, Shipping, *commodities*, vent, and the wants and disadvantages of places. Wherein also, for your good hereafter, and for your friends, it will befit to note their buildings, Furnitures, Entertainments ; all their Husbandry, and ingenious inventions, in whatsoever concerneth either Pleasure or Profit.

For the people, your traffick among them, while you learn their language, will sufficiently instruct you in their Habilities, Dispositions, and Humours, if you a little enlarge the Privacy of your own Nature, to seek acquaintance with the best sort of strangers, and *restrain* your *Affections* and Participation, for your own countrymen of whatsoever condition.

In the story of France, you have a *large and pleasant Field* in three lines of their Kings, to observe their alliances and successions, their *Conquests*, their Wars, *especially with us* ; their Councils, their treaties ; and all Rules and examples of experiences and Wisdom, which may be Lights and Remembrances to you hereafter, to Judge of all occurants both at home and abroad.

X

Lastly, for the Government, your end must *not be like an* Intelligencer, to spend all your time in fishing after the present News, Humours, Graces, *or* Disgraces of Court, which happily may change before you come home home; but your letter and more constant ground will be, to know the Consanguinities, Alliances, and Estates of their Princes; Proportion between the Nobility and Magistracy; the Constitutions of their Courts of Justice; the state of the Laws, as well for the making as the execution thereof: How the Sovereignty of the King infuseth itself into all Acts and Ordinances; how many ways they lay Impositions and Taxations, and gather Revenues to the *Crown*.

What be the Liberties and Servitudes of all degrees; what Discipline and Preparations for wars; what Invention for increase of Traffick at home, for multiplying their commodities, encouraging Arts and Manufactures, or of worth in any kind. Also what Establishment, to prevent the *Necessities* and *Discontentment of People*, To cut off suits at Law, and Duels, to suppress thieves and all Disorders.

X To be short, because my purpose is not to bring all your Observations to Heads, but only by these few to let you know what manner of Return your Friends expect *from you*; let me, for all these and all the rest, give you this one Note, which I desire you to observe as the Counsels of a Friend, *Not* to spend your Spirits, and the *precious* time of your Travel, in a Captious Prejudice and censuring of all things, nor in an Infectious Collection of base Vices and Fashions of Men and Women, or general corruption of these times, which will be of use only Among Humorists, for jests and Table-Talk: but rather strain your Wits and Industry soundly to instruct your-self in all things between *Heaven and Earth* which may tend to Virtue, Wisdom, and Honour, and which may make your life more profitable to your country, and yourself more comfortable to your friends, and acceptable to God. And to conclude, let all these Riches be treasured up, not only in your memory, where time may lessen your stock; but rather in good writings, and Books of Account, which will *keep* them safe for your use hereafter.

And if in this time of your liberal Traffick, you will give me any advertizement of your commodities in these kinds, I will make you as liberal a Return from my self and your Friends here, as I shall be able.

And so commending all your good Endeavours, to him that must either *wither* or *prosper* them, I very kindly bid you farewell.

Your's to be commanded,

THOMAS BODLEY.

DAS KLASSISCHE IN HAMLET.

THE publication of Dr. Konrad Meier's learned and original work on the classic elements in *Hamlet*, has already been referred to in this journal. The early publication of a translation by Dr. R. M. Theobald is announced. The English translation, moreover, will not be a mere reproduction of the German original. Owing to the circumstances under which that was published, the author was compelled to restrict himself within narrower limits than he desired for the full exposition of his theme. For the translation no such limitation is necessary, and Dr. Meier will add for the English translation a large amount of material which he could not use. He will also in a concluding chapter clearly enunciate the formerly suppressed conclusion, that the scientific and classic scholarship shown in *Hamlet* points to Bacon as the only possible author. Dr. Meier is no half-hearted Baconian; he is an Associate of the Society, and on 11th November read a paper to the Dresden Philological Society entirely devoted to Dr. Theobald's "*Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light*." In his *Hamlet* notes he refers to all the successive editions of *Hamlet*, each more rich in classic allusion than its predecessor, beginning with the Ur-Hamlet published in Albert Cohn's "Shakespeare in Germany," and then the Early Quartos and finally the 1623 Folio. The first chapter deals with the mythological allusions. The second refers to the personal allusions. The third to the philosophical allusions. The fourth to the general, rhetorical allusions, the verbal and propositional echoes and correspondencies, resemblances in thought or expression. It is stated that this work will probably take classic rank among the annotated editions of *Hamlet*, as the most complete and learned collection of *Hamlet* notes published. One of

those books which cannot be left out in any well-equipped Shakespearean library.

One of the most distinctive and original features of Dr. Meier's book is his contention that the drama of *Hamlet* especially represents the Reformation period in life and learning. The two most important characters are Hamlet and Horatio, who are Wittenberg students; so are Rosenkrantz and Guildenstern. The University of Wittenberg was the most intellectual centre of Reformation learning and literature, and Philip Melancthon was its most illustrious representative. Consequently the speeches of its Wittenberg students are crowded with (hitherto unnoticed) citations or borrowings from the works of Melancthon. This gives them their most copious classic allusions. Erasmus also represents the same period and the same influences. Dr. Meier has pointed out the curious circumstance that the name *Philipp* is to be found in the Northumberland House manuscript, exactly over the Latin quotation.

Multis annis jam transactis
 Nulla fides est in pactis
 Mel more, verba lactis,
 Fel in corde, fraus in factis.

And these lines are to be found in *Philip Melancthon's* works.

A very admirable imitation of these lines may be seen in *Love's Labour's Lost*, Act V., scene ii. 230—237, where honey, milk and sugar are coupled with gall.

SONNETS XXIII.—XXVI.

A CONTRIBUTOR (R.D.) to the *Westminster Gazette* propounds a very interesting theory as to the Sonnets Nos. 23—26, which he suggests refer to the poet's literary work. He points out that in No. 26 ("Lord of my Love") Dr. Drake detected a resemblance to the dedication of "Lucrece," and that in No. 23 ("As an Imperfect Actor," etc.) the last six lines refer to a written poem, whilst the reference to the pleading tongue is suggestive enough of *Venus and Adonis* to justify the conjecture that the writer is here again referring to his own work.

R.D. maintains that the accepted explanation as to No. 25 ("Let those who are in favour with their stars"), which is generally thought to be of a piece with the many other protestations of love or devotion to his patron, *may be incorrect*.

"Surely," says the writer, "the argument is rather that of Ovid's *Elegy*, from which Shakespeare took the motto that is printed on the title page of his first published work, *Venus and Adonis* :

"Vilia miretur vulgus mihi flavus Apollo
Pocula Castalia plena ministret aqua.

"The significance of this quotation has, I venture to think, been rather overlooked; at all events, I cannot at the moment recall ever having seen it mentioned with reference to its context in any Shakespearian commentary. The opening lines are thus translated by Ben Jonson, and put into the mouth of the young Ovid in the opening scene of the *Poetaster* :

"Envy, why twit'st thou me my time spent ill?
And call'st my verse fruits of an idle quill?
Or that, unlike the race from which I sprung,
War's dusty honours I pursue not young?
Or that I study not the tedious laws

And prostitute my voice in every cause?
 Thy scope is mortal, mine eternal fame
 Which through the world shall ever chaunt my name.

“Though the comparison with Ovid need not be pressed too far, it may be recalled that Shakespeare seems to have had some excuse for selecting the passage in question as his motto, or we might say even his manifesto, in making his first appearance in the poetical lists; for at a later period of his career, when applying to the Heralds’ College for a grant of arms, he claimed descent from the Ardens; while for his legal knowledge, and the probability that he practised the profession of the law in his youth, abundance of evidence has been adduced by both Lord Campbell and Professor Churton Collins.”

Of course if R.D. could accept the view that Francis Bacon was the writer of the Sonnets, how reasonable and forcible his interpretation becomes. The descent from the Ardens is rather a long journey. “War’s dusty honours” would certainly require some more auspicious prototype, and as for the legal attainments of the poet, well—that is the old way of reasoning backwards. The poet had, as Lord Chief Justice Campbell said, “a deep technical knowledge of the law,” and an easy familiarity with “some of the most abstruse proceedings in English jurisprudence,” and therefore, because William Shakspeare wrote the Sonnets and plays he must have “practised the profession of the Law in his youth.” But not a shred of evidence is to be found that the actor had a speaking acquaintance with the practice of the law, let alone “a deep technical knowledge.”

R.D. proceeds :—

“That he should ‘unlooked-for joy in that he honoured most’ and be happy to ‘love and be beloved where he might not remove nor be removed’ sounds much more

like the young Ovid than the obsequious Shakespeare flattering a patron (even if he were not a great prince) by such different means as this, for instance :

“ Wretched in this alone that thou may'st take
All this away and me most wretched make.

“ It may have been that the sharp reverse experienced in 1593 (a probable date for this group of Sonnets) by his patron's aspiring friend, Francis Bacon, in the matter of the Queen's subsidy, impressed the poet with the uncertainty of the favours of great princes, and recalled to his mind the motto he had set out with and the elegy he took it from :

“ But Heavenly Poesy no death can fear
Kings shall give place to it . . .

“ This, it seems to me, is the spirit in which the Sonnet is written, and which is summed up in its concluding couplet—the poet's content with his muse, from whom no one may divorce him, no accident separate him.”

R.D. correctly identifies Ovid Junior as the writer of the Sonnets. The first scene of the *Poetaster* opens with Ovid Junior sitting in his study, with Luscus, the faithful servant of the family, gesticulating in the background. Young Ovid is repeating to himself some verses which he has written when Luscus breaks in :

Young master, master Ovid, do you heare? Gods a mee!
Away with your *songs* and *sonnets* and on with your gowne and
cappe quickly: here, here, your father will be a man of this roome
presently. Come, nay, nay, nay, nay, be briefe. These verse
too, a poyson on them, I cannot abide 'hem, they make mee
readie to cast, by the banks of *helicon*. Nay, looke what
a rascally untoward thing this *poetrie* is; I could tear 'hem now.

Ovid : Give me, how neere's my father ?

Luscus : Hart a'man : get a law book in your hand, I will not
answere you else. Why so : now there's some formalitie in you.
By Jove, and three or four of the gods more, I am right of mine
olde masters humour for that; this villanous *poetrie* will undo
you by the welkin.

There is very little flavour of Stratford about this.

R.D. may not have seen an essay published anonymously in 1899 under the title of Shakespeare-Bacon. The writer is in accord with the suggestion that Ovid Junior is intended to represent the writer of the sonnets. "A caricature of some notable Elizabethan Poet" is the description of the character.

"In my opinion," says the anonymous author of the essay, "Jonson's Ovid Junior was invented or designed to excite laughter at the expense of a distinguished contemporary 'wit,' who though less of a scholar in the academic sense, was probably more of a poet by many degrees than Jonson himself."

Of whom was the caricature drawn?

"Of the author of the sonnets," replies R.D.

There is only one step more to be taken. Identify Ovid Junior with a man of the time. Let R.D. spend a lifetime in attempting to get Mr. William Shakspeare into the character and he will be no nearer at the end than he was at the beginning. Let him try Francis Bacon and it will only take a few minutes to prove that the costume was made for him.

"All roads lead to Rome" is the old Roman saying, and how remarkable it is that commentators on Shakespeare cannot restrain their pen from writing the name of Francis Bacon. "It may have been that the sharp reverse experienced in 1593 by his patrons aspiring friend Francis Bacon on the matter of the Queen's subsidy impressed the poet with the uncertainty of the favours of great princes and recalled to his mind the motto he had set out with." Omit the words "by his patrons aspiring friend" and substitute "him" for "the poet" and R.D. has given an excellent and apparently an original explanation of Sonnets XXIII.—XXVI. which will live.

THE 1622 EDITION OF *HENRY VII.*

MRS. KINDERSLEY, writing in No. 11, Vol. III. (July, 1905) of *BACONIANA*, pointed out that she had found on examining several copies of the 1622 edition of *Henry VII.* that there existed differences in the setting up of the type.

There are two copies of this edition in the Society's library and a careful comparison of them has been made with a third copy. The italics in each of the three differ from the others. In no case so far has there been discovered complete disagreement. In some instances A and B will agree and C be different. In other cases A and C will be in accord and B will be at variance with them. It is difficult to suggest an explanation, as there appears to be uniformity in the Roman type.

A suggestion has been made that every member possessing a copy of the 1622 edition should be invited to lend it to the Society for say 14 days, in order that it may be compared with other copies of the same work. It would be a great sight to see a hundred copies stacked up on the library table; never since they were first published has such a sight been seen. The statistics of their points of difference and agreement might lead to interesting developments. How many distinct printings of the edition took place? There were at least three.

NOTES, QUERIES, AND CORRESPONDENCE.

"Euphues the Peripatetician" *

MR. PARKER WOODWARD is one of the stalwarts whose faith in the genuineness of Mrs. Gallup's Cipher Story has never wavered. "I make no apology," says he, "for having accepted the cipher story as true. It is the sign-post upon the lonely moorland; I have preferred to follow the road it indicates, and have not found it to fail. Let others wander into the bogs and tarns if they wish."

No impartial student will question the reality of these pitfalls. The facts brought forward in Judge Stotsenberg's *Impartial Study of the Shakespeare Title*, Mr. Crawford's *Collectanea*, and Mr. Bayley's *Shakespeare Symphony*, constitute of themselves alone a slough of despair from which one would welcome any reliable lead.

But while the Cipher Story may be admitted to be to a certain extent illuminative, on the other hand it creates fresh difficulties by its silences and omissions. Few, if any, Baconians believe that the pseudonyms claimed on the cipher are the real limits of Bacon's productiveness. Mr. Parker Woodward, for instance, finds himself compelled to add Lyly, Nash, Puitenham and Kyd to the list, and although he does not deal with any of these "authors" in an exhaustive manner, one must concede that the evidence he produces is very remarkable, and in some cases almost convincing.

Mr. Woodward brings out some very interesting facts about Greene. He might have added to this chapter some reference to Greene's lines from Mullidor's Madrigal in *Never too Late* :

Mon Dieu, aide moi !

* * *

Hé donc je serai un jeune roi
Trop belle pour moi, hélas, hélas !
Trop belle pour moi, voilà mon trépas !

These appear to lend colour to the statement made in the Bi-literal Cipher, that buried up in Word cipher are some French chansons addressed to Marguerite of Navarre.

Mr. Woodward hits off very happily the present position of orthodox opinion. Speaking of Bacon's "New Method," he observes "we can report it 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

* Gay & Bird, 198 pp., crn. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

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 labels as well!*”

Some of the chapters included in this volume were published originally in *BACONIANA*; these have been amplified and several new chapters added. “I do not hope,” says Mr. Woodward, “to capture general acceptance. No; I shall be content to have taken a small share in clearing the way for a few quiet people, enabling them to appreciate the work of the educator of his race and nation, and to follow up the investigation if inclined to do so.”

Whatever may be our own particular shade of opinion, one cannot but admire Mr. Woodward for the courage of his convictions and the charm with which he offers them for our examination.

TO THE EDITOR OF “*BACONIANA*.”

SIR,—Dr. Appleton Morgan is sending to “New Shakespeareana” chapters of his Autobiography which touch upon Shakespeare, and especially upon Bacon-Shakespeare matters. The whole will be of large interest to us Baconians, since Dr. Morgan has been in the thick of the great controversy for thirty years, and has known, either personally or by correspondence, all the protagonists. His own position has been (as *BACONIANA* recently informed us) of absolute hospitality to all schools of Shakespeare criticism, constructive or destructive, and he was not the first, I think, to contend that the Baconian theory was “The Higher Criticism of Shakespeare,” but in founding the New York Shakespeare Society announced that Baconians were Shakespeareans for the purposes of that Society and should always have the fullest hearing. He was the friend of Halliwell-Phillipps, whom Dr. Morgan declares was in no sense hostile to the Baconian hypothesis and expressed himself to him as interested to see what it would develop. Dr. Morgan thinks that Mr. Grant White was also very much shaken as to his belief in the man of Stratford by reason of his explorations in Stratford itself.

In the April, 1907, “New Shakespeareana” instalment of his autobiography Dr. Morgan suggests an entirely new proposition; that is, to say that Emerson, the friend of Carlyle and the greatest of American philosophers, was really the very earliest of American doubters, though not a *per se* Baconian investigator; in fact, that he it was who first inspired in Miss Delia Bacon the idea to the expounding of which she gave her life.

As proof, or at least as evidence tending to proof, Dr. Morgan shows that on every occasion when alluding to Shakespeare things at all, Emerson would dwell on the inadequacies in his biography to supply any opportunities or equipments for, or inducement to, literary production; and it certainly is improb-

able that a writer so little given to repetition as Emerson should so frequently refer to the one statement unless it were a favourite with him.

Dr. Morgan, however, appears to have overlooked a rather positive statement directly in point and confirming his theory, as it seems, exactly. In a letter to *The Republican*, a newspaper printed at Springfield, Massachusetts, for June, 1907, a Mr. Sanborn, a neighbour of Emerson's, has this to say: "It was a question with Emerson whether Shakespeare, the play-actor, could be reckoned the only author of the plays that go by his name."

I wonder if Emerson will now be added to "the half-educated Americans" who, according to Brandes, are the only persons, except "some women," who doubt, or the lunatics, idiots, half-baked, etc., etc., who the Book Reviewers tell us monopolise the hallucination that the greatest literature ever produced came from the offspring of "a bookless neighbourhood" (as Halliwell-Phillipps called Stratford-on-Avon). And speaking of "a bookless neighbourhood" may I suggest a field of investigation? May I suggest that in the records of Warwickshire Probates it would be interesting to discover what libraries or printed books there were in the vicinity of Stratford in and around Shakespeare's date? Books were costly possessions in those days and the inventories of testators or intestates would surely mention any literary properties.

Respectfully,

JOHN LANE.

Essex Fells, New Jersey.

Rawley's "Resuscitatio"

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—The above work is well known. It was "The Bringing into Publick Light several Pieces of the Works, Civil, Historical, Philosophical, and Theological, hitherto sleeping, of the Right Honourable Francis Bacon, Baron of Verulam, Viscount Saint Alban." The first edition was brought out by William Rawley, Bacon's amanuensis and chaplain, in 1657; and a second edition, with a dedication to Charles II., was brought out by Rawley in 1661. Rawley died in 1667, at the age of 79. A third edition was brought out in 1670, reproducing the second with Rawley's dedication to Charles II., but having attached to it a Second Part, now appearing for the first time, under the editorship of one Charles Molloy. There is a Dedication to the King and an Address to the Reader by Charles Molloy; and also a statement by the "Stationer to the Reader." The "stationer" was W. Lee, and in his statement he informs us that the second part of "Resuscitatio" was collected and designed by Doctor William Rawley. It is, however, with Molloy's Address to the Reader

that I am chiefly concerned. There is a Charles Molloy mentioned in the "Dictionary of National Biography," whom I take to be the same as the man of the "Resuscitatio." This Molloy was born in 1646, and died in 1690; he was entered at Lincoln's Inn on the last day of Trinity Term, 1663, and at Gray's Inn on the 28th June, 1669. In the books of Gray's Inn it is stated that in consequence of his previous standing at Lincoln's Inn, his admission was to date from the 7th Aug., 1667; perhaps his birthday when he was 21. He was the compiler of an extensive treatise on Maritime Law and Commerce, entitled "De Jure Maritimo et Navale." It seems to me likely that this is the same Charles Molloy as undertook to write the "Dedication" and "Address to the Reader" for the Second part of the "Resuscitatio," in 1670.

It is in the Address to the Reader that a passage occurs that is of very great interest to those who are trying to discover something of the mystery of Lord Bacon's life. The passage is as follows:—

"And though to live at another man's benevolence seems the smallest privilege of a Subject, and to dye at his own command the greatest Prerogative of a King, yet a base Heads-man shall not share so great a glory, as the Chopping of a Head enriched with so much policy and wisdom, but rather Justice herself shall seem to entreate no other hands in his stately execution than his Royal Master's mercy: which he no sooner besought but obtained, and then with a head filled up to the brim, as well with sorrow as wisdom, and covered and adorned with gray hairs, made a holy and humble retreat to the cool shades of rest, where he remained triumphant above fate and fortune, till heaven was pleased to summon him to a more glorious and triumphant rest. Nor shall his most excellent pieces part of which though dispersed and published at several times in his life time, now after his death lie buried in oblivion, but rather survive time, and as incense smell sweet in the nostrils of posterity."

The statement that Bacon "made a holy and humble retreat, into the cool shades of rest, where he remained triumphant above fate and fortune," is one that it is impossible to reconcile with the ordinarily accepted account of the last few years of his life, and with its termination in 1626. The date of his letter making his last appeal to King James, and after which he received forgiveness, was 30th July, 1624,* only about twenty months before the 9th April, 1626, the date given for his death. And during those twenty months he had in no sense made "a holy and humble retreat into the cool shades of rest." He was much in evidence, and was carrying on experiments in Natural History during the time of his residence in Lord Arundell's house at Highgate, when his life terminated. Indeed, so little had he retired into the "cool

* Stephen's "Letters," Ed. 1702, p. 298.

shades of rest," that he was summoned to King Charles' first Parliament in 1625.^o Note, too, how Molloy says, "Nor shall his most excellent pieces . . . *now* after his death lie buried in oblivion." This "*now*" does not seem appropriate if speaking of a death that occurred forty-four years before. The subject is very interesting, and the language used such as may well set men thinking—and perhaps was used with that intention.

GRANVILLE C. CUNINGHAM.

Who was "Captain Francis Bacon?"

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

IN "Howell's Familiar Letters" (David Nutt in the Strand, London, 1890) I find the following paragraph in Letter II., written by Howell and addressed "To my Father upon my first going beyond Sea :"

"Had I still continued Steward of the Glass-house in *Broadstreet* where Captain *Francis Bacon* hath succeeded me, I should in a short time have melted away to nothing among those hot *Venitians*, finding myself too green for such a Charge ; therefore it hath pleased God to dispose of me now to a condition more suitable to my Years, and that will, I hope, prove more advantageous to my future Fortunes."

The letter bears date March 1, 1618, and it seems that Howell had accepted employment from a company of "prime Lords of the Court" who had a patent for making glass with pit coal, as an "Agent abroad."

Now, who was this "Captain Francis Bacon?"

F. C. HUNT.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—May I make a suggestion that during the present winter arrangements should be made for more frequent meetings of members at the Society's rooms? One of my objects in joining the Society was to have an opportunity afforded me of meeting those who made a study of the literature of Bacon's period, exchanging views thereon, and receiving, and possibly giving, in some small degree, information. Much pleasure and advantage could be gained from such gatherings. The Society has excellent rooms, centrally situated, and if the Council would grant the facilities, I believe many of the members like myself would gladly avail themselves of the privilege. These meetings might have an important bearing on the future of the Society. The accomplish-

^o Mallet's "Life of Bacon," Ed. 1740, p. 113.

ment of the work contemplated requires many helpers and liberal supply of funds. I believe that enthusiasm on behalf of an object is stimulated more by contact with those who are influenced by similar objects and pursuits than by even a perusal of the columns of any journal. It would be very fitting if these meetings could be inaugurated on the anniversary of Bacon's birth, the 22nd of January. I believe that a circular of invitation sent out for that day would be largely responded to. The meetings at which papers are read and which are held in the drawing-rooms of lady members of the Society are admirable, but there is less of the freedom about them which one might hope to enjoy than would be the case at the Society's rooms. One other suggestion I should like to make, that members might be permitted to borrow books from the library.

A NEW MEMBER.

NOTES

THERE has been a breezy correspondence in the columns of the *Birmingham Daily Mail* on the claims made that Francis Bacon was the author of the Shakespeare plays, but it contains no new feature and is only referred to here by way of introducing a delightful criticism on Mr. Sidney Lee's last effort, "Shakespeare and the Modern Stage." One of the correspondents considered he closed all argument by quoting the dictum of Mr. Lee. "The opinion of Mr. Sidney Lee," he says, "admittedly the greatest living authority on Shakespeare, must always command respect and attention."

Not so says the New York Shakespeare Society, for in the last number of "New Shakespeareana" issued by them, the following paragraphs will be found:—

Books by Mr. Sidney Lee come not single spies, but in battalions. This last one (we mean, of course, the last so far, for we would not encourage the phantoms of hope) rejoices in the name of "Shakespeare and the Modern Stage;" "The Modern Stage," part of its title, being justified by a chapter or two of the cheapest and most common-place kind of newspaper criticism of a local actor—a Mr. Benson. While as to Shakespeare, the book, as is usual with Mr. Lee's product, there is nothing in it

that might not have been written two hundred and seventy-eight years ago. But jejune as it all is, even its repetition for the ten thousandth time is better than anything Mr. Lee gets into his own words. We read, for example, a sentence like this (page 30): "It was not merely the recognition of the critical and highly educated that Shakespeare received in person (*sic.*), it was by the voice of the half-educated populace, whose heart and intellect were once in the right, that he was acclaimed the greatest interpreter that literature had known." Letting pass Mr. Lee's slipshod English, one might comment that this was not only not true, but that, if it were true, then every line in every book in every Shakespeare library in Christendom is surplusage, and worse than valueless. If Shakespeare was known in his own day to be all that he has been discovered to be since, there not only never was any necessity of repeating it day by day for these three hundred years; no more necessity of writing more volumes—even of writing Mr. Lee's—than it is necessary to weary heaven and add a new tedium to existence by ceasing not to shout, day and night, that Queen Elizabeth was once a Queen of England! But of this statement Mr. Lee tells us (*ibid.*) "there is evidence." And we do Mr. Lee the justice of believing that he is trying to tell the truth and that he believes that he is telling the exact truth. Indeed, this is precisely the idea we have always had of Mr. Lee's calibre—that he understands the word "evidence" exactly to mean anything he copies out of anybody else's book to pad his own with. For if Mr. Lee has any capacity for, or tendency to undertake the toil of original research in Shakespeare fields, he certainly has been successful in concealing the fact in the Shakespeare literature he has so far manufactured. In the volume before us he makes quite as liberal use of Mr. Jusserand as he heretofore did of Dr. Halliwell-Phillips, though with the difference that he is polite enough to acknowledge his indebtedness. Mr. Lee's account of the various attempts made by Englishmen to erect at their own expense a monument to Shakespeare we have no means at hand to verify. As to the sporadic attempts of Englishmen to rear monuments to the dramatist at the expense of other nations on the plea that Shakespeare is "the World's Poet" (the appeals of late years have usually been headed by Dr. Furnivall) we once made some computation; noting also that upon their failure our English friends have invariably decided that Shakespeare was too great to need any

monument at all, that himself was his own best monument, &c., &c. In brief, this is only a binding up of more or less valueless things which Mr. Lee has written—for revenue no doubt. Its title, "Shakespeare and the Modern Stage," is to be justified, we suppose, by two perfunctory criticisms upon the acting of a Mr. John Benson. As Mr. Benson has never given us the pleasure of his performances in the United States, we cannot pronounce as to whether Mr. Lee's estimate of him is valid or otherwise.



A BOLT from the blue came into the midst of students of Shakespeare when it was announced that a new cypher had been discovered in the first folio edition of the plays, which held the secret that they were written by Henry Wriothesley, Earl of Southampton. Interviews with the discoverer were published in the daily Press, from which it appeared that the result so far had been to trace a cypher running through every play, showing that the author was Southampton and indicating that hiding-place of the MSS. of the plays. An invitation was sent by the Council of the Society to the discoverer, who is a schoolmaster at Willesden, asking if he would read a paper on the subject before the members.

The following reply was received :

"In reply to your favour, received this morning, I can say with pleasure, Yes, for one hundred pounds, cash down, on this day fortnight, the 3rd inst. I have the honour to be," &c.

"The rest is silence."



A CORRESPONDENT draws attention to a statement which he has frequently seen made without any authority being given. It is that copies of Napier's and Briggs' books on logarithms are extant with calculations therein in Bacon's own handwriting. He asks for information as to where such books are now deposited.



THE Duologue which appeared in the October number of BACONIANA was from the pen of Miss Alicia A. Leith. In that

Duologue on page 241 the word *Ogmius* was incorrectly spelt *Ogonius*.

• • •

MISS LEITH writes:—"A piece of important evidence *re Twelfth Night* has come to light. In 1906 I wrote two articles proving that Arabella Stuart was *Countess Olivia* in that play. Elton's 'Shakespeare,' p. 289, prints the fact that Arabella complained in 1610 of certain '*curnisi pubici*' intending to *put her into a play*."

• • •

THE 22nd of January this year will fall on a Wednesday and the Annual Dinner, inaugurated last year, of the Society will take place at Willis's Rooms, King Street, St. James's, when Mr. Granville C. Cuninghame will preside. After dinner "the immortal memory of Francis Bacon" will be honoured. During the evening, through the courtesy of Mrs. Buntin, it has been arranged that some of the songs of the period shall be rendered by eminent artists. This function should prove to be a very popular one. The Council hope, providing her health will permit, that Mrs. Pott will be present. It is just twenty-two years since she founded the Society, the first meeting having been held on the 18th of December, 1885. The tickets are 7/6 each, exclusive of wine. An early application to the Secretary is requested.

• * •

THE building up of the Society's library proceeds apace. The assistance of members in this work is solicited. Gifts of books of course would be very acceptable, but information as to books for sale which would be suitable will also be welcome. The greater part of the early controversial literature appeared in America, and many important works are seldom met with in this country. For instance, Nathaniel Hawthorne's "The Authorship of Shakespeare" is not often offered for sale. The Hon. Secretary will be glad to receive catalogues of second-hand booksellers, notices of auctions, where either early editions of Bacon's works or books upon the period are included. He will also be willing to assist members in the purchase of books which they may be desirous of obtaining.

• • •

SINCE when did the Treasurer of the Society become a dignitary of the Church? In an epitome of Shakespeare-Bacon literature by W. H. Wyman, which appeared some time ago in

"Shakespeariana," published in Philadelphia, a pamphlet by Mr. Francis Fearon is thus referred to: "Archdeacon Fearon gives in this pamphlet a very complete summary of all points favouring the anti-Shakespearian authorship."



A NEW edition of "The Diary of Master William Silence," by Judge Madden, has appeared. After ten years further study of the works of Shakespeare, the Vice-Chancellor of Dublin University thus dismisses the subject: "It is no part of my purpose to enter into a discussion of what is known as the Bacon-Shakespeare question. Had I been so minded I should have been deterred by the saying of my revered friend Provost Solomon: 'There is one more foolish than the man who believes that Bacon wrote Shakespeare—the man who argues with him.'" Had the Professor in mind the old saying that, He who fights and runs away lives to fight another day?



THERE are three men who have done Trojans' work to establish what is termed the internal evidence in favour of the Baconian authorship of the plays. They are Gervinus, extracts from whose commentaries are found in another column; George Brandes, who has from the plays constructed a life of the writer which in all its main features coincides chronologically with that of Bacon and differs at every point with that of Shakespeare; and G. Churton Collins, whose scholarly contributions to Shakespearean literature have demolished the Richard Farmer arguments, and who has, from the text of Ralph Walde Emerson, that the reputed writings of Shakespeare and his life were so utterly at variance that the twain cannot be united by a marriage ceremony, preached a series of sermons so powerful, so conclusive in their arguments, that he will ever be entitled to the reverence and homage of all Baconians.



A COLOSSAL work on papermarks has recently been published in Geneva, entitled: "Les Filigranes: Histoire des Marques du Papier des leur Apparition vers 1282 jusqu'en 1600." 4 Vols.; Geneva, 1907. Author, C. M. Briquet; price £8. These four volumes contain upwards of 12,000 illustrations. Mr. Bernard Quaritch is the English agent.

Obituary

MANY members of the Bacon Society will share the grief with which we have heard of the death of our greatly respected and well-accomplished representative in South Africa, Mr. Henry Stratford Caldecott, F.R.G.S., F.R.C.I. He had been in bad health for some time; he was a life-long sufferer from asthma, and this must have caused feebleness of the heart, for he died rather suddenly from heart-failure on Saturday, Nov. 30. He was born at Port Elizabeth in 1846, and received a liberal education at the colleges of Rondebosch and Grahamstown. He became the leading solicitor in Kimberley, and was associated with Mr. Rhodes and the leading gold and diamond merchants in Johannesburg. He married the sister of Mr. Sauer, well known in Transvaal politics; a highly accomplished lady, who had superintended the education of Miss Olive Schreiner. Mr. Caldecott was prominent in all movements connected with education and literary culture, and often lectured, especially on the Baconian question. He was in England in the year 1888, and we had the great pleasure of becoming acquainted, indeed intimate, with him and his family.

Mr. Caldecott was a very convinced and well-informed Baconian, and some of his researches and studies have been published in BACONIANA. He was especially interested in the Parnassus plays, and made a searching analysis of their history and relation to the Shakespeare drama. The July, 1896, No. of BACONIANA contains two brief papers from his pen, pp. 166 and 171; in one of them the Parnassus is employed to supply commentary on Shakespeare; and the No. for January, 1897, has another brief paper, p. 54. The writer of an obituary in the *Transvaal Leader* for Dec. 2 refers, without the ordinary vituperation, to Mr. Caldecott's Baconian belief: "He was a keen literary student, well versed in history, and as a student of Shakespeare had few equals in this country. Like many other disciples of the poet he was a believer in the Baconian theory." His funeral was attended by a large company, and the wreaths and garlands spoke of grief and esteem in all sections of society, for he made many friends, no enemies, and to know him was to love and revere him.

R. M. T.



BACONIANA.

VOL. VI. *Third Series.* APRIL, 1908.

No. 22.

BY the kindness of Messrs. Ellis and Elvey, of New Bond Street, we are allowed to publish a facsimile and transcription of an interesting personal document relating to Francis Bacon. It is an agreement by which the rent of an inn at Chelmsford (formerly the property of Benedict Barnham, a Sheriff of London) was to be divided between his four daughters and their husbands. The second daughter (Alice) became in 1606 the wife of Sir Francis Bacon.

TRANSCRIPTION.

. . . emorund[um] this Indented wryting witnesseth. Whereas the Messuage and Inn called the Fawkon in Chelmsford in the county of Essex late Benedict Barnham's esqr deceased is assigned to the right hob^{ble} Francis Lo: Verolam Lo: Chancellor of England and to the Lady Alice Verolam his wife for such estate and otherwise in such sorte as by Indent^{rs} in that behalf apeareth Nevertheles charged and chargeable to paie yearly one yearly rent of Sixtene ponde[s] by the yeare for equality of p[ar]tition unto Sr John Constable and Dame Dorothy his wife for such estate and estates as by Certeine quinquep[ar]tite Indent^{rs} of the date hereof apeareth. That now it is agreed by the p[ar]ties whose names are subscribed hereunto That if the said Messuage and Inn now bee or hereafter upon the expiration of the lease whereby the same is now Inioyed by the Tenante therefore shalbe of any better or more Yearly value then Sixtene ponde by the yeare. That then the said overplus of the said yearly value over and above Sixtene po[u]ndes p[er] Ann[um] is to be equally and ratably devided

amongest the said p[ar]ties (that is to saie) One fourth p[ar]te therof to the said Lo: Chauncellor and Lady Verolam for such estate as the said Messuage and Inn is to them and otherwise by their direction lymitted. And one other fourth parte therof to the Earle of Castlehaven and the Countesse his now wife for such estate as their p[ar]te of the Lands late the said Benedictes is to them limited. And one other fourth p[ar]te of the said overplus to the said Sr John Constable and Dame Dorothy his wife for such estate as they have in their parte of the Landes late the said Benedictes. And one other fourth p[ar]te to Sr William Soame and Dame Bridgett his wife for such estate as they have in their part of the Lande late the said Benedictes. And if the said Messuage and Inn now be not nor upon the expiration of the said Lease thereof shalbe of the cleere yearly value of Sixteene Pounce by the yeare wherby to answer the said yearly Rente of Sixtene pounce yearly to the said Sr John Constable and his wife as aforesaid That then it is also agreed by the said p[ar]ties That soe much only shalbe paid out of the said Inn as the same is reasonably worth, And that all such want and defect of value shalbe yearly ratably and p[ro]portionably paid by the said Lo: Chauncellor and Lady Verolam The Earle of Castlehaven and Countesse his wife and Sr William Soame and Dame Bridgett his wife and the heires of the said Lady Verolam of the said Countesse and of the said Dame Bridgett Soame unto the said Sr John Constable and Dame Dorothy his wife and the heires of the said Dame Dorothy. And as for the yearly value of the said Messuage and Inn, It is agreed that Allen and Tite the Surveyors who made the p[ar]tition of the said landes shall determyne therof.

In Wytnes wherof the said Lord Verolam Lo: Chauncellor of England and Lady Alice Verolam his wife the said Mervyn Lo: Andelay Earle of Castlehaven and Elizabeth Countesse of Castlehaven his wife Sr John Constable Kt. and Dame Dorothy his wife Sr William Soame Dame Bridget his wife have herunto subscribed their names the first day of May in the yeares of the raigne of our Sovereigne Lord James by the grace of god King of England Fraunce and Ireland defender of the faith &c the Eighteenth and of Scotland the three and fifteth

Fr. Verulam Canc
 Alice Verulam
 Jo: Constable
 Dorothy Constable

Castlehaven
 Eliza: Castlehaven
 W. Soame
 Bridget Soame

THE JEW OF MALTA

BY REV. WALTER BEGLEY.

THE results of the most advanced and latest criticisms on this play are,—

1. That it was written shortly after 1589: on account of the remark in the introduction before Act I., "Now the Guize is dead." The Duc de Guise was murdered December 23rd, 1588.

2. The first notice of its being played is of the date 26th February, 1592, when Henslowe's Diary records it as having brought in 50s.

3. It was entered in Stationers' Register on 17th May, 1594, but no proof exists that it was ever printed. Anyhow, no copies are recorded anywhere. Not till forty years later (1633) do we find it in print, when it was published by Thomas Heywood, the well-known dramatist, a contemporary of Marlowe.

4. The Jew of Malta (Barabas) is the prototype of the Jew of Venice (Shylock), and there is a closer connection of plot and character between the two Jews than was formerly noticed. Professor A. W. Ward says,—“In both Shakespeare's and Marlowe's plays the view inculcated is that, on the part of a Jew, fraud is the sign of his tribe, whereas on the part of Christians, counter-fraud, though accompanied by violence, is worthy of commendation. This I cannot but regard as the primary effect of the whole of either play.”

There are several things in *The Jew of Malta* which seem to point to the author of the Shakespeare plays. There is an odd passage in Act IV. scene i., where Ithamore, having, in conjunction with the Jew, Barabas, strangled Friar Barnardine, suggests that his corpse should not be left lying on the ground, but should be set up in a natural position. He does this on the stage, and then says to the Jew, his master,

“So, let him lean upon his staff; excellent, he stands as if he were begging of Bacon.” This passage would not suggest much were it not that Bacon is spelled with a capital B. This, conjoined with the singular way in which the word Bacon is introduced, apparently *a propos* of nothing, certainly renders it suspicious, and possibly cryptogrammatic.*

Another passage worth noticing comes two scenes later (Act IV., scene iv.), where Ithamore asks Bellamira to

“ . . . sail from hence to Grece, to lovely Greece,
I'll be thy Jason, thou my golden Fleece;
Where painted Carpets o're the meads are hurled,
And Bacchus' vineyards over-spread the world;
Where Woods and Forrests go in goodly green—
I'll be Adonis, thou shalt be Love's Queen.
The Meads, the Orchards, and the Primrose lanes,
Instead of Sedge and Reeds bear sugar-canes:
Thou in those Groves, by Dis above,
Shalt live with me and be my love.”

Now, this last line is the famous refrain of the still more famous *Passionate Shepherd*, which was first given to the world in a piratical publication by Jaggard in 1599, and was there attributed to Shakespeare. In the very next year (1600) it was included in that fine selection entitled *England's Helicon*, which evidently proceeded from Francis Bacon, helped by his brother Anthony, with the possible collaboration of Nicholas Ling and others. Now, here it was given to Christopher Marlow, and two new stanzas were added—the fourth and sixth—although Marlowe had been dead seven years. This has a strange appearance, and we are at once inclined to ask, Why did not Francis and Anthony

* Cf. Tit. Andronicus, V. i. 135, where the Jew, Aaron, says,—

“ Oft have I digged up dead men from their graves
And set them upright at their dear friends' doors.”

Bacon (assuming their connection with *England's Helicon*) give it to Shakespeare as Jaggard had so recently done? A possible answer seems to be that dead men tell no tales, and Marlowe's name at the end was much safer than Shakespeare's. We cannot exactly tell now how it was that Jaggard attributed this lyric and the rest of his piratical publication to Shakespeare. Perhaps he knew the stolen MS. came from a well-known scriptorium. But on the assumption of the Baconian authorship we can see how necessary it was that Jaggard's ascription of this popular lyric to Shakespeare should be annulled at the first opportunity.

Why? People would be saying that if Shakespeare was really the man who wrote *Come live with me and be my love*, then he was also, "by Dis above," the very man who wrote *The Jew of Malta*, with the well-known refrain, as long ago as 1589, perhaps, for they would have heard it on the stage as early as 1592; and it would also follow that Shakespeare was the author of the atheistical *Dr. Faustus* and other rather dangerous stage-plays, for which Marlowe was supposed to have sufficiently expiated by his untimely death. On this view there was every reason for the Bacons to assign the lyric to Marlowe, whether it were his or not.

Again, the affectionate relations between Barabas, the Jew, and his daughter, Abigail, remind us in many ways of Shylock and Jessica, and both may well have been suggested to Bacon from his frequent opportunities of acquaintance with Dr. Lopez, the Court physician, and some of his family, who were all daughters. Lopez had no son, and neither Barabas nor Shylock has a son brought into notice anywhere in the plays. Again, Barabas often speaks a kind of Judæo-Spanish lingo, and this piece of personal colour is much more likely to be put on him by Bacon, who must have had

frequent talks with Lopez, than by Marlowe, who had never any chance of meeting him.

There are also two lines in *The Jew of Malta* which remind me strongly of *Romeo and Juliet*, both in the circumstances they are uttered and in the words themselves.

Barabas comes in the darkness of night to visit his former house, where Abigail is immured as a nun, and to receive from her, if possible, his concealed bags of gold. After groping about he catches sight, as he thinks, of her at a high window, and thus soliloquises :

“ But stay, what star shines yonder in the east ?
The loadstar of my life, if Abigail.”

—Act II. scene i. 40.

Who does not remember the soliloquy of Romeo when he catches sight of his dearest treasure in a similar way ?

“ But soft ! what light through yonder window breaks ?
It is the East, and Julia is the Sun.”

Shylock, the Jew, in *The Merchant of Venice*, was traced back to Dr. Lopez as long ago as February, 1880, in *The Gentleman's Magazine*, and a great deal of ingenious supposition was brought forward to show that Shakespeare, who was well acquainted with Southampton, and probably also with Essex, “in their company . . . may not unfrequently have met the Doctor,” and, again, we hear that Shakespeare hit off the typical characteristics of a Jew to the very life, and “probably from Lopez.” This is Mr. Sidney Lee's theory as long ago as twenty-three years. He thinks Lopez, and his trial and fate, the models in the mind of the dramatist for several reasons. The name Antonio is suggestive, being a common Portuguese name, and, through Don Antonio, Lopez was brought to justice. Moreover, Shylock on the stage—or, rather, Burbage—

wore a peculiar kind of beard, which seems to have been an imitation of the beard of Dr. Lopez, for there is a portrait of the doctor in *A Thankfull Remembrance of God's Mercy*, published by Carleton, Bishop of Chichester, in 1627, where this same peculiar beard of Shylock is very noticeable.

Lopez moved in the highest Court circles on account of his reputation as a physician. He was no quack, and whether he was born in England or not, he belonged, at a comparatively early age, to the recently formed College of Physicians, having gained the rudiments of his profession in Italy. In 1575 he appears very high up in the list of the chief doctors in London quoted in Stow. He was married to a Jewess who had relations at Antwerp, and he was the father of a large family of daughters.

He had patients among the principal members of the aristocracy, but was for a long time specially attached to the household of Lord Leicester, who, as is well known, often had actors sent for to Kenilworth to amuse the guests there, and finally had a special licence for a company to be called "the Earl of Leicester's company of servants and players."

In 1586 he was appointed physician to Queen Elizabeth, and it appears from Walsingham's *Journal* (p. 12), and from various notices in the *State Papers*, that he was well acquainted with Sir Francis Walsingham and Lord Burghley, and often introduced his friends and kinsmen from abroad to the Lord Treasurer and Sir Robert Cecil. About the year 1588 there came to England a certain Don Antonio, as he was called, who had been a claimant, through illegitimate descent, to the crown of Portugal when the last king died. He had raised some supporters, and would, no doubt, have become king if Philip of Spain had not chased him out of the country. He first went to France, and coming

to England about the time of the Armada, he was received by the English people with great favour as one who had been unjustly treated by Philip. Don Antonio could only speak Portuguese, so that he required an interpreter, and through Essex, who had taken up the Don's cause very enthusiastically, the Queen asked Lopez to assist his communications, both in speech and writing. And thus, as Shakespeare knew Southampton, the great friend of Essex, very well, according to Mr. Sidney Lee, how very likely that he would also know Lopez and the peculiar character of his speech and manner.

Such ingenious Shakespearian inferences and arguments are, indeed, not up-to-date now. There is little room for Shakespeare's intimacy with Lopez and Southampton and Essex, whereas we know assuredly that Francis Bacon was closely intimate with two of them, and brought much in contact, at Court and elsewhere, with the Queen's physician. Indeed, Dr. Lopez was a man whose company Francis Bacon would be likely to seek for many reasons—intellectual and otherwise. I have a lurking suspicion that Essex, with the help of the Bacons, brought some rather Machiavellian policy into play against Lopez, the evidence of whose guilt does not seem to me sufficiently clear—but that is another tale. Essex was the one who persistently hurried Lopez to the gallows, and first found evidence against him. Possibly Lopez knew too much about Essex and his numerous intrigues with the maids of honour. We are told "Lopez made some very lewd suggestions" against someone who is not named in Bishop Carleton's account.*

Shylock's love for his daughter and his wife, Leah, well agree with the character of Lopez as we know it from the *State Papers*. Lopez was absent from Court,

* Cf. Carleton, *A Thankfull Remembrance*, p. 171.

and it turned out to be because the illness of his wife kept him at home, like a devoted husband. The family correspondence between England and Holland also shows that great domestic felicity which is so often noticeable among the well-to-do Jews and Jewesses. But again and again we seem to have Lopez's famous trial and death by hanging aimed at in Shakespeare's Shylock. For instance, the Jew of Venice is described as being infused with the spirit of a wolf lately hanged on the gallows for human slaughter, and his name is so frequently brought into connection with a "halter" that a reference seems implied to some event enacted at Tyburn, in which a Jew was concerned. The references in the play are *Merchant of Venice*, Act IV. scene i. 132, *et seq.* :—

" . . . thy currish spirit
Govern'd a wolf, who, hang'd for human slaughter,
Even from the gallows did his fell soul fleet,
And . . . infused itself in thee."

I wonder Mr. Lee, who noticed this reference so long ago, did not also notice that the personal name, *Lopez*, is equivalent to *Wolf*, for, looked at thus, the indication is much more telling—nay, almost certain—and very Baconian as well. The "halter" references in *The Merchant of Venice* are Act II. scene ii. 97 ; Act IV. scene i. 361, etc.

We know, as an historical fact, that Bacon and Essex were much brought into contact with Dr. Lopez, and the probability is that Bacon, with his numerous Court connections, had known the Court doctor for some years. How much more likely, then, that Bacon should write the two Jew plays than Marlowe or Shakespeare, who could have little or nothing to connect them with Lopez.

Shakespeare has in *Hamlet* (Q.): "With juyce of Hebona in a viall." Marlowe, in *The Jew of Malta*,

has: "The Juice of Hebon." This same Hebon, or Hebona, or Hebenon (F.), was a tremendous puzzler to the orthodox critics until Rev. W. A. Harrison read a most exhaustive paper (26 pp.) to show that the poison of the yew tree is meant. He proved his point out of most learned and rare books by an "array of authorities." He concluded his address by thus answering a supposed objector who might say, "I quite accept all you have so learnedly brought forward about the effects of yew poison; but where is your proof that Shakespeare knew all this?" To this the reverend lecturer answered, "I do not think it is incumbent upon me to furnish such proof. . . . I might retort that the burden of proof rests with those who assume that Shakespeare did not know it." This is an excellent specimen of the orthodox method.

The most colossal figures to be met with in the early Elizabethan drama are Tamburlaine, Faustus, and Barabas. There can be very little doubt that the author of these high-reaching models had studied Machiavelli very thoroughly. One has only to glance through what those excellent German critics Brandt and Edward Meyer say about the influence of the "Principe" on the Elizabethan drama generally to freely admit this. Now, since we know that Francis Bacon and his brother Anthony—and, indeed, all their chief friends and relations—were intensely interested in matters of State policy, we can, I think, safely say that Bacon was a likely author of these wonderful productions.

In corroboration let us hear what is said about the study of Machiavelli in France in 1577, the very time young Francis Bacon was crossing the Channel to spend a year or two of his life in that country.

It is an Englishman—one Simon Patericke—who makes the following remarks to the young men, Francis

Hastings and Edward Bacon (a half-brother of Francis through his father's first marriage), in the epistle dedicatory of a book addressed to him,—

“Moreover, Satan useth strangers of France as his fittest instruments, to infect us stil with this deadly poyson sent out of Italic, who have so highly promoted their Machivellian bookes, that he is of no reputation in the Court of France, which hath not *Machiavel's* writings at the fingers' ends, and that book in the Italian and French tongues, and can apply his precepts to all purposes, as the oracles of Apollo.”

Here was a school, indeed, for the author of *The Jew of Malta*. Did Marlowe ever have such a chance? Nay, do we not seem to hear Bacon's voice and Bacon's experience at the French Court in the opening lines of the famous *Tragedy of the Rich Jew of Malta*,—

“Albeit the world think Machiavel is dead,
Yet was his soul but flown beyond the Alps ;
And now the Guise is dead, is come from France,
To view this land and frolic with his friends.”

Anyhow, the author, in this prologue, thought Machiavelli had come to England from France, and Marlowe could not have imagined this half so well as Bacon, for Marlowe had little, if any, experience of the courtly life or courtly sentiments of France.

But it must not be forgotten that Marlowe had the reputation of having imbibed Machiaveli's principles, and was strictly and solemnly warned to give them up by Greene when leaving the world, and speaking from a bed of sorrow and repentance, and possibly the play *Macchiavelli*, now lost, was by Marlowe.

The external evidence for attributing the authorship of *The Jew of Malta* to Marlowe is very small. It depends on Thos. Heywood *only*, and his evidence, as is quite well known, is open to suspicion. If anyone will take the trouble to read Heywood's statement in the vestibule of the Jew of Malta when he intro-

duced it to the public after Bacon's death, it will, I think, be found unsatisfactory. But the *external* evidence for all the Marlowe plays is from many reasons so very weak that we are reduced, broadly speaking, to internal evidence only.

Finally, looking back at Tamburlaine, Faustus, and the Jew of Malta as a great connected and consecutive trilogy, we get additional evidence of an intuitional kind which tends to lead us to Francis Bacon rather than poor Kit Marlowe. We have in each case a one character drama, and the one character is a personification of a single great ruling passion.

Tamburlaine represents the lust for personal rule and dominion.

Faustus stands for the overwhelming desire for boundless knowledge.

Barabas, in *The Jew of Malta*, is the very personification of the fierce hunger for gold.

Now, each and all of these were at work in Francis Bacon's own personality in a higher degree, perhaps, than in any other man of that time, especially the first and second, as everyone knows, and as to gold, Bacon said, "Money was power first of all."

NOTE.

The Jew of Malta contains a large number of Shakespearean echoes, besides those referred to by Mr. Begley, and the style, the lyric beauty, the lavish wealth of knowledge and imagination, if they point to any author distinctively, certainly point to Bacon. Such parallels as the following are characteristically Shakespearean, whether they are found elsewhere or not:—

"Proteus for shapes, and Roscius for a tongue,
So could he speak—so vary."—*Prologue*.

Proteus, both as a proper name and as a symbolic

name, is constantly repeated in *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, and it occurs in 3 *Henry VI.* III. ii. 192.

Roscius is also in 3 *Henry VI.* V. vi. 10; also in *Hamlet* II. ii. 387.

Pygmalion is in the epilogue and in *Measure for Measure* III. ii. 42.

Swelling, produced by ambition, is remarkably Baconian and Shakespearean (see my "Shakespeare Studies," p. 238-9, 440, 453.)

This is repeated in Act IV. i. 6 in reference to poison.

Machiavelli, in his prologue, says, "There is no sin but ignorance." So do the Clown and Malvolio in *Twelfth Night* IV. iii. 41-45, and Lord Say in 2 *Henry VI.* IV. vii. 69.

Marlowe, Bacon, and Shakespeare all speak of money as *trash* (see I. i. 7, and "Shakespeare Studies," p. 271).

I can not tell—a particularly Baconian phrase—occurs also in I. i. 21st speech, and see "Shakespeare Studies," Chap. IV.

Barabas says:—

" Things past recovery

Are hardly cured with exclamations.

Be silent, daughter, sufferance needs ease.

—I. ii. 75th speech.

This is plentifully echoed in Shakespeare (see *Promus* 945, 951; also *Coriolanus* I. i. 20, and the *Promus* references).

A *reaching thought*, I. ii. 73rd speech, recalls the *reaching hand* of which Lord Say speaks (2 *Henry VI.* IV. vii. 76).

The word *exclaims*, as a noun, is in I. ii. 74th speech; also in *Richard II.* I. ii. 2, *Richard III.* I. ii. 52; IV. iv. 135.

Entreat 'em fair, I. i. 89th speech, is frequent in Marlowe and Shakespeare (see "Shakespeare Studies," p. 450).

Swift-footed time, II. i. 7, recalls swift course of time, *Two Gentlemen of Verona* I. iii. 23; swift foot of time, *As You Like It*, III. ii. 288, etc.

The raven and lark are coupled in II. ii. last speech, and in *Titus Andronicus* II. iii. 149; III. i. 158.

The Jew who says we

“Can fawn like spaniels when we please,
And when we grin we bite” (II. ii. speech 18)

is clearly echoed in

“Look, when he fawns he bites.”
—*Richard III.* I. iii. 290.

The serpent and the dove are both frequent in the two groups of writings.

When we read—

“What sparkle does it give without a fir?
The diamond that I talk of ne'er was piled.”
—II. ii. speech 29.

recalls *Promus* 89 with its large collection of parallels which, indeed, do not nearly exhaust the collection that might be made, both from Bacon and Shakespeare.

In Act V. scene ii. we find the familiar Baconian and Shakespearean echo, “Occasion's bald behind: slip not thine opportunity” (see *Promus*, 166, 856; “Bacon's Life,” VII. 179; and “*Essay of Delays*”).

Our critics are very fond of depreciating the significance of parallels or denying the reality of any pair if they are not textually identical. Whatever deductions, however, may be made from their import when *we* use them—(they are always highly important and convincing when *they* themselves use them)—at least we may assuredly claim that when there are a goodly number it proves that the two (supposed) writers possessed a good deal of the same mental furniture, and used it in a remarkably similar way. We are con-

tent that readers of ordinarily good sense shall determine the point at which similarity becomes identity. Some such point certainly exists, and if we *strain* our evidence perhaps our critics *dis-strain* it.

R. M. THEOBALD.

LETTER BY SIR THOMAS BODLEY

THE following letter written by Sir Thomas Bodley, from Fulham, to Sir Francis Bacon, is No. ccxxxiii. in the *Reliquiæ Bodleiana*. Spedding makes a passing reference to it in Vol. III. of the *Life and Letters*, page 365, for the purpose of fixing the date of a letter written by Bacon to Bodley. The *Cogitata et Visa* was published for the first time in 1653 by Grüter in Latin. It will be remembered that Mr. Edwin Reed in his *Francis Bacon, our Shakespeare*, draws attention to the remarkable discrepancies which exist between the text as published by Grüter and a manuscript copy of the *Cogitata* found about 1857 in the library of Queen's College, Oxford. This manuscript was undoubtedly genuine as there were on it corrections in Bacon's own handwriting. It contains reference to certain *Tabulæ Inveniendi*, which Bacon contemplated publishing, and which were to form the fourth part of his *Instauratio Magna*. Spedding says, "of the fourth part not even any fragment has come down to us." The whole of these references are omitted from the text published by Isaac Grüter. A full and most interesting account of these omissions will be found in the chapter in *Bacon's System of Philosophy* in Mr. Edwin Reed's work before referred to.

This letter contains that remarkable passage to which

the late Mr. G. C. Bompas drew attention in his *Problem of the Shakespeare Plays*, the great significance of which has perhaps not been sufficiently insisted upon by Baconians: "Which course (*i.e.*, diving yet deeper as it were into the bowels and secrets of nature) would to God (to whisper so much in your ears) you had followed at first, when you fell to the study of such a thing as was [not] worthy [of such a student." The words *to whisper so much in your ear* appear to suggest that the unworthy study, whatever it may have been, was considered a secret.

What a change has taken place in Bodley's attitude towards Bacon between the two letters. In the first he lectures the young man from a higher vantage ground, whilst in the second he has become deferential in his style of address.

A LETTER FROM SIR THOMAS BODLEY TO SIR FRANCIS
BACON, FULHAM, LONDON, FEBRUARY 19TH, 1607.

SIR

As soon as Term was ended, supposing your leisure to be more than before, I was coming to thank you two or three times, rather chusing to do it by Word than Letter, but was still disappointed of my purpose, as I am at this present upon an urgent occasion, which doth tie me fast to *Fulham*, and hath made me now determine to impart my Mind by writing. I think you know I have read your "*Cogitata & Visa*," which I have done with great Desire, reputing it to be a Token of your singular Love, that you joyued me with those of your chiefest Friends, to whom you would commend the first Perusal of your Draught; For which I pray you give me leave to say this; first, that if the depth of my Affection to your Person and Spirit, and to your Work and Words, and to all your abilities, were as highly to be valued, as your affection is to me, it might walk with your's arm in arm, and claim your Love by just Desert: But there can be no comparison, where our States are so uneven, and our means to demonstrate our Affections so different; in so much as for my own, I must leave it to be prized in the Nature that it is, and you shall find it evermore addicted to your worth.

As touching the subject of your book, you have set on foot so many rare and noble Speculations, as I cannot chuse but wonder (and shall wonder at it ever) that your Expence of time, considered in your Publick Profession, which hath in a manner no acquaintance with any Scholarship or Learning, you should have called out the Quintessence, and sucked up the Sap of the chiefest kinds of Learning: For howsoever in some Points you vary altogether from that which, and hath been ever the received Doctrine of the Schools; and was always by the wisest (as still they are deemed) of all Nations and Ages adjudged the truest; yet it is apparent, that in these very points, and in all your Proposals and Plots in that Book, you show your self a Master Workman. For my self, I must confess, and do speak it *Ingenuè*, that for Matter of Learning, I am not worthy to be reckoned among smatterers. Howbeit, sith it may seem, that being willing to communicate this Treatise to your Friends, you are likewise willing to listen to whatsoever they can except against it: I must deliver unto you that for my Private Opinion, I am one of that *Crew* that say there is, and we possess a far greater Holdfast of Certainty in the Sciences, than you by your Discourse will seem to acknowledge—For where at first you do object the ill Success and Errors of Practitioners of Physick; you know as well they proceed of the Patients Unruliness (*for not one Man in an hundred does obey his Physician in observing his Counsels*) or by Mis-Information of their own Indisposition (for few are able in that kind to explicate themselves) or by Reason their Diseases are by Nature incurable, which is incident you know, to many Maladies; or from some other hidden cause, cannot be discovered by Course of Conjecture. Howbeit, I am full of this Belief, That as Physick is ministred Now a Days by Physicians, it is much to be ascribed to their Negligence or Ignorance, or other Touch of Imperfection, that they speed not better in their Practice; for few are found of that profession so well instructed in their Art, as they might be by the Precepts which their Art affordeth; which if it be defective in regard of full Perfection, yet certainly it doth flourish with admirable remedies, such as Tract of Time hath taught, by experimental Events, and are the high way to that principal Knowledge which you recommend. As for *Alchemy* and *Magick*, some conclusions they have worth the preserving, but all their Skill is so accompanied with subtleties and Guils, as both the Crafts and Crafts-Masters are

not only despised, but named with Derision: Whereupon to make good your principal Assertion, Methinks you should have drawn the most of your Examples from that which is taught in the Liberal Sciences, not by pecking out cases that happen very seldom, and may by all Confession be subject to reproof; but by controuling the Generals and Grounds, and invent Positions and Aphorisms, which with greatest Artists and Philosophers have from time to time defended: For it goeth currant amongst all Men of Learning, that those kinds of Arts which Clarks, in time past, termed the "*Quadrivials*," confirm their Propositions by infallible Demonstrations; and likewise in the Trivials, such Lessons and Directions are delivered unto us, as will effect very near, or as much altogether as every Faculty doth Promise. Now, in case we should concur to do as you advise, which is, to renounce our Common Notions, and cancel all our Theorems, Axioms, Rules, and Tenents, and to come as Babes "*Ad Regnum Natura*," as we are willed by Scripture to come "*Ad Regnum Celorum*"; there is nothing more certain to my Understanding, than that it would enstantly bring us to Barbarism, and after many thousand Years, leave us more Unprovided of Theological Furniture than we are at this present; for it were indeed to become very Babes, "*Tabula Rasa*," when we shall keep no Impression of any former Principles, but be driven to begin the World again, and to travel by Trial of Actions and Sense, (which are your Proofs by particulars) what to place in "*Intellectu*," for our General Conceptions, it being a Maxim of all Men's approving, "*In Intellectu Nihil Quod non prius fuit in Sensu*": And so in Appearance it would befall us that till Plato's Years be come about, our insight in Learning would be in less esteem than now it is accounted. As for that which you inculcate of a knowledge more excellent than now it is among us, which Experience might produce, if we would essay to retract it out of Nature by particular Probations; it is no more upon the Matter, but to cite to us that which without Instigation, by natural Instinct, Men would practise of themselves; for it cannot in reason be otherwise thought, but that there are infinite Numbers in all Parts of the World (for we may not in this case confine our cogitations within the Bounds of Europe) which embrace the course you propose with all Diligence and Care that any Ability can perform; For every Man is born with an appetite of Knowledge, wherewith he cannot be so glutted, but still as in Dropsies, they will thirst after more; but yet why they should hearken to any

such Persuasion, as wholly to abolish those settled Opinions, and general Theorems to which they have attained, and their own and their Ancestor's former Experience, *I see no thing yet alledged to induce* me to think it. Moreover, I may speak with good Probability, that if we shall make mental Survey, what is like to be effected all the World over, those five or six Inventions which you have selected, and Imagine to be but of modern Standing, will make but a slender show, among many hundreds of many kinds of Notions, which are daily brought to light by the inforcement of Wit or casual Event, and may be compared, and partly preferred above those you have named: But were it so here, that all were admitted that you can require, the Augmentation of our Knowledge, and that all our Theorems, and general Positions were utterly extinguished with a new Subscription of Others in their Places, what Hope may we have of any Benefit to Learning by this Alteration: Assuredly as soon as the New are brought "*αδ ἀκμῆν,*" by the Inventors and their Followers, by an interchangeable course of natural things, they will fall by *Degrees* to be buried in Oblivion, and so in continuance perish out-right, and that perchance upon the *like* to your present Pretences, by Proposal of some means to advance our Knowledge to a higher Pitch of Perfection; for still the same Defects Antiquity found, will reside in Mankind, and therefore other *Uses* of their *Actions, Devices* and *Studies*, are not to be expected than is apparently by Record in former Time observ'd. I remember here a Note which "*Palerculus*" made of the incomparable wits of the *Grecians* and *Romans*, in their flourishing States, that there might be this Reason of the notable Downfal in their issue which came after, because by Nature "*Quod Summo Studio petitum est, ascendit in Summum, difficiltisq; in perfecto mora est*"; inasmuch that Men perceiving that they could not go further, being come to the top, they turned back on their own Accord, forsaking those Studies that are most in Request, and betaking themselves to new Endeavours, as if the thing they had sought had been by Prevention foreprised by others: So it fared in Particular with the Eloquence of that age, that when their Successors found they could hardly equal, but by no means excell predecessors, they began to neglect the Study thereof; and both to write and speak, for many hundred years, in a rustical Manner, till this latter Resolution brought the wheel about again, by inflaming gallant spirits to give a fresh Onset, with straining and striving to Clime unto the Height and Top of Perfection, not in that Gift alone, but

in every other Skill of any Part of Learning: For I hold it not an erroneous Conceit to think of every Science, that as now they are professed, so they have been before in all Precedent Ages, though not the like in all Places, nor at all times alike in Ours, and the same, but according to the Changes and Turnings of Times, with a more exact or plain, or with a more rude and obscure kind of Teaching. If the question should be asked what Proof I have of it? I can produce the Doctrine of Aristotle, and the deepest learned Clarks, whom we have any Means to take Notice of, that, as there is of other things, so there is of Sciences, "*Ortus & Interitus*;" which is also the meaning, if I should expound it, of "*Nihil novum sub Sole*," and is as well to be applied, "*ad facta*" as "*dicta*" at *Nihil neq; factum neq; dictum quod non dictum et factum prius*. I have further for my Warrant, that famous Complaint of *Solomon* to his Son, against the infinite making of Books in his time. Of which in all Congruity it must be understood, that a very great Part were Observations and Instructions in all kinds of Literature, of which there is not now so much as one petty Pamphlet (only some Part of the Bible excepted) remaining to Posterity, as there was not then any bound of Millions of Authors that were long before *Solomon*; yet we must give credit to what he affirmed, that whatsoever was then, or had been before, it could never be averred, *Behold*, this is *New*. Whereupon I must for final Conclusion infer, seeing all Endeavours, Studies, and Knowledge of *Mankind* in whatsoever *Art* or *Science*, have ever been the same as at this Present, though full of Mutabilities, according to the Changes & Accidental Occasion of Ages, and Countries, and Clarks Dispositions, which can never be but subject to *Intention & Remission*, both in their Desires, and in the Practices of their Knowledge; if now we should accord in opinion with you, first to Condemn our Present Knowledge of Doubts & Incertitude; but you confirm, but by *Averment*, without other Force of *Argument*, than to disclaim all our Axioms, Maxims, and general assertions that are left by *Tradition* from our Elders unto us, which have passed (as it is to be intended) all Probations of the Sharpest Wits that ever were.

And Lastly; to devise (being now become A. B. C. Darij) by the frequent spelling of *Particulars*, to come to the Notice of *New Generals*, and so afresh to Creat *New Principles of Sciences*; the end of all would be, that when we shall be *dispossessed* of the Learning we have, all our consequent Travel will but help in a Circle to conduct us to the Place from whence we set forward,

and bring us to the Happiness to be restored "*in integrum*," which will require as many Ages, as have marched before us to be perfectly atchived. All which I write with no Dislike of encreasing our knowledge with New Devices, which is Undoubtedly a practice of high Commendation, in regard of the Benefit they will yield for the present. And the World hath ever been, and will assuredly continue full of such *Devisers*, whose Industry, *that Way*, hath been eminent, and produced strange Effects, above the Reach and Hope of Men's common capacities; yet our *Notions & Theorems* have always kept in Grace, both with them, and with the rarest that ever were nominated amongst the Learned. By this you see to what *Boldness* I am brought by your *Kindness*, that if I seem too sawcy in this Contradiction, it is the Opinion I hold of your Noble Disposition, and of the Freedom in these Cases that you will afford your special Friends, which have induced me to it. Now though I my self, like a *Carrier's Horse*, cannot blanch the beaten Way, in which I was trained, yet such is my Censure of your "*Cogitata*," that I must tell you, (to be plain), you have much wronged your self and the World, to smother such a *Treasure* so long in Your Coffer; for though I stand well assured (touching the Tenour and Subject of your main Discourse) you are not able to impannel a substantial Jury in any University that will give up a Verdict to acquit you of Error; yet it cannot be gainsaid, that all your Treatise over doth abound with choice conceits of the present State of Learning, & with so worthy Contemplations of the means to procure it, as may perswade, with any Student, to look more narrowly to his business, not only by aspiring to the greatest Perfection of that which is now a Days divulged in the Sciences, but by diving yet deeper, as it were, into the Bowels and Secrets of Nature, and by Inforcing the Power of his *Judgement* and *Wil* to learn of St. Paul, *Consectari Meliora Dona*: which course would to God (*to whisper so much in your ears*) you had followed at first, *when you fell to the study of such a thing as was not Worthy of such a Student*: Nevertheless, being as it is, that you were therein settled, and your Country soundly served, I can but wish, withal my Heart, as I do very often, that you may gain a full Reward to the full of your Deserts, which I hope will come with Heaps of Happiness and Honour."

Your's to be used and Commanded,

THOMAS BODLEY.

WAS BACON EVER ABROAD? WHEN AND WHERE?

BY GEORGE STRONACH, M.A.

WHATEVER dubiety may exist over the visitation to the Continent by "the man of Stratford," there can be none as to the visit of Bacon to France at least—to Paris, Maine, Blois, Poitiers, Tours, and especially Navarre, the last named the scene of the first play written by William Shakespeare, *Love's Labour's Lost*, and published as "newly corrected and augmented By W. Shakespere, 1598." In the last number of BACONIANA I endeavoured to show that the author of the plays had been abroad, and had obtained his knowledge of foreign scenes, life, and manners from a sojourn on the Continent.

Lord Campbell says: "Bacon spent three whole years in France—the most valuable of his life—and his subsequent literary eminence may be traced to his long sojourn in a foreign country during the age of preparatory studies almost as much as that of Hume or Gibbon. He first resided at Paris under the care of his father's friend, Sir Amyas Paulet . . . where 'he sought that which is most of all profitable in travel—acquaintance with the secretaries and employed men of ambassadors, and so in travelling in one country he sucked the experience of many.'* . . . His original plan had been to visit Italy, but, on inquiry, all accounts agreed that, from the rigours of the Inquisition, an English Protestant would not then have been safe in that country." This later information may be characterised as rubbish. We had ambassadors in Italy then, quite capable of guarding the lives and interests of

* Bacon's "Essay of Travel."

British subjects, despite the terrors, pains, and penalties of the "Inquisition."

In the interesting letter to Bacon addressed to Orleans by Sir Thomas Bodley, given in the last number of *BACONIANA*, the writer advises his young friend "Not to spend your spirits and the precious time of your travel in a captious prejudice and censuring of all things, nor in an infectious collection of base vices and fashions of men and women." Strangely enough, this is just what the author of *Love's Labour's Lost* set himself out to accomplish in the earliest of the plays. Perhaps the warning suggested the performance, and Bacon rubbed it into them right royally. His experience of the Court of Navarre proved eminently profitable, and was reproduced to the letter in *Love's Labour's Lost*.

Much of what I have to say in this number will be associated with the earliest Shakespearean drama, *Love's Labour's Lost*, written *circa* 1587-9, the first of the plays which appeared with the name "Shakespeare" on the title-page. It is interesting to know that "the plot stands alone in Shakespeare's work in that it is not known to have been borrowed" (Lee's *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 51); and "In the composition of the play Shakespeare took a slight and amusing story derived from some independent source, which will, we hope, be before long discovered, and gave it a new and vital interest" (Lee in *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 1880). This "discovery" has yet to be made.

Well, it is believed that Shakspeare left Stratford in 1586—abandoned it compulsorily in consequence of a small poaching affair on the estate of Sir Thomas Lucy, the original, as Dr. Lee and others maintain, of "Justice Shallow" in *1 and 2 Henry IV.* and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, a theory which has been entirely demolished by Mrs. Carmichael Stopes (Shakespearean)

and Mr. John Hutchinson (Baconian). Unanimity for once!

Shakspeare left his native town in 1586 and went to London, where he held horses at the stage door, a splendid education for the composition of *Love's Labour's Lost*, which is ascribed, as I have said, to the period 1587-9. Furnivall gives 1588-9, and Lee 1589 as the date of composition. This play, it is therefore maintained, "the man of Stratford" wrote within three years after leaving Stratford—a play so learned that it cannot be placed on the modern stage, although it was frequently produced in the days of "Eliza and our James." As Professor Stapfer says, the play "is over-cumbered with learning."

Of *Love's Labour's Lost* Dr. Lee writes: "The subject matter suggests that its author had already enjoyed *extended opportunities* of surveying *London* life and manners, such as were hardly open to him in *the very first years of his settlement in the Metropolis*. '*Love's Labour's Lost*' embodies keen observation of contemporary life in many ranks of society, both in town and country, while the speeches of the hero Biron clothe much sound philosophy in masterly rhetoric."

This is splendid! The life is not *London* life but Court life at Navarre (Lee says: "The hero is the King of Navarre, in whose dominions the scene is laid")—the life of kings, princes, princesses and courtiers. We have glittering spectacles of courts and camps, foreign manners, customs, and surroundings, in short, experiences of high life of every kind as well as every manner of learning, of which "the man of Stratford," three years after leaving his native town, must have been absolutely ignorant, and which Bacon must have been thoroughly acquainted with, as he had visited the spot or spots. Dr. Lee says that Shakspeare's "*extended opportunities* were hardly open

to him in the very first years of his settlement in the Metropolis." He gives the date of Shakespere's retirement from Stratford as 1586 and the date of the composition of *Love's Labour's Lost* as 1589. May I ask him what were the "very first years of his settlement in the Metropolis?" Shakspere must have "bucked up" in those three years. 1586: holding horses at the door of the Globe Theatre. 1589: writing *Love's Labour's Lost*—a play "so learned, so academic, so scholastic in impression and allusion that it is unfit for popular representation" (Cowden Clarke). But, as Dr. Furnivall said, "Shakspere could then have been taking his M.A. degree." This, of course, will account for the wonderful "Shakspere" transformation scene—1586-9.

Not only is the play redolent of Baconian sentiments, as I shall show later on, but several of the characters introduced are men whom Bacon actually met and talked with when he was in the *entourage* of Sir Amyas Paulet, the English ambassador to France, and afterwards one of the "governors" of Mary Queen of Scots, at Tilbury and Fotheringay. Over and over again, in the letters of Sir Amyas, dated from Orleans, Poitiers, Tours, and elsewhere in France, we find mention made of Biron, Longaville, and Dumain, who appear as characters in *Love's Labour's Lost*. Mr. Lee says: "The names of almost all the important characters are actually identical with the contemporary leaders in French politics." These most interesting letters of Paulet will be found in a volume published by the Roxburghe Club, several of the letters being addressed to Sir Nicholas Bacon, the father of Francis, in one of which recommendation is made of a tutor to Francis, in the person of the messenger with the letter. It is to be regretted that we have none of the letters written by Francis during his stay abroad. Then we should have known if he had visited Italy.

In BACONIANA for October, 1903, I gave a letter from Sir Amyas to Burleigh, dated from Calais, describing the rough sea journey between Dover and Calais, when Francis had his first experience of a storm and sailors' "lingo," such as that used in *The Tempest*. In one of his letters to Sir Nicholas Bacon, Paulet writes: "I rejoyce moche to see that your sonne, my companion, hathe, by the grace of God, passed the brunt and perill of this journey; whereof I am the more gladd, because in the begynninge of these last troubles yt pleased your Lordship to referr his continuance with me to my consyderation. I thank God these dangers are past, and your sonne is safe, sound, and in good healtie, and worthie of your fatherlie favoure." This is from Poictiers, September, 1576.

From that date to March, 1578-9, Bacon was in France, on one occasion (in 1578) being sent by Paulet on a special mission to Queen Elizabeth, and all the rest of the time following the French Court in its wanderings from town to town. What more likely than a mission to Italy, as we read that the French king and the Venetian ambassador were fast friends, and met at Tours in friendly consultation with the King of Navarre and Biron, one of the heroes—in fact *the* hero—of *Love's Labour's Lost*?

There is no certainty of such a journey, although the late Mr. Begley showed, from a French life of Bacon, that Francis visited both Spain and Italy during his residence in France. This is more probable than Dr. Garnett's suggestion that Shakspeare went "on a confidential errand" to Germany and returned "by way of Venice." At any rate, if Bacon did not visit Italy personally he had facilities which were beyond the command of Shakspeare of obtaining information on the subject from "travelled friends" (*pace* Dr. Lee). His brother Anthony travelled in Italy on many occa-

sions; he also corresponded and stayed with the King of Navarre; Francis was the friend of Sir Thomas Wotton, for many years the English ambassador at Venice, meeting Bacon in London and returning to his post in the very year that *Othello* was written.

"Betwixt this and Italy," writes Wotton to Bacon, "I purpose to collect the memorablist observations that I have taken, and to present a copy thereof to your lordship's indulgent judgment. I shall now transport him (Mr. Meawtis) over the Alps where we will both serve your Lordship." Francis was intimate with Sir Anthony Standen, whose account of a residence in Italy Francis submitted to the Queen, in the author's absence owing to illness. He was intimate with Edward Jones, who wrote him from France full information regarding the doings of the French king, the Duc de Mayenne ("Dumain," of *Love's Labour's Lost*), and other celebrities, after the accession of the King of Navarre (Henry III.) to the throne of France as Henry IV. He was closely acquainted with Nicholas Faunt, who spent seven years "between Geneva and Italy"; and, as Birch says (8th August, 1596), "Mr. Richard Higgins, a friend of Mr. Francis Bacon, being on his travels, wrote sometimes to him, and in his letter from Venice, of the 8th of August, 1596, observed to him that when he wrote his last letter he thought to have troubled him with no more till his return from Venice . . . he thought proper once more to entertain Mr. Francis Bacon's remembrance with *news of Italy*."

Here we have, therefore, Bacon in communication with men who knew Italy intimately, and who could impart to him all the information necessary for the local colouring of the Italian dramas. Dr. Sidney Lee confesses it is impossible that Shakspeare "could have gathered his knowledge of Northern Italy from personal observation. He doubtless owed all to the verbal

reports of travelled friends or to books, the contents of which he had a rare power of assimilating or vitalising." Let Dr. Lee trot out the friends and the books he refers to. We have *Bacon's* friends supplying him daily with foreign information—who were *Shakspeare's* similarly accommodating correspondents or informants?

Another point in my argument—although I do not attach much importance to it—is the fact that in the earliest of the Shakespearean historical plays—*1 Henry IV.*—it is said "Maine, Blois, Poitiers and Tours are won away"—the very places visited by Bacon when he was in France; places, it is safe to say, that were never seen, if heard of, by "the man of Stratford."

To return to *Love's Labour's Lost*, in which one cannot but read much of young Bacon's mind, Dr. Furnivall says:—

"The best speech in the play is, of course, Biron's on the effect of love in opening men's eyes and making the world new to them." The sentiments in the play are entirely Baconian, *e.g.*,

Biron says:—

— "But love, *first learned in a lady's eyes.*"

Bacon says:—

— "Love is *first learned in a woman's eyes.*"

Biron says:—

"Is not love a *Hercules?*"

Bacon says:—

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

Biron says:—

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

Bacon says:—

"Love is *the motion that animateth all things.*"

Biron says:—

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

Bacon says:—

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

Biron says :—

"Love gives to every power a double power."

Bacon says :—

"Love gives the mind power to exceed itself."

These quotations are taken from *Love's Labour's Lost*—the first Shakespearean play, attributed to the period 1587-9—and Bacon's masque, attributed by Spedding to 1592-3. Of course it will be said that Bacon borrowed his ideas from Shakspeare. Very likely! Bacon had so few original ideas, and "the man of Stratford" had so many. *Love's Labour's Lost* was first published 1598.

There are a few other facts connected with *Love's Labour's Lost* which are worthy of notice. An obscure event in the history of Navarre, unknown in England at the time when the play was written, although mentioned in the French *Chronicles* of Monstrelet (not translated into English until 1809), is introduced into the drama; and Dr. Furnivall says of another point :—
"The meeting of Henry of Navarre [in the play] with a princess of France [is founded] on a real meeting of his with one in France in 1586"—the very year in which Bacon was in France, and, in every probability, present at the meeting.

Then we have the Baconian language in the play. "Don Armado" has been identified with Antonio Perez, the Spaniard who was befriended in England by Anthony and Francis Bacon, very much to their good mother's regret and remonstrance. Like "Armado," Perez was a "a traveller from Spain," and he published a book under the assumed name of "Raphael Peregrino." It is not surprising, therefore, to find in *Love's Labour's Lost* the statement :—

"He is too picked, too spruce, too affected, too odd, as it were, too peregrinate, as I may call it."

I am of opinion that when this word was used Bacon had in his eye his friend "Peregrino." He had already

"device"

that Bacon
have known
was of "L
from the sta
performance,
from the 60

called the Latin version of his "Essay of Travel"
 "De Peregratione in ~~Partes Extremos.~~" It was a
 natural word to Bacon—was it one natural to Shak-
 spere?

I might instance other Baconian sentiments in the
 play, e.g. :—"This is a gift that I have; simple, simple,
 a foolish, extravagant spirit, full of forms, figures,
 shapes, objects, ideas, apprehensions, motives, revolu-
 tions; these are begot in the ventricle of memory,
 nourished in the womb of *pia mater*, and deliver'd upon
 the mellowing of occasion." Surely Bacon satirised
 himself here, and again in: "*Novi hominem tanquam te.*
 His humour is lofty, his discourse peremptory, his
 tongue filed, his eye ambitious, his gait majestical, and
 his general behaviour vain, ridiculous, and thrasonical."
 The conjunction of Latin and English is characteristic
 of Bacon, as everybody knows who has read his
 letters.

At any rate, the clever—if bombastic—language of
Love's Labour's Lost seems to me to be that of a young
 student fresh from the schools rather than that of an
 ex-poacher who held horses at a stage door three years
 before its composition.

Shakespeare's second play is said to have been *The
 Comedy of Errors*, where, according to Furnivall (he
 dates it 1589-91), "The quip and crank, the word-play,
 rhyme, doggerel, etc., of *Love's Labour's Lost* are con-
 tinued, though they are not so overdone." If this
 was the same play—*A Historie of Errors*—acted in
 January, 1576-7, and January, 1582-3, then Shakspeare,
 of Stratford, never wrote it. Both plays were adapted
 from the *Mencæchmi* of Plautus, no translation of which
 was published till 1595, so that the writer was ac-
 quainted with Plautus in the original Latin. In the
 play the abstruse legal problem of "Fine and Recovery"
 is treated in the same way as in Bacon's *Use of the Law*.

Then, again, the description in the play of the vines climbing upon stakes in the vineyards in the South of France, and of the elms in Italy, was more likely to have come from the pen of Bacon, who had *probably* seen them, than from that of Shakspeare, who *certainly* had never had the opportunity. But this is not all. In the play Proteus is described as being *held by the sleeve*, when captured. In the *Sylva Sylvarum* Bacon says the same—in fact, perpetrates the same blunder—as all the classic writers, Homer, Ovid, Virgil, Hyginus, etc., maintain that Proteus was *bound by a chain*, not *held by the sleeve*. In the play the Abbess attributes indigestion to “unquiet meals,” and Bacon, a martyr to dyspepsia all his life, ascribes it to “strife at meats,” while the author of the play and Bacon agree in a wonderful manner as to the doctrine of “the human soul”—“the rational and irrational soul” (*De Augmentis*) and “the natural man and the spirit” (*Comedy of Errors*). Other points of resemblance to be found in both *Love's Labour's Lost* and *The Comedy of Errors* and the writings of Bacon are marvellous. They convince me at least that Bacon wrote both plays, and that it is certain that if the dates of composition are approximately correct (Furnivall 1588-9 and 1589-91) the man (or boy) who left Stratford in 1586 had no hand in them. Both works were written by a scholar who was also a philosopher—not by an actor who, three years previous to their composition, was also a poacher and a seducer, although, as Dr. Sidney Lee says, in his problematical *Life of Shakespeare*:—“Shakespeare, it should be remembered, *MUST have been a regular attendant at the parish church, and MAY at times have enjoyed a sermon.*”

Happy Shakspeare!

BACON'S TRAVELS

ONCE hazarded a guess that Bacon visited Italy in 1588. On further study, it seems more probable that he went there in 1590. In 1589, writing anonymously under the name of Pasquil, he had taken an active part in endeavouring to kill the Martinist schism in the English Church by the only method which seemed to him likely to be successful—ridicule.

In one of his pamphlets his method is thus explained:—

“Contention is a coale, the more it is blowne by dysputation the more it kindleth; I must spit in theyre faces to put it out.”

In January, 1589-90, he published the first part of the “*Faerie Queene*.” On 6th April following Sir Francis Walsingham, the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, died. Bacon promptly published in the pen-name of “Watson” a Latin Eglogue in Walsingham’s memory. On the 15th April was entered S.R. ‘The Royal Exchange,’ being a translation of a short Italian pamphlet which Bacon published in the name of Greene, and to which he added a valuable glosse.

From this point until November there was a cessation of Bacon’s literary activities consistent, I think, with an absence abroad.

The fact that Henry IV. of France at the latter end of 1589 had turned Catholic made it prudent that France and the friendly Catholic States of Austria and Venetia should be assured that Elizabeth was on the best of terms with her own Catholic subjects, and that the schism amongst her Protestant subjects was unimportant. With a hostile Pope, and the forces of equally hostile Spain still in possession of the neighbouring coast of the Netherlands, the Catholic volte face in France was most disquieting to England. Bacon

accordingly drafted an important letter of State dealing with the Queen's relations with her Catholic and Protestant subjects and submitted it to Archbishop Whitgift. It was then signed by Walsingham. Whether the letter was at once forwarded by Queen's messenger, or waited for a diplomatist to carry it, is not known.

But Walsingham's death and the Queen's nervous apprehensions would render it desirable that a skilled diplomatist should visit the Courts of France, Austria and Venetia. Sir Thomas Bodley, who had in previous years undertaken secret confidential errands of this kind for the Queen, was not then available, as he had become Minister Resident at the Hague. I think that in "Francesco's Fortunes," printed towards the end of 1590 in the name of Greene, Bacon does in his own cryptic way indicate that he had then recently undertaken a continental journey. He makes one of his characters refer to a journey by way of Dover to Calais, then to Paris (where he visited the French Court), then to Lyons, thence coasting (avoiding) the Alps, and through Germany to Vienna and afterwards to Venice.

In the person of the character in the novel, comments are made upon the French, Germans and Italians. If Bacon did visit Venice after Vienna, the proper way to have gone would have been to follow the regular trade route through Innsbruck, Botzena, Trient, Verona and Padua, then "unto the tranect the common ferry which trades to Venice" (*Merchant of Venice*). From the mention of Bergamo in "Francesco's Fortunes" and of the same city in the pamphlet, "An Almond for a Parrot," published later than the summer of 1590 (another lampoon upon the Martinists), it is likely that he returned by way of Bergamo to Coire and thence through Germany to Stade, a seaport at the mouth of the Elbe, having a regular shipping trade to England.

Fynes Moryson went that way six years later, his journey occupying two months; but, of course, he was sightseeing. Bacon could not safely have returned through France owing to the war waging between the French King and the Spanish forces from the Netherlands then invading France.

In "Francesco's Fortunes" Bacon shows great displeasure at the drinking habits of the Germans of the period. As Nash in "Pierce Penniless," in 1592, he recorded still stronger antipathy to the contemporary swaggering and drink-swilling Danish cavaliers. As Nash also in "A Prognostication," printed in 1591, he seems again to hark back to a journey commenced at Dover and finished at the flat coast around Stade, a district dominated by the Danes. The words are: "Sitting gentlemen upon Dover Cliffes to quaint myself with the art of navigation and know the tides, as *the Danske crowes gather on the sands against a storm.*" Perusal of Bacon's writings under the pen-names of "Greene" and "Nash" suggests very firmly the conclusion that the writer had more than a book acquaintance with the respective habits and characteristics of both Danes, Spaniards, Italians and Germans. If he started in May, or even June, he had ample time to be back in London in October.

I do not think the privately printed pamphlet, "Pasquil's Apology," purporting to have been published "on 2nd July 1590 at London stone," is inconsistent with the taking of the journey suggested.

This pamphlet was entered S.R. on 22nd December, 1589, so that he had written it long before it was published and probably left it with Whitgift or Bishop Bancroft to print at their private press some time after he had left the country; so that if the Martinists had ever suspected his handiwork in previous

pamphlets, this publication would throw them off the scent.

I doubt whether Bacon ever visited Elsinore. As the writer of *Hamlet*, he could record from hearsay the cannon-firing custom when the Danish King drank a health, and also the tapestry portraits of Danish kings at Cronburg Castle. Had he visited Elsinore he would not have described the coast as a cliff. Upon existing lists of names of the English actors who visited Elsinore in 1585, Shakspeare is not included. The special pleading that he was there, adumbrated by Herr Stefansson in the *Contemporary Review* for 1896 is therefore beside the mark. The argument that the writer of the Shakespeare plays of *Merchant of Venice*, *Othello*, *Taming of the Shrew* and *Romeo and Juliet* had some acquaintance with the Italian *loci in quo* has more substance, although I am disposed to agree with the *Quarterly Reviewer* in his article in July, 1889, that these plays could have been written by one who had no first-hand knowledge of the towns and districts in which their action is depicted as taking place. Nevertheless, if Bacon did pay a flying visit to Venice in 1590 he would be bound to see Verona and Padua, and it becomes significant that a play called a *Venetian Comedy*, which I have little doubt was the *Merchant of Venice*, was performed in August, 1594.

In the dedication to *Cornelia* (the play which Bacon in the name of Kyd translated from the French of Garnier), entered S.R. January 1593-4, Bacon promised a play in the ensuing summer upon the subject of Garnier's "Porcie." The Venetian comedy (*Merchant of Venice*, with its introduction of Portia) played in August, 1594, was evidently the fulfilment of the promise.

My suggestions are put forward quite tentatively,

and I trust may assist the discussion Mr. Stronach has been good enough to initiate.

PARKER WOODWARD.

P.S.—I think Sir William Herbert possibly alluded to a recent journey abroad in his verses addressed to the author of *Lucrece* and *Cornelia*, printed 1594, an extract from which I give below :

"You that to shew your wits have taken toyle
In registering the deeds of noble men,
Aud sought for matter on a foreign soyle
As worthier subjects for your silver pen."

"SHAKESPEARE AND VENICE"

MR. HORATIO F. BROWN has been described as "the greatest living English authority on things Venetian." He has written several admirable books on Venice—its history and its institutions. Recently his *Venetian Studies* have been re-published by Mr. John Murray with considerable additions thereto under the title of "Studies in the History of Venice." It comprises a series of essays full of information, presented in a most interesting and acceptable manner, and will amply repay a careful perusal. The twenty-two pages which are devoted to "Shakespeare and Venice" justify its inclusion in every Shakespearean library, and this essay alone forms the subject of the present comments.

The author treats of Shakespeare's knowledge of Venice and things Venetian, as exhibited in the plays, with special reference as to whether they bear evidence that the author was ever in Venice.

He commences by laying down the principles upon which his investigation is to be conducted.

"There is perhaps no region of intuitive knowledge which we may safely affirm to lie beyond the reach of the poetic imagination."

"The power to grasp some trifling indication, some fugitive

hint, and from it to reconstruct a whole scheme of things which shall in all essentials correspond to fact is peculiarly the poet's gift.”

In illustration of this, Mr. Brown says:—

“When Shakespeare tells us, for example, of ‘regions of thick ribbed ice,’ we are not to suppose that he ever threaded the seracs of an iccfall, though no poet ever devised a juster epithet than ‘thick ribbed’ to describe the colossal cleavage of a glacier.”

The illustration is an unfortunate one. When Claudio uses the expression he is not referring to a glacier which either he or anyone else has seen. In endeavouring to picture to Isabella the horrors of that undiscovered country from whose bourn no traveller returns, he lets his imagination run riot:—

“Ay, but to die, and go we know not where ;
To lie in cold obstruction, and to rot ;
This sensible warm motion to become
A kneaded clod ; and the delighted spirit
To bathe in fiery floods, or to reside
In thrilling regions of thick ribbed ice ;
To be imprison'd in the viewless winds
And blown with restless violence round about
The pendant world ; or to be worse than worst
Of those, that lawless and uncertain thoughts
Imagine howling ! 'Tis too horrible !”

Shakespeare did not apply the epithet “thick ribbed” to describe the colossal cleavage of a glacier. Bathing in “fiery floods,” residing in “thrilling regions of thick ribbed ice” and being “imprison'd in the viewless winds” are imaginative ideas, and are not descriptive of actual scenes in which the “intuitive knowledge of the poet could in all essentials correspond to fact.” This is a bad start, because the illustration leaves it open to doubt as to what is the exact principle which the writer desires to lay down.

“There is, however, another kind of knowledge—a

knowledge of minute facts in detail, which no imagination can fairly be expected to compass; a knowledge which we may justly call information." So says Mr. Horatio Brown, and he goes on to state that his object is to inquire how much knowledge Shakespeare possessed about Venice and the Venetian dominions; about the customs of the Republic, her laws, her state, about the habits of the Venetians, their mode of life and character.

It will be very interesting to see what is the value of the evidence adduced in support of the writer's contention that Shakespeare never visited Italy or Venice, for he does not proceed to conduct an impartial inquiry as to whether Shakespeare in his references to Italy and Italian subjects was speaking from actual experience. He starts off by accepting as a definite conclusion that which he proposes to inquire into. "As we shall see," he says, "the scattered allusions to be collected from the plays prove an intimacy with Venice which is surprising in a man who probably was never out of England."

Thus bad begins, but worse remains behind, for he continues: "We must conclude that all he had heard about Venice made him love the city, and that his burning imagination vivified the picture of it created by his fancy. We know how deep an interest he took in Italy and in all things Italian, and we surmise that he made good use of his opportunities to gather a considerable store of information about Italy in general and about Venice in particular."

This is the usual reckless method of expression adopted by superficial writers. Mr. Horatio Brown is referring to the man of Stratford, who probably was never out of England; about him he does not know, as he states he does, "how deep an interest he took in Italy and in all things Italian." He does not know

that he took the slightest interest in any country but his own, in any literature of any description, in any kind of art, in any single branch of culture. “It appears that in some way or other,” he continues, “Shakespeare had learned sufficient Italian to understand that language. In his Italian plays he introduces enough to prove his familiarity with its use.”

Before the value of the evidence to be obtained “from the scattered allusions to be collected from the plays” is considered, it is stated that:—

“Two main sources of information were open to the poet: first, the merchant class, whose relations with Venice dated from times as early as the year 1325, and were cemented by the yearly passage of the Venetian merchantmen, known as the Flanders galleys; and secondly, the travelled members of the aristocracy, the young gentlemen who returned to England with indelible memoirs of Italy, and all the charm of that pleasant land; who filled the town with talk of Italian cities, and made Venice, in a certain way, the mode, so that Sir John, for example, assures Mistress Ford that were she his lady her arched brow would become ‘The ship-tire, the tire valiant, or any tire of Venetian admittance.’”

How simple is the explanation if the plays were written by a young travelled member of the aristocracy.

Now for the evidence, which may be divided into two categories—the mistakes which Shakespeare makes about Italy and things Italian—the peculiar and precise knowledge which he appears to have possessed about Italy and things Italian.

Some evidence is inherently of more value than other. The writer of this article during the past three years has visited Berlin probably forty times, Paris twenty, and Amsterdam a dozen, and yet in writing in England any description of those cities he would probably make scores of mistakes, but those descriptions would contain certain statements which on investigation would be

found so accurate that they could only be the result of actual eyesight and experience.

So, in order to arrive at a just conclusion it is necessary to weigh the strength of the evidence of mistakes about Venice and compare it with that of the "intimacy with Venice."

The mistakes alleged in the article are :—

1. Verona is described in *Two Gentlemen of Verona* as a port upon the sea with tides that ebb and flow and boats may sail from thence to Milan—Valentine's father "at the road expects his coming, there to see him shipped"; and Launce, weeping over the misdemeanours of his dog Crab, his cruel-hearted cur, is like to lose the tide.

2. Verona is still a seaport in *Othello*, where Cassio's ship, the first to reach Cyprus after the storm, is a Veronesa.

3. Verona, being a seaport, the trade of a sailmaker was carried on by Tranio's father at Bergamo, which is not far distant from it.

4. In Shakespear's Lombardy, though not in the real Lombardy, there is mountainous territory between Milan and Mantua; the Duke bids Porteous and Sir Thurio meet him "upon the rising of the mountain foot that leads towards Mantua."

5. When we pass inside the city of Venice with him we feel that he has never "swum in a gondola," except in fancy; there are too many evidences that he did not know the sea-girt city, its waterways, its little *calli*, those narrow streets whose windings form such a delightful labyrinth in which the traveller may lose himself. Examples given :

(a.) Dobbin, old Gobbo's fillhorse, would never have been allowed to jog along the narrow *calli* of the town.

(b.) Shylock's house is more Florentine than Venetian; his orders to Jessica are

“Clamber not you up to the casements.”

The casements were high in Florence, the graceful Gothic windows are low-silled in Venice.

(c.) Gratiano and Salarino would not have found a pent house under which to take their stand in any Venetian street; a true pent house, as distinguished from a sotto portico, were it ever so narrow, would have filled most Venetian alleys from side to side.

6. There are certain evidences in the *Merchant of Venice* of a want of knowledge of Venetian law:—

The rate of interest was established by law, and Shylock could not have recovered in any Court of Venice, so Antonio could not have rated him many a time and oft as to his excesses. No mention is made of discharging the case—*Shylock v. Antonio*—only of adjourning it, but the Court had the power to discharge it.

Shylock was not in danger as long as he remained within the law; but his usury would have put him outside the pale.

For Jessica, a Jewess, to wed Lorenzo, a Christian, would have brought both of them before the Court of the Esecutori contro la Bestemmia and placed them in peril of their lives.

Whilst Shakespeare is aware that the true title of the prince is Doge or Duke, he does not know the Doge's proper style of address, which for an Englishman would be “Your Grace,” but for Venetians “Your Serenity.” It is improbable that the doge would himself have sat in Court at the trial. He only sat at the Council of the Ten, and then chiefly when the Court was trying for treason.

Had he been present, there was no need to entreat

the learned lawyer, Balthazar, home to dinner, for the doge was already at home in the ducal palace.

Mr. Horatio Brown devotes several pages to various theories which have been propounded as to the origin of the play of *Othello*, but there are no arguments to be obtained from these in support of his contention that the author had not visited Italy. The arguments advanced in support of the contrary proposition will be considered when the evidence for the affirmative is dealt with.

1. The treatment of Verona in *Two Gentlemen of Verona* is the most important—it may be said the only important—point made.

"For instance, Verona is a port, upon the sea, with tides that ebb and flow."

The text hardly justifies this statement. Valentine says to Protheus

"My father at the road
Expects my coming, there to see me shipped,"

and directly after Speed meets Protheus and says :—

Sir, Protheus, save you : saw you my master ?
Pro : But now be parted hence, to embark for Milan.
Speed : Twenty to one then, he is shipp'd already ;
 And I have played the sheep, in losing him.

Then follows further play on the word sheep, and the conversation ends by Protheus saying

Go, go, be gone, to save your ship from wreck,
Which cannot perish having thee aboard,
Being destined to a drier death on shore.

In Act II., Scene 2, Protheus is taking leave of Julia :—

My father stays my coming : answer not ;
The tide is now : Nay, not thy tide of tears ;
That tide will stay me longer than I should ;

In the next scene, still laid in Verona, Panthino meets Launce, and the following dialogue occurs :—

Pant : Launce, away, away, aboard ; thy master is shipp'd
and thou art to post after him with oars.
What's the matter ? Why weep'st thou, man ?
Away, ass ;

You will lose the tide if you tarry any longer.

Launce : It is no matter if the ty'd were lost ; for it is the
unkindest ty'd that ever any man ty'd.

Pant : What's the unkindest tide ?

Launce : Why, he that's ty'd here ; Crab, my dog.

Pant : Tut man, I mean thou'lt lose the flood ; and in
losing the flood, lose thy voyage ; and in losing
thy voyage, lose thy master ; and in losing thy
master, lose thy service ; and in losing thy
service—

Why dost thou stop my mouth ?

Launce : For fear thou should'st lose thy tongue.

Pant : Where should I lose my tongue ?

Launce : In thy tale.

Pant : In thy tail ?

Launce : Lose the tide, and the voyage, and the master, and
the service, and the tide ? Why man if the river
were dry, I am able to fill it with my tears ; if
the wind were down, I could drive the boat with
my sighs.

It is *the river* and *the boat*, not *the sea* and *the ship* that
Launce refers to.

When Protheus is leaving Valentine after their
meeting in Milan, he says:—

Go on before I shall enquire you forth.
I must unto the road, to disembark
Some necessaries that I needs must use ;

Speed and Launce meet in Milan and the former
says:—

How now, signior Launce ? What news with your
mastership ?

Launce : With my master's ship ? Why, it is at sea.

Speed : Well, your old vice still ; mistake the word :

The foregoing passages contain “the scattered allu-
sions” which form the main justification for the con-

tention that Shakespeare could never have visited Italy. In Act IV., Scene 1, laid in a forest near Mantua, Valentine is met by outlaws, and the following conversation takes place :—

2nd Outlaw : Whither travel you ?

Valentine : To Verona.

1st Outlaw : Whence came you ?

Valentine : From Milan.

Shakespeare is, therefore, taking Valentine back in a manner consistent with the geography of the country, so that his ignorance was not complete. How is it possible to explain the passages which certainly refer to a journey either for part of the way or for the entire journey by water ? It will be observed that the sea is never mentioned in connection with the journey. Launce speaks of the river, if dry, being replenished by his tears, and the boat being driven by his sighs if the winds fail. Panthio also refers to Launce having to post after his master with oars. The words "ship" and "tide" are in each case introduced for the purpose of reeling off puns. When all is said, in view of the present knowledge possessed, it is a matter of opinion whether this lapse in the geography of Shakespeare would justify the assumption that he could never have been in Italy ; as Valentine's journey back from Milan to Verona was undertaken by land and not by water, it is open to argument that Shakespeare introduced the references to ships and tides for the purpose of developing the misuse of those words.

One other point may be made. Did Shakespeare once more, know more than his critics ? Upper Italy, as early as the sixteenth century, was intersected with canals, and was there a watercourse by which, at any rate, part of the journey might be performed, possibly *via* the Lake of Garda, by boat ? The subject is worth investigation.

The play was not printed until it appeared in the folio edition of 1623. Meres, however, writing in 1598, mentions it. Malone assigns it to the year 1595. It is, undoubtedly, founded on a romance entitled *Diana in Love*, written in Spanish by George de Montemayor, before 1561, but not translated into English until 1598, after the play had been written.

It is substantially identical with *The History of Felix and Philomena*, a play produced in January, 1585, before the Queen, at Greenwich. No author's name is given in the record. Collier agrees in the identity of the two plays, but for the fact that Montemayor's romance was not translated into English, and could not, therefore, have been accessible to the dramatist. If Shakespeare could read Spanish the difficulty would be removed. As to this, Elze says,* “Could there be anything more to the point than the description he gives in *Love's Labour's Lost* of the Spanish language? Can one who describes the character of a language with such clearness and insight be unacquainted with it?” Upon these premises Mr. Edwin Reed assigns the play “with reasonable certainty to the year 1584.” Mr. C. Armitage Brown, writing in 1838, admits that nothing can shake his faith in Shakespeare's travels in Italy, and suggests the year 1593 as the probable date. He attributes the geographical confusion in the play to its having been written before that date.

The early commentators were sceptical as to its authorship. Upton determines “that if any proof can be drawn from manner and style, this play must be sent packing and seek for its parent elsewhere.” Hanmer doubted whether Shakespeare had any other hand in this play than the enlivening it with some speeches and lines thrown in here and there, which are easily distinguished, as being of a different stamp from the rest.

* Elze's Shakespeare, page 385.

Having regard to all these circumstances it may reasonably be urged that any loose geography in *Two Gentlemen of Verona* does not warrant the assertion that the author of the plays never was in Italy.

2. Verona is still a seaport in *Othello*, where Cassio's ship, the first to reach Cyprus after the storm, is a Veronesa.

Here the task of the apologist is easy, for Shakespeare never said anything of the kind. This is the passage, as printed in the quarto 1622 and the folio 1623.

<i>Third Gen :</i>	A Noble ship of Venice Hath seene a grievous wracke and suffer- ance On most part of their fleet.
<i>Montano :</i>	How? Is this true?
<i>Third Gen :</i>	The ship is heere put in : a <i>Verennessa</i> , <i>Michael Cassio</i> , Lieutenant to the warlike Moore, Othello, Is come on Shore.

Theobald substituted Veronese for Verennessa, and altered the punctuation, placing the colon after it and making it refer to the ship instead of to Cassio, thus :

The ship is here put in, a Veronese : Michael Cassio,
Lieutenant, &c.

Collier points out that as the third gentleman has already described the ship as "of Venice," "it is not likely that he would assert just afterwards that she was Veronese ; it seems much more probable that he would call Cassio, whom he did not know, a Veronese."

Be the explanation what it may, Shakespeare cannot be held guilty of a geographical error on the reading of the text as he left it.

3. Bergamo is close to the Lake of Garda, where, according to Mr. Horatio Brown, the Venetians kept their war galleys floating, so the idea is not far-fetched that there should be a sail-maker there. Scene I. of

Act V. of *Taming of the Shrew*, in which the reference occurs, is laid in Padua. Why should Shakespeare fix on Bergamo and on sail-making as the trade of Tranio's father unless he had some actual knowledge of the place which suggested the connection? The mistake, if it be a mistake, is of a very trivial character.

4. When, in *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, the Duke bids Protheus and Thurio meet him,

“Upon the rising of the mountain foot
That leads toward Mantua,”

it is urged that this is another blunder, as there is no mountainous territory between Milan and Mantua. “Perhaps,” says Mr. Horatio Brown, “the poet was thinking of the Euganeæ Hills, but put these on the near instead of on the farther side of Mantua.” This appears just such a mistake as a man would make who had passed through the country but had not stayed long enough to fasten in his mind the topography of the neighborhood. It is far too slight to justify the assumption that the poet could never have visited Italy.

5. There is no suggestion in the *Merchant of Venice* that Gobbo's horse, Dobbin, jogged along the narrow *calli*. Here is the text:—

Gobbo: Lord worship might he be, what a beard hast thou got; thou hast got more haire on thy chin, then Dobbin my phil-horse has on his taile.

Lancelot: It should seem then that Dobbin's taile growes backward. I am sure he had more haire of his taile then I have of my face when I last saw him.

What is the difficulty here?

Shylock's admonition to Jessica,

“Clamber not you up to the casements then
Nor thrust your head into the public street,”

may pass without comment, even if Shakespeare had in his mind's eye the Florentine building instead of the

Venetian, as may also Gratiano's remark to Salarino :

"This is the penthouse under which
Lorenzo desires us to make a stand."

All these inaccuracies, if they be inaccuracies, are introduced in so circumstantial a manner, as to convey the impression that the poet was speaking from the recollection of actual observation even if his memory failed as to details.

Turning to the other side, the author of the play's "intimacy with Venice," Mr. Brown says :—

"Yet in spite of this ideal geography we are startled, every now and then, by a touch of topographical accuracy so just as almost to persuade us that Shakespeare must have seen with outward eye the country which his fancy pictures ; must have travelled there, and carried thence a recollection of its bearings.

For to return to the *Merchant of Venice*, Portia says to Balthasar :

'Take this same letter,
And use thou all th' endeavour of a man
In speed to Padua : see thou render this
Into my cousin's hand, Doctor Bellario ;
And, look, what notes and garments he doth give thee,
Bring them, I pray thee, with imagin'd speed
Unto the tranect,^o to the common ferry
Which trades to Venice. Waste no time in words,
But get thee gone : I shall be there before thee.'

^o Coryat (*Crudities* i. 210) says : "There are in Venice thirteen ferries or passages, which they commonly call *traghetti*." Moryson, in his *Itinerary* i. 77, similarly describes the *traghetti*. Staunton suggests, therefore, that "Tranect," no other use of the word being known, is probably a misprint for "Tragect." Karl Elze, who maintains that the only possible explanation of the poet's exact local knowledge of Italy is that he visited Italy (*Essays*, 1873, p. 279), says : "What visitor does not here at once recognize the Venetian *tragheto* (*tragetto*)? And whence did the poet get a knowledge of the *tragheto*? Coryat is out of the question, and Vecellio, even if he knew that Shakespeare had read the book, which we do not, has not a word about the *tragheto*, so that the disbelievers in an Italian journey of Shakespeare cannot account for his knowledge by any other means than by oral communication.

They are at her country house of Belmont, which we may conjecture to be Montebello, just beyond Vicenza. Portia intends to reach Venice by the *burchio della Brenta*, the common ferry-boat which started from Padua and was towed leisurely down the pleasant stream, past Dola and La Mira and Malcontenta, and put into the lagoon at Lizza Fusina. It is possible that Shakespeare had heard that quaint and travelled gentleman, Fiacco Moryson, describe the *burchio* and its motley crew. ‘The boat is covered with arched hatches,’ he says, ‘and there is very pleasant companye, so a man beware to give no offence ; for otherwise the Lumbards carry shirts of male, and being armed as if they were in camp, are apt to revenge upon shameful advantages. But commonly there is pleasant discourse, and the proverb saith that the boat shall be drowned when it carries neither monk, nor student, nor curtisan.’”

However that may be, the poet knew that there was such a ferry and such a boat. Balthasar is despatched before to meet his mistress at the ferry, with documents and lawyers’ gowns, which he got from Dr. Bellario, whose namesakes live in Padua to this day. Portia, with Nerissa, follows in her coach; and how far is it that they have to drive between Belmont and Padua?

For we must measure twenty miles to-day—twenty miles! exactly the distance between Montebello and the gate of Padua. If Montebello and Belmont be identical, this is surely most surprisingly accurate; yet we cannot believe that this accuracy is due to more than a striking but fortuitous coincidence.

After referring to the casements and penthouse, he continues:—

“But although slight indications such as these induce us to conclude that Shakespeare never saw Venice, it is impossible to deny the truth of local colour which pervades the play. It is that salient point the Rialto, its mere sound and name, which give to the setting of the drama the strong Venetian flavour which it undoubtedly possesses. The fame of the great arch, which had been thrown across the Grand Canal soon after Shakespeare’s birth, had, no doubt, reached England; and it is round Rialto that Shakespeare has gathered his own Venetian knowledge; it is about the

Rialto that his fancy builds up the Venice he desires his audience to see. We are made to feel the crowd upon the bridge and at the foot of its long flight of stairs; we picture Antonio sauntering with his friends, waiting for news of his galleys, and Shylock creeping by, eyeing and eyed askance, and now and then tormented by the boys as they recognise the yellow sign of his Jewish blood upon his breast or his cap. In the characters of the play, too, the Venetian flavour is for the most part successfully maintained. Portia is most thoroughly Venetian; so also are Shylock and Antonio; indeed the Jew is not more distinctly Jewish than Venetian in many respects; the average Venetian merchant—not Antonio, of course, for he is meant to be an exception—and his Jewish rivals were, we suspect, at no time very different in their methods of conducting business. There is only one point where the Venetian quality of the play is violated—that is in the portrayal of the country clowns, Gobbo the Elder and Launcelot, his son. They are both peasant-bred, but their note, the tone of their conversation and their humour, is English, or at least not Italian. It is in Portia, Shylock and Rialto that we catch the purest aroma of Venice which the play exhales.

“If we ask how far do stray touches and phrases in this drama show on the part of the playwright a knowledge of Venetian habits, laws and customs, we shall find several points worthy of notice. Whether the poet drew his character of Antonio from the merchant-prince Fugger, as has been suggested; whether he was aware of the great German exchange-house, the Fondaco dei Tedeschi, which existed in Venice, or not, he is certainly fully alive to the fact that commercial relations between Venice and Germany were of the closest description. With no German city was trade more active than with Frankfort; and Shakespeare

shows his information on this point when he makes Shylock in his misery recall his business transactions in that city, and the diamond he bought there.” . . .

“Shylock’s confidence that he will receive pure justice from the Venetian tribunals is true to fact and honourable to the Republic; Antonio recognises this when he says :—

‘The Duke cannot deny the course of law ;
For the commodity that strangers have
With us in Venice, if it be denied,
Will much impeach the justice of his state ;
Since that the trade and profit of the city
Consisteth of all nations.’

“That states the truth about Venetian commercial policy; the great freedom and security she always allowed to strangers, which accounted for so much of her prosperity, and for the rooted affection which her dependencies bore towards her—an affection which manifested itself after the wars of the League of Cambray, when the liberated cities voluntarily returned to their allegiance towards St. Mark.”

And again :—

“The whole of the first act of *Othello* is full of the spirit of Venice, which the poet has known how to breathe into his words. The dark night, the narrow streets, Brabantio’s house with close-barred doors and shutters, the low voices of Iago and Rodrigo, the sudden uproar springing up out of the quiet night, the torches and lacqueys, the ‘knave of common hire,’ the gondolier, the doge and senators in council, their indignation at their brother patrician’s wrongs, Othello’s calm and noble statement of his wooing, how he sped by tales of moving accidents, and histories so strange as to tempt us almost to believe that Shakespeare had studied Marco Polo’s ‘Voyages;’ Brabantio’s bitter, resentful, unforgiving warning :—

‘Look to her, Moor, if thou have eyes to see :
She has deceived her father, and may thee,’

all this is admirably conceived to picture forth one full night in Venice.

"As in the comedy Portia is the type of the brilliant, playful, sprightly, Venetian lady, so in the tragedy Desdemona personifies the gentle, loving, submissive, patient type, so dear to the Italians. . . ."

And again :—

"We would draw attention to a few other points and touches which help to throw light on the extent of Shakespeare's knowledge of Venice, Venetian territory, and Venetian people. When Brabantio unwilling and with an ill grace resigns his daughter to the Moor, he says to Desdemona :—

'For your sake, jewel,
I am glad at soul I have no other child ;
For thy escape would teach me tyranny,
To hang clogs on them.'

"It is possible that in this passage Shakespeare is thinking of those high pattens which were then in favour with Venetian ladies. They were worn so enormously high that a lady required the attendance of two lacqueys, upon whose shoulders she leaned for support when she went abroad. The story in St. Disdier's 'La Ville et la Republique de Venise,' already quoted, appears to throw light on Shakespeare's intention in this passage. The French traveller relates that the Ambassador of France, in conversation with the Doge, remarked once that shoes would be much more convenient ; whereupon one of the ducal councillors broke in severely, 'Yes, far, far too convenient.' Again, Brabantio, when he learns his daughter's flight, calls for some 'special officers of night ;' would Shakespeare have thought of such a strange and picturesque description of the night patrol had he not known that in Venice those officers bore the title of *Signori di Notte*,

lords of the night? The poet is aware that Padua possessed a university, and was a famous *nursery of arts*; this is not surprising when we recollect how many Englishmen went to study in that city. But more than this, he knew that Padua belonged to Venice, and that Mantua did not. Tranio tells the pedant:—

‘Tis death for any one in Mantua
To come to Padua. Know you not the cause?
Your ships are stayed at Venice, and the duke,
For private quarrel ‘twixt your duke and him,
Hath published and proclaimed it openly.’

“It was surely not a little for a London play-actor to know so much of the complicated political geography of Italy. In the passage just quoted the term ‘pedant’ declares that Tranio shall ever be the patron, that is *padrone*, master of his life and liberty. We do not know if ‘Sound as a fish,’ an expression which passes from Launce to Speed in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, was an English proverb in use at Shakespeare’s date, but ‘*sano come un pesce*’ certainly was, and is a good Italian proverb to this day.”

And again:—

“Shakespeare is aware, too, of the right use of Italian Gentile names. Lucentio, in *The Taming of the Shrew*, describes his father as ‘Vincenzio come of the Bentivolii,’ that is, Vincenzo de’ Bentivoglii.”

What would be the verdict of an intelligent jury after listening to the testimony of Mr. Brown?

Must it not be this:—We find that the plays *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *The Merchant of Venice*, *Othello*, and *Taming of the Shrew*, contain a knowledge of minute facts in detail which no imagination can fairly be expected to compass, and which can only have been obtained and reproduced by a man who had travelled through Italy. Mr. Brown starts by referring to a man

Cambio
= exchange
Benedello
= blond
Blanca
= fair
or white

(Shakespeare, of Stratford) who probably was never out of England. *Ergo*, he could not have been the author of the plays.

THE GRAVE'S TIRING-ROOM

BY MR. J. E. ROE.

I N our paper in the April issue of *BACONIANA* under the foregoing title, we purposely avoided all conclusions touching the poem subscribed I. M. there under review further than they could be made to appear by the quotations themselves, which included Son. 68. That Sonnet involved the ultimate purpose of our paper, viz., the dead fleece of Bacon's first, and the beginning, subsequent to his fall, of a second literary period, and on second head.

The claim that all of the poems introductory to the plays were products of Bacon's pen, notwithstanding the appending of other names to them, we had distinctly laid long before they were claimed to contain cyphers.

But as the dead fleece and second life of the Sonnet are also touched in the poem I. M., we thought, if there was any change in Bacon's cypher methods in living that second life, some touch of it, indicated by cypher, might be looked for in this particular poem, standing, as it does, introductory to the plays, and framed by Bacon's own pen, touching not only the removal by death of his own cover, weed, *nom-de-plume*, or mask—Shakespeare—but also touching the printed worth of that dead fleece, and which poem is in these words:—

“To the memory of Mr. W. Shakespeare.

We wonder'd, Shakespeare, that thou went'st so soon
From the world's stage to the grave's tiring-room :

We thought thee dead ; but this thy printed worth
 Tells thy spectators that thou went'st but forth
 To enter with applause. An actor's art
 Can die, and live to act a second part :
 That's but an exit of mortality,
 This a re-entrance to a plaudit."—I. M.

Touching the use of this word "plaudit," we quote Bacon thus : "A popular judge is a deformed thing : and plaudits are fitter for players than for magistrates" (Sped. L.l. vi. 211). In our former paper we gave his use of the word touching the removal by death of Augustus Cæsar, who signified that his life was but a play.

To show Bacon familiar with the thought involved in the words of the poem, "The Grave's Tiring-room," we quote from his essay concerning the muses, entitled "The Sirens, or Pleasures," what he says of the taking off of Petronius, "He who, having been condemned to death, sought, in the very waiting-room of death, for matter to amuse him," etc. Note in our former paper what he says of his own retirement. The "plaudit" due to this second part, or this second coming forth of the poem, and the "second life on second head" of the Sonnet, is an allusion by Bacon, we judge, to that great yet untold tale referred to by him in Aphorism 97 of his "Novum Organum," where he compares or contrasts his own doings with those of Alexander the Great, and says :—

"But if a man of mature age, unprejudiced senses, and clear mind would betake himself anew to experience and particulars, we might hope much more from such a one ; in which respect we promise ourselves the fortune of Alexander the Great, and let none accuse us of vanity till they have heard the tale which is intended to check vanity."

As to the scheme itself—his "great basis for eternity" of Son. 125—he, in Aph. 120, alludes thus :—

"We neither dedicate nor raise a capitol or pyramid to the

pride of man, but rear a holy temple in his mind on the model of the universe, which model, therefore, we imitate. For that which is deserving of existance is deserving of knowledge—the image of existance. Now, the mean and splendid alike exist. Nay, as the finest odors are sometimes produced from putrid matter (such as musk and civet), so does valuable light and information emanate from mean and sordid instances.”

In a work of his second period, he, as to Alexander and this temple, says :—

“Thou, too, art a Conqueror and Victor ; but of the true sort, namely, over the Devil. Thou, too, hast built what will outlast all marble and metal, and be a wonder-bringing City of the Mind, a Temple and Seminary and Prophetic Mount whereto all kindreds of the Earth will pilgrim.”

Notwithstanding the prejudice and enmity awakened against him by reason of his fall, he still, in Son. 55, says :—

“Gainst death all-oblivious enmity

Shall you pace forth ; your praise shall still find room
Even in the eyes of all posterity

That wear this world out to the ending doom.

So, till the judgment that yourself arise,

You live in this, and dwell in lovers' eyes.”

In the quotation just given note the blind or cover word “you.” The cover words “thee,” “thy,” “thou,” “you,” “he,” “his,” allude to the author himself of the Sonnets, and their right conception must ever be the first postulate in their correct interpretation. This use notably appears in the use of the word “thee” in that self-condemnatory Son. 62, which ends thus :—

“’Tis thee, myself, that for myself I praise

Painting my age with beauty of thy days.”

This Sonnet should be read and noted, as it is a kind of key to the point here made. We say correct conception, for these cover words are not always so used. In the Sonnets alluding to the King, Queen, and others, the cover words, or pronouns, have their ordinary use.

For instance, we claim that the word "thou" at the beginning of Son. 88 has its ordinary use, and alludes to the King—King James—under whom Bacon was impeached. Note its word "attainted." This impeachment is likewise distinctly referred to in Son. 125, which ends thus :—

"Hence, thou suborn'd informer, a true soul
When most impeached stands least in thy control."

By the use of the mentioned cover words the author of the Sonnets preserved his manners in not directly or openly praising himself, as may be seen in Son. 3, which opens thus :—

"O, how thy worth with manners may I sing,
When thou art all the better part of me ?
What can mine own praise to mine own self bring ?
And what is't but mine own when I praise thee ?"

We shall have to refer to this use when we reach Son. 68, and so note it here. Dante, in excusing himself for this same use, says : "In Horace man is made to speak to his own intelligence as unto another person ; and not only hath Horace done this, but herein he followeth the excellent Homer." We return, through Son. 53, to our tiring or dressing-room of the poem.

Bacon alludes to his own mental gifts as "that poor talent, or half talent, or what it is, that God hath given me." And the author of the Sonnets, in Son. 53, not only alludes to his unusual mental gifts, but to his Grecian tires, wherein he tells us he is painted new. He says :—

"What is your substance, whereof are you made,
That millions of strange shadows on you tend ?
Since every one hath, every one, one shade,
And you, but one, can every shadow lend.
Describe Adonis, and the counterfeit
Is poorly imitated after you ;

The Grave's Tiring-Room

On Helen's cheek all art of beauty set,
 And you in Grecian tires are painted new.
 Speak of the spring and foison of the year—
 The one doth shadow of your beauty show,
 The other as your beauty doth appear ;
 And you in every blessed shape we know.
 In all external grace you have some part,
 But you like none, none you, for constant heart."

The cover words "you" and "your" refer to the author himself of this Sonnet. We have here the "man in hue, all hues in his controlling," of that difficult Son. 20. We trust, however, that it can be opened.

Touching these Grecian tires wherein the author says he is painted new, a volume might be written, beginning with that new tiring, clothing, dressing, or swaddling of Bacon's great babe—truth—touched first in his *Hamlet*. Mr. Spedding informs us that at one time Bacon intended to bring forth his entire philosophy shadowed anew in the Greek fables. In other words, he intended to put his new wine into these old bottles, thinking thereby the more easily to introduce it. They were his wooden horse of reform, but with new occupants. He was ever framing new thought patterns from these fables, and, as stated in Son. 108, he made "antiquity for aye his page." He opens the preface to his "Wisdom of the Ancients" in these words:—

"The most ancient times (except what is preserved of them in the Scriptures) are buried in oblivion and silence. To that silence succeeded the fables of the poets; to those fables the written records which have come down to us. Thus between the hidden depths of antiquity and the days of tradition and evidence that followed there is drawn a veil, as it were, of fables, which came in and occupy the middle region that separates what has perished from what remains."

It may here be seen in what manner Shakespeare browsed on that ancient root.

We are here giving but brief touches concerning

Bacon's first literary period—his dead fleece. His second was largely an expansion and retailoring of the first. And the work of "The Grave's Tiring-room" was, we judge, but a getting together, adjusting, or arranging of the dead fleece. This golden fleece, at his fall, Bacon thought ruined; it was the broken column, but became, we judge, the pyramid, new reared, of Son. 123. This fleece consisted not merely of the Sonnets and his wood notes—the plays—which he warbled wild, together with the withheld flooring for the second period, but likewise that other side of him—the more serious side—his weavings in philosophy and creamed from a world of his other work.

In our book "The Defoe Period Unmasked," and which concerns the second period, we, at page 114, claim that the Phoenix first folio of the plays was put forth under Bacon's supervision. And see page 307. We now claim that the same was true as to the Sonnets. Why, then, it will be asked, did Francis Bacon cause that thus far impenetrable blind, that screen, that false date, that ante-date, of 1609 to stand sentinel before them? He did it, reader, that you should not know. He did it for the same reason that you yourself would have done it had you been like circumstanced. He did it for the same reason that he caused the name of others to be appended to the poems introductory to the plays, and the plays themselves to be hooded with an assumed name. He did it for the same reason that he used the blind or cover words of the Sonnets, and caused that enigma subscribed T.T. to stand in their front, of which we will some day tell you more. He did it to save the rolling of his own head from the block, as we will soon make manifest.

Again, Bacon worked ever as he conceived Providence to work. He designed to be sought and found, in his non-attributed work, only as Providence is. He

says, "The human mind is the seat of Providence." He says, "From the deepest providence of my mind." He says, "For I have taken all knowledge to be my providence." He says, "For as he is a greater politician who can make others the instruments of his will without acquainting them with his designs than he who discloses himself to those who he employs, so the wisdom of God appears more wondrous when Nature intends one thing and Providence draws out another than if the characters of Providence were stamped upon all the schemes of matter and natural motion."

This was ever Bacon's basis of work in bringing forth his vast reform, which was to be slow, silent, deep-laid, and to be telling only in its issues. His eye was ever on posterity.

He believed that entertainment was ever the first step in reform, and this whether applied to the individual or to the masses. No instruction without attention, and this, by some means, must be got. And so he framed his pen for the hovel as well as the palace. He says the sun enters into sinks and is not defiled.

Until his fall he had upheld the doctrine of passive obedience and the divine right of kings, as evidenced in both plays and Sonnets. But in those Sonnets that were written subsequent to his fall he began vigorously to retailor those doctrines upon finding the king's faithless methods with him, and so, in Son. 118, he says to the king:—

"Even so, being full of your ne'er cloying sweetness,
 To bitter sauces did I frame my feeding,
 And, sick of welfare, found a kind of meetness
 To be diseased ere that there was true needing.
 Thus policy in love, to anticipate
 The ills that were not, grew to faults assured,
 And brought to medicine a healthful state
 Which, rank of goodness, would by ill be cured ;
 But thence I learn, and find the lesson true,
 Drugs poison him that so fell sick of you."

And he ends Son. 147 concerning the king thus :—

“For I have sworn thee fair and thought thee bright,
Who art as black as hell—as dark as night.”

But do these thoughts concern a king? If the reader doubts it let him but turn to and read Son. 57 and 58.

We conclude that these Sonnets were couched at, or near, the transit of events.

With such material woven into them think you Francis Bacon would have issued them, uncovered, unmasked? A statement in print ever binds the intellect, and who, think you, knew better than he the value of an ante-date as a cover? Through his entire career, and with all the subtlety of his genius—his Providence—he had studied methods for concealment. In this he never had an equal. Of his genius Macaulay says, “With great minuteness of observation he had an amplitude of comprehension that was never yet vouchsafed to any other human being.”

(To be continued.)

“THE MISFORTUNES OF ARTHUR.”

WITH a view to studying Francis Bacon’s early dramatic style, we cannot do better than glance at the first tragedy with which his name is connected. The actual play has some fine writing, though the plot is of a rather morbid character, quite in contrast to the usual Masques with which the gentlemen of Gray’s Inn helped to amuse Her Majesty.

The play must have made some stir at the time, and was printed in black letter, of which only one copy has survived. This copy came into Garrick’s hand, and has had various wanderings since then. Mr. Collier rescued it from oblivion, and reprinted it with a preface, along with other old plays. He remarks, “There is a richer and nobler vein of poetry running through it

than is to be found in any other previous work of the kind, and the blank verse is generally free and flowing." Though eight persons are mentioned as engaged in the production, it is more than probable that Francis Bacon did most of the writing, and strangely enough his name is printed beside that of "Nicholas Trott, Gentleman of Gray's Inn," from whom Francis was afterwards to borrow large sums, and repay still larger amounts, till he complains of usury, and the name of Nicholas Trott must have given him many a sleepless night. But here they are together devising a play for the amusement of the Court.

"THE MISFORTUNES OF ARTHUR"

"Certain devises and shewes presented to her Majestie by the gentlemen of Grayes Inne at her Highnesses Court in Greenwich, the 28 day of Feb. in the 30th year of her Majesties most happy reign.

At London. Printed by Robert Robinson 1587."

The names of the collaborators were: Thomas Hughes, William Fulbecke, Nicholas Trott, Francis Flower, Christopher Yelverton, Francis Bacon, John Lancaster, — Penruddock.

Mr. Hazlett says Fulbecke previously published a tragedy called *Christian Ethics*, and that Christopher Yelverton had written the epilogue to Gascoigne's *Jocasta*. These old hands were doubtless of use with their experience, but which of the eight corrected and expurged some objectionable passages we know not.

The story is taken from *Morte Arthur*, and the first pretty scene occurs when Three Muses, in classic attire, walk on the stage leading on five of the gentlemen student authors (in their usual law garments) as captives, and present them to Her Majesty the Queen. Was this Francis Bacon's first appearance? We think not.

There is a dumb show between each of the acts,

which must have been a relief from the long speeches which the bloodthirsty warriors had to recite. The female characters only appear at the beginning of the play, which arrangement would not suit our present-day audiences; but the first dumb show reminds us strangely of the opening scene of *Macbeth*, produced long afterwards.

Sounding the music there rose three *furies* from under the stage, apparelled accordingly, with snakes and flames about their black hair and garments. The first with a snake in her right hand and a cup of wine in her left; the second with a firebrand and a cupid in her left; the third with a whip in her right hand and a Pegasus in her left. Then came three nuns.

Guenevra, on hearing that her husband is returning after his long absence, cries passionately:

“And dare he after nine years space return,
And see her face, whom he so long disdaind,
Was I then chose and wedded for his stale,
To look and gape for his retireless sail
Puffed back and fluttering spread to every wind?”

She talks of suicide, and Augharet, who is the Queen's sister, soliloquises in one place upon death:—

“Eachwhere is death! The fates have well ordained
That each man may bereave himself of *life*,
But none of *death*: death is so sure a doom
A thousand ways do guide us to our graves
Who then can ever come too late to that
Whence, when he is come, he never can return?
Or what avails to hasten on our ends
And long for that which destinies have sworn!
Look back in time: too late is to repent
When furious rage hath once cut off the choice.”

On the whole the men's speeches strike us as the

most natural in the play, and Mordred has some vigorous lines, such as—

"He that envies the valour of his foe
 Detects a want of valour in himself.
 He fondly^o fights that fights with such a foe
 Where t'were a shame to lose, no praise to win,
 But with a famous foe succeed what will
 To win is great renown, to lose less foil
 His conquests were they more, dismay me not."

And again—

"The crown I'll keep myself, ensue what will
 Death must be once, how soon I least respect.
 He best provides that can beware in time
 Not why, nor when, but whence, and where he falls,
 What fool to live a year or twain in rest
 Would lose the state and honour of a crown?"

With one more extract we have done, and it reminds us of Francis Bacon as a boy in St. James's Park looking for the echo.

"Thou echo shrill, that haunt'st the hollow hills
 Leave off, that wont to snatch the latter word,
 Howl on a whole discourse of our distress,
 Clip off no clause; sound out a perfect sense."

Among the MS. papers of Anthony Bacon† which Thomas Birch left bound up, is a short poem which no doubt was written by an admirer of the play. In it he alludes to the first scene having a resemblance to Seneca's *Thyestis*, and also pokes fun at the numerous parents *The Misfortunes of Arthur* possessed, and wonders which of them "*so washed thy face in printer's ink,*" which is a very happy expression.

*Meaning "gladly."

† British Museum, Plut. 4125.

The MS. poem runs as follows :—

“ O Second Arthur bred in British brayne
Well hath myne host himself a prophet proved
For sure when first he sang thou camst again
Cassandra like his threatening few men moved
The effect expounds that oracle so dark
Forshewed this Brittish Bard’s surpassing wark.

Strange was thy birth indeede, and brant like
Much payns thy mother bidd with patience myld.
One noosed thee, another made thy checke,
And yet no doubt thou art but one man’s child,
But who so washed thy face with printer’s inke
Speck on the rest, I know well what I thinke !

Resigne thy buskens Sophocles the Great,
Tread Morter now with thy disarmed shanks,
For this man’s braynes hath hada happier sweat,
Whereof the world commends him ample thanks.
Blush Seneca to see thy feathers loose,
Plucked from a Swan, and stickéd on a goose.

And ye swet gentlemen of Grayan name,
Well was a Solace to her Highness meant.
And all that passed from you deserves good fame,
Your mendments good, your acting excellent.
But when your spyks of Poesie be ripe,
Dance ‘harvest home’ after a better pipe.”

A. CHAMBERS BUNTON.

THE LATEST FROM THE STATES.

“ NATURE’S working up,” said Whistler once.
But “Amurriky” is in a fair way of beating
“Nature,” whose “infinite book” Shakspeare
studied to some advantage, according to Sir Theodore
Martin and others.

A Yankee professor, Corson by name, who is
“Professor of English Literature in the Cornell
K

University," has issued a book entitled *An Introduction to the Study of Shakespeare*. And a wonderful "study" it is to a student of English literature. He actually condescends to devote a chapter to *The Shakespeare-Bacon Controversy*, in which we are informed—"there's not a particle of evidence to begin with, of a kind even to raise the faintest suspicion, that William Shakespeare of Stratford-upon-Avon, gentleman, [a Stratford man never spelt his name that way] was not the author of the Plays and Poems attributed to him." This is good for a start, as is also this:—"Such was the creative force of the man, that all knowledge outside the range of his own experience, he used with a grand audacity." Venice, for example, was "outside of the range of his own experience, and yet he describes it like a Murray or Baedeker's guide-book. His information he obtained "by force of his imagination." [S. Lee.]

Next appears this brilliant gem:—"Learning, indeed! If Shakespeare hadn't possessed something infinitely better than learning (and, I would add, something infinitely better than a great analytic, inductive, deductive, and classifying intellect, such as that possessed by Lord Bacon) we should not now be enjoying such a noble dramatic heritage as we are. And if John Shakespeare [? Shakspeare or Shagspur] had had the means to send William to Oxford or Cambridge, and William had gone through, or been driven through, the curriculum of either of these Universities, what a misfortune it might have been to mankind! He might have been schooled in, and might afterwards have adhered to, those laws of dramatic art which, in the absence of such schooling, he rendered obsolete for all time, and, by the wonderful dramatic art which he himself developed, wrought a complete revolution in the drama."

Marvellous! A University education would have spoilt Shakspeare. Yet, later on, we are informed by Mr. Corson that his Shakespeare "was the best educated man that ever lived; and by 'best educated' should be understood, that his faculties, intellectual and spiritual, especially the latter, and all that enter into a personality, had the fullest, freest, and most harmonious play." And the "best educated man that ever lived" was educated (till the age of 13) at Stratford Grammar School. "Shakespeare must have felt his superiority to the *merely learned* men with whom he came in contact, and must soon have discovered that *he* drank from fountains of which they knew nothing." It was not from "fountains" that Shakspeare "drank"—occasionally.

Of the First Folio Professor Corson says:—"And if *he* (Ben Jonson) had had any doubt . . . as to whether Shakespeare were the veritable author of the Plays, he was the unlikeliest man in all England to lend his name, and authority, to a work of questionable authorship." Was he? What does the Hon. D. H. Madden, the great Shakespearean, say on this point in his *Diary of Master William Silence* the perusal of which I recommend to Professor Corson:—"They (Heminge and Condell) succeeded in imposing on the simple guileless Ben Jonson, who was induced to lend the authority of his great name to their undertaking" (the First Folio). Ben Jonson played a double part by actually describing the merits of Bacon and Shakespeare in exactly identical language.

Then everybody does not think so much as Professor Corson does of "the authenticity of the First Folio," and the high standing and reputation of Heminge and Condell. The Editors of the best edition of Shakespeare—the Cambridge edition—convict Heminge and Condell of making false statements in their Preface to

the Folio, and describe them as "unscrupulous," "discredited," "knaves," and "impostors."

Professor Corson has a flying shot at the so-called "anachronisms" in Shakespeare—Bohemia made a maritime port, Julio Romano a sculptor, &c., &c., but the author knew more than his critics, as Bohemia once extended from the Baltic to the Adriatic, and Julio Romano, as is shown by the inscription on his tomb, was both a sculptor and a painter. Even if the anachronisms were anachronisms, over and over again in his works, as Lord Byron showed, Bacon perpetuated similar errors, for which "a boy at a public school would be soundly thrashed." This I showed fully in *Notes and Queries*, June 13, 1903.

Over these Shakespearean anachronisms Mr. Furness has something to say in his new *Variorum* volume of *Anthony and Cleopatra*. It is most interesting reading.

Furness quotes Hudson, who says, over the billiards "anachronism" in *Anthony and Cleopatra*:—"An anachronism," say the critics. But how do they know this? Late researches have shown that many things were in use in old Egypt, which, afterwards lost, have been re-invented in modern times."

Then he quotes Adee, who says:—"The human encyclopædia (Shakespeare) who wrote that sentence appears to have known—what very few people know nowadays—that the game of billiards is older than Cleopatra."

Next, *The Edinburgh Review* asserts, in reference to the mention by Shakespeare of "cannon" in *King John*, of "clock striking" in *Julius Cæsar*, and of "billiards" in *Anthony and Cleopatra*:—"No dramatic author, to produce a scenic effect, would shrink from such anachronisms, because they are not 'gross,' not so gross as to be detected in an instant by a theatrical audience, which knows nothing whatever about the origin of cannon, clocks, and billiards,"

Schlegel even adopts the same argument when he maintains:—"I undertake to prove that Shakespeare's anachronisms are for the most part committed 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."

So that if these anachronisms were committed purposely, and not from ignorance, what comes of the argument that the anachronisms show that Bacon could not have written the Plays?

In conclusion, the sapient professor is as cock-sure of everything as Macaulay or Sidney Lee when he writes: "If Shakespeare did not write the Plays attributed to him, *certainly* Lord Bacon did not write them;" and "the credulity of those who are suffering from the dry rot of doubt is something wonderful." "Dry rot" is excellent, and almost as expressive as S. Lee's "mad-house chatter."

GEORGE STRONACH.

CORRESPONDENCE

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIR,—The short life of Fra. S. Alban, commencing *Histoire Naturelle*, referred to in BACONIANA for April, 1906, has the statement that *he travelled in Italy*. It was not safe for an Englishman then to be in Rome under his own name. If your readers study the Italian edition of "Montaigne's Travels," they will, I believe, have a reliable and exact account of our Francis' Italian tour, with most interesting details of all he saw and did in Rome, Venice, Padua, Verona, and other places. The book is edited with an infinity of notes by *Prof. Alessandro D'Ancona* [1895. *littà di Castello*] and is called "*L'Italia alla fine del Secolo XVI. Giornale del Viaggio di Michele de Montaigne in Italia nel 1580 e 1581*."

This was the year after Sir Nicholas Bacon died, or was put out of the way, and about the time the first Shakespeare plays came out. I believe it was under the name of *Monsieur L'Estissac* that our Francis travelled [*i.e.*, p. 1.] "*Audit Beaumont, Mr. d'Estissac se mesla à la trope pour faire mesme voyage.*" A foot note

explains who this personage was: "*Figlio della Signora * d'Estissac, alla quale è dedicato il cap VIII. del lib 2nd degli Essais intitolato De l'perfectiō des pères aux enfans.*" At the same time another foot note says [p. 4.]: "Difficile è dire chi fosse il sig. d'Estissac, ma forse è quel Carlo signore della terra di tal nome nel Perigon, discesi di Périguenx, che morendo nel 1586, lascio erede la Torella Claudia maritala ad un Laroche foncauld."

Identification of this d'Estissac has evidently been wanting: Gregory XIII. during an audience "admonished him to study and to virtue," which proves him to have been "un giovane," of great promise and importance. Montaigne, apparently, attended him everywhere.

Naples, 1908.

Sincerely yours,

ALICIA AMY LEITID.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIR,—Bodley's letter to Bacon printed in your last issue is a valuable find. It shews:—

1. That Bacon was abroad as a student of state-craft, not as an intelligencer.

2. That his funds were supplied, not by his supposed father, the rich Sir Nicholas, but by certain important "friends" who communicated through Bodley.

3. He was to make his life profitable to his country and himself more comfortable (to give satisfaction) to his "friends." He was to keep full written notes of his observations and expenditure, and if he made proper reports and accounts of his expenditure, his friends would supply him liberally with funds.

4. In 1578 Bodley was a linguist and a well-educated Englishman, aged 36, was in the service of Queen Elizabeth as her gentleman usher, necessarily a most confidential office.

5. Until about 1588 he was occasionally engaged on private confidential errands for the Queen to the Continental States. Then, settled in the Northern Provinces as Minister Resident at the Hague, he corresponded regularly with the Earl of Leicester.

6. As Bodley was not related to Bacon, the expression "My dear cousin" would only be consistent with the letter having been written on behalf of the Sovereign to a person above the rank of a baron.

This is valuable confirmation of the truth of the bilateral cipher story as to Bacon's true parentage.

PARKER WOODWARD.

Lord Palmerston and Shakspeare

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—Some time ago I was asked by a doubting correspondent if I could inform him of my authority for the statement that Lord Palmerston was a disbeliever in the Shakspearean authorship of the plays.

* "*Contessa*," in Index.

He
entirely

I wrote him to the following effect:—"If you will look up *Blackwood's Magazine* for November, 1865, you will find an article on Lord Palmerston in which it is stated he (Palmerston) was tolerably well up in the chief Latin and English classics; but he maintained one of the most extraordinary paradoxes touching the greatest of them that was ever broached by a man of his intellectual calibre. He maintained that the plays of Shakspeare were really written by Bacon, who passed them off under the name of an actor for fear of compromising his professional prospects and philosophic gravity. Only last year, when this subject was discussed at Broadlands, Lord Palmerston suddenly left the room, and speedily returned with a small volume of dramatic criticisms, in which the same theory (originally started by an American lady) was supported by supposed analysis of thought and expression. 'There,' he said, 'read that, and you will come over to my opinion.' When the positive testimony of Ben Jonson, in the verses prefixed to the edition of 1623, was adduced, he remarked, 'Oh, these fellows always stand up for one another, or he may have been deceived like the rest.' The argument had struck Lord Palmerston by its ingenuity, and he wanted leisure for a searching exposure of its groundlessness."

I am confident that the book referred to was the excellent work by Mr. W. H. Smith, entitled "*Bacon and Shakspeare*," 1857, a perusal of which made me a convert to the Baconian cause.

The verdict of the writer that Palmerston "wanted leisure for a searching exposure of its groundlessness" is refreshing, and has a strong resemblance to some of the more modern dicta of Mr. Sidney Lee.

Old "Pam" was not far wrong in his estimate of the Jonson statement. Mr. George Wyndham has stated that Ben was "another of the great army of literary log-rollers;" and Justice Madden has put it on record that the Editors of the First Folio, by means of their lying statements, "induced the simple, guileless Ben Jonson to lend the authority of his great name to their undertaking." Not bad this for a Shakspearean!

GEORGE STRONACH.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—As it is always interesting to see a Shakspearean commentator quoting Bacon to explain Shakspeare, I send you a copy of a note to be found in Furness' "*Variorum Shakspeare*," Vol. XIV., *Love's Labour Lost*, at page 151. In Act IV. scene 2, where Nathaniel (or, according to some editors, Holofernes) says:—

"Fauste, precor gelida quando pecus omne sub umbra Ruminat, and so forth. Ah, good old Mantuan! I may speak of thee as the traveller doth of Venice:

Venetia, Venetia,
Chi non ti vede non ti pretia.

Old Mantuan, old Mantuan! who understandeth thee not, loves thee not. Ut, re, sol, la, mi, fa."

This is Mr. Furness' note:—

"Knight: The pedant is in his allitudes. He has quoted Latin and Italian; and in his self-satisfaction he *sol-fas* to recreate himself and show his musical skill.—[Douce thinks that Holofernes here hums the notes of the gamut, as Edmund does in *King Lear*, I. ii. 130. The parallelism between Nathaniel and Edmund may be closer than Douce supposed. In the 'fa, sol, la, mi' of Edmund excellent musicians have detected a phrase, based upon a poignant discord, appropriate to the tragic situation. So, also, here Nathaniel's notes do not seem to have been selected haphazard. The following note has been furnished to me by my son:—'It is curious to observe that these six notes form with the tonic the most harmonious intervals, and in the same order indicated by Bacon in his *Sylva Sylvarum*:—"The *Concords in Musick* which are *Perfect* or *Semiperfect*, between the *Unison* and the *Diapason*, are the *Fifth*, which is the most Perfect; the *Third* next; and the *Sixth* which is more harsh: And as the Ancients esteemed, and so doe myself and some Other get the *Fourth* which they call *Diatesseron*. . . . For discords, the *Second* and the *Seventh* are of all others the most odious in Harmony to the *Sense*."—*Century* II., §107, ed. 1651. Of course Bacon is not giving his individual opinion, but stating a general law in Harmony. It is merely a curious "coincidence" that the same law appears to have been hovering in Shakespeare's mind, and that apparently there is as much meaning in his present selection of notes as there is in the selection of Edmund in *Lear*.'—H. H. F., jr.]"

The "Fa, sol, la, mi" in *King Lear* is, it will be remembered, the subject of Mr. Edwin Reed's "Coincidences."

5 Feb., 1908.

G. B. ROSHER.

Justice Shallow.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—Before the insertion of my brief article under the above heading in the last number of *BACONIANA*, I was quite unaware that the subject had been exhaustively treated by so learned a Shakesperean as Mrs. Stopes, or I should not, perhaps, have thought it necessary to trouble you with my inadequate remarks. However, I cannot but feel flattered since reading that lady's article in the *Fortnightly Review* (February, 1903), kindly brought to my notice by your able contributor and correspondent, Mr. George Stronach, to find so eminent a critic at one with myself as to the identity, or, rather, non-identity, of the ridiculous "Shallow" with the sober and honourable personality of the Knight of Charlecote. Mrs. Stopes, however, having established so completely a truth in such exact keeping with Baconian ideas is evidently (as I think) not quite easy in her mind as to the

result, and at the end of her article introduces some matter, with a view apparently of still preserving the Shakspeare (of Stratford) legend, to which I should be glad to be allowed to refer. Having shown, as I have said, and conclusively, as I think, that "the introduction of the Coat of Arms (into the Shallow shield) did not refer to the Sir Thomas Lucy of Shakespeare's (Shakspeare's) youth," and being apparently unconscious of the logical deduction from this, or unwilling to admit it, the accomplished dialectician suggests that the coat armour incident might have reference to a later Lucy than the Knight of Charlecote, namely, his grandson, Sir Thomas, of Sutton Park, Worcestershire. And, in order to show this, she turns to an examination of the history of the Play (*The Merry Wives*). "The acting copy" of this—that is, the copy as now universally known—she reminds us "is taken from the Folio of 1623," and (to put it shortly), if I understand her rightly, the Coat of Arms references in it do not appear in any of the Quarto copies, of which there were three editions—those of 1600 (the original), of 1602 (imperfect), and 1619 (a "pirated" edition). Well, if this be so, and I have no doubt it is, though I have not seen copies of the Quartos, this seems to me to be a very remarkable fact, and one which, I think, leads to a conclusion diametrically opposed to the one which Mrs. Stopes would establish. For is not the establishment of this fact equivalent to an admission that the coat armour passages in the Play were never in it during Shakspeare of Stratford's lifetime? That, I think, is the natural conclusion, but Mrs. Stopes evidently does not think so, but suggests, as indeed is most probable, that the passages in question have reference to, and arose out of incidents in, the "Star Chamber Case," which Lucy (the grandson) "made" of the robbery of his park (Sutton) in 1610, and that it was *then* that "Shakespeare (Shakspeare) may have dashed in, as a merry retort, the suggestions of the Coat of Arms which have come down to us." But, if so, why was not this "merry retort" in the edition of 1619, in which, though it was a "pirated" edition, she thinks it "more than likely that all the points that pleased the groundlings would be seized and introduced, even if heavily garbled?" Well, this was surely just such a point. How, then, I would ask again, came it to be omitted? Simply, one would suppose, as I have already suggested, because up to that time (1619, three years after Shakspeare's death) the coat armour "business" had never formed part of the Play. But this apparently natural and logical conclusion would be one "too tolerable, and not to be endured" by good orthodox believers in the Stratford legend. Hence Mrs. Stopes will have none of it.

All the same I think Baconians will thank her for her suggestion that the introduction of the "lucres" arose out of the great "Star Chamber Case" of Lucy *v.* Wall and Harnage and others for Park breach in 1610; and, if so, will be inclined to ask—Who so likely, that being the case, to know all about it as

Francis Bacon, then Solicitor-General, and practising in such cases? And who—if he were, as all Baconians think, the author of the original Play—so likely to make use of his knowledge for the improvement, after his fashion, of the earlier drafts, and for the “perfecting of its limbes,” with a view to its inclusion in the great Folio collection of 1623, at a time when such an addition might be safely introduced without fear of offence to anybody? No one that I can think of. At all events it could hardly be the Shakspeare of Stratford, for he was dead.

JOHN HUTCHINSON.

Middle Temple Library.

Bacon and Edmund Spenser

TO THE EDITOR OF “BACONIANA.”

SIR,—In BACONIANA for July, 1907, I had some remarks upon the connection between Bacon and the writings attributed to Edmund Spenser. I called attention to the first biography of Spenser which appeared, written by some unknown hand, prefixed to the third folio edition (1679) of his works.

To this biography I again direct attention, on account of a discovery made since I was formerly considering it. It has reference to the cipher story of Bacon's birth; how that he was the son of Queen Elizabeth and Leicester, born of their secret marriage, and brought up by Sir Nicholas and Lady Bacon as one of their family, indeed, as their youngest son; and how Bacon himself only came to the knowledge of his lofty parentage when he was about 16 years of age. The following passage occurs in the biography:—

“Mr. Sidney (afterward Sir Philip), then in full glory at Court, was the person to whom he (Spenser) designed the first discovery of himself; and to that purpose took an occasion to go one morning to Leicester House, furnish'd only with a modest confidence, and the Ninth Canto of the First Book of the *Fairy Queen*.”

The tale relates how delighted Sidney was with the reading of these stanzas and ordered his steward to pay the poet first £50, and then £100, and then £200. This is the first time this story appears in print. I had read it often before I had the curiosity to turn to the Ninth Canto of the First Book to see what like it was. I was astonished to find that almost the opening stanzas relate the birth and upbringing of Prince Arthur as almost identical with that told in the cipher story about Bacon. Here indeed was a reason—and an unexpected one—for calling the reader's attention to this Ninth Canto.

The pointed attention drawn to this Canto by the tale told in the Spenser biography is, I submit, done for a purpose. There is nothing specially beautiful in it that it should be singled out; but it was

singled out to draw attention to these "birth stanzas," as I may call them, in order that they might act as a finger-post on the road, and tell the patient searcher that he was on the right track. With the traditionary Spenser in one's mind—the poor scholar, the son of a journeyman tailor, the Irish Secretary—these stanzas suggest nothing; but with Bacon's cipher story before one, and the idea of Bacon as the author of the poem, what an illuminating flash they throw!

In the second edition of the first volume of the *Fairy Queen*, published in 1596, there are "mistakes" in paging, which I think were intended to draw attention to these stanzas by indicating the page on which they appear; but this indication was possibly found to be too cryptic to be of use, and, therefore, a more direct way was adopted in the tale I have given.

GRANVILLE C. CUNNINGHAM.

NOTES

HERR DR. H. R. D. ANDERS has been taken to task by Mr. B. Frank Carpenter, the Editor of "New Shakespeareana." In his work on *Shakespeare's Books*, published in 1904 under the auspices of the German Shakespeare Society, Dr. Anders says that there are plausible or probable traces of William Shakespeare having read, in whole or in part, about three hundred authors or particular works, contemporary or classic, specifying such authors by name. Mr. Carpenter reminds Dr. Anders of this in a letter addressed to him, and calls his attention to the fact that on page 108 of his work he says, "I have not been able to discover any traces of Bacon in Shakespeare's works," to which is appended a footnote, "From the Baconians we learn how *not* to reason. This is some good, though a negative one." Mr. Carpenter in his reply proceeds to bring to the notice of Dr. Anders the report of the debate which took place in 1900 to 1903 between Dr. Appleton Morgan and Dr. Platt, especially the following clause in the protocol, which was drawn up as a result of such debate:—

There are so many thousands of identities of thought, phrase, phraseology, opinion, circumstantial statement, error and correction of error in the literatures we call respectively "Shakespeare" and "Bacon," and so many coincidences between Bacon's known doings, circumstances and studies and the material of certain of the Shakespeare plays, that it is a well-nigh successful demonstration that Bacon had more or less to do with the first folio edition of the Shakespeare plays.

Continuing, he says, "If this footnote means that you have familiarized yourself with the Baconian literature, in the course of which hundreds, perhaps thousands, of *parallellisms* between Bacon and Shakespeare are cited—*verb. lit. et punct.*, then your statement in your text means that you have found every one of these *parallellisms* specious, spurious, vicious and apparent only. If this is what you have found, sir, then you have found exactly what the reasoning and thinking world want to know and hear about. And it would be a great condescension to the Shakespeare student, who finds his studies disarranged and his preconceptions disturbed by a persistent and annoying Baconian-Authorship Theory, if you would elaborate with the weight of your authority and exact scholarship, the propositions which inferentially you italicise in your book, to wit, that there is no single trace in Shakespeare's plays of anything ever written or uttered by Francis Bacon, Lord Chancellor Bacon Verulam, Marquis St. Albans, &c., &c."

The letter proceeds to suggest that Dr. Anders should collect and frame specifications, under his propositions, or claim or thesis that there are no traces of Bacon in Shakespeare plays and poems.

To this communication Dr. Anders has replied in a letter in which he sets out the following questions:—

I. Why do Baconians accept the contemporaneous attestations with reference to the authorship of the works of Marlowe, Greene, Kyd, Jonson, Fletcher, &c., and not of Shakespeare?

II. The protocol or consensus of the debate you quote asserts

that there are thousands of coincidences between Shakespeare and Bacon. Can the Baconians mention TEN (10) convincing coincidences where the resemblance is truly striking and cannot be due to what we call "accident?" (speaking roughly) are there not thousands of coincidences between Bacon and Jonson, between Bacon and Chapman, between Carlyle and Browning, between Schiller and Goethe? What do they prove?

III. In my work, "Shakespeare's Books" (Berlin, 1904), I have been at pains to show what books and literary productions were known to Shakespeare. Even a cursory perusal of Bacon's works would make it apparent that Bacon's library must have been of a greatly different character. But Ben Jonson's works would doubtless show many more points of agreement with Bacon's. Can it therefore be doubted that Bacon wrote Jonson's and not Shakespeare's works?

IV. Can the Baconians mention ONE clear argument which undoubtedly proves Bacon's authorship of the "so-called" Shakespearean works? Or, if they have many arguments, can they give the FIVE (or, if perhaps, the SEVEN or EIGHT) best and strongest arguments. But, for mercy's sake, let them not kill their opponents by verbosity, or imagine that "Scheinargumente" will settle the "Question." It would be advisable also if the Baconians give clear references when they quote a passage, giving chapter and verse in each case, to refer not to Baconian literature, but to the ORIGINAL works on which the Baconians are themselves dependent.

"New Shakespeareana" says, "While Dr. Anders' letter is not exactly responsive at all points, here at last is a precise challenge!" . . . "New Shakespeareana" therefore respectfully invites the Hon. Edwin Reed, Dr. Isaac Hall Platt and Mr. Basil Brown to consent to resolve themselves into a committee which shall meet Dr. Anders' thesis as above pronounced."

There the matter stands for the present. The result will be awaited with curiosity.

* * *

In December last the *Hereford Times* reproduced the greater part of an article by the Rev. A. T. Bannister

on "Shakespeare ; the Man." The writer, whilst admitting that he is "not in any technical sense a student of Shakespeare or even of English literature as a whole," treats the subject from the conventional standpoint, and endeavours to create "the man" from what, his imagination suggests, the author of the plays must have been. One sentence may be taken as a fair sample. He says, "You can easily imagine the eagerness with which the young Shakespeare, on reaching London and beginning to breathe its literary atmosphere, threw himself into the study of the Italian language and literature ; how he devoured the translations which were beginning to be published ; how he bought, with his earliest gains, John Florio's recently published, 'First Fruits,' the earliest example we possess of a manual of 'Italian Simplified ;' how gladly, a little afterwards, he welcomed the opportunity of making the acquaintance of its author ; how the fascination grew upon him of the brilliant and passionate southern life," and more of such nonsensical gush. This brought that stalwart Baconian, Mr. John Hutchinson, of the Middle Temple, writing under the pseudonym of "Ladylift," into the field, and a controversy commenced. Mr. George Stronach brought his heavy artillery to bear upon the supporters of "the man of Stratford," and left them discomfited and vanquished. The contributions of Mr. Hutchinson have already filled nine columns of the *Hereford Times*, and the discussion is still proceeding merrily. Baconians are indebted to the liberality of the editor of so widely a read paper for an opportunity of ventilating their views.



In that admirable essay, "Shakespeare-Bacon," published anonymously in 1899, there is a note on page 40 to the effect that in the records of the Accademia dei Lincei, one of the earliest modern foundations for the

study of natural science, Bacon's name is said to have been found in a list of rejected candidates for membership. Canon Lonsdale Ragg has courteously supplied the following note on the subject :—

Among the distinguished foreigners whose names were suggested (it is not stated formally proposed) for election was that of Francis Bacon, recommended by a certain Cassiano Dal Pozzo —“*tragl' inglese*” are the words (*Breve Storia*, page 26) “*Cassiano Dal Pozzo raccomandò Francesco Bacone.*” There were, in fact, a Dutchman, a Fleming and three Germans among the very early members. There is no evidence as to whether Bacon was proposed and rejected or merely informally suggested. In either case the really significant fact is the date of Dal Pozzo's election, which was 1622, the year of Bacon's downfall.

* * *

The *Academy* is perturbed. It asks: “What has become of the Baconians? So far as we know, they have for some time forborne to shake the foundations of the literary world, and one is sorry for this silence. For, after all, there was something grandiose about the Baconian doctrine, and, since folly must always be with us, it is better that it should be on a great scale.” Folly on a great scale! It is not the steady-going, persevering Baconians that display this. For a colossal display of folly, those poor, misguided creatures, who are proposing to spend £200,000 on a useless pile of bricks and mortar as a memorial of the Stratford maltster, offer the crowning example. The *Academy* makes some wise remarks on this project. “*Memorials*,” it says, “are erected from one or more of three causes—the impulse of personal affection driving to practical expression; the need for reminding the present and future ages of the work of the man or woman celebrated; the desire to boast before foreign countries. Neither of the two first causes is operative in the case of Shakespeare. We have no personal affection for

him, not only because we never knew him personally, but because the Shakespeare of the public imagination is purely fantastic being guaranteed by no evidence whatever." The *Academy* may well inquire, "What has become of the Baconians?" It surely is not far from the kingdom of heaven, for it goes on to say, "The idea of a Shakespeare memorial is either ridiculous or offensive, or both." Before their scheme is completed, the promoters of the memorial will have a very rude awakening and the *Academy* will have an opportunity of gloating over folly on a scale which will satisfy even its insatiable appetite. One wrote in 1905:—"To those who are engaged in the business of erecting a national memorial to Bacon's idol of the theatre, William Shakespeare, I tender this unwelcome advice: they had better lose no time; the ground beneath that idol is *heavily mined*."



For the second time the members of the Society celebrated the anniversary of Francis Bacon's birth. There was a dinner at Willis's Rooms, St. James's Street, on Wednesday, the 22nd of January. The Chair was occupied by Mr. Granville C. Cuninghame, the Vice-Chair being occupied by Sir Edwin Durning Lawrence. Amongst the guests were Miss Marian Hepworth-Dixon and Mrs. Gertrude Atherton. The toasts included "The Immortal Memory of Francis Bacon" and "The Bacon Society." During the evening, ballads written from 1595 to 1626 were rendered by Madame Helen Trust and Mr. Gale Gardner, Mr. A. C. Bunten accompanying.

BACONIANA.

VOL. VI. *Third Series.* JULY, 1908.

No. 23.

POETRY THE DIVERSION OF BACON'S YOUTH.

HERE at last can be adduced from a contemporary definite testimony to the fact that Sir Francis Bacon was a poet, and, moreover, a poet who sang in the spring-time of his life as the diversion of his youth.

Edmond Waller was born in 1605.* He was the son of Robert Waller, a Buckinghamshire Squire, who was bred a lawyer. Robert Waller practised at the Bar for some years, but retired to live the life of a country gentleman, a course which he afterwards regretted as he considered it too idle. He married a daughter of Hampden of Hampden in Buckinghamshire, one of the most ancient families in England, who was sister to Colonel John Hampden. It is said that he was a man of parts and virtue, that he had a great esteem for the common law, the study of which he preferred to the Civil law. When Edmond was very young his father died, and he came into the estate of Hall Barn, Beaconsfield, with an income of £3,500 per annum. He was educated at Eton, and subsequently

* The facts here stated with reference to Mr. Waller's family and Life are taken from a life of the poet prefixed to the eighth edition of his poems published in 1711.

went to King's College, Cambridge. He was only 17 years of age when he was elected a member of the last Parliament of King James I., and served as Burgess for Agmondesham. This was the Parliament which impeached Bacon. Dr. Birch, who married one of Waller's daughters, gives an account of conversations between the King, Dr. Andrew, Bishop of Winchester, and Dr. Neal, Bishop of Durham, communicated to him by the poet, who was present on the day of the dissolution of the Parliament at the dinner at which they took place. It is said that Waller was well known at Court, and caressed by all the people of quality who had a relish of learning and wit. He was also one of that famous club which included Lord Falkland, Sir Francis Wainmun, Mr. Chillingworth, Mr. Godolphin, and others. Whilst he was at one of their meetings a noise was heard in the street outside, and, upon sending to learn the occasion of it, the members were informed that one of Ben Jonson's sons had been arrested. They sent for him, and he proved to be Mr. Morley, afterwards Bishop of Winchester. Waller liked him so well that he paid the debt (£100) on condition that he would live with him at Beaconsfield, which he did for some eight or ten years. How close a friend Lord Falkland was of Bacon's may be judged by the fact that in writing to Buckingham in December, 1621,* acknowledging the permission given him "to send to your Lordship one to whom you will deliver your mind," he says: "But if your Lordship will have one of my nomination, if I might presume so far, I would name above all others, my lord of Falkland." In the following March it was Falkland who brought permission from Buckingham for him to return to Highgate,† and to whom he wrote shortly afterwards: "It is the best

* Spedding's Life, Vol. VIII, p. 320. † Ibid, p. 342, 343.

accident, one of them amongst men, when they hap to be obliged to those whom naturally and personally they love as I ever did your lordship . . . ; so that the sparks of my affection shall ever rest quiet under the ashes of my fortune to do you service."* Lord Falkland is the subject of one of Waller's poems written in 1638.

It is, therefore, beyond question that the testimony of Waller with reference to any circumstance connected with Francis Bacon is of great value. Waller published the first edition of his poems in 1645. This book has a dedication "To my lady" but without a name. The commencement reads thus :—

"Madam,

"Your Commands for the gathering these Sticks into a Faggot had sooner been obey'd, but intending to present you with my whole Vintage, I stay'd, till the latest Grapes were ripe; for here your Ladiship has not only all I have done, but all I ever mean to do of this kind: Not but that I may defend the Attempt I have made up in Poetry, by the Examples (not to trouble you with History) of many Wise and Worthy Persons of our own Times; as Sir Philip Sidney, Sir Francis Bacon, Cardinal Perron, the ablest of his Countrymen; and the former Pope, who they say, instead of the Triple Crown, wore sometimes the poets Ivy, as an Ornament, perhaps, of lesser weight and trouble: But, Madam, these nightingales sang only in the spring, it was the diversion of their Youth; as Ladies learn to sing and play when they are children, what they forget when they are Women: The Resemblance holds further, for as you quit the Lute the sooner, because the posture is suspected to draw the Body awry; so this is not always practised without some Villany of the Mind, wresting it from present

* Spedding's Life, Vol. VIII., p. 344.

Occasions and, accustoming us to Style somewhat remov'd from common Use. But that you may not think his Case deplorable, who had made Verses; we are told, that Tully (the greatest Wit among the Romans) was once sick of the Disease, and yet recover'd so well, that of almost as bad a Poet as your Servant, he became the most perfect Orator in the World. So that so much as to have made Verses, as not to give over in Time, leaves a man without Excuse: The former presenting us with an opportunity at least of doing Wisely, that is, to conceal those we have made, which I shall yet do, if my humble Request may be of as much force with your Ladship, as your commands have been with me: "

This remarkable statement by Waller that writing poetry was the diversion of Bacon's youth has not been noticed by any of Bacon's biographers. It is significant that in 1645 Waller deemed it necessary to offer an apology for writing poetry, and, by way of justifying his action, cited, amongst others, Sir Francis Bacon as having pursued a similar course.

W. T. SMEDLEY.

DR. FAUSTUS.

BY REV. WALTER BEGLEY.

IN the consideration of *The Tragical History of Dr. Faustus*, the first great difficulty that meets us is that a large portion of the play seems to have been written after Marlowe had been dead some years. Part of the play was written when Marlowe was alive—that is clear from internal evidence, and all the critics agree here—but from Henslowe's Diary it appears to have had all the success and large receipts of a new piece just after Marlowe's death; and, indeed, if such a remarkable play had been acted between 1589 and 1593, we should expect some notice of it, but there is none. The comparison of the two editions (1604 and 1616) is very suggestive, both by the omissions and additions. It would take too much of my space to dwell upon it properly here, but in the excellent German (Heilbronn) edition of Marlowe's works the two editions are printed on opposite pages and the differences can be seen at a glance. Some of the omissions in the later edition are just such as might be too applicable to Bacon as the creator and impersonator of Faustus and so rouse suspicion; they are therefore left out for no textual necessities whatever. I will give but one or two instances, though there are many, *e.g.* :—

“Why, Faustus, hast thou not attained that end?
Is not thy common talk sound aphorisms?”

Now the second line is altogether left out in the later edition. Why so? It is harmless enough. No; Bacon and aphorisms went too much together to be separated by suspicious or envious critics in 1616, and one might lead up to the other, therefore the line was best out of the play. Moreover, the famous Brazen Head of the earlier Bacon spoke in aphorisms, it was thought. Again, the line—

“ Now, Faustus, thou art conjurer laureate ”—

is left out, without apparent reason, in 1616. But the words “ conjurer laureate ” might recall certain circumstances in Bacon’s share of the revellings at Gray’s Inn, when the proceedings terminated in a *fasco* and a certain “ conjurer ” was called in and “ arraigned before a jury of twenty-four gentlemen for having helped to increase the late confusions by foisting in some base common fellows as actors.” This “ conjurer or sorcerer ” was Francis Bacon, and the term has always been interpreted with a reference to his namesake, Roger Bacon ; but what if the reference was to Dr. Faustus ? Not unlikely, surely, especially if we remember the allusive contemporary remarks of Greene and Hall to alchemist and alchemy. But, in any case, it was just as well that Bacon should leave out that phrase, “ conjurer laureate,” if he really had anything to do with the revision of the play.

It may be asked, Why should anyone take this trouble about *Marlowe’s* heresies and atheism ; he had been dead years, and no envious tongues could hurt him ; his character was also well known ? Yes, why, indeed ? No one could harm poor Kit Marlowe now. But Bacon was alive and well in evidence before the eyes of the curious and the envious, and if he were connected with the conjurer, Faustus, and his atheistic blasphemy in the mouths of men, it would be a serious matter. I know I am dealing with what the majority of literary critics would call a highly fanciful and unfounded suggestion, but I must say that the more I study *Dr. Faustus* and *Tamburlaine*, and the other plays of Marlowe, the more I intuitively feel that they are not likely to be the work of so young a man—in their present form, at least—nor of *such* a man as far as his character has been handed down to us. The more I

read them the more they seem to be the expression of just such a mighty and aspiring genius as was Francis Bacon, and again and again I seem to see special beauties which can be only equalled by the special charms of similar beauties in the Sonnets of Bacon-Shakespeare or in his immortal plays.

Take only two lines out of that beautiful address to Helen when she appears to Faust—

“O thou art fairer than the evening aire,
Clad in the beauty of a thousand starres,”

and then take only two lines of the 18th Sonnet—

“Shall I compare thee to a summer’s day?
Thou art more lovely and more temperate.”

These supreme and *uncommon* gems of poetical simile seem to me marked by the impress of one and the same lofty genius. Or take the very first line of the same address—

“Was this the face that launched a thousand ships?—

and compare what Shakespeare says of Helen in *Troilus and Cressida*—

“Why, she is a pearl
Whose price hath launched above a thousand ships.”

Now, I hold that such similarities are more likely to be by the same author repeating himself unconsciously than by a plagiarist stealing or imitating another poet’s work. And beyond the peculiar charm of some of the poetry, there is an amount of learning, of philosophy, astronomy and cosmography in the several plays that we should not be inclined to expect from Kit Marlowe, whose career at Cambridge does not appear to have been marked by any distinction or honour in the College records.

Then the magic, necromancy and power over the elements which take up so much of the plot of Faustus

suggest Bacon rather than Marlowe. Of Faust the chorus says at the very beginning of the play—

“Nothing so sweete as majicke is to him
Which he prefers before his chiefest blisse,
And this the man that in his study sits.”

Now, we have evidence that Bacon had a high opinion of Hermes Trismegistus, the great *occult* philosopher, for he mentions him with the greatest respect in some of the speeches that he prepared for Essex's Device before the Queen. And Marston, who knew so much about Bacon under the feigned name of Labeo, hints that Labeo had turned his attention to alchemy, and there is other strong evidence which I have given in full in discussing that rare book, *A Woman's Worth*. I am well aware that the Folio editors of 1623 have in some instances altered passages in which occur the name of God, and in others omitted them altogether.* Such alterations after 1606 may be accounted for sometimes, I suppose, by the Stat. 3, James I., c. 21, which was *an act to restrain the abuses of players*, especially profanely abusing the holy name of God or of the Trinity. Admitting this explanation, it still does not cover the excision of such harmless lines as the one about aphorisms and others like it.

Mr. Bullen says of the two editions of *Faustus* of 1604 and 1616: “The alterations are such as we might expect the author to make on revision.” With this I agree thoroughly. But Mr. Bullen goes on to say, a page or two later: “My view, then, is that Marlowe revised his work.” But seeing that Marlowe was killed in 1593 and these two editions came out in 1604 and 1616, and we have Henslowe's accounts of additions to *Faustus* paid for after Marlowe's death, I

* Cf. Walker's “Examination of the Text of Shakespeare,” Vol. I., pp. 213—218.

cannot quite accept the solution that Marlowe was the responsible reviser.

Moreover, these revisions are just such ones as we should expect from Bacon, and considering the circumstances wherein he was placed, they seem much more appropriate to his peculiar position than to anyone else.

Before leaving *Dr. Faustus* I would say a word or two about "Germane Valdes and Cornelius." Who were intended by these dear friends of Faust whom he sent for to confer with him in his troubles and projects? This has been one of the most puzzling questions connected with the text of Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus*.

Cornelius has always been taken by critics to stand for Henry Cornelius Agrippa, the well-known magician. But there was the difficulty that Agrippa almost directly afterwards is referred to by name on the *Faustus* stage as having been some time dead, while Cornelius is one of the actors taking part in the performance. Critics have disposed of this difficulty in such airy fashion as: "Cornelius can be no one but Agrippa, a magician of universal fame at that time." But the difficulty of the mention of the dead Cornelius Agrippa while the living Cornelius Agrippa was taking an active part in the dialogue seems insuperable.

Nor is it certain that we are obliged to look for Valdes and Cornelius among the magicians or conjurers of the age. They were Faust's friends, well known, no doubt, to Wagner, his servant, who went to seek them by his master's orders.

Now, my contention is that *Dr. Faustus* may be the creation of Bacon, and the part representation of his own views and desires, so it was in Bacon's direction that I looked for a better explanation of Valdes and Cornelius than I had yet been given. I was not long in finding a Cornelius more suitable to the passage than Agrippa. This was Cornelius Valerius, who was,

perhaps, the best living exponent and teacher of that Natural Philosophy in which Bacon was so interested. This Cornelius was, no doubt, often taken down from the shelves of Bacon's study, or held in his hand while he sat thinking in his chair. If Bacon turned his thoughts to natural magic, then Cornelius Valerius would be the man whose book he would consult, for in a letter of advice to Sir Fulke Greville on his travels (c. 1595), which was supposed to come from Essex, but, as Mr. Spedding thinks, might much more easily have come from Bacon, there is the suggestion that Ramus is the best author for Logic, Lipsius for Politics, and *Valerius for Physics*, or the Philosophy of Nature. This word Valerius has also extremely Baconic associations. Valerius Terminus is an assumed name of Bacon in an early philosophical work, and there is the merry singing Lord Valerius, that recalls Bacon, in Thomas Heywood's *Rape of Lucrece*, where we seem to have an allusion to Bacon's Sonnets and Verses.

But who is meant by Germane Valdes? Here, I think, that the two Spanish Protestant Reformers, the brothers Juan de Valdés and Alfonso de Valdés, are referred to. If we take "germane" to mean "brotherly," as we speak of brothers-german, it would be a very applicable epithet for those twins; and since the friends are addressed as "Valdes, sweet Valdes, and Cornelius," it looks almost as if *three* were addressed. But there are other hints in this direction, for Juan de Valdéz translated the Psalms from the original Hebrew into Spanish and annotated them, being the first to do this in the vernacular; and he also expounded several parts of the New Testament. This would explain the *line*,

"The *Hebrew Psalter* and New Testament,"

which were to be brought to the place of conference where Faust and they were to meet.

Again, Fra Bernardino Ochino, who was the most popular preacher of his day, had taken the themes of his sermons very often from Valdés, and we know that Ochino was immensely admired by Lady Anne Bacon, Francis' mother, so much so indeed that she transcribed some of his writings herself and published them. Young Francis could hardly fail to hear of Valdés very often in his family circle when a boy, and Valdés was strongly against Spanish Papal influence, as was Francis Bacon as well. They would be friends by sympathy if not by personal knowledge.

I may also add, as a good instance of the adjective "german" referring to brothers, the fact that Anthony Bacon speaks of "the straitest link of german consanguinity" between himself and his brother Francis (Spedding's "Life of Bacon," I. 266).

But I only throw out this suggestion, and do not feel very confident about it, for although Faust calls for them as "dearest friends" to confer with him they seem at the same time to be experts in the "words and ceremonies" of the magic art, and able to instruct Faust in the rudiments of it.

But there is another critic's difficulty of which I *am* confident, and that is the line,

"And bear wise Bacon's and Albanus' works."

Albertus is the reading of modern editions, but there need not be much doubt as to what man is coupled with Bacon under the name Albanus. It was Petrus de Albano whose name appears thus written on the title-page of Agrippa's famous *De Occulta Philosophia* as the author of the *Heptameron*, which appears in a kind of appendix at the end, containing several smaller magical works which have been printed together after Agrippa's.

The more usual way of writing the name was Petrus

de Albano, and he was coupled frequently with Bacon (Roger) as being two famous conjurers or magicians. But here it looks as if *Bacon* and *Albanus* were put in juxtaposition for some cryptogrammatic purpose or hint.

Albanus is the reading of all the early Quartos, and Albertus must be sent packing with his huge load of tomes, enough to bury Faust beneath their mass.

In considering *Dr. Faustus* we must not pass over without notice the remarkable addition of "Bruno in chains," which first occurs in the 1616 edition of the Play, when Marlowe had been dead nineteen years. Now, Giordano Bruno was arrested in Venice in 1598, and ultimately disappeared from all knowledge in 1600. He is supposed to have been publicly burnt to death about that time (c. 1599), but the evidence of this fact is not strong. However, Marlowe certainly was buried in 1593, and therefore cannot be held responsible for these later additions to *Dr. Faustus* which bring in Bruno. Who, then, was it that brought Bruno into the play in 1616 or a little before. It cannot be answered yet with any certainty. The play was very popular, and Dekker may have revised it for the players just to turn an honest penny, and to improve the receipts of the play-house, for play-goers were always more ready to come if something new, or some old favourite revised, were offered to them. What made me think of Dekker was the Latin pentameter, or motto, with which the play ends:

Terminal hora diem, terminat auctor opus.

The source of this is not known, but it is also found at the end of *The Distracted Emperor*, generally thought to be written by Dekker. But it may also have had Bacon's revision, for all this new matter about Bruno would be very agreeable to King James I. from a theological point of view. And if critics will examine this Bruno

addition, they will see what I am surprised no one seems to have noticed before, that it is not the atheistical or pantheistical Giordano Bruno that we have to do with, but "*Saxon* Bruno," as he is distinctly named by Raymond, King of Hungary, in Act iii. sc. 1. The whole Bruno incident from beginning to end is connected with the Reformation in Germany (or Saxony) and the independence of the Kings and Emperor from the Pope's arbitrary rule. The personages mentioned quite exclude Bruno, who was not born when some of them were playing a prominent part in the political world, and I cannot understand how no one has noticed *Saxon* Bruno before this. There is not much to gain from it, except that, as now explained, it would please the King and the Anglican hierarchy; but the real Bruno would have been offensive to both, and would have gained no sympathy from King James, whether in chains or bound to the stake—for we know how he hated Vorstius and burnt his books when he could not burn the man. Taking all things together I think the Bruno addition was more likely to come from Bacon than from Dekker, but I cannot tell.

There is a Latin hexameter occurring among the fine poetry of Dr. Faustus which is worth a little notice. It has never been attributed to any classic author, and it might be very helpful if anyone could find out how it came to be used in this play, and from whom the line originated. It is this :

Solamen miseris socios habuisse doloris.

—*Dr. Faustus*, l. 482.

i.e., It is a consolation to those in misery to know that they have had fellow-companions in trouble.

The strange thing is that this unknown hexameter is frequently turning up in unexpected places just about this time (1590-1600).

It occurs in Robert Chester's puzzling poem, "Love's Martyr" (1600), p. 125. It also occurs in [the margin of one of Nash's prose works and in] Dekker's *Seven Deadly Sinnes of London*.

It is also most clearly in *Lucrece* at line 1,578, though here, of course, it appears in English garb :

" It caseth some, though none it ever cured,
To think their doulour others have endured."

This would be in 1594, but a year before, that is in June, 1593, it appeared in *The Honour of the Garter*, attributed to George Peele (line 247)

—" In misery
It is some comfort to have company."

In trying to trace this line I first looked into Erasmus' Adagia, fully expecting to find it there, but no; then sundry books of Latin quotations, but no; I then look down my *Geflugelte Worte* of G. Buchmann, 17th edition, 1892, and there found it, the earliest reference being "Marlowe's *Faustus* (1580)." This was early indeed, Marlowe being then just sixteen, but as this date had (in 1892) stood during seventeen editions, and may still be standing, in a book much trusted by Germans, possibly the average German has even a higher opinion of Marlowe's precocious genius than we have.*

One inference we are justified in drawing from the presence of these Latin hexameters and other recondite allusions, that could not possibly be understood or enjoyed by the great majority of the audience, is this, that neither *Tamburlaine* nor *Faustus* were presented on the common stage in the literary form we now have them. They were certainly revised for the Press by someone, even as Hamlet was undoubtedly revised and

* For a full discussion of this line and the sentiment expressed, see R. M. Theobald's "Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light," chapter v., on Companionship in Calamity.

added to later on. Would Marlowe be so likely to do this as Bacon? Would Marlowe put FRA.B. on the first page?

The chief reason for admitting Marlowe is that his name appears on the title-pages of the early Quartos: a reason strong if taken alone, but quite capable of being overruled if all the circumstances of the case are duly estimated. Moreover, Marlowe's name appears on the title-page of the 1616 edition of *Faustus*, when it is historically impossible that the whole play as there printed can be his. In fact, Elizabethan title-pages, and especially Shakespearean ones, and those allied to them, are all subject to a certain amount of suspicion.

THE GRAVE'S TIRING-ROOM.

(Continued from page 121.)

IN his introduction to the Sonnets Hudson says, "A book called 'Shakespeare's Sonnets' was entered at the Stationers' by Thomas Thorp on the 20th of May, 1609. In the course of the same year was issued a small quarto volume of forty leaves with the following title-page: "Shakespeare's Sonnets. Never before imprinted. At London: By G. Eld for T.T., and are to be sold by William Aspley."

We here deny that portion of the statement that says that "during the same year" the edition was issued. Nor was it issued prior to Bacon's fall in 1621, though bearing the ante-date. Will our Shakespearean critics point some reference to this printed edition prior to 1621. We are aware of the "sugared Sonnets" statements as to manuscript copies.

Francis Bacon no longer needs this shield, nor should it longer bind the intellect. It has done this for nearly 300 years, and it is now time for it to move.

We here turn to Son. xxx, which opens thus:—

“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 subdued
 To what it works in, like the dyer's hand.”

Believers in the Baconian authorship of the Sonnets—for to you we here address ourselves—what say you?

If Francis Bacon be author of this Sonnet, to what circumstances in his life, please, can it allude? Can there be doubt that he here alludes to his already mentioned impeachment?

If so, then must the date of 1609 be a blind, for both cannot be true. In Son. 123 he defies both Time and its Registers, which, he says, do lie.

Did space permit we would here place Bacon's lament for having entered public life into relation with Sonnet xxx. Let it, then, be anew investigated. Did the book accompany the entry at the Stationer's? If yes, did it contain the Sonnets in the line here touched? If so, has the entry itself been tampered with? If not, then both entry and book are but ante-dates.

We have an impression, however, that a small edition of the earlier Sonnets may have been printed and never spread, but suppressed, by reason of Bacon's fears, upon reflection, that Sonnets 1—19, which express a desire through Elizabeth for a Protestant heir to the throne of England, would, to use a Baconian expression, look through, and particularly so, on the theory of Mrs. Gallup's book. When really issued, after his fall, the ante-dated edition could be simply placed in the place of the one on file, and all would stand as now appears.

Why go so far? Because the mentioned date cannot be true. Why? Every phase of Bacon's fall appearing in his letters and papers appears also in the Sonnets, and belies it. We hope hereafter to have an opportunity, by aid of Bacon's letters and papers, of pounding to oblivion for ever this false date, and thus permit a true opening of the so-called Shake-speare Sonnets.

To instance, upon being charged, Bacon at once prepared minutes for an interview with the King, wherein he says: "The law of nature teaches me to speak in my own defense. With regard to this charge of bribery, I am as innocent as any born on St. Innocents day. I never had bribe or reward in my eye or thought when pronouncing sentence or order. If, however, it is absolutely necessary, the King's will shall be obeyed. I am ready to make an oblation of myself to the King, in whose hands I am as clay, to be made a vessel of honor or dishonor."

In this connection let the reader be sure to read in full Son. 88—91. Son. 88, to the king, is in these words:—

"When thou shalt be disposed to set me light
 And place my merit in the eye of scorn,
 Upon thy side against myself I'll fight
 And prove thee virtuous, though thou art forsworn.
 With mine own weakness being best acquainted,
 Upon thy part I can set down a story
 Of faults conceal'd, wherein I am attained,
 That thou in losing me shalt win much glory :
 And I by this will be a gainer too ;
 For bending all my loving thoughts on thee,
 The injuries that to myself I do,
 Doing thee vantage, double-vantage me.
 Such is my love, to thee I so belong,
 That for thy right myself will bear all wrong."

Touching the interview itself with the King, wherein Bacon agreed to abandon his defence, see Son. 113.

Note the words "to thee I so belong" in the Sonnet just quoted.

Touching Bacon's use of the word *oblation* in the foregoing statement, see Son. 125. In Son. 58 he says that the offence which needs pardon, is the King's own. In Son. 48, see his statement when first made Chancellor.

To show that a king or sovereign is here referred to, see Son. 57, 58, 114. We quote you Son. 57 thus:—

"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."

We could put a world of Baconian material into relation with this Sonnet did space permit. Upon being released from the Tower, Bacon, in a letter dated June 4th, 1621, wrote thus to the King:—

"It may please your most excellent Majesty. I humbly thank your Majesty for my liberty, without which timely grant, any further grace would have come too late. But your Majesty, that did shed tears in the beginning of my troubles, will I hope, shed the dew of your grace and goodness upon me in the end. Let me live to serve you else life is but the shadow of death to your Majesty's devoted servant."—*Sped. L.L.* vii. 281.

Concerning these tears, turn to Son. 34, which ends thus:—

"Ah ! but those tears are pearl which thy love sheds,
And they are rich and ransom all ill deeds."

In Son. 35 he tells him to grieve no more. But the King's tears after Bacon's later experience with him find expression in Son. 119, which opens thus :—

"What potions have I drunk of Siren tears,
Distill'd from limbecks foul as hell within,
Applying fears to hopes and hopes to fears,
Still losing when I saw myself to win !
What wretched errors hath my heart committed,
Whilst it hath thought itself so blessed never !"

—See Son. 49, 87, 120, 121, 140, 147.

Touching the fears here indicated, see Son. 107, as it applies to his dear love—his philosophy.

Touching the desire for death expressed in Son. 66 and 147, we quote from Bacon's letter to Buckingham upon reaching the Tower, thus: "Good, my Lord: procure the warrant for my discharge this day. Death, I thank God, is so far from being unwelcome to me as I have called for it (as Christian resolution would permit) any time these two months."

We have been trying to prepare the mind of the reader for a just conception of Son. 68, which is the ultimate purpose of our paper, and which is in these words :—

"Thus is his cheek the map of days outworn,
When beauty lived and died as flowers do now,
Before these bastard signs of fair were born,
Or durst inhabit on a living brow,
Before the olden tresses of the dead,
The right of sepulchres were shorn away,
To live a second life on second head ;
Ere beauty's dead fleece made another gay :
In him those holy antique hours are seen,
Without all ornament, itself and true,
Making no summer of another's green,
Robbing no old to dress his beauty new ;

And him as for a map doth Nature store,
To show false Art what beauty was of yore."

We were drawn to this second paper by an able one from Heidelberg by Mr. Gust. Holzer in BACONIANA, July, 1907, touching ours in April, who, though generally approving our paper, seems unable to find any relation between the poem I.M. and Son. 68, and due, we think, wholly to the mentioned antedate.

As we purpose to give that interpretation of Son. 68 that shall live, in spite of the 1609 date, we have been compelled to draw it to some length.

This Sonnet is an important one in that it must ever indicate the line of demarcation between Bacon's first and second literary period. It has, however, a political significance in that it is a contrasting of the days of Queen Elizabeth with those of James I.

A knowledge of the mentioned cover words comes now to our aid, and shows us that the word "his" at the beginning of Son. 68 denotes its author. Note next its expressions, "these bastard signs of fair"; "the olden tresses of the dead" (an allusion to Queen Elizabeth); "the right of sepulchres were shorn away"; "to live a second life on second head"; "beauty's dead fleece" (his literature of the 1st period); "robbing no old to dress his beauty new" (the retailoring of the fleece of the 1st period); and "him as for a map doth Nature store." And see Son. 67 as to the state of the Times.

Taken in relation with the Sonnets touched, to what may "these bastard signs of fair" allude?

They are not the true signs of fair. No; but are designed to show that the author of the Sonnet had been dealt with in a crooked and untrue, or bastard, manner. These words have the same significance as the expression "crooked eclipses" in Son. 60,

"Crooked eclipses 'gainst his glory fight."

The real eclipse which the author of the Sonnets endured at his fall is mentioned in Son. 107, where he alludes to himself as "the mortal moon." That eclipse was not a true eclipse of the orb, but the crooked one of Son. 60.

Bacon says, "The fountain of honor is the King, and his aspect and the access to his person continueth honor in life, and to be banished from his presence is one of the greatest eclipses of honor that can be."—Ll. iv. 403.

In his essay "Of Great Place," he says :

"The standing is slippery, and the regress is either a downfall, or at least an eclipse, which is a melancholy thing."—See Sonnet 90.

We desire to open Son. 107 in an article by itself, so touch it no further here.

Note that the word "crooked," as applied to an eclipse, is unusual and significant.

In *Henry VIII.*, Act V. scene ii., we have :—

"Men that make
Envy and crooked Malice nourishment,
Dare bite the best."

And *Cymb.* V. v. :—

"Laud we the Gods ;
And let our crooked smokes climb to their nostrils
From our bless'd altars !"

Bacon's Essay "Of Cunning" opens thus: "We take cunning to be a crooked wisdom." What do the words "cunning" and "my o'er pressed defense" in Son. 139 signify? (See Son. 149.) Again, "But I speak to you point blank: no crooked ends, either for myself or for others turn" (Ll. vii. 446). Note throughout his writings "the straight and crooked in the ways of nature." The plays abound in the use of these two words, and in exactly Bacon's sense of use.

Having touched these "bastard signs of fair," by

which the writer of the Sonnets was downed, let us next turn to the effect which he thought it would have on his philosophy—the “great basis for eternity” of Son. 124, 125—and which had been re-clothed or swaddled from the Babe in *Hamlet* until it had reached the form known as his Great Instauration, the tables of which are distinctly alluded to in Son. 122. Son. 124 opens thus:—

“If my dear love were but the child of state,
It might for Fortune's bastard be unfather'd.”

These three Sonnets should be read in full and in relation. This love-wooing of truth was distinctly Baconian. In his “Essay on Truth” he says:—

“Yet truth, which only doth judge itself, teacheth that the inquiry of truth, which is the love-making or wooing of it, the knowledge of truth, which is the presence of it, and the belief of truth, which is the enjoying of it, is the sovereign good of human nature.” And we find him ending a letter in 1622 thus: “Let our acquaintance be now established. Love me as you have begun, but love truth most. Farewell.” (L.l. vii. 378.

Touching his comparison of this Babe, his Child of philosophy with the Ancients, see Son. 59.

We are thankful that there is one author who sees no mistress, no unlawful love, in the Sonnets; no, not even in Son. 152, which we would be glad to open.

We come now to the expression “the right of sepulchres were shorn away.” By reason of his fall Bacon's sepulchre was shorn away, as well as his monument, and was bestowed upon his mask—Shakespeare—he himself making both epitaph and monument, as stated in Son. 81, which is in these words:—

“Or I shall live your epitaph to make,
Or you survive when I in earth am rotten;

From hence your memory death cannot take,
 Although in me each part will be forgotten.
 Your name from hence immortal life shall have,
 Though I, once gone, to all the world must die :
 The earth can yield me but a common grave,
 When you entomb'd in men's eyes shall lie.
 Your monument shall be my gentle verse,
 Which eyes not yet created shall o'er read,
 And tongues to be your being shall rehearse
 When all the breathers of this world are dead ;
 You still shall live—such virtue hath my pen—
 Where breath most breathes, even in the mouths of men."

This Sonnet tells the reader that there are two persons concerned in it—that one of the persons is to have but a common grave, and that it is the pen of the person that is to have but the common grave that made the monument for the other, and that whether or not he lived to make his epitaph. On what theory would William Shakespeare have penned this Sonnet if he had really been the author of it ?

Bacon would not now permit the stain put upon his name to ruin his great volume on metaphysics—the plays—the wood-note postulates on what is in man, and to be later expanded.

Upon reading anew Son. 82, 83, in connection with others, a new thought looms before us, and in accord with our expressed views. Does Son. 81 allude to the King instead of to his mask, Shake-speare? We stay here for further search, and close this point in the words which Bacon puts into the mouth of Henry V. —a play in which he is himself largely self-centred—thus :—

"Either our history shall with full mouth,
 Speak freely of our acts ; or else our grave,
 Like Turkish mute shall have a tongueless mouth
 Not worshipp'd with a waxen epitaph."

—*Henry V.*, I. 2.

Let the reader now read carefully Son. 70, 110, 119, and 123. Son. 119 ends thus:—

“O benefit of ill! now I find true
That better is by evil still made better;
And ruin'd love, when it is built anew,
Grows fairer than at first, more strong, far greater.
So I return, rebuked, to my content,
And gain by ill thrice more than I have spent.”

After the new awakening, he, in Son. 100, 101, calls himself back to his dear love, his love-wooing of truth, as embodied in his philosophy. Son. 100 ends thus:—

“Return, forgetful Muse, and straight redeem
In gentle numbers time so idly spent;
Sing to the ear that doth thy lays esteem
And gives thy pen both skill and argument.
Rise, resty Muse, my love's sweet face survey,
If Time have any wrinkle graven there;
If any, be a satire to decay,
And make Time's spoils despised everywhere.
Give my love fame faster than Time wastes life;
So thou prevent'st his scythe and crooked knife.”

And Son. 101 ends thus:—

“Make answer, Muse: wilt thou not haply say,
'Truth needs no colour, with his colour fix'd;
Beauty no pencil, beauty's truth to lay;
But best is best, if never intermix'd?'
Because he needs no praise, wilt thou be dumb?
Excuse not silence so; for 't lies in thee
To make him much outlive a gilded tomb,
And to be praised of ages yet to be.
Then do thy office, Muse; I teach thee how
To make him seem long hence as he shows now.”

Touching his desire to protect himself and his philosophy “against confounding age's cruel knife,” see Son. 55, 63, 64, 65, 107.

J. E. ROE.

South Lima, New York.

A FEW INTERROGATORIES.

WHILE preparing the manuscript, and also after the publication of the book entitled "An Impartial Study of the Shakespeare Title," certain questions were propounded to me and some statements were also made which (because records corroborating or confuting are all in England) I could neither answer, confirm nor disprove. I will briefly mention a few of them.

Note 1.—J. Payne Collier, in the first volume of his "Shakespeare's Complete Works," at page 70, asserts that William Shaksper is referred to in a letter from the poet and dramatist Samuel Daniel to Sir Thomas Egerton, preserved at Bridgewater House. Presuming that Mr. Collier's statement as to the letter and its place of deposit was correct, I inserted a copy of the letter, as printed by Collier, in the eleventh chapter of my book, and I undertook to show that the letter referred to Michael Drayton. Within a month after my book had been published, I received a letter from a learned and industrious Shakespearean scholar, in which he asserted that no such letter had ever been written by Daniel to the Lord Keeper, and he suggested that in future editions of my book, the eleventh chapter should be omitted.

Query 1.—Did Daniel ever write such a letter, and if he did, can the original be found? And who were the applicants in 1903 for the position of Master of the Queen's revels?

Note 2.—The following inscription was originally placed on the stone over William Shaksper's vault in the chancel of Trinity Church, Stratford.

" Good friend, for Jesus sake forbear
To digg ye dust enclosed here

Blesse be ye man y spares thes stones
And curst be he y moves my bones."

The statement has been made that the lines above quoted were merely copied from lines placed on other tombstones.

Query 2.—When the above inscription was placed on the stone which covered Shaksper's body, was it an inscription that was at that period either in common or occasional use? If the words were merely copied from similar inscriptions theretofore used in England that fact would tend to show that Shaksper's relatives, acquaintances and fellow-townsmen did not care very much about what became of his remains. It would also show that Appleton Morgan was right when, in his "Shakespeare in Fact and in Criticism," at page 85, he asked, "Why should we not honor William Shakespeare by opening his grave and enlisting all the resources of science to preserve whatever is mortal that may still be found therein—when every passing day leaves less and less to venerate? How much longer is this pious and patriotic duty to be delayed? While we are making our speeches about Shakespeare, organizing societies, and pageants, and writing books about him, we permit his actual bones to rot ignobly because some cobbler by an oversight of his betters managed to scratch a witch's palindrome upon the stone that was to cover them. It is ridiculous."

Note 3.—When *Hamlet* first appeared in quarto the play contained 2,143 lines, but in the folio of 1623 it contained 3,765 lines, showing an addition of 1,622 lines. *Henry V.* was revised by the addition of 1,900 new lines. *Much Ado About Nothing* and *King Lear* were greatly altered. *Titus Andronicus* obtained a new scene. Other revisions and additions were made and Michael Drayton, Thomas Dekker and Francis Bacon have been suggested as the revisionists.

Query 3.—Who should receive the credit for the principal additions and amendments to and the revision of the several plays? And why?

Note 4.—The most puzzling question propounded to me is based upon a quotation from a poem of Michael Drayton, descriptive of poets, addressed to his friend, Henry Reynolds. The lines read thus:—

“And be it said of thee”

“Shakespeare, thou hadst as smooth a comic vein
Fitting the sock, and in thy natural brain
As strong conception and as clear a rage
As any one that trafficked with the stage.”

Query 4.—To whom did Drayton refer? If William Shaksper was an ignorant and illiterate fellow, would not the fact of his ignorance and consequent inability to write or revise plays have been known to the actors and playwrights of that era? Could Drayton, who was something of a wag, have been referring to himself, or was he referring to Thomas Dekker, who, we know, had the smooth comic vein and the strong brain-conception which Drayton specifies?

There are two other queries important only in that an investigation may lead to more careful search and inquiry in more important matters affecting the authorship of the Shakespeare plays and furnishing at least the actual truth.

Who was Anna Whately, of Temple Grafton, who on November 27th, 1582, was named in the marriage license issued to William Shaxpere? Was she the widow of one Hathaway? She could not have been a child of Richard Hathaway, of Shottery, for he had no child whose Christian name was Anna or Anne.

Again, after William Shaksper's death, was his widow again married, and if so, to whom? Did she become Mrs. Richard James?

A continuous and systematic search ought to be made

for old letters, documents and records throughout England to ascertain, if possible, who the mellifluous Shakespeare really was. The world wants to know the truth and to give credit where the credit is actually due.

JOHN H. STOTSENBERG.

DR. APPLETON MORGAN
INTERVIEWED.

THE readers of BACONIANA may be interested in the following interview with Dr. Appleton Morgan, or in parts thereof. As Dr. Morgan is printing in *New Shakespeareana* such parts of his Autobiography as touch on the rise and progress of the Bacon-Shakespeare agitation in the United States, it occurred to me to sound him as to his own present attitude on that controversy.

I found him in his library (which he undignifies by calling it a "Den") at Westfield, New Jersey, across the Watchung Mountains from my home. Mr. Morgan, being a widower, escapes most of the small details of existence by living at his Clubs, in New York City, though the approach of Spring usually finds him settled at Westfield for his summer home. He is a lawyer, retired from the active pursuits of his profession, which were occupied during his active life with the affairs of two of the largest American Railway systems, for each of which he was respectively counsel. I found him a gentleman slightly under the average stature, the build of many of the world's workmen—Napoleon, Nelson, Hamilton—men who have done their full share of what the world calls "work." He looks somewhat older, perhaps, than his years. We plunged at once into the question.

I said, "*I have followed your Bacon-Shakespeare Biography, Dr. Morgan; I want to ask if you are still the sceptic of old times?*"

"Well, something of the sceptic still, but now my scepticism is rather confined to speculating whether the gentlemen who claim a complete Stratfordian origin of the plays, actually and absolutely accept the standard biographies of him. If, in short, they mean what they say, or wink when they say it—or laugh when they pass each other, like Roman augurs; or satisfy their consciences by some mental reservation. As if one should say, 'Goethe was the grandest intellect Germany has ever produced'; 'Well, who was Goethe?' 'O, Goethe was a chimney-sweep in Weimar, but he was such a bright and clever little chap that everybody wanted him and nobody else to clean their chimneys.' That, to my mind, is a proposition not too bizarre for a faith like that of those who say the Shakespeare of the biographies was the Dramatist of these immortal and oceanic plays."

"In other words, Doctor, you are a sceptic?"

"Well, the question absorbs me as much to-day as it did thirty years ago when I stumbled upon it first, and I have sort of come to be not an investigator so much as of counsel (as lawyers say) to the Heretics. It seems to me an absorbing literary question, as one vastly more important than a question of split infinitives or of a distributive pronoun, and one that has yet to be thoroughly argued by astute counsel who would cover every possible phase of it, and cover it once for all, to a competent tribunal, in their briefs. The Shakespeareans, for example, weaken their case when they say where Shakespeare was born—give the traditions and clumsy records, show us those pitiful relics, and cicerone us through that poor little scrubbed-up hovel on Henley Street. The only right way, from the

orthodox standpoint, is that taken by Prof. Walter Raleigh, who tells us, point-blank, that Shakespeare was a demi-god with a soul always in the Empyrean; or Prof. Baynes, who, while admitting that Shakespeare actually walked on earth, yet had him educated at a Stratford grammar-school of Prof. Baynes' own construction, where the curriculum was inclusive of all the classics, all the physical sciences, and, in fact, of all the humanities put together—such a course of studies as no University the world had ever seen to this day, except, possibly, the grammar-school at Ipswich, which Cardinal Wolsey drew up on paper. I congratulate from the bottom of my heart the gentlemen who believe in the Stratfordian authorship of Shakespeare. Such faith can move mountains—I wish I had half as much! The boldest Shakespearean of them all is a Dr. Anders, of the University of Greifswald, in Germany. That gentleman has lately published a volume, "Shakespeare's Books," in which he gives a list of between three and four hundred works in Greek, Latin, and perhaps Hebrew, which Shakespeare had read; works of which most of us had never even heard the titles, which list proves Shakespeare to have been a Porson, a Bentley, and a Gladstone rolled into one, and, moreover, reveals Ben Jonson as a base maligner when he declared that Shakespeare had small Latin and less Greek.

"After reading Dr. Anders' book, the wonder is that the plays and poems are not ten thousand times more learned than they are. If all the Shakespeareans had the courage of Dr. Anders, the Baconians would find themselves up against a pretty stiff fight.

"The Baconians are even more simple. Their error is, in basing their case on Parallelisms; that is, on similarities in passages in the plays and in Bacon, which appeal to themselves, *in camera*, no doubt, as identities, but which are always the critics' opportunity to laugh

the whole Bacon case to scorn and derision. The wonder would be if there were no parallelisms in the writings of two master-minds living in the same town, in the same years. But as cumulative evidence (once having shown a *prima facie* case), many of these parallelisms are almost final. Three or four thousand of them can't be pooh-poohed away as 'accident.' The anti-Shakespearean presumption should be proved—if at all—by purely circumstantial evidence, such as the results of the most penetrative and scrupulous and house-to-house search through Elizabethan London for a man or men with the equipment imperative to write the plays—the appearance of the First Folio at a date when there was no market for it, and under a false editorial assignment—the known record of the titular author as a man of affairs—the absence of his name in all literary fellowship, and things like that. Why, you may be unprepared for my telling you that I have tried infinitely harder to find a trace of William Shakespeare in the plays than I have tried to frame anti-Shakespearean or sceptic literature.

“And we must not only search for a man with the equipment required, but we must find that that same man wrote his mother tongue as no other man or men wrote it. I will admit that when I wrote “The Shakespearean Myth,” thirty years ago, I didn't know so much as I should have known about Bacon. You remember that the sub-title to that work was “William Shakespeare and Circumstantial Evidence.” But when I came to read Bacon I really felt that I had been on the right track, or, at least, on a right track. Bacon's English seems to have flowed, in spite of himself, into either the exquisite or the stately, even when setting down the merest details. Listen to this from his perfunctory ‘Wisdom of the Ancients’: ‘And this principally raises my esteem of these fables, which I

perceive, not as the product of the age nor invention of the Poets, but as sacred relics, gentle whispers, and the breath of better times—that, from the traditions of more ancient nations, came at length into the flutes and trumpets of the Greek.’ Or this—the last paragraph in the ‘History of Henry the Seventh’—and I should like to have somebody show me a nobler sentence in English: ‘He was born at Pembroke Castle, and lieth buried at Westminster in one of the statliest and daintiest monuments of Europe, both for the chapel and for the sepulchre. So that he dwelleth more richly dead in the monument of his tomb than he did alive in Richmond or any of his palaces. I could wish that he did the like in this monument of his fame.’ How could anybody, hunting for a great master of English, fail to be attracted by sentences like these, in which the merest narrative or category runs into a march like the march of an epic or a familiar sweetness like pastoral poetry?

“The struggle with me has been to believe in Shakespeare, not to believe in Bacon. I even went to the labour of writing a book of three hundred and fifty pages to show that there actually were traces of a Stratfordian authorship in the Plays, but what does that book amount to? I found three coarse (as Bacon would have said, ‘smutty’) things, too vile to quote, in which the *double entendre* depended upon a Warwickshireism. And I found some hundreds of Warwickshireisms, something like from one to twenty in a single Play; to which my always gentle critic, Mrs. Pott, overlooking the *secundum quid*, answered that these Warwickshireisms were common to all British dialects. So, as long as there is no consensus of the Baconian proposition, the Shakespeareans have the right to ‘stand pat’ (an expressive slang) on the presumption of three hundred years, but the moment they cut loose from that presumption they have naught to

do but to stand mute—they cannot prove the unprovable.

“What lawyer would not glory in a presumption three centuries old? Who can go behind such a presumption of time as that? To disturb it would be like tampering with ancient landmarks, *Interest Respublica ut fit finis legationem*, *Stare decisis*, and more law-jargon to the same effect. Apropos of this study in the Warwickshire dialect, I may tell a curious story. When *The Nation* came to review it they sent it to a certain Prof. Kittridge of some Massachusetts college to prepare the notice. It was in July, and a pretty hot season, and this gentleman, I suppose, was suffering from the weather, or did not happen to have his paper knife at hand, and so fell back upon the presumption that any book on a Shakespeare matter, written by Appleton Morgan, would be ‘tainted with Baconianism.’ And so this gentleman wrote a scathing review. I remember reading into it for some distance before suspecting that it was my own book that was being reviewed, since, whereas it was the one book I ever wrote to try and prove that Shakespeare actually wrote ‘Shakespeare,’ this Prof. Kittridge damned it as ignorant, worthless, and not worth the paper it was printed on. Doubtless being written to prove that Shakespeare did after all write ‘Shakespeare,’ it was all that! But the point is, that, for once, an orthodox Shakespearean kicked his own case out of court.”

“Then, Dr. Morgan, you have written books on both sides of the controversy?”

“Yes, I suppose I have; I wanted to be fair, don’t you see?”

“But I suppose you saw ‘that the Whig dogs got the worst of it?’”

“I am not so sure of that. There is a good deal to be said for Shakespeare. As for myself, I can truth-

fully say again that I have tried harder to find Shakespeare in the plays than I have tried to find Bacon in them.

“But don’t think much of parallelisms, as I said. They seem to me to be the weak points rather than the strong points of the Bacon case. The temptation of your parallelism-gatherer is to gather as many as possible; and no matter how startling or how strong most of them are, he is sure to get in one or two that don’t appeal to or convince anybody but himself, and your book reviewer will find his opportunity right there, and resort to the old trick that has been used to damn books so long that the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, namely, to pick out the weakest—while he claims to select at random—and riddle them for the whole structure. Lawyers know that the only way to make a strong case is not to have any weak points. If you convince your jury, why—stop! If you don’t, the next point may not appeal to him and, like as not, will set him to reviewing his own opinion. The juryman who says, ‘Well, your case is perfect, but I don’t know about the last point,’ is almost always a lost juryman for you, and once you have lost him you never catch him more.

“I can show you in dozens of parallelisms in these books (pointing to the bookshelves which lined the ‘den’) which need an explanation as recondite as themselves. Here is one for example :

BACON.

It was to show my skill
That more for praise than
purpose meant to kill,
That out of question so it is at
times,
Glory grows guilty of detested
crimes.

SHAKESPEARE.

I am of his opinion that said
pleasantly that it is a shame to
him that is a suitor to the
mistress to make love to the
waiting-woman.

"Now here is a book written by a gentleman who has done yeoman service in the controversy, who actually cites this as a parallelism *inter alia* between Bacon and Shakespeare. Imagine the glee of a jaded book-reviewer who knows nothing of the merits of the controversy, or don't bother even to read the book he is set to damn, over a recondite parallelism like that. The explanation is given in a footnote thus:—'Virtue is the mistress and Praise the waiting-woman in Bacon's analogy.' And Bacon holds that we should cultivate virtue not for the sake of praise, but for its own's sake! which rather makes it worse than better, don't you think?"

"Imagine the Horse Reporter of a great daily newspaper, who happened to be at leisure, called in to review a profound book like Holmes's 'Authorship of Shakespeare.' He would need only to open at that page to wipe the office floor with the entire volume. (I must add, however, that that 'parallelism' is not from Judge Holmes's book.)

"Of course, you say that is only one of two thousand, and, taken with something else, shows the bent of Shakespeare's mind. But your casual reader don't care anything about 'the bent of Bacon's mind,' and the casual reader is the man you are after. What Baconians should do is to pound away at the circumstantial evidence, and quote as few parallelisms as possible, and those only such as, by no mundane possibility, could be coincidence or accident."

"Are there any such, Dr. Morgan?"

"Yes, I think there are about ten or twelve that no two persons would state so exactly alike unless they were identities in something more than a common language, had pursued identical studies, made identical mistakes, held identical prejudices, and so on. Mr. Donnelly has listed some scores of these circumstantial

identities and it would have been rather hard to get away from his demonstrations if he himself had not killed himself with his 'cipher.' He deliberately buried the best work of his life, and while the evil that he did lives after him, like Bacon's, the good he did is interred with his bones. So let it be with Cæsar!"

"Am I to tell my people, then, that you are a Baconian?"

"When asked that question," replied Dr. Morgan, "I always say that I know no surer way of making people lose all interest in you or your opinions than to foreclose yourself by announcing that you think so and so and have made up your mind once and for all. No, I think I will remain in equilibrium 'on the fence.' Then perhaps somebody on one side or the other might listen to what I say. If I announce myself as committed, neither side will value my output—one side, because they believe in me, and the other side because they don't. This I will say, however, that there is no reason that I know of why we should not call the author of the plays 'William Shakespeare.' Only don't write biographies of a man of that name or something that sounds like it, who flourished in Stratford-on-Avon and so on, and ask us to accept the two as one and the same man, for faith in that case is not the evidence of things unseen."

Dr. Morgan is a gentleman of means sufficient to live a life of leisure and to indulge himself in antiquarian and Shakespearean pursuits. He has behind him a record of thirty-five or more large printed volumes and monographs, and feels proud of the distinction that, although his opinions have never been of conventional type, not even the most ignorant or the most hostile book reviewer has ever said that his published opinions were ridiculous or illogical. No work of his in thirty years has failed to not only attract attention, but respectful attention. Perhaps Dr. Morgan's only handi-

cap is (as he himself confesses) that if he finds too many people agreeing with him, his unfaith in the verdict of the Market-place leads him to lose confidence in his own conclusions and to set himself about enquiring how to modulate or recant them. If he had lived in the days of the Index he would have escaped the Auto da Fé.

JOHN LANE.

Essex Fells, New Jersey, March 29th, 1908.

THE RESPONSE TO DR. ANDERS' CHALLENGE.

[A summary of the correspondence which recently took place between Mr. B. Frank Carpenter, the editor of *New Shakespeareana*, and Dr. Anders, of Heidelberg appeared on pages 135—137 of the last issue of *BACONIANA*. The following marks the next stage in the controversy, and is reprinted from the April number of *New Shakespeareana*, pages 55—60.]

DR. MORGAN'S dictum that Shakespeareans answer the Bacon Hypothesis by looking the other way is no longer reliable. For, in our last issue, Dr. Anders, the most recent of the Shakespearean Protagonists (and nathless the bravest, since, although his eminent predecessor, Gervinus, had said that in more than forty given instances the expressions of Shakespeare and of Bacon were identical (Commentaries, edition of 1849), and "that in Bacon's Maxims lie as it were the whole theory of Shakespeare's Dramatic forms and of his moral philosophy," Dr. Anders had boldly asserted that no traces of Bacon could anywhere be found in Shakespeare. But Dr. Anders did not rest contented, as many another Shakespearean has

done with the mere assertion, and a refusal to maintain it, like a Lutheran Thesis, against all comers. In *NEW SHAKESPEAREANA* for January, 1908, he challenged Baconians to produce ten coincidences between Bacon and Shakespeare "not accountable for as Accidents! The committee we invited to meet this challenge we regret to say was inconvenient. But, out of their communications, I have been deputed to select eleven coincidences to be submitted to the learned Theban. The corrolary suggested being that if Dr. Anders pronounces these eleven coincidences "Accidents," then he confronts himself with the greatest coincidence of all, to wit: That of eleven random "Accidents," every one of them points to a single and identical solution of a literary problem.

COINCIDENCE NUMBER ONE.

On the seventeenth day of April, 1593, in London, Francis Bacon was arrested for debt at the process of a Jew named Sympson, and thrown into a sponging house. Bacon applied for succour to his brother Anthony Bacon, and Anthony raised the money and released his younger brother. In the same year 1593 there was written, and divers times acted in London, a play called *The Merchant of Venice*, until its acting value having been satisfied, it was printed in Quarto in 1600. In this play, the debtor is one Bassanio (which might not or might suggest Bacon), but the good friend who redeems him is Antonio, which is certainly the Italian form of "Anthony," and the remorseless creditor is "Shylock the Jew," near enough, under the circumstances, to "Simpson the Jew."

COINCIDENCE NUMBER TWO.

In *The Winter's Tale*, Perdita, cast away when a babe and rescued and reared among Bohemian shep-

herds ; when the Sicillian nobles discover her presents them each with a nosegay, with speeches which together are an exceedingly close paraphrase of Bacon's "Essay on Gardens." Dr. Anders can read the paraphrase for himself.

COINCIDENCE NUMBER THREE.

Between the first and second Quarto version of Hamlet there occurs a variant in statement as to the constituents of certain heavenly bodies. Also between the dates at which these two Quartos were printed, Bacon published a treatise "Cogitatione de Natura Rerum," in which he rejected the theory of the Earth having been a molten mass with fire at its core, and maintained that the earth is a cold mass. The parallelization between the two Quarto versions show the same change in theory as to the earth being fire.

THE FIRST QUARTO HAMLET,
1603.

SECOND QUARTO HAMLET,
1604.

Doubt that in earth is fire,
Doubt that the stars do move.

Doubt thou the stars are fire,
Doubt that the sun doth move.

But this is not the only touch of Bacon in this extraordinary love-letter. Bacon rejected the Copernican theory that the sun was stationary, and to state the extreme of vagary, he says "doubt that the sun doth move."

COINCIDENCE NUMBER FOUR.

Again in Hamlet we have a change in the text of the first Quarto—this time by an omission in the second Quarto.

THE SECOND QUARTO HAMLET, 1604.

FIRST FOLIO, 1623.

Sense, sure you have,

(Omitted.)

Else could you not have motion.

Restored in modern editions.

Acts III. Sc. IV., 71.

Simultaneously in the 1605 edition of the Advance-

ment of Learning, Bacon held to the doctrine of the old philosophers, that everything that moves has sensibility, or as capable of sensation. But in his 1623 edition, he recedes from that position and expressly declared the doctrine untrue, and that there could be motion in inanimate and insentient bodies—as, for example, in the planets.

COINCIDENCE NUMBER FIVE.

On a single page of Bacon's *Commonplace Book* or *Memoranda Book* in which he jotted down catch words to suggest to him or remind him of matters he wished to recur to at convenience, these entries :

Rome	Qui a bon voison a bon matin	Golden slepe
The Larke Abed	rouse out bed	Uprouse You are Up

appear upon a single page.

Dr. E. A. Abott, author of *The Shakespearean Grammar* and other Shakespeare works, is obliged to admit that, according to the habitude of literary persons—these entries seem to have been used as memoranda in framing this passage from the *Romeo and Juliet*, (or never used at all !) thus ;

“ Young man it argues a distempered head
 So soon to bid good morrow to thy bed
 Care keeps his watch in every old man's eye
 And where care lodges sleep will never lie
 But where unbruised youth with unstuffed brain
 Doth couch his limbs there golden sleep doth reign.”

being Friar Lawrence's greeting to Romeo on his early appearance at his cell (*Romeo and Juliet* II, iii. 133).

COINCIDENCE NUMBER SIX.

In the *De Augmente Scientarium*, Bacon says “ Is not the opinion of Aristotle to be regarded where he saith that young men are not fit auditors of moral philosophy because they are not settled from the boil-

ing heat of their affections nor attuned by time and experience."

And in *Troilus and Cressida* we have the same allusion

Unlike young men whom Aristotle thought
Unfit to hear moral Philosophy.

But what Aristotle did say was, not that young men ought not to hear Moral Philosophy, but that they should not study Political Philosophy! So that, whoever wrote the *De Augmente* and whoever wrote the *Troilus and Cressida* made the identical mismemorization of Aristotle.

COINCIDENCE NUMBER SEVEN.

Othello was first published, in 1622, in Quarto (Shakespeare having died in 1616). In 1623 it was reprinted in the Folio, with many important additions, among which was this passage:

"Like to the Pontic sea
Whose icy current and compulsive course
Ne'er feels retiring ebb, but keeps right on
To the Proponticke and the Hellespont."

"A short time previously, Bacon had been studying the phenomena of tides and currents, and had discovered the fact that the current in the Bosphorus always runs from east to west. He derived it from George Sandy's *Travels*, published in 1615, and used it in his posthumous treatise, *De Fluxu et Refluxu Maris*, written after 1615, and before 1623."

COINCIDENCE NUMBER EIGHT.

The Northumberland Manuscript should be submitted as a most astounding item of circumstantial Evidence of the more or less identity in literary output of Shakespeare and of Bacon. This manuscript has been described so minutely and examined so carefully

so many times in NEW SHAKESPEAREANA (Vol. I, p. 122, Vol. V, 118, 128, Vol. VI, p. 57) that it is only necessary to say that neither Prof. Anders nor anybody else can rail the seal from off that bond! A scrivener, trying his pen, scrawls the names "Bacon" "William Shakespeare" over and over; upon a single page also the names of sundry of their writings together with here and there words or sentences from those works. If there is any reason why this "Northumberland manuscript (or what there is left of it) is not circumstantial evidence of a coincidence of some sort between the two identities—that reason has never been stated.

COINCIDENCE NUMBER NINE.

It is a startling coincidence that Lord Bacon, with abundance of leisure after his fall, should plan and execute a life of Henry the Seventh, beginning it at the precise point at which the Shakespeare Play of Henry the Sixth ended, and closing it at the precise point at which the Shakespeare Play of Henry the Eighth began.

COINCIDENCE NUMBER TEN.

The fat knight in the two parts of Henry the Sixth was at first Sir John Oldcastle. When the Cobham family protested and the Lord Chamberlain ordered the name changed, he became "Sir John Falstaff." The origin of the name is beyond our guessing, unless a fact first pointed out by Judge Phelps gives us the clue. Says Judge Phelps "One of the famous cases of the day, the decision in which settled the action of assumpsit upon a firm basis, was Slade's Case, reported by Coke. The case was twice argued before all the Judges in England. It was pending from 1596 to 1602. Francis Bacon was counsel and associated with him as attorney on the same side as was John Halstaff.

When the author of the first part of Henry the Fourth found himself obliged to find some other name than to substitute for Sir John Oldcastle and to find it in a hurry, did he get it from the name of John Halstaff?

COINCIDENCE NUMBER ELEVEN.

In the first part of Henry the Sixth, Act II, Scene III, there is a parley between the English and French armies, for which there is no historical authority. Jeanne d'Arc addresses the Duke of Burgundy in long speech of thirty-three lines, which speech is an absolutely faithful blank-verse version of a letter written by the Maid of Orleans to the then Duke of Burgundy dated July 17, 1429. But this letter never saw the light of print until, in 1780 the Historian of the House of Burgundy, M. Brugiere de Barante, found it among the papers of that house. (Prof. Anders will find this letter printed in full in Edwin Reed's "Coincidences Between Bacon and Shakespeare" Boston—Coburn Publishing Company, 1906). The main incident in Love's Labours Lost—the embassy of the court beauties to procure a remission for France of a tribute due the King of Navarre which France found it inconvenient to pay—in the hope that the fascinations and blandishments of the French ladies would conquer a susceptible King—is the employment of an actual occurrence. But that occurrence was, in court affairs, so minor a record, that it is chronicled nowhere in any published History. It was not unearthed until found by Joseph Hunter in 1847. But Lord Bacon spent his early life in France as an attaché of an English ambassador, and certainly might—so far as opportunity went—have seen both these unpublished records. But unless the standard biographies of him are all wrong, William Shakespeare certainly could not have seen them.

Out of, perhaps, three or four thousand coincidences,

which by the patience of scholars, have been unearthed—possibly the eleven above given—out of which Dr. Anders can select his desired ten—are as apparent, to the general, and require as less an intimate familiarity with the works of both writers—as any others.

JOSEPH SOHMERS.

REVIEWS.

Shakespeare's Warwickshire Contemporaries.

By Mrs. C. C. Stopes. Published by the Shakespeare Head Press, Stratford-on-Avon. 253 pages, royal crown 8vo. 7/6 net.

A NEW edition, revised and enlarged, is published of Mrs. C. C. Stopes' "Shakespeare's Warwickshire Contemporaries." The earlier edition was a reprint of twelve articles which appeared in the *Stratford-upon-Avon Herald*. In the preface the authoress states: "I originally selected my subject on account of some relation, real or imaginary, which I believed they might have had to Shakespeare." The book bears evidence of an enormous amount of laborious research, which is set out in nineteen chapters. One of the most interesting is that in which Richard Field, the printer (1561-1625), and his connections are described. Amongst the latter, prominence is given to Thomas Vautrollier, whom he served under as apprentice for six years. Field, in the order of succession of Master Printers, is said to have married his widow and succeeded to the business; but elsewhere it is stated that he married the daughter. The account of the books printed and issued by these two men is very instructive. Mrs. Stopes does not produce a scrap of evidence to prove that Shakespeare knew Field or was in any way associated with him. Although she states (p. 67): "Imagination must not run riot in critical studies of Shakespeare," she gives free scope to her fancy. Here are some of her imaginings taken from the chapter on Field.

"When Shakespeare went to London as a stranger what would be more natural to him than to go straight to Richard Field, avail himself of his metropolitan knowledge, and very probably share his lodgings? He would want to know all about his friend's occupation, as he wanted to know about most things, and he learned a good deal about it."

"We have only to follow Shakespeare up to Richard Fields' home and office in Blackfriars to find him planted in a good reference library in the very midst of opportunities such as his works show he could take advantage of."

"The six years he (Field) spent with Vautrollier were those that determined his after career, and, as I think, had a strong influence over Shakespeare. If Shakespeare went up after the sad settlement with the Lamberts in 1587 he might be present at Richard's wedding and Vautrollier's funeral, and see his old friend installed at the head of the establishment."

"In some of the Sonnets there are such evident traces of the influence of Giordano Bruno that I long wondered how Shakespeare could have come in contact with him. That philosopher had, it is true, lectured in Oxford in 1583, but one could hardly fit Shakespeare into a university lecture room. He had visited in 1582 Sir Fulke Greville and Sir Philip Sidney in London; yet we cannot imagine Shakespeare in their company then. But in Vautrollier's shop the sayings of Bruno would acquire tragic interest at his death for a philosophic faith, and not only from the copy kept in the secret cupboard (!), but from the conversation of the workmen, Shakespeare may have picked up some of these."

"During the years that Shakespeare, homeless, and uncertain of a future, apprenticed to no trade, educated to no profession, inheritor of no property, was being driven with the wind and tossed till he should find a shore, it seems to me that he spent much time and study in Master Field's treasure house. . . . While studying the actor's parts which he played, or the old dramas that he patched and tinkered whereby he earned his bread, or the books in Field's shop, wherein he forgot his sorrows, there had dawned upon him the conviction that he, too, was a poet. Was it Ovid or Puttenham during the plague year that acted as the immediate cause? We know not."

"I have elsewhere shown how the Earl of Southampton, by active kindness and warm-hearted sympathy, stimulated Shakespeare to a new effort to 'graver labours.'"

"Though Shakespeare seems to have studied some of Field's later publications we find no proof of further connection between these Stratford men."

These are some of the gems of imagination in which the lady indulges who lays down the sound principle that "imagination must not run riot in critical studies in Shakespeare." There is no grain of evidence or even tradition of any connection between Shakespeare and Field, but of course it was Field who entered in the Stationers' Register a book entitled "Venus and Adonis," by William Shakespeare.

A chapter is devoted to each of three bearers of the title of Sir Thomas Lucy, 1532-1600—1551-1605—and 1585-1640. Again, no evidence is advanced of any acquaintance between any one of the three and Shakespeare, though, speaking of the elder Sir Thomas Lucy, it is said: "He must often have come into contact with Shakespeare." But we have no clue to the circumstance thereof. Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps says, "No record of the least value bearing directly on the Shakespeare traditions has ever been found in

Charlecote (Outlines, Vol. II. 383), and the minutes of the Court of Records and the Chamberlain's accounts are likewise silent."

Mrs. Stopes will have none of the Justice Shallow caricature, and deals very fully with the character. She says:—"I am sure that 'Shallow' was not intended to represent Sir Thomas Lucy; that there was no foundation for the tradition, and that the whole story was built upon a misreading of Shakespere's plays and a misunderstanding of his art." Yet there is more confirmation and probability of the truth of this tradition than there is of most of those which have been handed down.

The connection between Bacon and the second Sir Thomas Lucy is mentioned, and the letter written by Bacon to him is reproduced from the supplement to Rawley's "Resuscitatio."

This is a noteworthy passage from the chapter on "The Grevilles and Lord Brooke": "It is always considered strange that such a man (Fulke Greville) should not have mentioned Shakespere."

In writing of Dr. John Hall, Mrs. Stopes refers to the death of his mother-in-law, "the love of Shakespere's youth," and continues: "The touching ideas of her epitaph were doubtless his wife's, put into his Latin, but they go far to repel the unpleasant suggestions so many writers on Shakespere have made on Anne Hathaway." The unpleasant suggestions usually have reference to Shakespere's treatment of his wife; but there is no word as to this, nor any fact as to any tradition or circumstance in which he and his daughter and son-in-law are together connected.

The account of Michael Drayton is distinctly good; but here, also, Mrs. Stopes lapses into imagination run riot, when she states that: "We may safely picture him (Drayton) pacing the streets of Stratford by Anne's side, or dropping into New Place to have a chat with Shakespere."

There is a chapter on "The Clergy of Stratford" and another on "The Schoolmasters." In the latter it is said that "Alexander Aspinall was probably a friend, certainly an acquaintance, and might very well have helped the poet's later culture." To those who take an interest in Warwickshire Worthies of the past, the volume will be of value, but the ordinary reader must say "Cui bono?" Certainly when he has read it he will not be less ignorant about Shakespere than he was before he began it.

The Shakespere Problem Re-stated.

By G. G. Greenwood, M.P., of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law, sometime Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge.
Published by John Lane, The Bodley Head. 21/- nett.
523 pp. demy 8vo.

MR. GREENWOOD is wise in his generation. In re-stating the Shakespere Problem he has taken the offensive. He enters the

field thoroughly equipped for the contest, and so effectively does he wage war that he does not merely dislodge and rout his opponents, but he follows up success after success until he leaves them entirely annihilated. No book has been issued on the subject so overwhelming in argument, so piercing in criticism, so convincing in effect. The problem considered is whether William Shakespere, the Stratford man, was the author of the Plays published under the name of William Shakespeare. There is no attempt made to find out who was the author. Mr. Greenwood says in his preface:—"I hold no brief for the Baconians, though, like Mr. Gladstone, 'I have always regarded their discussion as one perfectly serious and to be respected.'" He continues: "The question, then, is a matter of evidence and reasonable probability—Was Shaksperc the Player identical with Shakespeare the Poet? It seems to me that that question must, on full consideration of the whole matter, be answered in the negative, and in this work I have endeavoured to state some of the reasons which, as it seems to me, make for that conclusion."

The subject is naturally divided into two portions. In the first place Shaksperc of Stratford is considered, followed by chapters on the Schooling of Shaksperc; Shaksperc and "Genius;" Later Life and Death of Shaksperc; The Traditional Shaksperc. It is to be expected that the remarkable contributions of Mr. Sidney Lee to the discussion should meet with the author's attention. Mr. Greenwood opens his case with an extract from a letter published in the *Times* of January 8th, 1902, in which Mr. Lee states: "Patient investigation, which has been in progress for more than two hundred years, has brought together a mass of biographical detail which far exceeds that accessible in the case of any poet contemporary with Shakespeare." Mr. Greenwood remarks thereon: "There is an audacity about the statement which borders on the sublime," and he cites in support of this view the late J. R. Green, who, in his "History of the English People," says: "Of hardly any poet do we know so little"; Mr. C. W. Crook, B.A., B.Sc., editor of many Shakespearean Plays for educational purposes, who writes: "Of the fifty-two years of his life in which he played his part, the most careful research has discovered but a few meagre incidents." He might also have cited Mr. Churton Collins, but of that more anon. From this point forward the work follows Mr. Sidney Lee's "Life of Shakespeare," considering such biographical facts as are adduced from it—facts resting upon evidence and not upon theory or imagination. The author contends "that such facts are meagre and unsatisfactory in the extreme." How utterly worthless and misleading is this Life, "which some look upon as an epoch-making work," the reader will appreciate as he accompanies Mr. Greenwood through the chapters which have been referred to. The lie is nailed to the counter that "Good ground is here offered for the belief that the poet's father wielded a practised pen," reiterated in the sentence: "When

attesting documents he occasionally made his mark, but there is evidence in the Stratford archives that he could write with facility." Mr. Greenwood asks for the production of at least one authentic document undoubtedly attested by John Shakspeare with his autograph signature, and adds: "Until this is produced the 'sceptics' may well be content *stare super antiquas vas.*" The chapter on Shakspeare and Genius is closely reasoned, and in addition to the arguments of Mr. Lee, those of Mr. Churton Collins and Sir Theodore Martin are ruthlessly exposed.

The other side of the Problem is dealt with in chapters on The Learning of Shakespeare; Shakespeare Allusions and Illusions; Shakespeare as a Lawyer; Shakespeare as Naturalist; and The Silence of Philip Henslowe. It would be impossible to write about *the learning of Shakespeare* without copious reference to Mr. Churton Collins' able essays on the subject.

This is not the first time that in the columns of *BACONIANA* cordial appreciation has been given to the splendid services rendered by Mr. Churton Collins to the cause advocated in them. If an action to determine the Problem was being tried, counsel contending that the man whom Messrs. Garnett and Gosse designated "the Stratford Rustic" was not the author of the poems and plays, after calling Mr. Churton Collins and putting in a series of his articles, might with confidence leave his case in the hands of the judge and jury. Mr. Greenwood could not justify his contention more absolutely than by citing the following paragraph from Mr. Collins' critique on *Lee's Life of Shakespeare* :—

"More than a century ago George Stevens wrote: 'All that can be known with any degree of certainty about Shakespeare is that he was born at Stratford-on-Avon, married and had children there, went to London, where he commenced actor, *wrote poems and plays,*' returned to Stratford, made his will, died, and was buried there.' And, if we set aside probable inferences, this is all we do know of any importance about his life. His pedigree cannot certainly be traced beyond his father. Nothing is known of his education—that he was educated at the Stratford Grammar School is pure assumption. His life between his birth and the publication of *Venus and Adonis* is an absolute blank. It is at least doubtful whether the supposed allusion to him in Greene's 'Groat's Worth of Wit' and in Chettle's 'Kind Heart's Dream' have any reference to him at all; it is still more doubtful whether the William Shakespeare of Adrian Quiney's letter, or of the Rogers and Addenbroke summonses, or the William Shakespeare who was assessed for property in St. Helen's, Bishopsgate, was the poet. We know practically nothing of his life in London or of the date of his arrival in London; we are ignorant of the date of his return to Stratford, of his happiness or unhappiness in married life, of his habits, of his

◦ The words in italics must, of course, be omitted as they would constitute the point at issue in the trial.

last days, of the cause of his death. Not a sentence that fell from his lips has been authentically recorded. At least one-half of the alleged facts of his biography is as purely apocryphal as the Life of Homer attributed to Herodotus."⁶

Could counsel have a better witness? Then let him put in from Mr. Churton Collins' *Studies in Shakespeare*, the articles on Shakespeare as a Classical Scholar; Sophocles and Shakespeare; Shakespeare as a Prose Writer, and The Bacon-Shakespeare Mania; † and from *Ephemera Critica* those on the Religion of Shakespeare, and the Sonnets of Shakespeare, and he would not require any improvement to be made. It might spoil a case that would be too strong to tamper with. If the question as to whether Bacon was the author of the poems and plays were also to be put to the jury the case would still be strong enough, especially if the importance of Mr. Collins' masterly essay on the Prose of Shakespeare was insisted on, and the chapter on "His Age" from the commentaries of Dr. Gervinus was also put in evidence.

How completely Mr. Greenwood is in accord with Mr. Collins the following extracts will testify:—

"Finally Mr. Collins claims to have demonstrated 'that Shakespeare could read Latin, that in the Latin original he most certainly read Plautus, Ovid and Seneca;' and as to 'the Greek dramatists and all those Greek authors besides Plutarch, who appear to have influenced him,' that he had at least read them in Latin versions, and very probably was, with such help, able to read them in the originals. I think the literary world is indebted to Mr. Collins for these scholarly articles."

And again:—

"Should the advocates of the ignorant, uncultivated Shakespeare theory make a cheap retort as to the limits of my comprehension or of my classical knowledge I will not vex myself, for I need only refer them to Mr. Churton Collins' illuminating articles."

But there is another aspect of Mr. Greenwood's Problem which has not hitherto been mentioned here—"that Shakespeare, whoever he was, did not write a very large portion of the thirty-six dramas which were published as his in the Folio Edition of 1623 is now generally admitted. 'It may surprise some of my hearers,' said Dr. Garnett, in the course of a lecture to the London Shakespeare Society, 'to be told that so considerable a part of the work which passes under Shakespeare's name is not from his hand.' The first thing to do, therefore, is to make up

⁶ *Ephemera Critica*, page 214.

† This essay, which comprises three articles which appeared in the *Saturday Review* by way of criticism on Judge Webb's "The Mystery of William Shakespeare," is notable for the fact that so powerful does the writer find the Judge's arguments that in combating them he is compelled to have recourse to "the suspension of natural laws."

our minds, so far as we can, as to how much of the Plays and Poems published under Shakespeare's name are, in reality, Shakespeare's work."

This is dealt with in chapters on Titus and the Trilogy; The First Folio; and The Early Authorship Argument. Mr. Greenwood is a staunch disciple of Malone. He will not accept *Titus Andronicus* or the "Trilogy of Henry VI." at any price, and here he is at issue with Mr. Churton Collins. He is also at issue with Mr. Edwin Reed on the Early Authorship Argument, and perhaps this chapter is the least convincing in the book.

But enough has been said to commend Mr. Greenwood's work to all students of Shakespeare. No Shakespeare library will be complete on the shelves of which it is not to be found. Its value is enhanced by a good index.

The Supernatural in Shakespeare.

By Helen Hinton Stewart. John Ousley, London. 159 pp. 2s.

A CHARMING little book, written by a member of the Bacon Society, dealing with the treatment by Shakespeare of the strong desire in the human heart "to peer beyond the boundaries of human existence, and to obtain a glimpse of that mysterious something which, although hidden from the senses, seems to vibrate in harmony with some secret chord within." The subject is divided into chapters on Presentiments, Ghosts, Fairies and Sprites, etc. It affords another testimony to the marvellous versatility of the mind from which the plays emanated. The authoress makes frequent reference to the writings of Bacon to assist in the elucidation of Shakespeare's metaphysical suggestions. The chapters on Fairies and Sprites, founded principally on *Midsummer Night's Dream* and *The Tempest*, may be specially commended. The style is good and the theories are unostentatiously expressed. The book will amply repay perusal.

CORRESPONDENCE.

The Present State of the Bacon-Shakespeare Controversy.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—There seems to be every indication that our controversy is nearly concluded. Hesitation about the Shakespearean authorship is being followed by scepticism. The critics are just a little more civil—not much, for their brief for the defendant still holds them pledged. They must be left to the next genera-

tion. Dr. Applcton Morgan writes to me these very hopeful terms: "It seems to me as if the Baconian occupation was gone. Nobody, except perhaps old Furnivall and your friend Churton Collins, and Simeon Lazarus Levi (Lee), who have copyrights, claims the Shakespearean authorship *au pied de la lettre*. *Restez tranquille, mon chere ami*. After thirty years of strenuous insistence that Elizabethan title-pages are barely *prima facie* evidence of anything, I am glad to see that Mr. W. W. Greg has at last, by studying the watermarks, been able to establish my point *sans dire*. He is to be congratulated, and I hope that the prominence that the discovery will bring him will direct public attention to his paper in the *Library* of some years ago, in which he showed up the callow ignorance of Lee in editing the First Folio reprint."

Shakespearean advocates do not as a rule use any argument, they only make dogmatic assertions which help our case very much more than their wish to damage it succeeds in its purpose of injuring us. Dr. Anders challenged the Bacon people to produce ten coincidences between Bacon and Shakespeare not assignable to accident. The last issue of *Shakespeariana* supplies eleven such cases, of which scores of quite convincing echoes and parallels can be given; but Dr. Anders might claim accident as accounting for them. But the eleven coincidences given are not simply parallels, they are hard, concrete facts of definite historic import. Mr. Joseph Sohmers supplies them, and suggests that "If Dr. Anders pronounces these coincidences accidents, then he confronts himself with the greatest coincidence of all, to wit, that of eleven random accidents, every one of them points to a single and identical solution of a literary problem."

These coincidences will be found in another part of the present issue. Mr. Greenwood, M.P., I observe, announces another book on the Shakespeare problem which, without adopting the Baconian solution, fully accepts its negative side, and makes it his business to prove that the current notions about William Shaksperre are untenable and some other author must be found.

And lately another pamphlet has been published for private circulation by Mrs. Septimus Harwood, M.A., of Sidney, entitled "Shakespearean Cult in Germany from the 16th Century to the Present Time." Mrs. Harwood has evidently studied the very valuable account of "Shakespeare in Germany," by Albert Cohn, in which the full text of the Ur-Hamlet is given; and her reading of it supplies the following very striking observations:—

Page 20. "One thing strikes me as very strange, to which Cohn does not even allude, and that is that these English actors in Germany seem never to have mentioned Shakespeare's name. Truly this is another Shakespearean mystery. To me it seems unthinkable that men, capable of appreciating in *any* degree Shakespeare's plays, learned in London in *his* very presence, and of performing them acceptably on foreign soil, had yet been so little struck with the personality of the *man* William Shake-

speare that among so many *bona fide* records of that time there is not *one* forthcoming to say that any one of them had ever spoken to him, or proclaimed his marvellous power to any of their German patrons and fellow-actors. Sometimes when reading Cohn's book one seems to get very near to Shakespeare; yet neither Pope nor Bryan nor Dowland tells a word about him, and the *man* Shakespeare escapes us here in the usual will-o'-the-wisp fashion that he does elsewhere. It is *almost* enough to make one think that, after all, the last nail in the Bacon-myth coffin has not yet been driven in, or, at least, to make one think that the Shakespeare whom these actors knew in the Lord Chamberlain's Company was a mere actor like themselves, and that they did *not* know the dramatist whose plays they performed; else how could they so completely have ignored him?"

Mrs. Harwood's harmless reference to the Bacon-myth is, of course, a sort of salaam to the literary police, who might put her under arrest and expose her to criminal prosecution if she ventured to join the ranks of the Baconian anarchists.

R. M. THEOBALD.

The Latest from the States.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

THE BACONIANA for April has an interesting article on a book by Hiram Corson, Professor of English Literature in Cornell University, New York State.

It is to be regretted that the writer of that article did not examine the book's copyright date, which is 1889 instead of the publisher's date, 1903. The book is so old and antiquated, not having been revised since 1889, that it is a sheer waste of time to pay any attention to it. No Shakesperite book of the last century is worth any serious criticism, for every such book is full of the forgeries of Cunningham, Collier, and other dishonest and unscrupulous Shagsperites.

To the article in the January BACONIANA, concerning early doubts of the Shakespeare authorship, I can add my commendation to that which is written concerning Col. Joseph C. Hart (1900-1856). I have read the part of the book that relates to the question of the Shakesperian authorship. The book is very rare. I found a copy in the Astor Library of New York City a few years ago. Mr. Hart did not at that time (1848), and in that book, make any claim for Bacon.

One day in 1844, at his house in Nashville, Tennessee, Mr. Return Jonathan Meigs was reading Bacon's "Instauratio" in the original Latin. He suddenly closed the book and exclaimed: "This man Bacon wrote the works of Shakespeare." Mr. Meig's son, then a lad of 14 years, who was sitting in the same room with his father, heard his father's remark, and has never forgotten it. In later years they frequently conversed on the subject of Bacon and his writings, and the son became a firm

believer in the statement that his father made on that day. This fact has been narrated to me more than once by the son, Mr. Return Jonathan Meigs, Junr., who is a clerk in the District Court of Washington, D.C. Emerson, Hawthorne, Whittier, Holmes and other American writers have expressed their doubts as to the ignorant peasant William Shaksper being the author of the Shake-speare plays, but there is no record that any of them came out boldly for Bacon, as Mr. Meigs did, as early as 1844.

Why do not the Baconians in England take up the records of the life of Shaksper, of Stratford, and prove the statements made in Major E. P. Burn's pamphlet of 1902, namely, that Shaksper must have been in Stratford every year after August 1596? Certainly the records of his law suits, land purchases, brewing malt, etc., etc., proves that he must have been in Stratford all those years. Halliwell-Phillips states that all documents call him "of Stratford," never "of London," and Halliwell-Phillips seems to be very much troubled about that evidence. He is also honest enough to state that there is no record that Shaksper ever purchased any property in London until 1613, which statement scatters to the winds all the statements about Shaksper's property in houses, theatres, etc., in London. If the same diligence is exercised in the case of Shaksper as has brought to light recently that Sir Thomas Bodley, as an officer of Queen Elizabeth's household, paid the expenses of Francis Bacon while the latter was in France (1576-79), surely something must be discovered that will soon put an end to the claims for the man of Stratford.

R. A. SMITH.

War Department, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

An Italian News-Letter.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR EDITOR,—Travelling may be profitably combined with research, as I have experienced lately. The Eternal City possesses in its Barberini Library in the Vatican a fair number of Bacon's "published works, but I can trace no MSS. of his, though MSS. are its especial feature, as Father Ehrlic, its courteous and learned Prefect, told me. I find there no record of Montaigne's visit to Rome other than in his Diary. When I suggested that Francis Bacon at nineteen might have accompanied the Mayor of Bordeaux to the Vatican in 1580 I was answered, "Very likely; young men used to travel with older men as guide." Gregory XIII. (Buoncompagno) was on the Papal throne then, and his fine statue adorns the once Jesuit Library, now the Victor Emanuel State Library, in the *Collegia Romana*, which he founded. Profound research work in Italy is made well-nigh, if not wholly, impossible owing to the absence of Catalogues. MSS. have none. I was refused sight of the Subject Catalogue in the Victor Emanuel Library; the Librarian

alone sees it. That gentleman politely brought me two works not inscribed on the cards arranged alphabetically, which represent the only public catalogue. One of these was "The Life of Bacon," by Mallet, translated into French, and another by Georges Fonsegrive, Prof. de Philosophie à Paris, au Lycée Buffon [1893], in which the author says it was Bacon's constant "préoccupation" to "work for the social happiness of Humanity," a vastly suggestive remark; and that, according to Bacon, "Virtue to exist needs health and happiness."

It is said that the *Journal des Savans* [1666] testified to Bacon's worth. Can any Baconian supply the reference? Curiously enough I came across a piece of evidence in this Victor Emanuel Library, Rome, which shows that Francis Bacon was as great an artist in the philosophy of dramatic expression as he was a past master in law. The *Daily Mail*, June 13th, found fault with Greenwood for ignoring this quality in Shakespeare. May I quote from *Histoire de la Vie et des Ouvrages de François Bacon* to emphasize it?

The author is Mallet, the date MDCCXLII. "Dans la conversation il pouvait prendre les caractères les plus différens, et parler le langage qui convenait à chacun de ces caractères avec une facilité qui était parfaitement naturelle, ou du moins avec une dextérité qui cachait tout apparence d'art. L'orsqu'il parloit en public il savait non seulement captiver l'attention de ses auditeurs mais aussi les faire entrer dans les sentimens qu'il vouloit leur inspirer. Comme ses paroles étoient alors accompagnées de toutes les graces de l'action . . . il ne manquait jamais d'exciter dans l'ame de ses auditeurs les mouvemens qu'il se proposoit d'y faire naître. Je suis que l'écho d'un autre."

As a footnote gives Ben Jonson [Discoveries] as reference, we may fairly call this "an actor's criticism of an actor."

It should also be remembered that history records the fact that Sir Francis Bacon dressed and staged matinees for Greenwich Palace. Among the many works by Bacon, and on him, in this Library, the most interesting is "*Saggi Morali del Signore Francesco Bacone, Cavaliere Inglese, tradatti in Italiano in Londra*" [G. Billio, 1618]. It contains a dedicatory letter to *Don Cosimo di Medici Gran Duca di Toscane*, written, of course, in Bacon's lifetime, by Tobie Mathew. It makes a very important statement, one that goes far to prove what I personally strongly believe—that Bacon in his youth visited Italy. I quote from the letter: "*Il vocabolo è moderno ma la cosa è antica . . . le epistole di Seneca a Lucilio, non son altro che Saggi; cio è meditationi, o concelli . . . in forme di lettere famigliari.*"

Now follows the circumstantial evidence on which we may fairly build: "*V. A. S. mi dara perdone è a questa opœra la sua proteltione; tanto più perche l'authore conserva, e honora la memoria di Gran Duchì Ferdinando e Cosimo di Medicis felicissimè progenitori di V. A. S. con affeto e ammiratione particolare.*"

To cherish the memory of a man "with affection and admiration" necessitates personal knowledge; at least, so it seems

to me. Ferdinand III. was a good and beloved Cardinal before he became Grand Duke in 1587 [b. 1551, d. 1609], and was ever an enlightened patron of art. He was, history tells us, secretly associated with England in commerce with Holland and Spanish America.⁹ We know Elizabeth used young Francis in secret embassy, and that Montaigne visited Siena and Florence in 1580. It was then, I suggest, that Francis learnt to respect and love Cardinal Ferdinand di Medici, just ten years his senior—an agreeable picture of whom hangs in the Ex-Palazzo Reale of Siena to-day, a Palace not open to the public, but courteously shown to me the other day by special permission. Tobie Mathew's correspondent had a great commercial instinct too, and was a merciful, earnest young prince who brought great prosperity to Tuscany. He became Grand Duke at the age of nineteen, and in his pictures wears the Knight Templar's cross on a riband round his neck. Tobie tells him in this letter that he found the translation, both portions, in the possession of *Sigr. Guglielmo Candiscio, Cavaliere, Inglese, nobilissimo, di bellissimo parti, e molto mio Padrone, chi con il bene placito dell'autore me le presto.*" This knight, of course, was no other than Sir William Cavendish, pronounced Candish—Bacon's faithful friend—and Ben of Hardwicke's son.

Who translated the "Saggi" into Italian is not said, but I find in the Jesuit *Casanatense Library* in Rome, in a Biographical Dictionary, the interesting fact that *Anna Bacon* translated twenty-five sermons by Bernardino Ochino from Italian into English. So there is no doubt whatever that her pupil, Francis, was already an accomplished Italian scholar in his early youth, and he probably did it himself. A fresh edition of the "Saggi," without this letter, came out in *Venice*, 1619, the next year, with the title: *Saggi Morali, opera nuova di Francesco Bacchon, correllta e data in luce dal S. Cavaliere Andrea Cioli, segretario Grand Duca di Toscana.* This first one, containing Tobie's letter, was only an English preliminary and private canter.

One other little bit of literary gossip and I am done. The *Casanatense* Biblioteca contains a Biography among "*Des Hommes Illustres*" of Domine Redempt Baranzane [b. 1590], who founded the Barnabite Order in Montargis, 1620. He was an inventor, says *Perè Nicéron*, his Biographer, at a time when to be one was a crime, and had relations with the *savans* of Europe. "I have in my hands," he goes on to say, "an original letter of François Bacon, Chancelier D'Angleterre, written to him a short while before his death. It is: 'Trop interessante et fait trop bien connoître la manière de philosopher qu'ils voulaient tous deux introduire pour ne la point communiquer au public.'" The letter, written in Latin, was signed by Bacon and dated London, June, 1622.

If Spedding has not included it among his letters, it would be easy enough to procure a copy. Baranzane was a famous

* ? Tobacco.

preacher near Geneva, where it is said he found scope for the controversies he carried on with zeal, and he died at thirty-three.

The Siena Library has no Catalogue of Subjects. Happily, before knowing myself guilty of a breach of etiquette, I handled the B.A.C. box of cards inscribed with the books of the library, *reserved for the use of the Librarian*, and saw many titles of Bacon's works, one an Elzevir, with a preface by Gruter, and an edition produced by a German, who says, "During Francis Bacon's peregrinations he wrote to me in the German Script," which is more than interesting. But I have already over-taxed your patience, and must reserve more chat for another time, and subscribe myself,
 Yours faithfully,
 ALICIA A. LEITH.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIR,—The portrait in the 1623 Folio, and the address "To the Reader" opposite to it, were for me for many years a puzzle. In the lines:

"O, could he but have drawn his wit
 As well in brass as he hath hit
 His face," etc.,

Ben Jonson seems to express a highly favourable judgment of the print as a portrait. Further, Martin Droeslout, by whom the portrait is signed, was, as we know from his other work, a most competent draughtsman. Yet the slightest examination of the portrait shows that it is about as bad a representation of a human face as it is possible to imagine; it would disgrace the most inexperienced beginner in any art school. There appeared to be here a mystery that demanded solution.

The mystery was for me in part solved by a lecture by Sir Edwin Durning Lawrence that I heard last year, in which the lecturer showed clearly that the portrait is not a human face, but a mask, and that in place of the right arm and right side of the coat, the back of the left arm and the left half of the back of the coat are shown.

This led me to examine more carefully the lines referring to the portrait, and it then struck me that the word "hit" might be an old form of "hid." I referred to the Oxford Dictionary and there found under the word "hide" the following quotation:

1386 Chaucer Squires T. 504, "Right as a serpent hit hym under floures"

"Till he may seen his tyme for to byte."

This seems to supply the complete solution of the mystery.

The scholarly Ben Jonson was no doubt well acquainted with Chaucer, and made use of this form, which was, we may safely assume, obsolete even in his day, to say that the true face of the author was hidden under a mask while appearing to express the exact opposite. If the word "hit" is read "hid" the lines become wholly intelligible in reference to the portrait.

A. à B. TERREL.

11, Stone Buildings, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.

NOTES.

MR. JOHN MOODY EMERSON, of Waver-tree, Liverpool, has discovered another anagram from the Sonnets. The last two lines of Sonnet 109 read :—

“ For nothing this wide universe I call,
Save thou, my Rose, in it thou art my all.”

These 61 letters, with much ingenuity, have been arranged to yield the following sentence: “ I, Francis Verulam, this loving dualitie, to Henry Wriothesley, Southam-ton.”

It is stated that “ The first published copy of this anagram was most graciously accepted by His Most Excellent Majesty King Edward VII. on June 1st, 1908.” It would be very interesting to know whether His Majesty was impressed by the anagram ; but it would be much more interesting to know whether the Shakespeare problem has received consideration from the king in the midst of all his multifarious State duties. The king is so level-headed and possesses such clear perception and sound judgment that a large number of his subjects would be very gratified to know that the facts which are the subject of the controversy had been seriously considered by him, and if so, with what result.

* * *

The *Lancet*, of the 13th of April last, had an interesting review of a pamphlet recently published by John W. Wainwright, M.D., New York, on *The Medical and Surgical Knowledge of William Shakespere*, with explanatory notes. The writer says: “ The works of Shakespere have been discussed from almost every conceivable standpoint, and many works have appeared dealing with his medical and surgical knowledge, notably one by Moyes, first published in 1896. A student, nay,

even a casual reader of Shakespeare, cannot fail to be struck with his numerous references to matters medical and surgical, displaying indeed a more or less intimate acquaintance with the medical lore of the times in which he lived. . . . All references relating to medicine are not given by Dr. Wainwright, but only those that have appeared to him to possess the most interest. The quotations are well chosen and the accompanying notes are, in general, useful."

* * *

There has been a correspondence in the *Westminster Gazette* as to whether the designation of "Lord Bacon" is correct. Mallet, Stephens, Montague, Spedding, and Hepworth Dixon, all use the term and it has come to be generally accepted. The following remarks, which appeared from the pen of Mr. Arthur Galton, appear correctly to sum up the position :—

"Bacon was Lord Keeper of the Great Seal before he was Lord Chancellor with a peerage. His proper title then was Lord Keeper Bacon ; or, popularly and improperly, 'Lord Bacon,' and this impropriety has been continued until it holds the field. It is none the less improper, though it certainly would be pedantic to speak of Bacon as Lord St. Albans. It would illustrate Matthew Arnold's phrase, 'Precise enough, but precisely wrong.' The great man should not continue to be 'Lord Bacon.' He should be Francis Bacon, or Bacon simply ; though he has not a monopoly of the name, and the other exceedingly great and interesting owner of it is too much forgotten in this age of science, of which he was so marvellous a prophet and precursor.

"The origin of the popular misuse is easily explained. We still have Lords of the Treasury, Lords of the Admiralty, Lords Justices of Appeal. The Litany makes a clear distinction between the Lords of the Council and 'all the Nobility.' Every Privy Council-

lor is technically a lord, though not necessarily a peer. His title of Right Honourable shows it. It would be unusual, though not perhaps incorrect, to speak of 'Lord Asquith,' 'Lord McKenna,' or 'Lord Vaughan Williams.' At any rate usage was much looser in the seventeenth century, and so the phrase 'Lord Bacon' was made current."

* * *

A Viennese Professor is reported to have delivered a lecture before the Society of Vienna Authors and Journalists, in which he took for his text the following extract from Lord Bacon's "Essay on Death": "It is as natural to die as to be born, and to a little infant perhaps the one is as painful as the other." The Professor maintained that death is almost invariably actually painless, that the *articulus mortis* is, except in quite exceptional circumstances, free from even the feeling of distress. The fear of death, common to all, is not a part of death itself, it is a physical scare of life. The actual and ultimate cause of death is undoubtedly in the large majority of cases the failure of the heart's action, and consciousness is generally lost before the heart ceases to beat. Even in gunshot injuries causing death, the fatal result occurs before the painful impression has had time to reach the brain from the skin. In drowning and all forms of suffocation the anæsthetic effect of the carbonic acid gas which has accumulated in the blood, exerts its full influence long before life terminates. In death from acute diseases, the toxins which accumulate in the blood so dull this mechanism of consciousness as to anticipate by, it may be, hours the bitterness of death. Thus, in a large majority of cases, that state of feeling described as the fear of death is itself not experienced.

* * *

In the April number of the *Library* is an article by

Mr. W. W. Greg on a volume in the library of Mr. Marsden Perry, at Providence Rhode Island, which contains ten Shakespearean and pseudo-Shakespearean plays. The binding is seventeenth century and bears the name of a contemporary collector—Edward Gwynn. The plays are: *Merchant of Venice*, 1600 (Roberts' quarto); *Midsummer Night's Dream*, 1600 (Roberts' quarto); *Sir John Oldcastle*, 1600 (T. P. quarto); *King Lear*, 1608 (N. Butler quarto); *Henry V.*, 1608; *Yorkshire Tragedy*, 1619; *Merry Wives of Windsor*, 1619; two parts of the *Contention of York and Lancaster*, 1619; and *Pericles*, 1619. Mr. Greg has had access to copies of the same plays now in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, which were presented to it by Edward Capell. Although now in two volumes, they appear to have been originally bound together. In an article in the *Academy*, of 2nd June, 1906, Mr. Alfred Pollard propounded the theory that owing to the publication of two editions of *Midsummer Night's Dream*, the *Merchant of Venice*, and *Sir John Oldcastle* in 1600, and of *King Lear* in 1608, one edition in each case failed to sell out and in 1619 Thomas Pavier purchased the "remainders" and bound them up with unsold copies of his edition of *Henry V.*, printed in 1608, and other plays which he was then re-printing. After a careful scrutiny of the Capell Plays, Mr. Greg has advanced another theory, to which he has made a convert of Mr. Pollard. It is this—the ten quartos were not merely collected and published in one volume in 1619, but whatever may be the dates which appear on the title-pages, the whole set was actually printed by one printer at that one date. After an exhaustive examination of the type, the watermarks, a wood block used, and other features, Mr. Greg thus summarizes the arguments upon which he basis his conclusion. He says:—

"I claim that the dates 1600 and 1608 in Pavier's

collection are proved to be false dates, and the whole volume shown to have been produced at one time, namely, in 1619, by the following considerations :

“1. That certain large numerals appearing in the imprints are not elsewhere found before 1610.

“2. That the *Heb Dieu* device on two title-pages, dated 1600 (one purporting to be printed by Roberts), and two dated 1608, is not otherwise known between 1596 and 1610, and does not occur in any other book bearing Roberts' name.

“3. That the *Post Tenebras Lux* device found on one title-page, dated 1600, and purporting to be printed by Roberts, is not otherwise known between 1594 and 1605, and does not occur in any other book bearing Roberts' name, and, moreover, that the impression on the title-page, dated 1600, shows the block in a more damaged condition than other impressions dated 1605 and 1617.

“4. That the whole volume is printed on one mixed stock of paper, and that this could not have been the case if the individual plays had been printed at different dates extending over a period of twenty years.”

In a subsequent article Mr. Greg proposes to treat of the false imprints of plays other than Shakespeare's. The foregoing conclusions afford some colour to the suggestion made in another column, in an article on “The Grave's Tiring Room,” namely, that the date 1609 on the Sonnets is a blind and that they were not printed until after 1621.

* * *

A well-known public librarian recently sent to *The Daily Chronicle* some facts relating to an inquiry into the comparative popularity of the cheap reprints of standard English classics, and the results are somewhat startling, and certainly worth reproduction in the pages of BACONIANA. This librarian's tabulation shows that

Bacon's *Essays* is first in vogue as a book which it is proper for the "average citizen" to have on his book-shelf, as it appears in no fewer than *eighteen* series—the recent popular reprints. Shakespeare, Goldsmith, and Holmes come second only in the list with *fourteen* each.

* * *

There is in the "Boston College Stylus" of Boston, Mass., an article by Edward J. H. O'Brien, headed "Francis Bacon's 'Shakespeare.'" The writer concludes by inviting objections and criticisms and offering to answer them. He subjoins a list of books for consultation—all in the Boston Library and really accessible. Amongst these is *BACONIANA* (New Series, Vols. I.—X.; Third Series, Vols. I.—IV.).

* * *

The Society is indebted to Mrs. Payne, of Haywards Heath, for a very valuable gift of books to the library. It comprises seventy-four volumes, of which forty-six are modern and twenty-eight are ancient. Amongst the former is a copy of "Purchas, His Pilgrimes," twenty volumes; "Hakluyt's Voyages," twelve volumes; and a number of reprints. Amongst the latter are the 1630 edition of Michael Drayton's *Poems*, Fabian's *Chronicles* (1533). One volume is of special interest; it is the 2nd edition (1589) of the French Academy, by Peter de la Primaudaye, dedicated to the most Christian King Henry III., and translated into English by T. B. On the title-page of the volume is the signature "Cecill Canc: 1592" in Cecill's own handwriting.

Lectures, 1907-1908.

THE Society is indebted to Mrs. Chambers Buntin for having arranged an interesting series of lectures which have been delivered during the past winter and spring months. It commenced in November, when Mr. Fleming Fulcher read a paper

on "Shakespeare's French" at Miss Soutter's Studio, 133, Park Road, N.W. Mr. Granville Cuninghame presided, and in the discussions which followed Miss A. Leith, Mr. Udney, Mr. Hawkins and others took part.

On February the 26th Mr. Parker Woodward read a paper on "Some Early Writing of Francis Bacon" at the house of Mr. Granville Cuninghame, who presided. This was followed by an interesting discussion, in which Sir Edwin Laurence, Mrs. Pott, Mr. Harold Bayley and others spoke.

On May the 8th Mrs. Henry Pott secured the rooms of the Asiatic Society at 22, Albemarle Street, W., for the reading of her exhaustive paper on "Francis 'Bacon,' Lord St. Alban, the Concealed Man: An Attempt to trace Who he was, What he did, and How he did it—Traditional Marks and Symbols of his Secret Society," which was illustrated by lantern slides. The paper was read by Mr. Fleming Fulcher. The views included portraits of Francis Bacon and his dwellings, also reproductions of pages of rare books and paper-marks. Sir Edwin Durning-Laurence, Mr. W. T. Smedley, Col. Columb, Mr. A. T. Sinnett and Mr. A. à B. Terrol were amongst those who spoke.

The last lecture was delivered by Sir Edwin Durning-Laurence at his own residence at 13, Carlton House Terrace, on the 13th June, and was largely attended. The subject was "Shakespeare, Shotbolt, and Wagstaff." With the assistance of magic lantern views of sections of the title-page vignettes from Gustavus Silenus' book of Cryptograms and Ciphers, and other works of the period, Sir Edwin deeply interested his audience in various theories which he propounded as to Bacon's connection with works published under another name. The discussion which followed was conducted by Mrs. Gallup and Messrs. A. T. Sinnett, Udney, Crouch, Batchelor, Burgoyne and Smedley.

ERRATA.—In *Was Bacon ever abroad?* in April number, page 90, for "The Latin version of his 'Essay on Travel,' '*De Peregratione in Partes Extremos*,'" read "The Latin version of his 'Essay of Travel' '*De Peregrinatione in Partes Exteras*.'" Page 91, for "In the *Sylva Sylvarum*, Bacon says the same, in fact, perpetuates the same blunder as all the classic writers: Homer, Ovid, Virgil, Hyginus, etc., maintain that Proteus was *bound by a chain, not held by the sleeve*," read "In the *Sylva Sylvarum* Bacon says the same, in fact, perpetrates the same blunder: as all the classic writers, Homer, Ovid, Virgil, Hyginus, etc., maintain that Proteus was *bound by a chain, not held by the sleeve*."

BACONIANA.

VOL. VI. *Third Series.* OCTOBER, 1908. No. 24.

NOTES ON THE *MERRY WIVES* *OF WINDSOR.*

BY ALICIA AMY LEITH.

I N a very suggestive article on Justice Shallow by Mr. John Hutchinson in the January number of *BACONIANA* he says :

“The prototype of Shallow would, we conceive, be well known to the wits of the Inns of Court, and be recognised by them in his stage dress. Is it not conceivable that Sir Charles Percy, who was one of them, . . . may have come upon him down Dumbleton way?”

Absence from England prevented my answering this question sooner, but I take the earliest opportunity of forwarding some notes on this subject which I am more than glad to make public. If we open Shakespeare at *Henry IV.*, Part 2, Act I., S. ii., we read :

Falstaff.—“What said Master Dumbleton about the satin for my short coat and slops?”

Here we find the key to Shallow's identity. In my opinion he was partly drawn from a well-known City character of that day, Baptist Hicks, silk mercer and moneylender, one of the Justices of the Peace for Mid-

dlesex. He contracted for Crown Lands, 1561—1629, was M.P. for Tavistock 1609, for Tewkesbury 1620, was created Baronet 1620, and built a magnificent mansion in Gloucestershire in 1608, nine miles as the crow flies from Dumbleton, sparing no cost, and setting atop a huge lanthorn, "as a solace and landmark upon the dreary wolds," as his biography tells us. Is the lanthorn alluded to by Shakespeare? I think so, in the scene in *Henry IV.* already alluded to.

Sir Charles Percy* became possessed of Dumbleton by right of his wife, the daughter of Thomas Cocks, Esquire, in 1608, the same year as Hicks went down into the Cotswolds.

Of course, Sir Charles knew Hicks well, in London too, where his "bonds," "securities," and "assurances" were as familiar as household words.

I am inclined to believe that the play of the *Merry Wives* was laid and possibly first played in the fashionable suburbs of Clerkenwell and Islington. Ordish, in his "Shakespeare in London," says that Elizabethan playgoers expected to see places and people portrayed which they knew. The Forest of Arden, for example, according to him, was represented by Hampstead Heath! It added greatly to the zest of plays if the persons and scenes were from life.

On the spot where Messrs. Rivington's printing works stand once stood in Clerkenwell (Saint John's Square) an Inn or Tavern, noted for its carriers and its Justices of the Peace. There they held their sessions till Justice Hicks built them a Hall, known to time as Hicks' Hall, a landmark long after Lord Campden was gathered to his fathers. The Hall was built in 1610, and Justice Hicks was created Viscount Campden in 1628.

If we remember, the City magistrates and the actors were at variance in the early days of the theatres;

* Friend of Essex, bespoke Richard II. at his imprisonment.

indeed, the Justices made a clean sweep of them out of the City and they were forced to confine their public performances to the outskirts of London.

"The Bookman" has had interesting remarks on this subject ("Illustrated History of English Literature," p. 68, Part 2). It says, "The Corporation determined enemy of the Stage." Francis Bacon was fifteen or sixteen when Leicester's and Warwick's Company merged into Hunsdon's, and the Plague and the City magistrates sent the players to the green fields of Finsbury, Moorgate, Southwark and Clerkenwell.

In 1584 the City appealed to the Privy Council to demolish "The Green Curtain" of the late Holywell Priory. Walsingham then obtained leave to form the company of the "Queen's Servants." The Privy Council writes (1601), "We do understand that certain players that use to recyte their playes at the Curtain in Moorfields do represent upon the stage in their interludes the persons of some gentlemen of good descent and quality that are yet alive under obscure manner, but yet in such sort that as all the hearers may take notice both of the matter and the persons that are meant thereby" (Ordish, p. 90, "Early London Theatres"). Was Justice Baptist Hicks one of these?

Francis Bacon, the astute man of law, would in all probability try to protect his playhouse from trouble of this sort by masking the originals from which the characters were drawn under the safety of numbers. Justice Hicks was not the only model for Shallow. Giles Brydges, third Baron Chandos, of Sudely Castle,* Gloucestershire, was another; at least, so I think. Dumbleton lay only five miles as the crow flies from

* Mary Seymour, child of Catherine Parr, and her husband, Admiral Seymour, who lived at Sudely, married a Sir Edward Bushel. Probably one of the same Gloucestershire family referred to presently.

Sudely; nearer, in fact, than Campden. The question naturally arises, Why should this important person, one who more than once received Queen Elizabeth and entertained her royally, be caricatured in a Comedy?

His personality is lost sight of. I know nothing of it except that he was not everything that could be desired with regard to law or neighbourliness.

Lord Chandos, whose name would according to Elizabethan fashion have dropped the "n" and be pronounced more like Shaddow, as I take it,* made himself exceedingly unpleasant in the Cotswolds, if not ridiculous, with regard to a certain gentleman, his neighbour, Mr. Thomas Bushel. He seems to have accused Mr. Bushel of murdering a servant of his, John Yate. That he spread damaging reports about Bushel in the county is certain. Then charges were brought against Lord Chandos (by Bushel, I presume) of certain fraudulent suits to deprive him of land he had legally purchased. A letter is extant from Gyles Chandos to Thomas Bushel, 1578, in which he threatens, "Thou shalt be justly and truly answered in the Star Chamber." Walsingham was in correspondence with irate Chandos on the subject.

Thomas Bushel was the name of Francis Bacon's Seal Bearer and friend,† who remained faithful to him in his fall when others deserted him, and who wrote a beautiful vindication of his master in the "Farmer of his Majesty's Mines in London" [1659, 40]. He entered Francis Bacon's service at 15 in the year 1609. He would have been, as I think, more than likely the son of the injured party who possibly applied to Bacon's court to pro-

* Danvers was pronounced Da'vrs.

† Thomas Bushel, friend and servant of Francis Bacon, generously provided Charles I.'s army with cloth. The big army cloth mills were all in the Golden Valley, Gloucestershire, where Friar Roger Bacon lived.

tect him from Chandos. But this I allow is only conjecture. Chandos was, I must not omit to mention, Constable of the Cotswolds—the quarter, if we remember, where Page's greyhound, according to Slender, was outrun. In Act I., S. i., we find the following :

Shallow.—"Persuade me not. I shall make a Star Chamber matter of it. If he were twenty Sir John Falstuffs he shall not abuse Robert Shallow Esquire."

Slender.—"In the County of Gloucester Justice of the Peace and Coram."

Shallow.—"Ay, cousin Slender, and *Cust-alorum.*"

Slender.—"Ay, and *ratolorum* too . . . who writes himself *armegero.*"

Shallow.—"Ay, that I do, and have done any time these three hundred years."

In 1431 Ralf de Sudely bore arms in France with Henry VI. It was now the third hundred since he was at the closing scene of *la Pucelle's* life.

Let us not forget that the irritation of Sudely, I mean Shallow, bursts forth again in the words: "Knight, you have beaten my men, killed my deer, and broke open my lodge." At any rate, the country home of Justice Shallow was Gloucestershire, not Warwickshire, in the play. In this my prototypes come nearer the truth than Sir Thomas Lucy does.

If Justice Shallow is partly drawn from Giles, Lord Chandos, it is rather significant that Falstaff should say in Scene iii. of Act V. of *Henry IV.*, Part 2:—

"Master Shallow; my *Lord Shallow*; be what thou wilt."

And Shallow in the same scene in Gloucestershire says: "Under the King I am in some authority." He was constable of the Cotswolds.

Falstaff, in the same scene says: "You have a goodly dwelling and a rich."

Shallow.—"Barren, Barren, Barren."

Now Giles was the third Baron of Chandos. Nothing, of course, if taken by itself, but much when it is one of several facts.

Now to consider the question why Clerkenwell should be the scene of the *Merry Wives*?

Falstaff is the central figure of this comedy supposed to be written in fourteen days to please the Queen. Now Daniel, in his "Merrie England in the Olden Time," says that the Rose Tavern, Rose Alley, Turnmill Street, Clerkenwell,* was the scene (under the Rose) of Falstaff's early gallantries.† It was kept by one John Sleep, who also kept the "Whelp and Bacon" in Smithfield Pound. Apparently, then, "The Rose" was the Garter Inn—not at all a bad synonym.‡ This is a point in favour of my notion that this fashionable quarter of the London suburbs was the scene of the play, together with Islington, easily reached through the green and flowery lane known then as Longwich.

It would not have taken Falstaff long to get by it to Canonbury Mansion (the abode, as I believe, of Mr. Page in the play), and an absolute trifle to Justice Hicks in his coach.

The owner of Canonbury or Cambray House, as it was familiarly called, was a City Alderman—Sir John Spencer—whose daughter, sweet Elizabeth, was god-daughter of the Queen and, I think, the original of sweet Anne Page.

Rich Spencer, as he was named habitually, was

* The tavern in Clerkenwell where the Elizabethan magistrates met was "The Castle." Whether "Windsor Castle" or "Old Castle," either is suggestive.

† Knight's "London," Vol. I., p. 66.

‡ In the order as roses are worn round the neck, the garter on the leg.

owner of the splendid mansion in Bishopsgate—Crosbie Hall. For fowling and hawking and fishing he went out to Canonbury House, Islington, where his syllabub farm and hawking ground lay. A river ran by the house (the New River), and Frog Mere or More lay close at hand. Giles Heron, Sir Thomas More's son-in-law, once owned Cutlers, part of the Canonbury Estate, and so it may well be that there was a Herne's or Heron's oak there as well as in Berkshire. My readers will readily remember the allusions to these local things in the *Merry Wives*.

South of Canonbury lay the Priory of Saint John's, Clerkenwell, where the Master of the Court Revels lived. In Tylney's official book of the Revels in the British Museum is an item, "Glazing the windows of Saint John's Hall, where the rehearsalls be made." The office contained a "Wardrobe, and other several rooms for Artificers to work in, viz. : Taylors, Imbrotherers, propertie makers, Painters, wire-drawers, and carpenters, together with a convenient place for Rehearsalls, and setting forth of Plays, and other Shows for those services" * (1588-4).

When Edmund Tylney (1621) ceased to be Master of the Court Revels and licenser of plays (he licensed thirty of Shake-Speare's) Francis Bacon's secretary, Ben Jonson, succeeded him as Master in the Gate House. If to-day we go over the quaint Gate House, † Samuel Johnson is spoken of as a tenant; Ben is never mentioned.

It yet remains for the Fords to be given a local habitation and a name.

Ford took the name of Brook, as will be remembered in the play.

* Edmund Tylney's "Court Revels."

† The Gate of the Priory of St. John of Jerusalem, now the head office of St. John's Ambulance.

One mile and a-half from Cambray or Canonbury was Old Ford and Brook House. Hackney, situated between two divisions of a stream, was a pretty flowery village at this time, rejoicing in as fashionable a reputation as Clerkenwell. The gardens of Brook House were far-famed, and remained so in Pepys' time. Orange trees were first cultivated here. In 1560—83 Lord Hunsdon* lived there, the Lord Chamberlain, with a company of servants or players. Brook House seems to have been Crown property; Edward VI. gave it to Lord Pembroke, and Elizabeth is said to have visited there. During her stay she is said to have held in her keeping the key of the Church; this reminds one that in Mrs. Gallup's decyphering of Bacon's Cypher she is said to have married Leicester from Lord Pembroke's house. Was it from his Hackney house? If Elizabeth stayed with Carey, Lord Hunsdon, who owned a troupe of professional actors who rehearsed at Saint John's Gate, were the *Merry Wives* performed on this spot to amuse her with local allusions? Fulke Greville, Lord Brook, owned Brook House later.

Mr. Page in the Comedy objected to his wealth attracting a lover of high degree, Fenton, who was offering his suit to his heiress daughter. "Rich Spencer" suspected the advances made by Lord William Compton to his only daughter and heiress and refused his consent to this match. Page distrusted Fenton, Spencer distrusted Compton, fearing (as Shakespeare puts it) he "should wish to knit a knot in his fortune with the finger of his substance." Like Page, Spencer's "consent went not that way."

Act III., Scene iv., Fenton says: "I cannot get thy father's love." And again: "He doth object I am too great of birth."

If he had been Compton, heir to the Northampton

* Henry Carey, first cousin to Elizabeth.

title, and wishful to marry a rich City moneylender's daughter, he could not have put the matter better. Fenton alludes pretty plainly to Anne's father's wealth. "Rich Spencer," obdurate, shut his romantic daughter up in a room in Canonbury Tower. Lord William, undaunted, disguised himself as a cook in the household and sent the pretty prisoner up *billets doux* in sweet confectionery, telling her to keep up a good heart, as he intended to carry her safe out of the Tower in a baker's basket, which he did—a parallel to Falstaff's exit in a Buck basket. The Queen, on the birth of a daughter to the happily wedded pair, obtained Spencer's tardy forgiveness and his wealth became theirs in due time. Later, when young Lord and Lady Compton were living in Canonbury House with their daughter Anne (1616), Francis Bacon rented the Tower from them. He lived in Canonbury mansion two years, and was in residence when he received the Seals;* and yet this fact is ignored in all his biographies, and at the Tower itself his name is not mentioned. Only Goldsmith and Johnson are said to have lived there. By the way, Goldsmith is said to have fled there from his creditors. Was it a hiding-place for our Gold Smith, who did more than most men to transmute base coin into true gold?

The facts I have stated are not all. Sir Anthony Cook, Francis Bacon's grandfather on Anne Lady Bacon's side, had a son William, who married Joyce, the daughter of Sir Thomas Lucy, of Charlecote, Warwickshire. He was given a grant of Highnam,† near Gloucester, the present estate of Sir Hubert Parry.

* Thomas Tomlin's "On Canonbury."

† Mary, daughter of John Brydges, first Baron Chandos, married Rowland Arnold, of Highnam, Gloucester. Their only daughter, Dorothy, married the son of Sir Thomas Lucy. Their daughter, Joyce, married Sir William Cook, who inherited Highnam.

(State Calendar, British Museum Reference Library page 317).

Henry IV., Part 2, Act V., S. i.

Shallow.—"William Cook let him come hither. For William Cook are there no young pigeons? Tell William Cook."

This scene is laid in Gloucestershire in Shallow's house. William Cook was Francis Bacon's cousin living in Gloucestershire.

Another interesting thing is that Francis Bacon himself was personally connected with Cheltenham, a few miles from Sudely. In 1597 he was presented with the Curacy of the Chapel of Charlton Kings, dedicated and made subject to the mother church, Saint Mary's, Cheltenham, in 1190. His church was in the deanery of Winchcomb, which is close to Sudely. The Rectory brought no profit to Francis, who said: "I praise God for it, I never took penny for any benefice or ecclesiastical living." What *did* yield profit in Cheltenham to its inhabitants was the plantation of tobacco, which flourished there from its introduction into England in 1565. This is not the first time that tobacco and Francis are found in juxtaposition, nor do I think it will be the last. This Curacy was leased by Francis for forty years. Edward IV. passed through Cheltenham on his way to the battle of Tewkesbury. The Abbey of Tewkesbury can be seen from Gloucester, where "lies the field of Tewkesbury." The tomb of Edward II. is in Gloucester Cathedral. How eminently Gloucestershire is a favourite county with Shakespeare! We have in *Richard II.*, Act II., Scene iii., that colloquy on the way to Berkeley, and how truly the author of the play knows the Cotswolds I can testify who have bicycled from Bird-lip to Berkeley.

Bolingbroke.—"How far is it, my lord, to Berkeley now?"

Northumberland.—"I am a stranger here in Gloucestershire. These high wild hills and rough uneven ways draw out our miles and make them wearisome."

Francis Bacon, as I believe, has here shown road-makers the necessity for altering the dreadful ups and downs which existed at that time. If the Cotswolds are bad travelling now their "rough uneven ways" were far worse then. We can trace the old roads, and their gradient in some places was more than one in six. Extraordinary steepness! The ascents and descents for travellers, indeed, then drew "out their miles" most unnecessarily. Before leaving the subject of Charlton Kings, may I add that I saw the name of Hamlet over a shop close against St. Michael's—Bacon, his church—and on a tomb in the churchyard. And now I bring this paper to an end with the hope that it may stimulate others to study Bacon in Gloucestershire and Islington.

THE CANONBURY INSCRIPTION

BY G. B. ROSHER.

MAY I be allowed, mainly with the view of recording some facts while the memory of them is fresh, to say something in continuation of the article on "The Canonbury Inscription" which appeared in *BACONIANA*, in April, 1903 (3rd series, Vol. I., p. 116).

When I wrote that article I had not examined the inscription subsequently to having formed the conjecture that the word in dispute had been *EAMQ*. Had I done so I should have spoken more confidently on the point than I did. Speaking from recollection of the traces, and from a sketch I had made of them before I had guessed what the word had been, I only ventured to say that "the few traces that remain of the letters

following the E seem consistent with the word having been EAMQ." But the first time I went to the Tower after having any particular letters in mind with which to see if the traces corresponded, I found I was in a position to say that *there could be no doubt* as to the word having been EAMQ., as the top of the A, the two tops of the M, the rounded top of the Q, and the tail of the Q, could all be distinctly seen.

They cannot, however, be seen now, as they have not survived the recent restoration. The lease of the Canonbury Constitutional Club, who occupied the Tower, expired in June, 1907, and the owner, the Marquis of Northampton, then resumed possession and restored the Tower, and in June of the present year re-opened it as a Social Club for the tenants of his estates in the neighbourhood, and their friends.

The above-mentioned traces of the A, M, and Q were clearly visible when I visited the Tower on May 31st, 1907, a few weeks before its occupation by the Constitutional Club ended, but these traces have no doubt succumbed to washing during the restoration. The inscription is stated to have been "merely washed and varnished," but I think there must be a slight inadvertence in this statement, or a misapprehension as to what, in fact, was done. Very likely washing and varnishing were all that was at first intended, but the inscription has obviously been repainted. Probably so much of the old paint came off in the washing that repainting became necessary. The result is that the habitual peculiarity in the last painter's handiwork (which I called attention to in my former article) of not joining the lower horizontal stroke of his E either to the vertical stroke or to the tick at the end, is no longer observable, as the restorer's brush has made the strokes continuous from the vertical to the tick.

The Tower is not now open to visitors except on the

introduction of a member of the Club, but there is not so much use in going there now for the purpose of ascertaining the identity of the damaged word as there was before June, 1907, as the restoration has obliterated the traces of the A, M, and Q that put the matter beyond doubt while they remained visible. It can still, however, be seen by a careful observer that the first letter was E; the original paint of the lower horizontal stroke being still traceable though the colour has departed from it. The letter has been restored as F, but the bottom stroke and tick that make the difference between an E and an F are still faintly visible.

Since writing the above I have looked up a letter which I received from Sir Benjamin Stone, M.P., who visited Canonbury Tower about the time that I first went there. The letter is dated Feb. 16th, 1902, and in it Sir Benjamin Stone says:—"I carefully examined the inscription at Canonbury Tower and you will be interested to know that I am entirely in agreement with you as to the first letter of the mutilated word being E. The chemical action of the paint is visible, though the black has partly disappeared." The last quoted sentence from Sir Benjamin Stone's letter strikes me as remarkably similar in substance to part of a sentence of my own description in the preceding paragraph—"The original paint of the lower horizontal stroke being still traceable though the colour has departed from it." I wrote this sentence two or three days ago after a visit to the Tower, not having at the time any recollection of the terms of Sir Benjamin Stone's letter of six years ago. Sir Benjamin Stone also stated in his letter that he was aware that Nelson, in his "History of Islington," had given the first letter as F, but said he was "prepared to say that he (Nelson) was wrong as to that." I may add that a friend of mine who accompanied me to the Tower in May, 1907, is prepared to corroborate what I have

said as to the traces of the A, M, and Q, being then plain enough to leave no doubt that the mutilated word was EAMQ.

What I am next going to say has no direct bearing on the word that has been in question ; but, while writing about this inscription, I may mention that the second line is not a complete hexameter, either as it stood before the restoration :—

“RI. JOHN HEN. TERT. ED. TERNI RIQ. SECUNDUS,”
which is only five and a-half feet instead of six ; or as it stands now :—

“RI. JOHN HEN. TERTIUS ED. TRES RI. SECUNDUS,”
which is altogether hopeless as a verse. Possibly the half foot deficiency may have been caused by the omission by successive restorers of letters that had become difficult to decipher. Richard II. now stands as RI. When I first saw the inscription a few years ago he stood as RIQ., Q. of course being an abbreviation for Que. Nelson’s “History of Islington,” published in 1811, gives RICQ. John Nelson said the inscription was “somewhat obliterated from damp at one end.” It was Richard the Second’s fate that his order in the series placed him at the damp end, where letters were apt to become illegible, and apparently to be ignored in consequence by restorers. There may have been previous restorations (especially at the damp end) in the 250 or more years since the inscription was put up, and as Richard II. has lost a Q and a C between 1811 and the present time, it would not be extravagant to suppose that he may have lost two or three more letters in the much longer period between the first painting up of the inscription in the reign of Charles I. and the time when John Nelson copied it. If Richard II. first took his place in the line as RICARDQ., the line with this lettering would have been a complete hexameter, as (like the

others), no doubt it originally was, for it is hardly possible to think that the writer of these verses would have allowed an incomplete hexameter to appear among them. The *c* given by Nelson raises the presumption that there were other letters, for it shows that Richard II. was not represented solely by *Ri.*, like Richard I. at the beginning of the line, and the mere addition of a *c* would not have had the effect of providing the syllable or half-foot which, in order to be a hexameter, the line requires; whereas the letters *CARDQ.* would have made the line a complete one, thus:—

Ri. JOHN HEN. TERT. ED. TERNI RICARDQ.
SECUNDUS.

Although in referring to *EAMQ.* I have had to remark that the traces of *A*, *M*, and *Q* have been lost in the restoration, and that what can even yet be seen to have been an *E* has been restored as an *F*, I do not wish to be understood as making any attack on the restoration. No doubt restorers often deserve all the abuse they get, but in this case it should be remembered that we are dealing with minute and hardly noticeable details which have escaped the observation of some of those who have inspected the inscription with a knowledge of the controversy. In these circumstances restorers, coming to the work probably without that assistance, cannot be blamed for not having observed what some other people had not observed, or for having made the same mistake as to the *E* as had been made long before in Nelson's "History of Islington." On the contrary, if I may express an opinion about the restoration of Canonbury Tower, I should say that, regarded as a whole, it has been carried out thoroughly and carefully, with good judgment, and without sparing of expense, and in consequence there is now every prospect that this interesting old building will stand for another couple of hundred years or more.

THE "SCHOOLE OF ABUSE," 1579.

BY PARKER WOODWARD.

THE writer of the above and a few other pamphlets and verses was an exceptionally learned man. He indicated acquaintance (amongst many others) with the works of the classical poets:—Homer, Ovid, Simonides, Pindar, Virgil, Lucan, Ennius; the theologians, Solomon and David; the philosophers, Plato, Cicero, Maximus Tyrius, Æsop, Hesiodus, Pythagoras, Aurelius, Aristotle and Demosthenes; the historians, Sallust, Plutarch, Xenophon, Dion, Cæsar, and Pliny; and with the dramatists, Plautus, Seneca, Menander and Euripides. He punned upon the name of the English poet, Whetstone.

From an allusion on the second page of the "Schoole for Abuse," viz., "the vizard that Poets maske in," he would seem to have considered it orthodox for writers of poetry or prose (both at that day being called poets) to conceal their individuality.

The question I propose in this paper to consider is whether this little group of writings, 1579 to 1583, was the genuine work of Stephen Gosson, whose name is on the title pages, or was he only the "vizard" for another person.

Young Gosson was not twenty-one when, having graduated B.A. in 1576, he proceeded to London. He is described as having become a player and as having quitted that occupation to become a preacher. Eventually by gift of the Queen in 1591 he became Rector of Wigborough. He died in 1624, Rector of St. Botolph, Bishopsgate, London, and was buried at night. It is very odd that a literary career commenced so brilliantly should (if his) have stopped abruptly in 1583.

On the authority of the Biliteral cipher story Francis

Bacon published his poetical and lighter writings under many vizards. That "Gosson" was one of them has not been claimed specifically in any cipher so far translated, but Bacon makes a general allusion to the occasional use of other names than those of Spenser, Greene, Peele, Marlowe, Shakspeare, and Burton. That the Gosson family had good friends at Court, Stephen obtaining the Wigborough rectory (gift of the Queen) and William becoming Her Majesty's drum player, supports the "vizard" assumption.

The dates of the "Gosson" writings offer further indication. Young Francis was in London in 1576, the date of the "Gosson" poem at the end of Kerton's "Mirror of Man's Life." When the two poems at the end of "The Pleasant History of the Conquest of West India," 1578, were added Francis would be back in London from abroad. The first poem is in distinctly "Spenserian" vein.

"Gosson" was noted (according to Francis Meres) for his admirable penning of pastorals, though no Gosson pastorals have come down to us. Yet Francis as "Immerito" and "Peele" was (while Gosson was still a player) writing pastoral verse and pastoral play.

The "Schoole of Abuse" is written very closely in the style of the "Euphues" of Lyly. It is passing strange, if not inconceivable, that two writers in the same year and in, as it were, the "first-fruits" of their respective "inventions," should independently possess and practise a new antithetical style, subsequently known as Euphuism. But if there were one author only masking under two different "vizards," the cause for wonder ends.

We have the authority of the cipher story that "Greene" was one of Bacon's "vizards" and the authority of Gabriel Harvey (Bacon's poetical adviser) that "Greene," "Nash," and "Lyly" were one and the

same personality. The printed testimony of Harvey is absolute on this point (see Pierce's "Supcrerogation," 1593).

That being so, one can notice with less diffidence that in the title of the "Schoole of Abuse," counting from the first "f," a sequence of letters will spell out "Francis Bacon." That this may not be entirely accidental is possibly indicated by the circumstance that in the head of the "Epistle Dedicatorie" (counting from the first "f") we again obtain "Francis," and from the bunched out words at the end of it (counting from the first "b") we obtain "Bacon."

Again, on the first page of the pamphlet in question it is suspicious to find references to "Virgils Gnat" and to "Dido," the one shortly afterwards used by Bacon as title for a "Spenser" poem, the other for a "Marlowe" play.

Later on in the "Schoole," p. 34, the author compares London to Rome and England to Italy, and says, "You shall finde the Theatres of the one, the abuses of the other to be rife among us. *Experto crede, I have seene somewhat*, and therefore I think may say the more." This remark is explicable from young Francis after about three years' continental travel, 1576—9.

At a shortly later date we find Bacon printing under the "vizard" of "Kyd" (the scrivener's son):—

"The Italian Tragedians were so sharpe of wit
That in one hour's meditation,
They would perform anything in action."

—*Spanish Tragedy IV.*

The late Mr. Bompas stated in his book on the Shakespeare problem that Italian players were settled in France from 1576 onwards.

In his scheme of writing a literature in the English tongue it will, I think, eventually be appreciated that Bacon made his various "vizards" refer to one another,

so as to increase the impression that the writings were by several individuals instead of by one. Of course the literary areopagus comprising Sidney, Greville, Dyer, and Harvey were in Bacon's secret. As proof of this, neither Greville nor Harvey ever mentioned "Shakespeare," although alive while the Shakespeare works were being produced. Writing as "Immerito," on the 16th October, 1579, Bacon makes a sly reference to the "Schoole of Abuse," evidently with the object mentioned above. Bacon and Sidney were, of course, hand and glove. The former at the beginning of the year 1579 dedicated his "Shepherds' Kalendar" to the latter. In August, 1579, he dedicated to him, writing as "Gosson," the "School of Abuse," and in the following November the "Ephemerides of Phialo." In 1582 he dedicated "Plays Confuted" to Sidney's father-in-law, Sir Francis Walsingham. Indeed, Bacon's association with the Sidney's and Walsingham's was so close that Sir Robert Naunton, a contemporary, printed the statement that for her third husband Sidney's widow (Walsingham's daughter) married Lord St. Albans! The suggestion that Sidney referred to "Gosson" in the "Apologie for Poetrie" has no foundation.

Careful comparison of the works under this "vizard" with those under other "vizards" confirms my theory as to the "Gosson" mask.

For instances :—

1. "Was easier to be *drawen* to vanitie by wanton poets *than to good government* by the fatherly counsel of grave senators.

"The right use of ancient Poetrie was too have the notable exploytes of worthy Captaines, the holesome councils of good fathers and the vertuous lives of predecessors set down in numbers and song to the Instrument at solemne feasts that the sound of the one might draw the hearers from kissing the cupp too

often; the sense of the other put them in mind of things past and chaulk out the way to do the like. After this manner were the Bœotians trained from rudeness to civilitie."—*Schoole of Abuse*.

If the above words were written by Gosson himself and not by young Francis Bacon then the latter was entirely anticipated in his notion of the true interpretation of the Orpheus legend.

Moreover, in the like event, to Gosson must be attributed the first encouragement to the revived production of history in dramatic form, a characteristic of subsequent Elizabethan plays. Also the methods of peaceful persuasion—chalking out lodgings for soldiers rather than hectoring invasion—to which Bacon clung so persistently.

2. "Gosson" is to be found to have Bacon's objection to duelling. "The crafte of defence was first devised to save ourselves harmless. . . . Those days are now changed . . . the cunning of Fencers applied to quarrelling; . . . these no men if not for stirring of a strawe they prove not their valure uppon some bodyes fleshe."—*Schoole of Abuse*.

Compare what Bacon wrote under another vizard:—

" But greatly to find quarrel in a straw
When honors at the stake."—*Hamlet* IV. iv.

In "Gosson" :—

"I have showed you loving countrymen ye corruption and inconveniencies of your plaies as the sclenderness of my learninge woulde afforde, being pulde from ye universitie before I was ripe and withered in the countrie for want of sappe."—"*Plays Confuted*," 1582.

3. In "Lyly" we find a reference to the University :—

"Wherein she played the nice mother in sending me into the countrie to nurse, where I tyred at a drie breast three years and was at the last enforced to weane myself."—*Prefacē to "Euphues his England,"* 1580.

4. "Gosson" possessed Bacon's contempt for the then existing system of University studies. "I cannot but blame those lither contemplators very much, which sit concluding sillogismes in a corner; which, in a close study in the University, coope themselves up fortie yeres together, studying all things and profits nothing."—*Schoole of Abuse*.

5. "Gosson," like another of Bacon's vizards, "Nash," refers to the sepia fish:—

"But the fish Sepia can trouble the water to shun the nettes that are shot to catch her: . . . Whether our Players be the spawnes of such fishes I know not well."—*Apology of the "Schoole of Abuse."* Gosson. 1579.

"They are the very spawnes of the fish Sepia where the streame is cleare and the Scriptures evidentlie discover them, they vomit up ynke to trouble the waters."—"Nash," in *"Pasquil's Return to England."* *Marprelate Pamphlet*, 1589.

6. "Gosson" was a reformer. "They that are greeved, are Poets, Pipers and Players: the first thinke that I banish poetrie, wherein they dreeme; the second judge that I condemn musique, wherein they dote; the last proclaime that I forbid recreation to man, wherein you may see they are starke blinde. He that readeth with advise the booke which I wrote shall perceiue that I touche but the *abuses* of all these." So that, like Bacon under the vizard of "Immerito," he was concerned with the reformation of English poetry. Like him, he was interested in the harmonies of music and their true limitation; like him, as manifested under other vizards, he laboured for a reformed drama.

7. At an early age he wrote "Cataline's Conspiracies," played at the "Theatre." "The whole marke which I shot at in that worke was to shoue the reward of traytors in Catalin and the necessary government of learned men in the person of Cicero which foresees every danger that is likely to happen

and forestalles it continually ere it takes effect." There is much reason for believing that *Cataline*, which made its first appearance in print, like *Sejanus* (also written by Bacon), amongst Ben Jonson's productions, was one of Bacon's early plays. Jonson may have subsequently worked upon it, but his prefaces and dedications make no specific claim to authorship. Like *Julius Cæsar*, and other "Shakespeare" plays dealing with Roman history, North's translation of "Plutarch's Lives" is freely drawn upon, the author in each case also correcting from the original Latin. Having regard to the date of its publication and its curious reference to the 5th November—the date of the Gunpowder Plot—it would seem to have been revised and published subsequent to the Guy Fawkes attempt in order to point the moral of the wickedness of conspiracies against the State.

The problem of "Gosson" authorship seems only soluble on the assumption that Bacon was the author, and that Gosson, the player afterwards preacher, was only the "vizard."

The preacher (if author) stopped writing at the age of twenty-seven, died at the age of sixty-nine, and made no claim to authorship.

The "Gosson" writings comprise verse as good as "Spenser's" and prose as good as "Lyly's." The presumed author showed that he possessed a wide, and at that date rather exceptional, acquaintance with classical authors. He admitted authorship of three plays, of which *Cataline* discloses like methods of composition to the "Shakespeare" Roman history plays.

The "Gosson" opinions on certain subjects were the same as held by Bacon and other of his vizards.

The author knew of the practice of poets to veil their utterances under vizards, and yet, if Gosson was really the writer, he did not follow the practice he approved.

My conclusion is that the circumstances and dates indicate that the young player Gosson was only a mask for young Francis Bacon at the threshold of his efforts at the creation of an English literature and drama for the instruction and enlightenment of his race.

Bacon from his association with the queen and her revels would as readily be able to make use of young Gosson as he was with the Earl of Leicester's clerk Spenser.

SHAKESPEARE AND ITALY.

IN an article in *BACONIANA* for April last an attempt was made to vindicate Shakespeare's knowledge of the geography of Northern Italy, or perhaps, to be more accurate, to show that Mr. Horatio Brown, in his essay on "Shakespeare and Venice," had on wholly insufficient grounds called it in question.

In the *Nineteenth Century* for August, Sir Edward Sullivan has placed the result of the controversy beyond doubt. There has been no more valuable contribution for many years past to orthodox Shakespearean criticism than the article from his pen on *Shakespeare and the Waterways of North Italy*. The wonder is that the subject should not have been investigated before and the evidence now advanced brought to light. Sir Edward Sullivan proves by quotations from Italian writers of and prior to the seventeenth century, and with the aid of a map of Lombardy published in 1564, reproduced by permission of the British Museum, that the high road from Milan to Venice was by water, thus justifying Prospero's description of his midnight journey with Miranda to the sea, and further that a journey from Verona to Milan could have been performed in a similar manner, at any rate as to the greater part of the distance.

Only a few of the quotations cited can be here reproduced, and the article should be perused by all students of Shakespeare, but the following extracts will be read with interest. First, as to the journey from Milan to the sea, Bruschetti in his "*Istoria dei progetti e delle opere per la Navigazione del Milanese*" says:—

"As a matter of fact, at the end of the twelfth century, or the beginning of the thirteenth, the two largest canals which to-day traverse the interior of the province of Milan were in connection with the rivers Adda and Ticino, the first on the eastern side of Milan (formerly called Nuova Adda and Muzza at a later date) running towards Lodi; the second, on the west, called Ticinello, leading towards Pavia. . . . It is well known that this same canal, before the end of the thirteenth century, under the name Naviglio Grande, was already adapted to the purpose of free and continuous navigation from the Ticino right up to Milan."

"The historian I quote from," continues Sir Edward, "tells us further that Milan had in the fourteenth century seen the advantages to be gained by a short and direct waterway to the Po (which was not, however, completed successfully until a much later date); but having extended the Naviglio Grande in the following century right up to the foundations of the Duomo for the purpose of carrying the marble of which it was being built from the Lago Maggiore, we find the city in 1497 in ship communication on one side (by the Naviglio della Martesna) with the Adda and on the other (by the Naviglio Grande) with the Ticino, the Po, and Lake Maggiore—a condition sufficient to justify Carlo Pagnano's statement in 1520 that Milan, far as it was from the sea, might easily be taken to be a seaport town."*

In the diary of Roberto Sanseverino, written about the year 1458, his journey from Pavia to the Holy Land

* "Mediolanum, quanquam a mari remotum, maritima civitas facile existimari posset."

is described. He and his friends embarked at Pavia on the 1st of May, on the Ticino, arriving at Venice on the 6th. Their passage was delayed by heavy rains and contrary winds, the ship being frequently driven to shore.

In the "Life and Memoirs of Isabella d'Este" similar journeys are described, and it is mentioned that on one occasion the Court painter, Ercole Roberti, suffered much from sea-sickness on the journey up the Po. In May, 1527, it is stated, "Isabella once more resumed her journey and sailed up the Po to Governolo. . . . The next day they sailed up the Mincio to Mantua."

Guicciardini's "History of Italy" is requisitioned to prove that through many centuries the Po and Adige had for all practical purposes been high seas for the contending navies of the hostile states whose dominions were made approachable by their waters. In June, 1431, Nicolò Trevisano, a captain of the *Signorie of Venice*, had a powerful fleet all but wiped out by the Milanese ships under Ambrogio Spiniola, close by Cremona.

English writers are also quoted in support of the contention that the usual method of travelling was by waterway. "The Pylgrimage of Sir R. Guylforde," relating a journey made in 1506, and the pilgrimage of Sir Richard Torkington in 1517, both contain statements confirming this view; also Fynes Moryson and Thomas Coryat. Speaking of Verona, the latter writes:—

"The noble river Athesis runneth by it. . . . This river yeeldeth a speciall commoditie to the citie. For although it is not able to beare vessels of a great burden, yet it carrieth prety barges of convenient quantitie, wherein great store of merchandise is brought into the city, both out of Germany and from Venice itselfe" (II. 90).

Sir Edward Sullivan points out that there is nothing in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* to suggest that the whole journey from Milan to Verona was made by water, although he is strongly inclined to believe that it may in fact have been possible. A footnote thereon reads :—

“The fossa, or canal, which joined the river Tarto with the Po at Ostiglia (ancient Ostia) is omitted on the map of 1564, but it undoubtedly existed from about the year 1000 A.D. (being marked on some other early maps), and was in all probability the canal by which the Venetian ships in 1510 escaped into the Adige, as described by Guicciardini.”

There is in the British Museum a map of Italy, published by Gastalde in 1564—the same year as that which is reproduced in the *Nineteenth Century*—which shows the water connection between the river Tartare at Pontemolin and the river Po at Ostia. The through journey from Verona to Milan could therefore be conveniently accomplished by water. Nor is Sir Edward Sullivan content only to vindicate Shakespeare's hydrographical knowledge of Italy. He refers to the fact that critics, from Ben Jonson downwards, have described as a blunder the passages in *The Winter's Tale*, which attribute a sea coast to Bohemia. His defence of Shakespeare in this is also complete. Briefly it is this :—There is nothing in the play to warrant the assumption that the period of the action is that during which it was written. The mention of the oracle of Delphos suggests the Bohemia of a very much earlier date. Under the rule of Ottocar (1255—1278) Bohemia comprised all the territories of the Austrian monarchy which had up till then, with some few exceptions, formed part of the Germanic Confederation. Coxe, in his “History of Austria” (I. 29, ed. 1847) stated that “Ottocar became the most powerful prince in Europe, for his dominions extended from the confines of Bavaria to Raab, in

Hungary, and from the Adriatic to the shores of the Baltic."

Richard Johnson in his "Honourable History of the Seven Champions of Christendom," the oldest known copy of which is dated 1597, after describing the arrival of St. George in the Bohemian Court with his children, says:—

"Thus were St. George's children provided for by the Bohemian King, for when the ambassadors were in Readiness, the Ships for their passage furnished, and Attendance appointed, St. George, in company of his Lady, the King of Bohemia, with his Queen and a Train of Lords, and Gentlemen and Ladies, Conducted them to Ship board, where the Wind served them prosperously, that in a short time they had bid adieu to the Shore, and Sailed chearfully away."

Sir Edward Sullivan has conferred a great benefit on Shakespearean students by disproving conclusively the prevalent erroneous notions as to the poet's knowledge of geography. It has at the same time destroyed the favourite argument advanced against the Baconian theory—"Could Bacon have described Verona as a seaport and attributed a sea coast to Bohemia?" The answer will now be, "Yes, he could and he did, and justly. Read Sir Edward Sullivan's article in the *Nineteenth Century* for August, 1908."

ARE THERE TRACES OF BACON IN *MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING?*

BY BASIL BROWN.

IT may be that Kempe, the Shakespearean actor, was related to Bacon. The following is an extract from a letter of Bacon's to his cousin, Kempe:—

“Good Robin,—There is no news you can write to me which I take more pleasure to hear than of your health and of your loving remembrance of me. . . . Your man Roger entered into a very subtle distinction to this purpose, that you would not come except you heard I was attorney. But I ascribe that to your man's invention, who had his reward in laughing. . . . For my fortune (to speak court) it is very slow, if anything can be slow to him that is secure of the event. In short nothing is done in that. Advise you whether you *will play the honest man* or no. . . . In the mean time I think long to see you. . . .”
—Fr. Bacon.

In *Much Ado About Nothing* Kempe plays the *honest man* Dogberry.

In “Actus Quartus” in the first folio edition of *Much Ado About Nothing* Kempe's name appears eleven times instead of the *honest man* Dogberry, whom he was representing. It has been said by some of the commentators that Kempe portrayed Verges, but even so Verges, too, was an *honest man*. However, we know from the first folio that he acted the part of Dogberry.

The very first words addressed to Dogberry are:—

Leon.—What would you with me, *honest* neighbour?

Dogb.—Marry this it is Sir.

Verg.—Yes, in truth it is Sir.

Leon.—What is it my good friends?

Dogb.—Goodman Verges speaks little of the matter. An old man sir, and his wits are not so blunt, as God help, I would desire they were: but in faith, honest as the skin between his brows.

* Spedding's “Letters and Life of Bacon,” Vol. I., p. 261.

Verg.—Yes, I thank God, I am as honest as any man living that is an old man, and no honeste than I.

So much for the Kempe letter and “honest man” coincidence. Robert Kempe, a young lawyer of Grays Inn, to whom the letter was written, was Bacon’s cousin, and if he afterwards became the Shakespearean actor he could easily have changed his name to William. We know that in the Tudor reigns relations “had to hang together or hang separately.” Bacon’s uncle, Lord Burleigh, had a Peter Kempe for his chief man as overseer at Burleigh House for many years. As far back as 1556 Anthony Kemp was a Post of the Court—a very secret and important office, which William Cecil, afterwards Lord Burghley, would be apt to put a relation in. I claim that there are reasons for believing William Kempe, the Shakesperian actor, held a like position at Court and that he was an actor when it suited his convenience. He dedicated his “Nine Days’ Wonder,” or Morris Dance, to one of Elizabeth’s ladies-in-waiting.

In Dr. Appleton Morgan’s Introduction to the “Hamlet and the ur-Hamlet,” XIII., he says:—“There was recently discovered in the Royal Archives at Copenhagen, the *Mounetz Besoldung ug Kostspendinge* (monthly payroll and board account) of the town of Elisnore for January 22nd, 1585, to January 22nd, 1587. In this is an entry in the year 1585 of a disbursement of four skilling to repair a board fence between the premises of Lauritz, the town clerk, and the yard of the Town Hall, ‘which the people broke down at the time the English played in the Yard.’ And, again, in 1586 is an entry of which Mr. Jacob A. Riis sends me this translation:—

XXXVI. daler Wilhemj Kempe, instrumentalist, got two months’ board for himself and a boy named Daniel

Jones. He had earned pay from June 17th, when he took service. In addition, a month's pay was given him as a parting gift. In all three months at twelve daler a month."

Burlcigh and Walsingham were keeping a sharp look out in Denmark in the years 1585—1587, and Kempe could be trusted to play the spy for Elizabeth in the Danish Court. Mary, Queen of Scots, was then imprisoned in England and her son, we must remember, married a Danish princess. Kempe's Morris dance, performed in nine days from London to Norwich, was a miraculous feat in these days. But if, as it seems probable, he was a Post of the Court, his getting over so much ground in so short a time will not be wondered at.

In the same act and scene in *Much Ado About Nothing* there are more traces of Bacon. Dogberry says to Verges:—

Go, good partner go, get you to Francis Seacoal, bid him bring his pen and inkhorn to the goal; we are now to examination these men.

Verg.—And we must do it wisely.

Dobg.—We will spare for no wit, I warrant you; here's that (touching his forehead) shall drive some of them to a *non com.* only get the *learned writer* to set down our excommunication, and meet me at the gaol.

Why should the learned writer's name be Francis? "The Stratfordians" may say this is another *mere accident*, and not a trace of Francis Bacon; but when we say there was a little lane near Gray's Inn, in Bacon's time called *Seacoal Lane*, it seems to us one living in Gray's Inn as Bacon did would very naturally call the "learned writer" Francis Seacoal.

Next to Bacon there is no writer of the Elizabethan period so much at home in Gray's Inn as Shakespeare, and in the Records of that Inn there may be found over forty members of the Bacon family. Sir Nicholas

Bacon (Francis' father) was the first of this name to enter Gray's Inn.

Shakespeare makes Shallow relate with much gusto how he "did fight" with one Sampson Stockfish, a fruiterer, behind Gray's Inn.

When documentary evidence is not to be found circumstantial evidence should not be neglected, and the following may be of interest.

The two inimitable guardians of the peace, Dogberry and Verges, were undoubtedly taken from life. "Strype mentions that by reason of the frequent disturbances and unthrifths of the gentlemen in the Inns of Court and Chancery, in the streets at night, the inhabitants were obliged to keep Watches."—"Pearce's History of the Inns of Court and Chancery," p. 263.

In 1582 Bacon's friend, Sir Wm. Fleetwood, was Recorder. In this year "The Recorder himself, with six more of the honest inhabitants, stood by St. Clement's Church, to see the lanthorn hung up, and watch for some of these outrageous dealers. At about seven o'clock at night, they saw young Mr. Robert Cecil, the Lord Treasurer's son, pass by the church. The parish authorities, no doubt expecting one of the disturbers of their peace, were surprised when young Cecil (who probably had some suspicion of their business) gave them as he passed a civil salute. At which Strype informs us they said 'Lo! you may see how a nobleman's son can use himself, and how he putteth off his cap to poor men.' The Recorder was quite charmed with this evidence of Robert Cecil's innocence, and wrote a letter to his father saying, 'Your lordship hath cause to thank God for so virtuous a son.'"—*Ibid*, p. 264.

Now, here we have Francis Bacon's cousin, Robert Cecil, caught in a scrape at night by the Recorder and

six honest inhabitants, who stood by St. Clement's Church. *Mark the coincidence of the church!* When Dogberry gives his charge to the Watches, and bids them good-night, the 2nd Watch says:—"Well, masters, we hear your charge: let us go and sit here upon the church-bench till two, and then all to bed."

We will now connect Robert Cecil's politeness, when he "puts off his cap" to the "poor men" and gives them as he passes a "civil salute" in the style and fashion of the Court, with the conversation in the same act and scene between Borachio and Conrad:—

Bora.—Thou knowest, that the fashion of a doublet, or a hat, or a cloak is nothing to a man.

Con.—Yes, it is apparel.

Bora.—I mean the fashion.

Con.—Yes, the fashion is the fashion.

Bora.—Tush! I may as well say the fool's the fool. But see'st thou not what a deformed thief this fashion is?

Watch (aside).—I know that Deformed; a' has been a vile thief this seven year; a' goes up and down like a gentleman: I remember his name.

The Watch, who are concealed by the church, continue to listen to the conversation, and eventually spring out with:—

1st Watch.—We charge you in the prince's name, stand.

2nd Watch.—Call up the right master Constable. We have here recovered the most dangerous piece of lechery that ever was know in the commonwealth.

1st Watch.—And one Deformed is one of them. I know him a' wears a lock.

Con.—Masters, masters.

2nd Watch.—You'll be made bring Deformed forth, I warrant you.

Robert Cecil was deformed from his birth. When Bacon's Essay "Of Deformity" was published, Chamberlain wrote to Carlton that all the world thought it shadowed forth his cousin Cecil.

CLASSICAL KNOWLEDGE IN SHAKESPEARE.

THE danger to a military commander of too much success is referred to by Bacon in one of his letters to Essex. "All immoderate success extinguisheth merit and stirreth up distaste and envy" ("Life" II., 129). This is more characteristic of Roman military life than of modern, and the sentiment is most appropriately introduced in *Ant. Cl.* and *Coriolanus*. In both these passages the poet shows remarkable familiarity with a very singular feature of Roman government. This is well expounded in the words of Gibbon. He says of the first Cæsars that they were "not disposed to suffer that those triumphs which *their* indolence neglected, should be usurped by the conduct and valour of their lieutenants. The military fame of a subject was considered as an insolent invasion of the Imperial prerogative, and it became the duty as well as the interest of every Roman general to guard the frontiers entrusted to his care without aspiring to conquests which might have proved no less fatal to himself than to the vanquished barbarians. Germanicus, Suetonius, Paulinus, and Agricola were checked and recalled in the course of their victories. Corbulo was put to death. Military merit, as it is admirably expressed by Tacitus, was, in the strictest sense of the word, *imperatoria virtus*."

Plutarch tells us that the Emperor Domitian, through envy of the glory of Arulenus Rusticus, put him to death.

Tacitus writes: "Nec minus periculum ex magnâ famâ, quam ex malâ." ("Agricola," V.).*

Gibbon was one of the most learned and accomplished classical scholars of his time. But Shakespeare,

* See also *Coriol.*, I. i. 267, *et seq.*

having, as we all know, acquired a most intimate knowledge of classic antiquities at the renowned school of Stratford-on-Avon—a school far superior to Harrow and Eton of the present time—may rank with Gibbon; and expresses the same fact in far nobler language than that employed by such an inferior writer as Gibbon!

O Silius, Silius,

I have done enough; a lower place, note well,
 May make too great an act; for learn this, Silius,
 Better to leave undone, than by our deed
 Acquire too high a fame, when him we serve's away. . . .
 Who does i' the wars more than his captain can,
 Become his captain's captain, and ambition,
 The soldier's virtue, rather makes choice of loss,
 Than gain which darkens him.—*Ant. Cl.* III. i. 11.

Banter apart, can anyone believe that this refined and exact knowledge of one of the most recondite features of Roman military life could be possessed by a rustic whose only training was in an obscure, remote, country town where many of the foremost townsmen were unable to write their own names! No one believes it!

R. M. T.

“THE GRAVE'S TIRING ROOM.”

A CRITICISM BY FRED C. HUNT.

MR. J. E. ROE, in his article, “The Grave's Tiring Room,” in the July, 1908, *BACONIANA*, asserts that the supposed 1609 edition of the Sonnets was not issued “prior to Bacon's fall, though bearing the ante-date.” I have never seen this statement made before, and would like to ask your contributor upon what evidence, aside from the sentiments expressed in the Sonnets themselves, he bases his statement.

Mr. Roe asks, “Will our Shakespearean critics point

some reference to this printed edition prior to 1621?" Permit me to answer that that has already been done. Mr. Dowden, who, I think, is entitled to be classed as a Shakespearean critic, says:—

"On May 20th, 1609, 'a book called Shakespeares Sonnetts' was entered on the Stationer's Register by Thomas Thorpe, and in *the same year* the Quarto edition appeared: 'Shakespeares Sonnets. Never before Imprinted. At London by G. Eld. for T. T. (Thomas Thorpe) and to be sold by William Apsley. 1609.' Edward Alleyn notes *in that year* that he *bought a copy* for fivepence. Some copies instead of 'William Apsley' have 'John Wright dwelling at Christ Church-gate.'"*

What has Mr. Roe to say to Mr. Alleyn and his five-pence?

Mr. Roe further says, referring to Sonnet III,

"Believers in the Baconian authorship of the Sonnets—for to you we address ourselves—what say you? If Francis Bacon be the author of this Sonnet, to what circumstance in his life, please, can it allude? Can there be doubt that he here alludes to his already mentioned impeachment?"

As a believer in the Baconian authorship of the Sonnets, and having given them some study, I should answer, first, that as the book must have been in circulation in 1609, or Mr. Alleyn couldn't have bought a copy at any price, the Sonnet couldn't possibly refer to an impeachment of the author in 1621, and the verse must bear another interpretation than the one Mr. Roe has given it. Second, that it is highly improbable that a fraudulent entry could have been made in the Stationers' Register. That would have been a criminal offence. Third, they were advertised to be *sold* in different places, and this would have been inviting all kinds of inquiries

* "The Sonnets of William Shakespeare," Edward Dowden (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Ltd., 1896).

and investigations by proposed purchasers who found that they could not buy what had been advertised for sale. Of course, with the fall of the theory of a false date of the issuance of the Quarto must also fall the interpretation placed by Mr. Roe upon the other Sonnets supposed to deal with the same subject.

What, then, is the correct interpretation of this Sonnet, based upon the theory of Bacon's authorship? The verse appears as follows, according to the style of the Quarto :—

SONNET III.

O For my sake do you with fortune chide,
 The guilty goddesse of my harmful deeds,
 That did not better for my life provide,
 Than publick means which publick manners breeds.
 Thence comes it that my name receives a brand,
 And almost thence my nature is subdu'd
 To what it workes in, like the Dyers hand.
 Pittie me then, and wish I were reu'de,
 Whilst like a willing pacient I will drinke
 Potions of Eysell against my strong infection.
 No bitterness that I will bitter think,
 Nor double pennance to correct correction.
 Pittie me then deare friend, and I assure yee
 Even that your pittie is enough to cure mee.

This number is part of a series commencing with number 97 in the line—

“ How like a Winter hath my absence been,”

and alludes to the “freezings” and “dark Daies” that the poet has seen. It is quite apparent from all of the context that this “absence” referred to is simply the cessation from literary work. In 98 he has been “absent in the spring” when even flowers (the emblem of his art) could not make him tell any “summers story,” that is, any dramatic or poetic story. In 100 he appeals to his Muse to revive herself and resume her work of praise of his genius, and the theme is continued

in 101. In 103 he asserts that his poetic strength has increased even if it hasn't so much appeared. In 104 we learn that this absence covered a period of three years—"three Winters colde," yet he assures his genius that he was not "false of heart," and that he has come back with tears of repentance. In 110 we begin to discover the nature of this absence. He had "gone here and there," and made himself a "motley to the view," and in the next number (the one under discussion) it is disclosed that this "going here and there" consisted in engaging in public life, which bred "public manners."

Now, in this number 111 the poet asks his creative genius, or soul, to chide fortune for his wanderings because that fickle goddess had not provided for his living, and he was thus obliged to engage in public life, where he had passed through so many troubles and disappointments. There seems to be here a direct allusion to the accident of the sudden death of his father, which left young Bacon unprovided for in life against his father's intention, and which forced upon him the study of the law, which, in turn, had caused him to exclaim that the "bar" would be his "bier." He was sick and tired of the baseness, hollowness, flattery, and strife and disappointment attendant upon the life of a courtier. This he looked upon as an "infection," as we see in Sonnet 67, where, after describing the baseness of his times in Sonnet 66, he says,

"Ah wherefore with *infection* should he live."

So, in Sonnet 111 he refers to the same "infection," which had reached himself, and which he was willing to drink "eycell" against, it being thought at that time that cysell, or vinegar, was a preventive of the plague. It is not hard to identify this period in Bacon's life. It evidently embraces the period of 1601 to 1603, covering his attempts to gain the office of

Attorney-General, when he was importuning his friends; when Essex was in a rage with the Queen because of her stubbornness; followed by the treason of Essex, Bacon's patron; Essex's tragic death, the slanders and threats against Bacon, the death of the Queen, the coming in of James, and the slow recognition of Bacon's merits. Indeed, Bacon had seen "darke daies" and felt the "freezings" of "old December's bareness." That he escaped with his life in the Essex conspiracy was a miracle, and he complains with bitterness of the threats of assassination that were made against him, and the "brand" which had been placed upon his name by reason of his association with the trial, conviction and death of Essex, the idol of the people. Speaking of this period of Bacon's life, Hallam says:—

"But he had passed the interval in active life, and in dangerous paths, deserting, as in truth he had all along been prone to do, the 'shady spaces of philosophy.'"

This seems a fair answer to Mr. Roe's question addressed to Baconians. The interpretation fits accurately with known incidents and conditions in Bacon's life, and at a time harmonizing with the probable date of the writing of this series of Sonnets, and without involving such a violent theory of the time of the issuance of the 1609 Quarto as your correspondent has advanced. And so all of the other Sonnet interpretations mentioned by Mr. Roe in connection with his theory will be found to possess much more rational readings than he has given them. This is noticeably true of number 68, upon which special stress was laid. In that number the poet is still talking of his art and comparing it with the poetry of antiquity—the poetry of the Greek philosophers. Thus he says his "cheek" (Art) is the "inap" (used in the sense of pattern or delineation) of "days out-worn" (the old days) when

“beauty” (poetic art) died, and before the “bastard signs of fair” (the false and superficial poetry of his own time) were born, and before such poetry dared to “inhabit on a living brow” (to strive with immortal works) and before the “goulden” (not “olden”) “tresses of the dead” (the same poetry of antiquity) which belonged to the sepulchre of the past (“the right of sepulchers”) were used by moderns to ornament their own ephemeral verse (“to live a second life on second head”). In his art, he says, is seen the real art of the past—the art of the Greeks—in itself containing the truth of philosophy and not simply stealing or borrowing from the past to enrich a new poetry. His genius, he again asserts, was the “map” or delineation, which Nature was “storing” with philosophical truth—

“To show false *Art* what beauty (or *true art*) was of yore.”

Guthrie, Oklahoma, U.S.A.

OF GREAT PLACE, BY SHAKE-SPEARE AND BACON.

BY ISAAC HULL PLATT.

I N spite of about a thousand resemblances or “parallelisms” between passages in the works of Bacon and those of Shake-speare, collected by Mr. Edwin Reed and others, Dr. Anders says he can find “no trace of Bacon in Shake-speare’s works.”* This is a strange statement, for, to say the least, there are many striking resemblances. If Dr. Anders had taken the ground that no conceivable number of “parallelisms” are conclusive proof of identity of authorship, he would have at least a foothold for de-

* Shakespeare’s Books, by H. R. D. Anders, Ph.D. Berlin, 1904, p. 108.

bate ; but that he could find no traces—well, it would indicate that his search had not been very thorough.*

So far as I can remember, I have not seen any notice of the very remarkable parallel between the following passages. It may have been noticed and I may have overlooked it or forgotten it. Notwithstanding Mr. Reed's indefatigable and praiseworthy industry, his books are so poorly indexed that it is impossible to tell what is in them except by reading them through each time they are consulted.

Belarius :

“ How you speak !

Did you but know the city's usuries,
And felt them knowingly; the art o' the Court,
As hard to leave as keep; whose top to climb
Is certain falling, or so slippery that
The fear's as bad as falling; the toil o' the war,
A pain that only seems to seek out danger
I' the name of fame and honour, which dies i' the search,
And hath as oft a slanderous epitaph.”

—*Cymbeline* III. iii. 44.

“ Men in great places are thrice servants; servants of the Sovereign or State; servants of fame; servants of business. So as they have no freedom; neither in their persons, nor in their actions, nor in their times. It is a strange desire to seek power and to lose liberty; or to seek power over others and to lose power over a man's self. The rising unto place is laborious, and by pains men come to greater pains; and it is sometimes base, and by indignities men come to dignities. The standing is slippery; and the regress is either a downfall, or at least an eclipse, which is a melancholy thing. *Cum non sis qui fueris, non esse cur velis vivere.* Nay, retire men cannot when they would; neither will they when it were reason; but are impatient of privateness, even in age and sickness, which require the shadow; like old townsmen, that will be sitting at their street door, though

° It might be added that Dr. Anders refutes his own statement, for on pp. 247-8 he *cf.* Bacon's “*Are the stars true fires?*” with Shake-speare's “*doubt that the stars are fire.*” Surely that is at least a trace.

thereby they offer age to scorn."—Bacon, *Essay XI.*, "*Of Great Place.*"

But the context in *Cymbeline* and the entire *Essay* should be read. It is hardly conceivable that anyone can take the ground that these resemblances—or rather identities—extending as they do, not only to the thought but to the very turns of expression—the passage from *Cymbeline* being merely a poetic paraphrase of the *Essay*—that they are accidental. It may, of course, be claimed that one writer has copied from the other. If so, which is the plagiarist? In this matter, of course, dates are of the first importance.

The *Essay Of Great Place* first appears in the second edition of "Bacon's *Essays*," 1612. *Cymbeline* is assigned to the period between 1609 and 1611—certainly not later, as Simon Forman, who died in 1611, mentions seeing a performance of that play. It would appear, then, that the play and the essay were written at about the same time. Certainly Shake-speare did not draw upon Bacon's *Essay* in print. Did he have access to Bacon's manuscripts, or did Bacon witness Shake-speare's plays and, in about a thousand instances, incorporate their language and sentiments in his writings? Commentators of both Bacon and Shake-speare usually tell us that it is extremely improbable that either man ever took the slightest interest in, or even saw or heard of, the other. To an ill-informed man, who is not a commentator and who does not boast of his scholarship, and who has not learned the scholarly habit of looking at all objects through a telescope with the big end to the eye—to such a man it would seem very unlikely that two such men should live for twenty years in the same small town of 60,000 people and never know of each other, especially when one of them was actually engaged all this time in supplying one of the "deficiencies" noted by the other—namely, a contem-

porary drama that should hold the mirror up to Nature ; and while all the time both were saying, in thousands of instances, almost the same thing in phraseology differing but slightly.

On the other hand Major James Walter, in his interesting but somewhat visionary "Shakespeare's True Life," tells us that the two great men discussed the plays, then in the making, seated under the two ancient cedars on Bacon's lawn at Twickenham, and, that there may be no mistake, he gives us a wood-cut of the very trees. This is most interesting, and it is greatly to be regretted that Major Walter withheld from us his sources of information.*

Really it is a most important question—this of the relations of the author of *Hamlet* and the author of the *Novum Organum*, but it seems to be beyond the pale of orthodox investigation. Shake-speare may be taken and cut up in little stars, as Juliet suggested Romeo might be after death, and distributed to Greene, Nash, Lodge, Kyd, Marlowe, Fletcher, and the rest ; but let the name of Bacon be mentioned in connection with that of the great dramatist, and the air is at once rent with hysterical shrieks, and yet there is more in Shake-speare's works to connect them with Bacon than with all the others put together.

* The source of Major Walter's information was his imagination. There is not a vestige of evidence in support of his assertion.—ED.

NOTES.

BY W. F. C. WIGSTON.

THE ORIGIN OF THE WITCHES IN "MACBETH."

IN the year 1605 King James I. paid a visit to Oxford, and was entertained there by the students of the University. This visit is described in a Latin work entitled "*Rex Platonicus; sive de potentiss. Principis Iacobo Regis ad Academ. Oxon. Adventu, Anno Dom. 1605*" (published Oxon. 1607. See Bodleian 4to L. 37 art.), which was written by Sir Isaac Wake, and a passage in this work is supposed, according to Anthony Wood, in his "*Athenæ Oxoniensis*," to have given rise, or suggested the subject of *Macbeth*. It is referred to by Farmer, and later annotators of Shakespeare, and particularly by Malone, in his edition of the plays (1790, Vol. IV. 436). The play of *Macbeth*, it is stated, did not appear till the year following the first edition of Wake's "*Rex Platonicus*." But before the passage alluded to is quoted, a little of the personal history of the author will not be out of place.

Sir Isaac Wake was the second son of Arthur, son of John Wake, of Hartwell, Northamptonshire, a descendant of the Lords of Blisworth. His father was Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, and rector of Great Billing, Northants. His mother was Christian, the daughter of Sir William Wigston (Knight), of Wolston, Warwickshire. He was born about the year 1575, and was entered at Merton College, Oxford, in 1593, when he was eighteen years of age. In 1604 he became a student at the Middle Temple, and in the same year he was elected public orator of Oxford University. He took part in the reception of King James in 1605, delivering an oration "at the Hall stairs foot in Christ Church" (Nichol's "*Progresses of James I.*"), so he describes what he actually saw, or was acquainted with

at first hand. He entered the diplomatic service, and soon after 1609 became secretary to Sir Dudley Carleton at Venice. In 1613 he returned to England, and pronounced a funeral oration on Sir Thomas Bodley. He became British representative at the Court of Savoy, and in 1630 Ambassador to the French Court, but died in February, 1632, in Paris. His body was brought to England with the ceremony due to his rank, and he was buried, by the king's command, in the chapel of Dover Castle.

The passage cited, from Wood's "*Athenæ Oxoniensis*," describes a device performed by the students of St. John's College, Oxford, in which three young men, dressed as three sibyls, or witches, greeted King James I. after the same fashion, and with the same manner of prophecy, as Macbeth and Banquo are greeted by the three sisters in the play, which appeared "*the year following the first edition of that work*" (*Athenæ Oxon.*, Vol. II, 541).

"Quorum primos jam ordines dum principes contemplantur, primisque congratulantium acclamationibus delectantur, Collegium D. Johannis, nomine literarum domicilium (quod dominus Th. Whitus prætor olim Londinensis, opimis redivitibus locupletarat) faciles eorum oculos speciosæ structuræ adblanditione invitavit; moxque et oculos et aures detinet ingeniosa, nec injucunda, lusiuncula, qua clarissimis præses cum quinquaginta, quos alit Collegium, studiosis, magnaue studentium conviventium caterva prodiens, principes in transitu salutandos censuit. Tabulæ ansam dedit antiqua de regia prosapia historiola apud Scoto-Britannos celebrata, quæ narrat tres olim sibyllas occurrisse duobus Scotiæ proceribus Macbetho et Banchoni, et illum præduxisse regem futurum, sed regem nullum geniturum multos. Vaticinii veritatem rerum eventus comprobavit. Banchonis enim e stirpe potentissimus

Jacobus oriundus. Tres adolescentes concinno sibylarum habitu induti, e Collegio prodeuntes, et carmina lepida alternatim canentes, regi se tres esse illas, sibyllas profitentur, quæ Banchoni olim sobolis imperia prædixerant, jamque iterum comparere, ut eadem vaticinii veritate prædicerent Jacobo se jam et diu regem futurum Britannicæ felicissimum et multorum regum parentem, ut ex Banchonis stirpe nunquam sit hæres Britannico diademati defuturus. Deinde tribus principibus suaves felicitatum triplicitatis terminum vicibus succinentes, veniamque precantes, quod alumni ædium Divi Johannis (qui præcursor Christi) alumnos ædis Christi (quo tum rex tendebat) præcursoria hac salutatione antevertissent, principes ingeniosa fictiuncula delectatos dimittunt; quos inde universa ostantium multitudo, felici prædictionum successui suffragans votis precibusque ad portam usque invitatis Borealem prosequitur" (Wood's "*Athenæ Oxoniensis*," Vol. II. 541).

It would seem highly probable that this incident of the sibyls was re-introduced into the play of *Macbeth* not only as a compliment, but as a reminder of this Oxford episode and his visit to the King. Here let it be observed, that Francis Bacon never lets an opportunity escape to pay compliments to Queen Elizabeth and James I., and this, though the fashion of the times, is also conspicuous in the plays. Shakespeare, whose classical knowledge has been summed up as "little Latin and less Greek," would probably have been unable to have read Wake's work in which this episode of the sibyls is described. It would be interesting to discover whether Francis Bacon accompanied the King or was present at Oxford during these festivities?

CARDINAL WOLSEY.

There are two or three things in the play of *King Henry VIII.* it would be well to note. One is the

prominence given to the history of the rise and fall of Cardinal Wolsey, the author showing peculiar and profound intimacy with the Prelate's personal character, and it will not be amiss to point out, that the grandmother of Francis Bacon was the daughter of Sir William Fitzwilliam, who had been in Cardinal Wolsey's service, and who entertained him at Milton, his seat in Northamptonshire, after his disgrace. Sir William Fitzwilliam became treasurer and high chamberlain to Cardinal Wolsey, who appointed him one of the King's Council. Sir Anthony Cooke (1504—1576), the father of Anne, second wife of Sir Nicholas Bacon, married Anne, the daughter of Sir William Fitzwilliam, of Milton, Northants (see "Dictionary National Biog.," Vol. XII. p. 76), consequently it is certain that Francis Bacon must have been in a position to hear, from the lips of his mother, Lady Anne Bacon, a great deal of the private character and life of Cardinal Wolsey transmitted from his great-grandfather, Sir William Fitzwilliam, through his daughter and her issue.

DOCTOR BUTTS.

Another very prominent figure introduced into this play, and also closely connected with the Bacon family, is that of the King's physician, Doctor Butts. In Blomefield's "History of Norfolk" (Vol. VII., pp. 164-5), will be found the genealogy and descent of this celebrated court doctor (under the local heading of Ryburgh Magna). Butts intercedes for Wolsey with King Henry VIII., and his interposition in favour of Archbishop Cranmer is well-known to readers of this play (Act V., scene ii.). He was court physician to Queen Anne Boleyn, and to Jane Seymour, the Princess Mary, and to Cardinal Wolsey. He married Margaret, daughter and heiress of Margaret Bacon, of Cambridgeshire, and by her had issue three sons, the youngest of whom,

Edmund, had one daughter, who married Sir Nicholas Bacon (the eldest son of Sir Nicholas Bacon, Keeper of the Great Seal), and half-brother to Francis Bacon. The pedigree is as follows :—

Edmund Butts, third son of Sir William Butts (the Doctor of the play), married Anne, third daughter of Henry Buers, and had issue :—

Anne Butts, who married the above Sir Nicholas Bacon, eldest son of the Lord Keeper to Queen Elizabeth. He died 1625, and was the first Baronet of England. He had issue :—

Sir Edmund Bacon, Henry Bacon, Sir Robert Bacon. From this it is plain, Francis Bacon, as a younger son of a second wife of Sir Nicholas Bacon, was in a position to pick up, from family gossip, a good deal of the private life and history of Doctor Butts, and of the part he played in the history of his times, and of his relations to King Henry the Eighth. It is exceedingly doubtful any dramatist without this intimate knowledge would have introduced Doctor Butts at all into the play? It is evident that the author of this play possessed some particular knowledge of this kind.

DOCTOR CAIUS.

In the play of the *Merry Wives of Windsor*, there is a character, called Doctor Caius, who is the butt of much amusing ridicule. Doctor Caius, the founder of Caius College at Cambridge, died in the year 1573, the same year Francis Bacon, and his brother Antony, were entered at Trinity College, Cambridge. It is important to notice how Whitgift, who was appointed Master of Trinity College in the year 1567, and still reigned when the Bacons were there, expelled Cartwright, the leader of the Puritan Party, from his professorship. Dr. Caius adhered to the old rites, and possessed a private collec-

tion of ornaments, vestments, and service books. An order was procured to investigate, and the result was a most scandalous scene. In the court of Caius College, between the gates of Virtue and Honour, a bonfire was lit, and for three hours Whitgift, assisted by the heads of King's and Clare, were to be seen toiling resolutely, and perspiring, as he threw, "the Popish trumpery" into the flames.

It is, therefore certain that the brothers Bacon had the character of Doctor Caius* and his history held very prominently before their eyes during their freshmanship; and particularly as their mother, Lady Anne Bacon, was a rigid Puritan, they would feel inclined to dislike Caius. Very little is known of the life of Shakespeare, but of that little one thing is certain—he was never at either the universities of Oxford or Cambridge. And yet there are indications that the author of the plays was an *Academician*, and acquainted with the three years' term, or curriculum, of the colleges! This, for example:—

"Navarre shall be the wonder of the world;
Our court shall be a little Academe,
Still and contemplative in living art,
You three, Biron, Dumain, and Longueville,
Have sworn for three years term to live with me,
My fellow scholars, and to keep those statutes
That are recorded in this schedule here."

—*Love's Labour's Lost*, I. i.

How familiar the author of these lines is with the college or university "terms," an expression still used to denote the periods when students are "up," and

° Mr. Edwin Reed, in "Francis Bacon our Shakespeare," p. 43, points out that the character in the play and Dr. Caius: both were physicians; both came from abroad; both were phenomenally quarrelsome, even to the extent of inflicting personal chastisement upon others with their own hands; and both hated Welshmen.—ED.

"*Michaelmas term*" is one of these periods! To conclude this particular subject, it is very unlikely that Doctor Caius should ever have attracted the attention of Shakespeare, but it is certain that Bacon must have had, through Whitgift, and the particular facts recorded, occurring as they did just prior to his entry at Trinity, a striking object-lesson set before his eyes.

DR. ANDERS' REPLY TO
MR. SOHMERS' COINCIDENCES.

I N the July number of "*Shakespeareana*" Dr. Anders replies to the Baconian coincidences as follows:—

"Griefswald, May 6th, 1908.

"A few 'coincidences' which the Baconians may adduce may, no doubt, fit in with either view. But the vital question is whether the coincidences brought forward by Mr. Joseph Sohmers—and he has probably chosen such coincidences as he considers particularly worthy of notice—can only be explained by the Baconian hypothesis. If this is not the case they can only be looked upon as pointing to a single solution in favour of the Baconian hypothesis, as Mr. Sohmers says.

"Let me begin with Mr. Sohmers' fifth coincidence. The argument, I am led to believe, is considered a particularly strong one by the Baconians. To my mind it weighs as light as a feather. But even Baconians will probably be obliged to leave this piece of evidence out of account in future. For if we may believe Dr. Engel, Bacon did not write the *Promus*, nor is the word 'rome' in the original manuscript. If it is in Mrs. Pott's book she must be put down as either a

wilful forger or as an ignorant transcriber. (Cf. 'Shakespeare,' Jahrbuck, XX. p. 226, and Engel, 'Engl-Literaturgesch,' S. V. der Bacon-Wahn.)

"Coincidence number six is answered by considering that the alleged error of submitting 'moral' for 'political' philosophy is more apparent than real. By 'political' philosophy, Aristotle, as his context amply shows, meant the ethics of civic society which are barely distinguished from what is commonly called morals. In the summary paraphrase of Aristotle's 'Ethics,' which was translated into English from the Italian, and published in 1547, the passage to which both Bacon and Shakespeare refer is not rendered literally, but its general drift is given as a warning that moral philosophy is not a fit subject for study by youths who are naturally passionate and headstrong. Such an interpretation of Aristotle is common enough among sixteenth and seventeenth century writers. In a French translation of the Ethics by the Comte de Plessis, published in Paris, 1553, the passage is rendered, 'Parquoy le ieune enfant n'est suffisant auditeur de la science civile,' and an English commentator, in a copy of De Plessis' book in the British Museum, in a note written about 1605, turns the sentence into English thus: 'Whether a young man may be a fit scholar of moral philosophy.' In 1662, an Italian, Virgilio Malvezzi, in his 'Preface Discoursi sopra Cornelio Tacito,' remarks, 'E non E di E non e discordante da questa mea opinione Aristotle il qua dice che gionani non sone buone ascolatore delle morale' (cf. 'Spedding' Bacon I. 739, III. 440).

"The passage in *Othello* regarding the current from the Pontic Sea to the Propontic, finds its satisfactory explanation in the following sentence in Philemon Holland's English translation of Pliny's 'Historia Naturalis,' which appeared in 1601, several years be-

fore *Othello* was composed : 'And the Sea Pontus evermore floweth and runneth out into Propontis, but the sea never retireth backe again within Pontus.'

"The next coincidence makes no impression on my mind. What conclusions can you draw from the scrawls of one who practises handwriting, and who writes on the cover, 'Bacon,' 'Shakespeare,' 'Nashe,' etc.? I have not seen the original MS. What I know of it I have ascertained from Holzer's Baconian pamphlet, published in 1908. If I correctly understand him, he says the original MS. disappeared after it was published in 1904; so I confess to a sneaking suspicion that not everything is quite in order.

"As to coincidence ten, Mr. Sohmers asks me whether the name Falstaff was suggested by Halstaff. I can give no definite reply to the question. Let me ask Mr. Sohmers whether there might not be some link or connection between Sir John Falstaff in *Henry IV.* and Sir John Fastolfe in the first part of *Henry VI.*

"As to coincidence number two, Mr. Sohmers has certainly said too much when he declares that Perdita's remarks about flowers 'are an exceedingly close paraphrase of Bacon's "Essay on Gardens."' I have carefully compared the two, and have certainly found some correspondence. But Shakespeare had as good eyes and as good brains as Bacon!

"Perhaps he may have referred to some book or other on gardening and flowers. Coincidences numbers one, three, four, and nine may remain unanswered. It is no use to be told to pull at the other end of a rope of sand!

"I have thus done my duty, and tried to show the inconsistencies of ten coincidences adduced by Mr. Sohmers. I regret I cannot discuss his superogatory coincidence number eleven, as I am not able to make use of a work by Mr. Edwin Reed to which Mr.

Sohmers refers me. The German libraries refuse to spend too much money on 'Baconian' literature—and rightly so.

"Facts are chieils that wilna' dang.

"I am, yours faithfully,

"DR. H. R. D. ANDERS."

NOTES.

DR. ANDERS cannot be congratulated upon the result of his challenge to Baconians to produce ten convincing coincidences between Shakespeare and Bacon "where the resemblance is truly striking, and cannot be due to what we call accident."

Mr. Joseph Sohmers produced eleven such coincidences (BACONIANA, Vol. VI., p. 178), and in *New Shakespeareana* for July last appears Dr. Anders' reply, which will be found re-produced on page 253 of this journal. A more ludicrous fiasco has never disgraced a literary man. It will be seen that no attempt is made to explain coincidences numbers one, three, four and nine, as "it is no use to be told to pull at the other end of a rope of sand." Number eleven Dr. Anders cannot discuss, as he has no opportunity of making use of Mr. Edwin Reed's book to which Mr. Sohmers refers. By the laws of evidence, therefore, these five coincidences may be taken as proved, for Dr. Anders can produce no testimony to weaken their weight. Out of two of the remaining six Dr. Anders attempts to shuffle by methods which deserve the strongest reprobation. With reference to number five he says, "For if we may believe Dr. Engel, Bacon did not write the *Promus*, nor is the word 'rome' in the original manuscript. If it is

in Mrs. Pott's book she must be put down either as a wilful forger or as an ignorant transcriber." Why introduce Mrs. Pott's name? It is not mentioned in Mr. Sohmers' statement of coincidence number five. Dr. Anders' attack on her is both unnecessary and unjustifiable.

That the *Promus* is in Bacon's handwriting is vouched for by Mr. Maude Thompson, the Keeper of MSS. at the British Museum, who is the highest authority on the subject, by James Spedding, and by E. A. Abbot. Doubt on this point has never been raised,—it is an accepted fact—except by Dr. Engel, who had never seen the manuscript of the *Promus* and was quite unacquainted with Bacon's handwriting—a set of conditions which, according to the usual Stratfordian methods, renders him eminently qualified to give an authoritative opinion on the subject.

Coincidence number eight, founded on the Northumberland MS., Dr. Anders tries to evade by stating that if he understands Dr. Holzer correctly, "the original MS. disappeared after it was published in 1904! So I confess to a sneaking suspicion that not everything is quite in order." Of course Dr. Holzer never suggested such a statement. In reply to an enquiry addressed by the Editor to Dr. Holzer he says:—

1. With regard to Dr. Anders' statement, or rather mis-statement, I beg to say that I myself noticed his misconstruction in the July number of *New Shakespeareana* in the beginning of August, when I received the copy.

2. I addressed Dr. Anders in a letter, explaining his mistake to him, and I further remarked that, as he was so intimately acquainted with Elizabethan literature, he might possibly have come across a fac-simile of the overleaf of the Northumberland MS. in Spedding's book: "A Conference of Pleasure," 1870.

3. I have so far received no answer from Dr. Anders to my letter, nor any acknowledgment of receipt of my pamphlet, which I sent to him towards the end of May. But I still do not abandon a hope that the same will be forthcoming.

4. I happened to mention the incident to some of my

colleagues, who were amazed that Dr. Anders could possibly so misunderstand or misconstrue what I said in my pamphlet.

The manuscript is at Alnwick Castle, Northumberland, and, by the help of Mr. Frank I. Burgoyne, photographic fac-similes are in the hands of hundreds of Shakespearean scholars. Dr. Anders does not merely display ignorance, but by disingenuously making these charges, suggesting rather than stating that they are made under the authority of Dr. Engel and Dr. Holzer, he exhibits an intentionally dishonest mind.

Out of the eleven coincidences four remain, and to those Dr. Anders offers the weakest opposition. What can be more feeble than the way in which he slurs over the remarkable paraphrase of Bacon's "Essay on Gardens," which appears in Perdita's speech in the *Winter's Tale*? He says: "I have carefully compared the two, and have certainly found some correspondence. But Shakespeare had as good eyes and as good brains as Bacon!" True, as good, and neither better nor worse. That is the point at issue.

And yet Dr. Anders has the effrontery to say, "I have thus done my duty, and tried to show the inconsistencies of ten coincidences adduced by Mr. Sohmers."

It might not interest Dr. Anders, but it will certainly interest the readers of *BACONIANA*, to learn that Mr. Bernard Quaritch has just purchased for the Royal Library, Berlin, a complete copy of *BACONIANA* from the first number to the last, and the Library is now entered as an annual subscriber.

* * *

Mr. Harold Bayley's new book will be published within the next few weeks by Messrs. J. M. Dent and Co. under the title of "A New Light on the Renaissance."

JOHN CHURTON COLLINS.

AN APPRECIATION.

THE tidings of the sudden death of Professor J. Churton Collins would be received by members of the Bacon Society with feelings of deep regret. The world of letters has lost one of its brightest ornaments. His knowledge of the Greek and Roman Classics was extensive and thorough. He had studiously explored English literature, not only in its trodden paths but in its byeways, with a carefulness and penetration which were unusual in their fulness. Endowed with extraordinary powers of memory, he had acquired a knowledge of writers and their works which was ever ready for comparison or illustration. His English was clear and forcible and his thoughts were conveyed in language which was unmistakable in its meaning and pleasant to read.

With the Elizabethan period he was especially familiar. His "Studies in Shakespeare" will remain an indispensable volume in the library of every student of the poet. The "learning" of Shakespeare has formed one of the principal subjects of controversy since commentators on his works began to ply their trade. They generally accepted the position that the poet was ill-educated, if not illiterate, justifying that position by the statement of Jonson that he had small Latin and less Greek; of Drayton that "Nature only helpt him;" of Fuller that "his learning was very little," and even of his own apology to the Earl of Southampton, when in the dedication of *Venus and Adonis* he described his offering as "unpolisht lines."* Amongst the earliest opponents of this view were Charles Gildon,† the

* Farmer, either unintentionally or by way of strengthening his case, in his *Essay* quotes these words as "untutored lines."

† John Dennis, attacking Gildon for his opinions, declared that "he who allows Shakespeare had learning, and a familiar acquaintance with the Ancients, ought to be looked upon as a detractor from the glory of Great Britain."

Editor of an edition of his Poems in 1718; Pope, who supposed "little ground for the common opinion of his want of learning;" Theobald, who was "very unwilling to allow him so poor a scholar as many have laboured to represent him;" and Upton, who wondered "with what kind of reasoning anyone could be so far imposed upon as to imagine that Shakespeare had no learning." But when Dr. Farmer, in 1767, published his well-known Essay on the subject, the poet's lack of learning was supposed to be settled so conclusively that it could not be re-opened.

In more recent times Dr. Magiun (in Blackwood's Magazine, 1837), Mr. Spencer Baynes and Mr. Russell Lowell have urged the contrary opinion, but it fell to Professor Churton Collins in his Essay on "Shakespeare as a Classical Scholar," which originally appeared in the *Fornightly Review*, to establish the hypothesis that Shakespeare had a competent knowledge of Latin, was well acquainted in the original with the Latin classics, and possessed enough knowledge of Greek "to enrich his dictums with its idioms and phraseology."

The words in which, in 1792, Malone described Farmer's Essay may, with much more justification, be applied to that of Professor Churton Collins, viz., that it is "the most conclusive Essay that ever appeared on a subject of criticism," and that its effect is that "the long-agitated question concerning the learning of Shakespeare was for ever settled."

Amongst the other Essays, all of which exhibit evidence of the writer's erudition, mention must be made of that on "Shakespeare as a Prose Writer." Professor Collins therein says:—

The truth is that Shakespeare's prose is a phenomenon as remarkable as his verse. In one way it is still more remarkable. The prose of Shakespeare stands alone. It was his own creation—as absolutely his own as the *terza rima* was Dante's, as the Spen-

serian Stanza was Spenser's. For every other form of composition he had models which he began by following very exactly. . . . But his prose is essentially original; and how greatly he contributed to the development of this important branch of rhetoric will be at once apparent if we compare his prose diction with the diction of those who preceded and of those who followed him.

The style of the prose of the higher comedy is described as "a style of which Shakespeare was the absolute and immortal creator, a style in which he has never been surpassed." As an example of the style or prose which Professor Collins classifies as highly-wrought poetical prose he says:—

This is the style where Shakespeare has raised prose to the sublimest pitch of verse and is, it must be confessed, the rarest of all his modes of expression. The finest and most obvious illustration of this is to be found in *Hamlet*, Act I., Scene 2 (this goodly frame, the Earthe, &c.). It would be hard to cull from the whole body of our prose literature a passage which should demonstrate more strikingly the splendour and the majesty of our language, when freed from the shackles of verse.

But the whole volume is of great merit and value. In *Ephemeræ Criticæ* Professor Collins includes several Essays of which Shakespeare forms the subject. Attention may be drawn to that on "The Religion of Shakespeare," in which the writer's clear discrimination may be seen at its best. Thus he states the poet's attitude toward "the undiscover'd country, from whose bourn no traveller returns."

Shakespeare, in truth, never attempts to lift the veil which for living men can be raised only by revelation. The silence of his philosophy—for we must not confound occasional sentiments and mere dramatic utterances with what justifies us in deducing that philosophy—in relation to a life after this is unbroken. It is, indeed, remarkable that he represents such speculations—the dwelling on such problems—as more likely to disturb, perplex, and hamper us than to give us any comfort.

In "Essays and Studies" are articles on the "Pre-

decessors of Shakespeare" and "The Porson of Shakesperean Criticism." The latter is a powerful vindication of Lewis Theobald as an editor and commentator. Here Professor Collins runs a-tilt at Warburton, Pope, Dr. Johnson, Malone, Leslie Stephen and the writer of the article on Theobald in the "Encyclopædia Britannica," and apparently conclusively establishes Theobald's claim to the gratitude and veneration of students of Shakespeare. He describes him as "the father of Shakesperean criticism" and says of him, "It may be said with simple truth that no poet in our own or in any language has ever owed so great a debt to an editor as Shakespeare does to this man." Even where the reader may feel inclined to differ from the Essayist, he cannot refrain from being fascinated by the power and force with which contrary opinions are advanced—power and force which have their origin in the breadth of knowledge which the writer possesses and which are not "heaps of learned lumber."

But it was as a critic that Professor Collins was to be seen at his best. The sound of literary battle had a charm for him and into controversy he entered with delight. His blows were hard and were backed up by the strong moral force which he ever wielded. He wore no gloves and he gave no quarter. His essay on "The Bacon-Shakespeare Mania," which originally appeared in the *Saturday Review* as three articles of criticism on Judge Webb's "The Mystery of William Shakespeare," will be remembered by all readers of *BACONIANA*. Time will prove how far his attack on a body of earnest and honest students of Elizabethan literature was justified. Writing to Dr. R. M. Theobald, in 1904, with references to these articles, he said :

"You are quite justified in rebuking me for the very acrimonious and contemptuous tone of my essay, but I am a man who feels strongly on this particular subject, and therefore I have expressed myself strongly—too strongly, perhaps . . ."

The writer of this notice had the good fortune, only about two months ago, to discuss the subject very fully with Professor Collins one evening, and a fairer or more courteous opponent in controversy it would be impossible to have.

Professor Collins' sudden death inflicts a special loss upon the members of the Bacon Society. Arrangements were practically completed for him to deliver to them a series of lectures on Bacon during the ensuing winter session, and on the Monday evening when he was lying dead on the Lincolnshire broads, the Council of the Society were discussing dates for those lectures. The following letter has therefore a peculiarly sad interest attached to it.

I have been thinking over what you said to me, on that delightful evening we dined with you, about lectures on Bacon. Now, suppose you are disposed to fall in with my suggestion, may I entreat you kindly to remember that I have no sympathy at all with the Shakespeare-Bacon question; that my attitude towards it is precisely that assumed so offensively, I fear, in my published writings; that nothing I shall say is intended to have the slightest bearing on the question? I am perfectly well aware that such lectures most necessarily contain much, and very much, which Bacon-Shakespeareans can use and apply, if they please, to their own purposes. For instance, there are remarkable parallels between what can be deducted about Shakespeare's personal character, ethics and religion, and what we know about Bacon's. But with such applications I have no sympathy, and in them no interest so far as they touch the controversy. This will be quite understood, will it not—that I do not refer in any way to the Bacon-Shakespeare question?

Will you, then, kindly consider whether such a course as this would meet what you were thinking of when you spoke to me?

I.—Bacon as a Man.

II.—Bacon as a Politician (which would include his Religion).

III.—Bacon as an Essayist and Moralist.

IV.—Bacon as a Philosopher—the "Instauratio Magna."

V.—Bacon as a Humanitarian and Prophet.

If you are still in the same mind, will you think over this, and tell me whether you are inclined to make an arrangement of this kind, either before or after Christmas?

Notwithstanding Professor Collins' violent antipathy to the subject, the mere discussion of which he described as being distasteful and repulsive to him, it is a fact that no man has, by his writings, done more than he to give it a sound and permanent foundation. The Shakespeare whom he has done so much to reveal is absolutely incompatible, on his own showing,* with the Stratford Shakspeare, and at any rate some substitute—whether it be Francis Bacon or some other—has to be found. Had the contemplated series of lectures been delivered it is possible that Professor Collins might have seen fit to modify his opinions as to what he termed “this ridiculous epidemic,” which “has now assumed the proportions and many of the characteristics of the dancing mania of the Middle Ages.”

Let the hard blows be forgotten, and let Baconians remember only the brilliant scholar and writer who has gathered together stores of literary ammunition, which remain to assist them in the battle they are waging against prejudice and convention on behalf of the truth, be it what it may.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

MR. GREENWOOD has every reason to be well satisfied with the notices of *The Shakespeare Problem Re-stated* by the public Press. The following extracts are significant because they admit, or imply, that the authorship of the plays is a subject of doubt :—

The Daily News :—“And let the biographers begin by confuting Mr. Greenwood. I cannot.”

* BACONIANA, Vol. VI., page 189.

Daily Mail :—" He (Mr. Greenwood) has written a book that ought not to be ignored by Shakespearean experts, and he has carried the war into the enemy's country, and provided plenty of matter for the consideration of those of the orthodox faith."

Manchester Guardian :—" On the destructive side his book is so strong that merely to call it the ablest extant argument against the identity of the Stratford-born actor with the author of the poems and plays does not give the full measure of its strength."

Bristol Times :—" Mr. Greenwood does not attempt to solve the problem; he simply sets out the evidence for and against the claims of William Shakspeare, of Stratford-on-Avon. And his verdict, as that of all unprejudiced persons must be, is that the claimant was not, and could not possibly have been, the poet whose works are so justly admired and revered by the whole civilised world."

Star :—" It is a tempting and tantalising book, but it is not light reading for the hot weather. It makes you think too hard. It stirs up all sorts of doubts in your mind. It rouses your scepticism and stimulates your incredulity. It spurs you into rebellion against authority. It breeds in you irreverence for literary mandarins."

The Observer :—" Pestilent heresies or no, his contentions are well worth studying, if only because they help to strip the Shakespeare cult of a deal of artificial, and, in some cases, nonsensical stuff with which it has become encumbered."

Sunday Times :—" Yet I would not deny the almost inconceivable hypotheses which adherence to the traditional story involves any more than I would deny that Mr. Greenwood has exposed the weaknesses of the Stratfordian position with splendid lucidity and cohesion."

Graphic :—" Who, then, was this hyphenated Shake-speare? I can hardly bring myself to refer to a certain too notorious controversy. Happily, however, even if Shake-speare was not Shakspeare it does not follow that he was Bacon. Why not let identification remain a magnificent mystery, in company with the North, South Poles, and the secret of the Holy Grail, and the unseen side of the moon, and all other really interesting things."

The Academy :—" What he means to do and what he does very well, is to set out the case against Shakespeare. It is a pretty strong one, of course; it always was."

Nation :—" For our part, while still preserving our belief in the 'Stratford Yokel' we are quite ready to admit there is a Shakespeare problem."

The Bookman (a remarkable admission) :—" The point is, however, that having entered this book (as we have said) in a spirit of sanctimonious orthodoxy, we have emerged from it (despite some disgust at its persistent and unfair personalities) sick and sore at heart, our deepest convictions bleeding and battered; for the time being, at any rate, in a hardened, unrepentant, agnostic frame of mind."

CORRESPONDENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—Can anyone throw any new lights on Francis Beaumont? I possess an old print of a handsome man of about twenty-eight or thirty, in Elizabethan dress; under it, in print, is the name Francis Beaumont, with a lion rampant as a crest. The picture might have been, as I think, taken from Francis Bacon at his zenith, before the cares of State and loss of teeth made his face worn and aged. The moustache is worn artist-fashion, not drooping, and the portrait altogether that of a particularly attractive, intelligent Courtier. Camden's *Brittania* (p. 445) gives: Beaumont, or Bellamont, established at Beaumanoir Park, Leicestershire, enclosed by Lords Beaumont, descended from a French family (*Vicomte de Bellamont*). "Certain it is," he says, "they come from John de Brenne, King of Jerusalem, and they settled in England about Edward I. Robert de Bellamont (*Beaumont*), a Norman, obtained a grant of this country, and married a daughter of Alexander Comyn, Earl of Bohun. Simon de Montford, 1206, married Amicia, sister and co-heir to the last Robert Bellamont, Earl of Leicester, and Lord High Steward. Henry III. conferred these honours on Edmund, his youngest son, and they came to John of Gaunt by marriage, and were revived in Robert Dudley, whom as Camden takes care to state, "Queen Elizabeth extraordinarily favoured." Simon de Montford, an Earl of Leicester, had land and an estate at one time on the site where Gorhambury stood later.

In Neue Town (Newington), Islington, has been found the arms of Bellamont—a Cinquefoil pierced. As the Dudleys were living in the Manor House of Newington it is a little difficult to know whether these arms were those of Robert Dudley or an earlier Earl of Leicester. Between 1103-1190 there were four Earls of Leicester, all Robert Beaumont. As to the later Francis Beaumont, Anthony Wood (*Ath. Ox.*), says: "He came to Broad-gates Hall, 1596, with his elder brother Sir John, a poet, and person of great knowledge, gravity, and worth." But Wood insists that he must not be understood to be the same with Francis Beaumont, the eminent poet and comedian. Actor, I presume? "For though he was of the same family, and most of his name studied in Oxon., yet he was educated at Cambridge, and after he had made himself famous all over England for the fifty Comedies and Tragedies he, with John Fletcher, had composed, made his last exit in the beginning of March, 1615, and was buried at the entrance of S. Benedict's Chapel within the Abbey Church of St. Peter's, Westminster. As for John Fletcher . . . he was also a Cambridge man, and dying of the plague was buried in the Church, or Yard, of St. Mary Overy, Southwark. 29 Aug., 1625. Aged 49." If Beaumont was as famous as Wood says, it is a little strange that Cooper in his *Athen. Cantabrig.* mentions neither

him or Fletcher at Cambridge. The "Students' Encyclopædia" tells that Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher lived together on the Bankside, not far from the Play House, the same cloak and cloathes between them. The only other statement with regard to Beaumont I have is on page 3 of the Italian edition of Montaigne's Diary.

"*Audit Beaumont, M. D'Estissac se mesla à la trope.*" A footnote adds, "*Beaumont sur-Oise, Nota del primo Editore M. de Querlon.*" This D'Estissac was, I believe, Francis Bacon (see BACONIANA, July, 1908).

AN ENQUIRER.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIR,—I have been much impressed by Mr. Terrel's explanation of the word *hid* in Ben Jonson's lines facing the portrait in the Shake-speare First Folio, and it carried immediate conviction. I have given much thought and study to those enigmatical lines, but I had not thought of that interpretation of *hid*. There is no doubt, however, that it may bear the meaning Mr. Terrel suggests. I have not access to the N. E. D. at the moment but I have consulted the Century Dictionary, with this result:

Hit 3 †, a (middle English) contracted form of *hideth*, third person singular, present indicative of *hide*.

This, of course, differs from Mr. Terrel's interpretation slightly, but not in a way to change the sense; it merely puts the verb into the present instead of the past tense.

But let us look through the entire stanza. The last two lines are very odd. After Ben's *apparent* praise of the picture we are told not to look at it. Singular commendation surely! This in itself seems enough to suggest an enigmatical meaning. Let us go back two lines from the one Mr. Terrel bases his comment upon.

"With Nature to out-doo the life."

Is it not quite possible that *out-do* is an inversion of *do-out*? I am not prepared to show that the word has ever been used in this sense, but it is not very far-fetched for a quibble, and seems worth considering. It hardly seems possible that Ben could seriously have entertained the idea that the perpetrator of that horrible caricature could have had a real struggle with Nature in the representation of the features of the gentle Shakespeare. Let us give Ben credit for not being quite such a fool.

Then we will examine the third line:—

"It was for gentle Shakespeare cut."

Now it surely is evident that *for* may mean *in place of*, but the Shakesperian knave is so absolute that we must speak by the card or equivocation will undo us. I again quote the Century Dictionary.

"FOR—In place of; instead of; in consideration of; as, to pay a dollar *for* a thing; two *for* five cents.

"To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord . . . to comfort all that mourn . . . to give them beauty *for* ashes, the oil of joy *for* mourning; the garment of praise *for* the spirit of heaviness (Isa. lxi. 2, 3).

"I'll give my jewels *for* a set of beads,
My gorgeous palace *for* a hermitage.

—*Shak., R. II. III. ii.*"

There are four more illustrations, but these seem enough. I have a vague suspicion that the word *cut* at the end of the line quoted above has some reference to the coat having being cut in two and half of it turned hind-side-before. In fact, there are so many "cuts" about the matter that it might mean any one of many things. Altogether it does "surpass all that was ever done in brass." Surely no more brazen humbug was ever perpetrated, and the author, like old Barnum, even has the audacity to tell us that we are being humbugged.

Paraphrasing the stanza, reading in the suggested meanings, we have this :

This Figure that thou here see'st put
It was [in place of that of] Gentle Shakespeare [which was for
that purpose] cut [to pieces] ;
Wherein the Graver [which might mean, one who digs a grave]
had a strife

With Nature to [do him out of his] life.

O, could he but have drawne his wit

As well in brasse [*i.e.*, if he could have succeeded so well in a
brazen-faced imposition] as he [hideth]

His face; the Print would then surpass all that was ever writ in
Brasse [*i.e.*, in one of the most brazen humbugs ever perpetrated.]

But, since he cannot, [quite hope to succeed to this extent],
Reader, [don't bother yourself about the picture at all, but]
looke

Not on his picture but his Booke [where you will find the real
poet.]

I do not believe the quibbles are exhausted yet. In quibbling
Ben was not to be excelled even by the Great Master.

ISAAC HULL PLATT.

Wallingford, Pa., July 12, 1908.

NOTE.—Attention has recently been called (see BACONIANA, July, 1908, p. 197) to the peculiar ambiguity of the line, "And though thou hadst small Latin and less Greek." Such a number of phrases and sentences from Ben carrying double meanings certainly seems very suspicious.—I.H.P.







