VOL. VII. THIRD SERIES

BACONIANA

A Quarterly Magazine

LONDON
GAY & CO.,
22 BEDFORD STREET W.C.
1909

"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.

INDEX OF NAMES.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

BACONIANA.

VOL. VII. *Third Series.* JANUARY, 1909. No. 25.

THE ELIZABETHAN MAZE.

WORKERS in the Elizabethan maze of literature may find a few hints useful to them.

It is in the first place most necessary to clear their minds of prepossessions and prepare for the unexpected.

They will discover that young Francis Bacon was a prolific writer masked under many vizards.

Moreover, that he had a good conceit of himself and did not hesitate under one vizard to praise his work under another.

It will be as well also to start with a proper understanding of what he was and under what conditions he developed.

Finally, they should not set aside the biliteral cipher and its story as something they are prepared to take up when further proofs are forthcoming.

Without the cipher story you are pottering in the dark, and while able to assemble parts of the mosaic you will not succeed in forming its pattern.

Bacon was the unacknowledged because base begotten son of parents of abnormal position and ability, that is to say, child of a belated and secret marriage of Queen Elizabeth and Lord Robert Dudley, afterwards Earl of Leicester.

Brought up as the son of the Queen's confidential man of business, Lord Keeper Bacon, he was cared for and educated most thoroughly as a child who might be one day called to the throne. His remarkable mental development is indicated at so early an age as eleven in the terra cotta bust of him now at Gorhambury.

As a boy of twelve his education was continued at Trinity College, Cambridge, founded and endowed by the Queen's father.

He was there three years, under the special charge of Whitgift afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, and there came under the influence of Gabriel Harvey, a young and highly popular professor of poetry and rhetoric.

Most of the year 1576 was spent by Francis at the English Court, and he was the subject of much speculation among the courtiers as to what was his precise relationship to either the Lord Keeper and Lady Ann Bacon or to the Queen and Dudley. His true parentage was revealed to him as the result of an unpleasant incident, and in September of that year he was packed off for a tour on the continent, travelling to France in the train of the English Ambassador. He was abroad until March, 1579, and while away was supplied with money for his expenses by certain "friends" represented by the Queen's confidential official, Sir Thomas Bodley, who was gentleman usher to her private apartments. This gentleman in an extant letter exhorted Francis to make a careful study of the arts of government and the sources of national prosperity. In 1578 he made a short re-visit to England on the subject of his desired betrothal to the French King's sister Margaret, at that time unwilling to fulfil her contract to marry Henry of Navarre. Occasion was taken of this visit to have his miniature painted by Hilliard, the Queen's Court

Limner. His marked mental ability at this date is evidenced by the Latin words written round this portrait, coupled with his own admission that during this year he invented the biliteral cipher and carefully studied the properties of sound.

The remarkable range in his studies in classical and foreign literature is manifest from the writings under his earlier vizards such as "Immerito," "Watson," "Lyly," "Gosson," and "Spenser."

Like the Queen, his mother (to whose extensive library he would have access), he was an accomplished scholar, fluent in Latin and French and able to read Greek, Italian and Spanish with ease.

We can well understand that when this highly talented young nobleman came back to England his parents were proud of him, though it was impossible for them to formally recognise him as a prince. He appears to have spent 1579 partly at the Court and partly at Leicester House and seems to have been well supplied with money.

A poet by training and disposition he could not fail to have been inspired by the poets of France as to the important nature of their calling. Ronsard's efforts at the improvement of the French vernacular by the introduction of new words of classic origin and of words from old French, almost obsolete, would be known to him. Fresh from the influence of talented French and Italian tragedians and comedians, the clownish performances which passed for play-acting in his own country would be an abomination. Proficient in music and a student of the laws of sound, much of the crude piping which was called music in the country of his birth would be equally abhorrent. The decadence of the English poetic muse since the days of Chaucer was only too apparent. Current versification was nothing but dull forced rhyming.

He had not been many months in his own country ere he published a strong protest against the abuses of poets, pipers, and players, entitled "The Schoole of Abuse."

Amongst the English courtiers at that period there was a great unwillingness to print their attempts in the poetic art. Bacon had manifestly reasons of his own for secrecy, so that while his firstfruits were given to the world in the pen-name of "Lyly" he chose as vizard for "The Schoole of Abuse" young Gosson, then one of the boy players of the Queen's Chapel. As sanction for the practice he instances the habit of the poets of ancient times to mask their productions under other names or vizards.

Not content with his own efforts, he infected others with his reforming zeal and formed a small literary society (or areopagus, as Harvey called it), charged to bring about some improvement in English poetry. The little band consisted of Sidney, Dyer, Greville and himself, while Gabriel Harvey, his old poetical tutor, watched and applauded the movement from Cambridge.

In the "Shepheard's Kalendar," 1579, Francis, under his vizard of "Immerito," essayed to do for English what Ronsard was doing for French. Taking Chaucer for one of his models, he endeavoured to revive obsolete English words and phrases.

From this time onward his literary publications constituted one steady flow, masked, as they were, under the vizards of young university students who sought employment in London as clerks, transcribers and players. Spenser was a clerk with the Earl of Leicester until sent off to Ireland. Peele was a sort of go-between with the actors. Greene, Marlowe, Shakspere and Gosson were players. "Watson" and "Lyly" were mere names. Kyd seems to have had employment as law clerk at Bacon's chambers in Gray's Inn.

The important fact that the attempted biographies would not marry with the works, has been quite overlooked by the critics, who have been entirely deceived by the "vizard" method of publication.

The mystification was made more complete by Bacon's habit (no doubt intended to create the impression that the foundation of an English literature was not the work of one individual) of making his puppets refer to one another as though they really were writing independently.

Harvey, Phillip and Mary Sidney, Fraunce, Greville and Dyer, together with many more of the courtiers, were more or less in Bacon's secret. So were Sir John Davies and Sir Toby Matthew. Marston, Hall and Jonson found it out, as the late Mr. Begley has elsewhere shown.

But the general reader was kept in ignorance. Below I give some examples of the practice I have referred to.

To the first set of "Sonnets," published in 1582 under the name of "Watson," he wrote a preface as "Lyly" and complimentary verse as "Peele." When a number of his plays had been for some time before the public, he, as "Greene" in "Menaphon," made some mysterious allusions as to their authorship and tried to suggest "Kyd" as one of the authors. As "Nash" he wrote a preface to "Menaphon" and continued to disperse an inky fluid like the Sepia or cuttle fish, as means of escape. In this preface he fathered the play of "Arraignment of Paris" on Peele, notwithstanding that it had been published anonymously five years earlier.

As Watson in 1590 he alluded to himself as "Spenser," while as Spenser he alluded to himself as "Lyly." By 1592 he had practically dropped the "Gosson" and "Lyly" vizards and he then wanted to abandon the vizards of "Watson" and "Greene." In

publishing the last "Watson" work he wrote as C. M. (Marlowe), regretting his death and so forth. Of the death of "Greene," he, as "Nash," and with Harvey's assistance, made great play, commencing with a sort of death-bed homily to Marlowe and others. The "Spenser" allusion of 1591 is very interesting. Thalia, in "Teares of the Muses," says :—

> "And he whom Natures self had made
> To mock himselfe and truth to imitate
> With kindly counter under Mimick shade
> Our pleasant Willy, ah, is dead of late."

The verses proceed to explain how things have gone wrong with the stage, and that Willy

> "Doth rather choose to sit in idle cell
> And so himself to mockerie to sell."

I believe that "Willy" is, as other critics think, a reference to "Lyly," and its meaning is not very difficult to follow.

Bacon's earliest attempts at comedy would be the few plays performed by the children of the Queen's Chapel from 1580 to 1584, and presented as under the authorship of "Lyly."

"Campaspe," "Sapho," "Gallathea," "Woman in the Moon," and "Endimion," are all dry, poor stuff written by Francis in his youth, and it is natural to assume they did not go down very well with the gallants and ladies of the Elizabethan Court.

Francis, who was doubtless very much chaffed, became huffed and discontinued his Court comedies. The "Lyly" vizard was dropped and he was reputed to be sulking in his cell. The Spenser allusion gives us the reason why a "Greene" pamphlet of 1587 purports to be compiled from some loose papers found in "Lyly's" cell; and in Greene's Menaphon, 1589, "Lyly" is still described as slumbering in his melancholy cell. Young

Francis had evidently a notion of abandoning the "Lyly" vizard. But as "Nash," in the preface to the last named work, he takes the precaution of fathering upon Peele the "Arraignment of Paris," which had been better received than the "Lyly" plays, and was a play in which Bacon had experimented successfully with a variety of metres. A verse prefixed to "Menaphon" indicates that his Lyly vizard was thenceforth to be merged in "Greene."

We must never forget young Bacon's extraordinary egotism. He had no hesitation in referring to himself as

> "That same gentle spirit from whose pen
> Large streames of honnie and swecte nectar flowe,"

any more than at other times would he refrain from assuring any person associated by name with any of his writings that they would thereby be eternized.

Yet in both instances he was quite correct.

The Vizard "Thomas Watson."

Let me say at once that in my opinion Thomas Watson is a biographical myth. Nothing is known of him. His supposed biography has been compiled merely by inferences from the writings printed with his name as author.

To these inferences the contents of two mare's-nests have been added. One discovered by Mr. Hall and recorded in the *Athenæum* for 1890 was that Watson was the same person as one "Watsoon," brother-in-law of Swift, a servant of a certain "Cornwallis." The assumption depended upon the correct reading of an old MS. letter to Burleigh of March 15th, 1593, in which Mr. Hall thought he deciphered a statement that "Watsoon" "could derive twenty fictions and knaveries in a play which was his daily practyse and his living."

Mr. Ellis, in a letter to the *Athenæum* a few weeks later, pointed out that the word plott or plan had pro-

bably been misread as "play," inasmuch as no trace of a play by Thomas Watson had ever been found.

The other probable mare's-nest is an entry said to have been discovered by that doubtful investigator, Mr. Collier, in the register of St. Bartholomew the Less, viz., "26th Sep. 1592, Thomas Watson, gent, was buried."

The burial entry may be a forgery. It is suspicious that Collier found a similar entry in St. Bartholomew's register about Lyly, viz., "1606, 30th Novr. John Lyllie, gent, was buried.

The first "Watson" publication was in 1581, and consisted of a translation from Greek into Latin of Sophocle's "Antigone," together with a few Latin poems and four Themata.

The first of the four Themata is written in Iambics, the second in Anapæstic Dimeters, the third in Sapphics, and the fourth in Choriambic asclepiadean verse. Surely here is presumptive evidence of a poet at practice. Next year (1582) came the "Watson" publication called "The Passionate Century of Love," in which the young poet exercised himself in expressing English verse in sonnet form. These sonnets numbered about 100 in all; eight of them are imitated from Petrarch, twelve from Serafina, four from Strozza, three from Firenzuola, and two each from Parabosco and Sylvius. What a range of careful reading in Italian poetical literature this betokens! In addition he imitated four sonnets of the contemporary French poet Ronsard and two of Etienne Forcadel, another Frenchman also then living. In the glosse to the verses he indicates acquaintance with other poets, viz.: the Italians Ariosto, Baptista Mantuanus, Poliziano, the German Conradus Celtes, and with the Greek writers Theocritus, Sophocles, Musæus, Aristotle, Homer, and Appolonius Of Latin authors, he quotes or borrows from Ovid.

Cicero, Lucan, Senecca, Horace, Pliny, Martial and Flaccus.

One English poet had great attraction for him, namely, Chaucer. It is a suspicious circumstance that this old poet was also a great favourite with the writer of the "Spenser" and "Greene" works claimed in the biliteral cipher to have been written by Bacon.

In 1585 appeared under the name "Watson" a translation into Latin of Tasso's pastoral drama "Amyntas." Bacon's love of the pastoral form is shown in the "Shepheard's Kalendar," 1580, in the "Spenser" Colin Clout (1595) in the pastoral play "Arraignment" of Paris and some of the Eglogues published in the name of Peele. In 1590 "Watson" used the pastoral form for an Eglogue upon the death of his friend Sir Francis Walsingham. Another translation into Latin of Tasso's Amyntas was made by "Watson's" friend Abraham Fraunce, who was a barrister of Gray's Inn at the time Bacon was then resident. This Fraunce had access to the "Fairy Queene" two or three years before it was printed, as in his work called "Arcadian Rhetorike," 1588, are quotations from it. On the assumption that Bacon's claim to authorship of the "Fairy Queene" is true, this access was natural. Fraunce, moreover, like Bacon, was a close and intimate friend of the Sidney family. In 1586, in the name of "Watson," was published a translation into Latin of the short Greek poem by Coluthus called "the Rape of Helen." A lost translation of the same poem into English was according to a Coxetian MS. attributed to "Marlowe."

It will be remembered that in "Marlowe's" name was printed a translation from Lucan, and translations of Ovid's "Amores," and of the Hero and Leander poem of Musæus, a long time after "Marlowe's" death. With Lucan, Ovid and Musæus, "Watson" was familiar. Of other classical poets well read by "Wat-

son" we find Pliny drawn upon largely by "Lyly," Cicero by "Greene," "Homer," and "Virgil" in the biliteral cipher—Virgil again in the "Dido" of "Marlowe," Senecca and others in the "Shakespeare" plays.

In 1590 a number of Italian Madrigals were Englished by "Watson" and set to music by William Bird, who was a prominent Court Musician. That Bacon had a first class knowledge of music is well shown in his acknowledged writings.

The "Tears of Fancie or Love Disdained," another series of sonnets, was the last effort attached to the name of "Watson." Mr. George Steevens, the Shakespeare Editor, thought the "Watson" better than the "Shakespeare" Sonnets. I think the year of publication of the "Tears of Fancie" was 1592 and not 1593 as guessed by some critics. I say this, because a later date was inconsistent with Bacon's decision to drop the name of "Watson" and yet to retain the works in memory.

On November 10th (1592) was entered in the register a book entitled "Aminte Gaudea Author Thom. Watson. Londoniensi juris studioso." It was prefaced by a Latin dedication to Sidney's sister, the Countess of Pembroke, by a writer printing the initials "C.M.," who deeply lamented "Watson's" recent "death." This lament, which I think Bacon wrote as "C.M.," he followed up as "Peele" in honour of the Garter, 1593, with :—

"To Watson worthy many epitaphs. For his sweete poesie for Amintas teares."

"Then as "Nash" in "Have with you the Saffron Walden," he wrote, "A Man he was that I dearly lov'd and honor'd, and for all things hath left few his equals in England." Bacon in this way perseveringly maintained attention to his "Watson" writings, which, like his "Greene" works, ceased to appear after the year

1592. His "death" as "Greene" in September of the same year was a most daring joke.

Bacon's intimacy with the Sidney family was close and continuous. He lost a great friend and fellow worker in Sir Philip. His panegyrics in the names of "Spenser" and "Nash" show this. Another great friend was Sir Francis Walsingham, Sidney's father-in-law, whose death was fitly lamented in the Watson Eglogue to Meliboeus, 1590. Sidney's sister Mary, Countess of Pembroke, to whom the last Watson work was dedicated, was a talented writer and another great friend of Francis. One can almost conjure up the friendly group of three ardent enthusiasts translating Garnier's plays, when published in collected form in French in 1586, the Countess undertook "Anthony" Abraham Fraunce "Cleopatra" and Bacon "Cornelia" (published in the name of "Kyd.")

The "Shakespeare" folio of 1623, comprising certain of Bacon's revised plays, was dedicated to the two sons of the Countess.

To return to the "Watson" writings. The biographers say that Watson was in Paris in or before 1581, and that he was educated at the University of Oxford. The first proposition depends upon a statement in the Eglogue to Walsingham, which runs:—

Tityrus (Thomas Walsingham) sings to Corydon (Watson):

> "Thy tunes have often pleas'd mine eare of yore
> When milk white swans did flock to heare thee sing
> Where Seane in Paris makes a double shore."

Bacon, we know, was in Paris at various times during the period from September, 1576, to March, 1578—9.

Young Thos. Walsingham was heir to the family estates and, compared to his uncle, Sir Francis

Walsingham, was a rich man. He was 21 in 1589. If through his uncle's influence he was ever sent to Paris to learn French, he would have been a boy of 10 when young Francis was there. Young Thos. Walsingham's friendship for Bacon seems to have been exercised in another way, by his giving some refuge to Bacon's assistant, Marlowe, at the time he was being searched for under warrant from the Star Chamber in consequence of the libels on the wall of the Dutch cemetery.

In addition to the references to the Sidney and Walsingham family in the "Watson" works, there are references and dedications showing intimacy with Queen Elizabeth and her leading courtiers — the Earls of Essex, Arundel, Oxford, and Northumberland, Lord Chancellor Hatton and Lord Burleigh.

The relationship of Bacon to the Queen and Robert Earl of Essex is explained in the biliteral cipher story. Lords Burleigh, Arundel and Oxford were high Ministers of State, and to the last named Bacon, in the name of "Lyly," had already dedicated one of his books.

With regard to the allegation that "Watson" was educated at Oxford, it must be noticed that no person of that name has yet been identified as having belonged to any college there at a suitable date. The allegation is solely based upon the fact that a short Latin verse prefixed to "Tullies Love," 1589 (a pamphlet published by Bacon in the name "Greene"), is printed as by "Thomas Watson Oxon." The use of the term "Oxon" was most probably owing to the fact that a Catholic Bishop of Lincoln named Thomas Watson, educated at Cambridge, died in 1584 at Wisbeach Castle, where he had been in confinement for several years. This Bishop was author of several works, including a play called "Absalom," the MS. of which is or was in

the possession of the Pembroke family at Penshurst. Bacon probably used the word "Oxon" to avoid any inference that Bishop Watson wrote the "Watson" poems.

The internal evidence of the "Watson" writings seems to confirm their Baconian origin. "The Passionate Century of Love" contains several distinctly Baconian phrases.

Take one:—

"But how bold soever I have been in turning out this my pettie poor stocke upon the open common of the wide world."

Take another:—

"Homer in mentioning the swiftness of the winde maketh his verse to runne in posthaste all upon dactilus."

It will be remembered that Ben Jonson walked to Scotland about the year 1617, and in his conversations with the poet Drummond, of Hawthornden, is recorded that at his hither-coming Sir Francis Bacon had remarked to Jonson, "He loved not to see poesy go on other feet than poetical dactylus and spondæus." The following seems to be another:—

In one of the prefaces referred to "Watson" wrote, "Therefore if I rough-hewe my verse." In Webster's Dictionary the example for "rough-hewe" is given from "Shakespeare" for "rough-hewn" from Bacon. We also find the word "rough-hewe" in the biliteral cipher story.

In Sonnet 9 of the "Passionate Century," 1582, there is a reference to the "marigold," the favourite flower of Marguerite of Navarre. A similar reference is in Lyly's "Euphues his England," and in the cipher story we learn of Bacon's unsuccessful love affair with Marguerite, who was sister of the French King. The

"Passionate Century" contains a number of sonnets on the subject of "my love is past," which would suitably follow the failure of the courtship by Francis of Marguerite in 1578.

In the 4th Sonnet is an exercise in the Greek figure of rhetoric "Anadiplosis," one of those discussed in the "Arte of English Poesie." Mr. Rushton gives examples of the use in "Shakespeare" of twenty other of the figures of rhetoric explained in the "Arte."

The 47th Sonnet is used bodily in the early play of "The Spanish Tragedy" written by Bacon, but fathered upon Kyd.

The 53rd Sonnet deals with the subject of the Labyrinth of Crete and the guiding thread by which it might be entered and quitted. Bacon, in several places in his acknowledged and elsewhere in his "vizard" writings, refers to this Labyrinth, which seems to have greatly impressed him. One of his unpublished tracts is entitled "Filum Labyrinthi," and it is evident that his scheme of literary production was upon Labyrinthine lines.

In other places in the Watson writings are to be found such Baconian expressions as "Winter's blast," "nipping frost," "swelling seas," "the vulgar sorte," "swelling pride," "sea of teares," "Titan," "hapless case," "extremest justice," "void of equity," "smokie sighs," "fickle fortune," "surging seas," "thousand cares."

"The Teare of Fancie" has the line, "Go idle rhymes unpolished rude and base," which resembles the lines prefixed to the "Shepheard's Calendar":—

> "Go little booke thyself presents
> As one whose parent is unkent."

In the "Arraignment of Paris" (1584), attributed to Peele, a variety of metres is employed. In the

"Shepheard's Calendar" Bacon (under the subriquet of E. K., in the glosse) mentions Theocritus, Virgil, Mantuanus, Petrarch, Boccacio, Marot, Sanazasso, "and also diverse other excellent, both Italian and French poets whose footing this author everywhere followeth." "Spenser" and "Watson" therefore adopted like methods of acquiring facility in verse-making. As Spenser was a "vizard" for Bacon, so it is fairly evident was "Watson."

At an early stage in his development Bacon had mastered the mysteries of style. "Style," said he in the "Arte of English Poesie," "is as the subject matter." It is most interesting to see the early evidence in "Watson" of the readiness in which he could change his style. In the Eglogue to Walsingham we have:—

Corydon:

"But I must sorrow in a lower vaine,
Not like to thee whose words have wings at will
An humble style befits a simple swaine.
My muse shall pipe but on an oaten quill."

In another place:—

"But Tityeus enough, leave a while;
Stop mourning springs, drie up thy drearie line,
And blithely entertain my altered stile."

The "Watson" writings are very evidently the work of Francis Bacon; much of it early work, but none the less important. He and he alone was the law student of London who had at an early date visited Paris and was the courtier whose association with the Queen and her chief ministers was so close and intimate. He it was who had perfected himself in the literature of ancient Greece and Rome, of Italy, France and England, and who had taken all knowledge for his providence.

Suffering is considered by many necessary to the

making of a truly great poet. That Bacon suffered and was baffled in his efforts through life we know full well.

He was unhappy in his first love. He was refused due recognition as the eldest (because base begotten) son of the Queen. He had great difficulty in preserving his health, in maintaining a position for himself, and even in avoiding treachery and death. That he alternately desired and shunned death can be gleaned from his life history as it becomes more open to us.

The Sonnet 44 in the "Tears of Fancie," published in the name of "Watson," has therefore significance :—

"Long have I sued to fortune death and love
But fortune love nor death will deign to hear me
I fortunes frown deaths spite loves horror prove
And must in love despairing live I feare me."

PARKER WOODWARD.

NOTES.

Carmina Paulus emit, recitat sua carmina Paulus
Nam quod emit, posse dicere quisquis suum.
—*De Officiis. Cicero.*

IN my work "Bacon, Shakespeare and the Rosicrucians," published in 1888, I advanced the theory that Christopher Sly, (brought into the Induction of the *Taming of the Shrew*), was a side portrait, parallel or analogy, for an impostor, wearing "the giant's robe," and set up by the very person whose part he is made to play, in a position he had not the least title to, and that, too, in relation to the theatre and actors, of which he becomes the pseudo patron and spectator, *so long as the play lasts.* Baconians postulate the theory, Shakespeare was another Christopher Sly, wearing borrowed robes, and from his accident of theatrical impresario, finding

himself in the position to father plays sent to him for acting purposes. Since this theory was brought forward I have found, that a man of the name of Sly was associated with Shakespeare, in the theatrical licence of 1603 from King James the First. It must be obvious, (allowing the hypothesis to be examined?), that an author levelling his ironical portraiture at Shakespeare, would seek *to come as near him as possible without revealing his actual name*, for, as the plays were tacitly permitted to be issued under his authorship, the latter course would be impossible. In short, we find Shakespeare had a sleeping partner in his theatrical enterprise, and after his own name of Shakespeare, nobody could come nearer him, nothing could indicate him better, than the other sharer in this partnership of lordship of the theatre and actors. In his, *Geneologica Shakespeareana*, French says :—

"William Sly, a comedian, supposed to be the original actor of 'Osric' in *Hamlet*, was joined with Shakespeare in the licence of 1603, from King James. In relation to the conspiracy of John Somerville against Queen Elizabeth in 1583, 'an examination of Thomas Slye of Bushwood was made before John Throckmorton and Robert Burgoyne touching Popish Plots.' (Lemon's *State Papers*, Eliz. 1581-1590. Page 128.) Thomas Sly of Lapworth and his wife Susanna were witnesses to the will of Thomas Shakespeare, of that place, fuller, who appointed Thomas Sly, 'his kinsman,' to be one of the overseers to his will, proved May 18, 1658. Edward Slye was of Stratford, 7 James I. 1610."

It seems very improbable that Shakespeare should have chosen a name for satire and ridicule so closely allied with his profession and his family as that of Sly? At Rowington we find (in Warwickshire) Shakespeares and Slys lying in the same churchyard, and there are grounds for strong supposition that these two families

inter-married. Mr. French shows how, there were Slys at Lapworth, Stratford-on-Avon, and other places, connected with the name of Shakespeare. It seems to be quite possible that had William Sly been the leading or prominent partner in the theatrical licence of 1603, and William Shakespeare the second fiddle, we should never have heard of the name of Shakespeare at all, except, perhaps, in this Induction to the *Taming of the Shrew?*

Objectors to the Baconian authorship of the plays, upon the grounds of its strangeness, or improbability, need to be reminded that the thing is really old, as we find in the charge the poet Horace brings against Paulus—that "*He buys poems and recites them as his own,*" *for, as, Horace ironically remarks,* "*For whatever is bought anyone can call his own*" (*Officiis*).

How exactly Ben Jonson, in his poem, "ON POET APE," (Epigrams), repeats this charge against someone, who Chalmers, (an editor of the plays), *was convinced was Shakspeare.*

> Poor Poet Ape that would be thought our chief,
> Whose works are e'en the frippery of wit,
> From brokage is become so bold a thief,
> As we, the robb'd, leave rage, and pity it.
> At first he made low shifts, would pick and glean,
> *Buy the reversion of old plays;* now grown
> To a little wealth, and credit in the scene,
> He takes up all, makes each manuscript his own,
> And, told of this, he slights it. Tut, such crimes,
> The sluggish, gaping auditor devours;
> He marks not whose 'twas first. *And after times*
> *May judge it to be his as well as ours!*

The footnote to this poem, in W. Gifford's edition of Ben Jonson's works, is interesting, and as it was penned prior to the year 1816, before the Bacon theory was started, it is worth repeating.

"*Poor Poet Ape Etc.* Mr. Chalmers *will take it on his death*, that the person here meant is Shakespeare."—(Ben Jonson's Works, W. Gifford, Vol. VIII. page 181.)

This poem was written with reference to a "*chief*" among the poets of the time.

> O imitatores, servum pecus, ut mihi saepe
> Bilem, saepe vocum vestri movere tumultus.
>
> —*Horace Epistolæ I., xix.* 19.

> Mean, miserable apes! the wit you make
> Oft gives my heart, and oft my sides, an ache.
>
> —*Conington.*

> The trade of others is replete,
> As others are with fraud and cheat,
> Such cheats as scholars put upon
> Other men's reason, and their own;
> A sort of drapery to ensconce
> Absurdity and ignorance.

In the church registers of Lapworth, in Warwickshire, are to be found repeated entries of the name of Sly and Shakespeare. Here is one borrowed from the pages of "A Warwickshire Parish," by Robert Hudson, 1904. The year is 1617 (16th February).

> "Johannis Shackspur et Maria Lucett, matromonis,
> Copulat. fuerunt Decimo sexto Februarii.
> Jocosa filia Edmond Sly baptizat, proximo
> die Marcii, et sepulta vicesimo die Maii.
> (20th day of May). (Page 152).

In these published registers there are carefully compiled figures showing how often certain family names recur. We find that, between the years 1561 and 1569, there are six entries of the name of Shakespeare—Shakesper (spelt ten different ways), and between 1590 and 1599 there are nine entries of the name. Total, 15 in 17 years. The name Slye [Slie, Sley, Sly] occurs six times in these same parish registers of Lapworth—six times between the years 1561 and 1569, seven times

between 1570 and 1579, eight times between 1580, and 1589, nine times between 1590 and 1599 (see page 303). Total, thirty entries during a period of less than forty years. "There were at this time, as shown by the register, certainly not less than four families of Sly in the parish, so that the name is one of the commonest." Not far from Lapworth is Knowle, and in the year 1506 appears in the register of members of the Guild of St. Anne, of Knowle, this:—

> "Rogerus Sley et Margareta uxor ejus de Lapworthe,
> Dnus Thomas Sly, Capellanus Cantarie de Lapworthe.
> (Page 83).

The last is Sir Thomas Sly, a relative of the above Roger Sly, who lived at Bromehall, and according to the author of "A Warwickshire Parish," was quite a gentleman, who lived in a patriarchal way on the best of terms with his neighbours. It will be observed that Christopher Sly in the Induction to the play of *The Taming of the Shrew*, makes a boast of his ancestry.

> Y'are a baggage, the Sly's are no rogues. Look in the Chronicles, we came in with Richard Conquerer.—Induction.

Perhaps Christopher Sly had heard of Roger Sly and Sir Thomas Sly, and that their names were entered upon the list of members of the *Guild of Saint Anne of Knowle?* It would seem as if the author of the play had something of this knowledge in his mind, for he makes Sly *swear by this saint!*

> *First Servant.*—My Lord, you nod; you do not mind the play.
> *Sly.—Yes, by Saint Anne do I.*
> —End of Scene i., Act I., *Taming of the Shrew*

It is interesting to find, in this same book of "A Warwickshire Parish," a letter addressed to Sir Nicholas Bacon, father of Francis Bacon (applying for a Writ of Subpæna in an action brought against the risk of alienation, against Thomas Grymshaw, of Packwood), written by members of this parish of Lapworth.

To the Right Honourable Sir Nicholas Bacon (Knight); Lord Keeper of the Great Seal of England :—

"In most humble wise complaining shew unto your Lordship your daily orators Humphrey Gower, William Ashby, George Walker, *Thomas Sly*, etc., etc., etc." (page 89).

This letter is without date, is endorsed "Bill unto the Chancery versus Thomas Grymshaw." Sir Nicholas Bacon was Lord Keeper between the years 1558 and 1578. In the church of Knowle there existed, (according to Dugdale's "Warwickshire"), the arms of the Belknap family, *a ladder placed against a Beacon*, on some of the stained glass windows. Philip Cooke, born in 1454, and son of Sir Thomas Cooke, of Gidea Hall, Essex, married Elizabeth, the daughter of Sir Henry Belknap, and sister and co-heiress of Sir Edward Belknap, by whom he had John Cooke, of Gidea Hall, Essex, who died in 1515, leaving by his wife a son, Sir Anthony Cooke, born 1504, preceptor to King Edward the Sixth and the grandfather of Francis Bacon. Sir Edward Belknap owned land in Warwickshire, and I think they are his arms that Dugdale depicts upon one of his plates. It is, in this neighbourhood of Knowle, that we get the earliest mention of the name of Shakespeare, at Temple Balsall, Rowington and Wroxhall. The last prioress of the Abbey of Wroxhall (which is quite close to Knowle), was Isabella Shakespeare, who is supposed, by Tom Burgess (in his "Historic Warwickshire") to have been the original of Isabella in *Measure for Measure.*

Among the laudatory pieces, published directly after the death of Lord Bacon in the year 1626, entitled *Manes Verulamiani*, which have already appeared in the Bacon Journal, is the following, in which *Francis Bacon is compared to the tenth Muse*, and Apollo is told he must remain content with being the ninth :—

"MANES VERULAMIANI,"

20.

IN OBITUM EJUSDEM, ETC.

Si nisi qui dignus, nemo tua fata (Bacone)
Fleret, erit nullus, credito nullus erit.
Plangite jam verè Clio, Cliûsque sorores.
Ah decima occubuit musa, decusque chori.
Ah nunquam verè infælix prius ipsus Apollo!
Unde illi qui sic illum amet alter erit?
Ah numerum non est habiturus; jamque necesse est
Contentus musis ut sit Apollo novem.

In this poem Clio is told to complain, and the sisters of Clio, because the *tenth Muse has fallen*, and the glory of the Muses. That is to say, Bacon is not only compared to Apollo but supposed to outshine him as the leader.

A most striking parallel to this threne is presented in the Sonnets, also connected with Apollo.

How can my muse want subject to invent,
While thou dost breathe, that pour'st into my verse
Thine own sweet argument, too excellent
In every vulgar paper to rehearse?
O, give thyself the thanks, if aught in me
Worthy perusal stand against thy sight;
For who's so dumb that cannot write to thee,
When thou thyself dost give invention light?
Be thou the tenth muse, ten times more in worth,
Than those old nine which rhymers invocate.—xxxviii.

Apollo was the god of the sun, hence the allusion to light in the sonnet, and he is described as the leader of the choir of the Muses, by the surname Musagets. Amongst these muses were the muses of tragedy and comedy, of lyric poetry, and of epic poetry, as well as of history.

W. F. C. WIGSTON.

FOOTNOTES (FOR "THE TENTH MUSE.")

In the Lady Chapel of Worcester Cathedral was an epitaph prepared by Bishop Thornborough (fourteen years before his

death in 1691, at the age of ninety-four). The epitaph is as follows :—

Denarius Philosophorum Dum Spiro, Spero.

On the other side :—

In uno, 2°, 3°, 4°, 10° non Spirans, Sperabo.

A writer comments upon this as follows :—"The *monad*, or unit, in the Pythagorean philosophy, was not only the point whence all extension proceeds, but it further symbolised the first principle. The *decad* represented the line, bounded by two points, or *monads*. The *triad* stood for surface, or space, as length and breadth. The *tetrad* for the perfect figure the cube, containing length, breadth, *and depth*. The *Decad* or *Denarius* (the number ten) was used summarily for the whole science of numbers.

Observe that the sum of the first four figures constituting the cube or solid is:—1+2+3+4=10. Also it will be noted that the number *ten* is the first numeral of *double figures*, indicating a *second series of the first series*, and thus, by analogy, a second life, or new birth. Bishop Thornborough was addicted to Alchemy, and in the year 1621 put forth a book, entitled, "Dithothecoricos, *sive Nihil aliquid Omnia, etc.*" There can be no question that the figure ten is associated here with the hope of immortality, or second life, and it probably is applied to Bacon in a similar sense, *with regard to literature*, as one who, in "Ben Jonson's" words, "*had filled up all numbers.*"

WAS FRANCIS BACON CONNECTED WITH THE ROWINGTON AND BLACKFRIARS PROPERTIES AFTERWARDS ACQUIRED BY SHAKSPER?

IN the biographies of the Stratford Shaksper we find much said of his wealth in real estate, but if we read carefully the original documents relating to these different pieces of property we will discover a string tied to them, and if we follow the string or

thread of the Shaksperian labyrinth to its very centre we find some member of the Bacon family connected with it! See p. 595, 2nd Edition of Halliwell-Phillipps' "Outlines," where an "Extract from the Court Rolls of the Manor of Rowington, being the surrender from Walter Getley to Shaksper of premises in Chapel Lane, Stratford-on-Avon, 1602," is to be found in the original Latin. Halliwell-Phillipps (*Ibid.*, p. 129) comments as follows on this document:—

"On Sept. the 28th, 1602, at a Court Baron of the Manor of Rowington, one Walter Getley transferred to the poet a cottage and garden which were situated in Chapel Lane, opposite the lower grounds of New Place. . . . It appears from the roll that Shaksper did not attend the manorial Court then held at Rowington, there being a stipulation that the estate should remain in the hands of the Lady of the Manor until he appeared in person to complete the transaction with the usual formalities. At a later period, he was admitted to the copyhold and then he surrendered it to the use of himself for life, with a remainder to his two daughters in fee."

The Lady of the Manor who held the Rowington property was none other than Ann Russell, Countess of Warwick, whose brother, Sir John Russell, had married Bacon's beautiful aunt Elizabeth! I say emphatically that the most important documents yet discovered in the Shakesperian field connect the name of the Bacon family with that of Shaksper. The Northumberland Manuscript was a magnificent "find," wherein the names of Francis Bacon, in juxtaposition with that of William Shakespeare, is written many times by their contemporary John Davies, of Hereford. Two of the Shakespeare plays are mentioned in this manuscript, as well as a verse from "Lucrece"; also a "Device" composed by Bacon for his friend Essex, which was

played before the Queen (see Spedding's "Life and Letters of Bacon," Vol. I.). And when we come to the celebrated Blackfriars property purchased by Shaksper, we find that this property also belonged to the Bacon family. Matthew Bacon, of Gray's Inn, owned it in 1590 and sold it to one Henry Walker, of London, a musician, for £100 in 1604." In connection with this property Halliwell-Phillipps, in his "Outlines," 2nd ed., p. 161, says: "The premises referred to, situated within one or two hundred yards to the east of the Blackfriars Theatre, were bought by the poet for the sum of £140, and for some reason or other, he was so intent on its acquisition that he permitted a considerable amount, £60, of the purchase money to remain on mortgage. That reason can hardly be found in the notion that the property was merely a desirable investment, for it would appear to have been purchased at a somewhat extravagant rate, the vendor, one Henry Walker, a London musician, having paid but £100 for it in 1604."

In a note on p. 299, *Ibid.*, Halliwell-Phillipps has the following: "The estate came to Matthew Bacon, then or afterwards of Gray's Inn, in the year 1590, in pursuance of some friendly arrangements, and it was sold by him to Henry Walker in 1604 for the sum of £100. See p. 630, *Ibid.*, where a copy of this indenture is given in full. The original was owned by Halliwell-Phillipps and purchased from his collection by Mr. Marsden J. Perry, of Providence, Rhode Island. I find, after years of research, that a Mathias Bacon was admitted to the Society of Gray's Inn in 1597, *sine fine* (without paying the usual fee). Could this Mathias Bacon have been the holder of the Blackfriars property which was afterwards acquired by Shaksper? There is reason for this belief, because in the original deed of bargain and sale of the Blackfriars property, he is referred to as "Mathie

Bacon of Graies Inn, in the Countie of Middlesex, gentleman." Mathias is, I believe, the Greek form of Matthew. That he was admitted to Gray's Inn *sine fine* shows that he had some great influence back of him.* In this same Blackfriars deed "Anne Bacon, Widowe," is mentioned. Anne was the name of Francis Bacon's mother, who became a widow in 1579 and died in 1610. Anne Bacon was the name of his half-sister. His half-brother, Sir Nicholas Bacon, married Anne Butts, of Thornage. They had nine sons and three daughters. Their daughter Anne married Robert Drury, and Francis Bacon's half-brother, Nathanial Bacon, married Anne, daughter of Sir Thomas Gresham, Kt. Sir Nathanial had a daughter Anne also, who married Sir Thomas Meantrys, Bacon's secretary. Bacon's half-brother Edward had a daughter Anne also, which proves that the name Anne was a favourite one in the Bacon family.

Shaksper did not redeem the Blackfriars mortgage and "the legal estate remained with the trustees until 1618." John Heminge was one of the trustees named in this deed. Could this John Heminge have been the actor and alleged co-editor of the first folio to whom Shaksper left thirty shillings in his will for a mourning ring?

BASIL BROWN.

CONCERNING THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE SHAKESPEARE PLAYS.

IN attempting to settle the chronology of the Shakespeare Plays, the commentators have all assumed, as a matter of course, that the author of the Plays was one William Shaksper, or Shakspere, a native of Stratford-on-Avon, who came up to London about

* See Greys Inn Admission Register, 1596 (Folio 358).

1586, became an actor and shareholder in certain theatres, retired to Stratford, and died in 1616. Any evidence as to the original date of a given Play which is incompatible with the known dates of this man's career must, of course, be explained away so long as this theory of authorship is held. But it appears to me that there is evidence relating to the chronology of the Plays, which cannot be explained away, going to show that certain Plays were in existence before William Shakspere could have begun his dramatic career, and, on the other hand, that certain of the Plays known as "Shakespeare's" were, if not written, at least revised, after the time of the death of the supposed author.

The subject has been ably—and to me convincingly—treated by Dr. Theobald in his "Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light," by Prof. Courthope in his "History of English Poetry," and by the late the Rev. Mr. Begley in BACONIANA. Their position has been ably—but to me unconvincingly—opposed by Mr. Greenwood in his interesting and most valuable and scholarly book, "The Shakespeare Problem Re-stated." It may be only pride and vainglory that lead me to believe that I can add anything to the strength of the former three gentlemen's arguments, but those are infirmities to which we are all liable, and I will make the attempt.

I will begin with the consideration of the date of *Twelfth Night.*

The first mention we have of this Play is that in the Diary of John Manningham, who saw it performed in the hall of the Middle Temple, January 2, 1602. As his description of the Play is quite specific and minute, it has naturally been assumed by the commentators that it was then a new Play, and consequently a date shortly preceding this has been determined upon as that of its origin. Manningham's description certainly gives the im-

pression at first sight that he had been witnessing something quite new, but any such impression as this must, of course, give way before positive proof that the Play was in existence long before. It may well have been new to Manningham even if it had been written and performed many years before and if the production he saw was a revival.

In 1905 I sent to *Notes and Queries* the following, which appeared in the issue of Jan. 7, Vol. III., Sec. 10, p. 7 :—

Tarleton, the Sign of "The Tabor," and St. Bennet's Church. In *Twelfth Night*, III. i., we have :—

Viola.—Save thee, friend, and thy music: dost thou live by thy tabor?

Clown.—No, sir, I live by the church.

Viola.—Art thou a churchman?

Clown.—No such matter, sir: I do live by the church; for I live at my house, and my house doth stand by the church.

In Act V. i. 42, the Clown says: "The bells of Saint Bennet, sir, may put you in mind."

Malone stated that "The Tabor" was the sign of an eating-house kept by Tarleton, the celebrated clown or fool of the theatre before Shakespeare's time. Boswell said that Malone was mistaken, and that the sign of Tarleton's house was "The Saba," meaning the Queen of Sheba.—See Boswell's "Malone's Variorum," 1821.

In a recent pamphlet it is stated that Malone was right; that Tarleton's house was at "The Sign of the Tabor"; and that, moreover, it was next to St. Bennet's Church in Gracechurch Street or Gracious Street. If this is true the two passages quoted would seem to be most interesting topical allusions, and tend to fix a much earlier date for the play than is usually assigned to it. What are the facts, so far as can be ascertained? Was it "The Tabor"? And was there a St. Bennet's Church in Gracious Street?—*Quirinus.*

This elicited the following replies (Vol. III., Sec. 10, p. 55) :—

Tarleton, the Sign of "The Tabor," and St. Bennet's Church (Sec. 10, III. 7). The church of St. Bennet, or more properly St. Benet, stood on the east side of Gracechurch Street, at the corner of Fenchurch Street. I do not know the exact date of its demolition, but it was standing in 1856. Its site is now partly or wholly occupied by the roadway of Fenchurch Street, which was widened when the church was removed.—WILLIAM HUGHES, 62, Palace Road, Streatham Hill.

St. Benet, Gracechurch, was "called Grasschurch, of the Herb Market there kept" (Stow). The church, built previous to 1190, was destroyed at the Great Fire (1666), and re-erected in 1685 from the designs of Sir Christopher Wren. It was pulled down about thirty-five years ago. Cunningham says, "The yard of the 'Cross Keys Inn' in Gracechurch Street was one of our early theatres."—EVERARD HOME COLEMAN.

And Vol. III., Sec. 10, p. 73:—

Tarleton, the Sign of "The Tabor," and St. Bennet's Church (Sec. 10, III., 7, 55). As the distinguishing marks of Patch the fool were his fantastic costume and his bauble, so the wandering clown mounted his platform to the strumming of his tabor, from which he was inseparable. Hence the probabilities are all in favour of the sign of Dick Tarleton, actor and clown, having been "The Tabor" and not "The Saba," although "The Saba" is printed, I believe, in an early edition of Tarleton's "Jests," where, however, its pointlessness compared with "The Tabor" suggests that it is a misprint for the latter. In the passage in *Twelfth Night*, quoted by "Quirinus," the clown's reply to Viola's question, "Dost thou live by the tabor?" imputes a second possible interpretation of the question, namely, "Dost thou live by (the sign of) the tabor?" Viola's real meaning having been, "Dost thou gain thy living in the calling of which the tabor is the symbol?"

St. Benet's Church was one of the twenty-nine City churches pointed out for erasement in 1854. It was completed by Wren in 1685. Daniell, in his "London Churches," says that the church stood at the corner of Fenchurch Street and Gracechurch Street. It was a living united with that of St. Leonard, Eastcheap. The church was curiously planned, like many other of Wren's churches, to fill every inch of an irregular site.—J. HOLDEN MACMICHAEL.

There does not seem to be any reasonable doubt that the sign of Tarleton's tavern was "The Tabor" and not "The Saba," and that being the case it seems impossible to escape the conviction that the Play was written with a view to having the part of Feste, "the allowed fool," performed by Dick Tarleton. Of course the audience would have been well aware of his association with "The Tabor," and would have enjoyed the topical hit. But Tarleton died in September, 1588.

"This individual, the 'pleasant Willy' of Spenser, who died in September, 1588, was the most popular comedian of the day, one of those instinctive humorists who have merely to show their faces to be greeted with roars of merriment."—Halliwell-Phillipps' "Outlines," 10th edition, p. 93.

It seems impossible that this conversation between Viola and the fool should not involve a topical allusion; otherwise there is no special point in it. But knowing the character of Dick Tarleton and his popularity with the audience of the time, and considering the delight with which allusions of this kind concerning a popular favourite are always received by an audience—especially by the groundlings and the gallery gods—it seems, at least to me, impossible, in view of the number of pertinent allusions, not to believe that the character of Feste was written for Tarleton. This, of course, carries the date of the Play back at least to 1588, or nearly to the time which the Shakespeare commentators and biographers have settled upon as that of the exodus of William Shakspere from Stratford. But *Twelfth Night* surely is not one of the earliest of the Plays? It represents the full maturity of the author's genius. *Love's Labour's Lost, The Two Gentlemen of Verona, The Comedy of Errors, The Taming of the Shrew, King John, Richard the Second, Richard the Third,* and the three parts of *Henry VI.*—leaving *Titus Andronicus* out of

account—must have preceded it; also, according to all modern reckonings, *A Midsummer-Night's Dream, The Merchant of Venice, The Merry Wives of Windsor, Romeo and Juliet, Julius Cæsar,* and *Hamlet.*

In 1588 the young man from Stratford would have been twenty-four years old. Of course many things have been done by many men before the age of twenty-four—witness the record of Keats for instance—but never quite such things as the Stratfordian authorship of the Plays calls for in this case. The evident facts, in this instance alone, seem sufficient absolutely to exclude any such theory, when we take into account even the few undisputed facts in the life of the putative author. Francis Bacon at this time was twenty-seven. We know him to have been very precocious, and for several years previous to this date we are unable to trace any details of his life. It is a blank. We cannot determine what he was doing. So far as education, time, and opportunity go he had ample to have accomplished all this work.

Of course I do not claim that "Bacon wrote Shakespeare," a phrase of which one becomes rather tired, but it does go to show that the authorship by the man of Stratford is impossible, while it leaves the question of the Baconian authorship open.

There are a number of matters connected with the chronology of the Plays, all pointing in the same direction, which I hope to lay before the readers of BACONIANA if the Editor can give me space.

ISAAC HULL PLATT.

BACON IN THE SONNETS.

I NOTE in BACONIANA for October, 1908, Mr. Fred C. Hunt's criticism of my paper, "The Grave's Tiring-Room," found in the April and July issues. It would have been well if Mr. Hunt had waited until I had put in my evidence, as thus far I have been but outlining the field of the Sonnets, and so indicate in my paper. To instance, and with a touch of evidence, Sonnet 29 opens thus:

> "When in disgrace with fortune and men's eyes,
> I all alone beweep my outcast state."

Mr. Hunt admits that Francis Bacon wrote this Sonnet. We say it concerns his fall in 1621. Every phase of Bacon's fall appearing in *his* letters and papers appears also in the Sonnets, and belies their date. In a subsequent letter, Bacon, as to this "outcast state," says: "Time hath turned envy to pity [note "pity" in Sonnet 111], and I have had a long cleansing week of five years' expiation and more. Sir John Bennet hath his pardon; my Lord of Somerset hath his pardon, and they say shall sit in Parliament. My Lord of Suffolk cometh to Parliament, though not to Council. I hope I deserve not to be the only outcast." (Bacon's letters by Sped., Vol. VII., p. 549).

Does not this Sonnet 29 refer to the same identical trouble set out in Sonnets 111, 88, 89, 90, 121, 125, 140, 147, and others?

To instance again, and with evidence, in Sonnet 72 we have:

> "My name be buried where my body is,
> And live no more to shame nor me nor you."

Upon his fall Bacon at once made his will, which opens thus:

> "I bequeath my soul to God above by the oblation of my Saviour.

My body to be buried obscurely.
My name to the next ages and to foreign nations."

In his last will we have :

"For my name and memory I leave it to men's charitable speeches and to foreign nations and the next ages." (Bacon's Letters, Vol. VII., pp. 228 and 539. See Sonnet 55 as to "next ages.")

In the first will only the body is to be "buried obscurely," while in the Sonnet the name is to be buried where the body is. And so we would prefer not to be brushed to the ash-pit by Mr. Hunt's unsustained conclusions ere we have made our entry.

Did Bacon write no Sonnets after 1609? What trouble to 1609—the antedate—had Francis Bacon to warrant the use by him of language such as is found in the mentioned Sonnets? Let them here be read in full, please. Bacon's words, in Sonnet 111, can never be so tortured as to support Mr. Hunt's indefinite presentation. The branding of the name as to the external, and the desire for "pity" and "renewal" as to the internal, will never yield to his cue.

The death of Bacon's father, the bar will be my bier, and the Essex trial, will, jumbled or separate, never explain to the thoughtful reader the "outcast state" of Sonnet 29; the "My name be buried where my body is" of Sonnet 72; the "I can set down a story of faults conceal'd wherein I am attainted" of Sonnet 88; the "To set a form upon desired change" of Sonnet 89; the "Now, while the world is bent my deeds to cross" of Sonnet 90; the "No, I am that I am, and they that level at my abuses reckon up their own" of Sonnet 121; and the

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

of Sonnet 125. We say Bacon's impeachment was the "brand" of Sonnet 111. We give evidence; does Mr. Hunt yield any?

Will Mr. Hunt inform the reader to whom the word "thou" in Sonnets 88, 89, and 90 alludes, if not to the King? See also Sonnets 34, 35, 49, 57, 58, 113, 118, 139, 140, and 147. Did not the King set Bacon right? Again, was not Bacon, as stated in Sonnet 88, attainted? Did he not, with his own hand, set down the particular detailed story of the faults concealed for which he was attainted, as stated in the Sonnet? If Mr. Hunt does not know where to find it we will point it out to him. Was not the King "foresworn," as stated in the Sonnet, in that he promised Bacon pardon if the Peers failed to recognise his merit on his voluntary submission, thus abandoning his defence? Neither the King nor Buckingham, fearing its disclosures, purposed to have it made. Note Sonnet 66, which applies to Buckingham. Do not the minutes of the House show this particular interview with the King? See Bacon's statement upon the interview in my former paper, page 157.

Upon Bacon's leaving the King (see Sonnets 113 and 57), touching the words "That thou, in losing me, shall win much glory" of Sonnet 88, we quote Bacon's letter to Buckingham at the time of his sentence, thus:

"My very good Lord,—

I hear yesterday was a day of very great honour to his Majesty, which I do congratulate. I hope, also, his Majesty may reap honour out of my adversity, as he hath done strength out of my prosperity. His Majesty knoweth best his own ways, and for me to despair of him were a sin not to be forgiven. I thank God I have overcome the bitterness of this cup by Christian resolution, so that worldly matters are but mint and cumin. God ever preserve you." (Bacon's Letters, Vol. VII., p. 282.)

Just before his fall he ends a letter to the King in these words:

"I have been ever your man, and counted myself but an usufructuary of myself, the property being yours; and now

making myself an oblation to do with me as may best conduce to the honor of your justice, the honor of your mercy, and the use of your service, resting as clay in your Majesty's gracious hands. "FR. ST. ALBANS, CANC."

—Bacon's Letters, Vol. VII., p. 226.

See in this connection Sonnets 26, 49, 57, and 58, and the words "To thee I so belong" in Sonnet 88. And did Bacon write this Sonnet prior to 1609? Mr. Hunt admits that he wrote them all. As to Bacon's word "oblation" found in our last quotation, see his word "oblation" to the King in Sonnet 125. Note the word "fortune" in Sonnets 25, 29, 37, 90, and 111, and in Bacon's Letters, Vol. VII., p. 218. Language features must, however, come later. The studious reader will do the writer a kindness if he will now read thoughtfully, and in full, all of the Sonnets referred to in this paper. The Sonnets are the true door to the entry of the Baconian mansion, unless you enter by cypher. See Sonnet 107.

Mr. Hunt at once throws mystery and doubt upon the 1609 date of the Sonnets when he tells us that the same edition was so printed as at the same time to be sold by two different persons and at different places. See what Hudson says of this in his introduction to the Sonnets. Note their title-page enigma, T. T.

This is not the only instance of the want of straight methods with title pages at this period and a little earlier, let it be noted by Mr. Hunt; and this, whether considered criminal or otherwise. As, in the plays, Bacon stands behind an assumed name; so, in the Sonnets, he stands behind an assumed date; and both name and date are but shields, and have stood now, as masks, nearly 300 years.

Mr. Hunt has no difficulty in accepting the first deception. If he ask, Can I make absolute proof that the date is wrong? I ask, Can he make absolute proof that the name is wrong?

It is not stated in his paper that the Sonnets purchased by Alleyn were the Shakespeare Sonnets, and if they were, see page 156 of my paper in the July issue. Want of space in the magazine makes me thus brief. To conclude, as the Sonnets are each a T.T., a tom-tit, a scholar's egg, for the unfoldment of light touching its author; so an egg will yield its meat, only upon cracking the shell. J. E. ROE.

South Lima, N.Y., U.S.A., Dec. 5th, 1908.

SOMETHING MORE ABOUT JUSTICE SHALLOW.

SINCE putting together a few notes on *The Merry Wives* for the last number of BACONIANA, I have come across further facts germane to the matter. Mr. John Hutchinson, in BACONIANA, January, 1908, put this question: "Is it not conceivable that Sir Charles Percy . . . may have come upon him (Justice Shallow) down Dumbleton way?" I find that Sir Charles actually alludes to Shallow in a letter quoted in the "Academy," February 6th, 1875. R. Simpson writes the article on "Shakespeare's Centurie of Praise," by Dr. C. M. Ingleby, and says: "A thin document that should come into Dr. Ingleby's next edition is a letter from Sir Charles Percy to Mr. Carlington (Carlton?) of December 27th, 1601.* Sir Charles had accompanied the Earls of Essex and Southampton into Ireland and was now returned to his Manor of Dumbleton, in Gloucestershire.

"'Mr. Carlington, I am so pestered with country business that I shall not be able as yet to come to London. If I stay here long in this fashion I think at my return you will find me so dull that I shall be taken

* Record Office; Domestic Eliz. of that date.

for Justice Silence or Justice Shallow. Wherefore I am to entreat you . . . take pity on me and as occurrences shall serve, to send me such news from time to time as shall happen; the knowledge of the which, though perhaps they will not exempt me from the opinion of a Justice Shallow at London, yet, I will assure you, they will make me pass for a very sufficient gentleman in Gloucestershire.' "

So much for the letter; then Simpson goes on to say:

"Can Sir Charles have been the object of any occult chaffing when Falstaff enquires: 'What said Master Dumbleton about the satin for my short cloak and my slops?' " (2 *Henry IV.*, I. ii.) Was is possible that the writer of that passage inserted the name of Dumbleton for fun in allusion to the remark made in his letter? Anyway the remarks of Percy are full of interest.

And now let us turn to *The Merry Wives* and see how Justice Shallow is described upon his first entrance.

Slender.—"In the County of Gloucestershire Justice of Peace and *Coram*.

Shallow.—Ay, Cousin Slender, and *Custalorum*.

Slender.—Ay, and *Ratolorum* too: and a gentleman born."

—Act I., Sc. i.

With these words in our mind's eye suppose we open Francis Bacon at his Law Tracts, and read in his "Office of Constables," "answers to the questions propounded by Sir Alex. Hay Knt. touching that Office (1608)."

The Office of Justice of Peace.

(After describing "Certain Gentlemen" who receive a Commission under the Great Seal to preserve the Peace, etc., Bacon says: "The chief of them is called *Custos rotulorum;* in whose custody, etc., etc. . . . Others there are of that number called Justices of Peace and *quorum* because, etc. . . . In every Shire . . .

there is a clerk of the Peace . . . this Officer is appointed by the *Custos rotulorum*."

I maintain that this shows that Shallow, as I had suspected, was drawn, not from any ordinary Justice but from a man who was the Chief of the Justices of his County. Is it possible to trace *who* were the eight Justices appointed by the Great Seal of England to Gloucestershire at the time *The Merry Wives* appeared? Also who the *Custos Rotulorum* was? I shall not be surprised if it was the Baron of Sudeley.

Information on this point would be of great interest. The question has been raised, If Sir Thomas Lucy was not the original of Shallow how about the Luces in the "old coat?" About that I am not able to decide at present. I have traced *Mullets* in the Chandos Arms; a mullet is a good, fresh fish. But, if there was any fear of the real Shallow taking offence at the representation of himself upon the stage, is it not in the bounds of possibility that Sir Thomas, Bacon's good friend, who was connected with him by the marriage of William Cook (Bacon's cousin), may have enjoyed posing as a mask to the real Shallow? To know the year in which the "Luces" first appeared in the Stage copies would assist the investigation. I should like to draw attention to the letter addressed by Bacon to Sir Thomas Lucy.* After writing such a cordial letter with a tribute of praise so prettily worded, it would be an impossibility to believe he would hold Sir Thomas up to ridicule in a comedy.

There is an interesting note in a letter of Carleton's from Chamberlain, 20th April, 1618, quoted in Spedding, Vol. VI., page 310, chap. vii. *re* Baptist Hicks.

"About this time we hear of Bacon going 'in all his pomp' to hear the Archbishop of Spalato preach at Mercer's Chapel, 'which was not so strange,' adds the

* Page 76, Rawley's "Resuscitatio," first part,

reporter, 'as not a month since to see him in the same State go to Sir Baptist Hick's and Barnes's shops to cheapen and buy silks and velvets.' As it is not said that this was his ordinary practice we may suppose that he found it convenient on that occasion to take them in his way from his Court."

Searchers after truth lay themselves open to criticism and I am interested to receive from Mr. Smedley the enclosed remarks from America on Baptist Hicks. The more light we can have on our subject the better. "Sir Baptist was a younger brother of Sir Michael and was also *a friend of Bacon's*." (This statement of friendship is not attended by any reference). The writer goes on: "He was born 1577, died 1629. Became King James' servant 1603, was knighted the same year. He kept a shop in Cheapside where he sold rich silks (to the Court largely) and in this way became very wealthy. Built Hick's Hall, 1610-12, was elected an Alderman 1611; built Camden House 1612. He was *interested with Bacon in the Virginian Company* and was one of those who purchased the Burmuda Islands from that Company 1612. There was certainly not one iota of Shallow-ness about him, or in his character. He was a shrewd, level-headed man of business and of large affairs. He distinctly told the Court of Aldermen (1607) that he did 'not intend to live altogether upon interest, as had been the custom after knighthood; but still intended to have a regard to his trade.' So Miss Leith will have to substitute some less level-headed Elizabethan than Sir Baptist Hicks for her Justice Shallow."

This is the view of our American correspondent. On the other hand Colonel Noel, a descendant of Sir Baptist Hicks, living in Gloucestershire, writes to Mr. Smedley that:

"It seems quite likely that the players might like to poke fun

at Sir Baptist Hicks. He would, in London, be a far more prominent character than Lucy—would the latter be known in London at all? Hicks was about the first citizen to keep shop after knighthood. His wife was a most imperious woman, and he had a great contest with the Alderman, about precedency, standing on his knighthood. This suit last for years. He was elected an alderman and paid a fine of £500 not to take it up. He had bought the manor of Hampstead and built a palace in Kensington, so that if he trod on the Player's corns, he would be a fine mark for their shafts. Do you notice that his first title was Baron Hicks of Ilmington in the County of *Warwick*. I have a fine miniature of him and a deed with his signature, which I should be delighted to show you at any time."

I leave the question to those interested in the subject, hoping that something may be proved one way or the other. I should like to say that reading Bacon one day I came across the words in juxtaposition, "*Barren, Shallow.*" I wish I could find the reference again; perhaps I may yet.

In the meantime if we turn to Bacon's Appopthegms (No. 50, folio 1671, page 230) we shall find an interview between a "rough-hewn Seaman" and a wise "Just-Ass"—an anecdote which clearly proves Bacon's opinion of a "gentlemen born" who pretends to "strength of learning," and is but a superficial, *shallow*, "*Just-ass*" after all!

The mistake of using "*nogus vogus*" for *nolens volens* is surely exactly on a par with Justice Shallow using *coram* and *rotolorum* for *quorum* and *rotulorum?*

ALICIA AMY LEITH.

[There is a fine oil painting of Sir Baptist Hicks in the Westminster Sessions House. and a magnificent recumbent effigy of him in Campden Church. A view of Campden House, which is preserved in the British Museum, shows a lanthorn similar to that referred to by Miss Leith in her former article. See Vol. VI., p. 106.—ED.]

THE GRAY'S INN CELEBRATION.

JUST 300 years have passed since Francis Bacon was made treasurer of Gray's Inn, and the Society celebrated the anniversary on Saturday, the 17th October last, by a luncheon given by the Benchers. Mr. Duke, K.C., treasurer of the Inn, presided, and in proposing "the immortal memory of Francis Bacon," delivered an oration in which Bacon's connection with Gray's Inn was fully dealt with. Mr. Duke made two points of special interest. The first had reference to the fallacious allegation in Macaulay's Essay, in which he states that Bacon came away from Cambridge with a supercilious mind—an ungrateful student. In combating this allegation it was pointed out that after Francis Bacon had attained a pre-eminent position at Gray's Inn, and the old master of Trinity (his old tutor) had been made Archbishop of Canterbury, Whitgift was enrolled among the Fellows of this house; and one of the first acts which followed was an act to which Bacon was a party, by which the Gate House was given to him as a lodging. The second point was the fallacy of the statement in the famous essay, that Bacon sprang suddenly into great practice as a young man, and during these early years gathered and squandered great gains in his work at the Bar. Mr. Duke pointed out that Bacon had been for eight years a member of the Bench before he was taken into public employment, and made reference to letters in which, year after year, Bacon besought aid in many quarters, saying that he must have a livelihood so that he might go on with the great task of his life—the Advancement of Learning. He mentioned that Bacon's first appearance in the Court of the King's Bench dated twelve years after he was called to the Bar, and his candidature for the office of Solicitor-General was

greeted with a chorus at the Bar that "he hath not come into the field at all."

There is cause for regret that no attempt was made by Mr. Duke to vindicate the character of Bacon except on the two minor points which have been referred to. The occasion was one which lent itself to such an object, but the treasurer was discreetly silent as to the allegations made by Macaulay in his Essays as to Bacon's conviction and the charges brought against him which were the cause of his downfall.

The American Ambassador, Mr. Whitelaw Reid, concluded a speech in which he did full justice to Bacon's intellectual supremacy by saying, "Never lived a man who had a better right to employ that humility in the pathetic bequest they had just heard: My name and my memory I leave to the charitable speeches of men, to foreign nations, and to the next age."

As to what extent Bacon is liable to censure, opinions still differ, but that the charges fulminated against him by Macaulay are grossly exaggerated, if not baseless, has been proved by Spedding in "Evenings with a Reviewer" and by Mr. J. M. Robertson, M.P. One cannot help wishing that it had been possible on such an auspicious occasion as this that the eloquent voice of Mr. J. M. Robertson might have been heard advancing such a vindication of the great Chancellor's character as may be found in the essay on Bacon appearing in his work "Pioneer Humanists."

The first night of the Michaelmas term was on the 2nd of November, and the members of Gray's Inn again celebrated the 300th anniversary of the famous treasurer's election, and on that occasion interesting booklets were presented to those present, containing a full report of Mr. Duke's speech on the 17th October and photogravures of Bacon, Queen Elizabeth, Sir Nicholas Bacon, and Lord Burghley, who was admitted in 1540

as a member of the Inn, of the accounts of Bacon with reference to the gardens, of Gray's Inn's walks as they were in the time of Elizabeth, and of Gray's Inn in 1905.

REVIEWS.

William Shakespeare: Player, Playmaker, and Poet; a Reply to Mr. George Greenwood, M.P. By H. C. Beeching, D.Litt., Canon of Westminster. (London: Smith, Elder & Co.)

IT was to be expected that an attempt would be made to answer the position taken up by Mr. George Greenwood in *The Shakespeare Problem Re-stated* in view of the remarkable character of the reviews on it which appeared in the Press, and especially having regard to the appeals made by some of the reviewers to Shakespearean scholars to provide a reply which they—the reviewers—were unable to do. But few would have anticipated that a reply put forth with as much ostentation as is the present book would be so weak and ineffective. The so-called reply consists of three lectures delivered by Canon Beeching, which are now printed in book form: 1. Mr. Greenwood's Case Examined. 2. The Story of the Life. 3. The Character of the Dramatist. The latter two are not even of passing interest. They are two lectures delivered by Canon Beeching some time ago at the Royal Institution, and occupy about 70 pages, with the usual commonplace mixture of extracts from the writings of Halliwell-Phillips and other Shakespearean investigators, and guesses, inferences, and imaginings founded thereon which are the stock-in-trade of the literary hack. The only apparent reason for their publication is that the book may have sufficient matter to enable it to be bound in cloth instead of paper covers.

The first lecture, which has been delivered before the Elizabethan Literary Society and the Royal Society of Literature, purports to be a reply to Mr. Greenwood. Is it?

Canon Beeching starts with an attempt to place Mr. Greenwood on an inferior plane to that which he himself occupies. He says:—

"Mr. Greenwood is careful to guard himself against being supposed to ask whether Francis Bacon wrote the Shakespearean plays and poems, for that is a literary question on which men of letters would be entitled to the last word."

The inference which it is desired the reader shall draw is obvious—namely, that Canon Beeching, a man of letters, is coming down from his high vantage ground to do battle with Mr. George Greenwood in the latter's lower sphere—namely, the

arena in which evidence is weighed and considered. This is the Canon's method of introducing the work he is about to attack :—

"We have, in these five hundred pages, finished examples of most of the arts, from browbeating to persiflage, from innuendo to declamation, which make up the equipment of the successful practitioner at the Old Bailey."

This is the ingenious and disingenuous manner in which he excuses himself for not attempting to deal with Mr. Greenwood's masterly examination of the arguments put forth by Stratfordians in support of their case. Before finally dismissing this important feature of "The Shakespeare Problem Re-stated," the Canon says :—

"There are, however, two forensic artifices, as I must call them, of which particular notice must be taken, because they are likely to mislead."

The first is a reference to an ode written by Ben Jonson for the celebration of Bacon's sixtieth birthday, in which the well-known lines occur :—

"Thou standst as though some mystery thou didst,"

and

"'Tis a brave cause of joy, let it be known,
For 'twere a narrow gladness kept thine own."

Canon Beeching ignores the second quotation from the ode, and describes the first as "an example of considerable importance for the Baconian case, if not for Mr. Greenwood's." This remark affords evidence of the writer's ignorance of the Baconian case, which is not in the slightest degree affected by the ode. But what use has Mr. Greenwood made of this reference ? In a chapter of 47 pages on *Jonson, Shakespeare, Shakspere and Bacon*, he devotes less than a page to his remarks on this subject, and concludes thus :—

"What was the 'mystery' which was being performed ? The Baconians assert that here is an allusion to the secret Shakespearean authorship, a secret known to Jonson, and which he hoped might soon be published to the world. The Stratfordians, of course, reject this interpretation with scorn, but they are unable to give any plausible explanation of Jonson's meaning, and the mystery remains a mystery still."

The second forensic artifice is thus stated :—

"The other artifice which Mr. Greenwood himself allows me to call forensic is 'bluff,' and it is curious to discover that the very keynote of Mr. Greenwood's elaborate piece of architecture is nothing better. I mean his assumption that the difference between two spellings of Shakespeare's name is significant. Throughout his book he distinguishes *Shakspere* the player from *Shake-speare* the poet; as though this assignment of the two

spellings were not, as it is, a mere fancy of his own. but clear on the face of the documents and indisputable. There is, in fact, not a tittle of evidence to support it."

And, again :—

"The evidence, therefore, of any definite intention behind the inconsistent spellings of the name Shakspere or Shakespere or Shakespeare is altogether absent, and the elaborate pains that Mr. Greenwood takes all through his book to distinguish *Shakspere* the player from *Shakespeare* the poet, is, to use his own term, nothing but 'a form of bluff.'"

Now, what are the facts? In a notice to the reader prefixed to his volume Mr. Greenwood says :—

"In this work I have followed the convenient practice of writing *Shakespeare* where I am speaking of the author of the plays and poems, and *Shakspere* when I refer to William Shakspere of Stratford (*whether* he was or was not the author in question), except in quotations, where I, of course, follow the originals."

Mr. Greenwood therefore disavows any significance in the distinction he makes of the two forms of spelling the name, a distinction which he adopts for the purpose of convenience only. The Canon designates this "a form of bluff"!

In a lengthy note to Chapter I. of the Shakespeare Problem Re-stated, an account is given of the various forms in which the name is spelt, and after a number of these employed by the family have been enumerated, it is stated : "But the form *Shakespeare* seems never to have been employed by them. As Mr. Spedding truly says in his essay on *The Conference of Pleasure*, Shakspere of Stratford never so wrote his name 'in any known case.'" Surely, in Mr. Greenwood's reference to these two subjects, there is no display of forensic artifice. His statements are clear and incapable of misleading the reader. But what of Canon Beeching's allegations? They savour of that which is far more hateful than forensic artifice—the artifice of the theologian.

So far, then, Canon Beeching has not only failed in his attack, but discredited himself as a critic, for his weapons are those which are not compatible with honourable argument.

In a preliminary note Canon Beeching says : "In the first lecture I have had to put the section headings which express Mr. Greenwood's contentions into my own words."

In this first lecture he says :—

"To come now to arguments employed to show that the Stratford player could not have written the Shakespearian plays and poems, I will take them one by one and treat them as briefly as possible."

These are the fourteen arguments upon which the Canon,

having read Mr. Greenwood's book, alleges that the writer of that work bases his contention "that there is such a thing as a *Shakespeare problem* :—

1. The town of Stratford was insanitary.

2. William Shakespeare's father could not write his name.

3. There is no evidence that William Shakespeare ever went to the Stratford Grammar School.

4. Supposing Shakespeare went to the Stratford school—why should we assume that the school taught the ordinary Grammar School curriculum ? [c]

5. But Shakespeare did not stay long enough at school to acquire as much Latin as the writer of the plays shows evidence of possessing.

6. But, allowing that an industrious boy could get a knowledge of Latin at Stratford, he could learn nothing else.

7. There is no contemporary evidence identifying the player with the author of the plays and poems.†

8. It is hardly possible to conceive that the poems and plays were written in William Shakespeare's illegible and illiterate scrawl.

9. There is not a letter, not a note, not a scrap of writing from the pen of Shakespeare which has come down to us except five signatures.

10. Jonson wrote hundreds of occasional poems, lines to friends and patrons, elegies, epitaphs, epithalamiums. Where are Shakespeare's similar effusions ?

11. Jonson's death "was greeted with a chorus of elegaic and

[c] It would be difficult to find an equal to this as an example of misrepresentation in quotation.

† Canon Beeching (p. 17) endeavours to disprove this assertion by stating that Richard Field, who published the "Venus and Adonis," was a native of Stratford. On page 48 he speaks of Field as *his school friend*, and goes on to say that he, for one, chooses to believe that Field would have sent down to his friend at Stratford any books he could get hold of. There is not a particle of evidence to show that William Shakespeare knew Richard Field, much less that he was his friend. But there is evidence to prove that upon the outbreak of the pest in 1592, the year before "Venus and Adonis" was published by Richard Field, Francis Bacon, in company with Richard Cecil, Robert Gosnold, and Richard Field, rode down to Twickenham Park. They fled from pestilence, not like the Florentines in Boccaccio, to play and revel, but to pursue philosophy and discuss the laws of thought.—Hepworth Dixon's "Story of Lord Bacon's Life," p. 56.

panegyrical verses, poured forth by the best poets of the moment. How different was the case of Shakespeare!"

12. Ben Jonson's mysterious relations with the folio of Shakespeare's plays.

13. Jonson's commendatory poem.

14. The silence of Philip Henslowe.

Anyone who has read Mr. Greenwood's book will recognise that these are a travesty of the arguments there advanced. No one has ever suggested that because Halliwell-Phillips describes the sanitary condition of Stratford-on-Avon at that time as being to our present notions simply terrible, that would render it impossible for a man who was born there to write the poems and plays. No one has ever suggested that because John Shakespeare was unable to write his name a son of his could not have written the plays and poems.

Canon Beeching seldom quotes *ad literam*, but, as he admits, puts into his own words Mr. Greenwood's contentions. In this operation he distorts and misrepresents, so that not infrequently all trace of Mr. Greenwood's meaning is lost.

Canon Beeching never faces, but always dexterously evades, the fundamental arguments advanced in the Shakespeare Problem Re-stated.

In a note on page 17 Mr. Greenwood says:—

"I would point out that the negative evidence against the Stratfordian authorship is cumulative. It must be judged as a whole. A very small strain is sufficient to break one horse-hair, but a large number of horse-hairs combined together to form a rope will support a very heavy weight."

Mr. Greenwood's case is summed up in the words of the first doubter, Ralph Waldo Emerson, "We cannot marry the man to his writings." Canon Beeching has not brought them any nearer, and a reply to *The Shakespeare Problem Re-stated* has yet to be written.

THE *National Review* for January contains an article on "The Shakespeare Problem—the Evidence for the Defence." The writer, Mr. George Hookham, is on many considerations eminently qualified to deal with the subject. He is a scholar, a man of affairs with a sound, keen judgment, and has always been attached to truth for its own sake. The article is mainly devoted to an examination of the evidence and of the attitude, as witnesses on behalf of the Stratford claims, of Mr. Sidney Lee and the late Mr. Churton Collins. Mr. Hookham says:—

"In an action at law it is sometimes obvious, from the demeanour of the witnesses and the arguments they rely on, either that they are conscious of the weakness of the case they are supporting, or are ignorant of the strength of that they are opposing. If I should select, as I think I may without injustice to the other combatants, Mr. Sidney Lee and Professor Churton

Collins as the two champions who, by common consent, stand in the forefront of the Stratford battle, I should venture on the criticism that Mr. Lee falls under the former description of unsatisfactory witness, and Professor Collins under the second."

The statement of Mr. Lee which Mr. Greenwood calls flamboyant, but which Mr. Hookham describes as "grotesque in its exaggeration," is first examined. This is it: "Patient investigation which has been in progress more than 200 years has brought together a mass of biographical detail which far exceeds that accessible in the case of any other contemporary professional writer." Mr. Hookham says: "There would be a pleasant quarter of an hour for the Court, and a very bad one for Mr. Lee, if he were in the box and undergoing cross-examination on this bit of expert evidence." Mr. Lee has never been more dexterously handled, or more completely exposed, than in this article.

Comparing the attitude of the two men to the subject, Mr. Hookham says:—

"The temper of mind in which Professor Collins approaches the whole question is, no doubt, as impossible as Mr. Lee's; but an important difference is to be noted. He does fairly and honestly think that the controversy is neither serious in itself nor worthy of serious consideration. With Mr. Lee the case is far otherwise. Though his formal treatment of the problem is relegated to a few contemptuous pages in an appendix, his entire book is moulded by it. . . . A tradition is credible or incredible, an argument weighty or worthless, just as it happens to bear on the authorship of the plays. There is a desperate, almost despairing, anxiety to identify their author with Stratford. . . . Of all this there is nothing in Professor Churton Collins. He knows little of the opposite argument, and cares less . . . His worst fault is ignorance of a subject that repels him. In this matter ninety-nine-hundredths of the reading public are similarly situated."

Mr. Hookham states there are three pieces of strong *primâ facie* evidence that Shakspere of Stratford wrote the plays, and that Mr. Lee's "200 years of patient investigation have added no fourth."

"First, the similarity (not identity) of name on the title-pages, and the practical certainty that it had reference, plain or mysterious, to Shakespere the player; secondly, the fact that he was regarded as the author by many, perhaps most, of his contemporaries—a belief which he can have done nothing to disturb; thirdly, the verses of Ben Jonson prefixed to the First Folio, and the passage in his Discoveries. Every attempt to add to these has resulted in fiasco, or is itself obvious delusion."

Mr. Hookham does not advance one scrap of evidence in support of the second point. Nor is there any to be found. The third point is the stronghold of the Stratfordians, and this

cannot be carried until the battle is actually won at every other point. Jonson was the only contemporary of Shakespere who directly refers to him as connected with the plays, and there is no direct reference to him by Jonson until the 1623 edition of the plays was published seven years after his death.

The anecdote in Manningham's Diary (1601) has reference to the player only, and having in view the previous remarks in a performance of *Twelfth Night*, if there is any inference to be drawn, it would be that Manningham did not, rather than that he did, regard the player as the author of the plays. Neither the Nash reference (1589) nor the Greene reference (1592) can be held to apply to Shakespeare except by conjecture, and neither necessarily establishes any connection between the player and the author.

The Chettle ireference (notwithstanding Canon Beeching's recent effort at manipulation) cannot possibly apply to Shakespeare. Mr. F. G. Fleay, an ardent but honest biographer, is emphatic in this view,* and Dr. G. M. Ingleby, who is always fair, admits that the Chettle commendation cannot be applied to Shakespere without a violation of the text. It is necessary, he says, to interpolate a few words to the effect that Greene wrote his letter *to* divers playwrights, his friends and associates, and *against* another, his avowed enemy, and that two of these, *including the latter*, took offence.†

The words put into the mouth of William Kempe, the actor, by the unknown author of the "Return from Parnassus" (1601) do not necessarily establish a connection between the player and author. They certainly approach nearer than anything else; but they are by no means conclusive. Their value as evidence might be materially affected if it was known who was the unknown author.

Up to the publication of the folio edition, where there is the testimony of John Hemmings, Henry Condell and Leonard Digges for what it is worth and also that of Ben Jonson, there is not even the suggestion of any connection between the player and authorship. There is no contemporary evidence that Shakespere was a broker in plays, an actor manager, or even a holder of shares in a theatre. Not until in 1635 (19 years after Shakspere's death) when Cuthbert Burbage, his wife and son, present to the Earl of Pembroke, the Lord Chamberlain, their answer to the petition of grievances of Benefield, Swanston, Pollard, is there any mention of the fact that Shakspere was interested in any theatre in other capacity than that of an actor! Even then all that is said has reference to the Globe Theatre and is "and to ourselves (*i.e.*, the Burbages) we joyned those deserving men, Shakspere, Hemings, Condall, Phillips and others,

* "Chronicle History of the Life and Works of William Shakespeare," p. 111.

† "Bacon *v.* Shakspere," Edwin Reed, p. 152.

partners in that they call the profittes of the House." The statement as to the Blackfriars house is this :—"And soe (we) purchased the lease remaining from Evans with our money and placed men players, which were Hemings, Condall, Shakspere, &c."

In the former of these extracts is to be found the only evidence in existence that Shakspere had any connection with any theatre at any time other than that of an actor.

It is very significant that, three years after the second folio edition appeared, when the Burbage family in this petition were advancing every argument which they could rake up to obtain consideration from the Earl of Pembroke, making mention of their association with Shakspere, they only refer to him as an actor. Surely in addressing one of "the uncomparable paire of bretheren" to whom the first folio was dedicated, Cuthbert Burbage, had he believed that his deserving man Shakspere had been the author of the plays, of which a second folio edition had recently been published, would have reminded the illustrious nobleman of the fact.

It would be most interesting to learn upon what grounds Mr. George Hookham would justify his statement that Shakspere the player was regarded as the author by many, perhaps by most, of his contemporaries; perhaps these may be learnt from a second article which Mr. Hookham promises.

NOTES.

Dr. R. M. THEOBALD will early in the year publish a book entitled "The Classical Element in the Shakespeare Plays," written by his cousin, the late Mr. William Theobald. The volume will be a demy 8vo. of about 350 pages, and will be by far the most comprehensive work upon the subject which has appeared. The late Mr. Theobald was for many years deputy superintendent of the Geological Survey of India and was a member of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and of the Numismatic Society of London. He was an exceptionally gifted classical scholar. It was after his retirement from active life that he became a convert to the Baconian creed. His interest in the subject was

first excited by a lecture at which he was present, delivered by the late Mr. Ignatius Donelly in the Westminster Town Hall. Mr. Theobald was a member of the Bacon Society and a contributor to the pages of its journal. Dr. Theobald will be glad to receive the names of subscribers for copies of the book, which will be published at ten shillings.

o o o

THE Harvard Publishing Co., of Detroit, Michigan, has recently published a pamphlet of 12 pages, containing the Bi-literal Cypher of Sir Francis Bacon discovered in his works by Mrs. Elizabeth Wells Gallup and deciphered from the 1625 Edition of "The Essayes." Mrs. Gallup states in a short preface that the matter is of less importance than that deciphered from some of the other works of Bacon.

o o o

ARRANGEMENTS have been made with Mr. J. M. Robertson to deliver a series of lectures on Francis Bacon to the Society. The subjects which will be treated during the forthcoming spring session will be: (1) Bacon as Writer; (2) Bacon as Man; (3) Bacon as Political Thinker. Mr. Robertson, in addition to writing the great testimony to Bacon's worth, which has been referred to (p. 46), edited that admirable edition of Bacon's worth published in 1905 by Messrs. Routledge and Co.

o o o

THERE is published in New York "The Matilda Ziegler Magazine for the Blind" in two editions of raised type, one in Braille and the other in New York point. This magazine is the great means of uniting the blind and keeping them in touch with the world, especially with the best that is being done in industrial work. Through its agency the blind can purchase typewriters, watches, and safety razors at cost. In November over a

thousand dollars' worth of watches were thus distributed. These watches have raised points on the dials so that the blind whose fingers are insensitive can tell the hour easily. A blind person with sensitive fingers tells the time instantly by the light touch on the hands of an ordinary watch. The magazine is practically free owing to the munificence of Mrs. Matilda Ziegler, the widow of William Ziegler, who fitted out several Arctic Expeditions. The explorer, Mr. Anthony Frala, is the Treasurer.

o o o

To Miss Helen Keller, the distinguished American writer who is blind, deaf and dumb, the Editor of the magazine entrusted the making up of the Christmas number and the writing of the Editorials. Miss Keller has devoted a considerable space in the number to an account of Mr. Greenwood's *The Shakespeare Problem Restated,* and it is thus for the first time that the blind are enabled to read of the grave doubts that have arisen as to the authorship of the Shake-speare plays and poems. Miss Keller concludes her able summary of the book with these words:—"Some years ago I declared that I was in an impregnable fortress, that no siege of fact or argument could make me honour another than Shakespeare of Stratford. At the present moment I feel like the Pontiffs of Rome who could not meet without laughing in each other's faces because the religion in which they officiated was no longer the religion of the people. It is not time to be positive with reference to the Baconian theory; but Mr. Greenwood's masterly exposition has led me to the conclusion that Shakespeare of Stratford is not to be even thought of as a possible author of the most wonderful plays of the world. The question now remains, Who was William Shakespeare? How long must we wait, I wonder, for the solution of this greatest problem in literature."

Obituary.

EDWIN REED.

THE Baconian cause has lost one of its most stalwart champions in Mr. Edwin Reed, who died on October 14th. He was born in 1835 at Phippsburg, in the Lower Kennebec, the son of William Maxwell and Caroline Drummond Reed. Many of his ancestors were prominent in the battles and historical events of their time, *ex gr.*, at Bunker's Hill, and the war of 1812. Mr. Reed studied first at Bath High School and Bowdoin College, and then in Leipzig, where he resided for two years, and gained the classic knowledge and general culture which are amply shown in the books which he wrote. On his return from Leipzig he was offered a professorship, but declined and joined his brother, Franklin Reed, in the business of marine insurance and ship-building, in which he was occupied for fifteen years. At one time he was Mayor of Bath, Me. His departure is mourned by his widow, by four sons, and four daughters, and two sisters.

Many years ago Mr. Reed became greatly interested in the Baconian question, and the study of it and writing about it were his chief occupations. He twice visited England, lodged near the British Museum, and spent many hours daily in the Reading Room gathering materials for his work. His first writings were comprised in a series of pamphlets, "Bacon *v.* Shakespeare: a brief for the Plaintiff." And these, with copious additions, were subsequently, in 1896, gathered into a considerable volume bearing the same title. But this also was re-moddled, and re-appeared in a series of separate volumes, "Francis Bacon, our Shakespeare," 240 pages; "Coincidences," 152 pages; "Parallelisms," 420 pages (quoting 885 parellels between Bacon's prose and Shakespeare); "Noteworthy Opinions, *pro* and *con*," 79 pages; and a small volume of detached essays, 70 pages. And annotated editions of *Julius Cæsar* and *The Tempest* are likely to be published, having been fairly completed. Mr. Reed had a slight, feeble physical frame, and was frequently interrupted in his literary work by illness. His unresting work and consuming enthusiasm contributed mainly to the nervous exhaustion and decay from which he died. Mr. Reed's books are full of interesting matter, presented in a lucid and scholarly style. In the matter of indexes and references they might be improved, as Dr. Hull Platt remarked in the last number of BACONIANA. Mr. Reed was a most excellent letter-writer, delighting in humour and mock battle. If any memoir of him is published, a great many of these charming compositions ought to be included.—R. M. T.

Edwin Reed, "the Baconian"; it is well to have known him.

A small, compactly-built man, his distinctive dress a long, flowing cloak or cape fastened at the throat with metal clasps, he came walking slowly down the long aisle in "Barton," ever and anon staying his steps to give a cheery word of greeting to fellow-workers. His hair, snowy white, was cut somewhat as in the

Dutch fashion for children ; brows and eyes of a striking darkness ; nose short, yet strong ; a long upper lip above a mouth set closely, its lower lip slightly protruding ; hands and feet fine and small. Such was the outer man—a gentleman to view. Yes—a gentleman of an inner as of an outer distinction, of a genial and generous soul, of the older and more courtly school ; a man accustomed to command, but as a gentleman commands—from life-long habit—with a courtesy ever an essential part of himself.

He seated himself in his accustomed chair, and one listened and learned. Then he sighed a little, and, leaning back, seemed to meditate sadly. Unnoted sympathy studied him. Upon his face in repose settled a pathetic weariness, his mouth drooping like a tired child's. He evidenced a vitality drained and exhausted by the eternal Weltschmerz, that world-pain-and-sorrow from which no sentient soul is exempt. Yet courage, brave struggler, for yet a very few years and thou shalt be free, while thy earth-circles widen ever and for ever! Nay, what sayest thou of thyself ? "Write me as one who loves his fellow-men," his spirit quoted softly, and the whisper seemed to fill the alcove round about with sweet, sibilant echoings. Yes, good friend, such is indeed thyself ; and, if we read aright, hymning before thee when thou goest home angels shall herald, "This is one who had come through great tribulation !" His the rest after agony, his the peace after pain !

. . . . . .

Some spoken words of his now come back to me : "You call this the B—— alcove ?" he commented, smiling. "A friend of mine amused me by stating that some day this world of ours will honour my poor memory (when I am dead, as is its backward way) by a window 'rich with storied glass,' placed even here in my favourite nook." "May it be so indeed !" I cried with a glad vehemence. Still smiling he shook his head and sighed again, and so sighing wrote on. But I continued gazing until his bodily presence faded from my view ; and high in the middle field of that tall window, I saw his face all glorified and shining with the peace which passeth understanding, and is but born of pain ; and colour, like unto great music, a rhythmical glory of swelling harmony, lay round about, breathing over it, cool and refreshing as the greeny mists adown a forest glade. The greens of resurrected life were there, the violets of sweet woodland fragrance gleaming into deeply purple pools where rested the rich shadows ; while beyond them and below lay the crimsons and saffrons and gold of life's sunset. What matters now "the weariness, the fever, and the fret" of earthly life ? He is gone home.—Z. A. GILMAN.

"Man is of no value except as he immolates himself to an ideal." A life that has no central thought is like a derelict freighted with drift, and its story is the fool's motley. A dominant idea is the necessary helmsman to make a port amid the respect of men. No man has signally influenced the thought of his time

who has not first been conquered by an idea, and made its willing slave. He must have given it a loyalty keyed to self-sacrifice, and an enthusiam proof against bitter hostility.

The best years of the life of Mr. Edwin D. Reed were devoted to his Bacon quest. Able for his work through faith, eager mind, and profound scholarship, he turned away the ashes of years from the rich and vital Elizabethan life till he had his sensitive fingers on its throbbing pulse. Then that wonderful kaleidoscope of men elementally strong in thought, and passion, and achievement paled the simpler pictures of modern years till his whole intellectual interest rooted in the world of Shakespeare. His enthusiasm was so quick and vibrant that it kindled sparks of response even in the most stolid conservative. He loved to talk of his work, glowing in the vividness of his interest. His books breathe the author's sincerity, and they are forcibly convincing. If they do not convert the reader to Reed-Baconianism, at least they force him to admit that "much is to be said on both sides."

I knew Mr. Reed only in his old age, when the appeal of years, slow step and slightly drooping shoulders called forth all the maternal in a woman. But perhaps to know him then was best, as he stood on the summit of his years viewing his life from the hilltops, ripe in thought and human experience. What he saw of tangible success was disheartening. The best of himself had been gladly given to further the cause of Bacon, but his labour had met with no just recognition. In his several books he had garnered telling facts, and presented them with a fascinating interest—his work was good—but his words found few listeners, because a massy wall of prejudice prevented a fair hearing. Chagrin, indignation, the consciousness of a life-service counting for almost naught, might well have soured him, but to use the words of a man of the world who cherished him, "he had one of the sweetest souls I ever knew."

A strong, fine soul glowed from his face. His speciality had not made him a mere mind lost in the intellectual world of the past. Rather it served as dream to make his spirit winged. The Bacon argument became for him a phase of that great Truth to which every soul must cling else it perish. And his heart beat warmly human. He had an almost overweening joy in the good fortune and happiness of his children. A beautiful kindliness was in him. His life would show more material success had his faith in men been tempered by shrewdness, but honesty and noble simplicity would not allow him to impute unworthy motives to others. The fine fibre of the man was shown by a trust that individual treachery could not warp. And his reward was genuine love and admiration from men and women who honour truth and single-dealing. Sympathy and large friendship were golden links that riveted his friends. They loved him for the wholesome sweetness and genial charm of his nature; they admired him for his sincerity, his enthusiasm, and his scholarly achievement.—ALICE H. O'NEILL.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Canon Beeching's Reply to Mr. Greenwood.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

ON November 25th Canon Beeching read a paper before the Royal Society of Literature upon Mr. Greenwood's "Re-statement of the Shakespeare Problem." There are one or two points in reference to the production of this paper which may be noticed before considering the paper itself. It is considered almost obligatory for anyone reading a lecture to the R.S.L. that such lecture should not be delivered previously. Canon Beeching read his paper at the Toynbee Hall before delivering it to the R.S.L. Also it is usual, and it is expected, that any such paper should be handed over to the secretary of the R.S.L. to be published in the Transactions of the Society, though it may be subsequently issued independently. Canon Beeching has not acted thus; he has published his lecture himself, and the Transactions of the R.S.L. are ignored. In both respects his action is unusual, not to say discourteous.

What I have to say about Canon Beeching's lecture may be best introduced by the following correspondence:—

"To Rev. H. C. Beeching, etc., November 30th, 1908.

"DEAR SIR,—I heard your paper read before the R.S.L. last Wednesday, and, if I had had the opportunity, intended to ask you for one or two references to the "forensic arts"—"browbeating, persiflage," etc.—which you said are plentiful—almost continuous—in Mr. Greenwood's book. I have read the book twice with great care, and I find nothing whatever of the kind. His book seemed to me invariably courteous to those whose views he combated. He had a perfect right to quiz Mr. Lee on his perpetual application of the word 'doubtless' to conjectural statements, and in a note in which he refers to this he points to twenty passages, and adds *et passim*. Of both Mr. Lee and Mr. Churton Collins he speaks with high respect as 'men of letters and scholars.' *Never* does he characterise their agreements as anything approaching to '*a conspiracy of fools*.' Surely you must know that by this kind of talk you put the saddle on the wrong horse, for it is not the Baconians or Mr. Greenwood who impute lunacy to their opponents, but Mr. Lee and Mr. Churton Collins. Who is it that talks about 'madhouse chatter'?—about the Baconian bacillus?—about 'the dancing madness of the middle ages'? To me your accusations seem scarcely honest—a flagrant violation of the ninth commandment. And as such I intend to characterise them in a notice I am writing unless you can show cause to the contrary. I am, Sir, yours very truly,

"ROBERT M. THEOBALD."

Reply, sent December 2nd.

"DEAR SIR,—You say that Mr. Greenwood is 'invariably courteous.' I have not Mr. Greenwood's book at hand, but his

references to Mr. Lee are *inexcusable*—most ungentlemanlike. In a footnote he referred to his change of name, and the very last reference in the book is, 'I thank thee, *Jew*, for teaching me that word.' As an example of his general rudeness to Shakespeareans (a conspiracy of fools) see the references to them about the interpretation of Chettle—page 318, I think.

"H. C. BEECHING."

"P.S.—I write this not at all to deprecate any sort of criticism you may choose to pass on my lecture."

Reply.

"DEAR SIR,—Thank you for your post-card, which amply confirms my impression of your behaviour as ungentlemanly and scarcely honest."

It may be thought that, by this final reply, the Canon's fire is returned too heavily and too hotly; but on examination of his points of justification I am not inclined to soften it.

1. As to the reference to Mr. Lee's change of name, it is pretty generally known that Mr. Lee's original *Christian* name was "Solomon Lazarus." Mr. Greenwood (preface, p. x.) describes in detail the University honours obtained by both Mr. Lee and Mr. Churton Collins as described in the Oxford Calendars of 1873, 1880, and 1882. And he adds as to Mr. Lee: "For the benefit of the puzzled investigator (and such, at first, was I) it may be mentioned that he there appears under a slightly different form of appellation to those by which he is now familiar to us, not at that time having discarded the two Biblical prænomina in order to assume the more Saxon name of Sidney." That is all. The nature of the alteration is not specified, and the reason for noticing it is to clear up an ambiguity which had puzzled Mr. Greenwood himself. Perhaps it would have been better to have given these prænomina. The omission shows how careful Mr. Greenwood was to avoid anything offensive. Canon Beeching's accusation is rather disproved than illustrated by the instance he supplies. No reasonable person will see anything discourteous in this.

2. Mr. Greenwood, having himself occasion to employ the word "doubtless," indulged in the good-humoured chaff of thanking Mr. Lee for his example in the use of the word, and in doing so he used a well-known and hackneyed quotation from the *Merchant of Venice*. The same quotation might have been used for anybody under similar circumstances, and there was no reason why it should not be applied in this particular instance—unless, indeed, Canon Beeching thinks that the word *Jew* is an odious epithet conveying discredit. At all events, the entire question is a matter of taste; there is nothing morally wrong or discourteous involved.

3. Mr. Greenwood is supposed to have characterised the agreements of various Shakespearean writers, in reference to Chettle, as "a conspiracy of fools." I am not sure that I can identify the passage which is supposed to convey this imputation. The words themselves are certainly not used, and I am inclined to deny, *sans phrase*, Canon Beeching's assertion; and to say that

such an imputation is *not* to be found in Mr. Greenwood's book. The author, after referring to a number of discordant (not concordant) speculations made by critics about Chettle, adds, as his comment, "Well! well! well!" (p. 318). If this is what Canon Beeching refers to I do not care in what terms his imputation is denied.

Moreover, when Canon Beeching seeks to defend Mr. Lee and Mr. Churton Collins from rude and violent criticism, he might as well ask himself whether these two are especially entitled to leniency. No good moralist will answer railing with railing; but when either a moral or a literary judgment is being recorded of those who are conspicuously intolerant and abusive, this fact may be allowed to have some weight in determining the attitude and tone of those originally misjudged and insulted when their time for reply comes; and considering this I think Mr. Greenwood has treated Mr. Lee and Mr. Churton Collins with far more gentleness than they deserve.

Canon Beeching devotes a good deal of space to the spelling of the word Shakespeare (etc.), and finds fault with Mr. Greenwood for using any kind of spelling *as an argument* for authorship. Mr. Greenwood has a learned and interesting discussion on the ways in which the word was spelt, but he distinctly repudiates the notion that any serviceable argument can be derived from it. He says, in the very first sentence of his book, "In this work I *have followed the convenient practice* of writing 'Shakespeare' where I am speaking of the author of the plays and poems, and 'Shakspere' where I refer to William Shakspere of Stratford, excepting quotation, where, of course, I follow the originals," and at p. 35 he writes: "Whether the Stratford player wrote his name 'Shaksper' or 'Shakspere' does not seem very material. It is more important to observe that he did not write it 'Shakespeare,' and still less 'Shake-speare.'" Now, when Canon Beeching laboriously confutes Mr. Greenwood's supposed argument derived from the spelling of the name Shakespeare, he is simply controverting what Mr. Greenwood never affirms but expressly disavows.

Canon Beeching blames Mr. Greenwood because he searches for hidden meanings in common-place expressions. For instance, when Ben Jonson says of Bacon, "In the midst, Thou seem'st as if some mystery thou didst." Whether Canon Beeching's explanation or Mr. Greenwood's conjectures about this or any other ambiguous phrase are right is of very slight importance, but in both cases there is an attempt to draw some definite meaning out of cryptic phraseology, and if this is to be condemned the whole of the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy may as well be abandoned, for it is nothing else. It is essentially an attempt to lift a veil—to disclose what is concealed. Canon Beeching's objection to this is simply an audacious *petitio principii*—a begging of the entire question.

As to any other matters in the "reverend" critic's discussion, doubtless Mr. Greenwood will deal with them himself. And he will have no difficulty in showing that the Canon ignores or

travesties his real argments, and occupies himself for the most part with irrelevancies and trifles.

I cannot help thinking that the whole of Canon Beeching's action, both in the lecture itself and in the mode of producing it, is throroughly discreditable, intellectually and morally. If "Churchmen's habits" are fashioned in this style, we may be well justified in preferring a lay costume. Of course, the ordinary newspaper critics will applaud Canon Beeching's answer to Mr. Greenwood as triumphant and conclusive.* They are beginning to do so already; but they are wrong. Mr. Greenwood's book is simply unanswerable, and Canon Beeching's attempt to answer it only makes its unassailable strength more evident.

R. M. THEOBALD.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

MISS LEITH in her very able paper, "Notes on the Merry Wives of Windsor," in the October issue of BACONIANA seems to have overlooked the fact that Thomas Bushel, according to his own statement, did not remain true to his master, Bacon.

Miss Leith states in her article (page 208, BACONIANA):— "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." Thomas Bushel was born at Cleve Prior in Worcestershire about 1594 and died 1674. Aubrey tells us in Cromwell's time "Mr. Bushel concealed himself in a house in Lambeth Marsh, where he constantly lay in a long garret, hung with black baize. At one end was painted a skeleton extended on a mattress, at the other was a small pallet bed, and the walls were covered with various emblems of mortality." Surely this was eccentric enough to frighten off even the spies of Cromwell, and would have inspired Holbein to add another picture to his Dance of Death.

But to return to Bushel's self-condemnation, we must look in Begley's "Bacon's Nova Resuscitatio," Vol. III., p. 29, where in a footnote we find the following :—

* Reviewers who take the trouble to read Canon Beeching's book do not so regard it. This is what the very able critic of the *Observer* says: "As a reply to Mr. Greenwood it is quite inadequate. Mr. Greenwood's was a painstaking and elaborate volume, crammed with facts and dates; Canon Beeching's is a thin book of 104 pages, of which 34 contain all that is intended as a 'reply' to Mr. Greenwood, the rest being a 'story of his life' of the usual vague and speculative type. Many of Mr. Greenwood's arguments are ignored; others are misrepresented or misunderstood. There is a strong—we believe an overwhelming—case against Mr. Greenwood, but no one would suspect it who had read only these two books."

"Thomas Bushel, one of Bacon's household dependents, gives this testimony to his master's character in a book 'The First Part of Youth's Errors' written by Thomas Bushel, the Superlative Prodigall London 1628, 8vo, printed two years after Bacon's death: A Letter 'To his approved beloved Mr. John Eliot Esquire.

"'The ample testimony of your true affection towards my Lord Verulam, Vicount St. Albans, hath obliged me your servant. Yet lest the calumnious tongues of men might extenuate the good opinion you had of his worth and merit, I must ingeniously confess that myself and others of his servants were the occasion of exhaling his virtues into a dark eclipse; which God knows would have long endured both for the honor of his King and the good of the Commonaltie; had not we whom his bountie nursed, laid on his guiltless shoulders our base and exercrable deeds to be scand and censured by the whole senate of a state, where no sooner sentence was given, but most of us forsook him, which makes us bear the badge of Jews to this day. . . . As for myself, with shame I must . . . plead guilty; which grieves my very soul, that so matchlesse a Peer should be lost by such insinuating caterpillars, who in his own nature scorned the least thought of any base, unworthy, or ignoble act, though subject to infirmities as ordained to the wisest.'"

BASIL BROWN.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

WITH regard to Richard Field and pastures new, I beg to draw your readers' attention to p. 62 (Note) George Greenwood's "Shakespeare Problem Restated":—"'Venus and Adonis' was printed by Richard Field, and Field was a native of Stratford; but there is absolutely nothing to show that Field had any acquaintance with, or any knowledge of Shakspere." Probably not; but what I wish now to do is to show that he had acquaintance with and knowledge of Francis Bacon (Promus, p. 71).

"Law at Twickenham for ye mery tales." Hepworth Dixon says (p. 56): "They fled (1592) from pestilence . . . to pursue . . . the laws of thought." Richard Field, Robert Gosnold and Richard Cecil were the friends Francis Bacon took flight with. "Venus and Adonis" came out the following year.

Yours truth,

A. A. LEITH.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

I QUITE agree with you that Dr. Anders's answer to the response to his own challenge to the Baconians is a ludicrous fiasco, than which none has ever more disgraced a literary man.

We doubt if any Shakespearean will accept Dr. Anders as a champion hereafter. Of all his specifications, the weakest ever is as to Mr. Sohmers's Number Ten. Mr. Sohmers quotes Judge Phelps, Chief Justice of the Supreme Bench of Baltimore and a prominent American jurist, who was examining "Slade's Case," which was pending from 1596 to 1602 and twice went to the highest appellants' court in England, a well-known Equity precedent reported in Coke R. Judge Phelps is no Baconian, and was not writing of a Baconian theory. But when he found that Lord Bacon was of counsel for the complainant in that case, and that his associate was an attorney named "John Halstaff," in view of the fact that no source for the name "Falstaff" has ever been discovered anywhere, Judge Phelps could not avoid exclaiming: "When the author of 'The First Part of King Henry the Fourth' found himself obliged in 1597 to find some other name to substitute for the offensive 'Sir John Oldcastle,' and to find it in a hurry, did he get it from the name of 'John Halstaff?'" ("Falstaff and Equity." Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1900). Dr. Morgan, in the "Morgan-Platt Debate," arguing the Shakespeare side ("New Shakespeareana," Vol. II., page 99), calls this a "bombshell."

To it Dr. Anders says (carelessly): "I can give no definite reply. Let me ask Mr. Sohmers whether there might be some link or connection between Sir John Falstaff in 'Henry IV.' and Sir John Fastolfe in the First Part of 'Henry VI.'?"

Suppose there were such a "link or connection"—O, great Anders!—how does that dispose of Bacon's colleague, John HALSTAFF? Wanting in a hurry a name to substitute for "Oldcastle" or go to gaol at the information of the Lord Chamberlain, the "Author of the Henry Fourth" goes BACK to the reign of a monarch two reigns LATER. (We admit, of course, that the two histories were written in reversed order.) But one wonders most whether Dr. Anders comprehends the significance of *cumulative* evidence at all!

I doubt if there is even a Baconian who would accept a verdict in his favour upon a debate with so lame an antagonist as Dr. Anders. Let us at least have foemen worthy of our steel. Dr. Anders would do better to rest his case as Prof. Kittridge, of Harvard, rests it (according to Edwin Reed, "Noteworthy Opinions," p. 55), who advises his classes "not to read Baconian books." Nor does Dr. Anders fail to overlook Mr. Sohmer's clincher—to wit, that if Dr. Anders pronounces every one of his (Mr. Sohmers's) eleven coincidences mere accidental, then he confronts the greatest coincidence of all, namely, that, of eleven random difficulties, every one is explainable upon an identical proposition, namely, that Bacon wrote the plays.

In your July issue Mr. Stotsenburg asks whether that letter from Daniel to Sir Thomas Egerton, published by Collier, is genuine? May I note that it is not? Dr. Ingleby, on p. 248 of his "Complete View of the Shakespeare Controversy"

(London, 1861), disposed of that. And let me add that there is no safety in Shakespearean research from these forgeries without a copy of Dr. Ingleby's book at one's elbow. No one—not the best of us—knows when he may be in the ditch, so industriously did Collier forge documents. For what reason he deliberately set to work to ruin a splendid reputation for faithful and valuable labour is one of the insolvable mysteries of Shakespearean history. B. B. C.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

As to Mr. Stotsenburg's query as to the second marriage of Mrs. Anne Shakespeare, *nee* Hathway, or Whately (there seems no contemporary warrant for spelling it HathAway at all. It is either "Hathwey"—in which case the first name is Agnes—or "Whately"—in which case it is Anne—so that here, as everywhere else where we come to touch a fact connected with William Shakespeare's Stratford biography, we, according to the expressive trapper dialect, "run up a tree.")

Mr. Howard Staunton, who edited his splendid edition of the Plays in London in 1857, arrived at the conclusion that the lady, whatever her maiden name, was married a second time, from the well-known entry of her funeral in the records of Trinity Parish for August, 1623, thus :—

8 { Mrs. Shakespeare
  { Anna uxor Richardi James.

In "New Shakespeareana," Vol. V., page 78, I tried to state all that I could find on both sides touching Mr. Staunton's theory, which you remember Dr. Halliwell-Phillipps pronounced absurd, stating that such bracketings were frequent in the Registers of Trinity Parish, merely denoting that the two funerals occurred the same day, and he was able to give there a fac-simile of the entry, which I replicated in my "New Shakespeareana" article. And I remark that it was referable to no possible state of affairs that I could even guess at, that the relict of the greatest man that ever lived in Stratford, with the grandest monument in the church, who was buried from the greatest house in the town, wife of a lay-warden of the parish, and so on, should be (if she were really Shakespeare's widow) snubbed by the simple entry of her title, while an unknown lady was dignified by mention of her maiden name as well as by her married title. My conclusions in this paper brought out Mrs. Stopes, who in the next "New Shakespeareana" declared that if Mrs. Shakespeare had become Mrs. Richard James, the entry would have been either "Nuper vidua Guglielmi Shakepeare uxor Richardi James," or "Mrs. Anne Shakespeare, *alias* James" (the Mrs. being the usual abbreviation for Mistress), that the brevity of the entry was because "Mistress Shakespeare

was too well known to need further description." "Mistress" being as sure a sign of gentle birth as "Lady," for if not gentle the entry would have been "Widow Shakespeare."

As in the late Moncure D. Conway's Reminiscences Autobiography, he tells of having often discussed this second marriage theory with Mr. Staunton. Dr. Morgan sent my article and this reply of Mrs. Stopes's to him, and Dr. Conway replied. And Dr. Morgan permits me to hand you copies of Dr. Conway's two letters.

"22, East Tenth Street, New York City,
"March 8, 1906.

"MY DEAR DR. APPLETON MORGAN,—I am right glad to see your handwriting again and to know that my autobiography has interested you.

"The paragraph you send me [Mrs. Stopes's reply] appears to me of no value at all. The entry in the Parish Register has been examined by persons very familiar with Parish Registers, and the writer of this paragraph [Mrs. Stopes] would have enforced her evidently foregone conclusion better had she gone through the Register and found another instance of two people buried on the same day and bracketed together. The entry is by no means a sufficient entry for a lady of wealth and distinction as Mrs. Shakespeare was. This writer [Mrs. Stopes] seems to think that the entry of marriages ought to be in the Burial Register. Many of us feel so! It is not correct to say that 'nuper vidua' would have been added after 'James.' Nor is it symptomatic of a trustworthy critic to assume that Anne desired to be buried in Shakespeare's grave. But facts are manageable when there is a poetic myth to be sustained!

"Cordially, MONCURE D. CONWAY."

To this letter Dr. Morgan replied, citing Halliwell-Phillipps' ninth edition, Vol. II., page 372, as follows:—

"This conjecture [of the second marriage] is altogether at variance with the terms of her [Mrs. Shakespeare's] monumental inscription, and brackets of like description are to be seen in other parts of the Register, no fewer than six occuring in the list of baptisms for the year in question—1623. The matter, however, is placed beyond all doubt by the record of the two funerals, as it thus appears in a contemporary transcript of the original notes that were made on the occasion—

August 8, Mrs. Ann Shakespeare.
August 8, Ann, wyfe to Richard James.

And it may be just worth adding, that, in an enumeration of persons remarkable whose names were to be noticed in the Stratford Register, and which was added to the volume toward the close of the seventeenth century, there is included the memorandum, '1623. One Mrs. Shakespeare was buried.'"

To this letter Dr. Conway replied—

"New York, March 16, 1908.

"DEAR DR. APPLETON MORGAN,—I have read the quotation in the 'Outlines,' ninth edition, and it strikes me as untrustworthy. Why is not the 'contemporary transcript' of the original notes located so that it can be verified? I have talked on the subject with Charles Flower, of Stratford-on-Avon, with Horace Furness, Howard Stanton, three learned Editors of Shakespeare, and neither of them mentioned any such 'transcript.' I have found several suspicious things in the 'Outlines,' and do not accept its assertion when the means of verification are withheld. The memorandum in the end of the volume, '*1623. One Mrs. Shakespeare was buried*,' doesn't bear on the question. Evidently the clergy have been puzzled and '*Mrs. Shakespeare*' becomes '*Mrs. Ann Shakespeare*' in some note, and in some other, '*One Mrs. Shakespeare*'!!! Brackets, except in the Deaths, I did not look for. In Baptisms, brackets (in case of twins) might be looked for. And if there are any in the Deaths, no doubt they would be mentioned by Halliwell-Phillipps. At any rate, it would be necessary in each several case to give us the bracketed names and descriptions so that we could see whether the bracketed people were unrelated. Why should a Shakespeare be bracketed with a James? There is an air of conscious unveracity in all the paragraph.

"Cordially, MONCURE D. CONWAY."

The discussion is very interesting. In my paper in "New Shakespeareana" I tried to state everything on both sides; but, of course, there is nothing but conjecture possible.

As to Mr. Stotsenburg's query as to the alleged letter from Daniel to Sir Thomas Egerton, Dr. Ingleby remarks ("Complete View of the Shakespeare Controversy," London, 1861, page 247): "To the practised eye it betrays its spuriousness at a glance. The paper is of a later date than the time to which the document professes to belong, and the supposition of its being an early copy of a genuine original involves the very improbable presumption that at so early a date documents of this kind were considered, from a literary point of view, as of sufficient interest to be copied for preservation. For no other purpose can we suppose such a copy to have been made. Another suspicious circumstance is that when Mr. Collier himself gives the letter in his 'New Facts' (page 49) he does not give it in SEVENTY places accurately as to details—such as orthography, punctuation, etc."

And as all the other documents produced by Collier are forgeries, there seems no particular reason for supposing this one alone to be genuine.

Yours obediently, JAMES F. REILLY.

No. 23, Park Row, New York, August 13, 1908.

BACONIANA.

VOL. VII. *Third Series.* APRIL, 1909. No. 26.

A FEW NOTES FOR MR. JUSTICE MADDEN.

I DO not understand why any person who has read Bacon's writings with any thought of discovering what images he *did* use, should advance the proposition that he seemed unfamiliar with field and forest sports, and that therefore we should assume that it was the Stratford man and not Bacon who wrote the so-called Shake-speare dramas and poems. There are three answers to this proposition :—

First. The character of Bacon's philosophical and scientific writings would preclude the use of so much imagery and descriptive work as would naturally be found in dramatic and poetic productions. As well search the prose writings of Goethe to prove that he did not write the poetic works going in his name, or examine the political works of Milton to prove that he did not write "Paradise Lost."

Second. The people in and about London were as familiar with all kinds of field and forest sports as were the country people of Warwickshire. (See *Sports and Pastimes of the English People,* by Joseph Strutt).

Third. It is *not* a fact that, considering the dissimilar character of the writings, Bacon shows less familiarity

with field and forest sports than Shake-speare does, as indicated by the use of imagery drawn from those sources.

Again, how does it come that Shakespeare evinces such great familiarity with the sports of kings, and princes, lords and ladies? If it is the Stratford man, where did he acquire the language, manners, customs —the very atmosphere of courts and courtiers? He was certainly less familiar with such surroundings than Bacon was with English sports of all kinds. Osborne said that Bacon could talk of hawks and hounds with any English squire, and could outcant a London chirurgeon. Remember, also, that Bacon was not *describing* field and country sports, and could only refer to them in the way of imagery. Now, what are the facts in this connection? Take the subject of archery, or shooting with the bow:

"A well experienced archer hits the mark" (*Pericles* I. i.).

"I am not an impostor that proclaim
Myself against the *level* of my *aim*.
(*Alls Well* II. i.).

"Our safest way is to avoid the *aim* (*Macbeth* II. iii.).

"Bring me within the *level* of your frown
But *shoot* not at me in thy wakened hate"
(referring to Cupid). (*Sonnet* 117).

"I am your *butt* and I abide your shot" (3 *Henry VI.* I. iv).

"Here is my *butt*
And every sea-*mark* of my utmost sail"
(*Othello* V. ii.).

"A *mark* marvellously well *shot*" (*Love's Labour Lost* IV. i.).

"Their conceits have wings fleeter than *arrows*—bullets" (*Love's Labour Lost* V. ii.).

"Look how I go
Swifter than *arrow* from the *Tartar's bow*."
Midsummer Night's Dream III. ii.).

Now, observe this last quotation as we pass. Assuming that Shaksper knew something about shooting with the bow, even at a mark, what did he know of the use of the bow by a Tartar? Had he ever seen a Tartar shoot? Where did he ever read about it? Now listen to Bacon:

"Words, as *Tartar's bow*, do shoot back upon the understanding" (*Advancement of Learning*).

How did it happen that these two men both use the same obscure simile? To my mind, it is quite evident that Bacon, in his reading, came across something in relation to the Tartars and their manner of shooting, and the simile was too good to be lost and he repeated it in *Midsummer Night's Dream*, or placed it there as one of his "foot-steps," by which he might be traced.

"*Shot* through the ear with a love song" (*Romeo and Juliet* II. iv.).

"This *murderous shaft* that's *shot*" (*Macbeth* II. iii.).

"Out of *shot* and danger of desire" (*Hamlet* I. iii.).

"That I have *shot* mine *arrow* o'er the house" (*Hamlet* V. ii.).

"The *shot* of accident, nor *dart* of *chance*" (*Othello* IV. ii.).

Now listen again to Bacon:

"Short speeches which *fly abroad* like *darts*, and are thought to be *shot out* of their secret intentions (*Seditions and Troubles.*)

Observe that in both of these latter quotations the fall of the *dart* is left to *chance*.

"Your *shafts* of fortune" (*Pericles* III. iii.).

Now, let us see what Bacon can do, not in poetry or in a descriptive way, but in prose, sober philosophical works:

"Like ill *archers* that draw not their *arrows* up to the head" (*History of Henry VII.*).

Bacon could evidently have instructed the archers as well as the actors.

"Doth spoil the *feathers* (of the arrow) of round flying up to the *mark*" (*Of Simulation and Dissimulation.*)

"The *aim* is better when the *mark* is alive" (*Advancement of Learning*).

"The surest *aim* that could be taken" (*Henry VII.*).

"Like the motion of the *bullet*"—as above in Shakespeare (*Of Delays*).

"Much bending breaks the *bow*: much unbending the mind" (*Ornamenta Rationalia*).

"*Outshoot* them with their own *bow*" (*Advancement of Learning*).

"Excell in *out-shooting* them with their own *bow*"—illustrating Bacon's trick of repeating similes which took his fancy—(*Of Honour and Reputation*).

"Planted above injuries so that he cannot be *shot*" (*Of Goodness*).

"Suspecting that they are *shot at*" (*Penthæus and Acteon*).

"For when the *butt* is set up men need not *rove*, but except the *White* be placed, men cannot *level*" (*Interpretation of Nature*). (The "white" in archery is the centre of the butt).

"It is an error frequent for men to *shoot over* and to suppose deeper ends" (*Advancement of Learning*).

"And had set up King Henry as a *mark* at whose overthrow all her actions should *aim* and *shoot*: inso-

much as all the counsels of his succeeding troubles came chiefly out of that *quiver*" (*Henry VII.*).

This last is pretty good for a man who knew nothing about archery—"mark," "aim," "shoot," "quiver"—all in one short sentence. Shake-speare cannot come up to it.

ARCHERY.

". . . that as the *mark we shot at*, was union and unity" (*Return of Commission of England and Scotland*, Vol. II., p. 150).*

". . . the *mark he shot at* was to see——" (Vol. II., p. 244).

". . . and then they could not *miss the mark*" (Vol. II., p. 324).

". . . but only set it down out of our *aiming and levelling* at the end. For having *set up the mark*, we deliver the light to others" (*History of Life and Death*, Vol. III., p. 507).

". . . neither is it a subject within the *level* of my judgment" (*Of a War with Spain*, Vol. II., p. 202).

". . . or some preferment is in sight at which they *level*" (*Observations on a Libel*, Vol. II., p. 243).

". . . which shows that this fellow in his slanders is no good *marksman*, but throweth out his words of defaming without all *aiming*" (*Observations on a Libel*, Vol. II., p. 263).

". . . I am persuaded she saw plainly whereat I *levelled*" (*Apology Concerning Essex*, Vol. II., p. 337).

". . . missing your *aim* you discredited what you had found" (*Expostulation to Coke*, Vol. II., p. 487).

"But my *level* is no farther, but to do the part of a true friend" (*Bacon to Buckingham*, Vol. III., p. 153).

"Because it is indeed the very *level* which doth direct

*This and the following references are to the three volume edition of Montagu's "Bacon's Life, Letters and Works."

the very ordinance of the statute" (*Reading of Statute of Uses*).

"First, when I open it you may take your *aim*" (*Charge against Somerset*, Vol. II. p. 323).

"They do directly show me the thing which we do *aim* at" (*Natural History of the Winds*, Vol. III. p. 442).

"I have *roved* at things above my *aim*" (*Of a War with Spain*, Vol. II. p. 215).

". . . "If I could purge it of two sorts of *rovers*" (*Letters to Burghley*, Vol. III. p. 2).

". . . Sure am I it was like a Tartar's or Parthian's *bow*, which shooteth backwards." (First use of this image of the Tartar's bow in Parliament of 30 Eliz. Compare with date of use of same imagery in *Midsummer Night's Dream*) (*Speech on the Motion of a Subsidy*, Vol. II. p. 268).

". . . Who have started aside like a *broken bow*" (*Advice to Villiers*, Vol. II. p. 418).

". . . For two months and a half together to be *strong bent* is too much for my *bow*" (*Bacon to Buckingham*, Vol. III. p. 126).

". . . my *bow carrieth not so high*, as to *aim* to advise touching ——" (*Bacon to Buckingham*, Vol. III. p. 153).

". . . as it were *headless arrows*" (*Of Church Controversies*, Vol. II. p. 418).

"I will *shoot* my fool's *bolt*" (*Bacon to Essex*, Vol. III. p. 6).

"A fool's *bolt* is soon *shot*" (*Shakespeare*).

". . . starting aside like a *broken bow*" (*Jurisdiction of the Marches*, Vol. III. p. 291).

"For a man may by the eye *set up the white* right in the midst of the *butt* though he be no *archer*" (*Bacon to Essex*, Vol. III. p. 7).

The Chase.

Of course, if there was any sport that Shaksper was

familiar with it must have been the *Chase*, and of course Bacon must have been ignorant of that subject and would never have thought of using images drawn from that source.

"*Parked* and pounded in a pale,
A little herd of England's timorous deer."
(*1 Henry VI.* IV. ii.).

"As of deer in an enclosed park, as in the forest at large" (*Advancement of Learning*).

"Do lead their lives like *stags, fearful,*" etc. (*Acteon and Pantheus*).

"For every natural action and so by consequence motion and progression, is nothing else than *hunting*" (*Pan*).

"As we see in beasts, that those that are weakest in the *course*, and yet nimblest in the turn ; as it is betwixt the *greyhound* and the *hare*" (*Discourse.*)

"That one is as the *greyhound* which hath his advantage in the race, and the other as the *hare* which hath his advantage in the *turn*" (*Advancement of Learning*).

"Then shall you see the dew-bedabbled wretch
Turn and *return, indenting* with the way"
(*Venus and Adonis*).

(And Shaksper couldn't even leave out the law term "indenting" !)

"And as it were *hounding* Nature" (*Advancement of Learning*).

(See this "hounding of Nature" or "hunting of Pan" in the first headpiece of the 1623 Folio of Shakespeare's Plays).

"Even as we used to *hunt* beast with beast" (*Advancement of Learning*).

". . . it being so wild a *chase*, as to serve process

upon the wrong-doer in foreign parts" (*Report of Spanish Grievances*, Vol. II. p. 196).*

"This ship, for the space of fifteen hours, sat like a *stag* among *hounds at bay*" (*Of a War with Spain*, Vol. II. p. 202).

". . . but I doubt it came not out of his *quiver*" (*Charge against Mr. Lumsden*, Vol. II. p. 310).

"My Lords, he is not *hunter* alone that *lets slip the dog* upon the *deer*, but he that *lodges the deer*, or *raises* him, or he that *sets a toil* that he cannot escape" (*Charge against Somerset*, Vol. II. p. 323).

". . . as if a man exercise by *shooting*, he shall not only shoot nearer the *mark*, but also *draw* a stronger *bow*" (*Bacon to Saville*, Vol. III. p. 72).

". . . your majesty shall *blow a horn*" (*To the King*, Vol. III. p. 72).

". . . when greatness is the *mark* and accusation is the *game*" (*Bacon to Buckingham*, Vol. III. p. 135).

". . . I would take and *snare* him by the foot" (*Charge against Duels*, Vol. II. p. 299).

". . . penal laws that lie as *snares* upon the subjects" (*Charge against Oliver St. John*, Vol. II. p. 306).

". . . is turned into a deadly *snare*" (*Charge against Mr. Lumsden*, Vol. II. p. 308).

Falconry.

And is it hawking of which Bacon knows and says nothing? Let us see again:—

"Like a *seeled dove* that mounts and mounts because he cannot see above him" (*Ambition*).

"Is as a *lure* to all birds of prey" (*Riches*).

"This *lure* she cast abroad" (*Henry VII.*).

("As a falcon to the *lure* away she flies."—*Venus and Adonis*).

* This and the following references are to the three volume edition of Montagu's "Bacon's Life, Letters and Works."

"She [Learning] holdeth as well of the *hawk* that can soar aloft, and can also descend and strike upon the prey" (*Advancement of Learning*).

"Even as we used to . . . . *fly bird* with *bird*" (*Advancement of Learning*).

"Both, like *tame hawks* for their masters," &c. (*Henry VII.*).

"For else young men shall go *hooded*" (*Travel*).

("Talking of hawking, nothing else my Lord." —2 *Henry VI.* II. i.).

". . . and, as a *lure cast abroad*, invite and entice all the nations adjacent" (*Of the True Greatness of Britain*, Vol. II. p. 225),*

"I would to God that I were *hooded*, that I saw less" (*Bacon to Queen*, Vol. III. p. 37).

"For now I am like a *hawk*, that *bates*, when I see occasion of service, but cannot *fly*, because I am *tied to another fist*" (*Bacon to Queen*, Vol. III. p. 37).

". . . that my *wings* should be *imped* again, I have committed myself to the *mue*" (*Essex to Bacon* (by *Bacon*) Vol. III. p. 37).

Swimming.

Swimming was a country sport, but more so in London in the Thames than in the Avon.

"Swimming in anticipations" (*Interpretation of Nature*).

"Swimming in conceit" (*Advancement of Learning*).

"Swimming in pleasures" (*Advancement of Learning*).

"Let him practice with helps, as *swimmers* do with *bladders* or rushes" (*Of Nature in Men*).

* This and the following references are to the three volume edition of Montagu's "Bacon's Life, Letters and Works."

("I have ventured
Like little wanton boys that *swim* on *bladders*"
—*Henry VIII.* II. ii.)

Of course, this is Shaksper frollicking in the Avon on bladders gotten from his father's butcher shop! But were there no boys in London swimming in the Thames on bladders, and where there were regular teachers of the art?

BOATING.

Or was boating one of the sports of the youthful "Shagsper of thone"?

Here we have him again :—

"Which did with *sails* and *oars* put on——" (*Henry VII.*).

"Like unto *rowing* against the *stream*" (*Advancement of Learning*).

"That bear the principle *stroke*"—that is, the "stroke oar" (*Henry VII.*).

NESTING.

And, of course, Shaksper must have gone nesting before he tackled Lucy's deer, and how easily the similes would come to him :—

"Hunt out his *nest*" (*Henry VII.*).

"And the seats and *nestlings* of the humors" (*Of Honour and Reputation*).

("Far from the nest the lap-wing cries away."—*Comedy of Errors* IV. ii.).

("A school-boy, who, being over joyed with finding a bird's nest."—*Much Ado* I. iii.).

NETTING AND SNARING.

And he must have been equally familiar with netting and snaring birds :—

"Seemeth but a *net* of subtlety" (*Advancement of Learning*).

"And as it were with a *net* made to just measure" (*Advancement of Learning*).

"Sacrifices to their *nets* and *snares*" (*Advancement of Learning*).

"*Snare* the understanding" (*Advancement of Learning*).

And those fishing days on the Avon :—

"*Fish* in droumy waters" (*Advancement of Learning*).

"He might *fish* the better" (*Henry VII.*).

"Casting the *net*, not out of St. Peter's" (*Henry VII.*).

DANCING.

And how Shaksper must have enjoyed *dancing* in his heavy shoes with one or both of the two Annes :—

"It is one method to practice *swimming* with *bladders*, and another to practice *dancing* with *heavy shoes*" (*Advancement of Learning*).

Is it possible that Bacon ever danced with heavy shoes? Is it possible that Shaksper ever danced with queens, princes and lords and ladies, and of which sport he talks so much?

WOODS.

And those woods the Stratford boy loved so much! How he used them in his similes :—

"The *wood* of suspicion" (*Of Suspicion*).

"Planting of countries is like planting of *woods*" (*Plantations*).

"And be, as it were, in a *wood*" (*Ambition*).

"The king being lost in the *wood* of suspicion" (*Henry VII.*).

"Like one *lost* in a thorny *wood*."

(Now who wrote this last, Shake-speare or Shaksper?)

Indeed, it is true that—

"He is a better woodman than thou takest him for" (*Measure for Measure* IV. iii.).

And if this is not believed, examine Bacon's similes and imagery drawn from trees!

Unquestionably, the list I have given you can be much enlarged. How foolish is the argument! Bacon knew more about Nature in a minute than Shaksper ever dreamed of. In the dramas and the poems he revelled in nature *descriptions* as well as in imagery derived from that source; in his prose philosophy he does not pretend to give us *descriptions* of natural objects and country scenes and incidents, but uses them chiefly for metaphors. Assume that Bacon was the author of the Shake-speare writings, and what right has anyone to demand or expect that he would duplicate the imagery used there in his philosophical and scientific works? Yet he does that to a very remarkable degree, especially in his early writings. But if he had not done so, no legitimate argument in favour of the Stratford man could be drawn from that fact. How weak is that argument in relation to field and forest sports! To my mind it seems plain that Bacon was so possessed with the poetic cast of thought that he overloads his philosophical writings with his profusion of imagery. He cannot escape it. He may deny himself for a time, but the first thing you know he is "at it again."

But the man that advances the argument that because Bacon uses less imagery derived from country sports and pastimes than Shake-speare does because Shaksper was a country, and Bacon a city man, and therefore not the author of the Shake-speare writings, must face the converse of the proposition, and this is where the Stratford man disappears from view. What had been Shaksper's connection with music? Where did he study medicine? When did he ever study statecraft? Where did he associate with nobility? When was he

ever in France where he had access to original historical data? When was he a student in philology? Whenever did he conclude to become a profound philosopher? When did he delve into mythology? When these questions are satisfactorily answered it will be time to spring the puerile argument that Bacon knew nothing of country sports. If Shaksper ever knew anything about anything it must have been the stage, and yet Bacon, the recluse, lawyer, statesman and dry philosopher, nowhere more copiously uses imagery than in that drawn from stagecraft. Is that not exceedingly strange? And so on almost *ad infinitum*.

Is not all this sufficient to answer Mr. Madden? It would appear that he wrote his book without attempting to confirm his impression that Bacon did not prolifically use imagery drawn from field and forest sports. The truth of it is that many of Shakespeare's supposedly original instances of imagery, taken from his personal country scenes and experiences, are cribbed bodily from ancient poets. The significance lies in the identity between Bacon and Shakes-speare of the *uncommon metaphors*, and out-of-the-way forms of speech, and the same predilection to certain mental traits.

F. C. HUNT.

JOHN STURM OF STRASBURG

(Born 1507, Died 1589).

NO biography of Francis Bacon could be complete without some reference to John Sturm. Under the care of Sir Nicholas Bacon and Anne, *née* Cook, his wife, the precocious boy received, as I think, other than their tuition. Roger Ascham, Queen Elizabeth's Greek tutor from her accession, published a book on the education of the young when Francis was nine years old. There can be little doubt that his parents would have been the first people to consult with Ascham on their son's education, for he was the close friend of Anthony Cook and of Lady Bacon's father; he was attached to the Court, and had been Professor of Oratory at Cambridge. There, as we hear, he had received any amount of public applause.

What has this to do with Sturm of Strasburg? Much; not only was Sturm dear to Ascham, but he was also the warm, personal friend of Anthony Cook.

A prisoner in the Tower, Mary Tudor and Gardiner, both attached to Cook, allowed him to take flight for Strasburg, where for a time he lived in close friendship with Sturm.

A scholar of Wittenburg, Sturm established in the quaint old town of Strasburg a Gymnasium on new lines, of which he became Rector in 1538. This excellent school developed in 1566 into an Academy renowned throughout Europe. It drew scholars from foreign countries, many from England.

John Sturm cherished a profound veneration, we are told by his biographer, A. G. Strobel,* for Queen Elizabeth.

The political leader of the Protestant cause in Francis

* *Histoire du Gymnase Protestant (Strasburg,* 1838).

I's. reign, that monarch desired him to interview Henry VIII., which no doubt he did.

His interest and love for England never flagged. He dedicated a preface in one of his works to the Princess Elizabeth;* another to Anthony Cook, tutor, as we know, to the Princess and Edward VI. The relations between Sturm and all Protestant princes were important. He met envoys from Queen Elizabeth in Frankfort to discuss how the Huguenot cause might be aided. When he was in doubt whether or no to continue his scholastic work he sought Queen Elizabeth's advice. He seems to have been a generous and hospitable friend to political agents and strangers, and Sir Philip Sydney was one of his faithful friends. The champion of liberal thought, he was, as a Polish Count, a student in his college, enthusiastically said, a man that "France contemplated, that Italy admired, that England, Scotland, Danemark, Hungary, and Bohemia surround with respect and affection." "Ask the young men of foreign nations," he adds, "why they undertake the fatigue of a long voyage which they would never have dreamt of, they will answer, To see Sturm and to follow his course of study. . . . Hero of the golden age, and of the renascent Church, the virtues of this noble old man are worthy of our veneration and our gratitude." Sturm was offered a Chair at Heidelberg in 1583, but his infirmities prevented his accepting this honour. At his death a volume of verses, dedicated to Queen Elizabeth, "his constant *protectrice*," appeared to his memory." †

In 1570 Sturm wrote to the Landgrave of Cassel that he had imagined a political and economic system for England to put her out of danger of all aggression and of outer and civil sedition. His serene and vigorous spirit seemed unquenchable. He addressed to Henry

* 1550. † 1590.

III. "*une réquete*" and carried on an active correspondence with Spain, Italy, Germany, and last but not least with England, with Leicester, through Sir John Wolley, with Queen Elizabeth by Roger Ascham, with Paget, Burleigh, Walsingham, John Hales and Anthony Cook. In 1569 he recommended *Cassiodoro*, the translator of the Bible in Spanish, to Queen Elizabeth. His enthusiasm for the Queen was so great that it was his wish to end his days in England near her; this wish was reciprocated by Elizabeth. In 1568 she sent him a subsidy for the French Protestants of 20,000 pounds sterling. Sturm was in receipt of a pension from Elizabeth to the day of his death.

Like Francis Bacon he was sincerely attached to the reform of the Churches, but he eagerly sought, notwithstanding, their reconciliation. He spared no effort to restore the unity of Christendom. Intolerance was hateful to him, and the defence of truth was the central spring of his useful life. His aim in education was to teach his scholars to live, think and speak well. And the means he employed were religion, logic, and literary study. His system included, besides a deep study of Latin and Greek, the art of expression, the power to convey thought by an interesting and agreeable speech and manner. He directed the mind and will to God, and strongly advocated the study and knowledge and understanding of our most holy faith.*

In the State Calendar in the Reference Library, British Museum, is a letter from John Sturm at Strasburg, to Burleigh, December, 1577, the year that Francis Bacon went abroad with Sir Amyas Paulet. It says:—

"A son of the Lord Keeper is with us, his good manners, modesty, and conversation please me so much

* *La Vie et les Travaux de Jean Sturm, par Charles Schmidt, Strasburg, 1855.*

that I am sorry I cannot be as much use to him as his goodness deserves."

Let us consider. Who was this son? Sturm goes on to say "He is named Edward." In Dr. Thomas Birch's Memoirs of Queen Elizabeth, he mentions a paper of Anthony Bacon's in which appears the name of *Edward Burnham*, praised by Walsingham for his successful conduct of secret embassages in Italy, Spain and elsewhere.

The connection of the names Edward Burnham and Anthony Bacon makes us ask, Was this the *soubriquet* adopted by Francis when on the secret embassage which history tells us he undertook for the Queen at this time?

Burn Ham is not a far-fetched synonym for Bacon! And if Francis was to be equipped for a delicate Protestant mission to foreign potentates on behalf of the Queen and her Ministers (Walsingham was famed for his clever choice of intelligencers), what better visit could he have paid first for his own and his country's benefit than to that Prince of Diplomatists and Prince of Pedagogues, Johannes Sturmius?

A boy among boys his presence at Strasburg Academy would have aroused no suspicions, though his admission under a name other than his own would no doubt have been thought expedient.

Sir Nicholas Bacon had an elder son Edward, at this time, as I believe, a married man, hardly to be described as Sturm describes his visitor: "Manners, goodness and modesty smacks of the boy rather than of the man;" particularly from the pen of a Schoolmaster.

As to the choice of the name Edward, the Queen's pet name for Francis was "my little Lord Keeper;" and "Edward," Camden takes care to tell us, means "Happy Keeper."

"Did Francis ever allude to Sturm in his works so as

to lead us to imagine he may have known him personally? Yes. "Then did Sturmius spend such infinite and curious pains upon Cicero the Orator, and Hermoginus the Rhetorician, besides his own book of periods, and imitation and the like." (*Advancement of Learning*, p. 41). When we know what a Master of Rhetoric Francis Bacon was may we not ask, Did these two sympathetic souls, master and scholar, wander in the fields in and about the quaint old Burgher Town among the flowers they both so much loved? We learn that Sturm, a lover of gardens, was also a profound and ardent believer in the stage as a means of education, and that he presented every month a Comedy of Plautus before his scholars, assisted by some of them, trained in the divine art by himself.

There seems no end to the bonds of sympathy linking these ardent educationalists together. Sturm wrote yet again to Burleigh in February, 1578.

"I have written a true report of his (the Lord Keeper's) son's goodness."

ALICIA A. LEITH.

MASKS OR FACES.

A WRITER in the *Contemporary* for February, 1909, reaffirms (what is already accepted) that Pierre de Ronsard, who flourished 1525—85, and his school did for the French language much the same type of service that the Elizabethan poets did for our own tongue. Substitute for the term "Elizabethan poets" the words "Bacon and his school," and we shall be nearer to accurate statement.

As usual when a man wishes to establish a new industry amongst an untrained community he has to do most of the work and all the preliminary teaching him-

self. When Francis, in England, had taken "all knowledge for his province," he commenced, like Ronsard, by improving the language of his compatriots, so as to provide a suitable medium for thought. Most of the earlier writings published with that end in view came necessarily from his pen alone.

After an interval of twenty to thirty years, when he had trained his assistants, he could restrict his own output and confine himself mostly to supervision.

For reasons which to himself seemed sufficient he preferred to conceal his authorship and publish his writings under vizards. Unless this were so the scholarship ordinarily attainable at the universities and schools could never have been of the indifferent quality testified to by the writers quoted in Mr. Bayley's book, "The Shakespeare Symphony."

According to those writers the colleges at Oxford and Cambridge in Elizabethan times were little better than endowed elementary boarding schools. To them large numbers of poor youths were sent to take advantage of the free meals, lodgings, and lectures provided out of the college revenues. Some hoped to become clergymen, tutors, or schoolmasters; others to obtain positions at the colleges, but the majority necessarily drifted to London and the larger towns to take up any occupation for which an elementary education might qualify them. The bestowal by the university of the M.A. degree seems to have been largely a mere form, coincident with the expiration of the period during which the plebian had been allowed to quarter himself on the college endowments. Its intrinsic value as an indication of scholarship may be judged by the fact that Robert Earl of Essex was given his M.A. degree at the ripe age of fourteen! The state of education in the sparsely-scattered schools was of course worse.

When Francis Bacon returned from France in 1579,

a period of great literary and dramatic activity, as part of a movement for the reform of English drama and poetry, set in. It is agreed on all hands that his scholarship was of the widest, his learning the most profound, and that he had all the facility which foreign travel long extended can give. Did he compass, devise, contrive and control this great output of literature and drama?

Or was it mostly the more or less syndicated work of six players, two clerks, and two obscurities? Surely the authorities quoted by Mr. Bayley must have been mistaken? Gosson, B.A., was a prodigy of learning. So were Peele, M.A., Lyly, M.A., Marlowe, M.A., Nash, B.A., and Greene, M.A. So was Spenser, M.A. Equally so was Kyd, of Merchant Taylors' School. But the greatest prodigy of all seems to have been the play-actor Shakspere, who, like Kyd, had no university education. The writings of *the ascribed authors*, namely, the six play-actors whose literary accomplishments so far outshone their histrionic efforts, the two clerks, Spenser and Kyd, and the two obscurities, "Lyly" and "Watson," show that the author possessed a first-class knowledge of French; seven that the author had travelled abroad; seven that the author could quote or write Italian, and three that he could quote Spanish. With the exception of "Watson," under whose name no plays were published, each ascribed author was an expert dramatist. There is no evidence that either Peele, Lyly, Greene, Marlowe, Nash, Kyd, Spenser, or Shakspere were ever trained as lawyers, yet each of them used law terms and legal phraseology with the accuracy of a highly educated lawyer. Singularly, on the other hand, the supposed author, "Watson," who on the title-page of a book printed under that name in 1592 actually described himself as a student of law in London, does not appear to use legal phraseology!

The later publications show a more profound knowledge of law than the earlier ones.

Passing next to the scholarship displayed in the writings, it is significant to notice what ample learning each ascribed author possessed. Gosson, B.A., at the age of twenty-one, became a player. He blossomed as "author" three years later. At the age of twenty-seven he became a clergyman, the Queen presenting him with a living, and died at the age of sixty-nine without writing anything more or making any claim to authorship. Yet if he wrote the works which stand to his name his qualifications for continuing as author were exceptional.

The writings under his name give proof of acquaintance with the works of Pliny, Virgil, Ovid, Plato, Cicero, Plutarch, Aristotle, Homer, Pindar, Lucan, Ennius, Hesiod, Æsop, Sallurst, Xenophon, Cæsar, Dionysius, as well as Euripides, Seneca, Plautus, Menander, David and Solomon.

The publications under the name "Lyly" also show familiarity with Pliny, Virgil, Ovid, Cicero, Plato, Homer, Aristotle, Cæsar, and Plutarch, and with Erasmus, Musæus, Guevara and Chaucer. Also like "Gosson" familiarity with the sacred books of David and Solomon.

The writings published under the name "Watson" indicate that their author, in addition to Pliny, Virgil, Ovid, Homer, Cicero, Aristotle, Musæus and Chaucer, also knew Theocritus, Martial, Horace, Flaccus, Coluthus, Mantuanus, Propertius, Sophocles, Lucan and Apollonius. For the purpose of equipping himself as a writer of Sonnets the author had moreover (in or before the year 1582) made special study of the poets Ronsard, Forcadel, Petrarch, Serafina, Tasso, Ariosto, Firenzuola, Parabosco, Strozza, Poliziano and Sylvius.

The "Spenser" writings give evidence of wide

scholarship. The extent of this does not appear to have been examined with anything like thoroughness. Indications have, however, been pointed out showing that "the author" was easily familiar with the works of Virgil, Plato, Æsop, Dion, Plutarch, Horace, Mantuanus, Catullus, of Chaucer, Lydgate and Gower, of Buchanan and Holinshed, as well as of Ronsard, Desportes, Marot, Du Bartas, Du Bellay, Petrarch, Dante, Ariosto, Ficino, Boccaccio and Sanazzaro.

In the "Greene" works the range of scholarship is again remarkable. The writer knew his Virgil, Plato, Ovid, Cicero, Juvenal and Æsop as well as his Erasmus. Chaucer, Gower and Solomon were amongst his great exemplars. Of Italian and Spanish writers he is found to be familiar with Dante, Ariosto, Boccaccio and Sanazzaro, and with Montemayor, Guazza, Castiglione and Macchiavelli.

The "Peele" writings show acquaintance with Virgil, Ovid, Pliny, Horace, Juvenal, Cicero and Plautus, with Ariosto and Du Bartas, and with Chaucer, Gower and Holinshed. What are known as the "Marlowe" writings, although the ascriptions are all posthumous, reveal knowledge of the works of Virgil, Ovid, Aristotle, Lucan, Musæus, Xenophon, Catullus, Euripides, and Herodotus, as well as with the contemporaries—Ramus, Holinshed and Macchiavelli.

The "Kyd" writings, also posthumously ascribed, show acquaintance with Virgil, Ovid, Plato, Cicero, Catullus, Lucan, Æsop, Claudian, Statius, Terence and Seneca, as well as with Petrarch, Tasso and Macchiavelli.

The "Nash" writings, although many of them are satirical pamphlets, indicate great scholarship. The author was familiar with Virgil, Ovid, Pliny, Cicero, Aristotle, Æsop, Theocritus, Lucan, Lucian, Plutarch, Musæus, Strabo, Homer and Hesiod. He knew his

Erasmus, Melancthon, Plautine and Sadolet, his Tasso, Celiano, Ariosto, and Petrarch, his Chaucer, Lydgate and Gower, his David and Solomon. He also knew the contemporary Aretine, Ramus and Macchiavelli.

The "Shakespeare" writings have been more carefully examined on the question of scholarship. The author, whoever he was, had knowledge of Virgil, Ovid, Pliny, Plato, Homer, Cicero, Plutarch, Juvenal, Horace, Livy, Catullus, Cæsar, Aristotle, Tacitus, Lucian, Tibullus, Hesiod, Herodotus, Mantuanus, Anacreon, Euripides, Sophocles, Musæus, Aristophanes, Terence, Plautus, Seneca and other classical writers. He was influenced by the writings of Chaucer, Gower and Lydgate, by Erasmus, Holinshed, and Buchanan, by Bandello, Rabelais, Ariosto, Cinthio, Ramus, Montemayor, Bruno and Macchiavelli. According to the researches of the late Mr. W. Theobald, M.A., even the above is very much short of a complete list.

The inferences for concluding that Gosson, Lyly, Watson, Spenser, Peele, Marlowe, Greene, Kyd, Nash, and Shakspeare were merely (to use the words ascribed to Gosson in 1579) "vizards that poets mask in" are many. Gosson was a player at the age of twenty-one, a parson at twenty-seven. Greene was first a Chapel Royal boy player, next a student, then a parson, then a man player and then a parson again. "Watson" and "Lyly" were mere pen-names. Peele was a player and died broken by poverty and disease. Marlowe was a player—had some employment as a copyist and died in a pothouse brawl. Spenser had employment as a clerk and copyist in Ireland, and died in destitution within three months from his return to England. Kyd was the son of a scrivener, was employed as copyist side by side with Marlowe and died quite young. Nash found similar employment at the age of twenty-one and died obscurely. Shakspere was a player who,

before the wonderful plays *ascribed to him* had ceased appearing, became a maltster in his native village. Not one of these persons, except by title page ascription, can be connected with authorship.

The writings show, in almost all cases, that the author was, like Francis Bacon, a courtier, on intimate terms with other courtiers and easily familiar with the sports that courtiers then indulged in; that in addition he was a highly trained lawyer and had travelled abroad. New work respectively ascribed to Spenser, Marlowe and Shakspere, undistinguishable in quality from other work in the respective name, was published in Bacon's lifetime, but after the ascribed author's death. Most of the writings of this group of ten ascribed authors betray Bacon's fondness for garden flowers. Most if not all of the ascribed authors were, like Bacon, inventors of new words and terms of expression. The author of practically each group shared Bacon's fluent French and Latin, and his ability to read and quote Italian and Spanish.

In each group of writings we find the author actuated by the great zeal for the reformation of English drama, poetry, and literature first shown in the Gosson writings, 1579, and many years later applied to the advancement of knowledge generally in Bacon's acknowledged works.

Bacon could write a sonnet, though he said he did not *profess* to be a poet.

He referred to himself as "a concealed" poet. Where are the concealed writings if not under these and other vizards? What were the "studies of greater delight" which, in 1580, he preferred to the study of law? What was the outcome of his association with the "waters of Parnassus" and his dedication of his time to "better purposes" than the law, about which he wrote to Essex in 1595? What were his *poor travails* (works) alluded

to in his letter to Burleigh in 1597 and his *public writings of satisfaction* referred to in his letter to the Earl of Northumberland in 1603? Where are his tales ("my own tales") to which in 1604 he alluded in his Apology concerning Essex? Bacon's notion of fame was something which should not accompany a man during his life, but arise after his death. For his name and memory he appealed in his will to the "next ages and to foreign nations." Archbishop Tenison said that Bacon also wrote that he left his name and memory to his own countrymen after some time be passed. But the "vizards" have impressed their pseudo-individuality deeply in the minds of the guileless literary workers of many years past. In the result, false deductions are fast imbedded in the mud of English biography and histories of English literature and the mud accumulates year by year.

PARKER WOODWARD.

AMAZED AT "THE ELIZABETHAN MAZE."

"It is certain that either wise bearing or ignorant carriage is caught as men take diseases, one of another: therefore let men take heed of their company."

THE two great Herculean pillars of English literature are Francis Bacon and William Shakespeare. To rob either of these names of an iota of glory is an unpardonable vandalism. Are we to have a true or a false Francis Bacon? The serious student of Shakespeare has too long been hampered and swamped in the mire of forged and garbled biographies and it will take another generation at least to get rid of the invented "facts" of Collier, Cunningham, and other early Shakespearians. Let us hope that

some day a lover of truth, who is a poet and a philosopher, will be born to write for us a true life of the poet.

So far as I know, no forger like Collier has besmirched the fame of Bacon, but the name he left to the tender mercy of men's charitable speeches, to posterity, and the future ages, is now being mangled in the house of his professed friends! The dogs of Actæon, it seems to me, were kindlier to their master. Bacon, the king of the intellectual world, the son of a good, pure, high-minded mother—whom he called "a Saint of God"—these same "friends" would stain with bastardy! They would rob him of his birthright to dub him "Prince of Wales," seeming to forget that no earthly rank or title conferred upon him could add one jot to his transcendent worth. Bacon was himself alone—the greatest genius in a distinguished family, which stood for all that was best in England, and I may say America, for I look upon him as one of the founders of our great nation. His grandfather, Sir Anthony Cook, was tutor to Edward VI.; his mother (Sir Anthony Cook's second daughter) was governess to this young king, and Francis Bacon, no doubt, learned to lisp in Greek and Latin at his mother's knees. His father, Sir Nicholas Bacon, Lord Keeper to Elizabeth, was a statesman, wise, learned, and witty, and interested himself in the Grammar School of St. Albans, and there are now in the library of that school more than two hundred books, many of them with his bookplate, which belonged to the Bacon family. These books had not been catalogued when I saw them in July, 1905. In 1579 Sir Nicholas Bacon bestowed on his favourite college (Corpus Christi, or Benet's College, Cambridge) £200 towards a new chapel. After his death his widow gave to the same chapel £26 13s. 4d. to be used to erect a portico, with an inscription which gave to him the whole credit of the chapel.

Sir Anthony Cooke's wife was a daughter of Sir William Fitzwilliam, who was not afraid to stand up and befriend his master, Cardinal Wolsey, after his fall; and the University of Dublin was founded by a Fitzwilliam. Thus Bacon sprang from a race of educators and reformers both on his father's and on his mother's side. Shall we remain silent and let these "friends" of Bacon rob him of his true parents? Shall we hold our peace and see them put another woman in his pure mother's place? No! not even if that woman was the greatest of all England's queens! Nor will we see them thrust aside the honourable, learned and loving Sir Nicholas Bacon, to make Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, the father of Francis Bacon. Leicester, the assassinator of an innocent wife, the most skilful and secret poisoner of the age of secret murders, never begot a Bacon! Such "dangerous conceits are in their natures poisons," and we can only pity the minds that are drugged by them. *We must meet these false theories with facts.* But the question then arises, are the minds which have invented these cipher stories capable of grasping facts? When in "The Elizabethan Maze" we find the following, it would seem hopeless:—

"Bacon was unacknowledged because base begotten son of parents of abnormal position and ability, that is to say, child of a belated and secret marriage of Queen Elizabeth and Lord Robert Dudley, afterwards Earl of Leicester."

The writer's authority for these "facts" is an invented cipher story! And he quite ignores documentary evidence found in Bacon's will:—"For my burial, I desire it may be in St. Michael's Church, St. Albans: there was my mother buried, and it is the parish church of my mansion house of Gorhambury, and it is the only Christian Church within the Walls of old Verulam. For

my name and memory, I leave it to men's charitable speeches, to foreign nations, and the next ages."

Bacon's voice is forever preserved in these beautiful lines—it speaks to us from the grave. Let those who would invent a fictitious Bacon remember his pathetic words to King James :—"I wish, that as I am the first, so I may be the last of sacrifices in your times : and when from private appetite, it is resolved that a creature shall be sacrificed, it is easy to pick up sticks enough from any thicket whither it hath strayed, to make a fire to offer it with."

BASIL BROWN.

FROM BACON'S VINEYARD.

"Who planteth a vineyard and eateth not of the fruit thereof? Or who feedeth a flock and eateth not of the milk of the flock?" (1 Cor. ix.).

IN Bacon's second book of the *Novum Organum* there is the following aphorism upon *bordering instances*, in the study of the "*union of nature*," which anticipates much that Darwin and Alfred Russel Wallace have written upon species and their relationship to other species (supposed before to be fixed, immutable, and completely separable from each other) :—

"Among prerogative instances I will put in the ninth place *bordering instances*, which I also call *participles*. They are those which exhibit species of bodies *that seem to be composed of two species, or to be rudiments between one species and another*. These instances might with propriety be reckoned among singular or heteroclite instances, for in the whole extent of nature they are of rare and extraordinary occurrence. But nevertheless for their worth's sake they should be ranked and

treated separately, for they are of excellent use in indicating the composition and structure of things, and suggesting the causes of the number and quality of the ordinary species in the universe, *and carrying on the understanding from that which is to that which may be.*

"Examples of these are moss, which holds a place between putrescence and a plant; some comets, between stars and fiery meteors; flying fish, between birds and fish; bats between birds and quadrupeds; also the ape, between man and beast; likewise the beformed births of animals, mixed of different species and the like.

> "*Simia quam similis turpissima bestia nobis.*"
> ("Aphorism" XXX.).

This must be studied by light of the preceding aphorisms, particularly of the twenty-seventh, where Bacon distinctly states that he is seeking "*steps towards the union of nature.*" "Among prerogative instances I will put in the sixth place *instances conformable*, or of *analogy*, which I also call *parallels*, or *physical resemblances*. They are those which represent the *resemblances and conjugations of things*. Hence they *may be called the first and lowest steps toward the union of nature* ("Aphorism" XXVII., Book II. "Nov. Org.").

The Latin quotation from *Ennius* * cited by Bacon, pointing to the extraordinary resemblance apes (most

*Observe that in the poem by Ben Jonson, prefixed to the 1623 Folio volume of the plays, Shakespeare (after having been praised with exactly the same words Ben Jonson gives to Bacon) is compared to the playwriters *Accius* and *Ennius*, the latter of which we find Bacon quoting from. Lucretius extols *Ennius* at the beginning of his work, as his master in Latin verse. His admiration for Ennius and the old tragic poets *Paccuvius* and *Attius* (or *Accius*) is fully expressed. These three are cited together by Ben Jonson in the poem of the Folio Plays 1623, and connoted with Shakespeare's supposed genius. Cicero also held Ennius in "*an intense esteem*" ("Monro's Lucretius," I. p. 318).

evil or vilest of beasts) bear to man, finds its complete parallel portrait in the play of *Measure for Measure*, where the ape is presented *as a caricature of the natural man*, whose chief characteristic is the outward or "*glassy essence*" of the "*vanity of the creature*," who, as Saint James says, "is like unto a man beholding his *natural face in a glass*, for he beholdeth himself, and goeth his way, and straightway forgetteth what manner of man he was" (James i. 24)—meaning, I venture to think, that "*he does not know himself*" who only recognises the natural, or outward self, constituting appearance, only. (Bacon quotes the above passage from Saint James in his two books of the "Advancement of Learning," also "Essay on Friendship.")

> "But man, proud man,
> Dressed in a little brief authority,
> Most ignorant of what he's most assured,
> His glassy essence, like an angry ape,
> Plays such fantastic tricks before high heaven
> As make the angels weep; who, with our spleens,
> Would all themselves laugh mortal."
>
> (*Measure for Measure*, II. ii.)

Observe that this speech is directed by Isabel at *Angelo*, who, as his name implies, is supposed to bear *impressed upon him the divine image*, and is accountable for a right use of the talents intrusted to him. The Duke observes to Angelo:—

> *Duke.*—Heaven doth with us as we with *torches* do,
> Not light them for ourselves; for if our virtues
> Did not go forth of us, 'twere all alike
> As if we had them not.
> *Angelo.*—Now, good my lord,
> Let there be some more test made of my *metal*
> Before so noble and so great a figure *be stamped upon it.** (*Measure for Measure*, I. i.)

* "They have in England
A coin that bears the figure of an angel,

Observe, in passing by, that the image of the *Torch being handed on* (to illustrate the tradition or handing on of knowledge, or talents) is the double of Bacon's image, *Tradition of the Lamp, or the handing on of the torch to posterity,* one of Bacon's deficients of his "New World of Sciences."

But with regard to Angelo, the best commentary on all we have been saying upon *the ape and the divine in man,* is furnished by Hamlet, who exclaims: "What a piece of work is a man! How noble in reason! How infinite in faculty! In form and moving how express and admirable! *In action how like an angel. In apprehension how like a God! The beauty of the world! The paragon of animals! And yet to me, what is this quintessence of dust?*" (*Hamlet,* II. ii.)

In Bacon's second book of the "Advancement of Learning," describing the soul, he says, "The soul, on the other side, is the simplest of substances, as is well expressed :—

Purumque reliquit
Æthereum sensum atque auraï simplicis ignem.

"So that it is no marvel though the soul so placed, enjoy no rest, if that principle be true, that *Motus rerum est rapidus extra locum placidus in loco.*"

Stamp'd in gold, but that's insculp'd upon."
(*Merchant of Venice,* II. vii. 56.)

This *Signatura Rerum,* or signature of things, representing Creation by the image of the seal and the clay (or wax) was a notable doctrine of the Rosicrucians, and is abundantly made use of by Bacon for the same purpose. For example, Bacon observes: "There is a great difference between the idols of the human mind and the ideas of the Divine. That is to say, between certain empty dogmas *and the true signatures and marks set upon the works of creation* as they are found in nature" (see "Aphorism," 23, Book I. "Nov. Org.")

"For all things are marked and *stamped* with this triple *character* of the power of God, the difference of nature and the use of man" (Book II. "Advancement of Learning").

In Bacon's *Dialogue of a Holy War* is to be found just the same philosophical descriptions of the soul as suggested by Hamlet's speech: "*Pollio.* Video quatuor hic presentes, qui mundum egregium, arbitror, constituere possint: tantum enim ab invicem discrepatis, quantum quatuor elementa, et nihilo secius concordes estis. Quantum vero ad *Eupolidem* * *quia moderatus est et placidus, illum loco quintæ essentia ponere libet*" ("Mallet's Edition of Bacon's Works," Vol. V.).

That is to say: "I see four (persons) here present, who, I think, can represent (or constitute), the great world, inasmuch as ye differ as much among yourselves as the four elements, and in nothing less is there agreement among you. *But as to Eupolis, because he is moderate and placid (or quiet), he may be allowed the place of the Quintessence.*"

Observe that in both instances the word *placidus* is employed to describe both the soul and the Quintessence.

"The ancient Greeks said there are four elements, or forms, in which matter can exist. *Fire*, or the imponderable form; *Air*, or the gaseous form; *Water*, or the liquid; and *Earth* as the solid form. The Pythagoreans added a fifth, what they called ether, more subtle and pure than fire and possessed of an orbicular motion. This element which flew upwards at creation,

* Eupolis was the name of a *comic poet*, whom Horace mentions:—

Eupolis, atque Cratinus, Aristophanesque.

Eupolis was the son of Sosipolis, an Athenian, and belonged to the school of the old comedy. In Book II., Aphorism XVI., of the *Novum Organum*, Bacon writes of the mind, "We must make therefore a complete solution and *separation* of nature, not indeed by fire, but by the mind, *which is a kind of divine fire.*" Compare Sonnets, "Till my bad angel *fire* my good one out" (Sonnet 144).

and out of which the stars were made, was called the fifth essence—*quintessence*, and therefore means the most subtle extract of a body that can be procured" (Brewer, "Dictionary of Myth and Fable").

In *Twelfth Night* we find this:—"Does not our life consist of the four elements?" (II. iii. 10).

Aristotle declared:—"That there is some essence of body *different from those of the four elements, more divine than those, and superior to them.*" ("De Cælo,"* I. i. See Whewhell's "Hist. of Inductive Sciences," Vol. I. p. 41).

Plotinus observes:—"To the intelligible world, man's mind ascends by a triple road, which Plotinus figuratively calls that of the musician, the lover, and the philosopher. The activity of the human soul is identified by analogy with the motion of the heavens" (see 2nd "Ennead" II. 2).

Bacon writes:—"But to the purpose: this variable composition of man's body hath made it as an instrument easy to distemper; and therefore *the poets did well to conjoin music and medicine in Apollo*, because the office of medicine is but to tune this curious harp of man's body and to reduce it to harmony" (2nd Book *Advancement of Learning*).

Bacon, speaking of the soul, says:—For as the substance of the soul in the creation was not extracted out of the mass of heaven and earth by the benediction of a *producat*, but was immediately inspired from God, so it is not possible that it should be (otherwise than by accident) subject to the laws of heaven and earth, which are the subject of philosophy" (2nd Book *Advancement of Learning*, p. 127, XI.).

In Bacon's "Colors of Good and Evil" we find a sophism propounded on the following text:—

Quod quis culpa sua contraxit, majus malum, quod

*Cleopatra.—I am fire and air, my other elements I give to baser life (*Ant. and Cleop.*, Act V. ii. 292).

ab externis imponitur, minus malum" (Sophisma VIII.) —viz., "That those evils which we bring upon ourselves are of a greater evil. Those evils imposed upon us from the outside (or not by ourselves) are of a lesser evil."

Bacon then re-argues and explains the sophism, as follows:—"Hujus rei causa est, quod morsus conscientiæ adversa conduplicet. Contra, conscium sibi esse, quod culpa quis vacet, magnum præbet in cala mitate solatium. Itaque poëtæ ea pathemata maxime exaggerant, tanquam desperationi propriora ubi quis seipsum accuset, et discruciet:—

"*Seque unum clamat causamque caputque malorum.*" Contra, calamitates virorum insignium elevat et diluit, innocentiæ et meriti conscientia. Porro cum malum ab aliis intentetur, habet quivis, quod libere conqueri possit, unde dolores sui exhalent, neque cor suffocent. Etenim iis quæ ab injuria hominum profecta sunt indignari solemus, aut ultionem meditari, aut denique Nemesin Divinam vel implorare, vel expectare: quinetiam, si a Fortuna ipsa inflectum quid sit, tamen datur quædam cum satis expostulatis:—

Atque Deos, atque Astra vocat crudelia mater.
(Liber VI. "Augmentis," Sophisma VIII.).

This, in English, is as follows:—

"The reason of this is, that gnawing of conscience doubles our trouble. On the other hand, the consciousness of blamelessness, provides great solace in calamity. And therefore poets greatly magnify those sufferings, as if nearer to despair where anyone accuses and tortures himself, and reproaches himself as the only (and sole) cause, and head of the evils."

Compare *Othello*'s desperation at his self-inflicted torture:—

"Whip me, ye devils
From the possession of this heavenly sight!
Blow me about in winds! Roast me in sulphur,
Wash me in steep down gulfs of liquid fire."
(Act V. ii.)

There is a passage in the play of Hamlet which singularly illustrates and parallels this of Bacon's, when Hamlet coming forward discovers Lærtes in the newly made grave of Ophelia, and exclaims:—

"What is he whose grief
Bears such an emphasis? Whose phrase of sorrow
Conjures the wandering stars, and makes them stand
Like wonder wounded hearers? This is I, Hamlet
The Dane! (*Leaps into the grave*)."
(Act V., sc. i.)

Observe, that the two griefs of Lærtes and Hamlet for the death of Ophelia, answer very closely to the two categories of Bacon's text, *i.e.*, the one *not self-inflicted*, the other *self-inflicted*, for, as Hamlet's mother exclaims to him,—"Oh, what a rash and bloody deed is this!"

Hamlet's soliloquy immediately after the departure of the ghost of his father, and the recital of his fate whilst on earth, is strongly in line with Bacon's quotation, especially the *calling the stars cruel* (Atque Deos, atque astra vocat crudelia mater).

"O all you *host of heaven!* O earth! What else?
And shall I couple hell? O fie!
Hold, hold, my heart!" (Act I. sc. v.)

Bacon's text is exactly *doubled*, or repeated by Patroclus, when he tells Achilles:—"*Those wounds heal ill that men do give themselves.*" (*Troilus and Cressida*, Act III. sc. iii.)

Naunton, in his *Fragmenta Regalia*, describes Francis Bacon in these words:—"Those that lived in his age,

and from whence I have taken this little model of him, give him a lively character, and they *decipher* him to be another *Solon, and the Sinon of those times*, such a one as Œdipus was in dissolving of riddles."

Sinon represents the very spirit of dissimulation and artifice—that is to say, of *concealment*, for it was by the happy device of the hollow horse introduced into Troy that the city fell. There is a portrait of this character given in the poem of Lucrece :—

> "In him the painter labour'd with his skill
> To hide deceit and give the harmless show." (1506).

Carlyle observes: "It has been said that, in the construction of Shakespeare's Dramas, there is, apart from all other 'faculties' as they are called, an *understanding* manifested, equal to that in Bacon's *Novum Organum*. That is true, and it is not a truth that strikes everyone.'"

Perhaps this *understanding* does really lie concealed behind the Dramas, even as Sinon was concealed within the womb of the horse, waiting to come forth, with Time?

> "To unmask falsehood, and bring truth to light.
> To eat up error by opinion bred." (*Lucrece*).

Bacon, in his first book of the "Advancement of Learning," observes: "*That knowledge is the double of that which is ;*" an observation made with the profound purpose of providing a hint of the character of this particular Baconian writing in its relationship to something else. It is in Job we find the original source of this idea :—Zophar, answering Job, exclaims, "And that He would show the secrets of wisdom, that they are the double of that which is" (Job xi. 6).

But these *secrets of wisdom*, constituting Bacon's *Invisible Globe*, and borrowed as to this title from (probably) the *Theatrum Orbis* of Abraham Ortelius,

published in 1595, are not an open day-light that anyone can run and read.*

It is as well to note that the title page engraving of the first English edition of the *De Augmentis Scientiarum* (published in 1640), consists of a *curtain*, stretched between two plinths, which are on each side of the engraving, and upon this curtain is written the title of the work—"Advancement of Learning." I have very little doubt this idea is borrowed from the Psalms of King David, where he exclaims:—

"Thou deckest Thyself with light as it were with a garment, and spreadeth out the heaven like a *curtain*. Who layeth the beams of His chambers in the waters, and walketh upon the wings of the wind" (Psalm civ. 2, 3).

This theory of mine will find confirmation in the title page engravings of the "Sylva Sylvarum," which although devoid of the curtain, are eminently *creative* pictures borrowed from Genesis, with the Creative Light and sea behind the two pillars.

In conformity with this hint of the occult nature of Bacon's Intellectual Globe (for the "De Augmentis" is

*There are four medallions, one at each corner of the map of the world, *i.e.*, the *Theatre of the Globe*, published by Ortelius in 1570, and again 1595, and in 1603. Only one concerns us. It is borrowed from Seneca: — "*Ulinam quemadmodum universa mundi facies in conspectum venit, ita philosophia tota nobis possel occurrere*" (*Seneca*).—(A. Ortelii, Antwerpia, 1595). The translation of this is:—"Would that the whole of philosophy might occur, or be presented to us after the fashion that a map and the entire face of the world comes before our sight."

Ortelius, I believe, inspired Bacon to copy this idea, and to imitate in his Intellectual Globe a map of the sciences. Perhaps, too, he was thinking of another *Theatrum Orbis* on the bankside of the Thames, near Blackfriars, to wit the *Globe Theatre*, where the plays attributed to Shakespeare were being acted. In Captain Scott's "Voyage of Discovery," 1907, there is a photographic reproduction of this map of Ortelius.

but an augmentation of Bacon's earlier sketches:—*Thema Cœli, Intellectual Globe of 1612, and Two Books of the Advancement of Learning, 1605*), is this passage:—"And therefore it was most aptly said by one of Plato's school, 'That the *sense of man* carried a resemblance with the sun, which, as we see, openeth and revealeth all the *terrestrial globe*; but then again it obscureth and concealeth the stars and *celestial globe;* so doth the *sense* discover natural things, *but it darkeneth and shutteth up divine,* and hence it is true that it hath proceeded that divers great learned men have been heretical, whilst they sought to fly up to the secrets of the Deity *by the waxen wings of the senses*'" (First Book "Advancement of Learning").

Bacon proceeds to maintain that "God worketh nothing in nature but by *second causes,*" and that "*second causes, which are next unto the senses,*" induce oblivion of the highest cause.

Again, "The Idols of the Tribe have their foundation in human nature itself, and in the tribe or race of men. *For it is a false assertion that the sense of man is the measure of things*" (Bk. I., Aph. 41, *Novum Organum*).

And yet it is just with this ordinary common-sense that the problem of the plays and their authorship is approached. These critics forget that the poet is a Creator, a God—Ποιητης—a Maker, and as Bacon says in the *Novum Organum,* "Man is sometimes a God to man."

The *Novum Organum* is full of cautions and re-apprehensions against trusting too much to *common-sense* in the investigation of the deep things of nature. And in *Love's Labour Lost* is the same inculcation:—

Biron.—What is the end of study? let me know.
King.—Why, that to know, which else we should not know.
Biron.—*Things hid and barred, you mean, from common sense?*
King.—Ay, that is study's Godlike recompense. (Act I. i.)

The attempt to solve the problem of the plays from

the outside side only, by means of common-sense, is preposterous, because we have countless hints we are dealing with a divine mind as deep as nature herself. For example, the moral of the three caskets of gold, silver and lead, in the *Merchant of Venice*, is pregnant with the deepest possible suggestion of an inward, concealed and least-expected revelation. It would seem to say, as if borrowed from Proverbs, "Receive my instruction and not silver; and knowledge rather than choice gold" (Proverbs xiii. 10, etc.).

"The subtlety of nature is greater many times over than the subtlety of the senses and understanding; so that all those specious meditations, speculations, and glosses in which men indulge are quite from the purpose (literally are a thing insane), *only there is no one to observe it*" (Aphorism X., Book I., *Novum Organum*). This applies not only to nature but equally to the plays which were, I suggest, created not only to exemplify this subtlety of nature, but to furnish a perfect example of Bacon's Inductive system. Bacon again observes: "But by far the greatest hindrance and aberration of the human understanding *proceeds from the dulness, incompetency and deception of the senses*" (Book I., Aphorism 50, *Novum Organum*).

We seem to hear him exclaiming, with his favourite Lucretius, "O miseras hominum mentes, O pectora cæca!" as if Bacon himself were looking down, like a god, from the heighth of his cliff, upon the errors and wanderings of men in the vale below, as out of a serenely situated temple of wisdom, placed above tempests.

> "Sed nil dulcius est, bene quam munita tenere
> edita doctrina sapientum templa serena
> despicere unde queas alios passimque videre
> Errare atque viam palantis quærere vitæ."

Bacon, in his second book of the two books of the *Advancement of Learning*, writes: "And although men

should refrain themselves from injury and evil arts, yet this incessant and Sabbathless pursuit of a man's fortune leaveth not tribute which we owe to God of our time; *Who (we see) demandeth a tenth* of our substance*, and a seventh, which is more strict of our time. *And it is to small purpose to have an erected face towards heaven, and a perpetual grovelling spirit upon earth, eating dust as doth the serpent: Atque affigit humo divinæ particulam auræ*" (p. 216, Frowde's edition).

This passage finds a parallel in Hamlet's soliloquies upon the nature of man and of his soul, seeming singularly in his inspired moments to be, as Plato would put it, "looking upwards to heaven," and at another time to equally feel his human nature, and mortality, by the picture of a man crawling upon the ground. Here is the portrait of a man erect with his face towards heaven, looking upwards :—

> *Hamlet.*—This most excellent canopy, the air, look you, this brave, overhanging firmament, *this majestical roof fretted with golden fire*, why it appears to me no other than a pestilent congregation of vapours! (Act II. ii).

And next compare Hamlet accusing himself of his baseness :—"I am myself indifferent honest; but yet I could accuse me of such things that it were better my mother had not borne me. I am very proud, revengeful, ambitious, with more offences at my beck than I have thoughts to put them in, imagination to give them

* In the thirty-eighth Sonnet, cited in my last article for January, there is an allusion to the tenth Muse. Compare :—

> Or ten times happier, be it ten for one;
> Ten times thyself were happier than thou art,
> If ten of thine ten times refigured thee! (Sonnet VI).

This strangely resembles Bacon's tithe, or tenth, as if cubically multiplied, to represent depth and interest too.

shape, or time to act them in. What should such fellow as I do *crawling between earth and heaven?* We are arrant knaves all, believe none of us" (Act III. i.). And then the exclamation, already quoted, which seems to sum up Bacon's "particle of divine air affixed to the dust" (*atque affigit humo divinæ particulam auræ*), *i.e.*, "And yet to me what is this quintessence of dust?"

Bacon:—"And therefore Velleius, the epicurean, needed not to have asked why God should have adorned the heavens with stars, as if he had been an *Ædilis*—one that should have set forth some magnificent shows or plays. For if that Great Work Master had been of an human disposition, he would have cast the stars into some pleasant and beautiful works and orders, *like the frets in the roofs of houses*" ("Advancement of Learning," Book II., p. 143, Frowde's Oxford University Press edition). (See Sonnet XV.).

W. F. C. WIGSTON.

MR. G. K. CHESTERTON AND MR. H. BELLOC'S OPINIONS ON THE BACONIAN THEORY.

MR. G. K. CHESTERTON favours the readers of the *Illustrated London News* each week with a page under the heading of "Our Note Book." In those columns he recently deigned *à propos* of Mr. Greenwood's rejoinder to Canon Beeching to make a reference to what is termed Baconianism. "Hitherto," says Mr. Chesterton, "the ordinary public (to which I am proud to belong) has regarded the Bacon-Shakespeare theory as a fad; and the ordinary public has been right—as it often is. The Bacon-Shakespeare theory would still be a fad even if it should turn out to be true."

Mr. Chesterton devotes more than the half of his article to a disquisition on a definition of a "fad." He states that it has three distinctive marks: (1) Unnatural seriousness about a small matter; (2) the tendency to concentrate on a topic rather than a truth; (3) its infinite expansiveness. If these are three marks by which popular instinct detects a fad, surely the authorship of the Shakespeare poems and plays does not come under that category. It is always difficult to recognise when Mr. Chesterton is serious and when he is not, or rather whether he is ever serious, or whether the sum and substance of his creed is not to be found in the refrain of the song, "What's the good of anything? Why, nothing!"

Mr. Chesterton has a very poor opinion of the value of the works attributed to Shakespeare. He considers that a journalist without genius could have picked up all the knowledge which Shakespeare possessed. "I would," he writes, "take a very plain position. I say that not only could a genius have picked it up, but a man who was not a genius could have picked it up if he knocked about in loose literary society. I, myself, for instance, know enough to talk fairly convincingly upon twenty subjects,* that I have never studied in any academy, the theology of the schoolmen, or the economics of the Socialists, the poetry of Heine, or the theory of Rousseau. But I am not a genius; I am a journalist. So was Shakespeare a journalist, as well as a genius; he was a Fleet Street sort of man. And when the Baconians say, 'How could he have known this or that detail in law or hunting?' I answer that it is exactly one or two details of horse-racing or gunnery that I do know. I forget where I heard them; and so did Shakespeare." After this pronouncement one can only suppose that Mr. Chesterton has yet to make the

* The Bacon-Shakespeare theory is not one of them.

acquaintance of the Shakespeare poems and plays, or if he has already done so that he forgets where he heard them.

Holding such views Mr. Chesterton naturally regards the consideration of any problem as to the authorship of such trivial writings as the poems and plays as evidence of insanity. Here is the gem in which he expresses his belief: "The popular instinct, in short, smells insanity and error wherever there is an attitude towards some matter which evidently expects the sensational and the marvellous. And it is impossible to deny that there has been such an attitude towards the Baconian problem."

Mr. Chesterton expresses his opinion emphatically: "To anyone who has the sense of literary individuality, Bacon and Shakespeare were more unlike each other than Dickens and Matthew Arnold." Well, if any man who has lived on this earth possessed the sense of literary individuality that man was Dr. Gervinus. He was no Baconian. He wrote in 1849—before there had been any suggestion made as to the Baconian authorship of the Shakespeare poems and plays. But if Mr. Chesterton would condescend to read in the distinguished German professor's "Shakespeare Commentaries" the chapter on "His Age,"* he would find that Dr. Gervinus was not in accord with this view. But then Dr. Gervinus had read both Shakespeare and Bacon. Mr. Chesterton commences his article by saying he had just been reading with great interest *The Shakespeare Problem Restated.* Mr. Chesterton says he has been reading the book and so he must be believed. But when he states that one of Mr. Greenwood's arguments is that Stratford was very dirty in Shakespeare's time; that it was not a meet nurse for a poetic child; that there were muck-heaps all along the street—the thought

* New edition, revised 1877, pages 884—887.

suggests itself that he must have been thinking of something else when he read it. But this is the most charitable construction which can be put on Mr. Chesterton when one reads: "Again he has gravely to explain that Shakespeare's mother was not really a charming lady, but was often engaged in 'the homeliest of rustic employments.' As if it mattered whether she was a lady; or as if a lady might not indulge in rustic employments! Poor Mr. Greenwood's doctrine drives him on further and further against what I am sure are his real democratic instincts. He has to try and prove that there never were really any geniuses who arose out of ignorance and poverty. In short he desires, on the most exclusive social ground, to transfer Shakespeare's glory to Lord Verulam, just as, for all I know, some future critics may desire to transfer Burn's glory to Lord Eldon."

It would be difficult in as many words to represent more unfairly that which is Mr. Greenwood's contention. Mr. Chesterton however must not be taken seriously. To write thus is only the eccentricity of genius which he undoubtedly possesses.

It is a relief to turn to a well-reasoned article upon the subject which appeared in the *Morning Post* from the pen of Mr. Hillaire Belloc.

Mr. Belloc reads Mr. Greenwood's book, and, differing from either Canon Beeching or Mr. Chesterton, thus summarises the arguments which form the basis of the writer's contention:—"It was not Baconian: it attempted to present all the negative evidence available in proper logical form, and it weighed the types of evidence which it presented. It further insisted upon the combination of two elements in the problem, both undoubtedly present, the contemporary silence (and what flowed from it, the long time before anyone bothered to establish a life of the poet), and the incon-

gruities that do undoubtedly surround the man and the work. No great poet living in a period when poetry was at its acme of reputation, when the greatest artists throughout European civilization were treated as gods, could surely be so neglected in his personality as was Shakespeare, and while it is common enough for men obscure or poor to produce excellent lyric work, or even, under primitive conditions, good epic work, yet it is quite unparalleled that in a time of very high scholarship, full of keen critics and with men already sharply divided between the learned and unlearned, work crammed with allusions to and citations of contemporary scholarships should proceed from a man not a member of the scholars' world. To these broad reasons something sharper was added, in an appeal to mechanical proofs, and notably in an appeal to the evidence furnished by emendations of the text, made after the Shakespeare of Stratford was dead."

That is the case of *The Shakespeare Problem Restated* according to the reviewers' understanding, and it is a fair statement. He goes on to refer to Canon Beeching's reply and to Mr. Greenwood's rejoinder, of the latter saying that its value lies upon the still greater insistence on detail than was apparent in his first book; though much shorter, every point is therein emphasised and sharpened.

Mr. Belloc contends that in intellectual discussions in the past it is not the great instructed mass of men that settle such problems. It is not experts, who are always divided amongst themselves, but the reading educated public, to whom after all the appeal is made. He says:—"Whoever wrote the plays and the poems and the sonnets (and pardon me, they were all written by the same man!) was the greatest poet of England, and perhaps of the world. He is a national glory of the highest conceivable sort, and it is utterly indifferent

to his glory and to ours whether it was a particular person living in one place or another person living in another."

When the plain man has confined himself strictly to the evidence upon this one point, "Was Shakspere the actor, who certainly existed, and of whom we know a little, the author of the plays, poems and sonnets?" Mr. Belloc considers the reply will be that the evidence against the tradition that these two men were identical is quite insufficient, and on these grounds :—(1) That the burden of proof lies always upon those who attack an established tradition; (2) that no mechanical proof has been advanced which would stand the test of close scrutiny.

The fact that certain emendations, some of them very striking, appeared in the text after Shakspere's death, Mr. Belloc admits to be an argument, but not conclusive, because it is exceedingly limited in scope, because there is no sort of reason why a poet's corrections should not be incorporated after his death, and because the work already done unemended was taken for granted to be his upon every side. This type of reasoning, expanded a hundredfold, might in Mr. Belloc's opinion shake the plain man's present conviction, which is now as firm as ever.

There is little for the Baconian to take exception to in this line of criticism except that without examination Mr. Belloc has set aside ninety-five per cent. of the arguments and the facts; as to the remaining five per cent. they are not accurately stated. A poet's corrections may be incorporated in an edition of his poems published after his death without casting any doubt as to the corrections being his. But in the case of the Shakespeare dramas that was not all. Shakspere died in 1616. In 1619 appeared a second edition of Part 2 of *Henry VI.* containing certain alterations from the

previous edition, but when the play appeared in 1623 in the folio edition it had a new title, 1,139 new lines added, 2,000 old ones retouched, though the version was based directly upon the 1619 edition. Exactly the same peculiarity has to be explained away with reference to the appearance in the folio of Part 3 of *Henry VI.* (3rd edition, 1619), *Merry Wives* (2nd edition, 1619), *King John* (3rd edition, 1622), *Richard III.* (5th edition, 1622), and *Othello* (1st edition, 1622).

Is it within the range of possibility that the poet would have left behind him two versions of each of these plays, in each case that appearing in the last edition being far in advance of the preceding and intermediate one, with instructions for the one to be published first, and the more perfect one some years afterwards? No; to three of these plays the emendations were made after 1619 and to three after 1622. That is the point which Mr. Belloc ignores. Then the second fallacy is that the work already done unemended was taken for granted to be his on every side. Leave out of account those concerned in the issue of the folio edition, and there is not a scrap of evidence—not any on any side, let alone "every side"—which in the slightest degree connects William Shakspere of Stratford with the poems, the plays, or the sonnets. There has been so much ridicule cast on the investigation of this subject that the plain man has not taken the trouble to read what has been written and weigh the evidence. *The criticisms which have appeared on Mr. Greenwood's book* are causing him to investigate the evidence, and it is only necessary that he should do this to ensure that his conviction will stand as firm as Mr. Belloc suggests it stands now, but that conviction will be that Shakspere the actor, who certainly existed and of whom we know very little (and nothing to his credit), was not the author of the plays, poems, and sonnets.

SIR THOMAS BODLEY AND ESSEX.

SIR THOMAS BODLEY left behind him a short history of his life, which is of a very fragmentary description. It concludes with the words, "Written under my owne hand Anno 1609 December the 15." So it does not deal with the last two years of his life, as he died on the 29th of January, 1612. In 1647 it was published by the University of Oxford.

There is no mention in it of his connection with Francis Bacon, but it contains two features of interest with regard thereto. The first consists of a statement with reference to Bodley's first visit to the continent after his appointment as Proctor at Oxford. He writes: "My resolution fully taken I departed out of England, Anno 1576, and continued very neare foure yeares abroad, and that in sundry parts of Italy, France, and Germany."

There recently appeared in BACONIANA* a letter, without date or place, written by Bodley to young Francis Bacon, with which he sent him £30 sterling. Bacon had applied to Bodley for money; for he commences his letter by saying: "According to your request in your letter (dated the 19th October at Orleans, I received here on the 18th of December), I have sent you, by your merchant, £30 sterling for your present supply; and had sent you a greater sum, but that my extraordinary charge this year hath utterly unfurnished me."

This enabled the date of the letter to be fixed at shortly after the 18th of December, 1577. Now by the aid of this Life, it is made clear that the letter was not written from England, for Bodley was abroad from 1576 to 1580.

The second and most important point has reference to Bodley's connection with Essex and inferentially with

* Vol. VI., third series, page 40.

the relations subsisting between Bacon and Essex. It might be suggested, not without justification, that Bodley's object in leaving behind him this short Life was to put on record how he had suffered by his indiscretion in permitting Essex to further his advancement in the State, for rather more than one-fourth of the Life is devoted to this subject. The following is the passage:

Now here I can not choose but in making report of the principall accidents that have fallen unto me in the course of my life, but record among the rest, that from the very first day I had no man more to friend among the Lords of the Councell, then was the Lord Treasurer Burleigh: for when occasion had beene offered of declaring his conceit as touching my service, he would alwaies tell the Queen (which I received from her selfe and some other ear-witnesses) that there was not any man in *England* so meet as my selfe to undergoe the office of the Secretary. And sithence his sonne, the present Lord Treasurer, hath signified unto me in private conference, that when his father first intended to advance him to that place, his purpose was withall to make me his Colleague. But the case stood thus in my behalf: before such time as I returned from the Provinces united, which was in the yeare 1597, and likewise after my returne, the then Earle of *Essex* did use me so kindly both by letters and messages, and other great tokens of his inward favours to me, that although I had no meaning, but to settle in my mind my chiefest desire and dependance upon the Lord *Burleigh*, as one that I reputed to be both the best able, and therewithall the most willing to worke my advancement with the Queene, yet I know not how, the Earle, who fought by all devices to divert her love and liking both from the Father and the Son (but from the Sonne in speciall) to withdraw my affection from the one and the other, and to winne mee altogether to depend upon himselfe, but so often take occasion to entertaine the Queene with some prodigall speeches of my sufficiency for a Secretary, which were ever accompanied with words of disgrace against the present Lord Treasurer, as neither she her selfe, of whose favour before I was thoroughly assured, took any great pleasure to preferre me the sooner, (for she hated his ambition, and would give little countenance to any of his

followers) and both the Lord *Burleigh* and his Sonne waxed jealous of my courses, as if under hand I had beene induced by the cunning and kindnesse of the Earle of *Essex*, to oppose my selfe against their dealings. And though in very truth they had no solid ground at all of the least alteration in my disposition towards either of them both, (for I did greatly respect their persons and places, with a settled resolution to doe them any service, as also in my heart I detested to be held of any faction whatsoever) yet the now Lord Treasurer, upon occasion of some talke, that I have since had with him, of the Earle and his actions, hath freely confessed of his owne accord unto me, that his daily provocations were so bitter and sharpe against him, and his comparisons so odious, when he put us in a ballance, as he thought thereupon he had very great reason to use his best meanes, to put any man out of hope of raising his fortune, whom the Earle with such violence, to his extreme prejudice, had endeavoured to dignifie. And this, as he affirmed, was all the motive he had to set himselfe against me, in whatsoever might redound to the bettering of my estate, or increasing of my credit and countenance with the Queene. When I had thoroughly now bethought me, first in the Earle, of the slender hold-fast that he had in the favour of the Queene, of an endlesse opposition of the Cheifest of our States-men like still to waite upon him, of his perilous, and feeble, and uncertain advice, aswell in his owne, as in all the causes of his friends: and when moreover for my selfe I had fully considered how very untowardly these two Counsellours were affected unto me, (upon whom before in cogitation I had framed all the fabrique of my future prosperity) how ill it did concurre with my naturall disposition, to become, or to be counted either a stickler or partaker in any publique faction, how well I was able, by God's good blessing, to live of my selfe, if I could be content with a competent livelyhood; how short time of further life I was then to expect by the common course of nature: when I had, I say, in this manner represented to my thoughts, my particular estate, together with the Earles, I resolved thereupon to possesse my soule in peace all the residue of my daies, to take my full farewell of state imployments, to satisfie my mind with that mediocrity of wordly living that I had of my owne, and so to retire me from the Court, which was the epilogue and end of all my actions and endeavours of any important note, till I came to the age of fifty three,

The experience of Bodley and Bacon appears to have been identical. It certainly materially strengthens the case of those who contend that Bacon's conduct to Essex was not deserving of censure on the ground of ingratitude for favours received from him.

The words which "the now Lord Treasurer" * addressed to Bodley, namely, that "he had very great reason to use his best meanes, to put any man out of hope of raising his fortune whom the Earle with such violence, to his extreame prejudice had endeavoured to dignifie," would with equal force have been applied to Bacon's case. Although there is no direct statement to that effect, the drift of Bodley's account of the matter points to his feeling that Essex's conduct had not been altogether of a disinterested character, and almost suggests that he felt the Earle had been making a tool of him.

The effect of this was that Bodley adopted the course which Bacon threatened to adopt when refused the office of Solicitor-General, solicited for him by Essex—took a full farewell of State employments and retired from the court to devote himself to the service of his "Reverend Mother, the University of Oxford," and to the advancement of her good. To this end he became a collector of books, whereas Bacon would, had he discontinued the pursuit for employment in State affairs, have become "some sorry book-maker or a true pioneer in that mine of truth which lay so deep."

* Robert Cecil.

AN IMPORTANT WORK TO BE PUBLISHED IN BOSTON.

INTEREST in the controversy as to the authorship of the Shakespeare poems and plays and other Elizabethan works has been greatly stirred in the United States by the announcement of the forthcoming publication of a book by the Houghton Mifflin Company, in Boston, and Messrs. Archibald Constable and Co., Ltd., in London. The title of the work is "Some Acrostic Signatures of Francis Bacon." The author is Mr. William Stone Booth, who for many years officiated as reader to the Houghton Mifflin Company. Mr. Booth was a staunch opponent of the Baconian theory, and many a time and oft has he in the past waged war with its supporters. Some time ago the work of Gustavus Selenus on Cyphers, published in 1624, came into Mr. Booth's hands and its perusal led him to take up the examination of books of the Elizabethan period in search of evidence of the existence therein of cyphers and acrostics. The result is the volume by him now announced, which discloses two hundred acrostic signatures of Francis Bacon to be found in works which with few exceptions appeared under the names of other men or with no names at all. The following particulars are taken from a prospectus which has been issued. The object of the book is to remove for all time from the realm of surmise the question of the authorship of the writings now attributed to the actor of Stratford-on-Avon, and to show that Bacon himself, sometimes collaborating with his brother Anthony, put forth or composed several important works ascribed in his time, and since, to his fellow-poets, Spenser and Marlowe, and to Puttenham, Bodenham and Shakespeare. Ben Jonson, Bishop Hall and John Milton also are represented by some remarkable acrostics, hitherto unknown.

The volume is richly documented, and with but three exceptions every acrostic is accompanied by a fac-simile of the earliest known text in which it occurs.

The fac-similes number 192 and contain about 200 acrostic signatures. The reader is thus enabled to test for himself the validity of every statement in the book. The fac-similes are preceded by chapters on Ciphers and their Users, on Anonyms and Pseudonyms, on Method, and a full chapter with specimens of acrostic signatures from Cynewulf to Poe. It is not too much to say, are the concluding words of the prospectus, that the discovery of these acrostics is the most astounding event in the history of critical literature. The secret as to the contents of the volume have been studiously guarded, but by the courtesy of one of the few who have seen the proof sheets, we may state that the brilliant surmises of the late Rev. Walter Begley, contained in his books "Is it Shakespeare?" and "Bacon's Nova Resuscitatio," are in a remarkable manner confirmed.

Mr. Booth recently showed one of the signatures of Bacon which he has discovered to a distinguished professor of literature of Harvard University, who remarked that it was simply a coincidence and of no value. Mr. Booth showed the Professor a second and third example, but only provoked similar comments. But when the two became twenty and the three thirty, the Professor became silent and pensive and eventually refused to see more. Shortly afterwards Mr. Booth received a letter from him stating that what he had seen had given him a sleepless night and completely shaken his confidence in the accepted beliefs. A correspondent writing upon the subject says:—

The habitual Stratfordian attitude has already begun to manifest itself. A certain University professor, author of a good three volume work on the Elizabethan drama, having read the announcement of Booth's book, wrote to the publishers saying he

was dismayed, &c. He got a reply to the following effect:—Houghton Mufflin Company do not hold themselves responsible for an author's opinions; but merely satisfy themselves that the book is able, that Mr. Booth's book was a book such as they were proud to publish, that they had published books on both sides of the discussion and proposed doing so, that he (the professor) would no doubt be agreeably disappointed when he saw his friend's book (!) and that as publishers they suggested the propriety of withholding his opinion until he knew the purport and contents of the book. Thereupon this zealous gentleman immediately wrote an apology full and complete.

A recent communication received states that the volume, originally announced for publication at the end of March, will be issued on May 15th. The writer goes on to say, "I am terribly impatient for the work to appear. Having been let into the secret I am tired of keeping back those good things." The price of issue will be 25s. net. Copies may be procured through the Secretary of the Bacon Society.

REVIEWS.

A New Light on the Renaissance Displayed in Contemporary Emblems. By Harold Bayley. Illustrated, super royal 8vo, 12s. 6d. net. (J. M. Dent & Co., London.)

MR. HAROLD BAYLEY states that the facts outlined in this volume are the result of some ten years' research, and that each new source of information but verifies and expands the conclusions at which he has arrived. Briefly put, these conclusions are that the water-marks and printers' ornaments—the former of which came into use about the year 1282, and the latter some two hundred years later—are emblems: thought fossils or thought crystals, in which lie enshrined the aspirations and traditions of the numerous mystic and Puritanic sects by which Europe was overrun in the Middle Ages. Further, that the awakening known as the Renaissance was the direct result of an influence deliberately and traditionally exercised by paper makers, printers, cobblers, and other artisans, and that it had its origin and was nurtured, not, as has been hitherto assumed, in Italy, but in the Provençal district of France.

The early paper-making districts were those which were strong-

holds of the heretical sects known as the Albigenses, whose character is described as a combination of unflagging industry, cold common-sense, and ardent mysticism. Mr. Bayley holds them to be the greatest practical exponents of the art of allegory that modern civilisation has seen. Persecuted with relentless ferocity by the Church of Rome, this people, cultured and liberal, with the power to think and the inclination and ability to execute, were gradually dispersed from the districts in which they had their origin, but they carried with them expertness in their craft and devotion to their religion. The result was that upon the discovery of printing that art fell largely into the hands of the same pious and industrious workers, who were originally the paper-makers of Europe, and a combination of paper-makers and printers was brought about in a Guild, or Commonwealth of letters, for mutual protection against persecution and for the furtherance of knowledge.

These sects were known in France as Albigenses and as Waldenses; in Italy as Cathari or Patarini; in England as Lollards; and elsewhere under varying descriptions.

The theory is worked out with great skill. The study and comparison of many thousands of mediæval water-marks has enabled Mr. Bayley to assert that not only are they emblematic of ideas current at different periods, but that they convey a coherent and romantic story. "It seems," says he, "to have been a happy thought on the part of the paper-makers to flash signals of hope and encouragement to their fellow-exiles in far-distant countries, serving, at the same time, as an incentive to faith and godliness in themselves. Quarles' definition of an emblem as 'a silent parable' is here peculiarly applicable, for if my surmises be correct, every ream turned out by these pious paper-makers contained some five hundred heretical tracts, each of which ran its course under the unsuspecting nose of orthodoxy." But it is impossible to convey how circumstantial is the evidence which is adduced in favour of this hypothesis. Although the subject of paper-marks and printers' devices does not, to the ordinary reader, savour either of interest or romance, he will find on a perusal of this book that Mr. Bayley has endowed it with both until it exercises a strong fascination.

The Legends of the St. Grail, the Romaunt of the Rose, and other mediæval allegories, are treated from a new point of view. In a chapter on "The Philosophers' Gold," alchemy and the alchemists are discussed, and it is asserted that the real aim of alchemy was the transmutation, not of lead into gold, but of the baser metals of man's soul into the gold of virtue. The chapters on "The Invention of Printing" and "Printers' Devices," are full of interesting facts.

How closely Mr. Bayley has followed his subject will be gathered from his chapters on "The Transference of Wood-blocks," and "Tricks of Obscurity." The identical block used by a London printer in 1634 for the head-piece to Book IV. of *Moses and Aaron* is used by an Oxford printer in 1640 over the

dedication of Gilbert Watts' translation of *The Advancement of Learning*. It is obvious, from a slight blemish on each of the prints, that both were impressions from the same block. On similar evidence Mr. Bayley has traced the use of a block in Amsterdam in 1687, in Paris in 1697, and back again at the Hague in 1720. In treating of "Tricks of Obscurity," the use of illustrative devices for cypher purposes is insisted on. Reference is made to the fact that the disciples of Pythagoras, when capable of receiving his secret instructions, were taught the use of cyphers and hieroglyphic writing, so that they might correspond with each other from the most distant regions in unknown characters; and by signs and words which they had received could discover those who had been educated in the Pythagorean school. "It is practically a certainty," it is added, "that some similar system existed among the scattered and persecuted Albigenses." In a passing reference to the part which anagrams played about the time of the sixteenth century, the reader is reminded that Roger Bacon published the constituents of gunpowder under the veil of an anagram, and in a similar manner Galileo announced his discovery that Venus had phases like a moon; that the three first editions of Camden's Remains were published anonymously, yet the learned author secreted his name under mottoes, in one case *Dum illa evincam*, in another *Nil malum cui dea*, both of which mottoes will be found to be perfect anagrams of "William Camden."

In conclusion Mr. Bayley says; "To the ethnologist and the psychologist the story I have disinterred will, I am in hopes, be of some value. The Church of the Holy Grail has broken the conditions which once fettered her, but her enemies, though now less material, are still ruthless and malignant. To contend with them successfully the Church of the future must cancel the unwarrantable distinction between "secular" and "sacred," and must re-enlist her old-time emissaries the musicians, the dramatists, the novelists, the painters, and the poets."

The book is embellished with upwards of 400 illustrations, and at the end there are copious notes and a full index. Enough has been said to indicate that *A New Light on the Renaissance* is a valuable addition to the literature dealing with the period in question. It is a volume which should find a place on the bookshelf of every literary student.

In re Shakespeare. Beeching v. Greenwood. "Rejoinder on behalf of the Defendant." By G. G. Greenwood, M.P. John Lane, The Bodley Head. 2s. 6d. net.

MR. GREENWOOD replies to Canon Beeching, taking for his motto—"Seeking the Bubble Reputation even in the Canon's mouth." The notes on Canon Beeching's feeble criticism on *The Shakespeare Problem Re-stated*, which appeared in the last number of BACONIANA, made it evident that little answer was

required on Mr. Greenwood's part, except for the purpose of setting right the many misrepresentations in which the Canon indulged. Mr. Greenwood has in his rejoinder, in no uncertain manner, exposed the unscrupulous methods of his adversary and at every point placed him *hors de combat*. The Rejoinder is a book to be read by everyone interested in this curious discussion. A valuable chapter is that in which Mr. Greenwood deals with some observations made by Mr. A. F. Leach and published in the "Victoria History of Warwickshire," relating to the masters of the Stratford Grammar School from 1569 to 1578. It clears away so many cobwebs which surround the subject. The Rejoinder has been favoured with many reviews and notices in the daily and weekly Press. Two of these deserve reproduction and are therefore now given *in extenso*.

The first is from the *Star* of the 6th March last.

IN *re* SHAKESPEARE, BEECHING *v.* GREENWOOD.

Controversy is the life-blood of criticism. Mr. George Greenwood, M.P., has enlivened the dulness of Shakespearean (or Shaksperean) criticism by his onslaughts upon the Shakespearean biographers. His book, "The Shakespeare Problem Restated," was a serious challenge to the orthodox defenders of the faith. But the orthodox defenders are curiously lethargic. They have not fallen tooth and nail upon Mr. Greenwood. When I reviewed his book in these columns I said that "his arguments ought to be respectfully examined and not contemptuously ignored." Mr. Thomas Seccombe, writing in the *Daily News*, took the same view: "Let the biographers begin by confuting Mr. Greenwood. I cannot." Well, the biographers have not begun. The only Shakespearean pundit who has entered the lists is Canon Beeching. He read a paper before the Royal Society of Literature. He subsequently published this so-called "reply." Anybody who has read Mr. Greenwood's book will realise that it could not be adequately answered in a brief paper. Its case is cumulative, and it cannot be demolished in a summary fashion. Its arguments must be tackled in detail. Mr. Greenwood, however, has published a rejoinder to Canon Beeching, entitled, "In *re* Shakespeare, Beeching *v.* Greenwood" (John Lane). It is a slashing rejoinder, and it is no exaggeration to say that it makes mincemeat of the Canon. Mr. Greenwood shows that Canon Beeching's reply is a travesty of his arguments. He convicts the Canon of the most flagrant misrepresentations, and of the most amazing inaccuracies. Being a humane person, I felt profoundly sorry for the Canon as I watched the process of flaying. Mr. Greenwood appears to have taken an unholy pleasure in torturing his reverend victim. He vivisects him with a dreadful gusto. I fear Canon Beeching must be regarded as a captive in the camp of heresy. "Every man is not a fit champion for truth, nor fit to take up the gauntlet in the cause of verity; many, from the ignorance of these maxims, and an inconsiderate zeal unto truth,

have too rashly charged the troops of error, and remain as trophies unto the enemies of truth." Canon Beeching remains for the present a "trophy" unto Mr. Greenwood. Who will deliver him? Why does Mr. Sidney Lee sulk in his tent? Will he not put me and all other orthodox believers out of the pain of doubt and the indignity of suspense? I want to be confirmed in the faith. I yearn to see this heretic burned at the stake. I long for a restoration of my lost illusions. How long, O Lee, how long am I to be left naked to this enemy of my childhood's dreams?

The worst of Mr. Greenwood is that he refuses to be written down a Baconian. He is an obstinate agnostic. He is a Didymus. He is a purely destructive critic. He challenges the whole fabric of the orthodox biographer, and pulls it to pieces brick by brick and stone by stone. He makes me feel that I can no longer walk by faith. I used to accept every statement made by Mr. Lee as if it were inspired. This wretched iconoclast has sown the seeds of honest doubt in my credulity. In vain I struggle against his blasphemous suggestions. I feel the ground slipping from under my feet. I falter where I firmly trod. And Mr. Lee refuses to put forth a hand to guide me, although I faint on the world's great altar stairs that slope through darkness up to Shakespeare. I implore Mr. Lee to save me from the abyss of infidelity and the pit of scepticism. I protest that I yearn to believe, and I beseech him to help my unbelief. Will he not hear my cry and the cry of millions like me, the exceeding bitter cry, "Give me back my Shakespeare"?

It is, of course, hard to believe that the world could possibly have been hoaxed for hundreds of years into believing that Shakespeare was a real name and not a pen-name. I have a great belief in the imbecility of mankind, but this feat of imbecility staggers me. Nevertheless, I pull myself together and force myself to remember that when mankind wishes to believe anything, there is nothing it cannot persuade itself to believe. Indeed, credulity prefers the incredible. Faith grows with what it feeds on. There is no doubt that Shakespeareanity has grown like any other superstition. It has made huge strides during the past hundred years. The Shakespearean scholiasts and commentators have swollen the bubble to a monstrous size. They have lost all sense of proportion and all perception of values. They have provoked the reaction led by the Baconians, a set of fanatics whose hysterical caperings died of universal derision. Now that the Baconians have been dead and buried, a new reaction has set in. It is a reaction of common-sense. It is a revolt against pedantic idolatry and academic credulity. The Shakespearean priesthood is no longer heard with dumb reverence and speechless servility. It is forced to fight for its life. It is compelled to come down from the pulpit into the arena and defend its dogmas without appealing to authority. I fear it will have to give up a good deal of its legend. The real Shakespeare will have to be excavated from the ruins of the imaginary Shakespeare.

It will not be an easy task, but I hope it will be performed. There must be a real Shakespeare somewhere, whatever may be the solution of the mystery that shrouds him. That there is a mystery is indisputable. The Sonnets alone prove that. They defy every effort to unravel their enigma. There is beyond doubt an incongruity of the most amazing kind when we contrast the conventional view of Shakespeare with the personality revealed in the Sonnets. I feel in my literary blood that there is a hiatus between the man who left his "second-best bed" to his wife and the man who wrote the Sonnets and *Hamlet*. I know nothing about the poet except what I find in his poetry. There is nothing in the orthodox biography which corresponds with the spiritual biography. It may be that the Stratford mime covered up his tracks with diabolical cunning. At any rate, they are covered up. That tracks can be covered up is proved by the case of Junius. We do not know who wrote the "Letters of Junius." Probably we shall never know. Or take a still more recent case of pseudonymity, the case of Fiona Macleod. There are some people who refuse to believe that William Sharp was Fiona Macleod. Let us suppose, for the sake of argument, that there was a real woman who wrote the prose poems published under the name of Fiona Macleod. Let us assume that she died and that William Sharp was the only person who knew her secret. Let us suppose that she arranged with William Sharp to preserve her secret during his life and after his death. Could anybody disprove William Sharp's assertion that he was Fiona Macleod?

Apply this assumption to the Shakespeare mystery. Is it possible that the Stratford Shakespeare played the part of such a William Sharp? Was he a living pseudonym? Was he paid to pose as the real Shakespeare? Or was his name "Shakspere," simply mixed up with the pseudonym "Shake-speare?" Was the fraud a slow and gradual growth, or was it a deliberate fraud? Mr. Greenwood maintains that the conventional identification of the real Shakespeare with the Stratford player was a kind of accident. Well, I cannot swallow that. It is too bad to be true. I cling to my Stratford Shakespeare. But I implore Mr. Lee to do unto Mr. Greenwood what Mr. Greenwood has done unto Canon Beeching.

JAMES DOUGLAS.

The other is from the *Bristol Times* of the 22nd March last.

IN *re* SHAKESPEARE. BEECHING *v.* GREENWOOD.

This is a "Rejoinder on behalf of Defendant," otherwise a complete annihilation of Dr. Beeching's attack on Mr. Greenwood's book, *The Shakespeare Problem Re-stated*. This latter work was a brilliant exposé of the notion that the plays and poems of Shakespeare could possibly have been written by William Shakspere, of Stratford-on-Avon. Mr. Greenwood did not attempt to suggest who the author really was; but he showed, to our thinking, beyond any dispute, that whoever he may have been, he certainly was not the Stratford rustic. Dr. Beeching,

Canon of Westminster, took up the cudgels on the latter's behalf; grossly misrepresented Mr. Greenwood's statements and indulged in much pulpit rhetoric. Mr. Greenwood has now replied, and there is nothing more to be said. He has scored an easy victory over his opponent, beating his arguments all round. It is not really a great victory, unless the overcoming of ignorance be great; the Canon does not seem to have been equipped for his task, even with the elementary weapon of accuracy—certainty of his facts. We remember a similar characteristic some short time ago in an article of his on ecclesiastical matter; but as that would naturally be the last thing to look for in an ecclesiastic, it caused no surprise. But a D.Litt. should surely have something to show for himself on a literary question!

Tudor Problems. Essays on the historical and literary claims alleged to be ciphered in certain Elizabethan and Jacobean books by means of the cipher "Omnia per omnia" invented by Frances Bacon in 1578, by Parker Woodward. 341 pp. 8vo. Privately printed. Boards, 5s. net, to be obtained of the Bacon Society.

MANY of the essays contained in this volume have already appeared in BACONIANA, the readers of which are familiar with the bold theories which Mr. Parker Woodward has advanced with reference to a common origin of much of the literature of the Elizabethan period. *Tudor Problems* cover the whole gamut of these theories. The relations existing between Elizabeth and Leicester—and Bacon—and Essex; the vizards adopted by Bacon, viz., the master-vizard (Bacon), Gosson, Lyly, Watson, Peele, Greene, Marlowe, Spenser, Kyd, Nash, Shakespeare, and Burton; the connection between Bacon and Philip Sydney; and Robert Earl of Essex are amongst the subjects to each of which a chapter is devoted. Much that is here written stands or falls upon the validity of Mrs. Gallup's discovery of the existence of the biliteral cypher in the italics found in first and early editions of works of the period. The supporters of Mrs. Gallup, though staunch, are few. To prove that no such cypher there exists is even more difficult than to prove that it is there. That to ply the art of the decipherer requires patience, clear sight, perseverance, and perseverance in the highest degree, is beyond question, and the fact that so far as any public profession goes, only Mrs. Gallup has yet been able to provide these capabilities to the degree necessary for success in the work is the great argument advanced against the validity of her work by its opponents.

But truth or otherwise of the cypher story, Mr. Parker Woodward's essays exhibit the results of years of laborious research in the literature of the period with which he deals, and to the student of that period are of great value.

Moreover, the main theory advanced, namely, that Bacon

wrote under several vizards, may be perfectly true even if on further investigation the truth of the cypher story was found to be untenable. The two theories do not necessarily stand or fall together.

If, however, Mr. Parker Woodward is right all along the line, he has discovered the greatest romance of all time. Beside it Bacon's authorship merely of the Shakespeare poems and plays becomes commonplace and prosaic.

If, however, the reader rejects all the theories which the author endeavours to prove, the essays are well worthy of perusal. There is one desideratum for a work of this character missing, and that is a good index.

MR. GEORGE HOOKHAM contributes to the February number of the *National Review* a second article upon *The Shakespeare Problem.* This, like its predecessor, is a closely reasoned and moderate contribution to the discussion. Mr. Hookham points out that it is necessary for anyone in approaching this subject to dispel from his mind the illusion that Shakespeare was regarded in his own time as a transcendent genius. He cites that Camden, after mentioning Shakespeare's name without comment, goes on to say, "Will you have all in all for prose or verse? Take the miracle of our age, Sir Philip Sidney." Shakespeare is not thought miraculous at all. The following extract will meet with a sympathetic response from many readers:—

"The truth is, there are two Shakespeares, even for the new generations. There is the Shakespeare that we devour as boys for plot and action and stage fun; and there is the Shakespeare that dawns upon us with dawning manhood, and is for us an ever renewed miracle, never failing till our faculties themselves fail. The first Shakespeare is a mortal man, not wholly unlike other mortals known to us. The second Shakespeare is less human than a force of nature, and affects us as the forces of nature affect us. Or, not to exaggerate, one might say that there are three orders of force known to us, cognisable by the intellect—man, nature, and Shakespeare. If this still seems exaggeration, I cannot help it. I can find no other way of expressing just the effect of Shakespeare as he impresses me individually, and, I must suppose, impresses other people. It is this elemental force in him that sets Shakespeare apart from all other artists—if we can call that art which is so closely akin to nature. Milton, with a humility that is almost awe-inspiring, pointed the generic difference when he compared Shakespeare's 'native wood-notes' with his own 'slow-endeavouring art.'

"Only one of these two Shakespeares, the Shakespeare of our boyhood, was known to the Elizabethans. They were dead to the other. And the reason is not far to seek. Shakespeare's poetry, with the use it makes of living individual characters as

contrasted with types, and its deep and intricate psychological drama, was perhaps the newest thing that created man ever in his turn called into being. New poetry, like new music, has always been hard to assimilate. This was of the most exaggerated novelty; no wonder it fell flat. I would not attempt here to characterise the poetry of Shakespeare in its deeper qualities, but I would venture a word concerning his humour. It is absolutely peculiar to himself. Other Elizabethans amuse us; but Shakespeare undermines us with wit and fun—wit that satisfies the intellect, humour that is the essence of mirth and renders us helpless with 'unquenchable laughter.' There is infinite magic in it, no less than in the 'blinding sweet' of his verse when he lends himself to beauty, or in the awe and pathos of his tragedy. I have no doubt Queen Elizabeth thoroughly appreciated the joke of the fat man being bundled into a basket and tumbled into the Thames, but whether the subtlety of Falstaff's 'Do, good Prince Hal; do, good king's son,' could penetrate her is, I venture to think, another question. Shakespeare, only too probably, spoke from sad experience when he condoled with the man 'whose good wit was not seconded by the forward child, understanding,' and said that this 'strikes a man more dead than a great reckoning in a little room.' I suspect, no man ever had more reason to say it. I venture to think that we have failed to realise the miracle of Shakespeare till we have realised that he was so far in advance of his age as to be unintelligible to it."

Mr. Hookham says, "the most incredible article in the orthodox creed is that which calls on us to believe that Shakespeare voluntarily ceased writing plays at forty-six, unless the orthodox explanation is more incredible still. He ceased from his great work when four years younger than Milton was when he commenced his, and what is the reason that is found satisfactory? Because his sole object all along had been money, and he had made as much as he required. . . . If ever man wrote for pleasure, it was Shakespeare. If ever poetry was written under supreme excitement it was Shakespeare's. To look further for incentive is pure perversity, or betrays ulterior motive." The genius argument is then dealt with in the following able manner:—

"One wonders if these distinguished critics (Professor Collins and Sir Theodore Martin) have ever seriously considered what the word connotes. . . . Surely it connotes a difference not merely of degree, but of kind. Now there are all degrees of capacity for acquiring knowledge, and the greatest is led up to from the least by an unbroken series. The extremes are no way different in kind from one another. For this reason—that genius is a thing *per se*, something mysteriously apart—acquisitive powers, even the most extraordinary, should not be reckoned genius. Conversely, no amount of genius can give the results of acquirement; the genius must gain these things by just the same methods as the rest of us. It cannot, for instance, give a

miraculous familiarity with foreign tongues, or with geography, or, again, with Italian legal process, or Italian canal systems. No more blind search for a definition was ever made than that which resulted in explaining genius as 'the infinite capacity for taking pains.' There is only one word in it that redeems it from inanity, the word 'infinite.' It is wrong essentially, because it identifies genius with an activity of mind, whereas in truth it is a passivity; a receptive state, not a state of effort; energetic indeed, but with derived energy. All our language with regard to it implies this. We use passive inflections for it. It is 'inspired,' it is an 'afflatus;' 'God whispers in the ear' of genius; 'the unpremeditated verse' is 'dictated;' one who, if ever man could, spoke from experience goes so far as to say that when a mortal is being borne on the 'viewless wings' the 'dull brain' (the organ of conscious intellect) "perplexes and retards.' Genius may not even go with exceptional all-round brain power. Merely, to use an expressive modern word for it, so far unspoilt, it has magic; and that is but another way of saying that its mental process is different in kind from ordinary mental processes. Genius has been so much the *deus ex machinâ* in this argument that it is necessary to clear one's ideas a little upon the subject. 'Ah, but you people do not know what genius can do,' we have so often heard. Perhaps not; yet we may know pretty decisively what it cannot do. It cannot give the results of education without the process of education. Genius has royal roads of its own, wonderful enough; but there is no royal road to information. It will not account for the learning in the plays."

The connection between Shakespeare and Southampton—the alleged lapses in his geographical knowledge—the lack of education with which his daughters were handicapped—the recent discovery of the Royal Historical Commission at Belvoir Castle, that in 1613 Shakespeare's name is mentioned in some family records—are each dealt with in turn.

In the concluding pages Mr. Hookham addresses himself to those who admit, what has always till now been admitted, that there are difficulties and great difficulties in the way of the Shaksperean authorship; and with whom, as with himself, the only question in comparing this with any other theory is, on which side are the greater and on which side the less. The difficulties being admitted, there is only, he maintains, to be opposed to them—a fixed idea. The foundations for this he proceeds to examine, demonstrating their insufficiency. It is difficult to abstain from reproducing further lengthy extracts from Mr. Hookham's admirable article—only want of space precludes this.

The relations of Jonson and Bacon, and the former's references to the latter, and to Shakspere and Shakespeare are treated at length.

Mr. Hookham sums up the position in the following words:—"On the one side, granting the primary, not improbable, premise

that an Elizabethan statesman might have had dramatic genius, all the rest follows not improbably. On the other is a mass of paradoxes and apparent contradictions, so great that the Shaksperean authorship was doubted and even denied before an alternative theory had been suggested."

ANNUAL MEETING.

THE Annual Meeting of the Society was held in the library, 11, Hart Street, W.C., on Thursday, the 25th of March, 1909. Mr. Granville Cuningham presided. The report of the Council and the accounts made up to December 31, 1908, were submitted and adopted. Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence, Bart., was appointed president for the ensuing year, Mrs. Pott, Mr. G. C. Cunningham and Mr. W. T. Smedley vice-presidents, Mr. G. C. Cuningham chairman, and Mr. Harold Bayley vice-chairman of the Council, Mr. W. T. Smedley honorary secretary and treasurer.

The following ladies and gentlemen were elected to act as the Council for the ensuing year :—Mrs. Chambers Bunten, Mrs. Kindersley, Messrs. H. F. Eaton, Francis Fearon, M.A., Fleming Fulcher, G. B. Rosher, and Parker Woodward. Mr. R. E. Mitchell, F.S.A.A., was re-appointed auditor.

NOTES.

FOR the third time the suggestion has been put forward that the author of the Shakespeare poems and plays was Roger Manners, fifth Earl of Rutland. The theory was propounded some years ago by a German professor. More recently a Willesden schoolmaster claimed to have discovered in the first Shakespeare Folio a cypher revealing Rutland's author-

ship and the location of the manuscript, but neither advanced any evidence in favour of the contention.

In the March number of *Fairchild's Magazine*, published in New York, a Mr. Lewis F. Bostelmann, editor of *The Younger Set*, gives its readers what he describes, writing in his own paper, as "an extraordinary treat."

If confident and emphatic assertion of improbable statements, unsupported by a tittle of evidence, can afford a treat or carry conviction, then the readers of *Fairchild's Magazine* are to be congratulated.

But it is stated that the gentleman is in possession of of data that will in due course of time be published in a book expounding the subject in every detail. In the meantime Mr. Bostelmann has written in blank verse a drama in four acts, styled *Roger of Rutland*, and purports to give a full account of young Roger Manners, of how he came to write the poems and plays, of the selection of a *nom de plume*, and of the difficulties which he encountered.

The *dramatis personæ* include, besides that of the title rolé, Southampton, Essex, Pembroke, Montgomery, Bacon, Sidney, Jonson, Shaxper, Burbage, Heminge, Condell, Queen Elizabeth, James I., and many other characters. It is at the best very poor reading, but as an attempt to solve a serious literary problem it is ridiculous.

From the introduction to this drama the following facts and dates referring to his life are taken. Roger Manners was born on October 6th, 1576, at Belvoir Castle, where his childhood was spent. He was styled Lord Roos. He succeeded to the title and estates on the death of his father on February, 1588, becoming fifth Earl of Rutland. He entered Corpus Christi, Cambridge, in 1593, and took his M.A. degree in 1595.

In 1596 he accompanied Essex on his expedition to the Ayores. The fleet being scattered in a severe storm he returned to England. Subsequently he spent some time as a student at the University at Padua. In 1598 he entered Grays Inn, and in the same year he crossed over to Holland and joined the Duke of Northumberland at his headquarters there.

In March, 1599, he married Sir Philip Sidney's daughter Elizabeth. In the same year he joined Essex in Ireland and was there knighted by him. In 1600 he was back in England and was appointed Steward of Nottingham and to other honorary offices. In the following year he joined Essex in his foolish attempt to capture the person of the Queen. He was committed to the Tower, his estates were confiscated and a fine of £30,000 was imposed upon him. His estates were restored to him and the fine was remitted on the accession of James in 1603. He died on the 26th June, 1612.

Not one fact which is stated, not one of the data which are given, in any degree points to Rutland being in any way connected with the production of the poems and plays, and the fact that he died in 1612 precludes him from being the author of the work which was put into the plays in the year immediately preceding the publication of the first folio edition. Bacon's claims have nothing to fear from this quarter, nor have those of the Stratford man.

A PARAGRAPH supplied from the office of "Der Menschenkenner," published in Berlin, has been freely circulated amongst the newspapers and journals in this country. It announces an article about to be printed, purporting to show that the will of Shakespere is in the same handwriting as the three signatures attached to it. Speaking of one of the signatures the writer

says:—"This copy is clear and good, and shows as well as all the other signatures a strongly individual and highly gifted personality of a passionate disposition." This view certainly has the merit of novelty. But it is not the first time that the suggestion has been made that the will and the signatures are in the same handwriting. Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence has drawn attention to the fact that the attestation is to the publishing of the will, not the signing or sealing. The words used are: "Witness to the publishing thereof." Sir Edwin considers that it is open to grave doubt whether the three signatures are even those of the Stratford Shakspere.

Mr. Edward J. H. O'Brien, of Boston College, Mass., has published a pamphlet on "An Interesting Discovery." He has found a small octavo volume of anonymous essays which appeared in London in 1620, with the following title page: *Horæ Subsecivæ.* Observations and Discourses. London. Printed for Edward Blount and are to be sold at his shop in Paul's Churchyard, at the signe of the Black Beare, 1620."

Though the book bears no external mark of its authorship, Mr. O'Brien thinks that a careful reading of its contents clearly reveals the creator, whose identity is masked, and he proceeds by a critical examination and comparison of it with Francis Bacon's acknowledged works to prove that he was the author.

The Baconian cause is already largely indebted to Sir Edward Sullivan, Bart., for his contributions to Sheakespearean literature, and he has placed them under further obligation by the articles which he has contributed to the March and April numbers of *The Nineteenth Century and After*, under the title of "The

Defamers of Shakespeare." He feels that it is necessary to utter a word of warning, and he has taken off the gloves and, without giving any quarter, attacked the Baconian theory and its advocates with might and main.

This entitles him to the sincere thanks of all those who, in pursuing this enquiry, simply desire to arrive at the truth. The more arguments that can be advanced in support of what Mr. Hookham describes as "the fixed idea" the better. Sir Edward Sullivan has come out of his tent, and the Baconians can learn from his onslaught the best and the worst that can be said against the theory they believe. This gives an opportunity for answer and retort, which in due course will be forthcoming. For the present it is only necessary to draw attention to the articles and to recommend a careful perusal of them.

THE past winter has not been prolific in lectures by members of the Society. In November last Mr. W. T. Smedley gave an account of the Ireland Forgeries, and after the lecture the members present had an opportnnity of inspecting his collection of books and pamphlets relating to the subject.

ON the 14th of May, at 8 p.m., Mr. Harold Bayley will lecture on "The Romance of the Rose" at Miss Souter's, Park Road, Regents Park, W., and during the month of June the President, Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence, will lecture at Carlton House Terrace, but neither date nor subject have yet been fixed.

A VERY important innovation has, however, been made in a series of lectures now being delivered to the

members by Mr. John M. Robertson, M.P., on "Francis Bacon." Mr. Robertson edited the edition of Bacon's works, published in 1905 by Messrs. Routledge and Co. In his "Pioneer Humanists"* Mr. Robertson has given perhaps the finest vindication of Bacon's character which has been written. So far two lectures have been given—on the 19th of February, when the subject was "Bacon as Writer," and on the 26th of March, when "Bacon as Man" was considered.

The third lecture will be delivered on Friday, the 28th of May, when Mr. Robertson will deal with Bacon as Political Thinker. Tickets for these lectures are issued to members free of charge; they may obtain additional tickets at a cost of 2s. each.

COLONEL COLOMB has published the first of a series of Papers styled the Shakespeare-Wakespear-Breakspear Leaflets.†

The brochure is brightly written and will prove amusing reading. That it is written in an ironical and sarcastic vein may be inferred from the concluding sentence:—"In the absence of evidence to the contrary it is conceived that Wake-spear has proved that Shakspere wrote Bacon. Q.E.D."

* Watts and Co., 1907, 6s. nett.

† "Mr. Nicholas Wake-speare on the Baconian Heresy," edited by Colonel Colomb. Eyre and Spottiswood, Limited, East Harding Street, E.C. Boards, 25 pp., 1s. nett.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Francis Bacon at Grays Inn.

(1579 to 1584).

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

Anagrammatiomus ex nomine et cognomine ornatissimi virtute.
Pariter ac eruditionis gloriæ insignis
Juvenis M Francisci Bacon, Juris
Municipalis in Hosp, Graiens studiosi,
Musarum fautoris, benignissimi.

FRANCISCUS BACONUS.

αναγραμματζόμενος

FAC BONUS, SIC CARUS.

Anagrammatis in epigrammate explanatio :—

Serpere nescit humi virtus, sed ut altius effert
Ad loca cultores, nobiliora trahit.
Sola etenim virtus, et quæ virtute paratur
Gloria non fictum creditur esse bonum.
FAC BONUS ut maneas virtutem semper amator.
Virtutem cures vita, colesque sacram.
Sic vir CARUS eris cordi quibus inclyta virtus :
Quæis animi pietas, quæis tua nota fides.
Observantiæ ergo
Fecit,
Thomas Zwanger.

This is copied from *Notes and Queries* of October 27th, 1900 (page 329).

This anagram is interesting, not only because it brings forcibly home to the reader, from the pen of an observant contemporary, the virtues of Francis Bacon, but it presents him already, at the ages of eighteen to twenty three years, as a patron of the Muses, and distinguished for his erudition. The anagram, which consists of a transposition of the letters of the name of *Francis Bacon* into the Latin "*Fac Bonus, sic Carus*" (do good, so you may be beloved),* is noteworthy in its explanatory lines, the first two of which observe :—

* CARUS was a *cognomen* of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius, so famed for his piety and goodness, whilst it also was the surname of the Latin poet Lucretius, whose *De Rerum Natura* holds in the depth of its philosophy many ideas and passages Bacon has borrowed from. But this may be only *a coincidence of letters*, and without intention from Zwanger.

That virtue refuses to *creep upon the ground*, but that as it lifts itself up higher, it drags its worshippers with it to nobler places.

This simile, or hint, *for the serpent that creeps upon its belly on the ground*, is very pregnant with allusion to base passions, and has striking parallels in passages both in the plays, poems and Promus of Bacon. In the *Rape of Lucreece* we find this (describing Tarquin's approach at night):—

A *creeping* creature with a flaming light (line 1,627).

. . . . .

Who sees the lurking serpent steps aside (*Ibid* 362).

. . . . .

"A *creeping* thief" (*Lucreece* 305). In the *Two Gentlemen of Verona* we find, "Love will *creep* in service where it cannot go" (IV. ii.). But this metaphor is often used by the Latin poets to denote *a low, grovelling poetic style*, and probably Zwanger is covertly alluding to Bacon's poetic proclivities in this expression of *Serpere nescit humi virtus*? The poet Horace writes:—"Serpit humi tutus" (Horace A. Ep. 2; 1,251), alluding to poets and poetry that are commonplace and of no lofty strain.

The Origin of Bacon's Name.

Old Richard Verstegan, famous for Saxon lore and archæological research, explains the name Bacon thus:—"Bacon of the Beechen tree,* anciently called Bucon, and whereas swine's flesh is now called by the name of *Bacon* it grew only at

* "Beechbark was employed for carving names before the invention of printing." "Books: Saxon, *boc;* Danish, *beuke;* German, *buche;* the first, *boc*, meaning *a beech tree*" (Brewer's "Dictionary of Myth and Fable").

> "Here on my trunk's surviving frame
> Carved many a long forgotten name,
> As love's own altar honour me,
> Spare woodman, spare this *beechen tree*."
>
> —Campbell.

In the play of *As You Like It* we find Orlando carving Rosalind's name on the trees. Jacques exclaims to him:—

"I pray you mar no more trees with writing love songs in their bark" (Act III. ii.).

Among the poetical pieces published in 1626, after Francis Bacon's death, and entitled *Manes Verulamianni* and which (to be found among the Harleian collections) have already appeared in Baconiana, is one comparing Bacon to a tree:—

Crescit occulto velut arbor ævo.

This probably is an allusion pointed at Bacon as one of the "*trees of righteousness*" (see Isaiah lxi. 3) that "shall bring forth their fruit in due season" (Psalm i.).

the first unto such as were fatted with *Bucon or Beechmast*" (Chap. IX. 299).

"This statement is singularly authenticated in Collin's 'Baronetage,' in the account of the *premier* Baronet.[o] The first man of this family to assume the name Bacon was one William, a great grandson of the Grimbaldus who came over with the Conqueror, and settled in Norfolk. He bore for his arms, '*Argent, a Beech tree proper*'" (*Notes and Queries*, January 18th, 1851, page 41).

The following is from *Notes and Queries* of December 10th, 1900, and is interesting.

"About four hundred yards from St. Michael's Church (where Francis Bacon, Vicount Saint Alban lies buried), near Gorhambury, at Verulamium, or St. Albans, is a wooden house, with overhanging upper story, *called Shakespeare's Cottage.*"

W. F. C. WIGSTON.

Shakespeare's "Coarseness" and Shakespearean Commentators.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—I should like to call the attention of all readers of BACONIANA to the sane and wholesome article by Theodore Watts-Dunton on "Pericles" in the February number of *Harper's Magazine*, treating of the alleged "coarseness" of Shakespeare. Anyone familiar with the dramatic literature of the period must recognise the fact that Shakespeare is purity itself in comparison with other writers of the time.

He says:—"Nothing is more whimsical than the ingenuity with which, in every Shakespeare play, the critics attribute to other hands every passage which they do not like—every passage found to be coarse, whether the humour is seasoned with Shakesperean humour or not."

I will not quote further, for the whole article should be read. He cites the scene of the drunken porter in *Macbeth* as an example. Surely there could be nothing more Shakespearean? Yet even Coleridge advanced the theory that the phrase, "The primrose way to the everlasting bonfire," is all that Shakespeare could have been guilty of.

Mr. Watts-Dunton draws a most interesting and valuable comparison between the so-called "coarse humour of Shakespeare"

[o] Sir Nicholas Bacon, first Baronet, was the eldest son of the Lord Keeper, Nicholas Bacon, by his first wife. He was knighted by Queen Elizabeth in 1578, and was the first person advanced to the dignity of Baronet, 22nd May, 1611, upon the institution of the order. He was half brother to Francis Bacon.

and the "cynical coarseness which certain writers of the present day are endeavouring to introduce into imaginative literature."

ISAAC HULL PLATT.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—I have read with great pleasure Mr. Harold Bayley's valuable work called "A New Light on the Renaissance," and feel that it is really an addition to the "Curiosities of Literature." By its help Bacon students should learn much on the side of watermarks and emblems, but there still seems a good deal to find out, and in one or two respects Mr. Bayley leaves us groping in the dark where we would fain have a light thrown, and I cannot quite agree with him that "*the same code which unlocks the obscurities of papermarks elucidates the problems of printer's marks*," for though he gives us clues to the former, he leaves the mysterious printer's head pieces and tail pieces unexplained. These latter, with their dots and marks of interrogation and divisions, evidently could be read if the cypher was once discovered, and they are even more interesting than the emblems, which speak for themselves.

This chapter in the book is headed "Tricks of Obscurity." Granted that the acorn represents a slowly germinating seed; that the vase is the holy cup St. Grail; that the fleur-de-lys is the emblem of purity; and that the S. S. represents "Sfantus Spiritus," still over and above this is the strange order in which they are arranged as headings in old books. For instance, on Mr. Bayley's examples why is "Fig. 376" so diversified? and what is the meaning of the various dots and queries in Fig. 382? and also those which break up the continuity of "Fig. 394"? Mr. Bayley suggests they are vehicles for cyphers, but who placed the cyphers in the book—the actual printers or the writer?

Supposing the matter written about was against the Romish Church, and that the printer reversed the verdicts by contradicting it in tail pieces of cypher.

A cypher becomes perfectly useless if it cannot be read, for then it fails in its message, whether it be in Latin or in English. As Bacon was an inventor of cyphers it would be well for his admirers to pursue the subject, especially in his wonderful head and tail pieces. Talking of printers' devices, I have often wondered at the combination of the "Crab and the Butterfly," and how such unneighbourly figures came to be thrown together. There is a good example in Fig. 309, and the explanation there given is "make haste slowly," but there must surely be more complete reading, if we only knew it, and perhaps the author will help us to it at a future time.

Very interesting is the explanation of the mysterious lady of worship that the poets wrote about from Petrarch to Shakespeare, Spencer, and others. Her real name was "Philosophy,"

or "Wisdom," and she is still being worshipped, but openly, now, instead of in secret. Let me quote only one more note of interest out of the many in the book, and that is on page 97, where we see that by ordinance in France every master paper maker was compelled to identify his own products by water-marking into each sheet his surname or emblems, and that many paper mills clustered together where there was a good water supply.

"Their output was collected by factors, who rarely troubled to keep separate the different makings; hence it is a common occurrence to meet with thirty or forty different paper marks in a single volume."

This clears up the reason of so many water marks being found in Shakespeare's works, as well as the early books of Caxton, which have puzzled many students.

Yours faithfully, A. CHAMBERS BUNTEN.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIR,—By accident, intuition, or inspiration, I recently deciphered that "Good Frend" doggerel graven upon the original so-called "tombstone" in the chancel of the church at Stratford-on-Avon, supposed to cover the "bones" and "dust" of the immortal "Shakespeare," which for nearly three centuries has so mystified all who read, or, more correctly, tried to read it.

Flushed with success, like Alexander, I sought for new worlds to conquer, and accepted the challenge to "stay" and "read if thou canst" the nonsensical rhyme inscribed upon the "monument" on the wall above the "tombstone"—that "page" of "wit" which there is "writt." After a week, more or less, of pure persistent and patient effort (unlike the almost accidental discovery of the epitaphal reading), I was again a conqueror.

Yet both "epitaph" and inscription are so easily read—when you find out how to do it—that their very simplicity makes one wonder why the discovery has been so long delayed.

In advance of their publication (for which I am now preparing) I send you "A Prophetic Rhyme" for the columns of BACONIANA if you deem it worthy of acceptance. Not being, as yet, a Shakespearean scholar, I had not seen your very interesting magazine until a copy of the issue for July, 1908, was mailed to me last week by my friend and fellow-vegetarian, Mrs. Adelaide Johnson, the famous sculptress and Vice-President of the Women's International Vegetarian Union.

Let us hope that "Sir Francis"—who, not only *in the very tille* of "Hamlet, Prince of Denmark," protests against being "*marked or yclept fine ham*," but also in his "Sonnets" (see No. 111), and in *Romeo and Juliet* as well—may yet come into undisputed possession of his chosen name, adapted and adopted at first, perhaps, only as a "mask" from the name of the illiterate

Stratfordian, Shaksper. As "Shakespeare" let us henceforward recognise in, name and memory the author of the essays and other writings now bearing the name of his foster-father, Bacon, as well as the plays and poems bearing the name he selected for posterity to honour, thus combining the learning and laws of Nestor, the genius and knowledge of Socrates, with the art of Virgil, in one man—or immortal.

Baconic SHAKESPEARE, rise! oh, rise!
Too long from mortal eyes
The tomb hath hid the truth. Arise!
No longer "marked or yclept fine ham"
(What sorry fate!)
We read thy 'plaint in *Hamlet*,
Though it be but late.
Disowned while living,
England's royal son
Hath writ his name in history
Till the world be done.
Shakespearean-Bacon,
Drop the latter name;
Let Francis "SHAKESPEARE!"
Live *alone* in fame.

Yours courteously,

CHARLES ALEXANDER MONTGOMERY,
Honorary Secretary, New York Vegetarian Society.

P. O. Box 888, New York, U.S.A., Feb. 15, 1909.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIR,—In my paper, "Of Great Place by Shake-speare and Bacon," in the October number of BACONIANA, I stated that I did not remember having seen noticed the parallel to which I there called attention. That statement was true enough, but I should have remembered it, and I wish to apologise to Dr. Theobald for my inadvertence. The matter is fully set forth on page 45 of his admirable "Shakespere Studies in Baconian Light," a book which I value most highly and often refer to. The cause of my oversight was that at the time of writing my paper the book had been removed from my shelves to lend to a friend. I hope my carelessness will have no other effect than to call renewed attention to Dr. Theobald's most entertaining and admirable book.

While I am writing, Mr. Editor, let me thank you for the pleasure derived from reading your most excellent appreciation of the late Prof. Collins. I fully agree with you in all the praise you accord him. While he did say some hard things about Baconians, they were of no consequence in comparison to the nails he drove into the coffin of the Stratford bugaboo. Prof.

Collins's would-be curse was, like Balaam's, turned into a blessing.

ISAAC HULL PLATT.

Runnemede, Wallingford, Pennsylvania, Oct. 21, 1908.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

I hope all Baconians will resent the particularly strong censure upon Mrs. Pott that Dr. Anders dares to put forth in the last numbers of BACONIANA when speaking of the word "rome" in Bacon's MS. "Promus" in the British Museum. Mrs. Pott is a painstaking student and has done valuable work, and Dr. Ander's sentence, "If it (rome) is in Mrs. Pott's book she must be put down as either a wilful forger or as an ignorant transcriber," cannot be allowed to pass without a challenge.

The book alluded to is called "The Promus of Formularies and Elegances, by Francis Bacon, illustrated and elucidated by passages from Shakespeare, by Mrs. Henry Pott, with a preface by E. A. Abbott, D.D., Head Master of the City of London School," (Longman, Green and Co.); and I have it before me at the present moment. On page 2 the following passage can be read: "Beside the proof afforded by identity of handwriting, these MSS. contain internal evidence that they were written by Bacon, for amongst them are the rough notes for the 'Colours of Good and Evil.'"

Another point I would remark is that Dr. Anders says, "If it is in Mrs. Pott's book," showing he has not read the book himself, and is speaking second-hand.

On consulting the original manuscript in the British Museum, one is struck by the difficulties she must have been met with in deciphering the faded writing of sentences in Latin, French, Italian, Spanish; sentences out of Erasmus's Adagia; Solomon; lines from Seneca, Horace, Virgil, Ovid, and the Bible, etc.; and on page 10 of her book Dr. Anders may read, "It will require the combined efforts of many minds to bring the work which has been attempted to a satisfactory state of completion, and it is not to be hoped that there should not be at present errors, omissions, and weak points which will be corrected by further study."

The record in question is hardly decipherable and might easily be mistaken, and Mrs. Pott would be the first to regret such mis-reading, but her work remains a monument of study and erudition and should be acknowledged as such. The reader of her "Promus" illustrations will find she has read many hundreds of books, which she gives lists of, and her labours must have taken years and cost a good deal of money.

Has Dr. Engel or Dr. Anders done as much? Trusting others will take up the cudgels, I remain, yours,

A. CHAMBERS BUNTEN.

The word "rome" is on page 386 in Mrs. Pott's "Promus," and she puts a mark of interrogation after it.

BACONIANA.

VOL. VII. *Third Series.* JULY, 1909. No. 27.

THE GOAL IN SIGHT.

THE steady and persistent labours during the past thirty years of the members of the Bacon Society appear at last to be making some impression. Gradually the case for the impossibility of attributing the poems and plays to the Stratford Shakespeare has been built up in such strength that no jury of average intelligent men, considering the evidence in an impartial spirit, could do other than return a verdict against the accepted authorship.

Concurrently coincidences, facts and theories have been gathered together which so strongly point to Francis Bacon as the author that at least there is sufficient support for the hypothesis to justify its serious consideration. By far the most powerful work advocating this view, on what may be termed orthodox Baconian lines, is "Francis Bacon—Our Shakespeare,"* by the late Mr. Edwin Reed.

The arguments contained therein may be supplemented by many important points, to which attention has been directed since its issue; but no impartial person could digest Mr. Reed's book without admitting that the chances were at least even that its title represented a fact.

* Gay & Bird, 1902.

That Bacon had made use of his biliteral cipher (invented by him during his sojourn in France, referred to in the "Advancement of Learning," 1605, and fully explained in the "De Augmentis Scientiarum," 1623) was to be expected. When, therefore, Mrs. Gallup announced that she had discovered its use, not only in Bacon's works but in the 1623 folio edition of Shakespeare's plays and other works of the period, there was nothing inconsistent with probabilities. Mrs. Gallup has many strong supporters, but many ardent Baconians refuse to admit that the evidence in favour of the use of the cipher as alleged is convincing. They contend that corroboration is lacking. The subject is one of great intricacy and difficulty. The fact that it may be affirmed that so far only Mrs. Gallup has been able to decipher on any practicable scale is probably the stumbling-block to many who are willing to approach the subject without prejudice. The controversy which arose on the biliteral cipher caused a set-back to the Baconian case. Ninety-nine out of every hundred men now, practising literature, are quite ignorant of the important part which ciphers played in the conduct of the affairs of nations, societies, and individuals in the sixteenth century. The opponents of the Baconian theory traded on this ignorance for all it was worth. The cipher was a fair subject for ridicule and satire. The Press, generally conducted in these degenerate days by men of superficiality, compelled by the position they occupy to assume a pose of authority on subjects as to which they are profoundly ignorant, threw all its influence against Mrs. Gallup; but if public opinion was against her, she was never proved to be an impostor. Those who know her best speak of her honesty and self-sacrifice in the highest terms, and it may yet be demonstrated that she has accomplished the greatest literary feat of any woman, living or dead.

Judge Webbs' "The Mystery of William Shakespeare" and Lord Penzance's summing up to the jury, strong in their forcible argument, left the matter much as it was. "An Impartial Study of the Shakespeare Title," by Judge Stotsenburg, followed in 1904. This volume has never in England received the attention which it deserved. It contains a masterly examination of the vocabularies and peculiarities of style of the principal poets and dramatic writers of the Elizabethan period.

It was not until June of 1908, when "The Shakespeare Problem Restated," from the pen of Mr. G. Greenwood, M.P., appeared, that public attention to the controversy was again aroused. Here was a book, written by a barrister and a scholar, who was also a Member of Parliament, who refused acquiescence in the belief that Bacon was the author, but who in a most unmerciful manner attacked and demolished the Stratford citadel. There are honest critics, and these were compelled to acknowledge that Mr. Greenwood had made out a case which required answering. Canon Beeching in a feeble and half-hearted manner attempted the task, but as misrepresentation was his chief weapon Mr. Greenwood had little difficulty in effectually disposing of his assault. Then Sir Edward Sullivan, Bart., renewed the attack in the *Nineteenth Century* for April and May, and in the June number, Mr. Greenwood, although his reply was unfairly shortened and mauled by the Editor, placed the Baronet *hors de combat.*

The reviewers had barely laid down their pens from the consideration of "The Shakespeare Problem Restated" when a chapter of Mark Twain's autobiography, under the title of "Is Shakespeare Dead?" was placed before them, and they found the man whose name has always stood for sound common-sense ranged in line

with the Baconians with a confidence that cannot be questioned.

Most of the Shakespearean reviewers, instead of meeting Mark Twain in fair encounter, ride off with the quibble that he is a humorist, and his book is only to be treated as a great practical joke. The able writer in the *Westminster Review*, however, commences his notice of the book by boldly stating: "My intended subscription to the Shakespeare Memorial is held in abeyance. Doubts assail my mind." No champion now sets forth to do battle for the old superstitious belief, and Baconians are noticing that there is a general tendency among those brilliant scholars of Elizabethan literature who constitute themselves guardians of William Shakspere's literary reputation to keep out of sight and hearing.

So far as the intellectual forum is concerned, the attack on Shakspere's authorship has succeeded beyond question, and the claims made for Bacon's authorship are so far conclusive as to leave little reasonable doubt. But as Mr. Hillaire Belloc averred in an article in the *Morning Post*, referred to in the last number of BACONIANA, the plain man will require more than intellectual proof before setting aside a title based on possession for upwards of three hundred years; he will require some mechanical proof which will stand the test of close scrutiny.

Such a proof would be the records alleged to have been made by means of the biliteral cipher; but until others besides Mrs. Gallup can decipher and corroborate her, the plain man refuses to accept her testimony.

At this interesting stage of the controversy Messrs. Constable and Co. publish a work by Mr. William Stone Booth on "Some Acrostic Signatures of Francis Bacon," which is dealt with elsewhere in these

columns. Here surely is that mechanical proof for which Mr. Belloc asked. It is a singular fact that up to the present time, although the book has been in the reviewers' hands for some weeks, no notice of it has appeared—at any rate, in any of the leading daily or weekly papers. It is true that Mr. William Archer has made some references to it in a column of gossip which he provides for the *Morning Leader*, but some of his contentions he admits were founded on error, and, as to the rest, they bear evidence that he has failed to grasp the problem which Mr. Booth advances.

In a few weeks will be published another work by Mr. E. V. Tanner, giving mechanical proof of the most remarkable character of the existence of a cipher in the lines "To the Reader," prefixed to the folio edition of Shakespeare's plays. There will be no difficulty about proof in this case. Every schoolboy will be able to verify Mr. Tanner's most ingenious discoveries.

And then—what next? A further mechanical proof of such a character that the plain man will stand aghast. Any evening a bomb may be thrown into the literary world which will cause a cataclysm in which the literary reputation of that silent man of Stratford will be engulfed with those of the Lees, Beechings, and other distinguished men of letters who "know so much that is not so." The mills of Francis Bacon have been grinding very slowly but very surely, and within a very short period those who, acting under his instructions, have been turning the stones will see him enter into his kingdom with undisputed sovereignty. That will be their reward, but it will be sufficient.

BACON ON THE STAGE.

STRATFORDIANS contend that Bacon had little sympathy with and no knowledge of the stage, or of stage-craft. To prove that there is no foundation in fact for the statements I proffer the following quotations from his prose works, letters, speeches, etc. The truth is that he was so keenly in touch with the best aims of the theatre and its operations that he continually turned to the stage and stage-craft for the expressions of his ideas in speaking and writing on very different matters.

ALLUSIONS TO SHAKE-SPEARE'S PLAYS.

Sir Francis Bacon's "*Apology concerning Essex addressed to the Earl of Devonshire,*" contains extraordinary admissions.*

"I remember an answer of mine in a matter which had some affinity with my Lord's (Essex) cause, which though it grew from me went about in other's names. For Her Majesty being mightily incensed with that book which was dedicated to my Lord of Essex being a Story of the first years of King Henry IV., thinking it a seditious prelude, to put into the people's heads boldness and faction, said she had an opinion that there was treason in it. . . . The Queen would not be persuaded that it was his writing whose name was to it, but that it had some more mischievous author."

The next passage proves that "the matter" alluded to was the "Book of Henry IV.," and also that Bacon wrote it :—

"The next news that I heard was . . . it was allotted to me that I should set forth some undutiful carriage of my Lord in giving occasion and

* Vol. I., *Bacon's Works*, p. 436. Published by William Ball.

countenance to a seditious pamphlet, as it was termed, which was the Book, before mentioned, of King Henry IV. Whereupon I replied to that allotment . . . that it was an old matter, and had no manner of coherence with the rest of the Charge . . . and therefore that I having been wronged by bruits before, this would expose me to them more; and it would be said I gave in evidence mine own tales."*

To prove that it was a play of Shake-speare which is here alluded to I quote from "*A Declaration of the Practices and Treasons Committed by Robert, late Earl of Essex.*"†

"To prove him privy to the plot it was given in evidence . . . that the afternoon before the rebellion, Merick, with a great company of others that afterwards were all in the action, had procured to be played before them the Play of Deposition of King Richard the Second. Neither was it casual, but a Play bespoken by Merick. And not so only, but when he was told by one of the Players, that the Play was old,‡ and they should have lost in playing it, because few would come to it; there were forty shillings extraordinary given to play it, and so therupon played it was. So earnest he was to satisfy his eyes with the sight of that Tragedy, which he thought soon after his Lordship should bring from the Stage to the State, but that God turned it upon their own heads."

In *The Proceedings of the Earl of Essex* we find—

"About that time there did fly about in London streets and Theatres divers seditious libels etc."§

In Apophthegm 21 the subject is again treated of.

* *Ibid*, p. 438. † *Ibid*, p. 424.

‡ Bacon had said in a former paragraph, "It was an old matter."

§ *Ibid*, p. 403.

"The book of Deposing King Richard II. and the Coming in of Henry IV., supposed to be written by D. Hayward, who was committed to the Tower for it, had much incensed Queen Elizabeth and she asked Mr. Bacon, being then her counsel learned, whether there were any treason contained in it?"

Again in James' reign Bacon alludes to the Shakespeare play in his "Charge against Mr. Oliver St. John."

"This gentleman, not suddenly by his pen . . . not privately, . . . but publickly as it were, . . . slandered and traduced the King. . . . Intending, as it seems, to play prizes, . . . would bring his papers upon the Stage.

"In this writing is a wicked and seditious slander; setting him (the King) forth for . . . a match for a Richard the Second. . . . Now Mr. I. S. . . . for your comparison with Richard II., I see you follow the example of them that brought him upon the Stage and into print in Queen Elizabeth's time." *

When Lambard, keeper of the Records, waited upon her at the Palace, she exclaimed to him, "I am Richard, know you not that?" †

DOUBTFUL ALLUSIONS.

"I shall not promise you weight for weight but Measure for Measure" (*Letter to Tobie Mathew*).

"In some Comedies of Errors . . . the Mistress and the Maid change habits" (*Advancement of Learning*).

"So well sorted with a Play of Errors" (*Grays Inn Masque*).

"More willing to hear Julius Cæsar than Queen Elizabeth commended" (*To Tobie Mathew*).

* *Works*, Vol. I., pp. 689, 691, 692.

† *Story of Lord Bacon's Life.* By Hepworth Dixon. P. 156.

"We see Brutus and Cassius invited to a supper certain whose opinion they meant to feel" (*Advancement of Learning*).

"All is well that endes well" (*Promus*, 949).

WITH REGARD TO THE STAGE.

In the charges by His Majesty's Attorney-General against the Earl and Countess of Somerset concerning Sir Thomas Overbury, Sir Francis Bacon speaks like a stage manager :—

"The great frame of justice, my Lords, in this present action, hath a Vault, and hath a Stage: a Vault, wherein these works of darkness were contrived, and a Stage with steps by which it was brought to light." *

"I will . . . hold myself to that which I called the Stage, or Theatre, whereunto indeed it may be fitly compared: for that things were first contained within the invisible judgments of God, as within a Curtain,† and after came forth and were acted most worthily by the king, and right well by his ministers." ‡

"Things stood by the space almost of two years during which time God . . . did bind and nail . . . fast the Actors and instruments . . . as neither the one looked about them nor the other stirred or fled." §

"Then follow the proceedings of Justice against the other offenders . . . all these being but the organs and instruments of this fact, the Actors and not the Authors . . . But, my lords, where I speak of a Stage, I doubt I hold you upon the Stage too long." ‖

And again, "Certainly, my lords, the Tragical misery of that poor gentleman, Overbury, ought somewhat to obliterate his faults." ¶

* *Works*, Vol. I. p. 702.

† Name of first Play House, The Curtain.

‡ *Works*, Vol. I. p. 703. § *Ibid*, p. 703. ‖ *Ibid*, p. 704.

¶ *Ibid*, p. 706.

"Weston was the Actor or Mechanical party in this imposionment."

"Weston . . . was the principal Actor in the impoisonment."

"Thus when they heard this poor gentleman in the Tower . . . then was the time to execute the last Act of this Tragedy."

(To Somerset): "You were the principal Actor and had your hand in all those Acts."

"Because there must be a time for the Tragedy to be acted . . . Overbury must be held in the Tower."

And, again, see "*The Charge of the King's Attorney-General against Mr. Lumsden*," etc.[o]:—

"For this His Majesty's virtue of justice God hath of late raised an occasion and erected as it were a Stage or Theatre much to his honour, for him to shew it and act it in the pursuit of the untimely death of Sir Thomas Overbury."

"No inglorious exit from the Stage" (*Felicities of Queen Elizabeth*, Latin ed., pub. by Rawley, 1608).

"Allen that was the Player . . . I like well that Allen playeth the last Act of his life so well" (*Letter to Buckingham*).

"The Scene of the Tragedy is changed, and it is a new Act to begin" (*War with Spain.*")

"All would be but a play upon the Stage, if Justice went not on in the right course" (*Letter to Buckingham*).

"Where a man cannot fitly play his own Part if he hath not a friend, he may quit the stage" (*Essay of Friendship*).

"Borrow a horse and armour for some Public Show" (*Letter to Salisbury*).

"The colours that show best by candle-light are white, carnation, and a kind of sea-water green, and ounches and spangs" (*Essay of Masques*).

[o] *Ibid*, p. 695.

"Naked and open daylight . . . doth not show the Masques and Mummeries half stately and daintily as candle lights" (*Essay of Truth*).

"He thought after the manner ot Stage-Plays and Masques to show . . . afar off, and therefore . . . sailed into Ireland" (*Henry VII.*).

"One of the aptest particulars that hath come or can come upon the Stage" (*Letter to Essex*).

"Those that dance too long Galliards . . . take them off, and bring others on" (*Essay of Discourse*).

"A good Cross-Point but worst Cinq-a-pace" (*Promus*).

"The foolish bird playeth the ape in gesture" (*Nat. History*).

"Moving the head or hand too much . . . sheweth a fantastical, light, and fickle operation of the spirit, Consequently like mind as gesture . . . use a modest action in either" (*Short Notes*).

"When . . . business comes upon the Stage I carry it with strength and resolution" (*Letter to Buckingham*).

"Stories invented for the Stage are neater, more elegant, and more agreeable to the taste than . . . true Stories" (*Novum Organum*).

"An Ædilio; one that should have set forth some magnificent Shows or Plays (*Advancement of Learning*, Book II.).

"An Action which seldom cometh upon the Stage" (*Advancement of Learning*, Book II.).

"It was one of the longest Plays of that kind that hath been in memory" (*Henry VII.*).

"Neither do I judge of the Play by the First Act" (*Letter to Essex*).

"Inconstancy of Fortune with inconstancy of mind makes a dark Scene" (*De Aug.*, Book VI.).

"These things should not be Staged" (*Letter to Buckingham*).

"Momus seeing in the frame of Man's heart such angles and recesses, found fault there was not a window to look into it. This window we can obtain" (*De Augmentis*).

"Like to reflexions in Looking Glasses" (*Nat. History*).

"The curious window into hearts of which the Ancients speak" (*Device of the Indian Prince*).

"Give me leave to set before you two glasses, such as never met in one age, the Glass of France, and the Glass of England" (*Attorney-General's Speech*).

"It is more than time that there was an end and surcease made . . . whereby matters of religion is handled in the style of the Stage" (*Of the Church*).

"The Stage is more beholding to Love than the life of man" (*Essay of Love*).

"As the tongue speaketh to the ear so the Gesture to the eye."

"He played as if he had been upon the Stage" (*Advancement of Learning*).

"A virtuous man will be virtuous *in-solitudine* in a desert, and not only in *Theatro* upon the Stage" (*Colours of Good and Evil*).

"One and one other are sufficient for the largest Stage (*Promus*).

"A perfect Palace . . . I would have only one goodly room above stairs, of fifty feet at least high. And under it a room of the same length and width, for a Dressing or Preparing place at Feasts, Plays and such Magnificencies, and to receive conveniently the Actors while dressing and preparing" (*Essay of Building*, Posthumous edition).

"I do not desire to Stage myself, nor my pretensions, but for the comfort of a private life" (*La: Buckingham*).

"Wherein he hath already so well profited . . . this entrance upon the Stage" (*Letter to the King*).

"In this entrance upon the Stage . . . he (Villiers) hath not committed any manifest error" (*Letter to King James*, clvii.).

"Who would not be offended at one that cometh into the pulpit, as if he came upon the Stage to play parts?" (*Of the Church*, Touching a preaching Ministry).

"What can be more disagreeable than in common life to copy the Stage?" (*De Aug.*, Book VI.).

"Let Anti-Masques not be too long; they have been commonly of fools, satyrs, baboons, wild men, antics, beasts, spirits, witches, Ethiopes, pigmies, turquets, nymphs, rustics, Cupids, statues moving, and the like" (*Essay of Masques*).

"Let the suit of the Maskers be graceful, and such as become the person when the vizards are off . . . . let the music . . . . be recreative. Double Masques, one of men another of ladies addeth state and variety" (*Ibid*).

"Will be ready to furnish a Masque" (*Letter to Burleigh*).

"Many other Plays of the same kind might be put together and harmonised" (*Novum Organum*).

"The alteration of scenes, so it be quickly and without noise are things of great beauty and pleasure" (*Essay of Masques*).

"Acting in song, especially in Dialogues, hath an extreme good grace, Acting, not dancing, for that is a mean and vulgar thing" (*Ibid*).

"Arts . . . are judged by Acts and Master-Pieces as I may term them" (*Advancement of Learning*).

REMARKS ABOUT STAGE-PLAYERS OR ACTORS.

"Stage-Players . . . . by this faculty of Playing" (*Adv. of Learning*).

"Such who themselves have been Actors on the Stage" (*Essay of Counsel*).

"A good Comediante" (*Promus*).

"First appearance upon the Stage in . . . . new character" (*Henry VII.*).

"A Player, who, if he were left out of his auditory and their applause he would straight be out of heart and countenance" (*Colours of Good and Evil*).

"Action . . . . that part of an orator which is but superficial, and rather the virtue of a Player" (*Essay of Boldness*).

"Acting the part of a prince handsomely" (*Henry VII.*).

"Advise you whether you will play the Honest Man or no" (*Letter to Kempe*).

"They would make you a King in a Play" (*Henry VII.*).

"The Actor or Mechanical party" (*Resuscitatio*).

"Tragedian's Buskin" (*Promus*).

"There be Mountebanks, as well in the civil body as in the natural" (*Memorial of Access*, 1622).

"A Buskin that will serve both legs" (*Promus*).

"Stage-Playing accustoms young men to bear being looked at" (*De Augmentis*).

"Insinuating his purpose to be an Actor" (*A Report*).

"Augustus Cæsar . . . when he died desired his friends about him to give him a *Plaudite* as if he were conscient to himself that he had played his part well upon the Stage (*Adv. of Learning*, Book II.).

"The Epicureans pronounce of the stoical felicity placed in virtue that it is a felicity of a Player . . . they in ridicule call virtue a Theatrical good" (*De Aug.*, Book VI.).

"Such a Mercurial as the like had seldom been known, and could make his own Part if at any time he chanced to be out" (*Ibid*).

"Use this lad to counterfeit and personate . . . frame him and instruct him in the Part" (*Henry VII.*).

"Playing the Prince" (*Ibid*).

"A serious Part" (*Ibid*).

"It is easier to retain the image of a Player acting his Part, than the corresponding notions of Invention and Action" (*De Aug.*, Book VI.),

"Buffoons do draw all things to conceit ridiculous" (*Adv. of Learning*).

"Nothing more variable than voices . . . a Buffoon or Pantomimi will express so many as pleaseth" (*Ibid*).

"There be certain Pantomimi that will represent the voices of Players of Interludes so to the life as if you see them not you would think they were those Players themselves, and the voices of other men that they hear" (*Nat. History*).

"Could counterfeit the distance of voices . . . in such sort as when . . . fast by you you would think, the speech came from afar off, in a fearful manner . . . I see . . . use for it in counterfeiting ghosts or spirits" (*Ibid*).

"I thought it not impossible but that I as a looker-on might cast mine eyes upon some things which the Actors themselves . . . did not, or would not see" (*Of the Church*).

"A looker-on often sees more than a Player" (*Adv. of Learning*).

"Did set foot on the Stage, and acted new fables neither much applauded or of any elegant argument or subject" (*Experimental History*).

"An Actful, sprightful man" (*Letter to Villiers*).

"Who, when one would think he standeth in great Majesty and felicity, he is troubling to say his Part" (*Gray's Inn Masque*).

"Bashfulness is a great hindrance to a man . . . of uttering his conceit" (*Short Notes*).

"Had you . . . acted your Parts to the best and yet matters should . . . have gone backward there would

be no hopes of amendment, but as it has happened principally through your own errors, if these are corrected all may be recovered" (*De Augmentis*, Book VI.).

"Knowing myself by inward calling to be fitter to hold a Book than Play a Part" (*Letter to Bodley*).

"None could hold the Book so well to prompt and instruct . . . Stage-Play as she could" (*Henry VII.*).

"Your life is nothing but a continual acting upon a Stage" (*Queen's Device*).

"There be some whose lives are as if they perpetually played upon the Stage, disguised to all others, open only to themselves" (*Harleian MS.*).

Of the Theatre.

"Theatres and the like are honorable things" (*Offer to King J. of a digest of laws*, p. 671, Vol. I., *Works*).

"Dramatic poetry, which has the Theatre for its world, would be of excellent use if it were sound, for the discipline and corruption of the Theatre is of very great consequence. . . . The action of the Theatre, though modern states esteem it but ludicrous unless it be satirical and biting, was carefully watched by the ancients that it might improve mankind in virtue; and indeed many wise men and great philosophers have thought it to the mind as the bow to the fiddle; and certain it is, though a great secret in nature, that the minds of men in company are more open to affections and impressions than when alone" (*De Augmentis*, chap. xiii., p. 97, Edited by Joseph Devey).

"The justest division of poetry . . . (1) Into Narrative. (2) Dramatic. (3) Allegorical. . . . Dramatic poetry is a kind of visible History, giving the images of things as if they were present, whilst History represents them as past" (*Ibid*, p. 96).

"Beholding this noble Action . . . as in a Theatre,

with great admiration" (*Retreat of Gaunt, A War with Spain*).

"Stood all as in a Theatre" (*New Atlantis*).

"In this Theatre of Men's lives, it is reserved for God and the Angels to be lookers on" (*Advancement of Learning*).

"Life . . . sends Men headlong into this wretched Theatre, where being arrived, their first language is that of mourning" (*An Essay on Death*, Vol. I., *Works*, etc., William Ball).

"Pedant's hath been scorned upon Theatres, as the ape of tyranny" (*Advancement of Learning*, Book I.).

"By the help and ministry of man . . . another Theatre comes into view" (*Parasceve* and *Hist. Nat.*).

"The Theatre of the Poets" (*Novum Organum*).

"Partakers of God's Theatre shall likewise be partaker of God's rest" (*Essay of Great Place*).

Tragedy and Comedy.

"The deformity of Flattery is Comedy, but the injury Tragedy" (*De Aug.*, Book VI.).

"The things to be seen and observed . . . Comedies, such whereunto the better sort of persons do resort" (*Essay of Travel*).

"Be pleased benignly to bow your ears to hear the Tragedy of a young man that by right ought to hold in his hand the ball of a Kingdom" (*Henry VII.*).

"The Tragedies likewise from them (King's children) have been many" (*Essay of Empire*, 1625).

"Tragedies and Comedies are made of one alphabet" (*Promus*).

"A false or factious Factor, might oftentimes make great Tragedies upon no great ground" (*A Report, Resuscitatio*).

"The Poets in Tragedies do make the most passionate lamentations" (*Colours of Good and Evil*).

"Fortune doth not commonly bring in a Comedy after a Tragedy" (*Henry VII.*).

"To a good man cruelty means Tragical fiction" (*De Aug.*, Book VI.).

"To turn religion into a Comedy is a thing far from the devout reverence of a Christian" (*Of the Church).*

"As to the Stage love is ever matter of Comedies and now and then of Tragedies, but in life it doth much mischief" (*Essay of Love,* British Museum Copy).

"In a lively Tragedy" (*Queen's Device*).

"Tragedy of calamities . . . Comedies of ridiculous frustrations, and Disappointments" (*Grays Inn Masque*).

I conclude with an application of a line from St. Luke :—

"Of the abundance of the heart his mouth speaketh."

ALICIA AMY LEITH.

"MARK TWAIN" *NOBISCUM.*

"The life of Shakespeare is a fine mystery, and I tremble every day lest something should turn up."—*Charles Dickens.*

IN his latest work, "Is Shakespeare Dead?" our greatest living humorist has made mince-meat of the Stratford miracle-mongers. Hence it has been left severely alone by newspaper critics. In fact, I have not seen a single review of the volume on this side of the Atlantic. More's the pity, as it deserves a thousand-and-one—at least, from the Baconian point of view. At any rate I shall give him the one with no little pleasure.

Mark is seen in his very best vein in this vigorous onslaught on the "Shakespeare" of tradition, whom he turns inside out in his singularly incisive process of analytical extermination. His dissection of "the man

of Stratford" leaves very few scraps of the original cadaver for the scalpels of subsequent anatomists.

When he was seven years old, Mark tells us in his inimitable style, he "meditated" a biography of no less a personage than Satan and found, on looking into the subject, that "it was 'conjectured'—though not established—that Satan was originally an angel in heaven; that he fell, that he rebelled, and brought on a war; that he was defeated, and banished to perdition. Also, 'we have reason to believe' that later he did so-and-so; that 'we are warranted in supposing' that at a subsequent time he travelled extensively, seeking whom he might devour; that a couple of centuries afterward, 'as tradition instructs us,' he took up the cruel trade of tempting people to their ruin, with vast and fearful results; that by-and-bye, 'as the probabilities seem to indicate,' he may have done certain things, he might have done certain other things, he must have done still other things."

"And so on and so on. We set down the five known facts by themselves, on a piece of paper, and numbered it 'page 1;' then on fifteen hundred other pieces of paper we set down the 'conjectures,' and 'suppositions,' and 'maybes,' and 'perhapses,' and 'doubtlesses,' and 'rumors,' and 'guesses,' and 'probabilities,' and 'likelihoods,' and 'we are permitted to thinks,' and 'we are warranted in believings,' and 'might have beens,' and 'could have beens,' and 'must have beens,' and 'unquestionablys,' and 'without a shadow of doubts'—and behold!

"*Materials?* Why, we had enough to build a biography of Shakespeare!"

He told his Sunday-school teacher—when remonstrated with on his iniquitous project—that he did not wish to "make fun of Satan," but that he "had only a warm desire to make fun of those others and laugh at them." "What others?" asked the teacher. "Why the Supposers, the Perhapsers, the Might-Have-

Beeners, the Could-Have-Beeners, the Must-Have-Beeners, the Without-a-Shadow-of-Doubters, the We-are-Warranted-in-Believingers, and all that funny crop of solemn architects who have taken a good solid foundation of five indisputable and unimportant facts and built upon it a conjectural Satan thirty miles high."

Next, in Chapter III., Mark gently approaches Shakespeare, and this is what he says on this delicate subject :—

"How curious and interesting is the parallel—as far as poverty of biographical details is concerned—between Satan and Shakespeare. It is wonderful, it is unique, it stands quite alone, there is nothing resembling it in history, nothing resembling it in romance, nothing approaching it even in tradition. How sublime is their position, and how overtopping, how sky-reaching, how supreme—the two Great Unknowns, the two Illustrious Conjecturabilities! They are the best-known unknown persons that have ever drawn breath upon the planet.

"For the instruction of the ignorant I will make a list now of those details of Shakespeare's history which are *facts*—verified facts, established facts, undisputed facts."

Then the *facts* of Shakespeare's biography are given as they were *known* to biographers who lived before Dr. Sidney Lee, with passing comments by Mark, such as—

"If Shakespeare had owned a dog—but we need not go into that; we know he would have mentioned it in his will. If a good dog, Susanna would have got it; if an inferior one his wife would have got a dower interest in it. I wish he had had a dog, just so we could see how painstakingly he would have divided that dog among the family, in his careful business way." . . . So far as anyone *knows and can prove*, Shakespeare of Stratford wrote only one poem during his life. This one is authentic. He did write that one—a fact which stands undisputed; he wrote the whole of it; he wrote the whole of it out of his own head. He commanded that this work of art be engraved upon his tomb, and he was obeyed. There it abides to this day. This is it:—

"'Good frend for Iesus sake forbeare,
To digg the dust encloased heare;
Blesto be ye man yt spares thes stones,
And curst be he yt moves my bones.'

"In the list as above set down will be found *every positively known* fact of Shakespeare's life, lean and meagre as the invoice is. Beyond these details we know *not a thing* about him. All the rest of his vast history, as furnished by the biographers, is built up, course upon course, of guesses, inferences, theories, conjectures—an Eiffel Tower of artificialities rising sky-high from a very flat and very thin foundation of inconsequential facts."

Then follows a chapter on "Conjectures," in which appears the following :—

"However, it is 'conjectured' that he accomplished this and more, much more; learned law and its intricacies; and the complex procedure of the law courts; and all about soldiering, and sailoring, and the manners and customs and ways of royal courts and aristocratic society; and likewise accumulated in his one head every kind of knowledge the learned then possessed, and every kind of humble knowledge possessed by the lowly and the ignorant; and added thereto a wider and more intimate knowledge of the world's great literatures, ancient and modern, than was possessed by any other man of his time—for he was going to make brilliant and easy and admiration-compelling use of these splendid treasures the moment he got to London. And according to the surmisers, that is what he did. Yes, although there was no one in Stratford able to teach him these things, and no library in the little village to dig them out of. His father could not read, and even the surmisers surmise that he did not keep a library.

"It is surmised by the biographers that the young Shakespeare got his vast knowledge of the law and his familiar acquaintance with the manners and customs and shoptalk of lawyers through being for a time the *clerk of a Stratford court;* just as a bright lad like me, reared in a village on the banks of the Mississippi, might become perfect in knowledge of the Behring Strait whale-fishery and the shop-talk of the veteran exercisers of that adventure-bristling trade through catching catfish with a 'trot-line' Sundays. But the surmise is damaged

by the fact that there is no evidence—and not even tradition—that the young Shakespeare was ever clerk of a law court.

"It is further surmised that the young Shakespeare accumulated his law-treasures in the first years of his sojourn in London, through 'amusing himself' by learning book-law in his garret and by picking up lawyer-talk and the rest of it through loitering about the law courts and listening. But it is only surmise; there is no *evidence* that he ever did either of those things. They are merely a couple of chunks of plaster of Paris. . . . Then in a noble frenzy of poetical inspiration he wrote his one poem—his only poem, his darling—and laid him down and died:

> "'Good frend for Iesus sake forbeare,
> To digg the dust encloased heare;
> Bleste be ye man yt spares thes stones,
> And curst be he yt moves my bones.'

"He was probably dead when he wrote it. Still, this is only conjecture. We have only circumstantial evidence. Internal evidence.

"Shall I set down the rest of the conjectures which constitute the giant biography of William Shakespeare? It would strain the unabridged dictionary to hold them. He is a Brontosaur: nine bones and six hundred barrels of plaster of Paris."

The next chapter is entitled, "We May Assume," which starts:—

"In the Assuming trade three separate and independent cults are transacting business. Two of these cults are known as the Shakespearites and the Baconians, and I am the other one—the Brontosaurian.

"The Shakespearite knows that Shakespeare wrote Shakespeare's Works; the Baconian knows that Francis Bacon wrote them; the Brontosaurian doesn't really know which of them did it, but is quite composedly and contentedly sure that Shakespeare *didn't* and strongly suspects that Bacon *did*. We all have to do a good deal of assuming, but I am fairly certain that in every case I can call to mind the Baconian assumers have come out ahead of the Shakespearites. Both parties handle the same materials, but the Baconians seem to me to get much more reasonable and rational and persuasive results out of them than is the case with the Shakespearites. The Shakespearite conducts his assuming

upon a definite principle, an unchanging and immutable law—which is: 2 and 8 and 7 and 14, added together, made 165. I believe this to be an error. No matter, you cannot get a habit-sodden Shakespearite to cipher-up his materials upon any other basis. With the Baconian it is different. If you place before him the above figures and set him to adding them up, he will never in any case get more than 45 out of them, and in nine cases out of ten he will get just the proper 31."

It is when Mark reaches consideration of the author of the plays as a *lawyer* that he fairly gets into the spirit of the business and gives his opponents some straight hits from the shoulder.

Following Dr. Garnett in the assertion, a writer in the May number of *Blackwood* stated that "though a poet may understand law, no lawyer was ever a poet." I have a sort of hazy recollection that Sir Walter Scott, "a lawyer," was also "a poet," if the *Lady of the Lake*, *Marmion*, and other verses from his pen can be considered "poetry." Sir Walter, of course, had no such opportunity in his *poems* as Shakespeare was afforded in his *dramas* and *sonnets* of introducing law into what he wrote; but in his *novels* Scott did not hesitate to utilize his law for the purpose of his art, giving it through the lips of Pleydell, Fairford, Glossin, Meikleham, Bindloose, Saddletree, Peebles, and other characters. Lowell and Blackstone, both lawyers, also wrote poetry. So did Bacon! Dr. Sidney Lee maintains that "Shakespeare's accurate use of legal terms . . . . *may* be attributable *in part* to his observation of the *many* legal processes in which his father was involved, and *in part* to early intercourse with members of the Inns of Court." Canon Beeching in his weak and evasive reply to Mr. George Greenwood, insists that "Shakespeare's legal phraseology can be traced perhaps to the *innumerable* [better than Dr. Lee's many] law papers belonging to the family suits;" and that "Meanwhile it is satisfactory to observe that if distinguished lawyers of our

own generation can be quoted for the opinion that Shakespeare's knowledge of law implies a professional training, other lawyers, *no less distinguished*, can be quoted on the other side." Who are they, Canon, as compared with Lord Chief Justice Campbell, Lord Penzance, Judge Webb, Judge Holmes, J. C. Hart, T. S. Dixon, Senator Davis, Pitt-Lewis, K.C., Mr. Greenwood, Commissioner Kerr, Russell Lowell, Dr. Furnivall, and Dr. Appleton Morgan, President of the New York Shakespeare Society, among others? The only "distinguished lawyer" I know of "on the other side" (if he *was* "distinguished") was E. J. Phelps, Lecturer at Yale, who declared: "As to the law in Shakespeare, there is not enough to qualify an attorney's clerk in all his writings put together." Marvellous! And he was American Ambassador at the Court of Saint James!

I may remind you, Canon, that the author of the Shakespearean plays, poems, and sonnets shows over and over again not merely a knowledge of the principles and practice of the law of real property, but also of the common law, and of the criminal law, and a thorough intimacy of the exact letter of the Statute Law. This *fact* you will clearly see if you refer to lawyer Rushton's two books entitled *Shakespeare a Lawyer* and *Shakespeare's Legal Maxims*, where proof incontrovertible is given that the dramatist known as Shakespeare was fairly steeped in the intricacies of the law—"never was incorrect and never at fault," according to Lord Penzance; and Lord Chief Justice Campbell wrote: "Whilst novelists and dramatists are constantly making mistakes as to the law of marriage, of wills and of inheritance, to Shakespeare's law, lavishly as he propounds it, there can be neither demurrer, bill of exception, nor writ of error." Dr. Sidney Lee says in reply to this statement of Lord Campbell: "Legal termino-

logy abounded in *all plays and poems of the period.*" *All*, Dr. Lee? Surely not. Who was it, Dr. Lee, that Sir John Davies attacked for "conceits" in his Sonnets "based on legal technicalities," according to your own showing? Was it not Shakespeare! with regard to his "legal phraseology" in Sonnets 26, 87, 134 (you give 124, in error, in your *Life*, p. 107)? Whom else had Davies in his eye when he wrote his "Sonnets" but Shakespeare and "insignificant rhymers like the author of 'Zepheria'"? You say — "Legal terminology abounded in *all plays and poems of the period.*" Trot out a few for Baconian edification in addition to those I have mentioned and the *Parthenophil and Parthenope* of Barnabe Barnes. And Barnabe's law is not in the same hemisphere with that of Shakespeare, say in the speech of *Hamlet* commencing "Where be his quiddits now?" An apprentice in a solicitor's office could have written every item of Barnes' law in a few minutes without assistance from Dr. Lee's accommodating "members of the Inns of Court."

That this Sir John Davies, curiously enough, was a friend of Bacon's cannot be denied, and he was certainly "in the know" as to Bacon being a "poet," as it was to Davies that Bacon wrote when Davies accompanied James VI. from Scotland to England on his accession (1603), "so desiring you to be good to *concealed poets;*" and in a list of *poets* who lived in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, Stow, in his "Annales" (1615), includes next to each other the names of Sir Francis Bacon and Sir John Davies. What poetry was it that Bacon had written before 1603 (when he was a "concealed poet") or before 1615 (when he was, according to Stow, one of "our moderne and present excellent poets")? Bacon's only known poetry to 1625 (the year of publication) was his much-abused "Translation of Certain Psalms." This is a point worthy of Dr. Sidney

Lee's passion for literary investigation. It has for long been a puzzle to me what was the Bacon poetry alluded to in the two references I have given. The allusion by Bacon to "concealed poets" Spedding, Bacon's greatest biographer, says: "I cannot explain." Can Dr. Sidney Lee solve the conundrum? He might also inform the Bacon "monomaniacs" and "cranks" what another John Davies (the writing-master of Hereford and of Northumberland House MS. celebrity) means when he addresses Bacon in the following terms :—

> "And to thy health in Helicon to drinke
> As to her Bellamour, the Muse is wont :
> *For thou dost her embosom ;* and, dost *keep*
> *Her company for sport 'twixt grave affairs,*
> So utterest law the livelyer, through *thy Muse:*
> And for that *all thy notes are sweetest aires.*"

This was written in 1610 or 1611—long before the Psalm translations were published.

How did Bacon "embosom" "the Muse"? and how did he "keep the Muse's company *for sport* 'twixt great affairs?" I ask Dr. Lee. Unless Bacon was "a poet" —"concealed," perhaps—what is the meaning of these enigmatical lines in John Davies' "Wittes Pilgrimage"? What was the "sport?" And what was the practical outcome of Bacon's companionship with the Muse? The Shakespearean plays, poems, and sonnets?

If Bacon was not a poet how did Waller come to speak of him and Sidney as "nightingales who sang only in the spring?" And if he was not a poet how comes he to confess that he once indited a sonnet to Queen Elizabeth on behalf of Essex? Could this be one of the "Shakespeare" Sonnets, many of which fit into the position of Essex, when out of favour with the Queen?

But this is a digression from "Mark Twain," whose seventh chapter is one of surpassing interest—to me it is—and begins :—

"If I had under my superintendence a controversy appointed to decide whether Shakespeare wrote Shakespeare or not, I believe I would place before the debaters only the one question, *Was Shakespeare ever a practising lawyer?* and leave everything else out.

"It is maintained that the man who wrote the plays was not merely myriad-minded, but also myriad-accomplished; that he not only knew some thousands of things about human life in all its shades and grades, and about the hundred arts and trades and crafts and professions which men busy themselves in, but that he could *talk* about the men and their grades and trades accurately, making no mistakes. Maybe it is so, but have the experts spoken, or is it only Tom, Dick, and Harry? Does the exhibit stand upon wide, and loose, and eloquent generalizing—which is not evidence, and not proof—or upon details, particulars, statistics, illustrations, demonstrations?

"Experts of unchallengeable authority have testified definitely as to the only one of Shakespeare's multifarious craft-equipments, so far as my recollections of Shakespeare-Bacon talk abide with me—his law-equipment. I do not remember that Wellington or Napoleon ever examined Shakespeare's battles and sieges and strategies, and then decided and established for good and all, that they were militarily flawless; I do not remember that any Nelson or Drake or Cook ever examined his seamanship and said it showed profound and accurate familiarity with that art; I don't remember that any king or prince or duke has ever testified that Shakespeare was letter-perfect in his handling of royal court-manners and the talk and manners of aristocracies; I don't remember that any illustrious Latinist or Grecian or Frenchman or Spaniard or Italian has proclaimed him a past-master in those languages; I don't remember—well, I don't remember that there is *testimony*—great testimony—imposing testimony—unanswerable and unattackable testimony as to any of Shakespeare's hundred specialities, except one—the law.

"Other things change, with time, and the student cannot trace back with certainty the changes that various trades and their processes and technicalities have undergone in the long stretch of a century or two and find out what their processes and technicalities were in those early days, but with the law it is different; it is mile-stoned and documented all the way back; and the master of that wonderful trade, that complex and

intricate trade, that awe-compelling trade, has competent ways of knowing whether Shakespeare-law is good law or not; and whether his law-court procedure is correct or not, and whether his legal shop-talk is the shop-talk of a veteran practitioner or only a machine-made counterfeit of it gathered from books and from occasional loiterings in Westminster.

"And so, as I have already remarked, if I were required to superintend a Bacon-Shakespeare controversy, I would narrow the matter down to a single question—the only one, so far as the previous controversies have informed me, concerning which illustrious experts of unimpeachable competency have testified: *Was the author of Shakespeare's Works a lawyer?*—a lawyer deeply read and of limitless experience? I would put aside the guesses and surmises, and perhapses, and might-have-beens, and could-have-beens, and must-have-beens, and we are justified-in-presumings, and the rest of those vague spectres and shadows and indefinitenesses, and stand or fall, win or loose, by the verdict rendered by the jury upon that single question. If the verdict was Yes, I should feel quite convinced that the Stratford Shakespeare, the actor, manager, and trader, who died so obscure, so forgotten, so destitute of even village consequence that sixty years afterwards no fellow-citizen and friend of his later days remembered to tell anything about him, did not write the Works.

"Chapter XIII. of 'The Shakespeare Problem Restated' bears the heading 'Shakespeare as a Lawyer,' and comprises some fifty pages of expert testimony, with comments thereon, and I will copy the first nine, as being sufficient all by themselves, as it seems to me, to settle the question which I have conceived to be the master-key to the Shakespeare-Bacon puzzle."

Then follows part of Mr. Greenwood's admirable Chapter XIII. of "The Shakespeare Problem Restated."

Later on, Mark descants on the Bacon possibilities. Here are a few :—

"When we read the praises bestowed by Lord Penzance and the other illustrious experts upon the legal condition and legal aptnesses, brilliancies, profundities and felicities so prodigally displayed in the plays, and try to fit them to the historyless Stratford stage-manager, they sound wild, strange, incredible, ludicrous; but when we put them in the mouth of Bacon they

do not sound strange, they seem in their natural and rightful place, they seem at home there. Please turn back and read them again. Attributed to Shakespeare of Stratford they are meaningless, they are inebriate extravagancies—intemperate admirations of the dark side of the moon, so to speak; attributed to Bacon, they are admirations of the golden glories of the moon's front side, the moon at the full—and not intemperate, not overwrought, but sane and right, and justified. 'At every turn and point at which the author required a metaphor, simile or illustration, his mind ever turned *first* to the law; he seems almost to have *thought* in legal phrases; the commonest legal phrases, the commonest of legal expressions were ever at the end of his pen.' That could happen to no one but a person whose *trade* was the law; it could not happen to a dabbler in it. Veteran mariners fill their conversation with sailor-phrases and draw all their similes from the ship and the sea and the storm, but no mere *passenger* ever does it, be he of Stratford or elsewhere; or could do it with anything resembling accuracy, if he were hardy enough to try. Please read again what Lord Campbell and the other great authorities have said about Bacon when they thought they were saying it about Shakespeare of Stratford. . . .

"I haven't any idea that Shakespeare will have to vacate his pedestal this side of the year 2209. Disbelief in him cannot come swiftly. Disbelief in a healthy and deeply-loved tar baby has never been known to disintegrate swiftly; it is a very slow process. It took several thousand years to convince our fine race—including every splendid intellect in it—that there is no such thing as a witch; it has taken several thousand years to convince that same fine race—including every splendid intellect in it—that there is no such person as Satan; it has taken several centuries to remove perdition from the Protestant Church's programme of post mortem entertainments; it has taken a weary long time to persuade American Presbyterians to give up infant damnation, and try to bear it as best they can; and it looks as if their Scotch brethren will still be burning babies in the everlasting fires when Shakespeare comes down from his perch.

"We are the reasoning race. We can't prove it by the above examples, and we can't prove it by the miraculous 'histories' built by those Stratfordolaters out of a hatful of rags and a barrel of sawdust, but there is plenty of other things we can prove it by, if I could think of them. We are the reasoning race, and when we find a vague file of chipmunk-tracks string-

ing through the dust of Stratford village, we know by our reasoning powers that Hercules has been along there. I feel that our fetish is safe for three centuries yet. The bust, too, there in the Stratford church. The precious bust, the priceless bust, the calm bust, the serene bust, the emotionless bust, with the dandy moustache and the putty face, unseamed of care—that face which has looked passionlessly down upon the awed pilgrim for a hundred and fifty years, and will still look down upon the awed pilgrim three hundred more, with the deep, deep, deep, subtle, subtle, subtle expression of a bladder. . . .

"Isn't it odd, when you think of it—that you may list all the celebrated Englishmen, Irishmen, and Scotchmen of modern times clear back to the first Tudors—a list containing five hundred names, shall we say?—and you can go to the histories, biographies, and cyclopædias and learn the particulars of the lives of every one of them? Every one of them, except one—the most famous, the most renowned—by far the most illustrious of them all—Shakespeare! You can get the details of the lives of all the celebrated ecclesiastics in the list—all the celebrated tragedians, comedians, singers, dancers, orators, judges, lawyers, poets, dramatists, historians, biographers, editors, inventors, reformers, statesmen, generals, admirals, discoverers, prize fighters, murderers, pirates, conspirators, horse jockeys, bunco steerers, misers, swindlers, explorers, adventurers by land and sea, bankers, financiers, astronomers, naturalists, claimants, impostors, chemists, biologists, geologists, philologists, college presidents and professors, architects, engineers, painters, sculptors, politicians, agitators, rebels, revolutionists, patriots, demagogues, clowns, cooks, freaks, philosophers, burglars, highwaymen, journalists, physicians, surgeons—you can get the life histories of all of them but one. Just one—the most extraordinary and the most celebrated of them all—Shakespeare!

"You may add to the list the thousand celebrated persons furnished by the rest of Christendom in the past four centuries, and you can find out the life histories of all those people too. You will then have listed 1,500 celebrities, and you can trace the authentic life histories of the whole of them. Save one—far and away the most colossal prodigy of the entire accumulation—Shakespeare! About him you can find out *nothing*. Nothing of even the slightest importance. Nothing worth the trouble of stowing away in your memory. Nothing that even remotely indicates that he was ever anything more than a distinctly com-

monplace person—a manager, an actor of inferior grade, a small trader in a small village that did not regard him as a person of any consequence, and had forgotten all about him before he was fairly cold in his grave. We can go to the records and find out the life history of every renowned *racehorse* of modern times —but not Shakespeare's! There are many reasons why, and they have been furnished in cartloads (of guess and conjecture) by those troglodytes; but there is one that is worth all the rest of the reasons put together, and is abundantly sufficient all by itself—*he hadn't any history to record.* There is no way of getting around that deadly fact. And no sane way has yet been discovered of getting around its formidable significance.

"Its quite plain significance to any but those Thugs (I do not use the term unkindly) is that Shakespeare had no prominence while he lived, and none until he had been dead two or three generations. The plays enjoyed high fame from the beginning, and if he wrote them it seems a pity the world did not find it out. He ought to have explained that he was the author, and not merely a *nom de plume* for another man to hide behind. If he had been less intemperately solicitous about his bones, and more solicitous about his works, it would have been better for his good name and a kindness to us. The bones were not important. They will moulder away, they will turn to dust, but the works will endure until the last sun goes down."

And then comes the familiar signature, "Mark Twain."

"Mark Twain" is to be congratulated on his racy contribution to the cause which the Baconians have so much at heart, and to which, I am certain, his latest effort will attract many converts. It deserves an answer of one kind or another (or both) from Dr. Sidney Lee, Canon Beeching, Judge Willis, and other worshippers at the shrine of Stratford. We shall wait anxiously till—we get it. Argument or explanation is not in their line, however. They are prepared, with Bishop Phillips Brooks, to declare: "If Bacon should rise from the dead and claim to be the author of the plays I would not believe him."

GEORGE STRONACH.

SUFFLIMANDUS ERAT.

"He was (indeed) honest and of an open free nature; had an excellent phantasie, brave notions and gentle expressions; wherein he flowed with that facility, that sometimes it was necessary he should be stopped."—BEN JONSON, *Discoveries.*

THE moderate Baconian led on excellent general grounds to a firm belief that Francis Bacon wrote the "Shakespeare" plays and poems, has always held fast to the prevailing first view as to who Bacon was and why he wrote plays. This first view is that Francis was a genius by heredity, the son of the learned Sir Nicholas Bacon and the no less learned Lady Anne. Further, that on Sir Nicholas accidentally failing to provide for him out of his great riches, Francis had to make his livelihood by his profession of a lawyer or by literary effort; that he wrote the plays to earn the £6 13s. 4d. apiece usually paid for them, and concealed his authorship because it was not respectable to be associated with actor folk.

These premises happen to have been entirely wrong and misleading, but in the "accesses and notions" of the minds of many resolute Baconians they are so "deeply rooted and branded in" that it is practically impossible to bring some holders to tolerate discussion of the subject in the light of new facts and discoveries. They do not understand that Francis during Elizabeth's time never earned any money at the bar from private litigants, except by her permission, in the year 1594, and that he abandoned this private practice the following year. They also overlook that Francis expended more money in a year than all the "Shakespeare" plays performed in Elizabeth's time could have earned for him. In fact, not knowing their subject biographically, they are irritated with the procession of anagrams, acrostics, ciphers, pagination problems, and the argu-

ments and researches following thereupon, and eventually yield to a desire to say something unpleasant to somebody. I am not, therefore, surprised at Mr. Basil Brown's April article, though it lacks the distinguished courtesies of the criticisms of the late Mr. Bompas and of Mr. Stronach, M.A.

He charges that I am deliberately engaged in mangling Bacon's name and fame, staining him with bastardy, robbing him of his parents, and generally fabricating a fictitious Bacon.

Holding this opinion Mr. Brown, like old Ben Jonson, has argued: "*Sufflimandus Erat.* Woodward and others must be stopped."

Some remarks recently addressed to the College of France by M. Loisy, concerning a different field of research, may serve to indicate my position and probably that of others also in this matter: "So far as it rests with me, all the new facts that are acquired . . . . all the new discoveries that concern it, all real progress in its methods will have here their echo; in that way we shall be able to elucidate our researches and to strengthen our conclusions. *And* we shall have no concern other than concern for the truth."

In the course of Mr. Brown's rhapsody he alleges that the only authority for my statement is an "*invented*" cipher story. This assertion is untrue in substance and in fact.

The cipher story is *not* an invention and is *not* my only authority. Let him read my book, "Tudor Problems," if he doubts this.

Bacon mentions in one of his acknowledged books that he invented the biliteral cipher in 1578. At considerable expense in engraved illustrations in his "De Augmentis," published near the date of the Shakespeare folio, he explained how the cipher was worked. Its use was manifestly for the printed page.

The inference that he put the cipher in practice is very strong.

I have neither the time nor the qualifications to be a decipherer. To decipher, whether it be old texts, cuniform inscriptions, hieroglyphics, or even handwriting, requires such a devotion of time and labour combined with great patience and quickness of perception that few attain the art.

But I am prepared to accept the result of a decipherer's work as honest unless it be proved otherwise.

The decipherer has explained the method of working and has from time to time met all criticisms fairly and intelligently. The differences in the types are there. Casual investigators have found this and I have myself noticed them in one of the 1609 quartos of "Pericles." The story is told in the vernacular of the period. Much of it is writing of the highest poetical quality, far beyond the capacity of any living poet, and the history it reveals is corroborated in quarters which were absolutely shut to the decipherer. The suggestion of fraud or self-delusion on the part of the decipherer is absolutely ridiculous. Yet Mr. Brown alleges that the story is "invented" and that it is my sole authority. Surely this is an impertinence?

With such a fundamental divergence in the main accusation it is not unnatural that I should also question some incidental allegations in Mr. Brown's article. I cannot see how the writer we call "Shakespeare" could in any way be besmirched by the forgeries he refers to. Nor could Bacon's fame, or for that matter any other great man's reputation, be stained by the fact that his parents declined or delayed to submit to the rites of marriage.

Regarding the charge of robbing, the cipher story only corrects a misapprehension which had become general. But if Francis had (like the infant in one of

Mr. Zangwill's tales) the liberty of selecting the parents through whose auspices he should appear on earth I think he might still have chosen Queen Elizabeth and her consort. They were both shrewd, well educated and clever, and the English throne is a great prize. The Earl of Leicester has not been well treated by many historians, but Mr. Brown's unfairness overleaps itself in dubbing him "the assassinator of his wife and the most skilful and secret poisoner of the age of secret murders." I have studied in many books, and at considerable length of time, the circumstances of Amy Robsart's death.

The Queen and Leicester may have compassed it—the age was rough and bloody—may even have endeavoured and possibly succeeded in bringing it about, but a fair view of the facts is equally if not more consistent with the conclusion that Amy committed suicide. The Queen's desperate condition must have been known to or suspected by her, and may have caused her on the 8th September, 1560, to send all her servants away to a local fair while she committed an act of heroic self-sacrifice. All honour to Amy Robsart in either event!

The poisoning charges against Leicester must also belong to the category of "non proven." Leicester was in "great place," and was, therefore, subject to the usual greater share of the calumny of jealous and ignorant persons. Medical knowledge in those days was practically *nil.* It is to the great glory of Francis Bacon that in his many editions of the "Anatomy of Melancholy," and in his acknowledged writings, he did his utmost to prepare a remedy for this deficient.

Sir Nicholas Throckmorton's death was manifestly due to pneumonia. He was an old Puritan friend and the suggestion that Leicester, his host, poisoned him, is as mythical as the charge that he also poisoned Lord Sheffield.

Men in the Elizabethan age died like flies—at one time of a surfeit, at another of a dysentery, or a lung or intestinal trouble, which the vacuous mind at once set down to some secret poison, and not to a natural cause. No; had Leicester been the fiend Mr. Brown alleges, he would not have held the firm friendship of honourable, God-fearing men, such as Henry Sidney, Francis Walsingham, and Thomas Bodley.

Leicester did try his best to help his son to the succession, but the mother's vanity and shame, and her eventual senility, was a block which could not be overcome.

If my moderate Baconian fellow-workers would only free themselves from prepossessions they would be as near the heart of the Baconian mystery as, I think, a few of us are already. Man had to write in parables in those days; the naked truth could not safely be stated, but it could be hinted at. As an instance, see Ben Jonson's poem in honour of Bacon's 60th birthday:—

"And in the midst
Thou standst *as if some mystery thou didst!*"

See how ingeniously Jonson works a double meaning in his last two lines:—

"Give me a deep crowned bowl that I may sing
In *raising* him the wisdom of my *King*."

Very frequently during his life Francis Bacon had to defend the fame of the mother who, nevertheless, on her deathbed, refused to name him as her successor. "I will have no rascal to succeed me; send to Scotland." The gossip at the Queen's death (1603) was countered by his preface to the "Advancement of Learning." A serious renewed attempt to defame her in Paris, in 1607, was promptly met by his Latin pamphlet, "*In Felicem Memoriam Elizabethæ*," which he asked the

English Ambassador to circulate in high places. In 1621, just after his removal from the Woolsack, and when he was ill and expected to die, he made a will in which he expressly directed that this pamphlet should be translated into English, such being, I think, his anxiety that no revived rumours should operate to the prejudice of his late brother Essex's children.

His troubles having practically passed over he made another will, dated 19th December, 1625, by which his purposes were more neatly effected. He gave up the expedient for silencing rumours adopted in his previous will, namely, of directing the Eulogy of Queen Elizabeth to be printed in English (it was not so printed until 1657). Instead, his last will made two clever references to Lady Anne Bacon as his mother, and to Sir Nicholas as his father. Mr. Brown has mentioned the first. The second was accomplished by a direction to his executors to place books of his writings "in the library of Trinity College, where myself was bred, and in the library of Bennet College, *where my father was bred.*" After his death this will was lodged with the probate authorities, when it should, like other wills, have been retained and preserved for reference. But it was removed—and removed, I believe, for a very important reason. It was a document of the utmost State value to the Stuart king as constituting a declaration in writing, although feigned, that Sir Nicholas and Lady Anne were Francis Bacon's father and mother.

Thus was the Stuart king made safe in his succession to the throne, as to which there might otherwise have been trouble afterwards. That there was need of this is shown in the fact that Bacon's nephew Robert, second Earl of Essex, who had been brought up and educated by King James in his own family, and virtually with the honours of a young Prince, and who was afterwards the guest and friend of the King of France, eventually

headed and brilliantly generalled the Parliamentary forces in rebellion against Charles I.

Bacon, close about the date of his last will (1625), wrote and published certain new essays. To that entitled "On Simulation and Dissimulation" attention may usefully be drawn. In some respects it is his Apologiæ. Starting with the proposition "that an habit of secrecy is both politic and moral," he proceeds:—"It followeth many times upon secrecy by a necessity that he that will be secret must be a dissembler in some degree." The great advantages of simulation and dissimulation are, according to the essay, three in number. "First to lay asleep opposition and to surprise. For where a man's intentions are published, it is an alarum to call up all that are against them. The best composition and temperature is to have openness in fame and opinion; secrecy in habit; dissimulation in reasonable use, and a *power to feign if there be no remedy.*

For the disinherited descendants of the last of the Tudors *there was no remedy.* It matters very little whether my views as to the heart of Bacon's mystery find general acceptance in my day or not. Never was a more remarkable romance in real life than that of the two unhappy sons of Queen Elizabeth, the elder of whom developed the greatest intellectual attainments as a poet, philosopher, and statesman, and, when fairly understood, one of the finest of characters that the world has yet known.

Holding these views, and seeking as I have to further Bacon's desire that the true facts about him should be known and fairly judged by his countrymen of a later day, I submit that Mr. Basil Brown's alarm is not warranted, and his accusations not justified.

PARKER WOODWARD.

MACAULAY—BACON'S WORST ENEMY.

IT happened a few weeks ago that I came into possession of a volume published in 1869 by Miss Harriet Martineau, entitled, "Biographical Sketches." It consists of brief estimates of a number of eminent men and women, originally published in the *Daily News* — royal persons, politicians, professional men, clergymen, lawyers, soldiers, scientific men, those talked about in Society, and literary men. There are forty-six such sketches, and among them is one on Macaulay, published soon after his death in 1859. The accomplished lady critic describes Macaulay and the hopes which were centred in him when he first came forward as orator and poet, the most brilliant rhetorician and essayist of his day. Let us briefly reproduce her judgment.

Macaulay was the son of a great philanthropist, Zachary Macaulay, whose name will be remembered in connection with the anti-slavery movement. His son did not inherit his philanthropic qualities. His was a case often noted—sons of pious clergymen becoming men of the world; sons of metaphysicians becoming chemists or geologists; sons of mathematicians becoming artists; sons of statesmen settling in the bush as graziers or cattle breeders. "The child of a philanthropist, Thomas Macaulay *wanted heart.* This was the one deficiency which lowered the value of all his other gifts. . . . He had kindliness, and, for aught we know, good temper, but of the life of the heart he knew nothing." The reaction in his mind from the Clapham school of religionists made him "a conventionalist in morals, an insolent and inconsistent Whig in politics, a shallow and inaccurate historian, a poet pouring out all light and no warmth, and, for an able man, the most unsound reasoner of his time." When

he entered Parliament great were the expectations centred in him. The Administration, when becoming unpopular, was glad to have Macaulay for their spokesman and apologist. "The drawback was his want of accuracy, and especially in the important matter of historical interpretation. If he ventured to illustrate his topic in his own way, by historical analogy, he was immediately checked by some clever antagonist, who, three times out of four, showed that he had mis-read his authorities, or more frequently, had left out some essential point whose omission vitiated the whole statement in question." In 1834 he went to India "as a member of the Supreme Council to frame a code of laws for India. . . . The story of that unhappy code is well known. It is usually spoken of by Whig leaders as merely shelved, and ready for reproduction at some time of leisure. But the fact is there is scarcely a definition that will stand the examination of a lawyer or a layman for an instant, and scarcely a description or provision through which a coach and horses may not be driven. All hope of Macaulay as a lawyer, and also as a philosopher, was over for any who had seen his code." This time, after his return from India, was the time of his greatest brilliancy in private life. His marvellous table-talk, and his brilliant essays in the *Edinburgh Review*, made him intensely popular, and his "History of England" was eagerly expected. But as an historian, apart from his epigrammatic style, his value was speedily discounted. "The critical impeachments which followed must have keenly annoyed him, as they would any man who cared for his honour as a relater of facts, and a reporter and judge of the characters of dead and defenceless men." "There was sure preparation for his failure, as well as success, as an historian, after his article on Bacon in the *Edinburgh*. That essay disabused the wisest who expected services of the

first order from Macaulay. In that article he not only betrayed his incapacity for philosophy, and his radical ignorance of the subject he undertook to treat, but laid himself open to the charge of helping himself to the very materials he was disparaging, and giving as his own large excerpts from Mr. Montagu while loading him with contempt and rebuke."

These are the most significant parts of Miss Martineau's sketch, and Baconians will be glad to find their own resentment against Macaulay's treatment of Bacon more than justified by such an accomplished literary critic.

The current number of the *Quarterly Review* gives other illustrations of Macaulay's literary rancour and asperity, in his warfare against the Right Hon. John Wilson Croker, a regular contributor to the *Quarterly*. The cause of offence is thus described: "Croker had repeatedly countered him on the floor of the House, and on one occasion in particular, during the debates of 1832, with marked success. This was more than Macaulay could stand. Knowing that Croker was about to publish his edition of 'Boswell's Johnson,' Macaulay wrote in his diary: 'That impudent, leering Croker congratulated the House on the proof I had given of my readiness. See whether I do not dust that varlet's jacket for him in the next number of the Blue and Yellow. I detest him more than cold boiled veal.'

"He was as good as his word. Two months later the *Review* appeared, and Croker's jacket was thoroughly dusted. In a letter to his sister dated Sept. 9, 1831, Macaulay writes: 'I have, though I say it who should not say it, beaten Croker black and blue.' He should have been ashamed to say it. What are we to think of a review written in that spirit?"

Mr. Gladstone remarks on this episode :—

"He never mentions Croker except with an aversion which may be partially understood, and also with a contempt which it is not easy to account for. . . . It is yet more to be lamented that in this instance he carried the passions of politics into the Elysian fields of literature, and that the scales in which he tried the merits of Croker's edition of 'Boswell' seem to have been weighted on the descending side with his recollections of Parliamentary collision." Other references to Mr. Gladstone's article on Macaulay are contained in the first number of the "Bacon Journal," p. 18. He sums up his judgment with the weighty words:—"The judgments of Macaulay we deem harsh, and his examinations superficial."

Macaulay's inaccuracies brought upon him heavy censure, especially from the admirers of the Quaker founder of Pennsylvania; and the Bishop of Exeter (Bishop Philpotts) published a pamphlet exposing inaccuracies in other matters. In all these cases Macaulay was defeated.

Macaulay was a strange combination of moral opposites, and for a long time his brilliancy as an orator and essayist made the public blind to his moral faults and historical inaccuracies. As a brilliant table-talker my own recollections may be given as confirmatory. When he became Lord Rector of Glasgow University I was one of the committee who supported his candidature, and was invited to breakfast with him at the house of one of the professors. Conversation at one time turned on celebrated diamonds, and Macaulay related many interesting particulars concerning some of the most valuable diamonds possessed by Indian princes. It was a remarkable exhibition of information on a subject not often introduced into books or speeches. After many particulars Macaulay ceased, and it seemed as if his story was completed. One of

the guests, however, asked him, "And what became of the diamond after that?" and then Macaulay resumed his narrative, and continued to pour out fresh facts for a considerable time.

As Baconians we may rejoice that Macaulay is "found out," and that in due time his estimate of Bacon will be more significant as throwing light on his own character and competency, than as a contribution to our judgment of Bacon.

R. M. T.

SHAKESPEARE AN ORATOR.

A SHORT time ago there appeared in the *Westminster Gazette*, under the title of "Cant About Shakespeare," an article from the pen of its able dramatic critic, Mr. E. F. Spence. The writer had taken for his text an opinion expressed in the criticism on the recent production of *Hamlet* at the Lyceum which appeared in the *Daily Mail* to the effect that it was better to have Shakespeare produced under such conditions than not at all. Mr. Spence dissented from this view. He suggested that the first-night audience of the Lyceum Theatre would prefer to have the play of *Hamlet* written up to date by some second-rate dramatist, and suggested Mr. Cecil Raleigh, whose reputation would not, he considered, suffer by having the term second-rate applied to it when put into comparison with Shakespeare. But Mr. Spence admitted that he failed to understand why the audience in the sixpenny gallery and shilling pit, who knew nothing of the philosophy of the play, who could not grasp (who can grasp them?) the motives and impulses which controlled the love passages between Hamlet and Ophelia, who sometimes laughed when the action of the play would have been more appropriately accompanied by

tears, were, notwithstanding, held spellbound during a performance which lasted from 7.30 until after midnight.

Mr. Spence has here raised a question of interest to the Shakespearean student, and one the bearing of which is of no slight importance to the Baconian case.

Mr. G. W. Foote has, in a recent article, fallen foul of the Baconians. One would have expected that his love of truth, and the sacrifices which he has made in what he believed to be her cause, would have led him to, at any rate, extend a courteous hearing to those who, conscientiously holding views differing from an accepted creed, ventured to express their doubts and misgivings. But no. Mr. Foote would extend to dissentients from an old superstitious creed which he had accepted without examination because it had been held by others before him, just the same scornful treatment which the orthodox have extended to him and his friends in respect of other beliefs.

But he makes a point against the authorship of the dramas by Bacon which has some affinity to the point raised by Mr. Spence. A consideration of the subject may bring to light an argument which has hitherto not been found in the Baconian storehouse, but which may prove to be a strong argument from what is termed internal evidence.

This is Mr. Foote's contention :—

Bacon was a master of English, though nothing like the master that Shakespeare was. Mark Twain may easily satisfy himself of a peculiar difference between them. Bacon wrote to the eye—Shakespeare wrote to the ear. Bacon's finest passages cannot be read aloud with ease ; Shakespeare's lines flow freely from the tongue, and cause no difficulty in respiration. No other dramatist is within measurable distance in this respect. And a part of the explanation is that he was an actor himself. He worked in the theatre, wrote for the theatre, and made his for-

tune by the theatre. "But it is not good," said Bacon, "to stay too long in the theatre." And Bacon didn't.

Mr. Foote has stumbled up against a remarkable feature of the Shakespeare writings. But his strong prejudice has blinded him, so that he cannot see its true significance. Can one single actor be named who wrote lines which flow freely from the tongue and cause no difficulty in respiration? That is not the special faculty of the actor, but it is of the orator. Shakespeare's verse and prose have a sweet music of their own which could only have been produced by a consummate orator. It is the gift of intuitively choosing words, which strike the ear with a pleasant sound in which to express thoughts, which constitutes the orator. Without it no man can be an orator. It was this sweet-sounding language which fascinated the Lyceum pit and gallery from half-past seven until after midnight on Mr. Matheson Lang's first performance of *Hamlet*.

Carlyle expressed the opinion that Shakespeare would have done better if he had confined himself to prose. It would be difficult to assent to this view. At the same time, it is undoubtedly the fact that Shakespeare's prose stands alone for originality, purity of style, arrangement of the words, evolution of the sentences, cadences, and harmony. Compare him with those who preceded him or those who came after him, and he will be found in a class by himself. It is impossible to get the full effect of either his prose or his verse unless it be read aloud. One can never tire of hearing it. A celebrated stage manager, of what is termed the old school, used to say that if he had doubts as to what to put on, providing he had one or two actors who could speak the lines, he always selected Shakespeare, because the sound of the words would always hold the audience.

"Bacon wrote to the eye—Shakespeare to the ear"! This could not be the statement of a man who knew Bacon's writings. It is a perfect feast for anyone who delights in oratory to read aloud or hear Bacon read aloud. The Essays are punctuated for declaiming. Let anyone read first Hamlet's advice to the players and then Bacon's "Essay on Despatch." They are both set to the same music. Were these lines not written for the ear?—

> "Hee was borne at Pembrooke Castle, and lyeth buried at Westminster, in one of the Statelyest and Daintiest Monuments of Europe, both for the Chappell, and for the Sepulcher. So that hee dwelleth more richly Dead, in the monument of his Tombe, than hee did Alive in Richmond, or any of his Palaces. I could wish he did the like, in this Monument of his Fame."

The passage bears the impress of the orator, just as do the passages of Shakespeare's prose. Could any sentences be more completely after the style of Bacon than Jacques' speech:—"I have neither the scholler's melancholy which is emulation, nor the musitian's which is fantasticall, nor the courtier's which is proud, nor the souldier's which is ambitious, nor the lawyer's which is politick, nor the ladies' which is nice, nor the lover's which is all these. But it is a melancholy of my owne, compounded of many samples, extracted from many objects, and indeed, the sundry contemplation of my travells, in which my often rumination wraps me in a most humorous sadness;" or the following from *Henry V.*, Act IV., scene i.:—"Now, if these men have defeated the law and outrun native punishment, though they can outstrip men, they have no wings to flye from God. Warre is his beadle. Warre is his vengeance. So that here men are punished for

before-breach of the King's lawes, in now, the King's quarrel. Where they feared the death, they have borne life away; and where they would be safe they perish. Then if they dye unprovided, no more is the King guiltie of their damnation than he was before guiltie of those impieties for the which they are now visited. Every subjects duty is the King's, but every Subject's soul is his own;" or the soliloquy of Hamlet in Act II. scene ii., which attains the very acme of our language for splendour and majesty? If the Stratford man was capable of writing those speeches he could not have kept silence. His transcendent power as an orator must have been recognised. Richard Grant White, in his "Memoirs of William Shakespeare," writes (p. cxi.):—

> Of his eminent countrymen, Rayleigh, Sydney, Spenser, Bacon, Cecil, Walsingham, Coke, Camden, Hooker, Drake, Hobbes, Inigo Jones, Herbert of Cherbury, Laud, Pym, Hampden, Selden, Walton, Wotton and Donne may be properly reckoned as his contemporaries, and yet there is no evidence whatever that he was personally known to either of these men, or to any others of less note among the statesmen, scholars, soldiers and artists of his day, excepting a few of his fellow-craftsmen.

Find the greatest orator of the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth centuries and you have found the author of the Shakespeare Plays. Ben Jonson points him out when he says:—

> There happened in my time one noble speaker who was full of gravity in his speaking. . . . His hearers could not cough or look aside from him without loss. He commanded where he spoke, and had his judges angry and pleased at his will. No man had their affections more in his power. The fear of every man who heard him was lest he should make an end.

That was William Shake-speare.

BACON'S CREATIVE SEAL, SIGN, AND COUNTERSIGN IN THE PLAYS.

"And the vision of all is become unto you as the words of a book that is sealed, which men deliver to one that is learned, saying, 'Read this, I pray thee:' and he saith, 'I cannot; for it is sealed.'"—Isaiah xxix. 11.

THE seal in Biblical times was considered equivalent to the *signature of the owner*, and, also, as the engraved amulet, or cylinder, when revolving, "impressed various figures, carved, or engraved, upon the plastic clay, so the morning light rolling o'er the earth, previously void of form, through the darkness —brings out to view, hills, valleys," etc. That is to say, Creation was identified with the process of the signature, stamping, or sealing upon clay, or wax of a seal, or die. In the Book of Job, the Lord asks Job—"Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth?" (chap. xxxviii., ver. 4). And, after describing Creation in various ways, exclaims—"*It is turned as clay to the seal, and they stand as a garment*" (ver. 14). Sealing, in ancient times, denoted an inalienable possession; the signet being, also, the type of all that was most precious and inviolable (see Ca. viii. 6; Jeremiah xxii., 24th verse). This comes out in the figurative application: "*Having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are His*" (2 Timothy ii. 19). It was finally connected with the idea of security and destination, and was the idea (an image) of *secrecy and postponement of disclosure, as when the words of a roll, more particularly if prophetic, were sealed up for the uninitiated, or profane,* till the time came to publish them. Job exclaims of God: "Which commandeth the sun, and it riseth not; *and sealeth up the stars*" (chap. ix., verse 7). The anointing, sealing or crowning of a King, is a strictly religious ceremony,—it confirms the character upon the

King,—he is *sealed* for an office. So likewise Holy Orders confirm character as a stamp or mark (*sigillum*), or *seal* upon priests, "In the express image of His Person" (Hebrews i. 3). In legal matters the seal ratifies, authenticates, and confirms. It is an assurance, or pledge, as sealing unto a bond (see *Merchant of Venice*). And the expression "*to set a seal*" upon a thing signifies it as settled and final. In Ezekiel there is the description of what was a sealed book, "And when I looked, behold, an hand was sent unto me; and, lo, a roll of a book was therein. And he spread it before me; *and it was written within and without*" (chapter ii. 9, 10). There is no allusion to a seal in this passage, but, nevertheless, this esoteric style of writing was Hermetic, that is sealed.

In Bacon's Distribution Preface, (*Distributio Operis*), describing, in a sort of introduction to the "Instauration" and its several parts, he writes :—

"Neque enim, hoc siverit Deus, ut phantasiæ nostræ somnium pro exemplari mundi edamus; sed potius benigne faveat ut Apocalypsim ac veram visionem vestigiorum et sigillorum Creatoris super creaturas scribamus."

("For we do not,—this God forbid,—give, as models of the world, our Dreams of Fancy, but rather that He may benig ntly favour us to write the true vision of the *impresses* (*footsteps*), *and seals of the Creator upon His creatures.*")*

This image of the *stamping and impressing, as of a seal upon wax, or clay* (which seems borrowed from Plato), is

* And, God forbid, that ever we should offer the Dreams of Fancy for a model of the world; but rather through the Divine favour, write a Revelation, and real view of the Stamps and Signatures of the Creator upon the creatures (Vol. I., p. 16, Works, Shaw, 1732).

frequently repeated by Bacon, and infects his style to a remarkable degree. In the Essay of "Goodness, and Goodness of Nature," Bacon says:—"The inclination to goodness is *imprinted* deeply in the nature of man"; and in the Two Books of the "Advancement of Learning," he writes:—"For all things *are marked and stamped* with this triple character of the power of God, the difference of nature and the use of man" (Book II. 9). In another passage:—"First the Scriptures, revealing the Will of God, and then the creatures expressing His power; whereof the latter is a key unto the former: not only opening our understanding to conceive the true sense of the Scriptures, by the general notions of reason and rules of speech; but chiefly opening our belief, in drawing us into a due meditation of the omnipotency of God, *which is chiefly signed and engraved upon His works*" (Book I., p. 46).

Again, discussing the relationship of truth and goodness:—"Certain it is that *Veritas* and *Bonitas* differ but *as the seal and the print:* for truth *prints* goodness, and they be the clouds of error which descend in the storms of passions and perturbations" ("Advancement of Learning," Book I. 62).

This idea of *signature* is singularly strong in Bacon's mind. For at the opening of the First Book of the "Advancement of Learning," in his address to King James the First, he declares that the "learning, propriety inherent, and individual attribute in your Majesty, deserveth to be expressed not only in the fame and admiration of the present time, nor in the history or tradition of the ages succeeding, but also in some solid work, fixed memorial, and immortal monument, *bearing a character or signature** both of the power

* In one of Bacon's letters to Sir Tobie Matthew he alludes mysteriously to what he calls his "*Works of the Alphabet.*" The letters of the alphabet are often called *characters,* and as the

of a king and the difference and perfection of such a king" (First Book "Advancement of Learning," pp. 5, 6).

Bacon then proceeds to conclude that he cannot do better than make an oblation of a treatise "*to that end*," so that the "Advancement of Learning" and all it embraces is to stand for this "immortal monument" he refers to. In his description of *Philosophia Prima* he asks, "Are not the organs of the senses of one kind with the organs of reflection, the eye with a glass, the ear with a cave or strait, determined and bounded? Neither are these only similitudes, as men of narrow observation may conceive them to be, *but the same footsteps of nature, treading or printing upon several subjects or matters*" (Book II. "Advancement of Learning," p. 95).

It seems Bacon had some profound apprehensions of evolution, for this passage, if it means anything, signifies that man's organs of the senses have been produced (or evolved) from the operations of the macrocosm working upon the plastic substance of the microcosm; printing, as it were in the organism, the effects of what we perceive on a larger scale, and in general laws at large in nature.

"So is the wisdom of God more admirable, when nature intendeth one thing, and providence draweth forth another, than if He had communicated to particular creatures and motions *the characters and impressions of His providence*" (Second Book of "Advancement of Learning," p. 106).

"The knowledge which respecteth the faculties of the mind of man is of two kinds; the one respecting his understanding and reason, the other, his will,

Drama consists chiefly of *Dramatis Personæ*, or the play of human characters in action, it is highly probable that Bacon used this expression to denote his plays.

appetite, and affection; whereof the former produceth position or decree, the latter action or execution. It is true that the imagination is an agent or *nuncius*, in both provinces, both the judicial and the ministerial. For sense sendeth over to imagination before reason have judged: and reason sendeth over to imagination before the decree can be acted. For imagination ever proceedeth voluntary motion. Saving that this *Janus* of imagination hath differing faces. For the face towards reason hath the *print of truth*, but the face towards action hath the *print of good*, which nevertheless are faces,—*Quales decet esse sororum*" (2nd Book, 130).

Bacon's doctrines of forms is closely bound up with his metaphor of stamping, or sealing. It is striking to find that what he writes upon the subject agrees with a text we are about to quote from *The Midsummer Night's Dream*. Ellis and Spedding, in a footnote, remark upon the *Form* :—"Bacon applies it to the *form* considered as the *causa immanens* of the properties of the body." And in the Third Aphorism of the Second Book of the *Novum Organum*, Bacon says:—"From the discovery of *Forms* therefore results truth in speculation, and freedom in operation." . . . "It is safer to begin and raise the sciences from those foundations which have relation to practice and to let the active part itself be *as the seal which prints and determines the contemplative counterpart.*"—(Bk. II., Aph. IV.).

Action is a name by which the Drama is generally understood, and if by *Active* we understand (in this passage) the Creator Dramatist, and by the *Contemplative* that which is to be interpreted, or understood, then this act of sealing and printing is simply suggestive of the poet's art.

In the *Midsummer Night's Dream*, Theseus, addressing Hermia, exclaims:—

"What say you, Hermia? Be advised, fair maid:

To you your father should be *as a God;*
One that composed your beauties,° *yea, and one*
To whom you are but as a form in wax
By him imprinted and within his power
To leave the figure or disfigure it."
(Act I., sc. i. 45).

Observe how closely this excerpt resembles the passage already quoted in Latin (from Bacon's Distribution Preface) at the commencement of this article. "For we do not,—this God forbid give *the fantasies of our sleep* as examples of the world; but rather that He should benignantly favour us to write the Apocalypse and *true vision of the footsteps and seals of the Creator upon His creatures*."

We have here two marked allusions to *dream and vision*, and, for my part, I believe that Bacon, when he wrote this passage, was thinking of *The Midsummer Night's Dream*, which so exactly answers to the description—"*phantasiæ nostræ somnium*"—for it is completely a poetical fantasy presented, under the title, and in the form, of *the chiaroscuro of a vision of the night!* The poet derives his name from his Creator,—because in his faculty of creation he comes nearest, as a matter, or Ποιητης, to the Divine image, and particularly so in dramatic composition. The philosophy, which properly belongs to this parallelism, is Plato's, who uses this expression of *seal and wax* to illustrate it. This play of the Dream strikingly resembles the *Comedy of Errors* in the cross purposes, confusions and mistakings of the two pairs of lovers in each play, who are grouped and linked

° Bacon writes:—"It is so then, that in the work of the creation we see a double emanation of virtue from God; the one referring more properly to power, the other to wisdom; the one expressed in making the subsistence of the matter, *and the other in disposing the beauty of the form*" (1st Book "Advancement of Learning," p. 41).

together after the same fashion of error. In the Dream we seem to have *the nightside of nature* presented to us. And as Bacon declares that the *light of nature* is insufficient for the acquisition of truth (because it only answers to the senses and second causes), so in this play we seem to have a picture of *the refracted and reflected light,* by which, according to Bacon's philosophy, man beholds nature and himself. (See Two Books of "Advancement of Learning.")

In the second book of the Two Books of the "Advancement of Learning" (1605), Bacon says:— "The invention of Forms is of all other parts of Knowledge the worthiest to be sought if it be possible to be found. But it is manifest that Plato, *in his opinion of ideas,* as one that had a wit of elevation situate as upon a cliff, did descry that *Forms were the true object of Knowledge.* For as to the forms of substances (man only except, of whom it is said: 'Formavit hominem de limo terræ, et spiravit in facum ejus spiraculum vitæ'), etc." (Page 102) And upon the next page Bacon calls Forms, "*essences upheld by matter.*" The name *Hermia* holds a close affinity, to the subject of this article. For we use the expression, "*Hermetic Art,*" *and "hermetically sealed"* to indicate occult, and closely hidden, or guarded secrets, that contain essence in one *form* or other,—and are as the spirit to the letter, in respect of seal and print.

Bacon's allusion to Plato, and his doctrine of Forms, quoted above, recalls Aristotle's saying of Plato's works:—describing them "as *published and not published,*" that is to say, they were written in an esoteric style "that must choose its reader," and in such a way as to exclude exoteric discovery.

Bacon applied the principal of forms to Induction itself. He says in the "Advancement of Learning:— "But the greatest change I introduce is in the *form itself* of Induction which shall *analyse experiences.*"

"Whosoever knoweth any form knoweth the utmost possibility of *superinducing that nature upon any variety of matter*" (*Ib.*).

This would be equally true of *poetic* form in the sense it is applied to Hermia by her father, who compares himself to a God, and says "one that *composed your beauties*," suggesting *poetic composition*,* always considered more or less divine and hence the Greek for poet means a God, or Maker,

> "For of the soul, the body form doth take
> For soul is form, and doth the body make."

Bacon says "To descend from spirits and intellectual *forms* to sensible and material *forms*, we read, the first *form* that was created was light" (1st Bk. "Advancement of Learning," page 41). This is important because it proves Bacon conceived *two distinct classes of forms*, the latter sensible the former intellectual. And this is confirmed by this passage upon truth:—"For the third vice or disease of learning which concerneth deceit, or untruth, it is of all the rest the foulest; as that which doth destroy *the essential form of knowledge*, which is nothing but a representation of truth" (1st Bk. "Advancement of Learning," page 31). Again he observes:—"In the same manner to inquire the *form* of a lion, of an oak, of gold, nay of water, of air, is a vain pursuit. But to inquire the *form* of sense, of voluntary motion, of vegetation, of colours, of gravity, of levity, of density, of tenuity, of heat, of cold, and all other natures

* Hamlet, in his instructions to the players, exclaims:—"The purpose of playing, whose end both at the first and now was and is to hold as 'twere the mirror up to nature, to show virtue her own feature, scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time, *his form and pressure*" (Act II. ii.).

The connotation of these two words, in italics, is striking. The author is thinking of the pressure of a form in a seal, or die, and thus of dramatic creation.

and qualities, which like an alphabet are not many, and of *which the essences (upheld by matter) of all creatures do consist*, to inquire, I say, the true *form* of these is that part of metaphysic which we now define of" (2nd Bk. "Advancement of Learning," page 103). Bacon's intellectual *form* is very clearly the essence, or essential idea of a thing, and in the case of Hermia, the wax may be considered as the efficient, or in Bacon's own words "*vehiculum formæ*," the vehicle of the *form*, that is to say, its material expression and qualities.

"The use of human reason in religion is of two sorts. In the former we see God vouchsafeth to descend to our capacity in the expression of His mysteries in sort as may be sensible unto us; and doth graft His revelations and holy doctrine upon the notions of our reason, and applieth His inspiration to open our understanding, *as the form of the key to the ward of the lock*" (2nd Bk. "Advancement of Learning," page 223). So that the discovery of Bacon's forms would be to discover the key to the unlocking of the Instauration.

The employment of the word *stamp'd* to denote congenital character is common in the plays. Richard III. exclaims:—

> "I that am rudely *stamped*, and want love's majesty."
> (*Richard III.* I. i. 16),

> "That most venerable man which I
> Did call my father, was I know not where
> When I was *stamped*."
> (*Cymbeline* II. v. 5)

> "Nay, he is your brother by the surer side,
> Although my seal be stamped in his face."
> (*Titus Andronicus* IV. ii. 127).

In the second book of the Two books of the "Advancement of Learning," Bacon observes of Our Saviour:—

"For we read not that ever He vouchsafed to do any miracle about honour or money (*except that one for giving tribute to Cæsar*), but only about the preserving, sustaining, and healing the body of man."—(page 121, T. Case). This allusion is to the episode when Christ was brought a piece of silver at His request (in reply to whether it was lawful to pay tribute unto Cæsar), and He answered, "Whose image and superscription is this?" "And they replied Cæsar's." When he exclaimed, "*Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's.*" In the question of the real authorship of the plays, attributed to Shakespeare, *it is just this image and superscription, and to whom it belongs,* that lies at the bottom of the entire problem. And it is not a little remarkable that this very same simile of coin, or of impression of a stamp, die, or seal, is repeatedly employed by Bacon to represent the Divine act of Creation upon the creatures, and is to be refound in the plays likewise. Sometimes Bacon used the word "*impressed,*" sometimes the word "*stamped,*" and sometimes "*engraven,*" but always with the same signification of ideas, character, or form, applied to Creation real, or poetic, as spirit and letter, soul and body. For example, "This double nature of good, and the comparative thereof, is much more *engraven* upon man if he degenerate not" (2nd Bk. "Advancement of Learning," p. 166). In another passage:—"There is *impressed* upon all things a triple desire or appetite proceeding from love to themselves;—one of preserving and continuing their form;—another of advancing and perfecting their form;—and a third of multiplying and extending their form upon other things; whereof *the multiplying or signature of it upon other things,* is that which we handled by the name of active good" (2nd Bk. "Advancement of Learning," 1605, page 171). Discussing "the several characters of natures and dispositions," Bacon says:—

"Of much like kind are those *impressions of nature*, which are imposed upon the mind by the sex, by the age, by the region, by health and sickness, by beauty and deformity, and the like, which are inherent and not extern" (*Ib.* 181).

A man's style in writing bears a certain *stamp, or signature* belonging particularly to himself, which is the outcome of two things—the substance of the writing, and the words and sentences by which they are expressed.

In the plays we find exactly the same image, the same use, and the same words employed to enforce this simile of *the seal and its print*, and applied to creation. Compare :—

> "It is the show and *seal* of nature's truth,
> Where love's strong passion is *impressed* in youth."
> (*All's Well that Ends Well*, Act. I., iii., 138).

In *Titus Andronicus*, Aaron's child is described:—

> "The Empress sends it thee, *thy stamp, thy seal*."
> (Act IV. ii).

And in *Cymbeline*, Guiderius is described :—

> "This is he, who hath upon him still
> *That natural stamp*." (Act V. v. 366).

In *Measure for Measure*;—describing illegitimate procreation :—

> "Do coin heaven *in stamps* that are forbid."
> (Act II. iv. 46).
>
> . . . . . .
>
> "Let there be some more test made of my metal
> Before so noble and so great a figure
> Be *stamped* upon it." (Act I. i. 51).
>
> . . . . . .
>
> "Nay, he is your brother by the surer side
> *Although my seal be stamped in his face*."
> *Titus Andronicus*, IV. ii. 127).

Speaking of the Schoolmen, Bacon says,—"Who were generally of the contrary part, and whose writings were in a different style and form; taking liberty *to coin and frame* new terms of art" ("Vanities of Studies," 1st Bk. "Advancement of Learning," p. 27). "For herein the invention of one of the late poets is proper, and doth well enrich the ancient fiction. For he feigneth that at the end of the thread or web of every man's life there was a little medal containing the persons name, and that Time waited upon the shears, and as soon as the thread was cut, caught the medals and carried them to the river of Lethe; and about the banks there were many birds flying up and down, that would get the medals and carry them in their beaks a little while." In the dedicatory epistle to the first edition of the Essays, Bacon describes this work in these words:—"Only I disliked now to put them out, because they will be like the late *new half pence, which though the silver were good, yet the pieces were small*" (30th January, 1597).

This simile of creation as moulded by a die, *seal, or stamp*, is no occasional chance image, but always introduced in the plays to illustrate natural processes and congenital human character. Hamlet exclaims of evil men:—"These men, carrying, I say, the *stamp* of one defect" (I. iv. 31).

. . . . . .

"To cozen fortune, and be honourable
Without the *stamp* of merit."
(*Merchant of Venice* II. ix.).

. . . . . .

"For use can almost change the *stamp* of nature."
(*Hamlet* III. iv. 168).

"Thou elvish-mark'd, abortive, rooting hog!
Thou that wast *sealed* in thy nativity
The slave of nature and the son of hell!"
(*Richard III.* I. iii.).

In the *Novum Organum* Bacon observes:—"But I say

that those foolish and *apish images* of worlds which the fancies of men have created in philosophical systems, must be utterly scattered to the winds. Be it known then how vast a difference there is (as I said before) between the idols of the human mind, and the Ideas of the Divine. The former are nothing more than arbitrary abstractions; *the latter are the Creator's own stamp upon Creation, impressed and defined in matter by true and exquisite lines*" (Book I. "Aph." CXXIV.). It will be observed that this passage strongly parallels the already quoted extract from the Distribution Preface. The "apish images" recall the context, where man is compared to an angry ape in *Measure for Measure*, and is told he is "most ignorant of what he is most assured." We commonly speak of a writer's *stamp or style*,—surely it never was more clearly revealed in the plays than by this repeated image of Bacon's, used, in spite of the disguised language, to illustrate creation poetic and dramatic as well as Divine?

In the *Novum Organum* Bacon observes:—"There is a great difference between the idols of the human mind and the ideas of the Divine. That is to say, between certain empty dogmas, *and the true signatures and marks set upon the works of creation as they are found in nature*" (Book I., "Aphorism" XXIII.).

In the Sonnets is to be found just the same image of the *seal, and unmistakably applied directly to the poet himself by himself!*

SONNETS II.°

"Let those, whom Nature hath not made for store,
Harsh, featureless, and rude, barrenly perish.
Look, whom she best endowed, she gave thee more,
Which bounteous gift thou shouldst in bounty cherish.
She carved thee for her seal, and meant thereby,
Thou shouldst print more, nor let that copy die."

In the poem of *Venus and Adonis*:—

° See Sonnets 84, 37; 67, 14.

"Pure lips, sweet seals in my soft lips imprinted,
What bargains may I make, still to be sealing?
To sell myself I can be well contented,
So thou wilt buy, and pay, and use good dealing.
Which purchase if thou make, for fear of *slips*,
Set thy seal-manual on my wax-red lips."

"*Slips*" were counterfeit coins, made of brass, washed over with silver, and are frequently alluded to in the plays of this period. From this extract, and the image of the "*seal manual*," which is a legal instrument, it is plain that the poet author very early attached great importance to this metaphor as evidence of truth and signature.

The Italians have a saying, borrowed from the "Orlando Furioso of Ariosto," to express any very extraordinary man, or artist, and in the expresson of it use this same image of the mould, or stamp :—"*Natura il fece e poi ruppe la stampa*,"—"Nature made him and afterwards broke the mould," that is to say, Nature formed but one such man,—which, without exaggeration, will, no doubt, be repeated throughout all time in praise of Bacon. "*Quæris Alcidæ parem?*" ("Do you seek the equal of Hercules?") Seneca asks (in his "Hercules Furens"), and the reply is :—"*Nemo est nisi ipse*" ("There is none except it be himself).

Sowing with the basket. Shall he not reap this this heavenly dower for posterity? Yes! he shall, as Lowell says :—

"Reap such harvests as all master spirits
Reap, haply not on earth, but reap no less
Because his sheaves are bound by other hands
Than his."

Aristophanes tells how Herakles crossed the Styx to bring back to Athens one of the great dramatic poets. But this was not to complete the incomplete, but to save Athens from her troubles. And, in like manner, if

we could recall Bacon, we might at once, and for ever, put to rest these perplexing questions of authorship. But it is only the learning of Herakles that can accomplish this task, and where are we to find this learning except in the works of Bacon himself? Lessing remarked: "What they used to say of Homer, that it was easier to rob Hercules of his club than him of a line, you can say with perfect truth of Shakespeare. On the least of his beauties is *stamped a seal*, which at once proclaims to the whole world, 'I am Shakespeare.'" That stamp, signature, and seal is no mere metaphor, or poetical image, for it is the very simile Bacon employs to represent Creation and human congenital character, just as we refind it expressed, with the same words, in the plays. It can therefore be rightly called a *câchet*, and the mark of a covenant, or sacrament. Bacon observes: "For the liturgy or service, it consisteth of the reciprocal acts between God and man; which, on the part of God, are the preaching of the Word, and the sacrament, which are *seals to the Covenant*" (End of second book *Advancement of Learning*, 1605). In the *Rape of Lucreece*, sealing is not only connected with creation, but introduced as the act, or authorship, of imprinting.

> "For men have marble, women waxen minds,
> And therefore are they formed as marble will;
> The weak oppressed, the impression of strange kinds
> Is formed in them by force, by fraud, or skill:
> *Then call them not the authors of their ill,*
> *No more than wax shall be accounted evil,*
> *Wherein is stamped the semblance of a devil.*" *

* The meaning is a little obscure. The minds of women being wax, are susceptible of any impression the harder marble may choose to make upon them :—

> How easy is it for the proper false
> In women's waxen hearts to set their forms!
> (*Twelfth Night*, II. ii.).

To set a seal upon a thing, is a metaphorical expression signifying that it is confirmed, established and settled, and, in the above passage, *stamping is implied as authorship* (which simile applies equally to poetic creation) and Bacon had this fixed in his mind very early in his poetic career.

Sometimes this image takes the form of printing, as when Leontes exclaims to Florizel:

> "Your mother was most true to wedlock prince;
> For she did *print* your royal father off,
> Conceiving you." (*Winter's Tale*, V. i.).

And Paulina, when presenting the babe Perdita to its father, says—

> "Behold my Lords,
> Although the *print* be little, the whole matter
> And copy of the father, eye, nose, lip,
> The trick of's frown, his forehead, nay, the valley,
> The pretty dimples of his chin and cheek,
> His smile." (*Ib.*, Act II. iii.).

In this same play we find an embassy sent to the shrine of Apollo.

> "When the oracle,
> Thus by Apollo's * great divine *seal'd up*,
> Shall the contents discover, something rare
> Even then will rush to knowledge."
> (Act III. i.).
>
> . . . . . .
>
> "You here shall swear upon this sword of justice,
> That you, Cleomenes and Dion, have brought
> This seal'd up oracle, by the hand delivered

* In the "*Assizes held at Parnassus by order of Apollo*," published by George Withers, Lord Bacon figures as the *President of the Muses*, a representative Apollo. In his reference to the *Apocalypse*, made in the passage quoted from the Distribution preface (at the commencement of this article) the sealed book mentioned in the fifth chapter of Revelation comes to mind.

Of great Apollo's priest, and that since then
You have not dared to break the holy seal
Nor read the secrets in't." (Act III. ii.).

The seal is always introduced as confirmative and conclusive.

Hamlet: "How in my words soever she be shent
To give them *seals* never, my soul, consent."
(Act III. ii.).

And in *King John*:—

"Oh when the last account 'twixt heaven and earth
Is to be made, then shall this hand and *seal*
Witness against us to damnation."
(Act IV. ii.).

W. F. C. WIGSTON.

A GREAT BACONIAN DISCOVERY.

MR. E. V. TANNER will shortly publish the results of fifteen years' labour on an arithmetical cipher of Francis Bacon, which he discovered in the lines addressed "To the Reader," placed opposite to the engraving by Martin Droeshout, forming the counterpart to the title-leaf of the 1623 folio edition of Shakespeare's plays.

An inspection of Mr. Tanner's work justifies the opinion that his is the most remarkable discovery of cipher which has yet been made in connection with the printing of those priceless dramas. The cipher is arithmetical and can readily be verified by "the plain man." It points to the fact that Bacon chose the year 1623 for the publication because of the peculiar powers of the figures constituting it.

But this is not all. Mr. Tanner, upon evidence that is almost eerie in its characteristics, but which is both ample and easy of verification, propounds the theory

that Francis Bacon was the re-organiser of Free Masonry. Through that Society, or by some similar means, such control of the printing press of the country was obtained as enabled the manner of spelling certain classes of words to be altered so as to agree in their numerical values.

In order to accomplish his design, Bacon must have prepared tables of proportions on a scale which has never before or since been approached.

The spelling of his mask name, "William Shakespeare," was finally adopted after much consideration and experiment solely on account of the numerical equivalents of the letters of which it is composed.

The book cannot fail to carry conviction. It almost passeth the understanding of man to conceive how Mr. Tanner can have, as it were, entered into the mind of Bacon and reproduced its most subtle workings. This has been accomplished simply by following out in the minutest detail Bacon's method of induction. But the process was so complicated and the reasoning so abstruse, until the results are obtained, that the work of the decipherer appears to be a mental achievement as great or even greater than that of the cryptographer.

REVIEWS.

Some Acrostic Signatures of Francis Bacon, Baron Verulam of Verulam, Viscount of St. Alban, together with some others, all of which are now, for the first time, deciphered and published by William Stone Booth. Archibald Constable and Co., Ltd., London, and Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston and New York, 1809, 4to, 631 pages, 25s. net.

THE Author introduces his work in a preface which is replete with sound principles. "It is ungracious," he says, "to destroy a pleasing illusion, and this book is not written with that purpose. It is written solely in the interest of Science—in this case the Science of Biography." After relating by what steps he was brought to examine certain works to see if Bacon could have

signed his name to them he proceeds :—" I confess that I was daunted at the outset of my work by the personal obloquy that has been heaped upon scholar and charlatan alike by the men who are content with the inferential method of writing literary history ; but reflecting that life is short and that a little obloquy does not do much harm, I decided to make known these acrostics in the hope that their discovery might lead men to approach the problems of biography in a more scientific spirit." And again, "The man who allows his inferences to crystallise into an orthodox opinion is on the highroad to oblivion, or is courting the ridicule of posterity. Literary history is science. It is a matter of facts. No lasting history can be built on opinion, and no scholarship which is afraid of enquiry can retain respect." In such an admirable spirit does Mr. Booth enter upon his task.

Part I., consisting of five chapters, 89 pages, is introductory and explanatory. Part II. consists of signatures of Francis Bacon and Anthony Bacon which appeared in works originally published anonymously, or over the names of other men ; together with a few names which have been found woven into some occasional verse of Elizabethan and Jacobean times ; these occupy the remainder of the book. In the case of nearly every acrostic a photographic fac-simile is presented from the earliest known edition of the page to which it refers, with directions as to the manner in which it is to be traced. The introductory chapters are full of interesting information on the subject. Mr. Booth explains that the discovery of the acrostics was the result of study in the cipher codes which were in use by ambassadors, intelligencers, and men who were directly or indirectly in the service of the governments of the last part of the sixteenth and the early years of the seventeenth century. He goes on to say :—

"The student of alphabetical ciphers quickly becomes aware that acrostics and anagrams are close variants of more recondite mathematical arrangements of types or letters to be seen in ciphers. He will be inclined to regard all such uses of letters as sprung from a very ancient habit—that, namely, of using signs to express meaning. The official cryptography of the times of Elizabeth brought into play a very high order of intelligence. To decipher a difficult despatch which had been intercepted, required not only a keenly developed analytical faculty, but often a wide knowledge of languages and mathematics. It would follow, naturally, that a man learned in the art of ciphering would find it easy to make an acrostic or an anagram. His occupation would suggest to him many a trick for hiding his name, if he wished to do so. The art drew into its service chemistry, curious cabalistic mysticism and ingenuity, astrology, mechanics, and as has been remarked above, languages and mathematics. . . . The use in both ways seems to have spread at that time, with the influence of Italian genius throughout the more polite literatures of Europe. Elizabethan literature is liberally strewn with acrostics and anagrams."

The connection of Anthony Bacon and Sir Henry Wotten with the art and practice of cipher-writing is described. They are selected as representatives of the class of men who, occupied in state affairs, were responsibly conversant with that art and practice. Francis Bacon's references to ciphers in the *Advancement of Learning*, 1605, and the *De Augmentis*, 1623, are also referred to in establishing the ground-work for the examples which follow.

Mr. Booth deals at length with the practice of Anonymity and Pseudonymity. He says :—

"The custom of unmistakably declaring one's self the author of literary works has become general only in very recent times." But in lieu thereof the author took "pains to sign his works internally (structurally) in such a way that his authorship could not be denied or forgotten."

The subject is treated at length, and in a very comprehensive manner. The opinions of the Author of *The Arte of English Posie* (than whom "no writer before, or since, has placed the art of the poet on a higher place") are copiously quoted.

Thus Mr. Booth, having established the prevalence of cypher-writing, the general practice of anonymity and pseudonymity, has prepared the way for proclaiming the discoveries to which it is the object of his work to give publicity. The reader is recommended to master thoroughly a chapter on "method" which follows, and to familiarise himself with the practical specimens which lie next to it. The plan for secreting the cipher most frequently adopted is termed a string cipher. In considering the text it is necessary to treat the letters as if they were on a continuous string running from left to right, then right to left, again left to right, and so on irrespective of the correct sequence of the words. The string cipher may be applied to (*a*) initials of words ; (*b*) terminals, *i.e.*, letters beginning and ending a word ; (*c*) terminals of all whole words and part words, *i.e.*, parts divided by a hyphen ; (*d*) all letters in the text ; (*e*) outside letters of a page, or side of a page ; (*g*) capitals. It is essential that each acrostic shall be *keyed* ; that is, that the points of commencement and ending shall either be two adjacent letters or words, or the commencement or ending of a verse or speech, or some two well-defined points between which the acrostic is self-contained. The places said to be naturally chosen for an acrostic signature are : the dedication, the preface, the so-called printer's preface, or address to a patron, or reader ; the first page or the last page. Sometimes one half of the acrostic will run from one corner of the text and the other half from the opposite corner, meeting on the same letter in the middle of the text, and so completing the keying.

But it is impossible, in the limited space here available, to give extracts which would fully or fairly describe the methods by which these acrostics are worked out. Let it suffice to say that there is no hedging or making easy in the conditions. The rules

are laid down at the outset, and in all the examples given in Part I. and in the 251 signatures set out in Part II. there is no waiver of any such rules throughout the work. The first signature is from the dedication to *The Arte of English Poesie*, where, between the R. F. with which it commences and the R. F. found as a signature at the foot, the name Francis Bacon occurs, keying on the first letter of the word "not" in the sentence "it could not scypher her Majesties honour or prerogative." There are other signatures found in the same work, and in the "Partheniades," which were printed in the same volume. Then follow signatures in "Venus and Adonis," "Lucrece," "The Sonnets," "The Passionate Pilgrim," "A Lover's Complaint," poems written by Wil. Shake-Speare, Gent. (1640), "The Phœnix and the Turtle," "Pericles, Prince of Tyre, "Two Noble Kinsmen," "Tamburlaine the Great," "The Famous Tragedy of the Rich Jew of Malta," "England's Helicon," "Palladis Palatuum," some poems which have appeared under the name of Edmund Spenser, and some prose which has been attributed to Edward Kirke, Mr. William Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories and Tragedies, which have been assigned to the actor William Shakspere. (First Folio Edition). Certain of the Quartos acknowledged by Bacon—My Essays, Religious Meditations, Places of Perswasion and Diswasion, A Translation of Certain Psalmes.

A table in the appendix gives 32 different forms in which the name of Francis Bacon appeared during his lifetime, and in his authorised works issued after his death. Many of these different forms are found in the acrostic signatures discovered.

There is no point of doubt as to the existence of these signatures—the fac-similes are there, and in every case the signatures can be traced therein, the rules laid down by Mr. Brook being strictly adhered to. The question then arises, Are these acrostics accidental? Might not similar arrangements of letters be found in any newspaper or periodical?

The point to be considered is this: It is a problem of *re*currence of a certain form of identifying mark in definite places in a series of works of suspected authorship. It is *not* a problem of *oc*curence of a certain form of mark in *any* place.

The book is one which should be studied closely. It is one of the most remarkable works which have appeared bearing on the authorship of the Shakespeare plays. It certainly contains positive proof that Francis Bacon, either as author—and probably as author—or in some other capacity, was concerned in the publication not only of the Shakespeare poems and plays but of other works the authorship of which has been placed under doubt. The contents of the volume bear evidence of great care in compilation, it is well printed and produced, and the reader will gain much pleasure and instruction from working out the problems which it proposes and explains. Mr. Booth is to be congratulated on his far-reaching discovery, the result of years of patient study and experiment.

The Classical Element in the Shakespeare Plays. By William Theobald, late Deputy Superintendent of the Geological Survey of India, Member of the Royal Society of Great Britain and Ireland, and of the Numismatic Society of London. Robert Banks and Son, London, 7s. 6d. net.

THIS erudite volume has been recently published under the superintendence of Dr. J. M. Theobald. It will be dealt with at length in the next number of BACONIANA.

NOTES.

HOW is it that Mr. Sidney Lee displays such lamentable ignorance whenever he mentions Bacon? In that remarkable book, "Letters from the Dead to the Dead," * the author points out one glaring lapse of the distinguished biographer. He says:—

"Mr. Sidney Lee, a renowned writer, who depends in part on his fancy for his facts and thereby has been much bepraised by the unthinking, is authority for the following statement: 'He (Bacon) knew nothing of Napier's discovery of the "Logarithms"' ("Great Englishmen of the Sixteenth Century," page 248). So far as Mr. Lee is concerned, Napier's letter † states the facts with pitiless accuracy; but *de hors* the record, as one may say, there are extant two books which utterly refute Mr. Lee's placid dictum—(*a*) Napier's 'Logarithms,' 1st Edition, 1614, annotated in Bacon's handwriting; (*b*) Briggs' 'Logarithms,' 1624, wherein Bacon with his own pen has verified some of Briggs' calculations."

In *The Fortnightly Review* for June Mr. Lee has an article on "French Culture and Tudor England," in which he says (p. 1,144):—"Neither Francis Bacon nor

* By Oliver Lector. Bernard Quaritch, 1905, p. 47.

† *Ibid.*, p. 47.

his brother Anthony passed in their early days beyond French bounds. As far as we know, Francis went no further than Paris. Anthony's wander-years were spent chiefly in the South of France, and while sojourning at Bordeaux he paid a visit to Montaigne."

In refutation of these statements, the letter of Thomas Bodley may be cited.* It is known from it that on the 19th October, 1577, Bacon was at Orleans. Spedding says Bacon went "from Paris to Blois, from Blois to Tours, from Tours to Poitiers, where in the autumn of 1577 he resided for three months." † But by far the most important testimony on this point is to be found in the life prefixed to the "Histoire Naturelle de Mre Francois Bacon, Baron de Verulam, Vicomte de Sainet Alban et Chancelier d'Angleterre" (Paris, 1631).‡ The translation is said to be by Pierre Amboise, and the translator was evidently the author of the biography which precedes it, and which is the earliest life published of the great Lord Chancellor. Here it is stated (page 8) :—

"Ie veux dire qu'il employa dans le voyages quelques années de sa ieunesse, afin de polir son esprit, and façonner son iugément, par la pratique de toute sorte d'estrangers. La France, l'Italie and l'Espagne comme les nations les plus civilisées de tout le monde, purent celles où sa curiosité le porta. Et comme il se voyoit destiné pour tenir en iour en ses mains le timon du Royaume, au lieu de considerer seulement le païsage et la diversité des vestemens, comme sont la pluspart de ceux qui voyagent, il obseruoit iudicieusement les loix et less coustumes de pays où il passoit, remarquoit les diverses formes de gouvernement, les avantages on les deffaux d'un Estat, et toutes les autres choses qui

* BACONIANA, Vol. VI., Third Series, p. 40.

† "Spedding's Letters," &c., Vol. I., p. 7.

‡ BACONIANA, Vol. IV., Third Series, pp. 69—84 and 146—150.

pennent rendre un homme capable de gouverner les peuples."

Mr. Granville Cuningham drew attention* to the importance attributed to this life by Gilbert Wats, who, in introducing the testimonies to the merit of Bacon, prefixed to the 1640 edition of the "Advancement of Learning," speaks of it as "his (Mr. Pierre D'Ambois) just and elegant discourse upon the life of the author." The statement as to Bacon's travels in France, Italy and Spain appears to be authenticated beyond question. Is it the result of carelessness, or has Mr. Sidney Lee some ulterior motive in thus misstating the facts as to the travels of Francis?

It is probable that great interest will in the future centre round "The Arte of English Poesie," published in 1589 and subsequently on grounds which are wholly insufficient attributed to Puttenham. Mr. W. Stone Booth, in his recently published work,† mentions the reference made to the book by the late Rev. Walter Begley, in his "Bacon's Nova Resuscitatio."

It is only right that attention should be drawn to the fact that it was Mr. Parker Woodward who first suggested Francis Bacon as its author. In Appendix IV., p. 110, to "The Strange History of Francis Tider," published in 1901, Mr. Woodward said, "I affirm that the following works to carry a strong suspicion of being the composition of Francis." He then mentions (1) "Certayne Notes of Instruction Concerning the Making of Verse or Ryme in English," Anon., 1275; (2) "Discourse of English Poetrie," William Webbe, 1586; (3) "Arte of English Poesie," Anon., 1589. There is

* BACONIANA, Vol. IV., p. 148.

† "Some Acrostic Signatures of Francis Bacon." Constable and Co., 1909, p. 121.

in the pages which follow the history of how Puttenham's name came to be associated as author. In BACONIANA for April, 1905, pages 95—103, Mr. Woodward presents what he terms "a fair *prima facia* case for ascribing to Francis Bacon the authorship." In 1905 the Rev. Walter Begley published his "Bacon's Nova Resuscitatio," in which, Vol. I., pages 1—65, he deals exhaustively with the subject. It does not appear that any other Baconian has claimed the work for Bacon. Now Mr. Booth puts the authorship beyond question. He reproduces in his "Acrostic Signatures," pages 96—123, eight signatures of Bacon from "The Arte of English Poesie," and three from the "Partheniades." The first edition (1589) of the book is very rare. In 1811 was issued Haslewood's reprint, on the title page of which the author is stated to be "Webster alias George Puttenham." It is also reproduced in the Arber reprints published by Constable and Co.

Mr. C. N. Montgomery, of New York, claims to have discovered "*Shakespearean Anagrams*" in the lines "To the Reader," facing the Title-page of the 1623 folio, and elsewhere.

He explains his system as follows:—

"*In transposing these Shake-spearean Anagrams always use every letter, every punctuation mark, hyphen* and *apostrophe*. No changes can be made in the letters, *except by what seems to be the one rule of the author*, for example:—

"Two small u's (or v's) can be used to form a small w (and the reverse);

"Four small u's (or v's) can be used to form a double (or capital) W (and the reverse).

"Any letter can be exchanged for its own kind, and only for its own kind (as above), *i.e.*, a capital A can be

divided into two small a's, or two small a's can be doubled, to form a capital A; but a capital A cannot be divided into *one* small a, and any *other* small letter; nor can a capital A be used as one small a only. If a capital letter, like the A in 'Enclo-Ased' (in Ye Original 'Epitaph') is used at all, it must be used (in transposition) either as a capital A or as two small a's. (Francis Bacon cannot be spelled 'FraNcis bAcoN'!)

"In transposing the punctuation marks, two periods can be used as a colon (and the reverse); one period and a comma (or apostrophe) can be used as a semi-colon (and the reverse)."

Mr. Montgomery brings his method to bear upon the epitaph on the original tombstone on Shakespeare's grave. The peculiar characteristics of that epitaph might favour the view that it contains "cipher." Mr. Montgomery has succeeded in evolving the following:—

> "Dig, Honest Man dost thee forbear
> I SHAKE-SPEARE didst but enclose here
> Grave mystery below these stones
> Great codes instead of my Bones. Fs B."

There have been three lectures given under the auspices of the Society during the past quarter. On the 14th of May, at Miss Souter's, Park Road, N.W., Mr. Harold Bayley read a paper on "The Raumont of the Rose." On the 28th of May, Mr. J. M. Robertson, M.P., delivered his third lecture, the subject being "Francis Bacon as Political Thinker"; and on the 17th of June Sir Edward Durning Lawrence, at 13, Carlton House Terrace, answered the question "What does it matter whether the immortal works were written by Shakespeare (of Stratford) or by another who bore or assumed the same name?"

CORRESPONDENCE.

Some Acrostic Signatures of Francis Bacon.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIR,—In the announcement of my book on "Some Acrostic Signatures of Francis Bacon," which appears in your issue of April, I see that some correspondent has inspired an apocryphal story as to the reception of my book by a Harvard professor. This story is not only not true, but it misrepresents the attitude of academic men in general in this country. My work is being very carefully examined in Harvard, Yale, Dartmouth, and Columbia Universities. It is not to be expected that any man will hasten to shout his error from the house-top, but there is no reason to suppose that American scholars will pursue anything but a scientific spirit in their attitude towards my discovery. After all, facts are facts, and as a man born and trained in England, I am proud to be able to say that I have never found Americans prone to intellectual cowardice. It is a mistake to wanton with the sensibilities of one's opponents while they are freely and even generously examining unwelcome facts.

Please pay no attention to stories which are sprung from the imagination of men who, on the face of it, are more interested in a quarrel than in the cause of the truth which we wish to uncover.

Hoping that you can spare me this space,
I am, very faithfully yours, WM. S. BOOTH.

Cambridge, Mass., June 12, 1909.

Recent Objections to Bacon as the Author of Shakespeare.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

ON the 7th of June Sir Edwin Durning Lawrence gathered a large audience of Baconians and others, and read a very interesting and instructive paper on the question, "What does it matter whether the Shakespeare plays were written by William Shakspere, of Stratford, or by another man who bore or assumed the same name?" A discussion followed, and one of the guests spoke strongly, but not wisely, against the Baconian hypothesis. There was no resemblance, he maintained, between Bacon and Shakespeare, and Bacon's views about married life were such as Shakespeare could not have held. And then he quoted the opening sentence of "Bacon's Essay on Married and Single Life"—"He that hath wife and children hath given hostages to fortune; for they are impediments to great enterprises, either of virtue or

mischief." And with exaggerated assumption of moral disgust and triumph the speaker commented on these words,—"You, ladies, mothers or sisters, what do you think of that? You are *impediments* to virtue." Over and over again this calumniator of Bacon reiterated the sentiment which he attributed to Bacon, "Ladies! you are impediments to virtue." Of course Bacon never said anything so insane, nothing in the least approaching to it. Wife and children are, he said, impediments to *great enterprises*, whether of virtue or mischief,—but not to either virtue or mischief. Bacon habitually used English words in their original Latin sense, and the word impediments in this passage is really equivalent to the Latin word *impedimenta*, which means baggage or luggage. Bacon simply meant that a married man is *handicapped*; he cannot give his undivided attention to "great enterprises." Both his allegiance and his action are divided. Accordingly, as Bacon adds in the next sentence, "Certainly the best works and of greatest merit for the public have proceeded from unmarried or childless men." The sentiment may be unpalatable, but it is true; and no question of morals is involved in it—simply one of fact.

But my objector was not satisfied with this novel impeachment of Bacon. He proceeded,—"Bacon had some sections in his *Novum Organum* devoted to a discussion of the Idols of the mind: and one of these Idols is the '*Idols of the Theatre*.' Only fancy! this from a great dramatic author! Would such a writer speak of the Theatre as an Idol?" Of course, the objector blundered in a perfectly shocking way. The *Idols of the Theatre* are philosophical systems which give theories of life and human experience, not such as exist in nature—unreal life, such as a stage play might present, nor actual history. Bacon devotes several sections to illustrate this from Nos. 71 to 75 in *Nov. Org.* I.

Here is a typical anti-Baconian, who presumes to censure Bacon, attributing to him idiotic conceptions and impossible theories of life, while he takes not the least trouble to understand him, and judges of his ideas by detached sentences without any regard to the context. Probably this objector has never heard of the 9th Commandment; but whether he had or not, it is a sin against God and man to bear false witness against one's neighbour.

R. M. THEOBALD.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—There is a note on page 618 of Vol. II. of Nathan Drake's *Shakespeare and his Times* (1817) giving the following quotation from "Wheler's Guide to Stratford," p. 87: "If Shakespeare's and Lord Totness's tombs were erected by one and the same artist, circumstances not at all improbable, it would not appear that he (Thomas Stanton, the sculptor) had any want of skill in preserving a resemblance; for the monumental likeness of Lord

Totness strongly resembles him in Clopton House and at Gorhambury, in Hertfordshire, as well as the engraving of him prefixed to his 'Hibernia Pacata,' a posthumous publication in 1633." The reference to Gorhambury in relation to a piece of sculpture in the parish church of Stratford-on-Avon makes one curious to know something of the man whom it represents and his connection, if any, with the master of Gorhambury, but diligent search has so far failed to provide me with the desired information. There does not appear to be a copy of "Hibernia Pacata" in the British Museum. Can any reader of BACONIANA throw any light on the subject? S. T. W.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

"And yet to me, what is this quintessence of dust?"
(*Hamlet* II. ii.).

SIR,—In my last article I cited the above words of Hamlet, in his contemplation of "*this goodly frame, the earth,*" in order to compare Bacon's view of the nature of man, and of the soul. In the First Book of the "Advancement of Learning," he says:—"So certainly if a man meditate upon the universal *frame of nature, the earth* with men upon it (the *divineness of souls* except) will not seem much better than an anthill, whereas some ants carry corn, and some carry their young, and some go empty, and all to and fro *a little heap of dust*" (p. 61, Book I., "Advancement of Learning").

This conception of man as *dust* is Scriptural: "For He knoweth whereof we are made; He remembereth that we are but dust" (Psalm ciii. 14).

Compare:—"Or my divine soul answer it to heaven."
(*K. Richard II.* Act. I. i. 38).

. . . . . .

"With the divine forfeit of his soul upon oath."
All's Well, Act. III. vi.

W. F. C. WIGSTON.

BACONIANA.

VOL. VII. *Third Series.* OCTOBER, 1909. No. 28.

BACON'S ESSAY OF TRUTH.

"To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth My voice. Pilate saith unto Him, What is truth?"—Gospel of St. John, chap. xviii., vers. 37, 38.

IT is very important to observe that Bacon's essay *Of Truth* occupies the first or foremost place in the collection. Also that this essay opens and concludes with allusion to our Saviour, who was the Way, the Truth, and the Life. Bacon commences with the words "What is truth? said jesting Pilate, *and would not stay for an answer.*" And the essay ends with the words, "Surely the wickedness of falsehood and breach of faith cannot possibly be so highly expressed, as in that it shall be the last peal to call the judgment of God upon the generations of men. It being foretold that when Christ cometh He shall not find faith upon the earth." This is repeated in the essay "Of Counsel."

It is worthy of note, too, what Bacon says of Pilate, that he "*would not stay for an answer,*" implying that there was an answer, but that he did not want to hear it, and this is often the attitude of the world towards any problem that offends its prejudices, rouses its passions, or dares to challenge its universal consent

upon some echoed tradition which has never hitherto been looked into or examined. In his essay "Of Atheism," Bacon points out, how the judgment is prejudiced by the feelings or affections, and how the mind is deprived of free judgment by the inclinations of the heart. "The Scripture saith, The fool hath said in his heart, 'There is no God;' it is not said, 'The fool hath thought in his heart,' so as he rather saith it by rote to himself, *as that he would have,* than that he can thoroughly believe it or be persuaded of it." This equally applies to the nature of all human beliefs that are allied by custom with consent and sentiment—and perhaps most of all to the opposers of the Bacon authorship of the plays. They, like Pilate, "*will not stay for an answer,*" or give a "learning patience" to the problem, and in their hearts declare the theory a heresy, a foolish fad, an impossibility. Mark Twain has recently drawn a parallel, comparing Shakespeare to Satan, and there is something in it, for all denial is of the badge of Antichrist; and has not the great German poet Goethe described Mephistopheles (and his followers?) with the words "*der stets verneint,*"—who everlastingly denies? After all, rebutting evidence is always easier than proof, for the thing saves trouble if one only takes one's ignorance seriously, or affirmatively, setting up for a judge instead of a learner, and imagining a faculty of not knowing can be a criterion for passing judgments upon new discoveries. *Coming in a man's own name,* Bacon declares, is no infallible sign of truth. "For certainly there cometh to pass, and hath place in human truth, that which was noted and pronounced in the highest truth. *Veni in nomine patris, nec recipitis me; si quis venerit in nomine suo, eum recipietis* (I came in the name of the Father, but ye did not receive Me; if any one shall come in his own name, him ye receive). But in this divine aphorism (considering to whom it was applied, namely, to Anti-

christ, the highest deceiver) we may discern well *that the coming in a man's own name, without regard of antiquity or paternity, is no good sign of truth*, although it be joined with the fortune and success of an *eum recipietis*" (2nd Book *Advancement of Learning*, p. 99). Therefore the coming of Shakespeare in his own name, although he has been received without question, is not an infallible sign of truth. In Aphorism 84 of the first book of the *Novum Organum:* "Again men have been kept back as by a kind of enchantment from progress in the sciences, by reverence for antiquity, by the authority of men accounted great in philosophy, *and then by general consent.*" "And with regard to authority it shows a feeble mind to grant so much to authors, and yet deny Time his rights, who is the author of authors, nay, rather of all authority. For rightly is truth called the daughter of time." By "*consent*" Bacon means, the world's general or universal assent, or tradition; as, for example, that Shakespeare is the author of the 1623 Folio plays. The world often mistakes *echoes for volume*, and there is the popular fallacy that counting of heads is proof of truth. But in matters intellectual it is not as with physical power or wealth—there is no aggregate or arithmetical sum total, as, for example, when men pull on a rope or heap up money. But it is rather as in a race, where only a few can be first, and there is no addition of speeds. Hear Bacon: "*For the worst of all auguries is from consent in matters intellectual* (Divinity excepted, and politics where there is right of vote). For nothing pleases the many unless it strikes the imagination, or binds the understanding with the bonds of common notions" (Aphorism 77, *Novum Organum*). Therefore the saying, "That the world says, or the world believes," though to be respected, is not final, and should not deter us from examining anew problems which the past generations had probably no time or curiosity to ques-

tion. Besides, as Bacon says, in this essay *Of Truth*, "The first creature of God, in the work of the days, *was the light of the senses, the last was the light of reason;* and His Sabbath work ever since is the illumination of His Spirit." The Vedas say, "In the midst of the sun is the light, in the midst of light is truth, and in the midst of truth is the imperishable Being." "Truth," says Chaucer, "is the highest thing that man can keep."

In this essay *Of Truth* Bacon says, "One of the late school of the Grecians examineth the matter, and is at a stand to think what should be in it, that men should love lies, *where neither they make for pleasure, as with poets;* nor for advantage, as with the merchant; but for the lies sake. But *I cannot tell:* this same truth is a naked and open day light, that doth not show the *masques, and mummeries, and triumphs* of the world, half so stately and daintily as candle-lights.* Truth may perhaps come to the price of a pearl, that showeth best by day; but it will not rise to the price of a diamond, or carbuncle, that showeth best in varied lights. A mixture of a lie doth ever add pleasure."

Observe the apology for *poetical fiction* in this passage, which presently we find repeated with something of an explanation. "One of the Fathers, in great severity, called poesy *vinum dæmonum* (the wine of devils), because it filleth the imagination, and yet it is but with *the shadow of a lie.*" That is to say, poetical fiction or invention, although it obscures truth, or veils it, is not all falsehood, and all parabolical poetry *shadows*, under tropes or similitudes, a concealed meaning or truth. It

* Compare Omar Khayham on the world as a theatre by candle-light:—

"For in and out, above, about, below,
'Tis nothing but a Magic Shadow Show,
Play'd in a box whose candle is the sun,
Round which we phantom figures come and go!"

would seem, then, that this essay *Of Truth* is a sort of apology for the poetical veil, or masque of Truth, upon the score of man's dislike, or incapability, of receiving unadulterated truth itself? Bacon uses the expression "*I cannot tell*" to excuse himself explanation of the world's love of lies. In the play of *Richard III.* the same phrase is introduced, together with what would seem to answer the question in context with it:—

> "*I cannot tell:—the world is grown so bad*
> That wrens may prey where eagles dare not perch."
> (I. 3).

Christ exclaimed "That the world cannot receive truth," and Bacon implies the same thing, and he then proceeds to explain that the disguises and actings of the world's stage are better adapted, *than* the search-light of open daylight, for the half-lights of the theatre. If the reader will turn to the essay entitled *Of Masques and Triumphs*, he will find complete proof that this is an allusion to the stage in the essay *Of Truth.* And it would seem as if there existed some sort of antithesis between these two essays, *i.e.*, that the one is an apology for the other, *i.e.*, the world's love of pleasure is so great, "*Satis alter alteri magnum theatrum sumus*" (We are sufficiently the great theatre of each other),—"All the world's a stage, and all the men and women merely players,"—and acting has little consonance with truth. Observe, too, in both essays there is the same allusion to candle-light.*

* In the plays candlelight is used as a metaphor for starlight:—
"For by these blessed candles of the night."
(*Merchant of Venice*, V. i).

. . . . .

"There's husbandry in heaven;
Their candles are all out." (*Macbeth* II. i).
"Night's candles are burnt out."
(*Romeo and Juliet* III. 5).

See Sonnet 21, "As those gold candles fixed in heaven's air."

Masques * were dramatic performances in which the actors were *disguised by the wearing of masks* which concealed their features, and so their identity. This point seems to me very pertinent to the entire subject of the essay (and authorship of the plays), and is a hint of the very first importance as to whether Bacon wore a mask known as Shakespeare. But the introduction of this subject, in connection with poetry, and with an apology for the poets' "*shadow of a lie*," on account of the pleasure afforded by the dainty shows of the theatre, seen by candlelight, is a hint that only the most obstinately blind or obtuse person can decline to perceive. The first Masque, in England, was held at Greenwich Palace (where King Henry the Eighth was born), "the first disguise (in the year 1513, on the day of the Epiphany), after the manner of Italy called a *Masque*, a thing not seen afore in England." In *Love's Labour Lost* we have a masque introduced, and also a scene in *King Henry the Eighth* where the royal dancers are masked. Triumphs were processional pageants, or shows by Torchlight. Bacon is telling us that man does not care about abstract truth, and when he says men do not care for open daylight, he is speaking very truly. For he points out that "*the archflatterer* with whom all the petty flatterers have intelligence, *is a man's self*" (essay *Of Love*). And in this essay *Of Truth*: "A mixture of a lie doth ever add pleasure.

* Bacon commences his essay *Of Masques and Triumphs* with the words, "These things are but toys," and concludes the essay with the words, "But enough of these toys." He means *trifles* by the word toys. It is most important to point out, that Heminge and Condell, in their dedicatory preface (to their patrons the Earls of Pembroke and Montgomery) in the first edition of the folio plays, published in 1623, employ the word "*trifles*" to indicate the plays they are editing:—"For, when we value the places your H.H. sustain, we cannot but know their dignity greater, than to descend *to the reading of these trifles*."

Doth any man doubt, that if there were taken out of men's minds vain opinions, flattering hopes, false valuations, imaginations as one would, and the like, but it would leave the minds of a number of men poor shrunken things full of melancholy and indisposition, and unpleasing to themselves?" This is as much as to say, that most men "walk in a vain show," and are actors, *i.e.*, play up rather to the parts they imagine they possess, than are what they really are by nature. In the essay *Of Love*, Bacon says "It is a poor saying of Epicurus, '*Satis magnum alter alteri theatrum sumus*,' (*i.e.*, we are a sufficiently great theatre to each other)". That Bacon should introduce this saying of Seneca (to be found in in his Epistles, Moral I., 17) in the essay *Of Love* is not strange. For Bacon knew that love is one of the greatest of actors (and cause of acting) in life, as well as the motive for stage comedies in the theatre. He writes, "The stage is more beholding to love than the life of man. For as to the stage, love is ever a matter of *Comedies*, and now and then of *tragedies*. It is strange to note the excess of this passion; and how it braves the nature and value of things, that the speaking in a perpetual hyperbole is comely in nothing but love." The ancients painted Cupid blind, because people in love are deprived of reason and sound judgment, and see everything by a candlelight of glamour and illusion, where all is appearance, as in a theatre. The lover conceals his real character, and pretends to all sorts of parts which he plays in order to attract the one beloved, just, as in natural selection, we find at the courting season, male birds spreading their peacock feathers to attract the female, that is to say, this passion consists of every sort of exaggeration both in action and in speech, which, to the onlooker, is ever a source of amusement and comedy because of its divagation from all semblance of truth. Observe how Bacon classes love with envy,

"There be none of the affections which have been noted to fascinate, or bewitch, but love and envy." He then makes this profound observation of envy, which is equally applicable to love: "A man that is busy and inquisitive is commonly envious . . . therefore it must *needs be, that he taketh a kind of play pleasure in looking upon the fortunes of others*" (essay *Of Envy*). This is written in the spirit of the text already quoted from Bacon, "*Satis magnum alter alteri theatrum sumus,*" we are a sufficiently great theatre one to the other. That is to say, all life is a theatre, and it may be noted, that love, of all passions, is the one that attracts most attention from those within the circle, or theatre of its influence. People of all classes are everlastingly watching it, or contemplating it, or talking about it. For it brings with it other passions into play, such as envy, or jealousy, and often ends in the tragedies we read every day in the papers. In the 1st Book of the *Advancement of Learning*, Bacon once more quotes this saying with an apology which would seem to be pointed at himself:—

"Another fault incident commonly to learned men, which may be more probably defended than truly denied, is that they fail sometimes in applying themselves to particular persons, which want of exact application ariseth from two causes—*the one, because the largeness of their mind can hardly confine itself to dwell in the exquisite observation or examination of the nature and customs of one person; for it is a speech for a lover, and not for a wise man. 'Satis magnum alter alteri theatrum sumus'*—we are sufficiently a great theatre to each other" (p. 23 1st Book *Advancement of Learning:* Frowde). It is very possible Bacon was thinking of Seneca, the dramatist, from whom he quotes this Latin saying (to whom he compares himself in the *De Augmentis* of 1623), particularly as he mentions him in the preceding

paragraph but one. But this passage appears as an apology written *for Bacon himself*, who was a learned man after the pattern of Demosthenes and Cicero, whom he has just previously cited. He is covertly telling us *he is a lover of the theatre—of the contemplation of life as a stage, but that he is not wise to tell us so.* In the 2nd Book of the *Advancement of Learning* he again introduces some part of the above passage, and *this time directly pointed at himself:* "My hope is that, if my extreme love to learning carry me too far, I may obtain the excuse of affection; *for that it is not granted to man to love and to be wise*" (p. 75 2nd Book *Advancement of Learning*). I should like to point out that *the poet is compared with the lover* in the *Midsummer's Night Dream*, and in his essay *Of Truth* he says: "But howsoever these things are thus in men's depraved judgments and affections, 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."

> "The lunatic, the lover, and the poet,
> Are of imagination all compact.
> One sees more devils than vast hell can hold;
> That is the madman. The Lover, all as frantic,
> Sees Helen's beauty in a brow of Egypt.
> The poet's eye in a fine frenzy rolling doth glance
> From heaven to earth, from earth to heaven.
> And as imagination bodies forth the forms of things
> Unknown; the poet's pen turns them to shapes,
> And gives to airy nothing a local habitation
> And a name."—Act V. i.

Observe how Helen is compared to Cleopatra, and observe that we have in the lunatic's and poet's frenzy a hint for the divine madness connected with Bacchus,

which was called *mania*,* and which fury was sometimes the effect of wine. The lover, Bacon identifies with madness (in his essay *Of Love*—"mad degree of love"). But it is poetic creation through love that Bacon is really thinking of, such as Plato describes as the love of wisdom, the begetting of truth upon the body of beauty.

It is somewhat strange to consider how the true character of Bacon's essay *Of Truth* has so long escaped discovery at the hands of critics—I mean the mingling, in this essay, of Truth and Poetry, and their inter-relationship after the manner (to borrow a title from the German poet, Goethe) of *Wahrheit und Dichtung*. For the entire essay is an apology for the veils of poetry—that is to say, for its shadows and outlines, its bare suggestions, its parabolical character, its complete reserve. What I mean will be best understood by a study of Bacon's introduction to the series of poetical and classical myths entitled *The Wisdom of the Ancients*, in which collection Bacon has endeavoured to rationalise and explain away *the shadows and veils* in which the kernels of this ancient wisdom are enwrapped. His efforts to discover the *true forms*, hidden behind poetical fancy in these pieces, are just what he would have us apply to his theatre, with the help of his prose works. Just what Bacon, in his essay *Of Truth*, calls "*a shadow of a lie*," constitutes the outward poetical garb of all myth containing inner meaning. "Æsop's Fables" belong to this class of parable. The *Fox and the Grapes*, outwardly, is the shadow of a lie, which conveys (and veils at the same time) the inner moral truth—"*We affect to despise everything unattain-*

* In the 4th Book of *Æneid*, Dido is described: "She rages even to madness, like a Bacchanal wrought up into enthusiastic fury in celebrating the sacred mysteries of her god—at hearing the name of Bacchus" (282—313).

able." Men, being for the most part of the nature of children in their intellects, are only held and interested in sensible objects, and in pictures, or emblems, which poetry can present to their imagination. Two objects are served by creative poetry that embodies wisdom in poetic imagery and parable. It serves to preserve and to reveal. Like the fly embalmed in amber, great truths may be handed down to posterity and preserved intact through barbarous ages. The secrets of a society of learned men can thus be transmitted to after-times. This indeed is living art, and probably it has been carried out to an almost incredible degree of perfection and completeness in the art we are now discussing.*

Tennyson once made the remark "*that the world was the shadow of God,*" meaning that it not only argued, as all shadows do, a great light to produce shadow, but also concealed God. In Esdras the dead are said to "flee the shadow of this world," and "which are departed from the shadow of the world" (2 Esdras ii. 36—39). So, in *like* manner, I would suggest, Bacon's theatre shadows a great rational interpretation, or revelation, with which latter Bacon has particularly identified his own unmasking in glory to man. Schopenhauer called matter "*a false truth,*" and in parabolical poetry (which is the "*shadow of a lie*" †),

* "And therefore in the infancy of learning, and in rude times, when those conceits which are now trivial were then new, the world was full of parables and similitudes; for else would men either have passed over without mark, or else rejected for paradoxes that which was offered, before they had understood or judged. So in divine learning, we see how frequent parables and tropes are. For it is a rule, that whatsoever science is not consonant to presuppositions, must pray in aid of similitudes" (2nd Book *Advancement of Learning*, p. 153).

† Bacon describes poesy in respect of matter, (and not words), as, "one of the principal portions of learning, and is nothing else but *feigned history*, which may be styled as well in prose as

the vehicle of truth is the veil which shadows forth the truth. Spiritual truths are always immeasurably greater than their vehicles of utterance, and are those *forms*, or philosophical ideas, which are conveyed by means of poetic myth and fable.

> "Truth in closest words shall fail,
> When truth embodied in a tale
> Shall enter in at lowly doors."

More than half the force of language, especially of poetical language, consists in its hints, suggestions, half-lights, which its words do not directly imply, yet habitually convey indirectly. Bacon's essay *Of Truth* is, I consider, an apology for poetical fiction, and for the masking and mumming of his theatre, on the score of man's absolute love of lies, and hatred of truth. The modern love of novels is a very strong corroboration of this statement. Put a profound truth in the form of a problem novel and thousands will read it, attracted by its outward dress, whereas written as a treatise it would attract little attention! How many readers have Lord Bacon's works compared to the plays attributed to Shakespeare!

I now turn to another point of this essay *Of Truth*, and its connection with poetry, *i.e.*, Bacon's allusion to "poesy as *vinum dæmonum*," in a passage already quoted. It is most important to trace this home to its classic source, and to give some indication of what it really means, because Bacon is not satisfied with this one reference to wine, but repeats the observation in the *Advancement of Learning*, and in the *Novum Organum*, so that altogether there are *three allusions to wine, in a Bacchic sense, in his writings*.

verse" (2nd Book *Advancement of Learning*, p. 90: Froude). So, in the play of *As You Like It*, "The truest poetry is the most feigning." That is to say, the *shadow of the lie* is only the envelope (Act III. ii.) of the inward truth, or form, imprinted on it.

In one of the "Fragments" left of the Greek poet Alcæus is this, "Wine, my son, is truth indeed" [οἶνος, ὦ φίλε, καὶ ἀλάθεα, "Fragment" 57 (37)]. And as for the application, or connotation, of plays with wine, it is commonly found in the old classic play writers. Plautus says:—

> "Qui utuntur vino vetere, sapientes puto
> Et qui libenter veteres spectant fabulas,"
> ("Casina," Prologue 5.)

(*i.e.*, "Who choose old wine, those I esteem wise; so do I those who come by choice to see old Comedies"). Bacon, in his *Advancement of Learning*, says: "Did not one of the Fathers, in great indignation, call Poesy *Vinum dæmonum*, because it increases temptations, perturbations and vain opinions?" (Book II.). Jerome, in one of his letters to Damasus says, "*Dæmonum cibus est carmina poetarum* (*i.e.*, Poesy is the food of demons)." Augustine, in his "Confessions," calls poetry "*vinum erroris*"; and it is easy to understand that Bacon is alluding to amatory poetry, such as "Anacreons," or Ovid's "Art of Love," and all poems which have a suggestive tendency, like wine, to heighten and inflame the passions, and which, as he says in his *Advancement*, spring from the lust of the earth, and are, like wine, of the spirit of the earth, and not of heaven. When Roderigo, in the play of *Othello*, loses heart in his profligate pursuit of Desdemona, Iago, to encourage him, exclaims, "The wine she drinks is made of grapes," implying that Desdemona possessed earthly passions, and was liable to temptation. The Bible puts it summarily—"Who hath woe? Who hath sorrow? *Who hath contention? Who hath babblings? Who hath wounds without cause?* Who hath redness of eyes? They that tarry long at the wine when it is red, and when it giveth his colour in the cup, when it moveth itself aright. At the last it

biteth *like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder*" (Proverbs xxiii. 29—32).

Cassio, in the same play of *Othello*, is a most excellent example of the contention, babblings, and wounds without cause, that come from excess of wine. He wounds Roderigo, and falls into disgrace with Othello from drinking, and exclaims: "O thou invisible spirit of wine! If thou hast no name to be known by, let us call thee devil!" (*Othello*, Act II. i. 87). Here we have Bacon's *Vinum dæmonum*, with its temptations, and perturbations, or passions, the play of which, in action, constitute a great part of tragedy and comedy.*

Bacon repeats, in the *Novum Organum*, this same point upon wine:—"I may say then of myself that which one said in jest (since it marks the distinction so truly), 'It cannot be that we should think alike, when one drinks water *and the other drinks wine.*' Now other men, as well in ancient as in modern times, have in the matter of sciences drunk a crude liquor like water, either flowing spontaneously from the understanding, or drawn up by logic, as by wheels from a well. Whereas I pledge mankind in a liquor strained from countless grapes, from grapes ripe and fully seasoned,

* In the first book of Esdras we are introduced to a banquet given by King Darius, at which the question is put, for competition and reply, whether wine, the king, women, or truth, are the strongest? The young man, who speaks for wine, answers exactly as Augustine describes poetry ("*vinum erroris*"). "And he said thus: O ye men, how exceeding strong is wine. *It causeth all men to err* that drink it. And, when they are in their cups, they forget their love both to friends and brethren, and a little after draw swords (chapter iii. 22). And King Darius replies: Wine is wicked, the king is wicked, women are wicked, and such are all their wicked works; *there is no truth in them:* As for truth, it endureth, and is always strong, it liveth and conquereth for evermore" (chapter iv. 38). The close context of wine with truth in these verses is very striking,

collected in clusters, and gathered, and then squeezed in the press, and finally purified and clarified in the vat. And therefore it is no wonder if they and I do not think alike" (Aphorism CXXIII., Book I., *Novum Organum*). One of Ben Jonson's contemporaries addresses him with these lines, alluding to their meetings at the Mermaid Tavern :—

> "Those lyric feasts
> Where men such clusters had
> As made them nobly wild, not mad,
> While, yet each verse of thine
> Outdid the meat, outdid the frolic wine."

There is an old Latin proverb, "*In vino veritas*," *i.e.*, Truth in wine, which singularly applies to Bacon's essay *Of Truth*, as if here he had written with a more open breast, and laid bare his poetic predilections. Indeed, in the Second Book of the *Advancement of Learning*, discussing *words*, he says, "They are not to be despised, specially with the advantage of passion and affection. . . . And therefore the poet doth elegantly call passions tortures, that urge men to confess their secrets—*Vino tortus et ira.* And experience showeth there are few men so true to themselves and so settled, but that sometimes upon heat, sometimes upon bravery, sometimes upon kindness, sometimes upon trouble of mind and weakness, *they open themselves ;* specially if they be put to it with a counter-dissimulation, according to the proverb of Spain, *Di mentira y sacaras verdad*—Tell a lie and find a truth."

In Virgil's second Georgic, which is dedicated to Ceres and Bacchus (the divinities of corn and wine), Virgil, in describing the pruning and dressing of the vine, tells us the origin of tragedy and comedy in connection with the yearly sacrifice of the goat at the harvest festivals in the vineyards, because the goat was inimical to the vine :—

"For no other offence is the goat sacrificed to Bacchus on every altar, *and the ancient plays come upon the stage:* and the Athenians proposed for wits, prizes about the villages and crossways; and, joyous amidst their cups, danced in the soft meadows on wine-skins smeared with oil. [On the same account,] the Ausonian colonists also, a race sent from Troy, sport in uncouth strains, and unbounded laughter; assuming horrid masks of hollowed barks of trees: and thee, Bacchus, they invoke in jovial songs, and to thee hang up mild images from the tall pine. Hence every vineyard shoots forth with large produce; both the hollow vales and deep lawns are filled with plenty, and wherever the god hath moved around his propitious countenance. Therefore will we solemnly ascribe to Bacchus his due honours in our country's lays, and offer chargers, and the consecrated cakes; and the sacred goat led by the horn shall stand at his altar, and we will roast the fat entrails on hazel spits" (Davidson's translation, Bohn's Edition, 2nd Georgic, 372—379).

Bacon was evidently studying, or keeping this Georgic in mind, when he wrote his essay *Of Truth*, because he quotes from it, "Happy is he who has been able to trace out the causes of things, and who has cast beneath his feet all fears, and inexorable Destiny, and the noise of devouring Acheron" (*Ib.* Georgic II., 463—492). Observe that this passage of Virgil springs out of the context of the previous paragraph, in which he exclaims, "But me may the *Muses, sweet above all things else, whose sacred symbols I bear, smitten with violent love, first receive into favour. . . .* O [to be] where are the plains, and Sperchius and Taygetus, the scene of Bacchanalian revels to Spartan maids" (*Quarum Sacra fero*, etc., Georgic II., 476).

Swinburne, a modern poet, steeped in classical spirit, in his *Memorial Verses to Théophile Gautier*, asks him the source of his inspiration :—

"Who made thy moist lips fiery with new wine
Pressed from the grapes of song the sovereign vine,
And with all love of all things loveliest
Gave thy soul power to make them more divine?"

And now listen to Bacon for the second time upon this subject. "But as Philocrates sported with Demosthenes, 'You may not marvel (Athenians) that Demosthenes and I do differ; for he drinketh water, *and I drink wine*, and like as we read of an ancient parable of the two gates of sleep:—

"'Sunt geminæ somni portæ: quarum altera fertur
Cornea, qua veris facilis datur exitus umbris:
Altera, candenti perfecta nitens elephanto,
Sed falsa ad cœlum mittunt insomnia manes.'

So if we put on sobriety and attention we shall find it a sure maxim in knowledge, that the more pleasant liquor (of wine) is the more vaporous, and the brave gate (of ivory) sendeth forth the *falser dreams*" (Second book *Advancement of Learning*, 189). This is but a metaphor, or concealed phrase, to tell us Bacon was a poet, and considered the dreams of a poet's inner imaginative vision to be superior to the illusions of sense. The translation of the Latin quotation from Virgil's "Æneid" is as follows: "Two gates there are of Sleep, whereof the one is said to be of horn; by which an easy egress is given to true visions; the other shining, wrought of white ivory; but [through it] the infernal gods send up false dreams to the upper world" (Davidson's translation of Virgil. VI. Book "Æneid").

In the *De Augmentis* of 1623 Bacon describes *poetry as dream*. "*Poetry is as a dream of learning*, a thing sweet and varied, and that would be thought to have in it something divine, *a character which dreams likewise affect*. But now it is time for me *to awake*, and rising above the earth, to wing my way through the clear air of philosophy and the sciences." This passage clearly

connects poetry with sleep and dream, and draws a subtle distinction between Bacon, *the poet and dreamer, asleep,* and Bacon, the philosopher and scientist, *awake.* Moreover, it is a strong confirmatory parallel for the *Distribution Preface* passage, quoted in my last article, in which Bacon refers to the "*phantasiæ somnium nostræ,*" and to the "*visionem veram,*" our fantasies of sleep and true vision.*

* Bacon evidently looked upon *divination by dreams* as a source of inspiration. "A certain rabbin, upon the text, '*Your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams,*' inferreth that young men are admitted nearer to God than old, because vision is a clearer revelation than a dream" (Essay *Of Youth and Age*). It is as the *dreamer*—as the poetic seer wrapt in inner vision—that the statue of Francis Bacon, in Saint Michael's Church, St. Albans, is conceived. He is seated in his chair, fast asleep, or, at least, with closed eyes, with the words "*Sic sedebat,*" etc. ("*thus was he wont to sit*"), and, truly, he still sleeps in his own works until we arouse him, like the sleeping beauty in the wood, to arise from the ashes of his own fires. All the characters of his wondrous theatre were made of dreams, for does not Prospero exclaim, "All these our actors are faded into thin air?"

> "We are such stuff
> As dreams are made of, and our little life
> Is rounded with a sleep." (*Tempest.*)

"Death, and his twin brother, sleep," wrote Shelley. And so Bacon makes Hamlet say—

> "To die, to sleep,
> To sleep, perchance to dream. Ay, there's the rub!
> For in that sleep of death what dreams may come,
> When we have shuffled off this mortal coil
> Must give us pause." (Act II. sc. ii.)

"The Bible is a great dream Book, and never apologises for the fact," says Mr. T. Brierly, and so are the plays known as the 1623 Folio. "As a dream it seems that two intelligences at least are here palpably revealed. There, is first, the 'I,' to whom the picture is presented, and who is visibly conscious of being not the producer, but the passive spectator of it. If he knew himself as the producer, he could not be, as is so frequently the

In Virgil's description of the twin gates of sleep we seem to possess a hint pointing to the *Bacchic dithyramb*, which literally means double triumph and probably alludes to the initiation into things human and divine, in which men were taught not only the deceits and illusions of the senses, but were given a glimpse of those immortal truths that transcend appearances and appertain to the poet's inner vision and the revelations made in the dramatic shows.

Observe that Virgil uses the word shadows (*umbris*), which exactly agrees with Bacon's description of poetry as "*the shadow of a lie*" (Essay *Of Truth*). To describe the true dreams connected with the gate of horn, I venture to translate Virgil's "*cornea*" as crystal, because horn is not a sufficiently *transparent* † substance

case, filled with astonishment at what he sees. But if this 'Ego' does not make the picture, who does? Who is the artist who has conceived this scena, grouped it, drawn the portraits, clothed the figures, and all in the twinkling of an eye?"

In the play of *King Richard II.* this duality and distinction of the soul from its instrument, the brain, is forcibly put in these words :—

> "My brain I'll prove the female to my soul,
> My soul the father: and these two beget
> A generation of still breeding thoughts."
>
> (Act. v. sc. iv.)

† Valpy's note upon the four lines quoted from Virgil's sixth book of the Æneid (line 893) is as follows :—*Geminæ Somni portæ.* This fiction is borrowed from the nineteenth book of Homer's Odyssey, line 562, *seqq.*, and probably was of still earlier origin. —*Cornea.* With our improvements in the arts, horn seems a rude material; but the inventor of the fable knew none more *transparent*, of which he could imagine gates to be composed.—*Veris umbris :* "unto true visions of the night," *i.e.*, true dreams. Among the several reasons why true dreams are made to pass through the horn-gate, and false ones through that of ivory, the most plausible appears to be this, namely, that horn is a fit emblem of truth, as being transparent and pervious to the sight; whereas ivory is impenetrable to the vision. Compare :

to express what is meant. The *cornea of the eye* is that crystalline substance by which the eye is protected, as a watch is by its glass. And Bacon writes, "That there be not anything in being and action which should not be drawn and collected into contemplation and doctrine. For so it is expressed in the Scriptures touching the government of God, that this globe, which seemeth to us a dark and shady body, *is in the view of God as crystal*" (p. 218, Book II. *Advancement of Learning*). Once more: "In substance, because it is the perfect law of inquiry of truth, that nothing be in the *globe of matter which should not be likewise in the globe of crystal or form*" (p. 200, 2nd Book *Advancement of Learning*). I gather from this, that Bacon's object was to furnish in his intellectual globe (*i.e.*, the *Advancement of Learning*) a complete understanding or rational interpretation of his globe theatre.† "It would be disgraceful if while the regions of the material globe —that is, of the earth, of the sea, and of the stars— have been in our times laid widely open and revealed, the intellectual globe should remain shut up within the narrow limits of old discoveries" (*Novum Organum*).

W. F. C. WIGSTON.

> "*Transparent Helena*, nature here shows art
> That through thy bosom makes me see thy heart."
> —*Midsummer Night's Dream*, Act II.

† In the essay *Of Great Place:* "In the discharge of thy place set before thee the best examples; *for imitation is a globe of precepts.*" One of the meanings of the Latin *globus* is a crowd gathered round anything. Thus Virgil ("Æneid" X., 373): "*Quâ globus ille virûm densissimus urget,*" and hence Milton: "Him round a globe of fiery seraphim enclosed" ("Paradise Lost," II. 512). *A globe of precepts* is a body or collection of counsels, and might be well represented by those wise, pithy, and moral sayings, we all quote from the plays, and which are to be found in the essays and prose works of Bacon.

A HAMLET INTERPRETATION.

WHEN Hamlet returned to Elsinore from school he was suffering severely from a deep and profound melancholy, seemingly caused by the death of his father, the blasting by his uncle of his natural expectations of succeeding to the throne, and his mother's infidelity to his father's memory. Claudius is painted by the poet as bold, unscrupulous, keen-sighted and resourceful, and Hamlet would have been devoid of common-sense had he not realized, along with the loss of his hoped-for career, the grave danger he would be in at his uncle's court should he evince a mutinous spirit towards the new king. His soul had prophesied to him that his uncle was back of his father's death, although his suspicions had not yet been confirmed by his father's spirit. The King had noted Hamlet's dark and melancholy bearing, and evidently with no favourable eye. The deserted son's heart was breaking over the base action of his mother, and he was contemplating suicide. He had intended going back to Wittenberg. Under such conditions the character of Hamlet is introduced to the reader. The King, in the room of state, had spoken at length to the Queen and assembled courtiers in relation to his plans towards Fortinbras, had dismissed Voltimand and Cornelius, and had granted leave to Lærtes to return to France. Then he turns to Hamlet and asks abruptly—

"How is it that the clouds still hang on you?"

The King speaks darkly by the use of the word "clouds," but there is no pretence on Hamlet's part that he doesn't understand the allusion. As a matter of fact, it is quite evident that the King's question is framed by the poet for the express purpose of making

apropos, by the antithesis of clouds and sun, Hamlet's equally dark answer, for the young man denies that there are any clouds hanging on him, but affirms that his trouble is the contrary. He counters thus:

"Not so, my lord; I am *too much i' the sun.*"

As the critics have never yet clearly determined the meaning of Hamlet's answer, the King may well have been set to thinking by this enigmatical retort. What did this melancholy young man mean? It has commonly been thought that Hamlet was sarcastically playing upon the words *sun* and *son*, in reference to having been called *son* by his uncle in the preceding line by the King—"But now, my cousin Hamlet, and my *son*"—yet it would puzzle us to catch the point in that connection. Hudson thinks the true meaning is best explained by a quotation from Grindal's "Profitable Discourse," 1855, reading: "In very deed they were brought from the good to the bad, and *from God's* blessings, as the proverbe is, *into a warme sonne.*" But what this explanation is, and how it appears from the extract cited, we are left by Hudson in the dark to helplessly grope after.

More than one Shakespeare student has been deeply impressed with the suggestion that in the character of Hamlet is reflected the mentality and experience of the poet at a profound and crucial period of his intellectual development, but when we seek to find the original of these reflections in the life of Mr. "Shagsper of thone part," we find not a thing to aid us, not even a whisper from the darkness to lead us on. Silence reigns supreme. But when, in idle curiosity, or in sceptical hardness of heart, we turn the searchlight upon the life and writings of Bacon, things begin to appear that attract the attention, rouse the mind and make the eye glisten with interest. The young *Noverint* mentioned

by Nash, who was busying himself with the "endeavours of art," comes into view. The return of a young student from a foreign land upon the death of his father, and the dashing of his hopes and expectations of advancement by a designing uncle, is heard again. The philosophy-saturated character of Hamlet finds its natural derivation. Why was the stamp of melancholy so indelibly impressed upon Hamlet by his creator? It was not observant in the "Hamlet" of Saxo Grammaticus. Was it not because at a time when the "Tragical History," by William Shakespeare, may well have been written, or revised, Bacon had passed, or was passing, through a period of profound melancholy caused by the failure of Essex to procure him the place of Solicitor General? As early as April, 1593, Bacon was writing to Essex about his fortune and complaining gently of Essex's silence, yet promising not to dispose of himself without Essex's allowance, but only part of the letter has been preserved. In September, 1593, Essex wrote Bacon that the Queen was so angry with himself that he found no chance to move Bacon's own suit, but would do so at the first opportunity. In the same month Burghly attempted to place Bacon with the Queen, but she had required Lord Keeper Puckering to furnish her with the names of two other lawyers. On the same day Cecil wrote Bacon about the Solicitor's place, from which it appears that Bacon was then suffering under the displeasure of the Queen, and had been denied access. About the same time Bacon wrote a few plain words to the Queen, asking to be allowed to correct his error and to become "reintegrate" in her favour, stating that he only desired a place of his profession of the law such as younger men than himself had received; that his mind was turning on "other wheels than those of profit," wishing in any event that her majesty should be served "answerably to herself,"

and craving pardon for his boldness and plainness. As late as November Bacon felt sure he would get the place, for on the 4th of November he wrote "Good Robin" Kemp from Twickenham—"For my fortune (to speak court) it is very slow, if anything can be slow with him that is *secure of the event.*" Then on the 28th of March, 1594, Essex wrote Bacon of an interview he had had with the Queen in which she had refused to do anything before Easter, and had told Essex "to go to bed" if he couldn't talk of anything else. The next day Essex also wrote Bacon that he had again seen the Queen and was much encouraged. This was answered by Bacon the following day in the now famous letter in which he complained that the delay had "gone so near" that it had "almost overthrown" his health. And we have indubitable evidence that he was telling the truth, for Francis' good mother, the Lady Anne, writing to his brother Anthony on the 30th of July, 1595, says:

"I gave your brother at twice £25 for his paling, rather to cheer him since he had nothing by me. Crosby told me *he looked very ill;* he thought he taketh *still inward grief*; I fear it may injure his health hereafter."

She writes again to Anthony on the 7th of August, the same year, saying:

"I am sorry your brother with an *inward secret grief* hindereth his health. Everybody saith he looketh *thin and pale.* With a humble heart before God let your brother be of good cheer."

And as late as October of that year Francis must have been still suffering, and had probably received the Queen's final negative, for his mother wrote again to Anthony on the 21st of that month:

"Since it so pleaseth God, comfort your brother kindly and Christianly."

And was it not Hamlet who also had this same "inward secret grief"? who said—

> "But I have *that within* which passeth show
> These but the trappings and the suits of woe."

Evidently the same Bacon, but not the same good mother. Bacon writes of the good memory of his father, of his kinship to the Lord Treasurer, of Essex's own favour, the recommendation of the councillors, the lords, the judges, and the master of the rolls elect. He was, as he said, "voiced with great expectation," and Hamlet was the "*expectancy* and rose of the fair state." In this same letter Bacon refers to his treatment by the Queen as an "exquisite disgrace," and states that he has determined, if the Queen rejects him, to "retire with a couple of men to Cambridge, and there spend my life in studies and contemplations," and he begs Essex's pardon for troubling him "with my *melancholy*." And again he writes Essex, hoping the Queen will not leave him to "pine here in melancholy." And it is Hamlet, another melancholy philosopher, who wants *to go back to Wittenberg to his studies*, but is refused by the crafty King and severely lectured. May 1st, 1594, Bacon writes his cousin, Robert Cecil, to move his father to "lay his hand to the same delay." Cecil lays the blame on Essex, but is sorry to see Bacon "so gravelled." Faulke Greville, Bacon's old-time friend, had been appealed to, and, after talking with her Majesty, had written Francis on the 17th of June, 1594, of the "gracious inclination" she had shown towards him, and offered to wager one hundred pounds to fifty that Bacon would be her solicitor. Again Bacon wrote direct to the Queen from Huntingdon on the 20th day of July. In the early part of 1594, Bacon had intimated to Essex his intention to travel abroad. This came to her ears, and she promptly vetoed that inten-

tion. She probably laid down the law as Claudius did to Hamlet :—

> "For your intent
> In going back to school in Wittenberg,
> It is most retrograde to our desire."

Bacon had written Anthony on the 25th of January of that year that he was going to "make the best with those small things" he had and "sing a mass of *requiem* abroad." He had also asked leave of Cecil to answer in writing the speech of the Queen on learning of his intention to travel. In this letter Bacon says :—

"I told his lordship of this purpose of mine to travel, accompanying it with these very words, that upon her Majesty's rejecting me with such circumstance, though my heart might be good, yet mine eyes would be sore, that I was not an impudent man, that I could face out a disgrace ; and that I hoped her Majesty would not be offended, that *'not able to endure the sun, I fled into the shade !'*"

Is it now hard to understand Hamlet's enigmatical retort to the King—"I am too much i' the sun"? The royal sun of Denmark, like that of England, was becoming uncomfortably hot to the young man. As the Sonnet says, "Sometime too hot the eye of Heaven shines;" and while Bacon was proposing to seek the shade of a foreign country, the "melancholy Dane" was doing identically the same thing ! And both proposals were promptly vetoed by their respective sovereigns ! The figuring of royalty by the sun was a favourite metaphor with Bacon, and he uses it repeatedly in letters and other writings. Having in his letter to Cecil used to such good effect this imagery of fleeing to the shade from the too hot sun of royalty, he repeats it in another letter to Essex. He says :—

"I am very sorry her Majesty should take my notion to travel in offence ; but surely, under her Majesty's

royal correction, it is such an offence as it should be an *offence to the sun* when a man to *avoid the scorching heat flieth into the shade.*"

The truth seems to be that the Queen never did forgive Bacon for his independent action in the matter of the subsidies in the Parliament of 1592; and after torturing him for four years, she at last gave Fleming the solicitorship, "to the surprise of the public and the deep-felt mortification of Bacon and of his patron and friend, Lord Essex." It is not surprising that when Elizabeth died no songs in her praise came from the pen of Shakespeare.

The delay that Bacon was experiencing in his efforts for advancement to the Solicitor's place racked his very soul. He was "in disgrace with fortune and men's eyes;" he was poor, and through his brother Anthony was trying to borrow two hundred pounds from his uncle, Killegrew. It was the crisis of his life. Upon the Solicitor's place hung his freedom from poverty, and, what was far more important, a position of security and influence where he could more safely and effectively carry out his world-wide plans of a "Universal Reformation" and of laying "great bases for eternity." Bacon felt that he was born to set a crooked world straight, but it was a task to make melancholy the bravest spirit, and from his tortured soul might well come the cry of Hamlet, that other world-reformer:—

> "The time is out of joint: O cursed spite!
> That ever *I was born to set it right.*"

Advancement Bacon must have, and the phonographic Hamlet immediately repeats, "Sir, *I lack advancement.*"

And right here Hamlet gives us another puzzle, for Rosencrantz very naturally asks:—

"How can that be, when you have the voice of the King himself for your succession in Denmark?"

Here is a fair test of our Baconian reflection theory. Bacon would very probably have said, "Yes, the Solicitor's place some time in the future may be very good, but it's this delay that's killing me now." And then Hamlet beautifully sidesteps the whole issue by his puzzling answer to Rosencrantz in the words:—

"Ay, sir, *but while the grass grows*—the proverb is something musty."

What a tantalizing young man, to be sure! Just the half of the proverb omitted that would have disclosed the hidden thought. That is a sly trick of Shakespeare, but we happen to *know the whole proverb*. Here it is:—

"Whylst grass doth growe, *oft sterves the seely steed*."

It is the very *delay* we expected, and the reflection again comes back true. The 1603 Quarto has nothing of this "too much i' the sun," of Hamlet's "lack of advancement," nor of the proverb of the "seely steed." They are all additions found in the published Quarto of 1604, and which are thought to have been written about 1594, at a time when Bacon was, coincidently, hunting the shade at Twickenham. Query: Could Shakespeare have been one of the "good pens" Bacon had with him about that time?

F. C. HUNT.

BACON ON PASTIMES AND DISPORTS.

IT is constantly stated that "Bacon" took no interest in Sport, whereas Shakespeare, on the contrary, did. The following quotations throw a different light upon the matter.

"THERE MUST BE TIMES FOR PASTIMES AND DISPORTS.—*To Villiers.*

"Games of Recreation I hold to belong to civil life and education."—*Advancement of Learning.*

"The world runs on wheels."—*Promus.*

"Nobody can be healthful without exercise."—*De Augmentis.*

"You know the fine bowler is knee almost to ground in the delivery of the cast."—*Conference with Buckingham.*

"You bowl well if you do not horse your bowl an hand too much."—*Ibid.*

"Quick of eye, hand, leg, the whole *mocio.*"—*Promus.*

"Tennis is a game . . . of great use in respect it maketh a quick eye and a body ready to put itself into all postures."—*Advancement of Learning.*

"The conditions of a garment . . . above all, it ought not to be too straight or restrained for exercise and motion."—*Ibid.*

"It appeareth manifestly to be but a brick wall at tennis to make . . . defamation and hatred rebound."—*Of a Libel.*

"A gentleman came to the tilt all in orange-tawny and ran very ill, next day he came again all in green and ran worse . . . one of the lookers on asked, "What is the reason this gentleman changeth his colors?" the other answered, "Sure, because it may be reported that the gentleman in green ran worse than the gentleman in the orange-tawny."—*Apophthegms.*

"HUNTERS, FOWLERS, FISHERS AND THE LIKE."

"Trouts and salmon swim against the stream."—*Natural History.*

"All birds find an ease in the depth of the air, as swimmers do in a deep water."—*Ibid.*

"The flight of many birds is swifter than the race of any beasts."—*Ibid.*

". . . Being as a hawk, tied to another's fist, that might sometimes bait and proffer but could never fly."—*To Queen.*

"The hunter takes such solace in his chase."—*Queen's Device.*

"The scent of dogs is almost a sense by itself."—*Natural History.*

"A fine bird bolt does not kill the bird."—*Promus.*

"The first point of a falconer is to hold fast."—*Ibid.*

"You started aside like a broken bow, so that by your variety and vacillation you lost the acceptable time."—*Resuscitatio.*

"I am a hawk that baits when I see an occasion of service, but cannot fly because I am tied to another's fist."—*To Queen.*

"The hawk flies high and thence descends and catches its prey."—*Certain Remains.*

"When a man hunteth in any forest, park, or warren by night or day with vizards and other disguisements, and is examined thereof and concealeth the fact, it is felony."—*Of the Laws.*

"Deer are a melancholy creature, as appeareth by their fearfulness."—*Natural History.*

"Where a man kills the king's deer in chase or forest, and can find no surety after a year's imprisonment, he shall adjure the realm."—*Of the Laws.*

"*Il ne chasse que de vieux léviers.*"—*Promus.*

"My lords, he is not the hunter alone that lets slip the dog upon the deer, but he that lodges the deer, or raises

him, or puts him out, or he that sets a toil that he cannot escape, or the like."—*Attorney General's Charge.*

"Venison is sweet of one's own killing."—*Colours of Good and Evil.*

"A company of scholars going together to catch conies carried one scholar with them which had not much more wit than he was born with. . . . He cried aloud, '*Ecce multi cunicute*' (behold many conies). . . . The conies ran to their boroughs. . . . Being checked by them . . . answered, 'Who the devil would have thought that the rabbits understood Latin?'"—*Apophthegms.*

"The grey-hound hath his advantage in the race . . . the hare . . . hath her advantage in the turn."—*Advancement of Learning.*

Horse-races and the Like.

"Alexander when his father wished him to run for the prize of the race, at the Olympian Games, for he was very swift answered: 'He would if he might run with kings.'"—*Apophthegms.*

"The ordinary instrument of horsemanship is the spur, and . . . the horse is not to be accounted the loss of which will not do well without the spur."—*Colours of Good and Evil.*

"I would rather take the ass which would carry me than the horse which would throw me."—*Promus* (*Spanish Proverb*).

"We see in horse races men are curious to foresee there be not the least weight more upon the one horse more than upon the other."—*Natural History.*

"*L'œil du maitre engraisse le cheval.*"—*Promus.*

"Nothing that is once perfect and hath run his race can receive much amendment."—*Natural History.*

"I am afraid of nothing but that the Master of the Horse, your excellent servant and I shall fall out who shall hold your stirrup best."—*To the King.*

"The things to be seen . . . are excercise of Horsemanship, fencing . . . and the like."—*Of Travel.*

"Dice and Cards May Sometimes Be Used for Recreation When Field Sports Cannot Be Had."—*To Villiers.*

"Gamesters use to call for new cards when they mistrust a pack."—*Speech.*

"Better call for a new pack of cards than play these if they be pack'd."—*Ibid.*

"He that follows his losses and giveth soon over at winnings will never gain by play."—*Promus.*

"I acknowledge myself not to be worthy to be a card-holder."—*Letter.*

"Some shall be . . . that would pluck the cards and others shall be . . . that would shuffle the cards."—*Speech.*

"The motions of shuffling of cards or casting of dice, are very light motions, and . . . gamesters imagine that some that stand by bring them ill luck."—*Natural History.*

"There be that can pack the cards and yet cannot play well."—*Of Cunning.*

"Cunning in making ye game."—*Promus.*

"He that playeth not the beginning of a game well at Tick-tack, and the latter end at Yrish shall never win."—*Promus.*

"We card holders have nothing to do but keep close our cards and do as we are bidden."—*Letter.*

"Tell your cards and tell me what you have won."—*Promus.*

"Persuading Pastimes and Sports."
—*Gray's Inn Mask.*

"Bold men upon . . . occasion they stand at a stay like a stale at chess where it is no mate but yet the game cannot stir."—*Of Boldness.*

"In games of wit as chess or the like, the draughts and first laws of the game are positive . . . but how to direct our play therupon with the best advantage to win the game is . . . rational."—*Advancement of Learning.*

"I know at Chess a pawn before the King is much played upon."—*Apology for Essex.*

"John, Duke of Saxony, whilst playing at chess received the order for his execution . . . whereupon . . . said, with a smile, 'Judge whether so far I am not the winner of the game, for as soon as I am dead, he,' pointing to his antagonist, 'will say that the game was his own.'"—*De Augmentis* (Book IV.).

"Practise swimming with bladders."—*Natural History.*

"Matter of Sport and Vanity."
—*Of Council Business.*

"When there is a Queen and Ladies of Honour attending her, there must be sometimes Masks and Revels and Interludes."—*To Villiers.*

"Recreation and putting away of melancholy."—*Promus.*

"I will not offer at that I cannot master."—*War with Spain.*

". . . Able to keep company at Play and gaming."—*Gray's Inn Mask.*

"Entertain hopes, mirth rather than joy, variety of delights rather than surfeit of them."—*Regimen of Health.*

"Dancing to song is a thing of great state and pleasure."—*Of Masques.*

"He dances well to whom Fortune plays a tune."—*Promus.*

"Practice dancing with heavy shoes."—*Advancement of Learning.*

"Who taught the Parrot to say Good Morrow?"—*Advancement of Learning* (Book II.).

"Arts and Sciences have their work, and human counsels their ends, which they earnestly Hunt after. All natural things have either their food as a prey, or their Pleasure as a Recreation which they seek for, and that in a most expert and sagacious manner."—*Pan, or Nature* (*Wisdom of the Ancients*).

"ART of ACTIVITY WHICH IS CALLED ACTIVITY."
—*Advancement of Learning.*

"For Athletic I take the subject of it largely, that is to say, for any point of ability whereunto the body of man may be brought whether it be of activity or of patience."—*Advancement of Learning.*

"His mind was to Wrestle a fall with Time."—*Promus.*

"'No, I will not wrestle now in my latter times.' 'My lord,' said I, 'you speak like a man.' Here you have the dialogue to make you merry."—*To Villiers.*

"Pursuits pass into character."—*Promus.*

"Like the Olympian gamesters who abstain from necessary labours that they might be fit for such as were not so."—*Apophthegms.*

"No knight of this Order shall put out money upon strange returns and performances to be made by his own person, as to hop up the stair of St. Paul's without intermission, or any other such like agilities."—*Gray's Inn Masque.*

"It is not amiss for men in their race toward their fortune to cool themselves."—*Advancement of Learning.*

"Mankind . . . should . . . try and exert their own strength and chances."—*Prometheus.*

"The matches and wages of sport pass away with such satisfactions and delights."—*Queen's Device.*

"For justs, and tourneys, and barriers, the glories of

them are chiefly in the chariots, wherein the challengers make their entry, especially if they be drawn with strange beasts, as lions, bears, camels, and the like: or in the devices of their entrance, or in the bravery of their liveries, or in the goodly furniture of their horses and armour."—*Of Masques.*

"Words, as a Tartar's bow, do shoot back upon the understanding of the wisest."—*Advancement of Learning.*

"The Turkish bow giveth a very forcible shoot."—*Natural History.*

"The Olympian games are down long since."—*Advancement of Learning.*

"Men mark when they hit, but never mark when they miss."—*Of Prophecies.*

"It is an error frequent for men to shoot over, and to suppose end and more compasses reached than are."—*Advancement of Learning* (Book II.).

"When the butt is set up, men need not rove, but except the white be placed men cannot level."—*Inter. of Nature.*

"The bolt of the rustic often hits the mark."—*From Observation.*

"A few times hitting . . . countervails oftimes missing."—*Advancement of Learning.*

"A man may by his eye set up the white in the midst of the but, though he be no archer."—*Resuscitatio.*

"Princes many times make themselves desires . . . sometimes upon obtaining excellency in some feat of the hand . . . with the arrow . . . playing at fence . . . driving chariots and the like. This seemeth incredible unto those that know not the principle that the mind of man is . . . cheered and refreshed by profiting in small things."—*Of Empire.*

"Let a man contend to excel any competitors of his in honour, in out-shooting them if he can in their own bow."—*Of Honour.*

"He shooteth too high a compass to shoot near."—*Promus.*

"Much bending breaks the bow, much unbending the mind."—*Ornamenta Rationalia.*

"In juggling feats . . . though we know not how they are done, yet we know well it is not as it seemeth to be, yet the more subtle sort of them doth not only put a man besides his answer, but doth many times abuse his judgment."—*Advancement of Learning.*

"Games of Activity and Passtyme, of Act, of Strength, Quickness."—*Promus.*

"Supple to all feats of activity and motions."—*Of Custom.*

"A man leapeth better with weights in his hands than without."—*Natural History.*

"Their snow-ball did not gather as it went."—*Henry VII.*

"Country fellows in a fencing school never ward till the blow be past. As country fellows use to do when they play at wafters . . . with them he that gets a blow straight falleth to ward when the blow is past, and if you strike him in another place thither goes his hand likewise; but to put by or foresee a blow they neither have the skill nor the will."—*War with Spain.*

"It is much better to be doing than enjoying."—*De Augmentis.*

"It is the life of an ox or a beast always to eat and never exercise."—*Resuscitatio.*

"Better is a lame man in the right way than a swift runner out of the way."—*Promus.*

"In races it is not the large stride or high lift that makes the speed."—*Of Dispatch.*

"He stumbles who makes too much haste."—*Promus.*

"Activity hath two parts, strength and swiftness; see practises in Tumblers."—*Advancement of Learning.*

"Some come to win the prizes . . . others come only to look on."—*Apophthegms.*

"He will never do his tricks clean."—*Promus.*

Being for "all time" even aeroplanes are not forgotten.

"Spreading of feathers thin and close and in great breadth will . . . bear up a great weight. Further extension of this experiment for flying may be thought upon."—*Natural History.*

Once more let me quote from St. Luke:—"Of the abundance of the heart his mouth speaketh." *

ALICIA A. LEITH.

THE ENIGMAS IN *PERICLES.*

THERE would seem to be two riddles in the play of *Pericles* (printed in 1609). The first—that set by Antiochus—follows the prose story entitled "Appolonius, Prince of Tyre," upon which the play is based, but this riddle, according to the play, was capable of prompt and easy solution.

The second riddle is manifestly more difficult, as it consists in the correct interpretation of the emblematical devices borne by the six knights in the Tryumph before King Simonides. The author of the play goes out of his way in substituting for the exhibition of the feats of skill, as told in and appropriate to the era of the prose story, a Tryumph or procession similar to those performed in the very much later Elizabethan period.

There may have been some hidden object in this substitution, as also in the re-naming (Pericles for Appolonius) of the titular character. In seeking a

* See p. 162 July BACONIANA.

solution of the riddle evidently propounded in the emblematical devices of the six knights, we may usefully turn to Whitney's book on emblems, printed in 1856. Whitney describes an emblem as having some witty device expressed with cunning workmanship; something obscure to be perceived at the first, whereby when with further consideration it is understood it may the greater delight the beholder. He proceeds: "All Emblems may be reduced into three kinds—Historical, Natural, and Moral. Historical as representing the acts of some noble persons being matter of history."

Dr. Creighton, in his book "Shakespeare's Story of His Life," helps to a clue. Alluding to the first riddle, he classes it with the one recorded in the Bible as propounded by Samson, which was insoluble until facts exclusively in Samson's possession were forthcoming.

Dr. Creighton thought the Armado references to Samson in *Love's Labour Lost* a sufficient indication that the history of Samson and his riddle were well known to the writer of the plays. The probabilities are that the enigma of the devices of the six knights was equally incapable of solution until certain facts in the dramatist's possession were eventually revealed. On that footing the enigma was intended for solution by and amusement of the reading public of a later age when possessed of the requisite facts. Confirming this view it is noticeable that the six devices give evidence of careful selection, the first and last of them (according to Mr. Green, "Shakespeare and the Emblem Writers") being special inventions by the author of the play.

The devices and mottoes, as described by Thasia, are as follow:—

1st Knight Device—"A blacke Ethyope reaching at the sun."
Motto—"Lux tua vita mihi."

2nd Knight Device—"An arm'd knight conquered by a lady."
Motto—"Pue per dolcera kee per forsa."

3rd Knight Device—"A wreath of chivalry."
Motto—"Me pompey provexit apex."
4th Knight Device—"A burning torch that's turned upside downe."
Motto—"Qui me alit me extinguit."
5th Knight Device—"A hand environed with clouds holding out gold that's by the touchstone tryde."
Motto—"Sic spectanda fides."
6th Knight Device—"A withered branch that's onely greene on top."
Motto—"In hac spe vivo."

(I have given the spelling as it appears in the Quarto.)

The 6th Knight was personified by Pericles himself. The Pericles of history was a gentleman of Athens who had received a remarkably complete education, and was a man of extraordinary ability and diligence. According to Plutarch's "Lives" (as translated by Bacon's contemporary, North), Pericles grew to have a great mind and an eloquent tongue, without affectation or gross country terms. Having obtained a deep understanding by studying philosophy (beside that Nature had endowed him with an excellent wit and capacity), he did so compass it with eloquence that he far passed all the orators of his time.

This description of Pericles agrees so well with what Gosnold, Ben Jonson, and Tobie Mathew had to say about Bacon's gifts as an orator, not to mention his other qualifications, that one is led to the assumption that the devices of the six knights are intended to compose some historical emblem concerning Bacon's own career at the date (1609) that the play was printed. Examined in the light of the facts as to his parentage and secret history, which, in 1609, were almost in Bacon's sole possession, but which have now been deciphered, the enigma should emerge from obscurity and be capable of solution.

In the hope that others will essay an interpretation I hazard mine. In the first device it seems to me Francis prays that light may in time be thrown upon the dark places of his life. In the second he alludes to his well-known method of surmounting difficulties, "more by gentleness than by force." The third may refer to his having been created a knight at the triumphal procession when James I. was crowned King of England. I think that preferably it is intended to represent Bacon's faith of eventually gaining the laurel crown of public fame. The fourth device would appear to be an allusion to Queen Elizabeth, who, though she gave him birth, extinguished his hope of being formally acknowledged as her son and successor to the throne by telling her Council to send to Scotland for her successor. The fifth device alludes to his true title of "Francis I.," as the device and motto were first invented for, and used by, the French king Francis I. In the sixth device Francis expresses his confidence that future ages would see his name and fame restored and properly recognised, and that he was sustained by the hope of this. A similar idea is symbolised in the enigmatic prophecy in *Cymbeline*. "And when from a stately cedar shall be lopped branches which, being dead many years, shall after revive, be joynted to the old stocke, and freshly grow then," etc.

The year that *Pericles* was published (1609) was also the year of the publication of the "Shakespeare Sonnets." It is possible that the play may help in the interpretation of the Sonnets.

PARKER WOODWARD.

WHO IS SELF-REVEALED? SHAKESPEARE OR PROFESSOR DOWDEN?

PROFESSOR DOWDEN has contributed to the *Contemporary Review* a very remarkable paper, entitled "Is Shakespeare Self-revealed?" Like everything Professor Dowden writes, it is wise, thoughtful, philosophical, full of searching criticism and large literary learning, luminously and felicitously expressed. There is, however, one single omission—it shows how Shakespeare's mind and art are revealed, it displays his psychological attributes, but William Shakspere himself is as far as ever from being disclosed. The learned professor draws a metaphysical, not a biographical, portrait. He quotes Dr. Sidney Lee, who seeks for a "tangible personality" and whose conclusion is that it cannot be found; and Professor Dowden has not come to his rescue; after reading his paper Dr. Lee's conclusion remains unshaken. The self-revealment, such as it is, is not personal, but impersonal. And yet Professor Dowden quotes, with something approaching to approval, Professor Raleigh's assertion that "the impersonal view of Shakespeare's art would never be entertained by an artist." Ben Jonson bids us "look how the father's face lives in his issue," and this is so far true of Shakespeare's writings that they all have a family resemblance such as belongs to no other writer. So that we can detach portions of the Shakesperean plays, and "refuse without hesitation to attribute them to Shakespeare, because the family likeness is absent—they are 'Un-Shakespearean.'" Of course, this may be true, and yet the "tangible personality" remain undisclosed, and this seems to be Professor Dowden's impression.

We must use the "spirit-sense" in this investigation; there is no use for optics or optical instruments; no painter can find entrance into this private apartment. If the hideous caricature of a portrait prefixed to the 1623 Folio does not content us, we must remain unsatisfied and accept Ben Jonson's sly suggestion:

"Look not on his picture but his book."

For instance, we know nothing of Shakespeare's digestion, "whether he was fond of cold mutton or not;" we only know, Professor Dowden tell us, that "he could turn the food he eat, whether beef or mutton, into such poetry as no other human being has created."

Professor Dowden brings forth a good many poets and authors in comparison with Shakespeare, and shows that self-revealment may be found in their writings. Browning lets us into many personal secrets as to his "aspirations, his hopes, his passions, his beliefs, his likes and dislikes." Schiller, Goethe, Walter Scott, Milton, and especially Balzac, show some trace of a "tangible personality" in their writings. And Shakespeare also reveals himself, but the "tangible personality" which is seen in Goethe, Schiller, and the rest, is not to be found in Shakespeare—he was so provokingly impersonal. So that, when Emerson says that Shakespeare is the only biographer of Shakespeare, the conclusion must be that no other biography is possible, and that this biography must for ever remain impersonal. We know, Emerson says, every trait of his private mind—"so far from Shakespeare being the least known, he is the one person in all modern history known to us." If Shakespeare sued Philip Rogers for 35 shillings and 10 pence for malt delivered, we are thankful for this information, but the same might be true of any man; the Shakespeare of the plays is still unrevealed. Indeed, according to Emer-

son, the mystery is augmented, for looking at such personal facts as this he is rather staggered than enlightened—these are facts which he "cannot marry to his verse."

What, then, do we know about Shakespeare from his verse? for it seems that this is the only source of his revealment. Just this: "His distinction is that he felt and expressed more profoundly than any other man what is common to us all." There is not much of a "tangible personality" here; we are as near to Jerusalem as to Stratford-on-Avon—perhaps nearer. And all the rest is of the same character. The plays introduce us to persons who are humorous and witty; the inventor of their speeches must have had wit and humour in his composition. He portrays the passion of lovers, but all we can conclude from this is that some veritable feeling capable of interpreting the signs and demonstrations of love must have been his—not that he had himself ever been possessed by the tender passion or loved any particular lady, any more than we can infer that Shakespeare was a murderer because he paints the death of Duncan and Desdemona. The creator of Hamlet, the master of irony, must have himself been capable of irony; the creator of Perdita must have seen loveliness in flowers.

As a somewhat nearer approach to a less vague and general likeness, most of those who have described Shakespeare ideally have affirmed that he was "a Tory and a gentleman"—here Stratford-on-Avon seems to recede—"he leaned towards a conservative view in political affairs," not a revolutionary, yet he sympathised with the trials and sorrows of the poor, he disliked mobs and distrusted citizen politics as narrow and self-interested. He valued rank and degree; he had a spirit of reverence and a deep sense of the mystery of things. But not one of these opinions and character-

istics are distinctive of any individual; opinions, the Professor reminds us, are not so significant as the way in which they are held.

Now all this is very interesting and very instructive, but if Professor Dowden had exercised his wonted keenness of scrutiny he might have referred to a few other matters much more approaching the "tangible personality" department.

For instance, he might have pointed out, what most critics who have any professional knowledge of law have recognised, that the poet was a trained lawyer,—several books having been written to prove this,—with such a knowledge of the technicalities and inner mysteries of the law as no personal or family litigation could supply. Such a man would not be likely at any time of his life to be a butcher, or a glover, or a money-lender, or a vendor of malt.

He might have pointed out that the poet was so familiar with classic history and classic authors, both Greek and Latin, as Professor Churton Collins and others have demonstrated, that the presumption of a University education is so great as almost to amount to demonstration.

He might, in company with Cowden Clarke, when commenting on *2 Hen. IV.* III. ii. 10, say, "This passage shows that a University education was a usual preparatory step in studying at one or other of the Inns of Court, and it gives ground to our belief that Shakespeare may have been a collegian at one of the Universities, and may have subsequently kept terms at one of the Inns of Court." (There are other indications that Mr. and Mrs. Cowden Clarke regarded Shakespeare as more resembling Bacon than the son of an unlettered country townsman. See my "Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light," p. 288, n.). He might have amplified his admission that Shakespeare was a "Tory

and a Gentleman"—such an admission conveys very little to the casual reader while it is left in the sequestered retreat of psychologic analysis, but it comes within speaking distance of a "tangible personality" when it is followed into detail. The Bellua multorum capitum of Horace is frequently reflected in the plays. "The blunt monster with uncounted heads," the "vulgar heart" and "beastly feeder," the multitude "blown, like a feather, lightly to and fro," who, as Bacon says, "love ever to run from one extreme to another," and show this facile mobility by shouting "We'll follow Cade" one moment, and "We'll follow Clifford" the next,—and, as a pendant to all this aristocratic scorn of the commonality, Professor Dowden might have referred to his remarkable familiarity with Court life, which is the *mise en scene* of nearly all his dramas—such a familiarity as could not at that time have been acquired without personal experience as a resident in Court circles.

He might have noticed the fact that the poet was a master of colloquial French, such as only residence for a considerable time with French-speaking people could have made possible.

He might have noticed that the poet had most probably travelled in France and Italy and knew, as only a travelled man could, the special local features of Italian cities, such as Venice, Milan, Verona.

He might have noticed that the poet was deeply imbued with the Platonic philosophy, both as interpreted by Cicero or St. Augustin, as in *Hen. V.* I. ii. 180, etc., and was, so Richard Grant White affirms, expounded in the then untranslated First Alcibiades (*Tro. Cres.* III. iii. 103, etc.), and that many of the plays are distinctly coloured by this philosophy, such as *Troilus and Cressida*, the *Merchant of Venice*, *Henry V.*, and the *Sonnets*.

He might have noticed that the poet was evidently acquainted with Bacon's philosophy, even with parts not published till after William Shakspere's death, and that the similarities in thought and expression between Bacon and Shakespeare are so numerous and so striking that, after making all allowance for chance resemblances, floating current phrases, identical reading and study, the residuum of correspondence which cannot be thus explained is very great, and raises questions of origin and authorship which demand patient and unbiassed investigation.

Now there is no Shakespearean scholar living who is more thoroughly conversant with all these facts than Professor Dowden, and the omission to produce any one of them, in discussing a topic to which they are so germane, seems to me to convey more than a hint that the learned professor knew that if he hunted too keenly for a "tangible personality," he was more likely to find Francis Bacon than William Shakspere. And I must conclude that, apart from Professor Dowden's exposition of Shakespeare's self-revealment, he has supplied a revealment of himself, and that we are entitled to ask him to tell us openly what his belief is, and whether he is a genuine Shakespearean or a Crypto-Baconian. He apparently holds a brief for William Shakspere, but he calls no witnesses, he supplies no arguments, he appeals to no evidence in support of his client. William Shakspere, of Stratford-on-Avon, is *nowhere* in his paper. Hs tells us that any other man than he might have sued Philip Rogers for malt, and the same may be said of any other fact revealed concerning the Stratford claimant.

Our suspicion is confirmed not only by the general tone of his paper, but by the brief and perfunctory reference which he makes to the Baconian theory. It is very significant that for the first fourteen

pages of his paper, he keeps to the non-committal region of psychology; only in the concluding 4½ pages does he faintly (as I have shown) grapple with his topic, and then the Baconian hypothesis is dismissed in a single short sentence. And what is the import of this sentence? Professor Dowden quotes a sentence from Dr. Bradley's recently published Oxford Lecture, that the creator of Launce's immortal Crab did not love a dog. But,—the Professor adds,—this cannot be said of Bacon, for, "when Secretary Winwood did beat his dog for lying on a stool," Bacon quarrelled with the Secretary, and declared that "every gentleman did love a dog." This apparently settles the case, for Professor Dowden adds, "I must postpone the declaration of my conversion to Baconianism until such zealous and learned Baconians as Dr. Theobald and Mr. Stronach prove that Dr. Bradley has maligned our gentle 'Shakespeare,' — our gentle Shakespeare who bit the hand of Essex that fed him." It is also significant that in this explanation of his purpose in the *Contemporary* article he still keeps to himself any account of his own belief. He has no answer to the inference suggested by his article that he is a Crypto-Baconian.

Can anyone find a more absolutely illogical and inconclusive argument than this in the whole range of controversial literature? It seems to me absolutely monstrous. Dr. Bradley's statement is purely conjectural, and there are not wanting passages in *Lear* and *Macbeth* which prove that the poet was something of a dog fancier, and had some knowledge, and consequently interest, in the different breeds of dogs; and Crab is certainly an amusing specimen of the tribe, such as any gentleman might love. Both Launce and his delineator could not have disliked dogs. Indeed, it is more easy to infer from these passages that the poet,

like every other gentleman, *did* love a dog than that he did not. And as to the collateral stab in the conclusion of this precious morsel of fantastic logic, Professor Dowden knows as well as any other scholar that the best and most recent critics fail to find anything blameable in Bacon's conduct in the Essex trial; so that Professor Dowden's selected reason for postponement of his Baconian creed is irrelevant, and to my mind the Professor is self-revealed as a Baconian.

I may add that I sent to Professor Dowden an account of the main points of this article, and the use I wished to make of it, by sending it to the *Contemporary Review*. The Professor is a gentleman, every inch of him, as courteous as he is accomplished, who never follows the bad example set by Sidney Lee, Churton Collins, Furnival, and others, of treating the Baconian hypothesis as a visionary hallucination of lunatics. In reply to my communication he writes as follows:—

"Though I gave my *Contemporary* article a Shakespearean name, it really dealt with the wider question of the appearance of personality through objective work in art, and I had no intention of presenting my own portrait of Shakespeare, though this was touched on incidentally."

It seems, then, that the question which Professor Dowden puts as the heading of his article is one that he had no intention of answering—only of touching incidentally. Exactly so! The question remains for us, Would Professor Dowden have left the question unanswered if he could have given a reply of a nature satisfactory for an avowed Shakespearean, as he is supposed to be? If his topic leads him to show how Goethe and Schiller, Browning and Balzac, are self-revealed in their writings, much more does it involve some indications of Shakespeare's self-revealment. If

parallel cases are suggested, we look for both sides of the parallel, not a single straight line without its fellow. The general question of the "appearance of personality through objective art" is undoubtedly an interesting one, and Professor Dowden handles it with his accustomed thoroughness and ability. But if this is intended as the exclusive topic, the title is misleading, for it invites us to an inspection of Shakespeare's personality as revealed in his writings. Why is this withheld? I can conceive of no other explanation except that suggested in the preceding pages.

[This article was sent to the *Contemporary Review*, but, as might have been expected, was rejected.]

Mr. Frank Harris's book, "The Man Shakespeare and his Tragic Life Story," deals with much the same topic as Professor Dowden's *Contemporary* article. But Mr. Harris takes a new and quite original view of Shakespeare, and seeks to find his portrait in several of the characters he has drawn in the plays. The typical portrait is Hamlet, and Mr. Harris contends that essentially the same character is given in at least five or six other persons in the dramas —Romeo, Posthumus, Prospero, Brutus, Jacques, Macbeth and others. By repeating so often the same character he betrays his own individuality; he himself is Hamlet, Macbeth and the rest. As before, it is an ideal portrait, not a biographical one, and as such is probably correct; but when he endeavours to fit it to the person of William Shakspere he signally fails. The portrait may easily be seen in Bacon, but not in anyone else. For instance, he writes, "Surely it is the country-bred lad from Stratford who speaks in this way,

"'They say the town is full of cozenage,
As nimble jugglers that deceive the eye,
Dark-working sorcerers that change the mind,'"

etc. This is *not* the language of a poorly educated rustic, but of a learned and cultivated scholar. Similarly he repeats the absurdity that William Shakspere came to London with *Venus and Adonis* in his pocket—a wild notion which has not an atom of probability. And all his attempts to identify his portrait with the Stratford townsman are equally futile; besides that, he buttresses his conjectures with all the guessing formulæ which we are so familar with in the writings of Sidney Lee and Mrs. Stopes, such as—probably—there can be no doubt—still less doubt—I dare say—I am pretty sure —all these occur in two pages, and some of them are repeated. As a Shakespeare study Mr. Harris's book is interesting and instructive, but as a revealer of the individual man it is hopelessly inconclusive.

What, however, we most object to is the excessively scornful and cocksure way in which he insults all critics who take different views from his own. Phrases of scorn and supercilious contempt occur in reckless profusion; and Shakespeare himself is not spared, if his words do not fit Mr. Harris's theories. They are—"ridiculous fustian," "poetic slush," "skimble-skamble stuff," "historic and poetic slush," "this *stuff*," "poetic balderdash," "this extraordinary mixture of priggishness and pious pity," "a judgment wholly out of place and very clumsily expressed," a "wretched invertebrate play without even a main current of interest," "Shakespeare's personal vindictiveness," "an indifferent playright, careless of the architectural structure of his pieces, contemptuous of stage craft," "self-esteem founded on snobbish non-essentials," "a snob of the purest English water," "his snobbishness," "pure snobbery," "overpowering sensuality and snobbishness,"

"inordinately vain and conceited," "he could not construct plays or invent stories," "inordinately vain and self-centred," "when his vanity was injured his blindness was almost inconceivable," "his jingoism," "his accumulated bitterness," "he was passion's slave and had experienced the ultimate degradation of lust," "the scene is as bad as bad can be," "his aristocratic pose." These phrases are applied to some of the most exquisite passages in Shakespeare, and the critics fare no better; apparently no one has a right to criticise Shakespeare but Mr. Harris himself. They "have buttered this drama with extravagant praise," they write "the absurdest nonsense, praising because praise has come to be the fashion and also because, no doubt, his bad work is more on the level of their intelligence than his good work," "beyond persuasion by argument," "Gradgrind and his compeers," or "Dryasdust" (repeatedly), "poor Coleridge's perverse ingenuity," "so superficial and false a judgment" (Professor Dowden is the false judge), "is a quaint example of mid-Victorian taste; it reminds me of the horsehair sofa and antimacassar," "these professors have no distinct mental image," "this sentimental balderdash," "the man who needs further proofs [than Mr. Harris's own] would not be persuaded though one rose from the dead to convince him," "mangled by unintelligent actors, such as Salvini," "foolish mummers."

It seems to me that anyone who has these opinions of Shakespeare and his critics ought either to ignore the subject altogether or leave his censure unexpressed. A great deal of his judgment of Shakespeare's personal life depends on the assumption that he was entangled by Miss Fitton. This, of course, is pure conjecture; there is not an atom of solid proof to sustain it; it could not possibly apply to a rustic stage manager, and there is nothing in

Bacon's story to corroborate it, if he is to be accepted as the true Shakespeare. But Mr. Harris speaks of it as if it were a well-ascertained historical fact resting on unimpeachable evidence.

The Westminster Review, noticing the book, says "If one can accept the portrait, the Baconian theory is dead for ever"—which is both true and false; for if the portrait is accepted, Bacon is the only possible original, and the Baconian theory ceases to exist as a speculation, it is established as a fact. But in truth those reviewers cannot write about our theory without talking nonsense. Mr. Harris does not refer to it, so we are spared the supercilious contempt which he would no doubt have poured upon it.

The book, like Professor Dowden's article, will help our cause; but its essential value will be much depreciated by the scorn which pervades its treatment both of Shakespeare and his critics. This tone is characteristic of the *Saturday Review*, which Mr. Frank Harris edited, and where the chapters of this book first appeared.

R. M. THEOBALD.

WILLIAM HENRY BURR.

ALTHOUGH some time has elapsed since the death of William Henry Burr, A.M. (1819—1908) in February, 1908, at Washington, District of Columbia, U.S.A., it would seem appropriate that the columns of BACONIANA should contain a slight tribute to his memory. Mr. Burr was a subscriber and contributor to BACONIANA from its first issue in 1892 (American edition) to the end of the nineteenth century, when failing eye-sight and a diminished income required him to lessen his magazine reading and to retrench in

his expenses. A graduate of a New York State college, and after residing for many years in New York City, he came to Washington, D.C., and became an official reporter and stenographer in Congress. At a later period he retired from active official work, and employed his time in literary work, contributing to papers, magazines, etc. From his knowledge of languages acquired in his college days he became very much interested in examining and refuting many errors that have crept into history and have been accepted by the general public, who are either too indolent, or have not the time and opportunity, to examine such matters for themselves. Residing in Washington for nearly half a century, and having access to the library of Congress, as well as to other large libraries in this city, which (aside from the library of Congress) contain over a million books, pamphlets, etc., he had unequalled facilities for the class of literary work and study that he followed.

Soon after Judge Nathaniel Holmes' (1815—1901) book, "The Authorship of Shake-speare," appeared in 1866, Mr. Burr procured a copy, and from that time he became a Baconian, and a most radical one. He accepted the mathematical cipher of the Hon. Ignatius Donnelly (1821—1901) and of the Rev. Edwin Gould (1899—1907), of Montreal, Canada; the word cipher and the bi-literal cipher of Francis Bacon as illustrated and deciphered by Mrs. Elizabeth (Wells) Gallup. With Messrs. Donnelly and Owens Mr. Burr was personally acquainted, and learned from them much more than he could possibly have learned from their book only. He contributed many artlcles on the subject to daily, weekly, and monthly papers and magazines, which articles were of great interest and value. Had that very valuable book "The Bibliography of the Bacon-Shakespeare Controversy," by W. H. Wyman,

Cincinnati, Ohio, U.S., 1884, been continued to the end of the century much of Mr. Burr's writings would have been recorded in it. As it is, a printed copy of much of his work has been preserved. The writer of this article has compiled many pages of type-written manuscript from the originals as found in Mr. Burr's several scrap-books.

The pamphlet of some fifty-two pages, "Shaksper Could not Write," by Wm. H. Burr, A.M., Washington, D.C., 1886 and 1906, contains a statement of facts that never have been answered or refuted. It shows the gross ignorance and illiteracy of "Willm Shagsper" (1563—1616), of Stratford, and of his family. Although Mr. Wm. Henry Smith, of London, had issued a similar pamphlet in London before 1860, Mr. Burr had never heard of it until after his book was compiled. It is hoped that the English readers of BACONIANA will procure this book, a copy of which may be seen in the library of the Bacon Society at 11, Hart Street.

Aside from his literary studies Mr. Burr was an artist and portrait painter of considerable ability, also a performer on the violin and flute. For many years he was a member of amateur orchestras and other musical associations.

R. A. SMITH.

War Dept., Washington, D.C., U.S.

BACON ASKING FOR OFFICE.

MANY of those who hunt up as many matters as possible for censure against Bacon have attributed to him incredible meanness and self-seeking in his, (as Professor Nichols writes), "endless suing for office." Apart from the great exaggeration with which these "endless pleas" are alleged, the accusation itself is absolutely groundless. On this point

I cannot put the case better than in the words of Dr. Hull Platt, who writes to me as follows :—

"I cannot see where the wrong is if a man wants public office to ask for it. With you, when a man wishes to be elected to Parliament, doesn't he ask for votes? And does anyone think it is wrong or undignified? I never heard of such an idea here. If a man desires employment, is there any impropriety in his saying so, and calling attention to his qualifications? I don't see that Bacon's offence was anything more than that. Why is it that almost everything which is perfectly proper and innocent when done by others is a rank offence on Bacon's part? I cannot understand it."

I may remind readers of BACONIANA that all the facts relating to Bacon's suits for office were completely discussed in the *Bacon Journal*, some years ago, in a review of Professor Nichols' book. That book is one of the most curious paradoxes in all literature; nearly everything that Bacon did or said is praised in one sentence and condemned or disparaged in the next, so that it is not easy to determine the author's final judgment. So surprising is this that Dr. Hull Platt, after reading this review, writes to me :—

"Don't you believe that the Bacon book of Professor Nichols is intended for satire? I have not seen the book; I am only judging by what you say. But I don't see how a man can seriously approve every individual action and yet condemn them in the gross. Will not the book bear this interpretation? From your account of it, it would seem to me as though it was an attempt to poke fun at the anti-Baconians while not separating himself from the orthodox camp. Think if that explanation will not fit the case."

I do not think this explanation can be accepted. Professor Nichols' case is that of "a man convinced

against his will," and who remains "of the same opinion still." Consequently his account of Bacon's career and character is full of inconsistencies and self-contradictions. The faults alleged in one sentence are answered by the facts stated elsewhere—the censure is the residuum of anti-Baconian opinion; the praise is the record of actual and present observation; the praise occupies the department labelled "against his will;" the censure is located in the pigeon-hole labelled "of the same opinion still." Much the same contrast may be detected in Macaulay's account of Bacon. It must be so; Bacon's merits are too many and too large to be overlooked; the crimes imputed to him are matters of construction, and are awkwardly placed in a framework in which they do not fit.

R. M. THEOBALD.

A DEFINITE ISSUE.

THE following letter appeared in the *Observer* of the 17th October, 1909.

THE SHAKESPEARE FOLIO OF 1623.

AN ENQUIRY CHALLENGED.

To the Editor of "The Observer."

SIR,—The recent discovery by Dr. Wallace of documents in which the name of William Shakespeare is mentioned does not in the slighest degree affect the question of the authorship of the dramas. The Burbages, in their communication to the Lord Chamberlain in 1635, in reply to the petition of Benefield Swanston and Pollard, related that they had built the Globe Theatre and go on to say, "And to ourselves we joined those deserving men, Shakespere, Hemings, Condall, Phillips and others partners in the profittes of that they call the house." The documents recently published afford the additional information that the "others" were Pope and Kemp, and that Shakespeare's

share was a fourteenth. That is all. There is not a shred of evidence yet adduced that he was a theatrical manager or a playwright, or an actor manager. All statements to this effect are pure surmises. The evidence all points in the opposite direction.

The author of the Shakespeare dramas was the most exquisite intellect the world has ever seen, *facile princeps* as a master of the construction of dramatic poetry, a brilliant orator—this is self-evident from the prose passages—and yet he lived and died in the midst of such eminent men as Raleigh, Sydney, Spenser, Bacon, Cecil, Walsingham, Coke, Camden, Hooker, Drake, Hobbes, Inigo Jones, Herbert of Cherbury, Seldon, Walton, Wotton, and Doune; and if he was William Shakespeare of Stratford, not one of this brilliant band has mentioned the man or appears to have recognised his transcendent genius. The only contemporary evidence connecting the man of Stratford with the authorship of the plays is prefixed to the folio edition of 1623.

Can the value of this evidence be undermined? It can, and I have therefore to make a suggestion. It is this: That you, sir, select a committee of three or five men well qualified impartially to consider evidence. It is not for me to suggest names, but if Major Macmahon, the General Secretary of the British Association, would consent to act as one of the jury, his assistance would be invaluable.

I will prove to such a committee:—

(1) That the lines "To the Reader," signed B.I., prefixed to the folio edition, 1623, of the Shakespeare Plays represent a scale or table of numbers;

(2) That the peculiar relations arising therefrom between the names "William Shakespeare" and "Francis Bacon" justify the assertion that the former was a pseudonym of the latter. That the name "Ben Jonson" is also connected with such scale or table;

(3) That the year 1623 was specially chosen as the date of the issue of the first folio on account of the peculiar properties of the figures constituting it;

(4) That the Droueshout Engraving represents a Mask, and is not intended to portray the face of the true author;

(5) That many, if not all, of the mispaginations contained in the folio edition are intentional, and are in direct correspondence to the said scale of numbers.

The evidence in support of these contentions is the result of fifteen years' labour by Mr. E. V. Tanner; and if the committee come to a decision, as I believe they will, that it justifies the foregoing contentions, to him solely will be due the entire credit of a remarkable discovery.

Yours obediently, WILLIAM T. SMEDLEY.

36, Russell-square, W.C., October 15, 1909.

[We are obliged to our correspondent for his confidence and deal with this letter in our editorial columns.—Ed., *Observer*.]

The Editor of *The Observer* commented thereon in the following leaderette:—

WHO WAS SHAKESPEARE?

In his interesting letter in another column, Mr. W. T. Smedley makes the somewhat astonishing suggestion that the claims of Shakespeare cannot be satisfactorily examined until they are dealt with like the claims of Dr. Cook. Our correspondent is good enough to suggest a committee of from three to five gentlemen, who shall undertake, in a scientific manner, a task similar to that which has been carried out by the Explorers' Club in New York. Until we have taken expert opinion on the preliminaries, we could not assume the somewhat awful responsibility with which Mr. Smedley desires us to charge ourselves. But at least it may be admitted that our correspondent represents a very complicated form of an apparently inextinguishable heresy. Starting from the contention that all the evidence for Shakespeare's connection with the plays depends upon the folio of 1623, Mr. Smedley asserts that year of publication to have been chosen on account of the "peculiar properties" of the figures

composing the date. From the introductory lines possessing "peculiar properties" to a still stranger degree, a scale of numbers may be deduced. Even the mispaginations are full of cryptic intention. And the results, we are told, will "justify the assertion" that William Shakespeare was Francis Bacon. The enquiry for which our correspondent appeals would either dazzle the mind or double the gaiety of nations. We agree that it ought to be made.

At last, therefore, a definite issue has been raised on specific points. These, it will be seen, do not include any of the arguments which have hitherto been advanced in support of what is termed the Baconian theory of the authorship of the Shakespeare plays. Mr. Tanner's work is, however, so complete and conclusive as to leave little doubt as to the result of the deliberations of the Committee, when it is formed. The task of obtaining a Committee which would be impartial, and at the same time be considered by the Editor of *The Observer* adequate, is no easy task.

The time of experts is valuable and the subject is not a popular one. Already, however, several gentlemen whose names will inspire full confidence have agreed to serve on the Committee, and within a few days it will be completed. Efforts are being made to obtain a Lord Justice of the High Court as President, so that the decision, when recorded, may be said to practically be that of a judicial enquiry.

NOTES.

WHAT a great stir has been made about a very insignificant discovery! Dr. C. W. Wallace turned up some documents connected with a law suit which was brought, about 1615, against John Hemyne by his daughter, in respect of leases of certain shares in the Globe and Blackfriars Theatres, acquired by her late husband and held in trust by her father for her. The additional information

afforded by these documents is very little more than was previously obtained from the Burbages' reply in 1635 to the petition to the Lord Chamberlain put forward by Benefield, Swanston and Pollard. The publication by the *Times* of Dr. Wallace's articles, heralded in a very ostentatious manner by a prior announcement of their great importance, produced the usual crop of satirical remarks about the Baconian theory by journalists who are wholly ignorant of the facts connected with the history of Shakespeare and Elizabethan theatres.

Perhaps the most ludicrous display of ignorance was contained in an article by a Mr. Charles Whibley, to which the *Daily Mail* devoted a column. "The popular superstition," says the writer, "that we know nothing of Shakespeare, should be dispelled by Dr. Wallace's discovery. The fact is, there are few of Shakespeare's contemporaries of whom we know as much as we know of Shakespeare." The gentleman who could make such a statement might, with advantage to himself, devote a few hours to reading any one of the many books which give a rough survey of the men of the period. Of course the clever writer drags in the usual sneer at the poor Baconian searcher after truth. He says: "The Baconian and the sceptic will remain unconvinced. Even if a vision were sent from heaven of Shakespeare inditing with his own hand the soliloquy of Hamlet they would still suspect a fraud."

The unveiling, by Sir H. Beerbohm Tree, of a bronze tablet erected in Park Street, Southwark, on the site of the old Globe Playhouse, has provoked another Shakespeare controversy. So authentic are the facts, upon which the enthusiastic Shaksperean relies when he makes a grand pronouncement, that a contention invariably springs up around them. The actor-knight

was supported by the Bishop of Southwark, Sir Edward Clarke, and other distinguished men. But already the articles of Dr. Wallace had thrown doubt as to whether the site of the old Globe was not some distance away from the position to be assigned to it by this memorable gathering. In unveiling the tablet, Sir Herbert described it as erected "to the memory of London's greatest Londoner, William Shakespeare." No exception can be taken to a dedication so accurately expressed.

It is a pleasure to turn to an article on the subject which appeared in the "Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects." The author, Mr. George Hubbard, F.S.A., has reprinted the same in pamphlet form, and attached to it reproductions of plans and maps of the period. The article is full of interesting facts relating to the Globe and its neighbourhood. Mr. George Hubbard locates it on the Bankside fronting the river, and adds: "The maps confirm and check each other with curious accuracy, and if reliance is placed upon them it is impossible to come to any other conclusion than the one I have attempted to expound."

Mrs. C. C. Stopes recently contributed a long article to the *Athenæum* on "The Burbages and the Transportation of the Theatre." It embraces such details as are available concerning litigation which took place between the years 1597 and 1601, in which the Burbages, Giles Alleyn, and others were concerned in connection with the transportation of the theatre over the water to Southwark. Halliwell-Phillips has set forth in a general way the main facts, but Mrs. Stopes has delved into documents and records, and in her article presents particulars of the various stages through

which the litigation passed, giving references to the sources from which the information is obtained. Twice only does Shakespeare's name appear, and in this way: "In a very short time a new 'theatre' rose, like the phœnix, from the ashes of the old. Shakespeare that time knew what was in a name, and as the decree had gone out against 'The Theatre' they changd its name. Was it because they knew 'all the world's a stage' that they called it then the Globe? There Shakespeare was free to create and Burbage to interpret his creations." Mrs. Stopes has drawn liberally on her imagination in these sentences, but as the facts do not introduce it, she has dragged the name of Shakespeare into her article. Then, with the incomparable logic of the true Stratfordian, she concludes her article with these words: "This paper acts as the second part of my answer to the Baconian query, 'Where did Shakespeare learn his law?'" Having read the article one can only answer, "I'll be hanged if I know."

Mr. George Stronach has been having a time after his own heart. John O'London, writing in *T.P.'s Weekly*, gave battle to him, and the result may be readily imagined. For weeks, for months, the controversy has been continued, occupying many pages of the journal. Mr. Stronach has been joined by other stalwarts, including Dr. R. M. Theobald and Mr. Parker Woodward. There is no doubt as to with whom the laurels lay, but valuable as such a correspondence is, though it may make some converts to the truth, some mechanical proof—to use Mr. Hillaire Belloc's words—is necessary to convince the plain man in the street, and that proof may now be expected any day. Mr. E. V. Tanner has such a mechanical proof, but anxious disciples of the great master are waiting day by day, knowing that other

proofs which he left—proofs which put the authorship of the Shakespeare plays and sonnets and other works beyond the realms of dispute—are in existence and will shortly be forthcoming. On the 20th January, 1910, the 350th anniversary of Bacon's birth will be celebrated. Here is a prediction, dangerous though it may be to hazard it, that before the sun rises on that day the truth will be definitely and for all time established.

Mr. George Greenwood, M.P., in *The Nineteenth Century and After* for July, replied to the two articles which had previously appeared therein from the pen of Sir Edward Sullivan, under the title of "The Defamers of Shakespeare." An impartial reader would be compelled to admit that Mr. Greenwood comes off with flying colours. He ruthlessly exposes Sir Edward's ignorance on important points and his general inaccuracy in statement. The reader must turn to the articles themselves for corroboration of this statement. In the August number of the same periodical, Sir Edward Sullivan and Canon Beeching both return to the attack on Mr. Greenwood—the former in a contribution styled "Francis Bacon as a Poet," the latter in an article entitled "A Last Word to Mr. George Greenwood." This is the first appearance of Canon Beeching in the pages of the *Nineteenth Century* in this controversy. He feebly endeavours to reply to the chastisement which he received "In *re* Shakespeare. Beeching and Greenwood. Rejoinder on behalf of the Defendant." At this stage the Editor closes the door. After placing 33 pages at Sir Edward Sullivan's disposal, he restricts Mr. Greenwood to 17 pages. He then permits Sir Edward to occupy 16 pages and Canon Beeching 10 pages, and then, in violation of that love of fair play upon which Englishmen pride them-

selves, he shields the orthodox contributors by refusing to insert an article which Mr. Greenwood had prepared in reply to his critics.

There the matter remains for the present, but Mr. Greenwood will shortly publish in book form his article amplified.

The issue of this number of BACONIANA has been held back in the hope that an important announcement might be first made public in its pages. The matter has not, however, yet matured. The contents and index of Volume VII. will be published as a supplement to the January number.

CORRESPONDENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

THE work inquired for by S. T. W. in your July number is, I think, "Pacata Hibernia. Ireland Appeased and Reduced . . ." By Thomas Stafford, London, folio, 1633. There are two copies of it in the British Museum, numbered, respectively, G 5853 and 186 d 8.

FRA. J. BURGOYNE.

Tate Library, Brixton, S.W.