BACONIANA

Bound by

Vol. XI. THIRD SERIES.

BACONIANA

A Quarterly Magazine.

LONDON:
GAY & HANCOCK, LIMITED,
12 & 13 HENRIETTA ST. STRAND W.C.
1913.

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

—Francis Bacon.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Francis Bacon as Treasurer of Gray's Inn	5
"Willobie—His Avisa"	15
Bohemia on the Sea Coast	21
The Stratford Gravestone	24
"Shakespeare, Bacon and the Great Unknown"	33
The Testimony of Florio	46
Shakespeare in the Theatre	49
"The Baconian Heresy" 69, 133,	185
Francis Bacon and the Rectory of Cheltenham	104
Literary Legends	110
Francis Bacon's Will	123
Another Bacon Signature	126
Adam Cupid	127
The Date of Spenser's Birth and Death...	153
The Witches in "Macbeth"	159
An Astronomical Similitude	160
Three Points of Interest	163
Is there a Bacon Signature in the Shakespeare Sonnets? ...	166
The Annual Dinner of the Society	168
To Francis Bacon	174
"The Hystorie of Hamblet"	216
"Ignoto"	219
Jottings on Lord Bacon	236
Number 287	244
Notes 52,	183
Correspondence	130
Reviews 56,	128

ERRATUM.—On page 192 for "Walter Laudor Savage," read "Walter Savage Laudor."

INDEX OF NAMES.

	PAGE
Abbott, E. A.	207
Adee, A. A.	181
Alexander, Sir G.	164
Anders, Dr.	145
Anjou, Duke of	64
Bacon, Anthony	59
Bacon, E.	185
Bacon, Sir N.	211
Badger, Eliz.	105
Ball, John	154
Barclay, John	63
Bartlet	212
Batchelor, H. Crouch ...	174
Bathhurst, T.	154
Bayley, Harold ...	56, 83
Baynes, Prof. ...	86, 134
Bede	112
Begley, Rev. W.	222
Black, Hugh...	24
Blackie, Prof.	171
Blomberg, A. M. Van ...	68
Bodley, Sir T. ...	170, 198
Bolton, E.	231
Bompas	130
Booth, B. Haworth ...	63, 177
Booth, W. S....	67
Boston, J.	119
Boswell, Sir W.	124
Bowditch, C. P.	66
Brown, Basil...	65
Buckley, R. K.	184
Bunten, Mrs. A. C. ...	54, 243
Burleigh, Lord ...	6, 169
Burns, Major	58
Burr, W. H.	231
Cabot, Samuel	66
Camden, W....	223
Campbell, Lord	79
Capell...	217
Carew, G.	188
Carew, R.	223
Carlyle, T.	192
Castellan, Prof. M.	183
Castle, E. J.	82, 130
Chapman	83
Chapman, W. M.	181
Charles I.	63, 238
Chaucer	116, 143
Clarke, Cowden	113
Clifton, W. E.	132
Collins, J. Churton	50, 85, 88, 104, 134, 192, 203
Collier, J. Payne	80
Constable, Sir J.	124
Cooke, Sir A.	188
Cooke, William	5
Couch, Sir A. Q.	164
Craddock, J....	102
Crawford, C.... ...	78, 135
Creighton, Dr.	15
Cuningham, G. C.	63, 158, 177
Dante	208
Darley, Richard	5
Dart, John	155
Davenport, H.	9
Davis, John	47, 67, 83
Davis, Senator	82
Deetz, C. H.	181
Dekker	82
Dennis, John	97
Dingley, Thomas	157
Dixon, Hepworth	104
Donnelly, I.	25, 59, 72, 86, 130, 134
Dorrell, Hadrian	15
Droeshout, M.	65
Drummond, N.	223
Dryden	93, 208
Dudley, Lord R.	129

PAGE
Dugdale, Sir W. 128

Eagle, R. L. 126, 177, 178, 184
Edwards, W. H. ... 58, 88
Elizabeth, Princess... ... 11
Elizabeth, Queen ... 63, 129
Elze, Dr. 218
Emerson, R. W. ... 122, 201
Essex, Earl ... 47, 129, 219
Ewig, Dr. 145

Faldo, Robert 5
Farmer, Dr. R. ... 85, 102, 134, 216
Fenton, Geoffrey 148
Fiske, Prof. 134
Florio, John 46
Ford, Daniel... 183
Forrest, J. E. 55
Forward, Alice 15
Fuller, Mrs. L. D. 167
Furnivall, Dr. 180
Furness, Dr. H. 217

Gentillet, I. 185
Gildas... 112
Gildon, Charles 97
Greathead, R. 114
Greene, Robert ... 37, 83
Greenwell, W. 105
Greenwood, G. G. ... 34, 59, 86, 130, 134, 144
Grey, Dr. Z. 101
Gruter, I. 124, 197
Gustch, F. 68

Hadrill, H. J. 62
Hallam 152
Hanmar, Sir T. 100
Hardy, Harold ... 14, 55, 109
Harrington, Sir J. 222
Harris, F. 183
Hastings, F. 185
Helme, Henry 5
Henry VII. 118
Henry VIII. 114, 121
Heywood 82, 130
Higden 112
Higgs, Thomas and Wm. ... 105
Holmes, Judge ... 33, 88
Holt, William 5
Holzer, Dr. G. 182
Hooker, Bishop 148

PAGE
Hornor, C. G. ... 57, 61
Hughes, Charles 15
Hutchinson, J. 57, 61, 123, 175
Hutchinson, R. 148

Inderwick, F. A. 87
Ingleby, G. M. ... 36, 89, 91
Islip, Adam 185

James I. 48, 198
Janssen, C. 174
Jaggard, W. 184
Johnson, Dr. S. 102
Jones, Edward 5
Jonson, B. 83, 90, 102, 130, 157, 160, 223

King, Dr. 247
Knight, C. 27

Lang, Andrew ... 33, 55, 194
Langbaine, G. 95
Langland, W. 117
Lawrence, Sir E. D. 49, 55, 59, 72, 160, 245
Leith, Miss A. A. 65
Leland, John 114
Lilly, John 83
Lomax, John... 174
Lytton, E. Bulwer 191

Macaulay, Lord 118
Maguire, Dr.... ... 85, 134
Malone, E. 27, 58
Manningham, J. 58
Mansell, Dr. 108
Mapes, W. 120
Markham, Francis 5
Marlow, C. 16
Massinger, B. 83
Masson, Prof. D. 202
Matthew, Sir T. ... 48, 172
Matthew of Paris 112
Meawtys, Sir T. ... 123, 237
More, Sir T. 121
Morgan, Dr. A. 180
Muller, Max 212
Munro, Dr. 46

Nashe, T. 83
Nennius 112
Nethersole, Sir F. 236
Nichols, J. 102

PAGE

Ottakar 22
Owen, Dr. O. W. ... 66, 245

Patericke, S.... 185
Paulet, Sir A. 169
Peddie, R. A. 184
Penzance, Lord 33, 86, 130, 134
Pepys, S. 93
Percy, H. 123
Pette, Phineas 12
Phillips, E. 94
Poel, William 49
Pollock, E. M. 184
Pope, A. 98
Pott, Mrs. 132
Powell, Thomas 246
Puttenham 185, 223

Rawley, W. 108, 237
Reed, Edwin... ... 130, 148
Rich, Sir R. 123, 237
Robertson, J. M. ... 69, 130, 133, 175, 185
Romano, Julio ... 21, 23
Rosher, G. R. 33
Rowe, Nicholas 95
Rudyard, Sir B. 236
Rushton, W. T. ... 82, 130
Rymer, T. 94

Salisbury, Earl 108
Scott, Dr. Mary A. 163
Sewell, Dr. 138
Shelley, H. C. ... ...
Shelley, P. 191
Shepherd, S.... 92
Sidney, Sir P. 232
Simpson, Thomas 37
Simpson 106
Smedley, W. T. ... 45, 55, 158, 163, 174
Smith, Alex.... 202
Southampton, Earl 15
Spedding, J.... ... 70, 123, 173, 186, 191
Spenser, E. 153, 225
Steevens 27
Stephens, R.... 105
Stephens, T.... 108

PAGE

Stewart, Mrs. H. H.... 166, 174
Stopes, Mrs. 184
Stronach, George ... 52, 180
Strype, J. 118
Stubbs, John 108

Tanner, E. V. 245
Taylor, John... ... 21, 136
Tate, Nahum 94
Tathwell, Dr. 101
Tenison, T. 123, 247
Tennyson, Lord 52
Theobald, Lewis ... 85, 99
Theobald, Dr. ... 71, 86, 128, 135, 176, 178, 185
Theobald, W. ... 86, 135
Thomson, Dr. W. 175
Twain, Mark... ... 33, 74, 86

Upton, J. 85, 100

Villiers, G. 219

Waller, E. 99
Walsingham... 112
Warburton, Dr. ... 100, 136
Ward, Rev. J. 93
Walton, I. 221
Webb, Judge ... 33, 88
Webbe, W. 232
Webster, John 83
Whalley, P. 216
White, R. Grant ... 36, 88
Wiclif, John 119
Wigston, W. F. C. 23
Willis, Judge ... 71, 135
Wilkins, Dr. J. 246
Willobie, Henry 15
Wolstenholme, Sir J. ... 237
Woodward, Frank 131
Woodward, Parker ... 21, 23, 61, 125, 128, 131, 142, 177, 182
Woollen, H. 177
Wotton, Sir H. 219

Yate, Avis 15
Yelverton, Sir H. .. 13, 172
Young, Mrs. J. D. 175

INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

PAGE

Academy, The ... 54, 180
Adam Cupid ... 127, 178
Advancement of Learning 200
Anagrams 177
Argenis, Barclay's ... 62, 177
Arte of English Poesie ... 224
Astronomical Similitude ... 160

Bacon, Francis—
„ Treasurer Grays Inn 5
„ Cheltenham Rectory 104
„ Will of 123
„ Letter of Advice to Queen 186
„ References to Death of 236
„ Desecration of Tomb 236
„ Monument to ... 243
Bacon Society Dinner ... 168
Bacon and Shakespeare Parallelisms 148
Bacon Signatures ... 126, 166
Baconian Heresy, The 69, 133, 175, 185
Baconian Mint, The 71, 151
„ Claims Examined 78
Belleforest's Novels ... 218
Bible, Translation of ... 164

Cheltenham Rectory ... 104
Cogitata et Visa 197
Collectanea 130
Comedy of Errors 7
Cryptomenytices ... 67, 247

De Augmentis ... 29, 176
De Morte 65, 221
De Principius 127
Droeshout Portrait 65
Dunciad 97

Every Man out of His Humour 60

PAGE

Farmer's Essay 103, 135, 216
Florio's Second Frutes ... 46
„ World of Wordes 46

Gesta Grayorum ... 14, 42
Gray's Inn Revels 5
„ Members Present Masque 13
Groatsworth of Wit 37, 181

Hamblet, The Hystorie of ... 216
Hamlet 240
Henry VII., History of 42, 196, 239
Hidden Signatures 67

Ignoto 219
Instauratio Magna 176
Is Shakespeare Dead? ... 74

Life and Death, History of 67
Lost Language of Symbolism 56
Love's Labours Lost ... 178
Lucrece 17, 66, 126

Macbeth 159
Manes Verulamiani ... 167
Merchant of Venice ... 137
Mermaid Tavern 186
Midsummer Night's Dream 93
Miller of Huntingdon ... 181

Notes on the State of Christendom ... 21, 64
Non Sans Droit 61
Novum Organum 198
Nova Resuscitatio 222

Pandosto 22
Parasceve 198
Pioneer Humanists ... 70, 72
Poetry, Complete Arte of ... 97

	PAGE
Porson of Shakespeare ...	99
Purple Island	156
Reliquiæ Wottonianæ	65, 219
Romeo and Juliet ...	52, 127
Roscicrucian Society ...	131
Saxo-Grammaticus	217
Shakespeare, W.—	
„ His Gravestone ...	24
„ Outlines of Life	26
Shakespeare, Bacon and the Great Unknown ...	33, 55
Shakespeare, Bacon and "Love"	52
Shakespeare's Centurie of Prayse	89
Shakespeare's Legal Accomplishments Considered ...	79
Shakespeare Problem Restated	34
Shakespeare's Sonnets ...	61
Shakespeare Symphony	83, 142
Shepherd's Calendar	154, 225
Society of Warwickshire Folk	184
Spencer's Birth and Death	153
Studies in Shakespeare	88, 103, 203
Sylva Sylvarum	208
Taming of the Shrew ...	93
Taylor's Works	138
Tempest ...	126, 140, 178
Temporis Partus Maximus	44
Troilus and Cressida	93, 183
Tudor Problems	128
Twelfth Night	93
Venus and Adonis	16
Willobie—His Avisa ...	15
Winter's Tale	21
World's a Bubble	221

BACONIANA.

Vol. XI. *Third Series.* JANUARY, 1913. No. 41.

FRANCIS BACON AS TREASURER OF GRAY'S INN.

(*Continued*).

THE Prince of Purpoole, so named after the manor in which Gray's Inn is situate, was Henry Helme, a young student of the Inn and a graceful dancer; and certain chambers were placed at his disposal and called the Presence and Council Chamber. Another set of chambers was assigned to the Inner Temple, which was invited to send an ambassador to the Court. Privy Councillors, Officers of State, of Law, and of the Household, were duly appointed, as well as gentlemen pensioners, to attend the person of the Prince, with Bacon's cousin, William Cooke, who afterwards married the daughter and heiress of Sir Thomas Lucy, of Charlecote, as Captain of the Guard.

A generous selection of officers was made, for the names include a number of members who had been suspended by the Benchers a few years before in consequence of their unruly behaviour on Candlemas night. Robert Faldo was appointed Master of Requests; Richard Darley, Master of the Jewels; William Holt, Attorney-General; Francis Markham, Lord Chamberlain of the Household; and Edward Jones, Clerk of the

Council. All of these members had been suspended in 1590 for their riotous celebration of the Lord of Misrule (see BACONIANA, Vol. IX., p. 251).

The Prince's treasury was supplied by contributions demanded by way of a benevolence under the authority of Privy Seals. Lord Burleigh sent a donation of £10 and a purse of fine needlework, while Edward Jones, "the great translator of books," was deputed to collect contributions from foreigners.

A week was spent in preparation, and on the 20th December, 1594, the gorgeous pageant began with a State procession of the Prince from his lodging to the hall, attended by marshals and trumpeters and all the officers of his Court. A flourish of trumpets, and the Prince took his seat upon the throne, the councillors ranged round the table, while the King-at-Arms delivered the royal proclamation. Again the trumpets sounded and the Prince's champion, in full armour, mounted on horseback, entered the hall and, throwing down his gage, he challenged anyone who dared to dispute the Prince's title. Then the King-at-Arms described in heraldic terms the arms of the Prince; the Attorney-General delivered a speech of welcome and congratulation, to which the Prince responded; the Solicitor-General produced the records, and as their names were called the nobles advanced towards the throne and on their knees did homage to their Prince. Then the Prince summoned the Master of the Revels, and the evening was spent in lively dances, old measures and galliards.

Another week passed, and the Prince again proceeded from his lodging to the hall in royal state, and the ambassador from the Inner Temple was presented to his Highness with great ceremony and graceful speeches. This was the first "grand night" at Gray's Inn, and an elaborate programme had been prepared for the entertainment of the visitors. A stage had been erected in

the hall with scaffolds reaching to the roof, and a company of professional actors had been engaged for the dramatic performances. Unfortunately the hall was packed and the audience pushed their way to the front, so that the Prince and his officers were helpless; the actors were embarrassed, as they had no room for acting; and the ambassador from the Temple, regarding the crowding and disorder as an insult, retired from the hall with the other Templarians. A scene of tumult followed, until at last it was decided to abandon the programme and resort to dancing and revelry with the ladies. Later in the evening, however, it was found possible to perform one at least of those "witty inventions" which had been originally intended for the entertainment of the guests. A *Comedy of Errors*, based upon the "Menechmus" of Plautus, was performed by the actors, and the so-called "night of errors" at Gray's Inn has thus become associated with a first night of one of the Shakespeare plays.

It is easy to imagine that the disorderly scenes in the hall, which must have offended the ladies no less than the visitors from the Temple, caused considerable uneasiness among the Benchers of Gray's Inn. The Court of the Prince of Purpoole, to which they had given their sanction and approval, had been the occasion of bringing discredit upon the Society. The privileges granted by them had been abused, and the proceedings gave offence to the guests whom they had invited to honour. If any ordinary person had been responsible for the extravagant humour of such proceedings, it is certain the Benchers would have put an end to their fantastic innovations and have ordered the abolition of the sham Prince and his Court and all the ridiculous burlesque which had been the occasion for so much disorder. But the wit that was capable of devising these inventions was also sufficient to find a way out of the trouble they

had caused; and so the serious grievance which resulted from the "night of errors" was cleverly removed by a device ingeniously prepared by the invisible author.

The plan was that of a mock trial, in which the accused was described as a sorcerer and charged with responsibility for the unfortunate disturbance. The Prince of Purpoole held his Court in the hall on the following evening and an individual, personating the prisoner, was brought in by the Lieutenant of the Tower, while the Sheriff impanelled a jury before whom the prisoner was arraigned. The Clerk of the Crown—a student named Roger Downes—read the indictment, which contained the following allegations:—

(1) That the prisoner had caused a stage to be built and scaffolds raised to the roof of the hall.

(2) That he had caused ladies and gentlemen of good condition to be invited, also the ambassador from the State of Templaria.

(3) That he had foisted a company of base and common fellows to make up disorders with a play of errors and confusions.

The prisoner appealed to the Prince that the Master of Requests might be allowed to read his petition.

It was a curious document, alleging that the law officers had exercised knavery and jugglery to throw dust in the eyes of the Prince, that things seen and done should appear but vain illusions, fancies, dreams, and enchantments wrought by a poor, harmless wretch who had never heard of such great matters in all his life.

At the conclusion of the petition the Prince pardoned the accused, but as the petition contained allegations against his officers and government he ordered the Master of Requests, with the Attorney and Solicitor-General, to be confined in the Tower.

And so the trouble passed off in jest and good humour,

without any damage to the state of the Prince of Purpoole.

The next proceeding was to remove the ambassador's resentment and to effect a reconciliation between Gray's Inn and the Templarians. Accordingly, another night of entertainment was arranged for the new year, and on this occasion an armed watch was ordered to be kept at the four gates of the Inn, so that ill-conditioned persons should not enter. The Lord Warden, personated by Humfrey Davenport, who afterwards became Chief Baron of the Exchequer, was deputed to supervise the guard.

The Ambassador and Templarians were invited to attend on the 3rd January, and a graceful masque was provided in their honour. It was the second "grand night" at Gray's Inn, and at the invitation of the Prince of Purpoole a distinguished audience attended, which included the Lord Treasurer and the Lord Keeper, the Earls of Shrewsbury, Cumberland, Northumberland, Southampton and Essex; Lords Buckhurst, Windsor, Mountjoy, Sheffield, Compton, Rich, and Monteagle, with a great number of knights, and ladies and other eminent persons.

The invisible author had again prepared an ingenious device for pouring oil on the troubled waters. A curtain was drawn aside and the archflamen of the goddess of Friendship was discovered standing at an altar, while around her were groups of nymphs and fairies who sang hymns in her praise. Then entered couples representing famous examples of friendship in history, and the last pair were Graius and Templarius lovingly linked arm in arm. They offered their incense on the altar, but the flame was choked with black vapour, until the arch-flamen, having performed some sorceries which caused the flame to burn bright and clear, declared them to be true and perfect friends and prophesied that their love would be eternal.

The masque being ended, the Prince invested the ambassador and twenty-four members of his retinue with the collar of Knighthood of the Order of the Helmet; and the King-at-Arms, having recited the history of its foundation, proceeded to read the articles of the Order, while each knight advanced in turn and kissed the helmet as a pledge of his fidelity.

The ceremony of investiture was followed with music; and a banquet was served by those knights of the Helmet who were members of the Inn. After the feast, a table was set in front of the throne, and round the table sat six Lords of the Council, who delivered "Baconian" speeches on the affairs of the kingdom. The speech on "Sports and Pastimes" by the sixth counsellor was more frivolous than the rest, and after the manner of Berowne in *Love's Labour Lost*, the courtier complained of the serious nature of the "strict observances." "What! nothing but tasks?" he protested; "nothing but working days? No feasting, no music, no dancing, no triumphs, no comedies, no love, no ladies?"

The Prince, having responded in a graceful speech, descended from his throne and led a lady by the hand to dance. The ambassador and courtiers followed his example, and the rest of the evening was given up to music, dancing and revelry. And thus ended, we are told, one of the most graceful Christmas entertainments that was ever presented to an audience of statesmen and courtiers.

Now let us pass to the second period, when Bacon was treasurer of Gray's Inn for nine consecutive years, from 1608 to 1617. During this time he was actively engaged in civil business, holding successively the offices of Solicitor and Attorney-General, and yet his enthusiasm for dramatic entertainments seems to have continued as fresh and keen as in his early years of

briefless irresponsibility. For example, among the festivities in celebration of the marriage of the Count Palatine and the Princess Elizabeth, at the beginning of 1613, there was a representation of a naval engagement on the Thames, followed by a masque, of which Bacon was "the chief contriver." The company of players assembled at Bankside, and it was arranged by Bacon that they should be conveyed by galleys from Southwark to Whitehall.

The following account is given by Chamberlain in a letter to Carleton, dated the 18th February, 1613 :—

"On Tuesday it came to Gray's Inn and the Inner Temple's turn to come with their masque, *whereof Sir Francis Bacon was the chief contriver;* and because the former came on horseback and in open chariots, they made choice to come by water from Winchester Place, in Southwark, which suited well with their device, which was the marriage of the river Thames to the Rhine; and their show by water was very gallant, by reason of infinite store of lights, very curiously set and placed, and many boats and barges with devices of light and lamps, with three peals of ordnance, one at their taking water, another in the Temple garden, and the last at their landing ; which passage by water cost them better than three hundred pounds. They were received at the Privy stairs, and great expectation there was that they should every way excel their competitors that went before them, both in device, daintiness of apparel, and above all in dancing, wherein they are held excellent and esteemed for the properer men."

Owing to the contrariness of the tide, and the company attending the masquers being very disorderly, there appears to have been some delay, which had almost exhausted the patience of the Court. When the performers arrived at Westminster the hall was so

crowded that there was no room for them, and, worst of all, the King was so tired and sleepy, with sitting up almost two whole nights before, that he wished to be relieved of the entertainment altogether. Saving the situation with a jest, Bacon ventured to entreat his Majesty that by this difference he would not, as it were, bury them quick; to which the King replied that then they must bury him quick, for he could last no longer; but he graciously appointed them to come again on the following Saturday.

Some of the facts relating to the river procession are taken from the autobiography of Phineas Pette, one of the King's master shipwrights, who was commissioned to provide the vessels for the sea fight, which preceded the presentation of the masque. The manuscript is printed in "Archæologia," Vol. XII., and on page 266 is the following entry:—

"After the sea service was performed, I was entreated by divers gentlemen of the Inns of business, *whereof Sir Francis Bacon was chief,* to attend the bringing of a mask by water in the night from S. Mary Over's to Whitehall in some gallies; but the tide falling out very contrary, and the company attending the masquers very unruly, the project could not be performed so exactly as was purposed. But yet they were safely landed at the plying stairs at Whitehall, for which my pains the gentlemen gave me a fair recompence."

As on the "night of errors" at Gray's Inn in 1594, the players were crowded out and disappointed, while the discouraging welcome given them by the King was enough to make them abandon the entertainment. "The grace of their masque is quite gone," Chamberlain writes, "when their apparel hath been already showed and their devices vented, so that how it will fall out God knows, for they are much discouraged and out of

countenance, and the world says it comes to pass after the old proverb, 'The properer man the worse luck.'"

But the temper of the "chief contriver" revealed itself in his dealings with men, and by adapting himself to their moods and humours. Moreover, his devices were more than the mere exhibition of the players and their apparel, "and there was novelty enough behind the curtain to make a sufficient entertainment by itself, without the water business for overture." Accordingly, the masquers proceeded again to Westminster on the Saturday, "and performed their parts exceeding well and with great applause and approbation from the King and all the company." The next night they were invited by the King to a supper in the new marriage room, "where they were well treated and much graced with kissing his Majesty's hand, and every one having a particular *accoglienza* from him."

A copy of this masque, with all particulars as to scenery, dresses, and stage arrangements, may be seen in any edition of Beaumont and Fletcher.

In the following year, when Bacon was Attorney-General, his enthusiasm for dramatic entertainments was marked by his lavish expenditure in providing "the Masque of Flowers" presented before the King in the Banqueting House at Whitehall by the members of Gray's Inn. Bacon, we are told, not only prepared the masque, but insisted upon bearing the whole expense himself. The members of Gray's Inn proposed to subscribe to the cost, and Sir Henry Yelverton offered to contribute the sum of £500, but Bacon declined all contributions, and generously defrayed the expenses, amounting to the sum of at least £2,000, which, according to the present value of money, would represent about £10,000 at the present day.

In a letter of the 23rd December, 1613, Chamberlain writes:—

"Sir Francis Bacon prepares a masque to honour this marriage (the Earl of Somerset and Lady Francis), which will stand him in above £2,000, and although he has been offered some help by the House, and specially by Mr. Solicitor, Sir Henry Yelverton, who would have sent him £500, yet he would not accept it, but offers them the whole charge with the honour."

A copy of this masque was presented to the Society of Gray's Inn by one of its members in 1874. In the dedication to Sir Francis Bacon, it is stated, "You have graced in general all the societies of the Inns of Court, ... and particularly Gray's Inn, which as you have formerly brought to flourish both in the ancienter and younger sort, by countenancing virtue in every quality, so now you have made a notable demonstration thereof in the lighter and less serious kind."

Bacon's life, indeed, was a curious mixture of the serious and the gay. The philosopher had a generous sympathy with human nature, and realised that the common discourse with men is sometimes wiser than books. In the "Gesta Grayorum" may be seen his advice to the knights of the Order of the Helmet, that they should "frequent the theatre and such-like places of experience; and resort to the better sort of ordinaries for conference, whereby they may not only become accomplished with civil conversation and able to govern a table with discourse, but also sufficient, if need be, to make epigrams, emblems, and other devices appertaining to his Honour's learned revels."

Like Sir Andrew Aguecheek, Bacon might very well say of himself—

"I am a fellow o' the strangest mind i' the world;
I delight in masques and revels sometimes altogether."

HAROLD HARDY.

"WILLOBIE—HIS AVISA."

A BOOK of verse, popular in its day, bearing the above title, was entered S.R. 3rd September and printed 1st October, 1594.

Modern reprints are due to its containing the first allusion in literature to the name Shakespeare:—

"And Shake-speare paints poore Lucrece rape."

Mr. Charles Hughes and Dr. Creighton have severally attempted solutions of the enigma of the poem's authorship and of the identity of the chaste lady in the case.

Mr. Hughes thinks Henry Willoughby, of West Knole, in Wilts, wrote the poem at the age of eighteen, or earlier, and that he met the play-actor in 1593, when the latter, possibly in the train of the young Earl Southampton, *was possibly* visiting Shaftsbury, where the Earl's only sister, Lady Thomas Arundel, may have resided.

Dr. Creighton believes that Henry Willobie was a myth, and that Earl Southampton, then aged twenty, wrote the poem. He, like Mr. Hughes, thinks the play-actor was the W. S. of the verses.

Mr. Hughes affirms the chaste lady to have been one Avice Forward, of Mere, in Wilts.

Dr. Creighton identifies her as Avis Yate, of Basingstoke, Hants, the Yate family being dependents of the Earl of Southampton.

Mr. Hughes cannot trace the "Hadrian Dorrell," the alleged discoverer and avowedly unauthorised publisher of the book. Dr. Creighton dismisses "Dorrell" as a myth, like Willobie.

I am not concerned in identifying the lady. She may have been either Avice Forward or Avis Yate. She may, as another critic once suggested, have been

merely a covert allusion to the first symbol of the biliteral cipher, viz., A 5 is A—that is to say, A.A.A.A.A. (as the illustration of the cipher in "De Augmentis" shows), being the cipher symbol of the letter A of any interior story.

Avisa, as "Dorrell," in reply to his critics in 1596, averred, may only have been an idealization of the virtue Chastity. I am, however, wishful to ascertain who wrote the poem, and I agree with Mr. Sidney Lee that "Dorrell" did so (see "Dict. Nat. Biography," title, Henry Willobie). "Dorrell" was the writer of the poem, dedications, and laudatory verses, and "Dorrell" was, I feel assured, merely one of the many pseudonyms of Francis Bacon. That Francis wrote the Shakespeare plays and poems is common ground with all members of the Bacon Society.

Earl Southampton was the only surviving son and heir to the vast estates of his father, who died when the boy was only eight years of age. During his minority —1581 to 1594—he was a Ward of Court, and the income of his estates must have accumulated to a considerable sum. From 1589 he was a student at Gray's Inn, opposite to which his large mansion and grounds were situated. Francis and he were thus close neighbours, and it may not be too much to assume that the Earl studied law in Bacon's chambers, or under his direction.

Francis, in 1593, at the age of thirty-two, in the full joy of his poetical powers, had great faith in his ability, through his poems, to hand down to all time the names and fames of his friends. What more natural that when his mask, the player Marlowe, died in June, 1593, he should induce a new-comer in his mother the Queen's company of players—Shakspere—to let him use his name in July for the *Venus and Adonis*, then printed,

and which he wanted to dedicate to his protégé, the young Earl?

The suggestion in the dedication that the lines were "unpolished," and that the player would "take advantage of *all idle houres* till I have honoured you with some graver labour," is amusing as insinuating that Shakspere's employment as a player occupied the bulk of his time! We shall never know to what extent Southampton, out of his accumulated wealth, helped Francis during 1594 while the latter was forbidden the Court and hard pressed for money. The obligation must have been considerable, having regard to the warmth of his dedication to the Earl of *Lucrece* in 1594, and to the assertion in the dedication to the Earl of *Jack Wilton* also in 1594, but published under the vizard of Nashe: "A new wit a new stile, a new soule will I get me to canonize your name to posteritie."

Let us assume that Southampton, discussing the virtuous behaviour of Lucrece, extolled, as equally constant and chaste, the behaviour of an innkeeper's wife or daughter known to him in the west of England, and that Francis resolved to celebrate it in verse. He would seek for another more appropriate pseudonym, and probably the name of some young page just sent to reside abroad upon Her Majesty's service was selected.

The internal evidence of the poem and dedications of "Willobie—His Avisa," support the assumption of Bacon's authorship.

The hand that wrote the dedication in *Lucrece*, 1594: "*What I have done is yours what I have to do is yours being part in all I have devoted yours.* Were my worth greater my *duty* would shew greater, *meantime*, as it is, is bound to your Lordship," also wrote the first dedication in "Avisa" in the same year: "*Whatsoever is in me I have vowed it wholy to the exalting of the glory of*

your sweete sex as time occasion and ability shall permit. In the *meantime* I rest *yours* in all *dutyfull affection*."

The dedications and prose in "Avisa," and in the 1596 "Apology," are entirely Baconian in character.

Catch the lilt of this passage: "Pleasant without hardnesse, smooth without any roughnesse, sweet without tediousnesse, easie to be understood, without harrish absurdity: yielding a gratious harmony everywhere to the delight of the reader."

Consider another: "But I see that as it happeneth in the distemperature of the body, so it often fareth in the disorders of the minde: for the body being oppressed with the venemous malice of some predominate humor, the seate of judgment, which is the taste, is corrupted."

"Dorrell" writes: "I have not added or detracted anything from the worke it selfe but have let it passe without altering anything."

Bacon wrote: "I alter ever when I add."

The scholarship of the author of "Avisa," like that of Bacon, was wide. He shows knowledge of the works of Plato, Aristotle, Pindar, Musæus, Plutarch, Homer, Mantuanus, Eusebius, and Josephus, and evidently many other of the classical writers. He freely quoted Italian, and was familiar with Sir Thomas More's "Utopia," Sidney's "Arcadia," and Spenser's "Færie Queene." Moreover, he was fully versed in the Bible.

The author had the same love of weak puns betrayed in Bacon's writings under other vizards. He puns on *rara avis*, paine and pen, queens and queans. The poem is dotted with expressions one feels to be very familiar with in Baconian vizarded writings:—

I cannot tell	Paint the rose
Wiser sort	Smokie sighs
Best sort	Hollow sighs

Greatest sort
Fancies bred
Stormie blasts
Flying fame
Seas of grief
A thousand times, etc.

The author betrays a trained knowledge of law:—

> "For further *trial* of my faith
> And rather make *some wise delay*
>
> . . . .
>
> And though I be by *Jury cast*
>
> . . . .
>
> And though I be *condemned* at last."
>
> . . . .
>
> "Inquire of me and *take the vewe*
> *Of mine estate* with good advise
>
> . . . .
>
> Of this I will *assurance* make
>
> . . . .
>
> That this *in trust* from me shall *take*
> *While thou dost live unto thy use.*
>
> . . . .
>
> Where nature *granteth* such a face
> I need not doubt to *purchase* grace."

Parallelisms are usually accepted as very decisive on authorship questions when Bacon's claims are not in controversy. The following show close renderings of the same lines of thought:—

1. "The lymed bird by fowlers traine."

This simile appears in *The Spanish Tragedy*, 1594, and in Bacon's letter to Greville of the same year.

2. "When she doth laugh you must be glad
And watch occasions tyme and place."
—W. A.

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

Bacon gives a similar warning.

3. "Its hard to love and to be wise."
—W. A.

Bacon uses this in Spenser :—

"To be wise and eke to love
Is granted scarce to God above."

Also in Shakespeare :—

"For to be wise and love
Exceeds man's might ; that dwells with God above."

4. "A spotless name is more to me
Then wealth then friends then life can be."
—W. A.

Compare Othello :—

"Good name in man or woman dear my Lord
Is the most precious jewel of our souls
Who steals my purse steals trash."

5. "I saw your gardens passing fyne
With pleasant flowers lately dect
With cowslips and with eglantine
When wofull woodbine lyes reject."
—W. A.

Compare Shakespeare :—

"Where oxlips and the nodding violet grows

. . . .

Just overcanopied with luscious woodbine
With sweet musk roses and with eglantine."

6. "You look so pale with Lented cheeks
Your wanny face and *sharpened nose*."
—W. A.

Compare Shakespeare :—

"How pale and wan he looks !"

Also the description of Falstaff's death in *Henry V.* :—

"His nose was as sharp as a pen."

Also Bacon :—

"The nose becoming sharp, the face pallid."
—*History of Life and Death.*

I think there is no reasonable doubt that Francis Bacon, the young poet of thirty-three, wrote the poem of "Willobie—His Avisa," and that in this book he first speculated with the use of the hyphen between the combined words making up the idealized name Shake-speare. He used the hyphen on the title-pages of the reprints of *Richard II.*, 1598, *Richard III.*, 1598, and *Henry IV.*, 1599, but only intermittently afterwards.

PARKER WOODWARD.

BOHEMIA ON THE SEA COAST.

THE ascription shelterers affirm that Bacon, as a learned and much-travelled man, could not have committed the geographical solecism in *The Winter's Tale* of placing Bohemia on the sea coast. *Ergo*, that the native genius from Stratford was likely to have made such a blunder, and consequently was the true author of the plays ascribed to him.

They do not explain how the native genius became aware that Giulio Romano, the painter, was also a sculptor. But that is another story.

The Bohemia crudity seems to have been discussed amongst Bacon's literary *entourage.* It troubled Ben Jonson in 1618, but by the time he wrote his "Discoveries" his doubt must have been resolved.

John Taylor, the water poet, did not think this solecism at all serious. In his "Travels to Prague," 1620, he said it was not a piece of very unusual ignorance in an Alderman of London not to be aware that a fleet of ships could not arrive at a port of Bohemia.

Of course, Francis Bacon knew a good deal about the great and ancient Kingdom of Bohemia. From his "Notes on the States of Christendom" he seems to

have personally visited the Austrian Court and probably passed through Prague.

But not long after the visit he wrote, under another vizard (the name of Robert Greene), a tale entitled "Pandosto," which he printed in 1588, and in this tale the error, if error it be, was first committed.

The critics remind us *ad nauseam* that *The Winter's Tale* was founded upon "Pandosto." But they do not tell us whether "Pandosto" itself was an original tale or was derived from an earlier source.

The author of the tale, whether Francis or some person further back in literary history, required for its purposes two kings and two kingdoms separated by the sea, but sufficiently near for occasional Court visits and sufficiently far as to make the possibility of the prolonged loss of a king's daughter reasonably plausible.

In the 13th century Sicily and Bohemia best fulfilled these conditions. Sicily had then kings of its own, and the enterprise of Ottakar II. of Bohemia had given his dominions seaports on the Adriatic.

Ottakar was defeated and killed in 1278, but while the boundaries of the old *kingdom* remained much about the same, the dominions of the Bohemian kings were vastly enlarged down to the end of the 15th century. It became proverbial that nothing could be done in the world without the help of God and of the king of Bohemia. So great a reputation would subsist through the ages, and when a London Alderman sent ships to the north-eastern ports of the Adriatic he considered that they were going to the coast of Bohemia. That such was the popular description of the part of the Adriatic coast dominated by this old, large, rich, and ascendant kingdom of Bohemia is confirmed by the European author, Tschamer, who, writing the "Annals of the Barefooted Friars" as late as 1654, stated that in 1481 "fourteen pilgrims, after being attacked by

Corsairs, landed at Bohemia." Austria was only a duchy, although it possessed the crowns of Bohemia and Hungary.

When Francis wrote his beautiful allegorical play of *The Tale of Winter*, illustrating (as Mr W. F. C. Wigston so ably shows) the myth of the sleeping Earth awaiting the return of its lost Spring child to restore it to life again, he made use of his "Pandosto" tale. A Bohemian sea coast was not a solecism in the days of the Middle Ages in which the story of the kings of Sicily and Bohemia was set. Nor was there need in the play to alter the statement.

Neither was the Giulio Romano reference an incongruity. The characters and *mise en scene* of the play were allegorical only, used for illustrating the passion of jealousy through all its causes and symptoms; used too in depicting the separation of Matter and Spirit and their eventual reconciliation—the central doctrine of the Eleusinian Mysteries.

"Pandosto" had probably a more purely personal object. It was stated to show "that although by the means of sinister fortune truth may be concealed, yet by Time, in spight of fortune, it is most successfully revealed." Upon its title page was the motto, *Temporis filia Veritas*—Truth the Daughter of Time.

The *tale* was probably written to indicate Francis Bacon's plans for the eventual revelation of the truth concerning his work and rightful heritage. In some respects the *play* of *The Winter's Tale* may allude to the same plans and expectations, but its general scale is vaster and higher. The progress of revealment may be slow, but it is sure, though incidentally one has to turn aside to those who, while swallowing the Romano camel strain at the Bohemia gnat.

PARKER WOODWARD.

THE STRATFORD GRAVESTONE.

WE may occasionally find it worth while to hunt upon an old scent—in the present instance that of the biliteral cipher in the inscription on the Stratford gravestone of the lines which in modern spelling would run :—

> Good friend for Jesus' sake forbear
> To dig the dust enclosed here ;
> Blest be the man that spares these stones
> And curst be he that moves my bones.

The first person to strike the scent was Mr. Hugh Black, of Ontario, who wrote an article in the *North American Review* for October, 1887, in which he advanced the view that the original inscription was cut in biliteral cipher letters. Mr. Black copied the inscription, he says, from Knight's edition of Shakespeare's Works. He does not specify which of Knight's editions, but the inscription is to be found both in the biography volume of Knight's Pictorial Edition (published 1839—1842), p. 535, and in Knight's Imperial Edition (published 1873—1876), Vol. II., app., p. 184, in the form in which Mr. Black gives it, that is to say—

> GOOD FREND FOR JESUS SAKE FORBEARE
> TO DIGG T—E DUST ENCLOASED HE.RE.
> BLESE BE T—E MAN $\overset{T}{Y}$ SPARES T—ES STONES
> AND CURST BE HE $\overset{T}{Y}$ MOVES MY BONES.

Knight calls the inscription an "extraordinary" one, but does not attempt to give a reason for its odd lettering. Mr. Black, however, was led by its appearance to think of Bacon's biliteral cipher, and when he found that the whole inscription consisted of 110 letters, *i.e.*, 22 groups of 5 letters each, and that when each large letter was regarded as a *b* and each small letter as an *a*,

as explained in the "De Augmentis," each group yielded one of the letters of Bacon's alphabet, and there were no biliteral letters left over, he had made a discovery of the highest importance; for in view of the above facts it cannot be doubted that the inscription was cut in Bacon's biliteral cipher—the cipher which he has told us he invented when at Paris in his youth, but which he did not publish until seven years after it had been used on this gravestone. Bacon's cipher on Shakspere's grave! What explanation can be given that will leave the Stratfordian creed unshaken. If Shakspere was under Bacon's control we could account for the existence of the cipher, but (as Mr. Donnelly says) "if Shakspere was Shakespeare he would have had no secret to reveal in a cipher." Who but Bacon could have instigated and arranged the use of the cipher? and why should Bacon have done so if the Stratford man was all that Stratford believes! The existence of the cipher is an immensely cogent fact in itself.

I have paused for a moment to emphasize the importance of the mere existence of Bacon's cipher on Shakspere's grave, irrespective of what may be read in it; but I will now return to Mr. Black and his attempt to decipher, and it will be convenient to notice at the same time the early part (Book I.) of Mr. Donnelly's small work called "The Cipher in the Plays and on the Tombstone," which was founded on Mr. Black's article.

Mr. Donnelly, while properly giving Mr. Black credit for being "the first man in the space of two hundred and seventy-one years who had perceived a relationship between Bacon's cipher and the inscription on Shakspere's tombstone at Stratford," thought that Mr. Black had not read the cipher as well as it might have been read, and set to work himself with the view of deciphering it better.

Mr. Black presented his 22 letters thus:—

S A E H R

B A Y E	E P
R F T A	X A

R A W A R

He pointed out that the letters above a line which he drew spelled *Shaxpeare*, and from the other letters he constructed the fragments of words which gave title to his article, "*Fra Ba wrt ear ay*," which form, he says, suggestive parts of the sentence, "*Francis Bacon wrote Shakespeare's Plays*."

Mr. Donnelly rightly concluded that this was not an adequate or satisfactory solution—the fragments of words not being sufficiently conclusive.

Before commencing his own decipher Mr. Donnelly notes that objection had been raised to Mr. Black's article on the ground that in the present inscription there is no mixing of large and small letters, and provides a useful answer to this objection by quoting from Halliwell-Phillips' "Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare," with reference to the substitution of a new stone when the original one had been worn out :—"The honours of repose which have thus far been conceded to the poet's remains have not been extended to the tombstone. The latter had, by the middle of the last century, sunk below the level of the floor, and about fifty * years ago had become so much decayed as to suggest a vandalic order for its removal, and in its stead to place a new slab—one which marks certainly the locality of Shakespeare's grave, and continues the record of the farewell lines, but indicates nothing more. The original memorial has wandered from its allotted station, no one

* Mr. Donnelly quoted from the 2nd edition (1882), but in the 4th edition (1884) and subsequent editions Mr. Halliwell-Phillips substituted "ninety" for "fifty," presumably after more careful investigation.

can tell whither—a sacrifice to the insane worship of prosaic neatness, that mischievous demon whose votaries have practically destroyed so many of the priceless relics of ancient England and her gifted sons." But for Halliwell-Phillips I have little doubt that official Stratford would assert that the present stone is the original one and that no more has been done than to cut the original letters deeper when necessary, for this is what I find in the official guide to the Collegiate Church of Stratford-on-Avon (1907): "The next is the stone which according to unbroken tradition covers the poet's remains. The lines upon it, which have naturally required to be cleaned and deepened in the lapse of years, are: 'Good frend,' &c."

On one of my visits to Stratford-on-Avon the suggestion that cleaning and deepening the old letters was all that had ever been done was verbally made to me. I said, "Do you say, in spite of Steevens, Malone and Knight, that there never was anything in the nature of an unusual mixture of large and small letters in the inscription? If you do, how do you account for the evidence to the contrary of these three disinterested observers, and on what grounds do you ask me to disbelieve them? And if you do not say that, but do say that the present inscription is only the old one cut a little deeper, which are the small letters in the present inscription?" No solution of this dilemma was forthcoming.

With regard to Malone and Steevens, the versions they give us may be found in Johnson and Steevens, 4th edition (1793), Vol. I., p. 32; Malone (1790), Vol. I., part 1, p. 129; and Malone (1821), Vol. II., p. 506; and to these the reader is referred. In each of the above is found the expression "an uncouth mixture of small and capital letters," and letters capital in form are not used except for the *b* letters. It may, however, be remarked

that it is not certain that the expression "small" letters means letters that are small in form. The distinction between letters of the height of small letters and those of the height of capitals may possibly have been the distinction intended to be described.

In any case, I feel sure that the inscription as originally cut did not present such an ostentatiously bizarre appearance as Knight's, Steevens' and Malone's representations would lead one to suppose. If it had done so the cipher would have compelled notice instead of eluding it, and it may be gathered from Bacon's explanation of the cipher that the two kinds of letters used should be sufficiently distinguishable for a careful observer to be able to distinguish them, without being so different as to compel the notice of everybody. The exaggerated eccentricity of the versions in question probably arises from the fact that instead of having a drawing of the inscription we have attempts to represent the two sorts of letters by the use of ordinary type in which there is a great difference between the height of the small letters and that of the capitals. For instance, the "SAKE" that Steevens and Knight saw on the gravestone was probably much nearer to the height of the letters in "forbeare" than it looks in the version their printers give us. I must not let this digression run to greater length. I merely want to impress on the reader that the *a*'s and *b*'s could be, and doubtless were, distinguished in the original inscription without the difference being made as absurdly striking as it is in the printed copies we have.

I think Mr. Donnelly makes some mistakes in his Chapter IV. as to the authorities for the respective variant readings he discusses, and I have never found any authority for the dash he alleges in "Enclo—Ased."

I wrote to BACONIANA ten years ago asking if any one could refer me to an authority for this dash, but without eliciting any reply.

Having reviewed and compared the different versions of the inscription and quoted Bacon's explanation of his cipher in the "De Augmentis," Mr. Donnelly sets to work to decipher, ultimately evolving by processes he details in about forty pages, the sentence, "*Francis Bacon wrote the Greene, Marlowe, and Shakespeare Playes.*"

This result cannot, like Mr. Black's, be objected to as inadequate; but in my opinion there is not a single word of it that is legitimately deducible from the cipher writing. That I say after long and full consideration, undertaken in the hope of being able to accept and support Mr. Donnelly's solution. To explain in detail why I think his solution cannot be accepted, I should require more space than he occupied in advancing it, so I must leave the matter with this expression of my opinion.

Now, where do we find ourselves after Mr. Donnelly's failure to improve on Mr. Black's solution? We are not left nowhere, for Mr. Black did, in my opinion, establish the existence of the cipher. Let us return to Mr. Black and accept his suggestion that the biliteral gives us the letters that spell *Shaxpeare*, though I do not myself attach any importance to Mr. Black's imaginary line, or care whether the letters of *Shaxpeare* come from one side of it or from both sides. But I should be disposed myself, before going further, to take the W from the bottom line of his table to make *W. Shaxpeare*, as I think it more probable that Bacon would have referred in cipher to *W. Shaxpeare* than to *Shaxpeare*.

Where do we stand now? *W. Shaxpeare* is 10 letters, and there are 22 letters in all, so we have 12 left, and that is just the number that would make *Francis Bacon*, and Mr. Black has already pointed out that we can get *Fra Ba* out of the remaining letters. That is something to start with. If the letters besides FRABA were NCISCON our task would be over, and we should have

shown that the application of Bacon's cipher to the inscription on Shakspeare's grave produced the letters of *W. Shaxpeare* and *Francis Bacon*, and how could that be explained consistently with the Stratfordian creed?

But Mr. Black took the remaining seven letters to be YETRAAR. Has he made any mistakes or can he have been misled by imperfections in the copy he worked by? Can we verify his deciphering? Where shall we begin?

To bring the matter to a head as quickly as possible, let us see if there are any of Mr. Black's letters that could not under any circumstances be used in spelling *Francis Bacon*, because if there are any such, and no reason can be found for altering them, our hopes of success are gone.

The only two of the twelve that could not under any circumstances be used in spelling *Francis Bacon* are Y and T.

Now as to the Y. I remember at once that in the 1793 edition of Johnson and Steevens, the first T—E is distinctly lighter than the second and third. I made a note of this some years ago with the idea that the difference between light and dark signified the difference between an *a* and a *b*. If the first T—E is regarded as an *a* fount T—E, the result is that the Y becomes a C. The Y, therefore, ceases to be a difficulty, and it may be noticed that when it is replaced by a C in Mr. Black's table, his second line of letters begins with BAC. The SAEHR of the first line, and the BAC of the second, then give useful hints as to the words the cipher is to yield us.

With regard to the T, if the $\overset{\text{T}}{\text{Y}}$ before "spares" were an *a*, and the initial s of "spares" were a *b*, the T would be an S. We should have *baaab* instead of *baaba*, and a letter that will do instead of one that will not do. But

I fear we have no sufficient reason to give for making the $\overset{\text{T}}{\text{Y}}$ an *a*. It is true that Mr. Black's reason for making it (and similarly also the later one) a *b* is a very poor one. He says he reckons $\overset{\text{T}}{\text{Y}}$ as a single large letter because the T is placed exactly over the Y, which is not a reason that would lead us to think he had had much experience in deciphering biliteral, and, indeed, we have no ground for thinking he had ever had the opportunity of trying to decipher any other biliteral than this, and very likely he had not. If biliteral had been the subject of as much notice and discussion before 1887 as it has during the last ten years or so, I think Mr. Black would have felt that the system must provide for distinguishing a $\overset{\text{T}}{\text{Y}}$ which is an *a* from a $\overset{\text{T}}{\text{Y}}$ which is a *b*, and that the distinction would probably be effected by making the *a* one lighter or smaller than the other. If that was done in this case, our copyists did not notice it, or else did not record it, and as the original has disappeared and we have only copies which treat both the $\overset{\text{T}}{\text{Y}}$'s alike, we are at the end of our tether. Of course it is not to be wondered at that copyists who knew nothing of biliteral should have failed in some cases to notice the slight differences by which the *a* letters might be distinguished from the *b* letters. On the other hand, it is wonderful that they have enabled us to distinguish the *a*'s from the *b*'s in as many instances as they have. There are 110 letters in the whole inscription, and to make the EAARR the remaining letters we have into the NNICO, which would enable us to spell *Francis Bacon*, only nine or ten corrections of *a*'s and *b*'s would be required. That is to say, copies made without having the biliteral cipher in view, and without knowledge of it, or of the importance of exactitude, or of *a* founts and *b* founts, have distinguished the *a*'s and *b*'s correctly in 100 cases as

against failure to do so in but ten cases. The ten cases are evidently in the latter part of the inscription. The copyist would probably be more careful when he began than he would be as he went on. His attention would be likely to flag in the tedious endeavour to copy eccentricities in which he did not suppose there was any definite object. He would not feel that it was of importance to be accurate in every instance, provided he gave a fair sample of the inscription. Twenty-five large letters would justify his statement that there was "an uncouth mixture" as well as thirty-five would.

I should therefore expect that the first part of the inscription would be more perfectly copied than the last part, and the view that it is so is confirmed by the fact that when the attempt is made to read the biliteral cipher in verses not written in biliteral, the result is to produce an undue proportion of A's and R's,* and that is just what Mr. Black gets from the last two lines. His last line of letters is RAWAR, and he has an R and two A's in the third line. The inference to be drawn is that in the latter part of the inscription the copyists failed to indicate some of the large letters. The *b*'s they overlooked would probably have given us the letters we require.

Without the original, however, we can only conjecture and surmise, and there is all the difference in the world for controversial purposes between conjecture and demonstration. I have no doubt myself, and I do not think many Baconians will doubt, that if the original inscription had been in existence, we should have been able to show the world that the application of Bacon's cipher to Shakspere's gravestone produced exactly the twenty-two letters that spell *W. Shaxpeare* and *Francis*

* The reason is obvious, and an example may be seen at pages 27 and 28 of Mr. Donnelly's book, where he tries whether the cipher will apply to the lines "Stay, Passenger," &c.

Bacon. But, most unfortunately, the original inscription is not available, and without it I fear we cannot get further than I have above indicated.

G. B. ROSHER.

SHAKESPEARE, BACON, AND THE GREAT UNKNOWN.

THERE will be a general feeling of deep regret amongst Baconians that the author of this book did not live to see its publication. In the preface to it, written by Mrs. Andrew Lang, it is stated that although it was in type before her husband's death, he "had no time even to correct the first proofs, and doubtless he would have made many changes, if not in his views, at least in the expression of them." This feeling of regret is accentuated by the fact that Mr. Lang endeavours fairly and squarely, to the extent of his knowledge, to meet many of the arguments advanced by Baconians against the Stratford authorship. Mr. Lang was an uncompromising opponent of the theory of the Baconian authorship of the Shakespeare plays. He describes the position of the controversy in these terms :—"But the Baconian theory is universally rejected in England by the professors and historians of English literature; and generally by students who have no profession save that of Letters. The Baconians, however, do not lack the countenance and assistance of highly-distinguished persons, whose names are famous where those of men of Letters are unknown; and in circles where the title of 'Professor' is not duly respected." Judges Holmes, Webb, and Lord Penzance and Mark Twain amongst others are referred to in this last sentence; but the author refuses to "regard them as,

in the first place and professionally, trained students of literary history." It was Mr. G. G. Greenwood's "The Shakespeare Problem Re-stated" and his later works that caused Mr. Lang to take a part in the controversy. He considers Mr. Greenwood to be worth fighting, cunning of fence, and learned, a man of sense, with a knowledge of Elizabethan literature.

Mr. Lang devotes his book entirely to answering certain arguments against the Stratford authorship put forward by Mr. Greenwood, and *only certain* of his arguments. Here and there are references to some of the arguments advanced by others in favour of the Bacon authorship and objections are raised as to its possibility, but these are digressions. The author does not consider any Baconian worthy of his steel, but Mr. Greenwood is different. "The Shakespeare Problem Re-stated" he considers beyond comparison the best work on the anti-Willian side of the controversy. So to answer this he addresses himself. But Mr. Greenwood does not profess to state the case urged on behalf of the Bacon authorship. Further, he explicitly disclaims a belief in that theory. The position he takes up is that William Shakspere, of Stratford, did not write the plays and poems. To the question, "Who then was the author?" he replies, "I cannot tell." So Mr. Lang does not get an opportunity of seriously examining the Baconian theory. Nor from this point of view is it incumbent upon him that he should do so. He proves to his own satisfaction that the Stratford man, who up to about fifty years ago held undisputed possession of the authorship, did write the plays and poems, so there is no need to consider the claims put forward on behalf of any other.

It would be impossible in the space here available to follow the arguments urged, always with fairness, by Mr. Lang. It is probable that they will in due course

be dealt with by Mr. Greenwood, who is ever ready for an encounter on this subject. A reply could not be in better hands. But it may not be amiss to point out certain fundamental propositions upon which Mr. Lang goes astray, and which really deprive his general line of argument of any weight. Mr. Lang assumes that there is contemporary evidence, outside the 1623 Folio Edition, that the Stratford man was the author of the plays and poems, but he does not advance any evidence in support of this. He writes on page xxvii.:

"The evidence for the contemporary faith in Will's authorship is all positive; from his own age comes not a whisper of doubt, not even a murmur of surprise. It is incredible to me that his fellow-actors and fellow-playwrights should have been deceived, especially when they were such men as Ben Johnson and Tom Haywood."

On page 18:

"There does not exist the most shadowy hint proving that the faintest doubt was thrown on the actor's authorship; ignorant as he was bookless and rude of speech."

On page 23:

"But in Elizabeth's time the few [playgoers] who cared were apt to care very much, and they would inquire intensely when the Stratford actor, a bookless, untaught man, was announced as the author of plays which were amongst the most popular of their day. The seekers never found any other author. They left no hint that they suspected the existence of any other author. Hence I venture to infer that Will seemed to them no unread rustic, but a fellow of infinite fancy—no scholar, to be sure, but very capable of writing the pieces which he fathered."

On page 30:

"To be puzzled by and found theories on the silence about Shakespeare is to show an innocence very odd in learned disputants."

On page 156:

"The more a man was notorious as was Will Shakespeare the actor, the less the need for any critic to tell his public 'who Shakespeare was.'"

This theme is harped on throughout the book. It is the fundamental argument relied on. But there is no evidence apart from the verses and preface prefixed to the 1623 Folio Edition, quoted in support of it. Nor could any be quoted, for it does not exist.

Against Mr. Lang's assumption, and it is a pure assumption, may be called three men of letters, two of them amongst the most eminent of Shakesperean scholars, neither of whom had been contaminated by any trace of Baconianism; the third, a man of letters, a philosopher, with a world-wide reputation. Richard Grant White, in "Memoirs of William Shakespeare," p. cxi., writes—

"Of his eminent countrymen, Raleigh, Sydney, Spencer, Bacon, Cecil, Walsingham, Coke, Camden, Hooker, Drake, Hobbes, Inigo Jones, Herbert of Cherbury, Laud, Pym, Hampden, Seldon, 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."

Dr. G. M. Ingleby * writes—

"The prose works published in the latter part of the sixteenth and the early part of the seventeenth centuries contain abundant notices of every poet of distinction save Shakespeare, whose name and works are rarely and only slightly mentioned. . . . . It is plain that the bard of our admiration was unknown to the men of that age."

* Dr. Ingleby was the compiler of "Shakespeare's Centurie of Prayer." In preparing this work he devoted more than two years exclusively to hunting through the literature from 1593 to 1693 for allusions to Shakespeare. His testimony is therefore of special value.

Emerson writes—

"Since the constellation of great men who appeared in Greece in the time of Pericles, there never was any such society; yet their genius failed them to find out the best head in the universe."

Now the testimony of these three men far outweighs the assumption of Mr. Andrew Lang, who thus endeavours to minimize Dr. Ingleby's words:—"When Dr. Ingleby says that 'the bard of our admiration was unknown to the men of that age,' he uses hyperbole, and means, I presume, that he was unknown, as all authors are, to the great majority; and that those who know him in part made no modern fuss about him." If Mr. Lang had read *the whole* of Dr. Ingleby's statement he could not have suggested such a presumption. But the opinions of other distinguished scholars are opposed to those of this author. Mr. Lang labours the hackneyed remarks of Robert Greene as to the *Johannes Factotum* and *Shake-scene*. Greene never mentions by name either the Stratford man or William Shakespeare the poet, but there are remarks made by him upon which Mr. Lang relies as evidence that the Stratford man and the poet were one and the same. Thomas Simpson's "The School of Shakespeare" may be termed a classic. The writer was a man of letters. He adopts the view that it was to the Stratford man that Greene referred in the "Groatsworth of Wit" and elsewhere; he deals with the subject exhaustively. The conclusion to which he arrives is this:—"Throughout we see Greene's determination not to recognize Shakspeare as a man capable of doing anything by himself." Mr. Simpson's investigation shows the existence of more than "the most shadowy hint proving that the faintest doubt existed" as to the Stratford man being the author of works attributed to him, if they were so attributed.

Another assumption of Mr. Lang is that the plays

attracted public attention and were popular. On page 31 he says:—

"He was popular on the stage."

On page 159:—

"It appears to me that Shakespeare's Company would be likely, as his plays were very popular," etc.

This is an unsupported affirmation. There is another assumption, equally without foundation, which in effect is implied in the foregoing, and it is that the plays were written for and performed at the public theatres of the period. Mr. Lang has not investigated his subject from first-hand sources. He relies on books which he has looked up written by partizans. His remarks recently quoted on Dr. Ingleby's statement may be instanced in support of this view. There is only evidence that two or three plays bearing the same titles as plays of Shakespeare were produced at the public theatres—there is no evidence that any one of Shakespeare's plays *as printed* was so produced. But there is overwhelming evidence that they were unfitted for such production and would not have been tolerated by the audiences. Anyone who has made himself acquainted from original sources of information with the conditions under which the public theatres were conducted, the entertainments which were produced at them, and the audiences which frequented them, can come to no other decision.

There is another assumption not supported by any evidence. Mr. Lang writes on page 15:

"A concealed poet . . . might obtain the manuscript copies from their owners, the Lord Chamberlain's Company, etc."

On page 31:

"We cannot be sure that he and his Company in fact did not provide publishers with the copy for the better quartos," etc.

On page 34:

"Probably the Company gave a good MSS. copy sometimes to a printer who offered satisfactory terms after the gloss of novelty was off the acted play."

On page 133:

"The story of the 'Concealed Poet,' who really, at first, did the additions and changes on the Company's older plays."

On page 164:

"The plays by the original authors, whoever they were, could only be obtained by the 'Concealed Poet' and man in high position from the legal owners, Shakespeare's Company usually."

It is a pure assumption, not supported by a scrap of evidence, that any one of Shakespeare's plays was at any time the property of any company of actors. There is no evidence that any company of players either owned the rights of any of the Shakespeare plays or were in any way interested in any copyright. But the book is full of such statements, which have no other authority than Mr. Lang's word. Here is an example:—

"We are sure that Will got money for them, but we do not know what arrangement he made with his company."

It is pure conjecture that the author ever made one shilling by either the printing or acting of the plays. There is no historical fact recorded to support this conjecture.

Reviewers of the book point out that there is nothing new in the way of evidence in Mr. Lang's contribution to the question at issue. But there is a considerable addition to the wild speculations of the Shakespearean fold. So far as additional valid arguments against what he terms the anti-Willian, the author is really barren. Take away the assumptions unsupported by evidence and you have little left.

Turning very briefly to Mr. Lang's remarks about Francis Bacon, it is obvious that he knew nothing of

the man and had not read his works. Every reference to the great writer displays only a superficial acquaintance with either. Here is a sentence:

"But just because Bacon, at thirty-one, *is* so extremely 'green,' going to 'take all knowledge for his province' (if someone will only subsidise him and endow his research), I conceive that he was in earnest about his reformation of science."

Bacon was not "going to"; he said he *had* taken all knowledge to be his province. What he was "going to" do was this—not ruin himself by contemplation as did Anaxagoras, but sell his inheritance and buy some lease of quick revenue or some office of gain which could be executed by a deputy and become some sorry bookmaker and a pioneer in that mine of truth which he (Anaxagoras) said lay so deep. It was bookmaking, not scientific research, that he was seeking means to carry out.

Mr. Andrew Lang makes a great point of what he terms the errors in the plays, particularly the anachronisms. After reciting some of these, he says:

"Nobody will persuade me that Bacon was so charmingly irresponsible."

And again:

"How could a scholar do any of these things? He was as incapable of them as Ben Jonson. Such sins no scholar is inclined to; they have for him no temptation."

Referring to *Love's Labour Lost*, he says:

"Thus early we find that great scholar mixing up chronology in a way which in Shakespeare even surprises, but in Bacon seems quite out of keeping."

On page 282 he says:

"But why was Bacon so woefully inaccurate on points of scholarship and history?"

Bacon himself appears to have answered this criticism in anticipation. In the "Advancement of Learning" (1640), Book II., Chap. I., poesy is defined thus:—"By Poesy, in this place, we understand nothing else but feigned History or Fables. As for verse that is only a style of expression, and pertained to the Art of Elocution, of which in due place. Poesy, in that sense we have expounded it, is likewise of individuals, fancied to the similitude of those things which in true History are recorded, yet so as often it exceeds measure; and thosé things which in Nature would never meet nor come to pass, Poesy composeth and introduceth at pleasure, even as Painting doth, which indeed is the work of the Imagination."

In the Latin version (1623) poesy is spoken of as being "in measure of words for the most part restrained, but in all other points extremely free and licensed, and therefore it is referred to the Imagination which may at pleasure make unlawful matches and divorces of things."

The poet, though a scholar, is justified, in order to obtain the effect he seeks, to ignore what are termed *the unities.*

Chapter XIII. is devoted to "The Pre-occupations of Bacon." It abounds in mis-statements, inaccuracies and contradictions. Seldom has a man sat down to write upon a subject upon which he was so ill-informed as was Mr. Lang on the occupations of Bacon. He speaks of Bacon's "ceaseless scientific pre-occupation." Exactly what the phrase means it is impossible to say, but there is nothing recorded of his life between 1576 to 1605 which supports any possible interpretation which could be put upon it. He states that Bacon was much concerned with the cause of reformed religion —with the good government of his native country, which he could only aid by his services in Parliament, where,

despite his desire for advancement, he conscientiously opposed the Queen; he was obliged to work at such tasks of various sorts—legal and polemical literature—as were set him by people in power. And then comes this remarkable deduction:

> "With these three great objects filling his heart, inspiring his ambition, and occupying his energies and time, we cannot easily believe without direct external evidence that he or any mortal could have leisure and detachment from his main objects (to which we may add his own advancement) sufficient to enable him to compose the works attributed to Shakespeare."

The "three great objects" are appropriated from Spedding, who, however, applies them to a purpose wholly different from that of Mr. Lang.

We know that Bacon was a rapid writer, for his "History of Henry VII." was not begun in June, 1621, and was finished in the following October, and of all Bacon's works this may be considered the one which would occupy more time per thousand words than any other, for it would necessitate more reference to authorities or original sources of information. But, accepting this as the average rate at which he would write, all Bacon's literary productions from 1580 to 1605—commencing with "Notes of the State of Christendom," written when he was on the Continent (1580-1) and a letter of advice to the Queen—a remarkable effusion for a boy of 24 years to address to his Sovereign, including the "Gesta Grayorum" (1594) and the first edition of the Essays (1597)—would not require at the outside for their production more than six months. A careful calculation of the time required for these—for his parliamentary duties, his practice as a lawyer so far as records exist—justifies the statement that the occupation of not more than two years out of the twenty-five are accounted for. This lack of adequate results for the most important years of his life would be

remarkable in an average literary man. But for the possessor of "the most exquisitely constructed intellect which was ever bestowed on any of the children of men," who "at 12 years of age in industry was above the capacity and in mind above the reach of his contemporaries," who, on account of his universal comprehension of things, was then "the observation of wise men, as he became afterwards the wonder of all"!—is it possible to conceive such a period of unproductiveness?

The charm of the Shakespeare plays lies in their spontaneity. They were no heavy tax on the time of the man, whoever he may have been who wrote them. Given the knowledge required, which in the author's case, according to Lowell, was in range and accuracy without precedent or later parallel, he could pour them out without effort. The writer of the article on Francis Bacon in the "Encyclopædia Britannica" describes his style as "quaint, original, abounding in allusions, witticisms, and rich even to gorgeousness with piled-up analogies and metaphors." No words could more accurately describe Shakespeare's style.

> "The occupations, and even more the scientific pre-occupation [*whatever that means*—Ed.] of Bacon, do not make his authorship of the plays a physical impossibility; but they make it an intellectual miracle."

They were that, whoever wrote them. But to whom is the miracle to be attributed? In Bacon are found all the qualifications required for the production of the poems and plays; the universal knowledge, the style of the writer—especially as to the prose portions, the existence of which Mr. Lang ignores—the legal experience, the versatility and wit, the love of punning, the imaginative faculty, the poetic imagery, the superb rhetoric (whoever wrote the plays was a consummate orator), the inconceivable wisdom, the philosophy, the

exquisite command of language—nothing is lacking, and he had the time to produce the works over and over again, and then ten times over. Of the Stratford man—Mr. Lang's "Will"—there is not "the most shadowy hint of the faintest" suggestion on the part of any contemporary recorded during his lifetime that he possessed a trace of any one of these qualifications. Some stronger term than "intellectual miracle" is required if this man was the author. A concealed poet indeed he was with a vengeance.

Mr. Lang describes Bacon's "Temporis Partus Maximus" as "his first essay on the Instauration of Philosophy." This description is not justified by the only words in which Bacon refers to the book in the letter to Father Fulgentia, written in 1625. The work has not come down to us, at any rate, under Bacon's name; but, whatever it may have been, it was not connected with the scheme of his Instauration.

On page 275 Mr. Lang writes:—

"Law is a hard mistress, rapacious of a man's hours."

He appears to be unaware that in 1594, when Bacon's appointment to the office of Attorney-General was being urged, he had never held a brief. He quotes a remark which Bacon made in 1604 when speaking of his connection with Essex in 1590-1: "I did nothing but advise and ruminate with myself to the best of my understanding, propositions and memorials of anything that might concern his Lordship's honour, fortune, or service." Mr. Lang comments:

"As Bacon did nothing but these things (1591-2), he had no leisure for writing poetry and plays." And again: 'We know that Bacon at this period did nothing but ruminate. The words are his own (1604).' No plays—no *Venus and Adonis*—nothing but enthusiastic service of Essex and the Sonnets."

It is difficult to have patience with such loose reason-

ing. From whence did Mr. Lang get authority for his statement that

> "Some Baconians vow he (Bacon) wrote the Sonnets to Essex" (page 172)?

The references to this subject on pages 278-9 almost justify the inference that Mr. Lang considers this suggestion plausible. It is certainly no part of the Baconian belief.

No! "Shakespeare, Bacon, and the Great Unknown" will not add to the literary reputation of the late Mr. Andrew Lang. It might with advantage have been reduced by two-thirds; the iteration and reiteration is frequently tedious to the reader. It is the work of a journalist not by any means at his best. From this point of view it is the more to be regretted that, as Mrs. Lang says, he had not time to correct the proofs, or "doubtless he would have made many changes, if not in his views, at least in the expression of them." If not in his views? Does this suggest that after the copy had gone to the printer Mr. Lang may have had some doubts as to whether the case against the Bacon authorship was quite as strong as he had believed it to be?

W. T. SMEDLEY.

THE TESTIMONY OF FLORIO.

WE are told quite clearly, if we are able to understand what we are told, that the plays known as Shakespeare's were in fact written by "a gentleman—a man of position—who loved better to be a poet than to be counted so."

In Florio's "Second Frutes," 1591, immediately after the address to the reader, there is a sonnet, "Phaeton to his friend Florio," which, it is admitted by Sir Sidney Lee, must have been written by "Shakespeare." I think that Dr. Munro was the first to discover that this was a "Shakespeare" sonnet (see the article "Shakespeare" in the old Encyclopædia Britannica). Well! what does Florio himself say about it? The sonnet appeared in his "Second Frutes," 1591, and he thus refers to it in "A World of Wordes," which is dated 1598: "There is another sort of leering curs, that rather snarle than bite, whereof I could instance in one, who lighting upon a good sonnet of a gentleman's, a friend of mine, that loved better to be a poet than to be counted so, called the auctor a rymer."

Here we see that Florio says most distinctly that the author of the sonnet which is addressed to himself "loved better to be a poet than to be counted so." But the author of that sonnet is admittedly the author of all the "Shakespeare" sonnets and admittedly also the author of the "Shakespeare" plays. Florio therefore tells us, in words the meaning of which it is not possible to mistake, that the mighty author of the plays was "a gentleman"—a man of position—"who loved better to be a poet than to be counted so."

Florio was always a servant of Bacon's and eventually received a pension of £50 per annum for making my Lord's works known abroad. It is absolutely impossible that Florio could have been alluding to the "Householder

of Stratford" when he said that the sonnet was written by "a gentleman" "who loved better to be a poet than to be counted so." The man of Stratford could have had no possible reason for desiring concealment if, indeed, he who could neither read nor write had been a poet. Furthermore, William Shakespeare, of Stratford-upon-Avon, did not become entitled to be styled "a gentleman" until he had obtained a coat-of-arms in 1599. In Ben Jonson's "Every Man out of his Humour" the clown who has bought a coat-of-arms appears upon the stage in Act III. and says: "I can write myself gentleman now here's my pattent." Writing in 1598, in reference to what had been printed in 1591, Florio could not have described the "essential clown," William Shakespeare, of Stratford-upon-Avon, as "a gentleman," "a friend of mine." If it were possible to imagine that Florio might have been friendly with the "essential clown," he would not have gone out of his way to say "a gentleman," "a friend of mine."

Bacon himself tells us that he loved better to be a poet than to be counted so, in his "Declaration of the Practices and Treasons attempted and committed by Robert late Earl of Essex and his Complices," which was published in 1601. In this work Bacon says: "About the Middle of Michaelmas term, Her Majesty had a purpose to dine at my lodge at Twickenham Park, at which time I had—though I profess not to be a poet—prepared a sonnet, directly tending and alluding to draw on Her Majesty's reconcilement to my Lord Essex, which I remember I also showed to a great person."

Here Bacon, writing in 1601, says: "I profess not to be a poet," which seems to fit in exactly with the testimony of Florio.

Bacon in 1603 repeats the same story of his being "a concealed poet" in his letter to John Davis, whom he

asks to use his good offices on his behalf with King James I., for he concludes: "So desiring you to be good to concealed poets."

Similarly in his last prayer Bacon says: "I have though in a despised weed procured the good of all men." Despised weed signifies a mean disguise. What disguise could be meaner than the name of the drunken, illiterate clown of Stratford-upon-Avon?

Again, the "gentleman"—the man of position—"who loved better to be a poet than to be counted so," writes in the "Shakespeare" Sonnet, No. 76:—

> "Why write I still all one ever the same,
> And keepe invention in a noted weed,
> That every word doth almost sel* my name
> Shewing their birth and where they did proceed."

Here we see that the writer of the Shakespeare plays tells us, in the actual words of Bacon in his last prayer, that he keeps his works of invention, that is, his poetical and dramatic works, concealed under a noted weed, a pseudonym, a mean disguise.

In Book VII. of his "De Augmentis," 1623, which was, however, not translated till 1640, Bacon again repeats the same story, for he says: "As for myself (excellent King) to speak the truth of myself, I have often wittingly and willingly neglected the glory of mine own Name, and Learning (if any such thing be), both in the works I now publish, and in those which I contrive for hereafter; whilst I study to promote the good and profit of mankind."

At about this time also Sir Toby Matthew, acknowledging "some great and noble token" which he had received from Bacon, writes: "The most prodigious wit that ever I knew, of my own nation and of this side of the sea, is of your Lordship's name, though he be known by another."

* Sel may mean sell or spell or tell.

Can anyone continue to doubt that Bacon wrote under Masks, Disguises and Pseudonyms?

EDWIN DURNING LAWRENCE.

Jan. 11th, 1913.

SHAKESPEARE IN THE THEATRE.

MR. WILLIAM POEL recently contributed a series of articles to the *Nation* on "Shakespeare in the Theatre." Mr. Poel entitled his second article "Position of Editors," and in it goes out of his way to have a tilt at Baconians in the following paragraph:—

> The arguments brought forward in the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy are a striking illustration of the imperfect knowledge of editors as to the playwright's art. While the Baconians pride themselves on discovering a similarity in the phraseology or philosophical sentiments of the two writers, they forget that Shakespeare was pre-eminent in the writing of drama—an art that is as difficult to master as that of a painter or a musician, and in which the hand of an amateur can be so easily detected; an art for which Bacon had slight opportunities of training and showed no aptitude. A novelist who describes characters vividly was once asked why she seldom made them talk. Her answer was, "I have little talent for writing dialogue; when my characters speak they often cease to be the same people." Undoubtedly, Bacon would have given the same answer to anyone attributing to him the plays of Shakespeare.

Before Mr. Poel again comments on what he terms *the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy*, it would be well that he should obtain some information as to the grounds upon which the Baconian case is founded. The similiarity in the phraseology or philosophical sentiment of the two writers is only one phase of it, and that by no means the most important. The utter mental confusion of Mr. Poel is manifest when he writes:

"They (*i.e.*, the Baconians) forget that Shakespeare was pre-eminent in the writing of drama—an art that is as difficult to master as that of a painter or musician, and in which the hand of an amateur can be as easily detected." Upon what evidence can it be contended that he of Stratford had experience or training in the drama to justify his inclusion in the circle (if it existed) of professional dramatists? There is not a vestige of evidence to point to such a conclusion. Such information as is available as to his life up to the very hour that the early dramas were produced is inconsistent with such a contention. If he did not write the Shakespeare Plays, he was not even an amateur. To anyone who has thoughtfully studied the Shakespeare Plays and recognised their value as drama and as literature, the Stratford authorship is unthinkable. The author *was* "pre-eminent in the writing of drama," but Mr. Poel does not appear to recognise that the point at issue is the personality of that author. But he knows very little of Bacon who can say that the drama was an art which Bacon had slight opportunities of learning, and for which he showed no aptitude. Let it be remembered that there were no dramas in the English language to serve as models for the author of the Shakespeare Plays. He originated a new dramatic style which has never been equalled then or since. This was founded on the Attic and Roman dramas. The articles from the pen of the late Mr. Churton Collins, which appeared in the *Fortnightly Review*, 1903, on this point will at once occur to the reader. That distinguished writer says: "It is, indeed, in the extraordinary analogies — analogies in sources, in particularity of detail and point, and in relative frequency of employment, presented by his metaphors to the metaphors of the Attic tragedians, that we find the most convincing testimony of his familiarity with their writings." Bacon was as familiar with both

the Greek and Roman dramas as he was with his native tongue. He had not only read them, but studied them, and copiously annotated them. The dramas of France and modern Italy were equally at his command. The works published under his name abound in the use of the stage and terms connected with it as similitudes. They show an intimate knowledge of the art of stage craft. Mr. Poel is wrong. In 1588, 1592, 1594 and 1595, Bacon was engaged in stage productions. If a list be made out of the acquirements which the author of the Shakespeare Plays must have been the possessor, it will be found that only one man has ever lived who possessed them all—and that man was Francis Bacon. *Ergo*, he must have been the author of the plays.

NOTES.

IT is amusing to see with what confidence the Shakespearean controversialists assert that the man who wrote the Bacon Essay on Love could not have written *Romeo and Juliet.* The discredit of originating the argument is usually attributed to Lord Tennyson. No one having more than a very superficial acquaintance with the works bearing the name of Shakespeare or Bacon could have originated such a ridiculous contention, or could repeat it. If both sets of works were not the product of one mind, no two writers have shown such a remarkable agreement in their treatment of the subject. Mr. George Stronach, in an excellent letter contributed to the *Academy*, gives the following passages, which justify the assertion that they were in complete agreement:—

"Will you allow me to endeavour to show that on the subject of 'Love' Shakespeare and Bacon were in complete agreement? Here are the relative passages on which I found my statement:—

Shakespeare: Love gives to every power a double power.

Bacon: Love gives the mind power to exceed itself.

Shakespeare: Is not love a Hercules?

Bacon: What fortune can be such a Hercules as love?

Shakespeare: Love is first learned in a woman's eyes.

Bacon: The eye where love beginneth.

Shakespeare: Love . . . with the motion of all elements.

Bacon: Love is the motion that animateth all things.

Shakespeare: But for my love . . . where nothing wants that want itself doth seek.

Bacon: When we want nothing, then is the season and the opportunity and the spring of love.

Shakespeare: By love, the young and tender wit is turn'd to folly.

Bacon: Love is the child of folly.

Shakespeare: Love is merely [wholly] a madness.

Bacon: Transported to the mad degree of love.

Shakespeare: Love will creep in service where it cannot go.

Bacon: Love must creep in service where it cannot go.

Shakespeare: To be wise and love exceeds man's might; that dwells with gods above.

Bacon: It is not granted man to love and be wise.

Shakespeare: We are soldiers, and may that soldier a mere recreant prove, that means not, hath not, or is not in love.

Bacon: I know not how, but martial men are given to love.

Shakespeare: Why to love I can allege no cause.

Bacon: Love has no cause.

Shakespeare: It cannot be that Desdemona should long continue in love to the Moor . . . nor he is to her . . . she must change for youth.

Bacon: Love is nourished on young flesh.

Shakespeare: Lovers cannot see the pretty follies that themselves commit.

Bacon: A lover always commits some folly.

Shakespeare: O, flatter me, for love delights in praises.

Bacon: There is no flatterer like a lover.

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

Bacon: Lovers never thought their profession sufficiently graced till they had compared it to a warfare.

Shakespeare: He's mad that trusts in . . . a boy's love.

Bacon: A boy's love does not last.

I can give many more passages to show that Shake-

speare and Bacon were in exact accord in the whole gamut of love—strong characters not being given to love, of love being fatal to worldly success, of love and self-love, of moderation in love, of witchcraft in love, of the language of love being hyperbolical, of unreciprocated love being treated with contempt, of love the first god, of love not being hid, etc., etc., but the passages are too long for quotation. Most of them will be found in Edwin Reed's book, 'The Truth Concerning Stratford-on-Avon and Shakespeare.'"

The columns of the *Academy* and *Pall Mall Gazette* have recently contained considerable correspondence on different phases of the subject. The battle has been very one-sided. No one reading the letters can fail to recognise that the writers who support the Baconian theory have far greater knowledge of the literature of the period than have their opponents.

In compliance with requests from several of the members of the Bacon Society, it has been arranged to renew the reunions of members either weekly or on alternate weeks. Friday evenings have been selected as most likely to suit the convenience of the largest number. The meetings will be held in the library at 11, Hart Street, W.C., and will be of a conversational character. Any members who desire to avail themselves of this opportunity of meeting their fellow-members should send their names to the Secretary, who will give them further information and advise them of the dates as they are arranged.

A largely-attended meeting of the Society was held on the 30th of October, 1912, at Mrs. Bunten's Studio, Hogarth Road, S.W. Addresses were delivered by

Mr. Harold Hardy and Mr. W. T. Smedley, and discussion followed.

Mrs. Bunten has placed her studio at the service of a number of members who are desirous of investigating the biliteral cipher. Mr. Ernest Payne has been making photographs of pages of the "Novum Organum" from the original edition, 1620, and these will be presented as lantern slides considerably enlarged, so that facilities may be afforded for testing the accuracy of the deciphering.

Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence has given several lectures on the Shakespeare myth, which have been attended by large gatherings. The Chelsea Town Hall on one of these occasions was crowded with an audience which exhibited deep interest in the lecture and warmly applauded it.

"Shakespeare, Bacon, and the Great Unknown," by the late Mr. Andrew Lang, has been widely reviewed. For the most part, the reviewers exhibit a deplorable ignorance of the subject of which that gifted writer treated in his posthumous work. They appear to have little knowledge of Elizabethan literature, or of what is known and what is not known of the life of the Stratford man. A notable exception is the review which appeared in the literary supplement of the *Times*. The historical facts as to the life of Shakspere are stated with a baldness which is quite refreshing.

Johannesburg is becoming interested in the Shakespeare authorship. Under the auspices of the Jewish Guild a large audience gathered to hear a discourse by Mr. J. E. Forrest on the "Vexed Question." It is re-

ported that he spoke for two hours without notes of any description, and weighed the fors and againsts in judicial manner, describing his efforts as those of "the devil's advocate." A discussion followed, and the report states that "the most noticeable speeches were delivered by gentlemen who appeared to have strong Baconian leanings." A full-dress debate is to take place later on.

REVIEW.

The Lost Language oj Symbolism. An enquiry into the origin of certain letters, words, names, fairy-tales, folklore and mythologies, by Harold Bayley. Williams and Norgate, London. Two Vols., 800 pp., cloth, 24s. net.

THIS book is an amplification of Mr. Harold Bayley's "A New Light on the Renaissance." In that work he propounded new and interesting theories on the purpose for which symbolical designs were introduced into printing and paper-marks. In the "Lost Language of Symbolism" the author has widened the range of his investigations and brought together such a wealth of information on the subject as never before has been presented to the reading public. He makes no idle boast when he says that he has taken all symbolism to be his province.

The work is embellished with 1,400 facsimile of mediæval emblems.

To give any adequate description of the extent of the array of iuformation given as to the ancient and modern symbolisms of East and West would occupy several numbers of this journal. The author traces from fresh vantage ground the direct continuity between the symbols of pre-Christian art and philosophy and the insignia of Christianity. The chapters on the important influence which symbolism has exercised upon language are of special interest. Mr. Harold Bayley must have covered an enormous range of literature of every description to obtain his facts. He has a remarkable aptitude for recognising similitudes and is aided in the working out of his theories by a fertile imagination, the exercise of which in investigations of such a subject is indispensable. But the volumes must be read to be appreciated. They will probably take rank as one of the standard works on the subject.

CORRESPONDENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—Recurring again to Mr. Hutchinson's "new view" of the Sonnets, I showed in my letter printed in your October number, that there is nothing new in this view. That as far back as 1907-8 I was treating this "view" as a commonplace. This is evident in the opening lines of one of my papers, quoted in my letter, viz :—

> "I suppose there is no person now, no student, at least, who doubts that the Sonnets have reference to the author, and to his genius, his art, and his writings."

If this view of the Sonnets, standing alone, is interesting, it seems to me vastly more so that the same symbology may be traced in a number of plays. In three papers sent you I showed, or endeavoured to show, that at least four of the plays, *The Tempest*, *Winter's Tale*, *Cymbeline*, and *Pericles* carried this symbolism. In the Sonnets it is too obvious to be very interesting, but it is not so easily detected in the plays where story, plot, and a running narrative tend to obscure it. I think those who find interest in the theory as applied to the Sonnets, will find much more in tracing it in the plays. Mr. Hutchinson's paper seems to have had one merit which mine did not. It has aroused interest in the theory. Only two of my papers were published—"A Piece of Tender Air," in October, 1907, and "Summer's Honey Breath," in January, 1908. The third paper, "Leontes' Heir," is probably among your files. My purpose in these papers was to show that the plays mentioned carry the same veiled meaning as the Sonnets, are a part and parcel of them in significance, and that by the expressions "summer's honey breath," "a piece of tender air" and "Leontes' heir," Shakespeare meant exactly the same as he means by "thee," "thou," &c., in the Sonnets.

Very respectfully,

C. G. HORNOR.

Guthrie, Oklahoma, December 20th, 1912.

An Anecdote of "willm Shagfper" in London.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—If the readers of BACONIANA who, like the writer, have owned and read the quarterly from the first issue of the magazine in 1892, could be furnished with more particulars of the true life of the Stratford peasant, "willm Shagfper" (1563—1616), items that have not yet appeared in the columns of BACONIANA, or if printed long ago, will bear repetition, it would be interesting and instructive.

The way to win the anti-Shagfper cause is to state and continue repeating the facts of that peasant's life. In 1900, in his book "Shaksper not Shakespeare," William Henry Edwards, A.M., of Charlestown, West Virginia, U.S.A., and in that 48 page pamphlet by Major G. H. P. Burns, printed in 1903 at Leicester, England, the writers have followed this plan. They have recorded facts that cannot be denied or refuted. The extracts from the Stratford records in Major Burns' booklet contain dates that Halliwell-Phillipps and Sidney Lee have suppressed—a conclusive proof that their examination of the Stratford Town records was very superficial. This is not to be wondered at, for the "Shagsper cause" is maintained by garbled statements, falsehoods, fallacies, the suppression of disagreeable facts, &c. Edwin Reed in his books gives many illustrations of their methods.

The writer would call particular attention to the only documentary evidence of what "willm" said and did when living in London. In the 11th edition of Halliwell-Phillipps' "Outlines" (1898), on page 266 of Vol. II., is printed a copy of a letter by Edmund Malone (1741—1812), an accepted "Shaksper" authority. In this letter Mr. Malone states that the name of the father of the Stratford man was never written with the final "e" until 1650, therefore in the following extract from the diary of John Manningham (1602—1603), acting on Malone's authority, the name is spelled without a final "e." In that 1898 edition of "Outlines," on page 82 of Vol. I., is a facsimile of a Feb. 2, 1601-2 item from the diary, but the very important one of March 13, 1601-2, the very one that narrates an anecdote of "willm," was not reproduced in facsimile; it was suppressed altogether, although it had been printed in the earlier editions of "Outlines." Mr. D. G. Lambert, in his "Shakespeare Documents," also suppressed all mention of this March item. Neither in either of these books is there any mention of that index-page of the Northumberland manuscripts (a manuscript which gave the death-knell to the Shagsper cause) that was brought to light in 1867. A manuscript on which (as so pointedly stated by Dr. Appleton Morgan, President of the N.Y. Shakespeare So.) was written before 1598, on the same page, by the same pen, the names of Francis Bacon and William Shake-speare and the names of two Shake-speare plays. Thus is the life of the "Divine willm" concocted by the Stratfordians.

The two extracts which follow are arranged as to length of lines from that facsimile of John Manningham's manuscript as printed in "Outlines."

IV. An Extract from the Diary of John Manningham, a barrister of the Middle Temple, London, 1601-2: from the original in the British Museum. MS. Harl. 5353.

Feb., 1601-2.

At our feast wee had a play called twelve night
or what you will . . . much like ye comedy of

> errors or Menechmi in Plautus but most
> like and neere to that in Italian called Inganni
> a good practise in it to make ye steward
> beleeve his lady widdowe was in love with him,
> by counterfayting a letter as from his lady in
> generall termes, telling him what shee
> liked best in him, and prescribing his gesture
> in smiling, his apparaile, &c., and then
> when he came to practise making him believe
> they took him to be mad, &c.
>
> March 18, 1601-2.
>
> Upon a tyme Burbidge played Rich. 3, there was
> a citizen gaen so farr in liking with him, that
> before shee went from the play shee appointed
> him to come that night unto her by the name of
> Rich. the 3. Shaksper overhearing their conclusion
> went before, was entertained and at his
> game ere Burbidge came. Then Message being
> brought that Rich. the 3 was at dore, Shaksper
> caused return to be made that William the Conquerour
> was before Rich. the 3. Shaksper's
> name William.

While this anecdote of the "Divine willm" has been printed in one or more "Anti-Shagsper" books written by American authors, English writers of similar books seem to have refrained from giving to the public this the only record of what "willm" said and did while in London. This March item confirms very conclusively the statement found by Hon. Ignatius Donnelly in the mathematical cipher in the 1623 Folio, viz., that "willm Shagsper" was only a gate-keeper at a theatre, in which theatre (it is stated in another cipher) Anthony Bacon (1558—1601) is said to have had an extensive financial interest. Being a gate-keeper only, and not an actor, "willm" was able to get away soon after the performance commenced, after the audience had entered the theatre; while Burbidge, being an actor, was compelled to stay until the play was over. Thus "William the Conquerour," as can readily be seen, was able to arrive at the appointed place before the actor Burbidge.

AN AMERICAN SUBSCRIBER AND READER.

"Not without Mustard."

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—In BACONIANA for October, 1912, Sir E. Durning Lawrence makes great play with the scene in *Every Man out of his Humour* between Sogliardo, Sir Puntarvolo, and Carlo Buffone, where Sogliardo boasts of his coat of arms, obtained after

much toiling "among the harrots" (his crest being a "boar without a head, rampant"), and where Puntarvolo suggests that his motto should be "not without mustard." Sir Edwin had already given prominence to this scene in his "Bacon Is Shakespeare" book (1910), and he seems to direct our attention to the comparison between Puntarvolo's suggested motto and Shakespeare's "*Non Sans Droict*" as though it were some new discovery.* May I point out that in my "Shakespeare Problem Restated," published in June, 1908, I went fully into all this and set forth the scene from *Every Man out of his Humour* at length? (see page 461 *et seq.*). As I believe Sir Edwin did me the honour to read my book I think there must be some "unconscious cerebration" at work here!

Sir Edwin says he transcribes the extract given by him "from an extremely rare early quarto" which is in his library, and that it is from Act III., scene i., of the play, but that "modern editions" give it as Act III., scene iv. But Nicholson and Herford's edition of Ben Jonson, from which I took the long extract which I published, gives the scene word for word as quoted by Sir Edwin and gives it also as Act III., scene i.

I should not be at all surprised to learn that others before me had suspected a reference to Shakespeare (or Shakspere) in this passage of Ben Jonson's play—indeed, it would be surprising if they have not done so—but if such is the case I have no knowledge of it and should be glad to be enlightened as to the fact.

Yours faithfully, G. G. GREENWOOD.

House of Commons, Nov. 18, 1912.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—in the last number of BACONIANA Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence, not for the first time, points out the significance of the coat-of-arms scene in *Every Man out of his Humour*, produced for the first time in 1599. To our readers it may seem as if "thrice he slew the slain," and that the reference by Ben Jonson to the alleged grant of arms by the Heralds' College the very year before to John Shakespere had been fully demonstrated. But Sir Edwin knows well that such facts must be driven into the unwilling minds of the public by much hammering, and can scarcely be too often repeated. Let me add to them perhaps the smallest point that has ever been made on the subject—viz., a comma. Except in dimensions it is by no means insignificant. On the 30th March, 1908, I examined at the Heralds' College the entries relating to the grant. There are two rough drafts much altered. At the head of the page on which they appear is written "Shakespere, 1598" (in the body of the proposed grant the name is "Shakespeare"), and on the left top margin is tucked the coat-of-arms—gold, on a bend sable a spear of the first, steeled, argent,

* As such he has again brought it forward in *Notes and Queries*.

and, for cognisance, a falcon, his wings displayed, &c. Above the arms is the motto. Herein is the point—for in the first draft the motto is written "*Non, Sans Droit*"="No, without right," although in the second it is written "*Non sans droit*"="Not without right." The secret history of the insertion of that comma in the first place and its omission in the second would be enlightening.—Yours faithfully, J. R., of Gray's Inn.

18th November, 1912.

The "Shakespeare" Sonnets.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR, In reference to my articles on the "Shakespeare" Sonnets which have recently appeared in your pages, may I ask you to do me the favour of giving publicity to the following "Note," which I have thought necessary to append to the reprint of my last article in pamphlet form, and which will, I hope, render unnecessary any special reply from me to Mr. C. G. Hornor, as to his remark respecting the "newness" of my "views." Thanking you in advance for this, I am, yours very truly,

JOHN HUTCHINSON.

NOTE.

Some of my correspondents demur, however, to my description of my "view" as "new," saying they think they have seen it mooted "elsewhere," and have, moreover, "anticipated" it in their own thoughts. In this, indeed, I cannot but rejoice, as evidence that I do not stand alone in my opinions, but I must add that, until I ventured to ventilate my "new view" in BACONIANA (after, I may say, a hesitation of some half century) I never saw any anticipation of it in print, and, right or wrong, believed it to be "certainly original," as the *Athenæum*, indeed, has pronounced it.—J. H.

"The Love Test."

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—The materialistic interpretation put upon the Shake-Spearean Sonnets by Mr. Parker Woodward in his article on "The Love Test" is not borne out by the lesson of the Dedication to the Sonnets which, as I have elsewhere scientifically demonstrated, deals with the Religio Fons.

Francis Bacon was the English Rosicrucian Rex. This fact was made known by him in various ways in his writings with surpassing finesse.

The Sonnets themselves may most certainly be said to form a Hymn of Glory and Praise to the Religio Fons with its Analogue in all mankind.

By the way, Mr. John Hutchinson's spiritual treatment of the Shake-Speareau Sonnets is most admirable, and certain phrases of Mr. H. J. Hadrill's in respect to them are also charmingly appreciative. He well speaks of the author's "consciousness of a higher life and mystical relations with a beyond."

As to Mr. Parker Woodward's assumption that Francis Bacon was the son of a certain Royal Personage I think the theory is quite negatived by Francis Bacon's wonderful autobiographic Play—"Tempes T"; for a careful analysis of it reveals for one thing the almost positive intention of the author to make the sinister witch, "Sycorax," represent Queen Elizabeth.

Yours faithfully,

HENRY WOOLLEN.

112, Caldershaw Road, West Ealing, W., Dec. 3rd, 1912.

Queen Elizabeth's Son.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIR,—In that extraordinary "Fable like a Historie," "The Argenis," written by John Barclay,* there are many important historical personages set forth under feigned names—personages of the Elizabethan age with whom we are very familiar—who do many things that are unknown to history, and appear in strange and startling surroundings. I have dealt with this in the little book that I published in 1911, "Bacon's Secret Disclosed,"† in the chapter entitled "John Barclay's 'Argenis.'" Here it is shewn that among the other characters introduced is the Queen Hyanisbe, and by the key added to the book in the 1629 edition it is explained that Queen Hyanisbe is Queen Elizabeth. Now in the tale—the Fable like a History—it is shown that Hyanisbe is married to one Siphax, who is described as being "a man of the most eminent qualitie, next the Kings," and of this union there is born a son, who is named Hiempsall; though when he travels abroad, with the permission and knowledge of his mother the Queen, he assumes the name Archombrotus, and under that is known outside his own country. It was very evident to me when writing about this that the name Hiempsall was a concocted or made-up name, and I asked in my book (p. 145): "Can anyone suggest the derivation of this name, or any hint wrapped up in its numerical value?" The mere look of the name suggested to my mind that it had been formed for the purpose of hiding something, especially when this curious name was put

* Joannis Barclaii, "Argenis," Paris, 1621: (First edition). London, 1625: (First English edition). London, 1629: (First edition with key to characters).

† "Bacon's Secret Disclosed in Contemporary Books." London: Gay & Hancock, Ltd., Henrietta Street, Covent Garden. 1911.

forward as that of the son of Hyanisbe, the feigned name for Queen Elizabeth. It was only a few weeks ago that I received a note from Mr. Ben Haworth Booth, of Rolston Hall, Hornsea, Hull—a gentleman who had been interested in my book—pointing out that the name Hiempsall contained the anagram, "I spell Ham." Every letter is complete. To the ordinary reader of "The Argenis" the discovery of such an anagram as this in the name of Queen Hyanisbe's son would convey little or nothing, and it would be of no more importance to spell "Ham" than to spell "Beer." But to one having the key to the names in "The Argenis," and knowing that Hyanisbe meant Queen Elizabeth, the fact is somewhat startling, and somewhat significant, that her son's name spells "Ham," when the secret story tells us that his name was "Bacon." Of course I easily hear the would-be wise and keen-witted gentry exclaim, "Oh! a mere coincidence." It is so easy to evoke the all-powerful "coincidence" to explain any difficult or troublesome passage. But I think to any unbiassed mind the explanation is much more reasonable that John Barclay saw more than meets the eye when he concocted the name Hiempsall for Queen Elizabeth's son in his "Fable like a History."

It is, I think, important to point out as having some bearing on this, that the edition in which the key to "The Argenis" was first printed, was not published till 1629—three years after Bacon had retired from the world's stage. Thus, up to that year no one knew who was meant by Hyanisbe, and therefore still less who might be pointed at under the name Hiempsall, even had the anagram been then evolved. The key to the book gave the key to much else besides, if only people knew how to use it. And I am again reminded of the very peculiar fact, as pointed out in my book before alluded to (p. 137), that Charles I. hastened and hurried on the publication of this 1629 edition of "The Argenis," with the key for the first time given to the world. I confess I have been quite unable to imagine any reason for Charles' wish for the publication of this book, with the key; especially when there had already been published in London the 1625 edition with the whole story in English.

I would further note that, I think, it is in the 1629 edition, when the key appears, that the name is first spelt "Hiempsall"; in previous editions it is given as "Hyempsal" and "Hyempsall." Of course for the anagram the spelling I have first given is required. In the 1629 edition the name is spelt with a "y" on two or three occasions, but most frequently with an "i," and it is so spelt on the first occasion that it is introduced as the name of the Queen's son.

GRANVILLE C. CUNINGHAM.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIR,—That Bacon paid several visits to France is history. Was the death of Francis Duke of Anjou one of the occasions of his crossing the Channel? Is he the mysterious B. alluded to in the following paragraph? That Francis Bacon was intimate with the Duke and how greatly he admired and respected him can be seen in the long paragraph about him in Francis' "State of Christendom."

"In France died Francis Duke of Anjou of sickness which he contracted through grief and trouble of mind. For the sad loss of these two (William of Orange and Duke of Anjou) Queen Elizabeth was very much troubled and sent B. into France (1584) to let the King understand how heavily she took the Duke of Anjou's death, whom she had always found to be a most faithful and dear friend to her" (p. 304, Camden's "Eliz.").

"Francis Duke of Anjou and Brabant, great praise for his calling and quality greatly to be considered as any Prince this day living. . . . There is noted in the disposition of this Prince great mildness, giving satisfaction to all men, facility of address and natural courtesy, understanding and speech great and eloquent, secresy more than is common in the French," &c., &c. (Francis Bacon's "State of Europe").

I am glad of this opportunity to draw attention to the remarkable expression Bacon uses with regard to this Prince and the "diseased state of the world" at the time.

"We do plainly see in the most countries of Christendom so unsound and shaken an estate, as desireth *the help of some great person to set together and join again the pieces asunder and out of joint.*" The italics are my own. Turn to *Hamlet*:

Act I., scene v.

"Still your fingers on your lips I pray.
The time *is out of joint*,—O cursed spite!
That ever I was born to *set it right.*"

And again, Act II., scene ii.

"Thinking our State to be disjoint and out of Frame."

The same idea and term "out of joint" occurs in John Donne's Poems.

"As Mankind so is the world's whole frame
Quite out of joint, almost created lame.

. . . . . .

The world did in her cradle take a fall
And turned her brains, and took a general maim;
Wronging each joint of the universal Frame,
The noblest part Man felt it first, and then
Both beasts and plants, curst in the curse of Man."

Mysterious John Donne! whom I think Gosse accuses of

brushing against Shakespeare in daily life and never mentioning him!

"Still, your fingers on your lips, I pray," essentially Bacon's motto!

May I draw the attention of your readers to another matter? This poem,

DE MORTE,

"Man's Life's a Tragedy. His Mother's womb
(From which he enters) is the Tyring room.
The spacious earth the Theatre. And the Stage
That country which he lives in: Passions, Rage,
Folly, and Vice are actors. The first cry
The Prolougue to th'ensuing Tragedy.
The former Act consisteth of Dumb Shows.
The Second, he to more perfection grows!
In the Third he is a man, and doth begin
To nurture Vice, and act the deeds of sin.
In the Fourth declines. In the Fifth diseases clog
And trouble him, then Death's his Epilogue."—IGNOTO

is from "*Reliquiæ Wottonianæ*" in the section "Found among the Papers of Sir Henry Wotton." It appears directly after the poem beginning "This world's a Bubble," attributed to Sir Francis Bacon in Palgrave's "Golden Treasury." It is significant that Francis Bacon wrote thus "On Death" in his prose works:—"Life . . . sends men headlong into this wretched Theatre, when being arrived their first language is that of mourning."

My attention has been drawn to this poem by Mr. Sellars, our ardent Baconian in New South Wales.

Yours sincerely, ALICIA AMY LEITH.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—Will you allow me to draw attention to a few interesting points.

Bacon hid his secrets in order that, like the play of innocent children, they should be found out. It is delightful how we find these secrets wherever we look in the books he claims as his, and how one finds one thing and another finds out the rest and it fits together; we are all trying to solve the great puzzle, and we *never* find anything that does not fit in.

If you will permit me the space I should like to mention two instances of this kind.

Last winter Mr. Basil Brown, of New York, kindly sent me his very interesting pamphlet, "Supposed Caricature of the Droeshout Portrait of Shakespeare," printed privately 1911, and told me besides of his having discovered that the name Droeshout is an anagram of *outherods* (*cp. Hamlet*).

Now, when I came to look at my facsimile copy of the 1623 Folio, I saw that the whole signature is *Martin Droeshout*, the

anagram of which is: *outherods min' art*, meaning, this portrait outdoes anything I have ever drawn.

Dr. Orville W. Owen told me that in all the original copies he had had a chance to examine, this portrait, which, as we all know, is nothing but a mask, is set in; I believe, when the manuscripts are brought to light, and I am convinced that they are all kept and carefully guarded, there will come forth at least one, possibly several copies of the 1623 Folio with Bacon's portrait on the title-page in place of the other.

Mr. Charles P. Bowditch, in his wonderfully interesting book, "The Connection of Francis Bacon with the First Folio of Shakespeare's Plays and with the Books of Cipher of his time" (Cambridge University Press, 1910), explains the joke contained in the address "To the Great Variety of Readers" on page A3, signed "John Heminge" and "Henrie Condell," showing that the *sixpen'orth*, the *shillings worth* and the *fiue shillings worth* are the keys for finding Bacon's name and a longer message hidden in this page. Counting from the end of the sentence which contains these keys and ends with the word *welcome*, the sixth word *Buy* begins with a capital B, the twelfth word *And* after that 1sh=12 pence), with a capital A, and the sixtieth word from there on 5sh=60 pence), counting *Cock-pit* as one word, with the prefix *con*, it is the significant word *confesse*.

When I tested this discovery I noticed the large ornamental F at the top of the page and the capital R directly beside it, very much as on the first page of *The Rape of Lucrece*, where it is printed like this:

When you turn that page A3 of the Folio upside down, you will easily detect a capital R, fitting directly into the space between the F, and forming part of the scrollwork. Whether Mr. Bowditch and the late Mr. Samuel Cabot, who found the hidden message, never noticed this *F R* I do not know; it is not mentioned in the book, but it seems to me to complete their solution. By the way, Mr. Bowditch's comment on the word *honorificabilitudini* is, to me, by far the most interesting and convincing I have ever seen.

In connection with the fact that the letters *Sh* in the fifteenth stanza of *The Rape of Lucrece*, mentioned on page 183 of your October issue of BACONIANA, stands on line 103, I should like to draw attention to the very curious page 103 in an emblem-book by Geffrey Whitney, 1586. It has on it a picture of the Goddess Minerva with the spear, in two different attitudes. On the right she stands erect, before a tree, laden with fruit and leaves, her face turned towards what I take for cornfields, suggesting a harvest; she holds the spear straight and firm with her right hand raised, the large shield covering her left arm, way up to her shoulder. On the left she is sitting down, leaning against a bare tree, and holds her spear slanting, with her right arm hanging

down in an attitude of weariness, her left hand resting the shield on her left knee; the landscape behind her is barren.

Below the picture stands the following verse :—

> "CONTINVAL toile, and labour, is not beste :
> But sometimes cease, and rest thy wearie bones,
> The daie to worke, the nighte was made to reste,
> And studentes must haue pastimes for the nones :
> Sometime the Lute, the Chesse, or Bowe by fittes,
> For ouermuch, dothe dull the finest wittes.
>
> For lack of reste, the feilde dothe barren growe,
> The winter coulde, not all the years doth raigne :
> And dailie bente, doth weake the strongest bowe ;
> Yea our delightes still vs'd, we doe disdaine.
> Then rest by fittes, amongste your great affaires,
> But not too muche, leste sloathe dothe set her snares."

The first word, made up entirely of capitals, contains Bacon's whole name, except the B, and that stands directly under the O, beside the capital C. In the first verse note the F-r on the last line and the capital B on the second, and in the second verse the F-r on the first line and the B on the last. The remaining initials of the first verse, S, T, A, I take to stand for St. Albans.

In the small volume of Bacon's "History of Life and Death," published in Dillingen on the Danube, near Augsburg, in 1645, there is a beautiful frontispiece drawn by the same Wolfgang Kilian, who did that most wonderful title-page of the "CRYPTOMENYTICES," by Gustavus Selenus, of 1624. On the former frontispiece the title is given: "Francisci Baronis de Vervlamio, Vicecomitis S. Albani, Historia Vitæ et Mortis," omitting the name Bacon. In the middle at the top there is a very sweet portrait of him at about the age of twelve; in the four corners are tiny pictures referring to his life, on the second one of which a lute is lying at his feet (*cp.* with the lute mentioned in the above poem); on either side are the two Masonic pillars entwined with laurel, which we attribute only to poets.

In the second verse it says in the fifth line: "Then rest by fittes, amongste your great affaires." Mr. William Stone Booth, in his second book, "The Hidden Signatures of Francesco Colonna and Francis Bacon" (W. A. Butterfield, 59, Bromfield Street, Boston, Mass.), page 44, quotes a poem, dedicated by John Davies "To the royall, ingenious, and all-learned knight, Sir Francis Bacon," in which he says that he "embosomed his Muse for sport twixt grave affaires."

Bacon, in his poem, uses the word "pastimes" in the fourth line, and in the last but one, "amongste your great affaires," precisely the same idea, expressed in almost the same words. Most likely John Davies knew this wise little poem of Bacon's, and quoted from memory.

Now others, who may never have seen this picture in Geffrey

Whitney's book, nor ever have read John Davies' verses, have proved that in the periods when Bacon was not in office one Shakespeare play after another came out; whilst, on the other hand, in the years when he was in office, and busy with his "great affaires," he had to let his Shakespeare-Muse, Pallas Athæna, with her spear, sit down and rest, and then the tree was bare and bore no fruit, and not a single play was published.

There will be a great deal of all this sort of evidence in my book, "Bacon-Shakespeare? Der Wahrheit die Ehre!" which is being printed by Friedrich Gustch in Karlsruhe now, with over forty illustrations. May it help towards making my dear countrymen and women open their eyes to the truth!

Yours faithfully, A. M. VON BLOMBERG.

116, Charles Street, Boston, Mass., U.S.A., Sept., 1912.

BACONIANA.

VOL. XI. *Third Series.* APRIL, 1913. No. 42.

"THE BACONIAN HERESY."

EVERY Baconian must regard the publication of this work with feelings of unqualified satisfaction. It has been promised, or rather threatened, by the author for some years past. Now that it has issued from the Press, the Baconian cannot repress a sigh of relief, which gives place to a sincere expression of admiration for the brilliant achievement of the author. Had a conclave been convened of all the Shakespearean scholars, who witness with alarm and consternation the growing influence of the band of men and women to whom the term Baconians is applied, for the purpose of selecting a champion to represent them who should go forth and denounce the heresy to which those misguided men and women are attached, no selection for the honour could have been more wise than that of Mr. Robertson. There are, perhaps, few other writers who have covered such a variety of subjects. Here are some of the titles of his works:—"The History of Christianity," "The History of Free Thought," "Christianity and Mythology," "Pagan Christs," "The Dynamics of Religion," "The Fallacy of Saving, "The Eight Hours Question," "Buckle and his Critics," "The Saxon and the Celt," "Tennyson and Browning as Teachers," "Essays in Ethics," "Essays on Sociology,"

"Letters on Reasoning," "Chamberlain," "Montaigne and Shakespeare," "Did Shakespeare Write 'Titus Andronicus'?" "Wrecking the Empire." Mr. Robertson also wrote the history of Charles Bradlaugh's Parliamentary struggles, which forms the second volume of his Life. He is undoubtedly the ablest defender of Free Trade doctrines, and his publications on this subject have been voluminous. Perhaps the finest work which has come from his pen is a volume styled "Pioneer Humanists," which contains a series of essays on Machiavelli, Bacon, Hobbes, Spinoza, Shaftesbury, Mandeville, Gibbon, and Mary Wollstonecraft. The gem of this series is the essay on Bacon. This is founded to a considerable extent on Spedding's "Evenings With a Reviewer," but it stands out as one of the most, if not the most, powerful defence of Bacon's life and character which has been written. The affectionate regard in which Mr. Robertson holds James Spedding will be referred to hereafter. As editor of the most convenient edition of Bacon's works, the author has displayed his intimate acquaintance with the *acknowledged* works of the great philosopher. It would not be without considerable justification that he might repeat the boast of the great man who said "I have taken all knowledge to be my province." Mr. Robertson has for many years held a seat in the imperial legislature, and is now a member of the present Government.

But it is as a controversialist that Mr. Robertson has won his greatest triumphs. Reared in a school which gave no quarter and asked no quarter, his cogent logical reasoning, his merciless sarcasm and power of denunciation, have reduced foe after foe to a state of helpless prostration. In this art he has no superior. And now this Prometheus has applied all his powers to a denunciation of the Baconians, and produced a work which, as a controversial effort, may without hesitation be characterised

as his most brilliant achievement. It is for this reason that Baconians, who hold tenaciously to the adage that "truth will prevail," must regard the publication of "The Baconian Heresy" with feelings of unqualified satisfaction.

Now the plan of the work is simple. It does not purport to be an enquiry into the truth of the contention that Francis Bacon was the author of the poems and plays which appeared under the name of William Shakespeare. It contains no impartial consideration of the evidence advanced for and against this theory. The existence of any evidence *for* is at the outset denied. *The author frankly announces that his purpose is not investigation but denunciation.* He refuses to consider the arguments of Baconians with one simple exception. That exception is made for one purpose only—that he may avail himself of the labours of Judge Willis, which are found in "The Baconian Mint." The Judge's criticisms are devoted solely to Dr. R. M. Theobald's "Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light." These labours could not be appropriated as they are—quite properly with all acknowledgments and complimentary references to the Judge—without the recognition of the existence of Dr. Theobald's work, and so it became unavoidable that he should be specially selected for denunciation. Without stint or curb, Mr. Robertson employs all his powerful resources of sarcasm and indignation to make Dr. Theobald appear unreliable, ill-informed and ridiculous. Throughout his book only once does he admit any Baconians to have, not classical knowledge, but ordinary intelligence, average education, knowledge of Elizabethan literature, or acquaintance with the works of either Shakespeare or Bacon. The possession by a Baconian of any degree of common sense he again and again specifically denies. Only once

does he suffer himself to relapse from this attitude. On page 5 he admits that Sir Edwin Durning Lawrence, like Dr. Theobald, is a learned man, which Mr. Donnelly was not. With the skill of a pastmaster in controversy, he thus seeks to discredit in the eyes of his readers those to whom he is opposed, whose opinions he does not deign to put forward even for the purpose of refutation.

But in order to induce his readers to unconsciously share his avowed contempt for Baconians, Mr. Robertson has recourse to a clever artifice which further accentuates his great controversial skill.

This theory is seriously propounded:—

"It is very doubtful whether the Baconian theory would ever have been framed had not the idolatrous Shakespeareans set up a visionary figure of the master" (page 2).

"All that one can hope to do is to arrest a minority on their path of mounting credence by confronting them with some evidence at least as valid as that on which they decided to take the Baconian turning. It was by garbled and erroneous information that they were first set going; fuller and more accurate information may turn them" (page 5).

"And the Baconian opinion—the wilder extravagances apart—is, in my opinion, an hallucination actually derivable and derived from opinions promulgated by some good Shakespearean scholars who scout the other" (page 6).

It would be impossible to conceive any theory which is more diametrically opposed to the facts. It is impossible to believe that Mr. Robertson holds this opinion except for controversial exigencies. This was not always his opinion, for in "Pioneer Humanists," after giving a number of quotations from Bacon's works, he thus commented on them:—

"The man who wrote thus, however he might hedge and temporise, and even lapse into ordinary religious unreason, assuredly made for freethought; even as the denouncer of the idols of the tribe, and the den and the market-place, though by

his constructive fantasies he might move the first inquirers of the Royal Society to trifle at large, helped in the end to banish arbitrariness from scientific thought. It is thus that genius is justified of her children; and it is in the obscure tenacity of her sway that we must look for the source of the strange dream that he who wrote the "Novum Organum" wrote also "The Winter's Tale."

Mr. Robertson cannot have entered into the fray without having read the works of some of what may be termed the leading Baconians, past and present. He is far too thorough in his methods. But it was not his object to search for the truth, but to win his case. Their valid arguments must be side-tracked. If they can be avoided the attack is rendered more simple, and the result is more secure. The hypothesis is therefore plausibly put forward that the main Baconian arguments and by inference all such arguments, are founded on the mistaken idolatry of too enthusiastic Shakespearean scholars. The mind of the reader of "The Baconian Heresy" being again unconsciously induced to adopt this hypothesis, it appears to him to follow naturally that if it can be proved that the source is contaminated, the streams which flow from it must be also, and so he is invited to say, "Agreed; proceed."

No one knows better than Mr. Robertson that the fundamental arguments of Baconians have not their origin in the idolatry of Shakespeareans. The method here employed, however unfair, is quite a common practice. Hardly an evening passes but it is adopted in the House of Commons. It is an ordinary weapon in party warfare. It was the current method in the school of controversy in which Mr. Robertson was reared. Now he has applied it to a literary discussion, and again it is impossible to withhold an expression of recognition of the skill with which it is used.

It being necessary that the men who have established

the Baconian case and their works should be kept out of the sight of the reader, a substitute has to be found to play the part of a lay figure. The perfect artist is at work. The more famous the substitute the better. Chapter II. is headed "The Position of Mark Twain" and thus commences :—

" Englishmen are wont with small justification to lay Bacon-Shakespearism at the door of 'America.' It was in fact first clearly propounded in England, and has been nourished from the start on the dicta of 'orthodox' English devotees who had either never heard of the Baconian heresy or regarded it as beneath contempt; and the avowed heretics have latterly seemed to swarm, or at least to hive, as actively in England as in the States. But since the publication of Mark Twain's 'Is Shakespeare Dead?' the cult bids fair to become predominantly an American movement, like 'Christian Science.' To a Briton, however, who knows it to be all a woeful mistake, there is no comfort in this. Error is as inevitable in its reactions as depression in trade; and the brotherhood of culture can no more than that of science recognise tribal divisions. We claim to cherish Mark Twain 'on this side' with a special regard, and it is the possession of a full share in that bias that proximately moves the present writer to lift up a systematic testimony 'on the other side,' in what Mark Twain has called, 'the Bacon-Shakespeare scuffle.' The thing has become serious since he entered the fray. Mark Twain's championship of the Baconian theory, or at least of the 'anti-Stratford' thesis, gives to the antis a dangerous advantage. He is apt to win the laughers—a thing not before to be apprehended from Baconian propaganda; and his influence in this way is even more potent since his death. And no man is likely to seek to meet him with his special weapons. The fun of 'Is Shakespeare Dead?' is nearly as good as it had needs be. But, as usual, the serious purpose or purport of its author is perfectly clear; and he is likely, as usual, to have justified or induced a strong belief by his fun where he so wished. It is accordingly justifiable to take his statement of the case as specially important, if not typical, and by controverting it, to supply an up-to-date introduction to the whole dispute. If the process involves some serious strictures on a beloved author's wilful way of handling a complex problem it cannot be helped; the master

of thirty legions in the order of humour must just take the chances in a literary war in which he was the challenger. Against one form of hostility he is secure. Against Mark Twain on no score can any man bear malice."

This is perfect! The true Briton armed with truth is to march forth against the predominantly American movement founded on error. The analogy of "Christian Science" is intended to do its work. What though there be no analogy? The implied odium has been put into the mind of the reader. The affectionate expression of regard for the great American humorist must win the sympathy of his many English admirers. "The thing has become serious since he entered the fray." Why? Because his knowledge of the literature of the period is so great and his arguments so cogent? No. Because he has thrown some new light on the subject? No. These might be considerations of consequence if truth was the object of the quest. "He is apt to win the laughers—a thing not before to be apprehended from Baconian propaganda." And it is this that causes Mr. Robertson to leave his retirement and publish a book, the greater part of which was prepared long before Mark Twain's pamphlet was dreamt of. But whether this be the cause, and not the opportunity, for its publication, all the same Baconians owe a debt of gratitude to the distinguished American for bringing about the publication of an argumentative work which neither Baconian nor Shakespearean can do other than regard with respectful admiration.

The next is a daring move. Chapter III. commences:—"Taking Mark Twain as the protagonist of the Baconian case." The Baconian has to read these words over several times before he can realise that they are printed in the book. The "half-educated" Baconian turns to his dictionary to see if it contains some meaning of the word "protagonist," of which he

knows nothing. But there remains the definite assumption that Mark Twain is adopted as the protagonist of the Baconian movement. Yet only a few pages previously Mr. Robertson associated Mark Twain with Baconians in a half-hearted, hesitating manner, for he said, "Mark Twain's championship of the Baconian theory, or at least of the 'anti-Stratford' thesis," &c. Now, to assist the exigencies of the position, he has blossomed forth into the Baconian protagonist. Let it here be stated definitely that the difference between the two shades of opinion is this—the Baconian from his knowledge of Bacon's works, literary style, methods, ideals and purposes is convinced that Francis Bacon was the author of the poems and plays, including *Titus Adronicus* and *Henry VI.*, written under the pseudonym of William Shakespeare, whilst the anti-Stratfordian is only convinced that whoever wrote them it was not the Stratford Shagspere. But the fact that Mark Twain went little if any further than the anti-Stratfordian does not hinder Mr. Robertson from testing the extent of the credulity of his readers by putting him forward as the Baconian protagonist. With but one other reference Mark Twain may be permitted to retire from the discussion. His name, without any good cause so far as it is concerned, was dragged in to prejudice the Baconian case—a clever and daring move, the purpose of which has now been communicated to the reader.

It is first necessary to examine the case advanced by Mr. Robertson against, *not* the Baconian case but against *what he chooses to substitute for it.* It will be shown hereafter that the one and the other are widely divergent.

The substituted case is thus put forward. Mark Twain's anti-Shakespearean case—not, be it observed,

the Baconian case of the Baconian protagonist—condenses into two main theses:—

1.—Shakespeare was of no account in Stratford-on-Avon in his lifetime; was utterly forgotten there from the moment of his death; and was therefore as a personality wholly incommensurate with the vast achievement of the plays.

2.—"The" plays are saturated with an exact technical knowledge of the law, which the Stratford actor cannot conceivably have possessed. On this thesis Mark Twain is willing to stake the whole question; for him it is a "crucial instance."

Other contentions arise in the course of the exposition, but these are the main fighting points.

This is definite and explicit. "The Baconian Heresy occupies 595 pages. Of these, Chapters IV., V. and V are headed Argument from Legal Allusions and Phras ology and Litigation and Legalism respectively, an take up 147 pages. Chapters VII. and VIII. are headed Alleged Classical Scholarship; Argument from Classical Scholarship, and occupy 198 pages. Chapters IX. and X. are headed Coincidences of Phrase, and occupy 107 pages. Chapters I. and II. mis-state The Conditions of the Problem and introduce Mark Twain in 30 pages, and Chapters XI., XII., XIII., XIV. and XV., from their headings, purport to deal with prose styles compared; Vocabularies, Intellectual Interests, Lives and Personalities, and occupy 113 pages. It will be observed that the chapters treating of the legal arguments and those dealing with the classical scholarship arguments take up three-fourths of the book. The greater portion of these consist of quotations from the works of contemporary authors; with few exceptions the dramatists and they are chiefly confined to six or eight men. Mr. Robertson acknowledges his indebtedness to Judge

Willis and Mr. Charles Crawford, to both of whom he refers in eulogistic terms. "The Baconian Mint: Its Claims Examined" (a book with which Baconians are familiar), by the former, is described as a work of the most patient and assiduous research. The essays of the latter, which originally appeared in *Notes and Queries* and which were reprinted in his "Collectanea," Mr. Robertson believes would with a wider circulation become "a fountain of healing to many distracted enquirers." But beyond the boundaries of the industrious research of these two writers, the chapters bear evidence of Mr. Robertson's wide reading in the works of the Elizabethan dramatists, poets and sonnet writers and their immediate predecessors. These works, however, form only a small portion of that wonderful literature which was produced during the golden age of English literature. Probably he may be one of the very few scholars who know anything about the greater portion, but the volume now under consideration affords no evidence on this point. It may be truly said that it would be difficult to find any subject that he was unacquainted with, his knowledge is of so encyclopædic a character. Be this as it may, every Baconian will be grateful to Mr. Robertson for bringing together for their use such a number of quotations from certain Elizabethan writers in an admirably classified condition.

The bearing upon the Baconian case of the arguments put forward may be conveniently arranged in the following order:—

1. The legal allusions which constitute the "crucial instance" of the Baconian protagonist.

2. The alleged classical allusions in the consideration of which Mr. Robertson revels.

3. The authentic facts known of the life of the Strat-

ford Shagspere, the allusions to the name to be found between 1593 and 1709, and the origin and value of the traditions as to his life and capabilities.

4. The life and works of Bacon and their bearing on the authorship of the Shakespeare poems and plays.

5. A statement of the Baconian case, comparing it to the supposititious case put forth in piecemeal by Mr. Robertson.

6. Replies to Mr. Robertson's argument on the prose and intellectual interests of Shakespeare and Bacon.

7. Some reasons why Mr. Robertson should not refuse to consider the value of evidence afforded by cyphers, cryptograms, and the like.

8. The position in which Mr. Robertson has landed himself.

9. A plea for a scholarly investigation of Elizabeth literature as opposed to Mr. Robertson's plea foi scholarly dissection of the plays.

10. The lessons which Baconians may learn from careful perusal of "The Baconian Heresy."

These points can only be dealt with in a very brief and insufficient manner in this article, because the writer has at his disposal only one page to answer every twenty of the larger pages in the work under consideration; but these should prove sufficient to convince every impartial reader, not only that in the main Mr. Robertson has failed in his attack, but that on every point which he has sought to establish, he has utterly broken down.

---

1. Baconians are not willing to accept Mr. Robertson's dictum that Lord Campbell's treatise, "Shakespeare's Legal Accomplishments Considered," is valueless. They say that he has in no degree depreciated its value as evidence. To-day it stands exactly where it did before his book was written. This may be conclusively proved

in less than a hundredth part of the space devoted to the attack on it. The treatise was written about the time the Baconian authorship was first suggested and before it had gained any general publicity. The question as to whether Shagspere was a clerk in an attorney's office at Stratford before he is supposed to have joined the players in London had been keenly agitated for some years.

As the dramatist's works began to be critically studied, the frequent use of legal terms in metaphors, illustrations and turns of expression attracted attention. In the Prolegomena to his edition of Shakespeare (1790) Malone, who was a barrister, drew attention to this. "His knowledge of legal terms," he writes, "is not merely uch as might be acquired by the casual observation of s all-comprehending mind; it has the appearance of *hnical* skill; and he is so fond of displaying it on all casions, that I suspect he was early initiated in at least the forms of the law." It was Chalmers who first made the suggestion that in his youth Shagspere might have been in an attorney's office. There had been, as Mr. Robertson definitely states (page 34), no tradition to this effect. Payne Collier invited Lord Campbell to consider the question from the point of view of an expert in law, and the treatise was the result. It is first directed to an examination of the traditions as to Shagspere's life which had come down—to suggestions as to the extent to which these were reliable. Lord Campbell refused to credit many of the traditions. The suggestions they contain relating to the circumstances of his early life did not fit in with the testimony of his works. He at last proceeded to a detailed examination of the legal allusions in twenty-three of the plays. He was not prepared to affirm that they afforded sufficient evidence to establish the attorney's clerk theory, but he asserted that if on the evidence, a jury of twelve men unanimously found a verdict they did, or did not, he did

not think the court sitting *in banco* could properly set it aside and grant a new trial. This, however, on the general question he did say :—

"Having concluded my examination of Shakespeare's judicial phrases and forensic allusions—on the retrospect I am amazed, not only by their number, but by the accuracy and propriety with which they are uniformly introduced." And again—

"To Shakespeare's law, lavishly as he propounds it, there can neither be demurrer, nor bill of exceptions, nor writ of error."

Now, as in the case of a trial of the issue, let the course which a Judge would adopt in making notes of the evidence be followed. Definite testimony by Lord Campbell to the above effect is in the Judge's notes.

What notes will he have from the 147 pages of M Robertson's evidence to contradict Lord Campbell?

There will be voluminous evidence that in *certain* othe plays and poems of the period the use of legal terms was prevalent. That the authors of those plays made as frequent use of legal terms as did Shakespeare. But not in one single case is evidence put forward to prove that he used them inaccurately.

It is affirmed, but without one shred of evidence in support, that Lord Campbell was not acquainted with the writings of contemporary dramatists. Mr. Robertson asserts that no one could have maintained Lord Campbell's opinion who was acquainted with their writings. But Malone had such an acquaintance and he maintained an opinion almost identical with that of Lord Campbell. It is doubtful whether Mr. Robertson's knowledge of the Elizabethan dramatists equals that of Payne Collier, and he maintained it. Mr. Robertson surely cannot claim that he alone has

read them; but his statements almost imply this. Nearly every Shakespearean scholar is opposed to him.

From pages 161 and 162 the Judge will take down on his notes from Mr. Robertson's pen these words:—

"I am not concerned to go into the question of the accuracy of Webster's or Massinger's phraseology; that is neither here nor there."

"I do not for a moment pretend that they exhibit 'deep' or 'accurate' knowledge. I leave these follies to the other side, who profess to certify a playwright's lawyership on grounds that would move a policeman to derision."

But surely accuracy and technical appropriateness ·ere Lord Campbell's main, nay, sole points. Mr. :obertson fails to prove Lord Campbell in error on this point, and refuses to advance evidence as to the accuracy of the use of legal allusions in the quotations from contemporary dramatists. What, then, must be the decision of the Judge? *That Lord Campbell's evidence stands unrebutted and must carry with it his judgment in an order of the Court.*

It is not necessary to follow Mr. Robertson through his criticisms of the writings on the law in Shakespeare by W. T. Rushton, Richard Grant White, Castle, and Senator Davis. They exhibit a wealth of knowledge and labour hopelessly misapplied. These chapters will be read from start to finish by very few except Baconians. They gratefully welcome them. The pages are crammed with stores of munitions to replenish the armoury of the heretics. The impartial reader will, however, observe that throughout it is the ardent and subtle controversialist who is writing—one who is much too anxious and alert to lapse even temporarily into the searcher after truth, one whose main object is to make things appear to be what they are not.

The illustrations are taken from Dekker, Heywood,

Massinger, Ben Jonson, Lilly, Webster, Nashe, Greene, Chapman, and in collaboration, Rowley, also from Sir John Davies. At any rate, Ben Jonson, Chapman and Sir John Davies were closely associated with Bacon. Mr. Robertson puts, as a poser, the question, "Was Lilly a lawyer?" Can he answer it in the negative, supported by any scrap of evidence? Can he say who John Lilly was? Was there any attempt to identify him before Anthony Wood in 1691 compiled his "Athenæ Oxoniensis"? The surname was a common one. Wood discovered a John Lylie who had matriculated in 1571, and straightway married him to "Euphues." Only by conjecture can this be done. Was Heywood a lawyer? He was at any rate of Gray's Inn. Thomas Nashe, whose name appears with those of Francis Bacon an William Shakespeare on the "Northumberland Man script," what was he? During these all-important yea 1579 to 1605—the most important years of his life-who were Bacon's associates and acquaintances? Outside the fragmentary references to his association with Burghley, Essex, and other statesmen, information as to which have come down to these times principally through documents relating to State affairs, can Mr. Robertson mention one literary man of the times, except Ben Jonson, that the brilliant young jester knew or was known to? But more of this anon.

If space permitted, there is statement after statement of Mr. Robertson's which might be questioned and disproved; but one there is which must be referred to. Again and again Mr. Robertson states and infers that Baconians were ignorant of the existence in contemporary writers of the use of legal terms. Yet he was acquainted with Mr. Harold Bayley's "The Shakespeare Symphony," and he would read on page 314: "Not only Shakespeare, but also the minor dramatists, were steeped in Jurisprudence. Their works are saturated

with allusions to supersedeas, lease parol, livery and seisin, caveats, fee simple, misprision, and so forth. The marked way in which they drag in the legal terms 'brief' and 'abstract' is a straw showing the trend of their thoughts."

And then follows *in extenso* the document from Act IV. Scene i. of Chapman's *All Fools*, referred to on page 141 of "The Baconian Heresy."

Mr. Parker Woodward and other Baconians have again and again drawn attention to the use of legal phraseology by contemporary writers.

It is difficult to refrain from again expressing admira-on at Mr. Robertson's exquisite skill. He feels com-elled to desribe this as a "useful compilation," which, he adds, "might serve to explode the Baconian delusion, albeit he speaks of it with surprising sympathy." Mr. Robertson knows Mr. Bayley to be an ardent Baconian. He is a member of the Council of the Bacon Society, and for some years was editor of BACONIANA. "The Shakespeare Symphony," prior to the publication of the "Baconian Heresy," was one of the few comparative works on the allusions of Shakespeare, the counterparts of which are to be found in the works of contemporaries. It covers the writings of Bacon, Marlowe, Kyd, Lyly, Peele, Greene, Heywood, Ford, Rowley, Marston, Chapman, Nashe, Lodge, Webster, Massinger, Beaumont, Fletcher, Middleton, Ben Jonson, Field, Day, Dekker, Shirley, Rowley, Drayton, Tourneur, Machin, Spenser, and the anonymous writers of the period, besides Falkland, Nabbes, Sir T. Browne, and others of the following period. It gives similitudes from the works of these writers not only on law but on religion, educational purpose, music, medicine and physiology, Elizabethan audiences, classicisms, error, wit and metaphor,

traits and idiosyncracies, and miscellaneous similitudes. An endeavour is made in it to form an estimate of the number of new words introduced into the language by Bacon, Shakespeare, and each of 24 other writers before named. How subtle is Mr. Robertson's reference to this book. It is a "useful compilation," and the author speaks of the Baconian delusion "with surprising sympathy"! In the same note "The English Language," a mere trifle by the side of Mr. Bayley's work, is referred to as "a charming little book." The student of the art of controversy should study this note with attention. He will learn from it when an author is suppressing the titles of all works which refute his contentions, and finds one which it is dangerous, in view of possible criticism, to omit some mention of, how that authc may, to protect himself, casually refer to it in a no give it reluctantly a mead of approval, coupling with tl mead an expression of surprise that the author of it h. sympathy with the object for which the book wa. written. It affords a unique example of perfection in the most delicate subtlety of the art where the borderline becomes very thin.

The present position of the Alleged Classical Scholarship of the plays is stated in the following sentences:—

"Here, again, the first instance being the legal knowledge in the plays, orthodox writers are as deep in fallacy as any of the Baconians. Long ago, Dr. Farmer proved to the satisfaction of the scholars of his generation that the author of the plays had little classical scholarship, and that the instances put forward by Upton, Lewis Theobald and others, were all reducible to English sources. The contrary thesis, however, has been zealously reviewed in recent times by two strongly anti-Baconian scholars, the late Professor Fiske and the late Professor Churton Collins, who drew upon the previous argumentation of Dr. Maguire and Professor

Baynes. Having elsewhere (Note by the author. See the authors, Montaigne and Shakespeare, 2nd edition, 1909, per index) discussed at length the classical case put by these critics and Mr. Greenwood, I will first deal with it mainly as it is put by Lord Penzance, who proceeds uncritically upon the data given him by Mr. Donnelly, and upon the sweeping assertions of several orthodox scholars."

It will be necessary directly to give a short summary of the controversy on the learning of Shakespeare, to show how thoroughly misleading is this statement of the case; but before doing so, the reader's attention nust be drawn again to Mr. Robertson's skill in the .hoice of his position for attack.

Lord Penzance, who, it is stated, "proceeds uncritically upon the data given him by Mr. Donnelly, and upon the sweeping assertions of several 'orthodox' scholars," is selected as a starting-point in this section. Then Mr. Greenwood receives attention, but the greater part of the attack is levelled at Dr. R. M. Theobald and his cousin, the late Mr. William Theobald. It would be presumption here to offerany defence for Mr. Greenwood. That gentleman is too capable a controversialist to need any assistance, and his reply to Mr. Robertson will no doubt be forthcoming in due course. Moreover, the strength of the Baconian case lies outside his arguments, which are strictly anti-Stratfordian, and Mr. Greenwood distinctly refuses to be classed as a Baconian.

Lord Penzance held about the same position with regard to the controversy as did Mark Twain. Indeed, it is incorrect to class him as a Baconian. He read much that had been written on both sides, and from the contentions of the parties drew out what he considered to be an impartial summing-up for the guidance of the jury. He was considered a sound judge, having a remarkable grasp of legal principles, and was endowed

by nature with a remarkable facility for marshalling facts. If on a perusal of his summing-up these facts appear to support the Baconian contention, so much the worse for the orthodox view. Mr. F. A. Inderwick, K.C., in a short account of the Judge's life prefixed to the volume, says, "Whether he ever formed a definite opinion on the question who was the author of the plays comprised in the Folio of 1623 is not quite clear." Here again is evidence of skill on the part of Mr. Robertson. The work of the late Mr. William Theobald is not sufficiently known to Baconians, but it is thorough and scholarly. He had a wide knowledge of the productions of the Elizabethan dramatists. His copies of their works, copiously annotated, bear evidence of this. Moreover, he prepared a concordance of Burton's "Anatom of Melancholy," the manuscript of which is in t possession of the writer of this article. Dr. R. Theobald's life's work is held in reverence by a Baconians, however they may differ from him on unimportant points. When belief in the Bacon authorship was unpopular and adherents were few, he worked and wrote to promulgate amongst his countrymen what he knew to be the truth. The line of operations of the cousins Theobald is so extended that there must be weak points in their armour; so Mr. Robertson selects them to bear the burden of his attacks, choosing only those points which he considers as most vulnerable.

It is better perhaps in these columns not to refer to the works of living Baconian authors. But during the last few years there have issued from the Press some of the ablest and most conclusive works in support of the Baconian thesis. The point it is now desired to make is this: It must be presumed that Mr. Robertson has read widely in the literature of the subject before

launching his fulminations against it. Why, then, did he not attempt to confute the arguments contained in Edwin Reed's "Bacon *v.* Shakepeare" and "Francis Bacon our Shakespeare," in Judge Webb's "The Mystery of William Shakespeare," in W. H. Edwards' "Shaksper Not Shakespeare," in Judge Holmes' "The Authorship of Shakespeare." Why did he not take as the basis for his refutation of parallelisms Mr. Edwin Reed's "Bacon-Shakespeare Parallelisms"? No! Mr. Robertson's object was to score off his opponents, to win the laughers and his case, not to find the truth. And this for reasons which will be suggested hereafter and which redound to his credit. In confirmation of this, one more point may be stated. He began by attributing the existence of the Bacon heresy solely to hallucination actually derivable and derived from opinions promulgated by some good Shakespearean scholars who are untainted by heresy. He began, when considering the legal attainments, with Lord Campbell and W. T. Rushton. Afterwards he leaves Shakespearean scholars severely alone. In a footnote before referred to he claims that the arguments of the late Mr. Churton Collins have been answered in "Shakespeare and Montaigne," second edition. Let the reader, as the writer of this article did long ago, take in his hand "Studies in Shakespeare," and go page by page through Mr. Robertson's book and mark in Mr. Churton Collins' work the references to it, and he will find that the most powerful arguments of Mr. Churton Collins have not been touched; practically nothing has been disproved; only on some particulars and on general conclusions have different opinions been expressed. There has been so far no answer to Mr. Churton Collins either by Mr. Robertson or anyone else. Here are two exceptionally able men, each of them an expert in polemics, each possessing a phenomenal memory, each a ripe

scholar. It has been said, and probably with truth, that Mr. Churton Collins had the most wonderful memory possessed by any man since Macaulay. Who is the unscholared man to follow? He must use such discriminative abilities as he possesses. Mr. Churton Collins devoted the whole of his life to the study of classical and modern literature; no man then living had read so widely or had a mind so stored with literary lore. It is no reflection on Mr. Robertson's classical or Elizabethan scholarship to say that his pursuit of knowledge has been in so many other directions that, given equality in memory, the younger man must yield to the elder in the latter's special line. So Baconians will accept Mr. Churton Collins where it is a matter of opinion only; the more so because the facts are all c his side.

The late Dr. C. M. Ingleby in compiling his "Shake speare's Centurie of Prayse," spent two years in research throughout English literature, from 1592 to 1693, to find every allusion, however slight it might be, to the poet Shakespeare or his works. He states that the references which he found denoted praise and, in some cases, dispraise, but not fame. No pains of research, scrutiny or study could connect the most trivial allusion to the bard or his works by any one of the great men of his day. This he regards as *tacitly* significant. The iteration of the same vapid and affected compliments, couched in conventional terms, from writers between 1592 to 1641, comparing Shakespeare's "tongue," "pen," or "vein" to silver, honey, sugar or nectar, while they ignore his greater and distinguishing qualities, is *expressly* significant. "It is plain," he adds, "for one thing, that the bard of our admiration was unknown to the men of that age." That is the testimony of the acknowledged authority on the subject.

Before passing on, reference must be made to the panegyric of Ben Jonson prefixed to the 1623 Folio. Although the transcendent qualities of the poet were not known to the men of his time, it is clear that Jonson realised them to the fullest extent, as did the author of the Sonnets. They are the two arch-idolaters. It was the custom of the time in such poetic efforts to indulge in exaggeration, but Jonson appears to have exhausted the capacities of the English language in this poem. Praise could go no further. The pet phrase of the belittlers of Shakespeare is contained in it. The lines are seldom quoted in full, but the statement is based on them that Jonson said, "Shakespeare had small Latin and less Greek." Do they bear that construction? Are they capable of any other? Here they are—

> "And though thou hadst small Latin and less Greeke,
> From thence to honour thee I would not seeke
> For names; but call forth thundr'ng Æschilus,
> Euripides, and Sophocles to us,
> Paccuvius, Accius, him of Cordova dead,
> To life again, to hear thy Buskin tread,
> And shake a stage: or when thy sockes were on,
> Leave thee alone, for the comparison
> Of all that insolent *Greece*, or haughtie *Rome*
> Sent forth, or since did from their ashes come."

The whole poem should be read and be fresh in the mind of the reader before he seeks to arrive at the exact intention of Jonson, who, in his "Discoveries" (1640, page 334) states that Bacon is "he, who hath . . . perform'd that in our tongue, which may be compar'd, or preferr'd, either to insolent *Greece*, or haughty *Rome*."

The author of Shakespeare is in these lines heralded as beyond all praise, surpassing all poets, ancient or modern, and with prophetic instinct Jonson sees him in the future advanced in the hemisphere and made a constellation.

This position he did not reach until the nineteenth century, and he was placed there by the men who would glory in being designated the idolaters of Shakespeare. But has this full brilliance of Shakespeare's fame yet been seen? Writing in 1874 Dr. Ingleby said, "We are at length slowly rounding to a just estimate of his works; and the time seems to be at hand when men of culture will attribute to the object of their admiration a much higher range of powers than were requisite for the production of the most popular and successful dramas of the world."

Dr. Ingleby was no Baconian; he was one of the most accomplished and conscientious students of the great poet's works.

Dr. Ingleby saw the truth dimly—he saw men as trees walking. Shakespeare is still obscured by cloud and mists, but they are gradually breaking. Scholar work by Baconians, painstaking research into t literature of the period, never before explored if t testimony of books written on the literature of the period can be relied on, a due appreciation of Bacon's life and works, the discovery of his own books crowded with annotations from his pen, are all helping to a full realization of and justification of Jonson's idolatrous metaphor. Jonson let Mr. Robertson have as a witness to the top of his bent.

Now let the reader try the effect of a cold douche from "The Baconian Heresy."

"The trouble is that, set going (*this is an error*) as they (*the Baconians*) were by the rebound of the idolatrous habit in regard to Shakespeare, they have developed a more extravagant idolatry in regard to Bacon. As the old Shakespeare worshipper (*Ben Jonson in his panegyric has never been equalled*) saw in his idol the sum of all intellectual excellence (*notwithstanding the belittlers of Shakespeare, the testimony of the culture of the world*), the

Baconian carrying credulity to new extremes proclaims a double miracle, and giving two kingdoms to one man, quadruples the folly of his predecessor," and *Jonson's prophecy is fulfilled, "I see thee to the Hemisphere Advanc'd and made a constellation there!).*

The passage commencing, "And though thou hadst small Latin and less Greeke" is not free from ambiguity —it may be contended intentional ambiguity—as are other passages in the panegyric. It is, however, capable of being construed thus: "And even if thou hadst small Latin and less Greeke, From thence to honour thee I would not seek." *

The words lend themselves as well to this reading as at which the belittlers insist upon quoting when they nit the word "though" and state that Jonson said ,akespeare had "small Latin and less Greeke." And .f the words permit the former construction (and they do) let the reader consider which is most in accord with the rest of the panegyric, bearing in mind this fact—that if the Bacon authorship be proved to be correct, the whole poem is the production of a wit, and is intended to make the reader use his wits to arrive at the truth.

The references to Shakespeare during the latter half of the seventeenth century usually bracket him with Ben Jonson and Beaumont and Fletcher. Sometimes one, sometimes another is preferred; but Shakespeare's supremacy is not recognized. Samuel Shepherd in "Theological Poems" (1651) says:—

> "Fletcher and Beaumont who so wrote,
> Johnson's fame was soon forgot,
> Shakespeare no glory was alow'd,
> His Sun quite shrunk beneath a cloud."

* This interpretation did not originate with Professor Conrad Mier, as stated by Mr. Robertson. It had been put forward nearly 20 years before the Professor repeated it.

It was in 1662 that Samuel Pepys saw *Midsummer Night's Dream* and described it as the most ridiculous play that ever he saw in his life; and in 1663 *Twelfth Night*, acted well, though it be but a silly play. In 1667 the *Taming of the Shrew* was a mean play; *Macbeth* one of the best plays for a stage and variety of dancing and music that ever he saw. Pepys did not appreciate Shakespeare.

It was in 1661 the traditions commenced, when the Rev. John Ward wrote in his Diary: "I have heard of y^{t} M$^{r.}$ Shakespeare was a natural wit without art at all." In 1662 Thomas Fuller wrote that if Shakespeare were alive he would confess himself never any scholar. The first appreciative estimate of Shakespeare is found in a letter from Margaret Cavendish, Lady Marchioness of Newcastle, published in 1664. He criticism of Shakespeare's works is excellent. The writ recognised the excellence of the women he had create She saw what few, if any, of the "scholars" ha realised—that Shakespeare was truly a natural orator. There is, however, no mention of his learning, though it appears to be implied.

Dryden first mentions Shakespeare in 1667. Dr. Samuel Johnson describes this writer as "the father of English criticism, the writer who first taught us to determine upon principles the merits of composition." The preface of his *Troilus and Cressida* (1679) contains his views on Shakespeare as a poet and dramatist. He was dissatisfied with Shakespeare's play, so he re-wrote it. Seeing some good in it he says: "I undertook to remove that heap of rubbish under which many excellent thoughts lay wholly buried." He belonged to the predecessors of Mr. Robertson's cult. Dryden considered that "no man ever drew so many characters or generally distinguished 'em better from one another" than did Shakespeare, "excepting only Johnson." He writes:

"The characters of Fletcher are poor and narrow in comparison with Shakespeare; I remember not one which is not borrowed from him ; unless you will except that strange mixture of a man in the King and no King : so that in this part Shakespear is generally worth our imitation and to copy from Fletcher is but to Copy after him who was a Copyer." So according to Dryden Mr. Robertson's many extracts from Beaumont and Fletcher must go by the board, for the style which utilized legal reference and classical allusions was copied from Shakespeare. Allowing that Shakespeare made his characters distinct, Dryden inferred that he understood the passions. He maintained that the fury of his passion often transported Shakespeare beyond the bounds of judgment, either in coining new words or phrases or racking words which were in use into the violence of a Catachresis. He speaks of Shakespeare as "that Divine Poet," and says that if he "were stript of all the Bombast of his passions, and dress'd in the most vulgar words, we should find the beauties of his thoughts remaining; if the embroideries were burnt down, there would still be silver at the bottom of the melting pot." This is the first serious criticism by a scholar, in fact the first criticism of Shakespeare's works. The question of his learning is not yet broached. It is clear that Dryden, although instinctively realising that Shakespeare was great, yet failed to see the beauty of the language and expression in his poetry. But the study of Shakespeare had been started. Edward Phillips in 1671 says probably his learning was not extraordinary. Thomas Rymer's criticism in 1678 is adverse to Shakespeare, but mentions not his learning; but in 1680 Nahum Tate published "The Loyal General: a Tragedy." Accompanying it is a letter to Edward Taylor, in which he exhibits a just estimate of the poet's characteristics. He shows an acquaintance with the plays, but is puzzled by the tradition that the poet lacked learning. He writes:

"What I have already asserted concerning the necessity of learning to make a compleat poet may seem inconsistent with my Reverence for our Shakespeare,

Cujus amor semper mihi crescit in Horas.

I confess I could never get a true account of his learning. And am apt to think it more than Common Report allows him. I am sure he never touches on a Roman story, but the Persons, the Passages, the Manners, the Circumstances, the Ceremonies are all Roman."

Directly cultured men began to study the dramas, the tradition as to Shakespeare's lack of learning was questioned. No intelligent man could read the plays without becoming conscious that an egregious mistake had been made.

The gossip Aubrey wrote about the same year, but throws no light on the subject. In 1691 Gerald Lar baine published an "An Account of the English Dr matic Poets." He esteemed his plays "beyond any that have ever been published in our language." He adds: "The truth is 'tis agreed by most that his learning was not extraordinary; and I am apt to believe that his skill in the *French* and *Italian* Tongues exceeded his knowledge in the *Roman* tongue."

Then another chapter opens with the publication of the first Life of Shakespeare, which accompanied the first octavo edition of his works in 1709 by Nicholas Rowe, and from that day to this a controversy has continued over the learning of the poet. Rowe in preparing his life was at considerable pains to gather together the existing traditions; he does not appear to have searched for the historical facts. The researches of Halliwell Phillips, however, brought to light many facts which he failed to discover. Rowe's Life contains the following account of Shakespeare's education :—

"Though he was his eldest son, his father could give him no better education than his own employment. He had bred him, it is true, for some time at a free school, where, it is probable, he acquired what Latin he was master of: but the narrowness of his circumstances, and the want of his assistance at home, forced his father to withdraw him from thence, and unhappily prevented his further proficiency in that language. It is without controversy that in his works we scarce find any traces of anything that looks like an imitation of the ancients. The delicacy of his taste and the natural bent of his great genius (equal if not superior to some of the best of theirs) would certainly have led him to read and study them with so much pleasure, that some of their fine images would naturally have insinuated themselves into and been mixed with their own writings; so that his not copying at least something from them, may be an argument for his never having read them. Whether his ignorance of the ancients was a disadvantage to him or no, may admit of a dispute: for though the knowledge of them might have made him more correct, yet it is not improbable but that the regularity and deference for them, which would have attended their correctness, might have restrained some of that fire, impetuosity and even beautiful extravagance which we admire in Shakespeare: and I believe we are better pleased with those thoughts, although new and uncommon, which his own imagination supplied him so abundantly with, than if he had given us the most beautiful passages out of the Greek and Latin poets, and that in the most agreeable manner that it was possible for a master of the English language to deliver them. Upon his leaving school he seems to have gone entirely into that way of living which his father proposed to him."

Shakespeare scholars seem to have adopted as much or as little of Rowe's "Life" as suited their purpose. It will be observed that the greater part of the foregoing paragraph consists of the biographer's opinions rather than history or tradition. Rowe was a good classical scholar and a barrister by profession. He early forsook the law for literature, and became a dramatist of considerable renown. It is difficult to estimate the precise amount of culture which Mr. Robertson will grant the author of the poems and plays possessed, but on the

whole he appears to be in practical agreement with Rowe. It may be said with confidence that the opinions expressed by him are at variance with those held by at least ninety per cent. of the men of letters who have since then devoted themselves to a study of the Shakespeare poems and plays. The circumstances attending the revived interest in Bacon and Shakespeare of the first forty years of the eighteenth century are remarkable, and call for careful investigation by students who are interested in the Bacon controversy. Much that is curious happened, but it is not necessary to say more here or to comment on what appears to be the inaccuracy of Rowe's conclusions.

The discussion now took a vigorous course. The leaders of the two factions were the well-known critics, Charles Gildon and John Dennis. The former wrote work, "The Complete Arte of Poetry." His view w that the poems and plays bore evidence that their auth was a man of culture, of vast reading, and a classic scholar. His views were subsequently supported by Dr. Sewel. Dennis would not admit that there was any justification for this opinion, and with patriotic vehemence affirmed that "he who allows Shakespeare had learning and a familiar acquaintance with the ancients, ought to be looked upon as a detractor from the glory of Great Britain. Dennis was a man of violent temper, and between the two critics, hitherto friends, a bitter feud ensued, for which Pope in the "Dunciad" unmercifully reproaches them. It is said that he only adopted the anti-learning position because he considered Gildon had attacked him personally. But the opinions of the "detractors" appear to have prevailed. The poems and plays were there for every man to form his own opinion on the points at issue. The tradition of the poet's lack of education and consequent want of learning had been accepted without investigation. With the

exception of Rhymer, so far the only comments which are recorded are from men and one woman (Margaret Cavendish), who, on studying the works, found the evidence they contained to be at variance with the tradition. The authority of the tradition had been considered to be so binding that men expressed opinions contrary to it with diffidence; but the intelligence of the students of the works rebelled against it.

Pope was commissioned to edit an edition of Shakespeare, which was published in 1722. In spite of the brilliant preface, it is said to be his only literary failure. It is useful to quote from this preface at some length:—

By these men (the players) it was thought a praise to Shakespeare that he scarce ever *blotted a line.* This they industriously propagated, as appears from what we are told by Ben Jonson in his "Discoveries," and from the preface of Heminges and Condell to the first folio edition. But in reality (however it has prevailed) there never was a more groundless report, or to the contrary of which there were more undeniable evidences. As the comedy of the *Merry Wives of Windsor,* which he entirely new writ; the *History of Henry VI.,* which was first published under the contention of York and Lancaster; and that of *Henry V.* extremely improved; that of *Hamlet* enlarged almost as much as at first, and many others. I believe the common opinion of his want of learning proceeded from no better ground. This too might be thought praise by some; and to this his errors have been as injudiciously ascribed by others. For 'tis certain were it true it would concern but a small part of them; the most are such as are not properly defects, but supersætations; and arise not from want of learning or reading, but from want of thinking or judging. . . . But, as to his *want of learning,* it may be necessary to say something more. There is certainly a vast difference between *learning* and *languages.* How far he was ignorant of the latter I cannot determine; but it is plain he had much reading at least, if they will not call it learning. Nor is it any great matter, if a man has knowledge, whether he has it from one language or another. Nothing is more evident than that he had a taste of natural philosophy, mechanicks, ancient and modern history, poetical learning and mythology. We find him very

knowing in the customs, rites and manners of antiquity. In *Coriolanus* and *Julius Cæsar* not only the spirit, but the manners of the Romans are exactly drawn; and still a nicer distinction is shown between the manners of the Romans in the time of the former and of the latter. His reading in the ancient historians is no less conspicuous in many references to particular passages; and the speeches copy'd from Plutarch in *Coriolanus* may, I think, as well be made an instance of his learning as those copied from Cicero in "Cataline," of Ben Jonson's. The manners of other nations in general—the Egyptions, Venetians, French, etc., are drawn with equal propriety. Whatever object in nature or branch of science he either speaks or describes; it is always with competent, if not extensive, knowledge. His descriptions are still exact; all the metaphors appropriated, and remarkably drawn from the true nature and inherent qualities of each subject. When he treats of ethic or politic, we may constantly observe a wonderful justness of distinction, as well as extent of comprehension. No one is more a master of the poetical stor or has more frequent allusions to the various parts of it. M Waller (who has been celebrated for this last particular) has n shown more learning this way than Shakespeare. We have tran lations from "Ovid," published in his name, among those poem which pass as his, and for some of which we have undoubted authority (being published by himself and dedicated to his noble patron, the Earl of Southampton). He appears also to have been observant in "Plautus," from whom he has taken the plot of one of his plays. He follows the Greek authors, and particularly Daves Phrygius in another (although I will not pretend to say in what language he read them). The modern Italian writers of novels he was manifestly acquainted with; and we may conclude him to be no less conversant with the ancients of his own country, from the use he has made of Chaucer in *Troilus and Cressida*, and in the *Two Noble Kinsmen*, if that play be his, as there goes a tradition it was (and indeed it has little resemblance of Fletcher and more of our author than some of those which have been received as genuine).

Lewis Theobald, who has been styled "the Porson of Shakespeare," followed. He was an accomplished classical scholar, and possessed a knowledge of Anglo-Saxon and early Middle English. He produced an

edition of Shakespeare's works which, in spite of the bitter criticisms of Pope, Warburton and Johnson, has since been accepted as the settled text. Theobald was "very unwilling to allow him so poor a scholar as many have laboured to represent him." Dr. Warburton, who expresses in the preface to his edition of the works his indebtedness to Theobald, was on the side of the "Detractors."

Sir Thomas Hanmar, whose splendid edition of Shakespeare's works was published in 1744, who, by republishing Pope's "Preface," expresses approval of its contents, does not directly refer to the question. He adds a Glossary, and in referring to that says:—"There being many words in Shakespeare which are grown out of use and obsolete, and many borrowed from other languages which are not naturalised or known among us, a Glossary is added."

Edwards in "The Canons of Criticism," published in 1746, does not refer to the subject.

In 1746, John Upton, Prebendary of Rochester, published the first work of pure commentary styled "Critical Observations on Shakespeare." His opinion is emphatic:—

"I have often wonder'd with what kind of reasoning anyone could be so far imposed on as to imagine that Shakespeare had no learning; when it must at the same time be acknowledged that, without learning, he cannot be red with any degree of understanding or taste. At this time of day it will hardly be allowed that 'inspiration' which his brother bards claim'd, and which claim, if the pretensions were anyway answerable, was generally granted them. However, we are well assured from the histories of his times that he was early initiated into the secret company of the Muses, and though he might have small avocations, yet he soon returned again with greater eagerness to his beloved studies. Hence he was

possessed of sufficient helps, either from abroad or at home, to midwife into the world his great and beautiful conceptions, and to give them birth and being. That a contrary opinion has ever prevailed is owing partly to Ben Jonson's jealousy and partly to the pride and pertness of dunces, who, under the umbrage of such a name as Shakespeare's, would gladly shelter their own idleness and ignorance."

Upton, as did Pope, does Jonson an injustice. It has already been pointed out that the words upon which the allegation is made are capable of a rendering exactly the reverse to that which was adopted with uncritical rashness. Pope misquotes them, as they are to-day usually misquoted.

And then in 1754 came Dr. Zachary Grey's critica' "Historical and Explanatory Notes on Shakespeare in two volumes. He writes :—

"As to his ignorance in the Greek and Latin languages though that has been more than once discussed, and much said on both sides of the question, I cannot but think from his exact imitation of many of the ancient poets and historians (of which there were no tolerable translations in his time), that his knowledge in this respect cannot reasonably be call'd in question. Nay, from the single play of *Hamlet*, which seems in many places to be an exact translation of 'Saxo-Grammaticus' (which I believe was never translated into any other language) it cannot be doubted that he had a competent skill in the Latin tongue."

In acknowledging the services of those who have assisted him in the preparation of the work, Dr. Grey mentions Dr. Tathwell thus :—

"His critical skill in the classics enabled him to point out to me several beauties in Shakespeare."

Then in 1765 was published Dr. Samuel Johnson's edition, with its celebrated preface. He thus disposes of the question :—

"There has always prevailed a tradition that Shakespeare wanted learning; that he had no regular education nor much skill in dead languages. Jonson, his friend, affirms, that 'he had small Latin and less Greek';* who besides that he had no temptation to falsehood, wrote at a time when the character and acquisitions of Shakespeare were known to multitudes. His evidence ought therefore to decide the controversy, unless some testimony of equal force could be opposed."

The reader will now be able to judge of the state of he controversy when Dr. Richard Farmer was provoked ,o come forward and for ever silence the "detractors from the glory of Great Britain." The pamphlet is an essay addressed to Joseph Craddock, Esq., in 1766. Farmer had projected a work, "History and Antiquities of the Town of Leicester," of which town he was a native. This was never completed. His labours were not altogether lost, for he handed the plates and some of his notes to John Nichols, the printer and antiquary, by whom they were utilised in that industrious compiler's well-known history of Leicestershire. He was of a careless, jovial, jocular disposition, but nevertheless took Orders as a clergyman. In 1775 he was appointed Master of Emmanuel College, Cambridge; he served in his turn the office of Vice-Chancellor, and in 1778 was appointed principal librarian of the University. After receiving some minor ecclesiastical preferments, eventually Pitt bestowed on him a canon-residentiaryship of St. Paul's, and thenceforth he spent his time between

* Again the same inaccurate quotation that Pope gives.

London and Cambridge in book-buying and book-reading. He was an ardent collector of black-letter books, and his signature in them is often met with. But he has left no evidence of having been a deep or painstaking Shakespearean scholar. This short essay on the learning of Shakespeare *was his only book.* It is a small octavo of 50 pages with less than 150 words on a page. In it Farmer comments on odd instances which have been put forward by different Shakespearean critics; takes exception to emendations which have been made in the text; rambles in a discursive manner round the subject of his essay; points out some errors that had been made; asserts a great deal and proves very little; but a perusal of the book does not leave upon any reader who is conversant with Shakespearean literature, the impression that he could take rank in the first line of Shakespearean scholars. Some point which he endeavoured to make will be canvassed in th next chapter, and he will be proved to be unreliable The pamphlet was republished in the editions of Shakespeare's works by Stevens, Read and Harris. It passed through several editions at the time, a second in 1767, and a third in 1789.

The reader will observe that the testimony of nearly every one of the great Shakespearean scholars up to this time was in accord. As each one devoted himself to a critical examination of the poems and plays, he found that the tradition of Shakespeare's want of learning was untenable. There was a lull in the controversy after Farmer's essay was issued, but as the study of the great dramatist's works proceeded, the inconsistencies between the facts and the tradition reasserted themselves throughout the long line of writers on Shakespeare; from thence onward the supporters of Farmer are few and far between. When "Studies in Shakespeare" from the pen of the late Professor

Churton Collins, appeared in 1905, it was considered that the question was finally disposed of without the glory of Great Britain suffering.

The revival of the subject and the laudation of Dr. Farmer by Mr. Robertson will come as a surprise to most Shakespeareans. That it should be revived as a *dernier resort* in a futile attempt to save the Stratfordian case is viewed with *satisfaction* by Baconians.

(*To be continued*).

FRANCIS BACON AND THE RECTORY OF CHELTENHAM.

AN interesting story relating to Queen Elizabeth's grant of the lease of the Rectory of Cheltenham to Francis Bacon is to be found in certain Chancery proceedings in which Bacon appeared as plaintiff, and which seem to have escaped the vigilance of Bacon's biographers. Mr. Hepworth Dixon, to whom we are indebted for the publication of the letters patent by which the grant was made, refers to the gift as an "act of princely grace," by which the Queen rewarded Bacon "most nobly for his momentous services" in agricultural reform. But, whether it was due to Bacon's characteristic carelessness in financial matters, or to his pecuniary embarrassments at the time, there is certainly clear proof that the sole benefit which Bacon derived from the gift was the sum of £666 13s. 4d.

The pleadings in the Chancery suit, which was commenced in May, 1599, are in the Record Office, and they throw some light upon a clause in the letters patent, which shows that the Queen's gift was of doubtful validity at the time of the grant, except so far as it gave to Bacon a reversionary interest.

The letters patent, which are dated the 27th February, 1598, granting a lease of the Rectory of Cheltenham to Bacon for forty years, refers to other previous grants of the same Rectory and suggest a doubt whether they are valid or void in law. If the claims of the former grantees were valid, Bacon would only be entitled to possession when their interests came to an end; and the pleadings in the suit show the alarm created at Charlton among members of the Higgs family, one of whom, named Elizabeth Badger, had been in possession of the Rectory for several years and was in possession of it at the time of the grant to Francis Bacon.

It appears from the documents at the Record Office that in 1560 the Queen had granted a lease of the Re tory by letters patent to Sir Henry Jerningham for six years, and that by an underlease the Rectory was he by Thomas Higgs, of Charlton, whose son bequeathe his interest in the lease to his wife Elizabeth Higgs, afterwards Mrs. Badger.*

From the time of Mrs. Badger's occupation there were rumours that her title was defective, and in 1590 the Queen granted a lease of the Rectory for twenty-one years to William Greenwell, ignoring the claims of Mrs. Badger, who made a complaint to the Lord Treasurer. The result of Mrs. Badger's suit was that a new lease for twenty-one years was granted to her brother, Robert Stephens, acting on her behalf, by letters patent in 1591; so that, when the grant was made to Bacon, Mrs. Badger was in possession of the Rectory, and there were still fourteen years of her lease to run.

But before the lease was granted to Bacon the Higgs family began to be nervous about Mrs. Badger's position; and William Higgs, another brother, who was a

* The name is sometimes spelt Badget, Bagehot, or Bagot.

merchant of London, requested his nephew, Thos. Stephens, to move the Lord Treasurer to stay the granting of the lease to Bacon. Stephens, who was a barrister and subsequently Attorney-General to Prince Henry, spoke well of Bacon, and assured his uncle that he believed he would deal fairly with his aunt. Accordingly, instead of complaining to the Lord Treasurer, the members of the Higgs' family entered into negotiations with Bacon, with a view to securing the possession of the Rectory to Mrs. Badger during the remaining fourteen years of her lease.

At the time of the grant to Bacon, in 1598, he was hard pressed for money; and it will be remembered that later on, in September of that year, having been sued by a usurer named Simpson on a bond for £300, he was seized by way of execution for the judgment debt and detained in custody at a fine house in Coleman Street, where he had been kindly recommended by his friend, Sheriff More, with whom he had been dining a few nights previously. Before this incident happened, it appears that in the month of June Bacon was particularly anxious to raise the sum of six or seven hundred pounds; and when Thos. Stephens and William Higgs interviewed him with regard to the claim of Mrs. Badger, they took the opportunity of procuring an assignment of the lease by way of mortgage. Bacon wanted 1,000 marks, and by an indenture dated the 20th July, 1598, he mortgaged the lease to William Higgs for £700, which represented 1,000 marks (£666 13s. 4d.), together with six months' interest at 10 per cent. per annum, there being a provision in the mortgage for the repayment of the money on the 6th February, 1599.

But before the day for redemption arrived William Higgs, who had borrowed the money himself, although

acting on behalf of his sister, Mrs. Badger, had another interview with Bacon in London, when he suggested a sale of the lease outright. There was some difficulty, however, in arranging the price, because Bacon considered his lease for forty years was worth double the mortgage money, while Higgs contended that the £700 was as much as the lease was worth. The negotiations for a sale caused considerable delay, and, according to Bacon's pleadings in the suit, the time for repayment of the mortgage money was extended, Higgs agreeing not to resort to extreme measures if the loans were not repaid on the 6th February, 1599.

Subsequently, however, Wm. Higgs denied this agreement and refused to re-convey the lease on repayment of the money unless Bacon would give some sor of guarantee that the possession by Mrs. Badger und her lease should not be disturbed. But Bacon firm insisted on the *status in quo*, and further negotiatic about the sale took place, with a fresh agreement, a Bacon alleges in the pleadings, that he should have three months after the Easter term for repaying the £700; while, in the meantime, Mrs. Badger should have the opportunity of considering the price, and could decide whether she would buy the lease or require her money back again.

Relying upon this agreement Bacon suspended the arrangements he was making to find the mortgage money, and was therefore taken by surprise when Wm. Higgs on the 19th May, which was a Saturday, peremptorily demanded repayment of the mortgage money on the following Monday—a demand which he knew it was impossible for Bacon to satisfy. In these circumstances there was no help for it but to apply to the court for relief, and Bacon immediately instituted a suit against William Higgs, Elizabeth Badger and Thomas Stephens, praying the Lord Keeper, Sir Thos. Egerton, to com-

mand them to appear and answer his complaint, and that a reasonable time should be allowed for repayment of the mortgage money.

The sequel to these proceedings is to be found in a letter from John Stubbs to Dr. Mansell, Principal of Jesus College, Oxford, written from Charlton Kings and dated the 25th June, 1633, which is quoted in Goding's "History of Cheltenham."

But before stating the sequel it may be convenient to recall the obligations under the letters patent granting the lease of the Rectory to Bacon, which attached to Mrs. Badger as his assignee. The rent was £75 13s. 4d., and the lessee was bound to pay the stipends of two chaplains and two deacons, as well as to provide the bread and wine and all other things necessary for the performance of divine service in the parish church at Cheltenham and the chapel at Charlton Kings. As lay rector he was also liable for the payment of the Archdeacon's procurations—a curious customary fee payable at visitations, which has recently been the subject of a civil suit in the Consistory Court at Exeter ("Law Reports" [1913], Prob., p. 21).

In 1610 there was trouble at Cheltenham about the covenants, and a formal complaint was made by the parishioners to the Bishop of Gloucester, who preached a sermon at Cheltenham denouncing Mrs. Badger for her breach of duty under the covenants in her lease to provide sufficient stipends for the ministers. Mrs. Badger's nephew, Thos. Stephens, being then Attorney-General to the Prince of Wales, and the bishop being one of the Prince's chaplains, endeavoured to persuade the bishop to deal favourably with his aunt; but the bishop insisted and sent the petition of the parishioners to the Lord Treasurer.

The Earl of Salisbury thereupon wrote a letter to Mrs. Badger, the lessee, calling her attention to the

neglect, which was causing a serious scandal in the parish. But before anything was effected the Lord Treasurer died and Dr. Parry was translated from Gloucester to Worcester, while Mrs. Badger obstinately refused to give the ministers any increase of their stipends.

The complaint of the parishioners was repeated in 1620 in a petition to Lord Chancellor Bacon, requesting that his lordship would compel his assignee to perform the covenants and to allow good stipends to the ministers, seeing that the Rectory was then worth £600 per annum. The Lord Chancellor answered that Mrs. Badger might well do so, because he had received only 1,000 marks (£666 13s. 4d.) for the term of 40 years.

Bacon's letter to Mrs. Badger, dated the 19th November, 1620, is set out in BACONIANA (1905), p. 256, and is in almost identical terms with those of the letter from the Earl of Salisbury to Mrs. Badger, dated the 10th April, 1610.

Lord Chancellor Bacon was removed from office before Mrs. Badger answered his letter, and the parishioners presented a petition to the King to enforce the covenants of the lease and to allow sufficient stipends for the ministers. The result was a submission to arbitration, and an award was made by which the stipends were settled at £40 for Cheltenham and £40 for Charlton Kings. The settlement was effected by deed of covenant, 17th February, 1622, and confirmed by decree in Chancery, 30th June, 1625.

HAROLD HARDY.

LITERARY LEGENDS.

READING the discussions which certain organs of the Press, with unusual and, therefore, significant, liberality, have recently allowed to appear in their columns on what is called the great Bacon-Shakespeare Controversy, nothing has struck me as more indicative of the weakness in the way of argument of the anti-Baconian partakers therein than their almost entire confinement of anything of that nature to the repetition, in the form of questions, of what they evidently regard as "posers" to their opponents, although, as a matter of fact, such "posers" have been answered over and over again. And amongst these "posers" there are none, from the frequency with which they are put, to which they give more prominence, or seem to attach greater importance, than to such as these—"Why did Bacon, if he wrote the plays, conceal the fact? Why did he not put his own name to them? What reasons could he have for such concealment? Would any man in his senses voluntarily deprive himself of the fame and glory attaching to the authorship of them?" etc., etc. Having so put the matter, the already self-satisfied questioners lean back with a smile of ineffable complacency, as if, instead of thereby displaying their very imperfect knowledge of the conditions of literary publication in early times, they had settled the whole question in dispute and there was no possible answer to their inquiries.

Although, in one sense, indeed, there can be no answer to such inquiries—for no man, but himself, can give the why and wherefore of his own actions—there have been many and satisfactory answers given to them, though not, I think, the most satisfactory of all, showing that Baconians even, in some measure, have not appreciated the enormous difference of the conditions above referred to

from those at present existing. The latter have been too ready to accept the Shakespearean, or rather Shaxperean, view, or the assumption on which it is based, that Francis Bacon, in seeking concealment, or temporary concealment, for some of his writings, was doing an unusual—an extraordinary, an unheard of thing, whereas in adopting a pseudonym, and, as some say, using other personalities under which to conceal his own, he was but continuing a practice which, it is little exaggeration to say, had prevailed almost universally from what is generally called the Revival of Letters in this country almost up to his own time.

And if this be so, as I hope to be able to show it is, it provides a more conclusive answer than any other which has yet been given on the subject of Bacon's secrecy and methods of concealment, by removing all the "won derment" there has been about it. For, going back t the time I have referred to—the "Revival," or, as might with more correctness be called, the "Introduction" of Letters into this country—for before this time (which I take to be contemporary with the arrival of the Printing Press) there were, properly so-called, absolutely none—going back to that date, which may roughly be fixed as the middle of the fifteenth century at the earliest, and tracing from it the stream or streams of English literature which proceeded from the press or presses then introduced, down to about the period of Bacon's birth, what is it that we find? We find—just what we should have expected *not* to find under the circumstances. For in an age supposed to be anxious about and, as it were, thirsting for the revival of learning, what we should have thought would have been the firstfruits of the Press would be the great masterpieces of classical literature—Latin and Greek—supposed to have been preserved in the great monastic or other houses. But not so. What we do find is the issue of what

are really a series of fictions, lying there in MS. form, all of them having a bearing, more or less direct, on the interests of those houses—fictions issuing chiefly under the form of "Chronicles," though as purely fictional as the "Romance of the Rose," or the "Story of Cambuscan Bold." And of these fictions (taking the form of Chronicles or Histories, which form the great mass of the earliest English literature) *no one can with any certainty say who was the author.* I am aware that they figure under well-known names—Gildas and Bede and Nennius, Matthew of Paris, William of Malmesbury, Walsingham, Higden, Geoffrey of Monmouth, and all the rest of the monastic fraternity writing suppositively contemporary annals, while *not one of them, in all probability, had ever any existence in the flesh,* but were names and names only under which the monastic writers of the time of the Renaissance hid their personality in order to give, as the device no doubt did, greater verisimilitude and authority to their writings.

No very great amount of literary knowledge and acumen will be necessary to show the validity of this statement, surprising as it may seem to those who, brought up entirely on modern notions as to literary publication, are accustomed to look no further than the title-page of a book for the name of its author. For, in the first place, we know nothing whatever of any of these supposed writers but the name, except what we gather from what we are told of them in their own writings. Thus; for example, take Bede, who may be considered the greatest of them, for upon him the whole story of Church history in England is based. What do we know of Bede? *Nothing except what he himself tells us.* He was a monk, he tells us, and represents himself as writing in the eighth century, and every other ecclesiastical historian following him has told us the same. But no scholar outside his Order knew anything about

him till the sixteenth century. His so-called works were not known till the reign of Henry VIII., not printed till 1643. This, in itself, is sufficient to show that Bede, the Venerable (as he is generally called, because of his representing the earliest of ecclesiastical historians), was no more writing in the eighth century than "Old Fuller," one of the latest of them, was when he threw doubts upon the actuality of his "venerable" predecessor. But, if this is not enough, the very language in which Bede wrote proclaims the fact that he was not an eighth-century man, for his language, fairly good Latin, was the Latin of the Renaissance. In the eighth century Latin was probably a language entirely unknown in this country. And, as if all this were not enough exclude Bede from any list of genuine writers, we a told that amongst his works are Commentaries on t Old and New Testaments, works which in his time di not exist.*

And what I have said of Bede applies in the main to all the other so-called historians and chroniclers of what are called the Middle Ages. They were all of them but lay figures, or masks for the more or less learned monastic writers (chiefly Benedictines) of the Renaissance period. If this were not so, where, I would ask, are the originals of the works which they wrote and which were subsequently printed? Were they treated as printer's copy and destroyed when done with? It might have been so from the absence of copies of them now in existence. But it was the boast of the monasteries up to the last that they had in their keeping these precious works, and others of vast antiquity, showing how true culture had begun in them and still continued. And so the monasteries and university colleges were supposed to be full of

* The jesting monk who wrote under the name of Rabelais, in ridicule of the works fathered upon Bede, makes him the author of a treatise, "De Optimitate Triparum!"

them, their owners regarding them as their most cherished treasures. And yet, when John Leland was sent round by King Henry VIII. in 1533 to seek for and report on these treasures, and he set forth on his journey and, armed with the royal warrant, examined every likely place—every hole and corner in the kingdom, as he himself declares—when he thus sought for them, what does he say that he found? Why, *nothing*, practically *nothing*—nothing at least to justify popular belief (which was also his own at starting) in the wealth of literary matter awaiting him. He came upon no Bedes, no Gildases, no Nenniuses but one, and that he found a forgery! "Was there ever such a fool of a book," he exclaimed on laying t down, "an affair of splendid lies, old wives' fables and rodigious barbarism?" Yet so infatuated was he eland)—this honest reporter—with the beliefs of the ime that he still believed that, though the copy might be a make-up, the real Nennius must still be "somewhere"! It would be amusing to follow this honest, but credulous antiquary on his rounds, but I have no space or time for the journey. Readers must search for themselves. I mention this as an incident which was repeating itself nearly everywhere and showing that, though the searcher never wavered in his belief that he should find something, he (and this is the important fact) *never did*. Only one other anecdote will I mention in illustration of this. Coming to Oxford—Oxford, the home of learning—Leland had a great desire to see the works of Robert Greathead and sought permission to view the Franciscan Library there. The monks, the keepers—"the asses," as Leland calls them—demurred, protesting and "braying out" that "no mortal was allowed to visit those sacred recesses and view the mysteries within." But when Leland insisted, showing them the royal warrant, and was admitted, "What," he cried, "did I find? Dust, cobwebs, moths, worms,

filth! When I asked for their treasures, they showed me coals! As for books—why, I would not buy them for three halfpence!"

But, turning from monastic or ecclesiastical to lay writers treating of secular subjects, and commonly spoken of as Humanists, we find, I think, the same secrecy prevailing in the matter of literary publication as in the former case, though from a different motive. The motive of the monastic writer, who wrote in the interests of his Order and under the protection which that Order afforded him, was, by placing his utterances in the mouths of venerable personalities, supposed to be treating of contemporary events, to give to his writings greater authority, the motive for the Humanist was simply safety and self-protection. It may truly be sai that a man in the days I am speaking of, writing, men do now, on his own responsibility, along with t pen took his life in his hand. Whatever his subjec however innocent, what with the political authorities on the one hand, on the watch for treason, and the ecclesiastical on the other, on the scent for heresy, the unhappy "author," writing under his own name, would never be free from the danger of the halter or axe on the one side, or the stake on the other. But, under the disguise either of a pseudonym or of the name of a man of straw, or, preferably, of a man long dead, he was comparatively safe. Hence his resort to some such disguises. True, he lost, or, at least, risked all chance of either gain or glory. But the secular writers of whom I speak, and whose writings have come down to us under feigned names, could not have been animated by the thought either of gain or glory, or they would have sought those rewards in other fields—in commerce, the law, about the Court, or on the battle-fields. They were those who, having tasted of the sweets of the new learning which, with the printing-press, was slowly

making its way into this country—were pursuing it for its own sake, and, like Bacon in somewhat later times, took up their pens purely for the "advancement" of knowledge and the benefit of mankind.

Naturally this brought them into conflict with monastic tradition and its literature, political, ethical and ecclesiastical, necessitating methods of concealment such as I have above hinted at in the way of publication, and an enforced self-effacement on the part of authors, evidently inconceivable by many in these days when, as the poet says with pride (though also with some exaggeration),

"A may man speak the thing he will."

And of these "methods of concealment," the one adopted in the case of Humanist writers was, as I have already said, the one also most favoured by their monastic or ecclesiastical rivals, though from a different motive, that, namely, of fathering their writings upon some ideal name of the past who could not be brought to account for any heretical or treasonable, or otherwise objectionable matter contained therein—a pious and generally successful fraud in the uncritical days when it was first adopted, and still apparently unsuspected or undetected in these.

And, as the best and most prominent illustration of what I mean by this, I will take the case of Geoffrey Chaucer, who, though, no doubt, as a mercer and citizen of London, Master of the Customs, and man of affairs in the late fourteenth century, had a personal existence, but who, as a poet, philosopher, dialectician, rhetor, mathematician—for as all these he is represented—in short a universal genius—is as much a myth and a legend as the great idol of the monastic writers, the "Venerable Bede"—his title of "Dan," or "Father," being not improbably suggested by the attribute bestowed upon the great monastic Classic.

For what reason this famous individuality was chosen by the coterie of wits and scholars in the beginning of the sixteenth century (whose home or habitat was, as I am personally inclined to think, like Bacon's, the Inns of Court)* it is impossible, of course, to say; but it is certain that in his literary character Chaucer was never known till then. John Leland, writing about the year 1540, is the first to tell us anything about him, but what he says is derived from rumour only. He tells us, indeed, that a collection of the great author's writings was made by Caxton, but he does not seem to have ever seen it. The editions he names are those of Thynne and Bertholet, published just before his time of writing, and from these he gives us a list of Chaucer' works, amongst which, he tells us, would have bee included "Piers Ploughman," but for its reflections c the morals of the monks, a remark which indirect points to William Langland, his supposed contemporary, as also a cloak-name. But that Chaucer, in the fourteenth century, could have composed such works as the "Canterbury Tales," full of learning only known, or beginning to be known, in the early sixteenth, is a mystery at least as great as that the Illiterate of Stratford should have been responsible for the scholarship—the profound and accomplished scholarship—displayed in the Shakespeare Plays, etc. To give but one instance in support of this, what would be the use of Chaucer telling his readers, at a time when classical literature had not crossed the Alps, to read not only

* The Inns of Court were the cradle of the new learning and civility—the great humanist university—at a time when the Oxford and Cambridge colleges were comparatively boys' schools. They were full of "young Bacons," thirsting for true knowledge—that is, the revival of the old and its "advancement." Ben Jonson (like Fortescue) describes them in his time as the "noblest nurseries of humanity and liberty in the kingdom."

"David in his Psalms" but Seneca, at a time when it is at least doubtful whether a copy of either of the writings referred to was to be found in this country?

I could, indeed, point to many more such anachronisms, as well as adduce other arguments, tending to show that these famous "Tales" could not have been written at the time usually assigned to them, and that, therefore, the Chaucer of the fourteenth century—the historical Chaucer—could not have been the author of them, but it would require more space than I am sure you could afford. As to who was the author, or, rather, who were the authors of these remarkable "Tales" (for I believe there was more than one), that is another story, into which I will not here enter, my object being to show what I believe is a fact—that the whole of what we are pleased to call "early" English literature, by whomsoever written, is not, and cannot be, older than the time loosely described as the "Revival of Letters," that is to say the beginning of the sixteenth century. Before that time there was practically no literature of any kind in this country. And not only no "literature," in the proper sense of the word, but really no "records" —nothing reliable on which to base what we now call "history." We have the authority of no less a person than John Strype for saying that in 1529, the year of Wolsey's fall, there were at the Rolls Office no Records more ancient than the reign of Henry VII. And this fact, so far as I can find, remains true to the present day. By "records" I mean, of course, as Strype did, genuine "records." Of records of a sort—falsified or fabricated—there are many, as Macaulay admits and deplores—"every source of information," as he says, "relating to our early history being poisoned by party spirit."

On the whole, therefore, it may, I think, with truth be said that before the time of Henry VII. (1485—the very

end of the fifteenth century) we know nothing—absolutely nothing *for certain*—of the history of our country, either political, ecclesiastical, or literary. The whole of it, back from that time, is simply a legend or series of legends, as mythical as those in which the early history of Rome or of Greece has come down to us. I have specially referred to the "Bede Legend" as illustrating the methods of Monastic, and the "Chaucer Legend" of Humanist, literary production and publication. But there are, of course, many others, as the great "Wiclif Myth," which is made to turn on disputes about Bible theology at a time when the Bible, as we know it, was not in existence, and to revolve round the name of an entirely fictitious personality, set up b the literary monks and friars as a kind of Aunt Sally the garb of a poor secular priest, against whom launch their polemical arrows.* Also I might refer what may be called the "Great Becket Legend," and t the traditional glories of the Court of the Second Henry, when, in a barbaric age—an age so barren of learning that the possession of two out of our three famous Board School "R's" was sufficient to gain for that monarch the title of

* John Wiclif (Johannes Vicoclivus=Wicked-lifed John) is said to have died in 1384, and to have left behind him, besides a translation of the Bible, many books so heretical as to earn for him by the punning monks the above title, or, as it is rendered in the "Granary" of the orthodox Wheaty-John (another monkish pun) of Wheathampstead, "a man of all men most wicked." Yet John Boston, himself a monk, compiling a catalogue of writers some hundred years later, makes no mention of the "Wicked John," or his works. Neither (still more strangely) does John Leland, making another catalogue in 1533, which seems to show that the "first English Reformer" was not so much a fourteenth century man as a sixteenth, and *then invented for literary purposes only.* Round him, far back in the former century, were made to revolve (as I have said) the "questions" agitating the sixteenth—the Scriptures in English, the Mass, etc., etc.

"Beauclerc"—an age when, perhaps, the only Latin known or heard was that of the Missal and Breviary—Gerald of Cambria and Walter Mapes of the Welsh Marches are represented as writing Latin verses, and quoting familiarly Virgil, Horace, Ovid, and other classical writers, long forgotten, and not as yet "revived" even in Italy!

Who can doubt, indeed, that the works of these supposed early scholars, busied as they are with the Church and Monastic questions of the time of Henry VIII., and written in the Latin of the Renaissance, were from the pens of writers of the latter date, though *dated back* to the thirteenth century?

And so, I contend, the habit of concealment (for doubtless good reasons) continued down even to the day when Francis Bacon (doubtless also for good and sufficient reasons) assumed his now immortal pen-name of Shake-Speare, or Shakespeare.

Why, indeed, he adopted this particular name as a pseudonym or pen-name, may-be, indeed is, a matter for doubt and controversy. But that does not concern me now. All I wish to point out here is that Francis Bacon, in assuming such a name as a cover, was doing nothing extraordinary—nothing, indeed, to account for the surprise of those (and they seem to be in the majority) who, judging everything by modern standards, seem to lay such stress upon what I may call the title-page argument; for, indeed, it was only in later days—in *these* days one might almost say—that this title-page argument has been regarded as incontrovertible evidence of authorship. "John Smith" puts his name now on the title-page of a book and all the world now accepts—and accepts reasonably—"John Smith" as its author; but in the 16th century that was not so. On the contrary, there were few books issuing from the press in that time of which it could be said, or can be

said, with certainty, that the name upon the title-page was the name of the real author. Take, for example, the series known as the English Chronicles, as opposed to the Monastic or Latin Chronicles; they appear under the names of Fabian, Hall, Grafton, Holinshed, and others of whose personalities we know nothing, or next to nothing, though, as their compilations were for the most part derived from the monastic chroniclers, there seemed no reason for concealing their identities. We cannot, however, be sure of them. Fabian, for instance, though called a printer, must evidently have been a clergyman. It would seem as if, in these cases, it was only thought necessary that some name might be fixed to the title-page in order to distinguish one of these Chronicles from the other, for they all go over som what the same ground.

But as a more prominent instance of the uncertaint to say the least, of the title-page of a book being co vincing evidence of its authorship, let me refer to one other great name responsible for a whole library of literature of various kinds. I refer to the name of Sir Thomas More, one-time Chancellor of England. To him is assigned, as everyone knows, the immortal work entitled "Utopia." But who can rise from the perusal of that book, after reading such a passage as the following, without having some doubts as to its coming from the pen of one who, though by tradition the gentlest and "mildest-mannered man" of his age, was practically the bitterest persecutor of anyone in the shape of a Reformer in his day, and who lost the favour of the King—even such a King as Henry VIII.—by his determined opposition to the relaxation of the Heresy Laws? In that ideal realm (Utopia) writes the author of the book:—

"They do not drive any to dissemble their thoughts by threatenings, so that men are not tempted to lie or disguise

their opinions, which, being a sort of fraud, is abhorred by Utopians."

Can anyone believe that this liberal sentiment—a sentiment which might be considered quite "advanced" even in these days—emanated from the mind and pen of one who, however mild and gentle in his private life, did not shrink on principle, and in practice, in the cause of what he considered true religion, to resort to the rack and the faggot?

On the other hand, whilst not shrinking from the sternest measures in case of what he thought "need," being notorious for mildness of manners and gentleness of speech, how can we, without many searchings of heart, attribute to him also the violence of language and the virulence of abuse contained in the tracts ascribed to him in refutation of Tyndale?

Such considerations as these speak far louder than title-pages in deciding upon the authorship of a book, and I cannot help thinking one-half at least of what are commonly called "More's Works" were fathered upon him simply because his was one of the conspicuous and popular names of the time. And what I here say of More is true also of other great names—used as covering names by writers whose real names we do not know, and probably never shall know. And, of such names, I will only mention three—to wit, Raleigh, Sidney and Spenser; for how are we—to use the well-known and searching language of Ralph Waldo Emerson—to "marry the lives" of these men to the works attached to their various names, or at least some of them? The task, it seems to me, is almost as difficult, though in a different way, as that of "marrying the life of the man of Stratford with the verse" of "Shakespeare."

I could continue the discussion of this subject almost *ad infinitum*, but I think I have said enough to show (1) that the concealment on Bacon's part, which our

"Shakespearean" critics make so much of, was no cause of wonderment, and (2) that the "Shakespeare" myth or legend is but one of many which require the same searching investigation which that is receiving, and that is my only object in this article.

JOHN HUTCHINSON.

FRANCIS BACON'S WILL.

IT may have been a practice at that time to deliver to administrators *cum testamento annexo* the original Will of a testator, where, as in Bacon's case, the executors renounced probate. The grant of administration to his estate was made to Sir Robert Rich and Thomas Meawtys on 18th July, 1627, and on 30th Jul 1627, the original Will was delivered out of Doct Commons. Mr. Spedding seems to have been surpris at this. Whether taken on the grant or not, it strange, in view of the great care taken of many documents belonging to Bacon, that the Will was not preserved, and that we only know of its contents by the official copy.

Tenison, in BACONIANA, 1679, gives a transcript out of what he calls "the Lord Bacon's last Will relating especially to his writings." What he transcribes is, for the most part, *not in Bacon's last Will at all.* He probably quoted from a Will later in date than the Will of 10th April, 1621, but earlier than the Will in respect of which Letters of Administration were granted. In this intermediate Will (which again is unforthcoming) Francis directed his servant Percy to perform certain duties concerning his manuscript compositions which, in the Will of 1621, he had directed his servant Harris to do. At the date of the latest Will, Percy was no longer his servant.

This appears by the terms of the document itself and of a letter from Bacon in the following month.

One cannot help asking what has become of the Will which Tenison quoted from in 1679?

While, in the earlier Wills, testator referred to his unpublished manuscripts and desired certain persons to advise or decide upon what should be published and what suppressed, the *last* Will contains no reference to manuscripts and gives no directions. There is only a request to his executors and Mr. Bosville to seal up his papers preliminary to examination.

Doubtless Francis by that date had already passed is manuscripts into the hands of Rawley, or other .iends, with any necessary directions. Had this not have been done, they would have had to be sold for the benefit of creditors. It looks as if he wanted his brother-in-law, Sir John Constable, and his literary friend, Bosville, to see that no papers had escaped destruction which might reveal facts inconsistent with his desire to keep secrecy as to his vizarded publications during his long-time experiment of teaching by the means of these publications.

Bosville was the man of letters, better known as Sir William Boswell, formerly engaged at the Foreign Office, but then Ambassador at the Hague.

While there (until his death in 1649) Boswell was actively engaged looking after the interests of the English Protestant Churches in the Netherlands. He was also the intermediary by whom certain of Bacon's manuscripts were entrusted to the brothers Gruter for printing and publication abroad.

Tenison and his intimates may have thought it prudent (when at Rawley's death in 1667 they received charge of Bacon's manuscripts) to account for their possession of them by the suggestion which the transcribed Will afforded.

Bacon's bequest of his books to Constable must, of course, have failed in consequence of the insolvency of his estate. His extensive library was probably sold in small lots privately, which would account for so many of the books eventually drifting into the hands of dealers.

From its construction and detail, Bacon seems to have expected that his Will would one day be eagerly scanned for the information as to his private affairs which he took pains to place there.

He lets us know, for instances, that his chambers at Gray's Inn were four stories in height; that James I. had given him a pension of £1,200 per annum; and that he was upon terms of intimacy with the Earl of Dorset (whose relative five years earlier erected the "Spenser" tomb in Westminster Abbey).

In his inimitable and quiet way he indicated that his marital relations had not been all they should have been; that he had much more than carried out the obligations of his marriage settlement; and that his wife's private fortune was not more than £200 a year. This disposed in advance of any suggestion that he married for money and not for loving companionship.

The weak places in his matrimonial experiences are indicated by the statement that his wife had at one time "lived at her own charge" (a covert way of intimating that at one period they had lived apart), and by the revocation for "just and grave causes" all gifts to his wife. After his death the lady married her gentleman usher.

He reiterates in his Will his regard of life as but a pilgrimage, an expression he had, as a young man, used writing as Lyly, at middle age writing as Shakespeare, and in old age in attributed poem and prayer.

He affirms that death should not be unwelcomed—"the day of death is better than the day of birth."

PARKER WOODWARD.

ANOTHER BACON SIGNATURE.

IN BACONIANA of July, 1912, it was noted that in the fifteenth stanza of *The Rape of Lucrece*—in which "Shakespeare" makes the extraordinary comparison of the lustful look in Tarquin's eyes with "the subtle shining secrecies" written in the margins of books —the marginal letters are B, C, N, W, Sh, N, M, and that Sh appears on line 103, which number by Bacon's system represents the numerical value of "Shakespeare."

In *The Tempest* (Act I. scene ii.) there is a similar instance, which appears to have gone unnoticed. It is where Prospero decides that the hour has come to tell Miranda what she is, and how they came upon the island :—

. . . . Sit down ;
39. For thou must now know further.
Mira.— You have often
Begun to tell me what I am ; but stopped
And left me to a bootless inquisition.
43. Concluding, *Stay, not yet.*
Prospero.— The hour's now come ;
The very minute bids thee ope thine ear ;
Obey and be attentive.

Here we have F. Bacon very clearly written, but in such a way that it is scarcely likely to be noticed by the reader. The example begins on line 39 of the scene, which number is the numerical value for F. Bacon.

The Tempest is autobiographical, and both Stratfordians and Baconians are agreed that "Shakespeare" speaks through the mouth of Prospero. Is it merely a coincidence that the moment Prospero begins his history we should find this curious illustration? These jests are worthy of "the most prodigious wit who ever lived"; but to those who would rather not look further, all revelations of Bacon's marvellous ingenuity will remain "coincidences." R. L. EAGLE.

ADAM CUPID.

In *Romeo and Juliet* (II. i. 11) we find the following lines:—

> "Speak to my gossip Venus one fair word,
> One nick-name for her purblind son and heir,
> Young Adam Cupid, he that shot so trim,
> When King Cophetua lov'd the beggar-maid."

Adam has puzzled the critics. *Upton* considers the allusion is to "a most notable archer, named Adam Bell."

Steevens thinks the same archer is alluded to.

Knight thinks Abraham is the right word—the cheat, the "Abraham Man," of the old stories.

Hunter thinks Adam is a nickname for Cupid, but he gives no reason for his opinion.

Dyke thinks Adam is a corruption for Abron, *i.e.*, Auburn, and gives some not very convincing reasons for his opinion.

Grant White agrees with Dyce, and quotes some passages in support of his belief.

Halliwell thinks that Upton's alteration to Auburn is forced.

Knightly comes nearest to the true sense: "Shakespeare may have known that in classic mythology Love was the first of beings."

All these show how conjectural and unsatisfactory the interpretation of Shakespeare is when Bacon is not consulted. In his Works, V. 461, he says: "Love is the most ancient of all the gods, and therefore of all things else, except chaos, which they hold to be co-eval with him. He is without any parent of his own." And in "De Principius" he writes: "Various attributes have been assigned to Cupid, as that he is always an infant—blind, naked, winged, and an archer."

Shakespeare frequently alludes to these attributes, thus:—

> "Love hath been ten thousand years a child."
> (*L. L. Lost*, V. ii. 11).
>
> "Love looks not with the eyes, but with the mind,
> And therefore is winged Cupid painted blind."
> (*M. N. D.*, I. i. 234).
>
> "Hit with Cupid's archery."
> (*M. N. D.*, III. ii. 103).
>
> "Nor hath Love's mind of any judgment taste;
> Wings and no eyes figure unheeding haste;
> And therefore is love said to be a child,
> Because in judgment he's so oft beguiled."
> (*M. N. D.*, I. i. 236).

In Bacon alone can we find in one passage the true interpretation of all these passages; and yet the Baconian hypothesis is scouted by most Shakespearean critics as idiotic and unreasonable. In truth no Shakespeare critic is fully equipped unless he has made as complete a study of Bacon as he has of Shakespeare.

R. M. THEOBALD.

REVIEW.

Tudor Problems, being Essays on the Historical and Literary Claims, ciphered and otherwise, indicated by Francis Bacon, William Rawley, Sir William Dugdale, and others, in certain printed books during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. By Parker Woodward. 334 pages. 8vo. Royal. London: Gay & Hancock, Ltd. 15/- net.

UNDER the title of "Tudor Problems" Mr. Parker Woodward published, in 1909, a volume of 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 Bacon in 1578. These essays have been extensively revised and augmented, and in the volume now under consideration are so presented together, with a number of additional essays which appear for the first time.

The sheet-anchor of the author is the biliteral cipher story as revealed by Mrs. Gallup. He writes to his fellow-Baconians in

italics :—"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." Starting with the statement contained therein that Francis was the son of Queen Elizabeth by Lord Robert Dudley, the vizard which first enshrouded him at his baptism, and which seems to be as tightly fastened on him to-day, was the surname of "Bacon." Other vizards which he adopted were :—Gosson, Lyly, Watson, Peele, Greene, Marlowe, Spenser, Kyd, Nash, Whitney, Webbe, Dorrell, Bright, Burton, and Shakespeare. An essay is devoted to the consideration of the works appearing under each of these names, and of what is known of the person who bore it. Mr. Parker also devotes chapters to Queen Elizabeth, Robert Earl of Essex, Filium Labyrinthi, The Allegory, Educational, The Play Folio, Eternizing, The Maze, Sidney, Plays, Re-entombed, The Love Test, Seven Psalms, Cipher History, Sonnets, among other subjects. Mr. Parker Woodward has covered a very wide range of literature. He has ransacked the works of the period, and brought together a mass of information which appears to support his contention that the biliteral cipher story is authentic and reliable. To those who have already given their adhesion t[o] that story this book must be conclusive, and place the matt[er] beyond the region of doubt. On the title-page is a quotati[on] from Pericles, "Truth can never be confirmed enough," and t[his] axiom has been ever present with the writer in his labours. [To] those who have not accepted the cipher story the work is of eve[n] greater value. Mr. Parker Woodward has made out a strong case by the production of historical and literary evidence.

Every page in "Tudor Problems" is alive with interest and full of suggestions. The chapter on "The Play Folio" is an able explanation of that which is generally considered the most formidable stumbling-block in the way of the Baconian theory. It is possible that Mr. Woodward has too readily accepted the tradition that Shagspere was known to his contemporaries as an actor or actor-author. There is no evidence in support of this tradition except such as would be under the control of Bacon, assuming that he had adopted the name of *William Shakespeare* as a vizard. The theory broached by Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence is the most reasonable explanation—that Shagspere was discovered after the pseudonym had been used on *Venus and Adonis*, packed off to Stratford, set up there as a gentleman, and kept out of sight as far as possible. "Eternizing" is another valuable contribution to the study of the literature of the period. The table given on pages 254, 255 of the dedicatees of the books might, with advantage, be enlarged to include some hundreds of books published between 1576 and 1620 which bear unmistakable evidence of having had their origin in the same workshop, although not from the same pen.

The chapter "Re-entombed," to which the author draws special attention in the Preface, indicates channels hitherto untouched for industrious research. Mr. Parker Woodward has opened new

ground in drawing attention to the series of curious circumstances which are found between the years 1702 and 1740, culminating in the erection of the monument to William Shakespeare in Westminster Abbey in 1740. If space permitted much might be said in amplification of the original and remarkable theories set out in this chapter. It should be read and re-read, and the many clues suggested followed up by Baconians.

Mr. Parker Woodward's style of writing is so clear that the reader may without difficulty find his way through "the Maze." His book is of special value at the present moment. It affords a complete refutation of Mr. J. M. Robertson's indictment that Baconians are ignorant of the literature contemporary with that of Shakespeare. It is a monument of patient research. It exhibits a knowledge of historical and literary facts ten times greater than that which is displayed in "The Baconian Heresy."

CORRESPONDENCE.

The Baconian Heresy.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—Mr. Robertson, M.P., has joined in the attempt to stay the Baconian tide. With Crawford's "Collectanea" as map, he pushes it at certain writers who have urged more or less tentatively that Bacon wrote the Shakespeare plays and sonnets.

It is very natural that in feeling the way to this conclusion, mistakes have been made, and some arguments carried too far. Yet notwithstanding the points made against Lords Campbell and Penzance, Judges Webb and Holmes, and other lawyers such as Mr. Greenwood, Mr. Rushton, Mr. Castle, K.C., and Mr. Bumpas, their general conclusion that the writer of the plays was a skilled lawyer remains common sense. Take away Peele, Marlowe, Greene, Spenser, Lyly and Nashe, as being other vizards used by Bacon, Mr. Robertson would have a platform left, though not a very big one. In his present state of mind I will not withdraw Kyd or Puttenham or anything of Jonson. But Heywood must have been a law student, or why was he at Gray's Inn?

On the classical question I should have preferred to see Mr. Robertson come to close grips with Professor Churton Collins and Mr. Edwin Reed's arguments and instances, rather than those of Lord Penzance and Mr. Donnelly.

Mr. Robertson expresses his scorn at cyphers, and passing by the "Manes Verulamiani" affirms that any belief as to a more extended authorship than that of the works under Bacon's name is monomania.

As he rather suggests that I have this trouble in a somewhat aggravated form I would, just by way of returning the compliment,

point out that Mr. Robertson may have the disease without being aware of it. He states that he has "lived as much in the spiritual society of both Shakespeare and Bacon as the majority of men of letters." Yes, there is the trouble. The notion of two individual authors has branded it.

Bacon intended that many people, particularly those of some generations afterwards, should do so. But, if I understand his "Cogitata et Visa" aright, he contemplated a time when folks would find the key of interpretation.

Mr. Robertson is a fine critic, but hopeless as an investigator. His own case, and what he thinks was the actors', have too much in common. Shakespeare helped his father. So did Mr. Robertson. Shakespeare may have been a law clerk. Mr. Robertson was. Both left school very early. Both, Mr. Robertson assures us, acquired culture in their spare time—the one sufficient for *Venus and Adonis*, the other sufficient to accuse of monomania those he differs from.

No, Mr. Robertson, M.P.; this business is rapidly being cleared without you.

When finally cleared, you will think more of Dogberry's words and less of the Stratfordian "library" sketched so imaginatively on page 544 of your "Confutation."

14th March, 1913. PARKER WOODWARD.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—I am a new-comer in the Baconian Society, and anxious to contribute my mite of information. What I have to impart may be old, but it is, perhaps, interesting, and may induce someone to take up the collection of old books on the lines I have followed.

I shall be most grateful for any information and assistance, and pleased to render either. I am making a collection of all books containing a colon or other stops in the headings. It is a big task, for up to the present I have over sixty. I have mentioned these marks to many expert booksellers and collectors, not one of whom had noticed them before. Printers have told me that they certainly mean something, and were not put in merely to fill up space. Of course it is possible that printers may have used them for some purpose of their own, but having studied them a good deal, I think they have some deeper meaning. They always seem to lead me back to Bacon and his Rosicrucian Society; but I will not attempt any theories until I have given an opportunity to your readers to show me that I have found a mare's nest. The books date from 1606 to 1780, and they come from many countries, and are in many languages. From studying some of the queer volumes which I have picked up, I have come to the conclusion that in the numerical cypher A is not 25 but 27. The "Resuscitatio" of 1671 contains at the end of Rawley's Life, a few lines of print with paper carefully pasted over. This is the same in the four copies I have knowledge of—Mr. Frank Woodward's,

my own, and two in the United States. This hidden printing is worthy of much study. At present I take it to inform us that A is 27. Now in any numerical cypher used by the inventor of the biliteral, it is quite certain that two numerals will always be used to indicate each letter, for otherwise it is necessary to punctuate the cypher, which renders it nearly useless. Therefore the numbers 1 to 9 will not be used, and K becomes the first letter. Is this the explanation of the Kay cypher? Working on these lines we can make a table, using the numbers 10 to 99. After Z comes &, and then E, followed by A, B, etc. That this is so is clearly proved by a reference to "A Repertorie of Records" by Thomas Powell, 1631, page 33. In such a cypher Bacon is 111 (three pillars!). Francis Bacon is 282. In "Gustavus Selenus," pages 111 and 282 are paginated in different type to the rest of the book. 259 means Shakespeare, as also 255, 249, according to the number of E's given the value of 26 or 31. Page 259 in "Baconiana," or "Bacon's Remains," reads, "259, That is Francis Bacon, Baron of Verulam, Viscount of St. Albans." On page 254 f "Selenus" is the chapter referred to by Sir Edwin Durning awrence as elucidating *Love's Labour Lost*. I could give any other extraordinary facts which seem to show that my ypher is correct, but I think the reading of Bacon as 111 is sufficient to convince those who think it over. To conclude, I will give you a little curiosity which shows how, by merely omitting the tail of one letter Q, the words ROSE, CROSS may be formed out of BACON as a key word. But before doing so, I would like to make two statements which will, I expect, convince your readers that I am rather a wild speculator. I have not made them, however, without some grounds. I firmly believe that Bacon's manuscripts are in the Tower of London, and I cannot believe that Bacon died in 1626, or until after 1631. Later I will, if you permit me, set before your readers a few reasons for these beliefs; but with regard to the Tower, surely it is the only place that a man of Bacon's intelligence could possibly choose. Here is the curiosity referred to above :—

B c d e f g h i k l m n o p q R S t u w x y z a
A b c d e f g h i k l m n o p O r S t u w x y z
C d e f g h i k l m n o p q R S̃ t u w x y z a b
O p q r s t u w x y z a b C d E f g h i k l m n
N o p q r s t u w x y z a b C d e f g h i k l m

Can any other words be made from this table? I do not think so. Some of the Rosicrucian marks are very like a Q, though such a simple explanation would shock Mr. Jennings.

I had not the advantage of reading Mrs. Pott's admirable works until quite recently, but had arrived at somewhat similar conclusions as to the Rosicrucians. The activity of Anthony Bacon in their literary Society is fairly obvious from the two dedications to him by Sylvester in the "Divine Weeks" (1608), which I do not recollect having seen any mention of.

Yours truly, WILLIAM E. CLIFTON.

St. Peter's Chambers, Nottingham.

BACONIANA.

Vol. XI. *Third Series.* JULY, 1913. No. 43.

"THE BACONIAN HERESY."

(Continued).

The Classical Scholarship of the Plays.

THE skill and subtlety of Mr. Robertson is again evident in the manner in which he opens and conducts the so-called enquiry into the classica scholarship. He commences by reminding the reader c the effectual manner in which "the legal argument" ha been disposed of by the laying bare of the incomplete induction which its advocates followed. It has been already shown that Mr. Robertson has left the main argument unattacked. Then comes the preliminary flourish:—

"Substantially the same error we shall find made in respect of the inference that the plays of Shakespeare exhibit wide classical scholarship because they contain classical allusions and classical commonplaces. For in this case also the conclusion has been drawn without resort to the comparative method, which would reveal non-classical sources for Shakespeare's small classical knowledge."

It will not be difficult to prove to the reader that this is mere controversial rhetoric. It will be observed that Mr. Robertson definitely adopts the position that Shakespeare had "small classical knowledge," not

merely that his Latin was small and his Greek less. Then follows some skirmishing intended to impress but really immaterial to the issue, but it contains these sentences :—

"In the face of such a variety of ordinary sources for matters of ordinary classical knowledge, it is a sufficiently reckless course to credit Shakespeare with scholarly knowledge on the score of the very ordinary classical references to the plays. Here again orthodox writers are as deep in the fallacy as any of the Baconians. Long ago Dr. Farmer proved to the satisfaction of the scholars of his generation that the author of the plays had little classical scholarship, and that the instances put forward by Upton, Lewis Theobald and others, were reducible to English sources. The contrary thesis, however, has been zealously revived in recent times by two strongly anti-Baconian scholars—the late Professor Fiske and the late Professor Churton Collins—who drew upon the previous argumentation of Dr. Maguin and Professor Baynes. Having elsewhere discussed at length the 'classical' case put by these critics and by Mr. Greenwood, I will first deal with it mainly as it is put by Lord Penzance, who proceeds uncritically upon the data given him by Mr. Donnelly and upon the sweeping assertions of several 'orthodox' scholars.—See the Author's 'Montaigne and Shakespeare,' 2nd Edition, 1909, per Index."

Mr. Robertson thus side-slips the idolaters, Dr. Maguin, Professor Baynes, Professor Fiske, and Professor Churton Collins. Let it be remembered that the idolatrous orthodox Shakespearean scholars are the origin of all the pother. The Baconian thesis would never have been heard of but for their rash conclusions. Their names are paraded and then they are ingeniously set aside and the ground is chosen:—"I will first deal with it

mainly as it is put by Lord Penzance, who proceeds uncritically upon the data given him by Mr. Donnelly and upon the sweeping assertions of several 'orthodox' scholars." But a section is devoted to Mr. Greenwood and others; by far the larger portion to the late William Theobald and good Dr. Theobald. The work of Judge Willis and Mr. Charles Crawford is requisitioned, and Mr. Robertson sails gaily on to select words used by Shakespeare which had a classical origin, but which he seeks to prove *might* have been obtained by him from English sources. Most of this work is unnecessary, and, if Professor Churton Collins had been attacked and silenced, Mr. Robertson might have claimed that he had made some advance in belittling Shakespeare. But, no; the real issue is carefully avoided.

Mr. Robertson is quite in error when he states that Dr. Farmer proved his case to the satisfaction of th scholars of his generation. Farmer did nothing of th sort. But the statement is a useful one for effect, as is also this extract from the Preface:—

"Nothing has ever made up for the turning away of Farmer from the task (the scholarly annotation of Shakespeare's text) which he was so uniquely fitted to perform. His brief 'Essay on the Learning of Shakespeare' remains an unmatched performance of its kind after a century and a-half. At its close he made a half-promise to extract more elucidatory matter 'from the chaos of papers' from which he had compiled the essay; but the unkind fates set him to other work, and no man of equal scholarly opulence has put his hand to the task again."

The reader shall have an opportunity of judging how far Farmer was capable of such a task as a scholarly annotation of Shakespeare's text. Certainly the essay bears no evidence that he was. But it is a delusion to

say that he ever contemplated such a work. In the year before the production of the essay he had advertised and sought to obtain subscribers for what was to be his great work—"History and Antiquities of the Town of Leicester," his native town. He was far too desultory and ease-loving in his habits to finish it. The foregoing extract is founded on these words:—

"And when I am fairly rid of the dust of antiquity, which is at present very thick about me, and indeed more in quantity than I expected, you may very probably be troubled again with the ever-fruitful subject of Shakespeare and his commentators." All that he contemplated was another joist at the critics—a favourite diversion of the time with men of learning.

Farmer's Essay is unique in this respect—that in the long chain of works which have been published on the Shakespeare plays and poems it is the only one published separately which has attacked the learning contained in them.

Mr. Robertson felt lonely and so trotted out poor Dr. Farmer, made an idol of him, attributed to him an authority which he never had, in order to support his own unwarranted theory. There they stand, two forlorn, solitary figures crying in the wilderness, trying to make things seem what they are not.

First, let a test be made of how far Mr. Robertson may be relied on in the backing up which he claims he receives from Farmer:—

"Neither Mr. Collins nor Mr. Greenwood has made the slightest attempt to meet Farmer's point—that Taylor, the water-poet, who avowed his failure to get through the Latin accidence and his ignorance of all languages but his own, has a far greater number of classical allusions than occur in all Shakespeare's plays."

Mr. Robertson's is not a verbal quotation. The comparison was an after-thought of Farmer's. It does not appear in the first edition of the Essay, but the words in italics are inserted in that published in 1667 :—"You perceive my dear Sir, how vague and indeterminate such arguments must be: *for in fact this sweet swan of Thames as Mr. Pope has called him, hath more scraps of Latin and allusions to antiquity than anywhere to be met with in the writings of Shakespeare.* I am sorry to trouble you with trifles, yet that must be done, when grave men insist upon them."

That Farmer should have made such a comparison between the works of Shakespeare and Taylor demonstrates how unreliable he is as a guide in litera criticism.

The following are the only references made Taylor in the Essay :—

"You know honest John Taylor, the water-poet, declares that he never learn'd his Accidence, and that Latin and French were to him Heathen Greek; yet by the help of Mr. Whalley's argument, I will prove him a learned man in spite of everything he may say to the contrary."

Now comes the proof upon which Mr. Robertson says that Farmer states that Taylor "has a far greater number of classical allusions than occur in all the Shakespeare plays." For thus he makes a gallant address his Lady—

"Most inestimable Magazine of Beauty—in whom the Port and Majesty of Juno, the Wisdom of Jove's braine bred Girle, the Feature of Cytherea, &c., have their domestical habitation."

In the *Merchant of Venice* we have an oath "By two-headed Janus," and here (says Dr. Warburton)

Shakespeare shows his knowledge of the antique, and so again does the water-poet, who describes Fortune

"Like a Janus with a double face."

"But Shakespeare hath somewhere a Latin motto," quoth Dr. Sewel; "and so hath John Taylor, and a whole poem on it into the bargain."

There is only one other reference by Farmer to John Taylor.

Old Heywood, the epigrammist, addressed his readers long before:—

"Readers, reade this, thus: for Preface, *Proface,*
Much good do it you the poor repast here," &c.

for hath it escaped the quibbling manner of the *water-poet* in the "Title of a Poem," prefixed to his "Praise of Hempseed"—

"A Preamble, Preatot, Preagallop, Preaface, or Preface; and Proface, my masters, if your stomacks serve."

It may be noted that in the date of his writings Taylor was a successor, not a contemporary, of Shakespeare's. There were two trifles published in 1612 (on the death of Prince Henry) and in 1613 ("Heaven's Blessing and Earth's Joy") respectively. Publications bearing his name appeared from 1618 onwards, but the volume issued as "The workes of John Taylor the Water Poet" was not published until 1630.

This volume is one of the curiosities of the period. The title page states that the works are "sixty and three in number," and has on it an impression of the identical block which was used in printing *Venus and Adonis* in 1593, and in the 1611 quarto edition of the Authorised Version of the Bible. If the comparative method which Mr. Robertson so highly extols were applied to Taylor's

works there would be very little of Taylor left, even without any very exhaustive application of it. In the Epistle Dedicatory addressed to *The World* the suggestion is thrown out that the book may not have been written by Taylor. In a note prefixed to "Taylor's Pastoral" he disclaims the authorship of all writings bearing the initials I.T., although there are a number in the volume. In "a few lines to small purpose against the scandalous aspersions, that are either maliciously or ignorantly cast upon the Poets and Poems of these times," he writes:—

> "Latin and French are heathen-Greek to me,
> The Grecian, and the Hebrew Characters,
> I know as well as I can read the Stars.
> The sweet Italian, and the Chip Chop Dutch,
> I know the man i'th Moone can speak as much."

In some lines at the end of "Sir Gregory Nonsence" he states, that "the meanest Scholler may plaine see I understand their tongues, as they doe me." Again and again are similar disclaimers made, and yet in certain portions of the works Latin quotations are freely used, and evidence is afforded that the author had a very extensive knowledge of classical writers and classical lore. Taylor's statements are entirely at variance with the testimony of many portions of the works. Farmer's comparison of Taylor and Shakespeare, which was adopted by Mr. Robertson, demonstrates that he was an untrustworthy critic, and was incapable from a lack of an intelligent understanding of contemporary literature of producing any commentary on the Shakespeare plays which would be of value.

Now let a definite test be made of Farmer's honesty, and if it be proved that in one of his main charges against his opponents he was either dishonest or culpably careless it will not be necessary to trouble the reader with any more of his feeble efforts. He writes,

"Prospero in the *Tempest* begins the address to his spirits,
'Ye Elves of Hills, of standing Lakes and Groves.'

"This speech, Dr. Warburton rightly observes to be borrowed from Medea's in 'Ovid'; and it proves, says Mr. Holt, beyond contradiction, that Shakespeare was perfectly acquainted with the sentiments of the ancients on the subject of enchantments. The original lines are these,

'Auræque, et venti, montesque, amnesque, lacusque,
Diique omnes nemorum, diique omnes noctis adeste.'

"The translation of which by Golding is by no means literal, and Shakespeare hath closely followed it;

'Ye Ayres and Winds; Ye Elves of Hills, of Brookes, of Woods alone,
Of standing Lakes, and of the Night approache ye everych one.'"

Mr. Robertson discreetly omits mention of this, although it is one of Farmer's strong points. It is introduced thus: "But to come nearer to the purpose, what will you say, if I can show you, that Shakespeare, when, in the favourite phrase, he had a Latin Classick *in his eye*, must assuredly have made use of a translation." Why was all reference to this clinching argument omitted? Because Mr. Robertson knew full well how Professor Churton Collins had dealt with the very passage. Dr. Maguin in two articles in *Blackwood's Magazine*, 1837, drew attention to the evidence which Farmer had ignored or misrepresented. He showed that if in this "crucial passage from the *Tempest* Shakespeare had followed Golding's version, he followed it only so far as suited his purpose, that he had the original in his hands or his memory, and had introduced touches from it." Professor Churton Collins thus deals with the matter:—

"As a test passage let us take the famous adaption in the *Tempest* (Act V. Sc. i.):—

"Ye elves of hills, brooks, standing lakes and groves

. . . .

. . . . by whose aid,
Weak masters, though ye be, I have bedimm'd
The noon-tide sun, call'd forth the mutinous winds.
. . . To the dread rattling thunder
Have I given fire, and rifted Jove's stout oak
With his long bolt: the strong-bas'd promontory
Have I made shake; and by the spurs pluck'd up
The pine and cedar: graves at my command,
Have wak'd their sleepers, op'd and led them forth
By my so potent art.

"This passage, according to Farmer, owes everything to Golding alone; Golding's version of the original (" Metamorphous " VII. 197—206) is:—

'Ye ayres and winds, ye elves of hills, of brookes, of woodes alone
Of standing lakes, and of the night, approache ye everye one,
Through help of whom (the crooked bankes much wondering at the thing)
I have compelled streames to run cleare backward to their spring
By charms I make the calm seas rough; and make the roug seas playne,
And cover all the sky with cloudes, and chase from thence againe
By charms I raise and lay the windes, etc.
And from the bowels of the earth both stones and trees do draw.
Whole woodes and forests I remove, I make the mountaines shake
And e'en the earth itself to moane and fearfully to quake.
I call up dead men from their graves . . .
Our sorcerie dimmes the morning faire, and darks the sun at noone.'

" Beside this place the original:—

'Auraeque, et venti, montesque, amnesque, lacusque,
Dîque omnes nemorum, Dîque omnes noctis adeste:
Quorum ope, quum volui, ripis mirantibus amnes
In fontes rediere suos: concussaque sisto,
Stantia concutio cantu freta: nubila pello
Nubilaque induco: ventos abigoque, vocoque:

. . . .

Vitaque saxa, suâ convulsaque roborâ terrâ,
Et sylvas moveo; jubeoque tremiscere montes,
Et mugire solum, manes que exire sepulcris.'

"From this it will be clear that if Shakespeare used Golding's version—and this seems likely from the opening line—he used also the original. There is nothing in Golding corresponding to the original in 'sua convulsaque robora terrâ,' which he omits entirely, but Shakespeare accurately recalls it in '*rifted* Jove's stout *oak*,' while the touch in 'op'd and *let them forth*,' unfolds the meaning of 'exire,' which Golding does not; so again Shakespeare represents 'voco' — 'call'd forth' — which Golding altogether misses. How admirably it may be added has Shakespeare caught the colour, ring and rhythm of the original, and how utterly are they missed in the lumbering homeliness of Golding."

Either Professor Churton Collins is right or he is wrong; the passage in the original and the translations of Shakespeare and Golding are there, so that each eader may decide for himself. If he is right, Farmer is onvicted either of intentionally suppressing the truth n order to make a point against Dr. Warburton or of culpable carelessness or of lack of scholarship. In any case he stands discredited as an authority unworthy of credence. So Dr. Farmer, who has been dragged out of his deserved obscurity to try and bolster up the anti-Stratfordian case, may be relegated there again.

Before referring to further affirmative evidence in favour of the growing and indeed almost universal belief that the plays and poems were written by a man of great learning and culture, it is necessary to enter a protest against the charge made against Baconians that they are ignorant of contemporary literature. Again and again this is asserted in the "Baconian Heresy," but without an argument or a scrap of evidence in support of it. Allusion has already been made to Mr. Harold Bayley's "The Shakespeare Symphony." Mr. Parker Woodward has covered a very wide area in dramatic literature and poetry, especially in the works attributed to Kyd, Marlow, Peele, Greene, Nashe, Spenser, Lily, Watson and Burton. His recently published work "Tudor

Problems,"* exhibits a knowledge of contemporary historical and literary fact far greater than that displayed in "The Baconian Heresy."

Professor Churton Collins thus summarizes the result of his exhaustive investigation into the evidence afforded by the plays and poems that the author was acquainted with Latin :—

"His familiarity with the Latin language is evident first from the fact that he has with minute particularity of detail based a poem and a play on a poem of Ovid and a comedy of Plautus which he must have read in the original, as no English translations so far as we know existed at the time; secondly from the fact that he has adopted and borrowed many passages from the classic which were almost certainly only accessible to him in the Lat language; and thirdly from the fact that when he may ha followed English translations it is often quite evident that he h the original either by him or in his memory.

"The story as told by Shakespeare follows the story as told by Ovid in the second book of the 'Fasti' ('Fasti' II. 721—852). It had also been told in English by four writers who had modelled their narratives on Ovid, by Chaucer in the 'Legende of Goode Women,' by Lydgate in his 'Falls of Princes,' by Gower in his 'Confessio Amantis,' and in prose by Painter in his 'Palace of Pleasure'; but a careful comparison of these narratives with Shakespeare's, which it is not necessary to give in detail here, will conclusively show that Shakespeare has followed none of them—that Ovid and Ovid only is his original. The details given in Ovid which neither Chaucer nor any of the other narrators reproduce, but which are reproduced by Shakespeare, place this beyond question."

And then follow a number of instances which prove the truth of this assertion up to the hilt. The writer continues :—

"In a word, a comparison of Chaucer's and Shakespeare's narratives will show that each represents an independent study of the Latin original, and that Shakespeare has followed Ovid with

* Gay and Hancock, Ltd., London, 1912.

scrupulous care. When this poem was written there was no English translation of the 'Fasti,' and Shakespeare must have read it in the original."

Mr. Robertson in endeavouring to refute an argument of Mr. Greenwood's urges that translations of the classics in manuscript were numerous in those days. He writes:—

"The reason for believing that MS. translations of Latin poetry were numerous in Shakespeare's day are manifold; and I confess to being astonished that anyone, even in the ardour of an *idée fixe*, should doubt its likelihood. . . . Did Mr. Greenwood never do such translations in his youth; and, if so, has he preserved them?"

These sentences prove that Mr. Robertson was unaware of the manner in which Latin was imparted to young boys in Shakespeare's time. There were no Latin-English grammars. No one required these translations. In the auction-rooms and book-shops many scores of manuscripts of the period have passed through the hands of the writer of this article during the past few years. They consist of transcripts of classical writers, always in the Latin language. These were common and have been preserved, but he cannot recollect to have seen one translation into English out of this number. It is much more probable that translations if they ever existed would survive rather than transcripts in the original language. Some of these latter have passed into the possession of the writer. "Juvenalis Satyræ," a quarto of 200 pages with a broad margin, is literally covered with Bacon's notes and marks. "Elegantiar Compendium Clarissimi Laurentii Vallae," a large octavo of about 80 pages vellum, is in his handwriting, and on the last page contains some curious notes. A small octavo of about the same length, "Tibullus Elegæ," also in Bacon's handwriting, which comes from the library of Matthew, has been made the channel for

one of Bacon's usual tricks—an oblong space has been cut in the centre of the page so that the letters by the side of it and those seen through it spell BACON. T. M. The men of those days who were interested in the classics did not need translations. They thought and wrote in Latin. Classical works were uniformly annotated in Latin by scholars both in France and England. Out of some thousands of classical books annotated in manuscript which the writer has examined he cannot recollect to have seen *one* annotated in English.

Mr. Robertson does not state the manifold reasons for supposing that MS. translations were numerous in Shakespeare's day. Such evidence as exists is against this theory. Professor Churton Collins pertinently remarks :—

> "If it be argued that he (Shakespeare) had access to manuscript translations, we can only reply that the balance of probability is very much more in favour of arguments based on facts than of arguments based on unsupported hypothesis, for of such translations there is no record."

Mr. Robertson carries his case no further in his criticism of this point in Montaigne and Shakespeare. He advances no facts, substituting "ifs" and possibilities for them. He quotes, however, the statement of Dr. Anders, who wrote on "Shakespeare's books":—"I think there ought to be no doubt that Shakespeare had recourse to the Latin direct." Mention is made on the same page of the thesis of Dr. Ewig, "That Shakespeare's poem is based upon Livy no less than upon Ovid, and perhaps uses Chaucer also." The copy of Livy which Bacon had when a young boy has been preserved. It is the 1535 edition of Froben. The margins bear evidence of the methodical character of his reading when he was probably about twelve years of age. They abound in sketches and in certain marks the use of which he continued during his life. On page

27 is a sketch of Lucreece, and under the words in his handwriting "Bruti juram enem" (the rest of the line has been cut off, and on the next line "Tra Targum").

Here are some more extracts from Professor Churton Collins' excellent work, "Studies in Shakespeare."

"But what I wish to insist on is that Shakespeare read Seneca in the Latin original, not in the lumbering English version of Studley, Nevile, Newton, Nuce, and Jasper Heywood, published by Newton in 1581."

"Next let us take Horace. In Shakespeare's time there was no translation of the 'Odes,' and yet his plays abound in what certainly appear reminiscences of them.'"

"Again, Juvenal was not translated into English until after Shakespeare's death, but that he had read him seems certain."

"It is difficult to believe that Shakespeare had not read Lucretius, and of Lucretius there was no translation until after the Elizabethan age."

"There remain to confine ourselves to works with all of which he was acquainted, and with some of which he was familiar, the 'Ænid' of Virgil, the 'Metamorphoses' and 'Heroides' of Ovid, the Comedies of Terence, and the Tragedies of Seneca. Now in all cases where he refers to these works, or has borrowed or adapted from them, it is at least as probable, and this may be maintained with confidence, that he had the originals in his hands or his memory as that he had the English versions."

These statements are supported by citations from the works referred to which find their counterparts in Shakespeare.

Professor Churton Collins in his next article devotes his scholarship to answering the question, "Had Shakespeare read the 'Greek Tragedies?'" It is impossible here to do justice to the arguments which are used and the quantity of extracts which are given in support of them. No one interested in this subject should accept Mr. Robertson's emphatic pronouncement without refreshing his memory by again reading "Studies in Shakespeare." It is far and away the most valuable contribution which has been made to the controversy.

One extract only will be given, which relates to the Attic dramas. It is this :—

"It is indeed in the extraordinary analogies—analogies in sources, in particularity of detail and point, and in relative frequency of employment, presented by his metaphors to the most convincing testimony of his familiarity with their writings."

With such weighty arguments, based on what appears to be indisputable evidence, Mr. Robertson does not deal in the "Shakespeare Heresy." He addresses his attention to what are termed "parallelisms." On pages 202 to 216 he attacks 21 arguments which somebody has said somebody else has used. How strongly he would censure dealing with arguments at secondhand in others can be imagined. On pages 224 to 249 he comments one by one upon 64 instances brought forward by the late Mr. W. Theobald ; and on pages 276 to 373 or 223 instances brought forward by Dr. R. M. Theobald. With the assistance of the work done by Judge Will and Mr. Charles Crawford, he seeks to minimize the value of the parallelisms as evidence that Bacon's Works and Shakespeare's Plays and Poems emanated from the same mind. He invariably deals with one word and not with the context, and seeks to show that the word with the same shade of meaning was used by other Elizabethan writers. Take one or two instances :—

"130 Person (=personna, part sustained, 2 Henry IV., IV., vii., 73). Bacon, Dr. Theobald points out, used the word in a similar sense. So did many other Elizabethan writers."

Extracts are then given from a translation of Calvin's "Sermons," 1597, from Hooker's "Ecclesiastical Polity," from Hutchinson's "Image of God," and Fenton's "Guicciardini," 1579. He then adds :—

"Dr. Theobald does not seem to reflect that the classic meaning of *person* is implicit in the historic description of the Christian Trinity."

Because Bishop Hooker, Roger Hutchinson and Geoffrey Fenton used the word in its original classical meaning it is no proof that the author of *Henry IV.* did not so use it. The extracts given rather confirm than confute Dr. Theobald's suggestion, for all three authors quoted were classical scholars. This argument is of a meretricious style, and piled up in great quantities has the effect of conveying the impression the reverse of true to a reader not versed in the subject. But it in no degree confutes the Baconian argument. Every word that Mr. Robertson has advanced in those 139 pages may be conceded to him (many of his contentions, however, may be successfully challenged), and the Baconian case is not affected by one jot or tittle.

It is the large number of parallel phrases which have been found in the writings of two authors in which the identity of thought and diction is obvious which constitutes the strength of the argument. Dr. Theobald gives 113 instances; but Mr. Edwin Reed, in his "Bacon and Shakespeare Parallelisms," gives no less than 885 examples, of which the following are a fair example :—

That strain again; it had a dying fall;
O, it came o'er my ear like the sweet south,
That breathes upon a bed of violets,
Stealing and giving odor.
—*Twelfth Night* I. i.

The breath of flowers . . . comes and goes, like the warbling music.
—Essay "On Gardening."

By a divine instinct men's minds mistrust
Ensuing danger; as by proof we see
The waters swell before a boist'rous storm.
—*Richard III.*, III.

As there are . . . secret swellings of seas before a tempest so there are in States.
—Essay "On Sedition."

Let him be his carver.
—*Richard II.*, II. iii.

You shall not be your own carver. — "Advancement of Learning."

Nothing almost sees miracles
But misery.
—*King Lear* II. ii.

Certainly if miracles be the control over nature, they appear most in adversity.
—Essay "On Adversity."

Who having unto truth by telling of it,
Made such a sinner of his memory,
To credit his own lie.
—*Tempest* I. ii.

With long and continual counterfeiting, and with oft telling a lie, he was turned by habit into the thing he seemed to be; and from a liar became a believer.—"Henry VII."

Have you a daughter? . . .
Let her not walk i' th' sun.
—*Hamlet* II. ii.

Aristotle dogmatically assigned the cause of generation to the sun.
—"Novum Organum."

I saw him run after a gilded butterfly; and when he caught it, he let it go again; and after it again.—*Coriolanus* I. iii.
(The play is assumed to have been written about 1610. It was not published until 1623.)

To be like a child following bird, which, when he is neare: flying away and lighteth a litt. before: and then the chila after it again.
—Private letter to Greville, written in 1595, not published until 1657.

It would beguile nature of her custom,
So perfectly is he her ape.
—*Winter's Tale* V. ii. (1623).

Governed by chance, custom doth commonly prove but an ape of nature.—"Advancement of Learning."

It must be repeated that Mr. Edwin Reed gives 885 parallelisms, of which the above are a fair example! The Baconians say in them lies a strong argument that the two sets of works were produced by one mind. The skilful controversialist again side-tracks the real argument and tries to persuade the reader that a side issue is the main issue. To accomplish this he again charges Baconians with ignorance of contemporary literature, talks about comparative study of this literature as if he

had discovered the method, when Baconians have been working it for all it is worth for years, heaps up extraneous quotations which do not affect the Baconian argument, and then writes :—

"I will not carry the 'quest' further. It has its distressing as well as its ridiculous side. These divagations of men utterly possessed by a foregone conclusion, blind to all countervailing evidence, hypnotized by a hallucination, tell of an 'expense of spirit' in error that is not to be contemplated without discomfort. It is the desire to minimize the amount of such aberration in future that has sustained me, as I trust it may do some of my readers, through the tedium of a detailed confutation."

It is the irony of fate that, in the future, Baconians will hold up the outcome of all this tedious labour as one of the strongest arguments in favour of their theory. When Mr. Robertson has produced not 885 but 100 parallelisms from the works of Shakespeare and some other contemporary author, parallelisms as identical in diction and thought as those now quoted, he may have the right to be listened to ; until then he must subside.

There is another view of Mr. Robertson's attempt to rebut the argument from classical scholarship to which attention must be drawn. Judge Willis, on whom the controversialist mainly relies, had read extensively the writings of Divines, ecclesiastical records and correspondence extant at the time. He draws his materials principally from these sources. He quotes from Rolls of Parliament, 1436 ; Beggar's Petition Against Popery, 1538 ; State Papers of Henry VIII., 1546 ; Commission of Edward VI. to his Council, 1552 ; The King's Authorization, Preface to Constitutional Canon's Ecclesiastical, 1604 ; various translations of Calvin's works, viz., on "Deuteronomy" ; on "The Harmony of

the Evangelists"; Sermons; Tyndale's translation of Erasmus' "Enchiridion," 1533; Philpot's translation of Curio's "Defence of Christ's Church," c. 1550; Hooker's "Ecclesiastical Polity"; John Rainhold's lecture on "Obadiah," 1584; Hutchinson's "The Image of God," and his other works; Hooper's "Declaration of Christ and His Office"; Whitehorne's "Arte of Warrs," 1560; and to numbers of similar works. All of these, be it observed, are the works of classical scholars. To these out-of-the-way books and manuscripts has Judge Willis to have resort to produce examples of words used in their classical sense as Shakespeare used them! Does Mr. Robertson suggest that the Stratford man had covered this wide field of literature and made it his own before he wrote *Venus and Adonis?* If not, what does his argument amount to? Not one contemporary author is quoted who was not a classical scholar! Judge Willis proves this and no more—that the author of the poems and plays was so familiar with the writings of classical scholars that he employed words which were used by them in their root meaning. "The Baconian Mint" was, like Farmer's Essay, becoming forgotten except by Baconians, who like to keep such trophies on their shelves. Mr. Robertson drags them forth to replenish the Baconian armoury. That is the net result of his labours.

In respect of this point Mr. Robertson on page 272 very unfairly and without justification brings a charge of equivocation against Dr. Theobald and, in doing so, makes this statement:—"Any Englishman of Shakespeare's day, whether he knew Latin or not, used those words in the so-called 'classic' sense, if he used them at all, simply because they had been introduced and adopted in the past by men who were habituated in Latin." *Judge Willis does not give one single instance of the use of one of these*

words by a writer who was not a classical scholar. And yet Mr. Robertson has the assurance to attribute their use to "any Englishman of Shakespeare's day, whether he knew Latin or not." Equally loose is the remark on page 451: "All this is Elizabethan commonplace." Equally loose is Mr. Robertson when, on page 254, in referring to Hallam's observations on Shakespeare's forced Latinisms, he remarks that he "has here, as we shall see, half claimed uniqueness for a number of Shakesperean words which were more or less current before 1590." To justify his rash statements he cites one example of the use of each of three words by classical writers.

The principle upon which Mr. Robertson acts throughout his book is that any statement made by any man, however distinguished he may be as an authority, is to be contradicted, whether it be right or wrong, if it in any way supports the Baconian theory. In this direction he says, on page 255: "The writer [*i.e.*, Hallam] who would have counted the Baconian theory insane becomes a stepping-stone thereto." Hallam was a man of the widest knowledge in literature, and he has not left one single sentence which justifies Mr. Robertson's deduction.

(*To be continued.*)

THE DATES OF SPENSER'S BIRTH AND DEATH.

THE 1679 Folio of Spenser's poetical works contains as a frontispiece a picture of the monumental tablet erected to the poet in Westminster Abbey, and this picture is sufficiently large to enable the epitaph on the tablet to be clearly set out. The striking peculiarity of this is that the date of Spenser's birth is thereon given as 1510, and of his death as 1596. These dates are most extraordinary, and do not at all agree with the accepted facts of the poet's life—that, as a young man, in 1579, he first began to write love poems and love ditties, when, if born in 1510, he would be 69 years of age. In the 1679 Folic there is a short sketch of Spenser's life, and the write of this, whoever he was, coolly accepts and evei endorses this incongruous birth date, without any cavil or attempt at explanation. I pointed all this out and dwelt upon it in the little book I brought out in 1911, entitled "Bacon's Secret Disclosed in Contemporary Books."* That the date would not fit Spenser the poet, as we knew him, or imagined him to be, is quite apparent; but it was equally apparent that this date was accepted by his contemporaries, or those who lived soon after him. And herein lies the puzzle. So incongruous did the date appear to be, as time went on, that in 1778, when the worn and defaced tablet was "restored by private subscription," the restorers coolly changed the dates, and made them as they now appear in Westminster Abbey—"born in 1553 and died in 1598"; and had it not been for the picture of the tablet preserved in the 1679 Folio, and in one othei place that I will speak of, no one would ever probably

* Gay & Hancock, Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, W.C. 1911.

have known that these "restorers" had had the sublime effrontery to change the dates on such a solemn record as a monumental tablet without a word of explanation. They found that the dates would not suit the poems, so they changed the dates as being easier than explaining the poems.

This subject has interested me a good deal, and I have endeavoured to unearth what other contemporary allusions there may be to this curious tablet of Spenser's, and what, if any, contemporary explanation there may be of these dates.

There is a Latin-English version of Spenser's "Shepherd's Calendar," made by Theodore Bathurst, and first published in 1653. This was again brought out by John Ball in 1732. To this is prefixed a short life of Spenser (in Latin), and in this the author quotes (in English) the epitaph from the Westminster tablet, with the dates 1510 and 1596. He then goes on to say that Cambden reports that Spenser died ("*immatura morti*," by a too early *death*) in 1598; and this date was adopted by Winstanley in 1684 and 1687 in his "Lives of England's Worthies"; but neither Cambden nor Winstanley mention any date of birth. A little further on John Ball discusses the 1510 birth date, and says it is in no way consistent with truth that he was born in that year, because that would make him past 60 years of age when he sent forth the "Shepherd's Calendar," and that was not exactly the age for a man to give himself up to drawing love pictures, which was evidently the line of argument that the "restorers" followed in 1778. But John Ball adds that what is worth more than all argument is the Register of the Cambridge University, though unfortunately he neglects to tell us what he inferred from this Register, or what it recorded.

Going back a few years from the date of this publica-on of John Ball's, we come to the survey of the Abbey

Church of St. Peter's, Westminster, taken in the year 1723, by John Dart, and published by him, together with an account of the Abbots and the Abbey, some time soon after that year. This was brought out in two sumptuous volumes, with splendid engravings showing the principal tombs and tablets.

Among these engravings there is a large picture of Spenser's tablet (Vol. I., p. 75), and in this picture the epitaph can be clearly read, as in the case of the frontispiece of the 1679 Folio. The picture is precisely similar to that of the Folio, and the epitaph is identical in respect of arrangement of lines, spelling and dates. John Dart has also a short account, descriptive and critical, of this tablet and its epitaph. He gives Cambden's Latin epitaph, and its allusion to Spenser's "too early death," and points out also that while Cambden giv the date of death as 1598, he mentions no date at all birth. But that this epitaph was ever placed on tl monument, Dart says, is "doubtful"; certainly there i no place for it, as the picture shows. John Dart then goes on to say:

"But what has raised the chief dispute concerning this Epitaph, is the date of Mr. Spencer's birth, which upon the Tomb was said to be in 1510. This indeed squares but ill with Mr. Cambden's expression of an early Death. Yet however (if poetically plac'd) may only relate to the too hasty Loss of such a Man, and allude to his Merit, rather than his Years. That Mr. Spencer was an old Man at his death is generally suppos'd; but of what age is doubtful, and was perhaps when this Inscription was plac'd here, which was not till the Year 1631; and therefore this of 1510, being added to supply the Vacancy, requires no great Stress to be laid upon it."

From which remarks we may gather that John Dart

smoothed over the difficulty of the birth date, for himself at any rate, by assuming that the date was stuck in to "supply the Vacancy" without much thought as to its correctness. Perhaps he had in mind the contemptuous words of Fletcher in "The Purple Island," * when he wrote of Spenser—

> "Poorly, poor man, he lived: poorly, poor man, he died."

And concluded that the date of the birth of such an one —whether 40 years one way or another—would not be a matter of much importance.

This may have been Dart's mind on the subject, but it is quite impossible to believe that such could have been the mental position of the man who wrote the short biography of Spenser prefixed to the 1679 Folio, gave a picture of the monumental tablet as a frontispiece to his book, and had clearly and unmistakably adopted the birth date of 1510 as that to be adhered to.

This is what he said of Spenser—

"He excelled all other ancient and modern Poets, in Greatness of Sense, Decency of Expression, Height of Imagination, Quickness of Conceit, Grandeur and Majesty ot Thought, and all the Glories of Verse. When he is passionate, he forces commiseration and tears from his Readers; where pleasant and airy, a secret satisfaction and smile: and where Bold and Heroique, he inflames their breasts with Gallantry and Valour. His Descriptions are so easie and natural, that his Pen seems to have a power of conveying Ideas to our mind, more Just, and to the Life, than the exquisite Pencils of Titian or Raphael, to our eyes. He was, in a word, compleatly happy in everything that might render him Glorious, and Inimitable to future Ages."

Greater praise than this it would be impossible to

* "The Purple Island," by P. F., Cambridge, 1633, Cant. I., Stanza 19.

give. Spenser is here exalted on a pinnacle above "all other Ancient and Modern Poets." How can we reconcile this with Fletcher's—

"Poorly, poor man, he lived: poorly, poor man, he died"?

Or how can we reconcile it with the fact that the unknown author of the above pæan of praise at the same time accepts the incongruous date of birth that would make his poet-hero an old man of 69 when he first began (as a youth) to write love songs? There is some mystery here that requires clearing up. It would certainly seem as though two totally distinct and different "Spensers" were being spoken of, even as Ben Jonson speaks of and praises two very different "Shakespeares."

There is yet another 17th century writer to be noticed who has recorded Spenser's monumental tablet. Th' is Thomas Dingley in his "History from Marble." Th book contains an account, with beautiful pen-and-i sketches, of various tombs and tablets throughout Eng land and Wales, and was compiled by Dingley, probably with the assistance of Theophilus Alye, throughout the years between 1640—1680. It was never published, but was reproduced in facsimile from the MS. by the Camden Society in 1868, Vols. XCIV.. and XCVII.

Dingley gives at p. 471 an exact reproduction of the epitaph on Spenser's tablet. There is no picture of the tablet, but the epitaph is given line for line, and with the same spelling as reproduced by the other writers I have brought forward, except that Dingley has different dates. His epitaph concludes—

HE WAS BORNE IN LONDON IN
THE YEARE 1516: AND
DIED IN THE YEARE
1598.

It is certainly curious that Dingley, professing to copy

the tablet, should make such a variation in the dates, and should hit upon the very date of Spenser's death that was afterwards adopted by the restorers of the tablet. It is quite possible that 1516 might be a slip of the pen for 1510, as the o in Dingley's notes might easily be misread for a 6, but the mistake of the 8 is not so easily understood.

There can, I think, be no doubt that the dates were originally 1510 and 1596. We have had handed down to us two pictures of the tablet—one published in 1679, the other in 1723—each from quite independent sources the one from the other, and each absolutely agreeing the one with the other. The descriptive matter with these pictures also accepts these dates. There is also the testimony of John Ball, before given, that reports the dates 1510 and 1596, though not accepting them without cavil. There is no testimony to be found anywhere supporting the birth-date of 1553 among Spenser's contemporaries, or those living near his time.

And thus the puzzle stands, and I fear with our present information we can get no nearer the solution of it. I do not doubt but that there will be found some explanation of it all when the grand clearing up takes place of the mystery of the English literature of those 100 years from 1570 to 1670. When all is understood about that period, there will be a great tumbling down of statues erected to departed "great ones" and a great scrapping of "biographies" and literary criticism that modern ingenuity has built up.

The spelling of Spenser's name even invites discussion. Mr. Smedley, in a correspondence in the public Press, lately drew attention to the fact that the name was frequently spelt with a "c" instead of an "s," and he was informed, editorially, in the usual *de haute en bas* style that, of course, "s" was the correct way. But in the Westminster tablet, the present one as well

as that which it replaced, it is spelt with a "c." In Bathurst's translation of the "Shepherd Calendar" (1653), on the English title-page it is spelt with a "c," and on the Latin with an "s." On the title-page to the 1679 Folio it is spelt with an "s," but in the same volume on the sub-title-page to the "Prothalamion" it is spelt with a "c." John Ball, in quoting Camden's epitaph, spells it with a "c"; and John Dart (1723), following the spelling on the tablet, of which he gives a picture, spells it with a "c." So I think it is by no means certain how the name should be spelt if one wished to spell it correctly.

GRANVILLE C. CUNINGHAM.

THE WITCHES IN *MACBETH.*

IN *Chamber's Edinburgh Journal* of April 27, 1844, attention is called to Knight's recently published "Biography of Shakespeare," and we are told that "the witches of *Macbeth* are a very peculiar creation. Witchcraft was not then rife in England."

In 1591, in an Edinburgh witch case, it was testified that several hags went "together" to sea, "each one in a riddle or sieve."

In 1596-7 Commissions for the trial of witches sat at Aberdeen and put to death twenty-one persons charged with witchcraft. In the records of these trials we read that Isabel Oig was accused of laying the wind; Violet Leys of haunting a vessel with bad winds so that the master was obliged to cast overboard the greater part of the lading or there to perish—men, ship and gear. These records seem to be embodied in *Macbeth* I. iii., where we read:—

Witch 1.—A saylor's wife had chestnuts in her lappe

And mouncht and mouncht and mouncht :
Give me, quoth I.
Aroynt thee, witch, the rumpe-fed Ronyon cryes,
Her husband's to Aleppo gone Master o' th' Tiger
And like a Rat without a tayle*
Ile doe, Ile doe and Ile doe.

Witch 2.—Ile give thee a winde.

E. D. L.

AN ASTRONOMICAL SIMILITUDE.

HUNDREDS—nay, thousands—have been the references made to the lines bearing the signature of Ben Jonson prefixed to the 1623 edition of Shakespeare's works. Sweet "Swan of Avon" has been quoted tens (if not hundreds) of thousands of times; "and though thou hadst small Latin and less Greek" has been misquoted nearly as many. And yet the most significant lines in the whole panegyric have almost, if not quite, escaped attention. The passage which far nd away exceeds all others in importance is this :—

"But stay ! I see thee in the Hemisphere
Advanc'd, and made a constellation.
Shine forth, thou Starre of Poets"

Jonson certainly had sufficient knowledge of astronomy to differentiate between a group of stars, a constellation, and a star. What did he intend to convey by this curious prophecy in metaphor? Why in the distant future should the author be likened to a constellation?

The influence which the coterie of young French writers known as the Pléiade exerted in France at the time the Shakespeare plays were being written is well

* Witches were believed to be able to change themselves and others into animals, but such witch creations were always supposed to be tailless.

known.* There is not to be found in contemporary English literature any reference which would lead to the belief that the work of the Pléiade was either recognised or understood in England. It is, however, beyond doubt that Francis Bacon must have been familiar with the men who constituted the group and with their work. He was in France from 1576 to 1579, and again in 1581, when their fame at the Court was at its zenith. Although he does not in terms refer to them, there are several passages in the "Advancement of Learning" which inferentially point to his knowledge of and appreciation of their work. Edmund Spenser, Joshua Silvester, and others, translated odes by D Bellay and Ronsard. Sir Sidney Lee has pointed o the influence which the Pléiade exercised o Shakespeare and some of his contemporaries. Jons has left no evidence which justifies the assumption tha he was acquainted with the contemporary literature of other countries. It is remarkable how slender are the grounds upon which he has obtained the reputation of being a learned man. But this is certain—that, having regard to the relations which existed between Bacon and Jonson from 1620 onwards, in view of the epoch-making work of the members of the Pléiade and Bacon's knowledge of it, Jonson could not have been otherwise than familiar with it.

The Pléiade is a group of seven stars in the constellation of Taurus. It was to the seven young men who were the backbone of the French Renaissance that their countrymen applied the designation. They were animated by a sincere and intelligent love of their mother-tongue; but, recognising its crudeness and insufficiency, they sought to bring the French language and literary forms to a state more comparable with that of the

* A brief account of this remarkable movement will be found in "The Mystery of Francis Bacon" (R. Banks and Son).

two great classical tongues. The language and literary forms of the English tongue in 1576 were far inferior to those of France in 1549, when Du Bellay, Ronsard and their associates entered upon their enterprise. And yet by the time the Folio edition of "Shakespeare" was published, a language and literature had been created in England which in its capacity was not inferior to that of France. Further, in the Shakespeare plays, examples of that language had been produced which, even after the lapse of nearly three hundred years, occupy the foremost position in the literature of the world. The remarkable feature of this Renaissance is that it appears to have been brought about by, *with one striking exception*, a very mediocre lot of men.

Now, let the passage under consideration in the panegyric be examined. Jonson had in his mind the Pléiade and their work for France. He had also before him the corresponding work, of even wider import, which had been carried through in England. He was writing lines to be prefixed to the culmination of that work. If the seven men who brought about the French Renaissance were likened to a group of stars, to what must that man be likened who had been the Alpha and Omega of the English Renaissance?—the man who, concealed under other names, had in so many divers directions brought into existence the foundations of a literature which was destined to become more influential than those of the great classsical tongues and hardly less powerful in its capacities. Jonson looked into the future and with prophetic vision saw the results of this great work, and so he penned the lines:—

> "But stay! I see thee in the Hemisphere
> Advanc'd, and made a constellation."

No group of stars were worthy of comparison to him; he must have a whole constellation to himself. He was

the Alpha, Beta, Gamma, Delta, &c., in it. But centuries might elapse before the constellation would be recognised.

"Shine forth, thou Star of Poets."

Jonson knew the difference between a star and a constellation. Shakespeare was likened to a brilliant,—the most brilliant star in that constellation. The constellation was Francis Bacon.

WILLIAM T. SMEDLEY.

THREE POINTS OF INTEREST

IT is a suggestive fact that whenever Elizabethan students, however orthodox, express themselves with freedom and honesty, their conclusions generally tend to prove the theory held by Baconians.

In an edition of "The Essays of Francis Bacon," with introduction and notes by "Mary Augusta Scott, Ph.D., Professor of the English Language and Literature in Smith College," U.S.A. (published 1908), the editress makes, among others, the following statements as the result of her careful and painstaking works:—

"Illustrations from King James' Bible and from Shakspere are the best to be had to explain the English of Bacon's 'Essays,' for the three great classics are almost as precisely contemporaneous as it is possible to be. Making the citations without forethought just as they occurred to me, I found on completing the notes that all the thirty-seven plays of Shakspere had been called into requisition to illustrate Bacon's fifty-eight essays.

"One reason why Bacon's 'Essays,' one of the most learned works in English, is so easy to read and to understand is that the language used is that of the Bible,

both in vocabulary and construction. The word 'marvel' meaning to wonder, 'wax' to grow, 'profit' to improve, need no explanation to the reader of the Authorised Version."

Dr. Scott is not a Baconian, and, unfortunately, she does not even understand the true character of the author she is editing; but her freedom from prejudice makes her work valuable and tempts one to wonder what the result will be when not only Bacon's fifty-eight essays, but all his works, including letters and fragments, are "called into requisition" to illustrate "Shakespeare's" thirty-seven plays.

Another frank utterance from a different source also points to the theory suggested by Mr. Smedley—that 'King James' Bible," although translated by a number of bishops, was revised and put into final form by one master-genius.

At the recent annual dinner of the Royal General Theatrical Fund held on May 22nd, Sir G. Alexander, according to a newspaper report, thus quotes his friend, Sir Arthur T. Quiller Couch, in reference to the double miracle of Shakespeare and the English Bible:—The latter (he said) was the "greater miracle; for individual genius, such as Shakespeare, we may allow to come in the course of nature. But how forty-seven men—not one known outside of this performance for any superlative talent—could have brought that marvel to birth, and after no very long gestation—well, he had a somewhat sceptical mind, but admitted that, before such a wonder as that, the sceptical mind must stand humble and aghast."

It is a step in advance that both "Shakespeare" and our English Bible are admitted as "miracles" and "a wonder," and it is to be hoped that after honest minds have "wondered on" for a while, "truth" will assert itself and "make all things plain."

It may be an admirable attitude to "stand humble

and aghast," but it is still more admirable to do justice to the God-given genius, literary and dramatic, of our greatest Englishman, Francis Bacon, as author of the supreme dramas and reviser of that "marvel" of literature—the Authorized English Version of the Bible.

Perusing lately the introductory essay to the old-fashioned "Family Library" edition of Æschylus, it was interesting to read that the great Greek dramatist, "an early and ardent admirer of Homer, used modestly to say, in allusion to the great benefit he derived from his [Homer's] works to his own tragedies, that he had been to a great feast of poetry and had brought away some of the scraps."

The figure of speech was familiar, and made one wonder where Shakespeare had found this little bit o ore of which he makes such excellent use in *L. L. I* V. i. 40.

I have not so far been able to find the original state ment, but an appeal to *Notes and Queries* has elicited the fact that there is a reference to Æschylus' modest remark in the "Deipnosophistæ" of Athenæus, who was himself possibly guided by it to the choice of his title, "Banquet, or Feast of Wisdom." The passage, which a friend has been good enough to translate for me, is as follows;—

> "The words of the noble and illustrious Æschylus who declared that his own tragedies were crumbs from the great banquets of Homer."

It is impossible to doubt that Shakespeare had the words of the Greek tragedian in his mind when he makes Moth say of Holofernes and Nathaniel—

> "They have been at a great feast of languages and have stolen the scraps."

It adds force to the satire on pedantry and affectation

when we realise that it is the reverse side of Æschylus' profound respect for *true* learning and genius. It is at the same time another of the many proofs that "Shakespeare" was not dependent on translations for the material wherewith to build his immortal "Palace of Truth."

H. H. S.

IS THIS A BACON SIGNATURE IN THE SHAKESPEARE SONNETS?

In Shakespeare's Sonnet No. 136, the writer states that his name is "Will."

> "Make but my name thy love, and love that still,
> And then, thou lovest me, for my name is 'Will.'"

This insistence that the name of the writer of the Sonnets is "Will" led me to seek a possibly concealed name, either as an anagram or concealed in the numbered letters of the alphabet (of twenty-four letters only, *i* and *j* being interchangeable, as were also *u* and *v*), as used in the prevailing ciphers of the 16th century.

I have reached a result. Is it convincing? Lines 8 to 14 of Sonnet 136 read thus. (The italics are mine.)

> "Among a number, *one* is reckon'd none:
> Then in the number let *me* pass untold,
> Though in thy store's account *I one* must be;
> For nothing hold me, so it please thee hold
> That nothing me, a something sweet to thee:
> Make but my name thy love, and love that still,
> And then thou lovest me, for my name is 'Will.'"

Following these hints I applied them to the word "Will," viz.:

W is the twenty-first letter of the alphabet.

I "Then in the number let me pass untold,
Though in thy store's* account *I one* must be."
(*See the Sonnet*)

L equals 50 }
L equals 50 } double L equals 100, or C.

* Worcester's dictionary cites "store treasure" from Bacon as meaning "accumulated."

APPLICATION OF THE ABOVE

W	is 21 } 2 is second letter in alphabet. 1 is first letter in alphabet.	B
I	"must pass untold" (*See Sonnet*)	A
LL	as shown above equals	C
I	"Though in thy store's account I one must be"	O N E

I find in *Love's Labour Lost*, Act IV., Scene ii., a justification of my use of the double L (LL) as signifying one hundred in analysing the letters of the name WILL in Sonnet 136 of Shakespeare.

"If Sore be Sore, then L to Sore makes fifty Sores one Sorel !
Of one Sore I a hundred make by adding but one more L."

Thus I find that WILL equals BACONE.

Now Bacone is Francis Bacon, for in 1621 Sir John Davies published "Selected Odes of Horace, Epigrams, Anagrams, and Epitaphs," and in it is the following anagram:

To the Right Honorable
Sir Francis Bacone Knight
Lord High Chancellor of England.

Anagram { Bacone
Beacon

"Thy Virtuous name and office
Joyne with Fate
To make thee the bright Beacon of the State."

Also in the "Manes Verulamiani," poems published after Francis Bacon's death and addressed to him, *Bacone* is mentioned seventeen times. *Vide* poems Nos. 9, 11, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 29, 30, in the Harleian Miscellany X., pp. 287, ff., London, 1813—reprint of the Editio Princeps by John Haviland, London, 1626.

During four months after finding the above signature, I was unable to discover that the name of Francis Bacon was ever written Bacone. The anagram of John Davies, of Hereford, and the many instances in the "Manes" were worth waiting for.

LUCY DERBY FULLER.

Boston, March 12, 1913.

THE ANNUAL DINNER.

THE Members of the Society dined together at the Trocadero Restaurant on the 22nd of January, 1913, to celebrate the 352nd Anniversary of the birth of Francis Bacon.

The President, Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence, Bart., presided over a large gathering. After the usual loyal toasts had been honoured Mr. Harold Hardy proposed "The Immortal Memory of Francis Bacon" in the following speech :—

In proposing the toast, "The memory of Francis Bacon," I am reminded of an incident a few months ago, when Mr. Balfour came to Gray's Inn to unveil the statue of Bacon in South Square. On that occasion Mr. Balfour told us that he had been invited by the Benchers to make a speech, and from the moment he accepted the invitation he had been regretting it. Of course, he referred to the greatness of the subject. And you can readily imagine that, if Mr. Balfour felt uneasy about the task before him, I am overwhelmed with the responsibility of proposing this toast. I feel great sympathy at the present moment with that gentleman who was called upon to propose the toast of Literature, and he said the subject filled him with sorrow and regret, "because," he explained, "Shakespeare is dead, Milton is no more, and I myself am feeling far from well." It is a great responsibility, because we are met to-night to celebrate a memory very precious to the members of this Society, who think of Bacon not merely as an eminent statesman and sage philosopher, but a poet, an orator, a great master of the English language, and, as we believe, the founder and creator of our English literature. It has been said that the ideal life divides itself into three parts—the first devoted to study, the second to action, and the third to reflection. If this be so, the ideal was at least in this way achieved in Bacon's case, for his life may be divided into three clearly-defined periods. There is the early life of study and contemplation before he began to practise at the Bar; the period of active life as lawyer and statesmen, when he filled the office of Solicitor and Attorney-General, Lord Keeper, and Lord Chancellor ; and finally in the winter of his years after his fall, when he retired to

Gray's Inn and devoted himself to the production of works for the benefit of mankind. I would ask you not to be alarmed, for I am not going to deal with all those periods to-night. But the picture of Bacon which I would present to you is this—"a man naturally fitted for literature rather than for anything else, and borne by some destiny against the inclination of his genius into the business of active life." That is the description of Bacon in his own words, and it is certainly a true description, for there is no doubt that the adoption of the legal profession by Bacon was not due to choice or personal inclination, but to the force of circumstances following upon his father's death. Originally, it was intended by Sir Nicholas Bacon that both his sons, Anthony and Francis, should qualify for the Bar, because they were placed under a law tutor, named Richard Barker, shortly after leaving Cambridge, on their admission to Gray's Inn in the summer of 1576. But a few months afterwards there was a change of plans. and Francis, probably at his own request, was allowed to trav abroad with Sir Amyas Paulet, the English Ambassador to th French Court. Francis remained on the Continent for near three years, and on the death of his father at the beginning o 1579 he returned to England and took up his residence in a set of chambers in Gray's Inn, which he occupied, more or less, during the remainder of his life. From that time down to the year 1594, when he first appeared in Court, this man of contemplations led a somewhat secluded life. He had a country house at Twickenham, where he stayed from time to time. He occasionally rode over to Gorhambury and visited his mother. He was a Member of Parliament, but Parliament seldom met, and when it did meet it only lasted for a few months. Sometimes, also, he attended at the Court. In other respects his life was private, devoted to study and contemplations, and the production of works for the benefit of mankind. He was conscious of great intellectual gifts, and some people described him as arrogant. He confided to his uncle, Lord Burleigh, that he had taken all knowledge to be his province. But his zeal was taken for ambition. He was thoroughly misunderstood. Like another youthful genius, he committed the crime of being a young man. That may sound strange, perhaps, to many people, who seem to regard Bacon as a sort of Peter Pan, only *vice versa.* Peter Pan was the boy who never grew up, and they picture Bacon as a man who never was young. He was certainly precocious. He was a

youth of tremendous industry, a great reader of books, and his memory as well as his judgment was phenomenal. He lived among the ancients, as he tells us, and it is manifest from his writings that he had read and digested all the Greek and Roman literature. It is sometimes pointed out that his quotations were faulty, but, according to his secretary (Dr. Rawley), he had acquired the habit of memorising what he read, and frequently gave the effect of what an author said rather than the precise words used. He was constantly altering and adapting quotations. "After he had surveyed the records of antiquity," says Gilbert Wat, "after the volumes of men, he betook himself to the volume of the world; and having mastered all that books possessed—his spacious spirit not thus bounded—he set upon the kingdom of Nature and carried the victory very far." His researches covered the whole field of history and philosophy, as well as poetry, which he enthusiastically describes as a "dream of learning." He was a poet and drank deep of the waters of "Parnassus." To Burleigh he writes: "Not as a man born under Sol, who loveth honour; nor under Jupiter, who loveth business; for the contemplative planet carrieth me away wholly." Again, to Essex he protests that he is "not much in appetite nor much in hope; for as for appetite, the waters of 'Parnassus' are not as the waters of the spa, which give a stomach, but rather they quench the appetite and desire." For fifteen years the most exquisitely constructed intellect that ever was bestowed upon any of the children of men—to quote Macaulay's phrase—was actively engaged on "works of recreation," as Bacon called them, in the solitude of his chambers in Gray's Inn. The year 1594 marks the transition from the private or contemplative life of the poet and philosopher to the active or public life of the lawyer and statesman. This distinction was ever present to the mind of Bacon, who, by a sort of mental detachment, separated the contemplative from the active life. And although biographers attach more importance to his professional and political career, it was contemplations, dreams, and inventions for the benefit of the human race which dominated his thought and obsessed his mind.

We see this over and over again in his letters and other writings. To Bodley he writes in 1605:—

"I think no man can more truly say with the Psalmist, 'My soul hath been a stranger in her pilgrimage.' For since I was of

any understanding my mind hath in effect been absent from that I have done, and in absence are many errors, which I willingly acknowledge, and among the rest this great one, which led the rest, that knowing myself by inward calling to be fitter to hold a book than play a part, I have led my life in civil causes, for which I was not very fit by nature, and more unfit by the preoccupation of my mind." In the dedication of his essays to his beloved brother Anthony, he says, "I sometimes wish that your infirmities might be translated upon myself, that her majesty might have the service of so active and able a mind, and I might be with excuse confined to these contemplations and studies for which I am fitted."

Throughout Bacon's life the same idea prevailed, and even when he is raised to the Bench, on his appointment as Lord Keeper, h refers in his speech in Chancery to the trend of his natural inclin tions. "The depth of the three vacations," he pleads, "I wo reserve in some measure free for the study of the arts a sciences, to which in my nature I am most inclined."

The poetic faculty was powerful in Bacon's mind, says Macaulay. He was a visionary in the midst of business and affairs. A State paper by Bacon is a literary gem; for even in legal and political treatises what might otherwise be dull and heavy matter becomes interesting for the picturesque phrasing, the delightful turns of fancy, the poetic imagery which characterise all Bacon's writings. His discourse on the union of the two kingdoms, with its analogies to Nature, reveals the poet and the man of contemplations. The same characteristic is manifest in his political speeches, for he was equally master of the phrase which gives an impression to the senses as well as of the logical argument which appeals to reason. His method of oratory was a matter of comment among the men of his time. There is a record of "Notes in Parliament," dated 1626, in which a contemporary states:—"Sir Fra. Bacon introduced his matter with poetry and history. He was a man most elegant though likened to a meteor."

There is abundant testimony to the poetic gifts of Francis Bacon. I will only trouble you with two quotations. Professor Blackie says, "Another virtue of Bacon's Essays is one which is not frequently found in union with the scientific or philosophical intellect, viz., a poetical imagination. Bacon's similes for their aptness and their vividness are of the kind of which Shakespeare

or Goethe might have been proud." Again, Lord Lytton tells us "We have only to open the 'Advancement of Learning' to see how the Attic bees clustered above the cradle of the new philosophy. Poetry pervaded the thoughts, it inspired the similes, it hymned the majestic sentences of the wisest of mankind."

Then there is the testimony of Sir Tobie Matthew, the intimate friend who describes Bacon as "a man so rare in knowledge of so many several kinds, endued with the facility and felicity of expressing it all in so elegant, significant, so abundant, and yet so choice and ravishing a way of words, metaphors, and allusions as perhaps the world has never seen since it was a world."

But there is another side of Bacon's nature which is apt to be forgotten, for he was a curious mixture of the serious and the gay. There is a phrase of Ben Jonson's which might be appropriately applied to an occupant of the judicial bench at the present time. Bacon could seldom pass by a jest, we are told by Jonson; and in the midst of sage counsel and grave opinions we must not forget that Bacon was a prodigious wit. According to Macaulay, the best collection of jests in the world is that which Bacon dictated from memory, without referring to any book, on a day on which illness had rendered him incapable of any serious study. He delighted in masques and revels and pageantry of every kind. He was responsible for dramatic entertainments at Gray's Inn, at Whitehall, and Greenwich, and was one of the Treasurers of Gray's Inn, when they held their mimic court of the Prince of Purpoole and the first performance of the *Comedy of Errors.* He spent over £2,000 on the *Masque of Flowers*, and would not allow the members of Gray's Inn to contribute to the cost. When Sir Hy. Yelverton offered £500 he declined it and insisted on bearing all the expense himself.

Like Sir Andrew Aguecheek, Bacon might very well say of himself:—

"I am a fellow o' the strangest mind in the world, I delight in masques and revels sometimes altogether."

But perhaps something ought to be said about Bacon's conduct to the Earl of Essex; for ever since Macaulay wrote his inaccurate and malignant essay upon Bacon, biographers have taken the cue from Macaulay and have said harsh things about Bacon's disloyalty to his friend. It is a subject too great to deal with in detail on this occasion, but if there is anyone here

to-night who believes that Macaulay's condemnation of Bacon is just I would ask him to read Spedding's "Evenings with a Reviewer," and he will there find the solid foundation upon which Mr. Spedding, who had devoted forty years to the study of Bacon's life and works, bases his opinion that in the conduct of Bacon to Essex he can find nothing to blame.

In spite of the sneers of Pope and the wanton exuberances of Macaulay, we prefer to rest our appreciation of Bacon upon the testimony of his friends and contemporaries. Whatever failings Bacon had, it was the general opinion of his contemporaries that his virtues far outweighed his faults. I suppose nobody knew that great man so intimately as Sir Toby Matthew. When Matthew returned to England and was abandoned by his family and alienated from his friends, and imprisoned for his religion, at the instance of the Archbishop of Canterbury, we know that Bacon stood by him with unshaken fidelity, and it was on the intercession of Bacon that he was released from gaol and removed to Bacon's house. No wonder Matthew tells us

> "He was a friend unalterable to his friends,
> A man most sweet in his conversation and ways.
> It was not his greatness I admire, but his virtue."

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

It has been said that the measure of a man's worth is the worth of his aims. I don't think I exaggerate when I say that no one can read the "Advancement of Learning" or the "Novum Organum" without realising that the persistent aim and lifelong purpose of Bacon in all his contemplations and studies was the ultimate benefit of the human race. The publication of his philosophical writings involved a considerable outlay, from which he could expect no sort of remuneration. For he knew they appealed to a limited audience, and his avowed intention was merely to bring into correspondence minds already prepared and disposed for the

argument. It was certainly most true, as he states in his autobiography, that his heart was not set upon any of those things which depend upon external accidents. "I am not hunting for fame," he says, "I have no desire to found a sect, and to look for any private gain out of such an undertaking as this I count both ridiculous and contemptible. Enough for me the consciousness of well deserving and those real and effectual results with which fortune cannot interfere."

That was the spirit of the man whose memory we celebrate to-night, and I ask you to drink to "the immortal memory of Francis Bacon."

Mr. W. T. Smedley gave the toast of "The Bacon Society," which was responded to by the President. "The Guests," proposed by Mr. Crouch-Batchelor, was responded to by Mr. John Lomax. The health of the President, Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence, was given by Mrs. Hinton Stewart. The souvenir and toast list contained a reproduction of the missing portrait of Bacon by Cornelius Janssen, referred to by James Spedding in the "History and Plan of this Edition," prefixed to Volume I. of his 1879 edition of the philosophical works of Francis Bacon. An account of the discovery of this portrait will be found in BACONIANA, Volume X., Series III., page 117.

TO FRANCIS BACON.

THE two years' effort, to read Night's great brow,
  To count aright the wheeling, whirling stars,
This vast gigantic task is finished now,
  And shows the truth of cloudy mists and bars.

Five hundred million stars we see—no less!
  And each star is a swift revolving sun;
And each is circled by its planets' press,
  And each performs its billion centuries' run.

And an astronomer's observing eye
  From these far spinning orbs could fathom yet
Myriads of others which still further lie,
  Madly gyrating 'gainst the wall of jet.

Well—on these towering, huge, and mighty globes,
  Be there what mystic unknown life there may;
No being breathes who could wear wizard's robes
  As thou did'st in thy brief and brilliant day.

No, there hath lived no man in earth or sky
  Who could conceive a deep-laid scheme like thine,
Carry it keenly through, and come to die
  Laughing but silent, making not a sign.

And we may take delight in this one thought—
  Our tiny trembling world, staggering, weak,
In having unto birth and being brought
  The Greatest Trickster grandly is unique.

JULIA DITTO YOUNG.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Robertson's "Baconian Heresy."

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—There is one characteristic of Mr. Robertson's book which ought not to be overlooked, and that is the title. In these days no theologian calls another heretic—it would be presumptuous to do so. The word is only used historically, and could only be applied to those who disbelieved what was at that time universally accepted, and when a standard of orthodoxy actually existed, viz., the doctrines approved by the Romish Church. So that anyone now applying the epithet to living persons constitutes himself an infallible judge of what is true and what is false; he is an amateur pope—an apostle holding a divine commission and authorized to speak in the name of God Himself. The same canon of orthodoxy has never existed in the literary world. Mr. Robertson is the first to crown himself with the quasi-apostolic mitre of literature, and in this his presumption is glaring and inexcusable.

A correspondent in Australia asks me if I have read this book, and remarks on its many omissions. The writer of the "Baconian Heresy" seems never to have heard, for instance, of Dr. William Thomson, who was one of the earliest champions of the Baconian alternative to the Shaxperian.

Mr. Robertson selects me as the Baconian most entitled to all the sarcasm, vituperation, and scorn that he can invent. My excellent friend, Mr. John Hutchinson, tells me that, with all its inaccuracies and sophistry, his selection of me is the greatest compliment he can pay me—as the most distinguished representative of the "Baconian heresy." If I can be smashed the case is complete, and all the rest may be ignored. Mr. Robertson com-

mits literary suicide as a controversialist when he "frankly announces that his purpose is not investigation but denunciation." A book of denunciation is *ipso facto* a crime.

The book is a monumental structure of impudence. This only could have led him to "denounce" as heretics such men as Judge Holmes, Judge Webb, Lord Penzance, Mr. Greenwood, Edwin Reed, Mark Twain, &c. His pose is that of infallibility: *I have spoken; let all others keep silence.* R. M. THEOBALD.

The Great Instauration of Sciences.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—On pages 261-2 of H. Brett's translation of E. Bormann's "Shakespeare-Secret" (1895) is an argument that the Folio of 1623 was intended by Bacon to be the fourth, fifth and sixth parts of the "Instauratio Magna." Attention is also drawn to the fact that the third part was incomplete when Bacon died.

I have here a print representing Bacon seated, writing in a book labelled INSTAV MAGNA, the date of which is 1640. It may, perhaps, be the portrait in the Folio edition of the "De Augmentis Scientiarum," published in that year. By his side are two books labelled I. and II., and on a shelf stand four others labelled III., IV., V. and VI. The remarkable fact about these books is that they have their backs to the wall.

This appears to me to be a hint bearing out Bormann's contention, and I take leave to ask you to confirm the point, and to tell me if it has been made before. W. E. L.

Shanghai, March 18, 1913.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—Can any of your readers explain the meaning of the following lines from *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (IV. i.)?

> *Evans.*—What is the focative case, William?
> *Will.*— O,—Vocativo O.
> *Evans.*—Remember, William, focative is *caret.*

The scene merely retards the action of the play, and is always omitted in representations. Dr. Johnson observed: "This is a very trifling scene, and no use to the plot, and I should think of no great delight to the audience." Steevens, however, says: "We may suppose this scene to have been a very entertaining one to the audience for which it was written." If the author's intention in introducing this scene was, by means of the Welshman's pronounciation, to give a clue to the authorship through the family joke (quoted in Bacon's "Apophthegms") of Hog not being Bacon until he be well hanged, it is probable that there are further ambiguities in these lines. No annotated edition appears

to offer any explanation of "focative is *caret*." It is certainly perplexing as to what is really meant. In the Folio the note of interrogation is printed inside the brackets with the name of William, thus :—

What is the focative case (William ?).

This apears to give significance to "O,—Vocativo O," for O is nothing. Yours truly, R. EAGLE.

4, Bampton Road, Forest Hill, S.E., June 6th, 1913.

Sundry Anagrams, &c.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—Mr. Parker Woodward has failed to complete his most interesting longer article in the January number of 1913 through not showing the full meanings attaching to the title, "Willobie—His Avisa," and to the supposed name-words—"Hadrian Dorrel'

These I find to be partly-alliterative anagrams built on startling subtle antithetical phrases of true Shake-Speare Baconi quality. They are, respectively—Alibi, as Love, I wish ; H Lord and Liar.

The concordance is obvious of these two surrounding sentences with the Poem's central idea of "Chastity" in spiritual Vis "A Vis A" Vis.

Students of Metaphysics will observe in the mode of this further-suggested evolution of "Avisa" some resemblance to the principle of duplication in the Mystical "Religio Fons." By the way, these last two words occur on Folio I. of the Northumberland MSS., and are evidently from the pen of Francis Bacon as a self-revealed successor of the Illuminate of the Renaissance.

It would be too long a task here to show the possible psychological relationships imported by the words, "Chastity," "Love," "Lord," and "Liar."

To change the subject, Mr. Granville C. Cuningham, in his letter on "Queen Elizabeth's Son," fails to recognize that the title of John Barclay's book—1621—"Argenis," is a perfect anagram of the word Reginas, acc. case, plural.

Prima facie, the word may relate to Mary, Queen of Scots, as well as to Elizabeth, Queen of England. The author of the "Fable" was born in France, and only spent a few years of his life in England. It is to be noted also that his father, who separated himself from the Scottish Court of Queen Mary, went to France with a grievance. The anagram solved ingeniously by Mr. B. H. Booth as "I spell Ham" has the validity of its rendering at once impaired by Mr. Cuningham's own admission that the basal name was not at first spelt "Hiempsall."

Yours faithfully, HENRY WOOLLEN.

West Ealing, February 24th, 1913.

"The Tempest" and "Adam Cupid."

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—In the last number of BACONIANA, Mr. R. L. Eagle and Dr. Theobald devoted three pages to studies of "Another Baconian Signature" and "Adam Cupid."

Mr. Eagle says :—"In the *Tempest* (Act I. Scene ii.) there is a similar instance, which appears to have gone unnoticed. It is where Prospero decides that the hour has come to tell Miranda what she is, and how they came upon the island :—

. . . . . . Sit down
39.—For thou must now know further.

Mira. You have often
Begun to tell me what I am ; but stopped
And left me to a bootless inquisition.
43.—Concluding, *Stay, not yet.*

Prospero.— The hour's now come ;
The very minute bids thee ope thine ear ;
Obey, and be attentive."

"Here," says Mr. Eagle, "we have F. Bacon very clearly written, but in such a way that it is scarcely likely to be noticed by the reader." Why does Mr. Eagle not tell us what he means? Years ago in *Notes and Queries* I showed from this passage that the authorship of Bacon was maintained. It was in this wise :—

"No, not so much perdition as an hair,
Betid to any creature in the vessel
Which thou heards't cry, which thou saw'st sink.
Sit down.
FOR thou must now know further.

Mira.— You have often
Begun to tell me what I am ; but stopp'd,
And left me to a bootless inquisition ;
CONcluding, 'Stay, not yet.'"

Well, what do we find here? Read down the initials of the lines :—N. B. W. S. for Bacon (or N. B. W. S., F. Bacon). In the first folio the words "Sit down" follow "sink," in the same line, so that if *sentences* commencing with capitals are taken in place of *lines*, the semi-acrostic still reads, "N. B., W. S. for you, Bacon." Something similar is found in *Love's Labour's Lost*, where we find the two consecutive lines :—

"BA moot seely sheepe, with a horne : you heare his learning,
[*Quis quis*] thou CONsonant."

Here we find, in this nonsensical dialogue, "Ba" commencing the first line and "con" beginning the last word of the next line —the conjunction forming "Ba-con."

Then in the cast of *The Tempest* we have a *Francisco*, a

perfectly useless character who speaks only a few words in the play. Following him is *Caliban*. The conjunction of the two characters is of some interest.

Francis | *co*
Cali | *ban.*

What is this but "Francis Bacon," without the "I cali"?

If there is any secret connected with the authorship of the Shakesperean dramas, it would certainly be revealed in *The Tempest*, the last of the plays. Curiously enough, at the end of the drama we have in the cast an "Anthonio, his brother," and a "Francisco." Anthony and Francis Bacon were brothers—the names are only "Italianized," Francis being known to his intimates as "Francisco." If we take the "Names of the Actors," it will be observed that if the letters forming the words "Francis Bacon" are taken and spelt on the top of each word from "Alonso" at *the beginning of the column* to the word "Francisco" on the seventh line, the "n" of "Bacon" lands on the word "Francisco," *the 36th word from the beginning*, the spelling of "Francis Bacon" by letters being included *exactly three times*. Then let us start the count from *the end of the column*, and the "n" of "Bacon" also lands on the same word "Francisco," again *the 36th word from the end*, as it was from the beginning, "Francis Bacon" being once more included in the count *exactly three times*.

Is this accident? And the same occurs in all the plays where "Francisco" or "Francis" appears.

At the end of the cast we have:—

Ariell, an ayrie spiris (*sic*).
Iris
Ceres
Iuno } *Spirits.*
Nymphes
Exit. *Reapers*

FINIS.

What do we find here? Take all the initials and they read "I, Francis" or, adding the "Exit," "I, Francis. Exit."

The last word "Reapers" naturally suggests the anagram "Speare," and if we take "Nymphes," "Reapers," and "Exit"—the last three words of the play—an anagram might be formed:—

"Shaxpere, my pen tires,"
or,
My Shaxpere, I repent."

Next take the first three lines of *The Tempest*:—

Boat-swaine.
Heere Master : | What cheere?
Good : | Speake to th' mariners.

Another anagram! "Heare, good Master. I, Bacon, wrote these. The name writ—Shakespeare." Good enough.

The last sentence, too, of *As You Like It* forms another very good anagram:—"As you like it of Francis Bacon, Lord Werulam. Do ye ne'er divulge me the wordes abroad, for this W. Shakespeare's fame is of me"! And this without adding or dropping a letter or leaving one over.

Some method in this madness!

In the same number of BACONIANA, on page 127, Dr. Theobald tries to explain the use of the term "Adam Cupid" in *Romeo and Juliet*, a term over which all the critics have been puzzled. We find in *Love's Labour's Lost* "Dan Cupid" (this also needs explanation). Dr. Theobald professes to find the key to this use of "Adam" in the Baconian statement that, like Adam, Cupid had "no parent of his own." But is it not more likely that "Adam" is a typographical error for "armèd"? In *A Midsummer Night's Dream* we have "Cupid all armèd." Certainly "armèd" applies admirably to Cupid, who is never seen in art without his bow and arrow. We find many similar typographical errors in the plays, many of them requiring long shots at sense from the commentators. For instance, take the opening lines of *Twelfth Night*, where "sweet sound" has been variously rendered as "sweet sough," "sweet south," &c., &c. Then we have all the guesses at "runaways eyes" in *Romeo and Juliet*, although I have seen it stated that in the days of Elizabeth a "runaway" was a night watchman, like Dogberry or Verges, which at once solves the difficulty. Yours truly, GEORGE STRONACH.

Edinburgh, 28th June, 1913.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—I HAVE read with interest the correspondence which has been carried on in the columns of *The Academy*. A correspondent (Mr. Ferguson), in his letters to that journal of March and April, quotes Dr. Furnivall as describing Baconians as "folks who know nothing of either writer, or are cracked," and makes the same mistake in methods of defence that other "standpatters" have made since the world began.

Why not look for the truth instead of defending an alleged truth? Why should not this, the most interesting literary problem ever propounded, be treated as a fair open question? The holding of one opinion or the other is not in itself evidence of superior wisdom or mental aberration.

Nothing is gained by Stratfordians in presenting Furnivall, of whom it is said that he found it more convenient to destroy a Baconian manuscript than to be confronted with the necessity of explaining it. Dr. Furnivall was a choleric, self-opinionated and ill-tempered man—the last person to quote on this subject. His methods were well illustrated by Dr. Appleton Morgan, author of

"The Shakesperean Myth" (1881), and Hon. Alvey A. Adee (both university men) in *New Shakespereana,* a quarterly magazine published by the New York State Shakespeare Society at New York City, U.S.A., copies of which can be found in the Library of the Bacon Society and in the British Museum.

The correspondent "Tom Jones" (a writer who, while sniffing at the idea of Francis Bacon using pen-names, makes use of one himself), in his efforts to identify "Shake-scene" with Shakespeare in Robert Greene's " Groatsworth of Wit" (1592), has proven nothing, but seems only to illustrate the desperate effort to obtain something tangible about "willm Shagsper" (1563—1616).

If "Shake-scene" is identical with Shakespeare, why not carry on the stupid conjecture and include, as identical with Shakespeare, "Shake-rags" in William Kempe's "Nine Day's Wonder" (1600), a pamphlet in the Bodleian Library. The quotation reads as follows :—

"My notable Shake-rags, the effect of my suit is discovered in the title of my application, but for your better understanding, for that I have known you to be a part of witless bettle-heads that can understand nothing but that is knocked into your scalp, so farewell and cross me no more with thy rabble of bold rhyme lest at my return I set a crosse on thy forehead and that all m know that for a fool."

In a recent publication by William M. Chapman, of Sa Monica, California, U.S.A., entitled "William Shaksper a Robert Greene : The Evidence" (1912), is the most exhaustiv analysis as yet presented on the identity of Greene's "Shake-scene" and Kempe's "Shake-rags." The most reasonable inference is that the former "Shake-scene" (equals Dance-scene) is no greater or lesser person than William Kempe himself, and not the Stratford actor. CHAS. H. DEETZ.

Geodetic Survey, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—Being engaged on a new publication on Bacon, intended for German Students, wherein the conclusive proofs of his authorship of the plays are taken from his own works, as published by Spedding, so far with eminent success, I am at a loss at the present juncture to trace the origin of a reference of his in Vol. XI., p. 137, which I beg herewith to submit to the readers of BACONIANA for elucidation.

There we read: "Myself am like the miller of Huntingdon that was wont to pray for peace among the willows ; for, while the wind blew, the windmills wrought, and the watermill was less customed. So I see the controversies of religion must hinder the advancement of science."

Whence is the story derived? Where the origin of it? So far as I am aware Bacon used it only once in the passage quoted. But what do we know else about this "miller of Huntingdon"?

Besides this, any innuendo or precise information concerning "*Toby Matthew*," that "alter ego" of Bacon's, would be most welcome. Does a recent publication exist containing satisfactory information? From what I find in Spedding, Toby Matthew appears to be the most important personage for Bacon-lore, besides Rawley and Ben. I even gather from this information the impression that this "rare friendship" may have left some traces in the Sonnets.

There are some most interesting hints or suggestions given about Toby Matthew in BACONIANA (1903, 1905, 1908, 1910, 1912). Even a publication about him is announced as forthcoming (1903), and another book about Matthew's "conversion" is recommended, 1905. But does this book give *all the rest* of what we ought to know about the "Alter Ego"? A monograph or special treatise available concerning all the data or information known about "Good Mr. Matthew," and any information about the "miller of Huntingdon," would be most welcome to

Your obedient servant, G. HOLZER.

Heidelberg.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—I desire to draw the attention of readers of BACONIANA to a proposal to establish a Correspondence Circle. Discussion in a publication which only appears quarterly is difficult. A few Baconians interested in tracing the cipher and other disclosures in the books of Francis Bacon and of his secret fraternity for the advancement of learning and arts, and the maintenance of the Established Church and its Protestant tenets, propose to start a Correspondence Circle.

They will print a column of notes and queries on these special subjects and circulate it amongst those who join the Circle, for addition, reply, or adverse comment. Each member will thus be able to judge how far any subject has approached solution or may be dismissed as wanting in proof or probability.

Resulting papers could be offered for publication, if desired, in BACONIANA, or any other public print willing to give them publicity.

The Circle would be confined to those willing to contribute.

Any valuable "finds" resulting from this co-operative research would belong to those who had contributed to the successful result, the proportion to be settled by arbitration in case of difference.

Names of those willing to join the Circle may be forwarded to me as Secretary *pro tem.*

PARKER WOODWARD.

York House King Street, Nottingham.

NOTES.

MR. DANIEL FORD, of the University of Minnesota, sent the following interesting information to the *New York Post*:—

"In Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*, in a speech by Hector, occur the following lines (II. ii. 165—7):

> "'Not much
> Unlike young men, whom Aristotle thought
> Unfit to hear moral philosophy.'

"For some time (*vide* Holmes's 'The Authorship of Shakespeare' *et al.*) Baconians have pointed to these lines as evidential of Bacon's authorship of the plays. They call attention to the fact that in Bacon's 'Advancement of Learning' (first printed in 1605) Aristotle, as in *Troilus and Cressida* (first printed in 1609), was misquoted, and in a similar manner Bacon says, 'Is not the opinion of Aristotle . . . to be regarded wherein h saith that young men are no fit auditors of moı philosophy?' (Aristotle had said that young men a unfit to *study Political* Philosophy.—'Nichomache. Ethics, I. 8.) But the misquotation goes back to a dat some eighty years ealier than 1605. Erasmus, in his 'Colloquia Familiara,' in his address to the reader, entitled 'De Utilitate Colloquiorum' (Basil, 1526) says, 'Velut irrepens in animos adolescentium quos recte scripsit Aristoteles inidoneos auditores Ethicæ Philosophiæ.' And again a few lines further on he says: 'Aristotelis Ethice non est apta pueris.' In regard, then, to the lines in *Troilus and Cressida*, Erasmus, not Bacon, was responsible for the misrepresentation of what Aristotle wrote. (*Troilus and Cressida*, though not published till 1609, was certainly acted much earlier, *vide* Malone, Furnivall, Halliwell, *et al.*)"

In *La Grand Revue* for June is an article by M. Maurice Castellan, Professor à la Faculté des Lettres de Poitiers. The article consists of an elaborate review of "The Man Shakespeare and His Tragic Life-story," by Mr. Frank Harris, which was published in 1909. Professor Castellan in his introduction refers to the Bacon theory. English criticism, he says, has never taken very

seriously to the arguments of the Baconians, and in this it has been wrong, for there are some very curious ones. But their theory only being an hypothesis until further discoveries have been made, the actor Shakspere must be considered as the author of the plays. The professor is making an investigation of the subject. He has read some eight or ten books on the question, and although hitherto not converted to the thesis, he confesses that some of the arguments are most curious and impressive. Considerable attention is now being directed in France to the subject. If the controversy catches on there will be a prospect of the arguments being impartially considered. Frenchmen little dream how great is their interest in the authorship of the Shakespeare poems and plays, and how closely these are associated with the great literary movement in their country of the period.

The Society of Warwickshire Folk in London have annually a literary evening. This year it was devoted to a debate on "Who Wrote the Shakespeare Plays?" The proceedings took place on Friday, the 23rd of May. The chair was occupied by Mr. R. A. Peddie. The debate was opened on the Baconian side by Mr. H. Crouch Batchelor, who was supported by Mr. Harold Hardy, Mr. W. T. Smedley, and Mr. R. L. Eagle. The Shakespearean side was advocated by Mr. William Jaggard (of Stratford-on-Avon), Mr. E. M. Pollock, M.P., K.C., Mr. Reginald R. Buckley, Mr. W. H. Edwards, and Mrs. C. C. Stopes. The audience were not invited to express an opinion, but the services of eight gentlemen were obtained who acted as judges. To them, at the close of the debate, the following question was submitted:—Which party has succeeded in establishing the best *prima facie* case this evening? The result was that five of the judges gave their vote in favour of the Shaksperean side, two in favour of the Baconian side, and one considered that although the *prima facie* case was in favour of Shakspere, the Baconians had the best of the arguments. There was a large audience. The proceedings were of a very interesting character, and the literary evening proved a great success.

BACONIANA.

Vol. XI. *Third Series.* OCTOBER, 1913. No. 44.

"THE BACONIAN HERESY."

(*Concluded.*)

THE space available in BACONIANA is not sufficient to accommodate exposure of the hollowness of the arguments of Mr. J. M. Robertson. In this concluding article on the subject attention can only be drawn to some of the misstatements contained in "The Baconian Heresy."

The following remarks are calculated to warn the reader from placing reliance on the assertions found in it. A few examples will suffice:—

"Puttenham, who had been educated abroad" (p. 307). There is no evidence to show that any Puttenham was educated abroad. This is a statement made by Mr. Robertson solely on his own authority. He does not even know who Puttenham was! or that he wrote the "Arte of English Poesy"!

Mr. Robertson's dates are frequently untrustworthy. He attributes (p. 317) Patericke's translation of Gentillet on Machiavelli to the year 1577. The first edition was printed by Adam Islip in 1602, twenty-five years after the date given! It is a very remarkable work dedicated to Francis Hastings and Edward Bacon. By

whom? Although it purports to be a translation, the original does not appear to be in existence.

It is said "questions of word values and word forms could hardly miss being debated at times among the company at the Mermaid, to say nothing of the green-room" (p. 255). "He must have heard at the Mermaid some mention of the scientific and other speculations of his day" (p. 477). Mr. Robertson knows that there is not a particle of evidence justifying the belief that Shagspere was a member of the Mermaid Company or in any way connected with it. The suggestion that the professional actors of the Elizabethan period *could* discuss word forms or word values is too ridiculous to be entertained.

Mr. Robertson writes (p. 444): "The State paper in question is not and could not have been by Bacon, who in 1584 was in no position to offer State counsel to Queen Elizabeth. It figures for historical students as Lord Burleigh's advice to Queen Elizabeth ("Harl. Misc.," 2nd Ed., II., 277). Did Lord Burleigh, then, write Shakespeare?" Perhaps there could be no better illustration of how with Mr. Robertson "inconsequence follows inconsequence." Mr. Spedding takes a different view ("Life and Letters," Vol. I., pp. 45, 46), for he writes:—

"I have taken some pains to ascertain whether this tract was ever ascribed to Burghley, in his own time or near it. But I find no such thing. This Harleian M.S. (which is probably the original transcript or a contemporary copy) is anonymous. . . External evidence therefore for ascribing the tract to Burghley there is, in my judgment, none at all; and when I turn to consider the internal evidence, I find it impossible to believe that he had anything to do with it. It is evidently the production of some young unauthorised adviser, who feels it necessary to offer an apology for volunteering his advice." . . . "Now if Burghley's claim is set aside, Bacon's may seem (on the strength of Tenison's list (1679), and of the fact that this paper

had somehow got mixed up with his writings—a fact to which the contents of the volume of 1651 bear witness) to stand next. And though I am far from thinking the evidence conclusive, yet I do think it sufficient to justify the insertion of this paper here as being *possibly and not improbably* his composition. Certainly the tone and manner of it suits his relation to the Queen perfectly well; and we know that not many years after she used to encourage him to deliver his mind on such matters."

Now let the reader judge fairly of Mr. Robertson's method of controversy. The "letter of advice" was attributed to Bacon by Spedding, and with the foregoing explanation printed in the "Life and Letters" by him. Mr. Robertson knows this, and yet because Dr. Theobald accepts Spedding's opinion, relying on the reader not being aware of the facts, he seeks to misreprese the position and discredit Dr. Theobald by asking, "D Lord Burleigh, then, write Shakespeare?"

How utterly Mr. Robertson has failed to grasp th basis of the Baconian theory is made evident from the following misstatements: "Supposing the literary world and the neighbours to have known *and appreciated* the plays, and yet to have regarded Shakespeare as a man of no account (and this appears to be the point of the argument before us), we are to infer that it was in Shakespeare's day a matter of common notoriety that the plays were the work of someone else, presumptively the Lord Chancellor, Viscount of St. Albans." It may be pointed out that as Shagspere died in 1616, and Bacon was not made Lord Chancellor until 1619, the unity of time has not been preserved in this suggestion. Further, that the Lord Chancellor never was Viscount of St. Albans, nor even Viscount St. Albans. If Mr. Robertson is to be taken seriously, it is obvious that he knows nothing about the educational condition of the people of Stratford in that period. It is ridiculous to suggest that they could appreciate the plays. It is highly improbable that they had ever heard of them.

But this need not be laboured, for Mr. Robertson destroys his own argument. On page 28 he writes :—

> "There is not the slightest reason to suppose that the average inhabitants of Stratford did or could appreciate the plays as literature, all questions of authorship apart."

And so he blows hot and cold.

There is not a scrap of evidence that during his lifetime Shagspere was regarded as a man of any literary or intellectual account, or of any account except as a well-to-do resident (probably maltster) of Stratford. There is no evidence that the literary world ever saw him or recognised him as an author, an actor-manager, or even as an actor. There are many points upon which Baconians are not agreed, but there is complete unanimity on this— that it was in Shakespeare's day *not* "a matter of notoriety that the plays were the work" of him who subsequently became Lord Chancellor. Dr. Ingleby's testimony may be again quoted, and it entirely destroys this argument of Mr. Robertson's and three-fifths of his others: "It is clear that the bard of our admiration was unknown to the men of his time." If the Stratford monument was erected in 1623, the literary world would never see it or know anything about it, and very few of the neighbours could read the inscription, and those who could would probably wonder how such terms could be applied to the countryman they had known as Shagspere. The inscription on it is altogether inapplicable to the Shakespeare Mr. Robertson describes. There is no mention of his being actor, poet or dramatist! Bacon's cousin, Sir Anthony Cook, when he walked down from his house to see the new monument on the church, might wonder who put it there and placed upon it such an apparently inappropriate inscription, but Bacon's intimate friend, George Carew, probably did not wonder. His influence in Stratford was paramount. "Was it,"

asks Mr. Robertson, "a universal conspiracy or a twice enacted mystification?" (p. 17). It was not a universal conspiracy. There is no necessity to attribute the knowledge of the facts to more than two or three people. It was a mystification twice and many more times enacted. Bacon was not seriously at fault in his calculations when he left his fame "to his own country after some ages had passed." But he had faith in a more rapid evolution of sound reasoning powers than has obtained. He believed his principles of inductive reasoning would be applied more speedily. He knew it would take time, but he never believed that it would be possible for a man possessing such intellectual capacities as Mr. Robertson possesses to be so rooted in prejudice and convention as to refuse to admit the consideration (an hypothesis because it had not been previously pı pounded. Jonson's words in his comment in ref ence to Bacon may be applied. "Nothing is mo ridiculous than to make an author a dictator, as 'Mr. Robertson' has made 'Spedding.' The damage is infinite, knowledge receives by it. Let 'Spedding' and others have their dues; but if we can make farther Discoveries of truth and fitnesse than they, why are we envied?"

It is stated that, unfortunately, Baconians "do not acquire the information that is relevant to this discussion" (p. 18). The *tu quoque* retort would be applicable. Mr. Robertson loftily informs his readers that biography was not the usage of the time. There were positively no newspapers to deal with such matters as the death of Shagspere. But he omitted to say that it was an age of writing of London letters to people in the country, and that such letters have come down to these times in considerable quantities. In them there will be found reference to society scandals, to literary matters, to political affairs, to everything which is to-day treated

of in the newspapers, but not one reference direct or indirect—not one reference is to be found which even Mr. Robertson's ingenuity could distort into a reference to the Stratford Shagspere or to the plays and poems of Shakespeare. "It is clear that the bard of our admiration was unknown to the men of his time." This, the testimony of *the* authority on the subject, Dr. Ingleby, Mr. Robertson has the assurance to characterize as "the extreme Baconian explanation" (p. 27).

"It is quite possible that Bacon had heard performances of the plays cited and echoed them" (p. 458). Thus, when the eminent controversialist gets uncomfortably cornered, does he seek to make a way out. Of course it *is* quite possible, but it is curious to see how careful Mr. Robertson is to keep Bacon away from the theatre. He says (p. 532): "It does not follow that before his official advancement he had not from time to time seen a play and carried away with him a line or two; but he was verily no haunter of theatres." Heard performances of the plays cited and echoed them! Before his official advancement from time to time seen a play and carried away a line or two! If men of culture did not go to the public theatres it was because such plays as those of Shakespeare were not performed at them. The more Mr. Robertson's arguments are examined the more insufficient they appear.

Mr. Robertson endeavours to convey to the reader that Bacon disparaged the stage (p. 531). The reader is referred to the opinions on it which Bacon expresses in his signed works.* If Mr. Robertson knows anything about the plays which were enacted at Elizabethan theatres, he must know that they were with few exceptions without literary merit, for the most part obscene, and that Bacon was right when he said that the stage is capable of no small influence both in discipline and

* See "The Mystery of Francis Bacon," pp. 177-186.

corruption. Now, of corruptions of this kind we have enough, but the discipline has in our times been plainly neglected. There was no "crying stinking fish" (p. 532). It was a perfectly accurate criticism of the Elizabethan theatres.

"And with all this it is the more wildly incredible that he should have been the greatest master of verse as well as the chief master of philosophic prose in his age. Monstrous as it is, the thesis that he taking all *knowledge* as his province, and tied by destiny to the vocations of law and politics, yet secretly supplied during twenty years of his crowded life, the main stock of the new plays of a London theatre, and penned *Venus and Adonis*, *Lucrece* and *The Sonnets*—monstrous in every respect as is that fantasy, it is hardly more incredible at bottom than would be, for those who can realise the conditions of artistic genius, the conception of the combination in one man of a faculty not far short of supreme for prose, and for prose themes with a quite supreme faculty for impassioned verse."

That is the opinion expressed by the controversialis' but it is in direct opposition to opinions expressed ' some of the greatest poets and literary men.

First let James Spedding speak:

"The truth is that Bacon was not without the fine frenzy of the poet. . . . Had his genius taken the ordinary direction, I have little doubt that it would have carred him to a place among the great poets."

Shelley wrote:

"Lord Bacon was a poet. His language has a sweet and majestic rhythm that satisfies the sense no less than the almost superhuman wisdom of his philosophy satisfies the intellect. It is a strain which distends, and then bursts the circumference of the reader's mind, and pours itself forth with it into the universal element with which it has perpetual sympathy."

Bulwer Lytton wrote:

"Poetry pervaded the thoughts, it inspired the similes, it hymned in the majestic sentences of the wisest of mankind."

Similar opinions might be quoted from many other distinguished literary authorities.

One testimony as to Shakespeare's prose will suffice. Thomas Carlyle placed the prose of Shakespeare so high that he expressed the opinion that had Shakespeare written prose instead of poetry he would have attained greater fame even than he has attained. If that opinion be correct, and it is not merely confirmed by Professor Churton Collins, but substantiated by the examples he gives, then Shakespeare possessed a faculty not far short of supreme for prose and prose themes, and with quite a supreme faculty for impassioned verse. The incredible is realised in this author.

It only remains for the identity of the author to be settled. Was he the irregular genius whom Mr. Robinson recognises, but whom Coleridge scouts, or Bacon? But Mr. Robertson admits that Bacon possessed a faculty not far short of supreme for prose and prose themes, and Spedding declares that he was not without the fine frenzy of a poet, and that had his genius taken the ordinary direction it would have carried him to a place among the great poets. Shelley, Bulwer Lytton, Taine, Lord Campbell, Macaulay, Walter Laudor Savage, and others of equal eminence in literature, proclaim him in superlative terms to have been a poet. So the incredible was also realised in Francis Bacon. This is, therefore, a double miracle, unless the works under both names were written by one man.

These opinions from both sides of the argument—Shakespeare's capacity for writing prose, Bacon's powers as a poet—completely confute Mr. Robertson's opinion and destroy the point of his arguments. And, let it be observed, the confutation does not come from Baconians.

Bacon had taken all knowledge to be his province, as indeed had the author of the plays. Bacon was not

tied by destiny during the twenty years to law and politics. Historical records confute this statement. During the twenty years, 1585 to 1605, or more correctly, the twenty-seven years, 1579 to 1605, no occupations of Bacon can be cited to account for one-tenth of the time. His life, as related by Spedding, was not a crowded one, but exactly the reverse. The plays were not the main stock of a London theatre. There is no contemporary evidence that they were. Every one of these statements of Mr. Robertson is the reverse of the fact.

There is yet to be considered an appeal to history in the following paragraph (p. 323):

> "Not in all literature is there a known instance of a literary prodigy that could be remotely compared with such a miracle as the production of the Novum Organum and Lear, the New Atlantis and Twelfth Night, Romeo and Juliet and the Essay on Love by the same man, even if we consider them solely as forms of literary output, without reference to the intellectua' predilections involved. . . . Those who are not repelled ' the 'fierce impossibility' of such a conjuncture, have thus l had set before them a number of concrete proofs that it ‹ not take place."

This argument is ludicrously weak even for Mr. Robertson to put forward. Once more he treads Bacon's law underfoot and goes about his task "with a more complete disregard of inductive research than was shown by any alchemist or physicist in Bacon's age." Because it *has* not been, it *cannot* be. What says the great philospoher? "For the wonders of Nature commonly lie out of the high road and beaten paths, so as the very absurdity of an attempt may sometimes be prosperous." The conjuncture took place, and the day is not far distant when there will be a general recognition of the fact.

The greatest of all Bacon's preoccupations (the late

Mr. Andrew Lang's favourite expression) is said to be "the comprehensive revision and reconstruction of scientific lore of all kinds, naturalist and humanist." It is impossible to misrepresent Bacon more completely than has been done in this sentence. If Mr. Robertson is right, Bacon was a disputant and not a reformer.

Bacon sought the good of all men. His object was that he might instruct the minds of men unto virtue. That was his life's ambition, that was his life's work. Every step which he took was to this end. "As for myselfe," he said, "I have often wittingly and willingly neglected the glory of my own Name and Learning (if any such thing be) both in the works I now publish and in those I contrive for hereafter, whilst I study to advance the good and profit of mankind." That was his "main aim" as stated in "his signed writings." He bent his powers year after year to achieve this great aim.

Has Mr. Robertson read the Shakespeare plays? Having read them can he say that they were written to entertain the illiterate and profligate audiences that frequented the Elizabethan theatres? In view of 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," how can Mr. Robertson say that if Baconians attribute the plays to Bacon "they must imagine Bacon striving to drown his scientific cares in drama as other men seek to drown pecuniary cares in drink." How low must be his estimate of the value of those plays! He can see no purpose in them except that of entertaining the audiences at the Globe Theatre. "No trace in the plays of any attempt to further the aims of the Advancement of Learning"! Bacon "alternately absorbed in an immense philosophic ambition and in a nerve wearing career of theatrical

craftsmanship, from which every thought of Baconian propaganda was expelled"! Could any wilder and more irresponsible sentences than these be penned?

Thus does Mr. Robertson "proceed from inconsequence to inconsequence." He considers that Baconians must be baffled because Copernicus is not mentioned in the plays! because the author wrote obtusely (which he did not) of Machiavelli in blank verse! because atheism and theology are not mentioned! because the word "philosophical" only once occurs! because the author did not scheme to introduce "A New Instauration" of the scienes in the plays! because he was in no wise zealous to vindicate dogmatic orthodoxy! Bacon was all for moral and intellectual improvement, therefore he could not have written the plays! One can hardly believe that John M. Robertson wrote "The Baconian Heresy." "It is all too blankly impossible."

The Intellectual Interests of Shakespeare and Bacon.

The most amusing chapter in "The Baconian Heresy" is that which is headed "The Intellectual Interests of Shakespeare and Bacon." It does not contain one sentence bearing upon the intellectual interests of Shakespeare! Only in the last sentence (and it is the last word in it) is the name even mentioned. There, without a pretence of supporting the statement with any proof, the writer asserts concerning the plays that "the general authorship and source of adaption can be vested in no other man than the actor-partner Shakespeare." Mr. Robertson has failed to find what were the intellectual interests of Shakespeare, and for this very good reason—that there have never been any heard of.

Mr. Robertson's opinion of Bacon's literary tastes is thus expressed :—

"His few excursions into pure belles lettres, apart from the Essays (1625) are but passing diversions; the Conference of Pleasure,* the version of a few of the Psalms (1625) tell of small predilection to pure literature for literature's sake. Of the Essays and the History of Henry the Seventh (1622) alone among the larger undertakings could it be said that they are in any large measure outside the social and philosophical purposes which mainly swayed their author; and even these, written as they partly were with an eye to getting an audience for the other works, are so far currents. Wide as it is, then, the mental outlook of Bacon has one prevailing bent. Persistently he strove and hoped to lead the mind of his time in matters of natural science by better paths than those it appeared to him to be treading."

Exactly what Mr. Robertson is thinking of when he says the Essays and "History of Henry VII." were written with an eye to getting an audience for his other works is difficult to appreciate. "The Two Books on the Advancement of Learning" was published in English; "Novum Organum" was in Latin. These and the "De Sapientia" were all the other books Bacon had published.

This Chapter XIII. is mainly devoted to an attempt to represent that the Shakespeare plays could not have been included in Bacon's "intellectual interests," and the controversialist has garbled Bacon's words and misrepresented the position he took up. But it is necessary to point out how absolutely Mr. Robertson, following Spedding, has failed to realise what was the great object Bacon had in view throughout his life, and in order to make this failure clear some further quotations from the text must be given.

Mr. Robertson says:—

"Unless they deny it, the Baconians must be presumed to see that Bacon throughout the mass of his avowed writings, has

*Not published until Spedding's edition, 1870, and not previously attributed to Bacon.

an end in view; that he is profoundly concerned to influence public opinion. Yet they impute to him the deliberate assumption of the time-devouring task of writing dozens of stage plays, in not one of which are his intellectual purposes so much as hinted at. They conceive him writing Love's Labour Lost, etc., etc., with all his life's ambition still unfulfilled; with the sciences in his opinion still misdirected; with the 'idols' of the tribe and the cave, the theatre and the market place, all along in command of the general allegiance. Possessed as he was by the vision of a world to reform, both on the intellectual and on the political side, we are to conceive him bending his powers year after year to the entertainment of the audiences of the Globe Theatre.

"They (the Baconians) must stand to the old German theorem of some profound didactic purpose that inspires all the plays, . . . or they must make the assumption that Bacon wrote the Plays in order to get away mentally from all his didactic ideals. As the didactic ideals of his works are specific and reiterated, while any implied in the plays are simply those normal and accepted ethics, they can have no refuge save the second alternative. They must imagine Bacon striving drown his scientific cares in drama as other men seek to dro pecuniary cares in drink. Whatever they may say about h doctrine of dramatic teaching in the Advancement of Learning, they can find no trace in the plays of any attempt to further the aims of that treatise. They must picture Bacon as a literary Jekyll and Hyde, alternately absorbed in an immense philosophic ambition and in a nerve-wearing career of theatrical craftsmanship, from which every thought of Baconian propaganda was expelled.

"The Plays are, in a word, the composition of a man not at all occupied with problems of scientific reform."

How can this extraordinary view be reconciled with the facts? There is, during the first forty-five years of Bacon's life, no more evidence that he was preoccupied with problems of scientific reform, or that he had scientific cares, than that he was engaged in writing the Shakespeare poems and plays. The "Cogitata et Visa" was not printed until 1663, when it was published by Gruter. There is a manuscript copy of it in the

library at Queen's College, Oxford, revised and corrected in Bacon's handwriting. This copy differs on material points from Gruter's copy. The date when it was written may be arrived at by a letter, dated 19th February, 1608, from Thomas Bodley to Bacon, acknowledging receipt of a copy. In this letter Bodley, after speaking in eulogistic terms of the author, whom he describes as a master-workman, criticises some features of the work, and in concluding introduces this mysterious sentence: "Which course would to God (to wisper as much in your ears) you had followed at first, when you fell to the study of such a thing as was not worthy such a student." A translation of the work has never been published in English. It is only a tract containing about 10,000 words, but it does not show Bacon as needing relaxation from his scientific cares. The "Novum Organum," the first book of which is an amplification of the "Cogitata et Visa," was published in 1620 with the "Parasceve." Bacon was sixty years of age before he gave to the world, and then only in Latin, any indication that he was preoccupied with problems of scientific reform! But even then there was no clear statement of what has been termed his inductive method. Let the reader refer to Spedding's Preface to the "Parasceve"* and read the dialogue therein, which was written by Spedding in 1847. The result of the examination as to its practical utility is this:—"No attempt has been made that I [Spedding] can hear of to carry the work further."

The "Novum Organum" received severe criticism when it was published. Coke said it was only fit to freight the ship of fools, and King James made the witty remark that "It was like the peace of God, it passeth all understanding." And yet, translated into English, the first book is one of the most fascinating

* "Works," Vol. i., page 369.

books in the language. It reads as the work of one who "had not his knowledge from books, but from some grounds and notions within himself."

That Bacon was always keenly interested in all scientific questions is beyond question; but that all his life he was preoccupied with problems of science to the exclusion of other pursuits, is about as far from the truth as it is possible for anything to be. Mr. Robertson is quite right when he says the mass of his avowed writings has an end in view, except that to apply the word "mass" to his avowed writings is inappropriate, for they are so few and so slight.

"That he is profoundly concerned to influence opinion" is not accurate; for opinions Bacon cared not one fig. He was profoundly concerned to influence men's action and intellectual advancement. The whol of this Chapter XIII. is based on a thorough misconce| tion of Francis Bacon, of his intellectual interests, ι his attainments, of his character, of his objects, and oι his works. "To his master-purpose he directed the advancement of learning." True! but what was his master-purpose? Was, as Mr. Robertson alleges, all his life's ambition unfulfilled?

It is immaterial whether or not Bacon wrote the Shakespeare poems and plays. The real problem is to arrive at some reliable conclusion as to what he was doing during the first forty-five years of his life. If Mr. Robertson is right, the world has never known a greater tragedy than that life. But every shred of testimony and evidence that exists goes to prove that he is as wrong as wrong can be.

Bacon states that until he was thirty-one Burleigh has been carrying him on, that he was neither slothful or prodigal. But he had exhausted his mother's and brother's resources; Burleigh would go no further, "and then came his determination to sell his inheritance and

purchase some lease of quick revenue" that might be executed by another and become a sorry bookmaker.

In all this history there is not one word to justify the talk about preoccupation in problems of science. It is book-making that is Bacon's goal. Yet no publication had appeared under his own name! When he was 37, ten short essays; and at 45, "The Two Books on the Advancement of Learning." The first book is just a ramble, full of anecdote and similitudes. The second book is a general exposition of how men should proceed in the pursuit of knowledge. Poesy—dramatic poesy—it deals with; every conceivable subject is reviewed, but it contains no evidence that the writer is preoccupied with problems of science. But everything that Bacon marks as deficient had either been previously supplied, or was being supplied at the time.

This chapter reveals not only Mr. Robertson's mistaken impressions of Bacon, but his want of preception of the object and value of the plays. Had they been to others what they are to Mr. Robertson, they would have been to-day known only to students of the literature of the period; they were not written for representation at the public theatres. No one who has any knowledge of the Elizabethan theatres, of the conditions under which plays were produced at them, or of the audiences which frequented them, can for one moment believe that the Shakespeare plays were produced as printed at the public theatres. Two hundred years had to elapse before their supreme merit was recognised. The author of the sonnets knew this would be the case, as did the writer of the panegyric prefixed to the 1623 Folio. Mr. Robertson expects to find in the writings on philosophical and educational subjects of an old man of sixty years the ideas, aspirations, passions, vocabulary, and style which a brilliant young man in his teens and early manhood would employ. And because they vary, he ex-

claims, "It is all too blankly unplausible for more detailed discussion," and indulges in such an assertion as this: "The rational and natural reading of the facts yields a perfectly intelligible situation: the Baconian theory reduces it, as usual, to a nightmare." A little knowledge is a dangerous thing, and Chapter XIII. reveals this fact—that having lived "in the spiritual society of Shakespeare and Bacon as much as most men of letters," Mr. Robertson has only been able to acquire just as little or as much knowledge of either the one or the other as becomes a very dangerous thing. As regards the author of the Shakespeare plays, the truth of this statement is made evident from the attempt to explain away Emerson's epigram, "I cannot marry this fa (the life of the Stratford man) to his verse."

This is the explanation:

> "He (Emerson) had formed an ideal of a supreme intelle identifying genius for utterance with genius in universal judgment, a commanding power for speech with command over all environment. And Emerson's lead has been followed by those—University men and others—unable to conceive how the greatest English poet can have been a man of short schooling, who gathered what knowledge he had outside of libraries and colleges. They first grossly exaggerated his knowledge under the spell of his art, ascribing to him scholarship and legal and other acquirements which he did not possess; then they call for a man who shall square with their ideal. And so we have the 'Baconian' theory and the 'Anti-Stratfordian argument.'"

The whole question at issue is raised in this extract. The testimony of those who have devoted themselves to the study of Shakespeare's works (Farmer cannot be included in this category, for he has left no evidence of being more than a smatterer) is that the author possessed a supreme intellect, a genius for universal knowledge and command over all environment (page 8). Mr. Robertson states that "no expert in Elizabethan litera-

ture, indeed, no good scholar in English literature, has ever held the heresy." This is incorrect; but, however thorough a man's knowledge of Elizabethan literature, and indeed English literature, might be, if he doubted the Stratfordian authorship, or believed in the Baconian authorship, it would not be admitted that he was an expert in the one or a good scholar of the other. Sixty years ago, Professor David Masson thus described the author of the Shakespeare plays:—"We have Thought, History, Exposition, Philosophy, all within the round of the poet. It is as if into a mind poetical in form there had been poured all the matter that existed in the mind of his contemporary, Bacon. The only difference between him and Bacon, sometimes, is that Bacon writes in essay and calls it his own; while Shakespeare writes a similar essay, and puts in into the mouth of a Ulysses or Polonius." *

The problem is not that the greatest students of Shakespeare's works are "unable to conceive how the greatest English poet can have been a man of short learning, who gathered what knowledge he had outside of libraries and colleges." It is this—that the authenticated facts as to the life of the Stratford man, and the traditions as to that life, are not only insufficient to account for the knowledge and learning displayed in the poems and plays, but are in the main inconsistent with the possibility of the Stratford man being the author.

The sophistry with which Mr. Robertson endeavours to bolster up this new theory is palpable. It abounds in misstatements and contradictions. It is supported by untenable hypotheses. It displays a remarkable ignorance of the Elizabethan theatres and the conditions under which plays were produced at them. The

* Wordsworth, Shelley and Keats, and other Essays, 1874; Essay V., p. 242, reprinted from "North British Review," 1853.

attempted refutation of the *a priori* side of the Baconian theory and the anti-Stratfordian argument is built up on assumption and inconsistencies which, in their extravagance, far exceed anything which has been put forward by advocates of that theory and that argument.

The Prose and Literary Styles of Shakespeare and Bacon.

"The Baconian Heresy" has been received with a chorus of approval by the reviewers. Objection has, however, been taken by several of them to the conclusions of the author with reference to the prose of Shakespeare. The brilliance of the poet's verse had obscured the merit of his prose until Thomas Carlyle, and more recently the late Professor Churton Collins drew attention to its great qualities. During the ce tury and a-half in which his works were studied fr nearly every point of view, the contemplation Shakespeare as a prose-writer escaped the vigilance c the commentators. Professor Churton Collins in an article in "Studies in Shakespeare" dealt exhaustively with the subject. Mr. Robertson affirms that Shakespeare is not a great writer of prose. It was essential for his case that he should say so. Professor Collins thus states his opinion :—

"The truth is that Shakespeare's prose is a phenomenon as remarkable as his verse. In one way it is still more remarkable. The prose of Shakespeare stands alone. It was his own creation, as absolutely his own as the terza rima was Dante's, as the Spenserian stanza was Spenser's. For every other form of composition he had models, which he began by following very exactly. . . . But his prose is essentially original; and how greatly he contributed to the development of this important branch of rhetoric will be at once apparent, if we compare his prose diction with the diction, both of those who preceded him and those who followed him. What, then, did Shakespeare do for English prose? He was the creator of

colloquial prose, of the prose most appropriate for drama. He showed for the first time how that prose could be dignified without being pedantic; how it could be full and massive without subordinating the Saxon to the Latin element; how it could be stately without being involved; how it could be musical without losing its rhythm and its cadence from the rhetoricians of Rome. He made it plastic. He taught it to assume, and to assume with propriety every tone. He showed its capacity for dialectics, for exposition, for narrative, for soliloquy. He purified it from archaisms. Indeed, his diction often differs little from that of the best writers of the eighteenth century."

Then follows an extract from the Epilogue to 2 *Henry IV.* which, it is asserted, in point of purity, rhythm and composition, will bear comparison with any paragraph in Addison.

Professor Collins, in examining Shakespeare's prose, discerns five styles—(1) the euphuistic; (2) the coarse colloquial prose, modelled on the language of vulgar life; (3) the prose of higher comedy; (4) prose professedly rhetorical; (5) highly-wrought poetical prose. It is impossible here to reproduce the scholarly and convincing process by which, with the aid of illustrations, the writer supports his contentions. In Hamlet's speech to his fellow-students in Act II., Scene ii., it is maintained that Shakespeare has raised prose to the sublimest pitch of verse:—"His poetical conceptions naturally and spontaneously clothe themselves in verse, while all that appertains to the familiar side of real life as naturally slides into its appropriate prose. The line of demarcation thus drawn between verse and prose is another proof of Shakespeare's delicate appreciation of style, another proof that he was what the French critics deny—a reflective artist." Let it be repeated that Carlyle expressed the opinion that Shakespeare would have done far better had he confined himself to prose.

To the important bearing which all this has on the question of the authorship, Mr. Robertson is fully

alive. He does not mention Professor Collins' article, although he had it in his mind. His readers may not have seen it, and so he runs a-tilt at Shakespeare's prose in the hope of influencing their minds. He gives twenty-nine prose extracts from the plays. Verve and vivacity, he says, they exhibit, fluency and fire, an endless fecundity of phrase, image and epithet, but not a great architectonic prose. But who would expect to find architectonic prose in the plays? Let anyone acquainted with the plays read Professor Collins' article and compare his method of examination with that of Mr. Robertson, and he cannot fail to arrive at the conclusion that the prose of Shakespeare is as remarkable for its dignity and beauty as is his verse.

In comparing the prose style of Bacon with that of Shakespeare, three extracts are given from the Essays two from the "Advancement of Learning," and o from "Henry VII."

The Essays are condensed and pithy, consisting suggestions or hints rather than dissertations. Bacon could never free himself from discursiveness, and they abound in imagery, similitude, and anecdotal sentences. The style, however, is very similar to that of much of the prose of Shakespeare. Long before there was any Baconian theory, Alexander Smith, himself a poet, essayist and critic, wrote: "He (Bacon) seems to have written his Essays with the pen of Shakespeare." He, then, was struck with the similarity. Professor Masson's opinion to the same effect has already been quoted.* The three extracts given in "The Baconian Heresy" are not representative of the whole. The best method of comparison is for the reader to take a copy of the Essays and read sentences taken promiscuously, and in a similar manner read sentences from the twenty-nine prose passages from Shakespeare given. He cannot

* See page 202, anti.

fail to be struck with the similarity in diction, rhythm, phrasing and style. But here again must be borne in mind the chronological position of the works compared. *Love's Labour Lost* was probably written as early as 1579 (Bacon was then 19, with all his life's ambition still unfulfilled); only ten of the Essays were published before 1612, and in their final form only in 1625. Is there a man who would not materially alter his style when writing after an interval of nearly fifty years? The disparity would be intensified by the difference in the language required for the purpose of a play and for an essay.

This may be said—that if the following passage was placed before any student unacquainted with the source from which it was taken, but familiar with Bacon's writings, he would not hesitate to attribute the authorship to Bacon:—

> "Now, if these men have defeated the law and outrun native punishment, though they can outstrip men, they have no wings to fly from God. Warre is the beadle. Warre is his vengence. So that here men are punished for before-breach of the King's lawes, in now the King's quarrel. When 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 hee was before guiltie of those impieties for the which they are now visited. Every subject's duty is the King's, but every subject's soul is his own." °

The extract given from the introduction to the "Advancement of Learning" is certainly not characteristic of Bacon's usual style. It represents his "nobly censorious style." It is of the graver periodic structure. From "Henry VII." is selected the opening sentence, which is quite dissimilar from by far the greater part of the history. This, too, is of the style which Jonson characterised as "nobly censorious." How complete is

° Henry V.

the difference between that, the first sentence, and the last sentences of the History. It concludes thus:—

> "Hee was born at Pembrooke Castle, and lyeth buried at Westminster in one of the Statelyest and Dainticste Monuments of Europe, both for the Chappell, and for the Sepulchor. So that hee dwelleth more richly Dead, in the Monument of his Tombe, than hee did in Richmond or any of his Palaces. I could wish hee did the like, in this Monument of his Fame."

That might have been written with the pen of Shakespeare.

Baconians may indeed retort that if Mr. Robertson considers the specimens he has given to be representative of Bacon's prose style, he cannot have read the greater part of his writings; or, adopting the method argument which he pursues throughout his book, m they not exclaim that "inconsequence proceeds fr inconsequence" when he triumphantly claims th Bacon could not have written the plays, because he finds "owing to" in the sense of "accruing to" in an essay, and the word "owing" occurs only once in the Shakespeare plays? How unsubstantial must be the case that requires to be bolstered up with such futilities?

No writer has shown more versatility in style than Bacon. Dr. Edwin A. Abbott, in his book "Francis Bacon: An Account of his Life and Works,"* writes (page 447):—

> "Bacon's style varied almost as much as his handwriting; but it was influenced more by subject matter than by youth or old age. Few men have shown equal versatility in adapting their language to the slightest shade of circumstance and purpose. His style depended upon whether he was addressing a king or a great nobleman, or a philosopher or a friend; whether he was composing a State paper, pleading in a State trial, magnifying the Prerogative, extolling Truth, discussing studies,

* MacMillan and Co., 1885.

exhorting a judge, sending a New Year's present, or sounding a trumpet to prepare the way for the Kingdom of Man over Nature. It is a mistake to suppose that Bacon was never florid till he grew old. On the contrary, in the early Devices, written during his connection with Essex, he uses a rich exuberant style and poetic rhythm; but he prefers the rhetorical question of appeal to the complex period."

Mr. Robertson has made no mention of the "Sylva Sylvarum," the most bulky work of Bacon which is written in the English language. Does he there find any examples of "architectonic prose"? Is there found there "the deliberation and balance of the exposition, the fore-planned arrangement of the thoughts"? Surely the literary style of this work differs more from the Essays and "Advancement of Learning" than do they from the Shakespeare prose. Has Mr. Robertson read Rawley's Preface to it and noticed the following passage in it?

> "I have heard his lordship say also, that one great Reason, why he would not put these particulars into an exact Method (though he that looketh attentively into them, shall find they have a secret order)," etc.

Mr. Robertson again asserts, and makes a strong point of his assertion, that few great poets have been good writers of prose. His remarks may be thus summarized: Dryden, in his day reputed a great poet and a good writer of prose, would not to-day be placed in the highest rank of either art. Dante wrote prose and verse, but no one ever ranked him with the great prosists. Milton has as high a twofold fame as any, but criticism to-day leans more and more to the opinion that his finest English tractate is rather a splendid example of mistaken prose than a triumph of prose art comparable to his poetry. Wordsworth and Coleridge wrote some excellent prose and some perfect verse, but more inferior verse than good. Shelley's prose never won

much praise. Byron and Keats wrote letters and notes exhibiting plenty of prose power, but neither attempted a prose work. Tennyson and Browning hardly attempted to write prose save by way of jottings. Apart from Milton, Wordsworth, and Coleridge, amongst great poets there are only Goethe, Heine, Poe, Leopardi, Hugo, and Arnold, whose prose notably competes in fame with their verse. The deduction to be made by the reader from these opinions of Mr. Robertson is that Shakespeare, being a great poet, could not have written great prose, and Bacon, being a great prose writer (although not a supreme master of prose !), could not have written great poetry. Is it possible to conceive any argument more feeble? But it demonstrates clearly how utterly Mr. Robertson has failed to realise the qualities of the intellect and the pre-eminence literature which the author of the Shakespeare poe and plays and which Bacon enjoy, notwithstanding boast that he has lived "as much in the spiritual societ of both Shakespeare and Bacon as the majority of men of letters." The real Shakespeare, the real Bacon, Mr. Robertson has never seen; into their spiritual society he has never entered. Every page in "The Baconian Heresy" proclaims this fact.

The Vocabularies of Bacon and Shakespeare.

Mr. Robertson devotes a short chapter to this subject. As to Bacon's vocabulary, he expresses no opinion. He remarks: "Of Bacon, unfortunately, there is no concordance; the Baconians have done nothing so useful as that" (as what?). But there is no attempt on his part to make a comparison between the vocabulary which Bacon uses, say, in the Essays and "The Sylva Sylvarum," or "The Advancement of Learning" and "Henry VII." There is no attempt to show that Bacon's works were built up with practically the same

stock of words; that he did not use a different vocabulary for each work, although it is essential for him to establish this fact in order to justify the argument upon which his contentions are based.

As to Shakespeare's vocabulary, he makes the following suggestion :—

> "That the playwright was really not a man of supremely large vocabulary for his time; the impression set up by a long scrutiny of the concordance is rather one of surprise at the large number of words familiar to educated men which do not appear in it, and the large number which appear only once."

And then he adds, and special attention is directed to his words:—

> "Multitudes of them, of course, he must have known."

What does Mr. Robertson's argument amount to? He has taken (1) the two first pages of "The Advancement of Learning"; (2) the last page of Book I. and the first of Book II.; (3) the last two pages of Book II.; (4) a sequence at random of four pages in the same book; (5) the first and the last of the Essays; (6) the first page of the "New Atlantis"; and (7) the first two and the last two pages of the "History of Henry VII." He has compared the words found in these passages with a concordance of Shakespeare and he finds that there are words in these passages which are not used in the Shakespeare plays, as follows: In (1) first page 7 words, second page 16 words; (2) last page of Book I. 11 words; first page of Book II. 8 words; (3) two last pages of Book II. 29 words; (4) four pages taken at random 49 words; (5) first and last of the Essays (16 pages in the 1625 edition) 39 words.

The result of the examination of Nos. 6 and 7 are not given!

What conclusion does Mr. Robertson arrive at from this comparison?

"The vocabularies of Shakespeare and Bacon are markedly and decisively distinct."

"We are contemplating too different verbal outfits, so to speak; two largely different selections from the stores of words common to all for all purposes; two diverging sets of preferences—in a word the output of two differently cultured men."

Surely Mr. Robertson has tripped here in bracketing together Shakespeare and Bacon as "two differently cultured men." Hitherto he has not admitted that Shakespeare was a cultured man. Here he ranges him alongside Bacon. But this point is beside the argument of this chapter.

A comparison is made between plays which Mr. Robertson affirms were written for the purpose of entertaining the audiences which frequented the Globe Theatre, which audiences Mr. Halliwell-Phillips states (and this is confirmed by all the contemporary testimony) were illiterate and for the most part profligate, and what Mr. Robertson describes as "the philosophi cal work of a man who had taken all knowledge to his province and who was pre-occupied with scienti investigation."

Because there are a number of words used in the passages taken from Bacon's works which are not in the Shakespeare plays, Mr. Robertson in his emphatic style avows that it is a concrete proof that the author of *Hamlet* was not the author of "De Augmentis"! Could any argument more insufficient be advanced? There are hundreds of words used in the Essays which are not to be found in the "New Atlantis." There are at least a thousand words in the "Sylva Sylvarum" which are not to be found in "The Advancement of Learning." To apply Mr. Robertson's precious argument, it follows that if Bacon wrote the Essays he did not write the "New Atlantis," and if he wrote the "Sylva Sylvarum"

he did not write "The Advancement of Learning." And this argument has much more force in comparing these works than in comparing works so dissimilar in character, though not in object, as the Shakespeare plays and "The Advancement of Learning." So another example is afforded of how with Mr. Robertson "inconsequence follows inconsequence." Here, as throughout "The Baconian Heresy," he endeavours to conceal the weakness of the arguments and to carry conviction to his readers by the arrogance of his assertion and the scorn which he heaps upon his opponents.

It *is* unfortunate that there is no concordance of Bacon's works. It is a pity that Mr. Robertson has not devoted his industry and scholarship to the task. The result would be more useful than indulging in abuse of Baconians.

A concordance of the "Sylva Sylvarum" is nearly completed, and several years ago the Bacon Society had under consideration its publication. It was considered, however, that the whole of the works should be concorded before the expense of publishing could be undertaken.

There have been reliable estimates made by competent scholars as to Shakespeare's vocabulary. Clark, in his "Elements of the English Language," p. 134, says:

> "The vocabulary of Shakespeare becomes more than double that of any other writer in the English language. Craik estimated it at twenty-one thousand words, without counting inflectional forms, while that of Milton was but seven thousand. . . . English speech, as well as literature, owes more to him than to any other man."

Max Muller, in his "Science of Languages," writes:

> "Shakespeare displayed a greater variety of expression than probably any other writer in any language."

Bartlet's concordance of Shakespeare, which includes

inflections, gives approximately 80,000 words! Cowden Clarke's concordance contains nearly as many. Mr. Robertson had one or the other of these before him when he made the comparisons before referred to. If he had made a simple calculation it *might* have saved him from making such a foolish suggestion as "that the playwright was really not a man of supreme vocabulary for his time."

If, as Mr. Robertson affirms, a long scrutiny of the concordance occasions an expression of surprise at the large number of words, multitudes of which Shakespeare must have known, which do not appear in it, and the large number which appear only once, why should there be any surprise that there should be found words in Bacon's philosophical works which are not used in the plays? Many of the words Mr. Robertson has enumerated are wholly unfitted for use in poetry. Take for instance, affirmatively, amplification, triplicity universality, consociate, amplitude, overcomen, ren vations, concordances, privatively, prolix, liturgy, occ pate, preoccupate, privatively, animosities, emerger multiplically, rigorously, perigrinations, Sabaoth, participant, reluctation, contradictories, enucleating, interdicteth, mediocrity, nonsignificants, surd, embaseth, mummeries, theological, abstruse, accurate, arietations, enervate, sustentation—none of these words lend themselves for employment in verse. Or again, elocution, oblation, tabernacle, signature, barleycorn, liturgy, summary, atheism, libertine (adj.), aphorism, preamble, theology, chess, dialectic, draughts (= written rules), ward (of a lock), astrologer, dispeople, mountainous, philology, schism—are not these words which would only be made use of if the subject of the verse demanded their interpolation? And yet the whole fabric of Mr. Robertson's argument, founded on the vocabularies—that the two sets of works could not have been produced by one man—

rests on the fact that these words are not met with in a concordance of Shakespeare! Mr. Robertson reels off a multitude of questions as if each one was a poser for his opponents. Here are some from which the reader may judge how ridiculous is the position adopted.

"How should Bacon use the terms, 'theory' and 'theoric' freely in his didactic works, and only 'theorick' (and that only thrice) in the thirty-seven plays?"

"How, after writing often of politiques in his avowed works, should he always write 'politicans' in his alleged plays, when other dramatists (e.g., Ben Jonson) used 'politiques'?"

"Why should he write 'overcomen' and 'holpen' in his prose and never in his poetry?"

"Why should he always use the spelling 'drought' in his signed works, and 'drouth' when writing dramatically?"

"How should it be possible to him to write of 'vicissitude' seven times in one essay,* and never once in thirty-seven plays?"

Is it not possible, even probable, that a man might make variations as wide, or even wider, than the foregoing between the use of words in prose and in dramatic poetry?

The writer of the plays was an aristocrat, and was conversant with the habits and language of the Courts of England and France. The plays, almost without exception, have their movement in the highest walks of Society. There is not one play which affords the suggestion that it was written by a man who was one of the people or had risen from the people. It is always the point of view of the aristocrat that is evident. Bacon speaks of "the ignorant and rude multitude," Shakespeare of "the rude multitude; the base vulgar."

Both the philosopher and dramatist appropriate in the most barefaced manner the production of other writers. Rawley describes Bacon as lighting his torch at every man's candles, and this was a constant practice

* The title of the essays was 'On vicissitudes.'

of Shakespeare's. Both were very fond of punning. They never tired of cultivating the habit. There are numerous references to St. Albans; not one to Stratford-on-Avon, and few to Warwickshire. Both were inattentive to accuracy in details. Bacon's Apothegms abound in historical inaccuracies. In several cases Shakespeare and Bacon make identical errors. It is apparent to the thoughtful reader that the author of each set of works wrote from an abnormally stored memory without reference to authorities. It has been truly said that Bacon and Shakespeare both differ from other authors in this characteristic—they never argue, they decree. On every subject they speak from the same point of view.

There is another point which does not appear to have been noted. Whoever wrote the Shakespeare plays was the most perfect orator of his time, and of all times. Never man spake like this man. The chief characteristic of the orator is the possession of a faculty for instinctively using words to express thoughts which give pleasure to the auditor as they fall upon his ear. It is the music of the words which an orator speaks which fascinates his hearers, and makes them wish that he should not stop. Shakespeare possessed this faculty as it has never been possessed before. The fear of Bacon's audiences was lest he should leave off. Archbishop Whateley says of Shakespeare, "The first of dramatists, he might easily have been the first of orators."

And so it comes to pass that the more carefully and penetratingly the student examines the works of Bacon and the poems and plays of Shakespeare, the more striking appear to be the similarities between the two authors. The more diligent and painstaking the investigation the more certain is the result. No man has lived at any period of history who possessed every qualification requisite for writing the plays and poems

bearing the name of William Shakespeare, except Francis Bacon. That is the broad basis of the Baconian faith.

"THE HYSTORIE OF HAMBLET."

DR. RICHARD FARMER'S reference in his Essay on the "Learning of Shakespeare," to this rare novel affords a striking instance of his unreliability as a commentator and critic.

In 1748 was published "An Enquiry into the Learning of Shakespeare, with remarks on several passages of his Plays," by Peter Whalley, B.A. This writer was a fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, and became master of the Grammar School of Christ's Hospital. He published in 1756 an edition of Jonson's works, which was more complete than any of its predecessors, and had the advantage of being accompanied by a life of that poet. In his Enquiry, Whalley contends that Shakespeare must have read "Saxo Grammaticus," in Latin, as he derived the plot of *Hamlet* from it, and no translation of the work into any modern language had been made.

Farmer in the 1657 edition of his Essay observes:

> "But the truth is he did not take it from Saxo at all; a Novel called 'The Historie of Hamblet' was his original; a fragment of which in black letter I have been favoured with by a very curious and intelligent gentleman, to whom lovers of Shakespeare will some time or other owe their obligations."

In the 1789 edition Dr. Farmer amplifies his statement thus:—

> "It hath indeed been said, that if such an history exists, it is almost impossible that any poet unacquainted with the Latin language (supposing his perceptive faculties to have been ever so acute) could have caught the charaoteristical madness of

Hamblet, described by Saxo Grammaticus, so happily is it delivered by Shakespeare."

There fellows an extract from the novel, consisting of Hamblet's speech to his mother in her chamber, and then Farmer goes on to explain that Mr. Capell, his communicative friend before mentioned, has obtained from the collection of the Duke of Newcastle a complete copy of "The Hystorie of Hamblet," which proves to be a translation from the French of Belleforest; and, adds Farmer, Mr. Capell states that:

> "All the chief incidents of the Play, and all the capital characters are there in embryo, after a rude and barbarous manner; sentiments indeed, there are none, that Shakespeare could borrow; nor any expression but one, which is, where Hamlet kills Polonius behind the arras; in doing which he is made to cry out, as in the Play, 'A rat! a rat!'"

Dr. Farmer, in his usual positive manner, adds: "So much for 'Saxo Grammaticus!'"

There is one very important fact connected with this translation which Dr. Farmer was shrewd enough not to reveal. The Hystorie is undated, and on the face of it there is no evidence that it preceded the play of *Hamlet*. Without proof on this point the argument fails to have any force.

The copy of the black-letter Quarto, owned by Capell, is the only one known, and is preserved among his books at Cambridge. It was reprinted in 1841 by Collier, in the first volume of his "Shakespeare's Library." It is given *in extenso* in the Variorum edition of *Hamlet*, by Furness, Vol. II. Capell points out that amidst all the resemblance of persons and circumstances, it is strange that none of the relater's expressions have got into "the play"; and yet not one of them is to be found, except in Chapter III., when Hamlet kills the counsellor behind the arras, and in doing so, cries out, "A rat! a rat!" After this ensues Hamlet's harangue

to his mother, which Capell describes as the only good stroke in the Hystorie.

Francis de Belleforest, a French gentlemen, published a collection of novels; in part, originals; in part, translations, chiefly from Bendello. The first tome appeared in 1564; the dedication to the fifth is dated 1570. The black-letter quarto to which Farmer refers is a translation of one of these novels; the date of this translation has not be ascertained. Professor Elze contends that the translation from Belleforest is of a later date than the play, for the following easons. It is noticeable in the popular legends of ·oth England and Germany that prose versions nvariably follow the poetical version. It is readily conceivable that a poet should select from Belleforest the story of Hamlet's feigned insanity and of his revenge, and cast it into a dramatic or poetic mould; but it is not so conceivable that a mediocre translator should pick out this single story *unless he was led to it* by the popularity of the poetical version. The clumsy translation adheres to the original with slavish fidelity, except in two places, which betray the mark of a superior hand and, says Professor Elze, "point decisively to Shakespeare." In the Histoires tragiques the counsellor who acts the spy during Amleth's interview with his mother, conceals himself under the quilt (*stramentum*, according to Saxo; *loudier* or *lodier*, according to Belleforest), and Amleth on entering the chamber, *jumps* upon this quilt (*santa sur ce lodier*), whereas the English version converts the quilt into a curtain or tapestry, and makes use of the same terms employed by Shakespeare, viz., "hangings" and "arras." In the second place, it is still more striking that the English translator makes Amleth exclaim, in the words of Shakespeare, "A rat! a rat!" *whereof not* a trace is to be found in Belleforest. It is more probable that the translator

adopted an incident and phraseology which had caught the popular fancy and become almost proverbial, than that two such striking passages were invented by a translator of a manifestly inferior stamp and transferred from his work to Shakespeare's, "especially when," as Dr. Furness remarks, "they are the only two points where the phraseology is common to both." He adds, "The above argument of Elze's in favour of the existence of the drama before the translation, has not, I think, met with the acceptance it deserves. To my mind it is convincing."

Dr. Elze places the date of the first *Hamlet* at 1585—1586, and of the translation from Belleforest at 1608.

Shakespeareans refer to this early *Hamlet* as being the work of Thomas Kyd. There does not exist a vestige of a fragment of any evidence to support this assumption. It forms part of the bundle of fiction with which those honourable men endeavour to bolster up the Stratfordian myth.

"IGNOTO."

IN the year 1651 there was published in London a volume in 12mo., entitled "Reliquiæ Wottonianæ," being a Collection of Lives, Letters, Poems, with Characters of Sundry Personages, "by the curious Pensil of the Ever Memorable Sir Henry Wotton, Kt., Late Provost of Eton Colledg."

Among other things there is an interesting parallel and disparity between the lives of Robert Earl of Essex and George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, and also a separate Life of the latter. In the parallel and disparity there is much interesting information about the Earl of Essex and his bearing towards the Queen; but for the present the part of the volume to which I desire to draw attention is the end, where some poems, the composition

of Sir Henry Wotton, are introduced, and these are followed by sundry other poems, said to have been "found among the papers of Sir H. Wotton." Of these "sundry poems," five are by Ignoto; one by Dr. B.; one by Chidick Tychborn the night before his execution, and one by Sir Walter Raleigh the night before his death.

The poems by Ignoto are those that claim our attention. The first one is "A Description of the Country's Recreations," and begins :—

> "Quivering cares, Heart-tearing fears,
> Anxious sighs, Untimely tears
> Fly, Fly to Courts,
> Fly to fond worldlings sports,
> Where strain'd Sardonick smiles are glossing still,
> And griefe is forc'd to laugh against her will,
> Where mirth's but mummery,
> And sorrows only real be."

ınd there are six more verses to this poem.

The next is "A Dialogue Between God and the Soul," in imitation of Horace.

After this comes another without any title, but commencing :—

> "Rise, oh my soul, with thy desires to Heaven
> And with divinest contemplation, use
> Thy time, where times eternity is given,
> And let vain thoughts no more thy thoughts abuse," &c.

Then this is followed by the famous little poem :—

THE WORLD.

> "The World's a bubble : and the life of man, less than a span;
> In his conception wretched: from the womb, so to the tomb,
> Nurst from his cradle, and brought up to years with cares and fears.
> Who then to frail Mortality shall trust,
> But lymns on water, or but writes in dust," &c.

The fifth and last poem is :—

DE MORTE.

> "Man's life a Tragedie. His Mother's womb,
> (From which he enters) is the tyring room,
> This spacious earth the theater," &c.

All these poems are signed "Ignoto," as being by some unknown or hidden person; for as most people, even without a knowledge of Spanish, would know, "Ignoto" means "Unknown." The book, "Reliquiæ Wottonianæ," was brought out by Izaac Walton, the famous angler (1593—1683), and both the "Epistle Dedicatorie" and the "Life of Sir Henry Wotton," prefixed to the book, are written by him.

The first edition was, as I have said, in 1651. Second and third editions were brought out in 1654 and 1672. These I have not got, but a fourth edition was brought out in 1685, which is at my hand. This contains a good deal more than was in the first edition, but the "Poems found among the papers of Sir Henry Wotton," are th same as those of the 1651 edition.

The noteworthy fact, however, is this—that tl poem, "The World's a Bubble," instead of being attributed to "Ignoto"—as are the others of the Ignoto series—is plainly set down to "Fra: Lord Bacon." This is very important, for it definitely shows the authorship of these verses, and likewise suggests that "Ignoto," in other places, may also stand for "Fra: Lord Bacon." I certainly believe that the other little poems in this small collection, signed "Ignoto," are also by Bacon.

This *nom de plume*, given to an unknown author, has been curiously persistent throughout the Elizabethan and Jacobean literature.[°] The name first appears, I

° See "England's Helicon," 1600 and 1614, and re-published by Mr. A. H. Bullen in 1887. This contains a number of poems signed "Ignoto."

think, in Sir John Harrington's Preface to his Translation of "Orlando Furioso," published first in London in 1591 and again in 1607. Here Harrington speaks of that "unknown Godfather, that this last year save one, viz., 1589, set forth a booke, called the Arte of English Poetrie"; and a little further on he alludes to this "unknown Godfather" by the words, "as this same Ignoto termeth all translators."

This, as I say, is the first appearance of "Ignoto," and it is not a little strange that it should be in connection with the authorship of that book, the "Arte of English Pœsie," whose authorship has been so much discussed. For it was in this book, as the Rev. Walter Begley points out in his "Nova Resuscitatio" (Vol. I., p. 31), that "we have a translation from the Greek anthology of that very epigram which Bacon also translated freely in his best authenticated poem beginning 'The World's a bubble.'" Begley argues very strongly for Bacon as the author of the "Arte of English Pœsie," rather than an old man Puttenham, to whom the learned —on very slight evidence—have attributed the authorship, and I think Begley would have greatly strengthened his argument had he known that Harrington used the very name "Ignoto" for the author of the "Arte," that was afterwards used to conceal the author of "The World's a Bubble," who was subsequently disclosed as Bacon. The connection is very curious, and would certainly seem to be beyond mere coincidence.

The question of the authorship of the "Arte of English Pœsie" is one of the most puzzling of the puzzles of Elizabethan literature. The book itself was one of the celebrated treatises on poetry that have been handed down to us from Elizabethan times. Hallam says of it: "In this work we find an approach to the higher province of 'philosophical criticism.'" The book appeared in 1589, and as late as 1607 Sir John

Harrington—who must be accepted as a representative literary man of the period, and in a position to know—was ignorant of the authorship. To him the author was still "Ignoto"; and Camden—the great Camden—was equally ignorant in 1605. I find, too, that Drummond, of Hawthornden, in his notes of a conversation had with Ben Jonson in 1619, speaks of the author of the "Arte" in a way showing that he did not know his name. I quote from the Folio edition of Drummond's Works of 1711, p. 226, in which edition the notes of the conversation with Jonson appear for the first time. What he says is: "He who writeth the Art of English Pœsie praiseth much Rawleigh and Dyer; but their works are so few that are come to my hands, I cannot well say anything of them."

The Rev. Walter Begley, in the book above allud to, has gone carefully into this question, and discus fully the claim of Puttenham to the authorship; and is very curious to see the method that was adopted t throw dust in the eyes of the public, and to make them believe that a trustworthy statement had been made disclosing the author. Why false information should have been given may puzzle us to conjecture; but a sufficient reason would be afforded if it were desired to muffle up and hide the real author, as would be the case if he were Bacon.

Begley shows that the evidence most relied on for the authorship was that of the Cornwall antiquary, Richard Carew, of Antony. He was a friend of Camden, and contributed a paper for the second edition of Camden's "Remaines" (1614),* which had not appeared in the first edition (1605). This was twenty-five years after the "Arte of English Poesie" had appeared. In this paper Carew mentions "Maister Puttenham," and he

* See the article "Puttenham" in the "Dictionary of National Biography."

places him between Sir Philip Sidney and Maister Stonihurst as a poet who used the classical metres for English verse better than it had been thought possible so to use them; and so forthwith Puttenham was accepted as the author of the "Arte," though up to that time (1614) no one had ever heard of him as an author, or thought of him in connection with the "Arte of English Poesie." But the Rev. Walter Begley did not cease his investigations here. By chance he heard that Richard Carew's original MS. was in the British Museum, in the Cottonian collection of manuscripts. On examination of the MS., Begley found that the name of Puttenham does not occur in it at all. It had been interpolated in the printed version, without any authority whatever from the MS. Puttenham has been foisted on the public so as to silence any talk about who the author was, and the public, encouraged by the learned writers upon Elizabethan literature, have, of course, without cavil, accepted him. That Camden should have lent himself to this trick is not a little strange, though possibly he may not have been aware of the interpolation. At any rate, we may charitably suppose this, for in other respects (Begley reports) the MS. is followed word for word, except only in one small instance, where the printed text has "coloured" for "colored."*

This will show how much pains have been taken to keep the author of the "Arte" hidden behind a curtain.

But while Sir John Harrington was writing about this "Ignoto," there was another Ignoto, though not so called, who had something to say on the subject of poets and poetry, and English poets in particular. This was he—the unknown author—who wrote the "Shepherd's Kalendar" (1579).

* See "Nova Resuscitatio," Vol. I., pp. 101—3. Gay and Bird Bedford Street, Strand, London, 1905.

In dealing with any of the complex problems of the Elizabethan literature, one cannot be too careful to keep constantly in mind, and constantly before one, the chief and outstanding facts of the case. One of these main facts in respect of the so-called "Spenser" poems is that the "Shepherd's Kalendar," a most important poem of the Elizabethan age, appeared anonymously in 1579 and was reproduced in four subsequent editions, 1581, 1586, 1591, 1597, all anonymous, though during that time other poems were being freely published under the name of Edmund Spenser. It was not until 13 years after Spenser's death that the "Shepherd's Calendar" was, in 1611, included as a "Spenser" poem in the first collected folio volume of Spenser's works, and even then there was not a word of explanation as to *how* this poem had been identified as one of Spenser's, nor as to *why* had been brought out so frequently during Spense life-time unacknowledged. From 1579 to 1611, a peri of thirty-two years, this poem passed in England as th work of an unknown man, and in 1611 it is slipped in among Spenser's works, and the public thus expected to infer that he was the author—certainly a left-handed sort of way of dealing with one of England's greatest poets. One would have thought that the *literati* of England would have devoted some time and attention to the explication of so curious a twist as this. Such, however, is not the case; but Bacon somewhere has said that critics love to "blanch the obscure passages, and discourse upon the plain."

That Spenser was unknown and unacknowledged as the author of the "Shepherd's Calendar" during his life-time, and up to the year 1611, cannot be gainsaid, and contemporary evidence of this condition of want of knowledge is easily produced. I have produced it in my little book, "Bacon's Secret Disclosed," p. 101, but, for the sake of the continuity of the argument, I will show it again here.

In Chapter XXXI., Book I., of the "Arte of English Poesie" (1589), when speaking of the various poets who have arisen in England and their characteristics, the author says :—

"For Eclogue and pastoral Poesie Sir Philip Sydney, and Master Challenner, and that other Gentleman who wrote the late 'Shepherd's Calendar.'"

This clearly shows that the author of the "Arte" was not able to produce the name of the man that wrote the "Shepherd's Calendar," or, what is more likely, was desirous that the public should continue in ignorance of the author's name.

Further, George Whetstones in his "Honourable Life and Valiant Death of Sir Philip Sydney," published in 1587, clearly and plainly attributes the "Shepherd's Calendar" to Sidney, and this though the book professes to be dedicated to Sir Philip himself.

From this it is apparent that the anonymity of the book was thoroughly maintained by the literary men of the time, and the public got no hint as to its authorship from the learned, even if they themselves might have had some secret knowledge.

In "Bacon's Secret Disclosed" I have shown that the personal references to the author of the "Calendar" fit accurately to Bacon, but are quite inapplicable to Spenser.

But now, after this digression to establish and emphasize the fact that the unknown author of the "Shepherd's Calendar" really was unknown, while the various editions of his book were coming out, let me get back to what the unknown author said—or at least to what was said about him—in the "Shepherd's Calendar."

The "Argument" to the October Eclogue is very

significant, and, though I have often glanced through it when reading the "Calendar," I confess that it was only recently that the great importance of its bearing "leapt to the eyes."

The argument is as follows :—

"In Cuddie is set out the perfecte paterne of a Poete, which finding no maintenance of his state and studies, complayneth of the contempt of Poetrie and the causes thereof. Specially having been in all ages, and even amongst the most barbarous, alwayes of singular accounpt and honour, and being indede so worthy and commendable an arte: or rather no arte, but a divine gift and heavenly instinct not to bee gotten by laboure and learning, but adorned with both: and poured into the witte by a certaine *enthusiasmos* and celestiall inspiration, as the author hereof els where at large di courseth in his booke called the English Poete, whic booke being lately come to my hands, I mynde also b God's grace upon further advisement to publish."

Here is an interesting development. The unknown editor of the "Calendar," masquerading as "E. K.," is evidently the writer of the above "Argument," for speaking as he does, in a detached way of the author of the "Calendar," it is plainly not the author himself who writes the "Argument."

And further, in the "Gloss" upon the October Eclogue, written by the unknown E. K., the following sentence is found at the end of a long discourse upon the words "For ever" :—

"Such honour have Poetes alwayes found in the sight of princes and noble men which this author here very well sheweth, as elsewhere more notably."

I think it is very evident from the foregoing that the unknown editor of the "Calendar" knew that the un-

known author of the same was also the author of another book called the "English Poet," "which booke being lately come to my (the editor's) hands, I mynde also by God's grace upon further advisement to publish."

What was the book called the "English Poet" that in 1579 he alludes to? I believe it was none other than the "Arte of Englisn Poesie," published ten years later, in 1589, anonymously.

The first chapter of the first book of the "Arte" is entitled "Poets and Poesie," and here the author discourses at large upon the inspiration of poets just as described in the above "Argument." Take the following as a parallel passage to the "Argument."

"And this science in the perfection, can not grow but by some divine instinct, the Plantonicks call it *furor;** or by excellencie of nature and complexion: or by great subtiltie of spirits and wit, or by much experience and observation of the world, and course of kinde, or peradventure by all or most part of them. . . . It is therefore of Poets thus to be conceived, that if they be able to devise and make all these things of themselves, without any subject of verity, that they be (by maner of speech) as creating gods. If they do it by instinct divine or natural, then surely much favoured from above."

I think the very short description in the "Argument," of what the "English Poete" contains, is sufficient to identify it with the opening chapter of the "Arte," showing that *that* is the book referred to.

But see what a coil is here!

The unknown author of the "Arte" refers to the unknown author of the "Shepherd's Calendar," and the unknown editor of the "Calendar" speaks of its

* Note that *furor* is the Latin equivalent of *enthusiasmos*.

unknown author as the author of the "Arte," who himself has referred to the author of the "Calendar" as being unknown! What a tossing about of these unknowns on a sea of doubt and uncertainty! And how those who really knew who the unknowns were must have laughed over the trick they were playing on the literary world of that age—and of future ages as well!

But amid all this juggling with "unknowns" there was certainly a danger that some shrewd guesses might tread too near "upon the heels of truth"—to borrow Rawley's expression—and so it was prudently arranged to fix the authorship on persons who were dead, and therefore could not be cross-questioned or could not give any disconcerting denials. And thus we have, by a piece of bold "bluff," Spenser credited with the authorship of the "Shepherd's Calendar" in 1611 (even as by similar "bluff" in 1623 the dead Shakespeare got the credit of plays with which he had nothing to do); and in 1614, by a trick, Puttenham [*] put forward as the author of the "Arte of English Poesie."

My little endeavour here to trace "Ignoto" and to lift the veil from him, has led me from 1685 back to 1579, and throughout that period all this curious juggling with names and personalities has been going on; and all, as I believe, and as, I think, is becoming more and more apparent to those who are willing to see, in order to hide Bacon behind the curtain and prevent his hand from being seen in the great poetic literature of the time.

When one looks at this literature with a seeing eye it is laughable, and almost farcical, to observe the ease with which Bacon and the αρειωπαλω (written about in the Harvey-Immerito letter) tricked the learned and the critical from his day down to the present times. They

[*] Spenser died in 1598, George Puttenham in 1590, and Richard Puttenham in 1601.

had merely to insert in some book a cunningly devised and veiled allusion to some person as being the author of a particular work, and thereupon the learned, having discovered what had been planted for them to find, trumpet forth the results of their labour, and display the fruits of their critical acumen; and the world is the richer by another literary find. Or the plan may be first to establish the name of some person as a writer; then fresh works are easily added to his list by the simple expedient of including them among his other works in a new edition, even though the supposed writer has been dead for years, and the critics satisfy themselves that the new works are by the same hand as the old, by discovering the similarity of style and by finding a plum of personal allusion deftly hidden where it may be discovered. And so the play has been carried on. The wits of the critics are not keen enough to enable them to imagine that neither the old works nor the new are by the man whose name has been attached to them, but are altogether by one man who remains hidden in the shadow, unknown, and thrusts some spurious name on the public to do duty as the author.

This trickery in literature is very similar to the modern trick played by the owner of a "bogus" gold mine, when he cunningly "salts" the pseudo mine with pieces of rich gold-bearing quartz; then an "expert" is sent to examine the mine and make an "independent report." And lo! the clever man actually finds gold-bearing quartz, *in situ*, and brings specimens to his employers, who, satisfied with the richness of the mine, buy it and laud to the skies the wonderful ability of their "expert."

Thus the critics, once taken in by the cleverness of Bacon and his *αρειωπαλω*, continue year after year, and age after age, to carry on the deception and to pour out praise on those who have in no way deserved it.

I have in a footnote alluded to "England's Helicon." This contains no fewer than twenty-five lyrics signed "Ignoto." Theobald, in his "Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light" (p. 157), has no hesitatation in attributing these, as well as some others, to Bacon under his Shakespeare mantle. He says of the entire book: "I have not the least doubt that this collection was made by Bacon; his royal and antithetic style is unmistakable in the prose dedications and prefaces."

In 1886 Mr. W. H. Burr published in Washington, D.C., a pamphlet showing that the "Ignoto" of the Helicon poems was none other than Bacon." He mentions also that in 1590 "Ignoto" contributed to Spenser's first publication of the "Faery Queen" lines beginning:—

> "To look upon a work of rare devise
> The which a workman setteth out to view
> And not to yield it the deserved prize
> That unto such a workmanship is due,
> Doth either prove the judgment to be naught
> Or else doth show a mind with envy fraught,"

and continues in four stanzas of six lines each.

These "Ignoto" verses do not appear in every copy of the 1590 "Faery Queen," and I am given to understand that copies in which they are present are rare. I have not seen any copy containing them. They are to be found, however, at the end of the "Faery Queen" in the 1611 Folio edition of Spenser's works, and also in the 1617 Folio and in the 1679 Folio, though not at the end of the "Fairy Queen."

Another man who has been quoted in support of the Puttenham authorship of the "Arte" is Edmund Bolton, who wrote his "Hypercritica" some time about 1620, though it was not published until 1722. He says that the "Arte" was the work, "as the fame is, of one of the Queen's gentlemen pensioners, Puttenham." His

qualifying remark, "as the fame is," very plainly shows that he was merely repeating the tale cunningly set going by interested people, and fraudulently endorsed by the Carew statement in the way I have shown.

Before leaving this subject — which interests me greatly—and even at the risk of wearying my readers, I must saying something about Webbe and his "Discourse of English Poetry" (1586). Webbe is frequently quoted as establishing beyond doubt that Spenser was the author of the "Shepherd's Kalendar." What he says was, I think, a little dust thrown in people's eyes, or one may call it a bit of rich quartz, such as I have described, planted where it might be found. His remarks are *:—

"This place have I purposely reserved for one, who if not only, yet in my judgment principally, deserveth the tytle of the rightest English Poet, that ever I read: that is, the Author of the 'Shepheardes Kalendar,' intituled to the woorthy Gentleman, Master Philip Sidney, whether it was Master Sp, or what rare scholler in Pembrooke Hall soever, because himself and his friendes, for what respect I know not, would not reveale it, I force not greatly to set down."

Of course, the critics at once say "Master Sp" means Spenser. If so, it is strange that George Whetstones, a year later (1587), should attribute the poem to Sir Philip Sidney, and knows nothing about Spenser in the matter; and that later still, in 1589, the Author of "The Arte of English Poesie" is blind to Webbe's hint about "Sp," and speaks of the author of the Kalendar as being unknown. Indeed, not one writer of this period down to 1611 alludes to Spenser as being the author, and not one has followed the lead supposed to

* From Arbor's English Reprints, "A Discourse of English Poetry," by William Webbe, p. 35.

have been given by Webbe, even when poems (the "Fairy Queen" and others) were being freely published under Spenser's name.

A few lines further on in the same part of Webbe's "Discourse" as that from which I have quoted, there is an interesting passage. Webbe is speaking of Master Sp and Gabriel Harvey (Harvey by that time had taken Holy Orders), and we should bear in mind that Spenser, in 1586, had been for some years a clerk in Ireland, a position of great preferment for the poor son of a journeyman tailor. This is what Webbe says:—

"Therefore will I adventure to sette them together, as two of the rarest witts, and learnedst masters of Poetry in England: whose worthy and notable skyl i' this faculty, I would wysh, if their high dignities ar serious businesses would permit, they would still grau to be a furtheraunce to that reformed kind of Poeti which Master Harvey did once beginne to ratify."

Note the reference to "high dignities and serious businesses." The latter term would be properly applicable to Gabriel Harvey. But what "high dignity" was there about the clerk, busy at his copying work in distant Ireland? If "Sp" were Spenser, it is difficult to see how his high dignity could be appealed to to permit him to continue his poetic work. But if we use our wits a little we will see that the numerical value of "Sp" is 33, and Bacon also is 33; so if we substitute the value "33" for "Sp" in the equation, and remember for whom that number stands, obscure passages become very plain. Thus when we come to the next allusion to "Sp," at page 52 of Webbe's "Discourse," we may substitute the above value of "Sp" and read:—

"But nowe yet at ye last hathe England hatched

uppe one Poet of this sorte, in my conscience comparable with the best in any respect: even Master 33, author of the 'Shepheardes Kalendar.'"

And I venture to think that the reason why other contemporary writers did not follow Webbe in his hint, was that "Sp" and 33 were rather too plain pointers at Bacon, and it was unsafe to give any such clear indication of the authorship, seeing how much of Bacon's secret life is revealed in the Poem, when once a hint of the real authorship is obtained.

It seems to me that a calm consideration of the foregoing should go far to convince even the most hidebound and most conventional of students that there *is* something about the literature of this period that is neither disclosed nor understood by the conventional writers on the subject. Why should Spenser—supposing that he wrote it—conceal his authorship of the "Shepherd's Calendar"? Why should the five editions of this book published during his lifetime come out anonymously? And, when the work is given to Spenser in the Folio Edition of his works in 1611, thirteen years after his death, what reason was there for doing it, in an underhand sort of way, without clear and distinct acknowledgment? Surely Spenser, if he were the author, was worthy of better treatment than that. But the treatment of the "Shepherds Calendar" is consistently intelligible, when one understands that it was written by another than Spenser, and merely attributed to him as a "blind."

And so with Puttenham. There were two Puttenhams, Richard and George. George has been generally credited with the authorship, though for the very flimsiest of reasons. And why should his authorship be hidden? Either of them was an old man in 1589—Richard 69 years of age, and George, perhaps, two or three years

older—neither at a likely age at which to have accomplished such a work as the "Arte of English Poesie." George died in 1590 and Richard in 1601. But supposing it were possible that either of these old men could have written, or did write, such a book as the "Arte," what reasonable reason can be given for the authorship being muffled up and hidden for years after the man was dead, and then brought out in the sly and crooked way that I have shown — not declared or plainly stated, but merely hinted at, and left to be guessed by a "clever critic." Surely there was nothing to cast any shame upon the name of Puttenham in plainly announcing him as having been the author of such a remarkable book as the "Arte"—if he were the author—so why make a concealment and secrecy abo' it? But, again, the play and trick about Puttenham consistently intelligible when one understands that th(was a desire to keep the real author of the "Arte hidden, and to stop enquirers' questions by giving them some other name to chew upon. And the trick has succeeded "excellently well."

Before concluding, I would like to say a few words about the name "Ignoto." It would be strange, and unlike Bacon, if that word did not contain some hidden and unsuspected meaning. At the outset it struck me as significant that the name should have been borrowed from Spanish or Italian (for the word is the same in either language), and that Latin had not been used, for one would think that Latin would come more naturally rather than Spanish or Italian, especially, too, when Latin was so much in use among the literary men of that time. "Ignotus" would seem to be just as good a name to travel under as "Ignoto," and, being more ordinary, less likely to attract the attention that an "Ignotus" would wish to avoid. But the awkward thing is that the numerical value of "Ignotus" is 100;

and 100 = Francis Bacon (Francis 67, Bacon 33); so that to assume the name "Ignotus" to cover Francis Bacon would have been to assume a veil that was a little too transparent. What about "Ignoto"? The numerical value of this is 76, and anyone having discovered that would have been likely to pass on without further consideration. But 76 *reversed* is 67, and 67 is Francis, so that in a secret way "Ignoto" may be said to cover Francis, and thus indicate who is meant. And have we not some warrant for *reversing* whilst trying to trace out Bacon's secret? when we see that in the famous Droeshout portrait of Shakespeare, prefixed to the 1623 Folio, the right arm is *reversed*, and shows us the back instead of the front, though for what reason no man knoweth. But from the above we see how the word "unknown" may be used to make known the Great Unknown.

GRANVILLE C. CUNINGHAM.

JOTTINGS ON LORD BACON.

REFERENCES TO BACON'S DEATH, AND THE DESECRATION OF HIS TOMB.

THE contemporary references we have of Viscount St. Alban's death on April 9th, 1626, are very few, but they are worth looking for, as the fact of his decease in that year has been lately disputed, though no proof of value has been brought forward to show a later date.

The first mention of his death is found in a letter dated April 10th, 1626, from Sir Benjeman Rudyard, at Whitehall, to Sir Francis Nethersole, where, after giving some news, he adds: "Lord St. Albans is dead, and so is Sir Thomas Compton." The reference can be found in "State Papers," Domestic Series, Charles I.

And we also find among the State Papers in 1626, "Minutes of application for an order for £1,000, borrowed by the late Viscount St. Albans from Sir John Wolstenholme in 1616, to be repaid out of the annuity granted to the said Viscount out of the Alienation Office." The chief authority for the date and place of Bacon's death has always been Dr. William Rawley's "Life" of him; but other writers have also alluded to it, though they have not been mentioned by his last biographer, Spedding.

Another proof of Lord St. Alban's death in 1626 comes before us in remembering the Latin verses written by the Cambridge University in admiration of her famous son—the Latin "Manes Verulam," which Spedding printed in full.

It appears that Bacon's will remained unexecuted for fifteen months, when letters of administration wer granted July 18th, 1627, to two of his credito Sir Robert Rich and Thomas Meautys. The lat had been his secretary for some years, and so gre was the love and admiration he had for the master, that after Bacon's death he erected an elaborate monument over his vault in the east end of St. Michael's Chnrch,* probably carried out from his own design, in remembering that Bacon had invented a canopied chair in which he could sit in the open air. So the philosopher is represented seated under an arch, in deep thought.

This is another proof of Bacon's death in 1626.

Lord St. Albans, who had occupied such important positions in Parliament and in the law, seems to have had, probably by his own desire, a private and very quiet burial in St. Michael's Church, St. Albans, Hert-

* In the course of restoration of the church, this monument was moved back half a yard into the wall.

fordshire, which is a little over twenty miles from London. The church is situated about a mile from Bacon's estate of Gorhambury. It is stated that he died during a cold wintry spell, at the home of his friend, the Earl of Arundel, at Highgate, to which he had been hastily taken when he was suddenly seized with illness during a drive, and Bacon's touching letter of apology to the Earl for occupying his house during his absence, is proof enough that he was there at that date. It is now thought that he must have died from acute bronchitis, which was an ailment not thoroughly understood in Bacon's day.

Highgate is a suburb of London, on the route to Gorhambury, and his body was evidently taken direct o his home there, or to the church, and no funeral ervice was held in London. One reason for a quiet funeral was that Bacon died heavily in debt, leaving no ready money; and further, his wife, Lady Verulam, Countess of St. Albans, had separated herself by her conduct from her husband, and could not be asked to take part in his obsequies. The plague was still raging in the metropolis, scattering people and causing panic, and we can also bear in mind that Bacon had a good many enemies, and had estranged many of his nearest relatives by continual money borrowings.

King Charles I., also, was not so warmly interested in him as his royal father had been; Buckingham was anything but friendly; and Bacon had lately led a retired life from the public eye.

His acknowledged books were only read by the learned, and he knew his philosophical writings were not appreciated, save by a few of his contemporaries.

"For my name and memory I leave it to foreign nations, and "to my own countrymen after some time be passed over."

His prophecy has come true!

To show Bacon's impoverished state, we will quote from a "*History of the reign of Charles I.*," which was written during that monarch's lifetime. The author praises Bacon, and also devotes some space to an account of the desecration of his body in the vault, which fact is but little known. This folio volume* has an engraved pictorial frontispiece, signed G. Faitherness, with a medallion in the middle:

"THE
HISTORY OF
KING CHARLES
BY
H. L. ESQR."

Following this comes the title page:

"*Reign of King Charles, an History disposed into annals, the second Edition, revised and somewhat enlarged. Printed by F. L. and J.G. for Hen: Seile, Senior and Junior, over against St. Dunstan's Church in Fleet Street and Edw: Dod, at the Green in Ivy Lane,* 1656."

Any student of the original editions of Lord Bacon's works would take this book for a companion volume to Bacon's "Henry VII.," though published thirty-two years after that history appeared.

It is a thin folio, printed with exactly the same variety of type that strikes the reader as being so strange in Bacon's History, with the double lines for marginal notes and some of the head-pieces of ornamentation exactly similar.

The author or compiler has concealed his name, and though there is the word "*Finis*" on the last page, the history only takes us to the year 1641, ending with the death of Strafford, which is a very incomplete chronicle of the reign of Charles I., and there is no sign of a

* British Museum (192. 6. 8), 1656.

Vol. II. Yet a second edition was printed in the year following its first appearance, which was seven years after the execution of Charles; perhaps the description of the king's execution had to be suppressed. But, besides the similarity of large and small type to Bacon's book, the chief interest lies in the mention of his death, and the desecration of his tomb, as follows:—

"In this year 1626 happened the death of Sir Thomas Compton and secondly, the then, and last Lord Chancellor, Sir Francis Bacon, Viscount St. Albans; for humane Learning his Ages miracle, but withall the mirrour of human frailty, and as most eminent in intellectual abilities, so too much in his prudential failings, occasioned by his August and Noble soul, which disdaining all drossie and terrene consideration never descended to know the value of money until he wanted it; and his want was never so great, as when he yielded to the Law of Nature, he left not of his own enough to defray the charge of his Funeral rites. He lyeth interred in the Church of St. Michael at St. Albans in Hertfordshire, and hath there a fair statuary Monument erected for him of white Marble, at the cost of Sir Thomas Meautys, his ancient servant who was not nearer him being then dead, for this Sir Thomas, ending his life about a score of years after,* it was his lot to be inhumed so nigh his Lord's sepulchre that in the forming of his grave, part of the Viscount's body was exposed to view which being spyed by a Doctor of Physick, he demanded the head to be given him, and did most shamefully disport himself with that shell which was somewhile the continent of so vast treasure of knowledge."

This description brings the scene to mind in *Hamlet*, where the latter says, in the gravedigger's scene:

* Sir Thomas Meautys is said to have died in October, 1649.

"Why may not that be the skull of a lawyer? Where be his guddits now, his quiblets, his cases, his tenures, and his tricks? Why does he suffer this rude knave now to knock him about the sconce with a dirty shovel, and will not tell him of his action of battery?"

Most likely the "Doctor of Physick" repeated those words with the skull of the author of them in his hands, and the incident is a most extraordinary one, bringing a shudder to those who reverence the great dead. One consoling thought is, how much greater the dead Philosopher and Lawyer still continues to be, than the fool who amused himself with his skull.

This desecration is also mentioned in "Fuller's Worthies," and the name of the doctor is given. Fuller's notice of Sir Francis Bacon shows a grea appreciation of our Philosopher, and a few sentence are worth quoting, as follows:

"Sir Francis Bacon Knight, youngest son of Sir Nicholas Bacon, Lord Keeper was born at York House—anno 1560. He was bred in Trinity College in Cambridge and there first fell into dislike of Aristotle's Philosophy, as barren, and jejune inabling *some* to dispute, *more* to wrangle, *few* to find out truth, and *none* if confining themselves to his principles. By King James he was made Solicitor and afterwards his Atturney, and Lord Chancellor of England.

"His abilities were a clear confutation of two vulgar errors (libells on learned men) First that *Judgment, Wit, Fancy,* and *Memory,* cannot eminently be in conjunction in the same person; whereas our Knight was a rich Cabinet filled with all four, besides having a golden key to open it,—Elocution.

. . . . . .

"He died, anno Domini 1626, in the house of the

* "Fuller's Worthies," British Museum, 2092 f.

Earl of Arundel at Highgate, and was buried in St. Michael's Church in St. Albans; Master Mutes, his grateful servant erecting a Monument for him. Since, I have read that his grave being occasionally (having occasion to be) opened, his scull (the relique of civil veneration) was by one King, a doctor of Physick, made the object of scorn and contempt; but he, who then derided the dead, is since become the laughing stock of the living."

It is to be observed that in these notices of the opening of the tomb, and discovery of Bacon's remains, there is no mention of any manuscripts, or other reliques in the vault.

Who was Dr. King? Was he physician to Sir Thomas and Lady Meautys? It is an interesting speculation as to whether this man, while "disporting himself" with Bacon's remains, had the conviction that he was handling the skull of the author of *Hamlet*, and felt there was a suitable association and a double satire in quoting from the play he had often seen, if, as we think, he *did* quote from the play. In what other way could he "disport himself"?

It is evident that he tried to be humorous on the occasion, whatever were the words he used, and that the spectators were shocked at his levity; as a doctor of physick should have shown more respect on this occasion to the Philosopher whom Sir Thomas Meautys had admired when living, and whose memory he had perpetuated by a handsome monument.

Fuller shows us that retribution overtook the scoffer, and that "Dr. King had since become the laughing-stock of the living." In all probability the skull was restored to its place, and the body wrapped more closely in its leaden sheet; as on the tomb being opened again, a good many years afterwards, the remains were seen still enclosed in lead, and "having the appearance of a body." Had the coffin crumbled to ashes?

Was the body originally placed in a coffin? What state would the vault now be in, should permission ever be granted to examine it?

We have lately seen a picture of Bacon's monument done in water-colours, and very fairly painted (British Museum, MSS. Dept. Illustrations of Hertfordshire, Vol. IV. S.A. Add 32. 351).

It is described as being "done on the spot by Thos. Trotter, 1779," and the letter below it runs as follows:

"Monument of Sr. Francis Bacon in the Church of St. Michael, St. Albans, Herts. 1799."

"The remains of this once illustrious ornament of th British nation, whose universability still extends and ill cidites the walks of all civilized society, rests in a va immediately under the tomb above represented.

"From the information of one of the Parochi Dependents who some years since was present at the opening of it, the venerable Dust was found wrapt up in lead, taking somewhat the form of the Body, perhaps after the manner of the Hungarfords in the Vault in Farley Castle Somersetshire. The marble Figure of the Monument is a most exquisite performance. The same person mentioned above also added that many years back there was an abortive attempt made by some Foreigners to carry off the Figure (marble figure) in the night, but on their removing it, they probably found it too weighty a matter for concealment. It was taken from its site, and left in the Chancel un-mutilated."

We learn from the above that Bacon's tomb and monument have gone through several vissicitudes.

A. C. Bunten.

NUMBER 287.

"'Prove it,' says I. 'His acts prove it,' says he. 'Prove them,' says I. 'And he could not prove them,' said the red-faced man, looking round triumphantly."—*Sketches by Boz.*

CHARLES DICKENS, who most people know was the author of the sketches, wrote to a friend in 1880, "The life of Shakespeare is a fine mystery, and I tremble every day lest something should turn up."

Something turns up now almost daily.

Those who sniff at cyphers, and seek to ignore or belittle the toilers upon those used by Francis Bacon and his secret fraternity, have much in common with the red-faced man.

Francis Bacon, Viscount St. Albans, sought fame, as a reputation to come to a man after death, rather than to accompany him during life.

He desired the considered, unemotional verdict of future ages.

His cyphers seem to have constituted separate cords, only to be grasped after hard inductive labour, whereby the labyrinth of his extensive schemes for the betterment and relief of man's estate might be reached and proved, and posterity's pronouncement obtained.

Whether the triumphant-looking red-faced man of our generation wants proof, or even understands it, matters very little. A later generation will.

That there were several cypher cords may have been disappointing to individual decipherers; yet the combination obtains the strength and value of a cable. The two pillars at the porchway of King Solomon's Temple are said in Freemasonry to be respectively called Boaz (meaning "strength") and Jachin (meaning "to estab-

lish")—conjointly "stability." Perhaps the joint effect of the cyphers may thus be symbolized.

Amongst the cyphers noted by Bacon in his "De Augmentis" was a Kay cypher which, to the extent to which we seem to have mastered its solution, we will refer to later, as it has a little to do with the subject of this paper on the number 287.

It may probably form a key or introductory link in Bacon's chain of evidence.

Mr. E. V. Tanner, whose wonderful researches will we hope soon appear in print, was the first to call attention to this number 287, which he found to be the count of the letters in the Address to the Reader prefixed to the Shakespeare First Folio.

Some tests made with this key number 287 we subjoin in the hope that others will make tests with this number.

Sir E. Durning-Lawrence has already noted that 287 is the numerical equivalent (by time cypher) of the long word in "Love's Labour Lost," which word is said to be the 151st on page 136.

287 is the count of the words (excluding italic words) which in the column of "King John, Act I., Scene i., in the First Folio, precede the words:

"My dear Sir,
"Thus leaning on mine elbow I begin."

Dr. Owen states that the above words begin Francis Bacon's instructions to the decipherer of his word cypher. There is every probability of the accuracy of this statement. One would almost think that Bacon intended the decipherer to be taken to this passage by count, because the last five of the 287 words reads, "My picked man of Count[ies]."

287 is the count of the letters and figures on the Latin inscription upon the statue of Bacon in St. Michael's

Church, Gorhambury, St. Albans, as rendered on page 258 of Tenison's "Baconiana," 1679.

287 A.D. is given in Preston's "History of Freemasonry" as the "date when St. Alban" was the first Grand Master.

287 in Kay cypher is the numerical equivalent of "Fra. Rosicrosse."

This last word is spelt as Dr. John Wilkins spelt it, a few years after Bacon's death, in "Mathematical Magick." We quote from page 136 of the fifth edition, where Wilkins refers to the sepulchre of *Francis Rosicrosse.* Dr. Wilkins was a member of the Invisible College, and a founder of the Royal Society, one of Bacon's projects. The name Francis does not appear in the "Confessio Fraternitatis," but as Bacon seems to have been the founder and first head of the English fraternity of the Rosy Cross, one can hardly regard this as a "slip" of the pen, more particularly as, omitting italic words until you come to Francis Rossicrosse, the latter is the 151st word on page 136 = 287. In the Translator's Address to the Readers in the 1612 Bible a count of 287 words brings you to three lines beginning thus :—

b | eing
a | re
con | science

Mr. W. E. Clifton, who joins in this article, inferred the Kay cypher to be so styled because K is the tenth letter of the Elizabethan alphabet, and its equivalent consists of two figures, 10. The letter L is number 11, and so on to the letter *Z*, which is 24.

To have represented A by 25 was to have taken risk of early discovery, as the letter A is often repeated. Mr. Clifton found a clue in a small book in his possession, published by Thomas Powell, a contem-

porary and admirer of Francis Bacon. In this, the next symbol to Z is & = 25, then a small letter e as 26 (probably both of them nulls). The letter A is thus made number 27, and the regular E is 31. B is, of course, 28.

At the end of Rawley's "Life of Bacon," in "Resuscitatio," 1671 (3rd edition), on page 17, is a notice to the reader, carefully covered with paper. It draws the reader's attention to the outward fact that a letter to Doctor A commeth in the 27th folio.

In this same "Resuscitatio," in the "Charge to the Verge," on page 27, line 27, after the 33rd word, is a strange punctuation mark, the type for which must have been specially cut. In consists of a large comma with a small comma immediately above it. Ther follow the words, "Watchful, not asleep." One could almost suspect that the "Charge to the Verge" masks an address to Rosicrosse initiates. The brotherhood were said never to hold any meetings. An initiate would know only the man by whom he was verbally initiated. If all other communications were made acroamatically through signs and cyphers in printed books, the risk of exposure and the danger of denunciation would be very limited.

In the first table of letters in Gustavo Seleno's "Cryptographiae," 1624, thirty-three letters each way form a square. In this square A is the 27th letter, counting from either side, and is the only letter in the table which counts the same both ways.

There are many odd things both in this 3rd Edition of the "Resuscitatio" and in "Baconiana," 1679. Refer in the latter to pages 4, 5, and 79 of the Introduction, and page 33 of the "Remains." The Introduction was written by Tenison, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury.

Why should this prominent clergyman have written

such rubbish about the great philosopher, Bacon, as the following on page 89:

He "set it down from his observation that the Bolt of the Rustic often hits the mark; and that the Sow in rooting may describe the letter A, though she cannot write an entire tradegy." We notice that commencing with the sentence at top of the page, 27 words (including words in italics) precede the words, "may describe the letter A."

The last page of the "Remains," forming part of the 1679 "Baconiana," is number 259.

259 is the Kay cypher equivalent of Shakespeare:

S = 18
H = 34
A = 27
K = 10
E = 31
S = 18
P = 15
E = 31
A = 27
R = 17
E = 31

259

The first words on the page are "That is Francis Bacon." By such merry devices did the Rosy Cross brethren instruct and amuse one another beneath the unsuspecting gaze of "Inferiour Readers."

PARKER WOODWARD.
WM. E. CLIFTON.