

acc.
no. 503

PR2945
R34
1906



THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA

GIFT OF

Mr. & Mrs. John R. Harris

COINCIDENCES

Henry Sterring, His Booke

"Use me gently, but use me rapidly!"

Mr. Reed's books on the Authorship of Shakespeare, uniform in paper, print and binding with the present one, wholesale and retail :

'BRIEF FOR PLAINTIFF, BACON VS. SHAKSPERE',
8th edition, illustrated. A summary of the
whole argument. (soon.)

'FRANCIS BACON, OUR SHAKE-SPEARE'.
242 pp. \$2.00 net.

'BACON AND SHAKE-SPEARE PARALLELISMS'.
437 pp. \$2.50 net.

'NOTEWORTHY OPINIONS, PRO AND CON, BACON
VS. SHAKSPERE'. 79 pp. \$1.35 net.

'COINCIDENCES, BACON AND SHAKE-SPEARE'.
152 pp. \$1.75 net.

'BACON AND SHAKE-SPEARE ON LOVE'. (soon).

EDITION OF 'JULIUS CAESAR' with Introduction and
Notes. (soon).

'EDITION OF THE TEMPEST' with Introduction and
Notes. (soon).

Apply to

Messrs COBURN PUBLISHING COMPANY,
60 Pearl St., Boston, Mass.

Forwarded on receipt of price, post or express pre-paid, to any part of the world.

Digitized for Microsoft Corporation
by the Internet Archive in 2008.

From University of California Libraries.

May be used for non-commercial, personal, research,
or educational purposes, or any fair use.

May not be indexed in a commercial service.



Nathaniel Holmes

COINCIDENCES

BACON and SHAKESPEARE

By EDWIN REED, A. M.

Author of BACON vs. SHAKSPERE, Brief for Plaintiff.

FRANCIS BACON, OUR SHAKE-SPEARE.

NOTEWORTHY OPINIONS, PRO AND CON, Bacon vs. Shakspeare.

BOSTON:
COBURN PUBLISHING Co.,
60 PEARL STREET,
1906

Copyright, 1906
BY EDWIN REED.

Entered at Stationers' Hall,
London.

COBURN PRESS,
60 PEARL ST., BOSTON, MASS.

IN
MEMORY
OF

NATHANIEL HOLMES,

The manliest man of manly men.

Only its owner should rate or under-
score in a book! Edwin Reed's books are
becoming rare, as probably long out of print
but I have 2 - this is an unannotated one. H.S.

Looking over a manuscript appended in
this book, after a lapse of 25 years, it seems to me
yet important and valuable! The book has now
been working for many a moon and shd. now be full
of vim, & since I hope a recent lecture in Sacramento
has stirred up interest there, suppose we set it at work
here! # # # Since 1925 the student has been

scores & scores more of weighty Baconian evi-
dences. This small space may briefly file for 2
important Ben Jonson evidences: We now know that
always whenever Jonson has written the name "Shakesp-

he means, thereby
force admit that
gliardo" (the slo-
n) stands for Wm
Shakespeare or Strat-
ford. "Penta-volo" ("5"
heaps thrown") also
stands for "Shake-
speare".

Francis Bacon
just as never
Sam Clemens
whom we rate
"Mark Twain".
Ben Jonson
has never rit-
ten; name or

the actor or Strat-
ford. But he did con-
- from him scathing
in his witty play on
"Every Man Out of
His Humour" in
1599. Stratfordia
authorities per-

Whilst the "authorities" are un-
ble to deny these identities, yet the compilers of
the Allusion Books have been handsomely "canny" & dis-
creet! Did they put this manifest allusion to M
Shakespeare into their Allusion Books? Not on your life!
Let us assist them with their Allusion Book
Let us make this book do as much work in the 21
months following March 29th 1750 as it ought to have
done in the 25 preceding years! Let us be effie-

ent! Pass it from one to another rapidly. Cheerily

PREFACE.

This book is an expansion of the first chapter of my 'Francis Bacon, Our Shake-speare', published in 1902. It will serve as a companion to my book of Parallelisms, especially when the latter shall be issued in its second edition, and the entries therein classified as far as possible according to subjects.

I take this opportunity to remind my readers, as I have already done in previous publications, that when the reputed Stratford author is referred to, his name is spelled as he and his kindred generally spelled it, Shakspere; but when the author of the plays, as such, without regard to personality, is meant, the name is spelled as it was often spelled in the early editions of the plays, both quartos and folios,—Shake-speare.

It is a noteworthy fact that while the orthography of proper names in those days was very capricious, the name of the dramatist was always (with two very slight unimportant exceptions) printed in one way in the dramas, but never so in a single instance in other writings. That is to say, what was invariable in the one case contrary to custom was in the other according to custom variable.

The hyphen between the syllables appears fifteen times in the printed editions of the poems and plays, but not once in any record made of the reputed poet during his entire life. This of itself seems to me to establish the name, Shake-speare, as a pseudonym.

EDWIN REED.

Coincidences.

I.

KENT COUNTY.

The author of the Shake-speare plays appears to have had a special prepossession in favor of the people of Kent County, England. In the drama of King Henry VI., written in his youth, he says:

“Kent, in the Commentaries Caesar writ,
Is term'd the civil'st place in all this isle;
Sweet is the country, because full of riches;
The people liberal, valiant, active, wealthy.”

2 King Henry VI., iv. 7, 61.

No compliment of this kind is paid in the plays to any other English county.

The Bacon family came from Kent.

II.

ARISTOCRACY.

The author of the plays was a patrician. He never speaks of the people but in terms of contempt. With him it is always the fool multitude, tag-rag people, sweaty rabblement;—

“The beast with many heads.”

Coriolanus IV., 1, 2.

“The monster with uncounted heads.”

2 King Henry IV, Induction, 18.

Bacon was a patrician, his rank in the peerage having been successively as Sir Francis Bacon, Baron Verulam, and Viscount St. Alban. In sentiment he was an extreme royalist, the champion of the King's prerogative against popular rights. According to him, “the lowest virtues draw praise from the people, the middle virtues work in them astonishment, but of the highest virtues they have no sense or perceiving at all.” He advised all men, when applauded by the multitude, “immediately to examine themselves to see what fault or blunder they may have committed.”

He was fond of using such expressions as these:

“The beast with many heads.”

Charge against Talbot.

“The monster with many heads.”

Conference of Pleasure.

The following will also indicate a like social rank :

“Let me have no lying; it becomes none but tradesmen.” —
Shake-speare. Winter's Tale, iv., 4, 745.

“Men of birth and quality will leave the practice when it comes so low as barbers, surgeons, butchers, and such base mechanical persons.” — *Bacon. Speech on Duelling.*

III.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY.

The author of the Shakespearean poems 'Venus and Adonis' and 'Lucrece' was educated at one or more of the three English universities, Oxford, Cambridge, and the Inns of Court in London. His name is given in such a connection as to indicate that he was a graduate of one or another of them in a book entitled 'Polimanteia,' and printed in Cambridge by the Printer to the University in 1595. He is specifically mentioned therein as the author of the Poems 'Venus and Adonis' and 'Lucrece.'

The particular university, thus indicated as Shakespeare's *alma mater*, it is almost certain, was Cambridge, for a dialectical usage, peculiar to the students there, found its way into 'Titus Andronicus,' a play written, as Coleridge affirms, when the dramatist must have been fresh from college life. Charles and Mary Cowden Clarke also held this view. The usage in question was to substitute the verb *to keep* for *to live*, as in the line,—

"Knock at his study where, they say, he keeps."

No person, however, by the name of Shakespeare, or Shakspeare, was ever enrolled at any of the institutions mentioned above. Indeed, we have no pretence in any quarter that Shakspeare of Stratford ever attended one of them.

The above-stated facts require some elucidation, not only because of their importance, but also because of the extraordinary efforts hitherto made by many Shakspeareans to suppress them.

1. The author of the 'Polimanteia' signed his name to it as W. C., probably William Clerke, who was matriculated as a sizar of Trinity College in

June, 1575, became a scholar there, and, four years later, proceeded B. A. He was soon afterward elected a fellow, and in 1582 commenced M. A. We may therefore safely assume, as Dr. Grosart assumes, in his Introduction to a reprint of the 'Polimanteia,' and as the book itself plainly shows, that Clerke was "familiar with his illustrious contemporaries," and worthy of credence in what he says of them. His character as an author has never been called in question.

2. The book was printed at Cambridge by John Legate, printer to the University, in 1595. It was issued from the press two years after the 'Venus and Adonis' was issued, one year after the Lucrece, but earlier than any Shakespearean play that has come down to us.

3. Prominent among its contents is a letter purporting to have been written by England in her sovereign capacity, and addressed to her Three Daughters, the Universities of Cambridge, Oxford, and Inns of Court. It is in spirit and terms highly eulogistic, especially in comparison with institutions of learning of the same rank on the continent. Then, scattered throughout the text and along the margins of the book are names of many persons who in the writer's opinion have evidently done honor to these institutions by their presence as students in one or more of them. The persons thus named number about thirty. They are called England's grandchildren, as the universities themselves are called England's Daughters. They include Shakespeare, and they include him specifically, too, as the author of the Shakespearean poems 'Venus and Adonis' and

'Lucrece.' With one exception the 'Polimanteia' is thus the first book in English literature, other than the two poems themselves, to contain the name of Shakespeare; indeed, to contain the name as it does, together with the titles of Shakespeare's works as then published, it was absolutely the first.

4. The passages in the 'Polimanteia' stand thus:

" All praise	Wanton
worthy	Adonis "
Lucretia	
Sweet Shak-	
speare	
Eloquent	
Gaveston	

These names and titles are in the margins of the book; a fact, however, of no special significance, for seventeen other names and titles are there also. In another chapter where Queen Elizabeth is eulogized, the author puts her name in the margin.

5. The persons mentioned, including all whose careers we can trace, and the particular universities to which they may be severally assigned are as follows :

Edmund Campion	(Oxford)
William Whitaker	(Cambridge)
William Fulke	(Cambridge)
Thomas Stapleton	(Oxford)
Lawrence Humphrey	(Oxford)
John Rainolds	(Oxford)
Sir Philip Sidney	(Oxford)
Edmund Spenser	(Cambridge)
Henry Stanley	(Oxford)

Ferdinando Stanley	(Oxford)
Sir Christopher Hatton	(Oxford)
Earl of Essex	(Cambridge)
Thomas Campion	(Cambridge)
Nicholas Breton	(Oxford)
William Percy	(Oxford)
Henry Willoughby	(Oxford)
Abraham Fraunce	(Cambridge)
Thomas Lodge	(Oxford, Inns of Court)
Sir John Davies	(Oxford, Inns of Court)
Michael Drayton	(Oxford)
Sir Hugh Plat	(Cambridge, Inns of Court)
Thomas Kidd	(Cambridge)
Gabriel Harvey	(Cambridge)
Thomas Nash	(Cambridge)
William Alablaster	(Cambridge)
Sweet Shakspeare	()
John Lydgate	(Cambridge, Oxford)
Samuel Daniel	(Oxford)

The book is dedicated in terms of most extravagant eulogy to the Earl of Essex, with whom Francis Bacon was then, as legal adviser and friend, closely associated. Bacon's name does not appear in Clerke's list, although he had at that time been out of college nineteen years, was a leading member of Parliament, had produced a work on philosophy, and become generally known as a man of extraordinary talents. Perhaps Clerke included him under a pseudonym, as any one now, in making a list of the distinguished graduates of Miss Franklin's school in Coventry, would insert, not the name of Mary Ann Evans by which one of the pupils was known in school, but that which Mary Ann Evans subse-

quently adopted for literary purposes, George Eliot. In that case the blank space above, in our assignments to the respective universities, would be filled up thus:

(Cambridge, Inns of Court.)

6. From 1595, date of publication of the *Polimanteia*, to 1849, a period of 254 years, this book in its bearings on the education of the author of the plays received from Shakesperean scholars no recognition whatever. It was not mentioned, we believe, by any one of them during that time.

But in 1849 the Rev. N. J. Halpin of Dublin published a learned work on the 'Dramatic Writings' of Shakespeare, and in the course of some observations on Shakespeare's knowledge of the Greek drama made the following statement:

"There is in my possession evidence of the most authentic kind, quite sufficient to satisfy me, that of one (or perhaps more) of the English universities, as then existing, William Shakespeare was a student. Is not this an astounding discovery, which has kept itself *perdue* from the critics until the middle of the nineteenth century?"

It will be seen that Mr. Halpin does not venture to name the book. If we may judge from the tone of his confession, he appears to have been under some personal restraint.

7. From 1849 until the present time, the state of things on which we are commenting has become, if possible, even worse. With hundreds of authors searching or pretending to search every nook and cranny for information relating to Shakespeare's life, and especially to the extent of his knowledge

and where he may have acquired it, not one, so far as we know or can ascertain, has cited the 'Polimanteia,' or even poor frightened Halpin's conviction on the subject. Ingleby, to be sure, criticised the wholly unimportant arrangement of the marginal names and titles as given above; such as, for instance, the insertion of the note, "eloquent Gaveston," between the titles of the two Shakespeare poems; but on the bearings of the book respecting the great question, where was Shakespeare educated or was he educated at all, not a word. Halliwell-Phillipps casually mentions the book in his *Outlines*, and among the formal documents in the second volume quotes from it; but he carefully excludes all reference to it from his index; a fact, however, not surprising in the case of a man who was himself excluded for many years from the privileges of the British Museum library on charges of dishonesty. Sidney Lee says simply, "In 1595, William Clerke in his 'Polimanteia' gave 'all praise' to 'sweet Shakespeare' for his 'Lucretia.'" This is all, for Lee also excluded the subject wholly from his index. Richard Grant White, Charles Allen, Professor Dowden, Thomas Campbell, Howard Staunton, George Brandes, F. J. Furnivall and others never mention either the book or its author.

8. It cannot be claimed that this reticence is un-studied and without significance. Here is a contemporary of the author of the plays, a man of high character, of large acquaintance with men of letters, himself a Cambridge graduate, who practically informs us, in a book printed at a university and dedicated to the Earl of Essex, that the author of the plays was educated at one or more of the English

Universities. Why is this testimony ignored? Why is it concealed from the public?¹

Bacon was educated at Cambridge and Gray's Inn. He entered the university at the age of twelve, and left it three years later without waiting to take a degree, for he was dissatisfied, as he confessed to his amanuensis, Rawley, with the kind of philosophy taught there. From college Bacon went almost immediately to France, returning in 1579. It was in 1579, while he was studying law and living among the enthusiastic young playwrights of Gray's Inn, that the Shakespeare dramas began to be produced.

¹ The spirit of this extraordinary Letter will be well understood from its opening paragraph:

"If from the depth of entire affection I take upon me to deal more plainly than your honorably augmented dignities will well permit, or from too fervent a love overweighingly value you at too high a rate, persuade yourselves (if these be my faults) that the name of a mother hath a privilege to excuse them both; and howsoever a mother to her daughters might more fitly speak in secret and not hard, yet, seeing my naked truth desires not to shroud itself from my greatest enemies, I challenge those kingdoms that have had children to be witnesses of my talk; and if either there be folly in me, for to love so much, or fault in you to deserve so little, then let them blame me of too blind affection, and accuse you of not deserving; and so speedily from Fame's book will I cancel out your praise, and recant my love to a mother's shame. But if I (justly fortunate) have high cause to commend you, and Europe for your sake hath greater cause to commend me, then may I not lawfully with a mother's love show the affection of a grandmother to commend your children?"

The chapter following in the 'Polimanteia' is entitled

ENGLAND TO ALL HER INHABITANTS,

and written without regard to university affiliations.

England to her

deared wit decking admired daughters,
 write and let the worlde know that hea-
 uens harmonic is no musicke, in respect
 of your sweete, and well arte-tuned
 strings: that *Italian Ariosto* did but sha-
 dowe the meaneſt part of thy muse, that
Tassos Godfrey is not worthie to make
 compare with your truelie eternizing
Elizas stile: let France-admired *Bella*,
 and courtlike amarous *Rouſard*. confeſſe
 that there be of your children, that
 in these latter times haue farre surpaſ-
 sed them. Let diuine *Bartasse* eternally
 praise worthie for his weeks worke, say
 the best thinges were made first: Let o-
 ther countries (sweet *Cambridge*) enuie,
 (yet admire) my *Virgil*, thy petrarch, di-
 uine *Spenser*. And vnlesse *Terre*, (a thing
 easie in such simplicitie) deluded by
 dearlie beloved *Delia*, and fortunatelie
 fortunate *Cleopatra*. *Oxford*, thou maist
 extoll thy courte-deare-verse happie
Daniell, whose sweete refined muse, in
 contracted shape; were sufficient a-
 mongst

*M. Alabla-
 ster.
 Spenser and
 others.*

*Lylia clou-
 ped, whose
 seares are
 making.*

*All praise
 worthy.*

*Lucrecia
 Sweet Shak-
 speare.
 Eloquent
 Gaueſton.*

The above is a reproduction of a page of the Polimanteia.

three Daughters.

mongst men, to gaine pardon of the Wanton
 sinne to *Rosemona*, pittie to distressed Adonis.
Cleopatra, and euerliuing praise to her Waffons
 louing *Delta*: Register your childrens heyre.
 petegree in Fames forehead, so may Sowell gra-
 you fill volumes with *Chausers* praise, ced Anthonie
 with *Lydgate*, the Scottish Knight, and deseruet
 such like, whose vnrefined tongues immortall
 farre shorte of the excellencie of this praise from the had
 age, wrote simplie and purelie as the of that diuine Lady
 times weare. And when base and in- who like Corinna
 iurious trades, the sworne enemies to contending with
 Learnings eternitie (a thing vsuall) Pindarus was oft vi-
 shall haue deuoured them, either with torious.
 the fretting cancker worme of mouldie Sir Danid Lynsay.
 time: with *Arabian* spicerie: with eng- Matisilda
 lish honnie: with outlandilh butter honorablely
 (matters of imployment for the aged nored by so
 dayes of our late authors) yet that then sweet a Fœ.
 such (if you thinke them worthie) in Diana.
 despite of base Grosers, (whome I Proculhine,
 charge vpon paine of learnings curse, proculite
 not to handle a leafe of mine) may liue prohani.
 by your meanes, canonized in lear-

R 3 ming

The above is a reproduction of the following page of the Polimanteia.

IV.

SELF-CONFIDENCE.

Shakespeare's self-confidence was unlimited. He believed that his poetry would live forever. We quote from one of his sonnets:

"Not marble, nor the gilded monuments
Of princes, shall outlive this powerful rhyme ;
But you shall shine more bright in these contents
Than unswept stone, besmear'd with sluttish time.
When wasteful war shall statues overturn,
And broils root out the work of masonry,
Nor Mars his sword, nor war's quick fire shall burn
The living record of your memory.
'Gainst death and all-oblivious enmity
Shall you pace forth ; your praise shall still find room
Even in the eyes of all posterity,
That wear this world out to the ending doom.
So, till the judgment that yourself arise,
You live in this, and dwell in lovers' eyes."

Sonnet 55.

Again:

"Thy eternal summer shall not fade,
Nor lose possession of that fair thou ow'st ;
Nor shall Death brag thou wander'st in his shade,
When in eternal lines to time thou grow'st.
So long as men can breathe, or eyes can see,
So long lives this, and this gives life to thee."

Sonnet 18.

Bacon's self-confidence was also unlimited. He claimed to have been "born for the service of mankind." He began one of his works with this extraordinary assertion: "Francis of Verulam thought thus; and it was his opinion that both the living and posterity ought to know the method he pursued and the conclusions he reached." In the first book of 'The Advancement of Learning' he tells the King that inasmuch as "there has not been since Christ's

time a monarch so learned in all literature and erudition as yourself, there ought, therefore, to be some solid work, fixed memorial and immortal monument erected to your honor;" and such a work, or one tending to that end, he goes on to say, "I now present to your majesty." The two authors promise, one to his friend and the other to his King, through their own eulogistic tributes and in almost identical language, immortal fame.

V.

VOCABULARY.

A common farm laborer in England uses, it is said, five hundred words. The average educated business man, three thousand. A writer, like Thackeray, five thousand. The great poet, scholar and publicist, John Milton, used seven thousand. According to Professor George L. Craik, a recognized authority in this branch of science, the author of the Shakespeare plays and poems used twenty-one thousand (inflectional forms not counted). This is admitted to have been the largest vocabulary ever possessed by any individual of the human race.

The extent of Bacon's vocabulary has not been definitely ascertained. We are certain only that it was immense, probably the greatest, with one exception (if it be an exception), ever known. Dr. Samuel Johnson, the lexicographer, said that "a dictionary of the English language might be compiled from Bacon's works alone." Bacon made a study of comparative philology in order to show, as he said, "in what points each language excels and in what it fails, so that not only may languages be enriched by mutual exchanges, but also the several beauties of each be combined and thus made to constitute a model of speech itself."

VI.

EXTENT OF KNOWLEDGE.

We quote from Dr. H. H. Furness, editor of the *Variorum Shakespeare*, now in course of publication:

"Shakespeare [author of the Plays] so devoted himself to the study of every trade, profession, pursuit and accomplishment that he became master of them all, which his plays clearly show him to have been."

We quote also from Francis Bacon in *Youth*:

"I have taken all knowledge to be my province."

VII.

PREMATURE OLD AGE.

The Sonnets were first mentioned as in existence by Frances Meres in 1598. The author confesses that he was then a prematurely old man, thus:

“That time of year thou may'st in me behold,
 When yellow leaves, or none, or few do hang
 Upon those boughs which shake against the cold,
 Bare ruin'd choirs, where late the sweet birds sang.
 In me thou seest the twilight of such day
 As after sunset fadeth in the west,
 Which by-and-by black night doth take away,
 Death's second self, that seals up all the rest.”

Sonnet 73.

The dramatist (whether Shakspeare or Bacon) could not have been over thirty-seven when the above was written.

Bacon considered himself an old man when he had reached the age of thirty-one. In a letter to his uncle, Burleigh, written in 1592, he said:

“I am now somewhat ancient; one and thirty years is a great deal of sand in the hour-glass.”

We have the same sentiment from him, (peculiar to poets) in a letter to Cecil (1599):

“Her Majesty being begun in my first years, I would be sorry she should estrange in my last years,—for so I account them, reckoning by health, not by age.”

VIII.

ORATORY.

The dramatist was a great orator. Antony's speech over the dead body of Caesar is famous as perhaps the best specimen of the art as yet produced in the history of the world. What Shake-speare says of Prince Hal in this respect would certainly apply to himself:

"When he speaks,
The air, a charter'd libertine, is still,
And the mute wonder lurketh in men's ears,
To steal his sweet and honey'd sentences."

King Henry V., I. 1, 47.

Bacon was also a great orator. Ben Jonson says that "the fear of every man who heard him was, lest he should make an end." Another contemporary pronounced him, "the eloquentest man that was ever born in this island."

IX.

KNOWLEDGE OF LAW.

That the plays and poems of Shakespeare are saturated with legal principles, technically expressed, no one, competent to form an opinion on the subject, can possibly deny. We quote the following from well known jurists:

"I need go no further than this sonnet (46), which is so intensely legal in its language and imagery that without a considerable knowledge of English forensic procedure it cannot be fully understood."

Lord Campbell, Chief Justice of England.

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

Idem.

"He was a ripe, learned and profound lawyer, so saturated with precedents that at once in his highest and sweetest flights he colors everything with legal dyes."

Appleton Morgan, LL. D., President of the N. Y. Shakespeare Society.

"He must have obtained his knowledge of law from actual practice."

Heard's 'Shakespeare as a Lawyer.'

With this conclusion all must sooner or later agree.

Francis Bacon was Lord Chancellor of England, and, with possibly one exception (Sir Edward Coke), the greatest jurist of his age.

X.

EARLY PLAYS.

Bacon spent the years of his childhood partly in London, and partly at his father's country seat at Gorhambury, near St. Albans; in 1573 he was matriculated at Cambridge University; from 1576 to 1579 he was in France; on his return to London he took up his residence as a law student at Gray's Inn; in 1584 he entered Parliament.

The first in order of composition of the historical dramas of Shake-speare was 'King Henry VI.' It bears unmistakable marks of the immaturity of a great genius. It bears, also, marks of the author's personal acquaintance with those localities where, previously to the date of the play, Bacon had lived. Of the seventy-eight scenes into which its three parts are divided, thirty are laid in London, where Bacon was born; three in St. Albans, where he was brought up; twenty in France, and in those provinces of France which he had visited; one is laid in the Temple, an institution for lawyers closely associated with Gray's Inn; and one in the Houses of Parliament.¹

¹A young author's first work almost always bespeaks his recent pursuits."—SAMUEL TAYLOR COLERIDGE.

XI.

THE FRENCH LANGUAGE.

The author of the Plays knew the French language. He had even a colloquial use of it, as we find demonstrated in the drama of 'King Henry V.,' where long conversations are carried on in that tongue. This would seem to indicate for him an actual residence of some considerable time in the country.

Bacon was sent to France by his father in the suite of the English ambassador, Sir Amias Paulet, in September, 1576, when he was fifteen years of age. He returned in March, 1579, having acquired a mastery of the language during a residence there of two years and six months.

XII.

ENGLISH CAMPAIGNS IN FRANCE.

In his earliest historical play, written in or about 1590, the dramatist devotes himself in part to the English campaigns conducted in France during the reign of King Henry VI. In so doing he displays an intimate knowledge of the territory where the battles were fought, including the cities of Orleans, Blois, Tours, and Poitiers. In Orleans, as we have already pointed out elsewhere, he mentions a church where pilgrims were accustomed to resort, calling it by the name of the saint to which it was dedicated. Richard Grant White wonders at this local and apparently uncalled-for reference in the play.

Francis Bacon was in France in 1577, and, for reasons not stated, visited the cities of Orleans, Blois and Tours, which were immortalized by the dramatist for the parts they played in those campaigns. In Poitiers, where Edward, the Black Prince, won his great victory, he spent three months.

XIII.

JOAN OF ARC.

That the author of the Plays had resided in France in early life, and under circumstances that gave him unusual access to some of the political records of the country, seems to be indicated in the Plays themselves. 'In 'King Henry VI.,' Part 1, we have a most extraordinary scene in which the famous Joan of Arc and the Duke of Burgundy are the principal characters. The Duke is an ally of the English. He is marching at the head of his troops toward Paris, while the French King, also at the head of his troops and accompanied by the Maid, appears on the field in the distance. A herald demands a parley, and then the following dialogue ensues:

- King.* A parley with the Duke of Burgundy !
Bur. Who craves a parley with the Burgundy ?
King. The princely Charles of France, thy countryman.
Bur. What say'st thou, Charles ? for I am marching hence.
King. Speak, Pucelle, and enchant him with thy words.
Joan. Brave Burgundy, undoubted hope of France !
 Stay, let thy humble handmaid speak to thee.
Bur. Speak on ; but be not over-tedious.
Joan. Look on thy country, look on fertile France,
 And see the cities and the towns defaced
 By wasting ruin of the cruel foe.
 As looks the mother on her lowly babe,
 When death doth close his tender dying eyes,
 See, see the pining malady of France ;
 Behold the wounds, the most unnatural wounds,
 Which thou thyself hast given her woeful breast.
 O, turn thy edged sword another way ;
 Strike those that hurt, and hurt not those that help.
 One drop of blood drawn from thy country's bosom
 Should grieve thee more than streams of foreign gore.
 Return thee, therefore, with a flood of tears,
 And wash away thy country's stained spots.
Bur. Either she hath bewitch'd me with her words

Act II.
 Sc. 3

Or nature makes me suddenly relent.

Joan. Besides, all French and France exclaims on thee,
 Doubting thy birth and lawful progeny.
 Who join'st thou with but with a lordly nation
 That will not trust thee but for profit's sake?
 When Talbot hath set footing once in France,
 And fashion'd thee that instrument of ill,
 Who then but English Henry will be lord,
 And thou be thrust out like a fugitive?
 Call we to mind, and mark but this for proof:
 Was not the Duke of Orleans thy foe?
 And was he not in England prisoner?
 But when they heard he was thine enemy,
 They set him free without his ransom paid,
 In spite of Burgundy and all his friends.
 See, then, thou fight'st against thy countrymen,
 And join'st with them will be thy slaughter-men.
 Come, come, return; return, thou wandering lord;
 Charles and the rest will take thee in their arms.

Bur. I am vanquished; these haughty words of hers
 Have batter'd me like roaring cannon-shot,
 And made me almost yield upon my knees.
 Forgive me, country, and sweet countrymen,
 And, lords, accept this hearty, kind embrace.
 My forces and my power of men are yours;
 So farewell, Talbot; I'll no longer trust thee."—iii. 3.

No such interview as above described ever took place. The duke did, indeed, abandon the cause of the English, but not until 1435, four years after the death of Joan. But was this scene, therefore, wholly and absolutely an invention of the dramatist? Did the author merely anticipate the duke's defection, and, by connecting Joan of Arc with it, violate, in spirit as well as in letter, the truth of history?

In 1780, according to the well-known historian of the House of Burgundy, M. Brugière de Barante, some one in France for the first time put in print a letter, dated July 17, 1429, addressed to the then reigning duke, and written by Joan of Arc. It con-

tains a passionate appeal to the duke to take precisely the same course which is urged upon him in the play. The letter is as follows :

“ I HESUS MARIA

“ High and mighty Prince, Duke of Burgundy, Joan la Pucelle prays you, for the sake of God in heaven, my rightful and sovereign Lord, to make a long and durable peace with the King of France. Pardon each the other with a good heart, as good Christians ought to do; if it please you to make war, go against the Saracens.

“ Prince of Burgundy, I pray you, I supplicate and entreat you, as humbly as I am able to do, to make no further war upon the kingdom of France; withdraw at once all your forces from the towns and fortresses you are occupying in the kingdom. The noble king of France is ready to make peace with you, on any terms consistent with his honor; you will find no difficulty with him.

“ I warn you, however, in the name of God in heaven, my rightful and sovereign Lord, and for the sake of your own well-being and honor, that you can win no battle against the loyal people of France; and that all those who war against the said kingdom of France, war against Jesus, the King, the King of heaven, and of all the world, my rightful and sovereign Lord. I pray you and beseech you with clasped hands not to do battle or fight against us, neither you, nor your family, nor your subjects. Be assured that however large an army you may bring against us, you will gain no victory over me; it will be a pity to fight a great battle and shed the blood of those who come against us.

“ It is now three weeks since I wrote to you and sent good letters by a herald, asking you to come to terms with his sacred majesty who, to-day, Sunday, July 17, is in the city of Rheims. I have received no response to those letters, nor indeed any tidings of the herald.

“ I commend you to God. May he protect you, if it so please Him; and I pray God to give us peace. Written at Rheims, the said 17th of July [1429].”

It is safe to say that the existence of this letter was unknown in England in the time of Shakespeare. Neither Hall nor Holinshed nor any other English chronicler mentions it. It appears to have

been unknown also in France, for it remained in manuscript, buried among the ducal papers at Lisle, the capital of Burgundy, for a period of three hundred and fifty years after it was written. Fabert, who wrote a history of the House of Burgundy in 1687, knew nothing of it. And yet this identical letter opened the series of negotiations that finally resulted in the treaty of peace in 1435, as represented in the play. The dramatist simply changed its form, preferring a spoken address in the open field as better suited to stage effects. Even for this he had an historic basis, for the duke is known to have marched to Paris over the plain of Rouen in the summer of 1429, and to have agreed to a truce soon after his receipt of the Maid's letter.

Here, then, is substantial proof that the author of 'King Henry VI.' was acquainted with an important fact in French history which English and French historians did not discover until more than two centuries after the date of the play.

The only rational explanation of the mystery seems to us to be this: the author we call Shakespeare was in France when he first formed the plan of portraying dramatically the foreign campaigns of his countrymen in the reign of Henry VI.; and that in pursuance of this design he not only visited the scenes made memorable by those great campaigns (as we know that Bacon did), but that he also personally gathered some of the materials for his undertaking from the French and Burgundian national archives. Not the slightest evidence exists to show that William Shakspeare of Stratford was ever in France.

XIV.

SONNETING.

At various times, beginning in or about 1598, the author of the Shake-speare plays wrote 154 sonnets. They are the finest in the language.

In 1599 Bacon wrote a sonnet to Queen Elizabeth, which was highly praised. Unfortunately it is now lost.

XV.

JOHN FLORIO.

In the year 1591, the well-known Italian teacher, John Florio, published a book entitled 'Second Frutes,' in London. The book contained a remarkable sonnet, addressed to Florio, but name of author not given. The sonnet was as follows:

" Sweet friend whose name agrees with thy increase,
 How fit a rivall art thou of the Spring?
 For when each branche hath left his flourishing,
 And green-lockt Sommers shadie pleasures cease,
 She makes the Winter's storms repose in peace,
 And spend her franchise on each living thing.
 The dazies sprout, the little birds doo sing,
 Hearbes, gummes, and plants doo vaunt of their release ;
 So when that all our English Witts lay dead,
 (Except the Laurell that is evergreene)
 Thou with thy Frutes our barrenness o'respread,
 And set thy flowrie pleasance to be seene.
 Sutch frutes, sutch flowrets of moralitie,
 Were nere before brought out of Italie."

Phaethon.

Judging from internal evidence, Professors Baynes and Minto pronounced this sonnet the work of the author of the Shakespeare plays.

A few years later, however, Florio published another book ('A Worlde of Words'), and in it took occasion to refer to the sonnet of 1591 as having been written "by a gentleman, a friend of mine, that loved better to be a poet than to be counted so." That is, according to Florio himself, the author was high born, a personal friend of his, and a concealed poet. Bacon answers to all of these qualifications: He was a *gentleman* (patrician), his father having been Sir Nicholas Bacon, Keeper of the Great Seal; he was Florio's *friend*, having often entertained

Florio at his home in Gorhambury; and on his own confession, as made to Sir John Davies, he was a "concealed poet." To the third of these points, the only one concerning which there can be the slightest doubt, Aubrey, Milton's friend, also testifies: "His lordship [Bacon] was a good poet, but concealed."

XVI.

GROWTH OF DEMOCRATIC SENTIMENT.

In the first draft of 'Hamlet,' published, as we have said, in 1603, but produced on the stage in 1586, the prince, referring to the clown in the gravedigger's scene, says to Horatio,—

"An excellent fellow, by the lord, Horatio;
These *seven* years have I noticed it; the toe of the peasant
Comes so near the heel of the courtier
That he galls his kibe."—v. 1.

In the second quarto (1604) this speech appears as follows:

"By the Lord, Horatio; this *three* years have I taken note of it; the age is grown so picked that the toe of the peasant comes so near the heel of the courtier, he galls his kibe."

The period of seven years in the first edition gives place to that of three years in the second.

Bacon returned from the continent, where he had been living from boyhood, in 1579; consequently, in 1586, he had been an observer of manners and customs in and around the court of Elizabeth, to which he had had easy access, for a period of seven years.

In 1603, we find Bacon full of alarm over the progress of democratic sentiment in the country. He then wrote to his cousin, Secretary Cecil, that he thought of abandoning politics and putting himself wholly "upon his pen;" he even predicted the revolution that followed forty years later. This fear had its chief origin in the last parliament of Queen Elizabeth, when he saw the House of Commons converted into a pandemonium over public grievances.

The play of 'Hamlet' was re-written and re-published in 1604; the last parliament under Elizabeth sat three years earlier, in 1601. Hence the substitution of this last-named period for the first.

XVII.

INNS OF COURT.

Bacon, as we have seen, was a member of Gray's Inn; he had lodgings there during the greater part of his life. In close alliance with Gray's Inn was the Inner Temple, the two fraternal institutions always uniting in their Christmas revels, and each bearing its associate's coat-of-arms over its own gateway. Of their internal affairs the public knew but little, for guests were seldom admitted behind the scenes.

The Inner Temple was governed in accordance with some very remarkable rules. One of these rules, handed down from the time of the founders, the old Knights Templar, enjoined silence at meals. Members, dining in the hall, were expected to make their wants known "by signs," or, if that were not practicable, in low tones or whispers only.

Another rule provided that members should seat themselves in the dining-hall in messes of four, the tables being of the exact length required to accommodate three messes each. This arrangement prevails to the present day.

Shake-speare was familiar with these petty details. He laid one of the scenes of 'King Henry VI.' in the Temple garden itself, where we have, properly enough, a legal discussion on the rights of certain claimants to the throne. In the course of this discussion the following colloquy takes place :

- Plantaganet.* Great lords and gentlemen, what means this silence?
Dare no man answer in a case of truth?
Suffolk. Within the Temple hall we were *too loud*;

The garden here is more convenient.

Plan. Thanks, gentle sir ;
Come let us *four* to dinner."—ii. 4.

Edward J. Castle, Esq., of London, a member of the Queen's Council and a life-long resident in the Temple, comments on the above passage as follows:

"This reference to the Temple Gardens, not saying whether the Inner or the Middle Temple is meant, curiously enough points to the writer being a member of Gray's Inn ; . . . an Inner or a Middle Temple man would have given his Inn its proper title."—*Shakespeare, Bacon, Jonson, and Greene ; a Study*, 65 n."

Gray's Inn garden had not been laid out when the play of 'King Henry VI.' was written.

XVIII.

COMMONPLACE BOOKS.

In one of the Shake-speare sonnets every scholar is advised to keep a commonplace book.

“Look ! what thy memory cannot contain
Commit to these waste blanks, and thou shalt find
Those children nurs'd, deliver'd from thy brain
To take a new acquaintance of thy mind.
These offices, so oft as thou wilt look,
Shall profit thee, and much enrich thy book.”

Sonnet 77.

Bacon kept a commonplace book. He began it in December, 1594, and continued it until January, 1596. A few years later (1605), after he had tested its value in his own experience, he said: “I am not ignorant of the prejudice imputed to the use of commonplace books, but . . . I hold the keeping of them to be of great use in studying.”

XIX.

THE NORTHUMBERLAND MANUSCRIPTS.

Some of Bacon's manuscripts, bound together with a few others in the form of a volume, and evidently belonging to the age of Elizabeth, came to light about forty years ago (1867) in a private library in London. Among them, according to the table of contents, were once included two of the Shakespearean plays, 'Richard II.' and 'Richard III.' These, however, at some unknown time and for some unknown reason, had been abstracted from the book and never recovered.

In close proximity to these Shakespearean titles on the cover the name of William Shakespeare, as printed on the plays, and not as it appears in a single instance on the records at Stratford, had been written and rewritten several times. Also, the long Latin word *honorificabilitudine*, found in 'Love's Labor's Lost' (a play first printed in 1598, at about the time this strange volume was bound up), is seen there. A few lines from the Shakespearean poem 'Lucrece' were also on the cover. And the same person who wrote Shakespeare's name in so many places there also wrote Bacon's with it, over and over again, thus showing that, at the time when the Shakespearean plays were beginning to come from the press, these two names were closely associated together in the mind of, at least, one contemporary, and that one having access in the most confidential manner possible to Bacon's private papers.

The present custodian of this collection at the Northumberland House library expresses the opinion, it is said, that the MS. contents of the cover, in-

cluding some of the entries, if not all of them, that connect the book with the poems and plays of Shakespeare, are in Bacon's handwriting. An accomplished expert, employed in this line of work by the city of Boston, Mass., concurs in this view.

It thus appears that the only known place in the world where any of the manuscripts of the Shakespearean plays ever existed, was in Bacon's portfolio.

XX.

FRIENDSHIP FOR LORD SOUTHAMPTON.

Shake-speare dedicated his poem 'Venus and Adonis' in terms of social equality to Lord Southampton, in part as follows :

" RIGHT HONORABLE:

I know not how I shall offend in dedicating my unpolished lines to your lordship, nor how the world will censure me for choosing so strong a prop to support so weak a burden; only, if your honor seem but pleased, I account myself highly praised, and vow to take advantage of all idle hours, till I have honored you with some graver labor."

It appears from this that the Earl's consent to the dedication had not been previously obtained; a circumstance so improvident in a play-actor that the poet would probably, as a consequence, have lost his ears.

One year later (1594), this time in terms of high friendship, Shake-speare also dedicated the ' Rape of Lucrece ' to Lord Southampton, thus :

" The love I dedicate to your lordship is without end, whereof this pamphlet, without beginning, is but a superfluous moiety. . . . 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 show greater; meantime, as it is, it is bound to your lordship, to whom I wish long life, still lengthened with all happiness."

Evidently the first dedication had given no offence, for the reason, we venture to say, that the dedicator and dedicatee were both noblemen.

Bacon was politically and socially an intimate friend of Lord Southampton. Both were members of Gray's Inn, and both were closely attached to the personal fortunes of the Earl of Essex.

On the occasion of Southampton's prospective re-

lease from imprisonment in the Tower Bacon wrote him the following letter :

“It may please your Lordship:

I would have been very glad to have presented my humble service to your Lordship by my attendance, if I could have foreseen that it should not have been displeasing unto you. And therefore, because I would commit no error, I choose to write; assuring your Lordship (how credible [incredible] soever it may seem to you at first, yet it is as true as a thing that God knoweth) that this great change hath wrought in me no other change toward your Lordship than this, that I may safely be now that which I was before. And so, craving no other pardon than for troubling you with this letter, I do not now begin, but continue to be

Your Lordship's humble and much devoted.”

The estrangement between the two was caused by Southampton's complicity in Essex's act of treason two years before. They had previously been the closest of friends.

XXI.

VENUS AND ADONIS.

In the dedication of the poem 'Venus and Adonis,' published in 1593, to Southampton, the author calls this poem "the first heir of his [my] invention." A work of invention, as the term was then used in such connection as this, meant one of imagination; it was applied to poetry and the drama. It is curious to see into what a dilemma this statement of the author has thrown Shakespearean scholars. If the poem were the author's first poetic composition, as he says it was, it must have ante-dated every Shakespearean play. It must also have ante-dated the reputed poet's arrival in London, for Shakespearean plays had been on the boards there for years before that more or less important event occurred. Richard Grant White says that Shakspeare brought it with him from Stratford "in his pocket." But here another and perhaps a still greater difficulty confronts us. We are quite certain that the poem could not have been written by a citizen of Stratford who had had no other means of education than that the town afforded. Not a word of patois appears in it, nor anything inconsistent with the purest, most elegant and scholarly English of the time. Hence on the ordinary hypothesis no escape from this dilemma is possible. The difficulty on that basis is to this day unsolved and insoluble.

On the other hand, if Bacon wrote the poem, it must be conceded that he wrote the plays also. The latter down to the date of the poem were anonymous. In the two cases of poems and plays, however, the reputation of authorship was very different. To be

known as a writer of plays would have disgraced and ruined Bacon; but for a poem, especially one under a pseudonym, he might have safely called it, whenever written, the first of his inventions, ignoring all others. The pseudonym did not appear on a play until 1598, after several plays had been published; it did appear on the first Shakespearean poem.

XXII.

THE STAGE.

The Shakespeare plays began to appear on the stage in London in or about 1580, the 'Two Gentlemen of Verona' certainly as early as 1585, before the Queen, and the 'Hamlet' in 1586. They continued to be acted, sometimes several in the same year and frequently to crowded houses, during the life time of the author, whoever the latter may have been.

The difference in this respect between the two candidates for the honors of their authorship is significant.

William Shakspeare, the play-actor, lived in a community to which theatrical performances were obnoxious. In 1602 the town authorities of Stratford prohibited everything of the kind under a penalty of ten shillings; the penalty was increased to ten pounds (about \$500 in our money) in 1612. At the last mentioned date Shakspeare had returned to Stratford, had been living there continuously for eight years, and yet, though the richest man in town, he does not seem to have exerted any influence whatever in favor of such performances, even of one of his own plays (if he ever wrote any), before his fellow-townsmen. At his death he possessed no book, dramatic or otherwise, and nothing to indicate that he had, or ever had had, as author, any interest in the drama.

Francis Bacon cherished a high opinion of the stage as a means of inculcating virtue. He recommended that the drama be taught in the schools. He even drafted a theatre building to be erected near

him, and provided under it a dressing-room for the actors as large as the auditorium itself. His brother Anthony, who was in full sympathy with him on all points, removed at one time from Gray's Inn, where he had been living with Francis, to the neighborhood of Bull's Inn where he could conveniently attend a theatre, and one accustomed to put the Shakespeare plays on its boards. The two brothers had such a penchant for the business of play-acting that their mother, a puritan, severely chided them for it.

XXIII.

USE OF OTHERS' PLOTS.

The dramatist is noted for his frequent use of others' plots on which to base his own dramas. For instance :

'The Two Gentlemen of Verona' was founded on Jorge de Montemayor's Spanish romance of Diana.

'Hamlet,' on the History of Hamblet, originally composed in Latin by the Dane, Saxo Grammaticus.

'Othello,' on an Italian novel by Giraldo Cinthio.

'All's Well that Ends Well,' on one, also in Italian, by Boccaccio.

'Twelfth Night,' on one by Bandello, either in the original Italian, or a French version of it.

'The Winter's Tale, on Greene's Pandosto.

'Romeo and Juliet,' on one in Massutio's collection.

'Timon of Athens', on Lucian in untranslated Greek.

'Julius Cæsar,' on Plutarch.

'Anthony and Cleopatra,' also on Plutarch.

'Cymbeline, on Boccaccio.'

In Bacon's first sketch of his history of the reign of Henry VII. he explains why he did not begin that work farther back in time. It was because he would then fail to get the help he wanted from historians who had preceded him. He was content to leave to earlier writers the simple actions of the times to be treated, provided that he himself could enrich the narrative (as he said) "with the counsels, and the speeches, and the notable peculiarities." Hence his frequent use of the plots of others. This was exactly what Shake-speare did.

XXIV.

LOVE'S LABOR'S LOST.

'Love's Labor's Lost' is one of the earliest of the Shakespeare dramas. Mr. Staunton assigns the date of its composition to a period somewhere between 1587 and 1591. The best evidence indicates that it was written in or about 1588.

The scene is laid at the court of Navarre, a small rude kingdom situated between France and Spain among the Pyrenees Mountains. The writer of the play seems to have been strangely familiar not only with this distant and at that time little-known territory, but also with its internal politics, for he has introduced, as *dramatis personæ*, the king himself and the leading councillors of state, mostly under their proper names. The king was at a later day the famous Henry IV. of France, but, as he was living when the play was published in 1598, Shakespeare has given him the name of Ferdinand. Of the king's councillors, we have also in the play Biron and Longaville (Longueville), both of whom were active in the cause of Henry, and Boyet (Bois), who was the king's marshal at Paris and who came to Navarre in the train of the princess.

The question arises, how did the dramatist acquire this intimate knowledge of the court of Navarre in 1588, at so early a period in the career of its king?

William Shakspeare came to London from an illiterate town, himself wholly illiterate, in or about 1586, one year or so only before the composition of the play. On the other hand, Anthony Bacon went to the Continent in 1579, and for five years — to wit, from 1585 to 1590 — was an honored guest at Henry's

court in Navarre, "on terms of close intimacy," says the Dictionary of National Biography (ii. 325), "with the king's councillors," and in confidential correspondence with his brother Francis in London.

The author of the play had knowledge, also, of a very obscure event in the history of Navarre, which, it is safe to say, was unknown in England in the time of Shake-speare, especially to persons who had never crossed the channel. We find it in the chronicles of Enguerrand de Monstrelet, where it is thus narrated : —

" Charles, King of Navarre, came to Paris to wait on the King. He negotiated so successfully with the King and his Privy Council that he obtained a gift of the castle of Nemours, with some of its dependant castlewicks, which territory was made a duchy. He instantly did homage for it, and at the same time surrendered to the King the Castle of Cherbourg, the county of Evreux, and all other lordships he possessed within the kingdom of France, renouncing all claim or profit in them to the King and to his successors, on consideration that with this duchy of Nemours the King of France engaged to pay him two hundred thousand gold crowns of the King our Lord." — i. 54.

This is given in the play as follows : —

" Madame, your father here doth intimate
 The payment of a hundred thousand crowns,
 Being but the one half of an entire sum
 Disbursed by my father in his wars.
 But say that he or we (as neither have)
 Received that sum; yet there remains unpaid
 A hundred thousand more." — ii. 1.

The Chronicles of Monstrelet were not translated into English until 1809, or more than two hundred years after the play was written. That Shake-speare, the dramatist, was perfectly competent to read Monstrelet in the original French, however, there is sufficient evidence in the play itself. He puns twice in that language; once when he uses the word

“capon” in the double sense of a fowl and a love-letter, and again the word “point” as the tip of a sword and a strong French negative. The play is also full of sentences in Latin, Spanish, and Italian, so much so that Professor Stapfer thinks it “overcumbered with learning, not to say pedantic.” Another commentator finds in it a “manifest ostentation of book-learning.” Francis Bacon, it must be remembered, spent nearly three years in France and at other places on the continent in his youth, after a course of study at Cambridge University.

Singularly enough, also, the embassy of the princess itself had an historical basis. Catherine de Medici made a journey from Paris to Navarre, “with many beautiful ladies,” it is expressly stated, “in her train,” in 1586, of which, it is quite safe to say, there could not have been any public account, known in England, in 1588. This took place, however, during Anthony Bacon’s residence in Navarre.

In ‘All’s Well that Ends Well,’ we read, —

“I am St. Jacques’ pilgrim, thither gone.” — iii. 4.

St. Jacques had a church dedicated to him at Orleans, to which in the time of Francis Bacon’s visit to that city pilgrims were used to resort. This fact could scarcely have then been known in England, certainly not with such prominence as to suggest the statement in the text; for, as Richard Grant White says, “it has no relation whatever to the dramatic progress, the interest, or even the vraisemblance of the scene. For Shake-speare’s purpose one saint was as good as another, — St. George, St. Andrew, excepted.”

Mr. George James of Birmingham, Eng., calls attention to the use of the word *l'envoy* in this play. The word is in the highest degree technical. Etymologically considered, it means simply what is sent, but, as defined by the dramatist himself, it is the last couplet of a song, —

“ An epilogue or discourse, to make plain
Some obscure precedence that hath tofore been sain.” — iii. 1.

Such songs, according to a custom peculiar to France, were written in competition for prizes, and, it is needless to add, would have been unknown at that time to a foreigner who had not studied French lyric poetry on the spot.

Mr. James has also been able to connect one of the principal characters of the play historically with Francis Bacon. He identifies Antonio Perez, the well-known Spanish refugee, with Don Armado. Perez visited England in 1593, and at once, joining the followers of Essex, was presented to the Bacon brothers, with whom for a time he seems to have been on terms of intimacy. The intimacy, however, was of short duration, for the Spaniard speedily developed so much affectation and bombast in the courtly circles to which he had been admitted that he soon fell into contempt. Essex left London to avoid him. In the following year Perez published a book under the assumed name of Raphael Peregrino, an undoubted allusion to which Mr. James discovers in ‘Love’s Labor’s Lost.’ Holophernes is ridiculing Don Armado, who, like Perez, is a “traveller from Spain” and noted for his bombastic style of writing, and says of him, —

“ He is too pick'd, too spruce, too affected, too odd, as it were, too *peregrinate*, as I may call it.” — v. 1.

As if to make the reference more pointed and unmistakable, Sir Nathaniel replies, —

“A most singular and choice epithet,”

and at once enters it in his note-book. Don Armado is, of course, a caricature of Perez.

‘Love’s Labor’s Lost’ was first printed in 1598, with the statement on its title-page that it had been “newly corrected and augmented.” This parody on Perez’ sobriquet was evidently one of the augmentations.

But it is in the *motif* or *raison d’être* of the comedy that we find the strongest proof of its Baconian authorship. ‘Love’s Labor’s Lost’ stands, indeed, as one of Bacon’s earliest protests against the barren philosophy of his time.

According to the play, the King of Navarre and his nobles pledge themselves under oath to retire from the world for three years and give their whole attention during that time to study. They are to lay aside all the cares, obligations, and pleasures of life for this purpose. The comedy turns upon the utter futility of such a scheme. It is a travesty on the kind of learning, and particularly on the methods of acquiring learning, then in vogue. For ages men had sought knowledge by turning their backs upon nature and upon human life. All that they had wanted was Aristotle and the Fathers; all that they acquired was, in the language of Hamlet, “words, words, words.”

In the ‘Advancement of Learning’ Bacon attributes to this method of study what he calls the “first distemper of learning.” He says: —

“Men have withdrawn themselves too much from the contempla-

tion of nature and the observations of experience, and have tumbled up and down in their own reasons and conceits.

“As many substances in nature which are solid do putrefy and corrupt into worms, so it is the property of good and sound knowledge to putrefy into a number of subtle, idle, unwholesome and (as I may term them) vermiculate questions, which have indeed a kind of quickness and life of spirit, but no soundness of matter or goodness of quality. This kind of degenerate learning did chiefly reign amongst the schoolmen; who had sharp and strong wits, abundance of leisure, and small variety of reading; but their wits being shut up in the cells of a few authors (chiefly Aristotle, their dictator), as their persons were shut up in the cells of monasteries and colleges, and knowing little history, either of nature or time, did, out of no great quantity of matter and infinite agitation of wit, spin out unto us those laborious webs of learning which are extant in their books. For the wit and mind of man, if it work upon matter, which is the contemplation of the creatures of God, worketh according to the stuff, and is limited thereby; but if it work upon itself, as the spider worketh his web, then it is endless, and brings forth cobwebs of learning, admirable for the fineness of thread and work, but of no substance or profit.”— Book I.

Here, then, is the key to the drama of ‘Love’s Labor’s Lost.’ It was Bacon’s first indictment against the Aristotelian philosophy as it had been studied by the schoolmen, and as it was still studied and taught in his own time. The lesson it teaches is this: that the closer the scholar keeps himself in touch with his fellow-men, the more successful will he be in the pursuit of truth. The rays of the sun give out no heat till they strike the earth; so those of truth cannot warm or fructify till they come into actual contact with human life.

Bacon left the University of Cambridge in his sixteenth year, before the completion of his course and without a degree. He did this, as he afterwards explained to Dr. Rawley, because he was disgusted with the methods of study which prevailed there, and which, it appears, are ridiculed in ‘Love’s Labor’s Lost.’

XXV.

DOCTOR CAIUS.

One of the most amusing characters in Shakespeare is Dr. Caius in the 'Merry Wives of Windsor.' He is an irascible, hot-headed French physician who is ready to draw his rapier on the slightest provocation against anybody who comes in his way, but with a special antipathy toward the honest Welsh parson, Sir Hugh Evans. Seeing in Evans a possible rival for the hand of Mistress Anne Page, he sends a challenge to him, charging the messenger who carries it, —

"You jack'nape, give-a this letter to Sir Hugh; by gar, it is a challenge; I vill cut his troat in de Park; and I vill teach a scurvy jack-a-nape priest to meddle—by gar, I vill kill de jack priest."
— i. 4.

At the appointed time and place for the duel the parson fails to appear, whereupon the following colloquy occurs between Caius and his servant: —

"*Caius.* Vat is de clock, Jack?

"*Rugby.* 'T is past the hour, sir, that Hugh promised to meet.

"*Caius.* By gar, he has save his soul, dat he is no come; he has pray his Pible well, dat he is no come; by gar, Jack Rugby, he is dead already if he be come.

"*Rugby.* He is wise, sir; he knew your worship would kill him, if he came.

"*Caius.* By gar, de herring is no dead so as I vill kill him. Take your rapier, Jack; I vill tell you how I vill kill him.

"*Rugby.* Alas, sir, I cannot fence.

"*Caius.* Villany, take your rapier." — ii. 3.

On another occasion he threatens Simple, whom Mistress Quickly for his safety had hidden in a closet, with instant death.

It may astonish some of our readers to learn that this ridiculous character in the play was drawn from life. The prototype was Dr. John Caius of Cam-

bridge University, a physician, the re-founder of Gonville Hall (which still in part bears his name), and in his relations with the students an exceedingly choleric and revengeful instructor. His true name was Kaye, but as he had been educated abroad, and was inclined to ape foreign manners, he changed his English cognomen into its Latin form, Caius, (pronounced Keyes), by which he was then and is now generally known. The Dictionary of National Biography says of him :

“Caius’s relations with the society over which he ruled at Cambridge were less happy. Lying, as he did, under the suspicion of aiming at a restoration of Catholic doctrine, he was an object of dislike to the majority of the fellows, and could with difficulty maintain his authority. He retaliated vigorously on the malcontents. He not only involved them in law-suits which emptied their slender purses, but visited them with personal castigations, and even incarcerated them in the stocks. Expulsions were frequent, not less than twenty of the fellows, according to the statement of one of their number, having suffered this extreme penalty.”

To complete the likeness between the two characters, dramatic and historical, we find that Caius had an especial antipathy to Welshmen, for in the ordinances of the college founded by him, Welshmen are expressly excluded from the privileges of fellowship.

It appears then —

1. That both were physicians.
2. That both came from abroad.
3. That both were phenomenally quarrelsome, even to the extent of inflicting chastisement upon others with their own hands.
4. That both hated Welshmen.

Now, how did William Shakspeare of Stratford become acquainted with these idiosyncrasies of a Cambridge professor, and how did he acquire sufficient in-

terest in the subject to induce him, twenty-nine years after the professor's death, to hold the man up to public ridicule in a play? Dr. Caius died in July, 1573, at which time the reputed poet was living at Stratford, nine years old. The controversy, as it raged in Cambridge and as it is reflected in the play, was a personal one, and in the absence of newspapers or equivalent means of disseminating general information could hardly have been known beyond university circles.

Francis Bacon was the nephew of Lord Treasurer Burghley, to whom the students appealed for protection against their oppressor. He entered the university in April, 1573, three months before Dr. Caius' death and in the height of the prevailing excitement.

XXVI.

MAGNA CHARTA.

In the historical drama of 'King John' Shakespeare does not mention Magna Charta, the granting of which was the great event of the reign. The fair inference may be that he was not in sympathy with such a movement.

Francis Bacon also in all his writings does not allude to the subject. He despised the people and thought them unworthy of taking any part in public affairs. He stood inflexibly, even against the nobles, for the royal prerogatives. Any attempt to extort concessions from a King by force was his special abhorrence.

XXVII.

HUMPHREY, DUKE OF GLOUCESTER.

A singular instance of what must be regarded as a misjudgment of character is found in the drama of 'King Henry VI.' Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, was the youngest son of Henry IV. On the death of his brother, Henry V., he became, in the absence of the Duke of Bedford, Protector of the Kingdom, and was therefore practically for many years at the head of the government. His administration of public affairs, however, was very unsatisfactory. The country was kept in a continual turmoil by his ill temper and his fondness for intrigues. "His greediness," says the Dictionary of National Biography, "was notorious. He was unprincipled, factious and blindly selfish." The introduction into the country contrary to law of the practice of torture in judicial proceedings was due to him. He persecuted Wickliffe's followers, who were driven to hold their conventicles for worship and to read the bible in peasants' huts, saw-pits and field ditches, at the risk of being burned alive at the stake. Even the reputation for patriotism which he acquired among the vulgar was false, for it was his scandalous marriage with the Countess of Hainault that led, as he must have known that it would lead, to the estrangement of the Duke of Burgundy and to the consequent expulsion of the English from France. At the meeting of Parliament at St. Edmondsbury in 1447 he was arrested for treason, and the next morning was found dead in his bed. His death was natural.

The Duke is represented very differently in the play. There he is always the "good Duke Hum-

phrey." In every quarrel he is the innocent victim, while the Queen, the Duke of Suffolk and Cardinal Beaufort, his brother, are the wicked conspirators. As to the circumstances of Gloucester's death which, according to the dramatist, was a deliberate murder, parliament having been summoned to an out-of-the-way place for this special purpose, we again quote from the Dictionary of National Biography:

"His health, ruined by debauchery, had long been weak. The portraits of him depict a worn and prematurely old man. He had already been threatened with palsy, and the sudden arrest and worry might well have brought about a fatal paralytic stroke. Fox's contemporary narrative of the parliament at Bury, the best and fullest account of his last days, says no word of foul play. . . . The fact that Suffolk was never formally charged with the murder in the long list of crimes brought up against him when he fell, is almost conclusive of Gloucester's innocence. . . . Cardinal Beaufort certainly could have had no part in the tragedy. Bitter as was the Duke's enmity against him, the Cardinal would never have done a deed which was so contrary to the interests of the Lancastrian dynasty, and which opened the way for the ambitious schemes of the rival house. A few weeks later the great Cardinal died. The scene in which Shakespeare portrays the "black despair" of his death has no historical basis."

The explanation of this great discrepancy generally given, is, that the Duke founded a public library at Oxford and thus won the hearts of scholars. This is wholly inadequate and inadmissible.

Francis Bacon lived at Gorhambury in the immediate vicinity of St. Albans. The Duke of Gloucester also lived at St. Albans. The Duke and his wife were admitted to the fraternity of the great Abbey there in 1424. A stately arched monument of freestone, adorned with figures of his royal ancestors, marks his last resting place near the shrine. He was, therefore, identified in the closest manner with the town and particularly with its religious institu-

tions. The Abbot himself venerated his memory. If a good opinion of him could have existed anywhere in England, it would naturally be found at St. Albans. The play was a youthful production, written at a time of life when such impressions are strongest. Furthermore, in considering a case of this kind it must never be forgotten that the portrayal, not of history, but of human nature, is the chief aim and end of dramatic art.

XXVIII.

THE MERCHANT OF VENICE

In this drama a Jew, who had loaned money to a Venetian merchant and for non-payment at maturity exacted a penalty that would have caused death, is held up to scorn and ridicule for all time.

Francis Bacon once borrowed money of a Jew named Simpson, and was sued for it in the spring of 1598. Soon afterward the creditor, contrary to agreement and under circumstances intended to inflict personal disgrace, had Bacon arrested on the street and held in custody.

The play was entered on Stationers' register in July, 1598.

XXIX.

'TROILUS AND CRESSIDA.'

The play of 'Troilus and Cressida' was first published in 1609. A singular circumstance attended its appearance. The first copies that were issued from the press contained a preface which, for some reason not acknowledged, became unsatisfactory to those "grand possessors" (as they were called) who controlled the manuscript, and it was accordingly for the remainder of the edition withdrawn. Shakespearean scholars have hitherto sought in vain for an explanation of this curious anomaly. The truth, however, seems to us to be quite apparent. The play bears on its surface, as well as in its texture, the proof of its having been the work of a lawyer. At the same time we can easily understand that a suggestion to this effect in the preface might not have been agreeable to all concerned. And yet here it is, almost in so many words:

"Were but the vain names of commedies chang'de for the titles of commodities, or of playes for *pleas* [pronounced in those days *plays*], you should see all those grand censors, that now stile them such vanities, flock to them."

That is, were they but *pleas*, (or the work of a lawyer), people of quality would flock to see them. Francis Bacon was a lawyer.

XXX.

JULIUS CÆSAR.

The dramatist seems to have had a special admiration for Julius Cæsar. He not only wrote one of his greatest tragedies on Cæsar's life, but he also mentions Cæsar, generally in approbation of him, thirty-nine times in his poems and plays.

Bacon's admiration of Julius Cæsar was unbounded. He wrote a highly appreciative treatise on Cæsar's life, besides referring to him approvingly thirty-four times in his other writings.

The two agree, also, as to the cause of the conspiracy that ended in Cæsar's assassination, as the following respective citations from them will show :

Bacon: "How to extinguish envy he knew excellently well, and thought it an object worth purchasing even at the sacrifice of dignity. . . . He did not put off his mask, but so carried himself that he turned the envy upon the other party. At last, whether satiated with power or corrupted by flattery, he aspired likewise to the external emblems thereof, the name of king and the crown, which turned to his destruction."

Imago Civilis Julii Cæsaris.

Shakespeare:

"All the conspirators, save only he [Brutus],
Did that they did in envy of great Cæsar."

The Tragedy of Julius Cæsar, V, V, 69.

The assassination itself they described in almost the same language :

Bacon : "They came about him as a stag at bay."

Shakespeare : "Here wast thou bay'd, brave hart."

Both of our authors seem to have laid great stress upon Cæsar's reformation of the Roman calendar. Bacon says of it :

"So we receive from him, as a Monument both of his power and learning, the then reformed computation of the year; well express-

ing that he took it to be as great a glory to himself to observe and know the law of the heavens as to give law to men upon the earth."

Advancement of Learning.

The author of the plays after his manner illustrates the popular confusion that necessarily attended the introduction of a new calendar among the people of Rome, as follows :

THE TRAGEDY OF JULIUS CÆSAR.

Act II, Scene I.

The Conspirators at Brutus' House before sunrise; Brutus and Cassius apart, whispering.

"*Decius.* Here lies the east ; doth not the day break here ?

Casca. No.

Cinna. O ! pardon, sir, it doth ; and yon grey lines,
That fret the clouds, are messengers of day.

Casca. You shall confess that you are both deceiv'd.
Here, as I point my sword, the sun arises ;
Which is a great way growing on the south,
Weighing the youthful season of the year.
Some two months hence, up higher toward the north.
He first presents his fire, and the high east
Stands as the Capitol, directly here."

Not a single editor of the play or commentator on it has, so far as we know, ventured a word to explain the grounds of this disputation among the conspirators or even to account for its existence. The difference of opinion was due, as we have already intimated, to the recent introduction of a new calendar, by which nearly 80 days had been added to the civil year, to make it coincide with the course of the sun. The conspirators had simply spoken from the points of view of different calendars.

Shakespearean editors, however, unable to appreciate the text, have resorted, as usual under such circumstances, to mutilations of it. Brutus, awaking

early on the morning of the fifteenth, or Ides, of March, and uncertain what day it was, had the following colloquy (*as Shake-speare wrote it*) with his valet:

- "*Brutus.* Get you to bed again, it is not day.
Is not tomorrow, boy, the first of March?
Lucius. I know not, sir.
Brutus. Look in the calendar and bring me word.
Lucius. Sir, March is wasted fifteen days."

Editor Lewis Theobald (1733), unable to comprehend how Brutus could commit such an error as to mistake the fifteenth of March for the first, promptly substituted for the latter the word *Ides*, and has been followed by editors generally from that time to the present, a period of one hundred and seventy-two years. Probably none of them ever heard that under the operations of the old calendar, which did not terminate until January 1st, 46 B. C., the Roman year had been advancing at the rate of eleven minutes and fourteen seconds per annum against true time for hundreds of years. Theobald (the hero of the *Dunciad*) also tampered with Lucius' reply, making Lucius say that March had wasted fourteen instead of fifteen days, because it was very early in the morning of the fifteenth when Lucius spoke. In this respect also he has been followed by other editors, though none of them could hardly have been ignorant that the law recognizes no parts of days. The author of the play was a lawyer.

The Earl of Beaconsfield once seriously asked the question, "Did Shakespeare ever write a single whole play?" A safe answer, considering the parts that editors have taken and that they still take in correcting (!) Shakespeare, would be, no.

XXXI.

THE REIGN OF KING HENRY VII.

With the exception of 'King John,' the historical dramas of Shake-speare extend consecutively from the reign of Richard II. to that of Henry VIII., a period of 181 years. One break, and one only, occurs in the series, viz., that of Henry VII., which is omitted.

Bacon wrote one historical work, that on the reign of Henry VII. He began it abruptly with the victory of Bosworth Field, making but slight reference to the causes and events that led up to it. Shake-speare leaves us at this exact point in the drama preceding 'Richard III.' This ends with the crowning of Henry on the battle-field by Lord Stanley who plucks the crown for the occasion from Richard's "dead temples." Bacon's history begins with the crowning of Henry on the battle-field by Lord Stanley, who finds the crown "among the spoils." The two accounts seem to be tongued and grooved together, as though from one hand.

XXXII.

HENRY THE EIGHTH.

'Henry VIII.' was also one of those dramas of Shakespeare, sixteen in number, that were printed for the first time in the folio of 1623. Possibly it was in existence in an earlier draft in 1613, for at the burning of the Globe Theatre on the afternoon of June 29 of that year, a play, described by a contemporary as "representing some principal pieces in the reign of Henry VIII." was in course of performance there, under the title of 'All is True.' Whether this be so or not, the drama, as we now have it, seems in some important particulars to have been suggested by the condition of things under King James in 1621. It treats of fallen greatness, of Queen Catharine, the divorced wife of Henry, and of Lord Chancellor Wolsey, who was degraded from his high office, stripped of the seals, and ordered to be imprisoned in the Tower.

The argument for Bacon's authorship of this play may be rested in part on three points:

1. The author was indebted for some of his materials directly to Cavendish's 'Life of Wolsey,' which, though written in 1557, was not printed until 1641, or eighteen years after the appearance of the play. As Bacon was one of Wolsey's successors in office, he would naturally have had access to this manuscript, while a play-actor would not.

2. It is practically certain that in 1622-23, Bacon was engaged upon a work pertaining to the reign of Henry VIII. He completed his history of Henry VII. in October, 1621. This was so much admired that Prince Charles immediately requested him to

write also a history of Henry VIII. Bacon promised to do so. Accordingly, in January, 1623, he applied to the proper authorities for the loan of such documents as might be in the public archives relating to that monarch's reign. The application was formally granted. At this time, Bacon appears to have been actually at work in real or apparent fulfilment of his undertaking, for under date of February 10, Mr. Chamberlain writes:—

“Lord [Bacon] busies himself about books, and hath set out two lately ‘*Historia Ventorum*’ and ‘*De Vita et Morte,*’ with promises of more. I have not seen either of them because I have not leisure; but if the life of Henry VIII., which they say he is about, might come out after his own manner, I should find time and means enough to read it.”

A few days later (February 21), Bacon himself writes to Buckingham, who had gone to Spain with Prince Charles, asking to be remembered to the Prince, “who, I hope ere long, will make me leave King Henry VIII. and set me on work in relation to his Highness's heroical adventures.”

The next reference to the subject is also in one of Bacon's own letters. Acknowledging the receipt of a communication from Toby Matthew, June 26, 1623, he says:—

“Since you say the Prince hath not forgot his commandment touching my history of Henry VIII., I may not forget my duty. But I find Sir Collier, who poured forth what he had in my other work, somewhat dainty of his materials in this.”

It appears, however, that notwithstanding all these repeated implications to the effect that he was engaged upon a history of Henry VIII., he was actually doing no such thing. He did, indeed, make a beginning; he gathered materials; he dictated one morning about two pages; and then he wrote to

the prince, apologizing for not going on with the work and for dropping it altogether. But did he drop it? From whose pen came those wonderful panegyrics of Queen Elizabeth and King James that were printed six months afterward in the drama of 'Henry VIII.,' and that can be exactly paralleled in the 'Advancement of Learning' and the *In felicem Memoriam Elizabethæ*? Those heart-breaking lamentations over fallen greatness, such as Bacon must have still been uttering in private over his downfall in 1621? Those entrancing visions of peace and plenty, of honor and gladness for the English people, characteristic of one in whom forgiveness of injuries was a cardinal virtue, and love of mankind an absorbing passion?

3. Queen Catherine, the first wife of King Henry VIII., made her residence during the latter part of her life at Kimbolton in Huntingdonshire. The Duke of Manchester, to whom the place belongs, published in 1864 a valuable collection of papers, found in the castle and at Simancas in Spain, which show that of all the numerous and gifted persons who have written of that unfortunate princess, two, and two only, have correctly adjudged her character. These two, thus in singular agreement, are Francis Bacon and the author of the Shakespeare dramas. The Duke says:—

“So far as concerns all popular ideas of her, Catherine is a creature of the mist. Shakespeare and Bacon, the highest judges and firmest painters of character, have, it is true, described her, if only lightly and by the way, as a woman of flesh and blood; the flesh rather stubborn, the blood somewhat hot; as a lady who could curse her enemies and caress her friends; a princess full of natural graces, virtues, and infirmities. Had the portraits by Shakespeare and Bacon been painted in full, they would have been all that we

could hope or wish. But they are only fragments of the whole; and the work of all minor hands is nothing, or worse than nothing. In these inferior pencillings, the woman is concealed beneath the veil of a nun. In place of a girl full of sun and life, eager to love and to be loved, enamoured of state and pomp, who liked a good dinner, a new gown, above all a young husband; one who had her quarrels, her debts, her feminine fibs, and her little deceptions, even with those who were most near and dear to her; a creature to be kissed and petted, to be adored, and chidden, and ill-used—all of which Catherine was in the flesh—we find a cold, grim Lady Abbess, a creature too pious for the world in which her lot was cast, too pure for the husband who had been given to her. Such a conception is vague in outline and false in spirit. Catherine was every inch a woman before she became every inch a queen.”—*Court and Society*, i. 5.

This judgment is confirmed by high literary authority :

“The whole story of the Queen, as now told from the ample Simancas text, is in perfect harmony with what Shakespeare and Bacon say of her.”—*The Athenæum*, January 16, 1867.

Lord Montagu of Kimbolton, first Earl of Manchester, was one of Bacon’s dearest friends.

XXXIII.

INSANITY.

In the famous interview between Hamlet and his mother in the chamber-scene, already referred to, the prince sees the ghost of the murdered king and addresses it. The Queen, unable to hear or see anything to account for her son's conduct, finally exclaims, —

“This is the very coinage of your brain ;
This bodiless creation ecstasy
Is very cunning in.” — iii. 4.

Hamlet replies :

“It is not madness
That I have utter'd ; bring me to the test
And I the matter will re-word ; which madness
Would gambol from.”

Dr. Wigan, a specialist, points out the scientific pertinence of this reply. Hamlet asks to be put to a test, and suggests one known only to experts, viz. : to repeat, word for word, what he had previously uttered. Inability to recall a train of thought is said to be a special mark of insanity, even in the mildest form of the disease.

Other passages in the plays show the writer's exceptional knowledge in this branch of therapeutics. When King Lear, for instance, falls into a deep sleep in the fourth act and gives signs of immediate restoration to health, the physician in charge orders music, thus :

(Enter Lear in a chair carried by servants.)

Doctor. Ay, madam ; in the heaviness of sleep
We put fresh garments on him.

Kent. Be by, good madame, when we do awake him ;
I doubt not of his temperance.

Cordelia. Very well. [*Music.*

Doct. Please you, draw near. Louder the music there.” — iv. 7.

In the 'Tempest,' also, Prospero refers to the effects of music on the insane, as follows :

[Solemn music.

"A solemn air, and the best comforter
To an unsettled fancy, cure thy brains." — v. i.

No less clear are Richard II.'s words on the subject in his last monologue :

"This music mads me ; let it sound no more ;
For though it have holp madmen to their wits,
In me it seems it will make wise men sad." — v. 4.

"Shakespeare knew, however he acquired the knowledge, the phenomena of insanity as few have known them." — *Goethe*.

Bacon wrote to Queen Elizabeth in the spring of 1600 that his mother was "much worn"; soon afterward, perhaps at the death of her son Anthony in 1601, she became violently insane, and continued so under the sole, unremitting care of her only surviving son Francis until her death in 1610. It was during this period that 'King Lear' and the revised version of 'Hamlet' were written. The author's portrayal of insanity in these plays is still regarded by specialists as a psychological marvel.

"Shakespeare must have had an opportunity of observing [a person or] persons afflicted in mind. Prof. Neumann very justly remarks concerning Ophelia's case: 'Whence could Shakespeare have known that persons thus afflicted decorate themselves with flowers, offer flowers to other people, and sing away to themselves; I myself cannot conceive where.' Dr. Bucknill even maintains that *watching persons mentally afflicted must have been a favorite study of Shakespeare's.*" — PROF. ELZE'S *William Shakespeare*, 405.

XXXIV.

BOSPHORUS.

The tragedy of 'Othello' was first printed in quarto in 1622 (six years after the reputed author's death), though it had been in existence as an acting play for ten or twelve years preceding. In the folio of 1623, it appears in a revised form, containing among other striking improvements one hundred and sixty additional lines, due without the slightest doubt to the dramatist himself. Among these lines we find the following :

" Like to the Pontic sea,
Whose icy current and compulsive course
Ne'er feels retiring ebb, but keeps due on
To the Propontic and the Hellespont." — iii. 3.

It seems to be probable, then, that sometime between the date of the first appearance of the play on the stage (1610) and that in the Folio (1623) the author's attention had been called to a tidal peculiarity of the Mediterranean Sea; namely, that the current through the Bosphorus flows continuously in one direction, from east to west. William Shakspeare died in Stratford six years before the first publication of the play in its original draft, which was, as we have said, in 1622. Francis Bacon investigated the tides of the Mediterranean in or about 1616, and in his treatise on the subject, entitled *De Fluxu et Refluxu Maris*, made especial reference to the fact that through the Bosphorus the tide never ebbs.

It is curious, also, that the two seas, east and west of the Bosphorus, are mentioned under the same names by both authors:

" Pontus and Propontis " — BACON.
" Pontic and Propontic " — SHAKESPEARE.

Also, the same minute particulars regarding the current :

“Pursues its course” — BACON.

“Keeps due on” — SHAKE-SPEARE.

“With extraordinary swiftness.” — BACON.

“With violent pace.” — SHAKE-SPEARE.

XXXV.

SIR JOHN FALSTAFF.

The great dramas of 'King Henry IV.' (two parts) and 'King Henry V.' were developed from a preceding one written by the same author in his youth, covering both of these reigns, entitled 'The Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth.' In this early production the buffoon was named Sir John Oldcastle, an historical personage who lived one hundred and fifty years before the time of Shake-speare, and was a highly respectable martyr to the cause of religion. The name was brought along and used on the stage in the new play, as we now have it, of 'King Henry IV.,' Part First; but, before the play was printed (in 1598) it was withdrawn (probably under compulsion from the royal court) and that of Sir John Falstaff substituted for it. The latter must therefore have been selected in or about 1597. At this time or thereabouts, perhaps while the manuscript of the play was in the hands of the printer, Bacon was prosecuting an important suit at law before the courts in London, with an associate named John Halstaff. The origin of the name in the play has been for more than a hundred years the subject of a great deal of wild and absurd speculation.

XXXVI.

AN IDIOSYNCRACY.

Bacon had a habit, which he derived from his mother, of writing on special occasions in one language with the alphabet of another. This he did whenever he wished to conceal something he had in mind from people generally or from those not in the secret. The languages selected for this purpose were Greek and English. A notable instance is found among his private papers preserved in the library of the Lambeth palace in London, in which he seems to hint that there was a reason, although under the circumstances he could not make it known, why he offered no defence against the charges of bribery brought against him before the House of Lords. We have the explanation, however, from his servant Bushel, who says that his master made no defence because the King, fearing its effect upon himself and his favorite, the Duke of Buckingham, privately forbade it. What Bacon wrote was as follows :

Οφ μγ οφφενς, φαρ βε ιτ φρομ με το σαγ, δατ νενιαμ κορβις; νεξατ κενσυρα κολυμβας· βυτ ι ωιλλ σαγ θατ ι ανε γοοδ ωαρραντ φορ· θεγ ωερε νοτ θε γρεατεστ οφφενδερς ιν Ισραελ υπον ωηομ θε ωαλλ φελλ.

Converting the Greek letters into the corresponding English ones in the foregoing, we have the following transcription :

Of my offence, far be it from me to say, *dat veniam corvis; vexat censura* Columbas: but I will say that I have good warrant for: they were not the greatest offenders in Israel upon whom the wall fell.

Lady Bacon and her son often used this device in their private correspondence. In compositions in-

tended for the general public the order of substitution would naturally be reversed.

The dramatist did the same thing. In the *Merry Wives of Windsor* he represents the Host as inviting some friends to accompany him to a field of honor where a duel was to be fought. After some parley he repeats the invitation thus :

“ Will you go, An-heires ? ”

The word *An-heires* has been an inexhaustible puzzle to all modern editors of the play. They are agreed that the word is not English, that it appears in the text by a printer's blunder, and that the best substitute possible must be found for it. Accordingly in the following named editions, all of good and regular standing, we have the line given respectively thus :

Kemble, Heath, Campbell: “ Will you go on, hearts ? ”

Stanton, Dyce, Verplanck, Theobald: “ Will you go, Mynheers ? ”

“ Warburton: “ Will you go on, heris ? ”

Malone: “ Will you go on and hear us ? ”

Steevens: “ Will you go on, heroes ? ”

Boaden, Singer: “ Will you go on, Cavaliers ? ”

Collier: “ Will you go on, here ? ”

White: “ Will you go on, Min-heers ? ”

Becket: “ Will you go on, eh, sir ? ”

Halliwell-Phillips, Hudson: “ Will you go on, Sirs ? ”

Knight: “ Will you go on, heers ? ”

Harness: Will you go, Cavalieres ? ”

The word, which Mr. White pronounces “ an incomprehensible combination of letters,” is the Greek *άνήρ* (gentleman), *άνέρες* (gentlemen), in which English letters of the alphabet are substituted for the Greek. The meaning is—

Will you go, gentlemen ?

XXXVII.

THE SPANISH LANGUAGE.

Shakespeare gave to the name of the Bermuda Islands the Spanish pronunciation *Bermoothes*. This was before the islands were settled by the English and before the name could have become extensively known in England. Even in the Jourdan pamphlet, published in London in 1610, a short time only before the play was written, giving an account of the author's and Sir George Somers' shipwreck there, one year earlier, the name is printed with a *d*.

Singularly enough, we find a statement of about this date in Bacon's works that "the Spaniards dislike thin letters and change them immediately into those of a middle tone," thus flattening the *d* in Bermuda into the medium intervocal *z* (th). Bacon was a member of the company whose ship was wrecked. Both authors seem to have been familiar with the principles of the Spanish language.

XXXVIII.

THE ITALIAN LANGUAGE.

“When Othello in the dawning of his jealousy chides Desdemona for being without the handkerchief he had given her as his first love-token, he tells her, —

‘There’s magic in the web of it.
A sibyl that number’d in the world
The sun to course two hundred compasses,
In her prophetic fury, sew’d the work.’

“The phrase, ‘prophetic fury,’ is so striking, so picturesque, and so peculiar that in itself it excites remark and remains upon the memory as the key-note of the passage. Now, in the Orlando Furioso, . . . we have the identical thought, and, in their Italian form, the identical words *furor propheticus*, used in the description of a woman, sibyl-like, if not a sibyl, weaving a cloth of magic virtues. There is, too, in both passages the idea of a great lapse of time. . . . There was no other translation of the Orlando Furioso into English in Shakespeare’s time than Sir John Harrington’s, published in 1591, and in that the phrase, ‘prophetic fury,’ or any one like it, does not occur.

R. G. White.

“The great majority of the *dramatis personæ* in Shakespeare’s comedies, as well as in some of his tragedies, have Italian names, and many of them . . . are as Italian in nature as in name. The moonlight scene in ‘The Merchant of Venice’ is Southern, in every detail and incident. ‘Romeo and Juliet’ is Italian throughout, alike in coloring, incident and passion. In the person of Hamlet Shakespeare even appears as a critic of Italian style.”

Gervinus.

Bacon made free use of Italian literature, quoting it in its own language.

XXXIX.

THE GREEK LANGUAGE.

The dramatist punned in Greek. In the tragedy of 'Anthony and Cleopatra,' Cleopatra pronounces the following eulogy on Anthony, thinking him dead :

" His legs bestrid the ocean ; his rear'd arm
Crested the world ; his voice was propertied
As all the tuned spheres, and that to friends ;
But when he meant to quail and shake the orb,
He was as rattling thunder. For his bounty,
There was no winter in't ; an Anthony 't was,
That grew the more by reaping." — *V, 2, 82.*

Mark Anthony always boasted that he was a descendant of Hercules, being named indeed, as he claimed, for Hercules' son, Anthos. Shake-speare knew this, for, mentioning Hercules in this same play, he adds, —

" Whom Anthony lov'd."

The word *anthos* in Greek means flower, thus suggesting to the dramatist an analogy between Anthony's bounty and a flowering plant, —

" That grew [grows] the more by reaping."

Unfortunately, editors of Shake-speare, in ignorance of their author and of his knowledge of the Greek language, have regarded the word *Anthony* in this connection as a printer's blunder, and for nearly 200 years have actually substituted *autumn* for it, making this substitution simply and solely because this word seems to bear some slight typographical resemblance (in number of letters at least) to the original. They are not to be chided, of course, for doing all in their power to extinguish one of the

finest metaphors in Shake-speare, for their prejudices on the subject of Shake-speare's scholarship blinded their eyes to it. But with this example before us, what becomes, may we ask, of the "sacred text"?

Further proof of the dramatist's knowledge of Greek is found in 'King Lear'. The King, referring to Edgar, says, —

"I'll talk a word with this same learned Theban,"—

evidently alluding to Simmias in the Phædo, whom Socrates calls "my Theban friend," and with whom he discusses the nature of the human soul. The dialogues of Plato had not been translated into English when the play was written.

It is unnecessary, of course, to show that Bacon was familiar with Greek. It was household knowledge in the Bacon family, and exactly the kind of knowledge possessed by the author of the Shakespeare plays.

XL.

EPILEPSY.

Bacon had a curious notion regarding epilepsy. Treating of this disease (Nat. Hist., X, 966) he attributes it to "gross vapors rising and entering the cells of the brain."

Shake-speare had the same singular belief. In the drama of 'Julius Cæsar' he represents the Dictator as having had an attack of epilepsy (falling sickness) in the market-place of Rome, caused by the foul breath of the multitude of people surrounding him, thus :

Casca. "The rabblement hooted, and clapp'd their chopt hands, and threw up their sweaty night-caps, and uttered such a deal of stinking breath, because Cæsar refus'd the crown, that it had almost choked Cæsar ; for he swooned, and fell down at it. And for mine own part, I durst not laugh, for fear of opening my lips, and receiving the bad air.

Cassius. But, soft, I pray you. What, did Cæsar swoond ?

Casca. He fell down in the market-place, and foam'd at mouth, and was speechless.

Brutus 'T is very like he hath the falling-sickness."

Modern editors print the line, last quoted above, thus :

"'T is very like ; he hath the falling-sickness," —

converting Brutus' conjecture into a statement of fact. This is unwarrantable. Brutus had no information, so far as we know, that Cæsar was thus afflicted, for Cæsar had had but one or two attacks of the disease, and those in recent and distant campaigns. Plutarch mentions it, but Plutarch wrote his life of Cæsar 150 years after Cæsar's death.

Epilepsy was very prevalent among the Romans, so much so that the Senate had a standing rule immediately to adjourn whenever one of its members

was seized with it. The line in question, *as written by Shake-speare*, exactly fits Casca's description of what had taken place in the Forum; why garble it?

No historical authority exists for this remarkable scene in the market-place, the connection between foul breath, "entering the cells of the brain," and an attack of epilepsy being wholly due to a private theory of the dramatist, in which Francis Bacon agreed with him.

And even in minute details respecting the kind of odors suited to the purpose the two authors were also agreed, thus :

"They clapped their chopped hands and threw up their sweaty night-caps, and uttered such a deal of stinking breath that it had almost choked Cæsar."—*Shake-speare*.

"If such foul smells be made by art and by the hand, they consist chiefly of man's flesh or sweat putrified; for they are not those stinks which the nostrils straight abhor and expel that are most pernicious; but such airs as have some similitude with man's body."—*Bacon*.

"The rabblement hooted; the common herd was glad."—

Shake-speare.

"These empoisonments of air are the more dangerous in meetings of people, because the much breath of people doth further the infection. Therefore, when any such thing is feared, it were good those public places were perfumed before the assemblies."—*Bacon*.

XLI.

CENTRAL FIRE IN THE EARTH.

The tragedy of 'Hamlet' was written in or about 1586, but not printed until 1603. In this first draft of the play we find a letter, written by the prince to Ophelia, in which she is told she may doubt any proposition whatever, no matter how certain it may be, but under no circumstances must she doubt the writer's love. From this letter, which is partly in verse, we quote :

"Doubt that in earth is fire,
Doubt that the stars do move,
Doubt truth to be a liar,
But do not doubt I love."—ii. 2.

Among the certainties here specified, which Ophelia was at liberty to question before she could question the writer's love, is the doctrine of a central fire in the earth. "Doubt that in earth is fire." The belief in the existence of a mass of molten matter at the centre of the earth was then, as it is now, universal; but for some reason the author of the play changed his mind in regard to it within one year after the play was published. The second edition of 'Hamlet' came from the press in 1604, and then the first line of the stanza, quoted above, was made to read as follows :

"Doubt that the stars are fire."

The doctrine of a central fire in the earth was thus taken out of the play some time between the appearance of the first edition in 1603 and that of the second in 1604. How can this be accounted for? Was there another person known to fame in all the civilized world at that time, besides the author of 'Ham-

let,' who entertained a doubt as to the condition of the earth's interior? Yes, there was one, and perhaps one only. Francis Bacon wrote a tract, entitled *Cogitationes de Natura Rerum*, assigned to the latter part of 1603 or the early part of 1604. Mr. Spedding, the last and best editor of Bacon's works, thinks it was written before September, 1604. In this tract, evidently a fresh study of the subject, Bacon boldly took the ground that the earth is a cold body, cold to the core, the only cold body, as he afterwards affirmed, in the entire universe, all others, sun, planets, and stars, being of fire.

It appears, then, that Bacon adopted this new view of the earth's interior at precisely the same time that the author of 'Hamlet' did; that is to say, according to the record, in the brief interval between the appearance of the first and that of the second editions of the drama, and, furthermore, against the otherwise unanimous opinion of physicists throughout the world.¹

¹ "The heaven, from its perfect and entire heat and the extreme extension of matter, is most hot, lucid, rarefied, and moveable; whereas the earth, on the contrary, from its entire and unrefracted cold, and the extreme contraction of matter, is most cold, dark, and dense, completely immoveable. . . . The rigors of cold, which in winter time and in the coldest countries are exhaled into the air from the surface of the earth, are merely tepid airs and baths, compared with the nature of the primal cold shut up in the bowels thereof." BACON'S *De Principiis atque Originibus*.

XLII.

COPERNICAN SYSTEM.

The second line of the stanza in this extraordinary love-letter is also significant. In the first edition it runs as follows :

“Doubt that the stars do move.” 1603.

In the second edition the change is merely verbal :

“Doubt that the sun doth move.” 1604.¹

The doctrine that the earth is the centre of the universe around which the sun and stars daily revolve is thus retained. It has been retained in every succeeding edition of the play to the present time. How can this, also, be accounted for?

Copernicus published his heliocentric theory of the solar system in 1543, eighteen years before Bacon was born. Bruno taught it in Geneva in 1580; in Paris, in 1582; in London and Oxford, in 1583; in Germany, in 1584; in Switzerland, in 1588; in Venice, in 1590; and he was burned at the stake as a martyr to it in Rome in 1600; Kepler announced two of his great laws, governing planetary motions, in 1609; Galileo established the truth of the Copernican system beyond the shadow of a doubt by his discoveries of the phases of Venus and the satellites of Jupiter in 1610; Harriot saw the sun spots and proved the rotation of that luminary on its axis in 1611; Kepler proclaimed his third law in 1619; and yet, notwithstanding all these repeated and wonderful demonstrations and in opposition to the general current of contemporary thought,² Bacon persistently

¹ The change was made necessary in reforming the stanza by the promotion of the word *stars* to the first line.

² We take no notice of the opinions of theologians, or of astronomers writing under the influence of the Church.

and with ever increasing vehemence adhered to the old theory to the day of his death. The author of the Plays did the same. The two were agreed in holding to the cycles and epicycles of Ptolemy after all the rest of the scientific world had rejected them; and they were also agreed in rejecting the Copernican theory after all the rest of the scientific world had accepted it.³

³ In 1622, Bacon admitted that the Copernican theory had become prevalent (*quæ nunc quoque invaluit*), but he thought that a compromise might be effected between the two opposing systems, evidently unable, on account of the mathematical principles involved, to comprehend either of them. At one time he seems to have deprecated both.

A slight circumstance throws some light upon the state of his mind on this subject. In the first edition of the 'Advancement of Learning' (1605), he said that "the mathematicians cannot satisfy themselves, except they reduce the motions of the celestial bodies to perfect circles, rejecting spiral lines, and laboring to be discharged of eccentrics." In the second edition (1623) he omitted the reference to eccentrics.

"Shakespeare does not appear to have got beyond the Ptolemaic system of the universe." — ELZE'S *William Shakespeare*, page 390.

XLIII.

THE TIDES.

In the second edition of 'Hamlet,' 1604, we find the tides of the ocean attributed, in accordance with popular opinion to the influence of the moon.

"The moist star,
Upon whose influence Neptune's empire stands,
Was sick almost to doomsday with eclipse."—i. 1.

This was repeated in the third quarto, 1605; in the fourth, 1611; in the fifth or undated quarto; but in the first folio (1623), the lines were omitted. Why?

During the Christmas revels at Gray's Inn in 1594, Bacon contributed to the entertainment, among other things, a poem in blank verse, known as the Gray's Inn Masque. It is full of those references to natural philosophy in which the author took so much delight, and especially on this occasion when Queen Elizabeth was the subject, to the various forms of attraction exerted by one body upon another in the world. Of the influence of the moon he says:

"Your rock claims kindred of the polar star,
Because it draws the needle to the north;
Yet even that star gives place to Cynthia's rays,
Whose drawing virtues govern and direct
The flots and re-flots of the Ocean."¹

At this time, then, Bacon held to the common opinion that the moon controls the tides; but later in life, in or about 1616, he made an elaborate investigation into these phenomena, and in a treatise entitled *De Fluxu et Refluxu Maris* definitely rejected the lunar theory.

¹ The Masque is not in Bacon's name, but no one can read it and doubt its authorship. Bacon was the leading promoter of these revels.

"We dare not proceed so far as to assert that the motions of the sun or moon are the causes of the motions below, which correspond thereto; or that the sun and moon have a dominion or influence over these motions of the sea, though such kind of thoughts find an easy entrance into the minds of men by reason of the veneration they pay to the celestial bodies."—BACON'S *De Fluxu et Refluxu Maris*.

"Whether the moon be in her increase or wane; whether she be above or under the earth; whether she be higher or lower than the horizon; whether she be in the meridian or elsewhere; the ebb and flow of the sea have no correspondence with any of these phenomena."—*Ibid.*

In every edition of 'Hamlet' published previously to 1616, the theory is stated and approved; in every edition published after 1616, it is omitted.²

² It should be said that those of the plays in which the theory had been stated approvingly before 1616, but which were not revised after 1616, still retain it. The passage from 'Hamlet' has been restored to the text by modern editors. Bacon ascribed the spring or monthly tides however to the combined influences of the sun and moon.

XLIV.

MOTION AND SENSE.

In 'Hamlet,' again, we have a singular doctrine in the sphere of moral philosophy, advanced by the author in his early years but subsequently withdrawn.

The prince, expostulating with his mother in the celebrated chamber-scene where Polonius was hidden behind the arras, says to her, —

"Sense, sure, you have,
Else could you not have motion." — iii. 4 (1604).

The commentators can make nothing of these words. One of them suggests that for "motion" we substitute *notion*; another *emotion*. Others still contend that the misprint is in the first part of the sentence; that "sense" must be understood to mean *sensation* or *sensibility*. Dr. Ingleby is certain that Hamlet refers to the Queen's wanton impulse. The difficulty is complicated, too, by the fact that the lines were omitted from the revised version of the play in the folio of 1623, concerning which, however, the most daring commentator has not ventured to offer a remark. But in Bacon's prose works we find not only an explanation of the passage in the quarto, but also the reason why it was excluded from the folio.

The 'Advancement of Learning' was published in 1605, one year after the quarto of 'Hamlet' containing the sentence in question appeared; but no repudiation of the old doctrine, that everything that has motion must have sense, is found in it. Indeed, Bacon seems to have had at that time a lingering opinion that the doctrine is true, even as applied to

the planets, in the influence which these wanderers were then supposed to exert over the affairs of men. But in 1623 he published a new edition of the 'Advancement' in Latin under the title of *De Augmentis Scientiarum*, and therein expressly declared that the doctrine is untrue; that there can be motion in inanimate bodies without sense, but with what he called a kind of perception. He said:

"Ignorance on this point drove some of the ancient philosophers to suppose that a soul is infused into all bodies without distinction; for they could not conceive how there can be motion without sense, or without a soul."

The Shake-speare folio with its revised version of 'Hamlet' came out in the same year (1623); and the passage in question, having run through all previous editions of the play,—*i. e.* in 1604, in 1605, in 1611, and in the undated quarto,—but now no longer harmonizing with the author's views, dropped out.

XLV.
MUSIC.

'King Lear' was published in quarto in 1608, two editions having been issued in that year. It contains the following speeches on the disorders of the time :

"*Gloucester.* These late eclipses in the sun and moon portend no good to us; though the wisdom of nature can reason it thus and thus, yet nature finds itself scourged by the sequent effects. Love cools, friendship falls off, brothers divide; in cities, mutinies; in countries, discord; in palaces, treason; and the bond crack'd 'twixt son and father. This villain of mine comes under the prediction; there's son against father. The king falls from bias of nature; there's father against child. We have seen the best of our time; machinations, hollowness, treachery, and all ruinous disorders follow us disquietly to our graves." . . . [*Exit.*
"*Edmund.* . . . O! these eclipses do portend these divisions." — i. 2.

The next appearance of the play, in print, was in the folio of 1623, where the closing part of Edmund's soliloquy, suggested by what Gloucester had said before leaving the stage, is given as follows :

"O! these eclipses do portend these divisions. Fa, sol, la, mi."

Here is a musical phrase added to the text fifteen years after the play was first printed; probably seventeen or eighteen years after the play was written. It consists of syllables for solmization (including a tritonus or sharp fourth), which in Shakespeare's time and until a comparatively recent date implied a series of sounds exceedingly disagreeable to the ear. It was called the "devil in music." As an illustration of the state of moral, political, and physical discord described by Gloucester, nothing could have been more felicitous; but how shall we explain its late introduction into the play?


Evidently the figure was suggested to the author

for use in this connection sometime between 1608 and 1623, and then only after the careful study of a science the technique of which is exceptionally difficult and abstruse. William Shakspeare, the reputed dramatist, was then living in Stratford,¹ in an environment wholly unfitted for such a study. He died in 1616. Francis Bacon, on the other hand, began the composition of his *Sylva Sylvarum* in October, 1622 and in that work investigated not only the general laws of harmony, but also this particular tritonus or sharp fourth, given one year later in the revised version of the play.²

¹ See Bacon *vs.* Shakspeare, 8th ed., Chapter II.

² "Edmund alludes to the unnatural division of parent and child, etc., in this musical phrase which contains the augmented fourth, or *mi contra fa*, of which the old theorists used to say, *diabolus est.*" — NAYLOR'S *Shakespeare and Music*, p. 36.

Example of Sol-Fa (16th and 17th centuries).



"The augmented fourths, formed by the notes fa and mi, marked with x, are the *mi contra fa* which *diabolus est.*" — *Ibid.*, p. 186.

XLVI.

NATURE AND ART.

The antithesis between nature and art was a conspicuous dogma of the peripatetic school of philosophy. In the contention of Aristotle the distinction between nature and art is sufficiently expressed when we say that a formative principle is at work inherently in one, while in the other the source of energy is without.¹ Bacon declared that no antithesis whatever exists between the two cases; that the processes are identical, except in one particular, namely: man has power by bringing natural objects together to institute new processes, or by separating natural objects to destroy old processes, the processes themselves, however, being always strictly in accordance with natural law. The difference, according to Bacon, resolves itself into a power of motion. For instance, the sun shining through drops of water falling from a cloud creates a rainbow; so, also, when it shines through the spray of a fountain. Nature does the work in her own way in both cases. Given a shower of rain or mist, whether natural or artificial, in sunlight, and the rainbow comes as a matter of course. Gold is refined by one method, and by one only, whether in the hot sands of the earth or in a furnace prepared by art. In the grafting of a tree, man may insert a scion in the stock, but the new fruit is developed under the same laws that govern the production of the old. This view was then not altogether a new one, but it is significant in our

¹ ἡ γὰρ τέχνη ἀρχὴ καὶ εἶδος τοῦ γενομένου ἀλλ' ἐν ἑτέρῳ ἢ δὲ τῆς φύσεως κίνησις ἐν αὐτῷ ἀφ' ἑτέρας οὐσα φύσεως τῆς ἐχούσης τὸ εἶδος ἐνεργεῖα.

Aristotle De Gen.-Anim.—ii. i.

case because profound scholars only, and those comparatively few in number in the world, had knowledge of it. That the author of the Plays, however, was perfectly familiar with this abstruse speculation, and that he stated it in almost the same language, word for word, as Bacon did, the following parallelism will show :

“ Nature is made better by no
mean [means]
But Nature makes that mean ;
so, over that art
Which, you say, adds to Nature,
in an Art
That Nature makes. You see,
sweet maid, we marry
A gentler scion to the wildest
stock ;
And make conceive a bark of
baser kind
By bud of nobler race. This is
an art
Which does mend nature, change
it rather ; but
The art itself is nature.”

Winter's Tale, iv. 3 (1611).

“ It is the fashion to talk as if
art were something different
from nature, or a sort of addition
to nature, with power to finish
what nature has begun, or cor-
rect her when going aside. . . .
In truth man has no power over
nature except that of motion, —
the power, I say, of putting nat-
ural bodies together or separat-
ing them, — *the rest is done by
nature within.*” — *Descriptio Globi
Intellectualis* (cir. 1612).

The doctrine appeared for the first time in Bacon's prose works, as above, in 1612 ; in the plays in 1611.

It appears, then, that the two authors made the same recondite study of the relations between nature and art, made it at the same time, and reached the same conclusion.

XLVII.

TORTURE.

The 'Second Part of King Henry VI.' was published under another title, in 1594, in 1600, and again (three years after the death of the reputed poet at Stratford) in 1619. In each of these versions, Gloucester is forced to confess that in his administration of affairs as Protector during the minority of the king he had tortured prisoners contrary to law. It was he, in fact, that actually introduced the practice into England. He says in the play, as first printed in the quartos :

" Why, 't is well known that whilst I was Protector,
Pity was all the fault that was in me ;
A murderer or foul felonious thief,
That robs and murders silly passengers,
I tortur'd above the rate of common law."

In the folio (1623), however, where the play appears again in a revised form, this statement, that torture of suspected criminals was contrary to, or "above the rate of" common law, was omitted. The passage was then made to read as follows :

" Why, 't is well known that whilst I was Protector,
Pity was all the fault that was in me ;
For I should melt at an offender's tears,
And lowly words were ransom for their fault ;
Unless it were a bloody murderer,
Or foul felonious thief that fleec'd poor passengers,
I never gave them condign punishment.
Murder, indeed, that bloody sin, I tortur'd
Above the felon, or what trespass else."—iii. 1.

English lawyers were always opposed to use of the rack as unknown to law. The right was claimed, however, by King James, who ordered Bacon, as Attorney-General, to take part in some proceedings

of the kind in the Tower. Bacon complied ; but as author of the play, in its revision after 1619, he would not naturally have cared to retain in it a judgment against himself.

XLVIII.

THE PASSION OF ENVY.

Shake-speare wrote a drama after his manner to exemplify the passion of Envy. It is that of 'Julius Cæsar,' which in this view is saved from the degrading hypothesis, hitherto entertained by many scholars, that originally, as it came from Shake-speare, it was two dramas, but afterward imperfectly or loosely united in one by another hand. The ground of its unity is indeed distinctly stated in the play itself, thus :

" All the conspirators, save only he,
Did that they did in envy of great Cæsar."

It follows, of course, that the evil deed and its punishment are legitimate and equally important parts of the famous tragedy.

Bacon wrote an essay on Envy, every point of which is illustrated and enforced in the play.

Of the many misinterpretations of this play, now current, the worst perhaps is that of Reverend Fred-eric G. Fleay, as follows :

"The Tragedy of Julius Caesar contains Caesar's Revenge as well as his Tragedy, and seems to me to be a condensation of two plays into one, made after Shakespeare's retirement by Ben Jonson."

We regret to add that this has been pronounced a "plausible" view by Professor Barrett Wendell of Harvard University.

XLIX.

OBSOLETE LAWS.

On one subject Bacon was continually, but unsuccessfully, pressing his views upon the government. It was on the necessity of a regular systematic revision of the laws, so many of which had then become obsolete. He laid the matter before parliament in what was perhaps the first speech he made there, citing the customs that had prevailed in Greece and Rome, and those that were still prevailing in France, in reference to it, and showing on his own part special interest in the subject. This was in 1593. In 1608 he spoke again in advocacy of the appointment of a commission for the purpose. In 1611, in 1614 and once more also in 1621 he urged the matter directly upon the attention of the king, offering his personal services in the execution of the work.

Shake-speare wrote a drama to demonstrate the importance of removing laws that were obsolete from the statute-books. 'Measure for Measure' was printed for the first time in the Folio of 1623, although probably written in the last days of Elizabeth. We may be sure that the author's heart was in it, for it is one of the grandest productions that ever came from a pen.

L.

PERIOD OF FINAL PUBLICATION.

The Shake-speare Plays began to issue from the press, singly and in quarto form, in 1597. They continued to do so until 1623 when they were collected together, enlarged, revised and published in one folio volume for preservation.

Bacon began to write for the public and for publication in book form also in 1597. He brought his great work, the *Novum Organum*, to a finish, after having spent many years upon it, in 1620. He did the same with the *Advancement of Learning*, first printed eighteen years earlier, in 1623. The *Essays* were printed by him for the last time in 1625. The latter had been continually growing, in number, size and excellence, during the entire preceding period of twenty-eight years. It was, therefore between 1620 and 1625, and chiefly in 1623, that Bacon devoted his time to the revision, enlargement, publication and preservation of his prose writings. The two authors began and ended their respective careers, as shown by their works, at substantially the same time.

LI.

SIR EDWARD COKE.

The dramatist seems to have had a prejudice against the great lawyer, Sir Edward Coke. He caricatured Coke in 'Twelfth Night,' thus :

Sir Toby. "Taunt him with the license of ink ; if thou thou'st him thrice, it shall not be amiss, and as many lies as will lie in thy sheet of paper, although the sheet were big enough for the Bed of Ware in England, set 'em down."

This is a reference to one of Coke's brutal speeches made at the trial of Sir Walter Raleigh, in which occurred these words: "Thou viper! for I thou thee, thou traitor!" Louis Theobald (1733) cites this passage as a proof of the author's detestation of Coke.

Bacon's most implacable enemy throughout his life was Sir Edward Coke. In our 'Bacon vs. Shakspeare, Brief for Plaintiff,' we say:

"The two were constant rivals for the favor of the Court and for the highest honors of the profession to which they belonged. They were rivals, too, for the hand of Lady Hatton, the beautiful widow, who finally waived the eight objections which her friends urged against Coke (his seven children and himself) and gave him the preference. At one time the contention became so personal and bitter that Bacon appealed to the government for help."—7th ed. p. 211.

When the *Novum Organum* appeared, Coke said of it :

"It deserveth not to be read in schools,
But to be freighted in the ship of fools."

LII.

QUEEN ELIZABETH, A VIRGIN.

In the drama of 'King Henry VIII,' written after Queen Elizabeth's death, ~~the author~~ declared that the Queen had lived and died a virgin. *a character*

"She shall be, to the happiness of England,
 An aged princess; many days shall see her,
 And yet, no day without a deed to crown it,
 'Would I had known no more! but she must die —
 She must, the saints must have her — yet a virgin;
 A most unspotted lily shall she pass
 To the ground." — *v. 4, 57.* *H.S.*

Bacon entertained for the Queen nothing but the sincerest and most affectionate sentiments. In 1608, five years after her death, he wrote a memorial of her in which he gave many points of her character and condition in life that had contributed to her felicity. One was the fact that "she was childless and had no issue of her own;" and another as follows: "She was, no doubt, a good and moral queen. Vices she hated, and it was by honest arts that she desired to shine. . . . Very often, many years before her death, she would pleasantly call herself an old woman, and would talk of the kind of epitaph she would like upon her tomb, saying that she had no fancy for glory or splendid titles, but would rather have a line or two of memorial, recording in few words only her name, her virginity, the time of her reign, the reformation of religion, and the preservation of peace."

Bacon was so impressed by his sense of duty to the Queen's memory that in his will (first draft) he gave special directions to his executors to publish this memorial of her.

Queen Elizabeth died March 24, 1603. Within a few months of that event Bacon recorded his opinion of her in the following words: "If Plutarch were now alive to write lives by parallels, it would trouble him, I think, to find for her a parallel among women."

Belief in the Queen's virginity may be said to rest, therefore, upon the testimonies of Francis Bacon, William Shake-speare, and the Queen herself. Ben Jonson also testified to the same effect in his conversations with William Drummond of Hawthornden, sixteen years after the Queen's death. We pity those who can doubt it.

LIII.

WRITINGS DESPISED.

The author of the Plays was fully aware that his writings were generally despised. He did not permit himself, so far as we are informed, to become personally known as their author to any one in London, either within or without theatrical circles, Ben Jonson (who was often at Gorhambury with Bacon) and Sir Thomas Bodley (who was Bacon's confidential correspondent) alone excepted. The Plays were constantly on the boards, and more than sixty editions of some of them published during a period of thirty-two years, but no letter, written by the author on the subject, or in which the slightest reference is made to them, has ever been discovered or heard of.

Certain important writings of Bacon, as we know from his own confession, were despised. In a prayer which he composed shortly before his death he commended himself to God because he had, as he said, "(though in a despised weed) procured the good of all men." What this "weed" or kind of composition was, we may perhaps infer from a statement made by Sir Thomas Bodley that "Bacon had wasted many years of his life on such study as was not worthy of him." Bodley was founder of the library that bears his name at Oxford; under the terms of his gift he specially excluded from it all dramatic productions, on the ground (to use his own words) that they are nothing but "riff-raffs."

No attempt to identify the particular work or works of Bacon that were despised has ever been made. Bodley's condemnation of dramas for his

library, his condemnation of Bacon for writing what was "unworthy of him," and Bacon's confession that "he had sought the good of all men" in some kind of effort that was "despised," may, taken together, lighten the search. If it could be admitted that Bacon wrote dramas, every difficulty would vanish.

LIV.

BRIBERY.

Judge Say was another character in the drama of 'King Henry VI.' He was arrested by Cade and accused of various crimes and misdemeanors for which he was finally beheaded. According to the quarto editions of 1594, 1600, and 1619, he answered his accusers as follows :—

"Kent, in the Commentaries Cæsar wrote,
Is term'd the civil'st place of all this land ;
Then, noble countrymen, hear me but speak ;
I sold not France, I lost not Normandy."

In the play as revised after 1619 and published in the Folio of 1623, this speech is thus enlarged :

"Kent, in the Commentaries Cæsar writ,
Is term'd the civil'st place in all this isle ;
Sweet is the country, because full of riches ;
The people liberal, valiant, active, wealthy ;
Which makes me hope you are not void of pity.
I sold not Maine, I lost not Normandy
Yet to recover them would lose my life ;
Justice with favor have I always done ;
Prayers and tears have mov'd me, gifts could never.
When have I aught exacted at your hands,
But to maintain the king, the realm, and you ?
Large gifts have I bestow'd on learned clerks,
Because my book preferr'd me to the king ;
And seeing ignorance is the curse of God,
Knowledge the wing wherewith we fly to heaven,
Unless you be possess'd with devilish spirits,
You cannot but forbear to murder me ;
This tongue hath parley'd unto foreign kings
For your behoof." — *Second Part*, iv. 7.

In this addition to the speech four passages may be noted :

1. The judge denies that he has been guilty of bribery, though not accused of it in the play, nor, historically, in the administration of justice in his court.

Bacon fell from power in the spring of 1621, under charges of bribery, which he also declared to be false and of which we now know he was innocent.

2. The judge had sent a book of which he was the author to the king and been "preferred" on account of it.

Bacon sent a copy of his *Novum Organum* in 1620 to King James, who immediately created him Viscount St. Alban.

3. The judge had bestowed large gifts on persons of subordinate rank.

Bacon's generosity to the same class of people was a distinguishing trait in his character. He frequently gave gratuities to messengers, who came to him with presents, of £5 10s., or (in money of the present time) £66 (\$330). On one occasion the gratuity (present value) was £300, or \$1,500. In three months (June 24 to Sept. 29, 1618) he disbursed in this way the sum of £302 7s., equal now to £3,600, or \$18,000. This was at the rate of \$72,000 per annum.

4. The judge had conversed on public affairs with foreign potentates.

Bacon had been attaché of a British embassy abroad, and on intimate terms with kings and queens.

The above addition to Judge Say's speech was thus made not only after 1619, at which time the reputed poet had been three years in his grave at Stratford, but even after May 3, 1621, the date of Bacon's degradation from the bench on charges of bribery.

LV.

DARK PERIOD.

At one time Bacon thought himself in serious danger of his life. The popular feeling against him grew out of his connection with the Earl of Essex, although Mr. Spedding has been able to show beyond a doubt that it was wholly misdirected and unjust. The fact of its existence, however, cannot be questioned. Bacon frequently referred to it in his correspondence during the period 1599-1601.

"My life has been threatened and my name libeled."— *Letter to the Queen.*

"As for any violence to be offered me, wherewith my friends tell me I am offered, I thank God I have the privy coat of a good conscience. I know no remedy against libels and lies."— *Letter to Cecil.*

"For my part I have deserved better than to have my name objected to envy, or my life to a ruffian's violence."— *Letter to Howard.*

The Shake-speare Sonnets were written in the latter part of the sixteenth and the early part of the seventeenth centuries. From some unexplained cause the author of these productions seems also to have been at that time in danger of his life.

"Then hate me if thou wilt ; if ever, now,
Now while the world is bent my deeds to cross,
Join with the spite of fortune."— *Sonnet 90.*

"The coward conquest of a wretch's knife."— *Sonnet 74.*

"Your love and pity doth the impression fill,
Which vulgar scandal stamp'd upon my brow ;
For what care I who calls me well or ill,
So you o'ergreen my bad, my good allow ?
You are my all the world, and I must strive
To know my shames and praises from your tongue ;
None else to me, nor I to none alive,
That my steel'd sense or changes right or wrong.
In so profound abysm I throw all care

Of others' voices, that my adder's sense
To critic and to flatterer stopped are,
Mark how with my neglect I do dispense." — *Sonnet 112.*

On this point we quote from Mr. Thomas Tyler's *Shakespeare's Sonnets,* as follows :

"In the series of Sonnets 100 to 126, there are allusions to some scandal which, at the time when these sonnets were written, was in circulation with regard to Shakespeare. . . . How deeply Shakespeare felt the scandal is shown by the first two lines of 112, where he speaks of his forehead as though branded or stamped thereby :

"Your love and pity doth the impression fill,
Which vulgar scandal stamp'd upon my brow."

"The great difficulty in the way of supposing that the reference is merely to the stage and acting is presented by the remarkable language of Sonnet 121, from which it appears that the scandal had some relation to Shakespeare's moral character :

"'T is better to be vile than vile esteem'd,
When not to be receives reproach of being."

"The poem consisting of Sonnets 100 to 126, which speaks of the scandal from which the poet was suffering, we have placed in the spring or early summer of 1601." Page 113.

The Earl of Essex was executed in February, 1601, at which time, or immediately afterward, the scandal against Bacon reached its height.

It appears, then, —

1. That each of these two authors (if there were two) had a "dark period" in his life;
2. That this dark period arose in each from the same cause, a public scandal;
3. That it culminated in each at precisely the same time, "in the spring or summer of 1601;" and
4. That it inspired in both cases fear of assassination.

LVI.

GALEN AND PARACELSUS.

Bacon seems to have had a special enmity against both Galen and Paracelsus. In his ridicule of the ancient sages he yoked these two men together, regardless of the fact that they had nothing in common, were of different nationalities, and lived with an interval between them of fourteen hundred years. Bacon says of them :

“Galen was a man of the narrowest mind, a forsaker of experience, and a vain pretender. Like the dog-star, he condemned mankind to death, for he assumed that whole classes of diseases are incurable. . . . But I could better indure thee, O Galen, weighing thy elements, than thee, O Paracelsus, adorning thy dreams. With what zeal do both of you take shelter under the authority of Hippocrates, like asses under a tree? And who bursts not into laughter at such a sight?

Redargutio Philosophiarum.

Strangely enough, Shake-speare also uses these two names together, and in Bacon's own vein of ridicule and contempt. The passage is in ‘All's Well that Ends Well’ where they are held up to scorn, and that, too, in connection with the Court Physicians, “the learned and authentic fellows,” who had pronounced the King's malady incurable. The passage is as follows :

“*Lafeu.* They say miracles are past ; and we have our philosophical persons, to make modern and familiar things supernatural and causeless. Hence is it, that we make trifles of terrors, ensconcing ourselves into seeming knowledge, when we should submit ourselves to an unknown fear.

Parolles. Why, it is the rarest argument of wonder, that hath shot out in our latter times.

Bertram. And so 't is.

Laf. To be relinquish'd of the artists, —

Par. So I say ; both of Galen and Paracelsus.

Laf. Of all the learned and authentic fellows —

Par. Right ; so I say.

Laf. That gave him out incurable.”

II. 3, 1.

What is said of Galen and Paracelsus in both sets of works has every mark of an individual fancy.

LVII.

INTELLECT.

Shake-speare.

"The glory of the human intellect."—*De Quincy.*

"The greatest intellect in literature."—*Carlyle.*

"An intellectual miracle."—*Chalmers.*

Bacon.

"The most exquisitely constructed intellect that has ever been bestowed on any of the children of men."—*Macaulay.*

"The greatest of all intellects."—*Hallam.*

LVIII.

WISDOM.

Shake-speare.

"The wisest of men." — *Walter Savage Landor.*

Bacon.

"The wisest of men." — *Henry Hallam.*

LIX.

PARADISE REGAINED.

The object of Bacon's philosophy, as repeatedly stated by him, was to restore man's lost empire over nature. But in 1613 he was appointed by King James, Attorney General, and therefore, being at that time over fifty years of age, he could have expected no further leisure for the prosecution of such work. What could then have been more natural to him than the conception of a specially devised drama in which, before bidding farewell to the subject on which he had expended so much thought and which he deemed so important, he should display, on a field apart by itself, some of the new powers he had sought to confer upon mankind? Macaulay says:

"In Bacon's magnificent day-dreams there was nothing wild, nothing but what sober reason sanctioned. He knew that all the secrets feigned by poets to have been written in the books of enchanters are worthless when compared with the mighty secrets which are really written in the book of nature, and which, with time and patience, will be read there. He knew that all the wonders wrought by all the talismans in fables were trifles when compared with the wonders which might reasonably be expected from the 'philosophy of fruit,' and that, if his words sank deep into the minds of men, they would produce effects such as superstition had never ascribed to the incantations of Merlin and Michael Scot. It was here that he loved to let his imagination loose. He loved to picture to himself the world as it would be when his philosophy should, in his own noble phrase, 'have enlarged the bounds of human empire.'" *Essay on Lord Bacon.*

Shake-speare actually wrote such a drama, on precisely the same subject and at precisely the same time. We quote from Sir Richard Garnett: "Here [in the drama of the *Tempest*], more than anywhere else, we seem to see the world as, if it had depended upon him, Shakespeare would have made it."

The date of the drama is assigned to the year 1613, when it was first produced, and when Bacon, as we now know, could have done no further dramatic work until his downfall in 1621.

It was almost immediately after his downfall that he revised and published in complete form and for final preservation his philosophical writings (1621-23), precisely at the same time that the author of the Shake-speare Plays collected together and published in one folio volume all the plays (1623). This was seven years after the death of the Stratford play-actor.

During the middle ages it was a wide-spread opinion throughout continental Europe that storms and tempests are the work of evil spirits, and that they can be dispersed by the ringing of consecrated bells. For this purpose church bells were solemnly baptized, often with water brought from the river Jordan, and also duly tagged at their tongues with scriptural texts. Fortunately the practice never gained a foothold in England, at least in the time of Bacon and Shake-speare, and yet these two authors became in some measure both of them victims to the superstition. We quote from Bacon :

“It is thought that the sounds of bells will dispel lightnings and thunder.”
Sylva Sylvarum, II, 127.

In the Shakesporean play of *The Tempest*, Prospero wishes to allay the storm that had wrecked the king's ship, and he does so in part by the ringing of bells. Ariel sings:

“Ding-Dong ;

Hark ! now I hear them,—ding-dong, bell.”

The *Sylva Sylvarum* was written in 1622-25 ; *The Tempest* was printed in 1623.

LX.

PRODIGALITY.

'Timon of Athens' was neither printed in quarto nor, so far as we know, produced on the stage previously to its appearance in the folio of 1623. No hint of its existence before that date has ever been discovered in contemporaneous literature. This is true of no other play in the Shake-spearean canon. At the outset of our inquiry, then, we encounter a presumption that the 'Timon' of Shake-speare was a new drama, fresh from the hand of its author in 1623, or seven years after the death of the reputed poet at Stratford. Indeed, the character of the play itself seems to raise this presumption to the level of a probability, if not, in connection with other well-known facts, to that of a practical certainty.

Timon was a citizen of Athens; at the beginning of his career, of large means, but so prodigal of expenditure for the good of others that he finally became bankrupt. His ruin was due to an excess of generosity, or to a fatal inappreciation of the value of money. At the slightest need of a friend or even of a servant his hand and purse were always ready to help. The consequence was, that falling at last into great pecuniary straits, and seeking in vain to supply his wants from those whom he had befriended, he became a misanthrope.

Except in one particular, this is an exact portrait-ure of Francis Bacon, and one drawn at the exact time in his own life when he too encountered a like experience of ingratitude.

Bacon was perhaps the most prodigal man that ever lived, more so even than was the younger Pitt,

in both of whom indifference to money considerations amounted almost to a disease. Bacon kept his money in his library, in a chest to which his servants had free access and from which they were accustomed at pleasure to fill their pockets. On one occasion he gave to the man who brought him a buck as a present from the king £25, a gratuity equal in our time and in our money to \$1500. Young men of good families flocked to his service, because they were sure not only of generous and kindly treatment while they were in it, but also of gratuitous and valuable preferments when they left. At his downfall, however, all his parasites forsook him. In vain he begged for help. His letters to Buckingham and the king on the subject of his pecuniary distresses are extremely pathetic. His experiences are precisely those of Timon in the play, though with one characteristic divergence, namely: under the rules of dramatization Timon becomes a misanthrope; Bacon's sweetness of disposition is retained to the last.

Bacon falls from power in 1621; the play first becomes known in 1623.

LXI.

REVISIONS OF WRITINGS FOR THE PRESS.

Many of the Plays were revised and re-revised by the author before they were printed, and also between successive editions. The custom may be said to have been an idiosyncrasy with him. We give some examples :

The drama of 'King John' was first published in 1591; it was extensively re-written for the Folio of 1623.

'The Taming of the Shrew' came out anonymously in 1594. More than one thousand new lines were afterwards introduced into it.

'King Richard II.' was published in several editions between 1597 and 1623. The edition of 1608 had a new scene added to it; and that of 1623 many other important additions.

'King Henry V.' was published and re-published several times before its appearance in the Folio. It grew in the meantime from 1721 lines, as it was in 1602, to 2133, as it was in the Folio.

'Titus Andronicus' was published in 1600, but it had a new scene added to it in 1623.

'The Merry Wives of Windsor' began with 1620 lines in 1602, and reached 2701 in its final form in 1623.

'Hamlet' was revised by the author three times at least in successive editions before it appeared in the Folio.

'King Lear' came from the press in 1608, but underwent many alterations for the edition of 1623.

The second and third parts of 'King Henry VI.' were printed in 1594, but the changes made in them

in 1619, and again in 1623, were extensive. The number of lines was carried, in the one from 2214 to 3353, and from 2311 to 3217, in the other. The old lines retouched (and many of them after 1619) were about 2000.

'Othello' was published for the first time in 1622, six years after William Shakspeare's death at Stratford. One year later, however, it appeared again in the Folio, with 160 new lines and other important emendations.

'King Richard III.' was subjected to like revision, with marked additions and improvements in its final form in 1623.

Bacon rewrote the *Novum Organum* twelve times before its publication in 1620. To the edition of his *Advancement of Learning* (1605) he added seven books in 1623, having extensively revised and rewritten the former text. The *Essays* which he published in 1597 he rewrote for the edition of 1612; and those of 1612, including many of the older ones, he rewrote again for the edition of 1625. Many of his private letters have come down to us in two drafts, the second one rewritten, enlarged and improved from the first.

It will be seen, as already noted, that in the case of both authors the work of revision culminated in or about 1623. William Shakspeare of Stratford had then been seven years in his grave; and during the last twelve years of his life, while living in Stratford and unemployed, had taken no steps to preserve his works (if he had any), or shown any interest whatever in them.

LXII.

POSTHUMOUS WORKS.

It has always excited some astonishment among the students of Shakespeare to learn that of the thirty-six plays printed in the first collective edition (1623), fourteen of them had been written many years earlier, but never before printed. And these included some of the most important, such as *The Tempest*, *Macbeth*, *Julius Cæsar*, *Anthony and Cleopatra*, *Twelfth Night*, *As You Like It*, *Measure for Measure*, *Cymbeline* and *The Winter's Tale*. The inquiry naturally arises, why were they kept back from the custody of type for fifteen or twenty years on the average, while an equally formidable list had been issuing from the press since 1591?

How was it now with Bacon? Was he also in the habit of restraining his literary ambition and postponing for years the publication of his works? The answer to this question must be in the affirmative. The following were written at various dates between 1603 and 1616, but were kept in MS. by him for about twenty years during the remainder of his life: *Cogitata et Visa*, *De Interpretatione Naturæ*, *Descriptio Globi Intellectualis*, *Thema Cœli*, *Filum Labyrinthi*, *De Fluxu et Refluxu Maris*, *Redargutio Philosophiarum*, and many others. The first draft of his greatest work, *Novum Organum* was made in 1608, but the book was not printed until 1620.

So far as one set of these works is concerned, we may have a partial explanation of these delays in a preface to the '*Troilus and Cressida*,' for we are told in it that this play had *escaped* for purpose of publication from *grand possessors*; but for others we have

the explanation in Bacon's own words, written to the Bishop of Winchester in 1622 :

"I account the use that a man should seek of the publishing of his own writings before his death to be but an untimely anticipation of that which is proper to follow a man, and not to go along with him."

LXIII.

FALLEN GREATNESS.

The drama of King Henry VIII. was first printed in the Folio of 1623; no certain proof of its existence previous to that date has been discovered. Its principal character is Cardinal Wolsey, and its most brilliant speech the Cardinal's lament over his fallen greatness.

"Farewell! a long farewell to all my greatness!
 This is the state of man: to-day he puts forth
 The tender leaves of hope; tomorrow blossoms,
 And bears his blushing honors thick upon him;
 The third day comes a frost, a killing frost,
 And when he thinks, good easy man, full surely
 His greatness is a ripening, — nips his root,
 And then he falls, as I do. I have ventur'd,
 Like little wanton boys that swim on bladders,
 This many summers in a sea of glory,
 But far beyond my depth; my high-blown pride
 At length broke under me, and now has left me
 Weary, and old with service, to the mercy
 Of a rude stream that must forever hide me.
 Vain pomp and glory of this world, I hate ye."

iii. 2, 351.

Then follow the well known lines:

"O Cromwell, Cromwell!
 Had I but serv'd my God with half the zeal
 I serv'd my King, he would not in mine age
 Have left me naked to mine enemies."

iii. 2, 454.

Bacon fell from power, and from the same exalted office as that from which the great Cardinal fell, with equal shame and disgrace, in 1621. A few months afterward, in a letter to the King, he wrote:

"Cardinal Wolsey said that if he had pleased God as he had pleased the King he had not been ruined."

Shakespeare wrote that passage from the Cardinal's speech in the play, and Bacon the same passage in a letter to the King, at practically the same time.

LXIV.

DISAPPOINTMENT IN LIFE.

The author of the Plays led a disappointed life. He makes this confession in one of the Sonnets :

“O! for my sake do you with fortune chide,
The guilty goddess of my harmful deeds,
That did not better for my life provide
Than public means, which public manners breeds
Thence comes it that my name receives a brand,
And almost thence my nature is subdu’d
To what it works in, like the dyer’s hand.
Pity me then.”

Sonnet iii.

We quote from Bacon :

“I do confess, since I was of any understanding, my mind hath in effect been absent from that I have done; . . . knowing myself by inward calling to be fitter to hold a book than to 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.”

Bacon's Prayer.

LXV.

COMPANIONSHIP IN DISTRESS.

The craving for sympathy which the dramatist felt called upon on many occasions to express almost always took a particular direction; it was for that which comes from companionship. This is especially noticeable in 'King Richard II.', 'King Lear' and 'The Tempest.'

Bacon's life, it may generally be said, was one long series of misfortunes. In 1595 the Queen refused to admit him into her service, on the ground that, as member of Parliament, he had been too independent in his course. His friends frequently importuned him to make an apology for it, but he never did. On the contrary he suffered himself to be disgraced for ten long years on account of it, simply saying that "he was indifferent whether God or her Majesty called him." Six years later his old friend, the Earl of Essex, was executed for treason, his "entire dear brother Anthony" died, and his mother became violently insane. In 1621 he fell from power under charges of bribery (since proved to have been false) and was sentenced to pay a fine of £40,000, to be imprisoned in the Tower, to be forever incapable of any office in the Commonwealth, never to sit in Parliament, or come within the verge (twelve miles) of the court.

It is therefore easy to understand why the craving for sympathy runs through so much of his private correspondence, and especially for that peculiar and exceptional form of it that brings consolation from companionship. In a letter to a friend he said: "amongst consolations it is not the least to repre-

sent to a man like examples of calamity in others." The examples he cited, as applicable to his own case, were those of Demosthenes, Cicero and Seneca, men who, like himself, were orators and statesmen.

It is worthy of remark that the cases cited in the plays are also, as with Bacon, similar in kind, one with another. Take the case in 'Richard II.' The king is about to be deposed and murdered, and the sympathy he calls for is such as belongs to kings :

" For God's sake, let us sit upon the ground,
And tell sad stories of the death of kings ;
How some have been depos'd, some slain in war,
Some haunted by the ghosts they have depos'd,
Some poison'd by their wives, some sleeping kill'd.
All murder'd." iii. 2, 83.

In 'King Lear' Edgar seeks consolation for himself by comparing his own misery with the King's, for he sees the King borne off to escape being murdered by his daughters :

" When we our betters see bearing our woes,
We scarcely think our miseries our foes.
.
.
.
.
.
.
How light and portable my pain seems now,
When that which makes me bend makes the king bow." iii. 6, 102.

In 'The Tempest' Gonzalo has been shipwrecked; accordingly he turns to distresses among mariners :

" Our hint of woe is common ; every day some sailor's wife,
The master of some merchant, and the merchant,
Have just our theme of woe." ii. 1, 3.

LXVI.

DEATH OF DESDEMONA.

The most perplexing denouement in Shakespeare, one that has been deemed so utterly at variance with the laws of human nature that few editors and commentators have ventured to discuss it, is found in the circumstances attending Desdemona's death in the tragedy of 'Othello.' Shakespearean scholars have here as a rule and with exceptional modesty stood aghast, conscious of their inability to explain, and yet unwilling to risk against the great dramatist, who seems to have taken all knowledge for his province, a charge either of ignorance or of wilful violation of the canons of art. Dyce, Staunton, Halliwell-Phillipps, White, and many others do not even mention it. Voltaire and Furness, however, are two conspicuous exceptions; the one, exhausting his powers of ridicule over the scene as depicted in the drama, and the other, referring the difficulty to professional experts, and then in despair leaving it undefended and unexplained.

Desdemona, it is well-known, is smothered to death in bed by her husband. Within about a half minute to a minute, if we may judge by the dialogue between Othello and Emilia that ensues, to make sure that there will be no recovery, she is smothered again, this time beyond all question, for she is now pronounced by the dramatist, who has every fact at his command, to be actually dead. Three minutes more elapse, during which she lies motionless, without breath, when she suddenly speaks, utters several sentences at three several times, with pauses and replies in a rational conversation, and then, no further vio-

lence having been offered her, expires. The question is, how could Desdemona have retained consciousness and power of cognition and speech, not less than four or five minutes, after the actual stroke of death had been inflicted upon her?

Dr. Furness of Philadelphia, in his *Variorum* edition of the play published in 1886, discussed the matter at some length. Intimating as he did that "there does seem to be something not altogether true to physiology in the subsequent revival of Desdemona," and desirous of bringing to the aid of his exegesis the light of modern science, he addressed letters to several eminent physicians of this country, soliciting their views on the subject. We summarize the replies received, excluding all speculations in conflict with the text, as follows:

DR. AGNEW. "I would say that Shakespeare has been most unfortunate in killing Desdemona. Death by strangulation, inferred from the language used by Othello, — 'whose breath, indeed, these hands have newly stopp'd' — cannot readily be reconciled with a temporary revival and ability to speak at three different times on the part of the victim, after all signs of life had apparently disappeared.

DR. DA COSTA. That she should have spoken after being smothered is not possible; if she had regained consciousness sufficiently to speak intelligently, as she did, recovery would have ensued."

DR. HAMMOND. "A person smothered, and speaking afterwards, would not die from the smothering. . . . As to what really killed her, I think it is clearly apparent that Shakespeare was ignorant of the *modus operandi* of smothering."

Dr. Furnivall, in his edition of the play, simply says that Shakespeare "forgot that a person, once stifled, couldn't speak again." In view of these opinions, no one will be surprised to learn that some actors, in order to rescue the scene from absurdity,

have actually stabbed Desdemona on the stage. Booth and Fechter did it.

Mr. Swinburne thinks that the difficulty arises from the want of proper stage directions which the author would have supplied, had he revised the play. Such directions must have explained, he says, "how Desdemona manages to regain her breath so as to speak three times . . . after being stifled to death. To recover breath enough to speak, to think, . . . can hardly be less than to recover breath enough to revive and live."

The question now recurs, what could have induced the dramatist to foist upon the narrative a circumstance so extraordinary and so contrary apparently to all human experience? Is it known that at any previous time in his career he had ever investigated the possibility of so strange an occurrence?

The answer is at hand.

Francis Bacon was retired to private life in May, 1621; he died in April, 1626. One of the first of his works to which he gave attention during this interval was the *Historia Vitae et Mortis*. In this we find precisely what we are looking for, proof that one person at least, in the time when the Shakespeare plays were coming out, carefully inquired how long one's physical and mental powers can act in certain directions after every sign of life is gone. We now quote from Bacon:

"Eels, serpents, and insects move a good while in all their parts after being cut in pieces; so that countrymen imagine that the different parts are trying to unite again. Birds likewise flutter for a little after their heads are cut off; and the hearts of animals beat for a long time after being torn out. Indeed, I remember to have seen the heart of a man who had his bowels torn out (the punishment with us of high treason), which, on being cast according to

custom into the fire, leaped up at first about a foot and a half high, and then by degrees to a less height, for the space, as I remember, of seven or eight minutes.

“There is likewise an old and trustworthy tradition of an ox bellowing after his bowels were torn out. But there is a more certain report of a man who, having undergone the said punishment for treason, when his heart had been torn out and it lay in the hands of the executioner, was heard to utter three or four words of prayer.”

Desdemona spoke after she had for a long time been deprived of breath; here was a man who, according to Bacon's account of him, spoke not only after he had lost his bowels, but also an appreciable length of time after he had lost his heart. In such cases as these, of bird, mammal and man, Bacon seems to have seen only the natural flickerings of the lamp of life. He would, of course, have had the same opinion in a like case after smothering, for life is then, as in the case cited, instantaneously and irrevocably extinguished.

The tragedy was first printed in 1622; the *Historia Vitae et Mortis*, early in January following. The two studies in this exceptional matter were apparently simultaneous.

LXVII.

PHILIP HENSLOWE.

Henslowe was a proprietor and manager of theatres in London in the time of Shakespeare. He had dealings with nearly all the dramatic poets among his contemporaries, entering their names in his diary, the titles of the plays they sold him, and the amounts paid them. This diary was found at Dulwich in 1790, and is still extant. It covers almost the exact period (1591-1609), during which the Shakespearean plays were being first produced.

The following named playwrights are mentioned in it: Drayton, Jonson, Wilson, Hathway, Dekker, Monday, Chettle, Webster, Middleton, Heywood, Chapman, Day, Nash, Pett, Smith, Birde, Daborne, Mandeville, Singer, Slater, Marston, Porter, Rowley, Haughton, Rankins, Wadson and Boyle. These were all mentioned by name.

The plays themselves which are credited to these dramatists in the diary are very numerous, but others are entered there which have no authors assigned to them. Among these are King Lear, Henry V., Henry VI. (15 times), Richard III., The Taming of a Shrew, and Titus Andronicus. It is probable that Love's Labor's Lost under another name (Berowne, a character in it) was also acquired and produced by Henslowe in the same manner. But though the diary extends over a period of eighteen years and bears a record not only of the dramas played in the theatres under Henslowe's management but also of the amounts of money advanced by him from time to time to their authors, to those whose abilities and honor commanded his confidence, the name of Shake-

speare never once occurs in it from beginning to end. Why is this? Evidently a deliberate suppression, and explainable only on the ground that the author, perhaps because he was a nobleman or a high officer of the government, was, as Aubrey says of Bacon and as Bacon once said of himself, a "concealed poet."

LXVIII.

GEORGE SANDYS.

It is practically certain that both Bacon and Shakespeare read George Sandys' book of Travels, published in 1615, and even made use of much of its contents in their respective writings. Indeed, we know from Bacon alone not only what countries Sandys visited, but also the order in which he visited them. We give a few examples from each :

Bacon. "The water of Nilus is sweeter than other waters in taste."

Sandys. "Than the waters whereof there is none more sweet."

Bacon. "It is certain that in Egypt they prepare and clarify the water of the Nile by putting it in great jars of stone, and stirring it about with a few stamped almonds; wherewith they also besmear the mouth of the vessel; and so draw it off after it hath rested some time."

Sandys. "They put the water in large jars of stone, stirring it about with a few stamped almonds, wherewith also they besmear the mouth of the vessel; and for three or four hours do suffer it to clarify."

Bacon. "It is reported of credit that if you take earth from land adjoining to the river of Nile, and preserve it in that manner that it come to be neither wet nor wasted, and weigh it daily, it will not alter weight until June 17, which is the day when the river beginneth to rise."

Sandys. "Take of the earth of Egypt, adjoining to the river, and preserve it carefully, that it neither come to be wet nor wasted; weigh it daily, and you shall find it neither more nor less heavy until the 17th of June; at which day it beginneth to grow ponderous, and augmenteth with the augmentation of the river."

Bacon. "It is an old tradition that those that dwell near the cataracts of Nilus are stricken deaf."

Sandys. "He spouts down from a wonderful height into the valley below, and that with such a roaring of waters that a colony, planted by the Persians, and made almost deaf with the noise, were glad to abandon their habitations."

Bacon. "Upon that very day when the river first riseth, great plagues in Cairo use suddenly to break up."

Sandys. "The Plague, which here oft miserably rageth, upon the first of the flood doth instantly cease."

Shake-speare. "They take the flow o' the Nile
By certain scales i' the pyramid."

Sandys. "By the pillar, standing in a vault within the Castle, entered by the Nile, they measure his increase."

Shake-speare. "They know
By the height, the lowness, or the mean, if dearth,
Or foison follow. The higher Nilus swells,
The more it promises."

Sandys. "Answerable to the increase of the river, is the plenty or scarcity of the year succeeding."

Shake-speare. "As it ebbs, the seedsman
Upon the slime and ooze scatters his grain,
And shortly comes to harvest."

Sandys. "Retiring a month after within his proper bounds, it giveth way unto husbandry (the earth untilled) by throwing the grain on the mud, and rice into the water."

Sandys' book of travels was published in London in 1615; that is, as years were then reckoned, between March 25, 1615, and March 25, 1616. William Shakspeare, the reputed poet, died at Stratford April 23, 1616, or within less than one year and one month, perhaps one month only, after said publication in London. His will was drawn by a scrivener in January preceding, at which time he was unable to recall the name of a grandchild, eleven years of age. His death was occasioned, according to the best evidence that we possess, by a drunken debauch. That Shakspeare became acquainted with Sandys' book during the last year of his life in such a town as Stratford, where, according to Richard Grant White, not a half-dozen books, outside of the school and the church, could be found, and where only six of the

nineteen aldermen and burgesses could write their names, is well nigh incredible. If he did, his own daughters could not have read the title-page. One of them signed her name to a bond on the day of her marriage with a mark, and the other, after living with her husband twenty-seven years, could not distinguish his handwriting from another's.

Shakespeare made his last will and testament at the very time he would have been reading Sandys, that is, during the last year of his life, but no mention of such a book or, indeed, of any other, is found in it. It seems to be highly improbable, therefore, that he could have been the author of the Shakespearean drama, 'Anthony and Cleopatra,' in which the passages, taken from Sandys, appeared for the first time in 1623, seven years after his death. Bacon's work, *Sylva Sylvarum*, in which like passages appeared, was written in 1623-26. Bacon died in 1626.

LXIX.

FUTURE LIFE.

On the subject of a future life two authors of distinction perceive a remarkable coincidence between the writings of Shake-speare and Bacon :

“In his great tragedies he traces the workings of noble or lovely human characters on to the point, and no further, where they disappear in the darkness of death, and ends with a look *back*, never on toward anything beyond.”
E. D. West.

“As for the hopes and fears of a second life, they are as completely absent [from Bacon's Essays] as they are from the Pentateuch.”
Edwin A. Abbott.

LXX.

THE BUST AT STRATFORD-UPON-AVON.



Under Shakspeare's bust in the church at Stratford is the following inscription :

JUDICIO PYLIUM, GENIO SOCRATEM, ARTE MARONEM.

[In wisdom a Nestor, in genius a Socrates, in art a Virgil.]

In other words, the person thus commemorated

was a statesman, a philosopher and a poet. It is also stated under the bust that the body of Shakspeare lies "within this monument;" this is, of course, an error, for the body of the Stratford Shakspeare is buried under the floor of the chancel, at some distance from the monument, whence Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps justly inferred that the inscription was composed "neither by a Stratfordian nor by any one acquainted with its destined position."

Can it be that these words were intended to apply, not to an ignorant yokel, but to Francis Bacon? No one who does not stand at or near the head of the human race can satisfy the requirements, as the following considerations will show:

WISDOM. Bacon can be compared to no other person in ancient or modern times more fitly in this respect than to Nestor, who for his wisdom in practical affairs was reckoned by the Greeks among the immortal gods. Indeed, the title by which Bacon has now become universally known is, *THE WISEST OF MANKIND*.

GENIUS. Socrates and Bacon, one among the ancients and the other in modern times, are perhaps the two greatest moral forces ever introduced into humanity. Indeed, Bacon is often called Socrates. "No book," says Macauley, referring to the *Novum Organum*, "ever made so great a revolution in the mode of thinking, overthrew so many prejudices, introduced so many new opinions. Every part of it blazes with wit, but with wit which is employed only to illustrate and decorate truth."

ART. Under the head of art we have in the inscription as our third exemplar the Author of the *Æneid*. This is perhaps the happiest inspiration of all in the matter before us, for it serves to explain and justify the finest piece of literary criticism ever made on Francis Bacon. We give it without comment:

"There is something about him not fully understood or discerned which, in spite of all curtailments of his claims in regard to one special kind of eminence or another, still leaves the sense of his eminence as strong as ever.


George L. Craik.

The discrepancy between the bust (which all good judges say "has no more individuality or power than

a boy's marble ") and the inscription under it may be dismissed.



LXXI.
PORTRAIT.



Drëshout Portrait (as reputed) of the Stratford Shakspere.

This is the portrait inserted as a frontispiece in the folio editions of Shake-speare, beginning in 1623, seven years after the reputed author's death. It is hardly considered as the likeness of a human being.

Mr. Boaden, in his 'Portraits of Shakespeare' (1824), calls it "an abominable libel on humanity."

Richard Grant White, "a hard wooden staring thing."

Dr. Ingleby, "such a montrosity that I for one do not believe it had any trustworthy exemplar."

Mr. Norris, in his 'Portraits of Shake-speare,' p. 15, says, "it is not known from what it was copied, and many think it unlike any human being."

Dr. Appleton Morgan, President of the New York Shakespeare Society: "The face has the wooden expression familiar in the Indians used as signs for tobacconists' shops, accompanied by an idiotic stare that would be but a sorry advertisement for the humblest establishment in that Trade."

Mr. Skottowe, in his 'Life of Shakespeare,' p. 76: "Irreconcilable with the belief of its ever having borne a striking resemblance to any human being."

Craig's 'Shakespeare and Art,' p. 25: "The head is comparatively narrow, so very marked in this respect that it indicates not only weakness in the portrait but feebleness in the character. . . . As a monumental effigy, it would deservedly become the scorn and scoff of future ages."

The greatest portrait painter, with the possible exception of Sir Joshua Reynolds, England has produced was Thomas Gainsborough; in 1768, he expressed this opinion of the Shakespeare frontispiece:

"A stupider face I never beheld. It is impossible that such a mind and ray of heaven could shine with such a face and pair of eyes as that picture has."

It is marvelous that in all these years, nearly three centuries, and in a matter to which scholars have given so much time and attention, the explanation of this mystery is only now just dawning upon the world. Ben Jonson gives a hint of it in the lines referring to the engraver, contributed by him to the

first Folio and printed opposite the frontispiece, in part as follows :

“O, could he but have drawn his wit
As well in brass as he hath hit
His face, the print would then surpass
All that was ever writ in brass.”

That is, as Mr. Donnelly interprets the lines,

All that was ever writ — in brass.

The truth is, as Mr. Borman first conjectured, the portrait is masked. Even the line of demarkation along the chin is visible. The whole thing is evidently a caricature, to which the engraver, in view of a royal decree promulgated in the first year of Elizabeth, that no man under a penalty of 3s. 4d. should appear at the great table with a beard exceeding a fortnight's growth, has given a humorous touch.

LXXII.

BEHIND A MASK.

Bacon described his philosophy as The Interpretation of Nature. What he meant by nature in this connection he tells us in the *Novum Organum*, thus: "It may be asked whether I speak of natural philosophy alone, or whether I mean that the other sciences, logic, ethics and politics, should also be carried on by this method. Now I certainly mean what I have said to be understood of them all; and as the common logic, which governs by the syllogism, extends not only to natural, but also to all sciences, so does mine, which, proceeding by induction, embraces everything. For I form a history and tables of discovery for anger, fear, shame and the like; for matters political; and again for the mental operations of memory, composition, division, judgment and the rest, not less than for heat and cold, or light, or vegetation." (CXXVII). He says further, elsewhere and with more particularity, that he will treat of the "characters and dispositions of men as they are affected by sex, by age, by religion, by health and illness, by beauty and deformity; and also of those which are caused by fortune, as sovereignty, nobility, obscure birth, riches, want, magistracy, prosperity and adversity."

Bacon's philosophy, therefore, as he conceived it, embraced our whole being, the mind and its traits as well as the physical powers by which we are governed. It had no other limitation than that of our life and its interests here on the earth.

Among the personal qualifications of such an interpreter, as laid down by Bacon, is one to which thus

far little attention has been given, viz. *Let him manage his personal affairs under a mask, but with due regard to the circumstances in which he is placed.*¹ This is probably as clear a statement on the point as Bacon deemed it prudent to make, but the following inference from it is unmistakable; any person who would undertake Bacon's work as a philosopher and carry it on as he did must wear a mask. Therefore it follows that Bacon himself wore one. That is, he wrote under a pseudonym.

The author of the Plays also wore a mask, for the name he assumed — Shake-speare — could not possibly have been his true one. No such patronymic was ever known in the history of the world. It seems to have been derived from Pallas, the goddess of wisdom, whose name was itself derived from *πάλλειν*, to *shake*, and who was represented in the statuary art of the Greeks with an immense spear in her right hand. She was known indeed as the Spear-shaker or Shake-spear of the Grecian civilization.

This name, with a hyphen between the syllables, appears fifteen times in the Shakespearean Plays. Ben Jonson refers to it in the poem with which he opens the great Shakespearean Folio of 1623 :

“ He seems to shake a lance,
As brandish't at the eyes of ignorance.”

¹ The original Latin is as follows: *Privata negotia personatus administret, rerum tamen provisus subveniens*. Mr. Spedding says of it in a foot-note: “I cannot say that I clearly understand the sentence; but I think it must refer to the necessity of using popular ideas for popular purposes.” His associate in the editorship of Bacon's works, Mr. Ellis, is, to say the least, equally unhappy in his translation of it: “He must affect more interest in them [his private affairs] than he feels.” This seems to have spurred Mr. Spedding to still another conjecture of the meaning thus: “The interpreter must speak to people in their own language.” Comment on such ridiculous guesswork is unnecessary.

It may indeed have suggested the actual mask seen in the Droeshout portrait of the author of the Plays in the Folios. This explains why that portrait does not resemble a human being.

In Liddell and Scott's Greek-English lexicon the name of Pallas is etymologically given as *The Brandisher of the Spear*.

SUMMARY OF COINCIDENCES.

1. Shakespeare eulogizes the people of Kent county (and of no other) in England, the home of the Bacon family.

2. Both authors were aristocrats.

3. Both were educated at the same university.

4. Each was extraordinarily self-confident that his own writings were immortal.

5. Shakespeare's vocabulary is the largest ever attained by any individual in any language or in any age of the world. Bacon's is equally remarkable for its extent and richness.

6. Both seem to have acquired all knowledge then existing, Bacon having made this one of his professed aims in life.

7. Both considered themselves old men before they were thirty-seven or thereabouts.

8. Both were great orators.

9. Both were profound lawyers.

10. The scenes of the early plays are those where Bacon had spent his youth.

11. Both had a colloquial use of the French language.

12. Immediately before the historical drama of King Henry VI. was written, Bacon visited the English battle-grounds, described in that drama, in France.

13. Bacon had special opportunities, as an attaché of the English embassy in France, to investigate the career of Joan of Arc. The author of the drama of King Henry VI. must actually have investigated it.

14. Both wrote sonnets.

15. Florio published a sonnet the author of which

he described as (1) his friend; (2) a person of high rank; and (3) a concealed poet. Bacon answers to this description in every particular.

16. In the last days of Elizabeth both authors feared the rising democracy.

17. Both were familiar with the private rules that govern the Inner Temple in London, an institution for lawyers to which the public were not admitted.

18. Both favored the use of commonplace books, the dramatist advocating it at the time when Bacon was actually keeping one.

19. Both names were inscribed in the handwriting of the time on one of Bacon's private portfolios (recently discovered), the latter containing, *inter alia*, some of Bacon's manuscripts and among them two of the Shake-speare plays.

20. The first of the Shake-speare poems to be published was dedicated to one of Bacon's most intimate friends, a nobleman whose consent (for the want of which a play-actor would have lost his ears) had not been previously obtained.

21. This poem was written before the reputed poet's arrival in London, with no possible education beyond that afforded by the Stratford grammar school. And yet, as agreed by all scholars who have examined the subject, it bears every mark of collegiate elegance and culture.

22. Both were familiar with the art of play-acting, one laying down rules for it in 'Hamlet,' and the other superintending exercises of the kind as a recognized proficient therein among the young lawyers of Gray's Inn.

23. Shake-speare made a practice of using the

plots of others for his dramas, and Bacon, in writing history, acknowledged his dependence on authors who had preceded him and given him the main facts. The method which one acted upon the other explained and defended.

24. Bacon's brother was residing in Navarre and in constant correspondence with Francis at the time when the comedy of 'Love's Labor's Lost' was written. The scene of the play is laid at the court of Navarre. It deals with the mode of study then in vogue in the world, the one that caused Bacon's disgust at Cambridge and induced him to leave the university without completing his course or taking his degree.

25. Bacon was an undergraduate at Cambridge at the time when Dr. Caius was conducting himself in so exciting a manner among the students there. The doctor is ridiculed under his own name in the 'Merry Wives of Windsor.'

26. One of the historical plays of Shake-speare was devoted to the reign of King John, but no mention is made in it of the Magna Charta, the great event of the reign. Bacon disapproved of every effort of the people to gain a part in the government.

27. The author of the plays gives in the drama of King Henry VI. an erroneous view of the character of the Duke of Gloucester. It is the view that was taken of it at the Duke's home at St. Albans. Bacon lived at St. Albans.

28. Bacon became debtor to a Jew and was arrested in the street for non-payment under circumstances designed to disgrace him. It was but a month or two afterward that Shake-speare produced the 'Merchant of Venice' with Shylock as its principal character.

29. The author of 'Troilus and Cressida,' as intimated in the preface to it, was not only a member of the nobility, but also a popular lawyer. Bacon was both a nobleman and a lawyer.

30. Both of our authors had great admiration for the character of Julius Cæsar, one calling him "the noblest man that ever lived," and the other, "the worthiest man that ever lived." Shake-speare wrote a drama and Bacon a biography of him. Both were impressed with Cæsar's work on the calendar.

31. In Shake-speare's series of historical dramas the reign of Henry VII. is strangely omitted; but Bacon wrote a history of it in prose, beginning at the exact point where Shake-speare left off in the preceding drama, and leaving off at the exact point where Shake-speare began again in the next.

32. The author of the Plays dramatised Woolsey's downfall from the Lord Chancellorship of England in the play of King Henry VIII., first published in 1623. Bacon fell from the same high office in 1621, and died in 1626. The reputed poet died at Stratford in 1616.

33. Shake-speare portrayed the symptoms of insanity in several of the plays published after 1603. Bacon had sole charge of his mother, who was violently insane from 1601 to 1610.

34. Both authors knew that the tidal current through the Bosphorus always flows from east to west, Shake-speare mentioning the fact in one of his dramas; not however in the first edition of this drama, published six years after the reputed poet's death at Stratford, but in the second, published one year later still.

35. When the author of the plays was obliged to

seek a new name for his famous buffoon, he adopted that of Sir John Falstaff. The selection has never been satisfactorily accounted for, but it is now known that at the date of its adoption Bacon had an associate in the practice of law named John Halstaff.

36. Both authors had an idiosyncrasy for writing words in one language with the alphabet of another.

37. Both were familiar with the Spanish language.

38. Both were familiar with the Italian language.

39. Both were familiar with the Greek language.

40. Both held the opinion that foul odors were the cause of epilepsy.

41. Both authors adopted the theory that the centre of the earth is cold, at precisely the same time and against the otherwise universal opinion of mankind.

42. Both opposed the Copernican theory, and continued to oppose it through life, even after it had been generally accepted.

43. Both changed their views relating to the cause of the tides at the same time, in the same manner, and against universal opinion.

44. Both also changed their minds late in life regarding the philosophic connection between motion and sense.

45. The two were further agreed on an abstruse and purely technical matter in the science of music, but neither opinion was expressed until many years after the death of the reputed poet at Stratford, and then at the same precise time.

46. The difference between nature and art was defined by the two in the same terms and simultaneously.

47. In one of the early plays judicial torture was

condemned ; but in a later edition, after Bacon had been obliged by command of the King to take part in a case of the kind, the condemnatory passage was omitted.

48. Both authors wrote on the subject of envy, one a drama and the other an essay. The drama was first published in 1623 and the essay in 1625, with the same sentiments in the two productions.

49. Both took great interest in efforts to secure repeal of obsolete laws, one writing a drama on the subject and the other twice proffering his services to the government to that end.

50. The writings of both were brought into complete and permanent form and finally published for preservation at the same time, the Shake-speare plays and poems in 1623 and Bacon's *Novum Organum* and *De Augmentis Scientiarum* in 1620-23.

51. The two were alike at enmity with Sir Edward Coke.

52. Both declared that Queen Elizabeth had lived and died a virgin.

53. Both produced works that were despised by contemporaries.

54. Bacon was condemned for bribery against his protestations of innocence in 1621. The dramatist, in the name of one of his characters, disclaimed charges of bribery after 1619 and before 1623.

55. Each had a dark period in his life, due to a scandal of the same kind and producing the same effect.

56. Each associated closely together in ridicule and contempt two physicians, one who was born in Asia Minor and had been dead more than a thousand years, and the other born in Switzerland and had been dead

nearly a hundred years, with no apparent connection between them.

57. Each has been considered by excellent judges the greatest intellectual force that ever existed in the world.

58. Each has acquired the title, given by general consent, of 'the wisest of mankind.'

59. The great drama of 'The Tempest,' which has so long been an enigma to scholars, is simply an application of Bacon's philosophy to mankind.

60. 'Timon of Athens' was unknown until it was published in 1623, two years after Bacon's downfall. Its subject is prodigality, one of the causes of Bacon's distress at that period of his life.

61. Both authors were in the habit of making frequent revisions of their writings for the press, even after the writings had been printed; in some instances, after they had been printed several times.

62. Both authors left an extraordinarily large number of their works to be published posthumously, Bacon confessing that he did it on principle.

63. Cardinal Wolsey's lament over fallen greatness, as given in the drama of King Henry VIII., exactly befits Bacon's personal experience.

64. Both authors claim to have led disappointed lives.

65. Both sought consolation in like examples of distress in others.

66. Bacon investigated the question how long conscientiousness can exist after every sign of life in the body has disappeared; Shakespeare illustrated Bacon's erroneous and absurd conclusions in the death of Desdemona.

67. Philip Henslow had extensive dealings with

London dramatists during nearly all of Shake-speare's life, but though keeping a diary, never mentions Shake-speare by name.

68. Both authors are known to have read George Sandy's book of Travels and to have quoted from it.

69. The tragedies of Shake-speare and the Essays of Bacon are equally and strangely reticent on the subject of a future life.

70. The inscription under the bust at Stratford applies, not to Shakspere, the play-actor, but to Bacon.

71. The frontispiece in the Shake-peare Folios represents the author behind a mask.

72. Bacon advises all interpreters of human nature and life, such as he acknowledged himself to be and such as we know the author of the Shake-speare Poems and Plays to have been, to write under pseudonyms.

Notes

1950

SIMPLIFYD SPELING ASSN;

Y=i&I j&J="The";

2334 Durant, Berkeley, Calif.

*Very partially
used in this (1950)*

The first part of the book is devoted to a general history of the country, and to a description of the various parts of it.

The second part is devoted to a description of the various parts of the country, and to a description of the various parts of it.

The third part is devoted to a description of the various parts of the country, and to a description of the various parts of it.

The fourth part is devoted to a description of the various parts of the country, and to a description of the various parts of it.

The fifth part is devoted to a description of the various parts of the country, and to a description of the various parts of it.

The sixth part is devoted to a description of the various parts of the country, and to a description of the various parts of it.

The seventh part is devoted to a description of the various parts of the country, and to a description of the various parts of it.

1821
Printed by
J. B. R. & Co.
No. 101, South Street,
New York.

Manuscript Appendix by the donor for
 a copy of Edwin Reed's "Coincidences"
 presented to the Public Library of Young-
 town, Ohio, February 1925.
 (Copy of that in the actual book presented.)

The donor of this book has intended to
 make himself just as nearly the best-
 posted person in America upon the sub-
 ject of the Shakespearean authorship
 mystery and controversy as it is possi-
 ble for him to do. And he has ^{had} facilities
 to study it far superior to those enjoyed
 by the average person; for his business
 has taken him into most of the large
 cities of the United States and whatever
 has been available upon this subject
 in the great libraries of such cities
 as Cleveland and New Orleans and Pitts-
 burgh and Chicago and Milwaukee
 and Los Angeles and Seattle and ⁱⁿ the
 great State Library of California and ⁱⁿ
 the Public Library of New York City
 he has studied. He has read more than
 forty books upon the Shakespearean au-
 -thorship controversy and more than
 that many magazine articles upon it.

It is in a position to make some additions to Mr. Reed's present text that will be the most valuable and increase its effectiveness. --- One of the ^{minor} writers upon the Shakespearean authorship problem has very discreetly and very truly said:

"The transference of the honor of writing the immortal Shakespeare dramas from one man to another, if definitely effected, becomes not merely a national or contemporary event, but a world event of permanent importance, destined to leave a mark as enduring as human literature and the human race, itself."

This is true: and that transference most surely will be "definitely effected" to Francis Bacon, the man who is truly entitled to that honor and to our gratitude. The long and earnest labor of Edwin Reed has enabled him to make a most important contribution toward his establishment of justice and overthrow of the traditional Stratfordian folly and in-justice. Had Mr. Reed put the last, capping "shovelfull of earth upon his mountain" and brought his many valuable books upon this important matter into one book, that,

completer and more effective presentation
 might actually have produced that 'defi-
 nite transference' and have linked Mr.
 Reed's name indissolubly with that
 "world event." As it is he leaves the prize
 for us other men to strive for. The present
 writer has a forthcoming book upon the
 subject and he has studied the writings
 of Ben Jonson carefully and more thoroly
 than most other writers upon the Shake-
 spearean authorship appear to have done.
 He has found in Jonson's writings a very
 definite and convincing statement that
 Francis Bacon was the author of the "Shake-
 speare's Works." But without this, such
circumstantial evidence as Mr. Reed
 and many others have brought out would
 inevitably establish it, in time — "The
 mills of God grind slowly, but they
 grind exceeding small." Ben Jonson
 helped his friend Bacon in bringing out
 the Shakespeare Folio of 1623 under a con-
 cealing non-de-plume, but in the lat-
 ter part of his life the opprobrium that
 the fool Stratfordians had heaped upon
 Jonson himself goaded him to write
 things revealing the true authorship.

Note to Coincidence No. I, page 7, and also to No. X, page 19 :

The early Shakespearean play of King Henry VI is very notably such as we might expect from young Francis Bacon and not from young William Shakspeare of Stratford. It is further the fact that the name of St. Albans, Bacon's youthful home, occurs quite frequently in "Shakespeare's Works" but that Stratford is never once mentioned in them, and he was never once mentioned in them.

The hypphenating of the author's name upon most of the early-printed plays, to which Mr. Reed refers in his preface and in No. LXXII "Shake-speare", and the entirely diverse spelling of the name of Wm Shakspeare of Stratford upon legal records, and everywhere else, is a most significant thing. Wm Shakspeare and his neighbors could never spel his name the same way twice in succession and it is improbable that he was ever able to write a particle more than a scrawling, almost-illegible signature, and very

often shirked his formidable task out to the "law man". Sir Edwin ~~Turner~~ Lawrence, one of the best-posted men in the world in these matters, has examined his latest discovered ⁽¹⁹¹⁰⁾ "signature" ^(Prof. E.W. Wallace) under the microscope and he judges that it was written for Wm Shakespeare by the law clerk who wrote the deposition he was supposed to sign. We most definitely know that Shakespeare's daughter Judith passed her life as illiterate, quite unable to write her own name, and know facts making it strongly probable that this was also the case with his other child. It was partly because of his illiteracy and boorish ignorance that Bacon stuffed Wm Shakespeare off to the remote "peasant town" of Stratford in 1597-98 when he paid him to be posed as the "Shake-speare" author upon the play of Love's Labor's Lost - the first play to bear this nom-de-plume - and up on the trouble-making King Richard II. The scrawled, illiterate signatures of Wm Shakespeare, and his signatures by marks and by proxy, are the sole evidence that he ever wrote anything in his life and the strongest kind of evidence that he never wrote anything more. He has left not one solitary letter, even! A "Shakespearean Mystery"! Rather so, we say!

No. XVII, page 32:

One of Bacon's common-place books entitled "Promus" (Store-house) of Proverbs and Elegancies" is preserved in the British Museum. It was unknown to his contemporaries and to most moderns until it was first printed by Mrs. Constance Pott in 1883. Mr. Reed has truly remarked in one of his other books that the "Shake-speare's Works" are "everywhere ablaze" with gems from the Promus of Francis Bacon. And Mrs. Pott, by actual count, has found the items in the Promus used either in direct reproduction and quotation or by "echoes" more than 4000 times in the "Shake-speare's Works".

The Promus has, "Thought is free", and Tempest has "Thought is free". The Promus has, "Of sufferance cometh ease"; First Henry IV has "Of sufferance comes ease". All's Well That Ends Well was first published in the Folio of 1623, but Bacon's Promus had stored the title "All's Well That Ends Well" many years previously. "Shake-speare's" famous long word in Love's Labor's Lost - "honorificabilitudinitatibus" we find the first eleven letters of in Bacon's Promus, and we find almost all of it in

another of Bacon's manuscript-books now known as the "Northumberland Manuscript," altho' his unique word, so far as has been ascertained, had been printed only five times — and four of these times in Latin or Italian and the fifth time in a Scotch book published 15 years before the birth of Wm Shakespeare — in the four centuries preceding the printing of Lewis Labor's Leost!

One may find Bacon's Promus reprinted as an appendix to Sir Edwin Sturming-Lawrence's "Bacon Is Shakespeare", and libraries ought to catalog this under "Bacon". As has been said, innumerable other parallels between the Promus and Shakespeare's Works might be cited, were there time and room

No. XXXII, page 61, and No. LXIII, page 116:

The play of King Henry the Eighth, as anyone tolerably familiar both with it and with the writings and history of Francis Bacon necessarily discerns, plainly and unmistakably reflects the experiences of Bacon in the episode of his displacement from the chancellorship in 1621. Here is a significant item: In the play four persons are represented as having been sent to

Cardinal Wolsey to demand the Chancellor's Great Seal from him, while history tells us that only two were actually sent! But the four persons named in the play are exactly the persons who were really sent to Francis Bacon to demand the Chancellor's Great Seal from him! They were the dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk, the Earl of Surrey, and the Lord Chamberlain. In the interview, the play makes the Lord Chamberlain speak in just the lenient and for-Bacon way that he did actually speak in Parliament at the impeachment of Francis Bacon, five years after the death of Wm Shakspeare. The play was first printed in the Folio, seven years after Shakspeare's death.

In the play Wolsey advises his servant, Cromwell, "In thy right hand carry gentle peace to silence envious tongues." Those who have read the contemporary letters of the sweet-souled Francis Bacon know that this precept he was markedly exemplifying in his daily life. It is so outstanding as to be pathetic, and is one of the marked exhibitions of nobility of character in all human history. Ben Jonson said of this episode in his friend's life:

"In his adversity I ever prayed that God would give him strength, for greatness he could not want. Nor could I condole in a word or syllable with him as knowing that no accident could do harm to virtue but rather help to make it manifest. My conceit of his person was never increased toward him by his place or honors, but I love 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 the most worthy of admiration that had been in many ages."

No. XXXVI, pages 70-71:

This is a very telling coincidence and the peculiarity spoken of in The Merry Wives gives a distinct Baconian signature, or "hallmark Baconian," to the play. Bacon tells us in one of his ciphers that the main character in The Merry Wives of Windsor, Sir John Falstaff, he based upon Wm Shalespere the clown actor himself, literally created for him, and tells us that the original of Mistress Quickly was Shalespere's wife, hence the text of The Merry Wives that we now have is very different indeed and very

J
greatly augmented beyond that
with which Wm Shakespeare, the clown
"Fatty Arbuckle" of those days, made a great
hit with Queen Elizabeth, being increased
from 1620 lines in its early form to 2701
lines in its First Folio form — 1081 lines;
almost doubled. The Shakespearean plays,
as their author put them out in the Folio
of 1623, were not "primarily written
for acting, only" as many mistaken and
unpenetrating men have asserted, but
were augmented into a form effectively
to teach thru the reading of them. Most
of them have to be "cut" extensively for
stage presentation. Their author knew all
this quite as well as any man, and better.

No. XLI, page 78. After this page skip 10 pages
numbered in Arabic numerals 188
& pages with Roman numeral

The simultaneous,
identical changes which were made in
the Shakespeare's plays and in the writ-
ings of Francis Bacon — and there were
many such instances — are strong items
of proof of the Baconian authorship of the
plays. These changes extended even to
the making of the same unconvention-
al mistakes, and to the correcting of the
See page next

Opinions of Eminent Persons

"After ten years" (study of the controversy over the Shakespearean authorship) "I became a convinced Baconian. I have been brought to this conclusion mainly by the impossibility of reconciling the facts we know concerning the life of the man of Stratford with the technical and universal notes inherent in the plays." — Hon. Wm Waldorf Astor

"The weight of evidence is, I think, in favor of Bacon." — Lyzauder Hill, L.L.D.

"I am one of the many who have never been able to bring the life of Wm Shakespeare and the plays of "Shake-speare" within a planetary space of each other. Are there any two things in the world more incongruous? The popular reluctance to entertain Miss Helia Bacon's opinion appears to have no better cause than the fear of losing a great miracle of genius. But the miracle is far grander, besides being a rational miracle, when we make "Shake-speare" and Bacon one." — Dr. Wm H. Furness

"The facts of Shakspeare's life render his authorship of the plays so inconceivable that Schlegel pronounces it "a mere blind and extravagant error." But in these plays the genius of Bacon is manifest; they bear the stamp of his character, they reflect his intellect, they speak his language, they mirror his life." — George C. Bompas

I concur. — Henry Storing

"An obscure and profane life:" (William Shakspeare's) "I cannot marry this fact to his verse." — Ralph Waldo Emerson

"I am quite sure the man, Shakspeare, neither could nor did write the wonderful plays." — John Greenleaf Whittier

"Firmly convinced that Shakspeare of Stratford could not have been the author." — Walt Whitman

"I believe Lord Bacon and "Shake-speare" to be one and the same person: or rather, I believe that Lord Bacon wrote what are called Shakspeare's plays and sonnets.

... He shared with the divine Plato the highest human intellect."

—Mrs. Nathaniel Hawthorne, nee Sophia Peabody

"It must be spoken of, whether they like it or not. We'll

— have a starling shall be taught to speak

Nothing but "

Verulam", whenever "Shakespeare" is mentioned, if need be." — Oliver Wendell Holmes

"Perhaps in the whole history of literature there has not been an instance more notable of rank unreason than the persistency, not to say infuriated stubbornness, with which intelligent men, in the blazing light of improbabilities, adhere to the idea of the unlettered, penurious, litigious Shakespeare, who was never known to own a book or write a sentence or attend a school, being the author of the greatest literary works of all time." — Judge Arthur C. Putnam

"Upon their investigation, it is manifest that he" (Wm Shakespeare) "never wrote a line of them." — Hon. John L. T. Sneed, Supreme Court Justice of the State of Tennessee.

"Does not any man feel an unutterable indignation when he discovers—after long years of thought and study, perhaps—that he has been all the while misled by false instruction, and that housewrenly the prime sources of truth have been left lumbering his shelves in neglect"—"While he has been put off and be-fooled by paltry child's fables? By the help of the Eternal Power, and such abilities as we possess, let the truth and the proof of it come forth."

—Judge Nathaniel Holmes

After graduating from Harvard, Judge Holmes set up in the practice of law in St. Louis. He became for years Judge of the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and later became one of the professors at Harvard. His scholarly book of 1866-67 contains a thousand times more evidence for the Baconian authorship of the "Shakespeare's Works" than two and a quarter centuries of men's most intensive research has all been able to produce for William Shakespeare's.

"Any man who believes that William Shakespeare of Stratford wrote Hamlet or Lear is a fool." — Hon. John Bright

See page 5 next

Notes

— on —

Francis Bacon

[And he did] join the Kwire Invisible
 Of those immortal dead who live again
 In minds made better by their presence; live
 In pulses stirred to generosity;
 In deeds of daring rectitude; in scorn
 For miserable aims that end with self.
 In thoughts sublime that pierce the night like stars,
 And with their mild persistence urge man's search
 To vaster issues.

Sonnet

to Shakespeare
 Lord Verulam, Viscount St. Alban
 (words spelt in new, simplified spelling)

Shake speare at Ignorance, Francis Bacon,
 Master of teaching, learning's chief lover!
 Blo, shril your slogan "No leij is power";
 Point the path, leed the line, bare a beekon;
 Caliban from brute to manhood waken,
 Him with wisdom and with conscience dower;
 Sound your slogan from your Pisgah's tower,
 All strong doers, all brave dreamers harten.
 Long, long after, toord the world's sunset gate,
 Nonees your name to its own in later age:
 Benignant Prospero, us ye prosper;
 King of poets, your sway we selebrate;
 Sweet-sould beer and singer, take our homage;
 Immortal altruist, thou dost konkwer.

— Henry Sterring

Copy righted, 1923, by Henry Sterring, and printed here.
 Reproduction of the foregoing without arrangement
 with the author is forbidden expressly and by statute.

Lord Macaulay on Francis Bacon:

"It is by the 'Essays' that Bacon is best known to the multitude. The Novum Organum and the de Augmentis are much talked of but little read. They have produced, indeed, a vast effect upon the opinions of mankind; but they have produced it here the operation of intermediate agents. They have moved the intellects which have moved the world

..... "Without any disparagement to the admirable treatise, de Augmentis, we must say that in our judgment Bacon's greatest performance is the first book of the Novum Organum. All the peculiarities of his his extraordinary mind are found here in the highest perfection. Every part of the book glazes with wit, but with wit which is employed only to illustrate and decorate truth. No book ever made so great a revolution in the mode of thinking, overthrew so many prejudices, introduced so many new opinions. Yet no book was ever written in a less contentious spirit. It truly 'conquers with chalk and not with steel'."

"We have sometimes thought that an amusing fiction might be written in which a disciple of Epictetus and a disciple of Bacon should be introduced as fellow-travelers.

They come to a village where the smallpox has just begun to rage and find houses shut up, intercourse suspended, the sick abandoned, mothers weeping in terror over their children. The Stoic assures the dismayed population that there is nothing bad in the smallpox, and that to a wise man diseases, deformity, death, the loss of friends, are not evils. The Galician takes out a lance and begins to vaccinate.

..... "They find a shipwrecked merchant wringing his hands on the shore. His vessel with an inestimable cargo has just gone down and he is reduced in a moment from opulence to beggary. The Stoic exhorts him not to seek happiness in things that lie without himself, and repeats a whole chapter of Epictetus. The Galician constructs a diving-bell, goes down in it, and returns with the most precious effects.

"Look a follower of Bacon, what the "new philosophy," as it was called in the days of Charles II, has effected for mankind and his answer is ready: "It has lengthened life; it has mitigated pain; it has extinguished diseases; it has increased the fertility of the soil; it has given new securities to the mariner: it has furnished

new arms to the warrior; it has spanned great rivers and estuaries with bridges of form unknown to our fathers; it has guided the thunderbolt innocuously from heaven to earth; it has lighted up the night with the splendor of day; it has extended the range of the human vision; it has multiplied the power of the human muscle. it has accelerated motion. it has annihilated distance; it has facilitated intercourse; it has enabled men to descend to the depths of the sea, to soar into the air, to penetrate securely into the noxious recesses of the earth, to traverse the land in cars which whirl along without horses, and the ocean in ships that sail against the wind. These are but a part of its fruits, and of its first fruits, for it is a philosophy which never rests."

These the accomplishments of a thinker whose contemporaries, many of them, thought he "failed"!

Joseph Devey, M. A., in an Introduction to his edition of Bacon's Philosophical Works:

"If his nomenclature was logically incorrect, the empirical view out of which it

arose gave men's minds, perverted by speculative reasoning, a strong objective bent. If his scientific method was defective, it led men to abandon pure rationalistic inquiry, which had produced all the fruit it was capable of yielding, and to explore the fields of Nature where treasures undreamt of lay concealed. If he placed the end of philosophy in the discovery of visionary and chimerical objects, the pursuit led men to that detection of the laws of phenomena which has already tripled man's power over nature and enriched the intellect with the possession of a new world.

"Science can afford to overlook errors that balanced the one-sided tendencies of the human mind, turned the vessel aside from a barren coast, and shot it right into the harbor of discovery! The triumph to which his spirit led rectified the mistakes with which it was accompanied and left mankind nothing to gather from the mine of nature which he opened but the pure ore of truth.

"His ferovent appeals still thunder in the ears of every generation, irrespective of creed or nation, while the trains of light which they leave behind them stimulate every succeeding race to renewed efforts

in the path of discovery. The human mind had never been so profoundly stirred since the times of Archimides and Aristotle as on the day when his mighty magician spoke: the wheels of science, which had stood still for 2000 years, impelled by his breath began to move. . . .

"The collective wits of the brightest of European nations — as little inclined as the Greeks to look outside of themselves for excellencies — have paid homage to him as the Solon of modern science. . . . The tribes of every age and nation regard the father of modern philosophy with the reverence and devotion of children; and so loud and universal has been the acclaim, that the testimony of our own epoch falls on the ear like the voice of a child closing the shout of a multitude."

From Bacon's preface to "The Great Instauration":

"For our own part, from an earnest desire of truth, we have committed ourself to doubtful, difficult, and solitary ways; and relying on the divine assistance, have supported our mind against the vehemence of opinions, our own internal doubts and scruples, and the darkness and fantastic images

of the mind; that at length we might make more sure and certain discoveries for the benefit of posterity. . . . And thus we hope to establish forever a true and legitimate union between the experimental and rational faculties, whose fallen and inauspicious divorces and repudiations have disturbed everything in the family of mankind.

"But as these great things are not at our disposal, we here, at the entrance of our work, with the utmost humility and fervency, put forth our prayers to God, that, remembering the miseries of mankind; . . . he would vouch safe thru our hands, and those of others of like mind, to relieve the human race by a new act
 ~~~~~ [Of His bounty]"

From "Warner's Library":

"But it is as a man of letters, as the greatest writer outside the fields of imaginative art—as the Shakespeare of English prose—that Bacon has carved his name in enduring fame. He never wearied of pointing out the imperfections and fruitlessness of the methods of invention and research hitherto in use. . . . This led him directly to the conception of an improved and advancing civilization—to that idea of human progress which is the characteristic, the inspiration, and the hope of the modern world. Bacon was the first of men to grasp these ideas in all their comprehensiveness as feasible purposes, as practicable aims, and to look before him, instead of behind him, for the Golden Age."



"Take an old tom-cat that is scarred from stem to rudder-post with the memorials of strenuous experience, and is so educated, so cultured, so endlessly erudite, that we may say of him that all cat-mole is his province; take a house-fed, lap-bred kitten; take a mouse. Lock the three in a holeless, crackless, exitless prison cell.

After half an hour unblock the cell and introduce a Stratfordian and a Bakonian and let them figure and assume. The mouse is missing. The problem is, where is it? We know beforehand the positions that the two debaters will take — The Stratfordian will contend that the mouse is in the kitten; the Bakonian, that it is in the tom-cat."

— Mark Twain

Mark Twain had the same admiration for Stratfordian believers as John Bright, only he was not exactly as blunt as he. His book, "Is Shakespeare Dead?", is a strong and keen Bakonian argument.

"It appears from the evidence presented in the Aréna, in 1873, highly improbable that Shakespeare either wrote or could have rewritten what has been attributed to him."

— C. E. Wolbear



"The world's continued belief in Shakspeare is a morbid phenomenon of the times."

— Bernard Ten Brink

"If Shakspeare wrote the plays and poems attributed to him, nothing is so useless as a good education!" — David Swing

"In my opinion we are not far from the time when our fellow-countrymen and the English speaking peoples throughout the world will unanimously admit that the most wonderful genius that ever spoke and wrote the English language was the man who combined in one brain and produced from one brain the Essays and Philosophy of Francis Bacon and the Plays, Sonnets and Poems of "William Shakspeare" — undoubtedly the greatest miracle of intellect the world has ever seen, and a most extraordinary termination of the greatest literary mystification that ever passed unchallenged for nearly 300 years." — The author of "Is It Shakspeare?"

"Those abilities which commonly go single in most men were all met and conjoined in him" [Francis Bacon]. — Mr. Wm Rawley and Ben Jonson, Colte.

"For many years I have, in hours of leisure granted me, given much study to the life

and works of Francis Bacon, who in my eyes is one of the greatest geniuses of Christianity.

By this I have become persuaded that the opinion, so ridiculed by most scholars, that he was the author of the Shakespearean dramas is founded on truth." — Professor Georg Cantor

"Shakespeare has not only occupied the chief place in our respect and veneration, but he has also won his way into our affections, and this it is that makes his detronement at once difficult and painful, even tho our better judgment tells us that he was but the mask for the real author. . . . We can still speak of our "Shakespeare," altho with deeper feelings and more rational sentiment. And when we wish to get behind those brilliant productions to have a glimpse of the actual author, we think not of the commonplace bourgeois of Stratford, but of the poet and sage of St. Albans."

— Percy W. Ames, F. S. A., Secretary of the Royal Society of Literature, London.

"The Baconians produce a chain of circumstantial evidence . . . sufficient to carry the judgment of any intelligent juror, even in a capital case. . . . [The Stratfordians] deny these proofs presented and



answer argument with vituperation. . . .  
 . . . They offer no proof that the unlettered actor wrote these masterpieces of scholarly genius. . . . But all myths must yield in time, if combated. Slavery as a divine institution, polygamy, witchcraft, for ages held men in bondage. . . . Belief in none of these exploded follies . . . is less degrading . . . than a continuance in the myth that an unlearned actor, who left no literary remains, no books, no members of his family able to read or write . . . and whose active, money-making life excludes all possibility of useful self-education, produced these "learned and philosophical masterpieces".  
 — Samuel L. Garrison

"The day has come when, rejecting fictitious lives of an imaginary Shakespeare, and scrutinizing the insignificant circumstances which are all that is known of him, the discrepancy becomes more and more apparent between the intellectual genius of the author of the plays and the sordid and squalid characteristics of the man of Stratford".

— The Pall Mall Gazette, London.



The truth of this matter is that the bias and prejudice of the Stratfordian contenders and controversialists — of such men as Sir Sidney Lee, Professor W. J. Rolfe, Mr. H. H. Furness, etc., etc., etc. — has been monumental. The least investigation shows their contentions altogether unworthy of credence or of respect.

All of the "evidence" for Wm Shakespeare's authorship of the "Shakespeare's Works" that over two and a quarter centuries of most exhaustive and intense research has been able to pile up, is included in two certain books — Mr. E. M. Ingleby's "Centuries of Praise" and the "Shakespeare Allusion Book," which is an enlarged edition of the former. — If you will separate from all the other stuff and stuffing in these two books, the disingenuous, supposed testimony of Ben Jonson which was part of the "Introduction" to the First Folio of 1623 of "Shakespeare's Works" (and which was a part of the planned, concealing traditional attribution, and the genesis of it), then there is not another of the hundred of pettifoggery items in either of these tomes of Stratfordian "evidence" that, as evidence for Wm Shakespeare's authorship, rises above contemptibility.

And indeed not a few of the items con-

tained in these books are strong evidences for  
Francis Bacon's authorship, which the perblind,  
 prejudiced Stratfordian fanatics perversely mis-  
 interpret as evidences for their idol. All of the  
 Stratfordian "evidence" may be scanned here  
 with the single exception of the Wallace discovery  
 of the testimony and signature of "William Shake-  
 speare of Stratford-on-Avon, Genteman" (so the  
 law clerk described him in the deposition he  
 was supposed to sign, but the signature itself  
 is "Wilm Shaxp<sup>r</sup>", and a mark) in the  
 Bellott-Mountjoy law suit in which he was  
 one of the witnesses. This has been unearthed  
 since the printing of these books. As evidence for  
 the Stratford man's authorship of the dramas, it  
 is of a consistent contemptibility with all of  
 the other stuff gathered into these books. Unlike  
all of our other discoveries of our more than two  
 centuries of research, it, also, counters the  
 traditional attribution. What it does enable  
 us to know is that during the time when Shake-  
 speare plays were appearing, showing an author  
intimately familiar with court-life, Wm  
Shakespeare lodged with a plebeian wig-maker  
 in Silver St. — which Ben Jonson says was  
"a good location for a usurer" — amongst  
 the pawn-brokers of the low classes.



same mistakes. Mr. Reed tells us in his "Parallelismus":

"Shake-speare, in the quarto editions of Richard III and Merchant of Venice, printed in 1597 and 1600, makes the mistake of using 'Sabbaoth' (Hebrew for 'host') instead of 'Sabbath'. Francis Bacon made exactly the same mistake in the first edition of The Advancement of Learning, printed in 1605. In the First Folio of Shake-speare, in 1623, this mistake in these two plays was corrected. In the second edition of The Advancement of Learning, printed also in 1623, Bacon made the correction in it." See, also, #LXVI, pages 120 to 123, — The same mistakes!

No. LII, page 96:

Bacon tells us in his cipher historical notes — (And he tells us that he used five or six different ciphers, and at least three of these which have been thus far worked out have every mark of credibility and reliability — the "Homellian", the "Owenian", and the "Bi-literal.") — That Queen Elizabeth was really the wife of Lord Leicester — who has always been called one of her "favorites" — and was the mother of two sons by him, one of



whom became the Earl of Essex. Bacon tells us that Elizabeth acknowledged this to him personally, for he was an intimate of Essex, who was about of his <sup>7 years younger</sup> own age, and also an intimate of the Queen.

This revealed fact at last puts some sense and reasonableness into many of the affairs of that time which have always been mystifying and obscure. Three centuries have scandalized about the relations that subsisted between Queen Elizabeth and Essex, who has also been called one of her "favorites". They would visit in each other's bed chambers in their night robes and would sit up all night together till the morning birds sang playing cards or games. The Queen was Essex's senior by 34 years. Nor was it a case of a dashing young man of 26 or 21 years suddenly flashing upon the vain Queen: Essex was presented at court at 10 years of age and the Queen impulsively attempted to kiss him, but was rebuffed by the young gentleman. He was presented at court again in 1587 by Lord Burleigh, his true guardian, and the Queen immediately appointed him Master of the Horse; and he was a "favorite" from that time

forth until 1601, the year of his death.

But this new "favorite" did not interfere at all with the perfectly good "favorite" that Elizabeth already had on hand in the person of Lord Leicester, and the two "favorites" went harmoniously off together to the campaign of 1587 in Flanders where Essex distinguished himself at the siege of Zutphen. Lord Leicester continued to be Elizabeth's "favorite" from before her coronation in 1558 thru the thirty years to his death in 1588, and was then mourned by her with every mark of affection and sincerity. The Queen's love for these two men is dignified and made reasonable and understandable now that we know that the elder was her husband and the younger her son.

In the larger view, the concealment of the marriage of Elizabeth (like the concealment of the true authorship of the Shakespeare's Works) was a providential thing. It was probably, also, a very wise political strategy. For it is extremely questionable whether the re-conquest of Protestant Europe by Philip of Spain and the Catholic nations could have been averted without



the skillful dangling of the many proposed marriages with Elizabeth that she and her chief advisers kept up thru so many years. Bacon tells us that she calculated to "out-craft all Europe."

Bacon himself was one of the actors in these great political dramas and he helped to conceal their facts, as he concealed his authorship of the Shakespeare plays. With his ciphers and all, our "Shake-speare" was very exceedingly far from being a novice in craft, himself. It is true that in expressions for public consumption Bacon did, as Mr. Reed says in his "Coincidence" # 52, both in his Shakespeare's works and other writings, testify to the virginity of Queen Elizabeth. But he has told us the inside story of these matters in his cipher historical notes, and there are innumerable facts in conventional, known "history" corroborative of the real history Bacon has given us in these remarkable revelations.

That "Shake-speare's" character had the same exceeding subtlety and sophistication of Francis Bacon's is amply shown by the Shakespearean Sonnets. There has hardly been a more absurd thing proposed



in all human literature since man's first picture writing than that the author of the Shakespearean Sonnets was an "ingenious", simple-minded person! The Shakespearean Sonnets are so exceedingly enigmatical and subtle that not one in a thousand of ordinary readers of Shakespeare has any familiarity with them, and that there has hardly been a sane and reasonable interpretation of them made in the three centuries, aside from the interpretations made by a few recent Baconians. You will never savely understand the Shakespearean sonnets until you have familiarized yourself with the cipher historical notes that Francis Bacon has left us.

No. LXXI, page 133:

The "broochout Portrait of Shakespeare" which was prefixed to the First Folio of 1623 is the only authentic portrait of "Shakespeare" (aside from Francis Bacon's other numerous portraits) that there is in existence. There are many other spurious "portraits," and several of these priceless treasures, <sup>are</sup> preserved at the humbug-museum in Stratford.

It is a most significant Jousonian "coincidence" that Ben Jonson always uses the same terms in speaking of "Shake-speare" that he uses in speaking of Francis Bacon. Jonson composed a little verse which was printed <sup>opposite</sup> below the Martin Droeshout Portrait in the First Folio, vouching for its authenticity. He used an identical expression in this that the painter of Francis Bacon's portrait at the age of 18 had inscribed around his portrait.

Sir Edwin Hurning-Lawrence has conclusively and incontrovertibly demonstrated in his little "The Shakespeare Myth" and <sup>in</sup> another of his books that the Droeshout Portrait is a masked portrait (The ingenuous Shake-speare!); and Bertillon measurements have shown that if you will take a known portrait of Francis Bacon and the Droeshout and overlay the upper part of the face of one by the other you will not change the one overlaid by a line. The Droeshout "Shake-speare" is a portrait of Francis Bacon disguised by the removal of his ordinary hat and the covering of



The lower part of his face and his beard with a mask. And when the Broeshout "Shakespeare" and a known, adult portrait of Francis Bacon are placed side by side, practically every eye instantly acknowledges the marked similarity between them. It is true that the masking of the lower part of the face does give a look of "stupidity" to the Broeshout, but it is further true that the reproduction of the Broeshout in Mr. Reed's "Coincidences" does not do justice even to that, as the present writer knows from familiarity with the Broeshout in photographic facsimiles of the First Folio of the Shakespeare's Works.

The donor of this book has studied the Shakespearean authorship mystery and controversy much more thoroughly than the vast majority of cultured and well-educated Americans and Englishmen (he knows this from an extended compari-son) and in this matter it is not to the most famous Stratfordian "Shakespearean scholar" on earth nor to all the



R

Stratfordian "Professors of English" in all the universities and high schools on our planet that he will doff his hat. But he has studied it impartially and philosophically — both sides of the matter. After such a thoro and impartial investigation it is his judgment that the evidence for Francis Bacon's authorship of the "Shake-speare's Works" weighs immeasurably and infinitely more than that for any one of the other four claimants, William Shakspeare of Stratford, or Lord Oxford, or Lord Herby or Lord Rutland. It is his judgment that the evidence that Francis Bacon was our "Shake-speare" is thoroly conclusive. He has no more doubt that Francis Bacon wrote the "Shake-speare's Works" than he has that Lincoln wrote the Gettysburg Address. Nor is he intimidated or abashed by all the contrary opinion in the world, for he claims a thoro expertise for himself. But to convert the world to sanity and truth in this matter is an undertaking of surpassing difficulty, and therefore, also, of surpassing interest. Men do

not wish to be, and stubbornly resist being, disturbed in their comfortable beliefs - no matter how false and unfounded those comfortable beliefs are!

The literary and forensic excellence or weight of the Baconian books upon this controversy far and away exceeds that of the Stratfordian books. <sup>That is my weighed judgment after extended comparison</sup> In truth there are but few Stratfordian controversial books even of dignity beyond Andrew Lang's, "Shakespeare, Bacon, and the Great Unknown", and Hon. J. M. Robertson's, "The Baconian Heresy: A Confutation". These are quite well calculated to confirm a Stratfordian believer in his false belief if he is so poor and unthorough an investigator as to neglect a careful study of the other side in this controversy. The other half of the picture that Mr. Lang paints is well presented by Sir George G. Greenwood in his reply to Mr. Lang in his book, "Is There a Shakespeare Problem?" It is short-sighted to deplore this controversy: it is of an immense value and instructiveness.

Henry Sterring



No. XXXII, page 64:

The facts here brought out should be connected with the facts brought out on pages 22 to 25. Shakespeare — that is Francis Bacon — gathered material for his "Shakespeare's Works" from the archives of Kimbolton and the archives of Burgundy and was aware of things that probably no Englishman besides Francis Bacon had the opportunity of knowing until centuries after the "Shakespeare's Works" were written. Connect No. XIII also with No. X, and the notes I have made on that, all showing that King Henry VI was such a play as we might expect from young Francis Bacon, only.

Against the multitudinous and innumerable evidences for Bacon's authorship, the Stratfordians have just one item of evidence that rises above contemptibility — the supposed (but disingenuous) testimony of Ben Jonson in the Shakespeare First Folio. Jonson, Bacon's known intimate friend and the actors' known sower and lawfower!

Two and a quarter centuries of the most intensive literary research men have ever done has utterly failed to bring out one fact corroborative of the traditional Stratfordian authorship: every fact that has ever been discovered counters and contradicts it.

See page X next



I assure you, Gentle Reader, that there is no cipher in this appendix: you might not justly be so shure of that without my statement. . . . In its irregular pagination this appendix somewhat resembles the First Folio of the "Shake-speare's Works". An appendix to Mrs. Gallup's "The Biliteral Cypher of Sir Francis Bacon" treats of the paging of the original editions in which she found the biliteral cypher. In *The Comedy of Errors*, *As You Like It*, *Taming of the Shrew*, *Twelfth Night*, *Henry VIII*, *Hamlet*, *Cymbeline*, and *Bacon's Natural History*, in each one page is doubled and one page of other number is missing. In *The Merry Wives*, *Midsummer Night's Dream*, *All's Well*, *2 Henry IV*, and *3 Henry VI*, two pages are missing in each and two other pages are doubled. In *Bacon's De Augmentis* nine pages are doubled and nine of other number are missing and none of the missing ones are contiguous numbers to the doubled ones, proving that it was not inadvertance but place for purposes of cypher. In deciphering, Mrs. Gallup could not go on with the cypher story from a doubled page except to the double of that number. The whole play of *Troilus and Cressida* in the First Folio has only two numbered pages, the remaining 26 being without any numbers. The 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> pages of the play are numbered "79" and "80". The cypher on these pages joins to that of pages 79 and 80 of *Romeo & Juliet* (altho' two other plays intervene between these two). Mrs. G. could not go on with the cypher from page 76 of *R&J* to the next page, which was numbered "78". Then she recalled that *Bacon* had instructed in *King John* that *Troilus & Cressida* was to be joined to *Romeo & Juliet* and she found that the first page of *T. & C.* continued page 76 of *R&J*. and compensated for its missing page 77. But at the end of the page "79" of *T. & C.* she could not go on to the next page (numbered "80") but could to page 79 of *R&J*. The page "80" of *T. & C.* then joined to this doubled page 79 and then 80 of *R&J*. joined to this first "80". It is decidedly not intended that he who runs "may read a cypher". *Bacon* instructed his expected decipherer where to read next, just as I have you.

The first part of the document discusses the general principles of the law of evidence, particularly the rules governing the admissibility of testimony. It begins by stating that the primary purpose of the law of evidence is to ensure that the facts of a case are established as accurately as possible. This is achieved through the application of various rules, such as the hearsay rule, which generally excludes statements made by a person other than the witness, and the rule against character evidence, which restricts the use of a person's past behavior to prove their current character.

The document then proceeds to analyze the specific requirements for the admission of evidence. It examines the concepts of relevance and materiality, explaining that evidence is only admissible if it tends to prove or disprove a material fact in the case. It also discusses the importance of the reliability of the evidence, particularly in the context of hearsay, where the court must evaluate the trustworthiness of the statement based on factors such as the opportunity for observation, the ability to perceive, and the sincerity of the declarant.

In the latter part of the document, the author explores the role of the jury in the fact-finding process. It emphasizes that the jury is the ultimate arbiter of the facts, and the law of evidence serves to guide and assist them in their deliberations. The document concludes by reiterating the fundamental goal of the law of evidence: to ensure a fair and accurate trial by presenting the most reliable evidence possible to the fact-finder.





















R36  
1906

Henry ~~Sterring~~

His Bookce

Please return promptly, for I  
wish to loan my books to  
many other friends.

1918  
1925  
1946  
1950

