# THE SHAKESPEARE STORY

## AN OUTLINE

BY

GEORGE PITT-LEWIS, K.C., EX-M.P.

AUTHOR OF TENTH EDITION OF "TAYLOR ON EVIDENCE"; AND
AUTHOR OF VARIOUS LEGAL AND OTHER WORKS

*From Dugdale's Engraving of* 1656

SHAKSPER

*From Hilliard's Miniature* 1579

BACON

"Look not on his Picture—

but his Book"

London

SWAN SONNENSCHEIN & CO. LIMITED

PATERNOSTER SQUARE, E.C.



1904

# THE SHAKESPEARE STORY:
## AN OUTLINE

# THE SHAKESPEARE STORY:

## AN OUTLINE

BY

GEORGE PITT-LEWIS, K.C., EX-M.P.

EDITOR OF TENTH EDITION OF "TAYLOR ON EVIDENCE"; AND
AUTHOR OF VARIOUS LEGAL AND OTHER WORKS

"If circumstances lead me, I will find where truth is hid."—"SHAKESPEARE," *Hamlet, Act ii. Sc.* 2.

"No pleasure is comparable to the Standing upon the Vantage Ground of Truth."—BACON'S ESSAY ON TRUTH.

"Where there exist strong prepossessions no amount of evidence produces any effect."—HERBERT SPENCER.

London

SWAN SONNENSCHEIN & CO. LIMITED

PATERNOSTER SQUARE, E.C.

1904

THE RIVERSIDE PRESS LIMITED, EDINBURGH

This Outline

FOR THE REASONS IN IT ON PP. 25-7, AND WITHOUT ITS PERMISSION

Is Dedicated

TO THE EDUCATION COMMITTEE OF THE

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL

# SUMMARY OF OUTLINE

A Lord Keeper marries the daughter of a King's Tutor—The Lady corresponds with an Archbishop in Greek, and translates a volume of Italian sermons—The "Learning" of Cambridge University — An Infant Prodigy, and a Royal Patroness—A lovely miniature, with a Latin motto —Divination in Dreams—A Lord Keeper is the victim of a Barber's courtesy—A Patrimony lost through a Lawyer's lapse of memory as to the Law—A Lad with no Patrimony reaches the Bar, Parliament, and eventually the Woolsack —The Stage in Queen Elizabeth's day—A Cambridge Graduate grows to be a Play-writer—A Cambridge M.A., after a Stage accident, becomes a Playwright, and eventually meets a tragic death in a Tavern Brawl—A "double" secret preserved for three hundred years—The "Shakespeare" Plays tell their Story—"*Honorificabilitudinitatibus*" and "Hang-hog" hint it—An Intrigue at Court with a Maid of Honour — An Etching which is a "Figure" — A Diplomatic Arrangement dressed in Italian—A princely Gift—A new Globe—A Brother and an Uncle die, and a Mother becomes insane—An old Westminster, and old Soldier from the Ranks, fills a Brother's Place—A King obtains a new Kingdom—An old Adherent philosophises under the Garb of Flattery, gains a great Place, and meets with a terrible Downfall—The Motto and the Etching meet, and solve a Mystery—A Philosopher's "Ghost" is transferred into a Pseudo-Saint, working Miracles—Superstitious worship of him dissipated — The Labours of "Lunatics" without delusions finally avail.

# ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

*** Readers are earnestly entreated, before perusing the Book, to cut out and to gum on their proper pages in its text, as is arranged can be done, or to there copy all the alterations preceding the "N.B." overleaf. Those noted after that are of far less importance.

---

*Page* 18, *line* 8 *from bottom*, after "Patronage" and before "The" insert "The identity of the Play in the 1623 folio with that of 1576 is shown by its being the only one in the folio not containing any matter also found in the 'Promus,' which was only commenced about eighteen years after it was written."

*Page* 26, *in last line of footnote*, strike out "Third Volume of Book of Tune" and substitute "Temporis Partus Masculus."

*Page* 30, *line* 2, delete "one," insert "such a Tutor."

*Page* 37, *line* 11, after "date" insert "contains the Dedication, but."

*Page* 40, *line* 3 *from bottom*, delete "previous to"; insert "after."

*Page* 41, *line* 3 *from bottom*, delete the full stop after "Earl" and substitute a semicolon; after "unquestionably" insert "as"; so that the sentence will then read on, "; as unquestionably as." *Also in last line* delete "Southampton" and substitute "Lords Pembroke and Montgomery." Commence the word "There" with a capital letter, as it is the beginning of a new sentence.

*Page* 54, *line* 17, delete "a" and before "Novel" insert "an untranslated."

*Page* 62, *line* 18 *from bottom*, delete "contrasted," say "compared."

*Page* 66, *line* 4, strike out "before" and substitute "used over and over again." *In line* 5, after "Plays" add "; and none are of mere commonplaces, or of proverbs or expressions then in common use."

*Page* 68, *line* 16, delete "Promus," say "MS. Book." *Also line* 17, delete ":—", and insert "which, though not published till years later, is contained in a letter to Anthony Bacon about this date (1593-1600) now at Lambeth Palace Library."

[OVER

*Page* 73, *line* 4, strike out sentence commencing "The 'Promus'" down to end and substitute "The whole of the Plays in the Folio, save *The Comedy of Errors*, as to which see *ante* p. 18, contain matter also found in the 'Promus.'"

*Page* 99, *line* 5, delete "Or again, some" and substitute "One." *In line* 7, delete the words "were" and "yet," and in place of latter word say "is the only." *In line* 8, delete the words "not a" and "is."

*N.B.*—*Typographical errors* of an obvious nature, but not affecting the thread of the story, or otherwise material to it, may also be corrected upon pages 9, 19, 27, 32 (two), 37 (three), 50, 56, 57, 62, 68, and 81.

Matters which would be made the subjects of controversy, however they were stated, are, in the writer's judgment, stated in the way which the weight of the evidence calls for. Such matters are, as well as elsewhere, in particular, to be found on pages 19, 38, 39, 41, 69, 75, 77, 78, and 107.

# THE "SHAKESPEARE" STORY

## AN OUTLINE

THE "Outline" now put forward is meant to do no more than to prepare the way for, and to present in a connected form a mere sketch of, the story which his supporters are prepared to prove by evidence, establishing that a great Philosopher[1] has a right to be regarded as the actual writer of the "Shakespeare" Plays. A sketch of this sort will, it is believed, be welcome to that large General Public who are at present wholly unfamiliar with the leading facts of the "Shakespeare" Story. In a Sentence, the object of the "Outline" here presented is merely to tell the Shakespeare Story shortly and plainly; and it will be hereafter sought to prove it by the "Evidence." Such an outline is not, however, intended for those already expert in literary matters, or, to some extent at least, familiar with the controversial matters involved in the Story. To such, the present "Outline" will be by no means conclusive. They will, most reasonably, require all the "Evidence" which supports the story to be placed before them. The Outline must content itself with merely saying that it is founded entirely upon Evidence which has been already collected. Such Evidence, however, fills a Book far larger than the present. It is, moreover, only fit to be laid, in its full detail, before a Jury composed of the Literary men of the world—the right Tribunal for the determination of this question—and the world is now ripe for its trial. An "Opening" in full of the "Evidence" which can be brought forward in support of the claim just

[1] See *post* page 20.

made will, it is hoped, speedily follow this introductory "Outline."

Where a case is being tried by a Jury, it is the proper office of the Lawyer's "Opening" of the Evidence available in support of the claimant's Case to state fully the exact facts which, as he honestly believes, can be brought forward by those whom he represents in support of their claim. These facts, moreover, are arranged by the Advocate himself in a form which makes the story they tell a connected narrative, told in such a fashion that each fact falls into its proper place, and the whole makes a tale which must "hold the field" in the minds of the Court and Jury till the other side can bring forward facts telling a more likely story.

Such an "Opening" of the Evidence has been prepared, and will be published so soon as such a number of Subscribers for it has been obtained as will justify the considerable outlay which will be attendant upon its publication.

This "Shakespeare" Story, in a connected form, has never been yet told. We have, indeed, some theories which depend upon cyphers, cryptograms, and such like mysteries,[1] and we also possess much valuable fragmentary information concerning alike Bacon and these "Shakespeare" Plays. But this latter has never been all put together, and, consequently, it no more tells the story than the unconnected parts lying in an engineer's shop form an Engine.

From the commencement of the Middle Ages at any rate, and probably from an even earlier time, it has been not uncommon to submit questions, thought to be fairly open to discussion, to the tests of a supposed trial by Jury.

[1] On these no opinion is expressed, but they will not be at all relied upon as "Evidence."

Unless imagination has usurped the place of recollection it will even be found that, on one occasion, the motives and moral conduct of that cock who, by crowing thrice, reproached St Peter, was actually once debated in this manner.

The question of the Authorship of the "Shakespeare" Plays has of late years come to be known as "the "Bacon-Shakespeare" problem. It would appear to be obviously a proper one to be debated in such a manner as this, but for two seeming objections. These are—first, to get a sufficiently large Jury; and next, that its members shall be competent to decide such a question. For thus it, of course, must be possible for all that passes to reach them. Under such circumstances a Jury thus constituted inspires confidence, because it is a tribunal which may be trusted to decide all questions submitted to it solely by the light of broad common-sense applied to hard facts proved before it. Such a Jury is always especially welcome to an Advocate who seeks to establish his case solely upon a foundation of facts, intelligible to every shrewd man, and without, and independently of, any mere theory advanced in reliance upon the evidence of experts. Their theories may be entirely correct; yet it is better that, if it can be, a case shall be proved without their aid.

All the difficulties above suggested have been removed. The Press supplies the means of obtaining as large and as competent a Jury as is required, and also the opportunity needed for an appeal to the good sense of each Juryman. Let the "Bacon-Shakespeare" question be accordingly tried by a Literary Jury, upon which every Student of English Literature throughout the world shall be entitled to take his seat, and to hearken to the "Evidence."

The Addresses calling attention to the points upon

which each side relies should respectively be placed in the mouths of avowed Advocates, rather than in those of persons assuming to fill a Judicial Character. In this last-named capacity the person occupying it is bound to at least pretend to a certain amount of impartiality. In the character proposed to be assumed there need be no pretence of impartiality to be kept up. An Advocate, on whatever side, often can with advantage, alike to Truth and to the side represented by him, advance statements which a Judge trying the case cannot. It will, however, be supposed that the Trial is being conducted in accordance with the ordinary principles of Evidence which govern a Court of Law.[1] Each side is presumed to be bound by the strict rules of Evidence save in so far as they have been dispensed with by mutual consent. Where this seems to be reasonably required, however, such a consent to waive strict rules will be assumed. For example, "tradition" or "reputation," in other words "gossip," is usually not evidence at all in a Court of Law upon a question of mere private right. But the present inquiry is so far a matter of public concern that, where reputation or tradition would be properly receivable as evidence in such a private matter, it will be taken that, by mutual consent, each side has agreed that it shall be accepted as evidence in this case, leaving the Jury trying the matter to assign to it in each instance such weight as they think it deserves.

A supposed trial by Jury having been adopted by mutual consent[2] for the discussion of this much dis-

[1] As to this, see *post* page 21.

[2] Judge Willis, on the so-called "orthodox" side, and Lord Penzance writing for Baconian believers, have each in a book assumed the form of addressing a supposed Jury. The writer of this "Outline" and of the forthcoming Evidence is under great obligations alike to them, to a book by the late very learned Judge Webb (named by him a "Summary of

puted question, it will be well for all, on every side in this matter, if they can imagine that they really are in the calm atmosphere of a Law Court. To do so will enable them to debate the subject under discussion decorously and dispassionately, without any of the bitter personalities which it seems too often to provoke, as much as if it were a theological controversy. It may well be calmly treated, for, in any case, the English nation will still possess the glory of the writer of the magnificent plays having been a native of their country. If the great Englishman who wrote them was, as "orthodox" opponents persist, a self-educated Actor he indeed affords a magnificent example of that indomitable industry and perseverance which are National characteristics; and it is even more than a miracle that such an one could in a very few years, and without much previous learning, have so educated himself as to be able to produce Plays confessedly the greatest and the most Philosophical which the world has ever seen; Plays, moreover, exhibiting alike a vast range of learning and a mighty mind. If, on the other hand, as is contended by those whose views are here represented, these Plays were, in truth, the work of the greatest Philosopher of his day, and were really written by him to introduce and popularise the new system of Philosophy[1] which he intended to found and afterwards established—that now known to many by his name—and if we are convinced that he wrote them, then we may surely also look with a certainty that they are to be found, for new and hitherto undiscovered beauties and teachings in the immortal

Evidence"), and to Mr Edwin Reed's "Parallelisms" for great aid received from their respective works in putting the facts of this Shakespeare Story together in such a form as to make a connected narrative.

[1] As to his having done this, see *post* page 20.

"Shakespeare" Plays—as they must always be called by the name under which they were given to the world.

The Trial by a Jury of the Bacon - Shakespeare question having been accepted[1] by each side as the best mode of investigating the subject, the question for trial is, in a word, "Who was William Shakespeare, the writer of the plays?" Was he Francis Bacon, or was he the Actor of Stratford-on-Avon? This latter person's family name was certainly not Shake-speare or "Shakespeare." He was never so called in private life, either by his family, his friends, his neighbours, or even by himself. He spelt his proper name with a short "a" before the "k" in the first syllable, and with no "e" after the "k." Moreover, in the second syllable an "a" was introduced before the final "r" in the assumed name. So distinctly short was his pronunciation of the first syllable of his family name that, on the only two occasions on which we know that the Actor himself had to verbally state it to a stranger, while the first syllable of it was written down correctly, the second was on each occasion wrongly recorded. When he obtained his marriage licence his name was taken by the Bishop's official as "Shagspur"; when he had to state it to the officer of the Privy Council (because he was about to play before James I.) that functionary recorded it as "Shaxberd." When either the Actor himself, his family, or their fellow-townsmen had to write or record the family name they uniformly did it in such a way as, in each of many varying forms, would phonetically (and all spelling was at that time phonetic) represent the pronunciation of the "a" in its first syllable as short and hard, as also was the second. In the assumed name the added "e" after the "k" in the first syllable, and the "a" introduced

[1] See note on page 4.

before the "r" in the second, made both syllables soft. If this difference in pronunciation were not enough to mark the distinction between the real and family name and the assumed one, in the latter a hyphen (or "-") was frequently introduced in the middle, between its first and its second syllables, as if to proclaim: "This is a fancy name." This "fancy name" was, as we shall see, invented about 1593-5; gave an allegorical meaning to what closely resembled the family name of the Actor; and probably took its origin in a sneer at the Actor by a contemporary, in which the former was disparaged as a mere "Shake-Scene."

The full "Evidence," expanding the facts in the summary presented by it, and this "Outline," will both seek to do what Lord Penzance, with his great judicial experience, declared to be now required—viz. to show first, affirmatively, that Bacon wrote the Plays, and afterwards that Shakspere (or "Shaxspur"), the Stratford Actor, did not do so. An actual negative is, as every logician knows, incapable of absolute proof. So what Lord Penzance asked for was, strictly and exactly, such affirmative proof of Bacon's Authorship as to throw upon the defendants (who have long been in possession of the reputation that this belongs to their client) the burden of giving reasonable proof of the authorship of the Stratford Actor, and not mere guesses, with the huge chasms between them and the facts bridged over by a "doubtless," a "must," a "seemingly," or some similar expression.

The kind of evidence which, on this imaginary Trial will be offered on behalf of Lord Bacon's claim, shall be that which the famous Bishop Butler laid down to afford the means for proper investigation into a question of disputed authorship. The Bishop said that, in such cases, a comparison ought to be made

between the work, the authorship of which is in dispute, and any known works of some person suspected of such concealed or disputed authorship. The coming "Evidence" will contain such a comparison of each play, one by one, with the known philosophic and other works of Bacon. A similar comparison, for the purpose of affording *prima facie* evidence that the Stratford Actor did not write such plays, will subsequently be made between the "Shakespeare" Plays and the Tavern mock-Epitaphs, which constitute his only reputed works. A double inference is to be drawn from the test directed by the logical writer of the "Christian Analogy." It will be further pointed out that this test has once already been applied in modern times, with conspicuous success, to settle a question of disputed authorship. For, when the authorship of the famous Waverley novels was still concealed, and consequently still the subject of dispute, Mr Adolphus, then a well-known lawyer, applied to the question this test suggested by Bishop Butler. Adolphus succeeded in collecting some eighty instances of identity, principally of style, between the known works of Sir Walter Scott and passages in these novels. The case thus made by Adolphus was generally considered so strong as to be unanswerable. Soon afterwards Sir Walter Scott admitted that he was the writer of the Waverley novels, confessing that he had previously concealed this lest it should be thought that to be a novel writer was beneath the dignity of the office of "A grave Clerk of Session." Bacon, it will be pointed out, as he attained during his career the High Office of Lord Chancellor, was also justified by reasons of ambition in acting similarly to Scott. Further, contemporary writers will be cited to prove that for a man of Birth and Position to write for the Stage for

money (as Bacon undoubtedly did) was then considered a disreputable thing. That Bacon earned money in some disreputable way to supply himself with an income was conjectured by the late Mr Thorpe, F.S.A., who guessed that he kept a Usurer's shop for that purpose!

Moreover, the authority of no less distinguished a historian than the late Bishop Stubbs will be cited to show that, in addition to other reasons, Bacon may well have had cause to fear that a confession that he it was who had expressed some of the views contained in the Plays might bring a prosecution. Finally he had, most of his life, family reasons for keeping his authorship of "Stage Plays" a secret; and, as to the Waverley novels, eighty instances of identity, chiefly of Style, were held sufficient proof. In this Bacon-Shakespeare case numerous identities, amounting in the whole to hundreds, will be shown under at least a dozen heads claimed by the "Orthodox" for Shakespeare, besides it being shown that either the Philosophy, or some other teaching of Bacon's, runs throughout the whole of the Plays.

The Address, "opening" the Claimant's full evidence, to which this Outline is introductory, will be an attempt to achieve for Lord Bacon's reputation what Mr Adolphus successfully accomplished in showing the real authorship of the Waverley novels. To attain its end, the "Evidence" will endeavour to deal, in a connected narrative, alike with Bacon's life and with the various Plays and Groups of Plays. It will be shown more at length in the Evidence how such plays fit naturally into Bacon's life, in the manner shown in Table A. prefixed to this Outline, and that a knowledge of each of these things—that is, alike of the Life of Bacon and of the Groups which the Plays

form—is necessary to add to the full appreciation and understanding of either.

As before explained, the "Opening" pointing out these things will be addressed to a supposed Literary Jury of the world, and each side will be presumed bound by the strict rules of evidence, save in the respects already mentioned.[1] Moreover, the "Evidence" will not ignore the fact that there is another side of the controversy, and will accordingly sometimes endeavour to meet it by anticipation. The legal principles of evidence which will most affect the question are not only such as would prevail in an action to recover land, but those which would apply to an action for infringement of Copyright; or in a case, civil or criminal, raising the question of the identity of a person.

The principles as to Evidence governing a Copyright case are that, even where the work in dispute is a Dictionary or a Directory, each of which, of course, must be substantially similar to other books of the same description, yet, so soon as identical mistakes are pointed out both in an original work and the work which is denied to be copied from it, as soon are the owners of the alleged piratical work called on by a Court of Law to explain this identity, and to establish the independent authorship of their book. The "Evidence" will point out that, in the "Shakespeare" Plays, errors as to several matters are made, identical with those also made in Bacon's works. Nay, more; many of these errors will be shown to have been simultaneously corrected.

The principles of Evidence which would be acted on as Law in a court where a Judge was sitting without a Jury are in substance applied by a Jury to the ordinary affairs of life, merely by the light of their

[1] As to these, see *post* page 20.

common-sense. What Verdict, for instance, would a Jury be likely to give at a trial raising the question of who was the writer of some Libels, extending over many years, after it had been proved that both their writer and the person suspected similarly misspelt the same particular word about the same period, and that both corrected their mistake about the same time? Yet this very proof will be given as to Bacon and the writer of the Shakespeare Plays. At the end of the sixteenth century, and early in the seventeenth, both Bacon (in his "Advancement of Learning") and the writer of the Plays (in *Richard III.*, Act iii. Sc. 2, quarto edition of 1597, and in the *Merchant of Venice*, Act iv. Sc. 1, quarto edition of 1600) spelt Sabbath as "Sabbaoth." Both Bacon and the Play Writer discovered that this somewhat pedantic mistake was due to ignorance of Hebrew, in which "Sabaoth" means "host," while "Sabbath" means a day of rest. Each corrected this mistake in the year 1623—Bacon in the second edition of his "Advancement of Learning," "Shakespeare" in the folio edition of the two plays previously cited. Would a Jury be satisfied with the explanation that this mistake "must" have been common in 1597 and directly afterwards, but that it had been generally discovered in 1623 that it was a mistake? That they may not be, the Evidence will show a converse case of the identity of the two writers being proved by spelling. To this day many people confuse "counsel" and "council"; indeed, their use interchangeably was quite common till late in the seventeenth century. Yet Bacon and the writer of the Shakespeare Plays never confused the two words. Bacon, in a letter to Villiers in 1600, writes: "Besides the giving of counsel, the Councillors are bound to keep counsel." In the *Merry Wives* (Act i. Sc. 1)

we read: "The Council shall know this, 'twere better for you it were known in counsel." Many men of eminence were guilty of making the blunder of confusing these words. A list of those who habitually made the mistake is in Mr Edwin Reed's "Parallelisms" at p. 209. But Bacon and "Shakespeare" are the two writers conspicuous in that age for having never so blundered!

The "Evidence" will press that, after this, the verdict of a Jury could only be one. But, in addition to the striking "coincidences" thus pointed out, many mere expressions dropped in the Plays will be shown to be found cropping up afterwards in Bacon's private letters, though they are phrases of a most peculiar kind; and many philosophical views expressed in the Plays make their appearance in Bacon's philosophical works published by him long years *after* these efforts of "Dramatic Poesy," and quite at the end of his life. So important is this last consideration that a table (C) of most of these philosophical views, common alike to the Shakespeare Plays and to Bacon's philosophical pen, will be contained in the Evidence.

This Evidence will at an early point draw the Jury's attention to that portion of Bacon's early life as to which there can be no dispute. This will facilitate the following of the arguments. It will be pointed out that Bacon's father, Sir Nicholas Bacon, was for many years Keeper of The Great Seal, and that his mother was Anne, an accomplished daughter of Sir Thomas Cooke, the tutor of King Edward VI. This lady will be shown to have been herself a highly accomplished one, to have been familiar with Latin and Greek, able to correspond fluently with Archbishop Jewell in the latter language, and so familiar with Italian that she made an excellent translation into English of a volume of sermons by an Italian preacher. She was, moreover,

a most rigid Puritan, and hated "Stage Plays" with a fervid religious zeal.

His mother was, as the "Evidence" will tell, the teacher of Francis Bacon, the younger of her two sons, till he went to college together with his elder brother Anthony. The tale runs that before he went there Francis Bacon—mere child as he was—had been to the Court of Queen Elizabeth, and that he had, when only ten years old, already won the heart of the great Queen by replying to her, when asked his age, that he was "just two years younger than your Majesty's happy reign." The pleased Queen had then patted him on the head, and had called him her "young Lord Keeper." At Cambridge, Francis Bacon took a violent aversion to what he considered the narrow and crabbed Philosophy of Aristotle, and his chaplain and biographer, Rawley, tells us that, even in those youthful College days, he conceived the idea of supplanting it by a new Philosophical teaching of his own devising. This, he hoped, would be superior alike to the teaching of the hated Aristotle and to the equally unsatisfactory doctrines of others.

The "Evidence," when it comes to deal afterwards with the Play of *Love's Labour's Lost*, will point out that the latter embodies this idea; and it will draw attention to the satires in other Plays on the doctrines of Pythagoras, Epicurus, and their fellow-philosophers. The tale will be told how Bacon, disgusted at the narrowness of its teaching, left his University in 1576 without a Degree. The very year in which he did so he returned to London. Favourite as he was at Court, it is not strange that there was played before the Queen that year, at the Christmas Revels, by "the children of Paul's," an Academic Play, just such as would be written by a young lad lately from College. It will be discussed when the "Evidence" comes to

consider *The Comedy of Errors*. In the June following, Francis and his brother were entered as students at Gray's Inn. It will be narrated how, having obtained a release from the "Readings" and "Moots" at the Inn, Francis forthwith went to Paris in the train of the then English Ambassador, Sir Amyas Paulet.

In 1578 his fond mother had a miniature of her youngest and favourite son (then in his eighteenth year) painted by Hillyard, a famous and fashionable Miniature painter of that day. Hillyard was the engraver of the Great Seal of England used by Queen Elizabeth, and the painter of miniatures of the Queen herself and of many of her courtiers. Like many others of the great Queen's favourites, he was a west-countryman—indeed, a Devonshire man.

It is some test of the value of his work that his miniatures even now command high prices, one of them having been sold in London during this present month of June (1904) for no less than £2500.

So beautiful was the mind of Francis Bacon, even at this early age, that when the lovely miniature—the outline of which is intended to be reproduced by Photogravure upon the cover of this Outline—had been completed, beautiful as it was, the great Artist himself would appear—but possibly some other friends of Bacon did it—to have surrounded it with the motto: "*Si tabula daretur digna, animam mallem.*"

It would be out of place to mention this pretty little incident in this mere "Outline" did it not shed considerable light on the precocious beauty of Bacon's mind even in his early youth, and did it play an unimportant part in the Shakespeare Story. In this it takes a share of considerable importance, as will be mentioned in a future page, no further reference to which need be here given.

Arrived in France, Bacon travelled much in those parts of France which had once belonged to the English—Maine, Anjou, Poictiers—and, as some say, extended his travels into Italy also. In 1578 he was hurriedly recalled from Paris by the sudden death of his Father, the old Keeper of the Great Seal. Francis had, just before this, dreamt a strange Dream. It shall not be reserved for the "Evidence," but told at once in his own words. In his "Natural History" Bacon writes: "I myself remember that, being in Paris, and my Father dying in London, two or three days before my Father's death I had a Dream, which I told to divers English gentlemen, that my Father's house in the country was plastered all over with black mortar." In those days no telegraphs, and still less telephones, existed to convey the news. How, then, had it reached the mind of Francis Bacon? Can this be explained, otherwise than it is in *Richard III.* (Act ii. Sc. 3)?—"By a divine instinct, men's minds mistrust ensuing danger." The very sentiment expressed in *Richard III.* is repeated in *Julius Cæsar* (Act ii. Sc. 2). We at once see a reason why Dreams play so often a part in the "Shakespeare" Plays. What is the "divine instinct which warns men's minds"? Is it that telepathy of which the plays elsewhere speak? (*Cymbeline*, Act i. Sc. 4.)

Leaving speculations such as these, let Bacon answer the question in his own language.

In his "De Augmentis" he writes: "By natural Divination we mean that the mind has, of its own essential power, some pre-notion of things to come. This appears mostly (1) in sleep; (2) in ecstasies; (3) near Death; (4) more rarely, in waking apprehensions; and (5) . . . from foreknowledge of God and the Spirits."

In the Shakespeare Plays we have, in *Richard III.*, Act v. Sc. 3, that miserable King and his rival and conqueror, afterwards Henry VII., each narrating their dreams. The "Evidence" will display, borrowing them from Mr Edwin Reed's "Parallelisms" (No. 38, p. 24), examples from the Shakespeare Plays which furnish instances of all the other four kinds of Divination mentioned in the "De Augmentis." But none will be more striking than the first, in which the supposed dreams of the Rivals at Bosworth Field are obviously inspired by a haunting recollection of that Dream in Paris which Bacon himself described in his "Natural History," and wrote (*ut sup.*): "I myself remember." For the Dream of young Francis Bacon proved but too true, and must have much impressed his mind. Going into a barber's shop to be shaved, the old Lord Keeper, who was so fat that it was a standing joke at Court that "Her Majesty's Conscience was well housed," had gone to sleep while waiting his turn from the Barber, a window close to him being wide open because there was a rapid and oppressive thaw. The Barber, over-obsequious to so great a customer, had not dared to shut it, and he was told by the Lord Keeper, when the latter rose with a chill upon him: "Your civility hath cost me my life." And so, a few days later, it did. As with his famous son, nearly half-a-century later, the chill produced pneumonia, and he died.

After his Father's unexpected death Francis Bacon found himself left without a Patrimony worthy of that name; for the purchase of the estate, which his Father had intended for him, had been anticipated by the accident of Death, and by it the portion intended for Francis had fallen to be divided among the Father's entire family. The "Evidence" will tell how, nevertheless, Francis determined to go to the Bar; how he took

up his residence in Gray's Inn; and how, after a while, he was there joined by the Earl of Southampton as his "fellow-lodger." The Earl had been Ward to Bacon's Uncle, Lord Burleigh. He, naturally, joined Bacon's "set," with whom Masques and Interludes played a great part amongst the amusements of Gray's Inn. The Earl, too, was young, amorous, and rich. Burleigh's relationship to Bacon was that the former had married the sister of the latter's Mother.

The "Evidence" will further go on to show that Francis Bacon was called to the Bar of his Inn of Court in 1582, but that this was not equivalent at that time to a Call to the Bar of the Courts of Law, and so did not enable him to practise. He, consequently, did not become entitled to earn an Income by the Law until he was called *within* the Bar of his Inn of Court, and *to* the Bar of the Courts of Law, in the year 1586. Even after this latter Call he obtained no Practice, and consequently no income, till much later. It will be pointed out that Spedding, Bacon's Biographer, marvels how he could meanwhile both have lived, and also met his many heavy expenses of Court life, with a seat in Parliament. His slender Patrimony must soon have become exhausted. Spedding regards not only how he lived, but also how Bacon occupied himself, during those years, as being a mystery, inasmuch as his philosophical works did not appear till many years later.

Anthony Bacon, the brother of Francis, will be shown to have returned abroad so soon as their Father's affairs were settled, and to have remained there for about eleven years from 1579. During all this period Anthony was busily engaged as a Diplomatist, and conducted delicate negotiations and intrigues, both between Foreign Courts and the adherents

of James I., then King of Scotland, who was scheming to succeed to the English Crown on the death of Queen Elizabeth. Anthony Bacon will be shown to have lived much in Switzerland, and also to have had, through an Agent named Faunt, frequent communications with the Sovereigns and States of North Italy, and to be said by some to have himself once for a considerable time lived at Padua. The "Evidence" will further tell how poor Anthony returned to England about 1590-1, a martyr to Gout, and terribly broken in health in other ways; and it will show that he was, from his return till his death in 1601, either living with Francis, or at least in constant communication with him.

At this point, the forthcoming "Opening" of the "Evidence" enters upon controversial subjects. Indeed, the first debated matter in the history of Francis Bacon's life arises at an earlier period in it than that already reached. It will be recalled that *The Comedy of Errors* was acted by the "Children of Paul's" in the very year (1576) in which Bacon had left Cambridge, and had again appeared at Court. The "Children of Paul's," who had the privilege of acting at Christmas before the Queen, always performed a play previously approved of by the Lord Chamberlain. That Official was then Lord Leicester, and it is not curious that the Company of Play Actors, to which Shaxpere subsequently was attached, was that which played as under Leicester's patronage. The observation already made, that the play performed in 1576 was such as a young man fresh from College would be likely to write, is founded upon the fact that its plot was derived from the Menechmi of Plautus, a Greek poet whose Plays had not then been translated. The new Play was called at that time *A Historie of Errors*, and the source which inspired it was mentioned. In passing, it will

be recalled that, in after years, *Twelfth Night* was founded upon the plot of this same Greek Play, as the members of the Middle Temple were informed ; and one of them (Manningham) recorded when this play was performed there in 1601. The Play called *The Comedy of Errors* can be traced as having been performed in the presence of the Queen on several occasions. It was, when it was rewritten in 1594, rechristened as *The Comedy of Errors*, instead of *The Historie of Errors.* In the interval a Play had been again performed at Court in 1582-3 when it had been recorded by a manifest mistake as being *The Historie of Ferrers.* When the earlier Play was again performed, in 1594, it was played at some "Revels" at Gray's Inn, at which the Queen was present, which Bacon himself wrote a Masque for, and generally superintended. This, too, was an occasion on which the Company of Actors to which Shakespeare belonged was certainly present, and it probably was the first appearance of Shakespeare himself as an Actor before the Queen. It is a singular and significant fact that, while the Play never appeared in print until it did so in the Shakespeare folio of 1623, yet that Bacon must obviously have known all about it in 1594, although, says Stanton, "no earlier copy has been discovered than that of 1594."

The point as to what Bacon was employing his time on between his Call to the Bar of Gray's Inn and his entry upon much professional business some years later will be, of course, hotly disputed. It will be the object, alike of this "Outline" and of the "Opening" of the full Evidence, to fill the gap in the life of Bacon left by Mr Spedding, and dealt with by him in a very few pages. Both will seek to show alike how this period was occupied, and how Bacon obtained an income during it.

In dealing with a matter thus obscure and much

controverted, the "Opening" of the full Evidence will proceed to state, placing each under a separate head, the facts with regard to this period which can be fully established. These facts, when thus ascertained, conclusively prove, as is submitted, that Francis Bacon, a Philosopher of now world-wide fame, must henceforth be identified as the writer of the celebrated Dramas hitherto known as the "Shakespeare" Plays. For it cannot be too often repeated that, since it is the name under which their author wrote them and gave them to the world, the Plays must ever remain the immortal "Shakespeare" Plays.

The facts which will thus be established by the "Evidence" about to be thus "Opened" have been gathered from a detailed examination of each of the Plays by itself, and by a careful search into the period of Bacon's private life corresponding to the time when it was written. No investigation has ever been previously made into the first ten years or thereabouts of the career of the great Philosopher. It will be sought to trace Bacon's hitherto undiscovered employment and mysterious source of income from soon after his profitless Call to the Bar of his Inn of Court until he procured Political Preferment in the days of James I. In the interval, Bacon obtained little professional occupation, and consequently little income from the Law. At the end of his life, after his fall from the High Office of Lord Chancellor in 1621, a similar inquiry as to whence he derived an income must also be made. As a preliminary to the first of these investigations the position of the English Stage during the early part of the time dealt with will be shown. Moreover, the "Evidence" will give cause to believe that Bacon not only held, but actually carried into effect, peculiar views as to the proper province of the

Stage. The facts revealed by due inquiry will be placed in a form in which, according to all principles governing the law of evidence (which the writer has for years made the subject of special study[1]) they would be regarded in a Court of Law as evidence. But before summing up the proofs of Bacon's authorship, afforded by the internal evidence of the "Shakespeare" Plays themselves, the "Evidence" will sketch, in a few words, a short outline of the conclusions, on other and incidental matters, which are shown by surrounding facts. An understanding of these subjects will enable the argument to be more easily followed. Even before an explanation of these is entered upon, attention will be directed by the "Evidence" to some other preliminary facts having a special connection with the "Shakespeare" Plays. It will point out that Bacon, according to his Biographer and Chaplain, Rowley, had an inveterate habit of writing and rewriting any compositions of his over and over again, and that this was exactly what the author of the "Shakespeare" Plays continually did. Quarto editions of a Play successively claimed it in many cases "As it hath been lately acted"; while many subsequent ones each say that the Play in question has been "Newly augmented and revised," or "Newly corrected and enlarged," or "Newly corrected." As, on the occasion of each revision, the Play was "written up to date," as it were, it is made extremely hard to say when any particular "Shakespeare" Play was really first written. The best way to ascertain this is to refer back to the earliest incident to which the Play, as revised, still refers; and to conclude it to have been written at least not later than the earliest

[1] The writer is the editor of the tenth edition of "Taylor on Evidence." "Taylor on Evidence" is the standard text-book of authority on the English Law of Evidence.

event so alluded to. Even then, it is obviously impossible to be at all sure that the Play may not be of still earlier origin.

The next matter which the "Evidence" will point out is that the young Stratford Actor "Shakspere," of whom we shall hereafter hear much, is clearly shown by facts to certainly have not been an educated man — when he left his native town, and clearly not to have done this before 1587. Exactly how long it must be supposed to have been needed for even the "great genius," with which he is credited, to acquire that education, which every Play obviously required its writer to possess, is a matter which must rest with each Juryman to determine for himself. There is no example to guide him. For never, before or since, was so much learning attributed to so comparatively ignorant a man as "Shakspere" was when he left Stratford, and supposed to have been acquired, in some unknown way, in some undefined time.

Then the "Evidence" will go on to point out that the Stage sprang into existence soon after the Reformation had caused the discontinuance of the old Ecclesiastical Miracle Plays. To write for the Stage for money, it will be shown, long continued to be regarded as a most undesirable occupation for any person having a pretence to a position, seeing the close association which a Play-writer had of necessity to enter into with Actors—all then, with a few exceptions, vagabonds by Act of Parliament. A Literary Jury will then have laid before them, in some detail, a view of the history and position of the English Stage in its early days. It will be shown how Actors, and the "Poet that made the Play," were originally always one and the same person; how they soon became separate ones; how one "Poet" subsequently

"made the Play" for at first several different Actors, and finally for all; and how, in the end, it became usual for the manager of a Company of Actors to provide one "Poet," or Play-writer, to write their parts for each of its members. The "Poet," whose employment now grew to be a separate profession, will next be shown to have generally worked in conjunction with some other of his class, and the method of joint composition will be described. The "Evidence" will point out that, accordingly, it is probable that Bacon never worked alone, and was never in direct personal communication with "Shakspere" or any other Actor, but always had a Literary "mask" intervening between himself and the Stage.

Attention will be drawn to the singular precautions taken by Bacon throughout his life which the facts disclose. These show that the great Philosopher habitually adopted the teachings of his own Philosophy. This takes for its basis Nature, and an abandonment of everything artificial (as is taught by *Love's Labour's Lost*), and a return to Nature (as is taught by *The Winter's Tale*, and by *As You Like It*). In making his arrangements for the concealment of his name from the general public—that vulgar herd whom the aristocrat regarded with cordial contempt — Bacon himself took a lesson from Nature. Many a shy and timid creature is, in its Natural state, protected by its environments or surroundings. The foxes and pheasants of the Arctic regions grow white among the snow about them; the squirrel and its kindred, the partridge, and not a few other birds, are the less easily seen by reason of the close resemblance of their colouring to that of their surroundings; the Green Lizard takes the same hue as the green grass through which it creeps. Bacon, in the same way, always made the

Plays he was writing take their colouring from the Literary Coadjutor with whom he was at the moment writing. His first Literary Coadjutor appears to have been the Playwright Greene. The Plays then written took the form of Comedies and Philosophical Plays, based on passing Court incidents, and on the Novels of the hour. He, as his once coadjutor bitterly complained, "deserted" Greene. Marlow then became his fellow-worker. Now, Marlow was a writer of Plays illustrative of English History. Bacon forthwith commenced to write his English Historical Plays. Marlow's tragic death compelled Bacon to procure some other Literary "go-between." He at last found him in the person of his brother Anthony. Then, as Anthony was newly returned from foreign countries, and from frequent communication with North Italy, if not from actual residence in one of its towns (Padua), the Plays at once assumed an Italian aspect from this time till Anthony's death. After that event, Ben Jonson became suddenly reconciled with the Actor "Shakspere," with whom he had previously been at dire Literary enmity—to say the least. Having thus become qualified for the position, Jonson henceforth acted as Bacon's Literary "mask" or "go-between." The Plays immediately became of a character somewhat similar to those of Jonson, and they are made to simultaneously express Bacon's Political views, while they also served his personal ends. This startling series of "coincidences," as the "orthodox" call them, which the facts will be found to make manifest, will be traced fully and closely by the Evidence.

The Robert Greene just referred to was one of the very earliest, if not actually the earliest, of the writers who openly avowed that he wrote for the Stage. This man's life will be fully sketched in the "Evidence."

It will be shown that he was, like Bacon himself, a member of Cambridge University, with one of whom Bacon, throughout life, always kept in touch; that Greene obtained the Degree of M.A.; that he came to London about 1583-4; that he was in Denmark early in 1585, where he probably heard the tale of Hamlet, which Bacon would find recorded in the Novels of the French writer Belleforest; and that many traces of his Literary work are visible in the early "Shakespeare" Plays. In a passage which will be set out and discussed later in this "Outline," evidence is afforded that "Shake-Scene" was denounced by Greene in March 1592 as an Actor who was merely "an upstart crow beautified in our feathers," thus implying that he was not, in truth, the Writer of the Plays in which he was appearing. The whole argument of the "Evidence" will be, in a word, that "Shake-Scene," with his name improved and developed into "Shakespeare," continued to fill the character assigned to him by Greene until his retirement from the Stage in 1604. The key to the solution of the so-called Bacon-Shakespeare mystery, it will be contended, was really given by Greene in 1592, that writer being the coadjutor with whom Bacon had been recently working.

The Plays produced by "Shakespeare" in his earliest period, and while he was working with Greene, will be pointed out to have been either all Educational or else all Philosophical Plays, founded upon incidents at Queen Elizabeth's Court. Under the cover of dramatising these latter the Play-writer, at one time, ridiculed other systems of philosophy, while at another he prepared the world for his own. In the Plays of *Love's Labour's Lost*, of *Hamlet*, and of *Twelfth Night* the first of these objects was effected. The introduction of the system of philosophy, founded upon Nature, is best fore-

shadowed in *The Winter's Tale*." It is there personified in Perdita, the long-lost child of Nature, who is, at last, again found.

Such appears to be the general scheme of the early Plays, written in conjunction with Greene. Later Plays, written with different coadjutors, all likewise contained some distinctive teaching. The words of Bacon himself can be used to bear witness that this construction of the Plays is not the mere fanciful imagination of the present writer.

In his prose works,[1] Bacon tells us that "in some States of Antiquity" what he calls "Play-Acting" was "used as a means of educating men's minds." He also declares that, in his opinion, it ought to be so used in Modern States, enlarges upon its merits and possibilities, and goes on to discuss them. He says expressly that "Play-Acting" has been regarded by learned men and by great Philosophers as "a kind of magician's bow, by which men's minds may be played upon." He sought to "play upon men's minds" by the Dramas which have been already mentioned as intended to be introductory of his system of Philosophy. Again, we are told by Bacon that "Dramatic Poesy is as History made visible, for it represents actions as if they were present, whereas History regards them as past." The "Shakespeare" Plays, in the Prologue to what we shall hereafter find to be the last of their English Historical series (that to *Henry VIII.*), expresses the sentiment of Bacon's which has just been quoted, in language almost identical. Its exhorts the audience to "Think you see the very persons of our noble story, As they were living."

Not a little remarkable is it that, after the lapse of

[1] *See* "Advancement of Learning," Book II. ; "De Augmentis," Book II., cap. xiii. ; and also The Third Volume of the Book of Tune.

over three centuries, some men wisely, but probably quite unconscious of whose words they now seek to have effect given, should commence to urge the new Educational Authority for London at this day to use the "Shakespeare" Plays for the very purpose for which Bacon says that "Play-Acting" ought to be employed—that is, to "Educate men's minds." Not less remarkable is it that the "Shakespeare" Plays should be put forward by these men, thus unconscious of what they are unwittingly doing, as Plays exactly containing all that Bacon declared to be needed to attain the end now sought.

The value of the "Shakespeare" Plays as instruments of Education, in accordance with Bacon's suggestion, will be the more appreciated when it is recalled that there hardly is one of them which cannot be usefully so employed. For example, children previously taken to see such Plays might be afterwards well questioned, in competition with each other, as to the incidents of History referred to in any Historical Plays they had witnessed. The geographical knowledge which can be obtained from *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, and from many others of the Plays, could be similarly utilised. A knowledge of French might be tested after children have witnessed *King Henry V.* More advanced students could, in a similar way, be instructed in Botany and Natural History from the foundation laid by seeing *The Winter's Tale.* A knowledge of the Passions of human nature, displayed in the second Group of Dramas, is arranged in the Table (A.) affixed to this "Outline," and the moral which each teaches might be usefully imparted by a study of them. Even some knowledge of, and interest in, current political events, and the instruction which they give, might be excited in those who will form our future Electorate

by closely following the Plays written after the accession of James I., and constituting the third Group. In the fourth Group—the Plays of the Downfall—Bacon plainly seeks to obtain sympathy for himself, the victim of fallen Ambition, and for a faithful steward, while he also shows the evils which envy, even when achieving its immediate purpose, in the end entails.

From this digression into the teachings which can be derived from the "Shakespeare" Plays a return will be made to the narrative, telling the story of their coming into existence at different Periods of Bacon's life. The "Evidence" will collect the various traces of Greene's Literary labours which are to be found in the early "Shakespeare" Plays. To state here in any detail what these are would be out of place. Yet it will interest the readers of this "Outline" to know that the very early play, now known as *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, is admitted by Mr Sidney Lee, the champion of the Orthodox, to have been originally named *Felix and Philomena*. Under this name the Play had been produced at Court in 1884. It had been, and still is, founded upon the Plot of a Spanish Pastoral Romance named "Diana." This Spanish Romance was not, at that time, translated into English, nor was it till about ten years later; but it will be recalled that Greene had travelled in Spain, and was a Spanish scholar. Further, Bacon's commonplace book or notes, which shall be subsequently mentioned, betrays him soon after Greene's death making notes of common Spanish phrases of salutation and similar idiomatic expressions. The Play being an educational one, designed to show the advantage of foreign travel, it was important that the geographical statements contained in it should be accurate. Accordingly, as Bacon had never been in Spain, and Greene had been dead

for some years, it was afterwards, subsequently to Anthony Bacon's return to England, made to shift its scene from Spain to North Italy. Coming to another of the best known of the early Plays, it will be shown that *Hamlet* was written soon after a plot to murder Queen Elizabeth had been discovered in 1584, and Greene had returned from Denmark with the legend of Hamlet, as already pointed out. Indeed, the play was introduced into Germany by the Earl of Leicester's Company (in other words, by the Company of the Lord Chamberlain of the English Court) at a very early date. The English version of *Hamlet* has in it incidents which did not form part of the original story—for instance, the Ghost and the "Mousetrap" incident, in which, under pretence of seeking for a mouse behind the tapestry, Hamlet runs his sword through the man concealed there. While, on the one hand, other traces of Greene's work will be found in it, *Hamlet* will be shown to literally teem with the philosophy of Bacon. It will be pointed out that some of its most celebrated passages containing this are almost translations from Greek and other authors, so worded as to breathe the spirit, yet not the literal words, of their great originals. For example, Hamlet's famous soliloquy "To be or not to be" was in substance derived from the Dialogues of Plato, which at that time still remained untranslated from the original Greek. A contemporary writer, moreover, will be shown to have addressed the Members of both Universities in terms which allude to the writer of *Hamlet* as "The English Seneca." They would at once recall that Seneca was a most eloquent lawyer and pleader, also a Philosopher, a writer of Plays, and himself the Tutor of a King. All these descriptions are exactly corresponded to by Bacon, save that

the latter was not himself the tutor of a King but only the Grandson of one. After stating many more facts, showing that *Hamlet* must have been written soon after 1584, and "written up" by the addition to it of the poisoned cup incident in 1594, when Queen Elizabeth's Physician, one Lopez, had been detected in a plot to murder the Queen by placing a jewel supposed to be poisonous in her wine, the "Evidence" will leave *Hamlet*. It will proceed to show that others of the early Plays were written at a date long before that at which "Shakspere" the Actor left Stratford. The Play of *The Winter's Tale* will be pointed out to have been founded on a Novel of Greene's, which the Play so closely followed that, by an error in transposing scenes, Bohemia is given a sea-coast; while this Play is again made the vehicle of conveying, in allegorical form, much of Bacon's deep Philosophy. Dealing with *Love's Labour's Lost*, the "Evidence" will suggest further facts, indicating it to have been written by Bacon while he was still working in conjunction with Greene, and to have been, in truth, founded upon political events in France which had actually happened in the year 1586. The date at which the Play of *Twelfth Night* was written will be fixed by the "Evidence" to have been not later than September 1588. For some incidents at Court, the dates of which will be stated, are in it made the subjects of most delicate and veiled satire, which becomes plainly visible directly the key to it is afforded. But the incident, which is conclusive as to the date, is as follows:—One Tarleton had been found on the estate of Bacon's friend Lord Leicester, the Lord Chamberlain. Tarleton had been brought by Leicester to Court, and had been there made not only a Court Actor, but also the "Fool" usually attendant on the Queen. Sir

Walter Raleigh had about 1585 returned from discovering the Indies, and had made himself so familiar to the Queen that he was said to aspire to her hand; while his intimacy with Her Majesty, and insolent ways to everyone else, rendered him universally hated. One day, when the Queen was seated between Leicester and Raleigh, and the latter was absorbing all her conversation, Tarleton sarcastically remarked: "A strange thing, the knave commands the Queen." For this bitter jest Tarleton was banished from attendance at Court as a "Fool." To procure him an opportunity of once more appearing in the Royal presence the scene in *Twelfth Night* (Act iii. Sc. 1.) was introduced. Tarleton kept a Tavern called the "Tabor," next to St Benet's Church in "Gracious" (now Gracechurch) Street. This makes the following by-play between the Clown and Viola obviously plain:—

"*Viola.* Save thee and thy music. Dost thou live by thy tabor?

"*Clown.* No, Sir; I live by the Church.

"*Viola.* Art thou a Churchman?

"*Clown.* No such matter, Sir. I do live by the Church, for I do live at my house, and my house doth stand by the Church."

Local colouring, identifying Tarleton and his house, is here found; for the Tower of St Benet's Church contains chimes. So, subsequently, Tarleton the Clown tells Orsino: "The bells of St Benet may put you in mind, one, two, three." No one ever wrote a part for a dead man to play. Yet, as the Register of his burial records, Tarleton died in September 1588.

The approximate date of the termination of Bacon's collaboration with Greene will even be traced. None of the Shakespeare writings were assigned a name previous to the year 1591, but till *Venus and Adonis*

appeared in 1593, all were published anonymously; while no Play had its Author's name on it till 1548. Accordingly, in 1591, the Play of *King John* appeared anonymously. There is an anonymous copy in the possession of Capell College, Cambridge, dated 1591. Literary critics find in this Play, in its early part, distinct traces of Greene. In later portions of it the hand of Marlow is betrayed; while the title of The Troublesome Reign appears to be clearly borrowed from Marlow's *Troublesome Reign of Edward II.* The obvious inference is that the connection between Bacon and Greene terminated at some time while *King John* was in progress. It was probably brought about in consequence of Green's dissolute ways (which the "Evidence" will mention) rendering him an unsatisfactory fellow-worker. This date also tallies with Greene's complaint, in March 1592, that he had been "deserted"—as if somewhat recently.

Marlow was the Playwright with whom Bacon worked in conjunction on the termination of his connection with Greene. The "Evidence" will give a sketch of Marlow's career. It will show him to have exercised a great influence upon "Shakespeare," notwithstanding that their connection did not continue long, in point of mere time. Marlow, like his predecessor Greene, was a Graduate of the University of Cambridge. He was the earliest writer of English Historical Plays, and no one questions now that the "Shakespeare" Plays illustrative of English History were directly inspired by his influence. Some of his Historical Plays were, at least, not inferior to those of "Shakespeare"—and there are critics who claim them to have been superior. Marlow was an Actor before he left the Stage, after he broke his leg on it in a bad Stage accident, and then took to Play-

writing. He probably affords the earliest instance of a University man going upon the Stage. The "Evidence" will point out various Literary traces of his work in the "Shakespeare" Plays. So marked, indeed, are some that Mr Algernon Swinburne, no mean judge in such a matter, at one place (*II. Henry VI.* Act iv. Sc. 1), which commences with the line, "The gaudy, blabbing, and remorseful day," exclaims *Aut Christopherus Marlow, aut Diabolus!* and it is universally recognised that the way for the blank verse of Shkesapeare was prepared by "Marlow's mighty line." Unfortunately, Marlow, like Greene, was a man of dissolute habits. On 1st June 1593, as the "Evidence" will tell, he was tragically murdered, by being stabbed in the eye so that his brain protruded through it, in a tavern at Deptford, as the old writer tells us, "by a bawdy serving-man named Francis Archer during a quarrel over their lewd loves."

Bacon's arrangements were suddenly disconcerted by Marlow's terrible death. As with Greene, distinct traces of Marlow's work are visible in the Shakespeare Plays. Some zealous Baconians, indeed, would go so far as to assert that Bacon was the actual writer of all the Plays put forward as the work of Greene and of Marlow. For example, they would suggest that Marlow never wrote a Play in his life, and that his *Tamburlaine* was, in truth, wholly the work of Bacon. They would also urge that Bacon, under the pseudonym of "Shakespeare," during this early period did a lot of "touching up" of old Plays as a sort of Journeyman for Stage Managers. But of all this there is no actual evidence, and the finding of the work of Greene and Marlow in the early Shakespeare Plays appears not to warrant any of the conjectures just mentioned, and to, at least at present, no more than support the theory that Bacon and the two writers named were at different times

working in collaboration. As the "Evidence" will suggest, the Plays written by Bacon had hitherto got produced upon the Stage as the productions of, and by, Actors familiar with the fellow-worker with whom he was writing. Hence it was that, by Marlow's death, Bacon was placed in a great difficulty. But there was a skilled Diplomatist at his elbow at the moment. His brother Anthony had opportunely returned to England just in time. The "Evidence" will disclose facts from which the inference is plain that, with or without Anthony's aid, a Diplomatic arrangement was soon afterwards made with the young Stratford Actor. The exact nature of this has been the Literary "mystery" of over three centuries. It is believed that the writer has now discovered this by observing facts which have hitherto not received the attention they merited. Stated shortly, it was this. The name, or word, "Shake-SPEAR," or Greene's nickname, with "Spear" as its ending instead of "Scene," formed a figure of speech exactly expressing one of Bacon's ideas of a fit mission of the Stage.[1] So it was arranged that Shaksper of Stratford should assume it, either in that form, or written as one word. But, in this latter form, the name so closely resembled both the Actor's Patronymic, and also his Stage-name, in the form he might from time to time select, that none of the general Public would be likely to notice, though there it was, in days when spelling was largely Phonetic. Such an arrangement, too, was involved enough to puzzle (as indeed it long has done) better educated persons, or those about Court, who might suspect some connection to exist between the Philosopher and the Actor. Accordingly it was arranged that Bacon also should adopt the same name, in either of its forms, for Poetry

[1] As to its meaning, see *infra* page 36.

or Plays. But it was to be given to no Play, unless originally Bacon's, and one in which a Part had been played by Shaksper of Stratford, on the occasion of its being first produced upon any Stage. Such, the Evidence shows, was the substance of the 1593-5 arrangement. It will be found that the Actor usually used the name, as his Stage-name, with the Hyphen; while Bacon as a writer, often employed it, as his "Pen-name" written as one word and without a break; and this for obvious reasons. At the coming trial the facts, and the conclusion which it is submitted ought to be drawn from them, will be laid before a Literary Jury, to be tested by their common-sense. Proof will not be sought to be established by the aid of any such matter, as has been already disclaimed.[1]

This arrangement took a considerable interval, and much diplomacy, to bring it into effect. At Marlow's death, the name of the Stratford Actor was neither known in Literature nor famous upon the Stage. The first task was to procure Literary celebrity for it. To effect this, *Venus and Adonis* was published.

Much close connection between it and Bacon can be traced. The poem, though printed by one originally a Stratford man (which would serve as a "Blind" to many), had to be "Licensed" before Publication. For the then Archbishop of Canterbury, in conjunction with the then Bishop of London, had in 1585 procured the Star Chamber to decree that no Book should be published without being previously licensed. *Venus and Adonis* received the singular honour, notwithstanding the voluptuous nature of many of the passages in it, of being licensed by no less a personage than the Archbishop himself.

Under the circumstances, this is striking and strange.

[1] See *ante* page 2.

Had the alliance between the Stage and the Church, as we call it in this twentieth century, already commenced in the sixteenth? Can we believe that any Actor, even so great a genius as the man of Stratford is claimed by his friends to have been, "Must" have then been so closely intimate with the Archbishop of the moment that the latter readily licensed his somewhat loose love-songs?

The subject-matter of *Venus and Adonis* was to advise a rich and amorous young lord, in terms of familiar freedom, to marry and beget an heir to his title and wealth. Such advice might well come from a fellow-peer and fellow-lodger, but seems strange as proceeding from a hitherto totally unknown Literary man, and a little-known Actor.

No such conjecture as above suggested is needed when we find that Whitgift, Bacon's old tutor at Cambridge, had become an Archbishop, and that he it was who, in spite of his cloth, "licensed" *Venus and Adonis*. Moreover, that Poem was dedicated to "Henry Wriothesley," the young Earl of Southampton, who has been already [1] described as Bacon's "Fellow-lodger" and friend at Gray's Inn. The person who so dedicated it signed himself as "William Shakespeare." This name will, as above stated, be shown by the "Evidence" to have been Bacon's "Pen-name." When, about thirty years later, under the circumstances mentioned elsewhere,[2] the Folio was published, it had upon it a headpiece which contained an etching that embodied the exact idea which was expressed in verse by Ben Jonson in some lines in the folio also. This etching depicted a man behind a mask throwing a "spear" (hence the termination of the name) at Ignorance. In Ben Jonson's words, Bacon's "well turned and true filed

[1] See *ante* pages 16-17. [2] See *post* pages 56-57.

lines" are verses "in each of which he seems to shake a lance, as brandish'd at the eyes of Ignorance."

All the earlier published Shake-speare Plays have a significant fact, common alike to them and to *Venus and Adonis*, and to *Lucrece* (which was published in the year following, 1594). It appears in the Catalogue of Title-Pages given at the end of his Lecture by the (in this instance) "orthodox" Judge Willis, than whom a more vehement Shakesperian is not to be found in England. Every known copy (and there are eight) of *Venus and Adonis*, whatever its date, is without any Author's name upon the Title-page. The first four known editions of *Lucrece*, of which we have copies, have no Author's name upon their Title-pages; but the two copies mentioned below have an Author's name upon them. One known copy of *Venus and Adonis* has a Dedication signed in full —"William Shapespeare." But, while the 1593 Edition of *Venus and Adonis* has this Dedication, and a similar one is in the 1594 Edition of *Lucrece*, all the editions of both Poems have no Author's name upon their Title-pages, except in the case of two late editions of *Lucrece* which contain on their Title-pages the name "William Shapespeare" in full. As regards the Plays, when *King John* was published in 1591 it was put forth anonymously, as appears by an edition dated in that year, which is in the possession of Capell College, Cambridge. In 1611 the initials "W S" were placed upon its Title-page (the only instance of such initials being so employed), and in the Folio of 1623 the full name of "Shapespeare," of course, covered *King John*, as well as the other plays then published. All four editions of *Romeo and Juliet* were also published anonymously—one in 1597, and three others subsequently. The full name, "William Shakespeare," first appeared in the Folio of 1623, in which this Play was included.

Again, *Richard II.*, *Richard III.*, and *Henry IV.* were all published anonymously—the two first named in 1597, and the last named in 1598. In the year just named, however (1598), the Play of *Love's Labour's Lost* was shown to be then an old Play by the announcement on its Title-page that it had been "presented before her Highness last Christmas," and that it had been newly corrected and enlarged by "William Shakespeare."

After this, this full name appeared, as a rule, upon each Play when it was published. This looks as if the use of the Pen-name was not finally decided upon, and was hesitating and tentative from the publication of *Venus* in 1593, till the success of the publication of *Love's Labour's Lost* in 1598 showed that there was no need that more fear should be felt about its habitual use.

During the following year (1594), position as an Actor of some importance was procured for the Stratford Actor by obtaining for him the privilege of playing before Queen Elizabeth. The Members of Gray's Inn gave some "Revels" at Greenwich, where "Shakspere" acted before the Queen; and, subsequently, some at Gray's Inn, where Bacon, as the "Sorcerer," took the management of these. The Inn, when the first day's entertainment had proved a fiasco, complained that the "Sorcerer" had invited "a Company of lewd fellows" —in other words, the Company of Actors to which "Shakspere" of Stratford was attached—to come there and play *The Comedy of Errors.* Bacon, on this, arranged for another entertainment at the Inn, and himself wrote a Masque to be performed on this second occasion. In the same year, further Literary reputation was secured for the name of "William Shakespeare" by the publication (1594) of *Lucrece*, with a dedication by "William Shakespeare," in terms

of fervently warm and increased affection. Again it is asked, as it has been already shown to be the question for the Literary Jury: "Who was William Shakespeare?"

The "Evidence" will suggest that the tradition told by Rowe of the young Earl of Southampton having made a gift of £1000 (equal to about £8000 to £10,000 in these days) to "Shakespeare," in order "to enable him to complete a purchase for which he had a mind," is as well authenticated as any other "Shakespeare" tradition, and also, in all probability, absolutely true. Facts, too, will be collected showing that this munificent present, if ever made, must have unquestionably been bestowed about this time. For up to this date the young Earl was not of age; not long afterwards became engaged in an intrigue with one of the Queen's Maids of Honour, was compelled by circumstances to marry her; and soon was thrown into prison in the Tower and became impoverished. The "Evidence" after describing all these matters in full will go on to suggest that the purchase which Lord Southampton's gift enabled "Shakspere" to complete was not one of property in the neighbourhood of Stratford, where the "orthodox" have sought for it in vain, but was one of Shares in the Globe Theatre, which was just afterwards erected, and, as soon as opened, at once became the home of the "Shakespeare" Dramas. That the Stratford Actor did in some way become possessed of a large interest in it is not denied. Mr Sidney Lee airily says that the Burbidges, by whom the theatre was built, "Must" have given him the Shares. Yet they subsequently wrote of him merely as "a deserving man," so that the suggestion, which the "Evidence" will advance, seems at least as probable as Mr Sidney Lee's "Must." Other evidence, showing that Bacon also was greatly

interested, in other than a money sense, in this Globe Theatre will be adduced in the "Evidence." The name of the theatre closely resembles the title which would be suggested by one of his prose works; the classical motto for which it was conspicuous was plainly provided by a man of learning and deep reading. We do not exactly know how the interior of the theatre was arranged, since it was burnt down in 1613; but it is not a little remarkable that so great an interest was taken by Bacon in theatrical matters that after his death there was found among his papers the ground plan of a theatre, arranging its details down even to the arrangements of the dressing-rooms for the Actors.

That Francis Bacon took considerable interest in the new arrangement, whatever that was, will be treated by the "Evidence" as being already sufficiently made obvious. After an interval, which had lasted about two years—that is, from Marlow's death on 1st June 1593 until about the year 1595—the "Shakespeare" Plays assumed their appearance under that name. And as early as 1598 one of them made its appearance in print. This was that of *Love's Labour's Lost*, which had been seemingly performed at Court in 1587-8, at a time when the Actor "Shakspere," if he had left Stratford, could not possibly have obtained the learning and education exhibited in it. The style of the master mind dominating the "Shakespeare" Plays of the new series, commenced after the arrangement with "Shakspere," did not materially differ from that shown in those which this Outline has suggested, and the full "Evidence" will prove, there is cause to believe were of earlier date. No one, indeed, has ever ventured to suggest that the plays written previous to 1594 were written under the guidance of a different master mind from that which belonged to the author of the earlier ones.

Yet the participation of Anthony Bacon in some arrangement at about this date is abundantly clear. Anthony had just returned from abroad, and, if he had not actually come from Italy itself, he was at least familiar with the scenery and towns, the manners, and the people of North Italy. The "Shakespeare" Plays, on being resumed, at once assumed an Italian garb. In this dress they, one after another, painted pictures of the Passions of Humanity. In turn, they showed on the Stage Perversity, Devotion, Love, Scheming, Avarice, Lust, the love of Nature, and Jealousy. The "Evidence" will point out the hitherto unnoticed fact that just about this time someone, actuated by some unavowed reason, began to publish translations in English of Italian tales and novels, which subsequently formed the foundation of some of the "Shakespeare" Plays. Others of these Plays of the Italian Group incorporate previously untranslated gleanings from Italian Literature. The "Evidence" will, moreover, point out a passage of this description, in one of the "Shakespeare" Plays, where a mistranslation in an English version previously published is corrected, and the passage made accurate according to the original Italian.

That the Earl of Southampton played a prominent part in the "Shakespeare" story is ground common to both sides. It is undeniable that *Venus and Adonis*, and *Lucrece*, which, it is contended, were the earliest Poems written by "Shakespeare"—that is to say, Bacon — after he had made, but before he had finally concluded and acted upon, his arrangements with the Stratford Actor "Shakespur," were dedicated to the Earl. As unquestionably, the folio of 1623 collecting the "Shakespeare" Plays was also dedicated to Southampton, there ought to be no

doubt entertained about the sonnets published in 1609 having been also dedicated to Earl Southampton. Internal evidence makes it clear that he was the person addressed in them, and thus "the only begetter" of them. Of this opinion is Mr Sidney Lee. Some, indeed, see "an insuperable objection" in the fact of the dedication being to "Mr W. H." To the mind of a lawyer, the name adopted is a sort of pardonable "blind," which only makes the matter plainer. The name of the Earl of Southampton, it will be recollected, was "Henry Wriothesley." The initials employed are those of the Earl, merely reversed. Mr Sidney Lee's shrewdness as a critic made him see clearly that the Earl was the person addressed by the Sonnets. His candour compelled him to say so. The same shrewdness which led him to see to whom the Sonnets were addressed must, however, have told him that, in admitting the Sonnets to be addressed to Earl Southampton, he was enormously strengthening the case for the Baconians, in view of the close relationships which have been before pointed out[1] as existing between the Earl and Francis Bacon. The same candour which compelled Mr Lee to make this handsome admission will, it is hoped, lead him to accept the explanation of the real relationship existing between Bacon and "Shakspere" of Stratford, when such explanation as above is proved by the full evidence. He can the more easily do so when he finds that such explanation is altogether consistent alike with itself, with the conduct of everyone else, and with the part played in carrying out the arrangement agreed upon, both in the original production of the Plays, their subsequent publications in the quarto editions, and in their publication in a collected form in the folio of 1623. He will be glad to

[1] See *ante* pages 16-17.

find also that the ambiguities of the folio itself are cleared up. Even the curious act of placing under the portrait, "for gentle Shakespeare cut," lines embodying the sentiment in a motto originally round a miniature of Bacon in his youth, and embodied in the lines:

> "Oh, could he but have drawn his wit
> As well in brass, as he hath hit
> His face."[1]

will be found to have been explained. So will also the numerous antitheses in the verses, and elsewhere, between one "He" and "His" and another.

The "Evidence" will urge it to be a highly probable thing that three young men who were "fellow-lodgers" at Gray's Inn, and intimately associated, should agree to play the respective parts which are above suggested, and shown by the facts to have been subsequently performed by them. The Literary man, or "man of parts," becomes an author. The man of wealth liberally contributes out of his abundant means. The man of Diplomacy probably suggested the plan, and certainly took his share in carrying it out. Thus it will be suggested that the facts show all three friends contributed something—each according to his means—to effect an object in which they felt a common interest. Francis Bacon desired to use the Drama as a vehicle for instruction; both his brother and his friend were interested in the Stage, and desired to help him achieve his ends. The story is at least a probable one.

The arrangement thus come to between 1593 and 1601 continued for about six years. An indication

[1] A miniature of Bacon, painted for his mother by Hillyard, a Devonshire man (1537-1619), a famous miniature painter, probably on the occasion of his returning from abroad, is encircled by the words: "*Si tabula daretur digna animam mallem.*" The words quoted in the text are a free translation of this Latin motto, which is given in vol. i. of Spedding, page 7.

of the class of Play produced during those six years has already been given.[1]

It will, however, be usefully pointed out by the "Evidence" that the first of the series of Italian Plays which appeared did so under singular circumstances. A Play, entitled *The Taming of* a *Shrew*, was produced in English, having been adapted from the Italian. Directly afterwards a Play substantially the same made its appearance amongst the "Shakespeare" Plays. It was, however, there entitled *The Taming of* the *Shrew* (instead of *a* Shrew), and it was surrounded by what may be best described as a "setting," in which local Warwickshire colouring is lent to the Italian Play by the device of making the latter to be the dream of a dissipated Warwickshire tinker, who goes to an Inn kept by a Warwickshire landlady on a well-known heath in that County, there meets numerous folk with Warwickshire names, and finally falls asleep outside the ale-house door, and has this marvellous dream.

During this Second Period of his life Bacon completed the Group of English Historical Plays commenced during the First Period of it, under the influence of Marlow. Nothing of a special importance in connection with any of them will be noticed in the "Evidence," except that it is traditionally said that Queen Elizabeth was so pleased with the character of Falstaff that she desired to see him shown as in love. The Philosopher knew well that a being such as he had depicted Falstaff to be was not capable of love, in any true sense of that word. Nevertheless, he did not disappoint the Queen. Lust would not be inconsistent with the character of Falstaff. So, after a very short interval (traditionally said to have been no more than a fortnight), he wrote *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, in which the hero Falstaff

[1] See *ante* page 41.

is made the merry sport of the combined passions of his Lust and his Avarice. But the plot of the Play was taken from that Italian source which was at the moment dominant over the play-writer. A tale lately translated from the Italian, and called "The Two Lovers of Pisa," furnished its foundation.

Yet a third group of Plays came into existence during this second period of Bacon's life. In the year 1601 the following circumstances obliged him to commence a series of Historical Latin Plays:—In early life Francis Bacon had been the political adherent of the party in Opposition, headed by Lord Essex. In return, Essex had exerted (most injudiciously) all his influence to obtain for Bacon the Office of Solicitor-General. Their relationships, indeed, had been such that Essex may be said to have been Bacon's political father. A coldness, however, arose between them in politics. Then Essex was invited to take the command in Ireland of the Army sent to crush a rebellion there. On this he consulted Bacon. The latter at first advised him to accept the position. But a personal interview at Gray's Inn revealed to Bacon the real ends at which Essex aimed. He advised Essex, verbally, not to go to Ireland, and intimated that he himself could take no part in his designs. Essex, however, went; he made secret arrangements in his own interest with the rebels he was sent to subdue; suddenly returned to London, and tried to raise a rebellion there also, and so acted as was likely to arouse a suspicion that Bacon was a sharer in his treason. His rebellion failed, and Bacon took part, by the Queen's command, in the prosecution of Essex for treason which immediately followed, and resulted in the Earl's execution.

To justify himself, Bacon resorted to Latin History. He wrote the Play of *Julius Cæsar* directly

afterwards (in 1601). In it, when Julius Cæsar sought the overthrow of the old constitution of Rome, his own illegitimate son Brutus was one of those who, in the interest of his country, firmly opposed his designs. Bacon, in the Play, invests the position with pathos by suggesting that Brutus, who gave Cæsar his final stab, was his own son, and by making Cæsar pathetically exclaim, in words borrowed by Bacon from the Greek of the then untranslated Suetonius: "Et tu, Brute."[1]

Bacon's Biographer, Spedding, finds the "germ" of *Julius Cæsar* in Bacon's "*Conference of Pleasure.*"

The arrangement come to in 1595 was put an end to, as will be told in the "Evidence," by the death of Anthony Bacon about May 1601. Bacon's uncle, Lord Burleigh, also died about the same time. Bacon's mother, perhaps distraught by these double deaths, became insane, and so continued for six or seven years, when she died also. This was not all. After these dire calamities Queen Elizabeth, who had always been a kind friend to Bacon, making him handsome gifts just after each occasion on which she had declined to approve of him as a Law Officer of the Crown, fell ill, and she also died early in 1603.

Perhaps it is not a matter of wonder, under the circumstances just stated, that the production of any "Shakespeare" Plays was suspended, and was not renewed until after a long interval. After the death of Marlow, an interval of about two years had been required to effect new arrangements. On this occasion, one of three years occurred. During it, Ben Jonson became reconciled with Bacon's Stage Mask, the Stratford Actor, whom he had previously reviled much in

[1] In the original (and then untranslated) Greek of Suetonius, which is Bacon's authority for making the dying Cæsar exclaim, in English, "And thou, too, my son," the words are: "και συ, τεκνον."

the manner of Greene. It cannot but be suspected that the vacancy in the Office of Literary go-between for Bacon, which had been created by Anthony Bacon's death, had something to do with this. At all events, the reconciliation at that moment was opportune and convenient to everyone concerned. Great as Ben Jonson's name unquestionably is in English Literature, and unconnected with anything dishonourable as it is, his career is one which does not altogether, and of itself, carry evidence on the face of it that the suggestion just made is an utterly impossible one. Jonson had been educated at Westminster under Camden. Like Greene and Marlow, he had been a Member of Cambridge University. His stepfather had made him work as a bricklayer; then he had served as a soldier in the Low Countries. He had afterwards killed a man in a duel, claimed his benefit of clergy after conviction at the Old Bailey for the manslaughter, and had been discharged after the usual branding on the brawn of his left thumb. Next he turned Roman Catholic for twelve years (1598-1610), but at the end of that time is known to have recanted.

Much, however, also occurred in the long interval between Anthony Bacon's death and Jonson's succession as Literary go-between for Bacon, which the "Evidence" will point out in some detail. The accession of James I., with whom Bacon had for years previously been in secret communication, greatly altered his prospects, and opened for him a probability of professional and political advancement. Indeed, he had probably, without any delay, betaken himself to Scotland to see the new King; since we hear of an interview taking place between him and the Treasurer for Scotland. In 1604 James appointed Bacon to be a K.C., then a new rank amongst lawyers, which

Bacon made to carry with it considerable professional work for the Crown. In the same year "Shakspere" of Stratford had conferred upon him the Office of a Court-Actor. Then it was that he left the regular Stage, with an understanding, according to tradition, that he should return to London twice a year, and play at Court two Plays written by Bacon. This latter arrangement is shown by the books of the Privy Council to have been carried out for several years; but in 1611 the Actor finally left the Stage. It obviously was greatly convenient, alike to the Play-writer and the Actor, that such an arrangement as that of 1604 should take place. It left Bacon at liberty to devote such time as might be required to the development of his improved Professional and Political prospects; it left the Actor free to enjoy at Stratford the (in his eye) considerable wealth which he had acquired.

Again the type of Plays alters on the new literary go-between, Ben Jonson, assuming that Office. On Anthony Bacon undertaking it, the Plays had suddenly acquired an Italian character. Now that Ben Jonson entered upon it, they became distinctly of an English and classical style, not differing much from Jonson's own.

But, while taking this form, the Plays also resumed the characteristic of reflecting matters personal to Bacon, which had been distinctive of the early ones. The whole Group of Plays written between 1603 and 1613 will be found to, in some way, bear upon the Personality of Bacon. Thus the very first Play of the Group did so. Incidentally, it should here be mentioned that the Play of *Othello* belongs to the Group of Italian Plays, and the "Evidence" suggests that it was in an incomplete state when Anthony Bacon

died in 1601, and that this event, and those which followed it, prevented its production on the Stage till 1604, when it was one of the Plays performed at Court. The first Play of the new Group was that of *Measure for Measure*, which was also performed at Court in the year just mentioned. This Play of *Measure for Measure* is the most legal of all the "Shakespeare" Plays. It brings into prominence the legal abilities of Bacon. That, in itself, was no ill-chosen subject for an ambitious lawyer, aspiring to Political Office, to bring to the notice of a new King. But the Play did more than this.

Strange and striking are many of the Reflections of Bacon's Life contained in the Shapespeare Plays. But of all of them none is more remarkable than this of *Measure for Measure*.

With a new King just seated upon the Throne, nothing could seem more appropriate than that one of the very earliest Acts of Parliament of his reign should be a great Law Reform, proposed and urged by one who had been amongst the most staunch of his adherents in the days of the King's uncertainty and expectancy, and who was, as he had shown himself, well fitted to be one of the new Sovereign's Law Officers. The Codification of the Law, and securing its simplicity by constant Revision, was urged by Bacon, alike in his place in Parliament; in a Legal work ("Maxims of the Law"); now by a Play; and afterwards in his subsequently published Philosophical works. When the Play appeared, Bacon had already brought this reform forward in Parliament—in 1593—in an eloquent speech. His "Maxims of the Law" had subsequently developed his arguments.

In the Play in which he now again urged Codification it may well be believed that the Actor who served

him as his "Stage Mask" most probably, as an experienced Stage Manager, gave Bacon considerable aid by suggesting Scenes, Situations, and Dialogues, which made lighter and more pleasant a Play having but a dull subject—a Law Reform—for its theme. The Actor-Manager may well be supposed to have brightened this somewhat dreary teaching, in much the same way as he previously had the philosophical enumerations of the signs of approaching death detailed in King Henry V.

Bacon's efforts for Codification did not end, however, with an endeavour so embody them as the teaching of the Play of *Measure for Measure.* He afterwards returned to the subject in his "De Augmentis." That great work was translated into French, and, like his other Philosophical Works, once more gave proof that a Prophet is usually more honoured in a strange country than he is in his own. For, in France, these works commanded greater weight than was ever allowed to them in England. Consequently, it may well be that Bacon's labours for the Codification and Simplification of the Law, distasteful as they would naturally be in England to the lawyers of his day, and much as they may for that reason have contributed to the shipwreck of his life, may yet have had some effect in inspiring the code Napoleon.

The Play presented at Court in the next year (1605) was that of *Macbeth.* It appeared, at first sight, to flatter James by adopting his views on the subject of witchcraft. The King had not only written a book upon this subject when ruling Scotland, but his very first English Parliament had passed an Act of Parliament by which, in deference to the new Monarch's known views, the cruel enactments, under which witches were burnt to death, were consolidated and renewed.

Yet upon close examination it will be seen that Bacon makes the Play of *Macbeth* really teach the philosophical view that witchcraft, in truth, merely acts through the Imagination, which compels men to seize, when it arises, the opportunity of bringing into effect what the mind has already desired. But the Play also adroitly flattered James in another way. During the Royal progress from Scotland to England the new King of England, acting on his own mere authority, had ordered a "cut-purse," who had been caught in his train, to be forthwith hung. His advisers in English Constitutional Law had then told him that such a despotic act as hanging a man without trial was contrary to our English Constitution. The astute Bacon craftily comforted the King's wounded vanity, by suggesting in the Play that, in Scotland, such an act was perfectly proper and legal; since he depicted in *Macbeth* the execution of a Scottish Earl by the King's orders. The Play of *King Lear* was hardly less adroit in its flattery of the King. It painted the evils likely to be brought upon a kingdom when its sovereign left an unsettled Succession. Men had greatly feared that Queen Elizabeth, by leaving her Successor to the Crown unselected, would entail once more upon England all the evils of a Civil War consequent upon her failing to name one. At the last moment she had nominated "Our cousin of Scotland" to succeed to her throne. Both in *Macbeth*, and in *Lear*, Bacon utilised the knowledge of how "to minister to a mind diseased," which his own mother's sad insanity had given him a painful opportunity of studying. In 1609 the Play of *Troilus and Cressida* brought into prominence the deep knowledge of "Statecraft," which Bacon had studied from the days when he, in his youth, was abroad in the train of an Ambassador of England. This lesson alone

would not be lost upon a monarch who prided himself on his own knowledge of "Statecraft" as did James I.

But the Play of *Troilus and Cressida* was in many ways a remarkable one. It, alone of the Shakespeare Plays, other than those of the Trilogy of the Downfall, was published without having been previously placed upon the Stage.

One reason for this was that it was a Play likely to be the more appreciated the more closely it was read, and thus better suited for the Study than the Stage.

Another, in all probability, was that something, early in 1609, made Bacon anxious to bring the Play at once to the notice of those who would appreciate it. But Shakspere the Actor was at Stratford, and to have put it on the Stage in his absence would have been a violation of the Agreement between him and Bacon, which was scrupulously adhered to by both of them throughout life, and by Bacon during the ten years or so for which he survived the Actor. The "Evidence," when the nature of this arrangement has been disclosed, will make it clear that this was so. The excuse given for the Play's appearance in print, without having been previously acted, was insinuated to be that its readers had to "thank fortune for the 'scape it hath made amongst you" from some who were "insinuated to be its 'grand possessors.'" How the Play had "made its 'scape," or who its "grand possessors" were, was not stated. It is not a little remarkable that, in the same year as that in which the Play appeared (1609), the Sonnets appeared also in the name of "Shakespeare," but their author there plainly told us (Sonnet 76): "I keep Invention in a noted Weed, and every Word doth almost tell my name." Shakspere of Stratford was still alive, and in all probability played in *Troilus and Cressida* when he next was up from Stratford. For,

before the year 1609 had expired, that Play "was acted by the King's Majesty Servants at the Globe," as we are informed by the Title-page of another edition.

This "Monster of a Play" has largely puzzled Shakespearian critics. They confess to have found it "hard to characterise." Read by the light of the Stratford Actor's life only, this certainly cannot be done.

Homer, in the days of ancient Greece, and long afterwards Virgil, in the zenith of Rome's Literary glory, had, as their many imitators had done since, treated the Siege of Troy as a Martial subject, and had sung the glories of the Art of War.

Bacon, departing from tradition, made the tale tell of triumphs of Diplomacy, and of its representative, the crafty Ulysses. In a word, the teaching of the Play, as treated by Bacon, may be expressed in the three words: *Cedunt arma togæ.* The marvellous mind of the great philosopher seemingly foresaw how the Art of Diplomacy would one day triumph as, after three centuries, it is doing by the spread of Arbitration among nations, over the barbarous and antiquated Art of War.

This was the grand teaching of the Play, written by the enlightened and far-seeing Philosopher, who even then taught that "Men's minds might be played upon as by a Magician's bow," and led to seek some better method of adjusting the disputes of nations than by an appeal to brute force. While this was its great and splendid lesson, *Troilus and Cressida* did not forget either to flatter King James, or to identify Bacon. As says Judge Webb: "The glorious Planet Sol . . . it may be noted, was the cognisance of the Prince of Purpoole at the Gray's Inn Festivities of 1594, when Bacon was Master of the Revels." "It was a political Tract also," writes the late Judge (page 223), "and in

it 'James is the glorious planet Sol, and Bacon is the sly Ulysses.'"

The "Evidence" will quote many passages in this one Play which are identical with views expressed by Bacon in his prose works; and in a striking passage the late Judge Webb (p. 218) eloquently identifies the sentiments in the Play with at once the Law, the Science, the Horticultural Knowledge, the Natural History, and even the Astronomical Learning of Bacon, as well as with his habitual "Triads," and general style.

The Play of *Cymbeline* (produced about 1610), was a tale of an early British King, some of whose coins had been found near Bacon's home at St Albans. Just as the adventures of Falstaff, depicted in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, had been adapted from the Italian tale of "The Lovers of Pisa," so in *Cymbeline* a traditionary tale of the ancient Britons is founded upon a novel written by the Italian Boccaccio. The Play of *The Tempest*, with its picture of the loss of a ship in a storm off "the vexed Bermoothes," was first written and presented before the King at Whitehall in November 1611, being the very year after a ship called *The Admiral*, in which Bacon, the Earl of Southampton, and the Earls Pembroke and Montgomery (to the last two of whom the folios were dedicated) were jointly interested, had been wrecked off these very "Bermoothes." This Play was, after Bacon's usual fashion, altered and augmented on the occasion of the marriage, in 1613, of James's daughter Elizabeth with the Prince Palatine—a marriage, by the way, which confers upon our present Royal family their right to the Throne of England. When it was then performed, it was happily remoulded by its author, so as to represent James as the great magician whose power had brought about this auspicious marriage.

The full "Evidence" will state, in greater detail than

is here permissible, the specific evidence which can be produced in support of each of the statements made above.

While the main body of the Plays produced during the third period of Bacon's life (or period of Political progress) consisted of those already mentioned, a further Group of Plays was continued by him during the same period. About the year 1607 he wrote a continuation of the Crisis in Roman History, partially dealt with in his *Julius Cæsar*, and completed his History of that event. The new Play was called *Anthony and Cleopatra*. Soon after it was written, its author appears to have contemplated its immediate publication. It is known never to have been produced upon the Stage, and it was not published until it appeared in the folio of 1623. The Hon. Albert Canning, in his "Shakespeare studied in eight Plays," remarks (at p. 162) that "Bacon's opinion of Augustus, expressed in vigorous, concise prose, much resembles the poetic description of him by Shakespeare in the successive Plays of *Julius Cæsar*, and *Anthony and Cleopatra*." In support of his opinion he quotes a passage from Bacon's "Historical Essays," which will be set out in the "Evidence."

The fourth Period of Bacon's life was Official, for he was appointed Attorney-General in 1613 and Lord Keeper of the Great Seal in 1617. After obtaining promotions in the peerage, and advancement to the post of Lord Chancellor, he was impeached and degraded from the latter high Office in 1621.

It is extremely remarkable to note that, while new editions of such Plays as had been previously published continued to appear, in the name of "William Shakespeare," between the date of the death of "Shakspere" of Stratford in 1616 and that of Bacon's Fall, yet no new "Shakespeare" Play whatever

was put upon the Stage during that time. Nevertheless, we know that several had then been already written; as, for instance, *Anthony and Cleopatra* in 1607, and *Troilus and Crescidda* in 1609, besides the rearrangement in a "Trilogy" of *Henry VI.* The reason for this abstention from placing the Plays on the Stage was, as the "Evidence" will show, that to place them on the Stage, and to afterwards publish them as "Shakespeare" Plays, would have been a breach by Bacon of the honourable understanding with "Shakspere" of Stratford, which both appear to have observed in the most scrupulous and honourable way. To publish them and the Trilogy mentioned below as "Shakespeare" Plays, in the manner in which they were afterwards inserted in the folio, was not a breach of such understanding, if construed in the manner which the "Evidence" will suggest.

Bacon's Fall was brought about by his life-enemy Coke. That eminent, but sour and narrow-minded, lawyer contrived to stir up a popular feeling against the system of fees by which all Judges, as well as counsel, were then paid, and Arbitrators are still. The first victim was Yelverton, C.B., whom Bacon, as President of the Privy Council, had to sentence. The next was Bacon himself, who, like many another, before and since, fell a victim to a vile system, attacked by a popular fit of virtue, offering some men opportunities to ruin individuals, though it does not give courage to attack an abominable system.

The remaining period of Bacon's life is that of his Downfall. During the first part of it, he collected together and published, with the assistance of Ben Jonson, the previously existing "Shakespeare" Plays. To them he added a Trilogy, which may be called "The Trilogy of the Downfall." It completed, by a

concluding Play, each of the series of "Shakespeare" Plays, the Educational Plays being concluded by the Play *Timon of Athens.* In this, the original was so altered that it could be said to Bacon *de te fabula narratur;* and to suggest the Scene to be at York House rather than at ancient Athens. It brought into prominence the conduct of faithless friends, notable amongst whom were Sir George Hastings and Sir Richard Young, who deserted a once prosperous man after his Fall, and the one faithful servant—in Bacon's case his Steward, Sir Thomas Mentys—who remains true to him. The series of English History Plays was concluded by a new Play named *King Henry VIII.*, which took the place of an older Play of the same name. Critics of this detect that much of it was written by Fletcher, the son of a judge, and the colleague of Beaumont. There existed a close connection, probably through Archbishop Whitgift, between Bacon and the family of the Fletchers, one of whom Bacon, when Lord Chancellor, presented to a living in his gift in that capacity. This Play reflected two incidents in Bacon's life. A fallen Chancellor, like himself, was depicted in Cardinal Wolsey. Bacon's own views, strongly condemning Benevolences as oppressive of the people, expressed by him in Parliament many years previously, were in the Play placed in the mouth of Queen Anne Boleyn, the mother of Queen Elizabeth. Finally, the series of Latin History Plays was, like Bacon's own career, brought to a close by Envy (Coke personified) working the downfall of the object of its jealousy, *Coriolanus* (Bacon himself), by playing upon the popular feeling of the moment.

Having thus collected the "Shakespeare" Plays, Bacon devoted the remainder of his life to the publication of those Philosophical works for which the

Plays had prepared the way. He died, in the year 1626, of a chill contracted in an experiment strangely echoing the inquiries made in *Hamlet* (Act v. Sc. 1), as to how long a dead body can be preserved ere it decompose. In that Play, we read that a Tanner has his hide so tanned that he will last eight or nine years. Anticipating the modern system of refrigeration, Bacon was trying the effect of stuffing a dead fowl with snow, when he caught the chill which, as with his father before him, developed into pneumonia and caused his death.

Besides the evidence afforded by his entire life, identifying Bacon with the "Shakespeare" Plays, both internal evidence in those Dramas, and also considerable external evidence, similarly identifies him.

The internal evidence contained in the Plays themselves will, in the "Evidence," be analysed by a separate critical examination of each Play in its order. The following propositions will be proved by their contents :—

1. The Plays, as a whole, when closely looked at, show that they were written in pursuance of the ideas contained in Bacon's prose works, which have been already cited.[1]

2. Not only Bacon's Philosophy, but many of his other attainments, are found running through the "Shakespeare" Plays as a whole. In some his Classical knowledge is prominent. A Scholar, versed in the Classics, instinctively feels that the Classical allusions made in the Plays echo thoughts in the Classics, and are not the mere laboured efforts of a man, himself ignorant of Classics, working with the aid of a Translation which, however good — and the translations of those days were not the most excellent —always fails to catch the whole spirit of the

[1] See *ante* pages 26-7.

original. In not a few cases, moreover, those originals, as has been pointed out, were untranslated. In other Plays Bacon's legal, medical, musical, and nautical attainments, and, in yet others, his doctrines of Natural History, will be traced. These latter were, on many points, far in advance of his time, as some of them even foreshadow modern Discoveries—such as those of Sex in Plants, the Transmutation of Species, and, seemingly, even the future Transmutation of bodies; the Deaf and Dumb alphabet; Telepathy, which, with its sister Psychology, still puzzles Science; and, most remarkable of all, Electricity, or, as he often calls it, "Spirits." This last allusion strikingly shows how entirely Bacon kept himself well informed of the foremost discoveries of Science in his time. The dawn of Electrical Science was in the days of Queen Elizabeth; and the Queen and her Court interested themselves in it. Dr Gilbert, M.D., a native of Colchester, in the latter part of Queen Elizabeth's reign, wrote a treatise, "De magnete," and is generally regarded as the Father of modern Electrical Science. There is at Colchester a picture of Dr Gilbert, presented to the town by subscription from persons interested in Science, in which the Doctor is represented as demonstrating by experiments in Magnetism before Queen Elizabeth. Will a Literary Jury of the world believe that Bacon probably was an assistant attending some such demonstration? Or will they rather think that the Actor of Stratford was on such familiar terms with the great Queen that she, "doubtless," invited him to lunch at her Palace, and must "have made him stop to the seance afterwards"?[1]

[1] Seriously, this is no unfair Parody upon the approved style of the "orthodox" Shakespearians. In his "Life of Shakespeare," for example, Mr Sidney Lee writes of him that "his summons to act at Court was *possibly* due" to certain causes which he goes on to guess at. Again, Mr

Be this as it may, however, there are in all no less than a dozen attainments, claimed by an "orthodox" believer in him for the man of Stratford, which will be shown in the "Evidence" to have been shared with him not only at the date when he lived, but for many a year afterwards, with no human being save Bacon.

3. The Periods of Bacon's Life, already pointed out, are absolutely echoed in the Groups of Plays written during each. Moreover, Bacon's very nature is betrayed in the Plays. We know he was utterly careless of money, and used to leave it in unlocked drawers, so that it was pilfered by his servants; indeed, his carelessness on this head probably contributed largely to his first fall. In his "Essays on Sedition" he says money is, "like muck, of no good except it be spread upon the earth." Precious things are spoken of in *Coriolanus* (Act ii. Sc. 2) in almost identical language; they are called "The common muck o' the world."[1]

4. A man naturally writes about his own surroundings, and about scenes with which he is familiar. Bacon writes about Dukes and Duchesses, Bishops, Earls, and Barons, with their ladies, and great Warriors. The "Shakespeare" personages are all such as these, and the scenes of the Plays are laid in palaces and battlefields. Nay more, some are placed in parts of France where Bacon had resided, and so knew well; others

---

Lee says that his "wedding probably took place" under circumstances conveniently supposed by him. Mr Stronach collects fifty instances of guesses such as this solely from the one book just referred to, and says that he could without difficulty collect a hundred and fifty such instances. Probably he could, for any reader of the "Dictionary of National Biography," who will look at a column of the article there by the same author, and underrun with a pencil the numerous "guess-words," such as "probably" or "doubtless," and the like, cannot but be amazed at the number to which they will total up, even in one column where they appear to be somewhat plentiful.

[1] As to Shakespeare's views on money, see *post* pages 92 and 98.

are laid in the neighbourhood of his home at St Albans; and localities where the Court usually "lay" (such as Windsor) are depicted in the Plays.

5. Court life and fashionable Society were, in Bacon's days, notoriously loose.[1] Many of the most prominent Vices of the day are, however, vigorously reproved in the Plays. Drunkenness was, at that period, actually regarded as a gentlemanly habit, and Bacon must have seen it daily prevalent around him. Yet many are the passages in the Plays in which disgust and contempt for it are expressed; and of these the full "Evidence" will contain a collection.[2] Again, the morality existing, even in Court life, between the sexes is sufficiently exemplified by the fact that, till a hasty marriage, as has been pointed out, obliged him to make her his wife at last, the notoriously gallant friend of Bacon's, the young Earl of Southampton, for years carried on an immoral intrigue with one of the Queen's Maids of Honour, as will be related in the "Evidence." Nevertheless, Lust is denounced by Bacon, alike in his prose works and in the "Shakespeare" Plays—often in very similar terms. In *The Merry Wives* its victim is made the subject of ridicule and contempt;[3] while a song in it (*Act v. Sc.* 5) cries:

> "Fie on sinful fantasy,
> Fie on Lust and Luxury;
> Lust is but a bloody fire
> Kindled with unchaste desire,
> *Fed in heart; whose flames aspire,*
> As thoughts do blow them higher and higher."

The words in italics will be shown, in the "Evidence,"

[1] See as to this Greene's "History of the English people."

[2] See one also *post* page 99 *n.*

[3] For a comparison on this subject between the life of Shakespeare of Stratford and the sentiments expressed in the Play, see *post* page 99 *n.*

to exactly echo the expressions and sentiments expressed in one of Bacon's prose works. The action of a man acting as Bacon's friend Southampton had done is made the object of warning in the Plays. In *The Tempest* (Act iv. Sc. 1) he is told that:

> "If thou dost break her Virgin knot before,
> All sanctimonious ceremonies may
> With full and holy rite be ministered,
> No sweet aspersion shall the heavens let fall
> To make this contract grow. But barren hate,
> Sour-eyed disdain and discord shall bestrew
> The union of your beds with weeds so loathly
> That you shall hate it both."

A reference to a "Shakespeare" concordance will show that Lust is, over and over again, spoken of in the Plays in terms of ridicule and contempt. In the "Evidence" Bacon's sentiments in the Plays and in his prose works will be contrasted.

6. The writer of the Plays was, obviously, not only a gentleman in the best sense of that word, but also a courtier. The delicate satire on passing events at Court, which had required great delicacy of touch to make sport of, bespeak him to have been both. Thus, in *Twelfth Night*, Sir Toby Belch represents Queen Elizabeth's cousin, Sir Francis Knowllys, an apparently somewhat testy old soldier, who resided in the Royal Household, and there made himself as much at home as some people habitually do in the houses of relatives. The Maids of Honour slept near his bedroom, and they, after the fashion of some young ladies when going to bed, chattered so loudly and so long that the testy old soldier could get no sleep; so one night, taking a Latin book with him, he walked into the Dormitory belonging to them, and insisted on walking up and down in it, loudly reading his Latin the while, and

declaring that, if he were allowed no sleep in his room, the Maids of Honour should have none in theirs either. By the light of this explanation the passage in the Play (*Act i. Sc.* 3) where Maria tells Sir Toby that he "must come in earlier o' nights," and that "your cousin, M'Lady, takes great exceptions to your ill hours," is seen to be one of delicate raillery. The "chaff" (as modern slang would call it) of the rest of the Play is also made more evident. In the rest of *Scene* 3, Sir Toby's conduct is explained by the assumption that he was drunk when he acted in the way just described; while in *Act ii. Sc.* 5 we find that Maria and Sir Toby had grown to be close allies, and are (to again use modern slang) setting a trap to induce the unpopular[1] Malvolio to make a fool of himself. That there might be no mistake as to Raleigh being the person aimed at he has previously been described, in *Act iii. Sc.* 2, as one who "does smile his face into more lines than there are in the new map, *with the augmentation of the Indies.*"

7. Indeed, the actual jokes and pleasantries contained in the "Shakespeare" Plays will be shown by the "Evidence" to have been either jokes originally made by the Sovereign herself or pleasantries by some of those about her. Thus in *I. Henry IV.* Act ii. Sc. 4 we have a Royal joke, which cannot be understood without previously giving that "explanation" which is usually so fatal to any humour. In the money of old times, a Royal was worth 10s., but a Noble only 6s. 8d., and a groat 4d. Listening one day to a sermon by a probably "wordy" but tedious preacher, appropriately named Mr Blower, that Divine addressed Elizabeth as "My *Royal* Queen." Shortly afterwards he called her "My *Noble* Queen." Said the tired Queen: "Why am I ten groats worse than I was?"

[1] See *ante* page 31, as to Raleigh's unpopularity.

—a groat being 4d. (as all jurymen know to this day), and, consequently, ten groats being the exact difference between a "Royal" and a "Noble." This joke is echoed in the passage just referred to, where Prince Henry, on being told that his father had sent a "Nobleman" to speak to him, retorts: "Give him as much as will make him a Royal man, and send him back again to my mother." In *The Tempest*, Act i. Sc. 2, we get a witticism which had been originally made by Queen Elizabeth, and afterwards astutely adopted, with all gravity, by Lord Treasurer Burleigh; and in *Act iv. Sc.* 2 a family joke is repeated which had happened on the Northern Circuit to Bacon's own father, but was never published to the world, otherwise than in this Play, till nearly half-a-century later. A convict having claimed mercy from Sir Nicholas Bacon on the ground that his judge and he were "of kin," and explained that his name was Hogg, the judge had replied dryly: "But Hogg and Bacon are not of kin until the Hogg is hung." But the identity of "Shakespeare" with Bacon, established by jokes, can be carried even further than it has already been. Some of these jokes cannot be understood at all without a reference to the "Promus," or commonplace book, which will be mentioned hereafter,[1] and which is in Bacon's own handwriting. Thus Falstaff, on one occasion (*I. Henry IV.* Act iii. Sc. 3), says that if he has not forgotten what the inside of a Church is like "I am a brewer's horse." Asked the Commentators: "What is a brewer's horse?" The most erudite Dr Jonson most learnedly pointed out that, as a brewer's horse is apt to be lean and hard-worked, Falstaff undoubtedly meant to say: "If I am not speaking truly may I grow lean." Steevens, the most sapient of "Shakespeare" Scholars, commented

[1] See *post* page 65 *et seq.*

on the joke as one which did not refer to a horse at all, but rather to the "cross-beams on which beer barrels are carried into cellars." Bacon, in his own handwriting, has noted in the "Promus" that a brewer's horse is "the ass that carries wine and drinks water."[1]

8. It has just been pointed out that there is contained in one of the Plays a joke, the original of which is a subject of a note by Bacon in his commonplace book, written by himself. The "Promus" is a sort of Memorandum Book, in Bacon's own handwriting, which has come down to us, and is preserved amongst the Harleian MSS. in the British Museum. In his 77th Sonnet, published in 1609, Bacon advises the keeping of such a Book to hold "what thy memory cannot contain," just as he previously had done in his "Advancement of Learning," published in 1603. About eight years before this last-named date, he had himself begun to keep such a Book. It is included by Mr Spedding amongst his Works, and is entitled a "Promus of Formularies and Elegances." Mrs Pott, who has edited the Book for the Bacon Society, and Mr Hutchison, the Librarian of the Middle Temple, have supplied information as to the work, which may be summarised as follows:—The Book was commenced in December 1594, and was continued in January 1595 after an interval of a few weeks. It contained rough sentences, without any notes between them either of reference or of explanation. Apparently, whenever Bacon was greatly struck by any expression he had heard in conversation, had met with in his reading, or had himself employed in one of the "Shakespeare" Plays, he afterwards "made a note" of

[1] The way in which the joke is worked out is given *infra*, and on next page. For a comparison between the jokes in the "Shakespeare" Plays and those credited to "Shakspere," the Stratford Actor, see *post* page 97, *et seq.*

it. Thus we, at one place, get a group of notes from the new Vulgate Version of the Bible, at another of expressions in foreign tongues, or of foreign proverbs. Many notes are made of expressions used before in the "Shakespeare" Plays. *Romeo and Juliet* supplies a good example of this, as six Promus entries are all found in eleven consecutive lines (*cf. Act ii.*), and when the expression was one which had particularly struck Bacon's fancy (such, *e.g.*, as: "He may go by water, for he is sure to be well landed," noted by Reid as his No. 282; or as: "Happy man, happy Dole," noted by Reid as No. 517) we find it employed in the Plays over and over again. A better illustration of Bacon's mode of using his "Promus" or Commonplace Book could not be desired than is furnished by the expression "Brewer's horse" just referred to. The original note in the "Promus" was in French, and of the Proverb in that language: "L'asne qui porte le vin, et boit l'eau." Bacon worked out various ideas from this. Amongst others, we find a note by him: "Which carries malt liquor but does not drink it." Thus we get the expression "a Brewer's horse," to which reference has just been made, and a similar expression in *I. Henry IV.* Act iii. Sc. 3. A main idea the French Proverb suggested to Bacon was that of a Drudge doing work for another, for which the other gets all the benefit. This, too, is worked out, alike in the "Promus" and in the Plays (see, *e.g. Romeo and Juliet*, Act ii. Sc. 5; *Measure for Measure*, Act iii. Sc. 7).

Besides this "Promus," in his handwriting, another Document can be also connected with Bacon, in a way little less conclusive. Queen Elizabeth, in November 1595, presented Bacon with "a Lodge at Twickenham." His correspondence shows that he there employed "good pens," and was at least once, during a holiday period,

occupied with himself making notes for some "Merrie Tales"—a description not applicable to his Prose or to his Philosophical Works. Seemingly (the "Evidence" will furnish ground for so thinking) the "good pens" included Davies of Hereford. He, born in 1565, and educated as a Scholar, was, in 1594, about 29; and was then commencing his career by acting for others as a "good pen." By 1607, he had gone into the employment of one of the Earls (now Dukes) of Northumberland as writing master to his children. "Orthodox" supporters of the Stratford actor are invited to, if they can, show any connection between him and Davies by something more substantial than a "probably," or a "doubtless," or even a "must." In 1867, on the demolition of Northumberland House (near the site of the Grand Hotel, Charing Cross) in connection with the Thames Embankment Scheme, there was in it found a MS. book, in the handwriting of Davies, now preserved at Alnwick Castle. This book contained six or (if a "Speech for my Lord of Sussex" be included) seven known compositions of Bacon's. On the cover of this were numerous "scribblings," seemingly of some apparently recent matters of which Davies desired to possess memoranda. Amongst these were the names of several of Bacon's still unpublished books; and, at one place, each following the other, entries of "Orations at Graies Inn Revels"; of a "Letter to the Queen's Majesty by Mr Francis Bacon"; and "Essaies by the same Author, printed." When published, the Essays were dedicated to Francis's brother Anthony, and this probably explains why, on another part of the cover, there is "scribbled" also "Anthony Comfort and Consorte." Amongst the other "scribbles" on the cover there were the names of some Plays which had been in a packet, but were no longer all there, includ-

ing *Rychard the Second* and *Rychard the Third*, which were amongst those that had disappeared. Similarly "scribbled" upon the cover of the MS. book, seven or eight times over, was the name of "Bacon." About the same number of times there was also written the name, not of "Shaksper" the Actor, but the name of "Shakespeare," which has on an earlier page[1] been shown to have been invented about 1593-5. Besides the mention of two of the "Shakespeare" Plays in the list already quoted from there was amongst other "scribblings" on the cover the line from *Lucrece*:

"Revealing day through every cranny creeps";

and, in close juxtaposition, though not so placed as to quite "read on," are also the words: "See your William Shakespeare."

After this follows, on the cover of the "Promus," the following Latin quatrain:—

"Multis annis jam transactis
Nulla fides est in pactis
Mell[2] in are, Verba Lactis
Fell[2] in corde, ffraus[2] in factis."

After this quatrain there was written in English:

"Your lovinge ffrend,
Honorificabilitudin(e)." (Or some say "a.")

The termination of this long word, whether it be read "e" or "a," is a false case ending of the long word, "Honorificabilitudin-itatibus." We find the ablative case plural in Act v. Scene 1 of *Love's Labour's Lost*. But it is impossible, according to the rules of Latin grammar, for a noun formed as this long word is to

[1] *Ante* page 34.

[2] *Sic*. It will be noticed that in each of these three places an unnecessary letter is added. The reason why this is done will be made clear in the "Evidence."

have any case ending in either "e" or "a." The endings mentioned just above suggest the ablative case *singular*. But the true ablative case singular after the "din" ends in "itate," not only by the rules of grammar, but in two instances in mediæval Latin which will be shown in the "Evidence." Such a schoolboy's blunder as this is as bad as when, in *Tom Brown's Schooldays*, a Rugby boy translated "*Triste lupus stabulus*" as the "sorrowful wolf," and so annoyed Doctor Arnold that he lost his temper, and forthwith boxed the young scholar's ears. Davies, though not an Oxford University man, meant it for a hint to seek the root of the long word. This, as asserted by an ingenious American, forms a startling Anagram, containing in Latin an assertion of Bacon's authorship of the Play. Anagrams were in frequent use by scientific men in the sixteenth century. Francis Bacon was often jocularly called Friar Bacon. His famous namesake Roger employed at first a subtle Anagram to conceal his invention of Gunpowder. The great Galileo even, on one occasion, used Anagrams to conceal, for the moment, some of his astronomical discoveries, which he desired the credit of having been the first to make, while he at the same time was anxious that they should not be yet generally disclosed to the world. Regarding the Play of *Love's Labour's Lost* as written with the philosophical meaning already attributed to it in this Outline,[1] Bacon may well have had similar reasons for desiring present concealment, but ultimate disclosure thereafter, to those which actuated Roger Bacon and Galileo. Moreover, the "Evidence" will go on to point out that the Latin quatrain to which the root of the long word is appended by way of signature was founded on a similar quatrain which can be traced to Dijon—a place in France with which Bacon

[1] See *ante* page 23.

was very familiar, and where many of the scenes in the "Shakespeare" Plays are laid—and also that the original quatrain, and the variation of it given above, were both published in Paris in 1608. Attention will be further directed to the instructions for "secret writing," which Bacon gives in his "De Augmentis," requiring the use of such a number of letters as will form a multiple of five; while the "Evidence" will show that the number of letters in the original quatrain has been ingeniously expanded from eighty-six to ninety, partly by the addition of letters in the way pointed out above, and partly by variations made between the quatrain as printed above, and the original on which it is founded. Here, then, is a new puzzle for students of "enfolded writing," Anagrams, and such like things, which were dear even to the learned in the days of our forefathers, and are sometimes often now placed before their readers by the puzzle editors of newspapers, and found to still interest many people. The solution of the Anagram here suggested will not be regarded as a violation of the Copyright of this Outline.

Davies, in 1610, addressed *two* epigrams to "Shakespear." One of these is to "Our English Terence, Mr William Shakespeare," and this seems to address the *Author* of the Plays; the other is in his "Microcosmos," and is addressed to "Shakespear," avowedly *as an Actor*. In doing thus, Davies wrote consistently with, and indeed confirmed, the suggestion that "Shakespeare" covered two personalities, already made on an earlier page;[1] and in accordance with the works of Ben Jonson, and of the writer of "Ratsei's Ghost," as they will be explained hereafter.[2]

Further direct connection between written matter

[1] See *ante* page 34.

[2] See *post* page 78, *et seq.*

which can be traced to Bacon and passages in the Plays themselves, also exist in other instances. Thus there is one between *Julius Cæsar* and Bacon's "Interlude" on *Fortitude* contained in a Masque called *The Conference of Pleasure*, which he wrote for the Earl of Essex when the latter entertained Queen Elizabeth in 1592. A similar striking connection between passages in the Plays and matter in Bacon's handwriting, is also furnished by *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*. This contains (*Act ii. Sc.* 1) a passage of great beauty, commencing: "She, as her attendant, hath a lovely boy, stolen from an Indian Prince." A little further down in the Play there is an equally lovely passage beginning: "Cupid all armed." As in the case of *Julius Cæsar*, we find a Masque, written by Bacon for Essex, and performed before the Queen (in 1595), to contain a passage echoing that in the Play. In it the lines already referred to are apparently blended.[1] This passage was found after

[1] The poetry in the Masque will compare favourably with that in *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*. It runs thus:

"Seated between the Old world and the New,
A land there is no other land may touch,
Where reigns a Queen in peace and honour true;
Stories or fables do describe none such.
Never did Atlas such a burthen bear,
As, in holding up the world oppressed;
Supplying with her virtue everywhere
Weakness of friends, errors of servants best.
No nation breeds a warmer blood for War,
And yet she calms them by her majesty,
No age hath ever wits refined so far,
And yet she calms them by her policy.
To her thy son must make his sacrifice,
If he will have the morning of his eyes."

The whole of the verses set out above, as well as the passages from *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*, which are referred to in the text, we are told by Mr Hepworth Dixon (in his "Personal History of Lord Bacon," at p. 62), allude to an incident which had then lately happened in connection with our newly-acquired Indian Empire. A Mighty Monarch ruling the

it had lain for years in the dust of the State Paper Office, and a note upon it, and the official description in the calendar contains statements to the effect mentioned in the footnote below. The verses there quoted, if they served no other purpose, would afford a useful refutation of the assertions of those who boldly allege Bacon to have been incapable of writing Poetry. But direct connection between the "Shakespeare" Plays and matter in the actual handwriting of Bacon can be established in many more cases than the two or three just instanced. The "Orthodox" believers are challenged to point out Plays which do not contain, in each of them, at least one expression taken from the "Promus" or Commonplace Book in the handwriting of Bacon himself. The "Evidence" in dealing with each of the Plays will point out the particular expressions in it taken from the "Promus."

In a few words, there are in existence no less than four distinct written documents, each of which can be traced to Bacon, on the one hand, and into the Plays on the other. These are as follow:—(1) The Northumberland House MS. connects itself with *Lucrece* by a citation from it; with *Love's Labour's Lost*, as already explained, by the Anagram in the root word

---

country situated near the Amazon River had a son who had been born blind. He sent this son to Queen Elizabeth, with the hope that he might, through her, obtain "the morning of his eyes." This, the "Evidence" will add, he actually did, probably in consequence of medical men having, under her instructions, removed a film, which sometimes is found covering the eye at a person's birth, and rendering him blind until a proper surgical operation has been performed to remove it. Then the lad came to the Queen's Court, "as her attendant," and as "a lovely boy stol'n from an Indian King." He became "Cupid all armed"—in other words, "Love"; and according to the Play: "A certain aim he took at a fair vestal thron'd by the west." The "fair vestal thron'd by the west" of the Play is made, in Bacon's verses in the "Device," to become the "Queen in peace and honour true" who reigns "seated between the Old world and the New."

"Honorificabilitudin"; (2) The verses in the State Paper Office echo the ideas in *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*; (3) The *Conference of Pleasure* admittedly contains the "germ" of *Julius Cæsar*; (4) The "Promus" contains at least a few words taken, it is believed, from every one of the Plays. The supporters of the Stratford claim are invited to instance Plays which contain expressions not also set out in the "Promus."

In the face of this evidence of written documents, such a search as some have proposed, either in the seventeen-feet grave of the Actor, or at the Base of Bacon's statue, or elsewhere at St Albans, in quest of MSS. of the "Shakespeare" Plays, seems to be quite unnecessary. We have already enough written evidence to trace the genesis of the Plays.

9. The "Shakespeare" Plays exhibit, in addition to those somewhat enlarged upon under Head 2, a familiarity with at least one attainment, an acquaintance with which was comparatively seldom met with in the days when yachting had not yet become fashionable—that of Navigation. Bacon had, as we know, at any rate crossed and recrossed the Channel in a sailing ship, and probably he did so more than once. Moreover, we also know that he was once in a bad storm there, and was on that occasion nearly shipwrecked. The Playwright betrays familiarity alike with the cliffs of the seashore (*King Lear*, Act iv. Sc. 6), one of which at Dover is called "Shakespeare's" Cliff; and, in an early Play (*King John*, Act v. Scs. 3, 5), with the Goodwin Sands. In one, which is but little later (*III. Henry VI.* Act v. Sc. 4.), we have a powerful description of Shipwreck, which it is hard to believe was written by one who had never himself been in peril of it, so lifelike is it. Again, in *King Henry VIII.*

the buzz of an excited multitude is (*Act iv. Sc.* 1) compared to "such a noise as the shrouds make at sea in a stiff tempest." This comparison can only have been made by a man who had himself heard the "noise" of the shrouds "in a stiff tempest." *Henry VIII.* was first published in the folio of 1623. In the previous year (1622) Bacon published his treatise "*De Ventosis*," or "History of the Winds"—a subject on which he plainly was speaking with the experience of years behind him.

10. While several new Plays were, from time to time, placed upon the Stage down to 1613, in the year last named the appearance of any new Plays suddenly stopped. Till it did so many of the Plays which had appeared were such as would, at one time and another, have suited Bacon's purpose at the moment. When the appearance of Plays ceased Bacon had just accepted, in that very year, the Office of Attorney-General, and in 1617 succeeded to the Seals. From 1613 until his fall from the Chancellorship in 1621 his whole time would be taken up by Official Duties, and he, moreover, would not have any special object to be served by writing Plays. But, only a couple of years after his fall from Office, not only do the earlier "Shakespeare" Plays appear collected together in a folio (1623), but there are added to them the Plays comprised in the Trilogy of the Downfall, and these are once more Plays which obviously served Bacon's purposes at the moment. The arrangement, which the "Evidence" will suggest had been come to between Bacon and the Stratford Actor, would have been broken had these three new Plays been placed upon the Stage—so they were not.

11. Not only the thoughts, but also the style, phrases, and the very vocabulary of the Plays and of Bacon's works, are in many respects absolutely identical. The

"Evidence" will point out details of the respects in which they are so. Such details are so multitudinous that it is not possible to state them in this Outline.

12. Even the errors and changes of opinion made in Bacon's works are also contained in the "Shakespeare" Plays. Some of these have already been incidentally mentioned.[1] As in the case of the Identity referred to under the preceding head, justice to them can only be done by giving full details such as the "Evidence" will contain, and they cannot be compressed into mere Outline.

Such, then, being some of the most prominent points in the internal evidence as to their authorship, which is furnished by the "Shakespeare" Plays themselves, an examination will next be made into the evidence bearing upon this subject, which is wholly external to these "Shakespeare" Plays themselves.

This external evidence falls under five distinct heads. Briefly stated, these are as follows:—

1. It is a rule, alike of law and of common-sense, that Admissions made by a man himself — at the time when they are made contrary to his own apparent interest—are, after his death, evidence upon the subject they relate to should it become the subject of controversy. Bacon, as already pointed out, had many reasons for thinking that it would be very much against his interests to let it be generally known that he was a writer of "Stage Plays." His strict and severe Puritan mother once threw into prison, as a Papist, a mere messenger (Faunt), whom her son Anthony had sent to her, for no other reason than that he, as an avowed "Papist," was offensive to her as a violent and bigoted Puritan. So religious, indeed, was she that her son Francis affectionately speaks of her as a "Saint

[1] See *ante* pages 10-11.

of God." So strict a watch did she keep on her two sons, even when in London, that we find in her letters constant lectures about their health; hopes that Francis will not sit up late at night over some unmentioned labours, which were evidently then engaging him deeply; and an expression of hope that the two brothers at Gray's Inn do not there "mum, nor mask, nor sinfully revel." Besides the fear of offending such a mother, who was very dear to him, Francis Bacon would be kept back by his own personal ambition, and even by, as Bishop Stubbs says he would have had reason to dread, a fear of prosecution for expressing the views in them, from letting it be generally known that he was the Author of the "Shakespeare" Plays. All these things clearly made it "against the interest" of Bacon to admit his authorship of these Plays. Yet we, again and again, find in his correspondence statements by Bacon that he was a "concealed poet," that he had drank of "the waters of Parnassus," and one saying that he is purposed "not to follow the practice of the law . . . because it drinketh too much time, *which I have dedicated to better purposes.*"

As the letter, which contains the remarkable words in italics, is dated in 1595 it cannot refer to Bacon's Philosophical works, which did not begin to appear till long afterwards. This letter, indeed, puzzles his Biographer Spedding, who confesses that he cannot understand why Bacon proposed to give up the law, what his plan for earning a living otherwise at that time was, and that he does not find anywhere any indication of what Bacon was doing. The date, however, seems significant. A reference to Table A will show that just then Bacon was busily engaged in producing the Group of Plays of the Passions, and that they were produced in great profusion between 1594

and 1600-1; while he, during the same time, was not idle in producing English Historical Plays. During the six or seven years from 1594 to the end of the century no less than fifteen new Plays were written. In other words, during the whole of this period of six years "Shakespeare" Plays were being produced at the rate of one every few months (on an average, less than five months). During the latter portion of the period Plays which, by the arrangement with "Shakespeare" already referred to,[1] and which will be fully described in the "Evidence," were prevented from being "Shakespeare" Plays appeared in large numbers with, on their Title-pages, the name of "William Shakespeare." On these the writer of the "Shakespeare" Plays had at least spent some labour, though they were not originally conceived by him. The "Evidence" will set out much of Bacon's correspondence in detail.

2. Letters from his friends, addressed to a deceased man, in terms which afford evidence, showing what they said to him as bearing upon a matter which is a subject of discussion, are receivable in evidence when there is proof that the deceased read them. Not only did Bacon himself make many such admissions as are above pointed out, but he continually received letters from friends referring to the, in their opinion, unworthy occupation in which he was engaged. Thus Sir Thomas Bodley, the famous founder of the Bodleian Library at Oxford, in thanking Bacon for a philosophical book received during 1607, wishes that Bacon had followed such studies as it contained from "the first, when you fell to the study of such a study as was not worthy of such a student." Sir Tobie Matthew, an intimate friend of Bacon's, on one occasion wrote to him, when returning

[1] See *ante* page 34.

some "writings" to him, that he would promise to return him not "weight for weight" but "measure for measure." This latter expression seems identified with the "Shakespeare" Play of that name when we further find Sir Tobie, in another letter to Bacon (January 1621), writing to him: "The most prodigious wit that I ever knew, of my nation, and of this side of the sea (Sir Tobie was in England when he wrote the letter), is of your Lordship's name, *though he be known by another.*" The natural construction of these two letters seems to be that in the one last set out Sir Tobie refers to Bacon being best known as a wit under the name of "Shakespeare," while in the former he alludes to the "Shakespeare" Play of the name mentioned. The full "Evidence" will set out, of course, all the important letters alluding to the subject.

3. The conduct of Ben Jonson, looked at as a whole, really confirms the suggestion that, like Davies and the writer of "Ratsei's Ghost," he knew both the Actor Shaksper as such, and also knew that "Shakespeare" was a "Pen-name" under which Bacon wrote. Down to about the year 1601, when he, after the death of Anthony Bacon, suddenly became reconciled to the Actor Shakespeare, Jonson was at enmity with Shakespeare. He then wrote a Play in Greek, which was performed at Cambridge University in December 1601. In this he denounced Shakspeare the Actor as one who

> "With mouthing words that better wits had framed,
> Now purchase lands, and now esquires are made."[1]

So late as 1616, or the very year in which Shakspere

[1] This is an allusion to an application made to the Heralds' College by Shakspere of Stratford just before for a grant of a Coat-of-Arms, which would incidentally confer upon the "grantee" the rank of "Esquire."

of Stratford died, the Greek in which the Return from Parnassus (as the Play performed in 1601 had been called) was translated out of the Greek into plain English. In it had been asked: "Are there no Players here, no Poet-apes,

> "That come with basilisks' eyes, whose forked tongues
> Are steeped in venom, as their hearts in gall?"[1]

In the English translation published in 1616 the Player is again spoken of as a "Poor Poet-ape"; and it is said that he "from brokage is become so bold a thief, As we, the robb'd, leave rage and pity it"; and it is added: "He takes up all, makes each man's wit his own, And, told of this, he slights it."

It would seem plainly impossible that Ben Jonson himself, no mean Play-writer and Poet, could satirise, in terms such as these, the writer who, even before 1601, had produced *The Comedy of Errors*, also *Love's Labour's Lost*, with *Romeo and Juliet*, and *As You Like It*, and, in addition, *The Merchant of Venice*, as well as the other Plays enumerated in Mere's list of 1598. Much less could he do so after the same Play-wright had, between 1601 and 1616, amazed the world with *Macbeth*, with *Lear*, and with *The Tempest*, not to name other Plays. Indeed, Jonson had himself declared the "Shakespeare" Plays to be "such that neither man nor muse could praise too much." Nor did he. On close examination it will be seen that, while writing of *the Player* pretending to be a "Poet" in terms of contempt, such as those already quoted, Jonson speaks most consistently of the *writer* of the Plays in which the *Actor* appeared in the following words:—"I love the man, and do honour his memory, on this side

[1] Sentiments in the Latin quatrain set out, *ante* page 68, are almost literally translated in this last line.

idolatry, as much as any." This identification of the writer "Shakespeare" is subsequently conveyed by Jonson in a curious way. In his "Discoveries" there is a passage, which will be set out in full in the "Evidence," which has a heading "De Shakespeare nostrati." In this Jonson describes Shakespeare as "Our fellow-countryman"—in other words, as being a fellow-Londoner. But more. Immediately following the entry "De Shakespeare nostrati" there follows a heading, entitled "Dominus Verulamius," or Francis Bacon. In this latter entry Jonson repeats, in other language, every single thing, as applicable to Bacon, which had just before been said by him of "Shakespeare." Yet a further similar hint as to the identity of the writer "Shakespeare" with Bacon is given by Jonson in his "Scriptorum Catalogus." This work is a bead-roll of all the great masters of wit and language who had been contemporaries with him, and "in whom all vigour of invention and strength of judgment met." Among these the greatest of them, in Jonson's opinion, was Bacon, and to him he accordingly awards the palm. "Shakspere" is not even mentioned in this catalogue as having been either a writer or a wit.

This distinction between the Actor of the Plays and the Writer of them will be elaborated in the coming "Evidence"; and the arrangement under which the first named always appeared in the Plays of the latter will be there disclosed and discussed.

4. Contemporary writers, other than Jonson, also furnish evidence of the identity of the writer "Shakespeare" with Bacon. Thus it will be recollected that Nash speaks of "Shakespeare" as being the English "Seneca," and that Bacon has been already identified with Seneca.[1] Moreover, the author of a work called

[1] See *ante* page 29.

"Polimenteia," published anonymously at Cambridge about 1595, stated that the supposed author of *Venus and Adonis*—in other words, "William Shakespeare"—was a Scholar, and that he also had been a Member of Cambridge University, whence he had proceeded to one of the Inns of Court. It is curious that in one of the "Shakespeare" Plays the son of Justice Shallow is made to pursue this very course. After Bacon's death, his Chaplain and Secretary, Dr Rawley, collected no less than thirty-two Latin eulogies, written by his friends among eminent University men. Many of these speak of Bacon in terms implying that he had been a great Poet; while one almost commences by describing him as a "Teller of tales that 'mazed the Courts of Kings."

Nearly twenty years later there was published (in 1645) a book which, though anonymous, is generally known to have been written by one George Withers, a poet of that day. It describes the holding of a great Assize on Mount Parnassus, with Apollo presiding at the top of the mount, Bacon sitting below him as Chancellor of Parnassus, while Edmund Spenser attends as a Clerk. "Shakspere" is not forgotten, but —— he is only placed below as a mere juryman. The suggestion in this book seems to be not inconsistent with the description of him given by Greene in 1892, when we first hear of Shakespeare in London, and he then is described as "an upstart crow beautified in our feathers," or with Jonson's description of him in the very last year of his life as a "poor poet-ape."

5. The "Promus," in addition to its other testimony, affords a curious bit of external evidence which seems to have hitherto escaped notice. The fact that it is inferential rather than direct gives it additional weight. Greene, it has been pointed out, was well acquainted

with Spanish, and had travelled in Spain. He died in 1592. Two years later the "Promus," commenced in December 1594 and continued in January 1595 and onwards, almost in very early pages contains a series of Spanish expressions, noted by Bacon for future use. It appears as if Bacon, in the interval which had taken place since Greene's death, had already begun to realise that he was rapidly forgetting the little knowledge of Spanish he had picked up from Greene, and had accordingly made a note of as much as he remembered.

The acts of a man, whose conduct is under the consideration of a Court of Law, often afford more cogent evidence, either for or against him, than even his written or verbal admissions.

Bacon's interest when he, in early life, made the admissions to which attention has been previously drawn[1] was to conceal the fact that he was a writer of "Stage Plays," and his precautions to secure this concealment were most careful and elaborate.

In later life, and after his fall from the Chancellorship, he still seemed to affect a desire to conceal his authorship from his contemporaries, but grew much less careful in his methods of doing this, and seemingly determined that some future generation should discover his secret. Indeed, some of his acts after his fall almost tear off the Mask, and almost betray his Authorship. He certainly then concealed with far less elaborate efforts than in former days.

As the "Evidence" will show in more detail, Bacon at last allowed the genuine "Shakespeare Plays" to be collected into one large folio volume, which included in it a mere selection from among the numerous plays then current in London with the name of "William

[1] See *ante* pages 73-5.

Shakespeare" upon their Title-page as their Author. By this act alone he let it be plainly seen, by those who looked closely, that there was someone yet alive who knew what were genuine "Shakespeare Plays" and what were not, and was entitled to select some plays as such, and to reject others, as if they did not answer some test within his knowledge as to what were, and what were not, genuine Shakespeare Plays. The disguise of the two Actor-Friends Hemming and Condell (having somehow collected and gathered Plays which were at the Theatre or in the hands of other Actors) was one which Bacon's natural shrewdness must have told him was very poor and transparent. For not only had the Globe Theatre and all its contents been burnt no more than between two and three years previous to the Stratford Actor's death, but the contents of the Plays themselves were in many ways contradictory of such a supposition. For how could plays which had never been acted at all, or had thousands of lines in them altered since they were last acted, be either at a Theatre or in the hands of Actors who had never played them as they appeared? How, too, could it be that several Plays, such as the Trilogy of the Downfall,[1] reflect events which had happened to Bacon himself long after the death of the Stratford Actor?

The literary style of the supposed editors of the Plays was, again, too obviously like that of Ben Jonson, then notoriously one of Bacon's own "Good Pens"; the antitheses between one "he" and another, and between one "his" and another, as referring at one moment to the Stratford Actor and at another to the Playright, almost obtruded themselves. As if all this might not afford sufficient evidence to disclose the secret of his authorship Bacon added further to it.

[1] See *ante* page 56, as to these.

An etching embodying the idea which the very name "Shakespear" was intended to convey was allowed to appear in the Folio, together with verses which say that in each line of the Plays their writer

> "Seems to shake a Lance
> As brandished at the eyes of Ignorance."

It needed little reflection to tell that, so soon as the etching was observed, men would naturally ask whence Ben Jonson, Bacon's literary assistant when the Folio was published, and the avowed author of the verses, obtained the very idea pictorially represented by the newly-noticed etching, and that they would mentally at once answer their own question.

Lest this key should be lost or mislaid in any way another and a distinct one was supplied. As has been seen[1] many years before, and when he was but a lad of eighteen, Bacon's mother had commissioned Hillyard, the famous miniature painter, to execute a miniature of her son Francis, and that the artist or the lad's admirers had placed round it the Latin Motto: "*Si tabula daretur digna, animam mallem.*" This miniature, by the death of his mother and of his brother, had come into the possession of Francis himself. No one has, indeed, ever suggested that it had during Bacon's life fallen into the hands of anyone else. Yet, somehow placed in possession of the sentiment embodied in the Latin motto, Ben Jonson put under the "Figure" which we are expressly told was "for gentle Shakespeare cut" a translation of this motto, well worthy of the fame of his old school, Westminster, for its Latin versification. It "turned" the Latin in the words:

> "Oh, could he but have drawn his wit,
> . . . as he hath hit
> Upon his face."

[1] For this history of the miniature see *ante* page 14.

At this point the "Evidence," leaving the proof of Bacon's authorship, which has been now afforded alike by the internal evidence furnished by the "Shakespeare" Play and also by evidence external to them, will next proceed to attempt the second of the two efforts pointed out by Lord Penzance as necessary.[1] By sketching briefly as much as is really known of the facts connected with the life of Shakspere, the Actor of Stratford, and by pointing out the inconsistencies between that life and the Plays, it will now be endeavoured to throw upon his admirers the burden of proving that he ever wrote the "Shakespeare" Plays.

George Steevens, one of the earliest and the greatest of the Shakespearian Commentators, has been pointed out by Mr Stronach to have compressed all that in his time was known about the Actor into the following sentence: "All that is known with any degree of certainty concerning (him) is that he was born at Stratford-on-Avon, married, and had children there—went to London, where he commenced Actor, and wrote Poems and Plays—returned to Stratford, made his will, died, and was buried."

Even in this brief biography—probably one of the shortest that ever was written—there is one statement which must be rejected. For there is, in truth, no evidence whatever that he at any time "wrote poems and plays." On the other hand, there may fairly be added to the brief biography of Steevens, not, indeed, such a mass of imaginary facts as has been piled upon it, but a supplement to the effect following:—

The Actor William Shakspere was the son of one John Shakspere. His father was apparently a small farmer and general dealer, who, possibly, at times killed

[1] See *ante* page 7.

his own cattle. This man, it seems, was at one time prosperous, and became Mayor of the little Town he lived in. The son, William, attended the local grammar school from about seven till about twelve. Then he was prematurely removed from the school, owing to the straitened means of his father, with his education far from complete, and with only that "little Latin and less Greek" which, according to Ben Jonson, he retained through life. The accident that his father sometimes killed his own animals has given rise to an absurd tradition, now generally discredited, characteristic of the powers of imagination surrounding his career, that the lad was once employed as a butcher. "He never could kill a calf, except in high style, and without making a speech," writes one collector of gossip. The expression "killing the calf" is Stage-slang for a bombastic style of acting, which there is considerable evidence to show was Shakespeare's mode. If, as he appears to have been, the Actor had a somewhat broad humour of his own the phrase was just one in which he would poke fun at his rustic neighbours. It is well ascertained that, when no more than eighteen, the lad made the acquaintance of a certain Ann Hathaway, who was about eight years his senior. Contrary to the advice given in the Plays which are attributed to him, and contain a warning[1] against a

[1] About the time of Shakspere's marriage, when we may suppose that the Playwright Bacon had not yet made the acquaintance of the Actor Shakspere, we find the former writing in *Twelfth Night*—which Table A, if it proves no more, at least shows to be a very early "Shakespeare" Play—when the Duke asked Viola the age of the Lady whom she has recommended to him for a wife, and Viola has told him "about your years, my Lord," the Duke says:

> "Too old, by heaven; let still the woman take
> An elder than herself; so wears she to him,
> So sways she level in her husband's heart."

man marrying a wife older than himself, young William Shakspere, after the fashion of his day, presently found himself in a position which justified her friends in compelling him to marry her.

In justice to the lad Shaksper, and as some have sought to construe this to his disparagement, the "Evidence" will point out that the facts do not by any means necessarily show that he had been guilty of seducing Ann Hathaway before marriage, and only afterwards married her under pressure by her friends. This is, indeed, the most uncharitable construction placed by many on the circumstances. But, as Mr Halliwell-Phillips justly remarks (at p. 62 of "Outlines," tenth (1898) edition), it is only "with those numerous moralists [or rather, hypocrites, who, being evil-doers themselves, are greedy to think, and to affect belief in, all possible evil of others] who do not consider it necessary for inquiry to precede condemnation" that any dishonour rests in the matter upon the "young husband."

The Rites of the Roman Catholic Church had, just then, only very recently ceased to prevail throughout England. Under them marriages were not, as in modern days, celebrated in hot haste, perhaps leaving one or other of the parties, and sometimes both, to repent at leisure during the remainder of their joint lives. The ceremony of betrothal, or "precontract," usually preceded actual marriage by a few months; and, meanwhile, conferred upon the parties to it all the privileges of an actual marriage.

A "precontract" prevented either party from afterwards making a valid marriage with, or contract to marry, anyone else. The case of Henry VIII. will be recalled as affording a well-remembered instance of this. If, however, the union of the parties seemed

not likely to be happy or fruitful, or other good reasons intervened, the "precontract" was never followed by an actual marriage. At the Reformation the "precontract" of the Roman Catholic Church was abolished, in so far that it ceased to be a ceremony of any legal effect. But the practice it sanctioned continued for generations among the folk of this country. It long continued to be the custom, especially in country places, among the lower orders, that a marriage should not take place, till the celebration of one became necessary to render legitimate the child of which the bride was likely to become the mother. So well recognised was the practice that the present writer well recollects being called aside by a gentleman's respectable gardener in his own village and, being (as is always his wish) on very friendly terms with the humbler classes around him, confidentially told: "You see, Master Garge, I be sending my Annie [his only daughter] to Lun'on with he for a bit of a trip; he is a well-to-do widow man, that can make a wife comfortable if he be mind to."

In that particular case no marriage ever followed, no occasion for one ever arose, and the parties seemingly changed their minds after the trip to "Lun'on." Neither spouse was in such cases, in the country, regarded as having acted immorally or dishonourably.

In Shaksper's case, the need that a marriage should take place within a limited time became apparent. Ann Hathaway's friends, by the well-known marriage bond, obtained, and Shaksper honourably gave and discharged, legal validity to what was previously (under the Law as recently altered) only an obligation of honour.

To impute moral blame to people for following the manners and customs of their day, and to try the

standard of morals in the sixteenth century by the cold ceremonial fashions of the twentieth is cruel and hypocritical.

Justification of the requirement of the friends of Ann Hathaway was shown by the birth of a child to the possibly happy, but certainly impecunious, pair within about six months later. It would seem that not long after his marriage the young man fell into the company of wild young fellows at Stratford. The next we hear of him is that he formed part of a Company who engaged in a drinking bout with a delectable gang called the "Bidford Topers"; that these outdrank the Stratford party; that the latter, nevertheless, were unable to make their legs carry them home, and reposed for the night under a friendly crab-tree—an event which is depicted, at least to the extent of a likeness of the tree, in a picture at Stratford. It is also possibly immortalised in drama in the Plays in the person of the drunken tinker who, while reposing outside the ale-house on the heath, dreamt the Play of *The Taming of the Shrew* The next incident in the young man's life which lives in the memory of Stratford is that he "took up with poaching." To what extent this was carried on by him does not seem to be very material, though much good learning has been expended in an endeavour to show that Sir Thomas Lucy, whose game appears to have been the usual victims of young Shakspere's sport, had not a legally protected "park," and, therefore, could not have subjected the lad to the extremely severe penalties imposed by the law for slaying deer in a place duly "emparked." Be this as it may, the young sportsman, not content with helping himself to the game of an M.P. and county magistrate, as Sir Thomas Lucy was, stuck a scurrilous lampoon on that squire's gates. The assailed squire was then likely, especially in Elizabethan

days, to prosecute him criminally for libel. The future Actor having done as he had, Sir Thomas employed an Attorney at Worcester; and he, to use a modern simile, soon made it "so hot" for Shakspere that he fled that part of the country. This must have happened not earlier than 1587, for in the year named we find him joining with his father and mother in raising money on a mortgage of the latter's property. The exact date, however, when he thus fled the country is not really known. But the burden of proving precisely when this was rests with the admirers of Shakspere, according to law. Two legal presumptions place this burden upon them. In the first place, when a given state of affairs has once been established a Court of Law always requires those who assert any change to prove exactly when it took place. This very question was long ago decided as regards residence in the days when the old Poor-laws often made the question where a man was residing at some given time become one of importance in an inquiry as to his "Settlement." So the Literary Jury must patiently await this possibly-forthcoming proof from the Stratford Actor Shakspere's adherents. Another principle of law also throws upon these the burden of proving when it was that Shakspere left Stratford. For Courts of Law always say: "*Ubi uxor, ibi Domus*" —in plain English: "Where a man's wife is there is his home, and there it is presumed that he also is." About the year 1587, however, a Company of Strolling Players was in the neighbourhood of Stratford, and it would not be unlikely that Shakspere attached himself to them. At all events, he somehow got to London. He there seems to have been employed in connection with the Theatre kept by the elder Burbage, with whose son Richard, afterwards an accomplished Actor and Painter, the full "Evidence" will give reasons for

believing that he may have been at school in Stratford. The Burbages kept some Livery Stables near the Theatre. As people usually rode to such places of entertainment as this, in those days, it is easy to believe that Shakspere's first employment in connection with the Theatre was, as D'Avenant and the older writers have stated, that of organising a band of boys to take the horses of persons coming to see the plays. So well did young Shakspere manage this business that he was soon taken into the Theatre itself as a "Servitor" or attendant upon the Actors, and it cannot have been long before he became a "Player" himself, since we find him in March 1591 playing a part in *III. Henry VI.*—the first Play produced jointly by Bacon and Marlow after the first named had "deserted" Greene.

The arrangements come to after Marlow's death in 1593 were undoubtedly the making of Shakespeare's fortune.

A curious corroboration of the fact that the arrangements indicated on a former page[1] were come to, and that, as just stated, they were the foundation of the Actor's fortunes, is inferentially supplied by the history of his life. It may be assumed that he had left Stratford, at latest, somewhere between 1585—when one of his children was born—and 1590, since we hear of him on the Stage early in 1591. It is "probable" enough, notwithstanding that there is no actual evidence to prove it, that the actual date of young Shakspere's leaving Stratford was somewhere during the year 1587. But, whenever he left, we do not find any trace of his having returned to his native home before the time when the negotiations consequent upon Marlow's death were in progress. After this, however, the Actor, about 1593-94, returns to his native town. His visits to it grow

[1] See *ante* page 22.

more and more frequent, and each occasion betrays him to be increasing in prosperity. Gradually he purchased one piece of property after another in it, or adjacent to it, including the "big house of the town."

Some recent writers make a heavy call upon the credulity of Shakespeare's admirers when the latter are asked to believe that, all the time while Shakspere was "working his way up" in connection with the Theatre, he had in his pocket, and kept there for years, the MS. of *Venus and Adonis*. Why he, meanwhile, did not sell this to a Publisher, and write a similar poem, such as *Lucrece*, as a means of livelihood has not been explained, as yet, by those who advance this theory; any more than on what grounds, and for what reasons, they think it was that this strangely bashful prodigy never avowed that he was the writer either of the Poems, or of the Plays in which he appeared; and never signed his name in the form in which it became in print so familiar to the Public.

Of the life of Shakspere the Actor while he was living in London we know positively nothing, save a tale, not very creditable to him, which is recorded in a gossiping diary kept by one Manningham, a Member of the Middle Temple. This narrative, in language none too refined, says that Shakspere, once overhearing his fellow-actor, and probably schoolfellow, Richard Burbage, making an assignation with "a citizen's wife" for the following day, got there before the appointed hour and, when Burbage arrived, humorously sent down word to him that "William the Conqueror came before Richard II." Such is the only recorded incident of the life in London of one whom his admirers credit with having miraculously educated himself, and subsequently moved in the highest circles of Court, refined, and learned life.

When the Actor Shakspere retired from the Ordinary Stage in 1604, and returned to Stratford, he there anticipated the fiction of "Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde." For at Stratford he became quite another man from the one he had been in London. He threw off all the philosophy, learning, and polished courtly ways, with which he is credited when in town, and shown in the Plays. Indeed, not only was mere commonplace fiction outdone by him, but he even surpassed the fancies of fairy tales. Everyone is familiar with Hans Andersen's Fairy Tale of the Ugly Duckling who, one day, suddenly found himself a beautiful Swan. Even the imagination of the famous Fairy Tale writer never dared to fancy that the beautiful swan one day again became a mere ugly duckling—crept back into the shell out of which it had originally come and grew back again into that ugly duckling.

Yet such are said to have been the achievements of the "Swan of Avon." For, after his retirement to Stratford in 1604, we do not hear of the Actor making any pretensions to the qualities ascribed to him when in London, and manifestly possessed by the writer of the Plays. Indeed, he did not even gain local reputation as a fiddler, though the plays show their writer to have been a lover of music. Local gossips tell us that he was fond of his pipe, though, as Bacon would have been, he, assuming that he was their writer, was too good a Courtier to mention Tobacco in the Plays, lest he should by so doing vex the kingly author of the "Counterblast." We learn also that he was fond of sitting at his garden gate and having his little jokes with passers-by. But we do not hear that he fiddled at the Country Dances, or in the choir of the church now said to have been "his." The simple-minded man amused himself with farming,

varied by a few lawsuits, in which he claimed, besides debt for farm produce, some other paltry debts as due from his neighbours to him (one claim of this description was as small as two shillings). During all this time he was acquiring property (among it the Great Tythes of Stratford), and also had the satisfaction of what modern slang would call being "squared" over an Enclosure objected to by the town; and of successfully resisting a claim to the repayment of a trifle of forty shillings, which her father's shepherd claimed he had lent to the Actor's wife to meet her necessities during her husband's absence in London—until, at last, the shepherd left it by will, with instructions to his executors to collect the sum thus remaining "in the hands of Mr William Shakspere."

After some years thus spent at Stratford the retired Actor had a festivity at New Place, in company with his friends Ben Jonson and Drayton the Poet. After this he fell ill, and died within a few days.

At his death neither a single book, any musical score, nor musical instruments of any description, have ever been stated to have been found in his house. Needless to say, there was no MS. there either.

After the Actor's death the Will, which had been prepared for him three months previously, was found to have been duly executed by him—signed with his usual signature of "Shakspere," though his name had been given in the engrossment of it by the lawyer's clerk as "Shakespeare." By this Will the testator disposed of all his property, down to the minutest detail, and including his sword, his silver-gilt bowls, and his "second best bedstead." Yet it said not a word about the immortal Plays, in which his worshippers tell us he had added thousands of new lines—so fond of money as he was, he even apparently quite forgot

the large income which their writer must for years have obtained from the sale of the repeated editions of them which had been published.

The sketch of the career of the Actor which is given above may appear to be needlessly slighting. But, alas! it is founded upon hard facts, standing upon record. If these seemed to press somewhat cruelly upon Shakspere then, to quote the words of a great deceased Judge, "so much the worse for the facts." It is no part of this Outline to, without reason, belittle the Actor, whose posthumous admirers have thrust upon him a position which he himself in his lifetime never sought for, nor assumed. Truth, in any case, must not be suppressed, and, however disagreeable it may be, the words of the historian Hallam make it necessary that it should be told. Hallam's remark may be extended to every known incident in the Actor's life. That great historian observes that "to be told that he played a trick in a licentious amour, or that he died of a drunken frolic . . . does not exactly inform us of the man who wrote *Lear*." The stern duty of placing facts as they exist before a Literary Jury will be discharged, in justice alike to Bacon and to him, and in order that each of them may be given his proper place in connection with the "Shakespeare" Plays. It will be pleasant to turn to other matters for which Shakspere the Actor is entitled to some credit. Two good traits in his character may be pointed out. Both throw some light on the Authorship of the "Shakespeare" Plays. One is that the Actor appears to have been a man possessed of some genial humour. This, however, was more like that of a prosperous man of the middle class, sitting in a Tavern and making merry with his friends, than the classical "wit" of a polished gentleman and courtier, or the delicate humour and

refined raillery found running through the Plays. Further, assuming some arrangement to have existed between Bacon and himself, the highly honourable way in which he strictly kept faith, and neither by word or deed, directly or indirectly, advanced a claim to the authorship of the Poems or of the Plays, is greatly to be commended.

The Literary Jury may well be reminded that, after all, the fact of Shakspere being so honourable a man, however humble the part he played as to them, is one for which the world is much indebted to him, for this it was that made possible the production of the "Shakespeare" Plays. Had Bacon failed to find a Stage "Mask" after Marlow's death, or had Shakspere afterwards proved less honourable or less scrupulous in keeping the secret entrusted to him than he did, the great philosopher would probably have ceased to write "Stage Plays," and the world been so much the poorer. Moreover, it is not unreasonable to suppose that Bacon, like many a Play-writer since, was indebted to the Manager for whose Company he wrote for many valuable hints and suggestions of a practical sort as to the structure of the Plays. The "Evidence" will suggest at least one probable instance of this. In *Henry V.* (Act ii. Sc. 3) Dame Quickly gives an account of the signs of approaching death which she had noticed immediately before the death of Falstaff. The indications described by her are exactly those just preceding death which are subsequently enumerated in Bacon's "History of Life and Death." This description is accurately taken from the writings of medical experts—particularly Galen. But in the Play, when a certain point is reached, and the dying man should "cry out" at the very last (expressed in Latin by the words "*Et tunc clamor*"), the accurate de-

scription is broken off as too solemn for the Stage, and a bit of dialogue introduced, as we may well suppose at the suggestion of the practical manager Shakspere. Dame Quickly then says: "A' cried out 'God, God' three or four times; now I, to comfort him, bid him, 'a' should not think of God'; I hoped there was no need to trouble himself with any such thoughts yet." An experienced Stage manager would at once say that, otherwise, the ending would be too serious and solemn, and too heavy for the Stage. Other instances of "gags" or "business," which may well have been suggested by Shakspere's theatrical experience, such as his probable aid with facetious Law Court scenes in *Measure for Measure*, will be contained in the "Evidence," or will readily suggest themselves.

It remains to be seen whether the Plays themselves do not, in truth, bear witness that the Stratford Manager, while the Actor who took some part on the production of each Play, was not himself the writer of them. Shortly stated, the Plays, when carefully looked at, seem to furnish such evidence under the following heads:—

1. The Plays as a whole, if looked at as written by the Actor, do not show themselves to have been written in development of any preconceived plan whatever, much less in pursuance of any idea expressed by Shakspere the Actor at any time, either verbally or in writing.[1] Indeed, the Actor's admirers have until now not been even able to agree as to their probable Chronological order. In some important cases, as notably with regard to *King John* and *Hamlet*, his advocates, feeling themselves pressed, on the one hand, by the necessity for making the date of each Play as much later than 1591 as is possible, that being the date of the publica-

[1] As to Bacon's probable scheme, see *ante* pp. 25-7.

tion of *King John*; and, on the other hand, also feeling that it is impossible to really maintain that Shakspere left Stratford earlier than 1587, resort to what Mr Fleay calls "the imbecile device of a lost Play," when recourse to such a supposition is sought with regard to anyone other than Shakespeare. Moreover, the Stratford Actor left no written compositions of any sort behind him, and the five laboured signatures of his which we possess certainly do not suggest "the pen of a ready writer" capable of throwing off the thousands upon thousands of lines which the "Shakespeare" Plays alone would require.

2. Apart from the Plays attributed to him, without sufficient reason, the Stratford Player has not left any evidence, not even a tradition, that he either possessed any philosophy, any learning, or any of the attainments traced to Francis Bacon. Neither can we find anything in the life of the Player suggesting him to have been a man of any refinement, if the Plays be ignored for the purpose of supplying such evidence.

3. No division of the life of Shakspere can be formed which is echoed by the Plays in any way. Nor is the nature of the man. We have seen[1] that the writer of the Plays was a man that absolutely despised money, and spoke of it as "muck," yet Shakspere was rigorous in enforcing debts due to him; while, on the other hand, he was a person from whom it was not easy to extract money.

4. Not one of the scenes, except only the local colouring (the outside of an Ale-house, and some common Warwickshire names) used as a sort of "Setting" for the Italian Play of *The Taming of a Shrew*, is laid in or near Stratford, nor, indeed, anywhere in Warwickshire—yet many might have been. What, for instance, would have been the difficulty in

[1] *See ante* page 60.

placing the scene of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* as at Kenilworth instead of in Windsor Great Park, or in making its characters take their names from a family well known somewhere in Warwickshire, rather than from one dwelling at Windsor? Or again, some of the battles of the Civil Wars between York and Lancaster were fought within thirty miles of Stratford, yet not a battle scene is laid there in any historical Play.[1]

5. The very vices censured by the writer of the "Shakespeare" Plays are found to be parts of the life of Shakespeare. This has been shown to be the case with regard to the latter's greed for money. The drunkenness, reproved in the Plays, alike in comparatively early Plays[2] and in some later ones, is indulged in by Shakspere from the days of the Bidford drinking bout of his youth till he ends his life in consequence of a "festivity" with some friends. Again, like Bacon's friend Earl Southampton, and many others of his day, Shakspere committed ante-nuptial immorality in spite of the eloquent warning against it which the Plays contain.[3] In later life we find the incident recorded by Manningham in his diary to have taken place soon after, if not contemporaneously with, the eloquent denunciation of Lust contained (*circa* 1600) in the *The Merry Wives of*

[1] Yet many battle and other scenes are placed around St Albans.

[2] In the comparatively early Play of *The Taming of the Shrew* (about 1594) the Induction contains a vivid description of a man who is "dead drunk," and the Lord who has found him on the ground exclaims: "O monstrous beast! how like a swine he lies." In *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (written 1599-1600) it is said (Act i. Sc. 2) of a drunken man that "When he is best, he is little worse than a man; and when he is worst, he is little better than a beast." Again, in the Play of *Othello* (written about 1600-1) we find the passage following:—"Oh that men should put an enemy in their mouths to steal away their brains! That we should with joy, pleasance, revel and applause, transform ourselves into beasts. To be now a sensible man, by-and-by a fool, and presently a beast! Oh, strange! Every inordinate cup is unblessed, and the ingredient is a devil."

[3] See *ante* page 61.

*Windsor*.[1] Even the Actor's marriage was in violation of his own supposed teachings, which have been previously quoted.[1]

6. The jokes attributed to the Actor are all mere Tavern jokes, or else mock-epitaphs savouring of ordinary Village-Churchyard poetry. They appear to have been mostly made at the expense of either Ben Jonson, or of some neighbours. Very different do they seem from the delicate humour shown in the Plays.

7. Not a single joke in any of the Plays is connected, even by tradition, with anything ever known to have been said or written by the Player. It will be recollected that the joke as to the brewer's horse is explained by Bacon's Commonplace Book.[2]

8. Nothing whatever contained in the Plays can, indeed, be shown to be connected in any way with anything, written or unwritten, traced back to the Actor.

While four distinct written documents connected with Bacon have been shown[3] to be also connected with the Shakespeare Plays, the admirers of Shakspere, the Stratford Actor, are invited to produce one scrap of paper in his handwriting in any way connected with the Plays. His five crabbed and laborious signatures are all in his handwriting that can be produced. And these confirm the impression that the Stratford Actor was not likely to have written the thousands of lines contained in the Plays alone.

9. No practical experience of Navigation can ever possibly have been acquired by Shakespeare of Stratford. For it is admitted that there is no trace of his ever having been out of England. The nautical experiences traced to Bacon under this same head will not be forgotten.[4]

[1] See *ante* page 61.
[2] See *ante* pages 64, 65, 66.
[3] See *ante* page 70.
[4] See *ante* page 73.

10. While the heads under which the Plays have been considered hitherto in many cases have been in marked contrast, as between Bacon and Shakspere, yet under this tenth head there is absolute agreement between them. It is common ground that the appearance of any "Shakespeare" Plays absolutely ceased during the Period between 1613 and 1621, during which Bacon was holding High Legal Offices.

11. It would be at least very singular if the Actor and the Philosopher not only possessed many identities of thought, style, and phrases, but if each of them bore a great part in enlarging the vocabulary of the English language. Professor Max Muller says that, while some English labourers have hardly 300 words in their vocabulary, a well-educated English person usually employs in ordinary conversation some 3000 or 4000 different words. Now, Professor Craik estimates the vocabulary of the "Shakespeare" Plays at about 21,000 words. Some of these, variously estimated at from 3000 to 5000 in number, are new words. Many of them are derived from the Latin—a language with which, his contemporaries tell us, the Actor had little familiarity; while the numerous commentators on the "Shakespeare" Plays who support the claims of this man of Stratford in substance corroborate his contemporaries by relying on a theory that translations were used by Shakspere in the preparation of the Plays. No translation can possibly teach a man the structure of a language, or enable him to form derivations from its root words. Moreover, many of these same words thus derived from the Latin, and undoubtedly found in the Plays, are also met with in the works of Bacon.

12. It is impossible to believe that the subjects as to which many of the errors and changes of opinion

met with in the Plays are such as can be attributed to the Actor. It cannot be supposed, for instance, that *he* deeply studied the motion of the Universe; the question of how the interior of the earth is composed; or Natural History—and all these so deeply that he from time to time changed his views on important points connected with each of them.

The "Shakespeare" Plays, as above pointed out, furnish under twelve heads, which are above considered, such internal evidence as, on the one hand, proves that Francis Bacon was the author of them, and on the other hand, when considered in relation to the claim of the Stratford Actor to their authorship, throws considerable doubt upon it. The "Evidence" will next proceed to consider the external evidence bearing upon the question which the Literary Jury will try, when they are in effect asked to say: "Who was Shakespeare?" There is, in truth, no external evidence in support of the Stratford claim that a native of that town wrote the Plays. The Evidence usually put forward in support of that claim is that, seven years after Shakspere the Actor's death, the folio of 1623 appeared with the name of "Shakespeare" upon it. But when it is shown, as it has been, that this name is at anyrate not the Actor's Patronymic, or personal name, but is an assumed one, the use of it is seen to, in truth, furnish no evidence of the identity of the person who in 1623 wrote or edited the Plays, with the individuality of the Stratford man.

Another head of external evidence usually becomes available, when previously ascertained facts be proved to be connected with the contents of the document in controversy. In the case as to Bacon, much such evidence can be obtained. This Outline sketches what some of it is, while the "Evidence" will disclose much

more. "Orthodox" Shakespearians, however, content themselves with arguing in a circle. They say "Shakspere wrote the Plays—the Plays show great learning—therefore he must have been a very learned man." They can, however, when pressed, give no evidence of the previously ascertained fact that he was a man of any learning, independently of the proof in the Plays themselves that their writer, whoever he was, answers this description.

The Bust in Stratford Church has been "restored" out of recognition, from that depicted by Dugdale, on the Cover of this Outline. The gravestone now at Stratford supplies a piece of negative evidence which would very probably, though not of necessity, be fatal to the Stratford claim in a Court of Law, and with an ordinary Jury. It is a well settled rule of Law that every possible presumption must always be made against anyone who destroys or suppresses evidence. For example, a man in possession of a diamond, which he will not allow to be seen, would not be listened to for a moment were he to assure a Jury that it was only a very low quality one, and worth but a few shillings. The Jury would be told by the Judge that they were at liberty to give the Plaintiff the value of the most expensive sort of diamond known, and this they accordingly might do if they so pleased. Now, after the death of Shakspere the Actor, a stone, bearing an uncouthly-cut inscription upon it, was placed by someone over his grave. Varying copies of the strangely-cut inscription are given by several old writers, beginning with Dugdale and ending with the late Charles Knight. These will be reproduced in the forthcoming "Evidence." It is claimed by some that the apparently confused medley of large and small letters on the original

stone enabled the inscription to be read by the light of the system of "enfolded writing" given by Bacon in his "De Augmentis," and to there declare his authorship of the Plays. This system has been referred to on an earlier page of this Outline.[1] Such an assertion as is alleged to have been contained on the original stone might be easily tested by a reference to the actual inscription itself. But, on inquiry for this, it is found that it has disappeared, and been replaced by a neatly-cut modern inscription reproducing the original lines in letters of uniform size. The "Evidence" will contain a letter written by the present vicar of Stratford in answer to inquiries made by the writer. The vicar most courteously replied to this request for information; but did so in terms betraying that he was previously himself left in ignorance of what had taken place in the days of some predecessor, failing to refer to any Faculty or other legal justification for this removal, and even indicating a doubt whether there ever was such a stone. No reliance can be placed on the assertion that Bacon's authorship was alleged in the original inscription. The original inscription has, however, been sufficiently examined for it to be ascertained that, *if* the letters in it be made of the sizes which it is claimed they should be, but which none of the facsimiles exactly show, then the assertion alleged certainly comes out. But any reading of such an inscription can only be very unsatisfactory in the absence of the original.

The "Evidence" will, in conclusion, show the manner in which the Stratford superstition came into existence some years after the death of the actor. When Shakspere, in accordance with the arrangement just

[1] See *ante* page 70.

previously made, was journeying twice a year between Stratford and London, during the years intervening between 1604 and 1611, he used usually to stay a night at the Crown Inn at Oxford. This was at that time kept by one John D'Avenant. The Innkeeper had a pretty wife, who bore him ten children; he lived with her to the end of his life; and was, by his own wish, buried beside her after his death. Shakspere, who seems never to have objected to a pretty woman, and probably liked being made comfortable at his Inn, became godfather to one of the ten children—a boy who subsequently became an Actor, and was knighted. This man, reckless alike of his mother's honour, and of his own right to his name, by sundry mysterious nods and winks to those who mentioned that Shakspere was his godfather, to the effect that they must be careful not to take the name of God in vain, and likewise by affecting to know a great deal about the private history of Shakspere—who, by the way, died when D'Avenant was himself only about ten years old—managed to create an impression that the actor was considerably nearer akin to him than a godfather. All this stimulated an Actor named Betterton, who greatly admired the "Shakespeare" Plays, and was in D'Avenant's Company of Actors, to go down to Stratford about the year 1690 and to ascertain on the spot all that he could about the deceased Shakspere. He there ascertained nothing whatever, even at that date, which in any way tended to prove that the late Actor had written the Plays. But he discovered many little particulars of gossip about him. On the slender foundation thus laid, and by altogether omitting to notice that the name upon the folio differs, in the respects already pointed out, from the surname of the Actor and his family, there has grown up, in the course of

years, that which has come to be the Great Stratford Superstition; and it is now accepted by many, especially by Actors, as a Faith which it is blasphemy itself to doubt.

One final observation of a legal character yet remains to be made. It is an undoubted principle of Law that there can be no Insanity without Delusions. A Delusion is a belief based on supposed facts which have no existence. It has been the object of this humble Outline, and will be sought by the far fuller "Opening" of the evidence available which is intended to follow it, to show that the Baconian belief is based upon substantial facts, not upon fancies born of the Imagination. Mr Sidney Lee and Mr Churton Collins each has stated that those who believe Bacon wrote the Shakespeare Plays are fit persons for admission to an Asylum for the Insane.[1] Enough has now been here said to show a Literary Jury that the Baconians are suffering from no Delusions about their facts, and that there is at least much method in their madness.

[1] Adopting this playful language of ironical exaggeration, it will be satisfactory to all who hold the opinion, which the text mentions, as to those entertaining Baconian beliefs, to learn that the particular lunatic who has put together this Outline, and the "Opening" of evidence which it is hoped will follow it, was not "wandering at large" when he did so, but was then "under proper care and treatment." He, in truth, was at that time a prisoner on Dartmoor. He did not, indeed, "do his six months on Dartamoor," in the Government establishment there near Princetown, but at the delightful residence of a medical man, to whose experience and skill he is indebted for discovering and removing the causes of periodical rushes of blood to the head, causing temporary incapacity, which, many years ago, produced a long and dangerous illness, and would certainly have caused another, and probably a fatal one, unless discovered and relieved. Any inaccuracies or errors which may be found in this Outline will be explained by the consequent personal disadvantages under which this book has been written; without access to a Library, solely by the aid of copious notes already made by the writer, supplemented by that of books lent, and information from time to time afforded by the kindness of friends, amongst whom he is very especially indebted to George C. Bompas, Esq., and such books written by the other side as he chanced to have in his possession; particularly his friend Judge Willis's "Lecture," Mr Fleay's learned volumes, and Mr Halliwell-Phillips's "Outlines." Both friends and foes to the views here expressed will, it is hoped, unite in pointing out all errors and inaccuracies to the writer.

# POSTSCRIPT

SINCE the foregoing pages were written their author has discovered absolutely conclusive evidence, hitherto overlooked, that Francis Bacon was the writer of the "Shake-speare" Plays. Bacon's "Commonplace Book," or "Promus," is, as stated, *ante* p. 65, at the British Museum. It is amongst the Harleian MSS., and has long been recognised by the authorities of the Museum as a genuine document, and in Bacon's own handwriting. Dates in it show that it was commenced in December 1594, and, after a break of a few weeks, continued from January 1595 for some time. It contains a selection of striking sayings which had, in any way, arrested Bacon's special attention, as well as a collection of commonplaces, of literary hooks-and-eyes to form up sentences, and of ordinary proverbs; and it is not, as some think, merely the latter. Many a phrase noted in it has some characteristic individuality sufficient to make it easily recognised. This "Promus," when closely examined, as the writer has been doing for the purpose of arranging the "Evidence" promised in his present little book, discloses the facts following; and these facts, taken together, afford evidence which, as already stated, can only be regarded as absolutely conclusive.

First, every individual Play of the thirty-six contained in the 1623 Folio, save one alone, contains some marked expression which is also found to be noted in the "Promus." The one Play which does not contain any such matter is *The Comedy of Errors*. But this Play was written in 1576 (see *ante* pp. 13, 18), and, consequently, about twenty years before this "Note Book" or "Promus," was commenced; and the reason why the

Play and the "Promus" contain nothing in common thus becomes obvious. The answer "orthodox" Stratfordians might make to this fact, if it stood alone, would probably be that Bacon "must" subsequently have read all the later Plays as they came out in Quarto, and "made notes" from them for his own future use.

A second fact, however, disposes of this possible suggestion. There is an entry in the "Promus," of "Albada" ["good dawning"]. This is from "Alborada," the Spanish for "dawning"; and the "Promus" entry is evidently a reminiscence of one of the few Spanish phrases, which Bacon was now rapidly forgetting that he had learnt from Greene, who is shown, on pp. 24, 25, to have been acquainted with Spain and the Spanish, and to have been Bacon's early collaborator. The position of the entry in the book tells it cannot have been made later than 1596. And the expression "good dawning" is not found anywhere in all English literature except in the "Shakespeare" Play of *King Lear*. But *King Lear* was not placed on the Stage till 1604. If Bacon, in addition to being a diligent reader of the Quartos, making careful notes of all striking expressions in them, be supposed to have also been a regular "first nighter" on the production of each "Shakespeare" Play, even this latter supposition does not explain how he came to be able, in 1596, to make a note in his Commonplace Book of a unique expression contained nowhere else than in a Play not produced on the Stage till eight years later.

A third fact shown by the "Promus" is still more convincing. The Folio of 1623 contained six plays, all of which had never before been published. Two of these, besides the three Plays of the "Downfall," as far as is known, and most probably, never had been acted; though we know at about what dates one *Julius Cæsar* was written and acted (*ante* pp. 45, 46),

and the two, other than "Downfall" Plays (see p. 56), were written. Yet all six of the new Plays contain striking expressions, also noted in the "Promus." These will all be set out in full in the "Evidence," being too long for this mere "Postscript." The existence in the three Plays of the "Downfall," which had certainly never been either acted or published, previous to 1623, of expressions common alike to them and to the "Promus" necessarily requires a great deal before Shakspere of Stratford can be assumed to be their writer. The three Plays just referred to have been (*ante* p. 57) already pointed out to have dramatised incidents accompanying Bacon's "Downfall" in 1621. Now "Shake-spear" of Stratford—the *Actor* bearing that Stage name—had died in 1616. Let it for the moment be assumed, in true Stratfordian style, that the three Plays written in 1601, 1607, and 1609 respectively, previous to Shakspere's death, "must" have been seen by Bacon, as a regular and never-absent "first nighter"; and that he, as usual, noted some passages from them in his "Commonplace Book." Passing by the other and first-mentioned three Plays —half of the Folio's six new ones—still the "Promus" passages in the three "Downfall" Plays remain to be accounted for. Shakspere of Stratford cannot be assumed to have been the writer of these three Plays of the "Downfall"; unless, at the bidding of the Great Stratford Superstition, we can believe that, before he died, he not only foresaw and dramatised events in Bacon's career, about to happen some five years after the Actor's own decease, but also that he, in some miraculous and inexplicable manner, far more marvellous than any of those of modern spirit-writing, got expressions he had employed in the Plays, depicting these future events, recorded in Bacon's private Note Book!! This is impossible.

The only possible construction of the facts, shown by the "Promus" alone, without considering any others, has been suggested *ante* p. 34. All the facts on both sides, when put together and taken as a whole, show, as often happens, that truth in this matter, as in many another, lies hid in their midway. Sound sense bids us reject as evidence alike the mysterious and the marvellous. This book as early as page 2 disclaimed for the Shakespeare of literature reliance upon mysterious stories based on cryptograms or cyphers. Belief must in turn be withheld from the legendary miracle of Shakespeare the Actor being suddenly inspired with a finished education of a high order. The truth here dwells not too deep to be seen, nor at the bottom of any well. It discloses that, great as William Shaksper of Stratford was, as the first of a long line of magnificent Actor-Managers who have raised the English stage to the high position it now holds by the excellence of their selections of the Plays placed upon it, as worthily representative of the National Drama, he himself no more actually wrote all the splendid Plays produced at the Theatre he was connected with than did Sir Henry Irving either *Harold*, *Queen Mary*, or *The Cup*; or Mr Tree *The Tempest* itself. Let, then, literature unite with law in adapting the words of one of the earliest of the Plays (*Titus Andronicus*, Act i. Sc. 2) and saying that "*Suum cuique* is our Roman Justice"; and in coming to the conclusion expressed in the armed, and thus antithetical, Prologue (see *ante* page 53) to one of the latest (*Troilus and Cressida*), which tells us that these great "Shakespeare" Plays may be admired, by the respective believers in each, as the triumphs either

"Of Author's pen, *or*[1] Actor's voice."

[1] *The distinction of type here is, of course, not in the original.*

"Segnius irritant animos demissa per aurem
Quam quæ sunt occulis subjecta fidelibus."—HORACE, A.P. 150-1.

# TABLE A[1]

## BACON'S LIFE

### DIVIDED INTO PERIODS, WITH CORRESPONDING GROUPS OF PLAYS

PERIOD I., or the Early Period of Bacon's Life, extending from about 1583 (the year after his Call to Gray's Inn Bar) until Marlow's Death in 1593.

*GROUP I.(a) OF PLAYS*

*Educational and Philosophical Plays written under the influence of Greene*

Written about

1583-4. [2]The Two Gentlemen of Verona, formerly Felix and Philomena.
1584-5. Hamlet.
1586. Twelfth Night.
1587-8. Love's Labour's Lost.
1588-9. The Winter's Tale.
1590. A Midsummer-Night's Dream.
1591-4. Titus Andronicus.

*GROUP I.(b) OF PLAYS*

*Historical Plays written under Marlow's influence*

Written about

1590-1. King John.
1592. I. Henry VI.

[1] In order not to overload this Outline this Table is now presented in the very simple form here printed. But at the end of the "Opening" of the full Evidence, the incident which gave origin to each Play in its turn will be stated, and also the sources—in many cases previously untranslated Latin, Greek, or Italian Literature—which were drawn upon by their writer.

[2] The Academic Play of the *Comedy of Errors* was written *circa* 1575 immediately after Bacon left College. See pages 18-19.

[FOR PERIOD II. SEE OVER

PERIOD II., or the Struggling Period of Bacon's Life, extending from Marlow's Death in 1593 till James I.'s Accession in 1603, during which he is said (by Anthony Bacon) to have been "working for bread."

### *GROUP II.(a)—PLAYS OF THE PASSIONS*

*Plays in Italian garb depicting Human Passions, written with the aid and under the influence of Anthony Bacon*

Written about

1594. The Taming of the Shrew.
1595. All's Well that Ends Well (formerly Love's Labour's Won).
1596. Romeo and Juliet.
1596-7. Much Ado about Nothing.
1598. The Merchant of Venice.
1599-1600. The Merry Wives of Windsor.
1599. As You Like It.
1600-1. Othello (*not produced on the Stage until* 1604).

### *GROUP II.(b)—ENGLISH HISTORICAL PLAYS*

*Historical Plays written under Marlow's influence (continued)*

Written about

1594. II. Henry VI.
1594. I. Henry VI.
1597. Richard II.
1597. Richard III.
1597-8. I. Henry IV.
1598-9. I. Henry IV.
1599. Henry V.

### *GROUP II.(c)—LATIN HISTORICAL PLAYS*

Written about

1601. Julius Cæsar.

[FOR PERIOD III. SEE OPPOSITE

PERIOD III., or the Political Progress Period of Bacon's Life, extending from James I.'s Accession in 1603 till his appointment in 1613 to be Attorney-General.

*GROUP III.(a)—POLITICAL AND PERSONAL PLAYS*

*Plays written under the influence of Ben Jonson*

Written about
1604. Measure for Measure.
1605. Macbeth.
1606. King Lear.
1609. Troilus and Cressida.
1609. Cymbeline.
1610. The Tempest.

*GROUP III.(b)—LATIN HISTORICAL PLAYS*

Written about
1607. Antony and Cleopatra.

PERIOD IV., or the Official Period of Bacon's Life, extending from the year 1613, when he became Attorney-General, until his Fall from the Chancellorship in 1521.

*No Group of Plays written during this period*

PERIOD V., or the "Downfall" Period in Bacon's Life, during which he completed each of the series of Plays previously commenced, and all the "Shakespeare" Plays were collected and published in the Folio of 1623.

*TRILOGY OF PLAYS OF THE DOWNFALL*

(*a*) Concluding Educational Play: Timon of Athens.[1]
(*b*) Concluding English History Play: Henry VIII.[2]
(*c*) Concluding Latin History Play: Coriolanus.[3]

[1] Depicting the flight of faithless friends (Sir George Hastings, and Sir Richard Young) and a faithful steward (Sir Thomas Mentys).

[2] Depicting a fallen Chancellor in Cardinal Wolsey, with a Queen (Anne Boleyn, the mother of Queen Elizabeth) expressing political views previously uttered by Bacon in Parliament.

[3] Depicting Envy (Coke) working the downfall of the object of its jealousy by playing upon the popular feeling of the moment.

# TABLE B.

## ACKNOWLEDGED PROSE WORKS OF BACON REFERRED TO IN THE PLAYS

*N.B.*—When a reference is made in any Play, as is frequently the case, to a new edition of a work, which a previous Play has already quoted, the new edition is named below as well as the old one.

| | Published about |
|---|---|
| Temporis Partus Masculus | 1585 |
| The Power of Knowledge | 1592 |
| Observations on a Libel | 1592 |
| Maxims of the Law | 1596 |
| Colours of Good and Evil | 1597 |
| Essay on Faction | 1597 |
| Meditationes Sacræ | 1598 |
| Essays—First Edition. Dedication. Essay on Discourse. Essay on Followers and Friends | 1598 |
| Character of Julius Cæsar | 1601 |
| Valerius Terminus | 1603 |
| Pacification of the Church | 1603 |
| On the Interpretation of Nature (Cogitationes de Natura Rerum) | 1603 |
| Discussion on a Union with Scotland | 1603 |
| De Principiis et Originibus | 1603 |
| Helps for the Intellectual Powers | 1596-1603 |
| Advancement of Learning | 1603 |
| Redargutio Philosophiarum | 1608 |
| Essay on the Fortunate | 1608 |
| Office of Constable | 1608 |
| The True Greatness of the King of Great Britain | 1608 |
| Wisdom of the Ancients | 1609 |
| Filum Labyrinthi | |

| | Published about |
|---|---|
| Essays on | 1612 |
| Ambition | Love |
| Beauty | Riches |
| Deformity | Seditions and Troubles |
| Friendship | Seeming Wise |
| Fortune | Superstition |
| Greatness and Goodness | Vain Glory |
| Pride | |
| Descriptio Globi Intellectualis | 1612 |
| On Worship | 1612 |
| Plan of the Instauratio | 1620 |
| Novum Organum | 1608-20 |
| History of Henry VIII. | 1622 |
| De Principiis atque Originibus | 1622 |
| Historia Ventorum ; or, History of the Winds | 1622 |
| De Augmentis | 1622 |
| Advertisement touching a Holy War | 1622 |
| Descriptio Vitæ et Mortis. History of Life and Death | 1623 |
| History of Dense and Rare. Historia Densi et Rari | 1623 |
| Essay on Anger | 1623 |
| New Atlantis | 1624 |
| Apophthegms | 1624 |
| Natural History | 1625 |
| Essays on | 1625 |
| Adversity | Great Place (New Edition) |
| Anger | Innovations |
| Ambition | Love (New Edition) |
| Cunning | Nature |
| Custom | Revenge |
| Delays | Seditions and Troubles |
| Education | Simulation and Dissimulation |
| Envy | |
| Fortune | Travel |
| Friendships (New Edition) | Truth |
| Gardens | Vicissitudes |
| Goodness | |

*Dates uncertain*

| | |
|---|---|
| Uses of the Law | Death (posthumous publication) |
| Wisdom | |
| Wisdom of the Ancients | Physiological Remains |
| De Calore et Frigore | |

## KNOWN "DEVICES" INTERLUDES, AND "MASQUES" BY BACON

| | Published about |
|---|---|
| Misfortunes of Arthur. (Presented to the Queen at Greenwich by the Gentlemen of Gray's Inn) . . . | 1588 |
| A Device for the Earl of Essex. (Containing an Interlude of the Conference of Pleasure, and also a Sonnet in honour of the Earl, the Device being performed when Queen Elizabeth visited Bacon at Twickenham Park) . . . . . | 1592 |
| Masque of the Order of the Helmet; or, Gesta Graiorum. (Performed at Gray's Inn simultaneously with the Comedy of Errors) . . . . . | 1594 |
| Device for Essex. (Containing the Interlude of the Indian Prince, and also Philautia, otherwise Love and Self-Love) . . . . . | 1595 |
| Marriage of the Thames and the Rhine. (Performed contemporaneously with The Tempest on the occasion of the marriage of James I.'s daughter, the Princess Elizabeth, with the Count Palatine) . . . | 1613 |
| A Masque of Flowers. (Presented by the Gentlemen of Gray's Inn on the occasion of the marriage of the Earl of Somerset, at a cost of about £2000 to Bacon, who was then Lord Chancellor, and the "Chief Encourager") | 1614 |