

*If Bacon is Shakespeare...*

By Christina G. Waldman

March 5, 2019

Hypothetically speaking, if Francis Bacon is Shakespeare, or at least, played a major role in the writing and editing of the Shakespeare Works, what questions would that answer? What mysteries might it solve?<sup>1</sup>

Many literary critics seem to think that an hypothesis about obscure and remote questions of history can be refuted by a simple demand for the production of more evidence than in fact exists.—But the true test of an hypothesis, if it cannot be shewn to conflict with known truths, is the number of facts that it correlates, and explains.<sup>2</sup>

*“A prudent question is, as it were, one half of wisdom.”<sup>3</sup>*

*If Bacon is Shakespeare, might it not help explain why there has been such a concerted effort to foist upon the world an imposter, to hide the real author(s) from the world’s eyes?*

(Before you say no, please read to the end and, if you are so inclined so some reading in the sources I have referenced. I hope you will agree that any hypothesis or opinion is subject to reconsideration when new facts are brought to light. Some have already made up their minds, based on what they have always heard. However, “I think he wrote his own stuff” hides the question: who was “he”? Other candidates include Edward de Vere, Marlowe, John Florio, and others. However, was the case ever closed against Bacon? No. In fact, he won in an actual court case, based on the evidence presented— although the decision was later dismissed, for lack of jurisdiction (authority to decide the matter).<sup>4</sup>).

There is evidence from which it may be strongly inferred that Francis Bacon was the natural, although not publicly acknowledged, son of Queen Elizabeth.<sup>5</sup> Surely this would go a long way towards explaining why he would try to keep his poetical activities secret, for in them he could express in a veiled fashion his true thoughts and feelings.

Even aside from this contemplation, Bacon was a statesman and counsellor close to the Queen. She had named him her learned Counsel Extraordinaire, a role created just for him. As such, Bacon had state secrets to protect and confidences to keep. He was not just any nobleman who might have attended the theatre openly but written plays in secret.

In exploring the evidence, be prepared to look beneath the surface, for outward appearances can be deceiving.<sup>6</sup> This is where I disagree with Charlotte Stopes who in 1889 thought the answers to Baconian statements were “so simple and self-evident” that the question could be put to rest “once and for all.”<sup>7</sup>

As with other matters, the truth is sometimes buried under layers of smokescreens and requires digging. In the case of Bacon’s writings, this was apparently done intentionally, in order to discourage those who would not value it. Bacon himself used the metaphor of “mining” the truth.<sup>8</sup> Those who especially seek to know the truth include artists, lawyers, philosophers, theologians, and scientists, generally. Bacon was, at some level, all of the above. He concerned himself with first causes, mysteries, higher truths. “Time brings forth the hidden truth,” he said in

his *Advancement of Learning*.<sup>9</sup> However, being able to tell the real from the apparent is a skill valuable to everyone.

*But here we ought by no means to be wanting to ourselves; for as God uses the help of our reason to illuminate us, so should we likewise turn it every way, that we may be more capable of receiving and understanding his mysteries; provided only that the mind be enlarged, according to its capacity, to the grandeur of the mysteries, and not the mysteries contracted to the narrowness of the mind.*<sup>10</sup>

In fact, the very discussion of a pseudonym for Shakespeare suggests Francis Bacon's involvement, for he used pseudonyms and wrote under *personas* such as Valerius Terminus. As James Spedding, chief editor of the fourteen-volume set of Bacon's *Works* in the nineteenth century, observed, Bacon protected his ideas from the "many" he felt would scoff at them by writing enigmatically. He figured they would be safer in the hands of the "few" who would go to the trouble to figure them out. Some might even enjoy the treasure hunt.

One important teaching of Bacon's was that men and women need to make their own investigations and judgments about evidence, rather than merely accepting the word of authorities. For this reason, he was critical of the universities of his day which, he said, taught men what to believe instead of how to think. A truth-seeker does not have to accept the word of experts unquestioningly. After all, even experts may be biased at times or have their own agenda, not your best interests, at heart.

While knowing who really authored the plays and sonnets could certainly add to one's enjoyment and understanding, the plays are so much more than mere entertainment. They are storehouses of wisdom and knowledge—such teaching tools! Did the presumed author intend only to make money? Humanist Francis Bacon's purpose—what he said was the goal of his life's work—was to improve the state of men's souls.<sup>11</sup> Surely that is Shakespearean!

Sometimes it seems the argument for Francis Bacon is dismissed as if it were only about ciphers, a question already "asked and answered." "Been there, done that, let's move on," seems to be the tone. For example, the website of Tom Reedy and David Kathman, [TheShakespeareAuthorship.com](http://TheShakespeareAuthorship.com), does not make a strong case against Bacon's authorship, other than to challenge the cipher evidence.<sup>12</sup>

However, the argument goes far beyond ciphers or those well-intentioned investigators Delia Bacon and Ignatius Donnelly whose names became laughingstocks in the hands of the "orthodox."<sup>13</sup> Progress is only made by taking chances, as Bacon observed, even if it means appearing foolish at times. Many have never even heard that Delia was an intelligent, educated woman who encouraged people to read the Shakespeare plays as literature, only that she suffered from mental illness during her impoverished later years.<sup>14</sup> But is the book on the cipher argument really closed?

The book in question is one written by famous United States cryptologists William and Elizebeth Friedman, *The Shakespearean Ciphers Examined* (Cambridge at the University Press, 1957-58). It is often cited by Stratfordians as having conclusively established that there are no ciphers in the Shakespeare plays.

However, while Mr. Friedman did not find evidence that met his own stringent standards of proof, he did say that Bacon's own background as a cryptologist working in intelligence for the Crown lent credence to the bi-literal cipher theory. Bacon had, of course, invented the bi-literal cipher, the cipher upon which modern computer science is based.<sup>15</sup>

In his book, Mr. Friedman spent several chapters discussing (dismissing) the work of Dr. Orville Owen and Elizabeth Wells Gallup with the bi-literal cipher. Mrs. Gallup and her team at the Riverside Lab in Chicago—the lab where William Friedman met his wife Elizebeth in their youth—deciphered by means of Francis Bacon’s bi-literal cipher an entire play, *The Tragedy of Anne Boleyn*.<sup>16</sup> Spedding did not understand why Bacon devoted so much of his elegy to Queen Elizabeth to a defense of Anne Boleyn’s character. However, if Bacon is Queen Elizabeth’s son, Anne Boleyn would have been his grandmother.

*If Bacon is Shakespeare, could it help to explain...*

...how there came to be “two” literary geniuses such as the world has never known existing on the world’s stage at the exact same moment in history?

...why words said to be “coined” by Shakespeare, based on the first recorded use, were used by Bacon relatively contemporaneously?

Take the word “hint,” for example. The suggested derivation is from the Middle English *hent*, “the act of grabbing or seizing.” Shakespeare is credited with using the word “hint” first in *Othello* around 1604 and two years later in *Anthony and Cleopatra*.<sup>17</sup>

Bacon once spoke of something that is “more like a kind of hunting by scent than a science.”<sup>18</sup> “Hunt-plus-scent” equals “hint” makes sense, for Bacon frequently combined two words to make a new one, as did Shakespeare. Bacon uses the word “hint” in six different writings. Two are in the *Novum Organum* which was published in 1620.<sup>19</sup>

*If Bacon is Shakespeare, could it help to explain...*

...how “Shakespeare” came to know so much, and care so much, about history? He wrote history plays, including plays for Kings Henry IV, Henry V, Henry VI, and Henry VIII—skipping Henry VII. That would make sense if Shakespeare is actually the same *historian* who wrote *The History of the Reign of King Henry VII*; that is, Francis Bacon.<sup>20</sup>

...why *The Tempest* reveals the playwright’s knowledge of information known only to a select few involved with the Virginia Company, a group which included Francis Bacon?<sup>21</sup>

...why the cryptic Hall and Marston satires may allude to the real identity of Shakespeare, under the guise of calling him “Labeo,” an ancient Roman statesman whose life bore major parallels to Bacon’s?<sup>22</sup> Bacon sometimes wrote under other names; e.g., in ghost-writing for Essex and in taking on the *persona* of Valerius Terminus in the fragment known by that name.

...why Shakespeare knew so much? The playwright’s vast, encyclopedic knowledge which has so often been observed. In 1592, Bacon as a young man had written to his uncle, Lord Burghley, that he had “taken all knowledge to be his province.”<sup>23</sup>

...why several of the Shakespeare plays are brimming with law, and many show evidence of vast legal knowledge. Would this not have to mean the plays were written by a lawyer?

At first glance, it might seem like a playwright could pick up the knowledge he needed by consulting friends who were lawyers or clerking, or reading on his own. However, the legal knowledge displayed in the plays is not just the ordinary kind that an everyday, practicing lawyer would know. It goes beyond the English common law and includes civilian legal concepts, concepts of higher law. Bacon was not “just a lawyer.” He was a legal historian

and scholar. He had set himself to the task of modernizing the law, making it more certain. He was carrying on the work his father, Nicholas Bacon, Lord Keeper of the Seal, had begun for Queen Elizabeth.<sup>24</sup>

Bacon studied the past and borrowed ideas from it, refashioning them when necessary into tools and concepts applicable to his own time. He tells us that he wrote works of re-creation. He tells us he wrote plays, or “trifles,” for his own benefit, partly as a respite from the cares of state.

There was a culture of play-acting at the Inns of Court, the law schools of the day, which went back to the generation of Robert Dudley, the Earl of Leicester with plays like *Supposes* and *Gorbuduc*. Drama was an important teaching tool, for students might remember best what they learn with enjoyment. The pedagogical benefits of the theatre would not have been lost on a theatre-loving humanist, bent on changing the methods by which we learn, such as Bacon. *Such as Bacon?* Such as the world had never known, and may never know again.

*If Bacon is Shakespeare, might that explain...*

...why there are so many words and phrases including expressions in Italian, Latin, French, and Spanish in the Shakespeare plays that can also be found in Bacon’s private literary notebook, the *Promus*?<sup>25</sup> There are many “parallelisms” between the writings of Bacon and “Shakespeare.”<sup>26</sup> Those who say these were merely commonplace expressions are not being altogether fair. Some are; some aren’t. It is interesting how a study of the *Promus* can add to one’s enjoyment and understanding of the plays.<sup>27</sup>

...why Bacon asked John Davies to put in a good word for him to King James, asking Davies to be “good to concealed poets?” Yes, Bacon wrote poetry.<sup>28</sup> Tobie Matthew, Bacon’s good friend who had become a Jesuit priest, in a famous postscript wrote, “The most prodigious wit that I ever knew of my nation, and of this side of the sea, is of your Lordship’s name, though he by known by another.”<sup>29</sup> Some have argued, persuasively I think, that the beautiful style of the King James Version of the Bible (1611) is due to Bacon’s final editing, at the King’s request.<sup>30</sup>

...why Bacon praised stage–playing, considering it a worthy part of an educational program, as it had been so used by the Jesuits? Here is what he wrote:

*It will not be amiss to observe also, that even mean faculties, when they fall into great men of great matters sometimes work great and important effects. Of this I will adduce a memorable example; the rather, because the Jesuits appear not to despise this kind of discipline; therein judging (I think) well. It is a thing indeed, if practiced professionally, of low repute; but if it be made part of a discipline, it is of excellent use. I mean stage–playing: an art which strengthens the memory, regulates the tone and effect of the voice and pronunciation, teaches a decent carriage of the countenance and gesture, gives not a little assurance, and accustoms young men to bear being looked at. The example which I shall give, taken from Tacitus, is that of one Vibulenus, formerly an actor, then a soldier in the Pannonian legions....He played the whole thing as if it had been a piece on the stage....<sup>31</sup>*

...why the influence of the Italian *commedia dell’arte* can be observed within at least twelve Shakespeare plays, as Peter Dawkins writes?<sup>32</sup> For just one example, Richard Whalen saw

Othello as a type of the Spanish Capitano, a stock character in the *commedia dell'arte*, a “mercenary who serves the state and boast about his military exploits.”<sup>33</sup>

Bacon had opportunities to witness performances of the *commedia dell'arte* when he was in France with Ambassador Amyas Paulet between October 1576 and February 20, 1579, having been sent there by the hand of Queen Elizabeth, as Peter Dawkins has discussed.<sup>34</sup>

The embassy was in Blois, France, in December 1576. The Gelosi, a professional Venetian family troupe, performed in Blois in February 1577, before the Estates General, and in Paris on May 13, 1577 and July 27, 1577.<sup>35</sup> They were in Paris to perform *commedia dell'arte* from May, 1577 until April, 1578.<sup>36</sup>

In his essay “Of Travel,” Bacon names “comedies, such whereunto the better sort of persons do resort” in his list of “things to be seen and observed” in a foreign place.<sup>37</sup> This suggests that he knew that the *commedia dell'arte* was of two types, learned and rustic.

...why, on December 5, 1594, Bacon’s mother, Anne Bacon, wrote to Francis’ brother Anthony Bacon, “I trust they will not mum nor mask nor sinfully revel at Gray’s Inn?”<sup>38</sup> Later that month, Gray’s Inn put on their Christmas Revels, recorded in the *Gesta Grayorum*. Bacon wrote the speeches of the six councilors.<sup>39</sup> These Revels were followed by a play, “The Comedy of Errors” which James Spedding, Bacon’s nineteenth-century editor, “supposed” was Shakespeare’s.<sup>40</sup>

Bacon had written several masques.<sup>41</sup> He admitted, in his *Essays* and in a private letter to Anglo-Catholic minister Lancelot Andrews in or about 1622<sup>42</sup> that he wrote works solely for his own recreation. In his *Essay*, “Of Masques and Triumphs,” he called such works “toys.”<sup>43</sup> One meaning of “toys” or “trifles” is “plays.”

...why, of all the playwrights of his time, Shakespeare alone was never in trouble with the authorities, as Claire Asquith discovered?<sup>44</sup>

It is remarkable, too, how he came to have a seat in Parliament when he was but twenty years old, in 1581, even before he had been called to the bar.<sup>45</sup> Bacon had been called to the bar in 1582 or 1583, but he pled no case in court until 1594.<sup>46</sup> What was he doing? True, he was engaged in intelligence work for the Crown during some of this time, along with his brother Anthony Bacon, but he would have had time for reflection, study, and writing.

...why there are similarities between the Gray’s Inn Revels of Christmas 1594–95 (the *Gesta Grayorum*) and two other plays: *The Comedy of Errors* and *Love’s Labour’s Lost*?<sup>47</sup>

...why “Hand D” in *The Play of Sir Thomas More* in the Northumberland Manuscript—which has been acknowledged by Stratfordians to be “Shakespeare’s”—looks so much like Bacon’s handwriting?<sup>48</sup> The only handwriting samples purported to be William Shaxpere are six signatures, some of which may have been made by clerks.

...why, in 1992, a forensic handwriting analyst examined a handwriting sample from an earlier draft of a scene that has been called an “analog” to a scene in *The First Part of King Henry IV*. It was found in binder’s waste. She compared it to Bacon’s handwriting in a letter he had written, as well as to handwriting samples from at least thirty other Elizabethan writers. She concluded, based on identical copies of the originals, that the “likelihood of common authorship between the known by Bacon and the disputed script is of high probability.”<sup>49</sup> This evidence stands. It has

never been adequately explained away or afforded its proper credit by Stratfordians or those espousing other candidates for authorship.

\*\*\*

It is said that Bacon would not have had time to write the works of Shakespeare; that no one person could have written both all the works attributed to Shakespeare and all the known works of Bacon.

Yes, Bacon was prolific, but he did not have to do all his writing alone. He had helpers. In fact, Bacon was the leader of a group of writers. He had written a "Writer's Prayer" to be used, presumably, for leading such a group in prayer.<sup>50</sup> Bacon had his "good pens,"<sup>51</sup> his secretaries, to aid him in his literary endeavors. In addition, as Stratfordian Shakespeare scholars concede, there was collaboration on at least some of the Shakespeare plays.<sup>52</sup>

It is said that Bacon could not have been Shakespeare the literary artist because he was a philosopher of science, as if "ne'er the twain shall meet."

In Renaissance times, there was not yet such a division among what became academic disciplines. The classical Roman Lucretius, whose poem *De Rerum Natura* influenced many Renaissance thinkers, including Bacon,<sup>53</sup> was both a poet and a philosopher of science. Modern science did not yet exist. Bacon's new approach to learning facilitated its invention.

One of his methods was to glean ideas from the past and rework them,<sup>54</sup> like a bee gathering nectar to turn it into honey.<sup>55</sup> Numerous studies show that participation in the arts stimulates creative thinking ability.<sup>56</sup> Both science and the arts benefit from innovation, and Bacon was an visionary innovator.

It has been said that Bacon couldn't have been Shakespeare because he had the wrong personality. Bacon is made out to be cold, self-serving, and corrupt. But was he really? Nieves Matthews in her book, *Francis Bacon: The History of a Character Assassination* (New Haven: Yale, 1996), says not so! Ironically, Bacon himself warned others about the dangers of rumor and false reports to a man's reputation.

Some say the true test of a man's character is how he treats those who are beneath him. Once when Bacon was dining, one of the other dinner guests, Sir Ralph Winwood, Secretary of State, beat his dog off a stool where he had been lying. "Every gentleman loves a dog," Bacon told him.<sup>57</sup> Matthews places the politically-motivated charges of corruption against him into their proper historical framework. She shows how the people who knew him best revered him.<sup>58</sup>

Thus, whether or not Bacon is Shakespeare, he is a person whose thought and writings deserve a new Renaissance. From our vantage point four hundred years later, we may never know all the answers. However, Bacon taught us to keep an open mind while searching. He urged us not to simply rely upon the opinions of experts, but to investigate the facts for ourselves and come to our own conclusions. In doing so, we need to watch out for errors in judgment and perception caused by Bacon's famous "four idols" which he discusses in his *Novum Organum* (Don't be put off by those "four idols," like I was for so many years. Understanding does not need to come all at once).<sup>59</sup>

Spedding, who denied believing that Bacon was Shakespeare (although he had once believed Bacon wrote Hamlet<sup>60</sup>), states that Bacon buried his insights in order to protect them from those who would not value them, who would poke fun at his novel ideas, until they had had time to be

tested.<sup>61</sup> Bacon knew he was ahead of his time. He left his written legacy and his good name, in trust, to future generations (us).

In short, there is an abundance of evidence pointing to the fact that the Bard is Bacon—all puns on “barding and larding” aside. Or at least, that he played a major authorial or editorial role.

The case for Bacon requires that good evidence not be ignored simply because it does not fit within the established frame.<sup>62</sup> If it doesn't fit, maybe the problem is not with the picture, but with the frame (“Look not on his picture, but on his book.”—Ben Jonson, First Folio<sup>63</sup>).

---

<sup>1</sup> Much evidence has been accumulated over the past two centuries in favor of Bacon's authorship, and the search continues. See “Candidates, Sir Francis Bacon,” The Shakespearean Authorship Trust, <http://www.shakespeareanauthorshiptrust.org.uk/pages/candidates/bacon.htm>, Peter Dawkins, *The Shakespeare Enigma* (London: Polair, 2004) and Francis Bacon Research Trust (FBRT) website (2016); Francis Bacon's New Advancement of Learning, [www.SirBacon.org](http://www.SirBacon.org); the Francis Bacon Society's journal, *Baconiana*, and lectures on YouTube, Barry R. Clarke, *Francis Bacon's Contribution to Shakespeare: A New Attribution Method* (London: Routledge, 2018); and late barrister N.B. Cockburn's *The Bacon Shakespeare Question: The Baconian Theory Made Sane* (1998).

<sup>2</sup> Francis Macdonald Cornford, *The Origins of Attic Comedy* (London: E. Arnold, 1914), 220.

<sup>3</sup> “De Augmentis,” James S. Spedding, Robert Leslie Ellis and Douglas Denon Heath, eds., *The Works of Francis Bacon, Baron of Verulam, Viscount St. Alban, and Lord High Chancellor of England* 1:635, in Latin (London: Longmans 1857-1874). This is the standard reference. For the 14-volume set, see HathiTrust, <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/006685889>. See also “Quotes of Francis Bacon,” <http://www.sirbacon.org/links/baconquotes.html>.

<sup>4</sup> “Judge: Bacon Wrote Shakespeare's Plays,” *Chicago Tribune*, April 22, 1916, Alchemy of Bones, <http://www.alchemyofbones.com/stories/shakespeare.htm>, copyright Robert Loerzel.

<sup>5</sup> See, e.g., “Bacon's Royal Parentage,” references prepared by Francis Carr and Lawrence Gerald, <http://www.sirbacon.org/links/parentage.htm>; Amelie Deventer Von Kunow, *Francis Bacon, The Last of the Tudors*, trans. Willard Parker, President, Bacon Society of America, (Bacon Society of America, 1924), electronically typed and edited by Juan Schoch, <http://www.sirbacon.org/vonkunow.html>; facsimile, Baptismal Registration of Sir Francis Bacon from St. Martins-in-the-Fields (note Latin word *Custodis* by Nicholas Bacon's name; compare this entry with the others on the page), <http://www.sirbacon.org/baptismalregistration.htm>.

<sup>6</sup> “So may the outward shows be least themselves:/The world is still deceived with ornament.” *The Merchant of Venice*, Act III, Scene 2, 1440-1441, [www.opensourceshakespeare.org](http://www.opensourceshakespeare.org).

<sup>7</sup> See C. Stopes, *The Bacon-Shakespeare Question Answered*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010, first pub. 1889), 199; other famous nineteenth-century anti-Baconians include Andrew Lang, *Shakespeare, Bacon, and the Great Unknown* (London: Longmans, Green, 1912) and John G. Robertson, “The Shakespeare-Bacon Theory,” *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 11<sup>th</sup> ed., 25:786-7 (1911), reprinted in *Theatre History*, <http://www.theatrehistory.com/british/shakespeare030.html>.

<sup>8</sup> “If then it be true that Democritus said, “That the truth of nature lieth hid in certain deep mines and caves...,” trans. of Francis Bacon, “*De Augmentis Scientiarum*,” book 3, caput 3, *Spedding* 1:547 (Latin), 4:343 (transl.), HathiTrust, <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.b3618238>. See Simon Miles, “Francis Bacon and the Merchant of Venice,” Francis Bacon Society lectures, March, 2015, pub. Aug., 2015, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KcQCijc1Mv8>.

<sup>9</sup> As quoted by Francis Carr in “Point-Counterpoint: A Debate With a Stratfordian, Francis Carr and Stanley Wells,” August 13, 1994, <http://www.sirbacon.org/links/debate.html>.

<sup>10</sup> *Spedding* 5:114.

<sup>11</sup> *Spedding* 1:85–86, 113.

<sup>12</sup> <https://shakespeareanauthorship.com/howdowe.html>.

<sup>13</sup> Warren Hope and Kim R. Holston, *The Shakespeare Controversy: An Analysis of the Authorship Theories*, Warren second ed. (Jefferson, NC: MacFarland, 2009), 7–22, 34–46.

---

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

<sup>15</sup> William F. and Elizebeth S. Friedman, *The Shakespearean Ciphers Examined* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958), 188–287, 287; William F. Friedman, lecture 2, “Six Lectures on Cryptology” (1965), 15–36, 30–36; [William] Penn Leary, ch. 7, “Friedman,” *The Cryptographic Shakespeare*, at par. 30 and 4/5 down on the scroll bar, <https://www.baconscipher.com/chapter-seven—friedman>.

<sup>16</sup> Elizabeth Wells Gallup, *The Tragedy of Anne Boleyn, a Drama in Cipher Found in the Works of Sir Francis Bacon...* (Geneva, IL: Riverside Laboratories, 1916); see appendix for important line-by-line detail on the sources, HathiTrust, <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/hvd.hn1czc>. For discussion of the other plays deciphered, see the books by Owen and Gallup collected at their Online Books Pages. See also Christina G. Waldman, *Francis Bacon's Hidden Hand in Shakespeare's 'The Merchant of Venice,'* appendix 2, “The Tragedy of Anne Boleyn,” pp. 227-232 (New York: Algora, 2018).

<sup>17</sup> Jeffrey McQuain and Stanley Malless, *Coined by Shakespeare* (Springfield MS: Merriam–Webster, 1998), 95; “Shakespeare’s Plays Listed by Presumed Date of Composition,” Open Source Shakespeare, George Mason University (2003–2018), [https://www.opensourceshakespeare.org/views/plays/plays\\_date.php](https://www.opensourceshakespeare.org/views/plays/plays_date.php).

<sup>18</sup> Christopher Hill, ch. 3, “Francis Bacon and the Parliamentarians,” *Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution Revisited*, rev. ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 78.

<sup>19</sup> “*Novum Organum*,” book 1, Aphorisms ##93, 124, *Montagu* 3:362, 369, HathiTrust, <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=njp.32101068998507;view=1up;seq=7>. For more on Bacon’s early use of “hint,” see Waldman, *Francis Bacon's Hidden Hand*, p. 4, n. 2.

<sup>20</sup> See Francis Bacon, “*De Augmentis*,” book 2, *Spedding* 4:304–305: “...a truer picture of human life may be found in a satire than in some histories of this kind.” Chapters 1–12 of the *De Augmentis* all address history, one of Bacon’s three divisions of learning into history, poesy, and philosophy.

<sup>21</sup> Barry Clarke, “The Virginia Company and the Tempest,” <http://barryispuzzled.com/VirginiaCoTempest>; [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/258437287\\_The\\_Virginia\\_Company\\_and\\_The\\_Tempest](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/258437287_The_Virginia_Company_and_The_Tempest).

<sup>22</sup> See, e.g., N. B. Cockburn, ch. 14, “The Hall and Marston Satires and a Freeman Epigram,” *The Bacon Shakespeare Question*, 184–209; Walter Begley, “New Evidence—Hall’s Satires,” *Nova Resuscitatio*, vol. 2 (London: Gay & Bird, 1905), 22–31; Peter Dawkins, “Labeo is Shakespeare is Bacon,” FBRT, 1–12; Barry R. Clarke, appendix E, “The Hall–Marston Satires,” *The Shakespeare Puzzle: A Non–Esoteric Baconian Theory*, 228–234, <http://barryispuzzled.com/shakpuzz.pdf>; Walter Saunders, “The Identification of ‘Labeo’ and ‘Mutius’ as Francis Bacon in Hall and Marston’s Satires” (2011), <http://sirbacon.org/wsaundersHallandMarston.htm>.

<sup>23</sup> *Spedding* 8:109; Jürgen Klein, “Francis Bacon,” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, first pub. Dec. 29, 2003, subst. rev. Dec. 7, 2012, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/francis-bacon/>.

<sup>24</sup> See Daniel R. Coquillette, *Francis Bacon* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992), ch. 2, pp. 70-6, ch. 5, pp. 236-256, 248, 270, fn. 149; Waldman, ch. 2, pp. 46-51, ch. 6, pp. 115-118, ch. 12, pp. 203-209; on the Inns of Court, see Coquillette, pp. 9-10 and, generally, Jessica Winston, *Lawyers at Play* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

<sup>25</sup> Mrs. Henry (Constance) Pott, *The “Promus” of Formularies and Elegancies (being private notes, circulated 1594, being hitherto unpublished, by Francis Bacon, illustrated and elucidated with passages from Shakespeare*, HathiTrust, <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/100377288>.

<sup>26</sup> Edwin Reed, *Coincidences Bacon and Shakespeare* (Boston: Coburn, 1906).

<sup>27</sup> Download a copy of Bacon’s *Promus* from <http://www.sirbacon.org/newpage.htm>.

<sup>28</sup> March 28, 1603 letter of Francis Bacon to John Davies, *Spedding* 10:65.

<sup>29</sup> N. B. Cockburn, ch. 22, “The Tobie Matthew Postscript,” 255–276.

<sup>30</sup> See excerpts from A. E. Loosley, “Francis Bacon and the James 1<sup>st</sup> Bible,” William Smedley, “The Authorized Version of the Bible 1611,” *The Mystery of Francis Bacon*, ch. 27; Tony Bushby, “What Was the Church Trying to Hide?” *The Bible Fraud*, ch. 1, <http://www.sirbacon.org/links/bible.html>. See also “The Christianity of Francis Bacon” from a presentation by the late Professor Benjamin Farrington,” author of several books and translations of Bacon’s works, <http://www.sirbacon.org/farrington.htm>.

<sup>31</sup> “*De Augmentis*,” book 6, *Spedding* 4:496, HathiTrust, <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/hvd.hn6e7y>.

<sup>32</sup> Peter Dawkins, “Francis Bacon’s Life,” 4, fn. 7 and “The Bacon Brothers and France,” 1, Essays, FBRT, <https://www.fbrrt.org.uk/pages/essays.html>.

<sup>33</sup> Richard Whalen, “Commedia dell’arte in ‘Othello’: A Satiric Comedy Ending in Tragedy,” *Brief Chronicles*, ed. Roger Strittmatter, 3:71-106, 83 (2011–2012).

- 
- <sup>34</sup> Brian Vickers, ed., "Principal events in Bacon's life," *The History of the Reign of King Henry VII* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), xxxvi.
- <sup>35</sup> J. Clair, *The Great Parade, The Great Parade: Portrait of the Artist as Clown*, ed. Jean Clair (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 350.
- <sup>36</sup> Dawkins, "Francis Bacon's Life," FBRT, 4.
- <sup>37</sup> *Spedding* 6:417, HathiTrust, <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/hvd.32044058286733>.
- <sup>38</sup> *Spedding* 8:326.
- <sup>39</sup> *Spedding* 8:326–342.
- <sup>40</sup> *Spedding* 8:327.
- <sup>41</sup> Brian Vickers, intro., *Francis Bacon, a Critical Edition of the Major Works* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), xxiv to xxix.
- <sup>42</sup> *Spedding* 14:374.
- <sup>43</sup> *Spedding* 6:467. See Brian Vickers, "Bacon's Use of Theatrical Imagery", *Studies in the Literary Imagination*, 4: 189–226 (1971).
- <sup>44</sup> Claire Asquith, *Shadowplay, The Hidden Beliefs and Coded Politics of William Shakespeare* (Public Affairs: New York 2006), 29.
- <sup>45</sup> "Bacon, Francis..., 1558–1603," History of Parliament Trust (HPT), <https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1558–1603/member/bacon-francis-1561–1626>.
- <sup>46</sup> "Bacon, Francis..., 1558–1603," HPT; "Bacon, Francis..., 1604–1629," HPT, <https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1604–1629/member/bacon-sir-francis-1561–1626>.
- <sup>47</sup> Barry Clarke, "My Shakespeare—Francis Bacon," in William Leahy, *My Shakespeare* (Brighton, UK: Edward Everett Root, 2018), 163–189, 163–183.
- <sup>48</sup> Edwin J. Des Moineaux, *Manuscript Said to be Handwriting of William Shakespeare Identified as Penmanship of Another Person, Mystery of "Sir Thomas More" Document Unravelled* (printed for the author, 1924); Cover of *Sir Thomas More*, <http://www.sirbacon.org/stmcover.htm>; Directory of *Sir Thomas More*, <http://www.sirbacon.org/stmcontents.htm>; contra, N. B. Cockburn, ch. 39, "A Play Called *Sir Thomas More*," *The Bacon Shakespeare Question*, 634–646, 646.
- <sup>49</sup> Maureen Ward–Gandy, "Elizabethan Era Writing Comparison for Identification of Common Authorship," orig. examined for Francis Carr, 24 July 1992, reviewed for Mr. Lawrence Gerald, 2 July 1994, Waldman, *Francis Bacon's Hidden Hand*, appendix 4, "Handwriting on the Wall," 247–274.
- <sup>50</sup> *The Collected Works of Francis Bacon, Lord Chancellor...*, edited by Basil Montagu (hereinafter, *Montagu*), in three volumes, 2: 396, 406, reprinted from Thomas Tension's *Baconiana...* (London, 1679); "Shakespeare," FBRT, <https://www.fbrt.org.uk/pages/shakespeare.html>.
- <sup>51</sup> E.g., *Spedding* 14:406, 429, HathiTrust, <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/006685889>.
- <sup>52</sup> See, e.g., the debate: "Who Wrote Shakespeare? Sir Jonathan Bate & Alexander Waugh," How to: Academy, pub. Sept. 26, 2017, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HqImgdJ5L6o>.
- <sup>53</sup> Robert Schuler, 'Bacon and Lucretius' in "Francis Bacon and Scientific Poetry," *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 82, no. 2 (1992): 1-65, 34-42. JSTOR. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3231921>.
- <sup>54</sup> H. Floris Cohen, ch. 7, "The Third Transformation: To Find Facts Through Experiment," *How Modern Science Came Into the World* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2010), OAPEN, 245–270, 245–248, <https://www.oapen.org/download?type=d:ocument&docid=406703>; Jürgen Klein, "Francis Bacon," *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, first pub. Dec. 29, 2003, subst. rev. Dec. 7, 2012, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/francis-bacon/>.
- <sup>55</sup> Daniel R. Coquillette, ch. 2, "The Initial Jacobean Works," *Francis Bacon*, in Jurists: Profiles in Legal Theory (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992), 96, citing Benjamin Farrington, *The Philosophy of Francis Bacon* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1964), 131. Bacon frequently used the bee metaphor in his writings.
- <sup>56</sup> See, e.g., Sunny Chen, "The Importance of Creative Arts in Early Childhood Education," Novak Djokovic Foundation, July 16, 2016, <https://novakdjokovicfoundation.org/importance-creative-arts-ece/>.
- <sup>57</sup> As told by Bishop Goodman. *Spedding, Letters and the Life*, VI, p. 222, fn 2.
- <sup>58</sup> Nieves Matthews, ch. 2, "That Angel From Paradise," *The History of a Character Assassination* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 7–16.
- <sup>59</sup> See Manly P. Hall, "The Four Idols of Francis Bacon and the New Instrument of Knowledge," <http://www.sirbacon.org/links/4idols.htm>; Jürgen Klein, Francis Bacon, *Stanford Encyclopedia of*

---

*Philosophy*, sec. 3.1 (2003, substantially revised 2012), <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/francis-bacon/#ldo>; Coquillette, ch. 2, "The Initial Jacobean Works," *Francis Bacon*, pp. 92-93 and ch. 5, "The Final Vision," *Francis Bacon*, pp. 228-231.

<sup>60</sup> James Spedding's Feb. 15, 1867 letter to Nathaniel Holmes, repr. by Lochithea in *Baconian Reference Book*, "Commentarius Solutus," part 3, 596 (New York: iUniverse, Inc. 2009),

[https://archive.org/stream/BaconianReferenceBook/baconian\\_reference\\_book\\_archive\\_djvu.txt](https://archive.org/stream/BaconianReferenceBook/baconian_reference_book_archive_djvu.txt), from Nathaniel Holmes, appendix, *The Authorship of Shakespeare 2*: 612-618 (Boston, 1894); Alan Stewart, "The Case for Bacon," in *Shakespeare Beyond Doubt: Evidence, Argument, Controversy*, ed. Paul Edmondson and Stanley Wells (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 16–29, 21–22.)

<sup>61</sup> *Spedding* 1:85–86, 113.

<sup>62</sup> "De Augmentis," *Spedding* 4:14-15: "For when men have once made over their judgments to others' keeping...and have agreed to support some one person's opinion, from that time they make no enlargement of the sciences themselves, but fall to the servile office of embellishing certain authors or increasing their revenue."

<sup>63</sup> See Alan Farmer, "Shakespeare and the Book," with images from the Columbia Rare Book and Manuscript Library; Columbia Center for New Media Teaching and Learning, <http://ccnmtl.columbia.edu/projects/shakespeareandthebook/studyenv/author02.html>; Simon Miles, "The Prank of the Face, Unmasking the 'Droeshout Portrait of William Shakespeare,'" <http://sirbacon.org/The-Prank-of-the-Face.html>; "Mysteries of the First Folio, Episode 7 with Katherine Chiljan," *The Shakespeare Underground*, 2019, <https://www.theshakespeareunderground.com/mysteries-of-the-first-folioepisode-7-with-katherine-chiljan/>.