BACONIANA

FRANCISCVS BACON
EXORTVS VTI ÆTHEREVS SOL

Lewis Biddulph,
Cairo, Egypt.

Jan - Oct

VOL. VIII., NEW SERIES, 1900.

BACONIANA.

EDITED BY

A SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE BACON SOCIETY.

FOR THE GLORY OF THE CREATOR AND THE RELIEF OF MAN'S ESTATE

Published Quarterly.
Annual Subscription, Five Shillings, post free.

LONDON: ROBERT BANKS & SON.
RACQUET COURT, FLEET STREET. E.C

CONTENTS.

PAGE

Francis (Bacon) Lord High Chancellor of England... 5

Stenography, or Shorthand Writing, in the time of Queen Elizabeth, 28, 151

A Peep Behind the Curtain of the Dark 30

"Anthony and Cleopatra" and "Julius Cæsar" 35

An Explanation 50

Baconism—Past, Present and Future 53

"Timon of Athens" 63

The Ciphers of Almazan, 1485 – 1509 76

"The Comedy of Errors" 80

Francis Bacon's Friends and Associates 83

Canonbury, Tower, and Crosby Hall; Sir Thomas More, and Lord Verulam 94, 144

Let it be Enquired 100

Feigned Lives 101, 179

Chronicle Plays, Nos. 4 and 5 ... . 114, 160

Errors and Omissions in Printing, Pagination and Indexes 136

General Meeting of the Bacon Society 149

Francis Bacon's Biliteral Cipher 153

Franc-Baconry from the German Standpoint 191

Reviews, "The Cipher in the Plays and on the Tombstone," by Donnelly 150

,, "Shaksper not Shakespeare," by W. H. Edwards 194

Correspondence, Notices, &c. 51, 52, 151, 192

INDEX.

PAGE

lleyn, Edward ... 85, 86
"Alphabet," Bacon's ... 25
"Anthony and Cleopatra" ... 35—50
Aubrey ... 15
Bacon, Anthony ... 13
Bacon, Delia ... 53
Bacon, Francis, Character of 6—27, 103—110
,, ,, A Concealed Poet 20—26
,, ,, Defence of the Theatre ... 20, 84
Bacon, Francis, Friends of 10, 83
,, ,, Love for Marguerite of France ... 156
Bacon, Francis, Note Books ... 22
,, ,, Sentence on Essex 13, 158
,, ,, Son of Queen Elizabeth ... 155
Francis Bacon, Style ... 55
,, ,, Version of Psalms 21
Bacon, Lady Anne ... 20, 155
Bacon, Society ... 53, 149
Baconism ... 53
Balo, Peter ... 29
Baumont ... 86, 90
Boehner, Peter ... 29
Bright, T. ... 28
Brotherhood, A Secret ... 24, 25, 61
Browne ... 87
Brunswick, Duke of ... 191
Burghley ... 12
Bushel ... 192
Canonbury Tower ... 94, 114, 192
Carey, or Carew ... 87
Cary, James, Jun. ... 60
Chronicle Plays, The ... 114, 160
Cipher in Bacon's Time ... 23, 60, 153
,, Bacon's Biliteral 50, 51, 59, 153
,, Clock ... 60
Ciphers, Spanish ... 76
"Comedy of Errors," at Gray's Inn 80
Constable ... 89
Cowley ... 88
Cunningham, Peter ... 85
Davies, John ... 90

PAGE

Donne ... 91
Donnelly, I. ... 59, 150
Dyer ... 91
Edwards, W. H. ... 194
Elizabeth, Queen ... 60
,, ,, Secret marriage with Leicester ... 30, 155
Elizabeth, Queen, Mother of Bacon and Essex ... 155, 157
Ellesmere, Letter to Lord ... 54
Essex, Earl of, Son of Elizabeth ... 157
,, ,, Treason of ... 157
,, ,, Bacon's conduct towards ... 13, 158
"Essex, Tragedy of" ... 50
"Feigned Lives" ... 103, 179
Fleet, Charles ... 31
Fletcher ... 90
Folio, The 1623 ... 188
Franc-Baconry ... 191
Fulcher, Fleming ... 149
Fulgentius. Biographer of Salpi... 177
,, Correspondence with Bacon ... 83, 179
Galileo ... 83
Gallup, Mrs. "Bacon's Biliteral Cipher" ... 50, 60, 153
Gibson, The Hon. Harry ... 60
Gibson MSS. ... 85
Gould ... 60
Gray's Inn Revels ... 80
Guntor, Arthur. Confession concerning Leicester ... 30—34
Hawthorne, Nathaniel ... 54
Haydon, John ... 24
Henslowe's Diary ... 85
Herbert, The Family of ... 90
Inductive Philosophy ... 57
Jonson, Ben ... 10, 21, 90, 102
"Julius Cæsar" ... 35
Kemp, Robert ... 89
Kesselstadt Death Mask ... 149
Leicester, Earl of. Marriage with Elizabeth ... 31, 34, 155
Libraries ... 62
Lilly ... 82

PAGE
Macaulay. On character of Bacon 6 - 27
Mary, Queen of Scotland 50
Matthew, Sir Toby... 10, 19, 25, 102
"Measure for Measure" 19
Montagu, Basil 10
Montaigne 13
More, Sir Thomas 144
Owen, Dr. Orville 50, 60
Pagination, Errors in 136
Peel 82
Portraits of Bacon and Shakspeare 149
Preyer, Dr. Wilhelm 60
Rawley 10, 21, 91, 102
Register of Birth and Death wanted 52
Robsart, Amy, Death of 30
Rosicrucians 25
Sarpi, Paola, Feigned Life of ... 179
Sidney, Sir Philip 91, 92
PAGE
Smith, William Henry 54
Spencer 92, 95
Spenser 92
Sprat 89
"State of Europe." By Bacon ... 7
Stenography in time of Elizabeth 28, 151
Tanner, E. V. 60
Tennison Collection, The 85
"Timon of Athens" 60
Trento, Baptista di... 31
Trinity College 19
Virginia Colony 86
Wells, Miss 52
White, William 5, 51
Wigston, W. F. C. ... 35, 75, 135, 179
Willis, John 29
Wolfenbuttel Castle 191

London: Printed by ROBERT BANKS & SON, Racquet Court, Fleet Street.

Baconiana.

Vol. VIII.—*New Series.* JANUARY, 1900. No. 29.

FRANCIS (BACON), LORD HIGH CHANCELLOR OF ENGLAND.

"WHAT'S in a name?" According to the old proverb, if you give a good dog a bad name he may just as well swing for it, without mercy and without redress. And if somewhat similar treatment be meted out to a man, very much the same again may be said of him. Suspicion will pursue him and attach to his memory. If a false evil report be spread by rivals, or by such as are not themselves quite innocent, it is all the same. The report will gain more following, and make more way, than sober fact or sound argument. It was a startling illustration of the force of evil report and popular prejudice, when not long ago such a censure as this was cast upon the memory of Francis (Bacon), Baron Verulam, Viscount S. Alban:—"I will throw all argument to the winds; I will listen to nothing that would reflect the least credit upon that scoundrel." This was not the thoughtless utterance of a young, untaught, unintelligent, person, but of an eminent scientist, whose opinion on physical matters is entitled to great and deserved respect. Even professed historians are not wholly free from misapprehensions and prejudices; from which their studies do not always enable them to escape. If historians err it is not commonly through wilful misrepresentation of facts, but rather from misinterpreting or exaggerating them; or from attributing to the person concerned motives and conduct which might be suggested by supposed facts, yet which might be equally suggestive of the contrary. Traditional prejudices have a marked hold upon existing popular opinion; and if no satisfactory motive or reason be discovered for a man's questionable conduct, it is natural and easy to invent one. If there be the slightest doubt or uncertainty about the fact itself, the judgment respecting it is just as likely to be false as true.

Lord Macaulay well expresses and with undeniable force and precision, his own unconscious failing; when he warns his readers that "the fanaticism of the devout worshipper of genius is proof against all evidence and all argument." He even naively makes this remarkable acknowledgment :—"My accuracy as to facts I owe to a cause which many men would not confess. It is due to my love of castle building." We certainly are not accustomed to regard castle building as a pursuit at all likely to establish the truth, or historic accuracy of facts, especially as to small details, howsoever well it may strengthen or establish the conviction, or impressions of truths, or of untruths, already conceived.

In dealing with admitted historical difficulties, as to the life and true character of Lord S. Alban, more familiarly if not so correctly known at the present day as "Lord Bacon," we can but endeavour, however humbly and imperfectly, to sustain the high repute in the world's estimation, to which he is entitled, and chiefly under that mysterious circumstance of his life which has been ominously called his "fall," but which may much more truly be said to have been his great moral victory ; in spite of all the worldly loss that it entailed, and all the ill-feeling and the ill-fame that followed in its trail. We can but aim at combating the false traditions, the mistaken notions, the unfortunate prejudices, which have gathered around his memory, and which in the opinion of many have left a lasting stain upon his character ; at dispelling the doubt and hesitation, not to say antagonism, with which so many receive anything that may be urged in his favour. It will be useless to attempt this merely by acclamation of his virtues, or by declamation of the aspersions cast upon him, without bringing together a few important facts, unreasonable deductions, and false arguments which have led to existing doubts as to his life and conduct. We are the more concerned to do this inasmuch as his name has been of late years, brought much into public prominence. And at the present day when commercial corruption is rife, when public "company-making" is followed as a personal speculating business ; when illicit commissions are privately given and accepted as honourable transactions, and when patronage is largely bestowed upon money rather than upon merit, the memory of the great and the good ought to be jealously guarded from false calumnies, which might serve to furnish a questionable example for the conduct of the unscrupulous and evil.

When a taint of corruption and evil-doing has been allowed to attach, whether through the wilful, or through the unwitting misrepresentation of historians, or of others who may have failed to clear their own fame, the difficulty of approaching such a subject with a reasonable hope of removing traditional prejudices is indeed great. Nevertheless it ought to be by no means insurmountable, if only we can make up for the scant and lagging justice which has been awarded to the memory of a man who would innocently and meekly suffer injustice or injury, rather than resent it, or even choose to plead for the public vindication of his own character and conduct. His name should be transmitted to posterity as unsullied; and freed from the unjust aspersion cast upon it by those who have simply endorsed the unjust calumnies raised by former enemies, or rivals, against the judgment and the testimony of those who knew him best, and were familiar with his daily life as well as with his political aims and difficulties.

The "Popular Encyclopedia" tells us that "he was the most remarkable man of whom any age can boast." When nineteen years old he wrote a work entitled, "Of the State of Europe" in which he gave the most astonishing proofs of the early maturity of his judgment. Subsequently "he soared to such a height that his contemporaries could not fully estimate the extent of his genius, the justness of his views, and the importance of his labours." And no one has disputed his marvellous powers. But too many have joined in the common condemnation of his conduct, without sufficient enquiry. Respecting this, Professor Nichol writes, "No mind like Bacon's, living through its duration, and grand ideas, ought to be suspected of voluntary descent to utter meanness, unless on evidence which concerning the actions charged against him, has not come assuredly from that age. Dissimulation indeed, corruption, treachery to friendship—it matters not what the mind may be that is guilty of them, the acts are mean and the mind foul. But the error in the popular judgment lies here, dissimulation and corruption are inferred on the strength of obscure circumstances, and without the necessary enquiry!"

At the time when Bacon lived, we know that amongst many of those with whom he had to do, the circumstances would be purposely obscured, in order to disguise their own guilt and to shift the disgrace on to him. We have the best reasons for believing that the black stigma attaching to his name is absolutely unjust. He lived at the close of a dark period of English literature and of English history; and he ventured to work out single-handed a reformation not only in the teachings of philosophy, but also of social and official life; which were at that time, greatly and generally corrupted. The amount of animosity thus stirred up may be readily imagined. He became the natural enemy of such as considered it of small moment whether fair means or foul, truth or falsehood, should be employed in their daily intercourse and official transactions. And they would transmit to posterity their own distorted views of his unblemished character. Thus it is that we find such a gloomy catalogue of weaknesses and defects registered against him; to be countervailed, on the other hand, by the sterling appreciation of his character expressed by those who knew him the most intimately, and were the most fully acquainted with his high aims and his noble deeds. It is hopeless to expect a definite, trustworthy, account of his life and character, expect from such as really knew him. There is no name in history which has been so canvassed and criticised. On the one hand, special attention has been called to his narrowness of mind; to his mean and cowardly conduct. He has been termed servile, a flatterer, fawning on the great; intriguing, selfish and money-loving; from mere vanity and ambition hunting after place and power; arrogant; boasting of his influence; hypocritical, proud, lacking elevation of sentiment; low and utilitarian in his philosophy; a faithless time-serving friend; ungrateful, unloved as he was unloving; cruel even to animals; an inequitable judge, perfidious; corrupt in his judicial sentences; receiving bribes to pervert justice; without any sense of humour; never making a pun or a quibble; without poetry; without any imagination of the higher type; irreligious; tolerant in religious matters, even to indifference.

We need not fear, we need not hesitate, to give in detail this category of his imaginary faults, well knowing how false the imputations are. We must boldly face the difficulties inseparable from the vindication of his character; and show his innocence of the grave charges which have been made, but never proved. It is not surprising that in the corrupted condition of society at that period, ignorant reports should everywhere be reiterated and gain the day. The friends of aggrieved evil-doers would not be likely to listen to those who pleaded the positive side of his character, who esteemed him for his sterling worth, and were not misled by malicious misrepresentations and misinterpretations of his motives and conduct. The only marvel is that we should still find so full and so interesting an account of his character, of good actions done from the highest and purest of motives, under exceptionally trying and difficult circumstances. He was said to have inherited as rich a profusion of virtues as ever adorned a noble nature. He was generous, open-hearted, peculiarly sensible to kindness, equally forgetful of injuries; altogether too vast and grand to be an easy flatterer; so far from being servile, he did not sufficiently cultivate the courtly subservience required in those days; he was regardless of money, place or power for their own sakes; but he was desirous of a provision which might enable him to devote himself to literature; he strove for money and position only that he might use them for the good of all, to advance learning, science and religion; he was of a patient, conciliatory nature; a man most sweet in his conversation and ways; ever a countenancer and fosterer of other men's parts, being himself, retiring, nervous, sensitive, unconventional, modest; he was of a sanguine, hopeful spirit, without arrogance or pride; he was lofty in sentiment, truly great, always candid and accurate; unalterable to his friends; no man knew better, or felt more deeply, the duties of friendship; all who were good and great honoured him as one of the greatest of men and most worthy of admiration; it is not his greatness that we admire, but his goodness; his kindness and tenderness of heart; his love of animals and flowers; he was in no way responsible for the torturing of criminals, which he deprecated as cruel, and strove to suppress. He was a profound student of human nature; a patriot; politically bold and independent on important matters; he was an equitable judge; his judgment were neither questioned nor reversed. The lofty and gentle course which he took in the events culminating in the trial and condemnation of Essex commanded the admiration of all his contemporaries, save of a faction of the defeated band, of such as joined with Essex in his rebellion. With this we must deal more in detail presently.

Then again we are told that Bacon was the most prodigious wit that ever lived; fond of quibbles could not pass a jest, his speech was nobly censorious; his imagination was of the highest order; he was highly poetical; possessing every faculty and gift of a true poet, but "concealed," the poetic faculty was strong in his mind; his very prose was poetry. He had the liveliest fancy and most active imagination. He was truly religious, he was conversant with God; and able to render a reason for the hope that was in him. Such is the concurrent testimony of his friends. In the face of such conflicting traditional testimony, it might seem at first sight hopeless to rely for certainty upon either of the accounts given. But, if we can trace to their origin the causes from which the calumnies sprang, we shall certainly be one good step nearer the truth. Both accounts cannot possibly be correct; nor can even a compound mixture of them be so.

Let us then examine a little more closely into two incidents which gave rise to grave charges against him in the first instance. Apart from these and from the popular clamour to which they gave rise, nothing has occurred to contradict the general goodfeeling which was always entertained towards him.

His manful attempt to remedy certain evils quietly, without ostentation and without the public exposure of those concerned, cost him his position and brought him into undeserved disgrace. The common but discreditable custom of paying fees into Court, prior to the hearing of a suit, although in many cases a necessity, had opened the door to grave irregularities, which he himself repudiated and endeavoured to suppress. The charges against him arose mainly from the prejudiced misstatements of the friends of some who had suffered under his bold and straightforward conduct in the perplexing difficulties of the day, and from his unflinching administration of justice. There were of course those who would naturally resent the smallest interference with their assumed prerogatives, when their illegal perquisites began to be diminished and endangered.

Whether as a politician or as a justiciary, a philosopher or man of the world, there is in English history no nobler character than that of Francis Bacon. Yet no one has been more misapprehended, more misrepresented, more maligned, than he has been by Lord Macaulay, under cover of a true appreciation of his transcendant merits. Whilst ignoring what was said of him by his secretary, Ben Jonson, his chaplain Dr. Rawley, or his friends, Sir Tobie Matthew and others, Macaulay seizes upon a new edition of the "Life of Bacon and His Works," by Basil Montagu, "of whose minute and accurate researches" he speaks nevertheless in the highest terms. But he is said to have entertained a sort of contemptuous antagonism to Montagu. He proceeds, therefore, to spend his ingenuity and his eloquence in denouncing Montagu's arguments as reckless and inconclusive, as of a wild enthusiast. He exerts his whole powers to prove Bacon's mean, and debased, and debasing conduct; and his depraved moral instincts and sentiments to have been utterly at variance with his general life and character, as a man of the highest intellect, culture, and research. He becomes merely a special pleader against the true historian as well as against the subject of his history. He valiantly occupies, all the way through, the very place and the very character which he himself invokes against Montagu, as the great *avvocato del diavolo*, and by a distortion of facts he represents the great, the wise, the virtuous hero of philosophy, of literature, and of romance, as the author of cruel, selfish acts, which subsequently overwhelmed him in remorse and shame. He proclaims some of Bacon's superior external qualities in order to contrast them with his hidden, selfish, villainy. He sets him on the highest pinnacle, that he may the more completely cast him down thence. He speaks of him as patient, placable, amiable, and pre-eminently courteous, even to servility. He recognises some of his more brilliants parts, the riches and power of his mind; his highly-gifted intellect, even claiming for him a true poetic genius of the highest order. But he regards his moral character, as exhibited in his actions, low, mean, base, and contemptible. He calls him cold and calculating, unfeeling and cruel; mercenary and avaricious; wanting in all high sentiment of friendship and affection. In illustration of this, he quotes, as a striking instance, one in which Bacon—conceived by him to be seeking only his own ambition and serving his own personal interests—had sacrificed the friendship and affection of the youthful Earl of Essex. Macaulay determines to "ban Bacon with faint praise," and then to pile upon him a mountain of moral faults of which he was utterly incapable, and from which his noble nature would instinctively shrink. "The moral qualities of Bacon," he says, "were not of a high order. We do not say that he was a bad man. He was not inhuman or tyrannical." Yet he takes special pains to prove him as such. "He bore with meekness his high civil honours, and the far higher honours gained by his intellect. He was very seldom, if ever, provoked into treating any person with malignity and insolence," and so on. But then he goes on to say, "Bacon's faults were," we write it with pain, "coldness of heart and meanness of spirit. He seems to have been incapable of feeling strong affection, of facing great danger, of making great sacrifices. His desires were set upon things below—wealth, precedence, titles, patronage, the mace, the seals, the coronet, large houses, fair gardens, rich manors, many services of plate, gay hangings, curious cabinets, had as great an attraction for him as any of the courtiers who dropped on their knees in the dirt when Elizabeth passed by."

Yet we find in Bacon's conduct a self-sacrifice than which none more notable, none more noble, has been recorded in the annals of English history. Certainly, he had the ambition earnestly to sue for place of some sort, where he might gain profitable employment for his support. Yet here was a man of the highest social position, of the rarest intellect, desiring work, but despairing of it, burning with desire to amend laws and reform abuses; ready to labour for the good of his country, but left for years with the barest means, whether of keeping up his social position or of actual subsistence; again and again left out of office and employment by the jealousies of official personages and relations, and he was often reduced to the greatest straits. A reasonable cause for the determined, persistent refusal of Lord Burleigh, and of the Queen, to advance Francis Bacon has not yet been proved. Doubtless it arose from State complications of which no account could openly be given. It might merely be the knowledge that his promotion would cause difficulties and jealousies with other influential persons. It has been attributed to the enmity which existed between Sir Robert Cecil and the Earl of Essex, who was a confrere of Bacon's, but there were certainly other and deeper reasons.

When at last Bacon was called to office he performed his duties with such exemplary diligence and justice as to prove the truth of all that has ever been said in his favour, and to gain the admiration of all except a few powerful partisans, whose personal interests became endangered, and who eventually succeeded in taking advantage of a false accusation of misdemeanour, from which his character has not yet wholly recovered. In cleansing the Augean stables he was naturally, and mercilessly attacked by those who had hitherto tended them. That he should escape wholly unscathed would have been a still greater wonder under the circumstances than that his heroism should have failed to meet with its due reward. There was a reticence in his manner, with a nervousness and a shyness which led to his being much misunderstood, and gave rise to an appearance of indecision. Macaulay's treatment of Bacon, it is true, is but little worse than that of some of his predecessors, such as we find in the preface to a "New Edition of the Essays," in 1813; except that Macaulay goes on to give illustrations of Bacon's assumed moral corruptness and guilt; which nevertheless, and even in accordance with his own statements, he fails to prove. All that he succeeds in proving is that Bacon would not suffer his friendship for the Earl of Essex to blind his eyes to the public safety and to the public welfare; or to his own supreme sense of duty; that although he went so far as to do what he could to restrain the folly of his friend, yet he would not appear as a partaker and abettor of it, by throwing his ægis of protection over one who, against his warnings and expostulations, had turned traitor to his Queen and country in an openly incited rebellion. Had Bacon spoken in his favour, Macaulay's imaginative indignation might have found more fitting and more worthy scope for his eloquent denunciations; and he might then have shown himself more competent to express an unprejudiced opinion upon a question of exalted sentiment. The ablest and most conscientious counsel in the kingdom is denounced by Macaulay as treacherous and unfeeling towards his friend, simply because he performed without flinching his highest and most solemn duty in a manner, such as, at once, to subdue a smouldering sedition. Macaulay assumed that Bacon's affection should find expression in condoning a crime which must have been repulsive to his very nature; that in order to serve his friend he should ignore his positive duty and smother his conscience; that he should do that which would be popular amongst those whom Macaulay condemns as worthless and corrupt. It may be quite true, as Macaulay says, that the generous and ardent Earl had pleaded earnestly on behalf of Francis Bacon for the solicitorship—too earnestly, in fact, for success. And failing in this, he had even presented him with an estate. But so far as personal motives can be truly traced, even this must have been done partly from the sense of benefits received, or from a still more lively sense of favours to come. It may have been partly from a consciousness of undischarged debt which he owed to Antony as well as Francis, for years of assistance rendered without salary, and large expenses incurred during the period of Antony's employment as his secretary. Again, to quote in this matter, Macaulay's own deliberate verdict, "Nothing in the political conduct of Essex entitles him to esteem; and the pity with which we regard his early and terrible end, is diminished by the consideration that he put to hazard the lives and fortunes of his most attached friends, and endeavoured to throw the whole country into confusion for objects purely personal." "His mind, naturally ardent, susceptible, disposed to admiration of all that is good and beautiful, was fascinated by the genius and accomplishments of Bacon." Such is the friend for whom Macaulay claims Bacon's affectionate and unalienable attachment and regard; calling him cold, cruel, and faithless for not sacrificing his position, conscience, and honour, possibly his own life, to his defence. And yet Macaulay admits that Bacon had sincerely exerted himself to serve Essex, and that he did all in his power to dissuade him from accepting the government of Ireland, which proved such a disastrous failure; even as Bacon had forewarned him. And when Essex is accused of a capital crime, of which, according to Macaulay, from the nature of the circumstances, there could not be the smallest doubt that the Earl would be found guilty; Macaulay's fertile imagination forthwith discovers that Bacon was hard and callous, serving his own personal interests, sacrificing the sacred ties of friendship to his own personal ambition, because he fulfilled without fear or favour, probably with great and lifelong pain and sorrow, the duties of his official position. Thus it is that Bacon is said to have "employed all his rhetoric to shut out Essex from mercy when employed as counsel against his friend," a friend who had scorned his advice, and had out of a vain and reckless ambition, aimed at doing some deed of daring, ostensibly it may be for the freedom and honour of his country, and had hastened, though wholly unfitted for it, to undertake the government of Ireland which culminated in his overthrow; "of a deeply attached friend," who, by a treacherous trick, had succeeded in locking up the then Lord Keeper in an inner chamber, together with other high State officials, whilst he rushed out, sword in hand, with a band of his followers, to raise a rebellion on his own behalf, which he had been fomenting and fostering amongst the people against his Sovereign. Yet Macaulay poses in an attitude of lofty moral sentiment and maintains that Bacon should have sacrificed his conscience and his supreme sense of duty to private feeling. Bacon's first duty was only unflinchingly performed when he used his eloquence, his learning, and his power, to defend the honour of his Queen and country. Had he shrunk from this, a far graver indictment must have been made against him and with greater justice. He had failed himself to restrain Essex, and now to have condoned his treason, would have shown unjustifiable weakness in the execution of his duty, conducive to anything but his own honour, or the vindication of justice, and so far as we can judge, Bacon's very restraint of his personal feelings must have been to him the most severe trial of his life.

Macaulay having thus made discovery of Bacon's sordid and ambitious motive, had no difficulty in finding further scope for his eloquence, in attributing similiar motives to other acts of Bacon's public life, a few years later, in which his character was assailed by unscrupulous and inculpated persons. He fancied he had discovered Bacon's cruelty in the torture of Peacham ; of which Bacon did not approve ; and with which he had nothing to do but to bear official witness of it ; of its uselessness and cruelty. At that period we know that all sorts of illegal practices, and all sorts of legal pretences, were brought into requisition, upon which the gravest doubts hung, whether as to their equity, their policy, or their utility ; upon which such profound judges as Coke and Bacon might well entertain very opposite opinions. Yet no account is taken by Macaulay of the very obvious difficulties to be encountered in the conduct of such cases, under existing conditions. At one fell swoop he will dispose of all Bacon's decisions and actions, judging them by alleged, but wholly unproved motives of sordid selfishness and ambition, instead of by the known and acknowledged superiority not only of his intellect, but of his moral and sympathetic instincts also. This is bad enough, but there is worse to come. Macaulay charges Bacon with corruptly receiving bribes for the perversion of justice ; and he interprets his confession and humiliation "as an unmistakable recognition and admission of his guilt." Whereas it was not so. It was a purely formal legal confession in order to avoid an unjust tribunal. Bacon's officials had persuaded a poor suitor named Aubrey that a present of £100 would set matters right with the Lord Chancellor, and the money was paid in. No evidence is adduced to show that Bacon knew personally anything about the transaction, or ever received the money, whereas there is good ground for saying, as is stated by Macaulay himself, that it was these officials who had misled the suitor, against whom "a killing sentence" was pronounced; by the still impartial judge, notwithstanding their futile attempt to obtain a judgment in the suitor's favour. Then, excepting that a sum of £400 was involved, there was another charge of the same sort affording ample ground for disatisfaction, and for the impeachment of the Court in the person of its chief. Well might an honourable and conscientious man in the highest position of responsibility be overwhelmed, and indeed crushed, even to confession of unconscious neglect, by the discovery of such iniquity and corruption in his own Court, and by the false accusation brought against himself personally, by unscrupulous and remorseless enemies, seeking his overthrow in order to justify themselves. Well might he shrink from attempting a defence which could only show his inability to cope with the terrible state of things, resting, as mainly the evidence must, upon that of corrupted subordinates, and victimised suitors, who would have no scruple in sacrificing him in their own defence; whose evidence at the moment would be accepted rather than his own; and amongst whom would be moving—perhaps not openly—some such "friends" as Coke and Buckingham.

Macaulay says that Bacon was overwhelmed with shame and remorse at his guilt being discovered. But it was quite the contrary. He was overwhelmed with grief at the triumph of wrong, and his own unmerited humiliation. He was not conscious of guilt. He felt that the guilt of his officials had, in some way, been made to attach to himself. He confessed "that if it were a crime to receive the fees and presents which had customarily been paid into Court before the hearing of a case," then he was guilty; but he protested that it was the system, not his conduct, nor his conscience, that was wrong and corrupt; that he had never received a bribe to pervert justice. The two cases quoted by Macaulay to prove his guilt, if they prove anything at all, go to prove the contrary.

According to the "Popular Encyclopedia," "It must be allowed that he was actuated neither by avarice nor corruption of heart." It was the Chancellor's dependants who assured the poor suitors that all would be right. And thus it was that the accusation arose; and seeing how base and groundless the charges were, and how speedily the Lord Chancellor was released from his imprisonment in the Tower, and from the enforcement of his fines, it is but reasonable to suppose that the evidence against him could not be sustained without the inculpation of others in the crimes alleged against him, when he was accused before the House of Lords of having received money for grants of offices and privileges under the Seal of State.

But why should Bacon's officers and hangers-on, or others perhaps higher in rank, and in more responsible positions, be charged with, or even be suspected of such nefarious practices, rather than Bacon himself? Let us listen to Lord Macaulay's testimony as to this. He does not hesitate to tell us that "amongst men of rank, Bishops, Privy Councillors, Members of

Parliament, the whole history of that generation was full of the low actions of high people, and it was notorious that men exalted in rank were guilty of all sorts of corrupt practices." Yet history, as well as Macaulay, has lent its willing ear to calumnies cast, by such men as these, against the character, and the conduct of one who dared with all his might to oppose their evil doings. Even at this day a vindication of his true character is listened to with hesitating and uncertain acknowledgment. But if society at large were at that time in such a state of corruption, and lost to all sense of honesty and honour, except that of formal external politeness and gilded suasion, why should not Bacon himself be suspected of similar corruptions and extortions? Because it was he, and he alone, that grieved over the law's delays and the looseness of its administration; because he alone had, from the first, set himself to remedy the terrible abuses then existing. Thus it was that in the first year of his office he disposed of about 3,000 of the accumulated cases which had been interminably delayed, waiting for the negociation of presents, fees and bribes, which had hitherto formed the moving impetus of the Court. And in his determination to put an end to the frightful scandals which disgraced the administration of the law when he came into office, he simply went straight on, administering justice, as has been shewn, regardless of any personal consideration, with a clear conscience and an unbiassed will; with such rapidity, judgment and effect; moreover, that only these cases of his decisions were reported to have been appealed against or reversed. And yet these cases, such as they have proved to be, have been treated as typical, instead of being, as they were, sole exceptions; and the guilty were ready to make confession of their own criminality in order to convict him. Well might he be crushed at the failure of his attempts to remedy the corrupt state of the Court, and at the ruin and disgrace brought upon him by his endeavours to execute impartial justice, irrespectively of every other consideration, when he gave his judgment whether wittingly or unwittingly against a bribing suitor. He did not "make confession of his guilt." He distinctly and unequivocally expressed his resolution "to indulge in no vain excuses if he should be found legally guilty of having been partaker of the abuses of his times." And he afterwards protests modestly to the King "I have not the troubled fountain of a corrupt heart, in a depraved habit of taking reward to pervert justice—howsoever I be frail and partaker of the abuses of the times." And again he says "The law of nature teaches me to speak in my own defence. With respect to this charge of bribery I am as innocent as any born on S. Innocent's day. I never had a bribe or reward in my eye or thought, when pronouncing judgment or order." From all this and from the fact that the bribing suitors would not scruple to come forward against him in the panic which they themselves had created, it is pretty certain that if an unjust judgment had been given by him in favour of the bribing suitors, instead of against them, no more would have been heard of it.

In inflicting such heavy penalties on Bacon, says Macaulay, "the Lords had an excellent opportunity of exhibiting at small cost, the inflexibility of their justice, and their abhorrence of corruption;" at small cost truly to themselves, but not so to Bacon. In pronouncing judgment upon him, and increasing his punishment, it would seem that the Lords themselves were not wholly unconscious of subsidiary motives of some sort.

Macaulay, in his efforts to make use of forcible language, did not scruple to construct exaggerated antithesis in the character of his subject; which led to that impression of unfairness with which he is so commonly credited in his historical characters and historical incidents. In this case, certainly, if they were but true, or consistent, his antitheses would be very striking and very telling. He laments that we are "compelled to regard Bacon's character with mingled contempt and admiration, with mingled gratitude and aversion." And "we must" he says, "regret that there should be so many proofs of the meanness and selfishness of a heart, the benevolence of which was yet large enough to take in all races and all ages." And again, "We must blush for the disingenuousness of the most devoted worshipper of speculative truth; for the servility of the boldest champion of intellectual freedom." Surely eloquence is utterly degraded by such speculative antitheses. In some respects Macaulay appears to appreciate Bacon's character and Bacon's work. He speaks of him as expending his mighty powers in reducing to order the chaotic mass of English Law. But he then goes on straightway to accuse him of "perverting these laws to the vilest uses of tyranny." He remarks, however, that there was one act, and this "the only good one of his long life, as far as we remember, of real service to letters. He manfully saved the noblest place of education in England (that is Trinity College, Cambridge), from the degrading fate of King's College or New College." We will not ask of these colleges at the present day how deeply they may feel their state of degradation, whether under their founder's charter, or beneath this withering sneer. The salvation of Trinity may or may not be attributed to Bacon, but we can only modestly marvel whether at the innocency, or at the amazing audacity, of thus ignoring and repudiating the value of the literary life-work of one who did more "of real service to letters" than all others of his day, and of many subsequent days put together.

Now let us return to what may be gathered of some special characteristics of Bacon's life from written testimony. Apart from the prejudiced account of modern writers, we have no reason to suppose that he would depart from the great truths which he enunciated, and which he desired to teach. Three remarkable characteristics may be traced in contemporary history, which have met with little or no recognition; which by several modern writers, who profess to have studied his works and his conduct the most deeply, have been positively denied or ridiculed as absurd. First, there is his poetic genius and power; his high appreciation of dramatic poesy; and of stage representation; secondly, his strong advocacy, and his own large use, of commonplace books, as legitimate and important aids in literary composition; and thirdly, his high estimate of reticence, amounting in his own case to systematic and positive concealment when discovery might attract notice, or bring him repute as a poet. Various contemporary writers attest to his truly poetic conceptions and power; some have indicated their knowledge of certain works, which, if in existence have not yet been discovered, or at any rate have not as yet been generally recognised as his. There is correspondence with some of his intimate friends, whom he styles his kind inquisitors, to whom apparently certain works were submitted for criticism without any direct intimation to us of their title or subject. Of only two of these has any intimation been made, and of these by his friend Sir Tobie Matthew, who in the postcript of a letter, returning his MS. remarks in a punning if ambiguous manner, "I return you not weight for weight, but measure for measure." His philosophic mind led him to analyse the nature and structure of poesy, wherein he clearly shows, as does Dryden subsequently, his high appreciation of its purpose and value. This by no means certainly indicates a lack of poetic taste or power. To quote his own words, "The reason why poesy is so agreeable to the spirit of man is that he has a craving for a more perfect order and a more beautiful variety than can be found in nature since the fall. Therefore, since the acts and events of real history are not grand enough to satisfy the human mind, poesy is at hand to feign acts more heroical. Since the issues of action in real life are far from agreeing with the merits of virtue and vice, poesy corrects history exhibiting events and fortunes as according to merit and the law of Providence. Since true history wearies the mind with common events, poetry refreshes it by reciting things more unexpected and various. So that this poetry conduces not only to delight, but to magnanimity and morality. Whence it may fairly be thought to partake somewhat of a Divine nature, because it raises the mind aloft, accommodating the shows of things to the desires of the mind, not (like reason and history) buckling and bowing down the mind to the reason of things. By these charms and that agreeable congruity which it hath with man's nature, accompanied also with music, to gain more sweet access, poesy has so won its way as to have been held in honour even in the rudest ages and amongst barbarous people, when other kind of learning were utterly excluded." It may be as truly said, however, that, on the other hand, a philosophic treatise on poetry does not prove a man a poet, which can be demonstrated only by the fire or the failure of the composition itself. By some it is persistently denied that Bacon could write poetry. They venture upon a negative argument notwithstanding his keen perception of the true nature of poesy; notwithstanding his masterly use of poetic language; notwithstanding the appreciation with which his personal friends regarded him as a poet of the highest order although "concealed." The concealment of his own name as a poet is something too strange to be understood and credited in these days of display when the absence of reserve is almost accounted a virtue. This interesting and substantial characteristic, in his love of the Drama, was indicated in his early days in his having not only written, but taken an active part in the performance of devices, plays and masques, to the great distress of Lady Anne Bacon, and to the great delight of the Society of Gray's Inn.

And from what he says in his letters and elsewhere, he devoted all the time that he could spare from his public duties to such literature, in writing works of his "invention and recreation."

According to Spedding, he is known to have written sonnets, not only that he might himself present them to the Queen, but he wrote for Essex also. According to Spedding, moreover, he possessed "all the natural faculties which a poet should possess, a true ear for music, a fine feeling for imaginative effect in words, and a vein of poetic passion—none could well be fitted with imagery words and rhythm, more apt and imaginative; and in him there was a tenderness of expression which comes manifestly from the heart in sensitive sympathy with nature." Ben Jonson says of him, "It is he who hath filled up all numbers, and performed that in our tongue which may be compared or preferred, either to insolent Greece or haughty Rome, so that he may be named the mark and acme of our language." Whatever may be said of it by the modern critic, the expression "all numbers" can have been used only in the old classic sense of supplying to the full the perfection of rhythm and harmony in all that he wrote; that his poetry was indeed, and in effect, classical. There was no one but Ben Johnson, his secretary and amanuensis, and perhaps his Chaplain, Dr. Rawley, who could have the same intimate knowledge of what Bacon really was, and what he performed in these respects; and Jonson knew him as possessing the most profound knowledge and the most versatile genius of his own or of any other age. Bacon takes pains to denominate his works of imagination and recreation as fruits of his "invention;" as equivalent to "poems." He carefully excludes the idea that he meant works of his scientific experiment. And, both by himself and his friends, the works are alluded to, not openly but only by guarded and mysterious inferences. He is spoken of as endowed with the poetic faculty in a high degree, and in several instances as a "concealed poet." He would not be spoken of as a poet unless he wrote poetry, nor as a "concealed poet" if his poetry were published abroad in his own name. He translated the Book of Psalms into English verse. There was no concealment of mystery about this. It has been quoted by some as a clear indication of his inability to write poetry. But there was no attempt in this to invoke the poetic muse. There was no idea of "invention" or "poema" about it though the Psalms themselves contain abundance of poetic thought and feeling. It was merely a devotional exercise on a bed of sickness, not a poetic exploit. The literal translation of Hebrew poetry into English verse would not be likely to give much scope for the exercise of the "maker's" power, however full the originals might be of poetic thought and rich imagery. It is, moreover, a task which has baffled other poets since his day. It cannot be regarded at all as a true specimen of his poetry. And judgment has been passed on his poetic powers, in the absence of all generally accepted knowledge of what his works were.

There is in this connection a remarkable coincidence, capable of course of more than one interpretation. It seems almost a mystery in Bacon's life, considering his high estimate of dramatic poesy and dramatic art, and it has been deemed no less than a marvel, that he should never once mention, never allude to in any way, in letter or otherwise, the name or the productions of one who has been called his great rival in the domain of literature. He never once recognises his existence, or the wondrous merit of his works. And it may well seem incredible and almost impossible that the greatest man of letters of his age should altogether ignore the existence and the works of a greatly valued friend, as he has been called, of a contemporary poet, of a genius of such transcendant merit, of such astonishing beauty and resource. So remarkable did it seem to Samuel Taylor Coleridge that he attributed it to an unfair coldness and invidiousness. He remarks that Bacon "seems to have disdained to learn either the existence or the name of Shakespeare. At this conduct no one can be surprised who has studied the life of this

Wisest, brightest, meanest of mankind."

Even when upholding the theatre and its beneficial influence as a means of improving manners and letters, and of conveying instruction in history and politics, Bacon does not once allude to Shakespeare, or the Shakespeare Plays; not even whilst deploring the degredation of the stage, or pleading for dramatic poetry as "history made visible;" as "truly noble" with a special relation "to the dignity of human nature."

Then secondly there is his persistent advocacy and use of commonplace books which in him was quite a characteristic. At Winchester this is a marked voluntary feature of tradition in the education even down to the present day. Dean Church tells us of Bacon's habit of writing down words and phrases, terse sayings or metaphors, for future use in his compositions. And he instances a notebook written to form part of a masque entitled, "A Praise of Knowledge" and another on the "Praise of the Queen." Spedding speaks of this as illustrative of Bacon's manner of working. And there is in the British Museum, a manuscript folio, in Bacon's own handwriting, of

"Formularies and Elegancies" compiled by him for some special literary purpose, of which, however, he gives no special indication. But it does not appear that either the ideas or the phrases therein collected can be traced, except perhaps rarely, in any of his generally received works.

And thirdly there was his pervading spirit of concealment and secrecy in what he did. He was not a philosophic humbug. He carried out in his life his own principles and his own teaching. He quoted from Proverbs "The prudent man concealeth knowledge." And then he makes note, "It is wisdom to conceal our meaning." "The glory of God is to conceal a thing and the glory of man is to find it out."

In this connection it will be well to speak of the cypher writing which, at that period was so frequently employed and by Bacon very largely. The cypher writing was commonly used at that time for secret political correspondence or intrigue. There are several hundreds of letters written in cypher in the library of Lambeth Palace, in certain of which, at any rate his name appears. Several of these have been deciphered. One of them, written in French, from a Scotsman, to Antony Bacon, contains certain, mysterious, figurative expressions incomprehensible except to those initiated, such as the "parabloic rose," "XXI.," "Erato," "The bride," "The hermit," "The academics," "The peripatetics," "The wellbeloved."* Reference is here made evidently to some political or polemical matter. Cryptogram was used by him for the purpose also of historical record of information, to succeeding generations, of matters which could not politically, or indeed safely, be published in the lifetime of the author. Such cryptogram is discoverable in Bacon's known works, such as "The Sylva Sylarum" and the "New Atlantis," and in fact in all that he wrote. He devised six several systems of cypher writing and cryptogram, and transmitted instructions in his "Advancement of Learning," to such as should have ability and opportunity, patience and perseverance, at a future day, to decipher them. The first modern attempts to decipher his works, necessarily were somewhat uncertain and tentative; and still more so were some of the early criticisms of them. But a definite scientific method has been made out, in careful accordance with directions left by him. Thus a cryptogram concealed in ten pages of the

---

* Note "XXI." stood as a crypto-sign for Francis Bacon himself, who must have been a principal mover in this business; for in this letter it is stated that XXI. praises us, and praises us over again, for our past services.

"Novum Organum" has been from photo facsimile copies deciphered in exactly the same words by different persons separately. This, of course, cannot be accepted, until it shall have been thoroughly and scientifically tested and guaranteed by well-known, learned, mathematical experts.

Then again we know that in Bacon's day, whether he founded it or not, there was in existence a secret guild or brotherhood established for two specific purposes. One was for study of the secret science of numbers, or in other words of cypher writing, in which compounded numbers were made the equivalents of letters and words. The other was to organise a system of anonymous publication. We learn this from an apologist, "John Hayden, a brother," who gives in detail the rules and objects of the guild, whilst carefully concealing all account of the work which was published by its members. The number of the members, including apprentices was sixty-three, a multiple of nine with seven, commencing however with only an Imperator and three brethren. All were under a solemn oath of secrecy, even to death itself, for one hundred years, not to divulge the names of themselves or others as members of it; or their operations. Any work which they might wish to publish as members of the guild they must in no case publish with their own name as author, but under a pseudonym or initials, not under their own initials, nor under any form by which the writer might be identified. All must be published anonymously. Amongst this number must have been initiated publishers and printers. Without this the work could not have been efficiently carried on, not its secrets safely kept. And some of them may have been employed by Bacon in working out the ingenious and elaborate process of reducing to accurate order in the several special editions of his works, such facts and information as it was intended to record. Bacon's determined and systematic concealment is indicated in a correspondence, wherein for instance, in writing to the Earl of Pembroke, and to the King, he speaks of himself as "your concealed poet." And in several instances he and others speak of a hidden authorship as known only to certain others beside himself, in terms which can apply only to himself in their mysterious meaning. He never alludes, as author, to any poem, or poems, of his, which would reveal his authorship. His intimates moreover are careful to abstain from doing so, although they show themselves aware of the existence of such. And in their private correspondence with him, they employ ambiguous phrases, in a hidden manner, to be understood alone by such as were initiated into his secrets.

The fact of ambiguous and mysterious allusions, and of reference to matters understood by his correspondents, is clearly indicated when in a letter to Sir Tobie Matthew he mentions his "alphabet" as a class of work, which, without any special name he speaks of as "other works" and works of his "recreation" as a material branch of his literature. And at another time he speaks of his head being wholly employed upon "invention." He laments his unfitness for legal and political employments, as being out of his province, though needful for competence, and he grudges the time occupied by them when his desires were for literature. He says despondingly, "The law drinketh too much time which I have devoted to other purposes." Spedding tells us that Bacon would send his writings also to Bishop Andrews, the great Divine, the learned and pious Theologian of the day, for him "to mark whatever should seem to him not current in the style, or harsh to credit an opinion, or inconvenient for the person of the writer," or in other words likely to provoke antagonism. There was in Bacon's philosophy a Divinity which raised him above other learned men. He sought out Divine ideas and Divine methods; one of the chiefest being as has been said, what he calls, "working in secret, slowly, quietly, persistently."

Another important, and interesting, phase of Bacon's life, of which in a secret society, but little can be learnt, is to be found in his connection with Rosicrucians, philosophers of the occult sciences, Alchemists, Cabalists, Theosophists and other sects, with whose works, we read, at that day Germany was flooded. In any case the name of "Sir Francis Bacon" occurs in a Rosicrucian document published in Italy, between the years 1603 and 1613, as Secretary to the fraternity, and as pre-eminent among the philosophers. He is found also, in cypher, in a document published in German and Latin, emanating from him as "Francis S. Alba," but under the signature of "Rose Cross, Fra" or brother. He allied himself to these, and learnt the wanderings of their vain philosophies, with the view to their entire regeneration by bringing them into the embrace of Christianity and true religion. This would be one branch of the grand task which in his youth he undertook to fulfil, in the general reformation of the wide world. And apparently it was to teach this lesson that the feigned historical allegories were written, of the "Fama Fraternitatis" of the meritorious order of the Rosie

Cross; and "The Hermetic Romance, or Chemical Wedding." Herein is shown how that, out of a seething mass of humanity, huddled together in the dark dungeon of ignorance, in which each is struggling to secure his own position, regardless of his fellows, they were lifted up one by one into the joys of true freedom and the pure light of day; and that, after due preparation, they were admitted to the wedding of the Celestial Queen.

Both Bacon and his friends, when not writing in cypher, indulged very largely in metaphorical and ambiguous language, to be understood only of each other. Sir Tobie Matthew writes in a postscript to a business letter, "The most prodigious wit that ever I knew was of your Lordship's name though he be known by another."

Bacon had grasped the spirit of the precept, "Do not your righteousness before men to be seen of them." In his writings he sought not the applause of men. Still less would he cater for it. His sole, his highest aim, was to do his duty to his Creator in a way that should the most benefit his fellow men, by the increase and spread of knowledge. We may be able to prove nothing directly as to the fact of how much he wrote, or what he wrote anonymously or under a feigned name. All that we can be sure of is as to the possibilities, within his reach, of writing and publishing anonymously, and to almost any extent; as well as of concealing the fact from the knowledge of some of his intimate friends. He would not write for reputation, but only for the edification and instruction of others. In a preface to the "Sylva Sylvarum," Dr. Rawley writes, "I have heard his Lordship often say that if he had served the glory of his own name he had better not have published this Natural History; for it may seem an indigested heap of particulars, and cannot have that lustre, which books cast into methods have. But that he resolved to prefer the good of men, and that which might best secure it, before anything that he might have in relation to himself."

He carried out in his life the principles which he taught. And what especially were those principles, and what was his teaching? We have it in his own words when he says:—"The greatest error is the mistaking of the true end of knowledge. For men have entered into a desire of learning and knowledge, sometimes for ornament and reputation; sometimes to enable them to victory of wit and contradiction; and most times for lucre and profession, but seldom to give a true account of their gift of reason, to the benefit and use of men; as if there were sought in knowledge a commanding ground for strife and contention; or a shop for profit and sale and not a rich storehouse for the glory of the Creator and the relief of man's estate." What nobler words could testify to the greatness of an author of such vast resource? This glory of the Creator, and this relief of man's estate, were the true aim of his whole life; and he would not sully it by seeking popular applause. He would rather say with the saintly Christian poet (who also published without his name what proved to be one of the most popular volumes of English verse ever written):—

"I know thy flatteries and thy cheating ways;
Be silent praise;
Blind guide with siren voice, and blinding all
That hear thy call."

or in a similar strain—like the joyous nightingales, retiring from sight into the shade of

"The greenest, darkest tree;
There they plunge, the light declining,
All may hear, but none may see."

To the would-be popular author and the public at large, this may appear unintelligible, and hence incredible. But to Francis Bacon it was otherwise, he being, to use his own words, "not as a man born under Sol, that loveth honour." Yet the more his character and life, as exhibited in his writings and his conduct are studied, the more are discovered the proofs of his greatness and goodness, which ought to be historically and gratefully commemorated. The damage, or loss of name to a noble life is a loss to the whole community. True sympathy with greatness and goodness is far more elevating than the most righteous contempt for depravity. It has been well observed, "we can regard a national character in the light of a friend whom we admire and esteem; and of whom the recollection may be a great force to save us from evil, and to prompt us to good. Influence is the greatest of all human gifts, and we all have it in some measure." This is most true. Influence is indeed a sacred trust. It is this which gives to our smallest acts, whether of selfishness or of consideration for others, of vanity or of humility, of anger or of self-control, an importance which cannot be overestimated. It is this which presses us forward in our earnest endeavour to present in its true and proper light the noblest ife, the finest character, in the History of English literature.

STENOGRAPHY, OR "SHORT-HAND" WRITING IN THE TIME OF QUEEN ELIZABETH.

IT appears that an argument against the possibility of Francis St. Alban being the author of all that has been claimed for him, is based upon at least one great fallacy, namely, that Francis St. Alban could not have transmitted his thoughts and conceptions (as some of us maintain that he did) *verbally*, so that his utterances could be taken down in "short-hand" by some of his secretaries. "*It is*," says one correspondent, "*the general belief that there were no 'short-hand' methods in those days, and that transcribing as well as printing was a slow and laborious process*,—and we cannot make people believe to *the contrary*."

The present lines are written not with the intention of giving a history of stenography, but in order once and for all to do away with this mistaken idea amongst our own circle of readers, however much the erroneous belief may remain with "the general."

The first *English* book on Stenography seems to have been that published by T. Bright, in 1588. Here we may pause to note three particulars:

1. T. Bright was Dr. Timothy Bright, under whose name the "*Anatomy of Melancholy*," was first published in 1587. This edition is entered in the British Museum Catalogue as the work of T. Bright. The subsequent editions take no notice of Bright, but are published in the name of Burton.—"What's in a name?"—In the introduction to the "*Biliteral Cipher of Francis Bacon*" the Editor, calling attention to these facts adds that "The Cipher mentions both *Bright* and *Burton* as names under which 'Bacon' wrote the book, and also that the different editions contain each a different cipher story."

2. "T. Bright" dedicated his book on short-hand writing to Queen Elizabeth, with the title "Characterie, or the Art of Short, Swift and Secret Writing."

3. At the time of the publication of this book, Francis was 27 years of age, and passing through a period of the greatest leisure which he ever enjoyed. From 1586 to 1590 there is hardly a trace of his doings, but the press was teeming with and issuing works of all kinds—the English Renaissance had begun.

To the Treatise on Short Writing of 1588, there followed

"*The Writing School-master,*" by "Peter Bale." Here we are told that "Brachygraphy, or the art of writing as fast as a man speaketh treatably, may in appearance seem difficult, but it is in effect very easy, containing a many commodities under a few principles, the shortness whereof is obtained by memory, the swiftness by practice, the sweetness by industry." A most Baconian utterance suggestive of its true source. The date of this book is 1590.

The next attempt towards improvement in the art seems to have been printed in 1602 by "John Willis." It was entitled "*The Art of Stenographie or Short Writing by Spelling Characterie*" and after this had passed through numerous editions, a fresh treatise was published by Edmund Willis, in 1618, and two more in 1630, by Witt and Dix. These few facts must surely be sufficient to prove that short-hand writing began and flourished in the reign of Elizabeth, and was vigorously used and improved upon during the 16th and 17th centuries.

That Francis not only first introduced the art, but that he made good use of it the present writer does not for an instant doubt. The scanty records *published* of his mysterious private life seem in many places to hint, although they do not plainly affirm that this was the case.

Hear the saying of Dr. Rawley, when describing his master's habits of perpetual industry and the delight of his conversation.

"His meals were refections of the ear as well as of the stomach, like the *Noctes Atticæ*, or *Conviviæ Deipno-sophistarum*, wherein a man might be refreshed in his mind and understanding no less than in his body. *And I have known some, of no mean parts, that have professed to make use of their note-books when they have risen from his table*" (so they went prepared with note-books).

Peter Boehner, private secretary and medical attendant to Francis "Bacon" describes how in the morning he would call him or some other of his secretaries to his bedside, and how they wrote down from his lips the thoughts and ideas which he had conceived in the night. Had this process been so "slow and laborious" as the general belief is supposed to warrant, our indefatigable and nimble-minded author would have had to pass most of his days in bed. On the contrary, we think it far more probable that the amanuensis could write as fast as a man could speak "treatably," or in other words slowly and with deliberation, as (in the *Short Notes for Civil*

Conversation) he enjoins upon others who would speak pleasantly and to be understood. "In all kinds of speech . . . *it is convenient to speak leisurely, and rather drawingly than hastily*"—giving as one reason for this, that "a slow speech confirmeth *the memory*." Doubtless it is a great help to the writer from dictation.

Now if Francis did from the age of, say 25, dictate to his short-hand writers the thoughts which followed each other through his wonderful brain, his reflections on the philosophies which he was studying, his comments upon books which he read, notes and sketches of proposed works, or revised matter ready for the press—if he seldom put pen to paper, but in elbow chair, with head resting on his hand (and "thus he sat") dictated in the abundance of his full heart and mind to his expert short-hand writers, they in due course transcribing and writing fair the sheets which he had but read, and if needful to correct and polish—what a mass of matter could he thus have produced and given to the world under any name but his own! Would that our own thoughts and utterances were worthy of a like method of preservation. We could then exclaim with Armado in *Love's Labour's Lost:*—

"Devise wit; write pen; for I am for whole volumes in folio."

A PEEP BEHIND THE CURTAIN OF THE DARK.

AT a time when many intelligent minds are engaged upon the question, "Was Queen Elizabeth a married woman?" it seems desirable to print for the benefit of those who cannot make researches for themselves, extracts from books whose authors have entered into such researches with a view to throwing light into the dark places of history. For such as desire to verify, or to test the accuracy of published history, the following extract must prove interesting. It is taken from a book entitled, "Glimpses of our Sussex Ancestors," by Charles Fleet. Published by Farncombe and Company, Printers, *East Sussex News Office*, Lewes. 1883.

Readers of BACONIANA will, however, remember that reference was given in the July Number (Vol. vi., 1899), to Arthur Gunter's "Submission," concerning the death of Amy Robsart, his "Information" concerning the same and his

"Declaration" concerning the report that the Queen would marry Lord Robert Dudley. All of these are in Part VI. of the Hatfield, or Cecil MSS., Vol i. 252—257 and 792—811.

In Vol. ii. 165—170, is the letter from Baptista di Trento to Queen Elizabeth, telling her that the Earl of Leicester intended to make himself King of England by a marriage with her. (We reprint these references lest present readers should have failed to see them).

The subjects of the following extracts are:—(1) The probability that the Queen will marry Leicester; (2) Of her stopping and supping at his house; (3) The danger to anyone who may mention this; (4) The rivalry between the Reformed and Papal Churches—Leicester representing the former.

Re Queen Elizabeth's probable marriage to Leicester—the Queen at supper at his house, *circ.* 1560. Extract from "Glimpses of our Sussex Ancestors," by Charles Fleet. Second Series. Published by Farncombe and Company, Printers, *East Sussex News Office*, Lewes. 1883.

Chapter on "Liberty of Speech in Sussex, in Times Past and Present," page 172.

. . . In the days when men did not write and print so much as they do now, they had to be much more careful about what they spoke. . . . In our Sussex annals, so carefully collected by the members of the Archæological Society, we find some striking instances of the state of things to which we are adverting and of the danger which our ancestors ran in allowing their tongues to run too idly. Both the Crown and the aristocracy, nay the class below the nobility, had the power to call such offenders to a strict account. There was a special Court to take account of any words in derogation of the honour, or rank, or character of the upper classes uttered by the coarse-speaking rural or mechanic class; and a man might find himself "clapt up by the heels" in a very summary fashion for criticizing the appearance or expressing his opinion of the conduct or character of his grander neighbour in a style that would now excite no notice or only call forth a laugh.

But to our Sussex instances. The first has reference to Queen Elizabeth, and if our readers exclaim with Puff, in the "Critic," "No scandal I hope of Queen Elizabeth," we must leave them to form their own opinion on that point. *She* herself did think there was scandal in it, and that her liege subjects had no right to indulge in idle gossip at her expense. Only think if Queen Victoria could bring to account all the idle tongues who have indulged in idle tales . . . what an opening and shutting of prison gates, perhaps a shortening of ears and noses, to say nothing of heavy fines and long imprisonments there would have been!

If the reader doubts let him note the fate which befel *Arthur Gunter*, ancestor of Col. Gunter, of *Racton*, in West Sussex. . . . This Arthur seems to have been over fond of gossip, and one day when he "chaunced to be a huntynge with divers gentlemen" (we quote his own words) "I fell in Taulcke with a "Jentleman named Mr. George Cotton, who told me that hyt chaunced the Queen's Hynes *to be at supper on a tyme* at my *Lord Robert's House*, wheare hyt chaunced *Hyr Hyghness to be nyghted homeward*, and as hyr grace was going homeward by Torchelyght, *hyr Hyghness fell in Taulcke* with *them that carried the Torches* and seyd that hyr grace *wolde make ther Lorde the best that ever whas of* hys *name*. Whereuppon, I seyd, that hyr Grasce must macke him a Dewke, and he said that *the Reporte was that Hyr Hyghness sholde marry him*, and I answered, I pray God all men may tacke hyt well that there might rysse no troble thereof, and so I have seyde to dyvers others synce that tyme."

Whereby Arthur Gounter (or Gunter) did manifest that he was a very indiscreet individual, and that it would have been better for him if he had held his tongue; for if trees have tongues, so have they ears, and this "taulcke" in the Sussex hunting field came, in time, to the knowledge of the Royal lady whom it concerned, and not a little wroth, doubtless was she that "base churls" should make free with her maiden fame and her intentions towards matrimony or otherwise. So indeed Master Gounter found out, for he was speedily "clapt up by the heels," in other words, incarcerated, and made to speak out more plainly as to what he meant by the above "taulcke" and here upon he made the following :—

"Confessions of A. Gunter concerning Lord Robert Dudley (Earl of Leicester).

"Pleseth your Honor, further to understande that the sayde Mr. George Cotton seyde, that hyt was rumoured heretofore; that my Lord my Master (the Earl of Leicester) shoolde have maryed the Quene's Hyghnes; and I seyde that yf hyt pleased hyr Hynes, I thought him as mette a man as any in Inglande; and further he asked me, yf I herde of any Parlement towarde; and I seyde, No; but yf ther wer eny, I thynke every noble-man wyll geve his opinion, and then they that be my Lord Robert's friends wyll seye that he is a mette man ; and so hyt may fortune there wyll rysse troble among the noblemen ; which God forbede. And then he asked me, who was my Lorde's friends? and I seyde, my Lorde Markes of Northampton ; my Lorde of Pembroke ; Mr. Treasurer ; Mr. Lacfeld, with many others. Further, I seyd, I trust the *Whyght Horsse,** will be quiet and so shall we be out of troble ; hyt is well-knowen hys Blode as yette whas never attaynte, nor he was ever a man of warr, wherefor ys hyt lycke, that we shall syt still ; but if he shoole stomache hyt, he were able to make a great power. All these things befoore rehearseed, I have spoken unto dyvers other, as unto Mr. Robert Palmer, Mr. Stowton, Mr. Benyon, and others. Further, as touchynge my Lord Robert, I have seyde to Mr. Cottone that I thought hym to be the cause that my Lord my Master (the Earl of Arundel) might not marry the Quene's Hyghnes, wherefor I wolde that he had bene put to dethe with his father or that some roffen wolde have dyspatched hym by the way as he has gone, with some dagge or gonne. Farther, I seyde, that yf hyt chaunced my Lord Robert to marry the Quene's Hyghnes, then I dowted whether he woolde remember my owlde matter passed heartofore, and so be turned unto my Lord my Master's displeasure and hindrance.

"By me,

"ARTHUR GOUNTER."

A good deal of these "Confessions" is not very intelligible to us at the present day. But it is obvious that it had *reference to the Queen's marriage* either with the Earl of Arundel (*the "White Horse"*) or Robert Dudley, afterwards Earl of Leicester, and that the sudden and mysterious death of the wife of the latter, the ill-fated Amy Robsart, happened about this time, and had its bearing on the reports afloat, for in one of the *Hatfield MSS.* under the date 1560, occurs this entry :—"The saying of *Arthur Gunter to George Cotton* that ere this *my Lord Robert's wife is dead, and she broke her neck.* It is in a number of heads that the Queen will marry him. If she do you will see a great stir, for my Lord Arundel is sure of the Earl of Pembroke, and the Lord Rich, with divers others ; to be ready with the putting up of his finger ; and then *you shall see the White Horse bestir him ;* for my Lord is of great power, but a man shall have a ruffian with a dag to dispatch him out of a shop." Oct. 26th, 1560. *Hatfield MSS.*, Vol. i. p. 253, No. 801.

---

* The well-known badge of the Earl of Arundel.

Gunter, it is evident, was *a follower of the " White Horse,"* the *Norfolk, or Catholic* interest, whilst *Leicester* was the head of the *Protestant party* with a tendency *to Puritanism.* So that in this "*taulcke*" between two gentlemen "huntynge" in Sussex the *deadly rivalry* of two *great religious parties* was doubtless, shadowed forth. So indeed might it be in the present day without that danger to body and estate which Arthur Gunter ran and from the consequences of which he narrowly escaped. For as our Chronicler tells us, after being incarcerated and questioned, he was only pardoned on making a written "Confession" in which he declared that for the "unfytting wordes" uttered by him, he had been "most worthely punished," and was "very hartely sorry," that the like should never again enter into his heart, and much less pass his mouth ; and that he would study, by all means, to "re-duble and recompense" his former offence.

From Chalmer's Biographical Dictionary. Articles on Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, and his father, Duke of Northumberland, and brothers Lord Warwold, and Ambrose Dudley. Vol xii. pages 396—414.

In a note to a passage referring to *Leicester's* ambition, his great abilities, his persecution of Archbishop Quindal . . . "his power and influence becoming almost incredible" . . . is this.

> As to *his* power in the State, we may form an idea of that from the observance shown him when he visited Buxton Wells, by the Earl of Shrewsbury, one of the ancientest Peers in the kingdom and from the sense which the *Queen expressed* of the Earl's behaviour *in the following letter written with her own hand* which contains perhaps as high a testimony of favour as ever was expressed by a Sovereign to a subject.
>
> "Elizabeth.
>
> "Our very good cousin being given to understand from our *cousin of Leicester*, how honourably he was not only lately received by you, our cousin, and the Countess of Chatsworth, and his diet by you both discharged at Buxton's, but also presented with a very rare present ; we should do him great wrong, holding him in that place of favour we do, in case we should not let you understand in how thankful sort we accept the same at both your hands, *not as done unto him, but unto our ownself reputing him as another ourself.* And therefore you may assure yourself that we, taking upon as *the debt, not as his, but our own*, will take care accordingly to discharge in such honourable sort as so well-deserving creditors as ye are shall never have cause to think ye have met with an unthankful debtor," &c.

Here ends the note from Chalmer's Dictionary. The winding up of Queen Elizabeth's letter is not given, nor is reference made to the collection from which the letter was copied. But surely the expressions used by Elizabeth with regard to Leicester, that *he is another herself*, that *the debt is not his, but hers*, are such as no royal lady could use excepting in speaking of her husband or her son. Such expressions if uttered or written under similar circumstances, would be held by any ordinary hearer or reader to be tantamount to an acknowledgement of a marriage between the personages in question.

J. T. F.

"ANTONY AND CLEOPATRA," AND "JULIUS CÆSAR."

NOTHING is more certain, than that the Play of *Antony and Cleopatra* was composed, with an entirely ethical purpose of portraying the calamities and disasters, that accompany inordinate and irregular love, and how it "*interferes with fortune*," as Bacon remarks in his Essay upon this passion of Love. The sermon is written large, and the text might be—" More bitter than death, the woman whose heart is snares, and nets, and her hands as bands." Observe the moral motive is not merely contingent, or as we intend to say, *an after thought of the Poet*, but governs the Play from first to last, the opening keynote of Antony's weakness being struck immediately as follows :—

> Nay, but this dotage of our general's
> O'erflows the measure. Those his goodly eyes,
> That o'er the files and musters of the war
> Have glowed like plated Mars, now bend, now turn,
> The office and devotion of their view
> Upon a tawny front. His Captain's heart,
> Which in the scuffles of great fights hath burst,
> The buckles on his breast, reneges all temper,
> And is become the bellows and the fan
> To cool a gipsy's lust.
> Look where they come,
> Take, but good note and you shall see in him ;
> The triple pillar of the world *transformed*,
> *Into a strumpets fool.*—Act I. i.

This indeed is the central key motive of the Play, which crops out continually, in various contexts descriptive of Antony's character, one of which, we quote, is made by Octavius Cæsar :—

You shall find there,
A man who is *the abstract of all faults*;
That all men follow.—Act I. iv. 7.

This is an important text, because it illustrates the intention of the Poet, to furnish through the character of Mark Antony, an exemplar, or abstract, of some very common and besetting sins of men, and particularly of the one sin which ruined Antony.

Octavius Cæsar tells us what Antony's faults were:—

To give a kingdom for a mirth, to sit,
And keep the turn of *tippling* with a slave.—Act I. iv.

. . . . . .

He fishes, *drinks*, and wastes,
The lamps of night in revel; is not more manlike
Than Cleopatra (*Ib.*)

And after the defeat of Actium, Scarus exclaims:—

The greater cantle of the world is lost,
With every ignorance; *we have kissed away*[*]
Kingdoms and provinces.—Act III. x.

Indeed the complete subjection of Antony to Cleopatra, was fully recognized by his soldiers and generals. Canidius exclaims:—

But his whole action grows,
Not in the power on't: *So our leaders led;*
And we are women's men.—Act III. x. 71.

Enobarbus echoes the same sarcasm, when he says:—"Under a compelling occasion let women die. It were a pity to cast them away for nothing; *though between them and a great cause they should be esteemed nothing*" (Act I. ii).

Bacon concludes his Essay upon "*Love*" with the words "*Nuptial love* maketh mankind, friendly love perfecteth it; *but wanton love corrupteth, and embaseth it*" (*Love*, 1625). It is of the last we are now thinking. In his Essay upon "*Love*," Bacon writes:—"They do best, who if they cannot, but admit love, yet make it keep quarter, and sever it wholly from their serious affairs, and actions of life. For if it check once with business, *it troubleth men's fortunes, and maketh men, that they can no ways be true, to their own ends*" (*Love*, 1625).

This was strikingly exemplified in the fortunes of Mark Antony, who on account of his infatuation for Cleopatra, could not follow the career which was open to him through his marriage with Octavia, Cæsar's sister. It was indeed

---

[*] Appian remarks of Antony and Cleopatra:—"Their love brought themselves and all Egypt into extreme, and miserable calamities."—*Liber* V.

Antony's return to Egypt, that brought about the war which ended in his defeat and death. That is to say, his mad and inordinate love for Cleopatra, was the direct cause of his quarrel with his brother-in-law. Antony himself was fully aware of the toils into which he had fallen, he exclaims:—

> These strong Egyptian fetters I must break,
> Or lose myself in dotage.—Act I. ii. 120.

This Play being a sermon upon the tragedy of a character ruined by sensual love, it is not surprising to find, that in a certain subtle sense, Cleopatra has been conceived as a typical earthly Venus, if we may so put it? This idea, which we imagine was borrowed from some details furnished by Plutarch, was indulged in by Cleopatra herself. I refer to the description of the meeting of Antony and Cleopatra upon the river Cydnus:—

> For her own person
> It beggared all description. She did lie
> In her pavilion—cloth of gold of tissue
> *O'er picturing that Venus where we see*
> *The fancy outwork nature.* On each side her
> Stood pretty smiling boys, like smiling Cupids,
> With divers fans.—Act II. ii.

Plutarch writes:—"For when she (Cleopatra) sailed along the river Cydnus, with such incredible pomp, in a gilded ship, *herself dressed like Venus*, her maids like the graces, her pages like so many Cupids" (Vit. Anton. Plutarch's Lives). Bacon writes:—"That none of the affections *do fascinate or bewitch save love and envy*" (*Essays, Envy*, 1625). This is most powerfully reflected in the Play when Pompey exclaims:—

---

* Bacon writes:—"Good things never appear in their full beauty, till they turn their back and be going away" (Colours of Good and Evil, No. 6). Again:—"Death hath this also; that it openeth the gate, to good fame, and extinguisheth envy, *Extinctus amabitur idem*" (*i.e., the same when dead will be loved.*—(Epistles, Horace II. i. 15).—*Essays, Of Death*, 1625.

It is exactly in accordance with these words, that Antony hearing of his wife's death, exclaims:—

> There's a great spirit gone! Thus did I desire it:
> What our contempt doth often hurl from us,
> We wish it ours again; the present pleasure,
> By revolution lowering, does become,
> The opposite of itself. *She's good being gone;*
> *The hand could pluck her back that shoved her on.*—Act I. ii. 126.
>
> For it so falls out
> That what we have we prize not to the worth
> *Whiles we enjoy it, but being lack'd and lost,*
> *Why then we rack the value, then we find*
> *The virtue that possession would not show us*
> *Whiles it was ours.*—*Much Ado About Nothing*, Act IV. i.

But all the *charms* of love
Salt Cleopatra, soften thy waned lip,
Let witchcraft join with beauty, lust with both.*—Act II. i. 21.

Heliodorus held that *love is witchcraft*, for he observes :—

Ludit Amor sensus, oculos perstringit, et aufert
Libertatem animi, mirâ nos fascinat arte
Credo aliquis dæmon subiens præcordia flammam
Concitat, et raptam tollit de cardine mentem.
—*Liber* III. Mantuan.

Antony himself calls Cleopatra *his charm*, and exclaims :—

For when I am revenged upon *my charm*,
I have done all.

* * * *

Ah, thou spell, Avaunt.—Act IV. xii. 16—30.

And nothing is more certain than that this *power of witchery,*† *or fascination, has been fully conceived as a magical influence.* Scarus in describing the defeat at Actium, and the flight of Antony, exclaims :—

She once being loof'd,
The noble ruin of her magic† *Antony*
Claps on his sea wing, and, like a doting mallard,
Leaving the fight in height, flies after her.—Act III. x. 18.

It is as a *right witch*, as a worker of *grave charms*, that Antony learns to look upon Cleopatra. We can never admire too much the way the *gipsy* is insisted upon, and colours the canvas, whereon Cleopatra is portrayed. In the first act this keynote is struck by the introduction of a Soothsayer, a Palmist, and Fortune-teller, in thorough keeping with the kingdom of the Magicians and Enchanters of Pharoah—Egypt! And Antony also recognizes the gipsy blood running in Cleopatra's veins :—

O this false soul of Egypt! *This grave charm,*—
Whose eye beck'd forth my wars, and called them home;

---

* The Ghost (in *Hamlet*) describing the arts by which his brother Claudius won the dead King's wife (Gertrude), exclaims :—

Ah, that incestuous, that adulterate heart,
With witchcraft of his wit, with traitorous gifts.—Act I. i.

† Othello is charged with witchcraft in having gained Desdemona's love :—

Brabantio.—Damn'd as thou art, *thou hast enchanted her*,
For I'll refer me to all things of sense,
If she in chains of magic were not bound.
—*Othello*, Act I. ii. 64.

* * * *

Othello.—She loved me for the dangers I had passed,
And I loved her that she did pity them
This only is the *witchcraft* I have used.—*Ib.* III.

> Whose bosom was my crownet, my chief end,—
> *Like a right gipsy hath at fast and loose*
> *Beguiled me to the very heart of loss.*—Act IV. xii.

He also exclaims:—

> The *witch* shall die.
> To the young Roman boy she hath sold me, and I fall
> Under this plot; she dies for't.—Act IV. xii. 47.

But returning to our main subject, it is almost certain that Bacon conceived Love and Envy, as coming under what he calls *Natural Magic*, to which he has devoted (as an entire subject matter), one of his deficients in his *New World of Sciences*. In the "*Advancement*" Bacon says:—"Fascination is the power and intensive act of the imagination upon the body of another. In this kind the school of Paracelsus and the disciples of pretended *Natural Magic*, have been so intemperate, as they have only not equalled the force and the apprehension of the imagination, with the power of miracle working faith. Others, *drawing nearer to the similitude of Truth, when they had most intensively considered the secret energies and impressions of things; the irradiations of the senses, the transmission of cogitations from body to body;* the conveyance of magnetic virtues; came to be of opinion that much more might such impressions; informations and communications, *be made from Spirit to Spirit*, being that a spirit, of all other things, is more powerful and strong to work, and more soft and penetrable to suffer: whence the conceits have grown, made almost popular of the *Mastering Spirit*[*]*;* of men ominous and unlucky; *of the strokes of Love and Envy;* and of others of like nature.—(*Liber.* iv., p. 211; *Adv. of Learning*, 1640.)

This passage suggests that Bacon, was acquainted with the marvels of Telepathy, and he evidently was inclined to give credence to these things, for he observes they "*draw nearer to the similitude of truth.*" Love attraction, or fascination, would certainly come under what Bacon calls—"*the irradiations of the senses, and the cogitations from body to body;*"

---

[*] Antony asks the Soothsayer whether his own fortunes, or those of Cæsar shall rise higher.

Soothsayer. Cæsar's.
Therefore, oh Antony, stay not by his side.
Thy demon, that's thy spirit which keeps thee is
Noble, courageous, high, unmatchable,
Where Cæsar's is not; but near him, thy angel
Becomes a fear, as being o'erpowered; therefore
Make space enough between you.—*Ant. and Cleo.*, Act II. iii.

for in this subtle sense, sexual love is undoubtedly a process of *natural magic*, due to occult causes, the familiarity of their common and ordinary occurrence, blinding us to what is profoundly secret and akin to magic in their workings! Love is in this sense a species of *bewitchment*:—

> Now Romeo is beloved and loved again
> Alike *bewitched* by the charm of looks.
> —*Romeo and Jul.*, Prolog. Act II.

I have already said that I consider Cleopatra to be drawn, with some subtle under current of relationship to Venus. I mean Bacon has made her typical of a certain phase of feminine fascination, or attraction (not of the highest), which is understood by the *Venus Pandemos, or Venus Aphrodite.* In the epithet, "*Salt Cleopatra,*" applied by Pompey to the Egyptian Queen, we have of course an allusion to the birth of Venus from the foam[*], or salt of the sea; probably an allegory, or parable (of the wisdom of the ancients) concealing organic physical truths of generation and origin. The sea, in fact, stood in a certain sense, as emblem of Venus, and certain words connected with salt, have been applied to her influence. It is only on this theory we can explain certain obscure passages in the Play; pointing at Antony, Lucian says:—"Love was born in the sea, which is as various and raging in young men's breasts as the sea itself, and causeth burning lusts."

> His delights
> Were dolphin like; they show'd his back above
> *The element they lived in.*—Act V. 1.

The myrtle-tree was sacred to Venus. Euphronius, Antony's schoolmaster exclaims:—

> I was of late as petty to his ends
> *As is the morn dew on the myrtle-leaf*
> *To his grand sea.*[†]—Act III. xii.

Compare:—

. . . . .

> Sweet, rouse yourself, and the weak wanton Cupid
> Shall from your neck unloose his amorous fold,

---

[*] Cornesius salem enumerat inter eaquæ intempestivam libidinem provocaro solent. Et salaciores fieri fœminas ob esum salis—*Venerem ideodicunt ab Oceano ortam* (De Sale *Lib.*, c. 2.)

[†] Compare Lucrece's speech to Tarquin:—

> "Thou art," quoth she. "*a sea, a sovereign king*;
> *And lo, there falls into thy boundless flood*
> *Black lust, dishonour, shame, misgoverning,*
> *Who seek to stain the ocean of thy blood.*—*Lucrece*, 652.

> And like a *dew-drop* from the lion's mane
> Be shook to air.—*Troilus and Cressida*, Act. III. iii.

There is especial irony in the historical fact, that the sea, on which he was persuaded to fight by Cleopatra (instead of on land), was fatal to the fortunes of Antony at Actium!

The following extract, from the British Museum copy of the "*Essays*" of 1625, will show how Bacon regarded *the strokes of Love and Envy*. "There be none of the affections, which have been noted *to fascinate, or bewitch, but Love and Envy*. They both have vehement wishes; they frame themselves readily into imaginations, and suggestions; and they come easily into the eye; especially upon the presence of the objects; which are the points, which conduce to fascination, if any such thing there be. We see likewise, the Scripture calleth *Envy*, an *Evil Eye*. And the astrologers call the evil influence of the stars, evil aspects. So that still there seemeth to be acknowledged *in the act of Envy, an ejaculation, or irradiation of the eye*. Nay, some have been so curious as to note, that the times, when the stroke, or percussion of an *envious eye* doth most hurt, are, when the party envied is beheld in glory or triumph; for that sets an edge upon envy; and besides at such times, the spirits of the persons envied, do come forth, most into the outward parts, and so meet the blow" (*Envy, Essays*, 1625).

"Lastly, to conclude this part, as we said in the beginning, *that the act of Envy, hath somewhat in it, of Witchcraft* (*Veneficii et Incantationis*—witchcraft and charming") (*Ib.*).

Bacon couples Love and Envy in this common attribute of witchcraft, or charming, because probably, he regarded envy, as the opposite of love, that is as hate (*Invidia*), or love reversed, if we may so put it? Of Decius Brutus, one of the conspirators against Julius Cæsar, Bacon writes: "With Julius Cæsar Decimus Brutus had obtained that interest, as he set him down, in his testament, for heir in remainder, after his nephew. And this was the man, *that had power with him, to draw him forth to his death*. For when Cæsar would have discharged the Senate, in regard of some ill presages, and especially a dream of his wife Calpurnia; this man lifted him gently by the arm, out of his chair, telling him, he hoped he would not dismiss the Senate, *till his wife had dreamt a better dream*. And it seemeth, his favour was so great, as Antonius in a letter, which is recited *verbatim*, in one of Cicero's Philippics, *calleth him Venefica—witch* (*or sorcerer*) *as if he had enchanted Cæsar*."—(*Essays, Friendship*, 1625).

At the conclusion of the Play of *Julius Cæsar* we find this :—

This was the noblest Roman of them all
All the conspirators save only he[*]
Did that they did in envy of great Cæsar.—Act V. v.

This clearly tells us, this Decimus Brutus, conspired against Julius Cæsar, *out of envy.* In the Play, we find Decius Brutus, *laying snares of flattery and temptation*, to draw Cæsar forth to the Capitol. When Cassius expresses a fear that the augurers may hold Cæsar back from the Capitol, Decius replies :—

Never fear that, if he be so resolved,
I can o'ersway him ; for he loves to hear
That unicorns may be betray'd with trees,
And bears with glasses, elephants with holes,
Lions with toils, *and men with flatterers.*
But when I tell him he hates flatterers,
He says he does, being then most flattered.
—*Julius Cæsar*, Act II. i.

In Bacon's "*Civil Character of Julius Cæsar,*" we read :— "Till at the last, whether highflown, with the continual exercise of power, *or corrupted with flatteries*, he affected the ensigns of power (the style and diadem of a king), *which was the bait that wrought his overthrow*" (Page 285, *Resuscitatio*, 1661).

It is just with this *bait of the crown*, that we find Decius Brutus, drawing Cæsar forth to the Capitol :—

The Senate have concluded
To give this day a crown to mighty Cæsar.
If you shall send them word, you will not come,
Their minds may change. Besides, it were a mock
Apt to be render'd, for some one to say—
"Break up the Senate till another time,
When Cæsar's wife shall meet with better dreams."
—Act II. ii. 93.

Bacon evidently considered that Flattery was a species of fowling, or snaring, exactly as we have found Decius Brutus classing it—*with the capture of game!* In his collection of *Antitheta Rerum*, Bacon observes:—"*Flattery is that kind of fowling, which deceives birds by resemblance of voice*"† (*Flattery, Antitheta* xxxviii).

---

[*] *Decius Brutus* must not be confounded with *Marcus Brutus who is here pointed at.*

† In the Play of *Much Ado About Nothing*, Beatrice is *ensnared into the belief*, Benedict is dying of love for her, by overhearing the *flatteries feigned*, of Hero's conversation about Benedict—Beatrice *being compared to a lapwing :—*

We perceive the power, *Decius felt he held over Julius Cæsar*, confidently foreshadowed in these words of the former, to the conspirators :—

Decius.—Let me work,
For I can give his humours the true bent,
And I will bring him to the Capitol.—Act II. i.

And this mystic power of will compelling mastery, is never in doubt for a moment :—

Cæsar all hail! Good morrow, worthy Cæsar;
I come to fetch you to the Senate house.—Ib.

Cæsar refuses at first to go, on account of his wife's dream, just as Bacon has already told us. Cæsar replies :—

But for your private satisfaction,
Because I love you, I will let you know.
Calpurnia here, my wife, stays me at home.
She dreamt to-night she saw my statue,
Which, like a fountain with an hundred spouts,
Did run pure blood.—*Ib.*

At last Cæsar yielding to the flatteries, and bait of the offer of the crown, yields and goes forth at the instigation of the envious Decius to meet his death.*

Hero.—Now begin;
For look where Beatrice *like a lapwing runs*
Close by the ground to hear our conference.

. . . . .

Ursula.—She's *limed*, I warrant you: we have caught her madam.
Hero.—If it prove so, then loving goes by haps.
Some Cupid kills with arrows, some with *traps.*
—*Much Ado About Nothing*, Act III. i. 24, 105.

---

* Bacon writes :—" Finally Julius Cæsar never, to my remembrance, betrayed the impotency of his hidden thoughts, so much as in a speech of like nature; for when the Augurs gave him information that the entrails were not prosperous, he closely murmur'd to himself—' *Erunt lætiora cum volo*,' which saying preceeded not long before the misfortune of his death. But this *Extremity of Confidence* (as we have said), as it is an unhallowed thing, so was it ever unblessed" (*Liber.* VIII., p. 400. *Advancement of Learning*, 1640). This is exactly paralleled in the Play :—

Servant.—Plucking the entrails of an offering forth,
They could not find a heart within the beast.
Cæsar.—The gods do this in shame of cowardice:
Cæsar should be a beast without a heart,
If he should stay at home to-day for fear.
No Cæsar shall not; danger knows full well
That Cæsar is more dangerous than he:
We are two lions litter'd in one day,
And I the elder and more terrible.
And Cæsar shall go forth.
Calpurnia.—Alas! my lord,
Your wisdom *is consumed in confidence.*—Act II. iii.

Bacon writes:—"*There be that can pack the cards, and yet cannot play well*" (*Cunning. Essays*, 1625).

There can be very little doubt this is pointed at Cleopatra, who was profoundly *cunning*, so much so, that her lover Antony is made to exclaim:—

> She is cunning, past men's thoughts.
> —*Ant. and Cleo.*, Act I. ii. 150.

Later on Antony exclaims of her treachery:—

> I made these wars for Egypt; and the Queen,—
> Whose heart, I thought I had, for she had mine;
> Which whilst it was mine had annex'd unto it
> A million more, now lost,—she Eros, has
> *Pack'd cards with Cæsar,** and false play'd my glory
> Unto an enemy's triumph.—Act IV. xiv.

In the Essay upon "*Friendship,*" Bacon observes:—"That speech was like cloth of Arras opened, and put abroad, wherein the imagery doth appear in figure, *whereas in thoughts they lie best as in packs*"† (*Essays*, 1625). Bacon means that thoughts (in opposition to speech) are rolled up, or concealed, like cards we intend to play, but keep dark. Directly we read Cleopatra's replies to Thyreus (Octavius Cæsar's, Ambassador to Cleopatra), who comes to sound her policy, we find her disclaiming Antony, *and packing cards with Cæsar*:—

> *Thyreus.*—He knows that you embrace not Antony
> As you did love, *but as you feared him.*
> *Cleo.*—O!
> *Thyreus.*—The scars upon your honour, therefore he
> Does pity, *as constrained blemishes,*
> *Not as deserved.*
> *Cleo.*—He is a god, and knows
> What is most right; *mine honour was not yielded,*
> *But conquered merely.*—Act III. xiii.

Moreover, Cleopatra *did not play well in packing her cards with Cæsar.* For in order to deceive Antony, or get him out of the way, she caused a false rumour of her death to be circulated, which was the cause of Antony's suicide. Next her duplicity of character, is exposed to Cæsar, when her slave discovers her double-dealing, in having reserved and concealed from Cæsar's knowledge half her wealth—enough treasure to purchase what she made known to him (*Vide* Act V. ii.). In short, Cleopatra had it in her intentions to play her cards into Cæsar's hand, but she made a mess of it. Antony after discovering her treachery exclaims:—

---

* Prithee friend,
Pour out the *pack of matter* to mine ear.

† Themistocles, Plutarch, XXIX. 4.

You have been a boggler ever.—Act III. xiii.

Of Octavius Cæsar, Bacon observes: "But those that are of a *sedate and calm nature*, maybe ripe for great and glorious action in their youth" (*A Civil Character of Augustus Cæsar*, page 288; *Resuscitatio* 1661). In describing his own actions Cæsar says:—

Go with me to my tent, where you shall see
How hardly I was drawn into this war;
How calm and gentle I proceeded still
In all my writings.—*Antony and Cleopatra.*—Act V. i. 73.

Bacon remarks:—" You may observe, that amongst all the great and worthy persons (whereof the memory remaineth either ancient or recent), there is not one, that hath been transported to the mad degree of love. Which shows that great spirits, and great business, do keep out this weak passion. *You must except, nevertheless, Marcus Antonius the half-partner of the Empire of Rome;* and Appius Claudius the decemvir and law-giver, *whereof the former was indeed a voluptuous man and inordinate*" (*Essays, Love,* 1625).

Octavius Cæsar answers very closely to what Bacon calls a "great spirit," and certainly it is as a voluptuous and inordinate man," that Antony is presented in the Play of his name. Cæsar commenting upon Antony's "*lascivious wassails,*" exclaims:—

If he fill'd
His vacancy with his *voluptuousness*
Full surfeits, and the dryness of his bones

. . . .

Antony,
Leave thy lascivious wassails.—Act. IV. i.

Bacon adds of Love: "*But in life it doeth much mischief; sometimes like a Siren, sometimes like a Fury.* (*Love*, 1625). Compare this, describing Tamora:—

To wait said I! To wanton with this Queen,
This Goddess, this Semiramis, this nymph,
This Siren, that will charm Romes Saturnine
And see his shipwreck and his commonweals.
—*Titus Andronicus.* Act II. i.

Now turn to the second scene, of Act V. and see how Tamora is presented as Revenge, or—*as a Fury!*

Tit.—Long have I been forlorn, and all for thee;
Welcome, dread Fury, to my woful house.—Act V. ii. 82.

Observe what a *Fury*, Cleopatra becomes directly she hears of Antony's marriage with Octavia, *how she draws a knife, and calls herself mad!* To the messenger she says :—

Thou shoulds't come like a Fury crown'd with snakes,

. . . . .

Not like a formal man!
Melt into Egypt Nile! And kindly creatures
Turn all to serpents.—Act II. v.

Bacon writes :—"The stage is more beholding to Love, than the life of man. *For as to the stage, Love is ever matter of Comedies, and now and then of Tragedies*" (*Love. Essays*). It is certain we owe the magnificent tragedy of *Antony and Cleopatra*, entirely to the subject of love. I mean, that the Play is entirely founded upon the episode of the love histories of Antony and Cleopatra. Bacon also means, that Love though a most excellent subject for the stage, and particularly for Comedy, often in real life, brings much sorrow, and sometimes tragedy in its train. It is with great difficulty Bacon conceals (what we cannot escape noticing), his profound contempt for love, when taken too seriously. It is the enemy of Fortune, and of business, and he says: "But how much the more, ought men to beware themselves of this passion, *which loseth not only other things but itself.*" *(Love).* This is fully and excellently evidenced in the Play, we are discussing. Antony loses his empire, and Cleopatra betray'd, him to play into Cæsar's hands. In like manner, we find Troilus first losing Cressida, and then her love. The playwright, philosophically analysing the *chief motive of stage action*, is clearly to be discovered, in these remarks upon *Love* by Bacon. For example: "It is a poor saying of Epicurus, *Satis magnum Alter alteri theatrum sumus.* (We are a sufficient great theatre one to the other). As if a man made for the contemplation of heaven and all noble objects, should do nothing but kneel before a little idol. It is a strange thing to note the excess of this passion; and how it braves the nature and value of things, by this, that the speaking in a perpetual *hyperbole*, is comely in nothing but in Love" (*Love*, 1625). Bacon is very clearly implying, by this citation from Epicurus, that, what we call play pleasure, or the love of contemplating our fellow-creatures', actions, has mainly as its source and root, the love passion. For Romance is certainly a chief element of the Theatre, and, Romance cannot exist without love. Nevertheless, Bacon tells us, Love is a selfish passion, because it not only places false values upon the relative importance of things, but entirely forgets those larger outside issues, understood by heaven and earth. Bacon hints to us that directly we begin to contemplate each other's lives, we have the root principle of the stage before us, wherein the love passion, is the ruling or central motive of action as in most Comedies, and some Tragedies. Bacon's irony, and keeness of perception, upon the relative uses of Love upon and off the stage, is profound and wonderful. For the stage is indeed beholden to Antony's infatuation, that this Play, came to be written, but we can hardly say the same for Antony's fortunes, or the way in which love affected his destiny. That is to say, the tragedies caused by love, *afford the very best of stage materials, for those who look on only*, but for the real actors in life these tragedies, as they occured, were not so happy.

With regard to Bacon's observations, upon the perpetual *hyperbole of speech*, used by lovers, it is abundantly illustrated in the Plays. Take this for example :—

Cleopatra.—If it be love indeed, tell me how much.
Antony.—There's beggary in the love that can be reckon'd.
Cleopatra.—I'll set a bourn how far to be beloved.
Antony.—Then must thou needs find out new heaven, new earth.
—Act I. i.

Biron exclaims of his wooing :—

Nor woo in thyme, like a blind harpers song!
Taffeta phrases, silken terms precise,
Three-piled hyperboles.—Act V. ii.

Consider how *Othello* is a love tragedy; *Romeo and Juliet* is another love tragedy; *Antony and Cleopatra* a love tragedy; and reflect how true Bacon's words are of Love, when he says :—"*Love is ever matter of Comedies, and now and then of Tragedies*" (*Essays, Love*). Of the fourteen *Comedies* contained (1623 Folio Plays), *there is not one, in which love does not play a conspicuous rôle! The Two Gentlemen of Verona; The Merry Wives of Windsor; The Comedy of Errors; Much Ado About Nothing; Love's Labour's Lost; A Midsummer's Nights Dream; The Merchant of Venice; As You Like It; The Taming of the Shrew; All's Well that Ends Well; Twelfth Night;* are ever matter of love rivalries, love jealousies, love cross purposes, love aspirations, love intrigues, and their action and main central plot, turns and pivots, upon nothing but love and lovers! Even the *Tempest*, and *Winter's Tale*, in the episodes of the wooing of Miranda by Ferdinand, and of Perdita by Florizel, come also under this head. "Leave the goodly fabrics of houses, for beauty only, *to the Enchanted Palaces of the Poets, who build them with small cost*," writes Bacon. *(Of*

Building, *Essays*, 1625). Even in the case of the finding of Briar-Rose, and her awakening, in the Enchanted, or Sleeping Palace (of the House in the Wood legend), we find that love plays a great part, for the fairy prince, like Florizel first finds, and then woos the flowermaiden. As the Poet sings :—

All precious things discover'd late
To those that seek them issue forth ;
For love in sequel works with fate,
And draws the veil from hidden new worth.

We touch the very centre and heart, of the ethical motive, and lesson conveyed by the teaching of this Play, when we find Cleopatra, inquiring of Enobarbus, the true reasons of her defeat at the battle of Actium.

Cleopatra.—Is Antony or we in fault for this?
Enobarbus.—*Antony only, that would make his will*
Lord of his reason.—Act III. xiii.

Bacon writes: "*Right reason governs the will ;* good apparent seduceth it."—(*Adv. of Learning*, I., 7, p. 333, 1640.) Enobarbus (who plays the part of a chorus of truth), means to say, Antony in abandoning himself to the influence of Cleopatra, had succumbed to his passions, and surrendered his self-mastery, abandoning his Reason, and allowing his will to triumph over it. *The will, with Bacon is the appetite :—*

Then everything includes itself in power,
Power into will, will into appetite ;
And appetite, an universal wolf,
So doubly seconded with will and power,
Must make perforce an universal prey,
And last eat up himself.—*Troilus and Cressida*, Act I., iii.

It is exactly in this sense Bacon writes :—"In place there is licence to do good and evil ; whereof the latter is a curse ; *for in evil the best condition is, not to will ; the second not to can.*" (*Of Great Place*, *Essays*, 1625.)

Compare :—

Angelo.—I *will* not do't.
Isabella.—But *can* you, if you would?
Angelo.—Look, what I *will* not, that I *cannot* do.
—*M.M.* Act. II. ii. 50.

What Bacon signifies is, that it is the best condition not to be tempted (*will*) if possible ; (*i.e.*, *not to will things evil*, or as we say desire them) ; the second is, if we are tempted (*will*, *evil*), is not to yield, or to be able (*can*) to follow the will. It will be seen how entirely Bacon makes the will the instrument of appetite and of evil, *which ought to be governed by the*

Reason! Bacon says in his Essay upon *Love*, "And therefore it was well said, that it is impossible to love and to be wise.——For whosoever esteemeth too much of amorous affection, quitteth both riches and wisdom" (*Essays, Love,* 1615). Antony had abandoned his reason, and quitted his wisdom, as he confesses,

> I must from this enchanting Queen break off,
> Ten thousand harms more than the ills I know
> My idleness doth hatch.—Act I. ii.

Plutarch tells us how Antony was descended from Hercules. "He had a good thick beard, a broad forehead, a crooked nose, and there appeared such a manly look in his countenance, as is commonly seen in Hercules' pictures, stamped or graven in metal. Now it had been a speech of old time, that the family of the Antonii were descended from one Anton, the son of Hercules, whereof the family took name. This opinion did Antony seem to confirm in all his doings; not only resembling him in the likeness of his body, but also in the wearing of his garment." (*Plutarch's Lives, Antony.*)

This supposed descent from Hercules has not only been faithfully followed in the Play, but admirably turned to ethical example, as we shall presently show.—One of the most impressive and striking scenes in the Play is given in the picture of Antony's Guard, before his palace in Alexandria, who hear strange, weird, music on the eve of his defeat.

> *Fourth Soldier.*—Peace! What noise?
> *First Soldier.*—List! List!
> *Second Soldier.*—Hark!
> *First Soldier.*—Music i' the air.
> *Third Soldier.*—Under the earth.
> *First Soldier.*—It signs well, doth it not.
> *Third Soldier.*—No.
> *First Soldier.*—Peace, I say!
> What should this mean
> *Second Soldier.*—'Tis the god Hercules, whom Antony loved,
> Now leaves him.—Act IV. ii.

Antony, in confessing his retribution exclaims:—

> Eros ho!
> *The shirt of Nessus is upon me; teach me,*
> *Alcides, thou mine ancestor, thy Page.*
> —Act IV. xiii.

Nessus was a Centaur, celebrated for his lascivious disposition. Dumain describes Bertram's amorous temperament—"For rapes and ravishments he parallels Nessus." (*A. W.*, IV., 3, 281.) The fable of the "shirt of Nessus," is an allegory of the Nemesis which accompanies excessive lust of the blood, for the shirt of Nessus, whilst compelling the recipient to exclusively love the donor, *at the same time devoured with poison whoever put it on.* Cleopatra had played to Antony, the part Deianira played to Hercules. She had given him the shirt of Nessus, with all its sensual blood poisoning, and the black Nemesis accompanying it.

W. F. C. WIGSTON.

AN EXPLANATION.

THE Howard Publishing Company, Detroit, Publishers of the "Cipher writings of Sir Francis Bacon," as deciphered by Dr. Owen, and "Francis Bacon's Bi-literal Cipher" request that the following may be inserted in the present Number of BACONIANA. They are afraid that the allusion in the October Number, 1899, to Mrs. Gallup, as "type writer and expert cryptographer" may lead to some misapprehension.

"Mrs. E. N. Gallup is a lady of extensive literary attainments, now in middle life, a teacher of large experience, having fitted herself for positions of the highest importance by special work, including a period of study in France and Germany. She was for some time previous to becoming interested in Dr. Owen's discovery of the Word Cipher* in the Plays, at the head of an important educational institution, her special field being Literature and the Languages.

"She became associated in the work of developing the Word Cipher of Dr. Owen, during the preparation of Vol. II. of *Sir Francis Bacon's Story,* in January, 1894, deciphering part of Vols. III. and IV., and, with her sister, Miss Wells, all of Vol. V. as noted in Dr. Owen's preface to the book. *The Tragedy of Mary Queen of Scots,* and the *Tragedy of the Earl of Essex,* both most powerful works, were deciphered, and arranged in their published form by Dr. Owen.

"During, and after Dr. Owen's severe illness in 1895, and subsequent ill-health, which prevented him from going on with the work, these ladies completed Vols. VI. and VII. (as yet unpublished) and a portion of the Iliad, which is also found in Cipher in the works used. In the early part of 1897, Mrs. Gallup discovered in the *fac-simile* of the Folio 1623 Shakespeare Plays, the presence of Bacon's Bi-literal Cipher, so fully described and illustrated in *De Augmentis*, in the peculiar *Italic* letters found in two forms scattered profusely through the text. She deciphered the hidden story so unexpectedly revealed, which led to the examination of original Editions of Bacon's acknowledged works. The Cipher was found running through these as well, and confirmed, in the most positive and emphatic manner, both the Word Cipher discovered by Dr. Owen, and this Bi-literal Cipher in the Plays. A continuation of the work yielded some most remarkable revelations, which were put in type and copyrighted in April last, for private circulation. The results of the decipherings since that issue, are now in the printer's hands, and, added to what was printed in April, will be published in a single volume for general circulation as soon as practicable."

---

* This is the method here designated as the "Phrase Cipher." It consists of phrases, not single words, put together.

TO THE EDITORS OF "BACONIANA."

Seeing that the question of Cypher writing is not at all appreciated by the general public at the present day, I am quite ready to support the credit of my own personal opinion upon it.

Bacon devised six several systems of Cypher, as explained in the *De Augmentis*, some of them being elaborate and difficult, whether to write or to read when written. The simplest was one which he called the Bi-literal mode, and which he suggested should be the first studied by such as might at a future day be endowed with sufficient knowledge, patience and perseverance to master it.

When the deciphering of some of Bacon's writings began to be produced in modern times, it was necessarily attempted without the full experience required to ensure correctness. And when this came to be critically examined by those who were still less informed, and had given it far less attention, it is not altogether surprising that the result should be ridiculed as absurd. There is, however, no doubt now about the deciphering being absolutely correct, according to the highest mathematical and literary evidence that can be obtained.

William White, F.S.A.

NOTICES, ETC.

The Editors would be glad if the author of an article on "The Merry Wives of Windsor and its Cypher Message" would communicate with them.

The Editors wish to remind authors that they can receive no articles for publication unless the name and address of the author is sent to them (though not necessarily for publication).

We have been requested by a learned German correspondent to ascertain for him whether or not any registers of birth of Anthony and Francis Bacon are extant. James Spedding and other biographers seem not to have thought this particular of any importance, at least they do not take notice of it. The matter, however, as well as that concerning any register or notification of the death and burial of Francis, should surely be inquired into.

We hear from America that the very remarkable Book of Cipher extracted by Mrs. Gallup from the Shakespeare folio, the *Novum Organum*, and many other works attributed to Francis St. Alban, is all but ready for the press. The Cipher itself is the Biliteral Cipher invented and described by Francis St. Alban himself in the *De Augmentis*, and it is consequently capable of verification by anyone who will be at the pains to follow the instructions, and to work upon the photographic fac-similes of some of the deciphered sheets which have been marked by the decipherer in such a way as to facilitate the examination. Mrs. Gallup and her sister, Miss Wells (not *West*, as the name was in error printed in our last number), are now at New York working upon some portions of the narrative which from lack of the needful books they had been obliged to leave incomplete, "picking up missing links from old originals that are not in the Boston libraries."

The following are books lately published in connection with the Bacon-Shakespeare problem :—

"It Was Marlowe," by Wilbur Gleasar Zeigler. This is only a romance, but fully deserving the praise bestowed on it by the American Press, not only as readable, but as a careful study of Elizabethan times.

"Francis Bacon and His Shakespeare," by F. S. E. Dixon.

"The Cipher in the Plays and on the Tombstone," by Ignatius Donnelly.

Baconiana.

Vol. VIII.—*New Series.* APRIL, 1900. No. 30.

"BACONISM—PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE."

"Seeds and weak Beginnings which Time shall bring to Ripeness."

SINCE the establishment of the Bacon Society in 1883 many changes have taken place, and great advance has been made in the various branches of knowledge which it is our purpose to investigate and elucidate—knowledge, that is, of the real life, works, and aims of Francis St. Alban, better known as "Bacon."

In the first instance, the chief (and with many persons the sole) object of Baconian students was to prove whether or no Francis Bacon wrote the Plays and Poems called "*Shakespeare?*" If so, when and where did he write them? Why, if he wrote them, did he conceal his authorship? Assuming the low estate of the theatre in his day to have been accountable for his reticence, yet why, *in after times*, was that secret, which must have been known to scores of persons (friends, secretaries, publishers, printers, &c.), still carefully kept and guarded?

With regard to the main question, "*Did Francis Bacon write 'Shakespeare?'*" there was in it nothing new. So long ago as 1850 it was discussed by three lawyers (one afterwards Chief Justice, another a Privy Counsellor). These learned men scouted the idea that a tyro in the profession could have written the law in "Shakespeare," or so "tampered with our Freemasonry." One pronounced the legal knowledge to be that of "*an Attorney General;*" another added, "*Say, of a Lord Chancellor.*"

Two years later than this conversation, an article in *Chambers' Journal* opened thus:—"Who Wrote 'Shakspere?'" asked Miss Kitty, in "*High Life Below Stairs,*" the article then proceeding to discuss the elementary question.

In 1857 a remarkable book was published in America, by Delia Bacon, on "*The Philosophy of the Shakespeare Plays*" compared with that of her great namesake. The conclusions at which this learned student had arrived were not explicitly stated in her book, but they were sufficiently clear to raise the wrath of Shakespeareans, and to inaugurate the never-ended controversy. It must be to the eternal credit of Nathaniel Hawthorne that when Delia Bacon—poor, unbefriended by her own family, and at that time unsupported by literary opinion—underwent the inevitable course of persecution which befalls us all, and which ended in deranging her fine intellect, he alone helped and protected her, his poetic insight probably enabling him the more readily to enter into, and sympathise with, her views.

In that same year (1857) Mr. William Henry Smith published a "*Letter to Lord Ellesmere*," of which he personally gave the following account:—

"I was member of a Debating Society which met periodically to discuss all manner of things, and at the end of each meeting we used to arrange the programme of the next debate. One evening nobody had anything to propose, so after a little hesitation, I got up and said: '*Let it be debated whether or no Francis Bacon wrote "Shakespeare."*' This proposal was received with howls of derision. The idea was ridiculous, monstrous, could not be entertained, and so forth. John Stuart Mill was present, and he put in his word in my favour. No one, he said, had any suggestion to make, and doubtless Mr. Smith had some grounds for his motion. He therefore voted that Mr. Smith should be invited to state his case on the side of Bacon at the next meeting."

The result was the reading of Mr. Smith's paper which, elementary and superficial as it may now seem, produced such a revulsion of feeling that he was requested to have it printed in the form of a "*Letter to Lord Ellesmere*," then President of the first Shakespeare Society.

Needless to say that although the Shakespeareans expressed much interest in the "Letter," it was allowed to fall flat, and so far as we have ascertained, no member of the Shakespeare Society made any effort to follow up and examine, prove, or disprove, the positive statements formulated by Mr. Smith. Certainly none of these have been disproved.

It should be observed in passing that no one amongst these early exponents of the Bacon-Shakespeare Controversy professed to be *the first*. Delia Bacon, with much ability, expressed or suggested a great deal of which later writers have made use. She was the first *deep* writer on the subject, and seems to have thought out her theories and conclusions without help from others, but from a close and penetrative study of the philosophy of the great author himself.

William Henry Smith does not seem to have known of Delia Bacon's existence when he first attempted to formulate, and to speak out before an ignorant and disdainful public, the results of his own researches. All honour be to him as the leader of a forlorn hope which first made a breach, and stormed the citadel.

But it does not appear that in modern times any one individual *originated*, or professed to have originated, the theory that "Bacon wrote 'Shakespeare';" that the name "*Shakespeare*" was, and is, a *non-de-plume*, a "mask" for the true author. It seems (with present knowledge) impossible to doubt that this fact has been always acknowledged, and traditionally handed down by a certain select and high circle of his own (partly secret) society. For the present let this pass, whilst we state briefly some of the grounds for confident belief that the author of "*Bacon's*" works is identical with the author of "*Shakespeare*," and of many other works.

LITERARY GROUNDS OF BELIEF.

These grounds are identical with those upon which "the learned" have hitherto based all arguments and proofs in favour of the genuineness of other writings, from the Books of the Bible itself, to the Poems of *Homer* or the *Letters of Junius*. What are these grounds? To this question, the answer, in nineteen cases out of twenty, has been to this effect:—"We judge of the authorship, partly by internal and circumstantial evidence, but *chiefly by the style of writing*." Let us attack the last proposition first—"*The style of writing*." We ask, "What is style?" and the answer is usually prompt and decided: "Oh, everybody knows what *style* is. It is the way people write. There are grand, solemn, stilted, or affected styles; or simple, homely, unvarnished styles; styles pithy, dry, brief, business-like; or, on the other hand, diffuse, florid, graceful, poetical. Any one can see the difference in *style*."

True, but seeing differences does not explain them; moreover, without extending our researches beyond the "*Shakespeare*" Plays themselves, "anyone can see the difference in style" amongst them. So great is the diversity that critics have been driven to account for them by imagining a multiplicity of authorships for "*Shakespeare*." They seem to say: "Let us carve him as a dish fit for the gods." Reserving for himself and his fame the noblest parts, the cruder, weaker or coarser passages of his earlier days they apportion amongst his many masks. The style, they see, is so different between this or that play or passage. It does not seem to have struck the early commentators that the "Chameleon," "Proteus," the ebbing and flowing "Eripus," could for ever keep on changing his colour, shape, and motion; and *some still* deny the possibility of this, in spite of the kaleidoscopic variations in matter, colouring, plot, "*style*" of the much admired and disputed plays.

Hear now what our Francis says about this very point of *style*. After discussing in detail the many particulars needful, but in his day "*deficient*," for building up a noble model of language (noting as he goes, the existing poverty of language, the absence of words suitable for the expression of fine thoughts, the lack of literary ornaments, the loss even of the metaphors and figurative expressions by which in rude ages the world had been taught and elevated), he speaks of style in general, and this is what he says:—

"Style is as the subject-matter."

Here is a whole treatise in a nutshell. The style of a writer must vary according to the matter of which he discourses, or the nature of the individual who is supposed to be speaking. It is needless to return to details already printed in BACONIANA,* and which interest those only *who wish to know*. Such studious souls may, however, be assured that those who persist that *Bacon* and *Shakespeare* were different authors, because "their style is so different," have merely adopted a well-sounding form of words for the sake of upholding an argument disproved by examination of the facts. We earnestly invite all who sincerely desire to *prove all things*, to join hands with us in bringing truth to light, if only on this one point.

THE WORK OF COLLATION BEGUN.

Bacon urges that before men proceed to generalise, they should collect particulars. Inductive philosophy first, deductive last, true deductions being only possible when based upon facts. To give ever so brief an account of the work quietly going on during the past fifteen or twenty years must be, to most of us, but as the telling of an old tale. Still, for the sake of many in our Society who did not begin with us, it seems desirable to epitomise.

---

* See Vol. I. (*First Series*), pp. 2—13. Vol. I. (*Second Series*), pp. 124—138. Vol. III., pp. 2—7, 45—54, 166, 167. Vol. IV., pp. 198, 199, 208—220. Vol. V. pp. 125—136. Vol. VI. pp. 1—11, 22—30.

So long ago as 1874 a series of dictionaries was begun with a view of making a comparative analysis of the works of *Bacon* and *Shakespeare:* on the one hand, the works Legal, Scientific, Literary, Philosophical and Religious; on the other, the Plays and Poetry. The contents of this group of MS. books of reference may be classed thus:—

1. Horticulture and Agriculture, with lists of Flowers, Fruits, Trees, &c., their uses, beauties, culture, &c.
2. Natural History of Beasts, Birds, Fishes, Reptiles, Insects, with their use in metaphor, &c.
3. Human Life, its Prolongation; Death.
4. Medicine and Surgery—Diseases, Remedies, Drugs, Poisons, &c.
5. The Union of Mind and Body—Imagination, Superstition, Lunacy, &c.
6. Demonology and Witchcraft—Fairies, Vital Spirits in Nature, &c.
7. Natural Science—Physics, Light, Heat, Fire, Magnetism, Motion, Force, Air, Water, Dense and Rare.
8. Sound, connected with Music, &c.
9. Chemistry—Metallurgy, Combustibles, &c.
10. The Senses—Sight, Hearing, Touch, Smell, Taste, Perfumes, &c.
11. Foods—Cookery, Drinks, Brewing, Distillation, Fermentation.
12. Dress, Personal Ornaments, Jewels, &c.
13. Furniture, Stuffs, Equipages.
14. Architecture and all connected with Building.
15. Military, Naval, and Engineering Terms and Appliances.
16. Law—Lists of Legal Terms, &c.
17. Divinity and Religious Opinions—Study of the Bible and Lists of Texts quoted.
18. Mythology—List of Mythical Personages, Creatures, Places, &c.
19. History Ancient and Modern.
20. Geography Ancient and Modern—Typography of London and the Environs.
21. Apparent allusions in the Plays to the Author's Personal Friends, Assistants, Agents, &c.

22. Apparent allusions to his known Habits, Health, Experiences.

23. Apparent allusions to his expressed thoughts, "fixed notions," sympathies, and antipathies.

24. The Arts—Painting, the Theatre, Dancing, Sports, Exercises, Games, &c.

25. Language and Diction—(*a*) Vocabulary; (*b*) Coined Words; (*c*) Provincial and Keltic Words; (*d*) French, Italian, and Spanish Words introduced or adapted; (*e*) Words modified from the Latin; (*f*) Words Technical, Scientific, or Legal, brought into familiar use; (*g*) Peculiar Uses of Words; (*h*) Coupling of Certain Words; (*i*) Alliterations; (*j*) Words strung together; (*k*) Repetitions; (*l*) Pleonasms; (*m*) Grammatical Peculiarities, illustrated from Dr. Abbott's "Shakespeare Grammar;" (*n*) *Promus* Notes, Turns of Speech, &c.; (*o*) Metaphors and Similies, Analogies, &c.; (*p*) Puns, Quibbles, Paradoxes, Ambiguities; (*q*) A Comparison of the 56 "Characteristics" of *Shakespeare's* language, taken from Cowden Clarke's "Shakespeare Key," with the same "characteristics" from *Bacon.*

To these collections is appended another showing the tendency of "Our Francis" (especially as he advanced in life), to let his prose run into metre, or blank verse. Specimens of poetry, translations, verses for recitation in Devices, &c., and versified Psalms (the first approach to *English* hymns, verses, set to music to be sung in churches), all are indubitably his, put forth (seemingly as *Samples*) to attract attention to a quantity of verses of the same kind, indistinguishable in style, and attributed by turns to various authors, or signed *Ignoto,* or *Anonymous.*

Such preliminary studies led continually to fresh observations and consideration. It became necessary to attempt to trace more closely the *private* life, and often inscrutable doings, of Francis Bacon, his relation to, or connection with many supposed authors, in whose writings coincidences are frequently noticeable, not only between each other, but between all of them, and himself. These coincidences in matter and manner usually include particulars which the great Philosopher-Rhetorician had pronounced "*deficient*"—"Formularies and Elegancies" introduced and noted by himself, advanced ideas, inventions, and *desiderata* which he himself had promulgated.

A second Series of Dictionaries was therefore commenced, in order to bring the newly-acquired observations and fragments of information into line with the former. All attainable facts as to the personality, and circumstances of the supposed Authors, are now being collected; their abodes, their travels, their tombs and epitaphs are anxiously inquired after, with the result that up to the present time, the abundant lack of authentic records concerning them, their birth, death, doings, or writings, is a matter of growing astonishment to the inquisitors. One thing is certain, there must have been, and *be*, scores, hundreds of writers, teachers, and men of letters who are perfectly well aware that the large majority of "Elizabethan and Jacobean" authors are men of straw.

CIPHERS.

Critics and Commentators were beginning to calm down on the "*Bacon-Shakespeare Controversy*," when the storm rolled up again at the first mention of the word "Cipher," in connection with *Shakespeare.* That Shakespeareans should resist the attempt to decipher Baconian matter from the Plays is easily to be understood. Why Baconians should, in many cases, have followed suit, is less comprehensible. Did not the Philosopher himself point out the need of ciphers, enumerating six kinds in particular, and explaining in some detail his own invention? But the subject was so old as to be new, and difficult to follow; moreover, it is easier to disparage than to try to understand.

In 1888, Mr. Donnelly, after years of patient labour, brought out his pioneer work, "*The Great Cryptogram.*" The simultaneous chorus of praise and derision which attended this bold attempt to grapple with the tremendous problem, cannot be forgotten. Whatever may be the ultimate issue of present investigations and advancing knowledge, we must ever keep green in remembrance the name of the Discoverer and Reviver in modern times of the forgotten Art of Cryptography. Recently (Dec., 1899), Mr. Donnelly has published a sequel to his former work,* including the deciphering of the doggerel verse on the Shakespeare Gravestone.

A host of other decipherers have followed upon Mr. Donnelly's heels, usually diverging somewhat, and into other systems. This is not the place for explanatory details, but we must mention the remarkable results obtained by Mr. James Cary, Jun. (New York), who, by means of the "Clock" or "wheel," has worked out actual discoveries of secret facts, traced, and proved true only by means of the hints contained in the cipher. Other industrious and successful workers following in the lines of Mr. Donnelly are Mr. Wigston, Dr. Wilhelm Preyer, the Hon. Harry Gibson, Mr. E. V. Tanner, and Mr. Gould. All certify that ciphers of several kinds are embedded, not only in the *Shakespeare* folio of 1623, but seemingly in one edition, at least, of every work in which Francis had a hand.

---

* Sampson, Low, Marston & Co.

Next came Dr. Orville Owen's discovery of a cipher formed by connecting (by specific rules) phrases and sentences, gathered by means of "keys," from certain books and pages. It has been thought a pity that the mode of proceeding was not explained, so as to enable anyone unpossessed of the keys to test and work out this cipher for themselves. In consequence the two large 8vo. volumes of deciphered matter were in this country somewhat discredited, and much of the opprobrium cast upon the efforts of Mr. Donnelly was now eagerly swept together again, and piled upon Dr. Owen. Nothing has come to our knowledge which evidences any effort made by hostile critics to prove or disprove the astounding statements made in this cipher. Here, besides a poem of "*The Spanish Armada,*" a "*Tragedy of Mary, Queen of Scots,*" and other matter, we find a painful episode in Elizabeth's girlhood, and the repeated assertion that (before 1558) she married secretly Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, and that Francis was their eldest son, and true heir to the throne. These statements about the marriage seems to receive support from still more recent decipherings, but further proof is needed.

In assisting Dr. Owen in the preparation of his later books, Mrs. Gallup was led to study the "Biliteral" method of writing invented and described by Francis himself. His object seems to have been twofold: (1) To perpetuate a record of his true origin and history (which the Queen was resolved to suppress); (2) To secure his claim as author of the many works which were to be ushered into the world under fictitious names. The supposed writings of Peele, Greene, Marlowe, Spenser, and *Shakespeare*, and the "*Anatomy of Melancholy*" (assigned first to Bright, then to Burton), are here mentioned. Again the statements made in Dr. Owen's cipher are repeated and enforced with considerable detail, and in graphic language. We are not attempting to review this extraordinary book, but only to draw attention to it as a work of intense interest. Without the book itself and full explanations before us, we could in no way make ourselves responsible for its utterances; but no one with any sense of justice or respect for truth will deliver judgment upon these deciphered narratives, who has not examined, and if possible verified or disproved the statements which they contain.

The presence of Cipher presumes the existence of a decipherer. Elaborate ciphers could not have been contrived, and inserted in prints without great expense and trouble, and probably by the collaboration of many persons. Such collaborators would not contrive and labour merely for each other's edification. Their purpose seems distinctly to have been the transmission to a wide-spread association, and the handing down to the future ages, secrets at the time too dangerous for publication. And what is such an association for the "Handing-down of the Lamp," but an "*Invisible Brotherhood*," a Secret Society? Similar fraternities existed in many forms from the earliest ages. Originally religious and mystical in character, they became in later times mixed up with politics, scientific research, alchemy, architecture, and the "black art" of printing. But all such organisations are found to have possessed certain common features, and to be based upon methods adopted or perfected by Francis St. Alban. His aim evidently was the construction of an automatic machine capable of preserving, transmitting, advancing and distributing knowledge through the whole wide world.

When first these things were discussed amongst Baconians, the tendency, whether from ignorance or from timidity was, without investigation, to discredit every proposition. Francis Bacon had nothing to do with Freemasonry, which is of immense antiquity. Rosicrucianism was quite disconnected with either. There was no evidence that Bacon was member of any Secret Society—it was a mistake to think that there were any mysteries connected with the Great Printing Houses, or that they affect our studies, and so forth. One by one these and similar objections have been examined, and in most cases their fallacies have been exposed. Much has been learnt, but there is much more to learn.

With regard to the "Foundations" of which Bacon speaks, we are still too ill-informed. It has been ascertained that he was the true founder of the great nursing mother of all the sciences, the Royal Society; he appears also to have been instrumental in reviving the neglected libraries at the Universities, the Cathedrals, Palaces, and other important seats of learning. He was also anxious for the endowment of scholarships and lectures, and it would be well if some of our members would take pains to investigate the origin and workings of many institutions, such as the Society of Antiquaries, with its publications and its *Quattuor Coronati*, the Bodleian Library, the Ashmolean and Camden Collection, the British Museum and other great centres of learning.

Another and very close inquiry should be made into the history of Paper-making, Printing, and all kindred Arts and Crafts here and abroad. These things seem all to be parts of the mighty machine designed by our Philosopher to move the mind of the world, and to keep it stirring. We surely begin to understand something of the mechanism, to interpret his marks and signs, his symbols and parabolic fictions, figurative phraseology, feigned names and anagrams. We can observe the disguised portraits and other particulars which conceal and reveal the ubiquitous author. Thus by fitting together many apparently disconnected fragments we are enabled to form in our mind's eye a tolerably distinct image of the "method" of Francis St. Alban and his influence for good during the past 300 years.

As method was used to conceal, so must it be also used to reveal. Probably "we are but young in deed;" a future generation may look upon our present knowledge as almost contemptible, or as a mere groping in the dark. We are content if it be a watching of the dawn. For let it be considered under what disadvantages we labour. We would gladly turn a search-light into the dark corners, but a kind of literary extinguisher is deftly clapped on to the smallest taper which may shed a ray upon the objects of our search. With "reserved" collections, garbled Indexes and References, double Catalogues, and a system of silent suppression, how is it possible to advance quickly? There is but one thing to be done—PERSEVERE.

"TIMON OF ATHENS."

BACON entirely re-wrote the Essay of 1605—1612 upon *Friendship*. The British Museum Copy, I quote, is reprinted by Arber, in his collection of the Essays, and opens as follows:—"It had been hard for him that spake it, to have put more truth and untruth together, in few words, than in that speech; *Whosoever is delighted in solitude, is either a wild Beast or a God.* For it is most true, that a natural and secret hatred, and aversion towards society, in any man, *hath somewhat of the savage beast.* But it is most untrue, that it should have any character, at all, of the Divine Nature; except it proceed, not out of a pleasure in solitude, but out of a love and desire, to sequester a man's self, for a higher conversation. Such as is found, to have been falsely and feignedly, in some of the heathen; as Epimenides the Candian, Numa the Roman, Empedocles the Sicilian, and Apollonius of Tyana. And truly and really, in divers of the ancient Hermits, and Holy Fathers of the Church."—(*Essays*, 1625).

It is the object of this article to adduce evidence to show, how this passage applies to the character of Timon of Athens, as depicted in the Play, bearing his name. There are three points to be borne in mind for recognition, in the texts, going to be brought forward. I allude to these—*solitude,—the savage* (*beastlike*) *character,—the Divine*, of the man seeking it. Timon tells us himself of his intention of betaking himself to the *solitude* of the woods, in order to seek the fellowship of the *beasts*:—

> Timon will to the woods; where he shall find
> The unkindest *beast* more kinder than mankind,
> —Act IV. i. 35.

Indeed Timon couples himself with the beasts, in these direct words:—

> *Alcibiades.*—What art thou there? Speak.
> *Timon.*—*A beast as thou art.* The canker gnaw thy heart,
> For showing me again the eyes of man.—Act IV. iii. 49.

And Apemantus calls Timon "*beast*," when he visits him in the woods.—Act IV. iii.

But besides these points, there is a large body of text, which revolves upon a comparison by Timon, of his fellowmen with beasts, so that the problem, or question, seems, subtly suggested to us by the author, of answering, or deciding who the real beasts were? That is to say, were the "affable wolves," who eat Timon up (and forsook him afterwards), the disguised animals, or was it the other way and Timon the savage, he calls himself? The soldier discovering Timon's grave exclaims:—"Some *beast* rear'd this" (Act V. ii.). On the other hand, Timon's boundless bounty is clearly allied, in the Play, to exactly what Bacon calls *philanthropia*, in the accompanying passage:—"I take goodness in this sense, the affecting of the weale of men, which is that the Græcians called *Philanthropia;* and the word humanity is a little too light, to express it. Goodness I call the habit, and Goodness of nature, the inclination. This, of all virtues, and dignities of the mind, is the greatest, *being the Character of the Deity* (Adumbrata quædem effigies, et character;—*i.e.* a sort of shadowed likeness and character). And without it, man is a busy, mischievous, wretched thing; no better than a kind of vermin. Goodness answers to the Theological virtue Charity, and admits no excess, *but error.*"—(*Goodness and Goodness of Nature*, 1625).

First, it is important to note, how Timon, and his character, is introduced in this Essay by Bacon: "*Misanthropi*, that make it their practise, to bring men, to the bough, and yet have never a tree, for the purpose, in their gardens as Timon had. Such dispositions are the very errors of human nature" (*Ib.*). Now there can be no doubt Timon is depicted in the Play, *as a man of great goodness of nature*, and of a charity whose very fault, lay not in its excess, *but rather in the "error"* of the choice of the persons, who benefitted by it. Timon is described:—

Merchant.—A most incomparable man, breathed as it were,
To an untirable and continuate goodness.—Act I. 10.

* * * * *

Poet.—His large fortune
Upon his good and gracious nature hanging
Subdues and properties to his love and tendance
All sorts of hearts—*Ib.* 56.

* * * * *

Flavius.—Poor honest lord, brought low by his own heart,
Undone by goodness!—Act IV. ii. 37.

Timon unfolds his own character, when he exclaims:—

Methinks I could deal kingdoms to my friends,
And ne'er be weary.—Act I. ii. 227.

And a lord describes him:—

O he's the very soul of bounty!—*Ib.* 216.

This bounty of Timon's is portrayed as something magical:—

> *Poet.*—See
> Magic of bounty! All these spirits thy power
> Hath conjur'd to attend.—Act I. i.

But observe, that this, *goodness and goodness of nature, so conspicuously seen in these texts, is also coupled with the Divine character of the Deity.* For example, Timon's Steward commenting upon his master's misfortunes, as springing from bounty, exclaims:—

> Strange unusual blood
> When man's worst sin is, he does too much good!
> Who then dares to be half so kind again?
> *For bounty that makes Gods*, does still mar men.
> My dearest lord, blessed to be most accursed,
> Rich only to be wretched, thy great fortunes
> Are made thy chief affliction.—Act IV. ii.

It seems, therefore, to myself, at least, that Timon of Athens has been set side by side with his false friends and flatterers, with a very deep purpose indeed. It has been seen, how Bacon declares that man, without this character of *goodness and goodness of nature*, "is a busy, mischievous, wretched thing; *no better than a kind of vermin.*" Now this is an unmistakable hint for Timon's flatterers, who were really *parasites, or vermin*, living upon the former! Here is Timon's description of them:—

> Live loathed and long
> Most smiling, smooth, detested *parasites*,
> Courteous destroyers, affable wolves, meek bears,
> You fools of fortune, trencher friends, time's flies,
> Cap and knee slaves, vapours, and minute jacks.
> —Act III. vi. 104.

The student will, I think, not only be persuaded, that Bacon is pointing at Timon, in the passages indicated, but, as I proceed, perceive, that Timon's bounty,* has been made a peg for a parallel for Deity, on a small scale. Thus, Timon, in throwing off his false, and ungrateful friends, exclaims: "You great benefactors, sprinkle our society with thankfulness. For your own gifts make yourselves praised: *but reserve still to give, lest your Deities be despised.* Lend to each man enough, that one need not lend to another; *for were your Godheads to borrow of men, men would forsake the Gods*" (Act III. v. 79). In this ironical utterance, Bacon's conception of Deity, as Philanthropia, or Goodness of Nature, is indicated by Timon's past bounty. "It is the bounty that makes Gods," that is foreshadowed in Timon's character, and which he expected to find also in others, when it says of him:—

---

* To you
Whose star-like nobleness gave life and influence
To their whole being.—Act V. i.

> O, no doubt, my good friends, but the Gods themselves have provided that I shall have much help from you: how had you been my friends else? . . . O you Gods, think I, what need we have any friends, if we should ne'er have need of them?—Act I. ii. 91.

Of the *errors* of Goodness Bacon says:—"*Errors*, indeed in the virtue of *goodness*, or charity, may be committed. The Italians have an ungracious proverb: '*Tanto buon, che val niente—So good, that he is good for nothing.*' . . . Therefore to avoid the scandal and the danger both; it is good to take knowledge, of the *errors* of an habit, so excellent. Seek the good of other men, but be not in bondage, to their faces, or fancies; for that is but facility or softness; which taketh an honest mind prisoner. . . . And beware, how in making the *portraiture*, thou breakest the *pattern*. *For Divinity maketh the love of ourselves the pattern; the love of our neighbours but the portraiture.*"—(*Of Goodness and Goodness of Nature*, 1625).

It is exactly what Timon is doing in his speech, expecting his friends to be to him *what he had been to them*. In another Essay, Bacon writes:—"It was a sparing speech of the ancients to say, *That a friend is another himself*" (*Essays. Friendship*, 1625). Timon, in his extremity, sends his servant, Flaminius, to Lucullus, in order to borrow fifty talents from him. The servant discovers the friendship of this flatterer for Timon is false, and on being offered a bribe, (to say he had not seen Lucullus) exclaims of the latter:—

> Let molten coin be thy damnation,
> *Thou disease of a friend, and not himself.*
> —Act III. i. 55, 56.

That is to say,—a true friend will love his neighbour as himself, making, in Bacon's words, "*love of ourselves the pattern.*" Lucullus was not "*another himself*" of Timon's, but only a flattering lord—one of Timon's "*painted friends,*" as they are described by his steward. Bacon observes:—"For a crowd is not company, *and faces are but a gallery of pictures*" (*Friendship. Essays*, 1625). It is just in this spirit that Timon comments upon the painter's art:—

> The *painting* is almost the natural man;
> For since dishonour traffics with man's nature
> *He is but outside.*—Act I. i.

And when Timon's steward exclaims:—

> To have his pomp and all what state compounds,
> *But only painted like his varnished friends.*—Act III. ii.

it is just possible to surmise, that in this introduction of poet and painter, together with their arts, into the Play, some very deep moral purpose is prefigured. Certainly, if Timon had not based his *portraiture* of his friends feelings, upon the *pattern* of his own love towards them, he would not have been broken! I do not insist that this is what Bacon virtually means, but it certainly suggests the idea that it is a mistake to judge men (expect them to be) replicas, or portraits of ourselves. It must be remembered Bacon's remarks revolve upon the errors, of goodness and goodness of nature.

In the same *Essay of Friendship*, he writes:—" Want of true friends, as it is the reward of perfidious natures, *so it is an imposition upon great fortunes.* The one deserves it, the other cannot escape it. And therefore it is good to retain sincerity, and to put it into the reckoning of ambition,—that the higher one goeth, the fewer true friends he shall have."—*Essays. Friendship*, 1625.

There is little doubt the painter's art is introduced as a satire upon superficial or stage friendship. Timon exclaims with irony to the painter:—

> Thou draw'st a *counterfeit*
> Best in all Athens: thou'st indeed the best;
> Thou *counterfeitest* most lively.—Act V. i. 83.

Now the Play of *Timon of Athens*, really revolves largely, upon false, or *counterfeit friendship*, and the painter and poet, are proved in this scene, I quote from, to be of the same fellowship, as the other flatterers* who undid Timon. They were "*counterfeit coin*" (*John* III. i. 99). And therefore the student will understand, that the *arts* brought in here, are as venal, and corrupt as the rest. Bacon says:—"There is little friendship in the world, and least of all between equals, which was wont to be magnified. That that is, *between superior and inferior, whose fortunes may comprehend the one the other*" (*Expense. Essays*, 1625). This is fully borne out in this Play. Timon's only real and genuine friends are his servitors, particularly his faithful steward Flavius:—

---

* *Apemantus.*—Art not a poet?
Poet.—Yes.
Apemantus.—Then thou *liest:* look in thy last work, where thou hast *feigned* him a worthy fellow.—Act I. i.

Flavius.—All broken implements of a ruin'd house.
Third Servant.—Yet do our hearts wear Timon's livery,
That see I by our faces; we are fellows still;
Serving alike in sorrow; leak'd is our bark,
And we, poor mates, stand on the dying deck
Hearing the surges threat.—Act IV. ii. 16—21.

Bacon declares that: "*A natural and secret hatred and aversion towards society in any man, hath somewhat of the savage beast.*" Nobody can doubt this was written with an eye upon Timon, who remembers, the texts quoted already connecting him with a beast, or with this speech:—

Timon.—Therefore be abhorr'd all feasts, *societies, and throngs of men,*
*His semblable, yea himself,** *Timon disdains.*—Act III. iii.

Bacon at the same time, in the same context, says that: "*Whosoever is delighted in solitude is either a God, or a beast*" (*Essays. Friendship*, 1625). Observing, that these two contradictories, contain, or embrace, much truth and untruth, according to the motives, and character of the man, who thus shuns his fellowmen. The motive may be one of pure misanthropy, or it may be incited, as Bacon tells us, by a desire "to separate oneself for a higher conversation," as was the case with Apollonius, Epimenides, and others. That is to say, *Contempt of nature*, may be the outcome of disappointment, *or it may arise from Philosophy*,† *if it includes itself, as seems Timon's case*:—

Not nature
To whom all sores lay siege, can bear great fortune
But by contempt of nature.—Act IV. iii. 6.

Bacon, in his Essay, condemns *Misanthropi* of Timon's character, who he calls "*the very errors of nature*," meaning that nature had produced something at variance, or cross purposes with herself—*that is as hating or disdaining themselves*, as we discover in the texts just cited from the Play. For surely nature seems to commit a mistake when she constructs a being who is at war with herself, and with his own nature at the same time? Bacon's words about Timon are:—"Such dispositions are *the very errors of human nature* (*Vomicaset Carcinoria—i.e. Boils and Cancers*)."

Bacon compares true friends to *physicians*:—"A principal fruit of friendship, is the ease and discharge of the fulness and swelling of the heart, which passions of all kinds do cause and induce. We know *diseases*, and stoppings, and suffocations of all kinds, are the most dangerous in the body. And it is not otherwise in the mind."—(*Essays. Friendship*, 1625).

---

* Apemantus, who belonged to the school of Philosophy, called Cynics, is of the same spirit:—Apemantus, that few things loves better *than to abhor himself.*—Act I. i. 237.

† Bacon observes:—"Pride if it ascend from contempt of others to a contempt of itself, at last is changed into philosophy."—(*Antitheta* XIV.)

Bacon goes on to describe how we take various medicines to open the liver, so in like manner the fruit of friendship is the opening of the heart, and discharge of the mind when oppressed. In short friendship acts as a cure, or heal-all for mental troubles. Compare this speech of Sempronius, touching Timon :—

> His friends, like *physicians*
> Thrive, give him over : must I take the *cure* upon me?
> —Act III. iii. 11.

In thorough keeping with this idea Timon's false friends are called diseases :—"*Thou disease of a friend.*"—Act III. i.

"The best preservative to keep the mind in health, is the faithful admonition of a *friend*. The calling of a man's self, to strict account, *is a medicine*, sometimes too piercing and corrosive. . . . Even as you would call *a Physician*, that is thought good, *for the cure of the disease*, you complain of, but is unacquainted with your body ; and therefore, may put you in way for a present cure, but overthroweth your health in some other kind ; *and so cure the disease, and kill the patient.*"—(*Friendship. Essays*, 1625).

The *disease* Timon suffered from was poverty :—

> And his poor self,
> A dedicated beggar to the air,
> With his *disease* of all shunn'd poverty,
> Walks like contempt alone.—Act IV. i. 12.

It may be pointed out that Timon's moral sickness begins to mend in his solitude :—

> My long sickness
> Of health and living now begins to mend,
> *And nothing brings me all things !*—Act V. iii. 189.

Timon in the end refused all friendship, realising Bacon's words :—"The parable of Pythagoras is dark, but true—*Cor ne edito*—eat not the heart. Certainly if a man would give it a hard phrase those that want friends, to open themselves unto, are cannibals of their own hearts."—*Friendship*, 1625.

Bacon writes :—"The poets feign that when Plutus (which is riches) is sent from Jupiter, he limps, and goes slowly, but when he is sent from *Pluto* he runs and is swift of foot. Meaning that riches gotten by good means, and just labour, pace slowly. But when they come by the death of others (as by the course of inheritance, testaments, and the like) *they come tumbling in upon a man. But it might be applied likewise to Pluto, taking him for the devil.*"—(*Riches. Essays*, 1625).

Timon's bounty is described by a lord, in the Play, thus:—

> He pours it out; *Plutus*, the God of gold,
> Is but his steward: no meed, but he repays,
> Sevenfold above itself.—Act I. i. 287.

Bacon is very plainly here, deriving the name Plutus from the Greek *Ploutos* (or riches). "When goods encrease, *they are encreased that eat them*," observes Solomon (Ecclesiastes v. 11), a point illustrated in this Play abundantly, as is also that other saying: "There is a sore evil which I have seen under the sun, *namely, riches kept for the owners thereof to their hurt.*"—(*Ib.* v. 13).

Bacon writes:—"For certainly great riches, have sold more men, than they have bought out" (*Riches. Essays*, 1625). It is very evident Bacon conceived *Plutus*, as a prototype for everything evil. For, in direct connotation with the passage quoted, Bacon adds: "For when riches come from the devil (as by fraud and oppression, and unjust means) they come upon speed" (*Riches*, 1625). And Bacon leaves us in no doubt of how, he is thinking of Timon and his flatterers, when he writes:—"Riches gotten by service (*Servitium Regum, aut Magnatum, i.e.*, Services of Kings or great persons), though it be of the best rise, *yet when they are gotten by flattery, feeding** (*sese flectendo*, 'bending oneself to'), humours, and every other servile conditions, they may be placed amongst the worst."—(*Riches*, 1625).

Immediately, on reading this, we remember Timon's banquets, and his flattering but false friends, who were everlastingly *bending themselves before Timon*:—

> *Apemantus.*—What a coil's here!
> Serving of becks and jutting out of backs!
> Thus honest fools lay out their wealth on court'sies.
> —Act I. ii. 239.

Bacon writes of Expense:—"It is no baseness for the greatest to descend and look into their own. Some forbeare it, not upon negligence alone, but doubting to bring themselves into melancholy, in respect they shall find it broken, but would be cured without searching. He that is plentiful in expenses of all kinds, will hardly be preserved from decay."—(*Expense*, 1625).

---

* Ah, when the means are gone that buy this *praise*
The breath is gone whereof this praise is made:
Feast won, fast lost.—Act II. iii. 178.

> *Flavius.*—No care, no stop; so senseless of expense
> That he will neither know how to maintain it,
> Nor cease his flow of riot: takes no account
> How things go from him, nor resumes no care
> Of what is to continue.—Act II. ii.
>
> * * * * *
>
> *Nor will he know his purse*, or yield me this,
> To show him what a beggar his heart is,
> Being of no power to make his wishes good.—Act I. ii. 200.

Bacon says:—"Costly followers are not to be liked, least while a man maketh his train longer, *he make his wings shorter.*"—(*Followers and Friends. Essays*, 1625).

This is paralleled, by the Senator's speech, touching the *plucking* of Timon, by his importunate creditors:—

> For I do fear,
> When every *feather* sticks in his own wing,
> Lord Timon will be left a *naked* gull,
> Which flashes now a phœnix.—Act II. i. 29.

Bacon observes:—"*The improvement of the ground*, is the most natural obtaining of riches; for it is our *great Mother's blessing, the earth*, but it is slow."—(*Riches*, 1625).

Timon is presented in the Play as *digging*, and we may suppose improving the earth, and "*obtaining of riches*," *or gold*, by so doing, and we find him applying this epithet of *mother*, as Bacon does, to the earth:—

> Common *mother*, thou [*Digging*]
> Whose womb immeasurable, and infinite breast
> Teems and feeds all.—Act IV. iii. 177.

Bacon opens his Essay upon *Riches*, with these words:—"I cannot call riches better than the *baggage* of virtue. The Roman word is *Impedimenta.* For as the baggage is to an army, so is riches to virtue. It cannot be spared, nor left behind, *but it hindreth the march.*"—(*Riches*, 1625).

This is a very clear hint for the Third Scene of the Fourth Act of this Play, where Alcibiades is introduced *marching with his army upon Athens*, and coming upon Timon, just at the moment when he has discovered and dug up gold. Timon exclaims of the gold:—

> Come, damned earth,
> Thou common whore of mankind, that putt'st odds
> Among the rout of nations, I will make thee
> Do thy right nature. [*March afar off.*] Ha! a drum?
> —Thou art quick,

But yet I'll bury thee: thou'lt go, strong thief,
When gouty keepers of thee cannot stand:—
Nay, stay thou out for earnest. [*Keeping some gold*].
—Act IV. iii. 41.

Timon gives Timandra, and Phrynia, and also Alcibiades, gold, not however, with the end of benefitting them, but in order that it may act as a curse, and as the enemy of every virtue!

If the student is desirious of discovering how gold, in Timon's opinion, may be made the instrument of furthering wickedness and vice, and impeding virtue, let him read those terrible speeches Timon delivers, in direct connection with his gifts of gold, to those unmistakable impediments to virtue, Phrynia, Timandra, who are introduced as a sort of accompaniment, *or baggages* of armies, and particularly so in past history. To Alcibiades Timon exclaims:—

Follow thy drum;
With man's blood paint the ground, gules, gules;
Religious canons, civil laws are cruel;
Then what should war be? This fell whore of thine,
Hath in her more destruction than thy sword,
For all her cherubim look.—Act IV. iii.

We actually behold the army of Alcibiades delayed and hindered in its march towards Athens, *while it takes gold from Timon.* What does gold do to corrupt virtue?

Thus much of this will make black white, foul fair,
Wrong right, base noble, old, young coward valiant,
Ha, you gods! why this? what this, you gods?
Why this
Will lug your priests and servants from your sides,
Pluck stout men's pillows from below their heads,
This yellow slave
Will knit and break religions, bless the accursed,
Make the hoar leprosy adored, place thieves
And give them title, knee, and approbation
With senatours on the bench. This, is it
That makes the wappened widow wed again;
She whom the spital house and ulcerous sores
Would cast the gorge at, this embalms, spices
To the April day again.—Act IV. iii.

In Bacon's Essay upon *Riches*, he writes:—"The personal fruition in any man, cannot reach to feel great riches. There is a custody of them, or a power of dole and donative of them, or a fame of them; but no solid use to the owner. Do you not see, *what fained prices are set upon little stones and rarities?*"—(*Riches*, 1625).

In the First Act of the Play, a jeweller is introduced, offering a jewel—evidently a stone of a rare water—to Timon for purchase. When Timon complains of the excessive price asked, the jeweller replies :—

> My lord, 'tis rated
> As those which sell would give : but you well know
> *Things of like value differing in the owners*
> *Are prized by their masters.*—Act I. i. 168.
>
> . . . . .
>
> Not with fond shekels of the tested gold,
> *Or stones whose rates are either rich or poor*
> *As fancy values them.*—*Measure for Measure*, Act II. ii.

"And yet they are the fittest timber, to make great politics of. Like to knee timber, that *is good for ships, that are ordained to be tossed.*"—(*Of Goodness and Goodness of Nature*, 1625).

When Timon's fortunes have foundered, his servants exclaim of their master :—

> *Third Servant.*—Leak'd is our *bark*,
> And we, poor mates, *stand on the dying deck*,
> *Hearing the surges threat.*—Act IV. i. 19.
>
> . . . . .
>
> *Timon.*—Ne'er speak, or think,
> That Timon's *fortunes* 'mong his friends can *sink.*
> —Act II. ii. 240.

These two texts indicate, *Fortune conceived as a ship*, on which one is buffetted and tossed, and which finally may *sink.* Directly Bacon's Essay upon *Fortune* is examined, the same conception of *Fortune as a ship*, is suggested, by the following:—"So Cæsar said to the pilot in the Tempest, '*Cæsarem portas, et Fortunam ejus*' (Thou carriest Cæsar and his fortunes)."—(*Of Fortune. Essays*, 1625).

Timon owned his ruin, to his refusal to hearken to the arguments, and *good counsel* of Apemantus, who was never weary of warning him, of the false friends feeding on his bounty.

Bacon writes :—"In counsel is stability. Things will have their first or second agitation. If they be not *tossed* upon the arguments of *Counsel, they will be tossed upon the waves of Fortune.*"—(*Of Counsel*, 1625).

Bacon says :—"To take advice of some few friends is ever honourable. *For lookers on, many times, see more than gamesters,* and the vale best discovereth the *hill.*—(*Of Followers and Friends*, 1623).

This is very closely exemplified in the case of Apemantus, who comes to look on, and observe the different characters of Timon's pretended friends. When Apemantus appears at the banquet, given by Timon to his flatterers, the former describes his functions of the mere looker on:—

> *Apemantus.*—Let me stay at thy apperil Timon,
> *I come to observe, I give thee warning on't.*
> —Act I. ii.

The conceit of considering those high in the world, as seated on a hill, is prefigured, in the Play, and is applied to indicate Timon's fortune:—

> *Poet.*—Sir, I have upon a high and pleasant hill
> Feign'd Fortune to be throned. The base of the mount
> Is rank'd with all deserts, all kind of natures,
> That labour on the bosom of this sphere
> To propagate their states.—Act I. i.

It is Apemantus indeed who sees the entire game, of the noble flatterers who are feeding upon Timon. It is Apemantus who is Timon's true friend, who gives good counsel: "So that there is as much difference, between the counsel that a friend giveth, and that a man giveth himself, *as there is between the counsel of a friend and a flatterer.*"—(*Friendship. Essays*, 1625).

Again:—"There is no such remedy against flattery of a man's self, as the liberty of a friend."—(*Friendship. Essays*, 1625).

Apemantus exclaims, with allusion to Timon:—

> Oh! that men's ears should be
> To counsel deaf, but not to flattery.
> —Act I. ii. 256.

In just this same spirit Bacon quotes from Proverbs:—"Faithful are the wounds of a friend, but the kisses of an enemy are deceitful" (Prov. xxvii. 6). "A flattering mouth worketh ruin" (Ib. xxvi. 28); "A man that flattereth his neighbour spreadeth a net for his feet" (Ib. xxix. 5).

Indeed this Play, like that of *King Richard the Second,* is a complete sermon upon the dangers of great fortune, when exposed to flattery. When Lucullus (one of Timon's false flattering friends) refuses to lend Timon money, Strangers who are looking on observe:—

> *First Stranger.*—Do you observe this Hostilius?
> *Second Stranger.*—Ay, too well.
> *First Stranger.*—Why, this is the world's soul?
> And just of the same piece
> *Is every flatterer's spirit.*
> —Act III. iii.

Apemantus exclaims:—

He that loves to be flattered is worthy of the flatterer.
—Act I. i. 232.

In his Essay upon *Vain Glory*, Bacon writes:—"Glorious men are the scorn of wise men; the admiration of fools; *the idols of parasites*" (*prædæ et escæ*).—(*Essays*, 1625).

Apemantus.—Like madness is the *glory* of this life,
As this pomp shows to a little oil and root.
We make ourselves fools, to disport ourselves;
And spend our *flatteries, to drink those men*
Upon whose age we void it up again,
With poisonous spite and envy.
—Act I. ii. 139.

* * * * *

Thou giv'st so long, Timon, I fear me thou wilt give away thyself in paper shortly. What need these feasts, pomps, *and vainglories*?—Ib. 249.

Bacon's Latin,—(*prædæ et escæ*),—(as an afterthought, or variation, of the earlier Essay,) where the equivalent is—"*the idols of parasites*"—is a sort of revelation. For Timon in his full fortunes is depicted as the *idol of the parasites* (vermin) who made him both their prey and their booty. For example, the stage directions read, "*The Lords rise from table, with much adoring of Timon*, etc." (Act I. ii. 150). Indeed, there is little doubt, that when Bacon wrote upon *Praise* (*Flattery*), as follows, the text applied to Timon, as well as to Richard the Second:—"Men are praised maliciously to their hurt, thereby to stir envy and jealousy towards them: *Pessimum genus inimicorum laudantium* (the worst sort of enemies are flatterers). Insomuch as it was a proverb amongst the Grecians; that, *He that was praised to his hurt, should have a push rise upon his nose;* as we say: *That a blister will rise upon one's tongue, that tells a lie.*"—(*Praise. Essays*, 1625).

In conformity with this, Timon is found, after his ruin, exclaiming out of the bitterness of his experience, to the senators who seek him:—

Speak, and be hanged!
For each true word a *blister!* And each false
Be as a cautorizing to the root o' the tongue,
Consuming it with speaking!—Act IV. i. 134.

W. F. C. WIGSTON.

THE CIPHERS OF ALMAZAN, 1485 TO 1509, AND OTHERS SUBSEQUENTLY USED.

THERE is a book not lying within reach of many readers, but which contains some passages much to our purpose at the present time, when *nolens volens* the attention is being directed to the question of the use and variety of cipher writing. We therefore give some extracts which may be acceptable to such as have not time or opportunity for private research.

The book in question is entitled "*Calendar of Letters, Despatches and State Papers, Relating to the Negotiations between England and Spain, Preserved in the Archives at Simancas and Elsewhere,* Vol. I., HENRY VII., 1485—1509," &c. (edited by G. A. Bergenroth; pub., Longmans, 1862).

The Editor having described the exceeding difficulty of deciphering the confused old Spanish documents of Ferdnan Alvarez (Secretary of State to Ferdinand and Isabella), goes on to say that a great improvement is observable under his successor.

"Almazan was, if not the inventor, at any rate the person who introduced cipher into Spain. The whole history of ciphered writing, from its rudest beginnings until it had become so complicated a system that even those statesmen who were the most thoroughly initiated into the art were unable to make use of it, may be studied in the papers belonging to a period of about fifteen years. On some of the deciphered despatches marginal notes, such as the following, may be found: 'Nonsense;' 'Impossible;' 'Cannot be understood,' or, 'Order the ambassador to send another despatch.' After the year 1504, in which Queen Isabella died, it was found necessary to return to more simple systems of cipher."

Mr. Bergenroth then explains the enormous difficulties which he encountered in the deciphering, and how he finally succeeded in making 20 keys, by means of which he was able to interpret and to publish the whole of the ciphered despatches in the Archives of Simancas. He concludes the Introduction to the volume by some "Remarks" upon the cipher, from which the following passages are abridged:—

"There are different essays of the art of deciphering. In almost all of them the reader is directed, first, to discover what signs occur the most frequently, and to judge thereby whether they represent vowels or consonants. This method, if it be useful for discovering any other cipher, is useless to anyone wishing to discover the ciphers of Almazan. Where each letter of the alphabet may be rendered in 50 different ways, it is quite impossible to say which letter occurs oftenest. Besides, where one sign represents a whole word, or a whole phrase, letters cannot be counted.

"The ciphers which occur in Spanish despatches during the time of Ferdinand and Isabella are of very different kinds. The most simple is the one where Arabic numerals are interspersed with common writing.* . . . Another kind soon followed, in which Roman numerals were employed. But the number of signs belonging to this system was, from the first, much greater than the former, and soon increased from hundreds to thousands. The key to a cipher which contains two or three thousand signs is a little dictionary. If each sign represent a whole word, or even a whole phrase, it is not difficult to compose a letter without having recourse to a single word in plain writing. Letters written entirely in cipher first occur in the year 1495, and are composed of Roman numerals. . . . (To these) an alphabet is added, in which each letter of the alphabet is expressed by a single sign. . . . Each vowel is represented by five different signs, and each consonant by four. The number was soon increased . . . to 14 or more signs, so that more than 500 signs corresponded to the Spanish alphabet. To this complicated cipher was added a third kind. Certain significations were attached to monosyllabic words.† For instance, 'bax' = 'ciertamente,' 'dem' = '*gente de armes*,' 'nam' = 'yo, el Rey Catolico.' Signs without meaning, *nichil importantia*, as they were termed, were intermixed with the cipher. . . . These different signs were constantly mixed up, not only in the same letter, or on the same page, but in the same sentence, or even in one word. For instance,

DCCCCLXVIIII. *le* N *o* γ *malus* ζ = *enviando* (sending).
DCCCCLXVIIII. = *en*
le = *vi*
N = *a*
o = *n*
γ = *d*
malus = nichil importans.
ζ = *o*

---

* This is the kind used by Standen, Morrison, and others in the letters found in the Tenison Collection, Lambeth Palace.

† The points here enumerated nearly all accord with some of the Anthony Bacon correspondence at Lambeth Palace.

". . . I did not discover any of the keys to the cipher in a methodical manner. Whilst engaged in copying, I was constantly on the watch for a weak point, convinced that no man can for any length of time succeed in so completely disguising his thoughts, but that he will occasionally betray himself to a close observer."

The observant decipherer continues his explanation with a detailed account of how he gradually gained hints which raised his imagination and enabled him first to make successful *guesses* at the meaning of some of the signs. These ascertained and fixed, enabled him to reach others, and so on from one to another, until a key was so far completed that no serious difficulties remained even in this exceedingly complex cipher.

"Generally, I had to proceed from small beginnings. Had the discovery of all the subsequent signs of a system of cipher been as difficult as the beginning, I should, most probably, have never been able to complete my work. But, however a man may strive to act incoherently, he will not be able to free himself from certain rules. There never has been even a poet who, in the boundless exercise of his imagination, has succeeded in creating the character of a madman whose words have not been subjected to certain, albeit unsound, laws.

"The cipher used in the time of Ferdinand and Isabella was, as I have already hinted, of a twofold character. In one kind of keys each sign expressed only one letter of the alphabet, and in the other each sign represented a whole word, or a whole phrase. The writing in cipher, which signifies letters, is so far like common writing that all the signs for the letters which form the word must be put in their natural order . . . only each letter may have an unlimited number of signs to represent it. . . . The cipher in which each sign represents a whole word presents greater difficulties; . . . still the signs are discoverable. The first thing to be done is to bring all the signs of such a cipher into their order. The signs are before our eyes, and we shall therefore be enabled by close observation to discover the rule according to which they have been framed . . . the order must have some relation to the alphabet. If the reader be only fortunate enough to discover the meaning of a few—say, 10 or 20—signs which are distributed over different portions of the key, he will find it easier to fill up the intervening spaces. . . . If a man had to read a book in a language of which he knew nothing, and had to consult the dictionary for every word, he would find his task a tedious one. Yet that will give but a faint idea of what I had to undergo; for I had not only to consult my keys for every word, but for every letter. The labour entailed was rendered all the greater as, in the magniloquent language of Spain, many words contain 10 and more letters."

The cryptographer next meets the question as to whether his decipherings are trustworthy, and confidently affirms that they must be so. 1. Because, after having deciphered the despatches, he found copies of some of them in plain writing, and these original drafts corresponded with his interpretations. 2. After his return from Madrid, "The Key of Puebla" and fragments of two other keys were given to him, and were found to coincide with the keys which he himself had formed. Being correct so far as these different keys went, there is no reason why the rest of his work based upon the same plan should not be equally correct.

"Keys to ciphers are real keys, and though in the estimation of the statesmen of that time I should have been considered a thief, still, so far as the keys are concerned, they must have been like the original ones, or they would not have corresponded to the words of the lock."

Anyone truly concerned with the newly-revived study of ciphers should read and consider this interesting paper by Mr. G. A. Bergenroth on the old methods employed by statesmen of the Spanish Court in the 15th and early part of the 16th centuries. Such were the ciphers with which Francis St. Alban was acquainted, and his ostensible object in the composition of new ciphers was to make them *easier*, both to the writer and the reader. No wonder that he should have perceived the necessity for making his own inventions less complicated than those previously used. The Spanish methods read by means of Mr. Bergenroth's "Twenty Keys" were not ingenious, or cleverly contrived; they did not depend upon mathematical or geometrical rules, or artfully-contrived marks and different founts of type, neither did they work with a "dial," "clock," or "wheel," on the principle adopted later on by Wheatstone, nor by the exchange of two signs, after the fashion of the "Morse alphabet." All these were inventions made or adapted to his purposes by the "arch-contriver," whose ciphers are now being so eagerly traced and in part unravelled. They are probably to be reckoned as amongst those things of which he said that, so long as they were not known, men pronounced them impossible; but as soon as they were known, men wondered that they had not seen them all along. In his *Promus* jottings he notes, "Everything is subtile till it is conceived," and, "Every prince has his cipher."

THE "COMEDY OF ERRORS."

THE *Comedy of Errors* is the earliest of the Plays known as Shakespeare's, of whose production we have any definite record. A *Henry VI.* had been staged by Henslowe in 1591, and a *Titus and Andronicus* in 1593, but these are supposed to have been the rough hewn plays which had not as yet been shaped by the master-hand and vitalized by its touch. The peculiar circumstance and chrisom which swathed the firstling of the great dramatist on its introduction to "this great stage of fools" were briefly these.

In 1594 the youth of Gray's Inn determined to revive the Christmas revels in which they had been wont to excel, but which for some reason or other had during the few previous years been intermitted. Their device was to turn Gray's Inn into a mock court and kingdom, to elect a prince with all officers of law, state, and household, they "raised treasure" partly by a benevolence from those present and partly by letters in the nature of privy seals to those away. They sent to "their ancient allied friend the Inner Temple" requesting that an Ambassador from that State might be sent to reside among them. On December 20th, the Prince was enthroned with all state in the great hall of Gray's Inn, the King-at-Arms proclaimed his style and blazoned his arms; the Champion rode in full armour and threw down his gage in defiance of all other claimants; the Attorney made his gratulatory speech; the Solicitor summoned all his homagers and tributaries to appear and do homage, a burlesque pardon was read for every possible kind of offence; the Prince made a short speech and the evening ended in dances.

So great had been the success of the first night that it was resolved to hold certain "grand nights" on which something special should be performed. The first of these was held on December 28th, when the Ambassador from the Temple having arrived in great state together with a splendid company of "lords, ladies, and worshipful personages, that did expect some notable performance," the throng grew suddenly so great and the stage so crowded with beholders that there was not room enough for the actors and nothing could be done. The Ambassador and his train retired in discontent; when the tumult partly subsided, dancing and revelling were indulged in and afterwards "a *Comedy of Errors* like to *Plautus* his *Menechmus* was played by the players," "so that night," continues the historian, "was begun and continued to the end in nothing, but confusion and errors; whereupon it was ever afterwards called the Night of Errors."

Here we find ourselves confronted by the curious fact that the first staging of a Shakesperian Play took place, not at the Theatre, the Curtain, or the Rose, but at Gray's Inn where Francis Bacon was a student, and at a performance at which Bacon himself assisted.

On December 29th, "The Prince" and his council appointed a commission of Oyer and Terminer to inquire into the disorders of the previous night, who found that they were supposed to be caused by a certain "sorcerer or conjurer" who was arraigned before a jury on several charges, of which the last was "that he had foisted a company of base and common fellows to make up our disorders with a Play of errors and confusions."* It would be interesting to know who the "sorcerer or conjurer" was, we only know that the fame of Friar Bacon was great in the days of Elizabeth as a conjurer (see Greene's "Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay,") and that it may have been a punning allusion to Francis. But however this may have been, we find that the trial ended in the committal of the conjurer, the Attorney, the Solicitor, and the Master of Requests to the Tower. After which broad parody of justice, the Council held a consultation for the recovery of the lost honour of Gray's Inn, and determined that an entertainment of a superior kind should take place on January 3rd. First a masque was performed embodying the reconciliation and renewal of brotherly love between Grains and Templarius. Then the Prince invested the Ambassador and twenty-four of his retinue with the Order of Knight of the Helmet and the articles of the Order were read.

"This being done there was a table set in the midst of the stage before the Prince's seat and there sate six of the Lords of his privy council" who delivered addresses to the Prince on War, Philosophy, Buildings and Foundations, Treasure,

---

*I have given these extracts from the "Gesta Grayorum" as quoted by Spedding in his "Life of Bacon." Perhaps some further particulars might be gleaned from Nichol's "Progresses of Queen Elizabeth" where the "Gesta" are given in full. I have been unable to obtain a copy.

Virtue, and Sports, and Pastimes, after which the Prince returned his answer to them.

"The performance of which night's work being very carefully and orderly handled, did so delight and please the nobles and the other auditory, that thereby Gray's Inn did not only recover their lost credit and quite take away all the disgrace that the former Night of Errors had incurred; but get instead thereof so great honour and applause as either the good reports of our honourable friends that were present could yield, or we ourselves desire."

On this Spedding remarks "That the speeches of the six Councillors were written by him (Bacon), and by him alone, no one who is at all familiar with his style, either of thought or expression, will for a moment doubt; they carry his signature in every sentence."

Now we know that in 1587 eight members of the Society of Gray's Inn were concerned in writing a Play *The Misfortunes of Arthur*, one of whom was Francis Bacon. The Play was performed at Greenwich in February, 1587-8, before Queen Elizabeth, and is spoken of by Collier as having "a richer and nobler vein of poetry running through it than is to be found in any previous work of the kind."

The question now comes, If in 1587 the students of Gray's Inn had been capable of producing a better Play than any that had previously occupied the stage, what should have led them to apply to an obscure actor like Shakespeare, not one of whose Plays had seen the light, to provide them with a Play with which to retrieve the lost honour of Gray's Inn?

Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis* had been published in 1593, and his "Lucrece" in May, 1594, but as a dramatist he was quite unknown; not until 1598 did any Play appear authenticated with his name, but Lilly, Peele, and Kyd, were then at the height of their dramatic fame, and had the students of Gray's Inn been incapable of providing a Play for themselves, it is to the dramatists of established reputation we should have expected them to appeal. These things are a mystery which at present we are unable to solve, but we know that Bacon assisted in the production of a Gray's Inn Play in 1587, that in 1612 he was the "chief contriver" of a masque presented by the gentlemen of Gray's Inn and the Inner Temple, on the marriage of the Princess Elizabeth. What is more likely than that he had a hand in the production of the Play which in 1594 was acted at the revels at Gray's Inn?

E. S. ALDERSON.

FRANCIS BACON'S FRIENDS AND ASSOCIATES.

THE subject of this short paper is "Francis Bacon: his Friends and Associates," a matter hitherto singularly overlooked and neglected. There is an old proverb, "Tell me your company, and I will tell you what you are," but in trying to find out what Francis Bacon truly was, too little inquiry has been generally made as to his "company," neither do his biographers sufficiently enlighten us. Many interesting names just appear, and pass over the pages of the regulation "*Lives*" set before the public; foreign names such as *Galileo, Fulgentius, Bruno, Montaigne,* and many more *English* names presently to be noticed. Like fleeting shadows they come and go, unnoted by the inobservant or uninterested, but furnishing useful hints to the pioneer corps striving to clear the way to true discovery.

We cannot depend even upon the *Index* of any Baconian "Life" to guide us faithfully to the required particulars. Search the Index to James Spedding's seven 8vo vols. of Bacon's "*Letters and Life,*" and you will find no entry of any masque, revel, device, or entertainment, none of the "*Order of the Helmet,*" the "*Masque of the Indian Prince,*" or of "*Philantia, or Self-love,*" although these pieces are described, and some printed in these volumes. So on with many other matters pertinent to our inquiries. The authors or publishers of such works are evidently perfectly well informed as to what facts will lead up to the true revelation of "Bacon," these are therefore either omitted, or cleverly introduced so as to pass unnoticed by the "General." This will be the experience of all who follow this game, "*If*" (as Lear says), "*you will catch it, you must catch it by running.*"

Now we all know that Bacon's Courtly friends and associates, the Dukes of Buckingham and Norfolk, the Earls of Arundel, Derby, Essex, Leicester, Northampton, Nottingham, Pembroke, and Montgomery, Shrewsbury, Suffolk, Sussex, and Warwick; the Lords Buckhurst, Clinton, Dudley, Dorset, Herbert, Howard, Hunsdon, Rich, Sackville, Sheffield, Strange, Willoughby, and others, *kept theatrical companies.*

Your attention is asked to this point, for hereby hangs a tale. Can there be clearer evidence of the little interest which has been generally taken in Francis Bacon, or of how little his many critics have put two and two together concerning him, than in this, that none should have observed the fact *that of all the great Courtiers of his time, Francis Bacon was one* *of the few who did not keep a theatrical company*, whilst it was *he alone* who stood up in *defence* of the Theatre, and as an absolute advocate of the *use* of Stage Plays?

Readers of BACONIANA are acquainted with the eulogies of Francis Bacon, written by some thirty of his friends. In one it is declared that in no light or frivolous spirit did he "*draw on the socks of the Comedian and the high-heeled boots of the Tragedian.*" In his own eulogy of the Stage, he similarly describes the Drama as no mere pastime or amusement, but as a serious matter, a part of his "*Method*," his stupendous scheme for the "Great Restauration" of fallen and degraded humanity. He considers, as all experience shows to be true, that dull, untrained, ignorant minds should be instructed in the simplest and most natural way—objectively—as we teach little children, by showing them pictures, and by talking to them of things set before their eyes. Hamlet (in his instructions to the Players) tells them that they should "hold a mirror up to nature, show virtue her own figure, scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time, his form and pressure," or mode of expression. That speech is almost too familiar to be quoted, but how few people have thought of connecting it with a passage in the *Advancement of Learning (Bk. ii.* 13*)*, where Bacon describes "Dramatic Poesy which has the world of its theatre, and which would be of great use if well directed. For the stage is capable of no small influence both of *discipline* and *corruption.* Now of corruptions in this kind we have had enough, but *the discipline in our time has been plainly neglected.*" Pray read that chapter on Poesy narrative, dramatic, and parabolical, and mark, that the paragraph (of which the above extract forms about one-third) was *omitted* from the first edition *in English* of the "Advancement." It was inserted into the *Latin* edition (the *De Augmentis*), published when?—published in 1623, just after the issue of the Shakespeare folio. Is this fact without significance? Let me repeat. Within a few months of the publication of the first collected edition of the Plays (some of which had been before the public for thirty years), Bacon writes that *in his times the discipline of the Stage had been plainly neglected*, and esteemed but as a toy. Among the ancients, he adds, it was used as a means of educating men's minds to virtue. The true use and dignity of the Drama as a vehicle of moral instruction, is (as Spedding justly notes), connected in a striking manner with the remark that *men in bodies are more open to impression than when alone.* A magnificent illustration of this has lately been seen on the stage in the scene in *Julius Cæsar*, where Brutus and Marc Antony by turns address, and stir up the feelings of the buzzing, wavering, multitude, so easily impressed by a fluent speaker.

Shall Bacon's pregnant words about the *corruption and neglect* of the Stage in his day, be passed by unheeded? Note that he does not so much as allude to *Shakespeare*, *Ben Jonson*, or others of the "Great Dramatists." And note, too, that elsewhere, when touching upon similar deficiencies, he says:—"*Of myself* I am silent."

To return to the Royal and noble families who kept in their pay, theatrical companies. The fact has been accounted for by the assumption that this was "*the fashion of the time.*" Good words, and easily spoken, but we ask, *why the fashion?* How came it that such a fashion should have sprung up suddenly, at the very time when Puritanism was urging with tongue and pen the baseness and profanity of Stage playing?

And further, is no one surprised to find the Head Masters of St. Paul's and other schools, forming juvenile theatrical companies amongst their scholars, just such "Aerys of children" as Hamlet discusses with Rosencrantz, who describes them as "*the fashion.*" Such children's performances were in complete accordance with Bacon's repeated arguments in favour of an early training in acting as a means towards what he terms "the culture and manurance of the mind," and for gaining the self-possession and grace of gesture needful for a good public speaker.

Many names have been enumerated of the patrons of the Stage (some reputed authors) who were friends or associates of Francis Bacon. But it is not to his patrons or equals whom we should specially look. It is to humbler persons, the so-called "servants" whom he employed as *Secretaries*, *Travellers*, *Reporters*, *Business Managers*, and so forth. The names will not be those of men connected with science, politics, law, or religion; these will afford matter for future consideration. We now speak only of Poets, and others connected with the stage. Lists of names from the enormous correspondence of Anthony Bacon, whom Francis calls his "consorte." These names are found in the "Tenison" collection and in the "Gibson" MSS. in the Library at Lambeth Palace. To these are added lists from Peter Cunningham's "Accounts of the Revels at Court," the "Papers" and the "Memoirs" of Edward Alleyn, the actor, and "Henslowe's Diary."

The last-named six volumes were published by the first

Shakespeare Society, to whom Baconians are deeply indebted. It is the more kind of them to have furnished us with this valuable series since therein are found many clues to "Bacon's" associates, although not one word appears about the man, "William Shakespeare." To be sure the note *Shaxberd*, written in the margin, is annexed to the entries of three Shakespeare Plays performed by his Majesty's Players. But the total omission of any allusion to, or hint of the personality of such an individual as *Shakespeare*, is more than once commented upon by the Editors of these records as being "wonderful" and unaccountable.

For brevity's sake we omit references, merely enumerating some names common to nearly all the lists.

We find the Alleyn family in full force. First on the pages of Francis Bacon's letters appears *Capt. Francis Alleyn*,* a frank, plain-spoken soldier, employed by Anthony to intercede for the release of his servant, Lawson, who had been arrested after the charitable manners of the time, on suspicion of being a Romanist. *Francis Alleyn* seems to have been very useful to the Bacons *as a Messenger* or "Intelligencer."

William Alleyne got himself into political troubles. Bacon calls him "a base fellow and turbulent." *John Alleyn* was theatrical servant to the Lords Howard and Sheffield. He was elder brother to *Edward Alleyn*, the Player, and the ostensible founder of Dulwich College, in which Bacon was curiously interested. How Alleyn found the money to make that noble foundation is only one of the many points which remain "behind the Curtain of the Dark." Henslowe reports two more Alleyns, *Charles*, and *Richard*, and amongst Anthony Bacon's letters are at least six from *Godfrey* Alleyn. There is, therefore, no doubt that the Alleyne family were amongst Bacon's helpers or "servants."

The *Beaumonts*, *John* and *Sir Thomas*, were amongst the adventurers to Virginia. I suppose that all know how hard and successfully Bacon strove for the colonization and defence of this region in the New World. Most of the adventurers, including the Beaumonts, were his own friends.

Francis Beaumont dedicated a masque to the Gentlemen of Gray's Inn and the Inner Temple, thanking them for their help, and adding: "*You especially, Sir Francis Bacon*, as you did then by your countenance and loving affections advance it, so let your good word grace, which is able to add value to the greatest and least of matters."

---

* The Alleyns spell their names variously even in the same letter. Alen, Allen, Allin, Aleyn, Alleyne.

At that time Bacon was Solicitor-General, yet Spedding had no doubt that "*he had a good deal to say about the arrangements,*" and John Chamberlain, an eye-witness, describes the performance as "*a masque, of which Sir Francis Bacon was the chief contriver.*"

Browne is now a common name, yet we may note that *Edward Alleyne's step-father was a Browne,* that *Richard Browne* was one of the company of actors who went beyond seas to perform their plays, and that *Henry Browne* was a faithful servant friend to whom Bacon left a legacy. When in Bacon's anecdotes we find him telling of *Sir Edward Dyer,* the supposed poet, that he asked *Dr. Browne* a question which Browne answered "after his blunt and huddling manner," we gain a glimmering as to how it came that the *singularly Baconian works,* The *Religio Medici, Cyrus' Garden, Common Errors, Christian Morals, Urn Burial,* and other pieces, should have appeared under the name of this "huddling" doctor. "It is," says John Addington Symonds, "as a great master of diction, as a Rhetorician in the highest sense of that abused word, that this 'Author' (*Thomas Browne*), 'proclaims himself the rival of Jeremy Taylor, and the peer of Milton, in their highest flights of cadenced prose.'"

Rather high commendation is it not of "the blunt and huddling" doctor? The perusal of a few of Dr. Browne's *original* letters, may assure you that Bacon's judgment of his style was not far from the mark. But to continue about Bacon's friends and associates, bound by solemn vows and obligations to hand down the contents of the Cabinets and Presses full of papers which he left unpublished.

Amongst others of the Secret Society were the Careys or Carews. Four of this family were engaged in the Virginian enterprise. *John,* helped with the Revels at Court, and supplied properties. *Richard* is described as a writer chiefly on Topography. He died in 1620. His brother *George* was knighted by Queen Elizabeth, and is the reputed author of an account of France and of the Court of Henri IV. of France. This work, however, was not published, or (we believe) *heard of* until 100 years after his death, which occurred in 1614. This *Sir George Carew* was, from early youth to latest age, very intimate with Francis Bacon; we are therefore fully prepared to learn that *George and Thomas Carew* were Poets—

that *Thomas* was also a dramatist, and that he is said to have written the Masque entitled, "*Cœlum Brittanicum*," which was performed before the Court at Whitehall in 1633, and greatly admired. In fact, all these men were Bacon's "Masks," engaged in publishing his works.

Abraham Cowley is another "Poet" *who (we think) wrote no poetry, but who (we think) published many of Francis Bacon's juvenile effusions in prose and verse.* What was his actual history, apart from that given of the author in the poems themselves? He was born, according to various biographers, in 1612, 1616, or 1618, and educated at Westminster School, and Trinity College, Cambridge (Bacon's old college). There he helped with other members of the College to "produce" a Latin Comedy, and he lived in College till he was 36, when he was ejected by the Puritans because of his active partisanship in the Royal cause. For 12⅓ years he travelled, corresponded, ciphered, and deciphered for the King and Queen. He published no poetry until 1657, when he was about 45 (52?) years of age; and nothing in his supposed paper of "Myself" at all well fits his own history, but it is as hand to glove when applied to records of the *youthful* days of Francis Bacon. Having published this one volume of apparently juvenile works, Cowley returned to active politics; was thrown into prison, but being released, he again went abroad, and was again employed in helping the Royal cause. On the Restoration taking place, he was overlooked and neglected; but at length, by the interest of the Duke of Buckingham, he obtained the lease of a farm at Chertsey, which returned him £300 a year. He died at the age of 55. No more poetry came forth after that one volume in 1657.

Now anyone who has sufficient interest in these matters to be at the pains to follow the spring to its head, should read the "*Account of the Life of Mr. Abraham Cowley*," printed at the beginning of the 1669 edition of "The Works." Dr. Sprat, President of the Royal Society, wrote that Prefatory Account, and his name is signed in crooked printing and in mixed type, at the end of the Life. It is an excellent specimen of *a feigned biography;* pray somebody study it. You will see how ingeniously Dr. Sprat contrives to let you see that *the Author was one of the most wonderful men in the world,* but that Cowley was *not* the Author. And again to force you to connect "My Lord St. Albans" with Cowley. If Cowley were truly "dependent" upon the Lord St. Alban living in 1656—(of which we can find no trace) it must have been that mysterious

Lord who was a Jermyn—and who somehow popped into the title and out again, and "left no wrack behind." Dr. Sprat says: "*In his long* DEPENDENCE *on my Lord St. Albans, there never happened any kind of difference between them,*" and in another place, "I am confident his Lordship will believe it to be no injury to his fame, that in these papers *my Lord St. Albans and Mr. Cowley's names shall be read together by posterity.*" Dr. Sprat has previously said that Cowley had intended to dedicate all his works to Lord St. Albans, as a testimony of his entire respects for him, and as an apology for having left humane, or literary, affairs in the strength of his age, and when he might have been of some use to his country. Why the Dedication was omitted, Dr. Sprat does not say. The natural conclusion upon the whole matter is that he knew perfectly well that Cowley never wrote a word of his supposed works, excepting as an amanuensis writes for his master, on whom he is truly "*dependent.*"

Several members of the Cowley family corresponded with Anthony Bacon. Their letters may be seen in the Tenison Collection, where also, in the Gibson Collection, may be seen letters chiefly of news and politics from four more Cowleys.

Richard Cowley was a Player. His name is to be seen associated with the names of *Burbage* and *Phillips* in the Alleyne Papers, and other documents concerning Plays and Revels, published by the old Shakespeare Society.

In August, 1894, it was pointed out, in a short paper in BACONIANA how, in a section of *Much Adoe About Nothing*, the type in the 1623 folio *Shakespeare* is tampered with for purposes of cipher, and apparently, in order to change the correct words *Constable* and *Keeper*, into the names *Cowley* and *Kemp*.

The Constables were connections by marriage of the Bacons. In 1593, *Richard* and *Robert Constable* are found to have been corresponding with *Burbadge* at the same time that Anthony Bacon was receiving letters from the Cowleys.

The *Kemps*, too, were Bacon's cousins. He was evidently fond of *Robert Kemp*, whom he calls "Good Robin," and with whom he seems to have had pleasant, but unexplained, business. *William Kemp* was one of Lord Strange's company. *Thomas Kemp's* daughter married *Thomas Shirley;* another link, you see, with the supposed galaxy of poets. The *Shirleys* were great travellers, and gatherers of information. *John*, who was once a curate at St. Albans, is said to have turned Romanist, and "thereupon to have become a fertile writer for the stage;" but this tale rests upon as slight a foundation as many others.

Of the *Davies* family, *John* and *Lancelot* were Virginians; *John* helped in the Revels, and to him Bacon, wrote, praying him to be kind to *concealed poets*. This *John Davies* is the supposed author of a poem entitled, *Nosce Teipsum*, which two words (Know Thyself) form an entry in Bacon's *Promus*.

Now for the *Fletchers*, another large family of whom John, we know, collaborated with *Beaumont*, and who figures as a Dramatist. To *Dr. Giles Fletcher*, Bacon gave a living in Suffolk. His brother, *Thomas Fletcher*, was the Master of St. Paul's School, already mentioned as encouraging the boys to get up theatrical performances. In the *Revels at Court* we find this lively schoolmaster hiring apparel for public and private entertainments. Four other *Fletchers* are named in connection with Henslowe, and with the Virginian enterprise.

The noble family of *Herbert* was intimately connected with Bacon and his various undertakings. *Sir Henry Herbert* was *Master of the Revels*. To *Mr. W. H.*, (as we believe) *William Herbert*, afterward Earl of Pembroke, the *Shakespeare Sonnets* were dedicated. In his private theatre at Wilton, "*Measure for Measure*" was first performed, with speeches introduced to incline the king's heart to mercy, at a time when he and his Court were awaiting the trial of Sir Walter Raleigh, about to take place at Winchester.

George Herbert, the beloved rector of Bemerton, was the accredited author of the "Temple," and other sacred poems. He wrote two of the Latin elegies in praise of Bacon which we know as the *Manes Verulamiani*.

Space is limited, so only a few words can be said of the *Johnsons*. Englishmen have made up their minds to spell *Ben Johnson's* name without an *h*, though in his own time (and referring to *himself* and not to his *works*) it was invariably printed *with one*. Hereby (perhaps intentionally) confusion is worse confounded when we try to trace the family tree. However, Ben, whether with or without his *h*, was one of Bacon's able pens, writing under his roof, eulogising Bacon in precisely the same words which he used to eulogise *Shakespeare*, and finally contributing some Latin verses to the collection of Verulam elegies. Is it by mere coincidence that these Latin verses, signed *Ben Johnson* with an *h*, stand next to verses by *Boswell ?*

We would gladly have expatiated a little upon *Sir Philip Sydney* in his character of Poet, and as the supposed Author of the "Arcadia;" but the subject is too large for this little paper, and probably no two of our readers have read the "Arcadia" from beginning to end. We can but recommend to students an examination of the edition of that work published in 166½ just 100 years after the birth of Bacon. It will be seen that *Sir Philip Sydney did not claim the authorship*, but that the "Arcadia" was published *anonymously*, and entitled, "The Countess of Sidney's Arcadia."

That "deere ladie" was "Sidney's Sister, Pembroke's Mother," and few readers would, by their own unprejudiced judgment, arrive at the conclusion that the Dedication was from a brother to a sister. It appears indeed that this "*Life and Death of Sir Philip Sidney*," is another example of the "Feigned Histories" already spoken of, and the "Arcadia" itself one of Francis Bacon's earliest works, by degrees, and through a course of many years enlarged and revised for purposes yet to be explained.

It remains briefly to commend to the reader's notice the history of the Donne family, one of whom married a daughter of Edward Alleyne; another of whom was secretary to Bacon's warm friend, Lord Ellesmere. This John Donne rose to be Dean of St. Paul's, and *of course*, a Poet.*

Sir Edward Dyer also needs inspection. He was a correspondent of the Bacons. Massinger is found to be son of the Earl of Pembroke's Steward. Sir Henry Wotton was one of the Bacon's cousins. Richard Lovelace, the Middletons, Sandys, Shirleys, Butlers, Taylors, Fields, Hobby, all appear in the lists from the Bacon correspondence, with many less well-known names, and others well-known, but not included in the records of the Shakespeare Society.

A great deal is also to be learnt by a close search into the true history of the Rawley, or Raleigh family, of whom Sir Walter Raleigh has been reckoned the Star, and ranged with the scholars and courtly poets of his own day. It is satisfactory to observe that recent biographical dictionaries are beginning to discard this latter fiction. But how much is true concerning the visits of Francis to Sir Walter Raleigh in the Tower? What was the precise relationship between Sir

---

* See a most interesting *Life of Dr. Donne* (published since this was written) by Mr. Edmund Gosse.

Walter Raleigh, or Rawley, and the Dr. William Rawley who was Francis Bacon's confidential secretary. His collection of MSS. is known to be extant, but strangely "reserved" from the public eye. Where are these Papers?

However, in Bacon's notes is this entry: "*The setting on work my Lord Northampton and Raleigh.*" Bacon then, directed Raleigh's work, perhaps to beguile sad hours in prison, where Bacon is recorded to have visited him. Then, as usual, he handed over to him all the credit of their joint efforts.

Last, not least, a few words of the *Spencers* of whom at least two were Secretaries to Anthony and Francis. *Robert Spencer*, *George*, *Urion*, and *Dr. Spencer* are often met with in our dusty pages. *Gabriel Spenser*, an actor, was killed by Ben Jonson in a duel.

I have observed the significant fact that William Shaksper the man, *is utterly ignored, and the name, "Shakespeare," never once mentioned in the six volumes of Records, Accounts, and Registers published by the old Shakespeare Society.*

Is it not equally significant, that the name of *Edmund Spenser*—the supposed author of the "Fairie Queene," should be also absent from those records, and only introduced in some notes by Peter Cunningham, as if expressly to emphasise the fact that the first *(anonymous)* edition of the "*Shepherd's Calendar*" (1579) when Bacon was eighteen, was dedicated *to* Sir Philip Sidney, whereas, eight years later, it was declared to have been written *by* him.

To sum up briefly all that would be said did time permit. When we try to trace the history of any wit, poet, or dramatist of the century from 1560 to 1660, or thereabouts, we invariably find him connected, directly or indirectly, with Francis Bacon. On the other hand, Shakespere, the Man, is utterly ignored in the literary records of the age. No accounts of Theatres or Revels, no register of Stationers or Publishers so much as mention him. Neither is *Shakespeare* included in the lists of distinguished wits and authors enumerated by Ben Jonson, Sir Henry Wotton, and others of the time. Bacon is found apparently inviting criticism on *Measure for Measure* and *Julius Cæsar*, as his own Plays. *Richard II.* and *Richard III.* are also included with other Plays and devices in a MSS. list of Bacon's minor writings. But nowhere does Bacon, even when mourning the neglect and degradation of the Stage, allude to *Shakespeare.*

I have spoken only of *subordinates* in the great Bacon

Society—paid servants (as I believe), amanuenses, transcribers, and so forth, of the lighter pieces which he spoke of as "*the Works of my recreation.*" But a similar veil is drawn across the history and works of every *great* "*author*" so-called of that period; moreover, these authors are inextricably mixed up, not only amongst each other, but bound and linked in all manner of ways with Francis Bacon. Whether they be theologians, philosophers and moralists, or men of science, literature and art, historians or travellers; peep behind their masks or under their hoods, and there is Francis Bacon—*his* theology, *his* philosophy and morality, his experimental science, and universal knowledge enshrined in his own new and noble model of language. Some pieces, to be sure, are in the modelling-clay only, left for others to copy in more solid form. Many others are highly finished, polished with an art upon which no later hand has improved.

The helpers in such works may have been chiefly the "*voluntaries*" (as distinct from the paid subordinates) whom in his private notes, Francis Bacon is seen proposing to enlist. With time and money at their disposal his equals and superiors could render valuable aid. Yet these did but *follow his lead.* In every new enterprise he was (to use his own words) the "*inventor*" and "*contriver,*" the "*true Pioneer in the Mine of Truth.*" Others did but rough-hew the dead image for which he had made the design, and which only by his skill could be polished and perfected.

"I leave the work of Time," he says, "to Time's mastery." "Time is the wisest of all things, and the author and inventor every day of new cases." "Men err in disturbing the order of Time and in hastening the end when they are at the beginning." Yes, and Time, too, will alone complete and vindicate the gigantic work for the benefit of the human race in all ages, which was conceived, and in great part accomplished by Francis Bacon.

C. M. P.

A WORD OR TWO ON CANONBURY TOWER.

THERE are several suggestive points of connection to be noted between the old coventual buildings of Canonbury and our Francis St. Alban. There are also obscure particulars well worthy of inquiry.

Originally the property of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, Canonbury House is generally supposed to have been built in 1362, ten years after Edward III. had exempted the Priory of St. Bartholomew from the payment of subsidies, in consequence of their great outlay in charity. Stow says that William Bolton (Prior from 1509 to 1532) rebuilt the house, and probably erected the fine square tower of brick. Nichol, in his "History of Canonbury," mentions that Bolton's rebus of *a bolt in a tun* was still to be seen, cut in stone, in two places on the outside facing Wells' Row. The original house covered the whole space now called Canonbury Place, and had a small park, with garden and offices. Prior Bolton either built or repaired the Priory and beautiful Church of St. Bartholomew, but at his death the connection between Canonbury and monasticism ceased.*

The Tower House was now given by Henry VIII. to John Dudley, Earl of Northumberland, afterwards Viscount Lisle, father of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, whose history has lately risen into fresh and startling importance in consequence of certain deciphered history soon to be submitted to the world's judgment. John Dudley was executed as a traitor when Mary was proclaimed Queen in 1553. The Tower then again became Crown property, and Queen Mary gave it to "Rich Spencer," the magnificent alderman of whom history speaks so fully, giving us even that which it denied us with regard to Francis St. Alban—details of his funeral obsequies. It is from this Sir John Spencer (father-in-law of Lord Compton) that Sir Francis "Bacon," when Attorney-General (1616), leased Canonbury Manor.†

Neither James Spedding nor Hepworth Dixon, nor any biographer of Francis St. Alban, whose writings we have come across, allude to him as having leased this manor and house. The editor of Cassell's "Old and New London," who devotes a whole chapter to this historic place, skips the period of "Bacon's" tenancy, and writes thus :—

---

* See "Old and New London," Vol. II., p. 269.

† Sir John Spencer's daughter and heiress Elizabeth, married Lord William Compton (created Earl of Northampton), eloping with him from Canonbury Manor in a *baker's basket.* (As I am a man, there was one conveyed out of my house yesterday in this basket.—*Merry Wives of W.* Act IV., sc. ii.)

"After the Spencers, the Lord Keeper Coventry rented this house. In 1635 we find the Earl of Denbigh detained here . . . and in 1685 the Earl of Denbigh died here."

In a letter to Sir John Spencer, Francis refers to "my brother" as having some connection with the matter. Anthony Bacon died (*or is said to have died*) in the spring of 1601. "Anthony Bacon" (says Chamberlain to Carleton, writing on the 27th of May, 1601) "died not long since."* How then could he be concerned with Francis in the matter of renting Canonbury Manor in 1616?

Meanwhile we note further the great interest which Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, seems to have had in Canonbury, an interest apparently shared by Queen Elizabeth. When in her Royal progresses in 1574, she visited Kenilworth, the occasion was celebrated by the "princely pleasures," of a tournament, and "ambrosial banquet" and "a gorgeous masque." In this masque an apparently irrelevant episode was introduced by the entrance of a "Squire Minstrel," arrayed in a tabard especially designed and embroidered to commemorate Canonbury. The Minstrel sung of it as one of the most ancient and pleasant towns of England, and declared it to be famed for cream, butter, and frumenty. What can have been the underlying idea in this?

In one of Queen Elizabeth's progresses, Nichol also records that she visited Canonbury, and for a long time a picturesque building remained standing which was called "The Queen's Lodge." Nichol gives a picture of this building with a high tower, probably that built by Prior Bolton. We have found no record as to who owned or tenanted the house at this time, but in one account the traditional "Lodge" is described as being fifteen feet square, and as standing at the end of the garden belonging to "Fowler House." An old house in this locality was pulled down in 1800. It contained armorial bearings of the Dudley family, and a splendid chimney-piece containing the arms of St. John of Jerusalem, thus asserting its ancient origin and history.

A curious tradition remains to be noticed. This Canonbury Tower is said to have led by a secret passage to *Kensington Palace*, a distance of more than four miles. This is another point mentioned by Nichol, but omitted by the editor of "Old and New London," who, however, mentions that "a tradition once prevailed at Islington that the monks of St. Bartholomew had a subterranean communication from Canonbury to the Priory of Smithfield. This notion had arisen from the discovery of brick archways in Canonbury, which seem to have been only conduit heads, and had really served to lead water to the Priory."

---

* Spedding "Letters and Life," III., p. 4.

This conjecture (for it is no more) appears very plausible, but it is strange that two distinct "traditions" should have been put on record concerning subways from this house to distant points.

The internal arrangements and decorations of Canonbury House are commented on in detail by Lewis, who describes the elaborate ornamental carving, emblematic figures and devices, ships, flowers, foliage, and other objects which Baconians have learnt to associate with the symbolic method of teaching of the Renaissance, and pre-eminently of the "Great Master" himself, but which in the regulation literature of our day are described as "specimens of taste for ornamental carving and stucco work that prevailed about the time of Elizabeth." There are also medallions of three great men who seem to have been in a way models to our Francis—types of the noble Pioneer, the mighty Conqueror, the Master Builder, Alexander the Great, namely Julius Cæsar, Titus Vespasian. Then with the arms of the Dudleys may be seen the arms of Queen Elizabeth in several places, and her initials, "E. R." with the date—1599, at which time the premises were fitted up by Sir John Spencer.

"On the white wall of the staircase, near the top of the Tower are some Latin hexameter verses comprising the abbreviated names of the Kings of England from William the Conqueror to Charles I., painted in Roman character an inch in length, but almost obliterated. *The lines were most probably the effusion of some poetical inhabitant of an upper apartment in the building during the time of the monarch last named, such persons having frequently been residents of the place.*"

It is a pity that the names of some "such persons" are not given; but this would perhaps be too much to expect, considering all the circumstances of the case. Elsewhere we are told that after 1780 the house became "a resort for literary men who craved for quiet and country air." It is not suggested that this very reason may have moved Francis St. Alban to rent this pleasant place, but Samuel Humphreys, "a second-rate poet," Ephraim Chambers, the author of one of the earliest Cyclopædias, and several other Freemason publishers and printers, as well as poets (including Oliver Goldsmith) lived at or resorted to Canonbury Tower.

To return to whence we started. These jottings are suggestive of several inquiries :—

1. Why did Francis "Bacon," when Attorney-General, take a lease of Canonbury Manor?

2. Did he periodically retire thither, "craving for quiet and country air?"

3. Could this have been the Tower, and the little square room of which we see so often in "Bacon's" portraits the student sitting at a table in a small room with book shelves, and usually a view of a distant town, seen from an elevation. He is known to have written from such a room in a tower, but we supposed it to have been the Campanile-shaped tower at Gorhambury—perhaps both may be found to have been used for the same purpose.

4. What did Francis mean by referring to his "*brother*" as having something to do with the business of renting Canonbury? Was Anthony Bacon the *brother* referred to? If so, did Anthony live much longer than is generally supposed? Where did Anthony die? Where is he buried?

5. Why do "Bacon's" biographers and other writers in speaking of Canonbury, ignore, or studiously omit to mention, his connection with this historic house?

6. Why was Queen Elizabeth so much interested in Canonbury that it could be considered pleasing, or a compliment to her, to introduce a Minstrel Squire, plainly alluding to the delights of the place, into a masque given at Kenilworth in her honour?

Such questions as these are not irrelevant or useless. On the contrary, they are examples of the kind of investigation which should be pursued and driven home. In trying to ascertain what Francis did at Canonbury, we may find him studying those "monastic foundations" of which we have been told that "our poet" (*Shakespeare*) "knew the origin as well as the purposes they served;" at least we may find him secretly writing. In some future paper we hope that the interest of Francis St. Alban in the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, of Canonbury, and Bishopsgate Without, and his connection with them or their representatives, may be more fully discussed.

Since the foregoing pages on Canonbury were penned, other notes important to the subject have been collected from the Guildhall Library. These jottings furnish so many hints, as well as such positive information, that no apology is made for appending them.

Thomas Tomlins, in his "History of Islington," writes thus:—

"The Earl and Countess, by description Lord and Lady Compton, by indenture 15th February, Jac. 1616, let to the Right Hon. Francis Lord Verulam, Visct. St. Albans, by the name of Sir Francis Bacon Knight,* His Majs. Attorney General, all that mansion and garden belonging to what is called Canonbury House, in the Parish of Islington. . . . for 40 years from Lady-day, 1617."

With regard to the Tower, the same writer states:—

"The great Sir Francis Bacon resided here from February, 1616; as also at the time of his receiving the Great Seal, on 7th Jan., 1618, and for some time afterwards.† . . .

"After the decease of Henry Prince of Wales (in 1612) the Manor of Newington Barrowe was, with other portion of land, on 10th January, 14 Jac., granted upon lease for 99 years to Sir Francis Bacon, Knt., at that time the King's Attorney General, and also Chancellor to Charles Prince of Wales, afterwards Charles I. and others, his law officers and ministers in trust for him, which lease, upon his accession, became merged in the Crown."—Dated at Canonbury, 15th Sept., 1629.

In connection with recent statements concerning the parentage of Francis St. Alban, it will be observed that in Nelson's "History of Islington" the writer states that Queen Elizabeth was at Canonbury Tower in the year 1561, and that she had a "lodge" or summer-house looking into Canonbury Fields. It bore her arms and initials, with the date 1595. "The Tower was encompassed by pleasant fields and gardens, and a salubrious air." The place seems to have been a delightful summer resort—a district full of "cream farms" and flowery meads and walks.

Nelson writes that Queen Elizabeth "went from Canonbury Tower through Houndsden to the Spittle, and down Hog Lane, over the fields to the Charter House; . . . from thence, in a few days, she took her way over the fields to the Savoy."

At this time Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, had property in Islington, and Henry Carey, one of her half-brothers, lived in Hunsdon House in the same close neighbourhood. To go back a generation, it is said that Henry Percy, Earl of Northumberland, gave this property to Henry VIII. "and others." Henry VIII. is stated to have lived in one of the manors or large houses in the north-west corner of Newington Green, whilst in the other he kept a number of concubines. A walk close by was known as "King Harry's Walk." One manor, including "Cream Hall," was bestowed upon Prince Henry (died 1618). Another, as we have seen, on Dudley. Possibly, though this is not vouched for, Elizabeth may have passed some happy, idyllic days of her innocent youth in this sweet place with few child-companions excepting "Robin, sweet Robin," her playmate living on the spot, her equal in age, beauty, and talent, though not in rank. Well might they say:—

---

* Created Baron Verulam of Verulam 12th of July, 1618, and Visct. St. Alban Feb. 3rd, 1619.

† The acreage of various "closes" is here given.

> "We were as twinned lambs that frisked in the sun,
> And bleat the one at the other: what we chang'd
> Was innocence for innocence: we knew not
> The doctrine of ill-doing, nor dream'd
> That any did. Had we pursued that life,
> And our weak spirits ne'er rear'd
> With stronger blood, we should have answered Heaven
> Boldly—'Not guilty!' The imposition clear'd
> *Hereditary ours.*"

It would be pleasant to know that such were the happy memories recalled to the mind of the much-changed Queen by the "Squire Minstrel" at Kenilworth.

"He had a scutcheon . . . with metal, and colour of the ancient arms of Islington," and a delightful but long-winded description is given of all that he said and wore, and of how, when his minstrelsy was done, he made "a mannerly leg." The point is that he represented "the worshipful town of Islington," and that he bore emblazoned on his breast "a grey mare and silly fole, and three milk tankards," with the motto: "Lac, Caseus, Infans." This the writer renders, "Good milk, and young cheese." We may prefer to read it: "*Milk, cream cheese, a little child,*" or, as it may be construed, "*a foal.*" The allusion is obscure.

"LET IT BE INQUIRED."

It becomes daily more evident that one thing most needful for the prosecution of our difficult task is that we should have a band of paid experts for purposes of research and inquiry. True research demands both time and experience, and those who possess these qualifications have usually acquired them only by much toil; they cannot afford to give up time to such a work without remuneration. Yet the subjects to be investigated are many and difficult of access, as, for instance, the following, which yet must be capable of solution:—

1. Was Francis (called Bacon) the *true* son of Sir Nicholas and Lady Anne Bacon, or was he their *adopted* son?

2. Was Anthony Bacon (so-called) the brother of Francis?

3. Who was Robert, called Devereux? Was he the true son or only the ward of Walter Devereux, Earl of Essex?

4. Where and when did Anthony and Francis respectively die, and where are any records of their deaths and burial?

5. Why is there any mystery about these things?

6. How much did Francis travel?

7. What was his connection with the Sidneys?

8. And with the Raleighs?

9. Where is the collection of Dr. Rawley's (Raleigh's) MSS.?

10. Where are the letters to which those in the Tenison Collection of Anthony's correspondence at Lambeth Palace, are for the most part answers?

11. How many Libraries did Francis revive or establish?

12. Is it, or is it not true, that there are "reserved" collections and duplicate (differing) catalogues or indexes at most of our chief libraries?—If true, Why?

13. What is the connection between the Society of Antiquaries, the Royal Society, the Royal Society of Literature, and, indeed, between nearly all the learned societies? Is it true that these are for the most part ruled by Freemasonry, and that the same may be said of all great printing establishments and kindred institutions?

Accurate answers to these questions would be valuable, and we would next furnish another list. But the present need is for *expert researchers.* Who will help to supply us with them?

Baconiana.

Vol. VIII.—*New Series.* JULY, 1900. No. 31.

"FEIGNED LIVES."

WHAT is meant by Feigned Histories? How is it known that such histories exist? These questions have been so frequently asked and answered, that it seems time to discuss them in print, so as to elicit further information, or at least to encourage inquiry.

Francis Bacon divides all Human Learning into History, Poesy, and Philosophy, with reference to the three Intellectual Faculties—Memory, Imagination, and Reason—and he devotes twelve out of thirteen chapters in the Second Book of his *Advancement of Learning* to an investigation into the serious deficiencies which he finds in the first of these divisions. But when he comes to the second principal part of learning, namely *Poesy*, he divides it "besides those divisions which it has in common with History *(for there are feigned Chronicles, feigned Lives, and feigned Relations)*" into Poesy *Narrative, Dramatic* and *Parabolical.* "Under the name of Poesy," he says, "I treat only of *feigned* History."

These, and other remarks of the same kind, seem framed ambiguously in order to lead an observant initiate to look for *feigned* Lives and *feigned* Relations amongst the Histories which, poured out in the time of Bacon, supplying the "deficiencies" and supplementing the imperfections which he found in Histories Civil, Ecclesiastical and Literary—in Memorials, Commentaries, Registers, Annals, Chronologies, Antiquities, Collections, Chronicles and Lives. It was as though some magician had charmed the air to give a sound, and at once the whole world rang out in harmonious chorus.

In order to perceive or understand the "Feigned Histories" we must be truly acquainted with the Character, Pursuits, and Aims of their Subject, the first cause of their being—Francis St. Alban, better known as Bacon. We must know him as his friends and contemporaries knew him, face to face; not taking our impressions from pictures distorted for a purpose, and so handed on from one to another unsympathetic or hostile writer. How would we be treated in his place?

How do we study the memory of any other personage of whom we would learn true particulars? Let us study our present great subject in the same way. Of Francis St. Alban alone in the whole circle of distinguished men can it be shown that the literary world has combined deliberately to suppress or reject the evidence of his friends, collaborators, associates, and contemporaries, and to substitute disparaging or condemnatory accounts, unsupported by records of his own time. This effect is not without its cause, but the present business is to furnish such a thread that the reader who will patiently unwind and follow it up may himself penetrate into the very heart of this mysterious labyrinth.

The contemporary authorities from whose writings we have unravelled these particulars of the life of "Our Francis" were, first, his personal friends, secretaries or amanuenses, and familiar associates, as for instance, Dr. William Rawley, his chaplain; Dr. Peter Boener, his domestic physician; Dr. Tenison, Sir Toby Matthew, and Ben Jonson. Next, a host of correspondents who speak of him in letters to himself and to Anthony Bacon, as well as in mutual communications. To these may be added the writers of some thirty Latin Eulogies* found amongst Dr. Rawley's MSS., and printed in the Harleian Miscellanies. Lastly, men like Aubrey, who "though he never saw Bacon in the flesh, had peculiar means of arriving at the truth at first hand from his most intimate circle; for he associated with those who had been Bacon's secretaries and friends, and his anecdotes and impressions were derived from the lips of Sir John Danvers and Thomas Hobbes."† With the "Fictitious Biographies and Caricatures" of our wonderful concealed man, which Hepworth Dixon describes and satirises we have nothing to do. All that is false in them came through Goodman, d'Ewes, Welden, and two Lives of Pope, foisted (there is reason to think) into the *Essay of Man* for a very special purpose.

The private life of Francis St. Alban is much veiled, and the cause is clear. Had his aims and work been made public, their very publication and revelation would have prevented their accomplishment; his wide and lofty schemes for the benefit of the Future Ages would have been frustrated. Herein lies an explanation of his self-suppression and submissive rather than defensive attitude, even when the most malicious and condemnatory charges were levelled against him. They would have been vigorously repudiated and summarily dismissed had it not been for the self-imposed obligations to secrecy regarding himself and his works, which were part of his "Method" for the preservation of his infancy Society and the prosecution of his vast enterprises.

---

* Published *Baconiana*, July, 1896, Vol. iv. pp. 109—132; October, 1896, pp. 173—188; January, 1897, Vol. v. pp. 10—22, 103—109.

† Hepworth Dixon, "*Story of Lord Bacon's Life*," p. 1.

But to pass to his Character as pictured for us by his friends. It gives but a cold and meagre image of that "Large Heart," "Myriad Mind," and "Great and Noble Soul," to schedule their component parts, setting them down as it were in an inventory; yet for brevity's sake this seems best, and in the present Paper the examples given are abridged and dessicated to the utmost. But readers should not rest satisfied without making personal inquiries and comparisons. It will be observed that particulars which could by no means be made to fit *Cowley*, such as *Bacon's* distinction as a Lawyer and Orator in the Houses of Parliament have been omitted. It is also necessary to exclude the references to persons, places, etc., which further connect "Cowley" with "Bacon."

1. The childhood of Francis seems to be studiously veiled; yet we glean that "his first and childish years were not without some mark of eminency." He had a precocity, "*a pregnancy or towardness of wit*, presaging the deep and universal apprehension which he afterwards manifested."

2. *His witty sayings and prompt repartees* are recorded to have greatly "taken the Queen, who delighted to prove him with questions which he answered with a maturity above his years." Genial and original, he "mingled jest with earnest," and "was the most prodigious wit."

3. His genius was "*versatile*," he had "a brain cut with facets" and "a nimbleness of mind prompt to perceive Analogies." Beaumont said that he lent a charm to "the greatest as well as the meanest of matters."

4. His *memory* was extraordinary strong and ready.

5. Having been sent at fifteen to Trinity College, Cambridge, "he quickly passed through the whole circle of the liberal arts,"* exhausted the teaching and complained of the *barrenness of the method*, "for the production of works for the benefit of the Life of Man."

6. He found, too, that the grammar rules were unsatisfactory; that they taught "words not matter," and he therefore "made a grammar for himself." His view was to

---

* *i.e.*—"The whole Chain of Sciences linked together."

make a noble model of modern English by the help of the beauties of Ancient and Foreign Languages.

7. At this time he appears to have made Translations of the chief Authors of Greece and Rome, because although perfectly familiar with both languages, he could not "*exercise his judgment*" upon writings not in his mother-tongue.

8. His excellent *judgment* caused him to be compared to Solomon: he always seems to hit the mark. In after life it is recorded of him that "his decrees stand firme; there are fewer of his decrees reverst than of any other Chancellor." "His opinions and assertions were for the most part binding and not contradicted by any; rather like Oracles and discourses, which must be imputed to the well-weighing of his sentences by the scales of Truth and Reason."

9. "He was no plodder upon books. Though a great reader he had not his knowledge from books, but from some grounds and notions within himself." "Constant ideas," "fixed notions," formed in childhood, and which caused Dr. Rawley to write: "I have been induced to think that if there were a beam of knowledge derived from God upon any man in these modern times, it was upon him." He was spoken of as a "*Miracle*," "*Prodigious*," "*a Monster*," "*a Giant*," etc.

10. Withal, his *modesty, bashfulness, respectful submissiveness and sweetness in manner* are repeatedly commented upon. He regrets his bashfulness as a hindrance to him in his enforced life as a Courtier. He finds that this shyness is sometimes taken for pride and apologises for it to Lord Burleigh.

11. "He was keenly sensitive to kindness," and thankful for small mercies, "weighing men's minds and not their trash." Tender and moved to pity for suffering in man or beasts.

12. Of his powers of *Observation* on Nature, Physics, and the Visible World, his works and experiments bear witness, but as he says, he was "cunynge in the humours of persons"—a second Cassius, "he looks quite through the deeds and hearts of men" and notes the "Union of Soul and Body" in their faces and gestures.

13. His *Method* is seen in his instructions to his Sons of Science and in his system of note-taking, and for collecting, storing-up and utilising every scrap of information,

14. His favourite studies were divided between "History Civil and Ecclesiastical," and "History Natural." In questions of the *Advancement of Learning*, Literature and Science, Statesmanship and Politics we find him continually com-

paring the modern condition of things, with that of *Greece and Rome*, which he promised himself to emulate or excel. In his pursuit of Natural Philosophy he set himself to seek out the "Secrets of God"—"the Secrets of Nature"—and to bring into harmony "the Two Books of God." "For, saith our Saviour, *You err, not knowing the Scriptures or the Power of God:* laying before us Two Books, or Volumes, to study. . . . First, the Scriptures revealing the will of God, and then the Creatures expressing His Power." "This primary History is *the Book of God's works, a kind of Second Scripture.*"

15. On leaving the University he was sent abroad to travel; another period of his life placed under a veil; from his works and correspondence we see that he certainly travelled through and resided in France, Spain, and Italy, that he mastered the languages of those countries, and set down his observations and experiences for future use. His *Essay of Travel* records his experiences as to what should be seen and sought, and the eminent persons to be visited in travel that the traveller may "suck experience." He is of opinion that "Home keeping youths have ever homely wits."

16. He was destined for the "Arts of State," for Court Life and Ceremony. But all these, excepting as matter for observation or branches of study he disliked, and for all he repeatedly declared himself to be not only unwilling but most "unfit."

17. Although very severe in judging himself, he was very lenient in his judgment of others, taking "men as he found them," and looking with an eye of pity on the offender "even when it was his duty to punish the offence." The base and wicked he "pitied" for their weakness, their want of knowledge or of opportunities of being taught better. Like the Rosicrucian Father * whom he pictures in the *New Atlantis*, "he had an eye as though *he pitied men.*"

18. The same disposition rendered him most *tolerant* of other men's opinions. "He was neither a violent partisan against the Church of Rome . . . nor an exclusive advocate for the Church of England in opposition to the Puritans . . . but in the whole range of Ecclesiastical History we can recall no one whose mind looked upon Church controversies with more anxious concern. He was not the latitudinarianism of indifference, but a great comprehensiveness of Charity."

19. He deprecated and avoided Controversy and Disputa-

---

* So-called in the *early* edition, published *later*, as Joseph Heydon's "*Journey to the Land of the Rosicrucians.*"

tion mere for the sake of getting the best of an argument. Controversy, he said, retarded rather than advanced learning, treating "more of words than matter." "In learning, where there is much controversy, there is usually little inquiry."

20. He was a passionate lover of *Freedom* in thought, word, and action. In the *Promus* is the entry "*Thought is Free,*" a Freedom in thinking and reasoning which he ranked amongst the most precious of God's gifts to man, but which he carefully distinguishes from "the giddiness of those who count it a *bondage* to fix a belief; *affecting* free will in thinking as well as acting."

21. *Affectation* in any form he reproved and ridiculed; commending, and notably practising "*plainness*" and "*simplicity*" in speech, writing, and behaviour.

22. Preferring the pleasures of the country to those of the town, and above all things desiring peace and quiet for the prosecution of his studies, *he sought Retirement and Obscurity.* His frequent disappearances or eclipses were observed, sometimes with disapproval, at other times with admiration. He was compared to "the Angels, often heard of, but seldom seen."

23. He found it needful "*to keep state in some matters,*" and advocates a study and practice of the "*Arts of Secrecy*" and of "*Keeping Counsel.*" "Speech and conversation inform, but secresy induces trust."

24. All forms of *Lying and Imposture* were hateful to him. "There is no vice that doth so cover a man with shame as to be found false and perfidious." "To say that a man lieth, is as much as to say that a man is brave towards God, and a coward towards men. For a lie faces God, and shrinks from man."

25. He was ever a patron and encourager of workers, and especially of young and ardent spirits whom he sought for and whom he allied to himself as "Sons of Science," "Brethren" in his Secret Society. To such when they in any way assisted him in the composition, translation, or publication of his works, he handed on the credit and the profit. Their names, not his, are on the title-pages. But (excepting in later times) *the title of Author is absent from their tombstones.*

In the Tenison correspondence are grateful letters from writers whose works he has revised and adorned. "I have often observed," says Dr. Rawley, "and so have other men of great account, that if had occasion to repeat another man's words after him, he had a use and faculty to dress them in better vestments and apparel than they had before; so that the Author should find his own speech much amended, and yet the substance of it still retained.

26. He was very hospitable. "His meals were reflections of the ear as well as the stomach, like the *Noctes Atticæ*, or *Convivia Deipno-sophistarum*, wherein a man might be refreshed in his mind no less than in his body. And I have known some of no mean parts that have professed to make use of their note-books, when they have risen from his table."

27. "In which conversations, and otherwise, he was no dashing man (*who would put others out of countenance*), but ever a countenancer and fosterer of another man's parts. *Neither would he appropriate the speech wholly to himself, or delight to outvie others,*" but *gave others "leave to take their turns.*" "He would draw a man on and allure him to speak on a subject wherein he was skilful and would delight to speak. And for himself he contemned no man's observations, but would light his torch at every man's candle."

28. He was never idle, but rested his mind by the variety of his studies with which he would "interlace" a moderate amount of exercise, or "taking the air abroad."

29. "A friend unalterable to his friends," grappling to his heart with hooks of steel all who had done him a kindness, or whose sympathy in mind and pursuits had once been honoured by the name of "a true" or "assured friend," for he says, "A friend is far more than one's self."

30. Generous and liberal to a fault, he reminds us frequently in the anecdotes recorded by his contemporaries of *Timon of Athens*. Perhaps in that Play he satirised himself, his lavish expenditure and his ultimate poverty. "Charity fulfils the law," was a favourite maxim upon which he based his moral code. It is a prominent text in Masonry.

31. Perhaps some principle concerning "the common good" and "all things in common" may have actuated him in his apparent carelessness about money, for although he disliked "business" he was not unbusiness-like. He despises Riches and Money for its own sake, speaking of them with contempt and using the same terms which excited the anger of the citizens against Coriolanus. "Riches," he said, "was *like muck*, of no use except it be spread." So Coriolanus calls money "the muck of the world." But although both in prose and verse he repeatedly speaks of money as dirt and dross when valued for itself alone, he was fully alive to the need of it when it was to be "spread," and to promote the growth of

great enterprises. His efforts in proportion as work grew in his hands, to obtain some lucrative position which would free him from the necessity of earning a livelihood, whilst it would furnish him with means and power for pressing forward his mighty and multifarious undertakings, has been cited as witness to his avarice, extravagance, and love of ostentation, vices all contrary to his very nature. A leading obligation amongst the initiates of his brotherhood seems to have been that they should labour purely from *charity* and from *love of Truth*. Never for gain or profit—if possible, *gratis*.

32. Hints in his private notes tell us that he was *by nature Impatient;* over-zealous and eager. "*Impatience*," he writes, is "*my stay*" (or hindrance). Too great "alacrity and zeal" tended, he feared, to "overweening." He must strive against the "*extremes*" of "*too heavy—too hot.*" He notes that in excitement he speaks too fast, and struggles with his breath. He must calm himself, and refrain from showing impatience in tone, countenance or gesture. So few flashes of "heat" or impatience are recorded in him, and so many instances of his great calm and patience under provocation and bitter trials, that he has been charged with coldness or want of feeling. We know that self-examination and deep religious feeling wrought this calm. "The Scripture," he writes, "exhorts us to *possess our souls in Patience.* Whosoever is out of patience is out of possession of his own soul."

33. From childhood highly sensitive to Natural Beauties, to sweet sounds of music, birds, or voices, to perfumes, the smell of flowers, sweet air, to light and colour, glitter and "glorious" sights of all kinds, Francis soon began to see "Figures in All Things," books in the running brooks, sermons in stones, and God (or good) in everything. Finding himself to possess "a mind apt and nimble to perceive analogies," he felt himself well fitted to be an inquirer into the mysteries of Nature. This Poet's tendency to perceive analogies, and his peculiar facility of rendering them into Metaphor and blending them with the ordinary current language, is a strong and *identifying* characteristic of his style.

34. "It has been said that his Prose is more poetical than his Poetry," for as a Poet he was "*concealed*," and not many specimens of poetry have been allowed to appear under the Name of "Bacon." He "*did not profess to be a Poet;*" yet that he was a Poet seems to have been known, and grudgingly acknowledged by even his anti-pathetic biographers, and by

those who had (or have) ends to serve by suppressing the fact. Hear Ben Jonson and Aubrey, Devey, Macaulay, and Campbell:—

"It is he that filled up all numbers, and performed that which may be compared or preferred to Insolent Greece and Haughty Rome."

"His Lordship was a good Poet, but concealed."

"The creative fancy of a Dante or Milton never called up more gorgeous images than those suggested by Bacon, and we question much whether their world's images surpass his in affording scope for the imagination. . . . Unfolding the order of the universe as exhibited to Angelic intelligences," &c., &c.

"The poetic faculty was strong in Bacon's mind. No imagination was ever at once so strong and so subjugated. . . . Much of Bacon's life was passed in a Visionary World . . . of magnificent day-dreams, . . . analogies of all sorts," &c.

35. It was his aim "*to mingle Earth and Heaven.*" This also is one of his early notes. He would mingle Grave and Gay, marry Truth and Poetry, Science and Fancy, the Sublime and the Ridiculous, the Divine and the Commonplace, and so raise the minds of men a few yards off the Earth, and bring Heavenly thoughts within the reach of Earthly souls.

36. To this end *he took all knowledge to be his Province.*

37. "This Lord was *religious and conversant with God,* as appeareth by the whole tenour of his writings. . . ." "*A little philosophy, he says, maketh men apt to forget God, but depth of philosophy bringeth man to God again.*" "He was able to render a reason of the hope that was in him, which his writing '*The Confession of Faith*' doth abundantly testify. He repaired frequently to the service of the Church, to hear Sermons, and to the administration of the Sacrament of the Blessed Body and Blood of Christ; and died in the true faith established in the Church of England."

38. His true "goodness," "innocence," unselfishness, and loveableness are attested by the common consent of all who really knew, or experienced him.

"All who were *Good and Great* loved him." His trials and calamities only made him the dearer, and his friends the more devoted to him.

"In his adversity," says Ben Jonson, "I ever prayed that God would give him *strength;* for *greatness* he could not want. Neither could I condole a word or syllable for him, as knowing no accident could happen to Virtue, but rather help to make it manifest."

Turning now to our "Feigned Histories" we see an excellent example in the Works of Mr. Abraham Cowley, published 1669 by Herringman, with no Editor's name on the title-page, but with a (*crookedly printed*) signature, "T. Sprat" to the "Life" which precedes the *Preface.* Footnotes refer to the pages in "*Cowley,*" and to the *Paragraphs in the previous notes* on Francis St. Alban. Again we abridge painfully.

After some particulars of Cowley's true life we read that in early youth he went to school where his brilliant talents "soon increased the noble genius of that place." His love of poetry developed "when he was but just able to read" by delight in poems "*fitter for the examination of men than for the consideration of a child.*" But "*the strength of his fancy was not to be judged by the number of his years.*" In his 13th year a book full of "*force and manly wit*" came forth under his name,* and in an "*Elegy* . . . he described the highest characters of Religion, Knowledge, and *Friendship*, in an age when most men scarce begin to learn them."†

"*The authors of antiquity* he fully digested, not only in *his memory*, but *his judgment,* so that he learnt nothing when a boy that he forsook when he became a man. . . . His teachers could not get him *to retain the ordinary rules of grammar,* but *he supplied that want* from the Books themselves whence those Rules had been drawn. . . . *Having got the Greek and Roman languages as he had done his own,* not by precept, but by use, he practised them, not as a Scholar but a Native." "He was perfect in the Greek and Roman languages." ‡

"With these 'extraordinary hopes' he was sent to Trinity College, Cambridge,§ where by the progress and continuance of his Wit, it was seen to be both early-ripe and lasting. This brought him the love and esteem of the most eminent men of the University where his exercises *in all kinds* 'were seen fit to be shown on the true Theatre of the World.' Before his 20th year 'he laid the design of his most Masculine Works, finished long after.'" ‖

On leaving the University he travelled abroad and "enjoyed many excellent occasions of observation," beholding "the splendour of Courts and Princes," and "conversing with great men of all degrees." But having satisfied his "curiosity and experience,"[*] he became weary of the vexations and formalities of an active condition, perplexed with long compliance to Foreign Manners, and satiated with the unquiet Arts of a Court, he resolved to forego all Public Employments, and to follow the inclination of his own mind in the true delights of *Solitary Studies*, Temperate Pleasures, and a moderate income below the malice and flatteries of Fortune. He gave over all pursuit of Honour and Riches, and in his last years was "*concealed in his beloved obscurity, and in that solitude which, from his very childhood, he had so passionately desired.*"[†]

---

* Page 3, par. 1, 2, 3, 7. † Page 4, par. 10. ‡ Page 3, par. 4, 8, 13.

§ Francis Bacon's College. ‖ Pages 3, 4, par. 2, 3.

"*In all the several shapes of his style there is still the impression of the same mind*, the same *unaffected modesty, natural freedom, easy vigour, cheerful passions, and innocent mirth which appeared in all his manners. . . .*" "*In his Poetry as well as his Life, he mingled the Innocence and Sincerity of the Scholar with the humanity and good behaviour of the other—the Solidity and Art of the one, with the gentility and grace of the other. . . .*" "He never went before or after the use of the Age; he forsook the conversation, but never the language, of the City and Court."[‡]

"He understood *all the variety and power of Poetical Numbers, and practised all sorts;* there is scarcely any particular of all the passions of men, or works of Nature and Providence, which he has passed by undescribed, with due figures of speech, and with a wit which excelled other men's. In his Latin Poems he expressed to admiration *all the Numbers of Verse and all the Figures of Poesy, &c.* This is indeed most remarkable, that a man so *Constant and Fixed* in the Moral Ideas of his mind should be so changeable in his Intellectual, and yet both in the highest degree of excellence."[§]

"He has been wonderfully happy in *translating* many difficult parts of the noblest Poets of Antiquity in the elegance and true spirit of both the Poetries."[‖]

"His *Davideis* was wholly written at so young an age, that the vastness of the argument, and his handling of it make him seem one of the Miracles that he adorns; like a boy attempting Goliath."[¶]

---

[*] Pages 6, 8, par. 11, 14, 15, 21. [†] Pages 8, 9, par. 9, 22, 32. [‡] Pages 9, 11, par. 3, 9, 20. [§] Pages 10—15, par. 32. [‖] Pages 12, 13, par. 7.

[¶] The Editor says that "this way of leaving verbal translations was scarce heard of in England till this present Age. I will not presume to say that *Mr. Cowley* was the absolute Inventor of it." Pages 13, par. 1, &c.

On returning from his travels he chose as a profession "Physic, and studied Anatomy, Botany, and Simples, and speedily mastered that part of the art of Medicine. But *instead of employing his skill for profit*, he digested it into a treatise of Herbs, Flowers, and Trees." (See hints on these things in the allusions of Francis to his experiments on these subjects with Dr. Parry and others; and the many notes in the '*Sylva Sylvarum*, the '*History of Life and Death*,' and in his private note-books on Medicines, Recipes, and the Regimen of Health.)

"His style, like his behaviour, is hardest to be imitated, consisting of a natural easiness, unstudied, unaffected grace," to be seen also "*in his letters, of which there is a great collection, not to be published*," and his "*Discourses by way of Essays upon some of the gravest subjects that concern the contentment of a virtuous mind*."*

"He esteemed other men for their goodness, generosity, and neglect of vain pomp and human greatness, and for their *honesty* above all excellencies of their knowledge."†

"He had a perfect natural *goodness*, which neither the uncertainties of his condition, nor the largeness of his wit could pervert; a strength of mind that was proof against the Art of Poetry itself. Nothing vain, fantastical, flattering or insolent appeared in his humour. He had a great integrity and plainness of manners . . . the truth of his heart was above the corruption of ill examples."

"There was nothing affected in his habit, person or gesture; he practised the forms of good breeding without burdening himself or others." "He never oppressed any man's parts, nor put any man out of countenance. He had no emulation for Fame or contention for Profit with any man. His *modesty and humility* were so great that if he had not had many other equal virtues they might have been thought dissimulation."‡ Yet he had a great reverence for a good reputation.

"His *conversation* was most excellent, and rather admired by his familiar friends than by strangers at first sight; he was content to be known by degrees, and so the esteem conceived of him was better grounded and lasting." His *speech, grave and gay*, was so delightful that no man parted willingly from his Discourse: for he ordered it so that every man was satisfied that he had his share. "His wit was so tempered that no man had ever reason to wish it less."§

---

* Page 17, par. 31. See in *Essay of Travel* and elsewhere, recommendations to *letter writing*.

† Page 18, par. 23. ‡ Page 19, par. 20, 24, 28, 29, 9. § Page 19, par. 25, 26.

"He performed all his duties with admirable tenderness . . . his friendships were inviolable. The same men with whom he was familiar in his youth, were his nearest acquaintances at the day of his death." "His wit was so tempered that no man ever had reason to wish it less." "He governed his Passions with great moderation," patient under disappointments and ill-fortune, "his muse complained, but not his mind."[*]

"His Learning was large and profound, well composed of *All Ancient and Modern Knowledge*, but it sat exceedingly close and handsome upon him . . . He was *accomplished with all manner of abilities* for the greatest business, if he would but have thought so himself."[†]

"His earnest affection for Obscurity and Retirement (caused him to) withdraw out of the crowd with desire to enlighten and instruct the minds of those that remained in it."[‡] It was his resolution (in retirement) to "search into the Secrets of Divine and Human Knowledge and to communicate what he should observe." "He alway professed that he went out of the world as it was Man's, into the same world as it was Nature's, and as it was God's."[§] "The whole compass of Creation and all the wonderful effects of the Divine Wisdom were the constant prospect of his senses and his thoughts." Though he sprinkled his works with many allusions and similitudes taken from the Bible . . . he did of all men living abhor the abuse of Scripture by licentious raillery."[‖] "His poetry he dedicated to the service of his Maker, to describe the Great Images of Religion and Virtue wherein his mind abounded . . . singing the praises of God and Nature"[¶] and "designed to submit *Mortal Wit to Heavenly Truths*."[**]

"His body was attended to the grave by a great number of persons of the most eminent quality, and followed with the praises of All Good and Learned Men."[††]

---

[*] Page 19, par. 10, 16, 27, 30. [†] Pages 19, 20, par. 13, 34. [‡] Page 21, par. 9, 22. [§] Page 21, par. 12, 36. [‖] Page 14, Comp. Bacon's Essay on *Civil Discourse*. [¶] Page 9, par. 33, 35. [**] Page 13, par. 33. [††] Page 23, par. 36.

CHRONICLE PLAYS (No. 4).

IN his Essay upon *Ambition* Bacon observes :—"There is also great use of ambitious men, in being *screens to princes, in matters of danger and envy.* For no man will take that part, *except he be like a seel'd dove, that mounts and mounts, because he cannot see about him.*" (*Ambition. Essays,* 1625.)

This is the portrait of a blind man, and of a good man in high place, for the dove is the type and emblem of the Holy Spirit. Henry the Sixth was crown'd, at nine months old at Paris, and consequently during his long minority, was under the protectorship of his uncle Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester. The latter attracted the envy and hatred of Cardinal Beaufort, who was ambitious, and later of the Duke of Suffolk (because he opposed the King's marriage to Margaret of France). Finally he fell a victim to the machinations of these two, who had him done to death. But as long as he was alive he acted, exactly as Bacon describes, *as a screen to the young King, drawing to himself all the danger and all the envy,* not only of the Queen's party, but also of Richard Plantagenet, whose ambition for succession to the crown he check'd.

A "*seel'd dove,*" is an expression borrow'd from hawking, to signify *with eyes closed.* As applied, it means blindness, or ignorance. Thus Antony alluding to Cleopatra, exclaims :—

> The wise Gods *seel our eyes,*
> In our own filth drop our clear judgments ; make us
> Adore our errors.—Act III. xiii. 112.

In short, we have the idea presented to us, of a man, of a good and guileless character, *in great place,* or aloft, impelled by ambition, but blind to the dangers which that height suggests from "*birds of prey.*" When the Queen, Suffolk, Beaufort, and Buckingham, before the Abbey of Bury St. Edmunds, accuse Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, of treason to the King and State, the latter in defence of his Protector, *compares him to a dove* :—

> *King.*—But shall I speak my conscience,
> Our kinsman Gloucester is as innocent
> From meaning treason to our royal person
> *As is the sucking lamb, or harmless dove.*
> The duke is virtuous, mild, and too well given
> To dream on evil or to work my downfall.
> *Queen.*—Ah, what's more dangerous than this fond affiance!
> *Seems he a dove.* His feathers are but borrow'd.
> —2 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act III. i. 69.

Bacon observes in his Essay upon Riches:—"A great State left to an heir, is as a lure to all the *birds of prey*, round about to seize on him, if he be not the better establish'd in years and judgment." (*Essays*, 1625.)

This text is of great assistance in the understanding of the first quoted. For just as the former seems to point to good Duke Humphrey of Gloucester, so the last text, still more strongly, points at Henry the Sixth, and the state of England during his reign, and the War of the Roses.

Henry, who, in Bacon's words, was not the better establish'd in years and judgment, disinherited his own lawful son and heir-apparent, Edward, Prince of Wales, in favour of Richard Plantagenet, Duke of York, and his heirs; retaining only a life interest in the Crown. All this is depicted, in the first Act, of the third Part, of the Play of *King Henry VI.* Directly the King consented to this confirmation of the succession to the Crown to Richard, Duke of York (and his heirs), the Earl of Northumberland exclaims to Henry:—

> *Be thou a prey unto the House of York*
> And die in bands for this unmanly deed!
> —3 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act I. i.

Indeed so conscious was the King, of the act of suicide he was committing, that he exclaims the hope, his Queen would revenge him, upon Plantagenet:—

> Reveng'd may she be on that hateful duke,
> Whose haughty spirit, wing'd with desire
> *Will cost my crown, and like an empty eagle*
> *Tire on the flesh of me and of my son.*
> —3 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act. I. i.

Here then, is the imagery *pertaining to birds of prey!* The House of York is the eagle, the House of Lancaster the prey! And this metaphor is not only continued to Richard's son (afterwards King Richard the Third), but applied to the supporters of their claims,—to Warwick, and others who were stirred by *mounting ambition*, to fight for the succession. But first, a few citations to show how Bacon, who was an expert upon the subject of hawking (as Francis Osborn states), compares ambition to the mounting of birds in the air:—

> And for we think *the eagle winged pride*
> *Of sky-aspiring and ambitious thoughts,*
> With rival-hating envy, set on you
> To wake our peace.—*Rich. II.*, Act I. iii. 129.

A very natural metaphor to occur to a poet, replies a possible critic. But, I reply it is regularly introduced:—

These growing feathers pluck'd from Cæsar's wing
Will make him fly an ordinary pitch,
Who else would soar above the view of men
And keep us all in servile fearfulness.—*Jul. Cæsar* I. i. 77.

The ambition is coupled with the envy, and of course produces it, as in the case of Thomas Mowbray, Duke of Norfolk, and Bolingbroke, in the lines cited. Bacon writes:—"There is use also of ambitious men, in pulling down the greatness of any subject that overtops." (*Ambition. Essays,* 1625.) In the posthumous edition of the Essays of 1638, this variation occurs:—"*Ut prægrandibus alas amputent, et eorum potentiam labefactent.*"—*i.e.,* To cut the wings of persons who are too great, and to diminish their power.

It will therefore be seen that Bacon held the metaphor of the soaring, or mounting bird, as the best to illustrate pride of place. But by the term "*birds of prey,*" all the parties, or factions, concerned in the struggle of the War of the Roses might seem understood, but it is to Warwick and to the entire York faction, it is particularly applied. The king-maker Warwick stands easily *princeps* of these birds of prey. Warwick exclaims:—

Neither the King, nor he that loves him best,
The proudest he that holds up Lancaster
Dares stir a wing if Warwick shake his bells.
—3 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act I. i. 45.

The "*great State left to an heir*" was the Crown of England, and mark, Bacon does not say, "*a great estate,*" but "*a great state,*" quite another thing altogether. Warwick and the House of York were the birds of prey. The emblem of the eagle (applied to the Duke of York, by King Henry the Sixth) is endorsed by Richard, Duke of Gloucester, son of the former (afterwards Richard the Third). Speaking of his father to his brother, he exclaims:—

Gloucester.—Nay, if thou be that princely *eagle's* bird,
Show thy descent by gazing 'gainst the sun.
—3 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act II. i. 91.

• • • • •

And again:—

Gloucester.—I cannot tell; the world is grown so bad
That wrens make prey where *eagles* dare not perch.
—*Rich. III.*, Act I. iii.

* * * * *

Gloucester.—Our *aery* buildeth in the *cedar's* top,
And dallies with the wind and scorns the *sun.*—*Ib.* 264.

All these three allusions to the *eagle*, are applied to the House of York. The first refers to Richard Plantagenet, the second to his son Richard, Duke of Gloucester (who is pointing at himself), and in the last we probably have an indirect hint for Warwick the King-maker, *who is compared to both the cedar and the sun.* The defeat and death of Warwick at the battle of Barnet, by King Edward the Fourth, consolidated the House of York upon the English throne. It will be remembered, that Edward had been helped to the Crown by Warwick, but that the latter, upon hearing of the King's marriage, with Lady Grey, turned against him :—

Warwick.—I came from Edward as ambassador,
But I return his sworn and mortal foe;
I was the chief that raised him to the crown,
And I'll be chief to bring him down again.
—3 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act III. iii. 256.

When Warwick is brought in dying on the field of Barnet, he exclaims of his own fall, and death :—

Thus yields the cedar* to the axe's edge,
Whose arms gave shelter to the princely eagle,
Under whose shade the ramping lion slept,
Whose top branch overpeer'd Jove's spreading tree
And kept low shrubs from winter's powerful wind.
These eyes, that now are dimm'd with death's black veil,
Have been as piercing as the mid-day sun,
To search the secret treasons of the world.
—3 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act V. ii. 11.

Here then are the two emblems, applied by Gloucester to

---

* Of Nobility, Bacon writes :—"It is a reverend thing, to see an ancient castle, or building, not in decay; or to see *a fair timber* (*Annosam et proceram*—old and tall) *tree, sound and perfect.* How much more to behold an ancient Noble Family, which hath stood against the waves and weathers of Time. For new nobility is but the act of power. But ancient nobility is the act of Time." (*Essays. Nobility*, 1625.) This comparison of nobility to a tree, finds particular parallel in the great King-maker Warwick, who exclaims at his end :—

Thus yields the cedar to the axe's edge,
Whose arms gave shelter to the princely eagle,
Under whose shade the ramping lion slept,
Whose top branch overpeer'd Jove's spreading tree
And kept low shrubs from winter's powerful wind.
—3 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act V. ii. 11.

Bacon has given a decided clue for the cedar, when in his Latin variation of the Essays (1638), he indicates it as "old and tall." The same reflection as to overpeering heighth appears in the line placed in italics, that is to say, the cedar dominates the oak tree. Those who have visited Warwick Castle, must instantly recall to mind, those magnificent specimens of the Cedar of Lebanon, growing immediately beneath the castle walls, on the banks of the River Avon. Were these trees already extant in Bacon's time?—probably so

Warwick (and also applied to himself and his house by the latter), *cedar and sun!* Gloucester's speech signifies, the building of the York succession and power, upon Warwick's cedar, which was true. Edward the Fourth, as Warwick states, was "*raised to the Crown*," by the cedar. When Warwick alludes to the "*princely eagle*" and to the cedar, *("whose arms gave shelter,")* he speaks of Richard Plantagenet and, also how he (Warwick) was an instrument in the building aloft of the York House, by means of his arm. When Gloucester says "Our aery," we have a hint for the "*princely eagle*" who "*scorns the sun.*"—*i.e.*, scorned Warwick and defeated him at Barnet!

Virgil gives us in his "Georgics," the "*omens before the Civil War*," in these words :—

> Sol tibi signa dabit. Solem quis dicere falsum
> Audeat? *Ille etiam cæcos instare tumultus*
> *Sæpe monet, fraudesque et operta tumescere bella;*
> —*Georgics I.*, 465.

These were lines, applied by Virgil, to indicate the omens preceding *the Civil War, that followed the death of Julius Cæsar.* And the student will of course immediately perceive, the happy parallel, Bacon has hit upon (in introducing these two last lines in his Essay upon *Seditions and Troubles*), for as Bacon says, "Tempests in State are commonly greatest *when things grow to equality*," and this was exactly the case in events following Cæsar's death. Antony exclaims :—

> Our Italy
> *Shines o'er with civil swords.* Sextus Pompeius
> Makes his approaches to the port of Rome.
> *Equality of two domestic powers*
> *Breed scrupulous faction.—Ant. and Cleo.*, Act I. iii. 45.

Bacon perceived that the Civil War in England, commonly called the War of the Roses, was greatly due to equality of factions, or rival powers, whereof there was afforded an extraordinary parallel in Roman history. The faction of Antony, Octavius, and Lepidus, was opposed to the faction of Brutus and Cassius, in the same way the house of Lancaster was opposed to the house of York. "This faction, or party of Antonius, and Octavianus Cæsar, against Brutus and Cassius, held out likewise for a time. But when Brutus and Cassius were overthrown, then soon after Antonius, and Octavianus brake, and subdivided." (*Faction, Essay*, 1625.)

Something very closely akin to this took place in our Civil War of the Roses. Warwick not only broke up his own party, by deserting it, and going over to the other side, or faction, but undoubtedly he was :—

as piercing as the midday sun
To search the secret treasons of the world.

For example, it was Warwick who searched out the secret treasons of the Duke of Suffolk, and charged him with the murder of good Duke Humphrey of Gloucester.*—Warwick gathered from the appearance of the body, that the Duke had met his end from violence. With equal prescience, and lightning instinct he fastened upon the Duke of Suffolk, and Cardinal Beaufort, (as enemies of the Protector), as the guilty murderers. Limited space forbids quotation, but it may be read in the second scene, of the third act, of the second part, of *King Henry the Sixth*, particularly from lines 122, to lines 230. The piercing sight of Warwick foresaw and foretold from the first, the Civil War :—

Warwick.—And here I prophesy : this brawl to-day,
Grown to this faction in the Temple garden,
Shall send between the Red rose and the White
A thousand souls to death and deadly night.
—1 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act II. iv. 124.

It is remarkable to find Casca, calling attention, to the omens preceding the death of Cæsar, in parallel language to

---

* "Shepherds of people, had need know the *Calendar of Tempests in State ;* which are commonly greatest, when things grow to equality; as *natural Tempests* about the *Æquinoctia*. And as there are certain hollow blasts of wind, and secret swelling of seas, before a tempest, so are there in States :— *Ille etiam cæcos instare tumultus Sæpe monet, fraudesque et operta tumescere bella*," (*Of Seditions and Troubles*). The Latin means "He (*Sol tibi signa dabit*), also often warns of threatening hidden tumults; and treacheries, and of secret wars swelling to a head" (*Virgil, Georgics I.*, 456).

The *treacheries*, were the murder of Duke Humphrey of Gloucester, and "the secret wars swelling to a head," was the rebellion of Richard Plantagenet. who with his soldiers from Ireland, practically began the fierce tempest of the War of the Roses, at the battle of St. Albans. The tumult was that of Jack Cade, which was prepared by York.

York.—I will stir up in England *some black storm*
Shall blow ten thousand souls to heaven or hell ;
And this fell *tempest* shall not cease to rage
Until the golden circuit on my head.
—2 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act III. i.

What Bacon's text signifies is, that Protectors and Kings (Humphrey and Henry the Sixth) need State prescience, or political foresight, and the prudence accruing from such knowledge. Warwick alone possessed this gift. The passage has a double meaning. It applies to portents, and natural prodigies in the heavens, and nature, preceding great historical events. And it also pertains to political divination, of parties, and times, needed in every good, shepherd, and pilot of the State.

Bacon's opening passage to his Essay upon *Seditions and Troubles.*

O Cicero
I have seen *tempests*, when the scolding winds
Have rived the knotty oaks, and I have seen
The ambitious ocean swell and rage and foam,
To be exalted with the threatening clouds;
But never till to-night, never till now,
Did I go through a *tempest* dropping fire.
Either there is a civil strife in heaven,
Or else the world, too saucy with the gods,
Incenses them to send destruction.
—*Julius Cæsar*, Act I. iii.

The "*civil strife in heaven,*" was the portent of the coming *tempest* in the State—of the civil strife on earth! This "*calendar of tempests in the State,*" was easily read by a man of Warwick's temperament, but not by Humphrey Duke of Gloucester. Bacon says that signs of these troubles are:—"Libels, and licentious discourses against the State, when they are frequent and open." (*Seditions and Troubles*, 1625.) In the Second part of *King Henry the Sixth*, Thomas Horner is charged with publishing a libel, or licentious discourse, to the effect:—

That Richard Duke of York
Was rightful heir unto the English Crown.—Act I. iii.

So likewise Jack Cade's rebellion (introduced in the Second part of *Henry the Sixth*), stirred up by Richard Plantagenet, comes under the head of what Bacon calls "*seditious tumults,*" and "*seditious fames*" (reports), "the last being feminine (passive) the first masculine, or active. (*Vide* Essay: *Seditions and Troubles*). I now return to my first texts, from which this is a digression.

The "*lure to all the birds of prey*, was the unfortunate King Henry the Sixth:—

York.—Were't not all one, an *empty eagle* were set
To guard the chicken from the hungry *Kite*,
As place Duke Humphrey for the King's protector?
—2 *K. Hen. VI.*
Queen.—So the poor chicken should be sure of death.
—2 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act III. i.

In reality the "*empty eagle,*" was the speaker himself—the Duke of York (Richard Plantagenet). This charge against good Duke Humphrey, of plotting ambitiously against the King, was utterly false—only a device of his enemies' malice, to destroy him. His enemies charged him with ambition, in a scene laid at St. Albans.

King—But what a point, my lord, your falcon made,
And what a pitch she flew above the rest!
To see how God in all His creatures works!
Yea, man and birds are fain of climbing high.
Suffolk.—No marvel, an it like your Majesty,
My lord protectors hawks do tower so well;
They know their master loves to be aloft
And bears his thoughts above his falcon's pitch.
Gloucester.—My lord 'tis but a base ignoble mind
That mounts no higher than a bird can soar.
Cardinal.—I thought as much; he would be above the clouds.
Gloucester.—Ay, my Lord Cardinal? How think you by that?
Were it not good your grace could fly to heaven?
King.—The treasury of everlasting joy.—2 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act II. i. 5.

There is only one bird that can fly to heaven, in the emblematic sense, implied in these lines—to wit, the Dove! It is the "*seel'd dove,*" who can mount without accusation of ambition! Bacon writes:—"The spirit of Jesus is the spirit of a dove" (the miracles of our Saviour). It was this spirit, which animated Gloucester, for ambition he reproved in his wife Eleanor. (*Vide* 2 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act I. ii. 41—50). A thoroughly good man, beloved by the saint-like King, and by populace:—*

What though the common people favour him,
Calling him "Humphrey, the good Duke of Gloucester."
Clapping their hands, and crying with loud voice,
"Jesu maintain your royal excellence?"
With "God preserve the good Duke Humphrey!"
—*Ib.*, Act I. i. 157.

It was just part of the utterly guileless character of the good duke, to be like the "*seel'd dove,*" not only perfectly innocent, but somewhat blind to his danger. To get at Henry the Sixth, it was necessary to first get his protector out of the way. The Duchess of Gloucester clearly foresaw the malice of her husband's enemies:—

---

* The Queen, exclaims to Henry the Sixth:—

Is all thy comfort shut *in Gloucester's tomb?*
Why, then Dame Margaret was ne'er thy joy,
Erect his statue and worship it,
And make my image but an alehouse sign.
—2 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act III. ii.

This is clearly a reference, or allusion, to the *famous monument erected to the Duke of Gloucester*, in St. Albans Abbey. There was very probably *an alehouse also* (*at St. Albans*), *bearing the sign of "Queen Margaret,"* just as the poet knew very well, that there was an inn bearing the sign "*The Castle*," (*or Castle in St. Albans*), where the Duke of Somerset fell in battle.—2 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act V. ii.

Duchess.—For Suffolk, he that can do all in all,
And York and impious Beaufort, that false priest,
Have all lim'd bushes to betray thy wings,
And fly thou how thou canst, they'll tangle thee.
Gloucester.—Ah! Nell! forbear! Thou aims't all awry;
I must offend thee before I be attainted;
And had I twenty times so many foes,
And each of them had twenty times their power,
All these could not procure me any scathe,
So long as I am loyal, true and crimeless.—*Ib.*, Act II. iv.

Observe how Gloucester is compared to a bird. Observe the "*seel'd dove,*" in his reply—spoken out of a pure, and simple conscience of innocence, but a little blind, and ignorant of the dangers from the birds of prey! But Warwick knew, who the *Kites* were, who murdered Duke Humphrey:—

Warwick.—Who finds the partridge in the puttock's nest,
But may imagine how the bird was dead,
Although the *Kite* soar with unblooded beak?
Queen.—Are you the butcher, Suffolk? Where's your knife?
Is Beaufort termed a *Kite?*—2 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act III. ii. 191.

The metaphor comparing Henry the Sixth to a lure is always at hand. Clifford reproaches the King for disinheriting the heir apparent, in favour of Richard Plantagenet, and his heirs:—

Thou, being a King, blessed with a goodly son,
Didst yield consent to disinherit him,
Which argued thee a most unloving father.
Unreasonable creatures feed their young
And though man's face be fearful to their eyes,
Yet, in protection of their tender ones,
Who hath not seen them even with those wings
Which sometimes they have used with fearful flight
Make war with them that climb'd unto their nest.
—3 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act II. ii.

It was the envy, and ambition of his enemies, that brought about the fall of good Duke Humphrey of Gloucester. A little before his end, he exclaims:—

Gloucester.—Ah, gracious lord, these days are dangerous.
Virtue is choked with foul *ambition.*—142.

. . . . .

Sharp Buckingham unburthens with his tongue
The *envious load* that lies upon his heart;
And dogged York that reaches at the moon,
Whose overweening arm I have plucked back,
By false accuse doth level at my life.
—2 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act III. i. 156.

Bacon writes of *Ambition*:—"Ambition is like choler; which is an humour that maketh men active, earnest, full of alacrity, and stirring, *if it be not stopped. But if it be stopped, and cannot have its way, it becometh adust, and thereby malign and venomous.*" (*Essays. Ambition*, 1625.)

In order to get the ambitious Richard Plantagenet, Duke of York, out of the way, he was sent to Ireland to put down the rebellion there. However he discovers the real motive of his enemies, and exclaims :—

> *York.*—Well, nobles, 'tis politicly done,
> To send me packing with an host of men;
> *I fear me you but warm the starved snake,*
> *Who cherish'd in your breasts, will sting your hearts.*
> —2 *K Hen. VI.*, Act III. i. 341.

It will be observed how admirably this parallels Bacon's passage upon *ambition that is stopped?* Bacon is thinking of the serpent when he says, "*it becometh adust, and thereby malign and venomous.*" The word "*adust,*" is evidently derived from "*adusta,*" which signifies "*inflamed,*" *i.e.*, warmed. It is against Humphrey, that York is plotting.

> *York.—For Humphrey being dead, as he shall be,*
> *And Henry put apart, the next for me.—Ib.* 382.

Here then is the *ambition*, and its *stopping*,* with its consequent malice just as Bacon puts it. York's malice was entirely due to the fact that his, "overweening arm, had been plucked back," by Gloucester, as the latter confesses in the passage cited. This is the more apparent, from the fact, that quite recently York had been a recognizer of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester's virtues. In this same act, we find Richard Plantagenet saying :—

> *York.*—Do you as I do, in these dangerous days:
> Wink at the Duke of Suffolk's insolence,
> At Beaufort's pride, at Somerset's ambition,
> At Buckingham and all the crew of them,
> Till they have snared *the shepherd of the flock*,
> That virtuous prince, the good Duke Humphrey.
> —2 *K. Hen. VI.*, II. ii. 169,

---

* The cause of Iago's jealousy was entirely due to his soldier's *ambition being stopped.* Othello promoted Cassio in his place :—

> And I, of whom his eyes had seen the proof
> At Rhodes, at Cyprus and on other grounds
> Christian and heathen, must be be-leed and calm'd
> By debitor and creditor. This counter-caster,
> He in good time, must his lieutenant be,
> And I—God bless the mark! his Moorship's ancient.
> —*Othello I.*, i.

After Iago is discovered Lodovico exclaims :—

> Where is that viper? Bring the villain forth.—Act v. ii.

One might reasonably imagine Bacon was thinking of the Duke, and of King Henry the Sixth, when he is found observing:—"One of the doctors of Italy, Nicholas Macchiavel, had the confidence to put in writing, almost in plain terms: *That the Christian Faith, had given up good men, in prey, to those that are tyrannical and unjust.*" (*Essays. Goodness and Goodness of Nature*, 1625.)

Bacon writes: "This public envy, seemeth to beat chiefly, *upon principal officers, or Ministers, rather than upon Kings, and estates themselves.*" (*Envy.* 1625.)

This is most remarkably illustrated in the case of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester. The plots of the Duke of Suffolk, and the Queen, of Beaufort, the Duke of York, and Somerset, all set in the direction of the Protector, rather than towards the King. In this Essay, Bacon says: "So when Envy, is gotten once into a State, *it traduceth even the best actions* thereof, and turneth them into an ill odour." (*Ib.*)

All the best actions of good Duke Humphrey were traduced by his envious enemies, into charges of high treason. The Duke of York accuses him of peculation, whereas he had spent his money to relieve garrisons.

York.—'Tis thought, my Lord, that you took bribes of France,
And, being Protector, stay'd the soldiers' pay.

To which the Duke replies, not only with emphatic denial, but also adds:—

Gloucester.—No; many a pound of mine own proper store,
Because I would not tax the needy commons,
Have I dispursed to the garrisons,
And never asked for restitution.
York.—In your Protectorship you did devise
Strange tortures for offenders never heard of,
That England was defamed by tyranny.
Gloucester.—Why, 'tis well known that, whiles I was Protector,
Pity was all the fault that was in me;
For I should melt at an offender's tears,
And lowly words were ransom for their fault.
—2 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act III. i. 104—127.

Bacon continues:—"But this is a sure rule, that if the *envy* upon the Minister be great, when the cause of it, in him is small; or if the *envy* be general, in a manner upon all the Ministers of an estate; then the *envy* (though hidden) is truly upon the State itself (*Regem, aut, statum ipsum*—the King, or State itself! 1638)." (*Essays. Envy*, 1625.)

This was exactly the case with England, in the events preceding the War of the Roses—the envy was general, the causes for it, in the character, or acts of Humphrey, the Protector, of the smallest possible degree. Exeter exclaims:—

> But howso'er, no simple man that sees
> This jarring discord of nobility,
> This shouldering of each other in the court,
> This factious bandying of their favourites
> But that it doth presage some ill event.
> 'Tis much when sceptres are in children's hands;
> *But more when envy breeds unkind division;*
> *There comes the ruin, there begins confusion.*
> —1 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act IV. i. 187.

Bacon writes of King's Favourites:—"As for the pulling of them down, if the affairs require it, and that it may not be done with safety suddenly, the only way, is the interchange continually of favours and disgraces; *whereby they may not know what to expect; and be, as it were, in a wood.*" (*Essays. Ambition*, 1625.)

Richard, Duke of Gloucester, is pictured in exactly this situation of *uncertainty, and expectation*, when he exclaims of his hopes of the crown:—

> And yet I know not how to get the crown,
> For many lives stand between me and home.
> *And I,—like one lost in a thorny wood,*
> That rends the thorns and is rent with the thorns,
> Seeking a way and straying from the way;
> Not knowing how to find the open air,
> But toiling desperately to find it out
> Torment myself to catch the English crown.
> —3 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act III., ii. 172.

Bacon writes of *Envy*:—"It is also the vilest affection, and the most depraved; for which cause it is, *the proper attribute of the devil, who is called the envious man, that soweth tares amongst the wheat by night.* As it always cometh to pass, that envy worketh subtilly, and in the dark. And to the prejudice *of good things, such as is the wheat.*" (*Envy. Essays*, 1625.)

Directly we turn to the last scene, of the final act of the third part, of the Play of *Henry the Sixth*, Richard, Duke of Gloucester is to be found exclaiming, with reference to his nephew's hopes of succession to the throne of England:—

> *Gloucester.—I'll blast his harvest*, if your head were laid;
> For yet I am not look'd on in the world.
> —3 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act V., vii.

In this speech we have a perfect picture of the "*envious man*," who will, "feed upon their own good, or upon others' evil. And who wanteth the one, *will prey upon the other.*" (*Envy*). Richard the Third, indeed, was a devil incarnate, and as a devil he has been pourtrayed. Of him it may truly be said, "he ploughed iniquity, and sowed wickedness, and reaped the same." (Job iv. 8). Richard the Third was envious of Queen Elizabeth and her friends:—

Q. Elizabeth.—Come, come, we know your meaning, brother Gloucester;
You *envy* my advancement and my friends.
—*Rich. III.*, Act I., iii. 74.

I have very little doubt, (for myself at least), that Bacon was pointing at his Play portrait of Richard the Third, when he penned the sentence,—"*Envy is the proper attribute of the devil.*" Henry the Sixth exclaims of Gloucester:—

'Tis sin to flatter; "good" was little better:
"*Good Gloucester*" *and good devil were alike.*
—3 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act V. 6.

• • • • •

Q. Anne.—. . . and mortal eyes cannot endure the devil.
Avaunt, thou dreadful minister of hell!

• • • • •

Foul devil, for God's sake, hence, and trouble us not
For thou hast made the happy earth thy hell.
—*K. Rich. III.*, Act I., ii.

• • • • •

Gloucester.—And I nothing to back my suit at all
But the plain devil, ...—*Ib.*, ii. 236.

Queen Margaret calls him:—

A hell-hound that doth hunt us all to death.—Act IV., iii.

• • • • •

Hie thee to hell for shame, and leave the world
Thou Cacodæmon! There thy kingdom is!—Act I., iii. 143.

In the Bible, the wolf is the emblem, or type, introduced to indicate *the devil*, who scatters and devours the sheep. The Protector Humphrey had been the *Shepherd of his people* and of his King. But after his death, the poor King soon fell a prey to the wolf Gloucester, who stabbed him to death. Henry the Sixth, just before his death, at the hands of Richard, exclaims:—

So flies the reckless shepherd from the *wolf*;
So first the harmless sheep doth yield his fleece,
And next his throat unto the butcher's knife.
—3 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act V. vi.

• • • • •

Q. Margaret.—And yonder is the *wolf* that makes this spoil.
—3 *K. Hen. VI.*, V. iv. 80.

• • • • •

Queen Elizabeth alluding to the murdered princes:—

Wilt thou, O God, fly from such gentle lambs,
And throw them in the entrails of the *wolf?*
—*Rich. III.*, Act IV. iii.

In the Bible, "*the harvest*," means the end of the world, and the parable of the tares, to which I allude, is a parable of the "*enemy, who hath done this*,"—that is to say, of the envious man, who endeavours to spoil, the reaping of the corn—*that is the good life.* But it is applied also in a personal sense. For example Job says, "Thou shalt come to thy grave in a full age, like as a shock of corn cometh to his season" (Job v. 26). And in this sense of the *well-spent life*, we find it applied to good Duke Humphrey of Gloucester:—*

Why droops my lord, like over ripened *corn*,
Hanging the head at Ceres' plenteous load?
—2 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act I. ii

And of his death:—

His well proportion'd beard made rough and rugged
Like to the summer's *corn* by tempest lodged.
—*Ib.*, Act III. ii. 175.

* * * * *

Though we have spent our *harvest* of this King
We are to reap the harvest of his Son.
—*K. Rich. III.*, Act II. ii. 115.

The same idea of *blasting the wheat*:—

Here is your brother, like a mildew'd ear,
Blasting his wholesome brother.—*Hamlet* III., iv. 64.

Bacon says of *Envy*:—"We will add this, in general, touching the affection of *Envy*, that of all other affections, it is the most importune, and continual. For of other affections, there is occasion given but now and then. And therefore, it was well said, *Invidia festos dies non agit* (Envy keeps no holiday). For it is ever working upon some, or other." (*Envy. Essays*, 1625.)

This is meant for Richard the Third, whose envious nature was for ever at work upon friends and foes alike. In the first scene, of Act two, King Edward the Fourth, whose end is not far off, is presented as peace-maker between the rival factions:—

K. Edward.—Happy, indeed, as we have spent the day.
Brother, we have done deeds of charity;

---

* It is remarkable to note, how entirely opposite these two Dukes (both of Gloucester), were in character. Good Duke Humphrey of Gloucester, and Richard Duke of Gloucester—the identity of title, and the contrast, is striking!

Made peace of enmity, fair love of hate,
Between these swelling wrong-incensed peers.
Gloucester.—A blessed labour, my most sovereign liege.
Amongst this princely heap, if any here
By false intelligence, or wrong surmise,
Hold me a foe;
If I unwittingly, or in my rage,
Have aught committed that is hardly borne
By any in this presence, I desire
To reconcile me to his friendly peace:
'Tis death to me to be at enmity;
I hate it, and desire all good men's love.
First, madam, I entreat true peace of you,
Which I will purchase with my duteous service;
Of you, my noble cousin Buckingham,
If ever any grudge were lodged between us;
Of you, Lord Rivers, and Lord Grey, of you,
That all without desert have frown'd on me;
Dukes, earls, lords, gentlemen; indeed of all.
I do not know that Englishman alive
With whom my soul is any jot at odds
More than the infant that is born to-night:
I thank my God for my humility.
Q. Elizabeth.—A Holy day shall this be kept hereafter.
—*K. Rich. III.*, Act II. i. 48—73.

When Bacon writes, "*Envy keeps no holiday,*" he means, not only that envy never rests, or ceases, but, *that nothing is sacred to it,* no promise, no vow—for our modern word "*holiday,*" is but a corruption of "*holy day*"—*i.e.*, a day of rest, and peace, like the Sabbath. Gloucester, it has been seen, has in his speech, been proffering peace and amity to those he mentions—to his noble cousin Buckingham, and to Lords Rivers and Grey. Well, as the Play tells us, *he could not keep his promises,*—the Holy day, that was to be the type, or covenant, of this new pact, was going to be broken. Gloucester was not going to observe this day in the immediate future! And why not? Because his fiendish envy would not let him! The first to fall victims to his malice, after this scene, were Rivers and Grey, to whom he refers. Lastly, his bosom friend Buckingham fell a victim, who indeed was the first to help him to the crown. Bacon writes:—"Things there are that a man cannot do himself, and then it will appear that it was a sparing speech of the Ancients to say, *That a friend is another himself.* For that a friend is far more than himself." (*Friendship,* 1625.)

Richard the Third describes Buckingham as:—

My other self, my counsel's consistory,
My oracle, my prophet!—Act II. ii. 151.

And Buckingham, with regard to Richard, says:—

Fear not, my lord, I'll play the orator
As if the golden fee for which I plead
Were for myself!—Act III. v. 95.

In the same Essay, Bacon says of friendship:—"A man can scarcely allege his own merits with modesty, much less extol them. A man cannot brook to supplicate or beg." (*Friendship*, 1625.) Now this is exactly what Buckingham did for Gloucester, begging the crown for him from the citizens. The ghost of Buckingham exclaims of King Richard:—

The first was I that helped thee to the crown;
The last was I that felt thy tyranny.—Act V. iii.

Bacon observes, in his *Colours of Good and Evil*:—"Evil approacheth to good sometimes *for concealment*, sometimes for *protection*. So *hypocrisy draweth near to religion for covert and hiding itself. Sæpe latet vitium proximitate boni*, and Sanctuary men which were commonly inordinate men, and malefactors, were wont to be nearest to priests and prelates and holy men, for the majesty of good things is such, as the confines of them are reverent" (No. 7). Richard the Third put on the garb of religion to cover his profound hypocrisy, his unfathomable wickedness. No need of evidence, since he is made to say of himself:—

And thus I clothe my naked villainy
With old odd ends stolen out of Holy Writ,
And seem a saint, when most I play the devil.
—*K. Rich. III.*, Act I. iii. 336.

It was the Duke of Buckingham who suggested this:—

And look you get a prayer book in your hand,
And stand between two churchmen good, my lord.
—Act III. vii.

. . . . .

Ah ha, my lord, this prince is not an Edward!
He is not lolling on a lewd day bed,
But on his knees at meditation;
Not dallying with a brace of courtesans,
But meditating with two deep divines;
Not sleeping to engross his idle body,
But praying to enrich his watchful soul.
—*K. Rich. III.*, Act III. vii.

That is to say, Gloucester, *put on the colour of Good*, in order to *cover* his deceit. *Cover* is Bacon's especial word for this sort of concealment. (See *Colours of Good and Evil*, *Advancement of Learning*, *first English edition*, 1640.) And in just this sense, it is introduced into the Play. Gloucester describing the hypocrisy of Lord Hastings, says:—

Gloucester.—I took him for the plainest, harmless creature
That breathed upon this earth a Christian;
Made him my book, wherein my soul recorded
The history of all her secret thoughts:
So smooth he daub'd his vice with show of virtue.
Buckingham.—Well, well, he was the *covert'st shelter'd traitor*
That ever lived.—Act III. v. 25.

A very striking example of Bacon's Sanctuary (for protection) is afforded in this Play. Queen Elizabeth, with her son Edward, takes sanctuary:—

Hastings.—The Queen, your mother, and your brother York,
Have taken sanctuary.—Act III. i. 27.

When Buckingham endeavours to persuade Cardinal Bourchier to pluck the young Prince out of his mother's arms, and to violate *sanctuary* by force, the Prelate replies:—

Cardinal.—God in heaven forbid
We should infringe the holy privilege
Of blessed *sanctuary!* Not for all this land
Would I be guilty of so deep a sin.

Nevertheless Buckingham succeeds in persuading the Cardinal to break the Prince's sanctuary:—

Oft have I heard of *sanctuary men;*
But sanctuary children ne'er till now.
—Act III. i. 40—56.

Observe the expression used by Bacon, in the passage (already cited):—"*Sanctuary* men which were commonly inordinate men and malefactors, *were wont to be nearest to priests and prelates and Holy men.*" There is reasonable cause for suspicion, that in this passage, Bacon is pointing, with latent irony, at perhaps prelates of the type of Bourchier, who were not too particular, when they drew near to men of the type of Buckingham and Gloucester, who were malefactors albeit royal ones! But, however it may be, the student will readily perceive this parallelism of text to be double.

In his Essay upon *Boldness*, Bacon writes: "It is a trivial Grammar School text, but yet worthy a wise man's consideration. Question was asked of Demosthenes: *What was the chief part of an orator?* He answered *Action.* What next? *Action.* What next again? *Action.* He said it, that knew it best, and had by nature no advantage, in that he commended. A strange thing, that that part of an *orator*, which is but superficial, *and rather the virtue of a player*; should be placed so high above those other noble parts of *Invention*, Elocution, and the rest" (*Essays*, 1625).

In the Plays, no character, no scene, can equal in boldness, the second of the first Act of *Richard the Third*, where the latter is presented wooing and winning Queen Anne (whose husband he had murdered), in the very presence of the bleeding corpse! Bacon, in his Essay upon *Deformity*, says, "All deformed persons are extreme bold" (*Deformity*, 1625). Richard the Third was deformed, and surnamed *Crookback.* Bacon says of Boldness: "But nevertheless, it doth *fascinate, and bind hand and foot,* those that are either shallow in judgment, or weak in courage" (*Boldness*, 1625). It seems Queen Anne was in some such way, *fascinated and bound*, by the strong will of Richard, Duke of Gloucester. The latter is made to say:—"*I'll slay more gazers than the basilisk*" (3 K. Henry VI., Act III. ii.). This fabulous animal was supposed to possess the power of fascination at a distance. That is to say, by the power of its eye. And Richard says, "*I'll play the orator as well as Nestor*" *(Ib.).* So great were his powers of *acting*, that King Henry the Sixth exclaims of Richard:—

> What scene of death hath *Roscius* now to *act?—Ib.*, Act V. vi. 10.

So that there are to be found, connoted with the character of Richard the Third, *boldness, and oratory, with action (or acting), just as Bacon connotes them together.*

> *Gloucester.*—Come, Cousin, canst thou quake, and change thy colour,
> Murder thy breath in middle of a word,
> And then begin again, and stop again,
> As if thou were't distaught and mad with terror?
> *Buckingham.—Tut, I can counterfeit the deep tragedian—*
> —*Rich. III.*, Act III. v.

Bacon says:—"Envy is as the sunbeams, *that beat hotter, upon a bank, or steep rising ground, than upon a level. (Nobility).* In the 1625 Edition of the Essays, this passage is transferred to the Essay upon *Envy.* These remarks are therefore to be sought out under *two heads*—Nobility and Envy. The Dukes of Norfolk, of Buckingham, and Lord Abergavenny, *envied* Wolsey's sudden advancement, and their jealousy is depicted in the first scene of the first act of *Henry the Eighth.* Wolsey's quick rise, was the "*bank, or steep rising ground,*" on which the *heat* of this envy beat so fiercely. "And for the same reason, those that are advanced by degrees, *are less envied* in their rising, than those that are advanced suddenly, and *per saltum* (at a bound). Persons of noble blood are less envied in their rising. For it seemeth but right done to their birth" *(Envy,* 1625*).* When Buckingham gives vent to his feelings against Wolsey, in the *heat*, and *fire,* of his jealousy fury against the "butcher's cur," Norfolk counsels him:—

> Stay my lord,
> And let your reason with your choler question,
> What 'tis you go about. To climb *steep hills*,
> Requires slow pace at first.—*Hen. VIII.*, Act. I. i. 129.

The "*steep hill*" is meant for Cardinal Wolsey—as an impediment, or obstacle, to be overcome, or surmounted. Fortune is seated on a hill—the vale best discovers the hill—*i.e.*, those who lack fortune, more easily appreciate, and perceive it in others. Buckingham terms Wolsey, this "*top proud fellow*," in which the idea of heighth is implied. Norfolk exclaims:—

> Be advised,
> *Heat not a furnace for your foe so hot*,
> That it do singe yourself.—Act I. i.

Here is the *heat* that beat upon the "*steep rising ground*" of Wolsey's fortunes.

> Know you not,
> The *fire* that mounts the liquor till't run o'er,
> In seeming to augment it wastes it?—*Ib.*

All this is applied to Buckingham's envy against Wolsey, and here is a still more Baconian touch for the *sunbeams themselves*:—

> That such a Keech can with his very bulk,
> Take up *the rays o' the beneficial sun*,
> And keep it from the earth.—Act I. i. 55.

Bacon's mind was fond of finding, "*correspondences*," between things situated upon apparently different planes. Two opposed mirrors, reciprocally reflecting each other, suggests to him, a ball rebounding from wall to wall of a tennis court. So in the above instance, the physical fact, becomes image for the moral fact.

The Duke of Suffolk's envious curse, which at first he refuses to utter, but finally exclaims:—

> Deliver'd strongly through my fixed teeth,
> *With full as many signs of deadly hate*,
> *As lean-faced* Envy in her loathsome cave.*

---

* "And it is also noted, that *Love* and *Envy*, do make a man *pine*, which other affections do not, because they are not so continual" (*Envy*, 1625). That is to say, a man in love, or in a state of envy, would have *a lean look* from the pining, or fasting, produced by the consuming passion. Speed, describing his master's love symptoms, exclaims:—

> To *fast* like one that takes diet.—*Two Gent. Verona*, Act II. i.

And Julius Cæsar, comments upon the pining aspect of the envious Cassius, who was planning the conspiracy:—

It brings this reproof from the Queen :—

> Enough, sweet Suffolk, thou tormentest thyself;
> And these dread curses, *like the sun 'gainst glass*,
> Or, like an overcharged gun, recoil,
> And turn the force of them upon thyself.
> —2 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act III. ii.

It will be seen that the promptings of passionate *envy*, are compared *to the heat of the* "*sun against glass*,"—in perfect consonance of meaning with Bacon's words, describing *Envy*, "*as the sun's beams, that beat hotter upon a bank, or steep rising ground.*" In the case of Suffolk the cause of his envy was, "*a man of noble birth*" (therefore situated upon a flat), so the latter part of the metaphor, which fitted the fortunes of Wolsey's *rise*, cannot, and was not imaged, to express the other case.

Bacon says :—"So that it is not a simple slander, but a seditious slander like to that *the Poet speaketh of—Calamosque; armare venemo.* A venemous *dart that hath both iron and poison.*" (A charge against I. S. for scandalizing. Part I. Page 60 ; *Resuscitatio*, 1661).

The Duke of Norfolk, in cautioning the Duke of Buckingham against Wolsey's malice, exclaims :—

> You know his nature,
> That he's revengeful, and I know his sword,
> Hath a sharp edge: it's long and't may be said,
> It reaches far, *and where 'twill not extend,*
> *Thither he darts it.*—*Hen. VIII.*, Act 1. i. 108.

The Duke of Buckingham fell a victim to the malice, and venemous slander, of Wolsey. It was through the evidence

> *Cæsar.*—Yond Cassius *has a lean and hungry look*,
> He thinks too much : such men are dangerous.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Such men as he be never at heart's ease,
> *While they behold a greater than themselves.*
> —*Julius Cæsar*, I. ii.

That is to say, Cæsar suspected Cassius of envy towards him. In the sketch of Julius Cæsar's character (given in the *Resuscitatio*), Bacon says of him :—"*He was skilful to avoid envy*" (p. 285, 1661). In the same sketch Bacon says, Julius Cæsar *was skilled in astronomy.*

> But I am constant *as the northern star*,
> Of whose true fixed and resting quality,
> There is no fellow in the firmament,
> The skies are painted with unnumber'd sparks,
> They are all fire and every one doth shine,
> But there's but one in all doth hold his place.
> —Act III. i. 60.

of his surveyor; Sir Gilbert Peck; his chancellor, and John Car, his confessor—with Hopkins, that Buckingham was convicted of high treason and executed. But behind them all was the master wire-puller, and intelligencer,—Wolsey! Here is proof, in a conversation following the trial:—

Second Gent.—Certainly,
The Cardinal is the end of this.
First Gent.—'Tis likely,
By all conjectures: first Kildare's attainder,
Then deputy of Ireland; who removed,
Earl Surrey was sent thither, and in haste too,
Lest he should help his father.
Second Gent.—That trick of State,
Was a deep envious one.—*Hen. VIII.*, Act II. i.

This exactly falls in with what Bacon says that, "*Envy is as an ostracism, that eclipseth men, when they grow too great*" *(Envy*, 1625*)*. The trick of state, suggested in sending the Earl of Surrey to Ireland, so as to get him out of the way, answers to a sort of concealed ostracism:—

First Gent.—This is noted,

And generally, whoever the King *favours*,
The Cardinal will instantly find employment,
And far enough from court too.—*Ib.*

From this, it is quite possible to fully understand, what Bacon means, when he observes:—"It is counted by some, a weakness in princes, to have *Favourites. But it is, of all others, the best remedy against ambitious great ones.* For when the way of pleasuring and displeasuring, lieth by the *Favourite* it is impossible, any other (*alius aliquis ex Proceribus*, any other of the nobles) should be over great" (*Ambition*, 1625). "There is use also of ambitious men, in pulling down the greatness of any subject that *overtops*. As Tiberius used Macro in the pulling down of Sejanus" *(Ambition)*.

Just now we found, Buckingham terming Wolsey, *this* "*top proud fellow*," and it is writ large in the Play, how the Dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk, and the Earl of Surrey, pulled down Cardinal Wolsey. The latter exclaims to the former:—

Now I feel,
Of what coarse metal ye are moulded, *envy*,
How eagerly ye follow my disgraces,
As if it fed ye! And how sleek and wanton,
Ye appear in everything may bring my ruin.
—Act III. ii. 238.

Bacon writes:—"Princes had need, in tender matters, and ticklish times, to beware what they say; especially in those short speeches, *which fly about like darts, and are thought to be* *shot out of their secret intentions" (Seditions and Troubles, Essays*, 1625*)*. It was just such a short speech, that led to the murder of Richard the Second, in Pomfret Castle, at Exton's hands :—

Exton.—Dids't thou not mark the King. what words he spake,
" *Have I no friend will rid me of this living fear ?* "
Serv.—Those were his very words.
Exton. " *Have I no friend ?* " quoth he: he spake it twice,
And urged it twice together did he not?
Serv.—He did.
Exton.—And speaking it, he wistly look'd on me;
As who should say, " I would thou wer't the man
That would divorce this terror from my heart;"
Meaning the King at Pomfret. Come, let s go:
I am the King's friend, and will rid his foe.
—*Rich. II.*, Act V. iv.

After the deed is done, Bolingbroke exclaims :—

Bolingbroke.—Exton, I thank thee not; for thou hast wrought,
A deed of *slander* with thy fatal hand,
Upon my head and all this famous land.
Exton.—From your own mouth, my lord, did I this deed.
Bolingbroke.—They love not *poison* that do *poison* need,
Nor do I thee: though I did wish him dead,
I hate the murderer, love him murdered.
—*Rich. II.*, Act V. vi.

Notice how these last words, *connoting slander with poison*, perfectly parallel, Bacon's definition of seditious slander,—" *Calamosque; armare venemo.*" " A venemous dart that hath *both iron and poison.*"

That is to say, the evil tongue, darts forth, like a serpent, armed with poison to stab, and strike, at a distance,—secretly.

This seems to sum up the description of the evil man in the Psalms : " As soon as they are born, they go astray and speak lies. They are as venemous as the poison of the serpent" (lviii. 3, 4).

" Who imagine mischief in their hearts. They have sharpened their tongue *like* a serpent; adders' poison is under their lips" (cxl. 1—3).

With regard to the " *boldness of deformed persons*," I have ventured to add this text, describing Richard the Third, *from his mothers lips :—*

Thy prime of manhood, *daring*, *bold*, and venturous.
—*Rich. III.*, Act IV. iv. 170.

W. F. C. WIGSTON.

ERRORS AND OMISSIONS IN PRINTING, PAGINATION, AND INDEXES.

IT has often been said, and oftener hinted both in speech and print, that the "Invisible Brotherhood" inaugurated, or at least perfected and set in thorough working order by Francis St. Alban, continues its extensive and beneficent labours at the present day. Many people doubt or ridicule this notion, but they assuredly belong to one of two classes: either they are of those who, having never examined into the question, are the more positive that it is absurd, or else they have personal reasons for checking investigation, and perhaps there is no more serviceable implement of obstruction than ridicule.

With this latter class of sceptics we have nothing to do, but amongst the former class are some who, never having observed, wondered, or examined, yet do not object to being shown the products of research collected and inspected by others. Amongst this worthy class are a few minds rarer still, who, having been *drawn to observe*, will continue to do so, and who will presently begin to make and collect their own observations. To this select company of readers we dedicate the following brief notes:—

When we dissect or anatomise the structure of books on anything directly concerning Francis "Bacon," books incorporating matter first put forward by him, or which we have come to associate with him, we are struck by a variety of odd, recurring, but inexplicable things.

First, whether the matter concern history in which he was an actor, geography, and topography—that is, countries where he travelled, places which he visited, homes where he resided, *he*, often the central figure, *is conspicuous by his absence*. Or, if the matter be the biography of other individuals with whom he was much mixed up, of great men who corresponded with him and sought his acquaintance—say, Sir Walter Raleigh, the Sidneys, Montaigne, or Gondomar, Sir Kenelm Digby, or the Herberts—his name alone, of all the great ones with whom they consorted, is studiously kept in the background. Now this might, of course, be attributed to the fact that he was indeed the "concealed poet," and that his friends were bound to aid in preserving his *incognito*. But this explanation cannot suffice when we find the same or similar omissions in books down to the present time, when we flatter ourselves that "thought is free," that we may publish what we please, and that the march of knowledge and the researches of antiquarians and historians have cast light into the darkest corners.

Moreover, say that historians still repeat (perhaps refurbishing) the same old matter which satisfied their predecessors. Still, this does not get to the bottom of the subject; for on digging deeper we find, even in modern books, evidences of a combination (not to say conspiracy) for the purpose of at the same time "concealing and revealing" our Francis, veiling and *concealing* him from the inobservant by little clouds of confusion and intentional "errors," whilst at the same time *revealing* him by an ingenious system of *hints*. Some of these hints are easily taken, others at present elude us. We find, for instance:—

1. Dates wrong or confused, and pains taken to make them so.
2. Errors or "*errata*" seemingly preconcerted between the author and the printer.
3. Indexes garbled, incorrect, or deficient, apparently on a principle.
4. Omissions of names which should appear, and of authors quoted.
5. Omissions of facts and particulars intimately connected with the matter in hand.
6. Omissions in the index of matters treated of in the body of the works.
7. Pagination tampered with, numbers reversed, omitted, repeated, falsified.*

The difficulty of testing the accuracy of documents on account of "the wrong dates affixed to papers, or by the absence of all dates," is a frequent source of complaint in the works of writers upon Elizabethan books. In some, although dates are given, the writer calmly counsels his readers to take no heed of them, "chronology is so very uncertain that no man can form a conclusive answer from it."† We continually find books of which Vol. II. bears an earlier date than Vol. I.

In the editions of the Bible there is one in which the Old Testament is dated two years later than the New Testament, and in collections of letters such as those of Sir Tobie Matthew it is evident, *not* that the letters have become confused or mixed, but that they have been *intentionally* shuffled and dates altered or expunged.

---

* We do not here return to the "*secret marks in printing*" spots, breaks, emblems, tears, foldings treated of BACONIANA, February, 1894; of the anagrams in typography, &c., *April*, 1894, or of the printing of numbers, July, 1895 (Q.V.).

† See Friedmann's *Life of Anne Boleyn* i. (Pref. xxi.) and E. Budgell's *Lives of the Boyles*, p. 190, 191.

Not only so, but at a time when the use both of the Roman and the Arabic letters and figures were perfectly well understood, dates such as these were often adopted (as a scribe at the British Museum naïvely informed the present writer) "*to conceal the date.*"

LC=500. CLↃ=1,000. IↃↃ=5,000. CCIↃↃ=10,000.
IↃↃↃ=50,000. CCLↃↃↃ=100,000.

It seems as if the method were still to some degree in use, for in the "Graphic" newspaper there was, some few years ago, an article on Chatsworth by "*H. Brewer*," describing a monument to the sons of Sir W. Cavendish. (Henry died 1616 and William, first Earl of Devonshire, 1625). Brewer says: "The carver has come to grief; 1600 ought to be represented by CIↃ, IC, C (*sic*) instead of which it is CIↃ, IC, C (*sic*), which, if it meant anything at all, would be 1199.

To turn to *errata*. Isaac d'Israeli makes no bones about it, but speaks of "*errata purposely committed, that the errata may contain that which is not allowed to appear in the body of the work.*"* This method of conveying information by *errata* existed before the time of Francis Bacon. We read of the "*Anatomy of the Mass*," printed in 1561 (*but it may have been antedated*) with 15 pages of *Errata*. But one of the most remarkable complaints is that of Edward Leigh, appended to his curious treatise on "*Religion and Learning*," of which he says that "it is no easy task to specify the chiefest *errata;* false interpunctions there are too many; here a letter wanting; there a letter too much; a syllable too much, one letter for another; words parted where they should be joined; words joined which should be severed; words misplaced; chronological mistakes, &c., D'Israeli says that "this unfortunate folio" was printed in 1656; but it is evident that the folio is not so "unfortunate" as it appears, but crammed, like the *Shakespeare* folio and many other of Francis Bacon's works, with the ciphers upon which so many keen wits are now labouring.

Nevertheless, not all *errata* are put in with a view to cipher; some, as has been said, are *hints;* others are intended to injure and disparage the work if it tend to reveal Francis St. Alban. Such errors can be introduced by the printer in spite of the author and of repeated revisions for the press, and, that such things are done, we have the strongest evidence.

**Curiosities of Literature* i. 112, &c.

With regard to indexes, there are abundant proofs that they are extensively garbled *with reference to this one concealed person, Francis St. Alban.** It is impossible to do more than state a few cases, leaving others to examine and prove or disprove for themselves; but it may simplify matters to set down the results of the present writer's personal experiences in as few words as possible.

We conclude, then, that in every large standard library which owes its establishment or revival to Francis, there are two catalogues: one is public, and concerns matters in general—everything included in the world of learning, *excepting the private life and doings* of the great magician and master who presided over the whole. This public catalogue is usually printed. The second catalogue, on the contrary, is seldom printed. It is still in charge of the secret brotherhood who control the many different departments of this great organ for the promotion of human knowledge. By their works we know them, and by their marks they know each other.

Observe a few of the *omissions* from the Index of Spedding's *Letters and Life of Bacon.* To say the least of it, they are curious, for the matters are in the books, although the Index screens them. There are then in the Index no references to

The Device or Masque of "The Conference of Pleasure" ...	*Letters & Life*	i. 119.
The Device of "The Indian Prince"	,, ,,	i. 386—391.
"Discourse in Praise of the Queen" (Truth ?)	,, ,,	i. 126.
"Device of Philautia or Self-Love"	,, ,,	i. 375.
Neither any reference to *Device, Interlude, Entertainment, Masks and Mumming, Revels* (all in)	,, ,,	i. 32^5(*sic*)--343.
Nor of the *Comedy of Errors* ...	,, ,,	i. 32^5.

---

* Perhaps it is only right to add our conviction that to a certain extent Sir Thomas More shares this concealment.

The *Promus of Formularies and*
Elegances, unindexed under
any title ... ... *Letters & Life* i. and ii. 1.

(These are referred to in the Table of Contents, as in *Works* VII. 208; they are *Works* VII. 189—211.

Thomas Bushel, an important but somewhat mysterious worker for Francis, is mentioned in *Letters and Life* i. 371, but omitted in the Index.

Highnam, the seat of Sir William Cook, and mentioned by *Montaigne* as the home of his own family, is also omitted, though to be found in *Letters and Life* ii. 369. On the same page is mentioned "*Sir Thomas Lucy*—eldest son, I suppose, of *Justice Shallow*, . . . whose daughter, Joyce, married Sir William Cook," cousin of the Bacon's. The Index leads to none of these particulars.

Francis expresses his desire to make a collection of *Vulgar Errors*, a business which he seems to have accomplished, publishing the book under the name of "Sir Kenelm Digby." He also urges the necessity of raising and ennobling the theatre, or "stage-playing," "a thing, if be made a part of discipline, of great use." He speaks strongly on this subject in the *Latin* (*not the English*) version of Book VI. of the "*Advancement.*" Again, these passages are untraceable by the Index. And, lastly (for we must pass from Spedding with this bare sketch) there are scattered about throughout the *Life and Works* a very considerable number of terms and allusions which we have come to identify with Masonry and Rosicrucianism—allusions, for instance, to *Adam*, *Noah*, *the Ark*, *Babel*, *Solomon* and his *Temple*—with a multitude of *emblems* of which Francis explains the meaning. Ambiguous accounts of the *Philosopher's Stone* and the *Numbers of Pythagoras*, of the *Microcosm* and the Enigmas of the *Sphinx*, of the *Sun and Stars*, the Moon and the *Arcadians*, of the *Nile and Egypt*, the *Tigris and Euphrates*, and of allegories and metaphors, and all manner of ambiguous talk or "*Jargon*," as Francis himself describes it to be. "Bacon's" *Oratio ad Filios* (the address to his Sons of Science) and his *Oratio ad philosophos Parisiensis* (his French *Royal Society?)* are also kept out of the Indexes to *Letters and Life* iv. 458 and *Works* iii. 496. No, we are not intended to find out our philosopher "*in buskins*," or in "*the Cothurnos of Tragedy*." For a while he meant *to suppress himself*, and to make the world, sheep-like, follow his lead, supposing that learning was *everywhere*—"in the air," as the foolish saying is, and that it was the learning of a learned age, not the genius of one man which was creating this stir. His friends were not to forget him, but the vain and shallow multitude were to be flattered with the notion that they formed part of a highly intellectual and advancing community, that "galaxies of wits" and cohorts of "giant minds" swarmed in all directions. See then the strange omissions on the part of "Bacon" himself. He desired to elevate the theatre, and mourns its degradation, speaking as though it were at the very lowest ebb. *He omits to mention Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, Marlow, Middleton,* or any of the host of minor dramatists here or abroad. A good Spanish scholar, he does not hint at *Calderon Lope de Vega or Quevado.* Perfect in French and Italian, he says not a word of any of the new school of dramatists forming in those countries.

He advocates "*Foundations,*" both for education and for refuge in age and poverty. He does not mention Dulwich, although he was present at the inauguration of that great institution.

He is strong on the subject of libraries, and no doubt had much to do with the revival of some of our most important "foundations" of this kind. Where is his own library? Was such a methodical man as he without a catalogue of his own books? We might spend many pages in asking questions such as these. Let others now observe and note for themselves, whilst they bear ever in mind that our Francis was no "grudging" or "dashing man, but ever a countenancer and fosterer of other men's good parts." Ever ready to lend a hand to struggling authors, and to help each to appear wiser and brighter than by nature he was. This was one of the strong traits which made his personality so attractive to all who had the happiness to associate with him. Yet, seek through the Indexes to his works, and see how much you can find concerning his learned and often very intimate friends, collaborators, and devoted admirers—how much of *Edward Alleyn* (founder of Dulwich College), *Elias Ashmole* (the antiquary, "alchemist," and founder of the Ashmolean Museum), Sir Thomas Browne (Author of the "Religio Medici"), Sir Kenelm Digby, Descartes, Galileo, Gilbert, Harvey, Napier and Briggs, Sir Walter Raleigh, Pietro Sarpi and Fulgentius, and many more "philosophers and theologians," contemporaries and often correspondents of Francis St. Alban. Are not such omissions inexplicable excepting upon the assumption that they were intentional, and part of a system?

And as Bacon omits the names of nearly every great writer of his time, so they with one consent omit to mention *him*, or speak of him so casually as to excite no interest. An examination of the writings of any of the men above mentioned will satisfy most minds on this point; but the omission of references is not limited to printed books. The Indexes of the MS. collections will be found equally "imperfect" and with a great method in their imperfections. Not only letters and separate documents often uncatalogued, but whole collections, as the *Promus* and "*Bagford's Collection*" of 108 vols., are (or were) excluded from the printed catalogues, so as only to be attainable by those possessed of the proper pass-word, or who have found a clue of their own. Never despair of finding a document which you have reason to believe is extant; but when looking through the catalogues, *observe hints.*

To take an instance from the *Tenison MSS.* (Lambeth Palace). Here in vol. xv. 661 is *fol.* 175. In this folio are 184 documents, of which only 39 are catalogued. *No.* 174 is noted as being of special interest; but it is followed by 176. We guess therefore (and the guess proves true) that *No.* 174 *is of no special interest*, but that No. 175 will be worth looking at. This folio is found to consist of a number of very poor verses in French, addressed to Mons. Antoine Bacon, and describing him as "*the flower of Englishmen, honour of the Nine Muses, greater than the ancients, as well known beyond the seas as in his own island, a swan singing on the Thames. To do him justice, a poet must be able to write as he does, and as many works. He mingles heaven and earth. He is the eye of wisdom, fit to guide the helm of the State.* In short, "Antoine" is here praised in the terms which have been applied to Francis. Did they write "in consorte," or was Anthony only one of the many masks? We do not know; but this we do know, the compilers of that catalogue did not intend those verses about "Antoine" and his poetry to be either prominently *brought forward* or *lost*, and this is only one of many instances registered in our note-books.

A few words to draw attention to the page numbers of Baconian books. The "errors" here consist chiefly of—(1) Inversions; (2) Omissions; (3) Repetitions; (4) Displacements. Few of our particularly loved books are without one or other of these signs. Thus—

Spedding's *Letters and Life*, vol. i., has p. 325 printed 32^{5}.
" " " " ii. " p. 369 " 309.

Spedding's *Letters and Life*, vol. iii., has p. 218 printed 18.
,, ,, ,, ,, iv. ,, p. 122 ,, 212.
,, ,, ,, ,, v. ,, p. 103 ,, 10^{3}.

In the *Curiosities of Literature*, vol. i., p. 95 is followed by a blank page, then 79 for 97, and vol. iii., p. 274, is followed by 257 for 275.

In *Camden's Remaines* (pub. J. Russell Smith, 1870) p. 64 is followed by 56 for 65.

In *Sidney's Arcadia and Defence of Poesie* (1662) pp. 507 and 547 are both printed 5, with a very faint 7, and 562 is 5 with part of a very faint 3. But in this and earlier books the mispaginations are too numerous to speak of, and the *Shakespeare folio* is a curiosity in "*Errata*."

When we come to think of it, the "authors" of Bacon's time speak surprisingly little of each other *as authors*. Bysshe, a writer about poets, omits both *Spenser* and *Shakespeare*. "Massinger was unknown." Webster is so "shadowy" as to be practically unknown. There is no allusion in Spedding's voluminous "Life" and "Works" of Bacon to the intimacy which existed between the latter and Montaigne. Bayle, with eleven editions of his Dictionary of Critical Biographies, does not so much as mention *Montaigne*. He is equally ignored by Chalmers; and all that Hepworth Dixon has to say of this intimate friend and patron of Anthony (and who actually visited Francis in England) is that Anthony "cracked jokes with him," and that he (Anthony) was "the common friend of Beza and Montaigne."

Who that has observed such things (and they meet us at every turn) but must perceive there is no comedy of errors, but a plan well designed to conceal as well as to reveal the great inventor and the mechanism of the wondrous engine which he constructed, and of which he was the motive power. We ask ourselves how long, like children, are we to be kept playing at "Hoodman blind?" or at what epoch, under what circumstances, is it ordained by existing authorities that the present state of delusion and illusion shall be terminated?

Francis St. Alban evidently hoped and intended that, at the end of 100 years from the inauguration of his fraternity, he would "pace forth" and "let Time's news be known." But still we wait—for what? and for how long?

P. R. Y.

CANONBURY AND CROSBY HALL; SIR THOMAS MORE AND LORD VERULAM.

A FEW more particulars concerning Canonbury Tower may be acceptable to those who read and digested the short account of that interesting place, printed in BACONIANA, April, 1900.

First, it appears clear that "Canonbury Tower" was not the same building as "Queen Elizabeth's Lodge." The tower (Thomas Cromwell wrote in 1835, and the description holds good) was of brick, with turret atop, built probably for an observatory. It was sixty feet high and about seventeen feet square, and included twenty-three various apartments arranged in seven stories, connected by an oaken staircase. The uppermost room is cut off by a heavy door of panelled oak (an inner door and partition of painted deal are evidently recent innovations); at the top is a lead flat whence a fine view is obtained of the panorama which embraces London, the hills of Hampstead and Highgate, and on the opposite side, the river as far as Gravesend.

The Latin verses recorded to have been written on the wall by a poet in the time of Charles I. were these:—

"Mors tua, mors Christi, trans mundi, Gloria Cœli,
Et dolor Inferni, sint meditanda tibi."

Over one of the principal fire-places (of oak elaborately wrought with renaissance emblems) is carved *a pair of bellows*; this is particularly noticed by the historian. These bellows, which are still to be seen, are said to be a secret sign that there is a hiding-place or way of escape through the fire-place or chimney. In fact a small recess, now used as a cupboard, is to be seen immediately at the back of the chimney. We are not in a position to *prove* that this secret way connected with the underground passages or "subterrannies" alluded to in the former Paper, but the thing seems possible and should be investigated. Our present aim is to *suggest* a connection between Canonbury Tower and Crosby Hall—a place which from various circumstances has lately become of enhanced importance in the eyes of BACONIAN researchers.

The Manor of Canonbury derived its name from a mansion of the Prior of the Canons of St. Bartholomew's, which was given to the Priory by Ralph de Berners soon after the Conquest. It became, as we have seen, the property of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem. The Priory at Clerkenwell was very wealthy and magnificent, and was founded by Lord Jordan Briset in the reign of Henry I. At the dissolution of the monasteries, Henry VIII. gave the Priory to John Dudley, Viscount Lisle, but used the Church and Priory as a storehouse for his nets and other hunting appliances. Many historical scenes were enacted at this Priory, which was defaced by Protector Somerset, but partly restored by Mary.

In the reign of Elizabeth, Sir Henry Tylney, "the Queen's Master of the Revels, resided at St. John's with all his tailors, embroiderers, painters, and carpenters, and all artificers required to arrange Court Plays and Masques. In this reign Master Tylney licensed all Plays, regulated the stage for thirty-one years, and passed no less than thirty of Shakespeare's dramas, commencing with *Henry VI.* and ending with *Anthony and Cleopatra.*"

"He might have told us something about the *Great Unknown*," adds the writer, "*but he died in* 1610 *and left no diary or auto-biography*. The Court Revels were all rehearsed in the Great Hall at St. John's. In 1612, James I. gave the Priory to Lord Aubigny, and the Revels office was removed to St. Peter's Hill. The house afterwards came into the possession of Sir William Cecil, grandson of the famous Lord Treasurer Burleigh."

When we come to a minute description of the buildings and architecture of "that fine specimen of Sir Thomas Docwra's perpendicular, St. John's Gate," we learn that beneath it were "*two distinct passages*." The story, as usual, stops at the interesting point, and in no way enlightens us as to whither these passages led, or what was their use. It needs, however, no stretch of imagination to suppose that they led on the one hand to Canonbury Tower, and that they were originally constructed by the Knights of St. John who possessed both of these places. We may also take a leaf from "Shakesperean" authors and *suppose* that the dramatist living at Canonbury may (*if secresy and concealment were the mark!*) have found this private means of communication with his property-men and manager or master of the Revels highly convenient.

The tradition previously alluded to that there was a subterranean communication from Canonbury Tower to the Priory of St. Bartholomew's at Smithfield, receives confirmation by the discovery of the "two distinct passages" from St. John's Gate. The same Prior, Bolton, who carved a rebus of his name on Canonbury Tower, was also Canon of, and a great benefactor to, his two parishes of Great and Little St. Bartholomew.

That same Sir John Spencer from whom Sir Francis "Bacon" received his lease of Canonbury Manor, purchased in 1594 *from the sons of Alderman Bond "the most interesting of old city mansions," Crosby Hall, in the parish of St. Helen's.* Here again had once been a splendid old Priory, including a monastery (as Mr. Hugo speaks of "the *Fraty*") and a nunnery. From the Prioress of St. Helen's, Sir John Crosby had rented the ground to build himself the house of stone and timber, "very large and beautiful and the highest at that time in London." There is something odd about Sir John Crosby, for his annalist records that he *died in* 1475, and that *his widow in* 1470 sold the new city mansion to that dark and wily intriguer, Richard, Duke of Gloucester. "There," says Sir Thomas More, "he lodged himself, and little by little all folks drew unto him, so that the Protector's Court was crowded and King Henry's left desolate."* After Richard's departure to Westminster in 1483, he was succeeded at Crosby Hall by two Lord Mayors, Sir Bartholomew Reed and Sir John Rest; but in 1516, "there came a distinguished tenant—a man fit to stock it with wisdom for ever and to purge it of the stain of Richard's crimes."

"Between 1516 and 1523," says the Rev. Thomas Hugo, "Crosby Hall was inhabited by the great Sir Thomas More—afterwards Lord Chancellor of England." This fact, *that Sir Thomas More rented and lived at Crosby Hall for nine important years of his life, is ignored or suppressed by his biographers,* contemporaries, and even relatives, down to the present day. It is a case precisely corresponding to the suppression of the twin fact concerning Francis "Bacon," and his leasing of Canonbury Tower, and further investigation seems to reveal a similar explanation in both cases. Crosby Hall was, we think, the scene of the very first attempt to form a Society for the Advancement of Learning and the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, which was perfected, methodised, and made permanent, by the mysterious "poet" tenant of Canonbury Tower.

The public life and personality of Sir Thomas More have been too often written to need repetition. In the pages of his many biographers we see him in the midst of his family circle, reading, talking, and discussing with them every subject of interest, whether in religion* or philosophy, literature or science. We know of his devotion to his faith and his country, and of his friendship with Erasmus and other great spirits of the time. At Chelsea he built a beautiful house, where Erasmus visited him, and thus described his domestic life :—

---

* See *Rich. III.*, i. 2 and 3, and *ib.* iii. 1.

"There he converses with his wife, his son, his daughter-in-law, his three daughters and their husbands, with eleven grand-children. There is not any man living so affectionate as he, and he loveth his old wife as if she were a young maid. You would say there was in that house Plato's Academy; but I do his house an injury in comparing it to Plato's Academy, where there were only disputations of numbers and geometrical figures, and sometimes of moral virtues. I should rather call his house a School or University of Christian Religion, for though there is none therein but readeth or studieth the liberal sciences, their special care is piety and virtue; there is no quarrelling or intemperate words heard; none seen idle; that worthy gentleman doth not govern proud and lofty words, but well-timed and courteous benevolence; everybody performeth his duty, yet there is always alacrity; neither is sober mirth anything wanting."

It does not appear whether, when Sir Thomas More took Crosby Hall, he gave up the house at Chelsea, but it seems most likely that the family debating society grew to larger proportions than could be comfortably received at a private dwelling, and that on this account Crosby Hall was adopted for the reception of guests. At all events we read that More's house became the resort of all who were conspicuous for learning and taste; they came gladly to partake of "the hospitality of his table."

The delight of More's conversation and the comparison of his house to Plato's Academy, vividly recall the very parallel remarks of Dr. Rawley on the other great personage who is *his* peculiar subject. "His meals were reflections of the ear as well as of the stomach, like the *Noctes Atticæ*, or *Convivia Deipno-sophistarum*, wherein a man might be refreshed in his mind and understanding no less than in his body." And when we read of Sir Thomas More at the end of the meal or of the reading, trying to draw out the intelligence of his family by asking them questions, encouraging them to reply and express their own opinions, we cannot but think of his great successor—"ever a countenancer and fosterer of other men's parts," who would not "appropriate the speech to himself, but would delight to leave others free to take their turn, and would draw them on and allure them" to do so to the best advantage. Does it not seem as though Francis "Bacon" set before himself the "model" of Sir Thomas More? May it not be that Sir Thomas More laid the foundation-stone of that house of wisdom which it was the delightful though laborious task of the great Francis St. Alban to finish from the base to the topmost pinnacle?

---

* In his religious views Sir Thomas More was an ardent Roman Catholic, but so tolerant and large minded as to lead us to think that his aim like that of Francis Bacon was to draw together the opposed ends of religion, and to make Christian faith and worship truly *Catholic* or Universal.

The ultimate fate of Canonbury Tower and Crosby Hall have been in some respects similar. Of the former we read that "*after the Spencers*, the Lord-keeper Coventry rented this house." This is true only in a sense for, as we know, *after the Spencers* (or Spensers) *Sir Francis Bacon rented it and lived there*, having stipulated in his lease that if he died before the expiration of the forty years, the lease should be passed on to Lord Coventry, in trust for the *Prince of Wales*. Prince Henry died, but Charles, Prince of Wales, did succeed to Canonbury, and there may perhaps have been some traditional right of inheritance by "*Princes of Wales*;" for the Arms of Arthur, eldest son of Henry VII. are carved over a neighbouring doorway (formerly part of the same building). We are beginning to have strong suspicions about another and *unacknowledged* Prince—but Prince Henry died who should have received Canonbury after Francis Bacon's death. Prince Charles *did* receive it, and a portrait of the present Prince of Wales hangs (or was hanging in May, 1900) in the entrance of Canonbury Tower. The place seems always to have been a resort, more or less, for literary men, for poets down to Oliver Goldsmith, for editors such as Chambers of the celebrated Cyclopædia, and for printers and publishers as Woodfall, who printed "Junius," and some of the firm of Knapton and Horsfield who published for Pope. At the present time the mantle or veil of literature still descends upon the quaint old place, now poorly maintained as a club frequented by literary men, many of them Masons, as is evidenced by the portraits of the Prince of Wales and two others in full Masonic dress.

As to Crosby Hall, its history is briefly this. Sir Thomas More sold it in 1523 to his "dear friend," Antonio Bonvici (of him we would gladly know more). After some vicissitudes Bonvici bought the whole property from the King and bequeathed it to Germayne Cyoll, who had married a cousin of Sir Thomas Gresham, whose house faced Crosby Hall. In 1566 Alderman Bond bought the house, which in 1594 was again sold to Sir John Spenser. During his year of office as Lord Mayor, a Masque was here performed by the gentlemen of Gray's Inn ("*Bacon's*" *Inn*) and the Temple, in the presence of Queen Elizabeth. *The author of the Masque is not mentioned.* When Spencer left Crosby House, it was for a time tenanted by the Dowager Countess of Pembroke, "Sydney's sister, Pembroke's mother," immortalised says an authority, "*by Ben Jonson's epitaph.*" Although its former radiance became sadly dimmed, yet the building retains some halo of literary glory, for we find that "from 1842 to 1860, Crosby Hall was occupied by a literary and scientific institute." How are the mighty fallen! The "refection of the mind" is now exchanged that of "the stomach," and Crosby Hall is converted into a restaurant. But even now there are reminders of its former high estate in the paintings, including portraits of Sir Thomas More and "*Shakespeare,*" which adorn the walls. Would that Canonbury Tower could be as handsomely dealt with!

GENERAL MEETING OF THE BACON SOCIETY.

A GENERAL MEETING of the Bacon Society was held at 22, Albemarle-street, on Friday, June 22nd, when the accounts for the year were read and passed, and the officers for the ensuing year were elected.

A paper was then read by Mr. Fleming Fulcher, on "The Portraits of Bacon and Shakespeare." The lecture was illustrated by fifty-six lantern slides which exhibited first, a series of portraits of Francis Bacon from childhood and young manhood until middle age and old age, photographed from the celebrated portraits of Hilyard, Van Somers, Hoebraken, De Passe, and others, whose engravings are found in the best collections, and also from the monumental statue and from the medal made for the Royal Institution. Having run through some twenty of these pictures, we were then shown four or five views of the so-called Kesselstadt "*Death Mask of Shakespeare*" which, in 1860, was offered to the Trustees of the British Museum. After eighteen months' consideration the mask was rejected by them as in no way resembling the received authentic portraits of the Stratford hero. This mask is now being foisted upon the public, in photographs sold at Stratford-on-Avon, as the "*Death Mask of Shakespeare!*" Twenty or more portraits were then shown of Wm. Shaksper, beginning with the ugly effigy which Shakespeareans describe as "unintellectual," "coarse," and "bloated," and the oil painting (at the Stratford-on-Avon Cottage) for which a very large sum was paid, and which is, like the effigy, considered absolutely authentic. Of this the distinguished Shakespearean, Dr. Furnival, says "The beery, loose-looking picture in the so-called 'Birthplace' is a special abomination to me." Then, beginning with the caricature known as "Droeshout's Portrait" (which "out-does the life" as the verses declare) the Shakespeare portraits were shown with every possible or impossible variation; faces fat or thin, round or hatchet-shaped; hair dark or flaxen; head bald or with a large curl on the top; with flowing locks or short; with moustache curling upwards, or downwards; beard or no beard; flat collar, ruff, or the Charles I. lace collar, not introduced until eight years after the death of the supposed poet.

All these differences were shown to be made in order to make the picture accord with certain recognisable particulars in the head of Francis St. Alban, as represented in his best portraits and in the medals. "The Duke of Devonshire's Bust" at the Garrick is a very perfect representation of Francis St. Alban, and of this a full account was given in a short paper on this subject of "Disguised Portraits" in the first number of BACONIANA (New Series) May 1893, page 15.

REVIEWS.

On reading through Mr. Donnelly's new book,* one sees why it is that his critics have been able to find fault with him, with such apparent truth. His arguments are, on the whole, clear, concise and well connected, and the conclusions at which he arrives are generally sound. But the one thing which greatly mars his book is its inaccuracy in trivial details. There are a number of such mistakes in it, which, although evidently accidental, will afford to the incredulous ample cause for criticism.

But to pass on to the subject matter. Mr. Donnelly shows clearly that there is every reason to believe that the original inscription on Shakespeare's tomb contained a bi-literal cipher such as Bacon describes in the "De Augmentis." He then proceeds to decipher what he believes to be the internal message contained in the lettering of the inscription—namely, that "Francis Bacon wrote the Green, Marlowe, and Shakespeare Playes."

---

* "The Cipher in the Plays and on the Tombstone," by Ignatius Donnelly, published by The Verulam Publishing Company, Minneapolis, Minn.

An expert decipherer would possibly consider his method conclusive and correct; but to the ordinary mind it is not absolutely convincing, because there are no hard and fast rules to be followed, much being left to the ingenuity of the decipherer.

He is also of opinion that the Shakespeare "Sonnets" and the "Phœnix and the Turtle" contain a word cipher, but he is satisfied with giving quotations to illustrate his points, without going into the matter minutely.

Lastly, he goes most minutely into the question of an arithmetical word cipher in the Shakespeare Plays. The arithmetic entailed is very simple, but here, again, absence of hard and fast rules is a regrettable feature, to the lay mind. But in this connection it should be noticed that it would have been extremely hard to work such a cipher into the Plays except in the actual printing of the letters. Besides which, such a cipher with absolutely strict rules, would have been very easy to decipher.

We have received "Shaksper not Shakespeare," by William H. Edwards.* We hope to take further notice of this very interesting book in a future number.

STENOGRAPHY.

I CAN supplement the article on Stenography in the January number of BACONIANA. Amongst my books of Bacon's time is a folio, "The generall Historie of the magnificent State of Venice from the first foundation thereof untill this present. Collected by Thomas de Fougasses, Gentleman of Avignon, out of all Authors, both Ancient and Moderne, that have written of that subject. Englished by W. Shute, Gent. London: Printed by G. Eld, and W. Stansby, 1611." The work is one of the mysterious publications of the period with indications that they are not exactly what they purport to be. It is dedicated to William, Earle of Pembroke, and Philip, Earle of Montgomerie. Of the contents of this Volume, more perhaps hereafter, but, for the present, I wish only to call attention to the binding of my copy. Some printed paper, probably once covered by a blank page pasted on the front board, is a waste sheet of a lecture or sermon preached in the "Blackfriars" and "taken by Characterie." A fragment of "The Preface" happens to be on this waste sheet, and begins thus, "It hath beene (Christian reader) till of late, much wished, that there were an ordinarie way of swift writing, whereby sermons and lectures of godly preachers might be preserved for the use of the absent and posteritie hereafter. That whereas no more remaineth after the hower passed than so much as the frailtie of memory carrieth away: by the benefite of speedy writing, the whole body of the lecture and sermon might be registered. This desire of many, some have lately endeavoured to satisfie by an Art called Characterié: which I having learned, have put in practise in writing sermons thereby to preserve (as it were) the life of much memorable doctrine, that would otherwise be buried in forgetfulnesse." This comes down to the foot of the sheet, but on another part of it is the end of the Preface, signed, "Thy well wisher, A. S." Parts of the sermon occupy the rest of the page, and at the bottom is,

---

* "Shaksper not Shakespeare," by William H. Edwards, published by the Robert Clarke Company, Cincinnati, U.S.A.

"Printed at London by V. S. for
and to be sold at the sign
at Poules Church."

The missing words were cut off in fitting the sheet to the folio. V. S. was doubtless Valentine Sims, who printed in 1597 the Quarto of *Richard II.*, and in 1600 the Quarto of *Much Ado About Nothing*, the Quarto of the second part of *Henry IV.*, and the Quarto of the second part of *Henry VI.*,

The inference I suggest, is that the printer of sermons taken down in shorthand, also printed Plays which may have been taken down in shorthand.

J. R., of Grays Inn.

Baconiana.

VOL. VIII.—*New Series*. OCTOBER, 1900. No. 32.

"FRANCIS BACON'S BILITERAL CIPHER."

BEFORE these lines are printed, Mrs. Gallup's very important work on "The Biliteral Cipher of Francis Bacon" * will have been for two months in the hands of the public. Since it is probable that there may be due discussion of its wonderful contents, it seems desirable to say a few words, not by way of review or mere expression of personal opinion (in such a case valueless), but in order to draw attention to certain points which, if not at present capable of absolute verification or contradiction, yet surely demand and are worthy of the closest investigation. Questions of this kind must naturally arise, "Is this cipher such as any person of ordinary intelligence can follow? Is it provably correct? Has anyone besides Mrs. Gallup succeeded in deciphering by the same means, and with similar results?"

These questions may without hesitation be answered in the affirmative. With the explanation given by the great inventor himself, anyone can master the method described in the *De Augmentis* (Book VI.). Ordinary patience and contrivance enable us to arrange two different alphabets of italic letters and to insert these in the printed type, forming cipher sentences one-fifth in length of the "exterior" sentence or passage. Thus to bury one story within another is easy enough. To unearth it is another matter, and more difficult.

In the first place, there is nothing which particularly invites the decipherer to discriminate between the two forms of italic letters which are essential to this typographical cipher; or, if differences or deformities in letters are observed, we have been required to believe them "errors," defects in printing, carelessness of the compositor, or anything else which many explain them away. Be not deceived; there is no error, but consummate skill and subtle contrivance, all helping towards the cryptographer's great ends.

---

* Pub.: Gay and Bird, London. The Howard Publishing Company, Detroit.

Before beginning the work of deciphering, it is needful thoroughly to learn by heart the Biliteral Alphabet given by its Inventor in the *De Augmentis*. Here we see that the letters of the common Alphabet are formed by the combination of the letters A and B in five places, these two letters (A and B) being represented by two distinct "founts" of italic type. To discriminate between these two founts, is the initial difficulty; but observing that, in the Biliteral Alphabet, *A's preponderate*, and that *no combination begins with two B's*, we judge that the most frequent forms of italic letters are almost certain to be A's. A decision is best arrived at by repeatedly tracing and drawing out the various letters; and the decipherer must have keen eyes and powers of observation to detect the minute differences. For our Francis would not make things too easy. He speaks of "marks" and "signs" to be heeded, and Roman letters are often interspersed. It is also patent (and was found by Mrs. Gallup, and independently by others) that, in every biliteral alphabet, letters are here and there intentionally exchanged, as a device to confuse and confound the would-be decipherer.

In many cases we find alphabets suddenly reversed—A becoming B, and B, A, a change hinted by some "mark" or "sign," as a tiny dot. These changes seem to occur most frequently in very small books, where the limited space makes it the more needful to set snares and stumbling-blocks at every turn. Such things show that, besides the good eyes and keen wits required for successful deciphering, there must be no small amount of that "eternal patience" which Michael Angelo honoured with the title of "genius."

Let us contemplate the goodly volume presented to us by Mrs. Gallup, and try to realise the fact that every one of those 350 pages of deciphered matter was worked out *letter by letter;* that each ONE letter in this deciphered work represents FIVE letters extracted from the deciphered book—say, *Shakespeare*, or *Spenser*, *Burton*, or any of the eight groups of works indicated in the cipher. Not only should such reflections cause us highly to respect the "endless patience," perseverance, and skill of the cryptographer to whose labours we are so deeply indebted, but they should warn us from depreciating or discrediting statements or methods which we ourselves are incapable of testing. "Disparage not the faith thou dost not know," is a good, sound principle to begin upon, and Francis ("cunynng in the humours of persons") had evidently observed the tendency of the human mind to fly from things troublesome, or to take refuge in disparagement and ridicule. His notes teem with reflections on this matter. "Things above us are nothing to us"—"just nothing." "Many things are thought impossible until they are discovered, then men wonder that they had not been seen long before." On the other hand, he continually encourages himself with thoughts, texts, and proverbial philosophy, which we find him instilling into his disciples. "Everything is subtile till it is conceived." "By trying, men gained Troy," and so forth. But we must "woorke as God woorkes," wisely, quietly, with persistent patience and unremitting care, and "from a good beginning cometh a good ending."

The rules laid down in the *Advancement of Learning* must have been perfectly understood, not only by the fraternity instructed in their use, and deputed to hand down this knowledge, but they also must have been, and still be known to a certain high circle of compositors and printers (formerly, for the most part publishers,) whose duty it was to insert the cipher by means of the two founts of italic type.

It is the belief of the present writer that certain verbal instructions were (*and are*) given, as well as some mechanical aids to expedite the process of deciphering, and which might be summed up somewhat in these words: "You must go by line and level, and act upon the square." This, however, is not the recognised method, and Mrs. Gallup gives in her book not only "Bacon's" own account, with examples, of the "biliterie" and the "biformed" alphabets, and the method of using them, but also a long piece from "Spenser's *Complaint*" (Ed. 1591) to illustrate precisely her own manner of proceeding.

So much, then, for the "biliteral" itself. Another crop of inquiries springs up when we attempt briefly to rehearse the wonderful revelations now before us, and which it is within our power to examine and essay to prove.

Elizabeth, when princess, and prisoner in the hands of Mary, secretly married Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester. Of this secret marriage two sons were born. Francis the elder would have been "put away privilie" by the wicked woman whom he never could bring himself to think of as "mother." Lady Anne Bacon, however, saved his life, and under an oath of secrecy adopted him as her own son. The scene when these facts came to his knowledge, and again when they were tearfully confirmed by his "deare," "sweete mother," Lady Anne, are graphically described* in the cipher narrative extracted from the "*History of Henry VII.*" (Ed. 1622). Further details of the same extraordinary episode are, as may be remembered, introduced in the "word cipher," discovered, and in part published, by Dr. Owen, some seven years ago. From the disclosures made in the books deciphered, "it is evident," says Mrs. Gallup, "that Bacon expected the biliteral cipher to be the first discovered, and that it would lead to the finding of his principal or word cipher which it fully explains, and to which is intrusted the larger subjects he desired to have preserved. This order has been reversed in fact, and the earlier discovery by Dr. Owen becomes a more remarkable achievement, being entirely evolved without the aids which Bacon had prepared in this for its elucidation."

Some cryptographers believe that the several ciphers enumerated in the "*Advancement*" are embedded *one within the other*, as to some extent has been already found to be the case, the profounder kinds of ciphers being mathematical and only to be extracted by means of calculations and exact science. But to return to our story.

Francis was now sent abroad by Elizabeth's orders (*not*, as has been declared by his biographers. because Sir Nicholas Bacon wished him to see the wonders of the world abroad, but) in order to get him out of the way at the time when he had been the unwitting cause of a Court scandal. He left England in the suite of Sir Amyas Paulet, the English Ambassador. We know a little, and surmise more concerning his travels, and the places which he visited, or where he stayed studying and writing. The sad story of his ill-fated love for "My Marguerite" is briefly touched upon, rather as a thing understood to the reader than as a record, and of this more will be related in a future volume. The present extracts are from the undated 4to. of *Romeo and Juliet*, where we may read:—

"This stage-play in part will tell our brief love-tale. A part is in the Play previously nam'd or mention'd as having therein one pretty scene acted by the two. So rare and most briefe the hard-won happinesse, it affords us great content to re-live in the Play all that as mist, in summer morning did roule away. It hath place in the dramas containing a scene and theame of this nature, since our fond love interpreted th' harts o' others, and in this joy, th' joy of heaven was faintlie guessed."

---

* Francis was then about 16 years of age.

In the closing lines of *King John* are these instructions:—"Join *Romeo* with *Troy's* famous *Cressida* if you wish to know my story. Cressida in this Play with Juliet b——," which, says the Editor,* "ends the cipher in *King John* with an incomplete word. Turning to *Romeo and Juliet* (p. 53) the remainder of the word and of the broken sentence is continued, being a part of the description of Marguerite, and the love Francis entertained for her."

This love never faded from his heart, although before he married, at the age of 47, he had, he says, hung up, as it were, the picture of his love on the walls of memory. We remember the calm and uneffusive fashion in which he then imparted to his friends the news that he had found "a handsome maiden who pleased him well." The tones in which he bewailed his lost love are pitched in a different key.

"It is sometimes said, *no man can be wise and love*, and yet it would be wel to observe many will be wiser after a lesson such as wee long ago conn'd. There was noe ease to our sufferi'g heart til our yeares of life were eight lustres.† The faire face liveth ever in dreames, but in inner pleasances only doth th' sunnie vision come. This will make clearlie seene why i' the part a man doth play heerein and where-ere man's love is evident, strength hath remained unto the end—the want'n Paris recov'ring by his latter venture much previouslie lost."

A second son was born to Elizabeth, and named Robert, after his father, the Earl of Leicester. Robert was "made ward" of Walter Devereux, Earl of Essex, who "died" conveniently and unexpectedly, when Robert was old enough to succeed to his title and estates. At what period the brothers became aware of their kinship has not yet been told in the cipher. Francis describes the personal beauty, gallantry, and boldness of his brother, and says that for these qualities Robert was a great favourite with the Queen who thought that he resembled herself. The tale is still incomplete; but enough has already been disclosed to give us a firm sketch of the miserable outline. We see Robert taking advantage of the Queen's doting fondness for him, and Francis endeavouring to keep his ambition within bounds, and to smooth matters with his irascible mother when, as was often the case, she became irritated beyond endurance by his arrogant audacity. The aim of Essex was, not only in the future to supplant his elder brother, but even in the Queen's lifetime to seize the crown, and rule as king. It is a dark and painful page in history, and the more we read the less we marvel at the efforts made by Elizabeth to destroy or garble the records of her own private life, and of the times in which she lived. Having spoilt and indulged Essex so long as she believed him devoted to herself, she turned upon him "in a tiger-like spirit" when his treachery became patent, and because Francis had spoken strongly on his brother's behalf, and had endeavoured to shield him from the wrath of the Queen, she punished him, by forcing him, under pain of death, to conduct the case (in his official capacity) against Essex whom she had foredoomed to execution. An allusion is made to the ring which the Queen expected Essex to send her, but which miscarried. This story has been held doubtful, but it seems as though we may find it true.

---

* "Introduction," p. 11.

† He speaks in the third person—as a royal personage.

The sentence passed upon Essex was just; but the horror of the trial and the circumstances connected with the execution, haunted Francis for the rest of his life, his tender and sensitive nature, and his highly strung imagination continually reviving, whilst they shrank from, the recollection of the horrible details of which hereafter we shall have to read. Although Francis speaks in affectionate terms of his "deere" and cruelly used brother, we cannot but think that the tenderness grew out of a deep pity; for Robert had long ago proved himself a most selfish and unsatisfactory person, and a perpetual thorn in his brother's side, but, however this may have been, the gruesome tragedy remained imprinted on his soul, and clouded and embittered his whole life. "His references to the trial and execution of Essex, and the part he was forced to take in his prosecution, are the subject of a wail of unhappiness and ever-present remorse, with hopes and prayers that the truth hidden in this cipher may be found out, and published to the world in his justification.

"O God! forgiveness cometh from Thee; shut not this truest book, my God! Shut out my past—love's little sunny hour—if it soe please Thee, and some of man's worthy work; yet Essex's tragedy here shew forth; then posterity shall know him truly."*

The Queen commanded Francis to write for publication an account of the Earl of Essex's treasons, and he did so. But the report was too lenient, too tender for the reputation of the Earl to satisfy his vindictive mother. She destroyed the document and with her own hand wrote another which was published under his name, and for which he has been held responsible. Such matters as these were State secrets, and we cannot wonder that Elizabeth should have taken care by all means in her power to prevent them from becoming public property by appearing in print. We may well believe that, as the cipher tells us, all papers were destroyed which were likely to bring dark things to light. Nevertheless much must have gradually leaked out through the actors themselves, and more must have been suspected, and only through dread of the consequences withheld from general discussion. "See what a ready tongue suspicion hath;" in private letters and hidden records the value of which is perhaps now for the first time fully understood, evidence is forthcoming to substantiate statements made in the deciphered pages of Mrs. Gallup, and her forerunner, Dr. Owen.

---

* *Introduction* p. 8. It seems probable that this was written soon after the events in 1601.

The matter gathered from the deciphered pages is not limited to personal or political history. For instance, speaking of the "*Anatomy of Melancholy*" (edition, 1628), the Editor says:—"The extraordinary part is that this edition conceals, in cipher, a very full and extended prose summary—*argument*, Bacon calls it—of a translation of Homer's *Iliad*. In order that there may be no mistake as to its being Bacon's works, he precedes the translation with a brief reference to his royal birth, and the wrongs he has suffered. . . . In the *De Augmentis* is found a similar extended synopsis of a translation of the *Odyssey*. This, too, is introduced with a reference to Bacon's personal history, and although the text of the book is in Latin, the cipher is in English.

The decipherer is not a Greek scholar, and would be incapable of creating these extended arguments, which differ widely in phrasing from any translation extant, and are written in a free and flowing style."*

Readers must not expect to find in this book which we are noticing, a complete and shapely narrative explaining everything, and pouring out before us the true story of our wonderful "concealed man" from beginning to end. The cipher utterances are for the most part, nothing if not fragmentary. The writer himself says so, and adds that his objects in thus trusting his secrets to the care of his friends and to the judgment

---

† Introduction, p. 13.

of time were First, that he might hand down to the future ages the only faithful account of himself and his history, which would ever be allowed to reach them. Secondly, he proposed to link his unacknowledged works one with another in such a way that hereafter his sons of science should from the hints given in one work be led on to another, and so to another, until the vast mass of books, Historical, Scientific, Poetical, Dramatical, Philosophical, which he wrote, should be connected, welded together like an endless chain, and the true history of the Great Restauration and of the English Renaissance fully revealed.

CHRONICLE PLAYS.—No. 5.

BACON writes:—" Princes are like heavenly bodies, which cause good or evil times, and which have much veneration, but no rest.[*] All precepts concerning kings, are in effect comprehended in those two remembrances:—*Memento quod es homo*,—and '*Memento quod es Deus*, or, *Vice-Dei*' (*i.e.*, 'Remember thou art man'—and 'Remember thou art God,' or *His deputy*)." (*Essays. Empire*, 1625.)

Commencing with the last sentence, to the effect, that kings are representative Gods, or Vice-regents, the Bishop of Carlisle, describes King Richard the Second:—

And shall the figure of God's Majesty,
His Captain, Steward, Deputy-elect,
Anointed, crowned, planted many years,
Be judged by subject and inferior breath.
—*Rich. II.*, Act IV. i. 125.

King Henry the Sixth exclaims:—

And therefore, by His Majesty I swear,
Whose far unworthy deputy I am.
—2 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act III. ii. 285.

And therefore is the glorious planet *Sol*
In noble eminence enthroned and sphered
Amidst the other; whose medicinable eye
Corrects the ill aspects of planets evil,
And posts like the commandments of a king.
—*Troilus and Cressida* I. iii.

---

[*] Observe how the following passage, repeats this language, of the Essay upon *Empire*:—" After this manner, the foresaid instructors set before their King, *the examples of the celestial bodies*,—the sun, the moon, and the rest, which have great glory *and veneration, but no rest*, or intermission, being in a perpetual office and motion for the cherishing (in turn and in course) of inferior bodies. *Expressing likewise the true manner of the motions of Government.*" (*Persian Magic*, p. 198. *Resuscitatio*, 1661.)

Richard the Second says :—

> Not all the water in the rough rude sea
> Can wash the balm off from an anointed King;
> The breath of worldly men cannot depose
> *The deputy elected by the Lord.*
> —*Rich. II.*, Act III. ii. 55.

In his Essay *Of a King*, Bacon says :—"*A king is a mortal God on earth*, unto whom the living God hath lent His own name as a great honour; but withal told him, he should die like a man, lest he should be proud, and flatter himself that God hath with His name imparted unto him His nature also." (*Of a King.*)

This image of kings being *mortal Gods*, is frequently to be found in the Plays. In *Pericles*, we read :—

> *Kings are earth's gods; in vice their law's their will.*
> —*Pericles* I. i.

Here indeed are Bacon's words repeated :—"*Vice-Dei*" (*i.e.*, in place of God). And in various forms this finds repetition. Thus Richmond, in his prayer, before Bosworth, exclaims :—

> O thou whose Captain I account myself, etc.
> —*Rich. III.*, Act V. iii.

The consciousness of mortality by kings, (expressed in the words *Memento quod es homo*) is perfectly reflected by these words, delivered by King Henry the Fifth, just before the battle of Agincourt :—"*I think the King is but a man, as I am;* the violet smells to him as it doth to me; the element shows to him as it doth to me; *all his senses have but human conditions: his ceremonies laid by, in his nakedness he appears but a man;* and though his affections are higher mounted than ours, *they stoop with the like wing.*" (*K. Hen. V.*, Act IV. i. 104.) This speech spoken by the King, to the soldier Bates, who is ignorant of the King's identity, is uttered *in the spirit of man to man;*—it is a confession of humanlike conditions, as subsisting between the highest king, and the meanest private. And it is spoken, not only in the familiar spirit of comradeship in danger, and in arms, but outside of that disguise of *Ceremonies and Respects*, which otherwise would have hampered the King's speech. Bacon writes :—"Amongst a man's inferiors, one shall be sure of reverence; and therefore it is good a little to be familiar." (*Of Ceremonies and Respects. Essays.*)

King Richard the Second, in the extremity of his deposition by Bolingbroke, confesses to a like claim to human conditions, and common mortality, when he says:—

> For you have but mistook me all this while:
> I live with bread like you, feel want,
> Taste grief, need friends: subjected thus,
> How can you say to me, I am a king?
> —*K. Rich. II.*, Act III. ii.

Bacon writes:—"Certainly great persons, had need to borrow *other men's opinions*, to think themselves happy. For if they judge by their own feelings, they cannot find it. But if they think with themselves, *what other men think of them*, and that other men, would fain be as they are, then they are happy, as it were, by report, when perhaps, they find the contrary within: for they are the first that find their own griefs, though they be the last that find their own faults." (*Of Great Place.*)

> Princes have but their titles for their glories,
> An outward honour for an inward toil;
> And, *for unfelt imagination*,
> They often feel a world of restless cares.
> So that, betwixt their titles and low names,
> There's nothing differs but the outward fame.
> —*K. Rich. III.*, Act I. iv. 80.

Observe how, the "*unfelt imagination*," * of the third line, answers to Bacon's "*other men's opinions;*" that is to say, the great persons, princes, or kings, *cannot find in themselves, what others think of them*, because it is "*unfelt imagination;*" imputing lack of faculty in the one, and error in the other. Somebody has observed, that almost all error of judgment, with respect to others' characters, fortunes, opportunities, and the like, entirely arise from not only lack of imagination, but from reading our own characters, views, and opinions, into other people's. That is to say, position totally changes every point of view. The vale best discovers the hill, but when we have climbed the hill, not only is the entire view altered, but the hill has in some measure disappeared. If one compares the respective values set upon attainment, and realization, by ourselves, at different ages of our lives, it is possible to understand the postulate. Indeed King Henry the Fifth is presented to us, as envying the condition of private men:—

> O hard condition,
> Twin-born with greatness, subject to the breath
> Of every fool, whose sense no more can feel

---

* *Henry the Sixth.*—Was never subject long'd to be a king
As I do long and wish to be a subject.
—*K. Hen. VI.*, Act IV. ix.

> But his own wringing! What infinite hearts-ease
> Must kings neglect, that private men enjoy!
> —*K. Hen. V.*, Act IV. i.

Bacon writes:—"It is a miserable state of mind, to have few things to desire, *and many things to fear.* And yet that commonly is the case of *kings;* who being at the highest, want matter of desire, which makes their minds the more languishing; *and have many representations of perils and shadows,* which makes their minds the less clear." (*Empire,* 1625. *Essays.*)

What Bacon means by "*representations of perils and shadows*" is best exemplified by the representative character of King Richard the Third's *dreams,* just before the battle of Bosworth, who after the ghostly visitation of his murdered victims, exclaims:—

> By the Apostle Paul, *shadows to-night*
> *Have struck more terror to the soul of Richard*
> Than can the substance of ten thousand soldiers
> Armed in proof, and led by shallow Richmond.
> —*K. Rich. III.*, Act V. iii. 216.

The "*many things to fear,*" attributed to kings' minds, by Bacon, finds almost endless echoes in the Plays. *Henry the Fourth,* complains that the cares of a king, forbid the solace of gentle sleep:—

> O thou dull God, why liest thou with the vile
> In loathsome beds, and leavest the kingly couch
> A watch case, or a common 'larum-bell?
>
> . . . .
>
> Deny it to a king? Then happy low, lie down!
> Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown.
> —2 *K. Hen. IV.*, Act III. i.

Richard the Third's Queen, describes his dreams:—

> For never yet one hour in his bed
> Have I enjoy'd the golden dew of sleep
> *But have been wak'd by his timorous dreams.*
> —*K. Rich. III.*, Act IV. i.

The cares, the fears, the perils pertaining to the crown, are summed up in the speech:—

> O polish'd perturbation! Golden care!
> That keeps't the ports of slumber open wide
> To many a watchful night! etc.
> —2 *K. Hen. IV.*, Act IV. v. 23.

In his Essay, *Of a King,* Bacon writes:—"A king that would not feel his crown too *heavy* for him must wear it every day; but if he thinketh it *too light*, he knoweth not of what *metal* it is made." (*Essays. Of a King*, No. 3.)

I have little doubt, this aphorism, is pointed at King Richard the Second. This King either found the crown too heavy for him, or his character was too light to carry so grave a responsibility. Richard exclaims of the crown, which he surrenders :—

> Now mark me, how I will undo myself :
> *I give this heavyweight from off my head.*
> And this unwieldy sceptre from my hand.
> —*Rich. II.*, Act IV. i.
>
> . . . .
>
> Give me the crown. Here, cousin, seize the crown ;
> Here cousin ;
> On this side my hand, and on that side yours.
> Now is this golden crown like a deep well
> That owes two buckets filling one another,
> *The emptier ever dancing in the air.—Ib.*

The King, according to Bolingbroke, was of a shallow, light character, *devoid of weight*, and inconsequent of the dignity which pulled him down.* The image presented to us in the above passage, *is the complete one of the balance, and the weighing in the balance.* This simile of the two buckets is, of course, borrowed from those wells, which by means of a wheel, or a beam, are so fashioned that weight in one bucket draws up the other bucket, so that whilst one is coming up, the other is going down the well. This theory, as applied to Richard the Second, is indorsed by the aphorism, which follows, on the steps, of the one cited. "He must make religion *the rule of government, and not to balance the scale*; for *he that casteth in religion only to make the scales even*, his own weight is contained in those characters, 'Mene, mene, tekel Upharsin.' *He is found too light*, † *his kingdom shall be taken from him.*" (*Of a King*, No. 4.)

---

* Cardinal Wolsey exclaims of Anne Boleyn :—

There was the weight that pulled me down.—Act III. ii. (?)

† The Court of Richard the Second was the most foppish that England had ever seen. The King, who was the greatest fop of the day, had a coat estimated at 30,000 marks. He seems to have thought that his whole life was to be one of gaiety, splendour, and pleasure. His wanton extravagance was prodigal. He kept two thousand cooks, and when he celebrated his Christmas at Westminster Hall the daily consumption was twenty-eight oxen, three hundred sheep. When he came to the Crown, the city fountains were made to flow with wine, and the year after, at his coronation, four different sorts of wines were made to flow through the public channels. One of the coats ordered to be made, was embroidered with letters. leaves, and flowers, and thickly studded with precious stones, and cost as much as £80,000 of our

In this same Essay *Of a King*, "*His greatest enemies are his flatterers; for though they ever speak on his side, yet their words still make against him.*"* (No. 14.)

In his Essay upon *Empire*, Bacon writes upon the *tragedies, and dangers accruing to kings, from their wives, and from their children.* "For their wives, there are cruel examples of them (*Crudelia et atrocia*). *Livia is infamed for the poisoning of her husband* (Augusti—of Augustus). Roxolana, Solyman's wife, was the destruction of that renowned prince, Sultan Mustapha, and otherwise troubled his house and succession. Edward the Second of England, his Queen, had the principal hand, *in the deposing and murder of her husband.* This kind of danger is then to be feared, chiefly, when the wives have plots, for the raising of their own children (*Liberos ex priore marito*—Children by a former husband), *or else that they be adultresses.*" (*Empire. Essays*, 1625.)

King Richard the Second, *who was deposed, and murdered,* seems to have been following a similar train of thought, when he soliloquises thus :—

For God's sake, *let us sit upon the ground*
And tell sad stories of the death of kings. †
How some have been *deposed;* some slain in war;
Some haunted by the ghosts they have deposed;
Some poison'd by their wives; some sleeping kill'd;
All murder'd.—K. Rich. II., Act III. ii.

In pondering the passage from Bacon, upon the dangers accruing to kings from their wives, and particularly the case of Livia, who poisoned her husband; the mind is immediately held by the parallel presented, by the poisoning of the King in *Hamlet*, at the hands of his wife, and her paramour Claudius. The Play does not directly tell us what hand Gertrude had in the immediate death (while sleeping in his orchard) of the King, but indirectly she was privy to it, *as she was an adultress.* To use Bacon's words—(applied to Edward the Second's Queen), the Queen in *Hamlet* "*had the principal hand in the murder and deposing of her husband.*" So again, Margaret, Queen to King Henry the Sixth, was undoubtedly mistress to the Duke of Suffolk, and by her intrigues managed

---

money. To minister to this extravagance a poll tax of one shilling was levied upon every male and female above fifteen years of age. This tax produced the *seditious troubles* of Wat Tyler and Jack Straw.

* The Play of *Richard the Second* was probably inspired by *the Comedy of Eupolis*, called *The Flatterers*, and acted in the third year of the 89th Olympiad.

† Compare:—"Many kings have *sat down upon the ground;* and one that was never thought of, hath worn the crown." (Ecclesiasticus xl. 5.)

to bring the protector Gloucester to his fall and end, thus weakening and troubling her husband King Henry the Sixth's reign and stability. Suffolk exclaims:—

> Margaret shall now be Queen, and rule the King;
> But I will rule both her, the King and realm.
> 1 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act V. v.

The Essay upon *Empire*, contains this passage upon kings: "*For their prelates, when they are proud and great, there is also danger* * *from them.* As it was in the time of Anselm, and Thomas à Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury, who with their croziers did almost try it with the King's sword." (*Empire*, 1625.)

Bacon seems to have imitated Plutarch's system of writing parallel lives, in these hints for characters in the Plays. For example, Henry Beaufort, first Bishop of Winchester, (and finally made Cardinal), played a great part in the history of King Henry the Sixth. He is portrayed in the Play, *as a prelate both proud and great*, and dangerous to the King.

> *Gloucester.*—No, *prelate*, such is thy audacious wickedness,
> Thy lewd, pestiferous, and dissentious pranks,
> *As very infants prattle of thy pride.*
>
> . . . .
>
> Beside, I fear me, if thy thoughts were sifted
> The King, thy sovereign, is not quite exempt
> From envious malice of thy swelling heart.
> —1 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act III. i.

It was this prelate who murdered Humphrey Duke of Gloucester, and thus deprived the King of his best defence and support, his true counsellor and protector. After he was created Cardinal, Exeter exclaimed of his ambition:—

> What! Is my lord of Winchester install'd,
> And call'd unto a Cardinal's degree?

---

* "The danger is not from that state (*Prælatis*) *but where it hath a dependence of foreign authority.*" This was exactly the case of Cardinal Wolsey, who was not only a dependent of the popes, (*Empire*, 1625) but was in league with the Emperor Charles:—

> *Buck.*—Charles the Emperor,
> Under pretence to see the Queen his aunt,—
> For 'twas indeed his colour, *but he came*
> To whisper Wolsey.
>
> . . . .
>
> Let the King know,
> As soon as he shall by me, that thus the Cardinal
> Does buy and sell his honour as he pleases,
> And for his own advantage.
> —*K. Hen. VIII.*, Act I. i. 176.

> Then I perceive that will be verified
> Henry the Fifth did sometime prophesy,
> If once he come to be a cardinal,
> *He'll make his cap co-equal with the crown.*
> —1 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act V. i. 28.

His intentions were dangerous to the young King, during his minority :—

> *Winchester.*—I am left out; for me nothing remains,
> But long I will not be Jack out of office.
> The King from Eltham I intend to steal
> And sit at chiefest stern of public weal.
> —*Ib.*, Act III. i. 174.

It is of this Cardinal, Gloucester says :—

> Arrogant Winchester, *that haughty prelate*,
> Whom Henry, our late sovereign, ne'er could brook?
> Thou art no friend to God or to the King.
> —*Ib.*, Act I. iii. 23.

And the Mayor of London, describes him as—

> This Cardinal's more haughty than the devil.—*Ib.*

Another prelate, *both proud and great, and also dangerous to his king*, was Cardinal Wolsey. The following passage seems to be pointed at him, which I take from the Essay upon *Riches* :—"As Solomon saith ;—'*Riches are as a stronghold in the imagination of the rich man.*' (Prov. xviii. 2). But this is excellently expressed, that it is in imagination, and not always in fact. *For certainly great riches, have sold more men, than they have bought out. Seek not proud riches*, but such as thou may'st get justly, use soberly, distribute cheerfully, and leave contentedly." (*Essays. Riches*, 1625.)

Now, in the Play of *King Henry the Eighth*, it will be found, *that it was the inventory of his great, and enormous riches, falling by accident into the King's hands, that undid, and indeed sold Cardinal Wolsey!* Moreover, these riches, which included Hampton Court, are described in the Play, as *proud riches*, that is, they were part of the pomp and pride of the great Cardinal. The King exclaims :—

> *King.*—This morning
> Papers of State he sent me to peruse
> As I required: and wot you what I found
> There,—on my conscience, put unwittingly?
> Forsooth, an inventory thus importing;
> The several parcels of his plate, his treasure,
> Rich stuffs, and ornaments of household; *which*
> *I find at such proud rate, that it outspeaks*
> *Possession of a subject.*

The King gives Wolsey, this inventory to read, and the latter immediately divines his own fall, from the mischance:—

> *Wolsey.*—'Tis so
> *This paper has undone me*, 'tis the account
> *Of all that world of wealth I have drawn together*
> *For mine own ends; indeed to gain the popedom*
> *And see my friends in Rome.* *
> —*K. Hen. VIII.*, Act III. ii. 120—209.

Wolsey's pride and ambition were so great, that one of the charges brought against him was—

> That out of mere ambition, you have caused
> Your holy hat to be stamp'd on the King's coin.
> —Act III. 2.

"Above all, those are most subject to envy, which carry the greatness of their fortunes, in an insolent and proud manner. Being never well, but while they are showing, how great they are, either by outward pomp, or by triumphing over all opposition, or competition." (*Envy. Essays,* 1625.)

In his Essay upon *Empire,* Bacon writes of kings:—"For their *nobles,* to keep them at a distance (*Sunt illi certe cohibendi, et tanquam in justa distantia a solio Regali continendi;* —they ought assuredly to be restrained, and kept as it were at a proper distance from the King's throne). But to depress them, may make a king more absolute, but less safe, and less able to perform anything that he desires." (*Empire,* 1625.)

Bacon then cites King Henry the Seventh, as an example of a king "who depressed the nobility,"—"whereupon it came to pass, that his times were full of difficulties, and troubles." (*Ib.*) Richard the Second undoubtedly lost his crown by depressing Bolingbroke, and in confiscating his estates and those of John of Gaunt, his father. King Henry the Fourth, kept his most powerful nobles, particularly the Percies (who had helped him to the throne), at so great a distance, that they rebelled against the King, under Hotspur. The King exclaims to the Earl of Worcester :—

---

* Cardinal Wolsey was a man of prodigious ambition and love of show. His train consisted of five hundred servants, many of whom were knights and sons of noblemen. A priest went before him carrying a pillar of silver, surmounted with a cross, and noblemen-ushers cleared the way crying, "Make way for my Lord's Grace." His vest was of gold and silk; a robe of scarlet cloth adorned his shoulders; and he held a sponge to his nose, lest the breath of the common people should offend him. He rode upon a mule, trapped with crimson velvet and gold. At his banquets dukes and earls served him with wines; and bishops or abbots held him a basin in which to rinse his hands. Wolsey's pride and ambition soared to such a height that he became known by the epithet '*King Cardinal.*' The Duke of Norfolk charged him with giving himself precedence of the King;—

> Then, that in all you writ to Rome, or else
> To foreign princes '*Ego et Rex meus*'
> Was still inscrib'd; in which you brought the King
> To be your servant.
> —*Hen. VIII.*, Act III. ii. 314.

> Worcester, get thee gone, for I do see
> Danger, and disobedience in thine eye.
> O, sir, your presence is too bold and peremptory,
> And Majesty might never yet endure
> The moody frontier of a servant's brow.
> —1 *K. Hen. IV.*, Act I. iii.

This distance of the King's, brought about the difficulties, seditions and troubles, of the rising of Worcester, Hotspur, and Douglas, which ended by the defeat of the latter, at the battle of Shrewsbury. The complaint Worcester brought against the King, was, just this *keeping of his nobles at a distance*, Bacon speaks of, in relation to kings :—

> *Worcester.*—For, bear ourselves as even as we can,
> The King will always think him in our debt,
> And think we think ourselves unsatisfied,
> Till he hath found a time to pay us home.
> *And see already how he doth begin,*
> *To make us strangers to his looks of love.*
> —1 *K. Hen. IV.*, Act I. iii. 285.

Bacon writes: "So man, when he resteth and assureth himself upon *Divine Protection* and favour, gathereth a force, and faith, which human nature in itself could not obtain." (*Atheism.*)

In the description of King Henry the Fifth's piety, we read :—

> *Being free from vainness*, and self-glorious pride,
> Giving full trophy, signal and ostent,
> Quite from himself to God.
> —*K. Hen. V.*, Act V. i.

The Bible tells us, "*Man fell from vanity.*" The lightness, or vanity of Richard the Second is compared to the fall :—

> What Eve, what serpent, hath suggested thee,
> *To make a second fall of cursed man?*
> Why dost thou say King Richard is deposed?
> —*K. Rich. II.*, Act III. iv.

In his Essay upon *Counsel*, Bacon writes :—"The inconveniences that have been noted in calling and using counsels, are three. First *the revealing of affairs whereby they become less secret.*" (*Counsel.*)

Hastings.—Bid him not fear the separated councils.
His honour and myself are at the one,
And at the other is my servant Catesby:
Where nothing can proceed that toucheth us
Whereof I shall not have intelligence.
—*Rich. III.*, Act III. 2.

Bacon, continuing the inconveniences of Counsels, says:—"Thirdly, the danger of being unfaithfully counselled, and more for the good of them that counsel than of him that is counselled" (*Principis ipsius: i.e.*, the prince himself. Latin Ed., 1638). (*Counsel*, 1625.)

Prince.—Say, uncle Gloucester, if our brother come,
Where shall we sojourn till our coronation?
Gloucester.—Where it seems best unto your royal self.
If I may counsel you, some day or two.
Your highness shall repose you at the tower.
—*Rich. III.*, Act III. 1.

This *counsel* of Richard the Third's was given expressly to the Prince, in order to get the brothers into his clutches. They were both murdered by Dighton and Forest in the Tower. Lord Hastings was betrayed by his servant Catesby, to Richard the Third. In short, while pretending to play the spy for his master, he was in Richard's pay.

Bacon writes:—"There is a kind of followers, likewise, which are dangerous, *being indeed espials*, which inquire the secrets of the house, and bear tales of them to others." (*Followers and Friends.*)

The Dukes of Buckingham were both betrayed by such followers, or espials:—

Buckingham.— Both
Fell by our servants, by those men we loved most
A most unnatural, or faithless service.
—*K. Hen. VIII.*, Act II. ii.

Compare:—

. . . .

The princes' *espials* have informed me
How the English, in the suburbs, close entrenched,
—1 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act I. iv.

"Besides Counsellors are not commonly so united, but that one Counsellor *keepeth sentinel over another.*" (*Essays. Counsel*, 1625.) This conceit of jealousy *acting as sentinel*, finds its reflection in the poem of *Venus and Adonis*:—

For where love reigns, disturbing jealousy
Doth call himself affection's *sentinel.*—649.

"Solomon hath pronounced that in '*counsel* is stability.'

Things will have their first, or second agitation; if they be not tossed upon the arguments of counsel, *they will be tossed upon the waves of Fortune; and be full of inconstancy, doing and undoing like the reeling of a drunken man.*" (*Counsel. Essays,* 1625.)

Observe the double imagery, first of the waves of Fortune, next of the drunken man, both probably being borrowed from the Psalm: "For at His word the stormy wind ariseth, *they reel to and fro, and stagger like a drunken man.* And are at their wit's end." (*Psalm* cvii. 25—28.)

The entire moral of this Psalm is, that men should not put their trust in princes, or in their fellow-men, but in the Almighty, who alone is able to deliver them in time of trouble. Lord Hastings, who, be it closely observed, had been wisely *counselled* by Stanley to fly, refused, and was betrayed by his servant Catesby. He would not believe that he was in danger, but thought himself "*secure in grace and favour*" with the King. After the order of his execution, Hastings exclaims:—

> O momentary grace of mortal men,
> Which we more hunt for than the grace of God!
> Who builds his hopes in air of your good looks,
> *Lives like a drunken sailor on a mast,*
> Ready with every nod to tumble down
> Into the fatal bowels of the deep.
> —*K. Rich. III.*, Act III. iv.

The identity of the parallel, finds confirmation in Catesby's reply to Hastings, in the second scene:—

> *Hastings.*—Good morrow, Catesby; you are early stirring:
> What news, what news, in this our tottering State?
> *Catesby.*—*It is a reeling world, indeed my lord;*
> And I believe 'twill never stand upright
> Till Richard wear the garland of the realm.
> —Act III. ii.

A little more may be understood of this image of the *reeling, or tottering of the State,* when Bacon observes:—"For without that ballast the ship will roll too much," said of favourites, and nobles, who are to balance each other. (*Ambition.*) "And certainly the more a man drinketh of the world the more it intoxicateth." (*Essays. Youth and Age.*)

The Duchess of York exclaims of her sons:—

> And often up and down my sons were tossed.
> —*K. Rich. III.*, Act II. iv. 58.

In which image, Fortune is conceived as a ship, and the State also as a vessel, which carries the Fortunes, so to speak.

Wolsey describes himself as, "an old man broken with the storms of State" (*K. Henry VIII.* IV. ii.), in which something of the same image is implied.

Bacon says:—"Libels and licentious discourses against the State, when they are frequent and open, and in like sort *false news often running up and down*, to the disadvantage of the State, and hastily embraced, are amongst the signs of troubles." (*Seditions and Troubles.*)

> I find the people strangely fantasied,
> Possess'd with rumours, full of idle dreams,
> *Not knowing what they fear, but full of fear.*
> —*K. John* IV. ii.

"They are the most dangerous *discontentments*, where the fear is greater than the feeling. *Dolendi modus, timendi non item.* [There is measure in suffering, but not in fear]." (*Seditions and Troubles.*)

> *K. John.*—Our discontented counties do revolt,
> Our people quarrel with obedience,
> Swearing allegiance and the love of soul
> To stranger blood, to foreign royalty.
> —*K. John* V. i.
>
> . . . .
>
> Now powers from France and *discontents* at home
> Meet in one line.—*Ib.*, IV. iii. 151.

"Reverence is that wherewith princes are *girt* from God, who threateneth the dissolving thereof. *Solvam cingula regum.*" (*Seditions and Troubles*).

> Now happy he whose cloak and *cincture* can
> Hold out this *tempest.*—*John* IV. iii.

The State is always likened unto a ship, in the Chronicle Plays. King Henry the Sixth exclaims:—

> Thus stands my State, 'twixt Cade and York distress'd;
> *Like to a ship that having scap'd a tempest,*
> Is straightway calm'd, and boarded by a pirate.
> —2 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act IV. ix.

So likewise Bacon, in the Essay of *The True Greatness of Kingdoms* speaks of those, "*Who manage the helm of affairs.* (*Rerum gubernacula tractant*)." Compare:—

> And you yourself shall steer the happy helm.
> —2 *K. Hen. VI.*, I. iii.

So likewise the *tide is compared to Fortune, in its ebbing and flowing*:—

> *Northumberland.*—
> 'Tis with my mind

As with the tide swell'd up unto its height,
That makes a still stand, running neither way.
—2 *K. Hen. IV.*, II. iii.

Bacon says:—"When a State grows to an overpower, *it is like a great flood, that will be sure to overflow.*" (*Essays. Vicissitude of Things*).

The ocean, overpeering of his list
Eats not the flats with more impetuous haste
Than young Laertes, in a riotous head,
O'erbears your officers.—*Hamlet* IV. v.

"Then is the danger, when the greater sort do but wait, *for the troubling of the waters, amongst the meaner, that then they may declare themselves.*" (*Essays. Seditions and Troubles*).

This was exactly what Richard Plantagenet did;—who stirred up Jack Cade, to rebellion, so as to declare himself. The people are the *waters* in the metaphor, and they are put into agitation, or trouble, by the *greater sort*—by nobles, orators, men who possess powers of stirring up others.

Duke of York.—I will stir up in England some black *storm.*

* * * * * *

And, for a minister of my intent
I have seduced a headstrong Kentishman,
John Cade of Ashford.—2 *K. Hen. VI.*, III. i. 349.

So in like manner Pandulph exclaims:—

It was my breath that blew this *tempest* up,
Upon your stubborn usage of the pope.
—*John*, Act V. i.

"So when any of the four pillows of government are unduly shaken (which are religion, justice, counsel, and treasure), men had need to pray for *fair weather.*" (*Seditions and Troubles*).

It will be noticed that Bacon's Essay, *Seditions and Troubles*, evidently derived its title from the *sedition* of the factions of Somerset and York, which lost France to England, and led to the Civil War of the Roses:—

Lucy.—Thus while the *vulture of sedition*
Feeds in the bosom of such great commanders,
Sleeping neglection doth betray to loss
The conquest of our scarce cold conqueror,
That ever living man of memory,
Henry the Fifth.—1 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act IV. iii.

Bacon writes:—"Also that kind of obedience, which Tacitus speaketh of, is to be held suspected: *Erant in officio, sed tamen qui mallent mandata imperantium interpretari, quam* *exequi*—disputing, excusing, cavilling upon mandates and directions, is a kind of shaking off the yoke, and assay of disobedience; especially if in those disputings they which are for the direction speak fearfully and tenderly, and those that are against it audaciously." (*Seditions and Troubles.*)

Henry the Sixth gave his *mandate* to the Duke of Somerset to unite his troops to those of the Duke of York, in order to go to the assistance of Talbot, who was hard pushed by the French. Henry the Sixth's orders were not obeyed by Somerset, who makes excuses :—

Somerset.—It is too late, I cannot send them now.
This expedition was by York and Talbot
Too rashly plotted.—Act IV. iv.

Somerset and York were both in office, the one Regent of France, the other commanding troops going to Talbot's aid. York exclaims :—

A plague upon that villain Somerset,
That thus delays my promised supply
Of horsemen, that were levied for this siege!

. . . . . .

Maine, Blois, Poictiers, and Tours are won away,
Long all of Somerset and his delay.
—1 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act IV. iii.

Thus France was entirely lost owing to the pernicious disobedience of Somerset, who was jealous of York, and audacious to his king. The King of France confesses that "had York and Somerset brought rescue in, we should have found a bloody day of this." (1 *K. Henry VI.* IV. vii.)

Lucy exclaims to Somerset :—

You, his false hopes, the trust of England's honour,
Keep off aloof with worthless *emulation*.
Let not your private discord keep away
The levied succours that should lend him aid.
—*Ib.*, Act IV. iv.

Bacon writes of delays :—"There is surely no greater wisdom than well to time the beginnings, and onsets of things." Again : "Nay, it were better to meet some dangers half way, though they come nothing near, than to keep too long watch upon their approaches." (*Delays. Essays.*) The King is made to speak, "*fearfully and tenderly*," in giving his mandate to those in office. It is an expostulation, or apology, rather than an imperious order :—

King.—If they perceive dissension in our looks,
And that within ourselves we disagree :

> Besides, what infamy will then arise,
> When foreign princes shall be certified
> That, for a toy, a thing of no regard,
> King Henry's peers, and chief nobility,
> *Destroy'd themselves, and lost the realm of France.*
> —1 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act IV. i.

"It is commonly seen that men once placed *taken in with the contrary faction to that by which they enter*: thinking belike, that they have the first sure, and now are ready, for a new purchase. *The traitor in faction* lightly goeth away with it, for when matters have stuck long in balancing, the winning of some one man casteth them, and he getteth all the thanks." (*Faction. Essays.*) This is exactly what that traitor in faction, the Duke of Burgundy, did:—

> I have, upon especial cause,
> Moved with compassion of my country's wreck,
> Together with the pitiful complaints
> Of such as your oppression feeds upon,
> *Forsaken your pernicious faction,*
> *And join'd with Charles, the rightful King of France.*
> —1 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act IV. i. 55.

Bacon's Essay upon *Nemesis* says of her:—"She is called the daughter of Night and Ocean; her figure is described—'She was winged, and wore a crown; she bore in her right hand an ashen spear, in her left a phial, in which Æthiops were confined, and was mounted on a deer.' The allegory seems to be thus explained: The name *Nemesis* signifies manifestly enough, *Vengeance, or Retribution;* for the office, and ministry of this goddess, consisted in this, that she should interpose her veto, *like a tribune of the people,* against the constant and unvarying prosperity of the fortunate; and not only chastise insolence, but pay off prosperity even though moderate, and innocently acquired, *with alternate seasons of adversity*. The parents of this goddess, *were Ocean and Night, that is the Vicissitude of Things,* and the obscure and secret counsels of God; for changes of things are aptly represented by the ocean, *in his everlasting flux and reflux, and occult Providence, is well designated by night.*" (*Nemesis, or the Mutability of Things. Wisdom of the Ancients.*)

The mutability of things, particularly of national glory, or the flow and ebb of the tides of conquest and loss abroad, are strikingly illustrated in the successive reigns of King Henry the Fifth, and his son Henry the Sixth. Everything almost, the former king won by force of arms, abroad in France, the latter lost again. There was a prophecy:—

That Henry, born at Monmouth, should win all;
And Henry, born at Windsor, lose all.
—1 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act III. i.

Now we have just heard Bacon, ascribing these Vicissitudes of Fortune to Ocean and *Night.* Mark the opening of the first part of the Play of *King Henry the Sixth,—the stress laid upon Night* :—

Bedford.—Hung be the heavens with black, yield day to night!
Comets, importing change of times and states,
Brandish your crystal tresses in the sky,
And with them scourge the bad revolting stars
That have consented unto Henry's death!
—1 *K. Hen. VI.*, I. i.

And that this mourning does not only apply to the death of the King, but also to other things, may be seen in Exeter's reply :—

We mourn in black; why mourn we not in blood?

Bacon writes :—"Comets, out of question, have likewise power and effect, over the gross and mass of things; but they are rather gazed upon, and waited upon in their journey, than wisely observed in their effects." (*Vicissitude of Things. Essays.*)

It was during the military operations of Talbot in France, that the *national Nemesis,* or vicissitude of conquest, occurred in the loss of all that King Henry the Fifth, had gained in France. Well, therefore is this goddess coupled with his name :—

Is Talbot slain, the Frenchmen's only scourge,
Your kingdom's terror, *and black Nemesis?*
—1 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act IV. vii.

In Bacon's metaphor comparing the vicissitude of things *to the flow and ebb of the tides,* we have an image abundantly reflected in the Plays, both for public and private Fortune. Bacon writes :—"It is likewise to be remembered, that, forasmuch as the increase of any estate must be upon the foreigner (for whatsoever is somewhere gotten, is somewhere lost), there be but three things which one nation selleth unto another: the commodity as nature yieldeth it; the manufacture; and the vecture, or carriage; so that if these three wheels go, *wealth will flow as in a springtide.*" (*Seditions and Troubles.*)

Bacon writes :—"Nor is it to be wondered at, that Icarus perish'd by excess. For excess is usually *the vice of youth,* defect that of old age. Yet of two bad and dangerous paths he chose the better, for the defects are reckoned the most depraved, *since in excess there is some magnanimity shown*, and sound affinity to heaven as in a bird. Defect crawls on the ground like a reptile." (*Scylla and Icarus. Wisdom of Ancients.*)

King Henry the Sixth exclaims of his son, Edward Prince of Wales:—

> I, Dædalus; *my poor boy Icarus;*
> Thy father, Minos, that denied our course;
> The sun that seared the wings of my sweet boy,
> Thy brother Edward.—3 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act V. vi.

This speech is uttered to Gloucester (afterwards Richard the Third). The gallant young prince, who was slain by the latter, undoubtedly brought on his own death by his bold, daring, and fearless disposition. In Scene 5 of Act V. of this Play, we find him calling Richard, Duke of Gloucester, "this scolding crookback," and ordering him to be taken away. In short, the *excess* of his reckless courage, in defying King Edward the Fourth's authority, which he refuses to acknowledge, excites admiration, but foreboding of his fate. When his dauntless mother, Margaret of Anjou, rallies him, to fight for the crown, he replies:—

> Methinks a woman of this valiant spirit
> Should, if a coward heard her speak these words,
> *Infuse his breast with magnanimity*,
> And make him, naked, foil a man at arms.
> —3 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act V. iv. 39.

Here is the *magnanimity* Bacon connotes with the *excess* of a youthful, gallant, and ambitious spirit, that knows no fear, *in soaring too close to the sun.* Edward the Fourth was that kingly sun, and like Icarus, Prince Edward dared too close to the power that consumed him—*i.e.*, the House of York. Bacon writes, in the same Essay: "But the road between Scylla and Charybdis doth certainly require both skill and good Fortune *in sailings.* For if the *ships* fall on Scylla, they are dashed to pieces on the *rocks;* if on Charybdis, they are swallowed up." (*Scylla and Charybdis, or the Middle Way. Wisdom of Ancients.*)

Compare Margaret's speech to this prince, in which he is compared to the *pilot of the ship of State*, and his enemies are fatal rocks, quicksands, and seas:—

> We will not from the helm to sit and weep,
> But keep our course, though the rough wind say no,
> From shelves and rocks, that threaten us with wreck.
> As good to chide the waves as speak them fair.

And what is Edward but a ruthless sea?
What Clarence but a quicksand of deceit?
And Richard but a ragged fatal rock?
All these the enemies to our poor bark.
—3 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act V. iv.

Bacon writes :—"*So the poets in tragedies*, do make the most passionate lamentations, and those that forerun final despair, *to be accusing, questioning, and torturing of a man's self.*" [Quod quis culpa sua contraxit, majus malum; quod ab exterius imponitur, minus malum]. (*Colours of Good and Evil.*)

Cardinal Beaufort, who had a chief hand in the murdering of good Duke Humphrey of Gloucester, tortures himself thus on his deathbed :—

Bring me unto my trial when you will.
Died he not in his bed? Where should he die?
Can I make men live, whether they will or no?
O, torture me no more! I will confess.
Alive again? Then show me where he is.
I'll give a thousand pound to look upon him.
He hath no eyes, the dust hath blinded them.
Comb down his hair; look, look! It stands upright
Like limetwigs set to catch my winged soul.
—2 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act III. iii. 8–18.

Observe in this passage, the *questioning*, as well as the *torturing*, and implied *accusing*. In exactly the same *self-torturing strain*, the King, in *Hamlet*, exclaims of himself :—

O bosom black as death!
O limed soul that, struggling to be free
Art more engaged.—*Hamlet* III. iii.

Richard the Third, in his speech commencing:

I am a villain: yet I lie, I am not.
Fool, of thyself speak well: fool, do not flatter.
My conscience hath a thousand several tongues,
And every tongue brings in a several tale,
And every tale condemns me for a villain.
—*Rich. III.*, Act V. iii.

In his Essay upon *Cunning* Bacon writes :—"It is strange, how long some men will lie in wait, to speak somewhat, they desire to say; *and how far about they will fetch;* and how many other matters they will beat over to come near it. It is a thing of great patience, but yet of much use." (*Cunning. Essays*, 1625.) Stanley *beats about the bush*, in exactly this way, when he comes to announce Richmond's invasion, to King Richard the Third :—

K. Richard.—Hey-day, a riddle! neither good nor bad!

Why dost thou run so many mile about
When thou may'st tell thy tale a nearer way?
Once more, what news?
—*K. Rich. III.* Act IV. iv. 459.

W. F. C. WIGSTON.

"FEIGNED LIVES."

FRA. PIETRO PAULO SARPI AND JOSEPH MEDE.

WE return to the subject of Feigned Lives or Feigned Histories, opened in a previous paper,* and give as the next example the Life of Fra. Pietro Paulo or Paulo Sarpi, a man of whom the majority of readers know nothing, but who by students of his history and accredited works is highly esteemed. Those who would follow this study are commended to the works of his biographer, Fulgentius, a divine of the Republic of Venice, with whom, as we know, Francis Bacon was in correspondence as late as 1625.

The "History of the Council of Trent" is the work by which the name of Paulo Sarpi chiefly lives; but we must take notice that "*his fame as a historian is posthumous, and the authorship of the History was never acknowledged by him.*" † The indubitable facts of his life are as follow:—He was born in Venice, 1552. His parents and relations were of the middle class, and connected by family ties with the Church of Rome. He owed his education to his uncle, Ambrosio Morelli, and from childhood he was brought up in the convent of the Servites, or Servi di Maria, a Florentine order founded in the 13th century. For fifteen years of his life he was, as Galileo complained, "always at the Doge's palace, serving tables." To the last day of his life he was considered by the Venetian Magnificoes as a useful "*instrument;*" for, however they might acknowledge their obligation to him, they never forgot that he was but a poor Friar, with no pretensions. He was a firm Catholic, but strenuously opposed the Spanish-Jesuit policy, which he held to be the root of evil in the Church, and he spent his life in combating them and their methods. He died in 1623.

So much for the leading facts of the life of the man himself. Let us now turn to the account of his studies, works, faculties, inventions, and experiments described by his biographer, Fulgentius, and by all later writers,* premising, however, that in all probability Fra Paulo did possess some share of the brilliant qualities, or, at least, of the industry and love of study attributed to him. To suppose the following a true account of him would be to assume that one as great and as profoundly acquainted with the science which Francis enumerated amongst the "deficiences" in learning, was living, and beginning to supply these very deficiences ten years before Francis began to write of them. The following words need but a change of name faithfully to describe Francis "Bacon:"—

---

* BACONIANA, July, 1900. † *Quarterly Review*, April, 1893, p. 373.

"Young Sarpi was from the first a student and a thinker. He did not care for games, was much alone . . . so retired and modest that his companions called him *La Sposa*; but he so commanded their respect that no unseemly language was ever heard in his presence. . . . A devourer of books, he showed a universal capacity, surpassing his teachers in mathematics, in experimental science, in language, in logic, metaphysics, law, divinity.

"His intellectual power chiefly displayed itself in ease and certainty of apprehension and infallible retentiveness of memory. He saw into intricate problems at once, and never forgot what he had once comprehended. His studies were so comprehensive that one branch helped another; and as he was never superficial, so was he never narrow. The slightest acquaintance with his works will convince the reader of his power to concentrate on one subject the experience gained in others. The exactitude gained in scientific experiment is not laid aside when he approaches a historical theme, and the wide range of his historical knowledge is felt in the breadth of the grounds upon which he argues.

"As a boy and youth, he made such astonishing progress in learning that, at the age of 18, he was a professor of half-a-dozen sciences, and at the age of 54 he was known throughout Europe as one of the first scholars of the age, and corresponded on equal terms with the leaders of thought in every branch of science and letters. . . . He made himself acquainted with several Oriental languages. He got at his fingers' ends all Church history, and much of universal history. He studied all the ancient authors, especially the historians; . . . made himself master of the Canon, and with use and custom of *Venetian* law. . . . But his favourite study was that of physical science. In his cell he carried out an infinite variety of experiments in optics, astronomy, hydraulics, anatomy, medicine, chemistry, botany, mineralogy. He studied the transmutation of metals . . . the best spirits of the day, Porta, Fabricius, Galileo, all confessed obligations to him in the course of their discoveries . . .

---

* See "Fra. Paulo Sarpi," by the Rev. Alex. Robertson (1883).

"Few men have had so much attributed to them as Father Paul.* He has been accredited with discoveries concerning the valves of the heart, and the circulation of the blood, which anticipated those of Cesalpini and Harvey. . . . He observed the contractility of the iris of the eye, and it is possible that he foresaw the invention (it is certain that he understood the importance) of the telescope and the thermometer. . . . He wrote treatises on the tides and the motion of water, on projectiles, on the war engines of the ancients, demonstrating before Buffon the probability of Archimedes' burning glasses; and we may receive these accounts with respect when we remember that he would accept no conclusions in natural history which he had not himself verified by experiment. In mathematics he had few equals. . . . It is said he read mathematics every day of his life, that he criticised, completed, and corrected as a master, and improved "Vieta's Treatise on Algebra." † . . . His genius in mechanics was such that he would immediately divine the use and perceive the imperfections of any instrument brought to him. He used experiment in every thing; never contented with a result till he had interrogated nature upon it, nor with any result that was not his own. It is no discredit to his humanity that he saw no objection to experiments upon living animals; it is rather to his credit that in his later years he expressed some compunction on this score.

"It would have been satisfactory if the results of Father Paul's experiments had been preserved. Much of what he wrote perished by fire, much remains in MS. and will never be published. What he contributed to the sum of human knowledge must therefore remain doubtful."

(We pause here to point out that here is another instance in which—like Alciati, Ashmole, Barthius, Camden, Cowley, Harvey, Leland, Usher, Withers, Anthony Wood, and others—the MSS. necessary to prove the statements of the biographer were burnt or otherwise destroyed. Why, we also ask, and by what authority, are the many remains of "Paulo Sarpi's" MSS. *never to be* published? Where are they? Are the historians themselves to be debarred from an inspection of documents so much to their purpose?)

---

* We are obliged to omit references to the voluminous polemical and theological works attributed to the Friar.

† Bianchi Giovini i. 78.

The biographer continues the remark that Sarpi's contribution to the sum of human knowledge by saying that "it was probably more than will be put down to him, both because of the loss of his works, and *because he never kept his knowledge to himself, but let it bear fruit in the minds of the friends with whom he conversed.*"

"It was characteristic of Fra. Paulo, as it has been of a very few great men, that *he never desired his name to be connected with the inventions or discoveries which he made. Hence it is that much of his fame passed to his contemporaries, whom he never could regard as rivals; and that, while he is obscurely credited with some of the greatest discoveries of the time, none can be conspicuously assigned to him.*

"He had none of the jealousy which made Henri Estienne close the doors of his library to Casaubon. What Fra. Paulo knew was his own *et amicorum.* 'Like God and Nature,' he would say, 'let us give, not lend.' He was holden for *a miracle* in all manner of knowledge, divine and human, yet not a monster of memory, for all with him was orderly.*

"Space fails us to do more than catalogue the various interests and attainments of this wonderful man. He was well read in Hebrew and Chaldee, and familiar with Rabinnical studies, as his table-talk showed. His knowledge of law is confirmed by the fact that none of his decisions . . . were ever reversed; they did not admit of reply. . . . Never was anything proposed to him whereto he did not as readily and solidly give an answer, as if it had been his only profession, and yet he gave no resolution nor answer so suddenly that it seemed not to be most studiously considered of, and such a one as it was impossible to be bettered. . . . In another field of thought his '*Arte di ben pensare,*' *now lost,*† is said to have been founded on the principle that 'Sense never deceives,' and to have anticipated something of Locke's doctrine of the association of ideas."

The historian argues from the omission of art, poetry, and the belles lettres from the records of Fra. Paulo, that he knew little about them, and probably this is true of the good Friar, though not of the true experimental philosopher. On the other hand, we are told that he formed himself as historian upon Thucydides, Xenophon, and Livy, and knew the mediæval chroniclers as well as the Italian historians. His own style (he said) was more robust than theirs, and *all his own.* "I write," he said, "what comes uppermost, and *often break Priscian's head with my pen.*"

---

* In short, he had a method—set everything down in writing and orderly notes.

† Fr. P. Sarpi. Letter xxviii.

Again, we halt for a moment to remind readers of the use of the remarkable figure put in italics, which is made in the works of other "feigned authors" besides Sarpi.

"*Sir Thos. Browne*" says in the *Religio Medici* (Part II., Sec. ii.):—

"How do grammarians hack and slash for the genitive case in Jupiter, Jovis, or Jupitris? How do they *break their own pates* to salve that of Priscian?"

In "Verses to Sir Kenelm Digby," signed *Iohn Serjeant,* the supposed poet speaks of

"The schools . . .
Who, *if they do not Priscian the disgrace*
To break his head, they foully scratch his face:
Torturing poor innocent grammar to confess
The truth they hide by their dark wowishness."

And then Shakespeare:—

"Bone?—bone fore bene: *Priscian a little scratched*—'twill serve."—*L. L. L.* v. 1.

However, whatever objections our author had to the style and teaching of the grammarians of his day, we read that his own style was "as free from solecism as from pedantry. As we read his letters, which are numerous, *though others, we believe, remain unpublished,* we are impressed no less by the comprehensive interest and industry which made him eager to know everything that was going on in the world than by the moderation with which he writes. . . . He pronounces on the merits of Gilbert and Vietra '*the only two original writers of the age,*' each in his own line, touches with the hand of one who is master in all, such different subjects as the Copernican theory, terrestrial magnetism, selenography, feudal custom, constitutional history, art, ecclesiastical and civil law, Oriental subjects, metaphysics. With all this there is no sign of vanity. Great knowledge of one subject may puff up, but knowledge so wide and deep as that of Sarpi keeps company with humility. 'He was a man,' says Bishop Sanderson, who knew and loved him, 'of an invincible bashfulness.' Absolutely free from jealousy as from prejudice, he could tolerate all opinions. . . . His philosophy of life, and that temper of endurance and serenity, that sweetness and maturity of affections and spirit ascribed to him by his friend Diodati" is frequently illustrated by passages in his letters, and yet we find that though he used it sparingly, he was not unprovided with "the weapon of grave and temperate irony, and he no need, he says, to provide himself with the 'vile guns' of inductive learning (although 'the whole tone of his mind was Aristotelian and inductive' when his own quiver was so full of sharp arrows—witty and pithy replies and answers ready for immediate use. But for serious political conflict he used artillery, not catapults, appealing to precedent as well as to principle, to what had been done as well as what had been preached. . . . He ascertained facts carefully, and *disregarded authority*, and by so doing he arrived at conclusions which will stand inquiry, and deserved the praise of so conscientious a seeker of truth as Gibbon."

"He was a critic in everything,* but not a denier. . . . A saint may hold strong opinions, and express them with a caustic wit. *All agree to praise his wonderful modesty.* 'He was the humblest thing breathing.' He is said never to have spoken an impatient word, and the only complaint which his friends made was that he would not take care of himself. . . . It is an illustration of the vanity of human studies that one of the greatest natural philosophers of his age should now be chiefly known as the author of a history which is read by none but historians. Compensation for this may be found in the recollection that it is chiefly for the beauty of his moral character, the purity, modesty, and impartiality which found in company with a rare intellect that a later age still takes pleasure in hearing the story of Fra. Paulo, and the more we read of him the more we are inclined to repeat the lament of his friends when they lost him: *Non verra pere mai un Fra. Paulo;*" or, to make a free translation in the words of Hamlet—

> "He was a man, take him for all in all,
> I shall not look upon his like again."

Probably very few of those who will read these pages are acquainted with the bulky folio entitled "The Works of the Pious and Profoundly-learned Joseph Mede, B.D.," and of which the fourth edition was published by Roger Norton (Lady Anne Bacon's relative) in 1677. It consists of a series of theological discourses or sermons, ninety-eight epistles on learned subjects connected with Divinity, and some commentaries on the Scriptures. The work seems to have been first published about 1638.

---

* "I am nothing if not critical."—*Oth.* ii. 1.

At the beginning of this work (but after the general Preface) is "The Author's Life," and to this we turn, in order to obtain "*a faithful though imperfect pourtrait* of this excellent person, the authour of the ensuing discourses." The biographical particulars are scanty and not very interesting, and would not fill five out of forty-five pages of which this "Life" consists.

We learn in brief that "Joseph Mede was born in October, 1586, of parents of honest rank, at Berden, in Essex." His father died when Joseph was 10 years old. The mother married again Mr. Gower, of Nasing, by whom he was sent to school at Hodsden. There, having procured a Hebrew grammar, he began to learn Hebrew by himself, and being found to be a forward and studious boy, he was sent to Cambridge in 1602. He studied for three years at Christ's College, first under Daniel Rogers, then under William Addison, and took the degree of Master of Arts. Being made Fellow of Christ's College, he became reader and tutor, and instructed several persons of honour and eminency in the State. He died in his college room in October, 1638, and "his college to which, while he lived, he was so illustrious an ornament is now he is dead his monument."

These few dry details are all that we gather concerning the man himself, excepting that "he had so great a hesitancy in his speech as rendered his expression painful to himself and others. The forty or more folio pages which remain are filled with disquisitions upon "the pregnancy of his parts," "his happy progress through *all kinds* of academical studies," and "the early proofs which he gave of being designed for profound contemplations" by the manner in which he found his way out of the troublesome labyrinths of perplexed notions by which Pyrrho had industriously studied to represent the habitation of truth as inaccessible. "He was justly styled 'Master of Arts' and universally esteemed as one who well understood all those arts which make up the accomplishment of a scholar. He was an acute *logician*, an accurate *philosopher*, a skilful *mathematician*, an excellent *anatomist*, a great *philologer*, a master of many *languages*, proficient in *history* and *chronology*, . . . a great *florist* and accurate *herbalist, thoroughly versed in the Book of Nature, not unseen in any kind of ingenious knowledges for delight or use.*" Moreover, we read in another place, "In his youth he spent no small pains in sounding the depths of '*astrology*,' the doctrines of '*sympathy and antipathy*,' employing himself in his retirement in a curious inquiry into the most abstruse parts of learning, and endeavouring for the knowledge of those things which were remote from the common track."

He also wrote "an unparalleled commentary upon that mysterious book, the Apocalypse," a work high esteemed by Bishop Usher, and which was translated into French. But again it is necessary to suppress and curtail the dissertations upon the wonderful books, and their sentiments and doctrines expounded in language curiously analagous to that of Baxter's "Saint's Rest" and other books of the same suspicious authorship.

We read of the author's "noble genius leading him on to encounter difficulties in research and arguments which had never before been met and mastered. "As if he accounted them but half-scholars that did only *ex commentario sapere* . . . he was not wont to take expositions of Scripture upon the credit of any author nor to look upon their resolves *as if they were Hercules Pillars* with a *ne plus ultra* upon them." Thus we see how entirely he was at one with Francis Bacon and Fra. Paolo in their objection to accepting unproved authority.

Now, for the personal character of this author, we find that his *humility* and extreme *modesty* are the first points specially noted. "Although his various perfections and useful accomplishments made his company most desirable to scholars, so the goodness of his disposition made him equally communicative and free to impart his knowledge." He was totally without ostentation and affectation, but a hater of such vanity, and could not without trouble hear himself praised or his abilities extolled. He greatly preferred "retirement" and his "poor cell" to any public or academical honours. "The height of his ambition was only to have had some small donative *sine cura* . . . some such place of quiet retirement from the noise and tumults of the world, with a competency moderated by Agur's wish, *neither poverty nor riches*, was the top and utmost of his desires, not that he would be restless or discontented, but to show what kind of life he did affect."

We know how in his trouble and threatened fall Francis St. Alban expressed himself to the same effect, and almost in the same words, from his "full poor cell," and saying that all he desired was that he might "live to study, not study to live." "For my part, I see an *otium*, and if it may be so, a fat *otium*. Yet I am prepared for a *date obolum Belisario;* and I that have borne a bag can bear a wallet." *

"But though our author lived a retired studious life, his thoughts were not shut up within his *cell; but his soul covered the whole earth, his heart was as large and wide as the universe. He so lived and was affected as became a citizen of the world.*" That he might be the better informed as to "how the world goes," he kept up correspondence with knowing friends, and even spent money in paying for intelligence (weekly, for the most part) from foreign parts. He had a strong interest solicitude for the affairs of the Reformed Church, and most desirous for unity and peace; his designs for this purpose he called "heroic."

Together with his liberality of views and his generosity in imparting all that he knew or discovered, he combined a great reticence on certain subjects, and, with regard to unworthy persons, "he would not *cast pearls before swine.*" "He was content not to impart any of his *peculiar notions* but where he found some appetite and stomach. Much less would he *cram* them." As he disliked controversy, so he never hotly defended his own opinions, being confident that in the end "truth will be justified of all her children."

The biographer then winds up with a long dissertation of "Joseph Mede's" temperance, moderation, tenderness of affection, natural warmth of feeling, zeal, and all-pervading and diffusive large-minded love and charity—his zeal for God's honour and his devotion to Church and State; his well-grounded judgment and constancy of opinion in matters which he had tested; his abhorrence of idolatry, superstition, and irreverence, returning again and again to the total absence of conceit and pride; or malice or unkindness to be seen in him, and of the purity, peacefulness, and simplicity of his nature, together with his *submissiveness* and "incomparable patience" in times of suffering and trial, that we may be quite sure as to the individual described under the name of Joseph Mede. Our author describes his person.

---

* See Spedding (*L. L.* vii. 351).

"His body was of a comely proportion, rather of a tall than low stature. In his younger years he was but slender and spare of body; but afterwards, when he was grown, he became more fat and portly, yet not to any such extent as did diminish, but rather increased the goodliness of his presence to a comely decorum. His eye was full, quick and sparkling, His whole countenance composed to a sedate seriousness and gravity: *Majestas et Amor* were well met here, an *awfull Majesty*, but withall an *inviting sweetness*. His behaviour was friendly and affable, intermixed with chearfulness and inoffensive pleasantry. His complexion was a little swarthy, as if somewhat overtinctured with *melancholy*, which yet rather seemed to serve the design of his studious mind then to clog it with those infirmities which commonly attend that humour. . . . It could not be observed but that his vitals were strong, . . . but the subservient faculties did not duly perform their offices[*] . . . and yet there was nothing in the irregularities of his natural œconomy, which made him fall short of that chief desire of all wise men, the having *mentem sanam in corpore sano.*"

THE PUBLICATION OF THE SHAKESPEARE FOLIO, 1623.

TRANSCRIPT OF THE STATIONERS' REGISTERS (1554—1640).

8 Nov., 1623.

Master Blounte.
Isaak Jaggard.

ENTRED for their copie under the hands of Master Doctor Worrall and Master Cole, Warden — Master WILLIAM Shakespeare's *Comedys*, *Histories*, and *Tragedys*—So manie of the said copies as are not
formerly entred to other men.

Comedys.

The Tempest.
The Two Gentlemen of Verona.
Measure for Measure.
As you like it.
Twelfe Night.
The Winter's Tale.

---

[*] In the margin of "Mede's Life," page 32, is a note observing that the same was the case with Fra. Paul, of Venice. We know from his own notes and prescriptions that the observations apply directly to Francis St. Alban.

Histories. The third parte of Henry yᵒ Sixt.
Henry the Eight.

Coriolanus.
Timon of Athens.
Julius Cæsar.
Mackbeth.
Anthonie and Cleopatra.
Cymbeline.

It is at once observable that only 14 out of the 36 Plays in the *Shakespeare* folio of 1623 are entered at that date in the registers of the Stationers' Company. Upon inquiry, the present writer was informed by a librarian at the British Museum that this list does not include *Plays which had already been published,* and that this is implied in the statement that this list includes only "such copies as are *not entred to other men.*"

This explanation did not appear altogether satisfactory, neither did the register seem to be such as would naturally be expected in the case of a book of such pre-eminent value and merit as the 1623 folio of the Shakespeare Plays. We therefore looked a little further into the matter, and found that the following are the Plays said by Dr. Delius and many other Shakespearean writers to have been published before the date of the folio 1623:—

Richard II.	1597	These are the two historical Plays included with other pieces (Comedies, Devices, &c.) in a list of works by Mr. Francis Bacon on the outside leaf of the paper-book found by Mr. Halliwell Phillips amongst the Northumberland MSS.
Richard III.	1597	
Romeo and Juliet	1597	
Love's Labour's Lost	1598	
The Merchant of Venice	1598	
1st Pt. Henry IV	1598	
2nd ,, ,,	1598	
Titus Andronicus	1600	
Midsummer N. Dream	1600	
Henry V.	1600	

Much Ado 1600
Merry Wives...............1602
Julius Cæsar 1603
Hamlet ....1603 (Entered one year sooner at Stationers' Hall.)
King Lear 1608
Troilus and Cressida ...1609
Pericles ....1609 (Entered one year before at Stationers' Hall.)

Here are 17 Plays published *before* the publication of the folio 1623. The Stationers' Register accounts for 14 other Plays.

But 14+17=31, and in the 1623 folio there are 36 Plays, albeit that only 35 are included in the "Catalogue of the Severall Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies Contained in this Volume." The *almost unpaged* (but strangely paged) *Troilus and Cressida* is the Play omitted. That Play will prove a fertile field for research. For the present, to stick to our text. What are the five Plays in the folio. published for the first time in that volume, and *omitted* from the registers of the Stationers' Company? and why were they omitted? The answer to the first part of this question is easy. The omitted Plays are:—

The Comedy of Errors.
1st Part Henry VI.
” ” ”
All's Well.
The Taming of the Shrew.

The second half of the question we are unable to answer. Perhaps decipherers may presently throw some light upon it. Meanwhile, we see clearly that the omission is *intentional*, and for some purpose known to those who direct the actions of the printing and publishing world. For a thing so easy to see, and so distinctly incorrect, would long ago have been pounced upon and made the subject of Shakespearean disquisition, had it not been to the interest of somebody to keep it discreetly in the background.

It is probable that a careful examination of the Stationers Registers might furnish suggestive information as to true authorships. We cannot forget that in none of the registers published by the old Shakespeare Society, neither in the Stationers', nor in "Henslowe's Diary," nor in "Alleyne's Memoirs or Accounts," is there any mention of "Shakespeare" (spelt in any form) except the marginal note—Shagsberd—which occurs twice against some entry of payment on account of the *Merchant of Venice.*

Now that the study of the Life and Works of Francis St. Alban is happily extending in all directions, and freed from the trammels of mere "Bacon and Shakespeare" controversy, it would be very useful if the same kind of inquiries which were made concerning the greatest of his poetic works were to be turned upon matters connected with Spenser, Peele, Greene, Jonson, and the almost unknown host of minor dramatists and poets of greater or less magnitude, whose claims to authorship are daily becoming more and more discredited, and whose "garlands should be placed upon the proper head."

FRANC-BACONRY FROM THE GERMAN STANDPOINT.

IN Francis Bacon's "Notes on the State of Christendom" (Vol. VIII., p. 24) he mentions "Julius, Duke of Brunswick, at the strong castle of Wolfenbüttle on the Occar." Spedding, curiously ignorant of the river on which the two cities of Brunswick and Wolfenbüttle are built, improves upon Bacon by substituting the word Oder, adding a note (Occar in MS.). In drawing attention to this by letter, Edwin Bormann, a supporter of the Bacon-Shakespeare theory in Germany, satirises the knowledge of English scholars. "Francis Bacon," he says, "while still quite a young man, was better versed in things appertaining to Brunswick than many a grey-headed scholar of the present day."

Borman says no more, except to point out that Duke Heinrich Julius (born 1589, and who died at Prague, 1613) was the brother-in-law of James I., the first German dramatist, and a promoter of the drama and its English actors who repeatedly in 1600 visited the German Courts.

Once upon a time the grey old castle of Wolfenbüttle possessed not only the little ducal theatre upon whose stage Lessing, the dramatist, first produced his Plays, but an "excellent library," the treasures of which are now transferred to the fine "Augusta Bibliothek," which rises behind Lessing's pretty one-storied house and garden, and to one side of the "strong castle." On its fine façade is sculptured the cryptic Owl within a Shell, and within the "Besuch Zimmer" stands (one of two busts) the handsome Shakespeare, with the lace collar, so unlike in its intellectual and "spirituel" beauty the portrait which we are taught at Stratford-on-Avon to call William Shaxper. In this Bibliothek lie MSS. worth the handling, notably those of Johann Valentin Andreä, a philosopher and divine whose earnestness and good faith are above suspicion. During the years 1607—1614 he was employed in travelling about on secret embassies, and was closely connected with both Michael Maier and his English friend, Robert Fludd.

We have evidence of how highly Maier was respected in England. It was doubtless his influence which decided Fludd to publish all his works at Frankfort and Oppenheim "on inferior German printing paper." Fludd, like Maier and Andreä, dreamed a dream, and lived to see it realised, and this was to put into form and shape "Bacon von Verulamis Island of Ben Salem," establishing it not for an age, but for all time. To accomplish this, he went to Germany. Both Fludd and Andreä are credited with works which, as Herr Nicolai points out, they neither of them laid claim to.

"The Fama and Reformation of the World" is said to have compassed mighty results in the beginning of the 17th century. It circulated in MS. during 1610, and in 1614 it was printed. In 1617, at Oppenheim, Fludd published (under the name of "Otreb") "*De Vita, Morte et Resurrectione.*"

If I mistake not, Francis Bacon, in his "Natural History," in a little Introduction entitled "The History of Life and Death," says (p. 52), "Thus much by way of preface. Let us now proceed to the topics of the Inquisition, concerning which you must read 'The History of Life and Death.'"

Friedrich Nicolai, the friend of Lessing, who was the first man to introduce the Shakespeare cult into Germany, published in Berlin (1782) an interesting work on the "Charges Brought Against the Order of Knights Templar," and in this he points out that, which, if we are observant, will throw much light on a matter of considerable importance with regard to Bacon.

It is the interchangeableness of the letters M and B. Let us note this in our book of memory. He mentions it with regard to the words "Mahomet" and "Bahomet," which he holds are, and always were, identical. This taken in connection and with regard to what he says later, quoting from "Old and

New Mysteries" (Berlin, p. 279) is significant. He is tracing the history of modern Masonry, and proving that it sprang from the ideas of a few learned men, the Rosicrucian brotherhood, eager for the Reformation of the world, who accomplished its establishment by means of a secret society "*according to one of the noblest ideas of Bacon.*"

Nicolai does not beat about the bush; he proclaims this fact clearly, and says, further, something which causes much light to blaze out upon a subject hitherto so hidden in allegory and fable that half the world has missed its true meaning. This is the quotation he makes: "Masonry does not acknowledge Germany, but Britain for its nearest fatherland." And again quoting from p. 293, he says, "It can be well authenticated that the Order was brought from France into Britain." "Contradictory," says Nicolai, "as this sounds, the author knows very well what he means. One has only to know precisely of *what* he exactly speaks. When this is so, all I affirm and all he affirms agrees entirely, even though his intention and mine are different." Yes. From *France*, "our Abraham France," as John Donne would say. "Franc-Maçonnerie" springs, without any doubt, from *Francis*, and in England it must become known as Free-Masonry, not Franc-Baconry, as its "exalted father"—"*Abourama,*" or "Father Abraham," or *Abi-Albon* (father of strength) ordains.

And thus it is that Germany and the "Augusta Bibliothek" at Wolfenbüttle afford a new strong link in the great chain. It is because I am persuaded that Germany will yet prove a fruitful source from which to draw waters from the well of truth with regard to Francis Bacon and "his life private and concealed as well as public," that I accept the suggestion made by your Society, and use your valuable pages "as a *mouth*-piece."

SHAKSPER NOT SHAKESPEARE.

WHENEVER a new discovery or theory is broached in the present age, books are sure to be written about it. The writers may be by turns slanderous, malicious, ill-informed, or contemptuous, but sooner or later, and, in spite of all, book upon book will be written, until errors in the original statements or theories have been sifted out, and the true grains of golden knowledge collected and stored. For Truth is Truth to the end of the chapter. At the time when the last number of *Baconiana* was all but printed, a book by Mr. W. H. Edwards, entitled, "*Shaksper not Shakespeare*,"* was sent to our Editor; it could not then be properly noticed, and we desire again to draw to it the attention of Baconian Scholars, and those especially to whom the whole subject is comparatively new.

The title alone is sufficient to inform the reader that the book does not get beyond the "Bacon-Shakespeare" controversy, indeed, it does not profess to reach even so far, and the author declares as much; for, having asserted in the introduction that he can prove the Shakespeare Plays to have been *not* written for Shaksper's theatre—that excepting in special scenes, or in pantomime, no one of them was ever played in that theatre, and that no man during Shaksper's lifetime suspected him of any authorship whatsoever—having shown that the Sheksper myth originated in the verses of Ben Jonson (which Mr. Edwards regards as bitter ridicule),† the writer says: "I show that Shaksper died as devoid of accomplishments as when he entered London—unknown to any man of letters or of eminence, unnoticed and unlamented. . . . It is enough for me to prove that William Shaksper did not write these Plays. Who did, I know not, and offer no suggestions." He nevertheless endorses the opinion of Mr. Appleton Morgan, that "there were several associates who wrote under the name of William Shakespeare."

That Mr. Edwards should thus focus his field of view upon one spot, renders this book all the more valuable for its purpose. Here we have in brief, and clearly and methodically set forth, first, the "Proposition" that Shaksper did *not* write the works attributed to him, in which case some one else must have done so; then, the "Demonstration," founded chiefly on citations from Halliwell-Phillips' "*Outlines on the Life of*

---

* Pub. Cincinnati; The Robert Clarke Company, 1900.

† See Note at the end.

Shakespeare," and Dr. Ingleby's "*Centurie of Prayse.*" The former volume Mr. Fleay (a Shakespearian of eminence in America) terms "a treasure house of documents,"* and upon this excellent basis Mr. Edwards grounds his general argument, but not without consulting most of the now very numerous works from Rowe and Dr. Johnson down to the present day, which bear directly or indirectly upon the theses, now almost worn threadbare, connected with the burning question—"Did Shaksper write *Shakespeare?*"

It is on the score especially of the concentration of this book to one point, its limited area, that we do not hesitate to recommend it to the perusal of readers who may wish to get some idea of the subject, yet shrink from the labour of collecting information for themselves, or even of facing such a portentous volume as the last edition of the "Outlines." Here may they read, and see proved from the documents cited by the most erudite and distinguished Shakespearean scholars, all that is to be known, and a great deal more that has been assumed or "supposed," about "the illiterate butcher," or "the heaven-born genius" (according as we spell his name). Here is registered all that is generally ascertained about his family, home, surroundings and education (or total lack of it), with evidence already often brought forward to show that not only William Shaksper never learned to write, but that he never knew how to spell his own name. There are two very interesting chapters upon the Ignorance of Contemporaries respecting Shaksper, the absolute absence of facts bearing on his Literary Character, and the lack of any proof that he was personally known to any great man of the day, or to any of the lesser scholars and artists excepting a few of his fellow-craftsmen. The absence even of the name "Shakespeare" or "Shaksper," is dwelt upon as most remarkable. Emerson bears witness to the fact, patent to any who will seek, that Sir Henry Wotton, who mentions in his correspondence almost everyone of note in his day, *omits Shakespeare.* Halliwell-Phillips says that in a long series of letters from John Chamberlain to Dudley Carleton, from 1598—1623—"letters full of the news of the month, of the Court, the city, the pulpit, the booksellers' shops (in which Court masques are described in minute detail—authors, actors, plot, performance, reception, and all), *we look in vain for the name of Shakespeare, or any of his plays.*"

---

* These documents were reproduced, word for word, by Mr. D. W. Wilder, in 1893.

Mr. Edwards might have added that neither in the "*Accounts of the Revels at Court*" (published by the First Shakespeare Society, in their editions of the "*Memoirs*," and the "*Accounts*" of Edward Alleyne, the actor, and ostensible founder of Dulwich College), in "*Henslowe's Diary*," nor, more wonderful still, in the two volumes of the "*Accounts of the Stationers' Company*" (also published by the Society), is there any mention of *Shakespeare.* Two entries of payments in connection with the performance of the "*Merchant of Venice*" have the marginal note, "Shaxbird." When such things as these are duly weighed and considered it appears astounding that any person possessed of even the feeblest powers of reasoning, should be found still to credit the "fanciful might-have-beens" of which Mr. Fleay speaks. But as a rule it appears to be not so much lack of brains as lack of knowledge, which prevents most of our opponents from even looking into the subject, or even from putting together the facts collected by the many industrious and cultivated Shakespeare scholars, who have written or spoken in praise of the immortal poet. To such as these we heartily commend Mr. Edwards' valuable, suggestive, and extremely readable book.

Some points noted by Mr. Edwards may with advantage be followed up by industrious inquirers. On page 11 he quotes the late Richard Grant White with regard to the spelling of the name *Shakespeare*:—"The name sometimes appears Chaksper, or Shaksper."

That spelling of the name was a matter discussed in writing by the present writer some fifteen years ago, *apropos* to an entry observed in Francis Bacon's private journal or table book, which he termed *Transportata.* The entry is to this effect:—"To see Mr. Chr. on Wednesday concerning my new inventions." Spedding takes this to mean that Francis was to see the Lord Chancellor in connection with some Act of Parliament, or other measure. But there is no tittle of evidence in favour of this assumption. On the other hand, it it is unlikely that Francis would write Mr. for Lord Chancellor, and highly improbable that he would term Acts of Parliament, or schemes of measures to be undertaken, "inventions"—a word which he seems almost invariably to have applied to *works of the imagination.*

In one of his letters he explains his neglect in some matter personal of business which has caused trouble or loss "to fall upon and seize him." He says that at the time when this important business was in hand, he overlooked it: "my mind being then wholly occupied with my *inventions.*" It was endeavoured to show that in the entry the C might be mistaken for S, those letters in old English writing often closely resembling each other. Then we should readily read: "To see Mr. S(hakspe)r on Wednesday concerning my new (dramatic) inventions." But if Shaksper sometimes wrote, or if others wrote, for his name, Chaksper, the explanation is simple.

Grant White is also quoted as suggesting that "Shakespeare is a corruption of some name of a more peaceful meaning, and, therefore, perhaps of a humbler derivation;" and Dr. Morgan supposes the name to have been simply Jacques Pierre (or John Peter). He describes the ordinary country manner of sounding Jacques like *Shak,* as "mispronunciation, ... prevalent in Warwickshire." In point of fact, very few distinctive differences either in vocabulary or pronunciation are to be found in Warwickshire, when compared with other counties and in the list of words from the so-called "Warwickshire dialect" we found not one *used in Shakespeare*; which is not as common to other English rural districts as to Warwickshire. The Warwickshire dialect theory of Shakespeare is one of many delusions. As to "Jacques Pierre," it is quite possible that Shaksper was a corruption. Anyhow, the kindred sounds were sufficient for the witty poet who ." never could pass by a jest." Readers who have "*Montaigne's*" essays at hand should turn to his little paraphrase of the text "What's in a name?"—(We think that the passage was printed a year or two ago in *Baconiana*). Here the author asks what it signifies, whether he be known by his own name or that of another? It is all one to him whether he be called William, Jacques, or Peter (*or words to that effect*), we cannot quote by the book; but we know that Francis lost no opportunity of connecting himself occultly with his unacknowledged works, and that right and left he punned upon the names Bacon and Shakespere, which were his leading *noms-de-plume.* In an old book published anonymously many years ago, and entitled "The Book of God" or the "Apocalypse," it is mentioned that Minerva was called Pallas, because she "vibrates a javelin" ("shakes a spear.") This Mr. Reed quotes with the observation that "Athens, the home of the drama, was under the protection of the Spear-shaker."

Again, the Spear-shaker is brought to our notice in the portrait somewhat resembling Francis, but with the name "Quiriuus" which appears on one of the books which we ascribe to him. We know that this name of "Quiriuus" or the Spear-shaker was applied to him by his own friends, and used in one of the Elegies or Eulogies written by them, and collected by Dr. Rawley. They have already been published in this magazine.

We should also have commented upon the views of Mr. Edwards with regard to Ben Jonson, but the subject requires more space than can be given at the present time. We only add therefore, that we should be glad to see the same expert pen applied to the facts of Ben Jonson's (or truly *Johnson's*) life, which has been so successful in setting down the personal records of Shaxper.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

Apropos of the article on "Canonbury Tower," that appeared in your last issue, I would like to lay the following facts before your readers. It will be remembered that a secret passage connected Canonbury Tower with St. John's Gate, Clerkenwell. Between St. John's Street and Clerkenwell Green stood, already in the end of Elizabeth's reign (presumably), the Red Bull Theatre, as large as the Fortune, and as popular. Shakespeare's Plays were acted here for some time by "*an independent company*," of whose success the king's company grew jealous. Also there Prince Henry's Players acted an old Play in 1623, called "The Peaceable King." The stage was erected in the midst of an Inn yard. The groundlings stood; the paying audience for a small sum sat in the Inn galleries. The *actors wore vizards*, the reason put forward being that they doubled their parts.

Ned Ward, the rustic poet, lived a century after on this spot, and wrote lines:—

> "There on that ancient venerable ground, where
> Shakespeare in heroic buskins trod."

Has the theory ever been mooted that the *real author* of the Plays himself took parts in them masked on the stage of the Red Bull?

Can any reader of Baconiana trace this missing speech and substantiate this story?

It has been alleged that Thomas Bushell, a learned man, Francis S. Alban's Seal-bearer, and a member of his household during the time he was Lord Chancellor, printed in one of his works an oration which his Lordship intended making in Parliament, had he not been removed from office. The subject of the speech was the founding of the Royal Academy of the Sciences on lines laid down in one of his books.

This, of course, was Salomon's Temple, in the New Atlantis.