BACONIANA

FRANCISCVS BACON
EXORTVS VT ÆTHEREVS SOL

Lewis Randolph,
Cairo, Egypt.

VOL. X. NEW SERIES, 1902.

BACONIANA.

EDITED BY

A SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE BACON SOCIETY.

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

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

ROBERT · BANKS & SON
PRINTERS & PUBLISHERS
MAGNA EST VERITAS
ET PRE-VALECIT
LONDON

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PAGE

A Retrospective Review. By C. M. Pott 5

St. Alban and the Albanni. By A. A. Leith 12

An Examination Examined. By E. Wells Gallup 21

Moral Poisons. By W. F. C. Wigston 25

The Parentage of Francis Bacon. By Parker Woodward 41

What's in a Name? By J. R. (of Gray's Inn)... 48

"Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light" 51

Essays and Plays. By W. F. C. Wigston 57

Cupid in the Sonnets By F. C. Hunt 66

The Parentage of Francis Bacon. By George Stronach, M.A. ... 76

William Shakespeare: A Critical Study. By Alicia A Leith 84, 131

"Arthur Wilson." A Brief Study by A. A. L.... 88

Reviews. By W. F. C. W.... 92

The Bacon-Shakespeare Campaign 95

Abridged Report of the Meeting of the Council and Members of the Bacon Society. By C. M. Pott 105

A Humble Remonstrance. By Parker Woodward 112

"The Misfortunes of Arthur." By J. R. 117

The Dignity of Cipher-writing. By Harold Bayley 123

"The Owl and the Baker's Daughter." By P. C. 126

The Owen-Gallup Cipher Discoveries. By W. F. C. Wigston ... 137

Poems Hitherto Published Anonymously. By C. M. P. 148

"In Praise of the Queen." By C. M. Pott 155

Roger Bacon and His Times. By H. Candler 171

Francis St. Alban, Mystic and Poet. By A. A. Leith 184

Henry V. By W. F. C. Wigston 198

Rambling Notes. By Col. Colomb 210

A Humble Remonstrance. By George Stronach 217

Correspondence 54, 98, 152, 223

Baconiana.

VOL. X.—*New Series.* JANUARY, 1902. No. 37.

A RETROSPECTIVE REVIEW.

SEVEN years have passed since we attempted to review our position, and to measure the advance made by the Bacon Society, since 1884, when we still lingered and beat about round the then absorbing question, Did Bacon write Shakespeare? The process of analysis by which we have reached the absolute conclusion that Francis "Bacon" and "Shakespeare" were identical, and that consequently "Bacon" did write "Shakespeare," may be partly inferred from the lists given in an article on "Elementary Baconism."* These lists correspond in part to a collection of comparative extracts reduced to alphabetical form, and which now fill upwards of 150 portfolios of MS. 8vo. The language and philology of *Bacon* and *Shakespeare*, vocabulary, turns of speech, grammar, and every peculiarity of diction and style which has been noted, is added, or in process of being added to these MS. Dictionaries.

It was soon found necessary to attempt a collation of the books of the "Minor Poets and Dramatists," and indeed, of the works of all great writers or supposed authors of the Baconian age. This business is still in an elementary condition, but enough has been done to satisfy the workers in this field that one ruling mind controlled the vast literature of the 16th and 17th centuries.

Close inquiry has been made into the origin and owners of the first Paper mills and Printing houses in Great Britain and the Continent; the methods by which they marked the books which they issued, the designs and symbols by which they illustrated them, the "errors," false pagination, peculiar marks, (formerly hand made, now done mechanically, which are found scattered throughout them, and inserted even in the tooling of the binding. Such examinations tend to show that the whole of the printing and publishing trades, here and abroad, were parts of a vast secret or semi-secret society working in harmony, and that the same methods modified, and adapted to the machinery and requirements of the day, remain in perfect working order.

---

* BACONIANA, July, 1897, Vol. v., pp. 135-138.

Efforts to reach collections of MSS. and books containing the required information on these apparently simple subjects led to a conviction that organised resistance is offered to such researches. Further it has been found that there are in the British Museum, the Royal Society, the Bodleian, York Minster and other old libraries, collections of books, MSS., prints, &c., practically withheld and screened from the general eye, but open to the privileged circle, or to those provided with the requisite "Open Sesame."

One such collection is (or was not long ago), at the Royal Society, which Francis "Bacon" founded. It is said to contain mathematical papers in his own handwriting, which we have reason to believe concern his mathematical ciphers.

Another collection was, during the life of the late Earl of Verulam at Gorhambury, where the Earl informed a member of our Society, that in the chest which contained these interesting papers, were the play-bills of the first performances of the Shakespeare plays. These papers, said Lord Verulam, would be made public after his death, but as yet nothing more has been heard of them. We trust that the historical MSS. commission will soon turn their attention to them.

Towards the end of 1899, many eyes were turned towards the "Douce Collection" left, we were led to believe, by the former "Keeper of the MSS." at the British Museum, to be opened and made over to the nation in January, 1900. Since then repeated inquiries have failed to produce any but the most contrary information concerning this long promised store. Any one wishing for further particulars can have them by applying by letter to the editor of this journal. The general conclusion seems to be that it has been the object of the custodians to make applicants in London believe the collection to be at the Bodleian, and open to inspection, whilst inquirers at the Bodleian were informed sometimes that it was in London, or else in part at the Bodleian, but not to be seen. Meanwhile, it now seems certain that one box of papers of "no importance" remains at the British Museum, and why, under such circumstance these unimportant papers should have been treated so importantly, and kept so mysteriously, remains an enigma. If, as we have it in writing, from one inquirer, *the papers are to be seen at the Bodleian*, and are esteemed of great value, why are they not thoroughly well known? for, according to an authoritative statement at the British Museum, they have been for the last 67 years at the Bodleian, and according to another statement at Oxford "there is no concealment whatever." Since this yet another applicant at the Bodleian has been told that "the Douce MSS. are all at the British Museum." and when he urged the opposite statement made at the British Museum, this was declared to be "quite a mistake."

Our attention has also been called to *a sealed bag of papers at the Record Office.* It was, it is said, sealed at the death of Queen Elizabeth, and to be opened only by joint consent of the reigning Sovereign, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Lord Chancellor. Is not the time come when we may fitly memorialise His Majesty, King Edward, to command or sanction the opening and revelation?

The whole question of "reservations" is curious, and tends to confirm the conviction that Baconian literature, documents, and relics of every kind are still controlled by the Secret Society of Francis St. Alban.

The subject of ciphers (so needful in a secret society) has been so long suppressed, that we note with pleasure the interest stimulated by a more general comprehension of this intricate subject. The pioneer efforts of Mr. Donelly in this new old art or science, stimulated Mr. Wigston, Mr. Cary, Mr. Gould, Dr. O. Owen, Dr. Pryer, the Hon. H. Gibson, Mr. Bidder, Mr. E. V. Tanner and others, to prosecute this beguiling study. The work of each, though independent, seems to harmonise and to afford help to others. Thus the "word" (or *phrase?*) cipher of Dr. Owen led Mrs. Wells Gallup to embark in the attempt to apply "Bacon's" Biliteral Method* to the works which pass by that name. Hitherto nothing has appeared to disprove the accuracy of Mrs. Gallup's work or of the highly important matter revealed through this cipher, on the contrary other labourers in the same field confirm the results. Nevertheless the efforts of literary men seem to be for the most part directed to destroy rather than to construct or to aid in true advancement. The vastness of the subject prohibits any worthy discussion of it in this place.

Mr. Cary's calculations brought out circumstantial particulars about a deposit in the orb under the Cross on St. Paul's

---

* A new piece entitled "The White Rose of Britaine" is preparing for the press. We understand that the relation between the "word" cipher, and the "Biliteral" will here be shown.

Cathedral and of the existence of "A continuation of the New Atlantis," which were at the time denied, but which have since been verified, Mr. Cary's researches have been of great assistance to Mr. Tanner, the work of both these gentlemen being based upon arithmetic or numerical processes absolutely and mathematically exact.

In April, 1896, Dr. Cantor of the Universities of Halle and Wittenburg, called upon us to give due attention to the collection of 33 eulogies on "The Incomparable Francis of Verulam," printed in 1626, the year generally assigned as the year of his death.* These elegies are collectively found in the Harleian Miscellanies, and in Gambold's edition of Bacon's works (1765) and have been translated and printed in BACONIANA (Vols. iv., v). Considering the nature of their contents it is remarkable that these pieces should have attracted so little notice, and we ask why, when so many learned men must be acquainted with them, they are never quoted or alluded to by the few worthy biographers of "Bacon"—Francis St. Alban? Here we find him described as the "Tenth Muse," "Quirinus the Spear-Shaker;" he is comedian, tragedian, and the one poet, "Teller of Tales in Courts of Kings;" he is the priceless gem of *Concealed* oratory, "Sole Master of Things, and not only of Arts." We learn also to know him as the head of an "Areopagus," a supreme tribunal of Literature and Science. His deep interest in religion; his efforts to produce unity in the Church of Christ; his perpetual efforts to raise all knowledge a few yards above the earth and to "pursue Astrea to realms of light" where he would see "unclouded Truth," are rather hinted than proclaimed, yet one line sounds no uncertain note as to his profound though little paraded faith:—

"*A stole he wears dyed in Thy blood, O Christ.*" †

But (Proteus-like) "walks not each day showing the same face,"‡ and "only those who seek will know the man these records hide." Surely these records and their writers deserve more attention than has yet fallen to their lot.

---

*Baconians are now aware that there are many and strong reasons for discrediting this date. Some of us believe that he then *died to the world*, and that he lived and wrote in retirement and under a feigned name till his death many years later.

† "Mane's Ver., Pt. IV. (BACONIANA, Vol. v., p. 103, April 1897).

‡ "Verses to the Author of the Instauration" (BACONIANA, Vol. iv., pp. 39, 40).

The secrets of Baconism, like those of Masonry, seem to be chiefly attainable by the process of putting two and two together. Here are some ways by which the concealed Author was enabled to conceal, as well as to reveal himself. They have already been described in BACONIANA, but we enumerate them, as being of importance, and because by observation they lead to further discoveries.

(1) Feigned Portraits; (2) Feigned Histories; (3) Feigned Eulogies in Dedications; (4) Feigned Letters; (5) Feigned Epitaphs and Inscriptions; (6) Feigned Errors in Typography, Spelling, etc.; (7) Garbled Catalogues and Indexes; (8) Hieroglyphic or Symbolic Designs.

Many subjects offer themselves for serious research. We need a special fund for the purpose.

We are still in darkness as to where Francis St. Alban was born, where and how he lived, how much he travelled, when and where he died, who saw him die, where he was buried, and who were witnesses to these things?

Modern biographies are for the most part founded upon Dr. Rawley's "Life" of his Master, but even this "Life" must in many particulars be ranked with the *Feigned* histories. The Register of the birth of Francis, son of Sir Nicholas Bacon, at St. Martin's Church, Charing Cross, is unattested by witnesses, and no place of birth is mentioned. Registers at that date were, and are almost to be reckoned amongst the "deficiencies." If Sir Nicholas had caused the birth of this son to be registered, he was not a man to allow an imperfect entry to be made. Also if Francis were registered how came it that his supposed elder brother Anthony was ignored? But there is no entry about Anthony Bacon.

Until recently, the fact has passed unobserved that Dr. Rawley purposely in his account of the birth of Francis, confounds the residence of Sir Nicholas Bacon "York House" with the Royal palace of Whitehall, "York Place." If Francis were truly born at York Place, he was born at the residence of Queen Elizabeth, and this at the present stage of inquiry is important.

The interesting researches of Miss A. A. Leith have revealed the fact that Francis Lord Verulam rented Canonbury Tower, Islington, for 40 years from Lord and Lady Compton, and lived there from 1616, the date of Shakspeare's death.*

This subject should be closely followed up. Let it be inquired

---

* See BACONIANA, Vol. viii. 94—99; 144—149.

—How long did Lord Verulam live at Canonbury? What did he there? Who were the friends who there visited him? What use was made of the mysterious underground passage which seems to connect the Tower with St. John's Gate, Clerkenwell, and this again with the Bull Theatre, with Crosby Hall, and Sir Thomas More, whom we are learning to regard as the forerunner of Francis St. Alban in his visions, though not in his well-ordered methods for the establishment of speculative masonry, and for the revival and *advancement* of learning.

Until recently it has seemed even to be uncertain where Robert "Devereux, Earl of Essex" (now supposed to be the only brother of Francis), was buried. Light appears, however, on this point, and we hope to be able to supply some information with regard to it in this or the following number.

Another important discovery is the window in All Saints' Church, Westbrook, Margate.

The subject, St. Alban, our British proto-Martyr, represented as a *Tudor Prince*, holding a mason's symbolical staff, and surrounded by masonic emblems, the work of Messrs. *Bacon* & Sons, *Newman* Street, to quote Bocaccio, "Cast off the old man and put on the new, and thus what seems dark will be clear and easy."

It is satisfactory to hear of meetings of Baconian lectures, private as well as public, with affiliated societies springing up in various parts of this country and in America. Sketches or reports of such meetings will always be gladly received by the Hon. Sec. of this Society.

Mr. A. P. Sinnett has lately delivered a successful and telling lecture on the subject of Baconian theories in general, and we hear gladly that this is to be soon followed up by another with further developments. The Rev. William Sutton, who has done us excellent service by his series of eight papers in the "New Ireland Review," has been invited to deliver a lecture at Cork, and from Birmingham we hear of a Bacon Society being quietly formed which we trust will be affiliated with our organisation in London.

Many new books and pamphlets have been published, of which, if space permit, a list may be given at the end of this number. The lamented death of Mr. Justice Rice Henn, cut short his intention of writing a book especially for the advocates of his bar; we hear, however, that a somewhat similar work is expected from the pen of Dr. Webbe, another learned distinguished lawyer in Ireland.

We have to mourn the death of Mr. F. F. Arbuthnot, author of the "Mysteries of Chronology," and author-editor and translator of various works connected with Oriental studies. He contemplated the writing of much which would have been of great value to us as attempts "to unravel mysteries of the past which have been often carefully concealed, distorted, falsified, and misrepresented" so as "to render it now very difficult to get at the truth of them."

Another great loss to our Society befell us in the death of the Rev. H. R. Haweis, whose interest in our subjects and confidence in the truth of our statements he never failed to proclaim. He was an interested listener to a Baconian lecture held at Eastlake House Concert Room, Regent's Park, in 1901, proving that "Bacon" and "Shakespeare" were identical, himself adding these remarkable words:—"I have never yet met anyone who thoroughly investigated the matter, who came to any other conclusion."

In newspapers and magazines where our Baconian matters are allowed free air, there have been many excellent letters and articles. In America these are, of course, more frequent than at home. Nevertheless, we may mention a brisk correspondence carried on in the Scottish paper, *The People*, when Mr. Stronach and Mr. Dryerre took part; another in the *Western Daily News*, when Mr. Bathgate, almost single-handed, maintained our cause; a third has endured for many weeks, and still thrives in a lively state in the *Hampstead Advertiser*, wherein the stirring and sensible letters of "A Staunch Baconian" have done us good service. Recent admirable articles by Mr. A. P. Sinnett in the *National Review* and by Mr. W. H. Mallock in the *Nineteenth Century* have so roused London journalists to a sense of their responsibilities, that we begin to hope that subjects full of extraordinary interest and world-wide scope will not longer be prevented from coming into the light by ordinary methods. *We are fully aware of the difficulties* attending on this most exceptional case; but when secrets have become known, they are secrets no longer, and elaborate methods for withholding them from the public eye are mere anachronisms.*

We should have been glad to notice the lectures with or without lantern illustrations which have been given in various places, but space does not admit of this; they have sometimes been repeated, they should be repeated frequently, and reported, and we desire to see this pleasant means of conveying information largely developed. Any help possible will be afforded to reciters or lecturers who please to apply to the Hon. Secretary of this Society.

---

* Since the above was written, many letters, &c., on the Biliteral have appeared in the newspapers.

We cannot conclude this brief review of events without recording the fact which has given us the greatest pleasure of all. It is not generally known that our late beloved Queen Victoria was pleased not only to accept graciously a copy of the "Biliteral Cipher" submitted to her by Mrs. Wells Gallup, but the librarian at Windsor Castle was "desired to return thanks for this interesting addition to the Royal Library." The late Queen was not one who would accept as "interesting" a book of whose contents she had no knowledge: she was *thorough* in all that she did. We now know that it was Her Majesty's intention to master this book, probably, since sight failed, by having it read to her. The volume is therefore to be seen on the shelves of the Royal Library, by her command marked by the librarian in order to facilitate her study of this extraordinary subject.

Copies of BACONIANA have also been graciously accepted by King Edward, and by their Royal Highnesses Princess Christian and Princess Louise, the Duchess of Argyle.

Such episodes seem to be as signs of the times, and are full of encouragement. We work in faith, and with a strong and growing hope that the triumph of truth may not be long delayed, or that at least her chariot wheels stayed by intentional obstruction.

SAINT ALBAN AND THE ALBANNI.

"One that had a wit of elevation situate as upon a cliff."
—*Francis Bacon.*

"The loftiest hill.
Planting his steadfast footsteps in the sea.
Making his the heaven of heaven his dwelling-place,
The foil'd searcher of mortality."
—*Mathew Arnold on Shakespeare.*

ON the 18th January, 1620, "the most brilliant Englishman that ever lived" received the title of Viscount Saint Albans, having in January, 1618, already been created Earl of Verulam.

From childhood he had been associated with the Hertfordshire borough. Sir Nicholas Bacon, when Lord Keeper, had bought the estate of Gorhambury, close to Saint Albans, and here Francis spent much of his youth.

Its finely-timbered deer-park, and its superb sheep-pastures, the best in England, were the ground where his poesy woke and soared. The burgesses of Saint Albans returned him to parliament three times; on the last occasion he found himself elected by Saint Albans, Cambridge, *and* Ipswich. A perfectly unique instance in annals parliamentary.

There is small wonder that he chose his title from the town of such dear associations, but he was not the man to overlook the inner aspect of the name he made his own.

The interest connected with the name Alban is far wider and deeper than at first sight appears.

Francis Saint Alban was a Hebrew scholar of no mean order, skilled in the wisdom of the ancients, and we shall find the name of Alban where we should expect to find it, in the pages of Hebrew Scripture.

Alban or *Alvan,* meaning in the Hebrew and Keltic "tall," or "height," was a Duke of Edom, a descendant of Esau, better described as a Chieftain or Sheikh (pronounced *Shake*), brandishing his spear in the face of his enemies in the mountains of Seir.

His food was the simplest; broth or pottage kept him strong, the latter made of the grain of the country, meal boiled and "supped."

A fierce tribe his, of hardy mountaineers; preferring, unlike their cousins the Ishmaelites, the peaks of hills to plains and deserts.

The Albins from the first were Eagles, who made mountains their coverts.

The great excursion of eastern tribes found the Albins wandering north, south, and west. They left their traces among the stony fastnesses of Illyria and Scythia, as well as elsewhere, their name remains still after all the ages that have come and gone. On Latin hill-sides, on Teuton forest-summits they perched, till, spreading their strong wings and crossing the German Ocean, our *Albannachs* built their eyries on the craggy highlands of North Britain.

George Buchanan, who was well versed in things which we ought to know, says in his "History of Scotland" what seems to fit their case:

"Those who in their peregrinations were forced from their own country, yet retained the name of it, and were willing to enjoy a sound most pleasing to their ears, and by this umbrage of a name, such as it is, the want of their native soil was somewhat alleviated and softened to them, so that by that means they judged themselves not altogether exiles from or travellers far from home, . . . for, though it may casually happen that the word may be used in several countries, yet it is not credible that so many nations living so far asunder, should agree by mere chance in the frequent imposing of the same name."

Exiles, the Albanni found a home in which their natural instincts obtained full scope. The barley meal of the country and venison broth fulfilled their simple requirements, and their active bodies were well nourished by them. Their Caucasian brothers wore kilts of linen, but they, in a colder land, wore kilts of home-spun wool, dyed in bright colours, as they had done in the land of their birth.

Living as of old by plunder, attack, and rapine, these peak-men bore down on their enemies with brows and hands and breasts incised with occult signs (tattooed, we should call it) and Canaanitish gods, carrying terror before them, and havoc too, for their arms were sharp and deadly, and in the centre of their shields they fixed iron picks or *piques*. Large-limbed, strong-limbed, these sons of Alban traversed Britain and withstood the Roman hordes as Picts and Albains.

Having dwelt in the ridges and clefts of Seir, they learnt there a curious art which had originated with the Troglodites, the sons of Hori. Pursued by the enemy, they could burrow like conies and moles, and their cells and subterranean chambers are still to be seen honey-combing the land of cakes.

The study of the cells and catacombs of Scotland would be no unworthy task for any one. Deeside and Lothian have their caves; *Edanodunum, Duneidon, i.e.*, Edinburgh, has earth chambers in which the unhappy Mary Stuart sought sanctuary.

Who excavated them? The Picts? *Who* were the Picts? If any one can tell us, and say they were not what I aver, why, let them do so.

Saint Alban, our "*Pico Sacra*," is a father of many sons, who, hiding behind a wall of their own making, a wall of living stone (like his old namesake of the Alban hills), keep their enemies at bay; hard pressed, the Albanni fly to their coverts, below ground for preference, and yet their Master soared like the eagle, and with the eagle's feather for his crest, ever looked unflinchingly upon the face of the sun. The spear, the lance, the pike, the torch, the brand, the mace, the sceptre, the reed, are all Saint Alban's weapons and crest, and may be all included in one word of five letters, the *quill*.

To the great Brotherhood of Nations—"An emblem is but a parable," as Francis Quarles aptly puts it.

I.—Ancient Verulam.

The ancient city of Verulam, or Verolanium, the Roman name for Saint Albans, in the hundred of Cassio, and the County of Herts, or more correctly in the Province of Mercia, was a far more important place than is generally known.

When the metropolis of Lundinium was yet in its infancy, perhaps yet unborn, the British town of——, yes, of *what?* was a centre of activity and a Royal seat. I hesitate to say the name I think it was known by in those old days, because I have not sufficient proof for the assertion. A Caer it was, and as its Chief was called *Batu Yllan*, I venture to submit the theory that Verulanium was the Caerleon of early days. It seems quite open to discussion where the important spot of that name in early British times really stood.

At any rate Verulam was its Roman name,* and here Cassibelaunus, the great Chief of the Cassii, "king of many kings," built his palace. Wattled, like enough, but still the Royal seat of the "warrior of the woods or coverts," as his name denotes.

As we should suppose, Shakespeare, in his Play of *Cymbeline*, touches more than once on Cassibelan, uncle to Cymbeline, and tributary to Julius Cæsar.

Whether Shakespeare intends us to suppose Cymbeline's palace was at Verulam, or Cameldunum, in Essex (so singularly like Camelot), I cannot say, but as the seat of his late uncle, the British king, was at Verulam, it is quite possible that, interested in Saint Albans as the great playwright showed himself, he meant it to be understood, by those who care about such things, that Cymbeline's wicked wife wandered in her herb gardens there, where he Francis wandered as a child.

It seems that the river Ver formed, in early times, pools and marshes, and in the Roman times when Verulam became a free municipal town and an important military station, it formed a reservoir of twenty acres. A great glassy mirror, reflecting green pastures, banks, and blue sky, it became *gwer*, or *gler*, green glass, or *ver*; (all meaning the same) and gave the river and the town its new name. Williams, in his History of Saint Albans, mentions a fact worth noting, that the Ver was also known as the Mur, and Meuse.

---

* The ancient city was on the S. W. by S. of modern St. Albans. It was called Verulam and Verolam by Tacitus, and Verulamium and Verolanium by Antonius.

"See Historical and Topographical Description of Ancient Verulam," by Fred. Lake Williams. Printed and published at St. Albans, 1822, by Wm. Langley.

Fish-pool Street still marks the site of the old pools, and we hear that Francis built his "tiny but enchanted palace," close by his fish-ponds from which sprang the source of the Ver.

Peter Heylin, in his interesting "Table of Kings of South Britain, Isle of White and of Mann," gives on his first page the House of *Cymbeline*. He was preceded by Terantius, and he by Cassibelaunus, while the two lost princes, Aviragus and Guiridius, so prominent in the Play, succeeded their father Cymbeline on the throne. Arviragus was also known as Peasusagus.

II.—SANCTUS ALBANUS.

Turning again to Peter Heylin, we find Carausius, "a noble Britain," placed by him as reigning after Bassanius, the son of Severus, in South Britain. He seems to have raised to honour a knight of the country, called, says an old MS., "Albane, Lorde of Verelamye, prince of Knights, and Stewarde of all Brutayne." The *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1815, call him *Albones*, saying he "loved Masons well, and cherished them much, and gave them a charter of the king and his council." Another source tells us he was "The King's Chief Architect," and "The protector of all Masons," and that he built a wall by the king's command round Verulam, and built him a palace.

A monk of Caerleon, a Christian College (situation not given by Lake, who tells the story), was his friend, and with him he travelled to Rome. Diocletian then Emperor, does not seem to have troubled himself about this Gaul, or Kelt, or whatever he was, this dweller in one of the many villas which, since the Roman invasion had sprung up in and round Verulam. His martyrdom, unlike that of his contemporary, Saint Pancras, did not take place in Rome but in England, and apparently more because he withstood Roman justice than because he openly declared himself a Christian.

There seems to have been at this period, very little, if any, persecution on the score of religion. The story goes that Amphibilus (which means a mantel) was being searched for by Roman soldiers in Saint Alban's house, and he, to save his friend, exchanged cloaks with him. When taken before his judges he pleaded guilty, and declared himself a Christian. On a grassy knoll above the river Ver he was beheaded, this proto-Martyr of Britain. Flowers are said to have adorned him at the last, and as he crossed the Ver the waters parted at his approach. Many fantastic tales are told by Bede about this martyr, which seem all treated as fables, but it is stated that he was buried in his *Sklavin* or Palmer's weed, and that he carried the cross to his grave. Julius and Anthony were fellow-martyrs with him.

This is the story of Saint Alban, and why this Grand Master of Masons, and knightly architect of the usurper Carausius, whose date was A.D. 287-93, should be represented by Messrs. Bacon, of Newman-street, as a royal figure of Elizabethan date, with *pique-devant* beard, moustache, and peaked felt hat, I leave to those who know to answer.

"Every Man" is but another form of the name Pancras. Reminding us of the Pilgrim in his Sklavin, who, with his cross descended into his grave, in the beautiful miracle play given during last summer in the grounds of the old Charterhouse. Unearthed from the Cathedral of Lincoln, it was possibly once under the care of Bishop Williams, Francis Saint Alban's friend, to whom by will he deputed the privilege of preaching his funeral sermon.

Eventually the bones of Saint Alban were stolen by the Danes, and carried north, or rather, the Norseman thought he had possession of the prize, but a lover of the relics had hidden them safely, and in a church of fine workmanship, which Bede tells was raised by Christians over the shrine of the Saint, Ralph the Archdeacon lifted in view of all people the skull of *Sanctus Albanus*, with those words written on a scroll pendant from the fore part by a silken thread. This, Williams says, "was for the purpose of allaying the doubts of a certain college in Denmark."

It may be surmised whether Christian IV. was altogether pleased at the grave scene in *Hamlet*, the Black Tragedy when he saw it, as he did in London, and whether it brought with it memories of the thievish qualities of his subjects.

III.—Offa and His Vow.

"Some of our writers do record many fables which are fitter for the stage than an history," says George Buchanan. Fable, or no fable, the story of Offa presents an incontestable proof of Shakespeare's intense interest in all that concerns Saint Albans."

He seizes on a most dramatic incident and enshrines the wickedness of Offa's Queen in his tragedy of *Macbeth.*

From start to finish the history of the town of Saint Albans peeps out like a gold thread in the warp and woof of his magic toil.

In 155, Offa, renowned for "military virtues," as Williams tells us, reigned from the Thames to the Humber, and his powerful kingdom of Mercia included part of the County of Herefordshire.

The rest was the property of the King of the East Angles, King Ethelbert, or Albert as he was generally called, wise, young, handsome, who wooed Princess Elfrida, the youngest daughter of Offa.

Offa's Queen Drida was as cruel as she was ambitious; and not content with her husband's triumphs (he had fought and killed the usurper Beornred, and built a wall or dyke about the borders of Wales), she set her heart on obtaining for him the Kingdom of East Anglia.

An opportunity occurred commending itself to her malicious and treacherous heart. King Ethelbert was expected to visit the Castle of Sutton in Herefordshire, where Offa dwelt, and Drida hissed into Offa's ear her poison.

"Behold!" said she, "God hath this day delivered thy enemy into thy hands. If thou be wise, let him be murdered. This Prince, who while he who conceals his treason against thee, desiring while he is young and eloquent to supplant thee, now an old man, of thy kingdom, and moreover to vindicate the wrong which he and others have suffered (as he boasts), whose kingdoms and possessions thou hast unjustly spoiled." The angry king departed, detesting such wickedness in the woman; but first answered her in great indignation with Job's words;—

"'Thou speakest like one of the foolish women, begone from me, begone.' I abhor so villainous an act—which done—would be a blot to me and my successors for ever, and the sin would return upon my family with great revenge." How well we know the interview, and the very words given so closely by Shakespeare. The Queen, led her guest to the banquet prepared for him, and that she might as well make King Offa as Albert merry, joked with him, while he suspected no ill.

It seems that the imagination of the Queen invented and carried out Albert's murder with cool completeness.

She arranged a chamber richly hung with tapestry and silk hangings, wherein the guest might take his repose that night. A deep ditch was dug under the chamber to effect her cruel design.

With serene countenance she accompanied him there when the banquet was ended, and seating him on a chair said, "Sit down, my son, till she comes." Pretending to fetch Elfrida to her bridegroom, she left him, and instantly he was precipitated by a trap door into a dungeon, where an executioner waited to strangle him, assisted by Queen Drida, who, with her instruments, smothered his cries with pillows.

The Queen glorying in her cruelty, caused the head of Prince Albert to be severed from the body, which was ignobly buried by the executioner. Counterfeiting great passion of grief she threw herself upon her bed, feigning she was sick, and confined herself to her chamber.

Eventually she was enclosed in a "private place" for four years, and was drowned in a deep well.

Offa buried Albert decently in Lichfield Abbey, and afterwards in Hereford Cathedral, which he founded.

Williams says poor Albert was murdered "even by his host, who against his murderer should have shut the door."

This was the death of Ethelbert the martyr. His partnership in the hellish crime is pretty well shown by his seizing the kingdom of East Anglia, and "subduing the people by violence."

Then remorse set in; he gave the tenth of all his goods to the Church, founded Hereford Cathedral, and made a pilgrimage to Rome, where he was received by Adrian IV. with joy. Queen Drida had less taste for religion; she cursed the bishops openly, and was full of wrath and rage against them. What Offa wished and did, that wished and did he holily.

I do not think any unprejudiced person reading this story could doubt that Shakespeare had painted his foulest character from Queen Drida. The murder of old King Duncan is given of course by Buchanan in the history of Macbeth.

Matthew Paris tells us that previous to the Saxon incursion, Germanus of Auxerre built a shrine to Saint Alban's memory, but it is due to Offa that the famous Abbey now stands the glory of England.

He went to Bath about the year 770, and anxious to discover the spot where the remains of Alban lay, he had a dream which showed him by a torch of light the exact position of the relics. He dug for them, and 507 years after his death placed about the skull of the martyr a gold fillet.

The Saxon balusters in the trifolium are probably part of the early Church raised by Offa in expiation for the foul murder of Prince Albert. Since then, fresh building, mutilation, demolition, re-construction has each had its turn.

Last but not least, the Fraternity which claims Saint Alban, Lord Verulam, as its chief corner-stone, presented in these latter days to the Cathedral, full of their emblems and traditions, the marble pulpit which includes among its subscribers the present King (when Prince of Wales and Grand Master) and the Duke of Albany.

The North Transept is pointed out as the spot where the proto-Martyr of Britain was beheaded. His bones rest under the stones of his chapel, not far from the remains of that "Good Duke of Gloucester" whose death is shrouded in mystery.

In the eighteenth century some workmen stumbled accidentally on his burial place, and found his remains still well preserved. Perhaps more will some day be made public about this discovery; at present mystery surrounds it. A Latin inscription to his memory has been removed from the east wall, containing an allusion to a religious fraud practised by a man pretending to be miraculously restored to sight at the shrine of Saint Alban, and exposed by Duke Humphry. Shakespeare, of course, records the episode in *Henry VI.**

The words on the wall were, "*Fraudis ineptae Detector.*"

With Shakespeare, "the loftiest Hill," we began, with him we end, the chief or true sheik, who wields his pen for a sword and a torch. In his picture of Cardinal Wolsey we have the thirty-ninth Abbot of Saint Alban's Abbey; first, in 1524, General Overseer (a new office, created for him, by his own appointment). It does not appear that he came down to Saint Albans to take possession, but he spent the revenue in founding his New College at Oxford. He was Abbot in 1536. One other item of interest is this—Nicholas Breke-spear, refused as a monk at Saint Albans, became a Canon in Provence, Abbot or Bishop of Albu in Rome, and finally was Pope Adrian IV. His father, a monk, Breke-spear, was buried near the grave of Richard de Gorham in the Chapter House. The Abbot of Saint Alban's Monastery took precedence of all other Abbots of the English nation in "degree of dignity." Breke-spear gave this pre-eminence to Saint Albans.

That our Saint Alban had much to do with the restoration or the beautifying of the Abbey we may gather from the following inscription on a wall below a window in which was the representation of Saint Alban's martyrdom :—

---

* 2 Part, Act II., S. 1.

"This image of our frailty, painted glass,*
  Shews what the life and death of Alban was.
A knight beheads the martyr, but so soon,
His eyes drop out, to see what they had done ;
  And leaving their own head, seemed with a tear
  To wail the other head, laid mangled there ;
Because, before, his eyes no tear could shed,
His eyes, like tears themselves, fall from his head.
    O bloody fact! That while St. Alban dies,
    The murderer himself weeps out his eyes.
In zeal to Heaven, where holy Alban's bones
    Were buried, Offa raised this pile of stones ;
Which after, by devouring Time abused,
By James the First, of England, to become
The glory of Alban's proto-martyrdom."

ALICIA AMY LEITH.

AN EXAMINATION EXAMINED.

THANKS are due for the prompt and able reply, in the July number of the BACONIANA, to an article on "The Biliteral Cipher Story Examined," but if I may be permitted so to do, I would like to give a few additional references.

(1). The first objection applies alike to the Biliteral Cipher Story and Bacon's acknowledged works, as in either the use of *his* for *its* is very rare.

"The word *its* (*it's*) does not occur at all in any of the works of Shakespeare published during his lifetime, nor in the first folio. . . . Bacon seemed to prefer thereof." (BACONIANA, p. 104, 1, 2.)†

In the first folio *it's* occurs nine times and *its* once, as follows :—

A falsehood in *it's* contrairie .	*Tempest,*	p. 2, Right.
With *it's* sweet ayre . .	,,	p. 5, Left.
Heaven grant us *its* peace .	*Meas. for Meas.,*	p. 62, L.

---

* Sir Henry Chauncey's "History of Herts," p. 472.

† Mr. Candler desires me to state that he did not intend to say that *its* does not appear in the first folio.

How sometimes Nature will betray *it's* folly? . .	
It's tendernesse? . . .	*Winter's Tale*, p. 278, R.
Least it should bite *it's* Master	*Ibid.*, p. 279, L.
By *it's* own visage . . .	*Ibid.*, p. 279, R.
Dying with mother's dugge betweene *it's* lips . .	3 *H. VI.*, p, 136, R.
Made former Wonders *it's* .	*H. VIII.*, p. 205, R.

As there is no punctuation in the cipher, I am unable to determine which form Bacon used, *it's* or *its*, but that he used the word frequently in some parts of the cipher and not at all in others, any reader may easily see. *Thereof*, though more rarely found, was occasionally used. (*Biliteral Cipher*, p. 30, l. 4; p. 61, l. 24.)

(2). "From date 1000, or earlier, to 1767 we find many instances of *his* used instead of *s* in the possessive case, and, for the sake of uniformity, of *her* and *their*. . . . But at no time was *his* used instead of *s* continuously. . . . But in Bacon, after a diligent collation of a very great many pages, I find the constant use of *s* without an apostrophe for the possessive case both for singular and plural, and no single use of *his*, *her*, or *their* in this sense. When the noun ends with an *s* sound, Bacon joins the two words without a connecting *s*. Thus: 'Venus minion,' 'St. Ambrose learning,' and the curious form, 'Achille's fortune,' which may be a printer's error, as I find no other use of the apostrophe" (BACONIANA, p. 105, l. 13.)

If the reader will turn to the Hist. Hen. VII. (1622) he will find "King Henry, his quarrel," p. 24; "the Conspiratours, their Intentions," p. 124; "King Edward the Sixt, his time," p. 145; "King Henrie the Eight, his resolution of a Divorce," p. 196; "King James, his Death," p. 208. Also in *Advt. L.* (1605), Bk. i., "Socrates, his ironicall doubting," p. 26.

The critic further says: "And now for the Bacon of Mrs. Gallup. Turning casually over the leaves of her story, I find 'Solomon, his temple,' p. 24; 'England, her inheritance,' p. 27; 'man, his right.' p. 23 and p. 42; . . . . and, curiously enough, where we might have expected an Elizabethan to have employed *his* 'Achilles' mind'" (p. 302).[†]

Aside from the apostrophe, which could not, of course, be placed in cipher, in the one case—suggested as a printer's

---

[*] BACONIANA, p. 105, l. 13. [†] *Ib.*, l. 41.

error, in the other—the forms "Achilles fortune" and "Achilles mind" are the same. Now let us turn to the Biliteral Cipher, and, omitting the apostrophes, we have: "Elizabeths raigne," p. 4; "Kings daughter," *Ib.*; "loves first blossom," "lifes girlo'd," p. 5; "stones throw," "Edwards sire," p. 6; "lions whelp," p. 7, &c., which shows that both forms are used in the published works and in cipher.

(3). "Mrs. Gallup's 'Bacon' is repeatedly quoting from his own published works and from the plays of Shakespeare."

A reason is given for this (*Biliteral*, p. 25), but there are examples elsewhere. "Females of Sedition" (*Hen. VII.* 137); "Seditious tumults and seditious fames differ no more but as brother and sister, masculine and feminine" (*Ess. Seditions and Troubles.*)

"Times answerable, like waters after a tempest, full of working and swelling." (*Advt. L.* (1605), Bk. ii., p. 13). "And as there are certain hollow blasts of wind and secret swellings of seas before a tempest." (*Ess. Seditions and Troubles.*)

"   . . . . we see
The water swell before a boys'trous storme."
—*Richard III.*, p. 185, L.

"And as in the Tides of People once up there want not commonly stirring Winds to make them rough." (*Hen. VII.*, p. 164.) "For as the aunciente in politiques in popular Estates were woont to Compare the people to the sea, and the Orators to the winds because as the sea would of itselfe be caulm and quiet, if the windes did not move and trouble it; so the people would be peaceable and tractable if the seditious orators did not set them in working and agitation." (*Advt. L.*, Bk. ii., 2nd p. 77 *reverse*, 1605).

It is probable most of the culled expressions in "Bacon's" *Promus* are employed somewhere in the cipher.

(4). "There are, it appears to me, perhaps owing to my ignorance, words used in the cipher story in quite a wrong sense, or with a wrong spelling. I will give instances: 'Gems rare and costive.' Murray gives no example of costive meaning costly."*

"Bacon" may have thought the suffix with the meaning "having the quality of" preferable to that signifying "like."

In treating of metaphysics he says: "I desire it may be conceived that I use the word in a differing sense from that that is receyved," and "I sometimes alter the uses and definitions." (*Advt. L.* (1605), Bk. ii., pp. 24, 25, *reverse).*

---

* BACONIANA, p. 108, l. 34.

Innocuous is used only of things, when used at all, but he evidently employed it differently, and wrote "innocuous of ill" as he would have written "guilty of crime."

We may assume that Bacon had a right to use any word existing in any language if it suited his purpose, and we know that he did Anglicise many from the Latin and the French "*Cognomen, desiderata, cognizante*"—or, as it is elsewhere spelled in the cipher, *cognisant,* might be allowed him on this ground, and "*cognisances*" was certainly in use. ("*Henry VII.*" p. 211.)

Our critic finds "completio', instructio', portio', editio'., &c., and naïvely says: "I should have expected these words to have been spelt complec̄on, &c., as in early editions of 'Bacon' and according to the spelling of the time."*

In the *Advt. L.*, Bk. ii. (1605), we have "directio' speculatio'," p. 33 (reverse); "exhortacio'," p. 3, 74 (reverse); "vexatio' and directio'," p. 2, 93.

(5). "The style of the cipher is not Bacon's."†

There is variety in the style of the published works, and for the most part a formality that he did not use in these epistles. Now and then there are passages that are not what any critic would call magnificent periods. I quote a paragraph upon exercise of the mind from *Advt. L.*, Bk. ii. (1605): "The first shal bee, that wee beware wee take not at the first either to High a strayne or to weake: for if, too Highe in a differe't nature you discorage, in a confident nature, you breede an opinion of facility, and so a sloth, and in all natures you breede a furder expectation then can hould out, and so an insatisfaction on the end, if to weake or the other side: you may not looke to performe and overcome any great taske" (p. 4, 74).

There are a few lines applicable to this objection in the work last cited: "For the Proofes and Demonstrations of Logicke, are toward all men indifferent, and the same: But the Proofes and perswasions of Rhetoricke ought to differ according to the Auditors . . . if a man should speake of the same thing to severall persons he should speake to them all respectively and severall wayes" (p. 67, reverse).

(6.) "And with constantly recurring forms of speech like *'twas, 'tis,* which I cannot find in Bacon (though Shakespeare has the well-known passage: "'Tis true, 'tis pity, and pity 'tis, 'tis true,' but which, in any case, only became common in the 18th century."*

---

* BACONIANA, p. 107, 1—9. † *Ib.*, p. 107, 17.

I can give, if I have made no mistake in counting, 21 where *'tis* is used, in the Shakespeare Plays, in connection with *pity*; 49 in connection with *true*; 13 with *well*; 35 with *good*; 17 with *better*, &c., &c. While making this search I found *'twas* 7 times, and *'twere* 26. I think we may say the forms were sufficiently common.

And finally, "What would a man in such a predicament do?"†

To me the policy of one famous character in the Shakespeare Plays is an answer to that question. Hamlet did not avenge the murder of his father as a bold, impetuous man would have done, but the name of Hamlet is immortal and free from obloquy. And if one would call it lunacy to speak of the cipher, he must not forget that the key was withheld until two years before Bacon's death.

It is unfortunate in connection with such a work to have errors, however slight, so widely disseminated, and I have taken the liberty to point out these mistakes, because not all readers of the magazine have access to the early editions of "Bacon's works," and a wrong impression is sometimes difficult to remove.

ELIZABETH WELLS GALLUP.

MORAL POISONS.—KING RICHARD AND IAGO.

Ut varias usus meditando extunderet artes
Paulatim. (*Adv. of Learning*).

COMMENTING upon behaviour and outward carriage, (as part of the three summary actions of society) Bacon observes:—"On the other side, if behaviour and outward carriage be intended too much, first it may pass into affectation, and then, *Quid deformius quam scenam in vitam transferre* (to act a man's life?)" (*Two Bks. Adv. L.* 188). The literal translation of the Latin is:—"*What is more deformed than to transfer the stage to real life!*" Now, directly the character of King Richard the Third is closely studied, it will be found that he has been conceived *as a consummate stage-actor*, expressed in these words, which Richard puts to Buckingham:—

---

[*] BACONIANA, p. 107, 17. † *Ib.*, p. 107, 1, 17.

Gloster.—Come, cousin, canst thou quake and change thy colour
Murder thy breath in middle of a word,
And then again begin, and stop again,
As if thou were't distraught and mad with terror?
Buckingham.—Tut, I can counterfeit the deep tragedian;
Speak and look *back*, and pry on every side,
Tremble and start at wagging of a straw,
Intending deep suspicion; ghastly looks
Are at my service, *like enforced smiles;*
And both are ready in their offices
At any time to grace my stratagems.
—*K. Rich. III.* Act iii. v.

The *enforced smiles*, as part of the stage outfit of the perfect actor, are perhaps pointed at Gloster, who in the previous Play says of himself:—

Gloster.—Why, I can smile, and murther while I smile;
And cry, content, to that which grieves my heart;
And wet my cheek with artificial tears
And frame my face to all occasions.
—3 *K. H. III.* Act III. ii.

The query might be put, whether Bacon is not ironically alluding, or pointing at, the histrionic* element in Richard the Third's character when giving us the Latin quotation, "*Quid deformius quam scenam in vitam transferre*"? Because possibly, Richard's *deformity of shape and character* both receive their due in this line?

Gloster.—Then, since the heavens have shap'd my body so,
Let hell make crook'd my mind to answer it.
—3 *K. Hen. VI.* Act V. sc. v.

* * * * *

She did corrupt frail nature with some bribe
To shrink my arm up like a wither'd shrub;
To make an envious mountain on my back
Where sits deformity to mock my body.
—3 *K. H. VI.* Act III. ii.

---

*It was King Henry the Sixth who first discovered the *tragic actor*, in the dissimulation of Gloster's character. Just before his death he 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.
What scene of death hath Roscius now to act?
—*3 K. H. VI.* Act V. v.

Bacon remarks of Augustus Cæsar "How when he died, he desired his friends about him to give him a '*Plaudite*,' as if he were conscious to himself that he had *played his part well upon the stage*. This part of knowledge we do report also as deficient. *Not but that it is practised too much, but it hath not been reduced to writing*" (p. 192. Two Books *Advance. of Learning.*—Note the irony of the remark upon the practice of acting in life.

Bacon writes: "Deformed persons are commonly even with nature, for as nature hath done ill by them, *so do they by nature, being for the most part (as the Scripture sayeth) void of natural affection, and so they have their revenge of nature; certainly there be a consent between the body and the mind,* and where nature erreth in the one, she *ventureth* in the other. Whosoever hath anything fixed in his person that doth conduce contempt, hath also a perpetual spur in himself to rescue and deliver himself from scorn. *Therefore all Deformed persons are extreme bold.*" (*Deformity. Essays*). The bold, *venturing* spirit of Richard the Third is thus described by his own mother, the Duchess of York:—

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

The scorn and contempt endured by *Deformed persons*, together with the hatred, or grudge felt towards nature, is admirably set forth in these words of reproach, uttered by King Richard:—

> I, that am curtail'd of this fair proportion,
> *Cheated of feature by dissembling nature,*
> *Deform'd, unfinish'd, sent before my time,*
> *Into this breathing world, scarce half made up,*
> *And that so lamely and unfashionable*
> *That dogs bark at me, as I halt by them.*
> *K. Rich. III.* Act I. i.

Who can doubt Bacon is describing Richard Duke of Gloster, in the passage borrowed from the Essays? If the following description of himself is studied, it still further enforces the Baconian quotation — After stabbing King Henry the Sixth, Gloster exclaims:—

> I, that have neither pity, love nor fear.
> —3 *K. Hen. VI.* Act I. i.

This is the self description of a man "*void of natural affection,*" as described, and probably borrowed from the Bible:—

> *Gloster.*—And this word *love*, which greybeards call divine,
> Be resident in men like one another
> And not in me; I am myself alone.—*Ib.*

In Saint Paul's second Epistle to Timothy, he describes a certain class of evil doers: "*Lovers of their own selves,* covetous, boasters, proud, *blasphemers,* disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, *without natural affection, truce breakers, false accusers,* incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high minded, *having a form* of godliness, but denying the power thereof, which creep into houses, *and lead captive silly women laden with sins, led away with divers lusts*" (Chap. III. v. 2—6) Let us take the last text first, and apply it to Richard the Third. Queen Anne and Queen Elizabeth, both of them, were *led captive* by Gloster in spite of their perfect knowledge of his wickedness. Queen Anne cursed *Richard* for the murder of her husband, and yet yielded to his fascination!

Q. Anne.—Lo, ere I can repeat this curse again,
Within so small a time, my woman's heart
Grossly grew captive to his honey words,
And prov'd the subject of mine own soul's curse·
—*K. R. III.* Act IV. i.

* * * * * *

Q. Elizabeth.—Shall I be tempted of the devil thus?
K. Richard. —Ay, if the devil tempt thee to do good.
Q. Elizabeth.—Shall I forget myself to be myself?
K. Richard .—Ay, if your self's remembrance wrong yourself.

The Queen consents and King Richard exclaims:—

Relenting fool, and *shallow*, changing woman!—Act IV. iv.

It has been seen how the "*form of godliness*"—the pretending to, saintliness, was one of the parts Richard assumed to win the people's favour. Thus he appears in a gallery, propped up by two bishops with a book of prayer in his hand. (Act III. vii) As "*a truce breaker*" he was the first to violate the legacy amity, (called by Queen Elizabeth "*a holy day*")—sworn over his dying brother Edward the Fourth's sick bed. (Act II. i.). As "*a false accuser* he is to be found charging Clarence with Hastings with crimes they were perfectly innocent of.

Gloster.—Plots have I laid, inductions dangerous
To set my brother Clarence and the King
In deadly hate the one against the other.—Act. I. i.

* * * * * *

Richard charges Hastings with having bewitch'd him and withered up his arm.

Gloster.—I pray you all, tell me what they deserve
That do conspire my death with devilish plots
Of damned witchcraft, and that hath prevailed
Upon my body with their hellish charms?

* * * * * *

Off with his head: now, by *Saint Paul I swear*
I will not dine until I see the same.—Act III. sc. iv.

Observe that Richard the Third's favourite oath *of blasphemy was to swear by St. Paul,* whom he sometimes terms Holy Paul. (Act I. iii).

> *Gloster.*—Unmanner'd dog! Stand thou when I command;
> Advance thy halberd higher than my breast
> *Or, by Saint Paul* I'll strike thee to my foot
> —*R. III.* Act I. ii.
>
> By the Apostle Paul, shadows to night
> Have struck more terror to the soul of Richard
> Than can the substance of ten thousand soldiers
> *H.* Act V. iii.

The deeper thinker will probably concede, that there is some connection between this peculiar form of blasphemy and the hint Bacon gives us, in his *Essay* upon *Deformity,* for the passage quoted from St. Paul's second Epistle to Timothy? St. Paul described his own person "*as mean and contemptible*"—and possibly Richard the Third drew therefrom a parallel for himself? The *induction,* that this form of oath led Lord Bacon to draw a general portrait, from St. Paul's writings, applicable to evil doers of Richard's description is legitimate.

In Bacon's *Essay* upon *Wisdom for a Man's Self,* he points out that, "*self lovers end generally unfortunate.*" Undoubtedly Richard the Third answers to this class:—

> *K. Rich.*—Richard *loves* Richard: that is I am I
> Is there a murtherer here? No; yes; I am;
> Then fly. What, from myself? Great reason: why?
> Lest I revenge. What? Myself upon myself?
> *Alack I love myself.*—Act V. iii.

Of Boldness, Bacon writes: — "But nevertheless *it doth fascinate, and bind hand and foot those that are either shallow in judgment,* or weak in courage, which are the greatest part." (*Essays. Boldness*).

Now this was written for Queen Anne and Queen Elizabeth, the former being *bound hand and foot, by the fascinating, or infecting power of a bad bold will.* The entire scene in which Richard Duke of Gloster wins Queen Anne, in spite of her scorn, and of his confession that he murdered her husband, is almost repugnant to belief, did we not know that the power of fascination he exercised, has been painted as the influence of the mesmerising Basilisk or serpent! Queen Elizabeth, yielded her better judgment in like manner to the mastering spirit of Richard's oratory, (seeking to wed her daughter,) and as we have already seen, earned the epithet of a "*shallow changing woman*"—from him! Of Anne, Richard himself wonders:—

> Was ever woman in this humour woo'd?
> Was ever woman in this humour won?—Act I. iii.

Bacon observes:—"And it is no more unlawful to inquire the nature of *evil spirits* than to inquire the force of *poisons* in nature." (Two Books *Adv. of Learning*, p. 138).

It is certain Bacon's conception of evil spirits, does not postulate any extra mundane mechanism, or Mephistophelean embodiments, or indeed anything outside the realm of human nature, for (just previously to the passage cited, of the study of Angels and Spirits) he says:—"But the sober and grounded inquiry which may arise out of the passages of Holy Scripture, *or out of the gradations of nature*, is not restrained. So of degenerate and revolted spirits, the conversing with them or the employment of them is prohibited, much more any veneration towards them, but the contemplation, or science of their nature, their power, their illusions, either by, Scripture, or reason, is a part of spiritual wisdom.—(*Ib.* p. 138).

Queen Margaret calls Richard the Third, *Cacodæmon*, a word essentially *Greek*—which literally interpreted means, *evil spirit, or demon!*

> Hie thee to hell for shame and leave this world
> Thou *Cacodæmon!* There thy kingdom is!—*R. III.* Act I. iii.

---

* Bacon continues upon Boldness. "Therefore we see it hath done wonders in popular states, but with senates and princes less. And more even upon the first entrance of bold persons into *action* than soon after, *for boldness is an ill keeper of promise.*' (*Essays. Boldness.*) Observe the word *Action* introduced here, as a hint for *stage action*, meaning an *actor's or hypocrite's part*, played on life's theatre, wherein boldness covers the deceit. The opening scene of *Richard the Third*—the wooing of Queen Anne is a fine bit of *Action*, or acting. Gloster promised, (on his "*first entrance*" into *action*, for the crown of England), to Buckingham, an earldom for assisting him to the throne.

> *Gloster.*—And *look*, when I am King, claim thou of me
> The Earldom of Hereford, and all the moveables
> Whereof the King my brother was possess'd.
> *Buck.*—*I'll claim that promise at your Grace's hand.*
> *Gloster.*—And look to have it yielded with all kindness.—Act III. i.

Afterwards when Richard had become King, the Duke of Buckingham claimed the *keeping of the promise*. But, quite in conformity with what Bacon has told us, how, "*Boldness is an ill keeper of promise*," the claim was refused.

> *Buck.*—My lord your promise for the earldom.—

To which after many shifty evasions, the King replies:

> *K. Rich.*—I am not in the giving vein to-day.—Act IV. ii.

Even Queen Anne perceives in him evidences of evil necromancy, or of a familiar spirit :—

What black magician conjures up this fiend.
To stop devoted charitable deeds ?—*R. III.* Act I. ii.

And these allusions are not casual, but continued,—he is termed, "*hell's black intelligencer,*" and when he soliloquizes upon himself, he confesses to a certain connection with the prince of darkness :—

And I no friends to back my suit withal,
But the plain devil and dissembling looks!—Act I. ii.

* * * * * *

And thus I clothe my naked villainy
With odds and ends stolen from Holy Writ
And seem a saint when most I play the devil.—Act I. iii.

This colour, or cover of sanctity, is what Bacon calls "*the depths of Satan.*"

The Basilisk was supposed to *infect* at a distance its victims by means of its *poison,* and thus slay, Queen Anne exclaims of Richard the Third :—

Q. Anne.—Never hung *poison* on a fouler toad
Out of my sight! Thou dost *infect* my eyes.—*R. III.* Act I. ii.

* * * * * *

Duke of York.—O my accursed womb ; the bed of death ;
A cockatrice hast thou hatch'd to the world
Whose unavoided eye is murderous.—Act IV. i.

Queen Margaret calls Richard, "this *poisonous* hunch-backed toad" (Act I. iv.) Richard poisoned King Edward the Fourth's mind against his brother Clarence, and by this means got him out of the way. In confirmation of the principle of moral poisons emanating from evil persons, that "*degenerate and revolted spirit,*" Iago exclaims :—

Iago.—Call up her father
Rouse him. Make after him, *poison his delight.*
—*Othello,* Act. I. i.

"Self lovers that will set their neighbours' house on fire to serve their end."—(*Wisdom for a Man's Self. Essays*).

Iago.—Do, with like timorous accent and dire yell
As when (by night and negligence) *the fire*
Is spied in populous cities.—*Ib.*

"But to be speculative into another man, to the end to know how to work him, or wind him, or govern him, proceedeth from a heart that is *double and cloven.*" (Two Books *Adv.* p. 98). Iago completely answers to this description of duplicity. He also is another actor like Richard the Third. Bacon writes, "The poet saith, *nec vultu destrue verba tuo;* a man may destroy the force of his words with his countenance. (Two Books *Adv. of Learning* p. 188).

For when my outward action doth demonstrate
The native act and figure of my heart
In complement extern, 'tis not long after
But I will wear my heart upon my sleeve
For daws to peck at. I am not what I am,—Act I. i.

Iago's "*double knavery,*" as he himself calls it, is to "*work, wind, or govern,*" such characters as Roderigo, Cassio, and Othello :—

Iago.—The Moor is of a free and open nature
That thinks men honest that but seems to be so
And will as tenderly be led by the nose
As asses are.—*Othello.* Act I. iii,

The word "*wind*" suggests the volubility of the serpent,* or possibly may be connected with the winding up, or down, of a musical instrument :—

Iago.—O, you are well tun'd now !
But I'll set down the pegs that make this music,
As honest as I am.—Act II. i.

In Bacon's Essay of *Cunning*, he observes : "*The breaking off in the midst of that one was about to say, as if he took himself up, breeds a greater appetite in him, with whom you confer to know more.*" (*Cunning*, 1625).

This would pass through most readers' minds as a general observation, and has escaped even the student's notice, as probably the last likely trifle to find point or application in the Plays. Nevertheless there can be no reasonable doubt that this, as well as scores of similarly apparently insignificant minute points, are notes or parallels, purposely deduced from passages in the Plays, to which they apply as the text applies to the sermon.

One of the most striking features in the portraiture of the character of Iago (in the Play of *Othello*) is his *cunning*. The extraordinary art with which he goes about slowly and deliberately to undermine Othello's faith in Desdemona, and his belief in Cassio, is worthy of all study. Bacon writes in his *Resuscitatio* of one Weston, whom he charges with the crime of false information, as follows:—"I say, the false information to a King, exceeds in offence, the false information of any other kind, being a kind (since we are in matter of poison) *of impoisonment of a King's ear.*" (*Resus.*, p. 77, 1661.)

---

*Compare Lady Macbeth's advice to her husband :—

Look like the innocent flower
But be the serpent under it.
—*Macbeth*, Act I. v.

This finds its direct parallel in the Play of *Othello*, for there can be no doubt Iago's false information which he first invents out of malice, and then pours into his victim's ear, has been imagined and thought out by the author, *as a species of poison,[*] as the venom of the viper*, transferred, or translated to the higher plane of the morals, where it is the more fatal in its consequences because the more subtle and the less seen outwardly, to others at least! It is certain that after Iago's villainy is unmasked, Othello looks upon the former in the light of the fable, for he exclaims:—

> I look down towards his feet; but that's a fable,
> If that thou be'st a devil I cannot kill thee.—V. ii.

Now nothing can exceed the art, or cunning by which Iago feeds and excites, first the curiosity, and then the jealous feelings of his master Othello. His object is to stimulate suspicion by the most subtle, and least obvious shapes of insinuation,—in short, in every way to conceal his one object, for he well knows: "There is nothing makes a man suspect more *than to know little.*" (*Essays. Suspicion.*)[†]

Because this little, not only, as Bacon has told us, "breeds a greater appetite in him, *with whom you confer to know*

---

[*] Observe how the empoisonment of Hamlet's father the King—is effected through pouring the poison of hebenon into his ear? *False information* as to the way he came by his death, follows the report of his end.—

> Now Hamlet hear:
> 'Tis given out that, sleeping in my orchard,
> *A serpent stung me*; so the whole ear of Denmark
> Is by a forged process of my death.
> Rankly abused.—*Hamlet* I. v.

[†] Compare: *Othello.* Avaunt! be gone! *thou has set me on the rack*:

> I swear 'tis better to be much abused
> *Than but to know't a little.*—Act III. iii.

In perfect conformity with this passage Bacon writes, "And therefore the poet doth elegantly *call passions tortures*, that urge men to confess their secrets:—*Vino tortus et fra.* (Tried by wine and anger) (P. 194 Book II. Two Books *Advancement of Learning*).—Othello exclaims to Iago:—

> If thou dost slander her *and torture me*
> Never pray more.—Act III. iii.

To which Iago replies:—

> I see sir, you are eaten up with *passion.*—*Ib*

more," but it creates the belief that the relater is most reluctant to reveal, what he seems so anxious to conceal from us. And moreover, it leads to the putting of questions, and the wringing of information by the victim out of his tormentor, at slow lengths. In the third scene, of the third act of the Play, this cunning of "*breaking off in the midst of what he was about to say,*" is to be observed frequently in the conversation of Iago with Othello. Indeed, the double object of disarming Othello's doubts as to Iago's *bona-fides,* and of getting the Moor to question farther is attained, for the latter exclaims of this "*breaking off*":—

> *Othello.*—Therefore *these stops of thine* fright me the more,
> For such things in a false disloyal slave
> *Are tricks of custom,* but in a man that's just
> They are close delations working from the heart.
> —*Othello* Act III. iii. 120.

In the same essay, Bacon writes:—"Some build rather upon the *abusing* of others and (as we now say) *putting tricks upon them,** than upon the soundness of their own proceedings." It has been seen how Othello was perfectly familiar with the *possibility* of *tricks* of such sort being played upon him, but his belief in the justice of Iago's character had blinded him. This abusing of one man's confidence by another—these tricks—the placing of the handkerchief (given by Othello to his wife) underneath Cassio's pillow,—all belong to Bacon's description of cunning. Let the student study the entire passage where the *stops* of Iago, and the "*breaking off*" with cruel echoes of Othello's words may be found.

> *Othello.—I think my Lord!*
> By heavens he echoes me.
> As if there were some monster in his thought
> Too hideous to be shown.—*Ib.* Act III. iii.

This continued checking of his words by Iago, has its intended effect. Othello's suspicions increase with "*a greater appetite to know more,*" until maddened by curiosity and the jealousy inflamed by this *charoscuro* of Iago's speech—he exclaims:—

> *By heavens I'll know thy thoughts!—Ib.*

Here then is the "Appetite to know more," which has been bred, by exactly the same sort of crafty artifice, Bacon has so well described in his essay upon *Cunning*, And it is certain that Bacon by his system of double entry, intended to be *his own critic, and his own interpreter*, furnishing in his prose works *not only the hall mark, and sign manual of his poetical authorship, but* providing in these prose texts, finger posts for the interpretation of obscure or difficult passages!

---

* *Iago.*—Beshrew him for't!
How comes this trick upon him.—Act IV. ii. 127.
Emilia.—The Moors *abused* by some most villainous knave.—*Ib.*

Bacon calls "*Cunning a crooked sort of Wisdom.*" (*Essays. Cunning*). Now this means that cunning is, in its movements, never open, or direct, but always serpentine—employing subtility of artifice in negotiation, and particularly emulating in poison of speech, the serpent, as the Psalms describing slander says:—"*For the poison of asps is under their lips.*" The malice of Iago has been conceived as a sort of poison:—

> *Iago.*—The Moor already changes with my *poison*
> Dangerous conceits are, in their natures. *poisons*,
> Which at the first are scarce found to distaste;
> But, with a little act upon the blood,
> Burn like the mines of sulphur.—Act. III. iii.

And the result of this *mind poisoning* is that Othello's vengeance breathes forth the venom fraught will of the serpent's fury:—

> Arise, *black* vengeance, from thy hollow *cell!*
> Yield up, O love. thy crown and hearted throne
> To tyrannous hate! Swell bosom, with thy fraught
> *For 'tis of Aspics* tongues.—Act III. iii. 46.

Bacon conceives Nemesis as always *black*, just as it is represented in the Plays:—

> Your Kingdoms terror and *black Nemesis?*—1st *K. H. VI.* IV. vii.

Othello may be conceived as a man, (by virtue of his wife Desdemona,) dwelling, or placed, in a figurative paradise. Iago comes like the serpent in the Biblical story to destroy his happiness, and to expel him from his Eden *with the serpent's curse:*—

> *Emilia.*—If any wretch have put this in your head,
> Let heaven requite it *with the serpent's curse!*—Act IV. ii. 15.

See Suffolk's curse:—

> With full as many signs of deadly hate,
> As lean faced envy in her loathsome cave!
> —2 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act. III. ii. 313.

The conceit of envy dwelling in a cave, or cell, is borrowed from Ovid:—

> Invidiæ domus est imis in vallibus *antrum.*
> Quacumque ingreditur, florentia protervit arva,

> Exuritque herbas, et summa papavera carpit.
> Quo non livor adit ?

The curse was that the serpent should crawl upon its belly in the slime.

> *Othello.*—An honest man he is, and hates the *slime*
> That sticks in filthy deeds.—V. ii. 148.

Let us take another example of *cunning* to be found in the Plays: the character of Cardinal Wolsey? Queen Katharine thus describes him:—

> My lord, my lord,
> I am a simple woman, much too weak
> To oppose your cunning.—*K. Hen. VIII.*, Act. II. iv.

Bacon writes: "If a man would cross a business that he doubts some other would have handsomely and effectively move, *let him pretend to wish it well, and move it himself in such sort as may foil it.*" (*Cunning*).

This was exactly the procedure of Cardinal Wolsey in the matter of the divorce pending between King Henry the Eighth and his wife Katherine of Aragon. Outwardly, to the King, the divorce proceedings were favoured by Wolsey,* who in measure instigated them.

But directly the Cardinal saw the bent of the King's mind, inclined towards marrying Anne Boleyn, he secretly tried to cross or foil the divorce.

> *Suffolk.*—The Cardinal's letter to the Pope miscarried,
> And came to the eye o' the King: wherein was read,
> How that the Cardinal did entreat his Holiness
> *To stay the judgment o' the divorce*, for if
> It did take place, "I do" quoth he, "perceive
> "My King is tangled in affection to
> "A creature of the Queen's,—Lady Anne Boleyn."
> *Surrey.*—Has the King this?
> *Suffolk.*—Believe it.
> *Surrey.*—Will this work?
> *Chamb.*—The King, in this perceives him, how he coasts
> *And hedges his own way.*—*K. Hen. VIII.* Act III. ii.

In the Play of *Much Ado about Nothing*, Don John crosses the marriage of Claudio and Hero in just the same cunning fashion.

Don John.—That young upstart hath all the glory of my overthrow. If I can cross him anyway, I'll bless myself everyway.— Act. I. iii.

. . . .

---

* He dives into the King's soul, and there scatters
Dangers, doubts, wringing of the conscience,
Fears and despairs, and all these for his marriage.
And out of all these to restore the King
He counsels a divorce.—Act II. ii.

Any bar, any *cross*, any impediment will be medicinable to me. I am sick in displeasure to him.—How cans't thou *cross* this marriage ?—(II. ii.)

Then when Don John has arranged with Borachio and Conrade the slander which is to poison Claudio's ear, and undo his intended marriage with Hero, the former exclaims :—

> Be *cunning* in the working this, and thy fee is a thousand ducats.
> —*Ib.* II., ii. 53.

In Bacon's Two Books of the *Advancement*, he writes :—"And therefore we see that Plautus maketh it a wonder to see an old man beneficent, *benignitas hujus ut adolescentuli est*, (*i.e.* His benignity is like that of a young man)," (p. 182 Book II. *Adv. of Learning*). Falstaff endeavours to obtain a loan of one thousand pounds from the Chief Justice, in which the former fails, and exclaims of the latter :—"A man can no more separate *age and covetousness* than a man can part young limbs and lechery." (2 *K. Hen. IV.*, Act I. iiii. 256.)

In Bacon's Essay upon *Boldness* he points out, that this attribute is good for *execution*, or *action*, but bad in counsel, because boldness is always more or less blind. Too much reflection (or counsel), as in Hamlet's case, is to be "sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought," and to lose the name of action. But Bacon, in his Essay upon *Boldness*, *identifies it directly with action*, which latter, he subtly classes with the stage player's art. It is therefore to be noticed that very bold characters like King Richard the Third, and Cardinal Wolsey, are depicted in the Plays as blind to consequences, and as actors, or dissimulators. Richard the Third is, in accordance with this statement, compared to the celebrated Roman actor Roscius (3 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act V.) by King Henry the Sixth. Cardinal Wolsey is described :—

Heaven will one day open
The King's eyes, that so long have slept upon
This bold bad man.—K. Hen. VIII., Act. II. ii.

And the blindness of action, following upon prejudice, malice, or any other passion, such as ambition, or revenge, is well expressed thus :—

This is the Cardinal's doing, the King Cardinal
That *blind priest*, like the eldest son of Fortune
Turns what he list.—*Ib.* II. ii.

Bacon writes :—"And as the Spanish proverb noteth well, *The cord breaketh at the last by the weakest pull.*" (*Essay. Seditions and Troubles*).

King John is presented, in the Play bearing his name, as wasted and worn with illness, waiting to hear good news of his army. His life only hangs on a thread. All his last hopes are centered in his forces. He hears that the army crossing the Wash has been overtaken by the tide and swept away. This last blow is too much for his enfeebled frame to bear, and he expires as the immediate consequence of the news. The fact that the extract from Bacon given, is to be found in an essay in which already a very great number of texts bearing upon the Chronicle Plays have been found, reinforces the belief, the point is not an accidental parallel.

King John.—The tackle of my heart is crack'd and burned
And all the shrouds wherewith my life should sail,
Are turned to one thread, one little hair
My heart hath one poor string to stay it by
Which holds but till thy news be uttered.
K. John V. vii.

Bacon says "For there is rarely any rising (*Ad honores*) but by a commixture of good and evil arts" (*Essays Nobility*).

Thou wouldst be great;
Art not without ambition; *but without*
The illness should attend it.—*Macbeth*, Act I. v.

The number of these parallels is only limited by the amount of space at the disposal of the present writer (to display them), and the greatest possible sceptic of the Baconian theory would be astonished at their quantity as well as their appositeness were they all marshalled before him.

To say they are *endless* is to state practically the whole truth, and to imagine they are accidental coincidences of thought between two different, distinct writers, is to wilfully allow prejudice to mislead honest and frank judgment.

What do we expect a playwright, or dramatic author mostly to intend in the pursuit of his special art? I take it, every one competent to reply to this question, will exclaim, "*The study of human character?*" That is to say, knowledge of human nature, of the heart, affections, and passions of individuals, with their actions, (in their relationship,) constitute such an author's stock in trade. Now, do we find in Bacon's acknowledged prose writings any indication of these particular studies? Writing upon moral knowledge:—

"So then the first article of this knowledge is, *to set down sound and true distributions and descriptions of the several characters and tempers of men's natures and dispositions;* especially having regard to those differences which are most radical in being the fountains or causes of the rest, or most frequent in concurrence and commixture." (Two Books *Advance. of Learning*).

And in order no misconception shall arise, as to what Bacon is pointing at, he adds further on (in the same paragraph) of this knowledge and its study:—"Both history, *poesy*, and daily experience, are as goodly fields where these observations grow whereof we make a few posies to hold in our hands." —(*Ib.*)

And then following this, we find Bacon, quoting Plautus, Tacitus, Pindar, and the Psalms, to illustrate some of his points upon this subject. In another passage upon moral and private virtue Bacon makes this curious observation—*pointing at the theatre:* "Neither can any man marvel *at the play of puppets that goeth behind the curtain, and adviseth well of the motion.*" (Two Books *Adv.* 1st book). Hamlet utters something very akin to this, when he exclaims (of the interlude) in answer to Ophelia, who has called him "a good chorus":—

> I could interpret between you and your love, if *I could see the puppets dallying.*—Act III. ii.

The especial study of the dramatist's art is knowledge of those affections, and tempers, that set men and women in motion, or action, upon the stage of life. Riches, ambition, love, envy, revenge, anger, cunning, constitute some of the chief causes that go to set actors in motion. If the student turns to Bacon's Essays, he will see what deep study had been given to these subjects, each forming a special study of its own! In addition to these are, "*those impressions* which are imposed upon the mind by the sex, by the age, by the reason, by *health* and sickness, *by beauty and deformity,* and the like which are inherent, and not external; and again those which are caused by external fortune, as sovereignty, nobility, birth, riches, want, magistracy, privateness, prosperity, and adversity, constant fortune, variable fortune, rising *per saltum,* per gradus, and the like."—(*Ib.*)

The effect of deformity upon character has been already illustrated in the case of King Richard the Third. The effect of raising *per saltum,* or at a bound, is admirably illustrated in the character of Cardinal Wolsey in the Play of *King Henry the Eighth.* Almost all these *impressions upon character,* caused either by *internal accidents, or external fortune,* are subjects of Bacon's Essays, *i.e.,* Youth; Regimen of Health; Beauty, and Deformity; Empire; Kings; Nobility; Riches; Adversity; Fortune; are Essay titles! Observe how profound, how admirable, is this *inward and outward classification*; how philosophical, how exhaustive of the accidents that go to affect human characters! Consider the depth of the mind that could observe "That there are minds proportion'd to great matters, and others to small;" again, "that some minds are proportion'd to that which may be dispatch'd at once, or within a short return of time, others to that which begins afar off, and is to be won with length of pursuit;"; "that there is a disposition in conversation to soothe and please; *and a disposition contrary to contradict and cross.*" Do we not all recognize the last observation in many of our acquaintances in life? Is it not true? And in the Plays, surely Hotspur (1 *K. H. IV.* Act III. i.), who contradicts Glendower, and is reproved as follows:—

> *Glend.*—Cousin, of many men
> I do not bear these *crossings.*
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> *Mort.*—Fie! Cousin Percy! how you *cross* my father!
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> *Worcester.*—You must needs learn lord to amend this fault,
> Though sometime it shows greatness, courage, blood,—
> And that's the dearest grace it renders you,
> Yet oftentimes it doth present harsh rage,
> Defect of manners, want of government,
> Pride, haughtiness, opinion, and disdain.
> —1 *K. H. IV.* III. i.

"A man shall find in the traditions of Astrology some pretty and apt divisions of *men's natures*, according to the predominance of the planets, *lovers of quiet, lovers of actions, lovers of honours, lovers of pleasure, lovers of arts, lovers of change, and so forth.* A man shall find in the wisest sort of these relations which the Italians make touching conclaves, the natures of the several Cardinals handsomely and livelily painted forth. A man shall meet with in every day's conference, the denominations of sensitive, dry, formal, real, humourous, certain '*uomo di prima impressione—uomo di ultima impressione,*' and the like," (Two Books *Advance. of Learning*).

These studies of Cardinals may have been useful to Bacon in painting the portraits of Cardinal Pandulph (*King John*) or a Cardinal Beaufort (*K. H. VI.*) or of Cardinal Wolsey? But in any case, the student must perceive Bacon was an extraordinary and particularly deep observer of human nature, or character, under every condition of birth, or accident.

W. F. C. WIGSTON.

THE PARENTAGE OF FRANCIS BACON.

IF Francis Bacon was not the son of Queen Elizabeth, the bottom is knocked out of the cipher story.

The "don't put *my* head under the pump" attitude of some Baconians to cipher subjects is natural. The allegations are startling and difficult to realise, except by instalments.

One brilliant critic on our side, has, I notice, waded into the water, and cast his net over Marlowe, as another pseudonym of the great Francis. Soon others will be wetting their feet.

I do not count myself, who am but the Delia Bacon of the controversy. Someone must do the preliminary blundering.

Mr. Bompas and myself have from opposite points of view endeavoured to see how far historical records of the conduct of the principal parties support or contradict the astounding assertion as to the true parentage of Francis. My first essay treated January, 1560, old style, as coming before September, 1560; consequently I was not only wrong, but curiously enough at issue with the cipher story as well. Moreover, to put the birth a year before it did occur, was utterly destructive of the support which history gives to the truth of the asserted parentage. Grateful for the corrections in the October BACONIANA let me look at the subject afresh.

Mr. Bompas thinks the asserted ceremony of marriage in the Tower impracticable and most improbable, that the eulogy written of the Queen by Francis Bacon, correctly describes her character, and that the possibility of the Queen bearing and giving birth to a child, is inconsistent with history as we know it. He says the cipher story is fabulous. Another critic has ventured to suggest the cipher story is the result of hallucination. I cannot admit this alternative. It is either true or a deliberate fiction. Using the fiction theory of the parentage of Francis, I want to show what natural inferences the writer could have drawn from open story. I assume access by the fiction writer to Froude's History and magazine articles, to Strickland's Elizabeth, to the State records, Calendar of State papers, &c.

Having found the following passage in Miss Strickland's Elizabeth :—"The signal favour that Elizabeth lavished on Robert Dudley by appointing him her Master of Horse, and loading him with honours within the first week of her accession to the crown, must have originated from some powerful motive which does not appear on the surface of history . . . he must by some means have succeeded . . . in exciting an interest in her bosom of no common nature, while they were both imprisoned in the Tower, since being immediately after his liberation employed in the wars with France, he had no other opportunity of ingratiating himself with the Princess"—some sort of marriage between the parties might suggest itself, but with further enquiry as to the extent to which the parties were guarded (although Timbs in "Romance of London" says there was a door from the Beauchamp Tower leading by way of a private terrace to the Bell Tower where Elizabeth was imprisoned) and that one of them was already married, the allegation of a Tower ceremony would have been rejected by a careful novelist, and yet how very naturally and plausibly the incident is dealt with in the cipher story. (See the word Cipher, Vol. 2.)

Our assumed fictionist reading further history would find Ambassadors' letters reporting privately to their chiefs, matters bearing materially upon the politics of Europe, viz., the respective chances of the various suitors of the Queen.

What Mr. Bompas calls malignant gossip are statements made privately and contemporaneously in the course of business as to matters of State importance. Here are some of them:—

18th April, 1559. "Lord Robert has come so much into favour that he does whatever he pleases with affairs, and it is even said that Her Majesty visits him in his chamber day and night." Letter of Feria, Spanish Ambassador.

April, 1559. "Sometimes she appears to want to marry him (the Arch Duke Ferdinand), and speaks like a woman who will only accept a great Prince; and then they say she is in love with Lord Robert, and never lets him leave her." Letter of Feria.

10th May, 1559. "Meanwhile my Lord Robert Dudley is in very great favour and very intimate with Her Majesty." Letter of Schafanoya, Venitian Ambassador.

Nov. 1559. "I have heard from a certain person who is in the habit of giving me veracious news that Lord Robert had sent to poison his wife. Certainly all the Queen has done with us and with the Swede, and will do with all the rest in the matter of her marriage, is only to keep Lord Robert's enemies and the country engaged with words until this wicked deed of killing his wife is consummated. I am told some extraordinary things about this intimacy."—Letter Bishop de Quadra to Phillip, King of Spain.

7th March, 1560. "Lord Robert is the worst young fellow I ever encountered. He is heartless, spiritless, treacherous and false. There is not a man in England who does not cry out upon him as the Queen's ruin."—Letter Quadra to Phillip.

15th March, 1560. "Things are in a strange state. The Catholics look only to your Majesty. Lord Robert says that if he lives a year he will be in another position from that he holds. Every day he presumes more and more; and it is now said he means to divorce his wife."—Letter Quadra to Phillip.

In May, 1560, Cecil, the Prime Minister, the head of the Protestant party, went to Scotland and was away until about August. When he returned he was out of favour with the Queen. Suspecting the worst, we find him obtaining a written report dated 13th August, 1560, from Lord Rich, of the examination of persons who stated that Mother Dowe of Brentwood openly asserted that the Queen was with child by Robert Dudley (see Calendar of State Papers).

Cecil according to Froude decided to resign his office of Prime Minister. Consider what a monetary sacrifice that meant!

Our fictionist would next in sequence be confronted with the following statements:—

3rd September, 1560. De Quadra met Cecil whom he knew to be in disgrace, and who told him under promise of secrecy that the Queen was rushing upon her destruction, and this time he could not save her. "She has made Lord Robert Dudley Master of the Government, and of her own person. . . She herself was shutting herself up in the Palace, to the peril of her health and life. . . . they were thinking of destroying Lord Robert's wife. They had given out that she was ill; she was very well and was taking care not to be poisoned." — Letter, De Quadra to Phillip, 11th September. See Froude's article, *Fraser's Magazine*, 1861.

4th September, 1560. "The day after this (above) conversation, the Queen on her return from hunting, told me that Lord Robert's wife was dead, or nearly so, and begged me to say nothing about it."—Same letter.

8th September, 1560. Amy, wife of Dudley, found dead at foot of staircase at her residence, Cumnor Hall, near Oxford, on a day when all her people had that morning been sent away to Abingdon Fair.

Cumnor is about 35 miles' ride from Windsor, where Lord

Robert was with the Court. Instead of going personally to enquire into matters he sent a friend to attend the inquest.—See Froude's History.

"The conclusion seems irresistible that although Dudley was innocent of a direct participation in the crime, the unhappy lady was sacrificed to his ambition."—Same.

"She (the Queen) had already intrigued with Dudley. So at least the Spanish Ambassador says that Cecil told him and Cecil was the last person in England to have invented such a calumny."—Froude, in *Fraser's Magazine*, 1861.

September, 1560. Rumoured that some private but formal betrothal had passed between the Queen and Dudley.—Froude's History.

The word cipher names a ceremony conducted by Sir Nicholas Bacon in the presence of his wife and Lord Puckering. Is this name misspelt, a mistake of memory by Francis or the bungling of a fabulist? There was a Lord Keeper Puckering in later years. But closely intimate with Elizabeth at the date in question was Sir William Pickering, a rich bachelor at Court.

November, 1560. Jones sent by Throckmorton from Paris to interview the Queen at Greenwich, reported that she looked ill and harassed, and as to the Amy Robsart business said—"The matter had been tried in the country and found to the contrary of that was reported, that Lord Robert was at the Court, and none of his at the attempt at his wife's house, and that it fell out as should neither touch his honesty nor her (the Queen's) honour."—Letter, Jones to Trockmorton. (Hardwick Papers.)

January, 1560. In this month Francis Bacon was baptised. The register at St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, London, records:—
1560, 25 Januarie. Baptizatus fuit *Mr.* Franciscus Bacon.

In smaller writing and paler ink follow:—

"Filius Dm. Nicholo Baconi Magni, Anglie sigilli custodis."

(Other peculiarities are the use of the word "Mr." in the record of a child's baptism, that it is at the commencement of the register and without witnesses' names).

22nd January, 1560, is the date biographers state (but without naming any authority) that Francis was born. This is also the *date* of the commission to Archbishop Parker, signed by Elizabeth. The calendered documents of 3rd and 6th February, also quoted by Mr. Bompas, are unsigned drafts of 3rd and 11th February respectively. De Quadra's interview with the Queen was between 13th and 23rd February. No precise date can be assigned.

22nd January, 1560. Also date of a letter from De Quadra reporting that Sidney (who married Lord Robert's sister) had a day or two earlier offered that if the King of Spain would countenance a marriage between the Queen and Dudley *they would restore the Roman Catholic religion.*

De Quadra adds, "*Some say she is a mother already,* but this I do not believe."—Letter from De Quadra.

13th February, 1560. Dudley personally repeated to De Quadra the assurances which Sidney had made.—De Quadra, Letter of 23rd February.

23rd February, 1560 (about) "*The Queen made a confession* to Bishop Quadra."—Same letter.

"The details of that strange meeting one would be curious to know, but the Bishop this time kept the mystery of the confessional sacred. The sum of what passed came generally to this, that Elizabeth admitted that *she was no angel.*"—Mr. Froude, *Fraser's Magazine,* 1861.

Our fiction writer would naturally proceed to reason in this way :—

We have here the close association of two young people scandalising the public, and causing strong statements to be sent privately by Ambassadors in this country to their respective heads of State.

Next we have in August, 1560, one of those statements which are apt to leak out from serving women to their private friends, followed in September, by an admission by the Queen's Prime Minister to De Quadra that a guilty intrigue was existent. Surely on the assumption that Mother Dowe was right here is sufficient—but otherwise insufficient—motive for the Amy Robsart murder.

Given a Queen with child by one of her subjects whose wife was living, nothing but the latter woman's death, followed by some form of marriage could save the situation. Without it the Queen risked both her throne and her own life.

Dudley's scheme of the previous March to divorce his wife, was amply sufficient for anything short of the serious state of things openly alleged by Mother Dowe.

The nature of the intimacy being clearly admitted by the Prime Minister, the like consequences might fairly have been expected, and Mother Dowe indirectly vindicated. The Mother Dowe assertion at once gives our novelist the intelligible and only sufficient motive for the Robsart murder, to which the Queen according to De Quadra, was accessory before the fact. Dudley the "spiritless" Macbeth, the Queen as Lady Macbeth.

Given the Protestant outcry (see History), at the Robsart crime, public marriage antecedent to the child's birth was out of the question.

What more natural then for a cipher novelist to adopt and give detail to the rumoured secret marriage mentioned by Mr. Froude. First it would make the child legitimate; secondly, if the birth could not be concealed, it would help to save two badly damaged reputations.

While it is certainly true that the probable date of the birth of Francis coincides with the probable date of birth of the alleged child, the cipher novelist is not to be entirely congratulated on his choice of offspring. It was bound to bring many good Baconians into trouble. I agree that the story is consistent with reasonable inference, where it mentions that the birth was concealed. I agree also that Sir Thomas Parry, the Queen's old steward and confidant, being dead, and Cecil doubtful after the recent unpleasantness, Sir Nicholas and his young wife, Lady Anne, were, as close intimates of the Queen, very suitable custodians of the child.

Still, as we were gradually accumulating valuable internal arguments for the Baconian authorship of Shakespeare, it is hard lines, through cipher speculation, to have a recrudescence of journalistic scoffings.

One cannot put all the blame upon the cipher novelist, the Queen and Francis have something to answer for.

Why did she so frequently visit at Gorhambury and lavish so much wealth on Sir Nicholas? A self-respecting fabulist would infer that the mother was visiting her child, whose happy reply to her enquiry as to his age would naturally be gossiped in Court circles.

Why did they go to the expense of a bust of Francis at Gorhambury, when Sir Nicholas and wife were also sculptured, or at any rate, why not have one of young Anthony Bacon as well? Why as the Queen had her portrait painted by Hilliard, should Francis at the age of 16 or 18 have his painted by the same artist?

Why should Sir Nicholas, a very rich man, by his Will, made very elaborately on 12th December, 1578, his death following in February, 1578-9, make no provision for Francis, and why in 1580, should the Queen appoint Francis to the

Court, make provision for his maintenance (Letter Bacon to Burleigh, 15th October, 1580), and from that time forth continue to do so.

Why should the Queen from an early period have permitted him to take a prominent part in advising her in State affairs, and alternated so frequently in her behaviour to him? Was he constantly associated in her mind with a black spot in her own life? Was he, while legally legitimate, a bastard in her own and contemporary estimation? In 1584 we find him writing to her as follows:—

"Care, *one of the natural and true bred children of unfeigned affection* awakened with these late wicked and barbarous attempts would needs exercise my pen to your sacred Majesty." Francis was then only 24 years old.

Why did Lady Anne Bacon address practically all her letters to Anthony, and why was Francis so formal and dignified in his communications to her.—Dixon's Personal History.

Then Francis committed certain acts which might have misled the most careful cipher novelist. Why, though engaged to Alice Barnham, should he wait three years after the Queen's death (1603), before marrying?

Again, when he did marry, why array himself in kingly purple? "purple from cap to shoe," says the chronicler of the event.

Why, when Francis lived at Whitehall during the absence of James I., did he lend himself to the accusation of arrogating to himself Royal state and power?

Why, when made Viscount St. Albans, was Francis invested with the coronet and robe in the King's presence—a form of peculiar honor, other Peers being created by Letters Patent?

Why so secretive in his habits? "Mihi silentio." "Be kind to concealed poets." "Keep state in contemplative matters." Why as Harvey wrote to "Immerito" this "vowed and oft experimented secrecy?" Why cannot even Spedding tell us what Francis was doing between 1580 and 1594? Is it possible that he revenged himself for the secrecy of his birth by the secretiveness of his after life?

So I can only conclude that if the cipher be fabulous on the parentage subject, the writer has steered along a line of very reasonable inference from recorded historical facts. Judges of the Probate and Divorce Division have every day to base their judgments upon similar natural inferences. Facts such as Mr. Bompas insists upon are not procurable in such cases.

Some Baconians may be willing to examine the portraits at Gorhambury and Penshurst, and the "Spenser" portrait.

A gentleman wrote me some months ago as follows:—

"In some reproductions of Bacon's portrait there is a very striking obliquity in the eyes of Francis. I mean the eyes go up a little at the corners like some Easterns (do not droop). The same characteristic marks Leicester's portrait."

I do not think my correspondent was aware of the following lines in the word cipher:—

"The other that you are son and heir to Leicester. I incline to the latter opinion chiefly from a villainous trick of your eye, and a foolish hanging of your nether lip. That does warrant me in thinking you are son to the Queen and Leicester."

PARKER WOODWARD.

WHAT'S IN A NAME?

THOSE who dare to peer into the mysteries of the "Shakespeare" Plays, notwithstanding the frowns of the priests of English literature, find curious facts which even the many diligent commentators have failed to note or explain. Facts will be of more use than theories to the competent scholar, probably a German, who will some day scientifically examine the mass of material which must be analysed in order to solve the question as to the authorship of the plays. It will aid him in the search after truth if any hitherto unnoted facts which each enquirer may ascertain, are from time to time published without inference or argument. Readers will, of course, draw deductions from these facts—but that is inevitable. This short paper points to the fact that the proper names in the following list are either bestowed on *dramatis personæ*, or uttered in the text, and are repeated in different Plays. The reader will ask himself why those names were chosen, varied in form, and repeated by the author, and whether the use and recurrence of them is to be ascribed to poverty of invention, or to chance or to design:—

Francis.	In *Much Ado about Nothing.*
,,	,, *Henry IV.*
,,	,, *Midsummer Night's Dream.*
,,	,, *Romeo and Juliet.*
,,	,, *All's Well that ends Well* (Act III. sc. v.)

Francisco.	In *Hamlet.*
,,	,, *Tempest.*
Francisca.	,, *Measure for Measure.*
Anthony.	,, *Antony and Cleopatra.*
,,	,, *Julius Cæsar.*
,,	,, *Love's Labour's Lost* (Act I. sc. i.)
Antonio.	,, *Tempest.*
,,	,, *Two Gentlemen of Verona.*
,,	,, *Merchant of Venice.*
,,	,, *Twelfth Night,*
,,	,, *Much Ado about Nothing.*
,,	,, *Taming of the Shrew* (Act II. sc. i.)
,,	,, *All's Well, &c.* (Act. III. sc. v.)
Peter	,, *King John.*
,,	,, *Henry VI.*
,,	,, *Romeo and Juliet.*
,,	,, *Measure for Measure.*
Sedro.	,, *Much Ado about Nothing.*
Balthasar.	,, *Comedy of Errors.*
,,	,, *Romeo and Juliet.*
,,	,, *Merchant of Venice.*
,,	,, *Much Ado about Nothing.*
Flavius.	,, *Timon of Athens.*
,,	,, *Julius Cæsar.*
,,	,, *Measure for Measure* (Act IV. sc. v.)
Titus.	,, *Titus Andronicus.*
,,	,, *Timon of Athens.*
,,	,, *Coriolanus.*
Escalus.	,, *Romeo and Juliet.*
,,	,, *Measure for Measure.*
,,	,, *All's Well, &c.* (Act III. sc. v.)
Ferdinand.	,, *Love's Labour's Lost.*
,,	,, *Tempest.*
Dumain.	,, *Love's Labour's Lost.*
,,	,, *All's Well that ends Well* (Act IV. sc. iii.)
Stephano.	,, *Tempest.*
,,	,, *Merchant of Venice.*
Sebastian.	,, *Tempest.*
,,	,, *Twelfth Night.*
Hortensius.	,, *Timon of Athens.*
Hortensio.	,, *Taming of the Shrew.*
Ventidius.	,, *Antony and Cleopatra.*
,,	,, *Timon of Athens.*
Varro.	,, *Julius Cæsar.*

Varro.	In *Timon of Athens* (Act ii. sc. i.)
Vaux.	,, *Henry VI.*
,,	,, *Henry VIII.*
Angelo.	,, *Measure for Measure.*
,,	,, *Comedy of Errors.*
William.	,, *As You Like It.*
,,	,, *The Merry Wives of Windsor.*
Montano.	,, *Othello.*
,,	,, *Hamlet* (1st Quarto only).
Rinaldo.	,, *All's Well that ends Well* (Act III. sc. iv.)
Reynaldo.	,, *Hamlet.*
Katherine.	,, *Henry V.*
,,	,, *Henry VIII.*
,,	,, *Love's Labour's Lost.*
,,	,, *Taming of the Shrew.*
Juliet.	,, *Romeo and Juliet.*
,,	,, *Measure for Measure.*
Helen.	,, *Cymbeline.*
Helena.	,, *All's Well that ends Well.*
,,	,, *Midsummer Night's Dream.*
Mariana.	,, *All's Well that ends Well.*
,,	,, *Measure for Measure.*
Rosaline.	,, *Love's Labour's Lost.*
,,	,, *Romeo and Juliet.*
Rosalind.	,, *As You Like It.*

There are two Bardolphs in *Henry IV.* Part 2, and two Jaques in *As You Like It.*

The playwright used a number of names derived from the word *lux.*

Lucy.	In *Henry VI.*
Luce and Luciana	,, *Comedy of Errors.*
Lucius.	,, *Cymbeline.*
,,	,, *Julius Cæsar.*
,,	,, *Timon of Athens.*
Lucio	,, *Measure for Measure.*
Lucilius.	,, *Julius Cæsar.*
,,	,, *Timon of Athens.*
Lucentio.	,, *Julius Cæsar.*
,,	,, *Romeo and Juliet.* (Quarto)
Lucetta.	,, *Two Gentlemen of Verona.*

Several names formed with φίλος, viz.

Philo	In *Antonio and Cleopatra.*
Philario and Philarmonus	,, *Cymbeline.*
Philotus.	,, *Timon of Athens.*
Philostrate.	,, *Midsummer Night's Dream.*
Philemon.	,, *Pericles.*

And three names in one Play, the *Merchant of Venice*, beginning with *sal*, viz. :—

Salanio.
Salarino.
Salerio.

J. R. of Gray's Inn.

"SHAKESPEARE STUDIES IN BACONIAN LIGHT."

IN a recent lecture in Edinburgh, afterwards published in *The Nineteenth Century*, Mr. Asquith, K.C., gave utterance to the following opinions :—

"To take an obvious and at the same time an extreme instance, few things are more interesting to watch than the attempts of great scholars and critics, like Dowden and Brandes or Sidney Lee, to reconstruct the life of a man at once so illustrious and so obscure as the greatest of our poets. The case of Shakespeare presents, perhaps, the strongest array of difficulties and paradoxes in the whole range of biography. The most splendid genius of his own or any other time has left behind him outside his writings hardly a single undisputed trace of his own personality. There has not been preserved so much as a single line in his own hand-writing of any of his poems or Plays. Such of the Plays as were published in his lifetime seem to have been printed from stage copies—to a large extent by literary pirates. The apparently unbroken indifference of the greatest of all artists not only to posthumous fame, but to the safeguarding against defacement or loss of his own handiwork is without precedent or parallel. The date and order of his Plays, the identity of the 'only-begetter' of the sonnet, the manner in which his wealth was acquired, the literary unproductiveness of his last five years—he died at fifty-two, the same age as Napoleon—his easy acquiescence in the sleepy, humdrum, and the homely dissipations of social and civic life in a small provincial town —that all those questions, and a hundred more, should still be matters of conjecture and controversy is a unique fact in literary history. What else but this tantalising twilight has made it possible for even the most distraught ingenuity to construct the great Baconian hypothesis—which, by the way, an accomplished critic has only this month so admirably capped by the counter-theory—for which there is at least as much to be said—that it was really Shakespeare who wrote the works of Bacon. (Laughter.) The task which confronts the writer of a life like Shakespeare's is not to transcribe and vivify a record; it is rather to solve a problem by the methods of hypothesis and inference. His work is bound to be not so much an essay in biography in the stricter sense as in the more or less scientific use of the biographic imagination. The difficulty is, of course, infinitely enhanced in this particular case by the impersonal quality of most of Shakespeare's writings—a quality which I myself am heretic enough to believe extends to by far the greater part of the sonnets. We do not know that the greatest teacher of antiquity wrote a single line. Shakespeare, who died less than three hundred years ago, must have written well over a hundred thousand. And yet, thanks to Plato and Xenophon, we have a far more definite and vivid acquaintance with the man Socrates than we shall ever have with the man Shakespeare. (Applause)."

The expression "more or less scientific use of the biographic imagination" is distinctly good, and may be commended to the notice of Mr. Sidney Lee, and other so-called "biographers" of Shakespeare. Except for the usual sneer at the "great Baconian hypothesis," Baconians will agree with nearly every word of Mr. Asquith's statement with regard to the "mystery" of William Shakespeare.

We would recommend to Mr. Asquith for study in the intervals of political strife, a volume by Mr. R. M. Theobald, which has just been published, entitled, "Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light," where he will see his argument produced in almost the self-same language. Why, the Asquith argument is one of the main buttresses of the Baconian cause; and in his chapters on "Shakspere's Personal History," and "Shakespere Biography," Mr. Theobald explains the "mystery" in a fashion that has not yet been excelled.

This new volume will prove a mine of wealth to those who have the Baconian cause at heart. Mr. Theobald is not a mere servile follower of Mr. Donnelly and Mr. Reed; but in scholarly language argues every point and position of the Shakespeare and Bacon philosophy, showing us the "same mental attributes grandly philosophising in the stately meditations of the *De Augmentis,* and toying with Falstaffian fancies in Eastcheap, the same nimbleness of intellect, the same exuberance of fancy and brilliancy of wit in both cases."

One of the most conclusive chapters in the book is one entitled, "Love and Business, Bacon's Essay of *Love* compared with the treatment of love in Shakespeare," which it may be said "supplies a long-felt want," as it is a subject which has been left severely alone by writers in answering Shakespearean critics of Baconian literature. Bacon's "Literary Output" is also treated in a way that will surprise those who maintain that the authorship of the Plays, and of the Bacon works were too much for the life-time of one man. But the whole volume is to thinking Baconians an *embarras de richesses,* for which they ought to be profoundly grateful to Mr. Theobald.

The following ought to prove of interest to Mr. Asquith and others who talk of the "mystery" of Shakespeare's life :—

" While antecedent probabilities and inferences from known facts all favour the opinion that William Shakspere was *not* a learned man, at the same time the unbiassed, uncritical reader of the poems must inevitably conclude that the poet *was* a learned man, and that neither genius, nor good fellowship, nor cribs can account for the classic element in his writings, that a stage-manager at the close of the sixteenth century, a man full of theatrical business, and no one knows what other money-making pursuits, full also of domestic cares, with a family in a distant county, removed from London by some six score miles, and a three days' journey, dependent upon him for support, a man brought up in a remote country-town, a bookless district, quite out of touch with the best intellectual life of the cultured classes, belonging to a family and a neighbourhood where even reading and writing were exceptional accomplishments, even among the most respectable and influential townsmen, whose children signed their name with a rude mark, whose own writing was so execrably bad, so unmistakably rustic and plebeian, that one may reasonably doubt whether his penmanship extended beyond the capability of signing his name to a business document, that such a man could be also a man of wide and deep culture, of varied experience, with access not only to the best, but to the obscurest and least studied literature of the ancient world, all this seems absolutely impossible."

This has often been said before, but never so well as it has been done by Mr. Theobald.

CORRESPONDENCE.

TO THE EDITORS OF "BACONIANA."

Dear Sirs,—On recently visiting Canonbury Tower, the residence of Francis St. Alban in 1616—now printed in local directories, by order of the County Council, 5, Alwyn Villas (!)—I saw a list of the Kings and Queens of England, from William I. to Charles I., written on a wall high up over a door in a dark, narrow passage. Inspecting the lines closely from a ladder (I afterwards verified my facts from an exact copy made by the Constitutional Club, by whom the Tower is now used), I was interested to note that the letters F^{r} occur between the names of Elizabeth and James. The character used is Gothic, or old English, the lines are in Latin doggrel. The F is a capital letter, the r is small.

This extraordinary historical curiosity is mentioned in some of the old Histories of Canonbury.* I am glad to be able to testify to its existence. What do the letters F^{r} stand for? Francis Ist?

Yours faithfully,

Alicia A. Leith.

TO THE EDITORS OF "BACONIANA."

Sirs,—Mr. G. C. Bompas closed his article, in the April number, on Edmund Spenser's poems, by saying that "No *fact* has been adduced controverting or casting suspicion upon Spenser's authorship;" but in saying this he has overlooked what appear to be very suspicious facts.

The collected edition of Spenser's works was published, as Mr. Bompas remarks, in folio, in 1611. On the title-page of that book Queen Elizabeth appears on the right-hand side and Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, on the left. They are holding either end of a bar, in the centre of which is a shield bearing a pig with a rope round its neck. This is not a very dignified proceeding in which to picture such great people, and it is not unreasonable to suppose that the title-page has a special significance. The pig and rope bring to mind the passage in the *Merry Wives of Windsor*, "Hing Hang Hog is latten for Bacon, I warrant you," the anecdote recorded in Bacon's apophthegms, of Sir Nicholas Bacon telling prisoner Hog that he could not be Bacon till he was well hanged, and also the little pig which is the crest to Bacon's coat-of-arms.

Is there any good reason to doubt that the pig on the title-page of Spenser's works is intended to represent Bacon himself (hanged hog is bacon), and that the purpose of the title-page is not only to suggest his connection with Spenser's works, but also his close relationship to Leicester and Elizabeth?

The 1611 edition of Shepherd's Calendar does not bear the author's name (nor did any of the four editions which preceded it), and prefixed to the work is a verse signed "Immerito," which commences—

"Go, little Booke, thyself present,
As child whose parent is unkent."

---

* Pink's or Tomlin's.

Now, if Spenser were known to be the author, why should he be spoken of as "unkent?" And why is the dedication prefixed to the work signed (in two places) E. K., and not E. S., as one would naturally expect? This cannot have been done in error, as the dedication in the first edition, published in 1579, is similarly signed in two places. The title-page of the 1611 edition bears a monogram containing the letters BREX, as also do the title-pages of "Complaints" and "Amoretti." The R in the word HISTORIES in the Index of the 1623 Folio of Shakespeare's Plays is really a monogram containing the letters B R, and in the 1671 "Resuscitatio" the dedication to George Herbert of Bacon's translation of certain Psalms is signed ER. ST. ALBANS. The R is broken, and can be read as R or K.

In view of the accumulating evidence that "England's lawful Prince walked humbly without his crown," the meaning of these letters seems to be—

E. K. = England's King.
B. R. and BREX } = Bacon Rex.
E. R. = England's Rex.

It is probable that a careful inspection of other early editions of books which Baconians attribute to Bacon would reveal further instances of this nature, and people who have access to such works would do well to examine them.

There is another matter in respect of which it would be well to carefully examine such books. BACONIANA for January, 1897, contains an interesting article by Mrs. Potts on the numbers 25 and 11 and 10 and 11, considered as Francis Bacon's cipher signatures, in which Mrs. Potts gave many examples of their use. To these examples may now be added two striking ones in relation to the numbers 25 and 11, which have not, it is believed, before been mentioned.

In the 1623 Folio Edition of Shakespeare Plays, 25 of the Plays have an elaborate tailpiece, 11 have none, and of the headpieces 25 are properly printed, and 11 are upside down. These disarrangements seem to be Bacon's way of signing the Folio. Perhaps someone who has access to the Folios of 1632 and 1664 will find that those books have been similarly treated.

Yours faithfully,
A. J. WILLIAMS.

77, Colmore-row, Birmingham, June 19th, 1901.

TO THE EDITORS OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIRS,—I fancy this testimony of I. D'Israeli's to the secret work of "Our Francis" is not generally known, so I give it: "Were the origin of the Royal Society inquired into, it might be justly dated a century before its existence. The real founder was Lord Bacon, who planned the *ideal institution* in his philosophical romance of the 'New Atlantis!' This notion is not fanciful, and it was that of its first founders, as not only appears by the expression of old Aubrey, when alluding, to the commencement of the Society, he adds, *Secundum mentem Domini Baconi;* but by a rare print designed by Evelyn, probably, for a frontispiece to Bishop Sprat's history, although we seldom find the print in the volume. The design is precious to a Grangerite, exhibiting three fine portraits. On one side is represented a library, and on the table lie the statutes, the journals, and the mace of the Royal Society; on its opposite side are suspended numerous philosophical instruments, in the centre of the print is a column, on which is placed a bust of Charles II., the patron; on each side whole lengths of Lord Brouncker, the first president, and Lord Bacon, as the founder, inscribed *Artium Instaurator*."[*] Yours faithfully,

A STAUNCH BACONIAN.

Hampstead.

---

[*] Page 65 of "A Second Series of Curiosities of Literature and of Secret History," by I. D'Israeli.

Baconiana.

Vol. X.—*New Series.* APRIL, 1902. No. 38.

ESSAYS AND PLAYS.

"*Reason must be the last judge and guide in everything.*"—Locke.

OF all the characters of the 1623 Folio Plays, none exceed in *cunning* Falstaff. In Bacon's Essay upon *Cunning* he introduces this:—"A sudden, bold, and unexpected question, doth many times surprise a man, and lay him open. Like to him, that having changed his name, *and walking in Paul's, another suddenly came behind him, and called him by his true name, whereat straightways he looked back.*" (*Cunning*, 1625). In the Play of the second part of *King Henry the Fourth*, the following episode is presented which very closely approximates the above situation. Sir John Falstaff appears, (with his page), walking in a London street, and exclaims:—

Fal—Where's Bardolph?
Page.—He's gone into Smithfield, to buy your worship a horse.
Falstaff.—I bought him in *Paul's*, and he'll buy me a horse in Smithfield. If I could get me a wife in the stews, I were manned, horsed, and wived.

[*Enter the Lord Chief Justice, and an attendant.*]

Page.—Sir, here comes the nobleman that committed the Prince for striking him about Bardolph.
Fal.—Wait close, I will not see him.
Ch. Just.—What's he that goes there?
Attend.—Falstaff, an't please your lordship.
Ch. Just.—He that was in question for the robbery?
Attend.—He, my lord. But he hath since done good service at Shrewsbury; and as I hear, is now going with some charge, to the lord John of Lancaster.
Ch. Just.—What, to York? Call him back again.
Attend.—*Sir John Falstaff!*
Fal.—*Boy, tell him I am deaf.*
Boy.—*You must speak louder, my master is deaf.*
Ch. Just.—*I am sure he is to, to the hearing of anything good.* Go, pluck him by the elbow; I must speak with him.—2 *K. Hen. IV.*, Act I. ii.

Observe how Falstaff was what was called a "Paul's man," a frequenter of "Paul's walk"—Saint Paul's Cathedral being used as a general promenade, place of resort, and business exchange at the period in question, even down to Bacon's days. Prince Henry describes Falstaff with these words:—"This oily rascal *is known as well as Paul's.* Go, call him forth" (1 *K. Hen. IV.*, Act II. iv.). And although the scene from the Play does not take place in St. Paul's Church, nor has Falstaff changed his name, nevertheless when the fat Knight practically answers the Chief Justice's call, *by declaring he is deaf,*—he really gives himself away, and, in Bacon's words "*he looked back,*" *i.e.*, acknowledges that he heard himself called! The Chief Justice is not deceived—he is quite sure Falstaff *heard his summons,*—his deafness is only simulated,—a cunning that he puts on to escape reprehension of his faults,—for he does not want to hear anything good. Prince Henry, in commenting upon Falstaff's character, exclaims of him, "*Wherein cunning but in craft?*" (1 *K. Hen. IV.*, Act II. iv.). In a parallel of this sort, exactness of every detail must not be expected. Bacon presents us, in his Essay, with an example of a cunning man surprised out of his habitual caution, by suddenly hearing his name boldly called, and the like situation is presented by Falstaff's case.

In his Essay upon *Vain Glory,* Bacon observes:—"They that are *glorious* must needs be *factious;* for all bravery stands upon comparisons. They must needs be *violent,* to make good their own vaunts. Neither can they be secret, and therefore not effectual; but according to the *French* proverb, "*Beaucoup de bruit, peu de fruit.*" "Much bruit, little fruit." (*Essays. Vain Glory,* 1625.)

Of all the *followers and friends* of Falstaff, none answers closer to this description than Pistol. As his name suggests, he is of a fiery, explosive, or violent temperament, full of sound and big words, but of very little performance.

> *Pistol.*—Save you, Sir John!
> *Fal.*—Welcome ancient Pistol. Here, Pistol, I *charge* you with a cup of sack: do you *discharge* upon mine hostess.
> *Pistol.*—I will *discharge* upon her, Sir John, with two bullets.
> *Fal.*—*She is pistol* proof, sir; you shall hardly offend her.*
> —2 *K. Hen. IV.*, Act II. iv.

---

* It is hardly doubtful, that the name of *Pistol* was chosen with a keen sense of its appropriate character, as applied to this noisy, swaggering. swasher. For Pistol himself exclaims to Nym:—

> For I can take, *and Pistol's cock is up,*
> *And flashing fire will follow.*—*K. Hen. V.*, Act II. i.

. . . . . .

> *Pistol.*—My name is *Pistol* called [*exit.*]
> *K. H. V.*—*It sorts well with your fierceness.*—*Ib.* Act IV. i.

In a scene, laid upon the field of Agincourt, Pistol is introduced capturing a French soldier, who entreats mercy at his hands, speaking in the French language. Pistol's replies are highly amusing, from his complete ignorance of French. A boy translates for Pistol's benefit, and he replies to his prisoner's demands for mercy :—

> *Pistol.*—As I suck blood,* I will some mercy show. Follow me.
>
> *Boy.*—*Suivez vous le grande capitaine.* [Exit French soldier.] I did never know so full a voice issue from so empty a heart; but the saying is true, *the empty vessel makes the greatest sound.* Bardolph and Nym had ten times more valour than this *roaring devil* i' the old Play, that everyone may pare his nails with a wooden dagger.—*K. Hen. V.*, Act IV. iv.

This description of Pistol, *as "full of sound and fury," but without much performance,* is echo to Bacon's *French proverb,* he quotes, "*Beaucoup de bruit, peu de fruit.*"—*Much noise, little result ;* and if the reader will turn to the scene, cited from the Play, he will probably understand, from the amount of French introduced, the hint, Bacon gives us, in furnishing a proverb in that language, pointing at Pistol's noisy violence so excellently illustrated in his treatment of his prisoner.

> *Boy.*—As young as I am, I have observed these three swashers. I am boy to them all three; but all they three, though they would serve me, could not be man to me ; for indeed, three such antics do not amount to a man. For Bardolph he is white-livered and red-faced ; by the means whereof a faces it out but fights not. For Pistol—he hath a killing tongue and a quiet sword, by the means whereof a breaks words, and keeps whole weapons.—*K. Hen. V.*, Act III. ii.

Bacon has declared that vain glorious men "cannot be secret, *and therefore not effectual.*" And in his Essay upon *Followers and Friends,* he says, "Likewise *Glorious Followers,* who make themselves as *trumpets,* of the commendation of those they follow, are full of inconvenience ; for they taint business through want of secrecy, and they export honor from a man,

---

* Pistol and Nym are presented in the Plays as *horseleeches,* or bloodsuckers :—

Pistol.—Yoke fellows in arms,
Let us to France ! *Like horseleeches, my boys ;*
To suck, to suck, the very blood to suck.—*K. Hen. V.*, Act II. iii.

In Bacon's collection of proverbs, borrowed from Solomon, he observes :—"This parable was by the Ancients expressed and shadowed forth, under the fable of the *two horseleeches,* the full, and the hungry. For oppression coming from the poor and necessitous persons, is far more heavy than the oppression caused by the full and rich, because it is such, as seeks out all arts of exaction, and all angles for money" (p. 390, Prov. xxviii., Book VIII., *Adv. of L.*, 1640). Observe that Pistol obtains *two hundred crowns,* as ransom for the life of his French prisoner.

and make him a return in envy." (*Essays. Followers and Friends*, 1625.)

This last remark is very apparent in the case of Falstaff, and his followers, Nym, and Pistol. They betray him to Ford :—

Nym.—I have operations, which be humours of revenge.
Pistol.—Wilt thou revenge?
Nym.—By Welkin, and her stars!
Pistol.—With wit, or steel?
Nym.—With both the humours I.
I will discuss the humour of this love to Ford.—*M. Wives* I. iii.

Parolles, in the Play of *All's Well that ends Well*, is a *glorious follower*, also, (like Pistol), full of fine promises, and frothy words, but like all boasters, a poor doer! Bacon was probably thinking of the *Miles Gloriosus* of Plautus, when he wrote this passage, as a finger post, for such characters as Ajax, Parolles, Pistol, Nym, and others of their class. Parolles is described "He's a good drum, my lord, but a naughty orator." That is to say—all noise, and little else." (Act V. iii.).

In my last article I pointed out how Bacon quotes from the Play of Plautus (Miles Gloriosus)—"Plautus maketh it a wonder to see an old man beneficent, *Benignitas quidem hujus oppidò ut adolescentuli est*, and Saint Paul, commanding that the severity of discipline should be used to the *Cretans*, accuseth the nature of that nation from a poet, '*Cretenses semper mendaces, malæ bestiæ, ventres pigri.*'" (Book VII., p. 354, *Adv. of Learning*, 1640.) In Bacon's collection of *Antitheta*, under the head of *Vain Glory*, is the entry :—"*Thraso is Gnathoe's prey*" (Antitheta, XIX., Book VI., p. 309, *Adv. of Learning*, 1640). Thraso is a blustering, cowardly, boasting Captain, in Terence's Comedy of the Eunuch. It is evident from these two entries, that Bacon had been very closely studying the Plays of *Plautus*, and *Terence*, with regard to characters *vainglorious, from a military point of view.* A *Miles Gloriosus* was a blustering braggadocio, or Barbason (see Eunuch, Prol. 31). I think that Falstaff, Pistol, Corporal Nym (Parolles and Ajax also) fairly may be classed under this head as Thrasonical, vainglorious soldiers? And certainly of all the characters in the Plays, none exceed them *in the art of lying*, particularly Falstaff, who in this point suffers no comparison!—In his relation to the Prince, of how he was robbed at Gadshill, his account of the number who attacked and robbed him grows from two to eleven! The Prince exclaims to Falstaff: "These *lies* are like the father that beget them, *gross as a mountain*, open, palpable. Why, thou clay-brained guts, etc."—(1 *K. Hen. IV*. Act II. iv). When we think of Falstaff, his easy art of turning everything that is against him to his advantage, by means of a falsehood immediately occurs to us! But there is one still more striking feature about him, and that is his gluttony (and his drinking propensities), represented outwardly by his huge stomach and slothful habits. Such epithets applied to him as "fat paunch;"—"fat kidney'd rascal;"—"a gross fat man;"—"the fat knight with the great pelly doublet," (*K. Hen. V.*, IV. vii.) are endless, always pointing to him as a *glutton and a sloth.* He is described as:—"fat witted with drinking of old sack, and unbuttoning thee after supper, and sleeping upon benches after noon."—(1 *K. Hen, IV*. I. ii.). Falstaff is so fat that he confesses: "Eight yards of uneven ground is threescore and ten miles afoot with me"—(*Ib.* Act II. sc. ii.) The Prince exclaims:—

> *Hen.*—Peace, ye fat guts!
>
> *Fal.*—Have you any levers to lift me up again, being down? 'S'blood, I'll not bear mine own flesh so far afoot again, for all the coin in thy father's exchequer. (*Ib.*)

In every sense of the flesh Falstaff answers to St. Paul's description of the Cretans, that is to say as a liar, an evil liver, a slothful belly, or glutton.

> *K. Hen. V.*—I have long dreamed of such a kind of man,
> So surfeit swell'd, so old, and so profane;
> But, being awake, I do despise my dream.
> Make less thy body, hence and more thy grace;
> *Leave gormandising.*—2 *K. Hen. IV.* Act V. v.

St. Paul describes the Cretans, as, "*Unruly men, vain talkers, and deceivers.* One of themselves, a prophet of them, once said, Cretans are always *liars, evil beasts, idle gluttons:* this testimony is true." (Epistle to Titus.) This is the passage Bacon alludes to, which he cites in Latin. Certainly Falstaff and his followers, Bardolph, Pistol, and Nym, in every sense, are "*unruly men, vain talkers,*" and in this last attribute the touch is in conformity with the subject (Bacon is studying in the Plays of *Plautus* and *Terence*); *i.e.*, Vainglorious Soldiers! As "*evil beasts,*" certainly the text confirms the postulate.

> *Nym.*—I will cut thy throat, one time or other, in fair terms; that is the humour of it.
> *Pistol.*—*Coupe le gorge!* that's the word? I thee defy again!
> *O hound of Crete*, thinkst thou my spouse to get.
> (*K. Hen. V.* Act. II. i.)

Nothing is so insistent in the portraiture of Falstaff as his fat—the outcome of gluttony.

> *Fal.*—You make fat rascals, Mistress Doll.
> *Doll.*—I make them! Gluttony and diseases make them; I make them not. (2 *Hen. IV.* Act II. sc. iv.)

As an evil liver, or evil beast, Falstaff is described as a "*Bartholomew Boar-pig*" (*Ib.*) The Prince describes him thus:—"There is a devil haunts thee, in the likeness of a fat old man: a tun of man is thy companion. Why dost thou converse with that trunk of humours, that bolting hutch of beastliness, that swoln parcel of dropsies, that huge bombard of sack, that stuffed cloak-bag of guts, that roasted manningtree-ox with the pudding in his belly, that reverend vice, that grey iniquity, that father ruffian, that vanity in years" (1 *K. Hen. IV.* Act II. iv).

In his Essay upon *Nobility*, Bacon says:—"We will speak of *Nobility*, first as a portion of an estate; then *as a condition of particular persons*." "As for *Nobility in particular persons;* it is a reverend thing, to see an *ancient castle* or building not in decay; or *to see a fair timber tree sound and perfect*." (*Nobility*, 1625.)

Sir John Falstaff is described by the Lord Chief Justice, *as an old and decayed man*:—"Is not your voice broken? your wind short? your chin double? your wit single? and every part about you *blasted with antiquity?* And will you yet call yourself young? Fye, fye, fye, Sir John?" (2 *K. Hen. IV.*, Act I. ii.) In this same Play, Poins compares Falstaff to an old and *dead timber tree.*

> *Poins.*—Answer, thou dead elm, answer!
> (2 *K. Hen. IV.* II. iv.)

That is to say, *Falstaff is not sound or perfect*, and in this comparison, Bacon's "*condition of particular persons*," can be perceived, as applied very happily, to an example of nobility!

Prince Henry, in a passage quoted, calls Falstaff's lies "*gross as a mountain*."—1 *K. Hen. IV.* Act II. iv.

Bacon writes upon *Boldness*, "Nay, you shall see a *Bold fellow*, many times do Mahomet's miracle. Mahomet made the people believe, that he would call an hill to him; and from the top of it, offer up his prayers, for the observers of his law. The people assembled; Mahomet called the hill to come to him, again and again; and when the hill stood still, he was never a bit abashed, but said, 'If the hill will not come to Mahomet, Mahomet will go to the hill.' So these men when they have promised great matters, and failed most shamefully (yet if they have the perfection of *boldness*) *they will but slight it over, and make a turn, and no more ado.* Certainly to men of great judgment, *Bold persons are a sport to behold*; Nay, and to the vulgar also, Boldness hath somewhat of the ridiculous. For if absurdity be the subject of laughter, doubt you not but great *Boldness is seldom without some absurdity.*" (*Boldness. Essays*, 1625.)

Observe how Falstaff, after being detected in all manner of "*mountainous lies,*" outfaces by boldness, and in Bacon's own words, "*slights it over, and makes a turn*" out of the difficulty presented by his detection, with "*no more ado,*" than a fresh falsehood! After vaunting of his fight at Gadshill, *with eleven men in buckram suits*, the Prince thinks he will cover Falstaff with confusion and shame, by disclosing the true facts, *i.e.*, that the Prince, and Poins, were really the men who fell upon Falstaff and robbed him.

> *P. Henry.*—What trick, what device, what starting hole, can'st thou now find out, to hide thee from this open, and apparent shame?
> *Poins.*—Come, let's hear Jack: What trick hast thou now?
> *Falstaff.*—By the Lord, *I knew ye as well as He that made ye.* Why, hear me, my masters: Was it for me to kill the heir apparent? Should I turn upon the true prince?
> (1 *K. Hen. IV.* Act II. iv.)

Here is Bacon's "*turn*" and "*slight over*"—and "*no more ado,*" of the bold man, which provokes our laughter. Observe how Falstaff furnishes amusement, or sport to all classes—to men of *great judgment,* like the Lord Chief Justice, to whom he exclaims :—

> "My Lord, this is a poor mad soul, and she says up and down the town, that her eldest son is like you."
> *Lord Ch. Justice.*—Sir John, Sir John, I am well acquainted with your way of wrenching the true cause the false way. It is not a *confident brow, nor the throng of words that come with such more than impudent sauciness* from you, can thrust me from a level consideration.—2 *K. Hen. IV.* Act II. i.

To this Falstaff replies :—"You call honourable *boldness,* '*impudent sauciness.*'" (2 *K. H. IV.* II. i.) This absurd scene, between the Lord Chief Justice and Falstaff, is a good instance of what Bacon calls the ridiculous. In another scene, Falstaff appears acting the part of the Prince's father, and affords this time *sport* to the vulgar :—

> *Fal.*—Well, an the fire of grace be not quite out of thee, now shalt thou be moved. Give me a cup of sack, to make mine eyes look red that it may be thought I have wept; for I must speak in passion and I will do it in King Cambyses' vein.
> *P. Hen.*—Well, here is my leg.

Fal.—And here is my speech; stand aside, nobility.
Hostess.—This is excellent *sport*, i' faith.
Fal.—Weep not, sweet Queen, for trickling tears are vain.
Hostess.—O, the father, how he holds his countenance!
—1 *K. Hen. IV.*, Act. II. iv.

Bacon opens his Essay upon *Followers and Friends* as follows:—"Costly followers are not to be liked; lest while a man maketh his train longer, he maketh his wings shorter" (1625). This was an experience Falstaff evidently arrived at, for in the *Merry Wives*, he is to be found shortening his train:—

Fal.—Truly, mine host, *I must turn away some of my followers.*
Host.—Discard, bully Hercules; cashier: let them wag; trot, trot.
Fal.—I sit at ten pounds a week.
Host.—Thou'rt an Emperor, Cæsar, Keisar, and Pheezar. I will entertain Bardolph; he shall draw, he shall tap; said I, well bully Hector.
—*Merry Wives*, Act I. iii.

The *violence* Bacon attributes to such *glorious soldiers*, as Pistol, Parolles, and Ajax, may be studied, in the second part of the Play of *King Henry the Fourth*, to advantage. Pistol is introduced as so *violent*, that Falstaff has to eject him at the point of the rapier, out of the tavern where the scene is laid:—

Doll.—Thrust him downstairs, I cannot endure such a fustian rascal.
Pist.—Thrust him downstairs! Know we not Galloway nags?
Fal.—Quoit him down Bardolph, like a shovel groat shilling.
Nay, if he do nothing but speak nothing, he shall be nothing here.
Bard.—Come! get you downstairs.
Pist.—What, shall we have incision? Shall we imbrue? [Snatching up his sword.]
Then death rock me asleep, abridge my doleful days!
Why then, let grievous, ghastly, gaping wounds
Untwine the sisters three! Come, Atropos I say!
Host.—Here's goodly stuff toward!
Fal.—Give me my rapier, boy
Dol.—I prithee, Jack, I prithee, do not draw.
Fal.—Get you downstairs. [Drawing and driving Pistol out.]
2 *K. Hen. IV.*, Act II, iv.

Another instance of this kind will be found in *King Henry the Fifth*, in a scene between Pistol and Corporal Nym. (Act II. sc. i.) Bacon has remarked that "They that are *glorious* must needs be *factious*" (*Vain Glory. Essays*). This is prominently introduced with regard to the character of Ajax in the Play of *Troilus and Cressida*. Ajax becomes factious to the faction of Achilles, and is full of *vainglorious comparisons.* Nestor exclaims:—"Their fraction is more our wish than their faction." (Act II. sc. iii.) And Ajax, comparing himself, with Achilles, exclaims, whilst full of the very trumpeting vainglory he is condemning:—

Ajax.—What is he more than another?
Agam.—No more than what he thinks himself.
Ajax.—Is he so much? *Do you not think he thinks himself a better man than I am?*
Agam.—No question.
Ajax.—Will you subscribe his thought, and say he is?
Agam.—No, noble Ajax; you are as strong, as valiant, as wise, no less noble, much more gentle, and altogether more tractable.
Ajax.—Why should a man be proud? How doth pride grow? I know not what pride is.
Agam.—Your mind's the clearer, Ajax, and your virtue's the fairer. He that is proud eats up himself; pride is his own glass, his own *trumpet.*
—*Troilus and Cressida.* Act II., iii.

In his Essay upon *Anger* Bacon writes:—"The Scriptures exhort us, '*To possess our souls in patience.*' Whosoever is out of patience, is out of possession of his soul. Men must not turn bees—'*Animasque in vulnere ponunt*' (*i.e.*, lay down their lives in the wound). Anger is certainly a sort of baseness. As it appears well in the weakness of those subjects in whom it reigns—children, women, old folks, sick folks" (*Anger. Essays*, 1625).

Henry Percy, who was surnamed Hotspur, from his fiery, impetuous, rash, or *hot* temper, answers very closely to the first part of the above passage quoted from Bacon. In the Play, where he appears, he is presented as a man of so *impatient a temperament*, that he may be said actually to have (like a bee) laid down his life in the wound, *i.e.*, sacrificed himself and his cause. A study of the first part of the Play of *King Henry the Fourth* will endorse this parallel. Hotspur sought revenge upon Bolingbroke, out of temper, and would not listen to the sober counsel of his friends.

Worcester.—Farewell kinsman! I will talk to you
When you are better temper'd to attend.
North.—Why, what a *wasp-tongue* and *impatient* fool
Art thou, to break into this *woman's mood*.
Tying thine ear to no tongue but thine own.
Hotspur.—Why, look you, I am whipp'd and scourg'd with rods,
Nettled, and stung with pismires, when I hear
Of this vile politician Bolingbroke.—1 *K. Hen. IV.*, Act I. iii.

This is the portrait of a man so angry, that he *is out of patience*, giving way to what, Bacon has told us, is a weakness of women—*a* "*woman's mood*!"

Worcester, elsewhere, in commenting upon Hotspur's contradictory temper, and love of crossing others, observes of it:—

Yet oftentimes it doth present harsh rage
Defect of manners, *want of government.*
—1 *K. Hen. IV.*, III. i.

This is Bacon's, "Whosoever is out of patience, is out of possession of his soul"—*i.e.*, out of self-government! Hotspur would not follow his friends' counsel, but (without his father's help), rashly urged on by his angry spirit, fought (with inadequate forces), at Shrewsbury, King Henry the Fourth, where he was slain. Truly, Henry Percy realised Bacon's words—he turned bee (or wasp), and lay down his life in the wound!

W. F. C. WIGSTON.

CUPID IN THE SONNETS.

FRANCIS BACON, desiring to give to the world an example, or, as he terms it, a "platform," of allusive poesy, and at the same time to give just praise to, and a true estimate of, that marvellous genius with which he realized that God had endowed him, wrought out that creative marvel, "The Sonnets of Shake-speare"—a goal of poetic endeavour beyond which there will be no passing for many centuries. In the character of Cupid in his two manifestations as the oldest of the Greek gods—the god of creative or forming processes, and as the later smaller figure, "the little Love-God," Eros, or Desire, or Will, Bacon chose the figure by which to allude to his own genius or art child.

Bacon looked upon his poetic genius as "the world's fresh ornament," and in the first seventeen beautiful Sonnets calls upon that genius to reproduce itself in art children, closing with those powerful trumpet blasts of fame found in numbers 18 and 19. Thus it is that it appears by necessity to those who see the literal sense of these verses only, that this poet addresses a young man, presumably Southampton or Pembroke, and out of which literal interpretation, supplemented by the Stratford personality, has grown the absurd, debasing, and irreconcilable theories of these divine verses and of their supposed author.

In number 4 the person addressed is referred to as "thy sweet selfe," but not until 19 is there a probable allusion to the perpetual youth of Cupid in the line,—

"My love shall in my verse *ever live young.*"
"He was five thousand years a boy," says Shakespeare.

Sonnet 20 is as nearly a key to the whole collection as could be composed. There, as we see, the "Master Mistris" of the poet's poetic passion, has the face of a woman and the form ("hew") of a man, the word in the original Quarto being usually wrongly printed "hue" for colour or complexion. This person is "a man in hew" (form) "all *Hews* (forms) in his controuling," a direct allusion to Cupid as the creator, or former, and here especially as controlling poetic form. The fundamental meaning of the word "poet" is creator or maker. The popular name of "Love" applied to Cupid enables the poet to many times slyly allude to that god. Thus in 21 he is "true in love" and his "love" is as fair as "any mother's child." The perpetual youth of Cupid is again referred to in 22 in the lines,

"My glass shall not persuade me I am old,
So long as *youth and thou are of one date*,"

and the chances are that the "good conceipt" which in 26 the poet thinks will be bestowed "(all naked)," is a reference to the attribute of nakedness given to Cupid. And in this connection it will be interesting to read Bacon's identification of Cupid with the atom, and his explanation of the meaning of this nakedness. The perpetual youth of Cupid is also pointed at in the first line of 151—

"*Love* is *too young* to know what conscience is."

In 35 the person addressed is called a "sweet theefe," a most preposterous term to be applied to a dissolute nobleman who has robbed the poet of his mistress, but exceedingly appropriate for his art genius figured by Cupid, and in 37 the allusion to the one addressed as the poet's art child is obvious. Again is he called a "gentle theefe" in 40, with the added term of "lascivious grace," and in 51 we find that "desire" is the spirit which moves the poet and that such desire is made of "perfects love." The Greek origin of this wonderful youth is clearly shown in 53, where the form of Adonis and the beauty of Helen are but imitations of the poet's genius, with the added significant statement that the object written of is "painted *new*" in "*Grecian* tires."

The closing lines of 57 are also allusive of Cupid—

"So true a foole is love, that in your Will
(Though you doe anything), he thinkes no ill,"

it being remembered that in Shakespeare's time the word "will" was synonomous with "desire," or "passion."

He is referred to as "my sweet boy" and "eternal love in love's fresh case," in 108, and, to make the matter clearer, the one addressed is called, in 110, "a God in love." The entire propriety of these terms as referring to Cupid is clear enough, but applied to Southampton they become impossible. But think of the following line as referring to a thirty year old nobleman:

"Such cherubines as your sweet selfe resembles:"

Yet observe how appropriate to the character of Cupid the appellation of "cherub" would be. But we are hot on the scent here, for in 115 it is boldly stated that "Love is a Babe," and this is a clear and direct allusion to Cupid, and carries no other sense. Why is love a babe if this is not a direct reference to Cupid? But we find far more interesting and confirmative matter in the next Sonnet, number 116, in the following extract:

"Love is not love,
Which alters when it alteration finds,
Or bends with the remover to remove,
O no, it is an ever fixed mark,
That looks on tempests and is never shaken;"

The allusions to Cupid in the above extract are again striking and profound. For Bacon, writing of Cupid, in "Origins and Principles," argues that Cupid represents the indestructible atom of matter, naked and imperishable in itself, but dressed in many different forms. He says:

"Now an abstract principle is not a being; and again, a mortal being is not a principle; so that a necessity plainly and inevitably drives men's thoughts (if they would be consistent) to the atom; which is a true being having matter, form, dimension, place, resistance, appetite, motion and emenations; which likewise, amid the destruction of all natural bodies, *remains unshaken and eternal.*"

Thus, further explaining the allegory of Cupid, Bacon says:

"But matter itself, and the force and nature thereof, the principles of things in short, were shadowed in Cupid himself. He is introduced without a parent, that is to say, without a cause; for the cause is as the parent of the effect; and it is a familiar and almost continual figure of speech to denote cause and effect as parent and child."

So, the friend addressed in the Sonnets is introduced as an orphan—without a parent, and here we find the origin of the last line of 49, as follows:

"Since why to love, I can alledge *no cause.*"

The attribute of Cupid as an archer is used in Sonnet 117 in the lines—

"Bring me within the level of your frowne,"
But *shoot not at me* in your wakened hate:"

The eternal youth of Cupid is again alluded to in number 126, the closing number of the first great series, in the first two lines—

"O thou my lovely Boy who in thy power,
Doest hould times fickle glasse. his sickle, hower."

Even Sidney Lee has discovered the reference to Cupid in this number, after what he calls a "very narrow scrutiny" of the Sonnets, but looks upon this particular sonnet as simply a solitary, fanciful invocation to Cupid in imitation of similar exercises by some of Shakespeare's contemporaries, and little realizing that Cupid is the central figure of this great collection of lyrics. But the "lovely boy," in 126, is the same "beautie's *Rose*" of number 1; the "sweet theefe" of 35; the "gentle theefe" of 40; the "friend" of 42; the "beautious and lovely youth" of 54; the "sweet love" of 56 and 76; the "my love" of many Sonnets; the "sweet boy" of 108; the "cherubine" and "sweet selfe" of 114 and 151; the "Babe" of 115; the "deare love" of 124; the "fairest and most precious jewell" of 131; the "blind foole love" of 137; the "poore soule" of 146; the "cunning love" of 148; the "Cupid" of 153, and the "little love-god" of 154. It really would appear as if Mr. Lee's "scrutiny" of these verses was a little too "narrow."

One of the peculiarities of the Sonnets is the repeated references to the illegitimacy of the person or thing called "Beauty." In 124 the poet says:

"If my deare love were but the child of state,
It might for fortune's bastard be unfathered,"

and in 127 we learn that "blacke" is the "successive heire" of beauty—

"And Beautie slandered with a bastard shame."

In the same Sonnet we also find that "Creation" is slandered "with a false esteem," a clear intimation that the poet looked upon his art as creation in the true sense, and being another allusion to the character of Cupid, the god of creation. And, of course, Cupid in his later modified character was the illegitimate child of Venus, or as Shakespeare says, "that same wicked bastard of Venus, that was begot of thought, conceived of spleen and born of madness; that blind rascally boy that abuses every one's eyes because his own are out." And this attribute of blindness given to Cupid, who is generally represented as blindfolded, is glanced at in different Sonnets: Thus in 136 in the lines—

"If thy soule check thee that I come so neere,
Swear to thy *blind soule* that I was thy Will."

And again in the first line of 137—

"Thou *blinde foole love*, what doost thou to mine eyes."

In 137, 148 and 149 our poet has clearly shown that he has had some experience with that "blind rascally boy who abuses every one's eyes because his own are out." Thus, Sonnet 148 is devoted to the conceit of the trouble to his eyes which love has caused him, and 149 closes with the lines—

"But love hate on for now I know thy minde,
Those that can see thou lovest, and I am blind."

And so in 152 the poet states that "to inlighten thee" he "gave eyes to blindness," meaning that he blinded his own eyes to give sight to his genius. Bacon found in the character and stories of Cupid the most profound of all Greek philosophy, and his elaborate interpretations of what he believed to be an allegory are themselves striking examples of the delicateness of his perceptions and of his profound and penetrating thought. Explaining the alleged birth of Cupid from the egg Nox, or night, he says:

"Now that point concerning the egg of Nox bears a most apt reference to the demonstration by which this Cupid is *brought to light*. For things concluded by affirmatives may be considered as the offspring of light; whereas those concluded by negatives and exclusions are extorted and educed, as it were, out of darkness and night. Now this Cupid is truly an egg hatched by Nox, for all the knowledge of him which is to be had proceeds by exclusions and negatives; and proof made by exclusions is a kind of ignorance, and as it were night, with regard to the thing included. Whence Democritus excellently affirmed that atoms or seeds, and the virtue thereof were unlike anything that could fall under the senses; but distinguished them as being of a perfectly dark and hidden nature; saying of themselves, 'that they resemble neither fire nor anything else that could be felt or touched,' and of their virtue, 'that in the generation of things the first beginnings must needs have a dark and hidden nature, lest something should rise up to resist and oppose them.'"

It is interesting to observe the dramatic fidelity with which our poet, in these Sonnets, maintains this character of Cupid as applied to his own genius or spirit. The birth of Cupid from night, the egg Nox, is clearly reflected in Sonnet 27, describing the poet's nightly cogitations:

"Weary with toyle, I haste me to my bed,
The deare repose for lims with travaill tired,
But then begins a journey in my head
To worke my mind when boddies work's expired
For then my thoughts (from far where I abide)
Intends a zelous pilgrimage to thee,
And keepe my drooping eye-lids open wide,
Looking on darkness which the blind do see.
Save that my soules imaginary sight
Presents their shaddoe to my sightless view,
Which like a jewell (hung in gastly night)
Makes blacke night beautious and her old face new.
Loe thus by day my lims, by night my mind,
For thee, and for my selfe, noe quiet finde."

And this is again further developed in 43, which closes with the couplet—

"All days are nights to see till I see thee,
And nights bright daies when dreames do shew thee me."

The idea of Cupid being "brought to light" appears in 152 in the statement of the poet that to "inlighten thee," he "gave eyes to blindness," and the "affirmatives" and "negatives," which were the basis of Bacon's system of investigation of Nature, re-appear in the "eye" and "no" of 148, unless we mistake the punning allusions. The thought that Cupid's birth in darkness represented the necessity of seeds or beginnings having a dark and hidden nature "lest something should rise up to resist and oppose them" is reflected in 61, where the poet is obliged to "plaie the watch-man" for the sake of his literary child; in 48, where he fears his jewell will be "stolne;" in 124, in the assertion that his love is "builded far from accident;" in 22, where the poet urges his love to be "wary" of himself, as the poet will also be wary for his love, and whom he will protect as a "tender nurse her babe from faring ill."

The Sonnets give a prominent place to the conceit of a "hate" by the one addressed both of himself and of the poet, and there is good reason for thinking that this is but a reference to Anteros, the brother of Cupid, and who was generally associated with that god as the personification of Hate.

The Sonnets are too numerous to specialize in which the grace and beauty of the poet's friend is the prevailing theme, and which still further support the character of Cupid. Of that god, Murray, in his "Manual of Mythology," says:

"In early times his worshippers at Thespiae were content with a rude stone as an image. But in later times, and in contrast with this, we find him the *most attractive* figure among the works of the second Attic school of sculptors, the school of Scopas and Praxiteles, both of whom directed their splendid talents to adding *fresh grace and beauty to his form.* While artists rivalled each other to this end, poets were no less zealous in *singing his praises*—for he was then represented as lithe of limb and graceful of form, a model of ripening youth. As time went on, however, his figure became more and more that of the chubby boy who plays all manner of tricks with the hearts of men with which we are most familiar."

But if any doubts should remain as to the figure which the character of Cupid cuts in these Sonnets, the last two numbers of the collection should entirely remove them. Sonnets 153 and 154 have generally been considered by critics as not constituting part of the Sonnet series, proper, but as being duplicate exercises of the fancy upon the same conceit. A most remarkable fact is disclosed, however, that here is the same Cupid bearing his proper name for the first time in Sonnet 153, and associated with the later manifestation of the same god in number 154. Thus the first line of 153 says that—

"*Cupid* laid by his brand and fell a sleepe,"

while 154 opens up with the lines—

"The *little Love-God* lying once a sleepe,
Laid by his side his heart inflaming brand."

Thus it is that these last two Sonnets gain a new and remarkable significance, and disclose that they are an integral part of the collection and form a fitting close thereto, for they simply tell us that the poet has ceased the exercise of his dramatic art, but that the fires of poesy could not be quenched in the cool well of philosophy.

After a review of all of the allusions to Cupid which are found in the Sonnets, it is interesting to recur again to some extracts from Bacon's treatment of what he calls "the allegory of Cupid," as follows :—

"Let us now proceed to Cupid himself, that is, to the primary matter, together with its properties, which are surrounded by so dark a night. . . . But though Cupid is represented in the allegory as a person, he is yet naked. . . . The stories told by the ancients concerning Cupid or Love cannot all apply to the same person; and indeed they themselves make mention of two Cupids, very widely differing from one another; one being said to be the oldest, the other the youngest of the gods. It is of the elder that I am now going to speak. . . . He is without any parents of his own, but himself united with Chaos begat the gods and all things. . . . Various attributes are assigned to him, as that he is always an infant, blind, naked, winged and an archer. . . . Another younger Cupid, the son of Venus, is also spoken of, to whom the attributes of the elder are transferred, and many added of his own."

And thus in these Sonnets we find all of the attributes of Cupid directly alluded to, including the torch which the younger Cupid was frequently represented as carrying.

The Sonnets are divided into two principal divisions, the first ending with number 126. The second part commences with 127, and is generally referred to as the "Dark Woman" series.

In this latter part we find the character of Cupid still in the foreground, but it is in his more modern character of the "little Love-God," the god of amorous desire. This desire is also signified by the word "Will," which has so much prominence in the famous "Will" Sonnets—numbers 135 and 136. It is by the latter Sonnet that we learn through allusion that the name of the poet's genius is Cupid. The lines read,—

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

But this is not Will Shakespeare nor Will Herbert, but it is Desire, or Love, those passions of the human soul for which Cupid stands as the personified name.

How faithful these Sonnets are to those early and later characters and attributes of Cupid is fully shown by careful study of the verses, and which also disclosed the amazing familiarity of the supposed untutored poet from Stratford with the most profound and recondite features of ancient Greek art. It is too much for one who "sang his native wood notes wild," but when we find him also entertaining the same explanations of Cupid as an allegory as Bacon alone has left us, it is time to pause and consider various things. Even the wanton character of the younger Cupid, or Eros, finds handy and faithful allusion in the friendly admonition of the poet to the supposed licentious Southampton, but which have reference only to the author's dramatic art. It is only just beginning to be realized how thoroughly Shakespeare was saturated with antiquity, and to what extent he revived the poetic and dramatic art of the Pagans, and which he clearly saw was founded upon, and was an attempted interpretation of, the phenomena and processes of Nature. Not without reason did he exclaim that the cheek of his genius was the "map of daies outworn," when poetic beauty lived and died as did the flowers before the false imitations of his own day; that in him the true and "holy antique howers are seene," without ornament, true to nature, and that his genius, figured or personalized by Cupid as the god of creative poetic art, was a map or picture which Nature was storing—

"To shew faulse art what beauty was of yore."

And sometimes we will realize what a world of metaphor and allusion was used in these Sonnets in the delineation of the features of his genius, but which he placed behind the most amazing veil of allusive art that the world has ever seen. The word "Nothing" is the only answer to his question—

"What's in the brain that Inck may character,
Which hath not figured to thee, my true spirit?"

It was no idle boast when the poet asserted:

"And thou in this shalt find thy monument,
When tyrants' crests and tombs of brass are spent."

It seems never to have been considered by Shakesperian critics that it is a physical impossibility that such an art creation of fifteen thousand words as the Sonnets comprise, could ever have been devoted to the base subjects attributed to them.

Why the hermetic character of these verses was not long since generally recognized is something difficult to understand. It is true that some contemporaries of Shakespeare were anything but models of literary purity, but even Beaumont and Fletcher, chief of sinners in this respect, nowhere approach the depths of personal abnegation, sycophantic grovelling, unblushing lubricity, and salacious reminiscences which Shakespeare indulges in, if we give the Sonnets a literal interpretation. But Shakespeare was far and away above his contemporaries, both as a literary artist and a moral teacher. It is only in comparatively recent times that the great purpose of the Plays stands clearly revealed as an attempt, by the arts of rhetoric and example, to seduce men's minds to virtue, and to win them from their passions and prejudices. How utterly inconsistent with such a purpose and such a writer the Sonnets appear when literally construed is painfully apparent. It is likely, however, that the reported moral irregularities of the Stratford man have had much to do with preserving the debasing aspect in which these wonderful verses have been viewed. It is not remarkable that Stevens refused to print the Sonnets, called them "purblind and obscene stuff," and declared that an Act of Parliament could not make people read them. Certainly, it is time to find out what the mighty "Shake-speare," was aiming at when he penned these literary enigmas, if we wish to rest in any just conception of the Shakespeare genius or of the true personality of the author.

And the time will come when the "suspect of ill" which "masks the show" of these Sonnets will take its proper place, when Southampton, Herbert, the Dark Woman, and the whole horrible mess, will pass away from us like a frightful nightmare, and when the radiant mind behind it all will "pace forth from death and all oblivious enmity."

F. C. Hunt.

"THE PARENTAGE OF FRANCIS BACON."

IN an article in the last number of BACONIANA under this title Mr. Woodward brings evidence endeavouring to show that Mrs. Gallup had good historic ground to go upon, if she was what he styles a "fiction writer," in framing the "Biliteral Cipher" story. This is a much better way of putting it than bringing forward statements in doubtful history as "corroborations" of her "facts."

First, we are informed, from a passage in Miss Strickland's "Life of Queen Elizabeth," that because Elizabeth lavished favour on the Earl of Leicester, "some sort of marriage between the parties might suggest itself"—a marvellous piece of reasoning! If Elizabeth had married every man on whom "she lavished her favour," we would have had a new phenomenon in English history.

Next, Mr. Woodward has found in the "Spanish Calendar" and other documents, what Mr. Bompas has rightly termed "malignant statements"—certain reports transmitted by men who were "ambassadors" at the English Court, but who at the same time declared that in these reports not the smallest credit can be placed. "Spanish spies" would be a fitting designation for the Jesuit gentlemen who invented these slanders, and who, as we know, attempted to depose and assassinate the Queen, and who maintained also that she and Leicester conspired together to murder Amy Robsart. De Quadra, the Spanish Ambassador, puts the case in a nutshell, as Mr. Woodward himself shows, when he writes to the King of Spain that "Catholics look only to your Majesty." And what reliance as historical facts can be placed upon the statements transmitted by De Quadra? On the very day of Bacon's birth, this De Quadra writes Philip that "one public rumour credits Elizabeth having some children already. Of this I have seen no trace, and do not believe it;" and within a few days of this he writes that Elizabeth was "incapable of maternity." This history, such as it is, is against the theory of Elizabeth having been a mother.

Hear what Hepworth Dixon says on the subject of the contemporary scandals in connection with Elizabeth's name: "This lie against chastity and womanhood has been repeated from generation to generation for two hundred and sixty years. It oozed from the pen of Father Parsons. It darkens the page of Lingard. . . . It came from those wifeless monks, men of the Confessional and the boudoir, who had spent their nights in gloating with Sanchez through the material mysteries of love, and in warping the tenderness and faith of woman into the filthy philosophy of their own 'Disputationes de Sancto Matrimonii Sacramento.' Against such calumniators the Queen might appeal, like Marie Antoinette, to every woman's heart. Jealous of Lettice Knollys, of Bessie Throckmorton, of Frances Sydney! Elizabeth was indeed vexed with them, but had she not cause? Had not each of these courtiers married, not only without her knowledge as their Queen, but without honesty or honour? In secret, under circumstances of shame and guilt, Leicester had wedded her cousin's daughter, Lettice. Would the head of any house be pleased with such a trick? Raleigh had brought to shame a lady of her Court, young, lovely, brave as ever bloomed on a hero's hearth, yet the daughter of a disloyal house, of one who had plotted against the Queen's crown and life. Could any prince in the world approve of such an act? Essex himself, a member of her race, a descendant of Edward the Third, had married in secret and against her will a woman of inferior birth, without beauty, youth, or fortune—a widow who took him on her way from the arms of a first husband into those of a third. What kinswoman would have smiled on such a match?" Here, I am convinced, we have the real Elizabeth—not the fictitious Elizabeth of certain modern story.

Towards the end of his article Mr. Woodward asks certain questions with regard to Bacon's life, which I shall endeavour to answer.

1. "Why did she (Elizabeth) so frequently visit at Gorhambury and lavish so much wealth on Sir Nicholas Bacon? A self-respecting fabulist would infer that the mother was visiting her child," &c.

Well, Elizabeth no more frequently visited Gorhambury than she did the houses of other nobles of the day. Nichols, in his "Progresses," mentions that she paid a visit to Gorhambury, the mansion of her trusted but not favourite Lord Keeper, Sir Nicholas Bacon, on three different occasions. But what about her visits to Burleigh? She visited at *his* house (Theobalds) twelve different times, at his house in Westminster three times, at his house at Stamford twice, and at Cecil House three times—in all twenty times. Had Elizabeth children in all these houses, considering her more frequent visits thereto? As to the Queen "lavishing wealth on Sir Nicholas," this statement is not confirmed in any one of Bacon's biographies. Although he spent hundreds of pounds in entertaining her, all he got in return was his salary as Lord Keeper.

2. "Why did they go to the expense of a bust of Francis at Gorhambury, when Sir Nicholas Bacon and his wife were also sculptured; or, at any rate, why not have one of young Anthony Bacon as well? Why, as the Queen had her portrait painted by Hilliard, should Francis, at the age of 16 or 18, have his painted by the same artist?"

There is a bust at Gorhambury of Bacon, as a boy, by an unknown artist, and there are also busts of Sir Nicholas and Lady Ann Bacon. Anthony may have been abroad at the time these busts were made, as he often was.

Although portraits of Francis are plentiful, there is not even a portrait of Anthony extant, which leads one to suppose that perhaps his features did not lend themselves to successful reproduction in sculpture or painting, as his talented brother's undoubtedly did. As for the portrait by Hilliard, this artist was the first to work entirely as a miniature painter. Up to the reign of Elizabeth, no artist devoted himself entirely to portrait miniature as a profession. Hilliard became all the rage; and the Catalogue of the Loan Collection at South Kensington, in 1865, gives nearly forty examples of Hilliard's work, including nearly all the nobility of the reign of Elizabeth—Essex, Sidney, Drake, Walsingham, Somerset, Hatton, etc. What wonder, therefore, that Bacon is included in the list—as well as Queen Elizabeth and Anne of Denmark. The nobility rushed to Hilliard because he painted Royalty. And so it is at the present day.

3. "Why should Sir Nicholas Bacon, a very rich man, by his will . . . make no provision for Francis, and why, in 1580, should the Queen appoint Francis to the Court, make provision for his maintenance (Letter, Bacon to Burleigh, 15th October, 1580), and from that time forth continue to do so?"

Part of this query suggests most extraordinary history. Rawley answers the first portion of the question when he says that as a proposed purchase of land for Francis was "unaccomplished at his father's death, there came no greater share to him than his single part and portion of the money, dividable amongst five brethren, by which means he lived in some straits and necessities in his younger years." Abbott and Spedding write to the same effect.

Sir Nicholas was twice married, and the lion's portion of his estate appears to have gone to the children of his first wife.

The Queen never appointed Francis to the Court, according to all his biographers, neither did she make the slightest "provision for his maintenance, nor from that time forth (1580) continue to do so." The letter referred to is evidently the one dated 18th October, 1580, in which Bacon writes to Burleigh: "I am moved to become a humble suitor unto her Majesty." The Queen and Burleigh paid no attention to his appeal [Spedding says the application "was neither granted nor denied"], and she did absolutely nothing for him. In 1582 Bacon became a barrister, and for the rest of the Queen's life—the woman who is said to have been his mother—"he waited for some post which his Queen or Burleigh might give him." He waited in vain—all that he got was a "Q.C."-ship, a grant from Catesby's fine, and the *reversion* of a post in the Star Chamber, which did not fall in till long after the Queen's death. Time after time the struggling barrister was passed over for office (by his mother?), despite the powerful but pernicious backing of Essex, and it was only some years after the Queen's death that he got his foot on the lowest rung of the political ladder when he was appointed, by King James, Solicitor-General, after which his promotion was rapid. Rawley, his biographer, tells this part of the story well in his quaint language.

4. "Why should the Queen from an early period have permitted him to take a prominent part in advising her in State affairs, and alternated so frequently in her behaviour to him?"

Only on one occasion, when he was 24, did he offer advice to the Queen. On all other occasions, according to Hepworth Dixon and Spedding, his advice was asked, as that of a man "rising in reputation." On several occasions he incurred the anger of the Queen because he opposed grants to the Crown, and made a stand against her in Parliament. This will readily account for the "alternation" referred to. Bacon's greatest "Royal commission" was perhaps the command of Queen Elizabeth (said to be the mother of Bacon and Essex) to prosecute and convict his so-called brother Essex. One might naturally ask how Elizabeth as mother would execute her own son, and how Bacon as brother would do his best to aid his mother to that end?

5. "Why did Lady Ann Bacon address practically all

her letters to Anthony, and why was Francis so formal and dignified in his communications to her?" (Dixon's "Personal History").

On consulting Dixon's "Personal History," I find that most of Lady Ann's letters were addressed to Anthony. This is easily explained. A huge correspondence of Anthony's friends with him (but not of him with them) has been preserved in Lambeth Palace, and these can easily be drawn upon for Anthony's life. But both in Spedding and in Dixon there will be found a number of letters by Francis to Lady Ann, *in answer to letters from her*, which have not been preserved. Besides, at the end of most of Lady Ann's letters appear such words as the following:—"Let not your men see my letters. I write to you, and not to them." "I pray show your brother this letter, but to no creature else." "Burn, burn, in any wise." "Let not your men be privy hereof." "Nobody see this, but burn it, or send it back." This advice was given to Anthony, who seems to have kept the letters all the same. When Francis was similarly advised, what more likely than that, with filial duty, he destroyed the letters, knowing his mother's anxiety on this point? Spedding writes: "Of the letters which must for many years have been continually passing between her (Lady Ann) and Francis, only two or three have been preserved." As to the "formality" and "dignity" of Bacon's communications to his mother, the "formality" was customary at that period. For instance, Francis begins one of his letters: "My duty most humbly remembered. I assure myself that your ladyship, as a wise and kind mother to us both," and again he signs himself, "Your ladyship's most obedient son, FR. BACON."

I have no doubt Anthony's letters to his mother are equally respectful, and not signed, after the modern fashion, "Yours ever, Anthony." Contrast the early letters of Queen Mary written to her mother with those of Francis Bacon to his mother: Mary's letters are addressed—"A la Reine ma Mère," begin "Ma Dame," and are subscribed "Votre très humble et très obéissante fille, Marie." Henry, Prince of Wales, addresses his father—"Rex Serenissimus," and concludes, "Majestatis tuæ observantissimus filius, Henricus;" while Charles I., when a boy, addressed his father, "To my father the King," and concludes "Your Mties. most humble and obedient son, Charles." Algernon Sidney, about the same period, addresses his father as "My Lord," and throughout his epistle he speaks of "your lordship." This is simply what Bacon did in addressing his mother all through his letters as "Your ladyship." Then we have Frederick Henry, Count Palatine of the Rhine, son of James I.'s daughter Elizabeth, in 1624, writing "To the King" in the following strain:—"Sir, . . . Your Maties. most dutiful grandchild and most humble servant, Frederick Henry;" and this same Elizabeth, as the superscription of a letter to her father, puts it on record that she was his "Très humble et très obéissante fille et servante, Elizabeth." Even, at a much later date, Robert Burns, writing from Irvine, where he went to learn flax dressing, begins his letter to his father, "Honoured Sir," and ends it "I remain, honoured sir, your dutiful son, Robert." In these cases, as in that of Bacon, it was neither "formality" nor "dignity"—it was "respect," a quality which unfortunately has now long been lost in family correspondence.

6. "Why, though engaged to Alice Barnham, should he wait three years after the Queen's death (1603) before marrying?"

Bacon only became engaged in the summer of 1603, and waited three years simply because he was not in a position to marry. I married, I am not ashamed to confess, for the very same reason, when I was 40! In 1606 the position was altered, when he carried through the Bill for another subsidy to the King. Hepworth Dixon explains this thoroughly when he says,—"He was no longer poor." When he was 36 Bacon had wooed Lady Hatton, who became the wife of his great rival, Coke.

7. "Again, when he did marry, why marry himself in kingly purple? 'Purple from cap to toe,' says the chronicler of the event."

I would say because he could afford the extravagance. Mr. Woodward ought to have known that with reference to a monarch, the words "kingly purple" apply to the purple *mantle* or robe that is worn, not to the purple *doublet and hose*.

8. "Why, when Francis lived at Whitehall during the absence of James I., did he lend himself to the accusation of arrogating to himself Royal state and power?"

I have consulted all Bacon's biographers, and can find no such charge. When James left for Scotland, the Chancellor's duties as his substitute were strictly defined, and these were carried out to the satisfaction of the King and the Duke of Buckingham. Bacon certainly took his seat in Chancery with a large display of show, to which the Queen and the

Prince sent all their followers. He delivered a great speech, of which he sent a copy to the King, and it was acknowledged by Buckingham in the following terms:—"His Majesty perceiveth that you have not only given proof how well you understand the place of a Chancellor, but done him much right also in giving notice unto those that were present that you have received such instructions from His Majesty." Had Bacon arrogated to himself Royal state and power, he would soon have heard about it from Cecil and Buckingham. Bacon certainly lost favour with the King before his return from Scotland, but it was entirely over the attitude he took up in siding with Lady Hatton against Coke, with regard to the marriage of Frances Coke and Buckingham's brother, and the question of "monopolies" to the latter. With regard to the pomp displayed, Bacon wrote Buckingham: "This matter of pomp, which is Heaven to some men, is Hell to me;" and the Recorder of London at the time had the courage to write to Burleigh: "My Lord, there is a saying, when the Court is furthest from London, then there is the best justice done in England." So far was he from arrogating "Royal state," that Dixon says:—"Lady Verulam was surrounded at York House by a pomp of swords and lace; gentlemen of quality, sons of prelates and peers, many of whom had been foisted on the Chancellor by Buckingham and the King beyond his need. As soon as he felt himself strong enough, he cleared his house of some part of this splendid nuisance, putting not less than sixteen gay fellows to the door in a single day, and making enemies of their families, their patrons and their friends."

9. "Why, when made Viscount St. Albans, was Francis invested with the coronet and robe in the King's presence—a form of peculiar honour, other peers being created by Letters Patent?"

I would answer, not because Bacon asked for it, or James granted it to him as the son of Queen Elizabeth, but because such investiture—personally—was necessary, and could not be dispensed with. Spedding says:—"During Elizabeth's reign no one had borne the title of Lord Chancellor, and no Lord Keeper had been made a Peer." This was reserved for Bacon in the reign of King James. If any special distinction was necessary—as it was not—Bacon would be the man to get it. Not only so, but when he received the title of Lord Chancellor, he was at the same time not only offered a peerage for himself (which he accepted) but a second peerage "for his personal profit," which he generously offered to his step-brother, Sir Nicholas, but which was refused. If there had been any charge of "arrogating Royal state and power" against Bacon, it is most unlikely that any special distinction would have been conferred upon him in any exceptional manner —if, indeed, it was exceptional *in those days*. I maintain it was not. A peer could not be appointed by Letters Patent alone, without the investiture ceremony by the King. When it was proposed to make Ellesmere, Bacon's predecessor in the Chancellorship, a peer, "the ceremony of investiture could not be performed in the King's absence [in Scotland], and the question was whether he could be made an Earl *without* the ceremony." (Spedding. Vol. VI., page 166). There was a long correspondence between Bacon and Buckingham on the subject, as to precedents. None were found; but the King decided to make an exception by creating Ellesmere a peer "without either the usual ceremonies or delivery of the Patent by His Majesty's own hand."

10. "Why so secretive in his habits? . . . Why cannot even Spedding tell us what Francis was doing between 1580 and 1594? . . ."

For the very good reason that Spedding did not know what he was doing. Nor does anybody else. But Baconians have all along maintained that in these years Bacon was composing the Plays which he produced under the mask of Shakespeare. He was "secretive in his habits" because he was of a reserved and studious disposition and loved "peace and quietness." But what all these questions have to do with "The Parentage of Francis Bacon" is far from intelligible. If they are made on the grounds advanced by Mr. Woodward on which "Judges of the Probate and Divorce Division based their judgments," as Mr. Woodward says they do, I believe that every one of the judgments would be summarily reversed on appeal to a higher tribunal.

In conclusion, I would ask Mr. Woodward one question: If Queen Elizabeth was Bacon's mother, and if, according to Mrs. Gallup's Cipher Story, Bacon knew that Queen Elizabeth was his mother, how does it come about that in his Will he makes the request to be buried at St. Michael's, Gorhambury— "for there was my mother buried?" Till now it has been a matter of popular belief that Queen Elizabeth was buried in Westminster Abbey, a fact of which Bacon was probably aware, so that I am not surprised to learn that Bacon knew who was his mother better than either Mrs. Gallup or Mr. Parker Woodward. GEORGE STRONACH, M.A.

WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE:* A CRITICAL STUDY.

By Alicia A. Leith.

DR. BRANDES' most interesting book is worth studying, though its chief interest lies in a very different direction to that imagined by its writer. He claims that a parallel exists between the plays and the events and experiences in the life of their author. Which is not unlikely; indeed, so probable is it that the plays reflected the states of mind through which their author was passing at the time of their creation, that we take Brandes' theory and act upon it within the limits of this article, only substituting the *real* author, Francis Saint Alban, for that man of straw put up, no doubt for some good reason, in his place for the better part of four hundred years.

As to all the personal references to William Shaxpur in Dr. Brandes' book, they partake of the same nebulous character we are learning to know so well. While claiming to prove everything the upholders of the great literary hoax, which still holds the world in its net, has no foothold to offer the searcher after truth. Dr. Brandes by chance has stumbled on what may yet prove a perfectly true premise, while his conclusions are all wrong, because he fails to recognize Francis Saint Alban, and not the ignorant Stratford player, as the true author of the plays he discusses so carefully.

The *raison d'être* given for *Hamlet* is the death of John Shakespeare, and the close affection *perhaps* existing between father and son! A distinctly happier suggestion is that Hamlet himself may have been taken from King James I., or rather Prince James, allowing, of course, that the first original *Amleth* of Saxo Grammaticus was the foundation on which Bacon's more spiritual and philosophical Prince was afterwards built.

James Stuart, at twelve, had already assumed the reins of government, as Brandes points out, was at sixteen harassed by his nobility and obliged to dismiss his favourites, was a lover of plays and players—the son of a murdered father and of a mother held to be an accomplice in the crime which deprived him of life—was too irresolute and weak-willed to carry out any plans of revenge which he may have harboured and altogether fonder of study than of action. We certainly know him to have been of a contemplative spirit, a student occupied with poetry as well as with weird and occult subjects, one who traced his descent, according to Lyte, through the Scots to the Danes, and who courted and wedded a Danish princess, hospitably entertaining the Danish King in one of his English ships off Elsinore, and afterwards in England where Christian IV. was a spectator of "The Black Tragedy" itself. On the whole, James was a far likelier model for Shakespeare's Danish prince than the warlike Earl of Essex, whose relations with Lady Essex's first husband are not now thought to have been of a nature to warrant his cherishing a desire to revenge the Earl's death. While discussing *Hamlet*, Dr. Brandes gives a local touch which, coming from a Dane, is interesting. An English traveller, giving a contemporaneous description of a great chamber in the castle of Kronberg at Elsinore, says: "It is hanged with tapestry and fresh-coloured silk without gold, wherein all the Danish Kings are expressed in antique habits according to their several times." Showing that Hamlet's reference to the counterfeit presentment of his father and uncle was not made without perfect knowledge of his surroundings. Wittenberg, too, was a college which Danes, not Englishmen, were in the habit of frequenting, being, as Brandes points out, Lutheran. As we turn with a smile from Brandes' obvious efforts to make the play fit in in some way, with the Stratford player's coarse, prosaic life, we ask: Is he right, so far in that he believes the author "transforms himself into Hamlet"? "What a terrible impression," he adds, "it must have made upon himself when he first saw and realized that his ideal had fallen from its pedestal into the mire." If the cryptogram lately claimed to have been discovered be true, then great and terrible indeed was that awakening for a sensitive and poetic temperament, when at an early age the young student discovered his real parentage, and realized all that it involved. "Time was," indeed, "out of joint" for him, then and always, and we may well believe he must have cursed again and again the fate that called on him to "set it right." Speaking of Wittenberg reminds one of Giordano Bruno, who was a student there. He plays no unimportant part with regard to Shakespeare. It has been mooted again and again by critics that these two great thinkers *must* have met, seeing that the English plays and the Italian's works contains so many kindred thoughts. Another score for us, because Brandes finds it next to impossible to reconcile such a meeting with the date of the player's arrival in London and Bruno's departure from it.

---

* William Shakespeare: by George Brandes. Heinemann, 1898.

Giordano Bruno, the Italian mathematician and Pantheistic philosopher, born about 1550, visited England in 1583, remaining there till 1585. According to Brandes, once a Dominican Friar, he changed his views, and preached against the reasoning of Aristotle, and combated the Roman enmity to inquiry and learning in Paris, England, Marburg, Frankfort, &c., thereby courting the death by the stake which took place in Venice in February, 1600. A man of his advanced views and deep intellect must have found in the young Barrister of Coney Court, Gray's Inn, the youthful member for Melcombe Regis, the fellow politician of Walsingham, Philip Sydney, Walter Raleigh, and others no less renowned in letters and public affairs, a sympathetic and kindred soul, a deep scholar, at one with him in all his new ideas, his love of freedom in thought and action, hatred of the old methods of reasoning, intense zeal for the advancement and improvement of learning throughout the globe. What we find is this, that Bruno is said to have "frequented the company of the most distinguished and leading men of his day," these being enumerated as "Walsingham, Leicester, Burleigh, and Sir Philip Sydney and his literary circle." Surely that comprehensive term must emphatically have included the most brilliant, as well as the most profound, thinker and writer of his day? Why, then, is the name of Bacon absent from the list, except that here as elsewhere the Brethren of the Rose, or "under the Rose," step in and veil their prophet? The very silence in this case is a strong proof that Bruno and Francis met as brother pioneers in a world ill adapted as yet to receive or accept them.

A Baconian silence enwraps Bruno while in England. Brandes naively confesses that he can find no trace of him in Oxford or in London, beyond the fact that he displeased the still antiquated college, and that the dirt and coarseness of London manners displeased him. The Bodleian, sworn to secrecy, says nothing, at least to Brandes. There are different tongues for different peoples, and diverse modes of expression suited to diverse races. The brothers of the Rose possess a language of their own, and a key to it which a stranger intermeddleth not with. We read "that on the night of Ash Wednesday, 1584, Bruno was invited by Fulke Greville to meet Sydney *and others* to hear the reason for his belief that the earth moves," and their meetings were frequent, for Bruno writes that "we met in a Chamber in Greville's house, to discuss moral, metaphysical, mathematical and natural speculations." Are we reasonably meant to believe that Francis was not one of that inspired few—why? I for one refuse to hold so ridiculous a view, and without a shadow of doubt I believe that Francis was one of the most frequent and interested of the guests, assimilating no less readily than Philip Sydney, his inferior in mind, the new tenets then promulgated, freely discussing, if not originating them.

Where is the wonder that Bruno's thoughts are reflected in the plays, and that Hamlet's determinism should by critics be traced to Giordano? who speaks of that which, "if it be now, it is not to come," and says: "Whatever may be my pre-ordained eventide, when the change shall take place, I await the day, I, who dwell in the night, but thou await the night who dwell in the daylight. All that is is, either here or there, near or far off, now or after, soon or late." And again, that he should say: "Nothing is absolutely imperfect or evil, it seems so in relation to something else, and what is bad for one is good for another." While Hamlet says: "Nothing is either good or bad, but thinking makes it so."

Montaigne is credited with influencing the author of the plays to no small extent, indeed more so than Bruno, for Brandes, to escape the difficulty presented by Shakespeare's non-arrival in London till after Bruno's departure, suggests that Lily and his Euphues presents the needful link, that Lily drew his inspiration from Bruno, and Shakespeare drank from Lily. It is to Montaigne himself, or at least to Florio's translation (though before its publication) that the author of *Hamlet* goes for his remarks on Alexander and Cæsar—according to Dr. Brandes. "Hamlet comes very near Montaigne," he says, and "on a close comparison of Shakespeare's expressions with Montaigne's their similarity is very striking"; and again: "Outside *Hamlet* we trace Montaigne quite clearly in one passage in Shakespeare—who must have had the Essays lying on his table while he was writing *The Tempest*." Gonzalo's speech, *A. II. S.* 1, we find word for word in Montaigne. *Book I. Chap.* 30.

"In the Commonwealth I would by contraries execute all things, for no kind of traffic would I admit; no name of magistrate; letters should not be known; riches, poverty, and use of service, none; contract, succession, bourn, bound of land, tilth, vineyard, none; no use of metal, corn, or wine, or oil: no occupation, all men idle, all; and women too."

It is a nation that hath no kind of traffic, no knowledge of letters, no intelligence of numbers, no name of magistrate, nor of political superiority; no use of service, of riches or of povertie, no contracts, no successions, no partitions, no occupation, but idle . . . no manuring of lands, no use of wine, corn or metal.

"ARTHUR WILSON."

A brief Study by A. A. L.

A BOOK under this title was published in 1872 by Bentley, without the author's name. Its hero, Arthur Wilson, a poor friendless lad, of good parts, is engaged as a secretary by a wise man living in Stratford-on-Avon, his eyes being too weak by reason of arduous literary labours to make fair copies of his works. This learned man, whose wife is a Lucy of Charlecote, writes on "*everything*," with the exception of Shakespeare, whose plays he adores. His amanuensis becomes in time the High Sheriff of the county and stands in Parliament for Warwick. The writer adds those who wish to know more of him may read of him in Dugdale. There is, also, in the British Museum a Folio, published in 1653, under the title "Arthur Wilson." It is a History of Great Britain in the time of James I., and contains, for frontispiece, a fine portrait of the king. The Proem I print below.

Proem.

"The Author's picture drawn by himself."

As others print their pictures I will place
My Mind in Frontispiece plain as my face,
And every Line that is here drawn, shall be
To pencil out my Soul's Physiognomy,
Which on a Radiant height is fixed. My Brow
Frowns not for these Miscarriages below,
Unless I mean to limit and confine,
The Almighty Wisdom to conceits of mine.
Yet have no envious Eyes against the Crown,
Nor did I strive to pull the Mitre down,
Both may be good, but when Head's swell, men say,
The rest of the poor members pine away,
Like Ricket-Bodies upwards over-grown,

Which is no wholesome constitution.
The grave mild Presbytery I could admit,
And am no foe to Independent yet,
For I have levell'd my intente to be
Subservient unto Reason's Sovereignty,
And none of these State-Passions e'er shall rise
Within my Brain to rile and tyrannise.
For by Truth's sacred lamp (which I admire)
My zeal is kindled, not Fanatick fire,
But I'll avoid these vapours, whose swoln spight,
And foaming poyson, would put out this light.
Vain Fuellers ! They think (who doth not know it)
Their Light's above't, because their walk's below it.
Such blazing Lights like exhalation climb,
Then fall, and their best matter proves but slime.
For where conceited goodness finds no want,
Their Holiness becomes luxuriant.
Now my great trouble is that I have shown
Other's men's faults with so many of my own,
And all my care shall be to shake off quite
The Old Man's load for him whose burthen's light,
And grow to a full statue till I be
Found like to Christ, and Christ be found in me.
Such pieces are Grav'd by a Hand Divine,
For which I give my God this heart of mine.

In his history he says, speaking of noble families : "Where is there one (as that famous orator, the Lord Verulam, said) that like a fair Pomegronate hath not some corrupted cornel ? And may not that be picked out from the rest, but it must taint them all ?" This appears in his History, which, says the "National Biography," shows Wilson to be "strongly prejudiced against the rule of Stuarts." It is suggested there that it would have been better had he not attempted history but confined himself to other literature. Besides being an historian, he wrote plays which were acted at the Blackfriars Theatre, only one, it appears, has survived; this, "The Inconstant Lady," is published with an autobiography of the author. His father was Richard Wilson, of Yarmouth, in Norfolk.

At sixteen, after two years in France, he learned "court-hand" with J. Davis, of Fleet Street; became a clerk in the Exchequer Office, and was discharged for quarrelsomeness. In 1619, he made acquaintance with Mr. Wingfield, Steward to Robert Devereux, third Earl of Essex. Essex met him, and liked him, at Chartley, in Staffordshire, and made him a gentleman-in-waiting. He seems to have travelled with his master to the Palatinate, France, Holland, Breda and Cadiz. The second Lady Essex not liking him, he left her husband's employ, and entered Trinity College, Oxford, 1631. Here he went in for Physics and "drank with learned doctors of Divinity." In 1633 he became the Steward of Robert Rich, Esq., of Warwick. During the Civil War he lived on his master's estates peaceably, and was the means of preventing the Cavalier army destroying some of his master's property. He died 1652.

In Arthur Wilson's life of himself, he says he was seven years old in 1602. That in 1632 he was in Oxfordshire, and that on Shotover Hill he met an old man clad in a long black garment like "a Grecian," who wore a broad beard, and a hat, "whose brim was of an Eastern diameter," and that he spoke in a "strange, gibberish language," which was neither Latin nor Greek. It is a strange anecdote, and may be found useful on some future occasion. The same winter he spent at the Earl of Warwick's, his "Honorable Master's House."

He speaks of an "old natural balsam of Peru" (is not this Walter Raleigh's famous cordial which he sent to Prince Henry with the remark that if it was not poison from which he was suffering, he would be cured of his pains shortly—or words to that effect?). Wilson goes on to say that its "aromatick sapor is very penetrative, by letting some drops fall upon a peese of leather." Neat leather was an offence to the delicate nostrils of both Queen Elizabeth and Sir Francis Bacon. They both would have used the Balsam, no doubt?

Wilson mentions the "Comedies" which he "made," and which were acted in London by the King's players at Blackfriars, and at the "Act-time at Oxon with good applause," himself being present. He says he travelled in Germany, France and Spain, had "little skill in the Latin tongue, less in the Greek, a good readiness in French, and some smattering in the Dutch," and that he was "well seen in the mathematics," and was a "commendible poet." This is translated from the original MS. in a leaf prefixed to the copy of Wilson's "History of Great Britain," Fol., London, 1663, in Trinity College Library, Oxon.

Turning to his history of James we find an account of the Lords sending the Earl of Arundel to the Tower in 1621. The Earl had plenty of imprisonment, for King Charles committed him on his own authority for misdeamenours against himself, in 1626, thereby causing great disturbance amongst that august body. It was only owing to the Lords' repeated and urgent appeals that King Charles permitted him to return to his seat. This was the year when Francis St. Alban is said to have died in his house.

Wilson also remarks on the burning fevers that Henry, Earl of Southampton (Shakespeare's friend), and Lord Wriothesley, his son, contracted abroad. Lord Wriothesley, he says, died at Rosendale, his father at Berghen-ap-Zome, in view, and in the presence of, the relator. This is interesting, seeing that on the monumental tomb of the Earls of Southampton in Titchfield Church, Hampshire, there is no mention made of this Henry, whose little kneeling form as a boy, below the recumbent figure of his father, is pointed to now as the original of *Romeo*, and a personal friend of William Shakespeare. As a fact the parish register of 1624 does contain a notice of the burial of Henry Wriothesley, the Earl who died in the Netherlands, but there is no mention of him on the tomb, which contains inscriptions of some length on his father and grandfather. This is astonishing to say the least of it. There is a curious story extant in that parish that, some fifty years ago, a mandamus was granted, and a gentleman from London came down and opened the tomb for the purpose of finding a "Druce Mystery," a coffin buried with stones in it instead of a body.

Was Henry Wriothesley buried in Titchfield Church or not?

The tomb is now in the hands of the Earl of Portland by right of descent.

Now we come to the most interesting part, for us, of Wilson's "History of Great Britain." He speaks of Lord St. Albans, and says this: "He lost his peerage and his Seal, and the scale was wavering whether he should carry the title of Viscount to his grave, and that was all he did. Having only left a poor empty *being* which lasted not long with him, his honour dying before him. A pension allowed him by the King he wanted to his last, and had this unhappiness, after all his height of plenitude, to be denied beer to quench his thirst. For he had a sickly taste, and he did not like the beer of the house, but sent to Sir Fulke Greville, Lord Brooke, in neighbourhood (now and then) for a bottle of his beer, and after some grumbling the butler had orders to deny him.

So sordid was the one that advanced himself to be called Sir Philip Sidnie's friend, and so friendless was the other, after he had dejected himself from what he was. Wilson tells us he was of middle stature, his countenance was indented with age before he was old, his *Presence* grave and comely, of a high-flying and lively *wit*, striving in some things to be rather admired than understood, yet so quick and easie where he would express himself; and his memory so strong and active, that he appeared the master of a large and plenteous Store-house of Knowledge being (as it were) nature's Midwife. Stripping her *Callow-brood* and clothing them in new *attire*. His *wit* was quick to the last. Here he quotes the anecdote of Gondemar, so well known, and Bacon's quip in reply. "In fine," Wilson adds, "he was a fit Jewel to have *beautified and adorned a flourishing Kingdom, if his flaws had not disgraced the lustre that should have set him off.*" We heartily agree with the "National Biography," when it says, "Wilson would have done well to keep to his Comedies."

Anthony Wood tells us Wilson died at Felsted, near *Little Leighes* (the seat of Lord Warwick), in Essex, October, 1652, and was buried in the chancel of the church there. "After his death the said history coming into the hands of a certain doctor, had some alterations made therein, as 'tis said by him, who shaped it according to his desire;" which shows us how editors managed things in those days.

REVIEWS.

MR. HAROLD BAYLEY'S book, "*The Tragedy of Sir Francis Bacon: An Appeal for further Investigation and Research*" (Grant Richards, 48, Leicester Square), comes at a welcome moment, and can be cordially recommended to Baconians. It certainly is a work that everybody interested in our fascinating subject should possess, or at least read. It is very well done, excellently written, and deserves the highest possible praise for the way the evidence is presented. Not the least charm of this book is its author's modesty, and the acknowledgment he gives those who have preceded him on this difficult subject. Every thorough Baconian will applaud the truth and courageous outspokeness with which he concludes his Preface:—"*It is a deplorable truism that we English people know nothing, or next to nothing, of one that is perhaps our noblest countryman.* FRANCIS BACON, *instead of being rightly revered, or even respected, is to the majority, little more than a dishonored name. It is even more* *deplorable that as day by day new writers come forward with fresh facts, their evidence is unheeded or cried down.*" (Preface).

The last sentence is particularly happy. It seems, as if Englishmen, upon this subject at least, had entirely dethroned reason, and upraised passion, prejudice, and ignorance to reign in its stead! For what can be more extraordinary than an entire Press banded together *to uphold the powers of darkness, and to deny Englands glory,* which shall arise *from the doubling of her greatest genius, when the key works of Francis Bacon are rightly applied to the Folio Plays of* 1623? One of the most curious chapters in the history of the human mind, will be furnished to posterity, by this prejudice and blindness, and probably will provide excellent example for some of the most striking theories advanced by Bacon, and perhaps fully anticipated, as well as illustrated, in his philosophy. In the meanwhile, it is no good arguing with those who contend for victory rather than for truth! For when men decline to accept, or to hear evidence, when they range themselves upon the opposite side of the house, they become no longer judges, but counsel, or enemies, who are in league to suppress a cause, or to defend *ex parte* prejudice.

Mr. Harold Bayley's book deserves an exhaustive review at our hands, but (alas!) space forbids little more than the briefest possible of notices. The work is divided into two sections—the first of which deals with "*The Mystery of Rosicrucians;*" the second part introduces, under the general heading of "*Deciphered Arcana,*" interesting pieces or excerpts, gathered from the cipher discoveries of Mrs. Gallup, and Doctor Orville Owen. The first part is fully illustrated by most interesting plates (together with explanations) of Elizabethan paper *Water-marks; Printers' Hieroglyphics;* and *Mason Marks* in old Churches. Mr. Bayley has found as many as forty different water-marks in one book, proving that no printer, or publisher, would indulge in this extravagance of variety at his own expense; and therefore that some deep design lies hid behind these costly and almost invisible emblems. Particularly interesting is the collection of these secret marks, illustrated upon plates, which face pages 38, 39; attention being especially drawn to those reproduced from pages of Bacon's *Advancement of Learning,* published at Oxford, in 1640. This book is really the first English edition of the *De Augmentis Scientiarum* (published 1623 by the side of the Folio Plays). As we know Bacon employed Dr. Playfer, and even Ben Jonson, *to translate this work into Latin,* it is certain this posthumously published English version, *existed prior to the De Augmentis*, and therefore is most interesting. Mr. Harold Bayley presents several paper watermarks borrowed from this rare book, and observes that several (Nos. 1, 2, 3, 11), bear the initials R. C. The theory that Francis Bacon was at the head, or a member of the mysterious fraternity of the Rosicrucians, has been received hitherto with incredulity and scant notice. Mr. Bayley revives the question, and brings much fresh evidence of a most interesting character to bear upon the problem. Not the least of his many convincing proofs, are these secretly signed paper, or watermarks.

Another valuable feature of this book, is the collection of collated portrait engravings of Francis Bacon, and the Earl of Essex, as well as of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, the two latter, according to the Biliteral Cipher narrative, being brother and father respectively to Francis St. Alban. There is to be traced, a certain resemblance between the portraits of Bacon and Essex, who are set side by side. At least, people who are opposed to the Baconian theories, *do perceive and are forced to acknowledge this likeness of feature.* It is especially noticeable in the lofty frontal dome, that characterises all portraits of Bacon and Essex, as well as in certain curve lines of the nose and nostrils. I have in my possession another portrait of Essex. I wish Mr. Bayley could have reproduced it, for the resemblance is in this portrait still more striking.

Mr. Harold Bayley contributes a most interesting bit of evidence, about the name of "TIDIR" (or TIDDER), (introduced in the discoveries of the Biliteral Cipher), in place, or standing for the equivalent of TUDOR. To many minds, no doubt, this strange archaism has been conclusive of the ineptitude of the cipher discoveries! The following is therefore important:—"There is an inscription upon the walls of the Tower of London, which may prove to be an unexpected confirmation of Bacon's cipher story. Writing in cipher, he says: '*My name is* TIDDER', spelling the word TUDOR with an 'i' instead of the more usual 'u.' 'Now turbulent Robert (Devereux, Earl of Essex) was on his arrest committed as a State prisoner to the Tower, and during his confinement he appears to have carved his name on the wall of his prison. The official guide to the inscriptions in the *Beauchamp Tower* says that over the doorway of the small cell, at the foot of the stairs, is the name ROBERT TIDIR'" (p. 101, "Trag. of Sir F. Bacon"). Mr. Bayley observes, "If this be coincidence, it is little less than miraculous—because no prisoner of this name is apparently recorded, or known, to history or tradition" *(Ib.)*. If my memory does not deceive me, in the first edition of "The History of King Henry the Seventh," by Bacon (1622) the name "TIDDER" is introduced in place of "TUDOR?" As I am at the present moment, not in a position to verify this assertion, perhaps some reader will kindly if found, contribute the context?

I shall hope to be permitted to continue this most brief notice of a most absorbingly interesting work, in another issue of the journal? The appeal, the author makes in his title—"*for further investigation and research*," is certainly no less urgent than he imagines. But what is really needed, is a further *appeal to the purse, in order to provide funds whereby the investigations and researches made, may see light, and be published.* A vast deal of most important discovery awaits issue, that owing to the unpopularity of the subject, and other causes, cannot find printers who will look upon the subject kindly from a financial point of view. An enlargement, or more frequent publication of BACONIANA, would meet the case, but for this funds are wanted. In America, works like the late Ignatius Donnelly's, and Mrs. Gallup's Biliteral, readily find subscribers who assist publication, or printers who risk the expenses. Over here it is different.

W. F. C. W.

THE BACON-SHAKESPEARE CAMPAIGN.

THE battle of rival critics still rages, and seems likely to continue. Throughout the country newspaper paragraphs are circulated, and the journals that exclude the topic are few and exceptional. Most of the reviewers and paragraphists are bitterly hostile to us; occasionally our views are either adopted, or received with hesitating deference as possessing some plausability. If a book or a letter appears on our side, however reasonable and scholarlike it may be, it is denounced as an outcome of ignorance and sophistry. Censure is so extravagant as to raise serious questions as to its *bona fides.* When a Shakespearean advocate of high literary position calmly announces that the invariable tendency to monomania in our ranks has been ascertained by careful investigation of cases, he forgets the advice given by his idol,—

> "Heat not a furnace for your foe so hot,
> That it do singe yourself."

If any book might be expected to deserve respectful treatment, it would be that which our learned and scholarly colleague, Mr. G. C. Bompas, has just published.* A discussion so calm, so studiously courteous and gentle, so marked by careful and original research, has rarely come under our notice. And yet the same measure of invective that is applied to the crudest Baconian advocates has been given to this. Strange that its high merits are so invisible! For it is not simply a re-statement of the historic argument, it is a substantial contribution of new facts, so striking, so convincing as almost to afford demonstration of the conclusion which they support. We would gladly reproduce some of these new facts, but are not unwilling to leave them for our readers to find.

As a specimen, take the case of the gift of £1,000 to William Shakespere by Lord Southampton—a tradition much prized by some of our opponents. Mr. Bompas proves that the time when Shakspere made his first land investments, in 1597, was exactly the time when his profits as an actor made him very rich, and when Southampton's extravagance had so impoverished him that he had "joined the Paris Embassy to retrieve his fortunes."

Mr. Bompas also proves that Bacon was called a "concealed poet," not only by himself, but by others. Also our author almost proves that some of the plays appeared before Shakspere left Stratford; and that some of Bacon's early studies were distasteful to those who applauded his philosophical writings. And so the whole Shakspere myth collapses.

The exploded Southampton tradition gives a useful object lesson of the kind of basis by which current notions are supported,—doubtful traditions, faint rumours, irrevelant facts, unlimited conjectures, gratuitous augmentations, unlicensed imaginations, and hazardous assertions. All Mr, Bompas's facts are relevant to the issue. They are always supported by evidence capable of verification and by reference to authorities. Rarely is any merely probable argument even hinted at, and, if used, its grounds and value are distinctly stated. Nothing more judicial, nothing more entirely reasonable has ever been produced in this discussion. It is difficult to imagine how its strong argument can be resisted.

---

* "The Problem of the Shakespeare Plays." By G. C. Bompas. (Sampson, Low & Co.)

Per contra, Mr. Calvert has published, on the opposite side, a very handsome volume, sumptuously printed and bound, gilded and glazed, adorned by excellent plates and portraits; a book to ornament any drawing-room table.* And in saying this we have given all the praise to which it is entitled. It is so full of plentiful ignorance and sophistical argument that we are not at all surprised at the welcome which it has received from our very gentle critics. We were, ourselves, prepared for something worth consideration, perhaps a refutation of one or two of our cherished arguments. But as soon as we read the preface all those fond hopes vanished. The preface opens a fusillade of hot invective which never ceases through the volume; and as we proceeded we found that Bacon and all his advocates are not only entirely misunderstood, but unsparingly misrepresented. Mr. Calvert's hatred of Bacon is such that he is even willing to believe in any cipher contrivance of his devising, by which he might fraudulently appropriate literary credit which did not belong to him.

Some of Mr. Calvert's chapters are intended to crush the arguments or studies of our colleague Mr. R. M. Theobald, who, we are informed, writes "sheer nonsense," and who is credited with a variety of assertions which are not to be found in his book, and which no sane person would be likely to make. It is really very satisfactory to find that this fierce philippic is another over-heated furnace more damaging to its author than to the objects of his attack. For Mr. Calvert's crusade against the Baconian theory requires him to believe that Bacon was an unscrupulous scoundrel.

Is it conceivable that Bacon, as Mr. Calvert pictures him, or any other justly convicted criminal,—would leave his name and memory as a bequest "to men's charitable speeches, and to foreign nations, and the next ages?" Very few even of Mr. Calvert's own side will, we imagine, follow his leading in this sort of argument.

---

* "Bacon and Shakespeare." By Albert F. Calvert. (Dean & Co.)

TO THE EDITORS OF "BACONIANA."

Without in any way discussing whether Mrs. Gallup's deciphered story is or is not correct, it may be of interest to notice that some of the evidence brought forward to prove that it *cannot* be the work of Francis Bacon falls to the ground upon examination.

Mr. R. Garnett, in his letter to the *Times* of January 3rd, objects to the phrase in Mrs. Gallup's Cipher Story "'our colonies in all th' regions of the globe, fro' remote East to a remoter West,' when England did not possess a single colony anywhere except in North America."

Spenser in the "Faerie Queene," Book I., Canto 1, Stanza 5, speaks of Una as the descendant

> "Of ancient kings and queenes that had of yore
> Their scepters stretcht from East to Western shore."

Holiness is represented by Una in the first instance, but Elizabeth is also glanced at. Further, in those days when adventurers were sailing to all quarters of the globe, Englishmen felt that there was no limit to the possibilities of empire. Spenser, "Faerie Queene," Introduction to Book II., says:—

> "Who ever heard of th' Indian Peru?
> Or who in venturous vessell measured
> The Amazon's huge river now found true?
> Or fruitfullest Virginia who did ever view?
>
> Yet all these were, when no man did them knowe,
> Yet have from wisest ages hidden beene,
> And later times things more unknowne shall showe."

In some notes sent by Mr. Marston to the *Times*, January 3rd, we read, "Was Bacon a Yankee? He spells words like labour and honour without the 'u.'"

Notice the spelling in the following quotations:—

> "No sun shall ever usher forth mine honors."
> —*Henry VIII.*, Act III., Sc. 2 (Folio 1623).
>
> "Sounded all the depths and shoales of honor."
> —*Ibid.*
>
> "Peace, you ungracious clamors."
> —*Troilus and Cressida* (Folio 1623).
>
> "Every man in his humor."
> —Ben Jonson.

In "Epistle Dedicatorie to T. Bright's Treatise of Melancholie" (1586), we find "endevor," p. 4, and "to honor," p. 7. In the "Anatomy of Melancholy" (1621) we find "clamor," p. 12; "humor," pp. 74, 87; "labor," p. 213, etc., etc. The same words also appear spelt with "u." Examples might also be found *ad infinitum.*

Mr. Thurston in the *Times*, January 1st, objects to some of the phrases in the deciphered story as modern; but what could savour more of a present-day Americanism than "most elegantly done"? (Chapman's "Iliad," Book XIII).

A writer quoted in Baconiana for January says "'twas" and "'tis" only became common in the 18th century; but in the "Anatomy of Melancholy" (1621) we find "'twas" once, and "'tis" fifteen times in the Introduction.

Mr. Candler, in *The Nineteenth Century and After*, says that "his" instead of "s" is found in Elizabethan writers, especially after proper nouns ending in "s," and that Mrs. Gallup breaks this rule by writing "Solomon his temple," etc.; but in Florio's "Second Fruits," p. 61, there is—"Dr. Grillo his phisike;" p. 134, "Lippotopo his mouth;" p. 183, "Ariosto his ring," etc.

Mr. Candler also draws attention to the use of words, such as "cognomen," "desiderata," "cognizante," "costive," "innocuous," "surcease," "satiate." In the Shakespeare Plays a word is often coined for some particular case, as "enactures," "incarnadine." Such words as "cognomen," "desiderata," and "cognizante" are not less expected than "incarnadine," and on the other hand "tortive," "persistive," "unplausive" (*Troilus and Cressida*), present as strange an appearance as "costive."

"Innocuous" is used of people in the "Anatomy of Melancholy" (1621): "Northerne men, innocuous, free from riot," p. 82; and, "The patient innocuous man."

"Surcease" is used three times in the Shakespeare Plays, and also in the "Anatomy of Melancholy" (1621), p. 45 of the Introduction, "satiate" is found once, and "insatiate" four times in the Shakespeare Plays; also in the "Anatomy of Melancholy," p. 671, "Pale Jealousie, child of insatiate love."

Mr. Candler asks, "If Bacon had written Plays, would he have placed a port in Bohemia?" Freeman's "Historical Geography of Europe" states: "In the end, between marriage and conquest and Royal grants, Ottokar, King of Bohemia, obtained the Duchies of Austria and Styria, and a few years later he further added Carinthia, by the request of its Duke. The power of that King for a moment reached the Baltic, as well as the Hadriatic, for Ottokar carried his arms into Prussia and became the founder of Königsberg." George Sand also says Ottokar II. had a seaport on the Adriatic. Furnival's edition of the Shakespeare Plays has this note: "Tschamer's 'Annals of the Barefooted Friars' (1654) says: 'In 1481 fourteen pilgrims, after having been attacked by Corsairs, landed at Bohemia.'"

With regard to the question of the translation of Homer, is it not possible that Pope and Bacon both consulted earlier versions? Dr. Johnson says of Pope as a translator: "If more help was wanting, he had the poetical translation of Eobanus Hessius, an unwearied writer of Latin verses; he had the French Homers of La Valterie and Dacier, and the English of Chapman, Hobbes and Ogilby. With Chapman he had very frequent consultations, and perhaps never translated any passage till he had read his version, which indeed he has been sometimes suspected of using instead of the original."

Two examples given in *The Nineteenth Century and After* of passages parallel in Pope and Bacon, but not in Homer, are found also in Chapman. Homer speaks of Pylos and Peteleon without adjectives, but we find—"Pylos' sandy coast" (Pope); "from sandy Pylos" (Bacon); "Pylos' sandy soil" (Chapman); Pope says "'little' Pteleon," so does Bacon; yes, but so does Chapman.

These few facts were noted in a short time, and no doubt a longer and wider search would disclose further evidence on the use of the questioned words and on the parallelism of Pope's translation to earlier versions. Four French translations were published between 1530 and 1715, when Pope's appeared in England, namely—Samxou, 1530; Salel, 1545; Salel and Magny, 1570; Dacier, 1711. Madame Dacier considered that Pope had availed himself of her work without sufficient acknowledgment. It would be interesting if some of your readers could compare Pope's Homer with these various early versions, and would then give us the results.

Yours truly,
E. J. DURNING-LAWRENCE.

TO THE EDITORS OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIRS,—In the hope of shortening the controversy respecting Mrs. Gallup's book, I would suggest that our Society ask that lady to be kind enough to reveal, in detail, the method by which she obtained the passages in her book, which are copied in the right hand column below.

The similarity of these passages to those taken from *Henry VII.*, shown in the left hand column below, is so striking that one is forced to the conclusion that the likeness is intentional, and I feel that it only needs proof from Mrs. Gallup of the correctness of this portion of her translation to establish confidence in the whole of it as a faithful interpretation of Bacon's work.

My suggestion involves, I think, but little labour for Mrs. Gallup, or for those who may examine the particulars, which I hope she will supply.

The passages referred to are:—

From *Henry VII.* 1622 Edition, page 11.	From "Biliteral Cipher," page 135 (The Paraceve, 1620).
For that which concerned the entailing of the Crown (more than that he was true to his own will, that he would not endure any mention of the Lady Elizabeth: no not in the nature of special entail)	The desire of our father, who remained a simple Earl although he was wedded to a reigning Queen, was to make these affairs so well understood that the succession should be without question. To our mother no such measure was pleasing. By no argument, how strong soever, might this concession be obtained, and after some time he was fain to appeal the case for us directly to Parliament to procure the Crown to be entailed upon Elizabeth and the heirs of her body.
he carried it otherwise with great wisdom and measure.	He handled everything with greatest measure,
For he did not press to have the act penned by way of declaration or recognition of right:	as he did not press to have the act penned by way of any declaration of right,
as on the other side, he avoided to have it by new law or ordinance;	also avoiding to have the same by a new law or ordinance,

From *Henry VII.* 1622 Edition, page 11.	From "Biliteral Cipher," page 195 (The Paraceve, 1620).
but chose rather a kind of middle-way, by way of establishment,	but choosing a course between the two, by way of sure establishment,
and that under covert and indifferent words;	under covert and indifferent words,
That the inheritance of the Crown should rest, remain, and abide in the King, &c.	that the inheritance of this Crown, as hath been mentioned here, rest, remain, and abide in the Queen,
. . . . . .	
And again for the limitation of the entail,	and as for limitation of the entail,
he did not press it to go further than to himself, and to the Heirs of his body, not speaking of his right Heirs;	he stopt with the heirs of the Queen's body, not saying the right heirs,
but leaving that to the law to decide;	thereby leaving it to the law to decide,
so as the entail might seem rather a personal favour to him, and his children, than a total dis-inherison to the House of York.	so as the entail might rather seem a favour to her, Elizabeth, and to their children, than as intended dis-inherison to the House of Stuart.

Personally, I have no doubt of the correctness of Mrs. Gallup's work, for I have found much that corroborates it. Since my communication to the January Number of BACONIANA, I have noticed a number of things which have strengthened my belief. The vignette on "Four Hymnes," and "Teares of the Muses" in the "1611 Spenser" is unquestionably a pictorial reference to the Biliteral Cipher. It contains two female figures, the one holding a key, and a tablet with *five* letters printed on it; the other, a square and compasses. This reads, "The key to the Biliteral [*five* letter or *five* sign] cipher is the square and compasses." In the volume are several tail pieces showing the execution of Anne Boleyn, not with axe and block, but with a sword. I have an old print in which her execution is so depicted. The incident is emphasized on the last page of the recently published "Tragedy of Anne Boleyn." Other head and tail pieces in the 1611 Spenser illustrate passages in Mrs. Gallup's book. In the 1632 Edition of Bacon's Essays, the Essays numbered 12, 17, 19, 27, and 40, have I for their initial letter. On the left of that letter there is, in each case, a diminutive T and on the right a diminutive D. This gives TID, the first syllable of the name "TIDDER" in Mrs. Gallup's book. The only initial F in the book is that in the Essay "Of Delays," which is numbered 21. The number is the sum of 10 and 11, which as mentioned in my former letter represent F. B.

We have :—Initial letter F. = 10 and number of Essay 21 = $\underset{\text{F.}}{10} + \underset{\text{B.}}{11}$.

And if we add ... B. = 11 11

We get ... ... F. B. = 21 32

Now turn to Essay 32, and we find the *only* pictorial initial, commencing an Essay in this Edition. It contains an S *printed upside down* in a picture with a man holding a spear. In the back ground is a mountain with a river at its foot. May we not reasonably assume that these represent Shakespeare, Mount Parnassus, and the River Helicon? The initial of Essay 32 in the 1629 Edition is identical with this one, although those of all the other Essays in that Edition differ from the initials in the 1632 Edition.

Yours faithfully,

A. J. WILLIAMS.

77, Colmore Row, Birmingham, 10th March, 1902.

TO THE EDITORS OF "BACONIANA."

MR. A. J. WILLIAMS, in a letter published in BACONIANA, January, 1902, calls attention to the fact that in the Folio Edition of "Shakespeare's Plays (1623)" twenty-five of the Plays have a tailpiece, and eleven have none, twenty-five have headpieces properly printed, and eleven have them reversed. He asks if the same arrangement is observed in the Folios of 1632 and 1664.

In the 1632 Folio, the designs employed in the headpieces are the same as in that of 1623, but only in three cases, namely, over "King John," II. Part "Henry VI.," and "Richard III.," do they coincide in design and position. Of the thirty-six headpieces, ten are printed correctly and twenty-six are reversed. There does not seem to be systematic coincidence between those reversed in the two Folios; for example, on comparing the eleven reversed in the Folio of 1623 with the headpieces of the corresponding Plays in 1632, two are the same design and similarly reversed; six are the same design, but correctly printed; three are different design, though reversed. Of the Plays of 1632, twenty-one have tailpieces, and fifteen have none. The coincidence in the use of the tailpieces is more marked, as of the twenty-five Plays of 1623 which have tailpieces, twenty-one correspond to the twenty-one of the 1632 Folio. The designs differ except in one instance, "Henry VI.," Part I. The presence of tailpieces does not depend on the space at the end of the Plays, as often there is room enough, but it has not been used.

In the 1664 Folio, the headpieces are different from those in the previous Folios, and not any of them are reversed. Omitting the last seven Plays which the 1664 Folio has, in addition to the thirty-six of the other two Folios, there are twenty-two with tailpieces and fourteen without. Here, twenty-two of the twenty-five Plays with tailpieces in the 1623 Folio correspond to the twenty-two of the 1664 Folio, but none are like in design.

C. I. SHAWCROSS.

SIR,—Can any reader offer an explanation why Francis Bacon is not included in the *House List* of Trinity College, Cambridge. Anthony is. A detailed Life of Anthony is given, and his "illustrious brother," Francis, is mentioned as being with him and matriculating, June, 1573. *No Life of Francis is given. Athenae Cantabrigiensis* (Cooper).

AN ENQUIRER

SIR,—Isaac D'Israeli says that Queen Anne of Denmark had a "rhyming and fantastical Secretary" called Sir William Fowler. Has it ever been suggested that he was the origin of "Malvolio?" Can any of your readers furnish any information on this point?

A STAUNCH BACONIAN.

SIR,—With reference to the statement made that if Queen Elizabeth were married to Leicester her issue had no right to the throne, I quote from Hepworth Dixon, p. 124 of "Her Majesty's Tower." Copyright Edition. (1841. 16mo.) Charles Brandon married Mary, younger sister of Henry VII., secretly. "Her rights descended to Frances, though not without legal flaw, since, at the time of the Queen's marriage with Brandon that nobleman had a wife alive." And again, Henry Grey, Marquis of Dorset, "had a wife alive when he married Frances." Her father's and grandfather's bigamy did not debar Lady Jane from being crowned Queen.

Yours truly,
A. A. L.

March, 1902.

REPLY TO AN ENQUIRY.

CONCERNING the inquiry of "A. A. L." in the October issue of BACONIANA regarding the skull of Essex, there is in Bayle, 1736, under "Goutant" an account of Elizabeth exhibiting it to Goutant (Biron), and the marginal references may enable one to trace to its earliest sources the fact that Elizabeth kept Essex's hand and exposed it to visiting courtiers.

ERRATA.—JANUARY, 1902.

Page 12.—In Matthew Arnold's poem on "Shakespeare," line 3, delete the first "his."

Page 16, line 17.—For "Peasusagus," read "Prasutagus."

Page 16, last line.—For "mantel," read "mantle."

Page 11, line 22.—For "in the Scottish paper *The People*," read "in the *Stratford-on-Avon Herald* from 7th October, 1898, to 24th March, 1899."

Page 21, line 15.—A line of poetry was omitted. It should read.—

"Which after, by devouring time abused,
Into the dying parts had life infused,
By James the First of England, to become
The glory of Alban's proto-martyrdom."

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

The Tragedy of Sir Francis Bacon. An Appeal for Further Investigation and Research. By Harold Bayley. Crown 8vo. Cloth. 6s. net. This book is an attempt to throw further light on the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy, but it does much more than this. The author's evidence goes to prove that the secret fraternity of learned men known to history as the Rosicrucians, or the Brethren of the Rose and Cross, was really a company of writers with whom Bacon was closely associated, and under whose auspices the plays known as Shakespeare's, and also a considerable number of other works of the period, were written and published. These works were secretly hall-marked, and are to be identified by peculiar and distinctive emblems, in the form of paper-marks, printers' ornaments, and woodcuts. The volume is illustrated by several portraits and sixty reproductions of Rosicrucian symbols.

The Biliteral Cipher: Hints for Deciphering. By Mrs. Henry Pott. Price 6d.

Obiter Dicta of Bacon and Shakespeare on Mind, Manners, Morals. By Mrs. Henry Pott. Handsome cloth, gilt side and back, price 4s. 6d. net. Post free for postal order. 316 pages, crown 8vo.

Did Francis Bacon Write Shakespeare? Part I., "Thirty-two Reasons for Believing that He did"; Part II., "The Lives of Bacon and Shakespeare Compared"—two handbooks by Mrs. H. Pott; also Parts III. IV., V. (R. Banks and Son, 5, Racquet-court, Fleet-street, E.C.) Price 1s. each, post free 1s. 2d.

Bacon or Shakespeare? Compiled by Colonel Francis C. Maude, V.C., C.B. Paper cover, price 1s.

1892 "Baconiana" Volumes. Vol. I., London, May, 1893, to February, 1894; Vol. II., 1894-5; Vol. III., 1895 (all published by R. Banks Racquet-court, Fleet-street). Price 6s. each.

***The Shakespearean Myth: William Shakspere and Circumstantial Evidence.** By Appleton Morgan, A.M., LL.B., Author of "Notes to Best's Principles of Evidence."

The Great Cryptogram. By the Hon. Ignatius Donnelly, author of "Atlantis," "Ragnarok," "Dr. Huguet," (1888; Chicago, New York: R. Peale and Co.; London: Sampson, Marston.) Parts I. and II. are elaborate arguments, with evidence concerning the authorship. Following upon the 13 Essays which support this part of the contention is Part III., "Parallelisms" of Expressions Metaphors, Opinions, Quotations, Studies, Errors, Identities of Style, Character, &c Vol. II. is devoted to the much-discussed Cipher, concerning which it is certain that the last word has not yet been said.

The Bi-Literal Cipher of Sir Francis Bacon. Discovered in his Works, and Deciphered by Mrs. E. W. Gallup. Third Edition, with a large quantity of new deciphered matter. Large 8vo., with many facsimiles, paper covers, 6s. net; cloth, 15s. net.

---

*These pamphlets and most other works on the subject may be obtained of ROBERT BANKS AND SON, Racquet-court, Fleet-street, London. Volumes marked thus (*) are *out of print*, but MESSRS. BANKS will, if possible, obtain second-hand copies.

Baconiana.

Vol. X.—*New Series.* JULY, 1902. No. 39.

ABRIDGED REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL AND MEMBERS OF THE BACON SOCIETY, 22, ALBEMARLE STREET, MAY 12, 1902.

A GENERAL MEETING of the Council and Members of the Bacon Society was held on May 12th, at the Rooms of the Asiatic Society, 22, Albemarle Street, Piccadilly. The meeting was well attended. General Sir Percy R. B. Feilding, Bart. (President of the Society), was in the Chair.

After some preliminary words from the President alluding to the controversy about Mrs. Gallup's book, he called upon Mr. Fearon (Vice-President) to read some notes which he had prepared on the subject.

Mr. Fearon said that before commencing the business of the evening (namely, the appointing of officers of the Society for the ensuing year), it would be well that a few words should be said on matters connected with the Society's subjects and interests. He commented upon the fact that the Society, in spite of opposition and difficulties, had been steadily making its way. Many good, scholarlike, and convincing books continued to be published, and now formed a considerable literature (lists of these being from time to time printed in BACONIANA). Mr. Fearon then launched into the much-vexed question of the Cipher, describing the "strong divergence of opinion" immediately produced by Mrs. Gallup's book, and the strange and sensational story which it reveals. He spoke of the attempts made by himself and others to decipher, and their failure even to distinguish the necessary two founts of *Italic* type. Nevertheless, Mr. Fearon admitted "There was no sign of any desire (on Mrs. Gallup's part) to keep back anything, on the contrary she did her best to satisfy us, but failed." Mr. Fearon and those who share his views seemed to think it incumbent upon Mrs. Gallup to produce "10 or 12 alphabets for 10 or 12 of the principal books worked upon by her," in order that these should be lithographed, and distributed amongst those who wished to be convinced. Mrs. Gallup's sight, however, having failed her, she left England, and the alphabets, which Mr. Fearon considered to be promised, never came. The articles written to English magazines by Mrs. Gallup did not, in Mr. Fearon's opinion, carry the matter any further. The book was "pounced upon by the critics, who evidently had not studied it; but the word had evidently gone forth that it was to be smashed. This was a pity, as the question of the existence of the Cipher should be settled definitely."

The speaker then alluded briefly to Mr. Mallock's advocacy of the Cipher (in an article published in the *Nineteenth Century*). He described the Council as "reconciled to the policy of abiding events" by hearing that Mr. Mallock was causing enlarged photographs to be made of some pages on which Mrs. Gallup had worked, and which might facilitate research. The Council did not think it worth while to discuss the statements and stories supposed to have been evolved by the cipher, until they were certain that the evolution had taken place, and that what was stated to be told, was actually told.

On the conclusion of his paper the Vice-President read the list of the present officers of the Society, and of the Members whose names had been submitted as willing to serve on the Council. The following were elected, and now form the Council of the Bacon Society:—

President:
GENERAL SIR PERCY R. B. FEILDING, BART.

Vice-President:
MR. FEARON.

Re-elected on the Council:
MR. G. COX BOMPAS. MR. E. T. MILLER.
MR. HENRY POTT.

Newly Elected:
MR. HAROLD BAYLEY. MR. W. T. SMEDLEY.
MR. FLEMING FULCHER. MR. A. P. SINNETT.
MR. C. E. NEWBON. MR. R. M. THEOBALD.

MR. HENRY POTT was re-elected *Treasurer* to the end of the year.

MR. A. T. JONES was appointed Assistant Secretary and Clerk for the ensuing year.

A brisk debate then followed. Mr. Sinnett, being invited to speak, expressed his own opinions about the Cipher question. Personally he was disposed to believe in it, not because he had endeavoured to check or verify it, but because he found that the probability of its being correct was exceedingly strong. The wonderful narrative of Francis "Bacon's" parentage seemed to absorb all attention, but that was not nearly all that Mrs. Gallup's book contained; she could not have made that translation from Homer. He thought it a pity that in the present state of knowledge, such great stress should be laid upon the Cipher subject by its opponents, as virtually to make men forget or ignore other momentous questions. All possible efforts should be made to bring the Bacon Society and the mass of information which it has accumulated, prominently before the public. In spite of press opposition, he believed that there were now thousands of educated people in England in sympathy with the Baconians. He looked forward to the time when Baconians would hold their meetings in the largest halls of London. Whether the Cipher were true or false (and it seemed *impossible* to believe it false), this Cipher had created an amount of feeling never felt before, and if the Society failed to take advantage of the present opportunity, it would be better to dissolve it than to impede the work of propaganda.

Sir Percy Feilding in thanking Mr. Sinnett for the suggestions made in his speech, said that there seemed to be many present who believed in the Cipher, and he called upon any one present who understood the subject, to speak upon it.

Mr. Parker Woodward said that although he had not worked at the Biliteral Cipher, yet he had followed the story, and had come across many corroborative statements which should be probed into. He thought it unnecessary in the present condition of things for any one to be forced to pledge his opinions upon matters evidently not as yet clearly understood, and which must require much study and time before they could be fairly sifted and decided upon. He did not wish to enter into controversy or acrimonious discussion, but he thought it unfair, as well as unwise, for the Society to refuse to meet and patiently examine into facts or supposed discoveries which might be brought before them. He disapproved of the Resolution, passed by some of the Council in December, 1901, which committed the Society, as a whole, to hostile opinions shared only by a minority. He did not feel that Mrs. Gallup had been handled so kindly as she deserved, and he considered that the spirit in which she had met her critics was admirable.

Mr. Woodward concluded by saying that as the Press combined in trying to suppress Baconism, the Society should exert itself to make its whereabouts, as well as its publications and tenets, better known. (This speech was much approved.)

Mr. Newbon wished to corroborate the suggestion that the Society should now go boldly before the public. He hoped that the Society would consider the subject with a logical mind, and convince themselves as men capable of exercising judgment.

Mr. Harold Bayley next read some interesting notes from the point of view of an expert, on the different types "which stared him plainly in the face" in the Baconian type. The errors* which he had himself discovered in this Baconian type were so many, that it could not be thought surprising if Mrs. Gallup were sometimes mistaken. He was acquainted with Mrs. Gallup; he believed her to be on the whole correct; she always answered in a perfectly straightforward manner the questions which he put to her on these matters.

Mr. Smedley did not consider the Cipher subject of vital importance. He earnestly exhorted the Society to bestir itself, and to come prominently before the public. Ample funds, he was sure, would be forthcoming if only the Council and Society would very considerably wake up and regard its work in a more serious manner. It is a solemn duty that the life and true character of "Bacon," Lord Verulam—Viscount St. Alban—should be brought prominently before the people of this country, the erroneous views which have been propagated concerning him corrected, and his name and fame vindicated.

Sir Percy Feilding then called on Mrs. Pott to say what she knew of the Cipher.

Mrs. Pott declined to attempt an explanation in a few words, and without diagrams. She said that the thing depended upon many small particulars, and that one might as well try to explain hieroglyphics in ten minutes, as expound the minutiæ of deciphering in a few words to a mixed audience.

Sir Percy said that he believed that Mrs. Pott had worked out the Cipher satisfactorily on her own account, and had also worked out the same Ciphers which Mrs. Gallup had done. It would assist the Society very much if Mrs. Pott would give them an evening when she could explain how she herself worked out the Cipher.

---

* Some decipherers think that these supposed "Errors" are truly hints and guides in further developments of the Cipher.—Ed. Note.

Mrs. Pott replied that the subject was hardly suited to a mixed audience in a large room, it required patience and close attention. She has already printed a pamphlet, demonstrating the method of deciphering to many individuals, but she thought it a pity that people should worry themselves over this thing until the results of Mr. Mallock's researches were made known. Mrs. Pott had seen Mr. Mallock, and found him able readily to decipher 75 per cent of the Baconian italics, in accordance with Mrs. Gallup's readings. Mrs. Pott believed the remaining 25 per cent. to be equally distinguishable, if the geometrical principle be duly applied, and that when Mr. Mallock's many enlargements of deciphered pages, being made for him at the Clarendon Press, were completed, he would publish an article summing up his results.

Mr. Gay spoke boldly in favour of Mrs. Gallup, ridiculing the idea that she could have concocted a fraud with a view to gain. He appealed to Baconian writers present to say how much any one had ever made by upholding this cause. Everything published was a labour of love, carried out at much cost and almost invariable loss. He was proud of his acquaintance with Mrs. Gallup, and to be connected with her as the publisher of her work. He had done his best to get her Cipher investigated by Mr. Sydney Lee, but in vain. All that she had obtained up to the present time was abuse by men who ought to have helped her.

Dr. Washington Sullivan, in a very able speech, endorsed these remarks. He was absolutely convinced of the reality of the Cipher, and of its existence in the books named and deciphered by Mrs. Gallup. "Anyone who looked at her portrait would recognise in her a steady perseverance, and an industrious and resolute character. She was a typical New England lady."

Mrs. Pott said that Baconians who disliked the Cipher would do well to turn their attention to other branches of the great subject. Those who spoke of the vast amount of information amassed, should also consider the number of important points upon which we are still totally ignorant. We do not know when or where Francis St. Alban was born. Dr. Rawley, his Chaplain and Secretary, made the misleading statement (doubtless intentional), that he was born at

"*York House or York Place, Strand*"—expressing that the *House* or *Place* were the same building. But York House was the residence of Sir Nicholas Bacon, and was in the Strand; York Place was *not* in the Strand, but was the Palace of Whitehall. The dates given were equally confused and uncertain. Neither were definite facts known about the boyhood or youth of Francis called Bacon; or of his married life; nor were particulars known as to his death and place of burial.

Four equally reliable authorities give different records of these events. According to Dr. Rawley, he died at Highgate at the house of Lord Arundell. According to Dr. Spratt, President of the Royal Society, he died at the house of his friend and physician Dr. Parry, in a street in London. Another President (Dr. Wallis?) said that he died at the house of Dr. Witherbourne, one and a-half miles from Highgate. Fuller records that he died at the house of his cousin (*i.e.*, a cousin of the Bacons), Sir Julius Cæsar, at Mitcham.* There is strong reason for believing that Francis St. Alban died at none of these places, but that he *died to the world* in 1626, retiring for study and contemplation to some hermitage or religious house, and dying at a very advanced age.

In the course of the evening Mrs. Pott referred to the Douce MSS., *supposed to be* at the British Museum, but of which the greater portion were found to be in the Bodleian Library. Much mystery was attached to these MSS., *said to have been* left by Mr. Douce (Keeper of the MSS. Brit. Mus.) in 1834, and to be revealed to the public in 1900. They demand serious inquiry and examination.

There was also a sealed bag at the Record Office *said to have been* there since the death of Queen Elizabeth, and which was to be opened only with the joint consent of the King, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Lord Chancellor. As 1903 would be the 300th year from the death of Elizabeth, this seemed to be a fitting time for appealing to the proper authorities for permission to have this bag opened, and its secrets disclosed.

Mr. Fleming Fulcher also spoke in favour of greater activity in research, not only as to the mysteries of Bacon's life, but with regard to every new discovery or theory. Every one, he said, should keep an open mind with regard to the Biliteral and other Ciphers, which were being diligently worked out. These were not merely things to amuse school-boys—they went far beyond the mere interest of a puzzle or a curious problem; the very opposition and controversy to which they had led are sufficient to prove that the matter revealed by them are of extraordinary interest and importance. As for Mrs. Gallup, he was strongly impressed by her straightforwardness, and painstaking, plodding perseverance. She seemed to be "essentially genuine."

---

* Or Muswell Hill.

Lady Durning-Lawrence described a visit paid by Mrs. Gallup and her sister Miss Wells to Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence's magnificent Baconian Library. Here Mrs. Gallup found a copy of a rare edition used in the Biliteral, but which she had not been able to procure at the time when she was deciphering; a gap had therefore been left in the printed narrative. Mrs. Gallup, in the presence of Sir Edwin and Lady Durning-Lawrence, deciphered this piece, which fitted in perfectly to the place which had been previously left a blank.

Sir Percy Feilding considered this the strongest evidence yet produced, and after a little more discussion on points connected with the advancement of the Society, and the broadening of its basis, some remarks were passed on Pope's translation of the "Iliad."

Mrs. Pott pointed out how frequently the name, Pope, variously spelt, occurs in documents of the Baconian period; for instance, in letters to Anthony Bacon (Tenison Collection, Lambeth Palace) Morgan Pope was Lessee of the Bear Garden in 1585; Thomas Pope, a distinguished Comic Actor; John Pope (father of Alexander "the poet") was one of the earliest Fellows of the Royal Society founded by Francis; Sir Thomas Pope, friend of Sir Thomas More, founded Trinity College, Oxford. Mrs. Pott said that if Alexander Pope was merely one of "Bacon's" many masks and "Handers-down of the Lamp of Tradition," it would be easy to explain the proved similarities in thought and diction which Baconians have long ago collated from the works of "Bacon" and "Pope."

Miss Alicia A. Leith drew the attention of the meeting to the fact that the special volume of Homer's "Iliad" used by Pope for his translation was a marked book, illustrated with sketches by Pope's pen, and was at one time in the possession of Lady Waldegrave. If the volume were traced and inspected closely it might throw light on certain lines alleged to exist both in Pope's and Mrs. Gallup's "Iliad," but not in Homer's. The formal meeting was shortly after this brought to a close, and ended in a pleasant conversazione.

C. M. POTT.

A HUMBLE REMONSTRANCE.

IN the April number of this review Mr. G. Stronach, M.A., honoured a previous paper of mine with some criticisms, and invited my answer to a question. May I be permitted to deal with them in somewhat the same order?

FIRST, THEN, AS TO MISS STRICKLAND.

As a slight corroboration of the Cipher Story, I still think it worth noting that the behaviour of Dudley and Elizabeth—at one time prisoners in the Tower, but who did not meet again until the Queen's accession—should have occasioned the remark from a learned authoress (who had searched closely into Elizabethan records and wrote long before any Cipher questions) that there must have been a secret understanding established between them while prisoners, and that the conduct of the Queen "must have originated from some powerful motive which does not appear on the surface of history."

THE AMBASSADORS' REPORTS.

Next Mr. Stronach attacks the ambassadors. The ambassadors' letters are statements made in writing at the time and still preserved. It is against common sense to suggest that the ambassadors were not doing to the best of their opportunities the work they were in England for—namely, to represent and keep informed their potentates of what was going on.

There is no value in the emotional passage from Dixon quoted by Mr. Stronach.

In discussing the distasteful question of the chastity of Elizabeth, let us go direct to the documentary evidence—viz., the Seymour Papers, Ambassadors' Letters, Melville Reports, the Hatton Dyer Letters, and the Raleigh Letters, for example. Mr. Dixon's rounded sentences may appeal to the literary soul. I prefer the contemporary documents.

THE VISITS OF ELIZABETH.

Mr. Stronach objects to my inference that a mother was visiting her child at Gorhambury. I will accept his comment that nothing can necessarily be inferred as to this; but, added to the Cipher account, the facts have considerable evidential import.

She was at St. Albans when Gorhambury House was completed in August, 1568.

Anthony, according to tradition, was the elder brother of Francis. The date of the birth of the younger is recorded, that of Anthony unrecorded and unknown. There is a bust of young Francis, but not one of Anthony; a miniature by Hilliard of Francis at 18, but none of Anthony. The year this was painted the Queen gave Sir Nicholas her portrait by the same artist. She visited Gorhambury in July, 1572, and again in March, 1572-3, her visit being followed next month (April) by the despatch of Francis to Trinity College, Cambridge, at the early age of 12.

Sir Nicholas Bacon became wealthy by obtaining the forfeited estates of religious orders necessarily by grants from the Crown.

Anthony would not be sent abroad before he was educated, and there is no evidence whatever of his going before the year 1579. As between the two children, the differential treatment is singular and worth noting.

THE QUEEN'S PROVISION FOR FRANCIS.

Mr. Stronach attacks my propositions, that Sir Nicholas made no provision for Francis, and that the Queen provided for him. Once more I rely upon the documents: first, the will of Sir Nicholas, to be seen at Somerset House, and dated 12th December, 1578, ten weeks before he died, and which makes no provision for Francis.

Against this Mr. Stronach offers statements from a biography written by Rawley about fifty years after. This account has proved a useful red herring across the paths of Mr. Spedding, Dr. Abbott, and now of Mr. G. Stronach. Sir Nicholas did not die intestate. Even adding Francis, there were not "five brothers." Had there been an intestacy, the three girls as well as the boys would have taken share, and the share would have been not a fifth of the whole fund, but a seventh of two-thirds, the other third going to the widow. Sir Nicholas could have settled by the will any provision he wished for Francis. That he did not is a material piece of evidence, and the Rawley account is neither true nor sensible. As to the other point, Mr. Stronach, with the letter of 18th October, 1580, Francis Bacon to Burleigh, before him, has the courage to deny that the Queen appointed Francis to the Court and made provision for his maintenance. This is the passage:—

"And now, *seeing that it hath pleased* her Majesty to take knowledge of this my mind, *and to vouchsafe to appropriate* *me unto her service, preventing any desert of mine by her princely liberality,* first, I am moved humbly to beseech your Lordship to present to her Majesty *my more than most humble thanks therefore.*"

THE CONDUCT OF THE PARTIES.

Mr. Stronach says that only on one occasion did Francis *offer* advice to her Majesty, but that on others his advice was asked for. I have not checked this statement, because I find Mr. Stronach wrong in his observation, that on "several occasions" Francis incurred the anger of the Queen through opposing grants to the Crown. He only opposed one—viz., for a treble subsidy,—and then only in the true interests of the Throne. His opposition, for which he was afterwards made to suffer bitterly, was withdrawn at an early stage.

Mr. Stronach very properly takes the opportunity of commenting on the Essex trial and the seeming incongruity of a mother and son prosecuting another son, and the mother afterwards causing him to be executed. Let us look at the matter carefully. A report of the trial can be found printed from an original document in Vol. III. of "State Trials," recently edited by Judge Stephen. Why was Francis present at the trial at all unless the Cipher Story gives the clue? He was neither Solicitor nor Attorney-General. At the trial he had on two occasions to interfere to keep the proceedings in something like order. Coke jeered at Essex that he wanted to become "Robert the first." Surely this is curious? Except on the Cipher clue Robert had no possible claim to the throne. Francis was evidently present by special direction of the Queen, and the burden of his first speech was simply to press upon Essex that it was better for him to *confess* than to justify. His second was directed to the same end, pointing out that it was impossible for Essex to suggest that his armed proceedings did not amount to raising up a revolution. To my mind both the mother and brother merely wanted to put a stop to Robert's masterfulness, which was becoming most dangerous to the peace of the realm. If he would confess, and promise not to further offend, all would be well eventually. It was an evident desire of Francis to stop his brother's high-spirited conduct and bring him to that condition of sweet reasonableness which I seek in the case of my friend, Mr. Stronach. The brother failed; brothers often do. Devereux's "Life of Essex" shows that even after Robert's conviction and imprisonment in the Tower, the Queen was most anxious to secure his submission. His execution was either due to an order given by the Queen in a paroxysm of temper or to the treachery of Robert's enemies in not conveying to the Queen the tokens or proofs of his submission. The Cipher Story shows how terribly the tragedy affected Francis, and that he hated the Queen for ever onwards, but the collapse it caused to her is an indication that the warrant was only issued at a moment of passionate aberration. It must not be forgotten that death penalties and death warrants were very commonly ordered and then revoked in those days, and, like the case of Mary Queen of Scots, were sometimes used without real sanction.

THE LADY BACON LETTERS.

I do not press the point about the Lady Bacon correspondence.

But Mr. Stronach is wrong in stating that there are a number of letters by Francis to Lady Anne in answer to letters to her. Only *four* letters from Francis to her have ever been printed; of these, one was, and another may have been, a reply. Two further letters which Dixon quotes, viz.: 16th April, 1593, and 2nd November, 1593, Spedding says are from Anthony.

THE MARRIAGE.

With every desire to be yielding, I do not think Mr. Stronach has answered my argument as to the three years' delay before Francis married.

He was no better off in May, 1606, than in 1603, as he had no salaried post until he was created Solicitor-General on the 25th June, 1607. Having ventured to note that Francis was married in kingly purple—"from cap to shoe"—Mr. Stronach tells me the kingly reference is only to the mantle!

I therefore surrender the doublet, hose, cap, and shoes.

ARROGATING ROYAL STATE AND POWER.

Mr. Stronach can find no charge that Francis, while at Whitehall, lent himself to the accusation of arrogating Royal State and power.

I refer him to Weldon's "Court and Character of King James," or to the extract in "Nichols' Progresses of James," Vol. III,, p. 298 :—

"Now he instantly begins to believe himself King, lyes in the King's lodgings, gives audience," &c., &c.

"Winwood, the first Secretary of State rose and went away and would never sit more but instantly despatched one to the King to desire him to haste back for his seat was already usurped." Weldon says he was present when the King read the letter from Winwood.

As to the circumstances of peculiar honour in which Francis was made Viscount St. Alban, I quoted from my copy of "Dixon's Personal History," at page 245. The statement may be incorrect. I have not large faith in Mr. Dixon's accuracy.

THE QUESTION.

Mr. Stronach, in conclusion, asks me one question:—"If Queen Elizabeth was Bacon's mother, and if, according to the Cipher Story Bacon knew the Queen *was* his mother, why in his will does he request to be buried at St. Albans, 'for there was my mother buried.'"

Mr. Stronach concludes that he is not surprised to learn that Bacon knew who his mother was better than Mr. Parker Woodward.

My reply to Mr. Stronach is that his question is based upon two assumptions which he is not able to prove. The will of Lord Bacon is not to be found, nor is it established that the Queen is not buried at St. Albans. But, granting these assumptions, why should his lordship not be permitted to allude as mother to the lady who, according to the Cipher story, was for his first sixteen years regarded as his mother, and for whom he always cherished much affection. Disowned by his real mother, estranged from his wife, childless, and worn with great suffering, was it very unnatural for him to desire to be laid at rest beside the remains of his foster mother in the grave at St. Michael's.

A close student of Macchiavelli (*vide* Dr. Fischer's "Francis Bacon of Verulam," Longmans, 1857), a writer of the Essay on *Simulation and Dissimulation*, the man who took the special trouble of directing his eulogy of Elizabeth to be published after his death in order to close up the current rumours concerning her, was Bacon likely to make reference to Lady Ann in any other terms than those used?

If the statement in the will is to be accepted as authentic and final, Mr. Stronach has destroyed the Cipher case.

His destructive criticism must, however, be carried to its logical conclusion, whereby Mr. Stronach has sawn from the tree the branch upon which he and others have been sitting.

Two gentlemen of respectability, against whose character no breath of suspicion has come down to us, Messrs. Heminge and Condell, in the lifetime of Lord Bacon affirmed that the Plays in the First Folio of 1623 were written by their deceased fellow actor Shakspeare. Their statement is confirmed by a well known contemporary dramatist named Jonson. It is uncontradicted by any writing of Bacon left for publication after his death.

Apply the new test, and we must conclude that they knew who the author of the Plays was better than Mr. G. Stronach, M.A.

PARKER WOODWARD.

"THE MISFORTUNES OF ARTHUR."

THE tragedy called *The Misfortunes of Arthur*, produced in 1587, is a Play with which the name of Bacon is expressly connected and the name of Shakespeare is certainly not. But Baconians hesitate to point to it with a firm finger as evidence for them in the controversy as to "Shakespeare" authorship, because they fairly admit that the extent to which Bacon is alleged to have contributed to this Play is limited to the "dumb shewes." In Mr. Donelly's admirable work with the inadequate title, "The Great Cryptogram," which does not rightly describe the first and convincing volume of evidence, he refers (Vol. I., p. 249) to *The Misfortunes of Arthur*, cites Mr. Payne Collier's preface to the reprint of it in Dodsley's old Plays, and says, "I will discuss this Play and its merits at more length hereafter, and will make but one or two observations upon it at this time." He then suggests that the work, of which "Thomas Hughes" is stated to be the author, may have been, in fact, written by Bacon. The promised discussion is, however, not to be found in Mr. Donelly's book. Perhaps the absorbing labour of decipherment prevented him from carrying out his intentions towards the Play in question. But it is worth discussing, and these lines are written with the hope of directing the keen eyes of Baconian experts to the original text. A little more light has lately been thrown on the identity of the alleged author, and the question, at least, is worth considering whether Bacon had not a larger share in the composition of an epoch-making

Play than appears from the statements as to the authorship which are interspersed between the divisions of it with almost suspicious particularity.

The Play is historical, and may have been the outcome of an idea of dramatising the History of England from the commencement. The literary style is peculiar. An effort seems to have been carefully made to blend the alliteration used in Saxon poetry with more exact and harmonious blank verse than any previously written in English. The original print is said to be unique, and in the Garrick Collection. It is entitled: "Certaine Devises and Shewes presented to her Majestie by the Gentlemen of Grayes-Inne at her Highnesses Court in Greenwich, the twenty-eighth day of Februarie, in the thirtieth year of her Majesties most happy Raigne. At London. Printed by Robert Robinson, 1587 B.L." It states that eight members of the Society of Gray's Inn took part in the production of the Play. The Introduction is attributed to Nicholas Trotte, whose name is at the foot of it. The next page is headed, "The Misfortunes of Arthur (Arthur Pendragon's sonne), reduced into tragicall notes by *Thomas Hughes,* one of the societie of Grayes-Inne. And here set down as it passed from under his handes, and as it was presented, excepting certaine wordes and lines, where some of the Actors either helped their memories by brief omissions or fitted their acting to some alteration. With a note in the ende of such speeches as were penned by others, in lue of some of these hereafter following." After the Epilogue and "Finis" is the name *Thomas Hughes.* Then "Heere after follow such speeches as were penned by others, and pronounced instead of some of the former speeches penned by Thomas Hughes. A speach penned by William Fulbecke, gentleman, one of the societie of Grayes-Inne, and pronounced instead of Gorlois his first speeche penned by Thomas Hughes, and set downe in the first Scene of the first Acte." After the substituted speech—"One other speeche penned by the same gentleman, and pronounced instead of Gorlois his last speache penned by Thomas Hughes, and set downe in the second Scene of the fifth and last Act." And after this "other speeche"—"Besides these speaches there was also penned a Chorus for the first Act, and another for the second Act, by Maister Francis Flower, which were pronounced accordingly. The dumbe shewes were partly devised by Maister Christopher Yelverton, Maister Frauncis Bacon, Maister John Lancaster, and others, partly by the said Maister Flower, who with

Maister Penroodocke, and the said Maister Lancaster, directed these proceedings at Court."

Mr Payne Collier, in his edition of 1833, says that nothing was known about Hughes, Trotter, Flower, Lancaster, and Penroodocke. But from the "Pension Book" of Gray's Inn, recently published for the Society, and edited by the Rev. R. J. Fletcher, it now appears that Thomas Hughes was called to the Bar in 1585, Trotte in 1584, Lancaster was elected an Ancient in 1587, and Penroodocke Reader in 1584. Of Francis Flower we have still no information. Fulbecke was born in 1566. Bacon was 28 years old at the time of the representation of the Play, and Yelverton as early as 1566 had written the Epilogue to Gascoyne's "Jocasta," so must have been of much riper years. It follows, therefore, that four of the members were young men, three elderly men, and Flower of uncertain age.

Although Thomas Hughes is alleged to be the author of the Play, except certain substituted speeches, a difference in the style and merit of certain parts of the Play is perceptible. Mr. Payne Collier does not point out this fact in his Preface to the reprint of 1828. He says, however, "The mere rarity of this unique drama would not have recommended it to our notice; but it is not likely that such a man as Lord Bacon would have lent his aid to the production of a piece which was not intrinsically good, and unless we much mistake, there is a richer and a nobler vein of poetry running through it, than is to be found in any previous work of the kind." Those acquainted with prior and contemporaneous Plays will surely be of opinion that the devoted editor of "Shakespeare" did not "much mistake." As the reprint is not in every book-case the writer proposes to cite some passages that the reader may judge whether they do or do not resemble the writing of "Shakespeare." Let him notice the antithetical style, the statements *pro* and *con*, the original ideas, and he may also be reminded of the writing of Bacon.

The theme of the tragedy is the return of Arthur after wars abroad to find his wife unfaithful, and his realm usurped by Modred, his son, their civil war and its end. The gloom of the subject is unlightened by any touch of comedy.

The Introduction is a clever attack by one of the Muses on the study of laws and a defence by a law student in correct blank verse, with little or no alliteration.

After the "Argument of the Tragedie," and a list of *dramatis personæ*, comes "Gorlois' First Speech." This, stated to have been penned by "Thomas Hughes," was, however, not pronounced, nevertheless it is clearly superior to that "penned by William Fulbecke," which was substituted for it.

"Hughes'" speech is a kind of prologue and ends with a prophecy in compliment to Elizabeth, which is an example of pleasant and mellifluous alliteration:—

" . . . O Cassiopæa, gembright signe,
Most sacred sight, and sweet cælestial starre,
This clymat's joy, plac'd in imperiall throne,
With fragrant olive branche portending peace;
For you there rests
A happier age, a thousand yeares to come;
An age for peace, religion, wealth, and ease,
When all the world shall wonder at your blisse."

These lines anticipate the complimentary prophecy by Cranmer in *Henry VIII.*

In the Second Scene, between Guenevera and Fronia, the Queen is raging at the return of Arthur, and breathes revenge; *Fronia* tries to calm her:—

"A ladie's best revenge is to forgive.
What meane is in your hate?"

Guenevera: "And would you know what mean there is in hate,
Call love to minde, and see what meane is there."

And in the Third Act her sister, *Angharat*, answering her, despairing, says:—

"Then it is best to die when friends doe mourne.
Echwhere is death! the fates have well ordainde,
That ech man may bereave himself of life,
But none of death: death is so sure a doome,
A thousand wayes doe guide us to our graves;
Who then can ever come too late to that,
Whence, when h'is come, he never can returne?
Or what auailes to hasten on our ends,
And long for that which destenies have sworne!"

Towards the end of the Scene *Angharat*, consoling her sister, says:—

"Love is an error that may blind the best."

Guenevera :

"A mightie error oft hath seemde a sinne.
My death is vowed, and death must needes take place.
But such a death as stands with just remorse :
Death to the world and to her slipperie joys :
A full divorce from all this courtly pompe,
Where dayly pennance done for each offence
May render due revenge for every wrong,
Which to accomplish, pray, my deerest friends
That they forthwith, attyrde in saddest guise,
Conduct me to the Cloister next hereby,
There to professe, and to renounce the world."

The Fourth Scene of Act I. consists of argument between the *Queen*, *Modred* and *Conan*, as to the line of action to be taken against Arthur.

Modred suggests "war."
Conan : "That lies in chaunce."
Modred : "I have as great a share in chaunce as he."
Conan : "His waies be blinde that maketh chaunce his guide."
Modred : "Whose refuge lies in chaunce, what dares he not ?"
Conan : "Warres were a crime, farre worse than all the rest."
Modred : "The safest passage is from bad to worse."

And so on. In the Second Act Arthur has gained the first success over *Modred*, who, in similar style of alternate lines or short passages, discusses the situation first with *Conan* and then with *Gawain*.

The Third Act begins with argument between *Arthur*, disposed to forbearance towards his rebellious son, and *Howell* and *Cador*, who incite him to be stern.

Says *Cador :*

" . . . No worse a vice than lenitie in kings ;
Remisse indulgence soone undoes a realme :
He teacheth how to sinne that winkes at sinnes,
And bids offend that suffereth an offence.
The onely hope of leave increaseth crimes,
And he that pardoneth one, emboldneth all
To breake the lawes. Each patience fostereth wrongs.
But vice severely punisht faints at foote,
And creepes no further off than where it falls.

One sower example will prevent more vice
Than all the best perswasions in the world . . ."

Arthur replies:

"Compassion is as fit for kings as wrath."

And the philosophical conversation proceeds in the same strain, enriched with many fine lines. But a herald comes with a defiance from *Modred*, and the King is aroused.

Arthur:

"Hath all the bloud we spent on forreine coasts
The wounds and deaths and winters boad abroade,
Deserved thus to be disgrac'd at home?
All Brytaine rings of warres: no towne nor fielde
But swarmes with armed troupes: the mustering trians
Stop up the streets; . . .
Let him come
With sodaine soldiers pampered up in peace.

. . . .

They shall perceave with sorrow 'er they part,
When all their toyles be told, that nothing workes
So great a waste and ruine in this age
As doe my warres."

Space will not admit of the quotations which might be made from the Fourth Act in which the incidents of the war are narrated by *Nuncius*, and Arthur does not appear; but the whole Act seems inferior to the Third.

In the Fifth *Arthur* appears again, and regrets his successes:—

"This only now I crave (O fortune 'erst
My faithful friend), let it be soone forgot.
Nor long in minde, nor mouth where Arthur fell:
Yea, though I conqueror die, and full of fame,
Yet let my death and parture rest obscure.
No grave I neede (O fates) nor buriall rights,
Nor stately hearce, nor tombe with haughty toppe;
But let my carcase lurke; yea, let my death
Be ay unknowen, so that in every coast
I still be fear'd and lookt for every houre."

The above extracts may be enough to send readers to the Play itself. After reading it they will perhaps ask themselves why, if "Thomas Hughes" really wrote it, he wrote no more? *If*——

J. R. (of Gray's Inn).

THE DIGNITY OF CIPHER WRITING.

IT is to be regretted that the venerable art of writing in cipher is regarded now-a-days as little better than a toy. The present age, happening to have outgrown this particular subject, is apt to view it with a contemptuous, and perhaps a somewhat intolerant eye. In the following brief sketch the endeavour has been made to bring together a few facts which should tend to dispel the current contempt which obscures the subject. Though decayed and discredited to-day, cipher-writing has attracted great minds in past ages, and can claim an almost unparalleled ancestry.

"It is clear," says the author of "The Golden Remains of the Early Masonic Writers" (Oliver. London, 1847, 5 vols.) "the Egyptian Priests used a cipher which was known to none but themselves, and it was retained after alphabetical characters came into common use.* This was the sacred hieroglyphic which was rendered abstruse and unintelligible by the adoption of a new or esoteric meaning to the ordinary symbolic hieroglyphics."

"The royal soothsayer Mehrarish is said to have written more then 1,000 volumes which none could understand but those who had been instructed by himself. Various ciphers were also invented by several of the kings of Egypt, as well as by sooth-sayers, magicians, philosophers and others, whose names have been preserved, and particularly by Cophtrim, one of the kings of Egypt, who has the reputation of having composed an encyclopædia of all the sciences in a secret cipher of his own."

In Book VI. of "The Advancement of Learning," Bacon alludes to the enigmatic and achroamatic methods of publishing books which were employed by the ancients, and states that "the same we will transfer to the manner itself of delivery." One is inclined to conjecture whether he was alluding to Cophtrim or Mehrarish, and again to the same subject when he wrote in cipher.

"Yet shall I use a most blind waye . . . as th' wonderfully curious devices we have heard it said much occupied people of ancient Egypt." ("Biliteral Cipher," p. 22).

Of the disciples of Pythagoras, a philosopher whose aim was precisely that of Francis Bacon—the reformation and the education of mankind—Lempriere states: "When they were capable of receiving the secret instructions of the philosopher, they were taught the use of *ciphers*," and it is probable that Bacon had in his mind the systems of Hermes Trismegistus, or of Pythagoras when he wrote: "That the discretion anciently observed . . . of publishing part *and reserving part to a private succession*, and of publishing in a manner whereby it shall not be to the capacity or taste of all, but shall, as it were single and adopt its reader, is not to be laid aside, both for the avoiding of abuse in the excluded and the strengthening of affection in the admitted."

---

* The sacred Egyptian monolith on the Embankment, which marks the spot where York House once stood, is said to be inscribed with Masonic characters.—[Ed. Note].

According to Spedding, the words "*ad filios*," are inscribed in Bacon's handwriting on the left hand corner of the MS. of his *Filum Labyrinthi*. I have not come across any previous note of this fact, which appears difficult of explanation, except as a dedication to his disciples, or Sons of Science, "the true succession of wits" which was to carry out his contemplative ends.

Those who are disposed to regard anagrams, acrostics and such like, as puerilities unworthy of serious attention, would do well to remember that "The Sybilline books of the Romans were written in a cipher which Cicero describes as a complication of acrostics. They were so written that the letters of the first verse of every section commenced all the succeeding verses in the same order as they occupied in the first verse."

It is neither impossible nor unlikely that Bacon determined that he would better antiquity in this, as well as in other respects.

Suetonius tells us that Julius Cæsar was what the modern journalist would term a "ciphermonger."

Æneas Tacitus collected twenty different cipher systems, and invented several new ones. He appears to have been an even more inveterate ciphermonger than Bacon.

Few realise what an extraordinary outburst of books on cipher-writing there was in the sixteenth century. To quote a sprightly writer: "Those who care for the archæological side of the subject may refer to the writings of Palatino, dating 1540, of Bellaso in 1553, and of Glanburg in 1560. Should this not have damped their ardour, they may next take a course of Porta, Trithemius, Cardanus, Walchius, Bibliander, Schottus, Selenus, Herman Hugo, Niceron, Caspi, Tridenci, Comiers, La Fin, Dalgarno, Buxtorff, Wolfgang and Falconer. Even then, if they so wish it, are open to them the writings of Eidel, Soro, Amman, Breitkampt, Conradus, De Vaines, Lucatello, Kircher, and not a few others, while for those who do not care to dig their knowledge out of such dusty worm-eaten tomes, William Blair is the very thing." ("Cryptography." F. E. Hume, London).

Descending to the year 1847, we find the author of "The Golden Remains of Freemasonry" asserting that "The System of cipherwriting has been found so convenient *as a depository of ineffable secrets*, that it has descended down to our own times, and various methods have been prescribed for its use . . . In the higher degrees of sublime Masonry, there are several ciphers, almost every degree possessing an exclusive method of communication . . . The Cabalists used a numerical cipher. By placing the letters of the alphabet under the numbers as far as 24, they constituted words out of figures, and by adding together the result they propounded mystical questions, and solved abstruse and difficult problems. The cipher used by Weishaupt in his system of illuminism was a substitution of figures for letters."

Adam Weishaupt (1748-1830), was the founder of the best known sect of Illuminati. He "set himself to combat ignorance, superstition and tyranny, by founding an association which should be a luminous centre for the promotion of rational and religious enlightenment."

Weishaupt's cipher appears to have been a modification of the numerical system used by the Cabbala. The Cabbala was a secret system of theology and metaphysics largely based upon, and in close connection with, the Pythagorean philosophy. It is noteworthy that the Cabbalists, like all mediæval mystics attached superstitious importance to anagrams. We are told that they never plainly explained their mystic principles, but "les envelopoient sous les paroles les plus obscures comme autrefois les Pythagoriens qui ne produisoient leurs secrets que sous les enigmas tant *poir se faire remarquer que pour exciter la curiosite des savants* and suprendre les ignorants." (Traite des Signes de nos pensees. Costadau. Vol. ii., p. 123. Lyons, 1717).

Compare the italicised words with the following passage: "Puny little mindes, th' type most familiar to us, take much delight in talke. Th' surer methode to secure attention, is to put his written works in such a peculiar or secret form that it wakeneth th' curious to seek them." ("Biliteral Cipher," Bacon, p. 57).

It would baffle the wit of man to accurately define the distinction between the Cabbalists, the Rosicrucians, the

Illuminati, the Freemasons and the hundred and one secret sects that have flourished from times prehistoric down to the present day. It is apparent that many, if not all, of them employed cipherwriting. The author of "The Golden Remains of Freemasonry" states that: "The meaning of the [Heraldic] ciphers is no secret to those who will take the trouble of searching for it, but the study is so dry and forbidding, that the cipher is *almost as unattainable as the cipher of Freemasonry.*"

To what do the italicised words refer? What was "The Cipher of Freemasonry?" and where is it to be sought? Does Bacon's Biliteral unlock an unexpected El Dorado of information, "a depository of ineffable secrets?"

The writer concludes as follows:—"The reader of this essay must not understand that I have brought forward every possible evidence on the curious subject of cipher-writing. I have merely opened it, leaving it to those who have a taste for such investigations to take up the thread which I have spun, and to follow out the ideas that I have touched upon. *The mine is uncovered, let it be freely worked, and it will yield an abundance of sterling ore.*" ("Golden Remains," Vol. v., p. 31).

HAROLD BAYLEY.

THE OWL AND THE BAKER'S DAUGHTER.

IN "An Inventory of the Plate, Household Stuff, Pictures, &c., in Kenilworth Castle," taken after the death of Robert Earl of Leycester, 1588, there is an item, to which Baconians will be glad to have attention drawn, although there is nothing new in the particulars which we are about to state. As will be seen by the footnote,* all this has been for nearly half a century perfectly well known to antiquaries, historians, and learned Shakespeareans: known and even in print for the curious, and for a certain class of readers, but not set before the public so as to attract attention. As usual with such scraps of information bearing upon our subject, the question, which has for years interested Shakespearean commentators, has been discreetly kept behind the curtain.

---

* The Inventory is printed in "*Amye Robsart and the Earl of Leicester*," by G. Adelard, 1870, and had previously been printed by J. O. Halliwell Phillips from a "transcript of the original MS. *in private hands.*" See "Halliwell's Ancient Inventories," 4to, printed "*for private circulation only*" by J. E. Adlard, 1854. Of this elegantly printed volume, it is certified by the printer *only twenty-five copies* were printed. Why?

In the "Inventory of Pictures" we read first of "Two great tables of the Queene's Majesties' pictures with one curtaine of changeable silck; two great pictures of my Lord in whole proporcion, . . . with one curtaine to them," pictures of St. Jerome, of the Lords Arundel, Maltravers, and Pembroke, of Count Egmont, the Queen of Scots and King Philip. Then follows:—

"THE PICTURE OF THE BAKER'S DAUGHTER."*

It is the only picture in the collection, excepting one of "Occacion and Repentance," which is not of some distinguished personage. *There is no picture of Amy Robsart or Lettice Knowles,* married or unmarried.

Now, with regard to this entry of the baker's daughter, it is, as Mr. Adelard says (p. 267, "Notes"), "of extreme interest in connection with its most probable allusion to the same subject in the tragedy of *Hamlet:* 'They say, *The owl was a baker's daughter.*'" The writer questions the possibility that this very picture had been seen by *Shakespeare,* and had furnished him with the idea of introducing into the Play the subject of the legend, which is also the subject of the picture, and which is as follows:—

> "Our Saviour went into a baker's shop, where they were baking, and asked for some bread to eat. The mistress of the shop immediately put a piece of dough into the oven to bake for Him, but was reprimanded by her daughter, who, insisting that the piece of dough was too large, reduced it to a very small size. The dough, however, immediately afterwards began to swell, and presently became of a most enormous size; whereupon the baker's daughter cried out—'*Heugh, heugh, heugh!*' which owl-like noise probably induced our Saviour, for her wickedness, to transform her into an owl."

The legend is, according to Adelard, "related by Douce from oral tradition," though from whom Douce derived the oral tradition is not revealed. The fact that he was made the depository of such communications renders us all the more eager to become thoroughly well acquainted with the Douce MSS. in the Bodleian and the British Museum, and to fathom the mysteries connected with their present state of semi-suppression or partial concealment.

---

* The other portraits are of the Duke of Feria, Alex. Magnus, Two Young Ladies, Pompœa Sabina, Fredk. Duke of Saxony, Emperor Charles, King Philip's Wife. Prince of Orange, Marquess of Berges, Count Horn, Count Holstrate, Duke of Alva, Cardinal Granville, Duchess of Parma, Henry Earl of Pembroke, Countess Mary Sydney, Countess Essex, Lord Montacute, Sir J. Crofts, Sir Wm. Mildmay, Sir Wm. Pickering, Edwin (Sandys), second Archbishop of York.

But to return to the baker's daughter. In 1862, Mr. W. J. Thoms printed in *Notes and Queries* * a list of the pictures at Kenilworth, being apparently unaware that the Inventory had been already printed in 1854. At the end of the list Mr. Thoms says:—

> "There is one picture in this list respecting which I would make a special query—*What is the picture of the baker's daughter?* Could we suppose it to represent the legend to which Shakespeare refers in *Hamlet*—'*The* owl was a baker's daughter,'—we might see in this allusion a recollection of one of the many visits which Shakespere doubtless paid to the glories of Kenilworth."

Mr. Thoms seems here to have confused his spellings. Of *Shakspere* there is no hint, no scintilla of evidence that he ever was at Kenilworth. Excepting for the purpose of making the supposition fit in with the rest of his apocryphal history, there has never been a suggestion made by any biographer of whom we have yet heard, that Shakspere, Shaksper, Shakspurre, Shaxpur, or any man with a name of that sound, was in any capacity a visitor at Kenilworth Castle. To say that Shakspere *doubtless paid many visits* to the glories of that historic place, is therefore to draw a bow so long as to fit the arms of Guy of Warwick himself.

On the other hand, if, as we have growing cause to believe, "*Shakespeare*"—Francis called "Bacon"—was in truth a son of Robert Earl of Dudley and Queen Elizabeth, his presence at Kenilworth would not only be probable and likely, but almost certain or undoubted. When he was about 15 years old, the *Princely Pleasures* were conducted—a right Royal entertainment, given by Dudley to Elizabeth, of which Robert Laneham, an eye-witness, is said to have given the account, but in which the "Gallant Device" or open-air masque is attributed to Gascoigne.

Several hands may have helped to pen this device, and to arrange the performance, but the speeches and songs of Echo, Proteus, Diana, Mercury, Iris, and others are so absolutely in the youthful manner of Francis "Bacon," so full of his conceits, his favourite metaphors, expressions, *Promus* Notes, &c.,

---

* *Notes and Queries*, Third Series, No. 37, Sept. 13, 1862.

that considering the general poverty of language at that date, and that *he alone* was apparently alive to the fact and bent upon enriching his mother tongue from his own stores, considering also the striking analogies found in this with other pieces now ascribed to Francis in his youth, we, the unimportant writer, do not hesitate to add this device to the long list of his juvenile productions. We go further, and consider it in the highest degree probable that the *Squire Minstrel omitted by Laneham*, but picked out for special notice by Tomlin, and by Nichol in his "*Queen Elizabeth's Progresses*" was none other than this brilliant boy, the budding, but concealed poet, Francis Dudley.

An article on Canonbury Tower appeared in BACONIANA, April, 1900,* wherein this performance of the *Squire Minstrel* was described. The fact that at the royal entertainment given by Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, *at Kenilworth*, the *Squire Minstrel* should have been "arrayed in a tabard, especially designed and embroidered to commemorate Canonbury" with its dairy farm of cream, butter, and frumenty, is in that article commented upon as strange and noteworthy, and an attempt is made to connect the delightful summer resort of Canonbury, its pleasant fields, gardens, salubrious air, and "cream farms," with the happy childhood of Elizabeth, and of Robert Dudley. They seem at the age of eight years to have passed many sunny days in one of the houses belonging to Henry VIII., and which stood upon this estate.†

Baconians who have not read this paper, and a sequel in BACONIANA, July, 1900, Vol. VIII., No. 31, will do well to inquire into this curious matter.

We have often urged the necessity in Baconian research for putting two and two together; for indeed the secrets of Baconism are, we are convinced, to be discovered only by the working out of analogies, and by the connecting of disjointed links. In the present case we see first, that a picture (unique in the collection of which it forms part) is connected with a legend alluded to in a Shakespeare play. Next we find the speech of the unnamed *Squire Minstrel* alluding to the happy childish days of Elizabeth and Dudley; then again, we find that Elizabeth gave Dudley a mansion at Kew, called the "*Dairy House*." He was living there, whilst his wife Amye was at Cunmor, under the charge of Sir Anthony

---

* Vol. VIII., No. 30.

† One special one at Stoke Newington was used by Henry VIII. as a country house for his children when they needed change of air.—ED. NOTE.

Foster. From this "*Dairy House*" at Kew, Lord Robert Dudley wrote a letter to his brother's kinsman, Thomas Blount, instructing him to make inquiries as to the death of Lady Dudley, because he was becoming uneasy "as to how the matter falleth out." Dudley's anxiety was (on his own showing) caused by fear lest he should be considered privy to the act. He was staying at Windsor when the news of his wife's death reached him, but we observe that he made no effort to go to Cunmor or personally to examine into the tragedy, he merely went to the "*Dairy House*" at Kew, and conducted his examination such as it was, by letter. We seem to be digressing from the subject in hand, but it will be seen that there is a slight and hidden thread connecting all these episodes. Was there some underlying meaning or standing jest in these triple allusions to dairy farms, in each case linking Dudley with Elizabeth? Was Francis, in "the many visits which he doubtless paid" to Kenilworth Castle, impressed by the story of the Baker's Daughter, and did he in later life incorporate it with his finest tragedy? Or is there some other more occult meaning *known to the traditional members of his own Society*, attaching to that legend?

It is only right to add that Mr. Thoms in the following number of *Notes and Queries* to that in which he had given his own view of the legend, adds:—"Since my first communication appeared, my friend, Mr. H. Foss has suggested that the picture of the Baker's Daughter . . . is the well-known 'Fornarina' of Raffael, while Mr. J. G. Nichols, judging from the pictures of Philip and the Baker's Daughter being together, inclines to the opinion that they were companions, and that the latter was the portrait of a female respecting whom there was a scandal current during Mary's life; it being said in an old ballad that Philip loved:—

"The baker's daughter in her russet gown,
Better than Queen Mary without her crown."

Whichever version be the true one, Francis would as well have known of the one as of the other, but that advocated by Mr. Thoms recommends itself to our own mind as the most likely, especially since it was handed down by oral tradition.

These are only some loose notes and jottings, suggestive, not dictatorial. Of such our Francis would say, "Let it be inquired."

P. C.

WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE.

A Critical Study by George Brandes.*

TO explain the Danish element in Hamlet our author tells us, that in 1585 a troupe of English players appeared in the Courtyard of the Town Hall of Elsinore. Adding, that if we be justified in assuming these to have been the same as those established at Court, 1586, then William Kempe, George Bryan and Thomas Pope were amongst them. English actors, under Thomas Sackville, performed at Copenhagen, 1596, at the Coronation of Christian IV. It is significant that even Brandes does not attempt to hint that Shaxspur made one of this touring company. William Kempe, we know, visited most of the German Courts, so we are not surprised to find him at the Danish one.

To Lilly's *Euphues* Brandes points, as well as to Montaigne's Essays. "Writers like Montaigne and Lilly," he says, "were no doubt constantly in Shakespeare's hands, while *Hamlet* was taking shape within him," and, "there is no doubt that he (Lilly) exercised a very important influence upon Shakespeare's dramatic style." A letter of Ferardo from Euphues contains the same arguments as the King used to Hamlet on the unreasonableness of his "obstinate condolement" on his father's death; while Ferardo's words to Lucilla ring strangely like Hamlet's to Ophelia. "For oftentimes thy mother would saye that thou haddest more beautie than was convenient for one that shoulde bee honeste," and "O Lucilla, Lucilla, woulde thou were lesse fayre!" Old men in *Euphues* giving advice to young men appear with: "hoary hair and watery eyes," and Euphues repulses an old gentleman "whose intellect seems as tottering as his legs." In this "Anatomy of Wit," so like in title that "Anatomy of Melancholy" which we learn by the Gallup Cipher was Francis Saint Alban's work, we may yet find that he "painted the Lilly," originating the work in which Brandes, too credulous, only sees analogy. Brandes is more cautious than Beyersdorf, whom he quotes, and whom he accuses of claiming for Lilly the origin of some of Shakespeare's ideas. Brandes, while he says "that insults the genius of Shakespeare," fails in his logic, for he puts Montaigne and Euphues into our author's hands and babbles of "analogy." Shakespeare was either a plagiarist or he was not. Looking at the matter dispassionately, and accepting the view put forward by Brandes and his school, Shakespeare stole freely, not only ideas but words from other writers without a blush. In our opinion the author of the Shakespeare Plays had no need to borrow from other men's minds, because his was immeasurably superior. He was *Albanus*, "the loftiest hill—out-topping knowledge."

---

* **William Heinemann, 1898.**

Brandes puts forward one very reasonable theory, indeed, he has stumbled on what may prove to be a great truth, though he has not a shadow of evidence to offer for our acceptance of it. The fact being that his premises are false, while we, who build on the right foundation, may use his theory and profit by it. He suggests that the Plays are the mirror in which we may see the soul of the writer and the events which lightened and clouded it.

Before touching on this in detail we will note a few characteristics of the man Shaxpur, according to Brandes, the man Francis Saint Alban as we know him.

"His anti-democratic spirit sprang from his heart of hearts. His aristocratic contempt for the mob had its root in purely physical aversion for the atmosphere of the people—their evil smell repelled Shakespeare, more sensitive to noxious fumes than any woman." To prove this he quotes from 2 *Henry IV.*: "It will be stinking law, for his breath stinks of toasted cheese" (Act IV. sc. 7). "In their thick breaths rank of gross diet, shall we be enclouded" (*Antony and Cleopatra*, Act V. sc. 2). "The rabblement . . . uttered such a deal of stinking breath," etc., etc. (*Julius Cæsar*, Act I. sc. 2, and a similar passage in *Coriolanus*, Act II. sc. 4).

Considering the birth, life, and death of the Stratford player, to claim for him words and sentiments such as these, is, to say the least of it, ludicrous. On the other hand, in every way do they accord with the patrician Francis. There is no guessing here, we have solid fact to work on.

He was noted for his delicate nostril. His biographers record his dislike for all rank smelling things. The odour of neat-leather boots was an offence to him, this peculiarity he shared with Elizabeth, as Tennyson reminds us in "Queen Mary." On the Bench he carried a nosegay of herbs, in the study he condemned in no measured terms the poisonous emanations of jails and jailbirds, and, indeed, of all crowds; using the same nervous adjective that occurs in the passages referred to in the Plays. Was there ever a more critical discriminator between foetid breaths and fragrant odours, or one with a more subtle appreciation for perfume and gums, and the dainty scents of herbs and flowers, than the author of "The Natural History?"

On the other hand, it is a physiological truth that the habits indulged in by topers (William Shaxpur died of a drunken bout) is a certain destroyer of the sense of smell. Besides, is it reasonable to expect the rude peasant, the prison reprobate, the butcher and tanner's son, the stable help, the tavern roysterer, whose youthful nose was inured from the cradle to a midden heap before the paternal door, to be over particular where a smell was in question? His position in life doomed him to smells, which, happily for him, he remained unconscious of. But the refined and cultured courtier, whose very gloves were scented lest they might prove unpleasant in the wearing? The poet whose dinner table was strewn with fair scented blossoms for the refreshing of the senses? The lover of woodbine, and sweet briar, and violets for the odours which they give? With him, of course, it was very different. His patrician instincts prove themselves in such lines as these: "The ignorant and rude multitude, the vulgar to whom nothing moderate is grateful" ("*Wisdom of the Ancients*"). "If fame be from the common people it is commonly false and naught" (Essay of *Praise*). "The rude multitude, the vulgar" (*The Tempest*).

With one other touch characteristic of Francis' life story Brandes infers from Caius Marcius' words (*Cor.* Act I. sc. 1): "Who deserves greatness, deserves your hate," that their author suffered from "envy and hatred raised by the small and the mean." Nowhere in the actor's life do we trace any conspiracy for keeping him "under." It was, as far as we can judge, only his own paucity of talent that prevented him shining as a star of the first magnitude in his profession. With Francis, the proto-martyr of James' reign, it was different. "Envy," as he tells us in his Essay, "is as the sunbeams that beat hotter upon a bank than upon a flat." No more flagrant case of the power of envy to ruin a life can be shown than in his fall. With what almost seems to be bitter irony, when one surveys the life of the actor Shaxpur, Brandes interprets *Coriolanus*' "repellant arrogance" thus:

"There arose in Shakespeare's soul, from the depths of his stormy contempt for humanity, a pride immeasurably pure and steadfast." In the face of Stratford tradition, this is more than ridiculous; is there any one in their heart of hearts who would accuse Shaxburd of this attribute?

Brandes tells us that the author of the Plays "was brimful of scorn for the masses, for the stupidity, fickleness, cowardice of ignorant slavish souls, and for the baseness of their leaders." If this is so, it is to Francis and his views of men and manners, and not to the "base and common" though withal "useful fellow" Shaxburd, we must look for corroboration.

Brandes, among other Plays, takes *Troilus and Cressida*, and notes the passionate hatred and boundless bitterness with which Cressida is delineated. He puts *Antony and Cleopatra* first as to date, *Troilus* second. But Mr. Bompas gives 1599 as the probable date of *Troilus*, and 1608 as the year in which *Antony and Cleopatra* was written. This bears out the Cipher story, in which Marguerite of Navarre's inconstancy is given as the *raison d'etre* for Cressida. History tells us Francis married his pretty wife in 1606, which was about the time he must have been busy on the loves of Antony and his beautiful Queen.

1591 is the date Mr. Bompas gives for the first draft of *Romeo and Juliet*, the embodiment, as the Cipher says, of Francis' boyish, romantic passion for the French Princess, and the "product," Brandes remarks, "of truth and faith." In *Troilus* we have the sequel (if the Cipher be proved genuine) of the love story. For Troilus, "giddy with happiness, uplifted to the heavens, awakes from his intoxication, betrayed." "Spiritually repulsive, Cressida's very coquetry is void of charming qualities." The author of this Play may well be the same as he who wrote: "Love is the argument always of *Comedies*, and many times of *Tragedies*. Which showeth well that it is a passion generally light, and sometimes extreme."* And: "To love and be wise is scarcely allowed to a God."† In the 1625 British Museum copy we have this additional remark: "But in life it (love) doth much mischiefe, sometimes like a Syren, sometimes like a Fury."

Mr. Bompas, in his lately published admirable little volume, "The Problem of the Shakespeare Plays," traces so many analogies between the Plays and the events in Francis' life that this article may seem to be superfluous, except that while pointing out some of Brandes' most illogical deductions, I would hope to lead readers to make a study of his interesting book, a study which must from its very nature be most fruitful in Baconian results.

In the *Tempest*, produced at Whitehall in 1611, Brandes notes sufferings in the author, who, "absorbed in occupations of a higher nature, had neglected his worldly interests and had fallen a victim to his own careless trustfulness." "Superhuman man of spirit, he subdued nature within and without, and overcame the bitterness caused by his wrongs, in the harmony of his own richly spiritual life." Thus speaks Brandes of Prospero. What better words could we use to delineate our great philosopher, who "finds it easy to forgive because he sets very little value on what he has lost." Dr. Garnett adds his witness to the *Tempest* being autographical, and to "showing what discipline of life has made of Shakespeare." Brandes claims for both hero and author "a conscious superiority, untinged by arrogance, genial scorn for the mean and base, mercifulness into which contempt entered very largely, serenity excluding passionate affection while admitting tenderness."

---

* "Essay of Love," Ed. 1612. † Posthumous Latin Ed. 1638.

"It is Shakespeare's own nature," he says, "which overflows in Prospero. Thus the magician represents not merely the noble-minded great man, but the genius, imaginatively delineated."

What better word picture could have been drawn of Francis in his later life, the victim of base ingratitude, of mean and petty envy and spite? But Shaxburd! Where in the world does Brandes trace all this greatness in his smug provincial prosperity?

It seems as though every parallel to the Plays afforded by the life of the actor is, by Brandes' own showing, conspicuous by its absence.

Among the Plays of the "dark period" is *Timon of Athens.* "In harmony," as Brandes tells us, "with his own (the author's) distraught, excited frame of mind at that time."

The picture is of "a thoughtlessly, extravagantly openhanded nature, whose one pleasure is to give. He no more disturbs himself about the melting of his money from his coffers than if he were living in a communistic society with the general wealth at his disposal. The tide turns. Timon has to go a'borrowing. Requests for loans are refused by former friends; he cuts himself off from his friends, and retreats to the woods to lead the solitary life of a stoic. He digs for roots, dwells in a cave, curses and shuns mankind. The plot is scanty; it is a parable rather than a Drama." These are Brandes' words, his briefly quoted record of Timon the misanthropist.

Ingenuously he has now to confess that he can find no reason for the introduction of "this patron of artists and merchants, this Maecenus," into the Plays. He is pathetically at a loss to account for Timon. Timon puts him altogether out of his reckonings; Timon bewilders him. We, on the contrary, take up the thread of Francis Saint Alban's life, and find Timon fitting into his place as we should expect him to do. Engaged in pursuits which lifted his soul above, he permitted his servants a licence in the management of his house and affairs which he confesses was little short of criminal. They actually were seen to thrust their hands into his coffers and abstract what gold they wanted, unchecked by him.

Brandes complains "In all the obscurity of Shakespeare's life-story, nowhere do we feel our ignorance more acutely than here."

Nowhere do we trace more clearly the domestic and personal experience of the trustful philosopher whose servants not only robbed him of his wealth, but of what he valued most dearly of all, his honour.

His friends, whose adoption he had tried or thought he had, spurned him in his fall, and poor sycophants, late guests at his table, refused him the smallest courtesy when in his disgrace he sought it at their hands. The parallel is complete, no darker shadow eclipsed Timon than that which shrouded Francis' later days with gloom.

It is in his last pages that Brandes reaches the height of his absurdity with regard to the man who was born and died at Stratford, the town whose only value in the eyes of contemporary writers was that it possessed a bridge of fourteen arches.

He tells us that the boon companion of the retired actor Shaxburd was John a'Combe, Steward of Ambrose, Earl of Warwick, "a man of low repute as tax-collector and worse as money lender and usurer." This is bad enough, but there are comments that follow:

"Tradition tells us that the poet and Combe . . . spent much time together . . . in the tavern (now the Falcon), which lay just across the road. Here then, the mighty genius . . . sat tossing dice and emptying his glass . . . with a country bumpkin of doubtful reputation." It seems incredible that Brandes can seriously contemplate such a picture of the author of *Hamlet*.

"Tradition further states that it was one of Shakespeare's few amusements to compose ironical epitaphs for his acquaintances, and he is said to have written an exceedingly contemptuous one on John a'Combe in his character of usurer and extortioner." This epitaph is proved to have been printed as early as 1608; John Combe died in 1614. Was it on Shaxpur's character of epitaph writer his reputation of poet was established in his native town, not too particular in its taste? With his champion Brandes we began our article, with his words we finish. They are full of suggestion, but hardly of the kind which he would have chosen to call forth.

"If he (John a'Combe) was the best of Shakespeare's Stratford associates, we can figure to ourselves the rest."

ALICIA AMY LEITH.

THE OWEN, GALLUP, CIPHER DISCOVERIES.

"The soul's dark cottage, battered and decayed,
Lets in new lights through chinks that time hath made."

THE second part of Mr. Harold Bayley's book consists of selections from recent Cipher discoveries made by Mrs. Gallup, and Doctor O. Owen. Anybody, acquainted with Bacon's style, and way of thinking, will recognize the striking character of these excerpts! Of course, the critics attribute this appositeness to the novelist's art, of introducing from Bacon's prose writings, whatever is characteristic of his style or mind, into the Cipher revelations. All I can say is, that if so, it has been *miraculously well done*, and must have entailed harder work than even the Cipher itself! For example, take this, cited by Mr. Harold Bayley, from the Biliteral discoveries of Mrs. Gallup:—"*A man doth slowly eat his very inmost soul and heart, when there shall cease to be a friend to whom he may open his inner thought, knowledge or life.*" ("Biliteral," I., p. 109; "Tragedy of Sir Francis Bacon"). In his Essay upon *Friendship* Bacon says:—"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.*" (*Essays. Friendship*).

The "Biliteral" continues:—"In truth a man's thorough opening, thus to a friend all that his brain conceiveth, or th' soul is conscious of, *will oft save his reason.* He will eat his heart in lonely musings, for oft a feav'rous fire burneth in him, as worlds visions shifting and looming with wondrous swiftness on th' view, wore the mind from its *labours to a rest-*

less toss as a ship is beaten by merciless winds, or like to egg shells crush'd together, broken to pieces, or soon made wrack." ("Biliteral," p. 17). Bacon writes :—"It is not to be forgotten, what *Commineus* observeth, of his first master *Duke Charles the Hardy;* namely, that he would communicate his secrets with none; and least of all, those secrets, which troubled him most. Whereupon he goeth on, and saith, 'that towards his latter time' '*that closeness did impair, and a little perish his understanding.*' Surely *Commineus* mought have made the same judgment also, if it had pleased him, of his second master, Lewis the Eleventh, *whose closeness was indeed his tormentour.*" (*Friendship. Essays*, 1625). Bacon was evidently suffering from the same disease of closeness, as these examples, he cites! And with regard to the labouring of his mind, upon the tempest tossed sea of his troubled thoughts, *from want of someone to communicate with*, is it not reflected in this passage from the same Essay? "The second fruit of friendship, *is healthful and soveraigne for the understanding*, as the first is for the affections. For friendship maketh indeed a fair day in the affections *from storm and tempests.* But it maketh daylight in the understanding, out of darkness and confusion of thoughts." (*Friendship. Essays*, 1625).

Compare this magnificent passage *from the word Cipher, which if an invention* stamps Doctor Owen, as the inspired fabulist of a sublime pen :—"*Strive as I may, it is only driven from my brain by th' unceasing tossing of this sea of labouring cogitations for the Advancement of Learning. Oft driven as twere with sudden wind or tide, its waves strike against the very vault of th' heavens, and break in useless wreaths of bubbling froth.*" ("Word Cipher," p. 46).

There is nothing in this passage that a Cipher novelist could possibly attain to, so lofty is the language, so profound the imagery! If the student will turn to Bacon's "*Cogitata et Visa de Interpretatione Naturæ,*" he will find every paragraph commencing with the repeated words :—"*Franciscus Baconus sic cogitavit*" *etc.*—so that he will perceive how thoroughly Baconian is this word "*cogitations.*" It is an actual fact, that Bacon likened his *Advancement of Learning* (and *De Augmentis Scientiarum of* 1623) to a ship, crossing the ocean of time, in order to discover, and open out, his NEW WORLD OF DEFICIENTS, or the invisible and spiritual, concealed by his interpretative frame, or plan embraced in the Instauratio. The very port and haven of his rest was this end, so beautifully hinted at in the final book of the *De Augmentis*. And for the strange metaphor of a *tempest toss'd brain*, does not Lear exclaim :—

Lear.—The tempest in my mind
Doth from my senses take all feeling else
Save what beats there.—Act III. iv.

* * * * *

Kent.—Where's the King ?
Gent.—Contending with the fretful element ;
Bids the wind blow the earth into the sea
Or swell the curled waters above the main.—Act III. i.

If Doctor Owen made use of this, for his purposes of word Cipher fable, I must repeat, *it is exceedingly well done !* To penetrate the brain of poets, so as to reproduce their profundities of thought and style, and moreover to clothe the imitation in poet's language, is a feat nearly allied to creation itself! Observe the same imagery is introduced in the *Merchant of Venice.*

Your mind is *tossing* on the ocean ;
There, where your argosies with portly sail,
Like seigniors and rich burghers on the flood,
Or, as it were, the pageants of the sea
Do overpeer the petty traffickers.
—*Merchant of Venice*, Act I. i.

In direct context with the passage already cited, from the *Essay of Friendship*, upon the fruit thereof (*i.e.*, that "it maketh a fair day in the affections from *Storm and Tempests*") is the following expression, in keeping with the passage given by Dr. Owen :— "*He tosseth his thoughts more easily;* he marshalleth them more orderly." (1625).

Coleridge speaks of what he calls the *Oceanic mind* of the Author of these Plays, who he imagined was Shakespeare. It is an excellent image every way, for the vastness of this mind has set a barrier to its own discovery or crossing, thinkers of all descriptions and capacities, having set out in vain upon voyages of discovery, never imagining how useless such efforts were, unless they embarked in Bacon's saucy bark, on the enterprise of mapping out his intellectual Globe, or New world (with its deficiencies of sciences,) as a key book of discovery for the Plays.

Let this sad interim like the ocean be
Which parts the shore * where two contracted new

---

* In double connection with dreams of sovereignty, and sundering seas of time, and distance, the following passage appears important:—

Duke of Gloucester.—Why, then, I do but dream of sovereignty ;

Come daily to the banks, that when they see
Return of love, more blest may be the view.—Sonnets 56

Bacon frequently uses the words *froth*, *frothy*, to denote vain efforts, or vain dreams, fruitless of effect. The same image of striking against the vault of heaven, in close connotation with froth, is to be found in the description of the tempest tossed ship which carries the babe Perdita, and casts her ashore to the care of the Sheepheards.

Clown.—O, the most piteous cry of the poor souls! Sometimes to see 'em. and not to see 'em, and now the ship *boring the moon with her mainmast, and anon swallowed with yest and froth, as you'd thrust a cork into a hogshead.*—*Winter's Tale*, Act II. iii.

Bacon's *affection towards learning*, is eloquently set forth in the Two Books of the *Advancement* (as well as in the *De Augmentis*), and is apologised for in the first Book. These two works are each compared to a ship. "So that, if the invention of the ship was thought so noble, which carrieth riches and commodities from place to place, and consociateth the most remote regions in participation of their fruits, *how much more are letters to be compared to be magnified, which as ships pass through the vast seas of time, and make ages so distant to participate of the wisdom, illuminations, and inventions, the one of the other.*" (Two Books of *Advancement of Learning*, chap. i., Book II.).

This affection for learning had another incentive—its real object was to provide proof and interpretation for the Plays—to hand down to posterity a Keybook, that should open up the boundless stores of an undiscovered country. And hence the affection becomes a wind, an agitating force, exactly as we refind it in the Plays,—a pain because of obstacles of time and difficulty.

Throw up thine eye! See, see, what showers arise,
Blown with the windy tempest of my heart.
—3 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act II. v.

It is highly important to show, that the metaphor of the

Like one that stands upon a promontory,
And spies a far-off shore where he would tread,
Wishing his foot were equal with his eye,
And chides the sea that sunders him from thence,
Saying, he'll lade it dry to have his way,
So do I wish the crown being so far off.
—3 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act III. ii.

Bacon's case was very like this, whether we consider this crown in the light of his poetical authorship, or as a birthright in the other sense.— or as both?

ship device, as applied to the Two Books of the *Advancement of Learning* (and their re-writing, or augmentation of 1623, entitled, *De Augmentis*), was no passing simile but a settled, constant, and profound image repeatedly hinted at. For example, in conclusion of his last and Ninth Book of the *De Augmentis,* Bacon writes:—"And now we have *with a small bark,* such as we were able to set out, *sailed about the universal circumference, as well of the old, as of the New World of Science, with how prosperous winds and course, we leave to posterity to judge.*" (Book IX. p. 467, *Adv. of Learning,* 1640.)

This same image appears in the Sonnets:—

> But since your worth, wide as the Ocean is,
>   The humble as the proudest sail doth bear,
> My saucy *bark* inferior far to his
>   On your broad main doth wilfully appear.
>
> —Sonnets 80.

In another passage Bacon writes:—"The *gardens of the Muses* keep the privilege of the golden age; they even flourish and are in league with Time. The monuments of wit survive the monuments of power; *the verses of a poet endure without a syllable lost, while States and Empires pass many periods.* Let him not think he shall descend, for he is now upon a hill *as a ship mounted on the ridge of a wave.*"

In commenting upon the conspiracy of Lambert Simnel (who first counterfeited the second son of Edward the Fourth, supposed to be murdered in the Tower; and afterwards Edward Plantagenet, then prisoner in the Tower), Bacon writes: "*For this lad was not to personate one that had long before been taken out of his cradle, or conveyed away in his infancy known to few,* but a youth that till almost the age of ten years had been brought up in a Court where infinite eyes had been upon him." ("History of King Henry VII.," p. 21, 1622.) According to Mrs. Gallup's bi-literal Cipher discoveries, Bacon *had been conveyed away secretly in his cradle,* in exactly the sense described in the above passage. I think it is evident, Bacon in penning this sentence, had some such instance, or case before him, in his "mind's eye," else why does he introduce it? If the Cipher story is true, it is certain all cases of this sort, *i.e.,* pretenders, and claimants to the throne, would exercise extraordinary fascination for Francis St. Alban. It is therefore to be noted, he further adds of Simnel:—"But yet doubting that there would be too near looking, and too much perspective into his disguise, if he should show it in England, he thought good (*after the manner, of Stage Plays and Masques*) to show it afar off." ("History of King Henry VII.," p. 23.) Bacon tells us, in his *Advancement of Learning*, that he has employed a style, in writing, that he calls PERSPECTIVE, *by which one part is intended to illuminate another*. In fact, Simnel was alarmed, lest there should be too much inquiry, or putting of two and two together, as to his imposture, *i.e.*, "*too much perspective into his disguise.*"

One of Bacon's Essays is entitled, *Of Masques and Triumphs*. It is highly important to insist upon the point, *that the Masque was a Stage Play in which the actors concealed their faces.* Striking evidence of this fact is extant. In January, 1617, Bacon dined at Gray's Inn, to give countenance to their Lord and Prince, of Purpoole, and to see their revels. On this occasion a piece of Ben Jonson's, called "*Prince's Masque,*" was performed. Nathaniel Brent, commenting upon the performance, says, "The poet is grown dull, that his device is thought not worth the relating, much less the copying out. Divers think fit he should return to his old trade of bricklaying again." Chamberlain adds, "*I cannot call it a masque, seeing they were not disguised nor had vizards.*" (Chamberlain to Carleton, Feb. 7, 1617-1618. See p. 149; Mrs. Pott's "Francis Bacon and his Secret Society.")

It is exactly in this sense Bacon alludes to Lambert Simnel's imposture or disguise, *i.e.*, as an actor or man with a masque on! But I think Bacon is thinking of a particular case, or parallel (presented in Stage Plays or Masques)—viz., to the impostor Jack Cade, who makes the following false claim of descent:—

Staf.—Villain, thy father was a plasterer;
And thou thyself a shearman, art thou not?
Cade.—And Adam was a gardener.
Bro.—And what of that?
Cade.—Marry this: Edmund Mortimer, Earl of March,
Married the Duke of Clarence's daughter, did he not?
Staf.—Ay, Sir.
Cade.—By her he had two children at one birth.
Bro.—That's false.
Cade.—Ay, there's the question; but I say 'tis true:
The elder of them, being put to nurse,
Was by a beggar woman stolen away;
And ignorant of his birth and parentage,
Became a bricklayer when he came to age:
His son I am; deny it if you can.
2 *K. Hen. VI.* Act IV. ii.

Another passage from the bi-literal Cipher discovery, quoted by Mr. Bayley, runs:—"*In this work o' my hands, I am heir* *apparent to a much loftier seat, a sceptre of power, that must even extend to posterity. No time, nor death, can take my second kingdom from me.*" (*Ibid*, p. 190.)

There is a very strong echo to this in the Sonnets :—

Thus have I had thee, *as a dream doth flatter,*
In sleep a king, but waking no such matter—Sonnets 87.

* * * * *

'Gainst death and all oblivious enmity
Shall you pace forth; your praise shall still find room
Even in the eyes of all posterity. Sonnets 55.

The same consciousness of the *royal or kingly mind* refinds itself expressed in the Sonnets :—

Or whether doth my mind, being *crown'd* with you,
Drink up the *monarch's* plague this flattery?

* * * * *

O, 'tis the first, 'tis flattery in my seeing
And my great mind most kingly drinks it up.
—Sonnet 114.

Compare the bi-literal Cipher :—"It is no improper exaltation of self when one feeling in heart and brain *the Divine gifts that fit him for his princely destiny,*—or that rightly inherited, albeit wrongly withholden sovereignty,—*in true noble kingly spirit doth look for power,* not for the sake of exercising that gift, but that he may uplift his people from the depth of misery into which they constantly sink, etc." ("Bi-literal," p. 46.) In a prefatory poem prefixed to the first folio Plays, 1623, are the following lines by Hugh Holland :—

Dry'd is that vein, dry'd is the Thespian spring,
Turn'd all to tears and Phœbus clouds his rays :
That corps, that coffin now bestick those bayes,
Which crown'd him poet first, then poets King.

These metaphors may possibly be pertinent to poetical powers alone, but we are bound to admit the benefit of the doubt, whether something else does not lie hid behind them? Ben Jonson celebrates Bacon's birthday, 1620, by a poem in which are these lines :—

Give me a deep bowl'd *crown*, that I may sing
In raising him the wisdom of my King.

In a description of the character of Queen Elizabeth, the Biliteral Cipher says, "She commonly restrained the course and proceedings of her ministers, and servants, *for fear they would overtop and overshadow her*" (p. 94). This word "*overtop*" is thoroughly Baconian, and out of use in modern times.

In the Essay upon *Ambition*, Bacon says :—"There is use also of ambitious men, in pulling down the greatness of any subjects that *overtops : as Tiberius* used *Macro* in the pulling down of *Sejanus.*" (*Essays*, 1625).—Prospero, describing Miranda's false uncle, who supplanted him in the Dukedom of Milan, exclaims :—

> *Prosp.*—Being once perfected how to grant suits,
> How to deny them ; who to advance, and who
> *To trash for overtopping.*—*The Tempest*, Act I. ii.

This expression of *overtopping* is entirely an agricultural metaphor, borrowed from the garden.—

> *Gard.*—Go thou, and like an executioner
> Cut off the heads of too fast growing sprays,
> That look too lofty in our commonwealth.
> —*K. Rich. II.*, Act III., iv.

Bacon observes : "Periander being consulted with how to preserve a tyranny newly usurped, bid the messenger attend and report what he saw him do ; and went into his garden and topped all the highest flowers : signifying that it consisted in the cutting off and keeping low of the nobility and grandees." (2 Book of *Advt. of Learning*, p. 164).

Richard the Third, in just this fashion, cut off those young princes, *whose overtopping heads stood in the way of his ambition.*

> *Richard III.*—And will she yet abase her eyes on me,
> *That cropp'd the golden* prime of this sweet prince,*
> And made her widow to a woeful bed ?
> —*K. Rich. III.*, Act I. ii.

So Pericles, escaping the fury of the tyrant Antiochus, exclaims

> *Pericles.*—Then, lest my life be *cropp'd* to keep you clear,
> By flight I'll shun the danger which I fear.
> —*Pericles*, Act I. i.

Bacon writes: "Pindar when he would extol † Hiero speaks

---

* Compare Richard's *waking dream* of succession to the crown :—

> That from his loins no hopeful branch may spring
> To cross me from the *golden time* I look for.
> —3 *K. Hen. VI.*, Act III. ii.

In his *Advancement of Learning*, Bacon writes: "A matter revealed and prefigur'd unto Domitian, in a dream, the night before he was slain, for he seemed to see grow behind upon his shoulders *a neck and a head of gold*, which Divination came indeed accordingly to pass, in those *golden times* which succeeded." (Chap. VII., Book I., *Advt. of Learning*.)

† "*The cropping off the tops, or summities of all worthies*," may be understood, in the sense of a patron of learning gathering about him men of genius, as flowers are collected into posies ; or it may have been the opposite sense of banishment, death, or cutting off. Bacon, as usual, is guarded in his language.

(as usually he doth) most elegantly *that he cropp'd off the tops, or summities of all virtues*" (*Advt. of Learning*, Liber IV., p. 179, 1640). The hint given is very pointed. Hiero was a tyrant of Syracuse, and was a patron of literature. The poets Æschylus, Pindar, Simonides, took up their residence at his court. And Bacon is also indicating the power and danger of envy felt towards poets in all ages, and which finds its reflection in the Sonnets, particularly in that pathetic Sonnet, where the poet sums up his times.

And art made tongue-tied by authority.—Sonnets 66.

Dionysus, another tyrant of Sicily, banished Plato and Philoxenus, the poet, because they excelled his glory and eclipsed it as he thought. And Horace writes of envy :—

Siculi non invenere tyranni
Majus tormentum.

From a similar cause—the fear of a tyrant's envy—we find Pericles fleeing the court of Antiochus :—

Pericles.—I know him tyrannous; and tyrants' fears
Decrease not, but grow faster than the years.
—*Pericles*, Act I., ii.

Observe that this constitute one of Bacon's "*New World of Sciences*" entitled, "SUMMITIES," and very likely the subject embraces an apology for the cryptic character of his art? That is to say, that envy constitutes a danger to the poet who dares venture to speak truth in any age, and can be escaped, either by flight, *or by disguise and concealment*. In the same language, (of the murder of Prince Edward), Queen Margaret exclaims :—

Butchers and villains! bloody cannibals!
How sweet a plant have you untimely cropp'd!
—Third Part *K. Hen. VI.*, Act V. v.

The entire title of this deficient of Bacon's *New World of Sciences*, is, TRIUMPHI HOMINIS, *or of the Summities and highest pitch of human Nature*. (Liber IV., *Advt. of Learning*, 1640.) It is the sixteenth of the Deficients, in order, (as they are catalogued at the end of the work), and its subject matter evidently deals with genius, or with extraordinary examples of human perfection, that either as poets, or philosophers, or men of virtue have excited the admiration or envy of tyrants! Socrates and Seneca (the former exciting the envy of the Thirty Tyrants, the latter of Nero) are examples! Bacon observes that the Emperor Adrian mortally envied artists and poets (*Advt. of Learning*). And the length of Bacon's Essay upon

Envy, proves how he had observed and pondered over this subject. James the First was an author, and a poet, and perhaps as "*a concealed poet,*" Bacon found it expedient not to openly compete with the Royal Master whose favour he was soliciting?

Another passage of the "Biliteral" cited by Mr. Bayley runs:—

"It shall be seen that to my mind the discypherer "*is th' modest co'fessor who listeneth behind a lattice to what I do impart*" (p. 153).

This literary trifle, or simile of a "*lattice,*" is out of the ken of a fraudulent discipherer. It is a Baconian image and word, also to be re-found in the plays, introduced in the same sense. For example, *Parolles,*—whose name means *words,*—*has his character disciphered by one called* LAFEU:—

> *Lafeu.*—Do not plunge thyself too far in anger, lest thou hasten thy trial; which if—Lord have mercy on thee for a hen! *So, my good window of lattice*, fare thee well; *thy casement I need not open, for I look through thee.*—*All's Well that Ends Well*, Act II. iii.

Lattice is used here in the sense of woodwork, probably a sort of cross framing in which the old-fashioned diamond-shaped panes of glass were set, in Bacon's time? Through this the light passed through in a sort of *Chiaroscuro*. The same can be said of words (Parolles) as Tennyson exclaims:—

For words like nature *half conceal*
And half reveal the soul within.

In his Essay of *Simulation and Dissimulation*: "There be three degrees, of *this hiding, and veiling of a man's self.* The first *Closeness, Reservation*, and *Secrecy*. For the first of these, *Secrecy*: It is indeed *the virtue of a confessor;* and assuredly, *the secret man, heareth many confessions;* for who would open himself to a blab or blabber?"* (*Essays*, 1625.)

"These properties of *Art* or *Policy*, and *Dissimulation or Closeness*, are indeed habits and faculties several, and to be distinguished. For if a man have that penetration of judgment, as he can discern, what things are to be laid open, and what is to be secreted, *and what to be showed at half-lights*, and to whom, and when (which indeed are Arts of state, and Arts of Life, as Tacitus well calleth them) to him, a habit of Dissimulation is a hinderance and a poorness." (*Essays*, 1625.)

---

* *Parolles.*—I love not many *words.* [*Exit.*]
Sec. Lord.—No more than a fish loves water.—*All's Well*, Act III., vi.

* * * * *

Lafeu.—Go to, sir; you were beaten in Italy for *picking a kernel out of a pomegranate.*—Act II. iii.

In Bacon's Essay of *Friendship* is this:—"And these two noble *fruits* of friendship; (*Peace in the affections*, and *support of the judgment*) followeth the last fruit; which is like the *Pomegranate, full of many kernels;* I mean *aid*, and *bearing a part*, in all *actions* and *occasions*." (1625.)

Observe that this Essay may be called, an Essay upon *Concealment* (*or Closeness*), and that it embraces, or understands everything within the category of the cryptic, and acroamatic, besides being a finger post for characters like Richard the Third, *and, indeed, for all Actors on or off the stage of life.*

A lattice seems to answer to Bacon's "*half-lights*"—that is to say, half concealment and half revelation, as in a room where the sun enters through Venetian lattice work, or sun-blinds :—

> Revealing day through every cranny *spies*.
> —*Lucrece*, Northumberland MSS., 1086.

This *casement, or lattice of words* (Parolles) probably is identical with the *windows of the heart, or breast*, of Sonnet 24 :—

> For through the painter must you see his skill,
> To find where your true image pictur'd lies ;
> Which in my bosom's shop is hanging still,
> That hath his *windows* glazed with thine eyes
> Now see what good turns eyes for eyes have done :
> Mine eyes have drawn thy shape, and thine for me
> *Are windows to my breast*, where through the sun
> Delights to peep to gaze therein on thee.

In "Observations upon a Libel," Bacon alluding to Queen Elizabeth, makes the remark :—"Contrariwise, her Majesty not taking *to make windows into men's secret thoughts*." (Page 127, *Resuscitatio*, 1662.) In the *Advancement of Learning* Bacon describes the idea of Momus, which was to make a *window in every man's breast in order to discover his window, or his heart* :—"That window which Momus did require : who seeing in the frame of man's heart such angles and recesses, found fault *that there was not a window to look into them*." (Two Books of *Advt. of Learning*.) Pistol's obscure epithets are called, by Falstaff, "*red lattice phrases*." (*Merry Wives*, Act II.) And in this point it is plain Parolles is classed with the former.

These parallels might greatly be multiplied if space permitted. But enough has been adduced to prove that the Cipher discoveries reveal an amazing congruity of thought and style with the acknowledged work of Francis, St. Alban.

W. F. C. WIGSTON.

POEMS HITHERTO PUBLISHED ANONYMOUSLY, OR UNDER THE NAMES OF SEVERAL DIFFERENT PERSONS; AND FROM INTERNAL EVIDENCE BELIEVED TO BE THE PRODUCTION OF FRANCIS "BACON."

The Shepherd's Description of Love.

(*Before* 1600.)

Meliboms.—Shepherd, what's love? I pray thee tell.
Fau.—It is that fountain and that well
Where pleasure and repentance dwell;
It is perhaps that sauncing bell
That tolls all into heaven or hell: [*]
And this is love as I heard tell.
Meli.—Yet, what is love? I prithee say.
It is a work of holiday;
It is December matched with May; [†]
When lusty bloods, in fresh array,
Hear ten months after of the play:
And this is love as I hear say.
Meli.—Yet, what is love, good shepherd sain?
Fau.—It is sunshine mixed with rain; [‡]
It is a toothache, or like pain;
It is a game where none doth gain;
The lass saith no, and would full fain:
And this is love, as I hear sain.
Meli.—Yet, shepherd, what is love, I pray?
Fau.—It is a yea, it is a nay—
A pretty kind of sporting fray; [§]
It is a thing will soon away;
Then, nymphs, take 'vantage [||] while ye may:
And this is love, as I hear say.
Meli.—Yet, what is love, shepherd? Show!
Fau.—*A thing that creeps—it cannot go;*[¶]
A prize that passeth to and fro;
A thing for one, a thing for moe;

---

[*] "It is a bell
That summons thee to heaven, or to hell."—*Macb.* ii. 1.

[†] "He speaks holiday, he smells April and May."—*Mer. Wiv.* iii. 2.

[‡] "You have seen sunshine and rain at once."—*Lear* iv. 3.

[§] "Their jangling I esteem a sport.
. . . These lovers seek a place to fight."—*M. N. D.* iii. 2.

[||] "To take advantage," frequent Baconian expression.

[¶] "Love will creep in service where it dare not go" (*Two Gent Ver.* iv. 2). This saying, which seems to be compounded of two proverbs in "Heywood's Epigrams,' reappears in a letter from Bacon to James I., which accompanied the sending of a portion of the "History of Great Britain:"—"This (history) being but a leaf or two, I pray your pardon if I send it for your recreation, considering that *love must creep where it cannot go.*"

And he that proves shall find it so ;
And, shepherd, this is love, I trow.

De Morte.

Man's life's a tragedy: his mother's womb,
From which he enters, is the tiring room ;
This spacious earth *the theatre,* * and *the stage*
That country which he lives in : passions, rage,
Folly and vice are actors ; the first cry,
The prologue to the ensuing tragedy : †
The former act consisteth of dumb shows ;
The second, he to whom perfection grows ;
T' the third he is a man. and doth begin
To nurture vice. and act the deeds of sin ;
T' the fourth declines ; t' the fifth, diseases clog
And trouble him ; then death's his epilogue. ‡

A Farewell to the Vanities of the World.

Farewell, ye gilded follies. pleasing troubles !
Farewell, ye honoured rags, ye glorious bubbles !
Fame's but a hollow echo ; gold, pure clay ;
Honour, the darling but of one short day ;
Beauty, the eye's idol, but a damasked skin ;
State, but a golden prison to live in
And torture free-born minds ; embroidered trains,
Merely but pageants for proud-swelling veins ;
And blood allied to greatness is alone
Inherited, not purchased, nor his own ;
Fame, honour, beauty, state train, blood and birth
Are but the fading blossoms of the earth.
I would be great. but that the sun doth still
Level his rays against the rising hill ;
I would be high, but see the proudest oak
Most subject to the rending thunder stroke ;
I would be rich, but see men too unkind
Dig in the bowels of the richest mind ;
I would be wise, but that I often see
The fox suspected while the ass goes free :
I would be fair, but see the fair and proud
Like the bright sun oft selling in a cloud ;
I would be poor, but know the humble grass
Still trampled on by each unworthy ass ;
Rich, hated, wise, suspected, scorned of poor
Great feared ; fair, tempted : high still envied more
I have wished all, but now I for neither

---

* Compare :—" This wide and universal theatre
Presents more pageants than the scene
Wherein we play in. All the world's a stage,
And all the men and women merely players," &c.
—See *As You Like It* ii. 7 (lines 136—166).

† "Prologue to the omen coming on."—*Ham.* i. 1.

‡ Compare :—*As You Like It* ii. 7 (lines 136—166).

Great, high, rich, wise, nor fair: poor I'll be rather.
Would the world now adopt me for her heir;
Would beauty's queen entitle me the fair;
Fame speak me fortunes minion; could I vie
Angels with India; with a sparkling eye
Command bared heads, bowed knees, strike justice dumb,
As well as blind and lame, or give a tongue
To stones by epitaphs; be called great master
In the loose rhymes of every poetaster;
Could I be more than any man that lives
Great, fair, rich, wise, all in superlatives;
Yet I more freely would these gifts resign
Than ever fortune would have made them mine
And hold one minute of this holy visure
Beyond the riches of this empty pleasure.
Welcome pure thoughts! welcome ye silent groves,
These guests, these courts, my soul most dearly loves;
Now the winged people of the sky shall sing
My cheerful anthems to the gladsome spring;
A Prayer-book now shall be my looking-glass
In which I will adore sweet virtue's face
Here dwell no hateful looks, no palace cares,
No broken vows dwell here nor pale-faced fears;
Then here I'll sit and sigh my hot love's folly,
And learn to affect an holy melancholy;
And if contentment be a stranger then
I'll ne'er look for it, but in heaven, again.

This poem created much curiosity and interest when, in 1889, Dr. Alexander Grosart announced the intended publication of his new "Literary find"—an original poem in MS. by Francis Bacon. The promised event, however, did not take place, a fact said to have been attributed by Dr. Grosart to his dread lest the crazy Baconians should use this poem as an argument in favour of their own doctrines. The poem meanwhile had been long before printed and published under various names. In Walton's "Complete Angler," edited by Nicolas, it was, in the first two Editions, attributed to Dr. Donne, and later, to Sir Henry Wotton. In the Ashmolean MSS. it is entitled, "Dr. Donn's Valediction to the World;" in "Wit's Interpreter," it is said to have been written by Sir Kenelm Digby. Sir H. Nicolas says that the verses are by Sir Walter Raleigh; Archbishop Sancroft publishes them anonymously with the title, "An Hermit in an Arbour Spurning a Globe." (*MS. Tanner*, 465, *fol.* 59.)

These particulars, which were collected many years ago have since been found, independently collated and neatly put together, in a Note to "The Courtly Poets,"* by Dr. Hannah, former Vicar of Brighton, and Prebendary of Chichester. The "Farewell" consists of 52 lines, of which 45 furnish upwards of 100 analogies to *Shakespeare*, besides *Promus* Notes, and other references to acknowledged works of *Bacon*. These Notes were edited and published in the "New Ireland Review," July, 1901 (Vol. XV., No. 5), by the Rev. William Sutton, S.J. We do not therefore reproduce them.

---

* It is probable, from internal evidence, that almost every one of these "Courtly Poets" will prove to be a mask for Francis.

The following are some indubitable but seemingly little known lines, entitled :—

VERSES MADE BY MR. FRA. BACON.*

The man of life upright, whose guiltless heart is free
From all dishonest deeds, and thoughts of vanity;
That man whose silent days in harmless joys are spent,
Whom hopes cannot delude, nor fortune discontent;
That man needs neither armour, nor tower for defence,
Nor secret vaults to fly from thunder's violence.
He only can behold with unaffrighted eyes
The horrors of the deep and terrors of the skies.
Thus, scorning all the care that fate or fortune brings.
He makes the heaven his book, his wisdom heavenly things,
Good thoughts his only friends, his wealth a well-spent age;
The earth his sober inn,—a quiet pilgrimage.

—*Fra. Bacon.*

The more beautiful poem entitled, "The World,"† is more generally known, and begins—

"The world's a Bubble, and the life of man
Less than a span."

Space does not admit of more than the remark that, although in six instances this poem is signed, or *has been altered* to the name of the true author, yet there are as many different names attached to the various Editions, as we find with the other pieces which we ascribe to him. Thus, in the 1st Edition "The World" is signed *Ignoto.* In Farnaby's "Florilegium," 1629, p. 10, it is ascribed to *Lord Bacon.* In MS. Rawl., it is signed *R. W.* In the Ashm. MS., 38, the first title has "*by Dr. Donn,*" altered to *Sir Fran. Bacon.* In Mr. Pickering's MS. copy the first signature, *Henry Harrington*, is altered to *Lord Verulam Viscount St. Albans.* The Edition in the *Reliquæ Wotton*, which Spedding reprints, is signed *Lord Bacon.*

Surely we need little more to convince us that Francis was the "Concealed Poet," who should yet one day "pace forth" and be truly known.

C. M. P.

---

* Spedding, "Works," vii. p. 269. † *Ib.*

TO THE EDITORS OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIRS,—In the "Memoirs of Queen Elizabeth," by Thomas Birch, D.D., we find mention made of a secret correspondence between Anthony Bacon and Sir Francis Walsingham, and the fact that in the Sydney Papers a certain Mr. Burnham is mentioned (1577), with whom both Sir Francis and the Queen express themselves extremely satisfied. It seems that by their orders he travelled to Picardy, Calais, Boulogne, Montreux, Abbeville and Amiens to see and hear what French forces were levied to enter the Low Countries. At his return he passed through Licques, where he had a conference with Mons. de la Motte, Governor of Graveling. A *secret journey* was made by him into the Low Countries before the Duke of Anjou made his first entry there. After this Mr. Burnham was despatched by the Secretary for State to Paris to Sir Amyas Paulet, and from thence to Rheims in Champagne, in order to see and learn what ill-affected subjects of her Majesty were there. He conferred with Dr. Alan and the English averse to the religion and government of their own country. From thence he went to the camp of Don John of Austria, who was besieging Limburg, and continued in it fifteen days, concealing himself under the protection of John Baptista de Monty, pretending to be a gentleman of his Court, cornet of horse to an Italian gentleman of Paris. After he had observed the state of the camp, and the enemies garrison and the towns through which he passed, he carried the relation which he had drawn up to the Lord Cobham, and Secretary Walsingham at Antwerp.

1st October, 1578, Mr. Burnham was sent by the Secretary to the camp of the Prince of Parma, the successor of Don John. On his return he drew up a relation, which was approved by the Queen and Secretary. In 1580 Mr. Burnham was despatched by the Secretary into Portugal to see what state that country was in. He stayed twenty-two days in Lisbon, disguised as a servant to a factor of Mr. Bird, merchant. He was three months exposed to constant danger, and strictly examined at several places. Mendoza had received some intimation of his voyage to Portugal, and sent over a description of his stature, countenance, and particular marks to know him by. He had embarked but twelve hours on his return to England before orders arrived from the Court of Spain to apprehend him. For these services, as well as for the several journeys in which he had been employed by the Secretary to the Duke of Anjou, and to William, Prince of Orange, and the States of the Low Countries, he requested some extraordinary gratification. A paper among Mr. Anthony Bacon's papers has the following:—

> "A note of special services performed by Edward Burnham for her Majesty at the command and approval of the Right Hon. Sir F. Walsingham.
>
> "Curiosity and attention to public affairs, highly acceptable to Secretary of State; secrecy of the management of his intelligence—domestic and foreign—prevented posterity being acquainted with details of it."

Was Edward Burnham, Francis? The year in which Burnham commenced his diplomatic missions was the same in which Francis went, under Paulet's wing, to France. We know he was engaged in some secret mission for the Queen, which she expressed herself well satisfied with. Anthony did not commence his foreign travels, we are expressly told, till the year 1579, when he went to Paris. We also know that he had no interview with the Queen when he returned home because of his ill-health. If Francis was Edward Burnham—and there seems no reason why he should not have been, and every reason why he should,—he would have been an eye-witness of foreign camps and cities. With his knowledge of Italian, which he, no doubt, as Mr. Bompas points out, received from his mother Lady Bacon, he would have been useful in Parma, and this journey would give him ample opportunity for visiting Venice, and securing what we know he had, local colouring and definite impressions, almost impossible to acquire at second-hand.

The subject is well worth further investigation. The secrecy of the mission would have aided him considerably in the concealment of the authorship of the Plays; only a select few would have known that he visited Italy at all. It also explains, in a measure, his movements after leaving Cambridge being omitted from the *Athenae Cantabrigienses.*

Yours truly,

ALICIA AMY LEITH.

TO THE EDITORS OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIRS,—A recent work, Professor Engel's "History of English Literature," contains, not only much abuse of "Baconians," but also no small amount of censure upon Bacon himself.

Those who are hostile to the theories which inspire the periodical called BACONIANA, have in a vast number of cases fortified their arguments by depreciating the character and even the intellect of James the First's great Chancellor. In our opinion, such a proceeding is unfortunate. However displeased a disputant may be at the startling hints given from time to time as to the real authorship of the "Shakespeare Plays," it might have been prudent if the writers in favour of the "man" of Stratford-upon-Avon—and several of these writers are eminent in literature—*had welcomed a controversy which obliges the student to study both the plays and poems of W. S. and the great prose marvels which are attributed, without dispute, to Francis Bacon, Lord Verulam, Viscount St. Albans.*

Scoffs at Bacon himself, however, seem to be thought the most effective weapons—fortified by the everlastingly quoted disparagement of the immortal Francis, fulminated by Pope and Macaulay.

A foreign Professor may be, of course, allowed some latitude. We here, however, after quoting the Professor's grand peroration, think we can parry curiously his deadly thrust. Professor Engel thus concludes his diatribe :—

"And though the entire world's literary lunatic asylums should rise up and play their mad pranks in William Shakespear's name, Herder's words will hold good in time to come just as they have done for the last 250 years." (Here follows Herder):

"If there is one man *who calls up for me that grand image seated upon the lofty summit of a rock: Beneath his feet, storm, tempest and the raging of the sea; but his head in the radiance of heaven,* that man is Shakespeare. One must needs add though, how at the very base of his rocky throne are crowds that mutter, explain, curse, excuse, revile, translate, blaspheme—and none of them does he hear."

Had the Professor turned to the works of Bacon, he would have found something still more suitable to his purpose—namely Bacon's own allusion to poetic glory :—

"The monuments of Wit survive the monuments of Power. The verses of a poet endure without a syllable lost, while States and Empires pass many periods. Let him" (the poet) "not think he shall *descend : for he is now upon a hill as a ship is mounted upon the ridge of a wave : but that* HILL OF THE MUSES *is above tempests, always clear and calm ; a hill of the goodliest discovery, that man can have, being a prospect upon all the errors and wanderings of the present and former times. Yea, in some cliff it leadeth the eye beyond the horizon of time, and giveth no obscure divination of time to come.*"

Truly sublime words, eclipsing the quotation from Herder (if Herder indeed was not a copyist.) We have put in italics the portions of both passages which have more complete resemblance.

Bacon, though writing prose, can scarcely here be justly described as a "concealed" poet. Should not the anti-Baconians have the grace to admit that at least Francis Bacon was a great *Prose*-Poet ?

Yours faithfully,

GEORGE COLOMB (Colonel).

Junior United Service Club, S.W.

TO THE EDITORS OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIRS,—I should be much obliged to anyone who would kindly refer me to an authority (with edition and page) for the dash in "Enclo—Ased" as having been in the original inscription on Shakspere's tombstone. In Mr. Donnelly's book, ch. iv., p. 23, he says Malone gives the dash, and on p. 20 he apparently quotes Knight for it; but I have been unable to find the dash in any of the authorities, though I have searched in several editions. Although more than once in that chapter Mr. Donnelly gives the wrong authority for a particular variation from the present inscription, I have found that some authority or other supports him on each point except that of this dash, which is, as he says, "an important detail."

G. B. ROSHER.

35, Sheffield-terrace, W.

TO THE EDITORS OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—In the October issue of BACONIANA I made enquiry respecting Essex's skull, kindly replied to in April. The passage I had lost I have now found. It comes with singular interest to our notice at this time. It will be noted that the nearest relative of an executed person was the usual possessor of the head if it was preserved.

"William Shakespeare," by George Brandes, p. 311, Vol. II. :—"It is certain, . . . for the Duc de Biron, the Envoy of Henri IV., had no motive for telling a falsehood, that on the 12th Sep., 1601, after a conversation about Essex, in which she jested over her departed favourite, Elizabeth opened a box and took out of it Essex's skull, which she showed to Biron."

Yours truly,

A. A. L.

Baconiana.

Vol. X.—*New Series*. OCTOBER, 1902. No. 40.

"IN PRAISE OF THE QUEEN."

THE desire to discredit or to vindicate the deciphered work of Mrs. Wells Gallup, and the unpleasing matter which in part it divulges, has naturally led to closer inquiry into the personal history of that extraordinary compound of good and evil—Queen Elizabeth. Certainly in her we have a striking object-lesson in the "Contraries" expounded by *Bacon*, and the business of reconciling the absolutely opposed accounts extant concerning her, will perhaps be the life-long work of some future historian. "The *evil* that lives after" is, as a rule, carefully excluded from printed histories; it is painfully prominent in MS. collections "reserved," or kept behind the veil, in places somewhat unattainable,—precautions, questionable now, but needful in the times when these documents were written. Many of them are from private persons about the Court, or from Ambassadors and Statesmen to their correspondents here or abroad. Some are judicial examinations, affidavits, confessions, &c. For the most part they tell their tales in plain unvarnished language, and those tales are very evil.

With this dark side of the picture we have here nothing to do; let it be turned with face to the wall, whilst we examine the portraits full of goodness, beauty, and magnanimity, set before us in the prose and poetry of her day as "Queen Elizabeth," the great, the unmatchable. Turn where we will, we seldom get far without coming upon some passage "In praise of the Queen"—passages which colour and harmonise with the descriptions of later writers, who are usually content to copy from each other. The few who dig to the roots of the matter must know better; but by preference or obligation, they slide over or suppress particulars which differ egregiously and glaringly from history as taught in the schoolroom. It is essential to know and establish this fact; for, even in present times, charges have been brought against Francis St. Alban of vilifying Elizabeth's character in the secret history embedded in the Biliteral Cipher, whilst elsewhere, about the same date, and again later, he enthusiastically extols her parts and virtues.

The work dedicated to this purpose, and printed after her death, is known as "The Felicities of Queen Elizabeth."* We are not now concerned with the question whether or not Francis originally wrote this eulogy in Latin or in English, or whether he had it translated from English into Latin by some of his "able pens." It is plain that he thought out, or "exercised his judgment upon" every subject *in "his mother tongue,"* using translations made by others, partly to disguise his own style, but partly that the work should be rendered permanent, safe from the perversions of later writers, and intelligible to the educated of all ages and nations. Nevertheless, if he did write anything for publication in Latin, he may have written this "*In Felicem Memoriam,*" for the very reason that the writing has been pronounced by competent critics "careless," if not uncritical, showing signs of having been written hurriedly, and without revision. The same is perceivable in the *Promus* Notes; they were to register suggestive ideas, rather than to present neat axioms or polished periods. In some cases even the syntax seems faulty, and the quotations inaccurate; for our Francis is here studying matter more than words; his primary aim was to endow men with the wealth of knowledge and new conceptions, with which his capacious and versatile mind was full to the brim. To build up the noble model of language, which he compares to the beautiful statue of Apelles (or Zeuxis), an image composed of all beauties united in one person—this was a secondary matter which shaped itself as he went on; it was, however, a matter which he esteemed of high importance, since "Words are the images of thoughts," and in many of the poetic pieces which we have to notice, it may be observed how the idea, and the muse (or the language in which the idea is expressed) are mingled in the mind of our poet.

The Beautiful Lady, the sovereign mistress of Francis, whether she be interpreted of truth pure and simple, of the wisdom and knowledge which are truth, or of the muse or language which expresses truth—"Truth in beauty dyed,"—the allegory seems to be all one. Crowned, and invested with the raiment and jewels of splendid language, or naked and unadorned in her simplicity, Truth is still herself. She it is whom, in his youth, Francis vowed he would "woo and wed," and from whom he "would never be parted." She, divine wisdom, crowned, enthroned, and radiant in glory, was the Queen, described as presiding at the wedding of Truth and Beauty (the material, and the ideal or spiritual). *

---

* **Harl. MSS. 6797, folio 79, where it appears in Latin.**

A former article in BACONIANA † takes for text some lines from Dante's "*Convito*," which seem to have furnished the allegory of this wondrous Beauty, the "habitation" of his love, which Dante contemplated during the watches of the night. Can we doubt that this "habitation" was the *El Issa Beth*, or *Elisa-Beth*, the "House of God," "the Gate of Heaven?" Such an interpretation makes clear and easy things otherwise obscure and puzzling. It connects, by many interwoven threads, the "House of Wisdom," or "New Solomon's House," of Francis St. Alban, with the similar temple of speculative masonry, with its pillars and royal arch, and all the rest of its symbolic appurtenances framed upon the model of the Temple of Solomon. This is a large field upon which we need not now enter; but Masons of high Rose Cross degree do not deny the existence of these analogies, although, if interrogated concerning them, they may be forced to say that they "cannot tell."

We propose then to show :

(1.) That the *Praise of Queen Elizabeth* is *ambiguous;* in one sense a mere hyperbolical compliment to the reigning Queen to meet the fashion of the day; in its true sense, an allegory of Heavenly Wisdom, and of her "habitation," the Temple of Light and Truth, which the architect, or master mason, Francis St. Alban, was in process of erecting.

(2.) We would examine a little into the nature of the "praise" so lavishly but cautiously bestowed upon the Queen, so that readers who do not possess a copy of this tract may appraise for themselves the value of that eulogy as applied to Elizabeth, Queen of England.

In the first place we have to observe that *two different pieces extant* are *both* printed as "Bacon's" "*Praise of the Queen*." The first was dated 1592,‡ the second 1608; § but Spedding, who prints both in the "Life" and "Works of Bacon" seems intentionally so to confuse these two distinct tracts, as to convey the impression that there is but one. Although writing separately of each, in neither place does he allude to the other "Discourse" on the same theme. Let us take the last first. It was published in Latin by Dr. Rawley, the author's Chaplain and Secretary, who, in 1657, wrote these words:—"I thought it fitting to intimate that the discourse, entitled, *A Collection of the Felicities of Queen Elizabeth*, was written by his lordship in Latine onely: whereof, though his lordship had his particular ends, * then; yet in regard that I held it a duty that her own nation . . . should be acquainted and possessed with the virtues of that excellent Queen, as well as foreign nations, I was induced, many years ago, to put the same into the English tongue; † not *ad verbum*, for that had been both flat and injudicious; but (as far as my slender ability would reach) according to the expressions which I conceived his lordship would have written it in if he had written the same in English; yet ever acknowledging that Zeuxis' or Apelles' pencil could not be attained but by Zeuxis or Apelles himself. This work his lordship so much affected that he had ordained by his last will and testament to have had it published many years since; but that singular person entrusted therewith, soon after deceased, and therefore it must expect a time to come forth with his lordships' other works." ‡

---

* See "The Marriage of Christian Rosencreuz." Waite's "Real History of the Rosicrucians." † Vol. I., New Series, No. 2. August, 1893.

‡ "Letters and Life of Bacon," i. 126—143. § "Works of Bacon," vi., 283—318. See also Rawley's *Epistle to the Reader* "Resuscitatio."

This whole passage requires looking into; several points seem obscure—as to the translation, the unspecified "singular person," and the publication, *spoken of as a thing of the future*, whilst at that very time Rawley was introducing the "Felicities" to the public. But we must pass these things, and run through the brief memoir, in order to observe the virtues of Elizabeth as here set forth.

Chiefly she was praised for her "felicity," her long and prosperous reign, "her fortune favourable and serene," her "glory neither ruffled nor incomplete;" for the success of her arms, "no decline of greatness or inglorious exit from the stage." Peace flourished during the chief part of her reign, and was due to her good management and prudence. Her escapes from treacherous attempts of conspirators are also subjects of admiration. With regard to moderation in religion, "there may seem to be a difficulty," on account of the severity of the laws made against recusants; still "her intention was not to enforce consciences." The historian

---

* What were these "ends?" † We see that Rawley did not accredit ordinary *Englishmen* with the power to read Latin, though *foreigners* could do so.

‡ "Resuscitatio," *Epistle to the Reader*.

"makes no excursion into praises; for praises are the tribute of men, but felicity the gift of God." Elizabeth was "admirable amongst women," both because of her natural endowments and her fortune," and, "another principal thing, the time and period of her reign. . . . She had many outward gifts of nature: a comely and straight make, an extraordinary majesty of aspect, and good health. Her death was painless, and, to add to the full measure of her felicity, she was most happy in the abilities and virtues of her servants and ministers."

Felicity or good luck, success in arms and in diplomacy, good looks, good health, good servants and ministers—what is there in all this to confute or disprove the "slanders," "calumnies," "factious rumours," and repeated emphatic documentary statements and insinuations, that Elizabeth, though *a great Queen*, was *a bad woman;* vain beyond words, untruthful, treacherous, double-faced; at times tyrannical, cruel, merciless. Rawley continues:—

"As to those lighter points of character—as that she allowed herself to be wooed and courted, and even to have love made to her, and liked it, and continued it beyond the natural age of such vanities," the eulogist "finds something to admire in these things; for, if viewed indulgently, they are much like the accounts we find in romances of the Queen in the Blessed Islands, and her Court and institutions, who allows of amorous admiration, but prohibits desire."

The editor here notes that he has "not been able to learn what romance Bacon alludes to;" it seems, however, to be one of the many Rosicrucian allegories of Truth and Beauty of which we have often had occasion to speak. "To conclude, she was, no doubt, *a good and moral Queen;* and such she *wished to appear.* Vices she hated, and it was by honest arts that she desired to shine." This paragraph whilst conveying to a modern reader the impression that Elizabeth was *a good woman*, states, in point of fact, that she was a *good Queen.* "Moral" is to be taken (in books of the time of Dr. Rawley) in its classical sense—of good civil customs, political economy, government or administration. Just so the word "virtue" was used to express manliness, courage, vigour, rather than modesty, purity of life, true goodness. These last named virtues do not appear in the private character of Elizabeth. Not one, even of her flatterers, has placed on record that she was kind, gentle, modest, womanly, true.

To return to the narrative in the Biliteral Cipher. Francis seems to have been a mere boy when the scene occurred with his "wicked mother," which he so graphically describes. He was then living with the "good," "wise," "sweet," "saintly" Lady Anne, whom, until that date, he had believed to be his mother. The shock must indeed have been great when he learnt the truth. He knew of the scandalous story just related in his presence, but of the Queen's *goodness* he knew nothing.

From time to time he had fulfilled the custom of the day, and flattered this vain woman with complimentary speeches, or with "a Sonnet writ in her favour." We do not know how early he began to do this, but later on he draws attention to the fact; and perhaps it was in order to be able to pay such hyperbolic compliments without too much wresting his conscience that he wrote them *ambiguously,* after the manner described in a former paper on the *Shakespeare* Sonnets.* The writer of that article took for text some passages from Dante's "*Convito,*" believing that, in all these ambiguous sonnets and allegories, the original model was taken from the great poet of the Italian Renaissance.

"My Love in this allegory, is always understood of this study *(philosophy)* which is the application of the mind to that thing of which it is enamoured. . . . By Love, I mean that study I underwent to win the love of this lady. . . . This love produces wondrous Beauty . . . O, during how many nights, when the eyes of others were reposing in sleep, were mine contemplating the habitation of my Love ! "†

Now we observe that the Praise of the Sovereign Mistress, or, Fair Lady of the Sonnets, and other pieces in prose and verse, are parallel, not so much with the "Felicities" published after the death of Francis St. Alban, as with the former "*Discourse in Praise of the Queen*" included in the MS. book of Speeches, Essays, and Plays discovered amongst the Northumberland MSS. It is here entitled, "*Mr. Francis Bacon in Praise of his Sovereign,*" and follows immediately upon the "*Praise of Knowledge,*" which may have suggested the writing. Devey (who includes the "Felicities" as a history, with those of *Hen. VII.*, *Hen. VIII.*, and the *Praise of Prince Henry*) does not allude to the earlier *Praise of Elizabeth,* from which a different key-note is sounded. The very first sentences make us aware of this. The History begins thus:—"Queen

---

* BACONIANA, Vol. I., p. 64. August, 1893.

* "*Convito*" ii. 16; iii. 1, 12, 13.

Elizabeth, both of her natural endowments and her fortune was admirable amongst women."

The "Discourse" begins:—"No praise of magnanimity, nor of love, nor of knowledge, can intercept her praise that planteth, and nourisheth magnanimity by her example, love by her person, and knowledge by the peace and serenity of her times; and if these rich pieces be so fair unset, what are they set, and set in full perfection?" The Discourse then goes on to enlarge these particulars, much as in the later tract, but we cannot fail to notice how the metaphors reflect those elsewhere met with in connection with Truth, and with the peace, plenty, and quiet advance under her rule. We are reminded of the deep and secret conspiracies plotted against her sacred person, and of practices to conjure her death. We must also recall the efforts made, especially by the papal authorities, to prevent the spread of popular education, or advance of learning. Nevertheless the advance of the Fair Lady is uninterrupted, and is compared to "the travail of an elephant" (a Baconian symbol, as we know, for slow and sure). The provisions of her army were infinite; the setting forth of it, the terror and wonder of Europe; but nothing shook her, "her cheer, and her fashion was nothing altered." Like Cæsar, truth is constant to her purposes; "not a cloud appeared in that countenance wherein peace did ever shine."

We are called to observe "her contempt of *profit*." The Rosicrucians also were bound to look for no earthly reward, but to work for love of truth, and if possible, *gratis*. The world-wide beneficence of truth or knowledge is such that the writer scarce knows where to begin "in such a maze of benefits as presented itself to remembrance. Shall we speak of the purging away of the dross of religion, the heavenly treasure, or that of money, the earthly treasure?" and this in spite of "the very labyrinth of cozenages and abuse, such as great princes have made their profit of towards their own people." Presently, after a page about informers and promoters, heavy sharing laws, taxes, loans, and contracts, we read that the honour of the Queen and her house, and the good of her servants and subjects, "have been the only pores and pipes whereby the treasure hath issued, and in spite of the subtlety and humourous affections of these times, the security of peace is greater than can be described in that verse—

Tutus bos etenim rura[*] *perambulat,*
Nutrit rura Ceres, Almaque Faustibus:

or that other—

Condit quisque diem collibus in suis.

The allegory, as we take it to be, then alludes to the "fair houses"[†] built in the reign of Elizabeth, "as Augustus said that he had received the city of brick, and left it marble, . . . so she found it a realm of cottages, and hath made it a realm of palaces"—for the crowned truth to dwell in.[‡]

"Lastly, to make an end where no end is, the shipping of this realm (is) so advanced, made so mighty and potent as this island is become—the Lady of the Sea." The Rosicrucian symbols of ships,[§] and their voyages to distant lands seem all to point to schemes for bringing in the wealth of the Indies, the treasures of learning, from the coasts and provinces which Francis himself had visited. The ancients held that the sea or ocean was the source of all things, water being the best and most prolific of the subordinate elements. Maia, the "Virgin of Heaven," is with the Hindus, the "Waters from on High." She is the same as the Egyptian Ptha, the Ordainer, who did all things in truth and wisdom—the same as "water," called by the Greek Thales, "the principle of all things"—the Holy Spirit of God. Hence from very remote ages, the use of water in sacred rites, and especially in baptism. So with fountains, seas, and all forms of water, they represent the pure virgin, the Spirit who has formed the universe from this humid principle. Thus the repulsive looking crocodile, *being an emanation from the water,* became in Egypt a venerated symbol of God, or of the Holy Spirit.

The descriptions of the Fortunate Islands, and of Panchaia,[||] (the shining Land of Pan), are all, we think, descriptions of abode of truth, the "Green Isle of the West" with its encircling ocean—of the tempests which assail it during the nine days' passage (or initiation into the mysteries), and of the streams, rivulets, and navigable "river of the sun," which fertilise those glorious regions.

---

[*] *Cura* MS.

[*] *Seges* MS. Those seem to be instances of quotations made off hand, and to suit his purpose, by our Poet. Sometimes the quotations are incorrect, or "with a difference."

[†] See of the Libraries, Colleges, and other "Foundations" traceable to the efforts and influence of Francis St. Alban.

[‡] It is said that from her festival, as commemorated by the Hindus, we derive the custom of keeping May-day.

[§] See the Trade Mark of Messrs. Longman, Green, & Co., and compare Bacon's "History of the Winds, Ships, Navigation," &c.

[||] Diodorus Siculus. See also the Hymns of Orpheus (*Taylor*); Of fountains, of the ambrosial waters of life, to be passed before the eternal city could be attained (See of the *River*, "Pilgrim's Progress," 1760, I., p. 203; II., 194; *Spring and Sea, ib.*, 81; *Bath* I., p. 471).

In the "Watermarks" of our modern writing-papers (and drawn so as to pass for a figure of Britannia) we find various renderings of a design representing the crowned truth seated on a throne, her head encircled by the pearls of heavenly knowledge. In her right hand is a trefoil leaf, emblem of the Holy Spirit; in her left, a diamond-tipped spear, also associated with Minerva and with Juno Chrs (or *Kur-Is*), "the Fountain of all the Waters of the Universe." Nursed by the daughters of the Star-God—tended by the ocean nymphs—Queen of Heaven, we are sure that here we have the "Fair Lady," the "Sovereign Mistress," Queen of his heart, on whom from earliest youth Francis had fixed his affections.*

This lady was to rule the Isles of the West, "a point of so high consequence as it may truly be said that *the commandment of the sea is an abridgement of monarchy.*" Francis St. Alban lost no opportunity of enforcing this axiom, of which we in these later days have cause to realise the wisdom. A sketch of the state of affairs in his own times then follows, and appears to be a mixture of prose and allegory. He speaks of the flames of sedition, and the theatre of misery to be seen when war, "a Hydra, or monster with many heads,"† overspread the land; he contrasts the benignity of the Queen's rule with the oppressive ambition of foreign states. "Her beams of noble and radiant magnanimity are . . . set forth in my simplicity of speech with much loss of lustre, but with *near approach to Truth, as the sun is seen in water.* Now," he continues, "to pass to the excellencies of her person, the view of them, wholly and not severally, do make such a sweet wonder, as I fear to divide them again. . . . Nobility extracted out of the royal and victorious line of the Kings of England; yea both roses, white and red, do flourish in her nobility, and in her nobility as in her beauty. Health . . . that hath not hath not been softened by an umbratile life still under the roof, but strengthened by the use of the pure and open-air that still retaineth flower, and vigour of youth." For the beauty and many graces of her presence, what colours are fine enough for such a portraiture? Let no light pen be used for such a description, but the chastest and royalist.

---

* "Felicities of Elizabeth."

† "The Hydra son of War" (2 Hen. IV. iv. 2).

Of her gait, *et vera incessu patuit dea.*
Of her voice, *nec vox hominem sonat.*
Of her eye, *et laetos oculis afflaret honores.*
Of her colour, *Indu sanguineo veluti violaverit ostro, siquis Ebur.*
Of her neck, *et rosea cervice refulsit.*
Of her hair, *Ambrosiæque comæ divinum vertice odorem spiravere.*

If this be presumption, let him bear the blame that owneth the verses.

What shall I speak of her rare qualities of compliment? Which, as they be excellent in the things themselves, so they have always besides somewhat of a Queen, and as Queens use *shadows and veils with their rich apparel,** methinks in all her qualities there is somewhat *that flieth from ostentation,*† and yet inviteth the mind to contemplate her more.

He continues to extol "her excellent gift of speech," "the edge of her words," and "the glances" with which she could daunt, encourage, or amaze a man.

"How admirable is her discourse, whether it be in learning, state, or love, what variety of knowledge, what rareness of conceit, what choice of words, what grace of utterance! Doth it not appear that though her wit, as *the adamant of excellencies* which draweth out of any book ancient or new, out of any speech, the best, she enricheth it far above the value wherein she is received?‡ And is her speech only the language which the child receiveth with pleasure, and not those which the studious learn with industry?"

He "wanders on" to speak of the "Queen's" rare eloquence . . . her language infinitely polished, the excellencies of her nature, the constancy of her favours, her prudent temper in admitting access; on the one side maintaining the majesty of her degree, on the other not prejudicing herself by looking to her estate through too few windows; (a hint we think of the necessity, which our poet-philosopher enforces, of approaching Truth from all sides, and of opening the windows of the mind in all directions). "Her exquisite judgment in choosing good servants; her profound discretion in assigning and appropriating every one of them to their aptest employment," point, it would seem, to the method pursued by Francis, with regard to his Sons of Science, his Rose Cross brethren, assigned to work out whatever best suited their tastes and abilities, and which (when so worked out under his guidance and supervision) they were to "appropriate," as "*the Authors.*" The Queen, or Wisdom, is next commended for her penetrating sight in discovering men's ends and drifts, that skill or "cunning in the humours of persons," which is to be (as noted in the *Promus* Notes) a subject of study. She has the art of keeping her servants "satisfied, yet eager for more;" she has an inventive wit in contriving, and great foresight and quickness in taking advantage of opportunities* Such considerations, whilst they cause endless wonder at such a Queen, yet enable men to understand how, in dangerous and corrupt times, "she hath, notwithstanding, done such great things, and reigned in felicity."

---

* Metaphors and similes in their poetical and allegorical languages.

† *i.e.*—That is mysterious.

‡ This we interpret of "Bacon's" effort to build up a noble model of English language from materials furnished by ancient and modern writers.

With regard that *she liveth a virgin and hath no children,*† "let them leave children that leave no other memories." This saying sends a flight of memories through our brain. We recall the many allusions to the *heirs* of invention—*children* of the brain—posthumous works and essays left by Francis St. Alban for publication by friends and servants, and which, in this discourse, he seems to indicate. "Should a man have them (*his children*) *slain by his vassals as the posthumous* of Alexander the Great was? or call them his *imposthumes*, as Augustus Cæsar called his?"

The deep and absorbing love of his work on behalf of truth, the hope and belief in final triumph which possessed our Great Master, are nobly set forth in the closing words of this eloquent speech:

"These virtues and perfection with so much felicity, have made her the honour of her times, the admiration of the world, the suit and aspiring of greatest kings and princes, who yet durst never have aspired to her but as their minds were raised by love."

"But why do I forget that words do extenuate and embase matters of so great weight? Time is her best commender, which never brought forth such a prince; whose imperial virtues contend with the excellency of her person, both person and virtues contend with her fortune, and both virtue and fortune contend with her fame.

---

* Take advantage of the time.—*Rich. III.* ii. 3, 79.; iii. 3, 42 *2 Hen. IV.* 4, 78. *Tr. Cr.* ii. 2, 203, iii. 3, 2, and upwards of 70 other instances.

† A consideration apparently inapplicable to Queen Elizabeth.

> *Orbis Amor, famæ carmen, cœlique pupilla ;*
> *Tu decus omne tuis, tu decus ipsa tibi !*"

The sentiments and even the words of the *Discourse* may be paralleled throughout from *Shakespeare* and other Baconian works, but we cannot stop here for the purpose. Rather we would direct the reader's attention to the fact that, wherever in such works truth is parabolically alluded to, her attributes are found to coincide with those of the Heavenly Queen El-Issa-beth, and her Palace of Truth or Wisdom.

In the "*Marriage of Christian Rosencrentz,*" the fair and glorious lady of that allegory has her garments of *sky-colour*, for she is *Heavenly* Wisdom : she carries a bundle of letters in all languages, to be delivered in all countries—or, "in a snow-white glistering robe sparkling of pure gold (Knowledge) the beautiful Virgin cast such a lustre that we durst not steadily behold it."* Her throne is glorious, and *self-moving* (for Learning always advances), and "the Queen" likens this to "the unspeakable glory of Heaven." The *Palace*, we observe, is the "*House of the Sun.*"

Is not this queenly beauty the same as the Spirit Euterpe, described in "The Journey to the Land of the Rosicrucians ?" Euterpe is now clothed in the "Sea-water *Green*," prescribed in Bacon's "Essay of Masques and Triumphs," as a colour for *candlelight*, and by *Shakespeare*, for the dress of "Anne Page as the Fairy Queen," and of her attendant fairies, revellers "in the shades of night," who are to astonish and bewilder Falstaff.

> "Pinch him, and burn him, and turn him about,
> Till candles, and star-light, and moonshine be out." †

Euterpe's "eyes were quick, fresh and celestial. . . . From her veil did her locks break out like sunbeams from a mist. Her hair was rolled to a curious globe . . . her whole habit was youthful and flowery ; it smelt like the East, and was thoroughly aired with rich *Arabian* diapasms."‡

---

* An oft-repeated emblem of the dazzling caused by sudden influx of light or truth.

† This is called "John Heydon's." It is, however, an earlier form of Bacon's "New Atlantis," with proper names and some phrases altered.

‡ A hint of the learning and mysteries drawn from Arabic and the East, of which Francis made so much use, and of which we shall have more to say. High Rosicrucian Masons will probably understand this.

And who is Urania of the "Arcadia," but this same Heavenly Wisdom, "the all-beautie—sweetest fairness, fairest sweetness" of our poet's boyish dream? We read of her "*gait*," that all eyes were drawn to watch her movements, "all places were made happy by her treading." Like Euterpe and kindred spirits, she affected "a pretty green bank," for "with length laid down she deckt the lovely place. Proud grew the grass that under her did grow." The place where she abode was blessed and glorified by her presence, and Dorus exclaims, "Blest be the name whereby my mistress named is. All numbering arts her endless graces number not. Time, place, life, wit, scarcely her rare gifts measure doth;" her wealth and jewels are richer than the mines of the Indies.

Astrophel calls his beloved Stella "my heavenly Jewel;" her face, too, is a "*Habitation.*"

> "Queen Virtue's Court, which some call Stella's face,
> Prepared by Nature's choicest furniture."

This palace is of alabaster and gold, its door of porphyry and pearl, its porches of "mixed red and white marble;" from the windows the heavenly guest looks o'er the world, but upon nothing equal to its own glory. We read of Stella's eyes as beauty's skies; of her sweet breath and bosom, her musical voice, and the swelling lip whence heavenly graces slide. Her hair is fair and golden; in her face "Roses gules are born in silver field;" again the red and white or the roses and lilies which seem often to symbolise the union of the warring churches which our Francis so earnestly laboured to reconcile. "Beauty's total is summed in her face," and Stella, "the Sovereign of my joy," is "the star of heavenly fire," the "loadstone" of his desire.

Even when we turn to a Sonnet "made when his lady had a pain in her face," we find this poor woman turned to advantage, and made a peg upon which to hang a praise of "her in whose Heaven Angels of high thoughts swarm." As in the "*Discourse*," another "poet" extols her hair, her ivory forehead, her bright starry eyes, the snow-mixed roses of her cheeks, her ruby lips; comparing her likewise to a beautiful Queen.

> These all more fair are to be had in her,
> Pearl, ivory, coral, diamond, suns, gold,
> Teeth, neck, lips, heart, eyes, hair are to behold!
> (*Sonn.* 6. *W. Drummond*).

and again, "Her hair golden . . . brow of milk . . . eyes as burning planets . . . cheeks as blushing morning, or roses gules in fields of lilies borne . . . lips like coral . . . neck smooth as alabaster, breast foaming billow, with coral and circling azure waves."* Her face also is "a *Treasure House* where her best gifts do bide," a *seat* where beauty shines and virtue reigns. Constancy of purpose is seen in "her eyes whom never chance did more," her breath makes "sour answer sweet," her milken breasts, the nurse of child-like love, her legs and well-stepping feet," proclaim the excellence of her gait and dignified advance.

Peep into the pages of "*Cowley*," and read in "*The Mistress*," of her bright eyes, sunny hair, and sweet lips, and of how False Love (or False Philosophy), the black lady of the *Shakespeare* Sonnets, apes her face and form, and endeavours to delude men into taking her for the true beauty. The "Jointure of *both* the Indies," cannot express the value of the poet's mistress, if mankind discarded her, he would reign alone, "and my blest self" would be "the 'universal monarch of her *all*.'† His, were her fair East Indies, where beauties shine like gems of richest price, where coral grows and every heath is spice. His too, were "her rich West Indies, where mines of gold and endless treasures grow," his love for her is "*all-in-all in every part*."

But why multiply instances? The song is "all one, ever the same." Whether in the Plays of Peele, Greene, Marlowe, Heywood, Shirley, Middleton, or Shakespeare; whether in the sonnets, odes, songs or other pieces of Spencer, Cowley, Drummond, Donne, or any other; whether in the satire of *Hudibras*, or the treatise of *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, in the Rosicrucian Allegories or in grave books of devotion or religion‡ as *Jeremy Taylor's* "Holy Living"—in every place where we feel the touch or hear the voice of our poet-philosopher we find his sovereign mistress similarly described. A perfect beauty, her face beauty's tower, a high brow like unto the heavens, white and smooth as polished alabaster, a coral lip, a sweet smelling flower; a white neck, that via lactea, sweet breath, flaxen or golden hair, "Cupid's net to catch all comers," her eyes, love's fowlers, touchstones or adamant, watch-men, chief seats of love; and again the catalogue ends with the face of truth, a dwelling or habitation. Can we forget Miranda's words about the *temple* of her love?

---

* *Ib.* 21, 13. † "I have taken *all* knowledge to be my province."

‡ In such books the allegory is generally used to point the moral of the *Essay of Beauty.* "In beauty that of favour is more than that of colour, and that of decent and gracious motion more than that of favour. That is the best part of beauty which a picture cannot express, no, nor the first sight of the life." The beauty of the mind is contrasted with beauty of the person.

> "There's nothing ill can dwell in such a temple;
> If the ill spirit have so fair a house,
> Good things will strive to dwell with 't.—*Temp.* ii. 2.

Often as the Poet has invoked his muse, (his "truth with beauty dyed") he has ever found her ready to aid him:

> "Every alien pen hath got my use
> . . . For every vulgar paper to rehearse.
> And under thee, their poesy disperse."

In this he rejoices, for the poet who will but "copy what in truth is writ will make his style admired everywhere." *Truth* alone, amends the style,

> "But thou art all my style, and dost advance
> As high as learning my rude ignorance."

He feels tongue-tied, speaking of her fame,

> "O! let my book be then the eloquence
> And dumb presager of my speaking breast."

And in these words do we not hear an echo of those in "Bacon's Praise of the Queen" and in the "Praise of Knowledge?"

"Why do I forget that *words* do embase matters of so great weight?"

"*Silence* were the best celebration of that which I intend to commend."

Constance M. Pott.

For the following notes upon the above we are indebted to Mr. Fleming Fulcher. "The extravagant Latin quotations," on p. 164, he properly considers may, in their original application, have some bearing on the question.

Nos. 1, 5, 6, come from the following passage:—*Virg. Æneid* i. 402—405.

> Dixit et avertens rosea cervice refulsit,
> Ambrosiæque comæ divinum vertice odorem
> Spiravere, pedes vestis defluxit ad imos,
> Et vera incessu patuit dea.

(She spake, and as she turned away, light glowed from her rosy neck, and her ambrosial locks breathed forth divine perfume; her robe flowed down e'en to her feet, and by her gait was then revealed a goddess true.)

No. 2.—*Virg. Æneid* i. 325.
Nec vox hominem sonat.
(Thy voice has not a mortal sound.)

All the above are applied to Venus when she meets her son Æneas, after he has landed on the coast near Carthage. She appears to him disguised as a virgin huntress. He at first suspects her of being a goddess, and asks if she may be Diana, which he denies. After this meeting Venus makes Æneas and Achates invisible by wrapping them in a cloud, and thus they make their way in to the Temple of Carthage, and the presence of Dido.

At the right moment Venus dispels the cloud, and Æneas stands forth in a glowing aureole.

"His head and shoulders like a god's."

Namque ipsa decoram.
Cæsariem nato genetrix lumenque juventæ
Purpureum et lætos oculis afflarat honores.

("For on her son his mother had herself breathed radiant beauty, brilliant glow of youth, triumphant glory in his eyes.")

No. 4.—Indum sanguineo veluti violaverit astro.
Si quis ebur.
(" As one had ivory stained with crimson shell.")

This is applied to Lavinia (daughter of Latinus), whose mother betrothed her to Turnus, but whose father at the bidding of the oracle, promised her to Æneas. These two men Turnus and Æneas went to war; Turnus was killed, and Æneas married Lavinia.

ROGER BACON AND HIS TIMES: A COMPARISON WITH FRANCIS BACON.

THE "Dark Ages" had an uplifting in the thirteenth century. It was a flight of swallows before the spring. It was a reformation of religion before the Reformation; a gleam of true poetry before the later great outburst of song; a re-awakening of artistic feeling before the era of the great painters; a renaissance before the Renaissance. It was the century of the most famous "schoolmen," and, though scholasticism lingered on for a couple more centuries and died hard, no names of great eminence arrest the attention after that of William of Ockham, in the early years of the fourteenth century. The memory may be assisted by the subjoined list. In it we have placed the names of some of the great men who adorned the period; those ushering in the century to the left, those witnessing its close to the right, while the others occupy the middle space:—

Adelard of Bath, mathematician and natural philosopher.
Averrhoes, Arabian physician.
    Roger Bacon.
    Edmund Rich, Archbishop of Canterbury.
    Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln.
    St. Francis of Assissi.
    St. Dominic.
    Bonaventura, first Prior of the Franciscans.
    St. Elizabeth of Hungary.
    St. Louis (IX.) of France.
    Duns Scotus,
    Alexander of Hales,
    Raymond Lully, } Schoolmen.
    Thomas Aquinas,
    Albertus Magnus,
        William of Ockham,
    Matthew Paris, chronicler.
    Niccola Pisano,
    Giovanni Pisano, } Architects.
    Cimabue,
    Giotto, } Painters.
        Van Eyck,

Dante,
Petrarch,
Chaucer, } Poets.
Gower,
Langland,
Boccaccio, first writer of Italian prose.

On Roger Bacon's life, except so far as it illustrates his character and the character of his works, I do not propose to dwell. The man who wrote "De Nullitate Magiae" was known throughout the Middle Ages as Friar Bacon of the Brazen Head, as a master of the Black Art and a familiar of devils. He, who was a Franciscan monk and was protected and nurtured by the Franciscans, was also kept in confinement by them because of the freedom of his opinions—"*proper quasdam novitates suspectas.*" He who was persecuted by a Pope (Nicholas IV., Jerome of Acoli) was urged by a Pope (Clement IV., Guy de Foulques, an enlightened Frenchman) to write his great treatises, and send them to him "secretly and privately," and not to obey the strict prohibitions of his immediate superiors. He who had his training at Oxford and Paris, the homes of the schoolmen, inveighed against them in bitter diatribes—against their methods, their jargon, their ignorance of Greek, their barbarous terminology, their long-drawn-out syllogisms, their conclusions false because founded on unproved or false premisses, the idle baselessness of the whole system.* He who had a clear conception of the true spirit of the inductive system of reasoning, though without the nomenclature of a later day, was the slave of many of the superstitions of his time. His name and fame died before his death. After his death he had a spurious fame as master of the magicians. In modern times his true work has been recognised; his prophetic insight into the possibilities of science under improved methods of research revealed. We will consider these particulars in greater detail.

BACON THE FREETHINKER.

It is hard for us to conceive how difficult it was for a man of scientific pursuits in Bacon's day to take any step unauthorised by his generation in discovery of what was new or in condemnation of established errors. The Church and the religious foundations of the Universities which were the guardians of all the libraries, were also the custodians of the keys of knowledge. No man could overpass the jurisdiction of the Church except under peril of imprisonment and excommunication—even death, as in the case of Cecco of Ascoli. Gregory the Great, the founder, it may be said, of papal supremacy, the writer of "Magna Moralia" and other great tomes, despised learning, scorned the claims of pure Latinity and correct grammar, and punished his clergy for teaching it. And in Bacon's time, the study of Aristotle, later on a chief prop of the Church, was forbidden till 1237, because he taught the eternity of the world and the practice of divination, and sowed the seeds of atheism. Francis d'Assissi refused to allow his monks books, even religious books:—"I am thy breviary." Bonaventura, the first Prior of the Franciscans, says (In Sentent.):—"The man of real faith, should he know all science, would rather lose it all than lose or deny a single article of belief, whereby he seals his adherence to the accepted truth." Louis IX., the gentle saint, writes to Joinville—we retain the quaint French—"L'omme lay, quand il ot medire de la loy Chrestienne, ne doit pas deffendre la loy Chrestienne, ne mais que de l'espee, de quoi il doit donner parmi le ventre dedens, tant comme il peut entrer." And the fierce, black Dominic, the first Inquisitor-General, conducting the cruel crusades against the Albigenses of Provence and Languedoc, destroyed, as far as he could, the sweet and chivalrous cult of early French poetry of the 12th and 13th centuries, which did so much to civilise the south of France and north of Spain and to encourage humane sentiments.

---

* They were *sine arte ullâ Artium Magistri—sine doctrinâ Doctores.* They believed (he says) that the magnetic power was the influence of the star *Nautila* (scil., Nautica—the polestar). They believed that the diamond could be fractured by goat's blood. They had disquisitions in which they asserted that *Ego credit* was correct Latin, and maintained the proposition that *Contradictoria possunt esse simul vera.* John Locke, it will be remembered, instanced the opposite of this as an innate idea.

Now what could the solitary Bacon do in such a state of affairs? The "admirable doctor" was out of his element among the schoolmen of Paris, but there at least he was free. Later on, he was in close confinement for ten years under Bonaventura, not allowed books or writing materials. After an interval of eighteen months, under the secret protection of Clement IV., during which he wrote his "Opus Majus," his "Opus Minus," and fragments of his "Opus Tertium"—in which, among other things, he bitterly attacks the clergy for their vices, their ignorances, their enmity to science—persecution began again at the death of Clement. He asked leave to appeal to Pope Gregory X., but it was denied him. Again he was in prolonged confinement under Nicholas IV. He died at Oxford, a free man, but in obscurity—" unheard, forgotten, buried." The enemies of his life-time were the subtle schoolmen of the Universities, with their webs of futile dialectics ; the ignorance and apathy of the Church and laity ; the religious instincts of all classes ; the fears and distaste of the friars, both black and grey; and the ecclesiastics. Roger Bacon, the protest against his times, no less than Athanasius, the product of his times, was marked out as *contra mundum*.

How was it that this early rennaissance failed so speedily and so completely ? It is sadly true that it contained the seeds of decay within itself. As Danton said of the French Revolution, it was devoured by its own children. Its enemies were, apart from the jealous tyranny of the Church and the unspeakable wrongs of the Inquisition, first the "divine" teacher (Aristotle), next, the "angelic" doctor (Aquinas), and lastly, the "divine" poet (Dante).

Aristotle, mis-translated into Latin through Arabic and Syriac mis-translations, was nearly worthless. Bacon complains of the egregious blunders of men who did not understand what they read, and indeed could not understand when they were ignorant of Greek and science. To understand an author, he says, one must have a knowledge of the language in which the author writes, a knowledge of the meaning of words of the language he himself speaks, and some true conception of scientific matters. He complains that Aristotle was a name to conjure by and not a master to be understood. And the whole literature of ecclesiastical and learned Europe for centuries afterwards contains long proofs of the chains of servitude with which free thought was bound by the name and absurd authority of a misunderstood and ill-translated Aristotle.

St. Thomas Aquinas, the Dominican, stands forth confessedly the greatest of the schoolmen—a brilliant thinker and a profound logician. His logical conclusions, arrived at by a wearisome syllogistic process, were irrefragible. But so were the opposite conclusions of his adversaries, the followers of Duns Scotus, the Franciscan. It was not a question of conclusions, but of premisses and definitions ; and the premisses and definitions were in the air—baseless. Moreover, the deductive method could never advance anything really new, as, strictly speaking, the conclusions were bound up in the premisses.[*] And further, the stuff of the schoolmen's disquisitions was frequently so far removed from all human interests, moral or intellectual, that the results arrived at, as they were incapable of demonstration or even palpable illustration from known fact, so also were, initially and finally, futile and barren. What wise thing could ever be adduced by mortal man about the order of angelic virtues and the hierarchy of heaven, if he had a sea of ink and a continent of paper? It is perhaps fair to say that science and literature would have advanced with greater strides if it had not been for Aquinas and his congeners, and that the voice of Roger Bacon might have had a chance of being heard if it had not been drowned in the blatant clamour of the learning of the Universities.

As for Dante, his influence over freethought was even more disastrous. He was one of the great poets of the world—claiming for himself the honour to be the sixth,[†] and his fame was the heritage of all Europe. And he threw the glamour of his imagination and the power of his intellect as a viscous net over the intelligence of mankind and ensnared them in his fatal web, enslaving them to the worst side of mediæval Christianity. If hell was created "eternally" in preparation for the later "creation," and was created such as Dante describes it, so artificial, so inappropriate, so ineffably inept, and yet so terrible, by the "Creator," the "Divine power," the "highest Wisdom and Justice and pristine Love," so much the worse for "Justice and Love." And if men accepted this without demur as a reasonable representation of eternal verities, so much the worse for men. If Dante had not been a *poet* whose words had long fingers, whose phrases were flaming darts, whose thoughts took possession of the hearts of common men; if he had not sat in the seat of the mighty as a master in Israel and a teacher having the counsel of the Highest; if he had only been a *philosopher* known by the learned, no great mischief would have ensued—only a few more dusty folios. But he was a power on the threshold of the cottage and at the hearth of the peasant, and, like the angel of the Apocalypse, he bound Christendom with a great chain for a thousand years.

---

[*] This perhaps expresses the facts too baldly. It is doubtless true that the whole of pure mathematics is the outcome of Euclid's definitions, "axioms," and "postulates," and of others like them. But to write down the equation to an epicycloid, and trace the resulting curve compared with propositions about the elementary properties of a circle, presents a very definite advance from the known to the unknown.

[†] The other five were Virgil, "l'altissimo poeta," Homer, Horace, Ovid, and Lucan. Why exclude so many whom Dante, even in the desolation of Greek literature, must have known? And why not include Lucretius, whose atheistical tendencies were not more pronounced than those of Aristotle—a man the poet honours with a principal place in his "Castello?"

BACON, THE MAN OF SCIENCE.

Bacon saw how useless were the pursuits and the methods of his day. He wanted books, but he could not even procure the works of Seneca and Cicero. The gates of knowledge were through Arabic, but Bacon complains to Clement that the necessary Arabic treatises were not to be had, though, now and again, a book might be got hold of at the sack of the house of some rich Jew. Moreover, though Dante places Avicennes and Averrhoes in the "noble castle" in the first circle of the "Inferno," the study of Arabic was prohibited as dangerous. He saw the necessity that men who taught should know Greek, and only Grosseteste and two or three others knew Greek. He wanted "tables," but they were the work of a later day—of Tycho Brahé, of Kepler, of Regiomontanus, of Napier. "Better tables," he says, "are necessary ; they are worth a king's ransom." He wanted instruments. "Instruments are not to be found among the Latins, and could not be made for £200 or £300." He "often attempted to make them," but was stayed by failure of means, though he spent all his private means—£2,000. Moreover, they were broken by "folly of his assistants." He writes :—"The neglect of mathematics for nearly forty years * hath nearly destroyed the entire studies of Latin Christendom. For he who knows not mathematics cannot know any other sciences; and, what is more, he cannot discover his own ignorance or find its proper remedies." He laments over the statement of the philosophers that philosophy was a "completed" science. He complains that the Latin versions of the Bible were incorrect, and, that, such as they were, they were neglected for the "Sentences" of Peter Lombard, syllogised by Hales. He points out in telling words that experiment is necessary if, to the known, we wish to add the unknown ; if learning is to be progressive and more than a matter of mere phrasing :—"There are two methods of acquiring knowledge ; through argument and through experiment. Argument brings our enquiry to an end, but it does not remove our doubts, so that

---

* Adelard of Bath had brought over Euclid from abroad and translated it from the Arabic.

the mind should rest in clear vision of the truth, unless experience is brought to bear. Because many can argue on matters of knowledge, though they do not make use of experiments, their arguments do not convince them—they neither avoid what is hurtful nor follow up what is good. Now if any man who never saw fire proved by sufficient argument that fire burns and destroys things, never for all that would he convince a hearer. Nor would he avoid the fire until he had placed his hand on something which burns in the flame, to prove by experience what the argument had advanced. But after experience of burning, the mind rests satisfied of the true nature of fire. It is not argument, but experience, which is the proof." The thought here, though not the language, is quite that of Francis Bacon. It is exactly the note of the aphorisms quoted below.

But what a lesson this would have been to his generation if they would have taken it to heart? Augustine denied that there were any antipodes, because such a notion would be contrary to the Scriptures. He says that the flesh of a peacock does not putrify. He does not try the experiment as Thomas Brown (in "Vulgar Errors") did, but argues that it was the power of God that endowed the flesh with this property as a proof of immortality. Galen, in error, said that there was a hole in the *septum* of the heart. As a matter of fact there is no communication through the *septum*, and, if it occurred, the circulation of the blood would be interfered with. But Galen's authority induced succeeding physicians to find this hole which did not exist, and to prove the necessity of its existence. There was this excuse, that the human body was considered sacred; and, among others, Boniface VIII., in 1297, forbad the sacrilegious act of dissection, and the anatomist had to wait till the time of Vesalius, 1538, to find out the most elementary truths.

There are unnecessary lines in some of the diagrams of the Greek text of Euclid's "Elements of Geometry." These lines are reproduced with slavish uniformity in all succeeding texts in Arabic and the various tongues of Europe, from Euclid's day to the present year of grace, 1902.

Because water rises in a tube void of air, the verbal explanation was given (which explains nothing) that "nature abhors a vacuum." It would have been easy to prove the falsity by an experiment with mercury, but it required centuries to build up the men to make it. Thomas Brown's "Vulgar Errors" contains many hundred instances of common belief held implicitly and with argument sufficient ("*argumenta sufficientia*"), of which simple experiment demonstrates the folly.

---

* Boethius' "Euclid" consisted of the enunciations only, with the exception of the demonstration of Book I. i. Roger Bacon says the boys of his day could not be got to learn the 5th Prop. of the first Book, "though whipped and beaten"—a great encouragement to our present schoolmasters!

Against these fatal proclivities of human nature Bacon makes vigorous warfare. He lays down four principal causes of error, which he calls the *offendicula*, or stumbling-blocks. They are (i) Authority; ("Galen, Aristotle, said so, so it must be true," "*hoc exemplificatum est per majores*"); (ii) Custom; (grandam talk; proverbial philosophy; "everybody says so;" "dialectics is the fashion, no gentleman's education is complete without it;" "we must not remove the ancient land-marks; new paths are dangerous," "*hoc consuetum est*"); (iii) the opinion of the many; (*vox populi vox Dei*; eccentricity must be avoided, "*hoc vulgatum est; ergo timendum*"); (iv) Self-deception arising from phantasms of the mind conceived as realities.

On this last point Bacon is insistent. In mathematics a man cannot be ignorant without knowing he is so. Inexactness is its own immediate punishment. Mathematics is the alphabet of philosophy. Language must be exact and words used with clearly defined meaning. Definitions and postulates must be exact and clearly expressed. No book in a foreign tongue can be properly read and understood without a good text and a mastering of grammar. Science cannot be properly pursued without experiment and observation; without the necessary tables and instruments.

How much all this is like the later Bacon! To some extent the *offendicula* are parallel to the *Idola Mentis Humanæ*, though the Idola are much more obscure and artificial in phraseology and explanation; and seem also rather to overlap. The Idola, that is, *fallacies*, or false imaginations, are fourfold. The first division (*Idola tribus*, of the race) includes false imaginations owing to the imperfections of man's nature; the second (*Idola specus*, of the cave), false imaginations owing to a man's education and surroundings, to his individuality, false lights and shades cast over the prison-house of the mind by refraction from the direct outer light—what we now denominate the personal equation;* the third (*Idola fori*, of the market-place) includes

* Francis contrasts the "dry light" of philosophy with the "drenched

false associations of words and names with things. These associations are of two sorts. The *things* may be entities (as *moistness*). The *things* may be non-existent as *fortune*, the *primum mobile*. The former, Francis adds, is the worse sort —a most wise remark. The fourth division (*Idola theatri*, of the theatre) includes all false systems either of reasoning or of philosophy. The latter two divisions are comparable with Roger's Offendicula, though Roger's summation seems to me the simpler and more natural.

A Comparison between the Two Bacons.

A.—*The New Instrument.*

We have already seen how both the Bacons condemned the scholastic philosophies and rejected their methods; how they pointed out the causes of errors, the one with his four *Offendicula* the other with his four *Idola;* how they elevated observation and experiment to a supreme position for the discovery of truth; how the former by his practical modes of working and reasoning, the second in express words introduced the inductive method as that which should add to the old stuff and edifice of acquired knowledge new material to work on, and new annexes to a complete building of truth; how they cast away knowledge, falsely so-called, and held to that which should profit. We may add that both *expressly* take as their province—*omne scibile;* all that can be known. Also that science is one body—the Unity of Science is the burden of the Opus Majus. So Francis teaches that science is a pyramid, proceeding from its base upwards as an organic whole. We have found room for some pregnant remarks of Roger with regard to productive methods of philosophy. We will here add some of Francis'.

Homo naturæ minister et interpres. Man must obey and find out the secrets of nature. We do not, as we so fondly declare, master nature. We learn and get the mastery only through obedience.

Scientia et potentia humana in idem coincidunt. Knowledge is power.

Experientia docet.

Lucifera experimenta non fructifera quaerenda. Compare Gœthe's last words:—"Light, more light!" If we want what will be of use, we must strive to find out what *is*. We must seek *facts*, not advantage.

---

light" of passion. Compare Ruskin's "innocent eye;" the "single eye" of the N.T.; and Tennyson's "the low sun gives the colour."

Pessima res est errorum apotheosis. The worst thing that can happen is to give divine authority to error.

Things move easily in their places, violently to their places. A golden saying in physics, and in the sphere of morals, history, and theology.

B.—*Discoveries.*

It is a curious fact that neither of the Bacons greatly increased our knowledge of the physical world. Roger Bacon discussed the causes of rainbows and the flux and reflux of the tides. He did some useful work in "Perspectives," that is, Optics, and accurately described the structure and functions of the eye. It is doubtful whether he or Alexander de Spina (1285) invented spectacles. He rightly describes the nature of a telescope, but he neither made one nor possessed one. They were not invented till two centuries later. And about 1100 A.D. the Arabian, Al Hazen, had written a treatise on how to make a refractive telescope. Bacon tells us how to make gunpowder, but as this had been discovered and made use of by Eastern nations long before, he can only have re-discovered it—if he did as much as that —for we do not know how far he was indebted to his Arabic authors. Similar remarks apply to the burning-glass which he describes. If it is true, as Richard Browne (1683) declares in his translation of Bacon's "Cure of Old Age and Preservation of Youth" into English,* that he, Bacon, had written a Latin, Greek, and Hebrew Grammar, it would indeed be worthy of all honour, but I do not know how far this claim can be substantiated.† It was the crying need of his day, as Bacon knew only too well. Two things may definitely be laid to his credit. He showed how to rectify the Julian Calendar, and the paragraphs he devotes to this subject were used by Copernicus in 1581 for the service of the Council of Trent. He also sums up in his geographical chapters what he could find in Aristotle, Pliny Secundus, and Seneca, and suggests the probability of a successful voyage to the west with the object of discovering a new world or of reaching the known eastern parts of the old world. These chapters of the Opus Majus were embodied whole without acknowledgment in a treatise of some forgotten worthy and were there read and studied by Columbus, who acknowledged the debt he owed to them. On the whole, we may grant that Roger Bacon, in the words of Anthony-a-Wood, was the "Emporium Optimarum Disciplinarum" of his time, and freely concede at least the first part of the high praise of Whewell that he was the "Encyclopædia and Organon of the 13th Century." But the Organon, in a practical form, is almost beyond his merits.

---

* This had been translated many years before.

† Since writing the above, I observe that Roger Bacon's Greek and Hebrew Grammars are being printed from MSS. in the Bodleian Library.

As for Francis Bacon, I do not know that he enlarged the area of our physical knowledge in any direction.* He was patient enough, and minute enough, but he had not the "scientific imagination."† As he says with noble modesty:—"I only ring the bell to call other wits together. . . . I scatter the seed, leaving others in late times to gather the fruit." And the harvest of the seed he sowed was indeed speedy and abundant!

C.—*Neither philosopher free from the superstitions of his age.*

Though Roger wrote the book *De Magiae Nullitate*, he also wrote, or rather translated A Discovery of the Miracles of Magic. He believed in astrology and horoscopes, and in the philosopher's stone. And, though he was a good mathematician, and the knowledge of his time was sufficient to have prevented the error, he believed in the quadrature of the circle. He was also not above the pretences of the mountebank to possess a mysterious knowledge of secrets he would not divulge, thus involving himself in the condemnation of his fourth offendiculum.

It is clear from the tenth century of the natural history on the power of imagination that Francis with his Athenian inquisitiveness was δεισιδαιμονεστερος. He has not the sceptical spirit of Thomas Brown in the "Pseudodoxia" to make him hold his judgment in suspense or to reject, though his admissions are cautious, and he generally holds something in reserve to give him a loop-hole of retreat. The whole century should be read, but I would refer particularly to such sections as 910, 945, 958, 961, &c., 967, 991-2, 997, and especially 998. If it were not so long this last should be reproduced here in full. It is to the effect that it will heal a wound if the weapon is anointed which made the wound. This most ancient superstition, running back to the earliest history of the human race and common among all savage tribes, persists to the present day.[*] Bacon, though cautious, is very exact in details, *e.g.*, of the ingredients of the moss from the skull of an unburied dead man; of the powder of a bloodstone (see also § 967), etc. The party wounded need not be aware of the fact of the ointment being applied to the weapon, and "if the ointment hath been wiped off the weapon without the knowledge of the party hurt, presently the party hurt has been in great rage of pain." Francis does not implicitly accept all this; but at least he thinks it worthy of trial.

---

* He tells us that all things are attracted to the centre of the earth, and that heat is a form of motion. But the first is hardly to be called a discovery; and the second is too informally stated to be of any scientific value.

He writes:—"The poetic faculty is the resemblances of things, their differences is the logical or critical: this last is the last to ripen." The "poetic faculty" Bacon certainly had, if the stately march and measured harmony of prose, with quick insight into happy illustration come under that definition. But the "scientific imagination" which dominated Isaac Newton had not been given him. Into this very interesting side issue we must not deviate.

D.—*Did Francis borrow from Roger?*

Spedding says emphatically no, and gives as a reason—a lame one—that only one minor work of Roger's was printed in Francis' time, and that he was not likely to have consulted the manuscript works buried in obscure back shelves of libraries. Charles Forster, in "Mahomedanism Unveiled," is as emphatic on the other side, and prints parallel passages to prove his point. Hallam holds an even balance, inclining, I think, to the opinion that the later Bacon was indebted to the former; and he points out the curious fact that Francis' "favourite quaint expression, *praerogativae scientarium*" is also to be found in the Opus Majus. But, generally speaking, from two men writing on the same branches of philosophy the resemblance in words is slight, and the simple style and phrases of Roger contrast strongly and favourably with the sententious and artificial Graecicisms of Lord Bacon. But the modes of *thought* of the two men are most strikingly similar. I here transcribe the parallel passages, leaving them in the Latin.

Roger Bacon:—Scientia experimentalis imperat aliis scientiis sicut ancillis suis, et ideo tota sapientiae speculativae proprietas isti scientiae specialiter attribuitur.

And again:—Scientiae aliae (*i.e.* not experimental) sciunt sua *principia* invenire per experimenta, sed conclusiones per argumenta facta ex principiis inventis.

And again:—In istis omnibus quae sequuntur non oportet hominem inexpertum quaerere rationem ut primo intelligat hunc enim nunquam habebit nisi prius habeat experientiam, unde oportet primo *credulitatem* fieri; donec secundo sequitur experientia; ut tertio ratio comitetur.

---

[*] A labourer in Essex (Stambridge), less than fifty years ago, having been wounded by a pitch-fork, anointed the fork, threw it on a dung-hill, and never dressed the wound. I got this at first-hand from the employers.

By *credulitas* I suppose the writer means a willingness to believe. It corresponds to Huxley's "scientific imagination," which he so greatly eulogises, and to Newman's "atmosphere of faith," which is unscientific imagination. We may supply the paraphrase—a working hypothesis.

And now from the later Bacon:—Mathematica et logica quae ancillarum loco erga physicam se gerere debeant, dominatum contra exercere praesumunt.

And again:—Duo viae sunt . . . Altera . . . Altera a sensu et particularibus excitat *axiomata*, ascendendo continenter et gradatim, ut ultimo loco perveniatur ad maxime generalia; *quae via vera est, sed intentata* (untried).

I suppose the *principia* of the earlier writer corresponds to the *axiomata* of the later, meaning *elements* or *principles*. And also that scientia *experimentalis* corresponds to *physica*. Observe the common use of the word *ancilla*. *Particularis*, *perspectiva*, *speculativa*, are other common words. As for *intentata* (untried), this shews either that Francis did not know the earlier methods of Roger; or, knowing them, did not recognise their value. Lord Bacon, besides appropriating a story of Roger Bacon's in Historiae Vitae et Mortis, which he evidently thinks unworthy of belief, only refers to Roger once, in a passage which Hallam considers disparages the earlier philosopher. I cannot see this unless the words *utile genus* are used scornfully as belonging to the *fructifera* which are not *quaerenda*. This may be so, especially as Roger Bacon wrote treatises De *Utilitate* Astronomiae, De *Utilitate* Scientiarum. But how could Francis know all this unless he had known the man by his writings; for to the middle ages Roger Bacon was nothing but a vulgar magician? And it would be a very unfair inference of Francis with regard to his namesake, who complains bitterly that when he tried to create an enthusiasm for his studies he was asked, "Are they *fructifera?* What is the use of them?" * Roger, unlike Lucretius, and certain Indian philosophers of the Dhammapada, who contemplated with sombre satisfaction from their sublime heights the passions and low ideals of the struggling multitude below, laments that he could not induce the young men (? boys) whom he was so willing to teach to accompany him to higher and r graver work.

---

* Contrast a beautiful passage from Lord Bacon, quoted by Colonel Colomb in the July BACONIANA, p. 154.

One last word in recapit r of these men added much to the body c 'ge. The first suffered from want of mean all he had, on his work, tables, instrumen confesses he is an "importunate beggar"- eral antipathy and apathy of learned and he second from want of the scientific imagi wonderfully aided Newton. But both taught rganon, the new method of reason, and e: oneous aims and methods of their generation. While, however, the words of Roger fell on deaf ears and cold hearts, Francis scattered seeds over the fruitful soil of the spacious times of great Elizabeth and of her successor, and they sprang up and yielded fruit a hundred fold.

H. CANDLER.

FRANCIS SAINT ALBAN, MYSTIC AND POET.

"You are wisely silent in your own worth, and therefore 'twere a sin for others to be so."

"Let Eiron's modesty tell bashful lies, to cloak and masque his parts; he's a fool for't."

THOMAS RANDOLPH (*The Muses Looking Glass*).

THE Shake-speare problem is altogether too subtle, too profound, too wide in its results to be summarily disposed of in a magazine article, whatever Mr. Andrew Lang may fancy, or to be waived aside for ever, even by the eloquence of so great an artist as Sir Henry Irving.

I can only at best touch the fringe of it in this paper, addressed to intelligent enquirers rather than to determined opponents proud of still hugging tenaciously the Shaxburd myth.

The Bacon Society, what is it? Baconians, what are they?

These questions, so often heard, are best and most fully answered by analogy.

We are nothing if not Miners—Excavators of a literary secret, not without parallel, probably, in more nations than one, possibly in all possessing a literature.

For our main object and aim we have the study of the life and works of Francis, Viscount Saint Alban, Baron Verulam, *Baco Von Verulam*, as he is known in Germany.

"According to the innocent play of children," says our philosopher in the *Advancement of Learning*, the "Divine Majesty took delight to hide His works *to the end to have them found out.*"

The italics are mine, for in these last words our position as excavators of the real authorship of works published without "Bacon's" name is justified.

After the manner and example of the great Architect of the Universe, of whose Sacred Majesty Lord Saint Alban was so humble and devout a worshipper, he veiled his works, undertaken for the benefit of mankind, with the hope that "the ages to come," to whom he has left his "name and memory," may discover them. "Born for the service of mankind," as he himself asserts, he was, as is suggested by Randolph's lines above, "Wisely silent in his own worth, and therefore 'twere a sin for others to be so." Another justification for us Baconians and for our Society.

If it should be objected that it is in the noble ideas engendered by the pure wine of literature that its true value lies, not in the shape or fashioning of the chalice, however finely wrought, from which it flows, I answer: True, yet which of us is quite indifferent to the man whose works charm us? Our interest in an author apart from his works comes of the love we bear them, and represents our gratitude for the gifts received.

And now, who was this man universally known by the name of "Lord Bacon," without title to the same, and who is said by some to "cloak and masque his parts?" No "fool" whatever he was or was not.

One whom this dear land set in a silver sea may claim as her wisest and her best. Philosopher, Sage, Poet, Mystic. By virtue of whose "parts" of a strange whole the Shakespeare problem assumes the shape of a problem at this day.

The "Pilgrim's Progress," not entirely the simple tale it represents itself to be, founded on a still earlier cryptic "*Pelerinage de l'homme*," by *Guillaume de Guilville* (1295) says:—

> "Hard texts are nuts, I will not call them cheaters,
> Whose shells do keep the kernals from the eaters;
> Open the shells, and you shall have the meat,
> They here are brought for you to crack and eat."

It is with the desire to crack a hard nut that I quote Bunyan, and also Swift's "Tale of a Tub," as follows:—

"The greatest maim to the general reception of our Society has been a superficial vein among many readers of the present age, who will by no means be persuaded to inspect beyond the surface and rind of things, whereas wisdom is a fox, who, after long hunting will at last cost you the pains to dig out. It is a cheese, which by how much the richer has the homelier, the coarsest coat. It is a sack posset wherein the deeper you go, you will find it the sweeter. Wisdom is a hen whose cackling we must value and consider because it is attended with an egg, and lastly it is a nut."

There are enquirers who say they are deterred from joining us by the idea, most distasteful to their practical minds, of there being anything secret or mystical in the Bacon question.

They warmly deliver themselves of words such as these: "Truth has no secrets!" "Truth is open as the day!" A rash assertion. How much the most learned amongst us have yet to learn!

Look round; do not Truth's many aspects here below speak to us of a more high and abstract Truth still? Is not the Holy of Holies veiled? Is not the glorious invisible Truth only partially expressed in the brilliant many-sided facets which we see?

"What is Truth?" Truly the Mystery of Mysteries.

Can we in the face of the great mysteries around us, about us, within us; can we honestly refuse our adhesion to a question because it deals with what is or has been purposely hidden or concealed? Such a position seems on common sense grounds untenable.

That we have the right to discover "Bacon's" secrets if we can, and by his own inductive process, I have already shown. I will now proceed to demonstrate that a withholding of a portion of truth, and a disguising and a covering of truth on occasion, is an integral part of the moral philosophy of "Bacon" as Philosopher and Poet. Which fact may aid us in our study of him apart from his works.

We will begin with Brandes in his "Critical Study of Shakespeare," p. 327-8:—

"Shakespeare now sees clearly that the ethics of intention are the only possible ethics." (*Cymbeline* IV. 2) *Imogen:* "If I lie and do no harm by it, though the gods hear, I hope they'll pardon me." (A. IV., S. 3), *Pisano:* "Wherein I am false, I am honest, not true, to be true. (A. III., S. 5) *Pisano:* "True to thee, were to prove false, which I will never be, to him that is most true."

Words which Brandes explains thus: "That is to say he lies and deceives because he cannot help it, but his character is none the worse, nay, all the better on that account. . . . Thus all the good characters commit acts of deception . . . even live their lives under false colours without in the least derogating from their moral worth." He adds: "The Plays show that their author held neither deceit nor any other course of action in conflict with moral law is absolutely and unconditionally wrong."

If we want further proof that Shakespeare and Bacon thought alike on this as well as on every other subject, we shall find it in the Essay on *Simulation and Dissimulation.* "An habit of secrecy is both political and moral; he that will be secret must be a dissembler in some degree." And again, "The great advantage of simulation and dissimulation are three. First, to lay asleep opposition . . . for where a Man's intentions are published it is an alarm, to call up all that are against them. The second is to reserve to a Man's Selfe, a faire retreat. . . . The third is to better discover the Minde of another." And once more:* "The best Composition, and Temperature is, to have Openesse in Fame; Secresy in Habit; Dissimulation in seasonable use; and a Power to faigne, if there be no remedy."

A natural and fine reserve where his own life and life-work were in question, the Wisdom Politic of self-preservation, an attribute of all great Reformers and Thinkers till such time as their martyrdom should have ripened, in ages where persecution for independent thought still obtained; last but not least, the traditions, principles, and obligations of his Order, the most beneficent and secret of his or any age; these were one-and-all the cause of his laying his finger not only on his own lips but on those of his contemporaries, many of whom as Brethren of the Mystic Tie were solemnly pledged to defend the interests of the Members of their Fraternity, and above all of those of their *Rex, Imperator or "Monarcha."*

When we read over Bacon's own words in the "New Atlantis:" "We have consultations which of the inventions . . . we have discovered—shall be published and which not, and take all an oath of secrecy for the concealing of those which we think meet to keep secret . . ." we shall find less difficulty in receiving the suggestion that he commanded means for concealing his own "inventions" if he desired it.

Among the Secret Brotherhood of that day we find inscribed the names of James I., Charles I., Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel, that Patron of Art, at whose Highgate Mansion our Philosopher is said to have breathed his last; W. H., Earl of Pembroke, *Shake-speare's* friend; and Charles Howard, Earl of Effingham, Lord High Admiral, into whose ear Elizabeth poured her dying wishes; both of which last noble gentlemen owned Play Houses of their own, and commanded companies of "machanicals" who fretted their hour on the "green fields" which then girded London. Besides these well-known and honoured names we find also that of Sir Thomas Gresham, merchant and philanthropist, who founded the Royal Exchange, and the Gresham Lectures for the better knowledge of medicine, and the laws by which it works; while any one visiting the National Portrait Gallery and looking at the picture of the Court Architect of that day, Mr. Inigo Jones, will hardly be surprised to hear that he too was a member of this Society of which we have every reason to believe Francis Saint Alban was the *Rex, Imperator or "Monarcha."* Himself a Knight of the "Golden Stone," a Red Cross Knight, a true Crusader, who, like those of Arthur's Court, rose, "in ever highering circles up to the great sun of glory, thence to swoop down on all things base and dash them dead." The Red Cross, or Rosicrucian Society, rose from the ruins of Templarism, and its scheme, proclaimed in 1614,* to all the learned men and Princes of Europe in the form of a Fama, or Manifesto which had previously circulated in MS. on the Continent, was the Reformation of the whole round world.

---

* From the Posthumous Latin Edition of the Essays.

Though the name of Johann Valentin Andrea appeared on its title page, the young burgher of Stuttgart denied its authorship.

As Mr. Wigston points out in his interesting book, "Francis Bacon *versus* Phantom Captain Shakespeare," English words enter largely into its composition, and its thoughts are the thoughts of "The New Atlantis."

It is important to note how Bacon was in touch with Germany at this time, and if with Germany then with new German thought, which was absolutely and entirely Rosicrucian.

In his "Notes on the State of Christendom" (pp. 8, 24, Spedding), we find him speaking of *Heinrich Julius*, Duke of Brunswick, and of his "strong Castle on the Occer," which Spedding most inaccurately alters to Oder. This Duke, a learned Brother of the Order of the *Adepten*, was so highly in the confidence of Emperor Rudolph II. of Austria, that he became the Director of the Imperial Privy Council. He died at Prague, 1613, the year after Donne visited that city on an Embassy with Sir Robert Drury. Another Rosicrucian, Count Moritz, of Hesse, was also included in the visit. Heinrich Julius was a play-wright, and on the little stage which stands now in Wolfenbüttel Schloss Lessing's plays were first produced. It is interesting to remember that Heinrich Julius was brother-in-law to James I., having married Elizabeth of Denmark. Michael Mayer, another foremost Rosicrucian, and physician to the Landgrave Moritz, visited England at this period, and was the friend of Robert Fludd, Moral Philosopher and Rosicrucian. Mayer is said to have been greatly instrumental in producing the Manifesto. It is very difficult not to believe that Bacon was in touch with all these learned *Fras*, when we learn how his aims and theirs were so eminently the same. Christoph Friedrich Nicolai, whom I have had the advantage of studying in the Wolfenbüttel *Bibliothek*, which once faced the strong Castle of Duke Heinrich, says in one of his works that the general reform of the *Arts and Sciences* was a special part of the scheme set forth in the Fama. In May, 1617, Bacon, on taking his seat in Chancery, made use of these words: "The depth of the three long vacations I would reserve for business of estate and for studies, *arts and sciences*, to which in my nature I am most inclined." This speaks for his interests and sympathies marching with those of the Order, while his earnest remarks with regard to the Stage prove that particular branch of Art to be as much an object of care to him as any. In the "New Summary of Universal History," by *Febronius*, Nicolai tells us the Rosicrucian Brotherhood is in conformity with the first Apostolic Church, and desires Religious Unity, and the removal of all sects. That the principles of a Member was to live every hour as if he had lived from the beginning of the world, and would live to the end of it, to hide no action, to fear neither poverty, nor sickness, nor age. It seems that the Earls of Erbach and their wives entered the Society in 1621. I strongly recommend those who would like to dip deeper into the mysteries of the Order to read Mr. Wigston's works; it is unnecessary, even if I had the space, to discuss it further here; all I hope to do is to prove Lord Saint Alban's right to be called a Mystic and a Poet We shall see presently how, in his own poetical language, he speaks of the stage as playing on men's minds or souls as the "bow on the fiddle." Not as *Rosencrantz* * and *Guildenstern* played on *Hamlet* (we have a similar metaphor in the stops of the recorder), but as *Bacon*, who took *Philanthropia* and Goodness for his province always played that virtue might enter and other men's minds might ignite.

---

* Published at Cassel 1614.

Whatever Sir Henry Irving would have us believe, our Philosopher took, all his life long, the greatest interest in the stage, though for obvious reasons he never mentions the great playwright of the nation, shall I say world? In his *Advancement of Learning* occur these words: "Dramatic poetry which has the Theatre for its world would be of excellent use if it were sound; for the corruptions of the Theatre is of very great consequence, and the corruptions of this kind are numerous in our time, but the regulation quite neglected." Using an analogy only worthy of Shake-speare, he says; "The action of the theatre, though modern States esteem it but ludicrous unless it be satirical and biting, was carefully watched by the Ancients that it might improve mankind in virtue; and indeed many wise men and great philosophers have thought it as the *bow to the fiddle*."

That we find his prose works plentifully interlarded with allusions to the stage, such as the prompter's book, "judging the play by the first act," "he played it now as if he had been on the stage," "plaudites are fitter for players than for magistrates," "beholding noble action as in a theatre," and a host more, we realise how much Bacon did know about the theatre, its technicalities, and its possibilities. It is a significant fact, one that proves how determined the "general" is to abide by its own errors and traditions rather than learn, that after Sir Henry Irving's speech in America in which he disclaimed for our great Philosopher any interest whatever in the Theatre, I sent a letter to three of our leading dailies, in these words: "Whatever Sir Henry Irving says is worth listening to, and his Lecture on Bacon and Shakespeare has many good points. But as a Baconian, I would call attention to a flaw in his argument. Bacon emphatically knew much of stage-craft, and had the possible future of the English Drama strongly at heart. He constantly interlards his prose with allusions to the theatre." I added twelve examples with their references, and closed my letter with these words:—

"Bacon was chosen to stage Masques and plays at Gray's

---

* In an early Quarto printed *Rossencraft* and *Gilderstone*.

Inn and at Greenwich Palace, which meant a Matinee before Royalty."

Perhaps it is superfluous to add that not one of the papers inserted my letter, a proof of the one-sidedness of the press.

That Francis was associated with dramatic representations from his earliest years is a matter of history. Sir Nicholas Bacon heard him recite his little pieces from memory, too busy as the great man is said to have been to see much of the child, which argues that Nicholas himself had a dramatic and poetical taste. Hepworth Dixon is at pains to record that the boyhood of Francis saw him taking active part in the pomps and pageants with which a gay Court solaced themselves on the banks of the swan-flecked river.

And as has been so often pointed out, the revels at his own Inn of Court were the especial care of the accomplished, poetical, learned barrister, Sir Francis Bacon.

At whatever point we touch him we find an answering note in harmony with the title we assign him at the head of his paper.

Always be it remembered that it is rather in the form of "pinholes," by, or through which we may espy "great objects," that his hints are given to us his "discoverers." For if he systematically made use of secret means to attain his end with regard to the stage, it is against reason that he should permit of our finding out without a great deal of labour and trouble that he was the *one* great Poet-Dramatist of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

That this was his secret we are sufficiently assured, and that we may well claim him to be what we assert, I shall now proceed to show. To do this effectually I append a series of quotations from both Bacon in his more *contemplative* mood, when he writes as a philosopher and in prose; and from Shake-speare, whose Dramas represent the same ideas and wise thoughts taking *active* shape in the plays.

These quotations are here given in the form of questions by myself and answers by Bacon.

SUBJECT :—"MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM."

Q.—Oberon says: "I know a bank whereon the wild thyme blows, there sleeps Titania, lulled in these flowers with *dances* and *delight.* Can you explain why wild-thyme should lull her in delight?"

Bacon: "The breath of flowers is far sweeter in the air, where it comes and goes like the warbling of music than in the hand, therefore nothing is more fit for that *delight* than to know what be the flowers and plants that do best perfume the air. Those which do perfume the air most *delight*fully, being trodden upon and crushed, are three, that is burnet, wild-thyme, and water mints; therefore you must have whole allies of them when you walk and tread."

Q.—"Aye, and *dance* too I presume? But besides the wild-thyme, Oberon speaks of other flowers carpetting the ground. Can you suggest any others which you prefer?"

Bacon: "I also like little heaps such as are in wild heaths to be set with wild-thyme, some with *violets*, some with *cowslips* and *the like* flowers, withal sweet and sightly."

Q.—"Precisely, Titania's 'little heap' agrees with your ideas. Oberon describes it almost in your own words. 'I know a bank whereon the wild-thyme blows, where *ox-lips** and the nodding *violet* grows.' But can you tell me why nodding? Is there any reason, would you say, for preferring a nodding violet to a still one?"

Bacon: "When bodies are moved or stirred they smell more as a sweet bag is waved. The daintiest smell of flowers are violets, roses, woodbine."

Q.—Ah! roses and honey-suckle—should they adorn Titania's couch?

Bacon: "For the heath I wish it to be framed to a natural wildness. I would have some thickets made only of sweet-briar and *honey-suckle.*"

Q.—Quite so; I guessed as much. You have now accurately described all the flowers mentioned by Oberon as forming Titania's bower. "I know a bank whereon the wild-thyme blows, where ox-lips and the nodding violet grows, quite over-canopied with lush *woodbine*, with sweet . . . musk-roses." Do you agree with the last-named addition? Do *you* like the musk-rose?

Bacon: "The sweetest smell in the air is the violet, . . . next to that is the musk-rose. The smell of violets and roses exceedeth in sweetness that of spices. . . . These things do rather woo the sense than satiate it."

Q.—I have my answer. I am content.

It is in parallels such as these, and they abound, that we realise that the minds of Bacon and Shakespeare run in actually and entirely the same groove. Here is another instance.

---

* The greater cowslip.

SUBJECT—"HAMLET."

Q.—Hamlet says to the gravedigger: "How long will a man lie in the grave ere he rot?" What have you to say about this matter?

Bacon: "It is strange, and well to be noted, how long carcases have continued incorrupt and in their former dimensions, as appeareth in the mummies of Egypt, having lasted, as is conceived, three thousand years."

Q.—The gravedigger says in reply: "If he be not rotten before he die [we have many pocky corpses now-a-days], he will last some eight years," giving as a reason for a tanner lasting nine that his hide was so tanned, "He will keep out water a great while. Water is a sore decayer of your dead body." What do you say about this?

Bacon: "If you provide against three causes of putrefaction, bodies will not corrupt. . . . The first is that the air be excluded, for that undermineth the body. . . . The third is that the body to be preserved be not of that gross that it may corrupt within itself. There is a fourth remedy also, which is, that if a body to be preserved be of bulk, as a corpse is, then the body that incloseth it must have a virtue to draw forth and *dry the moisture* of the inward body, for else the putrefaction will play within."

Q.—The gravedigger and you agree. Besides this, Hamlet enquired thus, as he held the skull of Yorick: "Dost thou think Alexander look'd out o' this fashion i' the earth?" Can you answer him? Can our imagination trace the noble dust of Alexander till we find it stopping a bung-hole? Is it at all likely that Alexander's flesh could have ever formed a bung "to keep the wind away?'

Bacon: "When Augustus Cæsar visited the sepulchre of Alexander the Great, in Alexandria, he found the body to keep his dimensions. But withal, the body was so tender, notwithstanding all the embalming, Cæsar touching the nose defaced it. The ancient Egyptian mummies were shrouded up in a number of folds of linen, which doth not appear was practised on the body of Alexander."

Q.—Ah! that is what Hamlet alludes to, doubtless, when he says: "Alexander died, Alexander was buried, Alexander returneth to dust; the dust is earth, of earth we make loam, and why of that loam might they not stop a beer-barrel?"

Enquirers have only to take any subject they fancy from

Shakespeare's Plays, and search in Bacon's works; they will find the passages paralleled and explained—at least that is my experience.

"MEASURE FOR MEASURE."

Q.—The Duke of Vienna says: "I love the people, but do not like to stage me to their eyes." What says my Lord of Verulam?

Bacon: I do not desire to stage myself nor my pretensions. Do good to the people; love them, looking for nothing, neither praise nor profit."

Duke of Vienna: "I do not relish well their loud applause and *aves* vehement, nor do I think the man of safe discretion that does affect it."

Bacon: "The best temper of men desire good name and true honour; the lighter popularity and applause.

What more striking evidences of the truth of my assertion are there to be found than these? Here is another instance.

"MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM."

Hermia: "Little again? Nothing but low and little? I am so dwarfish and so low!"

Lysander: "Get you gone, you dwarf, you minimus, of hindring knot-grass made."

Q.—Explain why he calls her "hindring *knot-grass?*"

Bacon: "It is a common experience that when alleys are close gravelled, the earth putteth forth, the first year knot-grass, and after spear-grass. The cause is that the hard gravel of pebble will not suffer the grass to come forth upright, but turneth it to find his way where it can."

Q.—The reason for the curious words used by Lysander is now perfectly clear by your reply.

"TWELFTH NIGHT." Act I., Scene i.

Scene—A City in Illyria, and the Sea-coast near it.

Act I.—*An apartment in the Duke's Palace.*

Enter Duke (musicians attending):

Duke: "If music be the food of love, play on,
Give me excess of it; that surfeiting, the appetite
may sicken, and so die."

Q.—Explain this metaphor.

Bacon: "Generally music feedeth that disposition of the spirits which it findeth. There be in music certain figures almost agreeing with the affections of the mind and other senses, and the falling from a discord to a concord (which maketh great sweetness in music) hath an agreement with the affections; it agreeth with the taste also which is soon glutted with which is sweet alone."

Q.—And in this case, what figure had *this* music?

Duke: "That strain again, it had a dying fall. O, it came o'er my ear like the sweet south breathing o'er a bank of violets, stealing and giving odour."

Q.—Why should a strain of music be compared to wind?

Bacon: "Wind, all impulsion of the air is wind, will rise and fall by turns, the breath thereof carried upward, then languishing, as it were, expires and dies. We have some slides of strings, as it were, continued from one tone to another, rising and falling, which are delightful."

Q.—Why specify a south wind?

Bacon: "The south wind blows from presence of the sun. The south and west winds are warm and moist, to sweet smells heat and moisture is requisite to spread the breath of them."

Q.—Why a "south wind breathing o'er a bank of violets?"

Bacon: "The sweetest smell in the air is the violet, and the breath of flowers is much sweeter in the air at some distance, when it comes and goes like the warbling of music."

Q.—Why are south winds *sweet?*

Bacon: "The south wind is very healthful when it comes from the sea. In places which are near the sea the sea-trees bow and bend as shunning the sea air, but not from any averseness to them; the south winds are very agreeable to plants."

Q.—Why should this sea-coast wind give and take odour?

Bacon: "When bodies are *stirred*, then shall more the impulsion of the air bring the scent faster upon us. Winds are, as it were, merchants of vapours; they carry out and bring in again, as it were, by exchange."

Duke (to the musicians): "Enough! no more; 'tis not so sweet now as it was before. Away, before me, to sweet beds of flowers." [*Exit.*]

Q.—Why should the Duke take his music into the garden?

Bacon: "Smells and other odours are sweeter in the aire at some distance, than near the nose, as hath been touched heretofore. . . . We see that in sounds likewise they are sweetest when we cannot heare every part by itself."

Q.—Have you more to say about south winds and gardens?

Bacon: "In gardens the south wind, when it is stayed, it is so mild that it can scarce be perceived, and odours are sweetest at some distance."

Q. The Duke speaks of the south without the word wind; is that correct?

Bacon: "The smell of violets and roses exceed in sweetness that of spices. Gums and the strongest sort of smells are best in *a west* afarre off."

"MERCHANT OF VENICE." Act IV.

Scene—A Court of Justice.

Portia: "Earthly power doth then show likest God's when mercy seasons justice."

Q.—Explain this sentence.

Bacon; "It is the duty of a judge to enquire not only to the fact, but also as to the circumstances. Judges ought (as far as the law permitteth) in justice to remember mercy. They should imitate God, in Whose seat they sit."

Act V., Scene i.—*Belmont.*

[*The moon shines bright.*]

Lorenzo: "In such a night as this, when the sweet wind did gently kiss the trees, and they did make no noise. . . . How sweet the moonlight sleeps upon this bank! Here will we sit and let the sound of music creep into our ears. Soft stillness and the night become the touches of sweet harmony."

Q.—What agreement is there between moonlight and music?

Bacon: "Firstly the division and quavering that pleases so much in music have an agreement with the glittering of light, as moonbeams playing . . . upon a wave." "That which is pleasing to the hearing may receive light by that which is pleasing to the sight. Both these pleasures—that of the ear and that of the eye—are but the effect of good proportion of correspondence; so, that, out of question, are the causes of harmony."

Jessica: "I am never merry when I hear sweet music."

Q.—Explain how music affects the spirits?

Bacon: "We see that tunes and airs in their own nature have in themselves affinities with the affections. It is no wonder if they alter the spirits to variety of passions; yet, generally, music feedeth that disposition of the spirits which it findeth."

Lorenzo: "There's not the smallest orb that thou beholdest but in his motion like an angel sings."

Q.—Explain this.

Bacon: "Great motions there are in nature which pass without sound or noise. The heavens turn about in a most rapid motion without noise to be perceived; so the motions of the comets and fiery meteors yield no noise, though in some dreams they have been said to make excellent music."

Lorenzo: "This muddy vesture of decay doth grossly close it in, we cannot hear it."

[*Portia* and *Nerissa* enter.]

Nerissa: ". . . When the moon shone we did not see the candle."

Q.—Why does she say this?

Bacon: "It is true, nevertheless, that a great light drowneth a smaller that it cannot be seen."

Portia: "So doth the greater glory dim the less."
. . . . Music—hark!
Methinks it sounds much sweeter than by day."

Nerissa: "Silence bestows that virtue on it, madam."

Q.—Is that likely to be true?

Bacon: "Sounds are better heard, and further off, than in the day. The cause is for that in the day when the air is more thin the sound pierceth better, but when the air is more thick (as in the night) the sound spendeth and spreadeth abroad less. As for the night, it is true also that the general silence helpeth."

Q.—One question more and I am done. Why, if you aimed at the reformation of the stage by a new art of modern dramatic poesy, did you write anonymously or under a pseudonym, when you would have earned so much fame as its "inventor?"

Bacon: "In the degrees of human honour amongst the heathen it was the highest to obtain to a veneration and adoration as a god. Such as were inventors and *authors* of *new arts* were ever consecrated amongst the gods—Apollo and others; this unto the Christians is as the forbidden fruit."

Indeed Francis St. Alban Mystic and Poet! As I began, so I finish. If any doubt still, let them read what a Latin elegy by a contemporaneous writer has said of him:—

"ON THE INCOMPARABLE FRANCIS VERULAM.

"As the beams of the sun in the morning rising
Up from the eastward horizon, he shone as Apollo at noon.
He perceived how all arts and inventions, held fast by no roots,
Would soon perish, like seed cast abroad on the surface.

So he reigned in those Pegasus arts, and
Taught them to grow to a bay-tree,
Like the shaft that was wielded by *Quirinus*.

Having thus taught the Helicon Muses to grow,
And continue increasing,
Age on age cannot lessen his glory.

What effulgence is seen in his eyes!
As though Heaven's beams were upon him,
While he sings of the mysteries celestial.

Our Muses need bring no encomiums; thyself
Art the singer, full-toned; thine own verses
Suffice for thy glory."

ALICIA AMY LEITH.

KING HENRY THE FIFTH.

"King Henry the Fifth is the favourite hero of Shakespeare in English history; he paints him as endowed with every kingly virtue, one of the finest characters that have proceeded from his master mind."—(*Introduction to Play Manuals.*)

IF Mrs. Gallup's Biliteral Cipher discoveries are true, as to the royal descent and kingly birthright of Francis St. Alban, commonly called Lord Bacon, nothing would be more natural, than that he should take an immense, and even a personal interest in all his royal forefathers of the Tidir, or Tudor line. Of all these Harry the Fifth, stands out preeminent, both for the prowess of his arms, the virtue of his character, and the glory of his short-lived reign. The interest the author of the Plays, took in this King, is manifested by the important parts assigned to him, in the two parts of the Plays of *King Henry the Fourth*, where as Prince of Wales, or heir-apparent, he is introduced so frequently as the companion of Falstaff, Poins, and other wild characters.

It should be observed, as curious that the only four entries of the word *Bacon*, (also that of *St. Albans*, Bacon's home) are to be found in these Plays, and in the *Merry Wives of Windsor*, which belongs to the same period. And it seems to me, that there is no character in the entire repertory of the Plays, that could afford, by reason of his sudden reformation, a better example for Francis St. Alban to illustrate his ethics upon. For example, Bacon's *Georgics of the Mind* ("Cultura Animi), *i.e.*, the culture of the intellect, and character, after the manner of the cultivation and reclamation of wild land, is thus illustrated, or hinted at,—with allusion to Prince Henry, afterwards K. Hen. V.:

K. Hen. IV.—Most subject is the fattest soil to *weeds*;
And he, the noble image of my youth
Is overspread with them. (2 *K. Hen. IV.* Act IV. iv.)

Compare Bacon's Essays: "A man's nature runs either to herbs, or weeds; * therefore let him seasonably water the one, and destroy the other." (*Of Nature in Men.*)

"We will briefly re-examine and endeavour to open and clear the springs of moral habits, before we come to the doctrine of the *culture or manurance, of the mind*" (p. 337, Liber VI., *Adv. of Learning*, 1640.)

This farming, or dressing of the mind, called culture, finds its immediate echo, in this ironical speech of Falstaff's:—"Hereof comes it, that Prince Harry is valiant; for the cold blood he did naturally inherit of his father, he hath, *like lean, sterile, and bare land, manured, husbanded, and tilled* with excellent endeavour of drinking," etc. (2 *K. Hen. IV.*, Act. IV. iii.)

In commenting upon King Solomon's Proverbs:—"*I saw all the living which walk under the sun, with the succeeding young prince, that shall rise up in his stead;*" Bacon observes:—"The parable notes the *vanity of men who are wont to press and flock about the designed successors of princes.* The root of this vanity, is that frenzy implanted by nature in the minds of men, which is, that they too extremely affect their own projected hopes. For the man is rarely found that is not more delighted with the contemplation of his future hopes than with the fruition of what he possesses.———So further novelty is pleasing to man's nature, and earnestly desired. Now in a successor, a prince, these two concur, Hope and novelty. Yet notwithstanding, princes are not much moved by this fond humour, nor make any great matter of it, but rather smile at the levity of men, *and do not stand to fight with dreams; for Hope* (as he said) *is but the dream of a man awake*" (p. 387, Liber VIII., *Adv. of Learning*, 1640).

---

* As corn o'ergrown by weeds, so heedful fear
Is almost choked by unresisted lust.—(*Lucrece*, 281.)

"The *husbandman* cannot command, neither the nature of the earth, nor the seasons of the weather, no more can the physician the constitution of the patient, nor the variety of accidents. So in the culture and cure of the mind of man, two things are without our command; points of nature, and points of Fortune." (*Advt. of Learning.* Book II. *Cultura Animi*, 391). "*Moral Philosophy, to which they do essentially appertain; as the knowledge of the diversity of grounds and moulds doth to agriculture.*" (*Ib.* 394)

Falstaff answers very closely to this description of men who press and flock about the designed successors, or heir apparents to thrones. For we find him almost the shadow of Prince Henry (afterwards King Hen. V.) in the two Plays of *King Henry the Fourth*. And that he did this with a very vain, and confident expectation of profit, and promotion, upon the king coming in, cannot be doubted, if we study closely the text. So strong was this hope, or this dream, implanted in him, that we find him borrowing one thousand pounds from Justice Shallow, upon the strength of it. Directly Falstaff hears of King Henry the Fourth's death, he confidently exclaims :—

> Away, Bardolph! saddle my horse. Master Robert Shallow, choose what office thou wilt in the realm, 'tis thine. Pistol, I will double charge thee with dignities.
>
> *Falstaff.*—Master, Shallow, my lord, Shallow, be what thou wilt; I am Fortune's steward.———I know the young king is sick for me. Let us take any man's horses; the laws of England are at my commandment. (*K. Hen. IV.* Act V. iii.)

All this, turns out in proof, but a pitiable dream, when the Knight meets the new King! Directly King Henry the Fifth, upon entering Westminster Abbey, perceives Falstaff, he turns his back upon him :—

> *Fal.*—God save thy grace, King Hal! my royal Hal!
> *Pistol.*—The heavens thee guard and keep, most royal imp of fame.
> *Fal.*—God save thee, my sweet boy!
> *King.*—My lord Chief Justice, speak to that vain man.
> *Ch. Just.*—Have you your wits? Know you what 'tis you speak?
> *Fal.*—My King! my Jove! I speak to thee my heart!
> *King.*—I know thee not, old man: fall to thy prayers;
> How ill white hairs become a fool and jester!
> *I have long dreamed of such a kind of man,*
> *So surfeit swell'd, so old, and so profane,*
> *But being awaked, I do despise my dream*
> (*K. Hen. V.* Act V. v.)

Observe that this passage strongly parallels Bacon's observations (we have cited) *upon Hope as a waking dream*,[*] particularly as we perceive, Falstaff is described by the King as a vain man, belonging to the class of parasites, Bacon indicates. In the same passage by Bacon, which I cite at the commencement of this paragraph, upon Solomon's proverb, is this remark as to the crowding of courtiers about the heir apparent, or coming king :—"And this proverb implies the same as that which was said of old, first by Pompey to Sylla, and afterwards by Tiberius respecting Macro : *That there be more who worship the rising than the setting sun.*" (*De Augmentis* VIII. ii.)

Cardinal Wolsey exclaims to Cromwell his secretary :—

> I am a poor fallen man, unworthy now
> To be thy lord and master; seek the King;
> *That sun, I pray, may never set.*
> (*K. Hen. VIII.* Act III. ii.)

In the Sonnets, as I shall presently point out, this solar image is applied to the poet himself, in the light of the royal, or kingly mental faculty he possesses, but which he cannot realize in his own age :—

> In me thou seest the twilight of such day
> As after sunset fadeth in the west,
> Which by-and-by black night doth take away,
> Death's second self, that seals up all in rest.—Sonnet 73.

[*] Bacon says : "All that which is past is as a dream, and he that hopes, or depends on time coming, *dreams waking.*"—(*Death.*)

> Thou hast nor youth, nor age
> But, as it were, an after dinner's sleep
> *Dreaming on both.* (*Meas. for Meas.* Act. III. i.)

Observe how Christopher Sly's pretended part, that he plays as a lord, has been conceived entirely in the light of *a waking dream*.

> *Lord.*—What think you, if he were conveyed to bed,
> Wrapp'd in sweet clothes, rings put upon his fingers,
> A most delicious banquet by his bed,
> And brave attendants near him when he wakes,
> Would not the beggar then forget himself?
> *First. Hus.*—Believe me, lord, I think he cannot choose.
> *Sec. Hus.*—It would seem strange unto him when he waked,
> *Lord.*—*Even as a flattering dream or worthless fancy.*
> ("Induction," *Taming of the Shrew*, Act I. i.)

Bacon writes :—"The followers of Epimetheus are improvident, see not far before them, and prefer such things as are agreeable for the present, whence they are oppressed with numerous straits, difficulties, and calamities with which they almost continually struggle ; but in the meantime gratify their own temper, and for want of better knowledge of things, feed their minds with many *vain hopes* ; *and as with so many pleasing dreams*, delight themselves and sweeten the miseries of life." (Prometheus, *Wisdom of Ancients*).

It is as the *rising sun* that King Henry the Fifth represents himself, at the commencement of his reign, when about to invade France:—

> *K. Hen. V.*—But I will *rise* there, with so full a glory
> That I will dazzle all the eyes of France:
> Yea, strike the Dauphin blind to look on us.
> —*K. Hen. V.*, Act I. ii.

The following passage explains the idea embraced in the above lines. Richard the Second, beholding himself in a glass, after his deposing, exclaims:—

> Was this the face*
> That, like the *sun*, did make beholders wink?
> —*Rich. II.*, Act IV. i. 284.

And after his death, Henry the Fifth, is thus described, in the commencement of the first part of the Play of *King Henry the Sixth*:—

> His sparkling eyes, replete with wrathful fire,
> More dazzled and drove back his enemies
> *Than mid-day sun fierce bent against their faces.*
> —Act I. i.

The Chorus of the Prologue, that introduces the Fourth Act of the Play of *King Henry the Fifth*, describes his liberality:—

> A largess universal like the sun,
> His liberal eye doth give to everyone,
> Thawing cold fear.

Sir John Falstaff applies the same solar image, (when playing the part of King Henry the Fourth) to the Prince, in mock reproof:—"Why, being son to me, art thou so pointed at? Shall the blessed *sun of heaven* prove a micher, and eat blackberries?" (1 *K. Hen. IV.*, Act II. iv.).

It is most important to point out that the parallel, or poetical simile, *comparing Kings to suns*, is by no means casual in the Plays, but a most constant and philosophical image, endlessly repeated in various ways. Pericles, in describing King Simonides, exclaims:—

---

* King Henry IV., in reprehending the follies of King Richard the Second, to his son, afterwards King Henry the Fifth, exclaims:—

> He was but as the cuckoo is in June,
> Heard, not regarded; seen with but such eyes
> As, sick and blunted with community,
> Afford no extraordinary gaze,
> *Such as is bent on sunlike majesty*
> *When it shines seldom in admiring eyes.*
> —1 *K. Hen. IV.*, Act III. ii.

> Yon King's to me like to my father's picture,
> Which tells me in that glory once he was;
> Had princes sit, like stars, about his throne,
> *And he the sun, for them to reverence.*
> —*Pericles*, Act II. iii.

Francis St. Alban, in his charge to Judges, instructs them thus:—"You that are Judges of Circuits, are as it were *the planets of the kingdom. Do therefore as they (the planets do), move always and be carried with the motion of your first mover, which is your sovereign.*" ("Life," VI. 211.)

This idea Bacon had evidently borrowed from the Persians, who worshipped the sun, for he says:—"Was not the Persian Magic a reduction, or correspondence of the *principles and architectures of nature to the rules and policy of government?*" (*Advt. of Learning.*) That is to say, the sun is the centre and chief governing principle in the architecture, or great frame of nature. To apply it to policy of government, is to draw the parallel, that the King corresponds as a ruler, to the sun, since everything obeys and circles around him! Saturninus, Emperor of Rome, exclaims of himself:—

> *Sat.*—What, hath the firmament more suns than one?
> *Lucius.*—What boots it thee to call thyself a sun?
> —*Titus Andronicus*, Act V. iii..

In the Psalms of King David, the same image, or solar parallel, is instituted,* and applied to David himself:—

"His seed shall endure for ever, *and his seat is like as the sun before Me.*" (*Psalm* lxxxix. 35.)

King Henry the Eighth, and Francis the First of France, are thus described:—

> Those *suns of glory*, those two lights of men,
> Met in the vale of Andren.
> —*K. Hen. VIII.*, Act I. i.

As a Prince, and especially before his reformation, Prince Henry (afterwards King Henry the Fifth) had his virtues, talents, and shining parts obscured behind the wild courses that he pursued in the shadow of base companionship, like that of Falstaff, Poins, and others. Nevertheless, the Prince was perfectly aware of his own temporary (and partially pretended) eclipse, or lapse, *comparing himself to a sun which is obscured by clouds.* The passage is most important, because it finds a very striking parallel in the Sonnets, and also, because, comparing the parallel with other indications of a like character, *the induction strikes us, that this King has been chosen as a typical figure to represent Francis Bacon himself.*

---

* Bacon writes to King James the First:—"Neither ought a man to make scruple of entering into these things for the inquisition of truth, as your Majesty hath shown in your own example, who with the two clear eyes of religion, and natural philosophy, have looked deeply and wisely into these shadows, *and yet proved yourself to be of the nature of the sun*, which passeth through pollutions, and itself remains as pure as before." (*Two Books of Advt. of Learning*, Book II.)

Prince Henry.—I know you all, and will awhile uphold
The unyok'd humour of your idleness;
Yet herein will I imitate the sun *
Who doth permit the base contagious clouds
To smother up his beauty from the world,
That, when he please to be again himself,
Being wanted, he may be more wondered at,
By breaking through the foul and ugly mists
Of vapours that did seem to strangle him.
—1 *K. Hen. IV.*, Act I. ii.

If the following Sonnet is collated with the above soliloquy, the resemblance between both will appear striking, there being every indication to suggest that the author considered his own genius in the light of a literary sun:—

Full many a glorious morning have I seen
Flatter the mountain-tops with sovereign eye,
Kissing with golden face the meadows green,
Gilding pale streams with heavenly alchemy;
Anon permit the basest clouds to ride
With ugly rack on his celestial face,
And from the forlorn world his visage hide,
Stealing to west with this disgrace:
Even so my sun one early morn did shine,
With all triumphant splendour on my brow;
But, out, alack! he was but one hour mine;
The region cloud hath mask'd him from me now.
Yet him for this my love no whit disdaineth;
Suns of the world may stain, when heaven's sun staineth.
—Sonnet 33.

The subject is pursued in the next two Sonnets.

Why didst thou promise such a beauteous day
And make me travel forth without my cloak,
To let base clouds o'ertake me in my way,
Hiding thy bravery in their rotten smoke?
—Sonnet 34.

It is as a *Sun of the world* † that the poet here presents himself, suffering from temporary eclipse at the hands of an age unworthy of him. If the opening monologue of the Play of *K. Richard the Third*, is studied, exactly the same solar simile of eclipse and recovery is repeated, in terms of winter and summer.

---

* "*Primum Mobile* turns about all the rest of the orbs." (*Promus*, No. 1452). Thus the Sovereign becomes the sun of the solar system he controls. Bacon, on this point observes: "Those that he useth as his substitutes move wholly in his motion." ("Life," IV. 285.) Hamlet exclaims: "I am too much in the sun."

† For footnote see next page.

> *Glou.*—Now is the winter of our discontent
> *Made glorious summer by this sun of York*;
> *And all the clouds that lour'd upon our house*
> In the deep bosom of the ocean buried.
> —*K. Rich. III.*, Act I. i.

If the Sonnets are studied carefully, this idea concealed under various images (gaudy spring) will be discovered very frequently. (See Sonnets 5 and 6.)

> Lo! in the Orient when the gracious light
>   Lifts up his burning head, each under eye
> Doth homage to his new appearing sight,
>   Serving with looks his sacred majesty;
> And having climbed the steep-up heavenly hill,
>   Resembling strong youth in his middle age,
> Yet mortal looks adore his beauty still,
>   Attending on his golden pilgrimage;
> But when from highest pitch, with weary car,
>   Like feeble age he reeleth from the day
> The eyes, 'fore duteous now converted are
>   From his low tract and look another way:
> So thou, thyself outgoing in thy noon,
>   Unlook'd on diest unless thou get a son.
> —Sonnet 7.

(See Sonnets 20, 21, 27 43.)

> Clouds and eclipses stain both moon and sun.
> —Sonnet 35.

It is a very short step from the metaphor of the sun as applied to monarchy, to the metaphor of the kingly mind, *implied as light, or knowledge.* This step Francis St. Alban evidently took, for he remarks upon Prometheus, who was delivered, or set free by Hercules, that:—"The power of releasing him came from the utmost confines of the ocean, *and from the sun; that is from Apollo, or knowledge.*" ("Wisdom of the Ancients," "Prometheus, or the State of Man.") And here, exactly with the same imagery of the clouds, is the simile repeated once more, this time applied to wisdom:—

> 'Tis the mind that makes the body rich
> *And as the sun breaks through the darkest clouds,*

---

† Bacon says: "Princes are like heavenly bodies, which cause good, or evil times, and which have much veneration, but no rest." (Essays. *Empire.*)

"For the motions of the greatest persons in a government ought to be as the motions of the planets under Primum Mobile." (Essays. *Seditions and Troubles.*)

So honour peereth in the meanest habit.

* * * * * *

Study is like the heaven's glorious sun
That will not be deep search'd with saucy looks;
Small have continual plodders ever won,
Save base authority from others' books.
—*Love's Labour's Lost*, Act I. i.

The whole of the 38th Sonnet is dedicated to the sun,* or Apollo, as an emblem of light, and superlative knowledge, or plenary poetic inspiration.

For who so dumb that cannot write to thee,
  When thou thyself doest give invention light?
Be thou the tenth Muse, ten times more in worth
  Than those old nine, which rhymers invocate;
And he that calls on thee, let him bring forth
  Eternal numbers to outlive long date.

In the Second Part of the Play of *King Henry the Fourth*, we find the heir-apparent Prince Henry (afterwards King Henry the Fifth) together with Poins, planning to disguise themselves as drawers, and to play a trick upon Sir John Falstaff. The scene is as follows:—

P. Hen.—How might we see Falstaff bestow himself to-night in his true colours, and not ourselves be seen?

Poins.—Put on two leather jerkins and aprons, and wait upon him at his table as drawers.

P. Hen.—From a God to a bull? A heavy declension! It was Jove's case. From a prince to a prentice? A low transformation! That shall be mine: for, in everything the purpose must weigh with the folly.—2 *King Hen. IV.*, Act II. ii.

This merry proposal is carried into effect in the Fourth Scene of this Second Act:—

Fal.—Some sack, Francis.

P. Hen. and Poins.—Anon. Anon. Sir. [*Advancing.*]

Fal.—Ha! a bastard son of the King's? And art thou not Poins his brother?

P. Hen.—Why, thou globe of sinful continents, what a life dost thou lead?

Fal.—A better than thou; I am a gentleman, thou art a drawer.

P. Hen.—Very true, sir; and I come to draw you out by the ears.—*Ib.*, Sc. iv.

Observe that the Prince is playing the part of the mysterious waiter Francis, whose surname we can never learn (unless it be *Anon?*) whom we have met before, in the First Part of the same Play, in a scene laid in the Boar's Head Tavern in Eastcheap. Poins is instructed by the Prince to proceed calling "*Francis*" from out of another room of the tavern, while the Prince detains the drawer in conversation. The result is that every time Poins calls out "Francis," the latter responds with a brisk "*Anon, Anon.*" It is very difficult to understand this long scene at all, even by the light of the madcap freaks of a wild young Prince, and of his hare-brained companion Poins. Because Poins, who of all men, we must believe to be the best able to comprehend the Prince's humours, makes an observation, which we should do well to consider, before passing a superficial judgment on this scene.

---

* Compare Sonnet 76:—
For as the sun is daily new and old,
So is my love still telling what is told.

> *Poins.*—But heark ye, what cunning match have you made with this jest of the drawer? Come, what's the issue?—1 *K. Hen. IV.*, Act II. 5.

To this challenge the Prince vouchsafes no reply. It is to be observed, that the Prince's sole object is to get the drawer *Francis* to reply to the call of Poins, with the words "*Anon, Anon,*" which meant *presently* (*or by-and-bye*), but held, (and still holds) *another signification* as an abbreviation of *Anonymous;* several poems having come down to us from the Elizabethan period, signed *Anon!*

Observe that the Prince, in instructing Poins how to proceed in his calling, exclaims, "*I'll show you a precedent*" (calling out "Francis" at the same time). Now every Christian name is a *precedent to the surname.* In the subsequent exchange of rôle by the prince, with this same waiter Francis, of the Boarshead Tavern, Eastcheap (and not with another), there is suggested, *a certain identity of character (through disguise) of Prince Henry and this waiter Francis!* Let me here point out other parallel pages, shadowing forth exactly the same transformations, which it would be wise to study deeply? For example, Prince Florizel, son to the King of Bohemia, presents a close analogy to the case in hand of Prince Henry. In the *Winter's Tale*, Prince Florizel is introduced, disguised as a *poor humble swain, who thus transformed woos Perdita.*

> *Florizel.*—Apprehend
> Nothing but jollity. The Gods themselves
> Humbling their deities to love, have taken
> The shapes of beasts upon them : *Jupiter*
> *Became a bull and bellow'd ;* the green Neptune
> A ram, and bleated; *and the fire-rob'd God*
> *Golden Apollo, a poor humble swain,*
> *As I seem now.* —*W. Tale* Act IV. iv.

It is plain from this, *Florizel is Apollo, the sun itself*, disguised as a lowly shepherd, but in reality a concealed God and King. Both these princes (Prince Henry and Prince Florizel) compare themselves to the sun; both allude to the same transformation of Jupiter into a bull; both put on the lowest possible disguise! Bacon, in Observations upon the Vexations of Art says: "For like as a man's disposition is never well known till he be crossed, *nor Proteus ever changed shapes till he was straightened and held fast;* so the passages and varations of nature cannot appear so fully in the liberty of nature, as in the trials and vexations of art" (*Two Books Advancement of Learning*, 128). We find that actor, King Richard the Third, exclaiming of his disguise, which he intends putting on, as character concealment:

> I can add colours to the chameleon,
> Change shapes with Proteus for advantages.
> —3 *K. Hen. VI.* Act III. ii.

It will be asked, what possible analogy, or likeness, could Francis St. Alban find between himself and King Henry the Fifth? The best answer to this, is to point out, that the drawing of parallels between remote lives of kings and other great men, was a favourite pastime with Bacon. The fact stands that King Henry the Fifth has been compared to Alexander the Great (in the play), and without citing the entire passage, this is noteworthy:—

> *Fluellen.*—If you mark Alexander's life well, Harry of Monmouth's life is come after it indifferent well; *for there is figures in all things.* Alexander (God knows, and you know) in his rages, and his furies, and his wraths, and his cholers, and his moods, and his displeasures, and his indignations, and also being a little intoxicates in his prains, did, in his ales and angers, kill his best friend, Clytus.
>
> *Gower.*—Our king is not like him in that; he never kill'd any of his friends.
>
> *Flu.*—It is not well done, mark you now, to take the tales out of my mouth, ere it is made and finish'd. *I speak but in the figures and comparisons of it.* As Alexander killed his friend, Clytus, being in his ales and his cups; so also Harry Monmouth, being in his right wits, and his good judgments turned away, the fat knight with the great pelly-doublet; he was full of jests and gipes, and knaveries, and mocks; I have forgot his name.
>
> *Gow.*—Sir John Falstaff.
>
> —*K. Hen. V.* Act IV. vii.

It was just these *figures and comparisons* which fascinated, and drew the attention of Francis St. Alban. It is to be observed that the character of King Henry the Fifth has been drawn not without hints for the poet's character. Thus he is described mounting his horse:—

> As if an angel dropp'd down from the clouds
> *To turn and wind a fiery Pegasus.*
> —1 *K. Hen. IV.* Act IV. i.

If Bacon was thinking of himself, here is the connotation between the heir-apparent and the poetic steed of inspiration. Indeed, King Henry V. is described as just such a scholar as Bacon would have loved.

> *Canterbury.*—Hear him but reason in divinity,
> And all admiring with an inward wish,
> You would desire the king were made a prelate.
> Hear him debate of commonwealth affairs,
> You would say it hath been all in all his study.
>
> . . . .
>
> That when he speaks,
> The air, a charter'd libertine, is still
> And the mute wonder lurketh in men's ears
> To steal his sweet and honey'd sentences.
> —*K. Hen. V.* Act I. i.

The reformation of the king was sudden, complete, and is thus described :—

> Considerations like an angel came,
> And whipp'd the offending Adam out of him ;
> *Leaving his body as a Paradise,*
> *To envelop and contain Celestial spirits*
> Never was such a sudden scholar made;
> Never came reformation in a flood,
> With such a heady currance scouring faults.
> —*K. Hen. V.* Act I. i.

The lines placed in italics explains a passage in the Play of *Othello*, "*Our bodies are our gardens, to the which our wills are gardeners :* so that if we will plant nettles, or sow lettice, set hyssop and weed up thyme, supply it with one gender of herbs, or distract it with many, *either to have it sterile with idleness, or manured with industry.* Why the power and corrigible authority of this lies in our wills" (*Othello* I. iii).

This is Bacon's "*culture and manurance of the mind*" (cultura animi), being one of the deficients of his "New World of Science," entitled (in the *De Augmentis*) "Georgics of the Mind." The real Paradise can only be realized on this earth, by people who are conditioned to produce it. And the term has been truly conceived (as its Greek *Paradeisos* original indicates) *as a nursery garden*, in which culture has done its utmost ! Outward circumstances cannot contribute, so much as inward conditions to man's happiness on earth. There are plenty of terrestial paradises on this planet, but "man's inhumanity to man, still makes countless millions mourn," in spite of these beauty spots. Truly Bacon realized all the force of ethic, in the saying, "*The Kingdom of Heaven is within.*" That is to say, the first way to realize God's will on earth (as it is in Heaven), is by what Bacon calls, *the perfection of man's form.* "His approach or assumption to Divine or angelical nature *is the perfection of his form;* the error or false imitation of which good, is that which is the *tempest of human life,* while man upon the instinct of an advancement, formal and essential, is carried to seek an advancement local" (*Two Books Advancement of Learning* Book II.). Bacon evidently fully understood what we call evolution, or in Professor Drummond's words, "The Ascent of Man."

W. F. C. WIGSTON.

RAMBLING NOTES ON THE BACON-SHAKESPEARE CONTROVERSY.

BY COLONEL COLOMB.

ALTHOUGH to some of the most eminent Baconians the Rosicrucian Mystery, and the full unravelling thereof has more of interest than the question of the authorship of the Shakespear Plays: we cannot forget, that as masses of people cling to the associations of Stratford-on-Avon, and to an old FAITH—for such the enthusiastic belief in the glorious personality of the Woolstapler, Glover, or Butcher's son virtually is—there is still much to be done in the way of discovering fresh proofs of the GRAND SECRET, which Mrs. Potts (queen of specialists) and Ignatius Donelly illuminated; and which the recent works of Mr. Bompas and Judge Webb have so brilliantly displayed. If a preference seems to be given to Judge Webb's book, Mr. Bompas has made it difficult for the admirers of Mr. Sydney Lee's wonderful biography of W. S. to believe that the Shakespeare Plays can any longer show any true connection with the actual life of the quondam youth, who for 22 years or so lived on the banks of the Avon, helping his illiterate companions to snare hares and rabbits, kill deer, and drink beer in that neighbourhood. On the contrary, a careful study of those two books—that by Mr. Bompas and that by Mr. Sydney Lee—is apt to bring harmless and innocent folks to the conclusion that the incidents in the life of Francis Bacon, Viscount St. Alban and Lord Verulam—as Mr. Bompas has traced them—show the most startling and vivid connection with the Shakespeare Plays. In fine, if we treat the question as if it were the report of legal proceedings—the important case of *Bompas* v. *Lee* has ended in a victory for the former. It is, however, premature to boast. An appeal bringing forward new evidence—in BACONIANA, perhaps (!)—may revise or modify the verdict. One word more in favour of Judge Webb's remarkable work. We think that one result of its publication will be that we may cease to hear from the newspapers that a Baconian must be a "lunatic."

As we hinted above, there is still much to be done before the general public wholly change their mind as regards the authorship of THE PLAYS.

Those who have visited the beautiful old church at Stratford-on-Avon, and who have not too critically examined the copper effigy in the chancel (or dwelt too much upon the illiterate and strangely spelt epitaph, supposed to be the composition of W. S. himself, which was *revised* many years ago) and who have on a fine summer evening gazed on the placid river gliding past tall trees, with graceful white swans slowly sailing on its surface, or who have heard in drawing-rooms and concert-rooms, in their earlier days, the beautiful music of Dr. Arne, wedded to nearly immortal verse :—

" Thou soft-flowing Avon, by thy silver stream
Of things more than mortal thy Shakespear would dream !
The fairies by moonlight dance round the green bed—
For hallowed the turf is that pillows his head ! "

or who have fallen in love with the accepted but not too genuine portrait—so different from that which ? adorns the folio of 1623, " wherein," as Ben Jonson says :—

——" the graver had a strife
With nature to outdo the life ! "

namely, to *flatter* rather than copy accurately the features and expression of W. S. (!)

Those, we say, who have been swayed by these controlling fancies and associations—and what a multitude there are who are still so swayed !—are much more likely to console themselves by the study of Mr. Sydney Lee's wonderful biography than by pondering over hard facts printed in BACONIANA.

But *Magna est veritas !* It may be that pilgrimages to St. Albans may ere long be organised on a large scale by Messrs. Cook and Son, and that divers localities in that neighbourhood may even draw inconveniently large crowds of people, who may at length conclude that "native wood-notes wild" may have had their origin quite as naturally, near Gorhambury, as in those regions where W. S. and Anne Hathaway passed their youth.

Messrs. Cook and Son, indeed, might reflect upon the pregnant fact, that, while Stratford-on-Avon is not once mentioned in the Shakespear Plays, St. Albans is alluded to over and over again.

The valuable discovery recently noted—that Francis Bacon was apparently in the habit of presenting MS. copies of his effusions to eminent persons who may have been his admirers or friends, as, for instance, to the Earl of Northumberland, should stimulate research.

Sir Walter Scott—whose case is so strangely parallel to that of Bacon—had a staunch band of associates, who did not betray the secret of "The Great Unknown." And it is not at all impossible that there were perhaps half a dozen men who kept Bacon's secret sacred—and, like him, carried it to their tombs.

It has been suggested that if Scott had not become a bankrupt "The Great Unknown" might have remained "The Great Unknown," in which case there might have been a SCOTT SOCIETY, scorned and laughed at for a certain period as "lunatics."

If we may venture to make a suggestion, it might be well to enquire diligently who the men were who were most likely to be entrusted by Francis Bacon with entire confidence?

Among these, most certainly, we might mention that eminent lawyer—who if he had not been too old (as Clarendon hints) might have left the Long Parliament, that body so hostile to the drama, and, we might add, to the fine arts*—and have gone to King Charles at Oxford; for he was not at all favourable in reality to revolutionary Puritans. Need we name the author of *Mare Clausum*, the eminent Selden. But if Selden knew—and he was mentioned in the first drafts of Bacon's will, as one of those who were to decide what works of Bacon were to be selected from the vast pile of MSS. left behind for posthumous publication—if he knew, we say, that poetic effusions in a dramatic form were Bacon's—it is pretty certain that he would have consigned them all to flames! For he left on record his opinion that gentlemen of high position should not meddle with POETRY, or at least should not allow the public to know they did!

---

* Witness the great sale at Somerset House, 1648—9, of the decapitated King's splendid collection of pictures and works of art.

It might be otherwise with Essex or Southampton. As it is possible that Southampton contributed to the expenses of erecting the Globe Theatre on behalf of Bacon, by giving him (and not Shakspere) £1,000, it seems just possible that he, *i.e.*, Southampton, would not have burnt Bacon's offerings to the Muses; and that by some chance in some odd corner of press or bookshelf, some descendant, collateral or otherwise, may be the unconscious possessor of some priceless fragment in Bacon's hand, given by Bacon to the Earl. Is it quite certain that the Historical Commission has unearthed anything?

Let us now touch upon another subject. Had not ESSEX something to do with Bacon's *nom de plume*, or mask, and with the enterprise which Southampton assisted financially? We know how anxious Essex was to relieve the necessities of his faithful follower. Might not the favours of Essex have been secretly and cryptogramatically acknowledged by Bacon "The Great Unknown" of that age? Is it too far-fetched a speculation, that SX—a monogram still preserved on the gates at the entrance of Cassiobury, near Watford, the residence of the present Lord Essex—may be the germ of the name so long accepted as that of the author of THE PLAYS? Observe that SX may be easily transformed into SW, for in the form of an equation X = 10—VV or twice 5. Necessity for concealment would involve reading the letters backwards —S. W. appearing as W. S.

The fitting of the full title of "William Shakespeare" would take place when it was decided that a name was necessary to be assumed, more completely to mask the "concealed poet." Before the full *nom de plume* appeared on any of the Plays, W. S. was assumed to be intended for "Wentworth Smith." So that it looks as if it took time to decide what individual should be credited with the authorship of quarto edition, &c.

There is nothing fantastic in supposing that Bacon, who was as full of mirthful jests as he was of superlative wisdom, and who also was a grand inventor of cryptograms, should deal seriously with trifles, contrive anagrams, and even write and spell words backwards for a purpose, though *we* may be accused of carrying speculation "to ridiculous XS (!)" *

It is well known that some suspect MIRANDA in the

---

* "Wasteful and ridiculous excess."—*Shakespeare.*

Tempest to personify THE PLAYS, while PROSPERO is accepted as representing Bacon's philosophical works.

As to Miranda, it is curious to note that VERULAM—the name which Bacon chose for his title—can be twisted into something exactly like the compliment paid by Ferdinand to Miranda, if we resort to a little manipulation.

"O you wonder!" cries Ferdinand (*Tempest* I. 2). Now, a "wonder" is a "marvel," and the phrase may be legitimately changed into—O. U. MARVEL!

The anagram of this is—O VERULAM! We can imagine such trifles amusing a few choice companions. It might be part of Bacon's recreations to mock at his own creations and secret.

We are not done yet. It is suspected by many that the author of "Marlowe's mighty line," as Ben Jonson has it, was Bacon himself—that is, that the name "Marlowe" was, like that of Shakespeare, one of Bacon's masks, and that the youthful Bacon (?) just returned from the French Court, and not the quondam wild Canterbury boy, wrote *Dr. Faustus*, *Tambourlaine*, and *The Jew of Malta*, as well as *Love's Labour's Lost*, and the *First Part of Henry VI.*, &c.

It will appear on examination that O. U. MARVEL (the apostrophe to the peerless maiden, Miranda) can at once be twisted into the name

MARLOWE;

thus, putting v for its equivalent u, and then adding the two v's together, to make a w, MARLOUVE becomes MARLOWE.

One more quibble. If we take the NOVUM ORGANUM to be a sort of embodiment of Bacon's philosophy, represented by Prospero in the *Tempest*, we are entitled to look for its feminine. It is to be found in the AVON, if that soft flowing stream be turned backwards. "Sweet swan of AVON!" is an expression invented by (?) Ben Jonson and applied to the author of THE PLAYS.

AVON spelt backwards, according to this suggestion, may have more to do with St. Albans than with the dirty little town of Stratford of former times. Therefore, if NOVUM Organum represents Bacon's philosophy, NOVA may be taken as designating Bacon's poetry—*i.e.*, THE PLAYS, &c. (Q.E.D.)

Shifting our ground, how singular it is to reflect that Hamlet, showing his scorn of those decorated but empty-headed courtiers Rosen-Kranz and Guilden Stern, and lecturing upon "the recorder," or pipe (reminding us of the PIPE of

Calliope, Queen of the Muses), which can "discourse most excellent music," calls this pipe a "little ORGAN." The NOVUM ORGANum was therefore his *great* ORGAN, which, according to our interpretation, had its feminine—the *little* ORGAN—which the stupid courtiers "knew no touch of," and yet wanted to play upon Hamlet.

Was not Bacon here, with Hamlet as his mouthpiece, alluding to his "works of recreation?"

Talking of *Hamlet*, it has been very commonly concluded that in this Play, Shakspere—*i.e.*, the man of Stratford-on-Avon—is revealed, and that Hamlet is Shakspere. If once, however, we get it well into our heads that Hamlet is Francis Bacon, suspicions are raised in favour of Mrs. Gallup's discoveries, which the writer of this article has not yet been able fully to accept, involving, as those discoveries do, such fearful complications.

But, indeed, the story of a Prince deprived of his birthright, and of his succession to a throne by an uncle, brings to mind Bacon's relations with an uncle who seemed to be rather his enemy than his friend.

* * * * *

Singularly enough, the article in "The National Biography," which chronicles the life of the famous Earl of Leicester of Elizabethan times, might be almost imagined to have inspired Mrs. Gallup, or at least to have prompted her curious researches! While informing us that Leicester was at least the stepfather of Essex, this article alludes to the remarkable friendship subsisting between "the maiden Queen" and Leicester at a very early period of their lives, and to the scandalous comments made by foreigners and others at different times upon it.

It will be remembered that when Sneer, commenting upon incidents in Mr. Puff's *Tragedy Rehearsed*, put the leading question of: "No scandal about Queen Elizabeth, I hope?" Mr. Puff replied: "Oh, lud, no!" Probably Mrs. Gallup, and the author of the Leicester article in "The National Biography," were each quite as innocent of censorious suggestions as Mr. Puff.

As regards Mrs. Gallup—constant assertions of the simplicity of her character, and of the *bona-fide* nature of her, researches have been recently made. Anyone who carefully studies the language and incidents in the Play of *Hamlet* cannot fail to be struck with the realism of the story of the disappointed heir to a throne tricked out of his rights by the villainy of near relatives. How entirely inapplicable is the conception of "the courtier, scholar, soldier"—"the expectancy and rose of the fair state"—lamenting his unfortunate experiences and situation, to the Stratford-on-Avon individual, who ought to have been extremely well satisfied with his advancement from hungry poacher and livery-stable boy to the lucrative post of business manager of the Globe Theatre! How ill does the well-known soliloquy harmonize with the probable experiences of W. S.! how exactly with those of Francis Bacon! Think of the words:

> "For who would bear the whips and scorns o' the time;
> The oppressor's wrong; the proud man's contumely;
> The pangs of disprized love; the law's delay;
> The insolence of office; and the spurns,
> Which patient merit of the unworthy takes,
> When he himself could," &c.

Here we realise the neglect shown to Bacon, not only by Queen Elizabeth, but by his own relatives. His uncle and his cousin seemed, both of them, to have been envious of his superior abilities. Unlike W. S., he was disappointed in love. Until somewhat late in life his ambition was thwarted. That expression, "the law's delay," plainly applies to "the Solicitor-Generalship," promised by Queen Elizabeth, but never given; for it was not till after her death that he got any preferment of importance.

> "The insolence of office, and the spurns,
> Which patient merit of the unworthy takes,"

what a diorama do these culminating words, prompting suicide, unfold! Truly it is a greater miracle that a man at his best, something after the pattern of the late Druriolanus, should have conceived such a character as the Prince of Denmark, than that Francis Bacon should have been obliged to conceal his authorship. That obligation, in our humble opinion, was far more cogent than most Baconians imagine. But we must now conclude our rambling comments and remarks. Baconians are multiplying, and Baconian pens are gradually assuming something of the appearance and quality of the plumage of the porcupine. The glorifiers of Francis Bacon cannot any longer be trampled upon with impunity.

We often think of that wondrous collection of Baconian marvels, which are contained in a certain mansion at no great distance from the Athenæum Club. Remembering those rare first editions, and their startling frontispieces, we are inclined to consider that mansion—if not as the headquarters—at least as one of the principal temples of Baconian knowledge and progress.

P.S.—Should this valuable Journal, as some propose, be issued monthly instead of quarterly—it might be possible to add, as a Supplement to each number, a kind of Baconian NOTES and QUERIES. In such a Supplement parallel passages (*newly* discovered) in the PLAYS and in the writings of Bacon—or of his supposed "masks," might be inserted—to be commented on in a succeeding number. If the question had to be considered—perhaps a trifling charge *per* line might be imposed.

"A HUMBLE REMONSTRANCE."

IN his paper under this title, Mr. Parker Woodward maintains his original contentions, and brings forward others in support of Mrs. Gallup's "Bi-literal Cipher" to which, I trust, I may be allowed to refer.

So far as I am aware, no English historian except Miss Strickland ever suggested that there "must have been a secret understanding established between them (Elizabeth and Leicester) while prisoners." Miss Strickland is very far from reliable; and we find in the "Dictionary of National Biography," that "she lacked the judicial temper and critical mind necessary for dealing in the right spirit with original authorities. This, in conjunction with her extraordinary devotion to Mary Queen of Scots, prejudicially detracts from the value of her conclusions. The popularity of her books is in a great measure due to their trivial gossip and domestic details." She detested Elizabeth, and any story about her was good enough for insertion in her so-called *Life* of the Queen—more especially if it had the flavour of that of Elizabeth's relations with Seymour.

As to the reports of the ambassadors, who, according to Mr. Woodward, were "doing to the best of their opportunities the work they were in England for, namely, to represent and keep informed their potentates of what was going on," their information is entirely credited by Mr. Woodward; but such information as that of De Quadra that "One public rumour credits Elizabeth with having some children already. Of this I have seen no trace, and *do not believe it;*" and again, "that Elizabeth was incapable of maternity," is scarcely favourable to his argument that the Queen was the mother of Bacon and Essex.

Mr. Woodward tells me that "the date of the birth of the younger (Francis) is recorded, that of Anthony unrecorded and unknown." The date of Anthony's *birth* may be unrecorded, but every biographer agrees that it took place in 1558. What are *not* known are the exact date of his *death* and the place of interment.

Mr. Woodward scouts the statement of Rawley (Bacon's secretary)—"a useful red herring" he calls it—that Sir Nicholas Bacon died before arranging for a provision for his youngest son, but till the Cipher Story is proved, I incline to that statement rather than to the theory that Sir Nicholas left the duty to the Queen to perform, as she was his "mother"—a "mother" who kept her "son" from office till the day of her death, in spite of the solicitations of her other "son," Essex. To make a digression, nothing would better describe Bacon's position at that time than the 111th Sonnet:—

> "O, for my sake do you with fortune chide,
> The guilty goddess of my harmful deeds,
> That did not better for my life provide
> Than public means which public manners breeds.
> Thence comes it that my name receives a brand,
> And almost thence my nature is subdued
> To what it works in, like the dyer's hand."

Is it not possible the "harmful deeds" refer to Bacon's extravagance and debts, and that "public means which public manners breed," refer to play-writing? How could the name of Shakspere—a butcher's son— receive a brand by writing plays? It is certain the name of Bacon—a Lord Keeper's son—would receive such a brand, and his nature would be "subdued to what it works in, like the dyer's hand."

Mr. Woodward next informs us that Rawley is wrong in stating that Sir Nicholas's money was "dividable amongst five brethren," as "even adding Francis, there were not five brothers." I always understood Sir Nicholas was survived by eight children—five sons, and three daughters—*viz.*, Nicholas, Nathaniel, Edward, Anthony, and Francis, Anne, Jane, and Elizabeth. Including Francis, therefore, there *were* "five brothers." But perhaps Hepworth Dixon and the

"Dictionary of National Biography" are both wrong in this respect.

Mr. Woodward says that Bacon only opposed one subsidy —"the treble subsidy." He will find that in March, 1593, he had previously opposed another subsidy—his amendments being accepted by the Queen and House of Commons, and the Bill passed. As to the suggestion of Mr. Woodward that Elizabeth employed Bacon to prosecute Essex in order to save his life by not handling him too severely in the trial, Bacon appeared most unwillingly against his friend, but it was his speech, especially his references to the treasons of Pisitratus and the Duc de Guise, which convicted him. Is it not as likely that the Queen's action was instigated by the fact that Essex had been her *favourite*, and not necessarily that he was her *son?* Essex was condemned to death, and executed with the consent of his "mother," as Mr. Woodward says, in a fit of passion. There was little repentance for this fit, however, for when Bacon drew up his "Declaration," the Queen read it, and rebuked him with— "It is my Lord of Essex, my Lord of Essex on every page; you cannot forget your old respect for the *traitor;* strike it out; make it Essex, or the late Earl of Essex," not a very likely remark if she had been the "mother" of Essex. Besides, if Elizabeth had wished to bring Essex to submission —all that she wanted to do, according to Mr. Woodward— there were other means of doing so, by imprisonment, for instance, which would have been as effective, and cruel enough at the hands of any mother. This execution of a rebellious son by his mother needs a little more explanation than Mr. Woodward has yet vouchsafed. I am not yet prepared to accept the Cipher reason as Gospel. As Mr. Woodward says, "I prefer the contemporary documents."

Mr. Woodward holds that I am wrong in stating that "there are a number of letters by Francis to Lady Anne in answer to letters *from* [not *to*] her," and says that only *four* letters from Francis to her have ever been printed; of these, one was, and another may have been, a reply." *Both* were replies. The one is printed at page 50 of the "Personal Life" and begins, "I received this afternoon at the Court your letter," and the other on the next page, "I most humbly thank you for your letter."

As to Bacon's marriage, three years after the Queen's death, Mr. Woodward's argument evidently is that the Queen prevented Bacon from marrying sooner; but, unfortunately for this theory, Bacon made an unsuccessful effort to woo Lady Hatton when he was 36, and had she accepted him it is certain neither Queen, Lords, nor Commons would have held back the marriage. Coke, however, secured her, and Bacon had a lucky escape.

As to Bacon's marriage attire, Mr. Woodward says:—"Having ventured to note that Francis was married in kingly purple —'from cap to shoe'—Mr. Stronach tells me the kingly reference is only to the mantle! I therefore surrender the doublet, hose, cap and shoes." What Mr. Woodward previously asked was, "When he did marry, why array himself in kingly purple? 'Purple from cap to shoe,' says the chronicler of the event? And Mr. Stronach replied, "Because he could afford the extravagance. Mr. Woodward ought to have known that with reference to a monarch, the words 'kingly purple' apply to the mantle or robe that is worn, not to the purple *doublet and hose*." What is wrong with this? The term "the purple," or "kingly purple," as he puts it, is surely different from the simple word "purple?" I am not yet aware that because a monarch's *robes* are purple, that therefore a subject who weds in a purple *doublet and hose*—which a monarch doesn't wear—arrogates to himself royal state and power. Can Mr. Woodward not draw a distinction between the simple purple *suit* in which Bacon was married and the "kingly purple" *mantle* in which Edward VII. was crowned? His argument is childish. I would say the same with regard to Bacon's "arrogation" when the King was absent in Scotland, when the Queen and Prince of Wales visited Bacon, and Buckingham sent him a letter of congratulation on his judicious conduct in the King's absence. They would be the first, I maintain, to have resented any such assumption of royal state.

Mr. Woodward also states that "the will of Bacon [in which he desires to be buried beside his mother at St. Michael's] is not to be found, nor is it established that the Queen is not buried at St. Alban's," and that the expression "mother" may mean "foster mother," namely, Lady Anne. Well, the will was made on 19th December, 1625, and Bacon died on 9th April, 1626. The original will is certainly not in Doctors' Commons, but was delivered out on 30th July, 1627. But an exact copy of the original appears in the "Regr. Curiæ. Prærog. Cantuar.," and was certified by the depute registrar, when the executors renounced their trust on 13th July, 1627. This copy, with the Registrar's certificate, will be found on page 559, Vol. II., of Blackbourne's edition of Bacon's *Works*, 1730. And not only does Bacon in this will desire to be buried beside his mother at St. Michael's, but he bequeaths "a set of his books to the library of St. Bennet College, *where my father was bred.*" Was it the Earl of Leicester or Sir Nicholas Bacon who was bred at this College? Perhaps, however, Bacon again only refers to his "foster father." As to the possibility of Queen Elizabeth having been buried at St. Alban's, it is a matter of history that the Queen "was buried with great magnificence in Westminster Abbey." James I. erected a noble monument over the grave where her remains lay side by side with those of her sister Mary. Probably it will be ascertained by the Cipher Story that her body was resurrected and conveyed to St Albans. As to Lady Anne being simply Bacon's "foster mother," I prefer to read the word as it stands in the will, and in the subscription of Bacon's letters to Lady Anne, "Your ladyship's most obedient son," and in the body of another letter where she is described as having been "a wise and kind mother to us both." Mother, or no mother, she was certainly kinder to Francis than Queen Elizabeth ever was.

But the most interesting portion of Mr. Woodward's "Remonstrance" is the confidence with which he, a Baconian, launches out with the following statement:—"Two gentlemen of respectability, against whose character no breath of suspicion has come down to us, Messrs. Heminge and Condell, in the lifetime of Lord Bacon affirmed that the Plays in the First Folio of 1623 were written by their deceased fellow actor, Shakespeare. Their statement is confirmed by a well-known contemporary dramatist named Jonson. It is uncontradicted by any writing of Bacon left for publication after his death."

Mr. Woodward must have been asleep for many years if he is not aware that even eminent Shakespearians controvert his statement that Heminge and Condell were "two gentlemen of respectability, against whose character no breath of suspicion has come down to us." What does the Right Hon. D. H. Madden, Vice-Chancellor of Dublin University, say on this point?

"Who, then, were the editors of the First Folio, and how far are they entitled to credit? . . . It is, then, common honesty and veracity which are in dispute. . . . But these men were 'unscrupulous and unfair' in their selection, their whole conduct 'inspires' distrust. . . . In short, the authority of the Folio is uniformly rejected, the assertions of its editors discredited. . . . The theory which convicts the editors as knaves is deserving of more attention than that which lets them escape as fools, who published without looking a title page or preface. And for this reason, there have been editors capable of the imposition practised upon the public according to the former theory; there never were men capable of the folly suggested by the latter. They . . . succeeded in imposing on the simple guileless Ben Jonson [Mr. Woodward's 'well-known contemporary dramatist'] who was induced to lend the authority of his great name to their undertaking."

Pretty strong epithets, applied by a Shakespearean to Mr. Woodward's "gentlemen of respectability, against whose character," &c., "unscrupulous," "inspires distrust," "discredited," "knaves," "impostors." No wonder, as a Baconian, I do not believe so much in "Messrs. Heminge and Condell" as Mr. Woodward appears to do.

Then Dr. Ingleby says:—"I suppose I must cite the ostensible editors of the first collection of Shakespeare's works . . . but, unfortunately for their credit and our own satisfaction, their prefatory statement contains, or at least suggests, what they must have known to be false." Dr. Aldis Wright, the editor of the Cambridge Shakespeare, makes the same charge. "Messrs. Heminge and Condell" were, therefore, liars.

Next, Mr. Morgan writes:—"It must appear that it was actually these very men, Heminge and Condell, and not the other publishers, who were utterers of 'stolen and surreptitious copies.'" "Messrs. Heminge and Condell" were, therefore, resetters of stolen goods.

Now, all these authorities quoted are ardent opponents of the Baconian cause. They don't believe in Mr. Woodward's estimate of "Messrs. Heminge and Condell's" character. Neither do I—and there are some Baconians who agree with me in my belief.

Dr. Theobald sums up the argument very conclusively when he writes in his "Shakespeare Studies," p. 35, "Bacon writes of himself as a 'concealed poet.' One argument against his supposed Shakespearean authorship is derived from the concealment involved. It is contended that if Bacon had written 'Shakespeare' some indications of this would certainly appear in his correspondence, or in that of his personal friends, some of whom must have shared the secret with him. If Bacon himself wished to conceal this fact, he would, doubtless, do so very effectually, and would pledge his friends (especially Ben Jonson, John Heminge, and Henry Condell), to respect his incognito. The reasons for this secrecy are not difficult to conjecture, and have been so fully discussed by Baconian writers that I need not here dilate upon them (see Reed's 'Bacon *v.* Shakespeare,' p. 124; Donnelly's 'Great Cryptogram,' I., 246)." I may also refer to Donnelly, pp. 89—99, especially for the value of Ben Jonson's testimony, and to Mr. Bompas's and Justice Webb's recent books, where the "testimony" is knocked to pieces.

GEORGE STRONACH.

MRS. GALLUP AND MR. MALLOCK'S ARTICLE IN "THE NINETEENTH CENTURY."

To the Editors of "Baconiana."

THE suggestion has reached me that I prepare a paper for the next issue of the Magazine upon the Italic letters that Mr. Mallock, in his article in *The Nineteenth Century* for July, omitted from the analysis of a dozen lines from the Folio, and those which he characterised as doubtful.

Allow me to thank you for the opportunity to complete a work Mr. Mallock has so ably begun. It is, however, impracticable to prepare this in time for the October Number. The condition of my eyes is such at present that I should hardly attempt so close study now; and, again, I should be obliged to have access to an original Folio, corresponding to those Mr. Mallock examined, to point out the differences as they would appear to him. The nearest original is in the Lenox Library, New York, nearly a thousand miles distant. As the particular letters which seem to him doubtful are not indicated in the article, I should be unable to determine which to describe.

Mr. Mallock is to be congratulated upon his success. What I most wish to do, and in this I invoke the aid of the Society, is to impress upon all Baconians the importance of continuing the work along this line of investigation. Had I confined my examination to a single page and given up the work after the determination—admittedly correct—of seventy-five per cent. of the letters, abandoning further study before I had satisfied myself as to the remainder, the fifty-two works now deciphered would still hold their secrets.

I have ventured to ask Mr. Mallock, personally, if he would not apply similar study to some other work better printed, and with clearer type, suggesting that it be something not yet deciphered, and naming the 1623 Edition of *De Augmentis*. This is a fine specimen, typographically, and the volumes well preserved. Copies are in the Bodleian Library and in the British Museum, and there is a fine copy in the private library of Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence. Mr. Mallock's success—and I have no doubt he would succeed—in this independent research would be convincing to him and to his many readers and friends, and the decipherment would not only demonstrate the existence and use of the Cipher, but would add to our knowledge of the hidden work.

Yours very sincerely,
ELIZABETH WELLS GALLUP.

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY (FOR JULY) AND AFTER.

DEAR EDITORS OF "BACONIANA,"—Now that Mr. Mallock has given us the result of the "systematic examination" of the Biliteral Cypher that he announced at the end of last year his intention of making—What is his verdict? As a man of reputation, who approached the subject with an open mind, not giving hasty credence to the Cypher, but only claiming for it that it deserved enquiry, his considered judgment, if a definite one, would naturally have had immense weight. If adverse to the alleged Cypher it would, doubtless, have been regarded as final by the large majority; if favourable, it could not have been ignored by the public, and must have gone far towards making the Cypher a live issue. That being so, it is a pity that Mr. Mallock's six months incubation has produced nothing definite. Whether he has come to any conclusion, and if so to what, is almost a puzzling question itself. In his July article he says:—

"My own personal opinion, such as it is, is based on facts which, so far as I can see, are clearly verifiable by the eye. Reduced to their smallest dimensions these facts are as follows. The italic passages in the First Folio are undoubtedly printed in what Bacon calls a bi-formed alphabet." And in reference to the "test passage" he says:—

"I may be in error in my supposition; but it seems to me difficult, if we base an opinion on this passage, to avoid the conclusion that a Cypher really exists; and that those who put the idea aside as though it were not worth considering, do not know what they are talking about."

These passages are the nearest approach to a conclusion that I can find in his article, and would have reasonably been supposed to be intended as his verdict, had he not soon followed his July article with a letter which appeared in *The Times* of August 15th, in which he represents the state of his mind as follows:—

"I am not a convert. On the contrary I think it possible, perhaps probable, that her whole theory is a delusion."
He further says in the same letter:—

"Thus, from a typographical point of view, there are many facts which indubitably support Mrs. Gallup, and many others which seem altogether to discredit her. These last are sufficiently numerous and important to destroy all credence in her theory (though they must increase our estimate of her truly astonishing ingenuity), unless she can herself explain them in a clear and systematic manner."

Whether in the future it be proved that the Cypher exists, or whether it be shown to be a delusion, Mr. Mallock will be able to point to one or other of his hedging and oracular deliverances as having foreshadowed the accepted result, but can he be regarded as in any way a guide or authority on the question at the present moment? Which way is he guiding us? What is his decision? Has he any real opinion one way or the other? Has he got beyond sitting on the fence? Can we even say that he is more inclined to come down on the one side than on the other? If not, neither he himself nor anyone else is any forwarder for his "systematic enquiry." Far from having accomplished the "decisive test" to which he was going to bring the matter, it appears that he has not even been able to make up his own mind about it, and probably no one is better aware that he has failed in his undertaking, or is more disappointed thereat, than he is himself; for like those expeditions which start with high hopes of reaching the Pole but fail to get to it, he started with the confident expectation that his enquiry would ascertain the truth or falsehood of the Cypher, and he has ended without having reached his goal, or even got anywhere near it, and with his personal opinion still in a nebulous stage. Here is the prospectus of his voyage in his own words on Mrs. Gallup's theory from *The Times* of December 31st, 1901:—

> "Regarded as a subject of inquiry, its great merit lies in the fact that its truth or falsehood can be ascertained by purely mechanical means, such as photographic enlargements of the text, coupled with a systematic examination of them. . . . Pending such an examination, which I intend to undertake myself, other arguments appear to me a waste of time."

How sadly Mr. Mallock's performance has fallen short of his promise. Instead of having ascertained anything, he can now only invite Mrs. Gallup to explain.

G. B. Rosher.

August 21st, 1902.

P.S.—If anyone should be inclined to conjecture that I may have made a misleading use of short quotations I invite him to read the July article and the August letter carefully, and consider for himself whether the quoted passages do not represent the positions Mr. Mallock takes on the two occasions. If they had been consistent, and he had pledged himself to some definite view, I should probably have desired to say something about his methods of inquiry, but in the present circumstances it does not seem worth while to discuss them, as they have led him to no definite conclusion.

To the Editors of "Baconiana."

Dear Sirs,—Referring to my communication to your April issue I would like to say that Mrs. Gallup has kindly forwarded to me particulars of her work in relation to the Cipher paragraph extracted by her from "The Parasceve," a counterpart of which appears in Bacon's "Henry VII." I noticed a few differences in spelling, to which I invited Mrs. Gallup's attention. As I anticipated, they turned out to be printer's errors in her book. It is, of course, unfortunate that such errors exist, but when one reflects that a comparison of the manuscript with the printer's proof would have to be made, not word by word, but letter by letter, it is easy to understand how such errors would creep in. I am convinced that Mrs. Gallup will be able to establish her position. Certain of her critics seem perfectly reckless in their attacks, and to anyone who will give sufficient time and attention (and, unfortunately, much is wanted) to the subject, it is obvious they are engaged in the interesting process of preparing rods for their own backs.

Permit me to thank your correspondent, "C. I. Shawcross," for the great amount of trouble he has taken in noting particulars of the head-pieces and tail-pieces of the Second and Third Folios.

In reply to Mr. Wigston's enquiry, the name "Tidder" is used for "Tudor" in the 1622, 1628, 1629 and 1641 English Editions of "Henry VII.;" and "Tidderus" appears three times and "Tidderi" once in each of the Latin Editions of 1638 and 1662.

Strong evidences of Cipher arrangement appear in the several Editions of "Henry VII." I must not take up much more of your space, but I may perhaps be allowed to mention that I have compared the 1622, 1628 and 1641 Editions in some detail, and I find that, leaving differences in spelling and contractions out of sight, only one catch-word differs in the two books of 1622 and 1628; and that, comparing 1622 with 1641, there are only eight differences, and seven differences between 1628 and 1641. On page 239 in the 1622, 1628, 1629 and 1641 Editions, the word "aloft" appears in each of these Editions as "*a*Loft." It is also printed in a noticeable manner on page 135 of the 1676 Edition, where it is given as "A-loft." Bacon's signature will be noticed on pages 152, 153 and 154 of each of the four first-named Editions.

On page 152 the catch-word is "Royall."
On page 153 the printer's signature is "X."
On page 154 the catch-word is "TID."

X = 10, and the Lambeth MSS. show that 10 = F. So that we have "Royall F. Tid" (or Tidder).

A striking instance of this kind of thing is found on page 69 of the 1629 *Advancement of Learning*. The words "prince," "poet," "philosopher" appear on this page at the ends of their respective lines: the page contains a mention of "two adoptive brethren." The last line but one ends with "ex" (F), and the last line with "Royall ver." This gives us "F. Royall Ver" (or Verulum),

Yours faithfully,
A. J. WILLIAMS.

ROBERT BANKS & SON, Printers, Racquet Court, Fleet Street, E.C.

INDEX.

PAGE
A. A. L. 103
Ajax 64
Anatomy of Melancholy ... 08, 00
Aquinas, St. Thomas 174
Arbuthnot, Mr. F. F. 11
Aristotle 174
"Arthur, The Misfortunes of" ... 117
Arundel, Earl of 00, 110
Asquith, Mr. 61
Aubrey 55
Avon... 214
Bacon, Francis 103, 132
" " Birth of ... 9, 44
" " Bust of... ... 46, 78
" " Death of 110
" " Marriage of ... 81, 115
" " Parentage of, 41-8, 76-83, 112-117, 217-221, 226
" " Portrait of ... 46, 78
Bacon, Anthony 103, 113, 152
Bacon, Sir Nicholas ... 0, 12, 44, 46, 54
Bacon, Lady Anne ... 80, 115, 153, 221
Bacon, Messrs., and Son 10
Bacon, Roger 171-181
Bacon Society 5, 105, 106
Barnham, Alice 81
Bath Gate 11
Bayle 103
Bayley, Mr. Harold, 02, 100, 108, 120, 137
Bidder 7
Birch, Thos. 152
Bodleian 6
Bohemia 99
Bompas, Mr. G. C., 41, 54, 76, 86, 106, 134, 153
Brandes 61, 84, 131
Bright, T. 98
British Museum 6
Bruno, Giordano... 85
Bull Theatre 10
Burleigh 43, 77
Burnham 152

Cabalists, The 125
Calvert 97
Candler, Mr. H. 99, 184
Canonbury Tower ... 9, 54, 120
Cantor, Dr.... 8
Cary 7, 8
Catalogues, Garbled 8, 9
Cecil 43
Chapman 99
Ciphers 7 123-126
" Biliteral... ... 100, 105, 137
" Language of ... 21, 98, 99, 137
Coleridge 139
Colomb, Col. G. 154, 210
Compton, Lord 9
"Courtly Poets, The" 150
Cowley 168
Crosby Hall 10
Cupid 66-75
Cymbeline 15, 16

Dairy House, The 129
Dante 157, 175
Deformity 26
"De Morte" 149
De Quadra... ... ... 42, 76
D'Israeli, Isaac 55, 103
Donnelly 7, 117
Douce Collection... ... 6, 110, 127, 128
Dowden 61
Dryerre, Mr. 11
Durning-Lawrence, Sir E. ... 100, 111

Egyptian Ciphers 123
Engel, Prof. 153
Essays, Subjects of 39
Essex, Earl of, 10, 65, 00, 04, 103, 154, 213
Eulogies on Bacon 8
Euterpe 164
Evelyn 55

Falstaff 57-64
"Farewell to the Vanities of the World" 149
Fearon, Mr.... ... ... 105, 106
Feigned Eulogies, Portraits, Inscriptions, etc. 9
Feilding, General Sir Percy 106
"Felicities of Queen Elizabeth," 156-160
Feria... 42
Florio 99
Flower, Francis 118
"Four Hymnes" 101
Fowler, Sir Wm. 103
Froude's History 41
Fulbeck 118
Fulcher, Mr. Fleming ... 100, 110, 169

Gallup, Mrs. Wells, 7, 12, 25, 98, 100, 105, 111, 137, 155, 224, 225
Gambould 8
Garnet, Dr.... ... . 98, 137
Gay, Mr. 109
Gibson, Hon. H. 7
Gloster 26
"Golden Remains of Freemasonry, The" 123-126
Gonzalo 87
Gorhambury 12, 77
Gould, Mr.... 7
Goutant 103
Grosart, Dr. 150
Hamlet 84, 131
"Hampstead Advertiser" 11
Hannah, Dr. 160

PAGE
Harleian Miscellanies ... 8
Haweis, Rev. H. R. ... 11
Headpieces... ... 55, 102
Heminge and Condell ... 221
Henry V. ... 198-210
Hepworth Dixon ... 76, 103
Herder ... 153
Heylin, Peter ... 16
"His," Use of, for "Its," etc. ... 21, 22
"History of Great Britain" ... 91
Homer, Translations of ... 99, 107, 111
Hotspur ... 65
Hughes, Thos. ... 117
Hunt, Mr. F. C. ... 75

Iago ... 25
"Idola Mentis" ... 178
"Ignoto" ... 151
Illuminati ... 125
"It's" and "Its" in Shakespeare ... 21

James I. ... 84
Johnson, Dr. ... 99
Jonson, Ben ... 93
J. R. (of Gray's Inn) ... 122

Kenilworth Castle ... 126
Knollys, Lettice ... 77

Lancaster, John ... 118
Lectures Baconian ... 10
Lee, Sidney... ... 51
Leicester, Earl of, 41-43, 54, 76-83, 86, 94, 103
Leith, Miss A. A., 9, 21, 54, 84, 111, 137, 153, 198
Lily's Euphues ... 87, 131
Lingard ... 76

Macbeth ... 18
Mallock, W. H. ... 11, 106, 109, 223, 224
Malvolio ... 103
Margate ... 10
Marlowe ... 214
Marston, Mr. ... 98
Mason Marks ... 93
Miller, Mr. E. T. ... 106
Minor Poets ... 5
"Misfortunes of Arthur" ... 117
Montaigne ... 87, 131
More, Sir Thomas ... 10
"Mysteries of Chronolgy" ... 11

Names in the Plays ... 48
National Review... ... 11
New Atlantis ... 8, 55
New Ireland Review ... 10, 151
Newbon, Mr. C. E. ... 106, 108
Nineteenth Century, 11, 51, 99, 106, 223, 224

Offa ... 17
Owen, Dr. O. ... 7, 137-147
"Owl and the Baker's Daughter, The" ... 125-130

Pagination, False ... 5
Paper Mills ... 5
Parallels ... 25-40, 57-66, 198-210
Parentage of Bacon ... 41, 48, 76-83
Parolles ... 60
Parsons, Father ... 76
Paulet, Sir Amyas ... 152
Penroodocke ... 118
"People, The" ... 11
Pistol ... 58
Plautus ... 37, 60
Playfer, Dr. ... 93
"Poisons, Moral" ... 25
Pope ... 99, 111
Pott, Mrs. ... 108, 109
Printers' Hieroglyphics ... 93
Printing-houses ... 5
Pryer, Dr. ... 7
Puckering, Lord ... 44

Queen Anne ... 28
Queen Drida ... 18
Queen Elizabeth (of York) ... 28
Queen Elizabeth (Tudor). See Elizabeth
Queen Margaret ... 30
Quirinus ... 8

Raleigh, Sir Walter ... 86
Rawley, Dr. ... 9
Record Office ... 7, 110
Retrospect ... 5
Richard III. ... 25
Robsart, Amy ... 43, 76, 126
Romeo ... 91
Rosencrantz ... 166
Rosicrucians ... 93, 125, 166, etc.
Rosher, Mr. G. B... ... 154, 223
Royal Library ... 12
Royal Society ... 6, 55

S. X. ... 213
Schoolmen, The ... 171
Selden ... 212
Shawcross, Miss C. I. ... 102
Shakspeare's Tombstone ... 154
Shepherd's Calendar ... 54
Simancas' Papers ... 10
Sinnett, Mr. A. P.... ... 10, 11, 106, 107
Smedley, Mr. ... 106, 108
Sonnets, The ... 66-75
Southampton, Lord ... 91, 96, 213
Spenser, Edmund ... 54, 98, 101
Sprat, Bishop ... 55, 110
Squire Minstrel, The ... 129
St. Alban ... 10, 12
St. Albans, Viscount ... 12
St. Paul ... 29, 60, 61
St. Paul's Cathedral ... 7
State Papers ... 41, 76
"Staunch Baconian, A" ... 11, 103
Stella ... 167
Strickland, Miss ... 41, 76, 112
Stronach, Mr. George ... 11, 83, 112, 223
Sullivan, Dr. Washington ... 109
Sutton, Rev. W. ... 10, 151
Sydney, Frances... ... 77
Sydney Papers, The ... 152
Sydney, Sir Philip ... 86
Symbolic Designs ... 9, 14, 65, 56

Tail-pieces ... 55, 102
Tanner, Mr. E. V. ... 7, 8
"Tears of the Muses" ... 101
Tempest, The ... 134, 135
Terence ... 60
Theobald, Mr. R. M. ... 52, 97, 106
Thraso ... 60

	PAGE
Throckmorton	77
Thurston	98
Tidder	94, 101, 220
Timon of Athens	135
"Tragedy of Anne Boleyn"	101
Trotte Nicholas	118
Urania	167
Verulam	15
Verulam, Lord	6
Walsingham	86
Watermarks	93, 163
Webb, Dr.	10
Wells, Miss	111
Weishaupt	125
"Western Daily News"	11
Whitehall	9
Wigston, Mr. W. F. C.	7, 40, 66, 147, 210
Williams, Mr. A. J.	55, 102, 226
Wilson, Arthur	88
Wittenberg	85
Woodward, Mr. Parker	76, 107, 117, 217
"World, The"	151
Wriothesley, Lord	91
Yelverton, Christopher	118
York House	9, 110
York Minster	6
York Place	9, 110

ROBERT BANKS & SON
PRINTERS
RACQUET COURT
FLEET ST LONDON EC