

BACONIANA

JULY, 1927.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
The Vilifiers of Verulam. By the Hon. Sir John A. Cockburn, K.C.M.G., M.D. - - - - -	1
The Shakespeare Will. By Parker Woodward - - - - -	6
Of Masques. By Alicia Amy Leith - - - - -	9
Bacon's Secret Signature to Contemporary Plays. By Henry Seymour - - - - -	22
St. Alban's Helmet. By J. E. Roe - - - - -	31
The Masks of Bacon and other Works of Mr. J. E. Roe. By S. A. E. Hickson, Brig. General, C.B., D.S.O. (retired) - - - - -	45
Timon of Albans. By W. G. C. Gundry - - - - -	54
What really did happen to the Shakespeare folio MSS.? By Parker Woodward - - - - -	63
An Important Discovery. By "Historicus." - - - - -	68
Some Additional Notes on the Characters in Love's Labours Lost - - - - -	70
"To Prove you a Cypher." By C. W. Hopper - - - - -	72
Meetings - - - - -	83
Notes and Notices - - - - -	87
Correspondence - - - - -	93

LONDON

GAY & HANCOCK, LTD.

12, HENRIETTA STREET, STRAND, W.C.

The Bacon Society

(INCORPORATED.)

CANONBURY TOWER, CANONBURY SQUARE
LONDON, N.1.

THE objects of the Society are expressed in the Memorandum of Association to be:—

1. To encourage the study of the works of Francis Bacon as philosopher, lawyer, statesman and poet; also his character, genius and life; his influence on his own and succeeding times, and the tendencies and results of his writings.
2. To encourage the general study of the evidence in favour of his authorship of the plays commonly ascribed to Shakspeare, and to investigate his connection with other works of the period.

Annual Subscription. For Members who receive, without further payment, two copies of *BACONIANA* (the Society's Magazine) and are entitled to vote at the Annual General Meeting, one guinea. For Associates, who receive one copy, half-a-guinea.

For further particulars apply to Henry Seymour, Hon. Sec. of the Bacon Society, Canonbury Tower, N.1.

Single copies of *BACONIANA* from Gay and Hancock, 2s. 6d., plus postage. To Members and Associates, 1s. plus postage.

Officers of the Society: The President, The Hon. Sir John A. Cockburn, K.C.M.G., M.D.; Vice-Presidents, Lady Sydenham, Miss Alicia A. Leith, Granville C. Cuninghame, Parker Woodward and Basil E. Lawrence, LL.D.; Chairman of Council, Horace Nickson; Vice-Chairman, W. G. C. Gundry; Hon. Treasurer, Miss Marion Plarr; Auditor, G. L. Emmerson.

BACONIANA

VOL. XIX, *Third Series*

JULY, 1927. No. 72.

It should be understood that "Baconiana" is a medium for the discussion of subjects connected with the Objects of the Bacon Society, but that the Society does not necessarily accept responsibility for opinions expressed by its contributors.

THE VILIFIERS OF VERULAM.

BY THE HON. SIR JOHN A. COCKBURN, K.C.M.G., M.D.

DURING the life of Francis Bacon there was little said to his detriment. Hepworth Dixon remarks that "the lie against nature in the name of Francis Bacon broke into high literary force with Pope. Before his day the scandal had only oozed in the slime of Welden, Chamberlain and D'Ewes." Of these the last named is, from the position that he occupied, the most noticeable; it is therefore important that the value of his testimony should be investigated. The *Gentleman's Magazine*, Vol. II., 1846, contains a review of the Autobiography and correspondence of Sir Simonds D'Ewes; therein it is stated that his opinions of the men with whom he occasionally came into contact is very often not to be trusted, because, in the words of the reviewer, "D'Ewes was a narrow-minded man, who looked with strong prejudice upon everyone whose faith did not exactly square with his own, and in reference to such persons was uncharitably willing to believe all kinds of nonsense. Hence his slan-

2 The Vilifiers of Verulam

ders against Lord Bacon and Sir Robert Cotton, and his depreciation of Selden and many other persons."

The political enemies of Lord Verulam were astounded at the success of their infamous Cabal. It seemed incredible that the great Chancellor, the glory of his age, should have been laid low so easily. They were not aware of what had passed behind the scenes between the King and Buckingham and the wily prelate, John Williams, who supplanted Bacon as Keeper of the Great Seal. His advice was to save the favourite and the Crown by a vicarious sacrifice. Neither could it have been known that at His Majesty's entreaty Bacon abandoned his defence and consented to offer himself as "an oblation to the King." Possibly the dread of pressing the fallen Lord Chancellor beyond the limits of human endurance sealed the lips of his adversaries. He might have been driven to make recriminations. His peremptory demand to Buckingham for release as a prisoner from the Tower,—"Good My Lord, Procure the warrant for my discharge this day,"—may have acted as a salutary warning to the then all-powerful favourite.

Next to Pope, whose brilliant line on Bacon as the "Wisest, brightest, meanest of mankind" has provided the text for a host of libellers, comes Mrs. Catherine Macaulay as the foremost of Bacon's calumniators. Her name is now almost forgotten but for several generations she was regarded as a great and reliable historian. Pope's craving for antithesis was irresistible. No attribute could have been more inappropriate to Bacon than meanness, for lavish generosity was with him almost a weakness. But the poet required a dark background to set off the panegyric of the other adjectives. No such excuse can be offered for Mrs. Macaulay. She seizes on the word "meanest" to sum up her delineation of Bacon's character and writings. She was a republican and a radical, and naturally Bacon, as a whole hearted supporter of Monarchy, was obnoxious to her views. But no political prejudice can serve as an excuse for the following shameful words as applied to the greatest of England's philosophers and statesmen.

“Despicable in all the active part of life and only glorious in the contemplative, him the rays of Science served to embellish not to enlighten, and philosophy herself was degraded by a conjunction with his mean soul.”

One would have thought that such intemperate language applied to him who is universally admitted to have been the father of experimental philosophy would have put the writer out of Court as an unreliable historian. Yet Lecky called her the ablest writer of the new radical school, and her History was by some preferred to that of Hume. Her maiden name was Catherine Sawbridge, but she is known by the surname of her first husband, Dr. George Macaulay. Her *History of England* was published in eight volumes from 1763 to 1783. It had a wide circulation and was translated into French. It inspired Madame Roland with the ambition of being “*la Macaulay de son pays.*” She visited Paris in 1775 and was received with great honour. In 1785 she was entertained for ten days at Mount Vernon by General Washington. A white marble statue of her was placed within the altar rails of St. Stephens, Walbrook, in which she was represented in the character of *history*. A vault was also constructed to receive her remains. But the statue was afterwards removed and the vault was otherwise utilised. Many portraits of her were painted and a medallion was struck in her honour. Pitt eulogised her History in the House of Commons. She was noted for her vituperative language. Being addicted to the use of rouge, Dr. Johnson remarked of her that it was better that she should “redde her own cheeks” than blacken the character of others.

It is an ungrateful and repulsive task to say anything except what is good of the dead. But Bacon's counsels have played so important a part in founding the British Empire, and obedience to them is so essential to its maintenance, that the veracity of his vilifiers demands enquiry. They have known no restraint in their ghoulish propensity to desecrate his memory, and in the interests of justice their own characters must be subject to post mortem examination. In the *Gentleman's Magazine*, Part II., 1794,

p. 685, the following quotation is given from Isaac D'Israeli's Dissertation on Anecdotes. "I shall not dismiss this topick, without seizing the opportunity it affords of disclosing to the public an anecdote which should not have been hitherto concealed from it. When some Historians meet with information in favour of those personages whom they have chosen to execrate as it were systematically, they employ forgeries, interpolations, or still more effectual villainies. Mrs. Macaulay, when she consulted the MSS. at the British Museum, was accustomed in her historical researches, when she came to any passage unfavourable to her party, or in favour of the Stuarts, to destroy the page of the MS. These dilapidations were at length perceived, and she was watched. The Harleian MS. 7379 will go down to posterity as an eternal testimony of her historical impartiality. It is a collection of State-letters, this MS. had three pages entirely torn out; and it has a note, signed by the Principal Librarian, that on such a day the MS. was delivered to her; and the same day the pages were found to be destroyed."

Mrs. Macaulay's second husband, Mr. Graham, wrote letters to Mr. D'Israeli containing such insults as proved him to be an apt pupil of his wife's methods. Witnesses were reluctant to come forward to verify their previous statements, but Mr. D'Israeli in the final letter of the correspondence sees no argument or fact in what was brought forward to disprove the truth of the anecdote which he recorded. It would be interesting to know if Mrs. Macaulay ever had access to the MSS. in the Lambeth Palace library. That would explain many things.

This dissertation on the life of a lady now relegated to oblivion would appear superfluous, but it should be remembered that Mrs. Macaulay's history was regarded as a classic when Lord Macaulay was in his youth, and he could hardly have escaped its influence. His own delineation of Bacon's character has been described as "a mere heap of contradictory qualities" which could not have co-existed in any individual. Yet in the eyes of an uninformed public it still holds the field. Lord Chancellor Campbell

copied even its errors with meticulous care, just as a Chinese tailor reproduced in a new suit of clothes a patch on a sailor's old garments. Lord Campbell adopted Pope's glittering line as the text of his treatise, and his example has been followed by a host of feeble imitators whom it would be tedious to enumerate.

Not long ago one of the greatest of legal luminaries said that it was now unnecessary to write a Vindication of Verulam, because no one of any consequence credited Macaulay's accusations. But the flood of vituperation which found vent at the Tercentenary of Bacon's death, even from some men of literary fame, proves the contrary. Spedding's "Life and Letters of Francis Bacon" and his "Evenings with a Reviewer" fully dispose of the slanders against Verulam, but Spedding's works are too voluminous for the ordinary reader, and alas! one often finds them with the pages still uncut.

Never were words uttered by Lord Macaulay more true than when he said that "no reports are more readily believed than those which disparage genius and soothe the envy of conscious mediocrity." It is human nature for certain types of mind to hate any one who morally and intellectually towers high above their ken. But John Aubrey said that all that were good and great loved and honoured Bacon. Perhaps the converse holds good of the present day Vilifiers of Verulam.

"Dare to be true. Nothing can need a lie:
A fault, which needs it most, grows *two* thereby."
—George Herbert.

THE SHAKESPEARE WILL.

A SUPPOSITION.

BY PARKER WOODWARD.

I AM indebted for these notes to a powerful suggestion by Mr. Henry Seymour, on page 295 of *Baconiana* of December, 1926. He is of opinion that for cogent reasons Francis Bacon, with great artistry, designed the all-absorbing and perennial Bacon—Shakespeare problem, setting out to make the world believe, without telling a deliberate lie about it, that the actor was the author of the Shakespeare Plays. In this task I am satisfied that he had certain assistance from the secret fraternity of the Rosicrosse, of which he was Founder and Head, and upon whom he enjoined silence for at least one hundred years.

The Plays, with their aphorisms and wise sayings, were a new application of the esoteric teaching of the Ancients, whereby instruction was contrived to sink unknowingly into the minds of men. The teacher was made impersonal, behind the veil of a mere player.

To accomplish this, much was necessary, including the title paging of the collection of plays in the name of an indifferent actor who had died seven years before the date (1623) of the Folio collection. Then prefixed to the Plays were glorifying dedicatory writings and verses addressed to the pseudo author.

Whether upon a suggestion "conveyed" by the name Shakspeare, or by accident, Francis had thirty or more years before used the poetic appellation of Shake-Speare as a title under which he published some very remarkable poems and plays cannot exactly be known.

Once in for it, however, the camouflage had to be continued and supported.

A memorial bust of the actor was in 1623 placed in the left side of the Chancel of the Parish Church of Stratford on Avon above a supposed tomb rendered unexaminable

by a potent curse chipped on it ("Good Frend for Jesus sake, Forbear &c").

The bust was not manufactured at Stratford, but by a leading tomb sculptor, one Gerard Johnson, of Southwark, London. The fact that the monument was not erected until seven years after the actor's death is suggestive of its being of purpose contemporaneous with the 1623 Folio Plays. As originally built the Monument in the Chancel was a poor affair (see Dugdale's "Warwickshire") but years afterwards it was rebuilt in a more attractive form by persons unnamed.

The last Will and Testament of the actor was proved and filed by the executors on 2nd June, 1616, in the Prerogative Court of the Archbishop of Canterbury near St. Pauls, London.

I believe this Registry was at a later time known as "Doctors Commons." Anyway there is indication that the Shakespeare Will there deposited had been "doctored" after its deposit at the Registry. I am not prepared to say whether the testator's signatures were improved upon. They were nevertheless so badly written as to be readily altered by the addition of a letter or two. That a pen-knife had been used upon the pot paper upon which the Will was written is clear. The name of a beneficiary is *scratched out* and over it is written "Hamlett Sadler." Why "Hamlett" was deliberately written instead of "Hamnett" (who signs his own name (Hamnet Sadler) correctly as one of the witnesses) could only have been in order to suggest the testator as familiar with the name of an important play. Rather ingenious that? Another ingenuity was the interlining of gifts to *my fellowes* John Hemynge Richard Burbage and Henry Cundell 26/6 a peece to buy them ringes." Other unimportant interlineations gave verisimilitude to the really important variations. And the gift to the testator's widow of his second best bedstead (*also an interlineation*) was probably a sarcasm at the neglect of the supposed wonderful poet author to provide for his widow. On careful consideration the erasure and interlineations in the Shakespeare Will,

easily accomplished in London, appear to have been artistic pieces of artful camouflage. Except for the erasure and interlineations there was nothing to connect the testator with either Plays or Actors.

The King's Pardon granted in 1622 to Lord Chancellor Bacon, Viscount St. Alban, pardoned him (amongst many other supposed derelictions) for counterfeiting of deeds or writings . . . and for all *rasing* embezzling or *interlining* of any records writings or warrants also all contempts concealments deceits and other like offences. The new Lord Keeper Williams wrote to protest that the Pardon was more far-reaching than hitherto usual.

The matter of the Will requires careful consideration by experts on the spot. For the moment the alterations (which were not initialled by either testator or witness) seem to have had part in a general scheme to put upon the indifferent deceased actor an authorship repute which he at no time claimed, but which he was almost powerless to prevent, and which possibly because of the Kudos conferred his descendants had no desire to throw off, was effectually fastened until such time as the Secret Literary Society of the Rosi-crosse or their successors deemed or deem it their duty to draw aside the veil.

OF MASQUES.

BY ALICIA AMY LEITH.

"These things are but toys, and yet since Princes will have such things . . . they should be graced with elegancy. Let the suits of the Maskers be graceful, and such as become the persons when the visors are off."—FRANCIS BACON.

TWO years before the immortal plays were published in folio Bacon printed these words in his Essay "Of Masks and Triumphs," using jargon; the art which he was Master of, namely, writing one word and meaning another.

Shakespeare uses the word *Toy* in the sense of an "odd conceit," and an "antick fabel." To "toy" with him was to jest (Ven. & Adonis), also to "Play a part in a Masque." Kyd calls a Masque "a Jest" (Span: Tragedy). When Bacon wrote Masques he tried to open deaf ears, and blind eyes, to the spiritual and true, and in Mask or Play his Jester spoke "the Truth of God, which is the Touchstone ("Observation on a Libel").

Sir William Davenant, the Acting Manager and personal friend of King Charles says, in his Dramatic Works edited by his widow, that Francis Bacon, His Majesty's Solicitor General, was the Chief Contriver of a gorgeous Masque presented at Whitehall, 1612, by the Gentlemen of Gray's Inn and the Inner Temple, and that Sir Francis was one of the principal Maskers in it, "he having been used to such exhibitions in former years." The cost of it was in excess of two thousand pounds, and though money was offered towards it he refused it, and "offered the marriage of the Earl of Somerset the whole charge with honour." The Masque was arranged and perfected in a short three weeks. Rare dramatic taste and skill alone could have produced so gigantic and so poetical a task. Memories of happy childhood's Drury-Lane Pantomimes may convey to some of us something of the scenic splendour of a Tudor

or Stuart Court Masque, but even old Drury fell very far short of their real glory. Italy gives us our word Masque. *Maschera* means Pretext, cloak, covering; and stands for the visor or vizard used by the fair as protection against a too-hot sun or glance, and by the Elizabethan actor in the early London theatres. These followed the habit of the Attic stage, which prescribed Masks because its actors played out of doors to far-removed audiences, and were seen better so.

The word Mask, (the French spelling which Shakespeare uses is *Masque*) is of great antiquity. It also is used for military fortifications. A fort half in check is *masked*. The word *curtain* in military use is a wall between two bastions, and there is small doubt that the green curtain so prominent a feature in our less modern theatres, had its own special traditions and meaning. It is now, alas, quite out of fashion, together with the "green-room" of the good old past. Ben Jonson with acute meaning called the Globe Theatre the "Fort of the whole Parish," while "The Elephant and Castle," means a "Fort half in check" behind which arrows were sent flying home to their mark, and has also this esoteric significance.

Elizabeth Tudor and both the Charles Stuarts set the law a spying about the wings of their theatres, public and private. Religion, Politics, Science, falsely so-called, were taboo. Bacon and Shakespeare tell us that "There be nothing new but that which is, hath been before;" and religious, political, scientific philosophers of all time wrote with their visors down in self defence; so did Francis Bacon.

T. Fairman Ordish says, "The Theatre is an exotic planted on English soil by Royal and aristocratic hands." The Court Masque was first introduced by Henry VIII., when he and his courtiers opened a Masked Ball at Hampton Court, described in Shakespeare's Play of Henry VIII. A brilliant echo of Lorenzo de Medici's Carnivals in Venice and Florence and its details were recorded in his private Diary by Cardinal Wolsey's young secretary, Cavendish. This became a precious relic in the Cavendish

family, open, of course, to the great historian, Francis Bacon, the intimate friend of Sir William Cavendish, first Earl of Devonshire. Francis did not need to go to Hollingshed for his facts. Queen Elizabeth inherited her father's love of Pomp and Pageant. Shortly before her death, she joined hands with eight lovely Muses, herself the ninth, and trod "newly invented measures to music brought by Apollo." The *Morning Post* of that day, the fashionable *News Letter*, tells us that Lady Russell induced her friend Elizabeth to honour a Bridal Feast at her house in Blackfriars, given in honour of the marriage of her daughter Anne, to the son and heir of her Majesty's favourite, the Earl of Worcester. The *News Letter* omits to tell us that Lady Russell was Francis Bacon's aunt, and Lady Bacon's sister, also that as Francis was first cousin to the bride, and the Contriver of the Queen's Dramatic Entertainments at Greenwich, and the leader of her Court Dances at Whitehall, he and no other was the inventor of the new Dance of the Muses, exquisitely dressed and coiffed, and the Apollo who brought the new music for his Queen to dance to. In Italian, Boccacini's *Ragguagli di Parnasso* shows it is the god Apollo who is to make the great improvement of the world, by means of Art. In his great *Assizes of Apollo* (the poet creator) is *Lord Verulam*, Chancellor of Parnassus. He is placed first and foremost on the list; William Shakespeare is only one of the Jurors down below. At the foot of Mount Parnassus was the home of the Muses, and the Temple of Apollo.

Queen Elizabeth, on the night of the Russell wedding, was the guest of Lord Cobham, as Lady Russell's house was too small to accommodate the audience assembled to view a Marriage Masque. Mrs. Bunten found a volume of Masque tunes in the MS. Room of the Brit. Museum; one from the Marriage Masque of Lord Hay, one from that of Lord Somerset, which was Bacon's own as we know. The 48th tune is called Sir Francis Bacon's Masque, I., the 49th is called Sir Francis Bacon's Masque, II., invented by him, as Mrs. Bunten thinks, for his own marriage in 1606.

Italy has been our inspiration with regard to the Drama. Bacon, in his *Essay of Travel*, says young travellers must not go hooded, but look abroad, and learn what things are worthy to be seen; "Comedies, Triumphs, Maskes, Feasts and weddings"; "these," he says, "should not be neglected." It was at these last that the best Shows in the great Houses were presented.

Titian the painter, when he looked at the scenic Representations of his day, marvelled at their beauty, and said "Is it possible that this can be only all pasteboard and paint!" Catharine de Medici called the best painters of her country to Paris for the scene-painting of her Court Plays; and there Francis Bacon looked on, and pricked in to the poor dramatic art of his own country lovely flowers from the customs of Italy and France.

His orders are in his *Essay of Travel*, "Prick in some flowers of that learnt abroad in the customs of your own Country," and when did he preach and not practice?

The Libretto of his *Masque of Flowers* contrived for King James, says:

"Enter *Primavera*,* and *Inverno*. The Music to be *Stilo Recitativo*." The attire of *Primavera* was to be that of a Nymph, with knottes of fair hair, and cobweb lawns, garnished with flowers. Naked necke and breast decked with pearles, a kirtle of yellow cloth wraught with leaves, a green mantle cut out with leaves, and white buskins tied with green ribands and fringed with flowers." The Madrigals of high Order were tuned to the musical ear of Bacon, who says "the breath of Flowers comes and goes like the warbling of music" and "In music it is one of the ordinarist flowers to fall from a discord or hard tune upon a sweet accord," and once more, "The trembling of moonlight on the water is the same as the quavering of music." Bacon was an expert in opera. In his *Essay of Masques* he says: "Acting in song . . . hath an extreme good grace. "The Dialogue" is to be "strong and manly, a base and a tenor." "The chorus," he orders

* Botticelli's *Primavera* was then in the gallery of Francesco de Medici, Grand Duke of Tuscany, Bacon's friend.

“should take the voice by catches, anthem-wise, for they give great pleasure.” To give pleasure was ever his delight. “Sweet odours,” he says, should “come forth suddenly in such places as there is steam and heat,” places of public amusement presumably, why? “Because they are things of great pleasure and refreshment.” In obedience to this advice *The Masque of Barriers* (said to be by Ben Jonson) sent out sweet odours from a mist; while in the masque “*The Hue and Cry after Cupid*” the Maskers’ attire is said to be “throughout most graceful,” another express wish of our great *Scenetecnico*. Cupids and “Moving statues” are to have their places in Masques according to him, so in the *Masque of Beauty* a Throne, on which are seated lovely ladies of high Degree, moves forward with a motion of its own; its steps covered with a multitude of little Cupids with bows and arrows, quivers and wings; while other little cherubs pelt each other with golden fruit, under the branches of tall trees; Lucifera, the moon, riding above, in a silver chariot.

“A world of little Loves and Chaste Desires
Do light their beauties with still moving fires.”
And who to Heaven’s content can better move
Than those who are so like it, Beauty and Love?”

In this most symbolic Representation a glorious Isle is discovered, that of Eternal Youth and Chaste Desire, wherein many fair Nymphs “rest.” “Of all the earth for Beauty,” their Queen has raised them to a throne:

“That still is seen to turn about the motion of the world.”

Roses white and red, branches of myrtle, lilies, and garlands of flowers are in their hands. Myrtle was the emblem of spring with the ancients. On their bright flowing hair were garlands of flowers, olives, and vine-leaves. In flowery mazes they came dancing from “curious and elegant arbours.” During “full song” they again ascended the throne and the scene closed.

Idealism, and Eternal Truth was the “basis for Eternity” of these wonderful and beautiful Masques. The words of the last song of the *Masque of Beauty*, in which

Queen Anne of Denmark and her Court Ladies took the principal parts, are as follows:

Still turn and imitate the Heavens
 In motion swift and even;
 And as the planets go
 Your brighter lights do so.
 May youth and pleasure flow ever
 But let your state the while
 Be fixéd as this Isle.

Chorus: So all that see your Beauties' sphere
 May know the Elysian Fields are here.

Echo: May know the Elysian Fields are here.

Idealism was taught in the Pagan Mysteries, and the Theatre of modern England should do as the Pagans did, said Bacon, and teach mankind virtue. In the Renaissance of the Drama our Apollo took every care that in the Palaces of the Great, as in the Tavern Court-yard, "Things of great beauty and pleasure" should *inculcate virtue*, or he would not have the ordering of them. In the Moon that silvered the scene above, Bacon had higher thought made visible. "If the reflection of the Sun is so beautiful, what would the daylight in its perfect revelation be?" Floating on a sea of calm water, symbol of the River of Death, our Poet places a glorious Isle, which is a faint reflection of the Isle of the Blessed. "Island of souls invisible except to the spirit." "To those spirits who set forth on a voyage of discovery on the ocean of illimitable wisdom," as Mr. Wigston, the wisest of all our Baconians, puts it, in his own beautiful words. It was round the Altar that the Ancients brought to birth the Theatre; and Francis Bacon says—I, going the same road as the Ancients, have something better to produce," and again:

"To me, it seemeth best to keep way, even to the Altars of Antiquity."

The Masques already mentioned, published under the name of Ben Jonson, together with the *Vision of Delight*—and many another, bear the internal evidence of being invented by Bacon and no one else; while the author of the remarkable book *Collectanea*, Charles Crawford, writes as follows:

“If Bacon wrote anything for the Stage at all in addition to Masks, enquirers ought to try Ben Jonson, instead of troubling themselves about Shakespeare. Baconians may even assert, if they choose, that Bacon wrote all Ben Jonson’s Works, or largely assisted to produce them.”

Henry Morley is not behindhand in connecting Court Masques with Elizabeth’s Counsel learned in the law, and James’ Lord Chancellor Bacon.

The early uses of the Masque, he tells us, was associated with “Classical and mythological inventions,” and “Emblems and allegories were in highest favour in the Renaissance.” And then he quotes from our Prince of Emblematists, Francis Bacon.

“Emblems conduceth to conceptions intellectual, to images sensible, and that which is sensible more forcibly strikes the memory, and is more easily printed than that which is intellectual.” Morley records a Masque planned by Queen Elizabeth 1589 to grace the marriage of James Stuart with Anne, second daughter of Frederic the Second of Norway and Denmark; a lady whose after love for English Masques provided so famous a galaxy of them when James the First was King.

Ben Jonson tells us “Then in all their glory did they shine.” “Such was their exquisite performance as, besides the pomp, splendour, or what we may call the apparelling of such presentments that alone was of power to surprize with delight, and steal away the spectators from themselves. Nor was there wanting. . . . either in richness, or strangeness of the habits, delicacy in dancing, magnificence of the scene, or divine rapture of the music.”

“The fashion of the Lords” in the *Mask of Hymen* described by Ben Jonson “was taken from antique Greek statues; Whose Persic crowns were wreathed about with carnation and silver,”; their bodies of carnation cloth of silver rightly wrought. The Ladies’ attire was wholly new for the invention and “full of glory.” The upper part of white cloth of silver, their loose under gar-

ment full-gathered of carnation; striped with silver. And again in the "*The Masque of Beauty*" presented in the year 1607, "The spirits of the antique Greeks are come, Poets, and singers, Linus, Orpheus, all that have excelled in knowledge musical. The masquers are wearing sea-green and silver."

"The colours that show best by candle light are white, carnation, with a kind of sea-water green," says Francis Bacon in his *Essay of Masques* giving us the benefit of his own experience. To give great pleasure was his delight as well as to "feed and relieve" the sometime empty and dull eyes of his fellows, thereby of course feeding and relieving their minds. Subtle was the undercurrent of everything spectacular that he set his hand to. A high aim was not to be set aside because the pretext, cloak, covering was as artistic and beautiful as he, the great Artsman of England, could make it. Nay, on the contrary, the high aim deserved a fine Mask.

In *Cynthia's Revels* is appended a delightful Foreword quite possibly not of his penning.

"It is not powdering, perfuming, and every day smelling of the Tailor, that converteth to a beautiful object, but a mind shining through any suit, which needs no false light either of riches or honours to help it."

It is just the mind shining through the glories of the Masque of Queen Elizabeth's and the Stuarts' day made them of so exceeding beauty.

Their Muse "shuns the print of any beaten path,
And proves new ways to come to learned ears. Pled ignorance
She neither loves nor fears.
Nor hunts after popular applause, or foamy praise, that drops from
common jaws.
The garland that she wears their hands must twine
Who can both censure, understand, define
What merit is:"

"Their actions," says another little introduction, "their sense doth or should always lay hold of more removed mysteries." That the very beautiful *mise en scene* of these masques was originally owed to Italian Art is very certain.

The Masque called *Vision of Delight* was presented at Court in 1617. It has for its first Scene

"A Scene in Perspective,"

which changed, as Bacon says Scenes should change "quietly and without noise, because that," he says, "is a thing of great beauty and pleasure." "*Stilo Recitativo*" is the direction given for the first Song, sung by Delight, Grace, Love, Harmony, Revel, Sport and Laughter, with Wonder bringing up the rear. Wonder, Bacon has told us, is the beginning of Philosophy.

In his *Essay of Masques* he writes:

"Let the songs be loud and cheerful," so in the *Vision of Delight* when the scene changes to the Bower of Zephyrus, it opens to a "loud Music," where the Maskers are discovered as the "Glories of the Spring." This *Vision of Delight* so transports Wonder that

Wonder: "Wonder must speak or break."
 "What is this? Grows
 The Wealth of Nature here, or Art?"

Bacon's new Philosophy which he lived to discover to the world was this marriage; this union of Nature and Art, the mingling of Earth and heaven of Science and Art, of Reason and Emotion. Wonder begins to perceive this union and cries out.

"I have not seen the place could more surprise,
 It looks, methinks, like one of Nature's eyes.
 Or her whole body set in art; behold
 How the blue bindweed doth itself infold
 With honey-suckle, and both these intwine
 Themselves with briony and jessamine.
 To cast a kind and oderiferous shade."

Phant'sy: How better than they are, are all things made
 By wonder?"

Could anything be more Baconian than this? Lovely lines are spoken by Wonder of "Paunce, the lily and the rose," of crested lark and yellow bees "of finch's carol, and of turtles' bill"?

Italy was the inspiration not only of most of the Shakespeare Plays, but of the woodland and architectural scenes that mark our Jacobean Masques. Bologna contains a very remarkable pictorial illusion. At the end of a cor-

ridor in an old Monastery Church, S. Michele in Bosco, is an arch through which one sees many lofty pillars and arches, fading away till misty distance hide pillars and arches all from view. Just through the first high arch to the right a few worn steps lead up to an inlet of sunlight streaming through a door.

All this is scenic illusion painted on a dead wall. The effect is as startling as it is wonderful, and like Wonder one too could cry: "I have not seen the place could more surprise."

I quote from the Foreword of "*The Barriers*," an exceedingly interesting and suggestive Masque presented to King James on the occasion of a Marriage.

"It is a noble and just *advantage* that the things subjected to understanding *have*, of those that which are subjected to sense; the one sort are but momentary, and merely taking, the other impressing and lasting. . . . Shortlived are the bodies of all things in comparison of their souls. The outward Celebration or Show. . . though their voice be taught to sound to *present* occasion, their sense doth, or *should*, always lay hold on more removed mysteries." This word Mysteries confirms me in my opinion that Rosicrucians, (disciples of Francis S. Alban) were not at work only then, but *today* too on the Dramatic productions of both England, and *foreign* countries, especially when so admirable, so noble an Allegory is contrived as the Kinema from Germany, "*Metropolis*," lately showing at the Pavilion, Marble Arch.

With the war of Industrial troubles, and the loud dissensions between Capital and Labour, sounding in our ears, we hail such a noble Metaphor and allusion as *Metropolis*. We hail the Union it advocates, the Marriage it symbolises, and we remember words in the *Barriers Masque*,

"Princes attend a tale of wonder,
Truth is descended in a second thunder,
To grace the Nuptial part in the debate,
And end with reconciléd hands these wars."

Bacon has spoken to his disciples and they have heard

and obeyed. This was his message in the Preface to his "*Wisdom of the Ancients.*"

"If any man would let in new light upon the human understanding and conquer prejudice, without raising contention . . . he must have recourse to the method of Allegory, Metaphor, and Allusion."

The *Barriers Masque* was performed at a *Marriage*, it symbolised esoterically the Union of Love and Truth. *Metropolis* is performed to awaken thought and right action, and it too honours the Marriage of Truth and Love.

Those who have seen it will remember that the hero (all Love) is named *Eric*. Substitute *Eros* or *Rose* for *Eric*, and you have a Saviour or Redeemer of men, which is the part *Eric* plays in *Metropolis*.

He works for Union, for Marriage, that is his heart's desire.

The Masque called "*The Barriers*" has these beautiful lines.

"Marriage, Love's object, is it, at whose bright eyes
He lights his torches and calls them his skies.
Love, whose strong virtue wrapt heaven's soul in earth
And made a woman glory in his birth.
For her he wings his shoulders and doth fly
To her white bosom as his sanctuary
In which no lustful finger can profane him
Nor any earth with black eclipses wane him."

Those who have seen *Metropolis* will remember how Eric like Parsifal refuses the blandishments of the syren, and beating at the dividing doors (on which by the way the sacred and secret symbol of Light and Life called Solomon's seal is suggestively chalked in white), he flies through "*black eclipses*" calling loudly on "*Mary*," she who as the *Barriers* has it:

"makes him smile in sorrows and doth stand
Twixt him and all he wants, with her silver hand."

Mary of the Kinema is Truth of the *Barriers Masque* who faces her false prototype. (The *Barriers* has a false imitation of Truth called *Opinion*.) Wonderful is the parallel of this idea in *Metropolis*, even the false one is sent by the evil sorcerer to disseminate false opinion among the

workers, inciting them to scepticism, rebellion, and revolution, whereas Mary with brighter Light, counsels Faith, Hope, and Patience, and belief that in answer to needs and prayers a mediator *will* arise.

Truth: "Who are thou, thus that imitatetest my grace?

In steps, in habit, and resembled face?

Opinion: Grave Time and Industry my parents are.

(Remember please, that *Metropolis* is supposed to be placed in Time a hundred years on ahead.)

Opinion goes on: "My name is Truth, who, through these sounds of war, salutes the light.

Truth: "I am that Truth, *thou* some illusive spright,
Who to my likeness, the black sorceress Night
Hath of these dry and empty fumes created."

Night is a Rosicrucian word, for evil, the enemy which sows tares instead of good wheat. Bacon uses *Night work* in that sense.

Truth: With what an equal brow

To Truth, *Opinion's* confident! And how

Like Truth her habit shows to sensual eyes."

In the Kinema the false Mary succeeds in her efforts with the mob, * sure they are that she is the true Mary.

In the *Barriers* this is said:

"Clear Truth, anon, shall strip thee to the heart;
And show how mere phantastical thou art."

In the Kinema, the false Mary is falsest in that she has no heart. She is nowise married to love. That is shown when burning in flames lit by the deceived populace, the phantastical Mary *laughs* loud and long.

Opinion says in the *Barriers*:

"Untouched Virginity, laugh out, to see
Freedom in fetters placed, and urg'd against thee!"

Never could this be better depicted than in *Metropolis* when wagging her head to and fro in the fire, the false Mary laughs and laughs and laughs. But let who wins, laugh. Falsity drops from its pedestal and is burnt to ashes, as the *Barriers* says of Truth

*"Man, his approach or assumption of Divine or Angelic nature is the perfection of his form, the error or false imitation of which good is that which is the Tempest of human life."—*Ad. of Learning*.

“brightness do undo her charms.”
 “ ‘Tis mere Opinion
 That in Truth's forced robe, for Truth had gone!”

Truth says;

Vanish adulterate Truth, and never dare
 With proud maids' praise, to press where *nuptials* are,
 And Champions. Since you see the Truth I held.
 To sacred Hymen reconciled yield.
 Nor so to yield think it the least despite
 It is to conquer to submit to right.”

And now a word in commemoration of St. George, England's noble Champion, whose emblem is the red, red rose, and whose Day was so lately celebrated.

It is no chance that has caused a certain body of great Verulam's followers to wish to celebrate our Shakespeare's Birth on the same day. Our knight of the Spear who shook it in the face of ignorance. I ask your leave to quote once more from “The Barriers,” the *Jacobean Masque*:

“What place is this so bright that doth remain
 Yet undemolished? St. George's Portico.” Where now
 Knighthood lives honoured with a crownéd brow.
 Does he not sit like Mars, or one that had the better of him in his
 armour clad?
 Or like Apollo to the world's view, the minute after he the Python
 slew.”

“Apollo! Yes, thee, Noble Bacon, the darling of thy
 Fatherland!” as one of his contemporaries calls him in his
 “Elegy.”

The Apollo of dear, dear, England; the St. George who is England's best and bravest knight, St. Alban, the first sacrifice in James' reign, who hoped he might be the last. His Fort the Theatre. His Portico leads to the field of his Triumphs on the Stage.

The *Barriers Masque* has these beautiful lines:

“My thought grows great of him and fain would break
 Invite him forth Glory of Knights, and hope of all the
 earth,
 Come forth. Your fortress bids. Who from your birth hath bred
 you to this hour and for this throne,
 This is the field to make your virtue known.
 Come Knighthood, like a flood upon these lists,
 To make the field here good.”

BACON'S SECRET SIGNATURE TO CONTEMPORARY PLAYS.

BY HENRY SEYMOUR.

In my last contribution I attempted to shew that the original ascription of "Shake-speare" to the Great Plays was designed to deceive the "groundlings," and that the historical facts as well as the cumulative, corroborative circumstances in connection therewith made it manifest that the real author, from the outset, desired to conceal his identity from all except the select circle of wits who were sharp enough to pierce the veil.

I now propose to show that Francis Bacon, the real author of the plays, not only cunningly insinuated his signature into the very text of many of them by the method of the acrostic associated with certain initial letters of his lines, but that in the use of this method he closely followed an historical precedent which had been previously adopted by Francesco Colonna in his *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili*, and which had been published at Venice anonymously in 1499, more than half-a-century before Bacon was born.

Although the original (1597) edition of the play of *King Richard II.* was issued anonymously, as I have already pointed out, the arrangement of the lines upon its title-page sufficiently indicated Bacon as its author, in the following acrostic:—

THE
Tragedie of King Ri-
chard the se-

Cond.

As it hath beene publikely acted

By the right Honorable the
Lord Chamberlaine his Ser-
vants.

In the edition of 1598, which soon followed the first, and which bore the name "William Shake-speare" upon its title-page as author, the arrangement of the lines of the title-page was changed, but the signature was nevertheless covertly arranged in the text itself, for in Act I., Sc. 3, we discover a more direct acrostic signature in the following lines:—

Banish'd this fraile sepulchre of our flesh,
As now our flesh is banish'd from this Land,
Confesse thy Treasons, ere thou flye this Realme.

The ingenious use of the initial word *Confesse* in the third line easily suggests the pre-name *Francis* by the initial and terminal letters of the second syllable, *f,esse*.

Perhaps the well-known example in Act I., Sc. 2, of *The Tempest* is the most direct and complete acrostic to be found in the Folio of 1623:—

For thou must know farther.
Mira. You have often
Begun to tell me what I am, but stopt
And left me to a bootlesse inquisition,
Concluding, stay: not yet.

The addition here of the Christian name initial is very suggestive, but what is more convincing is the fact that the seven final letters of the word *Concluding* equal, cabalistically, the number 67, which is precisely the sum of the numerical equivalents of the name *Francis*.

In *Hamlet*, Act I., Sc. 3, we have a further variation of the acrostic, thus:—

And in the Morne and liquid dew of Youth,
Contagious blastments are most imminent.
Be wary then, best safety lies in feare.

In *Cymbeline*, Act V., Sc. 5, the same form is repeated,

but with another suggestion, as in *The Tempest*, of the Christian name, thus:—

And at first meeting lov'd,
Continew'd so untill we thought he dyed
By the Queen's Dramme she swallow'd.

The curious spelling and contraction of the word *Continew'd* (spelt in the modern way elsewhere in the play) at once also suggests *Francis* if we tick off the final letter,—as hinted by the use of the apostrophe,—for the sum of the numerical equivalents of the remaining letters of the second and third syllables amounts again to 67!

In the humorous introductory lines of *Julius Caesar*, Act I., Sc. 1, the direct form again appears, but is confined to the initial letters of the *spoken* words:—

Mur. **B**ut what Trade art thou? Answer me directly.
Cob. **A** Trade Sir, that I hope I may use, with a
 safe
Conscience, which is indeed Sir, a
 Mender of bad soules.

A similar confinement to the spoken word is to be found in *The Second Part of Henry the Sixth* (p. 137, Histories, First Folio), but the curious manner in which the signature is formed shows a departure from the previously considered forms:—

Lieu. **F**irst let my words stab him, as he hath me.
Base slave, thy words are blunt, and so art
 thou.
Lieu. **C**onvey him hence.

If we admit this more-or-less indirect form of signature to be anything but fortuitous, then it were easy to produce hundreds of similar examples in the First Folio alone, characterised by the most peculiar and significant variations.

If we examine the alleged apocryphal plays of "Shakespeare" we may discover further curious and analogous

instances. For example, in *Lochrine*, Prologue, Act II., the familiar form is presented:—

And that his kingdome should for all endure.
But, love, proud *Phineus* with a band of men,
Contriv'd of sun-burnt *Aethiopians*.

In the *Life and Death of Lord Cromwell*, Act IV., Sc. 3, we again have the direct form:—

By my faith, your summe is more then mine,
And yet I am not much behinde you too,
Considering that to-day I paid at Court.

In *Edward III.*, Act III., Sc. 2, the form is the same, except that it is in reverse:—

Content thee, man; they are farre enough from
 hence,
And will be met, I warrant ye, to their cost,
Be fore they breake so far into the Realme.

In the *Life of Sir John Oldcastle*, Act V., Sc. 9, another curious variation occurs:—

Lord Po. **B**ut do it secretly, you be not seene,
And make some signe that I may know
 your mind.
No **C**obham now, nor madame, as you
 love us.

In *The Lamentable and True Tragedy of M. Arden of Fevershame* (Act V., Sc. 1.) there is a peculiar example of a double acrostic, thus:—

And cause suspition where els would be none.
Ales. Why take that way that M(aister)
 Mosbie doeth;
But first **C**onvey the body to the fields.

Mos. Until to-morrow, sweete Ales, now
farewell:

And see you **C**onfesse nothing in any case.

But cleave to us as we wil stick to you.

In *Edward II.*, Act V., Sc. 2, (ascribed to "Marlowe"),
Queen Isabella speaks:—

Be thou persuaded that I love thee well;

And therefore, so the prince my son be safe

(Whom I esteem as dear as these mines eyes)

Conclude against his father what thou wilt.

There are numerous acrostic signatures of Bacon in other plays of "Marlowe," but the forms in many of these are less definite, as though the author were engaged in the experiment of "feeling his way," with a sense of apprehension. It must be remembered that "Shakespeare" first appeared upon the scene as "author" in about four months after the sudden death of "Marlowe," and that the works of "Marlowe" are wrapped up in a similar obscurity as those of "Shakespeare." Only one of his alleged plays, *Tamburlaine*, if I remember aright, was issued during his lifetime and that was anonymous. *After his death*, this and other plays appeared with "Marlowes" name attached as their author.*

The signatures in "Marlowe's" plays follow closely the less conspicuous form as that displayed also in "Greene's" lyrics.

In *A Maiden's Dream* (Greene), the form follows more nearly that of Colonna,—the suggestive initials of the name appear as a signal, while the remaining letters are to be found in another word of one or other of the lines involved:—

*Vitzthm von Eckstadt, in *Shakspeare and Shakespeare*, set out to prove that Francis Bacon wrote the dramas of "Shakespeare" and "Marlowe." This work was published at Stuttgart as early as 1888;

But in religion he was **constant**, bold,
And still a sworn profess'd foe to all.

In *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus* (Quarto 1604),
 Act 2., Sc. 1., the direct form, reversed, appears:—

Faust. **C**onsummatum est, this bill is ended.
And Faustus hath bequeathed his soul to
 Lucifer.
But what is this inscription on mine arm?

In Act 2., Sc. 1., of the same play, however, the earlier
 Colonna form also appears:—

A greater subject fitteth Faustus' wit:
Bid **E**conomy farewell, Galen come.

The plays attributed to "George Peele" reveal a similar
 form of the acrostic, as far as I have looked into a few of
 them. For instance, in *The Arraignment of Paris* (Pro-
 logue) we have:—

And stately Ilium's lofty towers be razed
By **con**quering hands of the victorious foe.

A further departure occurs in the same play, by which
 the second syllable of the name is cunningly changed in
 the spelling, while remaining virtually the same phoneti-
 cally. In Act 1., Sc. 1.:—

A bunting lamb; nay, pray you feel no bones:
Believe me now my **cunning** much I miss.

And in Act 1., Sc. 2:—

Because a Gorgon for her lewd misdeed,—
A piece of **cunning**, trust me, for the nones.

A still further double in the approved Colonna style;
 In Act 2., Sc. 1.:—

But take the sense as it is plainly meant;
And let the fairest ha't, I am **con**tent.

Also in Act 2., Sc. 1.:—

Approves itself to be most excellent;
But that fair face that doth me most **con**tent,

28 Bacon's Secret Signature

In *David and Bethsabe*, Act 2., Sc. 3, the same form is repeated, but another line is taken in:—

Because he forc'd Thamar shamefully,
And hated her, and threw her forth his doors,
And this did he; and they with him **con**spire.

In this play also, in Act IV., Sc. 2, the word *cunning* is employed:—

But since I vow myself to learn the skill
And holy secrets of his mighty hand
Whose **cun**ning tunes the music of my soul.

Such instances could be multiplied almost indefinitely. And the contracted signature, *Baco*, is quite ubiquitous. I will cite one example of this from the final canto of *The Masque of Flowers*,—a masque undoubtedly written by Bacon, and performed by the gentlemen of Gray's Inn in the Banqueting House at Whitehall before King James and his Court on Twelfth Night, 1613-14,—which reveals the "Baco" inscription in one of its several transpositions:—

But now is Brittain fit to be,
A seate for a great Monarchie,
Offer we to Her high deserts,
Chor. Praises of truth, incense of hearts,
By whom ech thing with gaine reverts.

There are numerous other contemporary plays which might be searched by any who have the inclination to do so, and particularly the Masques, and at least several of the plays, attributed to "Ben Jonson" of which Bacon is more than suspected to be the true author. Nor need the quest be confined to plays alone, but might be profitably extended to the pastoral and heroic poems of the period. The Colonna form is certainly conspicuous in "Edmund Spencer's" *Fairy Queen*, which I happen to have before me. In Canto II., of the First Book, thus:—

But double griefs afflict **con**cealing harts,
As raging flames who striveth to suppress.

And in Canto II., Second Book,—

But young Perissa was of other mind,
Full of disport, still laughing, loosely light,
And quite **con**trary to her sisters kind.

Also on "Shake-speare's Sonnets," the ornamental headpiece, known as the Double A piece, is obviously an ingenious monogramic Script of the letters in the name *Bacon*, if turned about for their identification.

In Sonnet XIV., the familiar acrostic form also stands out:—

But from thine eies my knowledge I derive,
And **con**stant stars in them I read such art

And in Sonnet XXVIII.,—

But day and night and night by day oprest.
And each (though enimes to ethers raigne)
Doe in **con**sent shake hands to torture me.

And in Sonnet CL.,—

But rysing at thy name doth point out thee,
As his triumphant prize, proud of this pride,
He is **con**tented thy poore drudge to be.

In *A Lover's Complaint*:—

And so much lesse of shame in me remaines,
By how much of me their reproch **con**taines.

Belev'd her eies, when they t'assaile begun,
All vowes and **con**secrations giving place:

In conclusion, there can be but one argument advanced against the foregoing examples having been purposely designed by Bacon himself, and that is that they are merely instances of peculiar accident or coincidence. But the odds are against such an argument. Try, if you please, to similarly extract "Shakspeare" from either of the plays which were published anonymously; or indeed the names of either of the other "authors" under review from their works before any authorship ascription had

appeared in respect of them. On the other hand, it is well known that the use of the acrostic signature to anonymous works was not peculiar to Bacon. Dante used it in the *Divina Commedia*, as Mr. Arensberg has shewn in his *Cryptography of Dante*. Boccaccio used it in *Amorosa Visione*, but constructed it on the units of consecutive stanzas. And as though to call attention to the method, "Ben Jonson," in the "Argument" to *Volpone*, spells "Volpone" by the initial letters of all the lines.

Illustrative of this acrostic skill is a poem in memory of Sir Francis Walsingham, a contemporary of Bacon's; and by the last three consecutive units (which read **HAM**), we may be sure that Francis Bacon was its witty author:

Shall Honour, Fame, and Titles of Renowne,
In Clods of Clay be thus inclosed still?
Rather will I, though wiser wits may frowne,
For to inlarge his Fame extend my skill.
Right gentle Reader, be it knowne to thee,
A famous Knight doth here interred lye,
Noble by Birth, renowned for Policie,
Confounding Foes, which wrought our Jeopardy,
In Forraine Countries their Intents he knew,
Such was his zeal to do his Country good,
When Dangers would by Enemies ensue,
As well as they themselves, he understood.
Launch forth ye Muses into Streams of Praise,
Sing, and sound forth Praise-worthy Harmony;
In *England* Death cut off his dismall Dayes,
Not wronged by Death, but by false Trechery.
Grudge not at this imperfect Epitaph;
Herein I have exprest my simple Skill,
As the First-fruits proceeding from a Graffe:
Make then a better whosoever will.

ST. ALBAN'S HELMET.

BY J. E. ROE.

[We offer no excuse for printing the following contribution from the pen of that veteran Baconian author, Mr. J. E. Roe, of the United States. It is probably his last effort, inasmuch as he has not only passed his 85th year of age, but, pathetic to relate, is now almost entirely deprived of sight. It is his wish that this communication shall appear in *Baconiana*.

The Sonnets of "Shake-speare" have always been regarded as enigmatic, and numerous "interpretations" of their hidden meaning have appeared from time to time. The entirely original interpretation put forward here by Mr. Roe, viz., that some of the Sonnets refer to Bacon's Fall in 1621, whereas the publication date of the original edition of the Sonnets is marked 1609, savours of an anachronism, to say the least. But, as Mr. Roe premises in his concluding paragraph, the date, like the author's name, is a feigned one. The late Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence used to say that we should always be prepared to ignore the veracity of publication dates when dealing with the works of Bacon. It has also been shewn by other writers that in two or three instances in connection with books supposed to have been written by Bacon, false-dating has been a conspicuous feature. In the present case, therefore, it were wise to withhold hasty judgment and to preserve an open mind on the particular point in question.—EDITORS.]

THE word Shakespeare was the helmet, the shield, the *nom de plume*, under which St. Alban, in other words, Sir Francis Bacon couched a considerable portion of the writings produced by him during his first literary period.

He was possessed of great subtlety, and in the use of figures of speech, ancient fables, cover-words and symbols he was gifted, and he ever placed great emphasis upon the subject of *time*. He does this notably in those covert compendiums of his known as the Shakespeare Sonnets wherein he relates facts touching the disgrace put upon him, the darkness of the time and his "purposed overthrow" by the King.

We here make use of the words "purposed overthrow" for the reason that the author, himself, makes use of them in Sonnet 90, wherein he asks that the "purposed overthrow" be not lingered out. That a sovereign or king is surely referred to in some of these Sonnets, see, please, Sonnets 57 and 58 which distinctly concern both sovereign and subject, whoever may be their author.

In Sonnet 57 we have: "whilst I my sovereign watch the clock for you." And in Sonnet 58 the author says to the king:

"Be where you list your charter is so strong
That you yourself may privilege your time
To what you will; to you it doth belong
Yourself to pardon of self-doing crime.
"I am to wait, though waiting so be hell;
Nor blame your pleasure, be it ill or well."

These two sonnets were written, we say, while their author Bacon, was endeavouring to secure the king's promised pardon, deliberately made to him after a quick jump from the covert business of certain "Referees" to bribery charges, later to be touched herein; but we do not claim these soliloquies, these self-reminders were in any way intended for the king's eyes, let it be remembered.

To permit the author of these Sonnets to tell of his own personal overthrow and of that wonder, his tabular system of philosophy, shall be the business of this paper. His own significant words will reveal to the careful student and we shall thus need to particularize but little.

The author desired to be known by his honorary title St. Alban and he desired to become "beauty's pattern to succeeding men," but was prevented by the wrongs of time, see Sonnet 19 later to be quoted in this paper.

The word "beauty" in the Sonnets to be quoted refers to the Author himself, as a "pattern," let it be remembered. Note "beauty" in Sonnet 53. It is a poetic figure for that which inheres within him, his truth, his purposes, his doings, his works. Touching these works at this dread hour see, please, "beauty's dead fleece" in Sonnet 68, later quoted herein.

Again Sonnet 63 ends thus:

“His beauty shall in these black lines be seen
“And they shall live, and he in them still green.”

We shall soon find this “beauty” was slandered by an untrue shame, that is, “with a bastard shame,” using the author’s own words.

These Sonnets are subtle, they must be stayed upon, they must be studied and closely, if you would know the real truths involved in them, and this must extend equally as well to the referred to, as to the quoted Sonnets. Space forbids full quotation. Again, some poetic license must be allowed in any theory of their interpretation.

The Sonnets have long been the world’s literary puzzle. They have thus far been considered enigmatic as to any special design or purpose. Their correct placing will go far towards their interpretation. Their numbering but confused their relation to each other.

Those particular Sonnets which definitely concern the author’s overthrow were couched, we judge, at or near the transit of events. By the course taken with the Author, whoever he may have been, he evidently expected to be attained at the writing of Sonnet 88. See what he says there to the king.

As Sonnet 127 has long been misinterpreted we purpose to examine it with more than ordinary care. In it, the author presents Time as his governor, his mistress; he presents her brows and eyes as raven black, so dark was it at the time of his overthrow. Bacon elsewhere personifies Time as his governor and in a non-attributed work he calls himself “the son of time.”

As we have elsewhere shown, Sir Francis Bacon’s overthrow was a covert piece of work. It had a borrowed face put upon it. This “borrowed face,” the bribery charges, would never have been made nor would they have prevailed had it not been for that which lay behind. Bribery was the occasion and not the cause of his overthrow.

Francis Bacon’s overthrow consisted of a secret, thwarted

Bacon scheme for the King's revenue wherein many Englishmen lost their money. The English treasury had long been placed in commission in order to devise projects with which to supply the king's lavish expenditure, Parliament having persistently refused to supply them. These courses had unduly raised the king's wants abroad, and notably to Spain with whom his son's marriage treaty was then on foot. The Bacon scheme was now to be carried covered, was to be carried with great secrecy. It took its definite shape, we say, in the Raleigh voyage of 1617 and 1618. It was patched along and the overthrow came three years later in 1621.

The Raleigh business was surely the king's covered, his despicable piece of work, and he did not purpose to have it opened, hence from the work of the "Referees" in the case came the quick jump to the bribery charges and silence was imposed, not only upon Bacon, but upon all concerned in the business.

Note here "My tongue-tied patience" in Sonnet 140, then see "tongue-tied" in Sonnet 66, which concerns Buckingham, the leech, that "needy nothing," the king's favourite. Love in this Sonnet concerns Philosophy.

That losses to others from the true cause, the secret revenue scheme, made the author, Bacon, sad, see Sonnet III. His entry into public life he now laments, also in this Sonnet.

Whose money ultimately paid Raleigh's forfeited 40,000 pound bond? It was not given until after Raleigh had set sail. Raleigh was one whom Bacon sought to interest in his great posterity scheme.

Touching Bacon's known interview with the king following the jump made to the bribery charges, see "since I left you" in Sonnet 113. He was "called to that audit by advised respects," by the king, Sonnet 49. See what he says to the king in Sonnet 118. That the king's part in the work was "as black as hell, as dark as night," see Sonnet 147.

When Bacon's estate, including York House, was confiscated for the benefit of those who had lost money in the

secret revenue scheme, the case was dropped. He had no trial and so the business seemed to have a fair face upon the part of those concerned in it. This was the "borrowed face" of Sonnet 127. The taint of bribery is not to be found in any one of the confessions made by Bacon. These confessions, he saw, they purposed to have to justify their work and he gave them as the shortest and easiest way, knowing well the king's intention. See here what Spedding says concerning these confessions in his *Life of Bacon*, Vol. 7, pages 251 to 280, then 212 to 251. Touching the jump from the "referees" to the bribery charges, see pages 134 to 214.

These confessions were the set-down story of Sonnet 88. See then the Sonnets 89 and 90 and say that the Stratford player, Shakspeare, was the author of these covert compendiums, if you can. Shakspeare was the player, Shakespeare was the *nom de plume*. These three Sonnets are the genuine clinchers of our claim touching the overthrow. The king's commission drawn by Bacon for Raleigh's voyage will be found in the Spedding Works, Vol. 6, p. 387 to 391.

We are the first to tell the true story of Francis Bacon's overthrow, and we have introduced him as at his worst, and shown that that worst was not a true worst, but a bastard. This is more believable for the reason that his life was ever regular, both before and after the overthrow. He says: "I was blown down as by a tempest."

We give here some facts of history out of which this subtle Sonnet 127 grew, in order to see more readily the true meaning of some of his subtle words. For instance, what meaning is to be given to the words "fairing the foul?" Biography is couched beneath these enigmas, and we must know some touches of it, in aid of their true opening. For instance, note "bastard shame" of this sonnet. In any sense looked at the sonnet is very subtle, and should be viewed in connection with others bearing upon the same subject. As "bastard signs of fair," Sonnet 68, and "slay me not by art," Sonnet 129. The work of Bacon's overthrow was foul, was black, but rendered fair

by having placed upon it "the false borrowed face of art." Note carefully the word "therefore" and all that impinges upon it.

Nature's two hands of this Sonnet should now be stayed upon for a bit of thinking in the light of that which has gone before. First, they were the "Referees" scheme, then "the borrowed face." Bacon says: "Heat and cold are Nature's two hands."

Elsewhere we have shown that there were three combined interests involved in the overthrow. Note in this the "several plot" in Sonnet 137. In it, he calls his "Love" a "blind fool" for not heeding this "several plot." This was the "false plague," to which both his heart and his eyes were now transferred.

We judge this Sonnet to have been written by Bacon immediately following the jump from the business of the "Referees" to the bribery charges, and when he first found himself within the trap. See Bacon's Letters by Spedding, Vol. 7, p. 213.

Among other things he here says:

"But Job himself, or whoever was the justest judge, by such hunting for matters against him as hath been used against me, may for a time seem foul, especially in a time when greatness is a mark and accusation is the game. And if this is to be a Chancellor, I think if the Great Seal lay upon Hounslow Heath, nobody would take it up. But the king and your Lordship, will, I hope, put an end to these miseries one way or other."

The person here referred to as "your Lordship" was the Duke of Buckingham, the king's favourite. His levity as well as his grip over Bacon at this time is clearly portrayed in Sonnet 66.

Bacon, in Sonnet 70 says to himself:

"That thou art blamed shall not be thy defect,
"For slander's mark was ever yet the fair."

Note Bacon's word "mark" in each of the quotations. In Sonnet 121 he again speaks to himself.

Bacon's overthrow was designed to shield the king. See his own words for it in Sonnet 125 where we have "but mutual render, only me for thee." Then see what he says to the "suborned informer."

This sonnet is basic in character. It was evidently written when its author believed his great literary scheme had been thwarted by his overthrow. It is a genuine tell-tale.

By interpretation these Sonnets, these compendiums, become something new. They are poetic jottings down of then existing events. Their words are like goads or nails driven in. "The words of the wise are as goads and nails fastened by the masters of assemblies which are given from one shepherd." Following his overthrow Bacon said: "I shall devote myself to letters, instruct the actors and serve posterity."

In the dark hour of his overthrow he, in Sonnet 25 says: "Let those who are in favour with their stars," etc.

In Sonnet 123 the author returns to his already mentioned "dark-eyed mistress," his governor, Time:

"No, Time thou shalt not boast that I do change
"Thy pyramids built up with newer might."

And he closes it with:

"This I do vow and this shall ever be;
"I shall be true despite thy scythe and thee."

The word "Love" in the preceding sonnet now gives apt opportunity to call attention to Bacon's great tabular system of philosophy distinctly alluded to in Sonnet 19, as "love's fair brow."

He turns from the king's service to that love and duty which ever bound him to philosophy.

"Devouring Time, blunt thou the lion's paws,"
etc.

We have shown earlier that the word "beauty" as used in this Sonnet refers to the author himself, as a poetic figure for that which inheres within him. Its word "him" should be "me." It is one of the pronoun cover

words used in the Sonnets by the author when referring to himself, and to be touched upon later.

In the Sonnet the author asks that his "love's fair brow" may be shielded from the wrongs of time. These words, "my love's fair brow," directly allude to the author's "new born child," his "Noblest Birth of Time," his "Great Instauration," as we shall see later.

That the author, whoever he may have been, desired to protect himself and his doings, his "beauty" and his works from "confounding ages' cruel knife," see Sonnets 63 and 64.

Bacon, in his last will made December 19th, 1625, about four months prior to his going into concealment, which he did in 1625, says: "For my name and memory I leave it to men's charitable speeches and to foreign nations and the next ages." He also says, touching his writings, that his "cabinets, boxes and presses" contain "That durable part of my memory." And these concern his secondary literary period.

In "my love's fair brow" of Sonnet 19, we have a direct allusion to the author's child of philosophy, that something absolutely new of Sonnet 59, and its eternised tables of Sonnet 122; and its "great bases for eternity" of Sonnets 124 and 125. It is the author's "blessed key" of Sonnet 52 which was not then in "Time's chest" of Sonnet 65, but he feared it might be stolen, Sonnet 48.

This key of Sonnet 52 was Bacon's "Formula of Interpretation;" it should enter his *Novum Organum* at aphorism 21 of its second book. It has never as yet been placed. It has been and still is in concealment, and his philosophy will remain a closed door until its recovery. This thought is new, and as far as we know we are the first to voice it; and this we now do for the benefit of students of English Literature; but here we are aside from our present work. This concerns Bacon's second literary period and his capital letter cipher. These capital letters will yet, we say, call to relation his works of both periods into one stupendous whole. His "Alphabet of Nature" centres here, in the strange use of capital letters, and called his "Cypher of Cyphers."

The mentioned "Formula" as well as the *Novum Organum* itself was structured for the use of an Interpreter. See the closing paragraph of its second book. But the Interpreter must first have the Formula which was the 4th part of the "Instauration." The knowledge concerning the contents of this "Formula" Bacon in his works ever kept covered. And with us in this particular statement, every careful Baconian student must agree.

Bacon, touching the publication of his writings in regard to this "Formula," which concerns an ascending and descending scale of axioms, distinctly states: "Not but that I know it is an old trick of imposters to keep a few of their follies back from the public which are indeed no better than those they put forward; but in this case it is no imposture at all, but a sober foresight which tells me that the Formula itself of interpretation and the discoveries made by the same, will thrive better if committed to the charge of some fit and selected minds and kept private." Bacon's Letters, by Spedding, Vol. 3. p.87.

But why stayed? This—the ruin of his name whether just or unjust—Bacon very well knew if this new light, the Formula were now to be brought forth that the infernal devil of human prejudices would but stumble over and brush it to the ash-heap as by a wave of the hand.

It may thus be distinctly seen that Bacon intended to and did reserve this "Formula" for a private succession.

Mr. Spedding has confused and belittled the entire Baconian system by treating this undated as well as another undated paper of equal importance to the subject as abandoned fragments. They were both written we say and turned into Latin after the publication of the *Novum Organum* in 1620.

This second paper "Valerius Terminus," showing his unwillingness to reveal his method, we shall refer to later. He thus, as have others, criticised a system without having it, that is, with its headlight, the "Formula" in abeyance. This Formula or 4th part is nowhere to be found in Bacon's writings. Suffice it to say that this Formula was "Time's best jewel" of Sonnet 65. At the writing

of it, it evidently was not in "Time's chest" for we therein have:

"O fearful meditation, where, alack

"Shall Time's best jewel from Time's chest lie Hid?"

The author had yet an untold wonder which was yet to be brought forth. And this is told in many of the sonnets. It has not been locked up in any chest and he fears it might be stolen. See Sonnet 48, where it also appears he had other jewels, other literary works which were "the prey of every vulgar thief." And these jewels were but trifles to the king. And how careful the author was of any wrong-doing when first made chancellor.

Return now to Sonnet 124.

Notice in Sonnet 37 that the author takes all his comfort in the worth and truth of this child of philosophy.

We may in Sonnet 59 find Francis Bacon's "new born child" of Philosophy, his *Novum Organum* definitely alluded to. It was the second burden of the Sonnet. Its first birth or "burden" having been thus the "former child." Bacon claimed that his tabular system was absolutely new to the world and wholly unknown to the ancients. In the Sonnets the author's brains were beguiled, only in case the child was not absolutely new, and a "composed wonder."

Touching now this child, "this composed wonder" of the Sonnet, we introduce Francis Bacon's letter on presenting a copy of his New Organ, to the University of Cambridge, Oct. 31, 1620. "As your son and pupil, I desire to lay in your bosom my new born child. Otherwise I should hold it for a thing exposed. Let it not trouble you that the way is new; for in the revolutions of time, such things must needs be. Nevertheless the ancients retain their proper honour that is of wit and understanding; for faith is due only to the word of God and to experience. Now to bring the science back to experience is not permitted; but to grow them anew out of experiences, though laborious, is practicable. May God bless you and your studies. Your most loving Son. Francis Bacon."—*Bacon's Letters*, by Spedding, Vol. 7. p. 136.

Again in presenting a copy of his New Organ to the king Bacon says: "Certainly they are quite new; totally new in their very kind; and yet they are copied from a very ancient model; even the world itself and the nature of things and of the mind. And to say truth, I am wont for my own part to regard this work as a child of time rather than of wit; such only wonder being that the first notion of the thing, and such great suspicions concerning matters long established, should have come into any man's mind. All the rest follows readily enough. "Bacon's Phil. Works by Spedding" Vol. 4. p. II.

Bacon's authorship of the Sonnets under review can surely require no further proof than its critical contrast by the reader with his words here given. Note in the letter to the king the mentioned rare "wonder." Note that it is called a "child"; that it is totally new; that it is copied after the world as a model or frame.

If now the player Shakspeare was the author of these sonnets, he, too, was possessed of a great wonder"; "new Born child," the frame of nature and its "Tables of Discovery"; and a noted key; "time's best jewel" together with a *nom de plume* or "weed," see Sonnet 76. He, too, met his overthrow, by a sovereign or king; he too, was possessed both in the plays and the Sonnets of Bacon's wonderful vocabulary, which is identical in both plays and Sonnets.

Bacon's first book of the *Novum Organum* was designed chiefly to prepare the mind for the reception of the new method. Its second book concerns itself chiefly with the structure of distinctive "Tables of Discovery." These, we say, are the distinguished tables of Sonnet 122.

The author here seems to claim a kind of divine assistance in these tables. They were to eternize his name. And they were to make him long outlive "that idle rank" engaged in his overthrow.

Bacon says, "I have raised up a light in the obscurity of philosophy which will be seen centuries after I am dead." Again he says "I confess that I have as vast contemplative ends, as I have civil moderate ends, for I have taken all

knowledge to be my providence." He elsewhere makes reference to "the deepest providence of my mind." Lord Macaulay says, "With great minuteness of observation, he had an amplitude of comprehension that was never yet vouchsafed to any other human being."

The Bacon system was in method absolutely new. It was constantly dealing with nature and not with arguments. It was based upon distinctive "Tables of Discovery." These tables are important in that all else in the system is based on them. All other systems of philosophy are logical systems and based on arguments. These tables are structured form selected particulars of knowledge drawn from a "Natural History" framed after Bacon's own particular method.

Their business is to deal with the concrete for its disclosures, that is, to find those particular instances that are prerogative.

The wonder of the system arose out of the discoveries which its tables reveal to Bacon, to wit, the forms or laws of what he calls "the simple natures" as of light, heat, cold, rare, dense, fluid, solid, etc., which simple natures are but few and as an alphabet.

This philosophy took origin in Bacon's investigation of the subject of light and colours, in transparent bodies, that is, with uncoloured substances as air, water, glass, etc.

He had distinctive views on the origin of light, also on the configuration of bodies. He says "Light is God's first form or law."

The business of the already mentioned "Formula," which was to be kept secret, was by the aid of these tables designed to teach the freeing of a direction to find these forms or laws of the "simple natures" and their use, but the method of doing this Bacon distinctly tells us he is not yet ready to reveal. See Bacon's Phil. Works, by Spedding. Vol. 3. p.236 & 7. He here begins what he elsewhere calls "the setting up of the mark of knowledge by the placing of the white." White is the mark to be aimed at in facing directions. It is his first step from transparent

bodies. It is the union of all colours in nature. They, colours, are all produced by difference in configuration. See the mentioned pages and our *Sir Francis Bacon's Own Story*, p. 64 to 72.

This freeing of direction to find the forms of a "Simple nature" was the summit of his art. This we say again was "time's best jewel" of Sonnet 65 and the "blessed key" of Sonnet 52.

We are of the impression that a new literary age will yet take its root from the recovery of this "Formula," and we would gladly pursue this subject further, but we are dealing chiefly with the question of authorship. And we are here making definite proof of it to posterity, let the pseudo critic say what he will.

In conclusion, we here turn to Sonnet 68 where the author declares his intention to live a new "second life on second head."

This Sonnet must ever indicate the line of demarkation between Francis Bacon's first and secondary periods. This Sonnet contrasts the government or good days of Queen Elizabeth with the "bastard signs of fair" of those of James I. under whom the author met his disgrace, his already mentioned overthrow. It is in these words:

"Thus is his Cheek," etc.

The pronouns his and him in this Sonnet should be in the first person, hence *my*, and *me*. This use of pronouns in the second and third person instead of the first occurs in many places in the Sonnets. Thus used they are pronoun cover words for the author himself, as we have shown elsewhere. In direct relation with these pronoun cover words we will later interpret the enigma upon their title page subscribed T.T. "These bastard signs of fair" have already been touched earlier in this paper.

The author's "literary dead fleece" of the Sonnets, by the ruin of his name is now to be "dressed new," reborn, in other words, is to have a new birth or burden. See in the already quoted Sonnet 59.

"This new-born child" and its author are now to have

a "second life on second head." We say, a second literary period and hence the reserved "Formula," the key to both periods.

Its words, "the olden tresses of the dead" clearly allude to Queen Elizabeth. She was supposed unmarried and was the last of the House of Tudor. But what of the word "before" ? This "the right of sepulchres were shorn away" before or in the very presence of these "olden tresses." This was literally true if Bacon and his brother Essex were sons of the Queen by a valid marriage, between her and her favourite Leicester, and thus her lawful successors as claimed in Bacon's own bi-literal Cypher.

At the Queen's death, James was proclaimed her successor before or in her very presence by Cecil, after she ceased to be able to speak, he declaring she made signs indicating that James was to succeed her. See Knight's *History of England*. Vol. 3. p. 225.

As to the words of this Sonnet:

"And him as for a map doth Nature store
"To show false Art what beauty was of yore."

Francis Bacon, the restorer of ancient learning, says: "So I seem to have my conversation among the ancients more than among these with whom I live."

As to the Author's views of his own inherent gifts, see Sonnets 53, 69, 122, then 55 and 107.

Touching the "second life on second head" of this Sonnet we would say this subject is carefully handled, as are Bacon's Cypher methods, and his sought concealment after 1626, in our work "Sir Francis Bacon's Own Story." When using the expression "as we have shown already" reference is made to this work.

In his attributed writings, Francis Bacon says, "I have, though in a despised weed, procured the good of all men." Note this word "weed" as a cover in Sonnet 76.

By a "T.T." enigma on the title page of the sonnets, and the confusion of an ante-date, their numbering, and by the use of pronoun cover words, the true interpretation of these Sonnets has been stayed now for nearly three centuries.

THE MASKS OF BACON AND OTHER WORKS OF Mr. J. E. ROE.

By S. A. E. HICKSON, Brig. General, C.B., D.S.O.,
(retired.)

THE remarkable works of Mr. J. E. Roe are as yet little known in this country. A few remarks as to their general purport may therefore be of service in introducing them.

Mr. Roe is still writing, though now 86 years old, and I was myself introduced to him and his work very kindly by Mrs. C. Thompson, now of Boston, Mass.; but like myself a native of Highgate, where I was born within two hundred yards of the spot where stood Arundel House, whence Bacon disappeared from before the world's eye in 1626.

Mr. Roe published his first and most important book in 1891—“*Bacon and His Masks*,” that is, in the same year that Mrs. Henry Pott published her study of “*Francis Bacon and His Secret Society*.” Both came to the same conclusion, that Bacon's was the Master mind of some vast organisation and confederacy, including publishers and printers and papers makers, as well as translators, composers, scribes, and versifiers. Yet either reached that opinion through an entirely different process.

Their reasoning is of the highest possible interest to-day, seeing that it is becoming more certain every day that Francis Bacon, Baron de Verulam, Vice-comes Sancti Albani, as he is called on the frontispiece of the *Silva Silvarum* was indeed Fra Rosa Crosse, and the Saint Albanus; who as Christian Rosenkreutz of the fabulous “Fama” laid the foundation of the secret Rosicrucian Society, through whose innocent aid he flooded the world and enriched the ages with his crowds of books:—as the elegies addressed to him and known as *Manes Verulamiani*

relate. This was the line that Mrs. Henry Pott pursued with so much energy.

Mr. Roe was equally led to the conclusion that Bacon was the Sovereign head, giving unity to a secret confederacy, in a very different way.

Taking first the *New Atlantis*, which Dr. Rawley says "hath so near affinity (*in one part of it*) with the preceding Natural History" or *Silva Silvarum* with which it was published, he quotes a speech made by Bacon on "the New Atlantis and Recovering of Drowned Minerals" in the House of Lords which concludes thus: "my ends are only to make the world my heir, and the learned fathers (illuminati?) of my Solomon's House the successive and sworn trustees in the dispensation of this great service for God's glory, my prince's magnificence, this Parliament's honour, our countries general good, and the propagation of my own memory."

By these words the reader skilled in the works of Bacon will at once be reminded not only of his own *Valerius Terminus*, containing the *motif* of Don Quixote who sought above all his own unreasoning self-glory; but of the splendid opening words of *Love's Labours Lost*, renouncing fame till time "shall make us heirs to all eternity," and as hinted in the last lines of Sonnet VI.

Mr. Roe then shows how Bacon as author of *The Anatomy of Melancholy* says "I will make an Utopia of mine own, a new Atlantis. . . and why may I not?—*pictoribus atque poetis*, If you know what liberty poets ever had." Did Bacon then, we here ask, follow indeed the same methods as Raphael, Rubens, and Vandycke did in their schools, which Rubens thus describes? "I proceed always in this way;—after having made the drawing, I let my pupils begin the picture, finish ever according to my principles; then I retouch it, and give it my stamp". Even so the great Nelson also spoke of the Nelson "touch," in respect of his strategy.

By such ideas was Mr. Roe led to consider what Bacon meant, when he said "I a man not old, frail in health, involved in civil studies, . . . have done enough if I have

constructed *the machine itself and the fabric*, though I may not have employed or used it." Thus Hamlet says "whilst this machine is to him Hamlet," and in the author's preface of *Don Quixote* we read of his project "to overthrow the (old) ill compiled Machina" of Knightly books; and in the opening pages of "all the Machina of dreamed inventions."

Pondering over what kind of machinery Bacon may have meant, Mr. Roe was struck by the peculiar use of the word "Providence" in his famous letter to Lord Burleigh in 1592, the Keynote of which is "I have taken all knowledge to be my *providence*." He was thus led to turn to the works of Defoe, more particularly *Robinson Crusoe*, in which "Providence" plays such an important part, and the true origin and history of which is also a mystery. This story he found had been "claimed as a product of the pen of Sir Robert Harley, our *noted manuscript collector* and first Earl of Oxford, during his imprisonment in the Tower on a charge of high treason in 1714." Had then the famous collector of the Harleian MSS. come into possession of manuscripts sketched by Bacon in outline, on the same principle as the great painters? And had Bacon indeed left behind him a machinery or Machina, to carry on his great work as "the successive and sworn trustees in dispensation of his great service" to the glory of God, and the benefit of man? This is the clue that Mr. Roe has followed up with results of such amazing interest, though perhaps all will not be prepared to go all lengths with him as present, or without examination.

Certain however it grows, that Bacon did leave behind him such a Machina; and a careful examination of the *New Atlantis* and a comparison of its *Printing and lace headpieces* with other works, leaves it beyond doubt that he was Fra Rosa Crosse, the concealed founder of the Rosicrucians.

A recent critic of *The Times* observed that "The Grand maxim of his (Swift's) beloved Houyhnhnms was to *cultivate reason and to be wholly governed by it?* and no one can deny the family likeness in that respect between "Don

Quixote," "Robinson Crusoe," "Pilgrim's Progress" and "Gulliver's Travels." Now this was the very fundamental principle, from beginning to end of his life, of Francis Bacon, as definitely expressed in his Essay "Of Goodness and Goodness of Nature" in which he commands above all, "a habit of goodness directed by right reason"; and his *Novum Organum* and *De Augmentis* are directed wholly to the culture of this habit; and above all things he tells us, that he worked with all his might to find and establish some definite *art of Direction*.

Thus, as Mr. Roe relates, he wrote no less clearly to Bishop Andrews in 1620, that having completed these parts of his great Instauration, he intended "to proceed in some new part thereof," evidently that 3rd and 4th part in which he talks of examples, types and models of a most noble kind; for he says of the Great Instauration so far that "I have just cause to doubt, that it flies too high over men's heads: I have a purpose therefore, though I break the order of time, to draw it down to the sense, by some *patterns of a natural story and inquisition?*" Have we not before us these very stories and inquisitions? What else are "Don Quixote," "The Argenis," "The Anatomy of Melancholy," "Robinson Crusoe," "Pilgrim's Progress," etc., etc., some of which he saw completed himself and gave them their finishing touch, others he left to be completed by the able pens of succeeding generations. "Epics," says "Don Quixote," may as well be written in prose as in verse." These prose epics are but the patterns which he spoke of.

"I learnt," says Robinson Crusoe, reasoning with himself, "to look upon the bright side of my condition, and less upon the dark side, and to consider what I enjoyed rather than what I wanted," and again "But it is never too late to be wise; and I cannot but advise all considering men, whose lives are attended *with such extraordinary incidents as mine*; or even not so extraordinary, not to slight such secret insinuations of *Providence* or let them come from what visible intelligence they will."

Here we have indeed the true Bacon touch disclosing the Baconian mind. It is the same in "Pilgrim's Progress," when Christian and Hopeful meet the four scientific Shepherds; Knowledge, Experience, Watchful and Sincere; who tell them that "he that wandereth out of the way of understanding shall remain in the congregation of the dead." These four wise men take the two eventually to the top of a high hill, and show them there the value of science by allowing them to look through a "perspective glass" or telescope. This helps them as knowledge does to discern their way, and they continue their journey joyfully, singing:—

"Thus by the shepherds secrets are revealed,
Which from all other men are kept concealed:
Come to the shepherds then if you would know,
Things deep, things hid and that mysterious be.

What have we here but the famous passage in "Love's Labour's Lost," Scene I, in which we learn that the end of study is knowledge of,

"Thing's hid and barr'd, you know, from common-sense."

II.

An Article on Edward Raban and the mysterious Right Right press, by Mr. Geo. Bushnell, in the "Librarian" for November 1926, was recently very kindly sent to me by Mr. Gay, of Messrs. Gay and Hancock, Ltd., of 12 & 13, Henrietta Street, Covent Garden. Thanks to these two gentlemen I have been led to compare the printing and lace head-pieces of the New Atlantis of 1669, (1) with those of the Right-Right Press, in certain works of Henry Ainsworth who was associated with Mr. John Robinson of the Pilgrim Fathers at Amsterdam and Leyden between 1607 and 1620,—and (2) with certain little German Rosicrucian Works of 1617-18.

My investigations in this direction are as yet in no wise complete, but it may set others to work if I mention briefly a few of the points that have come to my notice, and which

may lead to a discovery of very great importance.

The portrait of Bacon which forms the frontispiece of the *Silva Silvarum* Edition of 1669 has below it the following description:—

‘Hon. Francis ‘Bacon,’ Baro de Verulam
Vice-Comes Scti Albani mortuus 9th Aprilis
Anno Dei 1626 Annoq Aetat 66.’

It will be observed that in the original printing this description has 5 varieties of the letter A.

At the top of the opposite frontispiece of the *Silva Silvarum* is the Hebrew symbol for ‘‘Jehovah’’ יהוה found also on Rosicrucian books, and below it is the letter T standing for the T book said to have been found in the grave of Christian Rosenkreutz written on parchment in letters of gold. On this page, too, will be found 5 varieties of the Capital A. Some of these are suggestive of the double A of Venus and Adonis, others of that in Richard II.

The whole volume contains six pieces. (1) The Life of Francis Bacon; (2) the *Silva Silvarum*; (3) The History of Life and Death; (4) the New Atlantis; (5) *Magnalia Naturæ præcipue quoad usus Humanos*; (6) Articles of Enquiry,—but only 5 of these are by Bacon.

In the Century vi. of the *Silva Silvarum*, p. 121, Bacon points out that Prime-Roses, Bryer-Roses, single Musk-Roses, Pinks and Gilliflowers, etc. have *five* leaves, and adds ‘‘We see also, that the Sockets and *Supporters* of flowers are figured; as *in the five Brethren of the Rose* who supported and helped him?’’

On the right hand top corner of the Portrait of the Countess of Pembroke in the National Portrait Gallery will be seen a wreath of briar-roses, pinks, and gilliflowers having 5 leaves or petals. In the centre of this wreath are inscribed the words ‘‘Martii 12 Anno Domini 1614,’’ and below ‘‘No Spring till now,’’ the A being of the same type so conspicuous on the volume concerned, e.g. just as used in the name of Viscount St. Albans on the title page of the *Silva Silvarum*. And the Countess of

Pembroke was the mother of the noble and incomparable pair of brethren to whom the First Folio of Shakespeare plays is dedicated: while 1614 is the year which saw the publication of the first Rosicrucian book, the "Fama," announcing the discovery of the T book. It was the spring of the new faith in Nature's revelations.

Nor have we yet done with the number five which is the sacred number of the Rosicrucians. For, coming now to the beautiful tracery headpieces which in various forms decorate this 1669 issue of the *Silva Silvarum* volume;—on page 5 of the *New Atlantis* will be found a very remarkable specimen of it in five rows. This calls for very special examination. It looks uniform throughout. But it is not so. In the top row four figures from the left is a note of interrogation or query (?). After the thirteenth figure in the second and fourth row are notes of interjection (!). After the fourth figure in the last or fifth row is a Hebrew symbol. The fourth line needs special inspection. It has two similar flowrets at beginning and end, but of the two at the end, one is turned sideways and this is the 26th figure in the whole row, or the 13th figure, numbered from the left, in the half row. The seventh figure from the left in the fourth row is a solitary acorn!

We have in fact before us what is no doubt the most interesting word-puzzle in the world. This head-piece is cipher, which expert decipherers will easily interpret. It is apparently based on the simple and backward count of the alphabet, but I am no expert in cipher knowledge. However, the total figures in the five rows number 85, or 84—counting the 4th row *as only* 26. The three centre rows number 66: or 65, counting the fourth row *as only* 26 instead of 27..

85 (the whole)	stands for	Fr. Bacon Kt,	(simple count).
84	Stands for	Viscount,	(backward count).
66	„	Albanus,	(simple count).
65	„	Saint,	(backward count).

Space forbids more at present.

I shall, however, be surprised if this cipher headpiece

does not reveal Fr. Bacon, Knight, Baron Verulam, and Viscount St. Albanus, as Fra Rosa Crosse, and possibly much more; for Shakespeare and Cervantes, seem plainly signalled here by the numbers 13 or 103, and 11 or 101.

In conclusion, I can only briefly mention now that the "prayer" and italic letters of the "declaration" of Bartholomew in the *New Atlantis* employ similar letters to the Richt-Right Press in a purposely uncertain way, notably the A.

The book found in the ark is said to contain besides the New and Old Testament—symbolised by the T written on fine parchment—"some other books of the new testament which were not at that time written." The whole device is the same as that of the Rosicrucian "Fama" and "Confessio," and announces the same creed:—

"O Lord God of Heaven and Earth thou hast vouchsafed of thy Grace to those of our Order to know thy Works of Creation and true secrets of them. . . . for the laws of nature are thine own laws, and thou exceedest them not (to perform miracles) but upon good cause."

Even so, the early Rosicrucian books indicate, as did Bacon, that it is not the metaphysics of Aristotle that matter, but our infallible faith in God. God is revealed to us in Nature, and it is by the study, observation, and experience of Nature accompanied by meet experiments, that the future ages will acquire knowledge of the works of creation, to the immeasurable benefit of man, and the infinite glory of God. We see it now.

These Rosicrucian books will be found to employ, though published in German, the same prominent italics A as the *New Atlantis* and other capitals, notably the little book by A.O.M.T.W. (1617) entitled "Fraternitatis Rosatæ Crucis confessio Recepta."

The W will be found to be the same as that enclosed between Cornucopiæ, which forms the initial letter of the *New Atlantis* in the 1669 Edition. The A is the same as used in works by H. A. (Henry Ainsworth), e.g., in his

“Annotations” (1620), and “Counterpoyson” (1607 and 1642).

In conclusion, the emblem of this secret Richt-Right Press which published both for Bacon and the early Puritans, such as Henry Ainsworth and John Robinson, were distinctly Baconian, namely, the motto

‘Cor unum Via una,’

referred to by Laneham as ‘One heart one way,’—between Cornu-copiæ: and the words Richt-right that is really right, surrounding the *Royal Arms*.

The 1669 Edition of the *Silva Silvarum* calls itself strangely: “The Ninth *and Last* Edition.”

The important issue is that Puritans, Rosi-crucians, Free-Masons and Francis Bacon were allies, printing propaganda with a fixed end.

TIMON OF ALBANS.

BY W. G. C. GUNDRY.

“Unwisely, not ignobly, have I given.”—*Timon of Athens*, Act II, Sc. ii.

SHAKESPEARE'S play, *Timon of Athens*, was published for the first time in the Folio of 1623, and had not been heard of before this date.

Mr. Israel Gollancz says in his preface to the play:

“An interesting comparison might be instituted between the present play and Lucian's *Dialogue on Timon*; it seems almost certain that directly or indirectly the Dialogue has exercised considerable influence on the conception of the drama, though we know of no English or French version of Lucian's work that Shakespeare could have used; perhaps the other author of the play possessed the Greek he lacked.”

The present writer has always, even from his school-days, felt that the attempt to find “sources” for the plots of the plays very much overdone, and it has often occurred to him that the Poet had sufficient creative faculty to produce an original theme from his own brain. It is true that there may be superficial resemblances between original plots, but it does not necessarily follow that they are in any way related to one another. The last sentence quoted from Mr. Gollancz's preface is of interest as it evidences one of the difficulties of the conventional critic who believes that the plays were the work of a man unfamiliar with Latin and Greek, in demanding the presence of a second hand in the work.

It is fair, however, to observe that in the case of *Timon of Athens* Mr. Gollancz believes in the presence of a second hand on account of an alleged inferiority of style manifested in certain sections of the play.

It is suggested that this play was written by Bacon after his fall, and it will be the task of the present writer in the small space which is allotted to him, to endeavour to bring out some parallels between Bacon's experiences and life and those recorded in *Timon of Athens*.

It has been held that the play was hastily completed for insertion in the *First Folio* by another playwright, after having been left in an unfinished state by Shakespeare. If the play were written after Bacon's fall, which took place in the spring of 1621, and before the *First Folio* came out in 1623, it is easy to understand that the work might bear evidences of being hastily composed, especially when it is remembered that Bacon was at the time full of the financial difficulty of adjusting his living to his comparative poverty, and at the same time busy with his *History of Henry VII.* and the composition of *De Augmentis Scientiarum*. Mr. Gollancz says that the speeches of Timon are by Shakespeare though other parts are not.

It is possible that Bacon hastily sketched the play, and that it was, so to speak, assembled by one of his "Good pens." This being so, one can understand why Bacon would have concentrated his chief effort on *Timon's* speeches, particularly his indignation at the ingratitude with which he had been treated by his false friends; for Bacon was speaking through the mouth of Timon and voicing the injuries he had suffered.

As a French* contemporary writer said when dealing with his fall:

"In this I see the working of monstrous ingratitude and unparalleled cruelty; to say that a man who could mark the years of his life, rather by the signal services that he had rendered to the State, than by times or seasons, should have received such hard usage, for the punishment of a crime which he never committed."

Now Timon is essentially a type of generosity treated with ingratitude. We know that Bacon lived in great

**Histoire Naturelle de Mre. François Bacon, Baron de Verulan* (sic) *Vicomte de Saint Alban et Chancelier d'Angleterre*, translated by Pierre Amboise and published in Paris in the year 1631 by the firm of Sommaville and André de Soubron.

state when his fortunes were flowing, and that among his retainers were many of gentle birth—relations and sons of friends who were receiving an introduction to the Court through residence in his household. The Duke of Buckingham writes to Bacon from Newmarket on the last day of January, 1617: "I understand by Jack Butler how bountiful your Lordship hath been to him, for which I thank your Lordship, he being brother to my sister's husband, and besides I account your favour placed upon a thankful youth who speaketh of it to all his friends, which I take well in him that will not smother the benefits bestowed upon him."

What does Timon say?

But myself,
 Who had the world as my confectionary,
 The mouths, the tongues, the eyes and hearts of
 men
 At duty, more than I could frame employment;
 That numberless upon me stuck, as leaves
 Do on the oak, have with one winter's brush
 Fell from their boughs, and left me open, bare
 For every storm that blows:" (Act. IV. Sc. iii.)

While dealing with the subject of Bacon's *entourage* it may be noted that one of his pages was Mr. Cokayne, and it is not unlikely that this gentleman was a cadet of the family of that name (sometimes spelt Cokain) which occupied Pooley Hall, close to Polesworth, where the Master of Jesus College* is fain to believe that Shakespeare received his early education. But let us turn to evidences of Bacon's generosity as disclosed in his household accounts. We append a few extracts from Spedding:†

**A Chapter in the Early Life of Shakespeare*, by Arthur Gray, Master of Jesus College, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1926.

†*Lord Bacon's Letters and Life*, Vol. VI. pp. 327 et seq.

	£	s.	d.
June 26th, 1618, To one that brought your Lp. cherries and other things from Gorhambury by your Lp's order	0	6	0
June 30th, 1618, To Mr. Butler* by your Lp. order as a gift	22	0	0
July 1st, 1618, To my La. Hatton's man that brought your Lp. garden seeds	0	11	0
July 5th, To Mr. Matthew's man that brought your Lp. sweetmeats	0	5	0
July 5th, To Mr. Recorder's man that brought your Lp. a salmon	0	10	0
July 5th, To my La. Poyznes man that brought your Lp. a stag	2	0	0
July 6th, To the washerwoman, for sending after the Crane that flew into the Thames	0	5	0

The total disbursements in gifts and rewards from 24th June till 29th September, 1618, amounted to £302 7s., which in modern purchasing power would probably represent three thousand pounds!

Let us turn to the play again and quote:

Second Lord.

"He pours it out; Plutus, the god of gold
Is but his steward; no meed, but he repays
Sevenfold above itself; no gift to him
But breeds the giver a return exceeding
All use of quittance.'" (Act I. Sc. i.)

And again:

Timon.

"We are born to do benefits: and what better
or properer can we call our own than the riches
of our friends?
O, what a precious comfort 'tis, to have so
many, like brothers, commanding one another's
fortunes!" (Act I. Sc. ii.)

Third Servant.

"Please you, my lord, that honourable gentleman,
Lord Lucullus, entreats your company to-morrow
to hunt with him, and has sent your honour
two brace of greyhounds.

*Probably the relative referred to in the Duke of Buckingham's letter.

Timon.

I'll hunt with him; and let them be received,
Not without fair reward." (Act. I. Sc. ii.)

Bacon, even in the time of his prosperity, was saddled with interest on loans, some or all of these debts may have been legacies from his leaner years, though Spedding appears to hold the view that he was in the habit of borrowing even in the time of his prosperity.

Let us examine the household accounts further:—

	£	s.	d.
"2nd July, 1618. Paid Mr. Hallet for the interest of 100lb. for six months 5lb. and to his man 10s. in all"		5	10 0
"8th July, 1618. Paid the La. Hicks for the interest of 200lb. for 6 months"	10	0	0
"1st August, 1618. Paid for the interest of 1000lb. for 4 months due this first of August to Mr. Courten"	33	6	8
"5th September, 1618. Paid Mr. Wightman for the interest of 100lb. for 6 months due the 2nd of August, 1618"	5	0	0
"14th September. Paid Mr. Cambell for the interest of 200lb. for 6 months due 10th of year, 1618"	10	0	0

This is sufficient to show Bacon's borrowing habit. What does Timon's unhappy steward, Flavius, say in the play?

Flavius (aside).

"What will this come to?

He commands us to provide and give great gifts,
And all out of an empty coffer:

His promises fly so beyond his State
That what he speaks is all in debt, he owes
For every word: He is so kind that he now
Pays interest for't;" (Act I., Sc. ii).

We see from these accounts that Bacon's steward was paid £1851 between 24th June and 29th September, 1618, and that the total of payments for that period was £3,711 4s. 2d. In order to get an idea of what this means for a year at this rate in modern currency we must multiply

by four to get twelve month's expenditure and again by ten to indicate the equivalent in modern purchasing-power-currency; thus we find that if the above was an average quarter's expenditure it would represent in modern terms payments at the rate of £148,448 6s. 10d. per annum, and this apart from gifts and rewards.

No wonder Flavius voices his complaint when Timon upbraids him with not having laid his state before him earlier.

Flavius.

“You would not hear me,
At many leisures I proposed.

When for some trifling present you have bid me
Return so much, I have shook my head and wept;
Yea, 'gainst the authority of manners prayed you
To hold your hand more close: I did endure
Not seldom, nor no slight checks, when I have
Prompted you in the ebb of your estate
And your great flow of debts. My loved lord,
Though you hear now, too late!—Yet now's a
Time—

The greatest of your having lacks a half
To pay your present debts.

When all our offices have been oppress'd
With riotous feeders, when our vaults have wept
With drunken spilth of wine, when every room
Hath blazed with lights and bray'd with min-
strely,
I have retired me to a wasteful cock,
And set mine eyes at flow.” (Act. I. Sc. ii.)

These must have been poor Sharpeigh's (Bacon's Steward) feelings when he saw the arrival of forty or fifty coaches at Gorhambury with one or more occupants, and coachman and footman to each.

For Peter Böener says, that there were sometimes
“forty or fifty coaches of gentlemen and Lords coming to

take counsel with him and to perform their affairs and matters of business." And he further records that Bacon held "open house" and "free kitchen," and that his retinue sometimes amounted to a hundred or more persons.

As a further instance of Bacon's generosity may be noted frequent payments made to Humphrey Leigh in respect of relief to the poor. This Humphrey Leigh was probably the Sergeant at Arms of Bacon's household; for a Mr. Leigh is given in the roll of servants in Spedding.*

On New Year's Eve, 1617, Bacon writes the following postscript to a letter to Buckingham:

"I am bold to send your Lordship for your New Year's gift a plain cup of essay, in token that if your Lordship in any thing shall make me your sayman, I will be hurt before your Lordship shall be hurt.

I present therewith to you my best service, which shall be my All-Year's gift."

And on the same occasion he wrote to Sir James Fullerton, when sending a gift to the Prince of Wales:

"I presume to send his Highness a pair of small candlesticks of gold, in token that I hope and pray that his light and the light of his posterity upon church and commonwealth may never fail. I pray do me the favour to present it to his Highness with my best and humblest service.

Your most affectionate and assured friend,
FR. BACON, C.S."

On Bacon's magnificence it is hardly necessary to dwell. When James I. saw his servants hung with gold buttons that monarch observed:

"My Chancellor's servants are costlier than mine own; they are besemed and behung with gold buttons as if it cost no money."

Bacon had an unusual power of attracting affection from others, which proceeded from the largeness of his own heart, and this sentiment is seen in the letters of his friends, like Sir Tobie Matthew and Sir Thomas Meautys. This

*Lord Bacon's Letters and Life. Vol. VI. p. 336.

affection was not confined only to those of gentle birth, but was extended to him by those of humbler station. This is reflected in the play under discussion:—

Third Servant.

“Yet do our hearts wear Timon’s livery
That see I by our faces; we are fellows still,
Serving alike in sorrow.”

Flavius.

“Poor honest lord, brought low by his own heart,
Undone by goodness! Strange, unusual blood
When man’s worst sin is, he does too much good
Who then dares to be so half so kind again.”

Act IV. Sc. ii.

Mallet* records the following incident in a footnote:

“One day, during his trial, as he was passing through a room where several of his domestics were sitting; upon their getting up to salute him, ‘Sit down my Masters,’ he cried, ‘Your rise has been my fall.’ ”

When it was proposed as a means of raising money, at the time of the declension of Bacon’s fortunes, that the woods of Gorhambury should be felled, he observed: “I’ll not be stripped of my feathers.”

This thought seems to be reflected in the following lines:

Senator.

“When every feather sticks in his own wing,
Lord Timon will be left a naked gull,
Which flashes now a phoenix.”

(Act II. Sc. i.)

It will be remembered that in the last Act of the play two Senators, guided by Timon’s steward, Flavius, come to the former in order to persuade him to return to Athens.

First Senator.

“O, forget
What we are sorry for ourselves in thee
The Senators with one consent of love

*Mallet’s Life of Bacon, 1768; Footnote on p. 85

Entreat thee back to Athens; who have thought
On special dignities, which vacant lie
For thy best use and wearing."

First Senator.

"Therefore, so please thee to return with us,
And of our Athens, thine and ours, to take
The Captainship, thou shalt be met with thanks,
Allow'd with absolute power, and thy good name
Live with authority: so soon shall we drive back
Of Alcibiades the approaches wild;
Who, like a boar too savage, doth root up
His country's peace."

Listen to Peter Bœner in his *Life of Bacon* :*

"When the Parliament was once assembled, and a certain affair was being treated and could not well be brought to an end King James said: "Oh! had I my old Chancellor Bacon here, I would speedily have an end to the affair."

And finally let us glance at Timon's epitaph with which that learned philologist, Dr. Speckman, has dealt in "*Baconiana*." †

It will be remembered that one sentence reads:

"Seek not my name."

The same idea is expressed when Bacon says of himself "*Mihi Silentio*," and again when he writes to King James:

"I often, consciously and purposely, cast aside the dignity of my Genius and my name (if such a thing be), while I serve the welfare of humanity."

This sentence sums up Bacon's main purpose in life and unmistakeably stamps him as

I Γ E C T I Γ E C T I Γ

*Peter Bœner's *Life of Bacon* prefixed to the Dutch edition of Bacon's *Essays*, Leyden 1647. Translated by Professor J. d'Aulnis de Bourouill, of Utrecht University.

†*Timon of Athens*, by Dr. H. A. W. Speckman, of Arnheim, Holland. *Baconiana*, June, 1923.

WHAT REALLY DID HAPPEN TO THE SHAKESPEARE FOLIO MSS.?

BY PARKER WOODWARD.

The Tempest, Act V, Sc. 1, has this cryptic statement:—

“The strong-based promontery
Have I made shake; and by the spurs plucked up
The pine and cedar: graves at my command,
Have wak'd their sleepers; op'd and let them forth
By my so potent art: But this rough magick
I here abjure: and, when I have required
Some heavenly musick (which even now I do)
To work mine end upon their sense, that
This airy charm is for, I'll break my staffe
Bury it certain fadoms in the earth
And deeper than did ever plummet sound
I'll drown my book.”

Prospero (Francis Bacon) would seem here to be indicating an intention to open the Shakspere graves, fasten up the MSS. of his Folio “Shakespeare Plays” and bury them certain fathoms in the earth deeper than did ever plummet sound. He may have been indicating an intention to bury deeper by certain fathoms than the level of the bed of the river Avon adjoining the Parish Church at Stratford on Avon.

In the Bodleian Library at Oxford is a letter written by one William Hall stating that he (Hall) learnt at Stratford that the body of Shakspere had been laid full 17 feet deep, deep enough to secure him.

In August 1623 the body of Shakspere's wife was buried it is said interposed between the north wall of the chancel and the grave of her husband. The Shakespeare grave stone is said to be close by the door which led to the bone vault.

Dugdale's "Antiquities of Warwickshire" 1656, gives an engraving of a Shaksper Memorial and bust placed in the North Wall of the chancel.

When or at whose expense was the Memorial erected? Nothing is known.

In a verse prefixed to the 1623 Folio Plays the Monument is mentioned as then existing. We must bear in mind that the year 1623 did not end until 25th March of what by our notation would be the following year. So there was ample time to fix the Memorial and bust and to so arrange the coffins if necessary as to permit of a deep deposit of a box of MSS.

At page 29 of "The Lost Manuscripts" the decipher runs "William Rawley He it is which must fulfil our plans of placing certain M.S.S. (according to the custom of ancient people) to ensure their preservation in tombs graves or in Monuments."

From other decipherings up to 1671 it would appear that the plans were not generally capable of being carried out. The cipher in "De Augmentis" 1623 states we understand that the manuscripts of the Shakespeare Plays were placed in Shakespeare's Tomb but decipherings of later date allege a change of plan and that they were placed elsewhere. It is possible that there was no change of plan but that there was as directed by Bacon a request that no interference with the MSS. should be made until 100 years had passed.

"It is our last hope and urgente request of any or every comming Argonaut that he take not this precious Golden Fleece from this place of concealment unless it be of time far off."

The Memorial and bust according to Dugdale's engraving had two small figures seated upon the canopy one holding a spade pointing downwards the other an hourglass.

About 1723 some persons seem to have very materially altered the appearance of the bust making it look much more robust with a right hand holding a pen pointing downwards to the earth. These alterations would indicate that certain persons were interested in continuing to mark the site of a hidden deposit. It could hardly have been to

continue the misrepresentation as to the true authorship of the plays. That had served its 100 years of silence.

About the year 1820 workmen building a vault in the chancel being able to look through an opening into the reputed Shakspeare grave saw nothing but a hollow space with no sign of the earth having been touched.

May it be possible that the Shakspeare coffin was never there or had been removed and the MSS. box placed at a very considerable depth to avoid injury until recovered?

In one of the decipherings given in the 'Lost Manuscripts' Bacon is said to have ciphered the statement:—"That we set those workes apart in parcels tendeth unto the end that some portion thereof may be out of danger."

There is another notable observation of Rawley's deciphered from the Resuscitatio of 1657:—"But F. having put M.S. in tombs before consulting any of his thoroughly worthy men."

It is singular that Rawley, with the knowledge he ciphered in the 1625 Essays and the 1623 De Augmentis, should in the 1626 Manes Verulamiani have permitted the following statement in No. 15 by Robert Ashley:—"Why should I mention each separate work a number of which of high repute remain: *a portion lies buried*. Rawley his Fidus Achates ensures for Francis that they should see the light." Ashley was a writer and barrister of the Temple (see Dic. Nat. Biography).

Pope's edition of the Shakespeare Plays 1725 shews the Stratford Bust cenotaph with the pen pointing downwards and two figures on the canopy holding torches.

There is sufficient ambiguity in the whole matter to make it worth while to greatly deepen the hollow cavity beneath the Shakespeare stone at Stratford Church to see if a box of MSS. may have been deposited there. Great opposition may be expected from the Stratfordians.

BACON versus SHAKSPERE.

A Judicial Decision that Francis Bacon was the true author of the "Shakespeare" Plays!

[*New York Times.*]

Judge Tuthill awards to Colonel G. Fabyan, of Chicago, the sum of 5,000 dollars damages.

COLONEL FABYAN recently (1916) revived the theory that Bacon was the real author of the Shakespeare plays and that William of Stratford-on-Avon was merely employed by Bacon to interpret these dramatic works. Judge Tuthill awards the damages because William N. Selig, a moving-picture manufacturer, had sought to restrain Colonel Fabyan from publishing the facts which he alleged to be in his possession shewing that Bacon and not Shakspere wrote the plays. In his decision, Judge Tuthill says in part:

"That William Shakspere was born April 23, 1564; that he went to London about 1586 or 1587; that for a time thereafter he made his living working for Burbage; that he later became an actor in Burbage's theatre and in travelling theatrical companies; that he retired about 1609. . . to Stratford-on-Avon, that he engaged in business till the time of his death on April 23, 1616; and that he was not an educated man, are allegations which the Court finds are true.

"The Court further finds that Francis Bacon was born January 22, 1560; that he was educated not only in English, but in French, Latin, Italian, German, and had a general education equal to or superior to any of his age; that he was the compiler of a book of 1,500 axioms and

phrases selected from the greatest authors and books of all time; that in his youth, literary people were frowned upon in England, but in Paris they were in the favor of the reigning powers and literature was having a *renaissance*. Bacon went to Paris in his early youth and spent several years in this atmosphere.

“The Court takes judicial notice of historical facts, and facts well known, and finds that there has been for sixty years a controversy over the authorship of certain works which were published shortly after the death of Shakspere; that the question always has been an open one among scholars of equal authority and standing in the world of letters, and that a vast bibliography, estimated by those in a position to know, at 20,000 volumes, has been amassed in the discussion of the vexed question.

“The Court further finds that the claim of the friends of Francis Bacon that he is the author of said works of ‘Shakespeare,’ with the facts and circumstances in the real bibliography of the controversy over the question of authority and the proofs submitted herein convinced the Court that Francis Bacon is the author.”

AN IMPORTANT DISCOVERY.

By "HISTORICUS."

IN *Fly Leaves* (the magazine of the "Ladies' Guild of Francis St. Alban") for April, 1927, Miss Alicia A. Leith announces an important discovery which indirectly furnishes contemporary evidence supporting the cypher accounts of Francis "Bacon" being in reality a son of Queen Elizabeth. The discovery consists of a literary "find" in the shape of a book entitled "ALBION'S ENGLAND; a Continued Historie of the same Kingdom Not Barren in Varietie of Inventive and Historical Intermixture. First penned and published by William Warner, and now revised and newly enlarged a little before his Death. Dedication to the Right Hon. my very Good Lord and Maister Henry Carey, Baron of Hunsdon. Printed for G.P. 1612. London."

In the Epistle Dedicatory of this most remarkable book, says Miss Leith, the author describes himself as a "mean workman" and "feeble artist." The First Part was written during the reign of Elizabeth, the Second Part was written three years after her death. Its title is a *Continuance of Albion's England, by the first Author, W.W.*", and is "imprinted for George Petter, 1606, London, at the Sign of the Bible." It is dedicated "To the Right Hon. Sir Edward Coke, Knight, Lord Chief Justice of His Majesty's Court of Common Pleas." Regarding the mysterious author, the Dedication goes on: "Accept him (Friendly Reader) where hee is, not where hee ought, as he speaketh, not as hee should; misapplied hee is not for matter precedent, howsoever the penning or misplacing may like or mislike for the English or Order. Rather hath my Remissness been borrowed of Decorum, your Patience then, that a Patriarke of our Britons should be abruptly Estranged, of Æneas therefore it thus followeth."

The Two Parts are divided by an "Epitome of the whole History of England" and "The History of Æneas," plentifully indulging in the name of "Elisa." Sprinkled through the volume are familiar Shakespearean names:

Cassibelan, Cymbeline, Lear and daughters, Makbeth, Banquho, Macduff, Fleance, and three apparitions; Julius Cæsar, Æneas (mentioned 22 times in the Plays); Catherine of France, the Queen of Henry V.; Arthur and Owen Tudor, who is said to be "mashed." He says:

From ancient King Cadwallader I have my pedigree,
If gentry, Madam, might convey so great a good to me.

Wales plays a large part in the work, but the most significant statement regarding the deceased Queen is the following, which offers food for reflection:—

"England's heirs-apparent have of Wales bin Princes
till Our Queen deceased, conceal'd her heir, I wot not for
what skill."

The cypher revelations of Dr. Owen and Mrs. Gallup seem to have effected one purpose at least, which the opponents of the cypher (who have no stomach for the evident facts which the cypher reveals) will be unable to mock at, for they have given intelligent direction to those engaged in the search for the real facts of Elizabethan history. The facts are there, but they have been clouded in obscurity for reasons of State. An open mind and a penetrating eye alone are needed to dissipate this obscurity and to bring into the light of day the shams (or shall we spell it *shames*) of Elizabethan statecraft which have merely lived on a reputation of being "big" by the comparison with modern statecraft which is so infinitely little.

A letter from Bacon to the Lord Keeper Puckering, dated 1595, may be read in a two-fold sense as suggesting Bacon's royal birth. The Lord Keeper had taken offence at a certain political act of Bacon's, and the latter wrote an explanatory but not an apologetic letter in which occurs this significant passage: ". . . and further I remember not of my letter except it were that I writ, I hoped your Lordship would do me no wrong, which hope I do still continue. For if it please your Lordship but to call to mind from whom I am descended, and by whom, next to God, Her Majesty, and your own virtue, Your Lordship is ascended, I know you will have a compunction of mind to do me any wrong." *Verb. sap.*

SOME ADDITIONAL NOTES ON THE CHARACTERS IN LOVE'S LABOURS LOST.*

THE *dramatis personae* in the play appear to be composite portraits of men and women living at, or shortly before, the time of its production. In the King of Navarre there are traces of events in the history of both Francis I. and Charles V. "The sole inheritor of all perfections that a man may owe, Matchless Navarre," clearly indicates Henry the Great, but the scholarship attributed to King Ferdinand is more appropriate to Francis I., who founded the College of France and is known as the father of French Literature. The episode of forbidding women to come near the Court is reminiscent of Charles V., who retired to a monastery and prohibited the approach of any woman within two bow-shots of the premises under a penalty of a hundred lashes. In his seclusion he, like the King in the play, delighted in the society of learned men. The name of his brother Ferdinand, who succeeded to some of his vast possessions, may have suggested the title, given to the King of Navarre in *Love's Labours Lost*. In the description of the Princess of France and her ladies there is also a mingling of traits and a disguise of names. The Princess is called the Queen in Act IV. both of the Quarto and the Folio. The allusion of Costard the Clown to the head lady as the thickest woman present points to *Marguerite de Valois*, whose stately form, endowed by nature, was augmented by art.

In "Miniature Portraits" by Gédéon Taillement, it is stated that to improve her figure she had pieces of tin fitted to widen the span of her shoulders. The description of Katherine as one whose "shoulder was with child" may refer to this practice. According to the same writer Marguerite became bald early in life, and had her head

*V. *Baconiana*, Dec. 1926, p.281.

Some Notes on Love's Labours Lost 71

dressed with blonde hair. She kept a number of fair-haired footmen who were shorn periodically to keep up the supply. This may have prompted the reference to the "amber" and "usurping hair" also attributed to Katherine. Biron's Rosaline, "the whitely wanton, with two pitch balls stuck in her face for eyes," has been regarded as the dark lady of the Sonnets. It is from Rabelais that the name of Holofernes, the schoolmaster, is taken; he was the tutor of Gargantua, who is supposed to be a caricature of Francis I. The abduction of Jaquenetta, the clown's sweetheart, by the egregious courtier Armado, is paralleled by the story of Francis I. carrying off the daughter of his Court fool, which forms the plot of Victor Hugo's "*Le Roi s'amuse*" and of Verdi's opera "*Rigoletto*." It is strange that one after another of Shakespearean commentators should have mistaken Charles, Duke de Biron, for his father Armand, who was brought up as the page of *Marguerite d'Angoulême*, Queen of Navarre. He was a great wit and scholar and used to carry tablets in his pocket wherein he made a note of anything good that he saw or heard. So that it was proverbial at Court, when anyone let fall a striking remark, to say, "Ah! you found that in Biron's tables." This calls to mind Hamlet's exclamation "My tables, my tables, meet it is I set it down." Sir Sidney Lee was also mistaken in thinking that Dumain was meant for Mayenne, for the former was a beardless youth and as quick-witted as Mayenne was slow and dull. The whole play is full of detailed personal allusions and contemporary events which it is difficult to imagine could have been known to anyone who had not himself been on the spot.

JOHN A. COCKBURN.

"TO PROVE YOU A CYPHER."

"Love's Labours Lost," Act 1, Scene 2.

BY CHARLES W. HOPPER.

EIGHTEEN months ago I spent six months in the British Museum Library, applying Bacon's inductive method to the correlation of Elizabethan records with the alleged facts given in the Biliteral and Word cypher stories. I found much new and strange evidence, not yet published, which appeared to show that the incident, where Francis Bacon as a youth of fifteen discovered that he was Queen Elizabeth's son, happened at Gorhambury, apparently on August 31st, 1576. Later, partly with the support of Messrs. Parker and Frank Woodward, I spent a year in St. Albans, hoping to interest the City in its neglected, greatest citizen; also to search for fresh evidence.

In the first object I was not very successful, for reasons which it is futile to discuss, in fairness to many Baconian sympathisers in the City. However, I found further evidence which appeared to support my theory. Last autumn, just when I was about to write the summarising book or series of articles, which I hoped to publish (I felt this had never been done in any attractive manner), Mr. Horace Nickson sent me a *facsimile* copy of the First Folio. I immediately made what I believe is a very important discovery, which, if it can be accepted (and it is a big IF) and properly examined, should prove the truth of the Biliteral cypher story, and Bacon's concealed authorship and royal birth, to the satisfaction of those who still disbelieve the greatest and most romantic story ever known. It has done so to several non-Baconian friends, who have spent half-an-hour examining my newly-discovered and easily-checked numerical cypher, on which I worked long hours for several months.

THE NEW CYPHER—IS IT PROVABLE, AND RELIABLE?

“From the most able, to him that can but spell: There you are number'd.” “This *figure* that thou here seest put.” “He that hath filled up *all* numbers.” (Ben Jonson’s significant addition to the “Insolent Greece and haughtie Rome” tribute, paid first to Shakespeare, in the Folio, and later, to Bacon). The hundreds of similar forced references in the Plays and Sonnets to numbers, figure, count, tell, etc., first pointed out by Messrs. E. V. Tanner, Parker and Frank Woodward, in their pioneer investigations. “Add a royal number to the dead.” “The number’s ratified.” “Judge their number.” “My number is lessened.” “Increase the number.” “Part the numbers.” “I am happy above a number.” “I am ill at these numbers.” “A sybil that hath numbered.” “There is a divinity in odd numbers.” These are a few of a hundred or so references to numbers in the Plays; and many of them are obviously ambiguous and forced.

When I first began to grasp what might be concealed beneath this exploitation of the science of numerology, first used in Hebrew and classical literature, I was filled with a sense of awe. There is something almost revolting in the idea that poets like Shakespeare and Milton (whose epitaph to Shakespeare, published after Bacon’s death, is a remarkable and beautiful revelation) should combine poetry with arithmetic. But this ambiguity is easily explained. The lines were first written without this trammelling consideration. Then, in an age of careless printing and spelling, by means of an elaborate *camouflage* of mis-spelt words, mis-placed or deleted type, and a deliberate substitution of forced metaphors or words (as in the Sonnets) or a choice derangement of epithets (as in the buffooneries of the Plays) the requisite numerical totals were obtained. The thousands of mysterious dots scattered all through the works also emphasize numerical equivalents of the names that are intended to be substituted. Mispaginations also serve the same purpose. For instance, the last two pages of *King Lear* are 38 and 309. The difference, 271, is the numerical equivalent of “Francis Tudor” in K count.

74 "To Prove You a Cypher"

It must have taken years to do in the Folio: possibly one of the reasons for its belated appearance. And it will be years before this numerical mystery, a marvel of industry, ingenuity and wit, can be properly investigated (if it can be accepted as a basis for investigation). For this is the baffling part of it. Right from beginning to end, the Folio and the Sonnets are apparently a repetition of recurrent and overlapping names, like the monotonous vociferations of Robinson Crusoe's parrot. This was done, apparently, for two reasons (when dynastic considerations permitted the final revelation) to prove evidence of design to incredulous future ages by means of a long succession of apparently remote arithmetical coincidences. The odds against each apparent coincidence are, on the average, about six to one; but the "sorry bookmaker" who laid them would lose thousands of times in succession. The second reason was, I believe, to make the discovery of the hidden message the more difficult, possibly for reasons of safety during Bacon's life-time and the century which was planned to elapse before the trustees of the great secret (Pope and his illustrious friends) were given discretion to reveal it.

By a double irony of circumstance (Pope was a hunchback, and probably resented Bacon's criticism of Cecil, and deformity in general: and George I. had just come to the throne) it was not considered safe to reveal the secret. The Hanoverian succession was not popular, and the descendants of Essex, the second son of Elizabeth's secret marriage with Leicester, were living. But Pope and his friends took pains to reveal their knowledge of the great secret for the benefit of a more enlightened generation. As I claimed in the GRAPHIC articles over a year ago, on the Westminster Abbey monument they even symbolised the real author in the head of Henry V., below the pointing finger of the Stratford player, with those of the two great protagonists in the strange triangular drama, Elizabeth and the deformed Cecil (symbolised by Richard III.) on either side in the background.

The distorted and ambiguous inscriptions on the tomb, like that of the illustrious William at Stratford, "Read if

thou canst,” etc., are a triumph of numerical revelation; as is Pope’s “Essay on Man.” This, as I claimed in the *Graphic*, is a long argument, sometimes admiring, sometimes expostulating, with Bacon, whose philosophy about the danger of self-love (self-conceit) irritated the cynical and sensitive cripple. It can, I think, be proved that he eventually changed his mind, and had the utmost admiration and reverence for Bacon. The great field for Shakespearean research will probably in the future centre round Pope and his friends, but there is not space to deal with it in this short article.

THE NAMES USED IN THE NUMERICAL CIPHER.

These, which I put down fairly completely before commencing a six months’ investigation, are as follows: William Shakespeare or Shakespear, the names generally used in the published works (and in the cypher, where the *author* is meant), Shakespere or Shakspere (where the Stratford player comes into the story) as in the extremely humorous scenes (in the cypher story also) where Prince Hal (Bacon) and Falstaff (Shakspere of Stratford) chaff each other about their impecuniosity, and the future incredulity about the authorship of the plays. Bacon’s names used are: Francis Bacon, or Tudor, with the frequent addition of King of England, or England’s King: Francis the First of England (often used) Francis King of England, or England’s King, and, occasionally, Francis of England. Sir Francis Bacon was also sometimes used up to about 1618. After that it disappears, and the names of Francis Verulam, or Saint Alban, are used; and, but rarely, Lord Saint Alban.

To test this cypher, everything should be numeralised in the well-known simple, or Plain cypher: A=1, B=2, etc., remembering that the Elizabethan alphabet had only 24 letters, as i and j, u and v, were of the same type. Then the names, given by a word or phrase, should be substituted. As most of us know, Bacon is 33, Francis 67, William 74, Shakespeare 103; and it is surprising what a number of useful words count either 103, or 100, Francis Bacon. The complication, not a puzzling one, is that

76 "To Prove You a Cypher"

the names where long phrases are used to give a name, (and it was perhaps thought wise not to make the cipher too obvious) occasionally go back into one of the three variations. These are known as the K (see Bacon's reference to Kay cyphers) which gives each letter a double figure value, i.e., A=27, B=28, until K, 10, is reached: the Short (rarely used) or single digit, i.e., after J, 9, K starts again as 1, and T (19) as 1: or the Reverse, which is the Plain cypher reversed: Z=1, etc., until A, 24, is reached. For some years past these four alphabets have been published, with a few of the name equivalents, at the end of each number of the American *Baconiana*. I was very grateful for these tables, which supply the missing link to the numerical cypher. The abbreviations given there, used on a large number of title-pages, are apparently not used in the newly discovered cypher. Only the names given above are employed, except in a few cases where other authors (as claimed in the Biliteral cypher) are referred to. Bacon and Shakespeare are frequently linked together, or Francis Bacon, William Shakespeare. The names do not change from one count to another, unless a punctuation mark appears, or the line changes.

Owing to the prior claims of other articles, only a few specimens can be given here from the fifty sheets deciphered. Milton's epitaph, published in the Second Folio of 1632 (where most of the names go back into the Plain or K cypher) is as follows. The italicised passages indicate the substitutions. The metaphors are frequently forced, probably to give the right count and to arrest attention: or they bear an apt relevance to the hidden message, as in "Shakespeare's Sonnets" (of which I have deciphered over twenty).

An Epitaph on the admirable Dramaticke poet,
W. Shakespeare.

"What neede *my Shakespeare* for his honour'd bones,
The labour of an Age, in piled stones
Or that his hallow'd Reliques should be hid
Under a starre-ypointing Pyramid?
Deare sonne of Memory, great Heire of Fame,
What needst thou such dull witnesse of thy Name?

*Thou in our wonder and astonishment
Hast built thy selfe a lasting Monument:
For whil' st, to th' shame of slow-endavouring Art
Thy easie numbers flow, and that each part,
Hath from the leaves of thy unvalued Booke,
Those Delphicke Lines with deepe impression tooke
Then thou our fancy of her selfe bereaving,
Dost make us Marble with too much conceiving;
And so Sepulcher'd, in such pompe dost lie
That Kings for such a Tombe would wish to die.*

The hidden reading appears to be as follows:

“AN EPITAPH,

FRANCIS TUDOR, KING OF ENGLAND.

What need Verulam for William Shakespeare? Francis Bacon England's King, be hid under a W. Shakespeare? Dear Shakespeare of fame, what needst Francis Tudor King of England of thy name? Francis Bacon, Francis Tudor King of England, hast built thy W. Shakespeare monument. For, Francis England's King, thy William Shakespeare, Lord Saint Alban, hath from the leaves of Englands King, William Shakespeare took. Then thou our Francis Tudor bereaving: Francis Bacon King of England: Francis the First of England. Francis Tudor, such a tomb, William Shakespeare!”

In Ben Jonson's verse opposite the “Mask” portrait in the First Folio, each line (as in the long dedicatory poem and the “Read if thou canst” inscription on the Stratford monument) gives either a full title or two conjoined names, as well as a succession of shorter names (thus furnishing double evidence of design). The full line totals I omit, owing to exigencies of space. “Shakspere,” or “Shakespeare,” seem to mean the Stratford player, not the author.

To The Reader.

*This Figure, that thou here seest put,
It was for gentle Shakespeare cut;
Wherein the Graver had a strife
with Nature, to out-doo the life:
O, could he but have drawne his wit
As well in brasse, as he hath hit
His face: the Print would then surpasse
All, that was ever writ in brasse.
But, since he cannot, Reader, looke
Not on his picture but his Booke*

B.I.

78 "To Prove You a Cypher"

(the hidden reading).

"FRANCIS BACON, KING OF ENGLAND.

W. Shakspeare, that thou here seest put, it was Francis the First of England. William Shakespeare had a strife with nature to outdo the life: O, could he but have drawn Francis Bacon, Lord Saint Alban, as he hath hit (hid) his face, the print would then surpass all that was ever writ in W. Shakespeare. But since he cannot, reader, look, not on W. Shakespeare, but F. Tudor."

The new discovery, if it can be accepted (it is easily checked) goes a long way to explain the world's greatest literary enigma, "Shake-speare's Sonnets": and I spent many weeks on these. A sonnet can be numericalised in about half an hour; but it may take hours, and sometimes days, to substitute the right names so that they link up from start to finish with the rest of the sonnet, before the right reading is found. Note in the following example a number of curious ambiguities. Apart from the varied mis-spelling (as in all the Sonnets) in line 13 the i is omitted from "this", also the n from "when" in the next line. "34," the number of the next sonnet, is placed *close* to the last word at the bottom of the page, instead of, as in other instances, the opening word of the next sonnet, or line. Without these apparent mistakes the name counts would not be found. The sonnet itself seems to voice Bacon's feelings as a boy, when he expected his royal birth would be recognised; and his later disappointment. Hence the curious phrase "The *region* cloude hath masked" etc., which appears to suggest the royal cloud of Elizabeth's displeasure.

A further confirmation of the intention of this numerical cipher is given by the arbitrary hyphenation of the word "for-lorne" in the seventh line. This calls attention to the split count; also the greater part of the "l" is deleted, presumably so that it should not be counted. "And from the for," =136 (Bacon, Shakespeare) "orne world his visage" =211 (Francis Bacon, England's King).

SONNET 33.

"Full many a glorious morning have I seene,
Flatter the mountaine tops with sovaine eie,

*Kissing with golden face the meddowes greene;
 Guilding pale streames with heavenly alcumy
 Anon permit the basest cloudes to ride,
 With ougly rack on his celestiall face,
 And from the for-lorne world his visage hide
 Stealing unseene to west with this disgrace:
 Even so my Sunne onc early morne did shine,
 With all triumphant splendor on my brow,
 But out alack, he was but one houre mine,
 The region cloude hath mask'd him from me now.
 Yet him for th s, my love no whit disdaineth,
 Suns of the world may staine, whe heavens sun staineth. 34*

Deciphered, the sonnet reads:

‘Bacon, Francis Tudor, flatter Francis Bacon King of England, Francis Bacon England’s King, with W. Shakespear. Anon W. Shakespeare ride F. Bacon, King of England, Bacon, Shakespeare. Francis Bacon England’s King, hide Shakespeare. With this disgrace, even so Francis Tudor King of England did shine. Francis Bacon England’s King was William Shakespeare. F. Bacon yet W. Shakespeare disdaineth. Francis Bacon, W. Shakespeare stain Bacon, England’s King.’

Many of the other sonnets carry better readings, if not so full of confirmatory proofs. In Sonnet 38, after speaking of “Thine own sweet argument, too excellent for every vulgar paper to rehearse.” It proceeds “Bring forth eternal numbers to out-live long date. If my slight Muse do please these curious days, the pain be mine, but thine shall be the praise,” a prophecy which made me laugh heartily as I contrasted it with my actual experience. Bacon was much more accurate in Sonnet 71, where he says “Do not so much as my poor name rehearse. . . lest the wise world . . . mock you with me after I am gone.”

The essays are apparently full of this cypher from beginning to end. The Essay “Of Truth,” opens with a remarkable prophecy about the world’s attitude to the famous problem. “What is Truth: said jesting Pilate: and would not stay for an Answer,” represents the mental outlook of many of our literary authorities to-day. “What is the truth about Shakespeare? But we really don’t wish to know, unless it is what we have been taught to believe.” Bacon seems to have anticipated this.

“ESSAYES. I. *Of Truth.* What is *Truth: said jest-*

ing Pilate: And would not stay for an Answer. Certainly there be, that delight in Giddinesse: And count it a Bondage, to fix a Belcefe; Affecting Freewill in Thinking: as well as in Acting. And though the Sects of Philosophers of that Kinde be gone, yet there remaine certaine discoursing Wits, which are of the same veines, though there be not so much Bloud in them, as was in those of the Ancients. But it is not onely the difficultie and Labour, which Men take in finding out of Truth; Nor againe, that when it is found, it imposeth upon mens Thoughts; that doth bring Lies in favour: But a naturall, though corrupt Love, of the Lie it selfe. One of the later School of the Grecians, examineth the matter, and is at a stand, to thinke what should be in it, that men should love, Lies;" etc.

(deciphered, this reads) "Essays. 1. Shakespeare. What is William Shakespeare? William Shakespeare, for an answer, Francis Saint Alban be: Francis the First of England, Francis Tudor King of England, Bacon, Shakespeare, as well as Tudor. And though Francis of England be gone, yet there remain certain, Francis Tudor King of England: Francis Tudor King of England of Shakespeare. But it is not only the difficulty and labour which men take in finding out Shakespeare. Nor again, Francis Bacon King of England, that doth bring lies in favour: but a natural though corrupt love of the lie itself. One Francis Bacon, Francis the First of England, Shakespeare, Bacon King of England, should be Francis Tudor England's King," etc.

The most convincing specimens of this cipher occur on the Title-pages and in the prefaces of the "Breeches" Bible (1608) and the first four editions of the Authorised Version (1611 and onwards). Here the various editors, or whoever was responsible, confirm what Dagonet (George R. Sims) boldly claimed in the "Referee," some years ago: that Francis Bacon was not only the author of the plays attributed to Shakespeare, but that he also co-ordinated the labours of the fifty-two divines and scholars, who re-translated the scriptures, and personally transmuted their work into the magnificent poetry of the Authorised Version of the Bible. Letters are misprinted

and *frequently* left out, words mis-spelt, unnecessary dots and figures introduced, all apparently to give the right numerical results for the names, which, when substituted, remove all doubts. I have deciphered many pages of these.

The most humorous example found, so far, in the Plays, is Falstaff's long soliloquy, when he had been sent to raise soldiers; and where he says, "I have misused the King's Press damnably." This is so witty, that I believe even our opponents will find it impossible to be angry, that is, if they can ever bring themselves to read anything opposed to their own views.

Pope's use of this cypher is perhaps the most amazing. He used it without the mis-spelling and mis-printing which was such a help to Shakespeare and his friends. Note how cleverly he hints at the author's royal birth in the following short extract from the Preface to his 1725 edition of Shakespeare. Here he is referring to the crudity of some of Shakespeare's comic passages.

"Yet even in these, our Author's Wit buoys up, and is born above his subject; his Genius in those low parts, is like some Prince of a Romance, in the disguise of a Shepherd or Peasant: a certain Greatness and Spirit now and then break out, which manifest his higher extraction."

(The cypher reading) "Yet even in Bacon, Francis Tudor is Saint Alban, England's King. Francis Verulam is Shakespeare in the disguise of Francis the First of England. Greatness and spirit now and then break out which manifest Francis Bacon, England's King."

As certain friends doubted whether Shakespeare, Milton, Pope, and others, could use this cypher in the way I have claimed and attempted to illustrate, I put it into six or seven of a number of sonnets, which I wrote a few months ago (I had never attempted serious verse before). These, as a distinguished editor and poet points out, are neither Shakespearean nor Miltonic in form. I am quite aware of their limitations; but the curious thing is that all were greatly improved by the search for the right word or phrase, which would give the requisite numerical results. The following is one of two published in the *Herts. Advertiser* on the Bacon and Shakespeare birthday anniversaries:

"TO SHAKESPEARE.

*The poor blind book-men, searching in the dark,
 Attribute Shakespeare's gifts to accident.
 Obscure all light of the inspiring spark,
 That fires his muse, as if from heaven sent.
 Men doubt the presence, to their detriment,
 Of omniscient learning of such mark,
 Which no unlettered rustic could invent,
 Whose pen was guided by a parish clerk.
 A dubious idol of the market-place,
 Is by these priests of error thus enshrined:
 We cannot see, to our unshamed disgrace,
 The hidden glories of the poet's mind.
 We seek in vain all knowledge to conceal,
 Yet Shakespeare will fresh springs of truth reveal.*

This reads: "Francis the First of England, Francis Tudor King of England, obscure all Francis Bacon, William Shakespeare. Bacon, Francis Tudor, men doubt Shakespeare: Bacon, their Shakespeare! Francis Bacon, Francis Tudor, such mark William Shakespeare, whose pen was England's King. Francis Bacon, William Shakespeare, is Francis Tudor, thus enshrined. We cannot see Bacon, our William Shakespeare, hidden Francis the First of England. We, Shakespeare, Bacon King of England, conceal. Yet Francis Saint Alban, Francis Tudor, Shakespeare reveal."

This code seems to have been used through the ages, right up to the present day, by a number of our great writers, to reveal their knowledge of the great secret. Lack of interest and support, from quarters where I was led to expect it, compel me to relinquish further research into this fascinating mystery; and, owing to expense and difficulties of publication, to give up the idea of embodying these discoveries in a summarising book or series of articles; although I believe that there is now a new public interested in the question, largely owing to recent broadcasting mention, and the quiet process of permeation that has been going on for the last twelve months.

I wish to thank the friends who have lent me books, or helped in other ways, and will gladly place the results of my researches at the disposal of anyone who can make effective use of them, and so help the great cause which we all have at heart.

Meetings.

SOCIETY LECTURES.

A series of lectures was commenced on 5th May, 1927, under the auspices of the Bacon Society, in the Compton Oak Room at Canonbury Tower. In the evening of that date, Miss Alicia A. Leith opened with a Lantern lecture on "The Life and Times of Francis Bacon," which was much appreciated, and a good discussion ensued. On June 2nd Mr. Henry Seymour read a paper, mainly biographical, entitled "An Appreciation of Ignatius Donnelly," which traversed the principal incidents in the stirring life of this indefatigable pioneer in the search for truth, and embodied Mr. Cuming Walters' interesting experiences when coming in personal contact with Mr. Donnelly, and how he became converted to the Baconian faith in the process of assailing it. This exceedingly interesting episode appeared in the *Manchester City News* of April 9th last, and every Baconian should procure a copy, for it must prove a veritable sledge-hammer argument against the Stratford shams.

On July 7th at 7-30 p.m., Mr Horace Nickson will read a paper, entitled, "Bacon's Veiled Hints to Posterity." It is hoped that members and friends will turn up in good force, and perhaps the best feature of these lectures is the keen interest taken in the discussion which invariably follows. A further series will be arranged for the autumn and winter, commencing on September 1st at 7.30 p.m.—the usual time.

THE ANNIVERSARY DINNER.

This year's Anniversary Dinner in commemoration of Francis Bacon's birthday was held on Friday, 21st January, at Stewart's Restaurant, Piccadilly, when Sir John A. Cockburn presided. Amongst the guests of the evening were the Right Hon. Sir Frederick Pollock, Bart., Sir Edgar Wigram, Bart. (Mayor of St. Albans); the Princess Karadja; Lady Sydenham, and Sir St. Clair Thomson. The "Immortal Memory" was the toast proposed by the Rt. Hon. Sir Frederick Pollock, in a most felicitous speech. "The Bacon Society," was proposed by Sir Edgar Wigram in a witty and regular after-dinner-speech style. The responses were by the President and Mr. Horace Nickson (Chairman of the Council).

"The Ladies Guild of Francis St. Alban" (the Sister Society) next followed in a most interesting speech by the Princess Karadja, and responded to by Miss Alicia A. Leith, in her usual cultured manner. "The Visitors" was proposed by Mr. W. G. C. Gundry and suitably responded to by admirable speeches from Lady Sydenham and Sir St. Clair Thomson. The Rev. E. F. Udny proposed the toast to the "Officers of the Society," to which the Hon. Treasurer responded. An excellent meal was served by the establishment, and altogether, the function was a great success.

THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING.

The Annual General Meeting of the Bacon Society took place at Canonbury Tower, on March 17th at 3 p.m. There was a larger attendance than usual, and Sir John A. Cockburn presided. The Hon. Sec., Mr. W. Gundry, read a lengthy report of the references to and events connected with the Tercentenary Celebrations during the previous year. The Hon. Treasurer produced a "Financial Statement," for the year ending 31st Dec., 1926, which shewed £142 16s. 1d. on the receipt side, and a balance in hand of £5 19s. 1d. The President moved the adoption of the report, which was duly seconded, when Messrs. Gay, Standen, and Seymour offered some strong criticism concerning the preparation of the accounts, the latter insisting that as there was a definite infraction of the "Articles of Association" (by which the Society were governed), it would be necessary to adjourn the meeting with a view to getting the particulars in proper legal order. It was agreed that an adjournment must take place, and the Council was empowered to call the adjourned meeting after an inspection of the books of account, and the preparation of a "Balance-Sheet" as required by the "Articles."

Before closing the meeting, however, the President elected to proceed with the other business on the Agenda, viz., the election of Officers and Council for the ensuing year. In the end, Sir John A. Cockburn was elected President, Mr. Parker Woodward and Mr. Basil E. Lawrence, LL.D., were elected as Vice-Presidents in addition to Lady Durning-Lawrence, Miss Alicia A. Leith, and G. C. Cuningham (the retiring Vice-Presidents who were re-elected); Miss Marion Plarr was elected Hon. Treasurer and Mr. G. L. Emmerson, Auditor. The following were elected to the Council: Mr. Horace Nickson (Chairman), Mr. Henry Seymour (Vice-Chairman) Mr. G. C. Gundry, Mr. Chas. W. Hopper, Mrs. Vernon Bayley, Miss Elizabeth Rosen, Mr. E. Squire, Princess Karadja, Mr. S. B. Walter Gay, Mr. Parker Brewis, Mr. H. Bridgewater, and the Rev. E. F. Udny.

The adjourned meeting took place on 28th April, and as the President was unable to attend, Miss Alicia A. Leith, as Vice-President officiated in the Chair. The late hon. treasurer's financial statement, together with a Report from the Council, was submitted and on the auditor's recommendation, it was agreed to accept same, as it was found impossible to prepare a satisfactory Balance Sheet from the books and particulars supplied. In recommending the acceptance of this statement, Mr. Seymour said, on behalf of the newly-elected Council, that in future the accounts would be kept with the greatest care, and every requirement of the "Articles of Association" would be strictly carried out. The meeting adopted the report accordingly. And by reason of a vacancy in the Council, Mr. Gilbert Standen was duly elected thereto.

COUNCIL MEETINGS.

The first meeting of the new Council took place on April 7th, which, at the outset, had a somewhat stormy aspect, but eventually the atmosphere was cleared and an harmonious sequel resulted. Lady Durning-Lawrence tendered her resignation by letter from the office of Vice-President though not as a member of the Society; and by a resolution of the Council an expression of deep regret was adopted in the acceptance of her Ladyship's resignation, accompanied by a feeling that the resignation had only been moved by a misunderstanding or misrepresentation. Mr. H. Shafter Howard was duly elected as a Life-member of the Society on the payment of the authorized compounded subscription of ten guineas. Lady Sydenham was also duly elected as a member of the Society on the proposal of Mrs. Vernon Bayley, and subsequently, Mr. Seymour proposed Lady Sydenham as a Vice-President of the Society under Article 14, and this was duly carried.

Mr. S. B. Walter Gay moved an important resolution, which was also duly carried, to the effect that the Council appoint three sub-committees in order to facilitate the activities of the Society. The first (A) to be constituted for Literary and Historical Research, the second (B) for Cypher investigations and research, and the third (C) for concentrating on methods for Publicity. Members were elected, also, to form a nucleus in each committee, with power to add to their number. These will meet as often as need be, and will submit their respective reports to the Council for further deliberation.

At the Council meeting held on May 5th, the resignation of Mr. W. G. C. Gundry as Hon. Secretary was tendered on account of Mr. Seymour (as acting Chairman) having challenged the accuracy of

the Secretarial "Minutes." The resignation was duly accepted, Mr. Seymour then resigned from the office of Vice-Chairman of the Council, and the resignation was accepted on the understanding that he would accept the Secretaryship on the motion of Mr. S. B. W. Gay, seconded by Miss Alicia A. Leith, and this election was duly ratified. Mr. Seymour suggested that Mr. Gundry might fill the office of Vice-Chairman of the Council, and Mr. Hopper moved this, and after being seconded by the Rev. Udny, he was duly elected. At the same meeting the editing Committee of *Baconiana* was elected:—Miss Alicia A. Leith, Mrs. Vernon Bayley, Mr. W. G. C. Gundry, and Mr. Henry Seymour (Chairman).

It was further resolved to reprint the "Articles of Association" of the Society (which have been some time out of print), on account of the misunderstandings and confusion which have arisen in the official transactions of the Council in the past and which will help to remove such misunderstandings in the future.

NOTES AND NOTICES.

At the first meeting of the newly-elected Council of the Bacon Society three sub-committees were appointed to deal with the following matters, (A) Historical and Literary Research; (B) Investigations into Cyphers, and (C) Publicity. These committees will present reports to the Council, as occasion requires.

At the Britwell Court Library sale at Sotheby's on March 31, a copy of Stephen Gosson's *School of Abuse*, dated 1579, fetched £720 on account of its Shakespearean interest. A lost play entitled *The Jew* is described therein, in which the proverbial rapacity of usurers is held up to merciless scorn. Sir Sidney Lee was of opinion that the *Merchant of Venice* owed its origin to Gosson's book, in which the stories of the pound of flesh and the caskets were suggested. Indeed, he was quite sure that Shakespeare "probably" borrowed these stories from that source! But how could an author, writing with more pseudonyms than one, borrow from himself?

On the subject of borrowing, it has been said also by the Stratfordians that Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* was taken from Plutarch's *Life*. Very probably; but this merely goes to shew that Shakespeare was Bacon. For in Sir Thomas North's translation of Plutarch we have this:—

“For it is reported, that he had *three and twenty* (italics ours) wounds upon his body: and divers of the conspirators did hurt themselves, striking one body with so many blows.”

If we turn to Shakespeare's *Caesar* we find the following significant variation:—

“I draw a Sword against Conspirators,
When thinke you that the Sword goes up againe?
Never till Cæsar's *three and thirtie* (italics ours) wounds
Be well aveng'd.”

A Course of four lectures was given at Gresham College from April 26 to 29, by Professor Foster Watson, D.Litt., M.A., London; etc., the subject being “Some Shakespeare Questions.” The first lecture discussed the question whether Shakespeare was a page-boy, being largely an examination of the hypothesis brought forward by Mr. Arthur Gray, viz., that Shakespeare might have been a page-boy at Polesworth to account for his education and acquaintance with affairs. He pointed out that Drayton and

Massinger were actually page-boys, and that it would be quite possible for impressionable youths to pick up a good knowledge of things in the households of noblemen in that way; whereas very little except the bare rudiments of learning was available at the best schools in the neighbourhood. It was quite certain, said Professor Watson, that Shakespeare's name was *not* entered in the Register of Stratford Grammar School (as had often been supposed), nor was there any evidence that he had ever attended that school, or any other for the matter of that. We were unable to attend the second and third lectures, but attended the concluding one, which was very interesting and illuminating, in view of the decided opinion of many Baconians that Bacon wrote *Don Quixote*, citing as it did, numerous analogies of thought and parallelisms of sentiment and diction to be found in the Plays. Of course, the Professor did not go to the length of asserting an opinion that Shakespeare and Cervantes were one author, but it had struck him forcibly that they had a great work in common, and were contemporaneous; in fact, Shakespeare and Cervantes died on the same day!

There is nothing very remarkable except in the suggestion, that Shakespeare and Cervantes died on the same day, if one was also the other. But *did* Cervantes and Shakespeare die on the same day, namely, on April 23, 1616? The methods of computing *time* at *that* time, were different. This country still clung, with its conservative instinct, to the Julian Calendar, while Spain (where the mask, Cervantes, lived) had adopted the reformed calendar of Pope Gregory, the error of which was but 10 days. By the Julian Calendar, therefore, April 23 would have stood for May 3 in the Gregorian; and now that England has long since adopted the reformed calendar it is only reasonable to conclude that the Stratfordians have failed to advance with the times.

In *Baconiana*, September, 1924, we incidentally mentioned a tradition in connection with Canonbury Tower which, likely as not, inspired the illicit love-incident of Falstaff at the house of Dame Ford in the *Merry Wives*, which tradition has it that Elizabeth, the only daughter and heiress of Sir John Spencer, secretly escaped in a baker's basket in an elopement with William, afterwards Lord, Compton, on account of her sire being very much averse, for some inexplicable reason, to their engagement. It was said, further, that Queen Elizabeth brought about a reconciliation after their marriage. Now, in *Country Life* for April 24, 1926, the Marquess of Northampton,—the direct descendant of Lord William Compton,—contributed a most interesting archaeological essay, profusely

illustrated, on "Canonbury House," in which the aforementioned tradition is incidentally corroborated, as follows:—

"Love laughs at locksmiths, and tradition relates how Lord Compton carried Elizabeth out of Canonbury House in a baker's basket, himself being disguised as the baker's boy. To this story has been added the picturesque ending that Sir John met them on the stairs, and tipped Compton for being so early at his work. Sir John's fury on discovering the truth can well be imagined. But the couple were married on April 18, 1599, at the Church of St. Catharine Colman, Fenchurch Street, where it is entered in the register 'being thrice asked in the church.' We next hear that on May 5, 1601, 'the younge Lady Compton is brought abed of a sonne, and yet the hardhead, her father, relents ne'er a whit.' But Sir John's displeasure was overcome by the Queen's diplomacy. She invited Sir John to stand sponsor with her for a baby; she gave the child the Christian name of Spencer, and she then persuaded Sir John to adopt him as his own son, only afterwards telling him that he had adopted his own grandson. The reconciliation was complete, for we find that four years later a baby daughter was born in its grandfather's house at Canonbury."

At an important three-day sale at Sotheby's in February, a selected portion of the extensive Historical, Genealogical, and General Library of the late W. A. Lindsay, Esq., C.V.O., K.C., *Clarenceux King of Arms*, was disposed of. The collection included a number of MSS., and one in particular "A Curious and Circumstantial MS. Account of an Early Marriage of Queen Elizabeth, and of her having two daughters, together with some anecdotes of James' Court, *extracted from Dr. Will Twiss's Diary* (1638), unpublished. The lot was open for inspection and it was sold to Messrs. Maggs, the well-known booksellers. The contents of this manuscript are arresting, but seem to us to be incompatible in more respects than one. It opens with a narration that "Elizabeth, in King Edward's days or the beginning of Queen Mary's, — being always as Protestant and never thinking that Providence would bring her to the Crown, was marryed to a religious gentleman, one Mr. Upton, and by him had two daughters. She was marryed, some say, by the Bishop of Canterbury, a stiff Protestant, who suffered martyrdom; but this her marryage was kept very private, her husband, in her exile and in the Tower, for the most part wayting upon her as her servant. On coming to the throne, the Counsell wrought so yt they were privately divorc'd, and Mr. Upton marryed again, and after (at which distance of time I know not) brought his wife into Greenwich Garden, and when Queen Elizabeth saw her, who coming to her gave her a box of the ear,

telling her she wondred that her impudence was such as she would come and braze it out in her presence, upon which Mr. Upton gave the Queen a box on the ear. . . It was frequently given out that the two children were Essex's or other nobles—a meere trick to blind the world, for they were legitimately hers." Maybe, the whole story is a "feigned" one to blind the world to the real facts.

It is with the deepest regret that we have to chronicle the death of that ardent and devoted Baconian, Dr. H. A. W. Speckman, Professor of Mathematics, of Arnheim, at an advanced age. We convey our sincere sympathy to his widow in her bereavement.

In the library of the late Sir Edwin Durning Lawrence at Carlton-House Terracc, S.W., is a wonderfully preserved copy of the original edition of the Latin work on cyphers, entitled "Cryptomenytices et cryptographie," and ascribed to Gustavus Selenus. As we have remarked before, this work, which was published at the same time as the First Folio of Shakespeare, and of Bacon's "De Augmentis Scientiarum," is reputed by scholars to have been either written or compiled by Bacon, and we are indebted to the late Dr. Speckman for an ingenious interpretation of this opinion which he sent to *Baconiana* some time ago but which has not before been printed.

On page 287 of this intriguing book, there appears an example of a curious table of 16 letters in which a secret numerical code is given for the letters, thus:—

H	I	L	M	N	O	P	R
2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
S	T	V	A	B	C	D	E
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29

The letters of the table form an anagram:

L. MR. BACON EDIT OPUS,

or rendered L=50=Rosa. Magister Bacon publishes this book.

The figures below the letters also form a code. The initial and final letters of the first horizontal row are 2 and 9. They may be read as 29 (by the letter variant, B.I.), or 92 in reverse, which spells "Bacon" in the Reverse Cabala (B=23, A=24, C=22, O=11, N=12). They may be read also as $9 \times 2 = 18$ or 108, the inclusion or rejection of the cypher symbol being always permissible. The

number 108 spells "Francis" in the Reverse Cabala. Further, the sum of the numbers in Cross-Count of the first horizontal row, is 44, and the sum of the second row is 60 (or 6). The addition of 44 and 6 is 50, which represents "Rosa" in the Simple Cabala. The multiplication, further, of 44 by 6 equals 264, which spells "Bacon-Shakespeare" in the Reverse Cabala.

It is not commonly known that there exists a mathematical relation between the numbers of the Simple and Reverse cabalas, for the same name or word. If S is the Simple sign and R the Reverse sign of the same word, and n the number of letters in that word, then

$$R = n \times 25 - S.$$

Demonstration. The sum of the numerical values of the same letters in *Simple* and *Reverse* (Front and Back counts) is invariably 25. The sum of the numerical values of the n letters of a word in Simple and Reverse will therefore be

$$n \times 25.$$

$$\text{or, } S + R = n \times 25, \text{ or } R = n \times 25 - S.$$

Example. IMMERITO, Simple count, 97; Reverse count, $8 \times 25 - 97 = 103$ (which incidentally spells "Shakespeare" in Simple count.

In March, 1916, Mr. William N. Selig, the well-known cinema-film manufacturer, applied in the Circuit Court of Cook Co., U.S.A., for an injunction to restrain Col. George Fabyan, the Riverbank Co., Mrs. Elizabeth Wells Gallup and Miss E. Wells from publishing alleged decipherings of cypher communications from the works of Shakespeare which declare that Francis Bacon was the true author and that "Shakespeare" was but a mask. It was alleged on behalf of Mr. Selig that on the 23 April, 1916, the tercentenary of the death of William Shakespeare would be recognized throughout all civilized lands by appropriate services, ceremonies and representations to portray the love and respect which the literary world holds for William Shakespeare as the author of the said works. It was further stated that he (Mr. Selig) paid and laid out large sums of money and performed a great deal of work in the preparation for and arrangements of suitable characters, processions, shows, and other representations having to do with the life, the time, and the work of William Shakespeare, with the intention to produce moving pictures and pictorial reproductions of said characters, processions, shows, and other representations for the purpose of public exhibitions thereof in theatres and moving-picture playhouses throughout the United States of America, and that the exhibition thereof would produce very large financial returns if the same could be reproduced with the reputation of Shakespeare

as author unimpeached. It was further represented that the cypher stories were so marvellous in construction, so perfect in rendition, and so true in recital of historical facts, that wherever exhibited they had won acceptance, and the fear was expressed that if the defendants were allowed to publish and distribute books in the form in which they had prepared the same for publication the other side would be irreparably damaged, the fame of Shakespeare as author of all of said works would be shattered and the public generally would not attend exhibitions of said moving-pictures, thereby involving the loss, not only of all the profits which would otherwise be made, but of the capital investment connected with the enterprise.

In an application for an adjudication that William Shakespeare was the true author of all the Tragedies, Comedies, Plays and Sonnets, which heretofore had been attributed to him, Mr. Selig asked that the alleged secret cypher story discovered in said works and interpreted by a code found in the works of Francis Bacon be declared illegal and improper; that the defendants be restrained from publishing any of the books containing the Life of Sir Francis Bacon, and any of 13 plays, viz., 'The Life of Elizabeth,' the 'Life of the Earl of Essex'; the 'White Rose of Britain'; the 'Life and Death of Edward III'; the 'Life of Henry VII'; the tragedy of 'Mary, Queen of Scots'; 'Robert, the Earl of Essex (My late Brother)'; 'Robert, the Earl of Leicester (My late Father)'; the 'Life and Death of Christopher Marlowe'; the tragedy of 'Anne Boleyn'; the comedies, 'Seven Wise Men of the West,' 'Solomon the Second,' and 'The Mouse-Trap.' We reprint, in this issue, the result of the action, as reported in the American newspapers on April 22, 1916, which is the substantial part of the Decree of Court, a copy of which we have in our possession. We think that too few are aware that an important question such as this has actually been fought out in a court of law with a victory for the Baconians. We are arranging to reprint 'Bacon *versus* Shakspere' as a leaflet for distribution at a small charge per hundred.

H.S.

CORRESPONDENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SHAKESPEARE NOT AN ACTOR.

Sir,—

Nearly eighty years ago Gervinus wrote in his "Commentaries" that "Shakespeare despised the million, and Bacon feared with Phocion the applause of the multitude." The truth of this is apparent from the words of the Duke in "Measure for Measure"—a character which is a reflection of "Shakespeare" himself:—

I love the people
But do not like to stage me to their eyes.
Though it do well, I do not relish well
Their loud applause and Aves vehement;
Nor do I think the man of safe discretion
That does affect it.

In what is considered to be the earliest Shakespeare play we find the same point of view:—

Glory grows guilty of detested crimes
When for fame's sake, for praise, an outward part,
We bend to that the working of the heart.

Love's Labour's Lost, IV-1.

No professional actor ever wrote those lines. All "the working of his heart" is directed towards one end—Fame; and it is not considered a "detested crime" on his part to seek praise. No actor would have the slightest chance of success who adopted Shakespeare's sentiments on this subject, any more than would a professional playwright who, like Shakespeare, allowed his plays to be printed in the first instances without his name, and the works of inferior dramatists under his name without so much as a protest on his part.

Yours truly,
R. L. EAGLE.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

Sir,—

It is undoubted that Francis Bacon's great mind evolved the Church of England out of the chaos left by the Reformation.

There is evidence to prove he was the author of the beautiful prayer-book that succeeded the book of Edward VIth.

He it was who instituted the perfect service of Holy Communion which in its exquisite spiritual beauty transcends all others.

He freed it from the scriptural errors of the Roman Catholic Mass,

and steered it clear of the rocks of Lutheran and Puritan Sectarian latitudes.

It is precisely this wonderful edifice that the Bishops (forgetful of their vows) are now wrecking, with the aid of those enemies of the Church who have been slowly undermining her authority.

I advise all Baconians to read all that Bacon has to say about the Church, and religion, both in the Essays and his other works.

Yours truly,

FRANCISCAN.

RICHARD II. AND HENRY IV.

Sir,—I want to congratulate Mr. Henry Seymour on his excellent article in the last *Baconiana*. There is one point, and one point only, of criticism I would raise for the purpose of being better informed on the point. He says the Queen regarded Richard II., which was the last of the anonymous plays, as treasonable, and that she enlisted Bacon in the effort to find the author. But his footnote reference does not seem to me to confirm this, for "that book which was dedicated to my Lord Essex," was not Richard II., but Henry IV.

Yours truly,

A BARRISTER.

[The prose work entitled *The First Part of the Life and Raigne of King Henrie the III.*, ascribed to I.H. (John Hayward, Kt.), was to all intents and purposes, the life and reign of Richard II., and was the precursor of the latter, and was inextricably bound up with it. It has 150 pages,—the greater number of which give the most detailed incidents, including the deposition, of King Richard II.,—whereas the few concluding pages are devoted only to the coming in of Henry IV. The Dedication to the Earl of Essex is in Latin, and is signed "I. HAYVVARDE."—*Henry Seymour.*]

ELIZABETHAN SPORT.

Sir,—An interesting *Study of Shakespeare and of Elizabethan Sport* was published in 1897 by the Right Hon. D. H. Madden, Vice Chancellor of the University of Dublin, under the title of *The Diary of Master William Silent*. He quotes Dr. Johnson for his Motto to the book: "He that will understand Shakespeare must not be content to study him in the closet, he must look for his meaning sometimes among the sports of the field." He quotes on page 8 the "most venerable" tradition about the deer-stealer of Stratford. "Much given to all unluckiness in stealing venison and rabbits; particularly from Sir Lucy who had him oft whipt and sometimes imprisoned. and at last made him fly his native country

to his great advancement." The book presents more or less a problem which I would lay before your readers. The immortal plays are proved to be the work of one who has the hunt of the deer, and the hare, the game of England, the flight of the falcon and the hawk, the "talking of Hawking," absolutely at his finger ends. Indeed Madden proves that Shakespeare's Falconry is not only apt but exact. Then he writes this: p. 222:

"Who were the wise men whose love of Hawking amazed Ben Jonson?"

"I both learn'd why wise men hawking follow,
And why that bird was sacred to Apollo."

—Epigram.

adding:

"I know of one who in all respects answers the description; that wise man, namely, of whom Jonson wrote in his *Discoveries*, 'I loved the man, and do honour his memory, on this side idolatry as much as any.' So good so far, then he continues: 'There was indeed, another wise man of transcendent genius, also well known to Jonson, who happened to be a man of birth and breeding, but who differed from his fellows in his attitude towards the sports and pastimes of the day, and in whose mind the allusions collected in these pages would have excited no emotion, unless it were one of distaste. When Francis Bacon took all knowledge for his province, his *omne scibile* comprehended none of the mysteries in which the writer of these passages found unceasing delight. This is not to be wondered at. The "age between sixteen and three and twenty" (*Winters Tale* iii.3.59) was passed by him in pursuits far different from those which engaged the lifelong affection of Shakespeare. Had he been so inclined the delicacy of his health would have forbidden him to indulge in violent exercises. We should not have looked for any indication of such tastes. . . in his philosophical works; although I doubt that Shakespeare could have written the *Natural History*, or *New Atlantis* without his speech in some degree betraying him.' I break off to remark how about the exquisite language of Hamlet? Did that betray the dialect of a Stratford peasant? Madden is hardly logical. He continues as follows: 'It is in Bacon's *Essays* . . . that we expect to find evidence of his lighter pursuits. . . . He discourses of foreign travel, and condescends to such toys as masques, triumphs, dancing, and acting to song; but he never writes of horse, hawk or hound. In the *Essay of Building*, indeed . . . he mentions 'want of places at some near distance for sports of hunting, hawking, and races.' But beyond this general and almost inevitable reference to field sports, and a very commonplace reference to the greyhound and the hare in the *essay of Discourse* he has nothing to tell us about any of

them, not even when he speaks of the exercises proper to be taken for the regimen of health, and in the aid of studies. Bacon's attitude towards field sports, as far as it can be gathered from his writings and from the known course of his life was probably that of his kinsman Burleigh of whom Fuller tells the following tale'' etc.: I have quoted enough to make my suggestion a reasonable one. Can any of your readers explain how it is that in this matter of field sports so great a difference should be found between the tastes of Bacon and Shakespeare when we so faithfully believe them to be but one?

Yours,

Hampstead,
June, 1927.

A STAUNCH BACONIAN.

BACON ANAGRAMS.

Sir,—I send you a curious anagram I found in Marlowe's *Faustus*. Mr. Parker Woodward believes that Bacon wrote *Faustus*. I don't know what to think.

Yours sincerely,

GEO. REWCASTLE,
9, Cornelia Terrace,
Seaham Harbour.

Ending on the 33rd word from the end of *Faustus* (early edition) and also ending on the 33rd word after the Clock strikes twelve.

''And fall into the ocean, ne'er be found.''

The anagram is extracted by using the letters *h* and *o* twice, which is permissible (See Camden), and it reads thus:—

'' Tell e'en none of a hidden author, F. Bacon.''



