Vol. XXII.
No. 82 (Third Series.)

Price 2/6 net

BACONIANA

JANUARY, 1935.

CONTENTS.

PAGE.

Who was the first Baconian? By Bertram G. Theobald, B.A. - - - - - - - - - - - 1

A Cypher Criticism. By Howard Bridgewater - - 10

The Retort Courteous. By Henry Seymour - - 15

Of Wisdom of the Ancients. By Alicia A. Leith - 22

The Annual Dinner - - - - - - - - - 26

Francis Bacon. By W. H. Fox, F.S.A. - - - - 30

Pallas Athene - - - - - - - - - - - 31

A Belated Publication - - - - - - - - 33

The Interrogatories of Francis Bacon - - - 35

Annual Meeting of the Bacon Society - - - 42

Book Notices - - - - - - - - - - 43

Bacon Society Lectures - - - - - - - - 45

Notes and Notices - - - - - - - - - 46

Correspondence - - - - - - - - - - 48

LONDON:
THE BACON SOCIETY INCORPORATED
47, GORDON SQUARE, W.C.1.

The Bacon Society

(INCORPORATED).

47 GORDON SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.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 Shakspere, 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 Mr. Henry Seymour, Hon. Sec. of the Bacon Society, 47 Gordon Square, W.C.1.

Single copies of BACONIANA 2*s.* 6*d.*, plus postage. To members and Associates, 1*s.* plus postage.

Officers of the Society: President, Bertram G. Theobald, B.A.; Vice-Presidents, Lady Sydenham, The Dowager Lady Boyle, Miss A. A. Leith, Mr. Harold Bayley, Mr. Frank Woodward, Dr. H. Spencer Lewis, and Mr. Horace Nickson; Chairman of Council, Mr. Howard Bridgewater; Vice-Chairman, Mr. Percy Walters; Hon. Treasurer, Mr. Lewis Biddulph; Auditor, Mr. G. L. Emmerson, A.C.I.S., F.L.A.A.

AN APPEAL TO OUR READERS.

The unique collection of Elizabethan literature which is now possessed by the Bacon Society Inc. is next in importance to that of the Durning-Lawrence Library recently acquired by the London University.

This is mainly due to gifts of books made to the Society by various Donors during past years, or left to it by will, with the object of assisting its research work and rendering the collection still more complete.

The Bacon Society Inc. appeals to those who have accumulated books (whether few or many) bearing on the Bacon-Shakespeare Problem and the Elizabethan-Jacobean period generally, and who would be unwilling that such books should be dispersed in the future or remain unappreciated. It is suggested that bequests of collections, or gifts of individual books (especially early editions), as well as donations or bequests of money, would very much benefit the Society, and would be gratefully accepted.

Members of the Council will gladly give advice and assistance in the selection of any books which may be proposed by prospective donors.

BACONIANA

VOL. XXII, *Third Series*. JAN., 1935. No. 82

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.

WHO WAS THE FIRST BACONIAN?

By BERTRAM G. THEOBALD, B.A.

THE genesis of the Bacon-Shakespeare problem in England is commonly dated from the year 1856, when the attribution of the Shakespeare dramas to Francis Bacon was mooted in a letter written by Mr. William Henry Smith to Lord Ellesmere, followed in 1857 by Mr. Smith's little book, *Bacon and Shakespeare; An Inquiry Touching Players, Playhouses and Play-Writers in the Days of Elizabeth*.

Recently, however, Prof. Allardyce Nicoll has discovered an earlier Baconian in the person of a certain James Corton Cowell (See *Times Literary Supplement*, Jan., Feb,, 1932). In 1803 Mr. Cowell had occasion to read a paper before the Ipswich Philosophical Society on the genius of the poets Shakespeare and Milton, and then "undertook the task of enlarging yet further on the life of Shakespeare." But, as might have been expected, the more he searched for material, the more he was perplexed by the entire lack of reliable information. In

these straits, he came across a gentleman living at Barton-on-the-Heath, near Stratford-on-Avon, who furnished him with an explanation of the difficulty. It seems that the Rector of Barton-on-the-Heath was the Rev. James Wilmot, D.D., and that he was a great student of the works of Bacon. Through this study he very nearly came to a conclusion, which must almost inevitably be reached by any who will pursue the enquiry far enough. He felt that the astounding similarities of diction, phrase, thought, opinion, and even error, between the works of Bacon and those of "Shakespeare" could hardly have any other meaning except that the two sets of writings were the product of one mind. This was about 1785. Apparently Dr. Wilmot did not committ himself definitely to the opinion that Bacon wrote the Shakespeare plays, but he was "able to prepare a cap which fits him amazingly." Mr. Cowell thereupon had to appear before the Ipswich Philosophical Society in 1805 with the shocking confession that he had become a pervert to the faith which he had hitherto held!

In view of these facts, orthodox Stratfordians will now look upon Dr. Wilmot as being the first Baconian, and the date of his conversion to the theory round about 1785. But we know better. The good Dr. Wilmot was very far from being the first Baconian.

In 1769 there appeared a curious book entitled *The Life and Adventures of Common Sense: An Historical Allegory*, attributed on somewhat slender evidence to a medical man of the name of Herbert Lawrence. The story introduces a character called *Wisdom*, clearly to be equated with Francis Bacon; and there are enigmatical references to "the Mask of Humour," and to the robbery by a certain person of "the Goods and Chattles of Humour" containing this mask. Then comes the following passage; "With these materials, and with good Parts of his own, he commenced Play-Writer, how he succeeded is needless to say, when I tell the Reader that his name was *Shakespear*." Naturally orthodox critics affect to believe that all this was merely chaff and not to be taken seriously. But those who have delved into

these questions can see very well that this book was just one more attempt to convey hints as to the authorship problem.

Let us push the enquiry a little further back, say to the year 1740, when David Mallet published his edition of Bacon's works, containing a biography of the great author. Outwardly, Mallet does not appear to present any startling revelations. He relates quite soberly the main facts, basing himself, as all biographers must do, on the information given by Dr. William Rawley, Bacon's Secretary and Chaplain. But to those who can read between the lines, it becomes evident that Mallet knew more than he chose to tell; and by means of the very same secret codes employed by Bacon himself throughout his whole literary career, Mallet tells us that Francis Bacon was in truth "Shake-speare" and likewise that he was a Tudor Prince.

Although this latter problem has no direct connection with the Shakespeare problem, yet it is an extraordinarily fascinating question, and if Francis Bacon's royal birth is eventually proved to be a fact, it will shed light on many dark places in the literature and events of those days. Accordingly, it is desirable to collect evidence on this subject, in order that we may judge how the matter stands.

Looking still further back, we may say of the 1730 Blackbourne edition of Bacon's works precisely what applies to Mallet's edition. Blackbourne was in the secret and reveals it to us by similar methods. Then comes Nicholas Rowe, who in 1709 gave the world the first so-called biography of Shakspere. It is a poor thing at best, which is not surprising, seeing that Rowe, like all other biographers, can only supply very scanty facts concerning the actor's life—and not all these, for some are of modern discovery. He also gives the various rumours and traditions, which by that time had crystallized into something tangible. But unlike modern biographers, who give free reign to their fancy, and invent an imaginary personage, whose attainments match those which must have been possessed by the true author, Rowe was honest and did not invent. The result is, of course, a very un-

satisfactory and unconvincing picture. Again we note that Rowe, like Mallet and Blackbourne, says one thing in open print and quite other things in secret; for he too, shows his knowledge of the authorship secret. But even he was not the first Baconian.

From 1709 we travel back to 1679, when a very important book was published. After the death of Bacon's secretary and literary executor, Dr. Wm. Rawley, the remaining manuscripts which he had not dealt with, were entrusted to Dr. (afterwards Archbishop) Tenison, a great admirer of Francis Bacon. Tenison put together some more fragments, together with commentary of his own, and these appeared under the title *Baconiana or Certaine Genuine Remains of Sir Francis Bacon, etc.*" This little volume is packed with concealed allusions to the authorship secret, and Tenison gives a full and clever display of Baconian cryptography. But a passage in his commentary to which opecial attention may be drawn is by no means an obscure hint; it is an open statement, revealing as much as he dared at that time. His words are as follows; "And those who have true skill in the Works of the Lord *Verulam* like great Masters in Painting, can tell by the Design, the Strength, the way *of Colouring*, whether he was the Author of this or the other Piece, though his Name be not to it." Here is a definite, unequivocal affirmation that "the Lord *Verulam*" was the Author of works which did not bear his name; and, coming from so unimpeachable a source, it must be received as a truthful utterance. Tenison does not tell us whether the works alluded to were anonymous or pseudonymous, and so we are intended to use our own judgment in examining any book of doubtful authorship. This quite is in accord with Francis Bacon's own saying *mente videbor*, "by the mind shall I be seen."

The importance of this piece of evidence can hardly be over estimated, since it provides a prima facie case for minute inspection of any contemporary volumes which may be suspected of emanating from Bacon's pen. It is known that a considerable quantity of the literature of that period was and still is, anonymous; also that many books

were published with names or initials on their title-pages which did not represent real authors, since the ethical code on those matters was far looser than it is in our day. We are therefore fully justified in applying a close scrutiny to this aspect of the problem; and having been assured by a trustworthy authority that anonymous or pseudonymous works from Francis Bacon's pen are in existence, we may search in the expectation of being rewarded. We have searched, we are rewarded; but much still remains to be done, for the full tale is not yet told.

But Tenison was not the first Baconian; and we now continue our backward movement from 1679 to the years 1671, 1661, and 1657, when Dr. Rawley issued the third, second and first editions respectively of his "Resuscitatio, Or, Bringing into Public Light Severall Pieces of the Works, *Civil, Historical and Theological*, Hitherto Sleeping; of the Right Honourable Francis Bacon, etc. He also edited in 1658 the *Opuscula Varia Posthuma*, a small collection of miscellaneous fragments. It has often been remarked that his "Epistle to the Reader," as also his "Life of the Honourable Author," is in several places curiously ambiguous, and gives the impression that he, like others, was deliberately keeping back facts which he did not deem ripe for disclosure. In one passage he remarks, "Whereby, I shall not tread too near, upon the *Heels of Truth*;" and in another he announces that "FRANCIS BACON, *the Glory of his Age, and Nation*; *The* Adorner, *and* Ornament *of* Learning; *was born in York* House, *or* York Place *in the Strand*." Now Rawley must have known perfectly well that "York House" was the former residence of Sir Nicholas Bacon, while "York Place" was another name for the royal palace of Whitehall, a residence of Queen Elizabeth. Why did he speak in this enigmatical way, unless it was for the purpose of cautiously raising the question as to whether Francis was really the son of Sir Nicholas Bacon, or secretly the offspring of Queen Elizabeth?

But I must not wander along such alluring by-paths as these. Suffice it to say that Rawley has given us ample

evidence, by concealed methods, that he was cognisant of the whole position but was bound to secrecy.

We now come to 1626, the year of Bacon's death—or shall we say his disappearance from public view? In that year, Rawley put forth a thin volume containing some 30 eulogies by contemporary writers, most of them University men of Oxford and Cambridge, written in Latin, which was the common language of the learned in those days. Now the extraordinary fact is, that while hardly ever referring to him as either lawyer or statesman, these eulogies not only give him praise as a philosopher, but many of them openly designate him as the greatest *poet* of his age, if not of all time. Not only so, but one of them exclaims that Bacon has "filled the world with tomes," which would appear to be nonsense; for the whole of his *acknowledged* writings would not occupy more than about four thick quarto volumes. Even allowing for customary exaggeration, these statements are so remarkable that we at once ask, "Where are these voluminous works?" And orthodox editors, even including James Spedding, tell us *nothing*. Spedding either had not discovered these *Manes Verulamiani* as they are called, or could not understand them and remained silent. But why do more modern editors and critics never allude to such astounding facts? There can be but one answer. They are afraid of them. The evidence is so startling that they dare not face it, and could not possibly explain it away. Many of those old writers were fully aware of the Shakespeare secret, and so we find among Bacon's own contemporaries quite a group of what would now be called Baconians.

Naturally this raises the final question as to how far the literary and scientific men of Bacon's own day were aware of his extensive concealed authorship. This subject would demand a series of articles in itself, and so cannot be developed here. Similarly, the evidence of Ben Jonson, commonly considered as the sheet anchor of the Stratfordian faith, would require special and lengthy treatment; for he is actually among the staunchest and

most effective supporters of the Baconian theory. Not only does he give us a wonderful display of cryptography in his well known poem in the 1623 Shakespeare Folio, and in the lines signed "B.I." facing the title page, but his own plays contain a number of hits at Francis Bacon as a concealed dramatist; while *Every Man Out Of His Humour*, printed in the collected edition of Jonson's works in 1616, and first acted in 1599, has a biting satire on the actor Will Shaksper in the character of *Sogliardo*, representing him as an upstart ignoramus "ramping to gentilitie." Yes, Jonson knew all about it; but even he was probably not the first Baconian, at least so far as written records may be taken as evidence; though of course he *may* have discovered the secret even a little before 1599.

We are now approaching the end of our quest; and almost necessarily so, since the name "Shakespeare" first appeared in print, at the foot of the dedication to Lord Southampton of *Venus and Adonis*. This poem was registered at Stationers Hall on 18th April, 1593, and no doubt published within a few weeks of that date, certainly by June. Be it specially noted that at this time Will Shaksper was not yet on the the official list of actors, since it was not until Christmas 1593 that his name is first seen in that capacity. Moreover, until 1598, all editions of the "Shakespeare" dramas had appeared anonymously. Shakspere the man was therefore almost, if not entirely, unknown to the literary world in 1593. Hence there was *at that time* no reason whatever for supposing him to be an author.

In 1597 there appeared a little volume of Satires from the pen of Joseph Hall, afterwards Bishop Hall; and according to the prevailing custom of the times, he lays about him vigorously, condemning some of the current fashions and foibles, and castigating various personages under thinly disguised allusions or nicknames. Among the characters thus lampooned was one whom Hall dubbed *Labeo*, and from an examination of the various passages referring to this person, it becomes clear that Hall has given this nickname to the author of the recently published

poem *Venus and Adonis*. In the next year, 1598, John Marston published his *Pigmalions Image* and he compares the metamorphosis of Pygmalion, as described in his own work, to that of Adonis described by "Shakespeare," in *Venus and Adonis*. A study of these allusions leaves no doubt that Marston likewise refers to "Shakespeare" under the name of *Labeo*. And to clinch the argument, the count of the word Labeo in all three of the cipher codes habitually employed by Francis Bacon, is the same as the count of the word Bacon.

The next step in the argument is this. Marston chaffs Hall, half reprovingly, for having satirised certain persons, evidently thinking that such satire was undeserved; and he makes this striking remark:

"What, not *mediocria firma* from thy spight?" i.e., Has not even *mediocria firma* escaped your spite? There cannot be any dispute as to the identity of this person, seeing that those two words formed the family motto of the Bacons. From this line we learn that Hall has satirised Bacon. But where? Hall does not mention "*mediocria firma*" at all. Examine all the references to men whom Hall did satirise, and we shall find that none of them can possibly allude to Bacon, *except* those in which he is talking about *Labeo*. In other words, Marston's *mediocria firma* is identical with Hall's *Labeo*. But both Hall's and Marston's *Labeo* unquestionably refer to the author of *Venus and Adonis*. Therefore *mediocria firma*, or Bacon, is that author. Naturally I have only given the pith of the matter, and in order fully to appreciate the weight of this evidence, the various extracts should be studied in extenso. But the argument is sound, and there is no possible escape from the conclusion that both Hall and Marston at this early date had already identified Francis Bacon as the writer of *Venus and Adonis*, and said so as openly as they dared.

Although this evidence has been published for more than a quarter of a century, and has been given by several Baconian writers, yet orthodox editors, so far as I am aware, never even mention it. Look at one of the standard

editions of Marston's works, that by A. H. Bullen. In various places he gives a foot-note explaining who is the person referred to in such and such an allusion. But in spite of the challenging italics in which *mediocria firma* is printed, both in Marston's original and in Bullen's text, the reference is passed by in silence. Here is another case where Baconian evidence is so deadly, that orthodox editors dare not face it; and this testimony of Hall and Marston has been virtually suppressed. By such methods is the establishment of truth delayed.

We have now reached the limit of our search; and although fresh evidence may yet come to light, we can already say that the first Baconian, so far as present knowledge goes, was Joseph Hall in 1597, only three years after the world had first seen the name "Shakespeare" in print. The Bacon-Shakespeare question, therefore, so far from being an invention of modern times, sprang into existence at least as early as the year 1597.

A CYPHER CRITICISM.

By Howard Bridgewater
BARRISTER-AT-LAW.

AMONGST his other activities Francis Bacon devoted himself, for a time, to the study of cyphers, which in his day were far more in vogue than they have been since. The suggestion, therefore, that he may have constructed certain parts of his writing so that, subjected to the analysis of certain cypher rules, they would reveal a message of some kind or other, cannot be ruled out. The search for such cypher messages is, accordingly, a legitimate pursuit.

But may I suggest that more restraint should be exercised in making public the results of such researches when they are obtained by means so fantastic that they can only bring not only the Bacon Society, but the cypherists themselves into disrepute?

Before emphasising this recommendation with criticism of an alleged cypher discovery to which prominence was recently given in Baconiana I would like to draw attention to the vast difference between such a cypher as the Biliteral, and the various numerical cyphers. The former has the great advantage that it can be applied to what has already been written. It does not, therefore, cramp one's style. The message which it is desired to convey can be incorporated by the simple instruction to the printer to use two fonts of type to differentiate the letters of each word, so that they may be read as "A" or "B" symbols.

Mrs. Gallup claims to have found that this method was in fact employed by Francis Bacon in many works. That being so, a principal work of the Bacon Society should be to prove that this was the case, for if Mrs. Gallup's contention is correct, the Baconian theory is proved up to the hilt. Surely it should be possible to prove the genuineness of Mrs. Gallup's decyphering to any dozen good men and true such as one would empanel in a jury: if not, then it should be neither accepted nor quoted in support of the Baconian case, as being something that can only be

accepted on *faith*—a hopeless foundation, nowadays, upon which to found any serious thesis.

To embody in one's writing a message by means of a numerical cypher would present, of course, a much more difficult task, for not only must the words written be selected with a view to their numerical values, but they must make sense, and also rhyme or be of the required metre.

I can understand a single word being thought out with a view to the value of its component letters, or to the application thereto of some cypher other than numerical, and I will admit that I was much intrigued by Miss Sennett's discovery that the unusual and apparently meaningless word "ducdame," which appears in "As You Like It," being subjected to the rules governing what is known as the "clock" cypher, was found to yield a string of letters containing, inter alia (but only inter alia) those forming the name F. Bacon. If that word was coined with the object of yielding this name upon analysis by this means, the author would, of course, have had to work backwards, making up firstly a series of letters containing those forming his name and then ascertaining the product by the reverse process—a matter involving no little time and patience, but still a possible explanation of so curious a word as "ducdame"; which, however, we are impolitely told by Jacques is "an invocation to call fools into a circle!"

But whereas one may assume that a single and so unusual word was evolved in this way, the mind boggles at the idea that whole sentences that flow according to the rhythm and sense of their context, could have been so devised so that their total, or even partial numerical values would yield a message.

To take a case in point. In the last issue of BACONIANA appears an article, by my good friend, Mr. Henry Seymour, in which he labours in the first place to show that "W.S.W.S. WAS A SOTT" is to be deduced, anagramatically, from the initial letters of Sonnet 76. Can we really imagine that the greatest philosopher of his

age would go out of his way to perpetrate and perpetuate such a message? And, if he did, why W.S. twice? And why are there in the total of initial letters two more than are required even after two of them have been mopped up in the repetition of W.S.? Mr. Seymour might, I think, have spared us this result of his research, more especially as he himself goes on to say that "Such a revelation, however, is not exactly what we are seeking!"

Mr. Seymour then proceeds to subject the last two lines of the sonnet to examination. He takes the initial letters of all the words therein and gets, as he thinks, this likely-looking string: F A T S I D N A O S I M L S T W I T. I shall show you in a moment what he makes of it, but let us just pause and consider (if Mr. Seymour is right in his conclusion) what this means. It means no less than that every one of the words in the following two lines were selected so that the sum of their initial letters should produce this string of letters and no other. The lines are

> "For as the sun is daily new and old,
> So is my love still telling what is told."

Now, ask yourself, could any man living construct two lines of rhyme which must complete the sense of preceding lines and be of exactly the required length and meter, subject to the handicap that the first letters of these words (however mixed up) must produce the particular string of letters above given? The fatuity of Mr. Seymour's investigation is here apparent, but it is nothing compared with what follows.

Overlooking altogether the improbability if not impossibility of such a feat as that just mentioned, Mr. Seymour thinks that out of this string of letters there "leaps to the eye" what he terms "the following anagram":—

T.DISSIMWLATION.F.AS T.

By assuming that the printer's error in an earlier line of the sonnet (by which the word "tel" was in the original edition made to read "Fel") was intentional, for the purpose of (as he calls it) "signalising" the number 22, Mr.

Seymour is informed that "the secret alphabet of Trithemius is being employed in the device!" Oh dear! Oh dear! So—to use his own words—he "chases the hare," and proceeds to anagrammatise the whole of the letters in the two lines, and, as he says "after several trials and eliminations, as also word transpositions" (which, in plain English means making up any words you can with the letters at your disposal and juggling them about) he gets this:—

Author's name is Hidd. Follow Sly Guides.
Sonnet Initials Two Dyalls Tell.

It doesn't matter of course that "Hidd" is spelt with two "D's" and "dial" with a "y" and two "L's". Little difficulties like that occasion, I find, no concern to the true decipherer. So the hare has still to be chased! But what I would like to ask is this: would any great man, desirous to convey a message to posterity, rely upon the chance of such interminable juggling with figures and words? But Mr. Seymour goes merrily on "towards the elucidation of the puzzle" (of his own creating). As a preliminary we are treated to a lengthy description of the Trithemius (or "clock") method, and are then asked to believe that one is instructed by the number of the sonnet (76) to turn the small dial to the seventh position on the left and the sixth on the right!

Mr. Seymour then proceeds to leave his last-line initial letters to take care of themselves and jumps back to the previously discarded initial letters which he now calls the secret key letters, and by juggling with these gets two rows of letters giving two complete signatures:—

M. FR. Bacon. M. FR. Bacon.

But what are they worth by this time? By such devious means? And even so, there are eight letters not used, whereas, as he himself points out "the perfection of an anagram is that every letter is accounted for." But, of course, there are certain exceptions! And nothing daunted, our indefatigable decipherer goes on to explain away the superfluous letters. It appears that the letter "H" may most conveniently be added or rejected and so

on. It is now abundantly clear to the reader, if not to Mr. Seymour, that by this means he could get the name F. Bacon out of anything he liked—without convincing anyone that there was the slightest significance in the accomplishment.

I now quote:—If, therefore, we reject the letter "H" of the first line and logically (?) the letter "T" of the second line of which it is but a counterpart, together with the other superfluous letters, which are all repeats of the letters once used in the anagram, then we may say that the double anagram of M. Fr. Bacon is doubly conclusive": With all due respect it is doubly fantastic. For we now see that what the author of the sonnet had to do was not merely to cramp his style by beginning each word of each line with a particular letter, but that each of these particular letters had to be selected so that having been doubly "dialed," first to the right and then to the left, after the manner described they would give (after all the eliminations, etc., taken advantage of by Mr. Seymour) letters out of which the name, M. Fr. Bacon could be drawn. I do not hesitate to say that it would take an altogether prohibitive amount of time to accomplish such a thing.

Perhaps Mr. Seymour, with his marvellous ingenuity would like to convince me otherwise. If he can himself devise a sensible verse which being subjected in all respects to the same process as that by which he has so conclusively shown that sonnet 76 was designed to yield the name Fr. Bacon, will yield his own name (which however must be understood to be Henry Seymour (and not Hy. Seymour, or H. Seymour or M. H. Seymour or other variant thereof) I will gladly present the Bacon Society with £2 2s. 0d.

THE RETORT COURTEOUS.

A REPLY TO THE FOREGOING.

BY HENRY SEYMOUR.

"*The Knowledge of Cyphering* hath drawn on with it a knowledge relative unto it, which is the knowledge of *Discyphering*, or of Discreting *Cyphers*, though a man were utterly ignorant of the *Alphabet* of the *Cypher* and the Capitulations of secrecy past between the Parties. Certainly it is an Art which requires great paines and a good witt and is (as the other was) consecrate to the Counsels of Princes: yet notwithstanding by diligent prevision it may be made unprofitable though, as things are, it be of great use. The judgement hereof we referre to those who are most able to judge of these *Arts*. *For seeing it is the fashion of many who would be thought to know much, that every were makeing ostentation of words and outward termes of* Arts, *they become a wonder to the ignorant, but a derision to those that are Masters of those Arts: we hope that our Labours shall have a contrarie successe, which is, that they may arrest the judgment of every one who is best vers'd in every particular Art, and be undervalued by the rest.*"—ADVANCEMENT OF LEARNING. (1640 edn.).

This happy quotation from Bacon himself suggests that H.B. does not really possess that "diligent prevision," or esoteric understanding that gives good judgment the palm, since he is evidently unable to observe the most obvious objectives in cryptographic procedure. If you want to understand Bacon's Cyphers you must be able to see new applications of old methods, and above all, eradicate dogmatic prejudices that seldom fail to warp the wits of every investigator; the more so when matters of great

secrecy (as we may infer by such concealment), it is easy to see, were planned with care and hidden with a goodly mass of camouflage in jests, clear only to the initiated.

Of course, it is open to those with the technical talent regarding decyphering to become a son of wisdom, so aptly designated by the Master. But more than elementary logical analysis is necessary "to pierce the veil" reliably. So I advise my friend Bridgewater to preach less and pray effectively to know more about established cypher rules.

Respecting his treatment of points, unavoidably misty, raised by me on the internal evidence of other authorship of "Shakespeare" than that of a yokel, note that he agrees with the mask theory, at any rate!

If I make no mistake, the burden of his onslaught whiffles down to this: that the unusual process I trotted out in the last number regarding Bacon's name infolded under "Shakespeare's" mask in Sonnet 76, has no definite law—the complications involved in its equations denoting a chaotic Babel of letters, unfit to render possible the results claimed; moreover, a process crippling rhyme, reason, metre and making a mess of style. Rare exceptions, my friend, prove the rule, and undoubtedly all styles to "Shakespeare" were one.

Concurrently, Bacon cyphers go out of their way to yield hidden proof by mathematical tests.

It certainly requires a fertile wit, and obviously some concentration, to construct (even badly) such juggling, puzzling acrostics; and language facility is a desideratum. Every cypher, too, is in *some* language and the experts regard the acquisition of linguistics as a basis for the study. Since Bacon's cyphers are in English, they are simple.

Even H.B.'s jibe about "sott" etc. is soft. See extract, verbatim, from Francis Bacon's *Advancement of Learning*, expressing "witt" with two *t*'s; "dial" printed, besides, (read Sonnet 77) with a *y* and two *l*'s—a joke I enjoy. All Elizabethan authors used archaic orthography, and even the *Letter Book* of Gabriel Harvey contains some rather overdone examples; one proclaiming appropriately (logically) "the great Architect of the Universe" (crowning

example) as "GODD"! Old English is not easily readable to us, and it was in the time of James I. that our regularized speech commenced to be printed as now. No doubt, Bacon's *Essay* assisted the transformation.

By the rules of anagrams, with such things H.B. is not, evidently, familiar, the letter H is unique, and it only falls out or is used as special conditions demand; only regarded as an *asper* sign, as he should understand. Regarding the letter O (cypher) this also is an *occurrent*. Even though it were otherwise, inasmuch as *i*, *j* and *y* yield the same symbol and phonetic values, it follows, obviously, that such defined textual liberties impress us with the proof of infolded cypher, for the reason that particular uses of such exceptions infer ordered effort. How the fogs and mists of "nulls" by formulae attest proof of cypher, the novitiate knows; and H (cockney-wise) may be dropped or adopted carelessly.

How the occasional omission of this symbol converts a fair cypher into nought is not "abundantly clear" to me exoterically or otherwise; even though as H.B. says, the recognition of such juggling enables me to unfittingly interpret, or get the name Bacon out of anything, only failing to convince anyone there is anything in it; yet you are told in the next breath that the said encyphering of Bacon's name, inset in the Sonnet initials, was a rare undertaking as to prove too difficult for Bacon to put over!

Doubtless, my friend, in his final paragraph fancied, over-confidently, that he had me on the hip; expecting no doubt that I should haply receive my quietus. But the fact remains, that such a personal challenge is not, nor can by any sophistry be made to appear, relevant, or pertinent to the issue. How *could* such a test have a real bearing on Sonnet 76 in any event?

Coming now to the test, I will follow the same letter-arrangement, or order, making but one exception, out of reasonable necessity. A single sonnet, to be typical, excludes numbering; so a title (Welsh) is used, easily arranged, leaving it to my super critic to recognize B as P, or P as B, when forming two anagrams in English.

TEN NOS AR OF Y GOL OEA.

I'm not a poet as my friend may guess,
Although in rhyme I'll blunt the points he wrought,
Cut capers with 'em, stamp them with impress
To prove how captious carpers can be caught.
Quaint cypher methods Bacon made his quest,
Worked secret magic—black and white—in wit;
Give "clocke" turn back (Trithemius assessed),
By two half-movements, right and lef, to quit.
Wherefore, my friend, fall by the "error" *fel*?
Quiddle as prophet (which word here fits best)?
For this rhymed wit, which thou could'st not foretell,
Full fills the measure of thine acid test.
By this, two guineas to the funds I'll add—
Now, who's the gainer—or which one is mad?

Let the title, firstly, be read backwards, varying each word-spacing to suit, when the newer title emerges. Subject next the letters to anagrammatic rule and see something like this: ONLY A BORN FAT GOOSE, a remark eloquent if not elegant. Next, notice abbreviation "'em" doing service for *them*, on the 3rd line—a pun just included to suggest the letter M (or numeral 12) sign. Of course, the word "fel" in the "Shakespeare" Sonnet is turned backwards, on the 8th line, and is also a hint your direction should take for the solution of the cypher.

Our next attempt is to explore the Sonnet initial anagram unmindful of its side-issues, and merely following example, respecting the double-lettered "WW. SS." final repeated. Covertly, taking all letters (A only doubled), is produced:

Total Sonnet Initials:

I A C T Q W G B W Q F F B N

Anagram:

QUAINT W(A)G, FF. BB., Q.C.

Rather a sorry specimen (like the original or worse), yet done easily. Francis has two *f*'s*, why not lefthandedly double the B for the surname? As to title, unquestionably it is true he was made Q.C. by Elizabeth's order.

The next attempt may be made with initials of the words of the two indented lines at the foot, to see if, in reckoning, a suggestive instruction is to be noted yielding a cypher clue or secret key for opening.

Initial Letters of Words.

B T T G T T F I A N W T G O W O I M

(B goes to M.)

Anagram:

GOT BIT, WANT-WIT, GO T'M.—F.

Obviously, H.B. it appears, is instructed to go to — M (under numerical equivalents, 12)—an equation recognized. Regularizing procedure, we anagrammatize the whole, expecting to get something like a definite solution, religiously taking in the whole of the letters.

Text:

By this, two guineas to the funds I'll add—
Now, who's the gainer—or which one is mad?

Anagram:

Two dials do discover author's name by a fine tuning in. Twelve. His Ghost. (HHH).

Eventually, you see, we get a merry anagram. Singularly the last three H's, which we can at least reject, throw a light trail on the proof of nulls, three times over. In the total, these three letters equal 24; the letter M gets doubled for corroboration (as the signatures); and the

* On the cover of the Northumberland Manuscripts appears "Mr. ffrauncis (sic) Bacon."

extraordinary fact, further, is that 12 is the seal giving the concealed name of 12 letters; moreover, even over-run to give the number 24—H doubly duplicated.

The double-dial Alphabet of the Abbot Trithemius.

(Arranged in parallel lines for easier observation, incidentally disclosing three anagram groups of "M. Bacon," alternating equidistantly).

```
                    Y                   W
                    J                   U
1.  [A B C] D E F G H I K L [M N O] P Q R S T V X Z [A B C]
12. [M N O] P Q R S T V X Z [A B C] D E F G H I K L [M N O]
                    U                   J
                    W                   Y
```

* * * *

THE TEST MATCH.

Outstanding Initials of *First* Words of the Lines:

I A C T Q W G B W Q F F.

Cypher Formulae:

12th Position to Left: UMOHEYSNYERR.
12th Position to Right: RRETNSYEHOMU.

Double Anagram:

HENRY SEYMOUR : HENRY SEYMOUR.

GOING ONE BETTER—A DOUBLE EVENT.

Outstanding Initials of *Last* Words of the Lines:

G W I C Q W A Q F B F T.

12th Position to Left: SYUOEYMERNRH
12th Position to Right: HRNREMYEOUYS.

Double Anagram:

HENRY SEYMOUR : HENRY SEYMOUR.

Every letter is used and the indented couplet reveals new seals—the B—N and A—M (first and last initials, one under the other, giving to either set the dial key again, openly.

Of course, this is but to rebut H.B.'s error as to style. Probably it will not satisfy him. I append an "extra" (of acrostics in rhyme) in the first initials (and last herein, the idea reversed). An anagram variant conceals a third.*

*POSTSCRIPT.—The acrostic referred to runs sequentially in the initial letters of the first words of my above reply, from the first to the last, excluding all within the bordered examples. The same verse, reversed on the right hand margin, runs sequentially in the first letters of the last word of the lines, from the last line to the first. The third variant (two words only changed on the last line of the quatrain) will also be found in the middle letters of all the words of five letters running through the text, including in this instance, the Bacon quotation at the head; but such letters do not run in sequence and require to be anagrammatized. Hoping every novitiate rightly interprets something else in meaning of verse re-arranged, finding even comedy in truth.

OF WISDOM OF THE ANCIENTS.

By Alicia A. Leith.

IN finding out what Bacon means by the word "wisdom", we shall, I believe, do good work in the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy. A modern expert on *Wisdom Literature* says the Ages never use the word "wisdom" in sense of knowledge pure and simple; a religious content was at its base. They held it to be a divine gift bringing with it close relation to God. It differed more from wordly wisdom in degree than in kind; Dr. Osterley says it was "a little more than kin to it." "Wisdom" with Bacon is a "beam of knowledge," called "Radius *refractus*," which is referred to "God", a "divine influxion of illumination," fraught with "fervency and elevation," a writing which has "more of the eagle than others." It was not only in use with the Hebrews, Bacon says, but "is more generally to be found in the wisdom of the more ancient times." Divine knowledge with Bacon is of profound importance. He quotes "Our Saviour speaking of divine knowledge as new and old store, brought forth by the kingdom of Heaven." Parables and tropes are frequent, Bacon says, in divine learning, and the wisdom of antiquity is in the poets.

Bacon believes in God applying "His inspirations to open our understanding." This is his key to the ward of the lock.

Dr. Osterley says, Wisdom Literature puts its fingers on black spots in Man, it sees them clearly; it does this that it may expunge them, and guide to better and higher knowledges. Folly, it holds as Man's heritage. It makes strong appeal to the better instincts in the brain of Mankind, if not in its heart. It ever calls reason to its aid, uses it as a wing feather in the arrows it sends on high flights. Laughter, it approves of, while it insists on it being rather more incidental than anything else. Reality of Life is more valued by Wisdom than humour. Of intrinsic Art, it paints evil in contrast to the good and pure; its rain falls equally on the good and on the evil.

Dr. Osterley quotes a Sage who teaches of *Three Tongued*; people who make mischief between others. There is a difference, he says, between the West and the East. The former is more self-controlled than the latter, while lacking the high ideals of the latter. Wisdom writers have been strong in both *knowing and doing*, in both *receiving and giving*. The gift of counsel is theirs, and they use it. And why? It is commanded them by a just God, and the fear of Him is their starting point. Wise counsel is only rendered possible by knowledge of Human Nature, and that is their Wisdom. They are a class, they do not stand alone. Sympathy with Man and with Woman is essentially theirs. They generally attune Wisdom to the understanding of men of the world, with the object of influencing them for good. Wisdom's advice is generally practical, terse, and to the point. It is not pessimistic; the harmless idiots of the world are not considered irretrievable by Wisdom Writers. It is the scorner, the arrogant and the proud who is that. Wisdom conceives ameliorative potentialities in men and women. Blind desire and grasping rapacity are shown as the chaos of life. To be hard and cruel is to find only disappointment. Mad folly says Wisdom never pays. Evil of heart, of imagination, is more dwelt on than evil of deed. The irresponsibility of the hey-day of youth gains attention and pity. It is thoughtlessness of word that destroys relations between God and Man. Self-indulgence, gluttony, receives due measure of contempt. Ethical teaching is always paramount. That people like to make merry over other folk being found faulty gives one specially to think, also that Wisdom encourages the use of object lessons, illustrations, *living impressions* to bring fact home. As we absorb these points emphasised, flashing come the Characters and Scenes of Shake-Speare to mind. The Macbeths and their grasping rapacity, Othello, Iago and Desdemona, the victim of the mischief maker, the three-tongued, show us also the uncontrolled Eastern, victim of his passions. Gravitating to their tomb we see Romeo and Juliet victims in their own sad turn of the madness

of love. We hear Jacques beg to be allowed to cure an infected world of its folly, pilot in higher flights of mind and imagination. Woman after woman, beautiful creations of purity and goodness, crowd on memory, contrasting vividly with the cruel pride and arrogance of Henry Tudor, irretrievable man of blood; while the Sovereign of Winter's Tale turns his hating to loving, and the potential grace in Catharine the Shrew materialises under the touch of the divine messenger, god of Love. Falstaff, the incidental laughter invoking Glutton, has his important place in our heart, bidding us face fact. To know all with the Writer of Wisdom is to forgive all.

Last but not least Mercutio springs on to the stage of our thought. The gentleman that "loves to hear himself talk." The "sweet goose," The pink of courtesy," he of the "thoughtless words" enough to make his best friend angry, he whose "talk begot of nothing," is child of "an idle brain." He has his lesson to give. In the heyday of youth the scythe that mows the grass cuts him down. Mercutio's irresponsible words to Tybalt destroy relations with Man, and life, and God.

It is Mercutio who brings us face to face with Francis Bacon as author of Plays not yet presented to their audiences. In his *Promus* Bacon asks: "Who taught the parrot to say *Bon Jour*?" Every one calls to mind Mercutio's parrot-tongue greeting Romeo with that same "*Bon Jour*," and we answer Bacon, who wrote his irresponsible part. One parallel more between the specimens given of Wisdom's teachings and that of the Plays. Prayers to Heaven must not be formal or they are worthless. Even Queen Gertrude's wicked spouse has conscience (a sparkle of Paradise, as Bacon calls it), hammering within. "My words fly up, my thoughts remain below. Words without thoughts never to heaven go."

And now for the Allegories and Tropes. That they abound in Shake-speare is well known to every student of the Plays. Ancient Wisdom appreciated "living impressions," so our Wise man enshrined in so absurd a

Farce as *The Taming of the Shrew*, universal and eternal truth. *Twelfth Night's* concealed instruction and mythology, beloved of Bacon, have been already largely discussed in pages of BACONIANA and *Fly Leaves*, so they will not engage attention now. The Tempest too, a most poetical Fable, brings into intercourse, as has been already shown, things divine and human. We have only to read Francis Bacon's Preface to his *Wisdom of the Ancients* to clearly see how the Immortal Plays and his own mind and heart run together on self same lines. And now I will no longer detain your occasion but will make an end. In his very own words "It is not for me to judge of the results of my efforts, but my object has been to pass beyond the obvious, the ordinary and the common-place, and throw some light on the difficult things . . and perhaps it will not fail the loftier understanding." Large-browed Verulam, in Prose and Poetry alike, for the virtue and happiness of Man, has added infinitely precious pages to Wisdom in his sublime character of Wisdom Writer.

THE ANNUAL DINNER, 1934.

The Annual Dinner of the Bacon Society took place on Jan. 22nd, last year, at the Criterion Restaurant, Piccadilly, W., its President, Mr. B. G. Theobald, B.A., presiding. There was a good attendance. In his opening speech on "The Immortal Memory," he dealt with the question which the late Lord Sydenham had raised, following Prof. Allardyce Nicoll's contribution to the *Times Literary Supplement*. We have not space to print it in full, but here is a concentrated synopsis:

WHO WAS THE FIRST BACONIAN?

EPITOME OF PRESIDENT'S SPEECH.

1856 Usually been considered that Baconian theory started in England by a letter to Lord Ellesmere from Mr. W. H. Smith in 1856, followed in 1857 by his book "Bacon and Shakespeare: An Inquiry, &c."

1805 Recently Prof. Allardyce Nicoll found that in 1805 a Mr. James C. Cowell startled the Ipswich Philosophic Society by saying that his studies of Shakespeare's life left him nonplussed, and that a friend had suggested the Baconian solution.

1785 This "friend" was Rev. James Wilmot, D.D., rector of Barton-on-the-Heath, near Stratford-on-Avon. Dr. Wilmot was thoroughly familiar with Bacon's works, and, through comparing these with the Shakespeare plays, became nearly certain that the same author was responsible for both. This was about 1785. But he did not publish anything, and only some 35 pages of his MSS. have been discovered.

1769 A work entitled "The Life and Adventures of Common Sense: An Historical Allegory," was published in 1769, and attributed, on very slender evidence, to a medical man named Herbert Lawrence. The Allegory describes how Shakespeare stole Bacon's mental equipment and then commenced play-writing.

1740 David Mallet edited Bacon's works, including a biography; and, by using the same secret methods employed by Bacon and his associates, proves that he knew the secret.

1730 Precisely the same may be said of the edition of Bacon's works published by John Blackbourne.

1709 Nicholas Rowe gave the world the first biography of Shakespeare, a very meagre affair, since he did not invent, as all modern biographers do. He likewise shows his knowledge of the truth.

1679 After the death of Dr. Wm. Rawley, Bacon's secretary and chaplain, the Bacon MSS. which he had not dealt with were entrusted to Archbishop Tenison, who published "Baconiana" in 1679. This is packed with the same secret allusions to Bacon's concealed writings. Tenison says openly, in one passage:

> "And those who have true skill in the Works of the Lord Verulam, like great Masters in Painting, can tell by the Design, the Strength, the way of Colouring, whether he was the Author of this or the other Piece, *though his Name be not to it*" (my italics).

This proves conclusively that Bacon wrote under other names.

1657 Dr. Wm. Rawley, Bacon's secretary, edited various posthumous works, and tells by secret methods much concerning the various pen-names used by Bacon, including "Shake-speare."

1640 The anonymous author of "Wits Recreations" says this:

> "Shakespeare we must be silent in thy praise,
> 'Cause our encomions would but blast thy bayes,
> Which envy could not."

Why must the literary men of those days be "silent" about Shakespeare? If the Stratford man were the true author, no possible reason can be adduced for this. But Francis Bacon was compelled to conceal his dramatic authorship for many weighty reasons.

1626 After Bacon's death in 1626, Rawley published a series of poetic eulogies in Latin, mostly by University men. Many of these openly refer to him as being the supreme *poet* of his time, if not of all ages. Allowing for customary exaggeration, how can such statements be justified on orthodox grounds? No critic has ever been able to explain this, and most of them discreetly say nothing at all.

1599 In his play, "Every Man Out of his Humour," Ben Jonson has a contemptuous caricature of Shakspere as an ignoramus. In several of his plays we find characters who are obviously skits on Francis Bacon as a concealed dramatist.

1597 The name "Shakespeare" first appeared in print on the dedication to "Venus and Adonis" in 1593. In 1597 Joseph Hall published a book of Satires, in the course of which he satirises a writer whom he nicknames "Labeo," and plainly alludes to him as being the author of "Venus and Adonis." In 1598 John Marston wrote his "Pygmalion's Image," and likewise refers to "Labeo" as being the author of "Venus and Adonis." He also reproves Hall for some of his attacks on various persons, and says:

> "What, not mediocria firma from thy spight?"

i.e. "has not even "mediocria firma" escaped your satires?" Seeing that "Mediocria firma" was Bacon's family motto, this *must* be an allusion to him. It is evident that "mediocria firma" is the same person as "Labeo," because

in all Hall's satires none can possibly refer to Bacon except those where he speaks of "Labeo." Accordingly we have:

Labeo	= Author of "Venus and Adonis"
Labeo	= "Mediocria firma"
Mediocria firma	= Bacon
Bacon	= Author of "Venus and Adonis."

A careful study of this evidence makes it certain that both Hall and Marston discovered who "Shakespeare" was, at this early date.

So far as we know, then, "the First Baconian" was not Mr. W. H. Smith in 1857, but Joseph Hall in 1597.

Mrs. Vernon Bayley proposed the health of "The Bacon Society," in the following words:

It is an honour to give this toast, and no more devoted people exist than the members of the Bacon Society. They have kept the flag flying in the face of terrible opposition for 50 years. Their "hard work" is having effect and the Shaxpurian Pundits have a supreme respect now for our Society, *though they don't say so*. The Society had some of the most brilliant minds of the century working for it, though their labours and names are only enshrined in its archives.

Our growing library of thousands of volumes, written mostly by people with no claims to literary ability but an intense desire for Truth, astonishes even our scoffers. Francis Bacon tells King James he has foregone his fame, his genius and his name in building up his literature; he also says he was a hod man and had to make bricks.

The Manes Verulamiani, those marvellous elegies proclaiming Francis Bacon a transcendent Poet, say he filled the world with volumes. His works as Bacon are eleven volumes.

Ben Jonson in his *Discoveries* says Bacon had "outdone Insolent Greece and haughty Rome." He uses the same words about Shakespeare in the Folio. He also says Bacon was the Mark and Acme of our language. And again, speaks of him as a Phœnix and says they are born every 500 years. He was a great classical scholar and not likely to overrate Francis Bacon when he puts him above the ancients.

Baconiana, 1675, says: They that have true skill in the works of the Lord Verulam, like great Masters in Painting, can tell by the design, the strength, the way of colouring, whether he was the author of this or that piece, though his name be not to it. The Tudor period was in a backward condition in England, having hardly emerged from mediæval illiteracy, and yet there was a marvellous outbreak of authors in 1578. It never happened before, and has not happened since. Literary Pundits imagine these bright souls, while drinking deep of sack, exchanging their thoughts and bon mots by the light of Tudor rush lights in low Tudor inns and slums, using their ink horns and quills to write each other's epigrams. We do not see George Bernard Shaw and the dramatists and writers of to-day doing this in the Ritz, in the glare of electric light, fountain pens, dictagraphs, typewriters and secretaries. The

group theory is untenable out of Oxford. It has never happened before or since. That Francis Bacon was the author of most of this literature will be found out one day. In examining this literature with this idea, it will be found wonderfully planned, executed, and bearing relationship of ideas.

Francis Bacon, in his biliteral cypher, tells us he wrote the works of Shakespeare, Spenser, Greene, Peele, Marlow, and others.

Mr. Bridgewater has shown us the sequence of historical plays, each written by Francis, Peele, Hayward; others fit in with Shakespeare, and the break in the sequence is *Henry VII*.

Francis Bacon's prose history of *Henry VII*. takes one back to Richard III. and contains names and episodes exactly like those of the play, and also links up with the play of *Henry VIII*.

Mente Videbor was one of Bacon's mottos and he wished to be recognised by his mind.

Mr. Wigston, one of our most important writers, says:—Suppose Shakespeare taking up Plato's challenge, thrown down in the 10th book of the Republic. Let us imagine he was so far in advance of his age, that art, and profound art only, could become the vehicle of his philosophical and other opinions.

Might he not marry Philosophy to Poetry and embody this idea of the entire Platonical ideal conception of the universe in his art? Should he not be thus enabled to initiate the dual unity of nature without, and within, at once, not only in reticence and secrecy, but in eternity and spiritual tendency also? awaiting the fire of men's intellect through posterity to give him a re-birth through Revelation.

For every line that he wrote would redeem him from the Tomb, as Leonard Digges indeed prophesies. *Leonard Digges' Sonnet in the Folio*.

Mr. Wigston says elsewhere that he had so outstripped the centuries that only now are we beginning to catch him up, and the new reading of Shakespeare shows the depths in his plays, so that perhaps in time we may understand them.

Bacon said the most terrible force in the world is Envy. Great Cæsar died through envy.

We Baconians know that our secret is no secret and that somewhere the manuscripts of all this wonderful literature are hid. The power that has this secret will not reveal it. I wonder if the literary men who may know this secret are at the back of all this and their envy keeping it back. These poor penny-a-liners are like the fisherman with the bottle! If they let out this genius they destroy their puny works, for it will fill the world. It will be like all the volcanoes going off at once, and the world be filled with the fame of Francis Bacon. I pray I may live to see the secret given to the world.

The Bacon Society has done its best to raise the lid and let our genii out. Let us drink to this devoted Society, and may God help them to discover the Truth.

Other toasts and speeches followed, which wound up a very pleasant evening.

FRANCIS BACON.

By W. H. Fox, F.S.A.

"IT seems that, having borrowed a pair of stockings at the house of Sir Michael Hickes, of Austin Friars, who was Lord Burleigh's Secretary and Bacon's Agent in his distresses about money from 1593 down to 1612, he was doubtful whether he lay under an obligation to Lady Hickes or to Miss Hickes. Therefore, on the 8th of January, 1612, he sent carnation-coloured stockings with the following letter:—'Sir Michael,—I do use as you 'know to pay my debts with time, but indeed if you will 'have a good and perfect colour in a carnation stocking it 'must be long in the dying. I have some scruple of 'conscience whether it was my lady's stockings or her 'daughter's and I would have the restitution to be to the 'right person, else I shall not have absolution. Therefore 'I have sent to them both desiring them to wear them for 'my sake, as I did wear their's for mine own sake.' "

Since it was not beneath the dignity of ancient biography to record that Epaminondas danced gracefully it may well be allowed in a modern Essay of this kind to point out, what has escaped the notice of Lord Bacon's biographers—that he had a pretty little foot and a slender ankle, otherwise he would surely have borrowed stockings from Sir Michael and not from the ladies. Assuming that the stockings were of silk we may learn too from this letter with what giant strides luxury in carnation-coloured silk stockings was stalking over the land, seeing that early in the reign of James I., Lady Hickes and Miss Hickes, of Austin Friars, were each gifted with an indefinite number of pairs of silk stockings of so gorgeous a colour dyed as one may guess by the hands of Lord Bacon himself; whereas Queen Elizabeth in the early part of her reign, had but one single pair of silk stockings and they were black!"

NOTE.—The foregoing extract is from a book (p. 258) entitled "English Prose being extracts from the works of English Prose "writers with notes of their lives," by John Fox, published in 1844 by James Moore, 4, Carthusian Street, Charterhouse Square, London.

PALLAS ATHENE.

PALLAS ATHENE was the tutelar Divinity of the Greeks. The name Pallas was derived from παλλειν, meaning to shake, evidently so called from the fact that she is represented in statuary art as armed with a spear. On the Acropolis in Athens, where her statue by Phidias was long the wonder of the world, the spear rose far above her head; it is said to have been seventy feet in length. In Liddell and Scott's Greek-English lexicon her name is given etymologically as

"THE BRANDISHER OF THE SPEAR."

The Romans, viewing her in the light of her intellectual qualities, called her Minerva, a word derived from *mens*, signifying mind. With them, accordingly, she was the personification of thought; thus under the two appellations combined she is presented to us by these great nations as the Divine symbol of wisdom and power. Her father, Zeus, was the greatest of the gods, and her mother, Metis, the wisest of them.

Among the ancients, therefore, Pallas Athene naturally became the patroness of learning. As such, she was universally worshipped. The great temple of learning in Athens, where poets, philosophers and men of letters generally were accustomed to meet and to read their works for the instruction of others, was named for her Athenæum (Athene). In the second century of the Christian era, Hadrian founded a similar institution in Rome under the same sacred name. Indeed, this has been the custom in nearly all literary communities throughout the world (as in Paris, London, Berlin, Boston, Brunswick and elsewhere) to the present day, however unconscious modern generations may be that the brightest, most god-like image of the highest civilization which the world has ever known is still animating and inspiring them. Athens, the home of the noblest cult; Pallas Athene, the recognized source of its intellectual and moral power. That is to say, the

goddess, with her spear stands for the strength that is always inherent in the cause of truth.

Another and deeper view of the subject remains to be considered. Pallas Athene represents not only art in general, but also in the highest sense precisely that branch of art to which the plays of Shakespeare belong. Richard de Bury, who was high chancellor of England in the fifteenth century and one of the most learned men of that age, attributed to Minerva (or Pallas Athene) a special function in literature, thus: "The wisdom of the ancients devised a way of inducing men to study truth by means of pious frauds, the delicate Minerva secretly lurking beneath the mask of pleasure."

This was published under the title, "A Vindication of Poetry," meaning, of course, epic or dramatic poetry, such as the Greek poets have given us, and such as 'Macbeth,' 'King Lear,' and 'Anthony and Cleopatra' are now recognized to be. These and all others of their kind, viewed historically, are what was meant by de Bury as "pious frauds." It thus appears that in the highest cultivated circles of England, long before the time of Francis Bacon, Pallas Athene was identified with the dramatic instinct, and became an exceedingly appropriate pseudonym for the author of plays to be known as Shakespeare's, or as those of the goddess, so named.

E. Reed.

A BELATED PUBLICATION.

Referring to the legal action taken by Wm. N. Selig against Col. George Fabyan and others for a judicial decision that Francis Bacon was not the real author of the plays ascribed to "Shakespeare:" In his decision at the Circuit Court of Cook Co., Illinois, U.S.A., Judge Tuthill found for the defendant, Col. Fabyan, and awarded damages to him in the sum of 5,000 dollars, for restraint of publication that Francis Bacon was, in fact, the real author. This action was tried in the year 1916. The decision set a good many people, on both sides of the Atlantic, to think furiously, and the London Bacon Society issued a propagandist leaflet putting forth the particulars.

It now appears that Mr. Wm. D. Austin, of Boston, U.S.A., not satisfied with the regularity of the case, referred the matter to a legal friend of his, Mr. Ralph Wardlaw Gloag, who eventually obtained from Mr. John E. Conroy, Clerk of the said Circuit Court of Cook Co., the following letter, which speaks for itself:

THE SELIG VS. FABYAN.
(BACON-SHAKES.).

April 30, 1934.

In re: William N. Selig
vs.
George Fabyan, et al
} B 19054.

Mr. Ralph Wardlaw Gloag,
30, Pemberton Square,
Boston, Massachusetts.

Dear Sir,—

Replying to your letter of the 5th ultimo. I would say that on March 9, 1916, Judge Richard S. Tuthill, then a judge of this court, entered an order that a writ of injunction issue in the above entitled and numbered cause restraining the defendants from publishing the five histories, five tragedies, etc., entitled "The Life of Elizabeth," "The Life of the Earl of Essex," "The White Rose of Britain," "The Life and Death of Edward Third," "The Life of Henry the Seventh," "Mary Queen of Scots," "Robert The Earl of Essex," "Robert the Earl of Leicester," "The Life and Death of Christopher Marlowe," "Anne Bullen," "Seven Wise Men of the West," "Solomon the Second," "The Mouse Trap," "History, in prose commixt with verse, of England and a few Englishmen," "Story in verse of the Spanish Armada," "Bacon's own story of his life in which Marguerite Valois figures," "A number of short poems in

French, written for Marguerite, form a part of the story of Bacon's life in France," "Life of Robert Greene," "Two Secret Epistles, expressly teaching a cipher," "Completion of the New Atlantis," "A Pastoral of the Christ," "Bacchantes, a fantasy," "The Iliad (Homer)," "The Odyssey (Homer)," "The Aeneid (Virgil)," "The Eclogues and a few short poems (Virgil)."

On April 21, 1916, Judge Richard S. Tuthill entered a decree finding that the claim made that Francis Bacon is the author of the works published under the name of William Shakespeare, and the facts and circumstances in the vast bibliography of the controversy over the question of said authorship convinces the Court that Francis Bacon is the author of the works so erroneously attributed to William Shakespeare.

The said decree further finds that the defendant, George Fabyan, has been damaged in the sum of Five Thousand Dollars ($5,000) by the improvident sueing out of the injunction.

On May 2, 1916, Judge Richard S. Tuthill entered an order vacating and setting aside the decree heretofore entered and placing the said cause upon the calendar of Hon. Frederick A. Smith for hearing.

I have been informed that the members of the Executive Committee, at the time of the entry of the decree in question, were of the opinion that this proceeding was instituted to exploit and advertise a moving picture involving the Shakespeare-Bacon controversy then being displayed upon the screen and that the question of the authorship of the writings attributed to William Shakespeare was not properly before the court.

Very truly yours,

JOHN E. CONROY,
Clerk Circuit Court.

Under these extraordinary circumstances, the Bacon Society takes the earliest opportunity of withdrawing its propaganda leaflet, No. 1, from circulation, in the common interest of truth and fair-play.

H.S.

INTERROGATORIES OF FRANCIS BACON.

V.

The Lords sent the same Messengers back again to the Lord Chancellor, to let him know that their Lordships have granted him time until Monday next the 30th of April, by ten in the morning, to send such Confession and Submission as his Lordship intends to make.

On which Monday the Lord Chancellor sent the same accordingly which follows *in hec Verba, viz.*

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE THE LORDS SPIRITUAL AND TEMPORAL, IN THE HIGH COURT OF PARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED:

The humble Confession and Submission of me the Lord Chancellor.

UPON advis'd Consideration of the Charge, descending into my own Conscience, and calling my Memory to account so far as I am able, I do plainly and ingenuously confess, that I am guilty of Corruption and do renounce all Defence, and put my self upon the Grace and Mercy of your Lordships.

The Particulars I confess and declare to be as followeth:

To the *first* Article of the Charge, *viz.* In the Cause between Sir *Rowland Egerton* and *Edward Egerton*, the Lord Chancellor received 300 *l.* on the part of Sir *Rowland Egerton*, before he had decreed the Cause.

I do confess and declare, that upon a Reference from his Majesty of all Suits and Controversies between Sir *Rowland Egerton* and *Edward Egerton*, both Parties submitted themselves to my Award by Recognizances reciprocal in 10,000 Marks a piece. Thereupon, after divers Hearings, I made my Award, with the advice and consent of my Lord *Hobart*. The Award was perfected and published to the Parties, which was in *February*. Then some Days after, the 300 Pounds, mentioned in the Charge, were delivered unto me. Afterwards Mr. *Edward Egerton* flew off from the Award. Then in *Midsummer* Term following a Suit was begun in Chancery by Sir *Roland*, to have the Award confirmed: And upon that Suit was the Decree made, mentioned in the Article.

The *second* Article of the Charge, *viz.* In the same Cause he received from *Edward Egerton* 400*l.*

I confess and declare, that soon after my first coming to the Seal, being a Time when I was presented by many, the 400 *l.* mentioned in the said Charge was delivered unto me in a Purse, and as I now call to mind, from Mr. *Edward Egerton*; but as far as I can remember it was express'd by them that brought it, to be for Favours past, and not in respect of Favours to come.

The *third* Article of the Charge, *viz*: In the Cause between *Hody* and *Hody*, he received a dozen of Buttons of the value of 50 *l.* about a Fortnight after the Cause was ended, it being a Suit for a great Inheritance, there were gold Buttons, about the value of 50 *l.* as is mentioned in the Charge, presented unto me, as I remember, by Sir *Thomas Perrot*, and the Party himself.

To the *fourth* Article of the Charge, *viz*: In a Cause between the

Lady *Wharton* and the co-heirs of Sir *Francis Willoughby*, he received of the Lady *Wharton* three hundred and ten Pounds: I confess and declare, that I did receive of the Lady *Wharton*, at two several times, as I remember in Gold 200 *l.* and 100 Pieces and this was certainly *Pendente Lite*: But yet I have a vehement Suspicion, that there was some shuffling between Mr. *Shute* and the *Register* in entring some Orders, which afterwards I did distaste.

To the *fifth* Article of the Charge, *viz*: In Sir *Thomas Monk's* Cause, he received from Sir *Thomas Monk*, by the Hands of Sir *Henry Holmes*, 110 *l.* but this was three quarters of a Year after the Suit was ended.

I confess it to be true that I received 100 Pieces, but it was long after the Suit ended, as is contained in the Charge.

To the *sixth* Article of the Charge, *viz*: In the Cause between Sir *John Trevor* and Ascue, he received on the part of Sir *John Trevor* 100 *l.*

I confess and declare, that I received at *New-Year's-Tide* 100 *l.* from Sir *John Trevor* and because it came as a *New-Year's-Gift*, I neglected to inquire, whether the Cause was ended, or depending: but since I find that tho' the Cause was then dismissed to a Trial at Law, yet the Equity was reserved, so as it was in that kind *Pendente Lite*.

To the *seventh* Article of the Charge, *viz*: In the Cause between *Holman* and *Young*, he received of Young 100 *l.* after the Decree made for him.

I confess and declare, that as I remember, a good while after the Cause ended, I received 100 *l.* either by Mr. *Toby Mathew* or from Young himself: but whereas I have understood, that there was some Money given by *Holman* to my Servant *Hatcher*, to that Certainty I was never made privy.

To the *eighth* Article of the Charge, In the Cause between *Fisher* and *Wrenham*, the Lord Chancellor, after the Decree passed, received a Suit of Hangings worth one hundred and three score Pounds and better, which *Fisher* gave him by advice of Mr. *Shute*.

I confess and declare, that some time after the Decree passed, I being at that time upon remove to *York-house*, I did receive a Suite of Hangings of the value, I think, mentioned in the Charge by Mr. *Shute*, as from Sir *Edward Fisher*, towards the furnishing of my House, as some others, that were no ways Suitors, did present me with the like about that time.

To the *ninth* Article of the Charge, In the Cause between *Kenneday* and *Vanlore*, he received a rich Cabinet from *Kenneday*, apprais'd at 800 *l.*

I confess and declare, that such a Cabinet was brought to my House, tho' nothing near half the value; and that I said to him that brought it, that I came to view it, and not to receive it, and gave commandment that it should be carried back, and was offended when I heard it was not. And about a Year and an half after, as I remember, Sir *John Kenneday* having all that time refused to take it away, as I am told by any Servants, I was petitioned by one *Pinkney*, that it might be delivered to him, for that he stood engaged for the Money that Sir *John Kenneday* paid for it; and thereupon Sir *John Kenneday* wrote a Letter to my Servant *Sherborne*, with his own Hand, desiring I would not do him that

disgrace as to return that Gift back, much less to put it into a wrong hand: And so it remains yet ready to be returned to whom your Lordships shall appoint.

To the *tenth* Article of the Charge, *viz*: He borrowed of *Vanlore* 1,000 *l*. upon his own Bond at one time, and the like Sum at another time upon his Lordship's own Bill, subscribed by Mr. *Hunt* his Man:

I confess and declare, that I borrowed the Money in the Article set down, and that this is a true Debt; and I remember well, that I wrote a Letter from *Kew* about a twelve-month since to a Friend about the King, wherein I desired, that whereas I owed *Peter Vanlore* 200 *l*. his Majesty would be pleased to grant me so much out of his Fine set upon me in the Star-Chamber.

To the *eleventh* Article of the Charge, *viz*: He received of *Richard Scott* 200 *l*. after his Cause was decreed, but upon a precedent Promise; all which was transacted by Mr. *Shute*:

I confess and declare, that some Fortnight after as I remember that the Decree passed, I received 200 *l*. as from Mr. *Scott* by Mr. *Shute*, as upon some precedent Promise or Transaction by Mr. *Shute*: Certain I am I knew of none.

To the *twelfth* Article of the Charge, *viz*: He received in the same Cause on the part of Sir *John Lentall* 100 *l*.

I confess and declare, that some Month after, as I remember, that the Decree passed, I received 100 *l*. by my Servant *Sherborne* as from Sir *John Lentall*, who was not the adverse Party to *Scott*, but a third Person relieved by the same Decree in the Suit of one *Power*.

To the *thirteenth* Article of the Charge, *viz*: He received of Mr. *Worth* 100 *l*. in respect of the Cause between him and Sir *Arthur Manwaring*:

I confess and declare, that this Cause being a Cause for Inheritance of good value, was ended by my Arbitrement and Consent of Parties, and so a Decree passed of course; and some Month after the Cause was ended, the 100 *l*. mentioned in the said Article was deliver'd to me by my Servant *Hunt*.

To the *fourteenth* Article of the Charge, *viz*: He received of Sir *Ralph Hansbye*, having a Cause depending before him, 500 *l*.

I confess and declare, that there were two Decrees, one, as I remember, for the Inheritance, and the other for the Goods and Chattels, but all upon one Bill: and some good time after the first Decree and before the second the said 500 *l*. was deliver'd unto me by Mr. *Toby Mathew*; so as I cannot deny, but it was upon the matter *Pendente Lite*.

To the *fifteenth* Article of the Charge, *viz*: *William Compton* being to have an Extent for a Debt of 1200 *l*. the Lord Chancellor staid it, and wrote his Letter; upon which part of the Debt was paid presently, and part at a future Day. The Lord Chancellor hereupon sends to borrow 500 *l*. and because *Compton* was to pay 400 *l*. to one *Huxley*, his Lordship requires *Huxley* to forbear six Months, and hereupon obtains the Money from *Compton*. The Money being unpaid, Suit grows between *Huxley* and *Compton* in Chancery, where his Lordship decrees *Compton* to pay *Huxley* the Debt, with Damage and Costs, when it was in his own Hands.

I do declare, that in my Conscience the stay of the Extent was

just, being an Extremity against a Nobleman, by whom *Compton* could be no loser. The Money was plainly borrowed of *Compton* upon Bond with Interest, and the Message to *Huxley* was only to intreat him to give *Compton* a longer Day, and in no sort to make me Debtor or responsible to *Huxley*; and therefore, tho' I was not ready to pay *Compton* his Money, as I would have been glad to have done, save only 100 *l.* which is paid, I could not deny Justice to *Huxley* in as ample manner as if nothing had been between *Compton* and me: But if *Compton* hath been damnified in my respect, I am to consider it to *Compton*.

To the *sixteenth* Article of the Charge, *viz*: In the Cause between Sir *William Bronker* and *Awbrey*, the Lord Chancellor receiv'd from *Awbrey* 100 *l.*

I do confess and declare, that the Money was given and received; but the manner of it I leave to the Witnesses.

To the *seventeenth* Article of the Charge, *viz*: In the Lord *Mountague's* Cause he received from the Lord Mountague 6 to 700 *l.* and more was to be paid at the ending of the Cause:

I confess and declare, there was Money given, and as I remember, to Mr. *Bevis Thelwall*, to the Sum mentioned in the Article, after the Cause was decreed; but I cannot say it was ended, for there have been many Orders since caused by Sir *Francis Inglefield's* Contempts; and I do remember, that when *Thelwall* brought the Money, he said, that my Lord would be yet farther thankful if he could once get his quiet. To which Speech I gave little regard.

To the *eighteenth* Article of the Charge, *viz*: In the Cause of Mr. *Dunch*, he received from Mr. *Dunch* 200 *l.*

I confess and declare, that it was delivered by Mr. *Thelwall* to *Hatcher* my Servant, for me, as I think some time after the Decree; but I cannot precisely inform my self of the time.

To the *nineteenth* Article of the Charge, *viz*: In the Cause between *Reynell* and *Peacocke*, he received from *Reynell* 200 *l.* and a Diamond Ring worth 5 or 600 *l.*

I confess and declare, that at my first coming to the Seal, when I was at *Whitehall*, my Servant *Hunt* deliver'd me 200 *l.* from Sir *George Reynell*, my near Ally, to be bestowed upon Furniture of my House; adding farther, that he had received divers former Favours from me: And this was, as I verily think, before any Suit began. The Ring was receiv'd certainly *Pendente Lite*; and tho' it were at *New-Year's Tide*, it was too great a value for a *New-Year's Gift*, tho' as I take it, nothing near the value mentioned in the Article.

To the *twentieth* Article of the Charge, *viz*: That he took of *Peacocke* 100 *l.* without Interest, Security, or Time of Payment:

I confess and declare that I received of Mr. *Peacocke* 100 *l.* at *Dorset-house*, at my first coming to the Seal, as a Present; at which time no Suit was begun: and at the Summer after I sent my then Servant *Lister* to Mr. *Rolfe*, my good Friend and Neighbour, at *St. Albans*, to use his means with Mr. *Peacocke* (who was accounted a mony'd Man) for the borrowing of 500 *l.* and after by my Servant *Hatcher*, for borrowing of 500 more; which Mr. *Rolfe* procured, and told me at both times it should be without Interest, Script, or Note, and that I should take my own time for payment of it.

To the *twenty-first* Article of the Charge, *viz.*, in the Cause

between *Smithwick* and *Welsh*, he received from *Smithwick* 200 *l.* which was repaid:

I confess and declare, that my Servant *Hunt* did, upon his Account, being my Receiver of the Fines upon original Writs, charge himself with 200 *l.* formerly received of *Smithwick*, which after that I had understood the nature of it, I ordered him to re-pay, and to defalk it out of his Accompts.

To the *twenty-second* Article of the Charge, *viz.*, In the Cause of Sir *Henry Ruswell*, he received Money from *Ruswell*, but it is not certain how much:

I confess and declare, that I received Money from my Servant *Hunt*, as from Mr. *Ruswell*, in a Purse: And whereas the Sum in the Article is indefinite, I confess it to be 3 or 400 *l.* and it was about a Month after the Cause was decreed; in which Decree I was assisted by two of the Judges.

To the *twenty-third* Article of the Charge, *viz.* In the Cause of Mr. *Barker*, the Lord Chancellor receiv'd from *Barker* 700 *l.*

I confess and declare, that the Sum mentioned in the Article was received from Mr. *Barker* some time after the Decree pass'd.

To the 24th, 25th, and 26thArticles of the Charge, *viz.* the 24th; There being a Reference from his Majesty to his Lordship of a Business between the *Grocers* and the *Apothecaries*, the Lord Chancellor receiv'd of the *Grocers* 200 *l.* The 25th Article; In the same Cause he receiv'd of the *Apothecaries*, that stood with the *Grocers*, a Taster of Gold, worth between 4 and 500 *l.* and a Present of Ambergrease. And the 26th Article; He receiv'd of a new Company of *Apothecaries*. that stood against the *Grocers*, 100 *l.*

To these I confess and declare, That the several Sums from the three Parties were received: and for that it was no judicial Business, but a Concord of Composition between the Parties, and that as I thought all had received good, and they were all three common Purses, I thought it the less matter to receive that which they voluntarily presented; for if I had taken it in the nature of a corrupt Bribe, I knew it could not be concealed, because it needs must be put to account to the three several Companies.

To the *twenty-seventh* Article of the Charge, *viz.* He took of the French Merchants 1000 *l.* to constrain the Vintners of *London* to take from them 1500 Tuns of Wine: To accomplish which he used very indirect means, by Colour of his Office and Authority, without Bill or Suit depending, terrifying the *Vintners* by Threats, and by Imprisonment of their Persons, to buy Wines, whereof they had no need nor use, at higher Rates than they were vendible:

I do confess and declare, that Sir *Thomas Smith* did deal with me in behalf of the *French* Company, informing me that the *Vintners*, by combination, would not take off their Wines at any reasonable Prices; that it would destroy their Trade, and stay their Voyage for that Year; and that it was a fair Business, and concerned the State: and he doubted not but I should receive thanks from the King, and Honour by it; and that they would gratify me with a thousand Pounds for my travail in it. Whereupon I treated between them by way of persuasion, and to prevent any compulsory Suit, propounding such a Price as the *Vintners* might be gainers 6*l.* in a Tun, as it was then maintained unto me. And after the Merchants petitioning to the King, and his Majesty recommending this Business unto

me as a Business that concerns his Customs and the Navy, I dealt more earnestly and peremptorily in it, and as I think, restrained in the Messenger's Land for a day or two some that were the most stiff; and afterwards the Merchants presented me with 1000 *l.* out of their common Purse; and acknowledging themselves, that I had kept them from a kind of Ruin, and still maintaining to me that the *Vintners*, if they were not insatiably minded, had a very competent Gain. These are the Merits of the Cause, as it then appear'd to me.

To the *twenty-eighth* Article of the Charge, *viz.* The Lord Chancellor hath given way to great Exactions by his Servants, both in respect of private Seals, and otherwise for sealing of Injunctions:

I confess it was a great Fault of neglect in me, that I look'd no better to my Servants.

This Declaration I have made to your Lordships with a sincere Mind, humbly craving, that if there should be any Mistake, your Lordships would impute it to want of memory, and not to any desire of mine to obscure truth, or palliate any thing; for I do now again confess, that in the Points charged upon me, tho' they should be taken as my self have declared them, there is a great deal of Corruption and Neglect, for which I am heartily sorry, and submit myself to the Judgment, Grace and Mercy of the Court.

For extenuation, I will use none concerning the Matters themselves; only it may please your Lordships, out of your Nobleness, to cast your Eyes of Compassion upon my Person and Estate: I was never noted for an avaricious Man, and the Apostle saith, that *Covetousness is the Root of all Evil*. I hope also that your Lordships do the rather find me in the State of Grace, for that in all these Particulars there are few or none that are not almost two Years old; whereas those that have an Habit of Corruption, do commonly wax worse. So that it hath pleased God to prepare me by precedent Degrees of Amendment to my present Penitency: And for my Estate, it is so mean and poor, as my Care is now chiefly to satisfy my Debts.

And so fearing I have troubled your Lordships too long, I shall conclude with an humble Suit unto you, That if your Lordships proceed to sentence, your Sentence may not be heavy to my ruin, but gracious and mix'd with Mercy: and not only so, but that you would be noble Intercessors for me to his Majesty likewise, for his Grace and Favour.

Your Lordship's most humble Servant and Suppliant,
Franc. St. Albans, *Canc.*

The Lords having heard this Confession and Submission read, these Lords under-named, *viz.* the Earl of *Pembroke* Lord Chamberlain, the Earl of *Arundel*, the Earl of *Southampton*, the Bishop of *Durham*, the Bishop of *Winchester*, the Bishop of *Coventry* and *Litchfield*; the Lord *Wentworth*, the Lord *Cromwell*, the Lord *Sheffield*, the Lord *North*, the Lord *Chandois*, the Lord *Hunsdon*, were sent to him the said Lord Chancellor, and shewed him the said Confession, and told him, that the Lords do conceive it to be an ingenuous and full Confession, and demanded of him, whether it be his own Hand that is subscribed to the same, and whether he will stand to it or not. Unto which the said Lord Chancellor answer'd,

My Lords, it is my Act, my Hand, my Heart; I beseech your Lordships to be merciful to a broken Reed. The which Answer being reported to the House, it was agreed by the House to move his Majesty to sequester the Seal: and the Lords intreated the Prince's Highness that he would be pleas'd to move the King; whereunto his Highness condescended. And the same Lords which went to take the Acknowledgment of the Lord Chancellor's Hand, were appointed to attend the Prince to the King, with some other Lords added. And his Majesty did not only sequester the Seal, but awarded a new Commission unto the Lord Chief Justice, to execute the Place of the Chancellor, or Lord-Keeper.

This was on the 1st of May: And on *Wednesday*, the 2nd of *May*, the said Commission being read, their Lordships agreed to proceed to sentence the Lord Chancellor to-morrow Morning. Wherefore the *Gentleman-Usher*, and *Serjeant at Arms*, Attendants on the Upper House, were commanded to go and summon him, the said Lord Chancellor, to appear in Person before their Lordships tomorrow Morning by nine of the Clock. And the said *Serjeant at Arms* was commanded to take his Mace with him, and to shew it unto his Lordship at the said Summons: But they found him sick in bed; and being summoned, he answer'd, that he was sick, and protested that he feigned not this for any Excuse, for if he had been well he would willingly have come.

The Lords resolved to proceed notwithstanding against the said Lord Chancellor. And therefore on *Thursday*, the 3rd of *May*, their Lordships sent their Message to the Commons to this purpose, *viz.* "That the Lords are ready to give Judgment against the Lord Viscount *St. Albans*, Lord Chancellor, if they, with their Speaker, will come to demand it." And the Commons being come, the Speaker came to the Bar; and, making three low Obeisances, said:

"The Knights, Citizens, and Burgesses of the Commons House of "Parliament, having made Complaints unto your Lordships of "many exorbitant Offences of Bribery and Corruption, committed "by the Lord Chancellor, understand that your Lordships are ready "to give Judgment upon him for the same; Wherefore I, their "Speaker, in their Name, do humbly demand, and pray Judgment against him the said Lord Chancellor, as the nature of his Offence and Demerits do require."

The Lord Chief Justice answered:

Mr. *Speaker*, Upon complaint of the Commons against the "Viscount *St. Albans*, Lord Chancellor, this High Court hath "thereby, and by his own Confession, found him *guilty* of the "Crimes and Corruptions complained of by the Commons, and of "sundry other Crimes and Corruptions of like nature.

"And therefore this High Court having first summoned him to "attend, and having his excuse of not attending, by reason of "Infirmity and Sickness, which he protested was not feigned, or "else he would most willingly have attended, doth nevertheless "think fit to proceed to Judgment: And therefore this High Court "doth adjudge;

"That the Lord Viscount *St. Albans*, Lord Chancellor of *England*, "shall undergo Fine and Ransom of 40,000 Pounds.

"That he shall be imprisoned in the *Tower* during the King's "pleasure.

"That he shall for ever be uncapable of any Office, Place, or "Imployment, in the State or Commonwealth.

"That he shall never sit in Parliament, nor come within the "Verge of the Court."

This is the Judgment and Resolution of this High Court.

Thus he lost the Privilege of his Peerage, and his Seal; and it was for some time doubtful, whether he should be allowed to retain his Titles of Honour, which was all he did, having only a poor empty Being left, which lasted not long with him, his Honour dying before him. Tho' he was afterwards set at liberty, and had a Pension from the King, he was in great want to the very last, living obscurely in his Chambers at *Gray's-Inn*, where his lonely and desolate Condition so wrought upon his melancholy Temper, that he pined away; and after all his height of Abundance was reduced to so low an Ebb, as to be denied Beer to quench his Thirst: for having a sickly Stomach, and not liking the Beer of the House, he sent now and then to Sir *Fulk Grevil* Lord *Brook*, who liv'd in the Neighbourhood, for a Bottle of his Beer; and, after some grumbling, the Butler had Orders to deny him.

He died on the 9th of *April*, 1626, being *Easter-day*, early in the Morning, in the 66th Year of his Age, at the Earl of *Arundel's* House in *High-gate*, near *London*, to which Place he had casually repair'd about a Week before. The Distemper of which he died was a gentle Fever, accidentally accompanied with a violent Cold; whereby the Defluxion of Rheum was so great upon his Breast, that he was quite suffocated.

He was buried in St. *Michael's* Church at *St. Albans*, being the Place directed for his Burial by his last Will, both because his Mother had been buried there before, and because it was the only Church then remaining within the Precincts of old *Verulam*; where he hath a Monument erected for him of white Marble, by Sir *Thomas Meautys*, formerly his Lordship's *Secretary*, afterwards *Clerk* of the King's Privy-Council, with an Inscription compos'd by the famous Sir *Henry Wotton*.

(FINIS)

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE BACON SOCIETY.

At the last Annual Meeting, held on March 1st, 1934, at Canonbury Tower, with the President in the Chair, the Accounts and Annual Report were unanimously adopted, and the annual elections followed. Mr. B. G. Theobald was re-elected President, and Lady Sydenham, the Dowager Lady Boyle, Miss A. A. Leith, Mr. Frank Woodward, Mr. Horace Nickson, Dr. H. Spencer Lewis, Mr. Harold Bayley, and Mr. W. Lansdown Goldsworthy were elected Vice-Presidents; Mr. Lewis Biddulph, Hon. Treasurer; Mr. H. Bridgewater, Chairman of the Council; Mr. Percy Walters, Vice-Chairman; and Mrs. Vernon Bayley, Miss M. Sennett, Mr. Vaughan Welsh, Mr. J. B. Wells, Mr. C. Y. C. Dawbarn, Mr. Parker Brewis, Mr. W. H. Denning, and Mr. Henry Seymour, Members of the Council. The next Annual Meeting takes place at 47, Gordon Square, W.C.1, on Thursday, March 7th, 1935, at 7-30 p.m.

BOOK NOTICES.

"SHAKESPEARE," by William Moore. 324 pp., handsomely printed, cloth bound, gilt lettered. Cornish Bros., Ltd., 39, New Street, Birmingham. 12s. 6d. net.

Yet another book dealing with Bacon Cyphers in "Shakespeare." The author is to be commended on his rare gift of penetration, patience, and ingenuity displayed, in formulating and demonstrating the peculiar features of the Cabala, or Arithmetical Cypher, of ancient Semitic origin, found in the play of "Loves Labours Lost," the initials of which title convey the secret number (33) of Bacon. He simplifies his task by confining himself to the examination of this early play, and it is a rational inference that if it can be shewn by such evidence as he produces that Bacon actually wrote this, he also wrote all the others which carry the pseudonym of "Shakespeare," for there are to be found in all the plays the same kind of irregularities and textual peculiarities, indicative of the same intent. He follows the hints and suggestions, which are carried both in the dialogue as well as in the many curiously misspelt words, whose occult meanings have so puzzled Shakesperean commentators; and sets out to shew that these supposed printer's errors (as they have been hitherto regarded) are in reality cleverly designed tricks to carry the numerical equivalents of Francis Bacon in a variety of forms, including also the Italian and Latin spellings. If his conjectures are correct (and they appear to be so) they settle for all time who was the real, though concealed, author of "Shakespeare," being none other than Francis Bacon.

It is such internal evidence, woven into the very structure of the plays, which carries the strongest conviction of such hypothesis, for the exterior evidence alone, strong as it is, is based on circumstantial evidence only. We have no hesitation, therefore, in recommending our readers to procure a copy of Mr. Moore's volume, which should be on the shelves of every Baconian library. The calculations of the author's masterly demonstrations may easily be checked, for he has furnished the means, also, of verifying his figures. His contention that the alleged Baconian Signatures are capable of being resolved by four different arithmetical cypher methods (each supporting the other) is ingenious, but this can hardly be accepted as infallible in every case. The four said methods are those of the well-known *Simple*, *Reverse*, and *Simple Digit*, and *Reverse Digit*, counts. It must be pointed out, however, that some discrimination is needed here, before we include as supporting-evidence, such letters or groups of letters as *necessarily* agree by the peculiar property of numbers. For example, the names of "Labeo" and "Bacon" :—

Labeo	(Simple	Count=33)		*Bacon*	(Simple	Count=33)	
,,	(Reverse	,, =92)		,,	(Reverse	,,	=92)
,,	(S.Digit	,, =15)		,,	(S. Digit	,,	=15)
,,	(R. ,,	,, =20)		,,	(R. ,,	,,	=20)

In these two names, we have an example of precise equality in the four Cypher methods. Mr. Moore also occasionally includes the

Trithemius "Clocke," double-alphabet, cypher in his interpretations, which is quite legitimate, as we know that Bacon employed this cypher in most of his works. I have found that an application of this cypher to the name of *Labeo* (whose count is 33) brings out a perfect anagram of Bacon. Turn one dial to the third position of the other "over the left," the *l* becomes *n*; turn it to the 3rd position to the right and the *e* becomes *c*. The remaining letters stand, and *Bacon* is there!

Now, Mr. Moore goes carefully through all the curious misprinted words and equally curious, ambiguous phrases in L.L.L., and the result of his calculations is strikingly appropriate. One has but to remember that this particular method of identification is not an invention of Mr. Moore, but was a common practice amongst Elizabethan authors, who seemed to delight in such puzzling artifices, or used them probably to screen their identities, when such drastic censorship of printing and punishment of authors was in the hey-day of its power to prevent the dissemination of truth. Therefore, buy this book, which, like "Francis Bacon concealed and Revealed," by our President, are the two elaborated works which reveal Bacon's concealed name as the author of "Shakespeare."

At the same time, it is not permissible in logic to assume that any given numerical equivalent of words or names *necessarily* interprets any given name of an author, or pseudonym, standing by itself. The well-known seal of 287 (a key-number in British Masonry), which by the *Reverse* (secret) Count correctly agrees with that of the words, "Bacon is Shakespeare," or "W. Shakespeare, F. Bacon," whichever you please, may conceivably stand for other things. The words, "The Bacon Society, Incorporated," count up to 287, and "Stutis" (the Company from whom we rent our headquarters) count up to 103, which number has long been religiously supposed to be the seal number for "Shakespeare." Even this number may stand for "Queen Elisa," by the premises, as the count is the same. So the fundamental question remains: how can we safely assume these various counts to represent any preconceived name without additional corroborative evidence of the fact? The logic of Mr. Moore's book, however, is not easily to be set aside, as the method he follows is the same as the Elizabethan authors undoubtedly used for conveying occult facts to the initiated members of the Rosicrucian Fraternity.

"KING HENRY THE SEVENTH (OR THE TRAGEDY OF PERKIN WARBECK)"—a play in four acts by GILBERT WITTER. Basil Blackwell, Oxford. 5s.

Containing as this play does much relating to Lady Katharine Gordon, "the White Rose of Britain," and presenting the case of Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck from a new angle, an explanation is offered of the mystery surrounding these two persons, and of their intimate connection with Richard, Duke of York.

The fact that Sir James Tyrrell was especially brought home from abroad so as to act as one of the jurors in connection with the Earl of Warwick's and Perkin Warbeck's combined plot in the Tower, is a surprising discovery, and can but induce one to "think furiously." No less is the fact that 'Perkin's' letter to "his mother Catherine Warbeck"—and from which the Confession and Pedigree was

compiled—was *written in one hand and signed in a different one*. This is new to us, and yet is strangely alluded to by Bacon in his *Henry VII*. prose history: "Soon after, now that Perkin could tell better what himself was, he was diligently examined; and after his confession taken, an extract was made of such parts of them, as were thought fit to be divulged." Fresh light is also thrown on many another episode, and the whole appears to form a connected story.

It should be of interest to Baconians, especially in view of the fact that Francis Bacon's *Life of Henry VII*. contains, we believe, much that has yet to be deciphered.

The whole matter makes an interesting play to read, but it is a pity, we think, that the story has not been written in book form, in the form of an historical novel, in which references might have been given to shew the sources from which the author's information has been derived, and deductions drawn.

H.S.

BACON SOCIETY LECTURES.

The following addresses were delivered at our new headquarters, 47, Gordon Square, since our last issue:—

5th April.	"The Shakespeare Myth." By the President.
3rd May.	"Evidence Connecting Francis Bacon with 'Shakespeare'." By Howard Bridgewater.
7th June.	"Documentary Evidence of Bacon's authorship of 'Shakespeare'." By Henry Seymour.
5th July.	"Francis Bacon: Citizen of the World." By Miss A. A. Leith.
6th Sept.	"Francis Bacon, Second Father of Rosicrucianism." By Dr. H. Spencer Lewis.
4th Oct.	"Shakespeare's Life Story." By Miss A. A. Leith.
1st Nov.	"Concerning Cyphers." By Miss Mabel Sennett.
6th Dec.	"When did Francis Bacon Die?" By the President.

These were all well attended and gave rise to animated and interesting discussion. The new series will begin this month, and the meeting hour is 8 p.m. The public is admitted free and may engage in the discussions.

NOTES AND NOTICES.

It is with deep regret we have to record the deaths of Mr. W. Lansdown Goldsworthy (Solicitor of Serjeant's Inn), who was at the last Annual Meeting elected to the Vice-Presidency of the Bacon Society, and Mr. W. T. Smedley, the author of "The Mystery of Francis Bacon," and who, some years ago, was a very active member of our Society. May they repose in peace.

In the *Cambridge Review* of Feb. 23rd, last year, appeared an interesting article by Mr. H. G. Button, citing the analogous cases of Bacon and Shakespeare, and of the alleged concealed poetry of Charles D'Orleans, issued under the name of Francois Villon, who was an uneducated person of the stamp of Will Shakspere of Stratford-on-Avon, whereas D'Orleans, like Bacon, was "an educated and cultured nobleman who had mastered both the French and English languages, and who, as the poems shew, was equally at home in the Court and in the common tap-room.

Mr. Edward P. Smart writes in the *Radio Times* that "Ben Jonson's" sonnet "To Celia," which was first published in 1616, is almost a literal translation from an ancient Greek poem by Philostratos "the elder," who flourished during the third century. He further points out that "the hand of Catullus and other writers of old Italy and Greece may often be traced in "Jonson's" poetic works. Which reminds one of the query often put,—whether "Shakespeare" or Harvey was the real discoverer of the circulation of the blood. In *Coriolanus*, this "discovery" was revealed a dozen years or more before Harvey said anything about it. But "Shakespeare," that is, Bacon, probably got the idea from Catullus, for that writer was about a dozen centuries before Bacon in announcing this discovery.

The Annual Dinner of the Bacon Society for 1935 will mark the jubilee year of the Society's existence. It will take place at the Langham Hotel, Portland Place, W.1, on Tuesday, Jan. 22nd., at 7 for 7-30 p.m. Sir Edward Boyle, Bart., has accepted the Society's invitation as the principal guest of the occasion. Tickets for the dinner may be obtained from the Hon. Sec. of the Society at 7s. 6d. each, and early application should be made.

The Society is desirous of expressing its thanks publicly for the generous gift of valuable books from Mrs. Haworth-Booth, accumulated during his painstaking Baconian labours by her late husband. Many of these books are fifteenth and sixteenth century originals and will not fail to prove of value in reference work by the more studious of our members.

The Bacon Society is indebted to Miss Annette Covington, of Cincinnati, U.S.A., for a number of printing plates and a collection of illustrated articles which have appeared in the *Cincinnati Times Star*, indicating her extraordinary discovery of Francis Bacon's name and Tudor portraits cunningly interwoven and concealed in

the floral decorations of the Shakespeare Sonnets and First Folio of plays, to which we have previously drawn attention.

In the April (1934) issue of *The Masonian* appears a sympathetic notice of our friend, Mr. R. L. Eagle's "Shakespeare: New Views for Old," which makes good reading. We have been favoured with a copy of an excellent article by Mr. Eagle which was sent to the *Masonian* and which, I presume, was published in a following issue. In this, Mr. Eagle re-inforces his original contentions with great perspicuity and persistence.

Mr. Percy Pigott addressed the Hull Theosophical Society last October on the greatness of Francis Bacon. Dealing with the authorship of "Shakespeare's" plays, he said that the onus of proof was now on the Stratfordians. Little was known of Shakspere's life, but what we knew made it impossible for him to have been the author of the dramas. Bacon is known to have been the head of the Rosicrucian fraternity, and the plays were found to be full of Rosicrucianism. Cyphers were much used in those days. Other authors, at least in Italy, had embedded a cypher message in their works. Bacon's death was not, also, without mystery. Contemporary writers seem to have hinted that he had not died. Certainly, it was strange that we had no account of his funeral.

The lecture in September by Dr. Spencer Lewis, Imperator of the Rosicrucians at St. José, California, before the Bacon Society, drew a large audience, many attending from remote distances. If space admitted we would have been glad to reprint the lecture in *Baconiana*, but the principal points were that Francis Bacon was the head or Imperator of the whole Rosicrucian Brotherhood; that the London Philadelphian Order was Bacon's Lodge; that it was a mistake to repeat that Philadelphia (in the States) was founded by the early Quaker settlers, when it was really named after Bacon's lodge in London, from which was sent two members to spread the light of the Rosicrucian philosophy in America. These actually built the first meeting-place there for the poor Quakers who have been regarded as the founders of the Colony. He said the great "noise" regarding the *Fama Confessio* in Germany during the 17th century was but a local revival of a pre-existing organization. He said that the "Francis Bacon Hall" in the States was crowded last summer with delegates from twenty-six countries and nationalities. He paid a tribute to the late Mrs. Pott in her wonderfully inspired research work in this field, and said he had seen the very seals and book-marks, which she had published, in the originals, impressed on authoritative Rosicrucian MSS. in Germany, Holland and other parts of Europe, shewing they were not as often asserted, mere trade marks, but genuine secret sigils of the fraternity.

An important suggestion was made by a French Professor, M. Mathias Marhardt, in a paper read before the Society of Authors of Acquitaine, to the effect that "Shakespeare's" play, *Love's Labours Lost*, was the sequel to a long visit paid by "Shakespeare" to the town of Nerac, where Marguerite de Valois, wife of Henry of Navarre, held a brilliant Court. Professor Marhardt contended

that the play in question could only have been written by one intimately familiar with French politics and the famous court of Henry V., King of France and Navarre, who was murdered in 1610, six years before "Shakespeare's" death. Scholars have asserted that "Shakespeare" procured the knowledge requisite for writing the comedy from Monstrelet's Chronicles, but the Professor points out, very accurately, that these Chronicles do not contain such important details as are found to be in the play by modern historical research, and also that the characters in the play are thinly-disguised persons in Henry's Court itself, which historical portraits could only have come into being by personal observation.

The knotty question then arises: Is there the slightest evidence that Shakspere ever visited France at any time? It was impossible for an Englishman to set foot on French soil in those days without a passport. There is no record of any such passport in the name of William Shakspere, but we know that Francis Bacon was sent to the French Court whilst a youth, and stayed there some three years. Anthony Bacon was also at Navarre in the Intelligence Service, and the passports are to be seen in the Manuscript room of our British Museum.

H.S.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editors of "Baconiana."

Sir,—Are people familiar with the Epigrams of Palladas upon Fortune (*Anth.* p. 87)? One of them has been thus translated by the Canadian Professor, T. R. Glover, in his *Life and Letters in the Fourth Century*.

Our life's a slave that runs away
And Fortune is a courtesan;
We needs must laugh to see their play,
Or else must weep to mark alway
The worthless is the happier man.

Can this be the source of Francis' line in Hamlet, "Fortune, Oh most true, she is a strumpet."

Glover gives the Greek at page 314 of the Cambridge University Press edition of 1901.

Yours truly,
W. Welsh.

Some Books on the Bacon-Shakespeare Controversy.

(Obtainable from Publishers indicated.)

Anon. The Northumberland Manuscripts. A beautiful Collotype Facsimile and Type Transcript of this famous MS. preserved at Alnwick Castle, Northumberland. In One Volume, Royal quarto, 100 pp.; 90 full-page Collotype Facsimiles and 4 other illustrations. Transcribed and edited, with Introduction, by F. J. Burgoyne. 1904. Becoming scarce. £4 4s. (Bacon Society).

Anon. Queen Elizabeth, Amy Robsart and the Earl of Leicester. A reprint of the scarce historical work entitled "Leycester's Commonwealth," 1641. Edited by F. J. Burgoyne, 1904. 7s. 6d. (Bacon Society).

Barrister (A). The Bacon-Shakespeare Controversy. A statement of elementary facts concerning the actor named Shakspere, impugning the commonly accepted opinion that he was the author of the "Shakespeare" plays. 6d. (Bacon Society).

Batchelor (H. Crouch). Francis Bacon wrote Shakespeare. 2s. 6d. net. (Bacon Society).

Begley, Rev. Walter. Bacon's Nova Resuscitatio, or the unveiling of his concealed works and travels. 3 vols. 10s. 6d. (Bacon Society).

Bunten (Mrs. A. Chambers). Twickenham Park and Old Richmond Palace and Francis Bacon's Connection with Them (1580—1608). 1s. net. **Sir Thomas Meautys (Secretary to Ld. Bacon), and His Friends.** Illustrated with Portraits. 1918. Price 1s. 6d. **Life of Alice Barnham (1592-1650), Wife of Sir Francis Bacon. Mostly gathered from Unpublished Documents.** Price 1s. 6d. (Bacon Society).

Clark, Mrs. Natalie Rice Clark. Bacon's Dial in Shakespeare. This scholarly work brings to light an unique cypher which the authoress has discovered in the First Folio, designed by Bacon in his Alphabet of Nature and History of the Winds, and based on the union of a clock and compass in dial form. Amongst numerous examples, a complete study of Macbeth is made, accompanied by the Cypher calculations, so that its track can be easily followed. The Cypher actually runs through the whole of the 36 Plays and throws clear light on many obscure passages that have puzzled commentators. It is furthermore essential for the right understanding of the Plays,—providing a literary framework on which they are built and showing that a definite theory of construction underlies them. Silk cloth, 10s. (Bacon Society).

Cuningham (Granville C.). Bacon's Secret Disclosed in Contemporary Books. 3s. 6d. net. (Bacon Society).

Dawbarn, C. Y. C., M.A. Uncrowned: a story of Queen Elizabeth and Francis Bacon. 204 pp. 6s. (Bacon Society).

Some Supplemental Notes (on above). 96 pp. 30 illustrations, 2s. 6d. (Bacon Society).

Drury, Lt.-Col. W. P. The Playwright: a Heresy in One Act. Suitable for Baconian Amateur Theatricals. 1s. (Samuel French, 26, Southampton Street, W.C.2.)

(*Continued on next page*).

Eagle, (R. L.) "Shakespeare: New Views for Old." Demy 8vo., with 3 Illustrations. 5s. net. Postage 6d. (Cecil Palmer, 49, Chandos St., W.C.2).

Goldsworthy, W. Lansdown. Shakespeare's Heraldic Emblems; their Origin and Meaning. With numerous reproductions from old plates and figures. Cloth. (H. F. and G. Witherby, 330, High Holborn, W.C. 15s.). **Ben Jonson and the First Folio.** An analysis of "The Staple of News;" shewing Bacon, not De Vere, to be the concealed "Shakespeare." Price 2s. 9d. post free. W. Glaisher, Ltd. or F. & E. Stoneham, Ltd., of High Holborn, or from the author, "Point-in-View," Iver Heath, Bucks.

Greenwood, Sir George. The Vindicators of Shakespeare: a reply to Critics. 3s. (Bacon Society).

Lawrence (Sir E. Durning, Bart). Bacon is Shakespeare: With Reprint of Bacon's Promus of Formularies. Copiously illustrated. 6s. net. The Shakespeare Myth, Epitaph and Macbeth Prove Bacon is Shakespeare. Cloth, gilt. 2s. 6d. (Bacon Society).

Seymour (Henry). A Cypher Within a Cypher. An elementary lesson in the Study of the Bi-literal Cypher, and a disclosure of an anagrammatic signature of "William Shakespeare" in Bacon's original editon of "De Augmentis." 1s. On Biliteral Deciphering. Reprinted from *Baconiana* 1922, with facsimile illustration and key page. 3d.

"John Barclay's 'Argenis' and Cypher Key," reprinted from *Baconiana*, with an Addendum. 6d., postage 1d. (Bacon Society).

To Marguerite (a Song attributed to Francis Bacon and set to music by Henry Seymour). In E flat or G. Illustrated Elizabethan cover, designed by the late Chas. E. Dawson, and Hilliard portrait of Bacon, at 18, in colours, 2s. net. (Edwin Ashdown, Ld., 10, Hanover Square, W.)

Theobald, Bertram G. Shake-speare's Sonnets Unmasked. The author opens by giving cogent reasons justifying the decision of the true "Shake-spear" to remain concealed during his lifetime, and then proceeds to explain some of the secret methods by which he signed not only his many pseudonymous publications, but even his acknowledged works. 5s. Francis Bacon Concealed and Revealed. A masterly analysis of the methods of Secret Signature adopted by Bacon in his anonymous or pseudonymous poems and plays. 7s. 6d. net. Exit Shakspere. 2s. 3d. post free. Enter Francis Bacon, a sequel to "Exit Shakspere." 3s. 4d. post free. (Cecil Palmer, 49, Chandos Street, W.C.2.).

Woodward (Frank). Bacon's Cypher Signatures. 21s. (Bacon Society).

Gallup, Mrs. E. W. The Tragedy of Anne Boleyn: a drama in cypher, deciphered by Mrs. Gallup. Cloth 5s. 9d., Paper post free 3s. 3d. (E. F. Hudson, Ltd., 116, New St., Birmingham).

Hickson, S. A. E. The Prince of Poets. Epilogue by H. S. Howard. 368 pp. Cloth 2s. 6d. post free. (E. F. Hudson, Ltd.).

Denning, W. H. Dressing Old Words New. Striking parallelisms in "Shakespeare" and the private correspondence of Lady Anne and Anthony Bacon. Paper 6d. (Bacon Society).

Sydenham, Lord. The First Baconian. Shewing the earliest modern speculation of Dr Wilmot that Bacon was "Shakespeare." Post free, 1½d (Bacon Society).

Sennett, Mabel. A Study of "As You Like It." Post free 1s. 1d. (Bacon Society).

"Antonio." Bacon *v.* Shakespeare. Post free 6d. (Bacon Society).

The Rydal Press, Keighley.