

932P

G16

b

MAIN

UC-NRLF



B 3 564 842

UCB

5712
MAY 2 1917

*Alphabetical Cypher of
Francis Bacon* ❀ ❀

Replies to Criticisms

Elizabeth Wells Gallup

I AM in good hope that if the first reading move an objection, the second reading will make an answer.—*Adv. of L.*

932f
G16
b

UNIV. OF
CALIFORNIA

FRANCIS BACON'S BI-LITERAL CYPHER.

Surprise has been expressed that I have not more fully replied to the many severe and unjust criticisms of my work—the discovery and publication of the *Bi-literal Cypher of Francis Bacon*. On account of great distance causing lapse of time, the torrent of communications, which deluged the *Times* and other papers and magazines in London, had somewhat subsided before my replies to any could be returned to England, but the delay, although by no fault of ours and unavoidable, has not been due to distance alone.

The Times published two short letters with fair promptness. *The Literary World* gave space to two others, replying to articles appearing in its own columns; and the *Daily News*, of April 30, contained a part of my answer to Sir Henry Irving. An article in reply to some of the critics, prepared for the *Pall Mall Magazine*, could not, from prearrangement of space, appear until May—a rather late date. The delay was the more regretted because the article on the general subject, published in the March number of the same magazine, was prepared and sent forward before the criticisms of the latter part of December and January had reached me, and, though following shortly after, was in no way a reply.

In the January number of the *Nineteenth Century and After*, there appeared two articles of attack upon the Cypher, one by Mr. Candler, and one by Mr. R. B. Marston. Mr. Marston, I understand, is a member of the firm publishing the magazine. His article was a continuation of the unfounded and libelous charges appearing in the *Publishers' Circular* and in the *Times* concerning myself and my work. I replied at length and forwarded the articles to Messrs. Gay & Bird, under date of February 5th, desiring that the denial of these charges should be given equal prominence. Electrotypes plates were forwarded for illustration of the technical portions. Plates for

M50679

fac-simile pages from the two editions of *De Augmentis*, affording most interesting illustration of the method of the cipher and, of the differences between the editions of 1623 and 1624, were also furnished. I am now advised by Messrs. Gay & Bird that the *Nineteenth Century*, the *Contemporary Review*, and the *Times*, have declined to publish any part of these articles.

This must be my apology for now issuing in pamphlet form what was prepared for the public periodicals and should have appeared months ago as part of the discussion of the subject that is of interest to a large number of readers. The reluctance of the press in general, to print anything Baconian is well illustrated in this refusal of my critics to give place to my replies. I do not think it should be considered a waste of space to discuss discoveries that correct history in important particulars. The cipher is a *fact*, and cannot be ignored. It is neither imagination nor creation of mine. It is a part of the history of England, and effort should be directed to further investigations along the lines it indicates—to search among old MSS., in the museums and libraries and in the archives of the government, for other facts which in the light of the cipher revelations will be better understood than they have been in the past.

Concerning my reply to Mr. Marston's charges, I am in receipt of the *Literary World* of May 2nd, which over his name has the following:

“Dear Sir:—I will not waste your space replying at length to Mrs. Gallup, except to ask her where she has replied to my article in *The Nineteenth Century* for January, and to my letters in *The Times*?”

“In your columns and in the May number of *The Pall Mall Magazine* Mrs. Gallup says she has *elsewhere* replied to my request for an explanation of the fact that many passages in what she says is Bacon's translation of Homer are identical with Pope's Homer published more than 200 years afterward!

“In a letter in *The Times* Mrs. Gallup did suggest that Bacon and Pope had used some edition of Homer *unknown to any one else.*”

In the above we note the strange inconsistency of Mr. Marston, for my letter published in the *Times* did not “suggest” or even refer to any edition of Homer whatever. His

reference is to a paragraph in my reply (printed herewith) to his baseless aspersions, and shows conclusively that he had read my refutation, and knew that in the article submitted to his magazine and rejected I had "elsewhere replied" to his request.

In the article next preceding Mr. Marston's letter, "Reviewer" also states: "Now as to Homer, I have read Mrs. Gallup's 'answer' to Mr. Marston," etc.

This indicates that both Mr. Marston and "Reviewer" had examined my article, and they comment upon specific portions of it before it has been published, while ordinary courtesy should have withheld criticism, at least until the article had appeared in print.

It may not be inopportune to report at this time the results of researches made for me at the British Museum and elsewhere, since Mr. Marston's malicious charge of "paraphrasing Pope's translation of the Iliad" was made. Fourteen translations in Latin, French, German, Italian and English, published before 1620, were carefully examined for the reading in the disputed passages. Bacon's "impatient arrow" is "eager shaft" in Chapman's translation, and "long distance shots" is rendered "his hitting so far off," the Greek words conveying the same idea to these two minds. Mr. Marston matched Bacon's "cold Dodona" against Pope's "cold Dodona," but Hobbes has "Dodona cold," and a modern Greek scholar renders it "chilly Dodona." He also pairs "rocky Aulis" with the same in Pope, but gives it as the literal translation also; and he places Bacon's "he leapt to the ground" opposite Pope's "leaps upon the ground," while it is more like the line of Hobbes, "he leapt to land." Another renders this "he leapt to the land," and still another, "he leaped upon the earth."

The examination also developed the fact that Pope's original MSS., preserved at the Museum, have closer resemblances to Bacon's *Argument of the Iliad* than are found in Pope's published work. This is very significant, and in itself refutes the charge, as I have never seen the MSS., and the first edition of my book containing the *Argument of the Iliad* was published the year before I went to England to pursue the work at the British Museum.

In Bacon's *Argument* we find :

"*Peneleus*, *Leitus*, *Prothoënor*, joynd with *Arcesilaus* and *bold Clonius*, equall in arms and in command, led Bœotia's hosts."

This in his fuller poem appears :

"*Peneleus*, *Leitus*, and *Prothoënor*,
Join'd with *Arcesilaus* and *bold Clonius*—
'Two equal men in arms and in command—
Led forth Bœotia's hosts."

Pope's MS. at the British Museum reads :

"The hardy warriors whom Bœotia bred
Bold Clonius Leitus and *Peneleus* led."

But these were afterward emended to suit his verse, and the printed lines are :

"The hardy warriors whom Bœotia bred,
Penelius, *Leitus*, *Prothoënor* led :
With these *Arcesilaus* and *Clonius* stand
Equal in arms and equal in command."

By these comparisons we see that, in the *printed poem*, *Clonius* has lost his *boldness* and *Peneleus* has changed the spelling of his name.

Again in the original MS. we find :

"When first I led my troops to *Phaca's* wall
And heard fair *Jardan's silver waters* fall."

But in Pope's *printed* poem it reads :

"When fierce in war, where *Jardan's* waters fall,
I led my troops to *Phea's trembling* wall."

In this place Bacon omits all mention of the *Jardan*, but in the catalogue of the ships he says, "*Phæstus*, by the *silver Jar-dan*." Chapman gives the name of the river, *Jardanus*, another translator speaks of the *Jardan*, but Mr. Marston, I notice, writes the word *Iardus*.

In his MS. Pope had "hilly *Eteon*"; Bacon wrote "hillie *Eteon*"; but Pope's *printed* work has "*Eteon's hills*."

It is conceded that Pope followed *Ogilby* very closely. There may be some interesting developments in the history of the latter. We know that he was much employed about *Gray's Inn*, and that he was afterward taught Greek and Latin by the Oxford students to enable him to translate *Homer* and *Virgil*.

One thing needs no demonstration, that there was nothing in Bacon's Homer that made it necessary to keep it concealed before or after it was put in cipher. Upon that point he says that cipher writing became so much a habit, and pastime, that he embodied many things in it not necessarily secret. I quote :

“And yet I have also employed my cyphers for other then secret matters in many of my later bookes, because it hath now become so much an act of habite, I am at a losse at this present having less dificile labour, now, then in former times in Her Ma.'s service.”—*Bi-literal Cypher*, p. 66.

In the matter of criticism and expression of individual opinion, we might quote from Bacon's Essay of Custom and Education: “Men's thoughts are much according to their inclination; their discourse and speeches according to their learning and infused opinions, but their deeds are after as they have been accustomed.

ELIZABETH WELLS GALLUP.

Detroit, Mich., May 15, 1902.

REPLIES TO CRITICISMS.

ELIZABETH WELLS GALLUP.

In presenting the results of my work in deciphering the bilateral cypher, I expected criticism, but it has taken on some features that have been quite surprising to me.

To answer fittingly all the questions raised would be to write a book. Some are relevant, many not; some are prompted by desire for knowledge, others by a desire to check what they regard as a heresy; most show unfamiliarity with the subject, and not a few are mistaken in their statements of facts.

REPLY TO MR. CANDLER.

Mr. Candler, in the January number of the *Nineteenth Century*, republishes modified portions of an article that appeared in *Baconiana* to which I replied some time since, sending a copy of my article to him and to that magazine.

Mr. Candler makes his objections under the heads: History, Language, Arithmetical Puzzles, Geography, Proper Names, and Bacon's Poetry.

HISTORY.

As to History, I can only say, if the decipherings had been my own invention, I should have had them in substantial accord with such records as exist, defective as they now appear. Had I "followed" accepted history, and prevailing ideas, and found in the cipher confirmation of what people wish to have true, I should have received encomiums due to an important discovery, and commendation for great skill and industry in working it out.

It was my misfortune that the cipher would not read that way, and no preconceived notions of my own could affect it. As I have elsewhere said "the facts of history" is an elastic term, and means to the individual that portion which the individual has learned. The records are by no means in accord, and discrepancies may well be left to the investigators, whose

revisions from data they may hereafter be able to collect may greatly change existing ideas. The decipherer is in no way responsible for the disclosures of the cipher, nor allowed speculation as to the probabilities in the case. One question only is admissible—what does the cipher tell?

LANGUAGE.

Under Language, Mr. Candler makes five subdivisions.

1. "It was the English custom to use *his* in connection with inanimate objects where we now use *its*. This custom died out about 1670."

This first objection is answered by himself, but in this connection he states:

"*Its* (or earlier, *it's*) began to creep into literature about the end of the sixteenth century, though doubtless it was used colloquially at an earlier date."

As to his other deductions on this point, I cannot speak from knowledge, but whoever put out the First Folio was certainly not averse to the use of *its*. In my former paper in *Baconiana* I gave from the Shakespeare folio ten examples of the use of the word. As there is no punctuation in the cipher, I am unable to determine which form Bacon used, *it's* or *its*, but that he used the word frequently in some parts of the cipher and not at all in others, any reader may easily see. *Thereof*, of which Mr. Candler speaks, though more rarely found was occasionally used.—(See *Bi-literal Cypher*, p. 30, l. 4; p. 61, l. 24.)

2. "From the date 1000 or earlier, we find many instances of *his* used instead of *s* in the possessive case, and similarly, for the sake of uniformity, of *her* and *their*. . . . But in Bacon, after a diligent collation of a great many pages, I find the general use of *s* without an apostrophe for the possessive case both for singular and plural, and no use of *his*, *her*, or *their* in this sense. When a noun ends with an *s* sound, Bacon joins the two words without a connecting *s*. Thus: 'Venus minion,' 'St. Ambrose learning,' and the curious form 'Achille's fortune,' which may be a printer's error, as the apostrophe here is in the wrong place. All these come from 1640 edition of the *Advancement of Learning*, Books 1, 2."

In a footnote Mr. Candler speaks of the seven instances sent him of the disputed form, but I wish to give them here. *Henry*

Seventh, (1622), "King Henry his quarrell," p. 24; the Conspiratours their intentions," p. 124; "King Edward Sixt his time," p. 145; "King Henrie the Eight his resolution of a Divorce," p. 196; "King James his Death," p. 208. Also in *Advancement of Learning* (1605), Book I, "Socrates his ironically doubting," p. 26; and one may see, "Didymus his Freedman," in the *Tacitus*. How many instances does he wish?

Mr. Candler further says: "And now for the 'Bacon' of Mrs. Gallup. Turning casually over the leaves of her story I find 'Solomon, his temple,' p. 24; 'England, her inheritance,' p. 27; 'man, his right,' p. 23 and p. 24; 'my dear lord, his misdeeds,' p. 43; 'the roial soveraigne, his eies,' p. 59; 'Cornelia, her example;' 'the sturdy yeomen, their support;' 'a mother, her hopes;' 'woman, her spirit;' and, curiously enough, where we might have expected an Elizabethan to have employed *his* 'Achilles' mind,' p. 302."

Aside from the apostrophe, which could not of course be placed in cipher in the one case—suggested as a printer's error in the other—the forms "Achilles fortune" and "Achilles mind" are the same. We have the following examples and many others of the first form also in the *Bi-literal Cypher*, (omitting apostrophes,) "Elizabeths raigne," p. 4; "Kings daughter," *ibid.*; "loves first blossom," "lifes girlod," p. 5; "stones throw," "Edwards sire," p. 6; "lions whelp," p. 7, etc., etc., etc., and we see that both forms are used in the published works and in cipher.

3. Mr. Candler says: "It was the custom to finish the verb with *s* after plural nouns, as if it were the third person singular," but complains that I do not recognize this in the deciphered work.

In two plays fifteen instances were found, seven of which are with the verb *is* or the abbreviation 's. In the *Bi-literal Cypher*, p. 177, l. 9, Bacon speaks of "Illes which *is* laid by for the good opportunitie." There are undoubtedly other examples.

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

A reason is given for this, in the *Bi-literal Cypher*, p. 25. There are many examples also in Bacon's open works, *e. g.*,

“Females of Seditions” is found in *Henry Seventh*, p. 137, while in Essay, *Seditions and Troubles*, it appears in this form: “Seditious tumults and seditious fames differ no more but as brother and sister, masculine and feminine.”

From the Shakespeare plays we have,

—————“we see

The waters swell before a boyst'rous storme.”—*Rich. III.*

This occurs again as follows: “And as there are certain hollow blasts of wind and secret swellings of seas before a tempest.”—*Ess. Seditions and Troubles*. Also this: “Times answerable, like waters after a tempest, full of working and swelling.”—*Adv. of L.* (1605), Book 2, p. 13.

A like recurrence is found in these: “And as in the Tides of People once up there want not commonly stirring winds to make them rough.”—*Henry Seventh*, p. 164; “For as the aunciente in politiques in popular Estates were woont to Compare the people to the sea, and the Orators to the winds because as the sea would of itselfe be caulm and quiet, if the windes did not moove and trouble it; so the people would be peaceable and tractable if the seditious orators did not set them in working and agitation.”—*Adv. of L.* (1605), Book 2, 2nd p. 77.

Many of the culled expressions in Bacon's *Promus* are employed in the cipher, as I have already found. When the same incidents are related in the word-cipher that are given in the biliteral, large passages must appear in both the *Bi-literal Cypher* and Bacon's open works.

5. Mr. Candler makes a series of verbal distinctions, as follows: “There are, I think, words used in the cipher story in quite a wrong sense. I will give instances: ‘Gems rare and *costive*.’ Murray gives no example of *costive* meaning *costly*.

‘I am *innocuous* of any ill to Elizabeth.’ Neither Murray nor Webster gives any example of ‘innocuous of,’ *i. e.*, ‘innocent of,’ though *innocuous* may mean *innocent*. Shakespeare does not use the word.

‘Surcease’ is a good enough word, but ‘surcease of sorrow’ is used by Poe, an American author; and the use of the phrase by Mrs. Gallup's ‘Bacon’ makes one wonder whether he had ever read *The Raven*.

'Cognomen,' p. 29. No instance given in Murray earlier than 1809. 'Desiderata,' p. 161. No instance of 'desideratum' earlier than 1652.

'Hand and glove,' p. 359. Earliest instance in Murray, 1680.

'Cognizante' adj. Earliest example in Murray, 1820. Murray says, 'Apparently of modern introduction; not in dictionaries of the eighteenth century;' . . . (cognisance is quite early, both as a law term and in literary use.)"

These are refinements beyond reason. Bacon added thousands of new words and new uses of words to the language. There is something applicable to the case in the *Advancement of Learning* (1605).

"I desire it may bee conceived that I use the word in a differing sense from that that is receyved," and "I sometimes alter the uses and definitions."—Book 2, pp. 24-25.

Had the word *costive* occurred but once I should have considered it intended for *costlye* as we find it in Bacon. He may have used a *v* where *y* was intended.

It is true *innocuous*, from the Latin *innocuus*, in the dictionaries is used only of things, but Bacon evidently employed it differently, and wrote "innocuous of ill" as he would have written "not guilty of crime." In *Anatomy of Melancholy* (1621) we find "Northerne men, *innocuous*, free from riot" (p. 82), and "The patient *innocuous* man."

Surcease is used in the Shakespeare plays—Cor., Act 3; Rom. & Jul., Act 4; Macb., Act 1. It is in *Lucrece*, and also occurs in Bacon's acknowledged works. He had, perhaps, as good reason as Poe to desire 'surcease of sorrow.'

Certainly, Bacon had a right to use words existing in any language. We know that he anglicized many from the Latin and the French. *Cognomen* is of course from the Latin; *desiderata*, Mr. Candler admits, was used in 1652; *cognizante*—or as it is elsewhere spelled in the cipher, *cognisant*—might be allowed him on the ground that *cognisances* was certainly in use.—*Henry Seventh*, p. 211; 1 Hen. VI., Act 2; Jul. Cæsar, Act 2; Cym., Act 2.

ARITHMETICAL PUZZLES.

Mr. Candler is also inaccurate in his arithmetic. He has not carefully read pp. 66 and 67, where it is explained that Latin letters, called by us Roman, were used in a few dedications,

prologues, etc. I did not find these employed until the publications of 1623—in the folio and *Vitæ et Mortis*. I have also shown elsewhere that, at the end of short sections that did not join with other works, there were occasionally a few letters more in the exterior passage than were required for the enfolded portion. These are nulls and not used. Mr. Candler gives the number of letters in the catalogue of the plays as 850 and says the portion extracted required 860. Both numbers are wrong. The cipher enfolded required 855 letters, and that is the exact number of letters in the catalogue when the Roman type is included and the diphthongs and digraphs are regarded as separate letters.

GEOGRAPHY.

Just what Mr. Candler would have us understand by referring to the incorrect geography in the plays is not quite clear. It has no relevance to the cipher nor does it determine whether Bacon or Shakespeare would suffer most from the criticism. The same may be said of the next paragraph under "Proper Names," for it was, and is, at least poetic license to change the pronunciation in that manner; and as to the spelling of *Iliad* on page 176 of the *Bi-literal*, we have in *Troilus and Cressida* a parallel in, "as they passe toward Illium." Neither spelling nor pronunciation were well defined arts in Bacon's day or in Bacon's books.

BACON'S POETRY.

The quoted verse of this "concealed poet" speaks for itself, and on this point I may well be silent, except to say the particular poetry Mr. Candler condemns is said to have been written on a sick bed at the age of sixty-two.

It is amusing to see how many plans are made for Bacon by these critics, how many things are pointed out that he might, or should have done. Their long experience in surmising what Shakespeare may, can, must, might, could, would, or should have done in order to reconcile asserted facts has given them the habit of "guessing."

Mr. Candler adds some footnotes, in one of which he quotes: "Mrs. Gallup, when challenged, failed to point out the cipher, an easy matter if it really existed; and now avows that without extraordinary faculties and a kind of "inspiration," none, save

herself, need expect to perceive it.' ” And adds, “It should be understood that the President and Council of the Baconian Society enter a formal *caveat* that nothing in Mrs. Gallup’s interpretation can be said to have been satisfactorily proved.”

I remember very well the evening to which the extract from *Baconiana* refers, when, upon the invitation of a member of the legal profession, my sister and myself explained to two prominent Baconians the method and scope of our work. In theory, they accepted—or seemed to accept—what is unmistakably true, that for different sizes of type,—pica, small pica, English, etc. Bacon arranged different alphabets. It was shown that one size of ornamental capitals belonged to the ‘*a* fount,’ in another size the ornamental letters belonged to the ‘*b* fount.’ This was admitted as very possible, even probable; yet when this was applied to practical demonstration of what Bacon *did*, they exclaimed: “Impossible!!” “Bacon never would have done that! etc., etc.” This could not be thought a receptive frame of mind, and just how they knew what Bacon would not have done I cannot tell.

Afterward I showed them which letters belonged to the ‘*b* fount,’ in a number of lines of the Dedicatory Epistle of Spenser’s *Complaints*, in no single instance varying from the marking of the manuscript from which my book was printed. This was candidly admitted, yet, when this interview was reported, it read as above quoted.

When I first put out the cipher, I thought any one who would take the time could decipher all that I have done, but when I found people who could not distinguish between this *ſ* and *ʒ* to say nothing of obscure *o*’s and *e*’s, I despaired of their becoming decipherers. There are, of course, many who have a correct eye for form, who will be able in time to overcome the difficulties this study presents, but I wish to ask Mr. Candler if he does not think the small *a*’s, *c*’s, etc., of the Latin illustration in *De Augmentis Scientiarum*, which he says a child could manage, quite as bewildering as any of the Italic letters elsewhere?

At the close of Mr. Candler’s article he desires that I “get together a few men who know something about books, and add to them a printer or two, familiar with types, new and old;

between them if they extract a consecutive narrative
there is nothing more to be said." I have extended this invitation many times, only to have it politely declined. The Editor of the *Times* refused, more than a year ago, to consider this request. Now, having practically lost the use of my eyes for such close work as this entails, I shall be obliged to forego, for a time at least, until a greater degree of strength has returned, the satisfaction it would be to point out in detail to a committee the various differences, though it seems to me they should be readily observable without my aid. In the meantime I rest in confidence that it will be correctly done by some one, somewhere and sometime.

It seems rather infantile to call attention to the spelling, but as Mr. Marston deems it of sufficient importance to draw from it the following inference, he must think it serious. I quote from the *Times* of January 3: "The whole thing is so transparently a concoction that a school boy who was reading this deciphered *Tragedy* asks: 'Was Bacon a Yankee? He spells words like "labour" and "honour" without the "u".'"

I would reply that he was the same person that wrote the Shakespeare plays. The folio shows both ways of spelling. But all the word-cipher productions were printed according to modern American usage, as in this *Tragedy of Anne Boleyn*.

Mr. Marston emphasizes the matter by a second allusion to this peculiarity as discrediting my work, in the following words: "And Mrs. Gallup asks the world to believe Bacon wrote this 'new drama' in order to vindicate the 'honor' of his grandmother."

A few minutes' examination shows, in the first four plays of Shakespeare, forty-four instances of the spelling of honor, without the *u*, against twenty-five occurrences of the word with the *u*. For the spelling of labor, I will take time and space to quote only a single line from the first folio:

"There be some Sports are painfull and their labor—" Tem. 3-1-1.

These words occur in the cipher story, as in the plays, spelled both ways.*

This suggests one thing of value to present day readers of the plays who do not know, or do not stop to consider, that modern editions differ greatly, and in important particulars, from the original editions, both spelling and grammar having been modified, while in some parts, whole paragraphs of the text are omitted to meet the ideas of what the particular editor *thought* the author *should* have said.

Mr. Marston, in the *Nineteenth Century*, continues an argument first put forth in the *Times*, and further illustrated in the *Publishers' Circular*, attempting to prove that, because certain fragments of the Iliad, in the *Bi-literal Cypher*, deciphered from

*Even present day London writers are not in accord in the use of "u," for I find in the *Times*, "font of type." Mr. Marston and others write "fount." Are the writings of "A Correspondent" in the *Times* to be discredited for following the American method?

the *Anatomy of Melancholy* of 1628, are similar to Pope's version of the same passages, the whole long story comprising 385 pages—about 300 of which relate to matters entirely foreign to the *Iliad*—must be a conscious fraud, and that "bold lie" is the key to the whole matter. It was hardly a courteous expression, and I have every confidence that Mr. Marston will, after more careful investigation, retract it.

Any statement that I copied from Pope, or from any source whatever, the matter put forth as deciphered from Bacon's works, is false in every particular.

It will be noted that Mr. Marston makes no attempt to prove the cipher, but bases his convictions regarding the book upon this one point of similarity, in an insignificant portion of it, to Pope's translation of the *Iliad*.

As it chanced, I had read Pope to some extent in the rhetorical studies of my school days, but had never re-read his Homer until Mr. Marston called attention to it. I now see a similarity in some expressions, and in the arrangement of names, in that portion devoted to the catalogue of the ships. Bacon's directions for writing out the *Iliad* (by the word-cipher, p. 170), suggest that at that time he had not made as full preparation for writing out the catalogue as for the remainder of the work, and this seems significant.

I do not find any striking resemblances in the other parts, and, as I stated in a recent communication to the *Times*, in an examination of six English translations and one Latin, I found that each might with equal justice be considered a paraphrase of Pope, or that he had copied his predecessors. Why, among several translations of the same Greek text, two having both resemblances and differences should be classed together, and one should necessarily be a copy of the other, is not clear to me. Knowing that Pope's was considered the least correct of several of the English translations, yet, perhaps, the best known for its poetic grace, it is hardly reasonable to suppose that I should have copied his, had I been dependent upon any translation for the deciphered matter.

Bacon says his earliest work upon the *Iliad* was done under instructors. There were Latin translations extant in his day, which were equally accessible to Pope a century later. A simi-

larity might have arisen from a study by both of the same Latin text. George Chapman, in 1598, complained vigorously that some one had charged him with translating his Iliad from the Latin, and abusively replied. Theodore Alois Buckley, in his introduction to Pope's Iliad, says he was "not a Grecian" and that he doubtless formed his poem upon Ogilby's translation, besides consulting friends who were better classical scholars than himself.

But all this is of small importance, for it is inconclusive. The question is, did I find this argument of the Iliad in differing founts of Italic type in the text of the *Anatomy of Melancholy*?

I have had set up by our printers from my MS. two sections of the *Anatomy of Melancholy*, from which were taken some passages Mr. Marston quotes. Modern Italic type has to be used, of course, and the two founts will be easily distinguishable. They are so marked as unmistakably to indicate how the differing forms are used. A reference to an original copy of the *Anatomy of Melancholy* (1628), which may be seen in the British Museum, or in the fine library of Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence, will quickly show whether or not I have used all the Italic letters in the text, whether they are of differing forms as marked in this, whether they have been properly grouped, and, when the bi-literal cipher is applied, whether they produce the results I have printed. If the types are of differing forms, are properly grouped, and produce, by the bi-literal method, the results printed, the question of identities or similitudes is eliminated from the discussion.

I am aware that in offering this evidence in this way, I am at a serious disadvantage. The true classification of the types was determined after days of examination and comparison of hundreds of the old letters, until every shade, and line, and curve of those I marked was familiar, and as thoroughly impressed upon my memory as the features of a friend, while to those making this comparison the letters themselves will be new, the number examined probably limited to those in a few sentences, and by eyes entirely unskilled in this kind of examination.

Mr. Marston refers to my use of an edition of the *Anatomy of Melancholy*, published after Bacon's death, as evidence that

I may be wrong. The edition I used was that of 1628, published by Dr. William Rawley. Concerning this and Rawley's work, I had found in deciphering *Sylva Sylvarum*, the following statement from Rawley himself:

"When, however, you find this change where I beganne th' worke, you shall pause awhile, then use the alphabet as it is heerein employ'd and as explain'd in my preceding epistle. It will thus be like a new alphabet and doubtlesse will bee troublesome, yet can bee conn'd while some had to be discover'd; but in respect of a probable familiaritie with th' worke, and the severall diverse methods employed oft by his lordship, this may by no meanes be requir'd, since th' wit that could penetrate such mysteries surely needeth no setti'g forth and enlarging of mine.

Ere the whole question be dropt, however, let me bid you go on to my larger and fully arranged table where th' storie, or epistle, is finish'd as it should have beene had his lordship lived to compleat it, since my part was but that of th' hand, and I did write only that portion which was not us'd at th' time. All this was duely composed and written out by his hand, and may bee cherish'd.

From his penne, too, works which now bear th' name Burton make useful those portions which could by noe means bee adapted to dramaticall writings. If you do not use them as you decypher th' interiour epistles, so conceal'd, your story shall not be compleat.

Th' workes are in three divisio's, entitled *Melancholy*, its *Anatomy*. Additons to this booke have beene by direction of Lord Verulam, himselfe, often by his hand, whilst th' interiour letter, carried in a number of ingenious cyphers mentioned above, is from his pen, and is the same in every case that he would have used in these workes, for his is, in verie truth, worke cut short by th' sickel of Death."

This edition of Burton was the only old book in hand at the time of its deciphering, and, having found the cipher in it, I continued work upon it, though its contents were a serious disappointment, and I have since greatly regretted the time and strength spent upon what was of so little value, and of no interest historically as relating to the personality of Bacon or the times in which he lived. Has it been noted by Mr. Marston, or by others who have been incredulous about this book, that Burton in the appendix to his will does not include the *Anatomy of Melancholy* in "such books as are written with mine own hands"? While this might not be conclusive, it is, in the light of the cipher revelations, a very significant omission. I add here that the first edition was published in the name of T. Bright, under the title of *A Treatise of Melancholy*, in 1586, when Burton was ten years old and Bacon twenty-five. As the *Anatomy of Melancholy*, it was issued in Rawley's lifetime, in several editions under dates of 1621, 1624, 1628, 1632, 1638, 1651-2, 1660, 1676. The edition of 1676 was a reprint of an earlier edition and was issued after Rawley's death. Burton died in 1640.

One of the passages which Mr. Marston quotes in proof of a paraphrase of Pope's translation is the expression, "Hillie Eteon, or the waterie plains of Hyrie." On referring to my MS. of the deciphering from *Democritus to the Reader*, p. 73, l. 24, *Anat. of Mel.*, I find the phrase was extracted from the words, which are here set up in two founts of modern type.

No one should pass judgment upon the *Bi-literal Cypher* who cannot, at sight, assign these letters to their respective founts, for it is much less difficult in these diagrams than in the old books themselves.

FOUNTS USED

{ a b a b	a b a b	a b a b	a b a b	a b a b	a b a b
{ A A a a	B B b b	C C c c	D D d d	E E e e	F F f f
{ a b a b	a b a b	a b a b a b	a b a b	a b a b	a b a b
{ G G g g	H H h h	I I i i j j	K K k k k	L L l l l	M M m m m
{ a b a b	a b a b	a b a b	a b a b	a b a b	a b a b
{ N N n n	O O o o	P P p p p	Q Q q q q	R R r r r	S S s s s
{ a b a b	a b a b a b	a b a b	a b a b	a b a b	a b a b
{ T T t t	V V v v u u	W W w w	X X x x	Y Y y y	Z Z z z

Passage to be deciphered.

vitijs Crimine Nemo caret Nemo sorte sua vivit contentus Nemo in amore sapit, Nemo bonus, Nemo sapiens, Nemo, est ex omni parte beatus &c. Nicholas Nemo, No body quid valeat Nemo, Nemo referre potest vir sapit qui pauca loquitur

Grouping in fives as the words stand, we have:

v i t i j s C r i m i n e N e m o c a r e t N e m o s o r t e s u a v i v i t c
a a b a a b b b a b a a a a b a b a a b a b a a b a a a a a b a a a a b a a b a
E B K K A R T
o n t e n t u s N e m
a b a a a b a a a a b
I S

The first group forms the biliteral letter *e*, but the next has two 'b fount' letters at the commencement. There is no letter in the biliteral alphabet commencing *bb*, but there is a possibility of a printer's error, and it is necessary to examine the following groups. Each forms a bi-literal letter, but they are a jumble and cannot be set off, or divided into words.

Another attempt is necessary to pick up the cipher thread. Omitting one letter at the beginning, the grouping is:

i t i j s C r i m i n e N e m o c a r e t N e m o s o r t e s u a v i v i t c
a b a a b b b a b a a a a b a b a a b a b a a a a b a a a a b a a b a a
K C T T B B E
n t e n t u s N e m
b a a a b a a a b b
S D

Here, again, *bb* comes at the beginning of a group, but going on with the remainder of the line the resulting letters are again impossible to separate into any intelligible words.

Omitting another letter we have:

<i>l</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>t</i>
<i>buabb</i>	<i>babaa</i>	<i>aabab</i>	<i>aabab</i>	<i>aabaa</i>	<i>aaaba</i>	<i>aaaba</i>	<i>abaab</i>			
U	W	F	F	E	C	C	K			
<i>t</i>	<i>s</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>s</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>i</i>
<i>aaaba</i>	<i>aabba</i>	<i>babba</i>	<i>aabba</i>	<i>bbaaa</i>						
O	G	Y	G							

Another trial commences with the fourth letter, and the groups are:

<i>i</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>v</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>t</i>
<i>aabbb</i>	<i>abaaa</i>	<i>ababa</i>	<i>ababa</i>	<i>abaaa</i>	<i>aabaa</i>	<i>aabaa</i>	<i>baaba</i>							
H	I	L	L	I	E	E	T							
<i>e</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>s</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>p</i>
<i>aabaa</i>	<i>abbbab</i>	<i>abbaa</i>	<i>abbab</i>	<i>baaaa</i>	<i>baaba</i>	<i>cabbb</i>	<i>aabaa</i>							
E	O	N	O	R	T	H	E							
<i>s</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>N</i>
<i>baaba</i>	<i>aaaaa</i>	<i>baaba</i>	<i>aabaa</i>	<i>baaaa</i>	<i>baaaa</i>	<i>abaaa</i>	<i>aabaa</i>	<i>abbbba</i>						
W	A	T	E	R	I	E	P							
<i>o</i>	<i>q</i>	<i>v</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>v</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>s</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>s</i>
<i>ababa</i>	<i>aaaaa</i>	<i>abaaa</i>	<i>abbaa</i>	<i>baaab</i>	<i>abbbab</i>	<i>aabab</i>	<i>aabbb</i>	<i>aabbb</i>	<i>aabbb</i>	<i>aabbb</i>	<i>aabbb</i>	<i>aabbb</i>	<i>aabbb</i>	<i>aabbb</i>
L	A	I	N	S	O	F	H							
<i>a</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>r</i>									
<i>babba</i>	<i>baaaa</i>	<i>abaaa</i>	<i>aabaa</i>											
Y	R	I	E											

DECIPHERED PASSAGE

None of these groups begins with two *b*'s, and the resulting letters spell out the line quoted.

hillieeteonorthewaterieplainsofhyrie
 Hillie Eteon or the waterie plains of Hyrie.

The capitalization and punctuation are suggested by the rules of literary construction. There are four possible wrong groupings, but this illustration required only the trial of three to find the correct one. Should there be obscure, or doubtful, letters in the text that make the resulting letters of a group uncertain, pass the whole group by until those are marked which are certain. There are always a sufficient number of *b*'s to indicate what the word really is in the groups preceding and following. In the resulting phrase above, a number of the letters might be passed over as abbreviations and yet the sense could hardly be mistaken even in this short and disconnected line, while with the context it would be made perfectly clear.

Mr. Marston quotes another passage as evidence that I have "copied Pope":

"Hee was th' first of th' Greekes who boldlie sprang to th' shore when Troy was reach'd, and fell beneath a Phrygian lance."

Referring to my MS., I find this comes from page 38, *Anat. of Mel.*, commencing in line 11. I have had this printed, also, and grouped for the resulting bi-literal letters that form the deciphered passage, and I think it well to use this because it illustrates one of the points that should be clearly understood.

Anatomy of Melancholy, p. 38, l. 11 (Edition 1628).

Claudinus Hippocrates Paracelsus Non est reluctandum cum Deo Hercules Olympicks, Iupiter Iupiter Hercules Nil iuvat immensos Cratero promittere montes we must submit ourselves vnder the mighty hand of God vna eademq manus vulnus opemq feret Achilles A Digression of the nature of Spirits, bad Angels or Divels, and how they cause Melancholy. Postellus, full of controversie and ambiguity fateor excedere vires intentionis meae Austin finitum de infinito non potest statuere Acts Sadducees Galen Peripateticks Aristotle Pomponatius Scaliger Dandinus com in lib de

audin usHip pocra tesPa racel susNo nestr eluct
 aabbbb aabaa aubaa babaa auaaa baaab baaba aabbbb
 andum cumDe oHerc ulesO lympi cksIu piter Iupit
 aabab abbaaa baaua baaab baaba abbab uabab baaba
 erHerc ules Niliu vatim menso sCrat eropr omitt
 aabbbb aabba baaua aabaa aabaa aabab aabaa baabab
 eremo ntesw emust submi tours elues vnder themi
 babaa aabbbb abbab auaab abbab ababa aabbb ababa
 ghtyh andof Godvn aeade mqman usrul nusop emqfe
 abaaa aabaa baaab abbbb baaua aaaaa abbaa aabba
 retAc hille sADig ressi onoft henat ureof Spiri
 baaba abbab baaba aabbb baaab aabbb abbab baaua
 tsbad Angel sorDi relsa ndhow theyc auseM elanc
 aabaa babaa aabbb aabaa abbaa baaba baaua abbab
 holyP ostel lusfu llofc ontro versi eanda mbigu
 babba babaa aaaaa baab baaua aabaa aaaaa aabba
 ityfa teore xcede revir esint entio nisme aeAus
 aabbbb aabbb auaaa abbaa aabbb aabab aabaa ababa
 tinfi nitum deinf inito noupo tests tatue reAct
 abba aabab aabaa abbaa aabaa aaaaa baaba aabbbb
 sSadd ucees Galen Perip ateti cksAr istot lePom
 aaaaa abbaa aabbbb baaua babba abbaa abaaa aaaaa
 ponat iusSc alige rDand inusc ominl
 abbaa ababa aaaaa abbaa aabaa ababa

DECIPHERED PASSAGE

Hee was th' first of th' Greekes who boldlie sprang to th' shore when Troy was reach'd, and fell beneath a Phrygian lance.

In the word *Phrygian*, the fifth group which should make the letter *g*, *aabba*, really is *n*, *abbaa*, probably Rawley's mistake, for the printer should not answer to every charge. The two *b*'s stand together. as they should, but are one point removed to the left.

Every page of the book was worked out in the manner illustrated, every Italic letter classified and the result set down, nor could any "imagination or predetermination" change the result.

In this connection as few of your readers have opportunity to examine the old books I will reproduce the Cicero Epistle containing the Spartan dispatch from each of the 1623 and 1624 editions of *De Augmentis*, showing the differences and the errors in the second which like those occurring in the text of the old books have to be corrected if the work goes on.

LIBER SEXTVS.

279

Exemplum Alphabeti Biliterarij.

A	B	C	D	E	F
Aaaaa	aaab	aaaba	aaabb	aaaba	aaab
G	H	I	K	L	M
aabba	aabbb	abaaa	abaab	ababa	ababb
N	O	P	Q	R	S
abbaa	abbab	abbb	abbbb	baaaa	baaab
T	V	W	X	Y	Z
baaba	baabb	babaa	babab	babba	babbb

Neque leue quiddam obiter hoc modo perfectum est. Etenim ex hoc ipso patet Modus, quo ad omnem Loci Distantiam, per Obiecta, quæ vel Visui vel Auditui subijci possint, Sensa Animi proferte, & significare liceat; si modò Obiecta illa, duplicis tantum Differentiæ capacia sunt; veluti per Campanas, per Buccinas, per Flammeos, per Sonitus Tormentorum, & alia quæcunque. Verùm ut Inceptum persequamur, cum ad Scribendum accingeris, Epistolam Internam in *Alphabetum* hoc *Biliterarium* solues. Sit Epistola interior;

Fuge.

Exemplum Solutionis.

F	V	G	I
Aabab	baabb	aabba	aaaba

Præstò

Prælo simul sit aliud *Alphabetum Bisforme*, nimirum, quod singulas *Alphabeti Communis* Literas, tam Capitales, quam minores, duplici Formâ, prout cuique commodum sit, exhibeat.

Exemplum *Alphabeti Bisformis*.

a. b.
A A a a. B. B. b. b. C. C. c. c. D. D. d. d.

a. b.
E E. e. e. F. F. f. f. G. G. g. g. H. H. h. h.

a. b.
I. I. i. i. K. K. k. k. L. L. l. l. M. M. m. m.

a. b. a.
N. N. n. n. O. O. o. o. P. P. p. p. Q. Q. q. q. R.

b. a. b.
R. R. r. S. S. s. s. T. T. t. t. V. V. v. v. u. u.

a. b.
W. W. w. w. X. X. x. x. Y. Y. y. y. Z. Z. z. z.

Tum demùm Epistolæ Interiõri, iam factæ *Biliterate*,
Epistolam Exteriõrem *Biformem*, literatim accommoda-
dabis, & postea describes. Sic Epistola Exteriõr;
Manere te volo donec venero.

Exemplum *Accommodationis.*

F V G F
a a b a b b . a a b b a a b b a a a b a a .
Manere te volo donec venero

Apposuimus etiã Exemplum aliud largius eiusdem
Ciphre, *Scribendi Omnia per Omnia.*

Epistola Interior, ad quam delegi-
mus *Epistolam Spartanam*, missam
olim in Scyrale.

*Perditæ Res. Mindarus cecidit. Milites
esuriunt. Neque hinc nos extricare, neque
hic diutius manere possumus.*

Epistola Exteriõr, sumpta ex *Epistolâ*
Primâ Ciceronis, in quâ *Epistola Spâr-*
tana inuoluitur.

O o

Ego omni officio, ac potius pietate erga te;
 ceteris satisfacio omnibus: Mihi ipse nun-
 quam satisfacio. Tanta est enim magni-
 tudo tuorum erga me meritorum, ut quoni-
 am tu, nisi perfectam re, de me non conquis-
 si; ego, quia non idem in tua causa efficio,
 vitam mihi esse acerbam putem. In cau-
 sa haec sunt: Ammonius Regis Legatus
 aperte pecuniam nos oppugnat. Res agitur
 per eosdem creditores, per quos, cum tu ade-
 ras, agebatur. Regis causa, si qui sunt,
 qui delint, qui pauci sunt, omnes ad Pompe-
 ium rem deferri volunt. Senatus Reli-
 gionis calumniam, non religione, sed ma-
 lenolentia, et illius Regiae largitionis
 invidia comprobat. &c.

tummodò Literas solvantur ,; per Transpositionem earum. Nam Transpositio duarum Literarum , per Locos quinque, Differentiis triginta duabus, multò magis viginti quatuor (qui est Numerus *Alphabeti* apud nos) sufficiet. Huius *Alphabeti* Exemplum tale est.

Exemplum *Alphabeti Biliterarij.*

<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>
<i>Aaaaa</i>	<i>.aaaab</i>	<i>.aaaba</i>	<i>.aacbb</i>	<i>.aabaa</i>	<i>.aabab</i>
<i>G</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>K</i>	<i>L</i>	<i>M</i>
<i>aabba</i>	<i>.aabbb</i>	<i>.abaaa</i>	<i>.abaab</i>	<i>.ababa</i>	<i>.ababb</i>
<i>N</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Q</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>S</i>
<i>abbaa</i>	<i>.abbab</i>	<i>.abbba</i>	<i>.abbbb</i>	<i>.baaaa</i>	<i>.baaab</i>
<i>T</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>W</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>Y</i>	<i>Z</i>
<i>baaba</i>	<i>.baabb</i>	<i>.babaa</i>	<i>.babab</i>	<i>.babba</i>	<i>.babbb</i>

Neque leue quiddam obiter hoc modo perfectum est. Etenim ex hoc ipso patet Modus , quo ad omnem Loci Distantiam, per Obiecta, quæ vel Visui, vel Auditui subijci possint, Sensa Animi proferre, & significare liceat: si modò Obiecta illa, duplicis tantum Differentiæ capacia sunt, veluti per Campanas , per Buccinas, per Flammeos, per Sonitus Tormentorum, & alia quæcunque. Verùm vt Inceptum persequamur , cum ad Scribendum accingoris , Epistolam interiorem in *Alphabetum hoc Biliterarium* solves. Sit epistola interior:

Fuge.

Exemplum Solutionis.

F V G E.

Aabab. baabb. aabba. aabaa.

Præstò simul sit aliud *Alphabetum Biforme*, nimirum, quod singulas *Alphabeti Communis* Literas, tam Capitales, quam minores; duplici Formâ, prout cuiq; commodum, sit exhibeat.

Exemplum *Alphabeti Biformis*.

F V G E

a a b a b . b a a b b . a a b b a . a a . b a a

Manere te volo donec venero

Tum demum Epistolæ Interiori, iam factæ *Biliteratæ*, Epistolam Exteriorem *Biformem*, literatim accommodabis, & postea describes. Sit Epistola Exterior;

Manere te volo donec venero.

Exemplum *Accommodationis*.

N O P Q R S

abbaa. abbab. abbba. abbbp. baaaa. baaab

T V W X Y Z

baaba. baabb. babaa. babab. babba. babbb.

Apposuimus etiã Exemplum aliud largius eiusdem Ciphrae. *Scribendi Omnia per Omnia.*

Epistola Interior, ad quam delegimus *Epistolam*

Spartanam, missam olim in Scytale,

Perdita Res. Mindarus cecidit Milites esuriunt. Neque hinc nos extricare, neque hic diutius manere possumus.

a. b. a. b.
A A a. a. B. B b. b. C. C. c. c. D. D d. d.
a. b. a. b.
E. E. e. e. F. F. f. f. G. G. g. g. H. H. h. h.
a. b. a. b.
I. I. i. i. K. K k. k. L. L. l. l. M. M. m. m.
a. b. a. b. a.
N N n. n. O. O. o. o. P. P. p. p. Q. Q. q. q. R.
b. a. b. a. b.
R. r. r. S. S. s. s. T. T. t. t. V. V. v. v. u. u.
a. b. a. b.
W. W. w. w. X. X. x. x. Y. Y. y. y. Z. Z. z. z.

Epistola Exterior, sumpta ex Epistolâ Primâ Ciceronis,
 in quâ Epistola Spartana inuoluitur.

Ego omni officio, ac potius piebatur erga te; cæteris satisfacio omnibus: Mihi ipse nunquam satisfacio. Tanta est enim magnitudo tuorum erga me meritorum, ut quoniam tu, nisi perfectare, de me non conquiesci; ego, quia non idem in tuam causam efficio, vitam mihi esse acerbam putem. In causa hæc sunt. Ammonius Regis Legatus aperte pecuniam nos oppugnat. Res agitur, per eosdem creditores per quos, cum tu ad eas agebatur. Regis causam, si qui sunt, qui velint, qui parati sunt omnes ad Pompeium rem deferri volunt. Senatus Religionis calumniam, non religione, sed malevolentiam, et illius Regiæ Largitionis invidia comprobatur &c.

In the 1624 edition the second *i* in *officio* is changed by the law of tied letters; the second *u* in *nunquam* has position or angle of inclination, to make it an 'a fount' letter; *q* in *conquisti* is from the wrong fount, and the *u* has features of both founts but is clear in one distinctive difference—the width at the top; the *q* in *quia* is reversed by a mark; the *a*'s in the first *causa* are formed like 'b fount' letters but are taller; the *q* of *quos* is from the wrong fount; the second *a* in *aderas* is reversed being a tied letter; *l* in *velint* is from the wrong fount, also the *p* of *parati*, the *l* of *calumniam* and the *l* of *religione*.

In line twelve '*pauci sunt*' in 1623 ed. is '*parati sunt*' in the 1624 ed. The correct grouping is *ntqui velin tqiup ratis untom nesad*, the first *a* in '*parati*' must be omitted to read *diutius* according to the Spartan dispatch. Otherwise the groups would be *arati sunt mnesa*. The *m* and *n* are both 'b fount,' thus bringing two *b*'s at the beginning of this last group, indicating at once a mistake for no letter in the bi-literal alphabet begins with two *b*'s and wherever encountered may be known to indicate either a wrong fount letter or a wrong grouping. It is one of the guards against error. To continue the groups after the one last given several would be found to commence with *bb*, and the resulting letters would not "read."

Here, too, is an example of diphthongs, digraphs, and double letters, which are troublesome to "A Correspondent." The diphthong *æ* of "*cæteris*," the digraph *ct* in *perfectare*, and the double *ff*'s and *pp*'s are shown as separate letters and must be treated as such in deciphering Italics.

A very important feature, that most seem to forget, is that ciphers are made to hide things, not to make them plain or easy to decipher. They are constructed to be misleading, mysterious, and purposely made difficult except to those possessing the key. Seekers after knowledge through them must not abandon the hunt, upon encountering the first difficulty, improbability, inaccuracy, or stumbling block set for their confusion.

Were the confirmation of this cipher of importance to the government—a matter of life or death to an official, or likely to concern the strategic movement of an army—the energies of many minds would be centered upon deciphering it. But it

would appear from the writings we have recently seen, the greatest effort is to prevent its development or acceptance—that the ideas of a lifetime be not overturned, and the satisfaction remain that the individual has already compassed the limits of information. It is so much pleasanter to be satisfied with what we have than to delve for things we do not want to know.

Personally, it is a matter of no vital importance to me whether the cipher is accepted or not. I have put my best efforts into its discovery and elucidation. I know that I have accomplished what others have failed to do, and I can look on with equanimity as the world wrestles with the evidences, and finally comes, as it will, to the conclusion I have reached.

The impetus given the movement by this discussion will result in important research, and other discoveries concerning Bacon that I am unable to make, will, with the light that has now been thrown upon the subject, confirm what has been set forth and much more besides. As I write, an article in *Baconiana* makes a suggestion which should be acted upon at once:

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

REPLY TO SIR HENRY IRVING.

THE PRINCETON ADDRESS.

In an address at Princeton on the Shakespeare-Bacon controversy, Sir Henry Irving did me the honor of mention, although in rather a disparaging way, as “constructing a wonderful cipher out of the higgledy-piggledy lettering” of the First Folio and other Elizabethan books in which irregular lettering is found.

As comparatively few will recognize from the terms Sir Henry used, the actual meaning of this characterization of the peculiar printing, I beg leave to say that he refers to the two or more forms of Italic letters the printers of that day employed in the same text of many books, and that I have discovered that their use in a large number was for the purpose of embodying the biliteral cipher invented by Bacon. Much of this work has been deciphered and published as the *Bi-literal Cypher of Francis Bacon*, and no doubt the recent discussion of this book in England,—and the echoes, on this side, of the controversy,—was the suggestion, at least, of the theme of the Princeton address.

Sir Henry points out that by “this wondrous cipher Bacon is alleged to have written in addition to Shakespeare and Greene, the works of Ben Jonson and Marlowe, Spenser’s *Faerie Queene* and Burton’s *Anatomy of Melancholy*,” but says “its chief business is to stagger us with the revelation that Bacon was the ‘legitimate son of Queen Elizabeth.’ ”

It is not my purpose at this time to discourse upon the discoveries I have made, which, among a great deal else equally important, most certainly reveal all that Sir Henry mentions—except that Bacon lays no claim to the greater part of Ben Jonson’s works—but I wish to throw additional light upon certain passages in the address that are presented as facts irrecconcilable with the cipher disclosures. These “facts” are supposed to show that it is not in the realm of possibility that Bacon could have written the plays.

In the opening sentences, Sir Henry refers to some words of his own used as a fitting conclusion to a treatise on the *Bacon-Shakespeare Question* by Judge Allen of Boston. I quote: "When the Baconians can show that Ben Jonson was either a fool or a knave, or that the whole world of players and playwrights at that time was in a conspiracy to palm off on the ages the most astounding cheat in history, they will be worthy of serious attention."

If Sir Henry Irving to-day appeared in a new play, and at the same time claimed that it was the work of his hand, it would not, probably, require "a conspiracy of the whole world of players and playwrights to palm it off" on the present age to say nothing of the future.

The writers who refer so confidently to Ben Jonson's praise of Shakespeare, do not observe that he says:

—"he *seemes* to shake a Lance,
As brandisht at the eyes of Ignorance."

They are blind, also, to the significance of the lines:

"From thence to Honour thee, I would not seeke
For names; but call forth thund'ring Æschilus,
Euripides, and Sophocles to us,
Paccuvius, Accius, him of Cordova dead,
To life againe, to heare thy *Buskin* tread,
And shake a Stage: Or, when thy *Sockes* were on,
Leave thee alone for the comparison
Of all, that insolent Greece, or haughtie Rome
Sent forth, or since did from their ashes come.

The 'buskin' signified tragedy, 'socks' comedy, and it was as an actor, not as an author, that Jonson would compare Shakespeare with both ancient and modern Greece and Rome. His name was in the list of actors of some of Jonson's plays, as well as of "Shakespeare's." Beeston says, "he did act exceedingly well," and we are indebted to Mr. Sidney Lee's *Shakespeare in Oral Tradition* for a revival of "the exciting discovery some actors made" of Shakespeare's brother Gilbert whose memory "only enabled him to recall his brother's performance of Adam in his(?) comedy of *As you like it*."

It is true that Shakespeare was lauded for the literary work supposed to be his, yet in the article just cited we observe also that "Shakespeare's extraordinary rapidity of composition was an especially frequent topic of contemporary debate." There were men even then who realized that these things were not possible to their Shakespeare.

In the *Advancement of Learning* we read; "He is the greater and deeper pollitique, that can make other men the Instruments of his will and endes, and yet never acquaint them with his purpose: So that they shall doe it, and yet not know what they doe, then hee that imparteth his meaning to those he employeth." B. 2., 1st p. 33.

This would suggest that Bacon did not impart his purposes to his "masques." Ignorant of the fact that Shakespeare's name was being employed as was his own, Greene exclaimed, "An upstart crow beautified with *our* feathers!" The similarity of expression was apparent to him, as to students of the present day, and the charge of plagiarism was very natural.

Sir Henry points out that although Bacon "was the legitimate son of Queen Elizabeth, his unnatural mother showed not the smallest desire to advance his interests." But what shall be said of Sir Nicholas Bacon's failure to make provision for Francis? The cipher history makes that point quite clear. He made provision for his own sons, and in a certain sense Elizabeth provided for hers, although she did not give them public recognition nor show the elder any marked favor.

Sir Henry asks: "What did Bacon know about the stage?" What did he not know about the stage? A few random quotations will best answer these questions:

"*In the plays of this philosophical theatre you may observe the same thing which is found in the theatre of the poets, that stories invented for the stage are more compact and elegant, and more as one would wish them to be, than true stories out of history.*" *Nov. Or.*, p. 90.

"*Representative [poetry] is as a visible history, and is an image of actions as if they were present, as history is of actions in nature as they are (that is) past.*" *Adv. of L.*, p. 204.

"*In whose time also began that great alteration in the state ecclesiastical, an action which seldom cometh upon the stage.*" *Adv. of L.*, p. 193.

"*As if he were conscient to himself that he had played his part well upon the stage.*" *Adv. of L.*, p. 362.

"*But it is not good to stay too long in the theatre.*" *Adv. of L.*, p. 206.

"But men must know, that *in this theatre* of man's life it is reserved only for God and the angels to be lookers on." *De Aug.*, p. 198.

"As it is used in some *Comedies of Errors*, wherein the mistress and the maid change habits. *Adv. of L.*, p. 315, *De Aug.*, p. 199.

"What more unseemly than to be always *playing a part*?" *Adv. of L.*, p. 349.

"And then what is more uncomely than to bring the manners *of the stage* into the business of life?" *De Aug.*, p. 235.

"Besides it is unseemly for judicial proceedings to borrow anything *from the stage*." *De Aug.*, p. 340.

"But the best provision and material for this treatise is to be gained from the wiser sort of historians, not only from the commemorations which they commonly add on recording the deaths of illustrious persons, but much more from the entire body of history as often as such a person *enters upon the stage*; for a character so worked into the narrative gives a better idea of the man, than any formal criticism and review can." *Dc Aug.*, p. 217.

"This was one of the longest *plays* of that kind that hath been in memory." *History of Henry the Seventh*, p. 304.

"Therefore now like the *end of a play*, a great number came *upon the stage* at once." *History of Henry the Seventh*, p. 287.

"But from his first appearance *upon the stage*." *H. VII.*, p. 291.

"He had contrived with himself a vast and *tragical plot*." *H. VII.*, p. 302.

"As to the stage, love is ever matter of *comedies* and now and then of *tragedies*." *Essays*, p. 95.

The stage and stage plays were constantly in Bacon's mind. The point is not well taken that Bacon could not have written the plays from lack of familiarity with the stage, from lack of the old plays that were the basis of some, from the impossibility of altering the plays extant, or of collaborating with other writers in the historical dramas. Bacon had access to all sorts and conditions of men, to all varieties of literature, but the proofs of collaboration are entirely wanting.

Again, Sir Henry states: "His [Shakespeare's] knowledge of law was supposed to be wonderful by Lord Campbell but does not commend itself to Judge Allen."

This is the opinion of one man opposed to that of another. Warner, in speaking of the chorus in Act i., Sc. ii., *H. V.*, says: "It reads like the result of a lawyer's struggle to embalm his brief in blank verse."

A little further on in Sir Henry's speech we find an allusion to 'Shakespeare's careless notions about law, geography, and historical accuracy.'

When the great German Schlegel wrote, "I undertake to prove that Shakespeare's anachronisms are for the most part committed purposely and after great consideration," the truism was more far-reaching than he knew. The double purpose that many lines and often whole passages serve, was the real cause of the anachronisms, and want of historical accuracy. In *Richard the Second* the pathetic scene of the queen's interview with the dethroned Richard as he is being led to the Tower, is "both historically inaccurate and psychologically impossible. The king and queen did not meet again at all after their parting when Richard set out for Ireland, and Queen Isabel was a child."—*Warner's Hist.* Nearly the entire scene is a part of the hidden cipher drama, *The White Rose of Britain*, and is the parting of the pretended Richard, Duke of York,—Warbeck, named by the Duchess of Burgundy the White Rose,—from his faithful wife, Katharine, to whom the title was afterward given.

Qu. This way the King will come: this is the way
To Julius Cæsar's ill-erected Tower:
To whose flint bosome, my condemned Lord
Is doom'd a Prisoner, by prow—
Here let us rest, if this rebellious earth
Have any resting for her true King's Queene.

ENTER RICHARD AND GUARD.

But soft, but see, or rather do not see
My fair Rose wither: yet look up; behold,
That you in pittie may dissolve to dew,
And wash him fresh again in true-love Teares.
Ah thou, the Modell where old Troy did stand,
Thou Mappe of Honor, thou King Richard's Tombe,
And not King Richard: thou most beauteous Inne,
Why should hard-favor'd Griefe be lodged in thee,
When Triumph is become an ale-house guest?

Rich. Joyne not with griefe faire Woman, do not so.
To make my end too sudden: learne good Soule,
To thinke our former State a happie Dreame,
From which awak'd, the truth of what we are,
Shewes us but this. I am sworne Brother (Sweet)
To grim Necessitie; and hee and I
Will keepe a League till Death," etc.—*R. II.*, Act. v., Sc. i.

Again in *Henry the Sixth*, see all the conversation regarding the marriage of Edward the Fourth: A note on the play says "nothing is historically certain concerning the episode except that Edward *married* the Lady Elizabeth Grey." It is a part of another cipher drama, the *Tragedy of Anne Boleyn*, where some were bold enough to challenge the right of the marriage of Henry the Eighth with the beautiful Anne Boleyn:

"*Lady.* My lords, before it pleas'd his Majestie
To raise my State to Title of a Queene,
Doe me but right, and you must all confesse,
That I was not ignoble of Descent,
And meaner than myselve have had like fortune.
But as this Title honors me and mine,
So your dislikes, to whom I would be pleasing,
Doth cloud my joyes with danger, and with sorrow.

King. My Love, forbear to fawne upon their frownes:
What danger, or what sorrow can befall thee,
So long as ——— is thy constant friend,
And their true Soveraigne, whom they must obey?
Nay, whom they shall obey, and love thee too,
Unlesse they seeke for hatred at my hands:
Which if they doe, yet will I keep thee safe,
And they shall feele the vengeance of my wrath."

H. VI., Act iv., Sc. i.

Critics trace the marked anti-papal spirit of *King John* to 'Henry the Eighth's revolt from the Roman obedience,' and these passages are indeed a part of Henry's speech, in the *Tragedy of Anne Boleyn*:

———"What earthie name to Interrogatories
Can tast the free breath of a sacred King?
But as we, under heaven are supream head,
So under him that great supremacy
Where we doe reigne, we will alone uphold
Without th' assistance of a mortall hand:
For he that holds his Kingdome, holds the law."

And again:

"Yet I alone, alone doe me oppose
Against the Pope, and count his friends my foes."

K. J., Act iii., Sc. i.

The following lines are a part of the cipher poem, the *Spanish Armada*:

———"So by a roaring Tempest on the flood,
A whole Armado of convicted saile
Is scattered and dis-joyn'd from fellowship."

K. J., Act iii., Sc. iii.

A part of Cranmer's prophetic speech at Elizabeth's christening has reference to Francis himself:

"So shall she leave her Blessednesse to One
(When Heaven shall call her from this cloud of darknes)
Who, from the sacred Ashes of her Honour
Shall Star-like rise, as great in fame as she was,
And so stand fix'd."—*H. VIII.*, Act v., Sc. iv.

The mention of quoting Marlowe sometimes with acknowledgment—sometimes omitting the acknowledgment—shows that Sir Henry does not concede that the plays of Marlowe were from the same pen as the plays of Shakespeare, but he admits that 'Marlowe was Shakespeare's model in several ways,' and in making this admission he reveals a recognition of similarity that he can in no way account for until he accepts the very natural 'cause of this effect' made known in the cipher.

Next we find: "Shakespeare had an immeasurable receptivity of all that concerned human character."

This is, of course, an inference drawn from the plays. It is well known to all close students of that marvelous literature that its author discerned every type of human character, understood the influence of environment upon men and women, and had a wide and deep knowledge of the spirit of the times, in different ages and in many countries. We do not differ in opinion there, but Sir Henry speaks of the author by his pseudonym, I by the name his foster father gave him.

Tennyson is quoted to show Bacon's opinion of love: "The philosopher who in his essay on 'Love' described it as a 'weak passion' fit only for stage comedies, and deplored and despised its influence over the world's noted men, could never have written 'Romeo and Juliet'."

In the *Advancement of Learning*, Bacon says: "Love teacheth a man to carry himself. . . . to prize and govern himself. . . . onely Love doth exalt the mind and neverthelesse at the same instant doth settle and compose it." The play of *Romeo and Juliet* was the story of the love of Bacon's youth and early manhood, and the score of years between the time of writing the play and publishing the essay had filled his life with other things, yet those who have read the cipher story know that an inner chamber of his heart enshrined a memory of Marguerite.

I quote again from the address: "Still more noteworthy is the absence of any plausible excuse for Bacon's fond preservation of his worthless rhymes and his neglect of the masterpieces that went by Shakespeare's name. He gave the most minute directions for the publication of his literary remains.

His secretary, Dr. Rawley, was entrusted with this responsibility and faithfully discharged it."

Bacon's MSS. were given to two literary executors, not to Rawley alone, and a part was taken to Holland. Rawley continued the publication of Bacon's works after 1626, publishing all those that were left in his care. Without these, a large number of the interior works would have been incomplete and the work in the word-cipher interrupted.

Sir Henry's assertion, "nothing could be easier than to make an equally impressive cipher which would show that Darwin wrote Tennyson," etc., needs no refutation. Bacon does not say that it was exceedingly difficult to "make" the biliteral cipher.

Again we find: "It would be more to the purpose if the Baconians would tell us why on earth Bacon could not let the world know in his lifetime that he had written Shakespeare."

The principal reason was because the history of his life was largely given in those plays, not alone in the biliteral, but in the word-cipher, and the revelation of that in the lifetime of Queen Elizabeth would have cost his own life. He hoped against hope to the very day of the queen's death, that she would relent and proclaim him heir to the throne. But he states that the witnesses were then dead, and the papers that would authenticate his claims destroyed. What could he do? Simply what he did.

In the peroration we find: "I fear that the desire to drag down Shakespeare from his pedestal, and to treat the testimony of his personal friends as that of lying rogues is due to that antipathy to the actor's calling which has its eccentric manifestations even to this day."

This cannot in any way refer to my book, for the very nature of this work eliminates personal thoughts and wishes or preconceived ideas. It is as mechanical as the reading of hieroglyphics, as naming perfectly well-known objects, as discriminating the clicks of the telegraph. And as far as Bacon was concerned he desired only his right.

It is by its great men in every age of the world that the actor's calling is dignified, but the genius of the man of the stage is not necessarily the genius of the man who wrote the greatest plays that time through all the centuries has produced.

ELIZABETH WELLS GALLUP.

Now Ready
Third Edition:

The Bi-literal Cypher of Francis Bacon

Deciphered by Elizabeth Wells Gallup

The Tragedy of Anne Boleyn

(WORD CIPHER)

Deciphered by Elizabeth Wells Gallup

GAY & BIRD,
22 Bedford Street,
LONDON, ENGLAND.

HOWARD PUBLISHING CO.
DETROIT, MICHIGAN, U. S. A.

“*Replies to Criticisms*” mailed
to any address on application.

CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

APR 10 1948

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C035312899

