THE JOURNAL OF THE FRANCIS BACON SOCIETY

BACONIANA

VOL. XXXVI
67th YEAR
1952
No. 142

NEW YEAR NUMBER

2/6

56 PAGES

SPECIAL FEATURES

Who were Gabriel Harvey and Thomas Nashe?
By R. J. A. Bunnett, F.S.A.

Rosicrucians and Francis Bacon
By Nigel Hardy

An Idol of the Theatre
By W. Burridge, D.M., M.A.(Oxon), F.R.S.A.

Oxford—Alternative to Bacon
By Wm. Kent, F.S.A.

Editor's Comments

Correspondence

The Francis Bacon Society

(INCORPORATED)

PRESIDENT:

MISS T. DURNING-LAWRENCE

THE objects of the Society are as follows:

1. To encourage study of the works of Francis Bacon as philosopher, statesman, lawyer, and poet; his character, genius, activities, and life; his influence on his own and succeeding centuries as also the tendencies and effects of his work.

2. To encourage study in favour of his authorship of the plays commonly ascribed to Shaksper of Stratford, and to investigate his connection with other works of the period.

3. To influence and educate the public as far as possible by publicity methods available, to recognise the wisdom and genius as contained in his works admitted or secret and his great philosophical qualities which apply to all times.

Annual Subscription: By members who receive without further payment one copy of BACONIANA, the Society's quarterly magazine (post free), and who are entitled to vote at the Annual General Meeting, one guinea.

The subscription for full members in U.S.A. is $4 per annum, who receive as mentioned one copy of BACONIANA, post free.

All subscriptions are payable on January 1st.

Those joining later in the year are entitled to receive the back numbers of that year to date, on receipt of subscription.

All communications and applications for Membership should be addressed to the Hon. Secretary, at the office, 50a, Old Brompton Road, London, S.W.7. Tel. Knightsbridge 1020.

It facilitates election if those desirous of joining the Society could mention the name or names of any present member who may be personally known to them.

BACONIANA

VOL. XXXVI (67th Year) No. 142 Jan. 1952

COMMENTS

MAY I be permitted in all modesty to draw our readers' attention to the fact that with this issue of BACONIANA vol.36 (new series), makes its bow and opens the 67th year of the existence of the Francis Bacon Society? It is a fact which speaks highly of the enthusiasm and courage of its earlier members, many of whom bore famous names, like Mrs. Pott and Sir Edward Durning-Lawrence, who conducted the first public inquiry into the identity of the prolific genius who wrote the immortal plays, poems, and sonnets, disguising himself under the name of "Shake-speare." Various other claimants have been put forward within that period, including Edward de Vere, Earl of Oxford, the Earl of Derby, and always Will of Stratford, the latter possessing the worst "pedigree" of all but having most of the big backers' money on him. Recently, however, to the astonishment of students of Tudor history, a new candidate has been introduced, in the shape of Edward VI, to which further reference will be made later. How right was Bacon when he penned a Latin apothegm, *Scientia non habet inimicum praeter ignorantem*! It is, moreover, a somewhat sinister reflection on modern scholarship which is intended to include logic that so many adherents of their various champions are quite indifferent to the laws of evidence and of history also.

* * *

This Society of ours enters on its 67th year in circumstances by no means encouraging to what is purely a literary assembly of members, although registered as an incorporated company many years ago when the law on the subject of trading concerns was not so stringent as is the case to-day. The public company basis places us at the mercy of enemies or opponents for we are not out for profit. Our only wares are to attract through our publicity in as many ways as possible a public which believes in the cause that Francis Bacon was the original and true Shakespeare and that our aim and object is purely and solely to render justice and obtain recognition of the genius of the greatest philosopher and poet, which not only our country but the world has produced in the annals of history. Our funds are spent as frugally as possible in the production of this magazine, to sell our publications, deliver lectures in various centres, and obtain all possible publicity for our cause. Truly, other literary societies are doubtless feeling the backwash of the lack of revenue or donations due mainly to unfortunate politics leading to two world wars if we seek for the true culprits, but nevertheless we appeal to all in a position to aid the cause who are in favour of justice being done to the illustrious name of Francis Bacon, whether living in Britain or on the Continent, or in

CONTENTS

COMMENTS - - - - - - - - - - - 1

WHO WERE GABRIEL HARVEY AND THOMAS NASHE?
By R. J. A. Bunnett, F.S.A. - - - - 11

THE MALICIOUS DEFAMATION OF FRANCIS BACON
By Prof. D. W. Johnston - - - - - 17

THE ROSICRUCIANS AND FRANCIS BACON
By Nigel Hardy - - - - - - - - - 21

OXFORD—AN ALTERNATIVE TO BACON
By William Kent, F.S.A. - - - - - 28

AN IDOL OF THE THEATRE
By W. Burridge, D.M., M.A.(Oxon.), F.R.S.A 33

SOME SIDELIGHTS ON FRANCIS BACON
By M. F. Bayley - - - - - - - - 37

MARLOWE AND SHAKESPEARE
By H. Bridgewater - - - - - - - - 40

TO THE STRATFORDIAN "GENIUS"
By Anon - - - - - - - - - - - 43

CORRESPONDENCE - - - - - - - - - 45

Notice to Contributors.—The Editor is always pleased to consider articles for publication on subjects of interest to readers of the Magazine. Such should be addressed to the care of the Office, 50a, Old Brompton Road, London, S.W.7, with a stamped addressed envelope for return if unsuitable.

America, or in the Empire overseas, to come to the assistance of the Society, without which it cannot continue to exist. Its income from subscriptions is totally inadequate to necessary rising expenditure.

* * *

Believers in the claim of Francis Bacon as the true Shakespeare will surely regard it as a tragedy if, owing to stringent financial circumstances, it should be necessary to wind up the Society and thus possess no medium for the championship of the cause of Francis Bacon so that it will revert to other claimants and especially to the false Stratfordian pretensions backed up by large funds. It is surely not too much to aver that in such circumstances the world will be all the poorer in consequence as the result of the suppression of truth and justice. There is one aspect in which all rival claims are utterly defeated. I refer to the Bacon ciphers, in which he locked up with great effort, the story of his private life, his birth, and all else in relation to the tasks he set himself, and a full explanation as to why he could not acknowledge the authorship of the Plays in his lifetime. Anyone who studies these, especially the information contained ir his Biliteral Cipher—which can be checked by any doubter with th ability and patience—obtains proof positive. The most brillian exposition of these perhaps is demonstrated by Gen. Cartier, chief of the Cipher Department of the French Army in the first World War of 1914-18, in his work "*Un probleme de Cryptographie d'Histoire*, (1938), a few copies of which are, price 8s., obtainable from our office, the cipher story written in French and English. Bacon's opponents can only meet this evidence by flouts and sneers or by ignoring these ciphers. The Society has published many books and brochures and pamphlets by scholars if the world wants the truth. Is there no philanthropist, for the cause of truth and justice, who will not aid a great cause as ours may claim to be?

* * *

In view of the lifelong, close association of Francis Bacon with Gray's Inn, the re-opening of its historic Hall on December 5th, by H.R.H. the Duke of Gloucester, its senior Bencher, who was accompanied by the Duchess, in the presence of a distinguished gathering, is a matter of special interest to Baconians. The original Hall was erected about 600 years ago, but on May 11th, 1941, a German incendiary bomb completely gutted the beautiful edifice, the Chapel, the Common Room, the Library and other offices. The work of rebuilding and restoration of the Hall to its original Elizabethan aspect is a great accomplishment, and at its re-opening the Duke and eminent legal luminaries had behind them on the north wall, portraits of Queen Elizabeth, Lord Burghley, Sir Nicholas Bacon, Francis Bacon, and some other prominent legal lights of the past, related to Gray's Inn.

Very opportunely, in a recently published brochure entitled *The Story of Gray's Inn* (price 2s. 6d.) issued by the Treasurer and Masters of the Ancient and Honourable Society of Gray's Inn, written partly by Master H. E. Duke, K.C., M.P., later Lord Merrivale, up to 1912, and subsequently to 1950 by Master Bernard Campion,

K.C., several little-known but interesting facts relating to Francis Bacon are given, for he lived there much of his life. The Inn itself was originally called the Manor of Portpoole. The original entrance was on the north side and the present approach through Holborn was contrived by Francis Bacon, commemorated by an Order of Pension, granted to Bacon's "old tutor" Whitgift, who was given a residence in the Gate House.(1) It was in the Gardens of the Inn, which Bacon laid, out, says Lord Merrivale, that he walked with Raleigh and kept Robert Cecil waiting in his chambers on occasion. The masques he wrote and presented cost enormous sums; one given in the reign of James I, on the marriage of the Prince Palatine to the Princess Elizabeth, is said to have cost £20,000, in money of that time, equivalent to about £100,000 to-day, and, opines Lord Merrivale, "it may be that the burden of that costly masquing to which Francis Bacon had a leaning and which contributed to the splendours of the great life of the Court, had something to do with the impoverished condition of his finances when he died." Another masque to which Lord Merrivale refers which Bacon presented to Elizabeth in 1594 included "Shakespeare's *Comedy of Errors* produced for the first time." Quite so, but what his lordship overlooked was that it was not presented as "Shakespeare's" but as part of Bacon's masque, referred to in BACONIANA (Spring No. 1951, pp. 75-77). Shakespeare's name did not appear, only the title *Comedy of Errors*, which was first published in the Folio Edition of 1623, but mentioned by Meres in 1598. It affords evidence of Bacon's authorship and his alone. Gray's Inn is a great national institution and I respectfully suggest that it owes it to the memory of Francis Bacon the task of setting up a literary committee to investigate his claims to be Shakespeare. Why should so learned a community remain silent and aloof when Stratford has stolen the laurels from the brows of their own greatest genius? Let the Masters ponder over this respectful proposal.

* * *

A member of the Society has seemingly made an interesting discovery in relation to the authorship of *Don Quixote*. This gentleman recently had a series of nine photographs taken of "The Author's Preface to the Reader" in the British Museum copy of the first (1612) edition of Thomas Shelton's version of *Don Quixote* and has kindly sent us a set of the facsimile prints. The first point to which my correspondent draws attention is that the decorative heading contains the light and dark "A" design, believed to relate to AthenA, the goddess associated with the Rosicrucians, especially related to Bacon.

He then discovered that the whole of the 9 pages of Preface is printed in italics except here and there where a word or words are in Roman type. Usually, but not always, these words are proper names or quotations, but we find a word like "chaos" solus in Roman type incongruously and on one occasion the name Quix-ote is hyphened as if two words. All these Roman words add up to 157 in all, which

(1) Whitgift became Archbishop of Canterbury.

is the simple numerical count of Fra Rosi Crosse. The two combined appear to associate the work with Bacon and the Rosicrucians.

* * *

Who was this "Thomas Shelton" who is alleged to have been the translator of the English version of *Don Quixote* given the date-line of 1612? There are many references to the author as Cid Hamet Benengeli, and we are told that "Cid" means "Lord" and "Benengeli" means "son of England", thus Lord Hamet of England, writing under a disguised signature yet giving a clue. Hamet offers no distinct link but it is not far removed from Hamlet, who is generally believed to be Bacon himself in disguise. Also the supposed introducer of the work delivers himself of a remarkable sentiment after describing his dilemma of how to pen a preface, which purposely suggests that he had his tongue in his cheek, especially if it were Bacon, who composed dozens of prefaces to various works. He writes, "I bethought myself on my preface I was to make to Don Quixote's history, which did so much trouble me, as I neither meane to make any at all nor publish the history of the acts of so noble a knight. For how can I chuse (quoth I) but bee much confounded at that which the old legislator (the vulgar) will saie, when it see that after the end of so many yeeres (as are spent since I first stept in the bosome of oblivion), I came out loaden with my gray haires, and bring with me a book as dry as a kexe, void of invention, barren of good Phrase, poor of conceipts, and altogether empty both of learning and eloquence."

* * *

It must be admitted that it is a destructive sort of a preface, most uncomplimentary to the author, which sets out at the offset to criticise it so adversely. Throughout the phrasing and style is characteristic of Bacon, but what is most notable is the description the writer gives of himself, where he uses such phrases as "after the end of so many years as are spent since I first stepped in the bosom of oblivion"; and his reference to his "gray hairs" as implying old age. Surely such descriptions could not have applied to Bacon in 1612, when he was only fifty-one and had certainly at that time not lived in oblivion, as he stresses for so many years. It would be interesting to be able to trace if possible the real date of the publication of "Shelton's" work, because as we know Bacon took great liberties with the dates of publication of many works in which he was concerned. Unless it were his purpose to throw dust in the eyes of the reader his allusions suggest a publication date long after 1612. Also his attack on the work, apart from other indications suggest him as the true author for he was very flowery in writing prefaces and would surely never have vilified another author's work in a preface. His allusions to age and oblivion suggest that he might have penned this preface long after his official date of death in 1626.

* * *

Another historic puzzle, of another category, is the tomb of a little child in the Beauchamp Chapel of the ancient Collegiate Church

of St. Mary, Warwick, which contains the tombs and monuments of many famous Earls of Warwick of the Beauchamp family and other notable names in history. On the North side of the Chapel stands the marble tomb of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, and of Lettice his "wife." His effigy is adorned with the collar of St. Michael, bestowed upon him by the King of France, and the Mantle of the Order of the Garter. Baconians are well acquainted with the bigamous marriage of these two after the mysterious death of the first Earl of Essex, said to have been poisoned by agents of Leicester; his subsequent marriage with Lettice which so infuriated Queen Elizabeth who nevertheless found her hands tied, although she was married morganatically to Leicester in 1560, and subsequently of his own death, shortly after the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588, when he was suddenly taken ill travelling to London from Kenilworth Castle. His Countess Lettice, daughter of Sir Francis Knollys, soon after married Sir Christopher Blount, who was prominent in the Essex Rebellion of 1600, and was beheaded three days after Essex himself—who was supposed to have been her son—although according to the Bacon ciphers she adopted the child Robert at birth who was no blood relation at all.

* * *

These reminders take us back to the mystery of the child named Robert. According to the Guide to St. Mary's by Canon W. H. Elliott, to the South of the Sanctuary is the tomb of the boy bearing this inscription: "Here resteth the body of the noble impe . . . . a child of great parentage, but of far greater hope and towardness." The date is given as 1548, aged 3 years. If Lettice, as history records died in 1634 at the ripe age of 95, she would have been 42 at the birth of this boy christened Robert, and Leicester himself, born in 1533, was 48, thus quite possible parents. This child was possibly the result of the seduction of Lettice, Countess of Essex then, when her unfortunate husband, Walter Devereux, Earl of Essex, was commanding military operations in Ireland, and heard of his wife's infidelity. According to the author of *Leicester's Commonwealth*, published in 1584, the year the child died, it says that "when he was coming home with intent to revenge himself upon my Lord of Leicester, for begetting his wife with child in his absence," he was poisoned in Dublin by servants of Leicester. If this were the child in the Beauchamp Chapel, we are still left guessing by that one word of the missing or obliterated inscription, "impe . . . ." It cannot be "imperial," and if he were the son of Leicester and Lettice the words following "of great parentage" are very mysterious for neither Leicester not Lettice could carry such words as "of great parentage." Possibly some member may be able to afford us a clue.

* * *

So poor little Edward VI, who died in the arms of the well-known courtier, Sir Henry Sidney, in July 1553, of galloping consumption, is now put forward as the true Shakespeare! Wonders will never cease! This extraordinary new theory apparently emanates from a

Mr. James Morgan in the United States, who contends that at the time of his alleged death he was somehow smuggled away until in 1560-1, he became mysteriously Francis Bacon, although born originally in 1537 and thus in 1560-1 was aged twenty-three. Perhaps Mr. Morgan put forward his fantastic claim jocularly but at any rate the following letter sent for publication may induce him to think twice about it.

To the Editor of BACONIANA

WAS BACON EDWARD VI REDIVIVUS?

Dear Sir,

It has come to my ears that a strange and wild myth is being busily propagated over in the U.S.A. by a Mr. James Morgan, to the effect that Francis Bacon was really none other than a resurrection of Edward VI, the boy King who died in 1553 at the age of 15-16, according to commonly accorded history. But Mr. Morgan will have none of this. He claims that the boy King was smuggled out of the way and imprisoned (an anonymous prisoner?) in Colchester, where he remained for many years till he eventually was released and turned up in Queen Elizabeth's reign as Francis Bacon. Mr. Morgan also claimed that Edward VI married Lady Jane Grey who, according to history, was executed on the block. But these things do not at all daunt Mr. Morgan. According to the records still extant, Francis Bacon was born 22nd January, 1560-61, about eight years after the death of Edward VI. Now Edward VI was born 12th October, 1537, so he would have been 23 years and about three months old in January 1560-61, and when Francis Bacon went to Cambridge in March, 1573, aged 12, together with his brother Anthony, and continued there until Christmas 1575 when they were both entered at Gray's Inn. So we find, following Mr. Morgan's suggestion, that Edward VI was passed off as a boy under thirteen years old at Cambridge, being then of the ripe age of thirty-six years—"*credat Judaeus*"! No, No! Mr. Morgan, tell your tale to that well-known gullible group of men, the Marines. Edward VI cannot be made to coincide with Francis Bacon. It is denied by historical fact, and both the stories *viz.* the Bi-Literal and Orville Owen's Word Cypher. It is possible to conceal or change the identity of an historical personage though that is difficult enough, but you cannot juggle with an age difference of twenty-four years. I would suggest that members of our Society should not unduly perturb themselves with this preposterous fable. A book was once written to prove that there was no such person as Napoleon Bonaparte.

Yours faithfully,

JULIA BYRNE

* * *

Mr. William Kent, of the Oxfordians (Shakespeare Fellowship), a well-known publicist, journalist, and lecturer, kindly gave a lecture to a well-attended meeting of the Society's Discussion Group on November 13th, of which a report appears elsewhere. Interesting as he was, Mr. Kent disappointed some of his audience by raising doubts regarding Bacon's authorship instead of sticking to his last and telling his audience what claims could stand expert criticism in the contention that Edward de Vere, Earl of Oxford, was the author of the Shakespeare Plays. Mr. Kent questioned trifles in relation to the

Northumberland Manuscript and wanted to know why Bacon was referred to and called himself a "concealed poet." He also questioned the mystery of his supposed death in 1626, but told us very little about his hero Oxford. To Baconians the Oxfordians, it must be admitted, present a case which throughout lacks any evidence whatsoever and is based solely on surmises and assumptions. It would be a great event if we could combine our ranks and unitedly fight for Francis Bacon's overwhelming case.

* * *

Without embarking on any criticism of Oxford's apparently frivolous character and career, the fact remains that he was born in 1550, ten years before Bacon, and died in 1604, leaving little behind him in a literary capacity other than to be mentioned as a court poet. The truth is that the only writings associated with his name are a few mediocre poems of a pastoral character, though Meres states that he wrote comedies. We will not use it against him necessarily that Gabriel Harvey, who knew him at Cambridge, ridiculed him as a vain fop, but it is asking more than we can credit him with, that, as a leading Oxfordian writer claims, he was the author of the Shakespeare Sonnets because in Sonnet 121 the phrase occurs, "I am that I am," and that he wrote an indignant letter to Burleigh using the identical words! Where the Oxfordians drop hopelessly out of the running however, is the fact that Oxford died as early as 1604, and in 1623, was published the famous Folio of Shakespearean Plays, containing 36 plays of which 14 had never been published before in Quarto editions. Of the earlier plays, *Othello*, produced as a Quarto in 1622, only the year previously, has 160 new lines issued and important amendments to the text; in the Folio, *Richard III* had 193 new lines added since from the 1622 Quarto and about 2,000 words retouched; *Merry Wives of Windsor*, in the Folio has 108 new lines and innumerable alterations from the 1619 Quarto; while *Henry VI*, in Quarto in 1619, had no fewer than 2,000 new lines and many retouched besides. Looney, the Oxfordian, claimed that Shakespeare's last play, *The Tempest*, was written by some other playwright without a figment of evidence but really because the subject proved that Oxford could not have written it. If any final evidence be needed to overthrow the Oxfordian fallacy we surely have it in *Coriolanus*, one of Shakespeare's latest plays in the Folio, never issued in Quarto, which contains direct reference to Harvey's discovery of the circulation of the blood (Act 1. sc. i) *which he only made in* 1619, *four years earlier*. These facts not only defeat any claims on behalf of Shaksper of Stratford who died in 1616, but assuredly so by Oxford, who was buried fifteen years before.

* * *

One of the means of attracting attention to the cause of Francis Bacon is of course by lectures, which means lecturers who are prepared to devote their leisure time and trouble to this wide subject or to some phase of it. Mr. Eric Webb, for instance, in the Manchester area, has been most successful in attracting a following, making his

speciality in Bacon's diagrammatic ciphers to indicate his name and rank, working like a Trojan and producing a *Baconian Letter* as well. Warm thanks are due to him. The Rev. Ronald Herton, the Rector of Pinxton, Nottingham, is another. At a lecture given not long since at the Business Women's Club in Nottingham, which the Stratfordians had invaded in numbers, and was packed, Mr. Horton answered questions such as whether it mattered if Shaksper ever went to school, he announced amidst much ribald laughter and jeers of the Stratfordians, that he had application forms for the Society, but the laugh turned against the scoffers, when several present walked to the table and asked for one, and one previous Stratfordian lady said she had been on the "borderline," but was now converted. I gave a talk to the boys of the County School, Windsor, on September 25th, where many artful questions were put up, suspiciously like schoolmaster-manufactured, but the talk received an enthusiastic reception, so presumably it was something to the good. On November 25th I was invited to address the Heretics Society at Trinity College, Cambridge, and reminded an attentive audience of over 200, that Francis Bacon was their greatest luminary, who represented them in Parliament, and used many Cambridge slang-words in the Shakespeare Plays. I said that it was their privilege and task to elevate him to the position to which he belonged truly. Mr. Taylor, the Hon. Secretary, was kind enough to describe the talk as "stimulating." What we need are more volunteers.

* * *

May I respectfully remind members who have not yet sent their subscription that this is now due and that cheques should be sent to the order of the Francis Bacon Society, to the office, 50a Old Brompton Road, London, S.W.7. Those of our members who remain in arrears will not be able to receive the spring and subsequent issues.

* * *

On behalf of the Society I beg to acknowledge with many thanks, the following contributions to funds

An "American Member"	£100 0s. 0d.
Mr. F. Stanley Thompson	£4 4s. 0d.
Mr. Arthur Crump	£1 1s. 0d.
Dr. F. Langdon-Down	17s. 6d.

Also two further donations have been received by me towards the publication of the second volume of Alfred Dodd's *Personal Life Story of Francis Bacon*, which I may state for the information of those whose generosity will enable terms to be settled with the publishers shortly. I beg to thank the two following donors.

Miss Ella M. Horsey	£1 1s. 0d.
Mr. A. V. G. Bacon	9s. 6d.

* * *

Finally, I am asked to state the following: The President of the Francis Bacon Society would welcome letters expressing the opinions of members on any matters connected with the affairs of the Society. Such letters will be placed before the Council for consideration.

THE EDITOR

THE FRANCIS BACON SOCIETY

(INCORPORATED)

Special Notice to all Members

By kind permission of the Treasurer and the Masters of the Bench of Gray's Inn, the Annual General Meeting of Members will be held on Tuesday, March 11th next, in the COMMON ROOM of the Inn, High Holborn, at 6 p.m.

THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

1. To receive the Report of the Council and Accounts for the year ending December 31st, 1951.

2. To elect the Officers and Council for the ensuing year.

3. To appoint an Auditor and fix the remuneration.

4. To settle future policy, Resolutions moved, and transact any other business.

N.B.—All Resolutions Members may desire to move should be forwarded to the Asst. Secretary, Mrs. B. E. Duke, at the office, 50A Old Brompton Road, London, S.W.7, to be received not later than the first post on 12th February next.

The President, Miss Durning-Lawrence, trusts that all Members who can conveniently be present make a special point of attendance at the Annual General Meeting which may have an important bearing on the future of the Society, and in consideration of the opportunity granted to Baconians to visit the home for so many years of Francis Bacon, a privilege so kindly extended to its members by the Masters of Gray's Inn.

The entrance in High Holborn is No. 1 Grays Inn, one minute's walk from Chancery Lane Tube Station.

Further Notice—Owing to the above Annual General Meeting the Discussion Group date originally arranged for the 11th March is cancelled.

WHO WERE GABRIEL HARVEY AND THOMAS NASHE?

By R. J. A. Bunnett, F.S.A.

Part I

THE Harvey-Nashe controversy of Elizabethan times is a most intriguing literary mystery.

In the first place who was Gabriel Harvey? Probably born c.1550, he was the eldest son of quite a noteworthy citizen of Saffron Walden, near Cambridge, by trade a rope-maker, but a man of some property. Gabriel, with two brothers, was sent to Cambridge, and eventually became an erudite scholar, a Doctor of Laws, a deep reader, and a poet of distinction, with a particular gift for writing.

Though possessing broad views, and endowed with a certain sardonic wit, and inordinately ambitious, Harvey was totally lacking in humour, and his knowledge of the world was wholly derived from books. Pedant though he was—pedantry was, however, characteristic of the age—he introduced hexameter verses into the language, and practised his invention to a ridiculous extent. "If I never deserve any better remembrance," he exclaims in one of his pamphlets, "let me be epitaphed the inventor of the English hexameter!" Nashe characterized the hexameter as, "that drunken, staggering kind of verse, which is all up-hill and down-hill, like the way betwixt Stamford and Beechfield, and goes like a horse plunging through the mire in the deep of winter—now soused up to the saddle, and straight aloft on his tiptoes."

Though of middle-class origin, Gabriel prided himself on his family connections, and whilst looking askance at his father's trade, aspired to the patronage of the great, to shine at court, and be a man of affairs, but he completely failed to attain his ambition.

At the age of twenty-three, Harvey was appointed Professor of Rhetoric at the University, possibly through the good offices of Sir Thomas Smith, a Saffron Walden man, and a Government Secretary. Sir Thomas, whose death at this time deprived the young Professor of his further patronage, was also instrumental in promoting the publication of Gabriel's University Lectures on Rhetoric, 1577, and some Latin verses on the subject of a visit to Audley End, where he was introduced to Queen Elizabeth, and taken into the household of the Earl of Leicester. But, according to Nashe, the Earl found "he was fitter for the University than for the Court or his train",—we must

remember, however, that Harvey's personal character and peculiarities cannot be judged from Nashe's writings, which are pure burlesque—and he returned to Cambridge.

With his two brothers, one a divine and the other a physician, Gabriel became a student of astronomy—then scarcely distinguished from astrology—but as Anthony à Wood, the Antiquary, relates, "their sharp and learned judgment on earthquakes drove the people out of their senses." When their predictions did not materialize, the brothers lay at the mercy of the wits. The public then laughed at their foolish terrors; and, as Nashe put it, "when they sweated and were not a hair the worse."

Harvey is the 'Hobynol' or 'Hobbinol' of *The Shepheardes Calendar*, who invited Spenser to leave the languor of a country retirement for southern vales, and who introduced the unknown poet to Sir Philip Sidney. This incident in Spenser's career is carefully noted by a person who conceals himself under the initials "E.K." and who is usually designated as "The old commentator on The Shepheardes Calendar." Isaac D'Israeli in his *Miscellanies of Literature* declared "E.K." to be none other than Harvey himself: "Pedantic", he wrote, "but energetic thought pressed on thought, sparkling with imagery, mottled with learned allusions, and didactic with subtle criticism—this is our Gabriel!"

Harvey bestowed upon Spenser the highest praise that it seemed possible to give to an English sonneteer by entitling him 'an English Petrarch.' In his *Pierce's Supererogation* (1593) he enthusiastically commends the Italian poet's sonnets, and justifies the common practice of imitating them on the ground that, "all the noblest Italian, French, and Spanish poets have in their several veins Petrarchized; and it is no dishonour for the daintiest or divinest muse to be his scholar, whom the amiablest invention and beautifullest elocution acknowledge their master."

In March 1581 Gabriel Harvey was unsuccessful in securing the post of Public Orator at Cambridge, being defeated by Wingfield, a fellow of Trinity, evidently a bitter disappointment, since eleven years later he refers to it in a studied attack on Dr. Perne, whom he accused as being responsible for his defeat. In his *Foure Letters* (1592) he wrote: "I was supposed not unmeet for the Oratorship of the University, which in that spring of mine age, for my Exercise, and Credit I earnestly affected, but mine own modest petition, my friends' diligent labour, our high Chancellor's most honourable and extraordinary commendation, were all peltingly defeated, by a sly practise of the old Fox—." Later in the same letter the writer complains that Perne, "always played fast and loose" with him. Professor Moore Smith in his edition of Harvey's *Marginalia* remarked: "In his youth he hoped to rise in the world by combining in himself the qualities of a Cicero and a Caesar: as disappointment came to him he seems to have been ready to adopt baser methods."

In "*Pierces Supererogation*," published the following year, he renews his attack on Perne's memory, for which he was severely

castigated by Grosart, in his edition of Harvey's writings, but there is a good deal of admiration of Perne expressed amid the insidious detraction over twenty-three pages of print. He declares, "Of him I learned to know him, to know my enemies, to know my friends, to know myself, to know the world, to know fortune, to know the mutability of times and slipperiness of occasions."

A letter survives, dated April 1579 (?1580), in which Harvey solicits Burleigh's interest as Chancellor of the University, and another, dated June 1580, thanking him for his efforts on his behalf.

In 1585 he failed to obtain the Mastership of Trinity Hall, and was again unsuccessful (although no longer a Fellow) in 1598. There is a letter extant in which he entreats Burleigh's good offices with the Queen.

These failures to gain distinction reduced the man, it seems, to tragic penury, and he only emerges into the public eye through his literary controversy with Nashe, having as Wood tells us, "the ill luck to fall into the hands of that noted and restless buffoon." After this we hear no more of Gabriel Harvey, until his death at his home town in 1630, at the age of eighty.

E. G. Harman in his book *Gabriel Harvey and Thomas Nashe* (1923) sums up his character in these terms. "He was not a man of very delicate feelings, but he had good ideas and intentions, and in intellectual matters a fairly shrewd judgment, great memory and great powers of expression. But he had no sense of proportion and his wit, which was considerable, was rambling and disorderly. He also took special delight in fantastic writing, was fond of mystification, and evidently very diffident about publication. His writing suffers from want of definiteness, because, hankering always after activity, he had nothing definite to write about . . . As for his disposition, I believe he was harmless and well-intentioned."

. . . . . .

And what of Thomas Nashe? The Thomas Nashe who is commonly identified as the writer, is said to have been the son of an unbeneficed and impecunious minister of the Puritan persuasion at Lowestoft, where Thomas was baptized in 1567. Having become a 'Sizar' or serving scholar (*i.e.* he gave manual service in return for maintenance) he matriculated at St. John's College, Cambridge, in 1582: Nashe says he remained at Cambridge, "Seven years together lacking a quarter," which thus brings us to 1589, if this statement is to be relied on.

In a book published in 1595, *The Trimming of Thomas Nashe*, alleged to be by Gabriel Harvey, but more probably an imitation of his style, the writer remarks that Nashe got into trouble, and "forsook Cambridge, being bachelor of the third year."

In his works there is considerable evidence of continental travel, and Sir Sidney Lee said that, "he contrived to make a hasty tour through France and Italy"; though how could a poor sizar meet the cost of such a journey? There are references to Italy and Italian

affairs in the *Unfortunate Traveller* which would appear could not have been derived from books or from the conversation of other travellers; and in *Pierce Pennilesse* there are criticisms of Spaniards, Italians and Frenchmen of such a discriminating nature, which only personal experience could afford.

It is true that Robert Greene—likewise a Cambridge 'sizar'—claims to have travelled abroad in a private capacity, but the statement to this effect in his posthumous, *Repentance*, is utterly ludicrous.

In his writings Nashe's chief object was the reformation of manners and particularly the exposure and banishment of ignorance and barbarism. On this theme he employs every device of rhetoric and invention, and pours out a torrent of satirical and ribald invective of which he was a master, but which was used as a cloak for the ripest wisdom; somehow or other his books passed the Censor. He was a great favourite with the wits of his day: One calls him, "our true English Aretine," another, "sweet satyric Nash," a third describes his muse as, armed with a gag-tooth,[1] and his pen possessed with Hercules' furies." In *The Return from Parnassus*, Nashe is thus characterized:—

> "His style was witty, tho' he had some gall;
> Something he might have mended, so may all;
> Yet this I say, that for a *mother's wit*,
> Few men have ever seen the like of it."

Nashe's first published work was a preface to Greene's *Menaphon*, which appeared in 1589, and in which, describing the typical literary hack (which may well suggest Kyd, as the author of a pre-Shakesperean play on the subject of 'Hamlet') he notices that, in addition to the author's other accomplishments, "he will afford you whole Hamlets, I should say handfuls of tragical speeches." Why an obscure youth should have been given the task of introducing the work of a writer, who had been many years before the public, is a mystery.

In an arrogant tone he lashes out on his own account on the state of letters and of the drama in England, and the ignorance and incapacity which characterized them, and he blames the "reformatory churchmen, who account wit, vanity and poetry impiety," for the lack of capable poets. It is significant also that the writer's views on the philosophical value of the ancient myths coincide with those of Bacon.

Late in the same year Nashe's *The Anatomy of Absurdity* was published, when apparently the author was still at the University, though Lee asserts that by 1588 he "had settled in London, resolved to seek a livelihood by his pen!" How he met the cost of publishing, or how he obtained a licence for the book from the Ecclesiastical authorities, who had charge of the Censorship, remains a puzzle. The book was dedicated to one of the most distinguished courtiers and men of parts of the age—Sir Charles Blount, afterwards Lord

[1] A tusk.

Mountjoy[2]—in a letter in which the author describes himself as "your most affectionate," a subscription which would seem to be the essence of impertinence on the part of an unknown youth.

But the style of the *Anatomy* is quite mature, and its substance is based on a wide experience of the world: indeed the late Dr. W. S. Melsome in his *The Bacon-Shakespeare Anatomy* states that the latter part of the work is but an embryonic edition of the *Advancement of Learning* of 1605.

The author discourses freely on the subject of Poetry, "I account of poetry as a more hidden and divine kind of philosophy, enwrapped in blind fables and dark stories," he says, which bears a striking resemblance to Bacon's "Poesy parabolical . . . when the secrets and mysteries of religion, policy, or philosophy, are involved in fables or parables. Of this in divine poesy we see the use is authorised." (*Adv.* ii, 4.4.)

The following passage from the *Anatomy* is practically identical with Bacon's theory of poetry, set out in his *Wisdom of the Ancients*, and in the *Apology for Poetry*, allegedly the work of Sir Philip Sidney:

> "I would not have any man imagine that in praising of Poetry, I endeavour to approve Virgil's unchaste Priapus, or Ovid's obscenity: I commend their wit, not their wantonness, their learning, not their lust: yet even as the Bee out of the bitterest flowers, and sharpest thistles gathers honey, so out of the filthiest Fables, may profitable knowledge be sucked and selected. Nevertheless tender youth ought to be restrained for a time from the reading of such ribaldry, lest chewing over wantonly the ears of this Summer Corn, they be choked with the haulm before they can come to the kernel."

The same high view as to the functions of poetry, as taken by Nashe, appears in the Harvey-Immerito correspondence, and in his *Marginalia*, Harvey declares of poets: "It is not sufficient for poets to be superficial humanists: but they must be exquisite artists, and curious universal scholars." Nashe claims to have written, "in all sorts of humors privately, I am persuaded, more than any young man of my age in England." He was described by Harvey as a great writer of poetry—none of which survives.

Bacon found no "deficience" in the "third part of learning"—poesy, "but" he said, "it is not good to stay too long in that

[2]Charles Blount, Earl of Devonshire, and 8th Lord Mountjoy 1563-1606, was a favourite of Queen Elizabeth, and accordingly excited the jealousy of Essex, with whom he fought a duel, in which his antagonist was wounded, though they afterwards lived on friendly terms. Blount, notorious for his liason with Penelope, wife of Lord Rich, and Essex' sister—the 'Stella' of Sidney's sonnets—came into the Mountjoy title on the death of his elder brother, William, 1594. He succeeded Essex as Lord-Deputy in Ireland in 1600-1, and though implicated in the earlier plans of the Earl, remained safe in that country. Bacon addressed his "Apologie . . concerning the late Earl of Essex" to Mountjoy, then Earl of Devonshire, "because you loved the Earl." Mountjoy was popular with the poets of his day, a number of them having published laudatory verses in his honour.

theatre," and Nashe would have it, "That we dwell not so long in Poetry, that we become pagans!"

Nashe's Rules for Students are evidence of mature, serious, and deep thought, and are peculiarly apt: "Let his reading be temperate, whereunto wisdom, not weariness, must prescribe an end . . so the intemperate study of reading incurreth reprehension, and that which is laudable in his kind, is blameworthy by the abuse," which echoes Bacon's "To spend too much time in studies is sloth." (*Of Studies*, 1597).

"Heaven itself is but the highest height of knowledge," said Nashe; 'Shakespeare' declared: "Ignorance is the curse of God, knowledge the wing wherewith we fly to heaven." (2 *H.VI.*, iv, 7. 78:). There are many more close affinities in the *Anatomy* with ideas and sentiments as expressed in Bacon's acknowledged writings.

Nashe is also said to have assisted Marlowe in his tragedy—supposed to have been written before 1590—of *Dido, Queen of Carthage*.

(*to be continued*)

THE MALICIOUS DEFAMATION OF FRANCIS BACON (1)

By Prof. D. W. Johnston

WHO was Francis Bacon? Replies to this question given even by persons of high education would very likely include some or all of the following:

Francis Bacon? He was a very ambitious man who used any methods to gain his ends. He was a fawning and servile office seeker who finally became Lord Chancellor under King James. Bacon wrote some essays which revealed his unscrupulous materialism, and he evidently followed his own teaching. Towards his friend and patron, the Earl of Essex, he displayed unpardonable disloyalty, for it was Bacon's vigorous prosecution that led to the conviction and death of Essex. Bacon finally overreached himself when as judge in high office he was convicted of taking bribes and was dismissed in ignominy by King James. In short, he was a brilliant man with a weak moral character.

The data above stem largely from the rather notorious article on Francis Bacon by Macaulay in the *Edinburgh Review*. This article seemingly has been the source of information by many writers and biographers of Bacon.

Far less widely known, however, are the findings of James Spedding and Hepworth Dixon, who consulted many of the original documents dealing both with the trial of Bacon and the trial of Essex. Their conclusions were that a grave injustice had been done to a noble man. Further discussion of these matters will appear later.

Since Bacon's prodigious accomplishments are rivalled by few mortal contributors to the welfare of mankind, a brief review of some of his great gifts should be given.

Bacon's creed was expressed in a letter to his kinsman Lord Burleigh: "I confess that I have as vast contemplative ends as I have moderate civil ends, for I have taken all knowledge to be my province" This amazing utterance was not the vain-glorious boast of an untalented visionary, but the confident intent of a gigantic intellect. His announced purpose was to survey all knowledge and reorganize it for the benefit of mankind. His plan was to study all existing sciences; to develop a scientific method for interpreting nature; to reconstruct all knowledge in accordance with the new plan. It was actually the establishing of a great "instauration," or renewal of science. His *Novum Organum*, containing a penetrating analysis of

(1) The above was a radio address, given by Prof. Johnston of Atalanta University, Ga., U.S.A., entitled "Francis Bacon in a Sympathetic light."

human fallacies that obscure understanding, was perhaps the greatest work connected with the plan of the "Instauration."

His piquant essays, a concentration of amassed wisdom, are uncannily brilliant. They have hardly been surpassed in English literature. His concise style displayed a verbal economy beyond that of any other prose of the period.

Further evidences of his versatility were his writings in other fields of his extensive research. He wrote a notable *History of Henry VII*. This prose version serves as a fitting liaison between Shakespeare's historical dramas.

His *New Atlantis* presents an ideal commonwealth. This work differs widely from More's *Utopia* in its emphasis on the light of the intellect. It is a projected vision of a society of scholars and scientists working together to do what one could not do as an individual. The vision became a reality in the founding in 1662 of the Royal Society.

To Francis Bacon the aim of knowledge was practical. For man to extend his empire over nature, he must acquire pure knowledge, not be swayed by the fallacies which mislead the mind. And the process which leads to sound truth must be *inductive*; experience and observation must precede general truths. Methods of acquiring truth, rather than detailed results were his prime concern. His clearness of vision, his magnificent attainment, his lofty aspirations reaching toward intellectual immortality—all lift him out of his own age and make him a contemporary of scholars and scientists of all time.

Bacon's rise to eminence was slow. Queen Elizabeth, though using his services freely, was reluctant to reward him with appointments in keeping with his ambition and capabilities. Shortly after the accession of King James, however, Bacon was knighted. His rapid rise culminated in his appointment as Lord Chancellor, his elevation as Baron Verulam, and finally as Viscount St. Albans.

In the meantime many changes were taking place in governmental affairs, changes brought on by a shifting from the comparatively thrifty administration of Queen Elizabeth to the extravagant and corrupt rule of King James. To obtain funds both for himself and his favourite Buckingham, demands for which were constantly increasing, the King established monopolies in certain trades and prosecuted those who infringed upon these artificially created rights.

Francis Bacon voted against maintaining these monopolies, but the majority of the Law Officers voted for them. He was thus as Lord Chancellor made to appear as upholding this majority vote, a position, as previously stated, he personally disapproved.

Parliament took action against two who had extorted money and challenged the legality of the monopolies. Sir Edward Coke, leader of the House of Commons and bitter political enemy of Francis Bacon, had committees appointed to inquire into the rights of the crown to create monopolies. They were further instructed to examine abuses in the Law Courts for Bribery and other forms of corruption, which were notoriously in evidence.

The attack was centred on Bacon, who was accused of accepting

bribes. King James was alarmed, for he recognized this procedure as a prelude to an attack on the unpopular Buckingham, and then on the King himself.

Bacon was bewildered over the charges, and in consternation he wrote to the King, saying in part—"And for the Briberies and gifts wherewith I am charged, when the book of hearts shall be opened, I hope I shall not be found to have the troubled fountain of a corrupt heart in a depraved habit of taking rewards to prevent justice."

Bacon's consternation increased upon receiving the Royal command to offer no defence, but to trust his honour and safety to the Crown. The enforced silence by his compliance with the King's order was by implication a plea of guilt. The actual record contains no fawning confession of guilt, nor a pleading for mercy, as has often been written.

Bacon, however, prepared a document entitled "Memoranda of What the Lord Chancellor Intended to Deliver to the King, April 16th, 1621, upon his First Access to his Majesty after his troubles." In this document appears a significant sentence: "I am to make an oblation of myself"—the word oblation meaning, of course, *sacrifice*.

Instinctively feeling that Parliament was determined to find a scape-goat, Bacon remarked to his retainer Bushnell, "I see my approaching ruin; there is no mercy in a multitude."

In the trial, Bacon was found guilty, was sentenced to the Tower, enormously fined, and deprived of his offices. In a significant aftermath, he was released after only two days' imprisonment and the fine in large part restored.

Shortly before the bursting of the political storm, Ben Jonson had written of Bacon as one "whose even thread the Fates spin around and full out of their choicest and their whitest wool."

And then after Bacon's political fall, Ben Jonson wrote:

> "My conceit of his person was never increased towards him by his place or honours. But I have and do reverence him for the greatness, that was only proper to himself, in that he seemed to me by his word one of the greatest men, and most worthy of admiration, that had been in many ages. In his adversity I ever prayed that God would give him strength; for Greatness he could not want. Neither could I condole in a word or syllable for him; as knowing no accident could do harm virtue, but to rather help to make it manifest."

In dealing with another harsh view of Bacon, his alleged "ingratitude towards Essex," biographer Spedding revealed by factual record that the leading part in the prosecution of Essex on the charge of treason was taken by Sir Edward Coke. "Bacon had not sought the employment" in this case, confirms Hepworth Dixon. Bacon was commanded by Queen Elizabeth to take his part as Junior Counsel for the prosecution. Essex was so obviously guilty of treason that really no argument could have saved him. The minor role of Bacon in this case is not widely known.

Another besmirchment of Bacon that calls for comment is the concluding line of a couplet by Alexander Pope, in which Bacon is spoken of as: "The wisest, brightest, meanest of mankind." The interpretation of *meanest* by the Bacon detractors is the popular connotation of the term *mean*: base, ignoble, sordid. Overlooked is the equally feasible interpretation; humble or lowly in a sense of modesty. Wordsworth uses *meanest* in the latter construction in the well known lines from his great Ode:

"To me the meanest flower that blows can give
Thoughts that do often lie too deep for tears."

Supporting this contention further is the alignment of the three adjectives in a series with no pivotal connective before the last named to indicate a turn from the other two; the adjective *meanest* is actually the climax of the series.

A fair judgment of any person should be made in the light of the times in which he lived and conclusions formed from estimates of his contemporaries.

Shortly after Bacon's death in 1626, there appeared in pamphlet form a collection of thirty-two elegies. These elegies were called *Manes Verulamiani* or shades of Verulam. Written largely by eminent scholars of Bacon's times, they extolled his versatile genius, saying he was supreme as poet, scientist, and philosopher.

Regardless of what construction is placed on the alleged array of negatives in Francis Bacon's life, the clear products of his prodigious intellect in literature, science, and philosophy are monuments to the highest achievements of mankind.

PROGRAMME OF DISCUSSION MEETINGS

Tues., 12th Feb. 6-30 p.m.

The Rosicrucian Manifestoes
Lecturer: MR. LEWIS BIDDULPH.

Tues., 8th April. 6-30 p.m.

The Blind Eye of History
Lecturer: MR. COMYNS BEAUMONT.

Tues., 13th May. 6-30 p.m.

University Life at Poitiers in the Days of Francis Bacon
Lecturer: PROF. R. BONNICHON, *L. és L. Lycée Poitiers*,

Tues., 10th June. 6-30 p.m.

Interpretation of Pericles
Lecturer: MRS. B. POGSON.

Place of Meeting as usual at 50a Old Brompton Road, London, S.W.7.

ROSICRUCIANS AND FRANCIS BACON (1)

By Nigel Hardy

THE Rosicrucians or the Brethren of the Rose Cross are the successors of the Egyptian Mysteries, the Eumolpides of Eleusis, the Magi of Persia, the Essenes, the Pythagorians, the Neo-Platonists, the Gnostics, the Albigenses, the Orders of Chivalry, the Templars, and many others of a like nature.

Yet all these sects had one thing in common in their unflinching courage in the face of adversity or persecution, their abiding faith in darkness and in light and their unfailing constancy to perform the work given them to do.

They knew that they were light-bearers who had to proclaim their message to an unfeeling world, they knew that this very fact might be distasteful to the rulers of nations, yet whatever the risks they must hand on the message though it might lead to torture or death, for they would not betray their trust.

So they formed themselves into communities and instructed others in teaching them the wisdom of the living God, to distinguish between the things of light and the things of darkness, to understand the compositon of the universe and Man's relation to the Creator, by means of symbols and emblems, by allegories and stories, to compare and amalgamate various substances to form a perfect stone, and thereby lifting all humanity to a higher level of consciousness.

THE Founder of the Rosicrucians was King Thothmes, the Third, of Egypt (B.C. 1500—1447).

The first society consisted of twelve members, nine brothers and three sisters. The meetings were held every Thursday.

But the Thursday which proceeded the full moon after the Spring equinox, was celebrated with a special ceremony which with the changes wrought by time, is re-disovered in the customs of Holy or Maundy Thursday.

Thothmes was the friend of Joseph, the Hebrew, who became Governor and First Minister of Egypt.

In the year 1411 B.C. Amen-Hotep, the Third, ascended the throne of Egypt, he was the builder of the labyrinth at Hawarah and was known to the Greeks as Memnon.

In his reign the Tell-el-Amarna letters were written in the language of Assyria and also he wrote in Egyptian works of philosophy which are still actually used by the Rosicrucians of the present time.

The Order of the Rosicrucians consisted then of three hundred members, of whom there were sixty-two sisters.

The temple of Karnak was built in the form of an ansate cross, a union of the rose and the cross.

The Pharaohs of Egypt and members of the Society were Initiates of the Mysteries and as a mark of their knowledge they bore the serpent on their brows.

They knew the processes of the transmutations of base metals into gold, of the chemical industry of colours and the manufacture of Greek-

(1) A Lecture given to the Discussion Group by Mr. Hardy.

fire and explosive materials, of which they made use solely as a means of defence against attacks from without.

In the Egyptian Mysteries, science was on an equal footing with philosophy.

The Royal Art thus signified at the same time, wisdom and knowledge of Nature, especially of alchemy.

Later, when the Orphic Mysteries had fallen into decay the Greek philosophers resorted to the schools of the Egyptian Mysteries with the aim of there receiving esoteric and hermetic teachings, and among them are cited: Solon, Thales, Democritus, Pythagoras, and Plato the pupil of Socrates.

The Christ also gave to His disciples a secret doctrine which was not appointed for the outer world. In one of His Logia or short public sayings, He said: "Give not what is holy to dogs, nor throw your pearls before swine; for fear they should trample them under their feet, and turning, rend you." (*Matt.* vii, 6.)

THIS esoteric teaching formed the tradition of the Gnostics and is to be found in their Writings, especially in the *Pistis Sophia* (Wisdom of the Faith).

Then a period of decadence set in but the torch of Truth was handed on and in the East, it flourished.

In the West, the Council of Nicaea was assembled under the Roman emperor Constantine in the year 325 A.D. to suppress the ancient Mysteries.

But the Crusaders brought back the light of wisdom from the East and inaugurated an epoch in which the mystical spirit could no longer be contented with the word of life crystallised in the dogmas of the Church.

They gave birth to a movement which laid the foundation of the present order of the Rosicrucians as a result.

This movement showed itself in three different ways: (1) the Gnosticism followed by the Cathari, the Waldenses, the Albigenses and the Templars, of which Dante Aligheiri was the interpreter of genius, (2) the monastic Mysticism, (3) the alchemical and hermetic traditions which are found in the Rosaria.

In these times of oppression for liberty of faith, the secret of the Initiates was preserved *sub rosa* (under the rose); under that ancient symbol their truth was veiled, notably among the Troubadours and the writers.

Now in the year 1114 A.D. there was a man called Gerard de Carmone in the province of Andalusia, in Spain; he was a professor in later life at the University of Toledo and he was the first translator into the Latin language of the writings of Aristotle and of Ptolemy.

His successor was Albertus Magnus surnamed Doctor Universalis, the famous professor of the University of Ratisbon, Strasbourg, Cologne, and the Sorbonne. His pupil was Thomas of Aquin (b. 1225 d. 1274) the defender of the Hebraic writings against the mania for destruction of works by the Church of that time.

The *Roman de la Rose* the first part of which was written by Gillaume de Loraine in the year 1260 A.D. and was completed by Jean de Meung, also the *Divine Comedy* by Dante, are two different forms of expressing the same thought.

The first work is a veiled revelation of hermetism and alchemy.

The second is a Gnostic and Johanistic application of the teaching of the Kabbalah to the Christian dogmas; Paradise is there represented by a series of circles, divided by the cross bearing a rose at the centre, with petals widely spread.

In the fifteenth century Nicolas Flamel, the famous physician of Paris (b. 1330 d. 1413) dedicated his *Rose Mystique* to Venus, in the same spirit that the Christians consecrate the rose to the Virgin Mary.

In the year 1378 the German branch of the Rosicrucians was established and their founder was buried secretly, according to the rites of the Order, after a life of 106 years.

A secret order in a new form, linked to the Rose Croix was organised in Paris in 1507 by Cornelius Agrippa von Nettesheim (b. at Cologne in 1486, d. at Grenoble in 1531).

The society was called Sodalitium (community) and a branch of this society was later established in London. One of the most important members of the French Order was Theophrastus von Hohenheim, who latinised his family name into that of Paracelsus (exalted in spiritual things).

PARACELSUS was born at Einsideln in 1493. After some studies at the University of Basle, in Switzerland, he was accepted as a pupil by the Abbot of Sponheim, Johann Trithemius (the teacher of Afrippa) who instructed Paracelsus in telepathy and magnetism.

Paracelsus served as a surgeon in the armies of Italy, Sweden, Denmark and Holland, and wandered all over Europe and to Constantinople, whence he went into Egypt and Tartary.

He was given the names of Father of Surgery and Luther of Medicine; the medical art was in those days much more backward than that of the Chinese and the Egyptians.

Science owes to Paracelsus inestimable discoveries, such as those of zinc, calomel, flower of brimstone, chloride of mercury, and several preparations of iron and of antimony.

He also laid the foundation of the first principles of homeopathy.

His writings, to the number of three hundred and sixty-four, spread all over Europe, were on the counsel of the Archibishop of Cologne, collected after his death, by Huser, and published at the expense of the Elector. They were marked with the letter "R" or with a rose.

Among his disciples were Heinrich Khunrath (b. 1560 d. 1605), and J. B. Van Helmont (b. 1577 d. 1644) who was received into the Society of the Rosicrucians, in Bavaria.

He was condemned in 1632 by the Inquisition at Brussels, but he escaped and settled for a time in England.

Paracelsus had predicted that Elias Artista, an extraordinary person who would disclose many things, would come after him. He would teach the transmutation of all the metals and would renovate all the sciences, which, at that time were debased. A reformation of all things was expected by many, at the side of the religious reformation.

Barnaud (b. 1535 d. 1601), a French Hermeticist, in 1539 travelled through Europe and gathered round him the leaders of all the Rosicrucian Societies among whom were Michael Maier (Kissewetter), Simon Studion (b. 1543) founder of an association called Militia Crucifera Evangelica, based upon the symbolism of the rose and cross and in 1604 he published his *Naometria*, a mystical description of the divine temple of men.

These leaders published their two famous Manifestoes, the *Fama Fraternitatis* or Proclamation of the Confraternity of the order of the Rose Croix, and the *Confessio* or Confession, addressed to the Sages of Europe in the year 1614. The Editor of these works was J. V. Andrae, he was also the chief messenger.

The efforts of the Rosicrucians to rear the new spiritual movement of humanity had partly failed in Germany, in the Netherlands, in France; but they were destined to be crowned with success in England.

FOR in this island heritage there dwelt a man of genius, who had spent much of his early life at the Court of Henry of Navarre, he studied the earliest manuscripts of the Order and had met most of the leaders of it.

On his return to England on the death of his foster-father, Sir Nicholas Bacou in 1579, he was forced to take up the study of law, for he was not mentioned in his foster-father's will.

This man of genius was later to become known as Sir Francis Bacon, though in reality he was the Tudor Heir, first-born of that union between the Princess Elizabeth and Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester in the year 1560.

In the year 1580, he founded the secret society called "the Knights of the Helmet," which was dedicated to the Greek goddess Minerva or Pallas Athene (Athena), the goddess of wisdom, and all the liberal arts and sciences.

This goddess is usually represented as wearing a helmet, her right hand holding the Spear of Knowledge which strikes at the Serpent of Ignorance near her feet.

Each Knight was capped with the Helmet which made him a Shake-a-Spear. Their sign was the double "A. ." taken from the first and last letters of AthenA.

Francis Bacon with the united aid of his Knights and Pens, set himself the great task of creating a literature for England, by making translations of the classics, of histories, text-books of all kinds. Prose and poetry flowed from his pen.

His first play called *The Birth of Merlin* was performed at Gray's Inn in the year 1583.

It was followed by his second *The Misfortunes of Arthur*, a Tragedy which was performed by the Gentlemen of Gray's Inn at the Queen's Court of Greenwich on the 28th of February, 1587. It is a good example of his early dramatic style. There is a richer and nobler vein of poetry running through it than is to be found in any other previous work of the kind, and the blank verse is generally free and flowing.

In 1591 the Lord Mayor's Pageant was performed on 29th October, the law students took a prominent part in making it a success, Francis Bacon wrote the script and acted therein.

He wrote in 1592 *A Conference of Pleasure* for his younger brother, Robert Devereaux, Earl of Essex, which was performed at the Tilt-Yard Ceremonies.

While living at Twickenham, he wrote the script for the plays *Henry VI* in all three parts, the first describing the chief events of that reign, the second introduces St. Albans where Francis had lived, and the third sketches the very parts of France where he had travelled.

IN the year 1594, Francis Bacon wrote the play called *The Order of the Helmet or the Prince of Purpool*, which was performed at the

Great Hall of Gray's Inn, starting on the 28th December and ending on the 3rd January, 1595.

The entertainment was so gorgeous, so skilfully managed and so topical that the students had a very happy time.

So great was the crowd of spectators that the actors had difficulty in playing their parts, but at last things cooled down and a new play was acted called *A Comedy of Errors*; wherein the actors laughed at their own actions, the author of this piece being also master of the act and stage manager of the entertainment.

This play was afterwards published under the pen-name of Shakespeare in the year 1623.

Bacon compiled his *Promus of Formularies and Elegancies, i.e.* a larder or storehouse of words and phrases, smart dialogue, etc., from Latin, French, Italian, and English sources. They are to be used in literary work, manipulated in various ways. The significant fact is that they appear in the so-called Shakespeare Plays.

On November 17th Bacon wrote another play entitled *The Device of the Indian Prince*. This metrical composition featured a blind boy as an Oracle who speaks to Queen Elizabeth in the form of a Sonnet as follows:

Seated between the Old World and the New,
A Land there is no other Land may touch,
Where reigns a Queen in Peace and Honour true.
Stories or Fables do describe no such.
Never did Atlas such a Burden bear,
As she in holding up the World Oppressed;
Supplying with her Virtue everywhere
Weakeness of Friends, Errors of Servents best,
No Nation breeds a warmer blood for War,
And yet she calms them by her Majesty;
No Age hath ever Wits refined so far,
And yet she calms them by her Policy;
To Her THY SON must make his Sacrifice
If he will have the Morning of his eyes.

The words which follow this Sonnet are prophetic in their pathos and sadness "This Oracle hath been both our direction hitherto, and the cause of our wearisome pilgrimage; we do humbly beseech your Majesty that we make experience whether we be at the end of our journey or not."

This hints at his claim to the throne of England, the blind boy being the symbol of a concealed son, but he gave up his inheritance that might serve his people in a better way by taking all knowledge as his province.

In 1867 there was found at Northumberland House, in the Strand an Elizabethan Manuscript, which had once belonged to Sir Francis Bacon, it consists of a bundle of writings, the majority of which are undisputably the work of Francis Bacon, but some of the writings are missing. The forty-five remaining leaves bear no traces of stitching. Apparently the MSS had been placed loosely inside a paper cover which had served as a Catalogue, for written down are the titles of the works that once reposed inside it.

The handwriting has been identified as that of John Davies of Hereford, a scholar of Oxford University, one of Francis Bacon's Pens.

The first theatre was built near London when Bacon was fifteen and

none was allowed within the City for many years. Actors were held in abhorrence and classed by the law with rogues and vagabonds.

But the theatre gradually got a hold on the public through playhouses often attached to a roofless yard of a tavern.

The first regular theatre was built by James Burbage of the Earl of Leicester Company of Players, father of Richard, the actor, it was constructed out of a house of many rooms in Blackfriars. By the close of the century there were ten theatres, the Globe of Southwark being built in 1594. The Shakespeare Plays were only performed at the Globe and at Blackfriars.

Francis Bacon had known Burbage from childhood, and when he was frequenting the playhouses to advise and instruct the Players, he often spent his evenings and lodged in Bishop's Gate Street which was nearby the theatre.

SHAKSPER, a Warwickshire rustic, had left his native county and come to London to seek his fortune, at first he acted as ostler outside the playhouses, then as call-boy and then as a Player in minor parts, his rude dialect causing much merriment, the top of his acting being the ghost or shadow of another's Hamlet.

In 1594 the poem *Lucrece* was published, *Venus and Adonis* poem was published the previous year.

Shaksper had agreed for a sum of £1,000 to sell his name, and to father, if necessary, whatever poems, etc., were printed under the name of "Shakespeare."

In 1597, there occured an incident which neccesitated the use of a Mask for Francis Bacon, it was the printing of the play called *Richard II.* It contained a deposition scene which was construed by Queen Elizabeth as a reflection upon herself. Francis Bacon was in danger, the time had come when he must divert suspicion. The Player Shaksper was therefore persuaded to return to his birth-place at Stratford, quite an inaccessible village, to lie low till the storm had passed over, to give colour to the rumour that the play was the work of a strolling player.

Tradition states that it was the Earl of Southampton, Francis Bacon's Gray's Inn chum and Robert Devereaux's friend, who provided sufficient money to gild the risk.

Shaksper bought in the same year the largest house in Steatford, called New Place. He was also promised to be made into a "Gentleman" by Letters Patent. Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, being then Head of the College of Heralds.

The moment that Shaksper was definitely out of the way, a friend of Francis Bacon named Francis Meres, M.A., afterwards Rector of Wing in Rutland, printed a book, called *Palladis Tamia or Wit's Treasury*, in which he said: "As the soule of Euphorbus was thought to live in Pythagoras so the sweete witte Soule of Ovid lives in the mellifious and Hony-tongued Shakespeare, witnes his Venus and Adonis, his Lucrece, his sugred Sonnets among his private friends."

NOW we turn to the year 1614 when Maier was visiting England; here he met Robert Fludd and his friend and helper Sir Francis Bacon, they discussed a scheme for a world-wide brotherhood, which would have its headquarters in England.

This Rosicrucian Order was established in England, Scotland, Wales, in the year 1621. It was divided into two parts as follows: (1) The outer

or exoteric part led to the foundation of Free-Masonry and the beginning of the Invisible College, which later under the leadership of Boyle, the naturalist, carried on the experiments of Bacon and gathered the great men of that time together to form the Royal Society.

The Head of the outer Society was Robert Fludd, a great scientist, who had a rare spirit of observation.

Sir Francis Bacon organised and edited its Journals and collected the rites from many sources.

(2) The inner or esoteric part carried on the original work of teaching the Mysteries.

The members of the Society consisted of the most learned and practical people of the nation.

In the year 1626 the supposed death of Francis Bacon took place, but in reality he did what many a Brother has done, he feigned death, that he might pass the remainder of his life in quietness and at-one with the Deity; who the Rosicrucians call "The Sun behind the Son," for when we reach that wisdom it seems as though all light was concentrated as upon one single point, the brightness and the glory passeth all understanding.

In the Order of the Rosicrucians are enrolled the names of those who have mysteriously disappeared in one place, only to transplant themselves to another.

It is significant that a rare print of John V. Andrae appears to be a portrait of Lord Bacon at eighty years of age and bears a helmet, four roses, and the St. Andrews Cross, the arms of St. Albans town.

Francis Bacon is believed by some to have lived to the great age of one hundred and four years; so his death would have taken place in the year of the Great Fire of London in 1666.

To Francis Bacon, we owe the foundations of our knowledge of science, medicine and philosophy. A great dramatist, a superb poet and a master of all the arts.

To those who knew him, he was an inspiration and a kingly man; who bore the sorrow of great grief and in his exile crowned it with a prayer.

For what he wrote in poetry, he first observed in life, and what he saw, was displayed upon the stage to cheer his fellows and his countrymen.

To read his words, we need more than intellect, though our minds will hold the key.

Forever, he garbed truth in rustic speech, that it might confound the wisdom of the court.

The ministers of State and kings sought by disimulation to conceal their thoughts and actions from their enemies, when treachery and treason filled the air and men knew not whom to trust.

To distribute then, the wisdom, needed a mind which seemingly did tell an ancient tale, but in reality to those who knew, propounded mysteries of brighter things.

And so in the words of the Bible, we close our pilgrimage, "The darkness and the light are both alike."

For in the story of the Prodigal Son, we have set before our eyes the truth for which we seek and having come to our senses or learnt to govern them, then we are ready to return to our Father's house.

OXFORD—AN ALTERNATIVE TO BACON

By William Kent, F.S.A.

A talk given to Baconians at a Discussion Group meeting by a leading member of the Shakespeare Fellowship or "Oxfordians"

I am reminded of a few lines in a well-known hymn 'Onward Christian Soldiers':

'We are not divided,
All one body we.'

As I grew older I found that they had no foundation in fact. Christendom was divided on everything except a rejection of the gods of all the other religions. I fear this applies to anti-Stratfordians. They are united only in rejection of the god of Stratford. There is, however, one point upon which we can join hands. That is in repudiating the lazy attitude that says 'What does it matter who wrote the plays?' Even Ivor Brown—wobbling and wavering before the Stratford shrine—happily once wrote in the *Observer* in scorn of these people. It does surely matter, he said, to put the laurel on the right brow. The professed indifference of the Stratfordians is an affectation. If they were sincere, they would not wax so hot about us sceptics. I have noticed time and again that, if you start an argument with an adherent of what I may call "the old faith" they will trot out stock arguments. 'Genius' of course, as the solution of every difficulty, and then, when they are stuck for a reply to your rejoinders, they ask 'Does it matter?' This is a flag of distress. The Stratford ship is going down!

When, however, we sceptics, to adapt Emerson's phrase, attempt to marry a particular man to the plays and poems our paths divide. Whilst it is true that the Rev. Dr. Wilmot was struck by 'similarities of thought, diction, opinion, and even error which he noticed in both Bacon and Shakespeare' as R. L. Eagle wrote, as soon as scepticism came creeping in, even without these, Bacon might well have been proposed as a candidate. His intellectual powers were equal to the works of Shakespeare and to Sir Sidney Lee he ranked second to him. There is, however, more than intellect required in such works of genius, and Tennyson was justified in asking if such a man could have written *Romeo and Juliet*? When did Bacon experience the grand passion? He seems to have been extraordinarily cool towards the opposite sex. He married late, and there is only one suggestion of a previous affair. There is an extraordinary allusion to Romeo coming in without his roe. It would ill behove Baconians who can propose cryptograms incredible to me to sneer at the suggestion that Romeo without roe might mean 'Me—O for Oxford.. It is perhaps significant that in Arthur Brooke's poem, admittedly the original of *Romeo and Juliet*, the hero is Romeus. Why was the name altered?

What about the Northumberland MS? It is barely plausible as Baconian evidence. Gilbert Slater, an Oxfordian, pooh-poohed Spedding's suggestion that it was 'a waste leaf upon which a stationer's apprentice tries his pen', but it is equally difficult to accept it as a list of contents. Why the abbreviations? These are even more than the gentleman of

Stratford used in his signatures—'Sh', 'Shak'. Why write sometimes upside down? Much is made of the fact that below 'Richard the Second' is written Ffrauncis, but above 'Richard the Second' is written 'Wm. Shakespeare'. There were no Shakespeare plays in the packet. May they not have been removed because they were not Bacon's? After the quotation that, except for one word, is found in *The Rape of Lucrece*—'Revealing day through every cranny peeps' is written 'See Shak.' It is submitted by Baconians, as well as Stratfordians, that Francis Meres' reference in 1598 to the Earl of Oxford and Shakespeare shows that, in his view, they were two different personalities. The same argument may apply here. Shakespeare, whoever he was, and Bacon, were regarded by the scribbler—and F. J. Burgoyne, a Baconian who edited the MS uses this expression—as two different writers, the chief of their time, as Lee says.

Bacon was referred to as a 'concealed poet', but apparently only in private letters. Why no other references to him as such? Why were there no contributions to anthologies? Posthumous tributes are cited, as also Shelley. The latter obviously was not referring to verse, but to characteristics of style. I think his praise was exaggerated. 'Concealed' is not a synonymn for 'good'. If Bacon could write good poetry, why did he publish bad? He was ill when he translated some psalms, it is said. Granted, but how does this excuse publication? Publication is not an affair of an hour or two, as composition may be. Comparisons are made with Milton, but he only published two of his paraphrases of the psalms, and these were written when he was fifteen. One is of sufficient merit still to be sung as a hymn:

'Let us with a gladsome mind
Praise the Lord for he is kind.'

If so many knew of Bacon as a poet when he was dead, it is odd so little was said of it whilst he was alive. If he did not die in 1626, but spent many subsequent years abroad, the mystery is deepened. Bacon's career was then finished; he had nothing to fear. He could have acknowledged poems and plays and saved the tremendous trouble in which cryptogrammatists are involved to-day. If Bacon did conceal his identity by means of such obstruse signs, I think he is very lucky to have found people with the patience to penetrate the mask. I should not have expected it if I had been him. To me this consuming concern about cryptograms does not enhance the wisdom of the great Lord Chancellor. I should be sorry to believe he wasted so much time on them, thus causing such colossal consumption of it on the part of Baconians. Wherever Baconians are gathered together there is a blast of cryptograms, but the trumpet has an uncertain sound, and until all of them agree upon one, few outsiders will pay any heed.

I now turn to the alternative to Bacon, and, judging from the voting at debates, one who increases in favour with those interested in the Shakespeare problem.

He was born at Castle Hedingham in Essex, the Norman keep of which still remains. At the age of twelve he lost his father. He was then not simply Viscount Bolbec (whose heraldic cognizance was a lion shaking a spear), he was also the 17th Earl of Oxford. His father had been highly regarded; of him it might have been written:

'He was a man take him all in all, I shall not look upon his life again.'

His mother took as her second husband the insignificant Charles Tyrrell.

The union may have caused feelings of revulsion in her son, and perhaps

'the funeral baked meats
Did coldly furnish forth the marriage tables.'

Young De Vere became a royal ward, and went to reside with Sir William Cecil, later Lord Burghley, at his house in the Strand. He went to Cambridge and the knowledge of university life displayed in the plays has been the subject of comment. The orthodox Dr. F. S. Boas once remarked of certain expressions used by Timon of Athens: 'Here the misanthropist talks as if he had graduated on the banks of the Cam.' This point need not be stressed, as Bacon also was a Cantab.

Whilst living with Burghley, he stabbed a cook. Did he think it was his master spying upon him? If so, how apt the speech in Hamlet:

'Thou wretched rash intruding fool farewell,
I took thee for thy betters.'

I hope it will not be said that a man of violence could not write plays. Ben Jonson stabbed Gabriel Spencer in a duel, but his reputation as an author has not suffered..

In 1571, on attaining his majority, De Vere married Anne Cecil, daughter of his guardian. It was a good match for her. 'Lord Hamlet is a prince out of thy stars,' Polonius tells Ophelia. It is generally acknowledged that the prototype of Polonius was Burghley. A passage in *Hamlet* sounds something like a paraphrase of a passage in one of his letters. He left behind maxims similar to those that Polonius gives to Laertes. Who would know better the characteristics of Burghley than his son-in-law?

In 1574 De Vere wanted to seek adventure abroad. This recalls Bertram in *All's Well that ends Well*:

'I shall stay here the forehorse to a smock,
Creaking my shoes on the plain masonry
Till honour be bought up and no swords worn
But one to dance with, By heaven I'll steal away.'

Without permission—a serious affront to the Throne on the part of a nobleman.—De Vere left England. In a fortnight, by the Queen's orders, he was brought back. In the following year he was permitted to travel. He then spent over a year on the Continent, mostly in Italy. In the 'Shakespeare' plays there is a remarkable knowledge of that country, its art and sculpture, as well as its geography. Lady Morgan wrote: 'There is not an article described by Grumio in *The Taming of the Shrew* that I have not found in some one or other of the palaces of Florence, Venice, and Genoa.'

On his way home, De Vere heard that his wife had given birth to a daughter. It was hinted that she had been unfaithful, and that it was not his child. This suspicion led to estrangement, and for some years the Earl and his Countess lived apart. Samuel Johnson remarked upon the 'useless and wanton cruelty' in the attitude of Hamlet to Ophelia, and Frank Harris wrote: 'It is jealousy that is blazing in Shakespeare at this time, and not love.' In 1578 Oxford accompanied Queen Elizabeth on one of her progresses. At Audley End in Essex, Gabriel Harvey, Cambridge scholar and public orator, delivered addresses to the Queen and the Earl. He urged the latter to 'throw away the insignificant pen, throw away the bloodless books and writings that serve no useless purpose . . . Within thee burns the fire of Mars—Thine eyes flash fire, thy countenance shakes a spear.' Yet up to that date, De Vere's acknowledged verse amounted to no more than 150 lines.

The Earl, like his father, had a company of players. Sir Edmund Chambers says it was natural that he should write plays for them. One of these might have been 'the Jew,' which was in existence by 1579, when Stephen Gosson succinctly summarised the plot of what is now *The Merchant of Venice*. It represented, he said, 'the greediness of worldly choosers and bloody minds of usurers.' Bacon was then only eighteen. At this time the Earl had a quarrel with Philip Sidney, on the tennis court. A duel was threatened, but forbidden by the Queen on account of the Earl's superior rank. It is remarkable that Polonius coaching Reynaldo as a spy, asks him to report if his son quarrels at tennis. This would not be a common concern of a father.

In 1582, De Vere, still living apart from his wife, became intimate with a dark lady, Anne Vavasour, a maid of honour. Her portrait is now in the Tate Gallery. A child resulted, and both were sent to the Tower for a short time. In 1588, when Queen Elizabeth went to St. Paul's to return thanks for the defeat of the Spanish Armada, the leading earls bore a canopy over her head. Sonnett 125 runs:

'Wer't aught to me I bore the canopy,
With my extern the outward honoring.'

In 1589, in *The Art of English Poesie*, attributed to a writer named Puttenham, 'that noble gentleman, Edward Earl of Oxford' is placed first for comedy and interlude. In 1598 Francis Meres, in *Palladis Tamia*, wrote similarly.

In 1588 the Countess of Oxford died. She had been reconciled to her husband for several years. In 1591 he married again. His second wife was Elizabeth Trentham, a maid of honour. The Earl's last days were spent at Brook House, Hackney—now being repaired after bomb damage. A manuscript book in the College of Arms states that the Earl 'lieth buried att Westminster.' This book was the work of Percy Golding, His brother was the translator of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* which was translated when he was De Vere's tutor in the house of Burghley. The orthodox have emphasised the familiarity of this work to the author of the Shakespeare plays. Oxford was certainly first buried at the Church of St. Augustine, Hackney, but the body may well have been removed, as his son, the eighteenth earl, a man of no distinction, was buried in Westminster Abbey.

For several years after Oxford's death no quarto editions of the plays appeared. This would be expected if the author was dead. In 1609 the sonnets were published, as by an 'ever-living poet', a phrase that implied that he was physically dead. A few months after the death of Bernard Shaw, at a meeting of the Royal Society of Literature, Sybil Thorndike referred to him as 'ever living'. What do Baconians make of this? The sonnets were dedicated to 'W. H.', who was wished 'all happiness,' an obvious pun. William Hall lived in Hackney, and Sir Sidney Lee identified W. H. with him. It was in 1609 that the Countess left Hackney. Probably, in turning out some cupboard, she found the MSS which Hall procured. One line reads: 'Every word doth almost spell my name.' Oxford signed himself 'E. Vere.'

Adjectives are not arguments. The Oxford case is not disposed of by writing sacrastically about this 'Italianated Englishman.' A man may be foppish and write well. Oscar Wilde was an example.

A few questions for Baconians.

Do incidents in the life of Francis Bacon fit the 'Shakespeare' plays as do those in the career of De Vere? Are not similarities of expression,

so emphasised by Dr. Melsome, to be found not only in Bacon and Shakespeare, but in other writers, as shown by J.M. Robertson and Harold Bayley? How does that model of virtue, that prince of propriety that Francis Bacon is represented to be square with the sort of man that must be behind the plays? Saint Francis will not do! Baconians must find him a few vices to make him tolerable! Apparently he presented himself faultless before the throne of his God, despite his confession. He had enemies, it is said; so had Oxford. Why try to establish the religious orthodoxy of Bacon? Who can believe that the author of the 'Shakespeare' plays was a devout Christian? Oxford was accused of atheism. We know what Bacon wrote of it in his Essays.

Was Bacon in the secret? Here, I cordially agree with Baconians, that he was. I am impressed by the frontispieces to some of his works which show a man singularly resembling the man of Stratford running away with a book. Bacon, however, may have 'set forth' much that he did not write. It may be suggested that Ben Johnson thought he was 'Shakespeare' when he omitted that name from his list of 'great masters of wit and style' in *Discoveries*. It may be so. Johnson presumably never saw the plays being penned. He knew Bacon was behind the Folio. It is not in human nature, when a man is credited with some fine literary work, to run round disillusioning the mistaken believers. If the real author was dead, and survivors wished to conceal his share in the work, there would be every encouragement to deception. Whilst therefore not going so far as to say that Bacon could have written nothing of Shakespeare's works, I think he was much more editor than writer.

I agree with Sir Sidney Lee:

> 'The intellect of both Shakespeare and Bacon may well be termed miraculous. The facts of biography may be unable to account for the emergence of the one or the other, but they can prove convincingly that no two great minds of a single era pursued literary paths more widely dissevered.' (1)

(1) A criticism of Mr. Kent's Oxfordian claims will be found in our Editorial Comments.

AN IDOL OF THE THEATRE

by W. BURRIDGE, D.M., M.A.(Oxon.), F.R.S.A.

Formerly Principal of King's George's Medical College, Lucknow

AFTER a short experience as Professor of Physiology I found it desirable to postpone lectures on the eye to the students' last term because of the subject's special difficulties. There had grown up around each fact of vision a mass of conflicting theories of seemingly equal validity each of which was so good that the teacher could do no more than point out their respective merits without being able to decide between them. Moreover, if a dozen teachers got together in the earnest endeavour to find out which of the many theories was the right one, their efforts would only exemplify Bacon's picture of contentions and barking dispution which are the end of the matter and all the issues they can yield.

It was next the case that in Lucknow there was an annual race week which once fell within the period of these lectures. This coincidence enabled a professor to discuss for his students' benefit a group of theories concerning colour vision, say, in the morning, and to listen in the afternoon to punter friends discussing the respective merits of a group of horses before they raced. The coincidence further enabled one to realise the existence of similarities between efforts to determine which was the correct theory and that pastime popularly known as spotting the winner. There were also differences in that with the latter a decision was usually reached on which money was risked whereas no decision could be reached with the former. And, after such an experience, one could but respect such racing experts as Robin Goodfellow and Hotspur for it might be difficult to determine who worked the harder, the professor or the expert. The professor could but discuss theories that had been similarly discussed times out of number by his predecessors and contemporaries whereas the racing expert had always to consider the merits of the new and unexpected.

It just happens also that scientists know of the equivalent of the infallible system. This would be a principle or principles whence accurate predictions could be made. Such a principle, as Bacon knew, would be directly derived from the facts. If, however, the facts have been wrested into agreement with a false assumption then, according to my own findings, the result is the production of a group of competing theories of seemingly equal validity.

The simplest case of this is taken from modern psychology. The now familiar words, repression and dissociation, embody two competing theories of seemingly equal validity propounded by Freud and Janet, respectively, to explain certain facts. They are also striking examples of what Bacon called wresting the facts in that they

wrest the facts into agreement with the assumption that consciousness is a force. Freud made the further assumption that this force could be strong enough to effect repression whereas Janet assumed that it was so weak as to be unable to hold all things to itself. What it could not hold was lost or dissociated. My students were taught to be thankful that a force can only show the two variations of the strong and weak because, if other variations were possible, they would have had a corresponding number of extra theories to learn about.

Before any man can discuss the respective merits of these two theories, and there are many of such discussions, he must automatically accept the underlying assumption that consciousness is a force. If, however, before he used the word, repression, the user regularly or even once stopped to point out that when he used it he was making the assumption that consciousness is a force, he might in due course realise that repression was a theory which wrested the facts into agreement with an assumption for which there is no evidence. The user of the word, repression, is, in fact, Puck-struck in that something has happened to him of which he is unaware. Further, so much has been built up on that assumption that Bacon would have called it an idol of the theatre.

Ancient astronomy, it may next be noted, was built up on the false assumption that the sun moves across the sky. With its gods and goddesses, however, it was able to give dogmatic authority to a single theory explanatory of each fact. By contrast, the same assumption, treated according to modern freethinking methods, would first provide the three schools of thought of the pushers, pullers, and automobilists, and then each school would provide its own group of competing theories of seemingly equal validity to explain how it is that the sun is pushed, pulled, or moves of its own proper motion. But no seemingly independent commentator could discuss the respective merits of pushing, pulling and moving by proper motion without first automatically accepting the principle, or assumption, that the sun does move. And while a pusher and puller would fight each other to exhaustion over the respective merits of pushing and pulling, they would yet unite to crush anyone who suggested that the sun did not move. Thus did it possibly come about that at a recent congress in Copenhagen two propounders of competing theories appealed to the chairman of a meeting to rule out of order all mention of predicting what they had explained, and left the meeting in high dudgeon when the chairman refused. Their conduct confirmed Bacon's observation that inveterate errors, like the delusions of madmen, are exasperated by opposition. After a man has propounded some wonderfully involved theory about something, it is as exasperating to him to find it to be predictable as it can be for a conjurer to find his best trick given away.

Now, it may be accepted that Bacon's doctrine of idols stand in the same relation to the interpretation of Nature as does the doctrine of fallacies in ordinary logic. The cases given above exemplify this. Those whom Bacon would call philosophers of the eye generalised too

widely on too few experiments with the result that one of their fundamental definitions contains an unususpected error of over generalisation, and such an unsuspected error has Puck-like properties.

Puck has been equally active among the many who to-day speak glibly of repression or dissociation in that they appear to be completely unaware of the fact that all their discussions are based on an assumption for which there is no evidence.

My modernised ancient astronomy may be taken to illustrate an idol of the cave in that it implies over-confidence in the evidenceof the senses. If we accept without question the evidence of our senses, the sun does move across the sky, and that acceptance would make us Puck-struck.

I have been unable to find that Bacon anywhere directly points out that blind or automatic acceptance of a false assumption equally automatically leads a group of its believers to frame a corresponding group of conflicting theories or explanations of such seemingly equal validity that no decision is possible between them. But he did know that contention and barking disputation are the end of such matters and all the issue they can yield. He further knew that such inveterate errors, like the delusions of madmen, can only be overcome by art and subtlety whereas they are exasperated by violence and opposition. There is, next, the full element of comedy in false notions which have taken possession of men's minds and led them to endless disputation without any of them ever appreciating that the cause of their disagreement was their common belief.

Since, then, Bacon intended to introduce new ideas contrary to the inveterate errors of his contemporaries and knew not only that art and subtlety was required for their introduction but also that he was dealing with what he called idols of the theatre, the seeming obvious course was to write a play about it. It is not possible also to take that outside view of contention over conflicting theories of seemingly equal validity without appreciating that there is comedy in it, and that the comedy is provided by something of which each contestant is unaware.

On such ground I have to suggest that the comedy, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, was written by one who was fully acquainted with these discoveries and views of Bacon. The element of comedy therein is primarily provided by Puck who imbues his victims with idols of the theatre or false notions of whose origin each is completely unaware. Even in the subsidiary comedy played by Bottom and his friends the comedy is provided either by assuming that something is what it is not, or else by wresting a statement into a different meaning, a not uncommon process when two contestants declare what the other said. Also, any two men engaged in controversy over an idol can beat the air as fruitlessly as Lysander and Demetrius, and get equally exhausted in the conflict.

After which dates may be considered. The *Novum Organum* was published in 1620 whereas a *Midsummer Night's Dream* was published in 1600. The author of that play could not therefore have obtained

his ideas from the published work. We further know, however, that Rawley, Bacon's Chaplain, saw twelve yearly revisions of it before it was published. To that we have to add the time during which Bacon had considered these things before formally committing them to writing. Bacon held high office and put into writing his experience of the manner in which the officer is slave to his office. In my own case, for instance, it was several years pre-war when I last saw a *Midsummer Night's Dream* presented and realised that the results attained by Puck were excellent stage representations of the results obtained through belief in a false notion or Baconian idol of the theatre. But, before one could realise that, he had also to discover the cause which led to the production of the many thousand competing theories that had grown up round the facts of vision. In the meantime, the pressure of official duties, lighter in my case than in Bacon's, prevented matters going further than realising the point. An antedate of twelve years beyond Rawley, is, then, reasonable, and is enough.

In this connection another observation of Bacon is pertinent. He notes that the mind longs to spring to positions of greater generality. This causes the commentator on conflicting theories to seek the super-theory which will reconcile the differences between the group rather than to seek the source of the differences. As a result, as Bacon knew, what was once a question remains a question still, and instead of being resolved by discussion it is only fixed and fed. None of these commentators on vision ever set down the facts of vision to obtain a principle of vision from them. They have merely wrested the facts into agreement with an idol of the theatre.

It is worth while finally, perhaps, to set down my own teaching to my students. It was as follows. When you meet a set of conflicting theories of seemingly equal validity you should neither attempt to seek the super-theory which reconciles the differences nor should you seek the right one. Instead, you should seek what all are agreed on and reject that. What all are agreed on, you will find to be an assumption which has been treated as a fact for the purpose of framing the theories. Its fruits reveal it as false. You should realise also that, human nature being what it is, it will be long before any group of men, anxious to reach the truth and to resolve their differences and meeting in conference to do so, will open the proceedings by ascertaining their common ground of agreement and rejecting that.

SIDELIGHTS ON FRANCIS BACON

By M. F. Bayley

LADY BACON received grants from the Court of Wards. Receipts signed by her exist, or they did formerly exist.

In a letter to Anthony she says:—"I have ever treated your brother (meaning Francis) as a son, *not as a Ward.*" Was not Francis a Ward of Court? It was revealed in various records.

Quoted by Hepworth Dixon:—"Sir Nicholas Bacon left Francis no money or land, only the reversion after the death of Anthony! To all his other sons he left property."

When Francis was at Cambridge his expenses were, it is believed, paid by the Lord Treasurer, also Anthony's. This is an extraordinary fact: Francis and his foster brother Anthony Bacon went, under exceptional circumstances, to Trinity College, Cambridge. They entered as Fellow Commoners, wore a special cap and gown, and dined at the Fellows Table. Their tutor was Whitgift, later made Archbishop of Canterbury by the Queen. Only one boy, a few years later, had the same privilege, until a later reign when young noblemen were permitted to purchase this privilege.

Francis entered Gray's Inn also in unusual circumstances. He was given the same privileges as the 'Ancients' or Leaders of Gray's Inn, which caused much resentment as it was not customary to be given to other young men.

He was sent previously to France in an unusual capacity. In a letter to Essex he says:—"I was sent on an Embassy from the Queen's hand."

This is correct. He was sent on a *Special Embassy*. Sir Amyas Paulet was specially sent with him as an Ambassador attached to his Embassy. (The English Ambassador at the French Court was then called Gray). Sir Amyas Paulet accompanied Francis to the University of Poictiers and on all Francis' journeys, and his stay at the French Court. Reports of his progress and studies and doings at the French Court, which he made to Sir Nicholas Bacon, are extant. Paulet seems to have tried to help Francis' matrimonial scheme of marrying Marguerite de Valois whom Henry IV was divorcing as shown in Mrs. Gallup's cipher story, and incurred the Queen's displeasure. The indications are that Sir Amyas, who it is believed had taught Francis the French language, was specially deputed as his guardian.

On Francis' return to England he seems to have lived in *Leicester's* house—home of Lord Leicester—instead of with Sir Nicholas Bacon. His "Immerito" bears this out. He was intimate with Philip and Mary Sidney. Mary Sidney married Lord Pembroke of Wilton, near Salisbury.

In Wilton Library was the most *complete* library of all the books published at that period. It was sold a few years ago.

Francis says: (I quote from memory)—"I have often foregone mine own name and fame, if any such be, both in the works I write now, and those I write for posterity."

See Hannan's *Impersonations of Francis Bacon* which gives a clear description of this concealed author's style in "Spenser" works. The fact that the Royal Tudor Arms were used on Headpieces in the Spencer 1611 folio, completely wipes out the Secretary *Spenser*. Also the deference shown the author "Spenser" by Gabriel Harvey (Francis Bacon's friend), which Harvey would scarcely have shown his inferior, the Sizar of Cambridge.

Harvey alludes to the author with much respect as if he were *Royal*, as well as a courtier about the Court. In *Baconiana* 1679 Bishop Tenison writes: "They who know his lordship's writings can tell by the colour, the way of design, what books are through his pen *though his name be not to it.*"

As Francis uses the Royal Arms in the Spenser folio of 1611, it suggests that he may have been *crowned secretly, King of England,* and abdicated in James' favour. His first letter to King James speaks of offering himself as an "oblation" or burnt offering! After his fall he says to King James in a letter:—

> "As I was the *first sacrifice in your reign, so let me be the last.*"

Most curious words!

That this *secret* is known to many people is quite probable. Sir Edwin Lawrence in his books published in 1910—he found that his thirty three people who *should have* known the secret, only nine knew it. I do not think that three know it today!!!. It may be the only *important secret* of the Masons.

It would do great good to our Royal House and the young Princess if it were given to the world.

That Shakespeare was not only Francis Bacon but was also heir to the throne, is a *primary essential* of the Baconian theory in *Two Voices*! One of his being supposedly descended from Nicholas Bacon, and one of his *true* life, that of descent from Elizabeth and Leicester, is what is keeping back the truth.

The *Dictionary of National Biography* acknowledges Leicester's marriage in secret to Elizabeth. There is ample confirmation of it if only members would concentrate on that and not waste their time sticking to an outworn secret disguise of a "Pig."

"Whats' in a name?" But many still follow the false scent. The Baconian Room at Canonbury has the list of English Sovereigns from *Will Con. Elizabetha Tertius.* Elizabetha Fr., after the Fr. (something is scratched out) painted on the wall. Significant!

Will Con. Elizabetha Fr Jacobus, the 'AB' is dipthonged in Elizabetha the dipthong being under Will Con, which gaves the name Bacon.

The secret panel in the panelled room used by the Bacon Society years ago is supposed to have been a large cupboard. The builder who repaired it (after Mrs. Gallup published her *Lost Manuscripts* book) told the late Mr. H. Seymour he could stand upright in it. We were on the track of a workman who admitted he had started *burning* bundles of papers, when they were stopped but unfortunately the blitz started, and we were unable to trace him during 1939-40. *Were these the lost manuscripts of Shakespeare as Mrs. Gallup stated?*

I alluded to this in my speech at our Luncheon held in that room on January 22nd, 1940. This room, with its beautiful Tudor carving, was occupied by Francis Bacon in 1616. Tradition with Canonbury Tower credited a story that Elizabeth had given birth to a daughter in this room. We were told years before we had use of the Tower.

The writer of the Shakespeare plays in histories was writing the history of his ancestors. John of Gaunt and all his ancestors, and those of our present King George VI, and his family.

The Editor, BACONIANA
Sir,

ANOTHER STRATFORDIAN RETREAT

On 14th November, Mr. A. L. Rowse, Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford, gave a lecture to the Royal Society of Literature under the title "The Elizabethan Age and Ours." He chose to allude to "those harmless lunatics who think that Shakespeare did not write his own plays."

I wrote to Mr. Rowse about this matter, there having been no opportunity for discussion after the lecture. Incidentally, too, the lecturer seemed in a great hurry to get away. Did he fear attack by the "lunatics."

I gave Mr. Rowse a list of the "lunatics" and pointed out that he had alluded to one of them—Henry James. The latter had written: "I am sort of haunted by the conviction that the divine William is the biggest and most successful fraud ever practised on a patient world."

He had said that somebody had suggested that Queen Elizabeth wrote the plays. I asked who that somebody was.

I referred to the fact that there was an Oxford University Heretics Club to which I had lectured on the question. 'Who was Shakespeare'? I suggested a debate under its auspices. Of course, the secretary would be delighted to arrange it.

To this letter and to previous ones animadverting on remarks about the Shakespeare question in his book *The England of Elizabeth*, there has been no reply.

What adept Stratfordians are at Battles of Spurs.!

WM. KENT.

MARLOWE AND "SHAKESPEARE"

By H. Bridgewater

SOME thirty years ago there was published in *The Fortnightly* (in May and July 1903) some illuminating essays by the late Prof. Churton Collins. They were designed to demonstrate the extraordinary erudition (including knowledge of Greek, Latin and Law) possessed by the author of "Shakespeare."

Subsequent researches, such notably as those by Dr. Elze, Dr. R. M. Theobald and Sir Edward Sullivan have amply confirmed the high degree of classical knowledge which he must have possessed, while Lord Campbell, Malone, Richard Grant White and Lord Penzance have testified to the author's amazing familiarity with Law; how, as Grant White says, "legal phrases flow from his pen as part of his vocabulary and parcel of this thought."

Yet although the Plays of *Richard II*, *Henry VI* and *Titus Andronicus* manifest in the writer of them precisely the same profundity of knowledge as do the other immortal dramas of "Shakespeare," and although Prof. Collins wrote that "if Shakespeare was not the author of *Titus Andronicus* there is an end to circumstantial testimony in literary questions for the evidence external and internal is as conclusive as such evidence can be," there would appear to be a growing effort to gain acceptance for the theory that these plays were the work of Marlowe.

This theory would appear to be based on the fact that there is great similarity both of thought and expression between them and the plays of *Tamburlaine* and *Edward II*, which are now generally believed to have been written by Marlowe, although *Tamburlaine* never was published as by him during his lifetime while *Edward II* appeared with his name on the title page only after his death! Marlowe was slain in 1593, but the first known copy of *Edward II* (if we accept as genuine the copy dated 1594 found some fifty years ago in the Landesbibliothek of Cassel, Germany) is dated thirteen months after his death.

In view of these facts and the extreme improbability that contemporaneously with "Shakespeare" there should have been other playwrights capable of writing in the same superlative style in the same medium (*i.e.* blank verse, which was then a new, and extremely difficult form of literary expression) would it not be much more reasonable to assume that "Shakespeare" was the author of *Tamburlaine* and *Edward II* than that Marlowe wrote any of the immortal Plays?

Whatever may be thought of the veracity of the gentlemen, Messrs. Heminge and Condell, whose names were put to the dedication "To the Great Variety of Readers" in the 1623 folio, are we to believe that they admitted spurious dramas to be included therein?

An examination of Marlowe's life—in so far as it can be examined

—does not support the theory that he was gifted with great literary abilities—if once one questions his authorship of the works posthumously attributed to him.

What we certainly know is that he wrote a series of crude verses called "Elegies" and "Epigrames," which are notorious only for their vulgarity, and that copies of one edition of his "Elegies" were publicly burned at Stationers' Hall on 4th June, 1599, by order of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London. "All these Elegies," saus Mr. C. F. Tucker Brooke "are characterised by boyish stiffness of expression, by metrical inexperience and defective scholarship." To put it more plainly Marlowe's Elegies and Epigrams are nothing but a series of indecent verses none of which can give anyone the slightest reason to think that the author of them could possibly have written any such play as *Tamburlaine* or *Edward II*.

Here are a couple of examples of these precious "works"—

Elegia 13

Seeing thou art faire, I barre not thy false playing,
But let not me poore soul know of thy straying.
Nor do I give thee counsell to live chaste,
But that thou would'st dissemble when 'tis paste.
She hath not trod awry that doth deny it:
Such as confesse have lost their good names by it.
What madnesse is't to tell night's pranckes by day?
And hidden secrets openly to bewray?

Epigrames 29

Haywood that did in epigrames excell,
Is now put down since my light muse arose,
As buckets are put down into a well,
Or as a schoolboy putteth down his hose!

In what other respects does Marlowe's life square at all with authorship of works of such supreme merit as those attributed to him? The truth is that no one appears to know anything about him though Mr. John H. Ingram's book of 395 pages (*Christopher Marlowe and His Associates*) purports to tell the story of his life. But like *Shakespeare's England*, and the so-called biographies of Shakespeare, this book, while giving one a mass of not uninteresting information concerning Elizabethan times, furnishes no more information about Marlowe than could be written on a half sheet of notepaper. There does not appear to be a particle of evidence to support the tradition that he was the son of a Canterbury cobbler, or (assuming that he was) that that youth ever obtained a scholarship at King's School; for that assertion is based upon the fact that the name, not of Marlowe, but of "Marley" (very clearly written) appears in the lists of the Treasurer's accounts of payments made to the scholars in 1578-9.

If one is content to believe that the name of a boy christened as Marlowe would be carefully inscribed as "Marley" in the books of

the principal school of his native town, the rest of the story, which takes us, though somewhat painfully, to Corpus Christi, Cambridge, can be followed, if not accepted; for here we find our hero entered (in the following year, in the register of admissions) not as Marlowe, be it remarked, nor even as Marley, but as "Marlin"! And, as in the case of the Canterbury "Marley" this name can be seen there to this day—beautifully inscribed!

No letters to or from Marlowe exist, and there is no authentic signature of his; while the only contemporary reference to him would appear to be the highly uncomplimentary remarks relative to his character that were made by his erstwhile friend Thomas Kyd, whom Mr. Ingram can find no words harsh enough to describe.

In face of such uncertainty as to his identity it would be merely wearisome to trace the steps whereby, as the resut of Mr. Ingram's researches, Marlowe is made to take his degrees of B.A. and M.A. Suffice it to say that he does this under still variously spelled names, and at different colleges!

But however unreliable as a biographer he may be, Mr. Ingram agrees with Dr. Theobald and Mr. Richard Simpson, that "the very structure of *Edward II* seems to bear witness to the counsel and aid of Shakespeare. And, indeed," continues Mr. Ingram, "it is difficult to resist the belief that Shakespeare's own work is present in the play . . . Marlowe's reflections in this drama are sometimes so Shakespearean in tone and temper that one is frequently prompted to think that he must have been dipping his pen into the ink-horn of the young man from Warwickshire"!

Mr. Ingram thus stands on the edge of assertion that this play was written by "Shakespeare" and probably he would quite definitely have done so had he realised not only that the name of Marlowe but also that of William Shake-speare (which is the form in which that name first appeared on the title-pages of the immortal plays) was merely a pseudonym designed to shield from the abuse and bigotry of the times the personality of that great aristocrat whose studies of the classics, and of Law and literature were pursued in the shadow of Gray's Inn and not in the intervals of slaughtering cattle in Stratford-upon-Avon, nor in those attendant upon the holding of horses' heads outside the theatres of London.

TO THE STRATFORDIAN "GENIUS"

"No amount of genius can drive the results of acquirement—the genius must gain these things by exactly the same methods as those used by the rest of us. Genius cannot possibly give a miraculous familiarity with foreign tongues, medicine, the practice of the law, and court procedure . . . Nature imposes a limit on genius, which is necessarily confined within the limits of personal experience and wide reading. Genius does not supply a man with facts. It does not give the power to create something out of nothing, but only to make fresh and unexpected combinations of existing materials." (*Edwd. D. Johnson,* The Shaksper Illusion, p.p. 53-4).

I SHAKSPER

To show that "knowledge is the wing (1)
Wherewith we fly to heaven."
'Tis best that to your darling child,
No lessons should be given.

To gain command of English words,
And every grammar rule,
'Tis best to be a butcher's boy;
To booze and play the fool.

To write fine plays in thrilling style
And full of classic knowledge,
'Tis best to be a poacher bold,
And never go to college.

To tell of ladies, lords and dukes,
Of kings and kingly sport,
'Tis best to be a common man,
And never go to court.

To speak about philosophy,
And law and flowers fine,
'Tis best to stand at horses' heads
And never read a line.

To treat of foreign lands in strains
That all men must applaud,
'Tis best to stay in England,
And never go abroad.

To scale the heights of lovers' bliss,
And sound the deeps of woe,
'Tis best to pile by usury,
And never to let go.

(1) From du Bellay's Deffense et Illustration de la Langue francoyse: "ce sont les ailes dont les escripts des hommes volent au ciel"—after speaking of hard study!

If come to ripe maturity,
When genius has full play,
'Tis best to lead an easy life,
And lay the pen away.

To prove your noble kindly heart
Is governed by your head,
'Tis best to leave your wife to starve
Upon your cast off bed.

Surely to win undying fame,
As England's greatest bard,
'Tis best to leave no manuscripts:—
And die of drinking hard.

II BACON

Bacon : *alias Pallas*, shaking a spear,
To win in justice and contempt,
From every biassed mind,
'Tis best to be the wisest,
And the brightest of mankind.

III

L'envoi Sérieux

To warm the strong , to teach the proud,
To give new learning scope,
'Tis best to use a nom de guerre;
And write in faith and hope,
That future ages, wiser grown,
Would learn the cosmic rule;
"La Science infuse" does not exist,
The knave preys on the fool!

By ANON.

Re-edited by Salvamen, 1950.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of BACONIANA
Sir,

"DON ADRIANA'S LETTER"

This letter first appeared in the Quarto of *Love's Labour's Lost* which was printed by W.W. (White) for Cuthbert Burby in 1598. The title-page says that it is "newly corrected and augmented," and that the play is "as it was presented before Her Highnes this last Christmas." In 1607 Burby transferred his rights in it to Nicholas Ling together with *Romeo and Juliet* and *The Taming of a Shrew*.

The first allusions to the play all occur in 1598. These are by Meres, Robert Tofte and an unknown author, "I.M." in a book called *A Health to the Gentlemanly Servingmen*. This Work was also printed by W. White. Here there are allusions to Act III, Sc. 1 of the play, particularly the remarks by Costard concerning "Guerdon" and "Remuneration." The author shows that he was familiar with the text of the play recently printed.

Now the "Don Adriana's Letter" appeared in the quarto, which was the only one published prior to the Folio text twenty-five years later. The wording of the letter is virtually the same in 1623 except for about a dozen trifling modernizations in spelling, *e.g.* beauteous for beautious, truth for trueth and so on. In spite of these alterations in the spelling of certain words, it is clear that the printers of the Folio had a copy of the 1598 quarto before them as many misprints from the quarto are repeated. Among them is "covercame" for "overcame" in the letter. Owing to the Folio being in double column pages, the measure of the lines is quite different from that in the quarto, the lines in the quarto being longer and fewer, which would mean, of course, a different word-square for the quarto version. This proves that the letter was not specially composed for the insertion of the "signals" which have been published *ad nauseam* in BACONIANA. It only needs one letter more or less in the printed text to throw the whole idea of especially inserted signals completely out of reckoning.

I hope "Arden" will procure a copy of the quarto in facsimile and compare it with the folio text and spelling, and when he has done so will suggest why, if the alleged "signatures" were intentional, the same line arrangement and spelling is different in the two texts? The spelling of certain words in the quarto is so quaint that it suggests a composition much earlier than 1598. We can observe how the Folio printers altered it by such examples as:

Quarto:	*Folio*:
hart	heart (in the Don's letter)
incke	inke
wincke	winke
hudge	huge
weerie	wearie
ductie	dutie
litle	little
trueth	truth (in the Don's letter)

No doubt "Arden" has a copy of Durning-Lawrence's *Bacon is Shakespeare*. On page 105, there is a photographic reproduction of a page from the 1598 quarto. On page 87 (Plate XXI) appears a facsimile of the same lines as they occur in the Folio. In these few lines we have these differences:

abhorre	abhor
frantique lunatique	franticke lunaticke
lyud	liv'd
maruaille	marvell
worde	word
horne	horn
singuler	singular

The misprint, which has puzzled the commentators ever since, *viz.*, "Bome boon for boon prescian" in the Quarto is repeated in the Folio which shows that the compositors were also unable to put it right, so they left it as it was. Obviously the author saw no proof.

"Arden" might also refer to The New Cambridge Edition of *Love's Labour's Lost* with Dover Wilson's clear notes on the text. Dover Wilson mentions the queer spelling of the Quarto. There are other scholarly works by Chambers, Pollard and Gregg on the quartos and Folio which he should consult. I am sure that when he is familiar with the textual problems and with Tudor bibliography and printing, he will see that he has been following a "Will-o'-the-wisp."

Yours faithfully,
JOHN WELLINGTON WELLS

To the Editor of BACONIANA
Sir,

DON ADRIANA'S LETTER

I am much obliged for the opportunity to reply to the letter from Mr. John Wellington Wells as I think it is time that the matters he raises should be dealt with once and for all.

With regard to the bibliographical details I am sure that everyone is familiar with the main points and I do not think that we need to discuss them further. But let us see what sort of a case Mr. Wells makes of such details as the differences in spelling. He writes that there are "about a dozen trifling modernizations in spelling." Here they are:

	Quarto	*Folio*		*Quarto*	*Folio*
1.	beautious	beauteous	9.	coulde	could
2.	trueth	truth	10.	raggs	ragges
3.	louelie	louely	11.	tytles	titles
4.	trueth	truth	12.	replie	reply
5.	(space omitted in Folio)		13.	lippes	lips
6.	kinges	kings	14.	hart	heart
7.	standes	stands	15.	industri	industrie
8.	lowlines	lowlinesse			

None of the examples he gives from *Love's Labour's Lost* is from the Don's Letter. However, the trend of the argument is that the "modernizations" were by way of being a normal revision by either the author

or the compositor. And, if I do not mistake Mr. Wells, such normality shows that the Folio text cannot be operative for a cryptograph since it stems from an early text which because of these differences and alterations in line cannot carry a cryptograph. I hope that I have taken the point.

But, are matters so normal as Mr. Wells suggests? The following points should be examined:

1. "Beautious" to "beauteous" is no great alteration and can hardly be termed a "modernization." The *second* word "beautious" is left untouched! The first is in the second line and the second is in the third line. It would not be because the second word "beautious" is not in the operative part of the letter that Bacon left it alone?
6. "Kinges" to "kings" is no correction at all. Logically, the first makes better sense since the possessive noun is needed.
8. "Lowlines" to "lowlinesse" is no modernization.
10. "Raggs" to "ragges" is no modernization.
15. "Industri" to "industrie" is no modernization.

The argument from "modernization" is suspect then since it operates in 10 instances and not in five. Furthermore, this is borne out by the fact that words like: faire, selfe, faire, beautifull, selfe, eie, victorie, entreate, selfe, mee, foote, euerie, desigue, etc., are not modernized, though the same words and similar modern forms do occur in the Letter.

To sum up the point; there are 15 alterations:
10 are possible "modernizations"
5 are not "modernizations"
13 words which might have been "modernized" are not touched.

The conclusion is that the argument from "modernization" is not valid. But to clinch the matter there is, in the Don's Letter one of the rare "misprints" of the Folio—"covercame" for "overcame."

Mr. Wells specially mentions this "misprint" and the question is then: if the author or the Elizabethan compositor set out to correct or alter the spelling of various words (shown to be haphazard) then why did he overlook this one outstanding "misprint" of the Quarto text of the Don's Letter?

The answer is also the same for the query about "Bome boon for boon prescian" which Mr. Wells mentions. Both the Don's Letter and the above phrase carry cipher material and had to be left in the correct operative form for decipherment. In the case of the phrase I know that Baconians are familiar with the solution, it is to be found in many Baconian works by responsible authors. Furthermore I shall have more to say about the extra letter E which has to be "scratched", but not here.

But it also happens that Mr. Johnson, author of *Don Adriana's Letter*, has shown that the intrusive letter "c" in "covercame" is part of the cryptography in the Don's Letter. Mr. Wells will forgive me for citing more cryptography in support of Mr. Johnson's view.

I refer him to Table 21 of the 2nd edition of *Don Adriana's Letter* where the letter "C" is shown on the corner of 100 squares. *The significance is that* 100=*FRANCIS BACON in Simple Numerical Cipher.*

Mr. Johnson shows the connections with five words SEE and the injunction to SEE TEN which runs down the 10th column. Here is the mass of letters which connect all the letters set on the corners of the 100 squares.

																		10	9	8<-
	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
8	I	C	I	W	H	I	C	H	T	O	A	N	N	O	T	H	A	N	I
9	O	B	**S**	C	U	R	E	V	U	L	G	A	R	V	I	D	E	L	I
10	H	**E**	**E**	**C**	A	M	E	**O**	**N**	**E**	**S**	**E**	E	T	W	O	**C**	O	U
11	T	H	**E**	K	I	N	G	W	H	**Y**	D	I	D	H	E	C	O	M	E
12	E	T	O	O	U	E	R	C	O	**M**	E	T	O	W	H	O	M	C	A
13	H	A	**T**	S	A	W	H	E	T	H	E	B	E	G	G	E	R	W	H
14	G	G	**E**	R	T	H	E	C	**O**	**N**	**C**	L	U	S	I	O	N	I	S
15	K	**I**	**N**	**G**	T	H	E	C	A	P	T	I	U	E	I	**S**	**I**	**N**	R
10 16	E	R	**S**	T	H	E	**C**	A	T	**A**	S	T	**R**	O	P	H	**E**	I	S
9 17	K	**I**	**N**	**G**	S	N	O	O	N	**B**	O	T	H	I	N	**O**	**N**	**E**	O
8 18	F	O	R	S	O	S	T	A	**N**	D	**S**	T	H	E	C	O	M	P	A
^ 19	O	W	I	T	N	E	S	S	E	T	H	T	H	Y	L	O	W	L	I
| 20	I	M	A	Y	S	H	**A**	L	L	**I**	*E*	N	**F**	O	*R*	C	E	T	H
21	N	T	R	E	A	T	E	T	H	Y	L	O	U	E	I	W	I	L	L
22	O	R	R	A	G	G	E	S	R	O	A	B	*E*	S	F	O	R	T	I
23	E	X	P	E	C	T	I	N	G	**T**	H	Y	R	E	P	L	Y	I	P
24	E	M	Y	E	Y	E	S	O	N	T	H	Y	P	I	C	T	U	R	E
25	A	R	T	T	H	I	N	E	I	N	T	H	E	D	E	A	R	E	S

The four letters on the corners of each of the 100 squares are: E and C on line 10, cols. 10 and 24; S and E on lines 16 in the same columns.

The major implication of all the arguments adduced by Mr. Wells is that the Don's Letter Cryptograph is a "following of a 'Will o' the Wisp'." We can from this conclude that Mr. Wells thinks it easy to extract "signals" from any text. On the other hand, I KNOW that unless a text is "loaded" no such thing can be extracted. I have tried too many texts not to learn how difficult it is to extract "signals" that give any sense. What is more, if my rules are obeyed: Symmetry, Keying, etc., I think the task impossible from "any" text. At the risk of extending this letter I shall have something to say about a Mr. Smith who acknowledged his defeat in this direction.

However, this is not the case with these four corner letters. Marked out in heavy type we find the following:

1. Top left. SEE crossed by CEE. (Keyed).
2. Top right. "C" of "couercame"
3. Bottom left. TENS SIGNING or TEN SIGN. (Keyed).
4. Bottom right. SEE ONE SINE. (Keyed)
5. Top centre. SEE MY ONE SYNE (keyed).
6. Along line ten=CEE. (Keyed on top left).
7. Up to a letter T in col. 17=CET (keyed by SET)
8. Down to a letter T in col. 17=SET from the letters S and E on line 16.
9. Along line 9 (S of SEE col. 10)—SEAL using A 16×17 and E 9×24. The L is on col. 17.
10. From the S of SIGNING=SEAL to the same letter L. (Keying around the L. top centre).
11. The A of SEAL for each case is the A of BACON and down from the two top corner letters C and E hangs the B of BACON. 17×17.

What is more, the full signature is FRANCIS BACON.

All that remains is to extract sense from the multiplicity of signals. SEE SET MY ONE SIGN C SEAL TENS SIGNING FRANCIS BACON.

A POPULAR BOOK BARGAIN!

The Francis Bacon Society has purchased the remainder of the First Edition of COMYNS BEAUMONT'S popular work

THE PRIVATE LIFE OF THE VIRGIN QUEEN

300 pages *Illustrated.* *With Index.*

ORIGINAL PRICE 16s. OFFERED AT 10/-

(Post Free)

This inside history of Queen Elizabeth and Francis Bacon is based largely on the Word and the Biliteral Cyphers.

*

A FEW PRESS COMMENTS

Cavalcade.—"Right or wrong, Mr. Beaumont provides a provocative thesis and some interesting reading."

Illustrated London News.—"Mr. Comyns Beaumont delights in fishing in strange waters. He has a literary courage far above the average. It is a book full of wonders."

Southern Times.—"A vividly new outlook on Queen Elizabeth's real life. This interesting volume will appeal to historian and general reader alike."

Torquay Directory.—"Mr. Beaumont has written a very readable book which is sufficiently interesting in itself to appeal even to the Philistines."

Western Morning News.—"The author holds tenaciously to the view that historians have ignored the rich mine of information which has lain at their disposal for the last fifty years."

* * *

Apply to

THE FRANCIS BACON SOCIETY, 50a Old Brompton Rd., London, S.W.7

If Mr. Wells does not understand what I mean by "keying" it is a rule which demands that a word spaced out should be found again around one of the letters in a *symmetrical* pattern. In other words it must be found at least twice. And to anyone who has not the patience to examine letters in close formation I say "keep an open mind" and to those who are interested, there is a lot more around the above signature if they will only take the trouble to look.

Before I can readily accept criticism of the kind Mr. Wells thinks is relevant to the matter of the Don Adriana's Letter Cryptograph I should like to see him attack the presence of the signature FRANCIS BACON set out in a symmetrical design. His letter reminds me that Mr. R. L. Eagle wrote me in similar terms some months ago and recommended me to a Mr. Smith who, it seemed, could extract his own name from the Table of Letters. I contacted Mr. Smith and he sent me his attempt. I still have his drawings and later when I pointed out that he had not only failed to observe the rules but had no idea of "symmetrical design" he admitted his error. When I sent a copy of the drawings to Mr. Eagle he failed to acknowledge Smith's failure.

I think Mr. Wells is probably more wise than either Messrs. Smith and Eagle in so far as he does not claim that the designs shown by Mr. Johnson and myself can be extracted from any text or that he could show his own name in a like manner. I recommend him to read my further articles on the Cryptograph in *Baconiana Letter*.

Or, if he thinks that he can emulate the "signals"—I suggest that he tries the other Don Adriana's Letter from *Love's Labour's Lost*. There is another letter read out in the play. I could find nothing so there is your chance Mr. Wells!

As for the change in spelling and line arrangement in the Quarto I suggest that it was for concealment of the cryptograph, especially since it was that dangerous year 1598 when later, Elizabeth considered herself Richard II by implication.

The conclusion I come to with regard to any attack on the Don's Letter Cryptograph is that in some way some people imagine that I set out to invent a mechanical proof of Bacon's authorship of the Plays. Nothing is further from the truth. I have examined all the "cipher proofs" and found them impossible of further extension by my own efforts. It was when I turned to Mr. Edward D. Johnson's *Don Adriana's Letter* that I discovered many details which he had overlooked. I have in mind the "countersigns" HOG which hang around the letter O's of his signatures BACON. If Messrs. Wells, Eagle, Smith, Wood and Co. cannot see how impossible of chance this is then something is wrong with their appreciative faculties—for they were given adequate leads in such works as *Hermes Stella* by F. W. C. Wigston and *Subtle Shining Secrecies* by William Stone Booth. The question of the Quarto Text is certainly an interesting detail but not one which should be used as a big stick with which to beat up yours truly. It is time the above gentlemen began to re-consider the Quarto Text in the light of the Don's Letter Cryptograph for if they leave it too long the full decipherment of the Don's Letter will have left them high and dry with their bibliographical details. Orthodox scholarship is a very suspect matter from all points of view and is mainly a history of error tardily admitted. Their best contribution in the main is that they all think the name Shakespeare a mask for someone else. We agree.

Here is one final confirmation of a cryptographic kind for which no

Two New Bargains
at Popular Prices of Recent Works

by

EDWARD D. JOHNSON

The Shaksper Illusion

A completely new and enlarged edition of his previous work, the most complete and thorough exposure of the Stratfordian myth yet given to the world. 192 pages illustrated.

Price only 7s. 6d., post free 8s.

Some Signatures of Francis Bacon

This brochure characteristic of Mr. Johnson's discoveries in Bacon's anagramatic Cypher, analyses the famous Amsterdam Emblem Book, introduced by the famous drawing of Fortuna, with one hand elevating Bacon to the highest pinnacle of Fame and with the other pushing an actor, Shaksper, off it. An anagramatic analysis of the text revealing Bacon's work.

Price 1s. 3d. post free

These two completely new works are obtainable from

THE FRANCIS BACON SOCIETY
50a Old Brompton Road, London, S.W.7

apology is needed and I know Baconians will recognise the force of the detail I am about to present.

In the recent issue of BACONIANA, No. 141, there is an article entitled "Controversy with a 'Doubting Thomas'," by T. Wright, who tells us that he and a friend had a "running discussion" which started by considering the word FREE which is the last word of the Shakespeare Play *The Tempest*.

Most Baconians will be familiar with the suggestion that this is a very subtle signing-off by the true author Francis Bacon—*viz.*

The root meaning of Francis =FREE
FREE =33 in Simple Numerical Count
FREE =67 in Reversed Count.
33=BACON (Simple)
67=FRANCIS (Simple)
Therefore FREE=FRANCIS BACON by triple entendre.

If Mr. Wells will examine the above Table of Letters which show the signatures FRANCIS BACON he will see that from the letter F, spaced out at one letter intervals, the word FREE!

What is more the word is "keyed" twice in the same vicinity with letters adjacent to the F.

Let Mr. Wells examine my Table VIII in the same BACONIANA, page 226, where I show the signature FFRAUNCISCO hanging from SOW. The same word FREE sits squarely on this design as it should do from the F on 20×20. There is no doubt that Bacon knew the value of the word FREE as a signal for his name and the suggestion that it so does at the end of *The Tempest* gains credence from the Don Adriana's Letter Cryptograph from *Love's Labour's Lost*.

I leave it to Mr. Wells to try and spot the word anagram LIBER, latin for FREE also in the vicinity of the above mentioned signatures.

What is more the word FREE is attached to all the signatures I have found in the Don's Letter!

I wish Mr. Wells could use his eyes in the simple matter of the Don Adriana's Letter Cryptograph and try and bring up a reason why my discoveries are a following of a "Will o' the Wisp" instead of just saying so. Any argument from bibiliography must first be based on *facts not opinion* and furthermore a knowledge of typography would help him to be more cautious in his pronouncements. Any one not trained in print can make the most awful "gaffes."

Yours faithfully,

"ARDEN."

Volume One *of*

Francis Bacon's

PERSONAL LIFE STORY

By **Alfred Dodd**

Author of "The Martyrdom of Francis Bacon" (2nd Impression), etc.

IN the fine, graphic style for which the author has become famous, we are given a vital, picturesque and true-to-life portrait of a very different personality from that portrayed by Macaulay, Church, or even Spedding; for since these men wrote, new facts have come to light, which for the first time are faithfully embodied.

It is the story of a philosopher, scholar, statesman, orator, lawyer, and teacher. Nominally the younger son of Sir Nicholas and Lady Ann Bacon, he is claimed to have been the legitimate son of Elizabeth and Leicester, but precluded for reasons of State from recognition, which affords the key to his entire career.

As his birth was a mystery, and also his private life, so was his death. Did he die of a sudden chill on Easter Sunday, 1626? The author skilfully unfolds the tangled skein which leads to the conclusion that it was a sham affair, and that Bacon escaped to the Continent and lived in retirement to an old age under an assumed name. No record of his funeral exists and when his tomb in St. Michael's Church, St. Albans, was opened it was empty.

Many other mysteries are revealed, especially the inside story of why he deliberately allowed himself to be dishonoured and ruined in 1621, leaving a stigma which yet attaches to his name.

Volume I covers the life of Francis Bacon from his birth up to the death of Queen Elizabeth. Volume II will start appropriately from the arrival in England of James I, and will end with the strange story of Bacon's supposed death in 1626.

38 *Half-tone and* 11 *Line Illustrations. Large Demy* 8vo. 382 *pp.* 30s.

SPECIAL TO OUR MEMBERS:— Having a few copies of this brilliant work now left we offer them at 25s. (postage 8d. extra) a reduction of 5s. Please apply to the office, 50a, Old Brompton Road, London, S.W.7

To the Editor of BACONIANA
Sir,

DID FRANCIS BACON DIE IN 1626?

Most willingly I avail myself of your offer to make some remarks upon your article about the death of Francis Bacon.

In his letter of 1647 to the Princes of Brunswick, J. Val. Andrea wrote:

"... In our house died December 18th Paulus Jenischius, a greyhead advanced in years, who had still to live the second half of his 90th year, being born long ago in Antwerp, June 17th, 1558. A man, from many-sided knowledge in Literature and Languages, from scanty musical talent, author of a Seelenschatz, not infamous, who through envy and intrigue bore the guilt and penalty of others and even a banishment of more than fifty years. ..... "

Andrea calls him also a man of high birth, great learning and great fame.

From the beginning Mr. Speckman's opinion was that Paulus Jenischius' name was a blind and perhaps even the name of a non-existent person. This last appeared as not being the case, Jenischius being born 25th October, 1602. He studied divinity in Jena and at other universities and became a Minister in several places, not in the neighbourhood of Brunswick.

If Paulus Jenischius had been the celebrated person, as described in Andreae's letter, many of his contemporaries might have given evidence of him, but Mr. Speckman did not find the least trace, nobody knew him except Andreae.

In the first edition of Bayle's Dictionary his name is not to be found. In the second edition his name appeared, but the author writes the name with reference to Andreae's letter.

It is clear Andreae wished that no agreement should exist between the name of the deceased person as given by him and the name of the real deceased one. Therefore he did not give a name, which might be a pseudonym of Bacon.

To make the blind as clear as possible he will have chosen a name which was quite unknown to the Princes.

By calling him Paulus Jenischius, who died 14th November, 1648, it was possible to prove that Jenischius' name was a blind, as he was still living when the letter was written in 1647! It is clear that Paulus Jenischius could never have been the celebrated person, as mentioned by Andreae.

Mr. Speckman concludes that it was Francis Bacon. The mentioned qualities agree in the main with Francis Bacon and who knows another person in that time who would have possessed the same qualities?

As Andreae did not wish to give any direct indication, it was not possible for him to communicate to his readers that the unknown person had been born in London. He chose therefore Antwerp as a place, where it was possible that the name of Jenischius was known, but Mr. Speckman tells us neither there nor in Holland, where so many strangers had settled in those days, the name was to be found.

The birthday 17th June is St. Albans day and needs therefore no explanation.

In the number of the year 1558 some Bacon numbers are hidden. The number may be diminished, according to the rules of the Kabala, by the sum of the figures, 1 +5+5+8=19, being the letter T &Librum

TWO ATTRACTIVE NEW BARGAINS

of works by

BERTRAM G. THEOBALD, B.A.

EXIT SHAKSPERE

88 pages 2/6 post free

This work is invaluable to those requiring a clear summary of the main facts relating to the Stratfordian claims, and to appreciate both the weakness of these claims and the strength of the opposing arguments.

* * *

ENTER FRANCIS BACON

(A Sequel to *Exit Shakspere*)

122 pages (9ins. by 5½) 3/6 post free

This work vindicates Bacon's Moral Character; regarded as a concealed poet; his connection with the Shakespearean play Richard II; *and amongst much else how the Shakespeare Plays fit into Bacon's own life-story.*

* * *

BOTH WORKS ARE OUT-OF-PRINT AND ARE OFFERED TO OUR READERS AT ORIGINAL COST-PRICE, PLUS POSTAGE

5/6 *the two*

THE FRANCIS BACON SOCIETY

50a Old Brompton Road, London, S.W.7

Testamentum), The new number is 1539 or 19×81, thus once more 19, 81 being one of the eminent numbers of the Rosicrucians, i.e. in Sonnet 81. The number 19 is also mentioned in Andreae's letter, the unknown person having 19 "liberorum." The number of Andreae's letter is 190. It would be very interesting to know if this is the real number of the letter or only a number to include 19.

More details might be given, but it seems preferable that cognizance is taken from Mr. Speckman's booklet "*Francis Bacon und sein Tod in Stuttgart im Jahre* 1647". Only then all the data given by Mr. Speckman would be used.

Yours sincerely,
L. DE RANDWIJCK.

Aerdenhout, Holland.

(According to Count de Randwijck, taking Dr. Speckman, of the Hague, as his authority, he says that the latter definitely believed that the mysterious Paulus Janischius, who died in his 90th year in 1647, was Francis Bacon, but that Joh. Val Andræ who wrote of Janischius' death used a false name as a blind. It is very confusing, for there was such a real person as Paulus Janischius, and in any case if he died in 1647 in his 90th year, Francis Bacon would not have reached his 90th year until 1650. With apologies to Count de Randwijck, the contention does not sound convincing. I have unfortunately not a copy of Dr. Speckman's booklet referred to. The problem was unravelled as far as possible in our Summer Number (140) p.p. 136-7.—EDITOR.

To the Editor of Baconiana
Sir,

THE TWO NATHANIEL BACONS OF VIRGINIA.

With regard to your former doubts about the Virginian, Nathaniel Bacon. There are indeed two . . The elder Bacon was born in 1619 and died March 16th, 1692. On his tombstone, found on his farm Kingsmill and now in Bruton Church, Williamsburg, Va., it says "Here lyeth interred ye body of NATHANIEL BACON, Esq., whose descent was from the Ancient House of ye BACONS (one of which was Chancellor BACON & Lord Verulam) who was Auditour & President of ye Honourable Councell of State & Comander in Chief for the County of York having been of the Councell for above 40 years & having always discharged ye offices in which he served with great Fidelity and Loyalty to his Princ who departed this life ye 16 of March 1692 in ye 73 year of his Age." (Complete text) partly quoted by Mr. A. S. Otto (exact spelling and typogr.) On top of the tombstone are the familiar arms of the Bacon family.

The family relationship is as follows: Francis Bacon's father, Sir Nicholas, had a brother James, whose son James married a cousin, Elizabeth of Hesseth, who somewhere is found mentioned as "heiress of Francis Bacon." They had two sons, James, Rector of Burgate and Nathaniel of Friston Hall, Suffolk, the Nathaniel of the above tombstone. He had a son Thomas, whose son Nathaniel was born at Friston Hall on January 2nd, 1647. This is the so-called rebel! He apparently went to England and entered Gray's Inn in 1664 and married Elizabeth Duke in 1674. He sailed for Jamestown, Virginia and lived at Curles Neck, now the seat of the Randolph family. In 1676 the rebellion took place during which this young Nathaniel Bacon used "Bacon's Castle" across the James River from Williamsburg for four months as a fortress. He also died that year.

JOHAN FRANCO.

403, Lake Drive, Virginia Beach, Va.

FRANCIS BACON SOCIETY'S BOOKS FOR SALE

	Price including British postage
Beaumont, Comyns. Private Life of the Virgin Queen (Illustrated). Price reduced.	10/-
Cartier, General. Un Problème de Cryptographie et d' Histoire (4th Ed. in French and English).	8/-
Dodd, Alfred. Francis Bacon's Personal Life Story (Illustrated. Price reduced).	25/8
The Martyrdom of Francis Bacon (Illustrated)	21/6
Shakespeare's Sonnet Diary—Personal Poems Francis Bacon (10th Ed.)	8/-
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin. Shakespeare Myth—Milton's Epitaph and Macbeth Prove Bacon is Shakespeare (The ten hundredth thousand)	4/6
Eagle, R. L. Shakespeare, New Views for Old (Illustrated)	11/2
Farrington, B., Francis Bacon, Philosopher of Industrial Science	13/-
Gundry, W. G. C. Francis Bacon— a Guide to His Homes and Haunts. Price reduced (Illustrated).	2/3
Manes Verulamiani (edited by W. G. C. Gundry) Price reduced	30/-
Was Shakespeare Educated? (Illustrated)	2/8
Johnson, Ed. D. Bacon-Shakespeare Coincidences	3/8
The Bi-Literal Cipher of Francis Bacon (9 plates)	3/9
The Fictitious Shakespeare Exposed	2/8
Francis Bacon Cipher Signatures (31 diagrams)	4/4
Mystery of the First Folio of the Shakespeare Plays	5/10
Shakespearean Acrostics. 139 Folio pages	8/2
The Shaksper Illusion (Illustrated)	2/8
The Shaksper Illusion (Enlarged edition illustrated)	8/-
Melsome, W. S. Bacon-Shakespeare Anatomy. Price reduced	10/-
Pogson, Beryl. In The East My Pleasure Lies (An interpretation of 9 Shakespeare Plays).	9/4
Prescott, Kate H. Reminiscences of a Baconian-	13/-
Sennett, Mabel. His Erring Pilgrimage (Price reduced)	4/2
Theobald, B. G. Exit Shakspere Enter Francis Bacon, sequel to Exit Shakspere	5/6 the two books
Francis Bacon Concealed and Revealed (Illustrated)	8/7
Shakespeare's Sonnets Unmasked	5/5
Woodward, Frank. Francis Bacon's Cipher Signatures (Photo Facsimile Illustrations).	26/-

PAMPHLETS FOR SALE

	Price including British Postage each
Baker, H. Kendra. Who Wrote Love's Labour's Lost?	7d.
Bridgewater, Howard. Bacon-Shakespeare Controversy	7d.
Bacon or Shakespeare—Does it Matter?	9d.
Shakespeare and Italy	1/2
Evidence Connecting Francis Bacon with Shakespeare (illustrated)	1/8
Dodd, Alfred. Mystery of the Shakespeare Sonnets	1/2
Who Was Shakespeare?	1/8
Eagle, R. L. Shakespeare Forgers and Forgeries (illustrated)	1/-
Eagle/Hapgood. Stratford Birthplace. (Illustrated)	1/3
Ellis, Walter. Shakespeare Myth (illustrated)	1/8
Franco, Johan. Bacon-Shakespere Identities Revealed by Their Handwritings (illustrated)	2/7
Gundry, W. G. C., "Notes on Hinton Saint George."	1/9
Johnson, Ed. D. Don Adriana's Letter (21 diagrams)	2/9
Francis Bacon: Similarity of Thought	1/2
Francis Bacon v. Lord Macaulay	1/2
The Shakespeare Quiz	7d.
Some Signatures of Francis Bacon.	1/3
Murchison, Sir K. Who Wrote the So-called Shakespeare Plays?	4d.
Sydenham, Lord. The First Baconian	9d.
Trew, Corona. Influence of Francis Bacon on Modern Thought	1/-

All the books and pamphlets for sale can be had from the Assistant Secretary, 50a, Old Brompton Road, London, S.W.7. Tel.: KNI. 1020

There is a Circulating Library for the use of all members, the only charge being the postage. Applications for books and pamphlets should be addressed to the Assistant Secretary, at the office of the Francis Bacon Society, 50a, Old Brompton Road, South Kensington, S.W.7. Hours 10 a.m. to 5 p.m., Saturday excepted.

BACONIANA

The official journal of the Francis Bacon Society (Inc.) is published quarterly at 2/6 (postage 2d). Jan., April, July and Oct. Back numbers can be supplied.
When enquiry is made for particular numbers the date should be carefully specified, as some are now very scarce and, in the case of early issues, difficult to obtain except from members of the society who may have spare copies for disposal.

LONDON:

Published by the FRANCIS BACON SOCIETY INCORPORATED at 50a. Old Brompton Rd., London, S.W.7 (Knightsbridge 1020) and printed by The Rydal Press, Keighley, Yorks.