Vol. XXXVI. No. 143. Price 2/6.

BACONIANA

Founded 1886.

July 1952

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Editorial	57
Observations on Shelton's "Don Quixote"	58
Bacon, the Royal Society, and the Inns of Court	68
"He was a Scholar, and a Ripe and Good One"	73
Shakespeare and Catullus	75
Is Bacon's Cipher in Psalm 46?	78
Who were Gabriel Harvey and Thomas Nashe?	81
Francis Bacon's Secret History	88
Bacon Shakespeare "Invention"	93
Alleyn and Francis Bacon	95
University Life at Poiters in the time of Bacon	97

LONDON:

Published by the FRANCIS BACON SOCIETY INCORPORATED at 50a Old Brompton Road, S.W.7, and printed by the Rydal Press, Keighley

The Francis Bacon Society

(INCORPORATED)

Among the Objects for which the Society is established, as expressed in the Memorandum of Association, are the following:—

1. To encourage the study of the works of Francis Bacon as philosopher, statesman, and poet; also his character, genius and life; his influence on his own and succeeding times, and the tendencies and results of his writing.

2. To encourage the general study of the evidence in favour of Francis Bacon's authorship of the plays commonly ascribed to Shakespeare, and to investigate his connection with other works of the Elizabethan period.

Officers of the Society:

President: SYDNEY WOODWARD, Esq.; *Council Chairman:* Commander M. PARES, R.N.(retd.); *Hon. Treasurer:* Capt. B. ALEXANDER; *Hon. Secretary:* ALAN SEARL, Esq.; *Editorial Board:* Messrs. S. WOODWARD, M. PARES, NIGEL HARDY, NOEL FERMOR.

Council Member, T. WRIGHT, Esq.

Hon. Vice-Presidents; Miss E. MAPOTHER, Miss T. DURNING-LAWRENCE, Miss C. M. POTT, Miss M. THEOBALD, Mr. ALFRED DODD, Mr. WILFRED WOODWARD.

The subscription for Membership is one guinea ($4 for U.S. Members) payable on election and on the first day of each succeeding January. Members receive a copy of each issue of BACONIANA, without further payment, and are entitled to vote at the Annual General Meetings.

Subscriptions should be sent to the Hon. Treasurer, and all other communications to the Hon. Secretary, both c/o 50a Old Brompton Road, London, S.W.7.

BACONIANA

VOL. XXXVI (67th Year) No. 143 July, 1952

EDITORIAL

THE present Editorial Board is not in a position to continue, without some kind of a break, the recent Editorial policy of BACONIANA, able and interesting though this was. There must of necessity be a pause, after which our comment may be expected to develop according to the need.

Shortage of space is another reason for temporarily restricting this column, for it is an obligation (no less than a pleasure) to give place to some good articles which are awaiting publication.

Nevertheless we cannot pass over altogether an amusing post card from Belgium in which one of our friends draws attention to the word "Ham-let" as a pseudonym for "Little-Bacon." When this correspondent proceeds further to detect an arabized version of the same root in the words "Hamet" and "Mo-ham-ed" we are inclined to suspect a leg-pull. But in truth there is a strong smack of Bacon in the word Hamlet! Many are the puns which have been made on Bacon's name, and they occur in the plays of Shake-speare as well as in Bacon's own works.

We should be interested to hear more of this subject and would remind our readers of an 18th century book called "The Learned Pig".

To conclude, we would remind Members that articles sent to the Board will receive careful attention, as suitable contributions for publication are most welcome. It should be understood that BACONIANA is a medium for the discussion of subjects connected with the Objects of the Bacon Society, but that the Society does not necessarily endorse opinions expressed by its contributors.

OBSERVATIONS ON SHELTON'S *DON QUIXOTE*

By Dr. R. Langdon-Down

IN the series of Tudor translations No. XIII dated 1890 is an excellent transcript of the first (1612) edition of Thomas Shelton's *Don Quixote*, and the second part which followed in 1620. Mr. James Fitzmaurice-Kelly, the great Spanish scholar and the authority on *Don Quixote* writes an admirable introduction which occupies fifty pages. After considering all the facts he admits that we know nothing of Shelton but for the appearance of his name dedicating this "translation out of the Spanish tongue to the Lord of Walden, etc. as his Honours most affectionate servitor." The name of Shelton does not appear in the second part of the book which was published in 1620 but it is held to be the work of the same hand. After a critical examination of the facts Fitzmaurice-Kelly writes:

"The basis of Shelton's version is, it may be asserted, irrefragably proved to be the Brussels reprint of 1607." He also states: "On a review of the available evidence only one conclusion is possible, that Shelton translated directly from the Spanish edition published in Brussels in 1607. Any other inference is not only illegitimate but manifestly absurd" and "there is absolutely no evidence to support a recent theory that Thomas Shelton is a pseudonym." At this time (1890) it is probably true that no doubts had been expressed on the claims of Cervantes to the authorship of *Don Quixote*, and on that assumption Fitzmaurice-Kelly would appear to have ample justification for these conclusions. For it seems clear that the Shelton version is definitely associated with the Brussels text more closely than with any other. Since those days it has been realised that in the question of the authorship of *Don Quixote* we are confronted with a world of make-believe as shown in "The Author's Preface to the Reader," in the references in the text to Cid Hamet Benegeli as the author, the probable significance of the name given to him and the ambiguities of the dedication letter signed by Shelton in his version. It is perhaps going too far to regard this as evidence but it should surely warn us to be cautious in accepting statements made at their face value.

Fitzmaurice-Kelly himself draws attention to a curious fact, *Don Quixote* was licensed for the press in September 1604 and was published in Madrid early in 1605. "Oddly enough," he says, "the book is twice named at a date earlier than that imprinted on its title page." Lope de Vega in a letter dated August 4th, 1604 writes—"No budding poet is as bad as Cervantes, none so foolish as to praise *Don Quixote*."

It is indeed difficult to understand how it was that the book was known in the literary world of Madrid some six months before its

publication and its author had openly praised it at the time. Some explanation is needed, but is not given. It would not be difficult to suggest how this might have come about if Cervantes were only a mask or agent for the real author.

Fitzmaurice-Kelly as well as Lope de Vega has no high opinion of Cervantes as a poet. He writes: "In a collection of verses on the death of Philip the Second's wife, Isabel de Valois, Cervantes dawns upon literature with five redondillas, an epitaph and an elegy, all of decent mediocrity. So far as concerns the poetic gifts his endowment was scant, to the last day of his life he was all too ready a sonneteer." "He also wrote some twenty plays none of which were a success and to judge from the examples left to us he was rejected on his strict demerits." "In competition with homelier wits he fails to shine." And yet *Don Quixote* was hailed as a masterpiece in Spain and later in Europe outside Spain. A fifth edition was published in Valencia in July 1605 and a second part was published in 1615 shortly before Cervantes' death in 1616, and yet he died in poverty.

Nothing seems to fit. In view of these strange circumstances the suggestion has been made and received considerable support that the book owes its origin to some other hand than that of Cervantes. The remarkable character of Shelton's so called translation, the mystery of its production and the failure to identify Shelton have led to the view that here in some way we have the origin of *Don Quixote*, and in Shelton a mask behind which stands the real author. A summary of the grounds on which this theory has been based may be found in a chapter of Mr. Edward Johnson's recent enlarged issue of his book, *The Shaksper Illusion*. The search continues. When it was seen that the Author's Preface to the Reader was printed in italics in the 1890 reprint, it was thought that this might be a vehicle for embodying information by the bi-literal cipher, and provide material for an independent test of the genuineness of Mrs. Gallup's decipherment, and so photographs of the Preface were taken from the original in the British Museum. When the prints were examined clues of a different kind were found. It will be seen from the facsimiles reproduced in this number that the ornamental headpiece shows an example of the light and dark. A design often associated with books in the production of which Bacon was closely interested. It also appeared that parts of the Preface were printed in Roman type, this being used for the most part for proper names and quotations but not consistently, some words being in Roman type for no obvious reason and some names being in italics. It was also found that in one place the word Qui-xote was divided by a hyphen as here written. These facts suggested a count of the Roman-type words and when all the words or part-words in the Preface were counted it was found that the number was 157. This is held to be significant as it is the simple cipher count of Fra Rosie Cross as has been noted elsewhere by the late Frank Woodward and others.

Shelton or the true author seems at times to be playing a game with his readers as we have already seen. Thus in Book 1, chapter 7,

we read "Then did they bestow on them some title of an Earle or at least a Marquesse, etc.," on which Shelton remarks in a side-note, "The title of a Marquesse is less than that of an Earle in Spain." The writer of the Preface to the Reader who is supposed to be the author of the book and a Spaniard and therefore likely to be familiar with the precedence of titles in Spain gives a rather superfluous list of titles when he writes "such sonnets, whose authors bee Dukes, Marquesses, Earles, Bishops, Ladies or famous Poets." He thus makes the very mistake to the avoidance of which the foriegner Shelton surprisingly calls attention in the text. Not content with this in Part 2, chapter 24, there is a note made by Shelton that the term Grandee is a name given to men of title Dukes, Marquesses, Earles in Spain, again seemingly superfluous and making the very mistake in precedence of which he was aware as shown by his note in Part 1. Is all this mere frivolity or does Shelton wish to throw doubt on the identity of the writer of the book and once more to direct the reader's attention to it? A similar ambiguity occurs when the writer of the Preface goes on to say: "Although, if I would demand them (*i.e.* Sonnets) of two or three Artificers of mine acquaintance I know they would make me some such, as those of the most renowned in Spaine would no wise be able to equall or compare with them." It is not surprising that the reader should be puzzled by the contrasts and apparent inconsistencies in Shelton's work as is manifest in what Fitzmaurice-Kelly says about its excellencies and demerits. Thus he writes that Shelton's colloquial knowledge of Spanish urges him to a close adherence to the letter and the first found word too often contents him if in sound and semblance it approaches the Castilian. Shelton translates "trance" by "trance" where the context obviously demands "emergency" as in "all the trances of warfare" and "this unexpected trance." Similarly he translates "sucesos" by "successes" and "talente" by "talent" which make no sense. Again he writes "they tortured the prisoner who confessed his delight," the word thus translated being "delito." It is not necessary to know Spanish if one has a slight acquaintance with Latin to recognise this word as "crime." This treatment of everyday words our guide describes as a "tendency to the servile-exact or a crazy prepossession;" "anxious haste—fine nonechalence; frolicsome humour; and impetuous fidelity."

Here is a writer who, if we are to take his dedicatory letter seriously as does our critic, was able to translate some 550 pages of Spanish in forty days making mistakes of the most elementary kind. On the other hand he remarks that the owls of pedantry have bitterly resented his juggles with a gerund; and the arrogant disdain for them and theirs. "He brought to the execution of his enterprise an endowment and a temperament such as no later rival could pretend to boast." "He owned an alert intelligence, a perfect sympathy for his author's theme and a vocabulary of extreme wealth and rarity. Moreover before and above these things he was an Elizabethan, a contemporary of Shakespeare's nurtured on the marrow of lions, and

blessed with the clear accent of that spacious age. His language is ever fitted to the incident . . . he despatches his phrase with address and vigour, the atmosphere of the book is his own."

"It were too much to say that so had Cervantes written in English; but equity demands the admission that his manner is more nearly attained by Shelton than by any successor." "He is never lacking in a shrewd equivalent for an idiomatic phrase." "Cervantes abounds not greatly in purple passages but where the Castilian original affords the occasion Shelton rarely fails to seize and match it. So with infinite felicity of phrase and setting, with sustained sonority and splendour in passages of uncommon majesty he continues his deliverance of a classic masterpiece of Spain."

Who then is this Shelton of whom Fitzmaurice-Kelly can write in such glowing terms and of whom no one has heard before or since? And how reconcile this brilliance with the petty childish mistakes recorded above? Surely not by ascribing to him a tendency to servile exactness or even merely a frolicsome humour, though that indeed may be part of the explanation. Have we not here the deliberate intention of the writer to make the reader think he is reading a translation as he had stated it to be while the vigour and freshness of the work as a whole point in the opposite direction? It is indeed possible that these are a few retranslations from the Spanish fathered by Cervantes on to the world whether the Spanish text as a whole was the work of Cervantes or another Spanish scholar.

It seems that Cervantes' most successful work, if for the moment we exclude *Don Quixote* was in his *Novelas Exemphlares*. Is it not possible that some of the supplementary stories in *Don Quixote*, not all brilliantly successful it would seem, were Cervantes' own work, thus justifying to some extent a claim for his authorship and so satisfying his *amour propre*? Shelton too would thus be in part a translator from the Spanish. If, as is asserted above, our 1612 edition of Shelton is more closely aligned with the Brussels version of 1607 than with the Madrid text of 1605 and that both of them derived from Shelton, it would seem that there must have been an earlier script of Shelton which we do not now possess on which the Madrid text was based.

There are other puzzles and obscurities at the solution of which we can at present only guess. The change by Shelton of La Mancha into Aethiopia, the statement that Cid Hamet was an "Arabical" Manchegan are some of these. Fitzmaurice-Kelly writes, "nor do his (Shelton's) embellishments stop here. After writing about a number of Knights Errant of foreign lands, Shelton's patience is vanquished and in a fine burst of patriotism he strikes a blow for England with the splendid interpolation of Sir Bevis of Hampton, Sir Guy of Warwicke, Sir Eglemore with divers others of that nation and age."

Again we ask who is this servile exact translator, this Shelton?

Having considered the problems which the First Part of *Don Quixote* presents we turn to the Second Part with some wonder as to

what it may tell us. Again we meet doubts and difficulties. The first part has proved extremely popular not only in Spain but in the outer world. Nine editions were published in Spain alone; Cervantes promised on several occasions that there should be a sequel and it would seem that it should win both fame and money for the author. For the next eight years Cervantes produced little of note. There were many requests for more Quixotisms but as Fitzmaurice-Kelly says, the Knight and his Squire seemed to hang heavy on their creator's hands, and he played the stepfather with perfection. Other less important work claimed his first attention. At last in 1614, nine years after the issue of Part 1, a spurious sequel appeared as a small quarto under the name of Avellanede of whom to this day nothing is known. This book seems to have been of some merit and considerable vogue.

Whether by design or not, this publication acted as a spur to Cervantes for in the following year he produced the genuine Second Part. He was now sixty-eight years old and the surprising thing is that this second part is held to be the equal or even superior to the First in many ways. In the following year he died. He seems to have derived little financial benefit from the proceeds of the most noted book in Spain.

In England the so-called Shelton version of the second part was published in conjunction with a fresh edition of Part 1 in 1620, the dedication being signed by Edward Blount who entered the First for registration at Stationers' Hall in 1611. Although Shelton's name does not appear in connection with Part 2 the critics seem to be satisfied from its style and from the recurrence of the same mistakes as occurred in Part 1 that it is certainly by the same hand.

Part 2 in Spanish was licensed for the press in Madrid on November 5th, 1615, and on December 5th, 1615, Edward Blount registered his copy, *The Second Part of Don Quixote*, and paid the fee of vjd. It would clearly be impossible for the Spanish text to be brought to England, translated and printed in a month.

On this Fitzmaurice-Kelly states that this copy was "unquestionably" Avellaneda's counterfeit published in 1614. When such assertions are made it is wise to examine them with care. It was natural, of course, for Fitzmaurice-Kelly to assume, as at first sight most people would, when no question had been raised as to Cervantes' status in the matter, that this must be the only possible explanation; but when this status is called in question the matter takes on a different aspect and calls for further examination. By implication, if not explicitly Fitzmaurice-Kelly admits that Blount paid no fee for the registration of Shelton's version of the genuine Second Part other than that recorded on December 5th, 1615, which he asserts was paid for a translation of Avellaneda's book. He attributes the avoidance of paying a further fee to "frugality" on the part of Blount. In effect this is an aspersion on the character of Blount whose name stands high among the publishers of that time, being associated with Jaggard as printer of the First Folio of the Shakespeare Plays. He further states that no translation of Avellaneda's counterfeit is known. He explains

this by suggesting that the enterprise was dropped when the authentic work appeared in Madrid. This seems a very tame explanation even if it were possible to make one registration serve for two different books. It may be asked why Blount should register a book in 1615 which did not appear until 1620. This could be explained by the desire to secure priority as soon as he was assured that the Spanish Second Part was ready to appear as he would know if he were in collaboration with Cervantes. Moreover some delay in publication would be desirable if the inverted relation with Cervantes were to be concealed successfully. Clearly these facts leave much room for speculation: as Fitzmaurice-Kelly himself says, "the curious Reader draws his own inferences from indubitable facts." He himself seems to sense some difficulty. Why for instance does he say of the suggestion that the author of *Don Quixote* himself corrected the Madrid edition of 1608 that it is a "wanton fable and dangerous deceit?"

As an example of Shelton's style Fitzmaurice-Kelly quotes Don Quixote's defence of Knight Errantry from Part 2, chapter 22, "Is it happily a vain plot or time ill-spent to range through the world, not seeking its dainties, but the bitterness of it, whereby good men aspire to the seat of immortality? If your Knights, your Gallants, or Gentlemen should call me 'Coxcombe,' I should have held it for an affront irreparable; but that your poor scholars account me a madman, that never trod the paths of Knight Errantry, I care not a chip. A Knight I am, a Knight I'll die if it please the most Highest. Some go by the spacious field of proud ambition, others by the servile way of base flattery, a third sort by deceitful hypocrisy and few by that of true religion. But I by my starres inclination go in the narrow path of Knight Errantry; for whose exercise I despise wealth but not honour. I have satisfied grievances, rectified wrongs, chastised insolencies, overcome Gyants, triumphed over sprites and I am enamoured only because there is necessity Knights Errant should be so, and though I be so, yet am I not of those vicious amourists but of your chaste Platonics. My intentions always aim at a good end, to do good to all men and to hurt none." Fitzmaurice well says: "So Shelton manifests himself an exquisite in the noble style, an expert in the familiar and with such effect as no man has matched in England."

Whose is this pen? Whose is this thought?

The Authors Preface to the READER.

THOV maiſt beleeue mee (gentle Reader) without ſwearing, that I could willingly deſire this booke (as a child of vnderſtanding) to be the moſt beautifull, gallant, and diſcreet, that might poſsibly bee imagined. But I could not tranſgreſſe the order of Nature, wherein euery thing begets his like: which being ſo, what could my ſterile and il-tild wit ingender, but the hiſtory of a dry toſted, & humorous ſon, full of various thoughts & conceits neuer before imagined of any other: much like one who was ingendred within ſome neyſome priſon, where all diſcommodities haue taken poſſeſsion, and all dolefull noyſes made their habitation? ſeeing that reſt, pleaſant places, amenity of the fieldes, the cheerefulneſſe of cleere skie, the murmuring noyſe of the Criſtall fountaines, and the quiet repoſe of the ſpirit are great helpes for the moſt barren Muſes to ſhew themſelues fruitful, and to bring forth into the world ſuch births as may enrich it with admiration and delight. It oft times befals, that a father hath a child both by birth euil-fauoured and quite deuoide of all perfection, and yet the loue that hee beares him is ſuch, as it caſts a maske ouer his eies which hinders his diſcerning of the

faults and ſimplicities thereof, and makes him rather to deeme them diſcretions and beauty, and ſo tels them to his friends, for witty ieſts and conceites. But I (though in ſhew a Father yet in truth but a ſtepfather to Don-Quixote) *will not be borne away by the violent current of the modern cuſtome now a daies, and therefore intreate thee, with the teares almoſt in mine eies as many others are wont to doe, (moſt deare Reader) to pardon and diſſemble the faults which thou ſhalt diſcerne in this my ſonne: for thou art neither his kinſman nor friend, and thou haſt thy ſoule in thy body, and thy free wil therein as abſolute as the beſt, and thou art in thine owne houſe wherein thou art as abſolute a Lord, as the King is of his ſubſidies, and thou knoweſt well the common Proverbe, that* vnder my cloake a fig for the King, *all which doth exempt thee and makes thee free from all reſpect and obligation; and ſo thou maiſt boldely ſay of this hiſtory whatſoever thou ſhalt think good without feare eyther to be controlled for the evil, or rewarded for the good that thou ſhalt ſpeake thereof.*

I would very faine have preſented it vnto thee pure & naked, without the ornament of a Preface, or the rabblement and Catalogue of the wonted Sonnets, Epigrams, Poems, Elegies &c, which are wont to bee put at the beginning of bookes. For I dare ſay vnto thee that (although it coſt me ſome paines to compoſe it) yet in no reſpect did it equalize that which I tooke to make this preface which thou doſt now reade. I tooke oftentimes my pen in my hand to write it, and as often ſet it downe againe, as not knowing what I ſhould write, and being once in a muſe with my paper before me, my pen in mine eare, mine elbow on the table, and my hand on my cheeke, imagining what I might

write,

To the Reader.

write, there entred a friend of mine vnexpectedly, who was a very discret & pleasantly witted man who seeing me so pensatiue, demanded of me the reason of my musing: and not concealing it from him, said, that I bethought my selfe on my preface I was to make to Don-Quixotes *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 sees that after the end of so many yeeres (as are spent since I first slept in the bosome of oblition) I come out leaden with my gray haires, and bring with me a booke as dry as a kexe, void of inuention, barren of good Phrase, poor of conceipts, and altogether empty both of learning & eloquence: without quotations on the margents, or annotacions in the end of the book, wherwith I see other books are stell adorned be they neuer so idle, fabulous, and prophane: so full of sentences of* Aristotle *and* Plato *and the other crew of the Philosophers, as admires the Readers, & makes them beleeue that these Authors are very learned and eloquent. And after whē they cite* Plutarch *or* Cicero, *what can they say, but that they are the sayings of* S. Thomas *or other Doctors of the Church: obseruing herein so ingenious a Methode, as in one line they will paint you an inamoured gull, and in the other will lay you downe a little seeming deuout sermon, so that it is a great pleasure and delight to reade or heare it, all which things must bee wanting in my booke, for neither haue I any thing to cite on the margent, or note in the end, and much lesse doe I know what Authors I follow, to put them at the beginning as the custome is, by one letter of the* A.B.C. *beginning with*

To the Reader.

Aristotle, *and ending in* Xenophon, *or in* Zoylus *or* Zeuxis. *Although the one was a Railer, and the other a Painter. So likewise shall my booke want sonnets at the beginning, at least such sonnets, whose Authors bee Dukes, Marquesses, Earles, Bishops, Ladies or famous Poets. Although if I would demand them of two or three Artificers of mine acquaintance I know they would make mee some such, as those of the most renowned in* Spaine, *would in no wise be able to equall or compare with them.*

Finally good sir, and my very deer friend, (quoth I) I do resolue that Sir Don-Quixote *remain intombed among the old records of the* Mancha, *vntill heauen ordaine some one to adorne him with the many graces that are yet wanting: for I finde my selfe wholy vnable to remedy them, through mine insufficiency and little learning: and also because I am naturally lazye and vnwilling to goe searching for authors to say that, which I can say well enough without them. And hence proceeded the perplexity and extasie wherin you found me plunged. My friend hearing that, and striking himselfe on the fore head, after a long and lowd laughter said: In good faith friend, I haue now at last deliuered my selfe of a long and intricate error wherwith I was possessed all the time of our acquaintance, for hitherto I accounted thee euer to be discreet and prudent in all thy actions, but now I see plainely that thou art as farre from that I tooke thee to bee, as Heauen is from the Earth.*

How is it possible, that things of so small moment, and so easie to bee redressed, can haue force to suspend and swallow vp so ripe a wit as yours hath seemed to be, and so fitted to break vp and trample ouer the greatest difficulties that

BACON, THE ROYAL SOCIETY AND THE INNS OF COURT

By H. W. JONES

I

THE influence of Francis Bacon on the early members of the Royal Society (which received its first charter in 1661, though unofficially in existence since the beginning of the Civil War) is well known, and readers will be grateful to Mr. Gundry for pointing out ("Prospero, Bacon the Prophet", BACONIANA, Vol. XXXV. No. 140, Summer 1951) further details on the subject. The object of this article is to draw attention to certain clearly documentable data which have not so far, I believe, been noticed or stressed, and also to transcribe and comment on the Register of Gray's Inn signed by Bacon which forms the centre plate of BACONIANA, No. 141; (an appeal for such a comment appeared in the *Daily Telegraph* of 12th November last).

Writing from the Marxist point of view, Mr. Benjamin Farrington in his *Francis Bacon, Pioneer of Industrial Science* (U.S.A., 1949; London, 1951) notes (p.137) that Bacon's "recommendation to learn from the crafts" was followed up seriously in the early days of the Royal Society and that certain members, notably Robert Hooke in his *General Scheme or Idea of the Present State of Natural Philosophy* (1705) interpreted Bacon over-literally and (what Bacon himself would most certainly have deplored) uncritically. Mr. Farrington refers us to where Coleridge, the literary critic, writing on "Principles of the Science of Method" in *The Friend* (1809-10) calls Bacon (sect. ii, Essay ix; 1937 edn., iii. 168) "our great legislator of Science", but rightly ignores the later misunderstanding and perversion of Baconian ideas by the Royal Society. For more precise manifestation of the influence of Bacon on the Society perhaps I may be permitted to refer the reader, in passing, to two short studies ("Some Reflexions on the Beginnings of Experimental Science" in *Annals of Science* (London, 15 March 1950) and "La Société Royale de Londres au 17e Siècle" in the *Revue d'Histoire des Sciences* (Paris, July-September 1950) where I examine the Society's treatment of some of his ideas.[1]

Let us return to Mr. Gundry (who rightly notes the importance attached by the Royal Society and by the Restoration to Bacon as a scientific pioneer). Abraham Cowley, the well known Restoration poet, compares Bacon to Moses because in a favourite image of his, Bacon, though he saw the Promised Land of the New Science "from

[1]As a side-line, I believe hitherto unnoticed, on Bacon as scientist, it might be noted that the phrase "Expense of spirit" occurs both in Sonnet CXXIX and in the *Advancement of Learning*.

the Mountain's top" (not "mountain top") "of his exalted wit" (*Ode to the Royal Society*) yet did not live to enjoy its benefits. May one add a remark here to an observation made by Mr. Gundry? "Dr. William Rawley, Bacon's first and last Chaplain, states that Bacon had composed a book called *Abcedarium Naturae*, the 'A.B.C. of Nature', and notes it as having been lost" (BACONIANA, 140, p.143) It is interesting to note that Cowley uses precisely the same illustration in several poems such as *The Garden*, *Ode on Harvey*, and others, and that Thomas Sprat, first historian of the Royal Society, in his *History* of that body (1667; 4 editions down to 1734), to which I shall return, also mentions "the Book of Nature" (p.345), though it is true, of course, that the phrase might be a commonly accepted philosophical trope of the age.[2] Yet it is rather misleading, I think, to say that "in his *New Atlantis* he pictures a Scientific College for the advancement of learning *such as was realised in the foundation of the Royal Society*" (*ib.*, 141; my italics), for there is no real parallel between Solomon's House and either the actual or the projected scientific academies of Europe in the mid-seventeenth century, save in Sprat's frequent (*op. cit.*, pp. 15, 37, 82, 408) and Bacon's many (as in the *Advancement* and the *New Atlantis*) mentions of Solomon. There are, on the other hand, certain deliberate and conscious echoes of Bacon in Sprat and in the early apologists for the Society such as Joseph Glanvill and, as one would expect, abuses of him by its opponents such as Henry Stubbe. To save space here, perhaps I may indicate that a carefully compiled list of verbal parallels between Bacon and Sprat has been prepared by Mr. Harold Fisch and myself, and will shortly appear.[3]

Before passing to the transcription and translation of the leaf from the Register of Gray's Inn (the original transcription was unfortunately destroyed in 1941) one or two minor points may first be dispatched. Part II of Mr. Beaumont's interesting query: "Did Francis Bacon die in 1626?" (BACONIANA, 140, p.131) notes Bacon's visit, in that year, to Arundel House, Highgate: it is memorable that the library there deposited should have become the basis of the first library of the Royal Society, and it is a possible and, I believe, a new speculation in connection with the same article to suggest that if Bacon was indeed in France in the 1640's and 1650's when the Civil War had drawn Royalist sympathisers into exile there, Cowley, one of these, met Bacon; this would give a positive motive for his often-shown enthusiasm towards all matters Baconian—which appears in his prose (such as his project for founding a Philosophical College) as well as in his verse.

As a fitting conclusion to this section, may I quote as a corollary to Mr. Gundry's extract from a letter from Bacon to King James I

[2]For an examination of what I term Cowley's "prefabricated imagery" see the first article referred to in the previous note.

[3]In *Modern Language Quarterly* (University of Washington). An edition of Sprat's *History* is also in preparation. For an account of attacks on, and defences of, the Royal Society see *Osiris* (Bruges: St. Catherine Press) for 1950.

—a fine encomium to him who "rendered the age a light unto posterity, by kindling this new torch amid the darkness of philosophy" (the Restoration followed Bacon closely in its concern for the opinion of posterity)—that fine passage from the beginning of Book II of the *Advancement*:

> And surely, when I set before me the condition of these times, in which Learning hath made her third visitation or circuit in all the qualities thereof; as the excellence and vivacity of the wits of this age; the noble helps and lights which we have by the travails of ancient writers; the art of printing, which communicateth books to men of all fortunes; the openness of the world by navigation, which hath disclosed multitudes of experiments and a mass of natural history; . . I cannot but be raised to this persuasion, that this third period of time will far surpass that of the Grecian and Roman Learning . . .
>
> (Spedding's edn., *Works*, 1883, ii 476)[4]

II

Bacon was a true child of his age in regarding Science and Philosophy as being complementary and not opposed; Miss Theobald's *obiter dictum* that (BACONIANA, 140, p.157) "Bacon established the English language, introducing some 15,000 words unknown to it before this time" is a tribute not only to the range of his scientific interests which demanded a wider vocabulary for their expression than was then available to him (a point which Sprat, the mouthpiece of the plea by the New Science for the simplification of scientific language, surprisingly neglects), but also to his literary invention, for no writer since Chaucer had done likewise. As we turn to consider Bacon's connection with another public body—the Inns of Court—it is fitting that we remind ourselves of the close and amicable relations between Bacon and the foremost society of his day—in Mr. Drood's words (BACONIANA, 140, p. 152) "There are 27 other beautiful and vertuous ladies or Honorable Gentlemen [than the Countess of Cumberland], to whom poems were dedicated under Spenser's name. Francis Bacon brought up at Court would know them all: but Spenser in the Backwoods of Ireland without even a Who's Who or Debrett's Peerage would be rather at a disadvantage!" A caveat, however, is necessary when one assesses Elizabethan poets who had associations with the nobility. Mr. Drood's three apt points of comparison between the lives of Spencer and Shaksper are unfortunately not, in my view, enhanced by the additional two he makes when he says that (a) We know little of the life of either poet, and (b) First work published

[4]As evidence that Bacon's views came to be widely accepted compare their weaker version in a poem by Thomas Bastard:

> "The first and riper world of men and skill
> Yields to our later world for three inventions;
> Miraculously we write, we sail, we kill,
> As neither ancient scroll nor story mentions"

and of course we find the same views expressed by the Royal Society.

anonymously, for could not one say the same of a hundred other Elizabethan poets? May one leave the point there and turn with satisfaction to Bacon's own delightful piece—"Farewell, ye gilded follies . . ." which itself appeared anonymously in Thomas Farnaby's *Florigelium* (1629) and Joshua Sylvester's *Panthea* (1630) and later, duly ascribed, in the *Reliquiae Wottonianae* (1651) and subsequently in Palgrave's *Golden Treasury*, as one turns to the question of the Register entries?[5]

When read from the photostat, which has the disadvantage, for the reader, of being "reduced to about a quarter or less of the original" the entries appear to be as follow (one item only has been checked from Joseph Foster's *Admissions to Gray's Inn and Marriages in Gray's Inn Chapel*, n.d.):

Radulphus Garrardus filius Gilberti Garrardi militis Magistri Rotulor(um) admissus est in hanc societatem Martij nono A(nn)o D(omi)ne Reginae Elizabethe tricesimo.

Rogerus Butler gent. admissus est in hanc societatem (*next two words erased*) (A(nn)o regin) die et A(nn)o supradicto.

Thomas Gray filius et Gent (?) Gray Baronus de Wilton admissus est in hanc societatem Martij duodecimo A(nn)o D(omi)ne Reg(inae) Eliz. 30°

Edwardus Langham de stationis d(omin)e reginae (?) admissus est in hanc societatem die ij anno tertio.

Henricus Scroop filius d(omin)i Scroop admissus est in hanc societatem duodecimo die Martij anno regin(ae) Eliz. 30.

Carolus Gray armiger frater & hereus apparens Henrici Comitis Cattij admissus est in hanc societatem eodem die & anno.

Beniamin Piggot de Gravenhurst in com(itatu) Bedf(ord)shire admissus est in hanc societatem die iii anno tertio.

Gulielmus Fosbroke de Cranford (*next three in caret*) In Com(itatu) Northampt(on) de Barnards Inne admissus est i die Maij a(nn)o 30 Eliz(abethae) Regine.

Thomas Stockett de Lond(on)—admissus est in hanc societatem 2° die Maij A(nn)o 30° Regine Elizabeth.

Edwardus Lenton de Woodford in Com(itatu) Northampton Gent. admissus est in hanc societatem j° die 30° Eliz(abethae) Regine.

Willm Holt (?) de Ashworth, in (Com(itatu) Lancast(er) gent. admissus est in hanc societatem A(nn)o 3(o)° Eliz(abethae) Reg(inae) i° die Maij.

All the entries are signed by Bacon, and I offer the following translation:

"Ralph Garrard, son of Gilbert Garrard, Knight, Master of the Rolls, was admitted into this Society on the 9th of March in the 30th year of our Sovereign Queen Elizabeth; Roger Butler,

[5]As an interesting side-line, one might note that *opponents* of the Royal Society such as Hobbes are also indebted to Bacon as in Hobbe's division of history (*Leviathan*, Part I (Of Man), chap. ix: 'Of the Several Subjects of Knowledge'), which follows Bacon's in the *Advancement*, Bk. ii.

gentleman, was admitted into this Society in the said year; Thomas Gray, son of — Gray, Baronet, of Wilton, was admitted into this Society on the 12th of March in the 30th year of our Sovereign Queen Elizabeth; Edward Langham—was admitted into this Society on the second day on the aforesaid year; (*marginalia, then*:) Henry Scroop, son of Master Scroop, was admitted into this Society on the twelfth day of March in the 30th year of the Sovereign Queen Elizabeth; Charles Gray, Knight, brother and heir apparent of the aforesaid Henry Catty was admitted into this Society on the same day and year; Benjamin Piggott of Gravenhurst in the County of Bedfordshire was admitted into this Society on the aforesaid day and year; (*marginalia before the next four*) William Fosbroke of Cranford in the County of Northampton and of Barnard's Inn was admitted on the second day of May in the 30th year of Queen Elizabeth; Thomas Stockett of London—was admitted into this Society on the second day of May in the 30th year of Queen Elizabeth; Edward Lenton of Woodford in the County of Northampton, gentleman, was admitted into this Society on the first day of May in the 30th year of Queen Elizabeth; William Holt, gentleman, of Ashworth, in the County of Lancashire, was admitted into this Society in the 30th year of Queen Elizabeth on the first day of March."

The above is as free from error as I can conceivably make it without working from the original; meanwhile it may serve as a draft until an authoritative version can be made.

"HE WAS A SCHOLAR, AND A RIPE AND GOOD ONE."

By EDWARD D. JOHNSON.

IN *Troilus and Cressida* we find the following line:

As near as the extremest ends of parallels.

(I, iii, 167.)

Whoever wrote this line was acquainted with Euclid, and as the ends of parallel lines can never meet the phrase is used sarcastically.

Euclid was not taught at the Stratford Grammar School, even if Will Shaksper ever went there, of which there is no evidence, and he could not have picked up this expression by listening to the conversation of his friends.

(This was noted by William Theobald in *The Classical Element in the Shakespeare Plays* (1909), p. 155.)

* * * *

In *King John*, Act II, scene 1, we read:

Do like the mutines of Jerusalem
Be friends awhile. (II, i, 378.)

This play was first published in 1595, so it follows that *the writer must have read the original text of Flavius Josephus*, who described the mutines of Jerusalem—there being no translation of Josephus until 1602.

(See *The Classical Element*, etc., p. 394.)

* * * *

In *The Tempest*, Act VI, scene 1, Ceres speaking of Iris says:

Who with thy saffron wings, upon my flowers
Diffusest honey drops, refreshing showers.

Saffron wings is a peculiar expression, but it is used by Vergil, who in describing the death of Dido writes, "Therefore dewy Iris flies down through the sky on saffron wings."

(See *Classical Element*, etc., p. 373.)

In *Henry VI*, Part 1, Act IV, scene 3, we read:

Thus, while the vulture of sedition
Feeds in the bosom of such great commanders.

This is clearly an allusion to the vulture which fed unceasingly on the liver of the giant Tityus, as described by Vergil.

It therefore appears that the writer of *The Tempest* and *Henry VI* was acquainted with Vergil's works.

(See *Classical Element*, etc., p. 376.)

In *Henry VI*, Part 2, Act VI, scene 1, we find the words:

Brutus' bastard hand stabb'd Julius Cæsar.

Plutarch relates that Savilia, the mother of Brutus, had been mistress to Julius Cæsar and that by some Brutus was thought to be Cæsar's son. Unless Will Shaksper had read Plutarch he would not be likely to know of this incident in Cæsar's life.

(See *Classical Element*, etc., p. 318.)

In *Titus Andronicus*, Act I, scene 2, we read:

> The Greeks upon advice did bury Ajax
> That slew himself; and wise Lærtes' son
> Did graciously plead for his funeral."

Steevens says that " this passage alone would sufficiently convince me that the play before us was the work of one who was conversant with the Greek tragedies in their original language. We have here a plain allusion to the *Ajax* of Sophocles, of which no translation was extant in the time of Shakespeare." A Latin version, as Mr. Theobald points out, existed in 1502. Theobald gives many other examples of Shakespeare's indebtedness to Sophocles.

(See *Elements Classical*, etc., pp. 329-342.)

* * * *

In *The Winter's Tale*, Act V, scene 2, we find:

> " No, the Princess hearing of her mother's statue, which is in the keeping of Paulina, a piece many years in doing, and now newly performed by that rare Italian Master Julio Romano."

The above extract shows that the writer of this Play must have himself travelled in Italy and seen Julio Romano's works in marble or else read *The Lives of Celebrated Italian Sculptors*, by Georgio Vasari, 1550.

(See *The Classical Element*, etc., pp. 368-9.)

* * * *

In *King Lear*, Act I, scene 4, we find the following:

> The hedge sparrow fed the cuckoo so long,
> That it had its head bit off by its young.

If Will Shaksper, who was born in the country, wrote this he ought to have known that the cuckoo does not bite off the head of its foster parent, but this incorrect statement is derived from Pliny.

Will Shaksper in his boyhood must have roamed the woods round Stratford-on-Avon, and yet in the Plays there is no reference to the birds and animals who inhabit woods.

(See *Classical Element*, etc., pp. 308-09.)

* * * *

There is another mistake in *Titus Andronicus* which is not likely to have appeared if Will Shaksper had been the author. In Act II, scene 3 of this Play we read:

> The Trees, though summer, yet forlorn and lean,
> O'ercome with moss and baleful mistletoe.

Shaksper would have known that mistletoe is not harmful to trees, but this effect of mistletoe on forest trees is set down in Pliny, who writes, " It is certain that trees are killed by ivy, and it is supposed that a similar injury results from mistletoe." The author of *Titus Andronicus*, who was Francis Bacon, has followed Pliny, as not being a countryman he did not know that mistletoe does not kill trees.

(See *Classical Element*, etc., pp. 314-5.)

SHAKESPEARE AND CATULLUS.

By R. L. EAGLE.

THE writings of Catullus were not translated into English until 1795. Although belonging to the golden age of Roman literature and culture, his poems have never been very popular or widely read. Caius Valerius Catullus was born at Verona B.C.84, the son of a wealthy Veronese gentleman who was a friend of Julius Cæsar. He came to Rome about 62 B.C.

Shakespeare was very familiar with his writings. The following examples showing how he applied his reading of the poems (which are mostly satirical, and often obscene) will, I think, be of interest to students :

Qui nunc it per iter tenebricosum
Illuc, unde negant redire quemquam.

(*Now he goes along the dark road whence, they say, no one returns*)

III.

The undiscovered country from whose bourn
No traveller returns.

Hamlet, III, 1.

Quare, si sapiet, viam vorabit.

(*Wherefore, if he is wise, he will devour the way*)

XXXV.

He seemed in running to devour the way.

2 Henry IV, I, 1.

Mentem amore revinciens,
Ut tenax hedera huc et huc,
Arborem implicat errans.

(*Binding her mind with love, as the clinging ivy entwines the tree*)

LXI.

Sleep thou, and I will wind thee in my arms ;
So doth the woodbine the sweet honeysuckle
Gently entwist ; the female ivy so
Enrings the barky fingers of the elm.

Midsummer Night's Dream, IV, 1.

Sic virgo dum intacta manet, dum cara suis est ;
Cum castum amisit polluto corpore florem,
Nec pueris iucunda manet nec cara puellis.

(*So a maiden, whilst she remains untouched, so long is she dear to her own ; when she has lost her chaste flower with sullied body, she remains neither lovely to boys, nor dear to girls*)

LXII.

For women are as roses, whose fair flower
Being once displayed, doth fall that very hour.

Twelfth Night, II, 4.

Virginatus non tota, tua est, ex parte parentum est ;
Tertia pars patri est, pars est data tertia matri,
Tertia sola tua est.

(*Your maidenhood is not all your own ; partly it belongs to your parents, a third part belongs to your father: a third to your mother, and only a third is yours*)

LXII.

Prospero (to Ferdinand): If I have too austerely punish'd you,
Your compensation makes amends ; for I
Have given you here a third of mine own life,
Or that for which I live.

Tempest, IV, 1.

" Third " is the Folio reading, but Lewis Theobald changed it to " thread." Some modern editions read " thrid," but Catullus makes the reading of " third " clear and correct.

Si quicquam mutis gratum acceptumve sepulcris
Accidere a nostro, Calve, dolore potest,
Quo desiderio veteres renovamus amores
Atque olim amissas flemus amicitias &c.

(*If the* silent *grave can receive any pleasure, or* sweetness *at all from our* woe, *Calvus, the grief and regret with which we make our old* loves *live again, and weep for long lost* friends; &c.)

XCVI.

When to the sessions of *sweet silent* thought
I summon up remembrance of things past,
I sigh the lack of many a thing I sought,
And with old woes new wail my dear time's waste:
Then can I drown an eye, unus'd to flow,
For precious *friends hid in death's dateless night*,
And weep afresh *love's* long since cancell'd *woe*,
And moan the expense of many a vanish'd sight:
Then can I grieve at grievances foregone,
And heavily from woe to woe tell o'er; &c.

Sonnet XXX.

Hoc tibi, quod potui, confectum carmine munus
Pro multis, Alli, redditur officiis,
Ne vestrum scabra tangat rubigine nomen
Haec atque illa dies atque alia atque alia.

(*I send you, Allius, this gift of verse, the best I could write, in return for many acts of friendship, that this day, or that, or that, may not touch your name with the rust of oblivion*)

LXVIII.

The general idea of these lines is reflected in several of the Shakespeare sonnets, *e.g.*, 55, &c. The last line I have quoted from this poem of Catullus appears to have suggested

Tomorrow, and tomorrow, and tomorrow

Macbeth, V, 5.

Odi et amo; quare id faciam, fortasse requiris:
Nescio sed fieri sentio et excrucior.

(*I hate and love, You, perhaps, ask how that can be. I know not; but I feel it, and I am in torment*)

LXXXV.

Who taught thee how to make me love thee more,
The more I hear and see just cause of hate.

Sonnet, 150.

The entire writings of Catullus which have survived amount to very little. In order to make up a volume, they are generally combined with those of Tibullus. There are several other possible Shakespearean sources in Catullus, but as it might be suggested that the thoughts and expressions are such as might have occurred to two writers independently, I have omitted them. The above parallelisms should be sufficient to prove that Shakespeare was familiar with Catullus, whose poems would not have been in the library, and certainly not read, by one whose Latin had not progressed beyond the standard of "small." Catullus has never been in the curriculum of a school. Even to-day nobody would dare to print an unexpurgated and complete translation.

IS BACON'S CIPHER IN PSALM 46?

By T. WRIGHT

"The human understanding from its peculiar nature, easily supposes a greater degree of order and equality in things than it really finds; and although many things in nature be sui generis *and most irregular, will yet invent parallels and conjugates and relatives, where no such thing is."*

. . . .

"The human understanding, when any proposition has been once laid down (either from general admission and belief, or from the pleasure it affords), orces everything else to add fresh support and confirmation."

. . . .

"Man always believes more readily that which he prefers. He, therefore, rejects difficulties for want of patience in investigation."

Novum Organum (version by Wood).

"You might prove anything by figures."—CARLYLE

THREE hundred years after Francis Bacon wrote the words of wisdom entered above, it still seems necessary to heed the warning they convey, and this applies to ourselves as Baconians just as much as to those who don't see eye-to-eye with us. There is ever mystery associated with the records of Bacon's life and writings: with the investigation of mystery there is fascination: with fascination, judgment may become disordered, and then arises the danger of the mind being conscious only of the notion of arriving successfully at a predetermined solution. This is certainly so in the field of cryptography, and particularly so in the matter of the numerical ciphers used by Francis Bacon. Recently, I came across a case of this, in which one of our members claimed that he had discovered Bacon's cipher signatures in a modern edition of the Bible, printed three hundred years after Bacon's time.

In BACONIANA, No. 113 (1944) was an article by Ernest G. Rose, under the heading '*A Biblical Reference to Francis Bacon.*' Accompanying the article was a photo-facsimile of Psalm 46, which, however, the writer of the article does not seem to have seen, as he made no reference to it, although it was vital to his investigation. Mr. Rose had read of the suggestion (jestingly made) that, in Psalm 46, it could be proved that Shakespeare wrote the Psalms, because the 46th word down from the beginning was SHAKE, and the 46th word up from the end was SPEARE. Intrigued by the repetition of the number 46, and wondering whether Francis Bacon had anything to do with the translation of the Bible, he set himself to find out whether Psalm 46 contained any cipher message. From *Francis Bacon Concealed and Revealed* (B. G. Theobald) he understood that, in order to decipher Bacon's cryptograms, it was necessary to use the originals. Yet, curiously enough, he did not do so, although Theobald had written—"It is absolutely necessary to consult either original editions of the various works under examination, or a photographic facsimile . . . Modern editions, however good, are therefore useless." Our writer had a copy of the 1911 reprint of the original 1611 Authorised Version of the Bible, and to this he turned. He found that it

agreed with the "specimens of 17th century printing as given in Mr. Theobald's book, particularly as regards ornamental capital letters at the beginning of chapters, which it is claimed are to be disregarded, as also words in italics." It is difficult to understand this statement, for Theobald's book gives no reproductions from the Bible, and such as are given are nearly all in modern type, as are the large capital letters. Moreover, the 1911 Reprint is not a facsimile, being about octavo in size, and printed in modern Roman type with occasional italics, and the large capital letters are also modern; whereas the original is folio in size and printed in black-letter type with occasional Roman, but no italics. However, our would-be decipherer proceeded to examine Psalm 46 as he found it in the 1911 Reprint.

Mr. Rose's first step was to count the words in the opening paragraph, and from the total, 34, deduct one word printed in italics, giving 33= BACON, in Simple Count. The actual text in both Reprint and Original being the same, this number of words will, of course, not vary; but Mr. Rose would not have found any italics in the Original to enable him to arrive at the all-important 33. The second step was to take the *letters* flanking the large initial letter, and from their total value in Simple Count, 69, deduct 2 for italic letters in the body of the first paragraph, giving 67=FRANCIS, in Simple Count. This 67 was then added to the 33 obtained in the first step, as above, to give 100="Bacon's mask." Now, the flanking letters here taken do not tally with the letters appearing in the same position in the 1611 Original, because the arrangement of lines differs in the two versions; and the total numerical value of those in the Original is 84, or 82, if we deduct 2 for italics, which, however, do not exist. So this cancels out the 67 (FRANCIS) obtained by Mr. Rose, and also the 100, resulting from its addition to the 33 obtained in the first step. The third and last step was to count the number of words "between" SHAKE and SPEARE, giving 111=BACON, in the K Cipher. Here, Mr. Rose seems to have accepted the positions given for SHAKE and SPEARE without question, although, to find them in the 46th places down and up, it is necessary to include all italics, but omit the word SELAH despite its being in the same type as the body of the text. However, he gets the 111 words "between" by the same method, that is, by including all italics, omitting SELAH twice, but including SHAKE and SPEARE.

We see, then, that our would-be decipherer did not go to the originals, and, in consequence, made a false start, from which it could not be expected that it would be possible to detect any cipher placed in the originals. Obviously, he must have predetermined that the cipher was indeed present, and that it but needed the exercise of his own ingenuity to reveal it, and (to quote Francis Bacon) he "forced everything else to add fresh support and confirmation." We, of course, do not criticise Mr. Rose personally; but the error should be corrected.

Assuming that Francis Bacon was associated with the editing of the Authorised Version of the Bible, it is to be questioned whether he would have used the actual text of Holy Writ as the medium for carrying his cipher signatures; but these might very well be found in the title-page and Introduction. That he did make use of the numerical counts, there can be little doubt; but, surely, it would have been in no uncertain way, and according to a definite plan known to the initiated. Certainly not in a manner that could be so easily discovered by Mr. Rose. One does not feel that these cipher signatures were intended to be for "posterity,"

that is ourselves; for Francis Bacon had already made provision for "posterity" in his Bi-literal Cipher story, in which he clearly indicates the particular writings of which he was the author, including the "Works of William Shakespeare." Yet, at the time of publication of those writings, often anonymous, it was possibly necessary to reveal the true authorship to his "twenty young gentlemen", his "able pens" and the Illuminati, who, with him, were secretly working for the founding of a new system for the advancement of knowledge. If that is so, would it not be more profitable to concentrate on a closer study of the Bi-literal Cipher, rather than spend valuable time in the search for cipher signatures?

Editorial Note—Mr. Wright contributes this article in a friendly and impartial spirit of criticism. We should welcome further opinions.

WHO WERE GABRIEL HARVEY AND THOMAS NASHE?

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

Part II

AT this time, Richard Harvey, Gabriel's brother, in the introduction to a book, *The Lamb of God*, dedicated to the Earl of Essex, and doubtless published with his financial help, made a strong attack upon Nashe, declaring that he did not know him at Cambridge. It is probable that (judging from the style) the address was the work of Gabriel, and this practically began the Harvey-Nashe controversy. Nashe had hitherto in his writings treated Gabriel with considerable respect, though three years later he was to cover him with ridicule, which points to the fact that the whole affair is fictitious. Nashe's next work (1592) was "*Pierce Pennilesse, his Supplication to the Devil*," as written by "Thomas Nashe, Gentleman." The book begins with a plaint (which formed a subject of Harvey's comments), and never were the woes of authors more vehemently echoed. Nashe proclaimed himself to the world as Pierce Pennilesse,—"the creature of genius, of famine, and despair" —and looking back on his literary life observed that he had, "sat up late and rose early, contended with the cold, and conversed with scarcity": he declares, "all my labours turned to loss,—I was despised and neglected, my pains not regarded, or slightly rewarded, and I myself in prime of my best wit laid open to poverty."

The author laments the death of "Gentle Sir Philip Sidney," which is rather curious as the latter had been dead six years, and the two men had probably not met, and he speaks of the better conditions which scholars enjoyed in Sidney's day, compared with those of his own. After a peculiar and somewhat unpleasant allegory of "Greedinesse" and of "Dame Niggardize" he proceeds to a denunciation of the vices and habits of the age. Although of comparative humble origin, Nashe, like 'Shakespeare', writes from an aristocratic standpoint, and whilst a strong advocate of uniformity in Church and State and for the maintenance of royal prerogative, he treats with contempt all popular religious expression. Equally with Bacon and 'Shakespeare', Nashe knew the Bible from beginning to end. He finds "almost as much confusion of Religion in every quarter, as there was of tongues at the building of the Tower of Babel." "We divide Christ's garment amongst us in so many pieces, and of the vesture of salvation make some of us Babies and apes coats, others straight trusses and Devils breeches." Bacon in his Essay *Of Unity in Religion* mentions, "as it is noted by one of the fathers, Christ's coat indeed had no seam, but the Church's vesture was of divers colours; whereupon he saith, 'In veste varietas sit, scissura non sit,' they be two things, unity and uniformity."

Among the vices, which Nashe censures, is gluttony, and he draws a contrast in this respect between England, Spain and Italy and then in a remarkable passage he discourses on drunkenness.

"Let him be indued with never so many virtues, and have as much goodly proportion and favour, as nature can bestow upon a man: yet if he be thirsty after his own destruction, and hath no joy or comfort, but when he is drowning his soul in a gallon pot, that one beastly imperfection will utterly obscure all that is Commendable in him." Hamlet's words immediately leap to mind:—

"They clepe us drunkards, and with swinish phrase
Soil our addition; and indeed it takes
From our achievements, though perform'd at height
The pith and marrow of our attribute."

and

"Their virtues else-be they as pure as grace,
As infinite a man may undergo—
Shall in the general censure take corruption
From that particular fault."

Next he deals with sloth and idleness, followed by a most able defence of plays as a safeguard and outlet against vices.

The author declares that a State enjoying peace, "is not half so strong or confirmed to endure as that which lives every hour in fear of invasion," and that if the people "have no service abroad they will make mutinies at home." Bacon expresses the same idea in his Essay, *Of the True Greatness of Kingdoms*, with which may be compared Shakespeare's:—

"Therefore, my Harry,
Be it thy course to busy giddy minds
With foreign quarrels."—(*Henry IV*, Pt. ii, iv. v.)

"For no play they have," wrote Nashe, "encourageth any man to tumults and rebellion, but lays before such the halter and the gallows, or praiseth or approveth pride, lust, whoredom, prodigality or drunkenness, but beats them down utterly."

"Our Players are not as players beyond sea, a sort of squirting bawdy Comedians, that have whores and common courtesans to play women's parts, and forebear no immodest speech or unchaste action that may procure laughter . . . our representations honourable, and full of gallant resolution, not consisting like theirs, of a Pantaloon, a Whore, and a Zany, but of Emperors, Kings and Princes." Doubtless the author was entering the lists against the militant hatred of the Puritans for the English stage.

Bacon, in his *De Augmentis* declared: "Stage-playing: an art which strengthens the memory, regulates the tone and effect of the voice and pronunciation, teaches a decent carriage of the countenace and gesture, gives not a little assurance, and accustoms young men to bear being looked at."

The author concludes his deeply interesting book:—

"And so I break off this endless argument of speech abruptly."

In *Christ's Tears over Jerusalem* (1593) dedicated somewhat intimately to Lady Elizabeth Carey, wife of Sir George Carey, the

son of Lord Hunsdon, the Queen's cousin, and Captain-General of the Isle of Wight (Nashe appears to have been on very friendly terms with his wife and daughter), together with Bacon and 'Shakespeare' he seeks to enrich the English tongue with coined words, in which he reveals a mastery of language. "For the compounding of my words, therefore, I imitate rich men who having gathered store of white single money together, convert a number of those small little scutes into great pieces of gold." "Therefore what did I but having a huge heap of those worthless shreds of small English in my Pia Mater purse to make the royaller show with them to men's eyes, had them to the compounders immediately, and exchanged them four into one, and others into more according to the Greek, French, Spanish and Italian."

In his dedicatory epistle the author speaks of a "handful of Jerusalem's mummianized earth," and he says the word 'mummianized' had been "shrewdly called in question" . . But "to Physicians and their confectioners," the word was "as familiar as Mumchance[1] amongst Pages, being nothing else but man's flesh long buried and broiled in the burning sands of Arabia. Therefore "Jerusalem's mummianized earth" is merely "Jerusalem's earth manured with man's flesh."

In this work Nashe treats of the inter-relation of the arts, with an attack on ignorant divines. "Human Arts are the steps and degrees Christ hath prescribed and assigned us, to climb up to heaven of Arts by, which is Divinity."

"Scripture we hotch-potch together," he writes, "and do not place it like Pearl and Gold-lace on a garment, here and there to adorn, but pile it and dung it upon heaps, without use or edification, We care not how we mispeak it, so we have it to speak. Out it flies East and West . . Violent are the most of our packhorse Pulpit-men in vomiting their duncery."

Then the writer shoots an arrow against the ladies of the Court—"They shew the swellings of their mind," he declares, "in the swellings and plumping out of their apparel."

He indulges in some fine imaginative flights in the *Terrors of the Night*, 1594, also dedicated to Lady Elizabeth Carey. "The Night is the Devil's Black book, wherein he recordeth all our transgressions. What do we talk of one devil? There is not a room in any man's house, but is pestered and close-packed with a camp royal of devils."

"When I was a little child" he wrote, "I was a great auditor of theirs (of "aged mumping beldames") and had all their witchcrafts at my fingers' ends."

In this work the author discusses dreams: "A dream is nothing else but a bubbling scum or froth of the fancy, which the day hath left undigested; or an after feast made of the fragments of idle imaginations." In *Sylva Sylvarum* Bacon stated:—"For imagination is like to work better upon sleeping men than men awake; as we shall show when we handle dreams." Aubrey in his *Brief Lives*, tells us

[1] A game of hazard played with cards in silence.

that Bacon "would often drink a good draught of strong beer (March beer) to-bedwards, to lay his working fancy asleep: which otherwise would keep him from sleeping great part of the night."

Then Nashe speaks very knowledgeably of the effects of torture on the imagination. "There is no man put to any torment, but quaketh and trembleth a great while after the executioner hath withdrawn his hand from him . . all the night time they quake and tremble after the terror of their late suffering, and still continue thinking of the perplexities they have endured."

Is this Bacon writing from his experience in examining accused people in the Tower on the rack; or here ruminating on the "law's delay?" "So there is no long sickness," wrote Nashe, "but is worse than death, for death is but a blow and away, whereas sickness is like a Chancery suit which hangs two or three year ere it can come to a judgment."

He bewails "long depending hope frivolously defeated, than which there is no greater misery on earth"—none, therefore, are more miserable than courtiers. "The poor hunger starved wretch at sea (Bacon in 1595 compares himself to "a tired sea-sick suitor," and Hamlet commented, "Sir, I lack advancement.") who still in expectation of a good voyage, endures more miseries than Job."

"The standing is slippery," said Bacon in his Essay *Of Great Place* "and the regress is either a downfall, or at least an eclipse, which is a melancholy thing."

The same year, 1594, there appeared, dedicated to the Earl of Southampton, a work in a totally different style, *The Unfortunate Traveller, or the Life of Jack Wilton*, the first of the picaresque novels in English literature.

The author indulges in a bitterly mocking account of a function, at a University, which later in *Christ's Tears* (1595 edition) he declares to be Wittenburg, and not an English establishment. "A most vain thing it is in many universities at this day, that they count him excellent eloquent, who stealeth not whole phrases but whole pages out of Tully. If of a number of shreds of his sentences he can shape an oration, from all the world he carries it way, although in truth it be no more than a fool's coat of many colours."

Here also Nashe puts up a very able and convincing defence of Aretine,[2] "one of the wittiest knaves that ever God made," who had been treated most contemptuously and savagely by Harvey. "If lascivious he were he may answer with Ovid . . . 'My life is chaste though wanton be my verse' . . what good Poet is or ever was there, who hath not had a little spice of wantonness in days?"

An account of a tourney is exactly parallel in style with Spenser's knights, and those in Sidney's *Arcadia*.

There are also passages in the book which might possibly have been written by an untravelled man, possessed of wits and of wide reading, but the improbability is so strong as to be hardly worth discussion.

2Pietro Aretine, 1492-1557. Notorious for his alleged disreputable life and licentious verses, had for patron, Francis I of France.

When the author writes, "I saw a summer banquetting house belonging to a merchant . . . it was built round of green marble . . . within there was a heaven and earth comprehended both under one roof, the heaven was a clear overhanging vault of crystal, wherein the sun and moon, and each visible star had his true similitude, shine, situation and motion . . . these spheres in their proper orb observe their circular wheelings and turnings, making a certain kind of soft angelical murmuring music in their often windings and going about; which music the philosophers say is the true heaven, by reason of the grossness of our senses, we are not capable of," there instantly rises to the mind the incomparable passage in *The Merchant of Venice*—

"There's not the smallest orb which thou beholdest
But in his motion like an angel sings,
Still quiring to the young-ey'd cherubims,
Such harmony is in immortals souls:
But, whilst this muddy vesture of decay,
Doth grossly close it in, we cannot hear it."

Nashe utters warnings against travelling abroad: "Let no man for any transitory pleasure sell away the inheritance of breathing he hath in the place where he was born. Get home, my young lad, lay thy bones peaceably in the sepulchre of thy fathers, wax old in overlooking thy grounds, be at hand to close the eyes of thy kindred."

Is not this Bacon, undoubtedly drawing on his own experience? From the *Discours sur M. Bacon* 1631, by Pierre Amboise—that mysterious work—we learn that he travelled in France, Spain and Italy. In a letter to the Earl of Rutland on travel, which he composed for the Earl of Essex, he dilates on the simplicity of the Englishman abroad.

Nashe's last work, 1599, was *Lenten Stuffe*, allegedly written as a burlesque panegyric on Yarmouth "the principal metropolis of the Red Fish" and its red herrings. On the title page it is declared to be a description of Yarmouth, "fit for all Clerks of Noblemen's Kitchens to be read, and not unnecessary by all serving men that have short board-wages to be remembered." The author states that, in fear of proceedings against him for his comedy *The Isle of Dogs* (now lost), which so markedly pointed to abuses in the State[3]—it is believed he was actually imprisoned—he "gave ground" and retired to Yarmouth, where he was so hospitably entertained, that he felt constrained to sing its praises. This no doubt is fictitious, as the whole work appears an imaginative construction out of books, which is rather evidenced by the writer expressing his intention of dealing similarly with other coast towns.

[3]The play was judged seditious by the Privy Council, and the players were committed to gaol, to be examined by the sinister Topcliffe. If Nashe was sent to the Fleet Prison, it would seem that he was quickly liberated, possibly through the intervention of either Whitgift or Bancroft, in view of his services in the Marprelate affair.

Yarmouth, Nashe wrote, "in rich situation exceedeth many cities . . . out of a hill or heap of sand, reared and enforced from the sea most miraculously." "Yarmouth, regal Yarmouth, of all maritimal towns that are no more but fisher towns, solely reigneth sans peer."

There are passages also in the book which bear distinct traces of Camden's *Britannia*.

Why should Nashe insert here a digression on gavelkind, a purely legal question, but a significant point? He was not a lawyer. And then he wanders on to a very striking completion, though burlesqued, of Marlowe's unfinished poem, "Hero and Leander." In one passage he practically admits that he was using a mask—"Let them look to themselves as they will, for I am theirs to gull them better than ever I have done, and this I am sure, I have distributed gudgeon dole amongst them, as God's plenty as any stripling of my slender portion of wit, far or near."

An attack upon lawyers could hardly have been written except by one of the fraternity, anxious for the reform of the law. "I speak of the worser sort, not of the best, whom I hold in high admiration, as well for their singular gifts of art and nature, as their untainted consciences with corruption: and from some of them I avow, I have heard as excellent things flow, as ever I observed in Tully or Demosthenes." Civil Law he called, "this uncivil Norman hotch-potch, this law of lead, that hath never a ring at the end to lift it up by, is without head or foot, the deformedst monster that may be." As Bacon wrote: "look into the state of your laws and justice of your land; purge out multiplicity of laws, clear the incertainty of them, repeal those that are snaring, and press the execution of those that are wholesome and necessary."

Nashe returns here to the question of the abuses of judicial examination and the employment of the rack to extort confessions—as in his *Terrors of the Night*—"The poor fellow so tyrannously handled would rather in that extremity of convulsion confess he crucified Jesus Christ, than abide it any longer." He is not opposed to torture if it be for the prince's safety, but treasons are sometimes pretended against them not out of zeal or love "as to pick thanks and curry a little favour."

At this period Bacon was frequently employed by the Government on taking confessions from prisoners on the rack, following the custom of the day, even if his private judgment condemned its use, except in genuine cases of treason.

In a sketch, however brief, of Nashe's supposed career, his connection with the Marprelate controversy, a pamphlet warfare carried on by the Elizabethan Puritans against the established system of Episcopacy (1589-90) cannot be passed over.

Libellous pamphlets by various writers, who adopted the generic *nom-de-guerre* of Martin Mar-prelate, poured from a moveable printing press, which was shifted from place to place, and thus escaped detection.

Nashe, it is said, placed his services at the disposal of Bancroft,

Bishop of London, the Press Censor, and never perhaps has there streamed forth such a rushing and roaring torrent of wit, ridicule and invective as in the rapid succession of pamphlets wherewith he plunged into the fray against the fanatics. Their ribaldry rebounded on themselves, when Nashe replied to their fulminations with his, "Pap with a hatchet, or a fig for my god-son; or Crack me this nut! To be sold at the sign of the Crab-tree Cudgel in Thwack Coat Lane," which was assailed by Harvey.[4] Not less biting was his, "Almond for a Parrot, or an Alms for Martin."

An earlier pamphlet called "Martin's Month Mind" (1589) which was no doubt the work of Nashe, although the writer signs himself "Marforius," describes in the Preface the object he had in view. "The Ape, the more sagely you look on him, the more he grinneth; and the fool, the more substantially you reason with him, the less he understandeth . . . It is therefore thought the best way . . . to answer the fools according to their foolishness." So in "Pap" the author apologises for his levity, pleading that it is useless to counter Martin with arguments.

Unbounded ridicule soon quashed the pamphleteers, and Bacon intervened in the question with his Paper—*On the Controversies of the Church*—favouring moderation and tolerance, wherein he expressed the strongest disapproval of the method adopted by the authorities. Was Bacon thus writing with his mask removed?

In Nashe's *Pasquils Return to England* (1589) wherein the political opinions expressed are entirely on a par with those of Bacon, the writer eulogizes Elizabeth very much in the style of the former's *Discourse in Praise of the Queen*, written when he was about thirty. "Hath God poured so many blessings upon the Church of England"—Nashe wrote—"by the very often, and very miraculous preservations of her sacred Majesty's royal person, and thereby given testimonies out of Heaven to the Religion of the land, and dares *Martin* attempt to make a doubt both of it and her?". . . "If we search it till the world's end, we shall find no other cause of this sweet harmony of peoples' hearts, that remain faithful and flexible to the shaking of her princely finger, but only this, the Religion of the Land."

In 'Pap,' the writer relates the supposed end of "Old Martin"—"This being done (his will having been read) it was not half an hour, but he began to faint; and turning on his left side, he belched twice: and as my friend Pasquin reporteth very truly the third time he belched out his breath." This pamphlet included an attack on Harvey in a totally irrelevant passage.

The Marprelate affair probably gave Nashe the idea of getting up a fictitious literary controversy of the type well-known in Italy. As his opponent he selected Gabriel Harvey, who had not published anything for twelve years, doubtless through lack of means, and he, thus gratified at the opportunity to appear in print, lent his willing co-operation to the scheme.

[4]This pamphlet was ascribed by Harvey to John Lilly, though it bears no relation to the "Euphuistic" style. "Surely Euphues was someway a pretty fellow: would God Lilly had always been Euphues and never Paphatchet."

Editorial Note—Part I appeared in BACONIANA, No. 142.

FRANCIS BACON'S SECRET HISTORY: SOME NOTES AND COMMENTS

By Brig.Gen. F. G. Fuller

AS most Baconian students are aware Francis Bacon was sent to France by Queen Elizabeth, when he was sixteen years old, in charge of Sir Amyas Paulet, her special Ambassador.

At the French Court he soon became attracted to a society, consisting of all the most literary figures in France, who named themselves Pleiades. Their object was to improve and embellish the French language and literature. He also became intimate with the Rosicrucians. Both these societies worked in great secrecy, and used all sorts of ciphers. Bacon was very attracted by their work, and intrigued by the ciphers.

His eager and forcible mind soon made him invent a cipher of his own, of which he eventually published a description, in his book *The Advancement of Learning*, and called it "The Biliteral Cipher." It required italic letters to be taken from two separate fonts of type (a) and (b). The letters of (a) font were to be made distinguishable from the same letters in the (b) font. The letters in the printed matter are used in groups of five, each consisting of a varying number of (a) and (b) letters, and each group representing one letter in the cipher message.

It is clear then that the ease, or difficulty of decoding the cipher would depend entirely on how the same letters varied in (a) font and (b) font. Bacon, when he eventually used this cipher, was desperately afraid of its being decoded by his enemies in his lifetime, and, therefore made it as difficult to read as possible, by using two fonts only slightly distinguishable from each other. This was not difficult to effect because the italic letters, used in print in his day, were cut by hand in little hardwood blocks, and consequently no two similar letters were exactly alike.

Colonel Fabyan, a well-known Baconian, towards the end of the last century, being very interested in ciphers, and an expert cryptographer, collected a team to decipher messages, contained in sixteenth and seventeenth century books, such messages often being found in them.

One of his assistants, Mrs. Gallup, and her sister, proved to be great acquisitions, and originally worked under Dr. Orville Owen, who discovered the Word Cipher. The former was interested in Bacon's description of his biliteral cipher in his *De Augmentis Scientiarum* and wondered whether he himself had used it. From one of the first editions of a work of his, she soon detected the presence of a biliteral cipher and managed eventually to read it.

With Colonel Fabyan's assistance and guidance she concentrated on this cipher, and found hidden messages in nearly forty books, printed between the years 1585 and 1635. The end of each message was signed, as a rule, by Bacon as Fra B or F.B. or Fra Rex and in later works as Verulam or St. Alban.

Mrs. Gallup had to travel to Washington and New York, and later to Oxford and London, to find the books she required. She spent her life doing this till her eyesight gave out. In the year 1900 the results of her work, up to that date, were published in America, to be met with a storm

of protest and incredulity. This did not prevent Mrs. Gallup from continuing for some years in order to complete her task, in spite of the fact that most people were led to believe the whole thing was a product of her imagination.

Yet any open minded person who read her book and studied the evidence, would very soon be convinced of her *bona fides*, since

(1) She was a very conscientious and talented woman devoted to an extremely exacting job.

(2) She worked with her sister, under Colonel Fabyan, a distinguished and wealthy American publicist, with a team. This would involve a conspiracy of three or more persons if the work were not genuine.

(3) When in England she stayed with Mr. Frank Woodward and his wife in London, when she and her sister often carried on the work in their presence.

(4) Henry Seymour, a cipher expert in this country managed to get two first folio copies of Bacon's *History of Henry VII*, one of the books deciphered by Mrs. Gallup, and after many months work he managed to decipher it. On comparison the result, except for two groups of two or three words, was identical with Mrs. Gallup's.

This last fact alone would appear to be conclusive.

(5) A large portion of the ciphers consists of instructions to the decipherer, as to what books to read and how to decode other ciphers of Bacon's. Interspersed in these directions are portions of the story of Bacon's life, parts of which, written in his beautiful English are directed to be collected together to form his "Cipher Story."

Shelley considered Bacon's prose to be the most poetical in English literature. Yet many people argue that the writer of Bacon's Essays could not have written poetry. His prose can be recognised in his Cipher Story and would require a genius to compose it.

(6) As stated, the biliteral Cipher can be made the most difficult yet invented, and only very experienced cryptographers with perfect eyesight can be dogmatic about it.

General Cartier, who was head of the cryptographic department of the French War Office, in the first world war, has written a book describing how he himself would tackle a biliteral cipher and declaring his full belief in Mrs. Gallup's work. He was in close communication with Col. Fabyan who originally introduced him to the Biliteral Cipher.

It is true that all cryptographers are not agreed on the matter, and think that decipherers may make mistakes. General Cartier agrees to this, but points out that mistakes could only occur, at the most, in two or three words at a time, not more, the odds against it being so fantastic. This is exemplified in Henry Seymour's decipher referred to previously.

The above six paragraphs convey the direct evidence, but if they are accepted, the circumstantial evidence is equally strong.

In his ciphers, Bacon asserts that he was the son of Queen Elizabeth and the Earl of Leicester, and that the Earl of Essex was so also, and thus his younger brother. He was told this by the Queen herself and by Lady Bacon his foster mother. The latter told him that his parents were married after the death of Amy Robsart, Leicester's wife, and before his birth.

That he was not Sir Nicholas Bacon's son seems clear from the fact that the latter, though a very rich man, who left his son Anthony Bacon several properties and his daughters well off, did not mention Francis in his will, though he was very fond of him.

As the elder son of the Queen he was, in his opinion, the rightful heir to the throne.

When in Paris, he fell violently in love with Marguerite de Valois, wife of Henry of Navarre, and his love was reciprocated. He wanted to marry her (and she was seeking a divorce), but Elizabeth would not agree.

He claims to have written the works of Shakespeare, Marlowe, Spenser's *Faerie ueen* (the last in honour of Marguerite), and the works of Greene and Peele.

Now all critics seem to agree that *Hamlet* is the most self revealing of Shakespeare's plays. Yet none of the facts known of Shakespeare of Stratford, seem to fit in any way with Hamlet either in character or circumstances.

On the other hand *Hamlet* seems to be almost an autobiography of Francis Bacon himself:

(a) He was heir to the throne.
(b) Marguerite was in a sense his Ophelia.
(c) His father caused his first wife to be murdered, to marry his mother the Queen, who condoned the offence. Not very different from Hamlet.
(d) His parents wanted to put him on one side as did Hamlet's.
(e) When the Players came on the scene, Hamlet asks the leading player to insert some lines of his in the play. This is just what Bacon had been doing to Shakespeare, and the latter may well have been the model for the leading player.
(f) Hamlet was a philosopher; so was Bacon, the greatest of his day.
(g) Hamlet shows indecision of character, so did Bacon.
(h) Bacon affirms that he portrayed his own experience in his plays, and mentions *The Tempest* ahd *As You like It*, where the rightful king is denied his throne.

In *Love's Labour Lost*, the earliest Shakespeare play, the author shews an intimate knowledge of the Court of Navarre, the venue of the play, the principal characters being given the names of courtiers then at Navarre, Marguerite obviously being the Princess. Francis Bacon almost certainly must have visited Navarre and his foster brother Anthony was accredited to the Court.

Bacon acknowledges that he was intensely ambitious. In his ciphers he stresses his royal birth twenty seven times in different volumes. On the other hand he only claims directly three or four times that he wrote Shakespeare, though he comments on his plays by name now and then.

Would anyone, if capable of inventing the cipher story, have made such a point of the royal birth as compared with the authorship of the plays; or for that matter, reiterated his birth so often?

Bacon's explanation of his writing under assumed names, is that he would have forfeited his life if he had acknowledged the authorship, especially, of his Historic plays.

He gives the same reason for writing his life story in cipher, and for disseminating it, in short pieces, in several books.

Referring to the plays, he disclaims the reason that playwriters were looked on with contempt, but, when hoping to occupy the throne, he may well have been considering the strong feeling against the theatre. He says that he wrote in different styles to suit his various *noms-de-plume*, and to expand the vocabulary he used. He instances *The Faerie Queen* where he borrows words from Chaucer.

One of his main objects was to enrich the English language, as the Pleiades were the French tongue.

Bacon says he had to pay the people under whose names he wrote, to ensure their silence. This seems to be confirmed in a letter by Spenser to a friend, in which he complains that he had to allow a young man to write under his name. It also explains how Shakespeare became comparatively well off.

New and fanciful books about Shakespeare keep on being published by Stratfordian believers usually of the "it can easily be imagined" variety.

The book published by Ivor Brown the year before last, however, though of this variety, is of peculiar interest. He deals at length with the dates of the plays, and divides them into seven periods:—the sixth he calls the "dark vision" containing all the darkest tragedies. He dates this as commencing in 1602. This is almost immediately after the execution of Bacon's brother Essex, at whose trial the former had taken a leading part. In his cipher story Bacon makes it clear that he was absolutely overwhelmed by remorse, and although he tries to throw all the responsibility on to Elizabeth, it is evident that his conscience would not let him do so. It explains the dark vision which lasted for several years. Ivor Brown calls Shakespeare's the "Hand of Glory," and says it can be traced infallibly in any lines written by him. He says that, curiously enough, you can discern the "hand of glory" in Marlowe. It is not curious because Bacon says he wrote Marlowe as well as Shakespeare.

Critics seem to conspire in constructing an imaginary Shakespeare, according to their fancy, and flouting any questioner, but they forget that all the evidence, in biliteral cipher, is still contained in the various libraries, and only awaits a second decipherer, of outstanding ability and perseverance, to confirm all Mrs. Gallup's work, as Mr. Seymour did with a portion of it.

The almost complete lack of contemporary information about Shakespeare is a strange fact considering that he was the supposed author of the plays published under his name.

The authors of the numerous books about him, which are published year by year, have to imagine his character and personality by deducing them from the speeches and opinions of the principal figures in the plays.

Prejudice unfortunately prevents them from consulting the best evidence available about him, namely that of Francis Bacon in his Biliteral Cypher, which contains several references to him.

The following extracts from his Biliteral Cypher together tell us a good deal.

> In *Colin Clout*, Bacon says "Marlowe is also a pen name ere taking Wm Shakespeare as my mark or vizard that I should remain unknown."
>
> In *Masques*, he says: "When I have assumed men's names the next step is to create for each a style natural to the man."
>
> In *Hamlet*, he says: "In this actor we now employ is a witty vein different from any formerly employed. In truth it suiteth well with a native spirit humerous and grave in turns in oneself. Therefore when we create a part that hath him in mind the play is correspondingly better therefore."

Bacon appears thus to have modelled some of his characters on Shakespeare, though it is often suggested that he was a very poor actor because his name does not appear in the record of plays performed at court.

This does not seem to have been Bacon's opinion for in *Titus Andronicus*, he says in cypher:

> "Whilst there may even be a work found to afford opportunity to actors who may play those powerful parts which are now so greeted with great acclayme, to win such name and honours as Wil Shakespeare of the Globe so well did win acting our dramas."

It is clear from this that Shakespeare was not a bad actor but perhaps he acted only in character parts leaving the name parts to such men as Burbage, etc. This is perhaps confirmed by the following extract. In *Historia Vitae et Mortis*, Bacon says in cypher—

> "The first part of Henry the fourth the second part of the same and one entitled *Othello* reveal knowledge of life wanting in the common plaies that had this pen name on the title page. These are I have many times said the crowning glory of my pen."

Bacon here seems undoubtedly to refer to the knowledge of life shown in the part of Falstaff in *Henry IV* and of Iago in *Othello*.

It seems therefore that Bacon had Shaksper in mind when he created the part of Falstaff "and the play is correspondingly better therefore." In other words Shaksper was the model for Falstaff and if so the converse must also be true and a study of Falstaff should tell us much about the character of Shaksper, who seems therefore to have been a man of very strong personality, a vain and unscrupulous though not unattractive rogue. Bacon obviously cast himself for Prince Hal, berated by the King for consorting with players as he was himself by Elizabeth.

Robert Cecil by the way seems to have been the model for Iago as he was always pouring poison into Elizabeth's ear about Bacon.

BACON SHAKESPEARE "INVENTION"

By Lewis Biddulph

WHAT did Shakespeare mean or understand by the word "invention" as applied to literary production? Did he mean something new? Something never before heard of? What does he mean in Sonnet -6 where he writes:

"Why is my verse so barren of new pride?
So far from variation or quick change
Why write I still all one ever the same
And keep invention in a noted Weed?
So all my best is dressing old words new
Spending again what is already spent."

As a preliminary I must apologise to the reader for lifting lines out of their setting and applying their meaning in other than the obvious intention, but the truth is that the body of the Shakespeare text is not unlike the old Sibylline oracles or our own sacred text. A sermon hangs on almost every line.

It must be assumed, or taken for granted, that the word Invention does not mean inventing new stories or tales or the creating of something out of nothing. The poet invents or creates, as his name signifies, that something new out of what already exists. The great poets may be termed Alchemists because they transmute the base matter on which they have to work into a new and glittering fabric of golden tissue, dressing old words anew, as for example Homer, Vergil, Milton and Dante. Aristotle would have us believe that Homer invented every detail, every name of every character in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* together with the gods and goddesses out of his own head. In fact that all the Greek mythology and Pantheon was entirely due to Homer's creative imagination. *Credat Judaeus*. On the other hand, Plato quotes the priests of Sais in Egypt as telling Solon that the Greeks had no knowledge of antiquity or antiquity of knowledge: "in mind you are all young; there is no old opinion handed down among you by ancient tradition, nor any science which is hoary with age." They had forgotten both their ancestry and their past history.

All great poets and writers join in refuting this theory of Aristotle by their works. Does not the wise king Solomon say there is no new thing under the Sun? But let us return to the art of Invention in the literary sense. Who does not know that the delightful 18th century Sterne created much of his writing by unravelling old writings and out of old words and ideas making new matter? In plain English, Sterne has been accused of plagiarism. Was Dean Swift hinting at this when he wrote of the imaginary visit to the University of Laputa by that famous traveller, Lemuel Gulliver, who whilst staying there was permitted to visit the Grand Academy for experimenting with "speculative arts"? I will quote the passage which appears to me to be of peculiar interest to our subject, namely the invention of new literature. (It may seem that some or at least one of our present day literary experts may have taken a leaf out of Gulliver's note book).

"The first professor I saw was in a very large room with forty pupils about him. After salutation, observing me to look earnestly upon a frame which took up the greatest part of the length and breadth of the room, he said 'Perhaps I might wonder to see him employed in a project for the improvement of speculative knowledge by mechanical operations and the world would soon be sensible of its usefulness. Everybody knows how laborious the usual method is of attaining to arts and sciences, whereas by his contrivance the most ignorant person at a reasonable charge and with a little bodily labour might write books in philosophy, poetry, politics, laws, mathematics and theology without the least assistance from genius or study.'

He then led me to the frame, about the sides whereof all his pupils stood in ranks. The frame was 20 ft. square and was placed in the middle of the room. The superficies was composed of several bits of wood, about the bigness of a die, but some larger than others. They were all linked together by slender wires. These bits of wood were covered on every square with paper pasted on them; and on these papers were written all the words of their language in their several moods, tenses and declensions, but without any order. The professor then desired me 'to observe for he was going to set his engine to work.' The pupils then, at his command, took each of them hold of an iron handle, whereof there were forty fixed round the edges of the frame, and giving them a sudden turn the whole disposition of the words was entirely changed. He then commanded six and thirty of the lads to read the several lines softly as they appeared upon the frame, and when they found three or four words together that might make part of a sentence they dictated to the four remaining boys who were scribes. This work was repeated three or four times; and at every turn the engine was so contrived that the words shifted into new places as the square bits of wood moved upside down.

"Six hours a day the young students were employed with this labour and the professor showed me several large volumes in folio already collected of broken sentences which he intended to piece together and out of these rich materials to give the world a complete body of all arts and sciences; which, however, might be still improved and much expedited if the public would raise a fund for making and employing 500 such frames in Lagado. He assured me that the *invention* had employed all his thought from his youth, that he had emptied the whole vocabulary into his frame and made the strictest computation of the general proportion there is in books between the number of particles, nouns, verbs and other parts of speech."

Such is the satirical fable propounded by the witty Dean. One cannot help thinking of Dr. Orville Owen's Word Cypher. Could Dean Swift have heard of it in some way by private oral tradition, or was he merely drawing a bow at a venture? If so, the arrow has hit the mark in the method avowedly employed by not a few literary practitioners of to-day.

ALLEYN AND FRANCIS BACON

EDWARD ALLEYN, the leading actor of the Admiral's Company, was even more famous in his day than Burbage. He was a careful and astute man of business, and was one of those fortunate people who turn everything they touch to gold. If actors were paid as poorly as the play-writers then Alleyn did not make his fortune on the stage. We know, from Henslowe's Diary, that the dramatists received a miserable pittance but, unhappily, there are no records of what the actors were paid. Alleyn was proprietor of the Bear Garden on Bankside, and we have his own word for it that on an outlay of £450, it brought him in £60 a year—quite a good income in relation to present day money values. And so it was with everything in which he dealt. He was born in 1566 and in 1592 married Joan Woodwarde. It is assumed that she brought him a considerable amount of property. Joan was step-daughter of Phillip Henslowe—part owner with Alleyn of the Rose and Fortune Theatres.

As an example of Alleyn's luck, it is interesting to point out that in 1604 he purchased the lease of Kennington manor for £1065 and sold it in 1609 to Sir Francis Calton for £2000. He then became interested in the manor of Dulwich, and by successive steps bought the manor from Sir Edmond Bowyer, Thomas Calton and others between 1606 and 1614. He had given up acting in 1603 though he continued to take part in the management of the Fortune until at least 1612 when Henslowe died. In 1613 he entered into a contract for the erection of a chapel, schoolhouse and twelve almshouses on his Dulwich property. In 1616, the College was so far ready that the chapel was consecrated by Archbishop Abbott on 1st September, and twelve poor scholars, with their master and usher, were admitted in 1617. He had to encounter certain difficulties and one proceeded from Lord Chancellor Bacon, partly on account of the financial detriment to the Crown, and partly on the ground that "hospitals abound and beggars abound never a whit the less." These reasons Bacon explained in a letter to Buckingham, and he proposed that the endowment should be reduced from £800 to £500. The patent did not pass the Great Seal until 21st June, 1619, and the corporate existence of the College dates from 13th September following. I think it highly probable that this opposition to the higher amount of endowment proceeded from the Crown and that Bacon was merely the mouthpiece of the King.

On this memorable day Alleyn publicly read and subscribed the Deed of Foundation in the chapel before a distinguished company, whom he afterwards entertained at dinner. The first name in the list of guests is that of Bacon, whose presence on the occasion did equal honour to himself and his host. We observe from Alleyn's Diary that on 17th August, 1618 he writes, "I went to London to ye Lo: Chancellors about stayeing ye patent," and on 29th August of that year: "water to ye Lord Chancellors." On 15th July, 1619, he again called on Bacon: "againe to Lor: Chancellor for ye sealle." It was

handed to Alleyn on the following day. Also among those present at the Foundation were Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel, and Inigo Jones. Bacon's secretary, Richard Jones, was also present. In the picture Gallery on the Alleyn Estate in Dulwich Village one of the four copies recording the Foundation, and signed by Alleyn and Bacon and the other notable persons present on the occasion, was on view. The Gallery was destroyed by an incendiary bomb during the war, but I understand that the best pictures and the documents had been previously removed to a place of safety.

There is an account of the ceremony by Edward Howes, who also signed as one of the witnesses, in his continuation of Stow's Chronicle (1631, p.1032).

One of the interesting manuscripts at Dulwich is described as:

> "Petition to Francis, Lord Verulam, Lord Chancellor, from Ursley Sherbeyrd, widow, 'daughter of Basile Johnson, servante to (Sir Nicholas Bacon) your honours honorable father in the Chancery, and kinswoman to Jeremy Becknum,' praying him for a letter to Edw. Alleyn to receive her 'amongst the nomber of his pentioners'; *no date*. Below is a note by Bacon, 'write a letter to the purpose desired, Octob: 7: 1615.
>
> Fr. V. Ca.'

There is a letter from Bacon to Buckingham dated 18th August, 1618 (the day after Alleyn had paid him a visit in connection with the Foundation) in which he writes, "I like well that Allen playeth the last act of his life so well."

R. L. Eagle.

UNIVERSITY LIFE AT POITIERS IN THE TIME OF FRANCIS BACON

By Professor M. L. Bonnichon (Lycée de Poitiers)

WHEN Joan of Arc came to inform Charles VII of her divine mission, he decided to take her to Poitiers so that the Doctors might examine her. The good townsfolk saw her set out for the pyre which awaited her at Rouen.

At the very moment when intolerance and passion were triumphant in Rouen, the Pope was taking steps which aimed at extending over Joan's country the beneficent influence of Reason. On 29th May, 1431, His Holiness Eugene IV had instituted by Papal Bull the University of Poitiers. Charles VII was to take the young institution under his protection and give it his particular attention. By letters patent of March 16th, 1432, he ratified its construction and endowed it with numerous privileges. On February 1st, 1432, the University statutes were drawn up by an assembly of Doctors and Aldermen. Jean Lambert, Professor of Theology, was appointed Rector. The first lessons were given in this same month of February in the Jacobins' convent. A new place of culture had been created, which was soon to attract numerous French and foreign students.

The University comprised four faculties: Theology, Law, Medicine, Arts. The students were divided into four nations: France, Aquitaine, Touraine, Berry. Germans, Englishmen, Scotchmen, mingled with the French "escholiers". Like all students all over the world, this youthful company was very picturesque and turbulent.

In vain did the Faculty of Arts request them to "walk respectably in proper clothes and not to sin either in deed or dress . . and other things"![1]

The feeling of reverence so dear to Carlyle had not yet touched these young minds. And many must later have sighed with the "poet-scholar" Villon:

> Ah! God, had I but studied more
> And listened to the moral law,
> When I was young and wild!
> Now home I'd have and bedding soft.
> Instead I shunned the school full oft,
> Like any naughty child.

The citizens of Poitiers, from the windows of their comfortable dwellings, used to look at them with a half-indulgent, half-reproving air as they passed by in gay and noisy groups.

No wonder Rabelais echoed their pranks:—

> "Then he sent him to the school to learn and to spend his youth in virtue; in the prosecution of which design he came first to Poitiers, where, as he studied and profited very much, he saw that the scholars were often times idle, and knew not how to bestow their time, which moved him to take such compassion on them, that one day he took from a long ledge of rocks (called the Passelourdin) a huge stone of about twelve fathom square, and fourteen handfuls thick, and with great ease set it upon four pillars in the midst of a field, to no other end but that the said scholars, when they had nothing else to do, might pass their time in getting up on that stone, and feast it with

[1] Quoted by P. Boissannade—*La Faculte des Lettres de Poitiers*—Poitiers—1922, pp.10-11.

store of gammons, pasties, and flaggons, and carve their names upon it with a knife; . . ."[2]

A century later to the effervescence of student life was added the turmoil of religious strife. 1562 was a year of fever for Poitiers where Calvin had come in 1534 to sow the new ideas. When King Henry III resumed the war against the Protestants, he installed himself at Poitiers with his whole court. The king of France was welcomed in the old city with great solemnity by the Mayor Raoul D'Elbenne on July 2nd, 1577. In the royal retinue was a young man fresh from Cambridge, with a pleasant, intelligent face, Francis Bacon.[3]

Bacon had come to France with the English ambassador to the French Court, Sir Amyas Paulet, and had followed him as he moved about in accordance with the changes in the royal residence, particularly to Blois, Tours and Poitiers. We may therefore legitimately fix the date of Bacon's arrival in Poitiers as July 2nd, 1577.

He had left Cambridge very dissatisfied with the teaching given there. There is surely nothing odd in his wishing to sit at the feet of the renowned Masters of Poitiers;—were it only for purposes of comparison. The University of Poitiers was at that time one of the first of France after Paris, and, under Lewis XII, it had numbered 4,000 students. There are no documents—at least to our knowledge—which might have enlightened us as to this sojourn of the future author of the *Novum Organum* in the old city. In the article on Lord Bacon in *Chamber's Cyclopaedia of English Literature* we find the following sentence:

> "After spending three years at Cambridge, he went to France, where he resided about three years, chiefly at Poitiers, pursuing closely his studies." (I. 196-197)

Personally, we incline to the belief that his stay was quite a short one. In fact, Henry III left Poitiers on October 5th, 1577. From there he went to La Fere, where he met his sister Marguerite; then, followed by his Court, he returned to Paris. "The Court having arrived at Paris"—writes Mongez—"the balls and the festivities which the war, the King's journey to Poitou, and above all the absence of the beautiful Queen of Navarre had suspended, were resumed."[4]

The same author stresses the number of foreigners then in Paris, all fervent admirers of the fair Marguerite. It seems pretty certain that the young Bacon was among them.

In July 1578 the Queen Mother and the Queen of Navarre left Paris to pay a diplomatic visit to the future Henry IV, the leader of the Huguenot party. The two queens spent the months of December 1578 and January-February 1579 at Nerac. Was Bacon in their suite? Was it at Nerac that he learnt of his father's death, which had occurred on February 20th, 1579, and which forced him to leave France? It is very possible, and it is tempting to believe it, for then one of the problems of *Love's Labour's Lost* would be solved.

Be that as it may, and even if Francis Bacon did not long listen to the Masters of Poitiers, the University has been anxious to honour his memory—equally with that of Rene Descartes—by giving his name to one of its amphitheatres.

([2]) *The Works of Francis Rabelais*—Translated from the French by Sir Thomas Urquhart and Motteux—London—1876—Book II—Chap. v., p.163

([3]) We have found most of these particulars of Henry III's visit to Poitiers in: Jehan Pictave: *Poitiers, ses Monuments, son Histoire.* Poitiers. 1909. pp.123-124.

([4]) M. A. Mongez—*Histoire de la Reine Marguerite de Valois premiere femme du roi Henri IV*—Paris. MDCC. LXXVII. p.204

WHITGIFT'S ACCOUNTS FOR FRANCIS AND ANTHONY BACON AT TRINITY COLLEGE

FROM Whitgift's ledgers, in which he recorded the expenses he paid out on behalf of pupils placed in his charge at Trinity, we can gather some interesting information as to the health and studies of Francis and Anthony Bacon. Edward Coke and Essex were also among his pupils at different times. From time to time Whitgift sent in his accounts to the parent or guardian. He advanced money for such items as commons, furniture, books, stationery, candles, medicines, hire of horses, clothes, etc. The brothers Francis and Anthony went up to Trinity in April, 1573, Francis being then a little over 12 years of age, and Anthony 15. Both matriculated on the same day, June 10th, 1579. Neither possessed a good constitution. Anthony, in particular, was at an early age subject to rheumatic disorders and other infirmities. Francis was delicate throughout his life and suffered from sleeplessness.

It is strange to read that 3 pairs of shoes cost 3s. 4d. As they had 21 pairs in this half year, it was fortunate for Sir Nicholas that they were so cheap! We must remember, however, that we have to multiply those prices by about four times to get the present-day equivalents. This makes the cost of books very high. Two copies of Plato's works cost 24s., and two copies of Aristotle's works, 36s. These were big books, and small ones like Cicero's "De Oratore" cost only 4s., or about 16s. in modern money.

A candle was 3s. Their matriculation is down as 6s. Two loads of coals are entered as 30s., and 6d. was paid for "cutting of wood." "A stone Jugg" was bought for 10d. Both had illnesses during the period, as we learn from the following items:

for Anthonie beeing syck	xij	s.	vj	d.	(12s. 6d.)
more in the time of his sycknes	v	s.	vj	d.	(5s. 6d.)
more in his sycknes	x	s.	iiij	d.	(10s. 4d.)
oyle for Frances neck			xij	d.	(1s. od.)
conserve of barberies			x	d.	(10d.)
for other meate when he was syck	iij	s.	4	d.	(3s. 4d.)
to the potiquarie when Frances was syck	iij	s.			(3s. od.)
for meate for Fraunces beeing syck	iiij	s.	iiij	d.	(4s. 4d.)

Whitgift bought "2 tables for there studies" for 10s., and "2 deskes" for 6s.

We learn that 2 horses were hired for 7 days for a visit to Redgrave at a charge of 9s. 4d. The next item is a curious one reading "for dressing horsse and horssemeat at my L. northes at Redgrave." This cost 2s. 10d., and presumably refers to food for the horses, unless one of the horses died and was "dressed" as meat!

Lord North would be the second Lord North (Roger, 1530-1600). He was the elder brother of Sir Thomas North, the translator of Plutarch. Lord North was Knight of the Shire of Cambridge, and High Steward of the Town of Cambridge. In 1596 he was made Treasurer of the Household and was known to have been a patron of players. He was sent as Ambassador Extraordinary to the Court of Henry III of France to congratulate him on his accession in 1574. In Paris he resided with Dr. Valentine Dale, the appointed Ambassador at that time. Lord North returned in November 1574. Redgrave was the seat in Suffolk owned by Sir Nicholas Bacon. It was left to his eldest son, Nicholas, by the will of his father. Lord North was apparently staying at Redgrave, and I suggest that the object of the visit of Francis and Anthony was that they should be given information and advice from one who had just returned from the Court of Henry II, it having been already determined that the two young men should be sent to France when they left Cambridge.

We know very little of the boyhood of Francis Bacon and any scraps we can unearth from the documents of the period are valuable. Whitgift's accounts do throw some intimate light upon his life, studies and health while at Cambridge. To the credit of Whitgift's account is "receavyd xxvj l. xiij s. iiij d. (£26 13s. 4d.). I am not sure whether this was an advance towards general expenses, or the fee for tuition.

R. . E.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of BACONIANA

Sir,

DID FRANCIS BACON DIE IN 1626?

Allow me to make still some observations, which were unknown to me when writing my last letter, on your article about Bacon's death.

In Lord Campbell's "Lives of the Lord Chancellors and Keepers of the Great Seal of England", is mentioned that the office of Lord Chancellor some times was given for life, but this is not mentioned in Bacon's case. His predecessors from 1547 were all created Lord Chancellor, except Sir Nicholas Bacon and Sir John Puckering.

In consequence of his sentence in 1621 Francis Bacon "should be for ever incapable of holding any public office, place or employment." In 1624 he received a full pardon, but he was not reinstated in his offices for Williams remained Lord Keeper of the Great Seal.

However, was the King bound by the regulation "for life?" It seems not to be the case as in 1641, when Bacon was still alive, the Lord Chancellor's office was offered by King Charles to Lord Essex. (Coissac de Chavrebiere. Histoire des Stuarts. p. 178).

This proves that the appointment of Sir Edward Hyde in 1657-58 did not depend on Bacon's death.

An explanation why Hyde was created Lord Chancellor in 1657-58 would take up too much room. This point is referred to in Lord Campbell's book, Vol. IV.

> "It was suggested in council, that as Charles was now formally recognised as King of England by Spain, and was entering into a regular treaty, offensive and defensive, with that country, it would be proper that his own Court should assume more the aspect of royalty, and that he should have a Lord High Chancellor.
> There was only one person that could be named for this distinction."
> p. (56)

I may now state:—

that it is not known to me that any person has suggested another person than Dr. Speckman did for the unknown and hypothetical Paulus Jenischius, born in 1558:

that the Editor did not contradict this solution but only wrote the hypothethis was altogether far-fetched and did not sound convincing.

With apologies to the Editor I remain of another opinion.

Andrea could not mention the name of the real person, nor the date of his birth, his wife having remarried after his escape to the Continent and being still alive. He chose therefore a name, which had not been mentioned in his correspondence with the princes and which might even be unknown to them, expecting to make them eager to guess at the real person.

However in the description of this person, Andreae could point out cautiously to Francis Bacon.

To make everything clear as as possible Andreae turned attention to the number 19 and from the year of his birth 1558, after diminishing it with the sum of the number 19, to the numbers **19** and **81**, the sum of which is **100**, the well-known cypher of Francis Bacon.

From Andreae's letter it follows that he and Francis Bacon were intimates which might throw some light on the pictures, mentioned in BACONIANA Nos. 126 and 140.

It would be interesting if the correspondence with the Princes would be studied once more, but I am too old for that.

Andreae's correspondence 1643-1649 was edited under the title:

"Joh. Val. Andreae domus Augustae Selenianae princ. juventutis, utriusque sexus, pietatis, eruditionis, comitatisque exemplum." Ulm 1654.

In an edition of 1649 the title was: Augustalia Seleniana incepta.

Yours sincerely,

L. DE RANDWYCK (COUNT).

Aerdenhout, Holland.

EDITORIAL NOTE.—In an earlier letter our correspondent apologises for an error. The sentence inserted in his communication printed in the New Year Number "that the unknown person was a man of high birth, etc." was not from Andreae but from Dr. Speckman.

To the Editor of BACONIANA

Sir,

"TIME REVEALING TRUTH," AND OTHER BOOK EMBLEMS

In BACONIANA (Summer 1948) the emblematical device from the title-page of the first edition of *New Atlantis* is reproduced. This edition was published within a year or two of Bacon's death. The probable date is 1627, and the printer and publisher are assumed, on good evidence, to have been A. Matthews and William Law. Neither date, printer nor publisher are mentioned on this title-page. The device is the well-known one showing Time rescuing Truth from a cave. The motto is "*Tempore patet occulta Veritas.*" This device was

first reproduced in BACONIANA, October 1911, as having special significance in connection with Francis Bacon. Since then others have followed.

The history of this block is interesting, as it is of most printers' and publishers' devices, title-pages, headpieces, tailpieces &c. These were lent, borrowed, sold or otherwise transferred from printer to printer, and publisher to publisher. The block under discussion was first used on Chapman's *Ovid's Banquet of Sense* in 1595. The printer was Richard Smith, and, if the block on *New Atlantis* be examined it will be seen that it still bears the initials "R.S." From Smith it passed to the bookseller, W. Wood, and was used by him on *Diet's Dry Dinner* by H. Buttes. The printer was Thomas Creede. In 1624, it came into the possession of the printer, A. Matthews, who used it on *Youth Know Thyself* by R. Turner. It was still in his hands in 1633, for it is found in that year on *Catalogus Librorum*, which he printed. Finally, it is on *Annotations upon the Book of Moses* in 1639 by H. Ainsworth, printed by M. Parsons for J. Bellamy, still bearing the initials of the original owner after 44 years. The emblem was copied from one used by C. Badius—a printer of Geneva—in 1554.

Mention of Geneva directs attention to the title-page of *A Midsommer Nights Dreame* dated 1600. This is the edition "Printed by James Roberts" without a publisher's name. The device on the title-page consists of the arms of the City of Geneva, with the motto, "Post Tenebras Lux." This block was originally used on, and specially chosen for, *The Laws and Statutes of Geneva*, printed by R. Hall in 1560. It was passed to Roberts in 1599; to William Jaggard in 1606, and finally to Thomas Cotes in 1627. All these printers used it on books having no possible connection with Geneva. There was a large English colony in that City composed of protestants who had fled from the terror of Mary's reign. They had their own Church, printing-presses &c. and this block was one of several which were brought to England when the printers returned. They also brought back headpieces, tailpieces, type, &c.

It is curious that there should have been another edition of *A Midsommer Nights Dreame* in 1600. This was "Imprinted at London for Thomas Fisher," and has Fisher's device of a Kingfisher. No printer's name is given, but the type is *not* the same as that used by Roberts. The only entry on the Stationers' Register is in the name of Thomas Fisher, on 8th October 1600. The "Roberts" edition has some corrections in spelling; improvements in punctuation, and additional stage-directions. It is most unlikely that there would be such a demand that two quartos should be set up in the same year by different printers. There seems to me to be no doubt that this quarto was actually printed by William Jaggard in 1619, and that the date of 1600 is false.

W. W. Greg, in *The Library* for 1908, pp. 113-131, 381-409, first questioned the authenticity of this and of *The Merchant of Venice* (printed by J. Roberts, 1600); *Henry V* (printed for T.P. 1608); *King Lear* (printed for Nathaniel Butter, 1608), and *Sir John Oldcastle* (printed for T.P., 1600).

The five false-dated quartos have been met bound up in a single volume of early 17th century date, along with four other Shakespeare, or pseudo-Shakespeare quartos which were *admittedly* printed in 1610. These are:

The Merry Wives of Windsor
Pericles
The Yorkshire Tragedy
The Whole Contention, &c.

Greg's evidence of the false-dating of the four Shakespeare quartos, and *Sir John Oldcastle* was examined and enlarged upon by Alfred W. Pollard in his *Shakespeare Folios and Quartos*, 1909, pp. 81 *seq*. William Jaggard was James Roberts's successor, and took over his stock of type, devices, &c. All these quartos were printed in collusion with the stationer, Thomas Pavier. It is suggested that Pavier planned in that year a first partial issue of Shakespeare plays in which he intended to include all nine quartos. The resort to false-dated imprints in the case of five plays shows that he had no licence from the Stationers' Company. There is no entry on the Register to correspond with these editions.

The water marks of the paper used on all nine quartos are identical. Eight of the quartos bear on the title-pages the same device of a carnation plant with the Welsh motto "*Heb Ddim, heb Ddieu*." The exception is *A Midsummer Night's Dream* with the Geneva arms, to which I have already referred, and which was then in William Jaggard's possession. But the evidence for the false-dating is too long to enter into here. I might mention, as a point of interest, that the device with the Welsh motto was originally that of the printer Richard Jones, and was used by him 1592-1595.

With these facts before us, we are left to wonder how many other books of the period were printed and published at dates far removed from those appearing on the title-pages.

Yours faithfully,
R. L. Eagle.

DICKENS AND SHAKESPEARE

Letter dated 13th June, 1847, addressed to William Sandys, a Cornish friend:

> "I have sent your Shakespearean extracts to Collier. It is a great comfort to my thinking that so little is known concerning the poet. It is a fine mystery; and I tremble every day lest something should come out. If he had a Boswell, society wouldn't have respected his grave, but would have had his skull in the phrenological shop windows."

Letter quoted by L. C. Staples, Editor of *The Dickensian* to Mr. William Kent, F.S.A.

This does not suggest that Dickens was referring to a mystery as to the authorship of Shakespeare, but rather the fear of further revelations as to the real life of the Stratford man about whom we know so little but "as much too much."

NOTES AND QUERIES

In reply to the Queries raised by Mr. G. B. Curtis:

1. *Gorboduc* was performed before the Queen at Whitehall on 18th January, 1560/1 by the gentlemen of the Inner Temple. The

record is at The Public Record Office and is included in The Calendar of State Papers (Domestic).

2. The London house of Henry Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel (who died in 1580) was Arundel House, Strand.

3. It is not an easy matter to arrive at the date of Easter Sunday in 1560 owing to subsequent alterations in the calendar, but perhaps some reader has been more successful, and also in discovering the whereabouts of the Queen on that day.

R. L. EAGLE.

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).	8/5
Dodd, Alfred. Francis Bacon's Personal Life Story (Illustrated. Price reduced).	25/8
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)	11/3
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	30/6
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	10/4
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).	26/1

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

BACONIANA

The official journal of the Francis Bacon Society (Inc.) is published at 2/6 (postage 3d). Back numbers can be supplied. When enquiry is made for particular numbers the date should be specified. 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.