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EDITORIAL

It was gratifying to hear that Baconiana 189 was well-received and even more pleasing to report that in the present issue we are able to publish original and important articles, if not from China to Peru, then at least from the Americas to the Antipodes. If this means that the Editor's plea, in the last issue, for more contributors has been noted and acted upon, the Society will be the residual beneficiary.

How sad to report, therefore, the demise of Baconian Jottings which simply became too much for its Editors, Mary and Elizabeth Brameld, such stalwart Members of the Society over many years. Their gracious drawing room, at 12, Nevern Square, has for so long been the "heart" of the Society that I suspect we all rather tended to take Mary and Elizabeth for granted in this and other roles simply because they were always faithfully and generously there. It gives me immense satisfaction to report that as a token of its gratitude the Council, on behalf of the Society, has invited Mary to become an Honorary Vice-President, and this new role she has very kindly agreed to take on.

It is also sad to report the deaths of a number of our Members, Alfred Howell, Frank Ledgard and H. N. Thomas. Alfred Howell was known to me personally. A quiet, unassuming man, he regularly and loyally attended our meetings at Earls Court. Alfred very much epitomised the "spine" of the Society, that large group of determined amateurs for whom the authorship controversy and other aspects of Bacon's secret and public life encapsulate a leitmotif every bit as appealing as the song the Sirens sang and without whose dedication
the Society would be nothing. However, it is pleasing to inform Members that Merle Lacey Freid has been elected to membership of Council and appointed Honorary Secretary.

At the time of writing, our Library remains without domicile being scattered in boxes at Canonbury and other places. Council has deliberated long and hard about this and it may be that before too long a permanent home for the Library, which is unique, will be found. We have received magnanimous offers but our paramount concern is to ensure that the hard “core” of the collection, harvested over so many years and the Society’s priceless asset, save its goodwill, is preserved intact in one place. Hopefully, Baconiana 191 will report that this is so. Certainly the Society’s interests should be well served by offers recently received from William Gaunt Co. of Florida to market Baconiana to non-members in the U.S. and Canada and to reprint the entire series from 1886. This will prove of inestimable value to the Society and we are very grateful to Gaunts for their interest.

A final Editor’s indulgence; our Chairman constantly tells me that some Members become very concerned if they do not receive Baconiana by such-and-such a date. Indeed, it is sometimes said that our journal is published “late”. I do sympathise with this view, but please remember that publication dates depend upon a variety of factors – the timely receipt of copy, the turn-round rate of proofs (two sets), the expedition of printers, even the vicissitudes of one’s professional and personal life. The present expectation is that the journal will go to press some time in December and that it will be produced annually. There is, however, no official publication date and, as our front cover declares, publication is “periodic”. Bear with us then, as they say, gentle reader.
A great many attempts have been made to unlock the secrets of these essentially enigmatic poems. Critics widely differ about their meanings, the dates when they were written and to whom they refer. For example, Sir Sidney Lee told us that a large proportion of the sonnets give the reader the illusion of personal confessions. He also suggested that:

“the thoughts and words of the sonnets of Daniel, Drayton, Watson, Barnaby Barnes, Constable and Sidney were assimilated by Shakespeare and that the latter was indebted to Petrach, Ronsard, De Boef and Desportes or of English disciples of the Italian and French masters.”

Lee was careful to avoid any suggestion that Shakespeare read any of these classical poets in their native tongue, nor did he remind us that Daniel, Drayton, Constable and Barnaby Barnes were of practically the same age as Shakespeare who was probably their master.

Baconian scholars such as W.F.C. Wigston, Alfred Dodd and others have produced enlightened books on the Sonnets and I am indebted to them in compiling this article which concerns some interesting cipher discoveries found in some of these sonnets.

An author who, for good reasons, wishes to conceal his authorship for a number of years has only a few options. Obviously, he would need to find a suitable pseudonym, but also it would be necessary to tell his secret to certain close friends who could be relied on to pass this on to a later generation. He could write a carefully worded book, or article, about this for a later publication, or he could encipher his story in his pseudonymous work in the hope of a future decipherer while, at the same time, demonstrating the cipher system used either in one of his other books or in an authentic book on cipher which might later be studied by someone who was aware of his interest in that subject. In fact, the true author of the Shakespeare
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works did all of those things and, in my opinion, these precautions give absolute proof that that author was Francis Bacon.

The use of codes and various cipher systems have been essential for diplomatic and military purposes for ages and numerous books on this subject have been written from time to time. In 1624, a few months after the appearance of the 1623 Shakespeare Folio, a large manual called Cryptomenytices et Cryptographiae was published in Germany. I have a copy of this book and one cipher system demonstrated in it shows how a specially prepared text, when set out as though on squared paper, can produce a group, or groups, of letters which spell out the concealed message.

The message, given by the marked letters, appears below and it tells us that Hrabanus, who was an Abbot of Mainz in the ninth century, invented this cipher system. I have found, however, that those marked letters also contain a symmetrical group of letters which informs us that this particular demonstration was supplied by Francis Bacon. This led me to examine the strange epitaph on the Shakespeare monument in the Church at Stratford. By squaring this text, I found a clear message FRANCIS BACON AUTHOR.

Later, I looked at the epitaph on the Shakespeare monument in Westminster Abbey which was completed in 1741, some 115 years after Bacon’s recorded death. The scroll consists of an adulterated version of the famous speech from The Tempest and it contains some curious spelling mistakes which seem to have been intentional. The words “Cloud cupt” should have been “clowd-capt” and the word “fabrick” in line seven is spelt with an N. The words “Shall Dissolve” with their capital letters have been given a line to themselves which suggest that they are important.

This prompted me to start my squaring with these words which consisted of thirteen letters. This amazing group of letters was found which spell FRANCIS BACON with a spare H, set out in the shape of an arch or doorway whose central letter is the incorrect N of the word “Fnbrick” of line 7. Sometime later were found letters which included the spare H in column 8 which spell AUTHOR in columns 8 and 12. The U of this word is the incorrect U of “cupt”.

It must now be pointed out that this squaring system is controlled by two strict rules. The groups found must be symmetrical in shape and they must be contained by lines and columns whose numbers, or
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Liber Quartus. Cap. 5.

Hic Verus vario colore dispar. Versus Hrabani bis sunt:

Literea Lineis inclusa, per quem arcum binc inde sparit, prima, octava, decimaquinta, vigesima secunda, vigesima nona & trigesima sexta, sine ultima, transversis Lineis prima, octava, decimaquinta, vigesima secunda, vigesima nona & trigesima sexta suae ultima buius quadrati, sequentia prompta verba.

Majentius Hrabanus Maurus hoc Opus fecit.
The Cloud shall dissolve
The Gorgeous Palaces
The Solemn Temple
The Great Globe itself
And like the breaths of winter's blast
Leave not a wreck behin

FRANCIS BACON (II)
their initial letters, add to a number which is the count of a word, or words, which relate to the message found. For instance, the Abbey message is contained by lines 3–8 which numbers add to 33 which, in the Elizabethan alphabet of 24 letters, is the count of the name BACON where B=2, A=1, C=3, O=14 and N=13 which numbers add to 33. The column numbers 6, 7, 8 and 12 also add to 33.

We will now turn to the sonnets which Sidney Lee believed were personal confessions. However, we are introduced to a “beautious and lovely youth”, the famous “Dark Lady” and a so-called rival poet who seems to have usurped the poet’s claim to fame. Critics have tried to identify these beings as Shakespeare’s friends and acquaintances, but these interpretations are far from the truth.

In 1884, W.F.C. Wigston published his A New Study of Shakespeare. He was a classical scholar who became one of the founder members of The Bacon Society, later called The Francis Bacon Society so as to disassociate it from the butchery trade. That book contains a number of chapters on the Sonnets many of which Wigston believed were influenced by Plato. He also pointed out that Sonnet 53 concerns the Sun which brings “the spring and foyzon of the yeare”, foyzon being a word meaning bounty. This Sonnet also introduces us to Adonis whom we meet again in Sonnet 54 and who, in ancient mythology, represented the Sun, and the initial letters of lines 3–7 actually spells Adonis, that is, S A D I O N.

Though this sonnet (53) introduces us to Adonis, the cipher message in it is rather different. When squared, Sonnet 53 produces a symmetrical group of letters which spell AUTHOR. Interwoven with

```
V V
Hat is your substance, whereof are you made,
That millions of strange shadows on you tend?
Since every one, hath every one, one shade,
And you but one, can every shadow lend?
Describe Adonis and the counterfeit;
Is poorly imitated after you,
On hollow cheeks all art of beauty set,
And you in Grecian lines are painted new;
Speak of the spring, and foyzon of the yeare,
The one doth shadow of your beautie show,
The other as your bountie doth appeare,
And you in every blessed shape we know.
In all external grace you have some part,
But you like none, none you for constant heart.
```
it and sharing the O, A and U, is another symmetrical group which spells FRA TUDOR. The entire group is contained by lines 8–12 and columns 7–10 whose numbers add to 133, the count of THINE AUTHOR. On the right is a group which spells ROYAL on lines 9–13 whose initial letters add to 66, the count of ROYAL. Columns 12–14 add to 39 the count of HEIR and, sharing the R of ROYAL, is a further group of letters in columns 10–14 which spell HEIRE, as often spelt in the Shakespeare works. The initial letters of the lines and columns which contain this group add to 98 which is the count of FRA TUDOR.

This clever series of letter groups confirm the long held belief that Francis Bacon was, in fact, the eldest son of Queen Elizabeth who secretly married Robert Dudley whom she created Earl of Leicester. The marriage appears to have taken place a few months before Francis was born. As a child, he was brought up in the household of Sir Nicholas and Lady Bacon.

Oh how much more doth beauteous beantious seeme,
By that sweet ornament which truth doth give,
The Rose lookes faire, but fairest we it deeme
For that sweet odor, which doth in it liue:
The Canker bloomes have full as deep a die,
As the perfumed tincture of the Roses,
Hang on such thornes, and play as wantonly,
When fommers breath their masked buds dislopes:
But for their virtue only is their show,
They liue vnwood, and vnrespectful side,
Die to themselves. Sweet Roses doe not fo,
Of their sweet deatches, are sweetest odors made:
And fo of you, beauteous and lovely youth,
When that shal vade, by verse distils your truth.
In this sonnet (54) we meet the beautious and lovely youth who is compared with sweet roses which do not fade. Squared, we have a diagonal line of letters which spell F. Bacon on either end of which are the letters H and A.

Diagonally alongside the central C and F are the letters T U D R. We now have letters which can spell FRA TUDOR BACON AUTHOR with four shared letters. This group is contained by lines 1–8 and columns 17–24 which numbers add to 200, the reverse count of FRANCIS BACON and, as it happens, the simple count of FRANCIS ROSICROSSE. Below, on lines 9–11, is a symmetrical ADONIS group. These line numbers add to 30 which, with the central column of this inverted triangle, makes a total of 59 the count of ADONIS who is presumably the beautious youth mentioned in line thirteen. In fact, this is confirmed in Sonnet 76 which follows.

Why is my verse so barren of new pride?
So far from variation or quick change?
Why with the time do I not glance aside
To new found methods, and to compounds strange?
Why write I still all one, ever the same,
And keep invention in a noted weed,
That every word doth almost tell my name,
Shewing their birth, and where they did proceed?
O know sweet love I always write of you,
And you and love are still my argument:
So all my best is dressing old words new,
Spending againe what is already spent.
For as the Sun is daily new and old,
So is my love still telling what is told.
This sonnet (76) contains the lines often quoted by Baconians,

*Why write I still all one, euere the same,*  
*And keepe inuention in a noted weed,*  
*That euery word doth almost fel my name,*  
*Shewing their birth, and where they did proceed?*

which clearly tells us that its author’s name was a concealed one.

The word “fel” in line 7 is a word connected with weaving and is, perhaps, the word which we should first examine. It starts with an F in column 24 under which is an R, so that we already appear to have been given a lead. Above the F are the letters O R T D which, with the U in column 22, spell TUDOR. Symmetry demands that the H in column 26 must be used. With the A above the O we now have a symmetrical group of letters which spell FRA TUDOR AUTHOR.

The remaining lines of this sonnet speak of the author’s “Sweet love” who must surely be the “beautious and lovely youth” of Sonnet 54. Centrally placed under these words are a D and an O from which diagonals of letters complete letters which spell ADONIS. The initial letters of lines 10-12 plus the column numbers 9–13 add to 92 the reverse count of ADONIS and below this group of letters are the words “the sun is”.

10
Sonnet 126 is the last of the "lovely boy" sonnets and here he is accompanied by the "Dark Lady" who, "As thou goest onwards still will plucke thee backe". She seems to be some sort of temptress. Now, if Wigston is right, this lady was probably one of those Goddess Mothers like Diana of Ephesus whose statue is said to have been made of a black substance, possibly ebony. Her Greek name was Artemis and on the right of the squared text is her name contained by columns 18–22 which numbers add to 100 the FRANCIS BACON
count. Below, in these same columns is an ADONIS group of letters contained by lines 10–12 which add to 33 the BACON count. The initial letters of lines 4–8 which contain the ARTEMIS group add to 59 the count of ADONIS. Clearly, these two mythical persons are to be linked in some way and later we will deal with Sonnet 20 which will amplify this.

Lines 6–9 contain an AUTHOR group in the shape of a cross, while above, in lines 1–4 and columns 14–19 is a group of letters which give FRANCIS BACON with a spare E in line 4. The column numbers plus the initial letters of the lines add to 157 the count of FRA ROSICROSSE which name, with shared letters, is also contained in this group, thus using the spare E.

The first part of this sonnet (127) concerns the shame and disgrace of bastardy in which “Sweet Beauty hath no name no holy bour.”

Based on column 6, this group consists of symmetrical groups of letters which spell PRINCE FRANCIS THE TUDOR HEIR with a shared E of PRINCE. The word AUTHOR can be found in the A of FRANCIS and the R U T H O of TUDOR HEIR group.

Later, we are introduced to the author’s Mistress with her raven black eyes and, at the end of those curiously spelt words “My Mistersse” in line 9, we have a symmetrical group of letters which spell ARTEMIS. This group has been placed in lines 8–11 which numbers plus their initial letters add to 158 the reverse count of THE
With a shared T this group of letters spells MISTRESSE FITTON, the lady whom many people believe was “the dark lady of the sonnets”, and this group is contained by lines and columns whose initial letters add to 80 which is the count of FITTON.

Mary Fitton gave birth to a son by young William Herbert in 1601 when he would have been about twenty one years of age and she probably a little younger. It may be asked why her name should have been enciphered in this sonnet with that of Artemis and I would like to suggest a possible explanation.

The sonnet clearly concerns the humiliation of bastardy which Francis Bacon had suffered when he first learned that the Queen was his mother. Here, he seems to condemn those who “slandered beautie with a bastard shame” so that “sweet beauty hath no name no holy boure, but is prophan’d if not lives in disgrace”. In other words, he is
incensed by the Queen and her Court which poured abuse on this striking beauty, a Court which indulged in many such covert relationships. To him, "Mistersse Fitton" (note that the word "my" in line 9 is not part of the symmetrical group) was not his mistress but one of nature’s children who charmed and fascinated men with her looks and her dancing skills. In this sonnet he contrasts his mistress, Artemis, who was no beauty but black, with this beautiful girl whose hair was auburn but who had been made black by a hypocritical Society.

Later was found confirmation of this theory in a group of letters below the words IF NOT in line 8. On either side of these words is a D and an L. These letters are joined below by the letters S A N D S which, with the L, E and R above give letters which spell SLANDERS.

With shared letters, the above group can spell the words DETESTED SLANDER. The line and column numbers which contain this group add to 139 which is the count of HATEFUL (70) SLANDER (69), while their initial letters add to 81 which is not only the count of ARTEMIS but the word SHAMEFUL. This sonnet then, introduces an ethical purpose which asks us to curb our darker instincts inherited from Artemis.

This sonnet (20) is the one which alludes to the mysterious "Master Mistris" of indeterminate sex. The meaning of this being has been somewhat distorted by most of our earth-bound critics. Wigston had this to say of him/her:

"Note the androgynous character of the object of the poet’s passion, ‘Master Mistris’, pointing out very plainly that this is the duo-uno paradox of the Phoenix and the Turtle. The eye that ‘more bright than theirs – gilding the object whereupon it gazeth’ is
A Woman's face with nature's own hand painted,
Has it the Master Minnis of my passion,
A woman's gentle heart but not acquainted
With shifting change as is false women's fashion,
An eye more bright than theirs, if it false in rowing;
Gilding the object whereupon it gazeth,
A man in hew all Hew in his controlling,
Which steals men's eyes and women's souls amazeth,
And for a woman were thou first created,
Till nature as she wrought thee fell a dotage,
And by addition me of thee defeated,
By adding one thing to my purpose nothing.
But since the pricks thee out for women's pleasure,
Mine be thy love and thy loves vse their treasure.

the Sun, namely 'the man in hew, all hews in his controlling.'
Spirit is always masculine as Nature is feminine with the ancients.
These are the poet's two spirits, the one 'a man right fair' and the
other 'a woman coloured ill.' The Sun and Moon were the classical
protagonists of heaven and earth."

This sonnet then, according to Wigston, concerns the two sides of
human nature, the light and dark, that is, our spiritual aspirations
and our earthly origins or instincts, represented in these sonnets by
Adonis and Artemis.

In lines 6–12 and columns 21–23 is a group of letters which spell
PRINCE FRANCIS TUDOR AUTHOR and these numbers add to
129 the count of PRINCE FRANCIS. On the left is another group of
letters which, with a shared S, spell ADONIS – ARTEMIS. They also
contain letters which can spell the words MASTER MISTRIS as spelt in this sonnet. This is quite an achievement and the lines 9–11 and columns 8–13 add to 93 while their initial letters add to 66. Together they give a total of 159 the reverse count of FRANCIS TUDOR.

Not mine owne fears, nor the prophetick soule, Of the wide world, dreaming on things to come, Can yet the leaf of my true loue controule, Suppos’d as forfeit to a confin’d doome. The mortal Moone hath her eclipse indur’d, And the sad Augurs mock their owne prefage, Incertenties now crowne them-selves aslue’d, And peace proclaims Oliues of endlesse age. Now with the drops of this most balnie time, My loue lookes fresh, and death to me subscribes, Since spight of him I live in this poore rime, While he inflicts ore dull and speechlesse tribes. And thou in this fislest finde thy monument, When tyrants crest and tombs of brasfe are spent.
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This sonnet (107) has generally been taken to refer to the “eclipse” of Queen Elizabeth as “the mortal Moone” and the succession of James as King in 1603. This was an anxious time for Francis Bacon owing to the “incertenties” regarding his own future and that of his “true love”.

Some critics, however, have thought that “the mortal moon” referred to the crescent formation of the Spanish Armada as it passed through the Channel in 1588. Alfred Dodd thought it referred to Francis himself and that his “eclipse” referred to his impeachment. It must be remembered, however, that the moon is always feminine and line five endorses this by using the words “her eclipse”.

Squared, a group of letters was found in lines 3–6 and columns 15–18 which includes the final E of “Moone” and which spells MAIESTY. These line and column numbers add to 84 which, believe it or not, is the count of ELIZABETH.

On the same lines and in columns 7–14 is another group in the shape of a V which spells OURE LATE. These column numbers also add to 84 or ELIZABETH, while the line numbers together with their initial letters add to 59 which is the count of QUEEN.

Line seven has the strange word “Incertenties now crowne themselves assur’d’e” and the first five letters of the words “now crowne” are part of another group of letters on lines 7–10 and columns 13–17 which can spell IAMES NOW WEARS CROWN. The initial letters of these lines together with the column numbers add to 110 which is the count of the words ENGLISH (71) KING (39).

Towards the end of lines 10–14, the author’s claim to authorship appears in columns 26–31. Firstly, we have a symmetrical group giving FRANCIS BACON. The entire group, however, can spell PRINCE FRANCIS BACON AUTHOR HEIR TO THRONE, and the line and column numbers add to 231 which can be made to spell FRA TUDOR (98) THINE (54) AUTHOR (79).

This leaves us with the question concerning the words “my true loue” in line three. Lines 3–6 of the group on the right spell FRATER, while the entire group give us the word FRATERNITIE. The initial letters of these lines and of columns 20–24 add to 129 the count of the word FRATERNITY, this time spelt with a Y. Later, we will find that this was the author’s ROSE FRATERNITY. It seems that the last four lines of this sonnet which starts “Since spite of him” refers to the
new King who "insults are dull and speechless tribes" meaning the Scots! Later, however, in a speech in the House of Commons, Bacon praises the Scots as an asset to this country owing to their fighting skills.

18.

Shall I compare thee to a Summer's day?
Thou art more lovely and more temperate:
Rough winds do shake the darling buds of May,
And Sommers leaves hath all too short a date:
Sometime too hot the eye of heaven shines,
And often is his gold complexion dimm'd,
And every fair from fair some time declines,
By chance, or nature's changing course untrimm'd:
But thy eternal Sommers shall not fade,
Nor loss of possession of that faire thou ow't,
Nor shall death brag thou wand'rest in his shade,
When in Sommers lines to time thou grow'st,
So long as men can breathe or eyes can see,
So long lives this, and this gives life to thee,

Alfred Dodd believed that this lovely sonnet (18) expressed Francis Bacon's love and admiration for Marguerite of Navarre, whom he met as a young man in France. Roderick Eagle thought this sonnet referred to the author's "better half", his higher self.

The group on the left contains letters which can spell FRAUDOR AUTHOUR. The centre group contains letters which, with a shared A and R spell MARGARET. This group is linked with the
group on the right which gives us the words OF THE VALLEY, that is De Valois. The Margaret group is contained by lines 4–8 and columns 18–22. These numbers add to 130 which is the reverse count of MARGUERITE. The column numbers (100) plus the initial letters of the lines (23) add to 123 which happens to be the count of the words “Of the valley”. The initial letters of lines 1–4 which contain the OF THE VALLEY group of letters add to 55 and the column numbers 11–17 add to 98. Together these numbers add to 153 which is the count of QUEEN (59) OF (20) NAVARRE (74).

21

So is it not with me as with that Muse,
Stir'd by a painted beauty to his verse,
Who heaven it selfe for ornament doth vfe,
And every faire with his faire doth rehearse,
Making a coopelment of proud compare
With Sunne and Moonne, with earth and seas rich gems:
With Aprills first borne flowers and all things rare,
That heavenes ayre in this huge roundure hems,
O let me true in loue but truly write,
And then beleue me, my love is as faire,
As any mothers childe, though not so bright,
As those gould candells fixt in heauens ayer:
Let them say more that like of heare-fay well,
I will not prayse that purpose not to fell.

Alfred Dodd claimed that this sonnet (21) was written as a wedding gift to Alice Barnham, Bacon's young wife, in March 1606. Its meaning is a little obscure and most critics seem to have fought shy of it. The first six lines seem to tell us that the author is not now referring to his Muse which in this instance is inspired by the Sun and Moon, "the protagonists", as Wigston put it, "of spirit and
phomena, heaven and earth". The next eight lines appear to refer to the beauty of Spring with its first born flowers, and of another love which is "as faire as any mother's child" though not, perhaps, as bright as heaven's stars.

On lines 5–8 and columns 21–25 is a group of letters which can spell FRA TUDOR THE AUTHOR and these line and column numbers add to 141 which is the count of FRANCIS TUDOR.

Lines 7–11 contain another symmetrical group of letters in which the names ALICE and FRANCIS, who borrows her A, I and C, are interwoven; a delightful little trick which must have intrigued this young girl. The initial letters of these lines and of columns 11–13 which contain this group, add to 92 which is the count of the words "YOU AND ME". And here, it seems, Francis played another little trick since 92 in reverse is 29 which is the count of the name ALICE.

It so happens that the initial letters of the lines of this sonnet add to 168 which is the reverse count of FRA ROSICROSSE.
Sonnet 136 is one of the “Will” sonnets and in it this word is repeated seven times. Its meaning is somewhat obscure to say the least and it contains the conundrum which starts in line 8, “Among a number one is reckon’d none” and ends with the strange lines:

Make but my name thy love, and love that still,
And then thou lovest me for my name is Will.

I have never been able to unravel this number puzzle, and those last two lines have naturally been quoted by orthodox scholars who oppose our Baconian beliefs. However, I have found that some of these words respond to Bacon’s simple cipher and the squared text amply justifies these counts.

Lines 5–6 tell us:
Will, will fulfill the treasure of thy love,
I fill it with wils and my will one.

These lines clearly refer to two different persons. Surely, we are being introduced to “I”, the author, and “Will”, his pseudonym, who “will fulfill the treasure of thy love”. The words “thy love” seem a little incongruous here, but Bacon’s simple cipher tells us that the count of these words is 100 the count of FRANCIS BACON. This suggests that Will will complete, or bring to fruition, my literary treasures.

The last two lines of this sonnet are even more enigmatic. They not only repeat the words “thy love”, that is Francis Bacon, which are followed by the words “my name”, but the words “my name” add to 66 the count of ROYAL while the following words “is Will” add to 79 the count of AUTHOR! And the sonnet number is 136 the count of BACON-SHAKESPEARE.

Squared, this sonnet produces a symmetrical group of letters in lines 9–14 and columns 18–24 which spells, with shared letters, PRINCE FRANCIS TUDOR AUTHOR. These line and column numbers add to 216 the count of AUTHOR (79) A TUDOR PRINCE (137).

In a letter to King James, dated the 25th March 1621, Fr St Alban protested his innocence of taking bribes and gifts to pervert justice,
and adds "however I may be frail, and partake of the abuse of the times". He ends this remarkable letter by writing, in reference to the King’s command that he should neglect his defence and so admit his guilt:

"and now making myself an oblation to do with me as may best conduce to the honour of your justice, the honour of your mercy and the use of your service, resting as clay in your Majesty’s gracious hands."

Is it not a little strange that in lines 9–12 of this sonnet 125, these words are not only paraphrased but, in the last two lines of this sonnet, mention is made of a "subbornd Informer" and the word "impeacht".

Alfred Dodd, in his estimation of Sonnet 125, interpreted the words "I bore the canopy" as referring to Bacon's high office, "the canopy of State", while "my extern the outward honoring" referred to his title "Francis St Alban".
SQUARED, this sonnet produces a diamond-shaped group of letters which gives FRANCIS with a spare U and H which, with the A and R of FRANCIS and the O in line 10, suggest the word AUTHOR. By adding the B L N T and S in lines 10 and 11 we now have a symmetrical group of letters which spell FRANCIS ST ALBAN AUTHOR.

The initial letters of lines 6–11 add to 67, or FRANCIS, while those of columns 15–21 add to 74, or TUDOR, but even more interesting is the fact that these line and column numbers add to 177 which is the count of I (9) FRA ST ALBAN (89) AUTHOR (79) which, with our enciphered message, confirms that this sonnet was written after 1621 when Francis was awarded the title. It also shows, as Alfred Dodd and others claimed, that these sonnets were not published in 1609 as suggested on their title pages.

It will now be noticed that the F of the word “Forgoing” in line 7 is printed with an unnecessary capital letter. This F is the F of FRANCIS in our message, while the curious C in the word “oblacion” in line 10 is needed for the C of FRANCIS.

It has been pointed out by Maurice Barbotin, a French member of the Francis Bacon Society, that this particular sonnet has some further “counts” of considerable interest. The line numbers 6–11 (51) together with their initial letters (67) add to 118 which is the count of GUILTLESS. Moreover, the count of the word SUBBORND in line 13 adds to 90 which is the count of the name CHURCHILL who was the “subborn’d informer”. This number is the reverse count of the words NOT GUILTY.

Alfred Dodd found that a number of the sonnets deal with Francis Bacon’s impeachment, the false charges made against him and the King’s command to neglect his defence. Sonnet 90 refers to “a purposed overthrow” and Sonnet 89 contains the line “Against thy reasons making no defence”. These sonnets were written as though addressed to King James who shamefully participated in his “purposed overthrow” of his trusted friend and Chancellor Francis St Alban.

There may be many who are not prepared to recognise the validity of these cipher disclosures and, in particular those concerning this sonnet. It should be mentioned, however, that Hepworth Dixon, a Barrister who was one of Bacon’s biographers, stated in his The Story
of Bacon's Life (1862) at pages 380-81:

"The right of impeachment by the House of Commons lay a dormant and disputed power in the Constitution. Men had been impeached by that House for various crimes, Latimer had been the first, Suffolk the last; one in 1376, the other in 1449."

It was revived by Coke for this occasion.

Is there anyone living in Shakespeare's time who could have referred to Bacon's letter to King James and have found it applicable to mention this out of date practice of impeachment together with a "subborn'd Informer"? Perhaps Francis Bacon, with his irrepressible wit, may have chosen to number this sonnet 125 which is the count of the words FRANCIS HANG HOG.

66

Ty'd with all these for restful death I cry,
As to behold defect a beggar borne,
And needie Nothing trim'd in jollitie,
And purest faith unhappily forsworne,
And gilded honor shamefully misplast,
And maiden vertue rudely trumpetered,
And right perfection wrongfully disgrac'd,
And strength by limping swain disabled,
And arte made turgid by authoritie,
And Folly (Doctor-like) controuling skill,
And simple-Truth miscalde Simplicitie,
And captiue-good attending Captaine ill.
Ty'd with all these, from these would I be gone,
Save that to dye, I leave my loue alone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Having now found a number of sonnets which encipher their author's name as FRA or Francis Tudor, we are in a better position to tackle the problem of the curious dedication to this book of sonnets which has puzzled critics for a great number of years.

The stops which appear between each word, and the peculiar phrasing which distorts its meaning, make it clear that it has been so worded to contain a cipher message. If the author's name is
enciphered in this dedication, it will be noticed that in it there are no C's or K's. This means that the names Francis, Bacon or Shakespeare will not be found. It should also be noticed that the only two F's in the text are the last letter of the first line and the first letter of the last line. Looking now at the sonnet text, the letters near the F in line 1 do not seem very promising, but the square of letters formed by the first three letters of lines 10, 11 and 12 contain letters which can spell FRA TUDOR, with a shared R, and the numbers 10, 11 and 12 add to 33 which is the count of BACON.

TO THE ONLIE BEGETTER OF THESE INSVING SONNETS
MT W H ALL HAPPINESSE
AND THAT ETERNITIE PROMISED
BY OVR EVERLIVING POET
WISHETH
THE WELLWISHING ADVENTVRE IN
SETTING
FORTH

T T

If we now look at the square of nine letters above our first square, it will be seen, with the A in line 10, it contains letters which can spell THE AUTHOR. By completing the symmetry of each square and add the I in line 8 and the S in line 11, we now have a symmetrical group of letters on lines 7–12 which can spell THE AUTHOR IS FRA TUDOR. These lines add to 57 the count of FRA BACON, while their initial letters add to 79 the count of AUTHOR.

According to Alfred Dodd, the letters T.T. which scholars have taken to refer to Thomas Thorpe who entered this book at the Stationers Register in 1609, "are the symbols for the two pillars of Masonry, and they predicate an invisible T. Conjoined, this gives the correct numerical Rosicrosse count of FRA BACON (3 x 19 = 57)."
SHAKES-SPEARES SONNETS

Neuer before Imprinted.

AT LONDON

By G. Eld for T. T. and are
to be solde by John Wright, dwelling
at Christ Church gate.

1609.
This admission of authorship is confirmed by the reference to Mr W.H. who is clearly the author of “these insuing sonnets” – a begetter in those days could only mean a creator or father – who must also be “our ever living poet”. There have been numberless guesses as to who was Mr W.H., but it has been found that, in simple cipher, MR = 29, W.H. = 29 and HANG = 29, HOG = 29 and, as we all know, “Hang Hog is latten for Bacon” (Merry Wives IV I.) It is suggested that “the well-wishing adventurer” in this dedication is he who adventures in deciphering the author’s name as well as the deeper philosophical messages intended for mankind. If my suggestion is correct, I am grateful for Francis’ good wishes and “that eternity” promised! It should also be added that the word TO which starts this dedication adds to 33 or BACON, and the word BEGETTER adds to 79 or AUTHOR, so that cryptically, the first two lines read ‘Bacon the onlie author of these insuing sonnets’.

Now that we have confirmed that these sonnets were not published until after 1621, we can turn to the title page of their first edition.

The words SHAKE-SPEARES SONNETS add to 221 which is the count of FR ST ALBAN (88) THINE AUTHOR (133).

These sonnets form only part of those examined for cipher. Others, which are of historical interest, concern the tragic execution of Robert Essex, which could have been stopped had the ring been delivered to the Queen, and what happened to Francis St Alban when his burial was reported in 1626. These have all been put on slides and are available for demonstration should anyone be interested.
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Francis Carr

Five Facts

1. The 1623 Folio of the Shakespeare Plays – and perhaps the Sonnets – were dedicated to William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke. This young man was in his late teens when most of the sonnets were probably written.
2. Pembroke loved Mary Fitton, one of Queen Elizabeth’s Maids of Honour, and had a child by her in 1601.
3. The Young Man in the Sonnets loved the Dark Lady.
4. The author of the Shakespeare plays also loved the Dark Lady.
5. The Dark Lady and the two Rosalines (in Romeo and Juliet and Love’s Labour’s Lost) are described in identical terms – with dark hair, musical, a good dancer, unfaithful, beautiful. These terms correctly describe Mary Fitton.

One of the finest Tudor houses in England is Gawsworth Hall in Cheshire, the home of the Fitton family from 1316 to 1661. Earlier it had been the home of the de Orreby family, who first lived here in 1130. In 1316 Isobel de Orreby married Thomas Fitton, of Boleyn in the county of Chester. In 1661 the house became the property of Charles Gerard, the first Earl of Macclesfield whose father married Penelope Fitton in 1611. Penelope’s father, Edward, was the brother of Mary Fitton, the mistress of William Herbert, later the Earl of Pembroke. Many historians think that Herbert was the man to whom most of the Shakespeare Sonnets were addressed.

In 1984 one of the only two existing copies of the 1602 edition of Venus and Adonis was sold for the sum of £129,600. It had been the property of the first Earl of Macclesfield, and it may have been inherited from Sir Edward Fitton or from Mary Fitton herself. There is no record in the Macclesfield archives that this book was purchased. The only other copy of this poem is now in the British Museum.
The year 1601 was one of great excitement and drama for Mary Fitton. Sir William Knollys, the Comptroller of the Household, was in love with her, and he hoped that one day he would be free to marry her. She may have given him some indication that she would agree to this; he may have been her first lover.

We are given a Malvolio-like picture of him at this time, endeavouring to control his charges, the high-spirited Maids of Honour. In the words of Sir Nicolas l’Estrange, who wrote a collection of anecdotes, *Merry Passages and Jests*:¹

“The Lord Knollys (as he became at King James’s coronation) had his lodgings at Court, where some of the Ladies and Maids of Honour used to frisk and hey about in the next room, to his extreme disquiet a-nights, though he often warned them about it. At last he gets one to bolt their own back door when they were all in one night at their revels, strips off to his shirt, and so with a pair of spectacles on his nose, Aretine in his hand, comes marching in at a postern door of his own chamber, reading very gravely, full upon the faces of them. Now let the reader judge what a sad spectacle and pitiful fright these poor creatures endured, for he faced them and often traversed the room in this posture above an hour.”

Who was engaging Mary’s affection is made clear in this letter that Rowland Whyte wrote to Sir Robert Sidney:

“One Mrs. Martin, who dwelt at the Chopping Knife near Ludgate, told me that she had seen priests marry gentlewomen at the Court, in that time when that Mistress Fitton was in great favour, and one of her Majesty’s Maids of Honour. During the time that the Earl of Pembroke favoured her, she would put off her head tire and tuck up her clothes and take a large white cloak and march as though she had been a man to meet the said Earl out of the Court.”²

1. D. 1655. BM Harl. MS 6395.
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Such Rosalind- and Viola-like conduct could not have gone unnoticed at Whitehall. Like the other Maids of Honour who had found no difficulty in attracting men, she found herself pregnant. Lord Oxford, Raleigh, Southampton and Sir Henry Shirley, by whom Frances Vavasour had been made pregnant, all married their mistresses. Mary Fitton’s lover, William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, was of a different mould.

In the opinion of S.R. Gardiner, the author of *A History of England, 1603–1642*, “his character was wanting in robustness.” 3 Francis Bacon, who knew him well, declared that “for his person, he was not effectual”; 4 bringing his character into sharper focus, Rowland Whyte, confidential secretary of Pembroke’s uncle, Sir Robert Sidney, detected that “there is a want of spirit and courage laid to his charge, he is a melancholy young man. He doth not follow his business with the care that is fit; he is too cold . . .” 5 At the age of fifteen he had refused to marry Elizabeth, the nineteen-year-old daughter of Sir George Carey, the son and heir of Lord Hunsdon, the Lord Chamberlain. Two years later in 1597, he again refused an offer of marriage, this time to Lady Bridget Vere, the thirteen-year-old daughter of the Earl of Oxford, and grand-daughter of the powerful William Cecil, Lord Burghleigh. Both these proposed marriages were arranged by the respective families. One affliction he suffered from was migraine, the pain of which he mitigated with strong tobacco.

When Pembroke resisted all the pressures put upon him to marry Mary Fitton, even when this meant imprisonment in the Tower of London, or the Fleet, he clearly demonstrated that for him marriage was not primarily a matter of love. Three years later he married Lady Mary Talbot, the diminutive and physically unattractive eldest daughter of the vindictive and acrimonious Earl of Shrewsbury. She was co-heiress of the vast Shrewsbury estates. Thus Pembroke’s wealth was restored, a large part of the money left him by his father having been squandered. He preferred sexual, as distinct from loving, relationships with women. He was, in the opinion of Lord Clarendon, “immoderately given up to women”; he indulged in “pleasures of all kinds, almost in all excesses.” 6 That Pembroke married for money

3. Ed. 1899, p. 179.
rather than sexual pleasure or affection is confirmed by Clarendon’s dry comment that “he paid much too dear for his wife’s fortunes by taking her person into the bargain.”

Pembroke admitted that he was the father of Mary’s child, but refused to marry her. For this offence he was sent to the Fleet Prison. Mary was not punished in this way; she was looked after during her confinement by Lady Hawkins, the widow of Sir John Hawkins, Treasurer of the Navy and fearless naval commander. Mary gave birth to a boy, but he died soon afterwards; we have no record of any name given to him. On March 25, 1601, Tobie Matthew mentioned laconically to Dudley Carlton that “the Earl of Pembroke is committed to the Fleet; his cause is delivered of a boy who is dead.” Alluding to Mary as the cause, Matthew indicated that she, not he, took the initiative sexually.

Two months later Mary’s parents still hoped that Pembroke would change his mind. “I am in some hope,” her father wrote to Anne, “of your sister’s engagement shortly, but what will be the end with the Earl I cannot tell. So soon as I can, you shall hear” (April 24, 1601). Three weeks later he went to London and brought Mary back to Gawsworth. On the way back, at Stanner, near Chester, he wrote to Cecil:

“I can say nothing of the Earl, but my daughter is confident in her chance before God, and wisheth my Lord and she might but meet before indifferent senes [impartial elders]. But for myself I expect no good from him that in all this time hath not shewed any kindness. I count my daughter as good a gentlewoman as my Lord is, though the dignity of honour be greater only in him which hath beguiled her I fear, except my Lord’s honesty be the greater vertues.”

This last phrase, about Pembroke’s honesty, could indicate that he, in his defence, was claiming that Mary’s conduct with other men, or another man, was hardly blameless. He would not agree to meet

6. Clarendon, History of the Rebellion, ed. Macray (1888), p. 72. Pembroke was “not so much transported with beauty as with those advantages of the mind as manifested an extraordinary wit and spirit and knowledge, and administered great pleasure in the conversation. To these he sacrificed himself and much of his fortune.”
Mary, as proposed in this letter. Some of his feelings about her may be found in a short poem he wrote entitled ‘To a Lady residing at Court’:

Then this advice, fair creature, take from me:  
Let none pluck fruit, unless he pluck the tree;  
For if with one, with thousands thou’lt turn whore;  
Break ice in one place and it cracks the more.

In one of Pembroke’s poems, To his Mistress, he wrote this stanza:

And those Love-alluring Darts  
Shot from thy translucent eye,  
To the knowing man imparts  
Such an awful Majesty,  
That each man may read the mirror  
Of thy mind, and he his error.²

The full title of this poem is ‘To his Mistress, of his Friends Opinion of her, and his answer to his Friend’s Objection, with his constancy towards her.’

His request to go abroad was granted; where he went is not known. He was back in England in July of the following year. Because of his refusal to marry Mary Fitton, he never regained the Queen’s favour, and returned to Court only after her death.

Mary could have changed her mind and married Sir William Knollys. She stayed for a short time with her parents at Gawsworth and then moved to Arbury, to live with her sister. In the grounds of this Tudor house can be seen today some of the old trees of the Forest of Arden, in which most of As You Like It is set. This play was probably written in 1599 or 1600.

Sir William’s wife died at last in 1605; he was now free to marry again. As Mary Fitton would not marry him, he proposed to another young girl, Lady Elizabeth Howard, daughter of the Earl of Suffolk, and she accepted him. Sir William was now sixty-one; she was only nineteen, six years younger than Mary Fitton.

If Mary had married him, she would have become a Countess, as

in 1616 he became Viscount Wallingford, and ten years later, the Earl of Banbury. He lived for another six years, dying in 1632, at the age of eighty-eight. His monument and grave is in the Knollys chapel in the village church at Rotherfield, near Henley.

This courtier and relative of Queen Elizabeth had led a long and distinguished life and had been amply rewarded. But the author of *Twelfth Night* had made fun of him in portraying him as Malvolio. If Mary Fitton was indeed the Dark Lady of the *Sonnets*, this same man had, along with William Herbert, taken her from him. In April 1621, when the House of Lords was debating whether to prosecute Francis Bacon on a charge of bribery, it was William Knollys, Lord Wallingford, who took the leading role in sustaining this charge. He insisted that Bacon should give the House a full answer to the charges brought against him.

Mary Fitton certainly made a great impression at Court. The Queen allowed her to ride one of her best horses, named Grey Fitton in a list of horses in the Queen’s stable in October 1598.

One of the grandest portraits of the men and women at Queen Elizabeth’s Court is of Mistress Fitton, painted by George Gower, or one of his school. Only the Queen herself is portrayed wearing a costume of greater splendour. Mary wears a magnificent gown with enormous puffed sleeves, with an unusual flame-like pointed border, a motif repeated on either side of her deeply plunging bodice. Her dark brown hair is embellished by a richly bejewelled head-tire. Framing her beautiful face is a large lace ruff, and, drawing the eye to the very low neck-line of the bodice, a covered oval miniature lies on her heart. She is not smiling in this portrait, but her general expression is one of shrewdness and vivacity. She was also portrayed at this time by Marcus Gheeraerts, in a beautiful white satin dress, wearing a jewelled crown.

In the church at Gawsworth, Mary Fitton’s family memorial – the tomb of her father, surrounded by effigies of her parents, her two brothers and her sister – has been severely damaged. It was originally placed against the east wall near the altar. Two years after his death in 1606, Mary’s great-uncle, Francis, died, and his tomb was placed on the other side of the altar. Two further Fitton tombs were later placed in the chancel, those of Mary’s brother, Edward, and his eldest son, also named Edward. For some reason, so far undiscovered, it was
decided to place these tombs close to the altar, near the north and south walls respectively, positions which would mean moving the tombs already near the altar further away towards the chancel steps, where they now stand. When this move was made is also not known.

It was also decided to eliminate the effigy of Sir Edward himself from his own tomb. In its original position he had been represented on one side of the tomb and his wife, Alice, on the other, with their four children at each corner. In its new position, against the north wall, the effigies of Alice and the four children are all on one side, the two sons in front of her, the two daughters, Anne and Mary behind. Both have black hair.

This closing up of the figures has necessitated further destruction, that of the feet of one of the sons, Richard, who is shown kneeling in front of his mother. Someone has carried out further mutilation, destroying the hands of all the four children, and knocking off the end of Mary Fitton’s nose. The effigy of her father has disappeared. The head of her brother Richard was so badly damaged that in 1955 it was decided to put a new head in its place. When this desecration occurred we do not know.

By far the most extraordinary deeds of destruction took place underground. In 1969, a local historian, Arthur Marlowe, with the permission of the Rector of Gawsworth church, began a four-month preliminary investigation to find the entrance to the Fitton family vault. An entrance, bricked up, was found by taking echo soundings, and Mr Marlowe and a team of men from the Royal Engineers made their way down into the vault. They were appalled at what they found. All they saw was a pile of bones at the end of the vault. The coffins had been smashed, and traces of lime lay on the floor. This was not the work of grave-robbers. It was clearly done by someone determined to leave nothing of value or dignity. Near the bones lay an entrenching tool that had no doubt done the damage. In the opinion of experts at the Leicester Museum, this instrument was used by the artillery at the time of the Crimean War, in the early 1850s.

The remains were sorted out and examined by a pathologist. Two men and two women, in his opinion, were buried here. The ages of these bodies when buried indicates that they can be identified as Sir Edward Fitton and his wife, Alice, his son, Edward, and his wife, Anne. The bones of a fifth body were found just outside this vault,
and these have been identified as those of Richard Fitton, Mary's brother, but this cannot be proved. It was discovered that Mary's father had suffered tertiary syphilis. Evidence of this was visible in the bones of the left leg. None of the bones discovered here could have been those of a sixty-three year old woman; this was the age of Mary Fitton when she died.

To find the coffin of Mary Fitton, drillings were made in the chancel floor of the church, and a vault adjacent to the one already entered was found. In this little vault, an endoscope, a camera placed at the end of a stethoscope, revealed that here indeed was a coffin. On the lid could be seen a representation of a pansy, the flower which can be seen in the portrait of Mary Fitton at Arbury Hall and on her effigy in the church. Armed with the statement in Mary's will that she wished to be buried in Gawsworth church, and with photographs of this coffin, Mr Marlowe appealed to a Consistory Court in 1971 to be given permission to examine it. He argued that, as he lacked the evidence for stating with certainty that Mary Fitton was the Dark Lady of the Sonnets, an attempt should be made to examine what may be her coffin, and then to see if it contained any indication of a Shakespeare connection. The Chancellor of the Consistory Court decided that permission to examine the coffin should not be granted as he lacked evidence for stating with certainty that Mary was the Dark Lady.

The Bishop of Stockport, Gordon Strutt, objected to this investigation. He said that the Fitton vault should be opened only for reasons of "great public concern". It would be, he said, very irresponsible if the Church appeared to be "more interested in the remains of a woman who might or might not have had some relationship with William Shakespeare than in its proper task of the worship of Almighty God and the preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ."

In his judgment, the Chancellor, Rev. Kenneth Elphinstone, said: "I do not think that the finding of Mary Fitton's remains would be in itself of outstanding historical importance, other than for specialised reasons. So much about her connection with Shakespeare was complete speculation that there is little chance of discovering anything useful. I feel strongly that unless there is some very good reason, whether in the cause of historical or literary knowledge, the
dead should be allowed to rest.” This last remark is significant. In the opinion of all those who want to know more about Mary Fitton, this certainly is a matter of great literary and historical interest.

Textual evidence

“The most plausible suggestion (as to the identity of the Dark Lady) is Mary Fitton, the Maid of Honour who was Pembroke’s mistress ... The more widely accepted dating of the Sonnets is between 1594 and 1599.”


“William Herbert has the right initials (as the Friend in the Sonnets); he was known to have patronised Shakespeare; he was averse to marriage, and he had a notorious intrigue with Mary Fitton.”


“The identity of Mr. W. H. The most obvious person is William Herbert, third Earl of Pembroke. There is no time after 1590 appropriate for the composition of the Sonnets if they were dedicated to Southampton. Nor was Southampton’s patronage worth much after 1594.”


As we can find no evidence, apart from the dedications, that William Shakespeare ever met Southampton or Pembroke, it is interesting to see if there is any evidence that links either of these two peers, the Shakespeare Plays and Sonnets and Mary Fitton. A link does in fact exist.

The first of the Shakespeare Sonnets begins with the word “FRom”, with the first capital printed large enough to cover the first two lines; the next line begins with a capital B.
Thus all three poems begin with an identically printed word, "FRom". Under the first three letters of "concave", in the first line of A Lover's Complaint, is an "a" in the second line and a "b" in the third line.

FRom off a hill whose concave wombe reworded,
A plaintiff storie from a sistring vale
My spirrites t'attend this doble voyce accorded,
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These lines are oddly worded and spelt; in them we can see without difficulty Fra Bacon inserted into the text.\(^8\)

If Bacon took the trouble to leave his signature, it is reasonable to hope that he inserted also the name of the Dark Lady into the text. It is generally agreed that the first sonnet addressed to her is No. 127. The previous sonnet is the only one of the 154 which has only twelve lines, instead of fourteen. That two lines have been omitted is indicated in the original text by brackets.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{IN the old age black was not counted fair,} \\
\text{Or if it were it bore not beauties name:}
\end{align*}\]

Here is the sonnet as it is printed:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{IN the old age blacke was not counted faire,} \\
\text{Or if it were, it bore not beautyes name:}
\end{align*}\]

Thus special attention is drawn to the beginning of the next sonnet.

The very next lines, in Sonnet 127, are:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{IN the old age black was not counted fair,} \\
\text{Or if it were, it bore not beauties name:}
\end{align*}\]

Therefore my mistell eyes are Rauen blacke,
Her eyes soured, and they mourners seeme,
As such who not borne faire no beauty lack,
Standing Creation with a false esteeme,
Yet so they mourn g [becoming of their woe],
That every young faires beauty should look so.

The wording of some of these lines suggests artificial contrivance, the deliberate insertion of certain letters, resulting as it does in sentences which are difficult to understand. Dr A.L. Rowse, in his study of Shakespeare’s Sonnets (1964), describes this sonnet as an “artificial poem, curiously difficult to interpret, in its general argument no less than in detailed phrasing.”

In the second line of this sonnet the first three letters of ‘Fitton’ appear as ‘Ifit’, and the remaining three letters, ton appear, reversed, four words later:

Or if it weare it bore not beauties name:

The words ‘if’ and ‘it’ are printed as close together as possible, without it looking as if the two words were one:

Orifir

In the next line, underneath ‘if it’, the letters ‘t o n’ can be found, rearranged:

if it
But now

The placing of these two words is similar to the placing of ‘fit’ and ‘one’ in Act 4, Sc. 1, of Love’s Labour’s Lost:

9. Shakespeare habitually thought in quibbles (OED: a play on words, pun). Imagery and double meanings are generally inseparable. Quibbling was indeed a game, like the modern cross-word puzzle. In Love’s Labour’s Lost the quibbling is endless: Dover Wilson, Introduction to Hamlet, C.U.P. (1968).
O’ my troth, most sweet jests! most incony vulgar wit!
When it comes so smoothly off, so obscenely as it were, so fit.
Armado o’ th’ one side –

In the Fitton family home of Gawsworth Hall there is a fine shield of arms, surrounded by a motto which contains a punning version of the name:

FIT ONUS LEVE ET IUGUM SUAVE
UNUM QUODQUE NIHIL OMNE TOTUM

May the burden be light and the yoke easy.
One alone is nothing, the whole everything.

This shield was carved in 1570. The first line is taken from St. Matthew’s Gospel (11:30). The name of Fitton was incorporated again as a pun – fit one – in a rhyming couplet inscribed on a tablet on a monument erected in 1619 by Lady Anne Fitton, the wife of Mary’s brother, Edward, in the church at Gawsworth:

Whose soule’s and body’s beauties sentence them
FITTONS to wear a heavenly Diadem.

The family name can be seen in a third inscription, in the parish church of Shangton, in Leicestershire. In 1612, seven years after the death of Matthew Saunders’ wife, he erected a plaque on the chancel wall. It was assumed that this was an epitaph for his wife, but there is nothing in the inscription which proves this. In the third line the words indicate that it could refer to Anne Fitton, Mary’s sister, whom he dearly wished to marry.

HOW SHOULD RESPECTLES DEATH SO RIGHTLY HIT
THOSE WHOSE PERFECTIO STAYES YE WORLD FRO FALLIG
DID NOT HEAVNS MERCY CHOOSE THE ONLY FIT
TINHERIT BLISSE FOR EVER BY THEIR CALLINGE
The first line of the next quatrain of sonnet 127 contains the letters of the name Fitton:

For since each hand hath put on Nature's power,
Fairing the foule with Arts faulse borrow'd face,

And in the first line of the third quatrain we find the name of Mary rearranged, in four consecutive words:

Therefore my Mistersse eyes are Raven blacke,
Her eyes so suted, and they mourners seeme,

In the line following the one in which 'Fitton' is found, the letter F is signalled by four words beginning with that letter,

Fairing the foul with Arts false borrow'd face.

When alliteration is made so obvious, it looks as if the poet is more interested in suggestion than in literary merit.

In the line following the one in which 'Mary' is found, the letter M is signalled by two words containing that letter, 'mourners seeme'; and the penultimate line of the sonnet contains this strangely worded sentence:

Yet so they mourne becomming of their woe,

It can be argued that the author of these lines had no idea, when he was writing them, that the names of Mary and Fitton were in fact lying there. But examination of the original version of the Sonnets reveals the following pointers.

In both lines in which these two names are found, there are two capital letters, F and N, M and R. 'Fitton' begins with a capital F and ends with a capital N. The capital F is the first letter of the line, so it is, by itself, not remarkable; the second capital letter, N, is the first letter of 'Nature'. In other sonnets (e.g., no. 20) 'nature' is not printed with a capital N. Attention is drawn to the M of 'mistress' by its spelling, 'Mistersse'; and the second capital, R, is the first letter of Raven. In other sonnets (e.g., no. 130) colours are not given a capital letter -
And in 1605 Humphry Spurway wrote to Sir John Willoughby, on January 28, saying:

There has been a disputation before the kinge, who was moderator, between the Bishops and Mynisters...

Locally, in Cheshire, the name may have been pronounced 'Phutton' just as in Lancashire today, in Liverpool, 'pill' is pronounced 'pull'. In the Greyfriars Chronicle of 1529 we read the following spelling of the word 'bishop':

that day the bushoppe of sent Asse (St. Asaph)...

And in 1605 Humphry Spurway wrote to Sir John Willoughby, on January 28, saying:

There has been a disputation before the kinge, who was moderator, between the Bishops and Mynisters...

A third indication of the way in which certain vowel sounds were pronounced four hundred years ago is seen in the New Year's royal Gift Roll of 1596. One of the donors is listed as "Mr Bushop a Stacioner" – the bookseller and printer, George Bishop.

In certain words in English today, such as 'live', 'milk', and 'children', the 'i' is sometimes pronounced as if it were 'u'.

In the Quarto edition of Henry VI, part 3, 'bird', is spelt with a 'u'

And Beautie slanderd with a bastard shame,

Why did the author choose this particular adjective?
In 1601 Mary Fitton was slandered, having given birth to a bastard, the son of the Earl of Pembroke.

Lines 7 and 8 apply literally to Mary's situation at this time:

_Sweet beauty hath no name, no holy bower,
But is prophan'd, if not lives in disgrace._

The theme of this sonnet is our changing attitude to dark colours:

_In the old age blacke was not counted faire . . ._

Black can here be taken as referring to the colour of hair and eyes or to darkness of complexion. As can be seen in the two portraits of Mary Fitton at Arbury Hall, in Warwickshire, her hair was indeed dark brown. Her eyes, in the portraits, are not black, it is true. They seem to have been grey or hazel. In the sonnet we read

_... my Mistesse eyes are Raven blacke_,

It could be that the author chose that adjective for a special reason. A raven's eye is brown, but, because of its black plumage, it often seems to be black. In Gawsworth church the effigy of Mary Fitton shows her as having black hair.

Three of the earlier sonnets, 40, 41 and 42, give details of the poet's love of the Dark Lady, and of her affection for the poet's friend. Sonnet 41 contains these lines:

\[
\begin{align*}
Thy beautie, and thy yeares full well befits, 
For still temptation followes where thou art. 
Gentle thou art, and therefore to be wonne, 
Beautious thou art, therefore to be assailed. 
And when a woman woos, what woman's sonne 
Will soarely leave her till he have prevailed.
\end{align*}
\]

Here we have perhaps an exact description of Mary Fitton's wooing of Pembroke and the natural result.

Mary Fitton's nickname at Court was Mai, and we find this name in the Shakespeare plays – on each occasion with significant associations.

In *Twelfth Night*, a story adapted from the anonymously written Italian novella, *The Deceived*, published in 1537, Shakespeare added a new character, Malvolio. To anyone at Court when it was first performed at Whitehall on January 6th, 1600, and again at the Middle Temple on February 2nd, 1602, after Mary had left court in disgrace, this name would suggest 'I desire Mal' in Italian. In Act I, scene 3, Sir Toby Belch says:

\[
\begin{align*}
Wherefore are these things hid? Wherefore have these gifts a 
curtain before 'em? Are they like to take dust, like MISTRESS 
MALL's picture. Why dost thou not go to church in a galliard and 
come home in a coranto? My very walk should be a jig. I did think, 
by the excellent constitution of thy leg, it was formed under the 
star of a galliard.
\end{align*}
\]

We know that Mistress Fitton was very fond of dancing.

In *Love's Labour's Lost*, which was re-written by the author in 1598, two years after Mary had come to Court, the sonnet-writing
Baconian: Mary and Helena:

All's Well That Ends Well

All is well that ends well: Bacon, Promus, Folio 103, 1597.

Helena, in All's Well, is a new character in English literature, unlike any other character created by earlier or contemporary authors. We can see aspects of her personality, this charming combination of reserve and passion, in Romeo and Juliet, and As You Like It. Juliet and Rosalind express their love of Romeo and Orlando with the same surprisingly explicit intensity that we find in Helen's pursuit of Bertram. These three plays were all written during, or soon after the time when Mary Fitton served as a Maid of Honour, impressing the Queen, the Earl of Pembroke, Sir William Knollys, Sir Richard Leveson and others with her beauty and erotic charm. When Helena first appears at the Court of the King of France, the elderly...
nobleman, Lafeu, twice mentions her sexual vitality.

In Sonnet 127 and in Love's Labour's Lost, we saw how if it and fit appeared above the letters t o n. The word 'fit' is repeated over and over again in the very next scene of All's Well That Ends Well (Act II, Sc. ii):

Clown:  I have an answer will serve all men.
Countess:  Marry, that's a bountiful answer that fits all questions.
Clown:  It is like a barber's chair that fits all buttocks.
Countess:  Will your answer serve fit to all questions?
Clown:  As fit as ten groats is for the hand of an attorney.
Countess:  Have you, I say, an answer of such fitness for all questions?
Clown:  From below your duke to beneath your constable, it will fit any question.
Countess:  It must be an answer of most monstrous size that must fit all demands.

This absurd exchange seems to have been written with one object only – to alert the reader or the audience that a certain surname is being mentioned. If that is not the message, the whole scene is pointless.

There is no evidence that this play was ever performed, in public or at Court, during the reign of Queen Elizabeth or King James. It came before the public for the first time when the First Folio of the Shakespeare plays was published in 1623, and there is no record of a public performance until 1741.13 A reason for there being no public performance of the play during the author's lifetime could be his personal involvement with the man and young woman whose love affair is portrayed in the drama.

It does not require much imagination to appreciate what a young woman without wealth or much social standing, like Mary Fitton, must have felt as a Maid of Honour, at the very centre of Elizabeth's brilliant court, surrounded by the richest and noblest men of the land. It was a position no young woman can be in now, since we no longer

have Maids of Honour, a privileged rank which was terminated in the reign of George V. It was indeed life at the top, lived in the golden age of court entertainment, with lavish banquets, frequent balls, great tragedies, elegant and sometimes bawdy comedies, exciting jousts, grand progresses around the country, and opportunities in plenty for clandestine affairs. Helena, in *All’s Well That Ends Well*, speaks for all those who have found themselves at a disadvantage because of their social position, wishing that they were able to add nobility and wealth to their physical attributes. If Mary Fitton’s parents had been rich, she would have become the Countess of Pembroke, the wife of one of the “incomparable Pair of Brethren”, to whom the Shakespeare *First Folio* was dedicated. Like Helena, she must have wished that the cards dealt to her at birth had been stronger:

*Helena*  
'Tis pity  
That wishing well had not a body in’t  
Which might be felt, that we, the poorer born,  
Whose baser stars do shut us up in wishes,  
Might with effects of them follow our friends,  
And show what we alone must think, which never  
Returns us thanks . . .  
Monsieur Parolles, you were born under a charitable star.

*Parolles:*  
I will return perfect courtier . . . Get thee a good husband, and use him as he uses thee.

*Helena*  
What power is it which mounts my love so high,  
That makes me see, and cannot feed mine eye? . . .  
Who ever strove  
To show her merit that did miss her love?

In *All’s Well That Ends Well*, Helena secretly leaves the French Court and, wearing a pilgrim’s cloak, makes her way to Florence, where Bertram is living. Mary Fitton, as mentioned earlier took the same steps to leave Whitehall *incognito*, with her skirt pulled up and clad in a white cloak, to visit William Herbert. Arriving in Florence Helena asks an old woman where she might stay the night. “At the Saint Francis here beside the port” is the reply. Where Mary Fitton went to meet Herbert clandestinely is not known, but it so happens that Francis Bacon lived near Whitehall, at York House in the
Strand. In German, Dutch and Danish, Strand means the sea shore. Commentators explain the use of the word ‘port’ in the old woman’s reply by giving the alternative meaning of this word, a city gate. This could be the correct interpretation, but it is not the usual meaning of this word. When the old woman advises Helena to stay at ‘the Saint Francis’, she asks “is this the way”. The old woman’s reply is “Ay, marry, is’t”. This word was pronounced ‘Mary’, as it is an abbreviation of ‘by St. Mary’.

In All’s Well one of the Dumaines asks Parolles for “a copy of the sonnet you writ to Diana” on behalf of Bertram. This is, in fact, what Francis Bacon did, writing placatory letters to the Queen on behalf of Essex, making them look as if they were written by Essex himself. Towards the end of the play, Lafeu sums up the tragedy of Bertram’s treatment of Helena in words that apply exactly to Herbert’s refusal to marry Mistress Fitton.

... the young lord

Did to his majesty, his mother and his lady
Offence of mighty note, but to himself
The greatest wrong of all. He lost a wife
Whose beauty did astonish the survey
Of richest eyes; whose words all ears took captive;
Whose dear perfection hearts that scorn’d to serve
Humbly call’d mistress.
The Shakespearean *Sonnets* have baffled countless students over the years. One of the reasons for this is because they are not printed in sequence, timewise, so that it is difficult to determine what happened when, so to speak. There is also the problem of interpretation. Several scholars have interpreted them symbolically, and have completely disregarded what the poet had to say. Some think, for example, that he was writing to his muse, or to his lost youth, or to his inner self, instead of to a young man whom he loved. Given all this, one can understand why the problem seems so difficult. I have interpreted the poems literally, as I think the poet meant them to be. As for the time sequence, if one will just relax and read them straight through for thought and feeling, one can get a reasonable picture of the story presented by the *Sonnets*. In general, Sonnets 1–126 are addressed to the beloved youth, and 127–152 to the dark lady, although Sonnets 33–35 and 40–42 also deal with her. The last two Sonnets, 153–154, tell a pretty tale about Cupid and how the waters of a "seething bath" could not cool the fires of love.

No discussion of the dark lady can be fruitful without knowing when and by whom the *Sonnets* were written. In my books on Shakespearean authorship, *The Bacon–Shakespearean Mystery* (1960) and *The Shakespearean Portraits* (1964, 1966) I have defended the thesis that Anthony Bacon, older brother of Sir Francis Bacon, was the chief author of the Shakespearean plays and sole author of the *Sonnets*. Sonnet 107 is helpful in determining the date:

*The mortall Moone hath her eclipse indur'\text{de},
And the sad Augurs mock their owne presage,
Incertenties now crowne them-selves assur'\text{de},
And peace proclaimes Olives of endlesse age.*

Leslie Hotson in *Shakespeare's Sonnets Dated* (1949) suggested that the "mortall Moone" referred to the Spanish fleet, which assumed a crescent or moon shaped formation for battle. He therefore dated the
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Sonnets at about 1590. He was thinking, of course, of the Spanish armada of 1588. However, the remnants of the Spanish fleet returned to Spanish ports to rebuild for another attempt against England. The second Spanish armada was defeated in June of 1596 and Cadiz was sacked and burned. I place the Sonnets slightly after this second defeat, with dates hovering around 1600. Anthony Bacon was forty years old in 1598, as mentioned in Sonnet 2, the only Sonnet to give a figure for age, although a number of Sonnets describe his aged condition. Sonnet 2 begins:

When Fortie Winters shall beseige thy brow,
And digge deep trenches in thy beauties field,

Since the poet was giving advice in this sonnet, he apparently speaks from the vantage point of the forty years which he describes.

The Sonnets were dedicated to "Mr. W.H.". I have followed the lead of a number of Shakespearean scholars in identifying him as young William Herbert, who became the 3rd Earl of Pembroke. William Herbert was presented at Court in 1598, when he was eighteen years old. The poet apparently met him the preceding summer, soon after the youth's arrival in London. Anthony Bacon had once been deeply in love with William Herbert's mother, the former Mary Sidney, sister of Sir Philip Sidney. In the young man he saw the son who, under happier circumstances, might have been his, and he loved the youth with all the devotion of his ardent nature. So he wrote in Sonnet 3:

Thou art thy mother's glasse and she in thee
Calls backe the lovely Aprill of her prime.

At this time Anthony Bacon was serving as confidential secretary for Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex, who was Queen Elizabeth's current favourite. A letter written to Essex by the Lord Henry Howard on September 14, 1597, on behalf of Anthony Bacon, whose hands were disabled by gout, gives us the approximate date:

"He knows your noble disposition, and hath often had experiment of your facility in acquitting persons guilty, as he
cannot feel your hard conceit against him, that ever will be innocent, believing your most noble favour to be grounded upon principles of antient experience, too strong to be shaken with any blast of emulation."

Sometime during this period the poet met the “dark lady”, so called because she is described as black in a number of Sonnets. However, we must remember that until recently in England and even today in Germany brunettes are referred to as black, meaning that they are not blondes. The dark lady apparently did not conform to the poet’s standards of beauty, as is evident from Sonnet 141:

*In faith I doe not love thee with mine eyes,*  
For they in thee a thousand errors note,  
But ’tis my heart that loves what they despise,  
Who in despite of view is pleas’d to dote.*

He dwells upon her black eyes in several Sonnets, but he also writes in Sonnet 130, “*her breasts are dun*”. I get the impression of a dark brunette but not a really black woman, as we usually think of one. Sonnet 128 shows that the affair progressed slowly:

*How oft when thou my musike musike playst,*  
Upon that blessed wood whose motion sounds  
With thy sweet fingers when thou gently swayst,  
The wiry concord that mine eare confounds,  
Do I envie those Jackes that nimbly leape,  
To kisse the tender inward of thy hand,  
Whilst my poore lips which should that harvest reape,  
At the woods bouldness by thee blushing stand.*

This Sonnet gives us the best objective description of this fascinating woman, because it was written before the poet had any claim upon her. We discover that she was musical. There is also an atmosphere of some culture. It does not sound as if she initiated the love affair.

Many of the later *Sonnets* are concerned with her infidelity, real or
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imagined. Sonnet 152 calls her “twice forsworn”, indicating that she had broken with a previous lover. Some commentators think that she may have been a married woman, but not living with her husband at the time of the poet’s involvement with her. Or she may have been the mistress of someone else.

She probably became the poet’s mistress in the spring of 1598. This arrangement may have continued for close to two years, and is best described by Sonnet 138:

When my love sweares that she is made of truth,  
I do beleeve her though I know she lyes,  
That she might thinke me some untutord youth,  
Unlearned in the worlds false subtilties.  
Thus vainely thinking that she thinkes me young,  
Although she knowes my dayes are past the best,  
Simply I credit her false speaking tongue,  
On both sides thus is simple truth supprest.  
But wherefore sayes she not she is unjust?  
And wherefore say not I that I am old?  
O loves best habit is in seeming trust,  
And age in love, loves not t’ have yeares told.  
Therefore I lye with her, and she with me,  
And in our faults by lyes we flattered be.

Sonnet 134 tells us that the beloved youth was entrapped when he was sent with a message from the poet, who was temporarily unable to go to her. His fall seems to have been immediate. Indications are that this beguiling woman was older than the youth but younger than the poet. She soon became the young man’s mistress.

Many scholars have been disturbed because the poet continued to love the young man in spite of the latter’s infidelity. The reason for this is simple. The poet loved the youth more than he loved the woman. He tells us so in Sonnet 42:

That thou hast her, it is not all my grief,  
And yet it may be said I lov’d her dearly;  
That she hath thee is of my wailing chief,  
A loss in love that touches me more nearly.
There has been much speculation about the identity of the dark lady. The most popular candidate has been Mary Fitton, a twenty-year-old Maid of Honor to Queen Elizabeth in 1598. In 1601 she had a child out of wedlock by William Herbert, who refused to marry the mother of the child, which died soon after birth. A portrait shows a woman with brown hair and gray eyes. Leslie Hotson thought the dark lady was a madam whom the poet met in a brothel. To prove that Anthony Bacon was not that kind of man, one has only to turn to Daphne du Maurier’s *Golden Lads*. This reference also shows that the poet’s relationship with the beloved youth was not a homosexual one. So does Sonnet 20.

In my own search for the dark lady I have relied upon some basic facts that should be considered. First and foremost is Anthony Bacon’s situation as confidential secretary of the Earl of Essex. In this capacity he handled political correspondence with important people in Britain and on the continent, translating foreign letters into English and deciphering those in cipher. Besides this, he was writing his plays. He had little or no time for social intercourse. On top of that, his lameness and other physical problems limited his activities. As he neared the age of forty, he seldom ventured out except for business. His friends came to him.

Under these conditions, where would he be likely to meet the dark lady? There is a possibility, but only a faint one, that he met her in Essex House, as we shall see. Besides the Earl’s commodious quarters, there were a number of other apartments there. Among these were those of Henry Wriothesley, Earl of Southampton, of Fulke Greville, and Anthony Bacon’s own. The Earl of Southampton was the nobleman to whom the poet had dedicated his *Venus and Adonis* in 1593 and *Lucrece* in 1594.

I have long thought that one should turn to the large Italian colony in London in searching for the dark lady. One of the most prominent of the Italians in London at that time was John Florio, a prolific writer in English, French and Italian. His father, Michael Angelo Florio, had been the pastor of the Protestant Italian church in London after the family fled religious persecution in their native Italy. He later taught Latin in London and produced books in French and Italian.
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The family had fled from England at the accession of Queen Mary, so that John Florio received his early education on the continent. He later resided at Oxford, where he matriculated at Magdalene College. He served as a tutor in French and Italian and produced several books before moving to London in the early 1590's, where he worked on his Italian–English dictionary. Here his chief patron was the Earl of Southampton.

It was at this time that the Bacon brothers began to consider a translation of Montaigne's *Essais* into English. Florio seemed the natural one to whom to turn for this work, and I now believe that the translation of Montaigne’s *Essais* bearing John Florio’s name, which appeared in 1603, was more or less a co-operative effort.

Mrs. Henry Pott was the first to suggest that Francis Bacon was deeply involved in the first English translation of Montaigne’s *Essais*. One of the reasons for this belief was the fact that the title page of the 1632 edition of John Florio’s English translation pictures an upright broken arch and two lower complete arches forming the letters FB. This device was first pictured as Emblem no. 45 of the 1577 edition of Alciat’s *Emblemata*, and copied as Emblem no. 53 of Whitney’s *Choice of Emblems* (1586). Mrs. Pott was also suspicious of the discrepancies between different editions of the original English translation. Another clue that interests me is the fact that the six women to whom the three books of the first edition were dedicated (two for each book) were relatives or friends of one or both Bacon brothers.

The original idea for the translation of Montaigne’s *Essais* was probably Anthony Bacon’s, since he had been a close friend and admirer of Montaigne, but it was Francis Bacon, I think, who was primarily involved in this venture. Florio’s quarters were used for consultation or work on this project. It was probably at one of the preliminary meetings that Anthony met Florio’s daughter Aurelia. Or she may have accompanied her father when he stopped by at Essex House. Whatever her morals may have been, she seems to have captivated the poet by her vibrant personality and, being John Florio’s daughter, by her considerable culture.

It is interesting to learn that William Herbert, who became the 3rd Earl of Pembroke in 1601, was a patron of John Florio. Aurelia may have ceased to be his mistress after his marriage in 1604 to Lady
Mary, daughter of Gilbert Talbot, 7th Earl of Shrewsbury. At any rate, he continued his friendship with and patronage of Florio until the latter's death in 1625 at the age of seventy-two.

According to the Dictionary of National Biography, Florio’s will left most of his worldly possessions to his wife Rosa, but directed that his books and manuscripts be turned over to Pembroke. Florio beseeched Pembroke to look after his wife and to ensure that she got her due share of any money resulting from possible publication of his manuscripts. At this time Aurelia was living in London as the wife of a surgeon, and Anthony Bacon was long since gone.

Anthony Bacon never forgot Aurelia, and paid tribute to her in Anthony and Cleopatra. When the poet wrote,

\[
\text{Age cannot wither her, nor custom stale}
\text{Her infinite variety.}
\]

I think he was describing his lost mistress, whom he idealized in this play. This was one of the poet’s later literary efforts, written about 1607 but not published until 1623. The Folio of 1623 was dedicated to the Earl of Pembroke, the beloved youth of the Sonnets, and his brother, the Earl of Montgomery, who probably bore at least part of the cost of publication. Approximately twenty-five years after the love affair of the Sonnets, Pembroke paid his debt to Anthony Bacon and to Aurelia.
The First Folio plays can be reduced to themes essentially agreeable with Francis Bacon’s Prerogative Instances. Joel Disher suggested this in his article “Early Rosicrucian Manifestoes” that appeared in the September 1959 Rosicrucian Digest. In the history, architecture, literature, and myths of most cultures the frequent appearance of twenty-eight seems a coincidence. This coincidence becomes meaningful – becomes a synchronicity – with an understanding of the thesis of the archetypal twenty-eight. The thesis of an archetypal twenty-eight provides a rationale for an agreement of themes between Bacon’s Prerogative Instances and the Shakespeare plays.

Bacon outlined six sections for his Great Restoration, which he called The Great Instauration. The second part, The Novum Organum, provided rules for inquiry and included the details of the Prerogative Instances, instances that are vital for a correct interpretation of natural laws. No fourth part exists among Bacon’s writings except a small fragment. In the last paragraph of this fragment Bacon stated that the fourth part was to provide examples of the second part, The Novum Organum. Bacon and his fraternity of men who labored toward a renaissance of learning, The Great Restoration, were aware that drama was a good way of reaching both the emotions and reason. The Shakespeare plays were the promised fourth part.

As an example of an agreement between the Prerogative Instances and the Shakespeare plays, Joel Disher, who later became editor of The Rosicrucian Digest, took one of the Prerogative Instances, “Divorce”, as a clue. He found nothing in Bacon’s essays about divorce but noted that the theme in the Shakespeare play Henry VIII was the divorce of Henry and the Lady Katherine. Disher believed this example suggested a method which, if followed step by step, reduced the plays to essential themes that agreed with the Prerogative Instances.

This article poses four hypotheses:
1. An archetypal twenty-eight manifests synchronistically across cultures in history, architecture, literature, and myths as twenty-eight separate and distinct phases, personalities, and characteristics.

2. Francis Bacon's Prerogative Instances and the characters mentioned within the titles of the 1623 First Folio Catalogue are each a list of the archetypal twenty-eight.

3. This archetypal twenty-eight results from the seven phases of all cycles passing through the four functions of physical, feeling, thinking, and spiritual.

4. The ten comedies listed in the Catalogue of the First Folio that do not have a character mentioned within the title are representative of the four functions and the seven phases.

The establishment of these four hypotheses provides a rationale for an agreement between Bacon's Prerogative Instances and the Shakespeare plays in the 1623 First Folio.

The archetypal twenty-eight

The symbolism of the zodiac, like all phenomena based on twelve, lies in the idea that the four elements (earth, water, air, and fire) may appear in the three different ways, giving twelve divisions. The three different ways, called qualities in astrology, may be thought of as levels, grades, or parts of a cycle based upon the Hegelian dialectic (the law of three). The active cardinal qualities represent the thesis of the dialectic, the slower fixed qualities represent the antithesis, and the unifying mutable qualities represent the synthesis of the dialectic.

The zodiac summarizes the movement of the law of three through the four elements, resulting in twelve divisions. The sun in its passage around the zodiac symbolizes this cycle of twelve divisions.

The four elements of astrology are analogous to Carl Jung's four functions: sensation, feeling, thinking, and intuition. A phenomenon based upon the movement of the seven phases of all cycles (the law of seven) through these four functions produces twenty-eight divisions. The moon symbolizes this phenomenon when its twenty-eight day cycle is divided into quarters of seven days each. This lunar cycle of twenty-eight is similar to the solar cycle of twelve.

In the fourth chapter of Revelation there are twenty-eight about
the throne: twenty-four elders [twice twelve] and the four beasts. When the solar twelve is doubled, it approaches the lunar cycle. This relationship between twelve and twenty-eight is described in the following two examples in which the solar cycle approaches the lunar cycle.

The twelve knights of the round table were based upon the twelve disciples of Jesus. To represent the dual aspect, the male and female, the twelve are doubled to twenty-four, and with the addition of the king and queen they total twenty-six. The Siege Perilous was the throne for the perfect man. A knight worthy to occupy the Siege Perilous, accompanied by his lady companion, would bring the total to twenty-eight.

The second example appears in Robert Graves’s book King Jesus in which he speaks of the Hebrew mystic “song of the Sacred Year that contains the names of the original fourteen tribes.” These fourteen tribes are the twelve mentioned in Genesis plus Joseph’s two sons, Ephriam and Manasseh. In Hebrew Myths: the Book of Genesis Graves noted that all of the patriarchs except Joseph had twin sisters whom they later married. This suggests a compromise in the days of the Judges between joint worship of a god and goddess, the masculine zodiacal twelve symbolized by the sun and the feminine archetypal twenty-eight symbolized by the moon. Graves stated that Leah also bore a daughter, Dinah, without a male twin. Extrapolating, thirteen patriarchs (the fourteen minus Joseph) married to their twin sisters plus Joseph and Dinah total twenty-eight.

The coincidence of twenty-eight in the literature, myths, history, and architecture of diverse cultures becomes meaningful with the unfolding of order within the following examples. Similar to the order founded upon patterns of twelve, which can be split up into three fours or four threes, the order founded upon patterns of twenty-eight is based upon four sevens or seven fours.

In the Prologue to The Canterbury Tales Chaucer speaks of twenty-nine pilgrims but lists twenty-eight or thirty, not twenty-nine. Chaucer describes twenty-six pilgrims, most with his insightful detail of character. The troublesome sentence follows the description of the Prioress:

Another Nun with her had she,
That was her chaplain, and priests three.
The Nun and three priests added to the twenty-six total thirty. Kenneth Kee suggests in Geoffrey Chaucer: A Selection of his Works that there is reason for doubting that the Prioress would be accompanied by three priests. It is suggested that “and priests three” was added by some scribe to fill out an incomplete line of Chaucer, the line possibly having been,

*Another Nun with her had she,*  
*That was her Chaplain, and a priest."

The Nun and priest plus the other twenty-six total twenty-eight pilgrims that came to the inn.

The sketches of the various pilgrims contained in the Prologue are regarded as graphic pictures of typical figures of fourteenth century England, individuals as well as types. The tales fit the teller and stand in intimate relation to all that Chaucer reveals about the personality traits of the tellers.

These twenty-eight pilgrims are listed in CHART 1.

William Butler Yeats is considered by many to be one of the great poets of the twentieth century. He wrote that on the afternoon of October 24, 1917, four days after his marriage, his wife surprised him by attempting automatic writing. Three years after the communications through his wife ended, Yeats had recorded some fifty copybooks. From these communications Yeats received an exposition of the twenty-eight typical incarnations or phases.

The system given to Yeats is the Great Wheel of the lunar phases. The first quarter is concerned with the body (physical), the second with the heart (feeling), the third with the mind (thinking), and the fourth with the soul (spiritual). The Great Wheel consists of twenty-eight incarnations, a single judgment, act, or thought and, as historical cycle, takes some two thousand years to complete.

In his book *A Vision* Yeats explains the system of supernaturally inspired images and metaphors which provided the framework of some of his greatest poetry. The list of persons Yeats considered representative of the twenty-eight phases is found in CHART 1.

Dante’s *Divine Comedy* is in the form of an allegory, a blend of
truth and fiction. Dante finds himself in a dark wood where Virgil appears and leads him through the nine circles of the Inferno and the seven terraces of the mountain Purgatory. Reaching the summit, Dante and Virgil enter Eden, the earthly Paradise where Beatrice takes Virgil’s place.

Beatrice guides Dante in Paradise through the ten levels: the seven planets, the stars, the Primum Mobile, and the Empyrean. Then for a moment Dante is privileged to gaze upon the Trinity, the Beatific Vision.

The nine circles of Inferno, the seven terraces of Purgatory, and the ten levels of Paradise total twenty-six. Eden and the Beatific Vision bring the levels to which Dante travelled to twenty-eight. [See CHART 1]

The Great Assises Holden by Apollo at Parnassus was published in 1645 by George Wither. The Lord Verulam (Francis Bacon) is listed first after Apollo and is made Apollo’s representative to preside over the learning of his Age. On the left of CHART 2 twenty-eight names are listed. On the right four names are listed.

One of the codes used by Bacon was a simple number code in which A was 1, B was 2, etc. (I and J being the same). In this code ‘Bacon’ was number 33. The twenty-eight names on the left of CHART 2, the four names on the right, and the name Apollo in an ornately trimmed box at the top total 33, Bacon’s cipher name.

The third chapter of Ecclesiastes begins: “For everything there is a season; a time for every matter under heaven.” A list for fourteen opposites follows (e.g., a time to keep and a time to lose) for a total of twenty-eight.

The seventh and eighth stanzas of Yr Awdil Vraith by the mythic Welsh poet Gwion are:

Twice five, ten and eight,
she was self-bearing
The mixed burden
Of man-woman.

And once, not hidden,
She brought forth Abel,
And Cain the solitary
Homicide.
Robert Graves in *The White Goddess* believes this means that Eve bore twenty-eight children, acting as her own midwife before bearing Cain and Abel.

In the Spaniard’s Chapel at S. Maria Novella in Florence a fresco is devoted to St. Thomas Aquinas, who is shown trampling false teachers underfoot. The lower portion of the panel shows twenty-eight seated persons in two rows: fourteen men in the bottom row and fourteen women in the row above.

Of all the disciples of John, the baptist and forerunner of Jesus, Simon Magus was the favourite. According to the method of combination or coupling, Jesus had twelve disciples as the sun, and John, as the moon, had thirty, the number of days in a lunation, or more correctly twenty-nine and a half, one of his disciples being a woman called Helen, a woman being reckoned as half a man.

When John died, Simon was away in Alexandria, and Dositheus was chosen head of the school. Later, Simon took over from Dositheus the leadership of a cult based on that of Hercules and the Moon-goddess, his mistress. Simon Magus had “twenty-eight disciples, arranged in four weeks.” The extra day and a half that composed a lunar month were represented by himself and a woman, Jezebel, a priestess of Hierapolis. After marrying Simon, she was known to his followers as Selene the Moon.

The first Emperor of the Chin dynasty in China was Chin Shih Huang (third century A.D.), who possessed a magic mirror, The Mirror of Tang, which had the power to reflect what was inward of those who looked upon it. Four hundred years later the second Emperor of the Tang dynasty remarked, “By using a mirror of brass you may see to adjust your cap; by using antiquity as a mirror, you may learn to foresee the rise and fall of Empires.”

On the back of the mirror a center circle represents the Great Ultimate Principle (Tai Chi). Next are the four animals of the Four Quadrants: Dragon, Phoenix, Tiger, and Tortoise. Outside these are the eight diagrams, which figuratively denote the evolution of nature and its cyclic changes. Next to them are the twelve animals of the twelve terrestrial branches: dragon, hare, tiger, fox, rat, pig, dog, cock, monkey, goat, horse, and snake. The outermost zodiac is composed of twenty-eight animals, each corresponding to one of the ancient constellations. More than 3,000 years ago the Chinese divided
the celestial sphere into twenty-eight constellations. Seven constella-
tions were allotted to each of the four quadrants of heaven.

Called Samsara, the Buddhist Wheel of Life sets forth the basic
beliefs in reincarnation. The circle of twenty-eight human figures
around the hub consists of fourteen on a black background and
fourteen on white and represents the perpetual rebirth of souls.

Pythagoras was an initiate of twenty-eight mystery schools
including the Greek, Egyptian, Chaldean, and Hindu. The Mystery
Schools taught the same doctrine. Each school, however, laid special
emphasis upon one part of the doctrine.

The principal churches of the city of Rome after the third century
were headed by priests called titular priests. The custom was not
restricted to Rome, but the titular priests of Rome came to have a
special importance. They were part of the electors of the pope, and
from them the later order of cardinal priests developed. In the Middle
Ages there were twenty-eight such traditional titular or cardinal
priests, seven for each of the four major basilicas of the city: St.
Peter's, San Paolo, San Maria Maggiore, and San Lorenzo fuori le
Mura.

The Egyptian measuring rod was most often made of wood and
intended for actual use. Marked on the Turin Museum Cubit are the
remen cubit of twenty digits or fingers, the small cubit of twenty-four
digits (six hands of four fingers each), and the Royal Cubit of twenty-
eight digits (seven hands of four fingers each – an ordinary cubit with
a seventh hand added). The lower half of the cubit is divided into
three sections of twenty-eight divisions. The top section, read from
right to left, contains the names of twenty-eight divinities, one for
each digit.

In the Grand Gallery of the Great Pyramid are two ramps, one on
each side of the corridor. Seven courses of overlapping stone form the
sides of the Grand Gallery. Twenty-eight notches are cut into each
ramp.

The Holy Staircase is in the Piazza San Giovanni in Lateran.
Here, Pope Sixtus V placed the stairway of the residence which
tradition identifies as the staircase ascended by Jesus in Pilate's
palace in Jerusalem. The staircase, brought to Rome by St. Helena,
consists of twenty-eight steps which the faithful climb on their knees.

The coincidence of twenty-eight in these examples becomes
meaningful, becomes a synchronicity, with an awareness of the archetypal twenty-eight.

The prerogative instances and the Shakespeare plays as examples of the archetypal twenty-eight

Francis Bacon separated the Prerogative Instances from all other instances because they possess special rights and powers in the interpretation of nature. They are useful to describe a natural history, apart from the general guidelines. It is their singularity that forces them on our attention. For example, in what Bacon calls "Traveling Instances", one characteristic is seen to change, as when water freezes and becomes hard.

In the second book of *The Novum Organum* under "Instances Agreeing in the Nature of Heat" Bacon lists twenty-eight instances of heat, twenty-seven as positive instances of heat and number twenty-eight (the last numbered) as "other instances". After discussing three other lists concerning heat, he describes in great detail the twenty-seven Prerogative Instances.

Peter Urbach in *Francis Bacon's Philosophy of Science* observed, "Oddly enough the number of Prerogative Instances exactly matches the number of types of positive instances of heat that Bacon listed." Urbach dismissed this as a coincidence rather than a synchronicity, the meaningful coincidence he apparently intuited - the archetypal twenty-eight.

Justification for considering Bacon's list of twenty-seven Prerogative Instances as a valid example of the archetypal twenty-eight are provided by William Butler Yeats and the Knights of the Round Table. Yeats implied that twenty-eight distinct phases are not always necessary in the archetypal twenty-eight, metaphorically the Lunar Cycle. In *The Phases of the Moon* Yeats wrote:

> Twenty-and-eight the phases of the moon,  
The full and the moon's dark and all the crescents,  
TWENTY-AND-EIGHT, AND YET BUT SIX-AND-TWENTY  
The cradles that a man must needs be rocked in:  
For there's no human life at the full or the dark.
THE PREROGATIVE INSTANCES AND THE SHAKESPEARE PLAYS

According to Yeats the first and fifteenth phases (the full moon and the new or “dark” moon) have no description. Phase one is not human, being complete objectivity, a supernatural incarnation. Phase fifteen has no description except that it is a phase of complete beauty.

At the Round Table the perfect man and his lady were to occupy the Siege Perilous. Being perfect, they are not human and are analogous to the two phases (one and fifteen) which Yeats said had no description.

The Prerogative Instances, rather than examples, are single word concepts which, followed by descriptions, summarize twenty-seven of the separate principles or themes of the archetypal twenty-eight. [See CHART 1] As examples of the Prerogative Instances, the Shakespeare plays provide types and models of the twenty-eight principles or themes of the archetypal twenty-eight.

The Catalogue of the 1623 First Folio of Shakespeare plays lists thirty-five plays. A thirty-sixth play, Troilus and Cressida, is not listed but is printed in the First Folio. Within the titles of the plays are twenty-two names of individuals plus Merchant, Shrew, Two Gentlemen, and (two) Merry Wives for a total of twenty-eight characters. [See CHART 3]

Most modern publications of the Shakespeare plays include Pericles, bringing the total plays to thirty-seven and the characters to twenty-nine. Several reasons are given for Pericles not being included in the First Folio: copyright difficulties, no promptbook available, or it was considered a collaborative effort. Of course, by not including Pericles the First Folio list of characters totals twenty-eight.

The quaternary and the septenary

Like all natural numbers twenty-eight is an archetypal representation, its singularity residing in it being the product of four and seven, the quaternary and the septenary. The number four represents stability and is symbolic of the earth. Four expresses a quantity in ‘four apples’ and a unit in ‘apple number four’. The quaternary principle, based on the number four, is the fourness in a square, a
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cross, a cube, as well as the idea of fourness in the seasons, the cardinal points, the phases of the moon. Groups of four such as the Four Evangelists and the four sons of Horus are universal religious and cultural symbols.

The concept of a fourfold psyche is not new. Early man intuitively recognized the importance of the fourfold self in the endeavor to realize full spiritual growth as evidenced by Indo-Tibetan mandalas and American Indian sand painting.

In translating The Republic Jowett calls Plato’s observation of the four main ways we experience phenomena as understanding, faith for conviction, reason, and perception of shadows. With his profound interest in the symbolism of the quaternary, Carl Jung came independently upon the same fourfold division. Building up the pattern of the human psyche as one endowed with four functions, Jung called them sensation, feeling, thinking, and intuition.

By means of these four functions, man comprehends, assimilates, and responds to his experiences. Sensation (sense perception) tells you something exists, thinking tells you what it is, feeling tells you whether it is agreeable or not, and intuition from whence it comes and where it is going.

In all oriental rituals the candidate progressed through the four elements of earth, air, fire, and water in the process of unfoldment. When the young man asked Jesus what he should do to inherit eternal life, Jesus asked him how he understood the law. The young man answered: Love God with all your strength, heart, mind and soul—the four functions. Jesus replied, “You have answered right.” Carl Jung would agree.

CHART 4 lists tetrads (Greek for a group of four) analogously grouped under PHYSICAL, FEELING, THINKING, and SPIRITUAL and includes some of those that appear in literature.

Traditionally, seven is symbolic of perfect order, a complete cycle. Everything within the universe has its expression in cycles. Whether a journey, the development of an embryo, the movement of tides, or the growth of a plant, seven periods or phases make up all cycles.

1. Initiation. Everything, outside of some First Cause, whether a growing process or evolutionary process, must first begin; a seed sprouts.
2. **Differentiation.** Before the original cause can have any effect, it must differentiate into its positive and negative aspects: roots and stem appear.

3. **Manifestation.** The positive and negative aspects bring into manifestation a new entity: the plant appears above ground.

4. **Development.** The new entity grows: rapid plant growth.

5. **Application.** The process becomes of use or value: flower and fruit appear.

6. **Maturity.** Complete development: fruit matures.

7. **Transition.** Closure, in which every end is a beginning: seeds drop.

Every cycle is a process of becoming and making preparation for a further becoming. Every cycle is in itself a phase, being one of seven that comprises a greater cycle. Each phase is itself a cycle with seven phases, each in turn a cycle.

The quaternary and septenary principles in the catalogue of the First Folio

The thirty-five plays in the Catalogue of the 1623 *First Folio* are listed under three categories: Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies. Listing *Troilus and Cressida* with the other plays in the Catalogue results in twenty-eight characters. *How* this play is listed can result in twenty-eight characters being a total of four groups of seven, the two factors that produce the archetypal twenty-eight.

*Troilus and Cressida* defies classification. The 1609 *Quarto* called it a history, the epistle to the reader refers to it as a comedy, and the title page in the *Folio* is *The Tragedie of Troylus and Cressida*. The word “Tragedie” also appears on the following two pages, which are the only ones numbered. The remaining pages are headed “Troylus and Cressida” with no pagination. Apparently the first three pages were initially placed after the play *Romeo and Juliet* but later withdrawn. In the *First Folio*, *Troilus and Cressida* was printed between the last of the histories and the first of the tragedies and was omitted from the Catalogue of plays.

By placing the name “Cressida” with the Comedies and “Troilus” at the beginning of the Tragedies, and then dividing the Tragedies
into two separate categories, the Catalogue of plays is divided into four groups of seven names each. [See CHART 3]

Justification for adding a fourth category of plays is found in Act II of *Hamlet* where Polonius speaks of “tragedy, comedy, history, and pastoral”. The addition of a fourth category is not the pastoral denoting shepherds and the rustic life, of which *As You Like It* would be an example, but pastoral connoting the metaphorical shepherd, the leader of a people – a king.

Among the Comedies are ten plays having no name or title of a person. These ten ‘no name’ plays represent the *quaternary* and the *septenary*. Listing only these ten plays in sequence results in the following distribution:

1. *The Tempest*
2. 
3. 
4. *Measure for Measure*
5. *The Comedy of Errors*
6. *Much Ado about Nothing*
7. *Love's Labor's Lost*
8. *A Midsummer Night's Dream*
9. 
10. *AS YOU LIKE IT*
11. 
12. *All's Well That Ends Well*
13. *Twelfth Night*
14. *The Winter's Tale*

The tenth play, *As You Like It*, can be grouped with the first six for a total of seven or with the last three for a total of four. Serving in both groups, *As You Like It* is the seventh play in the series of seven and the first play in the series of four.

There is precedent for allowing one unit of a list to be used twice when the list is divided into two groups. In *The Universe of Numbers* the statement is made that in the Ten Sephiroth of the Kabalah there is a series of *three* and a series of *seven* Sephiroth. The fourth of the ten is both part of the first series and part of the second. The comment is made that in a sense this fourth completes the series of three making it
THE PREROGATIVE INSTANCES AND THE SHAKESPEARE PLAYS

four, and it makes the series of six into seven.

1. Crown
2. Wisdom
3. Intelligence

4. LOVE

5. Judgement
6. Beauty
7. Firmness
8. Splendor
9. Foundation
10. Kingdom

Within the play *As You Like It* are three lists of seven, two references to *four*, and Touchstone’s description of *four* quarrels and *seven* causes:

*All the world’s a stage,*  
*And all the men and women merely players.*  
*They have their exits and their entrances,*  
*And one man in his time plays many parts,*  
*His acts being seven ages.*

1. Infant
2. Schoolboy
3. Lover
4. Soldier
5. Justice
6. Pantaloon
7. Old Man

JAQUES, ACT II. sc. vii

*I will name you the degrees [of the lie]:*

1. Retort Courteous
2. Quip Modest
3. Reply Churlish
4. Reproof Valiant
5. Countercheck Quarrelsome
6. Lie with Circumstance
7. Lie Direct

TOUCHSTONE, ACT V. sc. iv

*I have neither the:*

1. Scholar’s melancholy
2. Musician’s
3. Courtier’s
4. Soldier’s
5. Lawyer’s
6. Lady’s
7. Lover’s

JAQUES, ACT V. sc. i

*From seventeen years till now almost FOURscore*

Here lived I, but now live here no more.
At seventeen years many their fortunes seek,
But at FOURscore it is too late . . .

ADAM, ACT II, sc. iii

*Here’s eight that must take hands*
To join in Hymen’s bands,

1. Orlando and Rosalind
2. Oliver and Celia
3. Silvius and Phebe
4. Touchstone and Audrey

HYMEN, ACT V. sc. iv

*I have undone three tailors; I have had FOUR quarrels, and like to have fought one . . .*

Faith, we met, and found the quarrel was upon the SEVENTH cause.

TOUCHSTONE, ACT V. sc. iv

These references to four and seven in *As You Like It* provide justification for this play being included in both the list of seven and the list of four of the ‘no name’ comedies.
The Conference of Pleasure, a device based on the four functions, was written by Bacon for the Earl of Essex and presented at Court. The play is based on the four functions. Four friends, meeting for intellectual amusement, each speak in praise of what he holds to be the worthiest:

1. Virtue or Fortitude [Physical]
2. Affection (Love) [Feeling]
3. Power, Knowledge [Thinking]
4. Person [Spiritual]

The “person” of number four was exoterically the Queen, but esoterically Bacon's Sovereign Lady whom he termed “crowned truth”.

Aware of the principles of the archetypal twenty-eight, Francis Bacon summarized them in the Prerogative Instances, characterized them in twenty-six Shakespeare plays, arranged the titles of the plays in the catalogue of the First Folio to agree with the quaternary and septenary principles, and may have defined the parts of both these principles by the themes of the ten ‘no name’ plays.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAUCER</th>
<th>YEATS</th>
<th>DANTE</th>
<th>BACON</th>
<th>SHAKESPEARE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knight</td>
<td>Limbo</td>
<td>Alliance</td>
<td>Valentine</td>
<td>(T G of V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squire</td>
<td>Lustful</td>
<td>Analogy</td>
<td>Proteus</td>
<td>(T G of V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeoman</td>
<td>Gluttony</td>
<td>Awakening</td>
<td>Mistress Page</td>
<td>(M W of W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioress</td>
<td>Prodigal</td>
<td>Bordering</td>
<td>Mistress Ford</td>
<td>(M W of W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nun</td>
<td>Byron's Don Juan</td>
<td>Sloth</td>
<td>Clandestine</td>
<td>Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priest</td>
<td>Walt Whitman</td>
<td>Heretic</td>
<td>Constitutive</td>
<td>(M of V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monk</td>
<td>Alexandre Dumas</td>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Cressida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friar</td>
<td>Dostoevsky's Idiot</td>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>Crucial</td>
<td>John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>An artist</td>
<td>Traitor</td>
<td>Deviating</td>
<td>Richard II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>Charles S. Parnell</td>
<td>Pride</td>
<td>Divorce</td>
<td>Henry IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Spinoza</td>
<td>Envy</td>
<td>Door</td>
<td>Henry V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Nietzsche</td>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>Glaring</td>
<td>Henry VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haberdasher</td>
<td>Charles Baucelaire</td>
<td>Sloth</td>
<td>Magic</td>
<td>Richard III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>Keats</td>
<td>Avarice</td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Henry VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td>Giuttony</td>
<td>Proportionate</td>
<td>Troilus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyer</td>
<td>Paracelsus</td>
<td>Lust</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Coriolanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapestryman</td>
<td>Dante</td>
<td>Eden</td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>Andronicus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>Goethe</td>
<td>Moon</td>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>Romeo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailor</td>
<td>Byron</td>
<td>Mercury</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Juliet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician</td>
<td>Napoleon</td>
<td>Venus</td>
<td>Solitary</td>
<td>Timon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife of Bath</td>
<td>Bernard Shaw</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Strife</td>
<td>Julius Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Priest</td>
<td>Darwin</td>
<td>Mars</td>
<td>Striking</td>
<td>Macbeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plowman</td>
<td>Rembrandt</td>
<td>Jupiter</td>
<td>Subjunctive</td>
<td>Hamlet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeve</td>
<td>Queen Victoria</td>
<td>Saturn</td>
<td>Summoning</td>
<td>Lear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>Martin Luther</td>
<td>Fixed Stars</td>
<td>Supplementary</td>
<td>Othello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summoner</td>
<td>Nero</td>
<td>Primum Mobile</td>
<td>Travelling</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pardoner</td>
<td>Socrates</td>
<td>Empyrean</td>
<td>Wrestling</td>
<td>Cleopatra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manciple</td>
<td>Shakespeare's Fool</td>
<td>Final Bliss</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cymbeline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chart 1**

Lists of Twenty-Eight

Yeats gave no examples for the first four or the fifteenth.
The twenty-eight names on page 3, the four on page 4, and Apollo total thirty-three, Bacon’s name in “Simple” Cipher.
### A Catalogue

**COMEDIES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Tempest</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Two Gentlemen of Verona</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Merry Wives of Windsor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure for Measure</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Comedy of Errors</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much Ado About Nothing</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love's Labour's Lost</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midsummer Night's Dream</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Merchant of Venice</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As You Like It</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Taming of the Shrew</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All is Well, That Ends Well</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelfth Night, or What You Will</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Winter's Tale</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRESSIDA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HISTORIES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Life and Death of King John</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Life and Death of Richard the Second</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRAGEDIES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The First part of King Henry the fourth</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Second part of King Henry the fourth</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Life of King Henry the First</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The First part of King Henry the Sixth</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Second part of King Henry the Sixth</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Third part of King Henry the Sixth</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Life and Death of Richard the Third</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THE FIRST FOLIO CATALOGUE**

By placing the name "Cressida" with the Comedies and "Troilus" at the beginning of the Tragedies, and then dividing the Tragedies into two separate categories, the Catalogue of plays is divided into four groups of seven names each.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PHYSICAL</th>
<th>FEELING</th>
<th>THINKING</th>
<th>SPIRITUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carl Jung</td>
<td>Sensation</td>
<td>Feeling</td>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>Intuition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Earth</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Ages</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gospels</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuga</td>
<td>Kali</td>
<td>Dwapara</td>
<td>Treta</td>
<td>Krita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcendence</td>
<td>Fakir</td>
<td>Monk</td>
<td>Yogi</td>
<td>Mystic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cast System, India</td>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>Warrior</td>
<td>Artisan</td>
<td>Brahmin (Priest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>Erotic</td>
<td>Affection</td>
<td>Friendship</td>
<td>Agapi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories</td>
<td>Myth</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>Mystery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>Literal</td>
<td>Allegorical</td>
<td>Tropological</td>
<td>Anagogical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Divine Comedy</td>
<td>Dante</td>
<td>Beatrice</td>
<td>Virgil</td>
<td>St. Bernard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brothers Karamazov</td>
<td>Smerdysakov</td>
<td>Dimitri</td>
<td>Ivan</td>
<td>Aloysha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moby Dick</td>
<td>Flask</td>
<td>Starbuck</td>
<td>Stubb</td>
<td>Captain Ahab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Musketeers</td>
<td>Porthos</td>
<td>D'Artagnan</td>
<td>Athos</td>
<td>Aramis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wizard of Oz</td>
<td>Lion</td>
<td>Tin Woodsman</td>
<td>Scarecrow</td>
<td>Wizard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind In The Willows</td>
<td>Toad</td>
<td>Rat</td>
<td>Badger</td>
<td>Mole</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chart 4**

Tetrads Analogously Grouped
ARE THERE CIPHERS IN SHAKESPEARE?

Penn Leary

It is considered by some (yet certainly not by all) academicians that it is a lunacy to question the authorship of the Works of William Shakespeare - a comical 1984 thought-crime, a preposterous and radical and specious view of the obvious, a conspicuous deviation from normal and proper opinion.

But Charles Dickens, a student of human nature, had this to say: “The life of Shakespeare is a fine mystery, and I tremble every day lest something should turn up.”

Ralph Waldo Emerson wrote: “As long as the question is of talent and mental power, the world of men has not his equal to show. . . The Egyptian verdict of the Shakespeare societies comes to mind that he was a jovial actor and manager. I cannot marry this fact to his verse.” John Greenleaf Whittier said: “Whether Bacon wrote the wonderful plays or not, I am quite sure the man Shakspeare neither did nor could.”

James M. Barrie put it more whimsically: “I know not, sir, whether Bacon wrote the works of Shakespeare, but if he did not it seems to me that he missed the opportunity of his lifetime.” Samuel Taylor Coleridge said: “Ask your own hearts, ask your own common sense, to conceive the possibility of the author of the Plays being the anomalous, the wild, the irregular genius of our daily criticism. What! are we to have miracles in sport? Does God choose idiots by whom to convey divine truths to man?”

And there yet remains a band of doubters. If someone else wrote the plays and poems, then who?

Let us consult a calendar of years:

The Reign of Queen Elizabeth I (1558-1603)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication of the Plays.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1560  1570  1580  1590  1600  1610  1620  1626</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Edward De Vere, Earl of Oxford (1560-1604)

Christopher Marlowe (1564-1593)

William Shakspere, of Stratford (1564-1616)

Francis Bacon (1561-1626)

The 1623 edition of the First Folio contained twenty new plays. At that time Shakespeare had been dead for seven years, Edward De Vere for nineteen and Christopher Marlowe for thirty. Only Francis Bacon survived the 1623 publication.

This is hardly enough to credit the authorship to Bacon, but it casts some suspicion upon the prospects of the other three leading contenders.

There is also considerable doubt about the facts of Shakespeare's own life. Let us read what Mark Twain had to say about that (From Is Shakespeare Dead? (1909)):

"He was born on the 23rd of April, 1564.

Of good farmer-class parents who could not read, could not write, could not sign their names.

At Stratford, a small back settlement which in that day was shabby and unclean, and densely illiterate. Of the nineteen important men charged with the government of the town, thirteen had to 'make their mark' in attesting important documents, because they could not write their names.

Of the first eighteen years of his life nothing is known. They are a blank.

On the 27th of November (1582) William Shakespeare took out a license to marry Anne Whateley.

Next day William Shakespeare took out a license to marry Anne Hathaway. She was eight years his senior.

William Shakespeare married Anne Hathaway. In a hurry. By grace of a reluctantly granted dispensation there was but one publication of the banns.
Within six months the first child was born.

About two (blank) years followed, during which period *nothing at all happened to Shakespeare*, so far as anybody knows.

Then came twins – 1585. February.
Two blank years follow.
Then – 1587 – he makes a ten-year visit to London, leaving the family behind.
Five blank years follow. During this period *nothing happened to him*, as far as anybody actually knows.

Then – 1592 – there is mention of him as an actor.
Next year – 1593 – his name appears in the official list of players.
Next year – 1594 – he played before the queen. A detail of no consequence: other obscurities did it every year of the forty-five of her reign. And remained obscure.

Three pretty full years follow. Full of play-acting. Then.
In 1597 he bought New Place, Stratford.
Thirteen or fourteen busy years follow; years in which he accumulated money, and also reputation as actor and manager.
Meantime his name, liberally and variously spelt, had become associated with a number of great plays and poems, as (ostensibly) author of the same.

Some of these, in these years and later, were pirated, but he made no protest.
Then – 1610–11 – he returned to Stratford and settled down for good and all, and busied himself in lending money, trading in tithes, trading in land and houses; shirking a debt of forty-one shillings, borrowed by his wife during his long desertion of his family; suing debtors for shillings and coppers; being sued himself for shillings and coppers; and acting as a confederate to a neighbour who tried to rob the town of its rights in a certain common, and did not succeed.

He lived five or six years – till 1616 – in the joy of these elevated pursuits . . . ”

When Shakespeare died in Stratford *it was not an event*. It made no more stir in England than the death of any other forgotten theatre-actor would have made. Nobody came down
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from London; there were no lamenting poems, no eulogies, no national tears – there was merely silence, and nothing more. A striking contrast to what happened when Ben Jonson and Francis Bacon, and Spenser, and Raleigh and the other distinguished literary folk of Shakespeare's time passed from life! No praiseful voice was lifted for the lost Bard of Avon; even Ben Jonson waited seven years before he lifted his.

So far as anybody actually knows and can prove, Shakespeare of Stratford-on-Avon never wrote a play in his life.

So far as anybody knows and can prove he never wrote a letter to anybody in his life.

So far as any one knows, he received only one letter during his life.

So far as anyone can know and can prove, Shakespeare of Stratford wrote only one poem during his life. This one is authentic. He did write that one – a fact which stands undisputed; he wrote the whole of it; he wrote the whole of it out of his own head. He commanded that this work of art be engraved upon his tomb, and he was obeyed. There it abides to this day. This is it:

Good frend for Iesus sake forbeare
to digg the dust encloased heare!
Blest be ye man yt spares thes stones
And curst be he yt moves my bones.

Richard Bentley, writing in the American Bar Association Journal,¹ abridges Francis Bacon's biography:

"The facts of Bacon's life are well known. He was born three years before Shakspere (1561) and died ten years after him (1626). Bacon was educated at Cambridge University (1574–6). He then went to Paris in the suite of the English Ambassador. After his return he studied law and was admitted to the Bar at the age of 21 years. He became a Bencher at Gray's Inn . . .

Bacon came into royal favor with James I. He was knighted

BACONIANA

almost at once, became Solicitor General (in 1607), Attorney General (in 1613), Lord Keeper of the Great Seal (in 1617) and then (in 1618) Lord Chancellor. Within four years, however, he confessed to a charge of bribery and was imprisoned; but was released after a few days [by order of James I who had required him to confess for political reasons]. Thereafter he devoted himself to literature, writing on jurisprudence, science and philosophy. His education, his breadth of learning, knowledge of law, familiarity with Court circles both abroad and in England, and his unusual literary ability made him the natural choice of those who were convinced the Shakespeare works must have been written by someone possessed of these advantages, and not by Shaksper of Stratford, who apparently had none of them.”

Bacon was interested in ciphers and invented one of his own that he called the “Biliterarie Cipher”. Without explaining it in detail, his system anticipated the Binary Scale supposedly invented by Leibniz in 1671. In the Advancement of Learning (1623) Bacon had this to say:

“The knowledge of Cyphering, hath drawne on with it a knowledge relative unto it, which is the knowledge of Discyphering, or of Discreting Cyphers, and the Capitulations of secrecy past between the Parties. Certainly it is an Art which requires great paines and a good Witt and is (as the other was) consecrate to the Counsels of Princes: yet notwithstanding by diligent prevision it may be made unprofitable, though, as things are, it be of great use. For if good and faithfull Cyphers were invented & practised, many of them would delude and forestall all the Cunning of the Decypherer, which yet are very apt and easy to be read or written: but the rawnesse and unskillfulnesse of Secretaries, and Clarks in the Courts of Princes, is such that many times the greatest matters are Committed to futile and weake Cyphers.”

At another place Bacon continues on the same subject:

For CYPHARS; they are commonly in Letters or
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Alphabets, but may bee in Wordes. The kindes of CYPHARS, (besides the SIMPLE CYPHARS with Changes, and intermixtures of NVLLES, and NONSIGNIFICANTS) are many, according to the Nature or Rule of the infouling: WHEELE-CYPHARS, KAY-CYPHARS, DOVBLES, &c. But the vertues of them, whereby they are to be preferred, are three; that they be not laborious to write and reade; that they bee impossible to discypher; and in some cases, that they bee without suspition. The highest Degree whereof, is to write OMNIA PER OMNIA; which is undoubtedly possible, with a proportion Quintuple at most, of the writing infouling, to the writing infoulded, and no other restrainte whatsoever. This Arte of Cypheringe, hath for Relatiue, an Art of Discypheringe; by supposition vnprofitable; but, as things are, of great vse. For suppose that Cyphars were well mannaged, there bee Multitudes of them which exclude the Discypherer. But in regarde of the rawnnesse and vnskilfulness of the handes, through which they passe, the greatest Matters, are many times carried in the weakest CYPHARS."

By ciphers “without suspition”, Bacon meant steganography. This may be accomplished by the use of acrostics, whereby the first capitalized letter of each line in a poem may convey the message; the strategy included his own Biliterarie Cipher. Here the very existence of a cipher writing may never be noticed.

Francis Bacon was not a poet: so say modern critics. Perhaps they are unaware of these quotations collected by Mrs Henry Pott:

¶ It is he that filled up all numbers [lines of verse], and performed that which may be compared or preferred to insolent Greece or haughty Rome (Ben Jonson).

¶ His Lordship was a good poet, but concealed, as appears by his letters (John Aubrey).

¶ The author of “The Great Assises Holden in Parnassus” [attributed to the playwright John Day] ranks Lord Verulam next to Apollo [the Greek god of all the Arts].

¶ The poetic faculty was strong in Bacon's mind. No imagination was ever at once so strong and so subjugated. In truth, much of Bacon's life was passed in a visionary world... magnificent day-dreams... analogies of all sorts (Macauley).

¶ Few poets deal in finer imagery than is to be found in Bacon... His prose is poetry (Campbell).

¶ The varieties and sprightliness of Bacon's imagination, an imagination piercing almost into futurity, conjectures improving even to prophecy... The greatest felicity of expression and the most splendid imagery (Basil Montagu).

¶ The Wisdom of the Ancients... a kind of parabolical beauty... To the Advancement of Learning he brings every species of poetry by which the imagination can elevate the mind from the dungeon of the body to the enjoying of its own essence... Metaphors, similitudes and analogies make up a great part of his reasoning... Ingenuity, poetic fancy, and the highest imagination and fertility cannot be denied him (Craik).

¶ The creative fancy of a Dante or Milton never called up more gorgeous images than those suggested by Bacon, and we question much whether their worlds surpass his in affording scope for the imagination. His extended over all time. His mind brooded over all nature... unfolding to the gaze of the spectator the order of the universe as exhibited to angelic intelligences (Devey).

¶ The tendency of Bacon to see analogies is characteristic of him, the result of that mind not truly philosophic but truly poetic, which will find similitudes everywhere in heaven and earth (Dr. Abbott).

¶ I infer from this sample that Bacon had all the natural faculties which a poet wants: a fine ear for metre, a fine feeling for imaginative effect in words, and a vein of poetic passion... The truth is that Bacon was not without the "fine phrensy" of a poet (Spedding).

Sir Tobie Matthew, writing to his friend Francis Bacon in 1618, states: "The most prodigious wit that ever I knew of my nation, and of this side of the sea, is of your Lordship's name, though he be
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known by another."

In the Scourge of Folly, John Davies of Hereford (1565–1618)

wrote this epigram:

To the Royall Ingenious and All-learned Knight –
Sr Francis Bacon

Thy bounty and the Beauty of thy Witt
Compris’d in Lists of Law and the learned Arts,
Each making thee for great Employment fitt,
Which now thou hast, (though short of thy deserts)
Compells my pen to let fall shining Inke
And to bedew the Baies that deck thy Front;
And to thy health in Helicon to drinke
As to her Bellamour the Muse is wont;
For thou dost her embozom; and dost vse
Her company for sport twixt graue affaires.
So vtter’st Law the liuelyer through the Muse.
And for that all thy Notes are sweetest Aires;
My Muse thus notes thy worth in ev’ry Line.
With ynke which thus she sugers; so, to shine.

Thus John Davies in 1610 states plainly that Francis Bacon was a

poet and that he had woven into his works spirited illustrations of the
law. John Davies was the same man to whom Bacon had written a

letter which concluded, “so desiring you to be good to concealed

poets.”

Francis Bacon had a great respect and affection for poetry; here

are his words:

“... Poesy cheereth and refreshes the soule; chanting things

rare, and various, and full of vicissitudes. So as Poesy serveth

and conferreth to Delectation, Magnanimity, and Morality;

and therefore it may seem deservedly to have some Participation

of Divinenesse, becauwsse it doth raise the mind, and exalt the

spirit with high raptures, by proportioning the shewes of things

to the desires of the mind; and not submitting the mind to

things, as Reason and History doe.”
Why might Bacon have concealed his creations? George Puttenham in *The Arte of English Poesie* (1589) wrote: “I know many notable Gentlemen in the Court that have written commendably, and suppressed it agayne, or else suffered it to be publisht without their owne names to it, as if it were a discredit for a Gentleman to seem learned, and to shew himself amorous of any learned Art.” In addition, the *Plays* were written during a very dangerous period. The airing of some political doctrine might offend a royal sensibility, and death or mutilation was the penalty.

What did Bacon’s contemporaries think of his poetic talents? Here is a statement made by Edmund Howes in 1615:

“Our moderne, and present excellent poets which worthely florish in their owne workes, and all of them in my owne knowledge lived togeather in this Queenes raigne, according to their priorities as neere as I could, I have orderly set downe (viz) George Gascoigne, Thomas Churchyard, Edward Dyer, Edmond Spencer, Philip Sidney, John Harrington, Thomas Challoner, Frauncis Bacon, John Davie, Iohn Lillie, George Chapman, W. Warner, Willi Shakespeare, Samuell Daniell, Michaell Draiton, Christopher Marlo, Benjamine Johnson, Iohn Marston, Abraham Frauncis, Frauncis Meers, Joshua Siluester, Thomas Deckers, John Flecher, John Webster, Thomas Heywood, Thomas Middleton, George Withers.”

Thus did Edmund Howes rank “Frauncis” Bacon with Shakespeare among these twenty-seven contemporary “excellent Poets”. He put him six names ahead of “Willi”.

Are there ciphers in Shakespeare’s Works? Yes, dear reader, indeed there are. Necessarily, the discussion that follows is not complete because it is very much condensed from my book *The Second Cryptographic Shakespeare* (Westchester House, 218 So. 95, Omaha NE 68114, $15).

Let us begin with the 1609 edition of *SHAKE-SPEARES SONNETS*. Here is a copy of the title-page:
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SHAKE-SPEARES

SONNETS

Neuer before Imprinted

AT LONDON
By G. Eld for T.T. and are
to be solde by William Aspley.
1609.

And next, on the recto of the second leaf, the mysterious
Dedication (all quotes are from facsimiles of the originals):

TO.THE.ONLIE.BEGETTER. OF.
THESE.INSVING.SONNETS.
MR.W.H.ALL.HAPPINESSE.
AND.THAT.ETERNITIE.
PROMISED.

BY.

OVR.EVER-LIVING-POET

WISHETH.

THE.WELL-WISHING.
ADVENTVRER.IN.
SETTING.
FORTH.
T.T.

What were all those periods doing there, stuck in for no befitting
reason, after every word? Were they just someone's attempt at
Here are the ciphertext letters:

\texttt{SSRDTNYGD\textit{T}MY\textsl{A}FI\textsl{O}ERFE\textit{G}SR}

Julius Caesar is said to have invented this elementary substitution cipher. Here is the "Caesar cipher" –4 table (using the "FORTH." letter back) for decipherment:

Ciphertext alphabet: \texttt{EFGHIKLMNOPQRSTVYABCD}
Plaintext alphabet: \texttt{abcdefghiklmnopqrstuvwxyz}

It has been said that the solution to any cryptogram, once found, looks easy. Here is the easy solution:

\texttt{oonypirycypphrsbekaanbacon}

The ciphertext letters are selected by using the last letter of each capitalized word (and a capitalized letter standing alone is to be recognized as the last letter of a capitalized word) beginning with \texttt{SHAKE-SPEARES} on the title page and ending with the lower case, superscripted "r" in "Mr." in the Dedication. For the date, "1609", the letters "A F I" are entered because these numbers represent the elementary, numerically corresponding letters of the Elizabethan alphabet (there is no letter equivalent to the number zero).

Using a computer and my Baconian Caesar cipher program, you may enter:
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(from title-page) date (from Dedication)
169 AFI OEERFEGR

SSRDTNYGDTTTYMY SSRDTNYGDTTTYMYAFIOEERFEGR
RRQCSMVFCSSLTVYEHNDDQEDFRQ1
QQPBRTLTEGRKTVDMCCPDCEQP2
PPOAQKSDAQQISTCFLBBOCBDPO3
OONYPIRCYPPHRSBEKAANBACON4

The first four possible plaintext lines of the –4 (fourth letter back) computer readout look like this:

SSRDTNYGDTTTYMYAFIOEERFEGR
RRQCSMVFCSSLTVYEHNDDQEDFRQ1
QQPBRTLTEGRKTVDMCCPDCEQP2
PPOAQKSDAQQISTCFLBBOCBDPO3
OONYPIRCYPPHRSBEKAANBACON4

The solution appears as the fourth numbered line. We notice that the words “CYPPHRS”, “BEKAAN” and “BACON” are directly adjoining. Bekaan is a phonetic spelling of Bacon, while Cypphrs identifies this plaintext as having been originally written in cipher.

In Elizabethan England, spelling was still in its infancy; there were no standardized dictionaries. Words were spelt aurally, as they sounded and one spelling was considered as no better than another.

According to the comprehensive Oxford English Dictionary, these forms of the word “cipher” were also acceptable in the Seventeenth Century: “sipher, cyfer, cifer, ciphre, sypher, ziphre, scypher, cyphar, cyphre, ciphar, zifer, cypher.” Francis Bacon spelled it “ciphras” in Latin.

As to “Bekaan” for “Bacon”, Francis once wrote his brother’s name (in a legal document preserved in the London Lambeth Library) in this way: “Anth. Bakon.” Books dedicated to Bacon spelled his first name as “ffrauncis”. His kinsmen were not particular about it either.

“It is worthy of notice that the Bacon family in early times spelt their name ‘Becon’ or ‘Beacon’. Some of them seem to have written under this name, and there is a work by Thomas Becon, 1563–4 in which, on the title page of the second volume, his name changes from ‘Becon’ to ‘Beacon’.”

John Florio (1591, Second Frutes) once alluded to a “gammon of bakon”. The Oxford English Dictionary gives these as valid spellings for the period: bacoun, bakoun, bacun, bakon, baken, bacon.

But there is a much better reason for the misspelling of Bacon’s name, as it appears in this solution and in many others to be described.

The Italians, in the 15th Century, discovered that their wartime ciphers were being broken by the “probable word” method. For some good reason, a guess might be made by the enemy that a letter was addressed to someone in Venice, or contained reference to Venice. Then a search could be made in the ciphertext for repetitions of identical six letter groups. When found, these reliable six letter cipher conversions were used to extend the unknown alphabet.

Cipher clerks have always been lectured on cryptographic security. Whenever a place name or personal name appeared more than once in a message it had to be misspelled, and in as many ways as possible. Failure to follow this rule would have disastrous results, as one Lt. Jaeger once found out.

The example is given by David Kahn in The Codebreakers. During WWI a German Signal officer by the name of Jaeger set out to stiffen code discipline. However his own name was not in the codebook and had to be spelled out in every transmitted order. “This was frequently. Its peculiar formation – the repetition of the high frequency e, for example – permitted G.2 A.6 to identify it readily, and this in turn led to important clues concerning the superenciphering Geheimklappe . . . Jaeger was beloved by his adversaries because he kept them up to date with code changes, and it was with genuine regret that they saw his name disappear from the German traffic.” Thus any word (a suspected “crib”) routinely recurring in cipher messages is an apt key to a solution.

In the Sonnet title-page and Dedication, Bacon’s name appears twice more, spelled as “Beakyn” and “Baikehn”, together with “Fs” (his signature abbreviation of his first name), and also “Fra”. Space will not permit an exposition; however, following the solution given above, his cipher system afterward consistently used the fourth letter forward, rather than the “FORTH” letter back.
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Those who may mock such spellings must consider that the authenticated Shakespeare signatures spell the Bard's name in six different ways, a matter the Shakespearean philologists have chosen to disregard. According to Charles Hamilton, a manuscript expert who says he can read the untidy scrawls, these are the spellings:

Shackper, Shakspear, Shakspea, Shackspere, Shakspere, Shakspeare.

The man was baptized as Shaksper, gave bond for marriage as Shagspere, was married as Shaxper and buried as Shakspeare.

William F. Friedman was perhaps the most famous cryptanalyst of modern times. During WWII he and a U.S. Army Signal Corps cryptographic team broke the Japanese "PURPLE" cipher in August, 1940. The enemy never afterward materially changed the system. Our admirals often knew the current position of every group of the Japanese battle fleet; the messages were sometimes deciphered before the enemy commanders received them. The advantage gained was enormous.

In 1916 Friedman had become interested in cryptography because of his study of certain ciphers claimed to be found in Shakespeare's works. He retired in 1955 and, surprisingly enough, he became an historian of what he considered to be false cipher methods. In 1957 he and his wife Elizebeth (also a cryptanalyst) published *The Shakespearean Ciphers Examined.*

It is worth observing that, before the Second World War, and especially before the Friedmans, the science of cryptography was almost unknown to the universities and to the public. Except for the rare and scattered and concealed professional practitioners, there were hardly any authorities for those interested to consult. Where it was taught, it was taught secretly. Books explaining cryptography were mostly out of print and never had much circulation. The casual reader became aware of the topic through Herbert O. Yardley's book, *The American Black Chamber,* which was published in 1931. The U.S. State Department had closed its own cipher room in 1929. There was really no way for a reader to make a sophisticated judgment of the cipher "systems" which were invented. Very possibly some of the

authors of these methods, in their ardor, had no better way to innocently judge their own creations. It is too bad, but many of them actually harmed their cause.

The Friedmans, using wry but cheerful humor, took aim at the Baconian crypto-cryptologists and sank their frail, poorly armed, mostly 19th century vessels. The litany of the names of the drowned and the dates of their too-early ventures into combat with the forces of science and mathematics, not to mention the Friedmans, is a grievous sorrow; they sailed forth almost unarmed. To wit: Ignatius Donnelly, 1887; Dr. Orville Owen, 1893; William Stone Booth, 1909; Sir Edward Durning-Lawrence, 1910; Walter Arensberg, 1921; Frank and Parker Woodward, 1923; Elizabeth Wells Gallup, 1899; Mrs. Henry Pott, 1891. Their bones, already bleached, were exhumed, sorted, categorized, mounted, and illuminated by the Friedmans in their entertaining treatise.

As has been mentioned, Francis Bacon preferred steganographic ciphers in which the occurrence of a hidden name would not be noticed. What better way to conceal that name than within one word? And where should that word be placed so as to be most preeminent?

The name of the real author of the First Folio of Shakespeare’s Plays is concealed in the first spoken word. It stands alone as the first word of dialogue on the first page of the first printing of the first play in the First Folio, the 1623 first edition of Shakespeare’s collected Comedies Histories and Tragedies. It is a solitary word distinguished by its primal detachment. A cipher method based upon whole words, rather than designated letters, presents itself.

The Tempest, as recorded in the First Folio, is the sole authority for the language and printing of that fanciful drama. The first word of dialogue in The Tempest is “BOte-swaine.” The first letter, “B”, is a great capital, the kind of large ornamental initial that heads the first page of almost all of the plays. The script, after some “scene setting” instructions which are printed in italics, gives the “Master” the first word to speak:

Master.

B Ote-swaine.
Botes. Heere Master: What cheere?
Mast. Good: Speake to th’Mariners: fall
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too't, yarely, or we run our selves a ground,
bestirre, bestirre.

Exit.

To apply the Caesar decryption here we must remember that the letter “W” is not included in our key alphabet but it was often typeset as “VV” in the Folio and in the Sonnets. We shall install “BOTESVVAIN” as the ciphertext and run our computer program:

```
BOTESVVAIN
CPVFTYYBKOFI
DQYGVAACLPG2
ERAHYBBDMQH3
FSBIACCHNRI4
```

The plaintext, then, is “FSBIACCHNRI”. It appears on the “FORTH” (+4) line in which “A” = “e”. Bacon’s 21 letter alphabet, ending in “TVY”, remains the same. “FS” is Bacon’s own abbreviation of his first name while “BIACCHN” is yet another phonetic spelling of his surname.

Two different versions were typeset and printed as the first page of The Tempest in the First Folio. In both of them “Bote-swaine” appears as the first word, but something noteworthy happened to one of the initial great capital “B”s (preceding “ote-swaine”) on at least one of this play’s journeys to the press. It was printed upside down.

We should keep in mind the typographical oddities that adorned the Dedication of Shake-speare’s Sonnets, the decimal points (or periods or full stops, if you will). Like pointers, these signals attracted our attention to that page so as to merit a suspicion that a cipher was concealed in the text. Here again in The Tempest such an absurd, capsized great capital “B” deserves the same respect; the use of such signals is confirmed by the discovery that Francis Bacon’s ciphered name is to be found, and is entirely contained, within that word “Bote-swaine”. It is the word that begins with this freakishly printed letter “B”.

We shall next be dealing with acrostic ciphers; here is an example from the Friedman’s book:
"We have already mentioned that acrostics were popular in Elizabethan literature; it should also be stressed that spelling in those days was erratic. Sir John Salusbury, who was as devoted to acrostics as he was to a lady called Dorothy Halsall, enfolded her name in poem after poem [citing Bryn Mawr College Monographs, vol. XIV, 1913]. One of them runs [with critical letters shown in bold type]:

Tormented heart in thrall, Yea thrall to love,
Respecting will, Heart-breaking gaine doth grow,
Ever DOLOBELIA, Time will so proue,
Binding distresse, O gem wilt thou allowe,
This fortune my will Repose-lesse of ease,
Vnlesse thou LEDA, Over-spread my heart,
Cutting all my Ruth, dayne Disdaine to cease,
I yield to fate, and welcome endles Smart.

This, with occasional irregularities, conceals the name CUTBERT (Dorothy's husband) reading the initial letters upwards from the seventh line, and the two parts of the name DOROTHY HALSALL as the letters on either side of the break in the middle of each line; the initials I.S. (for John Salusbury) appear as the first letter of the first word and the first letter of the last word in the final line... In all, Salusbury uses six different versions of his own name in various acrostic signatures; spells the name Francis as Fransis wherever it suits him; regards I and IE as interchangeable with Y; and replaces J's with I's or I's with J's according to whim."

Thus Friedman does not insist upon accurate name spelling and permits "occasional irregularities". The cipher does not read from top to bottom; it is reversed and the plaintext travels from bottom to top. Here, he writes,

"... is one of a number of instances which could be cited; but what makes it true that they, and the others, are genuine cases of cryptography is that the validity of the deciphered text and the inflexibility of the systems employed are obvious..."
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each case, there is no room to doubt that they were put there by the deliberate intent of the author; the length of the hidden text, and the absolutely rigid order in which the letters appear, combine to make it enormously improbable that they just happened to be there by accident."

This brings us to a number of acrostic signatures in the works of Mr. Shakespeare. Remember that the cipher system, after the example given in the Sonnets, now follows the fourth letter (+4) forward:

Ciphertext alphabet: STVYABCDGFHILMNONQ
Plaintext alphabet: abcdefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyz

Often the text includes curious language – hints to the existence of a cipher. Here is a specimen in which the capital letters are employed, from Measure for Measure (i, 3, 40); they are shown in bold type:

I have on Angelo impos’d the office,
Who may in th’ambush of my name, strike home,
And yet, my nature never in the fight
To do in slander: And to behold his sway

A signature is hidden “in th’ambush of my name”. Reading all capitals downward, the

Ciphertext is:
I A W A T A

Ciphertext reversed is:
A T A W A I

Plaintext (+4) is:
E B E C E N
"Caps" is a word long used by printers as an abbreviation for upper case type. This word, or "cap", is used six times in thirty lines in *The Taming of the Shrew* (iv, 3, 68).

*Fel.* Heere is the cap your Worship did bespeake.
*Pet.* Why this was moulded on a porrenger,
A veluet dish: Fie, fie, 'tis lewd and filthy,
Why 'tis a cockle or a walnut-shell,
A Knacke, a toy, a tricke, a babies cap.
Away with it, come let me have a bigger.

Then follow these five lines:

*Kate.* Ile haue no bigger, this doth fit the time,
And Gentlemwomen weare such caps as these.
*Pet.* When you are gentle, you shall haue one too,
And not till then.
*Hor.* That will not be in hast.

Let us examine these "caps", the initial capitalized letters of each line:

Ciphertext is:

I A W A T

Ciphertext reversed is:

T A W A I

Plaintext is:

B E C E N

Published in 1640 by John Benson was a book of *Poems: Written by Wil. Shakespeare. Gent.*. Many of the *Sonnets* were included, but in a different order, together with other poems. Most of the latter are rejected by the scholars as unjustly imputed. Several verses
ARE THERE CIPHERS IN SHAKESPEARE?

memorialize the Bard, as witness the following:

On the death of William Shakespere, who
died in Aprill, Anno Dom. 1616.

REnowned Spenser lie a thought more nigh
To learned Chauzer, and rare Beaumont lie
A little neerer Spenser to make roome,
For Shakespeare in your three-fold, foure-fold Tombe;
To lodge all foure in one bed make a shift,
Vntill Dommes-day, for hardly shall a sift
Betwixt this day and that by Fate be slaine,
For whom your Curtaine may be drawne againe.
If your precedentie in death doth barre,
A fourth place in your sacred Sepulchre
Vnder this sacred Marble of thy owne,
Sleepe rare Tragedian Shakespeare, sleepe alone;
Thy unmolested peace in an unshar’d Cave,
Possesse as Lord, not Tennant of thy Grave.
That unto us, and others it may be,
Honour hereafter to be laid by thee.

W.B.

“For whom your Curtaines may be drawne againe.” Consider the initial capitalized letters (bold) of the five lines following that one:

Ciphertext is:

I A V S T

Ciphertext reversed:

T S V A I

Plaintext is:

B A C E N
BACONIANA

Or, we may choose all of the capitals in the four lines following “Curtaines”, and just preceding *Shakespeare*:

Ciphertext is:

I A S V M S T

Ciphertext reversed:

T S M V S A I

Plaintext (+4) is:

B A Q C A E N

The following is a comparison of two very similar versions of a Shakespeare sonnet. The lines printed in Roman type are from verse II of *The Passionate Pilgrime* (1599), while the lines shown in italics are from Sonnet 144 of the 1609 *Quarto*:

1. Two Loues I haue, of Comfort, and Despaire,
   *Two Loues I haue of comfort and dispute*,
2. That like two Spirits, do suggest me still:
   *Which like two spirits do sugest me still*,
3. My better Angell is a Man (right faire)
   *The better angell is a man right faire*:
4. My worser spirite a Woman (colour'd ill.)
   *The worser spirit a woman colour'd il.*
5. To winne me soone to hell, my Female euill
   *To win me soone to hell my femal euill*,
6. Tempteth my better Angell from my side,
   *Tempteth my better angel from my sight*,
7. And would corrupt my Saint to be a Diuell,
   *And would corrupt my saint to be a diuel*:
8. Wooing his purity with her faire pride.
   *Wooing his purity with her fowle pride*,
9. And whether that my Angell be turnde feend,
   *And whether that my angel be turn'd finde*,
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10. Suspect I may (yet not directly tell:
   \[\textit{Suspect I may, yet not directly tell,}\]

11. For being both to me: both, to each friend,
   \[\textit{But being both from me both to each friend,}\]

12. I ghesse one Angell in anothers hell:
   \[\textit{I gesse one angel in an others hell,}\]

13. The truth I shall not know, but liue in doubt,
   \[\textit{Yet this shal I nere know but liue in doubt,}\]

14. Til my bad Angell fire my good one out.
   \[\textit{Till my bad angel fire my good one out.}\]

In this later version there are minor changes in spelling, punctuation and one change in sense (\textit{faire} in line 8 becomes \textit{fowle} in the later version). The major change is in capitalization. Let us string all the capitals together and examine them:

Ciphertext of the 1599 verse:

\[TVLICDTSMAMMVTFTAASDVAASIFIATITA\]

Plaintext, +4 is:

\[BCPNGHBAQEQQCBKBEEAHCEEANKNEBNBE\]

Perhaps the earlier version of Bacon’s plaintext name seemed too long; therefore, in editing the 1609 version, the author reduced fifteen of the capitals to lower case with this effect:

Ciphertext of the 1609 verse:

\[TVIVTTTAVASIBIYT\]

Plaintext, +4 is:

\[BCNCBBB\underline{BECEAN}FND\]

97
Karl Andreassen, writing in *Computer Cryptology*, discusses null ciphers of this variety:

"An interesting type of cipher not often seen in the popular literature is the concealment, or null, cipher. Among its many variations is the use of prearranged letter positions in ordinary plaintext. Because the English language is so richly endowed with synonyms and capable of colloquial interpretation, it is particularly adaptable to null-cipher applications.

For instance, a plain language sentence may appear to convey an interesting but common statement of fact. While the sentence reads innocuously like simple plain language, the words used are carefully selected to divert attention, that of concealing [by steganography] a message other than the obvious one."

A few years ago, Wayne Shumaker, Professor Emeritus of English at the University of California at Berkeley, published a book entitled *Renaissance Curiosa*. The Professor shows himself to be a master of Medieval Latin and German.

In one of his fascinating chapters he discusses the copious writings of Johannes Trithemius (1426–1526) who was a German monk. Trithemius' books, written in Latin, were mostly concerned with history and theology but the author has been called "the first theoretician of cryptography". His *Steganographia* was circulated while the manuscript was still in composition and John Dee, later to become a friend of Francis Bacon, copied at least half of it in 1563.

Steganography was the basis for most of Trithemius' schemes and a key, a hint, was customarily included in the ciphertext. Professor Shumaker explains one method (the significant letters will be shown as superscripted and bold):

PAMERSIEL ANOYR MADRISEL EBRASOTHEAN ABRULGES

ITRASBIEL NADRES ORMENU ITULES RABLON HAMORPHIEL
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"If we ignore the first and last words, which are nulls – that is, insignificant for the meaning – and read only the alternate letters of the rest, we arrive at a key for the decoding of the following cryptogram: 'Nym die ersten Bugstaben de omni uerbo', or ‘Take the first letters of every word.’"

Thus alternate letters of the plaintext may be made significant, as in this example from The Comedie of Errors (v, 1, 336):

Duke. One of these men is genius to the other:
And so of these, which is the naturall man,
And which the spirit? Who deciphers them?
S. Dromio. I sir am Dromio, command him away.
E. Dro. I sir am Dromio, pray let me stay.
S. Ant. Egeon art thou not? or else his ghost.
S. Drom. Oh my olde Master, who hath bound him heere?
Abb. Who euer bound him, I will lose his bonds,
And gaine a husband by his libertie:
Speake old Egeon, if thou bee’st the man
That hadst a wife once call’d Äemilia,
That bore thee at a burthen two faire sonnes?
Oh if thou bee’st the same Egeon, speake:
And speake vnto the same Äemilia.

Of the Dromios, one is suspected of being an imposter; this affords a convenient moment for the author to discard his mask. We must choose the initial capitals of each line of dialogue:

Ciphertext is:

0 A A I I E O V A S T T O A

Ciphertext reversed is:

A O T T S A V O E I I A A O

Plaintext, +4 is:
BACONIANA

ESBBAECSINNEES

Plaintext, alternate letters:

EBACINE

Who deciphers them? *We do.*
Here is another acrostic from *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* (iv, 1, 50):

1. *Out.* And I, for such like petty crimes as these.
But to the purpose: for we cite our faults,
That they may hold excus’d our lawlesse liues;
And partly seeing you are beautifide
With goodly shape; and by your owne report,
A Linguist, and a man of such perfection,
As we doe in our quality much want.
2. *Out.* Indeede because you are a banish’d man,

The capitalized first letters of each line produce the ciphertext:

BTAWAAAAI

Plaintext is:

FBECCEEN

Ciphertext of the last line is:

INDEDEBECAVSEYOVARAREABANISHDMAN

Plaintext, +4 is:

NRHIIHIFIGECAIDSCEYIEFERNAMHQER

Bacon’s fascination with acrostics led him to rewrite his own previously published works. He hints at ciphers with suggestive
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In The Life of Henry the Fift (ii, 2, 53), and, compared to the 1600 Quarto, these lines were painstakingly rearranged when edited for the 1623 Folio:

In the earlier Quarto he had written:

If little faults proceeding on distemper should not bee winked at, How should we stretch our eye, when capitall crimes, Chewed, swallowed and digested, appeare before vs: Well yet enlarge the man, tho Cambrige and the rest In their deare loues . . .

Now we may glimpse the cryptographer at work, as he redrafts this excerpt, so as encipher the initial capital letters of each line for the 1623 Folio:

If little faults proceeding on distemper, Shall not be wink'd at, how shall we stretch our eye When capitall crimes, chew'd, swallow'd, and digested, Appeare before vs? Wee'l yet inlarge that man, Though Cambridge, Scroope, and Gray, in their deere care

Ciphertext is:

\[I S V A T\]

Ciphertext reversed is:

\[T A V S I\]

Plaintext is:

\[B E C A N\]

The sense of these lines was scarcely modified, and the remainder of this speech of King Henry V was not altered.

In the edited version the clues have been preserved for the benefit of the most intractable academicians. The lower case letters in the
original version have been “inlarged”. By the use of “capittalls” the writer has directed our attention to these newly minted upper case letters. For what reason were these transformations made, unless to encipher the author’s name?

A cardinal measure of cipher authenticity – intention – has been demonstrated. The author has left behind an unmistakable “smoking pistol”.

Here is a passage from The Tragedie of Julius Caesar (i, 2, 198):

\[Cas.\] Would he were fatter; But I feare him not:
Yet if my name were lyable to feare,
I do not know the man I should auoyd
So soone as that spare Cassius. He reades much,
He is a great Obseruer, and he lookes
Quite through the Deeds of men. He loues no Playes,
As thou dost Antony: he heares no Musicke;
Seldome he smiles, and smiles in such a sort
As if he mock’d himselfe, and scorn’d his spirit

Now, having described a character to mistrust, these lines continue. Witness the initial letters:

\[That could me mou’d to smile at any thing.\]
\[Such men as he, be neuer at hearts-ease,\]
\[Whiles they behold a greater then themselves,\]
\[And therefore are they very dangerous.\]
\[I rather tell thee what is to be fear’d,\]
\[Then what I feare: for alwayes I am Caesar.\]

Ciphertext of these five initial capitals:

\[T S V A I\]

Plaintext, +4, is:

\[B A C E N\]
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But we are not finished with this illustration. We shall repeat the last two lines of the above:

I rather tell thee what is to be fear'd,
Then what I feare: for alwayes I am Caesar.

Ciphertext is:

\[ \text{IRATHERTELLTHEEVHATISTOBESFEARDTTHENVHATI FEAREFORALVAYESIAMCAESAR} \]

Plaintext, +4 is:

\[ \text{NYEBMIYBIPPBMIICMEBNABSFIKIEYHBMIRCMEBN} \]
\[ \text{KIEYIKSYEPCEDIANEIQGEIAEY} \]

Plaintext, skip even letters:

\[ \text{NEMYPMIMBASEIYBICENIYKYPEINQEAY} \]

Plaintext, skip odd letters:

\[ \text{YBIBPBICENBFKEHMRMBKEISECDAEGIE} \]

Here the author has inserted his name, first within the initial capital letters of each line, and then twice within the last two lines as alternate even and odd letters with identical spelling. And notice the reference to Caesar, as in Caesar cipher.

The verse following is from The Rape of Lucrece, lines 890-896:

Thy secret pleasure turns to open shame,
Thy private feasting to a publicke fast,
Thy smoothing titles to a ragged name,
Thy sugred tongue to bitter wormwood tast,
Thy violent vanities can neuer last.

How comes it then, vile opportunity
Being so bad, such numbers seeke for thee?
BACONIANA

Bold type indicates the words that suggest a cue. The ciphertext of the second and third lines is:

THY PRIVATEFEASTINGTOAPVBLCKEFAST
HYSMOOTHINGTITLESTOARAGGENDNAME

Ciphertext reversed is:

EMANDEGGARAOTSELITGNIHTOOMSYHTTSAFEKCI
LBVPAPTGNITSAEFETAVIRPYHT

Plaintext, +4 is:

IQERHILLEYESEBAIPBNBLRNMBSSQADMBBAEKIOGN
PFCTESBLRNBAAEKIBECNYTDMB

Plaintext, alternate odd letters:

IEHLEEBIBBRMSQDBAKONFTSLNAI1ENTM

“Bakon”, we will recall, is how Francis spelt the name while drawing a Power of Attorney for the signature of his brother Anthony.

Bacon delighted in employing single words that contained a version of his name. In As You Like It (iv, 3, 166), the word “counterfeit” is repeated six times in seventeen lines for no good reason except stress:

Oli. Be of good cheere youth: you a man? You lacke a mans heart.
Ros. I doe so, I confesse it: Ah, sirra, a body would thinke this was well counterfeit, I pray you tell your brother how well I counterfeit: heigh-ho.
Oli. This was not counterfeit, there is too great testimony in your complection that it was a passion of earnest.
Ros. Counterfeit, I assure you.
Oli. Well then, take a good heart, and counterfeit to be a man.
Ros. So I doe: but yfaith, I should have beene a woman by right.
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Cel. Come, you looke paler and paler: pray you draw homwards: good sir, goe with us.

Oli. That will I: for I must beare answere backe. How you excuse my brother, Rosalind.

Rosalind. I shall devise something: but I pray you commend my counterfeiting to him: will you goe?

Exeunt.

Ciphertext is:

ABODYVOVLDTHINKETHISVASVELLCOVNTERTFEITE
DIPRAYYOTELLYOVRBROTHEHOVVELLICOVNTER
FEITEDHEIGHHOTHISVASNOTCOVNTERTFEITTHHERE
ISTOOGREATTESTIMONYINYOVRCOMPLEIONTHATI
TVASAPASSIONOFEARNESTCOVNTERTFEITIASSVRE
YOVVELLTHENTAKEAGOODHEARTANDCOVNTERTFEIT
TOBEAMANSOIDOEBVTYFAITHISHOVDHAVEBEENAV
OMANBYRIGHT

Plaintext, +4 is:

EFSHDCSCPBMNROIBMNACEACIPPGSCHRBIYKINBI
HNTYEDDSCBPDPSCYFYSMBMIYMSCIPPNGSCHRBIY
KINBIHMIMLMMSBMNACEARSBGSCRBIYKINBBMIYI
NABSLLYIEBBIABNQSRDNRDSCYGSTPINSRBMEBN
BCEAETEAANSRSKIEYRIABGSCRBIYKINBBNEAACYI
DSCCIPPBMBRBOIELSSHMIYBERHTGSCRBIYKIN
BSFIEEQERASONHSIFCBDKENBMNAMSCPHEMECFIIIRE
CSQERFDYNLMB

Here we see the name five times, followed by the word "CIFIIIR". The emphasis is awesome. Even more accent is placed on the definitive ciphertext word "counterfeit" in The First Part of King Henry the Fourth (v, 4, 115), where it may be found nine times in twelve lines.
Falst. Imbowell'd? If thou imbowell mee to day, Ile giue you leaue to powder me, and eat me too to morrow. 'Twas time to counterfeit, or that hotte Termagant Scot, has paid me scot and lot too. Counterfeit? I am no counterfeit, to dye, is to be a counterfeit, for hee is but the counterfeit of a man, who hath not the life of a man: But to counterfeit dying, when a man thereby liueth, is to be no counterfeit, but the true and perfect image of life indee. The better part of Valour, is Discretion; in the which better part, I have saued my life. I am affraide of this Gun-Powder Percy though he be dead. How if hee should counterfeit too, and rise? I am afraid hee would prove the better counterfeit: therefore Ile make him sure: yea, and Ile sweare I kill'd him. Why may not hee rise as well as I: Nothing confutes me but eyes, and no-bodie sees me . . . [Emphasis supplied.]

For every "counterfeit" in this passage, we may read "BIYKIN", and nine times. Our eyes have confuted the supposed author; now we may perceive who is truly holding the pen.

So that its significance may not be overlooked, here is the Merriam-Webster unabridged dictionary definition of this word:

Counterfeit: 1.(a) SPURIOUS, not genuine or authentic; esp: not composed by the author indicated.

Hereafter we may leave the counterfeit labels on some old books to trustful schoolmasters.

Another word that contains Bacon's enciphered name is "travail".

"So to the Lawes at large I write my name." Seven lines following this begins this passage from Loves Labour's Lost (i, 1, 161):

Fer. I that there is, our Court you know is hanted
With a refined traveller of Spaine,
A man in all the worlds new fashion planted,
That hath a mint of phrases in his braine:

Ciphertext, +4 is:
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Plaintext, +4 is:

**Ciphertext**

**Ciphertext reversed** is:

Having given us a plain signal, in three lines the author has confided his name, labeled it, and identified it as being written in cipher.

And how could the author have pointed out his name more plainly than in *The Tragedy of Cymbeline* (iii, 3, 59):

And when a Souldier was the Theame, my name
Was not farre off:

Ciphertext is:

**ANDVHENASOVLDIERVASTHETHEAME**

**MYNAMEVA**

**SNOTFARREOFF**

Ciphertext reversed is:

**FFOERRAFTONSAVEMANYMEMAEBTHEHTSAYREIDL**

**VOSANEHVDNA**

Plaintext, +4 is:

**KKSIYYEKBRSRAEClQERDQIQEIMBIMBAECYIHPCS**

**AERIMCHRE**

The existence of plain indicators cannot be neglected. The word “Cipher” is often such a clue, as in “The History of Sir John Oldcastle” (1664 *Folio*, p.46, col. 1, line 37). Title-paged to William Shakespeare in a 1619 quarto, “it was certainly not by him,” say the
knowing critics. One says it was written by Munday, Drayton, Wilson and Hathaway; another claims it was composed by Kyd, but rewritten by Peele, Greene and Marlowe. The critics confusion may now be ended. Here are some lines:

And sit within the Throne, but for a Cipher.  
Time was, good Subjects would not make known their grief,  
And pray amendment, not enforce the same,  
Unlesse their King were tyrant, which I hope

Following “Cipher”, we may read the next six capital letters in the familiar acrostic fashion of the times:

Ciphertext is:

T S A U K I

Plaintext, +4 is:

B A E C O N

Conclusion

We have reached a place where each of these signatures cannot all be ascribed to happenstance. In my book I have described one-hundred and thirteen similar illustrations; they must not all have occurred by chance. Fourteen separate examples are shown in which the playwright’s name appears three or more times. Ten times an abbreviation of his first name just precedes his last. Forty-three times it is found in conjunction with a version of “cipher”. Nine times it is found twice within one line of text.

In addition, this name appears on twenty occasions together with, either in ciphertext or plaintext, the word “name”. Must such subtlety forever escape the perception of the literary mind? While we follow the trail of these vintage etymological imprints, must we overlook such peculiarities? Our compass points across the wake of an immensely informed scholar; shall we still insist that he was innocent of cryptographic design – helpless to reveal his name
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through the composition of such coherent, but well concealed, devices?

Indeed, what does it matter who wrote the works of William Shakespeare when the poems and the plays remain for us to admire and enjoy – to venerate, as Mark Twain said, “until the last sun goes down”?

It matters because truth matters. There is some elemental secret about Francis Bacon’s life, some basic circumstance still unexplained. At least Ben Jonson must have known. Had Bacon other friends, faithful to this strange trust, who never revealed his quiet deeds? Have the descendants of such a coterie persisted through the long ages? Do such initiates still quietly enjoy this deception with cryptic smiles?

In 1621, when he retired from public life, he wrote a letter to his friend Count Gondomar, the Spanish Ambassador:

“No now indeed both my age, the state of my fortune, and also that of my genius, which I have hitherto so parsimoniously satisfied, call me, as I depart from the Theatre of Public Affairs, to devote myself to letters; to marshal the Intellectual Actors of the present, and to help those of future time. Perchance that will be my honour; and I may pass the remainder of my life as if in the vestibule of a better one.”

It is amusing to contemplate in our imaginations the scene as the curtain rises for the first act of a faithful production of The Tempest.

According to Shakespeare’s own stage directions, “A tempestuous noise of Thunder and Lightning heard: Enter a Ship-master and a Boteswaine.”

What is the first word that the “Master” shouts above the din? Not really “Bote-swaine,” but the name of the author, Francis Bacon – that extraordinary man of astonishing equivocacy, that man who, Ben Jonson wrote, “could never pass by a jest.”
BACONIANA

ALL THAT IS WRIT IN BRASSE:
ANOTHER CRYPTOGRAPHIC SIGNATURE

P. G. B. Rogerson

Ben Jonson's lines "To The Reader" (Figure 1) at the beginning of the 1623 First Folio, opposite the Droeshout engraving of the author's face, have often been discussed,¹ and with very good reason. These ten lines are packed with hints, puns, word-plays, double entendres and other messages, not immediately discernable.

To the Reader.

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

B. I.

Figure 1

Without going through all the details it is clear that what at first seems to be a simple identification of the portrait and how difficult it was to draw, followed by an exhortation to disregard the picture and read the book, is, in fact, an extremely subtle and ingenious announcement that all we see is not as it seems.

What we are told is that the engraver struggled against his own natural inclination to depict the person to the life and managed to efface ("out-doo") the real man behind the mask excellent well; and if

¹ Most notably by E. Durning Lawrence, Bacon is Shakespeare (1910).
the engraver could have drawn Shakespeare's mind as well as he had hidden ("hit") his face, it would have been the best of all engravings; but as the engraver could not, we should read the book to see Shakespeare's mind. Looking for a moment at the "figure", we see again the famous, unanatomical line along the left jaw of the portrait, suggesting a mask, and the equally well known two left sleeves of the tunic, also implying something "sinister", or fishy.

Having digested all of this and being unable to read Jonson's verses or look at the portrait in any other meaningful way, it seemed probable there could be more hidden, as it were, underneath, beyond that already found by other miners.

As a result of my travels through the Shakespeare authorship labyrinth, I believe that what I am about to set down is original, a new discovery, and a very potent piece of evidence in the case for Bacon.

The catalyst and precedent for what follows was the "squaring" cypher information contained in Mr T.D. Bokenham's "Brief History of the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy",* particularly with regard to the Stratford monument, Henry Peacham's _Minerva Britanna_ (1612), p. 34 and the Westminster Abbey Shakespeare monument. These led me to consider squaring "To the Reader" which I did. At first, a fourteen letter square which revealed nothing of interest. Seeing then that Shakespeare and "To the Reader" both are eleven letters long I made an eleven letter square to produce Figure 2.

You will notice that:
1) The name Shakespeare falls completely on line 6.
2) The word "hit" is in the centre of line 16.
3) "Shakespeare hit"... hit what? The answer appears neatly and vertically in column B from lines 15–18 inclusive – BACO.
4) But there's more – proceeding to line 21 column 9 and following the diagonal to line 24 column J we find the letters BCAO. At both BACO's there are convenient 'N's to complete the anagram but not the symmetry – ACHITOB² strikes again. Indeed we may say that the author's wit is writ in Brasse, twice.

5) If this is not enough, to cap the whole thing off and give a lever

---

to that other can of worms, that of Royal Birth, we find, also "writ in Brasse", from the R at line 21 column H reading up the column to line 17 the word "Ruler". But pursuit of this prickly pear is not for this time.

6) Having gone this far we find also that at the end of the first "BACO" at line 19 we have the word Passe. I take this as a directive to compare the Droeshout portrait of Shakespeare with the Simon Passe portrait of Bacon. As W. S. Booth\(^3\) demonstrated in 1911, even if he did mis-read Ben Jonson's meaning, the two portraits when superimposed fit physiognomically with uncanny accuracy.

That this was a deliberate creation and not a coincidence cannot easily be denied by anyone who is well acquainted with the Shakespeare question. The beauty of this find is in its simplicity and clarity as well as its incontrovertibility and irrefrangibility.

Further comment is for you the reader. Some more fog has been cleared from around the Shakespeare monument.

---

ALL THAT IS WRIT IN BRASSE: ANOTHER CRYPTIC SIGNATURE

FIGURE 2
The Editor, Baconiana. 

December, 1990

Dear Sir,

You will no doubt be surprised to receive a letter from the Editors concerning the 1990 issue of Baconian Jottings – Then and Now. This can be included with the magazine for Members living in the United Kingdom, but for those living overseas it must be sent under separate cover because of postal regulations, and it will probably arrive sooner than the magazine. This is in the nature of a letter of farewell and also of explanation.

It is with much regret that we have decided that the time has come at last when we must bring the long series of Baconian Jottings – Then and Now magazines to an end with this issue because, alas, we can no longer sustain the work of production nor the supply of articles.

In the first issue of this booklet, compiled in 1962 but not able to be printed until early in 1963, there appeared an ‘Introduction’ explaining that twenty-five years after the foundation of The Francis Bacon Society, a small band of its Women Members formed themselves into an independent Group known as ‘The Ladies Guild of Francis St. Alban’ under the leadership of Mrs Henry Pott. The Guild called its small and modest journal Fly – Leaves of the Ladies Guild of Francis St Alban. We, personally, liked reading the Journals and thought that Members of The Francis Bacon Society might also enjoy many of the contributions contained in them. By 1962 the Journals had long been out of print. We made the offer to the Council Members of The Francis Bacon Society to reproduce, in arranged and abridged form, and using a different title, some of the most interesting of these articles, in order to create a new, independent and supplementary magazine. The ‘Citation’ pages, devoted to quotations from the works of Francis Bacon and related in subject matter to one of the articles, was an innovation which we, the Editors, thought might prove to be a valuable addition. The Members of Council liked our ideas and accepted our offer.

From the outset in 1962/3, in order to keep costs down to a bare minimum, we offered to do the selecting and editing of articles, the
typing, the choice and production of the art-work, and the preparing of the paper-plates ready for photocopying ourselves, entirely by hand and of course free of charge, and this has continued to be our policy. Since our late Secretary's death we have also done the majority of the despatch work.

This literary venture and the varied work involved was executed over the years between us but more recently, as a result of poor health of one half of the team, only the choice of articles and art-work, and the editing, remained a shared task and the rest of the work has had to be done single-handed by the other half of the duo. Because of continuing health problems of one of us, and the diminished strength of the other, the work-load is now proving to be too taxing to continue with it, as well as writing lectures for The Society's Social Meetings, in addition to regular commitments in our private life. This factor, in addition to the realisation that the 'store-house' of articles is nearly empty, are the two reasons for prompting our decision to withdraw the offer we originally made twenty-eight years ago, and bring to an end the series of *Baconian Jottings* magazines. We would like to thank past and present Council Members for always having given us a free hand in the choice and presentation of our annual 'offering', and of thanking our readers for any comments of appreciation and encouragement, for their patience with postal or production delays, forbearance towards imperfections of typing or printing, and we bid you all a fond farewell.

Yours sincerely,

Mary and Elizabeth Brameld.
Dear Sir,

Olive Wagner Driver has plainly read with care, and yet one thing she has missed, and that is the late Mr. Ivor Cook's identification (Shakespeare Survey No. 21, 1968) of Mr. W.H. with the young seaman, William Hervey, certified dead on 3 March 1589/90, who crossed out the certification of his own death with the explanation that though he had been thought drowned at sea he had but been held a prisoner in Spain – and who then became the third husband of the Countess of Southampton, at the time mourning the loss of a brother. The situation created was so like that in Twelfth Night, wherein Sebastian, thought drowned at sea, returned from the apparent dead to marry the Countess of Southampton, who had just lost a brother, as to give this William Harvey a far better claim than either Henry Wriothesley, Earl of Southampton, or William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke. Mr. Cook's argument was that the opening sonnets, addressed to a very young man, urging him to get married, were addressed to the young Earl of Southampton at the request of the mother, who had reason to be very worried about him, and those to the "dark lady" to the Countess herself and those to the friend to William Hervey. On this reading it is the Countess who was the object of the poet's love. There are indications that Anthony Bacon was celibate by habit because homosexual by disposition, so that I doubt he would have had this relationship.

But several of the later plays include references to things that happened after Anthony's death, notably The Tempest, which draws upon the wreck of 'The Sea Venture', 1609, and upon a letter sent on 7 July, 1610 by Strachey to the wife of Lord Howard of Walden. This letter contained matter so damaging that although Lord Howard would have felt obliged to lay it before the Bard of the Virginia Company, it would most certainly have been kept confidential. Anthony was dead. Francis was not: he was on the Board of the Virginia Company.

Yours sincerely,

Jean Overton Fuller
The Editor,
Baconiana.

Dear Sir,

Mr. Gwynne has proved his case that Bacon should be judged in accordance with the scientific methods which he laid down and not by preconceived ideas that he was in every respect above reproach. It is particularly important that a learned body such as ours should submit its conclusions to the most rigorous examination before accepting them, otherwise we shall fall victim to what Bacon warned us about in his *Novum Organum*: the idols of the tribe which tempt us "to carry on in a particular direction of thought even where there is no factual support for it and thus to end in such pseudo-explanations as those by final causes . . ."

It is only because Mr. Gwynne has rather overegged his pudding that I am writing this letter. In *Baconiana* (189) he asserts that Bacon should be judged by higher moral standards than those of his time—and even by absolute standards. This surely forces us back to the very presuppositions and subjective opinions that he wishes to prevent. Bacon did not have more lofty principles. He did consent to torture and he did help to prosecute the Earl of Essex after he had been befriended. The passage on civil knowledge in *The Advancement of Knowledge* shows that he found fraud and deceit acceptable when personal advantage was at stake.

He knew that there were some things which he could change and some which he could not change. In some matters, such as the part he played in the trial of Essex, he had to bow to the will of the sovereign, and in others, such as the torture of Peacham, he accepted the decision of his superiors. A greater man than he might have resigned his offices to avoid being put in the position of having to carry out these distasteful duties.

The fact that Bacon was not a martyr, however, does not detract from the breadth of his mind, the quality of his philosophy, the power of his English, or the wisdom of his opinions. His ideas were expressed in his *Essays* and elsewhere—ideals which related to the obligations of a judge, a statesman and a friend. He could hardly have expressed his beliefs in such resonant language, and so openly, if they had been manifestly contrary to what people knew about him, people
such as Ben Jonson who said:

"My conceit of his person was never increased towards him by his place or honours. But I have, and do reverence him for the greatness that was only proper to himself, in that he seemed to me ever, by his work, one of the greatest men, and most worthy of admiration, than had been in many ages."

Yours faithfully,

J.B. Reavill
All the following publications are available from the Francis Bacon Society. Enquiries should be made to the Chairman, T.D. Bokenham, at 56 Westbury Road, New Malden, Surrey KT3 5AX, from whom an up-to-date price list may be obtained.

Baker, H. Kendra

*The Persecution of Francis Bacon*
A story of great wrong. This important book presents lucidly the events and intrigue leading up to the impeachment of Francis Bacon, Lord Chancellor. (Paperback – 1978).

Barker, Richard

*How to Crack the Secret of Westminster Abbey*
A step by step guide to one of the key ciphers concealed in the Shakespeare Monument, and a signpost to what it implies.

Bokenham, T.D.

*A Brief History of the Bacon-Shakespeare Controversy*

Dawkins, A.P.

*Faithful Sayings and Ancient Wisdom*
A personal selection of Francis Bacon’s *Essays* and *Fables* from the Wisdom of the Ancients, chosen for the teachings that Bacon gives in these concerning the fundamental laws of Creation and Redemption. Illustrated. (Paperback – 1982).

*Journal 3: Dedication to the Light*

*Journal 5: Arcadia*
The Egyptian Mysteries and Hemeticism. The mystery of Arcadia. The secret Arcadian Academy of English alchemical poets & beginnings of modern Freemasonry. (Bacon’s life: 1579–85).

*Francis Bacon — Herald of the New Age*
An introductory essay to the genius and hidden nature of Sir Francis Bacon, and to the nature of his vast philanthropic work for mankind.
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Bacon, Shakespeare & Fra. Christian Rose Cross

Dodd, Alfred

Francis Bacon's Personal Life-Story
A revealing account of Bacon's secret as well as public life, revealing his genius and role as poet, author, playwright and director of the English Renaissance, as 'Shakespeare', as 'Solomon' of English Freemasonry, and as Francis Tudor, son of Queen Elizabeth I. (Hardback – 1986).

Gundry, W.G.C.

Francis Bacon — a Guide to his Homes and Haunts
This little book includes some interesting information and many illustrations. (Hardback – 1946).

Manes Verulamiani
A facsimile of the 1626 edition of the elegiac tributes to Francis Bacon by the scholars and poets of his day, showing Francis Bacon to have been considered a scholar and a poet of the very highest calibre although 'concealed'. With translations and commentary, this is a most valuable book. (Hardback – 1950).

Johnson, Edward D.

Francis Bacon's Maze
The Biliteral Cipher of Francis Bacon

Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin

Bacon is Shakespeare
With Bacon's Promus.

Macduff, Ewen

The Sixty-Seventh Inquisition
The Dancing Horse Will Tell You
These two books demonstrate by means of diagrams and photofacsimiles that a cipher, brilliantly conceived, but simple in execution, exists in the 1623 Shakespeare Folio. The messages revealed, and the method of finding them, form a fascinating study and an unanswerable challenge to disbelievers. The books are the result of many years' careful research. (Hardbacks – 1972 & 1973).
Melsome, W.S.

Bacon-Shakespeare Anatomy
Dr. Melsome anatomises the 'mind' of Shakespeare, showing its exact counterpart in the mind of Francis Bacon. (Hardback – 1945).

Pares, Martin

Mortuary Marbles
A collection of six essays in which the author pays tribute to the greatness of Francis Bacon. (Paperback).
A Pioneer
A tribute to Delia Bacon. (Hardback – 1958).
Knights of the Helmet

Sennett, Mabel

His Erring Pilgrimage
An interpretation of As You Like It. (Paperback – 1949).

Theobald, B.G.

Exit Shakespeare
A concise and carefully reasoned presentation of the case against the Stratford man, Shakespeare, as an author of the Shakespeare works. (Card cover – 1931).

Enter Francis Bacon
A sequel to Exit Shakespeare, condensing the main facts and arguments for Francis Bacon as a supreme poet and author of the Shakespeare Plays. (Hardback – 1932).

Trevelyan, Sir George

The Winters Tale — An Interpretation
An esoteric interpretation in the Light of the Spiritual World View showing that the play is in essence a Mystery Play based upon the Greek Mysteries.

The Merchant of Venice — An Interpretation
An esoteric interpretation in the Light of the Spiritual World View showing that the play is a story of soul initiation based upon the Ancient Wisdom teachings.
Woodward, Frank

*Francis Bacon’s Cipher Signatures*
A well presented commentary on many of the ‘Baconian’ cipher signatures in text and emblem, with a large number of photofacsimiles. (Hardback – 1923).
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