

LABYRINTH
of
RUINS

Francis Bacon's
Encrypted
Sonnet Sequence

Volume I

Richard B. Shapiro

LABYRINTH
of
RUIINS

Francis Bacon's
Encrypted
Sonnet Sequence

Volume I



© Richard B. Shapiro 2020, 2023

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical reviews and certain other noncommercial uses permitted by copyright law. For permission requests, write to the publisher, “attention: Permissions,” at the address below.

Richard B. Shapiro has asserted his moral right to be identified as the author of this work.

Published in the United States of America
Leonidas Press
6 Liberty Square #2128
Boston, MA 02109

www.Hekatopathia.com

Editor: Kelly Clody
Proofreader: Penelope Wayne-Shapiro
Cover Design: David Moratto

Second and Complete Edition

First printed June, 2023

9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

ISBN: 978-1-7353651-2-1 (Hardcover)

ISBN: 978-1-7353651-3-8 (Softcover)

To my parents

*who provided me with a liberal education and
encouraged the lifelong pursuit of learning*

Notes (Vol. I)

Chapter 1 » Introduction: A Systematically Concealed Text

- 1 “Deciphering and the Exhaustion of Recombination,” in *A Material History of Medieval and Early Modern Ciphers: Cryptography and the History of Literacy*, ed. Katherine Ellison and Susan Kim (New York: Routledge, 2018), 202.
- 2 *The Shakespearean Ciphers Examined: An Analysis of Cryptographic Systems Used as Evidence That Some Author Other Than William Shakespeare Wrote the Plays Commonly Attributed to Him* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958).
- 3 I am aware of only one systematic cryptographic claim among those claiming an alternative authorship of the works of Shakespeare. However, this system did not actually operate on a Shakespearean text but employed Bacon’s bilateral cipher invention to recognize supposed differences in the fonts used in printing the First Folio. The so-called “Gallup cipher” is described and debunked in Friedman and Friedman, *Shakespearean Ciphers Examined*, 188–278.
- 4 Rollett presents his claim on two occasions, in “The Dedication to Shakespeare’s Sonnets,” *Elizabethan Review* 5.2 (1997): 93–122, and later in “Secrets of the Dedication to Shakespeare’s Sonnets,” *Oxfordian* 2 (1999): 60–75. In the first publication, he assessed the probability that his deciphering could arise serendipitously at 1 in 270,000, for which he does provide a calculation. In the second publication, he assessed the probability at 1 in 20,000, without providing a calculation. Apparently, he realized that he had missed some of the possible variations (they are easy to overlook). In my analysis, the additional variations I found made a serendipitous deciphering very probable, which thoroughly undermines the validation.
- 5 See note directly above. My calculation, with the necessary explanations, would require a dozen pages, far beyond the space available here. Suffice it to say that the degrees of freedom that I have identified (called variations in the above note) produce a high probability of a serendipitous deciphering.
- 6 Correctly calculated, the probability is a function of negative, not positive, instances. I have simplified the calculation, which results in an insignificant difference.
- 7 The 100 poem count is not exact. There are precisely 100 pages labeled with Roman numerals. However, the page marked LXXX contains the puzzle instructions, not a poem. There is also a poem labeled as the *Epilogue* that appears subsequent to the last numbered poem, and another poem, titled *Quid Amor*, consisting of 39 Latin hexameters, which is unnumbered and appears between XCIII and XCIX. The poet refers to the poems as “passions” three-quarters of the time and as “sonnets” the remainder of the time, according to Phillips (Phillips Dissertation, 30).

8 Oddly, Bacon refers to his Neo-Latin poem 45 as a sonnet in its headnote.

9 See A. E. B. Coldiron, “Watson’s *Hekatompathia* and Renaissance Lyric Translation,” *Translation and Literature* 5.1 (1996): 7–8.

10 Murphy Dissertation, abstract, 5. The abstract is a separate document stored with the dissertation, available at the Harvard Archives.

11 Coldiron, “Watson’s *Hekatompathia* and Renaissance Lyric Translation,” 7.

12 Frank Ardolino, “Thomas Watson, Shadow Poet of Edmund Spenser,” *Notes and Queries* 61.2 (2014): 225–29. Also, Phillips Dissertation, 43.

13 Heninger Edition, xvii–xviii. See also Vol. II, Appendix D, “Notes on the Text.”

14 Thomas Watson, “A Looking glasse for Loovers,” Manuscript: (British Library: Harleian 3277, n.d.). The British Library has available a microfilm of the manuscript from which copies may be ordered.

15 Wendy Phillips, “No More Tears: Thomas Watson Absolved,” *Comitatus: A Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 20.1 (1989): 75. However, there are four lines that break metrical form: an 11-syllable line (48.9), two tetrameters (56.14; 77.1), and a hexameter (92.3). See 246–47; II 67, 109, 165, 179, 383–84.

16 Thomas Watson, *Thomas Watson Poems*, ed. Edward Arber (London: English Reprints, 1870), 3–4.

17 Murphy Dissertation, abstract, 4; xcvi. The abstract is a separate document stored with the dissertation, available at the Harvard Archives.

18 See the discussion of translation in Excursus 4.

19 “Ma il petrarchista non è un plagiario nel senso moderno della parola: è un poeta rinascimentale, e cioè un razionale imitatore di quello che egli riteneva essere il meglio delle opere che prendeva a modello.” *Thomas Watson e la tradizione petrarchista*, Messina G. Principato, 1969, 266. Translation: Phillips Dissertation, 45.

20 Phillips Dissertation, 78.

21 “Watson’s *Hekatompathia* and Renaissance Lyric Translation,” 22, 9.

22 “Thomas Watson’s *Hekatompathia* and European Petrarchism,” in *Petrarch in Britain: Interpreters, Imitators, and Translators Over 700 Years*, ed. M. L McLaughlin, Letizia Panizza, and Peter Hainsworth, Proceedings of the British Academy 146 (Oxford, UK: Published for the British Academy by Oxford University Press, 2007), 223–27.

23 *Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance* (London: Faber and Faber, 1958), 151.

24 On the influence on later sonnet sequences, see Sutton Edition, 135N3. On the influence on Shakespeare’s sonnets, see. E. Pearlman, “Watson’s *Hekatompathia* [1582] in the Sonnets and Romeo and Juliet,” *English Studies* 74.4 (1993): 343–51.

25 Phillips Dissertation, 69–74.

26 *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century Excluding Drama: The Completion of the Clark Lectures, Trinity College, Cambridge, 1944* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 483.

27 *The Elizabethan Sonnet Sequences: Studies in Conventional Conceits* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1966), 17.

28 Sutton Edition, vi.

29 *Ibid.*, xiv–xv.

30 “Thomas Watson, Playwright: Origins of Modern English Drama,” in *Lost Plays in Shakespeare’s England*, ed. D. McInnis and M. Steggie (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 198.

31 *Ibid.*, 187.

32 Wendy Phillips argues that “Watson’s first madrigal reads like an autobiographical account of a first meeting with Sidney, leading to a close friendship” (Phillips Dissertation, 63–66). With respect to Spenser, see Harry Morris, “Richard Barnfield, ‘Amyntas,’ and the Sidney Circle,” *PMLA* 74.4 (1959): 318–24. Also, William Ringler, “Spenser and Thomas Watson,” *Modern Language Notes* 69.7 (1954): 484–87.

33 Sutton Edition, vN2. The words “and apostle of Continental culture” appear only in the online edition.

34 Hirrel, “Thomas Watson, Playwright: Origins of Modern English Drama,” 198.

35 *Ibid.*

36 *Ibid.*, 199.

37 See the section titled “The Significance of Bacon’s Pseudonyms” in Richard Serjeantson, “Francis Bacon’s *Valerius Terminus* and the Voyage to the ‘Great Instauration,’” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 78.3 (2017): 348–57.

38 *Works*, 10.65

39 Georg Cantor, *Resurrectio Divi Quirini, Francisci Baconi, Baronis de Verulam...* (Cura Et Impensis G.C. [Georg Cantor], 1896).

40 Opinion of James Spedding (*Works*, 8.325–26).

41 *The Anonymous Renaissance: Cultures of Discretion in Tudor-Stuart England* (University of Chicago Press, 2003), 3–4.

42 “Ignoto in the Age of Print: The Manipulation of Anonymity in Early Modern England,” *Studies in Philology* 91.4 (1994): 393, 397, *passim* 390–416.

43 Marcy North, “Anonymity’s Revelations in ‘The Arte of English Poesie,’” *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* 39.1 (1999): 1–2.

44 *Ibid.*, 5–7.

45 *Ibid.*, 13–14.

46 Serjeantson, “Francis Bacon’s *Valerius Terminus* and the Voyage to the ‘Great Instauration,’” 348–49. Serjeantson provides this note: See Lisa Jardine and Alan Stewart, *Hostage to Fortune: The Troubled Life of Francis Bacon* (London: Gollancz, 1998), esp. 55–58.

47 *Works* 8.109.

48 *Reading Memory in Early Modern Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 220.

49 *Works*, 4.444–447. Bacon writes that this invention “I devised myself when I was at Paris in my early youth” (445).

50 *Ibid.*, 445.

51 James Gleick, in *The Information: A History, a Theory, a Flood* (New York: Pantheon, 2011), identifies the first instance of Information Theory as the biliteral cipher (159–61). However, he misattributes Bacon’s invention to John Wilkins, who appropriated it without attribution in 1641. Gleick writes, “The essential idea of information theory poked to the surface of human thought, saw its shadow, and disappeared again for four hundred years” (161).

52 *Works* 4.84.

53 See Benjamin Farrington, *The Philosophy of Francis Bacon: An Essay on Its Development from 1603 to 1609, with New Translation of Fundamental Texts* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966), 111.

54 *Theogony*, 27–28.

55 “Suspicion, Deception, and Concealment,” *Arion: A Journal of Humanities and the Classics* 1.2 (1991): 121. Plato reference: *Republic*, III, 389b.

56 Leo Strauss, *Persecution and the Art of Writing* (Glencoe: Free Press, 1952), 57–58. I wish to thank Palle Yourgrau for suggesting this work.

57 *Ibid.*, 61–62.

58 *Ibid.*, 67.

59 Arthur F. Kinney, *Continental Humanist Poetics: Studies in Erasmus, Castiglione, Marguerite De Navarre, Rabelais, and Cervantes* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1989), 46. Second quotation: Desiderius Erasmus to Justus Jonas, May 10, 1521, in *Correspondence*, 8:203.

60 See David Weil Baker, *Divulging Utopia: Radical Humanism in Sixteenth-Century England*, Massachusetts Studies in Early Modern Culture (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999), 25–26.

61 See Martin Mulsow, *Knowledge Lost: A New View of Early Modern Intellectual History*, tr. H. C. Erik Midelfort, Bilingual edition (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2022). Mulsow argues that historians of the early modern period have often failed to uncover the knowledge that is intentionally hidden in many texts. Indirect forms such as commentary and annotation are often used to subtly express heterodox views (14).

62 *Works*, 4.450.

63 See Rhodri Lewis, “Francis Bacon, Allegory, and the Uses of Myth,” *Review of English Studies* 61.250 (2010): 367.

64 “Ethics and Politics in the *New Atlantis*,” in *Francis Bacon’s New Atlantis: New Interdisciplinary Essays*, ed. Bronwen Price (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 73.

65 In the *To the frendly Reader* preface, the sonnets may either be defended, or excused as *idle toyes proceedinge from a youngling frenzie* (second paragraph). In the final stanza of the *Quatorzain* preface, the personified book may either declare its worth or *confesse* that it is a *Toye*. The *Protrepticon* preface also suggests two alternative reading modes (see Chapter 6).

66 See Daniel S Russell, *The Emblem and Device in France*, French Forum monographs 59 (French Forum, 1985), 48. Russell is referring to emblems, but I believe the principle applies more generally to poetry.

67 Bartolomeo Fontius (1455–1513). Quoted from Concetta Carestia Greenfield, *Humanist and Scholastic Poetics, 1250-1500* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1981), 288.

68 *Summa theologiae* I.Q. I, a9, r.2.

69 *On Christian Doctrine*, 2.6.8, tr. Rev. J. F. Shaw; Golding, “Too the Reader,” in Ovid, *Metamorphosis*, tr. Golding (London, 1567), A2v (STC 18956).

70 His preface to Henry Savile’s translation of Tacitus (1591), STC 23642.

71 *Visionary Spenser and the Poetics of Early Modern Platonism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 70.

72 *Boccaccio on Poetry*, tr. Charles Osgood (New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1956), 60–62.

73 *The Discarded Image: An Introduction to Medieval and Renaissance Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964), 10.

74 Erasmus’s *Adages*, translated into English, appeared in 11 editions in the sixteen century. Claudia Corti argues that Erasmus was at “the very core of

the extraordinary co-textual and inter-textual experience of the English Renaissance.” *Silenos: Erasmus in Elizabethan Literature*, Studi di letterature moderne e comparate 1 (Ospedaletto [Italy]: Pacini, 1998), 9–10.

75 Thomas More, *Utopia: With Erasmus's the Sileni of Alcibiades*, tr. David Wootton (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 1999), 169.

76 *Ibid.*, 169–70.

77 Quoted from Arthur F. Kinney, “Rhetoric as Poetic: Humanist Fiction in the Renaissance,” *ELH* 43.4 (1976): 422–23. Kinney quotes the English translation of Sir Thomas Chaloner (1549): E3.

78 *Ibid.*, 426.

79 *Utopia: With Erasmus's the Sileni of Alcibiades*, 24–25.

80 “Prologue of the Author,” in *Gargantua and Pantagruel*, tr. Michael Andrew Screech (London: Penguin Books, 2006), 207.

81 Quoted from Ronald Levao, “Francis Bacon and the Mobility of Science,” *Representations*, 40 (1992): 5.

82 The quotation is from Laurence Lampert, *Nietzsche and Modern Times: A Study of Bacon, Descartes, and Nietzsche* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 276. Lampert points to the first sentence of Descartes's *Discourse*, a direct quotation from Montaigne: “Good sense is most evenly distributed in the world, for each thinks himself so well endowed therewith that even those who are most difficult to please in all other things are not wont to desire more of it than they have.” He argues that both Montaigne and Descartes know this declaration to be false and that to the contrary, people struggle to distinguish the true from the false. Indeed, according to Lampert, Descartes eventually tells his reader that “almost all people are deficient with respect to distinguishing the true from the false” (207). Thus, both Montaigne and Descartes brazenly state a bold lie in their rhetorical approach to argument. Bacon applies a similar rhetorical approach in both the *Hekatompathia* and his *Essays*. On his use of rhetoric in the *Essays*, see Stanley Fish, *Self-Consuming Artifacts: The Experience of Seventeenth-Century Literature* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), 78–155.

83 See Stephen Clucas, “A Knowledge Broken”: Francis Bacon's Aphoristic Style and the Crisis of Scholastic and Humanist Knowledge-Systems,” in *English Renaissance Prose: History, Language, and Politics*, ed. Neil Rhodes (Tempe: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1997), 147–72. See also Lampert, *Nietzsche and Modern Times*, 19–26, for his discussion of Bacon's esoterism.

84 “Francis Bacon and the Mobility of Science,” 5.

85 *Ibid.*, on Bacon's poetics, see 5–8, *passim*, 1–32.

86 *Novum Organum*, civ. *Works*, 4.97.

87 “Francis Bacon and the Mobility of Science,” 19.

88 The quoted words are Levao's, *Ibid.*, 20.

89 “The Collapse of the Religious Hieroglyph: Typology and Natural Language in Herbert and Bacon,” *Renaissance Quarterly*, 45.1 (1992): 112.

90 *Ibid.*, 112.

91 “Refashioning Fable through the Baconian Essay: *De sapientia veterum* and Mythologies of the Early Modern Natural Philosopher,” in *The Essay: Forms and Transformations*, ed. Dorothea Flothow et al., (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag, Winter 2017), 25.

92 *Science and the Secrets of Nature: Books of Secrets in Medieval and Early Modern Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 288.

93 Ibid., 289–90.

94 “Francis Bacon and the Rhetorical Reordering of Reality,” *Rhetor* 6 (2016), 12.

95 Quoted from *Nietzsche and Modern Times*, 277 (Daybreak, preface 5).

96 An acrostic is formed by the first letter of each chapter forming a message that includes the name Francesco Colonna; however, the identity of the author is uncertain.

97 *The Cornucopian Text: Problems of Writing in the French Renaissance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), 181–82.

98 Ibid., 164.

99 *Works*, 4.449.

100 From “Thoughts and Conclusions,” in Farrington, *The Philosophy of Francis Bacon*, 75–76.

101 David Colclough, “Non Canimus Surdis, Respondent Omnia Sylvae’: Francis Bacon and the Transmission of Knowledge,” in *Textures of Renaissance Knowledge*, eds. Philippa Berry and Margaret Tudeau-Clayton (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003), 86.

102 *Works* 4.449.

103 “Francis Bacon, Allegory and the Uses of Myth,” *Review of English Studies* 61.250 (2010): 369.

104 *Explorations in Ancient and Modern Philosophy*, Vol. 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2012), 27.

105 See the discussion in the final chapter: Sidney’s goal is not to create a Cyrus (a prototypical hero) but a maker of Cyruses.

106 “Rabelais’s Realism, Again,” in *François Rabelais: Critical Assessments*, ed. Jean-Claude Carron (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), 37.

107 “Francis Bacon and the Art of Misinterpretation,” *PMLA* 130.2 (2015): 246, 243.

108 “Francis Bacon, Allegory and the Uses of Myth,” 381.

109 “Ethics and Politics in the New Atlantis,” 72.

110 “Non Canimus Surdis, Respondent Omnia Sylvae’,” 88.

111 “The Hermeneutical Anarchist: *Phronesis*, Rhetoric, and the Experience of Art,” in *Gadamer’s Century: Essays in Honor of Hans-Georg Gadamer*, ed. Jeff Malpas et al., (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2002), 61.

112 Quoted from “The Hermeneutical Anarchist,” 61 (*Truth and Method*, 116).

113 “The Hermeneutical Anarchist,” 61–62.

114 Quoted from Stanley Rosen, *The Ancients and the Moderns: Rethinking Modernity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 212.

115 See *The Ancients and the Moderns*, 213.

116 Ibid., 211.

117 Ibid., 232.

118 “Francis Bacon and the Art of Misinterpretation,” 238.

119 See Pierre Hadot, *The Veil of Isis: An Essay on the History of Idea of Nature*, tr. Michael Chase (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006), 93, *passim*.

120 *Works* 6.713.

121 Sophie Weeks, “The Role of Mechanics in Francis Bacon’s Great Instauration,” in *Philosophies of Technology: Francis Bacon and His Contemporaries* (2 Vols.), ed. Claus Zittel et al., Vol. 1 (Koninklijke Brill NV, 2008), 140.

122 *Ibid.*, 163–64.

123 *Ibid.*, 180.

124 *Ibid.*, 174, 180, 184–85.

Chapter 2 » Stage 1: The Puzzle Sonnet

- 1 Two poems fall outside of the *Hekatompathia*’s numbering scheme: *Quid Amor* and the Epilogue. The headnote of Sonnet 98 (which precedes *Quid Amor*) states that the poet placed *Quid Amor* on the *next page following, but not as accomptable for one of the hundredth passions of this booke*, thus excluding it from being counted. The headnote of the Epilogue also appears to exclude it from being counted as one of the 100 passions: *more like a praier than a Passion*. Thus no poem replaces Sonnet 80 in the sonnet count, and the title’s promise of 100 passions falls short by one.
- 2 Trithemius uses “*transpositionis*” to mean the change or enciphering from a plaintext alphabet to a ciphertext alphabet (“*mutationem seu transpositionem;*” Oii). He labels both his *Recta* and *Aversa* tables (at the top of the page) as “*tabula transpositionis*” (Oii, Oiiv). In his “*Explanatio in quintum librum polygraphiae nostrae brevis*” (explanation of the fifth book; Biv), which is an appendage to the 1518 edition, he uses “*transpositionem*” a dozen times. “*Orchema*” is the title given to his irregular enciphering table (Pii, but the page number is mislabeled). “*Orchema*” appears about 10 times in his “*Explanatio in quintum librum polygraphiae nostrae brevis*.” Thus the Puzzle’s instructions make the reference to *Polygraphia* 5 extremely clear.
- 3 The reference to “the syllabic count of each line increasing by odd instead of consecutive numbers” refers to the “*orchematical*” base of the Pasquine Pillar featured in Sonnet 81. Phillips Dissertation, 424.
- 4 In steganography, an ordinary, readable text forms the ciphertext (ciphertexts are normally gibberish), which is deciphered to produce the (secret) plaintext. Typically, only a modest percentage of the ordinary text—say the first letter of every sentence—is used in deciphering. Here, a small percentage of the letters of the acrostic (*amare est insanire*) would amount to only one or two letters, hardly sufficient for a message. In the course of this chapter, we will discover that Bacon, through his prodigious skill (*how much art and study the Author hath bestowed*; Sonnet 80), managed to utilize 50% of each acrostic, an impressive accomplishment.
- 5 Post-Petrarchism Origins and Innovations of the Western Lyric Sequence (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), 102–6. Roland Greene recognizes correctly that the Puzzle Sonnet marks a significant turning point in the work, and such an event could be marked by ritual. However, an acrostic sonnet is neither mystical nor a sacrament.
- 6 Of the 100 numbered poems, 4 are Neo-Latin poems (6, 45, 66, and 90) and 3 are devoted to the Puzzle Sonnet (the instructions and the two versions of the Puzzle Sonnet). This accounts for 94 English language sonnets, counting the two Puzzle Sonnet versions as one sonnet.
- 7 Phillips Dissertation, 421.

8 I calculate the average number of lines that intermediate a rhyme pair or triplet: zero is the value for adjacent lines and one for alternating rhyme lines, etc. The scheme is a b a c b d e f g h e a h g c d f f. Examining the first “a” rhyme (a triplet), its first gap (one intervening “b” line) is equal to 1; the second gap (these lines intervene: c b d e f g h e) is equal to 8. The calculated gap values are: a: 1; b: 2; c: 10; d: 9; e: 3; f: 0, 8; g: 4; h: 2. The average of these 10 gaps is 4.7.

9 I calculated what the average gap value would be for a randomly ordered poem consisting of 6 rhyme pairs and 2 triplets. For rhyme pairs, the maximum gap is 16 and the average gap is $(1 \text{ to } 16) \sum ((1 \text{ to } 16) \sum N) / (1 \text{ to } 17) \sum N = 5.33$. For triplets, the maximum gap, averaged across the two gaps, is 7.5, and the average gap is $.5 (1 \text{ to } 15) \sum ((1 \text{ to } 15) \sum N) / (1 \text{ to } 16) \sum N = 2.5$. A weighted average between the 6 pair gaps and the 4 triplet gaps yields an average gap of 4.2.

10 Examples of sonnet structure include the three-quatrains-plus-couplet Shakespearean sonnet (actually Wyatt’s invention), the octave-plus-sestet Petrarchan sonnet, and the *Hekatompathia*’s three-sestet sonnet.

11 *The Literary Riddle before 1600* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1948), 3.

12 The couplet would be forced to play some role of intermediation between the two octaves, and it is too small to do so. In a Shakespearean sonnet, the third quatrain often intermediates between the first two quatrains. In a Petrarchan sonnet, no couplet follows the two sections, the octave and the sestet.

13 “For” may be a misprint: Sonnet 81 reads “or” and Sonnet 82 “for.” However, the manuscript’s Sonnet 81 reads “for,” and thus three of four instances read “for.” Here, “for” likely means “under the influence of” (OED 20a) and thus *mirth* is said to arise from *mischance*.

14 In the reordered poem’s rhyme scheme, abaab cdcde eefgfg hh, all rhyming end words either fall in adjacent lines or are separated by only one line, with the one exception of the “b” rhymes, which are separated by two lines. But abaab is a reasonable rhyme scheme for a combined triplet and pair. Rhyme schemes of abba are, of course, common. True, the rhyme scheme overlaps the bipartite structure of the sonnet. But given the pairs and triplets with which we have to work, this rhyme scheme is certainly reasonable.

15 *Polygraphia* 5, Oii.

16 The Recta tables include 25 rather than 23 tables, but this includes 2 erroneous tables that fill up what would otherwise be empty columns on the page titled “*Quinta figura expansionis tabulae rectae*.” These 2 extra tables are actually Orchemia tables and are clearly out of place. Most of my references to *Polygraphia* 5 are made by page title or other means because many of the work’s page numbers are misprinted.

17 *Polygraphia* 5, second page: “And if, on account of a multitude of difficulties, the family of alphabets which we have noted are not sufficient, or if some of them seem too open and too obvious, we will be able to introduce various new transpositions of which the number is large, and the mode of the secrecy remains always concealed.” (The original text begins with “Quod si prae multitudine” and ends with “occultus.”)

18 Trithemius uses a 24-letter alphabet that includes the non-Latin letters K and W. It is identical to the 24-letter Elizabethan alphabet except that Trithemius’s

alphabetic order places “W” as the last letter of the alphabet, as was the custom in the German language. The Puzzle uses the standard order of the 24-letter Elizabethan alphabet, in which W follows U/V.

- 19 Trithemius’s master Aversa Table, titled *Tabula transpositionis aversa* appears on the fourth page of *Polygraphia* 5. This master table is rendered oddly and is inconsistent with his expansion into the 23 tables that appear on the tenth through fourteenth pages of *Polygraphia* 5. My version uses the values from the 23-table expansion. Also, my version, following the Puzzle, is modified such that “W” is the 21st letter of the alphabet.
- 20 A late sixteenth-century dialogue on love, *Contramours*, was published under the pseudonym Battista Fregoso. The acrostic in a fourteen-line prefatory poem spells out THOMAS SEBILLETT.
- 21 Phillips Dissertation, 427.
- 22 *Ibid.*, 427–29.
- 23 In this assignment of tables, only two binary assumptions have been made. The first is the assignment of the increasing numbers to the Recta tables and the decreasing numbers to the Aversa tables, as opposed to vice versa, which would be an unnatural choice. With respect to the Recta tables, one can read them either as encryption or decryption tables, also a binary choice.
- 24 Alberti embedded letters in the ciphertext itself that signaled which alphabet would be used.
- 25 If in cryptanalysis, one makes too many arbitrary and elaborate assumptions about the cryptographic system, the validity of any deciphered message may be called into question. For example, if one’s conjecture about a cryptographic system arbitrarily settles on one of a million possible systems, this reduces confidence in the validity of the deciphered message. Here we have made only a handful of assumptions; if the assumptions had instead been numerous, it would be necessary to factor this into the mathematical validation at the conclusion of this chapter.
- 26 Credited to mathematician David Silverman, this was reportedly published in August 1970 in *Kickshaws* (no further information is available).
- 27 Aloys Meister, *Die Geheimschrift im Dienste der Päpstlichen Kurie von ihren Anfänge bis zum Ende des 16. Jahrhundert* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1906), 297. The table below provides references to some sixteenth-century polyphonic ciphers documented in *Die Geheimschrift*.

Year	Correspondent	Page in <i>Die Geheimschrift</i>
1544–50	Bishop of Ajaccio	178
1579	Camillo Capozucca	296
1582	Vincenzo Vitelli	296
15??	Cardinal Sabellus	200
1583	Cardinal Sabellus	297
1585	Cardinal Sabellus	298
1585	Bishop of Amalfi	350
1586(?)	Anonymous	255

- 28 For each letter, the absolute rate of language is 4.6 bits ($\log_2 24$). To compare the information content of the absolute rate of language with the output of a polyphonic cipher with one bit of indeterminacy, divide the information content of each: $(4.6-1) / 4.6 \approx 78\%$.

29 Katherine Ellison, “Deciphering and the Exhaustion of Recombination,” in *A Material History of Medieval and Early Modern Ciphers: Cryptography and the History of Literacy*, ed. Katherine Ellison and Susan Kim (New York: Routledge, 2018), 187.

30 *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 230–31, 245.

31 He is depicted as either possessing powers, symbolized as arrows or a brand, or as dispossessed of these powers (Sonnets 70 and 100).

32 Sonnet 25, line 8 where the fabricated pronoun “he” represents he or she. This is necessary in the poem to account for the change in the gender of the person referenced in the echo.

33 *Blyndfold bratte and thee* (M, F); *Blind cupids carr* (M); *Ciprya la nemica mia* (F).

34 See Clive S. Lewis and Alastair Fowler, *Spenser’s Images of Life* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 16.

35 *Ibid.*, 15.

36 “Emanations of Glory: Neoplatonic Order in Spenser’s *Faerie Queen*,” in *A Theatre for Spenserians: Papers of the International Spenser Colloquium, Fredericton, New Brunswick, October, 1969*, ed. Judith M. Kennedy and James A. Reither (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973), 54.

37 The *Polygraphia* 5’s Orchema tables, printed on a single page labeled “Orchema,” consist of 6 tables or Alphabets. The first and second tables skip 1 and 3 letters, respectively, between entries. The third and fourth tables exhibit a wholly different pattern consisting of sequential letters with periodic reversals of direction. The fifth and sixth tables are *recta* tables, an error.

38 The OED lists *pesum* (*pensum*), the neuter gender of this masculine verbal adjective, *pesus*, in its entry for “avoirdupois.”

39 A hypogram is a key word or phrase that underlies a complex network of relations within a text.

40 The final word, PESUS, was only a guess because the value of the Orchema Transforms is unknown. Therefore, it is not included in our validation test.

41 It should be noted that Shannon’s figure of 25% is based on experiments he conducted in which his subjects made successive guesses at each letter of a text that was 100 letters in length. On average, they had 50 letters of prior context to help them in their guessing. This is significantly longer than our 13-letter text. As evident from Fig. E3.3, meaning, grammar, and context are implicit in this 25% information rate. The reason that I believe that the 25% rate is applicable to our plaintext message, even though it is short, is that it is meaningful, grammatically correct, and fits perfectly with its larger context, the Puzzle Sonnet from which it emerged. The Puzzle Sonnet, the circumstance of the *Hekatompathia*’s poet addressing a reader, and the necessity of giving a clue to the Puzzle’s next stage, all severely limit what text we might expect to find. The plaintext message is four words forming two sentences. The compactness of Latin allows for this amazingly concise message. Despite its short length, the message exhibits grammatical structure. Most importantly, its words precisely fit the context of the Puzzle Sonnet from which it emerged.

42 The probability of an event occurring at least once if repeated n times is not actually the product of n and the probability of the event, p . However, when $p \ll 1$ and $n \ll p$, n times p is a close approximation.

43 There are 18 Puzzle Sonnet lines, which generate a 13-letter message, and thus there are $18!/5!$, or approximately 5.3×10^{13} permutations or reorderings (without restriction). The vast majority of these will fail to maintain logical coherence, adhere to an appropriate rhyme scheme, exhibit appropriate structure, or make sense in the context of the MLIP Subsequence. I estimated the number of poetically valid reorderings by making the following judgment: for any given line in the Puzzle Sonnet, only 3 of the 17 remaining lines could appropriately follow it. This results from the need to maintain logical and grammatical flow from line to line, and the requirement that a reasonable rhyme scheme be maintained. The judgment that only 3 of 17 lines are appropriate successors is based on (1) examining each sonnet line for potential successors, and (2) knowing that the requirement for rhyme will often allow for only one possible successor line. The value of 3 possible successor lines is an average of greater and lesser values incurred during a traversal from the first sonnet line to the 13th. Of course, it is an impractical task to map out each of what are likely thousands of traversals.

This successor line estimate may now be used to estimate the number of valid reorderings. For each successive line after the first, there is a 3 out of 17 chance that that line is valid, logically and poetically. This is true even as the supply of remaining lines decreases as one progresses toward the 13th and last line. My calculation assumes that only 6 lines are appropriate to begin the sonnet, and then each of 12 successive lines has only a 3/17 chance of being valid. The probability of a valid reordering is then $(6/18)(3/17)^{12} \approx 1$ in 3.3×10^9 . Multiplying this probability by the total number of permutations (5.3×10^{13}), we obtain approximately 16,000 valid reorderings. This estimate does not account for all restrictions on reordering the Puzzle Sonnet, as previously discussed (e.g., the requirement that the reordered sonnet exhibit structure).

Chapter 3 » The *Hekatompathia*'s Foundation: Sonnets 1–17

- 1 Just prior to the 1580s, Spenser's *Shephearde's Calender* (1579) used an Old English font for the poetry and a more modern font for the commentary, the same practice adopted by the *Hekatompathia*. That choice also appears to have been made in order to cast the text in an antiquarian light.
- 2 An exception is Spenser's *Shephearde's Calender*—its glosses perform a function similar to those found in the *Hekatompathia*.
- 3 The gloss that appends the December eclogue states: “This poet in his Epilogue sayth he hath made a Calendar, that shall endure as long as time etc. following the ensample of Horace and Ovid...” (folio 52). According to Patrick Cheney, Spenser imagines a poetic career patterned after Virgil (the concept of the “Virgilian wheel” in which a poet's career progresses from eclogues, to georgics, and finally to epic). See “Spenser's Pastorals: *The Shephearde Calender* and *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Spenser*, ed. Andrew Hadfield (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 79–80. See further discussion in this study's final chapter.
- 4 Exceptions include Dante's *Vita Nuova*, which includes commentary; Scève's sequence has elaborate designs.
- 5 Rita Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics and Translation in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 66, 70–71.

- 6 *Ibid.*, 67, 69.
- 7 “Continental Poetics,” in *A Companion to Rhetoric and Rhetorical Criticism*, ed. Walter Jost and Wendy Olmsted (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2004), 81.
- 8 *Ibid.*, 80. Cicero’s influence on Renaissance rhetorical theory is discussed later in this study.
- 9 *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics and Translation in the Middle Ages*, 70.
- 10 *Ibid.*, 77.
- 11 *Ibid.*, 187–88, 77–78.
- 12 Quoted from Kathy Eden, *Hermeneutics and the Rhetorical Tradition: Chapters in the Ancient Legacy and Its Humanist Reception* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 83–84.
- 13 *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics and Translation in the Middle Ages*, 82.
- 14 Parkes, “The Influence of the Concepts of *Ordinatio* and *Compilatio* on the Development of the Book,” in *Medieval Learning and Literature: Essays Presented to Richard William Hunt*, ed. J. J. G. Alexander and Margaret Gibson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), 117–19.
- 15 *Ibid.*, 130–32.
- 16 “Well Grounded, Finely Framed, and Strongly Trussed up Together” the ‘Medieval’ Structure of ‘The Faerie Queene,’ *Review of English Studies* 52.105 (2001): 28, 26.
- 17 *Odyssey* 5.193.
- 18 *Hermeneutics and the Rhetorical Tradition*, 58.
- 19 *Hermogenes and the Renaissance: Seven Ideas of Style* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970), 9–10.
- 20 III.23. *The Art of English Poesy: A Critical Edition*, ed. Wayne A. Rebhorn and Frank Whigham (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2007), 348.
- 21 *Hermeneutics and the Rhetorical Tradition*, 17–18.
- 22 7.10.16–17. Quoted from *Ibid.*, 29–30.
- 23 *De inventione* 2.40.117. Quoted from *Ibid.*, 18.
- 24 *Hermogenes and the Renaissance: Seven Ideas of Style*, 12–13.
- 25 “Epistle,” 125. *The Yale Edition of the Shorter Poems of Edmund Spenser*, ed. William Oram et al. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 17.
- 26 In the first translation, I have associated *lea* with the participle *pesus*, and in the second, with the verb *nuo*.
- 27 Translating short Latin expressions, such as those that appear in emblems and impressa, is often problematic. In both translations, LEA is taken as a metonym for love (surely not an actual lioness). In the second translation, LEA is also taken to be the image of the lioness, the Lioness Design.
- 28 Sonnet 1’s headnote provides an overall description of the work’s content: *miserable accidentes... described hereafter in the copious varietie of [the poet’s] deuises* [i. e., sonnets]. It suggests that the work progresses toward an end that is consistent with *the nature & true qualitie of a loue passion*. Yet the sequence ends (in its published order) with the death of Cupid, which seems inconsistent with *the nature & true qualitie of a sonnet sequence*. Reordering the sequence will resolve this contradiction, as discussed in Chapter 8.
- 29 Sonnet 1 describes the speaker’s pitiful state: *despaire* (6); *yoake upon my necke* (9); *live in servile kinde* (10); *live her thrall* (17). Sonnet 2’s headnote acknowledges this state when it declares *how pitious a case the hart of a lover is*. A more specific Sequential Tie between these sonnets is found in the

link between *I now cry creake* (1.11), which can mean to “confess oneself beaten” (OED 5) or, literally, “a strident cry,” and *blubbering teares* (2.3; *blubbering* means “sobbing noisily and unrestrainedly” [OED 2]).

30 *Dialogues of Love* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), 68, 176.

31 II.8. Translation from *Commentary on Plato's Symposium on Love*, tr. Sears Reynolds Jayne (Dallas: Spring Publications, 1985), 144.

32 *Dialogues of Love*, 68.

33 *The Book of the Courtier*, ed. Virginia Cox, tr. Thomas Hoby (London: Everyman, 1994), 343.

34 See the note after the next.

35 See the sections that treat the L39 Series in Chapters 9 and 14.

36 The sidenote reads: *Materna redimitus tempora Mirto*, which may be a corrupted quotation from the *Aeneid* (*Sic fatus, velat materna tempora myrto*; 5.72), or from the *Georgics* (*cingens materna tempora myrto*; 1.28). The latter is a reference to Augustus, a supposed descendent of Aeneas and Venus.

37 Jeffrey Todd Knight, *Bound to Read: Compilations, Collections, and the Making of Renaissance Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013), 115.

38 See the discussion in Appendix D, "Notes on the Text".

39 William Murphy sees this proverb as similar to one quoted by Michael Drayton in his *Idea*: “Fortune assists the boldest” (*Idea*, 59.7) (Murphy Dissertation, 134).

40 See Kaske, *Spenser and Biblical Poetics* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999), 24.

41 *Semiotics of Poetry* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1978), 161.

42 Michael Riffaterre, *Text Production* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1983), 111–12.

43 “Andreas Capellanus's Scholastic Definition of Love,” *Viator* 25 (1994): 209–10. Monson provides the following note: “According to Aristotle, *De anima* 1.5 (410a25–26), thinking, like sense perception, is a kind of passion; that is, in perceiving or thinking the soul both acts and is acted upon. Cf. Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* la2ae.22.1, contra: ‘sentire et intelligere est quoddam pati’” (210N53).

44 Hearing is a poetical representation of the intellectual (as opposed to sensual) acquisition of knowledge. This is the “coaptation of visible forms to demonstrate something invisible” (Dionysius the Areopagite, as discussed later in this chapter). A nonphysical, spiritual event is given a physical representation. In the Annunciation, it is a dove—symbolically the Holy Ghost—that enters through Mary's ear.

45 *Dialogues of Love*, 177–78.

46 Book 1, 1.1. Translation: *The Art of Courtly Love*, tr. John Jay Parry (New York: W.W. Norton, 1969), 28.

47 “The Subject of the ‘De Amore’ of Andreas Capellanus,” *Modern Philology* 50.3 (1953): 152.

48 4377–84. See Charles Dahlberg, “Macrobius and the Unity of the ‘Roman de la Rose,’” *Studies in Philology* 58.4 (1961): 579.

49 Douglas Kelly, “Courtly Love in Perspective: The Hierarchy of Love in Andreas Capellanus,” *Traditio* 24 (1968): 147.

50 In *De Amore*, the cognitive process is what distinguishes courtly love from sensual love. Douglas Kelly writes: “For as both Paul Zumthor and Schlosser

have shown, the difference between Andreas' conception of courtly love and other forms of sensual love lies in the rational control the courtly lover exercises over his senses when directing his love to only one person" (*Ibid.*, 131–32).

51 Sweet: 11.2; 11.17; 12.8; 13.HN; 14.10; 16.HN; 16.1. Delight: 12.14; 13.4; 14.12; 16.7; 17.12.

52 Six other instances of love's double power:

For nowe my life is double dying still,	(31.11)
But I feele paines, though blinde and double deade	(35.15)
And to my double hurt his pow'r do proue?	(65.10)
Am now twise free, and all my loue is past.	(85.18)
Though now my selfe twise free from all such care.	(89.18)
Forgetting, Time well spent was double gaine	(93.18)

53 *Dialogues of Love*, 191.

54 An interesting view on the philosophical development of these two categories, sense and intellect, and their treatment in Petrarch can be found in Edward Cranz, "A Common Pattern in Petrarch, Nicholas of Cusa, and Martin Luther," in *Humanity and Divinity in Renaissance and Reformation: Essays in honor of Charles Trinkaus*, ed. John W O'Malley et al. (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1993), 53–70.

55 See S. K. Heninger, *Touches of Sweet Harmony: Pythagorean Cosmology and Renaissance Poetics* (San Marino: Huntington Library, 1974), 287–397. Heninger argues that in early modern poetics the poet is a "maker," analogous to the demiurge in Plato's *Timaeus*, which is the *locus classicus* of this tradition (291). He further argues that poetry may be a literary microcosm patterned after creation. In this way, the poet is not an imitator of imitation, a criticism that Plato makes in the *Republic*, but a revealer of the true nature of things (364). See also Coulter, *Literary Microcosm: Theories of Interpretation of the Later Neoplatonists* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 32–126. For cosmopoiesis in Spenser, see Kenneth Borris, *Visionary Spenser and the Poetics of Early Modern Platonism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 50–53, *passim*.

56 "From the Universal to the Particular in Medieval Poetry," *MLN* 85.6 (1970): 822.

57 Horapollo Niliacus, *The Hieroglyphics of Horapollo* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 28. Introduction by George Boas.

58 Murphy Dissertation, xcvi.

59 *Essays in Medieval Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980), 19.

60 *The Subtext of Form in the English Renaissance: Proportion Poetical* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994), 41.

61 *Touches of Sweet Harmony*, 5–6. See also S. K. Heninger, "Sequences, Systems, Models: Sidney and the Secularization of Sonnets," in *Poems in Their Place: The Intertextuality and Order of Poetic Collections*, ed. Neil Fraistat (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986), 69–71.

62 *Semiotics of Poetry*, 115, 154, 160.

63 *The Rhetoric of Poetry in the Renaissance and Seventeenth Century* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1983), 8–10, 15. Houston argues that Scève, as Petrarch's heir, takes this use of images for structural purpose even further (32–33).

64 "Sequences, Systems, Models: Sidney and the Secularization of Sonnets," 71.

65 “The Mind’s Eye: Memory and Textuality,” in *The New Medievalism*, ed. Marina Scordilis Brownlee, Kevin Brownlee, and Stephen G. Nichols (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991), 31.

66 Underlying this model is Aristotelean causality and scholastic psychology, according to Don Monson’s “Andreas Capellanus’s Scholastic Definition of Love,” 209–11.

67 See Robert J. O’Connell, *Images of Conversion in St. Augustine’s Confessions* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1996), 126–27.

68 See Brian Stock, *Augustine’s Inner Dialogue: The Philosophical Soliloquy in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 102.

69 See Winthrop Wetherbee, *Platonism and Poetry in the Twelfth Century: The Literary Influence of the School of Chartres* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972), 59.

70 For the *Vita Nuova*, see Peter Dronke, *Dante’s Second Love: The Originality and the Contexts of the Convivio* (Exeter: Society for Italian Studies, 1997), 8.

71 *The Individual and the Cosmos in Renaissance Philosophy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963), 22.

72 *The Elizabethan Love Sonnet* (London: Methuen, 1966), 135–36.

Chapter 4 » The Poetics of Ruin and Restoration

1 Sonnets 44 and 45 are an obvious pair. Sonnet 79, which refers to the forthcoming MLIP Subsequence, is properly placed immediately prior to Sonnet 80.

2 Order is evident in two cases: Sonnets 80–82, which form the Puzzle Sonnet, are in their proper order; Sonnet 98 and the unnumbered *Quid Amor* poem are also correctly adjacent. However, elsewhere disorder is evident. As discussed in Chapter 5, at the Subsequence’s midpoint, Sonnet 90 directly contradicts the theme of all other sonnets in the MLIP Subsequence. Also, the *Epilogue* and its closing apothegm controverts the sequence’s last sonnet, which immediately precedes it.

3 See Michel Jeanneret, *Perpetual Motion: Transforming Shapes in the Renaissance from Da Vinci to Montaigne*, tr. Nidra Poller (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001), 104–5.

4 *The Veil of Isis: An Essay on the History of Idea of Nature*, tr. Michael Chase (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006), 25–26. See also the extensive treatment in *Perpetual Motion*, 11–103.

5 *Perpetual Motion*, 1.

6 *Ibid.*, 2.

7 *Ibid.*, 6.

8 Terence Cave, *The Cornucopian Text: Problems of Writing in the French Renaissance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), 179–180, 68–69.

9 *Spenser’s Ruins and the Art of Recollection* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012), xii, *passim*.

10 *The Poetics of Ruins in Renaissance Literature* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2016), 2.

11 “Spenser’s Languages: Writing in the Ruins of English,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Spenser*, ed. Andrew Hadfield (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 175.

12 “The Genesis of Shakespeare’s Sonnets: Spenser’s *Ruines of Rome:by Bellay*,” *PMLA* 98.5 (Oct. 1983): 800–14. See also Anne Ferry, *All in War with Time*:

Love Poetry of Shakespeare, Donne, Jonson, Marvell (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975).

13 "The Fig Tree and the Laurel: Petrarch's Poetics," *Diacritics* 5.1 (1975): 39, *passim*.

14 For *ruinae*, see Thomas M. Greene, *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry*, Elizabethan Club series 7 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982), 92.

15 *Poetry, Signs, and Magic* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2005), 256.

16 The argument of his *Sciences and the Self in Medieval Poetry: Alan of Lille's Anticlaudianus and John Gower's Confessio Amantis*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 25 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

17 *Ibid.*, 67.

18 *Ibid.*

19 *Ibid.*, 14.

20 *Ibid.*, 25–26.

21 *Ibid.*, 138.

22 *Ibid.*, 29–30.

23 *Ibid.*, 31.

24 *Ibid.*, 69–70.

25 See the discussion of "fore-conceit" in Chapters 3 and 15.

26 *Ibid.*, 72–74.

27 *Ibid.*, 70. Simpson quotes Geoffrey of Vinsauf's *Poetria nova*, which describes "the initial creative act as the formation of an idea." Geoffrey writes: "The measuring line of his mind first lays out the work, and he mentally outlines the successive steps in a definite order" (70).

28 Michael Hetherington, "Renaissance Rhetorical Theory," in *Edmund Spenser in Context*, ed. Andrew Escobedo (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 172. See discussion in Chapter 3.

29 *Ibid.*, 173.

30 *Spenser's Supreme Fiction: Platonic Natural History and The Faerie Queene* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001), 14.

31 *Sidney and Spenser: The Poet as Maker* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1989), 55.

32 Heninger bemoans the legacy of New Criticism for its undervaluation of authorial intention, which he characterizes as distancing the artifact from the artificer (*Ibid.*, 39–41).

33 See Sophie Weeks, "The Role of Mechanics in Francis Bacon's Great Instauration," in *Philosophies of Technology: Francis Bacon and His Contemporaries* (2 Vols.), ed. Claus Zittel et al., Vol. 1, (Koninklijke: Brill NV, 2008), 189–90.

34 "Homer Atomized: Francis Bacon and the Matter of Tradition," *ELH* 76.4 (2009): 1029.

35 *Ibid.*, 1031–32.

36 *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue: From the Art of Discourse to the Art of Reason* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1958), 119.

37 *Ibid.*, 120. Quotation from 1553 edition, 37r.

38 *Ibid.*, 124–25. Agricola argued for the orderly arrangement of *argumenta* within places or *loci* (*ibid.*, 237).

39 *Works* 3.323. See Andrew Wallace, "Virgil and Bacon in the Schoolroom," *ELH* 73.1 (2006): 174. See also Rhodri Lewis, "Francis Bacon and Ingenuity,"

Renaissance Quarterly 67.1 (2014): 122. For the use of this metaphor by Ronsard and Erasmus, see *Perpetual Motion*, 247–48, and by Quintillian, Macrobius, Montaigne, 253–54. For use by Seneca, Lucretius, and Horace, see Greene, *Light in Troy*, 73–74.

40 *Works*, 4.93.

41 *Works*, 4.449.

42 “The Masculine Birth of Time,” in *The Philosophy of Francis Bacon: An Essay on Its Development from 1603 to 1609, with New Translation of Fundamental Texts*, tr. Benjamin Farrington (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966), 72.

43 See David Colclough, “Ethics and Politics in the New Atlantis,” in *Francis Bacon’s New Atlantis: New Interdisciplinary Essays*, ed. Bronwen Price (Manchester: Manchester University Press 2002), 68–69. Also, see his “Non Canimus Surdis, Respondent Omnia Sylvae: Francis Bacon and the Transmission of Knowledge,” in *Textures of Renaissance Knowledge*, ed. Philippa Berry and Margaret Tudor-Clayton (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003), 83–88.

44 M. B. Parkes, “The Influence of the Concepts of *Ordinatio* and *Compilatio* on the Development of the Book,” in *Medieval Learning and Literature: Essays Presented to Richard William Hunt*, ed. J. J. G. Alexander and Margaret Gibson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), 128–29.

45 Katherine Jackson, “Sylvester’s ‘Du Bartas,’” *Sewanee Review* 16.3 (1908): 317. Joshua Sylvester published a full translation in 1605.

46 “Well Grounded, Finely Framed, and Strongly Trussed up Together” the ‘Medieval’ Structure of ‘The Faerie Queene,’ *Review of English Studies* 52.205 (2001): 26.

47 Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics and Translation in the Middle Ages*, 152.

48 *Ibid.*, 190.

49 Robert Stillman, “The Scope of Sidney’s *Defence of Poesy*: The New Hermeneutic and Early Modern Poetics,” *English Literary Renaissance* 32.3 (2002): 372.

50 James Coulter, *The Literary Microcosm: Theories of Interpretation of the Later Neoplatonists* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 84, *passim*, 95–126.

51 Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics and Translation in the Middle Ages*, 108–9.

52 *Ibid.*, 124.

53 *Ibid.*, 174–75.

54 See Ramus, *Method, and the Decay of Dialogue*, 112.

55 *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (New York: Vintage Books, 1970), 29, 32, 47, 51 (his italics).

56 Ramus, *Method, and the Decay of Dialogue*, 113.

57 *Ibid.*, 184–85.

58 *Ibid.*, 187.

59 *Ibid.*, 267.

60 “The Masculine Birth of Time,” in *Philosophy of Francis Bacon*, 64.

61 “Rhetoric and Action in Francis Bacon,” *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 14.4 (1981): 213.

62 See Craig Walton, “Ramus and Bacon on Method,” *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 9.3 (July 1, 1971): 291.

63 *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics and Translation in the Middle Ages*, 153. *Institutio oratoria* 2.17.26; 18.1–2.

64 *Philip Sidney and the Poetics of Renaissance Cosmopolitanism* (London:

Routledge, 2008), 114. The quotation from Sidney's *Defence* may be found in *An Apology for Poetry or The Defence of Poesy*, ed. Geoffrey Shepherd (London: T. Nelson and Sons, 1965), 101. For a similar view on Sidney, and also on Pontano, see Victoria Kahn, *Rhetoric, Prudence, and Skepticism in the Renaissance* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985), 41, 40.

65 Works, 4.449.

66 See Stillman, "Scope of Sidney's *Defence of Poesy*," 383. The quotation from the *Defence* ("strange effects") may be found in *An Apology for Poetry* (Shepherd), 114.

67 Stillman's translation of Melanchthon, *Corpus Reformatorum* XIII, 138: "Scope of Sidney's Defence of Poesy," 380N44.

68 *Bound to Read: Compilations, Collections, and the Making of Renaissance Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013), 95–96; *passim*, 94–116.

69 Ibid., 93; 220N30. Moreover, interleaved books were relatively common in the sixteenth century: the printer could easily add blank pages in between the pages of a book in the printing stage—be that "on demand" for a prospective customer or, which frequently occurred, for commercial reasons in religious texts that invited extensive glossing well beyond the page margins. See Petra Feuerstein-Herz: "Weiße Seiten. Durchschossene Bücher in alten Bibliotheken," in *Idee. Zeitschrift für Ideengeschichte* XI/4 (Winter 2017): 101–14. My appreciation to Gerhard F. Strasser for this insight.

70 *Bound to Read*, 93–94.

71 Ibid., 106.

72 Ibid., 111.

73 Ibid., 12.

74 Ibid., 113.

75 See Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics and Translation in the Middle Ages*, 153.

76 *Hermeneutics and the Rhetorical Tradition: Chapters in the Ancient Legacy and Its Humanist Reception* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 31–32.

77 Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics and Translation in the Middle Ages*, 124–25.

78 *Semiotics of Poetry*, 150 (italics in original).

79 Chapter 5, lines 4–8. Translation of Traugott Lawler, *The "Parisiana poetria" of John of Garland* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974), 85.

80 See Eden, *Hermeneutics and the Rhetorical Tradition*, 8.

81 Augustine insists the *res* or doctrine is set although the words or *signa* (signs) are not (Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics and Translation in the Middle Ages*, 157–58). Eden cites the *Clavis scripturae sacrae* (1567) of Matthias Flacius, which recognizes that "a discrepancy between the writer's words and her or his intention" must be resolved. Eden concludes: "The ultimate aim of interpretation, in other words, is to establish authorial intention, the *mens authoris*: to look beyond the meaning or signification of the words to what the writer meant (*magis in mentem, quam in verba Scriptoris, respicere*) (2.31)" (*Hermeneutics and the Rhetorical Tradition*, 93–94).

82 George Puttenham, *The Art of English Poesy: A Critical Edition*, ed. Wayne A Rebhorn and Frank Whigham (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2007), 347N1; 360.

83 *Spenser and Biblical Poetics* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999), 18–19.

84 "Truss up" is taken from E. K.'s "well grounded, finely framed, and strongly trussed up together," discussed in the previous chapter.

85 *Spenser and Biblical Poetics*, 20. The Leclercq quotation is from *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God*, 91.

86 *Ibid.*, 21.

87 *Ibid.* Luther quotation is from *World and Sacrament 3* (Vol. 37 of *Works*), 21.

88 *Spenser and Biblical Poetics*, 21.

89 *Ibid.*, 27.

90 *Ibid.*, 27. Kaske's index, which appears in her study in Appendix 2, covers the images that she treats in her book.

91 *Ibid.*, 59.

92 Bush is referring to the works of Donne and Andrewes: *English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century, 1600–1660* (London: Oxford University Press, 1945), 305.

93 *Spenser and Biblical Poetics*, 60.

94 *Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery: Renaissance Poetic and Twentieth-Century Critics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947), 44.

95 "Allegory, Emblem, and Symbol," in *The Oxford Handbook of Edmund Spenser*, ed. Richard A McCabe (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 442.

96 "Yeats and the Language of Symbolism," *University of Toronto Quarterly* 17 (October 1947): 1.

97 See Kenneth Borris, *Visionary Spenser and the Poetics of Early Modern Platonism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 68–69.

98 See Charles Lemmi, *The Classic Deities in Bacon: A Study in Mythological Symbolism* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1933).

99 *Touches of Sweet Harmony: Pythagorean Cosmology and Renaissance Poetics* (San Marino: Huntington Library, 1974), 338.

100 *Fables of Identity: Studies in Poetic Mythology* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1963), 71.

101 *Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery*, 24–26.

102 *Spenser's Images of Life* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 8–10.

103 *Sciences and the Self in Medieval Poetry*, 11, 11N22.

104 "The Influence of the Concepts of *Ordinatio* and *Compilatio* on the Development of the Book," 117, 131.

105 The *Ars Memoriae* is founded on the idea of an ordered, itemized list of short phrases that act as a mnemonic device. Simonides of Ceos (556–468 BCE) is credited as the founder of this art. He was said to have attended a banquet, and when called outside the building to meet others, narrowly escaped death when the building collapsed. The diners' bodies were so disfigured that they could not be identified. However, Simonides, aware of their positions at the banquet table, was able to identify the bodies by remembering where they were seated.

106 The *Ars Memoriae* was an essential tool of the rhetorician. Cicero's five parts of rhetoric include *dispositio* (arrangement) and *memoria* (memory). The *dispositio* of a work—the order in which an argument is presented—was considered critical to whether an argument would prevail. The *Ars Memoriae* can also utilize images or short phrases as an aid in the recall of texts. For example, it was used to recall Scripture: often one biblical phrase provided sufficient stimulus to allow the recall of a far longer passage. Ordered lists of phrases were also used by orators to remember the sequence in which to deliver the order of a speech's arguments or topics. The delivery of topics in their

proper or ideal order, *kairos*, was considered essential for a speech to be persuasive.

107 See Rhodri Lewis, “A Kind of Sagacity: Francis Bacon, the *Ars Memoriae* and the Pursuit of Natural Knowledge,” *Intellectual History Review* 19.2 (2009):155–175. Watson wrote a treatise on the *Ars Memoriae: Compendium Memoriae Localis* in the early 1580s. See Sutton Edition, Vol. 2, 11. I have not examined the issue of whether this might instead be the work of Francis Bacon.

108 *The Canonization*, 32. In Ramism, topics or *loci* are “pictured as individual structures in real-estate developments, separated from one another according to ‘Solon’s Law’ by a clear space of so many feet” (*Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue*, 121).

109 “A Kind of Sagacity,” 156, 169, 172.

110 *Expositio magistri Joannis de Celaya, Valentini, in primum tractatum Summularum magistri Petri Hispani*, Bibliothèque nationale de France, 1525, folio M3r.

111 *Dissemination* (Chicago: University Press, 1981), 51 (his italics).

112 *Art and Illusion: A Study in the Psychology of Pictorial Representation* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1960), 90, 155.

113 “Francis Bacon and the Art of Misinterpretation,” *PMLA* 130.2 (2015): 238.

114 In the Puzzle’s first 6 Stages, 138 characters are encrypted using 135 Cipher-Lines. There are 3 cases of double use of a CipherLine: Sonnet 90 and one preface with two Designs, employed twice. The seventh Stage uses a different method to specify CipherLines.

115 *The Dyer’s Hand and Other Essays* (New York: Vintage Books, 1962), 50.

116 *Semiotics of Poetry* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1978), 168N16, 70, 165, 150.

117 As quoted in the above section, “Paratexts and artifices inform the reader’s re-creation.”

Chapter 5 » Stage 2: Reason Prevails

- 1 However, the relative position of these two poems is later modified in a subsequent Puzzle Stage, as revealed in Chapter 8.
- 2 Running titles are present in Sidney’s sequence and Shakespeare’s, but not most others. In the case of the *Hekatompathia*, the appearance of running titles only over the second Subsequence arouses our curiosity.
- 3 The headnote states that the sonnet’s first and sixth lines allude to the headnote’s two Sophoclean sententiae; however, the first Sophoclean quote aligns not with the first line but the fifth line, which I presume to be an unintentional error.
- 4 This adumbrates the conclusion of sequence in the restored order. As discussed in Chapter 14, love is “process physics,” a Heraclitan flux, which is not divine. In contrast, the speaker’s mind is characterized as divine.

Chapter 6 » The Precision System

- 1 Two particularly useful studies that discuss prefaces are Gérard Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, Literature, Culture, Theory 20

(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), and Jacques Derrida, *Dissemination* (Chicago: University Press, 1981).

- 2 See discussion in Chapter 1.
- 3 See discussion in Chapter 1.
- 4 Sutton's translation.
- 5 A revision of Sutton's translation. Sutton identifies *cypriogeno* (Venus-born) as Cupid; Heninger claims it is Venus; however, *cypriogeno* means Venus-born, not Cyprus-born (Cupid was not born in Cyprus).
- 6 Sutton's translation; however, I have modified his translation of *qua* from “any girl” to “any Nymph.” *Qua*, which appears in both lines 35 and 37, surely refers back to *piis Nymphis* (33). The whole passage is about readers in the literary circle, who are called nymphs, and therefore would use the feminine *qua*.
- 7 LS *calx* (2), II.B; also, Quintilian 8.5.30.
- 8 The 18 Designs include 4 pictorial Designs (Figs. 6.1a–6.1d), the DoubleA Design printed inverted (Fig. 7.6), 6 Flower Designs (Fig. 7.2), 2 Bulb Designs (Fig. 7.4), 2 Root Designs (Fig. 7.5; Roots-4 appears with Sonnet 4), a diamond-shaped Design (see Sonnet 42/L90.6), a diamond with a border Design (see Sonnet 52/L64.5), and a Design that appears to be a combination of bulbs and flowers that appears only once (Sonnet 5).
- 9 On Daedalus, see Yves Bonnefoy, *Greek and Egyptian Mythologies* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 88–90.
- 10 According to Peter Dawkins, the image of a “Double-A” first appeared in 1577 in Christopher Platin's edition of Andrea Alciato's *Emblemata* (Antwerp), Emblem XLV (*The Shakespeare Enigma* [London: Polair Publishing, 2004], 328–29).
- 11 “Changed Opinion as to Flowers,” in *Renaissance Paratexts*, ed. Helen Smith and Louise Wilson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 63.
- 12 *Visionary Spenser and the Poetics of Early Modern Platonism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 87–92, 87N16.
- 13 The two locations are below the prefatory poems of Royden and Peele, and below Sonnet 85. There are press variants at other locations (see Appendix D, Notes on the Text), which may be an attempt to correct the orientation to the author's specification. We will discover in the second and subsequent Stages of the Puzzle that the normal and inverted printings of this Design signal different Transform Pairs (cryptographic tables). See further discussion in Chapter 7.
- 14 *Polygraphie, et uniuerselle escriture cabalistique*, de M. I. Trithemie abbé ; traduict par Gabriel de Collange, natif de Tours en Auvergne (Paris: Pour Iaques Keruer, 1561), Clavicle et interpretation, Kv.
- 15 See Spedding's comment in *Works*, 2.501. From *De Augmentis Scientiarum* (1623), Book VI, chapter 1.

Chapter 7 » Decoding the Designs

- 1 Peter Pesic, “François Viète, Father of Modern Cryptanalysis-Two New Manuscripts,” *Cryptologia* 21.1 (1997): 12.
- 2 See discussion in Appendix D, Notes on the Text.
- 3 *Fables of Identity: Studies in Poetic Mythology* (New York: Harcourt Brace & World, 1963), 18.

Chapter 8 » Stage 3: The Restoration of the Third Subsequence

- 1 Prominently located at the center of the title page, as shown in Fig. 14.1.
- 2 Sutton Edition, 139.
- 3 The adherence strictly to reason is not a tenet of Christian, Platonist, or Aristotelean thought. Although Stoic philosophy advocates reason, the MLIP Subsequence cannot easily be cast in this light: the speaker's emotions are in high gear.
- 4 See E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1951). Chapter 7 is especially relevant: "Plato, the Irrational Soul, and the Inherited Conglomerate," 207–35.
- 5 Ardolino, "Thomas Watson, Shadow Poet of Edmund Spenser," *Notes and Queries* 61.2 (2014): 227.
- 6 Monson, *Andreas Capellanus, Scholasticism, and the Courtly Tradition* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2005), 56.
- 7 See Robert M. Durling, *The Figure of the Poet in Renaissance Epic* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1965), 35.
- 8 *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century Excluding Drama: The Completion of the Clark Lectures, Trinity College, Cambridge, 1944*, Clark lectures 1944 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 61.
- 9 See the discussion in Chapter 4.
- 10 Durling's translation.
- 11 Sonnet 90 does not appear elsewhere in the manuscript. Only these three lines appear, above the Epilogue, on the manuscript's last page.
- 12 Phillips Dissertation, 471; Sutton Edition, 275–76.
- 13 As discussed in Chapter 4.
- 14 *Sciences and the Self in Medieval Poetry: Alan of Lille's Anticlaudianus and John Gower's Confessio Amantis*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 25 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 31.
- 15 For antiquity, see William S. Anderson, "The Theory and Practice of Poetic Arrangement from Vergil to Ovid," in *Poems in Their Place: The Intertextuality and Order of Poetic Collections*, ed. Neil Fraistat (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011). For the early modern period, see Earl Miner, "Some Issues for Study of Integrated Collections," also in *Poems in Their Place*.
- 16 Anderson, "Theory and Practice of Poetic Arrangement from Vergil to Ovid," 49.
- 17 These diagrams appear in Doranne Fenoaltea, "A Poetic Monument: Arrangement in Book 1 of Ronsard's 1550 Odes," in *The Ladder of High Designs: Structure and Interpretation of the French Lyric Sequence*, ed. Doranne Fenoaltea and David Lee Rubin (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1991), 55, *passim*, 54–72.
- 18 The term "Hexameral" is only meant to mean "six of something" and is not related to the hexameral literature that organizes around the six days of Creation.
- 19 The conceit that Cupid has two arrows, one gold and one lead, can be found in Ebreo's *Dialogues of Love*; however, his symbolism is entirely different from the symbolism in Sonnet 63. *Dialogues of Love*, tr. Rossella Pescatori and Cosmos Damian Bacich (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), 142–43, 164.

20 In this calculation, we completely relax the conditions of CipherLine selection such that any line may be handpicked to produce the appropriate crib letter. This relaxation does not permit any plaintext letter to be produced because of restrictions in the Transform tables and the restricted range of letters that are typically found at the beginning and end of sonnet lines. I examined the first and last letters of each of the 18 lines of the 24 sonnets in the Puzzle's third Stage (excluding those sonnets with Designs for which the Transform Pair value is unknown). I found that, on average, there were only about 8 different letters that were used to begin a sonnet line, and only about 4 letters that ended a sonnet line. Not surprisingly, the first letters of sonnet lines have a limited range over the 24-letter Elizabethan alphabet—certain letters such as, say, “T” are far more common than, say, “Q.” There was even less variation in the ending letters of sonnet lines. In Elizabethan spelling, the letter “E” ends many words. Furthermore, given that lines end in rhymes, certain letters such as “S,” “T,” and “Y” are particularly common.

The following analysis approximates the range of plaintext letters that may be generated. (A stricter analysis would utilize the actual text of the 24 sonnets to calculate the range of plaintext letters; in this analysis, I found the range to be more restricted, and thus my approximate calculation here is more conservative.) If, on average, there are 8 different first letters in a sonnet's lines and 4 different last letters, then there are 12 different ciphertext letters that can be generated (allowing the CipherLine to be any one of the 18 sonnet lines). The number of possible plaintext letters, each deciphered from a single ciphertext letter, is thus also limited to a range of 12 different letters. However, the crib has a full range of 24 possible letters for each crib letter, and thus for any given sonnet, there is only a 12 out of 24 chance, equal to a 1 out of 2 chance, that 1 of those 12 plaintext letters will match the required crib letter. The probability that this 50/50 event would occur for the 24 sonnets that generate a crib letter is equivalent to tossing a coin 24 times and getting heads each time. The probability that one would win a 50/50 bet 24 times in a row is approximately 1 out of 16 million.

Chapter 9 » The Third Subsequence: a Palinode and an Epiphany

- 1 *Visionary Spenser and the Poetics of Early Modern Platonism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 106–10, *passim*, 83–121.
- 2 “(H)eroic Disarmament: Spenser's Unarmed Cupid, Platonized Heroism, and *The Faerie Queene's Poetics*,” *Spenser Studies* 31–32 (2018): 97, 117.
- 3 39.2 and 78.3.
- 4 *On the Nature of Love: Ficino on Plato's Symposium*, tr. Arthur Farndell (London: Shepheard-Walwyn Publishers, 2016), 16 (Speech 2, chapter 2).
- 5 *Dialogues of Love*, tr. Rossella Pescatori and Cosmos Damian Bacich (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), 324.
- 6 *Visionary Spenser and the Poetics of Early Modern Platonism*, 160; *passim*, 127, 136, 160–65.
- 7 The classic study on this subject is Arthur O. Lovejoy, *The Great Chain of Being: A Study of the History of an Idea* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1936).

- 8 *De amore*, 3.3. A translation of the Tuscan version, *Sopra lo Amore*: “This is why all the parts of the cosmos—being the works of a single craftsman, parts of a single mechanism, and mutually alike in being and living—are bound together by means of a reciprocal love, in such a manner that Love may rightly be called the everlasting knot and bond of the cosmos, the unmoving support of its parts, and the firm foundation of the whole mechanism” (*On the Nature of Love*, 38 [Speech 3, chapter 3]).
- 9 See Edgar Wind, *Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance* (London: Faber and Faber, 1958), 82.
- 10 Petrarch Sonnet 164.
- 11 *Dialogues of Love*, 194.
- 12 Alastair Fowler, “Emanations of Glory: Neoplatonic Order in Spenser’s Faerie Queen,” in *A Theatre for Spenserians*, ed. Judith Kennedy and James A Reither, Papers of the International Spenser Colloquium, Frederiction, New Brunswick, October, 1969 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973), 54.
- 13 Wind notes the interweaving of opposites in a perfect maze in Jonson’s *Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue* (*Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance*, 168) and in the riddle that the Sphinx proposes to Cupid in *Love freed from Ignorance and Folly* (180). On the spread of knowledge to England: 181–82.
- 14 Don A Monson, *Andreas Capellanus, Scholasticism, and the Courtly Tradition* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2005), 108–9.
- 15 “The Fig Tree and the Laurel: Petrarch’s Poetics,” *Diacritics* 5.1 (1975): 34, 36.
- 16 The use of italics in the *Hekatompathia*’s sonnets is uncommon, as discussed in Appendix D.
- 17 Michael Riffaterre writes, “Ungrammaticality is a sign of literariness” and a call to exegesis (*Semiotics of Poetry* [Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1978], 139).
- 18 Annabel M. Patterson, *Hermogenes and the Renaissance: Seven Ideas of Style* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970), 11–12.
- 19 Patterson’s quotation from the *Hekatompathia* appears on pages 12–13 (*Ibid.*).
- 20 *Ibid.*, 13.
- 21 Puttenham expresses hostility toward carnivalesque (in Bakhtin’s sense of the word) poetry, at length, but then indulges in the very same in his treatise on poetry, breaking the decorum that he advocates. See Wayne A. Rebhorn, “His Tail at Commandment: George Puttenham and the Carnivalization of Rhetoric,” in *A Companion to Rhetoric and Rhetorical Criticism*, ed. Walter Jost and Wendy Olmsted (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2004), 96–99, *passim*.
- 22 *Virgil’s Aeneid*, tr. Rev. Oliver Crane (New York: Baker & Taylor Company, 1888), x.
- 23 Previously quoted in Chapter 1: Wendy Phillips, “No More Tears: Thomas Watson Absolved,” *Comitatus: A Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 20.1 (1989): 75.
- 24 The other three metrical faults are L82.Scoff.7/92.3 (hexameter) and corruptions at 48.9 and 77.1. See commentaries on these sonnets in Vol. II.
- 25 John Freccero, *In Dante’s Wake: Reading from Medieval to Modern in the Augustinian Tradition*, ed. Melissa Swain and Danielle Callegari (New York: Fordham University Press, 2015), 60–61.
- 26 *Ibid.*, 67.
- 27 *Ibid.*, 207.

- 28 “The Fig Tree and the Laurel,” 34, 37.
- 29 She is mentioned in a reference to the past in L73.H.11 and hypothetically in L73.2.16. Her eyes become dispersers of love’s power in L73.6.13.
- 30 “Sequences, Systems, Models: Sidney and the Secularization of Sonnets,” in *Poems in Their Place: The Intertextuality and Order of Poetic Collections*, ed. Neil Fraistat (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986), 73.
- 31 *Poetry, Signs, and Magic* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2005), 247, 256. Also, the rest of this intriguing chapter titled, “Poetry and the Scattered World,” 245–59. Although Greene asserts that Petrarch’s speaker does not reach an end, one could argue that he does in the final three poems of the *Canzoniere*, in which he places himself in God’s hands. However, Greene’s claim that the *Canzoniere* never reaches a resolution seems to me to be correct because the speaker’s attachment to Laura (and poetic fame, symbolized by laurel) is never truly abandoned. As in Petrarch’s *Secretum*, this conflict never resolves.
- 32 “Petrarch,” in *Edmund Spenser in Context*, ed. Andrew Escobedo (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 239–40.

Chapter 10 » The Precision System’s Orchema Tables

- 1 Stage 2’s 21-letter crib and Stage 3’s 37-letter crib were generated from 57 sonnets/Designs (Sonnet 90 and its Lioness Design were used twice).
- 2 TP4 and TP13 are also unassigned. However, TP4 is among the Flower Designs and so its likely value is the Flowers-2x3 Design. TP13 is unassigned, but its value (A8, A7) is unlikely to accommodate one of the frequently appearing pictorial Designs. Also, either TP10 or TP11 is unassigned: the Roots-5 Design must be assigned to either TP10 or TP11, but we do not yet know which one (because the first Transform of both TP10 and TP11 is A11). However, we would naturally expect that the Roots-4 Design lies adjacent to the Roots-5 Design, and therefore neither TP10 nor TP11 is likely available. See also Chapter 7, “The pictorial Designs” section.
- 3 The *Hekatompathia*’s reference to the Orchema tables in *Polygraphia* 5 directs us to a single page (Oii, 1518 edition, but the page numbering is corrupt). This page includes 6 tables of two columns each, followed by these two sentences, translated from the Latin:

In these Orchema tables, a flexible alphabet [what I call a Transform] is presented through transposition and skipping, as much as by the pattern of succession as by the position of the letters. These together suffice through the example of their arrangements: their method and form resist discovery because they can be varied without limit.

The *Polygraphia*’s back matter includes “brief explanations” of each of its books. In the section titled “EXPLANATIO IN QUINTUM LIBRUM polygraphiae nostrae brevis,” the last sentence (page C, my translation) refers to the Orchema tables:

And it is a great secret that few will understand, to be able to find out all the senses of the transposition of letters, however they are hidden.

- 4 Recta: R1, R4, R5, R6, R8, and R9 through R12; Aversa: A3, A4, and A6 through A12.

- 5 See the first edition of this study, pages 394–95, for my erroneous selection of line 14. The correct CipherLine selection for Sonnet L50.6 is line 13. The argument for why line 13 is the correct selection may be found in Addendum 5.
- 6 See the first edition of this study, pages 320–21, for my erroneous selection of line 7. The argument for why line 8 is the correct CipherLine selection for Sonnet L64.H may be found in Addendum 4. As it happens, the distinction between lines 7 and 8 is inconsequential: both lines end with “E,” and it is the last letter of the CipherLine that produces the required plaintext letter.

Chapter 11 » Stages 4 and 5: The Poet’s New Instructions

- 1 Sonnet 90 is used twice, once in the MLIP Subsequence and once in the third.
- 2 There is another polyphonic alternative available here, for if one looks at the 12th through 15th columns of Fig. 11.4, MAGI can be formed. But as this would be read as a *plural* second-person vocative, it conflicts with the second-person *singular* imperatives of EXI and ADI, and thus I rejected it.
- 3 See LS I.B.1 for “approach” and “assist.”
- 4 Another possible reading of ME ADI PIA FAMA is “Assist me with [gaining] a pious reputation.”
- 5 See Addendum 10. There are 13 Designs, but only 12 CipherLines, because the CipherLine on the *Quatorzain* preface, which has two Designs, is used twice.
- 6 This inversion is discussed above. The reason for this anomaly is taken up in the next chapter.

Chapter 12 » Stage 6: The Hidden Labyrinth

- 1 As previously quoted in Chapter 3. Also discussed in Chapter 4.
- 2 A Cardan or Cardano grill is described in David Kahn, *The Codebreakers: The Story of Secret Writing* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1967), 144.
- 3 Servius calls the *Aeneid* a text when he refers to the “totius libri textum” of Book 7 (ad 7.601). See Shadi Bartsch, “Ars and the Man: The Politics of Art in Virgil’s *Aeneid*,” *Classical Philology* 93.4 (1998): 322–42.
- 4 Varro was frequently read by humanist scholars (*De Lingua Latina* 7.36). My thanks to Chris Cochran for this insight.
- 5 URET: LS II.B.1: “to vex; annoy.”
- 6 On Bacon’s use of this motto, see Richard Serjeantson, “Francis Bacon’s *Vale-rius Terminus* and the Voyage to the ‘Great Instauration,’” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 78.3 (2017): 341–368.
- 7 Murphy Dissertation, 185. *Strozii Poetae Pater Et Filius* [Titus Vespasianus Stroza; Hercules Stroza] (Parisii: Ex officina Simonis Colinaei, 1530) 224b–225b.
- 8 I read IRE and EMI as historical infinitives. Alternatively, the message could be read with different word boundaries: I RE FORE XI EMI. In this reading, RE FORE is an ablative of attendant circumstances and might be translated: “Proceed [imperative], in the circumstance of the thing (i.e., sonnet) being a gateway. I acquired 11.” However, reading IRE and EMI as historical infinitives better fits the context.

9 BEO might instead be read in the historical present tense: “I blessed.” This would fit with the use of the historical infinitive mode in the prior sentence, as described above.

Chapter 13 » Stage 7: The Seventh Seal

1 The double use of VERA... DIA is explained in Chapter 12.

2 The number of lines not excluded were, beginning with Sonnet 26 and ending with Sonnet 82, as follows: 4, 1, 4, 2, 3, 3, 4, 2, 5, 3, 2. The sum of the foregoing numbers is 33, or an average of 3 lines per sonnet (33 divided by 11 sonnets).

3 For example, the value of the feminine pronouns in Sonnet 126 shift near the poem’s end. See Helen Vendler, *The Art of Shakespeare’s Sonnets* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1997), 534.

4 17.1, 25.11, 26.18, 29.1, 29.14, 32.15, 52.8, 55.18, 75.11, and 76.7.

5 ARDI can refer to a meager manner of living (LS, *arduis*, IIA).

6 I performed an analysis of the ciphertext letters required to generate the actual plaintext message (ERUM FS BACON) for each possible offset. For example, in the case in which the Transform Pair loop starts at an offset of one (at the second sonnet letter), a difficulty is encountered when trying to encipher the tenth letter, which is the “O” in BACON. To generate an “O” using TP9 (A12, A12) requires that either the first or last letter of the CipherLine be “Z,” a very severe restriction. About half of the possible offsets were likely unusable (1, 2, 3, 7, 8, and 10). Of the remaining ones, some would have provided the poet with greater flexibility than others in constructing appropriate CipherLines.

7 See E. C. Woodcock, *A New Latin Syntax* (Mundelein, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, 1959), 3–4 (paragraph 5).

8 See “Practices of Unmasking: Polyhistors, Correspondence, and the Birth of Dictionaries of Pseudonymity in Seventeenth-Century Germany,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 67.2 (2006): 219–50. Mulsow argues that literary scholars have been focused on literary issues such as Foucault’s “author-function” and seem to be unaware of Vincentius Placcius’s monumental *Theatrum anonymorum et pseudonymorum* (220N1). See also Mulsow, *Knowledge Lost: A New View of Early Modern Intellectual History*, tr. H. C. Erik Midelfort, bilingual edition (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2022). He argues that the obscuration of authorship was widespread during the early modern period: “Pseudonyms were used, and publishers posted false information about the printer or place of publication; titles were falsified as well” (15). I wish to thank Sarah A. Lang for recommending Mulsow’s work.

9 *Ibid.*, 231–34.

10 *Ibid.*, 222.

11 *Ibid.*, 219. See also Ernest Barker, “The Authorship of the *Vindiciae Contra Tyrannos*,” *Cambridge Historical Journal* 3.2 (1930): 167.

12 Although commendations may be part of a literary game, they may also be written to satisfy a printer’s requirements (printer refers to the publisher). See Clara Gebert, *Elizabethan Dedications and Prefaces* (New York: Russell and Russell, 1966), 23–24.

13 See Michael Bath, *Speaking Pictures: English Emblem Books and Renaissance Culture* (London: Longman Group, 1994), 110.

14 See “Practices of Unmasking,” 223–24, 224N15–17.

15 Sutton’s comment; see Chapter 1.

16 On *Praise of Folly*, see Chapter 1. With respect to Montaigne’s work, P. J. Hendrick argues, “Sebond appears to be forgotten, and the value of his work undermined by the sustained attack of the *Apologie* on human reason in general. This apparent betrayal of Sebond... has given some credibility to those who would argue for an ironic, anti-religious design in Montaigne’s *Apologie*. If he entitles an important essay ‘Apologie de Raimond Sebond’, and goes on to destroy the whole foundation on which Sebond’s work is built, it might seem legitimate to suppose that a certain irony is intended” (“Montaigne, Lucretius and Scepticism: An Interpretation of the ‘Apologie de Raimond Sebond,’” *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy: Archaeology, Culture, History, Literature* 79 [1979]: 143).

17 Bacon’s father died in 1579, and the estate could not provide adequately for Francis, his mother, his brother Anthony, and his half-brothers.

18 Although an 11-letter sequence is short for the purposes of this calculation, the context is extraordinarily restrictive. Any message that appears after such a long journey (solving the Puzzle) would be ridiculous if it did not have great import. Surely a significant secret must be revealed.

19 Shannon speaks of “the probabilities of the various possible messages” (see *Excursus 12*).

20 One possible exception is the enigmatic headnote to Sonnet 74: *The Author in this passion, upon a reason secret unto him selfe, extolleth his Mistres under the name of a Spring.*

21 A more detailed explanation of the number of possible messages that would reveal Bacon’s name is provided here. Bacon signed letters either Fr. Bacon or Fs. Bacon, as discussed earlier in this chapter. The remaining 4 letters may have used a word or words other than ERUM to describe Bacon’s role. For example, SUM (I am) could have been used instead, though this leaves us a letter short. Yet, I cannot think of any appropriate four-letter words other than ERUM. Furthermore, ERUM is foregrounded by its earlier appearance (in other forms) among the Stage 6 Sequential Ties (AI ERI and LEA ARDI. ERE.) and is thus more probable than any other word that indicates authorship. Nevertheless, to be conservative, we imagine that there are 4 alternatives that have not come to mind and further treat them as equiprobable, for a total of 5 possibilities. Bacon’s name, FS BACON, could have either preceded or succeeded the 4-letter word. In all, there are 5 possibilities for the word indicating authorship, 2 possible orders of the 4-letter word, and 2 alternative abbreviations for Bacon’s first name (FS and FR). Multiplied together, this gives us 20 possibilities.

22 The earlier estimate of 1 in 55,000 multiplied by 2,000/6,500.

23 See the discussion in *Excursus 12*.

Chapter 14 » The Ontology of Love

1 *Plato’s Symposium*, 2nd ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987), 2–3.

2 “Cosmogony and Love: The Role of Phaedrus in Ficino’s Symposium Commentary,” *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies Durham, NC* 10.2 (1980): 152.

3 Rosen's term. For example, *Plato's Symposium*, 44.

4 Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Dialogue and Dialectic: Eight Hermeneutical Studies on Plato*, tr. P. Christopher Smith, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980), 86.

5 *Ibid.*, 86N4 (P. Christopher Smith's description).

6 A glimpse of prelapsarian human existence is found in the first four lines of Sonnet 1 and the last four lines of the Neo-Latin poem, Sonnet 45/L90.2.

7 *The Ancients and the Moderns: Rethinking Modernity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 22.

8 See Andrew Fuyarchuk, *Gadamer's Path to Plato: A Response to Heidegger and a Rejoinder by Stanley Rosen* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2010), 68–69.

9 According to Rosen, the *Symposium*'s first speaker, Phaedrus, has the Titans prevail over the Olympic gods (*Plato's Symposium*, 50). The Titans represent forces of the natural world; the Olympic gods are, as Ezra Pound characterized them, eternal states of mind manifested by poets.

10 The *Oxford Francis Bacon*. Vol. 6, *Philosophical Studies, c.1611–c.1619*, ed. Graham Rees (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 197. Rees suggest that Natalis Comes may be Bacon's source (416–17).

11 See Rosen, *Plato's Symposium*, 48–49.

12 With respect to the use of other translators' work, see note 3 in Sutton's "Introduction" to *Antigone*. Available at www.philological.bham.ac.uk/watson/antigone, or Sutton Edition (see "List of Primary Sources"), 3–15.

13 On the form of the pomps and themes, see Sutton's "Introduction" (*Ibid.*, notes 10 and 11).

14 *Ibid.*, note 10.

15 *Ibid.*, notes 12–14.

16 *Ibid.*, notes 9, 22.

17 The complete verse is "Musa Sophoclaeas Watsoni imitata Camoena Ismenidem Latio reddidit ore loqui."

18 Sutton's translations of Cooke's Greek preface and the author's Latin preface addressed to Howard, respectively. These are avaialble online or the Sutton Edition (see my note 12 above).

19 Fourth pomp, 30th line.

20 Third pomp, 30th line and 41st line, respectively.

21 Sutton, a Hellenist, at times bristles at this usurpation of Sophocles's play (which is fair enough), but he also recognizes that Elizabethans had their own agenda. See his "Introduction" to *Antigone*, notes 6–10 (op. cit., my note 12 above).

22 For example, Shakespeare, in *Troilus and Cressida*, similarly applies a thick coat of Petrarchan paint to his source material. See my discussion of Sir Walter Raleigh's *Commendatory Verse* to the 1590 *Faerie Queene* below. See also *Petrarch in Britain: Interpreters, Imitators, and Translators Over 700 Years*, ed. M. L McLaughlin, Letizia Panizza, and Peter Hainsworth, Proceedings of the British Academy 146 (Oxford, UK: Published for the British Academy by Oxford University Press, 2007), especially Stephen Clucas's "Thomas Watson's *Hekatompathia* and European Petrarchism" (217–28). Other sources include Gordon Braden, "Shakespeare's Petrarchism," in *Shakespeare's Sonnets: Critical Essays*, ed. James Schiffer (New York: Garland, 2000), 989; and Thomas Roche, *Petrarch and the English Sonnet Sequences* (New York: AMS Press, 1989).

23 See Sutton's notes on this line, 89.1 online, or print Sutton Edition, 266).

24 The quotation I cite is from a work published one year after the *Hekatompathia*: Petrus Canisius, *Commentariorum De Verbi Dei Corruptelis, Tomi duo* (Sartorius, 158), 204. It provides a corrupted quotation followed by Jerome's "true" words: "Rursus vero Hieronymus: Difficile est, inquit, Haereticum reperire qui diligit castitatem." Apparently, Bacon was not the only one to corrupt this line. A substantially similar version of Jerome's words appears in Thomas Gascoigne's fifteenth-century theological dictionary, *Loci E Libro Veritatum*: "difficile enim est haereticum reperiri qui diligit castitatem."

25 *Cupido Cruciatu*s: "Quas inter medias furvae caliginis umbram /disputit inconsultus Amor stridentibus alis" (45–46).

26 Sutton reports that this is "evidently not a quote from Seneca (Senior or Junior)." See his notes for 89.3 (online) or print Sutton Edition, 266.

27 On the relationship between the sun and the Good, see *Republic* 509b.

28 See Jacob Howland, *The Republic: The Odyssey of Philosophy* (Toronto: Twayne, 1993), 148.

29 Rosen, *Plato's Symposium*, 147–48.

30 *The Spenser Encyclopedia* (Abingdon: Routledge, 1996), 18.

31 Edgar Wind's summary of this cosmology is worth quoting at length:

Among Renaissance theologians it was almost a commonplace to say that the highest mysteries transcend the understanding and must be apprehended through a state of darkness in which the distinctions of logic vanish. The 'negative theology' of Dionysius the Areopagite had developed the argument in ecstatic language; and by the dialectical skill of Nicolaus Cusanus 'the portentous power of the negative' had been refined to a 'learned ignorance.' One did not need to turn to Pico's *Conclusiones* to learn of this particular principle. Any Platonist knew it as 'the One beyond Being,' to which Plato had pointed in the *Parmenides*; any Cabalist knew it as 'the absconded God' (*Ensoph*). And all agreed with the Areopagite that the ineffable power of the One could be described only by contradictory attributes, that is, by negating those traits which would render it finite and thereby accessible to the intellect. In another part of the *Conclusiones* Pico himself had already stated the principle in strictly philosophical terms: 'Contradictoria conincident in natura uniali.' [Contradictions coincide in the nature of the One.] And in this form, so closely reminiscent of the Areopagite and of Cusanus, the proposition did not yet contain any 'Orphic' secret. It was only by association with the image of Blind Love, as the power 'above the intellect', that Pico's argument acquired an unexpected 'Orphic' twist. Unexpected, because the blind Eros was known as a wanton god, a demon befuddling man's intelligence by arousing his animal appetites. The common *voluptas*, which gratified these desires, was known as blind pleasure unguided by the counsels of reason, and hence deceptive, corrupting, and short-lived. How could the god responsible for these delusions be transformed into a force superior to reason, a guide to delights that are secure? (*Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance* [London: Faber and Faber, 1958], 57–59).

32 See Rosen, *Plato's Symposium*, 92, 95.

33 "Francis Bacon and the Art-Nature Distinction," *Ambix*, 54.2 (2007), 127–28.

34 *Ibid.*, 128.

35 Rosen, *Plato's Symposium*, 98; *Symposium* 186ab.

36 Rosen, *Plato's Symposium*, 112.

37 The 6 sonnets in which the conflict of opposites dominates are L39.H, A3, A5, B3, B5, and B6. The conflict of opposites is subtle in L39.A3: the poisonous wound of Telephus made by Achilles is both potentially fatal and potentially a cure—analogous to love, which is both disease and cure, as discussed below.

38 The remaining three sonnets that feature endless motion are A1, A2, and B2: Sonnet A1's concern is the Cretan maze, a figure of endlessness; Sonnet A2's concern is *endlesse toyle* (16); Sonnet B2 features *a lasting warre* (16).

39 *How Socrates Became Socrates: A Study of Plato's Phaedo, Parmenides, and Symposium* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2021), 179.

40 *Perpetual Motion: Transforming Shapes in the Renaissance from Da Vinci to Montaigne*, trans. Nidra Poller (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001), 105, 85.

41 *Perpetual Motion*, 84 (*Microcosme*, 25–26).

42 *Perpetual Motion*, 86.

43 Sonnet L18.B4 alludes to the conflict of opposites (e.g., *flame and frost*; 18). This sonnet also depicts atomism, as discussed below. Sonnet L18.B5 may suggest perpetual motion in *endlesse strife* (18).

44 This description of the Milky Way as consisting of many stars is surprising as it predates Galileo's 1610 telescopic observations of the Milky Way.

45 Adam Rzepka, “Discourse Ex Nihilo: Epicurus and Lucretius in Sixteenth-Century England” in *Dynamic Reading: Studies in the Reception of Epicureanism*, ed. Brooke Holmes and W. H. Shearin (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 120, 122.

46 *Ibid.*, 123–24. See also Stephen Greenblatt, *The Swerve: How the World Became Modern* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2012).

47 “Discourse Ex Nihilo,” 124–29.

48 *Ibid.*, 130–32.

49 Rosen, *Plato's Symposium*, 169.

50 *Ibid.*, 177.

51 *Spenser and Biblical Poetics* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999), 63–64.

52 *The Expulsion of the Triumphant Beast*, ed. Arthur D. Imerti (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1964), 238.

53 Rosalie Colie asserts, “One Renaissance philosopher was able to marry the Platonic and Democritan worlds, in language at least, to achieve a fusion of Being and Becoming in which the concepts were mutually inextricable. Bruno presents the puzzling portrait of a philosopher and poet who was at once a pantheist—for which, among other things, he was terribly burned—and an atomist, a man who quite deliberately attempted the fusion of these utterly different traditions, with their utterly different concepts of the value of materiality” (*Paradoxia Epidemica the Renaissance Tradition of Paradox* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966], 330).

54 *Spenser's Supreme Fiction: Platonic Natural History and The Faerie Queene* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001), 292.

55 *Ibid.*, 291–92. Quitslund finds a similar philosophy in Spenser's *Mutabilitie Cantos* (287–92). Nor does Sidney accept the division between the sublunary

and supralunary spheres, according to Robert Stillman, who asserts that Sidney “is not readily characterized as a neoplatonist [because he] does not conceive of Ideas as deriving from or participating in some transcendent realm of meaning and value” (*Philip Sidney and the Poetics of Renaissance Cosmopolitanism* [London: Routledge, 2008], 109).

56 Benardete, *Plato's Symposium* (University of Chicago Press, 1993), 189.

57 Rosen, *Plato's Symposium*, 214–15.

58 *Ibid.*, 136.

59 *Ibid.*, 196.

60 *Francis Bacon*, ed. Brian Vickers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 115, 117.

61 *Ibid.*, 117.

62 For example, Shakespeare's Sonnet 124. The uniqueness of the beloved in the sonnet genre goes hand in hand with the speaker's singular vision of love.

63 As previously discussed, Socrates claims a lack of knowledge except with respect to love. In the *Symposium*, Alcibiades asserts that Socrates “is absolutely unique” and that his ideas are his own creation and unlike any other's (*Symposium* 221c).

64 *Symposium* (207cd). See Rosen, *Plato's Symposium*, 253.

65 *Ibid.*, 192.

66 *Le sixiesme livre des poemes de Pierre de Ronsard* (1569), 1.

67 Montaigne believed that Plato wrote in a veiled mode, as discussed in the next chapter. See the accompanying note.

68 *Spenser's Supreme Fiction*, 104.

69 Levinus Lemnius (1505–68) was a Dutch physician. The text quoted here is Quitslund's translation (*Spenser's Supreme Fiction*, 104) of a French translation (*Des occultes merveilles et secretz de nature* [1574], 12r).

70 According to Quitslund, “Spenser goes a long way toward accepting Bruno's vision of a cosmos in flux, with everything in heaven and earth made of eternal substances, shaped from within by mutable formative principles” (*Spenser's Supreme Fiction*, 295). S. K. Heninger asserts that “by the mid-fifteenth century in Ficino's Italy there had begun to emerge an ambiguous interpretation of mimesis: while art must be truthful to the ideal order prescribed by the deity, it may shamelessly imitate the world that lies open to our senses. ... As the location of ultimate reality shifted from the Christianized version of Plato's realm of essences to the empiricist's world of observable nature, a work of art became a representation of what exists in fact, rather than a presentation of what is *supposed* to be in ideal principle. ... By the time of Sidney and Spenser, the relocation of reality was well under way; they lived, in fact, when the conflict was at crisis” (*Sidney and Spenser: The Poet as Maker* [University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1989], 64). Indeed, Spenser appears to be under the influence of Cusanus. Alastair Fowler argues that “Spenser's most obvious expression of his philosophical vision takes the form of representing aspects of the divine image by sexually coupled contraries” (“Emanations of Glory: Neoplatonic Order in Spenser's *Faerie Queen*,” in *A Theatre for Spenserians*, ed. Judith Kennedy and James A Reither, Papers of the International Spenser Colloquium, Fredericton, New Brunswick, October 1969 [Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973], 54).

71 *The Expulsion of the Triumphant Beast*, 235.

72 See F. J. E. Raby, “Nuda Natura and Twelfth-Century Cosmology,” *Speculum* 43.1 (1968): 72–73.

73 See D. W. Robertson, “The Subject of the “De Amore” of Andreas Capellanus,” *Modern Philology* (1953), 148, N21, N22. Robertson quotes Ailred of Rievaulx: *Quod in omnibus creaturis quoddam vestigium divinae charitatis appareat*. He asserts that a similar idea can also be found in Augustine’s *De genesi ad litteram*.

74 C. S. Lewis argues that such an explanation may be found in Cusanus, and that others, such as Spenser, should not necessarily be viewed as blasphemous when in their works nature assumes the appearance of God (*Spenser’s Images of Life* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967], 42–43).

75 Quitslund cites the work of Genevan theologian Lambert Daneau (1530–95) as an example of Calvinist condemnation of pagan natural philosophy. His work was translated into English in 1578. Natural philosophers were said to be at fault for confining their study to the phenomenal world—that is, secondary causes—and neglecting the primary causes, which are found in the Creator (*Spenser’s Supreme Fiction*, 126–27).

76 See the beginning of this chapter.

77 *Works*, 6.729 (*Wisdom of the Ancients*, “Cupid; or the Atom”).

78 *Ibid.*

79 *Ibid.*, 730.

80 “Francis Bacon and the Art-Nature Distinction,” 122.

81 *Works*, 6.729 (*Wisdom of the Ancients*, “Cupid; or the Atom”).

82 *Ibid.*, italics in original.

83 *Ibid.*, 6.730–31.

84 *Ibid.*, 6.731. Spedding translates *exquisita* as “exquisite,” which I have changed.

85 *Works*, 6.747.

86 See “Francis Bacon and the Art-Nature Distinction,” 142.

87 Rosen, *Plato’s Symposium*, 48.

88 Phaedrus’s speech is incoherent in several respects. He argues that the beloved is more praiseworthy than the lover but then later contradicts himself when he praises lovers who have died for their beloveds, concluding that the lover “is always nearer than his beloved to the gods” (180b). Rosen argues that by this Phaedrus has deviated from his major premise (*Plato’s Symposium*, 58).

89 Rosen, *Plato’s Symposium*, 7–8.

90 *Ibid.*, 40.

91 I wish to thank Adam Rzepka for his insights into Lucretian atomism, here and elsewhere in this chapter.

92 For Augustine, says John Freccero, “all things are signs [and] God is the terminal point in the referential chain” (“The Fig Tree and the Laurel: Petrarch’s Poetics,” *Diacritics* 5.1 [1975]: 38). With respect to Petrarchism, he writes: “The love must be idolatrous for its poetic expression to be autonomous; the idolatry cannot be unconflicted, any more than a sign can be completely nonreferential if it is to communicate anything at all” (*Ibid.*, 40). Shakespeare, in his sonnet 105, raises the issue of idolatry: “Let not my love be called idolatry / Nor my beloved as an idol show.”

93 The expression “ontological mezzanine” is borrowed from Kenneth Borris, *Visionary Spenser and the Poetics of Early Modern Platonism* (Oxford:

Oxford University Press, 2017), 201. For Spenser, see *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*, line 351.

94 *Themes and Variations in Shakespeare's Sonnets* (London: Hutchinson, 1961), 151.

95 Leishman found this inverted Platonism difficult to explain and wondered whether Shakespeare had serious philosophical intent or was merely careless with his ideas. Subsequent *Sonnets* scholarship has largely ignored Leishman's concern, with the exception of Richard Strier, as discussed below.

96 "Petrarch," in *Edmund Spenser in Context*, ed. Andrew Escobedo (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 239.

97 *Ibid.*, 236.

98 *Ibid.*, 243, 242.

99 Freccero sees Laura as incarnational: "As all desire is ultimately a desire for God, so all signs point ultimately to the Word. In a world without ultimate significance, there is no escape from the infinite referentiality of signs. Signs, like desire, continually point beyond themselves. ... Short of the Word made flesh, there can be no bridge between words and things" ("The Fig Tree and the Laurel," 35). In contrast to Dante's Beatrice, who is a mediatrix to God, Petrarch makes "his 'God' the lady Laura, the object of his worship" (*Ibid.*, 38). Laura is the endpoint of referentiality, like the Word made flesh.

100 *My Secret Book*, tr. Nicholas Mann (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016), 169.

101 Strier also notes that sonnet 4 contains "a direct parallel between the circumstances of Christ's birth and those of Laura's" (*The Unrepentant Renaissance: From Petrarch to Shakespeare to Milton* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012], 60, 73–74, 76).

102 *Ibid.*, 60.

103 *Philip Sidney and the Poetics of Renaissance Cosmopolitanism*, 163.

104 *Ibid.*, 166–68. Stillman believes that critics have misapprehended Sidney's poetics because it has been viewed in "a critical context within which Reformed theology has been mistakenly identified as dogma proceeding from the writings of a single person, John Calvin" (xi).

105 According to Rosen, "the cosmic Eros of pre-Socratic physics is difficult if not impossible to reconcile with the human Eros ostensibly being praised [by Phaedrus]" (*Plato's Symposium*, 44).

106 Rosen argues that a true logos must exhibit "the unchanging form it describes. Moving logoi are in fact mythoi. ... The Platonic dialogues give ample reason to doubt the possibility of such a logos. ... There can be no logos of Eros, which perpetually comes to be and passes away. ... The *Phaedrus*, *Phaedo*, and *Timaeus* all teach us that it is impossible to grasp the immortal and divine by means of logos. ... Eros is not merely moving but is formless; hence the extraordinary difficulty in speaking about it at all" (*Plato's Symposium*, 207–10).

107 *Swerve*, 6.

108 Regarding Aristophanes, see Rosen, *Plato's Symposium*, 131.

109 *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1951), 218.

110 Lampert argues that Plato attempts to hide the radical temporal life because "the truth about Eros is terrifying." To speak the truth directly is profane. Lambert reminds us that "both the frame and the core of the *Symposium* is

drenched in the religious crime of profanity" (the historical event of the desecration of the Hermae). The work is ring-fenced by multiple interlocuters. The truth must be hidden (*How Socrates Became Socrates*, 153–55).

111 See Stanley Rosen, "Are We Such Stuff as Dreams Are Made On?", in Jeff Malpas, Ulrich Arnswald, and Jens Kertscher, eds., *Gadamer's Century: Essays in Honour of Hans-Georg Gadamer* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2002), 262–63.

112 Rosen, *Plato's Symposium*, 251–52.

113 According to Rosen, "The absence of the eternal is a mark of the incompleteness of the teaching of the *Symposium*" (*Plato's Symposium*, 219). "If we restrict our attention merely to the *Symposium*, the result is a distorted understanding of Plato's conception of philosophy." Indeed, Diotima "is not the final stage of Socrates' teaching as presented in the corpus of Platonic dialogues." A complete teaching on Eros "must encompass the ugly as well as the beautiful or somehow make peace between them," which does not occur in Diotima's speech (*Ibid.*, 221). Rosen argues that "the philosopher must neither scorn the ugly nor mistake it for the beautiful" (*Ibid.*, 223). He quotes Kierkegaard: "[Plato] starts out from the concrete and arrives at the most abstract, and there, where the investigation should now begin, he stops" (*Ibid.*, 278). Unlike the ascensions that take place in Hegelian and Christian thought, Plato does not have Diotima explain how an ascension up the *scala amoris* might impact our life. See further discussion below.

114 According to John Lepage, Bacchus and Apollo are together instillers of good health (*Revival of Antique Philosophy in the Renaissance* [New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012], 37–43).

115 Eros is "harsh and arid, barefoot and homeless, sleeping on the ground... and always partaking of his mother's (Penuria) poverty" (203cd). Socrates is poor and typically shoeless—his ugliness is a form of poverty.

116 Rosen, *Plato's Symposium*, 221.

117 According to Laurence Lampert, "Parmenides turns Socrates toward an ontological psychology." This psychology limits human knowledge: "Knowledge of ignorance is knowledge of the soul in its way of 'knowing'" (*How Socrates Became Socrates*, 131–32).

118 Lampert argues that Socrates (and Nietzsche) "recognize the need to inquire first into the inquirer and his fitness to know—epistemology—and only then a properly prepared inquiry into being as far as it is knowable—ontology. ... Ultimately, knowledge of the self and the human pointed each of them [Socrates and Nietzsche] to an ontology that could never be more than inferential." Lampert argues that Eros, and its equivalent in Nietzsche's philosophy, the will to power, is "the most fundamental fact [quoting Strauss]" (*How Socrates Became Socrates*, 223).

119 Lampert makes this argument with respect to the *Symposium* and the philosophy of Nietzsche (*How Socrates Became Socrates*, 221–22).

120 Rosen offers a fascinating discussion of what he calls "the two main types of philosophical thinking... the mathematical and the poetical." He argues that "the poetic mode culminates in a celebration of transience" (*Gadamer's Century*, 259–60, *passim*, 257–77).

121 Rosen, *Plato's Symposium*, 37. The *Republic* explicitly refers to this trial as the "quarrel between philosophy and poetry" (607b). Although the poets are thrown out of the ideal city, music is not.

122 According to Rosen, “The proper ordering of Eros depends upon a vision of, or friendship for, the good. ... Eros alone is insufficient to make a man a philosopher (*Plato’s Symposium*, 84). In the *Republic*, “The city cannot be founded upon, or preserved by, the unmitigated truth because the ‘goodness’ of the Ideas, and so too of the god of the philosophers, has nothing to do with everyday human existence” (“Suspicion, Deception, and Concealment,” *Arion: A Journal of Humanities and the Classics* 1.2 [1991]: 122).

123 *Ibid.*

124 *Quarrel Between Philosophy and Poetry: Studies in Ancient Thought* (New York: Routledge, 1988), 26.

125 *Ibid.*, 117. The Latin language conveys this sense: *elementum* can mean either letter or element.

126 Michel Serres, David Webb, and William Ross, *The Birth of Physics* (London: Rowman & Littlefield, 2018), 170.

127 “Francis Bacon and Scientific Poetry,” *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 82.2 (1992): 27, 25N38. Schuler provides further evidence of the importance of Lucretius to Bacon in his discussion of *Wisdom of the Ancients* (34–35) and *Cogitationes de natura rerum* (35–36).

Chapter 15 » Conclusions

- 1 Chapter 4 discusses the poetics of ruin, the hermeneutics of restoration, and the importance of rhetoric.
- 2 *Works*, 6.695–96.
- 3 *Ibid.*, 6.698.
- 4 *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1971), 29.
- 5 *Ibid.*, 51, italics in original.
- 6 *Plato’s Symposium*, 2nd ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987), liv. In contrast, Rosen adds, “Philosophers like Leibniz, Hume, Rousseau and Nietzsche were better informed” (*ibid.*). See also Chapter 1, sections titled “The obscured text” and “Erasmus’s Silenic literary model.”
- 7 See Marc Cogan, “Rhetoric and Action in Francis Bacon,” *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 14.4 (1981): 213. “The entire field of logic as Bacon conceived it is in fact heavily rhetorical. ... Bacon describes rhetoric in terms of its relation to and effect on, a given set of human faculties. By reorienting the discussion of rhetoric to the faculties, he makes a striking innovation in rhetorical theory.”
- 8 *Works*, 6.697.
- 9 Montaigne argues that philosophers “wrote for the needs of society, like their religions; and on that account it was reasonable that they did not want to bare popular opinions to the skin, so as not to breed disorder in people’s obedience to the laws and customs of their country. Plato treats this mystery with his cards pretty much on the table. For where he writes on his own, he makes no certain prescriptions. When he plays the lawgiver, he borrows a domineering and assertive style, and yet mixes in boldly the most fantastic of his inventions, which are as useful for persuading the common herd as they are ridiculous for persuading himself; knowing how apt we are to accept any impressions, and most of all the wildest and most monstrous” (Michel de Montaigne,

The Complete Essays, tr. Donald Frame, II:12 [Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958], 379). Stanley Rosen claims that “throughout the Platonic dialogues, one finds a continuous interest in falsehood, suspicion, deception, and concealment, an interest that is curiously unnoticed in the secondary literature” (“Suspicion, Deception, and Concealment,” *Arion: A Journal of Humanities and the Classics* 1.2 [1991]: 121). Most Plato scholars read literally, that is, they consider Plato to be a Platonist (Lloyd P. Gerson makes this argument in *From Plato to Platonism* [Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013], 3–33). However, in the last century, beginning with Gadamer, a dissenting group of scholars have recognized Plato’s deception and read his dialogues through a hermeneutic lens. These scholars include Leo Strauss, John Herman Randall Jr., Stanley Rosen, Seth Benardete, and Laurence Lampert.

- 10 *An Apology for Poetry: Or, The Defence of Poesy*, ed. Geoffrey Shepherd (London: T. Nelson and Sons, 1965), 95.
- 11 Philip Sidney, *An Apology for Poetry, or, The Defence of Poesy*, ed. R. W. Maslen (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 39.
- 12 See the discussion in “The hermeneutics of restoration” section of Chapter 4.
- 13 *Nietzsche and Modern Times: A Study of Bacon, Descartes, and Nietzsche* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 236.
- 14 See Robert M. Schuler, “Francis Bacon and Scientific Poetry,” *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 82.2 (1992): 43–46.
- 15 “Virgil and Bacon in the Schoolroom,” *ELH* 73.1 (2006): 167.
- 16 *Works*, 3.419. *Georgics* 3.289–90: “Nor doubtfully know how hard it is for words to triumph here, and shed their luster on a theme so slight” (tr. Greenough).
- 17 Schuler writes, “Bacon shows that he—like most English readers of the period—considered the *Georgics* to be a didactic poem containing practical, technical information on agriculture” (“Francis Bacon and Scientific Poetry,” 46).
- 18 *The Essays Translated by John Florio* (London: M. Bradwood for E. Blount & W. Barret, 1613), 301.
- 19 *Apology for Poetry* (Shepherd), 114.
- 20 *The Literary Microcosm: Theories of Interpretation of the Later Neoplatonists* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 75, 77. Italics in original.
- 21 *Philip Sidney and the Poetics of Renaissance Cosmopolitanism* (London: Routledge, 2008), 110.
- 22 See Stillman’s description of Sidney’s “golden world,” upon which my description is based (*Ibid.*, 163).
- 23 *Apology for Poetry* (Shepherd), 100.
- 24 Stillman, *Philip Sidney and the Poetics of Renaissance Cosmopolitanism*, 121. See commentary page for Sonnet L50.1: the poet prefers the inspiration of his beloved to that of the muses.
- 25 *Philip Sidney and the Poetics of Renaissance Cosmopolitanism*, 215.
- 26 *Sidney and Spenser: The Poet as Maker* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1989), 207, *passim*.
- 27 See Coulter, *Literary Microcosm*, 76.
- 28 Stillman argues for “the development of an early modern poetics in England that stood apart conspicuously and self-consciously from the allegorical tradition. ... Sidney clearly belongs to an alternative, non-allegorical history of hermeneutics” (*Philip Sidney and the Poetics of Renaissance Cosmopolitanism*, 72).

29 See Coulter, *Literary Microcosm*, 74. He cites *Phaedrus* 268d.

30 *Philip Sidney and the Poetics of Renaissance Cosmopolitanism*, viii.

31 *Ibid.*, 110–11.

32 *Ibid.*, 117, 119. Quotation from Sidney, *An Apology for Poetry* (Shepherd), 104.

33 *Ibid.*, 164.

34 *Ibid.*, 223, 162.

35 Kenneth Borris, *Visionary Spenser and the Poetics of Early Modern Platonism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 51. Borris references *Discourses on the Heroic Poem*, tr. Mariella Cavalchini and Irene Samuel (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), 77–78. He also cites Coulter, *Literary Microcosm* (in its entirety), and S. K. Heninger, *Touches of Sweet Harmony: Pythagorean Cosmology and Renaissance Poetics* (San Marino: Huntington Library, 1974), 287–397.

36 *Second World and Green World: Studies in Renaissance Fiction-Making* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 49.

37 *Ibid.* 45, *passim*, 49–50.

38 “Petrarch,” in *Edmund Spenser in Context*, ed. Andrew Escobedo (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 235.

39 *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry*, Elizabethan Club Series 7 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982), 115.

40 See Marjorie O’Rourke Boyle, “A Likely Story: The Autobiographical as Epideictic,” *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 57.1 (April 1, 1989): 25–26, *passim*, 23–51.

41 See Jean-Pierre Maquerlot, *Shakespeare and the Mannerist Tradition: A Reading of Five Problem Plays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 19.

42 *Spenser’s Supreme Fiction: Platonic Natural History and The Faerie Queene* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001), 16.

43 *Discourses on the Heroic Poem*, tr. Mariella Cavalchini and Irene Samuel (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), 78.

44 “Petrarch,” 235–36.

45 See Rosen, *Plato’s Symposium*, 326.

46 J. V. Cunningham argues that “the direction of the action in tragedy is from order to disorder; in comedy the converse” (*Woe or Wonder: The Emotional Effect of Shakespearean Tragedy* [Denver: University of Denver Press, 1951], 38).

47 A good example is Petrarch’s *Canzoniere* 164, which Bacon translates in Sonnet L39.B4 (66). The world is peaceful while the poet’s mind is full of turmoil. The poet’s focus on his own emotive engagement with the world, rather than producing a mimesis of the world, is a revolutionary change.

48 Richard Strier, as quoted in the previous chapter (*Unrepentant Renaissance*, 60).

49 See Teodolinda Barolini, “The Self in the Labyrinth of Time,” in *Petrarch: A Critical Guide to the Complete Works*, ed. Victoria Kirkham and Armando Maggi (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009), 49.

50 *Shephearde’s Calender* (London: Hugh Singleton, 1579) edition, folio 52.

51 *Hic tamen, hic moneo, ne speres tanta futura: / Attica non auris murmurava probat* (21–22).

52 *Ingenio tandem praestans Watsonus, et arte / Pieridas docuit verba Britannia loqui* (13–14). The translation is Sutton’s. For other English poets’ failings, see lines 15–16.

53 The *Shephearde's Calender* (folio 52) quotes Horace ("Exigi monimentum aere perennius, / Quod nec imber nec aquilo vorax &c") and Ovid ("Grande Opus exegi quae nec Iouis ira nec ignis, / Nec ferum poterit nec edax abolere vetustas &c.").

54 See Northrop Frye, *Fables of Identity: Studies in Poetic Mythology* (New York: Harcourt Brace & World, 1963), 17.

55 *Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance* (London: Faber and Faber, 1958), 143.

56 There is an intrinsic value to suffering in the soteriological scheme presented in the New Testament. See Thomas More, *Utopia: With Erasmus's the Sileni of Alcibiades*, tr. David Wootton (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 1999), 9.

57 *Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance*, 144.

58 "De Libro Sexto Cum Commento," in *François Rabelais: Critical Assessments*, ed. Jean-Claude Carron (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), 190.

59 *Sciences and the Self in Medieval Poetry: Alan of Lille's Anticlaudianus and John Gower's Confessio Amantis*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 25 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 14–15.

60 See the block quote immediately above.

61 Frank Kermode, *The Genesis of Secrecy: On the Interpretation of Narrative*, Charles Eliot Norton Lectures 1977–1978 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979), 5.

62 Ibid., 131, 116.

63 Ibid., 53.

64 "The Hermeneutical Anarchist: *Phronesis*, Rhetoric, and the Experience of Art," in *Gadamer's Century: Essays in Honour of Hans-Georg Gadamer*, ed. Jeff Malpas, Ulrich Arnswald, and Jens Kertscher (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2002), 64–65.

65 "Cosmology and Cosmography," in *Edmund Spenser in Context*, ed. Andrew Escobedo (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 328.

66 See Laurence Lampert, *How Socrates Became Socrates: A Study of Plato's Phaedo, Parmenides, and Symposium* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2021), 225.

67 "Wer den Dichter will verstehen, Muss in Dichters Lande geben" (Noten auf West-östlicher Divan).

68 As quoted above, *Sciences and the Self in Medieval Poetry*, 14–15.

69 As quoted earlier in this chapter, *Apology for Poetry*, (Shepherd) 101.

70 As quoted above, *Sciences and the Self in Medieval Poetry*, 14–15.

71 On the "noetic plot" of the *Anticlaudianus*, Ibid., 31, 34, 122–27.

72 Ibid., 125.

73 Ibid., 62.

74 "At the third remove," that is, a copy of something that is itself a copy of a form (598b, 599d).

75 Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Dialogue and Dialectic: Eight Hermeneutical Studies on Plato*, tr. P. Christopher Smith (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980), 54.

76 Ibid., 53.

77 Ibid., 54.

78 Ibid., 88–89.

79 See: *What man, but I, could thus encline his will / To live in Love, which hath no end of ill* (L73.2.17–18); *Love hath no leaden heeles* (L73.3.18); *Nor any time can make me cease to love* (L73.4.18); *A majori ad minus* (L73.6.HN).

80 See Rosen, *Plato's Symposium*, 177.

81 According to Rosen, “The poetry of Agathon is an attempt to transform traditional religion into a religion of poetry” (*Ibid.*, 200). This view has much in common with Nietzsche’s religion of art (*Ibid.*, 132).

82 Rosen’s words, in the context of Aristophanes’s speech (132).

83 See Bruns, “Hermeneutical Anarchist,” 65. He quotes Gadamer from *Truth and Method*, tr. Joel Weinsheimer and Donald Marshall, 2nd rev. ed. (New York: Continuum, 1989), 102.

84 Bruns writes: “In Gadamer’s aesthetics, the event of the work of art is not a museum event in which we simply gape at the thing” (“Hermeneutical Anarchist,” 65).

85 *Ibid.* Bruns references *Truth and Method*, 126–28.

