

# BACONIANA

Founded 1886

December 1978

## CONTENTS

Editorial .. .. .	1
Obituary .. .. .	5
A Memoir of Jane Wheeler Beckett .. .. .	6
A Rosicrosse Portrait of James I .. .. .	8
Burrswood .. .. .	11
King Lear .. .. .	12
The Christianity of Francis Bacon .. .. .	20
The First Sacrifice .. .. .	36
All is not Gold that Glisters .. .. .	50
Shakespeare's first Biographer .. .. .	58
Bacon and Pope .. .. .	63
Book Reviews .. .. .	67
Correspondence .. .. .	72

© Published Periodically

LONDON:

Published by THE FRANCIS BACON SOCIETY INCORPORATED at  
 Canonbury Tower, Islington, London, N.1., and printed by  
 Stanley L. Hunt (Printers) Ltd., Midland Road, Rushden,  
 Northamptonshire.





**The Rainbow Portrait of Queen Elizabeth I**

*(By permission of the Marquess of Salisbury, photograph by  
courtesy of the Courtauld Institute of Art)*

# BACONIANA

VOL. LXI (92nd year)

No. 178

DECEMBER, 1978

---

*It should be clearly understood that BACONIANA is a medium for the discussion of subjects connected with the Objects of the Society, but the Council does not necessarily endorse opinions expressed by contributors or correspondents.*

---

## EDITORIAL

The last two issues of *Baconiana* featured H. Kendra Baker's fine article *The Vindication of Francis Bacon*, which not only cleared Bacon of the specific charge of bribery, but demonstrated the integrity of his character. Daphne du Maurier had already vindicated Bacon's rôle in the Essex trial proceedings in *The Winding Stair* reviewed in *Baconiana* 177,<sup>1</sup> and Peter Dawkins in *Canonbury Tower* and *The Brotherhood Sign* linked him with the Renaissance esoteric brotherhoods "of love and fellowship". Some readers have commented on the underlying theme common to these and other articles, particularly in *Baconiana* 177; yet this was without deliberate editorial direction.

The religious and mystical tone of our contributions, in fact, has been the logical result of enlightened research, penetrating ever deeper into the true nature of Bacon's activities. We make no apology therefore for including in the following pages articles by the late Professor Farrington and Professor Henrion, concerned with the Authorised Version of the Bible of 1611, the Rosicrucians, the Utopias, and Bacon.

It is difficult for many Baconians to believe that the greatest of all literary works was produced without consultation with, or the connivance of, the greatest English literary genius of the period, and Dr. Frances Yates recently startled the literary world by her revelation that Bacon was involved in Rosicrucian and esoteric society activities in Europe as well as at home.<sup>2</sup> In logical sequence the Henrion article strengthens the belief that the masterly rhythm and magnificent prose of the King James Bible were the product of a guiding genius which, like that in the contemporary Shakespeare Plays, has not been equalled before or since.

With these thoughts in mind we were reading one evening *Troward's*

<sup>1</sup> pages 68/75.

<sup>2</sup> *The Rosicrucian Enlightenment*, 1973.



*Comments on the Psalms*,<sup>3</sup> as is our wont, and noticed his verdict on Psalm 45: "This is a highly mystical Psalm. All the allusions throughout it are to the deepest of the Divine things revealed to man."

Since this Psalm precedes Psalm 46 in which the words "shake" and "spear" appear, as has been pointed out by Baconians on numerous occasions, latterly by our Chairman in a letter to *The Times*,<sup>4</sup> on 26th April, 1976, and now Professor Henrion, Troward's judgment on Psalm 46 is well worth reproducing in full.

A Psalm of confidence in having God's presence with us. He is at the back of all things and therefore the wildest appearance need not alarm us. Verses 4 and 5 speak of the *Holy City* and the *River of Life*, and the *Supreme Secret* called the *Tabernacle of God*. This is on the same lines as Ps. XLV and XXIX. The way in which the ideas and nomenclature of the Divine School R.C. are carried out throughout the Psalms is extremely to be observed. Students in the School should note this. It is a magnificent proof of the Unity of Divine Teaching. Again see the call carefully to observe the works of God (verse 8). This is the basal principle of School R.C.

Does "unto the end of the earth" (verse 9) mean the time of the end of the age? Is there a suggestion (verse 8) that the ceasing of wars will result from desolation?

"*The Lord of Hosts*" (verses 7 and 11). Therefore all the hosts of which He is Lord are also *with us*. "They that be *with us* are more than they which be *with them*." "*The God of Jacob*" (verses 7 and 11)—the suggestion in School R.C. is the *Scala Grande*, and this explains why *God of Jacob* is joined with "*Lord of Hosts!*" The same idea in both. "Jacob" perhaps more internally.

Our readers are requested to have a copy of Psalm 46 by them, and to refer to verse eight with its "call carefully to observe the works of God". This injunction is indeed "the basal principle of School R.C.", and will be recognised at once as the *casus belli* of Bacon's teachings as exemplified in the *Advancement of Learning, et passim*. J. G. Crowther in *Nature to be Commanded must Be Obeyed*<sup>5</sup> makes this abundantly clear and points out that only when this principle is observed will Man know how to command Nature for the benefit of humanity, *in sui generis*.<sup>6</sup> The moral for our times is painfully obvious.

<sup>3</sup> Robert M. McBride, 1929.

<sup>4</sup> *Baconiana* 176; pages 92/93.

<sup>5</sup> *Baconiana* 177; pages 63/67.

<sup>6</sup> In *Letters of Dr. Bucke to Walt Whitman and His Friends*, published by Wayne State University Press at Detroit in 1978 (price £12.95), Dr. R. M. Bucke quotes fourteen "cases" of men who had experienced cosmic consciousness. These included Francis Bacon, William Blake, Whitman and St. Paul amongst others.

It is to be remembered that Thomas Troward was apparently not a Baconian—the only reference to the controversy in his writings appearing on page 167 of his *Bible Mystery and Bible Meaning*—“What’s in a name?” asks Shakespeare—or Bacon (?)—so that his confirmation of the Rosicrucian significance of the text of Psalm 46, which contains a downwards count of 46 words up to and including the word “shake”, and a count upwards of 46 words from the end to the word “spear”, is exciting and, surely, a jolt for the incredulous.

Bacon’s interest in the Psalms is amply testified by *The Translation of Certain Psalms* which he published in 1625; and the 1623 First Folio, of course, is redolent with quotations and source derivations from the Authorised Version of the Bible.

In his *Comments* Troward also singles out Psalm 47, saying that “the special call for understanding shows the veiled nature of this Psalm”. He remarks that the Princes among the people of Faith become, under God, the shields of the Earth. Verse nine, the final verse, contains these truths, and Troward’s verdict is as follows:

This is the College (Collegium) R.C. to which School R.C. is the training and introduction. College R.C. corresponds with “the Church of the Firstborn” (*cf. The Epistle to the Hebrews: 12, 23*).

All this corroborates Professor Henrion’s article *A Close-meshed Tudor Network*, which we printed in our last number, and indeed his *Jonathan Swift Unlocks a Shakespearean Door*, in the previous issue; but we would refer now to *A Rosicrosse Portrait of James I* which we print with supporting illustrations. Truly *Moniti Meliora* is a motto for us all, and not Bacon alone!

Professor Farrington’s article, *The Christianity of Francis Bacon*, was printed in *Baconiana* as recently as 1965, but as a brilliant exposition of Bacon’s philosophical and religious beliefs is outstanding. Let it speak for itself.

\* \* \* \* \*

For those who may still doubt the altruism of Francis Bacon we would pinpoint Joseph Addison’s verdict in *The Tatler*:

I was infinitely pleased to find among the Works of this extraordinary Man a Prayer of his own composing, which for the elevation of Thought and Greatness of Expression, seems rather the Devotion of an Angel than a Man.

For those who may still doubt the Royal Birth evidence advanced by Professor Henrion, Joan Ham and “Jon Benson”, we would point to the emblematic title page of Spenser’s *The Faerie Queen*, showing the Earl of Leicester on the left with the bear and staff, opposite Queen

Elizabeth with the lion rampant. These supporters sustain between them a shield bearing the arms of Francis Bacon.

Beneath the boar, upside down, is a crown.

This cumulative evidence, supported by the arguments advanced by our three contributors, is indeed hard to confute. . . .

By kind permission of the Editors of the American periodical *The Cryptogram*, we re-print a review of David Shulman's *An Annotated Bibliography of Cryptography*. The review appeared in May-June, 1976, and we are grateful to Mrs. Elizabeth S. Wrigley, Director of The Francis Bacon Library of California, for her kindness in communicating with the American Cryptogram Association on our behalf. As *The Cryptogram* is the official organ of the Association the criticisms in the review demand attention, and are endorsed by Mrs. Wrigley, particularly since the section devoted to the Baconian controversy is glaringly inadequate, and the references difficult to locate. We trust that a revised and enlarged edition of the book will be published in due course.

\* \* \* \* \*

We were pleased to note the appearance of a new book, *The Nazi Connection*, by one of our better known Members, Group Captain F. W. Winterbotham.

Readers of his previous book, *Ultra Secret*, will doubtless need no persuading that *The Nazi Connection* is well worth perusal, and it only remains for us to offer our congratulations, and sincere wishes for success in this latest venture.

\* \* \* \* \*

The news from the Archaeological Correspondent of *The Times*, in August, that the original grave of St. Alban may be under the Norman nave of the Cathedral and not behind the present high altar, followed total excavation of the site of the old chapter house, and will interest our readers. The Abbey was made premier abbey of England under Nicholas Brakespear, the only English pope, with the title Adrian IV (1154-1159), his father Robert having been interred in the chapter house.

The saint's shrine was venerated throughout the period now known as the Dark Ages and is still being sought. The Roman city of Verulamium, of course, was in the valley below and to the west of the hill on which the Cathedral structure now stands. The old chapter house was substantially rebuilt by Robert of Gorham from whom Gorham-bury derived its name.

## OBITUARY

The late Marquess of Northampton who died at Tenerife, aged 92 last January, represented one of the wealthiest families in the English peerage. He was the sixth Marquess, and it was through him that The Francis Bacon Society owes its present sub-tenancy of Canonbury Tower, Islington, on the Northampton estate.

The family had lived at Compton Wynyates in Warwickshire since 1204, and at Castle Ashby, built by the first Lord Compton, from 1574. The Marquess owned a vast country estate at Lochluichart in Ross-shire, but in 1976 he moved into a Rectory near Castle Ashby. We in The Francis Bacon Society owe him, and now his son, a great debt of gratitude for our tenancy of the Compton room at Canonbury. It was the 1st Earl of Northampton who, in 1618, gave Francis a short-lived tenancy of the Tower where Bacon held meetings in private with some of his illustrious contemporaries.

The writer remembers his visits to our house in Windsor, where he used to play with us as children, when my father was in the Blues. My last memory of him was at Canonbury, where I met him when Canonbury and the Canonbury estate were being made over to Lord Compton.

M.P.



## A MEMOIR OF JANE WHEELER BECKETT

(born August 1902; died March 1977 at Englewood, N.J.)

I first met Jane and Wheeler in their summer home on Ragged Island on Lake Winnepesaukee, New Hampshire. Jane was my charming and most lovable hostess and I think that anyone who visited Ragged Island as a guest would have fallen under her warmth and charm. Before Wheeler married Jane in June 1922, her name was Jane Wintermute. It was "love at first sight" and it was to last 55 years. Jane had a rare combination of qualities—beauty of soul and body, a keen mind and great intuition. It was in the organ loft in the Masonic Temple in Berkeley, California that Jane and Wheeler had first met, and it was love of music that transformed their lives. Besides music Jane had another talent; in architecture. She designed their first bungalow which Wheeler built in Oakland, California.

Jane was a great reader. It seems that her father read *Midsummer Night's Dream* to her on the train going to Stratford-on-Avon. When the guide told her about the carcasses hung on hooks in the basement of the butcher's shop, and how William, before cutting the animals' throats, would make a speech and dramatise the event, her father, seeing the look on her face, took her up into the garden of flowers and told her that many people believed that the Plays were written by the great Francis Bacon. Her face lighted up, and from that day she resolved to do something about it. The rest of her story is in her book *The Secret of Shakespeare's Doublet*, her sole motive being to ascertain the Truth.

My Chairman, Noel Fermor, will have more to say about Jane's researches on the 'Shake-speare' Quartos and the First Folio.

To conclude my own part of the story, I will take you back to Ragged Island. There was a central and luxurious bungalow where, in a large room, I delivered my lecture on Bacon and Shakespeare. The room was crowded with folk from neighbouring islands. A likely lad helped me with lantern slides, and I remember that I had to show him how to tie a bowline!

My shack, beautifully furnished, was further down the island and the kitchen and breakfast room was between the two. At the far end of Ragged Island there was an islet on which Wheeler had established his Steinway grand pianos. Around the walls of that studio was his musical library where he used to compose. Around it were water lilies which Jane took home, and it was wonderful to watch them open and close at dawn and evening, even in a vase. The birch trees with their snow-white bark were all around. The scent of burning birch bark is like incense and I leave you with that memory. M.P.

*Postscript*

Jane Wheeler Beckett was born in Berkeley, California, on 7th August, 1902, and died on 6th March, 1977.

As might be expected of a lady with the many accomplishments mentioned by our President, Mrs. Wheeler Beckett was a great reader, and travel to Europe with her mother and father at an early age had supplied the practical background so helpful to a keen and enquiring mind. On her return home her uncle greeted her with the comment that no one with half a mind could believe in the hoax that Shakespeare was the author of the Plays. The remark fired a life-long resolve.

For the rest of the story our readers should refer to *The Secret of Shakespeare's Doublet*,<sup>1</sup> the result of 25 years altruistic research to ascertain the Truth.

In this recently published work, with its copious illustrations, the authoress presented new proof that the name BACON lay concealed in the title page of the 1623 Folio, the title pages of all the Quarto first editions including the eight anonymous Plays, the letters of dedication in the *Rape of Lucrece* and *Venus and Adonis*—and the Shakespeare tombstone in Holy Trinity Church, Stratford-upon-Avon.

All these concealments were discovered by the same unchanging technique, and her husband informed our President that Professor Jack Wolfe of Brooklyn College, New York City, told her that the most impressive thing about her work was the presence of *unsought* words, e.g. Francis, Fra,<sup>2</sup> or the words "writ" and "poet".

He added that if she found the last two words three times in connection with and contiguous with "Bacon", the chance of this being coincidence was astronomical—"one in a million". Mrs. Beckett replied that she found each word *five* times—"poet" in connection with the Comedies, and "writ" in the "Histories"!

*The Secret of Shakespeare's Doublet* is not a long book, but has over 60 illustrations, and deals faithfully and convincingly with at least two vital pieces of evidence which are almost invariably ignored by the orthodox—*The Promus* (Bacon's notebook), and The Northumberland MS. Chapters on the Droeshout Portrait, the Shakespeare Tomb at Holy Trinity Church and other evidence help to buttress a powerful case in support of the Baconian cause.

Jane Wheeler Beckett's life work was not in vain . . .

The earth can have but earth, which is his due,  
My spirit is thine, the better part of me.

(Sonnet 39.)  
N.F.

<sup>1</sup> Obtainable from Mrs. R. V. Hay Drummond, Westridge House, Streatley, Berkshire, RG8 9RJ. Price £12.

<sup>2</sup> Used by Bacon in some of his official signatures.

## A ROSICROSSE PORTRAIT OF JAMES I

By PIERRE HENRION  
Agrégé de l'Université

The portrait of James I reproduced here is taken from the 1603 French edition of *Basilikon Dôron*. I sent it to be added to our Editor's archives in case he wished some day to print it. He asked me to comment upon it but I am afraid my cryptanalysis of it is only sketchy and I count on fellow-members to improve upon it in Letters to the Editor.

It is a typical dual Rosicrosse portrait authenticated in the quatrain below by the broken-alignment system, vastly superior to fingerprinting expounded in *Baconiana 177 (Tudor Network)* to which, with apologies, I will have to refer several times. It is necessary to follow the exegesis on Fig. A "for study" before you explore the full-sized portrait.

The call-words are *ce tableau* (this picture). I have repeated the quatrain with the useless letters of the "structure" obscured to enable you to spot the useful letters more easily and appreciate better the impeccable accuracy of the construction. The *b* of *tableau* is at the apex of a Bacon "signature" (*cf.* no. 177, p. 44, *et sequitur*). Go down slightly to the left for the *b, c, a* segment, then down right for the *b, o, n* segment. The *z* of *gravez* is cut by the tangent, on the valid side of which is only a word-spacing (no. 177, p. 46).

This segment is the more interesting as it uses the word *Roy* (King, once again see no. 177, on the *idée fixe* of pure chance!). In *Heroes and Hero-worship* Carlyle was aware that he was not writing idly with his *King Shakspeare shining in crowned sovereignty over us all!* Now the prolongation of our segment (dotted line)<sup>1</sup> reaches one tip of the foot of a capital *I* in the oval. So we have "myself king Bacon" in a construction "ever so precise"—to use Bacon's very call-words elsewhere. Now if you count one for the *I* of *IAQUES*, in the oval, and take into account all the typographical signs (I have inscribed their count in Fig. A) the *I* we have thus reached counts 33; one of those "coincidences . . ."! But do not stop there, count one on the following *R* of *IRLANDE*, do not forget the dots nor the 3 and 7 taken at their numerical value nor those three horizontal elements of the cross at the top since they are on your elliptical course. What do you count on the *I* of *IAQUES* when you have run full circle, or rather full oval? The necessity of adding one letter to complete a 33 count has led to the unique spelling *eage* for *âge*, another case of proof by imperfection (no.

<sup>1</sup> Up from the quatrain to the portrait surround—Editor.



~~Ne cherche en ce tableau l'esprit et la science  
 Ni les meurs de ce Roy par le peintre imité:  
 Luy seul les a gravez dedans l'Éternité  
 D'où ces rares vertus ont puisé leur essence.~~

~~Ne cherche en ce tableau l'esprit et la science  
 Ni les meurs de ce Roy par le peintre imité:  
 Luy seul les a gravez dedans l'Éternité  
 D'où ces rares vertus ont puisé leur essence.~~

Fig. A (for study)





*Ne cherche en ce tableau l'esprit et la science  
Ni les meurs de ce Roy par le peintre imité:  
Luy seul les a grauez dedans l'Eternité.  
D'où ses rares vertus ont puisé leur essence.*

Portrait of James I reproduced from the 1603 French edition of  
*Basilikon Doron*

177, p. 46). The excuse, a lame one, is that the E stands for the circumflex of *âge*, as there are no accents on the capital letters of the oval: such a "rational" explanation must always be available to give food to the sceptics.

To return to the quatrain, the *b* of *tableau* is the link between Bacon and Tudor as it is in the prolongation "ever so precise" of the *d*, *u*, *o* segment of the Tudor signature, which uses *Luy seul* to intimate that James had no part at all in the writing of the book which was to make him the great authority on the theory of the divine nature of monarchy. Now, starting from the initial N of the verse (see diagram at bottom of Fig. A) and more precisely from the extreme tip of its curve, near the margin (and not from the foot, not small enough to give perfect accuracy!) you have two segments *N, r, e, i* and *N, m, a, u*, in all *Minerva*, the Latin name of the spear-shaking goddess Pallas. The international Pallas Organisation had the code-word Shake-spear (not Shakspeare as Carlyle cunningly wrote) for its British branch and Minerva or Minerve for the French branch. The words met by the Minerva structure are a homage paid to the goddess: *meurs* (morals) and *vertus* (virtues) *puisé* (drawn as from a well from Minerva). There is no question, of course, of pagan idolatry but of a symbolical embodiment of those qualities; virtue meaning efficient ability, talent. Moreover, in the Renaissance era, the revival of interest in Ancient Wisdom coexisted quite peacefully with the worship of Jehovah and Christ.

The fact that it had been so for a long time is shown by Psalm 46 in the Great Bible of 1539. As noticed by the Friedmans<sup>2</sup> the 46th word of Psalm 46 is *shake* and the 46th backward from the end is *spear*. The mysterious word *Selah* at the end can rightly be counted as a null as this conventional Hebrew sign never added *meaning* to the context, playing, as it were, the part of a full stop or a rest in music. As there was no question of Francis or the Stratford man in 1539, it is obvious, according to our detractors, that it was just a coincidence (a startling one indeed!) and therefore that the same arrangement in the

<sup>2</sup> William F. and Elizebeth S. Friedman, in *The Shakespearean Ciphers Examined*, a very "clever" book, instructive, sobering, and ingeniously—if disingenuously—biased. What the late W. F. Friedman would have found to say to prove as illusory the structure system I shall never know. When, in 1964, I challenged him with coruscating examples of it, he never dignified, or did not dare, to answer. Perhaps he was too busy with his psychiatrist. As we know now through Ronald W. Clark's biography, or rather hagiography, *The Man Who Broke Purple*, there were some "command performances", well rewarded, that made his subconscious mind feel "their erosive psychological effects on an honourable man", to use Mr Clark's words.

But one must sympathize with this absolutely eminent expert's predicament. It would have been excruciating for this proud, ambitious man (as he is portrayed by Mr Clark) to resist official pressure, with its accompanying rewards, without the backlash of nervous disorder—for the man was certainly honest at bottom (again, as testified by Mr Clark).

1611 Bible make the Baconians who attach importance to it simply ridiculous. Either our authors did not know or they knew but abstained from saying, that the international Shake-spear Minerva organisation existed long before it was necessary, in 1597, to hire, for an enormous consideration, a (very imperfect) namesake of the goddess—an illiterate (he could not even sign his name in spite of five so called signatures extant) but astute and covetous Stratford native whose name sounded vaguely like shake-spear.<sup>3</sup> So, already in 1539, as it was to be in 1611, the Minerva non-pagan organisation was interested in perfecting the translations of the Bible.

After this digression, started by the arrival of Minerva on the scene, let us return to the portrait arranged in her honour. In *Baconiana* 177, p. 46, in fine, we saw the added wonder of complex intersections. Here, our three "signatures" are linked into a coherent structure by such a feat, under *de ce* (lower diagram, line 2).

Now that the document has been duly and ritually identified, we can look at the picture itself, a typical Rosicrucian one. You must have dissimilarity between the shoulders (as in the Droeshout portrait among others) or a cloak covering only one shoulder (also frequent in France) or, as here, a light-shade partition. The little cross at the top is indicative of the Rosicrosse rank (not a high one for James!) of the person pictured. It is slightly awry, its near-vertical axis fixing the direction in which the portrait must be cut to distinguish the two brethren. Fig. A shows that the dividing line (exaggerated) is parallel to the light-shade division and to the line of buttons of the doublet and is also in the precise direction of the *b* at the apex of the Bacon-Tudor structure (pure chance, of course—chance having the knack of organisation and concatenation!). Now, leaving Fig. A for the good print, put the blade of a table-knife edgewise, very carefully, in the direction thus defined and then revolve it on its edge slightly so as to hide the two sides of the face alternately.

The two half-faces are evidently of the same type but you will see that the half on *your* left is older (by how much no biographical dictionary will tell you . . .). The cheek is hollower, the tip of the moustache higher than in the other half. The two eyes have a slightly different expression, so that the whole of the dual face has a slight squint. Needless to say, the laws of perspective are supposed, officially, to account for all that! Something I cannot explain is the unnatural

<sup>3</sup> The present writer has sent the Editor photographs of documents which are sufficient proofs that it was in 1597 that were put in action the (probably prearranged) measures devised to camouflage publicly the real authorship of the Plays in case of emergency. At that date the emergency arose, the stipulated hush-money was paid and the man of straw whisked away to the obscurity of his (then) far away province where the *parvenu* could lord it at ease in his new status and his . . . New Place.

second moustache, under the lower lip, overflowing the beard: a fashion of the times or some esoteric device?

May I urge the reader to compare this dual portrait with the higher-ranking one of Bacon-Selenus which I found in a copy of *Cryptomenytices et Cryptographiae* no other print of which, to my knowledge, is extant (but I never was one to explore the Folger Library)? See *Baconiana* no. 136 (*Bacon, Selenus and Shakespeare*) for explanations but with a printing-block accidentally damaged; and chiefly no. 139 for a perfect reproduction, with its merry-go-round of 33's already marked on the print I found, which simplified the cryptanalysis! The quatrain underneath also has its identification structure but, unfortunately for me, the addressee of the portrait left no trace of his eventual decoding.

Those portraits give an interesting insight into the turn of mind of our ancestors, both mystical and humorous. They certainly enjoyed fooling the unsuspecting viewers of their pictures.

*Note:* Readers are urged to take some pains to follow the explanations of the portrait—if necessary using a magnifying glass to study the quatrain lines.

## BURRSWOOD

*Leaving the chapel after Healing Service—  
The breath of Scented Roses everywhere—  
I drew one down to drink that lovely smell,  
A Bee was in the bloom! He didn't mind,  
But drank and drank and drank with me  
And stayed within the Rose when I was gone.  
A friend exclaimed: "Perfume is the highest reach,  
'Supreme Initiation' in the Vegetable Kingdom".  
He must be right! For are not Roses  
Beauty and Scent in One? All in a single Flower?  
Most beautiful of all God's gifts to Earth?  
This lovely planet; poised in a medium range  
Of Temperature and Clime, where Life should be in Peace  
Forever? But no! Our World won't have it so,  
Arms and the Man and Valour will be needed  
To keep the Peace, And, at the blackest moment we will need  
"The Second Coming" of the Lord Christ Jesus  
For to dispel the darkness and the Fear  
Of this dark cloud that hovers overhead  
And will so remain, Until the HEART  
IS OPEN TO THE CHRIST.*



# KING LEAR

## PRELUDE

For me *King Lear* is most vibrant when read from the open page. Stage productions are disappointing. Key phrases are often muffled and sometimes cut. I give great credit to the late Beryl Pogson for being the first to elucidate the esotericism in *Lear*:<sup>1</sup> also to Michael Srigley for his brilliant article in *The Beacon*.<sup>2</sup>

My purpose here is to emphasize the dramatic impact of *King Lear*, which for me is the most poignant of all the Plays, without decrying its undoubted esotericism. In *Lear* the high point is reached and abruptly relieved by foolery. Lear becomes comical. He almost changes places with the fool; and the tension vanishes. It is the same in *Macbeth*. When the bloody deed is done we are unexpectedly shocked by two words—"knocking within"—words which indeed carry a spiritual meaning. Swiftly all tension is released by the vulgarity and profanity of the porter.

The phrase "look with thine ears" which forms part of my title, shows that vision, hearing and feeling are all intermingled in this play. Even the words "auricular Assurance" are in Shakespeare's vocabulary. This intermingling of vision, hearing and feeling persists through *King Lear*. The fool has wisdom, the king none. Swedenborg's words are appropriate.<sup>3</sup>

Love opens the interiors of the mind to the third  
degree and is the receptacle of all things of Wisdom.

Angels of the third heaven are perfected in Wisdom  
by *hearing* and not by sight . . .

For the *ear* corresponds to Obedience and obedience  
is the life—Therefore we must *listen*.

### WHERE THERE IS NO VISION

"LOOK WITH THINE EARS." I SEE IT FEELINGLY.

by M.P.

Again that phrase "Look with thine Ears!"<sup>4</sup> Lear simply will not listen. He has no patience:

<sup>1</sup> *In the East My Pleasure Lies.*

<sup>2</sup> *An Esoteric Study of King Lear.*

<sup>3</sup> Swedenborg, *Heaven and Hell*, p. 271: *Lear* 4/6/154.

<sup>4</sup> *Lear* 4/6/152.

Lear            Give me the map there. Know that we have divided  
in three our Kingdom and 'tis our fast intent. . . .<sup>5</sup>

Impatience is Lear's fault throughout the play. At last he comes to Patience—to Wisdom never.

Lear            Out of my sight!

Kent            See better Lear and let me still remain  
The true blank of thine eye . . .

Lear            O vassal! Miscreant!

Kent            Kill thy physician and the fee bestow  
Upon the foul disease. Revoke thy gift:  
Or whilst I can vent clamour from my throat  
I'll tell thee thou dost evil.

Throughout *King Lear* is woven an important theme. That theme is *vision* "To see or not to see", both in the natural sense and in the spiritual sense. Two of the *dramatis personae* appear at first, Cordelia and Kent. Both have spiritual qualities, Cordelia the *loving heart* and Kent. Ah, who is Kent? He seems to rule the action of the play throughout, appearing, disappearing like an "Arisen Master". At times he represents the author, first an Earl who has no fear of Dukes; then banished, then back again and "in the stocks" and in disguise; and always ready to do service when that is needed. Kent is the embodiment of wisdom.

Even Cordelia can recognize a superior spirit in the end . . .

Cordelia      Oh thou good Kent! How shall I live and work<sup>6</sup>  
To match thy goodness? My life will be too short . . .

\*       \*       \*       \*       \*

The play begins in quiet conversational tones. Kent and Gloucester are discussing Albany and Cornwall, and in particular Gloucester's bastard son. Gloucester makes an indecent boast . . .

Kent            Is not this your son, my Lord

Glouc:        His breeding hath been at my charge . . .

Kent            I cannot conceive you

Glouc:        Sir, this young fellow's mother could . . .

From here the play descends into a vortex. Violence, cruelty and inhumanity prevail. Cordelia and Kent are banished to France, and "France" esoterically means "Freedom". We see no more of these lovely characters until the end; but always *Vision* is our theme. Gloucester, who began with bawdy jest, is blinded in the cruellest and

<sup>5</sup> *Lear* 1/1/39.

<sup>6</sup> *Lear* 4/7/1.

most hideous scene in Shake-Speare. We see how cruelty is even relished.

Goneril Pluck out his eyes  
 Cornwall Leave him to my displeasure; Edmund  
 Keep you our sister company. The revenges we are  
 bound  
 To take upon your traitorous father are not fit for your  
 Beholding.  
 Cornwall See thou shalt never, Fellows hold the chair  
 Upon these eyes of thine I'll set my foot . . .

We spare the ghastly details. Shake-Speare has reached the Nadir of his work. But now behold! There come redeeming features:

1st Serv: Hold your hand my Lord  
 I have ever served you since I was a child  
 But better service I have never done you  
 Than now to bid you hold

Combat ensues. Cornwall is wounded. Regan takes up his sword and runs the servant through.

Regan Go thrust him out at gates and let him *Smell* his  
 Way to Dover.

"Smell" is perhaps the lowest sense we have yet felt. But now a touch of real compassion.

3rd Serv: Go thou. I'll fetch some flax and whites of eggs  
 To apply to his bleeding face. Now heaven help him

Again compassion!

Old Man You cannot see your way  
 Glouc: I have no way and therefore want no eyes.  
*I stumbled when I saw; full oft 'tis seen*  
 Our means secure us and our mere defects  
 Prove our commodities. . . .

Old Man Fellow where goest?

The last we hear of this Old Man (whose quality is Compassion) is when he says to naked Edgar "I'll bring thee the best 'parel that I have". So Edgar (as "poor Tom" more warmly clad) leads his poor wretched sightless father as they go stumbling on their way to Dover.

And now blind Gloucester's heart is opened:

Glouc: Here take this purse . . .  
 Let the superfluous and lust-dieted man

That slaves your ordinance, that will not see  
 Because he does not *Feel*, feel your power quickly  
 So *distribution should undo excess*  
 And each man have enough

Voluntary undoing! We think of Bacon's words:

"For voluntary undoing may be as well for a man's country as for the Kingdom of Heaven."<sup>7</sup>

One of the most endearing qualities in this despotic old King is his love and tender care for dogs. Lear even personalizes them, giving them names.

Lear        The little dogs and all  
               Tray, Blanche and Sweetheart, see they bark at me.<sup>8</sup>

Edgar now breaks into rhyming verse:

Be thy mouth or black or white  
 Tooth that poisons if it bite  
 Mastiff, greyhound, mongrel grim  
 Hound or Spaniel, brach or lym  
 Or bob tail tike or trundle-tail  
 Tom will make them weep and wail  
 For, with throwing thus my head  
 Dogs leap the hatch and all are fled.<sup>9</sup>

(In love of dogs I am at one with the *author of King Lear*.)

Exeunt Kent, Gloucester and the Fool, bearing away Lear, distracted, confused and carried by the three who love and serve him best.

Lear        Then let them anatomize Regan, see what breeds  
               about her heart. Is there any cause in nature that  
               makes these hard hearts?

There is a point in this great play where Tragedy meets Comedy. Lear becomes comical.

Lear        Hark in thine *ear*: change places and handy-dandy,  
               Which is the justice, which is the thief?  
               Thou hast seen a farmer's dog bark at a beggar?

Glouc:     Aye Sir.

Lear        And the creature runs from the cur?  
               There thou might'st behold the great image of authority  
               *A dog's obeyed in office.*<sup>10</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Essay, *Of Expende*.

<sup>8</sup> *Lear* 3/6/65.

<sup>9</sup> *Lear* 3/6/68-76.

<sup>10</sup> *Lear* 4/6/164.



A while ago, we left blind Gloucester and Edgar stumbling on to Dover. Now they begin to recognize each other's voice. Sound impinges on them both

Glouc: Methinks thy voice is altered and thou speak'st  
In better phrase and matter than thou didst.  
Methinks you're better spoken.

Edgar Come on Sir, here's the place, stand still  
(and here imagination bodies forth)<sup>11</sup>  
And dizzy 'tis to cast ones eyes so low  
The crows and choughs that wing the midway air  
Show scarce so gross as beetles: halfway down  
Hangs one that gathers samphire, dreadful trade  
Methinks he seems no bigger than his head.  
The fishermen that walk upon the beach  
Appear like mice, and yond tall anchoring bark  
Diminished to her cock, her cock a buoy  
Almost too small for sight. The murmuring surge  
That on the unnumbered idle pebbles chafe  
Cannot be heard so high.

What splendid visualisation! What sound and colour! The cliffs at Dover! The *Sea* I know so well.

So Shake-Speare could "imagine" sound as well as hearing, feeling, seeing—never having gone to sea: whereas we know that Bacon knew the sea. He speculated on the tidal streams and currents and saw in them a clear distinction for these were facts and not imaginings.<sup>12</sup> In Bacon's *History of the Winds* these matters are discussed. In Sonnet 116 Shake-Speare (Bacon's other voice) writes a couplet which indicates the *Sextant* or *Astrolabe* as it was then called:

It is the star to every wandering bark  
Whose worth's unknown unless his *height* be taken  
We know full well that Bacon could "imagine" too.

In the very prophetic excerpt which follows we find Bacon's plan for an altruistic and deeply religious use of experimental science. He predicts refrigeration, air-conditioning, meteorology, radiology, telephony, submarines, synthetic perfumes, textiles and dyes. All these have come to pass, while some novel uses of sound may be still to come. The father of Salomon's House is speaking:<sup>13</sup>

God blesse thee, my Son; I will give the greatest Jewel I have.

<sup>11</sup> *M.N.D.* 5/1/14.

<sup>12</sup> *Othello*, page 4 in *Mortuary Marbles*.

<sup>13</sup> Extract from *Francis Bacon and the Utopias* by Martin Pares.

For I will impart unto thee, for the love of God and Men, a relation of the true state of Salomon's House. . . . The end of our Foundation is the Knowledge of causes and secret motion of things; and the enlarging of the bounds of Human Empire, to the effecting of all things possible.

We have large and deep caves . . . for the imitation of natural mines, and the production also of new artificial metals. . . . We have also great variety of composts and soils. . . . We have high towers . . . for the view of divers meteors, as winds, rain, snow, hail and some fiery meteors also. . . . We have also certain chambers of health, where we qualify the air as we think good and proper for the cure of divers diseases, and preservation of health. . . . We have also divers mechanical arts, which you have not; and stuffs made by them; as Paper, Linen, Silks, Tissues, excellent Dyes . . . Instruments also which generate heat only by motion.

We have also perspective houses, where we make demonstrations of all Light and Radiations and Colours. We represent also all Multiplications of light which we carry to great distances, and make so sharp as to discern small points and lines. . . .

We procure means of seeing objects afar off. . . . We have also sound-houses, where we practise and demonstrate all sounds and their generation. . . . We represent small signals as great and deep. . . . We have certain helps which, set to the ear, do further the hearing greatly. . . . We have also the means to convey sounds in trunks and pipes, in strange lines and distances. . . . We have also perfume houses. . . . We multiply smells. . . . We make divers imitations of taste likewise. . . . We imitate also the flight of birds. . . . We have ships and boats for going under water. . . .

These are, my son, the Riches of Salomon's House.

This is Bacon's *imagined* Fable!

We go now to the moving Scene where Kent and Lear have mutual recognition.

Kent	No my good Lord; I am the very man
Lear	I'll see that straight
Kent	That from your first of difference and decay Have followed your sad steps.

A little before that Lear appeared:

Cordelia	As mad as the Vex'd sea singing aloud Crowned with rank furmiter and furrow weeds With burdocks, hemlock, nettles, cuckoo flowers
----------	---

Darnel and all the idle weeds that grow  
In our sustaining corn.

To this the Doctor replies:

Our foster-nurse of Nature is repose  
The which he lacks; that to provoke in him  
Are many *Simples* operative, whose power  
Will close the eye of anguish.<sup>14</sup>

It is precisely these *simples*, Poppy and Fumitory, which are mentioned in Bacon's *Sylva Sylvarum*, 482,<sup>15</sup> which may have closed the eye of anguish in *King Lear*.

- Doctor Be by, good Madam, when we do wake him  
I doubt not of his temperance.
- Cordelia Very well (music)
- Doctor Please you draw near. *Louder the music there*
- Cordelia Oh my dear Father! Restoration hang  
Thy medicine on my lips and let this kiss  
Repair those violent harms . . .
- Kent Kind and dear Princess . . .
- Lear You do me wrong to take me out o' the grave  
Thou art a soul in bliss; but I am bound  
Upon a wheel of fire . . .  
And my poor fool is hang'd  
No No No life!  
Why should a dog, a horse, a rat, have life  
And thou no breath at all?  
Thou'lt come no more  
Never, Never, never, never, never!

Part of the final scene in this great Tragedy has been so beautifully and visually depicted by Michael Srigley that I beg leave to quote verbatim from his brilliant Essay. To him the palm!

Do you see this? Look on her!  
Look—at her lips! Look there! Look there!

What did Shakespeare mean us to understand by this? Is it just the raving of a lunatic old man? Or is it that, physically dead, she is yet alive spiritually and like Christ in dying conquers death? It is possible that part of the answer to this enigma lies in these words of the Tibetan:

<sup>14</sup> *Lear* 4/4/14.

<sup>15</sup> See *Mortuary Marbles*, page 84.

The will and the breath, my brother  
are occultly synonymous terms.

The last couplet belongs to Kent, as he prepares to vanish to his  
"Home" the author's breast.

Kent        I have a journey, Sir, shortly to go  
              My Master calls me, I must not say no.

\*        \*        \*        \*        \*

Feeling is the reward of believing  
By feeling shall the Lord touch THEE.

### EPILOGUE

Two names shine; *Kent* and *Cordelia* have a quality all their own—  
Sounding the Chord *Love-Wisdom*. Our Author, speaking through  
Lear and Edgar, voices the Age-old love 'tween Man and Dog.

From Sirius, the Dog-Star in *Canis Major*—brightest of all fixed  
Stars in the Firmament.

The LIGHT shines in the darkness  
THE *WORD* GOES FORTH

# THE CHRISTIANITY OF FRANCIS BACON

by the late PROFESSOR BENJAMIN FARRINGTON  
*Emeritus Professor of Classics*

I need a sympathetic audience this evening, for the subject of my lecture is far above my powers. I have not, for instance, felt theologian enough to discuss his *Confession of Faith*. It is however a subject that imposes itself, as I found when I first attempted to write about Francis Bacon as a scientist some dozen years ago. Then it became clear to me, not simply that Bacon was a Christian, but that his Christianity was vital to the understanding of his philosophy of science. Plenty of scientists have, of course, been Christians. But the fact that Napier used his logarithms to solve problems concerning the Number of the Beast, or that Boyle was an ardent evangelist, or that Faraday was a Sandemanian or Mendel a Roman Catholic, does not assist our understanding of their contributions to mathematics, chemistry, electricity, or the laws of inheritance. But unless we give Bacon's Christianity a central place in our interpretation of his thought we must be for ever content to skirt round the edges of it. So here I am under the auspices of the New Atlantis Foundation to talk about the author of *The New Atlantis*, trusting that this happy coincidence will ensure me an indulgent hearing.

I shall need it. For I shall make bold to say at the outset that, to the best of my judgment, Bacon intended a reform of religion just as much as a reform of science. Or, to be more precise, that he did not separate the two. For while it is a fact that he laboured to distinguish the realms of faith and knowledge, it is equally true that he thought one without the other useless. Edwin Abbott, an unsympathetic but competent biographer, long ago noted the religious character of Bacon's physics. It is a shrewd observation, and I should like to put you a simple question. Are the Fathers of Solomon's House in *The New Atlantis* priests or scientists, or both? Is the House itself a temple or a research institute? Was it not the most natural thing in the world that the first historian of the Royal Society, Bishop Sprat, in acknowledging Francis Bacon as the inspirer of the whole enterprise, should go on to ask, "If our Church should be an enemy to commerce, intelligence, discovery, navigation, or any sort of mechanics, how could it be fit for the present genius of this nation?"

The Bishop's question was a most pertinent one. He was conscious of a change in the spiritual climate of England. He talks of "the

present genius of this nation" and is fully conscious of the role Bacon had played in forming it. England is to go forward with a scientific and technological revolution, and the Church is to play an active rôle in it. Listen to him again. "The universal disposition of this age is bent upon a rational religion; and therefore I renew my affectionate request that the Church of England would provide to have the chief share in its first adventures; that it would persist, as it has begun, to encourage experiments, which will be to our Church as the British Oak is to our empire, an ornament and a defence to the soil wherein it is planted." Nor is that all. Experimental science, the Bishop claims, will overcome narrowness of mind; enable minds distracted by civil and religious differences to meet calmly on neutral ground; and, by contriving "a union of men's hands and reasons", it will "unite various classes and occupations—soldier, tradesman, merchant, scholar, gentleman, courtier, divine, Presbyterian, Papist, Independent, and those of Orthodox judgment". All these, he claims, have "calmly conspired in a mutual agreement of labours and desires". Such was the temper of England in the first spring of the Baconian revolution. When Boyle was simultaneously laying the foundations of modern chemistry and expending vast effort and vast sums on the dissemination of the Scriptures in many tongues. When Christopher Wren combined the building of churches with original contributions to ten or a dozen nascent branches of natural science. The Baconian revolution, one might say, seemed a further instalment of the Reformation.

At the appearance of Bacon's masterwork *The Great Instauration* in 1620, George Herbert, a personal friend of his, who knew his thought well, with his usual justness of perception and precision of speech, hailed the author in a Latin poem as

*Mundique et animarum sacerdos unicus,*

the alone-only priest of nature and men's souls.

On the foundation of the Royal Society, the less inspired Cowley was voicing a common sentiment when he wrote:

From these and all long errors of the way  
 in which our wandering predecessors went,  
 And like th' old Hebrews many years did stray  
     In deserts but of small extent  
 Bacon, like Moses, led us forth at last.  
     The barren wilderness he past,  
     Did on the very border stand  
     Of the blest promis'd land,  
 And from the mountain's top of his exalted wit,  
     Saw it himself and shew'd us it.

The truth is that Francis Bacon envisaged himself and was, after

his death, for a while accepted as leader of a total revolution in the conditions of human life; and that this revolution consisted in the recovery by mankind of his true relation towards the world of nature; namely in the Dominion over the Universe which had been promised to Adam before the Fall. Hence the aptness of the comparison with Moses; hence the justification for calling him the priest of nature and mankind.

A rough and ready way to bear out these claims is to make a cursory examination of *The New Atlantis*. You remember the story. A ship has been driven off course in the Pacific and, when supplies begin to run out and there are many sick on board, the crew sight an island, which, as they later discover, bears the Hebrew name of Bensalem, Son of Peace. This island utopia turns out to be very much a home from home. Its customs are not unfamiliar to the new arrivals; they are simply better. In Spedding's happy phrase Bensalem is "simply our own world as it might be made if we did our duty by it". A boat puts out from shore to contact the ship and brings a document couched in four languages—ancient Hebrew, ancient Greek, good Latin of the School, and contemporary Spanish. The culture of the island, therefore, is not different from that of England; nor is its religion. For the scroll is stamped with the sign of the cross, which is taken as a certain presage of good. "God is manifested in this land" they exclaim soon after they come ashore. "We are come here among a Christian people full of piety and humanity." Of the first important official they meet they enquire who was the apostle of the island. "Ye knit my heart to you," he cries, "by asking this question in the first place; for it showed that you seek first the kingdom of heaven." He then explains the miraculous circumstances in which, not long after the Ascension, the islanders became possessed of a small ark of cedar wood containing all the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments. For in Bensalem, as in Bacon's ideal for England, the Bible is the treasure, the Church only the ark that contains it. There is a Hebrew element in the population living in great mutual amity and respect with their neighbours—a point of some curiosity, since the Jews had been expelled from England in the XIII century and not allowed re-entry till after Bacon's time. It is owing to their presence that scientific works of Solomon, lost to Europe, have survived in Bensalem. The central institution of the island, though its main business is science and technology, is called Solomon's House, or The College of the Six Days Works. Its chiefs are designated Fathers, and their spokesman explains: "We have certain hymns and services we say daily, of laud and thanks to God for his marvellous works; and forms of prayer imploring his aid and blessing for the illumination of our labours, and the turning of them into good and holy uses." Such is



the setting Bacon provides for his brilliant sketch of the scientific wonders of Bensalem, which so strikingly anticipate the achievements of the last three centuries. Bacon was probably about fifty years of age when he composed it. May we take it that it represents, in its deeply religious and consistently Biblical colouring, a permanent and life-long characteristic of his thought?

This is certainly so. Bacon was already Lord Chancellor of England and fifty-nine years of age before he published his *Great Instauration*. By the title, as he explains more than once, he indicated his intention of instructing mankind to overcome, so far as might prove possible, the consequences of the Fall and to merit the long delayed fulfilment of God's promise to Adam of dominion over the universe. "Man by the Fall fell at the same time from the state of innocence and from his dominion over creation. Both of these losses, however, can even in this life be in some part repaired; the former by religion and Faith, the latter by arts and sciences. For creation was not by the curse made altogether and forever a rebel, but in virtue of that covenant 'In the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat bread' it is now by various labours (not certainly by disputation or idle magic ceremonies, but by various labours) at length, and in some measure subdued to the supplying of man with bread: That is, to the uses of human life" (N.O. II, end).

It is true that many students of Bacon's thought take this, and the many similar pronouncements which adorn the pages of *The Great Instauration*, as insincere. Joseph de Maistre regarded it as a heavy disguise of orthodoxy laid on to conceal his real atheism and materialism from the prying eyes of James. Professor Broad, the exponent of a more moderate scepticism, says, "It is evident that he was a sincere if unenthusiastic Christian of that sensible school which regards the Church of England as a branch of the civil service and the Archbishop of Canterbury as the British Minister for Divine Affairs." But it may be that Professor Broad's tolerant flippancy is even further from the truth than the angry hostility of de Maistre. The fact is that Bacon was a man with a mission. He was still but a boy, according to what he later told his secretary and literary executor, Dr. Rawley, when he became impatient of all philosophy that was strong only in disputations and contentions and barren of the production of works for the benefit of the life of man. In which mind, adds Rawley, he continued till his dying day.

Here, as it seems to me, it is all important to consider what Bacon meant by a philosophy productive of works for the benefit of the life of man. If we take it to mean, as most of his commentators seem to do, that what he had in mind was the mere multiplication of comforts and commodities, then it becomes impossible to understand the passion with which Bacon, throughout his life, pursued so trivial an ambition.

It becomes impossible to understand why he should solemnly pronounce it his "only earthly wish". But that this is not the sense in which Bacon intended the words is beyond dispute. I have mentioned the prayers that were in use in Solomon's house in *The New Atlantis*. Here is the beginning of the prayer that Bacon composed for use in scientific institutes such as he tried all his life to get set up in England. "To God the Father, God the Word, God the Spirit, we pour out our humble and burning prayers, that mindful of the miseries of the human race and this our mortal pilgrimage in which we wear out evil days and few, he would send down upon us new streams from the fountain of his mercy for the relief of our distress." And to the prospective student, the reluctant neophyte being initiated into the new philosophy of works, the promises he holds out are these: "My dear, dear boy," he says, "that which I purpose is to unite you with things themselves in a chaste, holy, and legal wedlock; from which association you will secure an increase beyond all the hopes and prayers of ordinary marriages, to wit, a blessed race of Heroes or Supermen who will overcome the immeasurable helplessness and poverty of the human race, which are the source of more destruction than all giants, monsters, or tyrants, and will make you peaceful, happy, prosperous, and secure." It is only when we take the philosophy of works in this universal and philanthropic sense that we can begin to understand how it has for Bacon religious significance.

The words I have just quoted come from the writing called *The Masculine Birth of Time*. This title is eloquent of the belief which animates all Bacon's writings; that he was destined to be the herald of an unimaginable change in the fortunes of the human race. The words quoted were written in 1603, when Bacon was forty-two. Seventeen years later he expressed the same thought in still stronger terms. "The sixth part of my work," he says in *The Great Instauration*, "for which the rest are but a preparation, will reveal the philosophy which is the product of that legitimate, chaste, and severe mode of enquiry which I have taught and prepared. But to perfect this last part is a thing both above my strength and beyond my expectation. What I have been able to do is to give it, as I hope, a not contemptible start. The destiny of the human race will supply the issue, and that issue will perhaps be such as men in the present state of their fortunes and of their understandings cannot easily grasp or measure. For what is at stake is not merely a mental satisfaction but the very reality of man's well-being and all his power of action."

To interpret his thought in historical terms and express it more concretely, Bacon had observed that while antiquity had not failed to create a whole encyclopaedia of the sciences (the word is Greek and was in use in the sense in which we employ it already in the second

century before Christ) those sciences were of such a kind as to give mankind little control over nature, little power of action. They were barren of works for the benefit of the life of man. For Bacon this was not simply a problem of the state of learning. When he wrote cautiously he so described it, being well aware of the obstacles which would confront him if he disclosed the full depth of his thought. But for Bacon the real problem was not an academic one. It was a problem of life and death. He took the same view of the situation in England in his own day as the more serious scientists do in our day of the situation in the world, and felt the same desperation. We have associations for the advancement of science just as Bacon wrote books in support of the advancement of learning. But we still lack an association for the liquidation of world poverty. It is respectable to hoist the academic banner, not so respectable then or now to point to the "immeasurable helplessness and poverty of the human race". But we shall not begin to understand Bacon until we take him at his word and accept his protestation that to overcome poverty was the primary business of science. In that sense he called it his only earthly wish.

In England, as the historian of philanthropy<sup>1</sup> tells us, "the sixteenth century was deeply concerned with the problem of poverty; its literature and documents are filled with the question; its discussion of causes, of extent, and of methods of action mount as the century wears on." Like other public men Francis Bacon was deeply involved. When the parliament of 1597 discussed the whole problem of poverty and its relief he spoke of the blighting effect of the enclosures and was subsequently one of the members of the commission appointed to sort out the tangle of remedial legislation proposed in some ten or dozen different bills. But Bacon, though fully apprised of the nature of the problem, was not satisfied with the remedies proposed. The beginning of the century had seen More's wistful but dubious glance at the solution of poverty proposed by the spokesman in his *Utopia*—the solution of an equal distribution of property. This had no appeal for Bacon. Neither did the actual course which charity took wholly satisfy him. W. K. Jordan, the historian of this remarkable movement, the beneficial effects of which are with us still, being knit into the very foundations of the social life of England, has revealed by a patient examination of the testamentary dispositions of the age what a vast volume of private wealth was poured by the merchants and industrialists who made fortunes at this time into carefully planned and well endowed charitable trusts. But just as Bacon had seen no solution of the problem of poverty in Thomas More's egalitarianism—which was only fair shares in poverty and not the creation of plenty—so also he disliked that form of society in which a few individuals make vast fortunes in the midst

<sup>1</sup> *Philanthropy in England, 1480-1660*, by W. K. Jordan, p. 57.

of widespread poverty and seek to redress the balance at the end of their lives by the distribution of what, soberly speaking, is no longer even theirs, since, as everybody knows, you can't take it with you.

The solution in which Bacon believed depended first on the structure of society itself. It must not breed poverty and riches at opposite poles and delude itself with the fancy that men who have spent their lives in the amassing of private gain will on their deathbeds have such a wise understanding of public needs that they can be safely entrusted with the creation of permanent institutions for dealing with them. Instead he tried to turn the eyes of his fellow countrymen to the example presented by the Low Countries, "who could never have endured and continued so inestimable and insupportable charges, either by their natural frugality or by their mechanical industry, were it not also that their wealth was dispersed in many hands, and not ingrossed in few; and those hands not so much of the nobility, but most and generally of inferior conditions." (*The True Greatness of the Kingdom of Britain.*)

That was one requirement. The other was, of course, the creation of a new kind of science, which unlike the encyclopaedia of sciences inherited from the Greeks, should be constructed from the foundation up to be a means of producing works for the benefit of the life of man. Such were Bacon's two requirements, nor were they unconnected with one another. Both the new society, in which wealth would be more equally distributed, and the new science in which knowledge would be power, must, he was convinced, rest upon a revaluation of the rôle of the mechanical arts in the development of civilisation. The mechanical arts were innocent of theory and of but limited efficacy, and yet it was entirely due to them that, in the small measure to which they were effective, nature had by various labours been subdued to the supplying of man with bread. If a science of works was to be created, the mechanical arts must provide the foundation.

It is only when we place ourselves at this view point, when we bear in mind both the problem of poverty and the nature of the remedies Bacon had in mind, that we can begin to discuss the religious character of his thought. The plague of Baconian scholarship has been that his commentators, with few exceptions, try to fit his philosophy into a category too narrow to contain it. Thus, his philosophy of works, which ought to be accorded a major place in the philosophy of history, is often cut about and cruelly mangled in order to make it fit into the history of smaller movements of thought, and the man who, in Schweitzer's phrase, "drafted the programme of the modern world view", has become merely one of the contributors to inductive logic, or to the growth of rationalism, or the history of English Erastianism or something of the sort.

For my part I propose to take him at his face value as he presents himself to his readers. That is to say, he was a man whom the circumstances of his age presented with the problem of poverty; who saw the solution of that problem in elevating to the dignity and power of a theoretical science the craft knowledge implicit in the mechanical arts; who found the traditional philosophy derived from the Greeks of no avail for two great reasons, one moral and the other intellectual; and who consequently turned his back upon the Greeks and discovered for himself in the Bible a world-outlook and a morality on which he could base his new philosophy of works.

This new world-outlook is succinctly defined in the twelve brief *Sacred Meditations* which Bacon brought out in 1597 as his first publication together with the more familiar *Essays*. The religious thought of these meditations is strongly marked by the practical morality which had increasingly characterised English thought from the days of Colet and Erasmus. The first meditation is no more than one hundred words in length. The gist of it lies in these words, "God saw the works of his hands and they were exceedingly good; when man turned to consider the works of his hands, behold all was vanity and vexation of spirit. Wherefore if you will do God's works your sweat will be like aromatic balm and your rest like the Sabbath of God; for you will work in the sweat of a good conscience and rest in the leisure of sweet contemplation." The significance of these words for Bacon is in inverse proportion to their length. By recalling the fact that God had not only created the world but seen that it was good, he rejected the long tradition of contempt for this world which had come down from the Orphics through Plato and the neo-Platonists, the gnostics and the mystics, the pseudo-Dionysius and the Florentine platonists, and was still active in his own day. That early Baconian, the poet John Milton, echoes his thought when he says (or makes his Satan say):

O Earth, how like to heaven, if not preferr'd  
More justly, Seat worthier of God's, as built  
With second thoughts, reforming what was old;  
For what God after better worse would build?

Furthermore, if Nature is God's handiwork, there can be no study more pleasing to him than natural philosophy.

On one condition, however—which is the subject of the second meditation, on the miracles of the Saviour. God the Father made the world good, but the works of man's hands are vanity and vexation of spirit. For this there is only one remedy, that every action should be motivated by love. This was not clear until the appearance on earth of God the Word. In Old Testament days the prophets brought

all sorts of calamities on their enemies, which even the Apostles imitated, Peter striking Ananias dead and Paul making Elymas blind. Not so Jesus. He never performed a miracle except upon the human body and that for the purpose of healing it. "He restored motion to the lame, light to the blind, speech to the dumb, health to the sick, cleanness to the lepers, sound mind to them that were possessed with devils, life to the dead. There was no miracle of judgment, but all of mercy, and all upon the human body."

The third meditation could hardly be more pertinent to the actual rôle Bacon had designed for himself. It is on The Innocence of the Dove and the Wisdom of the Serpent, and it considers the case of a man who aspires, not to a solitary and private goodness, but to a fructifying and begetting good involving the lives of others. The business of such a man will be with the world; and, though his purpose may be as innocent as the dove, it will be necessary for him to show himself acquainted with the cynicism and villainy of the world or risk being taken for a pious simpleton. He must arm himself with the wisdom of the serpent, but need not on that account fear pollution any more than a sunbeam which shines into a privy.

The meditation that deals with hypocrites has again the same practical ends in view. Hypocrites make a great display of public worship, which costs them nothing. They are exposed when directed towards works of mercy, reminded that pure religion and undefiled is to visit the widows and orphans in their affliction, and asked how a man who does not love his brother whom he hath seen can love God whom he has not seen.

Religious literature is the subject of another meditation which deals with three types of imposture. The first consists of the tedious trivialities of the Schoolmen, who create a specious appearance of system by the use of technical terms, the piling up of distinctions, the propounding of these, and arguments pro. and con. Then there are the lives of the fathers and the compositions of ancient heretics in which the poetic fancy is given free reign to invent every kind of example that could appeal to men's minds. Finally there are the mysterious and magniloquent writings, filled with allegories and allusions, of mystical and gnostic heretics. The first is a trap, the second a bait, the third a riddle, and all mislead. The remedy lies in the study of the Bible and of Nature. The Scriptures reveal the will of God, Nature reveals the power of God. Bible reading and natural philosophy are the cures respectively for superstition and atheism. The Bible and Nature are God's two books.

These brief meditations, I am well aware, could easily appear nothing more than a jejune and perfunctory set of typical seventeenth century commonplaces. But that, I am sure would be to mistake



their significance. Bacon shared with his age the predilection for the Bible as the true guide to religion and morality. But his conviction of the necessity and desirability of a scientific and technological revolution was peculiar to himself and the special purpose of the meditations was to supply a Biblical inspiration and justification for this revolution. It would be easy, even tempting, to dismiss this as a mere policy; to imagine that Bacon did not genuinely owe any of the inspiration which prompted his reform to Biblical sources, but pretended to do so in order to win acceptance for his proposals. Is this the truth? Let us consider the facts.

That the sciences current in his own day had come down from the Greeks Bacon knew and acknowledged. His complaint was that while intellectually brilliant and beautifully articulated in their logical structure they were practically useless. Fertile in arguments, barren of arts. Beneath this strange paradox he detected an attitude to nature, and a relation between man and nature, which he could not accept. Such arts as were known to the Greeks were regarded by them as imitations of nature. All that man could do, or ever expect to do, was to learn some of nature's tricks and copy them, with perhaps slight modifications and adjustments to suit himself. A radical transformation of nature was out of the question. But Bacon saw things differently. He aimed, in his own words, "to shake nature in her foundations", and the justification for this ambition he found in the Bible. God, who created nature, made man in his own image. Man must therefore also be a creator. Not a child of nature but a lord of nature. And this, precisely, was what God, according to the Scriptures, had designed man to be. He was to exercise dominion over nature. True, this could only be done by studying nature. To conquer nature one must obey her. But that need not mean that man's ambitions must be limited to reproducing nature's works. The essential character of an artificial thing is that it is not natural. It is something that could not have existed without the art and agency of man. The history of the mechanical arts, limited as their achievement has been, has yet shown that man can create something that would not have existed without him. This is the process that must be carried forward. If man is to solve his problems of poverty and disease it can only be by the creation of new arts. Not merely improved arts, but radically new arts, examples of which, though they be too few, yet exist in history. Over the mantlepiece in his father's home Francis Bacon read the words in which Lucretius describes the transition from a food-gathering to a food-producing stage. "In days of old Athens, of glorious memory, spread among the hungry tribes of men knowledge of grain-bearing crops and thereby fashioned for them a new life." What was to prevent the industrial revolution, the evidence of which was every-

where to be observed in Francis Bacon's England, from effecting a similar revolution in the life of the modern world? Was this not what God had promised Adam when he promised him dominion over the rest of creation? That Bacon believed so I cannot doubt, and for this reason, from 1603 to 1620, when he drafted and re-drafted his statement of his plan, the approved title was always *The Great Instauration of the Dominion of Man over the Universe*.

But why had the Greeks with all their brilliance failed? Why did it seem hopeless to expect that the modern world, so long as it was content to follow in the footsteps of the Greeks, could ever escape the same futility? This question also the Bible answered. The failure was a moral one—intellectual pride. Through intellectual pride philosophy had failed in two ways. Lacking the patience and humility to piece together the image of the universe by faithful study of Nature, one of God's books, philosophers, both ancient Greek and modern Italian make empty logical constructions which are but superficial pictures of reality. With these, men find it possible to remain satisfied, only because they ignore the lesson of the Bible, that the prime function of knowledge is to serve mankind. What more reasonable, then, than that God should smite this presumptuous and uncharitable wisdom with barrenness?

Here is the account of the matter in Bacon's own words: "Without doubt we are paying for the sin of our first parents and imitating it. They wanted to be like Gods; we, their posterity, still more so. We create worlds. We prescribe laws to nature and lord it over her. We want to have all things as suits our fatuity, not as fits the Divine Wisdom, not as they are found in nature. We impose the seal of our image on the creatures and the works of God, we do not diligently seek to discover the seal of God on things. Therefore not undeservedly have we again fallen from our dominion over the creation; and though after the Fall of man some dominion over rebellious nature still remained—to the extent at least that it could be subdued and controlled by true and solid arts—even that we have for the most part forfeited by our pride, because we wanted to be like gods and follow the dictates of our own reason. Wherefore, if there be any humility towards the Creator, if there be any reverence and praise of his works; if there be any charity towards men, and zeal to lessen human wants and sufferings; if there be any love of truth in natural things, any hatred of darkness, any desire to purify the understanding; men are to be entreated again and again that they should dismiss for a while or at least put aside those inconstant and preposterous philosophies which prefer these to hypotheses, have led experience captive, and triumphed over the works of God; that they should humbly and with a certain reverence draw near to the book of Creation; that there they should make a stay, that

on it they should meditate, and that then washed and clean they should in chastity and integrity turn them from opinion. This is that speech and language which has gone out to all the ends of the earth, and has not suffered the confusion of Babel; this must men learn, and, resuming their youth, they must become as little children and deign to take its alphabet into their hands." (*History of the Winds*, 1623.)

This extraordinary burst of eloquence, which has suffered at my hands in being translated from its original Latin, was written in 1623, when Bacon was sixty-two years of age, after his disgrace and fall from power, when he was trying to crowd into the remaining years of his life the scientific labours which he had neglected during his years of political servitude. He had already written his Last Will and Testament in which he bequeathed his soul to God above, his body to be buried obscurely, and his name to the next ages and foreign nations. Twenty-seven strenuous years had gone by since he had composed his *Sacred Meditations*, but the thoughts remain the same. Only the conviction is stronger, the vision clearer, the accents more prophetic. Finally, and this is the point at which I am trying to arrive, the ideal of science here presented is unlike anything derived from the Greek tradition. It is less metaphysical, less ideal, less logical, less intellectual. It is more religious, more practical, more experimental, more ethical. It is not pure science, but science understood as a means of worshipping God and serving mankind. Or to put the matter in another way, it is a development of Biblical thought and not of Greek. It is, not merely in expression but in substance, Christian, and post-Reformation Christian at that. And it is this the neglect of this character of Bacon's thought that has made the accounts of his contribution given by historians of science so unsatisfactory. The usual fate of historians when faced with the problem of Bacon's place in the history of science is to find themselves reduced to the conclusion that he really contributed nothing except his eloquence. In fact he contributed a new conception of the rôle of science which has been, and still may be, of great consequence for mankind.

It is a curious reflection that when we utter the word ATHENS it is for us a symbol of the past whereas the word JERUSALEM is a symbol of the future. We look back to the Glory that was Greece, but we think of building Jerusalem. Athens is a memory Jerusalem an aspiration. Out of compliment to Athens we go to school in academies or lyceums, but who could imagine a popular gathering singing about building Athens in England's green and pleasant land? The origin of this distinction lies far back in time. But with the rise of vernacular translations of the Bible it began to be of fundamental importance for the culture of the English people; and from the time of Colet onward the resentment at Aristotle's being allowed to usurp the

seat of St. Paul became more and more vocal. To this mounting tide of feeling Francis Bacon gave a new twist. It had been a theological issue for some generations, though not for that reason devoid of significance for the growth of the national character. Bacon extended it to cover the whole field of learning, insisting that what St. Paul called "science falsely so called" was not merely an obstacle to the religious life of the nation, but an effectual bar to her material progress as well.

"This philosophy," he writes, with regard to the Greek tradition as still taught in the universities in his day, "this philosophy, if it be carefully examined, will be found to advance certain points of view which are deliberately designed to cripple enterprise. . . . The effect and intention of these arguments is to convince men that nothing really great, nothing by which nature can be commanded and subdued, is to be expected from human art and human labour. Such teachings, if they be justly appraised, will be found to tend to nothing less than a wicked effort to curtail human power over nature and to produce a deliberate and artificial despair. This despair in its turn confounds the promptings of hope, cuts the springs and sinews of industry, and makes men unwilling to put anything to the hazard of trial." These, which were not idle words but words born of much bitter experience, were first penned in *Thoughts and Conclusions* in 1607, repeated in the *Novum Organum* in 1620, and began to have effect with the foundation of the Royal Society. In the context of Bacon's writings they were a manifesto in favour of the industrial expansion of England, with Greek philosophy appearing in the rôle of the villain and the Bible in the rôle of liberator. Thus it was that Bacon did not, could not, choose the Academy or the Lyceum as his symbol when he sought to liquidate poverty in England by the application of science to industry. If England was to be transformed into Bensalem it could only be under the auspices of Solomon's House.

I have already referred to the Sacred Meditation on three kinds of imposture in writing. It was a warning against Scholasticism, that is against letting the quibbling Aristotelian logic of the Schools usurp the spirituality of St. Paul. It was a warning against the element of pious fable in church history and in the lives of the saints. It was a warning against mystical works like the *Celestial Hierarchy* of the pseudo-Dionysius. If it means little to us, that is because the three types of literature here condemned, went rapidly out of favour. In the fifty or sixty years after 1600 England passed from a mainly medieval to a mainly modern outlook on the world, the two chief agents in the change being the two causes championed by Bacon—the Bible and the new philosophy of nature.

But apart from the literature of imposture countenanced by the Church and indeed fostered by it and nurtured in its bosom, there

were two other contemporary types of imposture against which a genuine philosophy of nature had to wage victorious struggle if it were to prevail. These were alchemy and magic. Both these powerful movements had roots going far back into pagan antiquity, and, what is more they had, in Bacon's view, certain claims to consideration which the Church lacked. The Church, in its pre-occupation with the affairs of the next world, had neglected the affairs of this. Not so the magicians and the alchemists. They had kept alive a dream, expelled from the bosom of the church, that it might be possible to make some other use of a knowledge of nature than St. Augustine allowed. For St. Augustine the justification of natural philosophy was that it might be of help for the understanding of the Bible. Francis Bacon had sharply departed from him on this point, advancing instead his view that God was the author of two books, not one; and that while the Bible was indispensable for the knowledge of God's will, it was from God's other book, Nature, that we could learn to understand his power. In this stand Bacon was much closer to the alchemists and the magicians than to the orthodox view, for they had always kept alive the dream that it might be possible, by acquiring knowledge of Nature, to effect great and dramatic alterations in man's state.

Historically speaking it would be true to say that alchemy and magic had drained off from the tradition of Greek science those elements in it which aimed at controlling nature, leaving to the orthodox tradition the barren satisfaction of contemplation. In short the alchemists and magicians kept alive the concept of knowledge as power, and Bacon did no more than borrow it from them. Hence the many traces of alchemical and magical thought in Bacon's writings, which make him in a certain sense the heir of his thirteenth century name-sake Roger, who had struggled in his own day to have the concept of knowledge as power openly accepted and approved by the church.

Nevertheless Bacon was throughout his whole life the sworn foe of the alchemists and magicians. And again his condemnation of them is more than intellectual. When he keeps speaking throughout his writings of his method of science as being chaste, holy, legitimate and so forth, the explanation of this somewhat surprising terminology is his detestation of the moral and spiritual atmosphere which hung about the practice of these two professions. He condemned them because, though they believed in knowledge as power they did not set before them the great public goal of the relief of man's estate. Instead they sought possession of certain secret processes which would put power into their own hands. He condemned them because they made a mystery of their procedures and because their writings were deliberately enigmatic and obscure. He condemned them because of their pretence that the kind of knowledge they sought could only be attained

by a limited number of persons who happened to be endowed with more than natural powers. He condemned them because, working under these conditions, their results were in fact meagre, while their boasts were as magnificent as they were unjustified.

Looking at his achievement from the strictly scientific point of view some of the more perceptive of the modern historians, Zilsel and Needham, for instance, agree in recognising Bacon as "the first writer in the history of mankind to realise fully the basic importance of modern scientific research for the advancement of human civilisation." This is true and finely said. But it is necessary also to insist that his greatness lies, not in the inductive process he made an abortive attempt to describe in his *Novum Organum*, but in his conception of the true goal of science, the spirit in which it must be undertaken, and the manner in which it must be organised. Its goal must be, at least until this object has been attained, the relief of man's estate. The spirit in which it is pursued must be humble, sincere, unpretentious. The organisation must be public, democratic, co-operative.

It was characteristic of the England of the seventeenth century that in one department after another of life and thought the ecclesiastical gave place to the secular. In descriptions of this process the terminology preferred is often to say that the religious gave place to the secular. This is unfortunate. Religion is not much good unless it is as closely identified with the secular as two faces of a coin. Jerusalem is no good unless we try to build it in England's green and pleasant land. For this reason I have found it impossible to give a full account of what Bacon was after without including it in the history of religion as well as in the history of science. Of course some of his opinions about the Bible are as out of date as are so many of his explanations of natural phenomena, his astronomy, cosmology, anthropology, or what not. But if the true description of any religion is to be found not simply in its starting point but in its history, then Baconianism is a chapter in the history of Christianity. And, while its scientific significance is obvious, it has also an inescapable religious significance. Bacon called the fulfilment of his programme his "only earthly wish" thereby keeping the door open for the conviction, which he certainly held, that there is more to us than what is seen to happen between the cradle and the grave. Furthermore, like so many modern scientists, he found it impossible to derive the moral ideals he served from the natural science he was trying to create. He therefore accepted the law of love as a revelation, a mystery beyond the reach of human reason. In short, he was, as his private secretary asserts, and as his friendships and his writings proclaim, a religious man. What I have tried to do is show how his Christianity is knit into the very substance of his philosophy, and I would venture to suggest that it is one of the most original and fruitful developments



of Christianity of which we have any record. It is also, to my way of thinking, so wise and so tolerant, so set to avoid theological disputes and be judged only by its fruits, that it can, does, and will continue to enter into that slow spiritual process by which the human race, if it survives, will evolve for itself—what does not yet exist—a genuine world religion. The goal of such a religion might well be described in Spedding's phrase—"Our world as it might be made if we did our duty by it." Bacon is generally misjudged as one concerned only with the know-how of this process—that is as a scientist. But he was at least as much concerned to reveal it as a duty. This lies outside the purview of science and gives his thought its religious character.

(Reprinted from *Baconiana* 165)

## THE FIRST SACRIFICE

by Joan Ham

Bacon's chaplain Dr. Rawley, states in his *Life of the Right Honourable Francis Bacon* "that he was born in York-house or York-place in the Strand, on the 22nd Day of January; in the year of our Lord 1560". This tells us quite definitely *when* he was born, but what does Rawley mean by York-house or York-place. Was the Lord Keeper's residence known by alternative names? Was Rawley not sure where his employer was born? Was he simply inaccurate?

We know that R. Agas' *Plan of London* circa 1560 to 1570 does label the property "Yorke Pl.", but it was customary to refer to the Lord Keeper's official residence as York House. The *Survey of London* published by the L.C.C. in 1937, states in chapter 5, that the property became York House when granted to the Archbishop of York in 1556, and Sir Nicholas Bacon himself, left his "interesse in *Yorke House*" to his wife. As a lawyer writing his last Will and Testament, he would surely have been precise as to what property he was thus bequeathing. William Rawley was another man far too exact and meticulous to name his employer's birthplace (a most important detail in a biography!) in an equivocal manner, Yorke-house or Yorke-place. He was especially exact when dealing with Francis Bacon, as one example will demonstrate.

Rawley was entrusted with the posthumous publication of Bacon's papers, and fulfilled his task slowly and with great precision. In 1638, the publisher Humphrey Moseley put out an English translation of Bacon's *History of Life and Death* which Bacon had written in Latin, and had published first in that tongue in 1623. *In the self-same year* (1638), printed by John Haviland for William Lee and Humphrey Moseley, another English edition appeared in Humphrey Moseley's bookshop at Prince's Arms in Paul's Churchyard, and clearly stated on the title-page, written in Latine by the Right Honourable Francis, Lo. Verulam. . . . The address to the Reader is a clap of thunder from William Rawley, pointing out that there "came forth of late, a translation of this Booke, by an unknowne PERSON; . . .". Rawley explains that this person knew nothing of his Lordship's style and manner of expression, and he casts scorn on his efforts. To remedy the wrong, Rawley has had the book translated anew by "a diligent and zealous pen".

Rawley then, was not inaccurate. The two names belong to two

different houses. York House was the London home of the Lord Keeper of the Great Seal. York Place was the royal palace. The witness who testified to that fact was the author Shake-speare.

You must no more call it *York-place*, thats past  
For since the Cardinall fell, that titles lost,  
Tis now the *Kings*, and called White-Hall.

*Henry VIII.*

This little scene is of no importance to the action, which is a description of Anne Boleyn's coronation. Moreover, the change of name, if it took place after the fall of Cardinal Wolsey, occurred in 1529—more than 80 years before the play was written. Henry VIII had deliberately obliterated all reference to the Archbishop of York's ownership when changing the name to Whitehall. Why revive such an out-of-date and trivial incident? We are left with the idea that Rawley did not *know* with certainty (or wish to publish definitely) which of the two houses was Bacon's birthplace.

Let us turn our attention to the Queen's activities and events which are a matter of historical record around this critical time. The succession was to prove a touchy subject throughout the Queen's long reign, but in the year 1559, an Act of Parliament spoke of "heirs of your body *lawfully to be begotten*". The Queen had been on her throne just a year. She was a young woman; there was no Royal consort, and the Act was a rational provision for a foreseeable future.

In 1571, twelve years later, Parliament was anxious to discuss and settle the vexed question of the succession, which was not now as predictable; it was warned in no uncertain manner, not to *meddle* with other than matters propounded to it! The succession was *not* one of those matters. By the following year, Elizabeth was directing her parliament to nominate the *natural* issue of her body as successor! The "Virgin Queen" was 38 years old, and unmarried! This, however, is advancing further into the future.

When Queen Elizabeth mounted her throne, she had an inseparable friend in the person of Robert Dudley. He was advanced with great and inexplicable rapidity. Rumours bred thick and fast, but those we shall consider later. In September, 1560, Dudley's wife died in such suspicious circumstances that Dudley found it almost impossible to clear himself. Throckmorton wrote to Cecil that; "I know not where to turn me, nor what countenance to bear". Mary Stuart wrote to Elizabeth;

*qu'un, auquel elle disoit que vous aviez fait promesse de mariage devant une dame de vostre chambre, avoit couché infinies foyz avecques vous avec toute la licence et privaulté, que se peut user entre marie et femme.*

In a coarser vein, the Cecil papers at Hatfield House record that when a certain John Whyte was examined, he claimed that Thomas Burley; "known by the name of the drunken Burley, hadde said to hym in his own howse that the Lord Robert Dudley dyd swive the Quene, etc." The paper is endorsed by Cecil and dated "Februar 1560." *In vino veritas?* Cecil was most unhappy around this time, because of the situation between Elizabeth and Dudley, and wished himself out of office and the coming storm which he foresaw. In his anxiety, he spoke to de Quadra, mentioning a plan to kill Amy Robsart which had come to his knowledge. Even the Queen seems to have lost her hard-won caution, and told the Ambassador that "Lord Robert's wife was dead, or nearly so,"<sup>1</sup> begging him to say nothing of it!

Elizabeth and Dudley made little secret of their attachment, once Amy Robsart was dead . . . and in January 1560-61 it was reported that she was formally betrothed to him, and that she had secretly married him in Lord Pembroke's house, and was "a mother already". During the same January Sir Henry Sidney asked the Spanish Ambassador whether he would help with the marriage if Dudley undertook to restore the Roman Catholic religion in England. In February, Elizabeth and Dudley talked to de Quadra openly about it, and in April, Dudley accepted the Ambassador's terms.

Was there a secret marriage? Could there have been such a ceremony? The precedents are there for anyone to see.

Edward IV, Elizabeth's great-grandfather, had secretly married Elizabeth Woodville; for months, no one outside the lady's close family knew of it. Even Edward's brothers and leading noblemen were kept in ignorance. She was a most unsuitable match and very unpopular with Edward's powerful nobles, as he had known would be the case.

Henry VIII had married Elizabeth's own mother, Anne Boleyn, in a secret ceremony attended by only two witnesses. Again it was highly unpopular, and in the eyes of many Englishmen, bigamous. The marriage was only announced publicly when Anne's pregnancy became advanced.

In 1562, Elizabeth became seriously ill and thought herself to be dying. She nominated Dudley Protector of the realm. Protector for whom? The last Protector (Somerset) had been appointed because Edward VI, Elizabeth's step-brother, was a minor. In the following year, Robert Brook of Devizes was sent to prison for publishing rumours that the Queen had had children by Dudley. He was not the only person to be punished for such an offence.

In 1588, a young man calling himself Arthur Dudley arrived in Madrid. He claimed to have been born in 1562, and that his parents

<sup>1</sup> Bp. de Quadra to Duchess of Parma. 11th September 1560.

were the Queen and Dudley. Philip II received him and paid him a pension.

It was difficult to stop men writing down their suspicions and beliefs with regard to the Queen's state, and after her death the dammed-up flood of material came from the presses. In 1586, William Warner published *Albion's England, a continued History of the same Kingdom. . . .* The book passed through nine editions, until in 1612 a posthumous edition was released. It contained the new information;

Hence Englands Heires-appearant have of Wales bin Princes, till  
Our Queene deceast concealed her Heire, I wot not for what skill!

John Taylor, the water poet, published his *Workes* in 1630, which included "A memoriall of all the English Monarchs . . . from Brute to King Charles." There are woodcuts of each sovereign, and from the Norman Conquest onwards there is a page dedicated to each monarch's exploits and times. On page 319, the heading is, "ELIZABETH, QVEFNE (*sic*) of ENGLAND . . . etc.

There is a short verse, ending with the line;

I liv'd and dyed a Queene, a Maid, a Matron.

The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines a *matron* (Latin *matrona, matrem, mater*, mother) as a married woman, or a married woman considered as having expert knowledge in matters of pregnancy, etc.

At the end of the Play of *Henry VIII*, the author sings the praises of Elizabeth, under the guise of Cranmer's prophecy. He speaks of the "Mayden Phoenix" creating a new heir from her ashes. This is perfectly good stuff, classical in its allusions. A few lines later, Cranmer repeats his allusion, but with a small, significant, difference.

One . . . who from the sacred Ashes of her Honour  
Shall star-like rise, . . .

The phoenix of tradition immolated itself on a pyre, and from those ashes a new phoenix arose; but in the later lines, the poet speaks of the "Ashes of her Honour", not the ashes of her body. If a lady's honour goes up in flames, she has done something dishonourable. Out of this lady's dishonour, says the poet, her heir will appear.

The sober and practical Dr. Rawley says in his *Life*:

"It may seem, the Moon had some principal Place, in the figure of his (Bacon's) Nativity. For the Moon was never in her Passion or Eclipsed, but he was surprized with a sudden fit of Fainting." It is neither fanciful nor far-fetched to point out that Queen Elizabeth was constantly compared and equated with the moon, or with Diana whose emblem the moon was. It is also a known fact, that Bacon suffered

an infirmity which made him ill at times of stress during his life—the Queen in a passion could make anyone quake!

Shakespeare's sonnet 107 has these lines;

Not mine owne feares, nor the prophetick soule,  
Of the wide world, dreaming on things to come,  
Can yet the lease of my true love controule,  
Supposde as forfeit to a confin'd doome.  
The mortal Moone hath her eclipse indur'de,  
And the sad Augurs mock their owne presage . . . ,

Many scholars assert that this "mortal moon" is Queen Elizabeth, and that the line refers to her death.

In 1631, Bacon's *Sylva Sylvarum* was published in Paris. Prefixed to this French edition was a discourse on the life of Francis Bacon by Pierre Amboise, Sieur de la Magdelaine. Several extracts from this "life" are worthy of note.

Bacon was in duty bound to imitate the virtues . . . of several other ancestors of his who have left so many marks of their greatness in History that honour and dignity seem to have been at all times the lot of his family. And he could certainly not be reproached with adding less than his predecessors to the splendour of his race.

Sir Nicholas Bacon, for all his high office and learning was a simple knight, grown rich on confiscated monastery property. His younger brother was "in trade" in London. His father had been a yeoman farmer. The yeomanry of England was certainly the nation's centuries old backbone, but would anyone seriously suggest that it left "many marks of their greatness in History that honour and dignity seem to have been at all times the lot" of a yeoman's family and its ancestors? Sweat and honest toil, possibly, but *honour and dignity*? No, these applied to higher stations in life. What great man of the name of Bacon left his mark on the course of history prior to the 16th century (leaving aside the monk, Roger Bacon!)? Pierre Amboise continues;

Since he was born in the purple and nourished in the hope of a high destiny . . .

Is even the son of the Lord Keeper fairly described as "born in the purple"? Amboise becomes more definite;

And as he saw himself destined to hold one day in his hands the helm of the Kingdom

(This is a description, surely, of the heir to the throne.)

. . . he shrewdly heeded the laws and customs of the countries he visited, noticing the various forms of government, the advantages





ATTRIBUTED TO NICHOLAS HILLIARD

A Queen and her son; a drawing attributed to  
Nicholas Hilliard (1547-1619)

*(With acknowledgements to The British Museum)*



Miniature of Queen Elizabeth I, by Nicholas Hilliard  
*(By kind permission of the Victoria and Albert Museum)*





Miniature of Francis Bacon at the age of 18, by Nicholas Hilliard



and drawbacks of each state and all the other things that can make a man capable of governing peoples.

This is the apprenticeship of a King-to-be.

There are specific documents which add support to the idea that Bacon was of Royal birth. These were found in Northumberland House, and were transcripts of some papers belonging to Francis Bacon. They are thought to have been put into boxes where they were found after 1780 by Dr. Percy, domestic chaplain, before leaving to take up his appointment as Bishop of Dromore; and had remained undisturbed until 1867, when the then Duke of Northumberland commissioned Mr. John Bruce to examine and report on his MSS. The Bacon transcripts were then discovered. They formed an unbound volume, and it was the outer cover which particularly interested Mr. Bruce, with all the scribbles on it, including the words:

Mr ffrancis Bacon your sovereign

Part of the contents was pages from a piece known as *Leycester's Commonwealth*. This was published secretly on the Continent in 1584 and smuggled into England. Such were the accusations and crimes laid at Leicester's door in the book, that it was officially seized and destroyed whenever possible. A few extracts will suffice for examples.

First by seeking openlie to marrie w<sup>th</sup> y<sup>e</sup> Queenes Matie her selfe and so draw y<sup>e</sup> crowne upon his owne heade, & to his posteritie. Secondlie, when y<sup>t</sup> attempt took not place, then he gave it out, as hath ben showed before, y<sup>t</sup> he was privilie contracted to her Matie then he might have entituled any one of his owne broode (whereof he hath stoor in manie places as is knowen) to y<sup>e</sup> lawful succession of y<sup>e</sup> crowne . . .

. . . he had a new fetch to strengthen ye matter & y<sup>t</sup> was to cause y<sup>e</sup> words of Natural issue to be put into ye statute of succession for ye Crowne, against all order & custom of our Realme, and against ye known commō stile of law . . .

A further discussion along these lines is annotated in the margin,

The statute of concealing the heire apparant

It was reported that an account of Queen Elizabeth's confinement was found among the archives at Windsor. This was given to Queen Victoria who promptly burnt it, saying that it was Queen Elizabeth's private affair! . . .

Francis Bacon was the supposed younger son of Sir Nicholas Bacon and Lady Anne Bacon. He was the only one of Sir Nicholas' sons of two marriages *not* provided for in his "father's" will, although as Bacon

himself says, he had his love in abundance. Lady Bacon wrote to Anthony, her firstborn, when Francis was desperately trying to raise money on a small estate, called Markes, and Lady Anne was helping with sermons on his way of life rather than practical aid;

... I am sure he [Francis] must understand, was not to use him as a ward—a remote phrase to my plain motherly meaning

Letter from Lady Anne to Anthony Bacon; April 18th, 1593.

In 1679, some of the smaller pieces and fragments of Bacon's writings were published together in a book entitled, *Baconiana, or Certaine Genuine Remains*. . . . The publisher, Thomas, Archbishop Tenison wrote an introductory discourse giving an account of all Bacon's works and some biographical details. This included the strange passage,

The cause of his suffering is to some a secret. I leave them to find it out, by his words to King James. I wish (said he) that as I am the first, so I may be the last of sacrifices in your Times.

Those words were uttered in 1620-21 in an interview with the King. It was then becoming obvious that parliament was going to demand a scapegoat for certain abuses. The King knew that this must be his favourite, Buckingham, or his Chancellor Bacon. Bacon was ordered by the King to submit himself entirely to the Lords, and to abandon his defence. As he left the King's presence, sadly bowing to the royal will, Bacon said "Those who aim at your Chancellor, will strike at your Crown", and continued with the words already quoted about the last sacrifice. That part is plain enough, but how was he the *first* sacrifice? Under King James, he had risen from the obscurity imposed upon him by Elizabeth, to the position of Lord Chancellor, but before examining this point, let us look at a letter which Bacon wrote to James "upon his first coming in" in the year 1603. The letter offers James his services, and ends;

"But to sacrifice himself a Burnt Offering or Holocaust to your Majesties service: Amongst which number no Mans Fire, shall be more pure and fervent than mine." He also speaks earlier in the letter of "making Oblation of himself to his Majesty".

Oblation means offering in a sacred sense, a sacrifice.

But in 1603, Bacon was a free man under no danger or threat of prison. He had every reason to hope for preferment under James. How then could he think of himself as a sacrifice before the King had even set foot in his capital, or taken up the reins of office? Knowing himself the true heir to the throne whom Elizabeth with her last gasp had failed to acknowledge, he knew that the very fact that James was

the unopposed King made him a sacrifice to the cause of peace. James must also have known this perfectly well.

When writing to the Attorney-General towards the end of Bacon's life, ordering (at last) his complete pardon, James wrote;

Trusty and well-beloved, we greet you well: whereas our right trusty and right well-beloved *cousin*, the Viscount of St. Alban, under sentence given . . ., etc.

In 1618, James re-visited his native Scotland. He left a regent in England with wide powers—not one of the ancient nobility, or the Earl Marshal, but Francis Bacon. Although he favoured and advanced Bacon, it was not until the 45-year-old lawyer married an unknown 14 year-old daughter of a citizen, Alice Barnham, that his upward progress was set in motion. Even a simple knighthood was not conferred on Bacon until just before the wedding. Bacon especially asked that this be conferred in a private ceremony. The marriage was one of convenience, which announced to James as completely as anything could, that Bacon finally abandoned any pretensions to the throne. Was it a last defiant gesture for the bridegroom to dress himself in brand-new royal purple from head to foot? It certainly caused comment among his friends!

During the whole of Bacon's life, the coat-of-arms which he used was Sir Nicholas Bacon's, differenced with the cadency mark of a crescent, denoting the second son. As this was Sir *Nicholas'* difference, Francis should have charged this crescent with an annulet, as the fifth son of Sir Nicholas, but he did not do so. Engravings of Bacon prefixed to his books, usually show him wearing a broad ribbon around his neck. In books published before his death, whatever hangs upon this ribbon is deliberately obscured by his hand, or by a paper held in his hand. In 1640, the first English edition of the *Advancement of Learning* showed a full-length portrait with the medal on the ribbon clearly visible. Bacon is wearing the Lesser George, an insignia of the Order of the Garter. This has been confirmed for me by the College of Arms (Somerset Herald). I have also been assured by Somerset Herald that Bacon was *not* a knight of the Garter, or of any other order. Other contemporary portraits show Knights of the Garter, Leicester, Essex, etc., wearing their Lesser Georges in exactly the same way! Since the institution of the Order of the Garter in the time of King Edward III, *every* Prince of Wales and even female heirs such as Mary and Elizabeth had been K.G.s and blazoned the Garter with their Arms.

I have heard suggestions (as usual when such problems arise!) that William Marshall, who engraved the portrait, was simply careless and did not know enough about heraldry; that he *assumed* Bacon to have



been a K.G. William Marshall, however, knew enough about the subject to show the Arms of a younger son of Sir Nicholas Bacon, and to display them as a hatchment instead of a shield, signifying that the owner was deceased. Was Bacon allowed his rightful Order of the Garter, as the true Prince of Wales, and the records suppressed, as with his royal status? Does this explain the private ceremony which he asked for? Was this the reason why he never applied for his own Arms when created a peer? If he was entitled to the royal quarterings, what other arms would have had validity for him?

In 1592, Morgan Colman, secretary to the then Lord Keeper, drew up for Francis Bacon a Royal Genealogy. It traces the descent from the Saxon Kings to Elizabeth. After several blank *numbered* pages following the page devoted to Queen Elizabeth, Bacon's Arms are drawn on a separate page. They are drawn in a very unusual manner—the shield is almost enfolded in a very large cloak hanging from the torse (the twisted wreath bearing the boar crest). The normal manner of displaying arms is to have mantling flowing from the torse. This takes the form of very decorative twisted slashed and dagged ribbon-like bands which frame the shield or sometimes just the top around the crest. Bacon's coat-of-arms are almost wrapped in a cloak—suggesting something to be hidden? They are drawn at the end of a royal genealogy, but not connected by descent lines to it, and they are "cloaked" in mystery.

There is a collection of sixty-four ivory miniatures in a museum in Czechoslovakia (Bohemia in the 16th century). Most of them are portraits of important people concerned with the 30 Years' War on the Continent, and are executed to form matching pairs, e.g. the Duke and Duchess of Parma. These and two others are the largest and finest of the whole collection of 17thc. works. The other large pair are portraits of Queen Elizabeth and Francis Bacon. Why did the artist, or the collector who commissioned the work, decide that they were a matching pair? Why not Leicester, or Burleigh, or any other well-known statesman or courtier? Bacon did not even hold office under Elizabeth.

Bacon once wrote to Hatton, that "as statues and pictures are dumb histories, so histories are speaking pictures". In the British Museum are two volumes, entitled *A catalogue of British Drawings*. One of these drawings speaks volumes to us. It is known simply as "A Queen and her son", and by virtue of the initials NH in one corner, is attributed to Nicholas Hilliard, who lived from 1547-1619. The subject of this pen-and-ink drawing is best described by the *catalogue*:

A Queen & her son.

Wearing the costume of about 1610-1615 . . . lace closed standing bands and a circular French farthingale. Before her, standing on

a footstool, her son, wearing a diadem on his head, and doublet patterned with Tudor roses, petticoats and apron, and holding in his left hand an orb and in his right a sceptre tipped with a fleur-de-lis, which he receives from his mother. In an architectural setting (unfinished) . . . with part of a sarcophagus.

It is suggested in the British Museum inventory of 1837 that the picture is of Mary, Queen of Scots, passing her sceptre to her son James, but almost all of Mary's known pictures show her in the costume of the period in which she lived. The costume drawn by Hilliard is of much later date.

Another suggestion is that the lady is Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia (daughter of James) with her small son Frederick Henry, born in 1614. The sarcophagus, it is claimed, might be that of her elder brother, Prince Henry, who died in 1613.

I reject these tentative suggestions, for reasons explained below, but first let us concentrate on the artist, Nicholas Hilliard. In the year 1615—a date suggested by the costume—he would have been 68 years old, a goodly age for those days. There is no record that he ever left the country after Queen Elizabeth's death in 1603, or that Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia ever re-visited England after her marriage in 1613 to Frederick, Prince Elector Palatine, until long after Hilliard's death. Any picture which Nicholas Hilliard may have drawn of her and her son must, *per se*, have been purely imaginary.

In the year 1606, Hilliard wrote to Cecil applying for the commission to have the "trimming" of Queen Elizabeth's tomb. Is it possible that some of his ideas for this are sketched in the drawing? The child in the picture wears a diadem and a doublet patterned with Tudor roses, but the Tudors died out in 1603 with Elizabeth. Elizabeth Queen of Bohemia, was a Stuart princess, wife to a German prince.

Again, she is handing her son a sceptre; he already has an orb in his hand. Elizabeth did not become Queen of Bohemia until 1619. Her husband was crowned after a revolution, not as an automatic inheritor: Frederick Henry would then have been five years old. By 1620 they had lost their throne again and were homeless exiles, but Hilliard would have known nothing of any of it, because he was dead. What sceptre did he imagine was handed to the child in his picture? In 1615, Elizabeth was not Queen of anywhere.

In view of the extremely tentative nature of the British Museum's suggestions, I am going to advance an idea which fits many facts.

The Queen in the picture is Queen Elizabeth of England, shown with her son. Hilliard drew it after her death—it would have been fairly safe by then, and as it is merely a drawing and not a finished portrait, was probably not intended to go outside his private papers. The sarcophagus is the beginning of Elizabeth's tomb, which Hilliard wished

to design. He was appointed "limner and goldsmith" to the Queen at an early date—his earliest portrait of her was executed in the 1560s, and he painted her many, many times. Comparison of his pictures of Elizabeth with the drawing shows identical features (*cf.* especially V. & A. 79). He also painted a miniature of Francis Bacon at 18 years of age. He was about the Court on his business sufficiently to hear whispers and pick up gossip.

There is a famous portrait of the Queen at Hatfield House, home of the Cecils, known as the "Rainbow Portrait".\* Elizabeth is shown as Iris, wrapped in a cloak decorated with the eyes and ears of Fame. The portrait is crammed with symbolic details, suggesting Virginity, Royalty etc. An inscription on the picture in Latin translates as "No rainbow without sun" (suggesting the pun, No Règne Beau without son). Although the picture belongs to the period 1600, the Queen is drawn as a beautiful young woman—identical to the drawing by Hilliard. It is not known for certain who painted this portrait, but among more recent thoughts have been the name of Isaac Oliver (a pupil later a rival of Hilliard). It is also said that the Queen's face in the Rainbow Portrait is based on Hilliard's stock representation of her features.

The orb and sceptre in the child's hands are very like the ones held by Elizabeth in the obverse design for the Queen's Great Seal of Ireland—designed by Nicholas Hilliard around 1584. The Tudor rose is a feature of the seal.

A cast-iron case surely emerges to verify Bacon's royal parentage, when the historical and pictorial evidence above is added to cipher discoveries published so often in these pages, all asserting that Queen Elizabeth was the real mother of Francis Bacon.

#### ADDENDUM

*Bishop de Quadra to the King. August 4th. 1560*

... [The Queen's] affairs, however, are in such a condicion that if she do not marry and behave herself better than hitherto, she will everyday find herself in new and greater troubles.

*Bp. de Quadra to Duchess of Parma 11 Sept. 1560*

... [The Queen] promised me an answer about the marriage [with the Archduke] by the third instant, and said she was certain to marry, but now she coolly tells me she cannot make up her mind and will not marry. After this I had an opportunity of talking to Cecil, who I understand was in disgrace, and Robert was trying to turn him out of his place. After exacting many pledges of strict secrecy, he said the

\* See Frontispiece.

Queen was conducting herself in such a way that he thought of retiring. He said it was a bad sailor who did not enter port when he saw a storm coming on and he clearly foresaw the ruin of the realm through Robert's intimacy with the Queen, who surrendered all affairs to him and meant to marry him. He said he did not know how the country put up with it, and he should ask leave to go home, although he thought they would cast him into the Tower first. He ended by begging me in God's name to point out to the Queen the effect of her misconduct and persuade her not to abandon business entirely but to look to her realm—and then he repeated twice over to me that Lord Robert would be better in Paradise than here. . . . He ended by saying that Robert was thinking of killing his wife who was publicly announced to be ill, although she was quite well, and would take very good care they did not poison her. He said surely God would never allow such a wicked thing to be done . . . I am sure he speaks the truth and is not acting crookedly.

The next day the Queen told me as she returned from hunting that Robert's wife was dead or nearly so, and asked me not to say anything about it. Certainly this business is most shameful and scandalous, and withal I am not sure she will marry the man at once or even if she will marry at all, as I do not think she has a mind sufficiently fixed. Cecil says she wishes to do as her father did.

Their quarrels cannot injure public business, as nobody worse than Cecil can be at the head of affairs, but the outcome of it all might be the imprisonment of the Queen and the proclamation of the Earl of Huntingdon as King. He is a great heretic and the French forces might be used for him. Cecil says he is the real heir of England, and all heretics want him. . . . The cry is that they do not want any more women rulers, and this woman may find herself and her favourite in prison any morning. They would all confide in me if I mixed myself up in their affairs, but I have no orders. . . .

Since writing the above I hear that the Queen has published the death of Lord Robert's (wife) and said in Italian, "she broke her neck". She must have fallen down a staircase.

*Minute of letter from Bp. Quadra to the King 15th Oct.*

It relates to the manner in which the death of Lord Robert's wife happened, the homage immediately paid to him by the Counsellors and others and the dissimulation of the Queen. That he had read they were devising a very important plan for the maintenance of their heresies, namely, to make the Earl of Huntingdon King in case the Queen should die without issue, and that Cecil had told the Bishop that the succession belonged of right to the Earl, as he was descended from the house of York. . . .

*Bp. Quadra to the King Nov. 20 1560*

. . . the design of Cecil and the heretics is to make the Earl of Huntingdon King, and Cecil has given way to Robert, who they say was married to the Queen in the presence of his brother and two ladies of the chamber. . . .

*Bp. Quadra to the King 22 Jan 1561*

Since writing the enclosed letter, Henry Sidney, who is the brother-in-law of Lord Robert came to see me. He is a sensible man and better behaved than any of the courtiers . . . the matter was now public property, and I knew how much inclined the Queen was to the marriage. [Sidney then solicited aid at great length] . . . although it was a love affair, yet the object of it was marriage, and that there was nothing illicit about it or such as could not be set right by your Majesties authority. As regards the death of the wife, he was certain it was accidental, and he had never been able to learn otherwise, although he had enquired with great care, and knew that public opinion held contrary . . . I am certain that if she do not obtain your M. consent, she will not dare to publish the match. . . . Things have reached such a pitch that her chamberlain has left her, and Axele (Yaxley) of the Privy Chamber is in prison for having babbled, indeed there is not a man who has not some tale to tell. Cecil is he who most opposed the business, but he has given way in exchange for the offices held by Treasurer Parry who died recently of sheer grief. I must not omit to say also that the common opinion, confirmed by certain physicians, is that this woman is unhealthy and it is believed certain that she will not have children, although there is no lack of people who say that she has already had some, but of this I have seen no trace and do not believe it. . . .

*Bp. Quadra to King 13 Sept. 1561*

. . . Great suspicions are entertained of the Earl of Arundel with whom Lord Robert has had such words that the Earl went home and he and others are drawing up copies of the testimony given in the inquiry respecting the death of Lord Robert's wife. Robert is now doing his best to repair matters as it appears that more is being discovered in that affair than he wished. . . .

What is of most importance now, as I am informed, is that the Queen is becoming dropsical and has begun to swell extraordinarily. I have been advised of this from three different sources and by a person who has the opportunity of being an eye witness. To all appearances she is falling away and is extremely thin and the colour of a corpse. . . . That the Marchioness (of Northampton) and lady Cobham consider the Queen in a dangerous condition is beyond doubt. . . .

*Bp. Quadra to Duchess of Parma. Nov. 24 1561*

. . . [Swedish ambassador] had written certain things to his King upon which he was badly informed. . . . In this he had acted lightly and like a man who picked up his information in the streets . . . she is as free from any engagement to marry as the day she was born. The meaning of this is that a Frenchman called Viscount de Gruz [employed as a spy by Leicester] who was here lately as a double spy had told them that the ambassador written to his master not to come as she was already married.

\* \* \* \* \*

We print as an addendum the preceding extracts from Bishop de Quadra's correspondence *circa* the date of Amy Robsart's tragic death. Our contributor copied these from the Simancas Archives at the Public Record Office, and our President Commander Pares believes they should be reproduced for the consideration of our readers. Editor.

## ALL IS NOT GOLD THAT GLISTERS

By "JON BENSON"

(*Promus*, Folio 92, circa December, 1594)

During the last 80 years, many Baconians have believed that Francis Bacon was the son of Queen Elizabeth of England by Robert Dudley, later to become the Earl of Leicester, whom she may have married secretly soon after the deplorable death, on the 8th September, 1560, of Amy Robsart, Dudley's young wife. Francis Bacon was born four months later in January 1560, and it is important to remember that at that time the year ended on the 24th March.

The subject of Bacon's parentage has been a source of heated discussion and division, not only in the literary world generally, but also in the ranks of the Baconians: therefore it seemed essential to research the English Queen's movements in the period immediately preceding Francis Bacon's birth. It is obvious that if this secret marriage did take place, all documentary evidence would have been safely concealed or, far more likely destroyed; so we must rely on any contemporary evidence we can unearth in the way of recorded statements made by ambassadors or agents from foreign or other sources. Much of this evidence has been quoted in the past but it is believed that some of it will be new to readers. Many Baconians to-day may not have had the opportunity to read this evidence and thereby draw their own conclusions, and it was therefore thought sensible to restate the case.

The appalling barbarities of punishments in Elizabeth's reign make it obvious that the voicing of any rumours by her own countrymen of her Majesty's pregnancy out of wedlock, would have been unwise, to say the least. This, of course, would not rule out foreign rumours. It is a curious fact about England, that anything remotely critical of Royalty is invariably reported first abroad and considerably later in England. The French and American Press to-day still bear witness to this fact. Research into the evidence of foreign rumours concerning Queen Elizabeth and Dudley at this time is most revealing and these rumours first began to take shape in 1559 when, on the 18th of April of that year, Philip II of Spain received a despatch from his Ambassador to the English Court (Count Feria) containing this sentence:

Lord Robert Dudley has come much in favour that he does whatever he pleases with affairs and it is even said that her Majesty visits him in his chamber day and night.

Only rumour, of course! but there is a convenient *cliché* which says "no smoke without fire". Again the Venetian Ambassador also reported "My Lord Dudley is in very great favour and very intimate with her Majesty," and later; "She will eventually take him as her husband or none at all." Several weeks later, another despatch was sent to Spain recording increasing remarks concerning the Queen and Dudley. Some rumours went so far as to suggest that the latter was contemplating poisoning his wife Amy and, moreover, they accused Elizabeth of fobbing off public opinion by

keeping Lord Robert's enemies and the Country engaged with words until the wicked deed of killing his wife is consummated.

These were still rumours but they were contained in official reports on which the Spaniards would base their political judgements.

In 1560 gossip was rife all over the Continent and English Ambassadors abroad were desperate and at their wits' end to know how to counter it. From these various rumours one in particular persisted, that the Queen and Dudley were lovers. The Spanish Ambassador described the Queen as, "A true daughter of a wicked Mother," and went on to suggest that Robert Dudley was "intending divorce" from his wife. On the 8th September Amy Robsart died, having conveniently fallen "from a paire of staires and so to breake her necke", and, unbelievably, "without hurting of her hood that stood upon her head". It is interesting to note that the only two men who were with her at the time, died soon after the accident, one of these being "privily made away with in prison because he offered to publish the manner of the said murder". At the inquest, the jury are "believed" to have brought in a verdict of accidental death. The reason for the word "believed" is because all records of the inquest are missing from the Register; thus, this verdict is pure assumption. It is further a significant fact that all the records before and after this inquest are intact in this Register—a singular set of circumstances. Another curious thing connected with this event, was that Dudley had been issuing a fictitious string of bulletins concerning his wife's health, announcing that she was ill and finally, after a period of weeks, that she had died. Dudley was not present at her burial and does not appear to have shown much concern at the tragedy except for his own reputation with the public. The curious poem, *Leicester's Ghost*, published anonymously in 1641, described these events as follows:

This dismall hap unto my wife betide;  
 Whether yee call it chance or destiny,  
 Too true it is, she did untimely dye.  
 O had I now a showre of teares to shed  
 Lockd in the empty circles of my eyes,  
 All could I shed in mourning for the dead,



That lost a spouse so young, so faire, so wise,  
 So faire a corps so foul a coarse now lies,  
 My hope t'have married with a famous Queene  
 Drave pity back, and kept my teares unseene.

The unpleasant suggestions which circulated after Amy's death seemed to have had no effect on Elizabeth's attitude to Dudley, because she continued their intimate association more intensely than ever, so much so that "our man in Paris", Throckmorton, was driven near to desperation by the ever increasing gossip in Court circles and, in a despatch to the Queen to acquaint her with these scandalous rumours, he described the things that were being said in the following terms:

—which every hair of my head starteth at and my ears glow to hear. His secretary, one Jones, conveyed this message to the Queen and reported back that "she looked ill and harassed".

Rumours became worse and worse in England, culminating in the Spanish Ambassador's sending a report to his King openly stating that: "The Queene is expecting a childe by Dudley." By November 1560, it was rumoured that Elizabeth and Dudley had been married in the Chapel at Wilton Place, the Earl of Pembroke's residence. In January the Spanish despatch repeated this rumour of a secret marriage, adding that it was performed "before witnesses at the house of Lord Pembroke". Poor old Throckmorton in Paris by this time was so desperate that he tried to intervene. In a dispatch to Cecil, Lord Burleigh, he said:

If her Majestie do so foully forget herself in this marriage, as bruit runneth here, never thinke to bring anything to pass either here or elsewhere.

He was promptly told by Cecil "not to meddle . . . because what her Majestie will determine to do only God I thinke knoweth".

Another interesting fact, from the psychological angle, was that Elizabeth's moods at this time had become entirely unpredictable and very much in keeping with a woman in pregnancy. Another extraordinary thing was that the Queen took no interest in the Christmas revels for this year (1560) and, unlike all the previous years of her reign, failed to make her appearance. In fact, for months she never showed herself at Court, spending all her time with Robert Dudley.

But the crisis suddenly passed. In March 1561 the Earl of Bedford was able to appease the fears of the near-demented Throckmorton in a despatch which included the words, "the great matters wherof the worlde was wont to talke are now asleep". Francis Bacon had been born some weeks earlier on 22nd January. Rumours, however, continued to be voiced even in this country. For instance, Lady Willoughby claimed that

“the Queen looked very pale like one lately come out of Childebed”. Ann Dowe of Brentford was sent to prison for asserting in the previous August that the Queen was with child by Dudley. Several others were tactless enough to express their thoughts and lived to regret it, especially one Burley of Totnes, who said in public, “the Lord Robert did swive the Queene”.

It can, of course, be argued that despatches and statements by ambassadors and others were merely based on rumours and were therefore exaggerated, but the weight of so many of these significant rumours cannot be overlooked. It is therefore interesting to record what uncommitted people stated, bearing in mind the appalling risks they took if their statements were too open. One author named Warner wrote a long glowing history in verse, entitled *Albion's England*. This first appeared in 1589 and then again twenty-three years later, in 1612, the second edition being much enlarged by another chapter at the end, also in verse. In this he discusses the heirs to the throne and their connection with the principedom of Wales:

Hence England's heires-apparent have of Wales bin Princes till  
Our Queene deceast concealed her heire, I wot not for what skill.

Warner would certainly not have dared to be so outspoken when Elizabeth was still alive which is the obvious reason why this last chapter was reserved till nine years after her death in 1603, when he thought he would be reasonably safe. One of the most famous writers of the day was the learned William Camden who, as an historian, was naturally a great user of pseudonyms for safety's sake. He refers to certain laws of succession, and attempts to tamper with them by (who else?), Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester. Under one of his pseudonyms, he wrote *The Life and Death of Mary Stuart* and, on page 101 he mentioned that Leicester surreptitiously tried to insert a clause to the effect that a bastard son of his as the natural issue of the Queen, should qualify as heir to the throne. This devious act was also reported at some length in a passage in a book published in Antwerp in 1584 (*Leicesters Commonwealth*), which included a clause which the cautious Camden overlooked, maybe in the interest of personal safety. The passage, which of course concerned the abominable Dudley, is as follows,

so let him with shame and dishonour remember now also ye spectacle  
he secrettie made for the persuading of a subject and Counsellor of  
great honour in the same cause, to the end that if her Majestie should  
by anie waie have miscarried, then he might have entitled anie of his  
owne broode (whereof he hath stoor in manie places, as is knowne)  
to ye lawful succession of ye Crowne vnder couler of ye privie and

secret marriage, pretending the same to be by her Matie: wherein he will want no witness to depose what hee will.

In other words, Dudley could produce witnesses to this secret marriage even as late as 1584. In view of the above, is it any wonder that this book was not then printed in England?

Another rather strange statement appears in one of Francis Bacon's writings on the subject of Queen Elizabeth. Naturally, he could not openly impugn her political virginity but, in a eulogy to her, he likened her to Alexander the Great and Julius Caesar because, like her, they left no issue behind them. Now this statement is not true. Admittedly they did not leave recognised heirs but they did not die childless. Alexander had a son, and Caesar also had one by Cleopatra called Caesarion; the lady wanted to be sure that the world should know who the father was. Bacon was, as everyone knows, a very learned man, particularly where history was concerned, and in his numerous writings he made frequent references to both these great rulers, so that it is inconceivable that he was ignorant of their parenthood.

Study of Francis Bacon's background poses many unanswered questions. William Rawley, his Chaplain, a man who knew more about him than most, wrote a short history of his master's life, the first English life ever written, and he starts the first paragraph with an enigma by expressing doubt about his Lordship's birthplace, stating that he was born "either at Yorke House or Yorke Place". The former was, at the time of Bacon's birth, the home of Sir Nicholas and Lady Bacon, while the latter was the old name of the Queen's Palace. Lady Ann Bacon, at that time, was Lady-in-Waiting to the Monarch and it seems strange that such a meticulous man as William Rawley did not trouble to discover exactly where he was born before writing his life. When Bacon was three days old he was christened at St. Martins-in-the-Fields: the entry in the Register is equally strange:

1560 25 Januarij Baptizatus fuit Mr Franciscus Bacon.

The prefix Mr was most unusual in the baptism of a three day old baby and contrary to the custom of this church. No other child of Sir Nicholas Bacon was honoured by such a title at his christening. The mystery deepens even more when the register is examined closely because, at a later date and in a different hand and in different ink, the parents' names were added. This might seem consistent with a baby of unknown parents receiving foster-parents somewhat later, the register being altered to adjust matters. On examining Sir Nicholas' family genealogy, things become even more mysterious because no mention of Francis Bacon can be found.

Another very odd statement by a contemporary, Thomas Fuller, divine, historian and wit (1608-1661) describes Sir Nicholas Bacon as "a Father of his country and of Sir Francis Bacon". The curious use

of "a" strongly suggests that Sir Nicholas was not Bacon's true father but a father to him. Then again, Lady Ann, in a letter to her son Anthony, complained about Francis' "enigmatic folded writing" and further wrote "the scope of my so-called by him circumstance which I am sure he must understand, was not to use him as a ward"—a strange word for a mother to use in a letter about her son. As a matter of interest, the word "folded" was used by Francis Bacon in the 1605 "Tvoo Bookes" to describe cipher practices.

The Queen was a very frequent visitor to the Bacon household where she delighted in proving young Francis with questions. So brilliant was the child that she dubbed him "my young Lord Keeper". At the age of twelve, the following was said of him,

—his great and methodical memory, his solid judgement, his quicke fancy, his ready expression gave assurance of the profound and universal comprehension of things which then rendered him the observation of great and wise men, and afterwards the wonder of all

and this at the age of twelve! Is it any wonder that he was sent to Cambridge University, but oddly enough, not to Sir Nicholas Bacon's college, "Bennetts"? He was placed in the personal care of the Queen's private Chaplain, Whitgift, at Trinity College, founded by the Queen's father, Henry VIII, and patronised by Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester. On leaving Cambridge the University wrote to Lord Burleigh "they had nothing left to teach him". He was later sent to France, Bacon himself recording this as being "from her Majestie's own Royal hand". On his return in 1578, the Queen ordered her private portrait painter, Hilliard, to paint a miniature of him and, at the same time, one of herself. The likeness between the two portraits is quite startling. In 1580 he started to press a mysterious and undisclosed suit which he continued unsuccessfully for twelve years. Eventually, in 1592, he gave up the struggle and, in a letter to the aged Burleigh, made the cryptic statement that he was prepared to settle for the Kingdom of the Minde—and to Fulke Greville, "My matter is an endless question . . . I dare not go further."

After Bacon's death in 1626 Pierre Amboise, a French historian, wrote a preface to the *Histoire Naturelle de Monsieur Francois Bacon* in which he intimated that Bacon "was born to the purple and saw himself as destin'd one day to hold in his hand the helm of the Kingdom". A *propos* of this last statement, there is an amazing parallel in the form of a portrait published 81 years later in de Larrey's *Histoire d'Angleterre d'Ecosse et d'Irlande*. This book was published in Rotterdam and its portraits, which are enigmatic, are described as giving "pleasant relief and, at the same time, a just idea of the

person". The portrait of Queen Elizabeth, there reproduced, shows her looking over the heads of two young boys, one of whom is holding a rudder of ancient design surmounted with its helm, symbolic of "the helm of State". There is a third child in the dark background who is dousing the vestal flame, the symbol of virginity. This astonishing revelation seems to bear out a remark made years previously in 1568 by one Francis Edderman of Chester that "the Earl had two children by the Queen". Earlier, in 1564, Gonzales on 11th April reported to Philip of Spain that the Queen was going to Warwick (Dudley's Castle) "in order to rid herself of the result of an indiscretion". Another man, Edward Frances of Melton Osmonde, said that "the Queene had had three bastards by noblemen at Court, two sons and a daughter, and was herself base born". And yet, the Queen had the effrontery to present an early edition of the *Works of Chaucer* to her favourite maid of honour, Margaret Radclif, with the following inscription on the front fly-leaf, "*Donu honoratissimae Virginis Regineae Margaretae Ratclif 1597*" (given by the Virgin Queen to Margaret Ratclif).

To close this saga of intrigue, the story of the learned Roger Ascham's famous book *The Schoolmaster* and the controversial suppression of its preface, must be told. This book was written in 1566 under direct instructions from the Queen herself, for the purpose of educating the near illiterate young noblemen of the Court. The preface was a remarkably brave document which could easily be construed as a very pointed admonition to the Queen. In view of the suspicious circumstances of Amy Robsart's death referred to earlier, it is not surprising that this preface was suppressed by the monarch because, in effect, it draws a thinly veiled parallel between her and the worst side of the Biblical King David. The preface reads as follows:

Divae Elizabethae October 30 1566

Most noble Princesse and my best Ladie and Mistres, I ofte thinking of this race of Davide's life; of his former miseries, of his later felicities, of God's dealing with him in all pointes, to bring happinesse to his present tyme, and safety to his posterity have had, for many like cause, manie like thoughts, even of the like life and state of your Majestie. For when God hath showed him his greatest favour and given him the hiest benefits that man in earth could receive, yet God suffered him to fall into the deepest pitte of wickednesse; to committe the cruellest murder and shamefullest adultrie, that ever did man upon earthe. However, even then, God had not taken from Davide His graces.

This is where Ascham points out the moral of David to the Queen, almost openly comparing her to him.

therefor was I verie willinge to offer this booke to your Majestie, wherein, as in a faire glasse, your Majestie shall see and ACKNOWLEDGE, by God's dealing with Davide, even verie many like goode dealings of God with your Majestie.

Needless to say the Queen's "acknowledgement" was not forthcoming and the preface promptly disappeared from the book. However it is interpreted, the preface inherently suggests that the English Queen was guilty of the sin of David, and naturally she could not risk open publication of its contents, because the story of the death of Bathsheba's husband Uriah and the birth of her son would have been well known to all and sundry. Imagination would not be too far stretched for them to substitute Amy Robsart for the name Uriah.

Roger Ascham died very soon after completing his book which, despite the strong pressure put upon him to write it, was held back until 1570, three years after his death and published, wonder of wonders, without the preface. Had this been included it would have destroyed what little was left of the Queen's reputation. One hundred and ninety-one years later, the book was republished, with the controversial preface; in 1761.

One further source records the following statement alleged to have been made by Mary Stuart, then Queen of France, and later Scotland:

The Queen of England was about to marry her Horse-Keeper who had killed his wife to make a place for her.

The use of the word "was" is interesting because it does suggest that the marriage may not have taken place. One wonders if Elizabeth remembered this remark at 11 o'clock on 8th February 1586 when she had Mary Queen of Scots executed, showing her neither mercy nor forgiveness. Ironically, the last act in the English Queen's life was to nominate Mary's son, James VI of Scotland, as her successor to the throne of England.

SIC TRANSIT GLORIANA

## SHAKESPEARE'S FIRST BIOGRAPHER

by T. D. BOKENHAM

Nicholas Rowe (1674-1718), poet and dramatist, was educated at Westminster School and became a barrister of the Middle Temple. He later abandoned the legal profession and turned playwright. He became acquainted with Pope and Addison and, between 1700 and 1706, produced three Tragedies at the theatre in Lincoln's Inn Fields. Two more of his plays were later produced at the Haymarket Theatre and still later his *Jane Shore* and *Lady Jane Grey* appeared at Drury Lane. In 1715, he became Poet Laureate.

In 1709 Rowe published his edition of *Shakespeare*, based on the 1685 Folio with emendations, which incorporated a biographical preface which included some interesting comments on the Plays and on Shakespeare himself. In this year he became under-secretary to the Duke of Queensberry who had joined William III in 1688 and had been appointed a Privy Councillor, Lord High Treasurer and Lord Privy Seal. In 1706 he procured the signing of the Treaty of Union with Scotland. In 1718, the year of his death, Rowe had become Clerk of Presentation to Thomas Parker, Earl of Macclesfield who, in that year, had been appointed Lord Chancellor. Rowe's portrait had twice been painted by Kneller. His poetical works included a translation of Lucan (1718) and his collected works appeared in 1727.

Let us now turn to his biographical preface which he called *Some Account of the Life etc. of Mr William Shakespeare*, which, at the very outset, seems to suggest a little frivolity on his part.

It seems to be a kind of respect due to the memory of excellent men, especially of those whom their wit and learning have made famous, to deliver some account of themselves, as well as their works. For this reason, how fond do we see some people of discovering any little personal story of the great men of Antiquity! their families, the common accidents of their lives, and even their shape, make and features have been the subject of critical enquiries. —and though the Works of Mr Shakespeare may seem to many not to want a comment, yet I fancy some little account of the man himself may not be thought improper to go along with them.

—His father, who was a considerable dealer in wool, had so large a family, ten children in all, that tho' he was his eldest son, he could give him no better education than his own employment. He had

bred him, 'tis true, for some time at a Free school, where 'tis probable he acquired what Latin he was master of; but the narrowness of his circumstances, and the want of his assistance at home, forced his father to withdraw him from thence, and unhappily prevented his further proficiency in that language. It is without controversy, that in his works we scarce find any traces of anything that looks like an imitation of the Ancients. The delicacy of his taste, and the natural bent of his own great Genius (equal, if not superior to some of the best of theirs) would certainly have led him to read and study 'em with so much pleasure, that some of their fine images would naturally have insinuated themselves into and been mixed with his own writings; so that his not copying at least something from them, may be an argument of his never having read 'em. Whether his ignorance of the Ancients were a disadvantage to him or no, may admit of a dispute: For tho' the knowledge of 'em might have made him more correct, yet it is not improbable but that the regularity and deference for them, which would have attended that correctness, might have restrained some of that fire, impetuosity and even beautiful extravagance which we admire in Shakespeare: And I believe we are better pleased with those thoughts, altogether new and uncommon, which his own imagination supplied him so abundantly with, than if he had given us the most beautiful passages out of the Greek and Latin poets, and that in the most agreeable manner that it was possible for a master of the English language to deliver 'em.

Qualifying these remarks, Rowe later refers to "the Tragedies of Mr Shakespeare" about which he says:

If one undertook to examine the greatest part of these by those rules which are established by Aristotle, and taken from the model of the Grecian Stage, it would be no very hard task to find a great many faults. But as Shakespeare liv'd under a kind of mere light of nature, and had never been made acquainted with the regularity of those written precepts, so it would be hard to judge him by a law he knew nothing of. We are to consider him as a man that lived in a state of almost universal license and ignorance:

He later states:

His Tales were seldom invented, but rather taken either from true History, or Novels and Romances.

Writing of Shakespeare's characters, however, Rowe's enthusiasm seems to have made him lower, for an instant, his satirical guard:

Nor are the Manners, proper to the persons represented, less justly observed, in those characters taken from the Roman History; and of



this, the fierceness and impatience of Coriolanus, his courage and disdain of the common people, the virtue and philosophical temper of Brutus, and the irregular greatness of mind in M. Antony, are beautiful proofs. For the two last especially, you find 'em exactly as they are describ'd by Plutarch, from whom certainly Shakespeare copy'd 'em. He has indeed followed his original pretty close, and taken in several little incidents that might have been spared in a Play. —*Hamlet* is founded on much the same tale with the *Electra* of Sophocles. In each of 'em a young Prince is engaged to revenge the death of his father, their mothers are equally guilty, are both concern'd in the murder of their husbands, and are afterwards married to the murderers.

An interesting comment is made on the play *Henry VIII* in which Rowe says,

The Prince is drawn with that greatness of mind, and all those good qualities which are attributed to him in any account of his reign. If his faults are not shewn in an equal degree, and the shades in his picture do not bear a just proportion to the lights, it is not that the Artist wanted either colours or skill in the disposition of 'em; but the truth, I believe, might be that he forbore doing it out of regard to Queen Elizabeth, since it could have been no very great respect to the memory of his Mistress, to have expos'd some certain parts of her father's life upon the stage.

Finally, we come to the passage in this biography which is so often quoted, which, in its entirety, seems almost more telling than was first thought:

His name was printed, as the custom was in those times, amongst those of the other Players, before some old Plays, but without any particular account of what sort of parts he us'd to play; and though I have enquir'd, I could never meet with any further account of him this way, than that the top of his Performance was the ghost in his own *Hamlet*. I should have been much more pleased, to have learn'd from some certain authority, which was the first Play he wrote;\* it would be without doubt a pleasure to any man, curious in things of this kind, to see and know what was *the first essay* of a fancy like Shakespeare's.

And the footnote at the bottom of the page states: "The highest date of any I can yet find, is *Romeo and Juliet* in 1597, when the Author was 33 years old; and *Richard the 2nd and 3rd*, in the next year, *viz.* the 34th of his age."

These years, which are added almost unnecessarily are, of course, of interest since 33 stands for Bacon and  $33 + 34 = 67$  which stands for

Francis. Moreover the date 1597 is that in which Francis Bacon's first ten "Essays" were given to the public.

It must now be added, that Nicholas Rowe's friend Alexander Pope took a very different view of the former's censures which seem so much to have been given in jest. In his preface to his 1725 edition of *Shakespeare*, Pope states:

To judge therefore of Shakespeare by Aristotle's rules, is like trying a man by the laws of one country, who acted under those of another. He writ to the People; and at first without patronage from the better sort, and therefore without aims of pleasing them; without assistance or advice from the Learned, as without the advantage of education or acquaintance among them.

This might well be called "special pleading", but later Pope says:

But as to his want of Learning, it may be necessary to say something more. —Nothing is more evident than that he had a taste of natural Philosophy, Mechanics, ancient and modern History, Poetical learning and Mythology; We find him very knowing in the customs, rites and manners of Antiquity. In *Coriolanus* and *Julius Caesar*, not only the Spirit but Manners of the Romans, are exactly drawn; and still a nicer distinction is shewn between the manners of the Romans in the time of the former, and of the latter. His reading in the ancient Historians is no less conspicuous, in many references to particular passages; and the speeches copied from Plutarch in *Coriolanus* may, I think, as well be made an instance of his learning, as those copied from Cicero in *Catiline*, of Ben Johnson's. The manners of other nations in general, the Egyptians, Venetians, French etc. are drawn with equal propriety. Whatever object of nature, or branch of science, he either speaks of or describes, it is always with competent, if not extensive knowledge; his descriptions are still exact, all his metaphors appropriated, and remarkably drawn from the true nature and inherent qualities of each subject. When he treats of Ethic or Politic, we may confidently observe a wonderful justness of distinction, as well as extent of comprehension. —We have Translations from Ovid published in his name, among those poems which pass for his, and for some of which we have undoubted authority. —He appears also to have been conversant in Plautus, from whom he has taken the plot of one of his plays; he follows the Greek authors, and particularly Dares Phrygius, in another (although I will not pretend to say in what language he read them). The modern Italian writers of Novels he was manifestly acquainted with and we may conclude him to be no less conversant with the Ancients of his own country, from the use he has made of Chaucer

in *Troilus and Cressida*, and in the *Two Noble Kinsmen*, if that play be his, as there goes a tradition it was.

Pope's judgement is sound and, in the certain knowledge of the present writer, he knew a great deal more about the author of the Shakespeare Plays and Poems than he allowed himself to say in this fine Preface.

## BACON AND POPE: A HUMOROUS PARODY WITH A SERIOUS SIDE

By RICHARD R. REYNOLDS

The Pope-Swift *Miscellanies* (1727) contains *A Specimen of Scriblerus's Reports, Stradling versus Stiles*. After the publication, Pope told Spence that he wrote "the law case of the black and white horses with the help of a lawyer", whom Spence inferred to be William Fortescue. Short and comic, the piece is a skilful caricature of the law reports of the time, which Lemuel Gulliver (in his *Travels*), explains to his Houyhnhnm master this way:

It is a maxim among these lawyers, that whatever hath been done before, may be legally done again: And therefore they take special care to record all the decisions formerly made against common justice and the general reason of mankind . . . this society hath a peculiar cant and jargon of their own, that no other mortal can understand.

Seventeenth and early eighteenth century reports, like their predecessors, were often second hand and inaccurate, but nonetheless they were much demanded by practitioners. These accounts frequently give greater attention to the arguments of counsel, the remarks of the judges and the notes of the reporter than to the actual decision, which occasionally is not stated at all. They report little or none of the judicial reasoning in the case. Not until the middle of the eighteenth century did a system begin of authorised reporters attached to particular courts.

The jargon to which Gulliver refers may be simply legal rhetoric, but he probably alludes to law French, in which all pleadings were filed up to the middle of the seventeenth century, and in which some reports of cases were still written in the eighteenth century. Thus Scriblerus captions his report with the information that the case was heard before all four justices of the Court of Common Pleas in 1606:

Le Report del Case argue en le commen Banke devant tout les Justices de mesme le Banke, en le quart an du raygne de Roy Jacques. . . .<sup>1</sup>

The surnames of the plaintiff and defendant occur often in the period, but are no doubt chosen because they are appropriate to this case,

<sup>1</sup> *The Works of Alexander Pope*, new edition, ed. Whitwell Elwin and William J. Courthope (London, 1886; rpt. New York, 1967), X, 430.

whose facts are simple. John Swale, deceased, bequeathed to Stradling "all my black and white horses". At his death he owned six black, six white and six pied horses. Stradling sued to obtain the six pied ones, evidently having already received the others. Scriblerus does not say what legal standing Stiles has; he may be the residuary legatee, who, upon the failure of Stradling's claim, would be entitled to the horses.

Stradling's advocate, an apprentice barrister named Atkins, opens the argument in an absurd, inflated manner:

*Horse, in a physical sense, doth import a certain quadrupede or four-footed animal, which, by the apt and regular disposition of certain proper and convenient parts, is adapted, fitted and constituted for the use and need of man . . . (and) to the behoof of the commonweal (431).*

Atkins makes many references to statutes concerning horses, to illustrate the animal's importance in England over the centuries. He is wordy, pedantic and ostentatious. Eventually he bases his claim on two points: (1) black and white are the extremes of color, and Swale must have intended to give Stradling all horses of those, or intermediate, shades; (2) "black and white" literally means "pied", so again the horses should go to Stradling.

Stiles' lawyer, Catlyne, has the rank of serjeant, and is thus one of a select group appointed by the Crown. His opening statement imitates Sir Edward Coke's famous contention that the essence of law is reason, "artificiall . . . gotten by long study, observation and experience, and not of every man's naturall reason", a comment vigorously attacked and defended. But Pope deletes "observation and experience" from Catlyne's argument, so that the lawyer appears to champion deduction. By connecting Coke with a highly placed barrister named Catlyne, Pope implies the treason of those who rate judge-made law above the sovereign; he takes the side of Francis Bacon (whom he thought England's greatest genius), and of Hobbes, in favor of subordinating the common law, and thus the legal profession, to the royal prerogative, to statute and to the equity administered by the King's court, Chancery. Nor is it coincidence that this case is supposed to occur in the Court of Common Pleas in 1606: Coke was appointed Chief Justice in that court that year. To some extent, then, the report is a serious warning against lawyers' power and the danger of reverence for legal reasoning.

Catlyne replies to Atkins' first interpretation that it would convey red or bay horses to Stradling, an absurd result. To plaintiff's second point, Catlyne answers that a pied horse is neither white nor black; "how then can pyed horses come under the words of black and white horses?" "Pyed," he contends, is a descriptive term whose meaning has been established by custom, and if Swale intended to give his pied horses to Stradling he would have said so explicitly.

At this point Scriblerus breaks off his account of the debate with a personal remark, "le reste del argument jeo ne pouvois oyer, car jeo fui disturb en mon place" (433). But he does report a partial result: the court decides for Stradling, whereupon Catlyne moves that judgment be arrested because the horses are actually mares, preparing to contend that if Swale meant to give mares to Stradling, he would have said "mares" not "horses". Catlyne asks that the animals be inspected. The court, apparently unsure what to do, goes into deliberation again, and Scriblerus' report ends.

Gulliver's comments about lawyers, as well as about reporters, sound like this case. He tells the Houyhnhnm

(attorneys are) bred up from their youth in the art of proving by words multiplied for the purpose that *white* is *black* and *black* is *white*, according as they are paid. . . . If my neighbor hath a mind to my *cow*, he hire a lawyer to prove that he ought to have my cow from me. . . .

In as much as Swift visited Pope in 1726 and met Fortescue then, it is likely the three discussed those aspects of the law they might satirize.

*Stradling v Stiles* was quoted at length in the notes to a 1799 decision by the Chancery Court of Virginia. Its reporter doubted that the case was genuine:

"the reports of master Scriblerus had not been published . . . if they had been published, they would have been disregarded, not being authorised by the judges' *imprimatur* . . . the name of the supposed author is believed to be fictitious (sic). . . ."<sup>2</sup>

A nineteenth century legal author, who knew the case was composed by Pope and Fortescue, nonetheless found it worthy of discussion:

. . . the question ought never to have arisen "whether the pied horses were included in the legacy", as was assumed by those gentlemen. As there can be but one meaning attached to any sentence, the testator could not have meant by his words all black and all white horses, and, at the same time, all black and white horses. The only difficulty arising from this will could be this; whether the testator meant to bequeath to Mr. Stragglng (sic) all black and all white horses, *or* all black and white horses.<sup>3</sup>

And a twentieth century editor summarised the facts as those of "a celebrated case, frequently quoted",<sup>4</sup> implying the authenticity of the report.

<sup>2</sup> *Wilkins v. Taylor*, 1 Wythe 338, 352.

<sup>3</sup> Francis Lieber, *Legal and Political Hermeneutics* (Boston, 1839), p. 88.

<sup>4</sup> Virgil M. Harris, *Ancient, Curious and Famous Wills* (Boston, 1911), p. 178.

The piece effectively makes fun of the reporter, the lawyers and the legal process, for the ultimate absurdity is the time and expense involved in litigation over six horses before one of the highest courts in the land. It seems quite likely, considering fee and costs, Stradling and Stiles would each have been better off with three pied horses, or mares. But the parody is also noteworthy, when its mockery of Coke is observed, for its attitude of Baconian skepticism toward deductive reasoning.

*University of Connecticut.*

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Sir Nicholas Bacon's Great House Sententiae*, by Elizabeth McCutcheon; published by the University of Hawaii and the Francis Bacon Foundation and Library, in conjunction with *English Literary Renaissance*. Price \$3.50 U.S.

This volume of 98 pages with paper covers is Number Three in the English Literary Renaissance Supplement series, and we were grateful to Mrs. Elizabeth Wrigley, President of The Francis Bacon Foundation of Claremont, California, U.S.A., for kindly sending us complimentary copies.

Sir Nicholas Bacon founded a grammar school at Botesdale, prepared rules for the governance of the grammar school at St. Albans, built a Library at Gray's Inn, donated 73 volumes to the University Library, Cambridge, and was a generous benefactor to Corpus Christi.

Thus the public man, but the book is concerned primarily with his humanism.

He was, a most eloquent man, and of rare learning and wisdom, as ever I knew England to breed, and one that joyed as much in learned men and men of good witts.

George Puttenham; *The Arte of English Poesie*, 1589.

... abjuring undue ambition, following the golden mean of his own motto (*Mediocra firma*) steeped in the classics and law, experienced, prudent, practical and responsible.

The author.

The *Sententiae* or wise sayings, were indited on fourteen decorated vellum leaves, and given originally to Lady Lumley, daughter of the Earl of Arundel. They passed to Prince Henry, and were eventually handed over to the British Museum by George II. An illustration of folio 5 is reproduced in this book.

Readers may remember that in the Editorial in *Baconiana* 176,<sup>1</sup> mention was made of Sir Nicholas' interest in building and architecture, Gorhambury, Stiffkey and Redgrave manor houses all bearing witness to his exceptional skill. The *sententiae* were initially painted in the Long Gallery at the first-named in the Great Hall, in which Aubrey noted three pictures; one with "Ceres teaching the Sowing of Corne, the word *Moniti meliora*".

<sup>1</sup> *Baconiana* 176, page 6.



The Rosicrucian significance of the motto was brought out clearly by Professor Henrion in *A Close-meshed Tudor Network in Baconiana* 177, page 41. The accompanying illustration of the frontispiece of *Les Oeuvres Morales* drove home the point.

So far Sir Nicholas' wide-ranging cultural interests, and we may now include astronomy (page 15), were all shared by Sir Francis. If we could include the Tudor passion for *sententiae*, of which Sir Nicholas was a leading protagonist, his all round influence on Francis becomes crystal clear. In fact, the proof is irrefutable. We have merely to mention *The Promus* and *The Wisdom of the Ancients* to clinch the matter. Hence the importance of this book in effectively revealing the source of the younger man's knowledge of the classics, proverbs, aphorisms, *i.e.* *sententiae*. Nor is this all, for these supplied themes for devices, emblems, paintings, engravings, and the like. Mrs. McCutcheon quotes no fewer than eight modern authorities in support of this contention, the importance of which relative to the Shakespeare Plays needs no emphasis.

The 37 groups of *sententiae* and the 22 differing commonplace headings adorning the walls of the Long Gallery at Gorhambury are reflected in many of the Essay titles used by Francis, and the author quotes a formidable list: Of the Greatest Good, Of Leisure, and topics such as reason, ambition, flattery, friendship, riches and poverty, and fortune. Many of these were derived from Cicero, an author also familiar to Francis as is evident from his acknowledged writings.

We are reminded of Shakespeare again by the *sententiae* which appeared on Folio 3 of the Lumley illuminated MS:

*Summum Bonum Extrinsecus Instrumenta non Querit.  
Beatissimus, qui Crastinum Sine Sollicitudine Expectat.*

We refer to the well-known lines from *Hamlet*:

There's a Divinity that shapes our ends  
Rough-hew them how we will.

v, ii, 10.

That many of Sir Nicholas' *sententiae* were concerned with a combination of ethical and legal maxims will not surprise our readers. No. 53 in particular distinguishes between the roles of the judge, seeking truth, and the lawyer employing verisimilitudes; and is echoed by the Essay *Of Judicature*:

The principal duty of a judge is to suppress force and fraud. . . .

As H. Kendra Baker showed in *The Persecution of Francis Bacon*, Sir Francis followed this precept to the ultimate, as did Sir Nicholas.

Senecan and Ciceronian philosophy, coupled with a deep Christian faith characterised both men, and Sir Robert Naunton's verdict.<sup>2</sup>

Those that lived in his age . . . describe him to be another Solon, and the Sinon of those times; such a one as Oedipus was in dissolving of riddles

applied to each.

Francis, however, surely appreciated to the full yet another Senecan aphorism:

If candidates about to seek office were to consult ambitious men who had attained the highest honours, they might change their prayers.

The significance of this book for students of Elizabeth thought and Baconians will now be obvious, but, in the words of the Psalmist,

There is a river, the streams whereof shall make glad the city of God . . . Psalm 46, verse 4.

On page 50 Elizabeth McCutcheon points out that Ben Jonson's own motto was a Senecan *sententia*, and in his list of masters of wit and language in *Timber: or Discoveries* Sir Nicholas is described as "singular and almost alone, in the beginning of Queene *Elizabeths* times" (vii, 591).

The relationship between Sir Nicholas and his son Francis, we are told, is both more immediate and more complicated. As readers of *Baconiana* know full well the aphorism and the *sententia* are "clearly central to Francis Bacon's method and thought, form and style alike". Both men were brilliant in rhetoric and law. The younger man's debt to his senior is evident but Francis was the more subtle, complex, inductive, imaginative and original—perhaps the greatest thinker of his time and since. The *Promus of Formularies and Elegancies*, and his *Apophthegms New and Old* bear witness still. . . .

*An Annotated Bibliography of Cryptography*, David Shulman; Garland Publishing, Inc. New York, 1976, 390 pp., \$35.

*Biggest Bibliography on Cryptology Finally Arrives*

After working on it for over 35 years A. B. Struse has brought a lifetime of work to fruition with a hefty volume describing more than 3,000 books, articles and manuscripts covering every aspect of codes and ciphers.

Reviewing this most important book poses a personal problem in mixed emotions. The book is so significant that it belongs in every

<sup>2</sup> *Fragmenta Regalia* (London, 1824).

ACA-er's library. At the same time it is sufficiently flawed that certain deficiencies cannot be overlooked. A bibliography represents the quintessence of scholarship in its field. It is supposed to be the ultimate for neophyte and expert. Errors or omissions, therefore, take on added weight and must be noted.

To start, the title of the book is misleading because many, if not most, of the entries are not annotated. Further, the title should properly read *Cryptology*, not *Cryptography*.

A bibliographic entry is a standardised, scholarly reference which includes the name of the publisher. Regrettably, this work does not.

The organisation of the book is confusing. It consists of five parts, each with its own numbering sequence. The parts are arranged chronologically giving the reader a good historical perspective on the development of the art. The index to authors, however provides the dates of publication instead of page numbers. This makes it time consuming to use. There are also some errors in the index, e.g. Givierge and Rowlett listings.

The book has been produced directly from the author's typed script resulting in an unsightly job, poor quality reproduction and some typographical errors.

The book's first entry is the momentous work by Trithemius<sup>1</sup> with a full page rightfully devoted to it. Most amazingly the page is used to list libraries possessing copies, to give some biographical data and details on illustrations, but not one word on its cryptologic contents!

Many of the ancient works in Latin, Italian and other foreign languages are likewise devoid of any description of their contents.

While it is not feasible to point out all deficiencies (it is especially weak in the area of declassified U.S. Government publications) there are four important items that must be corrected. First, the second edition of Hitt's *Manual* should be 1918; second the title of the appendix to Friedman's *Riverbank Publication No. 22* repeats the error in Galland's *Bibliography*. The exact title is *An Application of the Science Statistics to Cryptography*; third, the annotated listing for Yardley's *The American Black Chamber* says nothing of the Japanese edition or the furor the book caused in Japan; fourth, the complete title for Military Cryptanalysis Volume IV is *Transposition and Fractioning Systems*.

Another disturbing feature of the book is the listing of certain libraries and collections by name without any further identification, assuming that all readers will know, for example, the location of the Newberry Library, John Crerar Library, Witt Collection or the W. J. Carlton Collection.

Although Galland's *Bibliography* is criticised for including books not

<sup>1</sup> *Cryptomenytices*—Editor.

on cryptology, this compilation contains a number of works without any cryptologic references.

One almost inexcusable error is in listing for *The Cryptogram* where incorrect dates are given for the tenure of the various editors.

A final critical note is that for a 1976 book it is unfortunate that the entries end in mid-1973 except for some 1974 references to *The Ultra Secret*.<sup>2</sup>

Despite shortcomings, A. B. Struse has produced a remarkable volume which will undoubtedly remain the prime source on the subject until he decides to publish a revised edition. That should be no surprise because A. B. Struse has had a long interest in the field. The June 1933 issue of *The Cryptogram* carried a note that he had joined and shortly thereafter his name appeared regularly on the "complete" list of solvers. The June 1940 issue contained the first hint of his being involved in the preparation of a bibliography.

The detail contained in the book is testimony to the vast amount of loving work devoted to the task. He personally examined virtually every item in his bibliography and performed the tedious chore of isolating exact page numbers that specifically mention codes or ciphers in novels and other non-cryptologic works. The book also has 15 full page illustrations of significant people and items in the field.

Only a limited number of copies has been printed. So, despite its relatively high price, ACA-ers are urged to order a copy immediately before it becomes unavailable. With all of its flaws this book is the best thing that has happened to cryptology since the publication of David Kahn's *The Codebreakers* and both books should be in everyone's collection.

(Reprinted from *The Cryptogram*.)

<sup>2</sup> By Group Captain F. W. Winterbotham—Editor.

## CORRESPONDENCE

The Editor,  
Daily Telegraph,  
135 Fleet Street,  
London EC4 4BL  
Sir,

18th April, 1978.

### THE MERCHANT FROM STRATFORD

Baconians cannot be "simply clobbered" so easily as John Barber thinks.

Of course Samuel Schoenbaum is right in debunking the legends that have come down to us concerning the actor William Shakespeare but has your critic not noticed that the biographical facts he mentions are invariably discreditable? Yet he asks us to believe that the world's most sublime literature was written by this man.

Mr. Barber is "astonished" that so much is known about William, but I would like to ask a few questions. What documentary proof is there that he was born at Henley Street, that he toiled "12 hours a day, six days a week" at Latin grammar, etc., or even went to Stratford School? How does your critic or anybody else know that he was "house-writer" to the Lord Chamberlain's Men? These are not facts, they are supposition.

Certainly William *bought* a coat-of-arms, but whence did his money "flow in"? Suppose he was paid to keep quiet and retire to the country?

John Barber claims that "no one would have had time to do more than the man from Stratford". He might have had if he had employed a school of "good pens" as Bacon did.

Perhaps I may suggest that it is not at all surprising that William took no apparent interest in the ultimate fate of the Plays. He died in 1616 and the 1623 First Folio, the principal authority for the text of well over half the 36 Plays did not appear until seven years later. A completely new Play, *Othello*, appeared in quarto in 1622, and in revised form in the Folio. Whose was the master mind?

Yours faithfully,

NOEL FERMOR, *Chairman*.

20th April, 1978.

Dear Mr. Fermor,

Your letter has been passed to me for comment.

The answers to your questions are contained in Samuel Schoenbaum's

books, where all the problems are fully discussed. Not all the *facts* are "discreditable": almost all the reports on the actor-playwright, William Shakespeare, as I indicated, are generally complimentary.

Thank you for your interest in my article.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN BARBER.

9th May, 1978.

Dear Mr. Barber,

Thank you for your courteous letter which I appreciated receiving. However, I know that as a drama critic your chief interest is not biography or a controversy over authorship, and I am afraid you have been deceived by the Shakespeare "industry".

The main interest in Schoenbaum's book is the documentation collating all available evidence concerning the Stratford man. If all the *facts* known about him are not discreditable they are at best mercenary, and I must repeat we do not know where William was born. It may have been in Greenhill Street as his father, John, who could not read or write, bought a house there in 1556. So much for the "Birth-place", which in any event is not the original building as earlier engravings show.

The "reports" on the playwright to which you refer beg the question. William himself did not claim to have written the Plays. How could he have pretended to the vast knowledge of law, the classics, and Court life, for instance, contained therein? No, the "reports" refer to the author, *whoever he was*. As I pointed out W.S. had died seven years before the 1623 Folio!

So I could go on, and I am willing to send you some of our literature if you would like to see it. If you do not wish to see it, please believe that Baconians have arrived at their beliefs after many years' research, and Schoenbaum's book is *not* the answer.

Yours sincerely,

NOEL FERMOR, *Chairman*.

16th May, 1978.

Dear Mr. Fermor,

If no one can prove that Shakespeare was born in that house in Henley Street, no one can prove that he was not. The testimonies of Chettle, Scoloker, Davies and, above all, Ben Jonson, suggest an aimable enough character.

It has also been shown that Shakespeare's knowledge of the classics, etc., was not profound but merely average for his day. As for the ascription of the Plays to him, Jonson, as well as the editors, had no apparent doubts of their authorship.

I was interested in your letter, but doubt if this correspondence is worth pursuing.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN BARBER.

2nd June, 1978.

Dear Mr. Barber,

Thank you for your letter of 16th May. To take your first point—if no one can prove William Shaksper was born in Henley Street, why is the present "Birthplace" shown to visitors, as such, for money, when it is known that the original structure was pulled down; except possibly for the cellars. What justification can there be for this?

Opinions differ as to the extent of the playwright's knowledge of classics, but you do not mention the profound knowledge of the law, Court life at home and in France, and depth of philosophical thought displayed in the Plays. No wonder Coleridge wrote: ". . . Even this, that Shakespeare, no mere child of nature . . . first studied patiently, meditated deeply, understood deeply, till knowledge became habitual and intuitive." Hear Andrew Lang: "It gives me pause if I am to believe that between 1587 and 1592 Will wrote *Love's Labours Lost*, *The Comedy of Errors*, *Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Romeo and Juliet*. There is a limit even to my gullibility, and if anyone wrote all these plays, as we now possess them, before 1593, I do not suppose that Will was the man."

As you mention, a few contemporary writers allude to Shakespeare, but by no means all are complimentary, and Ben Jonson is both derogatory and complimentary. In Jonson's case (as in his testimony in the 1623 Folio) he is referring to the *playwright*, whoever he was.

This correspondence is worth pursuing if you are interested in arriving at the truth of the authorship mystery, but meanwhile I enclose a copy of *Exit Shakespeare*, by Bertram Theobald which, though written some years ago, demonstrates that the orthodox theory breaks down completely. As it is short, please do me the courtesy of reading it.

Yours sincerely,

NOEL FERMOR, *Chairman*.

The Editor,  
*Baconiana*.

13th February, 1978.

Dear Sir,

I write to you about a discovery I have just made—quite fortuitously! You are printing my article about the 1640 *Advancement of Learning* frontispiece and Bacon's "Order of the Garter". One of my points is that W. Marshall, the engraver, knew enough about heraldry to

engrave Bacon's Arms as a "hatchment", signifying that the owner was deceased. Heraldry is so beautiful because it is perfect historical shorthand for those who can read it. Now for the news—Bacon was *NOT* dead in 1640. The "hatchment" tells this quite plainly but I missed this obvious point for so long!

I have just been glancing at a little heraldry book which I found at the weekend (editor, Francis J. Grant, *Rothsay Herald*), I quote—

Funeral! Escutcheons or Hatchments contain the Arms of a deceased person within a *black* lozenge-shaped frame . . . the *ground* of the hatchment is *black* that surrounds the arms of the *deceased* whether baron or femme, and *white* round the arms of the survivor.

This point is so important that no less than six possible hatchments are illustrated to show different conditions simplified.

*Nowhere* does it describe a white Frame and white ground, as Marshall engraved. That is for the *survivor*. What is more, this white hatchment stands out the more because the background of the engraving is all dark—it looks as bright as a window! It all says one thing—Bacon was *alive* in 1640.

Sincerely,

JOAN HAM.

Dear Commander Pares,

Please forgive me for my long delay in writing to you, and for typing this letter. I have been wanting to thank you very much for giving me your two books, and to let you know that you have completely convinced me! I was very impressed with your arguments in *Knights of the Helmet* about the changes in the First Folio, and with Bacon's tragic and noble words in his Will. After that I could not put it down and then eagerly turned to *Mortuary Marbles* where I was overwhelmed by the constant similarity of thought forms which cannot be explained away by coincidence, plagiarism or "typical Elizabethan expressions" as I have heard argued!

Well, you really have turned my world upside down—I found I could not put it out of my mind, and kept saying to myself, "Bacon wrote Shakespeare—how extraordinary!" It has been a great effort to carry on with my work and not succumb to the temptation of looking up all the Baconian works in the British Museum! What a wealth of study now opens up, to read the Plays in the light of the biography of the man, and to read Bacon as Shakespeare's other voice. I am sure you are right about the Sonnets as allegories, they become much clearer when interpreted as the lament of a man whose genius was a secret. In some Sonnets in any case he openly addresses his soul, so



why not his genius too? How I agree with your refutation of Dr. Rowse. I have since bought a copy of Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence, and was fascinated by the Folio portrait and the Stratford Bust, and by *The Promus*, which can't be anything but preparations for dialogues.

I have been immensely enjoying the *Essays* (I must have been put off before by the Elizabethan language)—how beautiful the essay *Of Gardens*, and *Of Friendship*, and how wise the essay *Of Revenge*. What a fine vision is his Utopia with its Aristocracy of Service. In today's *Times* Professor Jones talks of his ideal political party, the Party of Service, with its motto never to take out of the community more than you put in.

It is sad how little of Bacon remains, where he was born, where he lived, where he died, and sad that although the *Oxford Book of Quotations* is full of his sayings, he is neglected in schools and on the public library shelves. There is an incredible character assassination in *Chambers' Biographical Dictionary*, and the British Museum display case chooses to show only a page of his notebook in which he is hoping to ingratiate himself with the Prince.

The problems of the Baconians are, of course, formidable—how to reach the public before they have had their minds made up by the Stratford scholars. One of my friends, an antiquarian book dealer, literally leapt up from his seat in surprise when I told him that the Folio portrait has two left arms, but mostly I find people impatiently refusing to discuss the possibility. I suppose the fashion of the time makes it essential to retain the notion that our greatest writer was *not* a University man, and besides, as one friend said to me, "the name Bacon is so *dull!*"

The task of Baconians seems to be threefold: first, to establish that the Stratford player's unedifying life does not marry with his verse; secondly, to re-establish Bacon's reputation, and I think your idea of a modern trial to clear his name would give a chance to the public to judge for themselves; thirdly, to link the two writers together and show the same mind at work in their writings. I think you have succeeded in these three aims with your truly admirable knowledge of the works of both Bacon and Shakespeare.

Diana has brought to my attention Daphne du Maurier's *The Winding Stair*—perhaps now at last attitudes will begin to change.

Thank you once again for your fascinating books, and for revealing to me the identity of our greatest writer.

Yours sincerely,

IDINA LE GEYT.

1 Molyneux Park Gardens,  
Tunbridge Wells.

12th March, 1978.

The Editor,  
*Baconiana*.  
 Dear Sir,

### HONEST AND UNFETTERED COMMENTARY

If we look into Shakespearean commentary before the question of the authorship of the Plays and poems assumed importance, it will be found that, in general, the writers credit Shakespeare with a wide range of knowledge such as no orthodox men-of-letters would dare to admit today, for fear of confirming the truth of the disclosures made by Baconians and others who oppose the Stratford tradition. The Preface to *Shakespeare and the Emblem Writers* by Henry Green, M.A., published in 1870, is a notable example:

Shakespeare possessed great artistic powers so as to appreciate and graphically describe the beauties and qualities of excellence in printing, sculpture and music. His attainments, too, in the languages enabled him to make use of the Emblem books that had been published in Latin, Italian and French, and possibly in Spanish.

In everything, except in the actual pictorial, Shakespeare exhibited himself as a skilled designer—indeed a writer of Emblems; he followed the very methods on which this species of literary composition was conducted, and needed only the engraver's aid to make perfect designs.

About the same year, Mary Cowden Clarke became occupied with the immense work of compiling her Concordance to the Plays. In her Preface, published in 1879, she proclaimed Shakespeare as "the most universal genius that ever lived". Her years of work had, as she wrote, found him to be a *divine*, an *astronomer*, a *naturalist*, *lawyer*, *botanist*, *philosopher*, *musician*, *painter*, *orator* and *humanist*—all of which were attributes of Bacon. Mary Cowden Clarke found the Plays to be "A rich mine of intellectual treasure". Substitute "mind" for "mine" and it fits Bacon admirably!

Yours faithfully,

R. L. EAGLE.

It must be many years since an issue of *Baconiana* appeared without a contribution or letter from the late R. L. Eagle. To maintain the sequence, and as a small tribute to a redoubtable Shakespearean scholar and learned Baconian, we print the above letter. As ever the arguments are succinct and convincing—Editor.

---

Readers of Joan Ham's article *Bacon's Belated Justice*, which appeared in *Baconiana* 173, will be interested to see Professor Henrion's letter, which appeared in the *International Herald Tribune* of 2nd August, 1977. The "unpalatable character" was, of course, Robert Cecil, who

was no friend to Francis Bacon, and would have had strong objections to Bacon's "real identity" being revealed to the public in Henrion's.

The original article, *The Tudor Conspiracy against Richard III*, appeared on 21st July, 1978. The argument of Joan Ham and the implicit contention of Professor Henrion, is that Bacon went some way towards correcting the Shakespearean jaundiced description of Richard in his prose work, *Henry VII*. It is pertinent to note that Henry VII was an egregious exception to the succession of Kings who feature in the Shakespearean historical Plays.

## POOR RICHARD

Re your enlightening article on Richard III, may it be said to Shakespeare's partial exculpation that, even if he had known better—and probably he did know better—he could hardly go counter to the public image of Richard, all the more as the dire opinion the public had of the vanquished king was furthered and nurtured by the Tudor propaganda.

If he had given a more impartial account of Richard, his spectators and, even more, the court circles and the Privy Council itself would have wondered where he had nosed out his documents in proof, how he could have had access to unpublished documents. If he had gone one inch on the way to redress, he might not have lived to write many further plays. Besides, the idea of a "command performance" is far from unthinkable.

Being given the poet's psychology, it can also be suspected that, since he was compelled to draw the portrait of a villain, or supposed villain, the dramatist availed himself of the opportunity to put on the stage some unpalatable character picked among his contemporaries, a man that he had not met in books but in the flesh. But no more need be said on that matter until some passions be spent. It would hardly do to put a name on the venomous private enemy he would have thus portrayed—with the obvious gusto of an injured man "getting a bit of his own back".

PIERRE HENRION.

Paris.

*International Herald Tribune*, Wednesday, 2nd August, 1978.

## PAMPHLETS FOR SALE

*Price not  
including  
British  
postage*

<b>Baker, H. Kendra.</b>	
Bacon's Vindication . . . . .	10p
Pope and Bacon—The meaning of "meanest" . . . . .	10p
Shakespeare's Coat of Arms . . . . .	10p
<b>Bokenham, T. D.</b>	
The "Original" Shakespeare Monument at Stratford-on-Avon (Illustrated) . . . . .	10p
<b>Bridgewater, Howard.</b>	
Shakespeare and Italy . . . . .	10p
Evidence Concerning Francis Bacon and "Shakespeare"	10p
<b>Dawbarn, C. Y. C.</b>	
Oxford and the Folio Plays . . . . .	10p
Bacon-Shakespeare Discussion . . . . .	15p
<b>Dodd, Alfred.</b>	
Mystery of the Shakespeare Sonnets . . . . .	10p
Who Was Shakespeare? . . . . .	10p
<b>Eagle, R. L.</b>	
Shakespeare Forgers and Forgeries (Illustrated) . . . . .	10p
Bacon or Shakespeare—A Guide to the Problem . . . . .	15p
<b>Eagle/Hapgood.</b>	
The Stratford Birthplace (Illustrated) . . . . .	10p
<b>Ellis, Walter.</b>	
The Shakespeare Myth (Illustrated) . . . . .	10p
<b>Franco, Johan.</b>	
Bacon-Shakespeare Identities Revealed by their Handwriting . . . . .	15p
<b>Gundry, W. G. C.</b>	
Was Shakespeare Educated? (Illustrated) . . . . .	15p

*All the books and pamphlets for sale from the Secretary,  
Canonbury Tower, Islington, London, N.1*

### BACONIANA (Copyright Reserved)

The official journal of the Francis Bacon Society (Inc.) is published at £1 (post extra). Back numbers can be supplied. When enquiry is made for particular copies the date should be specified. Some are now very scarce and, in the case of early issues, difficult to obtain unless from members of the Society who may have spare ones.

Please note that in future subscriptions should be sent to the Hon. Treasurer, T. D. Bokenham, at Flat 5, 12 Kings Gardens, Hove, Sussex. It is regretted that, owing to the ever increasing postage costs receipts for payments by cheque can no longer be sent to Members unless specially requested. Members are reminded that both time and postage are saved if subscriptions are paid to the Society's Bank by Banker's Order. Forms for this may be obtained from the Hon. Treasurer.

## ADDITIONAL BOOKS FOR SALE

### CONTROVERSY

<b>Borman, W. S.</b>		
Francis Bacon's Cryptic Rhymes (1906)	. . .	£2-00
<b>Dodd, Alfred</b>		
The Martyrdom of Francis Bacon	. . .	£2-00
Personal Poems (Sonnet Diary) of Francis Bacon	. . .	£2-00
<b>Gallup, E. W.</b>		
The Biliteral Cypher of Francis Bacon (1901)	. . .	£5-00
<b>Theobald, B. G.</b>		
Francis Bacon Concealed and Revealed (1930)	. . .	£1-00
Exit Shakespeare (1931) Paper cover	. . .	.50
Enter Francis Bacon (1932)	. . .	.75
<b>Woodward, Frank</b>		
Francis Bacon's Cipher Signatures—Fully illustrated	. . .	£1-30

### COLLECTED WORKS

The Complete Works of Shakespeare—Irving Edition 8 Vols.	£8-00
The Complete Works of Shakespeare—Porter and Clarke, Intro. Churton Collins, 13 Vols.	£8-00
Works of Shakespeare—Globe Edition 1 Vol.	£1-00
Works of Spenser—Globe Edition 1 Vol.	£1-00

### FRANCIS BACON SOCIETY'S BOOKS FOR SALE

*Price not  
including  
British  
postage*

<b>Baker, H. Kendra</b>		
The Persecution of Francis Bacon	. . .	75p*
<b>Eagle, R. L.</b>		
The Secrets of the Shakespeare Sonnets (with facsimile)		£1-30
<b>Gerstenberg, Joachim.</b>		
Bacon, Shakespeare and the Great Unknown	. . .	50p
Coincidences—a Baconian Essay	. . .	25p
Bacon-Shakespeare for Beginners	. . .	50p
<b>Greenwood, Sir George.</b>		
Shakespeare's Law	. . .	35p
<b>Gundry, W. G. C.</b>		
Francis Bacon—a Guide to his Homes and Haunts		9p
Manes Verulamiani—a facsimile of the 1632 edition of the elegiac tributes to Francis Bacon by the scholars and poets of his day, with translations and comments		£2-50

