

BACONIANA

CENTENARY

Founded 1886

DECEMBER, 1986

CONTENTS

Apologia.....	3
Editorial.....	5
Appeal	24
Obituary.....	26
Master Will's Paramount Proofs Positive	29
Francis Bacon: A "Landmark in the Law"?	34
Loophole to Freedom. The 51st Psalm.....	52
Book Reviews.....	61
Correspondence	71
Publications	78

THE FRANCIS BACON SOCIETY

(INCORPORATED)

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

1. To encourage, for the benefit of the public, the study of the works of Francis Bacon as philosopher, statesman and poet; also his character, genius and life, his influence on his own and succeeding times, and the tendencies and results of his writing.
2. To encourage for the benefit of the public, the general study of the evidence in favour of Francis Bacon's authorship of the plays commonly ascribed to Shakespeare, and to investigate his connection with other works of the Elizabethan period.

OFFICERS AND COUNCIL

Hon. President

James Maconachie, Esq.

Hon. Vice Presidents:

Lady Browning
(Daphne du Maurier)

Sir George Trevelyan, Bt.

Council:

Noel Fermor, Esq., Chairman

T.D. Bokenham, Esq., Vice Chairman

J.D. Maconachie, Esq.

Nigel Hardy, Esq.

Francis Carr, Esq.

Peter Dawkins, Esq.

Robert Cowley, Esq.

Gerald Salway, Esq.

Hon. Treasurer:

T.D. Bokenham, Esq.

56 Westbury Road, New Malden, Surrey, KT3 5AX.



Portraits of Angelo Notari, the inverted picture revealing the bent elbow (see page 64)

FRONTISPIECE

BACONIANA

VOL. LXIX (100th year) No. 186 DECEMBER, 1986

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.

AN APOLOGIA

by the Chairman

The decision of the Council of the Francis Bacon Society to hold a Thanksgiving Service as part of the Centenary celebrations may seem imaginative to some, inappropriate to others. The truth is rather different.

No one who has studied Bacon's works in depth, whether under his own name or not, can in all honesty fail to appreciate his devotion to, and humble acceptance of, the teachings of the Lord Jesus Christ. His beautiful prayer and translation of Psalm 91 alone offers ample evidence of this, but if any doubt this view, may I point to his *Confession of Faith*?

The late Professor Benjamin Farrington, one of the many distinguished men and women who have been Members of the Society in the past, confessed that it was clear not simply that Bacon was a Christian, "But that his Christianity was vital to the understanding of his philosophy of science." He added, that unless Bacon's Christianity occupied a central place in our interpretation of his thought "We must be forever content to skirt round the edges of it." If we may enlarge on this theme I would refer also to one of his best known works *The New Atlantis*, an account of an ideal Christian State which can only be realised when mankind has ceased to relegate the Deity to a secondary role, and has installed the Divine Spirit in its rightful place as Lord of all.

In other words Bacon wanted to reform religion, urge tolerance, and turn the hearts of men. No wonder George Herbert, a personal acquaintance, commenting on *The Great Instauration* when it appeared in 1620, referred to the author as:- *Mundique et animarum sacerdos unicus, i.e.,* the alone and only priest of nature, and man's soul. As we know from Genesis, Adam was promised command of Nature, before succumbing to temptation in the Garden of Eden.

When the voyagers approached Bensalem we are told, in *The New Atlantis*, that they asked who the apostle of the island was. "Ye knit my heart to you," the official replies by asking this in the first place "for it shows that you seek first the kingdom of heaven". In Bensalem, and therefore for Bacon, the Bible was the dominant influence. Indeed, in his time, the English were known as the people of the Book. Would that it were so now!.

Let us consider also the first sentence in Bacon's essentially personal treatise, *The Masculine Birth of Time*:-

To God the Father, God the Word, and the Spirit, we pour out our humble and burning prayers, that, mindful of the miseries of the human race and our own mortal pilgrimage, in which we wear out evil days and fears he would send down upon us new streams from the fountain of his mercy for the relief of our distress.

He was 42 when he wrote this, and 59 when *The Great Instauration* appeared. I think that we may reasonably infer that he was incapable of the frailties of which he has been and still is accused, including corruption.

But my purpose is not to be controversial but to sway the hearts of my readers to help achieve Bacon's great aim – the redemption of Mankind through the Crucifixion and Resurrection of his Master, Jesus the Christ.

EDITORIAL

The Society Centenary celebrations on Saturday, June 21st, proved to be a complete success and greatly enjoyed by all who attended. The warm sunny weather undoubtedly contributed to the occasion, and many stayed until the very end of a long day which finished at approximately seven o'clock on an unbelievably beautiful summer's evening.

The programme of events was outlined in the *Baconiana* 185 Editorial, and although our President was unfortunately unable to welcome the guests at St. Michael's Parish Hall opposite the Church at Gorhambury owing to illness, we estimate that 70 or 80 arrived, many from considerable distances. The informal gathering gave every opportunity for mutual introductions and greetings against the background of a carefully and expertly selected background of Elizabethan string music. The players were Amber and Gerard Bonham-Carter (particularly welcome as representing the family of the late Commander Martin Pares) on the viola and cello respectively, Elizabeth Hovhanness (an accomplished pianist), and on the recorder Joy Plumstead, a specialist in this type of music.

The full repertoire was as follows:-

Music Programme at the Parish Hall Reception

Sonata Polonese	Telemann
Andante – Allegro – Dolce – Allegro	
The Duchesse of Brunswick's Toy	Dr John Bull
Muscadin	Anon
Elizabethan Dances and Ayres	
La Volta	William Byrd
Fayne Would I Wedd	Richard Farnaby
Alman	Thomas Morley
Ayre "What is a day"	Philip Rossiter
Pavan and Galliard "The Earle of Salisbury"	William Byrd
15th Century Folk Song	Anon
Elizabethan Dances and Ayres	
Corranto	Anon
Wolseys Wilde	William Byrd
Ayre "And would you see my mistress' face"	Philip Rossiter
The Duke of Brunswick's Alman	Dr John Bull

Greensleeves

Music from Shakespeare's Plays	Anon 16th Century
Corranto	
English Jig	
The Sick Tune	
Light O'Love	
Morisco	
A Toy	Giles Farnaby
The Irishe Ho'Hoane	Anon
Alman	Robert Johnson
Masque Dances	Anon
Sir Francis Bacon's Masque	
Sir Francis Bacon's Second Masque	
Graysin	
The Second (of Gray's Inn)	
The Mountebanks Dance at Grayes Inne	
The Standing Masque	
Trio sonata in F	Telemann
<i>Vivace - Mesto - Allegro</i>	

Rested and refreshed, the party adjourned to St. Michael's for the Centenary Service timed for 11.30 am in this historic Church containing Francis Bacon's Monument, the beautiful Elizabethan pulpit, the more modern Rosicrucian window, and the Sir Thomas Meautys tomb.

We reproduce below the details of this very moving Service which impressed all by its spiritual significance, enhanced by the hymns, the first and second Lessons read by Noel Fermor and Sir George Trevelyan respectively, and the address by Peter Dawkins, a Member of the Council and Director of the Francis Bacon Research Trust.

The clear reading from Francis Bacon's *Essay Of Goodness* by Mary Brameld which followed was an appropriate reminder of her mother, Hope, who gave so many years of devoted service to the Society. The final Blessing set the seal on a vivid occasion which we are sure will remain in the memory of those fortunate enough to be present; and, we submit, more than justifies the *apologia* written by our Chairman to stress the Christian overtones of Francis Bacon's message for posterity.

THE FRANCIS BACON SOCIETY
CENTENARY THANKSGIVING SERVICE

at
St. Michael's Church, Gorhambury,
St. Albans

on
Saturday, 21st June, 1986

* *

(The Service was conducted by the Rev. Alan Fermor.)

HYMN

King of Glory, King of Peace

* * * * *

THE STUDENT'S PRAYER

written by Francis Bacon

To God the Father, God the Word, God the Spirit, we pour forth most humble and hearty supplications; that He remembering the calamities of mankind, and the pilgrimage of this our life, in which we wear out days few and evil, would please to open to us new refreshments out of the fountains of His goodness, for the alleviating of our miseries.

This also we humbly and earnestly beg, that human things may not prejudice such as are divine; neither that from the unlocking of the gates of sense, and the kindling of a greater natural light, any thing of incredulity, or intellectual night, may arise in our minds towards divine Mysteries. But rather, that by our mind thoroughly cleansed and purged from fancies and vanities, and yet subject and perfectly given up to the divine Oracles, there may be given unto Faith the things that are Faith's.

Amen

COLLECT



HYMN 335

Blesst are the Pure in Heart



FIRST LESSON

Psalm 91 (Bacon's translation)

He that dwelleth in the secret place of the Most High shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty.

I will say of the Lord, "He is my refuge and my fortress: My God; in Him will I trust."

Surely He shall deliver thee from the snare of the fowler, and from the noisome pestilence.

He shall cover thee with His feathers, and under his wings shalt thou trust: His trust shall be thy shield and buckler.

Thou shalt not be afraid for the terror by night; nor for the arrow that flieth by day;

Nor for the pestilence that walketh in darkness; nor for the destruction that wasteth at noonday.

A thousand shall fall at thy side, and then thousand at thy right hand; but it shall not come nigh thee.

Only with thine eyes shalt thou behold and see the reward of the wicked.

Because thou hast made the Lord, Which is my refuge, even the Most High thy habitation.

There shall no evil befall thee, neither shall any plague come nigh thy dwelling.

For He shall give His angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways.

They shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone.

Thou shalt tread upon the lion and adder: the young lion and the dragon shalt thou trample under feet.

Because he hath set his love upon Me, therefore will I deliver him: I will set him high, because he hath known My Name.

He shall call upon Me, and I will answer him: I will be with him in trouble; I will deliver him, and honour him.

With long life will I satisfy him, and shew him My Salvation.

* * * * *

Peter Dawkins

We are gathered today in celebration and thanksgiving for the life and work of Francis Bacon, and for the one hundred years of existence of the Francis Bacon Society that was founded to honour his name and to research his life and work.

The Psalm that we have just heard was Psalm 91, which begins:-

He that dwelleth in the secret place of the Most High
Shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty.

The Shadow of the Almighty, or Shadow of God, is a powerful and deeply mystical image, worthy of meditation, and one which was important to Francis Bacon. It also occurs in Psalm 57:-

Be merciful unto me, O God, be merciful unto me,
for my soul trusteth in Thee;
And under the shadow of Thy wings shall be my refuge,
till this tyranny be overpassed.

The symbology is well explained by Orpheus:-

God is Truth, and the light is His shadow.

and by Marsilio Ficino:-

What then is the light of the sun?
It is the shadow of God, sun of the sun.
The light of the sun is God in this world,
And God is the light of the sun above the angels.

The motto, "Beneath the shadow of Thy wings, O Lord," was used on emblems dedicated to Francis Bacon, and as the principal motto on Rosicrucian manifestoes and books associated with Bacon's work and, as a symbolic description used by Bacon in his book, *The New Atlantis*.

Francis Bacon was a deeply committed Christian, in the most universal and enlightened sense, and this motto, or Biblical statement, was not used lightly by him. It points the way towards something profound – a goal to attain.

GOD is Love. God is All-Good. God is Truth.
The LIGHT of God is God's Holy Wisdom.
This Light or Wisdom is God's "Shadow".

To dwell in, or "beneath" God's shadow is to dwell in His Holy Wisdom, which illumines our hearts and minds. This is the whole principle and basis of Francis Bacon's work – the illumination of men's minds by the Holy Wisdom of God – the heavenly light which is itself but the shadow of God, but by means of which we can approach the Divine Presence, the "Father which art in heaven".

As if to emphasise this goal, Bacon caused a monument to his memory to be erected right by the side of the high altar in the chancel of St. Michael's Church. This monument is placed on the north side of the altar – the place where all sacrifices or offerings were traditionally made to God in Solomon's Temple. There, portrayed in white marble, sits Francis Bacon, eyes wide open and gazing up into the heavens in contemplation of the divine Mysteries.

He is sitting, very much awake, neither lying nor slumbering in the sleep of the dead. And engraved on this monument, instead of the usual "Here lies" so-and-so, the inscription reads SIC SEDEBAT – Francis Bacon "sat thus".

SIC SEDEBAT is a Biblical quotation, derived from the Vulgate version of the Holy Bible. The phrase occurs in the Gospel of St. John, chapter 4, verse 6, where the story describes Jesus who "sat thus" at Jacob's well at Shechem in Samaria. At this well Jesus encountered the Samaritan woman and asked her for a drink. In return, Jesus announced to her that he was the Christ, and that, if she asked, he would provide her with the water of everlasting life:-

Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life.

Water is a symbol not only of life, but of knowledge – particularly when that water is turned to wine.

Elsewhere, following this line of thought, Francis Bacon says:-

The knowledge of man is as the waters, some descending from above, and some springing from beneath; the one informed by the light of nature, the other inspired by divine revelation. The light of nature consisteth in the notions of the mind and the report of the senses ... So then, according to these two differing illuminations or originals, knowledge is first of all divided into DIVINITY and PHILOSOPHY.

Francis Bacon refers to DIVINITY as being the Mistress, and PHILOSOPHY as being the handmaiden who serves her Mistress.

Concerning the importance of Philosophy, and its role of service, Francis Bacon wrote:-

Let it be observed, that there be two principal duties and services, besides ornament and illustration, which philosophy and human learning do perform to faith and religion ...

The one, because they are an effectual inducement to the exaltation of the glory of God ...

The other, because they minister a singular help and preservative against unbelief and error;

for as our Saviour sayeth: “You err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God;” laying before us two books or volumes to study, if we would be saved from error; first, the Scriptures, revealing the Will of God; and then the creatures expressing His power; whereof the latter is a key unto the former ...

The quotation, “SIC SEDEBAT”, on Bacon’s monument, is an ENIGMA. Francis Bacon is himself an enigma. Much of his work is an enigma – and all deliberately so. He set out to imitate the Creator, and play the divine game of Hide and Seek.

Over and over again he quoted and emphasised a particular Proverb of Solomon [Proverbs 25:2]. Commenting on this, Bacon wrote:-

The Glory of God is to conceal a thing, but the glory of a king is to find it out, as if, according to that innocent and affectionate play of children, the Divine Majesty took delight to hide His works, to the end to have them found out.

If you look carefully, you will notice further enigmas on his monument. For instance, notice that Francis Bacon is not only shown seated, but also unusually, wears a hat – in church! Normally only bishops or kings are shown wearing hats, or crowns, in church monuments. The HAT is a very ancient emblem signifying the wisdom or illumination of an individual, of which the crown is the most obvious and highest symbolic form.

Notice that on Francis Bacon's shoes are large roses. The feet and shoes in symbology signify sympathy and understanding. The ROSE is the emblem of Beauty, Purity and the Understanding of the heart. It is equated with the Holy Grail.

Now look at this pulpit. This pulpit was originally made for the Bacon family, and stood in their chapel in Tudor Gorhambury – a house that was known as “the White Temple”. Notice that on this pulpit is carved a grail chalice, with a rose growing out of it. Over the rose is a crown. These are set between decorative pillars supporting an arch, like the Arch of the Mysteries. Overhead is a representation of a Cherub – a Great Angel of Light, or Illumination – its wings symbolising the spiritual Light which is the Shadow of God.

In these symbols and enigmas, Francis Bacon followed the way of the ancient sages and teachers of mankind, who taught that man is made in the image of God, and is intended to become the likeness of God in every conceivable way. As Francis Bacon rightly said:-

The perfection of the human form consists in approaching the
Divine or Angelic Nature.

GOD is Love; His Nature is Goodness. For man to become the likeness of God, we must each become a person who is all goodness. We must, in fact, become “Michaelic”. The name, Michael, means “He who is like unto God”, and this is exactly what man is intended to be. I don't suppose it is by chance that Francis Bacon's monument is placed in St. Michael's Church!

One of the principal ways in which to achieve the perfection ordained for each of us is to become as a little child and play the game of hide-and-seek. This is a divinely-given way in which to find Truth and become the likeness of Truth by living it, practising it. We can best practise Truth when we first know something about the Truth, and what we are meant to do, and how we are meant to do it.

It is a fact of human nature that man is best taught in parables or enigmas, because we like a mystery – we like to discover secrets, and to improve our abilities and performance. This is an important motivating

force in all of us; otherwise we would be content with knowing and doing nothing particularly worthwhile. But with a driving force to seek out mysteries, to learn from them and then to practise what we discover, we can become the likeness of God – if those mysteries we discover are real truths.

It is also a fact of human nature that we all need help on our path of discovery. We need teachers and interpreters; and to this end we learn how to help each other and share the enjoyment of that. Furthermore, in order to make great leaps in knowledge and ability, we need the geniuses – the really great teachers – who will appear on the scene at the right time and in the right place. It is a wonderful truth that God has never left mankind without such great teachers.

Those of us who have studied the life and works of Francis Bacon know that this is what he is – one of the really great world teachers – one of those mighty souls who appear but once in an age, if that! Francis Bacon set out to discover, understand and practise Truth on a vast scale, and to teach others how to do the same. He was a man of immense genius – an acknowledged wonder of the age – who earnestly sought for Truth, discovered a great deal concerning Truth, and who was an example of exceptional wisdom, loving-kindness, vitality and self-sacrifice for the good of others – particularly for future generations that he foresaw would benefit the most by his work and example.

The Francis Bacon Society was founded to seek truth out, following a trail set up for this purpose by Francis Bacon – a man-made trail that is designed to lead the seeker naturally into the divine game of hide-and-seek, training man's intelligence and abilities in the process, and giving mankind a clear and efficient method by means of which Truth might be discovered.

In Bacon's teaching, Philosophy cannot be divorced from Divinity, and neither of them should be separated from Action. It is not enough to simply feel or think truth: we must also practise that truth, or else all is simply vanity. The results of such practice should be good, for, as Bacon rightly points out, "The Character of God is Goodness".

"TRUTH PRINTS GOODNESS" – that is the proof of whether we ourselves are true, and whether we really do know Truth.

SECOND LESSON

1 Corinthians xii 27 - xiii 13

Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular.

And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets,

thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues.

Are all apostles! are all prophets? are all teachers? are all workers of miracles?

Have all the gifts of healing? do all speak with tongues? do all interpret?

But covet earnestly the best gifts: and yet shew I unto you a more excellent way.

Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal.

And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing.

And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing.

Charity suffereth long, and is kind; charity envieth not; charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up.

Doth not behave itself unseemingly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil;

Rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth.

Beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things.

Charity never faileth: but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away.

For we know in part, and we prophesy in part.

But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away.

When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child: but when I became a man, I put away childish things.

For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then I shall know even as I am known.

And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity.

* * * * *

HYMN 365
Praise my Soul the King of Heaven.

* * * * *

READING FROM ESSAY OF GOODNESS

by Francis Bacon

I take Goodness in this sense, the affecting of the weal of men, which is that the Grecians call *Philanthropia*; and the word *Humanity* (as it is used) is a little too light to express it.

Goodness I call the habit, and Goodness of nature the inclination. This of all virtues and dignities of the mind is the greatest, being the character of the Deity; and without it man is a busy, mischievous, wretched thing; no better than a kind of vermin.

Goodness answers to the theological virtue Charity, and admits no excess; neither can angel or man come in danger by it.

The parts and signs of goodness are many.

If a man be gracious and courteous to strangers it shews he is citizen of the world, and that his heart is no island cut off from other lands, but a continent that joins to them.

If he be compassionate towards the afflictions of others, it shews that his heart is like the noble tree that is wounded itself when it gives the balm.

If he easily pardons and remits offences, it shews that his mind is planted above injuries; so that he cannot be shot.

If he be thankful for small benefits, it shews that he weighs men's minds, and not their trash.

But above all, if he have St. Paul's perfection, that he would wish to be an *anathema** from Christ for salvation of his brethren, it shews much of a divine nature, and a kind of conformity with Christ himself.

*a Greek word used here in the original sense of a thing devoted.

HYMN

Breathe on me, Breath of God

* * * * *

BLESSING

* * * * *

At the buffet lunch at Pre Hotel which followed, guests were able to organise alfresco meals on the lawns to enjoy the warm sylvan setting situated so near to the Earl of Verulam's estate. After a while our Chairman introduced Peter Dawkins in the role of Master of Ceremonies in preparation for the visits to Tudor Gorhambury and Bacon's Mount. Peter reminded his listeners that although Marie Bauer* had been unable to fulfil her intention of travelling from the USA owing to indisposition, her place had been taken by Mr. Stephen Marble who then gave a message of greeting from overseas.

Sir George Trevelyan followed, with hardly a note, on the Toast to Francis Bacon. Sir George is Founder of the Wrekin Trust.

As a closing paragraph to his speech about Francis Bacon as a herald of the New Age of spiritual awakening, Sir George said,

It is a noble thought that God first created the Archetypal Ideas of all things, which exist as a living reality on the ethereal plane, before they manifest in the physical. This is clearly indicated in Genesis, where the Creation is first described as God making all things "after their kind" before they appear on earth. These are the archetypes or group egos of all the creatures. And primary in creation is the Human Archetype, made "in the image of God". We are all, through long evolution, working towards the realization of this archetype. It has clearly been demonstrated in its perfection in Jesus and in the Buddha in his enlightenment and compassion. Great men like Leonardo and Michelangelo demonstrate the unlimited human potential, as does Francis Bacon, to whom we do honour today. The words of the Great Bard can be taken as a noble description of him.

What a piece of work is a man, how noble in reason, how infinite in faculties, in form and moving, how express and admirable in action, how like an angel in apprehension, how like a god; the beauty of the world, the paragon of animals.

*who, we understand, is attempting to secure permission to search for MSS. in the vault in the foundations of the old church in Williamsburg, Virginia.

Ladies and gentlemen, dear friends, I give you the toast

Francis Bacon, Herald of the New Age.

* * * * *

Lastly Mr. Clifford Hall, Lecturer-at-law in the University of Buckingham, thanked the Society for such a wonderful occasion. We are happy to reproduce his remarks.

Vice-presidents, Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen.

On this historic day we have travelled to St. Albans, in Bacon's words, the younger of us as part of education, the older as part of experience (*Of Travel*). We have come as seers, mystics, metaphysicians, logicians, *litterateurs*, cryptographers, students of the natural sciences, the occult and the science of jurisprudence, as interested professionals and as dedicated amateurs. For myself, I come as a lawyer but of the academic sort unused to the rough and tumble of life at the Bar. One must say, therefore, that I came as a younger sort of amateur.

As Sir George Trevelyan has said, we have come as friends whether or not we know one another. Mr. Fermor I know of course – he has always been so helpful to me, so encouraging – and Miss Brameld I know for the kindness and courtesy she showed me when, some months ago, I delivered a paper to the Society, at her home at Nevern Square, which asserted that neither morally nor legally was Bacon a corrupt judge, whatever Lord Denning might say. For this reason alone, I am glad that Master Francis Cowper is here from Gray's Inn, Bacon's own. Some of Master Cowper's writings I have read through the good offices of our mutual friend, Lord Edmund-Davies, and it is good to know that we share an abiding interest in that grand old man, Judge David Jenkins of Hensol in Glamorgan. And Sir George Trevelyan I remember, though he could not possibly remember me, from those lofty week-ends at Attingham Park, a quarter of a century ago, when all things seemed possible and even schoolboys travelled to Atcham to hear the late Douglas Brown extol the recondite virtues of Yeats, and Eliot and Hardy.

Friends all ... and here today to discharge, in Bacon's words again, "the fullness and swellings of the heart" (*Of Friendship*). As "the occasion of any great virtue cometh on festivals" (*Of Ceremonies and Respects*), it is fitting that as friends all we should appropriately record our appreciation to the Society for its amplitude this day, at this unique festival redolent, as it has been, with "scenes abounding in light", with songs "loud and cheerful", with music "well-placed" (*Of Masques and Triumphs*), with

discourse distilled by the moment and stored in the precious vaults of memory and, as it will be later this day, with the "enchanted palaces of poets" (*Of Building*) and the delight of gardens, the "purest of human pleasures" which so refresh "the spirits of man" (*Of Gardens*) – more even than our admirable lunch!

To the Society, with its friends and from its friends, to all those who did so much and worked so hard to make this celebration possible, I record, in a way both formal and familiar, the very grateful appreciation of us all. Chairman, may our Society continue to flourish, let its words reflect the aspirations of the man, and let its next 100 years continue to excite the imaginations of young and old alike – in truth re-told, from new discoveries made and old heresies finally nailed. Thank you, Sir, from us all for this very special day.

* * * * *

FRANCIS BACON SOCIETY CENTENARY CELEBRATIONS 21st JUNE 1986.

List of Guests.

Sir George Trevelyan, Bt.	Mr. Noel Fermor
Revd. Alan Fermor	Mr. Thomas Bokenham
Mrs. Fermor	Mr. Robert Waygood
Mrs. Rhoda Cowen	Miss Elizabeth Horne
Mr. Peter Dawkins	Mr. Peter Horne
Mrs. Wendy Dawkins	Mr. Edward Posey
Mrs. Jean Aston	Ms. Liz Hosken
Mr. David R. Fairbairn	Mr. Keith Fielder
Miss Mary Gordon	Mrs. Maggi Fielder
Miss Mary Brameld	Mr. Arthur James
Miss Pat Stevens	Mrs. Patricia James
Ms. Jane Armstrong	Mrs. Merle Fried
Mrs. H. W. Oliver	Mrs. Elizabeth Kirsten
Mr. J. A. Reece	Mr. Adrian Kirsten
Mr. G.W. White	Master Francis Cowper
Mr. George Bennett	Mr. G.L. Fermor
Mr. Francis Carr	Mrs. G.L. Fermor
Mrs. Carr	Master Richard Fermor
Mr. J.W.F. Morton	Mrs. Sylvia Armstrong
Mrs. Morton	Mr. Armstrong
Mrs. Jessie Marsden	Miss Jenny Miles

Mr. Arthur Marsden
Mr. Leslie Gould
Mrs. Mary Gould
Mr. Christopher Stewart-Smith
Ms. Liz Marshall
Mr. Rupert Stewart-Smith
Miss Olive Davis
Miss Charlotte Yonge
Miss Donna James
Mr. Nigel Briggs
Miss Miriam Collingwood
Miss Lorna Billinghurst
Mrs. Barbara Siddall
Miss Shirley Wade
Mrs. Elizabeth Hovaness
Mrs. Amber Bonham-Carter
Mr. Gerard Bonham-Carter
Mrs. Joy Plumstead
Mr. Alfred Howell
Mr. Clifford Hall
Mr. Roger Earis
Mr. Nicholas Rose
Mrs. Henrietta Rose
Lt. Col. Tom Welch
Mrs. Lorna St. Aubyn
Mr. Stephen Marble
Mr. Henry Lincoln
Ms. Deborah Forman

Mr. Richard Barker
Mr. Harold Wood
Sarjano
Miss Ruth Briscoe
Miss Mary Moriggi
Mr. G. Parker
Mrs. Norah King
Mrs. Josefina Pugh
Maj. Gen. Brian Daunt
Mrs. Margaret Daunt
Mr. David Millward
Miss Deborah Harris
H.I.H. Princess Patricia Palaeologina
H.I.H. Prince Petros Paelaeiologos
Mr. John Spiers
Miss Sue Roe
Mr. Eric Warrington
Mrs. Shirley Warrington
Mr. Gerald Salway
Mr. Robert Cowley
Mrs. Veronica Cowley
Mr. Brian Williams
Mrs. Williams
Mrs. Margaret Milbank
Mrs. Brindi Ogle
Mrs. I.L. Lewis
Mr. Jeremy Smith
Ms. Marie Zanelli

Within a few miles of London is a place which is the epitome of the history of this island. Here buried in thick woods was the main settlement of the Belgic Catuvellani tribe. Here beneath the sloping green fields beside the banks of the little River Ver are the remains of a notable Roman city, and here a most remarkable theatre has been extricated from oblivion. Here the blood of Britain's first Christian martyr was shed. Here over the place of his execution there arose one of the greatest abbeys in England and its enormous church, now raised to the dignity of a cathedral, still defies the devouring teeth of time. In the streets of the medieval town was fought one of the decisive battles of the Wars of the Roses. A little way outside the town was the mansion of that enigmatic philosopher and lawyer, Francis Bacon. Here, on the highway from Scotland to London, Simon Fraser, Lord Lovat, halted at the White Hart Inn on road to the block for his part in the rising of 1745. Here still survives a school founded by Francis Bacon's father, the Lord Keeper. Here the Saturday market still breathes the spirit of an English country town. Not everything about this place has been for the best. A touch of Victorian vandalism in the restorations which that rich aggressive and eruptive Victorian lawyer, Lord Grimthorpe, forced upon the Abbey was out of harmony. So too, some think, is the modern Chapter House. But the great building has a living, cared for look, adorned with flowers and candles. Not long ago the town council, as stubborn town councils will, forced through the building of a new shopping precinct, in a town of useful little shops, which needed no such intrusion. Vocal public opinion only succeeded, with difficulty, in modifying the original monstrous design. Still, with all the marks of its long history upon it, St. Albans and its surroundings remain one of the pleasantest places within easy range of London.

In Search of Bacon

It was therefore with particular pleasure that the members of the Francis Bacon Society assembled at Gorhambury on 21st June to celebrate the centenary of its foundation. Gorhambury is a green easy walk from the Abbey, past the little ancient Fighting Cocks Inn along the placid little Ver. The peaceful village is crowned by the St Michael's Church, in the parish of which was the mansion of the Bacons. In that church is Francis Bacon's marble monument by the north side of the altar, with his figure not recumbent but seated reflectively in his chair as he was in life. *Sic sedebat*. Everything harmonised on this occasion. At the initial reception in the parish hall by the churchyard an orchestra of recorder, viola, 'cello and piano rendered 16th and early 17th century music by Telemann, Bull, Byrd and others, dances from Shakespeare's plays and Gray's Inn mas-

ques. The memorial service in the church was simple, including the 91st psalm and St. Paul's great letter on charity. From the pulpit, which originally stood in the chapel of Gorhambury House, Mr Peter Dawkins delivered an address on the enigma of Francis Bacon and the search for truth which he pursued in the conviction that:

the glory of God is to conceal a thing but
the glory of a King is to find it out,

so that in His creation wise men have been set a game of hide and seek to discern the truth on a cosmic scale. After the service the assembly adjourned to a *dejeuner sur l'herbe* on the lawns of a charming early Victorian country hotel named, in French, from the meadows around it. Here the guests, seated on the grass, so that one was reminded of the disciples of Socrates, heard an address by Sir George Trevelyan, nobly handsome and with an energy and eloquence which belied his years. Bacon is credited with having set scientific enquiry on the road which it has since followed, but Sir George reminded his audience that Bacon did not hold the materialistic doctrine that nothing exists which is not perceptible to the senses. The apex of the pyramid of scientific inquiry which he constructed touches the non material world, descending from God's own thought and design. The universe is a single whole comprising every creature in it and with all the parts interdependent, while humanity has been given the faculty to transcend reason and scientific enquiry, which only reach a certain way, and to put itself directly in touch with the universal mind of God, His whole design. Sir George is convinced that the senses of this mystic wholeness of the universe are being apprehended more than ever before and must increasingly influence man's dealings with the material world.

Visible Remains

Next, the company adjourned to Gorhambury House, the seat of the Earl and Countess of Verulam. The great pillars of its classical stone facade looked down on that quintessentially English country scene, a local cricket match. In that vast entrance hall, the dining room, the library and the drawing room there hang, rank upon rank, full length portraits of Francis Bacon and his contemporaries. There are two windows from the Tudor Gorhambury House with little reproductions of exotic flowers and plants and birds and beasts. In the library above the bookcases, with their contents arranged according to Bacon's systematic directions, stand lifelike terracotta busts of his father, Sir Nicholas, and his wife and their elder son Anthony. Then on, deeper into the parkland to the remains of old Gorhambury House, the Tudor mansion built by Sir Nicholas and enlarged by Francis. Of the great courtyard, the hall, the chapel, the long

gallery, with a cloister beneath, the stables, the mill, the brewhouse, little remains but the porch. All the classical and allegorical paintings and decorations with their enigmatic significance have malted away under the hand of time.

The final stage of the Baconian pilgrimage led by intricate paths through the deep, wild, richly mixed woodland that now covers the Prae Hills. Once those hills were treeless and were covered by the settlements of the ancient Catuvellani. Hidden at their heart, where a stranger would never guess, are the remains of a pyramid constructed in three tiers by Francis Bacon as an observatory. Only when one has actually scaled it does one appreciate the nature of the work now veiled by trees. At the very centre of the summit a great tree springs up very straight. Looking down the slope covered in vegetation and veiled by overhanging branches and leaves one seems to see an English version of those temples engulfed in the jungles of Latin America.

On such an occasion one can only pick up here and there the threads which Francis Bacon has left through the labyrinth of the centuries, the music, the system of thought, the ruined house, the enigmatic face recorded by painters, the remains of the strange hilltop observatory and play the game of "hide and seek".

With acknowledgement to the *Solicitors' Journal* (Vol. 130 pp. 501-2).

* * * * *

In December last year it was reported that archaeologists discovered a 17th century manor house Renaissance garden which, according to the Virginian state archaeologist, was similar to the one at Wilton, near Salisbury, designed for William Herbert – the fourth Earl of Pembroke (one of the "incomparable pair" to whom the 1623 Shakespeare Folio was dedicated) in 1615. An expert has suggested that the garden dated from *circa* 1680. It lies beside Bacon's Castle "a rural Virginian home" twelve miles south of Williamsburg, built in 1665.

What is believed to be an important Baconian vault was located, with the help of coded tombstones in Williamsburg, Virginia, in 1938.

Manly Palmer Hall in *America's Assignment with Destiny** quoted the above comment from Marie Bauer's *Foundations Unearthed*, and stated that Thomas Jefferson examined the repositories of the Bacon group in

* Reprinted in *Baconiana* 144 from *The Adepts*.

colonial America, checked their contents, and caused them to be re-sealed for future ages.

We know that Bacon was a member of the Virginia Council and was responsible for the advances and Charters granted to him and his associates in Guy's Newfoundland Company.**

It is claimed that Miranda's reference to the "brave New World" in *The Tempest* is to America, and we can add Ulster and the Bermudas to Bacon's list of "plantations".

As to the Bacon family in America, it may be noted that Benjamin Harrison, the twenty-third President was doubly descended from it, which may help to explain the following official verdict on Bacon's Castle gardens.

The largest, earliest, best preserved, most sophisticated garden that has come to light in North America.

We shall await further developments with the keenest interest.

* * * * *

Too little attention has been paid to Ben Jonson who was undoubtedly one of the most prominent personalities in Francis Bacon's *entourage*. We are therefore printing an article by Ewen MacDuff, not primarily about his works (The Oxford Press Edition issued eleven volumes to do this!), but about his character and life. In this way our understanding of Bacon's message for posterity is enhanced.

** *History of Newfoundland* by Alexander Brown, *vide The Colonial State Calendar*.

AN APPEAL

The *Council of the Francis Bacon Society* have embarked upon a major publishing enterprise. With generous support from Mrs. Irene Rowland, step-daughter of the late Alfred Dodd, we have sponsored a book of 580 pages, with illustrations. The hardback volume, *Francis Bacon's Personal Life Story*, is published and marketed by the well-known house, Rider & Co., at the price of £12.95 (in the UK only).

This substantial work is divided into two Parts. Volume I deals with Bacon's life up to the death of Elizabeth I; Volume II takes up the narrative from the summoning and accession of James I until 1626 – the putative date of Bacon's death.

The first Part was originally published in 1949 and, in common with *Shakespeare's Sonnet Diary* by the same author, also issued over thirty years ago, quickly became a best seller. The second Part, although completed, remained in MS. form owing to the death of the author, until located recently by Mrs. Rowland.

The combined work represents a major achievement, and we believe that several hundred copies have already been sold because of the great interest the author's original researches have aroused. Indeed it is impossible to study the text without revising one's perspective on the momentous events and leading personalities of the Elizabethan and Jacobean period. The writer also deals convincingly with the previous centuries in his chapter on the Mediaeval Era.

In fact the book is sensational in the best sense of the word, and the Council beg – no, plead with – Members to buy copies for their own enlightenment, and to support the Society. In this way, Bacon's altruism and genius will become more widely known and respected.

The two following extracts are designed to whet the appetite!

Is it possible for a man to hold noble ideals for the advancement of humanity, to sacrifice himself in the service of man and yet be corrupt in mind and shrunken in soul? Can any man serve two master – Altruistic Philanthropia and Avaricious Corruption? Is it possible for a man to create and found and practise the most marvellous allegorical and symbolical System of Ethics ever known to the world, and yet to be false to all he holds dear, "square conduct, level steps, upright intentions"? Has anyone ever known in history or private life, a bad man to inculcate consistently throughout a long life the "purest principles of piety and virtue," so that a contemporary wrote, "all who were good and great loved him?" Does the youthful face of the Hilliard minia-

ture, round which the artist wrote "Could I but paint his Mind," mask a soul that bore the seeds of bribery and corruption? Am I to believe that the honest English eyes that look at me from the portrait of Francis Bacon at fifty, by Van Somer, were given over to the evil practice of servile scrounging so that he might squander his ill-gotten gains on questionable extravagances? In short, how could a man who had taken "all Knowledge to be his Province", who was eminently wise and good, be a venial judge and a most dishonest man? Could Nature ever have made such a Jekyll-Hyde contradiction as is painted by Macaulay and the theologians – Abbott, Church, and Sortain?

In every monarchy, every school and university, a ceaseless silent espionage was set on foot. Every action of the student's life was reported to the Inquisitor

Ever since Italy had been darkened by the shadow of the Inquisition, *man had begun to devise means to communicate with each other, and with their public. In a style which should be intelligible to themselves* without giving offence to Rome. Open revolt was impossible. They matched their wits against their persecutors and *were able to say pretty nearly what they liked by a SYSTEM OF DISGUISED WRITING ...*

This use of DOUBLE WRITING in serious literature was the only method of free expression open to men of letters *to write in such a manner that the Authorities might assume their doctrine to be orthodox while the public for whom it was designed might readily perceive its real drift.* Except by resort to this OLD AND TIME-HONOURED DEVICE the spirit of independent thought would have perished altogether

The modern has nothing but distaste for cryptic modes of writing ... yet Dante lent his genius to this end ... like his master Virgil he chose to practise the subtlety of the *double entendre* ... Dante and his contemporaries had a *hidden multitude* eager for each work they produced.¹

¹Quoted by Dodd from *Passing of Beatrice* by Gertrude Leigh (Introduction, page X).

OBITUARY

*On profite plus d'une demi-journee de contact avec
un spécialiste que d'un mois d'etude sans aide.*

The Council record with the utmost regret the death of Pierre Henrion on Friday, 21st February, 1986.

Professor Henrion, late of Versailles University, and member of an elite body of French professors, was undoubtedly the most brilliant intellect in the Society. Despite his exceptionally successful academic career he was essentially a modest man. Tolerance and friendliness were his most notable characteristics, unless, as the present writer knows only too well, any attempt was made to compliment him on one of his contributions to the authorship controversy. Modesty and high mental activity combined are not common, particularly, as in this case, unceasing championship of the Baconian case, met so often and so long with bitter opposition. Sadly, some of his fellow academics employed every device to confute his arguments, not least when he took part in debates with University Professors on the French broadcast services. This, we know, was a grief to him, yet he maintained (and more than maintained) his views to the end; ever with innate courtesy and charm.

The late Martin Pares, an accomplished and learned man himself, was a considerate friend and sympathiser over a period of two decades and more. When the Master of Grays Inn invited the Society to provide speakers at a dinner to celebrate the quatercentenary of Francis Bacon's birth (in 1961), Pares asked Henrion at very short notice to speak. Henrion responded gallantly, coming over from France and delivering a speech which for wit and brilliance was, we believe, fully the equal of the addresses delivered by the distinguished speakers on behalf of the Inn.

It was Pierre Henrion who replied so cuttingly and effectively to Colonel and Mrs. Friedman's book *The Shakespeare Cyphers Examined* published in 1959. There again, Martin Pares helped him put the Friedmans' cleverly constructed arguments in proper perspective. This was indeed a *success foux* on their part. The Colonel, a professional U.S. Government cypher expert who claimed to have broken the Japanese Purple Code, was unable to refute their response despite being invited to do so.

Henrion himself had served in the French Cypher Service during the Second World War, but as the public and most writers are unaware of the Baconian defence, it is still widely assumed that our cypher claims are invalid. Undoubtedly the Friedmans were justified in denouncing numerous systems partly because of the lack of mathematical proof to the exacting standards demanded by professionals, but even in their book and

certainly afterwards they could not discredit the Gallup Biliteral Cipher, or the good faith of the progenitor (more recent ciphers such as those effectively demonstrated by Ewen McDuff, only some of which have been printed, do pass professional *criteria*).

Pierre Henrion informed this writer that he was not aware of the cipher methods adopted by Mrs. Gallup as transcribed in her books. He felt the Biliteral may have been a blind to conceal an inner system the secret of which was known to her, but not revealed. This opinion coming from such an authoritative source must be fully respected. Professor Henrion also pointed out that Bacon and his confederates, including Ben Jonson, would have scattered "clear" cyphers even anagrams and similar devices over their *corpus* of writings, in order to mislead contemporary sleuths and direct attention from the more dangerous inner ciphers, discovery of which could have had fatal consequences.

We mention these points in defence of a brilliant and intellectually honest defender and admirer of Lord Verulam, yet we remember his unfeigned admiration of *Jottings* edited by the Brameld family, and the characteristic comment:-

It never ceases to amaze me that Bacon could still inspire such devotion from such souls as the Brameld twins.

So far, we have not alluded to the succession of articles which M. Henrion contributed to *Baconiana*, his book *Defense de Will*, printed in Paris, or his unswerving devotion to the Society; but readers of recent issues of *Baconiana*, especially, will be in no doubt as to their unique character. These contributions do not rely on cipher, but on *sigillae* based on diagrammatic patterns culled from title pages and other sources in the Shakespeare quartos, and other works such as *Hemetes the Heremyte*. Readers who took the trouble to follow his directions with pen and ruler could only be convinced of the accuracy of his work, and those who have not the time for this will, we hope, take our word for this.

Fortunately, we are able to print in this issue a contribution which he himself considered to be *primus inter pares*, and which was originally submitted but not printed at the time of the Bacon quatercentenary. We are particularly pleased to repair this omission now, because in his last days we were able to tell him of our intention to do so.

The author's analysis of the secret *sigillae* incorporated in this diagrammatic representation of the Droeshout Portrait included in the 1623 Shakespeare Folio can only be described as masterly, and constitutes a major challenge to the orthodox position.

We urge our readers to study the diagrams and accompanying text

carefully as a last tribute to the contributor.

We have no space to comment at length on Professor Henrion's achievements, except to add that he did not rely only on the 1632 Folios and quartos as he believed and demonstrated that the Second Folio of 1632 also contained clues for posterity.

We have been asked by Ewen McDuff, a life long student of Shakespearean cipher evidence, to express his sincere sadness at the loss of a fellow cryptologist and Life Member of the society.

We extend our heartfelt sympathy to Madame Henrion and her family in their bereavement.

Avec toutes les amities.

Adieu.

N.F.

* * * * *

List of Articles

Title	<i>Baconiana</i>
Scientific Cryptology Examined	160
A startling "Document in the Case"	164
Jonathan Swift Unlocks a Shakespearean Door	176
A Closed-Meshed Tudor Notework	177
A Rosicrosse Portrait of James I	178
A Most Humorous Quixotic Quest	179
1597 ... When the Alarm Sounded	180
Heminge and Condell's Candid Confession	181
A Tentative Essay in Amateur Detection	182
From Elbow to King	183
The Autobiographical Element in Romeo and Juliet	184
The Daub	185



1623 Folio; draft drawing by the author

MR. WILLIAM
SHAKESPEARES
 COMEDIES,
 HISTORIES, and
 TRAGEDIES.

Published according to the true Originall Copies.

The second Impression. W



Zshaded
 null

LONDON,

Printed by The Coles, for Robert Ibbot, and are to be sold at the signe
 of the Blacke Beare in Pall-mal Church-yard. 1632.

MASTER WILL'S PARAMOUNT PROOFS POSITIVE

by the late Pierre Henrion

I. THE DROESHOUT PORTRAIT'S ULTIMATE SECRET

To get as quickly as possible to the ultimate secret of the tantalizing Folio portrait of "Mr William Shakespeare", I shall not dwell on its well-known peculiarities, on the impossible asymmetrical doublet that could hardly encase a human body, the papier-mache mask, the hair which suggests a wig of starched hemp, or the absence of neck. I shall just recall that the important point is the background of the picture that appears between the edge of the mask and the edge of the collar on the left side (right for the observer). One feels invited to pivot the fleshless puppet round the axis made by the line of buttons to see what is behind that awkward juxtaposition of three carnival "props".

The second step in the traditional investigation, as my readers know well, deals with four letters, slyly hinted at, and to be read in order of appearance as the eye climbs up from the collar. If we consider, on one hand, the two white lateral edges of the collar, slanting upwards on each side of the "head" and, on the other hand, two small tape-like pieces reissuing vertically under the chin, the eye is greatly tempted to merge each of these tape-endings as the natural extremities of the outside edges which, instead of joining behind the mask to form a half-circle, bend inwards behind the mask and, never meeting, reappear under the chin. The general effect of this construction would be to suggest a vast but rather elegant slanting capital B, of the ornate letter type, pinned at the top of the doublet and supporting the mask. Then, hiding the lower lip, we consider the upper lip together with the too deep and unnaturally shaped furrow running down from the nose and ending in an impossible downward spike in the middle of the lip. The whole suggests a capital A with the branches wide apart.⁽¹⁾ A white lunula under the left eye (to the right for observer) and a white disc in the forehead suggest a C and an O to complete BACO. Lunula and disc appear vividly, almost startlingly, in the 1685 folio, possibly because the copperplate, getting worn out, was touched up, with the result that the picture was more contrasted.

The preceding well-known remarks can easily be dismissed with a shrug by those who are fond of invoking subjectivity to discard whatever

(1) That type of A is frequent in trick Shakespearean drawings. One of the best is the gable of the hut in the picture of "Zelotypia" on the title page of *The Anatomy of Melancholy*. In that picture, the two successive curves of the brook are meant to suggest a lying B, the gable an unmistakable A, the round-arched bridge an inverted C and the moon at the top (with its full circle drawn though it is a waning crescent) the remaining O to form B.A.C.O.

will not conform to official views. What comes now cannot thus be dismissed: it is a marvel of accuracy and intelligent organisation. But before we tackle this essential feature around which – and to conceal which – the rest of the portrait was evolved, I must make bold to give the reader some preparatory training in the use of a very simple cipher. As Shakespeare spared no pains to make the portrait a masterpiece in the art of secret transmission, I am sure the reader will do him the favour of being patient for a few minutes and will follow these necessary explanations with great attention. The system in question, *apparently* childish, is most effective when artfully concealed.

A little map of an imaginary Regis Parva and the drawing of a palm-tree of sorts look innocent enough but to cipher correspondents who have agreed to simple prior conventions they give short messages, clear and strictly indubitable.* They are repeated with the messages revealed. A wheel with 24 spokes, corresponding to the Latin 24-letter alphabet, can be disposed in such a way, in the case of the village, that all the points where the lanes intersect the limits of the map receive a spoke. To make matters easier, the correspondents have here made the dangerous convention that the centre of the wheel would be in a remarkable place, in the disc representing the church, though not exactly in the centre of that disc. As the system is well-known (even though it may not necessarily be recorded in the Papal Curia) it is good to vary the value of the spokes with each message. For instance, here, the spoke passing near the exit of a river showing an island was agreed to mean Z and the presence of a compass to mean that the letters turn clockwise. Why is Z chosen to fix the wheel? Because it is the rarest letter in English (.07% in a normal English text). It will have few chances of being used in the message and, if necessary, will be replaced by S. In French, the letter K would be used to fix the wheel. These very letters are still used in the same way in the rotors and wheels of many ciphering-machines, as is recorded in all unclassified books on cryptography.

Let us now look at the “speaking” map. Our wheel is placed thanks to the church and the exit of the river. The exits of the lanes coincide with spokes D, L, N, O. The bends near N and O indicate that these letters are to be used twice: D, L, N, N, O, O, obviously LONDON. It would be advisable to add other lanes issuing *between* spokes, as nulls.

The defects of that childish system (all systems have defects) are that it can give but an anagram of the message and a very short message at that,

* Owing to the untimely death of the author the original maps are no longer available, but we urge our readers to construct their own or accept the integrity of the argument for which we can vouch.

but its advantage is that it can be dissimulated perfectly and, with ingenuity, the picture can be made apparently totally innocent, much more than in the present examples. Moreover, perfect concealment can go with perfect accuracy in the placing of the wheel, making the message foolproof, a hundred per cent authenticated, as we shall soon see, even if no special security check is devised. Now a short message can be of vital importance. The Allied Forces in 1940, the Germans in 1944, would have given much to be absolutely sure of the word *Sedan* or the word *Arromanches*. In 1918, a very short ciphered radio message saved the Allies and, in effect, the few words boiled down to one: *Compiègne*.

In the case of Shakespeare, one word is enough, too, if authenticated. We shall see what wealth of precaution was taken to authenticate it, but we must first finish with the question of dissimulation. It is important to hide the place of the centre of the wheel. The church is too obvious for illegitimate decoders. The round picture of the palm-tree is slightly better. Instinctively, the supposed "enemy" will put the centre of his wheel at the centre of the circular picture, then at the point from which the leaves diverge. In either case, no interesting features of the drawing will precisely place his spokes. But after moving his wheel about at random, he will soon find that it is possible to place it so that each tip of a leaf touches a spoke (as in the second or "speaking" sketch). If he suspects the use of French, he will suppose that the spoke hidden by the trunk is K. Then the tips read A, D, E, S, N = SEDAN. Now revealing the "speaking" or "active" by the exits of lanes or tips of leaves is too obvious. A stratagem must be devised to fool the investigator without impairing the *accuracy* of the design, since this is strictly necessary to prove authenticity or, in the case of Shakespeare, to show the successful investigator that he is not the victim of "wishful thinking", the famous "subjectivity".

When I first studied the Droeshout portrait, with its somewhat semi-circular collar and its six mysterious spikes, four on one side and two on the other, I could not help thinking of the spoked-wheel trick of my schooldays but felt uneasy at the obviousness of the suggestion. It did not conform to the psychology of the man. Sure enough, I had soon to confess that, for the nth time, I was fooled. The obvious suggestion was there both to show what system was used and to provide a little extra trap (like Bacon's over clear explanation of the Biliteral Cipher: you are shown where to start, then left flatly to your own devices). Try as I might, there was no way of placing my wheel to give the six spikes "active" positions, that is to make them point indubitably to six spokes. Then one day I had the idea that what counted were the bases of these elongated triangles that I call spikes, the intersections of those spikes with the inner edge of the collar on one side and with the chin on the other. But that, surely, as I had

lines and not points, introduced an element of flexibility, frequent with Shakespeare, but thoroughly undesirable here: the wheel would be a little loose. I was fooled again. There is not an iota of flexibility. There is only one position of the wheel for which each spike base is intersected or, at the limit, touched at one extremity, by a spoke. The portrait reproduced here with its wheel gives but a rough idea of the accuracy of the design: it is only meant to give the general idea to the reader. I not only used an excellent full-size photograph made for the purpose, but had to work on a wheel drawn by a professional draughtsman on a sheet of transparent paper; not with a pin point, which would not have been accurate enough, but with the point of a thin needle. Once the position of the centre had been carefully ascertained by trial and error – and it taxed all my powers of concentration – I tried to find whether there was a trick in the portrait to indicate the centre, that needle-prick lost between the lines of the engraver at no remarkable place of the chin. I failed. The line of buttons of the doublet points vaguely in the good direction. One of the straight lines on the sleeve, on the right, points to it, too, but why that one among others? Anyhow, I was satisfied by the startling accuracy of the design: if the wheel was turned, if only by a fraction of a degree, clockwise or anticlockwise, one of the spike bases “lost” its spoke. If I made the whole wheel slide, displacing the centre in any direction, even by an iota, at least one spike lost its spoke or, in some direction, got two! So I was totally exonerated from all possible accusations of subjectivity or exploiting a “coincidence”. Pure chance *CANNOT* achieve such a complex geometrical construction with such hair’s breadth accuracy, making it possible, but just on the brink of impossibility! If the engraver had disposed of one of his apparently fanciful spikes ever so little differently, moving it by the smallest jot or making a base ever so little shorter, the whole fabric would have irretrievably dissolved into nothingness. Yet no tribunal of judges in their senses can dismiss the wheel without flouting justice, no unscrupulous mind-poisoner talk me out of believing in its existence. And that is what counts, for the message is easy to guess! The topmost of the four spikes on the right is *completely* covered by the hatchings indicating the shadow of the hair: it is a null in the message but fixes the alphabet on the wheel by placing Z, as we have seen before, as is still the practice in the 20th century. The other spikes have at least their tips in full light, and count. Clockwise, they indicate A, B, C...N, O = BACON.

Most Shakespearean systems have recourse to flexibility for better protection, the flexibility being corrected – for the intelligent, non-primary investigator – by repetition, relativity to a text (remember Matthew Arnold’s double semi-acrostics which make use of both) or cross-reference to other documents (the deadly net of context). The ultimate

trick of the Folio portrait, exceptionally, is self-proving, self-supporting, and fool-proof. The diehards could only contend that Droeshout had a grudge against the Stratford prodigy and wished to rob him of his dues in favour of Bacon – who paid him for it, of course, out of the ill-gotten gains of a corrupt judge! But, strange to say, the puppet of the 1632 edition of the *Sonnets*, though seen from a different angle and seen from a slightly different collar, has practically the same trick (it says Baco, has no Z to fix the wheel but a device to help fix the centre) with the same accuracy: an alteration of any spike-base by an iota would ruin it. Our candid and well-meaning critics can call that the constancy of pure chance!

As to the difficulty of placing the centre of the wheel in the Folio portrait, a friend of mine set me at rest by referring me to the 1632 Folio (only the copies printed “for Robert Allot”) and reminding me that this Folio is generally a greater help to the investigator than the 1623 one. If you take the two long printed lines, one above and one below the portrait (see illustration) and draw “tangents” touching the outermost letters of those lines at their outermost point allowing tangentiality, you will find – O wonder – that they cross at the very needle-point centre of the wheel and, what is more, coincide accurately with four of the spokes. Two of these spokes, on our way from ABC to ON, draw our attention to the letters F and K, giving in all F BACON K, suggesting to over-imaginative people the formula F(rancis) B(acon) K(ing). One knows how foolish associations of ideas can be. F....B....K....might irrationally put one in mind of its Greek counterpart: Phi...Beta...Kappa.

Now the two upper spokes brought to light by the two long tangents are S and X: SX....Essex?? Many things point to the unfortunate brother as belonging to the Shakespeare “Superior Committee” (if I may call it so) in company, at some time or other, with (here I quote *verbatim* the secret checks in the *Anatomy of Melancholy*, in the order given) Ferdinando-Stanley-Strange-Tudor; William-Stanley-Derby-Tudor; Edward-De-Vere-Oxforde; Henry-Wriothesley-Southampton; James-Stuart-Tudor. Essex comes last but one in the list as Robert-Devreux (*sic*)-Essex-Tudor. If the Folio wheel hints at Essex in connection with the Plays, in what capacity did he collaborate? Adviser, inspirer, occasional co-author? I leave it to younger generations to explore the problem.

FRANCIS BACON: A "LANDMARK IN THE LAW"?

by Clifford Hall, School of Law; University of Buckingham.

Bacon was found guilty of bribery. He advocated "moral principles of high worth" but "failed miserably to keep them himself." He indulged in "wicked doings". He was "false and perfidious". He was "an unjust judge, lacking in integrity and proper virtue." He departed in "disgrace and misery".

Harsh words; uttered by Macaulay or Abbott we might take them for what they are – a dismal distortion of our legal past reflecting a long discredited historical school, the Whig methodology of reading history with one eye on the present.¹ Bacon himself warned us against this fallacy.² But these words were not uttered by a Whig historian but by perhaps the greatest judge of our time, none other than Lord Denning. They are written in his book *Landmarks in the Law*³ where he discusses Bacon and the torture and corruption issues. It is sad and strange that one known as devoted to fair play in the application of the artificial reason of the law, of whom most speak with the highest regard, should give so biased, so emotional, so selective an account of Bacon's fall. Coming from such a man, of whom future generations will say "Would that I knew him", it cannot go unchallenged. For Denning too will one day, if not already, be seen as the severed head whose oracular pronouncements will transcend the vagaries of time and space. Lord Denning is himself a lost cause on the Bacon issue. Mr. Fermor's correspondence with him testifies to that.⁴ "Fascination" with the other side of the picture does nothing to persuade him. So let us leave him be.

Our Own Times

If it be a historical vice to observe the past with an eye on the present, to judge it with values of our own time, then it is still worse to do so selectively. The giving and receipt of presents to and by those in "Great Place"⁵ has not been peculiar to Bacon's time. It is not anathema even to twentieth century cultures some of which must reflect, in their own way, the *mores* of Jamesian England. So let us for a moment play Lord Denning's game in relation to our own times and experiences, not, of course, in relation to the giving of presents to judges but in a more familiar way.

In Bacon's Time

There was no civil list. Few at Court received salaries from the Crown. Fortune had to be made from fees and gifts. In 1614, £1047.15.0 was allowed to the Lord Chancellor in fees and allowances. The sum was £918.15.0 when Bacon took the Seals. Only £238.6.8 was allowed to the

Lord Chief Justice; still less to the Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, though that office was the more valuable.⁶ The Officers of State, the Lord Treasurer, the Lord Admiral, the Master of the Wards were in much the same position. All gave and received fees and gifts whenever an act was done, the signing of an office or a grant, a knighting, on coming into office, for a mere signature; these apart from gifts at festivals, birthdays, New Year's Day. The judges, like today's barristers, could not sue for their fees. They were not public servants, paid by the State, in the modern sense. Their income arose from the hearing of private causes. The Lord Chancellor's Seals were thus worth £10,000-£15,000 in Ellesmere's time, and Bacon reckoned that the Attorney's office was worth £6,000 though the official allowance was £81.6.8.⁷ A man's right to his fees was as sacred as his right to his goods and lands. The offices of the staff of the central courts represented freehold interests that could be bought and sold.⁸ Sir Henry Montagu became Lord Mandeville and Lord Treasurer for £20,000. Judges drew a considerable part of their income from fees though they did not hold their offices as freeholds. No one minded. It was as if this condition was in the natural order of things. But so it was. It was as old as the Athenian State.⁹

Not that abuses were not well recognised, particularly in the Court of Chancery. Its officials, small in number (just 12 Masters and six clerks together with the Lord Chancellor and the Master of the Rolls), dealt with perhaps 20,000 subpoenas each year. Officials were appointed for life and paid by fees for business done. Suits might last for twenty years or more and it was inevitable to pay for expedition, queue jumping. Proceedings were largely in written form and documents were unduly and wilfully lengthened, a service for which suitors would pay more as well as for unnecessary copies. Three hundred years later a suitor was obliged to pay for three attendances at a Master's office when only one was given, and it was this which first called Bentham's attention to the condition of English law.¹⁰ The practice of the court was unsettled. Many suits were frivolous. Decrees were re-opened on mere surmises, which meant new orders, references and examinations. Contumacy was an art. Disobedience in face of decrees was commonplace. The Lord Chancellor, given the volume of business, was unable to give any detailed supervision over his officials. For Bacon, 2,000 decrees and orders each year over four years, working vacations as well as terms, was a tremendous burden. Small wonder that he could barely remember the causes or the parties or the nature and quantum of their gifts, especially when many, for whatever reason, were received not by him but by his servants or friends.

This then was the position in Bacon's time. Fees, gifts, presents were hardly the abnormal, horrendous, barbarous things Lord Denning sug-

gests. There was nothing essentially and abhorrently contradictory for Bacon to write in the essay *of Judicature* that of judges “integrity is their portion and proper virtue”, that their principal duty was “to suppress fraud” being the more pernicious “when it is close and disguised”; or, in the essay *Of Great Place* to warn us against binding our hands or our servants’ hands by corruption; or to instruct Justice Hutton, on his elevation to the Common Pleas, “that your hands, and the hands of your hands, I mean those about you, be clean and uncorrupt from gifts”; or for him to say of himself, after his fall, that he had been the “justest judge these fifty years.” The simple fact is that the exaction of fees and the receipt of gifts or the borrowing of money were not in themselves corrupt practices, were not bribery as we understand it, nor, as applied to Bacon, the foul workings of one who, in Macaulay’s phrase, sold judgements by the hundred. It is sad that this simple feature, the *mores* of the time, so often pressed remains largely overlooked.

Nonetheless, the nagging questions remain. Why then was Bacon impeached? How can it be said that whatever the custom of the time enjoined Bacon was not a corrupt judge? Were not the abuses of the time unlawful even then? Did not Bacon himself confess to corruption?

Did not Bacon admit corruption?

True, at the last he made a “Confession and Humble Submission” of corruption. The alternative was to deny the charges and, in his words, to rely on “the law of nature ... (which) teaches me to speak in my own defence.”¹¹ But this was not the King’s will. For whatever reason – to placate the spirit of the time, to protect Buckingham or the Crown itself, James required him to submit. For Bacon, as in Essex’s case, the paramount consideration was *bonus civis* and not *bonus vir*. James seems to have made it clear that if Bacon *did* submit then even if the House of Peers “should not be sensible of his merits” he, James, would restore him. The House of Peers *Journals* record that a meeting with James occurred on 16th April, 1621.¹²

It is clear what Bacon intended to say for he prepared minutes for the meeting: “With respect to the charge of bribery”, he writes, “I am as innocent as any born upon St. Innocent’s Day If, however, it is absolutely necessary, the King’s will shall be obeyed. I am ready to make an oblation to the King, in whose hands I am as clay, to be made a vassal of honour or dishonour.”¹³ This is consistent with his earlier letter to the King of 25th March: “And for the briberies and gifts wherewith I am charged, when the book of hearts shall be opened, I shall not be found to have the troubled fountain of a corrupt heart, in a depraved habit of taking rewards to pervert justice.”¹⁴ And then, in a meaningful sentence, though not that which his detractors would re-present – “howsoever, I may be frail, and partake

of abuses of the time.” Of course it was clear to him that gifts could be misconstrued; were an unsatisfactory way of augmenting a meagre allowance. But they were not thereby the signature of corruption. Why else would he have written to the Commons busily examining abuses in the Courts of Justice, that he welcomed a full inquiry into the affairs of his own Court? This was on 17th February. A month later (March 19th), it is clear from his words in a letter to the Lords that he was fully prepared to defend himself as need be.¹⁵

But seemingly at the King’s will he submitted on 22nd April. This Submission¹⁶, an earlier answer than the final Confession, was a subtle document. In substance, he proposes to desert all defence and requests that he be forthwith condemned and censured, forfeiting the Great Seal. He ignores particular complaints, of which he has received no formal notice, but rather prompts the Lords to do what he will not do himself; for he will not comment on the evidence, he says, or the character of the witnesses, or the extent to which there were extenuating circumstances relating to the time and manner of the gift; and he reminds the House that his Peers are Parliamentary judges who possess an arbitrary power not asserted by the ordinary courts of justice – as if the implication is that without such an awareness they may not act in the true spirit of justice.

When read, it is recorded that no Lord spoke to it for a long time. The Prince and Buckingham wished to accept the submission, but found no support. The Lord Chamberlain said: “He neither speaks of the particular charge, nor confesseth anything particular.” And to the Lord Southampton: “He is charged by the Commons with corruption and no word of confession of any corruption in his submission.”¹⁷ Well, of course not. To Bacon, there was none.

Thus he was required to be specific and only then was he sent the specific allegations. Kafka’s *Trial* without them. What would Lord Denning say of that? The Humble Confession and Supplication was in very general terms: “Upon advised consideration of the charge, descending into my own conscience, and calling my memory to account so far as I am able, I do plainly and ingenuously confess that I am guilty of corruption, and do renounce all defence”¹⁸ But in answering the particular charges he gives no more than a catalogue, so far as memory served, of what had occurred. The effect of the Submission, in pleading terms, amounts to a confession and avoidance. He admits, for the most part, the allegation of fact but denies the inference to be drawn from it, implicitly, by alleging a new matter, for example the circumstances in which the gift was given; in the same way as one might admit a breach of contract and yet allege that the plaintiff had already waived the breach. In short, Bacon leaves the world to judge the merits of what occurred. The confession, if that is what

it is, is in the general but his exact answers to the particular charges serve to avoid the proof of corruption. He might have gone further and argued the allegations closely, point by point. But, alas, that would have been inconsistent with what was, and all along had been, expected and required of him. And even though it be a maxim of law that an admission made in judicial proceedings is of greater force than all proof (*confessio facta in iudicio omni probatione major est*)¹⁹, in this case these were Parliamentary judges and, whatever the maxim enjoins the status of the alleged 'proofs' cannot be ignored. Thus, though Bacon formally condemned himself, the cause was left open for the scrutiny of future ages.

Was receipt of gifts contrary to law?

However distasteful the business of receiving gifts, was it contrary to law? We know that in general Bacon did not think so, irrespective of custom which might itself serve to end all discussion of the issue. There is certainly no evidence that it was illegal under all circumstances. According to Sir Edward Sackville, in his Report from the Committee for the Examination of the Courts of Justice of 17th February, Bacon was prepared "that any man might speak freely anything concerning his Court."²⁰ Clearly, therefore, Bacon was free from any personal apprehension arising from public busyboding and, save at the last, he did not live under any sense of on-going insecurity. Had the receipt of gifts been other than commonplace this could not have been so.

Now, on 19th March, in response to a letter from Bacon, the House of Lords declared that it intended "to proceed in his cause ... according to the right rule of justice." Was this reference some vague allusion to the dictats of natural law or to common sense or was it founded upon some clear rule? The judges were not consulted on the issue as a body, though some spoke in Parliament. There were no precedents where gifts had been given to the Officers of State save in Cardinal Wolsey's case, but the proceedings were badly reported in the *State Trials*. There were no statutes which drew a distinction between those gifts a Chancellor might accept and those which he could not. Coke records in his *Institutes*²¹ an Act of Parliament of 11 Henry IV to the effect that no Chancellor, Minister or Judge in receipt of wages or fees from the King could in future take any manner of gift for performing his office; but he admits that this instrument had never been printed and that it was not to be found in the Statutes of the Realm. As Spedding reminds us, the statute must have long fallen into desuetude since "it was broken every day"²². True, the King's judges by their oath²³ were required to take no gift or reward, save meat or drink of small value, from any man with any cause pending before them nor afterwards. The Chancellor's oath, on the other hand, was simply to "well and truly serve (the) king"²⁴. This difference in oaths is important for more

reasons than one. Obedience to the King's wishes and the recognition of that perceived to be for the sovereign good cannot be accounted superstition or hypocrisy. Moreover, Bacon himself reviewed the cases bearing some analogy with his own. The closest considered is that of *Sir William Thorpe*²⁵, who took money from felons for staying the processes of law directed against them and was thus himself an accessory to felony. But the record of the verdict on Thorpe concludes by declaring: "the judgement ... shall not be drawn into example against any, and especially not against any who have not taken the like oath. Which the Lord Chancellor, Lord Treasurer, Master of the Wards etc. take not."²⁶ The law, therefore, uttered no general prohibition.

One possibility, though this seems to be gainsaid by *Thorpe's case*, is that since by the common law all immoral acts are illegal the taking of the gift by anyone charged with judicial functions established corruption. The Statute of Edward III, prohibiting judges from taking gifts or rewards, might then be seen as merely a particular expression of a more general precept. But clearly not all immoral acts are illegal and if, as Viscount Simonds once declared (echoing Lord Mansfield), the judges are the *custos morum* of the people, the guardians of morals and so themselves accountable, it is of interest that his Lordship had in mind, not individual acts of immorality, but immoral conspiracies.²⁷ By parity of reasoning, therefore, we should have to look for conspiracies to corrupt justice by the giving of presents not merely for the giving or the receiving; as if Christ's response to the Devil's bribe "All this will I give thee if thou fall down and worship" had been to kneel.

Some hint at what the law required is given in the list of interrogatories put to the principal witnesses against Bacon before the Lords' Committee of four charged with examining all points.²⁸ There were four interrogatories in all, but the key question was whether the witness had given money or other gratuity to the Lord Chancellor or his servants, friends or followers when they had any pending cause before him or intended to have any. The question in part flies wide of the mark; even the modern doctrine of vicarious liability, making a master liable for the acts of his *servants*, does not extend to friends or followers. And how can a subjective intention for the future by another be accounted sufficient to establish in the Lord Chancellor the *present* fact of corruption? Much of the question may thus be discounted; but not the nub – Did you give a gift to the Lord Chancellor when there was any pending cause? If so, seemingly any gratuity was potentially a bribe irrespective of any contract that the gift would purchase a favourable decision. No mention is made, it will be noticed, in this or the other interrogatories of gifts received after the cause was ended.

Bacon does seem, at least implicitly, to have accepted that the nub of the question was reasonable. As is well known, he prepared two sets of notes prior to his interview with the King.²⁹ In both he sets out three degrees of gifts and rewards given to a judge. The later version reads:

1. Of bargain, contract or promise of reward, *pendente lite* – of which, he declares, he is innocent. I “had no bribe or reward in my eye or thought, when I pronounced any sentence or order”. The earlier version contains the rider, subsequently crossed out, “And yet perhaps in some two or three (cases) the proofs may stand pregnant to the contrary.”
2. A neglect in the judge (a culpable omission or simply *an* omission?) to inform himself whether the cause be fully at an end or no assuming, in good faith, that the cause is over. Here he seems to acknowledge that the receipt of a gift without *more* might be accounted a corrupt practice. Why should the judge be in neglect (culpably) unless it be that merely to take the gift, before the final determination of the cause, was *per se* potentially wrongful irrespective of any contract to pervert justice?
3. When the gift is received in good faith after the cause is ended which, in the opinion of the Civilian jurists is no offence.

The interrogatories make no explicit mention of gifts received after judgement (though the witnesses were to be asked whether they had *ever* given any money or other gratuity to the Lord Chancellor) and so the Civilian opinion seems to have been generally shared. Why otherwise, single out gifts given *Pendente Lite*?

Though Bacon appears to regard this central interrogatory as reasonable he does not thereby assert that the mere giving of a present *pendente lite* is corrupt, as a gift in pursuance of a contract clearly is. He leaves the weight to be attached to the giving and receiving unexplored save to imply that the situation is serious and may, perhaps, give rise to a *prima facie* case of corruption.

Unless the offence be accounted absolute, such that the state of the recipient’s mind is entirely irrelevant – the offence lying in the performance of the act, the taking of the gift – the crucial question, should have been with what intent the gift was taken. The fact of its being taken was not conclusive proof but, at most, strong evidence of a corrupt intent. This seems to lie at the root of Mr. Recorder Finch’s view (he was Recorder of London) expressed in the House of Commons debates on the evidence of the witnesses against Bacon. In his view there was nothing wrong in receiving presents for past favours and even if a cause was pending it did not follow that Bacon was corrupt since, in his words, “who keeps a regis-

ter in his heart of all causes?" This is from Howell's *State Trials*³⁰ upon which Lord Denning relies, omitting mention of Finch's speech.

Does the modern law help to unravel the difficulties? Not entirely, but there are useful lessons. Halsbury's *Laws* distinguishes for example, between an illegal practice and a corrupt practice.³¹ The illegal practice is *mala prohibita* – it is an act forbidden by law. A corrupt practice, for example an abuse of influence, is *mala in se* but a corrupt intent is necessary. The distinction between the illegal the corrupt may become blurred. Thus to Blackburn J. in *Bewdley's Case* (1869)³², the word 'corruptly' does not mean wickedly or immorally but, rather, conduct prohibited by statute. In Bacon's case there was no such compelling statute and no doctrine of parliamentary supremacy anyway. What of 'Our Lady' and the common law?. In the *Bradford Election Petition No. 2* (1969)³³, Martin B. characterised the essence of corruption as being the evil intent accompanying the act. A corrupt act is one performed with knowledge that one is doing what is wrong, with evil intentions and feelings. And in the *Launceston Case* (1874)³⁴, Mellor J. again made a speciality of the *mala fides* accompanying the act. Thus the offering or the acceptance of a gift may be a bribe or corrupt but the issue is contingent upon the reasons for giving or receiving, the intentions of the parties. As was once said in a Canadian case – *Gross* (1846) *per* Roach J.A., it is not necessarily a bribe to give a reward before or after an act.³⁵ The common law offence of bribery has been defined as arising "wherever a person is bound by law to act without any view to his own private emolument, and another by a corrupt *contract* engages such person *on condition* of the payment or promise of money ... to act in a manner which he shall prescribe ..." ³⁶. So the essence here is the corrupt bargain for reward. Under statute, for example S.1 of the Public Bodies Corrupt Practices Act 1889, it is a misdemeanour *corruptly* to receive or solicit any gift or reward as a bribe. Moreover, *per* Lawrence J. in *Bodmin Division, Cornwall Case, Tom & Duff v. Agar-Roberts* (1906) in a case of bribery there is always something in the nature of a contract.³⁷ And, finally, with bribery the commission is secret: *Hovenden v. Millhoff* (1900) *per* Romer L.J.³⁸ and *per* Slade J. in *Industries and General Mortgage Co. v. Lewis* (1949).³⁹

So: there is usually a contract or something in the nature of an contract, the receiving must be with evil intent unless the law, without *more*, specifically prohibits the act of receiving, and the transaction is secret. These considerations are all in Bacon's favour. There was no statute; no evidence of any contract, no allegation by the witnesses of any unjust judgement, no admission of evil intent and the gifts were not given secretly. Even Coke was forced to remark in the Lady Wharton case, the fourth Charge against Bacon, that it was strange that the sum of £200, if it

was given and received as a bribe, was openly given before witnesses.⁴⁰ And so we may ask, with Finch, where the bribery or corruption was, or where it was proven, on Bacon's part.

It is hard to resist the conclusion that the House of Lords, through these impeachment proceedings, was creating, rightly but retrospectively, a precedent relating to the mere receipt of gifts *pendente lite*. The law always shuns retrospective laws. As Lord Reid once declared: "It has always been thought to be of primary importance that our law, and particularly our Criminal Law, should be certain: that a man should be able to know what conduct is and what is not criminal, particularly when heavy penalties are involved."⁴¹ And did not Bacon himself say that there could be no justice without certainty?⁴²

Be that as it may, Bacon himself acknowledged the wisdom of this precedent. In his first Submission he told the Lords assembled: "hereafter the greatness of a judge or magistrate shall be no sanctuary or protection of guiltiness" and that "after this example, it is like that judges will fly from any thing that is in the likeness of corruption (though it were at any great distance), as from a serpent."⁴³ And, as Aubrey records, when the Earl of Manchester was moved from being Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas to be Lord President of the Council he told Bacon that he was sorry to see him made such an example, to which Bacon responded that it did not trouble him since he was made a precedent.⁴⁴

Of course this is the reason why Hale in his *Origin of the Jurisdiction of the House of Lords* (1796) records, though without proof, that many Chancery decrees were set aside having originated in gross bribery and corruption.⁴⁵ But no case of Bacon's is cited which was reversed by the House of Lords and, though a Bill is recorded in the Commons' Journals of 1623-24 to reverse a decree in Lady Wharton's case, there is no evidence of its having gone beyond its second reading.⁴⁶ That the attempt was made is not surprising since the precedent was then established; and it did entail that Bacon's executors were able to resist three claims against his estate on the ground that the debts had been pronounced bribes in the impeachment!⁴⁷

The Impeachment: was Justice seen to be done?

Hargrave in the Preface to Hale's *Jurisdiction of the House of Lords* describes the impeachment proceeding thus: "There is a judicature for impeachment and under it, on the one hand, the Commons, as the great representative inquest of the nation, first find the crime and afterwards, acting as prosecutors, endeavour to support their finding before the Lords; whilst on the other hand, the Lords exercise their function both of judge and jury, in trial of the cause and in deciding upon it."⁴⁸

There had been no impeachment in the strict sense, besides Bacon and

Sir Giles Mompesson, since 1459. Interestingly, the earlier experiments in impeachment had also been generally engineered by opposition groups who improvised machinery to reach ministers and others who were near the King. Other impeachments, those of Edward Lloyd and Sir John Bennett, followed quickly after Bacon's. Parliament had rediscovered a potent weapon. But its process must be accounted unsatisfactory. The procedure was unsophisticated. The House of Lords as a body was untrained in judicial business. It acted as judge and jury. The outcome was by majority vote. In Bacon's case the judges were not consulted as to what the law required. The precedents were wanting. Many of the charges rested upon the depositions of single witnesses and though Coke might aver that "he that accuseth himself by accusing another, is more than three witnesses"⁴⁹ the fact is that these witnesses, who had in some cases given the alleged bribes, had been assured of amnesty. Of these witnesses, Churchill was an extortioner and forger by his own confession. Keeling had left service at York House; he was, said Mewtys in the House of Commons, a "common solicitor".⁵⁰ Hunt, Bacon's servant, had been busy feathering his own nest and even those men of repute, the MPs, Sir George Hastings and Sir Richard Young, were, according to the contemporary account of Chamberlain⁵¹, known as brokers of bargains. It was a pretty motley crew, and their evidence was at times contradictory.

More significant, however, is the manner in which the Lords decision was given. A general submission from Bacon, it will be remembered, had been held insufficient. He was to answer to the particular charges. But the judgement was itself no more than a general one, no examination being given to Bacon's particular answers. It is insufficient to say that because Bacon had "confessed" generally so he was rightly "condemned" generally. Since he dealt with each and every charge it behoved the House to give its verdict in like manner. As Spedding says "they could find him guilty of what he had not confessed as well as what he had."⁵² The cases where gifts were received after the cause were treated in the same manner as those where receipt was *pendente lite*; monies borrowed were treated as bribes; where Bacon had acted as arbitrator and received gifts from all sides in demonstration of satisfaction he had been bribed; gifts for past services were bribes; New Year's gifts were bribes; gifts received when Bacon had conceived the cause at an end were bribes; gifts received for avoiding litigation were bribes; money given to servants and ordered by Bacon to be returned were bribes; no distinctions taken in all these cases. The Lords had demanded a confession. They had one. That was enough. But if this be the procedure whereby Bacon be characterised down the ages as "wicked", then alas for justice. Would Lord Denning have been satisfied that justice had been *seen* to be done? Doubtless it was done, at a

price; for from that day all transactions of doubtful origin between judges and suitors were formally ended. It is sad, however, that it is Bacon, of all people, who still carries the public shame of the example.

The particular charges

Perhaps the most damning, the fourth, was that of Lady Wharton.⁵³ Bacon himself admitted that two sums of money had been given *pendente lite*. The circumstances were not, however, entirely clear. It was a cause where there had been many orders. A sum of £110 was given in some manner before a decree and a further £200 after it but before its enrolment. Evidence was given by the “common solicitor”, Keeling, who had left Bacon’s service. His evidence was contradictory. He first said that he had been primed by Lady Wharton what to say to Bacon when the first gift was given, but then said that the lady had spoken to Bacon herself. The contradiction appears in *State Trials*.⁵⁴ When the second sum was paid, witnesses were present, which Coke thought strange if it was taken as a bribe.⁵⁵ Later, Bacon decreed against Lady Wharton declaring that the earlier order had been “unduly gotten”. A change of heart? A realisation that he had been set up by his servants? Whatever the motive, the money clearly did not influence his judgement. The complaint was made by one who had not received what she seemed to have thought she had paid for.

One of the earliest allegations was that concerning Aubrey (article 16), who had given £100.⁵⁶ Bacon admitted that the money had been given but, as he said, the manner of its giving he would leave to the witnesses. Not that he would accept what Sir George Hastings, his supposed friend and chief prosecution witness had said, but rather that he preferred someone to look more closely at Hastings’s allegations. He did not wish, openly, to call Hastings a liar. The latter’s evidence had also contradicted itself.⁵⁷ He first said that he had given the money on his own behalf – no blame could then be attached to Bacon – but later said that it was on Aubrey’s behalf. Aubrey himself wrote many letters to Bacon in connection with his suit. This led the Lord Chancellor eventually to lose patience. He wrote to Aubrey that if he continued to importune him he would “lay him by the heels”. Hastings attempted to moderate, warning Bacon that Aubrey intended to petition against him. This had no effect on Bacon. He decreed against Aubrey. Thus again, even if Bacon knew that the money was from Aubrey, which seems doubtful, it clearly did not warp his judgement.

The first two charges concerned Sir Rowland and Edward Egerton’s suit.⁵⁸ First Rowland; Bacon had acted as arbitrator, as was the custom when a cause concerned relatives, between Rowland and Edward. He awarded in Rowland’s favour. It was then that Rowland gave his gift. But Edward refused to abide by the award. Rowland then proceeded in Chan-

cery to have the decree upon the award confirmed because of Edward's contempt. It was only in this limited way, therefore, that the money was received *pendente lite* but it was no evidence of corruption. Now Edward; he had given money to Bacon, as he said, as a token of gratitude for past favours Bacon had accorded him when Attorney-General. Bacon was much taken with the gift, which came shortly after he took the Seals and when he was much belaboured with work. In fact, the cause between the Egertons had already dragged on for a considerable while and Bacon had previously decreed that the matter should be dealt with by the Prerogative Court and from thence the King's Bench. It was after this decree that the present for past favour was given. It came before the arbitration when Bacon awarded in Rowland's favour. No evidence again, then, of corruption.

In Trevor's case (article 6), the allegation was simply that Bacon had received money.⁵⁹ No particulars were given. According to Bacon, a sum had been given but as a New Year's gift, though he admitted that he gave no thought to the question whether there was any pending suit. In fact he had already referred the cause to a trial at law. It was not to be dealt with by his own hand. The cause might subsequently be remitted to Chancery but it was uncertain that it would be. Again, therefore, there is no evidence of corruption.

In Hansby's cause (article 14), Bacon received the sum after decreeing in part in Hansby's favour the matter then being referred to the Masters in Chancery for the examination of witnesses. It is clear from a letter from Buckingham that their Report would go in Hansby's favour and he thus pressed for expedition.⁶⁰ It may thus be surmised that the money had been paid to quicken the end of the cause, a very common practice then and in later times. It was considered by no-one to be a corrupt practice. Nor is it clear that Hansby received the expedition he may have thought he had paid for.

In Montagu's cause (article 17) we have similar facts to Rowland Egerton's.⁶¹ The money was paid after the decree but the defendant refused to observe it and so put himself in contempt. There were then many further compelling orders.

In the causes of Hody (article 3), Monk (article 5), Young (article 7), Fisher (article 8), Kennedy (article 9), Scott (article 11), Lentall (article 12), Wroth (article 13), where Bacon had arbitrated, Dunch (article 18), Russwell (article 22) and Barker (article 23), the sums or presents were paid or given after the cause was over. In most cases the allegations admit this. They can therefore be discounted.

In Smithwick's cause (article 21), money was paid but Bacon himself had not received it. It had been kept by his servant Hunt, one of the chief

witnesses against him. When Bacon heard that the money had been received he ordered Hunt to return it. Strange, if Bacon was corrupt, that he did not order the money to be paid over to himself.⁶²

The charges in respect of Compton (article 15) and Vanlore (article 10) were in respect of sums which Bacon had borrowed. They were debts not bribes and were recorded in writing.

Articles 24, 25 and 26 referred to sums Bacon had received from the parties to an arbitration. All the parties had been satisfied with the award. Gifts had been openly received and, indeed, would have to have been declared as company expenses. No evidence of corruption here.

In relation to article 27, Bacon had acted to prevent a suit arising. For these endeavours he had received £1,000 from the French Wine Merchants. The King had himself intervened since the matter concerned the navy and customs. The charge is that Bacon had used his influence. But that was what he had been required to do.

Of article 28 we can readily accede that the allegation, that Bacon had given way to great exactions by his servants, was, in a manner, just. Bacon himself admitted that he had neglected to superintend all their doings. One supposes, however, that he was entitled to assume that they were honourable. Moreover, with 2000 decrees issued each year, nearly six a day, allowing that he worked through the vacations, can it reasonably be expected that he could personally oversee all their doings?

It should also be remembered, that many allegations against him which had been considered by the Commons were dropped as being too frivolous. It may thus be assumed that the 28 eventually bought were the best evidence of corruption. Was there sufficient in these to warrant a finding of bribery and corruption? Allowing for the practices, the "abuses" of the time, it is thought not. Some would seem to be near the line, as Bacon himself considered they might seem to be. But even in those cases, the complaint was not that he had been "bought" but rather the reverse – he had decreed against the giver. Ought that not to have sounded a warning to all not to attempt to bribe? In this way, Bacon's hands were clean.

It is hard looking back to be entirely sure. The question of why, if there was nothing in these allegations, they were ever brought still requires an answer. My own view is that Bacon was the victim of the hue and cry, the prevailing spirit of this time, of the ground swell of opinion directed against abuses at Court, and the courts of justice, of the hostility towards monopolies and the Buckingham set. There is no very clear evidence of any concerted plot by envious and malignant persons though he certainly had enemies. The conspiracy theory, though attractive, remains a theory.⁶³ Once the examination of the courts of justice had begun, Bacon, like many public men then and since, was simply an easy victim to the embittered,

like Keeling and Churchill, to the schemers for public office, the future Lord Keeper Williams, and to those with old scores to settle, like Coke. There are many parallel cases. But Bacon's honour, in its true sense, despite those machinations, the vagaries of fortune, and the commentaries of later men fed on false premises, selective evidence, defective law and just blind prejudice, remains intact for those who wish to see it. This may not do for Lord Denning, but for us it is a cause of no small satisfaction.

NOTES

1. Lord Denning, *Landmarks in the Law* (1984), pp. 32-34.
2. See H. Butterfield, *The Whig Interpretation of History* (1931).
3. See, e.g., Montagu, *Works* Vol. 1, p. xci (hereinafter *Montagu*).
4. See Fermor-Denning correspondence, lxviii *Baconiana* (1985).
5. See Bacon's answer to article nine of his indictment in the cause between Kennedy and Vanlore, *Montagu*, page XCVI
6. Hence Coke's mortification on being promoted from the Common Pleas, in 1613, to be Chief Justice of the King's Bench which, though a position of higher rank, was considered less desirable because less profit-worthy than the former office. On the salaries of judges see, e.g., Holdsworth, *History of English Law* Vol. 1, p. 253; Campbell, *Lives of the Chancellors* Vol. 3, p. 68.
7. Holdsworth, *supra* n.6.
8. *Ibid.*, pp. 255-262.
9. See *Montagu*, p. lxviii.
10. Holdsworth, *supra* n.6, p. 426.
11. Minutes prepared prior to an interview with James, C.16th April 1621, *Montagu* p. xcii.
12. *Montagu*, pp. xcii-xciii.
13. *Montagu*, p. xcii.
14. *Montagu*, p. xc.
15. *Montagu*, p. lxxxviii.
16. *Montagu*, pp. xciv-xcv. James had required him to "submit" to the Lords impeachment proceedings but had suggested that "if they in their honours should not be sensible of his merits" then "upon his princely word he would restore him again": *Montagu*, p. xciii.
17. Abbott, *Francis Bacon* (1885), p. 301.
18. These general words are redolent with ambiguity. "Advised consideration" may refer to the fact that Bacon had by then received details of the particular allegations or the phrase may imply that he acted under instruction (from the King) to plead guilty. "Ingenuously confesses" may imply (a) that he declares nobly or openly that he is guilty whatever his private thoughts might have been; or (b) that he innocently and generously acknowledges, for form's sake, a feigned wrongdoing; or (c) that he genuinely confesses a perceived wrongdoing freely and with full knowledge of the circumstances. In the light of what he had previously written privately, what he actually said in his particular answers to the allegations and his subsequent public pronouncements interpretation (c) really cannot be sustained.
19. 145 Eng. Repts. 73; Jenkins' Centuries, Case xcix, 102.
20. Spedding, *Works*, Vol. 7, p. 210.
21. 3, C.68.

22. Spedding, *supra* note 19, p. 219.
23. 20 Ed.III, C.6.
24. Also: "to do right to all manner of people after the Laws and usages of the Realm"; "to counsel the King"; "not to suffer the hurt of the King"; and to "do and purchase the King's profit in all that he reasonably may, as God him help." The oath is relied on by Judge Jenkins in his *Plea* to the Commons of 14th February, 1647: see Terry, *Judge Jenkins* (1929), pp. 152-153.
25. 24 Ed. III.
26. Spedding, *supra* n. 19, p.232.
27. *Shaw v. D.P.P.* (1962) A.C. 220, 266.269.
28. Spedding, *supra* n. 19, p 224.
29. *Ibid.*, pp. 235-238.
30. 2 St. Trials, p. 1092.
31. 14 Halsbury's *Laws* (3rd. ed.), p. 163.
32. *Bewdley Case* (1869) 19 L.T. 676, 678.
33. (1869) 19 L.T. 723 727.
34. (1874) 30 L.T. 823, 831.
35. (1946) O.R. 1,9.
36. *Supra* n.30, p. 213; 2 Douglas Election Cases, 400.
37. (1906) 5 O'M & H 225, 231.
38. (1900) 83 L.T. 41, 43.
39. (1949) 2 ALL E.R. 573, 575.
40. 2 St. Trials, p. 1096.
41. *Supra* n.26, p. 282.
42. 8 *De Augmentis*, Spedding, *Works* Vol. 5, Aphorism 8, p.90.
43. *Montagu*, p.xciv.
44. Aubrey, *Brief Lives* (Penguin ed.) (1972), pp. 120-121.
45. P. 95. No case is recorded which was reversed by the House of Lords. The procedure would be either by Act of Parliament or by Petition to the King who would appoint a commission to examine the decree and proceedings.
46. Spedding, *supra* n.19, p. 558, the Bill being read for the first time on 13th March, 1623-1624. In a letter to Buckingham in late 1622 Bacon reports that in the preceding Parliament (14th November-18 December, 1621) there was "not a petition, not a clamour, not a motion, not a mention of me": Spedding, *supra* n.19, pp. 391-392.
47. Peacock (article 20); Holman (article seven); Vanlore (article 10); see Campbell, *Lives* Vol. 3, p. 146.
48. Pp. iv, viii.
49. 2 St. Trials 1093.
50. *Ibid.*, p. 1096.
51. Cal. of State Papers (Domestic), 24th March, 1621, Chamberlain to Carleton: "One Churchill, who was dismissed from the Chancery Court for extortion, is the chief cause of the Chancellor's ruin."
52. Spedding, *supra* n.19, p. 268.
53. *Montagu*, p. xcvi; 2 St. Trials 1094-1095, 1100.
54. *Ibid.*, p. 1095.
55. Gardiner being present; *ibid.*, p. 1096.
56. *Montagu*, xcvi; Spedding, *supra* 19, p. 222; 2 St. Trials, 1088, 1090-1093, 1097.
57. See Finch's speech, 2 St. Trials 1093.
58. *Montagu*, pp. xcv-xcvi; Spedding, *supra* n. 19, pp. 213-214, 222-223; letter to Buckingham, *Montagu* Vol. 2, p. 522; St. Trials 1089-1093, 1098.

59. *Montagu*, p. xcvi; 2 St. Trials 1096.
60. *Montagu* Vol. 2, p. 523.
61. Buckingham had pressed the defendant's, Englefield's, cause: see *Montagu* Vol. 2, p. 524.
62. *Montagu*, p. xcvi. Buckingham had pressed the merits of the other party to the cause, Wyche (*Montagu* Vol. 3, p. 116) as also had the Conde de Gondomar (*Montagu*, Vol. 3, p. 127). See also 2 St. Trials 1096, 1101.
63. See, on the conspiracy theory, H. Kendra Baker, "The Persecution of Francis Bacon", lx and lix *Baconiana*. With the exception of Buckingham, the lone dissenting voice to Bacon's sentence, the court party seems to have "swum with the tide". The Lord Chamberlain, supported by the Lord Treasurer, had proposed that fine and imprisonment would be appropriate. On the whole, however, the Lords appear to have been sympathetic, Southampton admitting there was no precedent.



Ben: Jonson.

*Ben Jonson the Man
First Poet Laureate*

One, though hee be excellent, and the chiefe, is not to bee imitated *Downes* alone. For never no Imitator, ever grew up to his *Aubar*, likenesse is *Verulianus* always on this side Truth: Yet there hapn'd, in my time, one noble *Speaker*, who was full of gravity in his speaking. His language, (where hee could spare, or passe by a jest) was nobly *confusious*. No man ever spake more neatly, more prestly, more weightily, or finer'd lesse emptinesse; lesse idlenesse, in what hee utter'd. No member of his speech; but consisted of the owne graces: His hearers could not cough, or looke aside from him, without losse. Hee commanded where hee spoke; and had his Judges angry, and pleased at his devotion: No man had their affections more in his power. The feare of every man that heard him was, lest hee should make an end.

*De Aug-
mentis sci-
entiarum.
Iulius Ce-
sar.
Lord S. Al-
banc.
Horat: de
art: Poetica.
De corrup-
tela morum.*

Ouis longum noto scriptori porriget ævum.

My conceit of his Person was never increased toward him, by his place, or honours. But I have, and doe reverence him for the greatness, that was onely proper to himselfe, in that hee seem'd to mee ever, by his worke one of the greatest men, and most worthy of admiration, that had beene in many Ages. In his adversity I ever prayed, that *God* would give him strength: for *Greatnesse* hee could not want. Neither could I condole in a word, or syllable for him, as knowing no Accident could doe harme to vertue, but rather helpe to make it manifest.

From 'Discoveries' by Jonson (facsimiles)
see page 59

been "almost at the gallows" but claimed extenuating circumstances because he had been "appealed to the fields" (challenged to a duel). He also mentioned that Spencer's weapon was a full ten inches longer than his own. It is hard to believe that Jonson was not telling the truth and it seems certain that his evidence of the duel was not properly brought out at his trial; in Elizabeth's day the accused was not permitted to speak in his own defence. It is fair that the readers be left to judge the justice of Jonson's case.

The run up to these traumatic experiences should now be dealt with; much of it must be conjecture, but the sort of conjecture that is very near to reality.

Jonson was working for a pittance as a hack script-writer for a well-known miserly theatrical impresario named Henslowe. At the same time Thomas Nashe, a friend, was working independently as a known scandal-monger and playwright, famous for the scurrility of his writing, which chiefly consisted of near slander about famous personages.

Nashe was working on a play which contained all his usual attributes but which also had the taint of sedition, for this time the combination of slander and scandal was about the Queen's Privy Council. The play was called *The Isle of Dogs* and excellently written, but well before its completion Nashe sensed trouble and chicken'd out, hastily setting off on the long journey to Yarmouth in East Norfolk – a very safe distance by 16th century standards. Ben saw his chance and took up the challenge of completing the play, keeping faithfully to the style and plot; it was for him (to quote Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*), the tide which must be taken at the flood. But it was a very, very, dangerous tide.

So great was the rage in high places (the Queen herself being much displeased) when the play appeared, that the City of London demanded that all theatres be closed immediately and perpetrators, including actors, be seized and suitably punished. Ben was dubbed as chief villain as he was in effect the author; the rest of the cast stood not upon the order of their going but fled to a safe town Bristol, where they continued to ply their disreputable trade.

Two were caught in the net together with Ben – Gabriel Spencer and Robert Shaw, and these three quickly took up compulsory residence in the infamous Marshalsea Prison where conditions were terrible, there being over one hundred inmates confined in one space in high summer.

It is here that conjecture must take a hand. Spencer was a very quick tempered violent man and it cannot be otherwise than obvious that he resented his misfortunes, labelling Ben as the villain of the piece. Of Shaw little more is known, and in the course of time, the records show that Spencer was the first to be released and Ben Jonson the last. Surely here were the

obvious seeds from which grew the duel situation.

It was after Ben's escape from the hangman that he gained great popularity, which gave him the springboard for his brilliant progress up the poetic and literary ladder, finally to be crowned Poet Laureate. Popularity is a strange master as many apparent wrongdoers have found to their great advantage – even in this present day.

The play *Isle of Dogs*, like any attack on the Establishment, met with approval from the general public and his slaying of a notorious bully, Gabriel Spencer, in a duel, his unfair trial and conviction, followed by a sensational escape from the gallows, all added up to his becoming a 16th. century "cult figure". Furthermore, the fact that he was a man of immense stature and power, weighing over twenty stone, enhanced the colour of his image.

This popularity enabled him to get partial release from the hack script work for miserly theatrical impresarios and he produced many fine plays bringing him triumph upon triumph. Unfortunately the misers remained miserly and his plays met with ridiculously low rewards, so his main source of existence was the patronage of aristocratic admirers, including the King.

He was reasonably paid for many masques throughout a number of years but the plays for which he became famous such as *Sejanus*, *Volpone*, *Every Man in his Humour*, etc., never received their just reward. As an example of this, the man Henslowe made large profits out of these plays, recording in his famous *Diary* (to his shame) rewards of from three to ten pounds for each work.

The road to triumph had one rather large hiccup. In the play called *Every Man Out of His Humour* (1598/9) he made an unfortunate blunder by choosing to satirise the procedure of the College of Heralds in their grants and, regretfully, sales of Coats-of-Arms. The general public knew little of this austere paternity and certainly the technical satire would have been over their heads, so the play was a comparative failure. The victim he mocked was an actor/author who had purchased a Coat-of-Arms. Ben chose a rude Italian name Sogliardo for the character and the scene where he reveals that he had obtained a Coat-of-Arms for £30 was devastatingly cruel of the College of Heraldry. This scene has quite rightly been of great interest and amusement to Baconians, because the man in question was obviously an actor who had been employed in one of Ben's plays, a Mr. William Shakespeare, gent..

There was another unfortunate angle to this error of judgement on Ben's part. William Camden, his lifelong friend and mentor, took great exception to the scene, clearly realising that the main thrust was against the College of Heralds to which he had recently been elected, and it is a

fact that for quite a long period there was a distinct coolness in the friendship, though it recovered in the course of time.

The next important date in Ben's life was February 3rd, 1616 (1617 Georgian Calendar). To Ben this was probably the very peak of his pride; it was on that day that the King created for him the title of Poet Laureate with an emolument of hundred marks per annum – approximately £65. Surely this must have been the zenith of Ben's life as a poet, but there is another side to his fame – his work as a playwright, which also had its zenith; but assessing this is near to impossible as it can only exist in the personal opinion of each individual reader. Newspaper critics are of no consequence as they too can only give a personal opinion; alas, not always genuine. It is not unknown for the world of Press criticism to be subsidised. The opinion of the author of this article for what it is worth puts the play *Volpone* at the head of the list, and that assessment might also apply to Eric Linklater in his book *Ben Jonson and King James*. The following quite delightful eulogy seems to confirm that he too had a very high opinion of *Volpone*.

In the hot summer-stinking gaol was conceived that superlative comedy *The Fox (Volpone)* It came in hot brilliant colour, vivid with the jewels of the Renaissance, a play that danced with the muscular vivacity of Harlequin. It invaded like a peacock the grey squalor of the prison. It laughed uproariously at human folly, and terribly at human greed. It was salt on the tongue, and spiced with wine in the throat.

Ben forgot the discomfort of the confining walls and thought of that splendid fool Sir Politick, the traveller agape for news and swallowing rumour as young starlings gobble worms.

Suffolk or Salisbury, d'Aubigny and Lady Bedford had spoken to the King and the order for Ben's release came at last. He walked out of the prison unmarked.

It will be remembered that he was imprisoned because of his association with the half-finished *Isle of Dogs* by Thomas Nashe, and the statutory punishment for his alleged crime was facial disfigurement.

Ben's popularity extended to King James with whom he became very friendly, and it is an interesting facet of his character that he was at ease in all levels of society – a gift which comes easily to Scottish people. His was the mentality that was never impressed by great wealth nor embarrassed through lack of it. Where the King was concerned he had no compunction about criticising one of His Majesty's favourite pastimes, that of reciting poetry – he was bold enough to rebuke James for “singing” his lines

instead of speaking them. He treated the important personages at Court whom he met in the same way, his attitude being "I may be your servant, but never your slave." Many of these aristocrats hired writers to produce masques and this was one of Ben's lucrative sources of income. On the occasions when an aristocratic employer overstepped the mark, he was promptly and firmly put in his place.

The next milestone is an enormous one, beyond the scope of this article to deal with properly. The famous walk from London to Edinburgh, a daunting and highly dangerous undertaking, not long after he received his Laureate.

When his intention was announced it caused considerable ribaldry among his friends, and it is at this point that a very famous person enters the picture – the great Francis Bacon who, from the rarified atmosphere of the world of jurisprudence, emerged to make an erudite joke which very few ordinary people could possibly understand; characteristically he made it without mentioning Ben's name – that "he loved not to see poesy go on other feet than poetical dactyl and spondee."

His motives for this joke were really rather obscure and it does seem that it was intended to belittle Jonson, or perhaps more kindly, to make fun of him, but one wonders, would he have done it had he known that it was the King who had instigated the idea of Ben going to Scotland? In London little was known about this great country and James, knowing of Ben's Scottish ancestry, is thought to have financed the journey. Ben certainly could not have afforded to have done so himself.

The immensity of his undertaking has to be taken into account when it is realised that Ben Jonson by the standards of the day was a middle-aged man (46), weighing 20 stone, who fully intended to walk 400 miles to Edinburgh. What is more he succeeded, but here lies a tragedy; it was always his habit to keep a diary of his activities and he did this during his long trek. The tragedy is that the diary in his neat meticulous hand was burnt, along with his library, on his return to London. The number of gems lost in that fire does not bear thinking about. Only one paltry incident has come down to posterity. The great man bought new footwear at Darlington. There must have been many encounters with Abraham men, footpads, thieves, and such like, and visits to the great houses and their owners on the way. His penetrating observations of the people, their customs, traditions and of course of the countryside through which he laboriously "yomped", sadly all are lost, and with Jonson these observations would indeed have been penetrating.

When he eventually arrived in Edinburgh he was greeted as Royalty and the Town Council arranged a vast banquet to honour him at the enormous expense of £221.6s.4d. At this point an interesting comparison of

the priorities of the age must be given, throwing a devastating light on the greed of the theatrical impresarios of London. In a period of forty years of playwrighting Ben's *total* payments amounted to little less than £200.

After arriving in Edinburgh he was lavishly entertained in the great houses in and around the city throughout the months of October to November. It was not until December that the Poet Laureate arrived at Hawthornden, the home of William Drummond. There is a threadbare tradition that when he arrived, the slight and somewhat foppish Drummond was sitting beneath a sycamore tree and, so the story goes, rose with the words "Welcome! Welcome! Royal Ben"; and Ben not to be outdone in rhyme replied "Thank ye! Thank ye! Hawthornden." Tradition has four fatal flaws, this was December in the East of Scotland, the tree was bare, the snowy winds were wild, and Drummond was delicate. It seems that Drummond was almost immediately overawed by the older man's dynamic personality and immense presence. Never before had he met anyone like this. It was almost as if the younger man had gone into shock. Jonson became instantly aware of this, and from then on any dialogue was doomed to failure and became akin to master and pupil.

Both men had the same standards of learning. Drummond's genius was nurtured during a lifetime of shelter in a quiet secluded glen, Jonson's genius was fashioned in the turmoil of the blood and guts of life. Much to the annoyance of serious literary people Drummond, one of Nature's subordinates, failed completely to take advantage of a wonderful opportunity to record valuable notes during the 17 day visit. He seems only to have made random jottings, more frequently than not of his own personal impressions of Jonson, and not of the valuable lessons which he could have learnt from the latter's vast worldly experience and greater learning, backed up by poetic genius. From the explanatory notes to this article the subject of the "Conversations" between Drummond and Jonson does not specifically apply here; suffice it to say that for the reasons already given they were a disaster, owing mainly to Drummond's petulant personal remarks.

However he made two which should be mentioned. On the subject of literature he said that Jonson "was better versed and knew more in Latin and Greek and Classical literature than all the poets and writers in England." He also described Jonson in this curious phrase – "He is passionately kind and angry." Certainly an article could be written about many of Ben's remarks in the "Conversations", but there is no space here. It would have been wonderful if this great man could have tucked another 160 years under his massive belt to the 1780s and, after crossing the Border, had changed course from north to Edinburgh due west to Ayrshire, to meet a really great poet, Robert Burns.

There indeed would have been food for Pegasus and gods of poetry! Magical the "Conversations" would have been!

There was one other giant of literature who cannot be ignored as there has already been a fleeting reference to him; Francis Bacon, Viscount St. Alban, Lord Chancellor of England. It is said that great friendship existed between these two men, but it does seem to have been one-sided. The evidence that Bacon corresponded with, or ever mentioned the Poet Laureate's name, has never come to light, but it may be among the many uncollated letters in Lambeth Palace. If these two great men really were friends, they could not have differed more, both in character and in their way of life, but one bond they had in common was learning. Ben was also a very learned man.

The main characteristic in which he differed from St. Alban was his total lack of ambition; all he looked forward to was to exist until the morrow. He was a literary visionary and poetry was his vision, at heart he was a very simple man, and the turbulent world in which he lived, was for him a warm, warm, world.

Bacon's genius can be summed up in one of his own phrases "Wordes are the footsteps of Reason." Cold scientific reason, honed razor sharp on the whetstone of philosophy. The world of scientific philosophy is indeed a cold, cold place.

Jonson wrote his poem for Francis Bacon's 60th birthday in 1620 with a personal tribute hidden within the text. We illustrate earlier facsimiles of some MSS, which were discovered among other papers after Jonson's death in 1637, it is said by Sir Kenelm Digby who collected them into the best possible order and published them in 1640 as Volume III, entitled very aptly in just one word – *Discoveries* – Volume III was incorporated at the end of Volume II and bound in the same cover.

This great human being, and Ben Jonson was just that, died as he would have expected – penniless. But he left behind valuable MSS. and, what was most dear to his heart, a little group of promising young poets known to all as the Tribe of Ben, totally devoted to him and he to them, as he saw in them the future standard bearers of the art he loved best, Poetry.

That was his legacy to his country.

It is recorded that Westminster Abbey found it hard to accommodate the great concourse of people which converged on the Abbey from all quarters of London for his funeral. They came from far and wide, Courtiers, Church and legal dignitaries, aristocrats, ordinary people, felons and beggars, but the chief mourners were the Tribe of Ben. Later he was buried at the sole charge of the Dean of Westminster who was a personal friend.

Among the great number of elegies on his death, the one he would most have liked was written by his friend John Taylor, the Water Poet, and there is only one recorded copy of this, at Corpus Christi College. The nicest way to close would be to record a delightful incident which occurred after the burial. Sir John Young happened to be passing by as the stone was being laid and he gave the mason eighteen pence to carve one letter and three words which just about say it all.

“O Rare Ben Jonson”

BOOK REVIEWS

Henry Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance; with illustrations: by Sir Roy Strong, Director of the Victoria & Albert Museum. Published by Thames and Hudson. Price £12.95.

After Prince Henry died, at the age of eighteen, the funeral procession consisted of two thousand mourners including all the members of his household and friends. Thus the tribute to a youth matured in wisdom beyond his years: but wisdom has to be acquired, either from experience or from an interpreter. We shall return to this theme.

Sir John Holles, of his household wrote *inter alia* in a letter to Lord Grey,

.....Good men of all professions were welcome to him. He cherished the true prophets....

All men of learning, countryman or stranger, of what virtue whatsoever,

military or civil, he countenanced and comforted..

a great, a judicious and a silent, searcher into dispositions, wise, just and secret....

never gave foul word or oath in his life.

And, our first clue,

all actions profitable or honourable to the kingdom were fomented by him, witness the North West passage, Virginia, Guiana, The Newfoundland, etc., to all of which he gave his money....

The year was 1613. The Prince had died in 1612. Francis Bacon wrote his essay *The Praise of Prince Henry*, described by Roy Strong as being all too short, but brilliantly perceptive, charged with innuendo; and he quotes Bacon's view that Henry "was ambitious of commendation of glory."

* * * * *

Let us now consider some of the men at the Prince's Court at St. James's Palace. Sir Thomas Chaloner (1561-1615) his childhood mentor, was the son of one of Lord Burleigh's closest friends, and had been an overseas agent of Essex from 1596-1599, by way of Francis Bacon....

Adam Newton (died 1630) had been Henry's tutor and translated six books of Sarti's *History of the Council of Trent*. An emblem dedicated to him appeared in Henry Peacham's *Minerva Britannia* (1612).

Sir William Alexander (*circa* 1576-1640) was "preoccupied" (1612) with colonisation; so much so that Charles I granted him Acadie, which he renamed Nova Scotia as noted in *Baconiana* 185 (page 54). John

Holles (1564-1637), later Earl of Clare, linguist, architectural and building exponent, was Comptroller of the Household. The surrounding demesne to his house at Houghton may have reflected in part Francis Bacon's water garden at Gorhambury.

Sir John Danvers (1588?-1655) was also interested in gardens and architecture and, in common with others, had travelled in France and Italy, probably before 1608.

Sir Arthur Gorges (1557-1625) was son to Raleigh's first cousin, and translated works by Bacon into English.

Friends as opposed to members of Henry's household included Henry Wriothesley, 3rd Earl of Southampton (1573-1674) Patron of "Shakespeare" and Thomas Howard, 14th Earl of Arundel (1585-1646), a favourite acquaintance of the Prince, and owner of the house in Highgate, at which (it was said) Bacon died of a chill in 1626. An exhibition of Arundel's pictures and *objets d'art* was held only last year at the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford.

We have already referred to Henry Peacham (*circa* 1578-*circa* 1642), author of *Minerva Britanna*, or a *Garden of Heroical Devises* (1612) which had been presented to the Prince, in manuscript form, and was based on *Basilikon Doron*, attributed to James I. However, Pierre Henrion demonstrated recently in *Baconiana* 178 that this was really published by the Brotherhood, specifically for Henry's instruction, and dealt with the concept of Kingship by Divine Right. Peacham also contributed *The Compleat Gentleman* (1622), and *The Art of Drawing* (1606) reissued in 1612 as *Graphice or The Gentleman's Exercise*. Heraldry, landscaping and allegory were discussed in this book, which carried the Prince's *imprese*.

Of Sir Walter Raleigh Aubrey wrote:

At the end of his *History of the World*, he laments the death of Prince Henry,....whose great favourite he was: and who, had he survived his father would quickly have enlarged him; with rewards of Honour.

Aubrey's Brief Lives; edited Oliver Lawson Dick, page 321.

Henry had been Raleigh's patron, and was actively involved in the fresh attempt to colonize Virginia in 1607. Both Bacon and Southampton were members of the Council of Virginia founded by Letters Patent in 1606, and Sir Thomas Gates discovered the Bermoothes in the 1611 expedition, as is recorded in *The Tempest*.⁽¹⁾ *A la Frances Yates*, Roy Strong writes that "from the beginning the Virginia enterprise would have appealed to the Prince as an expansion of the Empire of Great Britain both in the political and religious context (page 62).

Sir Henry Wotton, Ambassador to Venice from 1603, and the Doge sent Sarti's *Apologia* to Henry in 1606, the Prince then offering his services to the Republic against the Pope "if only he were old enough."

Art was also included in Henry's cultural *symposium*, and the language it spoke "was of Renaissance hermeticism and the occult", as in Emperor Rudolph's Court.

Cornelius Boel's title-page to the 1611 Authorised Version of the Holy Bible is reproduced (facing page 120) accompanied by equally fine illustrations of the title-pages to Chapman's *Homer*, 1610, and Drayton's *Poly-Olbion*, 1612.

Sir John Hayward (1564-1627) is a name well-known to Baconians owing to his treatise *The First Part of the Life and Raigne of King Henrie the IIII* (1590) dedicated to the Earl of Essex, and referred to as a seditious pamphlet at the Earl's trial for treason. Queen Elizabeth was outraged because of the deposition scene, and Sir John escaped with a prison sentence only through the intervention of Francis Bacon. Prince Henry engaged his services as a historian at a later date to maintain the Tudor Royal tradition.

Michael Drayton (1563-1631) was one of Henry's poets, published an ode *To The Virginian Voyage* and the patriotic *Poly-Olbion* already mentioned, with the Prince designated as the future *Imperator Britanniae*, the preface including the lines

BRITAIN, behold here portay'd to thy sight Henry, thy best
hope, and the world's delight;

This work was written for Henry as the first prince who, from birth, was destined to rule as the descendant of the Trojans, Brutus and King Arthur.

Perhaps we may be permitted a diversion at this point, to point out that William Compton, later Earl of Northampton and ancestor of the present Marquess from whom the Society has sub-let Canonbury Tower, had figured at every Ascension Day Tilt since 1610.⁽²⁾

Ben Jonson's masques were produced for both King and Prince of which *Oberon, The Fairy Prince* is best known and form an important part of the Henrician scene.

All the men we have listed in this review were friends or acquaintances of Bacon, besides others mentioned in Sir Roy Strong's most interesting and informative book. Since all were recruited by Prince Henry to help in the cultural Renaissance, we may very reasonably conclude that Henry was in effect the magnet used by Bacon in furtherance of his own secret society activities. We detail these collaborators in the attached chart.

The oval portrait of Angelo Notari, the Venetian composer in the Prince's service contains a small Tudor rose in the surround as in the case of Cap-

tain John Smith commented on in *Baconiana* 181, perhaps indicating a Rosicrucian of lesser degree. Nevertheless the picture depicts a reversed sleeve, to remind us of the Droeshout Portrait, and when turned upside down, reveals the bent elbow so typical of the Brotherhood pictorial representations, the significance of which was discussed by Henrion in *Baconiana* 183.

Leaning on my elbow I begin.

King John, I, 1.

The fact that the chiaroscuro⁽³⁾ is so arranged as to highlight the elbow also lends credence to the Rosicrucian attribution. The portrait is worth comparing with the frontispiece to the 1632 Shakespeare Folio which we reproduced in *Baconiana* 185.

Prince Henry commanded the Inns of Court masques himself and in George Chapman's *Memorable Masque*, the masquers were Knights of Virginia who were enjoined to undergo an act of conversion to the true One Christian God. This theme reminds us irresistibly of Bacon's *New Atlantis* not least because the Knights were committed to "British Imperial expansion into the Americas" (page 178). In one of the contemporary masques the accession of James I brought ... in the eyes of the mythographers of the *Ecclesia Anglicana*, the recreation of the ancient British Church as it had existed in this island when Christianity had first been brought by St. Joseph of Arimathea.

Prince Henry and his mother Anne of Denmark helped to pioneer picture collecting in England, aided by the Earl of Arundel and Sir Henry Wotton, and purchased the bulk of Lord Lumley's library for housing in St. James's Palace, though this was still smaller than John Dee's library with 4000 works. This library was dispersed subsequently, but some so far unidentified works may be in the British Library.

In 1612 Bacon had dedicated his *Essays* to Henry, but sadly, in the same year, came the Epilogue:

Our Rising Sun is Set.

N.F.

Notes

- (1) cf. Martin Pares; *Knights of the Helmet*, page 13.
- (2) In the Creation Tilt he appeared as a Shepherd, perhaps as a reference to the Shepherd Kings or Hyksos said by some to have been responsible for the Pyramid.
- (3) *I.e.* the light and shading composition.

The Henrician Web

*Sir Thomas Chaloner (overseas
agent for Essex)*

Adam Newton

Sir William Alexander

John Hollis (Earl of Clare)

Sir John Danvers

Sir Arthur Gorges

3rd Earl of Southampton

14th Earl of Arundel

Henry Peacham

Sir Walter Raleigh

Sir Henry Wotton

Sir John Hayward

Michael Drayton

*William Compton (Earl of North-
ampton)*

Ben Jonson

Angelo Notari

George Chapman

Francis Bacon

How to crack the secret of Westminster Abbey, by Richard Barker, Elixir Books; price £5; 34 pages.

This book is written in a racy conversational style, but the message is important.

Few of our readers will be unaware of the "flagrant" alterations to the text of Prospero's famous speech in the 1623 First Folio beginning

The cloud cupt Tow'rs

on the scroll in Shakespeare's tomb in Poet's Corner, Westminster Abbey. Yet, Alexander Pope, a Rosicrucian, was primarily responsible for its erection, and as a celebrated author himself who had "already produced an orthodox edition of Shakespeare's Plays", approved the numerous "in-accuracies" and deliberate manipulations with which most of us are familiar.

However we view the problems therefore,

A mystery thou did'st.

Only a bigot would deny that a cypher could be the answer, and the author of this fascinating work takes us, step by logical step, through the maze, having enjoined us, *en route*, to examine the scroll for ourselves.

A suitable tribute is paid to our Treasurer Thomas Bokenham's previous researches as the decipherment progresses and Gustavus Selenus's *Cryptomenytices et Cryptographiae, Liber Quartus, Caput VI* (1624),

William Camden's *Remaines Concerning Britaine* (1605), *The Gentleman's Magazine* (1741), and Pope's *The Dunciad* (1744) are listed as sources.

As we would expect, Francis Bacon's name is included in the decipherment, but the reader is also directed to the Rosicrucian publication *Fama Fraternitatis*, and Robert Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy* of 1614 and 1628 respectively. Dr. Frances Yates set the academic world alight when *The Rosicrucian Enlightenment* appeared in 1972 (as Sir Roy Strong noted in *Henry, Prince of Wales*, reviewed elsewhere) and the enigmatic tomb to Burton in Christ Church Cathedral, Oxford was examined in *Baconiana* 173.

Here we shall leave our Members to consult the author's solution to the Scroll Mystery for themselves. The book is full of interest to those who enjoy mysteries, and we urge, should be bought.

The publisher's address is:
Barker Press, 1986,
78 Grange Road,
Sutton, Surrey.
SM2 6SN

N.F.

In Search of Shakespeare – A study of the poet's life and handwriting
by Charles Hamilton

The author of this book, an acknowledged authority on handwriting who, in 1983, was the first expert to condemn "the Hitler Diaries" as forgeries, sets out initially to demonstrate that Shakspeare's Will and other documents, such as his application for a Coat-of-Arms, were written by William Shakspeare himself. This, as he says, has not been the opinion of other experts including Edmund Malone, Sir Edmund Chambers and Dr. Samuel Tannenbaum, some of whom believed that the Will was prepared by Shakspeare's Attorney, Francis Collins, and signed by W.S.

When experts disagree, the uninitiated have to rely on their own judgements which may be faulty. They may also be influenced by the persuasive prowess of a particular expert who, of course, is likely to be biased one way or another. Researches into past history are generally pretty tedious affairs without some bias, but it is most important that this should be recognised at an early stage. The theme of this interesting and well illustrated book is to create a plausible working relationship between the two literary giants of the late Elizabethan and early Jacobean age, Francis Bacon the Lawyer, Statesman and Philosopher and William Shakspeare the Actor, Poet and Dramatist, whose names appear many times on the

manuscript of *circa* 1586 which was discovered in Northumberland House in London in 1867. This manuscript, or sheaf of manuscripts, has caused considerable embarrassment to orthodox Shakespeareans because on its cover sheet is what purports to be a list of its original contents which include the plays *Rycharde the second* and *Rycharde the third* which were first published anonymously in 1597. Over these titles is written the words "By Mr ffrauncis William Shakespeare" while under them, written upside down, are the words "your soveraign" which interlineation is studiously avoided by orthodox critics.

To accomplish this task Mr Hamilton must first make some thrusts at the wayward Baconians – not very effective ones one hastens to add. He then has to show the Stratford man as an accomplished writer who, we are told, "has a beautiful, stately script for important occasions, a sweeping, rolling penmanship for his poetic compositions and a dynamic, swift, devil-may-care hand for everyday scrawls" (page 15). His script then, like Francis Bacon's, varied from time to time, which is perfectly understandable, and the different styles are well illustrated in this book. But the bias is clearly shown in his comment on page 44. He writes, "The variations in the Poet's signatures have brought joy and succor to the Baconians, who insist that Shakespeare was only a shill for Bacon, a semi-literate hayseed who could not possibly have written the sonnets and poems and plays."

Another interesting example of the author's bias is an extraordinary statement (page 19) concerning some of the "speeches" appearing in the Northumberland MS. He writes:

As I am merely a lover of Shakespeare, and not an expert on his stylistic quirks, I must leave a critical examination of the speeches written for Essex at the tilt to others. The style seems to me more flexible than Bacon's. The ideas, too, are in my opinion not those of the great thinker. Bacon's essays are little gems and, like his philosophical writings, mathematically structured, hard, compact, brilliantly cut, like the glass of a prism. It would be difficult to imagine the icy-souled, unemotional Bacon as a lover of poetry, or even comprehending the reason for poetry. Yet Bacon's speeches for Essex at the tilt are beautifully written and imply the vision of a poet. Take this little passage from the "Hermit's second speech": "But the gardens of the Muses keep the privilege of the golden age; they ever flourish and are in league with time. The monuments of witt survive the monuments of power: the verses of a poet endure without a syllable lost, while states and empires pass" Does this not suggest Shakespeare's Sonnet 55, probably written about the same time or perhaps several years earlier:

Not marble, nor the gilded monuments
Of princes, shall outlive this powerful rhyme.

Quite so, but this reversal of a more obvious inference suggests that our critic is one whom Bacon might have described as being inhibited by one of his idols of the mind.

Before turning to the author's further interesting speculations concerning the Northumberland Manuscript, which of course is of special interest to Baconians, some brief comments must be made about Shakspeare's Will which, as everyone knows, omits any reference to books or manuscripts of plays yet to be published, some of which were not even heard of before 1623. These were valuable assets which would have brought some profit to Shakspeare's beneficiaries. We are asked to believe, however, that these items were handed over to Heminge and Condell who, it is stated, were the only surviving members of Shakspeare's original company and who "exercised control" of the copyrights to many of his manuscripts and prompt books. It is also suggested that these men had been asked to continue the task of collecting his plays and poems for publication begun after his return to Stratford by William himself. Reading through the Will, which is quoted in full, it struck me that, even if written by Shakespeare, it must surely have been compiled with his Attorney sitting at his elbow. Would it not be more probable that these books and manuscripts, if indeed there were any, were overlooked by Collins whose employer was probably in the throes of death, by poisoning, as suggested by our astute author? It should, however, be remembered that many people now believe that the Dedication in the 1623 Folio, signed by Heminge and Condell was actually compiled by Ben Jonson whose clever adaptation from Pliny contained in it would have been beyond the ken of those actor-tradesmen.

We now come to the most interesting suggestion that, in fact, two pages of the Northumberland Manuscript were written by the same hand which wrote the Will. This opens up the possibility that Shakspeare, whom the author claims was unemployed at the time owing to the closure of the theatres, became one of Bacon's "good pens". It is well known that Bacon employed *amanuenses* to write many of his works under dictation and if Shakspeare had, as is maintained, a swift and flowing hand, this theory cannot be overlooked. The idea, it seems, was first mooted by the Countess de Shambrun in her book *Shakespeare Rediscovered* but Charles Hamilton goes a lot further. He believes that Bacon employed the poet to edit and revise some of the poetic speeches in this Manuscript which was intended to be bound. Even many of the "scribblings" on the cover sheet, including the beautiful ornamental monograms at the top of this sheet, which he tells us represent W.S., are claimed as Shakspeare's. These mon-

ograms also appear on the colophon page of the second edition of Holinshead's *Chronicles* which is illustrated and which also has as its headpiece the well-known "Archer" design.

One further statement made by the author about this important set of manuscripts is astonishing to say the least. On page 168, we have:

Spedding was impressed with the frequent scribbling of Shakespeare's name on the front page (or makeshift cover) of the manuscript. Spedding did not, however, attribute the writing to Shakespeare. But the mention of several works by Shakespeare, with an allusion or two from the poet's writings on the cover of this volume that contained writings of Bacon, led Spedding to conclude he had discovered fresh evidence that Bacon wrote the plays and poems of Shakespeare.

Now this admission most certainly does not appear in Spedding's *Lord Bacon's Works* or his *Letters and Life of Lord Bacon*, the last volume of which was printed in 1872. In Frank Burgoyne's facsimile volume of the manuscript of 1904, he quotes Spedding quite briefly and, as far as the names "Bacon" and "Shakespeare" on the cover sheet are concerned, he merely wrote: "Mr Spedding seemed to think that much of this writing was mere scribbles". It seems that Burgoyne was referring to Spedding's little booklet of 1870 which he called *A Conference of Pleasure* and which was a reprint of Bacon's four "Tributes" listed at the top of this cover sheet. In his Introduction, Spedding certainly refers to these writings as scribbles, but as far as the name "Shakespeare" appearing on this sheet is concerned, he makes no mention of the two names being linked in any way. He wrote

What other inference will be drawn from its appearance on the cover of this manuscript by those who start with the conviction that Bacon and not Shakespeare was the real author of *Richard II* and *Richard III* I cannot say, but to myself the fact which I have mentioned seems quite sufficient to account for the phenomenon.

Spedding, it must be noted, makes no comment on the fact that manuscripts of those two Plays had, to all appearances, mysteriously found their way into Bacon's papers before those Plays were committed to print in 1597.

Burgoyne, however, was more specific about these names, and wrote,

The fact that this title-page is scribbled over in a contemporary handwriting with the names of "Bacon" and "Shakespeare" in close proximity and seemingly of set purpose, has caused believers in the Baconian authorship of Shakespeare's plays to

cite this page as confirmatory evidence of their theory.
It is clear, therefore, that both Spedding and Burgoyne took good care to disassociate themselves from Baconian “theories”.

T.D.B.

Receipt of this letter by our Chairman, requesting its publication in Baconiana, was timely in that the questions and doubts it raises concerning Bacon's integrity are answered comprehensively in the masterly article by Clifford Hall. In fairness to our correspondent, however, we have to state that, for reasons of space, it was not possible to print his full text. — Editor.

22nd June, 1986

Dear Mr. Gwynne,

Please forgive the delay in replying to your letter of 20th May.

I think your fundamental error, if I may say so, is your failure to realize that Bacon was a deeply committed Christian, and clearly incapable of corruption. However, I appreciate your sincerity, and reply in more detail as follows:-

1. The spirit of the time in which the receipt of gifts was commonplace;
2. that it was entirely unclear that the law forbade the receipt of gifts;

3. the Lord Chancellor's oath required him to "serve the King at his need" – it was not the same as the Judge's oath;
4. Bacon's "confession" was too subtle a document to be dismissed as a confession in the ordinary way;
5. in the Court of Law evidence of confessions is inadmissible if the confession has been improperly obtained so that not too much store should be attached to the use of the word itself;
6. What Bacon acknowledged was that he was glad that the law had been either made or clarified and, in that sense, and without detracting from his qualities as a "just" Judge who was *not* influenced by presents, he was glad to be made a precedent;
7. You (forgive me!) and Lord Denning are reading your history backwards;
8. though Judges do not tell Juries to take into account that the accused has pleaded "not guilty" we are, in such a case, talking about a criminal trial where the law is more or less certain, where there are witnesses who are cross-examined, where there is Counsel on both sides etc. – none of these features being present in Bacon's case:
9. that Bacon's contemporaries (or at least his friends) did not see him corrupt in the modern sense; so that we do not just have Bacon's word for it;
10. the foregoing answers the point about the effect of Bacon's case on public morality;
11. there is no evidence that he lied, showed contempt for the legal process or was guilty of "doing deals".

Yours sincerely

N. Fermor Chairman

The Editor,
Baconiana

10 Armytage Road,
Budleigh Salterton,
Devon EX9 6SD

15/4/86

Dear Sir,

Readers may be interested to know that since your Editorial reference to my article in *Baconiana* 185 I have returned to live in England with my wife Jean. There is an erratum in note 2 on page 104 in brackets following the words ".....the remaining five rays". This should read "see Table I" not Table II.

Also I found the article by Betty McKaig extremely interesting and obviously the result of much original research. Thus on page 53 she cites William Kidd or Kydd, the pirate, as one of Bacon's masques or pen-names, since there is an obvious similarity between the skull and crossbones on the pirate flag and the E.....s OF M..y which form one of the focal points of the Masonic Third Degree.

Another point is that students of the history of mathematics, and computers, credit Bacon with the invention of the binary code for the alphabet; so presumably it is the manner in which the Biliteral Cipher is used and interpreted that is open to question and argument.

Yours sincerely,

William R. Wood

PUBLICATIONS

(for sale)

All the following publications are available from the Francis Bacon Society except those so marked. Enquiries should be made to the Hon.Treasurer, T.D. Bokenham, at 56 Westbury Road, New Malden, Surrey KT3 5AX, from whom an up-to-date price list may be obtained.

Baker, H. Kendra

The Persecution of Francis Bacon

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

Bokenham, T.D.

A Brief History of the Bacon-Shakespeare Controversy

A concise and clear summary, concluding with some new cipher evidence.Illustrated. (Paperback - 1982).

The "Original" Shakespeare Monument at Stratford-on-Avon

A history of the repairs and alterations made to the monument in 1749.Illustrated.(Booklet - 1968).

Dawkins, A.P.

Faithful Sayings and Ancient Wisdom

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

Eagle, R.L.

The Secrets of Shakespeare Sonnets

A scholarly and spiritual interpretation of these most beautiful poems, with a facsimile reproduction of the 1609 edition of the Sonnets and "A Lover's Complaint". (Hardback - 1965). Available from The Mitre Press, 52 Lincoln's Inn Fields, London WC2.

Gundry, W.G.C.

Francis Bacon - a Guide to his Homes and Haunts

Although inaccurate in parts this little book includes some interesting information and many illustrations.(Hardback - 1946).

Manes Verulamiani

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

Johnson, Edward D.

Francis Bacon's Maze
Francis Bacon's Cipher Signatures
Shakespearean Acrostics
The Biliteral Cipher of Francis Bacon

Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin

Bacon is Shakespeare
With Bacon's Promus.

Macduff, Ewen

The Sixty-Seventh Inquisition
The Dancing Horse Will Tell You

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

Melsome, W.S.

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

Pares, Martin

Mortuary Marbles
A collection of six essays in which the author pays tribute to the greatness of Francis Bacon. (Paperback).

A Pioneer
A tribute to Delia Bacon. (Hardback - 1958).

Knights of the Helmet
Useful notes on the Baconian background. (Paperback - 1964).

Sennett, Mabel

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

Theobald, B.G.

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

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

Woodward, Frank

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

THE FRANCIS BACON SOCIETY

(INCORPORATED)

SUBSCRIPTIONS

The subscription for membership is £7.50 payable on election and on the first day of each succeeding January. Those members who prefer to remit their subscriptions in American currency are requested to send \$18 if possible by international money order in sterling. Bankers Orders and forms for Deeds of Covenant can be provided on request. All subscriptions and enquiries about subscriptions should be sent to the Hon. Treasurer, T.D. Bokenham, Esq., at 56 Westbury Road, New Malden, Surrey KT3 5AX.

Members receive a copy of each issue of BACONIANA without further payment, and are entitled to vote at Annual General Meetings. They will also receive invitations whenever possible to lectures and discussions organised by or on behalf of the Society. In addition BACONIAN JOTTINGS is being issued free to all members, and at present this is published once a year.

Members would assist the Society greatly by forwarding additional donations whenever possible, and by recommending friends for election. Application forms for membership are obtainable from the Secretary, at Canonbury Tower, Islington, London N1 2NQ.

BACONIANA

(Copyright reserved)

The official Journal of the Francis Bacon Society (Inc.) is published periodically. Back numbers can be supplied. When enquiry is made for particular copies the date should be specified. Some are now scarce and, in the case of early issues, difficult to obtain unless from members of the Society who may have spare ones. Enquiries for back copies should be made to the Hon. Treasurer, T.D. Bokenham, at 56 Westbury Road, New Malden, Surrey KT3 5AX.

THE FRANCIS BACON SOCIETY LIBRARY

Details about the books and where they may be studied are available from the Hon. Treasurer, T.D. Bokenham, at 56 Westbury Road, New Malden, Surrey KT3 5AX.