Vol. XXXVII. No. 146. Price 2/6.

BACONIANA

Founded 1886.

August 1953

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Editorial	49
America's Assignment with Destiny	54
The Rosicrucians	56
Baconian Ideals in the French National Institute	57
Bacon's Wisdom of the Ancients Re-considered	60
Francis Bacon as Philosopher	62
Bacon, Shakespeare, and 'Henry VIII'	71
Was Shakespeare Illiterate?	82
Psalm 46 has Bacon's Cipher!	86
The Overbury Poisoning	90
The Vocabulary of the Bi-literal Cipher Story	93
Correspondence	95

LONDON:

Published by the FRANCIS BACON SOCIETY INCORPORATED at Canonbury Tower, Islington, London, N.1, and printed by the Rydal Press, Keighley

THE FRANCIS BACON SOCIETY

(INCORPORATED)

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

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

Officers and Council:

Hon. President:
SYDNEY WOODWARD, ESQ.

Past Hon. President:
MISS T. DURNING-LAWRENCE

Hon. Vice-Presidents:
MISS CONSTANCE M. POTT — MISS E. MAPOTHER
MISS M. THEOBALD — WILFRED WOODWARD, ESQ.

Council:
COMDR. MARTIN PARES, R.N. (Retd.), *Chairman*
CAPT. B. ALEXANDER, *Vice-Chairman*

'DNEY WOODWARD, ESQ. — A. D. SEARL, ESQ.
'EL FERMOR, ESQ. — T. WRIGHT, ESQ.
G. C. GUNDRY, ESQ. — JOHN O. WOODWARD, ESQ.
NIGEL HARDY, ESQ.

WILLIAM ASPDEN, ESQ., *Secretary*
Canonbury Tower, Islington, London, N.1.

Editorial Sub-Committee:
SYDNEY WOODWARD, ESQ. — COMDR. MARTIN PARES
NOEL FERMOR, ESQ. — NIGEL HARDY, ESQ.

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

Subscriptions should be sent to the Hon. Treasurer, and all other communications to the Secretary, both c/o Canonbury Tower, Islington, London, N.1.

TO OUR SUPPORTERS IN THE U.S.A.

The Council has pleasure in announcing that as from January 1st, 1953, there will be one rate of subscription of three dollars per annum or twenty one shillings sterling in place of the present two rates of four and two dollars. The subscription is payable on election and on the first day of each succeeding January.

In view of the present high level of costs,—notwithstanding the fact that the Society is now being run most economically—this new rate of subscription for membership is extraordinarily low. In these circumstances, the Council will be most grateful to all members if they can further promote our united witness to the cause of Lord Bacon by occasionally forwarding an additional sum by way of donation, and, above all, by recommending their friends for election to membership.

The Society would also be saved much time, and bank collection costs, if members found it convenient to remit their subscriptions in sterling (twenty-one shillings) by draft or International Money Order on London.

PLEASE NOTE THE NEW ADDRESS

BACONIANA

VOL. XXXVII (68th Year) No. 146 AUGUST, 1953

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.*

EDITORIAL

OUR Society has long enjoyed the distinction of attracting a proportion of French members, some of whom, happily, have corresponded. That these gentlemen should be interested in a literary society holding unorthodox views and conducting its business in a different language, has always seemed a happy augury. The Frenchman, less hampered by English traditions, is perhaps less deceived by academic blah! To him the *demonstrated fact must stand and the true mind must receive it*, however awkward its impact on received opinion. To disregard or reject such facts *because our learning is not equal to the task of reconciling them with what we thought we knew, is to hurt ourselves.*

We refer of course to such facts as the contrast between Bacon's and Shaxper's Wills, the contradictory and puzzling testimony of Ben Jonson, Shelley's unqualified recognition of Lord Bacon as a poet of supreme genius, Bacon's obvious interest in the Drama and his peculiar and most significant ommission in not mentioning either the name of the bard or of any of the Plays which were being produced periodically during his lifetime, Bacon's most intricate study of the uses of "Poesy" (narrative, dramatic and parabolic) in the *De Augmentis*, and so on. These unquestioned facts constitute a body of external evidence which orthodox opinion prefers to set aside, thus destroying the principle of integrity at its source; for *the conclusion that requires facts to be dispensed with is surely not going to stand.* [We wonder here if any reader will recognise whose words we have been quoting so freely!]

Why exactly did Francis Bacon commit his name to "foreign nations and the next ages"? Obviously he felt that a great injustice had been done; but which foreign nation was to be the custodian of this mystery? Was it France, the fair country in which he spent his adolescence, or America, in whose colonisation he became so deeply involved?

We print in this issue a piquant letter from M. Pierre Henrion who seems, more than most of us, to be alive to the quality, the magnetism, the charm of Bacon. His letter is really an echo of Archbishop Tenison, "they that have true skill in the works of the Lord

Verulam will know whether he be the author of this piece or the other, whether . . . his 'name' be to it or not." It is the quality of Bacon's Soul, as it is found embalmed in his own writings and in such Plays as *The Tempest*, that is challenging our powers of discernment.

In contrast to this awareness, this faculty of looking beneath the concrete word into the opalescent depths of Bacon's imagination, we must now advert to the harsher arguments of a contemporary newspaper, which records how Professor Isaacs, at the forty-third annual Shakespeare lecture at the British Academy, attempted to reconstruct Shaxper's early activities in the theatre from an examination of the "internal evidence" of the plays themselves. In the words of the Press report:—

> "There was proof, he said, that Shakespeare was impressed by outstanding and effective scenes in the theatre, and that his plays contained clear verbal echoes of scenes and motives of plays acted in the theatre in the years before 1594 which have survived in printed texts . . . His specific debts to Marlow, Lyly, Peele and Greene were analysed. Professor Isaacs suggested that much might be learnt from a more methodical and rigorous scrutiny of parallels and source material . . . ."

Now we certainly agree that much can be learnt from a study of "parallels and source material," but we feel convinced that it leads rather to Bacon than to Shaxper. Moreover internal evidence is of no value unless supported by at least some external evidence. Professor Isaacs' evidence serves only to associate the Plays with their author, for he, whoever he was, must have been familiar with certain earlier plays. Yet surely Bacon is just as likely to have read, witnessed, collaborated in, or (dare we say it?) written the plays of Marlow, as is the actor Shaxper; more so if Greene's gibe about "the trade of noverint" referred to a lawyer dabbling with the stage. It amounts to this. The "previous play-reading" shown in the Plays may point equally well to Bacon or Shaxper, but the "law" the "legal terms" and the "classical learning" in the plays, can all be easily reconciled with the external facts of Bacon's life, but hardly with that of the actor.

* * * *

It is difficult to estimate the services rendered to our cause by the late Alfred Dodd, whose obituary notice has already appeared. He was a Baconian of the most radical views, of what Stratfordians would call the "deepest dye"; and of a genuine ardour which, more than once, brought him into collision with more conservative members. There used to be a joke about the three kinds of Russian—the Whites, the Radishes (pretending redness), and the Tomatoes. Dodd in most of our controversial subjects, was an unqualified "tomato," hotly resenting the suggestion that Mrs. Gallup could have been an impostor or a lunatic. Of course, like everyone else, she may have made mistakes, and one remembers an occasion when Dodd himself re-wrote a whole chapter of *The Martyrdom of Francis Bacon* because the present

writer had suggested that he had been unfair to Sir Walter Raleigh.

Dodd's espousal of our cause brought it to the notice of various spiritualistic movements and widened our appeal to the public. Of his published works perhaps the sonnet diary is the most original and certainly the best seller. If the demand becomes strong it may be re-printed. Another valuable book is *Shakespeare Creator of Freemasonry*. This was sold out and not re-printed; second-hand copies are now practically unobtainable even if advertised for, showing that those who possess them (probably mostly Masonic Brethren) do not wish to part with them. The writer remembers lending his own copy to his Vicar who was an ex-headmaster and chaplain to the County Lodges. The book was returned with the comment that the Vicar was now convinced of three things, (a) that whoever wrote the Shakespeare Plays was a member of the Craft, (b) that the pen which wrote the Plays had clearly drafted the early English masonic ritual, (c) that this person was quite clearly Francis Bacon. This opinion had come from a very critical reader who, in the exercise of his profession, was something of an expert on rhythm and ritual.

The publication of the second volume of *The Personal Story* is no longer in the hands of the Society but was delegated by Dodd to our then editor Mr. Comyns Beaumont, who is therefore custodian of the funds subscribed. We have, however, the charge of some of Dodd's unpublished MSS, extracts from which may appear under his name in BACONIANA. But, in pursuance of the Council's declared policy, nothing of a violently controversial character will be introduced for the present.

If our readers will excuse a personal anecdote, we remember visiting the late C. Y. C. Dawbarn, M.A., soon after he had challenged Alfred Dodd on his literal rendering of the word "fell" in Sonnet 76, the context being usually rendered as follows:

"Why write I still all one, ever the same,
And keep invention in a noted weed,
That every word doth almost TELL my name,
Showing their birth and where they did proceed?"

"Fell" would be nonsense, said Dawbarn. "What will you bet?" said Dodd, and proceeded quite fairly to win his bet because the word "fell" (meaning to interweave a thread in the weft) is well known in the cotton-spinning industry. Dawbarn's last words were these. "Dodd has done what you and I may never do, he has produced in the sonnet diary a genuine creative work." With this generous encomium let us leave him.

* * * *

Members who are interested in the promised article on Don Quixote by G.S.O. will be sorry to hear of a temporary delay in obtaining a certain essential illustration from a book in Barcelona. We hope to have this in time for the Autumn number. Meanwhile, by the same author's permission, we re-print another of his Sonnet sequence, as the one which appeared in March has attracted the attention of poetry lovers. Any members who would be interested in purchasing a copy of

this remarkable sequence in the Shakespearian sonnet form, if it is re-printed in England at a price not exceeding 15/-, are requested to let us know. We believe it to contain more than may at first appear, and we strongly commend it.

* * * *

In books of many a deep-brained alchemer,
I've read of love beneath another word,
Stone, Rose and Gem and vital Elixir,
And self-enflamed uncinderable Bird.
Fashions are these of cryptics; mine is more
To touch at quicker heart the world's white flame,
Who take no print from Nature's varied store,
But single love by Love's unpareiled name.
Those are but forms by changing Time re-cast,
Dimming the sense with sight's particulars;
But when Time's moulds are broke and we are passed
Beyond the spare mew of these influent stars,
From the world's burnt-out shards this Flame shall rise,
And love shall still be love in Paradise.

Unfortunately there was a misprint in the sonnet which appeared last time, as "works" in the second line should have read "words". We apologise to our readers for this mishap.

* * * *

The second in Mr. Gentry's interesting series of articles provides us with a valuable and up-to-date precis of the general character and aims of what is often called Baconian Philosophy, but is perhaps better described as Bacon's philosophical teachings. We much hope that some of our readers will be stimulated to inquire further and to refer if possible to some of the works mentioned, thus furthering the first Object of our Society.

Bacon's *magnum opus*, the *Instauratio Magna*, and particularly the part of it which he himself esteemed most, *The Advancement of Learning*, is often discussed but seldom read; and no appreciation or criticism, however thoughtful and well-written, can ever really replace the beauty, rhythm, and grandeur, of Bacon's own words. We congratulate Mr. Gentry, and heartily second the plea in his last paragraph.

We hope to print further articles as opportunity permits, dealing with Francis Bacon as a lawyer, politician, etc. In addition we look forward to including some remarks on Canonbury Tower as promised in our last issue.

Meanwhile, we are happy to include an interesting contribution from Mr. Jay W. Stein, a U.S.A. Member, which outlines in an admirably concise manner the failure of ideals, which, though based on Bacon's philosophic principles, were too materialistic to succeed. Bacon drew the power and strength of his vast intellectuality from constant study and contemplation of the Mind of Nature, or the *Anima Mundi*, and presupposed One Intelligence immanent in all

noumena and phenomena. He was nothing if not a Christian *mystic* and yet through the mirror of the inner harmonies, never ceased to have proper regard for the workings of their physical affinities. As our contributor makes plain, Englishmen, and Bacon not least, respected divine and royal authority; the French Revolutionary philosophers, through a misunderstanding of the key to the entire Baconian *Instauratio* narrowed the universal sweep of his mind to a nationalistic, and indeed atheistic materialism.

Bacon always insisted that human reasoning *per se*, was fallible. True, he also maintained that mystical attainment was no excuse for neglecting science or human affairs—at all levels *ignorantia legis non excusat*—and indeed that all things, however mundane, were worthy of study, "for the Sun enters the Palace and the Privy alike, and is not thereby polluted." But he approved the study of Divinity "provided always the Mind be expanded to the Mysteries, and not the Mysteries reduced to the compass of the mind."

Napoleon Buonaparte, with his bold and voracious egotism, was no doubt quick to take advantage of the shortcomings of the incomplete Ideology of de Tracy and others, and it is pertinent to remember that his helpmeet, Josephine, was herself well versed in the occult. The period of French history, covered by Mr. Stein's remarks is one of absorbing interest, despite Napoleon's remark that "History is bu fable already agreed upon."

Mr. Stein, who holds an M.A. degree in political science, has made a special study of French philosophy under the Revolutionary and Napoleonic regimes.

* * * *

By kind permission of Mr. Manly Hall we are printing further extracts from his publication, *America's Assignment with Destiny*. Mr. Hall is here dealing with the period covering the birth of the independent Republic of the United States of America, and our readers will not fail to be impressed by his remarks on the activities of "the Baconian group."

* * * *

We are able to announce that Mr. Roderick L. Eagle has completed work, at the suggestion of the Council, on a valuable new addition to Baconian literature, called *Bacon or Shaksper, A Guide for Beginners*. This we hope to print in the next two issues of BACONIANA, and subsequently publish in brochure form. We are grateful to Mr. Eagle for his co-operation in this matter, as the booklet should satisfy a long-felt need.

AMERICA'S ASSIGNMENT WITH DESTINY

By Manly Palmer Hall

III. THE AMERICAN REVOLUTIONARY PERIOD

NO study of the descent of the adept tradition through the Baconian group would be complete without reference to *The Life and Adventures of Common Sense*, which was published in 1769 and was described as "an Historical Allegory." The work appeared anonymously, but is attributed on slight evidence to Herbert Lawrence, a surgeon and apothecary and an intimate friend of David Garrick. This book was the first to attribute the authorship of the Shakespeare plays to Sir Francis Bacon, but that reference, whilst the best known, is not by any means the most important fragment of the text. Bacon seems to appear personified under the pseudonym "Wisdom." His lordship's departure to Holland is specifically mentioned, and the descent of the Great Plan is traced allegorically from the schools of Greek philosophy through the medieval world to the rise of the Medici, and the account terminates with the crowning of George II as King of England.

Beginning on page 224 is the following stimulating remark: 'It was a few Summers ago, that GENIUS, HUMOUR and myself took this same Magistrate along with us to pass some Days at the Foot of a certain Hill called *Parnassus*, where we have a small Habitation, which we hold of the Ladies of the Manor, who are nine maiden Sisters.' It would be difficult to ignore this obvious reference to the Lodge of the Nine Sisters and all that it implies.

On page 237 of Volume II is a veiled reference to relevant matters: 'The Royal Club or Society (as it is called) founded by *Charles* Second, was, at first, filled with Men of real Science and Learning. WISDOM was an original Member, but of late Years he went so seldom amongst them, that they thought proper to expel him for non attendance. After the Expulsion of WISDOM, GENIUS was desirous of being chosen into this Society; and that he might not be rejected on Account of his peculiar Abilities, he was introduced to them as a grave Antiquary who had great Knowledge in Coins, Fossils and Cockleshells.' Obviously, *genius* in this case represents Elias Ashmole, Esquire, who was the most distinguished antiquary of his time, a world-famous collector of coins, and an accumulator of fossils, shells, and other geological curiosa. *Wisdom*, of course, was Bacon, who originated the entire project of the Royal Society.

Between January 21, 1769 and January 21, 1772, an unknown man using the pseudonym of Junius wrote as a man personally outraged. The sins of Parliament weighed heavily upon his soul. He spoke for England, for the American colonies, and for the world. He defended the freedom of the press, attacked taxation without representation, and was a vigorous and belligerent champion of human rights. There can be no doubt that his pen advanced the cause of the American Revolution and created sympathy for the victims of bungling English politicians. It is not remarkable that *The Letters of Junius*

gave inspiration and comfort to the cause of American independence. They were widely read in the colonies, and the solid judgment which these *Letters* contained influenced the thinking of Franklin, Jefferson, and Hancock. 'Both liberty and property are precarious,' writes Junius, 'unless the possessors have sense and spirit enough to defend them. This is not the language of vanity. If I am a vain man, my gratification lies within a narrow circle. I am the sole depository of my own secret, and it shall perish with me.'

Roderick Eagle contributed a curious observation concerning a possible association between Junius and the Baconian group. Eagle wrote that the first person so far recorded to name Bacon as the author of the Shakespeare plays was the Reverend James Wilmot, D.D. (1726-1808), who was rector of Barton-on-the-Heath, in Warwickshire, in 1785. This sober scholar of Trinity, Oxford, never married, and devoted his life to quiet scholarship. A short biography by him was published by his niece. She made no reference to his Shakespearean-Baconian interest, but did attribute to him *The Letters of Junius*. Eagle doubted that Dr. Wilmot was sufficiently close to the political situation of his time—he ministered in a remote hamlet—to have written the celebrated *Letters*, but suggested that he may have been a literary accomplice who transcribed the original to throw inquisitive persons, especially handwriting experts, into further confusion. Eagle adds: 'I have an old engraving showing 'Junius' dressed as a clergyman. He is writing on a sheet of paper which bears the heading 'to the King'. On either side of him sit two men, one of whom is dictating. Under these portraits have been written 'Lord George Sackville' and 'Lord Chatham'.' The same author suspected that Dr. Wilmot was the author of the book, *The Story of the Learned Pig*, published anonymously in London in 1786. Only one copy of this little book concerned with the transmigrations of a highly talented hog has been discovered. In one of its incarnations, the hog claimed to have written the plays attributed to Shakespeare. The editor of the pig's narrative signed himself 'Transmigratus'.[1]

Early editions of *The Letters of Junius* are ornamented with curious vignettes which may be described as landmarks of a French Secret Society. The first editions of certain of Voltaire's writings are similarly adorned. Dr. Wilmot would have been forty-three years old when the elusive Lawrence published his *Common Sense*. Here again, two men, both obscure and contemporary, nourished the same and most singular opinions. It is reported that Dr. Wilmot burned all of his findings! The 18th century was less suitable for the perpetuation of secret enterprises than were the 16th and 17th centuries. The cases of Junius, Lawrence, and Transmigratus proved, however, that it was possible to conceal an identity with the assistance of the proper persons. Even during the American Revolutionary period the public mind was inclined to ignore the mysterious and to accept appearance without question. Most historians have merely perpetuated popular traditions and have sought no reasonable explanation for extraordinary events.

[1] See *Shakespeare, New Views for Old.*

THE ROSICRUCIANS

IN the March BACONIANA the editors commented on Mr. Eagle's doubts as to whether the Rosicrucians ever really existed as an organised body. They also suggested that readers should consult, amongst other literature, Mr. Hall's books. The following will be of interest in this respect, and is quoted by this author to support the general theme of *The Adepts*.

"Yet it is as certain though this conviction is merely a *personal* one, that several Brothers of the Rosy Cross—or 'Rosicrucians,' so-called—did take a prominent part in the American struggle for independence, as much as in the French Revolution during the whole of the past century. We have documents to that effect, and the proofs of it are in our possession . . . it is our firm conviction based on historical evidence and direct inferences from many of the *Memoirs* of those days that the French Revolution is due to *one* Adept. It is that mysterious personage, now conveniently classed with other 'historical *charlatans*' (i.e. great men whose occult knowledge and powers shoot over the heads of the imbecile majority), namely, the Count de St.-Germain—who brought about the just outbreak among the paupers, and put an end to the selfish tyranny of the French kings—the 'elect, and the Lord's anointed.' And we know also that among the *Carbonari* —the precursors and pioneers of Garibaldi—there was more than one *Freemason* deeply versed in occult sciences and Rosicrucianism."—H. P. Blavatsky, *The Theosophist* (Madras, October, 1883)."

In deference to Mr. Hall's avowed aims and as a matter of courtesy, we include, in conclusion his views on the practical implications of Francis Bacon's mission to posterity; and would point to the celebrated men with whom his name is associated.

"Those initiates of the Western descent whose names are known convey a fair impression of acceptable qualifications. Such men as Roger Bacon, Francis of Assisi, Dante, Paracelsus, Basil Valentine, Robert Fludd, Francis Bacon, and St.-Germain immediately recall the remarkable abilities, the wonderful devotion, and the enduring fortitude of those who resolved to devote their lives to the improvement of mankind. Quiet thinking will dissolve all doubts as to the genuine teachings of the Mystery Schools and the qualifications necessary to membership. Usually, the Schools selected their disciples, imposing upon them rules of discrimination and discretion, so that no matter of importance was entrusted to anyone still plagued by his own ambitions or likely to succumb to the temptations of worldly acclaim.

"The principal test of existing religions and mystical organizations is, therefore, their practical acceptance of collective responsibility. If the group is concerned primarily with the perpetuation of its own abstract doctrines and has provided no means for the direct application of these doctrines for the advancement of all men, something is wrong. Wisdom is not destined for the few. Certainly, it must be

given to a few, that through them it may be taught to the many. Any group which imposes artificial limitations of prejudice, bigotry, or intellectual exclusiveness frustrates the legitimate program of universal enlightenment. No one religion, philosophy, sect, or creed will ever be the sole custodian of the esoteric tradition. Organizations pretending to provide the 'only hope of salvation' can be immediately discarded. The Great Plan has taken on innumerable appearances that meet the requirements of human evolution, but the Plan itself is beyond all appearances. Many have the privilege of serving, but only the divine wisdom itself has the authority to dogmatize, and it has never indulged that prerogative."

We feel that the motives attributed to Bacon in this writing are in strict accord with his lofty idealism, and, if proved, form a complete answer to Lord Macaulay and others of modern times—such as Mr. William McElwee—who so cruelly malign his reputation.

NOEL FERMOR

BACONIAN IDEALS IN THE FRENCH NATIONAL INSTITUTE

By JAY W. STEIN

DURING the French Revolution and the rise of Napoleon, the principles and ideals of Francis Bacon were deeply admired in France. As in the age of Bacon, new goals and inspirations had opened up for bold intellectuals. In every sphere of activity, especially in social, political and economic reform, new vistas of hope and promise lay before men's eyes. Unlike the character of Bacon's age in England, however, when divine and royal authority were respected and the blessings of God and King were asked on their work, the Revolutionary period in France climaxed the most excessive nonconformity, and self-centered materialism.

With the sweeping away of traditional loyalties to church and state and their potential replacement by 'liberal' and 'scientific' values, intellectuals began to proclaim the fulfilment of hopes which Bacon had eloquently predicted. Among the more active, but little known, were a group of Post-Enlightenment thinkers who had supported the breaking up of the old French Academy in favour of a National Institute endorsing a 'new' philosophy called Ideology. Its leading expounders were Pierre Cabanis (1757-1808) and Destutt de Tracy (1754-1836).

The Ideologues, as these thinkers were called, adopted the reformist principles and ideals of their Enlightenment predecessors—the sensationalism of Condillac, the materialism of Holbach, the educational aims of Helvetius, the anti-clerical and common sense views of Voltaire, the Encyclopedic systematization of Diderot. These 18th century luminaries, in turn, reaped directly from what Bacon had sown earlier. They, too, felt that scholasticism had kept philosophy involved in deplorable subtleties, in Platonic and Neo-Platonic ab-

stractions which drove the secrets of nature and mind into ignorant fanaticism. They hailed a new foundation in which natural knowledge would thrive by systematic observation and experiment. Condillac (1715-1780), the chief forerunner of the Ideologues, credited Bacon with 'first breaking the statues and altars of idols erected in the temples of scholasticism'. He praised him for first understanding that all knowledge comes through the senses and for clearing the way for the scientific study of ideas.[1]

Cabanis was a physician who made an experimental study of what he believed to be the physiological basis of man's moral nature. In his "Relations of the Physical and the Moral in Man" he paid tribute to Bacon for outlining the proper area of human intelligence and for proposing new methods to unlock the secrets of nature and direct and strengthen the human understanding.[2]

The close friend of Cabanis, Destutt de Tracy, was an ex-nobleman and retired cavalry officer whose Scotch ancestors had settled on French soil 400 years earlier. Although enthusiastic over the Revolutionary ideals of 1789, Tracy was imprisoned under the Reign of Terror for his aristocratic origin and his opposition to Jacobin violence. In his cell he read works of Bacon, Locke and Condillac and outlined his "Elements of Ideology."

Like Bacon's call for a 'Novum Organum' or new intellectual machine, Tracy's plan was 'to remake all our knowledge and the human mind itself' by reconstructing the process of learning on a scientific foundation of sensationalism. Like Bacon's expectations for a 'Great Instauration' of practical human improvement, Tracy's thoroughly utilitarian objectives were the dawn of human happiness and the unlimited progress of civilization. Like Bacon's enlistments for the cause of advancing learning, Tracy's attentions were directed toward discovering truth and popularizing education. Regarding Bacon as 'one of those authors much more cited than read, and much more read than understood,' Tracy summarized and commented on each part of the famous six-fold scheme for 'rebuilding the sciences, arts and all fields of knowledge from a firm and solid basis.' While seeing the need for this reformulation of the basis of knowledge, Bacon failed, in Tracy's view, to offer any precise means for the task, used faulty logic and remained very incomplete. Despite these errors, Tracy affirmed, Bacon's contribution marked 'the most memorable moment in the history of man, when the human mind began returning to its natural path for increasing and verifying knowledge.'[3]

While recognizing the place of Bacon in an important stage of intellectual progress, Tracy ardently felt that it was his own "Elements of Ideology" which formed the final 'Novum Organum' and the really 'Great Instauration.' He and his confreres in the National Institute laid out elaborate plans for developing the moral and political sciences on empirical principles and then for disseminating their findings to all the people. Participating personally in the political assemblies, they introduced numerous legislative proposals for scholarly recognition and popular education, many of which were passed and carried out. In

the spirit of their efforts the Ideologues felt they were actually fulfilling Bacon's dreams for the renovation of knowledge.

Intended as a pedagogical guide for the 'Great Instauration' in France, Tracy's "Elements of Ideology" contained a new scheme or classification of knowledge:[4]

(1) History of our means of knowing.
  (a) Ideology, properly speaking (formation of our ideas).
  (b) Grammar (expression of our ideas).
  (c) Logic (combining of our ideas).

(2) Applying our means of knowing to the study of our will and its effects.
  (a) Economy (our actions).
  (b) Morality (our sentiments).
  (c) Government (directing our actions and sentiments).

(3) Applying our means of knowing to the study of beings not ourselves.
  (a) Physics (bodies and their properties).
  (b) Geometry (properties of space).
  (c) Calculus (properties of quantity).

In the Ideologue scheme, the path to knowledge of internal and external nature was exclusively through its origin in the senses and their expression and combination, a progression of steps much more rigidly classified and neatly labeled than Bacon ventured. With the application of this truly 'new organum', of learning, all knowledge and behaviour was expected to fall into the beautiful pattern of reason and lead to the rich harvests of peace, progress and happiness for all mankind.

The plan of Ideology collapsed under the scorn of Napoleon, who regarded its questioning yardstick as a nuisance to his government, and under the bitter opposition of papal and other clerics who saw their dogma and scholasticism threatened by a materialist philosophy of individual sensations. Ideology became a term of contempt and was completely forgotten as a philosophy. In contrast, the name of Bacon lived on as a leading figure in many of the same humanitarian and scientific ideals which the forgotten Ideologues yearned to realize.

[1]E. B. de Condillac, "Essai sur l'origine des connoissances humaines" (1746) in "Ouevres philosophiques de Condillac" (Paris, 1947) I, p.5.

[2]P. J. G. Cabanis, "Rapports du physique et du moral de l'homme et lettre sur les causes premières, avec une table analytique" par Destutt de Tracy (1805) (8th ed.; Paris, 1844) p.75.

[3]Destutt de Tracy, "Elemens d'Idéologie" (1801-15) (3rd ed.; Paris, 1817), pt. 3, pp. 44-48, 122-3, 457-61, 489-514.

[4]*Ibid.*, pp.452-53.

BACON'S WISDOM OF THE ANCIENTS RE-CONSIDERED

by M.P.

The Cyclops or Ministers of Terror

THEY say that the Cyclops, for their ferocity and cruelty, were cast by Jupiter into Hell, there to suffer perpetual imprisonment. But the Earth persuaded Jupiter that it would be well to release them and set them to forge thunderbolts. Whereupon the Cyclops, all at once becoming very industrious and officious, continued hammering out thunderbolts and other instruments of Terror.

In course of time it chanced that Jupiter became incensed with Aesculapius, son of Apollo, for raising a man from the dead by means of medicine. But, concealing his anger (for the deed was pious and famous and no cause for resentment) he *secretly* instigated the Cyclops against him; and they without hesitation promptly killed him with a thunderbolt. Whereupon in punishment of this unscrupulous act Apollo, with connivance, shot them down with his arrows.

* * * *

This fable appears to refer to the actions of Rulers who, having bloody and exacting ministers, do first punish and degrade them and then, following "worldly" advice, allow expediency to prevail and reinstate them in order to have instruments of severity and harshness ready to hand. These creatures, being by nature cruel and by their previous fate exasperated, know at once what is expected of them and show a wonderful diligence in such things. But from want of caution and from eagerness to ingratiate themselves, they will sooner or later accept a nod or casual word from their master as sufficient warrant to perpetrate some hateful execution.

Whereupon the rulers, disinclined to bear the odium and well aware that they will never lack such tools, abandon them utterly to the relatives of their victims and to the general loathing of the people. So that at the last, amid sounds of acclamation and applause to the government (and too late rather than undeservedly) they are brought to perish.

* * * *

Leaving aside Bacon's interpretation, which was cast in language more or less suitable for the age in which he lived, one cannot avoid the feeling that a deeper meaning may be involved. Whether we take Jupiter as representing Divinity or the "ruling" self in any man, it seems on the face of it hardly to his credit that first he *secretly* incites the Cyclops to slay Aesculapius, and then *connives* at their execution by Apollo. It is perhaps here that a more esoteric meaning may be looked for.

By installing the Cyclops in his "workshops" Jupiter (the ruling self) admits them to his realm within his automatic or sub-conscious

self. Therafter, when angered, he can still outwardly control his feelings but cannot prevent the Cyclops from reacting automatically, or, as Bacon puts it, from accepting a "casual word or nod" as warrant to do a hateful deed.

However Jupiter, on becoming fully aware of the infernal power which he has harboured, consents at once to its removal; and it is significant that this is done by the arrows of Apollo, the God of Medicine and Music, thus suggesting that a sub-conscious unbalance may need both physical remedies and a raising of the spirits by some form of invocatory art.

The wider application of this fable is more palpable. In most revolutions, and certainly in modern ones, there has been a tendency to secure power by resorting to instruments of Terror. An exception, of course, was the Protectorate of Cromwell when religious toleration was established, and when the brief rule of the Major-Generals was the nearest approach to coercion. But in our own enlightened age the legitimacy of using Terrorism as a means of enforcing government has become almost a basic issue, dividing humanity as with a sword. In the West we regard such rule as a step backwards towards barbarism, but in other parts of the world it is looked upon as both legitimate and essential.

It remains to be seen how long the modern counterparts of the Cyclops—the Secret Police, etc.—will enjoy full employment, and whether eventually their rulers (like Jupiter) will wisely surrender them to their fate.

FRANCIS BACON AS PHILOSOPHER

By R. J. W. GENTRY

"FRANCIS of Verulam reasoned thus with himself and judged it to be for the interest of the present and future generations that they should be made acquainted with his thoughts. Being convinced that the human intellect makes its own difficulties, not using the true helps which are at man's disposal soberly and judiciously; whence follows manifold ignorance of things, and by reason of that ignorance mischiefs innumerable; he thought that all trial should be made, whether that commerce between the mind of man and the nature of things, which is more precious than anything on earth, or at least than anything that is of the earth, might by any means be restored to its perfect and original condition, or if that may not be, yet reduced to a better condition than that in which it now is."

Thus opens the Proemium of Francis Bacon's epoch-making group of philosophical writings—the *Magna Instauratio.*

At the age of fifteen Bacon had left the University of Cambridge in disgust at the unprofitableness of the curriculum; he regarded the prevailing subjection to Aristotelian dogmatism as stultifying and ineffectual in producing any furtherance of human power over man's physical environment through scientific knowledge. The idea that all the operations of human reason had been discovered and systematised long before, had cast a blight for centuries upon any intellectual enterprise that might have led to a fruitful exploration of the material plane of our existence. He resolved therefore to devote his splendid powers to "vast contemplative ends", and especially the "relief of man's estate."

He had no quarrel with the deductive side of Aristotle's method: it was rather his process of formulating premises that were to be submitted to syllogistic treatment, and the interminable pre-occupation of academic philosophy with sterile disputation, that moved Bacon to spurn the established order and offer the world a new and better Logic, designed "to subdue nature itself by experiment and enquiry."

As he had pointed out earlier, "It cannot be that axioms established by argumentation can suffice for the discovery of new works, since the subtlety of nature is greater many times over than the subtlety of argument." What Bacon very sensibly set out to do was to marry rationalism and empiricism, and to break fresh ground by elaborating a new method of analysing inductive arguments, whereby nature's laws could be better understood and utilised to produce results valuable to man's well-being in his world.

Of this tremendous work, his *Magna Instauratio*, Bacon has bequeathed a most detailed plan. It was to be made up of six parts, on the model of the Six Days of Creation. The first was to be nothing less than an entire encyclopaedia of the scientific knowledge acquired up to his own time, clarified by a method which showed up its deficiencies. These gaps had to be filled in, and how this could be done

was derived from an examination of the *nature* of the missing sciences. "In laying out the divisions of the sciences," he says, "I take into account not only things already invented and known, but likewise things omitted which ought to be there. For there are found in the intellectual as in the terrestrial globe waste regions as well as cultivated ones . . . I do not propose merely to survey these regions in my mind, like an augur taking auspices, but to enter them like a general who means to take possession." This preliminary labour was the business fully dealt with in the *De Augmentis Scientiarum.*

The second part, famous under its title of the *Novum Organum*, had as its object the foundation of the New Art of Interpreting Nature. This section is, in his own words, "a kind of logic; though the difference between it and the ordinary logic is great; indeed immense. For the ordinary logic professes to contrive and prepare helps and guards for the understanding, as mine does; and in this one point they agree. But mine differs from it in three points especially; *viz.*, in the end aimed at; in the order of demonstration; and in the starting point of the enquiry. For the end which this science of mine proposes is the invention not of arguments, but of arts; not of things in accordance with principles, but of principles themselves; not of probable reasons, but of designations and directions for works . . . In the ordinary logic, almost all the work is spent about the syllogism. Of induction the logicians seem hardly to have taken any serious thought, but they pass it by with a slight notice and hasten on to the formulae of disputation. I on the contrary reject demonstration by syllogism, as acting too confusedly, and letting nature slip out of its hands. For although no one can doubt that things which agree in a middle term, agree with one another (which is a proposition of mathematical certainty), yet it leaves an opening for deception; which is this. The syllogism consists of propositions; propositions of words; and words are the tokens and signs of notions. Now if the very notions of the mind (which are as the soul of words and the basis of the whole structure) be improperly and over-hastily abstracted from facts, vague, not sufficiently definite, faulty in short in many ways, the whole edifice tumbles . . The greatest change I introduce is in the form itself of induction, and the judgment made thereby. For the induction of which the logicians speak, which proceeds by simple enumeration, is a puerile thing; concludes at hazard; and is always liable to be upset by a contradictory instance; takes into account only what is known and ordinary; and leads to no result. Now what the sciences stand in need of is a form of induction which shall analyse experience and take it to pieces, and by a due process of exclusion and rejection lead to an inevitable conclusion."

Bacon goes on to claim for his method a much more thoroughgoing effect upon thought than the old logic could hope for, inasmuch as it would "sift and examine" the senses themselves, which, as the sources of information, are all too often erratic or unduly limited in compass. He thought this rectification of sensual experience could be achieved by letting the senses be only the "judge of experiment,"

and the experiment itself be the judge of the thing. Then, very acutely, he observes: ". . . As an uneven mirror distorts the rays of objects according to its own figure and section, so the mind, when it receives impressions of objects through the sense, cannot be trusted to report them truly, but in forming its notions mixes up its own nature with the nature of things."

The mind is also apt to be deflected from the true path of reasoning by what Bacon calls "idola mentis humanae", *i.e.* phantoms of the human mind. These are four in number: *idols of the tribe*, which, in Prof. Fowler's description, are "the tendency to feign parallels and similitudes where none exist, or, in other words, the excessive love of system, the tendency to attach greater importance to affirmative than to negative instances, the disposition to be unduly influenced by sudden and simultaneous impressions, the restless ambition to penetrate further into the nature and causes of things than the limits of the human faculties permit, the liability of the intellect to be warped by the will and affections, and the like"; *idols of the den*, to be found "in the affection of some men for particular sciences or kinds of speculation, in the tendency to notice differences rather than resemblances, or resemblances rather than differences, in the attachment to antiquity or novelty, in the partiality to minute or comprehensive investigations"; *idols of the market-place*, which have "insinuated themselves into the mind through the association of words and names with things. They are of two kinds, being either names of supposed entities which have no real existence, or words inadequately or erroneously representing things or qualities actually existing"; and *idols of the theatre*, which are so called because they succeed one another like plays on the stage, and which "arise either from false systems of philosophy or from perverse laws of demonstration."

These incidental faults of the human intellect may be remedied by virtue of three *Ministrations*, one each for the Senses, the Memory, and the Reason. The narrow range of the senses can be extended by the use of newly-devised instruments, and the subjective element minimised by careful comparisons between the observations of one sense and another, and one observer and another; the memory may derive assistance from a strictly methodical recording and tabulating of authenticated discoveries; the reason must turn from the prevalent mode of arriving at wide generalisations from a number of flimsy and unanalysed data by simple enumeration, and then applying the syllogistic process to them in order to obtain what cannot but be precarious conclusions, and adopt quite a different procedure.

C. D. Broad effectively explains Bacon's reformed method of studying nature with a view to practical control. "For this purpose", he says, "three fundamental changes are needed. (1) The data must be collected, arranged, and analysed according to the rules laid down in the *Parasceve* by men whose minds have been purged of the *Idols*, and whose senses and memories have been corrected and supplemented by the Ministrations already mentioned. (2) The order of procedure must be altered. We must not jump from particular facts to sweeping

generalities and then deduce propositions of medium generality from these. The right process is a very gradual ascent from particulars through middle principles to the highest laws and a very gradual descent from these to new middle principles and finally to new particulars. At every stage of the upward process the generalisation is to cover the then known facts and to extend a very little way beyond them, and this small extension is to be tested by a fresh appeal to experience. Thus the ascending and descending process, like the movements of the angels on Jacob's ladder, take place side by side, and the latter is the means of testing the validity of the former. Bacon does, however, allow to the weaker brethren an inferior method, *viz.* a direct passage from one experiment to another partly analogous experiment. He enumerates eight general methods of Instructed Experience, such as applying the old process to new materials, or, conversely, applying the same process a second time to the products of its first application (as in redistillation), inverting one of the agents (*e.g.* substituting cold for heat), and so on. And he makes extremely judicious observations on the fallacies to be avoided. He evidently holds that Instructed Experience is a useful preparation for the true method, which he calls the Formula of Interpretation, but that only the latter will lead to far-reaching discoveries and inventions. (3) We must substitute for induction by simple enumeration a method which makes use of negative instances and arrives at truth by successive eliminations of false alternatives. Our ultimate aim is to discover the forms of simple natures. But only God and perhaps the angels can have a direct positive knowledge of forms; men must proceed by rejection and exclusion. Now the form of a simple nature will always be present when the nature is present, absent when it is absent, and varying when it varies. We must therefore draw up comparative tables of cases in which the given nature is present, of cases when it is absent, and of cases in which its degree varies. We shall then know that the form cannot be anything that is absent in the first list or present in the second, or constant in the third list. By this means we may gradually eliminate all other natures and be left with the form which we are seeking." (*The Philosophy of Francis Bacon*, 1926).

With Bacon, the prime concern is the enquiry into the "forms of simple natures." Fowler asks, What is a Form, and How is the Form of a Simple Nature to be discovered? He explains: "The word 'Form', as employed by Bacon, is undoubtedly connected with the *Formal Cause* or *Essence* of Aristotle. But we are rather concerned with the way in which he himself uses the word, than with the historical antecedents which led him thus to use it. Now, after a careful consideration of the various passages in which it occurs, I have arrived at the conclusion that they may all be ranged under two classes. In one of these, the word 'form' may always be replaced by words like essence, differentia, definition, etc.; in the other by words like law, cause, etc. By form, in the sense of essence, is to be understood the aggregate of independent and un-derived (or, as we might call them, *primary*) attributes, from which all the other attributes appertaining to the

class, substance, or quality are derived, as effects from causes. By form, in the other sense, is to be understood the law of the development or manifestation or production of any given quality or body. And, if we take into account the pre-existing conditions as well as the law of their development, we obtain the conception of 'cause' in its fullest extent. Now, is it possible to reconcile or bring into any connexion these two apparently divergent meanings? But practically (and the practical interest is, with Bacon, always supreme) these two conceptions may, if we take a sufficiently sanguine view of human power, be regarded as leading to the same result. Given the aggregate of primary and un-derived attributes, and we are able to produce the phenomenon, or rather it follows as a matter of course. Given the pre-existing conditions and the law of their development, and (on the assumption that we are able to further their development) we are ourselves able to produce the effect. Thus the knowledge of the essence and the knowledge of the cause are, for all practical purposes, the same." (Introduction to Fowler's edition of *Novum Organum*).

The third part Bacon described as a *Natural and Experimental History for the foundation of Philosophy.* It was intended to be a collection of all the results of definite experiments and observations selected and ordered according to the principles laid down in the second part, and to form the empirical basis of Natural Philosophy. Unfortunately, it is only partially carried out; we have three natural histories, three prefaces to others, and the *Sylva Sylvarum*, a curious assortment of fact and fable. A writer in the *Times Literary Supplement* (16th Aug., 1947) remarks: ". . . the observation that the *Sylva* has its doubtful and erratic passages is not new, but the object of the work was not immediate perfection. Bacon was putting together a miscellany of materials so that others might select as their occasion proposed and, by the aid of his inductive method, go farther and produce accurate results," in much the same way as a gardener uses his nursery.

Bacon's acumen lay rather in his propounding of vitally important questions than in answering them. To glance in passing at only two of his speculations;—one regarding heat, in the *Novum Organum* (Aphorism XVIII), earns the comment from Spedding: "Bacon here anticipates not merely the essential character of the most recent theory of heat, but also the kind of evidence by which it has been established"; and another is spoken of by Ellis, in his preface to the *De Principiis atque Originibus*, as showing that "Bacon had obtained a deep insight into the principles of atomic theory." It was probably with reference to Bacon's views on this subject that Leibnitz remarked: "We do well to think highly of Verulam, for his hard sayings have a deep meaning in them." Fowler says: "(Bacon) threw out many suggestions of rare sagacity, and, in a certain sense, anticipated more recent discoveries. Such were his speculations on Colour, his anticipation of the recent theory of Heat, his experiment on the compressibility of water, and his wonderful appreciation of the combined unity and variety in Nature . . . To these instances may be added his sagacious and possibly fertile

suggestion of a closer union between formal and physical astronomy, as well as of the necessity of combining the explanations of celestial and terrestrial phenomena; the remarkable passage on Attraction, and the ingenious experiment proposed in connexion with it, in *Novum Organum* ii 36 (3); the brilliant conjecture, in *Novum Organum* ii. 46, that the actual state of the starry sky precedes by an interval of time that which is apparent to us, or, in other words, that light requires time for its transmission; the implied criticism of the ordinary doctrine of species contained in a passage on Realism in *Novum Organum* i. 66; and lastly (though this list is by no means exhaustive) the attempt made in the *Historia Ventorum* to consider the direction of the winds in connexion with temperature and aqueous phenomena, on which Humboldt highly compliments him as having thereby laid the foundations of a theory of the currents of the atmosphere. When we add to these claims on the recognition of scientific men, in the narrower sense of that term, the fact that in another department of knowledge, that of mind and conduct, Bacon's contributions . . . were neither few nor unimportant, the contention that he was unfitted to set up as a reformer of scientific method, because he knew next to nothing of science and was incapable of making any discoveries of his own, must surely be disallowed." (*Francis Bacon*).

Part Four, entitled *Scala Intellectus, sive Filum Labyrinthi*, should have comprised a number of fully worked out examples of the applied Organum. Various subjects of intrinsic importance were to be used to illustrate the Method. Of this Part, however, only a short preface is extant, but some very interesting statements are made by Bacon himself respecting these subjects. He says: "I mean . . . choosing such . . . as are at once the most noble in themselves among those under enquiry, and most different from one another; that there may be an example in every kind . . . I mean actual types and models, by which the entire process of the mind and the whole fabric and order of invention from the beginning to the end, in certain subjects, and those various and remarkable, should be set *as it were before the eyes.*"

This is not the only instance of Bacon's liking for the idea of things abstract and immaterial being made readily understandable by realisation in some visible form. He speaks of the human passions being so depicted, in the manuscript tract *Cogitata et Visa*, discovered by Spedding in 1857, and of his writings concerning such representations being "put forth and seen."

It is the opinion of some writers that the Work which Bacon envisaged as Part Four of the *Instauratio*, and which is ostensibly undone, or missing, is actually fulfilled in the "Shakespeare" Plays. Judge Holmes contends that the Plays are examples of the "Types" and "Plasmata" with which Bacon said the Fourth Part was to work. (*The Authorship of Shakespeare*). H. J. Ruggles shows how each play is the development of a "Form," or Baconian law or idea, which is its root, and has for its stem and branches, leaves, flowers and fruit, Baconian facts and notions drawn from his acknowledged works (*The Plays of Shakespeare, Founded on Literary Forms*). W. F. C.

Wigston's *The New Study of Shakespeare* puts forward a similar view, that the Plays are Bacon's ultimate philosophy, a kind of parabolic poetry to be interpreted as he interpreted the parables and myths of the Ancients, and that they form the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Parts of the Great Instauration.

The Plays have been described as "moral epics," as indeed they are. For example, *Macbeth* is really a powerful sermon against the evils of ruthless worldly ambition; *Lear*, against filial impiety; *Othello* against jealousy; *Timon*, against sycophancy; *Coriolanus*, against mob-rule and the proud autocracy of the individualist. In no other playwright may one find such scope for the study of all types and conditions of men in all kinds of situations, of the clash of various temperaments, and of the natural outcome of character striving against character. Representative men in action, animated by all the light and dark inner movements of their minds and hearts, are so placed before our eyes that we are taught human psychology in the most practical and impressive manner.

The Fifth Part was named the *Prodromi, sive Anticipationes Philosophiae Secundae*, and Bacon said it was to be "for temporary use only, pending the completion of the rest; like interest payable from time to time until the principal be forthcoming. For I do not make so blindly for the end of my journey as to neglect anything useful that may turn up by the way. And therefore I include in this fifth part such things as I have myself discovered, proved, or added,—not however according to the true rules and methods of interpretation, but by the ordinary use of the understanding in inquiring and discovering." He calls his speculations here "wayside inns" in which "the mind may rest and refresh itself on its journey to more certain conclusions." Again, of this Part only the preface exists; but the investigation of the nature of heat, which fills considerable space in the Second Book of the *Novum Organum*, is possibly an exemplar of what Bacon meant to include in this Part.

The final instalment of the great work was termed the *Philosophia Secunda, sive Scientia Activa*. Only the preface has come down to us, and the scope of this Part was to have been a complete science of nature, elaborated on the lines laid down in Part Two, from the factual data of Part Three. Bacon reveals that he has made a beginning of the work—"a beginning, as I hope, not unimportant:—the fortune of the human race will give the issue;—such an issue, it may be, as in the present condition of things and men's minds cannot easily be conceived or imagined. For the matter in hand is no mere felicity of speculation, but the real business and fortunes of the human race, and all power of operation."

A pertinent question, asked by C. D. Broad, is: "Did Bacon in fact discover and state explicitly those methods and principles of scientific research and inductive proof which scientists implicitly use with so much success?" Broad himself answers: "It seems to me that the honours of stating these methods and principles are pretty evenly divided up between Bacon and Descartes. Up to a point they cover much the same ground. There is considerable analogy between the

destructive part of Bacon's method and Descartes' systematic doubt. Here Bacon can be praised without reserve; he discusses in far greater detail than Descartes the causes of human error and the remedies for it, and his treatment is exhaustive, profound, and illuminating." (*The Philosophy of Francis Bacon*, 1926).

The principal objections that have been levelled at Bacon's method of scientific investigation are (i) that his theory of induction is too mechanical; (ii) that he unduly neglects the proper use of hypothesis; (iii) that his conception of a gradual ascent from axioms of the lowest, to axioms of the highest degree of generality does not correspond with the actual conduct of scientific investigation.

Against these it may be said that, if Bacon has ignored the function of imagination too much, it was because he recoiled from the prevalent wild licence that then attended its use. With regard to the third objection, the views of Gardiner (*Dictionary of National Biography*, Vol. I) may be quoted: "Though a more ambitious process is a common and perfectly legitimate method of *discovery*, the *proof* of the higher axioms, when established, will generally be found to rest on intermediate axioms, and these on still lower axioms, and so on, after the manner which Bacon describes. Moreover, when a science has attained anything like completeness, this will always be found to be the most convenient method of exhibiting the relation of its various laws. Though stated too exclusively, this part of Bacon's doctrine is by no means so untrue to facts or to the reason of the thing as it has sometimes been represented to be."

Another alleged fault is that Bacon rejects inquiry into *final* causes. But he did not banish it altogether, but relegated it from physic to metaphysic, the region of *speculation* as to the origin and essential nature of matter and mind, and the relation between the two. He lived too early or too late to take any other than a disinterested attitude towards such questions, regarding them as essentially beyond the limits of human *knowledge*.

Concerning metaphysical discussions, Fowler says: "In their scholastic form, they had become discredited, and their new form, under which they were to exercise so much of the best thought of the two succeeding centuries, had not yet been impressed on them by the genius of Descartes. Bacon assumes the ordinary distinction of mind and matter, a universe of objects to be known, and a thinking subject capable, with due care and discipline, of attaining to a knowledge of them without, apparently, troubling himself as to the ulterior questions, what is knowledge, how can I become conscious of that which is not myself, and what are the ultimate meaning and relation of the terms in this comparison." (*Francis Bacon*).

The same authoritative writer remarks also: "Bacon's merit does not consist in his philosophical teaching in the proper sense of the term, but in his assertion of the necessity of a new method, of a new range of studies, of a new spirit of inquiry. With the ultimate nature and conditions of knowledge and being he did not much concern himself, so long as he could arrive at what was practically true for man, and could certify to himself the steps by which he had arrived at it. He was a

logician, in the widest and fullest sense of the word. A philosopher he did not claim to be; and though I believe that his works exerted a very powerful influence on the philosophical speculations of the two succeeding centuries, a philosopher, in the strict sense of the term, hewas not."

Bacon himself was always very modest in his claims—in a letter to Doctor Playfer, he says: "I have only taken upon me to ring a bell to call other wits together" (Spedding, iii. p.301). Yet in ranging over all knowledge as his province, he achieved an intellectual feat that stamps him as a master of bold reasoning and superb exposition. Macaulay merely did him justice when he wrote that Bacon "moved the intellects which have moved the world." To give a final quotation from Prof. Fowler: "In the Introduction to my Edition of the *Novum Organum* (§14), I have adduced a large number of testimonies to the estimation in which Bacon's works on the reform of science and scientific method were held from the time of his contemporaries down to the middle of the eighteenth century, when the 'Baconian Philosophy' and the 'Baconian Method' had come to be almost universally regarded as terms expressive of accurate and fruitful investigation in every department of science. These testimonies include those of Descartes, Mersenne, Gassendi, Peiresc, Du Hamel, Bayle, Voltaire, Condillac, D'Alembert, in France; Vico in Italy; Comenius, Puffendorf, Leibnitz, Huygens, Morhof, Boerhaave, Buddaeus in Germany; and, in England, the group of men who founded or were among the earliest members of the Royal Society, such as Wallis, Oldenburg, Glanvill, Hooke, and Boyle. Not only do these writers speak with approbation of Bacon's method, but most of them furnish evidence of the impulse which he gave to scientific inquiry and the direction which he impressed upon it. Indeed there can be little doubt that the foundation of the Royal Society in England, and possibly the same origin may be assigned to some similar societies on the Continent, was due to the impulse given by Bacon to the study of experimental science and the plans which he had devised for its prosecution." He is also of the opinion that, in regard to Newton, "the precepts and warnings of the First Book (of the *Novum Organum*), in their most general form, had produced a deep impression upon him and had, in great measure, suggested to him the aims and methods of his own investigations."

Another notable tribute comes from the great Lecky. He tells us: "The splendid discoveries of physical science would have been impossible but for the scientific scepticism of the school of Bacon, which dissipated the old theories of the universe, and led men to demand a severity of proof altogether unknown to the ancients." (*History of European Morals*, Chapt. iv).

Yet, withal, Bacon ever discourses widely and deeply in language free from the obscurity and laboriousness so commonly the mark of the philosopher, and continually delights us with his magnificent literary skill and brilliance of illustration. The reading of his philosophical works, companioned with Professor F. H. Anderson's *The Philosophy of Francis Bacon* (1948), the first *systematic* treatment of them, provides one of the finest intellectual experiences it is possible to undergo.

BACON, SHAKESPEARE, AND *HENRY VIII*

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

"It is more pleasing to exercise our ingenuity in proving that which is not accepted, than to merely support what is."

BURKE

MALONE[1] in the 'Prolegomena' to his edition of Shakespeare, 1790, was the first to draw attention to the dramatist's predilection for legal phraseology, and to his no less extraordinary degree of accuracy in its employment.

Lord Campbell[2] makes special reference to Shakespeare's legal acquirements, both in his *Lives of the Chancellors* and in the *Lives of the Chief Justices*, and in 1859 published a long and elaborate letter, under the title of "Shakespeare's Legal Acquirements Considered"; but his scrutiny of the plays and poems though profound in a legal sense was otherwise superficial and perfunctory. The writer gave his opinion that there were twenty-three of the plays which showed evidence of legal knowledge, and fourteen which failed to do so, *viz.*: *Cymbeline*, *Henry V*, *Henry VI*, Parts I and II, *Henry VIII*, *Julius Caesar*, *Richard II*, *Richard III*, *Pericles*, *The Tempest*, *Timon of Athens*, *Titus Andronicus*, *Twelfth Night* and *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*.

Anyone, however, possessed of only a certain amount of familiarity with Tudor law can readily show that there is hardly a single play (without considering the Poems and Sonnets) which has not some reference to legal points and practice.

Despite Lord Campbell's fourteen exceptions, the legal subjects covered in the plays he enumerates cover a remarkably wide field, *e.g.* the rights of a freeholder, special pleading, judicial conduct, fine and recovery, arrest on mesne process, action on the case, deed polls, writ of extent praemunire, legal memory, criminal law, conveyancing, Crown Office practice, the court leet, trial by battle, tenure in chivalry, wardship, marriage of minors and numerous others.

Where an apparent ignorance of the law is displayed, or where there is an apparent misuse of some well-known legal term or phrase, this may have been deliberate, so far as Bacon was concerned, to help the concealment of his authorship, or it may have been the work of one of his 'pens' which had failed to catch his eye (knowingly or otherwise, on revision of the text.)

[1]EDMUND MALONE, 1741-1812. Critic. Aided in detection of the Rowley forgeries of Chatterton, and the Shakespeare ones of Ireland. Was a member of the Johnson Circle. Boswell made him one of his literary executors.

[2]JOHN CAMPBELL, 1st Lord Campbell, 1779-1861, held the offices successively of Solicitor and Attorney-General, Lord Chancellor of Ireland, Lord Chief Justice and Lord Chancellor.

The late Professor J. Churton Collins in the chapter "Was Shakespeare a Lawyer?" in his *Studies in Shakespeare*, 1904, obviously bewildered by even the small number of examples of law in the plays which he cites, can only come to this conclusion: "Perhaps the simplest solution of the problem is to accept the hypothesis that in early life he (Shakespeare) was in an attorney's office; that here he contracted a love for the law which never left him, that as a young man in London, he continued to study or dabble in it for amusement, to stroll in leisure hours into the Courts, and to frequent the society of lawyers. On no other supposition is it possible to explain the attraction which the law evidently had for him, and his minute and undeviating accuracy in a subject where no layman, who has indulged in such copious and ostentatious display of legal technicalities, has ever yet succeeded in keeping himself from tripping."

It is indeed extraordinary that learned professors and others should weave such a fantastic theory as to suppose the actor, William Shaxper, to have been an attorney's clerk and yet at the same time resolutely refuse to investigate the obvious. In Churton Collins' book there is also a chapter on "The Bacon-Shakespeare Mania" !

E. J. Castle, in his interesting study, *Shakespeare, Bacon, Jonson and Greene*, 1897, takes the view that, whilst William Shakespeare of Stratford was composing the plays, etc., he must have engaged the assistance of some erudite lawyer, showing as he does, besides legal knowledge, an otherwise unaccountable familiarity with the habits of counsel learned in the law, and decides that this friend could have been none other than Bacon. But why should William Shakespeare be so anxious to pour into his plays and other work so much of the law (and often quite irrelevantly) as to call on the services of Bacon, who, one would imagine, was hardly likely to lend himself to any such arrangement?

Sir Sidney Lee maintains that Ben Jonson and Spenser, Massinger and Webster, "employ law terms with no less frequency and facility," than Shakespeare. Spenser, he says, "in his romantic epic is even more generous than Shakespeare . . in technical reference to legal procedure." It is indeed passing strange that these men should also possess the necessary legal knowledge, but Lee's assertion leaves the problem unsolved. To those, however, who agree that all evidence points to Spenser's having been one of Bacon's 'masks', this point presents no difficulty.

Referring to the play of *Henry VIII*, Lee in his *A Life of William Shakespeare* remarked, "two different pens were clearly at work." "No reader," he declared, "with an ear for metre can fail to detect in the piece two rhythms, an inferior and superior ryhthm."

The authorship has been commonly attributed to a partnership between Shakeıpeare and Fletcher;[3] similar to that in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, first printed in quarto, 1634, and written according to the

[3]JOHN FLETCHER, 1579-1625. The plays attributed to Beaumont and Fletcher number fifty-two plus a masque; but it is generally believed that others, *e.g.* Massinger, Rowley and Shirley, collaborated in many of them.

title-page "by the memorable worthies of their time Mr. John Fletcher, and Mr. William Shakespeare, gentlemen." It was included in the folio edition of Beaumont and Fletcher, published in 1679, and was performed by the King's Players in 1613, together with a lost play, licensed for publication as the *History of Cardenis*, by Fletcher and Shakespeare, in 1653. Lee, obviously embarrassed as to the identity of the writer of *Henry VIII*, quotes the famous passage of "Wolsey's Farewell" as recalling at every point the style of Fletcher, and nowhere that of Shakespeare; but admits that the Fletcher style as here indicated is invested with a greatness that is not matched elsewhere in his work. Lee is driven to the conclusion that Shakespeare is giving "proof of his versatility by echoing in a glorified key the habitual strain of Fletcher, his colleague and virtual successor." Dr. F. J. Furnivall states categorically that this notable speech is unquestionably Fletcher's. Yet, when we read that Wolsey bids Cromwell, "Fling away ambition, by that sin fell the angels", we can recall Bacon's essay *Of Goodness*, 1625, "The desire of power in excess caused the angels to fall"; and when the Cardinal speaks of "little wanton boys that swim on bladders"—a quite out-of-the-way allusion, we discover that Bacon wrote: "It is one method to begin swimming with bladders, which keep you up, and another to begin dancing with heav shoes, which weigh you down." *De Augmentis*, VI, iv). Incidentally there is a striking similarity here with:—

> "You have dancing shoes
> With nimble soles: I have a soul of lead
> So stakes me to the ground I cannot move."
> (*Romeo and Juliet*, I, iv, 14)

Spedding had an elaborate theory that Fletcher hastily completed Shakespeare's unfinished draft for the special purpose of enabling the play to be performed by the King's Players in celebration of the wedding between the Princess Elizabeth and the Elector Palatine, which took place on February 14th, 1612-13.

According to an extant list, nineteen different plays were performed at Court during May 1613 in honour of this event, but *Henry VI Henry VIII* was not among them.

Dr. A. C. Partridge in his *The Problem of Henry VIII Reopened*, agrees with Spedding's idea that there was no simultaneous collaboration between the two dramatists, but says that when Shakespeare returned to Stratford, Fletcher was called in to complete the play.

The belief that this was the combined work of Shakespeare and Fletcher has been in the main accepted by succeeding Elizabethan scholars, though from time to time the conclusion has been challegged.

Some critics would bring in Philip Massinger (1583-1640) as the joint author with Shakespeare.

But, putting aside the many different and irreconcilable propositions as to the authorship of the play, as it appears in the First Folio, there is considerable and cumulative evidence pointing to Francis Bacon.

We know that he contemplated writing, "The History of Henry the Eighth," but only succeeded in compiling a very small portion published by Dr. Rawley in 1629 under "Certain Miscellany Works of the Right Hon. Francis Verulam, Viscount St. Alban."

According to Spedding (Vol. VII) in March 1621-22, Bacon had written in Greek characters notes for an interview which he hoped might be granted him by the King. It appears from them that he intended to ask His Majesty if he might recompile the laws etc., or alternatively proceed with his history of Henry VIII. It seems that at this time, the manuscript of *Henry VIII* having been returned by the king, it has been printed, and was on sale at six shillings. Copies were sent to James, to the Duke of Buckingham and later to the Queen of Bohemia.

On 10th January 1622-23, Sir T. Wilson had reported to the king that Bacon had applied to him for such papers as he had relating to the reign of Henry VIII; and one month later this request was granted.

Spedding also gives an extract from a letter written by Chamberlain on the same date:—

> "That Lord (Bacon) busies himself about books, and hath set out two lately, 'Historia Ventorum' and 'De Vita et Morte', with promises of more. I have not seen either of them because I have not leisure; but if the life of Henry VIII, which they say he is about, might come out after his own manner, I should find time and means enough to read it."

In a letter to Buckingham, then in Spain, Bacon, on 21st February that year, asks to be remembered to Prince Charles, "who, I hope ere long will make me leave King Henry VIII, and set me on work in relation of his Highness's heroical adventures." Did Bacon for some reason, which may later appear, and also to create sympathy for his own case, write the play or drastically revise an original, rather than continue with the 'Life'? The Prince of Wales was interested in Bacon's work on Henry, but the writer makes excuses for not proceeding. Writing to his good friend, Tobie Matthew, 26th June. 1623, he remarks:—"Since you say the Prince hath not forgot his commandment touching my history of Henry VIII, I may not forget my duty. But I find Sir Collier, who poured forth what he had in my other work, somewhat dainty of his materials in this." With this excuse Bacon proceeds—

> "My labours are now most set to have those works which I had formerly published, as that of 'Advancement of Learning,' that of 'Henry VII' that of 'The Essays', being retractable and made more perfect, well translated into Latin by *the help of some good pens which forsake me not.*"

And he afterwards wrote to Prince Charles:—

> "for Henry VIII, to deal truly with your Highness, I did so despair of my health this summer, I was glad to choose some such work as I might compass within days, so far was I from entering into a work at length."

Rawley, in his Dedication to *Sylva Sylvarum*, expresses his regret to Charles, now king, that the contemplated 'History', "died under the designation meerely, there is nothing left", and begs his majesty "graciously to accept of the Undertaker's Heart and Intentions who was willing to have parted for a while with his darling Philosophie that he might have attended your royal commandment in that other worke."

The late Sir George Greenwood in his *The Shakespeare Problem Restated* says that the play of *Henry VIII* and never before been heard of (together with *Taming of the Shrew*, *Timon of Athens*, *Julius Caesar*, *Coriolanus* and *All's Well*) before the publication of the First Folio. There was, however, a play on the subject entitled "All is True, representing some principal pieces in the reign of Henry VIII."

According to Sir Henry Wotton, in a letter dated 2nd July, 1613, this was a new play acted by the King's Players at Bankside, and was associated with the final scene in the career of the Globe Theatre, so closely identified with the Shakespeare Plays.

The theatre was destroyed by a fire on 29th June that year, caused it is said by the discharge of the chambers (similar to small mortars) which were used to signify the arrival of the king at Wolsey's house.

No lives were lost; "nothing did perish", declared Wotton, "but wood and straw and a few forsaken cloaks; only one man had his breeches set on fire, that would perhaps have brayed him, if he had not by the benefit of a provident wit put it out with bottle(d) ale."

And in a MS letter of Thomas Larkin to Sir Thomas Pickering, dated, "London, this last day of June" 1613, the story is thus told:—

> "No longer since than yesterday, while Burbage and his companie were acting at the Globe the play of Henry VIII and their shooting of certain chambers in way of triumph, the fire catched," etc.

The so-called play of *Henry VIII* is really a historical pageant or masque in two Parts, the first relating the triumph of Wolsey over Buckingham, the love of Henry for Anne Bullen, the divorce of Queen Katherine, the king's marriage, the coronation of Anne, the fall of Wolsey, the trial of Cranmer, and the prophecy of the fame of Anne's daughter, the future Queen Elizabeth. The action covers the period, 1521-33, though some events such as the death of Katherine, which occurred in 1536, have been moved from their actual sequence. The material is mainly taken from the *Chronicles* of Holinshed and Stowe, and from Foxe's *Acts and Monuments of the Church*.

Hazlitt claimed that the Play, "contains little action or violence of passion, yet it has considerable interest . . and some of the most striking passages in Shakespeare's works." Dr. Johnson wrote, "the meek sorrows and virtuous distress of Katherine have furnished such scenes, which may justly be remembered among the greatest efforts of tragedy. But the genius of Shakespeare comes in and goes out with Katherine. Every other part may be easily conceived and easily

written." Johnson, however, is at fault in his judgment. Hazlitt regards the scene of Buckingham being led to execution as, "one of the most affecting and natural in Shakespeare"; and says "the character of Wolsey, the description of his pride and of his fall are inimitable, and have besides their gorgeousness of effect, a pathos, which only the genius of Shakespeare could lend to the distress of a proud bad man like Wolsey."

The character of the king, Hazlitt remarked, "is drawn with great truth and spirit. It is like a very disagreeable portrait, sketched by the hand of a master. His gross appearance, his blushing demeanour, his vulgarity, his arrogance, his sensuality, his cruelty, his hypocrisy, his want of common decency and common humanity are marked in strong lines."

Although it would be difficult for anyone, without preconceived notions, to deduce from the play one-half of these evil qualities, was Bacon, consciously or unconsciously, giving expression to the bitterness he must have felt, with all his reverence for kingship, against James for the treatment to which he had been subjected?

The Prologue warns the audience in advance:—

> "I come no more to make you laugh; things now
> That bear a weighty and a serious brow,
> Sad, high, and working, full of state and woe,
> Such noble scenes as draw the eye to flow,
> We now present . . ."

Dr. Johnson remarked that the Prologue of *Henry VIII* was written by Ben Jonson, an opinion which has since been maintained by the majority of critics.

The tenor of the old play had been completely changed, losing its 'merry' and 'bawdy' character, Bacon thus seizing the opportunity to call attention to his own misfortunes and sorrows.

Amongst a number of others there are two or three special points, which indicate the Baconian authorship of the play. Despite the assertion of Lord Campbell, *Henry VIII* is a "legal" play in a very particular sense, and contains certain professional knowledge, which only a trained lawyer was likely to possess.

For example, the Queen, when confronted by Wolsey, declares that he shall not be her judge:—

> "I utterly *abhor*, yea, from my soul,
> *Refuse* you for my judge."

Sir William Blackstone has pointed out that 'abhor' and 'refuse' are technical terms of the Canon law, 'Detestor' and 'Recuso'. It is true that these words occur in the passage in Holinshed, from which the incident is derived, but it would require an expert to detect that they are technical terms in law.

Buckingham is arrested by Brandon's orders by a sergeant-at-arms in accordance with the law.

Wolsey, when accused of issuing illegal commissions, defends himself with the plea that he had proceeded, "by learned approbation of the judges"; and when the King asks him if he had acted by precedent, and gets no reply, his Majesty says:—

> "To every country,
> Where this is questioned, send our letters, with
> Free pardon to each man that hath denied
> The farce of this commission."

Bacon wrote: "Unjust sentences . . . which are afterwards drawn into precedents (*a quibus exempla petuntur*) infect and defile the very fountain of justice."—(*De Augmentis*, VIII, ii, parabola XXV).

These letters were to be despatched to the discontented counties where "bold mouths", "all in uproar", were traducing and censuring Wolsey on account of his exactions.

Bacon declared, "The first remedy, or prevention, is to remove by all means possible that material cause for sedition . . . which is want and poverty in the estate."—(*Essay* XV, 1625). In 1593 he delivered a speech in Parliament, in which he spoke of, "Danger and discontentment" from excessive taxation of "the general commonalty."

As the late Dr. Melsom remarked in his *The Bacon-Shakespeare Anatomy:* "As Bacon warns the members of parliament of discontentment caused by the oppression of the poor people and the consequent danger to the Queen; so Norfolk warns Henry that the poor people "are all in uproar and danger serves among them." (I, 2, '36).

In April 1604 Bacon was solicited by members of the House to petition the King relative to the "great grievance" of the common people. Therein he began: "It is affirmed unto me by divers gentlemen of good regard . . ." In the play Katherine is similarly solicited to petition her husband concerning the "great grievance of the common people", and she states, "I am solicited, not by a few, and those of true condition." (I, 2, 18). There are a number of very obvious parallels between various points in these speeches, and the scene in the play, which Dr. Melsome has detailed.

The oppression, which was the theme of Bacon's 1593 speech, was the granting of three subsidies, payable in four years:—"The danger is this," he declared, "we (shall thus) breed discontentment in the people. And in the cause of jeopardy, her Majesty's safety must consist more in the love of her people than in their wealth, and therefore (we should beware) not to give them cause of discontentment."

It is evident that in Elizabeth's time there was no precedent for "three subsidies payable in four years", neither was there any for Wolsey's exaction of a "sixth part of each to be levied without delay"—"a trembling contribution."

The word "wholesome", as applied to laws which do not cause discontent among the commonalty, frequently occurs amongst the writings of Bacon, and Katherine used it when she said, "But you frame things . . . which are not wholesome to those that would know

them . . .", and it appears again in *Coriolanus* in a similar connection.

Wolsey declares that his treatment of the Queen is warranted,

> "By a commission from the consistory,
> Yea, the whole consistory of Rome,"

and Campeggio, the papal legate (called Campeius in 'Hall' and 'Holinshed' and in the play) complains in what a difficult position the Court is involved by the Queen's quite legal refusal to attend its proceedings, as she had appealed to Rome. When his brother cardinal introduces Campeius to the king, it is all done in customary form. In the following passage there is a curious employment of the word 'scholars.' Wolsey in informing his Majesty that Katherine is entitled to legal assistance, says:—

> ". . . . not to deny her that
> A woman of less place might ask by law,
> Scholars, allowed freely to argue for her."

By royal injunction, Henry in 1535 had commanded the Universities to cease teaching, examining, or granting degrees in canon law, which by the supersession of the papal authority had been largely abrogated. If, therefore, it was no longer possible to obtain a degree in canon law, those versed therein must remain 'scholars' who are described by the Cardinal as, "reverend fathers, men of singular integrity and learning."

There is of course a slight anachronism here, as the trial, which was necessarily under canon law, took place in 1529, six years before the decree was issued, but such a slight discrepancy would not be likely to disturb the mind of Bacon, writing as he probably was in 1621 long after the event. The Court is left powerless, and has to be adjourned by her majesty's departing, after giving notice that she appeals to Rome.

Throughout the play 'law' seems everywhere to fit into the text.

An extremely interesting and significant feature of *Henry VIII* is the peculiar and intimate knowledge displayed of the manners and customs relating to the Chancellorship. Both Wolsey and Bacon were deprived of the office: to those of the Reformed Religion the former's humiliation was a matter more or less of conscience; jealousy was the main motive actuating Bacon's enemies in their determination that he should be crushed.

Wolsey lost his position because he could not obtain a decision from Campeius on the question of the divorce. The latter we know, had in a letter to the Pope affirmed that this should not be forthcoming. Wolsey was indicted on the 9th October 1529 on the formal charge of having illegally obtained Bulls to be made legate; but declaring he was not aware of having committed any offence, he threw himself on the king's mercy. The judgment, however, was that he was outside the king's mercy, and that he must forfeit all lands and goods.

Although in his greed, his Majesty allowed his Chancellor to be deprived of his possessions and the Seal, as both the latter and

Campeius expected, Henry did not desert him at once, but tried to help him as far as Anne would allow. Wolsey was well aware that there was the weight that pulled him down, and that in that one woman all his glories were lost for ever.

His plate was for the most part returned to him: he received a general pardon, and was permitted to retain a large retinue of servants: the king sent his own physicians to him when he was ill, and ordered them not to take any fees, and found him the money to set out for his archbishopric of York.

But Anne and the Duke of Norfolk were determined upon Wolsey's complete destruction, and Henry yielded. In the play the king is made as much his enemy as Anne. Now in the case of Bacon, sacrificed as he was to save the prestige of James, and Buckingham from impeachment, the king soon remitted the fine of 40,000*l.* imposed upon him, and he was released from the Tower after a few days' detention. When we reach the 'farewell to greatness' speech, we seem to hear Bacon rather than Wolsey. James' Chancellor had uttered his valediction to the pomp and circumstance of public life, which meant so much to him. We find him writing in Latin to the Spanish ambassador:—

> "Age, fortune and even my genius call me, that, leaving the theatre of civil affairs, I may give myself to letters, and instruct the actors themselves and serve posterity."

Is the phrase, "instruct the actors", a recondite allusion to the impending publication of the First Folio? The long Stage Direction at the commencement of Act II, 4, in which the procession to the Court is so fully detailed, must have been written by someone familiar with this kind of proceeding.

When the Lord Chancellor sits in Court in virtue of his office, the Mace is carried in. In the play both the sword and mace are borne before Wolsey when he goes with Campeius to open the Legatine Court at Blackfriars. Wolsey, however, takes his seat as Legate from the Pope, and not as chancellor, but no doubt would command any ceremonial which might enhance his dignity, and sense of authority and power. But in Bacon's case, when the Lords were debating the procedure to be followed at his forthcoming trial, they resolved that the mace should be shown to him only, and not carried before him: no degradation was to be spared him! Their victim, so fully conscious of his complete innocence, avoided the insult by feigning illness. He would of course be thoroughly acquainted with the significance of the mace.

Another circumstance, which points to the Baconian authorship of the play, is the emphasis so clearly laid on Wolsey as Chancellor, the office and all its attendant accessories being fully described, whilst little is heard of his cardinalate. His chancellorship was really only an incident among the other positions which he held. Campeius said that "all Wolsey's grandeur was connected with the Church."

Cavendish[1] tells us that Wolsey, "Had two great crosses of silver, whereof one of them was for his archbishopric, and the other for his legacy, borne always before him whithersoever he went or rode, by two of the tallest and comeliest priests that he could get within all the realm", and when he went to Westminster, "there was always borne before him first, the Great Seal of England, and then his Cardinal's hat, by a nobleman or some worthy gentleman right solemnly bareheaded, and also the two crosses of silver, and two great pillars of silver, and his pursuivant-at-arms with a great mace of silver gilt."

Cavendish was a servant of Wolsey as cardinal rather than as Lord Chancellor, and does not seem to have been interested as to who carried the Seal.

Lord Campbell states,[2] "When he (the Chancellor) appears in his official capacity in the presence of the Sovereign, or receives messengers from the Commons at the bar of the House of Lords, he carries the purse himself; on other occasions it is carried by his purse-bearer, and lies before him as an emblem of his authority."

Now in the stage directions when Wolsey first appears on his way to attend the king in the Council Chamber (I, 1) we read: "Enter Cardinal Wolsey (the purse borne before him), certain of the Guard, and two Secretaries with papers." No mention is made of the crosses nor of the Cardinal's hat, only the purse is referred to.

Wolsey's part in the history of the period was played as Cardinal and Legate and not as Chancellor; and therefore in the ordinary way stress would not have been laid on what was only incidental to his career.

In the trial scene (II, 4, 1) remarkable emphasis is placed on Wolsey with all his insignia. We have trumpets, etc., vergers, scribes, the Archbishop of Canterbury alone, then sundry bishops, "next them, with some small distance, follows a Gentleman bearing the Purse, with the Great Seal, and a Cardinal's Hat; then two Priests, bearing each a Silver Cross; then a Gentleman-Usher bare-headed, accompanied with a Sergeant-at-Arms, bearing a Silver Mace; then two Gentlemen, bearing two great Silver Pillars; after them, side by side, the two Cardinals, Wolsey and Campeius."

No cross, no Cardinal's hat for Campeius it seems, and the King and Queen come only "with their Trains."

But with Bacon there was a great difference. He was Lord Chancellor—that was all. When he lost that office and was deprived of the right to hold any other, and banished from Court, it was indeed, "Farewell, a long farewell, to all my greatness!" In the Order of Procession for the Coronation of Anne Bullen (IV, 1) when More was Chancellor, he appears second after two Judges "with the purse and mace before him", but the Mayor of London had apparently to carry his own mace.

1CAVINDISH, GEORGE (1500-1561). Gentleman Usher to Wolsey who continued to serve him to the end. He left in MS form a Life of his patron, which is the main original authority on the subject.

2*Lives of the Chancellors*, Vol. I, p. 27.

The last time the Chancellor is referred to in the play is again in the Council Chamber (V, 2) at the trial of Cranmer, when he "places himself at the upper end of the table on the left hand." Then in due form the Chancellor puts the question to the Council, as Bacon no doubt often had done:—

"It stands agreed
I take it, by all voices, that forthwith
You be conveyed to the Tower a prisoner;
There to remain, till the king's further pleasure
Be known unto us. Are you all agreed, lords?
All: We are."

Said Buckingham (II, 1):—

"For those you make friends,
And give your hearts to, when they once perceive
The least rub in your fortunes, fall away
Like water from ye, never found again
But where they mean to sink ye."

Wrote Bacon:—

"Who then to frail mortality shall trust
But limns the water, or but writes in dust."

WAS SHAKESPEARE ILLITERATE?

By R. L. EAGLE

THE reply to this question begins with a cliché made famous by the late Dr. C. E. M. Joad, "it depends what you mean" by illiterate. Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence certainly overstepped the bounds of probability when he described the player as "a drunken illiterate clown" who was "unable to write so much as his own name." There is no contemporary proof that he was a drunkard. The alleged drinking bout at Bidford is a legendary exploit first mentioned in 1762, and appears to have been invented by John Jordan, a Stratford "antiquary" who manufactured a variety of myths about Shakspere.

The story of the "merry meeting" between Shakspere, Drayton and Jonson at Stratford at which, it is stated, "Shakspere itt seems drank too hard, for he died of a feavour there contracted," had its origin in the Diary of the Rev. John Ward written between 1661 and 1663. It is a most improbable yarn. Drayton was described as "very temperate in his life, slow of speech and inoffensive in company," and is a most unlikely member of the trio at this supposed "merry meeting." So far as I can discover these two stories, which are valueless as evidence, led to the charge of drunkenness made by Sir Edwin.

As for the alleged illiteracy which Sir Edwin claimed was total, surely this is a rash and dangerous claim to make. If a Baconian writer or lecturer were to follow Sir Edwin by repeating him, he might be asked such questions as these:

> If, as is stated, Shakspere was totally illiterate, how did he manage to study plays and learn parts?
>
> Would Bacon be likely to take cover behind the mask of a totally illiterate person who was associated in public life with actors who took parts in the plays known as Shakespeare's?

It is true that, apart from the six signatures to legal documents, we have no undisputed specimen of his handwriting, but there are many other authors of the period of whom we have not so much as one signature. It is an indisputable fact that these signatures are dreadful efforts at handwriting, and even the "experts" cannot decide what all the letters represent; and no two of them are much alike. Three of the six are on the will, and it is strange that the words "By me William" of the third will signature are well-written, but are followed by the surname written in a hesitating and scrawling hand. I would like to quote what the late Sir George Greenwood has to say concerning this, in his little book *Shakspere's Handwriting* (John Lane, 1920), pp. 31-32:

> "Let us again examine the third signature, which is preceded by the words, 'By me,' concerning which Sir E. Maunde Thompson writes as follows:—'The firmness and legibility of the first three words, 'By me William,' as compared with the weakness and malformation of the surname, and of both the other signatures,

are very striking. We can attribute that weakness and malformation *certainly* to the condition of the dying man . . The firmness of the first three words indicate, we believe, an effort on the part of the invalid, which, however, he was incapable of maintaining to the end."

"*Certainly*!" Well, it is, of course, very convenient to assume certainty for that of which your argument stands in need, but, as I have already said, there is really no certainty whatever that William Shakspere was a 'dying man' at the time when these words were written; there is, indeed, no evidence at all that he was ill at the time, or so weak that it was an effort for him to write his name.

The will was originally dated 25th January 1615-6, and in it the testator is stated to be "in perfect health." The signatures were added on 25th March, and Shakspere lived for nearly a month afterwards. The words 'By me William' are certainly in marked contrast to the surname, being written in a fine, strong, legible hand. The only reasonable inference is that some man, other than the testator—a lawscrivener may be—wrote those words, and left it to Shakspere to add his surname. It is the writing of a good penman in ordinary health, followed by that of a man who probably was always a very poor penman.

The ornamental dot under the final curve of the 'W' in 'William' was a common feature in this and other capitals. In the great majority of cases, where it is found, it is the sign of the professional writers such as scriveners. A gentleman employed at the Guildhall Library, who had a very large experience in the reading of old manuscripts, wrote to Sir George Greenwood that "the dot was seldom, if ever, used by laywriters." Is it not extremely improbable that a "dying man," making a great effort to write his signature, would have been at pains to trouble about adding the ornamental dot?

Sir George Greenwood goes on to say, "At the present day, of course, when the law as to wills is far stricter than it was in Shakspere's day, and when a testator's signature has to be witnessed by an attestation clause in due form, such a course of procedure would be most irregular, but in the year 1616 things were very different, and I may again remind the reader that, at that time there was no actual legal necessity that a will should be signed at all." The law only required "sealing and delivery."

It does not necessarily follow that because the law-clerk wrote the words 'By me William' that the testator was incapable of writing them himself. My opinion is that Shakspere wrote his surname as evidence that he had read the will and given it his approval. Bad handwriting is not necessarily a sign of a poor education. Many men of intelligence and genius have written, and do write, in an almost illegible hand. The signatures on many a business letter are impossible to decipher!

If, as appears highly probable, Ben Jonson's epigram "On Poet-Ape" makes reference to the player Shakspere, it is highly important because it was written in the lifetime of the Stratford man. It was

published in a book of Epigrams in 1716, but was written a good many years earlier. The column was dedicated to William, Earl of Pembroke, Lord Chamberlain, the elder brother of the "Incomparable Pair" of the Shakespeare Folio. The epigram runs as follows:

Poor Poet-Ape, that would be thought our chief,
Whose works are e'en the frippery of wit,
From brokage is become so bold a thief,
As we, the robb'd, leave rage, and pity it.
At first he made low shifts, would pick and glean,
Buy the reversion of old plays; now grown
To a little wealth and credit in the scene,
He takes up all, makes each man's wit his own,
And told of this, he slights it. Tut, such crimes
The sluggish, gaping auditor devours;
He marks not whose 'twas first, and after times
May judge it to be his as well as ours.
Fool! as if half eyes will not know a fleece
From locks of wool, or shreds from the whole piece.

I can think of none other than Shakspere to whom these lines can apply. He has made some reputation by passing off other men's writings as his own, but all he has done is to add some "shreds" to those plays. He began as a broker or purchaser of plays, adding the "frippery" or cast off garments of "wit" from old plays. The Shakespeare plays prove that this was done, and many a play is marred by passages, and even whole scenes, of coarseness or banality by somebody who had not even the gift of style.

The first quarto of Ben Jonson's *Sejanus* (1605), gives the names of the actors who took part in its original production at the Globe in 1603, and the Stratford player heads the second column, and stands first in the list of actors in *Every Man out of his Humour* in the first quarto of 1498.

In the *Microcosmos* (1603) John Davies of Hereford, has the initials "W.S. R.B." in the margin against the lines:

Players, I love yee, and your Qualitie,
As ye are men, that pass time not abus'd:
And some I love for painting, poesie,
And say fell Fortune cannot be excus'd,
That hath for better uses you reus'd:
Wit, Courage, good shape, good partes, and all good,
As long as all these goods are no worse us'd,
And though the stage doth staine pure gentle blood,
Yet generous yee are in minde and moode.

Here W.S. is coupled with Burbage—the leading player of the King's Company. Davies' epigram "To our English Terence Mr. Will. Shake-speare" is better known, for it mentions that "good Will" had played "some kingly parts in sport." This epigram is in *The Scourge of Folly*, undated, but written about 1611. Most of the epigrams are satirical, and this one appears to be no exception. The

allusion to Terence, whose comedies were said to have been written by the consuls C. Laelius and Scipio is curious, if not significant, firstly because Shakespeare had then written his great poems, tragedies and histories as well as comedies, and secondly because of the opinion of the Roman *illuminati* that the Carthaginian ex-slave could not have written such polished and elegant Latin. That belief was expressed by Cicero (*Ad Att.* vii, 3) and Quintilian (*Inst. Orat.* x, 1, 99) among others. It is stated as a fact by Montaigne (*Essays*, Bk. 1, 39).

For performing "two several comedies or interludes" at the palace at Greenwich on December 26th and 28th, 1594, Kemp, Burbage and Shakspere received a total of £20 (see Accounts of the Treasurer of the Royal Chamber—Pipe Office Declared Accounts, vol. 542 folio 207b, in The Public Record Office).

When King James promoted the Lord Chamberlain's company to that of the King's Company, nine of the actors were mentioned in the licence of 19th May, 1603. Shakspere's name is second and Burbage third. The name of Lawrence Fletcher is first on the list. They then become numbered among the Grooms of the Chamber. As such they were included in the royal progress through London on 15th March 1604 and were allowed by the Master of the Wardrobe 4½ yards of scarlet cloth to make themselves suits. In the document authorising the grant Shakspere's name stands first, and is immediately followed by Lawrence Fletcher, John Heminges, Augustine Phillips and Richard Burbage.

In the face of such evidence, it is absurd to pretend that the Stratford man was not a person of some importance in the theatre. But that, of course, does not affect the Shakespeare authorship problem. There is nothing published, written or said during the lifetime of the Stratford man which so much as suggests that he was the master-mind who wrote under the name of William Shakespeare.

His name is placed at the head of the "Principall Actors" in the Folio of 1623. Although this is seven years after his death, most of the actors, and others who had attended the theatre, would know whether, or not, he did perform in the plays. It was not only the "penny knaves" who visited the theatre. Young "bloods" from the Inns of Court and other intellectuals (the very sort who might purchase copies of the Folio) were also frequent patrons of the playhouses.

PSALM 46 HAS BACON'S CIPHER!

By ARDEN

LIKE T. Wright, author of the article on Psalm 46 in BACONIANA July 1952, I had noted the errors in the previous article by Ernest G. Rose, BACONIANA, October 1944. Yet, having also noted that Mr. Rose was "a recent recruit to the Baconian theory" (see Editor's introduction) I thought that the article, despite certain mistakes, might arouse interest in the possibility that in Psalm 46 Bacon had inserted his cipher signature.

Since then, I have again examined the Psalm and I think there are further grounds for thinking that it carries cipher material. Before I set out my own findings it might be as well to examine the demurrer made by T. Wright in his article of 1952 that it is "to be questioned whether he (Bacon) would have used the actual text of Holy Writ as the medium for carrying his cipher signatures." For this I think we have enough evidence in the following.

Bacon translated a number of the Psalms into English verse.

There is an acrostic signature in the Preface To The Reader of the second version of the 1611 Authorized Version of the Bible.

We have long suspected that Bacon had a hand in the Committee work prior to the publication of the 1611 Bible.

Bacon shows complete familiarity with the text of the 1611 Bible.

Bacon's frequent use of the idea that it was 'the Glory of the Lord to hide a thing and the Glory of the King to find it out' gives us to suppose that he would probably favour the use of Holy Writ for a secret purpose.

The text of Psalm 46 contains echoes of this idea—*vide* verse 8 which begins, "Come, behold the workes of the LORD . . ."

The mixture of Gothic and Roman type faces in this Psalm present a problem. The word "is" is the most frequently Romanised word and at first glance appears to have been so composed to save space in the lines. This may be so in the bulk of such Romanised words but contraction does not explain the Roman words "and that" at the end of verse 5 where there is ample room for all the words, "And that right early" to have been in Gothic. Verse 4 also shows that there is reason to doubt a "contraction" theory though space forbids a full exposition dealing with the technicalities of the justification and composing of types.

An alternative conclusion is that Roman words were introduced for emphasis just as the modern practice is to use *italics* in a Roman type setting. To this we reply that all the words "is", are in Roman type, as well as an "am." If we use emphasis on such Roman words as we find, there does not seem to be any purpose gained. Verse 3 becomes unintelligible when read with the emphasis on the Roman words "though". Elsewhere, the words "LORD" are put into capitals, though the words "God" are all in

Gothic except for the first, in verse 1. I doubt if emphasis is the reason for the words in Roman type.

Let us then examine the Roman words from the point of view of cipher requirements. With this in mind I agree with T. Wright that decipherments should not be "uncertain." Whether we have a "plan" is another matter but since Mr. Wright is somewhat predisposed towards ciphers maybe the following will give him pause: Excluding the words Selah ×3 and all Roman words let us count first to the word "shake"=42 words (shake=42 Simple Cipher) and continue the count to the word "speare"=145, and "refuge"=187 words. Let us now list the co-incidences:

(a) The 42nd word (Gothic)=SHAKE
SHAKE=42 (Simple Cipher)

(b) The next 103rd word=SPEARE
and SHAKESPEARE=103 (Simple Cipher)

(c) The 42nd word from the end=SPEARE.

Now the *only* count we have not examined is that for SPEARE which in Simple Cipher=61 and it is precisely these counts along the Gothic text which force us to arrive at the two words SHAKE and SPEARE. The above principle of decipherment has the following "plan":

We counted the Gothic words only,
We excluded the words Selah×3.

Now let us continue and count ALL words in Gothic and Roman but still exclude the three words Selah. From the start to SHAKE =46; from the end to SPEARE =46: total =92, = BACON (Reverse Count). From SHAKE to SPEARE = 111, = F. BACON (Reverse Count). The last is the normal or more usual decipherment of Psalm 46. It has one merit and one difficulty. The merit seems to be that we are impressed by the *visual* need to start and end the middle count on the words "shake" and "speare." But to do this we must exclude the three words "Selah." The difficulty is to try and include *all* words with no exceptions; in which case we get: From the start to SHAKE= 46; From the end to SPEARE = 46 (excluding one "Selah"): From "with" to "the" = 111 (including Selah×2). The above decipherment has the merit of counting the words SHAKE and SPEARE only once and includes the two words "Selah." But the difficulty is that we still have one word "Selah" not counted.

The conclusion seems to be that we must examine these words SELAH, given the decipherments above which appear to have some strength. To this end I must quote from Camden's *Remains* 1623, where we find in the second paragraph of his Chapter on Anagrams:

> "The precise in this practise strictly observing parts of the definition, are onely bold with H, either in omitting or retaining it, for that it cannot challenge the right of a letter"

From the above it will be seen that we can now deal simply with the words SELAH. Let us drop the letter H and solve the anagram. We are left with SELA and the anagram may then be SEAL. Let us now re-assess the Simple Cypher decipherment.

The 42nd word=SHAKE=42.

The next 103rd word=SPEARE. SHAKESPEARE=103 (Simple Cipher), SPEARE=61 (Simple Cipher), and 103—42=61.

We have left over in Gothic: SELAH×3. Using Camden's principle governing the letter H we have by anagram SEAL three times. Re-assessing the Reverse Count we are again left with SELAH three times.

Now if the presence of the words SELAH has any anagrammatic significance (and remember that the number counts *are* "seals" from the cipher point of view) then perhaps their position in the text may bear this out. Let us examine the lines on which they are placed:

(a) We have three groups of words to count and three possible signals SEAL.
(b) The word-line SHAKE has "Selah" at the end, *as we might expect.*
(c) From SPEARE to the end finds another word "Selah."
(d) Counting up from the last line (with its "Selah") we find that the middle passage has a word "Selah" on the 13th line.
(e) From the uppermost line with "Selah" there are 13 lines to the middle "selah."

To sum up:

At the end of each short count of 42 or 46 we have a cipher word SEAL.

Exactly in the centre of the middle passage both 13 lines up and 13 lines down we have the third cipher word SEAL.

General Summary

A.—Ernest G. Rose did not examine the original 1611 A.V. text of the Psalm 46 and was therefore in error in his decipherment.

B.—T. Wright was correct in pointing this out.

C.—T. Wright was not wholly against Baconian cryptography.

D.—He was doubtful whether Bacon would use Holy Writ. I have adduced some reasons for thinking that Bacon did so.

E.—T. Wright pre-supposed "a definite plan" for any such decipherments which, he said, could be recognised by the "no uncertain way" that Bacon would use in the encipherment.

F.—Since this follows on his criticism of Mr. Rose's article detail by detail, perhaps the following methods will measure up to his sense of the fitness of things.

G.—With the following KEY (Plan),

(*a*) *Exclude all Roman words.*
(*b*) *Count all Gothic words once only.*
(*c*) *Apply Camden's principle for anagrams to the words SELAH*
(*d*) *Decipher the counts in Simple Cipher.*
(*e*) *Count hyphenated words once only.*

DECIPHERMENT:

1. Count of 42 leads to SHAKE. End of line has SEAL.
2. Count of 103 leads to SPEARE. Middle line has SEAL.
3. Count of 42 leads to remaining words. End line has SEAL.

4. *Co-incidences or Proofs are:*
   42nd word=SHAKE=42 (Simple Cipher)
   Count of 103=SHAKESPEARE=SHAKE and SPEARE (Simple)
   42nd word=SPEARE=61 (Simple Cipher)
   And we see that 103 minus 42=61=SPEARE (Simple Cipher).
   This can be put:
   SHAKE plus SPEARE=SHAKE-SPEARE
   42 plus 61=103. (All Simple Cipher)

H.—Here is the decipherment which attracted Ernest G. Rose. It has the merit that it is *visually* attractive, insofar as it seems to me to be a natural thing to do to count the words SHAKE and SPEARE twice.

With the following Key:

(*a*) *Count from start to SHAKE*
(*v*) *Count from SHAKE to SPEARE*
(*c*) *Count from end to SPEARE.*
(*d*) *Exclude all words Selah but include all Roman words.*
(*e*) *Apply Camden's principle for anagrams to the words SELAH.*
(*f*) *Decipher the counts in Reverse Cipher.*
(*g*) *Count hyphenated words as one word.*

DECIPHERMENT:

1. Start to SHAKE=46. SEAL at end line.
2. SHAKE to SPEARE=111. SEAL at middle line.
3. End to SPEARE=46. SEAL at end line.
4. *Co-incidences or Proofs are:*
   In Psalm 46 a count of 46 gives SHAKE.
   A count of 46 gives SPEARE.
   From SHAKE to SPEARE=111=F. BACON (Reverse Cipher)
   Therefore SHAKE-SPEARE=F. BACON
   but 46 plus 46=92=BACON (Reverse Cipher),
   Therefore SHAKE-SPEARE=BACON.

It should be noted that although it might appear that in the above decipherment H, the figures 111 plus 46=157=FRA ROSICROSSE *the real count* is one too many since one word is counted twice. The Key which sets out the method gives a limit to the counts in both H and G, and some of the errors creep in when decipherers do not set out a strict key. I am aware that there are other ways of proceeding with the counting of words in a text, *e.g.* a count of 100=FRANCIS BACON (Simple) in the middle passage if we move alternately left and right along the lines: but I am with Mr. Wright in that I believe we should keep our methods simple and follow only the ways which appear straightforward.

Book Review

THE OVERBURY POISONING

MR. WILLIAM McELWEE's recent book[1], so he tells us, is the outcome of his conviction that "a piece of history, if it is properly written, is a better story than any novel which can be written about it." But what does he mean by "properly"? In this respect it is a help to learn that he has "tried to avoid all speculation as to what must, or might, have happened", and has "contemporary authority for every fact and all the dialogue quoted." So far, so good; the emphasis is to be upon factuality.

Nevertheless there is a way of selecting facts, or placing them, that may yet cast on the figures concerned in an event just the kind of light (or shadow) the narrator desires to suit any prejudice lurking in his mind. That Mr. McElwee does suffer from prejudice is revealed by almost every reference he makes to Francis Bacon and the part he played in the Overbury case as Attorney-General. The value of his very readable and well composed book is thereby unhappily diminished.

Here are a few of many such references that the author permits himself:

> "Sir Francis Bacon began to pay him (Overbury) attention —a sure sign of rising fortune." (p. 27)
>
> "He (Bacon) was also cleverer than Coke at insinuating himself into the good graces of Villiers." (p. 223)
>
> "Bacon who cherished behind his sycophancy and his all-absorbing personal ambition . . ." (p. 227)
>
> "Through this labyrinth Bacon threaded his way with contemptible skill." (p. 227)
>
> "Bacon told his story well and convincingly and he ended up with another great show of treating the accused with exaggerated fairness." (p. 245)
>
> "Not only did Bacon, to his eternal shame, refrain from intervening. . . ." (p. 256)
>
> "The flagrant dishonesty of Bacon and Montague . . ." (p. 256).

It will be seen that Mr. McElwee's hope that his "more serious and critical readers" will be content with a general note on the available authorities at the end of the book is useful in enabling him to evade the obligation of proving precisely how far he is justified in casting these slurs. They are the outcome of a hasty judgement. To label Bacon as "sycophantic", for example, because of the tone of his letters to the King and Villiers is to misconstrue the prevailing fashion of elaborate compliment and verbal flourish. He makes a passing reference to the ". . . bribery scandals which brought down Bacon" leaving the implication that Bacon was guilty. Admittedly it was not his proper business to enter into this question; but he should have avoided such a remark if unwilling to add that of Bacon's biographer, Hepworth Dixon: ". . . On a scrutiny, unparalleled for rigour and

[1] *The Murder of Sir Thomas Overbury.* Faber; 21/-.

vindictiveness, into Lord St. Alban's official acts, not a single fee or remembrance traced to the Chancellor himself, could by any fair construction, be called a bribe. Not one appeared to have been given on a promise; not one appeared to have been given in secret; not one appeared to have corrupted justice." Mr. McElwee does not, however, proceed by "fair construction" but by preconceived opinion, which is a dangerous impediment in treating the material of history.

Was Bacon implacably hostile to Carr? In a letter of May 2nd, 1616, Bacon writes: "Yesterday being Wednesday, I spent four or five hours with the judges whom his Majesty designed to take consideration with, the four judges of the King's bench, of the evidence against Somerset: they all concur in opinion, that the questioning and drawing him on to the trial is most honourable and just, and that the evidence is fair and good." In another to the King he says: "For as for your justice there had been taken great and grave opinion, not only of such judges as he (Carr) may think violent, but of the most sad and most temperate of the kingdom, who ought to understand the state of the proofs, that the evidence was full to convict him, so as there needeth neither confession, nor supply of examination . . That his lady, as he knew, and that after many oaths and imprecations to the contrary, had nevertheless in the end, being touched with remorse, confessed; that she had led him to offend, might lead him likewise to repent of his offence; that the confession of one of them could not fitly do either of them much good, but the confession of both of them might work some farther effect towards both: and therefore, in conclusion, we wished him not to shut the gate of your Majesty's mercy against himself, by being obdurate any longer . . ." Bacon adds this postscript: "If it seem good unto your Majesty, we think it not amiss some preacher, well chosen, had access to my lord of Somerset for his preparing and comfort, although it be before his trial." This treatment of Carr does not suggest, as Mr. McElwee asserts, that Bacon, "irrevocably committed to the Villiers interest", was implacably hostile to the previous royal favourite.

That charge could with reason be laid against Coke, whose harsh methods of cross-examination drew from Bacon "An Expostulation" addressed to him, wherein he says forthrightly: "As in your pleadings you were wont to insult over misery, and to inveigh bitterly at the persons, which bred you many enemies . . so are you still wont to be a little careless, in this point, to praise or disgrace upon slight grounds, and that sometimes untruly . . You will jest at any man in public, without respect of the person's dignity or your own: this disgraceth your gravity, more than it can advance the opinion of your wit; and so do all the actions which we see you do directly with a touch of vainglory, having no respect to the true end. You make the law to lean too much to your opinion, whereby you show yourself to be a legal tyrant, striking with the weapon where you please, since you are able to turn the edge any way . . ." In view of such a remonstrance to Coke as this, Mr. McElwee's statement that Bacon, "conscious as he was of the flimsiness of the real evidence he had to offer and that he

would have to bully and cheat his way through" . . . etc., is quite incredible.

No, if only Mr. McElwee had put together two observations of his own, namely, "Bacon, one of the few men of that Court who cherished . . a genuine and lofty conception of the part which monarchy ought to play in the nation's development . . ." (p. 227), and, "It is doubtful if the popularity and prestige of the Stuart monarchy ever entirely recovered from the damage done by the Somerset case. Bacon had been quite right to foresee great mischief to Church and State, and not the least of the evils was the apparent condoning of sin in high places as represented by the rapid and easy pardoning of both Earl and Countess . . ." (p. 261), he might well have found the true key to Bacon's conduct and seen it in a different light altogether.

For the sake of James, Bacon sought to show the true extent of Carr's guilt, so that the King's actions would appear neither to be dictated by fear of Carr's possibly vindictive revelations in public, nor by pressure of the popular clamour against Carr and of the anti-Howard faction. Moreover, knowing Carr to be free from any certainty of guilt, he wished to enable James to exercise the royal prerogative of mercy and so perfect justice. In a letter to the King of April 28th, 1616, Bacon says: ". . . There may be an evidence so balanced, as it may have sufficient matter for the conscience of the peers to convict him, and yet leave sufficient matter in the conscience of a king upon the same evidence to pardon his life; because the peers are astringed by necessity to acquit or condemn; but grace is free: and for my part, I think the evidence in this present case will be of such a nature . . . It shall be my care so to moderate the manner of charging him, as it might make him not odious beyond the extent of mercy . . All these points of mercy and favour are to be understood with this limitation, if he do not by his contemptuous and insolent carriage at the bar, make himself incapable and unworthy of them."

To this last point the King himself noted: "That danger is well to be foreseen, lest he upon the one part commit unpardonable errors, and I on the other part seem to punish him in the spirit of revenge."

That Bacon made it possible for James to pursue this path successfully argues not only Bacon's skill (far from "contemptible") but also the lofty idealism of his duty to his sovereign, and so to the Church and State. It is Mr. McElwee's "warming" to his characterisation of Carr, in the manner of the novelist, that causes him, in the later portion of his book, to develop something of a partiality for the fallen favourite, and put him in rather the position of the hero of the piece struggling for his life against evil intriguers. It is his mistake to place Bacon among these last.

R.J.W.G.

THE VOCABULARY OF THE BI-LITERAL CIPHER STORY

On reading some portions of Mrs. Gallup's *Bi-literal Cypher of Francis Bacon*, I underlined a number of words which struck me as being unfamiliar in my reading of Tudor and Jacobean literature. I then consulted the *New English Dictionary* for the first uses given. In one or two cases I found words which had been coined in Bacon's lifetime, though not used in the sense given to them in Mrs. Gallup's work. It is obvious that if Mrs. Gallup relied upon her imagination in her alleged decipherment she could not avoid anachronisms. On the other hand, the *N.E.D.* is not infallible, and it would be interesting to know if any students of the literature of the period can trace a use of any of the following words during Bacon's lifetime. The dates are those given by the editors of the *N.E.D.* for the first appearance discovered:

Thrill	1680	Tudor	1779
Reveries	1653	Diplomatick	1787
Aventure	1672	Seductive	1782
Dubitancy	1648	Espionage	1793
Foibles	1673	Boyhood	1745
Enumerated	1647	Incriminate	1730
Epoch	1658	Insignia	1774
Umbratike	1677	Designate	1801
Shadowy	1677	Dominates	1818
Contrivance	1646	Dampening	1814
Meandering	1652	Surveillance	1802
Inalienable	1645	Hand-loom	1833
Scrutoire	1665	Leniently	1845
Generic	1676	Cressive (No such word given). Is it known in America?	

R. L. EAGLE

Editor's Note.—This is an interesting tabulation, and is in the nature of a constructive effort (on the part of a non-believer!) to get at the truth of Mrs. Gallup's cipher claims. But, as Mr. Eagle himself suggests, the *New English Dictionary* is certainly not infallible, and those who have faith in Mrs. Gallup need not abandon it.

The word "thrill" is to be found in *King John* (1623) Act v, Sc. ii;

" . . . . . to thrill and shake
Even at the crying of your nation's crow":

and in *Henry IV*, Act II, Sc. iv;

"doth not thy blood thrill at it."

The word "shadowy" occurs in *King Lear* (1623) Act I, Sc. i:

"With shadowy forrests and with Champains rich'd"

The word "meanders" (though not "meandering") occurs in *The Tempest* (1623), Act III, Sc. iii:

"here's a maze trod indeed
Through forth-rights and Meanders. . ."

These few findings give good reason to doubt the *New English Dictionary*, and, in addition, it might also be urged that certain words of French origin (reveries, aventure, surveillance, scrutoire, espionage and diplomatick) would readily occur to Bacon's mind, as also would words which he was wont to use in Latin (insignia, dominator, enumerator). Incidentally the word "dominator" (though not "dominates") occurs in *Love's Labour's Lost.*

On the other hand the word Tudor, as spelt by Mrs. Gallup is certainly a bad anachronism, the contempory spelling being Tidir or Tydyr. Perhaps the decipherer (whom we believe to have been sincere) may have manipulated two letters in an effort to help out the sense, conceiving that Tidir was a mistake either of her own, or of the encipherer.

We shall be grateful if any of our readers can throw further light on some of the possible anachronisms suggested by Mr. Eagle, to whom we are indebted for raising an interesting study.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of BACONIANA
Sir,

May I comment on Mr. Wood's letter in the current magazine regarding a discrepancy in the biliteral decipherment of the italics in *As You Like It*? It is desirable to reduce this type of criticism to its proper proportions.

It seems that Francis Frezer appears in the decoding as Francis Archer. That is to say, of the 13 letters, 3 letters were decoded incorrectly.

F (AABAB) was decoded as A (AAAAA)
E (AABAA) was decoded as C (AAABA)
Z (BABBB) was decoded as H (AABBB)

Considering the large number of letters which have to be allocated to the "a" and "b" founts in any particular passage, the error arising from allocating 5 letters to the wrong fount is very trivial.

What if the type setter had a few stray 'a' fount letters among the "b"s and vice versa and what about the difficulties inherent in tackling the Folio italics which are small and not perfect?

The difficulty of getting a cast-iron decipherment of awkward proper names could be appreciated by a perusal of the principles of biliteral deciphering set out in General Cartier's book "Un Problème de Cryptographie et d'Histoire" which you have for sale.

In any case I do not think the validity of Miss Gallup's biliteral decipherment *as a whole* is impaired.

Yours faithfully,
F. V. MATARALY

"Blue Haze,"
7 Richmond Rd., Lansdown,
Bath, Somerset

To the Editor of BACONIANA
Sir,

It often appears that those who delve deep, whatever their angle of approach and even though they are not specialists of Elizabethan studies, find the name BACON when they touch the rock of Shakespearian problems.

A typical example of this is given by a Professor of Philosophy, O. Maronni, in his recent book on the Psychology of Colonization (*La Psychologie de la Colonisation*, Editions du Seuil, 27 rue Jacob, Paris).

Lecturing and living in Madagascar, he worked on first-hand information and in the proper surroundings. Studying the complexes which concur to create the psychological "climate" of colonization, our author was led to read *Robinson Crusoe* and *The Tempest* in the light of his knowledge of the question.

Thus he curiously remarks (page 97) that *The Tempest* offers a psychoanalytical conjuncture almost identical with that of Crusoe (who, I believe, is a projection of Defoe's personality, even though Selkirk may have been the external model). From this, O. Maronni goes on to conclude that the only model that Shakespeare copied when delineating the character of Prospero *was himself*.

So far we have nothing strikingly unorthodox. But while Defoe's case can be explained by the influence of the ideological trend running from Locke to the French *Encyclopédistes*, O. Maronni says Shakespeare's case makes one *"think rather of Bacon whose conscious mind thinks of experimenting while his subconscious dreams of magic."* (This diagnosis, of course, shows up well enough in Bacon's overt work).

Speaking again of *The Tempest*, O. Maronni says later (p. 105): "The man who wrote this play had an obscure, unconscious but impetuous urge to rule men—even if only through his prestige—and that urge is much more powerful, much more difficult to overcome than Defoe's. *It is hardly likely that the man in question should have been the Stratford man*, though, with the resources of the subconscious, everything is possible."

Even the last words do not seem to me to weaken the case. They are those of a professionally cautious scientist who does not want to exclude the remotest possiblity or to conclude dogmatically. It is obvious that, short of a miracle of the subconscious, our author thinks that Prospero's psychological idiosyncrasy tallies with Bacon's. Baconians, moreover, are in a position to do special credit to O. Maronni's insight as they know of obvious grounds for the sort of frustration which caused Bacon's urge "to rule men even if only through his prestige."

May I add that, however good a man is at disguising his style and clothing his personality, his subconscious expression is the last thing he will succeed in altering completely? The positive results of modern psycho-analysis, even if imperfect on certain points, seem quite sufficient to enable a specialist to reach reliable conclusions on a comparatively simple problem such as that of the identification of Prospero-Shakespeare with Bacon. These conclusions are all the more reliable as they are now amply corroborated by sound scientific cryptological studies (excluding the Gallup cypher which seems probable but cannot yet be considered as scientifically proved). These cryptological proofs appear in another recent book where they are discussed on the photographic documentation supplied (*Défense de WILL ou la Véritable Identité de William Shakespeare*, Editions Vincent, 4 rue des Beaux-Arts, Paris). The book is, in my opinion, rather poorly written but the scientific methods of cryptological investigation employed, make its Baconian conclusions as valid as the Pythagorean proposition—much more valid indeed since they are reached in the light of the most up-to-date science. It is unlikely that Einstein could deny them.

Thus the scientific cryptologist working on strictly experimental principles and the laws of predictability, agrees with the student of psycho-analysis, who is not specially concerned with the question, and there cannot remain the least doubt in any honest mind that it is Bacon's soul, in a charming mixture of personal experiences and poetical reveries, which illuminates *The Tempest* and gives the play its unmatchable charm. Even the superficial or purely literary reader of *The Tempest* feels that he is mysteriously in touch with the supreme creative genius that was responsible for it. Then what of the reader who knows that it is the magnetism of Bacon that invades his captivated ear?

My own enjoyment of the play has been multiplied tenfold from the moment I decided the Bacon authorship was beyond all question. Everything then seemed to click in, so to speak. With no doubts, no thought blockages, no anxious queries now coming in between poet and reader, the current of sympathy which makes for the perfect savouring of a work of art could pass unrestricted and unhampered, and *The Tempest* then uncovered the throbbing heart which irradiated its poetry and transcendental human charm throughout the lines.

Such is the ultimate and substantial reward for being a Baconian; you have your Shakespeare with something plus.

Yours sincerely,

Lycée Hoche, Versailles PIERRE HENRION

Mr. Sidney Campion

We were pleased to note that the above gentleman, who is a member of the Society, was awarded the O.B.E. in the Coronation Honours List. We ask Mr. Campion to accept our sincere congratulations.

FRANCIS BACON SOCIETY'S BOOKS FOR SALE

	Price including British postage
Beaumont, Comyns. Private Life of the Virgin Queen (Illustrated). Price reduced.	10/-
Cartier, General. Un Problème de Cryptographie et d' Histoire (4th Ed. in French and English).	8/5
Dodd, Alfred. Francis Bacon's Personal Life Story (Illustrated. Price reduced).	25/8
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin. Shakespeare Myth—Milton's Epitaph and Macbeth Prove Bacon is Shakespeare (The ten hundredth thousand)	4/6
Eagle, R. L. Shakespeare, New Views for Old (Illustrated)	11/3
Farrington, B., Francis Bacon, Philosopher of Industrial Science	18/-
Gundry, W. G. C. Francis Bacon— a Guide to His Homes and Haunts. Price reduced (Illustrated).	2/3
Manes Verulamiani (edited by W. G. C. Gundry) Price reduced	30/6
Was Shakespeare Educated? (Illustrated)	2/8
Johnson, Ed. D. Bacon-Shakespeare Coincidences	3/8
The Bi-Literal Cipher of Francis Bacon (9 plates)	3/9
The Fictitious Shakespeare Exposed	2/8
Francis Bacon Cipher Signatures (31 diagrams)	4/4
Mystery of the First Folio of the Shakespeare Plays	5/10
Shakespearean Acrostics. 139 Folio pages	8/2
The Shaksper Illusion (Illustrated)	2/8
The Shaksper Illusion (Enlarged edition illustrated)	8/-
Melsome, W. S. Bacon-Shakespeare Anatomy. Price reduced	10/4
Pogson, Beryl. In The East My Pleasure Lies (An interpretation of 9 Shakespeare Plays).	9/4
Prescott, Kate H. Reminiscences of a Baconian	13/-
Sennett, Mabel. His Erring Pilgrimage (Price reduced)	4/2
Theobald, B. G. Exit Shakspere Enter Francis Bacon, sequel to Exit Shakspere	5/6 the two books
Francis Bacon Concealed and Revealed (Illustrated)	8/7
Shakespeare's Sonnets Unmasked	5/5
Woodward, Frank. Francis Bacon's Cipher Signatures (Photo Facsimile Illustrations).	26/1

PAMPHLETS FOR SALE

	Price including British Postage each
Baker, H. Kendra. Who Wrote Love's Labour's Lost?	7d.
Bridgewater, Howard. Bacon-Shakespeare Controversy	7d.
Bacon or Shakespeare—Does it Matter?	9d.
Shakespeare and Italy	1/2
Evidence Connecting Francis Bacon with Shakespeare (illustrated)	1/8
Dodd, Alfred. Mystery of the Shakespeare Sonnets	1/2
Who Was Shakespeare?	1/8
Eagle, R. L. Shakespeare Forgers and Forgeries (illustrated)	1/-
Eagle/Hapgood. Stratford Birthplace. (Illustrated)	1/8
Ellis, Walter. Shakespeare Myth (illustrated)	1/8
Franco, Johan. Bacon-Shakespere Identities Revealed by Their Handwritings (illustrated)	2/7
Gundry, W. G. C., "Notes on Hinton Saint George."	1,9
Johnson, Ed. D. Don Adriana's Letter (21 diagrams)	2/9
Francis Bacon: Similarity of Thought	1/2
Francis Bacon v. Lord Macaulay	1/2
The Shakespeare Quiz	7d.
Some Signatures of Francis Bacon.	1/3
Murchison, Sir K. Who Wrote the So-called Shakespeare Plays?	4d.
Sydenham, Lord. The First Baconian	9d.
Trew, Corona. Influence of Francis Bacon on Modern Thought	1/-

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

BACONIANA

The official journal of the Francis Bacon Society (Inc.) is published at 2/6 (postage 3d.) Back numbers can be supplied. When enquiry is made for particular numbers the date should be specified. Some are now very scarce and, in the case of early issues, difficult to obtain except from members of the Society who may have spare copies.