

PART 1:

THE HISTORIES

CHAPTER 1

HENRY THE SIXTH Part 1

The HVI trilogy is the best of starting-points for our journey, and the worst. Its objective presentation of a series of clear-cut principles involved in the aetiology and pathogenesis of Puritanism, unencumbered for the most part by the peculiar and intimate details of Shakespeare's inner life, which we will come to know so well in later plays, provides the ideal primer for the argument to come. Robert Graves remarked that his classic *The White Goddess* was difficult only in the early stages, until the rudiments of its symbolic and mythic language had been learnt; and so it is here, the difference being that we have 1-3HVI to introduce the allegorical principles of the First Folio in an accessible way, as a lesson for absolute beginners, right at the start. Unfortunately, it is precisely the revelation of Shakespeare's milieu intérieur – its progress from puberty to his cataclysmic breakdown aet.²³ after eight years as a Puritan thrall - that makes the historical sequence so fascinating. However, a little patience at this stage will bring the richest of rewards.

The theme of 1HVI as allegory is the insult delivered to the Ring or Grail tradition (the two are essentially the same)¹ by the Roman Catholic and Puritan tyrannies. This will continue to be the central concern of the First Folio, wherein the Grail Queen will be represented by Juliet, Portia, Cordelia, Cleopatra, Perdita, and all the other spurned Goddess-figures of the plays. The Grail Queen of 1HVI is Joan of Arc, whose death at the hands of York and the English will represent Her repudiation by the Puritan-to-be, whose final ascendancy will come with the coronation of Edward the Fourth in 3HVI. The Grail Queen of FF is also known as the Queen of Hell, or Goddess of the Invisible World or Underworld or Faustian Dimension. What exactly is Her significance? Her realm is the world that lies below the surface of the visible or phenomenal

¹ Laurence Gardner, *Realm of the Ring Lords*; and see AWT.

aspect of Nature. It is emphasised throughout FF, most clearly in TWT, that the Holy Grail – object of Shakespeare’s quest, with Sir Francis Bacon as his guide - is the wisdom based on knowledge of this invisible world as described in the written word. The exploration of this world has been the passion of the great modern scientists, depth psychologists, and artists, with the treasures retrieved therefrom becoming staples of Western culture, the unquenchable flow of which is now largely taken for granted.

Yet it was not so toward the close of the 16th century, when the first works of Shakespeare entered labour. The Ring tradition had bloomed again in the Medici court of Florence in the 1490’s, as Christian Cabalism, or Renaissance or Hermetic Occult Neoplatonism, in the works of the mages Pico dell Mirandola and Marsilio Ficino,² whose works, along with those of Francesco Giorgi, Cornelius Agrippa, Albrecht Dürer, and others, would come to inspire Sir Francis Bacon and his circle, - almost certainly initially via John Dee and his magnificent library, - and inform the philosophy of FF. This resurgence of the Gnostic tradition – which the Ring culture can alternatively be termed, as founded on engagement and knowledge (gnosis) of Nature, rather than blind faith – was initially tolerated by Rome; but by the Bacon era the reaction had set in, to culminate in the immolation of Giordano Bruno as a sorcerer in 1600.

One of the great achievements of the HVI trilogy is to locate the origins of the Puritan error in this forced suppression by Rome of the Gnostic tradition. The Roman Catholic Church will be shown to be represented therein by the Bishop of Winchester, later known as Cardinal Beaufort; the Puritan sect, by the Yorkist (White Rose) party; Catholic/Merrie England, by the Lancastrian (Red Rose) party; the Ring tradition, by Gloucester; the Holy Grail, by Joan of Arc, Eleanor Duchess of Gloucester, and Queen Margaret; and so on. Geoffrey Bullough in his monumental *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare* has characterised 1HVI as “not so much a Chronicle play as a fantasia on historical themes”, noting that “the play does not follow the sequence of events in the chronicles, but darts about the periods in a bewildering way”. It will be shown

² Dame Francis Yates, *The Occult Philosophy in the Elizabethan Age*.

below that the purpose of these variations was to serve the hidden allegory, the author changing details of events, or taking them out of sequence, - or both, - or inventing entirely new ones, while judiciously staying within the bounds of theatrical credibility.

Fascinatingly, there is a further technique of the utmost importance to the understanding of the allegory, which first shows itself in 1HV1 II, iv, occurs more often in 2HVI, and peaks in frequency in 3HVI, to reflect the gathering confidence of the author in its use. This is the substitution, in FF, of "I" for the expected "Ay", which the modern editor unfortunately, though understandably, invariably corrects. "I" for "Ay" stands always without exception for the ithyphallic/maypole principle, as an expression of the Queen of Hell in the visible or phenomenal world. In accordance with the Hermetic axiom "As without, so within", the HVI trilogy illuminates both the macro- and microcosmic dimensions of the Puritan world-view: the maypole rites, or any expression of the libido (in its broadest sense, the will-to-life), being an object of the Puritan's especial abomination; as also is – of the greatest relevance to the life of William Shakespeare, which the remaining histories will describe at more length - his own inner erotic nature, the conflict arising thereby bearing the potential for tragedy. The "I" principle is therefore that of the ithyphallos, and more broadly of the unseen world, realm of the Queen of Hell. The acknowledgement of this unseen world was the central plank of Bacon's philosophy (see Ch.10).³

It is clear that the trilogy was written in the main by neither Bacon nor Shakespeare; and I concur with the theory that would circle the name of the wonderful Christopher Marlowe. Such is the sublimeness and poetry of much of the writing, albeit it is atypical of FF as a whole, that the student of the artistic mind will find no other candidate plausible. Bacon, Marlowe and Shakespeare must have formed a tight unit in those early years, 1588-91 or thereabouts. The grand strategist would have been working on the ur-Hamlet, The Two Gentlemen of Verona, King John, perhaps the early comedies; while Marlowe, under his

³ The frequency of this technique in the apocryphal and Jonsonian plays has fascinating implications. See www.michaelbuhagiar.com

supervision, yet largely independently as a writer, was engaged on 1-3HVI; with Shakespeare at this stage developing his art (Orlando phase) after “two years and more” (last lines of MAF) of intensive reading (Melancholy Jacques phase). This last may have already been working on his highly significant contribution to RIII, which is essentially microcosmic in nature, as a record of his own breakdown (beheading of Hastings) and its aftermath, with the victory of Richmond representing the annihilation of the Puritan world-view by the wisdom of the invisible world. In Hamlet, the writing of which was almost certainly under weigh at this time, Ophelia floating supine and singing on the brook represents the “Spirit that moves on the face of the waters”, the Holy Spirit Herself (female in the Gnostic tradition, before its perversion by Rome), the female gnosis of Sophia, the Goddess of Wisdom; with the waters of the brook representing the invisible world.

Let us now examine 1HVI in detail.

ACTS I, II

The Gnostic and Pauline Christian traditions immediately proclaim their mutual unappeasable antipathy:

Gloucester	The church! where is it? Had not churchmen pray'd His thread of life had not so soon decay'd: None do you like but an effeminate prince, Whom like a school-boy you may over-awe
Winchester	Gloucester, whate'er we like thou art protector And lookest to command the prince and realm. Thy wife is proud; she holdeth thee in awe, More than God or religious churchmen may.

This allegoric value of Gloucester will be confirmed in 2HVI II, i: the hawking-party scene. The principle of the “ford” is contrasted at all times in the plays with that of the “bridge”, to mirror the relationship of Cambridge University, the home of Puritanism, with Oxford, bulwark of the Crown. The ford symbolises engagement with Nature; the bridge, avoidance of it: the river through which the farer passes symbolising the mortal world, ever flowing to its death

(cf. Anna Livia Plurabelle, of Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*). This is another expression of the age-old mythic theme of passing from the nearer shore of ignorance to the farther of enlightenment.⁴ Thus Milford in *RIII*, and Milford Haven in *CYM*, represent the written word as vector of the broadly Gnostic tradition, as derived from engagement with Nature: the river (Nature) turning the mill-wheel (pen) to produce the refined grain (Gnostic literature), the mill standing on the bank of enlightenment. This "ford" symbolism in "Bedford" is potentiated by "[river]bed". He therefore bears the value of engagement with Nature, and is naturally associated with Gloucester. He will later identify himself with the line of Celtic Pendragons, which stands opposed to Puritanism (Augustus Caesar) in *CYM*.

A messenger brings news of the loss of several territories in France, from "want of men and money". Money represents always in the plays the power of a principle. France represents the world of Nature Herself, with the city of Orleans Her underworld aspect. With the death of the dominance of the Gnostic heritage (funeral of Henry V), power over Nature has been weakened. Scenes of the English siege of Orleans frame Gloucester's unsuccessful attempt to enter the Tower (Gnostic tradition) held by the Bishop of Winchester. The point being made is that the sham Goddess Nature of Roman Catholicism holds the field, with the Grail Queen being forcefully suppressed.

The tower was associated in the Gnostic tradition specifically with Mary Magdalene, who was not at all the tart that Rome has painted her to be, but the wife of Christ, and mother of his children.⁵ The Hebrew *migdala* means "tower", and was used to denote a high titular station of guardianship. This symbol was perpetuated in the Tower, or House of God, card of the Tarot Major Arcana, which is traditionally referred to as the Magdalene card. When struck by lightning, or otherwise mysteriously assaulted, it represented the violence visited upon the Gnostic or Ring/Grail tradition by the Roman Church.⁶

What evidence is there that it was in fact the Tarot that was the source of the tower symbolism in *1HVI* and elsewhere? A

⁴ Joseph Campbell, *The Masks of God*.

⁵ Laurence Gardner, *Bloodline of the Holy Grail*; Baigent et al., *The Holy Blood and the Holy Grail*.

⁶ Gardner, *Realm of the Ring Lords*.

remarkable feature of the plays is the appearance, fully formed, of key creative symbols such as the Goddess, the Puritan figure, and the Fool, in the very earliest plays, such as *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. The Fool is particularly impressive, appearing in TGV, possibly the first play of all from the hand of Bacon, as Launce, who also bears the value of the ithyphallic or “I” principle, more broadly the unseen world. He will reappear in many subsequent plays, where his principle will be somehow essential for the recovery of the shattered Puritan figure (ultimately Shakespeare, in those early London years). It is as if Bacon were drawing on some pre-existing tradition of psychic transformation, a Western analogue of Hindu Kundalini yoga, or a variant, perhaps, of the pilgrim route from Santiago de Compostella to Rosslyn Chapel in Scotland. Whence, then, Launce, and all his kin in FF?

The origin of the Fool in the First Folio

There are three strong candidates for the source of the Fool in FF:

1) Ass-phase Lucius in Apuleius’ *The Golden Ass*. His adventures in ass-guise, with his witnessing of a series of libidinous encounters (undoubtedly the source of Falstaff’s mishaps in *MWW*), and his subsequent rebirth into glory, a man again, as a priest of Osiris, are an allegory of a psyche’s engagement with the unseen world, and ascent into the Gnostic nobility which this engagement enables. The allegory of TGA is therefore that of FF, precisely; and its influence on FF will be shown in the pages to come to have been huge, far beyond what the critics have suspected (see especially MAN).

2) Parzival as neophyte knight in Wolfram’s eponymous tale of the late 12th – early 13th centuries, the first complete Grail saga in literature. The importance of Parzival as a model for the architectonics of FF exceeds even TGA (see Ch.44.). Wolfram describes his young hero as being dressed in a suit of sackcloth made by his mother, and riding a young palfrey, in contrast to the mighty steeds of his opponents. There can be not the slightest doubt that this was the inspiration for *Don Quixote*, which is usually, though not definitively, ascribed to Cervantes. Parzival dishonestly acquires a ring – the same precisely as features in so many of the plays of FF, which is revealed in this light to be the greatest Ring saga in

literature – in his early Fool phase, and is afterward forced to return it, for he is not yet ready.

3) The Fool card of the Tarot.

These three possibilities are not as mutually exclusive as they might seem. Christopher Knight and Robert Lomas have demonstrated, in their impeccably argued *The Second Messiah*, a clear line from Egypt, through David and the Jerusalem Church, thence the Rex Deus tradition and the Knights Templar, to Freemasonry. There can be no doubt, on the basis of their findings, that Freemasonry is a direct inheritor of the Davidic tradition, which includes in its line (the Gnostic) Jesus Christ (the First Messiah), and Jacques de Molay (the Second Messiah), the last Grand Master of the Knights Templar, who was crucified by the French King Philip the Fair, for venal pecuniary reasons, in 1307. Freemasonry – the authentic version, that is, based on the thirty-three degrees of the Ancient Scottish Rite, before its suppression by the debased form that has prevailed in England and elsewhere since the early 18th century – is therefore an inheritor of the true Christian tradition, the religion Jesus taught: the Christianity that we know so well today being a confection of St. Paul's, inspired, but a sham nevertheless.

Sir Francis Bacon was formally inducted into Freemasonry by King James in 1603, as Knight and Lomas tell us in their *The Hiram Key*. Graham Hancock has shown, in his *The Sign and the Seal*, that Wolfram's *Parzival* was itself a Templar text, containing an Ark of the Covenant allegory: the Templars having discovered the whereabouts of the Ark, though not the Ark itself, in their excavations beneath Herod's Temple in Jerusalem from 1118. I show, in Chapter 44, that Bacon was thoroughly aware of this allegory, and further, of a second allegory, of psychic transformation, which provided the model for the principal FF allegory. Remarkably, evidence will be uncovered in later plays – for example, *T&C* – for the influence on FF of the rituals of the Ancient Scottish Rite. The Masonic lore which suffuses FF is utterly consistent with what is known of Bacon as Freemason (this being, as I say, the authentic form, which preserves the true teachings of Jesus). Finally, Knight and Lomas in *The Second Messiah* present really conclusive evidence that the Tarot was invented by the

Templars as a method of training and Gnostic transformation of their members. The lessons of the First Folio as allegory are therefore also the lessons of Jesus; and it must be regarded, in this light, as the greatest product of the authentic Masonic tradition. What, though, of Apuleius? The allegory of TGA is of a piece with that of Parzival and FF; and Apuleius was therefore himself most plausibly in the Rex Deus line, as an inheritor of the teachings of the true Christ.

*

Jesus Christ was of the royal line of David, whose origins are to be found in Egypt, rather than Mesopotamia;⁷ and King Solomon, whose presence is felt massively in FF, was of course the son of David. The rings which feature prominently in so many of the plays refer to the Ring tradition; while the additional presence of a diamond in 2HVI and the final play Cymbeline serves to highlight Solomon in particular, as referring to his dazzling jewel, the Schamir (described, along with his famous ring, in the Talmud). Further, the numerous references in FF to a Goddess-figure as “foul and fair”, or “black and fair”, point unmistakeably to the lover of the esoteric Song of Solomon, who is Solomon’s Grail Queen, the guardian of the Holy Grail itself (wisdom derived from engagement with unseen world), and who describes herself in just this way (melaine eimi kai kale). Mary Magdalene stands therefore in relation to Christ as the “black and fair” lover to Solomon: black as an underworld Goddess, fair because of the beauty of the Faustian dimension to the gnostically enquiring mind of the Ring Lord. The author combined Hall’s description of her as “foule” in face,⁸ with Holinshed’s “of favour... likesome”,⁹ to identify her as a Grail Queen: “And whereas I was black and swart before/...That beauty am I blessed with, which you may see” (I, ii). The Tower and Joan of Arc are therefore identical on the allegoric plane; and both are cognate with the siege-tower in the following scene, whence the English peer into Orleans: the meaning being that the Roman Catholic has usurped the rightful place of the Ring Lord, to his

⁷ Gardner, *Genesis of the Grail Kings*.

⁸ Edward Hall, *The Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Families of Lancastre and Yorke* (also known simply as the *Chronicle*). This was one of the two major sources for the trilogy, the other being

⁹ Ralph Holinshed, *The Chronicles of England, Scotlande, and Irelande*.

ultimate destruction (death of Salisbury in tower).

The choreography of the siege of Orleans is precise and exquisite, with Talbot the principal. The point of it is to show the vulnerability of the Pauline Catholic world-view, as based on a sham Goddess Nature (Virgin Mary) whose Queen of Hell aspect has been shrouded. This will be expressed in a different way by the repeated association of Winchester/Cardinal Beaufort with the “I” principle in 2&3HVI: the Pauline Catholic having failed to engage the invisible world, and therefore remaining subject to it. The Puritan’s characteristic abomination of the libido (murders of Suffolk and Clifford), as an expression of this Faustian dimension, will be shown to have arisen as a reaction (rather than response) to this vulnerability: an example of the power (ultimately delusory) of positive thinking, a confidence trick perpetrated on the Puritan by himself. This fragility of the Pauline world-view will also be depicted by the death of Rutland at the hands of Clifford in 3HVI I, ii. Here, however, the strategist takes the opportunity afforded by the plot as described in the sources – yet another beautiful example of the axiom “Form is the obstacle that brings creativity to birth” – to show the ideal outcome, where Gnostic (Christian Cabalist/Neoplatonic) reason now takes the field after the demise of the Pauline world-view, to deny the Puritan tyranny.

The magnificent Talbot bears the value of this Gnostic reason, as suggested by the episode, invented *de novo* for the purpose of the allegory, of his entrapment by and victory over the Countess of Auvergne, . He first appears in the negative, as captured by the French, after the desertion of Falstaff. At this stage Salisbury fights the French like “...a desperate homicide,/...one weary of his life”. Falstaff bears the allegoric value, of course, of the libido, and is cognate in this regard with Sir Toby Belch, Stephano, Trinculo, and all the other soaks of the plays: drunkenness always bearing in FF the value of dissolution in the libido, as will amply be shown in the argument to come. The capture of Talbot signifies the uselessness of Gnostic reason after its denial of the libido, more broadly the invisible world, as an object of contemplation (desertion of Falstaff), to form Pauline Catholic reason (the libido remaining associated with the Catholic, in Schopenhaurian terms, as will, rather than idea). Central to all of this is the Christian Cabalist’s belief in the

capacity of Gnostic reason to control and transcend the libido through engagement with it, as represented for example by the bony dog in Albrecht Dürer's *Melencolia I* (fig.1), Don Quixote's nag Rosinante, and the feeble Bill the pony in Tolkien's *Lord of the Rings*. This will be represented another way by the complete subjection of Kate (a Queen of Hell) to Petruchio (the "church-killer", from "Peter" and the Italian *uccidere*, "to kill") in TOS. This notion was, remarkably, central to the ritual of the twenty-eighth degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of (the authentic) Freemasonry, which was evidently a colossal influence on Sir Francis Bacon (see Ch.44).

The author seized upon the root "salis-" in "Salisbury" as a homophone of the Latin *salus*, "health", "well-being", to allot him just this value: so that as a "desperate homicide... weary of his life", before the walls of Orleans, he represents the flailing about of useless Catholic reason before the underworld, just managing to stay unconsumed by it. Not for long, however: for his fatal wounding by a cannonball while peering from the tower into the city represents the final vulnerability to the invisible world of the ego which has denied it as an object of his reason. Talbot witnesses it, and resolves to take Orleans – successfully, as it turns out, to represent the new triumph of Gnostic reason. The Falstaff principle has been reunited with reason in the character of Burgundy (a reference to the wine, with the allegoric value of the libido), who accompanies Talbot on his sortie. Also there is Bedford, whose name powerfully evokes both the ford of a river (see above) and its bed, symbolic in toto of engagement with the deepest, Faustian dimension of with Nature, rather than repudiation of it.

The author transferred, for the purpose of the allegory, the recapture of Le Mans to Orleans, which was in fact never regained after being lost to the French. Here it was that the French party fled before Talbot and the English, leaving their clothes behind. This episode suggests here the revelation by the Gnostic enquirer of the unseen world below the surface of the visible. Talbot's encounter with the Countess of Auvergne was invented to portray the engagement of Gnostic reason with the underworld, its initial overwhelming by it, then final victory. Again, the otherwise implausible instant rapprochement of the two following her attempt to take him prisoner finds its explanation on the plane of allegory.

In II, iv, the Puritan sect begins to cohere and separate from (Catholic) Merrie England (definition of Red and White Rose factions). Somerset and Suffolk (Red Rose) contend with Richard Plantagenet (later Duke of York) and Warwick (White Rose). This last bears the value of psychic conflict, as suggested by his name; and Suffolk, the ithyphallic/maypole principle, - as always without exception in the plays (even HVIII, which appeared some twenty years after 1HVI), - as will definitively be shown in 2HVI IV, i, and by his repeated association with the "I" principle. "Somerset" suggests the "setting of summer", the early months of winter in the Celtic tree (Beth-Luis-Nion) alphabet, including Coll (Aug. 5 – Sept. 1), the month of wisdom, whose tree is the hazel, and fruit the apple; Muin (Sept. 2 – Sept. 29), the month of Dionysius, whose tree is the vine; and Gort (Sept. 30 – Oct. 27), the ivy month, whose animal is the boar himself, as we have seen (RIII, I, i). There is evidence elsewhere in FF, especially in A&C, of Bacon's deep familiarity with the Druidic tree alphabet; and it is this, or even the Druid grove itself, which may have suggested to him the allegorisation of the written word in the numerous trees, groves, woods and forests of FF. All of these principles are richly relevant to Merrie England. The association of the fading of the sun with wisdom is the point of Christ's death occurring at 3 p.m.; and also of Shelley's likening of the mood of poetic inspiration to a fading ember. The Boar is the key symbol of FF, as representing the libido in negative aspect. Merrie England had, of course, a marked Dionysian quality, and was peculiar in Catholic Europe in that her Goddess was not the Virgin Mary, but Mary Jacob, an Aphrodite-figure, and the subject, in truth, of Botticelli's *The Birth of Venus*, a key work in the Renaissance Neoplatonic tradition.¹⁰ Thus the Catholicism of Winchester (Roman) in 1HV1 is to be distinguished from that of Somerset and the Red Rose faction (Merrie English); and Falstaff can flee the forces of Talbot in I, i to define Roman Catholic reason, while his principle (the libido) remains associated with Catholic England in the person of Suffolk (ithyphallos/maypole).

The first scene of RIII as allegory was plausibly influenced by the Beth-Luis-Nion alphabet; while the probability becomes a certainty in A&C and elsewhere. That Marlowe was also thinking along these lines in the character of Somerset is suggested by his absence from

¹⁰ Gardner, *Bloodline of the Holy Grail*.

Holinshed in this context.

Here is the first instance in the plays of “I” for “Ay”:

Somerset Hath not thy rose a thorn, Plantagenet?

York I, sharp and piercing to maintain his truth.

In 3HVI V, v, King Edward IV (Puritan ego) will say to young Prince Edward (identified with the “I” principle, in the context of the written word): “What? can so young a thorn begin to prick?”. The meaning in both instances is the same: that the Puritan finds the invisible world, of which the ithyphallos/maypole is an emblem, painful to contemplate.

In the long dialogue between the dying Edmund Mortimer and his nephew Richard, later to become Duke of York (Puritan ego), the former is identified with the “I” principle:

Richard I, noble uncle, thus ignobly used,
 Your nephew, late despised Richard, comes.

He dies, having anointed Richard, who vows vengeance on the Lancastrians. The meaning is that Puritanism will be founded on the death of the “I” principle. This same point will also be made later in different ways (e.g. the murder of Suffolk in 2HVI IV, i), to illustrate the allegoric principle, afforded by the broad lines of the plot as given in the sources, of returning to square one to reiterate an argument.

ACT III

Winchester and Gloucester continue their bitter antipathy in Parliament House:

Winchester Coms’t thou with deep premeditated lines,
 With written pamphlets studiously devis’d...

He tears up the documents proffered by Gloucester. These are the words that flowed off the pens of Pico della Mirandola and others, to syncretise the Hermetic and Christian traditions; to which Rome would react with vehemence, after an initial period

of tolerance. This is the central scene of the play, in which the conflict between the broadly Gnostic and Pauline Catholic traditions is (delusorily) appeased, in the mind of the individual and the broader society, by the espousal of Puritanism (ennoblement of Richard Plantagenet to Duke of York). The Bishop of Winchester is characterised as a perversion of the Gnostic Christ:

Gloucester ...Thou [Winchester] bastard of my grandfather.
Winchester I, lordly sir...

Somerset reiterates this identification of Rome with the “I” principle: for the Catholic ego, in its refusal to engage the underworld as idea, through the written word, remains bound to it as will, as exemplified, for example, by the notorious libidinousness of the clergy. This episode was adapted from the sources to portray the conception of Puritanism in the soil of the conflict between the Roman and Gnostic traditions: the forced suppression of the latter by the former. Warwick is prominent, as the principle of this conflict in micro- and well as macrocosm, with the latter upstage at present, the inner psychic dimension to the fore in later Acts of the trilogy. This is expressed in a different way in King Henry’s “Oh, how this discord doth afflict my soul”. The uneasy peace between Gloucester and Winchester is followed straight by the ennoblement of Richard to Duke of York: the moment of conception of the Puritan ego. More “I”s for “Ay”s appear in the exactly the right places. In a little gem of a speech, which bears all the hallmarks of the high style of Bacon, to raise the poetic tone considerably, Exeter (written word, now misinterpreted by the Puritan, who would suppress from it the wisdom of the underworld (Sophia, who will be represented by Ophelia floating supine and singing on the brook in HAM, as the “Spirit that moves on the face of the waters”, the Holy Spirit Herself)) predicts the devastation to be visited on micro- (now upstage) and macrocosms by the Puritan tyranny. This is a reference by Bacon to the coup that had stricken down his patient and pupil Shakespeare in 1587, after eight years of enthrallment by Puritanism, as precipitated by his encountering an erotic passage in

a book, most plausibly the graphically described seduction of Lucius by Fotis in Apuleius' *The Golden Ass* (see especially MAN). In a beautiful illustration of Freud, the Puritan has suppressed from the printed page the underworld, which lies buried but alive, ready to surge again and claim him:

Exeter I, we may march in England, or in France,
 Not seeing what is likely to ensue:
 This late dissension grown betwixt the Peers
 Burns under feigned ashes of forg'd love,
 And will at last break out into a flame...

Bacon was evidently much more aware than Marlowe of the details of the landscape of Shakespeare's shattered inner life, as one would expect; and he betrayed their intimacy in this flourishing personal signature to 1HVI, as its grand strategist.

Rouen, once lost in 1449, was not retaken by the French; but the author depicts it such; has Joan uphold a burning torch at the battlements, as in fact happened at Le Mans in 1428; and adopts to Bedford the sickness of the litter-bound Uther Pendragon (an unhistorical character) in Geoffrey of Monmouth: all for the purposes of the allegory. The torch or taper is always in FF symbolic of the activity of the visual imagination; and the newly victorious Joan raising it high means that the underworld is being recreated in the gnostically enquiring mind (Talbot and the English). This is represented another way by the Watch, which also invariably bears the value of the imagination (e.g. in R&J V). Bedford (engagement with Nature) although moribund, is still alive; and Rouen (Faustian dimension of Nature: underworld) accordingly is taken (understood) by Talbot (Gnostic reason). Bedford immediately dies; and soon (IV, i) Burgundy (engagement with invisible world) will defect (be denied by the Puritan); York fail to summon the forces of Somerset (Puritan sect ascend): and Bordeaux (cognate with Rouen as the Faustian dimension) be lost (understanding of Nature forfeited). Falstaff is identified with the "I" principle, and depicted as fleeing again, just before the taking of Rouen. The purpose of this is to enable his disgrace before the loss of Bordeaux, germane to the defection of Burgundy, both

representing the libido, now extirpated as idea from the Puritan mind. Here, however, Burgundy's presence at Rouen is emphasised, to correct for the turpitude of Falstaff.

The Act ends with Vernon and Basset, adherents of York and Lancaster respectively, at loggerheads. These two do not appear in the sources. The former's name may readily be derived from the Latin *ver*, "spring", and *non*, "not": for spring is the season when the unseen world becomes visible in the seen (*Persephone*, Goddess of the new life of spring, spent the rest of the year in the realm of *Dis*), and, as such, must be anathema to the Puritan. "Basset" may most plausibly be formed from the French *bas* = "low", and "Set", the Egyptian God, killer of *Osiris* and therefore cognate with the Boar (see Chapter 1: RIII, I, i). Set appears in *The Tempest* as *Setebos* ("Set", and the Greek *ebenos*, "[black] ebony"), god of the witch *Sycorax*, whose son *Caliban* both kindled *Prospero's* fires (Shakespeare's creativity, where the logs represent the written word, like all the other trees, woods, and forests in FF) and tormented him (cf. HVIII, II, ii). A quality of Set was his tendency to recur, like the Queen of Hell and Her Consort/Son the Boar, or *Caliban*. Fascinatingly, he was symbolised in Egyptian religion by the hound; and, given the familiarity with the bee as an attribute of Egyptian kingship evidenced in HV I, i, this would seem to be the most likely source for the name "Basset". The Queen of Hell truly was a continual problem for Shakespeare for all his creative life, not wholly to be dealt with till the laying down of his pen after HVIII.

Basset is Somerset's man. That Somerset represents the libido is shown explicitly by his association with the horse: "And good my Lord of Somerset, unite/Your troops of horsemen, with his bands of foot..." (King, IV, i); "A plague upon that villain Somerset,/That thus delays my promised supply/ Of horsemen..." (York, IV, i). The horse or horse-and-rider represents always in FF the libido in action, as sourced from *Socrates'* famous extended metaphor in *Plato's Phaedrus*. In this scene the libido is shown as a property of the Catholic, as it was most remarkably in the early life of Shakespeare, from puberty to aet.15, when *Eros* in negative mantle, as invested by his constitutive *Pauline Christian* puritanism (with a small "p"), danced him like a puppet on a string, to finally

provoke the defensive reaction of his espousal of Puritanism. This act of desperation would only serve to drive underground the negative libido – the Boar, or Ugly Dick factor (and Richard III gloried in the sobriquet of “the Hog”) – where it would remain, ready to surge again to precipitate his breakdown act.23, in 1587. This microcosmic dimension is upstage here, as in the following Act.

ACT IV

Gloucester reading the letter of Burgundy’s desertion represents the Christian Cabalist reading a Puritan tract, in which the Faustian dimension is denied: and his reaction is appropriately vehement. He is the dominant figure here, with his fury at Falstaff’s dishonour, the treachery of Burgundy, and the Vernon-Basset altercation, representing the Gnostic position vis-à-vis this corruption of it. The written word retains the capacity to heal (Exeter urging peace between Vernon and Basset), but only if it treats of the invisible world, in the true Gnostic manner (King ordering Somerset to unite his horsemen with York’s infantry). That this is not the case is signified by Henry’s assertion, in the same speech, that he is a Red Rose (Catholic English) man. This is followed straight by Warwick’s dialogue with York (anxiety at Catholic vulnerability to libido responsible for rise of Puritanism).

Here is a tiny sign, ignored by most, but noticed by the alert clinician. We have seen that the character of Basset is a reference to the Egyptian god Set, who was worshipped as a hound. The FF spelling is always “Basset”, except in the direction Enter Vernon and Bassit (IV, i). We will see in the cases of Ophelia, Ventidius (A&C) and the Braggart (LLL) that minutiae of this type are of significance for the allegory. Here, the sense is of a dog being told to “Sit!”: the invisible world, as engaged by the Gnostic enquirer, being taken out of play by the Pauline Catholic.

Exeter’s short speech in conclusion bears the hallmarks of the high style of Bacon. The sense here is the same as in his cameo in III, i: the written word in its oracular aspect, and retaining its capacity to shatter the Puritan ego, through its evocation of the Boar.

Now incipient Puritan reason will fail in its attempt to dominate

Nature (hopeless position of Talbot before Bordeaux). The forces of Somerset (horse) have failed to join those of York (men) to aid Talbot. It is later made clear that this is York's fault, not Somerset's. This represents again the uselessness of Puritan reason. William Lucy was Sheriff of Warwick under Henry VI, but is introduced unhistorically here, for the purpose of the allegory. His name analyses to "will-I-am" and "light" (< Latin lux, lucis). He is Talbot's man, and bears the same value as Joan on the walls of Rouen, with blazing torch held high, - of the unseen world imagined in the powerful mind of the Gnostic enquirer, and brought to the surface by it. Here is the first reference in the histories to the Resurrection of William Shakespeare, in London, through the healing ministry of Sir Francis Bacon and the Gnostic tradition:

Lucy I'll bear them hence: but from their ashes shall be reared
 A phoenix that shall make all France afear'd.

The boy often bears in FF the value of the libido (e.g. in HV). Children are pure expressions of the will-to-life, after all: the will(s)-to-survival and -power initially, with superaddition of the will-to-eros after puberty. This is made explicit in the name "John" given to Talbot's son - this name always signifying the libido/invisible world (cf. Falstaff, Stanley and King John (unconscious)) - and also here:

Talbot Shall all thy mother's hopes lie in one tomb?
John I, rather than I'll shame my mother's womb.

Again we return to square one, with reason (Talbot père) embracing the invisible world (Talbot fils): the two principles working together (father rescuing son from the Bastard of Orleans; later, son rescuing father). The Bastard bears also (here as in the roughly contemporary King John) the value of the libido, or invisible world, as immanent in the object of the reason's study. Thus it is he whom John Talbot grapples: the reasoning ego's appreciation of the Faustian dimension enabling it to discern that realm in the object of study. Now, with denial of the libido by the Puritan (death of John), his faculty of reason is also worthless

(death of Talbot), and all is lost. The choreography is precise, father following son to death, and is not thus described in Holinshed.

ACT V

It will be emphasised in the later plays that the goal of the Journey of the Hero, or the Ring/Grail Quest, is the wisdom derived from knowledge of the invisible world, the Faustian dimension that lies beneath the surface of apparent forms of Nature. This is the focus of properly Gnostic engagement with Nature, as represented here by Gloucester, and Talbot as victor at Orleans. Furthermore, it is the written word that is identified as the means of that Journey. Thus in CYM it is Imogen who is the Queen of Hell, Goddess of the Invisible World, while Posthumus Leonatus is the questing hero. A ring and diamond feature prominently in CYM, undoubtedly in reference to the famed Ring and Schamir of King Solomon, another Ring Lord.¹¹ A diamond also features here, as a gift from King Henry to Reignier d'Anjou, father of his prospective bride Margaret, who is herself, as will be abundantly demonstrated in 2&3HVI, another Queen of Hell-Grail Queen of the plays, to join Joan of Arc, Imogen, Portia, Cordelia, and the rest. It is the thwarting of a Ring Quest that is being adumbrated here, in Henry's acceptance of Margaret, against the advice of Gloucester. Acceptance of the Quest is represented by Henry's proposed betrothal to the daughter of the Earl of Armagnac, as arranged by Gloucester. Yet it will be refused, - the Faustian dimension denied by the Puritan, only to surge back into consciousness to precipitate Shakespeare's breakdown of 1587 (curse of Margaret in RIII); and the culprit is named as, au fond, the Roman Church:

Winchester Humphrey of Gloucester, thou shalt well perceive
 That neither in birth or for authority
 The bishop will be overborne by thee:
 I'll either make thee stoop and bend thy knee,
 Or sack this country with a mutiny.

The next scenes, - in Angiers and York's camp in Anjou, - of York's

¹¹ Gardner, Realm of the Ring Lords.

capture and eventual execution of Joan, record the Puritan's victory over the underworld aspect of Nature, which will be proved to be utterly spurious and delusory (curse of Margaret, who will be identified with Joan in subtle ways). Accordingly, the notorious Puritan witch hunt is represented in Joan's association with the spirit world in V, iii. Suffolk's attachment to Margaret d'Anjou is mentioned in the sources, but not this warm love, verging on the erotic. Suffolk is the ithyphallic/maypole principle, more broadly the unseen world, whose murder by Sir Walter Whitmore in 2HVI IV, i, (again, a character missing from the sources) will signify the anathematisation of that principle by Puritanism: a suppression malignant with Freudian potential, as the events of RIII will show. It is the Faustian dimension that lies, of course, at the bottom of the ithyphallos: hence the exceptional closeness of Suffolk and Margaret, which will continue in 2HVI. Here, however, the Puritan is in the ascendant, and the ithyphallos-Queen of Hell nexus is denied:

Suffolk O! wert thou for myself! But Suffolk, stay;
 Thou mayst not wander in that labyrinth;
 There Minotaurs and ugly treasons lurk...

These are the treasons of the body, which will rebel against the Puritan tyranny, to plunge Shakespeare into hell (RIII III, iv).

It is of the deepest significance that the diamond is presented to Reignier d'Anjou, to identify him as a Ring/Grail Lord (the two traditions being essentially the same¹²). 1HVI here steps beyond the sources to flesh out his character in this regard. Baigent et al. in their *The Holy Blood and the Holy Grail* give a beautiful discussion of this remarkable man, and his pre-eminent role in the rise of the High Renaissance. Reignier (Réné) d'Anjou was a guardian of the broadly Gnostic tradition, which the Roman Church had tried for centuries to obliterate, and an avid student of the Ring/Grail Quest. He came to hold a vast number of titles, including Count of Guise, King of Naples and Sicily, and King of Jerusalem – the last purely titular, yet of great influence in European royal circles. It was his visit to Cosimo de'

¹² Gardner, *ibid*; *All's Well That Ends Well*.

Medici that almost certainly prompted the inception of the latter's collection of esoteric manuscripts - Platonic, Neoplatonic, Pythagorean, Hermetic, and so on - which would find a home in the newly built Library of San Marco, which represented the first challenge to the Church's monopoly over public education. Of the highest relevance to 1HVI, he is the dominant figure, along with his mother Iolande, a favourite of the Dauphin's court, in the patronage and rise to power of Joan of Arc, and was even thought to be her lover.

Réné d'Anjou was therefore a key figure in the genesis of the new Christian Cabalism, which took definite form in Florence toward the end of the 15th century, in the persons of Pico dell Mirandola and Marsilio Ficino, under the patronage of Cosimo de' Medici, and which would come to influence so profoundly the Elizabethan philosophers, including Bacon, probably via John Dee and his magnificent library.¹³ He is explicitly named here as "King of Naples", and later "King of Naples and Jerusalem", the last title having been instituted after the capture of Jerusalem and its Temple by Godfroi de Bouillon in 1099, to be followed immediately by the formation of the famed Knights Templar. The purpose of this conquest was certainly to retrieve a store of lost wisdom of the Jerusalem Church, which would come to inform the activities of the Templars.¹⁴ The Temple of Jerusalem was built, of course, by King Solomon, whose wisdom would become legendary; and his Schamir is vividly present, as the diamond, here in 1HVI, and in CYM; while his Ring also features prominently in this latter, as well as the contemporary *The Winter's Tale*, and so many of the other plays.

There is a further King Solomon connection in FF, in the repeated references to a Queen of Hell figure as "black and fair" or "foul and fair" (e.g. *Love's Labour's Lost* IV, iii, 259; V, ii, 20; *Macbeth* I, i, 10). This is undoubtedly a reference to the Biblical Song of Solomon, where the lover of the Solomon-figure says "Black am I, and fair" (*melaine eimi kai kale*). We recall also the

¹³ Dame Frances Yates, *ibid*; Baigent and Leigh, *The Elixir and the Stone*.

¹⁴ This is a fascinating and complicated area of study, to which Michael Baigent and his co-writers do brilliant justice in their *The Holy Blood and the Holy Grail*. See also, of course, the epochal works of Christopher Knight and Robert Lomas: *The Hiram Key*, *Uriel's Machine*, and *The Second Messiah*.

book of The Wisdom of Solomon: and the source of this wisdom was the invisible world, or Faustian dimension, as represented by the Queen of Hell figure in the Song. Just so is it represented in the plays, by the Katherines of LLL, HV, TOS, and elsewhere, and by Portia, Cordelia, Imogen, and their kin. The Faustian dimension is represented in HAM by the brook; and Cordelia floating supine on it, singing, is the Holy Spirit (female in the Gnostic tradition, before its corruption by Pauline Christianity), - the "Spirit that moves on the face of the waters", nothing less, - Who is the female gnosis of the wisdom of Sophia. The point is repeatedly and emphatically made in FF that the goal of the Ring/Grail Quest - the Holy Grail itself - is the wisdom based on knowledge of the unseen world as described in the written word (see especially the characters of Perdita and Antigonus in TWT), the primacy of which was central to the philosophy of Sir Francis Bacon. This is the golden thread that winds a course through the tapestry of FF, to hold it all together: a production of awesome consistency and philosophical depth, in which King Solomon as Ring Lord has a starring role.

Margaret is to be identified here, as is Joan, with the lover of the Song of Solomon; and Joan's plea that she is carrying the child of Reignier d'Anjou is an explicit reference to what was believed in Elizabethan times of their relationship, with overtones of the Song. Joan's death at the hands of York will represent the suppression of the invisible world by the Puritan; and Margaret, as Queen of Henry the Sixth, the persistence of that principle in the unconscious, buried but very much alive. At this stage the ego is still Catholic or Merrie in nature (Henry as of the Red Rose faction), although suffering the onset of the Puritan disease, with his decline into its terminal stages to be represented by the death of Henry and coronation of Edward IV in 3HVI. The shepherd's vehement protestation of his fatherhood of Joan, as matched by that of Joan's insistence on her noble ancestry (V, iv), is another way of saying that "black is fair": that the Queen of Hell is a property both of the earth and of the highest Gnostic nobility.

Here are two more "I"'s for "Ay"'s, in exactly the right place:

Joan ...Whose maiden-blood thus rigorously effused

Will cry for vengeance, at the gates of Heaven.

York I, I: away with her to execution.

The Puritan thinks to have conquered Nature: a tragic delusion, as will strike Shakespeare on that day in 1587:

York [to Dauphin] Then swear allegiance to his majesty;
As thou art knight, never to disobey
Nor be rebellious to the crown of England.

Margaret will not bring a dowry: for the Puritan does not partake of the richness of the Gnostic tradition, which is upheld by Gloucester (soon to be eclipsed in 2HVI) in his opposition to the marriage. There is a strong microcosmic element here, suggestive of the influence of Shakespeare, although the verse still seems to be Marlowe's:

King Henry I feel such sharp dissension in my breast,
Such fierce alarums both of hope and fear,
As I am sick with working of my thoughts.

This is the sickness of Shakespeare as his tower crumbled beneath him aet.15, with the collapse of the pseudo-Alexandrianism of his Tavern phase, to leave him desperately reaching toward the final coping mechanism of Puritanism, beyond which, with its murder of the Goddess in all her aspects, there could be no other.

CHAPTER 2

HENRY THE SIXTH Part 2

The most memorable and striking image in 2HVI is the parading through the streets to her exile of the Duchess of Gloucester, cloaked in a white sheet, with papers pinned to her back, and holding a burning taper. The remainder of FF is rich in these and other symbolic motifs, in density and power of which 2HVI is a quantum jump from its prequel. The papers and taper represent here, as always in the plays, the written word, and the light of the reasoning imagination which acts upon it. The Duke of Gloucester is a Gnostic Christ, or Solomon-figure: the ideal of Ring nobility. His wife is the lover of the Song of Solomon, an underworld Goddess who is “black and fair” and the source of his wisdom. She appears many times throughout FF, in the person of Joan of Arc, Cordelia, Portia, Helena, Kate Minola, and so on. It is emphasised in TWT, as here, that She is to be found in the written word, which was the principal therapeutic tool employed by Sir Francis Bacon in the treatment of Shakespeare, who in 1587 had been devastated by a Puritan-induced severe anxiety/depression neurosis, which had prompted his flight to the metropolis in search of a *vita nuova*. The books referred to here, in the papers pinned to the sheet (her “fairness”, as acted upon by the reasoning imagination), can readily be named. They would include the *Corpus Hermeticum*, Apuleius’ *The Golden Ass*, Pico della Mirandola’s [Cabalist] *Conclusions* (1486), Cornelius Agrippa’s *De occulta philosophia* (1509-10), Francesco Giorgi’s *De harmonia mundi* (1525), and so on: the classic works of the Gnostic, lately Neoplatonic/Christian Cabalist, tradition, which are distinguished from the hitherto dominant teachings of the Roman Church, by their engagement with Nature and lucid exaltation of knowledge over faith. Here this tradition, with all its wisdom, is being suppressed by the upstart Puritan sect (exile of Duchess after arrest by York).

2HVI will examine the continuing growth of Puritanism (ascendancy

of York) in the psyche and the broader society, in which the ithyphallic principle (Suffolk: more broadly, the unseen world, engagement of which was the central pillar of Bacon's philosophy (see Ch.10)) and Queen of Hell-Grail Queen (Margaret), both invested in negative mantle by the Puritan world-view, will be driving forces, culminating in the murder of the former in Act IV, an episode conceived de novo for the allegory, like so much else in the histories. Buckingham makes here his first appearance of many in the histories, - the last being in HVIII, - yoked, as always, to the principle of the unconscious. Let us now take up our accustomed drill, to reveal the deepest level of detail of 2HVI.

ACT I

Suffolk has promoted the marriage of Margaret, daughter of the Duke of Anjou, to the King, as mentioned in Holinshed; yet the intimacy of their relationship goes far beyond the political affiance described therein, to reflect the immanence of the invisible world of the blind libido beneath the ithyphallos. Her new status as Queen, and Suffolk's as Duke, mark the beginning of the anathematisation of their principles by Puritanism. Gloucester casting away the paper on which is written the cession of Maine and Anjou to the Duke of Anjou represents the denial of the wisdom of the Gnostic written word: for René Anjou is cousin germaine to Gloucester as a Gnostic Christ/Solomon, and his retention of the counties at the expense of King Henry represents the diminution of the Gloucester principle in the incipient Puritan ego. At this early stage, however, it is the repudiation of this principle by the Roman Church that is emphasised (Beaufort's reading of the letter), as the fons et origo of the Puritan error. It is Suffolk ("I" principle in negative aspect, as yet as still cast by Catholicism) who has allowed the cession of the counties.

2HVI was almost certainly the first of the trilogy to be written, possibly as early as the late 1580's; and here we see the first appearance in FF of a key symbolic motif:

Cardinal ...For France, 'tis ours; and we will keep it still.
Gloucester I uncle...

Where "I" for "Ay" stands for the ithyphallos, a manifestation of

the Faustian dimension, over which the Queen of Hell (here Margaret) reigns. This is so at the every appearance without exception of this substitution in FF. The cardinal will be identified again with this principle (II, i):

Gloucester I my good cardinal, how think you by that?
Were it not good your grace could fly to heaven?

As it will also appear in the duel between Peter and Thomas (II, iii), who will be shown to represent the Pauline (Roman) Church and Puritanism respectively, the latter having not yet anathematised the libido, in its later characteristic way, and therefore destined to lose this test of power (ultimately spurious) over the invisible (Faustian) aspect of Nature:

York ...So please your highness to behold the fight.
Queen [Margaret] I, good my lord.

The duel is yoked in this way to the arrest of Eleanor, Duchess of Gloucester (the Ring Queen, identified with Margaret):

Bolingbroke ...will her ladyship behold and here our exorcisms?
Hume I, what else?

There is a point of fundamental importance being made here. It was a feature of the new Christian Cabalism, or Renaissance Neoplatonism, under whose auspices the First Folio was written, that its Gnostic enquiry enabled a transcendence of the libido, broadly the will-to-life, - the will(s)-to-survival, -eros, and -power, - through engagement with it (cf. the “ford” motif in FF, as opposed to the “bridge”). Through understanding of the invisible world, its power could be broken: an axiom expressed in the work of the great modern scientists, depth psychologists, and artists. This was symbolised by the half-starved dog in Albrecht Dürer’s *Melencolia I* (fig.1), and later by the bony nag Rosinante in Cervantes’ *Don Quixote*, and the equally feeble though endearing Bill the pony in Tolkien’s *Lord of the Rings*. The Roman Church, in its vicious suppression of the Gnostic tradition, which had hardened towards

the end of the 16th century, after an initial period of acceptance of Christian Cabalism, was therefore still at the mercy of the libido, a component of the invisible world, which it continued to admit as will and idea. It worshipped a Goddess (Who is nature divinised) after all, albeit an imperfect one, in the Virgin Mary. This is exemplified by the notorious libidinousness of the clergy, and the British maypole rites of the First of May (cf. the symbolism of “I may” in HV II, i). It was this vulnerability to the underworld in destructive mode that drove the Puritan reaction, in its complete extirpation of the libido as will and idea from the psyche: a triumph of positive thinking, yet ultimately spurious, as based on denial rather than engagement of the underworld.

Accordingly, Salisbury and Warwick now protest the iniquity of the decision of Suffolk (“I” principle): the former bearing the value of the impulse to well-being, the latter of psychic turmoil (see Ch.3): for the ego is now unsettled by the loss of its power over Nature in destructive mode, as allowed by the Roman Church. The next phase in the process should be espousal of Puritanism, as a defence against this Rome-induced vulnerability: and so it is, with the immediate entry of York into the argument, on the side of Salisbury and Warwick.

This central theme of FF, of the nature of Puritanism as a defensive reaction to the helplessness vis-à-vis Nature resulting from the Roman Church’s suppression of the Gnostic tradition, is now expressed in a different way: 1) Cardinal Beaufort (formerly Bishop of Winchester) drives Gloucester from the stage; 2) He now announces his intention to depose him, with the help of Suffolk, Somerset, and Buckingham, and himself exits; 3) Buckingham and Somerset plot his demise in turn. Phase one of this intricate dance represents the persecution of the Gnostic Christ by Rome; phase two, Rome’s delusion that it has conquered by this measure the invisible world; phase three, the truth of its extreme vulnerability to this world. Buckingham makes his first appearance of many in the histories as the unconscious; while Somerset bears the value of the libido, Suffolk of the “I” principle. The choreography again is precise, as Buckingham and Somerset exit, leaving Salisbury, then Warwick, then York, to speak up against Beaufort (Puritanism as a reaction to Rome). There is a distinctly clunky legerdemain here,

far below the standard of the others we will note in abundance in the plays to come, and an index almost certainly to the hand of Marlowe; yet it is of great import:

Warwick Unto the maine?

O father, Maine is lost,

That maine which by maine force Warwick did win

And would have kept, so long as his breath did last:

Main-chance father you meant, but I meant Maine,

Which I will win from France, or else be slain

The city of Maine is being identified here with “main[e]”, i.e. “the sea”. The sea bears here its age-old mythic value of the unconscious: the point being made that control over the unconscious, which is the invisible world of the psyche, has been ceded by Rome to Nature, and that the psychic turmoil induce thereby will drive the ego toward Puritanism in order to recover it. York is now left alone to adumbrate his overthrow of the Lancaster line (tyranny of Puritanism).

It is the Queen of Hell, the Ring/Grail Queen Herself, Who is the power behind the throne of the Gnostic tradition (Duchesses’ prodding of Gloucester to advance himself); but this tradition is being buried by Puritanism (Gloucester’s reluctance to do so). It is the libido and ithyphallos in negative aspect, as representatives of the invisible world, that are behind it (Gloucester’s dream that his staff is broken in two, with the severed heads of Somerset and Suffolk placed on the ends).

The challenge for the author now was to depict the witch-hunts of the Catholic Inquisition and Puritan tyrannies, with the victim of this persecution ultimately the Ring/Grail Queen Herself. This is the purpose of the device of the bribe paid by Beaufort and Suffolk to Sir John Hume to procure the spirit-conjurers for the Duchess. He has already been paid by Eleanor; but the bribe is much larger: for the witch-hunts were fanatical, with witchcraft imputed to many who were innocent of it. “Eleanor”, the name of the Duchess, suggests both “hell” and gold” (cf. “black and fair”); while Southwell and Hume, the procurers, are both “Johns”, to signify their association with the unconscious (as the value borne by King John in the eponymous play, entirely from the pen of Bacon, and

roughly contemporary with 1-3HVI). The names "Hume" and "Southwell" have a contemporary resonance, but are powerfully suggestive on the plane of allegory, so that their choice is unlikely to have been random. "Hume" may plausibly have been derived from the Latin humus, "earth", "soil" (this would have been an easy one for Marlowe, Bacon, or Shakespeare). This would be consistent with his role, for it is from the material world itself that the Ring Queen's magic springs. "Southwell" suggests the underworld, and the "well of wisdom"; and Ring Queens were associated with fountains, springs, or wells, in this tradition (e.g. Tolkien's Galadriel; Melusine; Lorna Doone). It is Southwell who writes down the oracles of the spirits, to signify the written word, which is once again identified as the vector of the Gnostic wisdom in question in FF. York peruses the oracles in his arrest of Eleanor (Puritan suppression of the Holy Grail and its wisdom). He is accompanied by Buckingham (unconscious), just as is Beaufort by Suffolk ("I" principle): for it is the unconscious, and its contents of the ithyphallos-libido in negative aspect, - more broadly the unseen world, - that has been driving the assault against witchcraft, and the Ring/Grail tradition, by Rome and the Puritan sect.

This denial of the invisible world as a characteristic of Puritanism, is put in a different way in the Peter-Thomas Horner dispute, the scenes of which intermit those of the germane arrest and exile of Eleanor, Duchess of Gloucester (Ring Queen: Goddess of the Underworld). It is a beautiful piece of choreography. Dissolution in libido will be represented here as always (cf. Sir Toby Belch; Stephano-Trinculo; Falstaff; &c.) by the drunkenness of Horner and the companions of Peter, though not, significantly, Peter himself, in the fight scene (II, iii), which Peter's sobriety will help him win against the odds. Yet the prevailing sense of the scene remains one of drunkenness. This is an adroit legerdemain, of a sort of which we will note many examples in the plays to come. The challenge was to show that Puritanism could never supplant the power of Catholic/Merrie England so long as it shared its general libidinousness (libido in its broad sense of "will-to-life"), as expressed in, for example, the theatre, whose tutelary god is ever Dionysius (and Falstaff is a Dionysius-analogue). Puritanism represents, if you like, a triumph of positive thinking, wherein the

victory over the Faustian dimension is thought to be total. Yet this delusion can only be maintained by the total suppression of the imagination: ideas always tending to foster Platonic Ideas, in which the roots of the visible world in the invisible are acknowledged. The crucial principle of the visual imagination, acting in concert with reason, is represented in FF by the numerous torches, tapers, and Watches: the Watch in the last scene of R&J representing, for example, the reinvigoration of this principle in the ego-in-transformation, after the psychological coup which had brought to a shattering end his enthrallment by Puritanism (death of Romeo), - the inner life in question ultimately being Shakespeare's. Herein will also be found the reason for Hamlet's shirking of the killing of King Claudius. In II, iii, the sense is that the drunkenness of the two parties is equal; the abstention of Peter serving to enable the victory of his principle. Peter bears here, as always without exception in FF, the value of the Roman Catholic Church, as a reference of course to St. Peter, the "rock" on which it was built. "Thomas" (the "doubter" of the New Testament) as the name of his opponent is utterly consistent with this.

Following the first Peter-Thomas episode there is a terse exchange, the object of which is to dispose of the Gnostic Christ. York (Puritanism) and Somerset (Catholic England) are at loggerheads over who should be regent of France (the dominant world-view). The choreography is closely wrought in the extreme. Initially York will be favoured; but the decision reversed in light of the petitioners' dispute (libido embraced by Puritan world-view would be a fatal flaw). Warwick and Salisbury consistently are antipathetic to Somerset (anxiety for well-being at bottom of rejection of Catholic world-view). The investment in negativity by Rome of the libido, unconscious, and Queen of Hell, all in negative aspect, has sabotaged the Gnostic tradition (rounding of Somerset, Buckingham and Margaret on Gloucester, prompting his exit). Margaret now trounces Eleanor with her fan (negative Queen of Hell means suppression of Holy Grail). Gloucester is reborn in a negative sense, having, on the plane of allegory, been hanged ("choler" as a homophone of "collar": cf. R&J I, i, 3-4). The suppression of the Gnostic tradition by Rome now invites the Puritan ascendancy (Gloucester's determination that York shall be

Regent); which fails, at this stage, because of its continued acknowledgement of the invisible world (Suffolk leading in Peter and Thomas, as a rebuke to Warwick). Now comes the arrest of Eleanor, whose exile in II, iv, will follow hard upon the victory of Peter (Catholic England still subject to unseen world) to mark the beginning of the correction of the notional fatal flaw in Catholicism, in the Puritan's total denial of the Faustian dimension. The primacy of this dimension, the invisible aspect of Nature lying beneath the visible, was central to the philosophy of Sir Francis Bacon (see Ch.10), as indeed it remains to that of the modern depth psychologist, scientist, or artist (whose gifts we now take for granted); and its prominence in this analysis of the pathogenesis of the Puritan error, is an index to the definitive influence of Bacon on 1-3HVI, albeit from behind the scenes.

ACT II

Peter's victory will come in II, iii; before which there are two scenes of relevance to it. II, i, describes a hawking party, in which Gloucester's hawks go higher than the rest:

Suffolk My Lord Protector's hawks do tower so well;
 They know their master loves to be aloft,
 And bears his thoughts above the falcon's pitch.

This confirms his allegoric value as a Gnostic Christ/Alexander/Solomon, albeit the ideal here is a variant of them: for the falcon was a symbol of Egyptian God Horus, with whom the living Pharaoh was identified. The Hermetic priesthood were also identified as "Sons of Horus";¹ and there was a highly significant component of the Egyptian Hermetic magical tradition in the new Christian Cabalism, which influenced Bacon and his circle so profoundly,² as is abundantly shown in FF, where magic (e.g. of Prospero) sits beside the symbols of Christianity (e.g. the Antony of A&C V as a resurrected Christ). The Egyptian connection

¹ See Alan F. Alford's astonishing *The Phoenix Solution* for the best synthesis of the bewildering maze of Egyptian religion, in which a plethora of academic commentators wander lost but happy.

² Dame Frances Yates, *The Occult Philosophy in the Elizabethan Age*.

³ Knight and Lomas, *The Hiram Key*.

is obvious too in TOS, where the Widow is a reference to the Goddess Isis: for Freemasons style themselves "Sons of the Widow" even now. Bacon was formally received into the Masonic brotherhood by King James in 1603.³ Gloucester's value could not be plainer.

Here, however, the Gnostic tradition is being ploughed under by Rome (the Beaufort-Gloucester quarrel). The lack of awareness of this conflict at the root of Puritanism is beautifully represented by King Henry's witless inability to hear their argument, which they convince him is about the hawking, rather than a bitter personal antipathy. There is an abundance of quotations from the Latin, here and in the previous Act, which is diagnostic of the pen of Marlowe. Bacon and his pupil Shakespeare, on the other hand, were only concerned with Latin in so far as English words could be derived from it: their linguistic concern being, above all, for the English language, the vulgar tongue which they determined to mould into a vehicle for the highest art, as Dante had done for Italian. From the Catholic-Gnostic (Beaufort-Gloucester) conflict there will be born the Puritan world-feeling:

King Henry When such strings jar, what hope of harmony?
 I pray, my lords, let me compound this strife.

There follows immediately the episode of the miraculous curing of Simpcox of his blindness, exposed by Gloucester as fake. Simpcox is identified with the ithyphallic principle, more broadly the unseen world, as two more "I"'s for "Ay"'s make plain. The final whipping of Simpcox over the fields by Gloucester, per the Beadle, represents the subduing of the Faustian dimension of Nature by the Christian Cabalist. One recalls the total subjugation of Kate Minola by Petruchio in TOS, an emphasis which jars with so many readers... but more of that later. The tightly wrought nature of the Simpcox scene as allegory strongly suggests the hand of Bacon, who will be shown to have been alone responsible for TOS. Gloucester's besting of Simpcox has already been described in a different way, in Gloucester's reply of "I go" (cf. Suffolk in III, ii, and many other instances in FF of this technique) to the King's invitation to the hawking (I, ii): hence the Simpcox episode is right

where it should be.

The Peter-Thomas fight is played out in II, iii, immediately after the suppression of the Gnostic tradition (Gloucester's surrender of his staff, after the impeachment of Eleanor). The witch and the three helpers will be executed, but she sent into exile: for, although many a witch may be burnt and Gnostic text banned, the Ring/Grail tradition will endure. Immediately after, in II, iv, we have the shame and banishment of Eleanor (see above). It is of the highest significance that she is accompanied in her exile by Sir John Stanley, whose first name suggests his value of the unconscious (cf. ultimately King John, who bears this value in the eponymous play, from the pen of Bacon alone); his second name the libido, as the value borne by George Stanley (Lord Derby) in RIII. The Sheriff who leads them away represents the ithyphallic principle: "I, I, farewell, thy office is discharged". It is all utterly consistent.

ACT III

The Roman Church (Beaufort), along with the Puritan sect (York) round on the Gnostic tradition (Gloucester), with the underworld (Margaret) and "I" principle (Suffolk), both in negative aspect, at the bottom of all. Beaufort taking Gloucester prisoner may be concretised in the burning of Giordano Bruno at the stake in Rome in 1600 (albeit postdating the play: but nevertheless typical). Immediately the ithyphallos, standing for broader underworld, is identified with the King (Catholic England), to continue the principal theme of the failure of Catholicism to subdue the unseen world:

Queen What, will your highness leave the parliament?

King I Margaret...

The world-feeling of Catholic/Merrie England is, in the absence of the Gnostic tradition, inadequate vis-à-vis Nature (Somerset announcing loss of French kingdoms). Puritanism is in the offing, as York pledges with Margaret and Suffolk to do away with Gloucester. Puritanism will entail a war against the unconscious (York's Irish campaign: this country representing the unconscious throughout the histories).

The Act will end with the stemming of the influence of Rome

(ignoble death of Beaufort), and Act IV will begin with the suppression of the "I" principle (murder of Suffolk): two notable landmarks in the ascendancy of Puritanism. The anxiety incited by the void left by the absent Gnostic tradition (distress of Henry at Gloucester's Death) is reflected in the prominence of Warwick and Salisbury in III, ii. The beginnings of Puritanism's anathematisation of the Suffolk principle is represented by Henry's shunning of him, as well as Margaret, whose survival, full of curses, into RIII, will reflect the Freudian potentiality of the suppression of their principles. This is continued in Warwick's contention with him, and his recommendation to the King that Suffolk be banished, which is willingly agreed to. We are seeing here a treatment of the problem highlighted by Peter's victory over Thomas Horner: the vulnerability of the Catholic to the Faustian dimension being addressed by the Puritan's total suppression of that world as both will (his own inner erotic dimension) and idea.

The malignant potentiality of this suppression is suggested by the warmest of intimate farewells from Margaret to Suffolk: for his principle will live on, on the plane of allegory, in hers, buried but not dead in the unconscious and the invisible world, and primed to cause havoc, of the sort represented by the breakdown suffered by Shakespeare in 1587 (RIII III, iv). Here, though, the macrocosmic aspect predominates: Marlowe being concerned with the general import of the suppression, rather than its tragic expression in the life of Shakespeare. Suffolk's "I go", where "I" stands for the ithyphallic principle, adumbrates the death of this principle in IV, i (murder of Suffolk).

The shameful death of Beaufort's death in the short III, iii, is a trenchant shot at the ignobility of the Roman Church:

Cardinal If thou be'st death, I'll give thee England's treasure,
Enough to purchase such another island,
So thou wilt let me live, and feel no pain.

ACT IV

The high style of Bacon has not been evident since the fifteen-line cameo of Exeter in 1HVI III, ii. Now here it is again, in the exquisite miniature of the Captain's opening speech:

Captain The gaudy, blabbing, and remorseful day
 Is crept into the bosom of the sea,
 And now loud-howling wolves arouse the jades
 That drag the tragic melancholy night...

The linguistic and metaphorical richness, high philosophising, and powerful poetic imagination of this style make it unmistakable, as the chapters to come will show. All too soon Marlowe takes up the baton, which he fumbles but manages to retain. It is an ugly though winning run, a spluttering two-stroke to the high-tech engine – smooth, subtle, silent – of Bacon’s allegorising, some techniques of which have already been noted, with many more to come:

Suffolk A cunning man did calculate my birth,
 And told me that by Water I should die:
 Yet let this not make thee be bloody-minded;
 Thy name is – Gaultier, being rightly sounded.
Whitmore Gaultier, or Walter, which it is I care not...

This achieves its purpose, for all its clunkiness, of highlighting the murder of Suffolk as representing the anathematisation of the ithyphallic/maypole principle by Puritanism. The French gaultier means “he who wields a long pole”; while “Whitmore” analyses to “white” and “death” (<French mort). The name “Walter Whitmore” therefore means “White death of the “I” principle”: i.e. its slaughter by the White Rose (Puritan) faction.

The broad lines of the rebel insurrection were taken from the source; but there are major variations from Holinshed’s account that point clearly to these scenes as a representation of the utilitarian baseness of the Puritan rabble. First among these is the Cade faction’s assault on the written word:

Clerk Sir, I thank God, I have been so well brought up, that I can
 write my name.
All He hath confessed: away with him! He’s a villain and a traitor.
Cade Away with him! I say: hang him with his pen and inkhorn

about his neck.

The “I” of Cade’s “I say” signifies the “I” principle as subject of the written word in question. Elsewhere they express their suspicion of the sophistication and magic of the written word (the magic, for example, of the great Christian Cabalist texts, such as Giorgi’s *De harmonia mundi*). It reaches a crescendo in the murder of Lord Say, who appears briefly in *Holinshed*, but is magnified considerably here, to represent command over the spoken and written word.

The Puritan world-view is born of the negative *ithyphallos*/maypole, as representative of the unseen world:

Cade Marry, this Edmund Mortimer Earl of March married the
Duke of Clarence’ daughter, did he not?
Stafford I sir.
Cade By her he had two children at one birth.
Brother That’s false.
Cade I, there’s the question.

The character of Alexander Iden, and his walled garden, described in *Hall*, presented the playwright with a beautiful opportunity to portray the ideal of defeat of the Puritan tyranny by Christian Cabalism. Cade’s followers have been arrested; while he has escaped, and after five days of hunger for meat finds himself in the garden. “Iden” may be formed from the Greek *idein*, meaning “to see”, whence “idea” (as discussed in the *Asclepian* discourse in the *Hermetica*, which the inspirational John Dee would certainly have had in his library); while “Alexander” suggests, of course, Alexander the Great, who represents the Gnostic ideal (see above) throughout the plays. The name in toto therefore signifies the primacy of the visual imagination in the attainment of Gnostic nobility, which is stressed so often throughout the plays, as represented by the numerous torches, tapers, and Watches. The word “paradise” is derived from the Persian for “walled enclosure”, “orchard”, and was naturally associated with the Garden of Eden in the Bible; but its provenance is in fact much older: witness the Garden of the Hesperides of Greek myth, with its golden apples,

the afterworld to which sacred kings were transported after death. The walls make the garden a temenos, or sacred space; with the fruits therein, their roundness set against an azure sky, symbols of wisdom and immortality (cf. the Biblical Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, and Tree of Immortal Life). Here, however, there is none of the Pauline Christian sense of exclusion from paradise, which the Gnostic heresy holds, on the contrary, to be available to anyone through inward psychological devotion: for the Gnostic Christ (Alexander Iden) walks therein. Cade's hunger for meat rather than the fruits of the garden (not mentioned in the sources) signifies the Puritan's rejection of Faustian wisdom.

The theme of the gardener as cognate with the alchemist was central to the Gnostic tradition, as symbolising the bringing forth of what is latent in nature; and given Bacon's status as an exemplary adept of this tradition, it is no surprise to find gardens and gardeners featuring often in FF. Michael Baigent and Richard Leigh in their *The Elixir and the Stone* quote an illustrative passage from Prest's *The Garden of Eden*:

...the value of a botanic garden was that it conveyed a direct knowledge of God. Since each plant was a created thing, and God had revealed a part of himself in each thing that he created, a complete collection of all the things created by God must reveal God completely. Given the supposed relation between the macrocosm and the microcosm, the man who knew nature best knew most about himself.

Here we recall the axiom "Know thyself" which was inscribed above the lintel of the Temple of Apollo at Delphi, which plays such an important role in *The Winter's Tale*, and elsewhere in FF. It is no surprise that Bacon's *Essays* includes one on gardens, wherein thirty of the thirty-three flowers mentioned in the *Complete Works* are to be found. The Cade-Iden episode serves as an examination of the ideal outcome; while the return of York from Ireland in arms signifies that this ideal does not obtain, as the day of the Puritan tyranny draws near.

ACT V

Here is another tight and dynamic piece of choreography. York's return from Ireland, with sedition on his mind, represents the advance of the Puritan error; his abandonment of that plan, when given news by Buckingham that Somerset (libido) is locked in the Tower, the forestalling of the Puritan ascendancy by the ego's espousal of Christian Cabalism: the Tower symbolising, here as in 1HVI I, iii-iv, the Gnostic tradition, - ultimately derived from the Tower card of the Tarot Major Arcana, -which has whipped the underworld into submission, as Gloucester did to Simpcox in II, i. This was put a different way by Iden's slaying of Cade; and he now enters, right on cue, with the head. This ideal does not obtain, however; the Gnostic tradition has been suppressed: and the libido and underworld aspect of Nature go unchecked (Somerset at large with Margaret). The allegory now takes a subtle turn, as Clifford and the word-weapons of Richard fils and Edward are identified with the "I" principle:

Clifford To bedlam with him, is the man grown mad.

King I Clifford...

[...]

Queen His sons (he says) shall give their words for him.

York Will you not, sons?

Edward I noble father, if our words will serve.

Richard And if our words will not, then our weapons shall.

The point is being doubly made here: the words, as linked to "I", and the weapons (swords) per se, both symbolising that principle, now property of the Catholic, rather than the Puritan at large. This is another way – cognate with the murder of Suffolk - of expressing the remediation of the fault exposed earlier by the defeat of the drunken Thomas by the not quite so drunken Peter. The bail is not accepted by Henry; but Clifford emerges all the same to bear its value. The identification of Clifford with the "I" principle (taking over this role from Suffolk) will be abundantly confirmed in 3HVI, by a flood of "I"'s for "Ay"'s linked to his son of the same name. The supersession of Suffolk by Clifford, and the latter by his son, are further examples of the technique, common in FF, of returning to square one to make a further point, or simply to emphasise. In the

case of the histories, this is most often determined by the exigencies of the pre-existing plot: another expression of the axiom, dear to the artist, that “Form is the obstacle that brings creativity to birth”. The ego, anxious for his own well-being, which remains threatened by the Roman suppression of the Gnostic tradition, sets the anathematised libido to replace the sacralised libido (entry of Warwick and Salisbury, followed by conflict of parties).

In the battle of St. Albans, the horses of York and Clifford represent the libido, as sourced by the playwright from Socrates’ famous metaphor in Plato’s *Phaedrus*. This is the case at the every appearance of the horse or horse-and rider throughout FF, with some few exceptions in 1-3HVI, suggesting perhaps the independence of Marlowe. Their mutual slaying signifies here, as does Richard’s killing of Somerset, and York’s of Clifford père (although with the focus shifted slightly), the suppression of this principle by the Puritan. The choreography is precise, as Warwick enters first to confront Clifford, then is supplanted by York: anxiety being the driving motivation behind the Puritan reaction. Drunkenness represents always in the plays the state of possession by the libido (e.g. Falstaff, Sir Toby Belch, Stephano-Trinculo, &c): so that it is utterly appropriate that Richard should leave the dead Somerset “underneath an ale-house’ paltry sign”. The Puritan victory over the Faustian dimension remains spurious, however, and malignant with latent potential, to be realised so tragically, and decisively for Western culture, in the breakdown which would strike Shakespeare in 1587 (RIII, III, iv).

Young Clifford

Henceforth I will not have to do with pity.
Meet I an infant of the house of York,
Into as many gobbets will I cut it
As wild Medea young Absirtis did.

CHAPTER 3

HENRY THE SIXTH Part 3

Like 2HVI, 3HVI follows its main sources more closely than 1HVI, consistent with its earlier date of composition, when the possibilities of the allegorical technique were still coming to birth. Yet there are some variations from Hall and Holinshed which point unmistakeably to 3HVI as a continuation of the allegory of the monstrous birth of Puritanism, so auspiciously begun in its predecessors. Among these are the momentous debut (I, iv) in FF of the device of the napkin/kerchief, which always symbolises, as a reference to menstruation (most vividly in *Othello*, where it is woven with strawberries), the Goddess as Woman, Whom the Puritan will anathematise; the presence of Richard at the murder of Clifford; and the flight of Richard and Hastings over the stage in the startling scene – the first in the trilogy to indicate, in its intimacy and personal detail, irrefragably the hand of William Shakespeare – of King Edward's betrayal by the Red Rose forces (IV, iii). It is fascinating, as always, to track the technique of the playwright as he selects judiciously from the material available in the sources, and mixes and matches for the purpose of the allegory, often with scant regard for the given chronology; then reinforces it all with an abundance of "I"'s for "Ay"'s at exquisitely chosen points: to secrete in this "fantasia on historical themes" the tightest of philosophical theses.

ACT I

Young Clifford emerges into prominence to perpetuate his father's principle ("I"). The treaty, soon to be broken, between York and the King, follows closely the account in Hall. There is a startling departure, however, when a messenger announces to the Yorkists that Queen Margaret is nigh, with a siege in the offing:

Gabriel ..And therefore fortify your hold, my lord.

York I, with my sword...
 Edward and Richard, you shall stay with me,
 My brother Montague shall post to London.
Montague Brother, I go...

The sword or dagger represents throughout the plays (though not invariably in the Marlovian 1-3HVI) the ithyphallos, more broadly the unseen world, as does “I” for “Ay” (invariably in 1-3HVI). Montague bears the priceless symbolic value of the visual imagination (see below), the suppression of which is a definitive trait of Puritanism: and his reply signifies the banishment of this faculty, along with the “I” principle: a delusive victory, merely a sweeping under the carpet, where they will remain undiminished. This episode works especially powerfully on the microcosmic plane, which may be taken to refer to the psychic conflict of Shakespeare-as-incipient Puritan: the invisible world (Queen) of the libido exciting an ithyphallos (“I”; sword) in the subject, against which unwelcome irruption he reacts by the espousal of Puritanism. York’s retention of his sons, and mission for Montague to London, where he will join Warwick against the King, depicts vividly the divided mind of the Puritan, which can all too easily slide over into frank neurosis (as in the case of Shakespeare) or even schizophrenia (Hamlet): on the one side, the libido-imagination-psychic conflict (King-Montague-Warwick), on the other, the Puritan ego from which these principles have been extirpated. This symbolism may also be read on the macrocosmic plane, as a beautiful realisation of the Hermetic axiom “As without, so within”: “I” and the sword standing for the exterior invisible world, which the Puritan anathematises. Richard’s “I, with five hundred...” continues this theme: the enemy of the Puritan being identified as the “I” principle.

It is highly significant that the messenger’s name is Gabriel, the Biblical “Messenger of the Lord”. This is another example of the golden thread of Christian symbolism that winds throughout FF, in concert with Gnostic magical, as an expression of Christian Cabalism. The point being made is that apprehension of the invisible world is a prelude to the attainment of Ring/Grail nobility: a pertinent example being that of King Solomon (and his Grail

Queen: cf. Song of Solomon; The Wisdom of Solomon), whose status was symbolised by his Ring and Schamir (precious jewel). The Ring motif is prominent throughout FF: a ring and diamond featuring especially prominently in the final CYM, while Perdita in TWT is a Grail Queen, a fount of wisdom, who is to be found in the written word. Sir Francis Bacon, the supreme architect of FF, was himself a Ring Lord, imbued with the wisdom of the written word; and the Ring/Grail quest described in FF is Shakespeare's own, with Bacon as his guide, a Virgil to his Dante, or Gandalf to his Bilbo Baggins: the Mirkwood of his quittance lying in thrall to the Puritan tyranny, which had brought him to the brink of madness in 1587. The strength of the symbolism of Gabriel, as well as Humphrey and Sinklo (III, i), overtowers their status as the names of actors who may have played them,¹ as a primary theory of their inclusion in 3HVI.

There follows now the episode of the deaths of Rutland and York at the hands of the Lancastrians, the significance of which has been described above (Ch.1). This is a beautiful example of the author seizing upon an episode in the source, then augmenting it here, changing some detail there, to suit it to the allegory. The author has taken the priest accompanying Rutland, as described in Hall, to identify him with the Roman Church. The vulnerability of Pauline Christianity to the underworld – for Rome had failed to bring it under control, unlike Gnosticism (Gloucester's whipping of Simpcox) – is represented by Clifford's murder of Rutland, where the former bears, like his father, the value of the "I" principle ("I, I, so strives the woodcock with the gynne"). Margaret's presence at the slaying of York, her help in commission of the act, and her order that he be beheaded, - vital for the allegory, which requires the Queen of Hell face-to-face with the Puritan-to-be, - are all variations from the sources, where she is described as being some way off from the battle. York wiping away his tears with the bloodied kerchief vividly represents the sorrow of the incipient Puritan at this vulnerability, with the aggressor now identified as the underworld itself (Queen of Hell: Margaret) rather than its expression (ithyphallos/maypole: Clifford). This kerchief is the first in a long line

¹ Bullough, Narrative and Dramatic Sources in Shakespeare.

in FF, all of them bearing, as a reference to menstruation, the value of the Goddess as Woman, in Whom the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen is powerfully immanent. Beheading signifies always in FF a psychic transformation: and York's represents the moment of birth of the Puritan ego.

ACT II

York's son Edward is this infant Puritan ego; Richard his brother the libido in negative aspect, as mantled by this ego. The FF direction "Enter one blowing" indicates that the messenger bearing news of York's death to the brothers has been running in haste, which signifies always that it is a thought process that is being described (e.g. MAN II, iii, 5).

The role of Montague is a fascinating one. At his first appearance the name is spelt "Montacute"; thereafter "Montague", invariably. This sets to throbbing the antennae of the alert reader, in response to possible activity on the hidden plane (e.g. as with "Ventidius"- "Ventigius" in A&C). The French *mont* means, of course, "mountain" while the noun *aguets* is "watch", "look-out"; and we recall the central role in FF of the Watch as symbolic of the visual imagination (e.g. in the final scenes of R&J), the extirpation of which is a definitive trait of Puritanism. Montague is banished in I, ii, as the Puritan ego comes into birth; is associated with Oxford (Gnostic tradition: see below) on the Lancastrian side; is murdered, with his brother Warwick, by the Yorkists in Act V; and so on. There can be no doubt that he bears the massive allegoric weight of the visual imagination. The "c" in "Montacute" and "g" in Montague are near homophones; while the "s" in *aguets* is silent. The technique (graven deep with the hallmark of Sir Francis Bacon) was to suggest the missing "t" in "Montague", and therefore the "watch" (visual imagination), by the one preceding instance of the variant "Montacute". We will observe many such dextrous *legerdemains* in the pages to come.

The Faustian dimension is once again identified as loathed of Puritanism:

Warwick ...And once again cry charge upon our foes,

But never once again turn back and fly.
Richard I, now methinks I hear great Warwick speak...

The Puritan tower is built upon the sands of turmoil:

Edward Lord Warwick, on thy shoulder will I lean,
And when thou fail'st (as God forbid the hour)
Must Edward fail...

The sources continue to be followed closely in II, ii, as the broad events of the Wars of the Roses are adopted to represent the ascent of the Puritan tyranny. The principle weapon of Puritanism is the libido in negative aspect (Richard's goading of the spent Edward-George-Warwick to the fight in II, iii). Richard's dismissal in II, iv, of Warwick from his pursuit of Clifford (germane to his murder V, ii) means that the Puritan tower is being erected to bury the shifting sands of anxiety (at the destructive capacity of the underworld) beneath it: in vain, as will abundantly be shown in RIII. The immensely poetic II, vi, bears everywhere the fingerprints of the wonderful Marlowe: the murders of father by son, and son by father, indicating the destructiveness of the ego's fight against its own self, as it attempts to extirpate its right-brain aspect; and, in the macrocosm, of England's inner conflict, which would culminate in the civil war, adumbrated here. The amplification of this episode in Hall was undoubtedly suggested by the description therein of the battle as "in manner unnatural": the *mot juste* to qualify the genesis of Puritanism. The Yorkists' insolent and prolonged spurning of the corpse of Clifford is germane to the murder of Suffolk in 2HVI IV, i, as representing the anathematisation of the "I" principle by Puritanism.

ACT III

King Henry is firmly identified with the "I" principle in "I, here's a deer" and "I, but thou talk'st, as if thou wer't a king"; and the "principal of all the deer" in turn with Henry: the primacy of the "I" principle being emphasised, and the enormity of its suppression by Puritanism. The arrows are ithyphallic symbols, as in the character of Sebastian in TN and elsewhere, whose value derives from the

martyrdom of St. Sebastian, a popular theme of Renaissance artists, who show him lashed to a cross and transfixed by arrows. In FF he represents Shakespeare-as-Puritan in the immediate aftermath of the “charge of the Boar” of 1587, as tortured by the principle he had vainly thought to have buried. Here in this early play it is somewhat different, with the two arrows – which are fired side by side, from equal distances, as the playwright emphasises (yet another apparent fancy of the highest significance) – representing the libido, more broadly the invisible world, or underworld, or Faustian dimension - in positive and negative aspects, the conflict between which will lead the Puritan to totally repress it from the psyche, and his world-view.

The placement of this episode immediately before King Edward’s wooing of Lady Grey is precise. For Richard and Clarence bear exactly the same value as the arrows, of the negative libido and positive, respectively; and their conversation out of earshot of the King signifies that these principles are conflicting on the unconscious plane, to drive the Puritan’s defensive denial of the underworld. Lady Grey initially refuses Edward’s suit; and in this phase she is identified with the “I” principle, in “I, widow?”; “I, good leave have you”; “I, full as dearly”; “I, but thou canst do”; and “I, but I fear me in another sense”: the last being especially suggestive of the defensive reaction in question. It is also of extreme fascination that the word “widow” is closely coupled to the “I”’s for “Ay”’s in the first four instances. For the meaning of this we recall that modern Freemasons style themselves even now “Sons of the Widow”.² The widow in question is Isis, the great Egyptian Goddess with a dominant underworld component, and the greatest of all Great Goddesses of the ancient world, as Apuleius tells us in his *The Golden Ass*, a colossal influence on FF, as the argument to come will show. Isis is analogous to the Cleopatra of A&C, as well as Dido of the myth of her abandonment by Aeneas, which is central to FF as allegory, as Ted Hughes observed. This is also precisely the value of the Widow in TOS. The incipient Puritan is considering here the Great Goddess, with Her Queen of Hell-Grail Queen aspect to the fore (Lady Grey linked to “I”), and rejecting Her because of it (Lady Grey’s refusal of suit). The turning point is reached:

² Baigent and Leigh, *The Temple and the Lodge*.

King I, if thou wilt say I to my request;
 No, if thou dost say No to my demand.
Widow Then No, my Lord: my suit is at an end.

It is now that she begins to soften, finally to accept his proposal. The Goddess Nature of the Puritan has been born, a sham and delusion, and no Goddess at all, as sundered from Her underworld (Ring/Grail Queen) aspect. Richard's "The ghostly father has done his shrift" is a startling reference to the ghostly King Hamlet of the ur-Hamlet, which was almost certainly being written about the same time as the trilogy, by Bacon himself. HAM will be shown to be an examination of the aetiology, pathogenesis and crisis of untreatable paranoid schizophrenia, the most destructive and tragic of all psychiatric illnesses. Lady Anne Bacon was probably even now suffering from the schizophrenia-like condition which was to plague her in later years. The likely scenario is that Shakespeare's arrival into Bacon's life, with a severe anxiety/depression neurosis, related to the incipient psychosis of Lady Anne, caused something to click in the mind of her ever-inquiring son; and that the great work began with his ur-Hamlet (examination of schizophrenia), and the HVI trilogy (Puritan error as cause of schizophrenia, as well as Shakespeare's less severe condition), with Marlowe his chief craftsman in the latter, and Shakespeare already developing his art (Orlando phase) with Mr. Arden of Feversham and his contribution to RIII, - which would record his own breakdown and terrifying confrontation with madness, - after "two years and more" (last lines of MAF) of intensive reading (Melancholy Jacques phase). The ghost of King Hamlet, and the cognate "ghostly father" here in 3HVI, represent the Puritan superego, which drives the subject's descent into psychosis.

What can be the significance of this seemingly pointless exchange? The author would seem to have taken his eye completely off the ball, to gaze at some incident in the crowd:

King You'd think it strange, if I should marry her.
Clarence To who, my Lord?
King Why Clarence, to myself.

The point being made is that the ithyphallos is an expression of the invisible world in the visible, and marks the latter's dependence on (marriage to) that substrate: so that the Puritan's anathematisation of the "I" principle is a denial of the invisible world. Acknowledgement of this underworld, or Faustian dimension, was on the other hand the central pillar of the philosophy of Sir Francis Bacon (see Ch.10).

This birth of Puritanism is marked by the precisely placed entry of a message that Henry has been captured. Richard is left alone on stage, and identified immediately with the "I" principle. His long manifesto of his intention to claim the throne is also precisely placed, as an expression of the Freudian potential of his now repressed principle to irrupt the psyche, and precipitate a nervous crisis (RIII III, iv); or, in the macrocosm, to shatter the Puritan's world-view, as a "reality check". The preceding episode of the wooing of the "Widow" is Baconian, par excellence, in its allegorical precision and tightness; while the flow of Classical references in Richard's speech, along with its general style, is an index to the hand of Marlowe.

The author continues to adapt the broad lines of the plot, as described in the sources. The Lady Bona of France, jilted by King Edward, represents the true Goddess, spurned of the Puritan, with Lady Grey – now Queen Elizabeth – as the sham; Warwick's defection to the French camp to join Margaret and Prince Edward, all against King Edward, - the (delusory) victory over psychic turmoil, as associated with the underworld as will and idea, by the ego's espousal of Puritanism. This is another way of expressing the subversive will of the Richard principle:

Margaret I now begins a second storm to rise...

The prominence of the Earl of Oxford in Margaret's party reflects the significance of Oxford University as the Royalist bulwark against the steadily increasing Puritan influence, much of it emanating from Cambridge University; and the related "ford" symbolism throughout

³ Gardner, Realm of the Ring Lords.

FF, which always stands opposed to the “bridge” symbol (e.g. Earl of Cambridge), the former representing engagement with Nature (the stream), the latter avoidance of it. It is fascinating to recall in this context that the historical Robin Hood was in fact Robert de Vere, who in 1214 became the 3rd Earl of Oxford.³ He may be styled a Ring Lord or Elf King, for the Earls of Oxford from July 1142 were the senior line descendants of Princess Melusine and Rainfroi de Verrières en Forez (subsequently shortened to “de Vere”). The “Hood” definition is a Ring style related to the Teutonic sprite Hodekin, who is associated in English lore with Robin Goodfellow (MND). Robin Hood is mentioned a further three times in FF, in TGV, HIV, and AYLI; and FF is itself a Ring saga, certainly the greatest of them all, as the argument to come will abundantly show. Margaret is therefore to Oxford in 3HVI as Diana is to Robin Hood, both being Ring Queens. The contention that the contemporary Earl of Oxford wrote the works of Shakespeare is certainly wrong; but he may yet have had a profound influence on them, by informing Sir Francis Bacon of the truth of the Robin Hood legend.

ACT IV

Richard’s “I, and ‘twere pity to sunder them” continues the theme of the Puritan’s anathematisation of the underworld. Hastings makes his first appearance, bearing the huge allegorical weight of the terminal Puritan censor that Shakespeare would become – lacking all reason and imagination - toward 1587 and the coup. Montague and Hastings conflict over the marriage, the former supporting the suit of the Lady Bona – naturally, for it is repeatedly stressed throughout FF that the visual imagination is required for the attainment of Gnostic nobility; and Lady Bona is the true Widow, the Goddess of the Gnostic noble the Ring Lord. The terminal Puritan, in suppressing the Goddess from his world-view, and from his imagination, which might resurrect Her, is vulnerable to the Freudian menace of the underworld (the curse of Margaret in RIII):

Clarence For this one speech, Lord Hastings well deserves
To have the heir of the Lord Hungerford.
King I, what of that?

Clarence prepares to defect, with Somerset (also the libido), to Margaret's party (libido associated with underworld). The coup – the shattering of the Puritan world-view (macrocosm), or Shakespeare's breakdown (microcosm) - is all the time being incubated:

King Which if they do, yet will I keep thee [Queen Elizabeth]
safe,

And they [Clarence and Somerset] shall feel the
vengeance of my wrath.

Richard I hear, yet say not much, but think the more.

[...]

King Now, brother Richard, will you stand by us?

Richard I, in despite of all that shall withstand you.

Here is an odd thing. Hastings and Montague together firmly pledge their loyalty to the King. If Montague indeed represents the visual imagination, and the Puritan is in the process of being born, with his imagination-less Hastings aspect already asserting itself – then how can Montague now remain with the King? This is yet another example of the author returning to square one to make a further point, as determined by the line of the pre-existing plot: another beautiful expression of the axiom "Form is the obstacle that brings creativity to birth".

- In what way we shall now see, in the episode of the King's capture by the Lancastrians. Here the emphasis moves decisively to the microcosm, as the psychic turmoil of the Puritan-to-be is anatomised. The inner scenario to be depicted is as follows. 1) "God is an infinite sphere whose centre is everywhere and circumference nowhere"⁴... On the other hand we have the Puritan, unable to connect with the broad sweep of humanity, locked in his frigid mentation, desperately defending against the truth of the invisible world; 2) Yet his barricade is flawed, in that the visual imagination remains active, always threatening to create anew the Goddess of Love, to stimulate the blind libido and plunge

⁴ Book of the Twenty-Four Philosophers.

him into turmoil; 3) Which now happens, to dissolve the hard-edged forms of his imagination in the flood of eros. The phases are represented thus:

1) King Edward in his tent in the middle of a chilly field, while his followers sleep in the town. His vow is "Never to lie and take his natural rest./Till Warwick, or himself, be quite suppressed" – where Warwick bears the value of psychic turmoil. He is accompanied by Hastings. The purpose of this is to foreshadow the breakdown of 1587, which will be (perhaps already was being) depicted in RIII III, iv, in the beheading of Hastings by Richard, with the former representing the hardened Puritan that Shakespeare had become aet.23.

2) The Watch is cognate with Montague, as the visual imagination. Their enemy is the Queen of Hell, - Who underpins the Goddess of Love, as well as the ithyphallos She stimulates, -and the inner torment that flows from the irruption of libido ("charge of the Boar"): "I but give me worship..."; "I: wherefore else guard we his royal tent...".

3) Warwick's besting and scattering of the Watch represent just this access of turmoil, as the forms of the imagination dissolve in the flood of blind libido, driven by the Queen of Hell. The Puritan has been sitting at his desk (King carried out in a chair by Somerset (libido) and Warwick), meditating perhaps on the vividly erotic passage of Lucius' seduction by Fotis in *The Golden Ass*, which the pages to come will present evidence to suggest may well have been the precise scenario of the coup of 1587. King Henry sitting at his desk in HVIII II, i, is germane to this. Remarkably, there follows the direction "Richard and Hastings fly over the stage". This can only mean that Richard is chasing him, to adumbrate the action of RIII III, iv. This is a prodromal phase of the breakdown, with the "charge of the Boar" less severe for now. The defensive reaction of the Puritan-to-be will be to extirpate the faculty of the visual imagination entirely from his psyche (murder of Montague in V, ii), a habit that would harden over Shakespeare's years of enthrallment to the Puritan tyranny aet.15-23. Yet the fury of the inrush of the Queen of Hell would be proportional to the vacuum thus created over those eight years, and the devastation caused total, though

not irrecoverably so.

The next two scenes illuminate this episode from different angles. The lords represent the faculty of reason, as they do in numerous plays, including *King John*, on which Bacon may have already been working. Elizabeth's unborn child Edward is identified with the "I" principle, as he will continue to be in *RIII*. This all represents the Puritan meditating on the sterile Nature of his delusion, then finding the invisible world ineluctably to rise out of it, courtesy of the visual imagination. It is of the highest importance to appreciate that the "chiefest thicket of the park" where the newly deposed King Edward is confined, represents, like all the other woods, forests, groves and trees throughout *FF*, the written word, the source being most plausibly the Druid grove, on the barks of which were nicked their sacred texts.⁵ Herein is described (secreted in the thicket) the libido, in the person of William Stanley, whose first name analyses to "will-I-am", and surname marks him of the eros-line of George Stanley in *RIII* and John Stanley in *2HVI* II, iv; with the mind of the Puritan reader (Hastings) vulnerable to flooding and domination by the libido in negative aspect:

Hastings To Lyn my Lord,
And shipped from thence to Flanders.
Richard Well guessed believe me, for that was my meaning.

They bear with them "horse and men": the horse and rider (soon to be King Edward) representing, as always, the libido in action, as sourced from Plato's *Phaedrus*. The occupants of the thicket are identified with the huntsman, who will be invited to accompany the escapees. This again is a reference to the popular Renaissance theme of the martyrdom of St. Sebastian (cf. the Sebastians in *TN* and elsewhere), where the arrows are ithyphallic symbols, the torment of the martyr corresponding to that of the Puritan, newly shattered by the inrush of eros.

Shakespeare has returned to the ego-state of his pre-Puritan phase, which admitted the libido, albeit against his will; or, on the

⁵ Graves, *The White Goddess*.

macrocosmic plane, the Puritan finds his world-view and positive thinking left vulnerable by the activity of the imagination. That the former aspect predominates here is shown by Henry's reference to the pleasure of his confinement in the Tower, which is identified (as the Gnostic tradition) with the "I" principle:

King ...For that it made my imprisonment a pleasure:
I, such a pleasure...

In the argument to come it will conclusively be shown that the immediate precipitating factor in Shakespeare's breakdown was an act of auto-erotism, consequent on his dwelling upon an erotic passage in a book, almost certainly the seduction of Lucius by Fotis in Apuleius' TGA – more vividly described in the original Latin than in the bowdlerised contemporary translation, yet powerfully enough for all that, if it was in fact that the latter that he was reading, which is not certain, given his linguistic talent (the tradition of his employment as a schoolmaster rings true in this context). The release of Henry corresponds to the aftermath of the erotic act, when knowledge of the libido, and inner turmoil, floods the shattered Puritan ego (appointment of Clarence and Warwick as co-Protectors). Clarence is identified with the "I" principle: "I, therein Clarence shall not want his part"; as is Richmond: "I: for if Edward repossess the Crown..." The latter's defeat of Richard at the battle of Bosworth Field (RIII V) will represent Shakespeare's healing at the hands of Sir Francis Bacon, the mainstay of whose therapeutic strategy was the reading of the written word as vector of the Gnostic tradition, and of its wisdom, which is gained through knowledge of the unseen world described therein (Princess Elizabeth in RIII; and Portia, Helen, Helena, Kate Minola, Perdita, and all the other Queens of Hell-Grail Queens of FF). In this foreshadowing of the rise of Richmond the macrocosm in turn predominates; yet it is a triumph of these scenes that inner and outer worlds are together on stage, with now one upstage, now the other, in beautiful conformity to the Hermetic maxim "As without, so within".

Edward's "Well have we passed, and now repassed the seas..." can only be a reference to the Styx, which is memorably described

in Virgil's Aeneid VI as *irremeabilis*, "unrepassable"; while Burgundy stands here as a reference to wine, for the state of possession by the libido, which drunkenness in FF always signifies. This has been a journey into hell for the Puritan-to-be, who now recovers himself and his resolve (return of Edward to England) for the final assumption of his defence against the "I" principle.

ACT V

Edward's entry into York represents, of course, just this transformation, as the Puritan ego now asserts itself. Henry is twice identified with the "I" principle". The purpose of the change is clear:

Hastings I doubt not I, but we shall soon persuade
Both him, and all his brothers, into reason.

The enemy of Puritanism in its final (delusory) victory is painted as the Gnostic – Neoplatonist/Christian Cabalist – tradition: the Ring/Grail tradition, in truth. Oxford is the Ring Lord; Montague the visual imagination; and Clarence the libido. The centrality to the new regime of the overthrow of the written word, as a vector of the unseen world, with its ability to stimulate the imagination, is shown in the dialogue between Henry and Exeter (written word), which is ended by the irruption of Edward, and seizure of Henry.

Turmoil prevails (Coventry held by Warwick); but not for long, as the anathematised libido supplants the sacred, in the reasoning ego of the Puritan:

Warwick Then Clarence is at hand, I hear his drum.
Somerville It is not his, my Lord, here Southam lies.

- Whereupon the Yorkist party enters. Edward as Duke of York (as urged by Warwick) is identified with the "I" principle: "I, by my faith, for a poor Earl to give..."; the implication being that Edward as King will mean its suppression. Oxford, Montague and Somerset (libido) now enter Coventry; but Clarence (also the libido) reverts to the Yorkists. The defection of Clarence is a historical fact that could hardly have been ignored. His murder by Richard in RIII will represent the supplanting of the positive libido by the negative; as

will the death of Somerset here.

Now psychic turmoil is quelled, and the imagination suppressed (deaths of Warwick and Montague). The Lancastrians bear the value of the written word: "Brave followers, yonder stands the thorny wood..." To its Ring/Grail wisdom of the libido (broadly speaking, the unseen world) the Puritan remains deaf:

Oxford I'll not trouble thee with words.

Somerset Nor I...

- As they are led off to their deaths. Their silences are germane to those of Hero, Hippolyta, and Cordelia, which signify the Puritan's deafness to the song of the underworld as described in the written word. Now comes the momentous suppression of the ithyphallic/maypole ("I") principle (murder of young Prince Edward). It is the immanence of this principle in the written word that makes it painful to the Puritan:

Edward What? Can so young a thorn begin to prick?

The Yorkists murder Prince Edward ("I" principle) but spare Margaret: for witless Puritan censoriousness is directed against the underworld's expression in the visible world, while leaving its underlying cause undiminished, like cutting off an irritating fleur du mal while leaving its roots intact, to shoot forth again. The death-dealing blade is identified with the ithyphallos, as so often elsewhere in FF: "I, but thou used to foreswear thyself". Its penetration of a body is to acknowledge this principle as a property of the character: thus, the stabbing and discovery of Polonius behind the arras (libido suppressed from consciousness, to anticipate Freud) represents the activation of the libido in the mind of the incipient schizophrenic (Hamlet), who connects it with his ithyphallos. This sort of analysis, to which FF must be subjected, will no doubt be resisted by many lovers and scholars of Shakespeare, including those critics who condemned Ted Hughes for portraying Shakespeare as excessively "male" (!); but schizophrenia is a profoundly shocking and tragic condition, which afflicts male and female equally, the principle in each case being

the same. The “Death of tragedy” was at no time effected so ruthlessly as in the Nineties of our era, mercifully just passed; and it must be the task of the new age to recover its nerve, and again look Nature squarely in the face, with unwavering gaze, like Hal before the walls of Harfleur. Thus, the dagger-death of Juliet represents the de-repression of the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, as She is acknowledged as immanent in the “I” principle, to effect the breakdown (death of Romeo); and so here in 3HVI, where this identification is avoided, to leave the underworld persistent in the unconscious, unseen but undefeated, ready to assert itself again (RIII III, iv) as the “charge of the Boar”, as befell Will Shaksper (as he was then) in 1587. It must be emphasised once again that FF at no time gives evidence that Shakespeare was schizophrenic. Rather, HAM alone of the plays examines this condition, as a ready extrapolation from the germane but less severe anxiety/depression neurosis which had stricken him down.

It was an erotic passage in a book – almost certainly TGA – that brought the Puritan Shaksper down; and, more generally, the printed page as vector of the underworld (the wisdom derived from the knowledge of which FF consistently identifies as the Holy Grail) was object of the Puritans’ especial wrath:

Richard Good day, my Lord, what at your book so hard?
Henry I my good Lord...

Daedalus and Icarus are identified with the “I” principle; the sea that swallowed the latter, with the Puritan (King Edward). Richard stabs him twice: once with the blade as the negative “I”, – “I, and for much more slaughter after this”, - and once to kill him, where the first “death” represents a transformation, with “I” going from positive to negative aspects, in the pervertive mind of the Puritan.

So the world-view of Catholic/Merrie England (Henry) has been killed off; likewise the old ego - Shaksper’s – with its subjection to the blind libido. The negative itthyphallos (Prince Edward, son of King Edward) remains as an informing principle of Puritan reason; while the Faustian dimension at its roots is repressed (banishment of Margaret to France). The stage is set for RIII, wherein that most heinous of crimes associated with King Richard – the murder of the

Princes in the Tower – will represent, on the plane of allegory, the ~~re-investment in sanctity of the Gnostic Christ, along with the~~ unseen world, on the engagement of which his world-view is founded (Shakespeare in London, after the coup and his flight from Stratford in search of a *vita nuova*, now embarked on his Ring Quest, with Sir Francis Bacon as guide), after the shattering trauma of the “charge of the Boar”, which had fulfilled the curse of Margaret.

CHAPTER 4

RICHARD THE THIRD

The centrepiece of the first Act of RIII is the intense scene iii, which will prove on careful observation to be the description of a thwarted act of meditation, in which the doors of perception will begin to slam shut to the contemplating mind at the very moment when Queen Margaret, who represents throughout the sequence the Triple (White) Goddess as Queen of Hell,¹ is rejected by the contemplating subject (the ailing King Edward/Ugly Dick), who shrinks thereby from the crucial stage in the journey of the Hero, - as so memorably recounted by Joseph Campbell in *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*, - of the Meeting with the Goddess.

The dragon that scares off this St. George manqué is of course the principle of the Great Goddess (Nature divinised) as anathematised by Protestant Puritanism. In III, iv she will return to stalk and kill him and drag the corpse back to her lair, whence he will be reborn to liberate the true Goddess; - but only after much travail. Richard (Ugly Dick) will be, as the resurgent libido in negative aspect, the tree, born from the earth as the will-to-eros is born from the Universal Mother, on which the barely reasoning ego (Hastings, the principle of mindless Puritan censorship, whose

¹ See Robert Graves' *The White Goddess* for a beautiful explanation of the meaning of the Goddess and Her myths.

condition Shakespeare evidently approached in the time leading up to the breakdown dramatised in III, iv) - is crucified, to be born again into Gnostic nobility. The resurrection will be predicated on his acknowledgement of the unseen world as described in the Gnostic written word, as provided by his mentor and guide – his Gandalf - Sir Francis Bacon. This unseen world will be shown below to be represented by the character of Richmond. Bacon's, and also his patient-pupil Shakespeare's, identity as an Hermetic or Renaissance magus, which the argument to follow will massively confirm, means that this in truth is the Gnostic Christ, - the Saviour of the Gospels of St. Thomas, St. Phillip, and so on, rather than of the authorised canon, - Who was an inheritor of the Egyptian tradition via the Qumran community, and Whose true teachings persisted in the Celtic and Coptic churches, and elsewhere – broadly, the Gnostic Church – though not in the church of St. Paul, which was an inspired confection of his own, whose fragile sweetness is now melting in the Gnostic revival of our times.

If this low-level analysis in the light of myth and the Goddess is pursued, the immediate cause of the trauma which necessitated the meditation of scene iii ("Meantime, God grants that I have need of you" says Richard to Queen Elizabeth, another Goddess figure) can be identified: for the conclusion will become inevitable that Lady Anne in the preceding scene ii must represent (like Anne Bullen in HVIII) - Anne Hathaway; further, that Shakespeare, while under the influence of Puritanism and its anathematisation of the Goddess, and hence his own Self, seduced her for the unconscious purpose of reclaiming his wholeness; that, finding himself a father-to-be, and forced to marry, he then was tormented by that union with the incarnation of the Puritan misconception of the Goddess as *ianus diaboli* ("gateway to the devil"): "For never yet one hour in his bed/Did I enjoy the golden dew of sleep/But with his timorous dreams was still awaked." (Lady Anne IV, i, 84); "Richard, thy wife, that wretched Anne thy wife,/That never slept a quiet hour with thee..." (Lady Anne V, iii, 161); and that at some point early in the marriage it culminated in a breakdown allegorised in the beheading of Hastings in III, iv, which he would deal with successfully (albeit incompletely), initially by relinquishing his old life in a flight to London in search of a *vita nuova*, to be centred

around Nature, his Beatrice ("Shall I go win my daughter to thy will?/... I go."- Queen Elizabeth, IV, iv, 152), with the goal thereby of at-one-ment with the Father, and ultimate apotheosis.

So yet another deduction from art to the life, and maybe as uncertain as most, were it not that it proceeds strongly and coherently from the words on the page, to leave the impression of, not a confection of fancies about a core of historical truth, as the sequence hitherto has been taken to be, but a true work of the imagination, sustained and powerful, and magnificent in its Aquinian virtues of consonance, radiance and integrity. The artist begins with an introduction to the nature of Richard, with the Goddess visible just below the surface.

ACT I

i

Richard Now is the winter of our discontent
 Made glorious summer by this sun of York...
 I, that am curtailed of this fair proportion,
 Cheated of feature by dissembling nature,
 Deformed, unfinished, sent before my time
 Into this breathing world, scarcely half made up...

Richard (Ugly Dick) bears the allegoric value of the libido, more broadly the world that lies unseen below the surface of things – the invisible world or underworld or Faustian dimension – as anathematised by the Puritan that was Shakespeare, aet.15-23. This world, as idea, is the object of study of the great modern artists, scientists, and depth psychologists (and Bacon was a godfather of all these three groups); as will, the will-to-life that plays in all of us, perhaps, most pertinently to the case of Shakespeare, to dissolve the ego in its blindness during the act of love. Both of these modes – idea and will - are object of the Puritan's especial contempt. The Puritan may be said to stiffen into the sun arrested at noon at the summer solstice; yet there must ineluctably come, as an expression of the "one poetic theme" identified by Robert Graves, the autumn equinox, - to drag the year into winter, - whose animal in Celtic mythology was the ivory tusked black boar, the same precisely as gored to death the

Goddess-scorning Adonis in Bacon's idiosyncratic reworking of the Greek myth, and which appears in all the tragedies precisely at the "Shakespearean moment", as so strikingly identified by Ted Hughes, when destructive unreason assumes control of the ego. This is also the symbolism of The Boar's Head tavern in 1 & 2 HIV (Chapters 6 & 7), as the field of Eros dominated by the libido (Falstaff). That same boar – malignant with Freudian potential - appears in RIII (III, ii, 28; IV, v, 2):

Hastings To fly the boar before the boar pursues
 Were to incense the boar to follow us...
Derby ...in the sty of the most deadly boar
 My son George Stanley is franked up in hold.

The "Shakespearean moment" in this play occurs with the assault on Hastings by the Boar (III, iv, 70):

Richard And this is Edward's wife, that monstrous witch,
 Consorted with that harlot, strumpet Shore,
 That by their witchcraft thus have marked me.

For the time being, though, King Edward still lives (reason still in control of the ego). Fascinatingly, Richard the Third gloried in the sobriquet of "The Hog": for his battle-standard featured a boar. The poem *A Myrroure for Magistrates* (1559), undoubtedly a source for RIII, refers thus to him: 'He knew my brother Richard was the Bore,/Whose tuskes should teare my brothers boyes & me...' The argument to come will show the strategic mind of Sir Francis Bacon behind all of this, and his pen behind the courtly scenes and noble speeches of RIII, and so much of the rest of FF. Yet Shakespeare must have made a considerable, even defining contribution to RIII: such is the detail and peculiar intimacy of so many passages – their point of view from the milieu intérieur – that no other conclusion can be drawn. RIII is then intimately related to the tragedies, and every other play of the corpus, as the argument to come will show: the basic pathological process examined being the same in every case.

The question must now be asked: "What are the indicators to a

good prognosis?" Let us climb the winding track up Mount Parnassus to the Temple of Apollo, Greek (though originally Hermetic Egyptian) God of healing, letters, the light of reason, at Delphi, c. 500 B.C. (as consulted by Leontes in *The Winter's Tale*). We look up and see inscribed on the lintel "Know Thyself"; and on entering find the tomb of Dionysius, a consort and son of the Goddess, and yet another of the ever-living, ever-dying semi-mortal gods of vegetation who die in the winter to rise in the spring. This is a symbol of reason as centred on the body (which Schopenhauer observed to be identical to the will), a powerful image of completeness: for without nature at its contemplative heart the mind would be, as Schopenhauer describes it, a mere "winged, bodiless cherubim". This is the point of the disembodied floating heads in Picasso's *Guernica*, which depicts the slaughter of nobility in the 20th century. It is of immense relevance to the present argument that the Temple of Apollo included the tomb of Dionysius, rather than a statue. This is also the point of the half-starved dog in Albrecht Dürer's *Melencolia I* (fig.1), and Don Quixote's feeble mare Rosinante: for the new Renaissance Neoplatonism/Christian Cabalism, whose spirit so thoroughly suffuses FF, sought total victory over the will through engagement with it, rather than denial. This is also the point of Kate's submission to Petruchio in *The Taming of The Shrew*. At the other pole is the Puritan's denial of the will (the invisible aspect of Nature), and subsequent vulnerability to it. Falstaff is, of course, a Dionysius figure: and his death in the early pages of HV will represent the victory (albeit spurious and temporary) achieved by Shaksper (as he was then) over the libido in his Tavern or pseudo-Alexandrian phase of mid-adolescence (see Ch.8).

Mere ideas are not enough for psychological healing however, for it is essential that the contemplating mind dwell on Platonic Ideas - not this tree or that tree, but the Tree; not this or that dog, but the Dog; not this man or that woman, but Man, - rapt in stillness, as it may be, before a painting, or a piece of music, or a poem, or Nature in a moment of poetic intensity: and as the mind takes the Hero's journey to the underworld it will come to the will-to-life, then the four fundamental forces of Nature, finally to the Universal Will, as described by Schopenhauer, which underpins all

phenomenal forms, and which modern physics recognises as the quantum world, beyond all human capability of knowing. Yet for the mind bent on enlightenment not to know is itself to know, which is the basis of the Gnostic world-view: and the debilitating sense of moral isolation vanishes in this knowledge.

Schopenhauer has pointed out that Man requires, for the full expression of His nature, integration with the Will in its lower objectifications as mineral, plant, animal, and so on. For the Will most easily shines through the apparent forms of its lower objectifications: for example in the gorgeous naivèté of flowers, which wear their genitalia on the outside. He has beautifully compared the nature of Man in its fullest achievement to a tetrachord, with the bass note representing inorganic life, - the closest to the Will and its lowest objectifications as the four fundamental forces of nature, - the third plant, the fifth animal, and the octave, - which carries the melody high above the others, but without which it would however lack harmony, - human life. Crucially in this context, it is precisely these forms of Nature in Her infinite variety and beauty which are lacking in the desert, - the spiritual home of Goddess-scorning Puritanism, - and also the snow-swept wastes of Hamlet's Dunsinane; and it is these forms, the material for Platonic Ideas, which Shakespeare had to recover to cast off the Puritan noose which was strangling him. He would find them on the stage, whose tutelary deity is Dionysius, and in the written word as vector of the Gnostic tradition, and acted upon by reason and the imagination.

The indicators to a good prognosis are therefore 1) a healthy faculty of the imagination, and 2) a powerful intellect, - both of which the suffering and gnostically inane Will Shaksper of 1587 possessed to the highest degree, - primed and ready to engage with the given world. In his case, this was to be principally per medium of the written word: hence its prominence in FF, as represented by the boy Pages in this play and elsewhere, and the numerous letters, as well as all the trees, groves, woods, and forests of FF (e.g. the Forest of Arden in AYLI; Birnham Wood in MAC; Ariel's tree in TT; and so on: the source ultimately being the Druid grove, on the barks of which were knicked their sacred texts). We will note this allegorical device time and time again.

In the Celtic languages “tree” also means “letter”. Hence the related symbolism of the following lines, right in the very first scene of RIII:

Richard This day should Clarence closely be mewed up
 About a prophecy which says that G
 Of Edward’s heirs the murderer shall be.

This prophecy was selected from the mass of material in Holinshed; and “G” of course stands for Clarence’s first name George, as well as Gloucester. In the context of Goddess lore it has a deeper significance, however, with which Bacon was certainly deeply familiar (see especially A&C). The immediate source of this knowledge in Elizabethan England was probably the magnificent library of John Dee.² Let us turn to the ancient Celtic Song of Amergin, said to have been chanted by the chief bard of the Milesians as he set foot on the soil of Ireland in 1286 B.C.:³

God speaks and says:

I am a wind of the sea,
I am a wave of the sea,
I am a sound of the sea,
I am an ox of seven fights,
I am a hawk on a cliff,
I am a tear of the sun,
I am fair among flowers,
I am a boar,
I am a salmon in a pool,
I am a lake on a plain,
I am a hill of poetry,
I am a battle-waging spear,
I am a god who forms fire for a head...

Robert Graves has convincingly shown that each of these thirteen conditions corresponds to a 28-day lunar month of the calendar year of the Celts. Further, each month had its own letter

² Dame Frances Yates, *The Occult Philosophy in the Elizabethan Age*.

³ Robert Graves, *ibid*.

which corresponded to the tree of that particular month, giving (with the addition of five vowels distributed throughout the year) the eighteen letter Druidic alphabet current in Britain long before the arrival of Christianity. This is the meaning of “when Birnam Wood comes to Dunsinane”, which refers to the Gnostic written word, as descriptive of the unseen world, as the central pillar of Bacon’s approach to his therapy of Shakespeare (Macbeth) in those early years. In the context of this scene however, it gives an indication of how deeply Shakespeare dug down to the Celtic roots of Britain in his own Journey of the Hero, which Jung would have admired, and which Ted Hughes identified with the “emergency flight of the shaman”. For G in fact stands for Gort, the ivy, the tree of the first month after the autumn equinox when the fall into winter has truly begun, - the month whose corresponding animal, as in The Song of Amergin, is none other than the Boar: the libido-in-negative aspect, the Ugly Dick principle itself. RIII thus gives a further proof, as if any more were needed, to the theory of Robert Graves three centuries before he was born. This pull towards Ireland, as symbolic of the unconscious, is one also deeply felt in the 20th century, which has witnessed the overthrow of the sanctity of Nature and the denial of the collective unconscious in so many areas: witness the enduring popularity of Joyce, and lately the stupendous success of Frank and Malachy McCourt, Maeve Binchy, Nina O’Faeolain and others. Shakespeare’s recovery was founded on his reaffirmation of the unconscious, broadly the invisible world:

King Richard ...a bard of Ireland told me once
I should not live long after I saw Richmond.

-Where Richmond is yoked to this principle of the unseen world. Clarence therefore bears the immense allegoric weight of the libido, which has been tormenting Shakespeare since his arrival at puberty, and which he now thinks to finally deal with by the espousal of Puritanism. Thus will Clarence’s distraintment to the Tower (suppression of libido from psyche) be followed immediately by news of Hastings’ release from it (Shakespeare as incipient Puritan).

I, i, introduces many of the principles that will subsequently interplay.

Richard Why this it is, when men are ruled by women;
 'Tis not the king that sends you to the Tower...

The Tower of London represents here, as in 1-3HVI, the Gnostic tradition, as derived from the Tower card of the Tarot Major Arcana (see Ch.1). What evidence is there to support this? Bacon has already used this technique in TGV (imprisonment of Sylvia). The murder of Clarence in the Tower was, of course, wholly factual. However, the imprisonment therein of Hastings was not, and is not mentioned in the sources. Yet Bacon has it otherwise, and emphasises, further, that he was released from there on the same day as Clarence was imprisoned (I, i, 68-9). This is yet another invention *de novo* for the purpose of the allegory, the point being that the Clarence and Hastings principles are polar opposites with respect to the Gnostic tradition.

Richard Dive, thoughts, down to my soul - here Clarence comes!

Why can the libido be identified with the soul? The libido resides in the unconscious, and is a lower objectification of the Universal Will. Schopenhauer has defined the property of Soul as an awareness in the conscious mind of the immanent operation of the universal Will, that foundation of the phenomena of space and time, beyond all categories of thought and feeling: the quantum world, beyond the cell, atom, quark, and finally beyond the four fundamental forces of Nature. Novalis said: "The seat of the soul is there, where outer and inner worlds meet.". The Will stands in relation to the forms of space and time, to which it gives birth and death, as the fluid principle of water, sap, milk, blood, amniotic fluid and so on does to life on earth. Plutarch termed the mindfulness of this fluidity (and, by extension, the Will) the Dionysian principle; and Nietzsche celebrated it rapturously in *The Birth of Tragedy*, where he contrasted it with the Apollonian principle of the straight line drawn against the fluidity of nature, of hard-edged form, of individuation. A predominance in the psyche

of the Apollonian principle at the expense of the Dionysian is the essence of what may be called Apollonism, a quality of which is soullessness, and a category of which is rationalism (cf. the character of Mortimer in 1-3 HVI, RII, 1 HIV). Look at the statue of Apollo atop the Archibald Fountain in Sydney's Hyde Park: he cares not a whit about you, - about the totality of your Self, which includes the (irrational) unconscious, and certainly Jung's collective unconscious, - but gazes fixedly at the horizon (symbolised by his outstretched arm: hence the Nazi salute), his sight diagnosing the interposed forms of nature like sunrays through a window. Oswald Spengler in his *The Decline of the West* put it beautifully:

...This prime feeling of a loosing, Erlösung, solution, of the Soul in the Infinite, of a liberation from all material insight... sets free also the energy of depth that is the Faustian soul; whereas Classical art limits its effect to the body and brings back the eye from distance to a Near and Still that is saturated with beauty.

This "depth" finally is Schopenhauer's "Will", or the quantum world, which is objectified in space and time as the four fundamental forces of Nature (electromagnetism, weak and strong nuclear forces, gravity), and on a lower plane as the libido, which will surge in negative aspect (Ugly Dick) to shatter the ego (King Edward, then Hastings, a further degradation) in III, iv. Yet when centred on Dionysius (Nature) Apollo can attain to perfection, as incarnate in the Gnostic Christ, or King Solomon (that figure of prime importance in FF), or Alexander the Great (see especially HV): and it is precisely to these last that the character of Gloucester in 1-3HVI has been shown above to correspond.

Richard Why this it is, when men are ruled by women;
 'Tis not the king that sends you to the Tower;
 My Lady Grey his wife, Clarence, 'tis she
 That tempers him to this extremity.
 Was it not she, and that good man of worship,
 Anthony Woodeville, her brother there,
 That made him send Lord Hastings to the Tower,
 From whence this present day he is delivered?

We are not safe, Clarence - we are not safe.

Richard here, on the gross historical plane, is lying to protect himself. On the subtle poetical plane, however, he is giving a true account of the trouble that is fomenting in the unconscious: for it is precisely the Goddess as *ianus diaboli* (the essence of Lady Grey, if not her character as the wife of the Puritan king) Who is driving the ego to withdraw, defensively, ever further from the border of its outer and inner worlds. Hereafter the libido will be denied, and the fate of the last remnants of reason (King Edward) in the suffering ego assured. This is the poetic significance of the words of Richard in the closing speech of this scene: "He [King Edward] cannot live, I hope, and must not die/Till George be packed with posthorse up to heaven." The ego of the Puritan censor (Hastings) is characterised by its dearth of ideation – the complete collapse of the Apollonian principle – in strict obedience to the Puritan Goddess (Queen Elizabeth; cf. "Humbly complaining to her deity/Got my Lord Chamberlain his liberty" – I, i, 76). Ideas are inherently painless; and the constriction of the ego to this extent must leave it indefensibly vulnerable to the traumatic – even to the point of psychosis, although this was not (only just) the case with Shakespeare – irruption of the will-to-eros as the Boar of FF. The ego as Hastings (which will be the form in which it succumbs to the coup of III, iv) is in fact imprisoned in the state of Man-as-sublimated-animal (in negative aspect), a confinement which it welcomes; and it is an enemy of the soul, that interface of outer and inner worlds, which will mirror his essentially libidinous nature:

Hastings But I shall live, my lord, to give them thanks
That were the cause of my imprisonment.

Richard No doubt, no doubt; and so shall Clarence too,
For they that were your enemies are his
And have prevailed as much on him as you.

These frauds are ruled by the anathematised Goddess, their negative anima. The Goddess in positive aspect they pretend to neutralise and dominate, and hence can never transcend; while the proper relationship of Goddess and Gnostic Christ, or Hermetic

mage, or of the Graces and Hyperborean Apollo (fig.2) will be expressed in the otherwise inexplicable lines of IV, iv. 355-6:

King Richard Say I, her sovereign, am her subject low.

Queen Elizabeth But she, your subject, loathes such sovereignty.

For King Richard here is on the way to a metamorphosis that can only be predicated on recognition of the Goddess. In I, i, however, he is swelling in the ailing mind of King Richard, whose travesty of a Goddess is represented by Lady Grey (Queen Elizabeth).

Buckingham For first he was contract to Lady Lucy-
...And afterward by substitute betrothed
To Bona, sister to the King of France.
Those both put off, a poor petitioner,
A care-crazed mother to many sons,
...Even in the afternoon of her best days,
Made prize and purchase of his wanton eye,
Seduced the pitch and height of his degree
To base declension and loathed bigamy.

This business of Lady Lucy, Bona, and Lady Grey can only be explained by reference to the poetic plane. St. Lucia is the hope of the blind, as the derivation of her name (from the Latin lux = light) suggests; and Lady Lucy is the light of the sun shining through the darkness of ignorance; while Bona in Latin means "good" (feminine gender). These two together are the perfect match for the Puritan in his delusion; but the woman he is really marrying is innately a moon Goddess, and hence in Puritan eyes a representative of all sinful women, an Aphrodite whom he will anathematise, woman in her Old Testament character of ianus diaboli, allurer, temptress, whore. Queen Margaret, representative here of the Triple Goddess in Her witch aspect (Hecuba: and witches can be good, witness Mary Poppins), will later apostrophise her as "poor painted queen, vain flourish of my fortune": for after her marriage to King Edward she will, as the Puritan wife, echo faithfully his judgements.

Hastings is, of course, the Lord Chamberlain, the Puritan censor at large. His (fictitious) release from the Tower on the same day as

Clarence's imprisonment serves to yoke the phase of terminal Puritanism to the suppression of the libido, and symbolises the different relationships of these contrary principles to the Gnostic tradition (the Tower: see above). The principle of mindless Puritan censorship is therefore to be considered as resurgent in the suffering ego, after its first appearance in 2HIV, and as causally related to the imminent death of the libido (more broadly, the unseen world) as will and idea, just as the ego still clinging to the remnants of self-governing reason (King Edward) is mortally ailing (Hastings: "The King is sickly, weak, and melancholy,/And his physicians fear him mightily").

Brakenbury, the lieutenant of the Tower, now reminds them that by order of the king Clarence is to converse with no-one: the meaning being that the libido (more broadly, the unseen world) must be silenced (cf. the germane silences of Cordelia, Hippolyta, Hero). The consequent meaningless mentation is typical of Puritanism in its shallowness and distance from the truth:

Richard We speak no treason, man. We say the king
 Is wise and virtuous, and his noble queen
 Well struck in years, fair, and not jealous.
 We say that Shore's wife hath a pretty foot,
 A cherry lip, a bonny eye, a passing pleasing tongue...

Shore's wife (i.e. at the edge of the sea, that old mythic symbol of the Goddess from Whom all forms derive, including Venus: cf Botticelli's *The Birth of Venus*) is of course the Aphrodite aspect of Woman, with whom the puritan King Edward reluctantly conjoins at night; and in the word "trudge" Bacon gives a beautiful sense of the character of Puritan love-making:

Clarence By heaven, I think there is no man secure
 But the queen's kindred, and night-walking heralds
 That trudge betwixt the king and Mistress Shore.

On the poetical plane, a sense is being given of the separation of the ego from the Goddess, the recognition of Whom will bring the libido into being: hence the allocation of these lines to Clarence. In

the following scene, the essence of the Ugly Dick factor (the will-to-eros) will drive the ego, bent on redressing its Goddess-less incompleteness, to pursue Lady Anne (sc. Hathaway), who is Venus/Aphrodite in essence and in character; while his character (that will anathematised, and therefore primitivised) will give it the form of a loveless seduction. One can get an idea, from all of this, of the terminally debilitating conflict which was going on in Shakespeare's psyche at this time, and which would finally cast him down aet.²³ (Act III), only to raise him up (Act V).

The censorious suspiciousness of the Puritan mind is now shown, and the corresponding incipient paranoia of Richard:

Richard Naught to do with Mistress Shore?
 I tell thee, fellow,
 He that doth naught with her (excepting one)
 Were best to do it secretly alone.

Brakenbury What one, my lord?

Richard Her husband, knave. Wouldst thou betray me?
 [...]
 We are the queen's abjects, and must obey.
 And whatso'er you [Clarence] will employ me in,
 Were it to call King Edward's widow sister,
 I will perform it to enfranchise you.
 [...]
 I will deliver you, or else lie for you

Note here the striking "abjects", as distinct from "subjects": the latter in the Schopenhauerian sense of the knowing subject before the beauty of Nature, the former meaning "cast away from", "abandoned", and therefore ignorant and without engagement with or transcendence of Her. The identification of the essence of the Ugly Dick factor with Queen Margaret (Queen of Hell-Grail Queen) by the reasoning imagination ("Think with the heart, feel with the mind" says a Buddhist verse) under the influence of the acknowledgement of the play of, broadly, the invisible world (of which the libido is a subset) certainly would restore integrity to the Self, and remove the threat to the ego. This precisely is what will fail to ensue in I, iii, when the meditation will be thwarted by Ugly Dick

(libido repudiated by imagination-less Puritanism), and Margaret sent packing, full of curses (... "Thou rag of honour! Thou detested-" "Margaret." "Richard!" "Ha!": I, iii, 233).

Richard ...Meantime, have patience.
Clarence I must perforce. Farewell.

For patience is the characteristic of the mind meditating under the influence of soul. It was shown by Buddha under the Bodhi tree, and James Joyce:

Now, patience; and remember patience is the great thing, and above all things else we must avoid anything like being or becoming out of patience.

Finnegans Wake, p.108, Faber text.

It is patience above all that Bacon had to maintain during the long, intense period of the construction of these histories; and in its very last pages he gives a spirited indication of just what his feelings were when he had finished. The former King Richard II is imprisoned in Pomfret Castle:

Richard The devil take Henry of Lancaster, and thee!
 Patience is stale, and I am weary of it.
 [Beats the Keeper]

RII, V, v

The first line above appears in Holinshed, though not the second, which serves to give Richard's outburst here a quite different sense. The word "patience" is derived from the Latin *pati*, to suffer, whence also come "passion" and "compassion"; but Buddha said there is a way out of suffering, through prolonged meditation using the functional left and right brains together (reason in concert with imagination and the soul) to leave passion/compassion behind. This is the meaning of Nietzsche's much misunderstood argument against pity: for the true healer must be through blind compassion and out the other side.

Clarence (libido) is a vital member of the court as the brother of the king, and his murder will signal the beginning of the end, while

Richard's rebirth will see the reinstatement of the Puritanism-annihilating principle of the invisible world in the figure of George Stanley (cognate with Richmond). The case of the Georges Clarence and Stanley – both representing the libido - illustrates a staple technique of Bacon's, to give characters with allegorical equivalence the same name, like atoms that bond covalently to give a product of higher radiance, energy, and resonance than the sum of its parts. The Stanley père must also represent the libido as will, while his son is that libido reborn as idea in the ego-in-transformation, courtesy of the written word. We will notice many other covalent bonds in the course of this argument; for example, here, at the end of scene i:

Richard For then I'll marry Warwick's youngest daughter.
 What though I killed her husband and her father [-in-law]?

 The readiest way to make the wench amends
 Is to become her husband and her father:
 The which will I - not all so much for love
 As for another secret close intent
 By marrying her which I must reach into.

In 3HVI IV, i, Clarence had announced to the newly crowned Puritan Edward his intention of marrying Lady Anne:

King Edward But say, is Warwick friends with Margaret?
Messenger Ay, gracious sovereign; they are so link'd in friendship,

 That young Prince Edward marries Warwick's daughter.

 Clarence Belike the elder; Clarence will have the younger.

Warwick represents, as will be shown repeatedly in later chapters, and as does Worcester in 1 HIV, the principle of psychic conflict (as his name suggests), and his ubiquity in 1-3HVI is an index to the state of Shakespeare's inner life in this period. Prince Edward is covalently bonded to the king and, as son of Margaret, represents the rebirth into completeness which presents itself as a

potentiality for the ego, yet which is implicated inextricably in its conflict. Clarence's anticipated status of brother-in-law to the Prince serves to identify the latter also with the libido. Ugly Dick, however, will murder both Prince Edward and Clarence, and his seduction of Lady Anne in RIII, I, ii, will therefore represent the predominance of the unconscious element in Shakespeare's wooing of Anne Hathaway. Its purpose, on the poetical plane, will be to appropriate for the incomplete, because Goddess-less, ego, - the self-mutilation of which it is acutely, though obscurely, aware, - the qualities of the murdered nobles King Henry VI and Prince Edward, both of them Consort/Sons of the Great Goddess: the former as of the Lancaster line, and the Red Rose faction, two symbols of the functional right side of the brain; Edward as nothing less than the son of Margaret, the Grail Queen Herself.

ii

This is a crucial scene, given its placement immediately before the thwarted self-examination of I, iii. The fuse will be lit for the eruption to follow, which, because of its minutely observed and personal quality, and its context in the allegorical sequence, can only be autobiographical. It follows then that I, ii, must also be autobiographical, and that Lady Anne (like Anne Bullen in HVIII) is none other than Anne Hathaway, opening a deep perspective into Shakespeare's previously occluded early life. If the theory of the Baconian double helix is found to be valid, then there can be no other conclusion; and it perhaps may have to wait until a later stage in this argument for the reader's understandable scepticism to be annihilated by the sheer weight of evidence. This scene is characterised by the determined, loveless seduction by Richard of Lady Anne, who owes allegiance to the Lancaster line, the sacred kings of the Goddess, with the "secret close intent", in his self-contempt, of appropriating their noble qualities for himself:

Richard Upon my life, she finds, although I cannot,
 Myself to be marvellous proper man...
 Shine out, fair sun, till I have bought a glass
 That I may see my shadow as I pass.

Anne is accompanying the hearse of King Henry VI to its burial place at Chertsey. The late King Henry, and his son Edward Prince of Wales, are both of the Red Rose faction (right-brain, intuitive, musical, sensual, sensitive, Goddess-worshipping):

Anne Set down, set down your honorable load-
 If honor may be shrouded in a hearse-
 Whilst I awhile obsequiously lament
 Th'untimely fall of virtuous Lancaster

Explicit in her mourning is her loathing of Ugly Dick (Puritan driven by negative libido), whom she recognises to be their murderer (3HVI):

Anne More direful hap betide that hated wretch
 That makes us wretched by the death of thee
 Than I can wish to wolves- to spiders, toads,
 Or any creeping venom'd thing that lives!

The coffin held high is symbolic of the immortality of the deceased in the minds of those left behind. Lady Anne is clearly an Aphrodite figure; and Anne Hathaway must have been utterly repelled by the Goddess-scorning Puritan Will Shaksper at their first meeting; yet with the seduction on his mind of she who is an image of the Mother/Wife he has lost, he will not be put off, and urges her to abandon her former attachments:

Richard Villains, set down the corse, or, by Saint Paul,
 I'll make a corse of him that disobeys!

She continues her obloquy, but young Will (of whose psyche Ugly Dick was the destructive principle at that time) will not be dissuaded. The falchion bears here, as always in FF, the allegoric value of the ithyphallos, more broadly the unseen world, in negative aspect:

Anne In thy foul throat thou liest! Queen Margaret saw
 Thy murd'rous falchion smoking in his blood;
 The which thou once did bend against her breast,

But that thy brothers beat aside the point.

The falchion in the body of this Edward is also the illness of King Edward (ego sickening because of negativity of unconscious and its contents). The negative ithyphallos can never be a property of the Queen of Hell: hence the Clarence and Edward principles which prevent it (ego reasoning on the invisible world). Ugly Dick now bluntly asks her to go to bed with him. This is germane to a similar approach by the Puritan King Edward IV to Lady Jane in 3 HVI III, ii ("To tell thee plain, I aim to lie with thee"), which similarly is eloquent of Puritanism's primitiveness. He now begs for her pity, as the seduction continues:

Richard Those eyes of thine from mine have drawn salt tears,
but

Shamed their aspects with store of childish drops...

At last Richard succeeds. She accepts a ring (the first appearance of this motif in FF as Ring/Grail saga), and abandons the hearse to his care. He promises to take it to Chertsey; but instead it is interred at Whitefriars (as belonging to the White Rose, or Puritan, faction). The character and aim of the seduction cannot be in doubt:

Richard Was ever woman in this humor wooed?
Was ever woman in this humour won?
I'll have her, but I will not keep her long...
My dukedom to a beggarly denier,
I do mistake my person all this while!
Upon my life, she finds (although I cannot)
Myself to be marv'llous proper man.
I'll be at charges for a looking-glass
And entertain a score or two of tailors
To study fashions to adorn my body...
Shine out, fair sun, till I have bought a glass,
That I may see my shadow as I pass.

So young Will had now remediated his self-contempt by

becoming a Consort of the Great Goddess; but a child would be conceived, and the expected erotic affair become a marriage: and in their bed beside him, as still under the influence of Puritanism, would lie the ianus diaboli to torment his nights and drive him to a breakdown: his death on the Cross, from which he would be reborn into Eternity.

iii

This scene describes the corruption of an act of meditation by the anathematised underworld. Mere ideas will become Platonic Ideas – the “Mothers” of Goethe’s *Faust* – in which the invisible world (Queen Margaret) lying beneath the surface of apparent phenomena should be revealed, to the enlightenment and wisening of the subject; but here this transformation is thwarted by the negative associations of that world. The bones of this meditation, and the psychic conflict which prompted it, will be fleshed out in the plays to come, where the centrality of the written word to all of this will become clear, and, further, that it was an erotic scene described in a book – almost certainly the vividly depicted seduction of Lucius by Fotis in Apuleius’ *The Golden Ass* – which precipitated Puritan-phase Shakespeare’s breakdown act.23. Here are the phases of the psychic process described in this scene:

1) The Puritan reader is forming ideas of the negative Goddess of Love (The lords conversing with Elizabeth) from the description, say, of the seduction scene in Apuleius.

2) The libido now surges from the unconscious (entry of Derby (Stanley) and Buckingham).

3) The ego is tormented by its Ugly Dick aspect, founded on the negativity of the libido as anathematised by Puritanism, and determines to get to the bottom of it through an act of meditation, which brings the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, Goddess of the Faustian Dimension, to the forefront of consciousness (entry of Margaret).

4) The Puritan however is unable to dismantle the Queen of Hell of Her negativity, founded on the vulnerability of the Pauline Catholic, with his view of sham Nature as enshrined in the Virgin

Mary, to the underworld in destructive mode (repulsion and exit of Margaret, after reprisal of the main events – including the death of Rutland (Pauline Catholic principle) - of 3HVI).

5) The only defence then can be the suppression of all ideation (Richard left alone on stage), to leave the Ugly Dick principle malignant with Freudian potential, ready to surge again and precipitate the breakdown described in III, iv (“charge of the Boar”), when ideation is once again aroused, as it must be, in response to Aphrodite described in the printed page.

The Goddesses of Love, Puritan sham (Elizabeth) and Gnostic (wife of Derby (libido)), are mutually antipathetic, but coalesce here, as the sham artifice is flooded with the eros she had been designed to deny:

Queen Elizabeth The Countess Richmond, good my lord of Derby,
 To your good prayer will scarcely say “Amen.”
 Yet, Derby, notwithstanding she’s your wife
 And loves not me, be you, good lord, assured
 I hate not you for her proud arrogance.

- With Derby then arguing for his wife’s love of Elizabeth. The sickening ego has suppressed his unconscious and its contents (Derby and Buckingham have just left the King), and is desperately trying to appease his inner demons: “He desires to make atonement...”; but with his affections as they are he must fail (“I fear our happiness is at the height”: Queen Elizabeth). The unconscious takes over, in the true Freudian way:

Richard They do me wrong, and I will not endure it!
 Who is it that complains unto the king
 That I (forsooth) am stern, and love them not?

The impulse to self-knowledge and healing holds sway for now:

Queen Elizabeth Brother of Gloucester, you mistake the matter:
 The king, on his own royal disposition,
 ...Makes him to send, that he may learn the

ground.

Richard I cannot tell...

[...]

Meantime, God grants that I have need of you.

The doors of perception now have parted slightly, and we expect the appearance in the meditating mind of the will, or invisible world, represented here by Queen Margaret, the Goddess of the Underworld, Queen of Hell, the White Goddess in late phase ("Dispute not with her; she is lunatic"- Dorset, 253); and Bacon announces this in a peculiar and striking way, which points to the world of The Song of Amergin:

Richard You may deny that you were not the mean
Of my Lord Hastings late imprisonment.

Rivers She may, my lord, for -

Richard She may, Lord Rivers...

She may do more, sir..

She may help you...

What may she not? She may- ay, marry, may she-

Rivers What, marry, may she?

Richard What, marry, may she? Marry with a king...

May in the northern hemisphere is the month of early summer, of increase in the plant and animal worlds, new growth, and in the countryside (the world of the Georges), of flower queens like the Welsh Blodeuwedd, the may day revels with their licentiousness and phallic symbolism, and so on. The character of Lord Suffolk (Sir William de la Pole) in 1-3 HVI will be shown to represent just this maypole/ithyphallic principle; and his murder by the White Rose faction in 2HVI IV, i, to be a crucial stage in the ascendancy of Puritanism. In pastoral-agricultural communities the new plant growth of spring was always evocative of the underworld, as exemplified by Persephone, the Goddess of Hell as well as the early corn: both the dark moon and its first silvery sliver. This is when the unseen world becomes apparent in the seen: an epiphany unknown in the merchant-dominated city which was the crucible of Puritanism. "Marry", like the "Merry" of Merry England is derived ultimately from the Latin mare meaning "sea", which

conforms here to its immemorially ancient mythic value of the unconscious, the psychic correlate of the external invisible world.

The meditating mind turns to a comparison of this true Goddess with Queen Elizabeth, as an arm goes through the doors of perception to follow the five fingers:

Queen Elizabeth I had rather be a country servant maid
 Than a great queen with this condition...
Enter old Queen Margaret [behind].
 Small joy have I in being England's queen.

This is the joy of the fiesta, of Lammas, Candlemas, All Hallows, and so on, of the willing participation in the dance of the cycle of the year, of life and death, which remained inviolate in the English countryside as the ancient Celtic (though somewhat Christianised) holy days.

Queen Margaret [aside]...

Thy honor, state and seat is due to me.

Richard I will avouch't in the presence of the king:
 I dare adventure to be sent to the tower.
 'Tis time to speak: my pains are quite forgot.

This means that this new, vivid realisation of the character of the sham Queen and her malign effect on his psyche is now forming in the ego as ideas which, as Schopenhauer observed, are inherently painless. There is a woodcut by Albrecht Dürer called The Great Crucifixion (fig.3), - beautifully discussed by Joseph Campbell in his The Inner Reaches of Outer Space, - which illumines by the power of symbolism exactly what is going on here. It is the evening of Easter Friday, the fifteenth day of the month, with the full moon rising on the left in equipoise with the sun of the spring solstice setting on the right. The former represents, of course, the world of the White Goddess, of the life and death inherent in Her year, like the moon which itself dies and is reborn; while the sun is symbolic of transcendence, a reminder of eternal principles at play in the field of space and time. They are equivalent: the moon is not quenched by the hard radiance of the sun, which in turn in the

context of the crucified Redeemer would be meaningless alone. This records the moment of the ego's self-realisation, when the flawed, mortal self will be seen in the light of eternity. The context here is, of course, of the Christlike Richard, who is dying to his old Puritan self under the light of reason brought to bear on that self at play in the ground of the Goddess; but he will abjure Her as in negative aspect, and this divinity for the time being will pass.

Richard Let me put in your minds, if you forget,
 What you have been ere this, and what you are;
 Withal, what I have been, and what I am.

It could not be clearer. This is the poetic faculty of *recueillement* (recollection - of his past life) at work, under the lamp of inspiration. "Know Thyself" says Apollo. Saint Albans is an apt name ("Was not your husband/In Margaret's battle at Saint Albans slain?") for the field of final defeat of the Goddess belongs to the White Rose faction (from the Latin *alba* = "white").

The vowel "O" belonged to spring in the Druidic tree alphabets. The order went A, O, U, E, I, corresponding to the early year, spring, high summer, the winter solstice (the time of the boar and the strangled laugh of the witch, his mistress) and death (dark moon time).⁵ This poetic significance remains potent to this day, though hidden beneath the accretions of centuries of rationalism. The stage of Richard's awareness with the invocation of the joyousness of the countryside, and Margaret the Queen of the Underworld who as yet remains occult to him, corresponds to "O", his earlier stage ("Meantime, God grants that I have need of you") to "A". This is the sense also of the Buddhist AUM, the progressive stages of meditation invoking the Goddess, where "M" is the dark moon, or the will, finally the universal Will; and it is this final realisation from which Richard in this scene will recoil. Joyce, whose feel for Druidic lore was infallible, expressed it beautifully in *Finnegans Wake*:

⁵ Robert Graves, *ibid*.

Now tell me, tell me, tell me then!

What was it?

A..... !

? O!

(p.94, Faber edition)

Richard's "I am too childish-foolish for this world" is an important realisation: for it will be the children in the Tower, the Princes desacralised, whom Shakespeare as Richard (ego tyrannised by negative libido) will have to extinguish in the meditative process of casting off his old self, through the ministry of the Gnostic tradition (the Tower); while "foolish" points straight to the many Fools of FF, for example in King Lear, where, sacralised, he will play a critical role in bringing the stricken Lear to union with the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen (Cordelia). The rationalist who "does not suffer fools gladly" is here seen in his proper light, as a tragedy waiting to happen. The height of knowledge, symbolised by the mid-summer sun in the mythologies of all races, must degrade to winter, and from that another summer will be born. "The world is full of sorrows", as Buddha said; and Giordano Bruno: "In tristitia hilaris hilaritate tristitia" (in sorrow cheer, in cheer sorrow). Indeed "there is a way beyond sorrow" as Buddha said, and as he, and Hyperborean Apollo, and Christ, all symbolising the transcendent principle have shown; but the catabolic/anabolic cycles of Nature must first be engaged to be transcended. Joseph Cambell, in his Creative Mythology, quotes Heinrich Zimmer:

The ineffable seed must be conceived, gestated and brought forth from our own substance, fed by our blood, if it is to be the true child through which its mother is reborn: and the Father, the divine transcendent principle, will also be reborn...

And here is (more pertinently) Giordano Bruno:

Because just as Divinity descends, in a certain manner, to the extent that one communicates with Nature, so one ascends to Divinity through Nature, as by means of a life

resplendent in
that presides over them.

natural things one rises to the life

Here the meditating mind (King Edward-Shakespeare) comes to the critical realisation that his Richard aspect must never be allowed to dominate. Focusing on Ugly Dick, then joyless Elizabeth who underpins him, now stilled as a Platonic Idea, the gates of perception swing wide open as the Faustian dimension is revealed beneath them both. The ego is full steam ahead toward healing:

Queen Margaret A little joy enjoys the queen thereof;
For I am she, and altogether joyless.
I can no longer hold me patient.
[Comes forward.]

The assembled nobles (Queen Elizabeth and her court, Buckingham, Dorset, Richard) now turn on her with vehemence, for she is in truth the representative of Nature in destructive mode, which the Puritan is desperate to deny. What exactly is the significance of the death of Rutland, the innocent young child of the Duke of York, brother to (the future king) Edward and Ugly Dick, at the merciless hands of Queen Margaret in 3HVI?

Hastings O, 'twas the foulest deed to slay that babe,
And the most merciless, that e'er was heard of!
Rivers Tyrants themselves wept when it was reported
Dorset No man but prophesied revenge for it.
Buckingham Northumberland, then present, wept to see it.

Intermission: 3HVI I, iii

The murder of Rutland by Margaret represents the vulnerability of the Pauline Catholic world-view, - as founded upon the Virgin Mary, that sham Goddess whose underworld aspect has been extirpated, - to the unseen world in destructive mode. Let us examine the relevant scene (3HVI, I, iii). Clifford, Queen Margaret's champion, comes upon Rutland, a young son of York (who will be covalently bonded to Rutland/Aumerle in RII), accompanied by his tutor, a priest. Clifford orders the tutor to leave, and he obeys

reluctantly. Rutland is defenceless, pathetic, a study in abject surrender:

Rutland So looks the pent-up lion o'er the wretch
 That trembles under his devouring paws;
 And so he walks, insulting o'er his prey,
 And so he comes to rend his limbs asunder.
 Ah! gentle Clifford, kill me with thy sword,
 And not with such a cruel threatening look.
 Sweet Clifford! Hear me speak before I die:
 I am too mean a subject for thy wrath;
 Be thou reveng'd on men, and let me live.

Queen Margaret and Clifford now take York prisoner, and mock his claims to nobility. She shows him a napkin she has stained with the blood of Rutland, and puts a paper crown on his head. York reviles her as Queen of Hell ("O tiger's heart wrapp'd in a woman's hide!"). He identifies her as daughter of the Gnostic Christ: "Thy father bears the type of King of Naples,/Of both the Sicils and Jerusalem..". York weeps, and she gives him the napkin to wipe his eyes. Northumberland, as the principle of blind, uninformed compassion, reacts characteristically: "Beshrew me, but his passion moves me so/That hardly can I check my eyes from tears." Clifford and the Queen have no such compunctions, and stab him. York is decapitated by Queen Margaret's men and his head set on the gates of the city that bears his name.

What is going on here? The purpose of this scene is in fact to demonstrate the crucial factor in rise of Protestant Puritanism: namely, the weakening of the Catholic intellect by its refusal to recognise anything but the (sham) Virgin Mary aspect of Nature, to leave it vulnerable to destruction by the underworld. This was also the underlying cause in more recent times of the Spanish civil war, after centuries of hegemony of the Roman Catholic Church. Rutland represents this principle of the enfeebled orthodox Catholic intellect; whereas Margaret's father (Rene d'Anjou, of the blood line probably of the Gnostic Christ, Whom orthodox Catholicism so ruthlessly suppressed) is a Gnostic Christ/Alexander/Solomon: a nonpareil of Gnostic nobility. This

scene therefore records the epochal realisation by the functional left-brain of the insult perpetrated to its faculty of reason by Pauline (orthodox) Catholicism. The reasoning ego (King Henry VI - York) senses the vulnerability of his enfeebled Catholic intellect (Rutland) to slaughter by the underworld in destructive mode (Queen Margaret-Clifford ("I" principle)), and in his fear embraces Puritanism (York's head on the city of York). The Duchess of York also represents the Goddess of Pauline Catholicism (see Ch.5: RII V, ii-iii).

The blood-stained napkin, like Desdemona's handkerchief, and every other napkin/kerchief in the plays, is symbolic of menstruation, and therefore of the Goddess and the female principle: of Woman, as anathematised by the Puritan. On the literal plane, York is wiping away his tears with it; on the allegorical plane, the incipient Puritan ego is grieving in anticipation of his suffering at the hands of Nature. Decapitation in FF is a symbol of psychic rebirth. York's fate therefore is to be interpreted as a repudiation of completeness of being for a life lived in the intellectualising left brain, a fugue driven by fear of the Goddess in catabolic mode, for the fight against Whom he has few resources (and it is precisely these resources that Shakespeare will acquire, - after the coup of RIII III, iv, - from the written word).

The beheading of York therefore marks the moment of birth of the Puritan ego.

*

Queen Margaret has entered *furens et agitans* as Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, the ground of all being, onto the stage of the meditating ego. She is the mirror in which the ego may contemplate the true nature of its being as corrupt; and the mutual antipathy of the two Goddesses, one true and one sham, is expressed by a fierce exchange of obloquies. This is a conflict which the ego at this still vulnerable stage is unable to resolve: it is all too much, and King Edward/Shakespeare turns Queen Margaret's curse back on herself at the climax of the conflict, as the Puritan principle reasserts itself:

⁶ Robert Graves, *ibid.*

Queen Margaret Thou elvish-marked, abortive, rooting hog!
 Thou that wast sealed in thy nativity
 The slave of nature and the son of hell!
 Thou slander of thy heavy mother's
 womb!
 Thou loathed issue of thy father's loins!
 Thou rag of honour! Thou detested -
 Richard Margaret.
 Queen Margaret Richard!
 Richard Ha!

Margaret puts her sham impostor in Her place ("Vain flourish of my fortune!"); and gives the divine utterance of words graven in the consciousness of every true artist:

Margaret To serve me well, you all should do me duty.
 Teach me to be your queen, and you my subjects:
 O serve me well, and teach yourselves that duty!
 Dorset Dispute not with her; she is lunatic.

- As indeed she is, as an exemplary moon Goddess. Dorset appears in Holinshed; but it is hard to believe that Bacon did not recognise the powerful symbolic possibilities of his name, which is then to be interpreted in its Druidic sense, as signifying "fixed door".⁶ This "door" is derived from the sanscrit duir, meaning "oak", a word widely distributed throughout Europe, to reflect the enormous reach of the Indo-Aryan tongue. In the Druidic tree-alphabet ("druid" being also derived from duir, to mean "oak-seer") the oak was the tree of the month of June, which includes the summer solstice, and provided, physically, the crucifix on which the sacred king of the Goddess was annually slaughtered, on this day, St. John's day, June 24, as so memorably elaborated by Sir James Frazer in his *The Golden Bough*. How it came to mean "door" is obvious, but less so is the door's religious meaning, as facing two ways, both forward to winter, and back to the old summer; and, in its ability to swing and either admit the good or repel the bad, it is a metaphor for the power of the sacred king himself. It may easily be understood, then, how the hinge came to represent the

Goddess of the Year, of promise (spring), fulfilment (summer) and death (winter), as cognate with the Triple Goddess of the moon: for without Her the king would be meaningless, as meaningless as the court of Edward IV is without Margaret, as Lear is without Cordelia. This is evident, for example, in the names of the Latin Goddesses Cardea Antevorta and Cardea Postvorta, cardea meaning “hinge”, from which the word “cardinal” is derived. This is also the origin of the term “unhinged”, to indicate psychic fragility. As catastrophic as the hinge missing is it being set fast; and, once again, one marvels at the symbolism of the plays: for this particular sacred king, brother to Edward, Richard, Clarence, and the dead Rutland, will be as useless as an immovable door. If all of this may seem far-fetched, it is worth looking at A&C (Ch.38), which gives powerful evidence of Bacon’s deepest familiarity with Druidic lore.

Queen Margaret They that stand high have many blasts to shake them,

And if they fall, they dash themselves to pieces.

- An axiom that Lear will come to illustrate. Her curses continue to induce the turning point of the play:

Buckingham Peace, peace, for shame! If not, for charity.

The unconscious, for reasons unknown to the ego (hence Buckingham, who confirms with every line his role), now induces a feeling of shame, on account of the ego’s assertion of the primacy of the Queen of the Underworld, from Whose curses it now begs release. Yet the unconscious, as unknowing, is blameless, in the way that the pre-Hellenic Goddess-worshipping inhabitants of Greece, from which Helen’s unfortunate first husband sprang, were referred to by later mythographers as “the blameless ones”:

Queen Margaret	O Princely Buckingham, I’ll kiss thy hand In sign of league and amity with thee... Thy garments are not spotted with our blood
	Nor thou within the compass of my curse.

The unconscious of this subject is however corrupt, as influenced by Christian Puritanism:

Richard What doth she say, my Lord of Buckingham?

Buckingham Nothing that I respect, my gracious lord.

[...]

Queen Margaret

Live each of you the subjects to his hate,
And he to yours, and all of you to God's!

Exit

The ego (Edward/Shakespeare) has been traumatised ("My hair doth stand on end to hear her curses"- Buckingham), and is conscious of the principle of libido being lost, for which it blames Margaret, Who is however beyond good and evil and all considerations of guilt. It is as if Ulysses recoiled from Circe (who is cognate with Margaret) and sailed back through Scylla and Charybdis (which represent all pairs of opposites in the world of forms) without ever reaching the Island of the Sun (final illumination, at-one-ment with the Father). Catesby, the go-between of the unconscious and the conscious ego, a pairing which his every later appearance will confirm (e.g. "For we to-morrow hold divided councils/Wherein thyself shalt highly be employed"- Buckingham to Catesby, III, I, 179) now summons the sham Queen and her court (Rivers, Grey, Dorset – the reason based on the sham Queen of Hell-Grail Queen) to the ego, to leave Richard alone in the unconscious, malignant with Freudian potentiality.

iv

It will be shown in the argument to come that drunkenness represents, always in FF, the state of dissolution in blind libido (Sir Toby Belch; Falstaff; Cassio in Othello, and so on). And so here, where the allegoric value we have determined for Clarence is confirmed by his drowning in a malmsey butt, and by Burgundy as the destination of the sea voyage of his dream: this town being a reference here, as in HV, to wine. The sea bears here its ancient mythic value of the unconscious, wherein the libido resides; the treasures Clarence finds on its floor, the

richness to be gained from engagement with the invisible world, which modern science, depth psychology and art have abundantly confirmed. This is what the Puritan forgoes in his repudiation of the Faustian dimension (Richard's dream murder of Clarence).

The letter read by Brakenbury, keeper of the Tower, bearing the murderers' commission, is yet another instance in FF of the letter as symbol of the written word, which takes on in the mind of the Puritan reader a different, perverse sense, as exclusive of the anathematised Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, whose realm is the unseen world. The restoration of acknowledgement of Her dimension will be the aim of Bacon's therapy, as expressed in the prominent roles of Portia, Cordelia, Imogen, and all the other Queens of Hell of the plays. These are the Ring/Grail Queens of FF; and Lady Anne, the Goddess as Woman, in Whom the underworld aspect is prominent, is the first of their line. The Winter's Tale will affirm that the Holy Grail (a tradition identical with the Ring, as affirmed in All's Well That Ends Well) of Shakespeare's quest is the wisdom founded on acknowledgement of the unseen world, or Faustian dimension of Nature, as described in the Gnostic written word.

Now the murderers enter, as Clarence lies asleep beside Brakenbury (Puritan preparing to deal with the suppressed libido once and for all, through the continued misconception of the written word). The protraction of the deliberations leading up to the assassination, in which the two murderers dispute with each other, reflects the length of this process, and the inner conflict and conscience of the ego: Shakespeare's abiding sense, with his great intellect and imagination, albeit now atrophying, of the hardening of his Puritanism as unjustified.

ACT II

i

The nobles embrace – Rivers and Hastings (ascendancy of Puritan censor's characteristic patterns of reasoning), Elizabeth and Hastings (- which are founded on the sham Nature), Dorset and Hastings (- and result in rigidity and ignobility of outlook), Buckingham and Elizabeth (- with the unconscious (Buckingham) being held in check by the perverse misconception of Nature). The

troubled Shakespeare (aet.18-19 approx.) trusts by this strategy to be released from the tyranny of the negative libido:

Richard 'Tis death to me to be at enmity...
 I do not know that Englishman alive
 With whom my soul is any jot at odds
 More than the infant that is born to-night.

The infant here symbolises the rebirth of which minds of imagination and rationality – yet denied by the Puritan - are capable (cf. the third apparition in *Macbeth* IV, i); and one recalls the majestic words with which Joseph Campbell concludes his monumental *Masks of God* series:

And in this life-creative adventure the criterion of achievement will be, as in every one of the tales here reviewed, the courage to let go the past, with its truths, its goals, its dogmas of “meaning”, and its gifts: to die to the world and to come to birth from within.

Richard now announces that Clarence (libido) is dead. Soon the last remnants of Gnostic reasoning will be lost (death of Edward), as Shakespeare hardens in his Puritanism to approach the state of the mindless censor (Hastings). The death of Edward is prefigured in the faces of the party:

Buckingham Look I so pale, Lord Dorset, as the rest?
Dorset Ay, my good lord; and no man in the presence
 But his red colour hath forsook his cheeks.

- For this is the last gasp of the Red Rose (Lancaster) principle of Gnostic engagement with Nature. The purpose of Edward's long speech in reply to Derby's request for pardon for a man of his, who has killed an attendant of the Duke of Norfolk in a drunken fit, is to identify Clarence with the murderer, both bearing the value of the libido (as indeed does Derby). This was an episode invented *de novo* for the allegory, and does not appear in the sources. Norfolk represents, as will be shown in RII, the *ithyphallos*, more broadly

the unseen world, as idea, with Suffolk that principle as will: the reference being to the imagination recreating the Goddess of Love as described in the printed page (for example, the graphic description of the seduction of Lucius by Fotis in TGA, which will be shown in MAN to have been the precipitating factor in Shakespeare's breakdown aet.23). Richard's "God will revenge it" is ominous with Freudian potentiality.

ii

The passing of the ego into the pitch darkness of Puritanism is predicated on the suppression of the libido, both as will and idea (Duchess of York's mourning of Clarence, then her odd denial of it to his children, claiming that she is rather weeping for Edward: to make explicit the link between the two). Here we note yet another instance in FF of a peculiar allegorical technique:

Boy Think you my uncle did dissemble grandam?
Duchess I, boy.

This is exactly as per FF; whereas most modern editors amend "I" to the expected "Ay". This is a remarkably common occurrence in the plays, where "I" stands always, on the plane of allegory, for the ithyphallic/maypole principle, with the broader connotation of the unseen world. Young Edward, son of Clarence (libido), is here being identified with that principle; while his sister Margaret is, of course, another Queen of Hell-Grail Queen (covalently bonded to Queen Margaret). He has just told the Duchess that Richard "bad me rely on him, as on my father,/And he would love me dearly as a child"; and he will not be dissuaded of his uncle's affection for him. For Ugly Dick (ego dominated by contents of negative unconscious) will be, of course, the source of the ithyphallos that will surge once again, after eight years of incarceration of the libido in the unconscious of Will Shaksper aet.15-23 (this chronology will be finally confirmed in the inductions to TOS), upon reading the seduction scene in TGA, to precipitate the breakdown, his recovery from which would give birth to the greatest Ring saga in literature.

Queen Elizabeth enters, mourning the death of the King; and the Duchess rounds on her. The latter identifies herself as "the mother

of these griefs". The frozen idiot Dorset, another aspect of the Edward/Richard/Clarence/Rutland complex, makes a characteristic response:

Dorset Comfort, dear mother; God is much displeased
 That you take with unthankfulness his doing.

What is going on in all of this? It will become clear (Ch.5) that the Duchess of York throughout the allegories represents the principle of the Goddess as Virgin Mary, mother of the fatally intellectually comprised Pauline Catholic ego (Rutland) - as reckless of the Triple Goddess in toto, but especially as Queen of Hell - and hence married to York, the principle of reason which will, sensing the vulnerability of his family, instead of embracing the Gnostic ideal, fatally reject the female principle, and imagination, in the service of Puritanism. It is not unreasonable to postulate also the Duchess to be a representation of Shakespeare's mother, the Catholic Mary Arden, and the Duke of York of his father, who seems to have had Puritan sympathies. This theme of the writer repudiating his Catholic past is a common enough theme by now; but never before or since – not even in Joyce - has it been set so comprehensively analysed in the context of the great sweep of religious history, from Egypt and Greece, through the birth of Christianity, to the Gnostic Renaissance, and the tyranny of Puritanism.

Elizabeth enters with news of the King's death, to add to that of Clarence's; and the Duchess names herself as "the mother of these griefs". It will be confirmed in the discussion of RII that she represents the sham Goddess of Pauline (Roman) Catholicism, the Virgin Mary, who is indeed, as the Great Goddess (Nature divinised) sundered from her Woman and Queen of Hell aspects, the fons et origo of the Puritan error. This is the point that is also being made in the murder of Rutland in 3HVI I, ii.

Rivers now counsels hope to Elizabeth, that her son Edward will be crowned the new king; and Ugly Dick enters in a peculiar way:

Richard Sister, have comfort. All of us have cause
 To wail the dimming of our shining star;

But none can help our harms by wailing them.
Madam, my mother, I do cry you mercy;
I did not see your grace. Humbly on my knee
I crave your blessing.

What is the true meaning of these lines, concealed behind a façade of fancy? They represent the uneasy relationship between the Ugly Dick factor and Catholic orthodoxy: the irrational asserting itself heedless of the strictures of the Church, and in consequence inducing guilt in the ego, and a fear of the wrath of the Old Testament God. Again, the inference of some such feeling in the suffering Will Shaksper vis-a-vis his mother may be made.

The coronation of the young Prince Edward (son of the King, not Clarence) now is mooted. This is the suffering ego's last hope, which will be extinguished with the disappearance of Queen Elizabeth's brother and son (Puritan ideation) as they lead the Prince on the road to his coronation (that hope to its fulfilment) and the imprisonment of the Princes Edward and York - all at the instigation of Ugly Dick. Richard, Buckingham, Hastings, Derby, and Rivers, all conspire to leave the Prince vulnerable to abduction on his journey to London. The last mentioned indicates that a remnant of ideation remains; but his murder, along with the other lords, will signify the death of this principle. Ugly Dick represents the ego as dominated by the negative unconscious:

Richard [to Buckingham] My other self, my counsel's consistory,
My oracle, my prophet, my dear cousin,
I, as a child, will go by thy direction.

iii

Here three citizens converse anxiously and accurately foresee the tragedies that will follow. Three is, and has been since time immemorial, a Goddess number- for the moon has three distinct phases, new, full and old; while four is a sun number. These associations continue to haunt the subconscious, as indicated by the great girl groups, which have exclusively been trios, such as the

Andrews Sisters and the Supremes; while male groups have tended to be quartets (e.g. the Beatles), or trios with a pronounced Goddess feel about them (e.g. Cream, the Witch (old moon); the Bee Gees, Aphrodite (full moon); silverchair, the Maiden (new moon)). This observation can be developed at fascinating length to illumine all areas of popular and high culture, but this is not the place; - save to remark that the Petrarchian sonnet owes its power, that feeling of completeness, to its being written both in sun-numbers (quatrains) and moon-numbers (sestet). It is both Nature and the reason applied to it, the right and left brains in complete cooperation, the "fair and foul" Goddess and King Solomon (see the Song of Solomon) indivisibly joined: and the predominance in Elizabethan England of the Baconian sonnet (see Ch.45), which gives the sestet as much "sun" character as possible (quatrain + couplet), while retaining the 14 (8 + 6) lines, is an index to Bacon's striving for closure and control, as exemplified also in TOS by the subjugation of Kate. If the cycle of the moon has such a significant physical correspondence as menstruation, it should not surprise if it have a psychological correlate as well, in the collective unconscious. The three prophetic citizens of this scene are therefore germane to the "weird sisters" in Macbeth.

iv

This scene serves to make absolutely clear the allegoric value of the young Duke of York:

York I, mother, but I would not have it so.

[...]

York ...I, quoth my uncle Gloucester,
Small herbs have grace...

The abduction of the young Prince Edward, and the flight into sanctuary of the Duchess of York and her younger son, are described in Holinshed; and Bacon took the opportunity to make some points, in illustration of the artistic axiom that "Form is the obstacle that brings creativity to birth". The differences from the account in the source are, again, scepticidal agents of the highest toxicity. Here, he has allocated to York the "I" principle, the

significance of whose extraction from sanctuary will be made clear in the next scene.

ACT III

i
Now what of the value of Prince Edward? There can be no doubt at all.

Richard The weary way hath made you melancholy.

Prince No uncle, but our crosses on the way
 Have made it tedious, wearisome, and heavy.

This identification with the Gnostic Christ makes it clear that the Prince's death in the Tower, along with his brother's, will represent a rebirth into divinity: the unseen world ("I") as idea being acknowledged by the suffering ego, to transform it. This is yet another common technique of the First Folio as allegory: the death of Lear (crucified Christ) and ascendancy of Edgar (resurrected Christ) being a further good example. The brothers' deaths will represent the end of the suppression of their principles in the Puritan psyche, as the transformation of the ego (Shakespeare in early London phase) is inaugurated. This is the reason for the otherwise incongruous rapturous speech of the murderer Tyrell over their corpses.

This is a good point to mention an illustration (fig.2), discussed beautifully by Joseph Campbell in his *Creative Mythology*, from *The Music of the Spheres*, a fifteenth century Hermetic work by Gafurius, of great relevance to the plays; and it is difficult to believe that Bacon was unaware of it. Not the least striking feature is its depiction, - both at the summit with Hyperborean Apollo, and at the nadir of the lion-mouth of the serpent, - of the Goddess surda Thalia ("silent abundance"), who represents the dreamlike natural world of the earliest humans, unadorned by words and the broader reason (left-brain). As the subject of art (the Muses) She becomes stilled as Platonic Ideas, which lead the contemplating mind directly to the Will. When transposed from this bottom-most station to the transcendental presence of Apollo she takes Her place with the three Graces at the summit of achievement of the

nine muses at Apollo's right hand. Of the trinity of beasts it is the lion who ingests her to effect the transformation. The silences of Cordelia, Hippolyta, Hero, and so on, are cognate with that of Thalia: for Nature is not at this stage speaking through the Musical arts to the Puritan subject (Shakespeare aet.15-23). The subsequent volubility of these silent Goddesses will represent the engagement of London-phase Shakespeare with the Musical arts under the tutelage of Sir Francis Bacon, to make of him an Hyperborean Apollo, or Gnostic Christ.

There are at this point two highly significant variations from Holinshed: the specification of Hastings as the agent of York's implied distraintment from sanctuary; and the fact that it was necessary, whereas Holinshed states that the request of the Cardinal was enough. It was vital that Hastings appear at this point, for it is the terminal Puritan censor who will desacralise the "I" principle and suppress it, as will and idea, along with the Christ principle.

Prince Edward now recalls the legend of the building of the Tower by Julius Caesar, whose fame has lived on through his own writings. The reference here is to Edward as the Gnostic Christ reborn, an Alexander figure, after his "death" in the Tower; and to Shakespeare also as this Gnostic Christ, who will live to conquer Nature, and put it all down in writing, in the pages of the First Folio:

Prince Edward That Julius Caesar was a famous man...

Death makes no conquest of this conqueror...

An if I live until I be a man,

I'll win our ancient right in France again

Or die a soldier as I lived a king.

Implicit in this last hope is the triumph over Nature (France: cf. HV), which in truth is no triumph at all ("Say I, her sovereign, am her subject low": Richard, RIII IV, iv, 355-6), in the way of the Hermetic mage (e.g. Alexander the Great: see Ch.8). For although the great, the unique achievement of the West has been the control of Nature, to allow each and every individual, - whose worth now is held sacred, - the chance to fulfil his destiny, yet the challenge has been to respect Her divinity, and to retain, even as

power is won, the principle of love: to see ourselves as, not as above Her company, but as Her greatest expression. An awareness of loss therefore opened like a chasm in the Western ego at the earliest stage of its differentiation, as recorded even then by the great artists:

Chorus Did your offence perhaps go further than you have said?
Prometheus Yes. I caused men no longer to foresee their death.
Aeschylus, Prometheus Bound

Prometheus ("forward thinker") was a Consort/Son of the Goddess, and brother of Atlas ("the sufferer") who is cognate with Ixion, bound irremovably to Nature's wheel of Fortune. Prometheus, with his theft of fire, and his subsequent exploitation of the smelting of iron, avoided a similar sentence for himself and the West. The struggle to control Nature had begun in earnest, and with it, the pain of loss: of the Goddess, of soul, of the self. Let us leave the last word to Schopenhauer:

The concept is abstract, discursive, undetermined within its own sphere, determined only by its limits, attainable and comprehensible by him who has the faculty of reason, communicable by words without any other mediation, entirely exhausted by its definition. The [Platonic] Idea, on the contrary... is always object of perception... It is never known by the individual as such, but only by him who raised himself above all willing and all individuality to the pure subject of knowing. Thus it is attainable only by the man of genius, and by the man who, mostly with the help of the works of genius, has raised this power of pure knowing, and is now in a genial frame of mind... Finally... the concept is like a sterile container: things put into it lie there, but no more can be taken out of it (by analytical judgements) than was put in (by synthetical reflection); the Idea, on the other hand, develops, in the person who has grasped it, ideas which, in relation to the concept of the same name, are new; it resembles a living organism, evolving, and with the power to engender and produce what had not simply been put into it.

A more accurate and succinct summation of the philosophy of the First Folio would be hard to imagine. The young York is now brought into the presence of Edward, Richard and Buckingham. His mother is missing (Elizabeth remains in sanctuary: the Goddess is sacralised), and with her the truly religious (< Latin *religare* = to bind back) sense of the unseen world. In terms of the Journey of the Hero, the meeting with the Goddess is aborted; *surda Thalia* remains silent; and the holy round of *kathodos-anodos*, death and rebirth, is interrupted, fixed like Dorset's door on its hinge.

The kinship of Richard and the young Duke of York is apparent in their dialogue. York's is incomparably the wittier of the two: for the *ithyphallos* is a property of the Fool (cf. the Elizabethan jester's cap; and the libidinous adventures of ass-phase Lucius in TGA), who is identified with wit and wisdom throughout the plays (see especially Feste in TN); whereas the ego informed by the negative libido (Ugly Dick principle) is devoid of it: hence the vital role played, in so many of the plays, by the Fool, in the redemption of the stricken ego. Richard gives his dagger to his nephew, but withholds his sword. Both blades represent here, as always in FF, the "I" principle: the point being that the ego in the grip of his unconscious, and its contents of the negative libido, will resist tumescence.

York Because that I am little, like an ape,
 He thinks that you should bear me on your shoulders.

The image irresistibly brought to mind is of Aeneas carrying his father Anchises on his shoulders from the burning city of Troy in Virgil's Aeneid II. The point being made is that in the *ithyphallos-libido* are to be found the roots of the Ugly Dick condition. Catesby's role as the mediator between the unconscious and the ego is emphasised:

Buckingham ...Come hither, Catesby.
 Thou art sworn as deeply to effect what we intend
 As closely to conceal what we impart.
Richard ...go, gentle Catesby,
 ...For we tomorrow hold divided councils,
 Wherein thyself shalt highly be employed.

If the sceptical mind, doubting of the theory of the Baconian double helix, could be given just one character to resolve, by examination of his every line and entrance, completely any lingering doubt, then Catesby it would have to be. A Freudian catastrophe is being incubated: the welling of the underworld into a complacent city, like the charge of the Boar at Adonis, or the shattering erosion by subterranean torrents of the roots of the tower of Lear Inc: for winter will hit, come what may; the gale lunge deep through the door set fast.

It is the evening before the day of the coup, then, when the libido will flash-flood the resourceless Puritan victim:

Buckingham And summon him tomorrow to the Tower
To sit about the coronation...

Ideation (Rivers, Grey, Vaughan) is still active; but not for long:

Richard Commend me to Lord William. Tell him, Catesby,
His ancient knot of dangerous adversaries
To-morrow are let blood at Pomfret Castle,
And bid my lord, for joy of this god news,
Give Mistress Shore one gentle kiss the more.

Mistress Shore is an Aphrodite-figure, whose erotic approach to the terminal Puritan Hastings, Her ailing Consort, will be received as a murderous assault ("charge of the Boar"). He will anathematise Her as a whore, as Hamlet does Ophelia, Othello Desdemona, Macbeth his motherland ("Donalbain", the "white river": again, the White Goddess contemned), and so on. In this pure enquiry into the crisis of, and recovery from, the Puritan disease, the tower will be rebuilt through the magian offices of Richmond ("I" principle: ithyphallos/maypole, more broadly the unseen world), with due regard, respect and love for the Goddess flowing at its roots. In HAM, on the other hand, the subject will not recover, but decline into irreversible paranoid schizophrenia. My dealings with many a schizophrenic as a medical student in psychiatry term, and my fascination with depth psychology, led me

to conclude that there is an immense nurtural component in the aetiology of that disease; and FF as allegory gives massive confirmation of that theory. There is no-one to blame, of course; for as Schopenhauer put it:

The true sense of tragedy is the deeper insight that it is not his own individual sins that the hero atones for, but original sin, i.e., the guilt of existence itself. As Calderon puts it plainly:

For the greatest crime of man
Is that he was born.

[Life is a Dream]

Yet FF posits imagination-less Christian puritanism as an important cause, perhaps the principal cause; and the gauntlet is thrown down thereby to modern psychiatric theory. Analysis of the following scenes will show that Shakespeare was suspended, after the coup of 1587, over the pit of psychosis by the thinnest yet strongest of ropes - his intellect on the one hand, his imagination on the other - so that the flames scarred the soles of his feet for life: a wound invisible to the onlooker, yet whose recurrent pain would evoke the crystal-clear memories of that trauma, to provide the material of his, and his mentor Bacon's, art.

Richard [to Buckingham]:

And look when I am king, claim thou of me
The earldom of Hereford and all the moveables
Whereof the king my brother was possessed.

The word "moveables" is of the greatest significance. For Buckingham (the unconscious) will not inherit the immoveable castle (reasoning ego), seat of noble power handed down through generations, as grounded in the earth, - which is Nature, - like a tree; but will inherit, a usurper, the temporal trappings, and not the substance of Gnostic nobility.

Richard has ordered Catesby to report back before sleep. The following scene opens at 4 a.m. the next morning in Hastings' bedroom. Catesby's answer has been that Hastings will support the

succession of Prince Edward: for the ego, whose activity is being played out on the stage, has totally repressed the negative contents of the unconscious; yet the night will bring a presentiment of disaster.

ii

Let us put ourselves in Shakespeare's place, at his desk. What exactly is the microcosmic scenario to be conveyed? Stratford-phase Shakespeare has picked up Apuleius' TGA, expecting to interpret it in the Puritan way, as usual, with violent objurgation of the invisible world, which includes the libido, and suppression of it both as will and idea. He turns the page, and comes upon the unforgettable, graphically described erotic encounter between Lucius and the Aphrodite-figure Fotis. The phases of the assault and defence are: 1) conscious ego becomes aware of the libido, and begins to recreate the scene in the imagination, with its threat of the "charge of the Boar", 2) - to induce the defensive reaction of Puritan censoriousness; 3) the blind unconscious comes into to play, to override rationality, and challenge the tyranny of the censor; 4) the reader now begins to identify with Lucius, and release his libido, 5) - which prompts the final defence mechanism of total suppression of the imagination, to remove the last resource necessary properly to deal with the conflict, and leave him fatally vulnerable to the Boar. Their correlates here are: 1) entry of a messenger from Lord Stanley (Derby: libido), who knocks on Hastings' door; 2) emergence of Hastings; 3) entry of Catesby; 4) entry of Stanley; 5) exit of Catesby and Stanley, followed by entries of poursuivant and priest. The beheading of Hastings in the Tower will represent the instant of the catastrophic coup that befell Shakespeare in 1587, to abruptly terminate his Puritan phase. Holinshed gives only the bare bones of this scene, with the entry of the messenger. The entrances of Catesby and Buckingham, each with their precise allegorical function, were inventions of the playwright.

In Holinshed it is midnight. Here, however, it is early dawn (first stirrings of imagination). Stanley has dreamt that "the Boar had rased off his helm" (consciousness of libido brings fear of its flooding the ego, to precipitate the coup). Stanley asks Hastings to

“take horse with him” (where the horse-and-rider represents, as always in FF, the libido in action, as sourced from the Platonic Socrates’ famous metaphor in Phaedrus). Stanley fears the “separated council” (ego conscious of libido fears the power of the unconscious). Hastings refuses, and invites him instead to go to the Tower, where “the Boar will use us kindly” (complacent engagement with the Gnostic written word – for example, Apuleius’ *The Golden Ass*, with its intense eroticism – which however will be trigger of the coup). The unconscious will not be denied:

Catesby It is a reeling world indeed, my Lord:
 And I believe will never stand upright
 Till Richard wear the garland of the Realm.
Hastings How wear the garland?
 Dost thou mean the Crown?
Catesby I, my good Lord.

“I” for “Ay” represents, as always, the ithyphallos; and consider “stand”: the meaning could not be plainer. Shaksper had become Shakespeare in London. Here is why:

Enter Stanley

Hastings Come on, come on, where is your boar-spear man?
 Fear you the boar, and go so unprovided?

This is the spear of the name “Shake-speare” – “Shaksper” transformed, through the ministry of Bacon and the Gnostic tradition – which signifies the Boar-killer, the conqueror of the erstwhile crippling psychopathology. The choreography is precise: Hastings tells of the murder of the lords (suppression of imagination), and straight the poursuivant enters, whose warrant is, on the plane of allegory, for the fall of the Puritan ego. Thus does Hastings give him his purse: for money represents throughout the plays, as we shall see, the power of a principle. His fate is sealed. This poursuivant appears in *Holinshed*, though not the purse. Hastings now meets a priest whom he calls “Sir John”. This priest appears in *Holinshed*, as does a knight, both unnamed.

Shakespeare has combined the two, and given him a name. These minutiae are, as always, of great importance to the allegory. Why “Sir John”, exactly? This must be a reference to King John, who represents the unconscious in the eponymous play, which Bacon was writing *solus*, probably at about the same time as he and Shakespeare were engaged on RIII. Hastings professes his indebtedness to the priest, but withholds his payment. This means that the subject is now totally suppressing the unconscious: an interpretation which is reinforced by Buckingham’s entry, to tell him that he will accompany him to the Tower, but cannot stay there. This is odd to say the least, given Buckingham’s central role in the scene to follow; but it is clearly explained by reference to the plane of allegory.

Here is another crucifixion reference, to the Last Supper, to indicate once again the successful syncretism of the Hermetic and Christian traditions by the new Neoplatonism/Christian Cabalism, in which Bacon and his circle were thoroughly immersed:

Hastings Nay, like enough, for I stay dinner there [in the Tower].

Buckingham And supper too, although thou know’st it not.

iv

This scene records the coup of 1587, the defining moment of Shakespeare’s life, and a momentous one for Western culture, the elucidation of the aetiology, pathogenesis, and treatment of which was to become the one, the only subject of the First Folio. Holinshed mentions the other lords present in general terms only, with Buckingham failing to appear at all: his expanded role being an invention of Shakespeare’s. The exit and subsequent sudden entry of Richard-Buckingham, followed by Hastings’ distraintment to beheading, represents, of course, the Puritan’s repression of and overthrow by the unconscious: nothing less than the moment of the breakdown, which became graven forever in the tables of Shakespeare’s memory, yet whose extreme suddenness of onset, and intense emotional accompaniment (see next scene), boded well for recovery, as modern psychiatry recognises.

Subsequent plays to be examined will reveal that the immediate

trigger for the breakdown was a vividly erotic passage in a book, almost certainly Fotis' seduction of Lucius in Apuleius' TGA, which, encountered by the reader, would drive him to an act of auto-erotism, to shatter his Puritan fastness. The constraints of the source meant that Shakespeare could not introduce a Goddess at this point: yet there was a way, albeit oblique. This was Hastings' injunction to Ely to fetch some strawberries from his garden in Holborn for the meal. Holinshed does not record their delivery; whereas here they closely precede the coup. The reference is almost certainly to the napkin/kerchief, which bears always without exception throughout the plays, as referring to menstruation, the allegoric value of the Goddess as Woman, as anathematised by the Puritan. In Othello, Desdemona's handkerchief is woven with a strawberry pattern, the reference to menstruation being even more vivid. The napkin has already appeared in 3HVI I, iii, bearing precisely that value. So then, here is Woman revealing Her full depth and mystery, in contrast to the sterile sham of Puritanism, to arouse the libido of the Puritan that was Shakespeare aet.15-23, and precipitate the breakdown.

Here is the archetypal "Shakespearean moment " of the plays, when the loved one is perceived by the double vision of the stricken subject, wounded after the "charge of the Boar", as a whore:

Richard Look how I am bewitched. Behold, mine arm
 Is like a blasted sapling, withered up;
 And this Edward's wife, that monstrous witch,
 Consorted with that harlot, strumpet Shore
 That by their witchcraft thus have marked me.
 ...Thou protector of this damned strumpet
 ...Off with his head!

The character of Sir Thomas Lovel(I) now makes his first appearance in the sequence. He will be shown in HVIII to represent the "love-hell" which enveloped Shakespeare after the act of eros;

⁸ "Now, at their coming, himself with the duke of Buckingham stood harnessed in old ill faring briganders, such as no man should weene, that they would vouchsafe to have out upon their backs, except that some sudden necessity had constrained

and here his significance is precisely the same. Needless to say, he does not appear at this point in the source.

v

Enter Richard [Duke of Gloucester], and Buckingham, in rotten armour, marvellous ill-favoured.

A dominant emotional component indicates a good prognosis in a breakdown of this kind; and this scene records the immediate sequelae of extreme anxiety and paranoia (stopping short of psychosis) in the stricken ego. The armour of the knights of the Crusades, and later of Don Quixote, was the first outward symbol of properly European individuality ("indivi-duality"). This scene, however, announces the shattering of the sham individuality of the Puritan psyche by the "charge of the Boar", the Consort/Son of the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, to smash the fraudulent mentation which has traduced Her. One thinks of the cognate disarray of Hamlet after the "charge of the Boar" (HAM II, i: "Lord Hamlet with his doublet all unbraced"); and also of the harmony between Apollo and the Three Graces in the illustration by Gafurius (fig.2), in contrast with their violent conflict in RIII: but this particular Apollo was always a tyrant, and the time of reckoning has arrived. Their entry was suggested by Holinshed,⁸ but its intensely peculiar sequelae were not.

Richard and Buckingham are alone on the stage: the will-to-eros in negative aspect, the contents of the unconscious, now ruling the ego. Now the mannerisms, intermixed with signs of neurotic anxiety, are assumed, easily recognisable by anyone who has mixed with large numbers of young adults of the highest intelligence, as I did in the Seventies at Sydney University, where there were to be found some prize specimens of true Christian puritanism who conformed to Shakespeare's graphic description to different degrees, and for whom psychosis seemed but a short step away:

Richard Come, cousin, canst thou quake and change thy colour
 Murder thy breath in the middle of a word,
 And then again begin, and stop again,

As if thou were distraught and mad with terror?
Buckingham Tut, and I can counterfeit the deep tragedian,
Speak and look back, and pry on every side,
Tremble and start at wagging of a straw:
Intending deep suspicion, ghastly looks
Are at my service, like enforced smiles...

He is playing for a crowd: his fellow man, whom he assumes to embody the Puritan consensus to which he has hitherto rigorously conformed, and which is antithetical to the properly Western ideal of the self-determining individual. Richard and Buckingham peering in terror over the battlements describes a frank anxiety attack. Lovel (the "love-hell") and Ratcliffe (Ugly Dick's executor in the ego) appear with Hastings' severed head, symbolic always of psychic transformation.

The broad outline of much of what follows was provided by the source; but Shakespeare was able to turn it to the advantage of the allegory. Richard orders Buckingham to go the Town Hall, and plead to the citizens on his behalf. This means, on the allegorical plane, that the suffering ego is attempting to divorce himself from his unconscious, and remove the possibly of a tormenting ithyphallos, as expressed in Buckingham's oddly put "I go", where "I" stands for the ithyphallos. Richard's order to Lovel to bring the preachers Shaw and Penker to his castle similarly does not appear in the source. Shakespeare must have sought refuge, in the aftermath of the breakdown, in an extreme intensification of Puritan piety: futilely, will soon be shown.

The association of this scene with Sonnet 145 is poignant and compelling:

Those lips that love's own hand did make
Breathed forth the sound that said 'I hate'
To me that languished for her sake;
But when she saw my woeful state,
Straight in her heart did mercy come,
Chiding that tongue that ever sweet
Was used in giving gentle doom,
And taught it thus anew to greet:

'I hate' altered with an end
That followed it as gentle day
Doth follow night who, like a fiend,
From heaven to hell is flown away.
'I hate' from hate away she threw,
And saved my life, saying 'not you.'

Given the cryptographic nature of FF, and the massive influence on Shakespeare of the master cryptographer Sir Francis Bacon, "hate away" can only be an easy encryption of the name "[Anne] Hathaway". The sonnet records a time shortly after the Boar had struck, when he had announced to his wife his intention of leaving her to fly to London. It was most plausibly written in 1589 or thereabouts, when Shakespeare had first taken up his pen (Orlando phase) after "two years and more" (as given in the final lines of MAF) of intensive reading under the guidance of Bacon (Melancholy Jacques phase).

vi

This allegoric significance of this scene lies in the Page bearing the indictment of Hastings: the written word, immediate precipitator of the coup. The figures given differ markedly from those in the source. Hastings was beheaded at 10 a.m. It is now 3 p.m. ("within these five hours Hastings lived"); the indictment has been eleven hours in the writing, and "the precedent was full as long a doing". Eleven hours back takes us to 4 a.m., the time of Hastings' reception of the messenger from Catesby (imagination beginning to work on the Fotis-Lucius encounter described in TGA).

vii

Buckingham's speech to the citizens on behalf of Richard has failed (ego suppressing unconscious, and so thwarting domination by Ugly Dick factor). When repeated by the recorder, however, it came closer to success, as Buckingham tells Richard (unconscious not however to be suppressed). The detail of what follows differs significantly from Holinshed. The defence mechanism of the outward show of extreme piety will collapse under pressure of the unconscious, and Ugly Dick will predominate. Once again, the

choreography is exquisite and precise. Buckingham advises Richard initially to secrete himself, and then take up a prayer book and be born aloft by the two preachers, on an upper balcony, as he himself approaches with the citizens (unconscious driving flight into piety). Richard says "I go" (suppression of ithyphallic principle as will and idea). Catesby (who else?) now acts as go-between, conforming to his allegoric value, and brings Richard out into view of Buckingham and the citizens (defence of flight from unconscious about to collapse). The immorality of the Gnostic world view vis-à-vis the Puritan is emphasized by the subject in his delusion: "Ah ha, my Lord, this Prince is not an Edward,/He is not lulling on a lewd love-bed...". Richard's initial refusal to accede to their pleading that he should assume the throne, and subsequent agreement, represents the ego's struggle against domination by the unconscious, to become Ugly Dick, and final surrender to it. Finally, in an illustration of the frequent technique of returning to square one to express the same point in a different way, Richard returns to his prayers, dismissing Buckingham and the rest: for his coronation will record the indefeasible (for now) ascendancy of the tyranny of the unconscious.

ACT IV

i

The Tower of London represents here the written word of the Gnostic tradition, by whose ministry, courtesy of Sir Francis Bacon, the patient Shakespeare will be extirpated of the Puritan error, and restored to health. The significance of the exclusion from the Tower of the Duchesses of York and Gloucester, and Queen Elizabeth, is now plain. The Duchess of York represents the Virgin Mary, mutilated Goddess of Roman Catholicism, that inveterate enemy of the Gnostic Church; Anne, Duchess of Gloucester, ultimately Anne Hathaway, the Aphrodite figure who, as *ianus diaboli* as cast by Puritanism, had precipitated Shakespeare's breakdown, through absolutely no fault of her own; and Queen Elizabeth, the sham Goddess of Puritanism, who is no Goddess at all. Anne is being taken away by Derby (libido) to be crowned as Richard's Queen; but she knows she will soon be abandoned (see IV, ii, 49, below). Her successor in Richard's affections will be the

young Princess Elizabeth (Queen of Hell-Grail Queen), whose ascendancy will mark the ego's phase of recovery (Richmond principle supplanting the Richard (Ugly Dick)). Her association here with Derby implies, on the plane of allegory, that he will also be abandoned: for Shakespeare's renaissance will be predicated on his victory over the libido, more broadly the unseen world (cf. subjugation of Kate in TOS).

Anne Despiteful tidings! O unpleasing news!
Dorset Be of good cheer. Mother, how fares your grace?
Queen Elizabeth O Dorset, speak not to me, get thee gone!
 Death and destruction dogs thee at thy heels;
 Thy mother's name is ominous to children.
 If thou wilt outstrip death, go cross the seas,
 And live with Richmond, from the reach of hell.

Now it is clearly, forcefully, definitively, stated that a Puritan upbringing is pathogenetic to the child; and implied further that Pauline Catholicism is the root cause of the Puritan error and the suffering it brings, both in the macrocosm of England, and the microcosm of Shakespeare's own psyche. It is a typically inane intervention by Dorset, who represents the (sham) mortal part of the sacred king of the Goddess (Castor): the door that guards the sacred space. Yet the irruption of Richard now has shocked it from its fixedness; all has changed; and Richard will be transformed in the temenos within, which will have need of protection of quality: This departure of Dorset is a turning point in the play, the remainder of which will dramatise, on the poetical plane, the resurrection of the ego after his death on the Cross of the libido (Richard supplanted by Richmond). To clarify: Richard is the ego flooded and dominated by the libido (more broadly, the unseen world), which it has cloaked, in the Puritan way, in a mantle of negativity, and which therefore torments it; Richmond, that ego now informed by the libido reborn, as idea, courtesy of the Gnostic written word, into sanctity. Soon the Virgin Mary will be extirpated from the psyche, and Nature sanctified anew:

Duchess of York Go thou [Elizabeth] to sanctuary, and good

thoughts possess thee,
I to my grave, where peace and rest lie with me.

ii

It is of the highest importance to the understanding of RIII as allegory to appreciate that this scene represents the beginning of the transformation of the suffering ego: Shakespeare's, as he embarks on the program of reading towards Gnostic enlightenment, prescribed by Sir Francis Bacon in 1587 or 1588. On a gross level this scene describes the evil of Richard in his determination to murder the Princes in the Tower; more subtly however, these princes represent the principles of the Gnostic Christ (Edward) and the unseen world (York), repressed as in negative aspect, which will have to be uprooted and burnt for the healthy tree to grow in its place, to the Christlike redemption of the gardener. Richard will say later (IV, iv) to Queen Elizabeth in suing for the hand of her daughter (the Goddess reclaimed): "But in your daughter's womb I bury them,/Where, in that nest of spicery, they will breed/Selves of themselves, to your recomfiture." Richard is no sooner enthroned than the sea change begins:

Richard Ah, Buckingham, now do I play the touch,
 To try if they be current gold indeed:
 Young Edward lives.
 Think now what I would speak.

It is the negative unconscious that has brought him to the throne, the force majeure whose days are numbered: for Buckingham will refuse to murder the princes, and Richard's promise of the Earldom of Hereford (covalently bonded to Bolingbroke in RII) together with the "moveables" of King Edward will be revoked. Here is, precisely, the crux of the play, and the turning point of Shakespeare's life, perhaps on his first perusal of a text given him by Sir Francis Bacon.

King Richard I will converse with iron-witted fools
 And unrespective boys. None are for me
 That look into me with considerate eyes.

For he must be merciless with himself. This is what Nietzsche meant in his much misunderstood argument against pity, when he warned against acting on compassion through attachment, which merely returns the recipient to the round of joy and suffering; whereas the true healer must be through blind compassion and out the other side. Whatever deep attachment King Richard has had in the past for the unsanctified Princes, they cannot be part of a healthy future.

The Princes are murdered, as the psychic transformation begins. Tyrrel's paeon over their bodies is anything but an artistic misjudgement, as some have claimed: for they have died only to be reborn, and the ego-in-transformation is contemplating anew the Gnostic Christ, and the knowledge of the unseen world which informs his wisdom. That this is as described in the written word is shown by the prominence of the Page in this episode, one of innumerable such appearances in FF. Further, it is specifically the written word as vector of the Gnostic tradition: for the Tower here is undoubtedly a reference to this tradition as symbolised in the Tower card of the Tarot, which was an innovation of the Knights Templar, who were heirs to the Egyptian tradition via the Jerusalem Church, the true (Gnostic) Jesus Christ, and the Rex Deus line. From their ashes was Freemasonry born; and Sir Francis Bacon was formally received into the Brotherhood by King James in 1603. (See Chs.1, 26, 44, for a fuller discussion of the influence on FF of Freemasonry, and the epochal work of Christopher Knight and Robert Lomas in retrieving its true history and beliefs).

There follows a speech full of seemingly arbitrary decisions, which are yet of the highest significance for the allegory:

King Richard Come hither, Catesby. Rumour it abroad
That Anne my wife is very grievous sick:
I will take order for her keeping close.
Inquire me out some mean poor gentleman,
Whom I will marry straight to Clarence's daughter.
The boy is foolish, and I fear not him...
...I must be married to my brother's daughter,
Or else my kingdom stands on brittle glass.

Shakespeare at this stage had no choice but to abandon his wife - the immediate cause of his suffering, through absolutely no fault of hers – and seek healing in the metropolis. Anne Hathaway had therefore to be as good as dead, as far as he was concerned. In Holinshed it is Queen Elizabeth, rather than Anne, who is the object of Richard's rumour: another crucial variation from the source. Clarence's daughter Lady Margaret Plantagenet is covalently bonded to the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen whose curses have brought this Saviour to the Cross, and her principle must be depowered (cf. Kate's total surrender to Petruchio in TOS); while reclamation of the Fool principle (the "foolish boy": the ultimate source being the ass/fool underworld journey of Lucius in Apuleius' TGA (see especially MAN)) is an object of the ego in its striving for health. Clarence's son is the first of many Fools we will notice in the course of this argument. Joseph Campbell in *An Open Life* had this to say about the Fool in myth:

... he always breaks in, just as the unconscious does, to trip up the rational situation... He's... beyond the system...The mind structures a lifestyle, and the fool or trickster represents another whole range of possibilities. He doesn't respect the values that you've set up for yourself, and smashes them... The fool is the breakthrough of the absolute into the field of controlled social orders.

Yet the neutralising of Lady Margaret here, in the phase of healing, is not so very different from her treatment in the phase of pathology ("Now I will go to take some privy order/To draw the brats of Clarence out sight"). This suppression of the Queen of Hell – undoubtedly with Bacon, with his love of control and closure, as exemplar - is an index to the nature of Shakespeare's continuing affliction ("I'll startle you/Worse than the sacring bell, when the brown wench/ Lay kissing in your arms, lord Cardinal [Wolsey]: HVIII, III, ii), which was not finally dealt with till the end of his career in London. The gentlewoman (as Lady Margaret now is), who is the other side of the coin to the tart, has already appeared in 2HIV as Doll Tearsheet, the eternal

maiden, forever deflowered, forever reconstituting herself, whose Christian name suggests her artificiality, and second name the tearing of the hymen (a “tearsheet” is a page torn from a book): the reference being to Shakespeare’s continuing problem with his libido, with the underworld aspect of the Goddess continuing to reassert itself, to drive the subject to auto-erotism, or the arms of a tart. His approach toward the Goddess during his creative life may be characterised as asymptotic: he got as close to Her as possible, infinitesimally close, through the power of reason, without ever being able to commune with Her in confidence. “Where are you between thoughts?” asks the Indian sage. Shakespeare was in free-fall toward the pit of psychosis which had opened beneath him at the moment of the coup (III, iv). Hence his need to be continually at work (TT I, ii, 181):

Prospero ...I find my zenith doth depend upon
A most auspicious star, whose influence
If now I court not but omit, my fortunes
Will ever after droop.

The principle of Gnostic Christhood, and the knowledge of the invisible world on which it is predicated, are born again in the ego-in-transformation, in the corpses of Edward and York, infants of the spring:

Tyrrel “Thus, thus” quoth Forrest “girdling one another
Within their alabaster innocent arms,
Their lips were four red roses on a stalk,
Which in their summer beauty kissed each other...”

Yet the Christian puritan error threatened to sabotage the surgery:

Tyrrel “A book of prayers on their pillow lay
Which once,” quoth Forrest, “almost changed my mind...”

The lion-mouth of the serpent has swallowed surda Thalia and will soon begin digesting her under the influence of the Musical

arts (Tyrrell, Milford: see IV, iv, below) to effect a transformation of the psyche (fig. 2). Elizabeth, daughter of the Queen, is Nature reborn – Her invisible aspect (where resides the blind libido) as divested of its negative mantle - in the ego-in-transformation. Thus is adumbrated – another exquisite piece of choreography – the battle of Bosworth Field, immediately upon Richard's declaration that he will go to the Princess as "a jolly thriving wooer". This principle will repeatedly be reprised in plays to come, where Portia, Kate, Imogen, and all their kind, will refer to the invisible world or Faustian dimension, the knowledge of which the ego-in-healing must acquire anew (their marriages). They and their kin bear throughout FF the supreme allegoric value of the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, where the Holy Grail is the wisdom derived from knowledge of the unseen world, as described in the Gnostic written word.

iii

To begin this psychic transformation, there is a sequence of reflective realisations in which the conflicting Natures interplay, and the meditating mind comes clearly to apprehend the nature of the losses it has suffered:

Queen Margaret [comes forward]

I had an Edward, till a Richard killed him;

I had a Harry, till a Richard killed him.

Duchess of York I had a Richard too, and thou didst kill him;

I had a Rutland too, thou holp'st to kill him.

Queen Margaret Thou hadst a Clarence too, and Richard killed him...

O upright, just, and true-disposing God,

How do I thank thee that this carnal cur

Preys on the issue of his mother's body

And makes her pew-fellow with others moan!

The Duchess of York is to be identified with the sham Goddess of Pauline Catholicism, the Virgin Mary (see II, ii above). Elizabeth sits down beside the Duchess. Sitting on or burial in the ground always signifies in the plays the quality of grossness, as opposed to the subtlety of Gnostic enlightenment (cf. KJ III, i; the burial of

Aaron the Moor (libido) in TitA). The underworld now is perceived as flooding through this world as the ground of its being. Mere ideas are becoming Platonic Ideas, the “Mothers” of Goethe’s Faust. For this is the sense of healing which comes when acknowledgement of the will shatters concepts inadequate to it, as happens, for example, when the mind is held in stasis by a work of art. Yet this does not argue finally against concepts per se, or the left side of the brain. As always, it is a matter of completeness. On the historical plane, the nobles are bewailing their losses at the hands of Richard. On the allegorical plane, however, the ego is sorrowing for its past possession by the two sham Goddesses: the Duchess of York (the Catholic) and Queen Elizabeth (the Puritan). Knowledge of the Faustian dimension points the finger squarely at the Pauline sham Nature as the *fons et origo* of the Puritan error, and the breakdown:

Queen Margaret From forth the kennel of thy womb hath crept
A hellhound that doth hunt us all to death.

The meditating subject now comes to a full apprehension of the truth expressed in Margaret’s words in I, iii, which he had repressed, and begins to find the words and concepts to realise this change in his life.

Queen Margaret I called thee then vain flourish of my fortune;
I called thee then poor shadow, painted queen,
The presentation of but what I was,
The flattering index of a direful pageant...
Queen Elizabeth O thou well skilled in curses, stay awhile
And teach me how to curse mine enemies!...
My words are dull. O, quicken them with thine!

The advice Margaret gives is that she should “Compare dead happiness with living woe;/Think that thy babes were sweeter than they were/And he that slew them fouler than he is...” This is precisely to say that they should be meditated upon as Ideals, which derive from Platonic Ideas, whose contemplation brings the world as idea into being. The assault on the Ugly Dick factor will

have a strong verbal component ("And in the breath of bitter words lets smother/My damned son...": Duchess of York, IV, iv 133).

A painful and hasty confrontation with the truth of his own error will not however produce lasting results. The psychic turmoil induced by this confrontation is registered in Richard's "A flourish of trumpets, strike alarum drums". The subject can either reject the call to the Journey of the Hero (as Joseph Campbell would have put it), and remain still-born, dead but not resurrected, or submit to the agony of his rebirth; but Shakespeare now has a Gandalf in Sir Francis Bacon, and the Brandywine river can be crossed. He recognises the Virgin Mary at the bottom of his torment from the ithyphallos-libido:

Duchess Art thou my son?

Richard I, I thank God...

-Where "I" for "Ay" stands, as always, for the ithyphallos. Richard's "I am in haste" signifies, as always in the plays, the nature of this dialogue as a thought process (cf. MAN II, iii, 5; &c.) The meditating ego sees with brutal clarity the role that the reasoning left-brain must have in his transformation:

King Richard Either be patient and enreat me fair,
Or with the clamorous report of war
Thus will I drown your exclamations.

Here is another conundrum solved:

Duchess of York Thou cam'st on earth to make the earth my hell.
A grievous burden was thy birth to me...
What comfortable hour canst thou name
That ever graced me with thy company?

King Richard Faith, none, but Humphrey hour, that called your
grace

To breakfast once, forth of my company.

Richard's reply has puzzled the commentators. The saying "Dining with Duke Humphrey" meant to go hungry. It is being

emphasised here that Pauline Catholicism, in its rejection of the Goddess as Aphrodite and Witch, - to leave only the Virgin Mary, - and hence of Her Consort/Son, the essential Ugly Dick, has left it inane. Its war against the unconscious has put true nobility forever out of its reach. The ego now realises that its recovery hinges on the battle to come, between the old and new libidos (Richard and Richmond). It is apprehension of the root Catholic rather than the Puritan error which is essential at this stage:

Duchess of York Therefore take with thee my most grievous curse...

Exit

Queen Elizabeth Though far more cause, yet much less spirit to curse
Abides in me. I say amen to her.

Finally the truth of the Puritan error is confronted, courtesy of knowledge of the Pauline error (Richard left on stage alone with Elizabeth). Now this sham Nature, as caged in the darkness of Puritanism, will begin its labour into the light (Richard's suit for the hand of the Princess). The meditating ego, having taken courage to confront himself in the context of Nature as in a mirror, sees clearly the unnatural foulness of his past, but will not be dissuaded from his quest to sit with the Great Goddess in toto, like Apollo with the Three Graces (fig.2):

Queen Elizabeth But that still use of grief makes wild grief tame,
My tongue should to thy ears not name my boys
Till that my nails were anchored in thine eyes.

King Richard Madam, so thrive I in my enterprise
And dangerous success of bloody wars
As I intend more good to you and yours
Than ever you or yours by me were harmed!

Richard (the ego) protests his love for the young Elizabeth (Nature reborn); but the brutal honesty that his redemption will require affirms the opposite:

King Richard What do you think?

Queen Elizabeth That thou dost love my daughter from thy soul.

So from thy soul's love didst thou love her brothers,
And from my heart's love I do thank thee for it

- "from thy soul" having the sense here of being separate from it (as the Queen must be divorced from her heart to thank Richard for the murder of her children); but the ego has recovered its soul with the contemplation of the world of the will (Queen Margaret), as it so tragically failed to do in I, iii.

Queen Elizabeth How canst thou woo her?

...Send to her by the man that slew her brothers
A pair of bleeding hearts; thereon engrave
'Edward and York'; them haply will she weep:
Therefore present to her- as sometimes Margaret
Did to thy father, steeped in Rutland's blood-
A handkercher, which say to her did drain
The purple sap from her sweet brother's body,
And bid her wipe her weeping eyes withal...

She goes on. In other words, he must confess to her and to himself that he did not love her. Only then can he win her; for the prize he is seeking lies beyond good and evil, beyond love and hate, and all pairs of opposites. He must have the courage to see Man as a Platonic Idea (to which realisation art will assist him), and how far from adequacy he has deviated. This is a fundamental principle of therapy, the association coming immediately to mind being with the "I am an alcoholic!" of Alcoholics Anonymous. Again, as in 3HVI I, iii, the blood-stained napkin refers to menstruation, and hence the female principle, the restoration of which to sanctity will be a crucial step in healing.

King Richard If I did take the kingdom from your sons,
To make amends I'll give it to your daughter...

He continues to protest his sincerity. She tries to learn the nature of the marriage he proposes:

King Richard Infer England's peace by this alliance.

Queen Elizabeth Which she shall purchase with still-lasting war.

Because of his constitutive Christian puritanism it will be an ongoing struggle; and one recalls Prospero's sense of incomplete victory over Caliban in TT (and see especially HVIII and T&C). He protests that his love for her will last her lifetime, and her life "as long as hell and Richard likes of it": where "it" is the ego's suffering.

KR Say I, her sovereign, am her subject low.

QE But she, your subject, loathes such sovereignty.

This describes perfectly the relationship between Hyperborean Apollo and the Three Graces (fig.2), or, of immense relevance to FF, between King Solomon and the "foul and fair" Goddess of the Song of Solomon.

KR Be eloquent in my behalf to her.

QE an honest tale speeds best by being plainly told.

KR Then plainly to her tell my loving tale.

QE Plain and not honest is too harsh a style.

KR Your reasons are too shallow and too quick.

QE O no, my reasons are too deep and dead-

Too deep and dead (poor infants) in their graves.

KR Harp not on that string madam; that is past.

QE Harp on it still shall I till heartstrings break.

This is to say that he never truly loved her in the Dionysian sense; and yet through the great healer Apollo may gain redemption. What guarantee can the Queen have of Richard's faithfulness?

KR Now, by my George, my garter, and my crown-

QE Profaned, dishonoured, and the third usurped.

He cannot swear by his own self, by the world, his father's death, God, or the time to come. The ego's (sc. Shakespeare's) apprehension of his past baseness is total, and in an extraordinary speech acknowledges that it is a matter of life or death, no less, for

the microcosm ("myself"), mesocosm ("thee, herself, the land") and macrocosm ("many a Christian soul"):

R. In her consists my happiness and thine;
Without her, follows to myself and thee,
Herself, the land, and many a Christian soul,
Death, desolation, ruin and decay.
It cannot be avoided but by this;
It will not be avoided but by this.

Again, Prospero's words are relevant: "I find my zenith doth depend upon/A most auspicious star, whose influence/If now I court not but omit, my fortunes/Will ever after droop" (TT I, i, 181). Elizabeth now consents; but the "still-lasting war", brooding with Richmond and his allies, to "Myself myself confound", has yet to be dramatised; and for this purpose the Ugly Dick in the subject must come to the fore. Here is another beautiful touch:

Richard I [for "Ay"], if the devil tempt you to do good.
[...]
Richard I [for "Ay"], if your self's remembrance wrong your self.
[...]
Queen Shall I go to win my daughter to your will?
Richard And be a happy mother by the deed.
Queen I go...

Richard's two "I"'s stand for the ithyphallic principle (unseen world); or rather, more precisely, the knowledge of it in negative aspect by the shattered Puritan ego, to his immense suffering. Elizabeth's "I go", where "I" also bears this value, the third instance in recent scenes, means that the ego is being relieved of this knowledge, and his torment. Whereas the first two instances were in the context of a shallow defence mechanism (exaggerated piety), doomed to failure, here the ego is on the track that will lead to his glorious resurrection. Shakespeare is in the very earliest stages of his treatment at the hands of Sir Francis Bacon.

Here is another instance of the author returning to square one, to make a point:

R. Relenting fool, and shallow, changing woman!

Richmond is gathered off the western shore, where throng “many doubtful hollow-hearted friends,/Unarmed and unresolved to beat them back”; they expect the aid of Buckingham to welcome them ashore. What is the inward scenario that is being recreated here? The choreography is intricate, and at first perhaps difficult to penetrate; but once the lines of the individual dancers are recognised and understood its significance becomes clear.

Richmond represents the libido (unseen world), as basis of London-phase Shakespeare as Gnostic Christ. Here he lies, as yet off the coast, which represents the bourne of the ego. Yet if he were to come ashore now, it would be only under the guidance of Buckingham, the unconscious, Ugly Dick’s “other self”. In other words, the subject (Richard/Shakespeare) has not yet developed the tools of reason adequate to release the inherent divinity of Nature from the prison of Puritanism, and escape from the tyranny of the unconscious. The Boar still threatens to charge. Yet, at this early stage of his healing, the knowledge of this limitation is at least there.

Here is a virtuoso cameo of the highest order. The newly aware psyche now replays the process of Puritan repulsion of the Goddess from the very beginning, as in a controlled laboratory experiment with the most dangerous of substances. The Ugly Dick of old gathers to strike: he calls Ratcliffe his ruthless executor, who of old would have immediately murdered Nature in either Her anabolic or catabolic phases; yet suspends the order, instead to call Catesby, the go-between of the subconscious and the conscious: for the meditating mind is lifting what was previously an automatic reaction into the plane of consciousness. He now commands Catesby, yet forgets to tell him the order. Catesby remains, as if in suspended animation: and the whole sub-scene has this character of suspension, as if the chemical process has been slowed down, its stages isolated, and cause uncoupled from effect, under the eye of the Prospero-like experimenter; or like an army firing blanks in a simulated battle, with the generals on the hill taking notes. He orders Ratcliffe to “post to Salisbury”, there to perform his usual function upon the arrival of Norfolk’s forces, by order of Catesby - then gives the order to Catesby

- then countermands the order to Ratcliffe, whose place he will take at Salisbury (for King Richard is now to be identified with the properly reasoning mind): the experiment has been played out to the end, yet without the result of the explosion of repulsion that would previously have followed. The reasoning ego is in control, and is at full steam ahead to the realisation of the Apollonian precept "Know Thyself"; yet with some way to go to attainment of the Gnostic Ideal (landing of Richmond), or assimilation of the Goddess: yet there She is, Her beauty within reach. "Away towards Salisbury! While we reason here,/A royal battle might be won and lost." says Richard in IV iv. "I go" says Catesby, as the torment recedes. Richard's final "My mind is changed" puts it in a nutshell. This is all graven deep with the hallmark of Bacon.

Straight upon Richard's "My mind is changed" comes the entry of Stanley, who announces "Richmond is on the seas". The identification of Richard and Richmond as two aspects of the same psyche, which Shakespeare will take pains to make clear in Act V, is adumbrated in Stanley's "None, good [sc. "None good,..."] my liege.../Nor none so bad...". That the ego-in-healing may not succumb to the libido as will, but come to acknowledge it as idea, through the written word, is expressed in Richard's imprisonment of young George Stanley (libido as idea) against the collaboration of Stanley père (libido as will) with Richmond. This principle is also expressed in the half-starved dog in Dürer's *Melencolia I* (fig.1), as well as Don Quixote's bony nag Rosinante. Richard both strikes and rewards the messenger who announces Buckingham's disaster (overthrow of tyranny of negative unconscious): again, to identify the two aspects of the ego. The wisdom of TGA will help implement the precept of "Know Thyself" in the ego-in-transformation, provided always that he does not dissolve in its early vividly erotic scenes as of old. Richmond has turned away from the coast after finding that the rebels who were awaiting him had come from Buckingham (tyranny of unconscious militating against psychic transformation). Now, - and the choreography is precise, - Catesby announces that Buckingham is captured (ego communicating with unconscious, finding its power to be broken), then that Richmond "Is with a mighty power landed at Milford". This town is to be identified here, as in CYM, with the written word as vector of broadly Gnostic wisdom. The icon is of a

mill situated on the bank of a river, where the waters represent the flux of Nature (cf. Joyce's Anna Livia Plurabelle), the refined grain the written words of the Gnostic – lately Neoplatonic/Christian Cabalist – artist. This is yet another instance of the “ford” symbol in FF, which signifies engagement with Nature, rather than denial of it in the way of the Puritan, as represented by the “bridge” (e.g. Earl of Cambridge in 1-3HVI). The bank on which the mill stands must be then, of course, the farther bank of enlightenment, as celebrated in world myth, which the Gnostic ego has attained through passage of the ford.

iv

The allegoric value of Sir Christopher, who does not appear in Holinshed, is to be found in his name, which means in Greek, of course, “I bear the Christ”. The news he will bear from Derby (Stanley) to Richmond is that the Queen has consented to his suit to marry the young Princess Elizabeth (whereas it is Richard who has recently most ardently and at length successfully pursued her: an inconsistency on the literal though not allegorical plane, for the Richard-Richmond identification is once again being made). He will also bear Derby's letter: the libido, - the world of the will, the invisible world, - as described in the Gnostic written word.

ACT V

i

Buckingham has been captured and is being led away to execution. Reason holds sway in the ego:

Buckingham Will not King Richard let me speak with him?
Sheriff No. my good lord; therefore be patient.

The death of the unconscious as the ruling principle of the psyche will allow reason and the imagination to work on the unseen world as described in the printed page, without dissolving in it: TGA being a perfect example, as certainly the most important text of Bacon's strategy. In 1587, the terminal Puritan Shakespeare had come upon the Lucius-Fotis episode in

an early chapter, and surrendered to it in an act of auto-erotism, to precipitate the breakdown (see MAN and elsewhere). Now, in London, he will have to train his reason and imagination on the wisdom of this magical masterpiece, to appreciate the immanence of the Faustian dimension, and how his anathematisation of it underpins his own pathology, and that of Puritanism in general, to practice the axiom of Apollo: "Know Thyself". The libido described in TGA will now be embraced as idea, rather than surrendered to as will.

Buckingham This is All Souls' day, fellow, is it not?
...Why, then, All Souls' day is my body's doomsday.
This, this All Souls' day to my fearful soul
Is the determined respite of my wrongs...

All Souls' Day (Nov. 30) marked, moreover, the death of the Celtic old year, and the beginning of the new; and its tree in the Druidic alphabet was the elder, which was thought to be the wood of which the Cross was made: an exquisitely chosen day for the eclipse of the Buckingham principle.

ii

Shakespeare is in the early stages of his treatment, with his mind slowly acquiring Gnostic nobility:

Richmond...Thus far into the bowels of the land
Have we marched on without impediment;
And here we receive from our father Stanley
Lines of fair comfort and encouragement...
The wretched, bloody and usurping boar...
Is now even in the centry of this isle...

Stanley represents, as we have seen, the libido, which is yet in both negative state, – as associated with the Ugly Dick principle,

⁹ Certain Baconists claim that Sir Francis Bacon wrote Don Quixote, as well as being its English translator. He certainly had the requisite mastery of the Spanish language, and was deeply influenced by Wolfram's Parzival, in which Don Quixote undoubtedly had its roots. It is an intriguing possibility, not as outrageous as it

which Shakespeare is working towards conquering forever, – and positive, as presented in the Gnostic written word. Shakespeare is reading, perhaps, of ass-phase Lucius' adventures in the world of the libido (like Falstaff's in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, of which Apuleius was certainly the source), and Psyche's harrowing of hell, and is absorbing their wisdom, and noting their example for his own exploration of the unseen world, through the great Neoplatonic/Christian Cabalist texts in Bacon's possession: "And here receive we from our father Stanley/Lines of fair comfort and encouragement". These two contrary states are reflected in Stanley's dual allegiance: to Richmond, whom he would assist (psychic transformation based on acknowledgement of unseen world as described in written word), and to Richard, whom he cannot as yet leave (negative imprinting in psyche not yet erased). The moment of healing will be recorded in the news of Stanley's desertion (V, iii, 344).

iii

Richard and Richmond pitch their tents on Bosworth field. It is the night before the final confrontation. The tents are on stage at the same time. They represent two aspects of the same psyche; and Bacon is at pains to make this identification clear:

Richmond Give me some ink and paper in my tent.

[...]

King Richard Give me some ink and paper.

-And so on. Shakespeare must have sensed especially powerfully the healing potential of the written word, as have so many other artists before and since. The style of the speeches of the two is instructive of their differences, Richard's being dully prosaic, Richmond's full in the Gnostic way of images taken from the natural world:

KR Call for some men of sound direction:

Let's lack no discipline, make no delay,

For, lords, tomorrow is a busy day.

[...]

R The weary sun hath made a golden set
And by the bright tract of his fiery car
Gives token of a goodly day tomorrow.

We will see in 1HIV that Blunt bears throughout FF the allegoric value of the ithyphallos/maypole. Richmond's dismissal of him, after commanding three others to stay with him in his tent, represents the victory of the imagining and reasoning mind over the libido, which remains likely to be stimulated by the representations of the Goddess of Love in the written word, and sabotage the healing process. This principle of victory over the libido was central to Christian Cabalism, and the point, to emphasise once again, of the shrunken dog in Dürer's *Melencolia I* (fig.1), and Don Quixote's feeble mare Rosinante, as well as Kate's subjugation in TOS.⁹ Richmond has ordered him to advise Pembroke that he is to join him early next morning. Wales bears the value throughout the plays, as we will see, the principle of the representation of the Goddess Nature in the imagining and reasoning ego that was Shakespeare's at this time. The morning will be the time of enlightenment, when the Puritanism is extirpated from the psyche, and the beauty/sublimity of Nature appreciated. In addition, Blunt is ordered to take a note to Stanley, whose forces lie "half a mile at least/South from the mighty power of the king". The relation of Stanley's forces to Richard's reflects the relation of unconscious to conscious minds. Blunt's letter is the first instance of many we will note of the important principle of referral, where the truth of an idea is found by reference to the invisible world aspect which underpins it. Here, the reader is discovering the truth of the ithyphallos (Blunt) as rooted anteriorly in the libido (Stanley), both of which, in negative aspect, have tormented him hitherto. Thus does his enlightenment progress.

Richard is with Catesby (go-between of unconscious and conscious minds) and Norfolk ("I" principle as idea). The ego is healing. Accordingly, Richard refuses Catesby's suggestion of supper: food representing throughout the plays, like money, the empowerment of a principle. This minutia is therefore consistent

¹⁰ Dame Frances Yates, *The Occult Philosophy in the Elizabethan Age*.

¹¹ Oswald Spengler, *The Decline of the West*.

with the eclipse of Buckingham (unconscious), as Shakespeare's torment is remedied. Norfolk is ordered to "use careful Watch, choose truty sentinels". The Watch always bears the value of the visual imagination, as we shall see (e.g. R&J V). The ithyphallos-libido is being perceived anew as idea, through the written word, rather than will. Here is another beautiful illustration of the allegoric value of Catesby:

Richard [to Catesby] Send out a poursuivant-at-arms
To Stanley's regiment; bid him bring his power
Before sunrising...

- The libido, swelling from underneath to flood the conscious ego. Richard insists on being given a bowl of wine, a Watch, and ink and paper: for the reader (ink and paper) is contemplating the wisdom of Lucius, imagining (Watch) himself as Ugly Dick, dominated by the negative libido (wine). The Apollonian prescription to "Know thyself" is being fulfilled, courtesy of the printed page wherein the invisible world is described.

Richard gives an order to "saddle white Surrey for the field tomorrow"; and five lines later mentions "Thomas the Earl of Surrey". The horse-and-rider represents always throughout the plays the libido in action, as we have seen, as sourced from Plato's Phaedrus. Surrey is white here, to indicate the White Rose (Puritan) side; and its slaying in the final scene will signify the libido's divestment of its negativity. The identification with Thomas (the Biblical "doubter") is a beautiful touch. The many New Testament references in the plays express the synthesis by the new Christian Cabalism/Renaissance Neoplatonism of the Hermetic (magical) and Christian traditions.¹⁰ The point being made here is that to be truly Christlike in the Gnostic way is to engage and honour the unseen world, the Faustian dimension, which underpins apparent phenomena: the organ exposed by the surgeon, the cell, the molecule, or the contents of the unconscious, the primacy of whose elucidation should be taken for granted in any great Culture, but which both the Roman Church and the Puritan sect ruthlessly suppressed, as they continue to do in some measure to this day.¹¹ The value of the name "Surrey" will be shown (HVIII) to inhere in

the Spanish sur and rey, to mean “King of the South”. This is the conscious ego in control of the libido – whether delusively or not. In RII he is Pauline Catholic; in RIII Protestant Puritan; and HVIII Gnostic Christian.

The ghosts of Richard’s victims now appear to both him and Richmond in dreams, with different salutations. The dreams represent the forms of the visual imagination: for the meditating mind is coming to terms with its past, to leave it behind. Richard wakes in terror. The cusp is being approached, where Richard will slide over into Richmond; and the identity of the two, as aspects of the one ego, is indicated with adroitness:

King Richard Give me another horse! Bind up my wounds!
...What do I fear? Myself? There’s none else by.
Richard loves Richard; that is, I am I.
Is there a murderer here? No. Yes, I am:
Then fly. What, from myself? Great reason why-
Lest I revenge. What, myself upon myself?...
I am a villain. Yet I lie, I am not...

“Give me another horse” signifies that the negative libido is being vanquished. It is the visual imagination that is the chief Puritanicide: “..shadows tonight/Have struck more terror to the soul of Richard...”. The Lords (reason-imagination) convene with Richmond (Gnostic Christ) in his tent. Richmond gives a powerful speech to his men which surely connotes the life of Shakespeare:

Richmond ...If you do fight in safeguard of your wives,
Your wives shall welcome home the conquerors;
If you do free your children from the sword,
Your children’s children quits it in your age...

In a striking coup-de-théâtre (but how was it managed?) the sun arises on Richmond, but not on Richard (Shakespeare reborn into enlightenment, from the ignorance of his Puritan-induced torment). The ithyphallos-libido imagined as Platonic Idea is driving

the defeat of Ugly Dick: "Arm, arm, my lord; the foe vaunts in the field." (Norfolk to Richard). This is conveyed by the written word.

Norfolk ...This found I on my tent this morning.
[He showeth him a paper.]
"Jockey of Norfolk, be not so bold,
For Dickon the master is bought and sold."

iv

The psyche is in the last stages of transformation (Shakespeare c. 1589, with the conclusion of his Orlando phase of intensive reading approaching. The negative libido is extirpated (slaying of Richard's white horse Surrey), - and with it the problem of the negative unconscious' influence on the ego, - all through the agency of Platonic Ideas: "Rescue, my lord of Norfolk, rescue, rescue!" (Catesby). Shakespeare has been saved from his torment, and given a life of the highest possible potentiality, by the intervention of Sir Francis Bacon and the broadly tradition. Richmond proclaims: "We will unite the White Rose and the Red" - which twins we now know, with the help of the theory of the Baconian Double Helix, to symbolise reason and Nature, intellect and intuition, Apollo and Dionysius: the functional left and right sides of the brain, the complementary and mutually potentiative minds of the complete human being, which the West has made an art form of sundering:

Richmond The brother blindly shed the brother's blood;
The father rashly slaughtered his own son;
The son, compelled, been butcher to the sire:
All this divided York and Lancaster,
Divided in their dire division.
O, now let Richmond and Elizabeth,
The true succeders of each royal house,
By God's fair ordinance conjoin together!

CHAPTER 5

RICHARD THE SECOND

Sir Francis Bacon, the genius and grand strategist, though not hero, of the histories as allegory, determined to plunge in medias res with the HVI trilogy, to deal with the theme that was of most immediate and vital relevance to Shakespeare and England: the aetiology and pathogenesis of the Puritan disease, as it had tyrannised over his pupil-patient's psyche, and had begun so malignantly to tighten its crab claws around the broader society. Bacon feared that the Puritan sect would ultimately destroy the Western cultural tradition (see Introduction), including, of course,

any such vehement and scarifying indictment of it as the First Folio as allegory: hence the absolute need for its watertight encipherment, and, further, for the encryption of his name as author: for there was always the fear that its true theme may be discovered in his lifetime. The first play to be read in the chronological order of the life of Will Shaksper, as he was in those years ("Shakespeare" would come later, as a reference to the Boar spear, weapon of the newly empowered patient-pupil of Bacon's against the negative libido), - is then not 1HVI, but rather RII, which was completed after RIII, and before 1&2HIV, in the early-mid Nineties.

RII records the defensive espousal, by the immediately post-pubertal Will Shaksper, of the shield of the ascetic heresy against the sudden shower of poisoned darts from the surgent libido, as cast in negative aspect by puritan Pauline Catholicism, whose description of the connexion between eros and sin had been imprinted deep in the tabula rasa of his early childhood psyche, possibly through the fervent faith of his mother. Asceticism is essentially Gnostic in outlook, and hence offers engagement with Nature and the female principle while providing, in its abnegation of communion with the Goddess of Love with dissolution of left-brain reason, a consistent strategy for keeping the troublesome libido at arm's length. It will become evident in 1&2HIV, and HV, which record the shattering of this phase by the renewed surge of libido, that young Shaksper's asceticism was of the rationalist-mechanist type. This is the point of the beehive simile in HV I, ii, wherein the immensely ancient religious significance of the bee is ignored in the description of the mechanics of the hive; and of Canterbury's "Never was such a sudden scholar made" (HV I, i, 32). This learning was garnered from the written word, this period being undoubtedly the foundation of his facility as a writer, which would be refined and advanced under the guidance of Bacon, in two years of intensive reading, from c.1587-9 (his Melancholy Jacques phase), to culminate in his first literary productions (Orlando phase), such as Pericles and Mr. Arden of Feversham. This early phase of bookish asceticism may be termed his Bolingbroke phase. One recalls Lucy of the Peanuts cartoons, whose aim in life was to know everything there was to be known.

Such was the prevailing illiteracy and rudeness of Stratford at this time, that a scholar of the Lucy type, however comparatively mundane his accomplishments, would have shone.

We have noted in 1-3HVI the repeated association of the Roman or Pauline Catholic Church with the "I" principle, which stands for the ithyphallos/maypole, more broadly the unseen world, or Faustian dimension: the point being that the Church, in its ruthless suppression of the Gnostic tradition, - which would culminate in the immolation of Giordano Bruno in Rome in 1600, - had shunned engagement with the invisible world, and therefore was still at its mercy. That the pathogenesis of the Puritan disease was a reaction to this vulnerability, is the point of the murder of Rutland, and beheading of York, in 3HVI I, iii, iv. Rutland is present in RII also, as the Duke of Aumerle in Acts I-IV and Rutland in the final Act, - where he bears precisely the same allegoric value, of Catholic reason, enfeebled as founded on the Virgin Mary rather than the Great Goddess: the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen aspect being an integral part of the latter, but extirpated from Her pale shadow. The Virgin is represented by the Aumerle's mother the Duchess of York (see especially her depiction on her knees before Bolingbroke in Act V); while York himself is the broader faculty of reason.

The rationalist asceticism of Shaksper's Bolingbroke phase grew from a substrate of puritan Catholicism, in which the anathematised libido had remained unengaged by reason, to surge at puberty and plunge him into conflict. Shaksper as Catholic is represented by John of Gaunt (Lancaster); as strapped to the newly rearing libido, by King Richard. The latter's seizure of the wealth of Lancaster signifies the supplanting of childish Catholic Shaksper by the new libidinous self, the ego of which the unconscious is always threatening to shatter; the coup of young Bolingbroke, son of Lancaster, to reclaim his patrimony, the assumption of asceticism, the first of a series of defence mechanisms against the troublesome Boar (libido in negative aspect: see V&A for his first appearance of many in the Complete Works).

Let us now bend, magnifier in hand, to follow the rich threads as they go to form the scenes of the gorgeous tapestry.

ACT I

The charge brought by Bolingbroke against Thomas Mowbray, Duke of Norfolk, and their quarrel, straight announces the hostility of rationalist asceticism to the will-to-eros, as the central theme of RII. We will meet Norfolk again in 2HIV and HVIII, where he will be shown to bear the same allegoric value at all times, of the ithyphallos as idea, as created in the imagination. Suffolk bears, on the other hand, the value of the ithyphallos as will, as it rises hard upon the flood of blind libido; and his murder by Sir Walter Whitmore in 2HVI IV, i, is an epochal event in FF, as representing the suppression of this principle by Puritanism, as we have seen. "Suffolk" is a contraction of "south folk"; "Norfolk" of "north folk": the directions south and north indicating body and mind, or will and idea, respectively, as they do so often throughout the plays (e.g. the Dukes of Naples and Milan in TT); with "folk" suggesting Man-as-sublimated animal, or the festivities of the maypole, that divinised alter ego of the ithyphallos.

Mowbray shares with the murdered Duke of Gloucester the name "Thomas", as a reference to the Biblical disciple who doubted the divinity of Christ (cf. Thomas Horner in 2HVI, in conflict with his servant Peter (Roman Church)). Gloucester bears here precisely the same value as in 1-3HVI, of the Gnostic Christ, or Solomon figure, with all that signifies of wisdom and Ring/Grail nobility. The wisdom of the Ring Lord is founded on knowledge of the unseen world that lies below the surfaces of things, for which underworld the ithyphallos/maypole more broadly stands, here as so often in FF. Thus both the Mowbray and Gloucester principles call into hard question the worth of the ascetic's claim to divinity, the quest for which will be represented in 1&2 HIV by Bolingbroke's crusade to Jerusalem. Thus, Mowbray denies that it was he who had Gloucester put to death. Also denied is the allegation by Bolingbroke that he had trousered the monies meant for the army in France. Money represents always the power of a principle; while France in HV will be analogous to Alexander's Asia, as the natural world, over which the Gnostic enquirer strives for dominion. The point being made is that the ithyphallos – the unseen world - as idea, and acted upon by reason, should form the basis of Gnostic nobility; but the rationalist ascetic sees it only as diminutive of his power, as presenting him with his foolishness,

and threatening to dissolve his hard-edged ideas in the flood of blind libido. The word "religion" is most plausibly derived from the Latin *religare*, "to bind back"; and the recognition of the binding back of the phenomenal or visible world to the underworld is the basis of the religious experience, which is imperishably built on the shifting sands of irrationality. Thus, the rationalist ascetic's brand of religion is a sham. The fons et origo of its espousal by the pubertal Will Shaksper was his constitutive Catholic puritanism (not yet differentiated into Protestant Puritanism); and the mortal threat of the underworld to the Catholic reasoning ego which has failed to engage it (cf. murder of Rutland in 3HVI) is represented by Mowbray's attempted ambush, admitted by him, of John of Gaunt.

The Duchess of Gloucester is cognate with Eleanor, wife of Gloucester in 2HVI, as a Queen of Hell-Grail Queen. Thus, John of Gaunt's deafness to her entreaties to revenge her husband's death represents the Catholic's denial, even active suppression, of the Ring/Grail tradition (cf. the germane silences of Cordelia et al.). Mowbray is banished for life (suppression of underworld as subject of rationalist ascetic reasoning); while Bolingbroke's term of exile is mitigated through his father John of Gaunt's plea on his behalf: for it is the Catholic error that will hasten the new regime. This punishment of Bolingbroke is described by Holinshed, though not his father's intervention, which was invented *de novo* for the allegory.

Aumerle is Catholic reason; Bolingbroke the ascetic heresy, albeit with a strong flavour of rationalism: hence Aumerle's antipathy to the latter, and fervent wish that he may never return. The outstanding precedent for this is, of course, the brutal suppression by Rome of the ascetic Cathars in the Albigensian crusade: for, as a Gnostic philosophy, the ascetic world-view, with its exaltation of knowledge over faith, must always be antithetical to the Catholic, with its refusal to engage Nature in Her completeness. Richard's campaign against Ireland is announced hard upon the description of the growing sympathy in England for Bolingbroke: for Ireland represents here, as always in FF, the unconscious, realm of the libido. This is also the value of Green (this being the national colour of Ireland); while Bagot and Bushy represent the *ithyphallos* and female *pudenda* respectively. These

three last appear by name in Holinshed; and Bacon or Shakespeare must have grabbed them for their allegoric possibilities, and run. The former, as master of the French language, - or possibly his pupil, had his instruction reached this stage (a scenario not at all to be ruled out), - would have recognised the homophony of “Bagot” with baguette, “rod”, “baton”, “wand” (cf. “Gaultier”, 2HVI IV, i). These allegoric values will be abundantly confirmed in the argument to come.

ACT II

i

This is an exquisitely choreographed set piece, falling into six distinct sections: York and the dying Gaunt together; a duologue of the King and Gaunt in conflict; the exit of Gaunt, to leave York and the King in conversation; Northumberland’s announcement of Gaunt’s death; York’s stern counsel to Richard, that his intention to seize the wealth of Gaunt is wrong; and Northumberland, Willoughby and Ross in conversation, ending in the news of Bolingbroke’s return with his army.

We allocate to each his invariable allegoric value, and the story – a summary of the central transformational process of the play - becomes plain. York (reason) and the ailing Gaunt (Roman Catholic ego) together on stage represent the feeling of unease and conflict which afflicts the pristine ego upon the irruption of libido. Now reason disappears, as blind, irrational libido floods the ego, to spell the end of Shaksper’s childhood Catholic phase (moribund Gaunt and Richard in conflict, with York silent). The Catholic idyll is shattered; and the ego sets his reason to work to construct a defence mechanism against the libido, which remains in negative mantle, as invested by his constitutive Christian puritan superego (exit of Gaunt; York and Richard in conversation). He glimpses his escape, in the espousal of the bookish, rationalist ascetic world-view; and the Catholic phase is decisively abandoned (entry of Northumberland announcing death of Gaunt). This cannot be achieved overnight, however: for the reasoning ego must adapt to the new world-view (York’s opposition to Richard’s plan; - later to

¹ See especially Laurence Gardner’s *Realm of the Ring Lords* for a beautiful summary of the Ring tradition.

² Graham Hancock, *The Sign and the Seal*.

be overcome). York, for all his tetchiness, is created Lord Governor of England (reason now becomes the ruling principle, with the blind libido suppressed). Willoughby and Ross were selected for the allegory from a group of nobles mentioned by Holinshed, their names conveniently suggesting to Bacon (almost certainly), aspects of the allegory that could now be expressed. The weeping willow ("willough-") is of course the tree of sadness; while Bacon took Ross to represent here the colour red, as suggested by the Italian rosso (and Bacon was a master of Italian). This is the redness of shame: and Willoughby and Ross bear the values of the sorrow and shame that engulf this ego upon the irruption of blind libido. This is confirmed by Ross's "To horse to horse... ", followed by Willoughby's "Hold out my horse": the horse-and-rider bearing here, as always in FF, the value of the libido in action, as sourced from Socrates' famous extended metaphor in Plato's *Phaedrus*. Thus they closely accompany Northumberland (rationalist ascetic world-view), and will come to lead Bolingbroke (Shaksper as defined by that world-view) to Berkely castle: for their principles are indissolubly linked.

ii

Richard's Queen represents, of course, the Great Goddess in Her Venusian aspect, object of the strongly felt though as yet poorly defined will-to-eros of the pubertal Shaksper. Bushy, as a reference to the female pudenda, bears also this value, though in a more particular sense; and it is he, therefore, who commiserates with the Queen as she laments the parting of Richard for Ireland. This campaign represents the incipient ascetic's suppression of the unconscious and its contents, supreme among which is the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, Goddess of the Invisible World, Whose realm it is. Her suppression is the cause, on the plane of allegory, of the Queen's grief: for the Goddess of Love has always a colossal underworld/unconscious component (this is why Cupid was so often portrayed as blind), - and She is about to die. This will be the point of the death of Bushy at the hands of Bolingbroke; and also of the death of the Duchess of Gloucester, who is cognate with the Queen, as Grail Queen, just as in 1-3HVI. Her mention in this scene is the occasion for the momentous introduction of the Ring motif,

yet another instance in FF, as a reference to the wisdom of Solomon, to clearly define Shakespeare's Journey of the Hero from the darkness of Puritanism to the enlightenment of Gnostic nobility, - one of the twin central themes of FF, the other being the analysis of Puritanism itself, - as a Ring Quest, with Bacon as his Gandalf or Merlin.¹

The Duchess is yet another "foul and fair" Grail Queen, - though this is not explicitly mentioned here, - as sourced ultimately from the King's lover in the Biblical Song of Solomon, also from the later Parzival by Wolfram von Eschenbach, the first complete Grail romance, itself inspired by the Solomon tradition.² Parzival was in truth Bacon's prime inspiration and model for the allegoric strategy of FF (see Ch.44). Ideally, reason should be based on and enriched by knowledge of the unseen world (York's request that the Duchess forward him "a thousand pound"); but the new regime threatens, where this will not obtain (request denied, because of her death). The money would have been exchanged for the ring: to establish her as a Ring/Grail Queen, him as a Ring Lord.

iii-iv

The seemingly throwaway "beyond yond tuft of trees", as a location of Barkley castle, is of immense significance. The grove, or wood, or forest, or even single tree, represents always without exception in FF the written word: and so here, where this is the value of the castle. This is reinforced by the FF variant of the name, which Holinshed spells "Berkelie". Its first appearance in the FF RII, in II, ii, is as "Barkely"; the second, in the present scene, as "Berkely"; and thereafter always as "Barkely". This is an allegorical technique of which we shall note many more examples in the plays to come. The lone root "Berk-" indicates that the author was fully aware of the source's spelling; the overwhelming frequency of "Bark-", that this was his intention, and not at all a compositor's mistake (and the hitherto much maligned compositor, favourite whipping-boy of the critics, will emerge from this argument as a master). The reference is of course to a tree, to emphasise the castle's allegoric value. The source was almost certainly the Druid grove, on the barks of which were nicked their sacred texts.

For in this scene is recorded the beginning of the ascendancy of

the rationalist-mechanist ascetic world-view in the interpretation of the printed page. Northumberland leads Bolingbroke toward Barkely castle. They are joined by Northumberland's son Percy (Hotspur), who will represent in 1&2 HIV the ascetic ego corrupted by irruption of blind libido: and so here, where it is he who points out the castle, wherein are the Lords Barkely (written word), York (reason) and Seymour ("see more": the visual imagination). The scenario here is that the ego is in danger of letting his imagination dwell on the Goddess of Love described in the printed page, to arouse his libido (immediate entry of Ross and Willoughby "Bloody with spurring, fiery red with haste": where "haste" signifies, as always in FF, a process of thought). This is prevented, however, by the induction of the ascetic world-view, as Northumberland announces the entry of Lord Barkely, of whom Bolingbroke demands "And I must find that title [Lancaster] in your tongue,/before I make reply to aught you say". In other words, the printed page will be interpreted anew in the monochromatic light of rationalist asceticism (Lancaster/Bolingbroke, with his other title of Hereford as the old dispensation). Percy has been silent since his indication of the castle, and will remain so for the rest of the scene, as the libido is suppressed. Reason is now applied to the written word (entry of York), initially with difficulty, as the new world is broached by the comparatively ignorant Shaksper (reluctance of York to bless Bolingbroke's revolt); then more readily, as his reading and study progresses (final acquiescence of York). Finally, Bolingbroke announces his plans against "Bushy, Bagot, and their complices", and Richard's reinforcements disperse, as Salisbury senses his demise: for the libidinous ego is being relinquished.

ACT III

i-ii

Bushy and Green are executed, with Bagot's time shortly to come. Bolingbroke announces a campaign against Glendower (hostility of rationalist to magical or underworld dimension, to anticipate the fuller treatment of this conflict in 1&2 HIV). Richard makes for Barkloughley castle. This is the FF spelling; while

³ Dame Frances Yates, *The Occult Philosophy in the Elizabethan Age*.

Holinshed has it as “Barclowlie”: again, to indicate its allegoric value of the printed page. This will also be the value of the garden in IV, iv. He hears of the loss of his Welsh allies, and “But now the blood of twenty thousand men/Did triumph in my face, and they are fled... “. This is the victory over the Ross principle, as the shameful will-to-eros is conquered. It is Aumerle who encourages the King to resist (Catholic reasoning ego yoked to libidinous ego: cf. Winchester/Beaufort’s repeated association with “I” principle in 1-3 HVI); but in vain, as York has defected (reason now in service of new world view).

iii-iv

Richard and his allies are ensconced in the castle, from which he will be seduced, finally to yield his crown to Bolingbroke. The action of these scenes, indeed of the Act as a whole, portrays the supplanting of the Catholic libidinous way of interpreting the printed page (Richard-Aumerle), by the rationalist ascetic (Bolingbroke-Northumberland). To clarify once again: the libido is yoked to Catholicism because of the latter’s failure to engage and deal with the invisible world as conveyed by the written word. Thus it remains at the mercy of the will, and Nature in destructive mode. The brutal suppression by Rome of the Gnostic tradition, in its latest incarnation of Christian Cabalism /Renaissance Neoplatonism (a broad brush portrait, but accurate enough for the present), was a feature of these latter years of the 16th century, soon to culminate in the immolation of Giordano Bruno in 1600. This conflict will be examined in the impeachment of Aumerle (Catholic) for the murder of Gloucester (Gnostic) in IV, i. It was the Gnostic tradition which examined most powerfully the invisible world, especially in the great modern works – of Mirandola, Reuchlin, Agrippa, Giorgi, and the other great Neoplatonist magi - that filled the library of the inspirational John Dee, a tremendous resource for Bacon and his circle.³ This Gnostic wisdom has been denied by the Catholic that is the pubertal Shaksper, to leave him vulnerable to the libido in negative aspect (the Boar), and to the grip of rationalist asceticism as a defence mechanism, the first of a

⁴ Hancock, *ibid.*

series of which would culminate in his espousal of Puritanism aet.15, to end in the tragedy of the breakdown of 1587.

The author now returns to square one, to make the same point in a different way, and with different aspects upstage. Bolingbroke, Northumberland, and York, are at the castle walls, with the last still maintaining the right of Richard to the throne. Percy joins them, and names the occupants. In other words, the Catholic reasoning ego still prevails in the interpretation of the written word; and it remains vulnerable to flooding by the blind libido. This is represented by the drum (throbbing of will-to-eros, as always in FF: e.g. Alcibiades' drum in TimA) which accompanies them, and by the presence, of course, of Percy (asceticism corrupted by dissolution in libido). The turning point comes with the following:

Percy Yes my good Lord,
 It doth contain a king...
 ...besides a clergy man
 Of holy reverence; who, I cannot learn.
Northumberland O, belike it is the Bishop of Carlisle.

The Bishop represents the Roman Catholic world-view. Immediately upon Northumberland's words will come the manifesto of Bolingbroke, who will move on the castle "without the noise of threatening drum": i.e., with the new regime in the ascendant. For Northumberland has had the last word over Percy; his "O" bearing the meaning of "zero": the point being that the Catholic influence (Carlisle) will be annihilated. The broad lines of the deposition of libidinous Catholicism for rationalist asceticism are readily traceable in the conversation of Northumberland with Richard, followed by the latter's descent from the castle, and announcement of his intention to relinquish the throne.

The garden scene is a philosophical examination of what exactly is changing vis-à-vis the written word. The flowers, plants and trees of the garden represent the forms created in the imagination in response to their portrayal on the page. Their roots are in the earth: for they are Platonic Ideas – the "Mothers" of Goethe's Faust

⁵ Knight and Lomas, *The Hiram Key*

– which reveal the substrate of the will-to-life beneath all forms of the visible universe. Thus, the Gnostic enquirer apprehends not this willow or that oak, but the Tree, whose basic physiology is common to all trees. Platonic Ideas are thus the foundation of scientific method, of true religious feeling, and of Gnostic wisdom. This was the point of St. Bernard of Clairvaux's famous dictum "God is length, breadth, height, depth": the crucial fourth dimension of depth divinising the three dimensional, merely objective world. St. Bernard was intimately connected with the Knights Templar in their early years, and with the early Grail romance *Parzival* by Wolfram von Eschenbach (writing in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries),⁴ which was certainly a prime inspiration of FF as allegory (see Ch.44). The Queen bears here the value of the Queen of the Invisible World, Queen of Hell-Grail Queen; her concealment in the shadows of the trees, this principle described in the written word (cf. Beatrice in the orchard in MAN), with the potential for the reasoning and imagining reader's achievement of Gnostic or Ring nobility. Here, however, she is sad, for her principle is about to be buried. She leaves the shadows, and finally the garden, to make her way to Bolingbroke (unseen world in written word denied by the rationalist). Her "Oh I am pressed your death for want of speaking" establishes her as germane to Cordelia, Hippolyta, and Hero, whose silences symbolise the deafness of the Goddess-denying subject to the song of the unseen world, from the stage of the printed page. The gardener is, of course, the magian writer. Her parting curse "I would the plants thou graft'st, never grow", represents the fervent wish of the incipient ascetic that his sham Goddess might deny the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen for good; but in vain, for the gardener plants a rue, which will "shortly be seen,/In the remembrance of a weeping Queen": the appearance of the flower of ruthfulness representing the dissolution of Shaksper's Bolingbroke phase in the flood of libido (Gads Hill robbery in 1HIV), in response to the Goddess – once buried, still alive - portrayed in the printed page.

ACT IV

The first theme of this long single scene concerns the brutal suppression of the Ring/Grail tradition by Rome, and hence the

young Shaksper's ignorance of it, with its wisdom and depth, to leave the frying pan of rationalism beckoning as a sham nirvana, refuge from the fire of Catholicism. Bagot stands, as the ithyphallos, more broadly for the invisible world, realm of the libido, just as the numerous "I"'s for "Ay"'s in 1-3HVI. Thus it is he who accuses Aumerle (Catholic world-view) of the murder of Gloucester (Gnostic world-view). The choreography here is precise, as Fitzwater and Percy back up Bagot. The name "Fitzwater" ("son of water") recalls the epithet "saved from water" which was applied to Moses, and so many other Ring Lords of Egyptian tradition, the first of whom was Noah (and Sir Francis Bacon, who would be formally inducted into Freemasonry by King James in 1603,⁵ would have been thoroughly familiar with this sort of Egyptian esoteric lore); while Percy (Hotspur), is the ascetic ego flooded with libido, and hence witness to the crime of Rome. Fitzwater names Norfolk as having impeached Aumerle: for the ithyphallos as idea is also witness to the horrific murder of Ring nobility. This illumination must remain unavailable, however, to Shaksper in this early period of trouble, for his first defence of asceticism will suppress the ithyphallos as idea (death of Norfolk in exile, to leave the judgement on Aumerle in abeyance).

The faculty of reason, now getting the hang of the rationalistic way of thinking, is about to deal with the troublesome libido (York leading in Richard to surrender his crown), along with the old Catholic regime (arrest of Bishop of Carlisle). Two precisely placed "I"'s for "Ay"'s – the first in RII, after a plethora in 1-3HVI – detail precisely the nature of the transformation:

Bolingbroke Are you contented to resign the crown?

Richard I, no; no, I: for I must nothing be.

- Where all three "I"'s represent the ithyphallos, more broadly the unseen world, defined and penetrable by St. Bernard's fourth dimension of depth, yet here denied by the rationalist ascetic. Interestingly, the style of this speech of Richard's, as of much in RII, suggests the hand neither of Bacon nor the early Shakespeare (e.g. MAF, the Falstaff scenes in 1-2HIV), but rather of the author –

⁶ Knight and Lomas, *The Second Messiah*.

probably Marlowe - of 1-3HVI, a scenario with which this flurry of "I"'s is wholly consistent. It is Northumberland, as the ascetic world-view, who conflicts with Richard. Finally we have the famous looking-glass episode, wherein Richard calls for a glass "Where all my sins are writ, and that's myself", - only to smash it, with Bolingbroke making the memorable observation "The shadow of your sorrow hath destroyed/The shadow of your face". What does this mean? Both the torment of the ego, and his conception of his libidinous self, are shadows, or counterfeits, falsely created under the influence of the Christian puritan superego, and not the real thing: for he is cut off from the wisdom of his true self. Thus the object of his destruction is not destroyed at all, but will rise again, as the libido and its sequela of auto-erotism (Gads Hill robbery) in 1HIV, to shatter Shaksper's Bolingbroke phase for good. This sorrow, too, is not the real thing, as remaining uninformed by Gnostic wisdom, and insight into the roots of his own condition; whereas the true sorrow - to bring in its train the Journey of the Hero into Gnostic enlightenment, and Ring nobility, - would be for his enthrallment by Catholicism. This is the point of the Gnostic Crucifixion, wherein the Christ goes to his death with eyes open; whereas Shaksper would be crucified in his blindness, on that momentous day for Western culture in 1587 (the typical Pauline Christ, hanging on the Cross with head bowed, and eyes closed). The breakdown would be a beautiful illustration of the colophon to Spengler's *The Decline of the West*: 'Ducunt Fata volentem, nolentem trahunt' ("Fate leads him who wills it, but drags him who denies it"). Thus all is in shadows, in darkness. Consistently, the Catholic troika of Carlisle, and Abbot, and Aumerle, plot revenge.

ACT V

i

Holinshed states that Richard was first gaoled in the Tower, and after conveyed to Pomfret; whereas in RII he goes straight to Pomfret, the Tower being avoided entirely. The point of this lies in the symbolism of the Tower as the Gnostic Church, as a reference to the Tower ("Magdalene") card of the Tarot Major Arcana. The Goddess, the Fool, the Wheel of Fortune (Hamlet), and so on, all point to the considerable influence of the Tarot on FF: for it was

almost certainly an invention, - later to be inherited by Freemasonry, - of the Knights Templar, as an aid to the Gnostic instruction of its brothers.⁶ That is to say, the ego in shadows shuns the path of Gnostic enlightenment. The Queen seated on the ground signifies the grossening by the rationalist of the unseen world, - its identification with earth rather than the heavens, - which will remain unsubtilised by the ego, and ready to claim him, as portrayed in 1-2HIV. This is also the meaning of the similar pose of Queen Constance in KJ III, i, and Aaron's interment in the earth in the final scenes of TitA.

ii-iii

This grossening of the Faustian dimension is represented another way by the dust thrown on the deposed Richard's head by the crowd. Bolingbroke on his "hot and fiery steed", yet with "slow, but stately pace", is to be contrasted, as portraying the suppression of the libido, with Aumerle, York, and the Duchess, all galloping at full speed to the new King, after York's discovery of his son's treachery. This is a beautiful representation of the activation of the will-to-eros, through engagement with the printed page (the incriminating letter) by the ascetically reasoning ego (York), against his will. Aumerle is explicitly given his new identity as Rutland, as it is made clear that the York-Duchess-Aumerle family bears exactly the same values - of the reason-Virgin Mary-Catholic ego complex - as in the foregoing 1-3HVI.

The choreography is precise, as Bolingbroke brings Prince Hal to our attention immediately before the arrival of Aumerle, and the irruption of York into the King's chamber: for Hal will embody just this principle, of the rationalist ascetic corrupted by dissolution in libido. The breaking in of York against the resistance of the door, graphically represents the psychological principle at work, of the vanquishing of the suppression of libido. This new swelling of libido will be quenched (King's proscription of the traitors): for the new regime is, for the time being, in the ascendant. The Duchess on her knees before Bolingbroke identifies her with the sham Goddess of Catholicism, the Virgin Mary. She secures Aumerle's pardon: for the Catholic-libidinous ego has not been extirpated, merely suppressed in a flimsy cage, from which it will soon burst forth as

the Boar (libido in negative aspect), in the Boar's Head tavern scenes in 1-2HIV, to plunge the adolescent Shaksper once more into crisis.

iv

Let us look closely at this great closing speech, which bears all the hallmarks – the novelty and richness of language and metaphor, the extreme sophistication of reasoning, the mastery of symbolism, and so on - of the high style of Bacon. Once again, this is not at all to disparage Shakespeare (as he had now become, with reference to the Boar-spear, his new weapon against the negative libido, his *bête noire*), as the Baconians have generally been too quick to do. Presuming RII to have come from the years 1594-5, then Shakespeare's instruction would now have stretched over about six years, with his creative writing (Orlando phase) having begun c.1589 (the final lines of MAF give the period of "two years and more" for his initial period of intensive reading (Melancholy Jacques phase) under Bacon's guidance). The most likely scenario has RII proceeding mostly from the pens of Bacon and Marlowe, with Shakespeare engaged upon MWW (almost wholly, though not exclusively, his work), and the Boar's Head tavern scenes of 1HIV. The examination of the plays which proceeded entirely from the pen of Bacon (the early comedies, A&C, TWT, CYM, &c) will show therein an indefectible consistency of style and allegorical content: the latter lacking the intimacy and tortured immediacy of the plays with a significant Shakespearean component (e.g. RIII, with its graphic portrayal of the breakdown and its immediate sequelae; T&C, a description of Shakespeare's continuing problem in London phase with the troublesome libido, resulting in a venereal disease (cf. the final two sonnets); TT, an examination of the psychological readjustment Shakespeare had to make to enable his return to his wife and family, - the context of the original breakdown, - after the laying down of his pen; and so on). RII, with its concentration on principle rather than personal detail, clearly does not belong to this latter group, unlike the forthcoming 1&2HIV, in which the intimacies could not be any more graphic or startling. Yet, as we have noted before, Bacon, Shakespeare, and Marlowe, and perhaps some others of Bacon's "good pens", must have formed an

Persuades me I was better when a king;
 Then am kinged again: and by and by 35
 Think that I am unkinged by Bolingbroke,
 And straight am nothing. But what ere I am,
 Nor I, nor any man that but man is,
 With nothing shall be pleased till he be eased
 With being nothing. Music do I hear? 40
 Ha, ha? Keep time! How sour sweet music is
 When time is broke and no proportion kept?
 So is it in the music of men's lives:
 And here have I the daintiness of ear
 To hear time broke in a disordered string; 45
 But for the concord of my state and time,
 Had not an ear to hear my own true time broke.
 I wasted time, and now doth time waste me;
 For now hath time made me his numbring clock:
 My thoughts are minutes; and with sighs they jar

50

Their watches on unto mine eyes, the outward watch,
 Whereto my finger, like a dial's point,
 Is pointing still, in cleansing them from tears.
 Now, sir, the sound that tells what hour it is
 Are clamorous groans, which strike upon my heart,

55

Which is the bell. So sighs and tears and groans
 Show minutes, hours and times; but my time
 Runs posting on in Bolingbroke's proud joy,
 While I stand fooling here, his Jack of the clock.
 This music mads me, let it sound no more; 60
 For though it have holpe madmen to their wits,
 In me it seems it will make wise men mad.
 Yet blessing on his heart that gives it me!
 For 'tis a sign of love, and love to Richard
 Is a strange brooch in this all-hating world.

Lines 1-10 serve as a summary of just what Bacon, Shakespeare,
 and Marlowe, under the general supervision of the first, have been
 on about in the historical sequence as allegory. The prison is both

the ego of Shakespeare, and Europe, both of which have been corrupted by the Roman Catholic tyranny, and are desperately in need of healing. What Bacon terms "humors", I have generally called "principles". Lines 11-16 ("The better sort...") describe the scrupulous contemplation of the divine potential of Man, and by how far the Catholic tyranny, and the milieu intérieur of

Shakespeare, as defined by it, have fallen short of this ideal. This sort of contemplation sets "the Faith itself/Against the Faith": a brilliant observation, which must strike anyone of a Gnostic persuasion who considers the wisdom of the Bible, and its often violent contrast with the history and teachings of Roman (Pauline) Church. The New Testament is in fact full of Gnostic wisdom, such as "It is easier for a camel to pass through a needle's eye, than for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of heaven": wealth standing here for the power principle, and Man-as-sublimated-animal, subject to and driven by the will: such as the remarkably venal and libidinous Catholic clergy of mediaeval-Renaissance times. This is the point of the continued association throughout the early histories of the Catholic (Winchester/Beaufort; Aumerle) and "I" principles. To contemplate, in light of the wisdom of the Bible, the misery caused to so many in the contemporary West, say, by the Vatican's proscription of contraception, is truly to "Set the Faith against the Faith". Every other utterance of Pope John-Paul II bespeaks his un-Christianness. The next two instances of "Thoughts tending to ambition" and "Thoughts tending to content" are, of course, of striking relevance to the spirit of FF: the sufferer being unable to deny the human condition, and finding no comfort in shallow reasoning; or, on the macroscopic plane, the Roman Catholic tyranny remaining resistant to forceful overthrow, - and that so many others throughout Europe are in the same boat is no consolation.

The construction of line 30 ("Thus play I...") is at first glance odd. The "I" is in fact bearing here its customary value of the ithyphallic principle, while "many people" is also, along with "I" the subject of "play": for the author is constructing an allegory of the invisible world, and its interplay with the various characters. The next passage "Sometimes am I king..." to "...unkinged by Bolingbroke" refers to the alternation between tumescence and flaccidity,

where the ithyphallos stands here, as above, more broadly for the invisible world, finally to be denied by the rationalist ascetic. Yet his victory will prove to be delusory (36-40). The music (41-65) represents here, as so often in FF (e.g. Bianca's music lessons in TOS), the Musical arts – reading, writing, poetry, and so on – as sourced, like Autolycus in TWT, by Bacon from the early pages of Plato's Republic. The time of the music is, of course, the will, or invisible world, as expressed in those arts, where its beating represents the rhythmic pulses of the universe: the heartbeats, the breathing, the births and deaths, the recurrence of the seasons, and so on. The disordered time he can now detect, refers to the inadequate representation of the underworld in the written word (here rationalist), or its inadequate acknowledgement by the reader. Yet he has been unable to detect its similar travesty in the word of Catholicism, to which as a child he has been wedded, and which has brought him to this pass. "I wasted time, and now does time waste me": for never at any stage, even now, has he engaged the invisible world in the truly Gnostic way. "This music mads me"; for the young and comparatively resourceless Shaksper's knowledge of the anathematised will-to-eros is inciting the present psychic conflict.

Richard's former groom enters to commiserate with him. Bolingbroke is now riding the "Roane Barbary", which goes "So proudly, as if he had disdained the ground". The pattern of the colour – mostly brown, with pale patches - represents the flooding of the visible world (pale colour) with the invisible (dark colour). This is also the point of the roan horse of Hotspur in 1HIV II, iii: "That Roane shall be my throne". The ground is always identified with grossness, in opposition to the subtlety of the heavens: and the horse's new lightness and tractability represent the success (albeit vain and doomed) of the Bolingbroke defence (cf. V, ii, above).

Here is a fascinating incident:

Richard [in his prison cell] The devil take Henry of Lancaster
and thee!

Patience is stale, and I am weary of it.

[Beats the Keeper]

~~The first line was taken from Holinshed, though the second was not.~~

King Richard sat down to dinner, and was served without courtesy or assay; whereupon, much marvelling at the sudden change, he demanded of the esquire why he did not his duty: "Sir" (said he) "I am otherwise commanded by sir Piers of Exton, which is newly come from K. Henry." When King Richard heard that word, he took the carving knife in his hand, and strake the esquire on the head, saying: "The devil take Henry of Lancaster and thee together!"

That is, Holinshed has the King's outburst directed solely against the esquire for his insolence; whereas in the play it is rather against the suffering of his confinement, a change in emphasis which is reinforced by the emendation of esquire' [gaol] Keeper. The reference here is to the extreme patience required for the construction of the foregoing allegory; and not only of the histories, but the comedies too: and we shall shortly see a product of that patience and astonishing application in Love's Labour's Lost.

Finally, King Richard is murdered. Utterly consistently, Northumberland (uncorrupted rationalist ascetic reason) now appears to announce the executions of Oxford, Salisbury, Blunt and Kent: the first, as supplanted by the Cambridge principle of rationalism (the "ford" of Oxford representing, as always in FF, engagement with Nature, the "bridge" of Cambridge avoidance of Her); Salisbury, as the principle of psychic safety (see Chapter 1), as imperilled by the Bolingbroke defence, with its denial of the heart of the matter; and Blunt, as the ithyphallic principle (see Ch.6). Kent's appearance out of nowhere in apposition to Blunt, and the homophonic closeness of his name to a colloquialism for the female pudenda, suggest his value, which will be abundantly confirmed in King Lear. Blunt stands here more broadly for the invisible world and the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, whose realm that world is. Carlisle (Roman Catholic world-view) is allowed to live, for this aspect of Shaksper's psyche is now buried, though not

dead, just as it was Richard's "shadow" that was shattered, not his true self. For now, however, King Henry announces his intention to "voyage to the Holy Land": that is, to become, through bookish rationalist contemplation, a Gnostic Christ. Yet he will not attain it; nor will Shaksper ever approach Golgotha of his own accord, until the libido drag him kicking and screaming to the Cross of Ugly Dick.

CHAPTER 6

HENRY THE FOURTH Part 1

Rll then is the record of the immediately post-pubertal Shaksper's adoption of the ascetic heresy in defence against the anathematisation by the Roman Church (perhaps with a Puritan component even at this early stage, through his father) of the will-to-eros, more broadly the invisible world, which was graven deep in the tables of his unconscious. Now 1&2 HIV will show the collapse of this stance, to plunge him, c. aet.14, into the ecstasy of eros (the "charge of the Boar"), and its sequelae of anguish and torment.

The scenario is as follows. Shaksper (as he was then) in his Bolingbroke phase of bookish asceticism, - with the imagination as yet active, in contrast to his later Puritan phase, - was all the time accumulating idea-triumphs in relation to Nature, yet in an entirely mechanistic way, such as we have come to know in the more unfortunate, yet thankfully largely atypical, schools of modern science – for example, that of Cambridge University, as celebrated in the novels of the dismal and dangerous C.P. Snow. These were victories of the male principle of the intellect, whose subject is cause-and-effect in the merely visible world, with the female principles of intuition and deeper wisdom ruthlessly suppressed. For a time all was well; then the libido in negative aspect began to intrude on his resisting ego, and cloud the clarity of his meditations. Finally, this ended in surrender to an act of auto-erotism, to shatter his Bolingbroke defence in a "charge of the Boar", and demand another mechanism of coping with the troublesome will-to-eros.

Here are the broad lines of the scheme. The sickness of Henry IV (Bolingbroke) represents the initial phase of this collapse of Shaksper's ascetic defence. Northumberland is the reasoning ego of the pristine Bolingbroke phase; his son Hotspur, this reason as corrupted by the blind libido. Harry is the ego dominated by libido;

¹ Robert Graves, *The White Goddess*.

his triumph over Hotspur (invented de novo for the allegory), the final collapse of asceticism. Falstaff (also largely unhistorical) represents, of course, the libido; the Gads Hill robbery, with Hal and their companions, the act of auto-erotism. These revelations are remarkable for the unflinching gaze of their writer, the spirit of brutal honesty in which he recalls the minutiae of his painful case history, for the benefit of himself and others. A tragedy is being incubated here, with a microscope trained on every stage of its misformed development.

ACT I

i

King Henry announces the end of civil war, and a crusade to recapture Jerusalem and the "Sepulcher of Christ" from the pagans. This represents the resolution of the psychic conflict of Shaksper's pubertal phase, when the libido surged in negative mantle, as invested by Christian puritanism, - by his espousal of asceticism as a way to the Gnostic Christ (the classic historical precedent being, of course, the heretical Cathars of Provence, who would be exterminated by the Roman establishment in the Albigensian crusade). Strict asceticism is not an option for the adolescent, however; and its untenability here is straight announced with the delay of the crusade by the capture by the Welshman Glendower of Mortimer, who will soon become his son-in-law and ally against the King. We have seen (1HVI II, v) that Mortimer bears the value of the "I" (ithyphallic/maypole) principle; while Glendower will be firmly identified as Welsh magician, master of the Faustian dimension, or invisible world (III, i). The unseen world is therefore becoming manifest through an ithyphallos, to disturb the peace of the ego's asceticism. The ithyphallos is falling from idea (as conceived by the ascetically reasoning ego) to blind will. This will also be the point of the Hotspur-Glendower dispute in III, i.

The victory of Hotspur over the Scot Archibald, and the capture of several of his nobles, represents the idea-triumphs of ascetic reason: the lords representing here, as in KJ and so many later plays, the faculty of reason. The point is made that this is predicated on the subject's abjuration of the libido: for the horse-and-rider, who has quitted the battle while it is in progress, bears always in FF the value

of the libido in action, as sourced from Socrates' extended metaphor in Plato's *Phaedrus*. This point is made more vividly with the dismounting from his horse of Sir Walter Blunt, to bring news of the victory. We have seen (2HVI IV, i), courtesy of Marlowe's gloss, the name "Walter" to signify the ithyphallos; and so here: the ithyphallos being uncoupled from the will, by the faculty of ideation. The corruption of ascetic contemplation by the blind libido is represented by Hotspur's retention for himself of all the prisoners bar one: the ego clinging desperately to the last remnants of his triumphs. He has been incited to it by his uncle Worcester, who bears the allegoric value of psychic turmoil, as signified by the root "Wor-" (cf. Warwick in 1-3HVI).

ii

Here we move to the expression of these principles and their interactions on the lower plane. Falstaff (libido) is introduced, and immediately makes crystal clear his status as a Dionysius figure (Consort/Son of the Moon Goddess):¹ "...for we that take purses go by the moon and the seven stars, and not by Phoebus... let us not that are squires of the night's body be called thieves of the day's beauty. Let us be Diana's foresters, gentlemen of the shade, minions of the moon; and let men say we be men of good government, being governed, as the sea is, by our noble and chaste mistress the moon..." The sea bears here its ancient mythic value of the unconscious. Mistress Nell Quickly is the Goddess of the auto-erotist. Her first name tolls the petit-mort; while her surname needs no explanation. Money signifies always in FF the power of a principle: and the payment of money to her represents surrender to her by the auto-erotist. Her allure has been growing without resulting, as yet, in consummation:

Prince Henry Why, what a pox have I to do with my hostess of the tavern?

Falstaff Well, thou hast called her to a reckoning many a time and oft.

Prince Henry Did I ever call for thee to pay thy part?

Falstaff No, I'll give thee thy due, thou hast paid all there.

Prince Henry Yea, and elsewhere, so far as my coin would

stretch; and where it would not I have used my credit.

- For the Goddess of Love - perhaps as vividly described in Fotis' seduction of Lucius in Apuleius' *The Golden Ass* - has steadily been increasing Her power over the ascetic, as created in his imagination, with more to come, to culminate in the final surrender. The Gads Hill robbery will shortly be demonstrated to portray this consummation. Now it tempts in the person of Poin (remarkably, from the French. *poignes*, "fists", "grips") and brings self-loathing in its train:

Prince Henry Where shall we take a purse tomorrow, Jack?

[..]

Fastaff ...Poin! Now we shall know if Gadshill have set a match. O, if men were to be saved by merit, what hole in hell were hot enough for him? This is the most omnipotent villain that ever cried "Stand!" to a true man.

- Where "Stand" refers, as so often in FF, to tumescence. The subject as yet resists:

Prince Henry Who, I rob? I a thief? Not I, by my faith.

The thrice-repeated "I" is not quite as strong as "I" for "Ay" in signifying the *ithyphallos*, but strong enough; and now we have an instance of the latter: "I, but is like that they will know us by our horses..." The "hard" in Hal's "Yea, but I doubt they will be too hard for us" bears the same significance as that in the King's "you are too hard for me" in HVIII V, i: the reference being to the *ithyphallos*. Sunk in self-loathing, he perceives himself as the sun, in contrast to Falstaff's moon: "Yet herein will I imitate the sun,/Who doth permit the base contagious clouds/To smother up his beauty from the world/That, when he please again to be himself,/Being wanted he may be more wondered at...". Yet both sun and moon (functional left and right brains) are required for completeness (fig.3).

² See especially his wonderful essay on schizophrenia in *Myths to Live By*.

iii

On the higher plane once more, the ego is beset with turmoil (King's invective against Worcester) as the peace of his mechanistic-ascetic contemplation is shattered by the surge of libido (Northumberland struggling to get a word in; Hotspur's increasing volubility). Hotspur's odd story of the giving away of his prisoners gives a beautiful description of the wisdom-less ascetic dandy, who is identified with the Bolingbroke-phase ego ("... demanded/My prisoners, in your majesty's behalf"). The choreography is precise, as Sir Walter Blunt ("I") speaks up, to be followed straight by Henry's vehement refusal to ransom Mortimer (ithyphallos remaining as will, subject to the blind libido).

The centrality of the written word to all of this – as it is more broadly to the Ring quest described in FF – is indicated by the "secret book" with "matter deep and dangerous" which Worcester unclasps to the gaze of Hotspur. The "razor's edge" of Oriental mythology, by which the initiate passes from darkness to Gnostic enlightenment, is evoked in Worcester's "As to o're-walk a current, roaring loud/On the unsteadfast footing of a spear". Apuleius' magical masterpiece of psychic transformation, - a colossal influence on FF, as the argument to come will show, - with its vividly erotic early scenes, would make an ideal candidate for the book in question. Now the subject is reading, creating against his will the Goddess of Love in the imagination: "He apprehends a world of figures here,/But not the form of what he should attend". Consistently, Hotspur now incandesces with defiance against the King, vowing to withhold his prisoners. Worcester now prevails on him to free the prisoners to the Scots, with the sole exception of the son of Douglas, as a precondition of the alliance against King Henry. Once again, the boy bears the value of the libido: the scenario being that the subject is imagining nothing but the Goddess of Love, with surrender to auto-erotism now in the offing.

ACT II

i, ii

By the end of I, ii, the ego, lured by temptation, had begun to cross the Rubicon of his inhibitions. Now the act adumbrated there will be

realised. These are remarkable scenes, with their description in graphic detail of the surrender to auto-erotism. We have become thoroughly used to this sort of unflinching engagement with Dionysian Man in modern art; but many lovers and scholars of Shakespeare will no doubt recoil from its presence here. Yet its purpose is anything but pornographic, rather, it serves the highest art. The closest correspondence is with James Joyce, whose works are every bit as serious and incorruptibly honest. Joyce's daughter Lucia suffered from schizophrenia of the involuntal type, and was institutionalised for the greater part of her life; and this may plausibly have been Joyce's fate too, had it not been for his art. We will see that the theme of Hamlet as allegory is the ego's descent into untreatable paranoid schizophrenia, as a ready extrapolation from the less severe, though incapacitating in itself, anxiety/depression neurosis which had stricken down Shakespeare in 1587, the case history of which would be the subject, in one way or another, of every play without exception of FF. There is no doubt that eros often plays a huge part in psychosis, as the works of Jung, R.D. Laing, Joseph Campbell,² and others, amply show. Right at the start of HAM the ithyphallos surges, as symbolised by the clockface at one o'clock: the minute hand representing the abdomen, the hour hand the member, as viewed from the side. This clockface technique is also used here in 1HIV, in scenes which could only have been written by Shakespeare himself. No other scenario is possible.

The two carriers represent the testicles: "This house is turned upside-down since Robin ostler died" (where living Robin and dead represent flaccid phallos and ithyphallos respectively); "I think this be the most villainous house in all London road for fleas; "and your chamber-lye breeds fleas like a loach"; "since the first cock"; "come away, and be hanged"; and so on. The time is stated as being four o'clock. If Shakespeare dressed to the right at angle of sixty degrees approximately, then this is exactly how the phallos would appear from underneath.

Gadshill (both the character, and Gads Hill, scene of the robbery) represents the phallos. A gad was a pointed tool; and a precisely placed "I" for "Ay" clinches it. Looking from beneath, the angle formed would correspond to four o'clock; from above, to two. The revaluation of the time to two o'clock is therefore an adroit way of

signifying that the subject is now looking down at the member. Gadshill has a gelding in the stable, which bears the value, as the horse always does in FF, of the libido. The carriers complement his missing parts, which would be superfluous for the allegory. The chamberlain represents the prepuce. Flaccidity reigns as yet ("Nay soft I pray ye..."); but not for long:

Gadshill What ho, Chamberlaine?

Chamberlaine At hand quoth pickpurse.

Gadshill That's even as fair as at hand quoth the chamberlaine.

- Where picking of purses is a beautiful simile for the manual retraction of the prepuce. There is no going back:

Gadshill Sirrah, if they meet not with Saint Nicholas' clerks, I'll give thee this neck.

- Where "give thee this neck" refers to the hiding of the shaft within the prepuce. The references to the coming act continue in "...for they ride up and down on her" and "We steal as in a castle, cocksure: we have the receipt of fernseed..." Finally, Gadshill bids his gelding be brought out (early swelling of libido); and bids farewell to the chamberlaine (prepuce disappears upon tumescence).

Poins (fists) has the first word on Gads Hill. He has removed Falstaff's horse, which "frets like a gum'd velvet" (libido activating as prelude to the act). Falstaff calls urgently for Poins (libido demanding act). Finally, full tumescence is attained with Gadshill's "Stand!" (to Falstaff). We note the ominous presence together of Peto (from the Latin for "I seek") and Bardolph (will to resist orgasm: see HV for a full derivation), to signify the conflict riving the ego of Shakespeare, over which his Christian puritan superego still tyrannises. Hal says: "You four shall front them in the narrow lane: Ned [Poins] and I will walk lower..." - representing the fists. It could not be more graphically described. Falstaff and company robbing the travellers on the peak of Gads Hill represents the moment of petit mort; Hal and Poins then relieving them of the money on the lower slopes, the downward course of the ejaculate

over the hands.

One is struck in all of this by the bravery and brutal honesty of Shakespeare in getting it all down, and by the depth of intimacy of his relationship with Sir Francis Bacon, who could not possibly have been unaware of the allegorical content of a play on which he collaborated, under his general direction. One senses also a certain delight in building the allegory, as he puts into practice the lessons of Bacon, whose astonishingly sophisticated cryptographic artistry will be noted time and time again in these pages.

iii

The purpose of this scene is to highlight the role of the written word. Hotspur reading the letter advising him against the revolt, and vehemently rejecting it, represents the subject reading the printed page, desperately trying to hold back the libido, but being drawn ineluctably into its grip. His deafness to the long entreaties of his wife Kate is closely germane to failure of Lear, Theseus, and Claudio, to hear Cordelia, Hippolyta, and Hero, respectively, albeit it is expressed in a different way in these latter, in their silences. Ted Hughes correctly placed the silence of Cordelia at the heart of Shakespeare's ethical system, but for the wrong reason: for her silence represents in truth not a virtue, but a vice, as the failure of the tragic figure to open his ears to the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen – guardian of the knowledge of the invisible world, as portrayed in the written word – as invested with the words of the Musical arts. This Kate is cognate, of course, with all the other Kates and Katherines of FF, as a Queen of Hell, Goddess of the Invisible World. Here, it is the mechanistic ascetic, rather than the Puritan (a later degradation of Shakespeare's tormented ego) who is denying the underworld.

Hotspur calls for his horse (libido); and while he remains on foot, protests his lack of love for his wife (mechanist ascetic rejecting underworld as idea). Once mounted, however, he will "swear I love thee infinitely" (ego seduced by underworld as will, inherent in the Goddess of Love). This is put another way in his "Whither I go, thither shall you go too..." This is a classically Freudian mechanism,

³ Dame Frances Yates, *The Occult Philosophy in the Elizabethan Age*.

recorded here some three centuries before the supposed inauguration of Western depth psychology: the formerly repressed libido irrupting the ego to precipitate the crisis. This is the “charge of the Boar”: the same tusks as gored the Goddess-rejecting Puritan figure Adonis in *Venus and Adonis*, the “first heir of my invention”, and reappears so often at the “Shakespearean moment” in the plays. Hence, of course, is the tavern named the Boar’s Head, as the lair of the negative libido (Falstaff).

iv

The Boar has charged, to dissolve in blind libido the hard-edged idea-triumphs of the ascetic enquirer (Hal in the Boar’s Head tavern, with Falstaff and the rest, having “sounded the very base string of humanity”). Hal and Poins play a prank on Francis the tapster, with Poins repeatedly calling “Francis” from offstage, and he replying “Anon”. What can be the point of this? – for it is an invariable rule of FF as allegory that there is nothing adventitious or fanciful. Compelling evidence will be produced in later chapters that Francisco in *Hamlet* and *The Tempest*, and Friar Francis in *MAN*, are all depictions of Sir Francis Bacon himself: the point being made, for example, by Francisco’s early exit, never to return, in *HAM*, that the denial of the Gnostic world-view is a key factor in the pathogenesis of schizophrenia. So it is here, with the reiterated “Francis” ... “Anon” signifying the anonymous hand of Bacon in the writing of this scene, and more generally throughout FF. *Love’s Labour’s Lost* will later be revealed to elaborate this theme in a spectacular and extraordinarily sophisticated way. Francis’ immobilisation in amazement at the end of this episode, and abrupt summoning away by the Vintner, signifies the germane absence of the Gnostic tradition at a crucial time in the pathogenesis of the coup of 1587: the implication being that its ministry could have healed Shakespeare’s tusk-wounds for good at this early stage; just as Bacon would later achieve in the early years of his patient’s London phase.

Falstaff and company now appear at the tavern door, and Hal orders “Let them alone a while, and then open the door”. Why, exactly? The contribution of this to the drama is hard to fathom, the author’s sense of structure seemingly having deserted him. Once again, its significance is to be found on the allegoric plane, in

another "Francis" and answering "Anon, anon sir" - from Francis offstage, or perhaps entering then quickly exiting again - followed by the entry of Falstaff. For it is the suppression of the Gnostic tradition that allows the libido to irrupt the ego in the immediate aftermath of the fall, ensuring that Shaksper's Bolingbroke phase of asceticism is doomed. This weakening of the power of the libido by the Gnostic enquirer, or "inspired melancholic" (hence Melancholy Jacques in AYLI, who represents Shakespeare in his phase of intensive reading from 1587-9 approx.) is symbolised by the withered dog in Albrecht Dürer's *Melencolia I* (fig.1),³ and those two memorably feeble nags of legend, Rosinante (Don Quixote) and Bill (Lord of the Rings). This is also the point of the repeated association of the "I" principle with Winchester/Beaufort (Roman Church) in the HVI trilogy: the brutal suppression of the Gnostic tradition by Pauline Catholicism leaving it still vulnerable to the underworld as will, to invite the Puritan tyranny as a (delusory) corrective.

A flurry of "I"'s for "Ay"'s in Falstaff's tale of the robbery confirms its allegorical significance. Hal and Poins have represented, of course, the two fists:

Falstaff Four, Hal, I told thee four.

Poins I, I, he said four.

The repeated emphasis on their investment in buckram suggests that this may have been an erotic aid. Hal's sending of Falstaff to prevent the entry of a messenger from King Henry (ascetic ego) represents clearly the change that came over Shaksper at this time. That this change would be permanent, will shortly be expressed by the (unhistorical) slaying of Hotspur by Hal at the battle of Shrewsbury, and subsequent death of the King in 2HIV. Falstaff standing in place of the King, and extolling his own virtues to Hal, vividly represents the supplanting of asceticism by the blind libido; Falstaff sitting in place of Hal, and refusing to abandon his copain, the same thing in a different way.

The utter primacy of the visual imagination in the attainment of

⁴ Knight and Lomas, *The Second Messiah*.

⁵ Knight and Lomas, *The Hiram Key*.

Gnostic – lately Christian Cabalist/ Neoplatonic – nobility, is a constant theme of FF. This is the point, for example, of Claudius’ “My words fly up, my thoughts remain below,/Words without thoughts, never to heaven go” in HAM; while the imagination is represented by the various torches, flares, and Watches of the plays. Here, in the final episode of Act II, we have the entry of the Sheriff and the Watch, and the subsequent deep sleep of Falstaff behind the arras where he has secreted himself. This is once again to anticipate Freud by some centuries: for the numerous self-concealments behind arrases of Falstaff and Polonius represent always in FF the mechanism of psychic repression of the libido. It has here a positive rather than negative significance, for it is the visual imagination of the inspired melancholic that depowers the will; - as stimulated by what, exactly? It is the written word as descriptive of the invisible world, realm of the Queen of Hell, as symbolised by the papers taken from Falstaff’s pocket, and read by Hal. Ominously, Hal orders the papers to be put aside till another time; and determines to enlist Falstaff in the wars on the morrow. Bacon has been showing us here the ideal resolution to the devastation caused by the Boar, and by how far this ideal finally failed to obtain in the case of the adolescent William Shaksper.

ACT III

i

We have seen that Shaksper’s world-view at this early stage was mechanistic in nature, with denial of the unseen world. The word “religion” is most plausibly derived from the Latin religare, “to bind back”: and the living world is bound together by its substrate of the unseen realm of the Faustian dimension. To celebrate this realm is to be truly religious: which is the point of the memorable axiom from the mediaeval Book of the Twenty-Four Philosophers: “God is an infinite sphere whose centre is everywhere and circumference nowhere”. The limits of mechanism, as embraced by the immediately post-pubertal Shaksper, will be expressed most clearly in the bee-simile in HV I, i: the bee having been a powerful religious symbol of Lower Egypt – as Bacon would certainly have

⁶ Gnostic Tarot.

been aware, through the colossal Hermetic component of Christian Cabalism; - yet degraded here by the analysis of the operation of the bee-hive, as if this were wholly to exhaust its meaning.

The religious world is also the magical world: the magic of prayer, of music, of poetry, of philosophy: their power to effect change beyond the limits of what mere rationality would think possible. This is the point of the vehement dispute between Hotspur and Glendower, an archetypal Welsh wizard, a Gandalf/Merlin/Rasputin. Glendower's daughter has married Mortimer, who represents the *ithyphallos*, more broadly the invisible world. Ted Hughes expressed the malignancy of mechanism most powerfully in his harrowing poem "Crow's Account of St. George", from Crow: "...Drops the sword and runs dumb-faced from the house/Where his wife and children lie in their blood". This had its origins in his time at Cambridge studying English literature in the rationalistic way of that university, which he soon chucked in favour of anthropology.

The Faustian dimension is honoured in the Magician card of the Tarot Major Arcana: and this was most plausibly the immediate source for Glendower. We have seen that the towers in 1-3 HVI and RIII refer to the Tower or Magdalene card of the Tarot, as symbolising the Gnostic tradition; while the Fool in FF would seem not to have crystallised *de novo* in the mind of Bacon, but far more plausibly to have derived from the Fool card. This is also the significance of *ass-phase Lucius* in TGA, a colossal influence on FF, way beyond what the commentators have hitherto suspected. The scenario would seem to be that Bacon had long ago synthesised the lessons of both Apuleius and the Tarot: an exercise for neophytes of the tree of Christian Cabalism. The Tarot was part of the Templar inheritance of Freemasonry; and the Hierophant card of the Major Arcana is indeed a striking representation of a Grand Master of Freemasonry.⁴ Bacon was formally inducted into Freemasonry by King James in 1603;⁵ but the frequency of Tarot references in these plays of the Nineties suggests a probable earlier familiarity with its lore. Let Lee Irwin, a modern master of the Tarot, describe for us the significance of the Magician card:

Magicians stand on the threshold between the observable and

known world and the world of the foreground that beckons us beyond the observable and known... [He] is often denied, neglected, or thought of as an imaginary projection by the more literally minded... This kind of knowledge usually requires long apprenticeship, training, and a certain inherent aptitude, without which one becomes a mere stage performer caught up in the footlights of ordinary illusion and misdirection... The Magician excels in guiding the process of transformation... Magical power, born out of a lifetime of searching and constantly purified intent, is an accomplishment of the greatest ability. This ability arises as knowledge, not as a chimera of the imagination, but as an actual insight and capacity to attune to the overflowing abundance of the sacred currents of transformation and becoming...⁶

A more perfect description of Sir Francis Bacon there could not be; and, in so far as one becomes the God one worships, of Shakespeare too: and so Prospero represents Shakespeare, but primarily and anteriorly Bacon. Hotspur's insistence that a moon-shaped length of the Severn river be straightened could be taken as referring in a general way to mechanist's antipathy to the White Goddess; but the immediate source again would seem to be almost certainly the Moon card of the Tarot, which Irwin describes as the card of "change, growth, and development, transformation and rhythmic cycles..." Glendower finally triumphs on this point; while Mortimer ("I" principle) and Worcester (psychic conflict) persuade Hotspur to rein in his hostility to the wizard: for the ascetic worldview is doomed. Glendower's daughter is a Goddess of Love; and the portrayal of her singing in Welsh, with Mortimer's head on her lap, until he may come to understand her language, and "our book, I think, be drawn", is a beautiful depiction of an erotic scene described in the printed page (perhaps the seduction of Lucius by Fotis in TGA), transforming the ithyphallos from idea to will, to flood the ego of the ascetic. That this transformation involves thought is shown by Glendower's "And those musicians that shall play to you/Hang in the air a thousand leagues from thence;/And straight they shall be here..." (cf. the speed of Ariel; and MAN II, iii, 5). The cause of this vulnerability is shown by Kate's refusal to sing

for Hotspur, which is precisely cognate with his deafness to her in II, iii, as representing the mechanist ascetic's denial of the unseen world.

ii

Here, the new dispensation becomes irrevocable, as Hal swears to ally himself with the King's forces against Percy. This is to introduce, of course, a logical inconsistency, in that the libidinous ego (Hal) is supposed to be hostile to the ascetic (King), not reconciled with it; and further, in that the Mortimer ("I") and Glendower (magian) principles should not ideally be associated with the ascetic (Hotspur). These problems are solved by the death of King Henry in 2HIV, and by the careful exclusion of both Mortimer and Glendower from the battle of Shrewsbury. We have here a beautiful description of what Shaksper must have been like in those early Bolingbroke-phase years, albeit this scene was certainly written by Bacon:

King	By being seldom seen, I could not stir But like a comet I was wondered at, That men would tell their children, this is he... Thus I did keep my person fresh and new, My presence like a robe pontifical, Never seen, but wondered at...
------	---

There is a reference also to Shaksper's phase of voluble gentility ("Never was such a sudden scholar made...": HV, I, i, 32), which intermitted his Boar's Head and pseudo-Alexandrian (HV I-IV) phases, in Hal's "I shall make this Northern youth exchange/His glorious deeds for my indignities": for the learning displayed to all and sundry in this phase would have been acquired in the earlier period. It is Blunt ("I") who announces, of course, the first stirrings of the battle.

iii

This scene is remarkable for its featuring of the ring, yet another instance in FF as the greatest Ring saga of all. It is a constant theme of FF that the Holy Grail, the acquisition of which confers upon the

finder the power of the Ring – the two traditions being essentially the same – is the wisdom derived from knowledge of the unseen world as described in the written word. Thus the great modern scientists, artists, and depth psychologists, - and Bacon was godfather to them all, - are all Ring Lords in one way or another. This will be shown most clearly in TWT; but here too, where the ring picked from Falstaff's pocket is identified with the papers stolen also. It is Hal who has done so: Hal (vain ascetic in grip of blind libido), who has put aside the papers (written word) till another time, and spurns the ring (wisdom derived from contemplation of libido, or unseen world, as idea) as a bauble, rather than the priceless heirloom Falstaff insists it is.

The choreography of this scene is precise, as a lead-in to the final overthrow of the ascetic (battle of Shrewsbury): the libido conflicting with the will to resist it (Falstaff and Bardolph dialogue); the libido overcoming, as the Goddess of the auto-erotist is created in the imagination (entry of Nell Quickly); the ego now in the grip of libido (entry of Hal and Peto (pursuit of eros) to the tune of Falstaff 'playing on his truncheon like a fife': a clear reference to the Pied Piper of Hamelin); - all of this in the context of the repudiation of wisdom (Hal's devaluation of the ring); ultimately to bury asceticism forever (preparation for Shrewsbury). Lord John of Lancaster, Hal's brother, bears the value of the unconscious/libido, like all the other Johns of the plays (e.g. King John; Sir John Stanley in 2HVI; &c); and Hal's order to Bardolph to "bear this letter to... my brother John" means that the will to resist eros will be overcome by the power – unmitigated by wisdom - of the written word over the unconscious. The drum always represents the swelling of libido (e.g. Alcibiades' drum in TimA); and Falstaff's "O, I wish this tavern [The Boar's Head] could be my drum" firmly identifies the Boar, lurking out of sight, ready to charge.

ACT IV

i, ii

Hotspur reads a letter from his father Northumberland, telling him of his sickness, and inability to fight at Shrewsbury. Worcester counsels against going on, only to be rebuked by Hotspur and Douglas. In other words, conflict arises (volubility of Worcester) as

the ascetic (Hotspur) reads of eros in the printed page, with that asceticism now in its death throes (sickness of Northumberland). The only thoughts he now has are of eros (Hotspur's affection for Douglas). The messenger's "His [Northumberland's] letters bear his mind, not I his mind" is odd. The "I" is in bold in FF, unlike another which follows three words later. This is the "I" principle again, spurned as blind will by the pristine ascetic.

The will to resist eros dissolves (Falstaff's refusal to pay Bardolph, and giving him liquor instead), as the pursuit of union with the Goddess begins (Falstaff's order for Peto to meet him). The libido waxes mightily (Falstaff's enrichment though fraud in managing his soldiers). Finally we establish Westmoreland's allegoric value as the ithyphallos, by virtue of a precisely placed "I" for "Ay".

iii, iv

Worcester (conflict) and Vernon counsel against immediate engagement; while Hotspur and Douglas disagree. Bacon seems to have adopted the name "Vernon", as given in the sources, to suggest "no spring", from the Latin *ver*, "spring". This is the season when the underworld becomes manifest in the visible world in the form of new plant life, as celebrated in the Goddess Persephone, who divided her year between the realm of Dis and the open air. Hal's forces have already been described to be "As full of spirit as the month of May,/And gorgeous as the sun at midsummer". (IV, i). The opposing camps are both described as wanting supply; and both their horse fatigued (psychic conflict tending to suppress libido): to make the identification between them as aspects of the one psyche. The phallos rises, to threaten the pristine ascetic (King):

Blunt And heaven defend, but still I should stand so,
 So long as out of limit, and true rule,
 You stand against anointed majesty...

- "Stand" being used of both camps, again to identify them. Now it subsides (exit of Blunt) as the ascetic world-view has a temporary victory, to return us to square one, in preparation for the final

overthrow, which is already predicted in Hotspur's invitation for ~~him to return on the morrow, with Worcester going to the King.~~ Hotspur's speech "Not so, Sir Walter..." is deliberately unclear (does the "surety for a safe return" refer to Blunt or Gloucester?), to reinforce the identification.

All of this has taken place at night. This signifies suppression by the reluctant ego of the visual imagination. The name Michael is always associated with this principle in FF (e.g. the Michaels Cassio in OTH, Williams in HV: the source most plausibly being Michael, the "Angel of the Sun" in Trithemius' *De septem secundadeis* (see Ch.8)). His value is reinforced here by "bear this sealed brief/ With winged haste". The "sealed brief" is the written word; while "haste" means, as always in FF, that a thought process is being described. This scene is followed straight by the day of the battle: the imagination now dwelling on the Goddess of Love depicted in the printed page.

ACT V

The King, Hal, Falstaff, and Blunt, suffer a long diatribe by Worcester, as thoughts of the ithyphallos-libido torment the ascetic ego. The image of Hal bestriding Falstaff serves to locate the offending principle anatomically. Worcester convinces Vernon not to disclose the King's offer of an olive branch to Hotspur: psychic conflict tending to suppress the libido. Worcester returns, and is exchanged for Westmoreland, who now returns to the King (ithyphallos shattering peace of ego). Hal's heartfelt encomium for Hotspur serves to identify them once again, as aspects of the one psyche. The subject puts down the book: "I cannot read them [the letters] now" (Hotspur). This is put another way in "I thank him that he cuts me from my tale". Tumescence is signified here by Hotspur's "And here I draw a sword": the sword or dagger bearing always in FF the value of the ithyphallos.

The slaying by Douglas (thoughts dwelling on libido) of Blunt (ithyphallos as idea) in mistake for the King is a subtle piece of allegorising, which looks forward to many other germane scenes throughout the plays. Blunt and the King are to identified: the

ithyphallos as idea, newly created by the ego as stimulated by an erotic scene in the printed page, now being activated as blind will, as expressed by the entry of the sword into the flesh. The Blunt principle is thus transformed; and with it, the ascetic (King). Just so will Juliet's fatal dagger-wound symbolise the activation of eros in the hitherto sham Goddess of Puritanism, - the image being of the act of love, - to plunge the Puritan into crisis (death of Romeo), from which he will yet be redeemed, - the reference being, of course, to the case history of Shakespeare himself; and just so will Hamlet's stabbing of Polonius behind the arras represent the activation of the hitherto repressed libido in the terminal schizophrenic, to set in train the final decline. Hal demands, and is refused, Falstaff's sword, then his pistol, and is finally given his bottle of sack: the point of which - sword and pistol and sack being thus identified - is to establish the allegoric value of alcohol as the libido, which it always is throughout FF, and to look forward, of course, to the character of Pistol in HV.

We have seen that Lord John of Lancaster represents the unconscious, home of the blind libido. The relation of this principle to the newly transformed ego is beautifully expressed in Hal's "I do respect thee as my soul". The descent into eros banishes hard-edged ideation from the ego (Hal chasing away Douglas from King). Hal kills Hotspur; and Falstaff wakes from playing dead to stab Hotspur in the thigh. This is precisely the same wound as given Adonis by the Boar in V&A: and the Falstaff and Boar principles are thus identified, as the libido in negative aspect which shatters the complacent ego of the Goddess-rejector, whether ascetic, as here, or Puritan, as in RIII and so many of the other plays (the reference in all of these, with the one exception of HAM, being to Shakespeare's breakdown of 1587). The location of the wound in the thigh again serves to locate the member anatomically.

The turmoil of the ascetic, with its tendency to repress the libido, now disappears, as the new regime decisively supplants the old (executions of Worcester and Vernon). Sir John Lancaster is ordered to liberate Douglas: for the unconscious will continue to drive the ego to think on the libido-charged image.

CHAPTER 7

HENRY THE FOURTH Part 2

2HIV as history is a sequel to its predecessor. On the plane of allegory, however, it covers much the same ground, although with several important new twists, and the totally new territory of the short phase, - marked by a new sociability, and ready expatiations on all manner of learned subjects, after the collapse of the solitary fastness of his Bolingbroke phase, - which would lead into the phase of his next coping mechanism against the Boar (irruption of libido in negative aspect): his Welsh or pseudo-Alexandrian or Tavern period of mid-adolescence, as examined in HV. The principles described in 1HIV in the main continue here, where the thread of the deeply serious allegory will more readily be traceable, as it winds its golden way, often redoubling on itself to intensify the effect, still going forward, through the now martial, now hilariously comical scenes of the tapestry, finally to point to its continuance in the next room, the Agincourt room, whose walls bear scenes of Will Shaksper the instant guru, aet.14-15, in the midst of his roisterous companions. The author departs from the sources – mainly Holinshed, and The Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth (1598) – on numerous occasions, always for the purpose of the allegory: and I would invite the HIV specialist to anatomise these findings as closely as possible, whereby the body will be found to secrete not one diseased cell.

ACT I

The sickness of Northumberland represents, of course, the demise of the contemplation, uncorrupted by blind libido, of Shakespeare's bookish ascetic (Bolingbroke) phase. It was thus that we left him in 1HIV. The unhistorical early death of such a major character would have been an unacceptable license, however; and the lapse of this pristine ascetic mentation will be portrayed here by his journey out of the country, to Scotland; while Scroop-Norfolk will be the Hotspur-analogue in this play, as the golden thread once

again turns back on itself, only to walk the same path again, but with eyes peeled for new discoveries. It is Bardolph who brings the false news of Hotspur's victory, for he bears the value of the will to resist eros (see HV for a full derivation).

The Page bears here, as always in FF, the value of the written word; his small stature in relation to his Gargantuan master ("I do here walk before thee like a sow, that hath overwhelmed all her litter but one": Falstaff), the uncontrollable swelling of libido from the stimulus of the printed page, - perhaps the seduction of Lucius by Fotis in *The Golden Ass*, - to dwarf its hold on the ego's attention. The Chief Justice who accosts Falstaff represents Shakespeare's Christian puritan superego, which had tyrannised over his ego since earliest childhood (RII); Falstaff's failure to heed him, the newly recalcitrant libido. The libido is about to swell, as stimulated by the printed page (Falstaff sending letters per his Page to Hal and the rest, asking for money, which bears here as always the value of the power of a principle).

The city of York, as located in the north of England, bears always in some way the value of the faculty of reason. Thus, the beheading of York in 3HVI marks the moment of birth of the Puritan reasoning ego. Here Scroop, the Archbishop of York, is ascetic reason; while Norfolk (Thomas Mowbray) is the "I" principle as idea, which will soon provoke the "charge of the Boar". We have seen that Suffolk ("south-folk") represents in 1-3HVI the ithyphallos as blind will. "Norfolk" analyses to "north-folk"; and he represents that principle as idea: a beautiful example of Bacon's geographico-symbolic strategy. His presence indicates here, like Blunt's in 1HIV IV-V, that the ego is teetering on the brink of the vortex of libido. Hastings is one of a group of several nobles mentioned by Holinshed. His election by the playwright as their sole representative is charged with significance: for it was his beheading in RIII that had been chosen to bear the inestimable allegoric value of the instant of the coup that had stricken down Shakespeare himself in 1587. The point being made is that this crisis is also a "charge of the Boar", and closely germane to the final breakdown, albeit less severe. This was expressed another way in the Adonis-like thigh-wounding of Hotspur by Falstaff in 1HIV. Bardolph completes the quartet of conspirators: for the corrupt ego is still resisting the Fall.

ACT II

Fang and Snare are the ithyphallos:

Fang Sirrah, where's Snare?

Hostess I, I, good Mr. Snare.

The ithyphallos-libido is disturbing the peace of the ascetic (their rowdy sword fight with Falstaff). The point of this is to show once more, as in I, iii, the intractability of the libido vis-à-vis the Christian puritan superego. The psychic conflict is signified by the presence of Bardolph (will to resist eros); the central role of the written word, here as always in FF in this situation, by that of the Page. The Chief Justice (superego) fails to convince Falstaff to repay the money he owes the Hostess (Nell Quickly), and to make an honest woman of her. The passage ends comically, with the Hostess once again promising to give Falstaff a loan, that night, in the Boar's Head tavern. She represents, as we have seen, the Goddess of the auto-erotist, created by him in the imagination. Her gift of money to Falstaff means that her epiphany is causing the libido of the reader to grow: the Boar ultimately to charge. By the scene's close, the libido is in the ascendant over the superego, a reversal of the roles that had obtained in I, iii (Chief Justice's failure to hear Falstaff).

All of this is yet to come. For the moment, the quondam saintly ascetic is anguished by his vice (Hal's long dialogue with Poin ("fists"), full of remorse, and a sense of his own debasement). The reader, tempted anew by eros, turns to another book in an attempt to suppress it by high thinking in the mechanist-ascetic way (entry of Bardolph and Page; the latter's adduction of the myth of Althea, who gave birth to a firebrand, with which Bardolph has been just been identified: a beautifully adroit legerdemain). Poin gives Bardolph a sixpence (auto-erotism ceding power to the will to resist it). Yet the fragility of this defence is now apparent, as Poin reads a letter (the written word, as always in FF) from Falstaff to Hal (reader turning again to erotic passage). Ominously, they

¹ cf. the eponymous work of Nietzsche.

² Joseph Campbell, *Occidental Mythology*.

arrange to meet Falstaff later that night in a tavern; but the defences will be up until the moment of surrender (Hal's gift of money to Bardolph). The tavern is "the old place"; the company they will meet "Ephesians... of the old church". The reference here is to the biblical Letters of the Ephesians: the letters representing here, as always in FF, the written word. The reiteration of "old" signifies that this is the word as descriptive of the passions, swelling from the unseen world, of Man-as-sublimated-animal, which will resonate in the reader to incite the blind libido.

The persuasion of Northumberland by the two ladies (a dual Queen of Hell-Grail Queen) to remove himself to Scotland, and postpone his involvement in the war, signifies the divorce of pristine mechanist asceticism from its new corrupt variety, due to the invasion by the underworld. The equation is pristine mechanism + assertion of unseen world = corrupt mechanism: so that the former is banished (Northumberland's exit to Scotland), to leave the latter, now vulnerable to extirpation by the ego controlled by libido (Hal's defeat of rebels, as weakened by absence of Northumberland).

We have seen that Nell Quickly is the Goddess of Love, created by the auto-erotist in the imagination. In like wise is Doll Tearsheet. Her first name was an Elizabethan colloquialism for a tart, and more broadly suggests her artificial nature; while a tearsheet is a page torn from a book. The later refers to the tearing of the hymen: for the Goddess of the auto-erotist is a perpetual virgin, ever being made love to, ever renewing herself, to be ravished again for the first time. II, iv, records the ineffectuality of the ego's attempt to resist temptation; and the choreography is striking and precise. The second Goddess is introduced as a balance to the new character of Pistol, who represents the "I" principle, as the examination in 2HIV of the ascetic's basic problem becomes more sophisticated. Doll is initially hostile to both Falstaff and Pistol: for the ego is resisting the surge of libido in response to the Goddess. This reluctance is personified in Bardolph, who enters with his boy Page (written word concentrated upon in a mechanistic way, to think down the ithyphallos). Falstaff leaves absolutely no doubt as to the scenario being portrayed here, in his "Do you [Pistol] discharge upon mine hostess". Both Bardolph and his Page adjure Pistol to "go down".

Falstaff is given his rapier ("I" principle) by Bardolph's Page, significantly; and the suppression of the ithyphallos by the temporarily intact ascetic ego is represented by his victory over Pistol in a sword fight. Falstaff has been wounded in the thigh, however, which incites the amorousness of Doll, to prove the ineffectuality of the defence. The location of the wound indicates that the libido, which has formerly been weakened, is transformed (cf. thigh-wounding of Adonis in V&A); and Hal and Poin ("fists", "grips") remain in the foreground, as Falstaff and Doll embrace (imminence of auto-erotism). The attempt to resist temptation is signified by the fourfold reiteration of "No abuse"; but to no avail, as "His grace [Hal] says that, which his flesh rebels against". Peto (from the Latin peto, "I seek": the wilful pursuit of consummation) leads away Hal, who demands his sword; and Falstaff follows him. Finally, Doll is summoned to accompany Falstaff, with Bardolph remaining, as always, in his company, to indicate the persistent psychic conflict.

ACT III

Here we have the first appearance since 1-3HVI of Warwick, who bears the same value as Worcester, of inner psychic conflict. He is accompanied by Surrey, whose name may be derived from the Spanish *sur* and *rey*, to mean "King of the South". In other words, the body has asserted itself in the mind of the reluctant mechanist, to torment him: "Uneasy lies the head, that wears a crown" (King Henry). This is confirmed by the time: "'Tis one o'clock, and past". This is again the ithyphallic symbolism of the clockface: the minute hand at one o'clock representing the trunk, the hour hand the member (cf. opening scene of HAM; HVIII V, i, 1). This could be Freud or Jung putting pen to paper:

Warwick There is a history in all men's lives,
 Figuring the nature of the times deceased
 The which observed, a man may prophesy
 With a near aim, of the main chance of things.

This scene (IV, i), like the others featuring the nobles, is written in the memorable high style of FF, which the argument to come will

firmly attribute to Sir Francis Bacon; while the tavern scenes of 2HIV could only have come, in the main, from the pen of Shakespeare, such is their peculiarity and graphic intimacy.

We have seen the Chief Justice to represent the Puritan superego; and now here we have the memorable introduction of the Justices Shallow and Silence. Friedrich Nietzsche had much to say on the subject of justice and morals, scarifying in particular the slave morality of the Judaeo-Christian tradition, which is epitomised by the beatitude "The meek shall inherit the earth". This is the point of Justice Shallow, who represents the moral sense, with its apprehension of punishment and reward, which is based on denial of the invisible world, realm of the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, – the wisdom derived from the knowledge of which, described in the written word, FF consistently and emphatically identifies as the Holy Grail, – as typical of the mechanist ascetic that was the young Will Shaksper, in the tables of whose memory the Christian puritan world-view was graven so deep. The challenge for the Gnostic enquirer is, on the other hand, to break the conventional bonds of the parochial group, and travel "beyond good and evil",¹ where knowledge may be gained of the unseen world. This is the point of Odysseus' threading of Scylla and Charybdis, finally to reach the Island of the Sun;² as well as Oedipus' flight from his sons Eteocles and Polynices. It is a timeless mythic theme.

The ostracising of a young unmarried mother from a conventionally religious family is an excellent example of the Justice Shallow principle in action. God knows, we have seen tragic examples enough. On the other hand, we have justice based on the wisdom of the Gnostic noble, such as King Solomon, who is specifically referred to here:

Shallow And how doth... your fairest daughter, and mine, my
God-daughter Ellen?
Silence Alas, a black ouzel...

Ellen is yet another of the "black and fair" or "foul and fair" Goddesses of FF, the reference being ultimately to the lover in the Song of Solomon, who sings *melaime eimi kai kale*, "black am I and

fair". She is in fact a Queen of Hell, - as her name suggests, akin to the Helenas of MND and AWT, - or Ring/Grail Queen, with King Solomon a Ring Lord. To the Puritan or Pauline Catholic, whom Scylla and Charybdis fill with reluctance and fear, she is, on the contrary, "black and evil"; and the aspect of Nature She represents is suppressed from their ken. The ascetic, whose torment we are witnessing in this play, will not listen to the voice of Gnostic wisdom, and the justice which derives from it: hence the name "Justice Silence". A germane principle operates in the case of the silences of Grail Queens Cordelia, Hippolyta, and Hero: the difference being that it is the Puritan there who is deaf to Her.

Shallow remembers Falstaff as "a boy, and Page to Thomas Mowbray, Duke of Norfolk". This is a reversal of the sizes of Falstaff and his Page that obtain in this play. Norfolk represents the ithyphallic principle as idea (perhaps Lucius' in TGA as he contemplates the naked Fotis), held fast in the mind of the contemplating ascetic, to deny its degradation into the anathematised blind will: the net effect being to suggest the ascetic concentrating on his book (Page), and suppressing the irruption of libido. The rest of III, ii, will depict the swelling of libido in defiance of the superego threatening punishment in return (Falstaff's enriching of himself through fraud in his enlistment of the men, whose election is contrary to the wishes of Shallow).

ACT IV

The lines of the battle are drawn up, with Prince John and Westmoreland representing the unconscious and ithyphallos respectively. A peace is brokered by the latter: the ascetic poring over the printed page in a mechanistic way, in denial of the underworld: "Then take, my Lord of Westmoreland, this schedule..." Perhaps it is the vividly described seduction of Lucius by Fotis in TGA, which the argument to come will show to have been a colossal influence on FF, far beyond the estimation of the critics. At any rate, the peace is now shattered by the irruption of libido. This is the moment of the "charge of the Boar", closely germane to that described in RIII III, iv, though less intense: "Good tidings my Lord

³ Graham Hancock, *The Sign and the Seal*.

Hastings, for the which/I do arrest thee, traitor, of high treason". The wine they have been drinking indicates, as always in FF, a state of dissolution in blind libido (cf. Sir Toby Belch; Stephano-Trinculo; Michael Cassio; and so on). The physiological change is described explicitly, in Westmoreland's "The leaders having charge from you [Prince John (unconscious)] to stand,/Will not go off, until they hear you speak". The name "Colevile" ("cole-vile") signifies the anathematisation of the unseen world by the mechanist ascetic; the arrest of the unresisting character by Falstaff, the corruption of this state by the activated libido. He will be beheaded, along with the other rebels, in the city of York. Beheading represents always in FF psychic rebirth; and the ascetic defence against the troublesome libido will not completely disappear, but be transmuted into yet another coping mechanism, the purpose of which will be represented by Hal's banishment of Falstaff in Act V.

The consummation of the act has been achieved. The volcano of the unconscious has spewed up its seething contents, to leave now an empty crater: hence now Prince John's lack of sympathy for Falstaff, and the latter's characterisation of the Prince as a sober weakling. We now move straight into the first stages of the next coping mechanism, as Bardolph enters, and Falstaff announces his intention to visit Justice Shallow in Gloucestershire, where he will surrender to his wishes.

King Henry's death scene is a fascinating one, again with numerous subtleties of choreography and nuance. Two of Hal's brothers – Humphrey of Gloucester and Thomas of Clarence – are with the King. The former recalls, of course, the Gnostic Christ or Ring Lord figure of the early 1-3HVI; while the latter's surname indicates his value of the libido (cf. John Stanley in 2HVI; George Stanley in RIII, which also predates 1&2 HIV), with his first name an allusion to Thomas, the doubter of the New Testament (cf. Thomas and Peter of 2HIV). Gloucester is deluded that Hal is hunting, when he is in fact with the low-life in London: for hunting is a metaphor here for Gnostic enquiry (cf. the hunter Lord in the Induction to TOS): and had Hal been a Ring Lord, this activity would have been a typical one. In fact he is not, however; and neither is the

mechanist ascetic whom he is about to supplant: for in the light of the libido, or invisible world for which it stands (Thomas of Clarence), he must be exposed as a sham, his quest for Jerusalem a delusion. Warwick is also present here, to signify the turmoil of the terminal ascetic. His "The Prince will, in the perfectness of time,/Cast off his followers: and their memory/Shall as a pattern, or measure, live,/By which his Grace must mete the lives of others,/Turning past evils to advantages" – is a specific reference to the next-but-one coping mechanism (HV), when the mid-adolescent Will Shaksper would become an instant guru to his tavern companions on the subject of the Journey of the Hero, whose quest is for the unseen world, without ever making that journey himself. In other words, he would pay it mere lip service, and also reject the unseen world or libido as will, in remaining chaste himself, in the manner of the young Alexander the Great as described by Plutarch. This period would end in degradation and shame, and the inception of his final, fatal phase of Puritanism.

We have seen that there is a problem of logic here, in that the victory of the King's party on the literal plane must represent the defeat of his principle on the allegoric. This is solved by the author by having his decline intensify immediately upon the victory: "And wherefore should these good news/Make me sick?" Significantly, Warwick, Clarence and Gloucester all exit, to leave Hal alone with dying King (psychic conflict, the libido which will cause it, and Gnostic Christhood, are none of them associated with the inception of the new defence (assumption by Hal of Crown)). Again they enter, with Hal in the next room; again exit on his return. The King's odd "Be it thy course to busy giddy minds/With foreign quarrels: that action hence borne out/May waste the memory of the former days..." is a specific reference to the immediate next coping mechanism, of newly sociable and voluble gentility, when Shaksper, driven from his bookish ascetic fastness by the turmoil of the "charge of the Boar", would regale his hearers with the vast store of mechanistic knowledge accumulated in his phase of solitary study ("Never was such a sudden scholar made" : HV, I, i, 32). Not that this would necessarily have been huge: the Stratford

of that time being particularly illiterate and rude, giving a young man of talent and determination plenty of opportunity to shine.

ACT V

Everything in the beautifully constructed first scene is designed to show the new subservience of the libido to the Christian puritan superego, as of old, as the new defence takes shape. Falstaff emphasises that Shallow and his servant Davy are to be considered as one. David was of course the father of King Solomon, an archetypal Ring Lord, whose wisdom is celebrated in the Biblical Wisdom of Solomon, and is symbolised by the ring (always the same) that appears in many of the plays. King David handed on to his son the Ark of the Covenant, which is to be identified with the Holy Grail of the early Grail Romances,³ - especially Wolfram's Parzival, whose influence is also to be felt throughout FF; and Bacon will be shown (Ch.44), strikingly, to have been thoroughly aware of this identification, and the cryptographic nature of Parzival. "Davy" is a diminution of David, to mean "little David": the net effect being to suggest "little wisdom": the inanity of Christian puritan justice. Davy ignores Shallow's order to have William Cook prepare the food. "William" analyses to "will-I-am", to represent the will, or invisible world (cf. Michael Williams in HV). In other words, the paltry wisdom of the Shallow principle is based on a denial of the unseen world as substrate of the seen. Immediately Davy secures a pardon his friend William Visor, whom he acknowledges as both a knave, and an honest man. The net effect of "William Visor" is to suggest the masking of the truth of the invisible world, or underworld. Davy's actions in this scene are to be interpreted as those of Shallow himself. Finally, Falstaff puts the taming of his principle beyond doubt with his "I come master Shallow, I come master Shallow".

This finds its counterpart on the higher plane, in Hal's adjuration of the newly restored Chief Justice to "...use the same/With the like bold, just, and impartial spirit/As you have done 'gainst me". The drunken scene in Shallow's orchard (the written word, as always in FF), with the entry of Pistol, and Falstaff's final exuberant confidence in their futures in the new King's court, serves to highlight the ego's new repudiation of libido as incited by the

printed page: for this scene will be followed straight by Hal's denial of Falstaff, intermitted only by the arrest of Doll Tearsheet by the "thin man" constable, and distraintment to a Justice (the Chief Justice, or Shallow, of course). The Goddess of the auto-erotist is taken out of play; yet, ominously, she is with child: for her principle will rise again (TimA I, ii, 120) to lead the desperate ego to the final coping mechanism of Puritanism, with its total extirpation of the female principle, and all Goddesses. Falstaff will owe Shallow a huge sum, having lost a bet on their advancement by the new King: this being a technique in FF as allegory for signifying the ceding of power from one principle to another. The next major period of Shaksper's adolescence, when he would become an instant guru to his roisterous copains on the subject of the unseen world, is adumbrated in Prince John's "But all are banished, till their conversations/Appear more wise, and modest to the world".

CHAPTER 8

HENRY THE FIFTH

1HVI opens with the funeral of Henry the Fifth. It is clear, then, that the ascendancy of the tyranny of Puritanism in the psyche under examination in the HVI trilogy is somehow predicated on the death of a principle represented in HV. The figure of the king represents, throughout the allegorical sequence, the conscious ego, which is also represented by England. What condition of the ego does Hal therefore represent? And how could its degradation predispose that ego to the cataclysm described in RIII?

HV is a dramatisation of Will Shaksper's Tavern or pseudo-Alexandrian phase of mid-adolescence, when he became an instant guru to his copains, an expert on the Journey of the Hero to the world that lies unseen below the surface of things, without ever coming to make it himself, to leave him still vulnerable to the negative libido, as cast by his constitutive Christian puritan superego. This phase would be terminated by yet another "charge of the Boar" (TimA I, ii, 120) to incite his espousal, aet.15 (this precise age is given in the induction to TOS (Ch.12)), of the next and final coping mechanism against the libido, the Protestant Puritan world-view, as described in 1-3HVI. As we have seen, an initial (Bolingbroke) phase of bookish asceticism at puberty, marked by solitariness and aloofness, and intense study of the written word, with the admiration of his largely illiterate family and friends ("Thus did I keep my person fresh and new,/My presence, like a robe pontifical,/Ne'er seen but wondered at": 1HIV III, ii), had been terminated by renewed inundation by the blind libido, to end in auto-erotism, which decline tormented him. This phase was followed in turn, under pressure of his undiminished Christian puritan superego, by the next coping mechanism of sociable and voluble gentility ("Therefore, my Harry,/Be it thy course to busy giddy minds/With foreign quarrels, that action borne out/May waste the memory of the former days": 2HIV IV, iii). Yet the Boar (negative libido) remained a torment; and the French campaign in

HV represents a healing journey, the first of Shaksper's life, to the root of his problem in the unseen world. His model and inspiration would be Alexander the Great, whose spirit suffuses HV. Alexander's conquest of Asia would be taken as a metaphor for the Gnostic's victory over the unseen world of Nature. Yet Shaksper's would be a pseudo-Alexandrian journey, not the real thing, the edification of a mere onlooker. One thinks of the Socrates of Plato's Kleitophon, who is reproved by his eponymous acolyte for precisely the same reason.

A further clue to the essential pseudery of the Journey of the Hero described in HV is given by Hal's continued insistence, after the victory, on his Welshness (e.g. "For I am Welsh, you know": IV, vii). The winning tactics will have come from the Welsh captain Fluellen, whose name is formed from a homophone of "flew" and "ellen" ("Helen", the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen), and who will wear in his cap, although it is not St. David's Day, and persuade Pistol (ithyphallos) to eat, - the leek, national symbol of Wales (symbolic of the flaccid phallos and, when worn in the cap, of victory over the libido). The essential quality of the Welsh intellectual may be described as a habit of spiritualisation (visualisation), as the UK television chat shows amply demonstrate. Yet the hard-edged forms of his imagination are always liable, if not yet Platonic Ideas, to be shattered by the blind libido, to bring the ill-made machine crashing down.

The early entry in 1HVI of Hastings (Puritan censoriousness) and Scales (Puritan justice) suggests a likely scenario for this disaster. For there was a strong tradition in Stratford that the youthful Shaksper had been the author of satirical verses nailed to the gates of the estate of the noted Puritan Sir Thomas Lucy, and that he had been prosecuted by Lucy for poaching. It is only too easy to imagine, then, a sequence of events of 1) appeasement of demons by the wine and conversation (rather than drunkenness) of the tavern; 2) delight in satirising a Puritan who richly deserved it, by a newly-discovered facility for verse, and poaching from his property, whether directly, as an accessory post factum, or simply by offering moral support; 3) impeachment, with humiliation of a still deeply vulnerable psyche; 4) forced sundering from his life-line; 5) defensive surrender, in his self-contempt, to Puritanism; 6)

seduction of Anne Hathaway; 7) disaster. This scenario will be considerably fleshed out in the chapters to come. Let us start, then, at the beginning.

ACT I

The Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Ely discuss a bill which will see the Church stripped of its treasury to finance a war against France. Money represents throughout the plays the power of a principle. They believe, however, that King Henry (Hal) will decide in their favour, for they have already pledged to supply him with "...a greater sum/Than ever at one time the clergy yet/Did to his predecessors part withal". What is going on here? The war against France represents the broadly Gnostic – Neoplatonic/Christian Cabalist - engagement of Nature. The principle represented by the two prelates is identified:

Canterbury It must be so, for miracles are ceased
 And therefore we must needs admit the means
 How things are perfected.

Here we have a precious insight into Shaksper's mentation in his earlier phase. It is clear from the above that Ely and Canterbury represent the principle of scientific rationalist mechanism, - typical of Shaksper hitherto, - with its characteristically utilitarian and superficial descriptions of Nature. On the other hand there is the unseen world, to which the entire created universe is "bound back", as the foundation of the religious world-feeling (religare, "to bind back"); and the magian miracle-worker Faust, or Hermes, that mediator between the seen and unseen worlds (cf. Glendower in 1&2HIV). This gives a clear picture of the parade of soulless learning which must have issued from Shaksper in his intermediate phase of gentility ("Never was such a sudden scholar made..."). Yet perhaps not so sudden, given the wide reading that he must have done in his earlier Bolingbroke phase (perhaps aet.12–14), referred to in 1HIV III, ii:

¹ Laurence Gardner, *Bloodline of the Holy Grail*

² Baigent et al, *The Holy Blood and The Holy Grail*.

³ Knight and Lomas, *The Hiram Key*.

Prince Henry ...For the time will come
 That I shall make this northern youth exchange
 His glorious deeds for my indignities.
Percy is but my factor, good my lord,
To engross up glorious deeds on my behalf...

The impressive repertoire of ideas gained through mechanistic enquiry (Ely, Canterbury) provided, then, the ground for the emergence of the pseudo-Alexandrian engagement with Nature (war against France), which would overthrow the ego's Aristotelian rationalism. The *casus belli*, the continued irruption into the ego of the libido (Falstaff) in negative aspect, will be adumbrated by Bardolph, Pistol, and Nym, in the hilarious yet alarming II, i. This particular war of course had been waged by many before Shaksper since time immemorial, and will continue to be as long as humanity will survive. It is - albeit in this instance it is corrupt - the "emergency flight of the shaman", as Ted Hughes characterised it, or the Journey of the Hero. Joseph Campbell summarised it admirably in his *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*, and Schopenhauer, in *The World as Will and Idea*, likened its onset to the breaking through stormclouds of a shaft of sunlight. The Dauphin of France will be identified in III, vii, unmistakably with the sun, the Constable with the moon, to evoke again the etching of Dürer (fig.3), for symbology of the sun and moon was a staple of the Gnostic tradition; and the gift from the Dauphin to King Henry of tennis balls (sun-symbols) later in this first Act therefore will be symbolic of the constant dialogue between Nature and the light of reason which is necessary for the Journey.

Canterbury gives now an exhaustive genealogical survey of the royal line of France, to demonstrate conclusively that its inheritance indeed has proceeded through the female, inconsistently with Salic law, which the French nevertheless adduce to repudiate King Henry's claim to their throne. Canterbury begins his final conclusion: "So that, as clear as is the summer's sun..." This is the breakthrough of Schopenhauer's shaft of sunlight. The purpose of this speech is to enthrone the Goddess as

⁴ Oswald Spengler, *The Decline of the West*.

universal Queen: to prove that humanity is a child au fond of the one Nature. The recognition of this inviolable condition is the first step on the way to true (Gnostic) divinity, which is both immanent in Nature and transcendent of it, unlike the God of the mechanists who is ontologically separate from it. Joseph Campbell has added the gloss that one does not demolish the lower floors of a building on reaching the top: that is, the ultimate aim of a spiritual journey of this kind is not to repudiate the will in its lower objectifications (libido), but to integrate it into a harmonious, indestructible whole, - as idea, perhaps as will, - precisely as Lear and the rest of the tragic characters have not. This will be the point of the "Upon the king" speech of King Henry in HV, IV, i ("The slave, a member of the country's peace,/Enjoys it; but in gross brain little wots/What watch the king keeps to maintain the peace,/Whose hours the peasant best advantages."). I personally can vouch for the power of this speech (Canterbury's) as an Hermetic device, when the whole concentration is given over to it and the reasoning followed precisely: it is magic.

The wealth of the Gnostic tradition and the depth of its wisdom are affirmed:

Canterbury She (England) hath herself not only well defended
 But taken and impounded as a stray
 The King of Scots; whom she did send to France
 To fill King Edward's fame with prisoner kings,
 And make her chronicle as rich with praise
 As is the ooze and bottom of the sea
 With sunken wrack and sumless treasures.

This recalls the dream of Clarence in RIII I, iv, with its submarine "Wedges of gold, great anchors, heaps of pearl,/Inestimable stones, unvalued jewels", and so on. These are the jewels retrieved by, for example, the great modern scientists, artists and depth psychologists, on their Faustian journeys to the world unseen below the surface of things, the realm of the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen of FF. Scotland bears here, as in 1&2HIV, the allegoric value of the

⁵ The Death of Tragedy.

enquiring ego's idea-triumphs over Nature. The King of the Scots will reappear as Captain Jamy in III, ii; while Gloucester, who always represents the Gnostic ideal, a Solomon or Christ or Alexander (except for RIII, where his name is borne by the polar opposite, to reinforce his degradation) will appear corrupted, as under the command of first the Irish Captain Macmorris (the unconscious), then of Fluellen. Canterbury's plan to send one quarter of the army against France, the rest against Scotland, is a beautiful touch, suggesting the rationalist-mechanist's tendency to engage with ideation itself, rather than with the Nature on which it should be based.

Canterbury now illustrates the defence against the Scots with a bee simile, which in its length and seemingly incongruous placement in the mouth of a mechanist sets to throbbing the alert reader's antennae. The argument to come will produce really conclusive evidence that the spirit of Alexander the Great, and of Egypt, suffused HV; indeed, that Alexander was the inspiration behind the the pseudo-Hermetic recovery of this "Welsh" phase of the adolescent Shaksper's psychological progress towards catastrophe, a conclusion which is reinforced here by Canterbury's simile. For the bee was the supreme religious symbol of Lower Egypt after its re-unification with Upper Egypt (not to be taken literally, but symbolically) by Menes c. 3100 B.C. Indeed, the king was to be known after this time as Ny-swt-bit, "He of the Sedge and the Bee". The bee persisted in the West as a politico-religious symbol in the Merovingian priest-kings of France, who were direct inheritors on both sides, through Jesus the Christ, of the Davidic - and therefore the Egyptian priestly - bloodline.¹ King Childeric's tomb contained no less than three hundred miniature bees made of solid gold. Most of the treasure of his tomb was eventually returned to France; and when he was crowned emperor in 1804 Napoleon made a special point of having the golden bees affixed to his coronation robes ². At the Council of Troyes in 1128, St Bernard of Clairvaux, who would there become the official patron and protector of the Knights Templars, used the beehive as his personal emblem. This is precisely the sort of arcana of which Sir Francis

⁶ Robert Graves, *The White Goddess*.

Bacon would have been master. There is no doubt that Freemasonry was born of the Templars; and Bacon was formally inducted into the brotherhood by King James in 1603.³ Yet it will be shown in Chapter 44 that there is clear evidence that Bacon was saturated with its lore even before the genesis of the works of Shakespeare.

Canterbury's anatomisation of the workings of a beehive is therefore an illustration of the rationalist-mechanist's disavowal of the religious dimension. The rationalist is in love with reason per se, rather than the Nature on which it should be based, and consequently denies all that is irrational in his world. André Malraux said in reference to Cervantes' *Don Quixote*, that the opposite of truth is not untruth, but reason: an axiom whose power Voltaire's bastards are slow to appreciate. The young Shaksper, new-emergent from his Bolingbroke phase, was a connoisseur of this sort of reason, whose unreasonableness he was only now coming to acknowledge.

ACT II

II, i, is a brutally honest self-portrait of the artist impaled on the tusks of the Boar, and of the band-aid solution, anodyne and temporary, he would apply to the wound in his Tavern phase. Bacon was undoubtedly responsible for the bulk of Act I, his high style coinciding with its nature as clinical allegory, its point of view from the bedside rather than the patient. Such is the intimacy and personal detail of this scene, however, that it could only have been written by Shakespeare himself. The warts detailed by the artist in the First Folio are as ugly and vivid as anything in 20th century literature – for example, in the works of Joyce; and their description may well repel those lovers and scholars of Shakespeare in whom sensibility holds sway over wit, in spite of the colossal advances of modern depth psychology, science, and art, with which they should be familiar. Indeed, the tyranny of sensibility over wit and wisdom has characterised the witless Nineties and Noughties, as it has all the great Cultures in their death throes,⁴ – albeit this is a fate that is by no means inevitable for the West.

The intimate and erotic conflicts presented here are anything

but gratuitous. They are described, on the contrary, as proceeding from the plane of tragedy, which would revolt to shake more powerfully the foundations of Shaksper's world on that day in 1587, so fateful for Western culture. 1&2 HIV and these early scenes of HV record its premonitory tremors – the less severe “charges of the Boar”, which were the product of his constitutive Pauline Christian puritanism, rather than the Protestant Puritanism of his later years, aet.15-23 (these ages, strongly suggested by the historical sequence as allegory, are confirmed in the induction to TOS). Tragedy may indeed be dead in the modern West, as George Steiner has argued;⁵ but in FF it breathes most powerfully: and delicacy of sensibility remains, as a barrier to its acknowledgement, merely a dragon that must be slain.

The scenario to be conveyed is as follows. A general state of detumescence and erotic dullness reigns (Nym: the flaccid phallos), accompanied by a will to resist excitement and orgasm (Bardolph), which has been summoned by the swelling of libido (Pistol: ithyphallos; and Nell Quickly: Goddess of the auto-erotist). This conflict often had visited Shaksper in the phase of dissolution of the Bolingbroke defence in the sea of his Boar's Head libidinousness (escapades of Hal and Falstaff in 1&2HIV). The libido is burning (fever of Falstaff), associated with the creation of the Goddess of Love in the imagination (Nell Quickly's exit to tend Falstaff). Now however, at the inauguration of Shaksper's Tavern phase, the ithyphallos is resisted (Bardolph appeasing Nym and Pistol), and the libido suppressed (death of Falstaff).

These allocations could not be more strongly suggested by the text. Shakespeare has Nym and Pistol go to great pains to disclose their identities with the flaccid phallos and ithyphallos respectively. Nym says: “I dare not fight, but I will wink and hold out mine iron. It is a simple one, but what though? It will toast cheese, and it will endure cold as another man's sword will - and there's an end”; and “Faith, I will live as long as I may, that's the certain of it; and when I cannot live any longer, I will do as I may.” “I may” signifies here the First of May, the feast of the maypole, an ithyphallic symbol, where “I” itself stands for the ithyphallos, a technique used repeatedly in FF, as we have noted. Nym is here looking forward to when the potentiality of his principle may be fulfilled. And Pistol:

“Pistol’s cock is up, and flashing fire will follow”. Pistol is clearly identified with an act of auto-erotism: “ Base tyke, call’st thou me host?/Now by this hand I swear I scorn the term;/Nor shall my Nell keep lodgers!”; and Nym: “ will you shog off? I would have you solus”. Similarly, Shakespeare (or Bacon) derived the name of the character Poin in 1&2HIV from the French poignes, “fists”, “grips”. The “host” refers to the hostess Nell Quickly, Goddess of the auto-erotist. Her surname needs no clarification; while her Christian name tells the petit-mort. “Nym” is derived from the Latin nimius, “too great”, “excessive”: for the will to flaccidity is unnaturally strong in this phase (cf. the erotic continency of the young Alexander).

Germane to Nym is Bardolph, who represents the will to resist eros, directed by the puritan (not yet Puritan) superego. This character appears in *Holinshed*; and he belongs to that group of pre-existing characters adopted for the allegory, rather than invented *de novo*. The rhythmic thrusting of the dolphin above the waves has been taken to symbolise orgasm. The contemporary British poet Craig Raine has recognised the same symbolism in the trout, in the poem “Rich”, from the eponymous collection. More relevantly, given Sir Francis Bacon’s mastery of Greek language and culture, the same association occurred to the Bronze-age inhabitants of the Peloponnese, who likened the dolphins thrusting up the river Crathis towards the Styx to a Titan going to his marriage.⁶ Cleopatra’s eulogy on Antony similarly connotes his erotic nature, in contrast to Aeneas (Augustus in A&C) who limply rejected Dido: “...his delights/Were dolphin-like, they showed his back above/The element they liv’d in”. The name of Delphi, which overlooks the mouth of the Crathis, and whose oracle features prominently in TWT, is in fact derived from the Greek *delphis* meaning “dolphin”. The original Bardolph was, like many others in the sequence, an historical personage, whose name lent itself beautifully to the cryptographic strategy of FF, the presentation by Bacon of whose true message in its naked form at that time would have ensured its destruction, and – were its author to be identified – perhaps of himself as well.

⁷ Laurence Gardner, *Realm of the Ring Lords*.

Falstaff's fever in this scene represents the burning of the will-
to-eros: for he is the essence of the Boar. His self-concealment
behind the arras in 1HIV II, iv, will be shown to represent
repression of the libido, and is cognate with the identical action of
Polonius in HAM, whose son Laertes represents the ithyphallic
principle. The Sheriff in HIV is cognate with the ghost of Hamlet's
father, as the Puritan superego of the subject. Hamlet's awareness
of and sword-murder of Polonius represents the activation of the
libido – which had lain latent in the unconscious – in the mind of
the incipient schizophrenic, as identified with the ithyphallos
(sword). This is a critical step, - occurring as it does simultaneously
with the rejection of the Goddess (Queen Gertrude), - in the
decline of the subject into terminal psychosis (vanquishing of
Hamlet by Laertes: and see the marvellous chapter on
schizophrenia in Joseph Campbells' *Myths To Live By*). Pistol's gift
of money to Nym represents the ceding of power from the one
principle to the other: a common technique in FF, as we have seen.
Shakespeare gives an accurate summation of himself at this time,
as brutally honest a revelation as anything in literature:

Nym The king is a good king, but it must be as it may: he
 passes some humors and careers.

- Where "may" refers to the First of May and the ithyphallos (see
above); and "careers" evokes the horse-and-rider, symbolic always
in the plays of the libido in action, as sourced from the famous
metaphor in Plato's *Phaedrus*; while "humors" needs, in the context
of adolescent auto-erotism, no further elucidation. The journey to
enlightenment has taken its first tentative step. The Boar has been
drugged and and calmed (death of Falstaff), but not yet killed off
(persistence of Boy). This will have to wait until the achievement of
the goal (murder of boys and the luggage by French in IV, vii).

Before embarkation all principles inimical to the achievement of
the goal must be extirpated. Thus Sir Thomas Grey (Puritan reason),
the Earl of Cambridge (Aristotelian rationalism), and Lord Scroop
(ascetic reason), are all convicted of treason and taken away to their

⁸ Robert Graves, *ibid*.

deaths. The lord bears always throughout the plays the value of the faculty of reason. The documents bearing the impeachment of the Lords represent, like all the other letters and writs and Pages of the plays, the written word. The wisdom conveyed by broadly Gnostic literature will be the object of this Hermetic journey, or Ring Quest. Grey is the brother of the Puritan sham Goddess Queen Elizabeth in RIII, whom Margaret (Queen of Hell) berates as "Poor painted queen, vain flourish of my fortune..." (I, iii). Cambridge University, then as now, is associated with rationalism. Don Quixote's boney nag Rosinante is cognate with the feeble Bill the Pony in Tolkien's Lord of the Rings, and both with the half-starved dog in Albrecht Dürer's Melencolia I (fig.1), as representing the breaking of the power of the libido by the gnostically reasoning ego of the Ring/Grail hero. All three are therefore cognate, of course, with the dead Falstaff.

In impeaching Scroop, Hal beautifully describes the ascetic intellectual:

King But thou, 'gainst all proportion, didst bring in
Wonder to wait on treason and murder;
...O, how hast thou with jealousy infected
The sweetness of affiance! Show men dutiful?
Why, so didst thou. Seem they grave and learned?
Why, so didst thou. Come they of noble family?
Why, so didst thou. Seem they religious?
Why, so didst thou. Or are they spare in diet,
Free from gross passion or of mirth or anger,
Constant in spirit, not swerving with the blood...

Bacon dwells on Scroop at greater length than the others, for it is the ascetic world-view that is being overthrown by Shaksper in this phase.

It is in RII that the Scroop principle first appears as Sir Stephen Scroop, an associate of Bolingbroke (his lesser title indicating the relative force of the principle, as throughout the allegories: for example, Bardolph, as the will to resist orgasm, is a Lord when associated with the Puritan forces in HIV, but a commoner elsewhere). In 1HIV I, iii, Scroop is stated as having died at Bristol,

to coincide with the waning of the ascetic principle in the ego of the subject ("So shaken as we are, so wan with care" says Bolingbroke in the opening line: and Prince Harry's star is correspondingly on the ascendent, to recall the technically identical "perne in a gyre" treatment of Richard and Richmond in RIII). Bristol, earlier in RII, was the place of execution of Bushy, Green, and the Earl of Wiltshire, on the orders of Bolingbroke. Bushy's name is symbolic of the female pudenda, and therefore of the female principle; Green's of the products of the union of male and female; and the Chancellor of the Exchequer Wiltshire's of the wealth and richness that results therefrom in both microcosm and macrocosm. The name of their copain Bagot is yet another reference, like that of Sir William de la Pole (Suffolk), Pistol, and Gadshill, to the ithyphallic principle. The murders of the first three therefore symbolise the sterilisation of the ascetic psyche (Bolingbroke) which has rejected the Goddess as an active principle in itself.

In II, iii, the Goddess of the auto-erotist tempts him to orgasm, but is resisted, as the first moves of the Welsh defence are made:

Hostess Prithee honey sweet husband, let me bring thee to
Staines.

Pistoll No...

- Where the point of "Staines" is clear. King Arthur was a Ring Lord;⁷ and the Renaissance revival of the Gnostic tradition, as the new Christian Cabalism/Neoplatonism, whose wisdom suffuses FF is essentially the Ring tradition by another name; while the Temple of Apollo at Delphi, which features in the FF, had the tomb of Dionysius at its heart. All these themes come together in the Mistress Quickly's "he's [Falstaff's] in Arthur's bosom". Her "a parted e'en just between twelve and one" serves to identify him with the ithyphallos. A germane clockface symbolism occurs in the very first lines of HAM, where the ghost of King Hamlet (Puritan superego) appears at one a.m., and Francisco (Sir Francis Bacon: the broadly Gnostic tradition) exits for good, to clear the stage, on the plane of allegory, for the ego's decline into irreversible paranoid schizophrenia. Shakespeare may have apprehended this

horrific fate to have awaited him, had he not been taken by Bacon down the Road Less Travelled; although suddenness of onset of the coup, and a dominant component of emotion, as exhibited in his case, remain indicators to a good prognosis. Once again, there is no evidence in FF that Shakespeare was at any time psychotic, even briefly.

Exeter bears throughout HV the allegoric value of reasoning based on the written word. Accordingly, it is he who presents Hal's pedigree in writing to the King of France, to emphasise once again the central importance of the written word to this pseudo-Journey. The tennis balls are mentioned once again (II, iv, 131), to signify that the psychic transformation will be founded on reason – on idea, rather than will. Why does the Dauphin style them "Paris balls"? Paris' abduction of Helen began the Trojan war. Helen was an exemplary pre-Hellenic Queen of Hell;⁸ and this is her value in FF. It is the Faustian dimension that will be the subject of Shaksper's reasoning in this phase. Further, the Trojan war lead directly to the wanderings of Aeneas, and the founding of Rome, just as the collapse of this phase will be followed by the tyranny of Puritanism, which would hold Shaksper in thrall aet.15-23: for the Goddess-rejector Aeneas, who was conceived by Virgil under the patronage of Augustus, bears always in the plays the value of the Puritan ego.

ACT III

The Journey of the Hero, or Ring Quest, continues (albeit corruptly) in this Act, which features the taking of Harfleur (acknowledgement by the ego-in-transformation of the "heart of the matter": where "Har-fleur" is construed as "heart's flower"), and the crossing of the Somme (immemorially ancient mythic theme of crossing from the near shore of ignorance to the farther of enlightenment), which is enabled by the bravery of Exeter and Pistol ("I" principle, more broadly the unseen world, as described in the written word (Exeter)). This is confirmed by yet another instance among a plethora in FF of a characteristic technical device:

King How now, Fluellen, cam'st thou from the bridge?
Fluellen I, so please your majesty: the Duke of Exeter has very

gallantly maintained the pridge...

- And also:

Pistol ...the Duke of Exeter doth love thee well.

Fluellen I, I praise God...

- Where "I" for "Ay" stands, as always, for the ithyphallos. In III, i, Hal invokes the underworld:

King Then imitate the action of the tiger:

 Stiffen the sinews, summon up the blood,

 Disguise fair nature with hard-favored rage...

- To recall the Duke of York's obloquy against Queen Margaret after the death of Rutland at her hands (3HVI I, iv): "O tiger's heart wrapp'd in a woman's hide!". For the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, who will prove fatal to the intellectually compromised orthodox Catholic Rutland after the death of Henry the Fifth, is here being invoked to be engaged and transcended in the proper Hermetic manner: the manner of an Alexander, in fact, whose identity as an Hermetic magus in his own right has been established by Robert Bauval in his *The Secret Chamber*, and is affirmed by his numerous mentions in this context in the plays (see the analysis of IV, vii, below for a fuller exegesis):

King ...Fathers that like so many Alexanders

 Have in these parts from morn to even fought...

Bardolph is identified with Hal ("Once more unto the breach..." ; "...to the breach, to the breach!") as he attempts to drive the unwilling Nym and Pistol, accompanied by their boy, through the defences of Harfleur, without success. The Welsh officer Fluellen succeeds, however; and the boy announces his intention to leave them. Drunkenness bears throughout the plays the value of dissolution in libido, which the Boy undoubtedly represents here: "Would I were in an alehouse in London...". His quitting of the Quest is cognate with the death of Falstaff: for the will-to-eros is

now being transcended, which is the point of it all. The complex of ithyphallos, flaccid phallos, and will-to-flaccidity, properties of Shaksper in his tormented post-Bolingbroke phase, will be dissolved in the new enlightenment. Fluellen's name was formed from Ellen, or Helen, yet another Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, and a homophone of "flew": for it is the Welsh intellectual's habit of spiritualisation which Shaksper will adopt to his (albeit unsatisfactory) salvation. He may have derived his feel for this principle from his former Welsh schoolmaster (cf. also the character of Parson Evans in MWW, a companion play to HV, and predominantly written by Shakespeare). The leek is a symbol of the flaccid phallos; its greenness a symbol of spiritual purity: and Fluellen's feeding of it to Pistol in V, i will be symbolic of triumph (albeit ultimately delusory) of Gnostic subtlety over the gross flesh.

III, ii, is crucial to the play, clarifying as it does the precise relationship of the Welsh principle to the Hermetic principle, and of both to the unconscious (Ireland) and to the principle of gentility (Gower, who is the Hal of I, i). The irrational unconscious (Ireland), which hitherto has driven him, is repudiated by the questing ego:

Gower Captain Fluellen, you must come presently to the mines.

The Duke of Gloucester would speak with you.

Fluellen To the mines? Tell you the Duke, it is not so good to
come to the mines; for look you, the mines is not according
to the disciplines of war. The concavities of it is not
sufficient.

Gower The Duke of Gloucester, to whom the order of the seige
is given, is altogether directed by an Irishman...

[...]

Fluellen By Cheshu, he [Macmorris, the Irish captain] is an ass in
the orld! ...He has no more directions in the true disciplines
of the wars, look you, of the Roman disciplines, than is a
puppy-dog.

The mention of "Roman disciplines" recalls the Latin lessons given William by the Welsh parson Hugh Evans in MWW, which is twinned with HV, as a treatment of the same phase of Shaksper's adolescence; and also the Roman Cardinal Campeius in HVIII: both

bearing the value of the wisdom inherent in the broadly Gnostic written word. The unconscious cannot be reasoned with: "It is no time to discourse, so Chrish save me!" (MacMorris); yet the Scot Jamy (Gnostic Christ/Solomon/Alexander) would have it otherwise: "Marry, I wad full fain heard some question 'tween you tway". This neatly summarises the problem: for it is precisely the fear of the blind irruption of Hecate from the underworld which causes the Welsh intellectual to spiritualise her; yet if he could just allow the Apollonian images to dissolve, and be confident in his own identity "between thoughts", then he would achieve completeness: become, in fact, a Gnostic Christ. The formula is: Wales + Ireland = Scotland (the Scotland of Robert the Bruce, home and bulwark of the banished Knights Templar, and of the underground Gnostic tradition). Captain Jamy may be taken to represent Sir Francis Bacon himself. England represents in HV the unredeemed ego: the gentility embraced by Shaksper in defence against the Boar, in obeisance to his Christian puritan superego, at the end of 2HIV ("I know thee not, old man"):

Gower Gentlemen, both, you will mistake each other.

The bloodless capitulation of Harfleur consequent on Hal's threats of savagery before its gates symbolises the peace that derives from a full engagement with the underworld, as of a worshipper, for example, before the image of the Hindu Black Goddess Kali, who holds in her twin left hands a bloody sabre and a dripping human head, while her upper right is extended in a "fear not" gesture, and her lower right bestows boons. The severed head symbolises psychic rebirth, and is a reminder that those who lose their life for Her will find it. One recalls the Christ of Dürer's The Crucifixion (fig,3), whose sun and moon symbolism will be represented here by the characters of the Dauphin and the Constable in III, vii. "Harfleur" here means "heart's flower". The response of distaste to Hal's speech by some modern commentators is an index to their ignobility in this regard, and accords with the general witless recoil from the Faustian dimension by the late 20th century ideologue. The ego-in-transformation is delving to the heart of the matter, below the apparent surface of

things.

In III, iv, the French Princess Katherine is painstakingly learning the English language. She is cognate, of course, with Kate in TOS, and all the other Katherines of the plays, as the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, Goddess of the Invisible World. The meaning is that the Faustian dimension of Nature is now beginning to speak to the ego-in-transformation: Katherine's new volubility bearing the same allegoric value as that of Cordelia, Hippolyta, and Hero. Ted Hughes' placement of the silence of Cordelia at the heart of Shakespeare's philosophy was therefore a misjudgement. It is rather her volubility that is of such importance to FF as allegory, for the erstwhile Goddess-rejecting subject has now begun to open his ears to Nature, Who is speaking to him through the Gnostic written word. The Princess' name is derived from the Greek *katharos* meaning "pure": for true purity derives not from rejection of the Queen of Hell, as in Pauline Christianity, but engagement with Her.

Enlightenment is being attained, courtesy of the Gnostic written word, perhaps TGA (crossing of the Somme). London-phase Shakespeare will become, under the healing ministry of Bacon, Lucius himself, rather than merely reading about him, as here, where he is a kind of Socrates, who was roundly reproved by Kleitophon for being an expert on the Journey, without ever having taken it himself. I would place, albeit reluctantly, the magnificent Joseph Campbell also in this category. The impeachment and execution of Bardolph for stealing a pax is a turning-point in the Quest. The Latin pax means, of course "peace"; and the peace attained by puritanical suppression of the libido has been corrupt, and dishonestly acquired. That defence mechanism however is now no longer required. The *ithyphallos* has been converted from will to idea (Pistol on the bridge with Exeter), per the written word, as acted upon by imagination and reason. In conversation with Fluellen, where he pleads for Bardolph's pardon, Pistol's allegoric value reverts to the *ithyphallos* as will: a scenario with which his hostility to Fluellen here, and Fluellen's otherwise odd "It is well" in response, entirely accords.

Money signifies always in the plays the power of a principle; and Hal's reward to French herald Montjoy represents the strengthening of Shaksper's familiarity with the wisdom-contents of the written

word, where the sun of reason (Dauphin) shines upon the moon of Nature (Constable-Orleans), with, over all, the Ring Lord or Gnostic Christ himself (King of France). These correspond respectively to the golden trees, Silverlode river, and Lord Celeborn, of the forest of Lothlorien in Tolkien's *Lord of the Rings*. Princess Katherine is cognate with the Lady Galadriel, as the Ring or Grail Queen. The various Queens of Hell of the later plays – Portia, Cordelia, Imogen, Helen, Helena, and so on – are consistently identified as Ring/Grail Queens: and the point is emphatically made that the Holy Grail of the Hero's (early London-phase Shakespeare's) quest is the wisdom derived from knowledge of the invisible world – underworld or Faustian dimension – as described in the written word. This especially evident with regard to Perdita of *The Winter's Tale*. There can little doubt that Tolkien's Lothlorien represents also the written word, like all the woods, forests, groves and trees of the FF: the source for both being most plausibly the Druid grove, on the barks of which were nicked their sacred texts. Bacon (as supreme strategist of FF, although Shakespeare may have had many ideas of his own) was faced with a technical problem, in that Agincourt was a battle, but was required here to represent a psychic engagement with the wisdom of the written word, in which notions of defeat and victory are inappropriate. This is solved in Act V, of course, by the treaty; and more subtly here:

King We would not seek a battle as we are,
 Nor, as we are, we say we will not shun it.

Once again, it is essential to the understanding of HV as allegory that Shakespeare's psychic transformation in this phase be recognised as a pseudo-Journey, that finally left him unable to deal with the resurgent Queen of Hell in negative mantle, as invested by his constitutive Christian puritanism. This is expressed in Act V by his awkward and mutually incomprehensive marriage to Princess Katherine. The characterisation of this phase as such is the point of III, vii, which otherwise must seem entirely supererogatory, a series of flights of fancy into shadows with not the slightest relevance to

¹⁰ Baigent and Leigh, *The Elixir and the Stone*.

the plot, to violate Aquinas' requirements of the true work of art, of consonance, radiance, and integrity.

The French nobles represent, as so often in the plays, the faculty of reason. Here it is grappling with the libido as described in the printed page, as the ego-in-transformation strives toward enlightenment:

Constable Tut! I have the best armour of the world. Would it were
day!

Orleans You have an excellent armour; but let my horse have its
due.

Constable It is the best horse of Europe.

Orleans Will it never be morning?

- Where the horse represents, as always without exception in the plays, the libido, as sourced from Socrates' famous extended metaphor in Plato's *Phaedrus*; and "armour" refers to the ego's intellectual resources against the "charge of the Boar", as glossed in line 137. So far, so good. Yet something is not quite right here. The Dauphin's endless rhapsody on the virtues of his horse, against the protestations of Orleans, along with his startlingly odd statement that "my horse is my mistress", is in truth a portrait of Shaksper's mentation in this phase, with his unstoppable loquacity on the subject of the libido, together with personal erotic continence, in the way again of Plutarch's Alexander. Here is another reference to the same, which is devastating in its honesty:

Orleans Your mistress bears well.

Dauphin Me well, which is the prescript praise and perfection of
good and particular mistress.

"Me well" is, on the literal plane, ugly and stylistically inchoate. It has immense allegorical significance, however, as a homophone for "mule", the sterile offspring of horse and donkey. The meaning is that the preferred mistress of Shaksper at this time would have had to be anerotic and sterile: a sham Aphrodite, and travesty of Woman. For any erotic activity would risk inciting a "charge of the Boar", and flooding of libido into the ego:

Dauphin Be warned by me then. They that ride so, and ride not warily, fall into foul bogs.

These “foul bogs” are of Ireland (52), which bears always in the plays the allegoric value of the unconscious. Here is a meaning-packed exchange, seemingly a throwaway joust on the literal plane:

Dauphin I tell the, Constable, my mistress wears his own hair.
Constable I could make as true a boast as that, if I had a sow
to my mistress.

Dauphin “Le chien est retourné a son propre vomissement, et la truie lavée au boubier”.

“The dog has returned to his vomit, and the new-washed sow to the mud”. The mistress refers to the horse, and both to the libido. The dog and clean sow of the proverb refer to the libido as idea, born of the libido as will, to dominate Shaksper’s Tavern phase mentation: the meaning being that the permanence of the transformation is a sham, and it will soon revert, to plunge the ego anew into conflict (see TimA I, ii, 120, for the moment of reversal). This is the point also of Fluellen’s oddly superogatory instance on mis-styling Alexander “the Pig” in IV, vii, 13.

Shaksper up to this time had been driven by the shrew (Queen of Hell) factor as will, with his reasoning ego totally inane of Her as idea:

Rambures That island of England breeds very valiant creatures.
Their mastiffs are of unmatchable courage.

[...]

Orleans I, but these English are shrewdly out of beef.

Constable Then we shall find tomorrow they have only stomachs
to eat and none to fight.

- Where “I” for “Ay” stands, as always, for the ithyphallos, more broadly the unseen world. This is also the point of the most unmartial feebleness of the English before Agincourt, as described

in Grandpre's "Yond island carrions, desperate of their bones..."

ACT IV

The defining of the essential pseudery of this phase continues, in the entry of Sir Thomas Erpingham, whose value lies in his Christian name, as the principle of doubt as to whether the product of this psychic transformation is a Gnostic Christ, or a sham. The choreography here is precise, Erpingham being paired with Gloucester, who represents always the true Gnostic Christ, except in RIII, where Richard is His polar opposite. They are sent away together by Hal, to bring the English lords (faculty of reason) to his tent; - from which he will however be absent, debating with his men. The meaning is that the reasoning enquiry into the lasting quality of this transformation is being suppressed.

Hal in disguise talks with Pistol, who first expresses his love for the King, then rebukes that King (still disguised) for his Welsh kinship with Fluellen: the meaning being that the ithyphallic principle is identified with Shaksper in his Boar's Head phase, though not in his (earlier, while still successful) Tavern phase. The name "Michael" refers to the Archangel (see above); while "Williams" may be analysed to "will-I-am [s]". This looks ahead to Shaksper's Puritan phase, and the breakdown, where he will be crucified on the tree of his libido (will), and later resurrected into eternal life, in London, through the healing ministry of Sir Francis Bacon: the re-irruption of the negative libido as will ("charge of the Boar"), being necessary for the new understanding of it as idea. We can be more specific as to the source of "Michael". We will see that the device in TWT of Leontes beholding his wife new-risen from the dead, was most plausibly suggested by the miracle ascribed to the Renaissance mage Trithemius, who similarly caused the dead wife of the Holy Roman Emperor to appear before him.¹⁰ Remarkably, a Michael holds centre stage in Trithemius' *De Septem Secundadeis*, with all the attributes of the Michaels in FF (see also Michael Cassio in OTH). The correspondences are exact and striking. David Ovason, in his *The Secret Zodiacs of Washington DC*, summarises it beautifully:

Trithemius claimed that the era which had commenced in 1525,

under the guidance of the planetary angel of the Moon, would come to an end in 1881. In this same year, a new era would begin under the control of the angel of the Sun, whom Trithemius named Michael. Far reaching changes would result, for, in a previous age, the angel had been not only the institutor of many new arts, and the inventor of astrology and astronomy, but also of architecture... Trithemius... insisted that under the rule of this planetary angel there would be inaugurated an exciting change of direction for mankind. The angel Michael was dedicated to the expansion of human consciousness and freedom.

This strikingly allocates to the Michaels in FF the divine principle of the visual imagination (Sun). Williams is accompanied by Alexander Court, whose name signifies that this Christhood is being hastily acquired (< French court, "quick"). He speaks briefly and then is silent, as the Williams principle strengthens. The other companion, John Bates, now speaks up, and takes Williams' side in the debate with Hal. His Christian name signifies the unconscious (see KJ); while "Bates" indicates that its power will abate with the assimilation of the Williams principle, which is here however being suppressed, subsequently to storm back with a vengeance, in a typically Freudian way. (There can be no doubt that Sir Francis Bacon, rather than Freud or Jung, should be acknowledged as the father of modern depth psychology). This is represented by the gift of money to Williams by both Hal and Fluellen in IV, viii: their principles being weakened, and Williams' correspondingly strengthened, in anticipation of the fateful day, when the visualisation in Shaksper's imagination of the Goddess of Love (perhaps Fotis, in the graphically described scene of her seduction of Lucius in TGA) will arouse the libido, to hasten the end of his Tavern phase (exile of Timon in TimA). Their gift will result from the mutual hostility aroused by the debate: the Hal and Fluellen principles being identified through the adroit technical device of the gloves.

Richard the Second represents the libidinous Shakespeare that arose at puberty. Now that nature is being buried, - alive, as it happens:

King O, not today, think not upon the fault
 My father made in compassing the crown!
 I Richard's body have interred anew.

Where "I" bears here its usual value. In IV, ii, the French steeds are contrasted with the feeble nags of the English: the horses representing here the libido as idea, rather than will, as celebrated by the endlessly voluble Shaksper to his tavern copains (see III, vii, above). In IV, iii, Erpingham "and all his host" hold the stage, together with Gloucester and the lords, with the King being once again absent: the meaning again being that the ego is banishing self-doubt as to the quality of his transformation. Salisbury leaves the group for the front lines. It has been shown, in the discussion of the HVI trilogy, that he bears the allegoric value of "safety first" for the ego: his name being derived from the Latin *salus*, "health", "welfare". The point being made is that this pseudo-Journey is a defensive one, against the persistent onrushes of the Boar, the ego's self-critical faculties being suspended for its sake. Hal now enters upon them. Westmoreland wants more men from England; for which the King rebukes him, even wanting some to return home. Under pressure of this counter-argument, Westmoreland will come to wish that "you and I alone/Without more help, could fight this royal battle". England represents here, once again, the unredeemed ego of Shakespeare in his Boar's Head phase. In the hands of a true mystagogue, like Sir Francis Bacon (a Gloucester-figure), the subject would be guided on its quest to emerge a Gnostic Christ, or Alexander, rather than a sham as here, in which some part of it will always remain its old self, subject to the libido and the Boar (men remaining in England).

There is something odd going on in Hal's famous exhortation before Agincourt. The sevenfold reiteration of "Crispine"/"Crispian" seems supererogatory. Not only that, but the feast day in question was of the early Christian martyrs Crispine and Crispinian; and the name of the latter is spelt thus in Holinshed. Yet it is persistently misspelt "Crispian" here, and given thus thrice in the space of eight lines. Hal names it as the feast of "Crispine Crispian" instead of "Crispine and Crispinian"; and the final instance is the correct

"Crispine", as if to highlight the oddity of the precedents.

This serves to alert the reader that all may not be as it seems. The reference here is undoubtedly to line 313 of Virgil's *Aeneid* I, a staple of elementary Latin, which could not possibly have been unknown to Bacon, and had quite likely been studied by Shaksper: 'bina manu lato crispans hastilia ferro': "Grasping two broad-bladed spears that quivered in his hand". The meaning of *crispans* is "brandishing", "moving up and down with a rapid movement": the spears being held by their shafts, approximately halfway between fore and aft. The name "Shakespeare" is clearly being suggested. In the argument to come it will be shown that the "- speare" of "Shakespeare", who was reborn from the Stratfordian "Shaksper" in London, refers to the Boar spear, the intellectual weaponry against irruption of the negative libido into the conscious ego ("charge of the Boar"), which had effected his breakdown of 1587, and the many less severe crises of his Boar's Head and Tavern (pseudo-Alexandrian) phases. Here we are in the early Tavern phase, however, and a spear (of sorts) is at hand. The works of Shakespeare are those of a Gandalf and his Bilbo Baggins, the man who suffered the "charge of the Boar" while under the influence of the Puritan error, and came later to acquire the philosophical weapons to ensure it never happened again. The comparison with Tolkien's *Lord of the Rings* is close enough. For it to be exact, the man Boromir should rather have taken the Ring from Frodo, and used it for the betterment of humanity, as did Bacon and his pupil.

York begs "the leading of the vaward". He will be shown, in 1-3HVI, to represent the faculty of reason, York being a northern city of England. It is reason that is central to Shakespeare's Tavern phase. Later, he will die while embracing and kissing the dead Suffolk: "My soul shall thine keep company to heaven". This battle is not a battle, of course, and the deaths are not deaths, but rebirths: the object of the spiritualising reason being the "I" principle, more broadly the unseen world (Suffolk: see discussion especially of 2HVI IV, i). It is Exeter who held York's hand as he died, and now relates the story to Hal: for it is the written word (perhaps the intensely erotic passages in Apuleius' *TGA*) that is the source of this rationalisation of the libido.

In IV, iv, the pseudery of this phase deepens, as the "I" principle

as will is shown to be strengthened, via the libido, by the new dispensation, instead of depowered (bribe paid to Pistol by French soldier, with the boy as translator). This again is a classical Freudian mechanism, the truth of which will strike home with a vengeance on that day to come in 1587.

Alexander the Great has already been mentioned twice in the course of the play: "Turn him [Hal] to any course of policy,/The Gordian knot of it he will unloose" (I, i, 46) and "Father that like so many Alexanders/Have in these parts from morn to even fought" (III, i, 19). Bacon now (IV, vii) goes to great pains to make the identification complete, rounding off the passage of sixty-four lines with a characteristic legerdemain, which serves to identify the victory at Agincourt with the repudiation of Falstaff (libido):

Fluellen As Alexander killed his friend Cleitus, being in his ales
and cups, so also Harry Monmouth, being in his right
wits and his good judgements, turned away the fat
knight with the great pelly doublet...

[...]

King I was not angry since I came to France
Until this instant...

This principle is reinforced by the slaughter of the boys (libido) by the French. Earlier, the genesis of this Tavern phase (birth of Harry at Monmouth) has been found in the "I" principle as idea, supplanting its torturous twin as will:

Gower O, 'tis a gallant king!

Fluellen I, he was porn at Monmouth...

This will be reinforced when the cap in which Fluellen will wear his leek (flaccid phallos: defeat of ithyphallos as will) is identified with the Welsh Monmouth caps worn at Crecy (IV, vii, 99). Pistol's refusal to eat the leek (V, i) is totally consistent with this scenario. Fluellen's oddly superogatory insistence on mis-styling Alexander "the Pig" (IV, vii, 13) refers to the proverb of III, vii, 63: "The dog has returned to his vomit, the new-washed pig to the mud". For Harry and Alexander are being identified: and this psychic transformation

(Bolingbroke'Harry) is a sham.

Alexander the Great is implied elsewhere in HV. He will reappear in the character of Alexander Iden in 2HVI IV, x; while the names of Cleomenes and Antigonus (via Antigone) in *The Winter's Tale* are borrowed (or stolen, in the way of the good poet, as T.S Eliot said) from Plutarch's *Life of Alexander*. It is evident that Alexander the Great, the philosopher-king believed to be of divine birth, is a towering figure behind the scenes of HV.

Robert Bauval presents in his *The Secret Chamber* an impeccable pedigree for Alexander the Great as an Hermetic magus, cousin germane to Bruno and the other great Renaissance magi. Alexander's mother Olympias was a priestess of the Oracle Temple of Zeus at Dodona in Greece; and she instilled in him a belief of his divine birth by that god. The shrine at Dodona was said to have been inaugurated by one of a pair of black birds which had flown from the Temple of Karnak in Upper Egypt: which is a mythic way of saying that it was a colony of the Egyptian priesthood. The other bird alighted at the oasis of Siwa in Egypt, to inaugurate the shrine of Ammon, the ram-god, located 190 miles inland through unrelieved desert. In spite of the legend of the Persian king Cambyses, who was reputed to have lost an army of 50,000 men in a sandstorm there, Alexander went out of his way to make the pilgrimage to Siwa, where he was greeted by the priests and priestesses as Son of God. Bauval continues:

It was no exaggeration when the eminent scholar Ulrich Wilcken wrote that "the whole subsequent course of history, the political, economic and cultural life of after times, cannot be understood apart from the career of Alexander". The French historian Paul Faure went much further. In his biography of Alexander, Faure demonstrated how Alexander, or rather the myth of Alexander, had paved the way and set the scene some three centuries later for a new "Son of God", a "Filius Dei", one whose modest Nazarene mother, somewhat like Olympias before her, also claimed to have become pregnant through divine intervention. For centuries after his death, his embalmed corpse, mummified in the ancient Osirian tradition and kept in a golden sarcophagus, was venerated in the city of Alexandria. Among

those nobles who paid homage at his shrine were Julius Caesar, Octavian and Hadrian. Even during early Christian times, when the body had been transferred into a glass coffin, crowds of devotees would parade through his shrine during the feasts of his birth (September) and death (June), and celebrate his resurrection as the god Dionysos. It seems that Alexander is also mentioned in the Koran as Iskander Dul El Qarnein, Alexander the “two horned”, i.e. the horns of the ram-god Ammon. It is reported that at the legendary place where the tomb of Alexander had stood, today in the busy street of Nebi Daniel, pious muslims would come to pray to the “prophet- king”, “instrument of divine will”, and later in the fifteenth century, roughly at the same spot, was raised the mosque of the prophet Daniel, the legendary founder of the Arab city of Alexandria.

Bacon’s true model for King Henry’s war against France in HV must have been Alexander’s conquest of Asia, symbolic of the Hermetic hero’s engagement with and triumph over Nature. The influence is clear. Hal’s exhortation to his troops before the battle of Agincourt (IV, iii) evokes Plutarch:

King ...And gentlemen in England now abed
 Shall think themselves accursed they were not here,
 And hold their manhoods cheap while any speaks
 That fought with us upon Saint Crispin’s day.

...Demaratus of Corinth, now quite an old man, had made a great effort, about this time, to pay Alexander a visit; and when he had seen him, said he pitied the misfortune of those Grecians, who were so unhappy as to die before they had beheld Alexander seated on the throne of Darius.

- As does the speech before Harfleur (III, iii):

King If I begin the battery once again,
 I will not leave the half-achieved Harfleur

Till in her ashes she lie buried.
The gates of mercy shall be all shut up,
And the fleshed soldier, rough and hard of heart,
In liberty of bloody hand shall range
Your fresh fair virgins and your flow'ring infants...

Here the barbarians, unexpectedly meeting with those who led Bucephalus, took them prisoners, and carried the horse away with them, at which Alexander was so much vexed that he sent an herald to let them know he would put them all to the sword, men, women, and children, without mercy, if they did not restore him. But on their doing so, and at the same time surrendering their cities into his hands, he not only treated them kindly, but also paid a ransom for his horse to those who took him.

Burgundy, both as the city (RIII, I, iv) and the Duke of the same name (HV, 1-3HVI), represents the principle of the alcoholic release of right-brain function. His otherwise puzzling appearance *de novo* in V, ii, is also explained by Plutarch, who remarks on Alexander's love of conversation over a convivial cup of wine:

Burgundy My duty to you both, on equal love,
Great Kings of France and England! That I have labored
With all my wits, my pains, and strong endeavors
To bring your most imperial majesties
Unto this bar and royal interview,
Your mightiness on both parts best can witness...

The choreography of the Fluellen-Williams imbroglio as allegory is precise. Warwick will be identified in 1-3HVI with the principle of psychic conflict, as suggested by his name. He enters with Gloucester (true Gnostic Christ) at the climax of the dispute: the Warwick principle deriving from the conflict of truth and falsity at this inception of the latest coping mechanism of Shaksper's, doomed to fail like the rest. The King and Exeter now enter, to appease them: for it is the written word that is the keystone of this phase. Ominously, Williams is richly rewarded by the King and Fluellen (see

above).

ACT V

Fluellen persuades Pistol to eat the leek, to symbolise the victory (albeit ultimately delusory) of the reasoning ego over the Queen of Hell (immanent in Aphrodite), Who lies behind the negative “I” principle as will. Yet the triumph will be spurious, and She will rise again with a vengeance in 1-3HVI and RIII as Queen Margaret.

Pistol’s “Doll”, of whose death he learns, is cognate with Doll Tearsheet of 1-2HIV, as the Goddess of the auto-erotist. “Doll” suggests her nature as an artifice of the mind; while a tearsheet is a page ripped from a book, to suggest the tearing of a hymen: for this Love Goddess is forever unspoilt, forever being deflowered anew. The power of the new defence is already being lost to the ithyphallos (Fluellen’s gift of a groat to Pistol) The ithyphallos as will is banished (Pistol’s return to England), yet remains finally undefeated, ominously, the wounds of its vanquishing a sham:

Pistol To England will I steal, and there I’ll steal;
 And patches will I get unto these cudgeled scars
 And swear I got them in the Gallia wars.

Burgundy makes his first appearance in this play in V, ii. There has been a lapse of years between Acts IV and V; so that his protestation of his long labour to bring the treaty to pass is justified, at least on the historical plane. Yet the length and magnificence of his speech “My duty to you both...” – one the great speeches of the FF – makes it out of place, in the context of his upstart newness. He bears, in truth, the allegoric value of wine, as a reference to the wine and conversation (albeit tending to be one-sided) that was feature of this phase of Shaksper’s self-defence against the Boar, - as based on the habits of the young Alexander.

The point of the remainder of HV is to emphasise the essential pseudery of this phase, and to highlight the Boar in the thickets, lurking darkly, unharmed. Princess Katherine is, of course, the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, Goddess of the Invisible world: “You have witchcraft in your lips, Kate” (V, ii, 275). Hal dismisses the

¹ Jung, C. G., *Aspects of the Feminine*, Routledge, 1992 (trans. R. F. C. Hull).

French and English nobles, and is left alone with Kate and Alice. At the end of some 181 lines of wooing, they are no nearer a rapprochement, their mutual incomprehension as deep as ever. Just so are Cordelia, Hippolyta, and Hero, all silent for long stretches: the significance being that the underworld, the unconscious, the Faustian dimension, unseen world – what you will – is not speaking, through the Gnostic written word, to the Goddess-denying tragic hero; or rather, that it is speaking, but he has closed his ears. The meaning here is the same. Now, however, Burgundy enters, and intervenes with the King, and the marriage is agreed to, while still doing nothing to remedy their mutual incomprehension. This represents vividly the role of wine and conversation in Shakspeare's unquenchably generous payment of lip-service to the Faustian dimension in this phase. Further, Exeter now enters, to put the finishing touches to the agreement. This represents, of course, the centrality of the written word to Shaksper's defence at this time.

CHAPTER 9

HENRY THE EIGHTH

Now for the clincher. HVIII, probably the last of the plays to be written, even post-dating *The Tempest*, will prove in the argument to come to hold a special place in the Complete Works, as a summary of the psychology of Shakespeare's creative life in London, and a record of the final solution of his long-standing conflict with his demon the Boar, to enable the return to his wife. Here, for example (II, ii, 61), is Shakespeare at his desk, at any typical moment of the approximately twenty years of creativity (corresponding to King Henry's twenty years of marriage to Katherine, who like all the other Katherines of FF is covalently

bonded to Queen Margaret of RIII, as a Queen of Hell-Grail Queen) during which the Queen of Hell continued to torment him with her curse:

The King draws the curtain and sits reading pensively

Suffolk How sad he looks; sure he is much afflicted.

King Henry Who's there, ha?

Norfolk Pray God he be not angry.

King Henry Who's there, I say? How dare you thrust yourselves

Into my private meditations?

Who am I, ha?

Suffolk (Sir William de la Pole) has been shown above to represent the ithyphallic ("I") principle, more broadly the unseen world; his murder, the anathematisation of this principle by Puritanism (2HVI IV, i). His name associates "folk", the dancers to the sacred round of the Goddess, with "south" (e.g. < Spanish sur), which direction in the symbolic language of FF represents the body/will, as opposed to mind/idea represented by the direction north. Norfolk then, as "north-folk", bears the value of the "I" principle as idea. Hence his banishment in Act 1 of RII represents the initial stage of Shaksper's first mechanism (rationalist asceticism, with denial of the unseen world) of coping with his troublesome Christian puritan superego. These lines represent, in fact, the breaking into consciousness of Eros and the thoughts which accompany Her, along with an erection (or, better, ithyphallos: the word of Greek origin rather than the utilitarian Latin releasing, as usual, the innate divinity of the meaning).

Suffolk As I am made without him, so I'll stand,
 If the King please.

Thus the "I" principle, immediately before the lines excerpted above. The otherwise inexplicable "Who am I, ha?" is now clearly understood to be the consequence of the reassertion in the ego of the estranged unconscious, as an indivisible aspect of the Self, as Jung argued. The disturbance elicited in Shakespeare was germane

(somewhat distantly) to the anxiety he felt in the acute phase of his pathology, dramatised in the neurotic terror of Richard after the beheading of Hastings in RIII III, iv:

King Henry Who's there? My good lord Cardinal? O my Wolsey,
 The quiet of my wounded conscience,
 Thou art a cure fit for a king.

The principle or “humor” associated with the northern city York throughout the histories is functional left-brain reason. Wolsey is Cardinal of York, and represents in HVIII the faculty of reason in its Apollonist (as not fully receptive of the Dionysius principle) character, which we will see, especially in T&C, to have been the dominant mode of Shakespeare’s creative mentation. He is closely associated in this play with Cardinal Campeius, who will be identified with the Latin language (II, ii, 94), which bears the value, here as in MWW (Parson Evans’ Latin lessons to William), of the broadly Gnostic tradition as imparted to Shakespeare by his mentor and healer Sir Francis Bacon. The greater part of this tradition indeed was written in Latin, which had been adopted as the common European language of the Renaissance. Latin is the language of the Law, rather than philosophy, and is the supreme language of conceptualisation; yet concepts invite shattering: hence the vulnerability of an Apollonist mind like Shakespeare’s. I have used the term “asymptotic” to describe Shakespeare’s relationship to the Goddess. An asymptote approaches an axis ever more closely without ever reaching it; and Shakespeare used the Wolsey-Campeius factor, heightened to the nth degree, to bring his right-brain back into play from a position of hostility to the left which is potentially schizophrenogenic: to resolve the civil war of his psyche, and enthrone once more the Goddess. Yet he could not help Her the last inch across that final divide, and so enthroned by default the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen in negative aspect, in a way that Jung well understood:

Official Christianity, therefore, absorbed certain Gnostic elements that manifested themselves in the worship of woman and found a place for them in an intensified worship of Mary...

Since the psychic relation to woman was expressed in the collective worship of Mary, the image of woman lost a value to which human beings had a natural right. This value could find its natural expression only through individual choice, and it sank into the unconscious when the individual form of expression was replaced by a collective one. In the unconscious the image of woman received an energy charge that activated the infantile and archaic dominants. And since all unconscious contents, when activate by dissociated libido, are projected upon external objects, the devaluation of the real woman was compensated by daemonic traits. She no longer appeared as an object of love, but as a persecutor or witch...¹

Hence the marriage of King Henry to Margaret in 2HVI; and hence also the attempt by Wolsey to marry King Henry to the Princess of Alençon (Woman as spiritualised, rather than embodied) upon his divorce from Katherine (Queen of Hell) in this play: for the daemonic projection of Woman stung like an adder Shakespeare's ego upon any attempt at union; and it was only through the heroic efforts of his left-brain faculty of reason, of which Cardinal Wolsey represents the (albeit Apollonist) perfection, to appease it, during the whole of his creative life, that he was able to fashion a peace for himself (cf. "Doctor Pace", II, ii, 120). His left-brain, that is, took over the function of both sides; but "only through time time is conquered" (T.S.Eliot, *The Four Quartets*): and he was under no illusion, certainly at this late stage, that his schism had completely healed. That could only occur by union with the Goddess, symbolised here by the marriage of King Henry to Anne Bullen (Boleyn), who can only represent Anne Hathaway, as ianus diaboli the tormenter of his youth whom he had to relinquish in search of the Goddess and subsequent at-onement with the Father; or, to use another mythic analogy, in a quest to retrieve the elixir of life. Yet the propiatory powers of the Goddess were not properly appeased; and Shakespeare's personal myth is therefore a variant of the "Elixir Theft", or the myth of Prometheus, whose glory and suffering were equally his.

² See also Ted Hughes, *SGCB*.

In the light of the above, Gardiner's "I... left him [the king] at primero/with the Duke of Suffolk." in Act V, scene i, can only represent a wanted form of Shakespeare's erotic expression. The name of Sir Thomas Lovell, who plays an important part in this final chapter of the greatest Ring saga career in literature (having first appeared in the "crack-up" scene in RIII), is formed from "love-hell", as the anguish which enveloped Shakespeare after the act of eros, - the pain of his wounding by the Boar, - and turned him towards left-brain dominated creativity for a cure (Prospero on his isle). This play will outline with some strength a picture of Shakespeare the man, and of his unsatisfactory love-life, during his London period; while Act V, set in Stratford, will tell the story of whether the dragon-companions of his life were finally slain.

HVIII is a companion-play to *The Tempest*. King Henry corresponds, of course, to Prospero, who is Shakespeare himself. Prospero as Duke of Milan is reasoning Shakespeare in control of his ego; and Milan is also Stratford: Prospero's usurpation by Antonio-Alonso (the latter the Boar) representing the coup of 1587 which had driven him to London and the healing magic of Sir Francis Bacon, which is cognate with the peace between England and France referred to in HVIII I, i. The Boar (libido in negative aspect) in TT is Alonso/Caliban; in HVIII the Chartreusian monk Nicholas Hopkins/Henton. The unconscious, - home of the Boar whence it charges to effect the coup of 1587, or any of its muted though still intensely painful charges as occurred repeatedly during Shakespeare's London phase, his final victory over which it is the purpose of both plays to record, - is represented in TT by the Master and crew of the ship; in HVIII by Buckingham, the King's execution of whom in HVIII is cognate with the shipwreck and its sequelae in TT. Shakespeare combatting the Boar, with the help of the intellectual weapons given him by Bacon, is represented in TT by Prospero as magus; in HVIII by the King as influenced by the Cardinals Wolsey and Campeius (the "speare" of "Shakespeare" is a reference to the Boar spear, symbol of these new weapons acquired by Shaksper, to transform him). Prospero's repudiation of his magic corresponds to the overthrow of Wolsey: both

³ Stephen Gaukroger, *Francis Bacon and the Transformation of Early-Modern Philosophy*, Cambridge, 2001.

representing Shakespeare's exit from the magic circle of Bacon and return to his family (King's marriage to Anne). Sycorax (Queen of Hell-Grail Queen in negative aspect) corresponds exactly to Queen Katherine; but whereas in HVIII the focus is on her, in TT it is on her son Caliban. The two Ferdinands are the same: the libido divested of its negative mantle, though not to assume a positive one, but rather beyond all considerations of negativity and positivity (cf. Scylla and Charybdis in Homer's *Odyssey*; Eteocles and Polynices in Sophocles *Oedipus* plays; Nietzsche's *Beyond Good and Evil*). In HVIII he is the father of Queen Katherine, an exemplary Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, so that his wife must have been the same, to make of him Her Consort. The Consort and the Son are equivalent in myth, and both Ferdinands therefore represent the libido, or unseen world, engagement with which was central to Bacon's philosophy (see Ch.10). The pages of Shakespeare's written works, products of the recurrent phase of his healing from the wounds of the Boar (see T&C), are represented, remarkably, by the logs Caliban must stack for Prospero's fire (see Appendix 1 for the same technique in *The Spanish Tragedy*); in HVIII, the "pages " referred to in I, i, 22. There is much more to be said in this vein.

Buckingham, Norfolk and Lord Abergavenny are discussing, in the opening lines of the play, a peculiar happening in France. Buckingham's homonymous ancestors in the previous plays have been demonstrated to represent the unconscious; and if the Baconian double helix is to be shown to be also the skeleton of HVIII, then this latest Buckingham must prove to be the heir of his fathers. One glance is enough.

ACT I

i

Buckingham An untimely ague
 Stayed me a prisoner in my chamber when
 Those suns of glory, those two lights of men,
 Met in the vale of Andren.

Norfolk 'Twixt Guynes and Arde.
 I was then present, saw them salute on horseback,
 Beheld them when they lighted, how they clung
 In their embracement, as they grew together;

Which had they, what four throned ones could have weighed

Such a compounded one?

Buckingham All the whole time

I was my chamber's prisoner.

Norfolk ...The two Kings,

Equal in lustre, were now best, now worst,

As presence did present them...

We are now inside the mind of the subject, and there can be no doubt on this basis, apart from any consideration of style, that this scene was written by Shakespeare. The absence of Buckingham is not mentioned by Holinshed, and is the first of numerous departures from the sources, which are of the greatest importance for the allegory: so that the play's subtitle "All this is true" is now understood to refer to, not its extreme factual accuracy, but the grounding in truth of its many variations from history, as significant on the plane of allegory, of which the presence of Anne Bullen at the banquet described in I, iv, is the most notable.

Shakespeare in scholarly mode has been intensely visualising, when the "I" principle as idea (Norfolk), more broadly the unseen world, enters his field of conscious. Control by the visual imagination threatens to be lost, as the unconscious (Buckingham), with its burden of communion with the Goddess of Love (Abergavenny: cf. the symbolism of Wales in previous plays), asserts itself. This will be represented in another way by the intrusion of Norfolk and Suffolk into the King's study in II, i. This temptation would have been followed hitherto by total surrender, in the early days in the form of communion with a tart (as described in T&C and the final two sonnets), later of auto-erotism ("Sir, I did never win of you before": Suffolk to King Henry, V, i, 58), after the contraction of a venereal disease² had scared him into a change of habit. The pain of the "charge of the Boar" precipitated by either surrender would then have driven him into creative mode (T&C), as a means of neutralising it. HVIII will record Shakespeare's final breaking of this vicious cycle.

The rebirth of Richard as Richmond in RIII was predicated on the execution of Buckingham on All Souls Day. Poetically,

Shakespeare's recovery depended on the subjugation of his unconscious, - the seat of power of the Ugly Dick factor, monstrous product of Protestant Puritan mentation, - to the exalted hegemony of his reasoning left brain. Here it becomes apparent that the triumph of the final scenes of *RIII* must be qualified. For Shakespeare evidently was never fully healed, at least until his return to his wife at the end of his career in London, which reunion is celebrated in this play: and the historical sequence is thus rounded off as a kind of *Odyssey* in its own right, all the way from his life as a warrior of male Puritanism, to the journey to the Island of the Sun (London), to his return to the Moon Goddess incarnate (Penelope's weaving and unweaving of her rug symbolising the cyclical death and rebirth of the moon, and of the womb). *RIII* thus becomes an expression of idealism; or perhaps in 1995 he still hoped that the healing would be complete.

At all events, here is the unconscious with its negative anima-contents still active eighteen years later, although repressed ("All the time I was my chamber's prisoner") to allow reason to get on with its job of shining like an Apollo ("Those suns of glory..."). The meaning of these suns is to be found in Bacon's *De sapientia veterum*, in his discussion of the myth of Pentheus:

Pentheus having climbed a tree for the purpose of seeing the secret mysteries of Bacchus, was struck with madness; and the form of his madness was that he thought everything was double; saw two suns, and two cities of Thebes... For since the light of nature is one thing and the light of divinity another, they are as men that see two suns...

Bacon interprets Thebes as meaning the "ends and aims of our actions". He may well have had in mind Augustine's doctrine of spiritual illumination, which holds that, just as we need the light of the sun to make sensible external objects, so too do we need a form of spiritual illumination to allow the working of the interior intellect.³ However, Bacon is undoubtedly referring here to the twin faculties of the visual imagination and reason, both of which, acting

⁴ Jung, C. G., *ibid.*

in concert, are necessary for the acquisition of Gnostic nobility, as is repeatedly emphasised throughout FF. The forms of the imagination, or of dream, are simply the sunlit forms of Nature internalised. Yet, although the capacity to dream is absolutely the first requirement of the philosopher, as Schopenhauer emphasised, this is not enough in itself, the illumination of these forms by reason being also necessary. This is captured beautifully by Keats in his apophthegm: "The poet and the dreamer are distinct,/Diverse, antipodes, sheer opposites:/The one pours out a balm upon the world,/The other vexes it". Bacon is arguing, in *De sapientia*, against ersatz nobility, which would assume divine wisdom without first properly engaging Nature. One thinks, for example, of the swarm of pontificators in the trash press. There are no shortcuts; and this is precisely what Shakespeare was not guilty of, in his long ascent to Gnostic nobility in London: for these two suns "met... clung in their embracement... grew together". It could not be clearer.

The name "Andren" reinforces the character of the encounter as an expression of the male, or Apollonian, principle (as < the Greek *aner*, *andros* = "man": hence Andrew, androgen, &c.); while "Guynes" seems to be derived from the Old French *guien*, "to guide" (hence "guy"), and *Arde* from the Latin *ardeo*, to burn (hence "ardent"), to suggest together the predominance of the principle of fire (Apollo, the sun) rather than water (Dionysius, the fluid principle) as the guide through the confrontation with Nature, which every day would build on the victories already won ("Each following day/Became the next day's master..."). Yet the ultimate aim of the war with France would be, as in HV, not tyranny but peace. Norfolk has more to say:

Norfolk Their dwarfish pages were
 As cherubinds, all gilt; the madams too,
 Not used to toil, did almost sweat to bear
 The pride upon them, that their very labor
 Was to them as a painting.

Norfolk is an aspect of Apollo, as representing the unseen world, wherein resides the libido, as idea. These "pages" symbolise, as throughout FF, its vector of the written word (the source of

Norfolk's power, albeit corrupt, as subject to an Apollonist lens), here glowing like the gold held up to the sun. The Goddess has been rediscovered in Her glory, though Her depth is invested in reflected light, as ever in FF. One miraculous play has been followed by another: "Now this masque/Was cried incomparable; and th'ensuing night/Made it a fool and beggar" (28).

Abergavenny is from Wales, which through the plays symbolises communion with the Goddess in consciousness, with dissolution of left-brain reason. He, Norfolk, and Buckingham (the unconscious), recognise that it is Wolsey (the left-brain) who ordered the wondrous spectacle in France (the Goddess in toto), and emphatically state their antipathy to him. Shakespeare recognises that he has lost (or never tried to find) an aspect of the rounded inner life in his great left-brain dominant adventure in London:

Abergavenny I do know

Kinsmen of mine, three at the least, that have
By this so sickened their estates that never
They shall abound as formerly.

Sequent to this triumph of the imagination is the storm of (ana-) lysis, precisely cognate with the storms in RIII and TT, as symbolising the action of the intellect on the objective world:

Buckingham Every man,

After the hideous storm that followed, was
A thing inspired, and, not consulting, broke
Into a general prophecy - that this tempest,
Dashing the garment of this peace, aboded
The sudden breach on't.

Norfolk Which is budded out;

For France hath flawed the league, and hath attached
Our merchant's goods at Bordeaux.

The storm referred to here must have followed the first "charge

⁵ Oswald Spengler, *The Decline of the West*.

of the Boar", of the muted kind, which would have struck Shakespeare early in his London phase, to prove to him that his miraculous healing had been finally incomplete. Poetically, the lines above mean that the peace gained by Apollonist analysis of the objective world could never have been complete, as detracted from by the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen in negative aspect lurking, in the unconscious, at the bottom of every Platonic Idea. At this point, of his pending divorce from his creative life (as King Henry's from Queen Katherine) Shakespeare's unconscious as ever is jostling with his creative reason (like Caliban and Prospero) for dominance; but the latter is as yet in control. He struggles, at this point of crisis, to maintain the control of the visual imagination, to prevent idea from declining into will:

Buckingham He's [Wolsey] gone to th'King.

I'll follow, and outstare him.

Norfolk Stay, my lord,

And let your reason with your choler question

What 'tis you go about. To climb steep hills

Requires slow pace at first. Anger is like

A full hot horse, who being allowed his way,

Self-mettle tires him. Not a man in England

Can advise me like you: be to yourself

As you would to your friend.

This is an explicit identification of Buckingham with the rising libido: the horse and rider being symbolic, as always in the plays (e.g. LLL IV, I, i), of the libido in action, the source being Socrates' metaphor in Plato's *Phaedrus*.

The relationship between reason and Nature is allegorised as a treaty between King Henry and the Emperor Charles of France, nephew of Queen Katherine (Queen of Hell-Grail Queen). Charles is also the Christian name of Suffolk (V, i, 59), and he and his homonyms represent throughout the plays the *ithyphallos* (e.g. Charles the wrestler in *As You Like It*). Charles visits England to warn Wolsey, who controls state policy towards France, of a threat to him (Charles) from the peace between the two countries; he pays off Wolsey in gold (*ithyphallos* depowered by Hermetic magic)

to retain the terms of the league. Charles promptly breaks his promise. In other words, Shakespeare (King Henry) tries to suppress the threat from Nature (Emperor Charles) by temporal expedients of reason (Wolsey); but to no avail, as Schopenhauer predicts: "A man can do as he will, but not will as he will"; as well as Jung:

The "supraordinate personality" is the total man, i.e., man as he really is, not as he appears to himself. To this wholeness the unconscious psyche also belongs, which has its requirements and needs just as consciousness has... I understand the unconscious rather as an impersonal psyche common to all men... When anyone breathes, his breathing is not a phenomenon to be interpreted personally. The mythological images belong to the structure of the unconscious and are an impersonal possession; in fact, the great majority of men are far more possessed by them than possessing them.⁴

Kore (Persephone), an aspect of Whom is the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen (for Kore spent part of the year in the realm of Dis), will appear incarnate in scene ii as Queen Katherine, who will urge to King Henry the malfeasance of the Cardinal. Meanwhile, for the suffering ego, in this recapitulation of its inveterate problem, nothing has changed:

Sergeant Sir,
My lord the Duke of Buckingham, and Earl
Of Hereford, Stafford, and Northhampton, I
Arrest thee of high treason, in the name
Of our most sovereign King.
[...]

Brandon ...'Tis his highness' pleasure
You shall to the Tower.

We recall that the Earldom of Hereford belongs to the House of Lancaster, the Red Rose faction, which in the symbolic language of the histories represents the Goddess-aspect of the psyche, or the anima, or the functional right hemisphere, the side of intuition,

feeling, music, sensuality, and so on. This title was denied to Buckingham by King Richard (negative libido) in the early stages of his metamorphosis into Richmond (libido as idea, courtesy of the Gnostic written word, and now divested of its negativity), which symbolic assertion of the conscious mind over the subconscious represented the turning-point of the play. It is clear, however, that the healing was incomplete; that Buckingham still lives, and the anima is confined to the unconscious under the influence of Puritanism in its malignant, negative aspect as Ugly Dick. Buckingham knows that his fate is sealed when his four confederates, including “A monk o’th’Chartreux” have been arrested and confined to the Tower.

Here is an odd exchange:

Buckingham So,so;

These are the limbs o’th’plot: no more, I hope.

Brandon A monk o’th’Chartreux

Buckingham O, Michael Hopkins?

This is exactly as per the First Folio, whose extraordinary accuracy will be demonstrated time and time again in these pages (O excellent compositor!). There are two oddities here: the “O” seems faux-naïf; and the monk is explicitly named later, following Holinshed, as Nicholas Hopkins (Henton). This is in truth a semaphore to the alert reader that the character of Hopkins is not as he seems: for the words “zero” (the letter “O”) and “cipher” share a common derivation from the Arabic *sifre*, “empty”: a cipher serving to point to a meaning, but having no meaning in itself. Thus was the letter “O” commonly understood in the Elizabethan era (hence the description of the Globe Theatre as the “world ‘O’”). Chartreux is a region of France, and the liquor Chartreuse is green, the colour of Ireland, which throughout the sequence symbolises the unconscious, as does drunkenness possession by the libido (e.g. Stephano-Trinculo-Caliban in TT). Hopkins/Henton therefore is a cipher for the libido in negative aspect, the power of which to shatter the conscious ego resides in its persistence undiminished in the unconscious (Hopkins/Henton as Buckingham’s Rasputin). The King’s elimination of this clique is cognate with Prospero’s victory

over Alonso-Antonio-Sebastian and Caliban in TT: both representing Shakespeare's victory over the Boar at the close of his career.

Shakespeare's recovery after the coup of 1587 depended on the ascendancy in his ego of Culture over City (Puritanism), as given him by Sir Francis Bacon. Yet this culture had a distinctly Apollonist-Classical character, as reflecting the mind of Bacon, who had taken for his personal muse the Greek Goddess Athena. (Hence the Latin of Campeius and Evans: see above). The essence of Apollonism is its enshrining of the visual dimension as the final reference, which must set the the Apollonist ego at odds with the invisible world, of which the blind libido is an aspect (hence the depiction of the love Goddess Aphrodite as a courtesan in Classical Greece, and the absence of this aspect in Athena, who was the Goddess as Maiden-Queen of Hell⁵), - and vulnerable to it. This was demonstrated par excellence in the inner life of Shakespeare, whose Apollonist meditations (city of Troy in T&C) were continually being shattered by the re-irruption of libido (Achilles in T&C), to stimulate creativity as a remedy (Ajax in T&C). Upon the exhausting of the soil that he and Bacon had tilled so tenaciously and inventively for so long (character of Sands), this cycle had to be broken: and both HVIII and TT record how this was achieved.

ii

The Buckingham faction has been neutralised; and only Norfolk (libido as idea) persists into this second scene: for this is a triumph of idea over will (cf. Prospero's delivering of the ship's company onto his isle, and Ariel's enchantment of them). Shakespeare will describe, in this scene, how he allowed the Queen of Hell (Katherine) to rise into consciousness as the key to his meditative healing, to throw into relief his intensely visual contemplations as the cause of his troubles. This London mode will begin to be thrown off (impeachment of Wolsey); yet it is only through this mode (based on intense visualisation) that it can be achieved (Wolsey's insisting on taking the credit for the new peace between the King and the people (the will), the restlessness of whom he was in fact the cause: 103-7). Schopenhauer would have approved (and perhaps was influenced by) Henry's receptiveness to the Goddess,

whose rejection as Queen Margaret by the ego in RIII resulted ultimately in its eclipse:

King Henry Arise, and take place by us. Half your suit
 Never name to us: you have half our power.
 The other moiety ere you ask is given.
 Repeat your will, and take it.

Queen Katherine Thank your majesty.
 That you would love yourself [...] is the point
 Of my petition.

The inveterate hatred of the Self, - which Jung defined as the supraordinate personality, to be distinguished from the (conscious) ego which is a subset of it, - must cease. Although Lovell ("love-hell"), who symbolises the torment that Shakespeare felt after erotic activity, speaks not word in this scene, consistently and significantly he is present all the time: for his principle has been evoked by the irruption of libido from the unconscious (Buckingham-Hopkins). The Queen's petition is on behalf of the (Dionysian) people who are suffering under the crippling weight of taxation levied by Wolsey. Consistently, Norfolk, who symbolises the Dionysian world as idea, speaks on their behalf: " ...upon these taxations" (30-7). The meditating ego is now through Scylla and Charybdis, to a region beyond good and evil; the dragon if not yet slain is at least drugged, and the Goddess set free:

Queen Katherine I am much too venturous
 In tempting of your patience, but am boldened
 Under your promised pardon.

The unconscious for the first time is being considered objectively, in its positive and negative aspects:

King Henry It grieves many.
 The gentleman is learned, and a most rare speaker,
 To nature none more bound; his training such
 That he may furnish and instruct great teachers,
 And never seek for aid out of himself. Yet see,
 When these so noble benefits shall prove

Not well disposed, the mind growing once corrupt,
They turn to vicious forms, ten times more ugly
Than ever they were fair...

- For the unconscious is a constitutive part of the human psyche, and not inherently bad in itself. "The mind growing once corrupt" refers to the sickness induced by repudiation of the invisible world, to cast the contents of the unconscious in negative aspect.

The Goddess of the Invisible World naturally would vehemently defend the unconscious: "Take good heed/You charge not in your spleen a noble person...". Buckingham's Surveyor is named as Charles Knevet in Holinshed: another Charles, and another representative of the ithyphallic principle. It is the physical presence of an ithyphallos which points to the guilt of the unconscious (Surveyor informing against Buckingham). The Lovell principle of anguish is a function of the nobility of the ego (cf. Stephane Mallarmé's great sonnet *Angoisse*); the Wolsey principle the intellect in action: and both would be sabotaged if the ego were to dissolve in the unconscious, with surrender to eros: the "love-hell" being swamped by the passing joy of the *petit-mort*:

Surveyor He [Buckingham] answered, "Tush,
It can do me no damage", adding further
That, had the King in his last sickness failed,
The Cardinal's and Sir Thomas Lovell's heads
Should have gone off.

What is this protracted business about Buckingham's knife? The blade is symbolic here, as always in the plays, of the "I" principle. The King's murder by Buckingham would represent the transformation by knowledge of that principle, of the ego that had thought to have conquered it (cf. especially the murder of Julius Caesar; also the death of Juliet; the many blade-murders in TST (Appendix 1); and so on, &c).

iii

The next scene will portray an episode of meditation in which Shakespeare imagines a successful, glorious reunion with Anne

Hathaway in Stratford. First, though, he determines in this scene that things must change. It opens with the Lords Sands and Chamberlain regretting the change that has been wrought in recent travellers to France, with Lovell, who has never left the stage, in the background. Ted Hughes has argued compellingly, from the evidence of four sonnets and the tradition of his walking stick, for Shakespeare's lameness (yet this not the whole story: see Epilogue). In this light, the following lines can only be autobiographical:

Sands They have all new legs, and lame ones. One would take it,
 That never see'em pace before, the spavin
 Or springhalt reigned among 'em.

The spavin and the springhalt are both diseases of horses causing lameness (they are not mentioned in Holinshed). Certain apparently gratuitous lines in TWT may be adduced in further support of the theory:

Camillo I very well agree with you in the hopes of him. It is a gallant child - one that indeed physics the subject, makes old hearts fresh. They that went on crutches
ere he was born desire yet their life to see him a man.
Archidamus Would they else be content to die?
Camillo Yes - if there were no other excuse why they should desire to live.
Archidamus If the king had no son, they would desire to live on crutches till he had one.

It follows, then, that the rest of this scene is autobiographical; wherein Shakespeare in his London period appears as grandiose ("...you would swear directly/Their very noses had been counsellors/To Pepin or Clotharius, they keep state so"), a dandy ("That fill the court with quarrels, talk, and tailors"), and prickly ("Abusing better men than they can be"). The metaphor of tennis,

⁶ Barbara Thiering, *Jesus the Man*.

⁷ Oswald Spengler, *ibid.*.

as the dialogue of the Hermetic nous with Nature, is reprised from HV I, i.

Sands is the Lord Chamberlain in Holinshed; but they are distinguished as two characters in the play, the former to represent the desert of Shakespeare's creativity at the close of his great work, the latter the principle of suppression, which had striven to keep the Boar at bay, through intense activity of the reasoning mind. Hence will Norfolk-Suffolk leave the Lord Chamberlain to interrupt the King at his desk (cf. approach of the ship in TT; assault of Achilles in T&C). The symbolic equivalent of Lord Chamberlain is obvious. The duty of this office was, until its abolition in 1964, to censor public art, including the stage; and the Suffolk and Norfolk principles have been blocked from entering the stage of the ego's mind, to remain in the subconscious. Lovell moves forward to announce a proclamation from the King that the travellers are to abandon the habits and practices they adopted in France (the Goddess in toto, inadequately engaged). The "love-hell" has therefore decided the issue: for the prior appearance of Sands has driven home the realisation that there can be no going back; and the way ahead, to Stratford, is now clear. Some idea of the nature of Shakespeare's love-life in London can be gained from the following:

Lovell	They must either, For so run the conditions, leave those remnants Of fool and feather that they got in France... Or pack to their old playfellows. There, I take it, They may, cum privilegio, "oui" away The lag end of their lewdness, and be laughed at.
Sands	'Tis time to give 'em physic, their diseases Are grown so catching.

- And so on. The last two sonnets, as Ted Hughes has pointed out, suggest powerfully that Shakespeare had at some stage contracted venereal disease (I will argue, in the Epilogue, that the Dark Lady sonnets were written by Shakespeare, the remainder by Bacon). That supposition is supported by the lines of Sands. One recalls also the sonnet "The expense of spirit in a waste of shame";

and the following striking lines which Surrey addresses to Wolsey (KHVIII, III, ii, 294):

Surrey I'll startle you
 Worse than the sacring bell, when the brown wench
 Lay kissing in your arms, lord Cardinal.

The "brown wench" is therefore likely to be the "Dark Lady" of the sonnets; and Surrey's lines would seem to record a personal experience of Shakespeare's, still vivid in the memory. Further, II, ii, (see below) suggests that auto-erotism was still for the adult Shakespeare an habitual form of erotic expression. A clear picture is emerging of an artist who was tormented by Eros, - for Whose ministrations he yet had a great need, - and who thus found himself in thrall to a cycle of compulsive lust and shame.

Sands, as the desert, recognises Wolsey as his antithesis, to recall the same technique of the reiteration of "may" and "marry" to evoke the Queen of Hell in RIII, I, iii, and by Nym in HV II, i :

Sands He may, my lord; has wherewithal: in him
 Sparing would show a worse sin than ill doctrine.

For it is similarly the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen of the Gnostic tradition (Katherine) Who, withheld from the ego in the unconscious, or irrupting into it through Her Consort/Son the Boar, has been the driving force of Shakespeare's (King Henry's) creativity (T&C), and who must now be relinquished. The creativity, balm to an injured ego, can now not continue; and neither must the scholarliness (Hector in T&C), with its sequela of the "charge of the Boar".

iv

The banquet scene is described in Holinshed; but Anne's presence there, and her partnership with the King, are not. This scene allegorises a dream had by Shakespeare of his reunion with his wife, with a beautiful reference to Marlowe's magical poem *The Passionate Shepherd to His Love*.

The turning point of the scene, and the play, occurs when

Cardinal Wolsey recognises amongst a group of travelling players, speaking French and dressed as shepherds (the Dionysius principle), one greater than himself:

Wolsey There should be one amongst 'em, by his person,
 More worthy this place than myself, to whom,
 If I but knew him, with my love and duty
 I would surrender it.

For that one is the King himself, who will take up Anne Bullen (Hathaway) for a dance. Shakespeare at first expresses clearly the point of the meditation, that the love-hell of his now uncreative self should be expunged and replaced by a natural, easy familiarity with the Goddess:

Lovell O that your lordship were but now confessor
 To one or two of these [the ladies]!
Sands I would I were;
 They should find easy penance.

He recalls the madness of his uncreative life before he left Stratford:

Sands If I chance to talk a little wild, forgive me;
 I had it from my father.
Anne Was he mad, sir?
Sands O, very mad, exceeding mad, in love too;
 But he would bite none. Just as I do now,
 He would kiss you twenty with a breath.

- Which is irreproachable behaviour in the context of a banquet, but not a marriage. An essential (Puritan) frigidity on Shakespeare's part in the earlier Stratford phase of his marriage is to be inferred. It is the recognition of the inherent divinity of Woman that will transform Her from a *ianus diaboli* to a *ianus deo*. As Joseph Campbell put it: "The demon conquered becomes a god":

Sands The red wine first must rise

In their fair cheeks, my lord; then we shall have 'em
Talk us to silence.

Drunkenness symbolises always in FF the state of dissolution in libido. The wine reddening the ladies' cheeks means that the unseen world is being beheld by the gazer: that they are, in truth, Grail Queens. Their volubility of the ladies signifies that unseen world is speaking to the ego, and is to be contrasted with the silences of Hippolyta, Hero, and Cordelia.

ACT II

i

Buckingham's apologia for his life and actions is enormously expanded from Holinshed, and conveys a sense of his extreme nobility: for the invisible world is, as it is the great task of the First Folio to confirm, the inviolable substrate of all phenomena whatsoever, and not at all to be repudiated or ignored or in any way denied. Just so is the unconscious, wherein resides the libido, the constitutive basis of the psyche, as it was the life's work of Carl Jung to affirm; and just so was Jesus Christ in truth the husband of Mary Magdalene, himself born "on the wrong side of the sheets", in defiance of the strict Essene marital code.⁶ The commons represent, as always in the plays, the raw will, property of Man-as-sublimated-animal, or Dionysian or Falstaffian Man; and their support of Buckingham is entirely consistent with the allegory.

Western culture at its peak is, like all great cultures, Faustian in essence, ever striving to seek explanations of the visible world in terms of the underworld,⁷ which reduces to the living cell, ultimately the atom, basis of all life whatsoever. The knowledge of visible forms gained therefrom is an attribute of the Divine, as expressed by the well-known axiom from the mediaeval Book of the Twenty-Four Philosophers: "God is an infinite sphere whose centre is everywhere and circumference nowhere". The fleur du mal in essence differs, to the divine eye, not one jot from the fleur du bon. Thus does Miranda affirm: "I should sin/To think but nobly of my grandmother:/Good wombs have borne bad sons." (TT I, ii, 117); and thus does Buckingham forgive: "I forgive

all./There cannot be those numberless offences/'Gainst me that I cannot take peace with" (83).

Holinshed has Buckingham meeting Sir Nicholas Vaux after a journey on the Thames; but in the play Vaux is to convey him in his boat. The river of course stands here for the Styx; and Bacon-Shakespeare's variation from the source is intended to identify Vaux with Charon. Vaux' Christian name serves to identify him with Nicholas Hopkins as representing the principle of libido, which indeed would serve, though not finally Hermetic in nature, to take the conscious ego into the realms of the invisible world. The Buckingham principle is not dying, but going home.

The facts of Buckingham's family history (101-136) as given by Holinshed, provide a beautiful fit to the plane of allegory. His father's betrayal to Richard the Third by his servant Banister, and his peremptory beheading, conveys a sense of the young Shakespeare's "o'er-hasty" recovery: Sir Francis Bacon's therapy being compared, perhaps, to a miraculous operation to remove a cancer, which yet leaves the diseased lymph nodes untouched: the deficiency lying in an overly Classical approach. The name "Banister" irresistibly suggests a staircase over which a body might fall, the effect being to suggest the suddenness of the demise of Buckingham père. The restoration of Buckingham fils under Henry the Seventh (Prospero on his isle, in the years preceeding TT) would represent, under this scheme, the re-irruption of libido in negative aspect into the ego of Shakespeare in scholar phase (approach of ship in TT; threat of Achilles in T&C). Now the negative contents of the unconscious will be effectively dealt with in this final act of Shakespeare-as-magus (Henry the Eighth; the Prospero of TT). The length and general tenor of this final speech of Buckingham's suggests that Bacon or Shakespeare certainly wrote it for this purpose. Now the false Queen of Hell, sovereign of the problematic unconscious, will be extirpated: "The Cardinal/Will have his will, and she must fall", - to be replaced by the true She (old lady servant to Anne Bullen sc. Hathaway).

First Gentleman 'Tis the Cardinal;
And merely to revenge him on the Emperor

For not bestowing on him at his asking
The archbishopric of Toledo, this is purposed.

For Spain is the birthplace of Queen Katherine, and in the symbolic language of HVIII represents the underworld. The "I" principle (Emperor Charles) would have had the capacity to bestow on scholarly-mode Shakespeare (Wolsey) a mastery of the invisible world, but was denied.

ii

Now comes the scene described above; but in contrast to every other troublesome intrusion of Eros into his creative contemplation in the past, this will mark the beginning of the end for the Ugly Dick principle, Her hitherto inseparable Consort/Son (albeit, as the Boar charging into a net of Hermetic meditation, now capable of injury, not death: there was only one crucifixion, as represented in RIII III, iv). Immediately before the drawing aside of the curtain on the King's meditation by Suffolk and Norfolk ("I" principle as will and idea respectively), Lord Chamberlain will part company with them. This illustrates clearly the principle of psychic suppression which he represents, as an analogue of the censor of the London stage. The scene opens with him reading a note that the horses he sent for from the north have been withheld by order of Wolsey. The horse is symbolic here, as always, of the libido, which was intended, as per usual, to be repressed by the Lord Chamberlain principle, but now intrudes on scholarly-mode Shakespeare, as will directly be amplified. The absence of this episode from Holinshed is a scepticidal agent of great potency. Now Ixion has loosed himself from the grip of the wheel of lust and shame, and is moving toward its centre.

Norfolk For, now he [Wolsey] has cracked the league
 Between us and the Emporer, the Queen's great
nephew,

 He dives into the King's soul and there scatters
 Dangers, doubts, wringing of the conscience,
 Fears, and despairs - and all of these for his marriage.

- For the “I” principle represented in the written word (Emperor Charles) has resonated with the similar principle in the reader’s unconscious, to bring it into consciousness (Suffolk-Norfolk), as a “charge of the Boar”, the pain of which is registered in: “Dangers, doubts...” Yet the danger is, as of old, that he will simply substitute for his dominance by the Queen of Hell a marriage to the projection of Woman as spiritualised rather than embodied (the Princess of Alençon, sister of Charles), to begin the whole cycle again:

Lord Chamberlain All that dare
 Look into these affairs see this main end,
 The French King’s sister.

The left-brain’s pre-eminent role as the instigator of Shakespeare’s creativity, and the means of dealing with his troublesome unconscious, is emphasised:

Norfolk We had need pray,
 And heartily, for our deliverance,
 Or this imperious man [Wolsey] will work us all
 From princes into pages.

- The “pages” representing here, as always in the plays, the vectors of the printed or written word. Now Eros intrudes on the ego:

Norfolk Our breach of duty this way
 Is business of estate, in which we come
 To know your royal pleasure.

The words “breach” (sc. “breech), “estate” and “pleasure”, along with Suffolk’s “so I’ll stand”, “please” and “proud” 15 lines earlier, suggest unambiguously the physical change that has come upon Shakespeare at his desk, and the choice that is as ever being offered. The outcome now is different, however, for Wolsey (“quiet of my wounded conscience”) enters, along with Cardinal Campeius, who represents the Gnostic tradition, on which

Shakespeare's creative life has been built (cf. Evans' Latin lessons to William in MWW IV, i: the Latin language standing for that tradition ("Rome, the nurse of judgement,/Invited by your noble self, hath sent/Our general tongue unto us, this good man..." - Wolsey, II, ii, 92)); and Eros disappears, the temptation resisted :

King Henry [to Norfolk and Suffolk] We are busy. Go.

The corresponding time in TT is approximately Prospero's summoning of Ariel to bring the ship to ground on the isle; in the life, to Shakespeare's opening of the book(s) which will enable him finally to heal his inveterate pain, and adapt to his new life. It is highly significant that King Henry welcomes Campeius "once more" (97): for his principle has been ever present when Prospero has been at his books, which was the greater part of Shakespeare's time in London. Now it will be put to a different purpose, however: finally to kill the Boar, and hang its grisly tusked head in the trophy-room of his mind. This is the point of Gardiner as the King's new secretary, for he represents Ariel (illumination, wisdom) at her last task (since the Holy Spirit is properly female, not male): Bacon-Shakespeare taking, as often, the raw facts from Holinshed and adapting them to the purpose. The entry of Gardiner is precisely choreographed, a short speech of Wolsey intermitting the King's two requests to see his new secretary: for insight and wisdom is being derived through the action of reason on the written word. King Henry now takes Gardiner aside, and they converse in whispers as Wolsey and Campeius hold the stage. The playwright has used this technique before, in JC V, i, where Brutus and Lucilius talk apart, Cassius and Messala openly, the purpose being to identify the two pairs: and so here, where the communication of the ego with the Holy Spirit is also that of the faculty of reason with written word. The former secretary was Doctor Pace, who represents... what, exactly?

Wolsey He was a fool,
 For he would needs be virtuous...

The "fool" gives the key. The Doctor represents the general wisdom and learning of Shakespeare's London phase, whose aim

was always virtue, but which was continually deliquescing into (fool-phase) libido, with its sequelae of communion with a tart, or auto-erotism, and always the “love hell”. Doctor Pace is the wisdom of Hector in T&C, with the Gardiner principle as yet nowhere in sight: for the events of HVIII and TT were as yet many years off.

iii

Anne Bullen (Hathaway) will in this scene begin to metamorphose from a *ianus diaboli* to a symbol of Woman as *ianus deo*. It is another representation of an act of meditation, with Anne stilled as a Platonic Idea to allow the will, or unseen world, personified in an old woman (Queen of Hell divested of negative mantle), to suffuse and shine out of her. Thus will the Goddess of Love be divorced from associations of guilt. Her anima-image in the suffering ego however is as yet at odds with the unseen world (Anne’s rebuttal of the old lady’s persuasions that she should become Queen). This new Goddess – Anne Hathaway as embraced again by her husband – is explicitly identified with Isis, the greatest of all Great Goddesses of the ancient world, as Apuleius remarks in TGA, which certainly must have played an important role in Shakespeare’s final transformation (see explication of TT IV, i):

Old Lady There was a lady once – ‘tis an old story –
That would not be a queen, that would she not,
For all the mud in Egypt.

The appearance of the phoenix in V, v, 40, will continue the Egyptian Hermetic symbolism, which is central to the Rosicrucian/Masonic tradition (cf. TT III, iii, 21-4). Why is it the Lord Chamberlain who announces to Anne that Henry will create her Marchioness of Pembroke? This is to emphasise that the “I” principle as both will and idea (Suffolk and Norfolk) has been suppressed, its temptation finally resisted, to allow the meditating ego to proceed on its way to transformation. The new dispensation is certain to continue to grow, but is as yet in its early stages, for Anne is not yet a duchess, still less a queen, and the negative Queen of Hell remains active in the unconscious:

Old Lady By this time

I know your back will bear a duchess. Say,
Are you not stronger than you were?

Anne ...The Queen is comfortless, and we forgetful
In our long absence. Pray do not deliver
What here you've heard to her.

Old Lady What do you think me?

This last line is a beautifully adroit segue into the next scene, when she indeed will be thought of: for Queen Katherine (or rather, the relationship between her and King Henry), with whom the old lady is cognate, although in a positive rather than negative sense, will be put on trial by the reasoning ego.

iv

This scene continues to follow closely the account given in Holinshed, which provides a beautiful fit to the transformation taking place. Shakespeare is here in the process of eliminating the Queen of Hell (Goddess of the Invisible World) of his London phase, from his unconscious, under the aegis of the written word. Queen Katherine is drawn sympathetically, for the Goddess as Witch is not essentially bad (cf. the witch-mother Mary Poppins), only the misconception of Her by the diseased superego. She is intensely hostile to Wolsey, for London-phase Shakespeare has sought to keep her suppressed by force of Apollonist Classical reason. Her opprobrium of Wolsey sorts beautifully with the London-phase Shakespeare described in I, iii:

Queen Katherine ... but your heart
Is crammed with arrogancy, spleen and pride...

- And so she continues. The ego now arrives at the principal underlying cause of its suffering. King Henry gives the reason for his pursuance of a divorce from Katherine. He explains that his conscience felt a "prick" at certain speeches by the Bishop of Bayonne who had been sent to debate a marriage between Princess Mary, their daughter, and the Duke of Orleans. However

in the course of the business he requested to withdraw, to determine whether Mary was legitimate. This respite, Henry explains, “shook/ The bosom of my conscience, entered me,/Yea, with a spitting power, and made to tremble the region of my breast...” (there is a quantum leap from the effect described in Holinshed to this coup). He thereupon thought that heaven had determined to deny him a male heir; and a consequent fear for the future of his kingdom pressed him to seek a divorce from Katherine.

The word “prick” gives the key, as does the name of the Bishop: for “Bayonne” can only refer to the town associated with the bayonet. Princess Mary is yet another incarnation of the Goddess as gateway-to-the-devil, and the anxiety described here by King Henry is thus essentially identical to the effect produced by the irruption of Suffolk and Norfolk on his contemplation in II, ii, and with the neurotic terror felt by King Richard after the beheading of Hastings, who symbolises the last remnants of reason in the suffering ego, in RIII, in that first appearance of the “Shakespearean moment”.

It is of the highest importance to realise that the male child referred to here, apparently cursed by God, refers to the “I” principle, as given explicitly by Bacon-Shakespeare in V, i, 164-6 (see below). Its blasting by God refers to the guilt associated with it, courtesy of Shakespeare’s constitutively (at least until the transformation represented in this play) Puritan superego. The male child (as mistakenly understood by the King, in an otherwise pointless piece of dialogue) of Anne Bullen will however represent this principle born anew, into freedom from anathematisation by Christian puritanism.

ACT III

i

In this scene the meditating ego will work on the negative Queen of Hell, at first with difficulty (Queen Katherine’s intractability to Wolsey and Campeius), later with success (Katherine’s agreement: “Pray do my service to his majesty;/He has my heart yet, and shall have my prayers/While I shall have my life”: 179-82). The song played for the Queen – the famous “Orpheus with his lute” – is

cognate precisely with the tune played by Ariel to bend Stephano-Trinculo-Caliban (ithyphallos, fool, libido) to her will in TT III, ii. Holinshed is still followed closely, often literally.

ii

This last observation is of the highest importance for determination of the authorship of HVIII. With the present scene we return to the point of view of the milieu intérieur, from which only one conclusion can be drawn, that it was written by Shakespeare alone. Immediately there is a quantum jump in wit and liveliness, to overshadow the previous scene, along with much of the rest, which generally is pedestrian and uninspired, the simple transliteration of numerous passages from Holinshed suggesting an artist inchoate and relatively jejune. It is inconceivable that either Bacon or Shakespeare could have written them; and the most plausible theory would seem to be the commonly held one, that their author was the young Fletcher, then at the very outset of a notable career. To the mass of evidence produced in support of this theory can now be added the explication of the allegory in HVIII. The sense of decisiveness in Shakespeare's laying down of his books as described in TT, and the depth of his psychic transformation, would suggest that he could not possibly have returned to his previous life of complete commitment, and that he made a special effort to pass on the torch to a young successor, sharing the burden with him. This would suggest that the plays of Fletcher should be examined for possible cryptographic content. There is no evidence as yet in HVIII of the high style of Bacon, which is beautifully exemplified by a cameo speech in TT (II, i, 110):

Francisco Sir, he may live:
 I saw him beat the envious surges under him,
And ride upon their backs: he trod the water,
 Whose enmity he flung aside, and breasted
 The surge most swoln that met him...

- Francisco representing, as I will show in the relevant chapter, none other than Bacon himself, his influence recollected by Shakespeare at this time of parting from him forever.

The previous scene has shown the power of Hermetic meditation to effect the transformation required (appeasement of Queen Katherine); yet that discipline must be thrown off: this is the last magic of Ariel's glorious career. Thus will the Wolsey/Campeius principle be repudiated by the ego (King Henry). We are now in Shakespeare's mind, with the "I" principle as will and idea (Suffolk and Norfolk) still repressed (Lord Chamberlain) in the unconscious (Surrey, son-in-law of Buckingham), as the higher mentation continues. Stephano-Trinculo-Caliban and the ship's company are in thrall to Ariel, as Prospero studies in his cell. The repression is in the first stages of being lifted:

Lord Chamberlain What we can do to him [Wolsey] – though
 now the time

 Gives way to us – I much fear...

Norfolk O, fear him not...

The incriminating letters of Wolsey (30), and the inventory of his dishonestly acquired wealth (201), both represent, of course, the printed page, object of London-phase Shakespeare's scholarly attention as of old, which he is about to renounce. Campeius has returned to Rome (books laid down as meditation continues), as the Cranmer principle shows over the horizon:

Suffolk He has returned in his opinions, which
 Have satisfied the king for his divorce,
 Together with all famous colleges
 Almost in Christendom.

Cranmer represents the Stratford-phase ego (of Shakespeare returned to his family) in easy communion with his unconscious (Surrey) and its contents, now stripped of negativity (Suffolk-Norfolk), as distinct from Shakespeare's Troy-phase ego (as allegorised in T&C), or King Henry at his desk, which was forever defending a fragile wall: "How dare you thrust yourselves/Into my private meditations" (II, ii, 64). The name lent itself

⁸ Robert Graves, *The White Goddess*.

beautifully to this adaptation: “cran”, a basket (e.g. of fish), and “mer”, the sea (e.g. the French mer), mythic symbol of the unconscious since time immemorial. Shakespeare would now become a Fisher King, a true Gnostic Christ or priest of Osiris: hence the intense Hermetic symbolism of the last great speech (V, v, 15 ff.) and the unicorn-phoenix symbolism in TT (III, iii, 21). This illustrates nicely how Shakespeare and Bacon used, in obedience to the axiom “Form is the barrier that brings creativity to birth”, the unavoidably prominent characters and incidents in the sources to illustrate aspects of the theme that may otherwise have remained hidden. HVIII and TT are both subsets of the whole: but the characters in the former of Campeius, Gardiner, Cranmer, Cromwell, and so on, allowed the playwright fill out, and bring to a higher level of sophistication, an otherwise barely limned scenario. Wolsey’s man Cromwell, who would remain in the King’s favour after the demise of his master, must represent the faculty of the visual imagination, which Shakespeare retained in his Stratford phase after his other Troy-phase features had been abandoned.

Troy-phase Shakespeare is at his books after the Boar has charged (approach of ship to Prospero’s isle), possessed, as always in this circumstance, by the love-hell; but now he is all self-awareness and insight (Gardiner principle), and sees the problems inherent in his Classical mode of reasoning (Wolsey principle):

Enter the King, reading of a schedule, and Lovell
Suffolk The King! the King!
King Henry What piles of wealth hath he accumulated
 To his own portion! And what expense by th’hour
 Seems to flow from him! How, i’t’h name of thrift,
 Does he rake this together?

- Where the schedule represents, of course, the printed page, object of Shakespeare’s attention. Finally, the reasoning ego identifies the love-hell with his Troy-phase strivings, and purposes

⁹ See the memorable discussion of the symbolism of the Odyssey by Joseph Campbell in his *Occidental Mythology*.

to eliminate them:

The King takes his seat, whispers Lovell, who goes to the Cardinal
[...]

King Henry Read o'er this,
 (he gives him papers)
 And after, this; and then to breakfast with
 What appetite you have.

Exit King, frowning upon the Cardinal...

The precision of this choreography, - its utter congruence with the plane of allegory, - is a scepticidal agent of great potency. Ariel's task is almost done: "Nay then, farewell!" (Wolsey, 222). Lines 1-210 can only have been written by Shakespeare. Now Fletcher takes over, with more simple transliteration of Holinshed, in the episode of the nobles' confrontation with Cromwell (victory of unconscious, with its contents of "I" principle as will and idea, over Troy-phase mentation which had sought to deny them: Surrey, Suffolk, and Norfolk principles respectively). The principle of repression will die with the Wolsey principle:

Lord Chamberlain ...My heart weeps to see him [Wolsey]
 So little of his great self.

Surrey I forgive him.

- Which reply is a reprise of his father-in-law's "I forgive all" (II, i, 83): Surrey and Buckingham representing the same principle of the unconscious, even the collective unconscious, the centre of the human psyche, to which the epicentre, if you like, is the "centre" in the famous mediaeval axiom "God is an infinite sphere whose centre is everywhere and circumference nowhere": God, whose attribute is forgiveness.

There are, however, two beautiful touches which suggest the guiding hand of Shakespeare. Surrey's "I'll startle you/Worse than the sacring bell, when the brown wench/Lay kissing in your arms, lord Cardinal" most plausibly refers to the Dark Lady of the sonnets; and Cromwell's entry in a state of speechless amazement at Wolsey's valediction, beautifully represents the rapture of the

meditating ego to the wordless imagination, the dream-consciousness of Dionysian Man (cf. the King's shepherd disguise in I, iv) which will characterise Shakespeare's mentation in his (second) Stratford phase.

ACT IV

i

The "I" principle as will and idea has risen from the ashes of Ugly Dick (preferment of Suffolk and Norfolk). Now he will be able to surrender to the blind libido in the arms of his wife Anne née Hathaway. Shakespeare emphasises once again that this has been achieved through the written word: "You may read the rest" (19). What has happened to his Troy-phase Queen of Hell (now the Princess Dowager), of whom Eros is an aspect?

First Gentleman That I can tell you too. The Archbishop
 Of Canterbury, accompanied with other
 Learned and reverend fathers of his order,
 Held a late court at Dunstable, six miles off
 From Ampthill, where the Princess lay; to which
 She was often cited by them, but appeared not.

Shakespeare retained this episode intact from Holinshed, as beautifully adaptable, without alteration, to the allegory. Dunstable can be derived from "dun", a hill-fort, and "stable"; Ampthill from "amplitude" and "hill". The former represents here the phallos, which remains, under the auspices of the Cranmer principle, unstimulated by the libido (understood), whose source is the negative Queen of Hell. The ithyphallos has therefore been divorced from the underworld in negative aspect: an epochal moment in this final transformation. This will be amplified in scene ii.

The order of the Coronation varies significantly from that given in Holinshed. Once again, this is a scepticidal agent of great potency. Holinshed has no mention of Norfolk and Surrey in the procession, yet here is Norfolk in HVIII, entering together with

Suffolk as he should be, in strict accordance with the allegory. Surrey has usurped the Earl of Arundel's place; although not quite precisely, for the latter is placed well back by Holinshed, while in HVIII he is at the front, as he should be, as representative of the unconscious. Further, he is described by Shakespeare as bearing "the rod of silver with the dove"; whereas the rod is of ivory in the source. This is a small variation of great significance: the colour silver being associated with moon, and hence the Goddess, in the alchemic tradition, and the Goddess religions of the ancient world.⁸

There comes now the ascendancy of the Goddess reborn, new-stripped of Her erstwhile negative mantle, expressed as the coronation procession of Anne Bullen (Hathaway). Here is an odd piece of dialogue:

2 Gentleman ...These are stars indeed -
1 Gentleman And sometimes falling ones.
2 Gentleman No more of that.

The "falling star" of the coronation procession is of course the Gardiner (Bishop of Winchester) principle, whose task – the transformation of the ego - is almost, but not yet finally, complete. Ariel will not be freed until the conference of V, iii. Her final casting off will be made easier through the persistence of the visual imagination, albeit in the service of dream rather than Troy-phase reasoning: "However, yet there is no great breach. When it comes,/Cranmer will find a friend [Cromwell] will not shrink from him" (105).

Here is another significant variation from the source:

1 Gentleman You must no more call it York place; that's past,
 For since the Cardinal fell that title's lost:
 'Tis now the King's, and called Whitehall.

- Whereas in Holinshed the new name is Winchester. For the colour white is also associated with the moon, and hence the Goddess. All of these departures from the source are utterly consistent with the allegory, and cannot be regarded as trivial.

The death of Katherine takes the process described above to its end. Her attendants Patience and Griffith are not named in *Holinshed*, the former having been chosen by Shakespeare to represent just that principle, essential to the ego in transformation.

Katherine delivers an obloquy against the dead Wolsey, Griffith a eulogy: for Shakespeare's Troy-phase ego had contributed, for all its inadequacies, to the writing of the *Complete Works* (albeit it was the declension from it into blind libido, with the concomitant "charge of the Boar", which had actually stimulated his creativity, as T&C makes clear in the victory of Achilles-Ajax over Hector and the Trojans).

The dream of Katherine suggests, with its richness of esoteric symbolism, on the other hand the pen of Bacon, which raises some important questions. Was this the contribution of Bacon to *HVIII*, to justify its inclusion in the First Folio, from which *PER* and *MAF* were omitted as by Shakespeare alone? Or had Shakespeare by this time long since graduated *summa cum laude* from Bacon's academy, to give him mastery over this sort of symbolism? The immediate sequelae of the dream have a microcosmic intensity which would suggest Shakespeare; but what about the dream itself? Its symbolism is graven deep with the hallmark of Bacon; but could his longtime pupil have also been capable of it? It can only be stated with assurance, for now, that the dream could not have been written by Fletcher. He is likely, however, to have contributed lines 109 to the end (from entry of *Capuchius* to exit of Katherine).

Let us look at the dream in detail. The garland held over Katherine's head by the dancers is symbolic of rebirth (crown protruding through vulva of Goddess). The dancers have white robes and golden visors, symbolic of moon and sun respectively, which have equivalence at dusk, the setting sun on one horizon being balanced by the rising moon on the other (fig.3). This represents in the Gnostic tradition the equal presence of Nature (the White Goddess) and Reason in the ego, or love and power, or right and left brains: that is, completeness of being. This is the time when Prospero, having studied all afternoon, releases Ariel from her task (noon symbolising the hegemony of reason, as in the Wolsey principle; afternoon the access of wisdom, to recall Shelley's metaphor of poetic inspiration as a fading ember). The number of the

dancers is six, which is both a sun and a moon number (2 x 3). The two dancers holding the garland over Katherine's head represent the opposites of the field of space and time (good and evil, male and female, birth and death, &c.), and thus are cognate with Scylla and Charybdis in Homer's *Odyssey*,⁹ Eteocles and Polynices in Sophocles' *Oedipus* trilogy, and so on. Katherine is not dying, but being reborn as the true Queen of Hell (old lady attendant to Anne Bullen), now with no trace of negativity, and divorced from the Boar.

The "sad and solemn music" represents the Musical arts, of which the written word is the most important (the source being Plato's *Republic*: cf. Bianca's music lessons in *TOS*). A messenger announcing the arrival of Lord Capuchius, envoy from the King, is upbraided and banished by Katherine: for this will be the last communication between the ego-in-transformation and the negative Queen of Hell. Capuchius leaves with a letter from Katherine to King Henry urging, inter alia, the welfare of their infant daughter upon him.

Katherine has not died, but been reborn, on the plane of allegory, as the old lady servant of Anne Bullen, who will announce the birth of her child to the King. Her child is therefore cognate with the old lady: the Queen of Hell reborn into divinity, on whose worship will Shakespeare's *vita nuova* in Stratford be predicated. Anne's child, the newborn Princess Elizabeth, represents the erstwhile gateway-to-the-devil Anne Hathaway reborn as gateway-to-God, the *ithyphallos* aroused by whom ("I, and of a boy": V, i, 164) will no longer bear its weight of Christian puritan negativity. Shakespeare will now bring the Boar to appeasement, and live with his wife in peace, with no fear of the catastrophic coup of 1587 being repeated. The interpretation of HVIII as a paean for the reigning Queen Elizabeth is therefore only true on the literal plane. Virgil may have degraded himself to the status of a political propagandist, but Bacon-Shakespeare - never!

ACT V

i

The scene is extremely tightly choreographed, and must have

¹⁰ Laurence Gardner, *Realm of the Ring Lords*.

¹¹ Knight and Lomas, *The Second Messiah*.

¹² Knight and Lomas, *The Hiram Key*.