

PART 2

THE BACON GROUP

CHAPTER 10

INTRODUCTION TO THE BACON GROUP

The plays of this group were written by Sir Francis Bacon alone, with no contribution from Shakespeare. The primary evidence for this is twofold: the nature of their allegory as clinical treatise, written from the external point of view of the therapist, of the principles involved in the aetiology, pathogenesis, and treatment of the catastrophic coup – a severe anxiety-depression neurosis of acute onset – which had stricken down Will Shaksper in 1587; and the secretion in the nonsense lines of *Love's Labour's Lost* of a multiplicity of hidden statements along the lines of "William Shakespeare is Francis Bacon incognito". In none of these plays are the traumatic events of the milieu intérieur, - the desperate defence against the libido, the descent into auto-erotism, the "charge of the Boar", and so on, with which we have become so familiar in the histories, - dwelt on with any intensity; while the cryptographic significance of LLL was proven by William Moore in his masterpiece "Shakespeare" (1934), the results of which will be summarised below (Ch.15). The secondary evidence is a matter of style: the predominance of the high style of Bacon, - as exemplified elsewhere, for example, in the short but powerful speech of Francisco (who represents Bacon himself) in TT II, i, and in the WH sonnets (the Dark Lady sonnets being from the pen of Shakespeare), - which is remarkable for its richness of metaphor, breadth of language, and depth of wisdom. The tertiary evidence, if you like, is also twofold: the plays' extraordinary frequency - an average of two per year - which is most plausibly explained as the product of two hands; and the clustering of this group around the early- to mid-Nineties, which marked the nadir of Bacon as *homme d'affaires*, to give him the time and inclination to channel all his energies into his writing.

Arthur Schopenhauer is the artist's philosopher, inspiration to Joyce, Mann, Eliot, and many others. It was he who so memorably

remarked the definitive presence in great art of the “x” factor, which is finally the will-to-life or, broadly, the libido (albeit “libido” is generally used in these pages in its narrower sense of “will-to-eros”). This is sensed, for example, most powerfully in *Wuthering Heights*, and not at all in the novels of Henry James. It is also sensed in the plays of the tragic sequence, which are nonpareils of “x” factor plays in the Western canon; but only sporadically in the comedies, and very little in the Bacon group, with the notable exception of *The Taming of the Shrew*, in the character of Kate, and in the poetry of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*. The *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *Love’s Labour’s Lost*, *The Comedy of Errors*, *The Merchant of Venice*, *King John*, even *The Taming of the Shrew*, and *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* as drama: these are in no danger of being mistaken for great art, as their chequered performance history would attest; albeit the quality of the writing is generally exceptional, and often inspiring, especially in *King John*, from which one emerges with a heightened appreciation of the power of metaphor, and renewed courage to put pen to paper one’s self.

This is all an index to the pen of Sir Francis Bacon, who had eliminated, in his lifelong quest for clarity of understanding, mastery of language, and philosophical depth, entirely the “x” factor as a problem from his psyche. Bacon believed heterosexual love to be incompatible with wisdom, and corruptive of excellence, and expressed his erotism in gay relations with his serving-men and others. He was evidently completely comfortable with his erotic life, his philosophy having put him securely above the flux of common emotion in this regard; while his inner life was a triumph of the intellect. Bacon’s striving for closure is expressed in the triumphant subjugation of Katherina by Petruchio in *TOS*, - by which so many readers are understandably taken aback, - and Luciana’s admonition to Adriana in *TCE II*, i, as well as in the principle of the final couplet of the Baconian sonnet. He was, in a word, become: and this quality, strongly if obscurely sensed by the critics, is surely the principle reason for their rejection of the Bacon theory, in spite of the few brilliant jewels (such as the works of Ignatius Donnelly and William Moore) in a vast cloth of circumstantial evidence to support it. What the critics have not been aware of hitherto, and what the present work provides, is the

source of the “x” factor, in the immediacy and horrific authenticity of Shakespeare’s own experience, the low point of which (but an auspicious event for Western Art) was the coup of 1587. His life-or-death struggle with the libido was the fuel that powered the immense and beautiful construction of Bacon’s devising, with its prodigious philosophical and poetic richness, into the empyrean of great art.

The Bacon group as a whole may not be great art, but they form, as allegory, part of what one might call the Philosophy of Ultimate Concern, whose theme is nothing less than the destruction of the West, the threat of which, in so far as the Puritan and Pauline errors have never died, remains to this day. However strong this threat may be (certainly not so much as in Bacon’s time), the malignity of Puritanism toward the individual psyche remains undimmed: and the plays of this group are, as psychiatry, a brilliant treatise on the aetiology, pathogenesis, and successful treatment, of the crippling breakdown suffered by his patient as a young man. In all of them is allegorised Shakespeare as Puritan (aet.15-23,) or more broadly Goddess-rejector (puberty-aet.23), who is susceptible to healing, as represented by Valentine, the King of Navarre, Shylock, Titus-Saturninus, and so on.

Bacon’s therapeutic regime would be based on the application of reason and the imagination to the Musical arts of reading and writing, speech and song, recital and repetition, and so on, as defined by Socrates in the early pages of Plato’s Republic: with intensive reading especially predominant in the early stages (Shakespeare’s Melancholy Jacques phase, c. 1587-9), and creative writing (Orlando phase) coming later, after “two years and more”, as given in the final lines of Mr Arden of Feversham . The printed page as vector of the Musical arts is represented in:

1) TGV by the wood of the Outlaws, who arrest Valentine on his way to Verona/Mantua (Musical arts preventing descent into the unconscious and Puritanism);

2) TOS by Bianca’s music lessons, with Padua representing as always without exception in the plays, as the famous university town, the shrine of the Musical arts of which Bacon was chancellor or keeper;

3) MND by the wood outside Athens (the city of the great Goddess-rejector Pericles);

4) LLL by the numerous letters and billets doux;

5) MOV by Jessica as Page, bearer of the torch (of enlightenment);

6) TitA by the arrows (the sun's rays, symbol of enlightenment) inscribed with letters, and shot into Saturninus' court;

7) TCE behind the chain and the ring (cf. Rosencrantz ("garland of roses") and the numerous rings elsewhere: the former symbolic of the vulva of the Goddess through which the ego is reborn, the latter the ring of the great Ring sagas – King Solomon's Ring as told in the Talmud, The Volsung Saga, The Ring of the Nibelung – as symbol of enlightenment and ultimate power;¹

8) KJ by the letter read by Arthur before his reprieve from blinding (retention of the visual imagination); and the orchard of the passing of King John (the unconscious), cognate with the garden of Alexander Iden (< Greek idein, "to imagine", whence "idea") in 2 HVI IV, x.

The woods in these plays are cognate with Birnam Wood in Macbeth (whose approach will signify the beginning of the resurrection of the hero), the Forest of Arden in AYLI, the grove by Berkeley castle in RII, and so on, all of them representing the printed page as vector of the Gnostic – lately Renaissance Neoplatonic/Christian Cabalist – tradition, as do the innumerable Pages and letters throughout FF. Their great lesson is that the phenomenal or visible world can only be understood if the unseen world underlying it is first understood: a blindingly simple and obvious proposition, and the basis of modern Western science, depth psychology, and art, but one which the Puritan continues to deny. This was a pillar of Bacon's philosophy:

The knowledge of man (hitherto) hath been determined by the view or sight; so that whatsoever is invisible, either in respect of the fineness of the body itself, or the smallness of the parts, or of the subtlety of the motion, is little inquired. And yet these be the things that govern nature principally; and without which you

¹ Laurence Gardner, *Realm of the Ring Lords*.

² Natural History.

cannot make any true analysis and indication of the proceedings of nature.²

The visible world or, more broadly, Nature as described in the printed page, is represented by Sylvia, Bianca, Hermia, Rosaline, Jessica, Luciana, and so on. The invisible world, or the Faustian dimension of Nature, - realm of the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, Goddess of the Underworld/Unconscious, to which the visible world must always refer, - is represented by Julia, Kate Minola, Helena, Katherina, Portia, Lavinia, Adriana, and so on

The ego-in-transformation will have to engage with the unseen world, over which the Grail Queen reigns; and his aspect which will do so is represented in

1) TGV by Valentine: the object of whose reasoning will be to conceive anew the Protheus principle, derived from the Greek god Proteus, “first man”, with the insertion of “h” suggesting his innate divinity (< Greek theos, “god”). Protheus is cognate with the various Adams of FF (e.g. in AYLI), the source most plausibly being the ritual of the twenty-eighth degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, whose purpose was to educate into truth, and in which “Thrice Perfect Father Adam” features prominently (see Ch.44 for a fuller discussion of this fascinating subject). The Protheus principle is therefore, as a reference to Man-as-sublimated-animal, or homo libidensis, the principle of truth, which depends upon the unseen world. André Malraux’ dictum that “The opposite of truth is not untruth, but reason” is strikingly relevant in this regard.

2) TOS by the remarkable Petruchio, whose name means “Church-killer”, nothing less, as formed from “Peter” and the Italian ucchiso, “I kill”: for the Pauline Church is recognised by Bacon to lie at the bottom of the Puritan error;

3) MND by Demetrius, taken from Plutarch’s Life of Pyrrus, where he is described as a sham Alexander (Shakespeare as Puritan, who would become a true Alexander (Gnostic Christ) in London). It should be noted that the wood outside Athens is cognate with the city of Padua in TOS: so that the Demetrius-(sham-) Alexander here becomes a Petruchio when he leaves Athens.

4) LLL by the King of Navarre: the object of whose reasoning will be to conceive anew the Dumaine principle of the unconscious – wherein resides Protean Man – as wed to the Faustian dimension, now stripped of its negativity;

5) MOV by Antony: who will work upon the Bassanio principle of the unconscious (cf. Bassianus in TitA) in the same way as Valentine and the King of Navarre on Protheus and Dumaine;

6) TitA by Titus himself;

7) TCE by Antipholus of Syracuse/Ephesus;

8) KJ by Lewis the Dauphin: negatively; for the collapse of his betrothal to Bianca of Spain will signify the hardening of the subject's Puritanism.

It was the libido, specifically the will-to-eros, property of Protean Man, which, irrupting in negative mantle into Shakespeare's consciousness after being encountered in the printed page – perhaps the vividly described (especially in the Latin original) seduction of Lucius by Fotis in Apuleius' *The Golden Ass* (see especially MAN) – tempted him to surrender to auto-erotism, to precipitate the devastating coup of 1587: such is the discordance of the Puritan ego. The libido is represented in the Bacon group by Gremio/Grumio, Robin Goodfellow, Gratiano, Aaron the Moor, the Dromio brothers, and so on.

In addition, the numerous swords and daggers throughout the plays also represent, as always in FF, the ithyphallic principle, which always carries with it the broader value of the unseen world. Fascinatingly, there appear in this group a number of other constants that throughout FF are yoked to their particular principle at their every appearance without exception. Amongst them are:

1) Peter The Pauline or Roman Catholic Church;

2) Balthasar The magus, or wise man, witness to the birth of the True King (Shakespeare renaissance, under the therapy of Bacon: cf. TN);

3) Mantua The Puritan ego, as birthplace of Virgil, creator of Aeneas, - the archetypal Goddess-rejector of FF (see especially TT II, i), as originally remarked by Ted Hughes;

4) Padua The Musical arts (see above);

5) Sebastian The ego forced to acknowledge the unseen world in himself, as was Shakespeare after the coup, as a prelude to rebirth (from the martyrdom of St. Sebastian, a favourite theme of Renaissance artists, who generally depicted him lashed to a crucifix, transfixed by (ithyphallic) arrows³);

6) Antonio Shakespeare as libidinous; also, more exaltedly, as the Gnostic (libidinous) Christ (from Plutarch's extended description of Antony and Cleopatra in his *Life of Marcus Antonius*);

7) Lucius The ego on the path to transformation (from the hero of Apuleius' *TGA*);

8) Horse; horse and rider The libido in action, as sourced from the famous Socratic metaphor in Plato's *Phaedrus*;

9) Letters; Pages The written word;

10) Ring Symbol of enlightenment and ultimate power (see above);

- And so on. It is time now to follow in detail the several inflections of the one philosophical theme in the plays of the Bacon group.

³ Ted Hughes, *Winter Pollen*.

CHAPTER 11

THE TWO GENTLEMEN OF VERONA

TGV has been posited as the earliest of the plays, and the occasional creakiness of what would become, in the other plays of this group, a prodigiously well-oiled machine, certainly supports this chronology. Here are presented the Goddess Nature described in the printed page (Sylvia,) and the bare bones of Shakespeare's early adolescent flight from the libido into bookish asceticism (Bolingbroke phase), later pseudo-Alexandrian nobility in his Tavern phase (the two conflated into Valentine's journey to Milan), followed by his notional enthrallment by Puritanism (Valentine's banishment from Milan towards Mantua), and recovery (happy betrothals of the final scene). There is a notable variation from Shakespeare's condition, in that Bacon presents here an idealised outcome of the initial impulse toward Puritanism, with the subject never actually embracing it (Valentine's arrest in the forest outside Mantua), and so never vulnerable to the breakdown which had stricken down Shakespeare in 1587 – that fateful year for Western culture - but entering straight upon the phase of healing, as instituted by Bacon for his patient c. 1587, the central plank of which was the acknowledgement of Nature through the written word (marriage of Valentine and Sylvia in the forest). TGV is notorious for its unresolved problems, such as the substitution of Verona or Padua for Milan as Valentine's destination, the episode of the two letters in IV, iv, the historically incorrect referral to the Duke as Emperor, and so on. The argument to come will provide solutions to most of them, to affirm once again the power of the theory of the Baconian Double Helix.

Let us look closely at the characters and places assembled for the allegory.

1) Valentine Shakespeare, from puberty (flight from Verona) to c. 1589, when the initial phase of his treatment had achieved its

goal. It was in 1589 or thereabouts, after two years of solid reading, that Shakespeare began to write, as portrayed by Orlando and his verses in the Forest of Arden in *As You Like It*, where Melancholy Jacques represents Shakespeare-as-reader of the previous two years. Fascinatingly, the Valentine of Act V is cognate with this latter: "This shadowy desert, unfrequented woods,/I better brook than flourishing peopled towns./Here can I sit alone, unseen of any,/And to the nightingales complaining notes/Tune my distresses and record my woes" (V, iv). This gives a priceless description of Shakespeare in Melancholy Jacques phase, and is consistent with a date of 1589 or before (before Shakespeare had begun to write) for TGV.

2) Sylvia The female aspect of Sylvius in AYLI, who represents the wisdom derived from literature. She is the Goddess Nature as described in the printed page, which is represented by

3) The Forest - outside Mantua, cognate with the Forest of Arden in AYLI, Birnam Wood in MAC, and the grove outside Berkeley Castle in RII II, iii. It is ruled by

4) The Outlaws Explicitly identified with the Merry Men of Robin Hood, a character of immense importance in the esoteric tradition, of which Bacon was a master, as a kind of Gnostic Christ (see below), with whom Valentine, as their leader, becomes identified. They have been outlawed by the city of

5) Mantua - which represents here, as in its every other appearance without exception in the plays, the Puritan ego, as birthplace of Virgil, creator of the archetypal Goddess-rejector Aeneas, the myth of whose abandonment of Dido (= Cleopatra of A&C, = Isis of TGA) is central to the plays (see especially TT II, i). Thus Mantua's impeachment of the outlaws beautifully mirrors the anathematisation of the Gnostic tradition by Puritanism.

6) Duke of Milan Germane, even at this early stage, to Prospero, who was to appear some twenty-three years later: both representing the ego informed by higher reason and judgement, in contrast to the ego dominated by the unconscious, as represented by

7) Verona - home of

8) Antonio The state of the ego in blind communion with the Goddess of Love (cf. the Antonios in MAN, TN, and TT): the ego

deliquescing into libido, as represented by his son

9) Protheus From the Greek proteus, "first man": Dionysian or Falstaffian or Polonian Man, Man-as-sublimated-animal, also cognate with Adam in AYLI. Bacon's idiosyncratic insertion of "h" into "Proteus" serves to emphasis his divinity, as suggestive of the Greek theos, "god". Protheus' appearance in Milan represents the intrusion of libido into the ego that had thought to deny it (escapades of Falstaff in 1&2 HIV). The Protheus principle is the principle of truth (see Ch.10 above).

10) Julia It will be the goal of healing to raise the contents of the unconscious into consciousness (Julia's journey to Milan; her identification with Sylvia: cf. the eclipse of Buckingham in RIII).

11) Lucetta A crucial character. Her name is formed from the Italian luce, "light", and etta, "a small amount"(< Gr. iota). It is she who intercepts Protheus' billet doux to Julia, with the immediate result of its rejection. This is another instance in FF of the principle of referral, where the truth (Protheus) as described in the written word, is being explained by reference to the unseen world (Julia) underpinning the seen. Here, however, this is being sabotaged by the weakness of the reasoning imagination (Lucetta). It is of immense significance that she will be left behind when Julia journeys to Milan, for this will see the full engagement of the imagination with Nature (Sylvia-Julia), and the ego's enlightenment and transformation.

12) Speed The faculty of thought: specifically, the visual imagination (cf. the many similar references to quickness throughout the plays, each with exactly this significance: e.g. MAN II, iii, 5).

13) Sebastian Julia in disguise. The first of a series of Sebastians in the plays, all of them inspired by the martyrdom of St. Sebastian (see especially TN I, ii, 7 ff.), a favourite theme of Renaissance artists, who generally depicted him lashed to a cross, transfixed by arrows. Bacon has recognised the ithyphallic symbolism of these arrows; and Sebastian represents here the ego forced to acknowledge, against his will, and to his great suffering, the libido (unseen world) in himself. The arrows are also cognate with

14) Launce - the ithyphallic principle (cf. Launcelet in MOV).

15) Thurio A character taken directly from the source. Bacon

recognised the potential for symbolism of his name, which in Greek means “ I shield”. Thus Thurio’s rivalry with Valentine for Sylvia’s affections represents the Goddess-rejecting ego’s impulse to protect himself from the truths of Nature.

16) Eglamour Formed from “egg” and l’amour, “love”. This is the springtime of the new ego, rising again after the winter of its rejection of the Goddess. Thus is Sir Eglamour rejected by Julia as a suitor in I, ii (ego still under sway of unconscious, with its contents of the negative Goddess (Julia) and libido (Protheus)); and thus will a different-but-the-same Eglamour shepherd Sylvia away from her imprisonment in Act V.

What is all this business about the letter in I, ii? Here is a powerfully adroit piece of symbolism. Speed, Valentine’s servant, represents the visual imagination. It is he who conveys Protheus’ letter (representing the printed page, object of the reader’s attention) to Julia, only for it to be intercepted by Lucetta, and rejected, then accepted, by Julia, only for her to tear it to pieces, the scraps with Julia’s name on them being dropped to the ground. This represents what is happening, on the allegorical plane, in Valentine’s mind as he forsakes Verona (in Shakespeare’s mind as he rejects the world of the unconscious and the blind libido and enters upon his bookish ascetic phase of early adolescence: the first of four coping mechanisms to deal with his negatively perceived will-to-eros, as cast initially by puritan Catholicism): eroticism (e.g. Fotis’ seduction of Lucius in TGA) being abjured (rejection of Protheus by Sylvia), in the typically ascetic way, as a subject for the imagination to dwell on (Speed/Lucetta). The letter is torn to pieces, and cast on the ground (Nature remaining gross, and unilluminated by the divine faculty of imagination: cf. HAM III, iii: “My words fly up, my thoughts remain below./ Words without thoughts never to heaven go”). Julia now does a volte-face and yearns for Protheus, in a beautiful illustration of Schopenhauer’s dictum that “A man can do as he will, but not will as he will”; or the basic Freudian mechanism of repression: for the Queen of Hell, Goddess of the Unconscious, will retain her hold on the subject, in spite of his denial of Her. Julia folds over a piece with Protheus’ name mentioned twice, so that they are opposed, and keeps it close to her breast. This is a powerful representation of the

basic conflict between the negative and positive libidos in the ego still cherished by the Goddess, and may well have provided the title of the play.

The “charge of the Boar” is implied in the journey of Protheus to Milan: the libido announcing its presence (“irrupting” would be far too strong a word here) in the conscious ego: albeit these are the comparatively muted charges which characterised Shakespeare’s pre-Puritan phases, before his total suppression of the imagination, to leave him exquisitely vulnerable to the Boar.

The moment critique of TGV will come with Protheus’ attempted ravishing of Sylvia in V, iv, which represents the new apprehension by the ego in transformation (Duke of Milan) – with the Valentine principle in the ascendancy – of the identification of the will (unseen world) at the bottom of all things: in other words, of its apprehension of Platonic Ideas, e.g. not of man and woman, but of Man (these are the “Mothers” of Goethe’s Faust). This is an excellent example of how the literal sense may be at 180° variance with the allegorical: what is required for its decipherment being its recreation in the imagination, and divorce from any qualifying words.

Sylvia imprisoned in the tower by her father the Duke represents beautifully the status of the Goddess in the ego who would reject Her. There can be no doubt that the source for this tower was the Tower card of the Tarot Major Arcana, which symbolised the Gnostic Church (see Chs.1, 44). Similarly, the references in TGV to the Duke of Milan as “Emperor” are not at all an error on Bacon’s part, but evoke the Emperor card of the Tarot Major Arcana. Here is Lee Irwin, in his admirable and instructive Gnostic Tarot, on the Emperor card:

Analytic by nature, the Emperor seeks the causal foundations of every phenomenon, thereby creating a Grand Synthesis and establishing foundational laws, customs, and principles that uphold a complex but unified world view... the Emperor becomes the living emblem of empowered self-authority whose will reflects the values and disciplines learned in the processes of gradual maturity and self-knowledge... In a compassionate and caring Emperor, these strengths and weaknesses are tempered

through the intuitive knowledge of the Empress... He is symbolised by the gods Osiris, Zeus, and Jupiter.

The Emperor is clearly of striking relevance to FF. Further, since the Duke/Emperor/King always represents the totality of the Self, and Valentine is an aspect of the Emperor in TGV, then Sylvia is a kind of Empress.

Sylvia's escape will represent therefore the acquisition of wisdom by the ego-in-transformation through the ministry of the Gnostic tradition, wherein is venerated the female principle. The rope ladder (notionally) used to access her cell is symbolic, as in *Romeo and Juliet*, of the *ithyphallos*; and it is fascinating to note here that the Greek word for "ladder" is *klimax*. The letter secreted along with the ladder in Valentine's cloak (III, i: in which Thurio exits, consistently with the allegory, at the very start) signifies that it the written word (e.g. Fotis' seduction of Lucius in TGA) that is stimulating the *ithyphallos*. Ben Jonson's famous remark about Shakespeare's ineptness in the Greek language we may take as entirely founded in fact; and the enormous Greek influence in the plays must have come wholly from Bacon, who had gained a Masters degree from Cambridge.

Valentine is banished by the Duke to sunder him from Sylvia; and here is a problem. He is captured by outlaws in a forest outside Mantua, and Sylvia believes it is there that he has gone (IV, iii, 23); yet he has told the outlaws that he is bound for Verona (IV, i, 16). This is totally consistent with the allegorical values of Verona and Mantua as the unconscious and Puritan ego respectively: for the irruption of libido ("charge of the Boar") threatens to subvert his reason, and return him to the world of the unconscious, from which terrifying fate Puritanism would offer an escape. This is precisely the crisis that confronted Shakespeare aet.15, when Puritanism seemed the only way out. So that he is indeed bound for Verona, and never gets there; and bound equally for Mantua, but never gets there: the healing with which Bacon provided Shakespeare, through the Musical arts, intervening immediately to stop the rot. This is the most crucial lesson of this first Baconian treatise on the pathogenesis, crisis, and remission, of Shakespeare's condition of acute and incapacitating anxiety-

depression neurosis.

The outlaws who capture Valentine in the forest are explicitly identified with Robin Hood's "Merry Men". Valentine becomes their leader, to identify him with Robin Hood himself, who was originally a kind of Celtic fertility god (cognate with Robin Goodfellow of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*). Maid Marian was based on Mary Jacob (St. Mary the Gypsy), who accompanied Mary Magdalene, wife of the Gnostic Christ, on their flight from the Holy Land to the West. Michael Baigent and Richard Leigh in their *The Temple and the Lodge* give a beautiful account of the protection given to the play *Robin Hood and Little John*, as acted by gypsies in the 16th century, by Sir William Sinclair of Rosslyn Castle, the spiritual home of the Templar tradition in Scotland, and the final stage of the pilgrim journey which began at St. Iago de Compostella in Portugal. Sinclair was in fact the leader of British Freemasonry, into which Sir Francis Bacon would himself be inducted, by King James, in 1603.¹ Valentine in the forest is therefore a kind of Gnostic Christ, and Sylvia a Mary Magdalene, or Isis. The Robin Hood legend thus has here an intensely philosophical significance. The Outlaws have interesting personal histories:

- 3 Outlaw Myself was from Verona banished,
 For practising to steal away a lady,
 An heir, and near allied unto the Duke.
- 2 Outlaw And I from Mantua, for a gentleman,
 Who, in my mood, I stabb'd unto the heart.

Verona had no Duke at the time of the play's action: and the reference here is to the Duke of Milan, as representing the Puritan ego in toto. The "heir" must be Sylvia or her sister – probably the latter, a Kate (Queen of Hell-Grail Queen) to Sylvia's Bianca (white moon: visible world). The third outlaw is of course, the will-to-eros. The second has been exiled from Mantua for the same reason that Valentine has been arrested on his journey there, banished by the Duke. The symbolic significance of Mantua has been noted many times in the course of this argument, as the birthplace of Virgil,

¹ Knight and Lomas, *The Second Messiah*.

creator of Aeneas, that archetypal Goddess-rejector of FF, as Ted Hughes so brilliantly described. Thus does the Pedant of Mantua appear in TOS; thus does Holofernes rhapsodise on the “good old Mantuan” in LLL IV, ii; and thus is Romeo banished thence in R&J.

Rejected along with Sir Eglamour by Lucetta as a suitor for Julia in I, ii, was Mercatio, cognate with Mercutio in R&J, as the principle of unconscious communication with the underworld: the insertion of “cat” for “cut” neatly combining the Mercutio and Tybalt (Consort/Son of the Queen of Hell: the Boar) principles of R&J (Tybalt is twice likened to a “Prince of Cats”, and Tybalt was a common name for a cat, and immemorially ancient underworld symbol). Sylvia is supposed to be going to Friar Patrick’s cell, just outside the forest, but is finally shriven by Friar Laurence within the forest itself: a clear reference to the rejection of the Goddess of Pauline Catholicism (St. Patrick) in favour of the true Great Goddess (ultimately Isis). There can be no doubt that the Friar is a reference to Lorenzo de Medici, under whose auspices the Gnostic revival had begun in Florence toward the end of the 15th century.

Act II has some beautiful set pieces of cryptography, virtuoso instances of Bacon’s colossal analytical-creative power, as he finds ways of secreting the allegory into the events of the literal plane. In II, i, the Goddess of Love gradually intrudes into the ascetic’s contemplation (Speed bringing Sylvia’s glove to Valentine’s attention). The ascetic imagination has steadfastly ignored the erotic dimension, which has refused to go away:

Speed You never saw her since she was deformed.

Valentine How long hath she been deformed?

Speed Ever since you loved her.

- Where “deformed” has the sense of “negatively conceived”. The Fool principle is asserting itself, which the ascetic imagination tries to suppress:

Speed O, that you had mine eyes...

Valentine What should I see then?

Speed Your own present folly and her passing deformity.

An ithyphallos rises: "In conclusion, I stand affected to her". The printed page refers to the Goddess: and the force of eros is felt between page and reader (exchange of billet doux between Valentine and Sylvia).

In II, iii, Launce (ithyphallos) enters right on cue with his dog Crab, whose name refers to the crab-apple, which is notable for its sourness: "I think Crab my dog be the sourest-natured dog that lives". The point of Launce's long rigmarole about his departure, when he compares the personages involved with items of his clothing, is to establish his own identity, as a principle, with his dog: "No, the dog is himself, and I am the dog. O, the dog is me, and I am myself ". The "O", which seems supererogatory on the literal plane, is used here in the sense of "cipher" (see above). It is the ithyphallos (unseen world) in negative aspect, upstart and unwelcome, which causes the ego to pucker the mouth of his soul. Yet, if swallowed and digested as idea (see fig.2), this would be the prelude to divinity:

Panthino Come; come away man, I was sent to call thee.

Launce Sir, call me what thou dar'st.

Panthino Wilt thou go?

Launce Well, I will go [to Milan].

The contretemps between Launce and Panthino, of which the above are the concluding lines, indicates the reluctance of the ego to admit this divine principle. The name "Panthino" is spelt as such in its every appearance in the First Folio bar one, in II, ii, where it is varied to "Panthion". A great lesson of the present work is the extraordinarily high level of accuracy of information transmission in FF, testament to the close supervision of Bacon, and the expertise of the compositors, those favourite whipping-boys of the critics. The lone variant "Panthion" is a semaphore to the reader of the character's allegoric value, referring as it does to the Greek for "all the Gods". "Panthino" can be analysed to "Panth-in-O", "all the Gods in a cipher": to emphasise the will-to-life as an attribute of Man-as-divinity. This was the point of the life's work of Nietzsche;

² Gardner Bloodline of the Holy Grail; Baigent et al., The Holy Blood and The Holy Grail; Barbara Thiering, Jesus the Man.

and one recalls the phallic horn of the unicorn, that age-old symbol of the Gnostic Christ, who himself was conceived “on the wrong side of the sheets”, and was married to Mary Magdalene, mother of his three children.²

In, II, iv, Bacon has a trenchant dig en passant at the Goddess-rejector, with his inane counterfeit of wisdom:

Thurio What seem I that I am not?

Valentine Wise.

Speed (visual imagination) and the Goddess (Sylvia) are also present, consistently with the allegory, in this episode. The Duke alerts Valentine to the imminent arrival of Protheus, and Valentine gives him a fulsome encomium (strong attachment of Gnostic Christ to libido (unseen world) as will and idea). Protheus briefly meets Sylvia in company with Valentine, before she is called away to her father the Duke who, as will emerge, intends to lock her away in the tower (defensive repression of the Goddess by the troubled ego: the book, perhaps TGA, has been put down, the imagination blacked out). The libido, or will-to-life, announces itself as a constitutive property of Nature (Protheus’ profession of his love for Sylvia), via the visual imagination (“’Tis but her picture I have yet beheld”: 205). Protheus’ attempted ravishing of Sylvia in V, iv, which will be immediately forgiven by Valentine, will mark the final recognition by the ego-in-transformation of this fundamental truth, as a prelude to Gnostic nobility and divinity. The word “religion” is derived from the Latin religare, “to bind back”; and humanity, and the visible world in general, is “bound back” to the invisible which underlies it. “God is an infinite sphere whose centre is everywhere and circumference nowhere”:³ His divinity being founded on the unseen world as idea.

II, iv, is full of phallic references. Here we have the visual imagination (Speed) and the ithyphallos (Launce-Crab); but the libido in negative aspect (the Boar) is also present:

Launce ...If thou wilt, go with me to the ale-house; if not,
thou art a Hebrew, a Jew, and not worth the name of

³ Book of the Twenty-Four Philosophers.

a Christian.

- For we know from the character of Borachio (<Spanish *borracco*, “drunkard”) in MAN that drunkenness refers, on the plane of allegory, to possession by the libido (this is also the significance of the sots Stephano and Trinculo in *The Tempest*; Sir Toby Belch in TN; Christopher Sly in TOS; and so on). The dialogue is full of references to the ithyphallic principle: “hanged”, “certain shot be paid [cf. Pistol]”, “stands”, “my staff understands me”, “Thou shalt never get such a secret from me but by a parable”. What on earth is the meaning of this last? The Greek *parabolo* means “I throw alongside” (hence “parable”, a story that follows the original). There can be no doubt, given the graphic, minutely observed, even Joycean, episodes of auto-erotism in the histories, especially in 1&2 HIV, wherein the character of Poins (<French *poigns*, “fists”) is prominent, that the reference here is to the same. This is one of those revelations that the majority will find sensational, and a proportion of them be moved to spit out; but if so, they will be denying themselves access to one of the bravest, most wondrously perceptive and conceived *de profundis* works of art, totally *sui generis*, which the present work has revealed FF as allegory to be.

The opening line of the scene is problematic:

Speed Launce, by mine honesty, welcome to Padua.

On the literal plane, Speed is jesting here with the clownish Launce, in implying that he has come to Padua, the famed University city. This is in truth the Padua of TOS: the university that was the Musical arts (in the Platonic sense of reading and writing, speech and song, recital and repetition), of which Sir Francis Bacon was chancellor, and to which the underqualified William Shakespeare had been admitted on special merit, having impressed at an intimate *viva voce*, and from which he would graduate with distinction.

In II, vii, *The Queen of Hell* (Julia.), is now leaving the unconscious, wherein the ascetic darkness (Lucetta) had trapped Her, to rise into consciousness, where the exercise of reason on the

printed page will enable the ego (Valentine) to comprehend Her at the bottom of the newly understandable visible world (Sylvia). Bacon shows once again his mastery of the Freudian theory of psychic repression, one of the stockpiles that Gustav Jung sorted from the chaff of his mentor:

- Lucetta Better forebear, till Protheus make return.
 [...]
 I do not seek to quench your love's hot fire,
 But qualify the fire's extreme rage,
 Lest it should burn above the bounds of reason.
- Julia The more thou damm'st it up, the more it burns:
 The current that with gentle murmur glides,
 Thou know'st, being stopped impatiently doth rage.

Julia determines to leave Lucetta behind; for her journey will represent several quantum jumps to enlightenment.

The long episode between Speed and Launce in III, i, in which the former convinces the latter, by reading a letter, that he is love with a milk-maid, and ends with Launce telling Speed that (banished) Valentine awaits him at the North Gate, serves to illustrate the inner psychic events at this stage: the visual imagination dwelling on the Goddess of Love, swelling the libido, finally disengaging as the ego flees defensively toward Puritanism (Mantua). That this is in truth the Goddess of the auto-erotist (cognate with Nell Quickly in 2 HIV) is suggested by the action of milking.

In IV, ii, the musicians serenade Sylvia under the direction of Protheus and Thurio, for the purpose of advancing the latter's suit. Julia-Sebastian contemns Protheus and the music; and the suit fails: for the ego is here as yet untransformed. Now, however, the sea change is inaugurated with the entry of Eglamour in IV, iii, who will lead Sylvia away from her confinement to the woods and Valentine. What is all this business about the dogs in IV, iv? Protheus has bade Launce present Sylvia with a dog from him; but it is taken from him, and he gives her Crab instead. Protheus orders him not to rest until he has found the first dog. The dogs represent the ithyphallos (more broadly the unseen world) in negative (Crab) and positive aspects. The transformation is beginning, which will

see the act of love (Sylvia and dog) divested of its negative aspect. Protheus gives Julia-Sebastian the ring given him by Julia to give to Sylvia, which she will refuse: so that the end result is that the Queen of Hell-Gail Queen has given Her ring to Sebastian (ego newly forced to acknowledge libido in himself). This is, remarkably, the ring of the Volsung Saga, Wagner's Ring cycle, Tolkien's Lord of the Rings, R.D. Blackmore's Lorna Doone, and all the other great Ring sagas of world literature, which Sir Laurence Gardner has shown to be cognate with the Grail sagas:⁴ both the Ring and the Grail being esoteric symbols of enlightenment and ultimate power. This is also the point of All's Well That Ends Well, in which Act I is dominated by the Grail (Fisher King) theme, the remainder by the Ring theme: Bacon's model being Wolfram's Parzival (see Ch.44).

For the transformation to be effected, the subject in his reading must always refer Nature described in the printed page to its underworld aspect, its Faustian depth, without an understanding of which the phenomenal world cannot possibly be understood, as the Puritan world-view amply demonstrates. This is the point of ass-phase Lucius' harrowing of hell in TGA which was, beyond any shadow of doubt, used by Bacon in his therapy of Shakespeare (see especially MAN). This principle is adroitly represented here by the double-letter episode, when Julia is about to give Sylvia the letter from Protheus, realises it is the wrong one, and gives her the right one. Sylvia tears up this letter (Puritan text), and begs to see the one Julia has kept (Gnostic text), which is a beautiful representation of this referral of the phenomenal world to the Faustian. Julia-Sebastian now gazes in wonderment at Sylvia's portrait (ego-in-transformation – Sebastian – applying visual imagination to Nature).

Finally, the unseen world is acknowledged to be the constitutive substrate of the phenomenal (Protheus' attempted ravishing of Sylvia; his (otherwise inexplicable) pardon by Valentine, who gives Sylvia over to him); the libido is recognised as a property of the Faustian depth of Nature, now divested of its negative mantle (betrothal of Protheus and Julia): and the transformed ego commits himself to engagement with a Nature newly enriched by

⁴ Realm of the Ring Lords.

reclamation of its invisible dimension (betrothal of Valentine and Sylvia).

There is yet another Baconian cryptographic tour-de-force in the very first scene, the apparently nonsensical ll. 70-140, which is blazoned ten feet high with the words "See Love's Labour's Lost". I have yet to find a critic who has read beyond the first few (easier) chapters of William Moore's rigorously argued "Shakespeare" (1934) – the vast majority indeed seem to be unaware of its existence, or have chosen to ignore it – but it is well worth the trouble and patience required, for in it Moore proves to a high level of certainty the secretion in the nonsense lines of LLL of a multiplicity of statements along the lines of "William Shakespeare is Francis Bacon" (see Ch.14). Similarly, this nonsense passage in TGV would seem almost certainly to secrete the same sort of information. The long sheep-shepherd debate (71) recalls, for example, the nonsense dialogue between Don Armado the Braggart and the Page in LLL V, i, where "THE SHEEPE" is found, by analysis of its simple, reverse, simple digit, and reverse digit seals, according to the Elizabethan alphabet, to secrete the name "Master William Shakespeare". The complete elucidation of this passage will be a sin of my old age, if it hasn't been grabbed by some lucky student first. TGV is clearly, then, a very early play, like LLL, with which it is twinned: the latter's quantum jump in cryptographic sophistication suggesting a somewhat later date of composition. If Shakespeare did in fact begin to put pen to paper in 1589, and LLL post-dates this event by some years, then Bacon's assertion would seem to be not quite the truth, with Shakespeare having already made significant contributions to FF. Yet FF was undoubtedly Bacon's "baby", and his purpose in the cryptographs perfected in the years intermitting TGV and LLL is justifiable, his assertion of authorship true in spirit if not wholly in fact.

CHAPTER 12

THE TAMING OF THE SHREW

The personality of Sir Francis Bacon shines out of every line of *The Taming of the Shrew*, as dazzlingly as does that of Shakespeare in so much of *RIII*, which was written at around about the same time, or perhaps a little later. Even in the latter the hand of Bacon can be detected in the noble speeches, language, philosophy, and symbolism. The inner life allegorised in the historical sequence can only be Shakespeare's; and only he could possibly have written the relevant parts of *RIII*, with its tenacious tracking, in the Jungian way, of every slightest twist and turn of a psyche's degeneration and repair.

Bacon successfully treated his stricken patient with, not medication, nor the lobotomy knife, nor the padded cell, but the timeless wisdom of the Gnostic tradition. He hit upon the idea of preserving his insights into Shakespeare's condition, and, by extension, into schizophrenia, - the principal aetiological agent of both of which he found to be, to imperil his own life and the endurance of his art, if the truth were to become known, the Puritan world-view - by encrypting them into the plays of *FF*, which could further serve, on the literal plane, as a vehicle for his philosophical speculations and broader interests: their power and success on stage being predicated - on the Hermetic principal of "As without, so within" - on the explosiveness of the microcosmic coup which had stricken his patient. The induction to *TOS* is in truth a representation of this doctor-patient relationship.

Let us examine the cast assembled for the allegory.

1) Bianca Minola Her first name is, of course, the Italian for "white". Bacon formed "Minola" from the Greek *meno-*, "crescent", and the Italian feminine indefinite article *la*. The

¹ Robert Graves, *The White Goddess*.

reference is clearly to the radiant moon as that immemorially ancient symbol of the phenomenal or visible world.¹ This is the Nature that must be understood by the ego-in-healing (Shakespeare's), who is represented here by

2) Lucentio Derived from the Latin present participle *lucens*, "shining". This is the ego informed by clarity of imagination and Gnostic reasoning. To arrive at this blessed state the ego will first have to understand, however, - and this is the central philosophical theme of the Bacon group, - that which lies below that visible surface: the underworld or Faustian aspect of Nature; the unconscious aspect of the Self. It is precisely this Faustian delving that is anathematised and abjured by the Puritan, the object of whose contempt is represented here by

3) Katherina Minola The shrew, elder sister of Bianca. An archetypal Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, Goddess of the Underworld/Unconscious. Kate Minola is the dark moon, immemorially ancient symbol of the cosmic sea from which the visible world arises: hence her seniority to her sister. The aspect of the ego that engages with the Faustian dimension is

4) Petruchio One of the most striking pieces of nomenclature in the plays, as formed from "Peter", the Pauline (Roman) Church, and the Italian *ucciso*, "I kill". This is the "Church killer", the mentation that restores the Grail Queen to Her throne, and extirpates the mutilated, sham Goddess of Pauline Catholicism, the Virgin Mary, who lies, as representing a false Nature, at the root of the origins of the Puritan error (see murders of Rutland and York in 3 HVI I, iii). He appears also in R&J, with exactly the same value.

5) Baptista Minola A wealthy citizen of Padua, and father of Kate and Bianca. A reference to John the Baptist, one of a long line of "Fisher Kings", whose ritual role in the Essene community which produced Jesus Christ was to draw the initiate out of the water, an act symbolic of the raising of the psyche out of the unconscious into the light of reason. Padua refers throughout the plays to the famed university town of northern Italy, and bears the allegoric weight of the Gnostic - lately Renaissance Neoplatonic/Christian Cabalist - tradition, of which Bacon was master. Baptista Minola represents this tradition, whence the visible and invisible worlds are born into the ego-in-transformation (Lucentio-Petruchio), to

free him from his longstanding enthrallment by the unconscious.

6) Gremio The libido, from the Latin gremium, "lap". As suitor for the hand of Bianca, he represents the libido in negative aspect, as cast by Puritanism. Once again we remark Bacon's mastery of the ancient Druidic tree alphabets, for he has replaced the "e", a vowel of the declension of the year into winter (Puritanism), with "u", the vowel of high summer, with all its mad and erotic connotations (cf. *A Midsummer Night's Dream*), - to form

7) Grumio Servant of Petruchio, with the value of the libido stripped of its negativity. The real Christ, as distinct from the anaemic Pauline fabrication, was married to Mary Magdalene, and had three children by her, and was himself born "on the wrong side of the sheets", in contravention of the strict Essene ascetic code.² The unicorn is an ancient symbol of the Gnostic Christ, whose horn is an ithyphallic symbol. Yet it is primarily as idea that the libido (unseen world) is honoured by this Christ.

8) Tranio Servant of Lucentio. Bacon derived his name from the Latin tranare, "to swim across". This refers to the staple ritual metaphor of passing from the nearer shore of darkness to the farther shore of enlightenment, and invokes the Hero and Leander myth (cf. Hero in *MAN*, a Bianca analogue). Lucentio and Tranio exchange clothes, to emphasise their identity.

9) Biondello Servant of Lucentio. Bacon formed his name from the Italian biondo, "golden-haired" (to evoke Apollo) and "hell". He is the light that shines into the Faustian dimension, which hitherto has danced Shakespeare like a puppet on a string.

10) Hortensio Suitor for the hand of Bianca. He represents, like Hortensius in *TimA*, the spoken or written word, as derived from Hortensius the orator in Plutarch's *Life of Lucius Lucullus*. The use of language as illuminative of Nature, in all Her beauty and Faustian depth, is represented most powerfully by Hortensio's marriage to

11) The Widow Another remarkable piece of nomenclature. Members of the Masonic brotherhood (Bacon became a Freemason under the aegis of King James II in 1603³), have traditionally been known as "Sons of the Widow", to identify them with Horus, son of Isis, - cognate with Dido and Cleopatra, - that

² Gardner, *Bloodline of the Holy Grail*.

³ Knight and Lomas, *The Hiram Key*.

One-and-Only Goddess behind the scenes of FF.

12) Vincentio A wealthy citizen of Pisa, and father of Lucentio. Bacon derived his name from, of course, the Latin present participle *vincens*, “conquering”. He appears late in the play, at the moment of victory of the transformed ego.

13) Mantua Represents here, as always in the plays, the Puritan ego, as referring to the birthplace of Virgil, creator of the archetypal Goddess rejector Aeneas, who abandoned Dido on the shores of Carthage (see especially TT II, i). The Pedant of Mantua’s final besting by Vincentio will represent the eclipse of the Puritan ego that was Shakespeare’s aet.15-23 by the *ithyphallos-libido*, more broadly the unseen world, new-stripped of its negative mantle (leaning tower of Pisa). It is thus the reversal of the eclipse of the unseen world by Puritanism which is allegorised in the murder of Suffolk by Sir Walter Whitmore (“White [rose] death of the *ithyphallic* principle”) in 2 HVI IV, i.

Inductions 1&2

The Baconians have asserted with confidence that the character Christopher Sly represents Shakespeare, who therefore must have been an illiterate drunk. The argument of these pages demonstrates that he was in truth nothing of the sort, showing, even in the early years in London, a notable talent for writing (see especially MAF), and demonstrating in the later histories the tenacity, memory, and raw intellectual processing power, that made him a true Baconian acolyte. Yet Sly undoubtedly does represent Shakespeare, as Bacon’s (the Lord’s) patient. His drunkenness represents a state of dissolution in, and enthrallment by, the *libido*, as it invariably does throughout the plays: for example, in the characters of Borachio (< Spanish *boracco*, “drunkard”) in MAN; Sir Toby Belch in TN; and Stephano and Trinculo in TT. The name Christopher is derived, of course, from the Greek *Christos* and *phero* (“I bear”, “I carry”). This is the Christ who perished on the Cross of Crosby (“Cross-by”) House in RIII, only to be resurrected into eternity, having engaged the unseen world as idea (Richmond): the Shakespeare who would rise from the dead, with the help of Sir Francis Bacon. The name “Sly” alerts the reader to his cryptographic significance. Bacon made sure of clinching the

identification by a further strategy, with which those who have read and understood (a small but happy band) William Moore’s

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24		
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z
24	23	22	21	20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		

“Shakespeare”, and/or my own explication of Love’s Labour’s Lost (Ch.14), will be thoroughly familiar. The spelling “Christophero” strikes the alert reader as being unusual; and using the following alphabet:

- A Simple Digit Seal value of 100 is obtained, which is also the SDS value of “Master Wm. Shakespeare”. The misspelling of pocas palabras (thus it also appears in Kyd’s The Spanish Tragedy, itself a member of the FF family: see Appendix 1) as paucas pallabris is also striking: and it would be not in the least surprising if it should prove, by analogy with other misspelt foreign words in LLL (e.g. quari for quare, intelegis for intellegis, gaudio for gaudeo, &c) to secrete, like them, the name “William Shakespeare”, along with “Francis Bacon” in a staggering forty-eight combinations.

The Lord who arrives with his hounds is a vivid image of Bacon as prosecutor of the Secret Cause of human motivation (the fox) - to use Oswald Spengler’s term for the apprehension, mostly unconscious, of the will, or unseen world. The path to this revelation lies – where else? – in the knowledge of the Goddess, Who is Nature divinised, as encoded in the names of the Lord’s hounds, which are worth examining in detail, to give an idea of the richness of the tradition from which Bacon drew.

The name “Merriman” is formed, of course, from “merry” and “man”. The former is derived, in the English context of “Merrie England”, from the Christian name of Mary Jacob, who accompanied Mary Magdalene (wife of Jesus the Christ) and Mary-Helena (Salome: the original “scarlet woman”, as so grotesquely anathematised by the Pauline Church) in their flight from Jerusalem in AD 44, to disembark in Provence at the town later named in their honour Les Saintes Maries de la Mer. Mary Jacob was closely identified with Aphrodite, and was proscribed by

Constantine, which however could not prevent her introduction to England via Spain. From her name is derived the English word “to marry”; and she was the original mermaid (“merri-maid”, by name Marina, and hence of immense significance to Shakespeare), in her capacity as a kind of Sophia, who represents the principle of female wisdom, which was associated by the Gnostics with water (hence the fate of Ophelia in HAM). She was portrayed by the Anglo-Saxons as the May Queen, and was ritually honoured by “Mary’s Men”, or the Morris-Men. Hence “Merriman”, which was employed by Bacon, - as was the striking image of Ophelia floating supine on the brook to symbolise the “Spirit that moved on the face of the waters”, - in full consciousness of its Gnostic associations.⁴

“Clowder” refers to the collective noun for a group of cats, the cat being, of course, an immemorially ancient underworld symbol, in Egypt for example, where it was associated, most significantly in the present context, with Isis⁵ (= Dido = Cleopatra). “Silver” is of course the colour associated with the radiant moon, and hence the Goddess, in all ancient cultures, and in alchemy. “Belman” is most likely derived from the name of Bel, Beli, Belus, or Belinus, the God of the Irish Tuatha-de-Danaan, and of the Danaan peoples of early England. This early Britain was the home of the Druids, and of Hyperborean Apollo, who was worshipped by the Pythagoreans, and whose exhortation “Know Thyself” was inscribed on the lintel of the Temple of Apollo at Delphi. Bacon’s appreciation of this early British Celtic period has been noted in his familiarity with the Druidic tree alphabet (see especially A&C), and the setting of Cymbeline, in which the character of Arviragus is especially notable, as of the same name as the King of Siluria, - brother of Caractacus the Pendragon, - who welcomed Joseph (James) of Arimathea, brother of Jesus the Christ, to Britain in 37 B.C., after his flight from Jerusalem with the Marys and the children of Christ.⁶ This is the James to whom was dedicated the cathedral of St. Iago de Compostella in Portugal, the first station of the initiate’s path to enlightenment on the well-known pilgrim’s route which ended at

⁴ Laurence Gardner, *Bloodline of the Holy Grail*.

⁵ Camille Paglia, *Sexual Personae*.

⁶ Gardner, *ibid*.

⁷ Tim Wallace-Murphy and Marilyn Hopkins, *Rosslyn*.

Rosslyn Castle in Scotland (the seventh stage, corresponding to the Crown chakra in Hindu Kundalini yoga).⁷ (cf. Iago in OTH).

There could not be a more perfect name for a hound of this particular lord than Echo. Ovid tells us, in his *Metamorphoses*, that Narcissus could never die so long as he remained in ignorance of himself. Hero, having lost the use of her own voice, pursued him as her lover, but without success. Narcissus then became enraptured by his reflection in a pond (i.e. began to know himself), and died of a dagger wound. Hero is here the silent Goddess, a Cordelia-analogue (cf., of course, the silence of Hero in MAN): which means, in the symbolic language of FF, that she is the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen to Whom the Puritan subject is deaf. Narcissus is therefore the Puritan that was Shakespeare aet.15-23; the pond, the written word as mirror of Nature, through whose ministry he began, under the aegis of Bacon, to know himself; the blade, the inthyphallos-libido – more broadly, the unseen world – the knowledge of which at play in himself as in the phenomenal world, did for his old self, and inaugurated his Resurrection. It is a beautiful piece of symbolism.

The play-within-a-play represents throughout FF (e.g. in HAM) the imagination working in conjunction with Gnostic reason. The sleeping Sly represents Shakespeare under the influence of imagination-less, reason-less Puritanism, and therefore the epitome of grossness (“O monstrous beast, how like a swine he lies!”). During this long period Shakespeare was totally at the mercy of his libido (drunkenness of Sly), either desperately trying to suppress it, or surrendering to it, with torment in its train.

This period is described, variously, as having lasted seven (Ind.1, 120), and fifteen (Ind.2, 112) years; while the term of his essential separation from the Goddess, and ignorance of the unseen world, is put at thirty (“I [for “Ay”], and the time seems thirty unto me...”: Ind.2, 123). These three superficially inconsistent figures are of the most fascinating significance, confirming in a striking way as they do the scenario of the histories as allegory. The “seven” must refer to the time between Shakespeare’s breakdown and the composition of TOF (1587-94). “Fifteen” fits perfectly the span of his thralldom to Puritanism, after his forced separation from his Dionysian companions c. aet.15 as I have demonstrated, a scenario

which is utterly consistent with the local traditions of his having been prosecuted by Sir Thomas Lucy for poaching, and forcibly rusticated, in lieu of gaol, to become a master at a Puritan school. "Thirty" is his age at the time of writing: for his failure to embrace the Goddess has been lifelong, being actuated in childhood by the Christian puritanism of his home milieu (see especially RII). These figures confirm that TOF was written in 1594, the coup having struck in 1587, with Shakespeare aet.23, as I have suggested. The Page here represents, as he does throughout the First Folio, the written or printed word. In the habiliments of Sly's wife, he represents the Goddess as inherent therein, as for example is Isis in Apuleius, whose monumental presence behind so many of the plays is demonstrated in these pages.

Bacon therefore is inducting Shakespeare into the Hermetic arts, wherein the unseen world is celebrated; but the patient must put aside any desire ("Thrice noble lord, let me entreat of you/To pardon me yet for a night or two...": Page, Ind. 2, 117): for the lessons of the written word – e.g. as conveyed by the graphically described seduction of Lucius by Fotis in TGA, which may well have precipitated the coup of 1587 (see MAN) – must be engaged as idea, rather than will. This is the point of the half-starved dog in Dürer's *Melencolia I* (fig.1). With the awakening of imagination and the development of reason, Shakespeare's inherent nobility is making the first tiny crack in its chrysalis: for the Page's "Thrice noble lord" refers most plausibly to Hermes Trismegistus ("Hermes Thrice-great"), who is an Alexander or Gnostic Christ-analogue.

ACT I

i

The exchange between Lucentio and Tranio which opens the first scene is a beautiful rehearsal of the Renaissance reaction against the sterile rationalism of Aristotle in favour of the deeper humanity of Plato (the symbolism of the Earl of Oxford in the histories: the "ford", unlike the "bridge", demanding engagement rather than avoidance of Anna Livia Plurabelle). This exaltation of Plato was a central feature of the new Renaissance Neoplatonism/Christian Cabalism which came to life in Florence toward the end of the 15th century, and whose spirit and

philosophy suffuses FF. The centrality of the Platonic approach to the high Western or Faustian Culture (the two qualifiers are absolutely interchangeable) is exemplified by the "Mothers" of Goethe's *Faust*, which represent Platonic Ideas: e.g. not the alder or the oak, but the Tree; not the tulip or the orchid, but the Flower; not man or woman, but Man. Only through Platonic Ideas can the Faustian depth of nature be revealed, and the universality of the unseen world at the bottom of all life whatever be appreciated. Thus Platonism penetrates deeply to the irrational and the unconscious, which is an inviolable component, along with the conscious ego, of the Self, which is the supra-ordinate personality, as Jung has observed. The attraction towards a particular artist or art-form, albeit it is for reasons of which the individual is unaware, must therefore be honoured and consummated: for it quite likely that it is the will (Schopenhauer's "x factor") that is perceived therein. The impulse to read, for example, Henry James, - in whose novels the will-to-life is entirely absent, to render them sham art, - can only proceed from the rationality of the ego, and must be resisted at all costs. The impulse to read D.H. Lawrence, on the other hand, must not be resisted for fear of succumbing to the foolishness of libido; for it is only through the will that the will can be transcended ("Only through time time is conquered"; T.S. Eliot, *Burnt Norton*); and there are deeper possibilities, as Joseph Campbell tells us in his *An Open Life*:

... there's a very special property in the trickster: he always breaks in, just as the unconscious does, to trip up the rational situation. He's both a fool and someone who's beyond the system. And the trickster hero represents all those possibilities of life that your mind has decided it doesn't want to deal with. The mind structures a lifestyle, and the fool or trickster represents another whole range of possibilities. He doesn't respect the values you've set up for yourself, and smashes them. The fool really became [in myth] the instructor of kings because he was careless of the king's opinion, careless of the king's power; and the king allowed this because he got wisdom from this uncontrolled source. The fool is the breakthrough of the absolute into the field of controlled social orders.

This was precisely the problem confronting Bacon and his patient, in whom the libido remained in negative aspect, as cast by puritan Christianity; and the above philosophy is beautifully put here, right at the inauguration of Shakespeare's journey to recovery:

Tranio Let's be no stoics nor no stocks, I pray,
 Or so devote to Aristotle's checks
 As Ovid be an outcast quite abjured.
 Balk logic with acquaintance that you have,
 And practise rhetoric in your common talk,
 Music and poesy use to quicken you,
 The mathematics and the metaphysics
 Fall to them as you find your stomach serves you.
 No profit grows where is no pleasure ta'en.

Note that Biondello appears, utterly consistently with his allegoric value of the light of reason illumining the unseen world, immediately upon Tranio and Lucentio exchanging clothes, to make the identification between them.

ii

What is the significance of the superficially inconsequential dispute between Petruchio and Grumio on the steps of Hortensio's house? This last in his house, whence he emerges to welcome Grumio as his "old" friend, and Petruchio as his "good" friend, represents the spoken/written/printed word whose real meaning, - as distinct from the sham meaning given it by imagination-less Puritanism (cf. "He who would reason out and understand the causes of things must first picture them in the imagination": Pico della Mirandola), - which the ego bent on healing (Petruchio as an aspect of Lucentio) is about to penetrate. The libido at this early preliminary stage is still in negative aspect, as cast by Christian puritanism, and therefore still in conflict with the conscious ego: which torturous scruple will be shaken from his shoe by the written word. Here will be richness, for the Goddess resides there, Her hellward aspect in its soil, as Isis resided in the underworld of

Egypt, and in The Golden Ass:

Hortensio And yet I'll promise thee she shall be rich,
 And very rich. But th'art too much my friend,
 And I'll not wish thee to her.

- For the word yields its treasures reluctantly at first. The ego will have to confront Nature in all Her catabolic fury, - and not deny or ignore or condemn it, as does the Puritan (and they persist even now in the public life of the West), - just as did Hal before the gates of Harfleur. This way only does victory lie:

Grumio I'll tell you what, sir, an she stand him but a little, he
 will throw a figure in her face, and so disfigure her
 with it that she shall have no more eyes to see withal
 than a cat.

- The cat being a symbol of Isis. With the help of the Gnostic written word, reason will illumine the hell of the libido, and the ego shed its burden and begin to soar:

Tranio Please ye we may... eat and drink as friends.

Grumio and Biondello O excellent motion! Fellows, let's be gone.

Hortensio The motion's good indeed, and be it so.

This will be, however, sometime in the future, when the ego is full steam on the way to Gnostic enlightenment, as symbolised by the marriage of Hortensio in Act V to the "Widow", whose symbolic value as Isis, widowed from the death of Osiris, - hence the long-standing appellation of the Masonic fraternity as "Sons of the Widow", - cannot be in the slightest doubt. Here at this preliminary stage – as the libido remains in negative aspect - the Hortensio principle is still to be identified with Puritan mentation. The libido is repressed from consciousness, remaining unilluminated by the written word:

Petrucchio Sirrah [Grumio], begone, or talk not, I advise you.

Hortensio Petruchio, patience, I am Grumio's pledge.

Katherina's smashing of the lute over Hortensio's head, and his subsequent rejection by Bianca in favour of Lucentio, will later mark the inauguration of the sea change.

ACT II

Katherina has tied Bianca's hands, and is trying to strip her of her "gauds", her fine clothes. Bianca begs to be released, and assures her sister she will take them off herself, if only she be released from her servility. Katherina demands to know her chosen lover, but is not satisfied with the inconclusive answer. Their father appears and releases Bianca from her bonds, and sends her inside. Katherina follows, protesting that "her silence flouts me". Immediately Gremio enters, with Lucentio disguised as Cambio, a teacher for Bianca; Petruchio, with Hortensio disguised as Licio, another teacher; and Biondello, bringing a lute and books.

What does all of this mean? Bianca in chains is a beautiful representation of the visible world held in the concepts of the rigid Puritan ego. Her stripping at the hands of Kate (a Queen of Hell-Grail Queen) signifies that the unseen world in destructive mode is ever assaulting these Puritan forms, threatening to bring them crashing down, as befell the tower of Lear Inc; but if the ego were to be liberated through the Musical arts, as revelatory of that underworld, then its tower would lie deep-rooted in solid ground. This is what it means to have found the Holy Grail, or the Ring. The silence of Bianca may now be added to the silences of Cordelia, Hippolyta and Hero, as representing Nature as apprehended by the unenlightened Puritan ego, over whom the underworld insults in spite of his delusion to the contrary. Nature does not at this stage speak to the ego through the written word; or rather, the ego in denying that word is deaf to Her. However this John the Baptist (Baptista Minola) now appears, to raise his Christ from the sea of the unconscious through the Musical arts.

The transformation of the ego will be a subtle process, to be effected in a definite sequence, like the progress of an initiate through the stages of a mystery school (the Mithraic religion; the pilgrim journey from Santiago de Compostella in Portugal, through

the great Cathedrals of France, to finish at Rosslyn Castle in Scotland; the voyage of Odysseus; and so on), and not in any facile way:

Petruchio And you, good sir. Pray have you not daughter

Called Katherina, fair and virtuous?

Baptista I have a daughter, sir, called Katherina.

Gremio You are too blunt, go to it orderly.

Hortensio is now named, highly significantly, as “born in Mantua”: to identify him with Virgil and his Goddess-rejector hero Aeneas. Baptista Minola has an orchard, which is precisely cognate with that of Alexander Iden in 2 HVI IV, x, (whose name may be derived from Alexander the Great, symbolic of the Gnostic Christ through the FF; and “Iden” from the Greek *idein* meaning “to see”, to signify the visual imagination: albeit this character appears in the source). The orchard tree is a Goddess-symbol; and its fruits are symbolic of Christ on the Cross. The red apple, an earth symbol, as lying on the background of blue sky (reason), in particular is symbolic of wisdom. The orchard trees symbolise, like all the other trees, groves, woods, and forests in FF, the written word.

Hortensio's head encollared by the lute ("And there I stood amazed for a while,/As on a pillory, looking through the lute...") is symbolic of psychic rebirth: the broken lute being cognate with the golden chain of A Comedy of Errors, the "-crantz" of "Rosencrantz" (< the Dutch crant, "garland"), Ophelia's garlands, and Lear's, and so on; the reference being to the vulva of the Goddess. Ophelia lying supine and singing on the brook with her garlands is symbolic of the "Spirit that moved on the face of the waters", i.e. Sophia, the Goddess of Wisdom in the Gnostic tradition. Katherina (underworld) and Lucentio and his books (that underworld illumined by the Musical Arts) together are therefore cognate with Sophia; and Hortensio's plight represents the first steps of the ego-in-healing towards self-knowledge and wisdom.

Why is music (the lute) emphasised here, when it is suggested that the written word must be the primary vector of the healing principle? This is music in its broad sense of speech and song, recital and repetition, reading and writing, - as defined by Socrates

in the early pages of Plato's Republic, which Bacon must have studied at Cambridge, and which undoubtedly gives the meaning of so much of the music in FF. Further evidence of his inspiration by the Republic is given by the emphasis therein by Simonides of the Autolycus (thief, trickster: see above) factor as a property of the just man (cf. Autolycus of precisely this symbolic value in TWT).

The ascent of the peak of enlightenment must be difficult (Katherina's fierce resistance to Petruchio's advances). The Hanged Man card of the Tarot Major Arcana is referred to, its meaning being that the ego-in-healing must dive into the underworld with eyes open:

Katherina I'll see thee hanged on Sunday first.

Gremio Hark, Petruchio, she says she'll see thee hanged first.

Tranio Is this your speeding? Nay then good night our part.

Petruchio Be patient, gentlemen, I choose her for myself.

- Where "I'll see..." and "Sunday" convey this sense of the visual. The "speed-" of "speeding" is cognate with Dromio (<Greek dromos, a racecourse, e.g. "hippodrome") of ACE, symbolising the aroused libido. However, it is the libido as idea, rather than will, by which the psyche will be transformed ("... pardon me yet for a night or two": Page as Goddess, Ind.2, 118). Tranio (ego in renewal) now prevails over Gremio (ego corrupted by perception of libido in negative aspect) as a suitor for Bianca (perception of universe informed by knowledge of the operation of the will therein).

ACT III

i

The ego-in-healing perceives the Goddess of Love, now stripped of her negative mantle, in the Musical word (the pages of Ovid):

Lucentio [to Bianca] "Hic ibat", as I told you before – "Simois",
I am Lucentio – "hic est", son unto Vincentio of Pisa –
"Sigeia tellus", disguised thus to get your love...

He repudiates the sterile inanity of the word as perceived by the Puritan ego (rejection by Bianca of Hortensio).

Here is another significant contretemps, not at all supererogatory as a superficial reading might suggest:

Baptista Is he [Petrucchio] come [to his marriage]?

Biondello Why, no, sir.

Baptista What then?

Biondello He is coming.

Baptista When will he be here?

Biondello When he stands where I am and sees you there.

This is the single letter “I” as symbolic of the ithyphallic principle, more broadly the unseen world, as we have noted repeatedly thus far (see especially 1-3HVI): for the will, as revealed by Platonic Ideas, is perceived to underlie all phenomena whatsoever, which revelation is a religious epiphany (the Latin religare means “to bind back”). Only now can the libido be retrieved from the unconscious and stripped of its negative mantle, in a way germane to the baptism of Christ by John the Baptist (Baptista Minola).

Petruchio’s down-at-heel marriage clothes, purchased at Venice, - symbolic of the sea, and therefore the unconscious, - are symbolic of the truth (ultimately the will) beneath the surface of the visible world, as revealed by sublimity rather than beauty (e.g. the hurricane rather than the rose: see Schopenhauer, *The World as Will and Idea*). His rudeness at the altar has a similar significance. His “old rusty sword ta’en out of the town armoury” is symbolic of the will at the bottom of the ithyphallic principle (the sword bears this symbolic weight throughout FF: e.g. in the Hamlet-Laertes duel), - and is precisely cognate with Joan of Arc’s sword of similar provenance in 1HVI I, ii. With integration into the psyche of the unconscious, where resides the libido, - as in the case of the Gnostic Christ (hence the horn of the Unicorn), - comes recognition of the Self, as the ego perceives anew the play of the unseen world in himself as in all phenomena: which axiom Petruchio puts in a memorable line: “To me she’s married, not unto my clothes” (116). The best teacher’s exhortation to the pupil to “Make it your own” is an assertion of the Gnostic principle, - of knowledge rather than faith, - which truth Bacon for certain knew:

Petruchio ...I will be master of what is mine own.
She is my goods, my chattels, she is my house,
My household stuff, my field, my barn,
My horse, my ox, my ass, my any thing...

ACT IV

i

The winter experienced by Grumio is symbolic of the freezing of the libido by Puritanism. The fire will soon be kindled, within Grumio as without, as consistent with his allegoric role ("Now were not I a little pot and soon hot...": the "I" symbolising the unseen world). The name "Curtis" is from the Latin *curtus*, "abbreviated", "cut short", to indicate his allegoric role as the flaccid phallos. Bacon takes pains to identify him with the frigid Grumio:

Grumio But thou know'st winter tames man, woman, and
beast; for it hath tamed my old master,
and my new mistress, and myself, fellow Curtis.
Curtis Away, you three-inch fool! I am no beast.
Grumio Am I but three inches? Why, thy horn is a foot, and so
long am I at the least.

Curtis now kindles the fire, and the true nature of the world as informed by the will, ultimately the Universal Will, is revealed: "I prithee, good Grumio, tell me how goes the world?". The ego now apprehends certain truths about itself:

Grumio ...thou shouldst have heard how her horse fell, and
she under her horse; thou shouldst have heard
in how miry a place, how she was bemoiled, how he
left her with the horse upon her, how he
beat me because her horse
stumbled, how she waded through the dirt to pluck him
off me, how he swore, how she prayed that never prayed
before, how I cried, how the horses ran away, how her
bridle was burst, how I lost my crupper...

The spurring of a horse up a hill is symbolic, throughout FF, of the mounting of libido towards climax (e.g. LLL IV, i, 1; the Gads Hill robbery in 1HIV). The Christian puritan guilt induced thereby has led to the (delusory) depowering and humiliation of the Goddess in the puritan (generally Christian, to include Protestant Puritan) ego. This ego now recognises, in the first stages of its transformation, the libido in negative aspect as the root cause of its suffering; which epochal knowledge is accompanied by excoriation, imprecation, and emotion: and it is highly relevant in this context that engagement of the root chakra (halfway between the anus and the perineum, with the initiate in the lotus position), of Hindu Kundalini Yoga is well known to be accompanied by intense emotion.

Petruchio's treatment of his servants seems to be, on the literal plane, unnecessarily harsh and tyrannical; but it is perfectly reasonable on the plane of allegory, where they are revealed to be old enemies of the ego's sanity. The significance of Nathaniel resides in the long standing rivalry of the disciple of this name to Simon Magus (Zelotes), the archetypal magician of the Gnostic tradition who was a fierce opponent of Rome, after its occupation of Palestine after the battle of Actium, which had seen the defeat of Antony:⁸ an event charged with symbolic significance in FF. Joseph is, of course, the name of the father of Christ, well known from the Pauline tradition which has always depicted him as old and decrepit, to conceal the libidinous young man he must, on the contrary, have been. The name "Walter" is from the French gaultier, "he who wields a long pole", and therefore represents the ithyphallic principle, as Marlowe thoughtfully glossed for us in 3HVI IV, i. This is confirmed by Grumio (121): "And Walter's dagger was not come from sheathing". All that is saccharine and superficial must interdicted in the healing journey: no "Sugarsop" being sufficient to subdue Cerberus and allow entry to the underworld. Gregory is, of course, the name of numerous Popes of the Roman Catholic Church, of which by the time of writing of TOS there had been no less than fourteen (the last being Pope Gregory XIV, 1591-2). The Archangel Gabriel of the Pauline tradition announced to the

⁸ Gardner, *ibid.*

sham Goddess the immaculate conception of the sham Christ. I am unable at the time of writing to discover the precise provenance of Nicholas, Rafe, and Philip :although I suspect that this last is a reference to Phillip II of Macedon, whose symbolic significance is likely to be found in the pages of Demosthenes. Are these derivations too *recherchés*? Certainly not, in view of Sir Francis Bacon's peerless scholarship and powerful creative imagination.

The old foe who must in particular be brought to heel with utter ruthlessness is, of course, Peter, that confirmed woman- (and therefore Goddess-) hater who was the rock on which the Pauline Church was built. This is the point of Petruchio's refusal to allow Kate to eat the mutton brought by Peter the servingman: for the strengthening of the ego's reconception of the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen must in no wise be influenced by the Church. Troilus (the name of Petruchio's spaniel) was a Prince of Troy, whence sprang Aeneas, whose symbolic value of the Puritan Goddess-rejector has been demonstrated exhaustively in Ted Hughes' work and my own. Shakespeare employs Troilus in much the same role in *Troilus and Cressida*, which is the story of his inner creative life, and to which he must therefore have contributed a very great deal, albeit some passages are blazoned with the unmistakeable signature of Bacon. The character of Ferdinand, whom Petruchio names as his cousin, intriguingly anticipates *The Tempest*, whose Ferdinand is germane, on the plane of allegory, to this namesake.

The ego is visualising intensely ("And sits as one new risen from a dream": 172), and knows that it must not relax ("Last night she slept not, nor tonight she shall not": 184).

ii

The subject is coming to understand the visible world, through apprehension of its roots in the underworld, now stripped of its negative mantle (success of Lucentio in his courting of Bianca). This has been predicated on the written (or musical) word being removed from under the lens of Puritanism, which liberation has allowed the evocation of its store of images ("Know, sir, that I am called Hortensio": 21).

iii

Grumio feeds Kate “with the very name of meat”: for the written word is revealing the Queen of Hell, now sundered from her Pauline associations (Peter), at the root of Man-as-sublimated-animal. Accordingly Petruchio and Hortensio now enter, right on cue, with meat (knowledge of the Faustian depth of nature) of which they allow Kate to eat.

A haberdasher now brings a hat for Kate, which Petruchio forbids; but not before a tailor has brought a gown, which is similarly refused (the significance of this order of entry will shortly be revealed). What is the meaning of all of this? The cap is “moulded on a porringer”, “lewd and filthy”, a “knack, a toy, a trick, a baby’s cap”, and symbolises therefore the libido as disassociated from the unconscious (lower circle of scalp) to render it subject to the reason. The current widespread fashion for shaving – in men and women - the hair (as the field of grain suggested to the ego by the collective unconscious, and therefore symbolic of the Queen of Hell, Persephone as wife of Dis) level with the scalp, while leaving the crown long, represents precisely the same symbolism at work, and is an index to the (Western) cultural exhaustion of our time: for it is precisely the achievement of Faustian or high Western or Faustian culture to have revealed the unseen world at the bottom of all phenomena whatsoever. In this it must be distinguished from Classical (Graeco-Roman) culture, which denies the existence of anything beyond, as Spengler put it, the material, the immediately comprehensible, the optically definite, to render it become, rather than becoming. It is precisely this Classical late phase (for the Graeco-Roman period was the end stage of the Cretan-Mycenean culture, derived ultimately from the Grooved Ware people of Britain, via Sumer and Egypt⁹) to which the West has now degenerated: and the porringer (pudding-bowl) haircut is one of its many diagnostic blemishes. Bacon was mystagogue to Shakespeare on precisely this Faustian journey, which is yet another Journey of the Hero of world mythology. Again, it is a popular fallacy of the late phase Western culture that Faust “sold his soul to the devil”. He in fact did nothing of the sort, but rather bet the devil that he could visit his kingdom and discover its secrets, and return

⁹ Knight and Lomas, Uriel’s Machine.

unscathed as the hero, which triumph of reason and the soul the Pauline Church has forbidden from day one, to its everlasting shame. Gentility is just the Greek world-feeling in action; and the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen must on no account be conceived in this way:

Petruchio When you are gentle, you shall have one too,
And not till then.

Hortensio (aside) That will not be in haste.

The wearing of the cap by Kate would render her cognate with Doll Tearsheet of 2 HIV, whose obverse aspect is the tart, and reverse the gentlewoman. It is a “toy”, not the real thing, as resumed also in the name “Doll”; while the surname symbolises the tearing of the hymen (a “tearsheet” being a page ripped from a book): the Goddess being perceived by the genteel ego as always a virgin, and therefore ever susceptible to being deflowered, as the tart, when the libido asserts itself in that ego. Thus also was Aphrodite, Goddess of Love, perceived by the Greeks as a courtesan. In this context, the last two sonnets, in which Shakespeare describes his venereal disease, are highly significant.

Petruchio’s acknowledgement of the tone, rather than the words themselves, of Kate’s railing (“Love me or love me not, I like the cap,/And it I will have...”: 84) is typical of Bacon’s cryptographic strategy, for the decipherment of which it is necessary to visualise the action in the imagination, quite divorced from the words on the page, and then see what other meaning it might represent. Kate here is speaking from the heart, as does Nature when Her Faustian depth is revealed.

What is the meaning of the otherwise unfathomable contretemps about the gown?

Grumio I confess two sleeves.

Tailor “The sleeves curiously cut”.

Petruchio I [for “Ay”], there’s the villainy.

Grumio ... I commanded the sleeves should be cut out, and sewed up again.

The substitution of a left arm for a right was an Elizabethan technique for signifying false identity. Thus the Droeshout engraving of Shakespeare, frontispiece to FF, shows his “curiously cut” coat as having two left sleeves, to signify that he was a frontman for Bacon, an interpretation reinforced by the clear line from the ear to the jaw, suggestive of a mask. The First Folio of course was compiled under the aegis of Bacon, long after Shakespeare’s death (the birth may have begun immediately upon his retirement), which accounts for the extraordinary accuracy of the information content of lines, words, even single letters, so readily susceptible to corruption at every stage of the publishing process, as shown in the subsequent Folios, less meticulously edited. Thus the gown must be refused for Kate, whose true identity is the object of Shakespeare’s search; but is taken up by Petruchio, who is a cipher for the Gnostic or Hermetic principle which annihilates the Pauline Church. The “I” principle of the ithyphallos/unseen world as “villain” is associated with the false arms, and the old dispensation, which is now being corrected. Thus also does the Tailor enter before the Haberdasher, to signify that subsequent dialogue, with Petruchio’s odd response to Katherine’s words, is a cipher for something else.

Grumio O sir, the conceit is deeper than you think for.

With the Queen of Hell and Her Consort/Son homo libidensis, Man-as-sublimated animal, Dionysian or Falstaffian or Polonian Man, being integrated into the ego-in-healing as idea rather than will, as provided by the written word, the subject has attained to the Holy Grail, which is, in the Gnostic tradition, the wisdom derived from knowledge of the unseen world: the Grail being identical to the Ark of the Covenant, which contains the “Tablets of Testimony” inscribed with the Word of God, nothing less (see Ch.44).

Petruchio ... We will hence forthwith

To feast and sport us at thy father’s house.

(to Grumio) Go call my men, and let us straight to him,
And bring our horses to Long-lane end,

There will we mount, and thither walk on foot.

Here, the “horses” represent, as always in FF, the libido (more broadly, the unseen world); “Long-lane end”, the upper, paracervical part of the vagina. The ego-in-transformation therefore has penetrated to the depths of the Goddess (Who is Nature divinised), where the libido remains, to reach the Holy Grail: all without succumbing to the libido as will (“...and thither walk on foot”); rather, engaging it as idea.

iv

The Aeneas principle (Puritan rejection of the Goddess as Dido = Cleopatra = Isis) represents a divergence from the true stream of Hermetism, and its worship of the true Goddess:

Pedant Signor Baptista may remember me
 Near twenty tears ago in Genoa,
 Where we were lodgers at the Pegasus.

- Where “Pegasus” is of course the winged horse of pre-Hellenic mythology, here symbolising the libido. The ego is continuing to imagine and reason, with victory in sight: “Imagine ‘twere the right Vincentio” (12). The libido in negative aspect is nowhere to be seen: “Not in my house, Lucentio.../[where]...old Gremio is hearkening still,/And happily we might be interrupted” (51). The Pauline Church has been repudiated: Enter Peter... “Come sir, we will better it in Pisa” (71). The light of reason illumining the underworld, has revealed the meaning of the symbols of the collective unconscious (the Goddess, the Boar, the Adonis-figure, and so on): “...but has left me here behind to expound the meaning or moral of his signs and tokens” (Biondello: 77). The transformation of the ego to enable it to harmonise with the phenomenal world, which is now revealed as a veil over the countenance of the Queen of Hell, is almost complete (preparations for Lucentio’s marriage to Bianca at the Church of St. Luke, the patron saint of healing). This has been a religious conversion in the truest sense, with the Will and its lowest objectifications as the four fundamental forces of nature, then the will(s)-to-survival, -eros, and -power of the plant and animal worlds,

being revealed as underpinning all human life whatsoever. The unseen world as a divine principle is expressed by Bacon in the powerful single-letter symbol with which you should by now be totally familiar:

Lucentio I may and will, if she be so contented.

v

The ego celebrates the memorable victory of reason and the soul, mediated by the written word, over the underworld which previously had tormented it: “Petruchio, go thy ways, the field is won “: Hortensio, 23). The sublimity of Nature in catabolic mode – the wild beauty of the seas, the hurricane, the inferno, &c, as revelatory of the will – has been recognised: “Pardon, old father, my mistaking eyes,/That have been so bedazzled by the sun/That everything I look on seemeth green” (Katherina, 44).

ACT V

i

The illumination of Hell by the written (or “Musical”, in the Platonic sense: see above) word has done its job, but will always be there in the power of the ego reborn:

Biondello Softly an swiftly, sir, for he priest is ready.

Lucentio I fly, Biondello. But they may chance to need thee at home, therefore leave us.

Exeunt Lucentio and Bianca

Biondello Nay, faith, I’ll see the church at your back, and then come back to my master’s as soon as I can.

The libido in negative aspect in extremis remains aligned with the Aeneas principle (Pedant, born in Mantua) which is about to be overthrown:

Gremio I dare swear this is the right Vincentio.

Pedant Swear if thou dar’st.

Gremio Nay, I dare not swear it.

Tranio Then thou wert best say that I am not Lucentio.

Gremio Yes, I know thee to be Signor Lucentio.

- For the Gremio principle will be repudiated with the final victory (Exeunt Biondello, Tranio and Pedant, as fast as may be).

ii

Here is another beautiful cryptographic set piece from the patient pen of Sir Francis Bacon. The Widow represents the Great Goddess Isis of the Masonic tradition (hence have its adepts been known since antiquity as “Sons of the Widow”, to identify them with Horus, conceived from the phallos of Osiris after his death). This is the final scene of the play; the initiate has attained to the knowledge of the unseen world at play in himself, and hence his essential kinship with the created universe (as expressed in the Hermetic axiom “As above, so below”, or “As without, so within”):

Petruchio Now, for my life, Hortensio fears his widow

Widow Then never trust me if I be afeard.

Petruchio You are very sensible, and yet you miss my sense:

I mean Hortensio is afeard of you.

Widow He that is giddy thinks the world turns round.

The single letter “I” carries here the symbolic meaning of the ithyphallos-libido, or unseen world, which, inhering in the written word, had caused the reader (Shakespeare in Puritan phase) hitherto to be afraid of its true meaning. There now is achieved the astonishing identification of Petruchio (the Pauline Church-killer) with the great God Osiris, and the initiate – the newly healed William Shakespeare – with Horus, to make him a true “Son of the Widow”, with the ability to recreate the macrocosm in his imagination, and recognise thereby his oneness with it:

Widow Thus I conceive by him.

[...]

Hortensio My widow says thus she conceives her tale.

Katherina’s identity as the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, an aspect of Isis, and the source of the libido - whence, as conceived in

negative aspect, the erstwhile suffering of the initiate, - is affirmed:

Widow Right, I mean you.

Katherina And I am mean, respecting you.

Knowledge of the unseen world has made the phenomenal world come alive in the mind of the initiate:

Vincenzio I, mistress bride, hath that awakened you?

Bianca I, but not frightened me, therefore I'll sleep again.

Petruchio Nay, that you shall not. Since you have begun,

Have at you for a bitter jest or two.

Bianca Am I your bird? I mean to shift my bush,

And then pursue me as you draw your bow.

- Where "I" for "Ay" bears its usual allegoric meaning. The arrows here represent the rays of the sun, which symbolise the faculty of reason at work, as in the mythology of all cultures great or small. Nature cannot submit to reason without the prior engagement of the will (failure of Bianca and the Widow to come at the command of their husbands, until invited by Kate, who has first obeyed Petruchio).

The victory over the unseen world of the will is celebrated; and Kate's last speech, which the reader may only accept with some difficulty on the literal plane, is triumphantly justified on the plane of allegory:

Katherina Such a duty as the subject owes the prince,

Even such a woman oweth to her husband.

... I am ashamed that woman are so simple

To offer war where they should kneel for peace,

Or seek for rule, supremacy, and sway,

When they are bound to serve, love, and obey.

CHAPTER 13

A MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM

A Midsummer Night's Dream gives every indication of having been conceived by Sir Francis Bacon as vehicle of a precious strain of the esoteric tradition, which its allegory of the principles of his treatment of the stricken William Shakespeare – for this play will be shown to be another in the Bacon group, all written from the therapist's exterior point of view – would give him the opportunity to convey. Sir Laurence Gardner, in his *Realm of the Ring Lords*, gives a fascinating survey, from which much of the following detail is taken, of the Ring/Grail tradition in World culture, as celebrated, for example, in the Talmudic story of King Solomon, the mediaeval Grail legends, The Volsung Saga, Wagner's Ring cycle, Tolkien's *Lord of the Rings*, and so on.

With its roots in Sumer circa 4000 B.C., or possibly before, the Ring Lord culture gave rise to the Pharaonic line of Egypt, the Davidic line of Judea, which included Jesus Christ, and... the famed Tuatha de Danaan or, as Gardner more correctly names them, the Tuadhe d'Anu of Ireland, who, along with their cousins germanes the Picts, gave rise to the Fairy and Greenwood culture of the British Isles, which thickly pervades MND. Bacon must have known exactly the value of the symbols he was handling; and, as one of the greatest masters of the esoteric tradition, nothing less should be expected of him.

The Tuadhe d'Anu, whose culture dominated Ireland in the 1st and 2nd millenia B.C., were known in those times as the noblest race in the world. This is a far cry from the amusing "little people" to which they were defensively reduced by the scribes of the mediaeval Church; and the word "fairy" in fact derives from the Egyptian phare, which itself derives from precisely the same root as pharo, "Great House", whence "Pharaoh". This conflict between the Ring/Grail (broadly Gnostic) and Pauline Christian traditions, mostly involving the brutal suppression of the former, was coming to a head in Britain already in the Shakespearean era. Although

nominally ruled by the Church of Rome, England had preserved much of the earlier pre-Christian culture, which mightily offended the Church – for example, the May Day revels, whose Goddess was Mary the Gypsy (Mary Jacob), who had accompanied Mary Magdalene, the wife of Jesus Christ, to Provence with their three children in 44 A.D. Now the rise of Puritanism threatened to destroy this tradition forever. 1-3 HVI is in fact a general allegory of the birth of Puritanism in the psyche and society, with the personal autobiography of Shakespeare beginning to take form in Part 3. Thereafter, the historical cycle would concern itself exclusively with his inner life.

Bacon's analysis of the principles involved in Shakespeare's catastrophic anxiety/depression neurosis, and, by near extension, of schizophrenia (HAM), and of his successful treatment of him, makes the First Folio a truly epochal document in the history of psychiatry, one whose true nature has remained hidden for too long, and whose wisdom has remained unavailable to the modern clinician, to the great misfortune of the afflicted. Although, perhaps not completely unavailable: for there has been a strong alternative Bacon-esque current of thought gathering strength since the early 20th century, whose conclusions were beautifully summarised by the late Joseph Campbell, that great master of the wisdom of mythology, in his wonderful essay on schizophrenia in *Myths to Live By*, which seems likely, like all his works, to remain in print for as long as Western culture may survive.

Psychosis is marked, by definition, by a loss of contact with reality, whereas the perceptions of the neurotic patient remain accurate: and the difference between the two may be quantitative rather than qualitative, both proceeding from the same root. This was certainly the case with Shakespeare's severe neurosis, which brought him to the brink of madness, and provided the basis for the examination of paranoid schizophrenia in HAM. The other main variety of schizophrenia is termed "essential": the difference between paranoid and essential schizophrenias being that in the latter the inward journey to the basal layer of the collective unconscious, which is forced on the resourceless patient against his will, is undertaken, no matter how traumatic; whereas in the former it is shirked, with the patient immediately turning away to

the macrocosm, whereon he projects the dangers of the journey, and erects defenses against it which can be rationalised and therefore coped with: for example, the delusion that foreign agents are communicating with his brain, and ordering him to kill. So that it is essential schizophrenia that is capable, like anxiety/depression neurosis, of being cured, with the immense benefit to the patient of having taken him on the Journey of the Hero. I cannot put it better than Joseph Campbell, whose hand the spirit of Bacon might have been guiding:

The usual pattern is, first, of a break away or departure from the local social order and context; next, a long, deep retreat inward and backward, backward, as it were, in time, and inward, deep into the psyche; a chaotic series of encounters there, darkly terrifying experiences, and presently (if the victim is fortunate) encounters of a centering kind, fulfilling, harmonising, giving new courage; and then finally, in such fortunate cases, a return journey of rebirth to life. And that is the universal formula also of the mythological hero journey... Now... in certain cases the best thing is to let the schizophrenic process run its course, not to abort the psychosis by administering shock treatments and the like, but, on the contrary, to help the process of disintegration and reintegration along. However, if a doctor is to be helpful in this way, he has to understand the image language of mythology. He has himself to understand what the fragmentary signs and signals that his patient, totally out of touch with rationally oriented manners of thought and communication, is trying to bring forth in order to establish some kind of contact. Interpreted from this point of view, a schizophrenic breakdown is an inward and backward journey to recover something missed or lost, and to restore, therefore, a vital balance.

This is all of extreme relevance to the Bacon-Shakespeare story. Allowance should be made, of course, for Shakespeare's maintenance of his contact with reality – the absence of hallucinations, delusions, and so on. So what exactly was it that held him from the pit of psychosis? Let us consider first Bacon's

identification of puritan Christianity, especially its extreme expression in the Puritan sect of England, as the culprit in the aetiology of Shakespeare's condition, and of schizophrenia. The question must then be asked: "Why are not all Puritans schizophrenics?" – and Puritans still abound in the West, God knows, some 350 years on. The answer is that the development of clinical schizophrenia depends upon the patient's never having made the hero journey, on his being totally resourceless, and inane of the symbols that might make the inhabitants of the sea-floor of the unconscious more familiar and rather less frightening. Whereas the majority of outwardly sane Protestant Puritans, or even merely Christian puritans, must be assumed to have at some point made that journey, or part of it, - possibly through childhood reading, or other exposure to art, - only to repudiate it. Shakespeare aet.23, after the breakdown, was somewhere in between: not a functioning Puritan, but a crippled one, yet remaining just this side of psychosis; and there are clear indications in the historical cycle as psycho-allegory of why this was so. For his Tavern or pseudo-Alexandrian phase of mid-adolescence, - the third of a series of mechanisms of coping with the underworld in negative aspect, evidently a constitutive part of his psyche, - had been enriched by considerable reading, and familiarity thereby with the timeless lessons of myth. He became an instant guru in this phase, an aficionado of the journey without ever having made it; yet it was the fund of learning in this period, largely forgotten during his long (eight years) Puritan phase, which would have come back to help him in extremis. To this one must add this great intelligence and imagination, albeit both had been dormant during his eight-year term of enthrallment to Puritanism.

Of great relevance also is Campbell's mention of the Indian siddhi (cf. the Indian connection via Titania in MND), the powers that can be gained from the completion of the Journey of the Hero: for they are cognate with the famed Gaelic sidhé, the "Web of the Wise" possessed by the Ring Lords of the Tuadhe d'Anu and the Picts. Bacon's Oberon is of a noble lineage. The English "over" derives from the Scythian uper, via the Middle Teutonic ober and Old European ubar: the Royal Scyths of the Black Sea region being the parent race of the Tuadhe d'Anu and Picts. "Reign" similarly

derives from the Scythian rgn (ron). “Oberon” as ober rgn therefore is a derivative style for Over Reign; as ober on for Over Light. In the Gaelic and Pictish tongues these are the equivalents of Ard Ri (High King) and Albe Ri (Shining King), whence the names Arthur and Albrey: Albe Ri referring ultimately to the “Shining Ones”, as the Annunaki of Sumer, the original Ring Lords, were known. Titania (“born of a Titan”) must be Diana, the Imperial Huntress (Ovid, *Metamorphoses*), whose bow and arrows contributed to the legend of Robin Hood, who was himself a kind of Shining (or Elf) King. She was in fact the Goddess of the Forest in ancient Britain; and Bacon’s symbolic strategy is beginning to cohere before our eyes. The forest of MND is the same precisely as those in AYLI and TGV, wherein the subject (Orlando; Valentine) is transformed, to his healing, and attainment of Gnostic nobility: all of them representing the written word, basis of the Musical arts (reading and writing, speech and song, recital and repetition, as defined by Socrates in the early pages of Plato’s *Republic*) which were the central plank of Bacon’s therapeutic approach to Shakespeare’s condition. In both AYLI and TGV the Robin Hood legend is explicitly mentioned. In the ancient world, time was measured by the moon, so that the year had thirteen 28-day months: hence the thirteen witches of the coven, and Christ and his twelve apostles (these most certainly may be mentioned in the same breath). Diana was a typical lunar Goddess, as also was the Indian Kali, Who was Queen of the cycles and periods of Nature; and it is most likely the latter that is represented by Titania’s double:

Titania The fairyland buys not the child of me.
 His mother was a vot’ress of my order,
 And in the spiced Indian air by night
 Full often has she gossiped by my side,
 And sat with me on Neptune’s yellow sands...

This serves to identify both of them with Mary the Gypsy (Jacob), the May Queen Herself, the Goddess of Love who steps onto the shore from a scallop shell in Botticelli’s *The Birth of Venus* (the scallop pattern was a Rosicrucian device, symbolising both the

male principle and the Holy Grail (Goddess principle)). The child is Kali/Diana's son, an incarnation of the libido (will-to-life), who is withheld from Oberon (Elf King principle in subject –Theseus – crippled by Puritan anathematisation of libido). Further, he is Titania's Page (II, i, 185) – yet another in FF, all of them without exception representing the written or printed word.. One recalls the deeply poignant lines in TT I, ii:

Prospero ...Knowing I lov'd my books, he [Gonzalo] furnish'd me,
From mine own library with volumes that
I prize above my dukedom.

Gonzalo is the "noble Neapolitan" who helped Prospero and Miranda on their coming ashore following the shipwreck (beginning of Shakespeare's healing). Naples throughout the plays bears, as a southern city of Italy, the symbolic value of the underworld or unconscious: and Gonzalo is therefore the libido. So that the Gonzalo-books unit is perfectly cognate with Titania's Page (cf. also Balthasar's ink and paper in R&J V, i). The Page represents here the printed page as vector of the will-to-life or libido, which will be recognised and engaged by the imagination of the subject (reunion of Oberon and Titania), in contrast to his hitherto Puritan repudiation of it. As will be established in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* and *Much Ado About Nothing*, there can absolutely no doubt that Apuleius' intensely erotic and inspirationally magical *The Golden Ass* was used as a therapeutic tool by Bacon; and now here - "From mine own library" - is strong support for it also as precipitator of the breakdown: the Puritan Shakespeare perhaps coming upon Fotis' vividly described seduction of Lucius therein, suppressing in vain the will-to-eros, long chained in the unconscious, and surrendering to auto-erotism, with its catastrophic sequela of the "charge of the Boar".

There is yet another Love Goddess in MND. Hermia is daughter of Egeus; and why is it spelt thus, and not the expected "Aegeus"? Aegeus was father of Theseus, and therefore absolutely could not be named thus in this play, where he does not bear this value. Why then have an Egeus at all, when another less problematic name could have served the purpose? The answer is that Egeus is a

reference, of course, to the Aegean sea, to make of his daughter a Mary Jacob.

There is a further Egyptian connection too. The Gypsy art of dukkering, fortune-telling through the reading of body signs, was believed to have been a form of magic inherited from Egypt; and the “Gyp-” root of Gypsy in fact derives from “Egypt”. So that Mary the Gypsy (Jacob), Goddess of the Mayday revels, is cognate with Isis, Whom Apuleius names as the greatest of all Great Goddesses of the ancient world, and is the goal of Lucius’ quest in TGA. Freemasons have long styled themselves “Sons of the Widow”, to identify themselves with Horus, son of Isis, widowed after the death of Osiris. This is the allegoric value of the Widow in TOS; and here she is again:

Lysander I have a widow aunt, a dowager,
Of great revenue, and she hath no child.
From Athens to her house remote seven leagues
And she respects me as her only son –
There, gentle Hermia, may I marry thee,
And to that place the sharp Athenian law
Cannot pursue us.

The symbolic value of the city of Athens is now clear. This is the Athens of the great misogynist and Goddess-rejector Pericles: hence also the title of the eponymous play, - which begs the question of why it was left out of FF. All of its plays have a significant Baconian component, to massively support the theory that it was published under his aegis, from his own manuscripts, as Part IV of his great philosophical work the *Instauratio Magna*. Shakespeare then must be presumed, on first principles, to have been the sole author of Pericles; and, certainly, North’s English translation of Plutarch would have been accessible to him, even if he did not possess, as seems likely, a jot of Greek. The frequent Plutarchian symbolism of the plays - for example, Fabian in TN as the faculty of the visual imagination, taken from *The Life of Fabius Maximus*, wherein the character Fabius Pictor (“painter”) consults the Delphic oracle at the Temple of Apollo, that great god of the visual principle – must therefore be allowed to have possibly been the work of Shakespeare as well as Bacon: a scenario which the

appearance of the allegorically precise term “hugger-mugger” in HAM, taken from Plutarch’s *Life of Julius Caesar* (trans. North), would support, as pointing to North rather than the Greek original as the source.

The ass is also, of course, present in MND, as Bottom, who represents that principle in Shakespeare, as he undertook the Fool’s journey to the underworld in the initial stages of his psychic transformation under the guidance of Bacon. The editor of the Oxford MND expresses his uncertainty that Bottom refers to TGA, on the basis of Lucius’s complete transformation to an ass, and his painful awareness of his plight, in contrast to Bottom’s acquiring of only an ass-head, - due to the magic of Robin Goodfellow, - and his ignorance of what has happened. These inconsistencies must now be seen to be utterly trivial: it is like denying that Homer was the inspiration for James Joyce’s *Ulysses* because of the lack of a Martello tower in the former. Titania then is cognate with Isis, and hence with Cleopatra of A&C, as well as Aeneas’ rejected Goddess Dido: hence the symbolic value of the town of Mantua (birthplace of Virgil, creator of Aeneas) in R&J, TGV, and TOS, as the Puritan pathological ego-state.

Gardner gives a beautiful summary of the dragon symbolism of the Ring tradition. The word “dragon” derives from the Greek *drakon*, meaning “serpent”: so that the dragon and serpent are interchangeable in this context. The serpent was a constant symbol of wisdom in the ancient world, dating back to millenia before the Graeco-Roman era; and *drakon* is apparent in the Greek *edrakon*, a past tense of *derkesthai*, “to see clearly”. The biblical Hebrew for serpent is *nahash*, which however related to a threshold of understanding and meant “to discover”, “to find out”. The Sarmatians were a noble cousin-race of the Royal Scyths, and their warriors wore armour of small interlinked plaquelets of bronze, which tarnished to green, to give them the appearance of serpents or dragons; and it was from them that the famous Red Dragon of the flag of Wales derived, via an army that was captured by the Roman legions of Marcus Aurelius in Hungary in AD 175, and transported to Britain. This serpent symbolism appears most powerfully in MND:

Oberon I know a bank where the wild thyme grows...
 There sleeps Titania sometime of the night,
 Lulled in these flowers with dances and delight;
 And there the snake throws her enamelled skin,
 Weed wide enough to wrap a fairy in...

This is different *toto caelo* from the Goddess-snake complex of the Garden of Eden story, which was yet another late perversion of the Ring/Grail tradition by the Pauline Church: for Titania (Diana/Kali/Isis) is associated with supreme wisdom, as indeed is Hermia (Mary the Gypsy, Goddess of Love):

Hermia Help me, Lysander, help me! Do thy best
 To pluck this crawling serpent from my breast!
 I [for "Ay"] me, for pity. What a dream was here?
 Lysander, look how I do quake with fear.
 Methought a serpent ate my heart away,
 And you sat smiling at his cruel prey.

Her "I me" identifies her with the unseen world. She is here waking after Robin Goodfellow has placed the magic drops on Lysander's sleeping eyes, to awaken in him love for Helen, which is as powerful as his new repugnance for Hermia:

Lysander ...Hermia, sleep thou there,
 And never mayst thou come Lysander near;
 For as a surfeit of the sweetest things
 The deepest loathing to the stomach brings,
 Or as the heresies that men do leave
 Are hated most of those they did deceive,
 So thou, my surfeit and my heresy,
 Of all be hated, but the most of me;
 And all my powers, address your love and might
 To honour Helen, and to be her knight.

The name "Lysander" is an alternative to "Alexander", who represents a type of Gnostic Christ throughout the plays, especially in

¹ Life of Pyrrus, trans North.

HV. His marriage to Hermia is being thwarted by her father Egeus, who favours Demetrius, who is in love with her. What is going on here? The immense debt of FF to Plutarch as a mine of symbols has been a constant theme of the argument to date; and Demetrius' allegoric value can be gleaned therefrom. Firstly, let us examine the character of Pyrrhus (HAM, the player's speech), whom Plutarch identifies firmly with Alexander:

For they [the Macedonians] thought they saw in his face the very life and agility of Alexander the great, & the right shadow as it were, showing the force and fury of Alexander himself in that fight. And where other kings did but only counterfeit Alexander the great in his purple garments, and in numbers of soldiers and guards about their persons, and in a certain fashion and bowing of their necks a little, and in uttering his speech with a high voice: Pyrrus only was like with him, and followed him in his martial deeds and warlike acts.¹

This is, of course, the Alexander/Pyrrhus (Gnostic Christ principle) who slaughters Priam (Puritan ego) in HAM, in the scene, spoken by the itinerant players, which Hamlet (incipient schizophrenic ego) has forgotten. Immediately before this passage, there is named a certain Alexander, king of Macedonia, whom Bacon recognised as a true Alexander for the purpose of his allegory. A conflict between Pyrrus and Demetrius is described; and Bacon must have grabbed it and run:

They [Pyrrus and Demetrius] had not been many days together, but the one began to mistrust the other, and to spy all the ways they could to entrap each other: but Demetrius embracing the first occasion offered, prevented Alexander and slew him, being a young man, and proclaimed himself king of Macedonia in his room. Now Demetrius had certain quarrels before against Pyrrus, because he had overrun the country of Thessaly...[and] the one stood in fear and mistrust of the other, and yet much more after the death of Deidamia... Now I say began the quarrel, to grow the greater between them.

Deidamia was the sister of Pyrrus, who had been assured to

Alexander, son of Alexander the Great and Roxanne, and then married Demetrius after Alexander's death: so that these two are to be identified, and each as a Gnostic Christ, and Deidamia as a Mary Magdalene, ultimately Isis. Now, however, that Goddess is dead – suppressed from the mind of the Puritan, in negative mantle – and the sham Christ Demetrius prevails over the true (Alexander). Demetrius is the Puritan who would presume, in his delusion, to be master of the natural world (the Goddess: Alexander's Asia). Hermia, as loved by Lysander and Demetrius in the early Acts, is in the character of the Puritan Goddess-who-is-not, a mutilated travesty; yet she remains, in essence, the true Goddess, who loves Lysander and not Demetrius. It is Egeus – the unconscious (the sea has borne this symbolic value since time immemorial) in negative aspect – who prefers Demetrius the sham, and obstructs the ideal union. So that Lysander's obloquy against Hermia after the magical transformation of his affections in the forest, represents the newly-enlightened ego's abhorrence of his wonted conceptions of Nature; and it is the ego-in-transformation's new love for the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen (Helena) now magically stripped of the negative mantle imposed on Her by Puritanism, which underpins it.

What exactly is the change that had to be effected in the stricken Shakespeare, to heal him and give him a life? Ultimately, he had to be re-oriented to the visible or given world – the milieu intérieur/extérieur or microcosm/macrocosm in which we move every day, - which Puritanism had distorted for him so grievously, so that his intellect and judgement had formed entirely the wrong conceptions. A tragic example of this was the Puritan projection of maleficent intentions on so many of the women-folk of the countryside, with their knowledge of natural therapies, celebration of the round of the turning year, pet animals, and so on, - to stigmatise them as witches, who had to be exterminated. The corollary of this was the extirpation, on the principle of "As within, so without", of the principle of Nature from their own egos. The remediation of this is signified in MND by the marriage of Theseus and Hippolyta, who is a moon Goddess (Hippolyta the Amazon carried a moon-shaped shield). Hippolyta's silence in the early Acts signifies that Nature does not speak to the subject; or rather, he is deaf to Her, Who has been trying to make him listen for so long,

through the Gnostic written word (cf. the silences of Cordelia and Hero and Bianca). This is a typical wasteland pathology (and T.S. Eliot's Puritan upbringing marked him for life).

The ego's transformation will be effected as if by magic – the magic of the Ring deities of the wood. It will be predicated on the divestment of the Goddess of Love's negative mantle, imposed on Her by Puritanism (see, for example, RIII III, iv: "And this is Edward's wife, that monstrous witch,/Consorted with that harlot, strumpet Shore,/That by their witchcraft thus have marked me": the moment of the breakdown). This will in turn be predicated on the stripping away of the negativity of the underworld (macrocosm) and of the libido-contents of the unconscious (microcosm), both of which are ruled by the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen. These magical transformations are represented by the Lysander-Hermia and Demetrius-Helen marriages respectively. The latter is cognate with the Petruchio-Katherina marriage in TOS.

What of the play-within-the-play? This is, like the similar plays in HAM and LLL, a representation of the imagination exercised in the mind of Shakespeare to effect the healing: the dream being, of course, Apollonist in nature, a triumph of the visual principle. This is therefore the real dream of the title. Further, Bottom resolves (IV, i, 210) to sing of his dream at the end of the play, - when Thisbe has died, - in a ballad composed by Peter Quince. This serves to identify the play with his dream, which treats of the same subject from a different angle. Peter Quince, producer of the play, represents in his Christian name, as always without exception in FF, the Pauline (Roman or establishment) Church; in his surname the principle of sourness (from the quince or crab-apple): in toto, the Pauline principle now perceived as distasteful by the ego-in-transformation, and spat out.

It is of the highest importance, and a fascinating discovery, to realise that the lion of the Clowne's play is precisely cognate with the "leo-" of Leonato (MAN), Posthumus Leonatus (CYM) and Leontes (TWT), as emblematic of Shakespeare as Goddess-rejector in either his Bolingbroke (lion in JC) or Puritan phases: the reference in all cases being to the tale of the lion torn to pieces by Samson on his way to meet the Philistine girl in Judges 14, which was mentioned by Bacon in a petition to the House of Lords (see Ch.23 for a full

derivation).

Thisbe's bloodied mantle is symbolic, like all the other napkins and kerchiefs without exception in the plays, of menstruation, and hence the female or Goddess principle: and over the action of Quince's play constantly shines the moon, that supreme Goddess symbol, whose rhythm is that of the womb. The final icon comprises Thisbe's mantle, the knife-wounded Thisbe and Pyramus, and the vanished lion. The lovers have died on the literal plane, but on the allegorical their principles (the Goddess, Her Consort/Son) still live, transformed by knowledge of the ithyphallic principle, more broadly the unseen world (the daggers), now divested of its negative mantle (cf. the murder of Julius Caesar): and Shakespeare's enthrallment by Puritanism has been broken. The ithyphallos/unseen world in negative aspect is represented by the wall, as played by Snout (a nozzle of a kettle); the hole through which Pyramus and Thisbe exchange douceurs, the access of the visual imagination, - that faculty utterly central to the acquisition of Gnostic nobility, and extirpation of the cancer of Puritanism, - acting to re-establish the bonds - between reason and Nature, love and power, right and left brains - which the Pauline Church has made an art-form of sundering ("I see a voice": V, i, 191).

Apuleius' masterpiece *The Golden Ass* is a truly magical work - that is, effective of psychic transformation which could not have been achieved by the action of reason alone - provided it be read with vivid imagination and in a spirit of total surrender. The same is true of *MND*, and for the same reason. Lucius' ass-journey into the world of the will is cognate with that of Psyche (who represents just that principle, of the human psyche) into the underworld/unconscious in the same book, and both correspond to Bottom's ass-journey into the world of Faëry. The various libidinous encounters witnessed by Lucius (whence Falstaff's travails in *MWW*) serve to bring the ego in transformation into touch with the Faustian roots of the visible world; and the same is true of the fairies in *MND*. Their homes are the plants and flowers, which incarnate the pure libido of nature, the latter (e.g. Peasblossom) with the gorgeous naiveté of wearing their genitalia on the outside. Procreation is everywhere (e.g. Mustardseed), along with the underworld (Cobweb). "Acorn" in Latin is glans, whence glans penis: "...that all

their elves for fear/Creep into acorn cups, and hide them there”
(~~Robin Goodfellow. II, i, 31~~). Extended passages like the following (III,
i, 155 ff.) are seductive and magical, and typical of MND, undoubtedly
Sir Francis Bacon’s tribute to the genius of Apuleius:

Fairies Where shall we go?
Titania Be kind and courteous to this gentleman.
 Hop in his walks, and gambol in his eyes.
 Feed him with apricots and dewberries,
 With purple grapes, green figs, and mulberries,
 The honeybags steal from the humble-bees,
 And for night-tapers crop their waxen thighs
 And light them at the fiery glow-worms’ eyes
 To have my love to bed, and to arise;
 And pluck the wings from painted butterflies
 To fan the moonbeams from his sleeping eyes.
 Nod to him, elves, and do him courtesies

CHAPTER 15

LOVE'S LABOUR'S LOST

The most powerful reason for the Stratfordians' rejection of the Bacon theory is, surely, their gut feeling that Bacon was not capable, as one who had conquered the "x"factor - Schopenhauer's term for the will-to-life, or (broadly) the libido, as definitively expressed in the great work of art – so completely in his life, of creating the tragedies, in which this factor is so prodigiously prominent. This gut feeling is sound: for Bacon despised heterosexual love in the context of leadership, judging it to be incompatible with wisdom, and was comfortable with his erotism, which found expression in gay relations with his serving-men and others. His inner life was a triumph of the intellect, and he continually strove for intellectual closure, as expressed, for example, in the total subjugation of Kate in TOS, and the final couplet of the Baconian (rather than Shakespearean) sonnet. Even those who have not read Ted Hughes sense powerfully, I'm sure, that the author of FF must have had a profound personal knowledge of tragedy. Yet the argument of these pages shows that Bacon was indeed the philosophical, linguistic, and architectonic genius of FF, with his pupil-patient Shakespeare providing the "x"factor, - from the depth and traumatic authenticity of his own struggle with the libido, - to transform so much of it into art of the highest possible order. Nevertheless, the Stratfordians' failure to engage with the really hard evidence produced by their opponents reflects a lack of hunger for the truth that does no credit to them or literary academe as a whole. Such satiety on the sweets of a usual diet is, on the contrary, totally atypical of the world of science ("natural philosophy") in which Bacon moved and strove. The fruits of the tree of Shakespeare's crucifixion would provide the *littérateurs* far more nourishing fare.

William Moore, apparently from Birmingham University, in the UK, provided one such piece of evidence. In his book "Shakespeare" (1934), a masterpiece of the cryptanalyst's art, he

proved with the utmost rigour that Sir Francis Bacon had encrypted into the play's many otherwise unfathomable "nonsense" lines numerous statements along the lines of "William Shakespeare is Francis Bacon incognito". The editor of the Pelican HV, 1999, exemplifies the orthodox viewpoint on such as Moore:

Once proposed, however, the issue gained momentum among people whose conviction was greater in proportion to their ignorance of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English literature, history, and society... The Baconians... are snobs... Besides snobbery, one other quality characterises the authorship controversy: lack of evidence.

- Though not as great as the *littérateurs* more grievous ignorance of philosophy; while the charge of "lack of evidence" is merely an index to the intellectual sloth of the writer. The issue of snobbery remains an important one, however; and the true Culture-person must be repelled by the notion that the great artist can only come from the upper or formally educated classes. God knows, there are examples aplenty to the contrary. The Baconists are mistaken in portraying William Shakespeare as an illiterate country yokel who could scarcely write his own name; yet even so, the word "romantic" is perhaps more just than "snobbish" in this context. William Moore was certainly no snob – the noblest minds never are: and he proved his argument to a high level of certainty indeed.

A survey of modern editions, the relevant section in the University of Sydney library, and the internet, shows precious little recognition of William Moore. Only two titles I have examined mention him at all; and they both dismiss his findings solely on the basis, largely spurious, of the flexibility of anagrams, the discussion of which in "Shakespeare" occupies in fact only the first 79 pages of some 300, the remainder being devoted to an explication of Bacon's own cryptographic system (see below) which is of a far higher level of sophistication. William S. and Elizabeth F. Friedman actually received a prestigious literary prize for their *The Shakespearean Ciphers Examined* (1957): which goes to show that bone laziness can be rewarded if you make the right noises. One gets the distinct impression they took one look at all those pages of

numbers and tables and decided it was all too difficult. Moore had words for them, had they only ears to listen:

...The better way would be that the reader adopt a challenging attitude towards the demonstrations; and, viewing them with a critical eye, ascertain on his own behalf whether they are or are not absolutely correct. To assume that any stated things are correct and valid merely because they appear to be tenable is no doubt an easy course, but whenever possible the wisest course is to be make quite sure by testing them. If they successfully withstand every fair and reasonable test that can be applied, then no rational mind need hesitate to accept them as true. An objection could be raised against making these essential tests, on the ground that they necessitate both time and labour. This objection may have weight, but, as a rejoinder, there is the old-established adage that everything worth doing at all is worth doing well.

There is evidence in the ciphers of LLL of the most colossal patience and application on Bacon's part in their construction. These qualities were also shown by William Moore, whose results do in truth withstand every "fair and reasonable test that can be applied"; but his final conclusion, that Sir Francis Bacon was the sole author of the Complete Works, is demonstrably wrong, as the argument of these pages exhaustively shows.

Let us begin now to delve into the Bacon's extraordinarily sophisticated work in LLL, which secretes both a cryptographic dimension, and the Shakespearean allegory in the double-identity way of TCE, TGV, &c. As if the mathematical certainty of the cryptanalysis of LLL were not enough, it is evident that the message can only be decoded from the exact spelling of the words provided by the Quarto (1598) or First Folio (1623) editions, and that the substitution of even one letter in efforts of "improvement" destroys it (for example, "Armado" for "Armatho"); that certain differences in spelling between the Quarto and First Folio editions have immense cryptographic implications, and prove that Bacon

¹ Finnegans Wake, p.108, Faber ed.

must have continued to work on the subject for long after the play's completion, perhaps even after the death of his collaborator (e.g. "Signeour" (Q)? "Signeor"(F)); and that Bacon provided elsewhere in the text the keys to help the decipherer in his task. The unusual spellings and nonsense words were designed to attract the eye of the alert cryptanalyst, like William Moore; and LLL was therefore critical to Bacon in ensuring that the labour of his love would not be lost to posterity for all time (although my own

a	b	c	D	e	f	g	h	i	k	l	m	n	o	p	q	r	s	t	v	x	z
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

sense of the allegorical nature of the "history" and other plays analysed above was gained independently of any knowledge of the ciphers of LLL, which came later: rather, it depended on the work

7r		7r		7r		7r		7r	
d	O	n	a	d	r	i	a	N	O
L		V		L		Q		V	

by the German magian philosopher Trithemius (1462-1516: cf. his Polygraphia), and a system of his own which used the numerical value of letters and words after subjection to the process of

	17r		17r		17r		17r		17r
d	O	N	a	d	r	i	a	n	e
	I		S		M		S		I

and I have included William Moore's extended proof of a typically virtuoso example in Appendix 2. It is astonishing that anyone who may have followed in detail the arguments of Moore's decryptions

L		V		L		Q		V	
	I		S		M		S		I
L	I	V	S	L	M	Q	S	V	I

patience, that quality without which no achievement at all is possible in the fields of Shakespeare, Bacon, and even Joyce:

Now patience: and remember patience is the great thing and

11r		11r		11r		11r		11r	
d	E	A	r	m	a	t	h	e	
P		M		A		H		C	
P	E	M	E	A	A	H	H	C	

The two sets of letters are now combined:

Before proceeding to the transpositional phase, certain external

Simple:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	V	W	X	Y	Z
Reverse:	24	23	22	21	20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

I maruell thy M. hath not eaten thee for a word...

Briefly, “M.” must refer to Costard the Clown’s master, Don Adriano. On the same page Costard refers to him as “Maister”. “M” must therefore stand, in the context of Don Adriano de Armatho, for “Maister” or “Master”. Let us now look at another part of the Folio dialogue:

Curate Vides ne quis venit?
 Pedant Video, & gaudio.
 Braggart Chirra.
 Pedant Quari Chirra, not Sirra?
 Braggart Men of peace well incountred.

The Braggart is Don Adriano de Armatho; the Curate Nathaniel; and the Pedant Holofernes. Incidentally, the misspelt Quari (for Quare) itself has cryptographic significance. To briefly summarise the findings: the dispute over the inexplicable use of “Chirra” for “Sirra” (“Sir”), comes down to “Query Ch.”, or “Q. Ch.” (“Q.” is a common abbreviation for “Query”, which now, as then, is rarely spelt out in full). We are now in a position to begin the transpositional phase:

decryptions are provided in Appendix 2.

Constable[Dull] Signeor Arme, Arme commends you:
Ther's villanie abroad, this letter will tell you more.
I, i

The words "Signeor Arme twice" are first analysed individually for their seals: SS, RS, SDS, & RDS. Working backwards to find the original message to which these seals correspond – for no seal is unique to a single word – the following staggering result is obtained:

"Master W. Shakespeare"

These are the English, Latin, Italian, and Latin (again) forms of the name; while "rosa" means "in secret": the latter being unsuitable for use with Latin and Italian words. Rosa is both a Latin and Italian word: and the rose was symbol of silence in Germany. The Latin expression *sub rosa*, which was equivalent among the Romans to an inviolable pledge, and later widely used in English literature, originated in the ancient dedication of the flower to Aphrodite, and its reconsecration by Cupid to Harpocrates, the

tutulary deity of Silence, to induce him to conceal the amours of the Goddess of Love. Bacon could hardly have found a more appropriate word. Signeor is the Folio spelling; while the Quarto has Signeour. By cryptanalysis, the latter is found to lack a complete and symmetrical set of Baconian seals; but it has the virtue of being more unusual and noticeable, and more liable to attract the alert eye. Arme, Arme however performs this function admirably, and the Folio version therefore is a definite improvement. Similarly, the variant Dun Adramadio, Dun Adramadio ("Dun Adramadio twice": IV, iii: Costard) is also found to encrypt a complete and symmetrical set of Baconian seals. The labour required to place these seals in the context of the play can hardly be imagined; and it was a task that was evidently dear to Bacon's heart, as the continuing labour on it over the intervening years attest: so that the burying of William Moore's findings, which should have earned him the highest honours and the gratitude of scholars everywhere, has done a massive disservice to the life and genius of Sir Francis Bacon. Indeed, a cursory look at four modern biographies of Bacon finds, at best, a single arch reference en passant to certain theories, without giving any details, - as if they had postulated the existence of men from Mars. Let Moore speak for himself:

This system of Cryptography [Bacon's] possesses the important merit of being mathematically constructed, and has therefore the exactitude common to all things mathematical. There can be no disputing the validity of the individual operations, for these are based on the arithmetical process of addition. Furthermore, as each item in the decipherment can be examined and its accuracy duly checked, the complete decipherment, which consists of a mere assemblage of those items, is quite proof against any challenge, and cannot therefore be viewed with suspicion or doubt. We have here no question of what may be possible or even probable; we are dealing with what actually and incontrovertibly is.

ACT I

i

The allegory in LLL concerns, once again, Shakespeare's espousal of Goddess (Nature)-scorning Puritanism aet.15; its corruption by ineluctable intrusion of the Goddess into his mentation, to precipitate the breakdown; and his subsequent healing by Bacon in London. The "charge of the Boar" is described in theoretical terms, with no note of that personal intensity with which the histories are replete, to point once again to the sole authorship of Bacon.

The King represents the totality of Shakespeare's reasoning ego. The intention to embrace Puritanism as a strategy for coping with the libido in negative aspect, is straight announced:

King ...When, spite of cormorant devouring Time,
 Th'endeavour of this present breath may buy
 That honour which shall bate his scythe's keen edge,
 And make us heirs of all eternity.
 Therefore, brave conquerors, - for so you are,
 That war against your own affections
 And the huge army of the world's desires –
 Navarre shall be the wonder of the world.

The King's companions in his reclusion will be Berowne, Longaville, and Dumaine. Their names are of course ciphers, whose meaning can be found without too much difficulty. Berowne's billet doux to Rosaline makes it clear that he is cognate with Orlando in *As You Like It*, as Shakespeare-as-writer, as distinct from Shakespeare-as-reader (Melancholy Jacques), in the early phase of his healing, with Rosaline the Goddess described in the printed page, as she is in *AYLI*: and we remember that the Musical arts (cf. Bianca's music lessons in *TOS*) included both reading and writing, as defined by Socrates in the early pages of Plato's *Republic*.

Longaville's associations give him away:

Maria I know him, madam. At a marriage feast
 Between Lord Perigord and the beauteous heir
 Of Jaques Faulconbridge, solemnized
 In Normandy, saw I this Longaville.

Perigord is a region in southern France, which would be

suggestive enough in itself; but why has Bacon spelt it with a “t”? To answer this we must return to the Druidic tree alphabet, - where each month is represented by a different tree, thirteen in all, - with which A&C and TimA in particular show Bacon to have been deeply familiar. The month of Gort falls in late October, and its animal is none other than the boar. So that Perigort is firmly identified with the Boar of FF.

Ted Hughes argued that Jaques (pronounced “Jakes”) may represent the first long syllable of Shakespeare’s name, and that the otherwise utterly superfluous Melancholy Jaques in *As You Like It* therefore may represent the playwright himself. In this he was far along the right track, though not to the goal: for Melancholy Jacques more precisely represents Shakespeare-as-reader, in the early phase (“two years and more”, from 1587-9, as given in the final scene of MAF) of his healing under the regime of Bacon. “Jaques” is therefore a cipher for “Shakespeare”. As for “Faulconbridge”, the falcon was an Hermetic symbol of soaring higher thought (cf. 2HVI II, i); while the “bridge” principle (e.g. Duke of Cambridge in 1HVI) throughout FF stands opposed to the “ford” principle (Earl of Oxford; Milford; Milford Haven), the latter symbolising engagement with Nature, through which the farther shore of enlightenment can be attained, the former the avoidance of it. Cambridge University was, of course, the spiritual home of Puritanism

Taken together, “Jaques Faulconbridge” therefore represents the ego in search of security through, not the true path of engagement with Nature, but the sham of Puritanism. It is therefore utterly consistent with conclusions of Part 1 concerning this phase of Shakespeare’s early life. The “beautiful heiress” of Jaques Faulconbridge is therefore the Goddess of Love (in Shakespeare’s case, Goddess of the auto-erotist as Nell Quickly) who takes form in the Puritan reader’s imagination against his will, to excite his will-to-eros, and precipitate the breakdown. Longaville was seen at the marriage of Perigort and the heiress, and represents the libido. That this is indeed his symbolic value is made clear in the text:

Maria ...a sharp wit matched with too blunt a will,

Whose edge hath power to cut, whose will still wills
It should spare none that come within his power.

Princess Some merry mocking lord, belike – is't so?

Maria They say so most that his humours know.

Princess Such short-lived wits do wither as they grow.

“Blunt” recalls Sir Walter Blunt of 1HIV, another representative of the ithyphallic principle, whose Christian name means “He who wields a long pole”, from the French gaultier, as glossed explicitly and somewhat heavy-handedly (almost certainly by Christopher Marlowe) in 2HVI IV, i. Longaville will be linked to Maria, whose name is Italian. Italy bulked large in Bacon’s symbolic landscape as a home of the Goddess (cf. for example *The Tempest*); and “Maria” in this context may most plausibly be a reference to Mary Magdalene, the wife of the true Jesus Christ, as described in the suppressed Gnostic gospels; or even to Mary Jacob, who accompanied Mary Magdalene and Mary (Helena) Salome on the sea voyage to Provence and the West after their flight from the Levant in 44 B.C. (cf. the name *Saintes Maries de la Mer* later given to their landing place). Mary Jacob was particularly associated with Aphrodite, and was venerated in England during the Middle Ages; and it is from her Christian name that is derived “Merrie” England, and “to marry”. She appears as Maid Marian in the Robin Hood legends; and, - of striking relevance to Pericles, and also *The Tempest*, - as the original mermaid (merri-maid), to whom was given the attributive name Marina. It is Mary Jacob Who is in truth the subject of Botticelli’s *The Birth of Venus*, whose scalloped shell incorporates the symbol of the Holy Grail.

So much for the libido and the Goddess of Love. At a lower level, these spring from the unconscious, realm of the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen: hence Dumaine, - the final signatory to the pledge to asceticism, along with Berowne, Longaville, and the King, - whose name is derived from “main”, meaning “sea”, that immemorially ancient symbol of the unconscious (again, as heavily glossed by Marlowe in 2HIV I, i). He is linked, utterly consistently, with Katharine, the third of the party of the Princess of France (Goddess in toto): for she represents, as do all the other Katharines in the complete plays, without exception, - in TOS, HV, HVIII, and so on, - the Queen of Hell, or Goddess of the Underworld, or of the

Unconscious, or simply Goddess of the Invisible World, Who is also always the Grail Queen.

The ithyphallos – more broadly, the unseen world, where resides the libido, as resumed in the “I” symbol of FF - is also represented by Costard the Clown; while Constable Antony Dull represents the “dulling” of the (Mark) Antony principle. As lover of Cleopatra, and opponent of Augustus Caesar, patron of Virgil, whose Aeneas is in Shakespeare’s mythos the archetypal Puritan Goddess-rejector, Antony symbolises the Gnostic Christ, Who honours the libido as will and idea. The name “Jaquenetta” is formed from “Jaque[s]” (Shakespeare), and “netta”, the Italian for “pure”. Jaquenetta is therefore Shakespeare’s true Self, as distinct from the Puritan sham (Don Armado).

Initially, though, the “I” principle and the true Self are suppressed by the Puritan ego (imprisonment of Costard and Jaquenetta, who have been caught in flagrante). The erotic symbolism is intense:

King [reading Don Armado’s letter] ..It standeth north-north-east and by east from from the West corner of thy curious-knotted garden. There did I see that low-spirited swain, that base minnow of thy mirth...

Don Armado represents, of course, Shakespeare as Puritan (see above); and Bacon takes the opportunity to have a trenchant jest at Puritan locution, in a long running gag (cf. Malvolio in TN):

Great deputy, the welkin’s viceregent, and sole dominator of Navarre, my soul’s earth’s god, and body’s fostering patron. So it is, besieged with sable-coloured melancholy, I did commend the black oppressing humour to the most wholesome physic of thy health-giving air, and, as I am a gentleman, betook myself to walk. The time when? About the sixth hour; when beasts most graze, birds best peck, and men sit down to that nourishment which is called supper. So much for the time when. Now for the ground which – which, I mean, I walked upon. It is yclept thy park. Then for the place where – where, I mean, I did encounter that obscene and most preposterous event that draweth from

my snow-white pen the ebon-coloured ink which here thou viewest, beholdest, surveyest, or seest. But to the place where...

The Don's love for Jaquenetta represents the reassertion of Shakespeare's true Self, in train of the libido, to shatter the feeble counterfeit of Puritanism. The King's response to the intrusion of Suffolk ("I" principle) in HVIII II, ii, is germane to this: "Who am I, ha?". The punishment for any woman coming within "a mile of my court" (Goddess Nature intruding into consciousness) will be to have her tongue cut out. This is symbolic, as in Titus Andronicus, and as are the silences of Cordelia, Hippolyta, and Hero, of Nature in the raw and denied, unilluminated by the Musical arts. Nature does not speak to the Puritan; or rather, he is deaf to Her, Who has been trying to make him listen for so long: so that the will-to-life or libido, an inviolable component of Nature, remains in its primitive state in his unconscious, ready to overwhelm his feeble defences.

*

Dull the Constable's "Signeor Arme -, Arme-" (185) encrypts the name "Master W. Shakespeare" and a full set of Baconian seals, as given in the introduction to this chapter.

ii

Mote, Don Adriano's Page, represents like all the Pages without exception in the plays, the written or printed word. As with Falstaff's page, he is tiny in relation to his master ("I do here walk before thee like a sow that hath overwhelmed all her litter bar one": Falstaff, 2HIV I, ii). In the Gnostic tradition the written word is vector of the invisible world – Katherine's realm - the ultimate mystery of which cannot be known: so that the ego is forced to admit his minority, and enters a state of (to use Goethe's term) becoming. For the Puritan this degree is reversed: so that he is become, rather than becoming, and is an insult to Western culture – as exemplified, for example, by the vile Canterbrigian C.P. Snow and his Goddess-suicide haunted novels. The character of Mote vis-à-vis the Don represents this perversion of values: so that Don Adriano (the Puritan) is become ("He speaks the mere contrary – crosses love not him": Mote, 33; and cf. the Christ symbolism of RIII and Othello/Iago). Falstaff represents on the other hand the libido,

whose irruption, welling from the backwards beyond reason, has forced precisely that same ego into a state of becoming (King Henry'Prince Hal), - just as the London-phase Shakespeare was continually forced from a Troy-soul to a Greek-soul, as allegorised in T&C: to prove that he never fully solved his problem with the Queen of Hell and Her Consort/Son the Boar.

Here, the Puritan has felt the stirrings of libido, and looks to the written word for help ("Comfort me, boy. What great men have been in love?": Armado, 63). He tries to keep the negative contents of the unconscious buried beneath the surface:

Mote

 If she be made of white and red,
 Her faults will ne'er be known,
 For blushing cheeks by faults are bred,
 And fears by pale white shown...

Don Armado invokes the ballad of the King and the Beggar. The written word still embodies for the reader the Puritan world-view; yet he has sensed therein the true Goddess, to stir the will-to-eros. Thus Mote disparages the ballad, while Don Armado vows to have it "newly writ o'er", to give his "digression... some mighty precedent". The ballad celebrates the love of a king for a beggar-maid, and his subsequent exaltation (cf. Don Armado's letter to Jaquenetta, IV, i). HAM II, i, 266 ff. will interpret it as a metaphor for psychic transformation, which Hamlet, on the downhill road to terminal psychotic collapse, will abjure. Don Armado is looking to the written word for comfort; but this cannot be given (Mote cannot sing) until he subdue the "I" principle, in the manner of the true Puritan (imprisonment of Costard on bread and water), and the Self (ego plus unconscious) be suppressed (confinement of Jaquenetta to the park, along with the Princess of France (Goddess in toto) and the ladies (aspects of Her); but the libido now cannot be denied (cf. Schopenhauer: "A man can do as he will, but not will as he will")):

h		h		h		h		h	
D	O	N	A	D	R	I	A	N	O
L		V		L		Q		V	

Don Armado's (Shakespeare's) only course now is to embrace

	17r		17r		17r		17r		17r
D	O	N	A	D	R	I	A	N	O
	I		S		M		S		I

sure I shall turn sonnet. Devise, wit; write pen; for I am
for whole volumes in folio.

*

11r		11r		11r		11r		11r
D	R	A	R	M	A	T	H	O
F		M		A		H		C

Baconian seals.

Braggart I have promised to study iij. yeres with the Duke.

Boy You may do it in an houre sir.

Braggart Impossible.

Boy How many is one thrice told?

Braggart I am ill at reckning, it fits the spirit of a tapster.

Boy You are a gentleman and a gamester, sir.

Braggart I confesse both, they are both the varish of a compleat
man.

Boy Then I am sure you know how much the grosse
summe of deus-ace amounts to.

Braggart It doth amount to one more than two.

Boy Which the base vulgar call three.

Braggart True.

Boy Why sir is thus such a peece of study?

Now here's three studied, ere you'll thrice wink, &
how easie it is to put yeres to the word three,

[, H Bacon	: H Baco	: H Baco	: H Baco
[, H. Bacon	: H. Baco	: H. Baco	: H. Baco
[, Hn. Bacon	: Hn. Baco	: Hn. Baco	: Hn. Baco
[, Hnn. Bacon	: Hnn. Baco	: Hnn. Baco	: Hnn. Baco
[, Hooo. Bacon	: Hooo. Baco	: Hooo. Baco	: Hooo. Baco
[, Hoooo. Bacon	: Hoooo. Baco	: Hoooo. Baco	: Hoooo. Baco
[, Hooooo. Bacon	: Hooooo. Baco	: Hooooo. Baco	: Hooooo. Baco

thrice told..... 111; b) Gross sum of deus-ace..... 3; c) One more

[, F Bacon .ssr	: F Bacon .ssr	: F Bacon .ssr	: F Bacon .ssr
[, F Bacon .ssr	: F Bacon .ssr	: F Bacon .ssr	: F Bacon .ssr
[, F Bacon .ssr	: F Bacon .ssr	: F Bacon .ssr	: F Bacon .ssr
[, F Bacon .ssr	: F Bacon .ssr	: F Bacon .ssr	: F Bacon .ssr
[, F Bacon .ssr	: F Bacon .ssr	: F Bacon .ssr	: F Bacon .ssr
[, F Bacon .ssr	: F Bacon .ssr	: F Bacon .ssr	: F Bacon .ssr

L V L Q V

17 is the Key-number for 1 set of letters:

11 is the Key-number for 1 set of letters:

- The “Key-number” being the number of places a letter has to be moved to the right or left in the relevant alphabet: so that, for example, “7r” means “to be moved 7 places to the right”. Moreover, Bacon provided visual confirmation that this is indeed the correct interpretation: for in FF what should have been “iii” (it was “three” in the Quarto), was written explicitly to suggest “117”: the dot being left over the first “i”, to preserve minimal credibility as a Roman numeral; but left off the second “i”; and the third written as a “j”, again with the dot left off (although it is just barely visible in the original). Bacon must have continued to work on improvements in the twenty-five years between the Quarto and Folio editions. His work in LLL evidently meant a lot to him: indeed a “labour of love”, and destined to be lost, until 1934.

Analysis of the SS, RS, SDS and RDS values of the two words “Three” and “Yeres” yields the words “Mr. W. Shakespeare”, and a full set of Baconian seals, as given above, viz.:

- So that the significance of the final exchange can be readily understood: the “most fine figure” being 117. Bacon gives another piece of supporting evidence in the dialogue of V, ii, 485 ff. This debate over elementary arithmetic, and the mathematics generally of LLL, has long exasperated the critics; but it is all of immense cryptographic importance. Berowne says: “And three times thrice is nine”; and Costard: “Not so sir, under correction sir. I hope it is not so. You cannot beg us, I can assure you sir, we know what we know...”; and so on in the same vein. For “three times thrice” in terms of the above cryptography (“three ways of expressing 3), is not 9, but 117. Costard also says: “...the actors sir will show where-until it doth amount”: the actors in question undoubtedly being Don Armado the Braggart, and Mote.

ACT II

i

Jaquenetta has called the libidinous Don Armado “Man” (I, ii, 128). In the opposite corner is Boyet (“boy yet”), an attendant lord of the Princess of France. His name refers to the attempt by the Puritan ego to maintain a pre-pubertal anerotism, as untransformed by the Goddess and the libido, which he conceives

in negative aspect; but the real Goddess (Princess of France), having been invoked by the written word against the will of the reader, will have none of this:

- Boyet Be now as prodigal of all dear grace
 As Nature was in making graces dear
 When she did starve the general world beside,
 And prodigally gave them all to you.
- Princess Good Lord Boyet, my beauty, though but mean,
 Needs not the painted flourish of your praise.
 Beauty is bought by judgement of the eye,
 Not uttered by base sale of chapmens' tongues.

In the analysis of 1-3 HVI, the Alençon principle (Duke, Princess of Alençon) was shown to be the Goddess spiritualised, held in the visual imagination, as a sea-wall against the inundation of the conscious ego by the blind unconscious (domain of the Queen of Hell). Thus, just as Longaville ("I" principle) was discerned by Maria (Goddess as Woman) at the marriage of Lord Perigord and the "beautiful heiress" of Jaques Faulconbridge ("charge of the Boar"); so Dumaine (unconscious) was seen by Katharine (Queen of Hell) at the Duke Alençon's (Queen of Hell spiritualised), though in a muted form ("And much too little of that good I saw/Is my report to his great worthiness"). The alert eye (Rosaline) also saw there the repression of the principle of merry wit (Berowne: another fool), deriving from apprehension of the contents of the subconscious.

The Goddess now enters the conscious ego, via the imagination stimulated by the written word, to produce an ithyphallos (the Greek word as usual eliciting the innate divinity of the object more than the utilitarian Latin "erection"):

- Princess Vouchsafe to read the purpose of my coming,
 And suddenly resolve me in my suit.
 She offers the King a paper
- King Madam, I will, if suddenly I may.

"I may" as a symbol of the maypole (seen on "First of May"), or ithyphallos, has also been demonstrated in HV II, i, as well as the

germane "I spy" of T&C III, i, 94. The vainly Puritan ego now illustrates Schopenhauer's "A man can do as he will, but not will as he will" (cf. "... a sharp wit matched with too blunt a will,/Whose edge hath power to cut, whose will still wills/It should none spare that come within his power": II, i, 51). This moment is, on the plane of allegory, contemporaneous with Don Armado's protestation of love to Jaquenetta. Immediately the ego senses his wound (from the "charge of the Boar"), and searches for healing (Berowne and Rosalind converse apart) which for the moment is postponed (He leaves her). The King pondering the page confirms once again that it was written word as vector of the Goddess of Love, acted upon by the imagination of the reader, which triggered the numerous "charges of the Boar" described in the histories. It gives occasion for a intricate set-piece of Baconian cryptography which, needless to say, has been completely misinterpreted by the critics (for example, the New Penguin Shakespeare LLL, 1982, Commentary: "Of course, no-one could grasp these ramifications in the theatre, and it is far from certain that Shakespeare worked them out for himself; he was simply concerned to produce a hopeless diplomatic tangle...")

Here is a beautiful legerdemain, an example of the powerful reasoning and colossally patient craftsmanship that lies behind LLL. The import of the letter is that Navarre's father helped finance a military campaign of the former King of France for which he believes he has not been paid half his due in coin, the remainder being the territory of Aquitaine in lieu; yet the King of France is demanding repayment of the amount, instead of offering to pay the remaining half to secure Aquitaine for himself. Money represents, as has been demonstrated in the analysis of 1-3 HVI, the power of a principle. Aquitaine, on the other hand, is the ego-transforming principle of the Goddess, which is being held at arm's length in the Puritan ego. Navarre therefore asks the Princess for full payment of the remaining half, in exchange for Aquitaine: the Puritan striving for understanding and power over the Goddess (Who is nature Divinised) without risking engagement with Her. The ego in question here is, in truth, powerless; but the presence of the Goddess has him desperately searching for that power which he hopes will come in time (consistently, via Boyet):

Princess You do the king my father too much wrong,
 And wrong the reputation of his name,
 In so unseeming to confess receipt
 Of that which hath so faithfully been paid.

King I do protest I never heard of it ;
 And if you prove it, I'll repay it back
 Or yield up Aquitaine.

Princess We arrest your word.
 Boyet, you can produce acquittances
 For such a sum from special officers
 Of Charles his father.

Boyet ...Tomorrow you shall have a sight of them.

Dumaine, Longaville and Berowne ask Boyet the names of their respective ladies, Katharine, Maria, and Rosaline, in that order: first the Queen of Hell, then the Goddess of Love, then the Goddess of the written word. The Goddess is shattering the misconceptions of his Puritanism: hence does Boyet describe Katharine and Maria as “heir of Alençon” and “heir of Faulconbridge” respectively. Boyet now tries to kiss Katharine, who naturally refuses: for the ego is beginning to incorporate the Queen of Hell (“Deceive me not now, Navarre is infected”: Boyet. 216). The ladies leave Boyet behind, to

[, Katharine Berowne,	Katharine Berowne	Princess Berowne	Faulconbridge Berowne
[, Katharine Berowne,	Katharine Berowne,	Princess Berowne,	Faulconbridge Berowne,

ACT III

On the plane of the Shakespearean allegory this Act, of one scene only, serves to advance the action some way, with Berowne giving Costard a letter for Rosaline, which in Act IV he will give by mistake to Jaquenetta, also giving Armado’s letter, intended for Jaquenetta, to Rosaline, - to make the identification between the pairs Berowne-Rosaline and Armado-Jaquenetta; but the import of this Act is almost entirely cryptographic.

*

Enter Broggart and Boy
 Song

Bra. Warble childe, make passionate my sense of hearing.
 Boy Concolinel.
 Brag. Sweet Ayer, go tendernesse of yeares: take this Key,
 give enlargement to the swain, bring him festinately

I, Francis Bacon.	Francis Baco	Francesco Bacono	Francisco Bacono
I, Francis Bacon was.	Francis Bacon was.	Francesco Bacono was.	Francisco Bacono was.

The word “Key” is remarkable in the context of encryption, and suggests that it may contain the information required for the decryption of the odd word “Concolinel”, for which the commentators have turned themselves inside out trying to provide a provenance, and which will prove to belong to the comparatively simple cipher class of substitutional-transpositional. If the word “Key” is analysed in terms of its Simple, Reverse, Simple Digit, and Reverse Digit values, the set of numbers 1,2,3,9,10,11 is obtained. This means that “Concolinel’ must be divided into two equal groups, viz., “Conco” and “linel”. One (1)of these groups, “Conco”, has its 3 odd letters changed 11 places to the left, and its 2 even letters changed three places to the right. One group, “linel”, has its 3 odd letters changed 10 places to the left, and its 2 even letters changed 9 places to the right. When the new letters are combined with the originals, we obtain the result:

I, CL : O : Francesco Bacono L.

When the Roman Numeral values of CL are substituted, along with the SS and RS values of “I” and “O”, we obtain the result:

16, 100 50 : 14 : Francesco Bacono 50

Analysis of the numbers in terms of the Elizabethan alphabet gives the final result:

“Master Wm. Shakespeare”

A problem with the word “Key” is that the potential decipherer

may overlook it, as being perfectly compatible with its context of the freeing of Costard from prison. Bacon therefore introduced a second vector in FF, in the form of the misspelling of Don Armado's name as "Broggart" (see above). Examination of the radical "ogg" shows that it contains the number of groups, the number of letters in each group, the four Key-numbers, and the number of letters to which these Key numbers apply, required for the decipherment of "Concolinel".

Due to the comparative impenetrability of the letters I, C, L, O, and L, in result a) above, Bacon provided a second cipher, "Sweete Ayer", which can be solved more readily; and analysis of its SS, RS, SDS, and RDS values, gives precisely the same final result, viz.:

"Master Wm. Shakespeare"

The following exchange gives further support to the significance of the number 117 in the decipherment of "Don Adriano de Armatho" (see I, ii, above):

Braggart I am all these three.

Boy And three times as much more, and yet nothing at all.

- "Three times three" giving, in this context, the result 117; and Don Armado being "nothing at all", i.e. O, the original symbol for "cipher": a cipher having no meaning of itself, but only in so far as it points to something beyond it.

The next section to be analysed is the dialogue beginning at line 68: "A wonder, master! Here's a costard broken in a shin". Costard's opening remarks amount to the following:

No egma in Don Adriano de Armatho
No riddle in Don Adriano de Armatho
No lenuoy in Don Adriano de Armatho
No salue in Don Adriano de Armatho

When analysed in terms of their SS, RS, SDS, and RDS values, “No egma”, “No riddle”, “No lenuoy” and “No salue” are found each to contain “Master William Shakespeare”, and a complete and symmetrical set of Baconian seals, as given above. Costard’s “...in thee male sir” like wise secretes the same result, as does “No salue sir but a-plantan”. The cryptographic weight of “lenuoy” and “salue” clearly came first, with Bacon later employing the device of an injured Costard to give them a context.

Again, the problem of the apparently senseless dialogue about the Fox, the Ape, the Humble-bee, and the Goose hangs on a question of simple arithmetic:

Armado The Fox, the Ape, and the Humble-Bee
 Were still at oddes being but three.
Page Untill the Goose came out of doore,
 Staying the oddes by adding foure.

This glaring mistake in arithmetic: – since $3 + 4 \neq 4$, but $= 7$; - has stimulated the inventive powers of the commentators, resulting mostly in an alteration of the text to conform to an ad hoc theory; but Moore’s approach is to examine the text exactly as it is in Q or FF, to give entirely consistent results, which point de plus, - along with the utter consistency of my own low-level explication of the plays as allegory, - to an extraordinary care on the part of Condell and Heming, undoubtedly with Sir Francis Bacon in the background, over what must have been a period of several years, perhaps from the moment of Shakespeare’s retirement. There can be no doubt at all that the editors of FF were thoroughly aware of the importance of textual accuracy for the ultimate revelation of the encryptions of Sir Francis Bacon. The nonsensicality of the above arithmetic is designed to attract the eye of the cryptanalyst; and the words he is to analyse are “three”, “foure”, and “seven”. Taken together, the three words, when analysed in terms of their SS, RS, SDS and RDS values, as per Bacon’s own unique cryptographic system, give the result: “Mr. W. Shakespeare”, plus a complete set of Baconian seals, as given above.

The next dialogue to be examined begins at line 118:

Armado Sirra Costard, I will infranchise thee.

value of the letter “D” (21) is also the Simple Digit Seal for the name “F. Bacon”: so that “i. d.” becomes “I, Francis Bacon”. The RS of “no” is 23, which is also the SD and RD seals for rosa. The course to be taken is now clear: and “this yncle i. d. no”, when analysed for its seal values, gives the result: “Master Will Shakespeare”, plus a complete set of Baconian seals, as given above. “Three farthings remuneration” gives an identical result, but with the substitution of “William” for “Will”.

ACT IV

i

Here (1-40) is another beautifully subtle set piece of Baconian allegorisation.

Princess Was that the king that spurred his horse so hard
 Against the steep up-rising of the hill?
First Lord I know not, but I think it was not he.

The “hill” is cognate with Gads Hill in 1 HVI as the rising ithyphallos; the king with Prince Hal, under the influence of Falstaff (gathering libido). The king is not himself: for his hitherto Puritan ego is in the process of transformation. The horse-and-rider represents always without exception in the plays the libido in action, as sourced by Bacon from Socrates’ famous metaphor in Plato’s Phaedrus. This is the “charge of the Boar” (irruption of Puritan ego by libido); and the challenge for Bacon was to describe both the inherent beauty of the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, and the brutality of Her wounding of the feebly defensive ego by the Boar. Hence the Princess’ dispute with the Forester, who initially describes her as fair, then retracts it, then reasserts it after she has given him money (recognition of Her beauty strengthening in the ego). The stag hit by the Princess’ shaft is of course cognate with the stag, similarly wounded, with which Melancholy Jaques identifies in AYLI: it is the ego lacerated by the charge, which is both cruel and kind, as the precondition for a Christlike resurrection into wholeness:

Princess ...Glory grows guilty of detested crimes

When, for fame's sake, for praise, an outward part,
 We bend to that the working of the heart;
 As I for praise alone now seek to spill
 The poor deer's blood, that my heart means no ill.

"Praise" here has still, however, a negative connotation, which the cryptographer now mitigates:

Boyet Do not curst wives hold that self-sovereignty
 Only for praise' sake, when they strive to be
 Lords o'er their lords?

Princess Only for praise, and praise we may afford
 To any lady that subdues a lord.

[, H Bacc	: H Bacc	: H Bacc	: H Bacc
[, H Bacc	: H Bacc	: H Bacc	: H Bacc
[, H Bacc	: H Bacc	: H Bacc	: H Bacc
[, H Bacc	: H Bacc	: H Bacc	: H Bacc
[, H Bacc	: H Bacc	: H Bacc	: H Bacc
[, H Bacc	: H Bacc	: H Bacc	: H Bacc
[, H Bacc	: H Bacc	: H Bacc	: H Bacc
[, H Bacc	: H Bacc	: H Bacc	: H Bacc
[, H Bacc	: H Bacc	: H Bacc	: H Bacc
[, H Bacc	: H Bacc	: H Bacc	: H Bacc
[, H Bacc	: H Bacc	: H Bacc	: H Bacc
[, H Bacc	: H Bacc	: H Bacc	: H Bacc
[, H Bacc	: H Bacc	: H Bacc	: H Bacc

Exit Rosaline

Costard By my troth, most pleasant! How both did fit it!

Why does Rosaline exit, to leave Costard, Maria and Boyet alone on the stage? Rosaline is the Goddess as a function of the ego desperate for healing (Berowne); yet there is no question yet of illness or health as the ego dissolves into the evanescent bliss of the act of eros (Costard-Maria: ithyphallos-Goddess of Love). Maria may equally well represent here the Goddess of the auto-erotist

(cf. Mistress Quickly of 1&2 HIV). It will soon become clear that Don Armado has got Jaquenetta pregnant; and this exchange between Costard and Maria records the moment ("Then will she get the upshoot by cleaving the pin": 137).

The exit of the other characters to leave Costard alone on the stage suggests that it is in fact auto-erotism that is being referred to. His soliloquy states that the act of eros is over (141-4); that it involved Shakespeare at his books (145-8: how else to explain the incongruous reference to Armado and Mote? and cf. HVIII II, ii), whence the Goddess has taken form against his will; and that it was a solitary activity (150: Sola, sola!: and cf. HV II, i, 43: "I would have you [Pistol] solus").

*

The letter from Don Armado to Jaquenetta (64 ff.) seems to me to include several suspicious groupings that William Moore has not examined: e.g. "robes for rags" and "tittles for titles". He has however examined the misspelling of Armado's name as "Don Adriana" (also regrettably emended by the editors), together with the Don's curious signing-off "Thine in the dearest designe of industrie". In every case where a variation in Don Armado's name occurs, the misspelling is of cryptographic import, and Adriana is no exception: so that "Thine in the dearest designe of industrie..." clearly is Bacon addressing the decipherer. The name "Don Adriano de Armatho" secretes the name of Shakespeare, but lacks a full set of Baconian seals; but the substitution of "Adriana" for "Adriano" makes up this deficit, to give the result:

"Mr. William Shakespeare"

The next passage to be examined (141 ff.) is dependent, as always, on its exact spelling in FF, and is illustrative of Bacon's further development of his ciphers in the years following the Quarto of 1598. Costard's unusual and superficially impenetrable line "Armathor ath to the side, O a most dainty man" calls for attention, as does "And his page atother side..." (as containing the unusual word "atother"). The former appears in Q as "Armatho ath toothen side, o a most daintie man". The significant part of the Folio version is: "Armathor ath to the side, O a", the remainder being used to fill up the sentence. When transposed and reassembled, they give the result: "de Armatho is a O to the r. ath". "O" stands as always for "cipher"; and when this word and the Reverse and Simple Digit seals of "O" are substituted, we obtain: - "de Armatho is a cipher: 5, 11 to the r. ath". The SD value of "ath" is 19 (RS of "F"), and its RDS value 20 (RDS of "Bacon"). So that the final result becomes:

De Armatho is a cipher: 5, 11 to the r.
F. Bacon

This is Bacon telling us that the name is a cipher, and that 5 of the letters are to be moved 11 places to the right (see above for table). This a neater way than the Quarto variant of conveying the same meaning, and also has the virtue of having substituted the comparatively mild "ath to the side" for the "fearsome dental oddity", as Moore calls it, of "ath toothen side".

"And his Page atother side...", when analysed for its SS, RS, SDS and RDS values gives the following result:

Don Adriano de Armatho is a Cypher.
Key items: - 2, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 17, 19.

ii

The Pedant Holofernes (pastor) and Nathaniel (Curate) appear for the first time. The name “Holofernes” is a striking piece of symbolism: the scene evoked being that of Judith holding Holofernes’ severed head before her king in the Old Testament Book of Judith. This character is therefore a head being held up for us to see: and it is Bacon’s (see cryptanalysis of V, i, below, where the italicised words taken in sequence are shown to proffer the name of Francis Bacon). “Nathaniel” in Hebrew means “Gift of God”: here, as an attribute of Holofernes, as a curate is of a pastor, an indication of the esteem, even awe, in which Sir Francis Bacon was held by Shakespeare and his contemporaries.

Holofernes has therefore a dual significance in this scene, one cryptographic, where his pedantry secretes a message, and the other allegorical, where he represents the Puritan. His locution recalls that of Don Armado; and his disapproval of the love-sonnet from Berowne to Rosaline mirrors that of the Puritan for art. Consistently with his role, he rhapsodises about the verse of Baptista Spagnolo Mantuanus (1447-1516), author of a standard pedagogical work in Elizabethan grammar schools. His “Eclogues” were evidently a pastiche of Virgil’s, the lines quoted by Holofernes being in the same hexametric metre. There can be no doubt however, given the utter centrality of the Augustus-Virgil-Aeneas axis in Shakespeare’s mythos, that it is Virgil (whose birthplace was Mantua; and cf. R&J) that is being referred to here, as the creator of the archetypal Puritan Goddess- (Dido-Cleopatra-Isis-) rejector Aeneas.

*

On the basis of the cryptography of V, i, this scene seems to me to secrete, in its abundance of Latin words, odd usages and suggestive groupings, a wealth of hidden messages. Moore did not analyse it fully, however, evidently feeling that the treatment of the spectacular V, i, would get his point across sufficiently, as indeed it does; and the labour required for the deciphering of V, i, being enough in itself to occupy most people for the period of a Master’s degree at least. So that there remains here an excellent

opportunity for the reader to make an original contribution to Shakespearean studies, providing they are not discouraged by the disgraceful neglect into which Moore and his towering achievement have been allowed to lapse.

Jaquenetta's variant of Armado's name in "...and sent me from Don Armatho" (91) stands out, as does her use of "from" when "by" would have been more precisely suitable. When analysed for its SS, RS, SDS and RDS values, "Don Armatho" is found to lack a full set of Baconian seals: but the addition of "from" corrects this deficiency, so that the final result becomes: -"Mr. William Shakespeare", plus a complete and symmetrical set of Baconian seals, as given above.

iii

The moment of bliss has passed. The ego has been traumatised by the reassertion of the will-to-eros in negative aspect (wounding of the stag), and now feels the impulse toward healing (Berowne's protestation of love for Rosalind). This must be mediated through the conscious ego and its Gnostic interpretation of the Goddess in toto (King's protestation of love for Princess of France: and these two will be identified with Berowne and Rosalind in the masque to follow in Act V); but first the "I" principle in negative aspect must be overcome (Longaville's protestation of love for Maria); but first, before all, the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, or the negative contents of the unconscious, Her domain, must be conceived anew (Dumain's protestation of love for Katharine). The precise sequence of avowals is therefore highly significant, and not at all adventitious or fanciful. Finally, the ego's impulse to healing has led it to acknowledge the crime of Puritanism, and admit the libido as idea into his reasoning ego (King's denial of his love to the others, then Berowne's disabusing him of this obvious lie); and the unconscious reinforces this will-to-healing, which will be a continuing process (Berowne's denial of love for Rosalind; Dumain's gathering up of the torn pieces of the letter brought by Jaquenetta which proves otherwise).

*

In line 197, "Dun Adramadio, Dun Adramadio", when compiled as "Dun Adramadio Twice", and analysed for its SS, RS, SDS and RDS

values, gives the result: - “Master Wm. Shakespeare”, plus a full set of Baconian seals.

ACT V

i

The significance of this scene is almost totally cryptographic, in a sustained and spectacular way; but first the question arises as to why this Act bears the epigram “Actus Quartus” in FF, when the true Actus Quartus has already appeared on pp. 129-35. Bacon misnamed it thus expecting that it would catch the alert eye; and when analysed for its seal values, in the way of Bacon’s own system, “Quartus for Quintus” gives the result “Master William Shakespeare”, plus a full set of Baconian seals, as given above.

In line 9, the variant “Don Adriano de Armatho” secretes the name “Master William Shakespeare” (see introduction to this chapter). The next passage to be examined is Holofernes’ speech (16 – 24), wherein he enumerates some odd usages of words by the Don. The groupings can be compiled for analysis thus:

- 1) speake dout fine, say doubt
- 2) abhominable, call abbominable
- 3) pronounce debt, not det
- 4) neighbour vocatur nebour
- 5) clepeth a halfe, haufe
- 6) clepeth a calf, caufe
- 7) neigh abreuiated ne

The order of decipherment as given here is important; for the analysis gives a complete and symmetrical set of Baconian seals for each of the above, plus:

- 1) W. Shakespeare
- 2) Will Shakespeare
- 3) William Shakespeare
- 4) Mr. W. Shakespeare
- 5) Mr. Will Shakespeare
- 6) Mr. William Shakespeare
- 7) Master William Shakespeare

Let us now move ahead to line 47:

Page Yes, yes, he teaches men the Horne-booke:
 What is Ab speld backward with the horn on his head?
Pedant Ba, puericia with a horne added.

Briefly, the answer to Page's riddle is "Bacorno" (the misspelt pueritia meaning "simplicity" in Italian, suggesting the Italian corno for "horn"). The problem for Bacon was therefore to remove the troublesome "r" from "Bacorno"; and the obvious home for it was with 'F.' (for Francis) to make "Fr.". To return now to the end of Holofernes speech (25):

Pedant ...it insinuateth me of infamie. Ne inteligis domine, to
 make franticke, lunaticke?
Curate Laus Deo, bene intelligo.

Holofernes' remarks can be compiled as: - "It entereth me of infamie: dost thou not understand, sir? To make franticke, lunaticke." He is criticising the Don's use of one word for the other, as on a previous occasion he did for his use of "Chirra" for "Sirra". In the latter instance the cryptographic significance was found to lie in the letters "Ch": so that, here, it is the letters "fr" and "lu" that are of importance, rather than "anticke [naticke]" which is common to both. Lu is the past participle of the French verb lire; and the argument of the preceeding chapters has demonstrated the abundance of French words used as ciphers in FF. The word "infamie" is of importance in the later argument; but here its SS is found to be the SDS of "Francis Bacon". So that the final message becomes:

"It insinuateth [entereth] me of infamie: dost thou not understand sir? To make "Fr." read.
Francis Bacon

This is Bacon telling the reader that he intends to "make 'Fr.' read", and this is somehow to be done by the use of the word

“infamie”; and the reader might well now agree with Nathaniel: “Praise be to God, I well understand”. The line immediately following is:

Pedant Bome boon for boon prescian, a little scratcht, ‘twil serue.

The italicised words form a combined substitutional-transpositional cipher based on the Trithemian alphabet, the hidden statement being:

e.g., Bacono pro Bacon

F. B*c*nu* fe.

- “fe” being here a standard abbreviation of “fecit”. So that the observation “a little scratcht, ‘twil serue” is entirely appropriate. The sense of this is to be found in the context of the remaining italicised words (see below). Let us now examine lines 43 ff.:

Page	Peace, the peale begins.
Braggart	Monsieur, are you not lettred?
Page	Yes, yes, he teaches boys the Horne-booke. What is Ab speld backward with the horn on his head?
Pedant	Ba, puericia with a horne added.
Page	Ba most seely Sheepe, with a horne: you heare his learning.
Pedant	Quis quis, thou consonant?
Page	The last of the five Vowels if You repeat them, or the fifth if I.
Pedant	I will repeat them: a e I.
Page	The Sheepe, the other two concludes it o u.

Holofernes’ “Quis quis, thou consonant” refers to the “r” in “Bacorno”. Mote is trying to make out that he is a sheep: hence he stops him at the letter “i”; but why is it capitalised to “I”? - and most editors indeed have emended it to “i”. Turning now to the word “Infamie” (64), to whose importance we have already been alerted: this is a simple cipher of:

I'm in a. e.
F.

The SS value of "ae" in 6, which is also the SS value of "F". So that the Holofernes' "a e I" now becomes "F I", or "I, F." which, when juxtaposed with the "Bacorno" of the immediately preceding lines, takes up the "r" by orthographic attraction to give the final "I, Fr. Bacono". The pronoun "I" precludes this from being a signature; so to what can it be linked? The immediately sequent "The Sheepe" gives the answer: for its SS and RS values are 38 and 88 respectively, which are also the RDS values of Master Shakespeare (88) and William (38): so that the final result becomes:

"Master William Shakespeare" – I, Fr. Bacono

Bacon then beautifully rounds off the section with "...the other two concludes it o u": for the SS and RS values of "ou" are 34 and 16, which are also the RS of "I" (16), and SDS of "Fr. Bacono", to give "I, Fr. Bacono": so that "ou" when deciphered prove indeed to conclude the final result. But wait, there's more:

Pedant	Thou disputes like an Infant: goe whip thy Gigge.
Page	Lend me your Horne to make one, and I will whip about your Infamie unum cita a gigge of a Cuckold's horne.

Mote's extraordinary and superficially impenetrable comment would certainly catch the alert eye. The significance of 'Infamie' has been given above. Unum cita is a simple cipher of un'uomo cita ("name a man" in Italian, to continue the Italian thread). The sentence must be compiled thus:

Lend me your Horne to make one, and I will whip about your
Infamie a gigge of a Cuckold's horne unum cita.

When the underlined words are analysed for their SS, RS, SDS and RDS values, the final result becomes:

Lend me your Bacorno to make I, Fr. Bacono, and I will alter
about your Infamie [I'm in a e, F.] and form, of a e I, a F. I then of
a Cuckold's Bacorno a man name – Fr. Bacono.

Francis Bacon

Let William Moore have the last word on this sentence:

In view of what the textual lines are here shown to contain, the
Reader will no doubt grant that our previous description of them
[...lines that are truly masterpieces of verbal and cryptographic
jugglery] was not without full warrant. He will perhaps
endeavour to find words, if words there be, that shall adequately
describe the man who conceived those lines; which possess a
subtlety so extraordinary that it is almost incredible.

The italicised words thus far in the scene also demand attention,
but in their correct spellings (the misspellings are significant, and
will be treated separately):

Satis quod sufficit
quondam
Don Adriano de Armatho
Novi hominem tanquam te
vocatur
ne intellegis domine?
Laus Deo. Bene intelligo
Bome boon for boon prescian
Vides ne quis venit?
Video, & gaudeo
Quare?
Pueritia Ba-horne
Quis quis?
unum cita

When compiled and translated the hidden statement is revealed:

Seest thou not who comes?
I see, and rejoice.

Dost thou not understand, sir?

Praise to God! I well understand. I know the man as much as I know thee.

Name a man!

Master William Shakespeare, formerly called Bacorno.

Who? Who? Why Bacorno? Simplicity! That which sufficeth is enough:

e.g., Bacono for Bacon.

F. Bacon fecit.

The next groupings to be examined are “Thou hast it ad dungil” (72), and “dunghel for unguem” (73). When analysed in terms of their SS, RS, SDS and RSS values, the former is found to secrete the name “Mr. William Shakespeare”, plus a complete set of Baconian seals; and the latter precisely the same, with the exception of the substitution of “Master” for “Mr.”.

In lines 76 ff., the grouping “Arts-man preambulat” gives “Mr. Will Shakespeare” and a full set of Baconian seals; and “Mons sans question” the same, with the exception of the substitution of “William” for “Will”; and “posterior: posteriors” a full set of Baconian seals, plus the name “Master W. Shakespeare”.

The next passage to be examined begins at line 118:

Curate Where will you find men worthy enough to present them? Pedant Iosua, your selfe: my selfe, and this gallant gentleman Iudas Maccabeus; this Swaine (because of his great limme or ioynt) shall passe Pompey the great, the Page Hercules.

How can two men (Holofernes and Don Armado) play one character? The answer is quite simple if Don Armado is taken as a cypher, i.e. 0: for then $1 + 0 = 1$. This supports the several textual reinforcements of the Don’s status as cipher.

We come now to the misspelt words:

Quari for quare

² Joseph Campbell, The Hero With a Thousand Faces.

ortagriphie for orthographie
inteligis for intelligis
quid for quod
gaudio for gaudeo
puericia for pueritia
hominum for hominem

The similar “dunghel for unguem” (74) is intended as a guide to the decipherer, to show him what form the questions should take. Analysis of these three letter groupings for their SS, RS, SDS and RDS values gives a full set of Baconian seals for each, plus, in order corresponding to the above:

W. Shakespeare
Will Shakespeare
William Shakespeare
Mr. W. Shakespeare
Mr. Will Shakespeare
Mr. William Shakespeare
Master William Shakespeare

ii

This scene describes a single, successful act of meditation. It is thus the healthy twin of its miscarried sibling RIII I, iii, wherein the repression of the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen in negative aspect marks the Rubicon on the way to the psychic catastrophe of RIII III, iv. Here, however, the ego bent on healing will recognise the Queen of Hell (Katharine) at the bottom of the Goddess as Woman (Maria), and embrace her, to be transformed. Just so transformed was Prince Niall of Irish legend, who was, alone of the five sons of the King of Eochaid, brave enough to kiss the ugly hag who guarded the well, to transform her by this act into the beautiful Princess “Royal Rule”, who thereupon created him King of Tara² The end result here will be that the ego coping with the will-to-eros in negative aspect by the weaving of an ornate yet preposterous carpet of Puritanism (Don Armado the Braggart), will recognise this inadequate response for what it is, and take up the path to enlightenment: “For mine own part, I breathe free breath. I have seen

the day of wrong through the little hole of discretion, and I will right myself like a soldier”: Don Armado, V, ii, 718.

The introductory lines 1-148 involve the Goddess in Her several aspects, and the film of Puritanism (Boyet) through which She is misperceived in the written word. In 149-264 the King and his lords present themselves “disguised like Russians and visored” to the Princess and the ladies. This episode is precisely cognate with the encounter of Odysseus with the Cyclops in Homer’s *Odyssey*, where the hero identifies himself as “Nobody” (ego leaving its identity behind) and escapes the Cyclops by clinging to the underside of sheep (ego identifying itself with Man-as-sublimated-animal, or Dionysian Man): for the *Odyssey* is itself an allegory of the hero’s journey of inward psychological discovery, as Joseph Campbell so memorably described in his *Occidental Mythology*. The Cyclops’ one eye is symbolic of precisely the same principle as the Puritan Salisbury’s remaining eye after half his face is blown off by a cannonball in 1HVI I, iv: namely, the action of the functional left hemisphere of the brain – the side of intellect and reason (with a small “r”), or the male principle – unmodified by the right, wherein resides intuition, music, emotion, wisdom, - or the female principle: - the two in concert enabling the full functioning of reason. Odysseus has hung up his sword (male principle) after the Trojan war, and in order to resume his true nobility as King of Ithaca, and husband (Son/Consort) of Penelope (the Moon Goddess: the weaving and unweaving of her rug symbolising the cycle of the moon), must now make the hero’s journey to the underworld (Hades, by the grace of the witch Circe): the end result of which will be his perception of the truth that lies beyond the opposites – good/evil, vice/virtue, success/failure, heaven/hell/, man/woman, life/death, and so on (as symbolised by Scylla and Charybdis) – of merely wordly experience (cf. William Blake’s *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*; and Nietzsche’s *Beyond Good and Evil*). The underworld, broadly speaking, is that which lies beneath the apparent surface of phenomenal forms: for example, the will(s)-to-survival, -eros, and -power, all attributes of Man-as-sublimated-animal, or Dionysian Man (e.g. “Madam, I will, if suddenly I may”: II, i, 111). With Circe, before Scylla and Charybdis, are the Goddess as Woman (Calypso) and Maiden (Nausicaa):

whose counterparts in LLL are Katharine, Maria, and the Princess of France in maiden aspect, to constitute the Great (Triple) Goddess in toto. The male principle in LLL V, ii, is embodied by Hector, - as played by Don Armado, - whose symbolism, in a slightly different context, as the active intellectual principle of Greek Apollonist Classicism (studious Shakespeare in his London phase), is explored to the full in T&C.

The really central figure in the introductory phase (1-148) is therefore Katharine, the Queen of Hell. Here she is all darkness. The task of the ego bent on healing will be to bring Her realm – the contents of the unconscious – into the light of consciousness; and the deeper the Faustian descent, the higher will be the subsequent ascent, and the more complete the freedom: an eternal truth which Pauline Christianity has great difficulty in acknowledging. Rosaline is the Goddess described in the written word, and is identified with the Princess of France (Great Goddess, Who will be all light, as known through the visual imagination by the now healed ego). The “foul and fair” lover of the Song of Solomon is powerfully suggested:

Rosaline You'll ne'er be friends with him [Cupid]; 'a killed your sister.

Katharine He made her melancholy, sad, and heavy;
 And so she died. Had she been light, like you
 Of such a merry, nimble, stirring spirit,
 She might ha' been a grandam ere she died.
 And so may you, for a light heart lives long.

Rosaline What's your dark meaning, mouse, of this light word?

Katharine A light condition in a beauty dark.

Rosaline We need more light to find your meaning out.

Katharine ...Therefore, I'll darkly end the argument.

Rosaline Look what you do, you do it still i'th' dark

Katharine So do not you, for you are a light wench.

[...]

Princess Well bandied both! A set of wit well played!

The healing will be mediated through the written word (Mote as herald of the “Russians”) perceived through, not Puritan, but

Boyet The tongues of mocking wenches are as keen
 As is the razor's edge invisible...

This episode therefore has been a ritual of falling of the scales; and the ego's reflection on its own character, in which it must perceive the grave fallacy which has informed it hitherto, now begins (164). The ego's apprehension of its wonted repudiation of the libido which inheres in it and all of Nature, to make of it a thing "become" rather than "becoming", and therefore ripe for tragedy (cf. the coup of RIII III, iv), and which has expressed itself for all to see in the outrageousness of the Braggart principle, will be hard to swallow ("Let's mock them still": Rosaline, 301); yet in this pain will be a greater joy: for "He who loses his life for my sake will find it":

Boyet ...for it can never be
 They will digest this harsh indignity.
Princess Will they return?
Boyet They will, they will, God knows;
 And leap for joy though they are lame with blows.

The auto-therapeutic ego now recognises the Boyet principle for what it is ("This fellow picks up wit, as pigeons peas...": Berowne, 315 ff.; and the King puts it in a nutshell: "A blister on his sweet tongue, with my heart,/That put Armado's page out of his part!"). Once again the Fool principle as a property of Man-as-sublimated-animal, or Dionysian or Falstaffian Man, asserts itself:

Rosaline I dare not call them fools, but this I think,
 When they are thirsty, fools would fain have drink.
Berowne This jest is dry to me. My gentle sweet,
 Your wit makes wise things foolish...
 [...]
 O, I am yours, and all that I possess.

The subject now vows to renounce his former ways; yet there is no instance elsewhere in the play of Berowne acting in this way. Rather, he is describing Don Armado, the Braggart, to a "t", for the two of course are to be identified:

Berowne Taffeta phrases, silken terms precise,
Three-piled hyperboles, spruce affection,
Figures pedantical, - these summer flies
Have blown me full of maggot ostentation...

The subject recognises the “I” principle in negative aspect at the bottom of his malady; and now he has the intellectual weapons to effect his self-transformation:

Berowne Lo, he [Boyet] is tilting straight. Peace, I have done.
Enter Costard
Welcome, pure wit! Thou partest a fair fray.

There now begins a play-within-the-play which, like the similar episodes in HAM (albeit aborted) and TT, records a period of imaginative self-reflection. Don Armado will be transformed by it; but, to establish the initial conditions of the experiment, he begins as his old self:

Armado Anointed, I implore so much expense of thy royal
sweet breath as will utter
a brace of words.
Armado and the King converse apart
Princess Doth this man serve God?
Berowne Why ask you?
Princess ‘A speaks not like a man of God his making.

This God is a principle, with which the Gnostic Christ will be united after his death and resurrection (cf. “For the Lord’s tokens on you do I see”: Berowne to the Princess, 423): in this idealised scenario having gone to his death with his eyes open; but in the bitter reality of Shakespeare’s life with them firmly shut. Costard will play Pompey the Great. This is the Pompey of the first triumvirate, and therefore an attribute of Julius Caesar, who, fascinatingly, was assassinated at the foot of the statue of Pompey (the “I” principle: and cf. the germane episode of Hamlet’s vanquishment by Laertes). The blade-wounded Caesar will come to

represent in JC the ego informed by the “I” (ithyphallic) principle, more broadly the unseen world. The ego in meditation recognises that the “I” principle has been suppressed from its field of consideration by the impulse to anerotism, as deriving from that principle’s negative aspect, as cast by Puritanism. This “Pompey” is not “Great”, as the unconscious insists he must be:

Costard [as Pompey]

I Pompey am –

Berowne You lie! You are not he.

Costard [as Pompey]

I Pompey am –

Boyet With leopard’s head on knee.

Berowne Well said, old mocker. I must needs be friends with thee.

Costard [as Pompey]

I Pompey am, surnamed the Big –

Dumaine The “Great”.

Consequent on Costard comes Nathaniel, who plays Alexander the Great, that supreme Gnostic Christ figure of FF. The Gnostic Christ, who as husband of Mary Magdalene integrated the libido as will and idea into his conscious ego, and thus was capable of Reason with a capital “R” (as acknowledging the invisible world), - is absent in principle from the Puritan ego that has prevailed heretofore:

Nathaniel [as Alexander]

My scutcheon plain declares that I am Alexander.

Boyet Your nose says “no”, you are not; for it stands too right.

Berowne Your nose smells “no” in this, most tender-smelling knight.

Costard now leads Nathaniel off the stage: for it is the “I” principle in negative aspect which has corrupted the potential Christlikeness of the stricken ego. Holofernes will play Judas Maccabeus, and Mote the boy Hercules. The role of Holofernes is to present to us the name of Francis Bacon; and it is he who, in this

character, orders Mote off the stage, without saying a word: the Herculean might of the written word as a vector for Puritan misconceptions of the world now diminished to insignificance. Bacon takes pains to identify this Judas with the betrayer of Christ, while insisting on his separate identity: for this Judas is likewise a betrayer, but of a different individual, viz. Sir Francis Bacon:

Holofernes speaks as Judas

Judas I am –

Dumaine A Judas!

Holofernes Not Iscariot, sir.

[as Judas]

Judas I am, yclept Maccabeus

Dumaine Judas Maccabeus clipped is pain Judas.

Berowne A kissing traitor. How, art thou proved Judas?

Holofernes [as Judas]

Judas I am –

Dumaine The more shame for you, Judas.

Holofernes What mean you, sir?

Boyet To make Judas hang himself.

Holofernes Begin, sir; you are my elder.

Berowne Well followed: Judas was hanged on an elder.

It is all a beautiful piece of allegory. There follows a by-play, with the other lords contesting to give Holofernes a countenance (a cittern-head; the head of a bodkin; &c. &c.), for, as they maintain, he has none (again, totally consistent with his role). Finally, another allusion to betrayal, this time by the construction by Berowne of the name as “Jude-ass”: the reference being to the ass that bore Jesus Christ into Jerusalem for the proclamation of His right to the throne.

Last comes Don Armado as Hector, whose symbolic value I have described above. The libido must be in eternal opposition to Puritanism in action:

Armado Sweet Lord Longaville, rein thy tongue.

³ Christopher Brennan, *German Romanticism, A Progressive Definition*, in Chisholm A.R. and Quinn J.J. (eds.), *The Prose of Christopher Brennan*.

Longaville I must rather give it the rein, for it runs against
Hector.

The crux in the ego's transformation comes with its invocation of the "I" principle to the field of contemplation of the Armado principle (Berowne steps forth and whispers to Costard). Already they are in conflict as the ego perceives the truth:

Costard Then shall Hector be whipped for Jaquenetta that is
 quick by him, and hanged for Pompey that is dead by
 him.

They shape to fight. The reference is to the tumescent phallos emerging from the foreskin:

Mote Master [Armado], let me take you a buttonhole lower.
 Do you not see, Pompey is uncasing for the
combat.

The brief reappearance of Mote here is utterly consistent with the action on the allegorical plane. Armado refuses to fight (the subject allows the possibility of an ithyphallos without resistance) – in words with whose symbolism the reader should by now be thoroughly familiar (cf. HV II, i, 14):

Armado ... I both may and I will.

The period of meditation is now over. Bacon signifies this by having Marcade announce the death of the Princess' father, the King of France. If she represents the Great Goddess, then her father is God, nothing less: for it is in this sort of contemplation of eternal principles that the human being attains to divinity. This is a truly remarkable piece of symbolism, anticipating, for example, Novalis and German romanticism by at least two centuries.

Coleridge's definition of imagination (*Biographia Literaria*, chapter xiv) helps us straight to the centre: it is, he says, "a fusion of all the powers of the mind, in their due order" (one can

reach from this a consideration of the elements that go to make up a poem: melody, image, significance). But this is equivalent to saying that the imaginative act is an anticipation of the final synthesis, that genius is the power of coming, at moments, into direct and living contact with the ultimate perfection, and that a continuous state of imaginative experience would be identical with the latter (the whole of Novalis is contained in this last clause).³

The name “Marcade” is therefore formed from “mark” and “adieu”, to give “Mark now the departure of God”. Don Armado repents, and the corner is turned; but the Princess’ party refuse their suitors for the time being, with a promise to return and reconsider after periods of self-transformation by Navarre and his lords: the King himself to spend a year in a Hermitage; Longaville and Dumaine likewise to present themselves after twelve months. Berowne must go to a hospital and “...still converse with groaning wretches; and your task shall be/With all the fierce endeavour of your wit/To enforce the pained impotent to smile”: the “groaning wretches” being the stricken ego, a vivid reference to Shakespeare in his early post-breakdown phase, when he has made the crucial recognition of the root of his malady, and determined on the flight to London, where his early years would be spent under the tutelage and Gnostic guidance of Sir Francis Bacon.

For this initial embrace with the Goddess will not dissolve into a Dionysian Sturm und Drang, but lead to a prolonged Apollonian self-development, involving the faculty of reason, and the imagination developed to the nth degree, especially the visual (cf. “When these suns...” &c.: HVIII I, i, 33). Yet HVIII and T&C tell of the continuing problem he would have with the Queen of Hell, and Her Consort/Son the libido, in negative aspect (the Boar); and even here the alarm-bells are ringing, for the King’s term of self-transformation in an hermitage will be strongly ascetic in nature:

Princess ...but go with speed
To some forlorn and naked hermitage...
If frosts and fasts, hard lodging and thin weeds,
Nip not the gaudy blossoms of your love...

- The asceticism of Shakespeare in auto-therapeutic mode, poring over his books (Bacon, Apuleius, Giorgi, &c.), visualising, understanding, memorising, - whose peace will be shattered by the irruption of the will-to-eros in negative aspect, to produce, not another breakdown as befell him in Stratford, after eight years of enthrallment by Puritanism had left his ego defenceless against the "charge of the Boar", but a strong discomfort, to be dealt with by the Faustian creativity of the stage (cf. HVIII II, ii, 60 ff.; and Hector's defeat by Achilles/Ajax in T&C). What then is the essential difference between Shakespeare in adolescent (ascetic/Puritan) and London phases? Though the tendency to asceticism remains (like that of his mentor and God, who yet had an outlet in homosexuality, which was denied to his still-suffering protégé), yet the sterile rationalism has been superseded by an intense and vivid imagination, primarily visual, with the Goddess as its final term of reference: to illustrate, in truth, Coleridge's definition of the imagination given above. Yet in Shakespeare's case this was Classicism in action: only that being acknowledged which can be apprehended which falls within the field of sight. The irruption of libido was therefore absolutely crucial to his creativity, as bringing with it an apprehension of what lies beyond the merely visual, - the will, and then the universal Will, and the limitlessness of Space, - which is the distinctive concern of the Western mind. Christopher Brennan suffered, too, this ennobling declension from the Classical to the Faustian world-feelings (cf. especially "There is a far-off thrill that troubles me..."; and *Lilith*, his greatest poem); as did James Joyce, as famously recorded in *Ulysses*: both he and Brennan being outstanding Classical scholars in their youth, with an especial predilection for Greek. One recalls the motif of Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*: 'For God has consigned all men to disobedience that he may have mercy upon all' (Romans 11, 32).

At no time is there even a brief return of the suitors' affections, although they all "converse apart". Scholars appear generally to have been surprised at the final lines of LLL; but in the light of the play as allegory, they are utterly routine: Shakespeare's Puritan phase having been Apollonist in character, as shunning the Dionysius principle of the irrational, as will and idea; the

subsequent healing phase predicated on acknowledgement of the invisible world, to which Mercury is the guide.

Armado The words of Mercury are harsh after the songs of
Apollo. You that way; we this way.

*

The passage beginning "Well bandied both! A set of wit well played." (29) contains the most extensive collection of cipher-words in the play. Rosaline's comment "O that your face were not so full of O's" (45) has marvellously stimulated the inventiveness of the commentators; but it is in fact Bacon alerting the decipherer that the preceding passage is a goldmine. The groupings to be examined are, in order:

- 1) in a Coppie booke
- 2) my golden letter
- 3) My red Dominicall
- 4) a good conclusion
- 5) Let me not die your debtor
- 6) Beauteous as Incke
- 7) Any thing like?
- 8) Much in the letters
- 9) Nothing in the praise
- 10) Ware pensals. How?
- 11) Faire as a text B.

The Quarto has "Beautious" for "Beauteous" and "pensalls" for "pensals". Both were demonstrably modified by Bacon in the interval between Q and FF for cryptographic reasons, as were "Signeour" ("Signeor") and "ath toothen side" ("ath to the side"). That this sort of hard scientific evidence could have been ignored by the commentators for so long, - so that the New Penguin Edition (1982), for example, makes not a single reference to Moore in its pathetic attempts to explain the play's multitude of problems, - is disgraceful in the extreme. All of the eleven groupings are found, on analysis, to secrete a complete and symmetrical set of Baconian seals, plus, in order corresponding to the above:

-
- 1) W. Shakespeare
 - 2) Will Shakespeare
 - 3) William Shakespeare
 - 4) Mr. Shakespeare
 - 5) Mr. W. Shakespeare
 - 6) Mr. Will Shakespeare
 - 7) Mr. William Shakespeare
 - 8) Master Shakespeare
 - 9) Master W. Shakespeare
 - 10) Master Will Shakespeare
 - 11) Master William Shakespeare

The next passage to be examined begins at line 225: "Then cannot we be bought; and so adieu". Its significance lies in the numbers with which, remarkably, it abounds. The groupings to be examined are, in this order:

- 1) one: three: two
- 2) Twice: half: once
- 3) Dozen: seventh: One
- 4) Treys: halfe: a

When analysed in the usual way, they are found each to contain a full set of Baconian seals, plus, in order corresponding to the above:

- 1) Mr. W. Shakespeare
- 2) Master Will Shakespeare
- 3) Master William Shakespeare
- 4) Maister William Shakespeare

It has been demonstrated above that Bacon provided the data required for the decryption of "De Armatho" in the phrase "Armathor ath to the side", which was found to secrete the statement:

De Armatho is a Cipher: 5, 11 to the r.
Francis Bacon

It is therefore to be expected that he would also have given the data required for the decipherment of “Don Armado”: and it is in fact secreted in two more variants of his name occurring in this scene:

King A blister on his sweet tongue with my hart,
That put Armathoes Page out of his part.

And:

King ...Armadoes Page Hercules...

This is compiled to the grouping “Armathoes Armadoes Page”, which then is analysed in terms of its SS, RS, SDS and RDS values, to give the final result:

Don Adriano de Armatho is a Cypher.
Key items: - 2, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 17, 19

Francis Bacon

6	17	1	13	3	9	18		2	1	3	14	13	100
F	R	A	N	C	I	S		E	A	C	O	N	

In other words, there is a grouping of 19 letters which must be split into 2: one (1) of 9 letters and one of 10. The group of 10 (DonAdriano) has 5 letters changed 7 places to the right, and 5 changed 17 places to the right. The group of 9 letters has 5 letters changed 11 places to the right (see introduction to this chapter).

12	11	10	15	5	17	11	12	13	3	1	10	5	15	5	11	17	5	10
M	e	a	n	d	t	h	e	s	i	s	a	n	a	r	r	e	l	y

The lengthy debate over simple arithmetic (485 ff.) – as to whether 3 times 23 is actually 9 – has been shown above to refer to the number 117, which is, in the Baconian context, the correct answer. 117 gives the numbers 7, 11, and 17, which are a subset (referring to the Key numbers themselves: 7r, 11r, 17r) of the complete data needed for the decryption of Don Adriano de Armatho, as given above.

17	14	11	1	50
R	O	S	A	

The next dialogue to be examined is the following (485):

Clowne No sir, but it is vara fine,
For euerie one pursents three.

The misspelt words “vara” and “pursents” attract the alert eye. In addition, the word “three” has been shown above (I, ii) to contain Baconian seals, though incompletely. This suggests that the words “For euerie on pursents” are intended to perform the same function as the word “yeeres” in I, ii, 52: namely, to complement the Baconian seals contained in “three”; and the groupings “but it is vara fine” and “For euerie on pursents three” are in fact each found, on analysis, to secrete a full set of Baconian seals, plus, in the former “W. Shakespeare”, and in the latter “Mr. W. Shakespeare”.

In line 542, “The ship is under saile, and here she coms amain”, the two groupings “The ship is under saile” and “and here she coms amain” are each found to contain a full set of Baconian seals, plus in the former “Mr. W. Shakespeare”, and in the latter “Mr. William Shakespeare”.

Mercury was the patron god of Elizabethan cryptographers; so that the final lines of the play have significance on both the Shakespearean plane (as I have shown above), and the Baconian: the “words of Mercury” – e.g. “pursents”, dunghel, “Caufe”, &c. &c. – indeed being “harsh after the songs of Apollo”.

Finally, we come to the significance of the title. Firstly, as many commentators have noted, it bears absolutely no relation to the literal plane of the play. William Moore’s elucidation of the Baconian allegory, and my own of the Shakespearean, demonstrate, on the other hand, that it is immensely relevant to a play which secretes two distinct and complementary “labours of love”, which were destined to be “lost” to its contemporaries, and to succeeding generations, - though not forever.

The title has, further, a cryptographic significance. In Q the title and thirty-six running titles appear as “Loues Labor’s lost”, except on the title-page, where the compositor has accidentally left off the apostrophe. In FF the title appears twenty-three times as “Loues Labour’s lost”. The points to be noted are the small “l” of “lost”, and the contraction of “Labo(u)r is” to “Labo(u)r’s”. The analysis of “Concolinel” has demonstrated (see above) that the cryptographic meanings of the letters C, L, L, are to found in their use as Roman numerals. Holofernes’ ballad in IV, ii (57 - 62) is also of relevance:

~~Holofernes ...If Sore be sore, then ell to Sore,~~
makes fiftie sores O sorell:
Of one sore I an hundred make
By adding but one more L.

This is Bacon alerting the cryptanalyst to the significance of the letter “L” as meaning 50. Further, every line is in the third person, except the penultimate, which is in the first person, suggesting his occult presence: and “I” (SS of Francis Bacon) does in fact “an hundred make”:

This does not, however, exhaust the range of “100”. When considered as a Simple Digit Seal the result is thus:

50, when considered as a Simple Seal, gives the following:

Hence:

“Master Wm. Shakespeare” – Francis Bacon rosa

That is:

“Master Wm. Shakespeare” - Francis Bacon in secret.

That the letters are to be grouped as LL, L is confirmed by the minimalisation of the “I” of “lost”. It now becomes obvious why the word “is” could not be allowed to stand: for this would have

corrupted the arrangement of the L's, and would have given, in fact, a value for the last L of 49 (as per the Roman numerical system).

¹ Wallace-Murphy and Hopkins, Rosslyn.

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

CHAPTER 16

TITUS ANDRONICUS

Titus Andronicus is yet another treatise on the pathogenesis, crisis and remission of the Puritan disease, with reference, of course, to the case history of William Shakespeare. Its standpoint (clinical rather than intimate) and style mark it as from the pen of Bacon alone. Central to it is the Puritan's vice of suppressing from the written word perceptions of the world that lies unseen below the surface of things, just as Shakespeare had done in his eight-year doomed enthrallment; and of course, from the Puritan's own psyche, this unseen world as will: so that dissolution in blind libido can never be allowed. This is the underworld whose elucidation by the great modern artists, scientists and depth psychologists, we now take for granted. The written word is represented here by the letter given by Tamora to Saturnine via Titus in the forest; but principally by the forest itself, just as in TGV, MND, MAC, AYLI, and so on, but most memorably in the last, where Melancholy Jacques in the Forest of Arden represents Shakespeare as reader (c. 1587-9), and Orlando Shakespeare as writer (1589'), all under the guidance of Bacon.

We meet in TitA Tamora, Goddess of the Visible World; that Goddess perverted by the Puritan ego (Tamora as wife of Saturnine); Lavinia, Queen of Hell, or Goddess of the Unseen World, or Grail Queen (cf. Cordelia in KL, which is closely germane to TitA; and all the other Queens of Hell-Grail Queens of FF); the libido in negative aspect (Aaron the Moor); the Puritan sufferer (Titus, whose epithet is "pius" (I, i, 24), precisely as the Goddess-rejecting hero's of Virgil's Aeneid: so that this is the first appearance of the myth which would be central to Bacon's strategy); the principle of Gnostic enlightenment (Lucius, taken from the hero of that name of Apuleius' magical allegory of psychic transformation *The Golden Ass*, a central plank of Bacon's therapeutics); and so on. The "charge of the Boar", - that metaphor of the first importance to the FF, symbolising as it does

the irruption of libido in negative aspect into the Puritan ego to effect the coup, as had befallen Shakespeare, - seems at first glance to be missing; however it is certainly there, behind the scenes, to precipitate Titus' suffering: so that Titus feeding the dust with his tears is cognate with Lear on the heath, both as representations of the stricken, distraught Shakespeare that Bacon had first come to know.

TitA is based on history in only the loosest possible way, with many of the characters and incidents introduced *de novo* by Bacon, for the purpose of the allegory. The name "Andronicus" must be taken to bear, in this context, an unsuspected but utterly consistent significance. We have seen how the Lion motif (Leontes, Leonato, Posthumus Leonatus, &c) bears throughout the plays the allegoric weight of Shakespeare as (mostly Puritan) Goddess-rejector, as most plausibly sourced from the tale of Samson and the lion in Judges 14, which Bacon mentioned in a petition to the House of Lords (see Ch. 23 for a detailed derivation). Bacon would have been familiar with Pliny's popular story of Andronicus the lion... and there you have it.

ACT I

Saturn was for millenia the visible planet farthest in the heavens from the sun. In the mediaeval mystery religions it therefore symbolised the highest possible level of purity of the initiate in his journey of enlightenment. Thus it was associated with Rosslyn Castle in Scotland in the pilgrim route of which Santiago de Compostella in Portugal was the first stop, representing the entry level of the path to enlightenment.¹ Saturninus represents in TitA a perversion of this enlightenment by the Puritan ego in its delusion, and is not at all to be confused with the real thing. Thus does Titus say in IV, iii, 56, when the psychic transformation of the subject is well under way: "To Saturn, Caius, not to Saturnine". This exalted significance of Saturn was a feature of the new Neoplatonism/Christian Cabalism that was sweeping Europe, and claimed Bacon and many others as adherents, ultimately via John Dee and his marvellous library.²

Titus Andronicus himself represents the totality of the Self (conscious ego plus unconscious), which surrenders to the

influence of Puritanism (his agreeing to Saturnine as Emperor of Rome), just as had Will Shaksper aet.15. His epithet is “pius” (see above), and he is identified with Priam, King of Troy (I, i, 80), whence Aeneas flees in Virgil’s epic to found the city of Rome: but not before he has repudiated Dido (the Goddess: Isis, Cleopatra), which Bacon took to be an expression of the same fundamental psychological error as corrupts Puritanism, and had crippled his patient. The cause of this mistake was apparent to him also. It is the vulnerability of the Pauline Catholic to Nature in catabolic mode, due to his mutilation of the Great Goddess – amputation of Her aspects as Woman and Queen of Hell – to leave the Virgin Mary:

Titus Romans, of five and twenty valiant sons,
 Half of the number that King Priam had,
 Behold the poor remains, alive and dead!

In HAM, Priam will be shown, utterly consistently with his symbolic value in TitA, to be slaughtered by Pyrrhus, who represents the principle of Hermetic enlightenment (Bacon having stolen Pyrrhus from Plutarch – as he did so much else – for his symbolic aptness, as described in the Life of Lucius Lucullus as, of all the great Romans, the most like Alexander the Great, that typical representative of Gnostic divinity in FF). Saturnine (the sham high-thinking of the Puritan) is pointedly shown, in his marriage to Tamora (the Great Goddess perverted by Puritanism) as rejecting Lavinia (the Grail Queen) who is now claimed by Bassianus (the unconscious: < “bass”: cf. Bassanio in MOV). Here she will be held in negative aspect, in her fragile keep, till summoned by the conscious ego in its engagement with an erotic passage in the printed page (cf. the Page family in MWW), where she will arouse the libido, also in negative aspect (Aaron), to shatter the ego informed by Puritanism: which coup will be forestalled by the Puritan ego’s suppression of the libido. Chiron means in Greek “worse”; while Demetrius is described in Plutarch’s Life of Lucius Lucullus as being a sham Alexander (cf. MND), and

³ Robert Graves, *ibid.*

Pyrrhus as indirectly the cause of his ruin. Alarbus, the eldest son of Tamora slaughtered on arrival in Rome, clearly represents the principle of Gnostic enlightenment, his name plausibly being derived from the Latine *alae*, “wings” (cf. the falcon symbolism in 2HIV II, i). His brothers, as survivors, therefore represent the degradation of his principle in the Puritan ego.

The name of Marcus, brother of Titus, was stolen (for bad poets borrow, good poets steal, as T.S.Eliot observed) by Bacon from Plutarch’s *Life of Paulus Aemilius*, where he is identified as the founder of that clan and, strikingly, as son of Pythagoras the Wise (cf. TN IV, ii, 54). Pythagoreanism was a major component of the new Neoplatonic/Christian Cabalist philosophy. Marcus therefore represents the principle of wisdom, albeit perverted in this first Act. This provenance is supported by the presence of a character called Aemilius (see discussion of Act V below). Titus’ sons are Lucius (hero of TGA, whose journey to enlightenment is its theme); Martius (battle or engagement with Nature: < “Mars”); Mutius, who symbolises verbal inarticulacy, or unfamiliarity with the true meaning of the written word as revealed by the imagination (that faculty whose extinction is the *sine qua non* of Puritanism); and Quintus. The silences of Mutius and Lavinia (as well as Cordelia) are therefore cousins germanes.

The provenance of Quintus is a fascinating one. In the early LLL the character Costard the Clown plays the role, in a play-within-the-play, of Pompey, who bears the symbolic weight of the ithyphallic (“I”) principle, more broadly the unseen world. In Plutarch’s *Life of Marcus Brutus*, Caius Ligarius is named as a confederate of Pompey, - who was defeated by Julius Caesar at Pharsalia (“I” principle repudiated by Shaksper in bookish ascetic/genteel phases c. aet.13-14, as allegorised in the later JC), - and therefore is to be identified also with the Pompey principle. In a marginal note North glosses, in reference to Caius Ligarius, “In an other place they cal him Quintus”, which would positively scream to the cryptographer “Use me!” Quintus therefore represents the “I” principle, in negative aspect, along with his brothers, in this first Act, with the ego still under sway of Puritanism. Bacon had his symbolic strategy well worked out long before JC, in which it would reappear.

Thus Mutius guards Lavinia and Bassianus from Titus, and will not let him near them. Mutius is killed by Titus, who initially refuses to honour him with burial, but then acquiesces to his brothers' wishes: for the Self and its divinity, and all its noble attributes, are here perverted. Titus' relenting is a neat way of allegorising the ego's slide into Puritanism.

ACT II

Aaron symbolises broadly the libido: the will(s)-to-survival, -eros, and -power, or simply the will-to-life, here cast in negative aspect by the Puritan superego of the subject (Shaksper aet.15-23). In the context of the inner life allegorised in FF, it is the will-to-eros which is most often emphasised, albeit the will-to-survival is another aspect of the will-to-life crippled by Puritanism (the will-to-power being its overriding concern, in vain, for it is a counterfeit without the substrate of the other two). The will-to-life is the essential quality of the sacred king of the Goddess, the King of the Waxing Year being identified with the will-to-eros (the May Day revels &c.), the King of the Waning Year (destructiveness of winter) with the will-to-survival.³ Chiron and Demetrius are these two kings, but are shams, as sons of the false Goddess of Puritanism. The rapier symbolises always the "I" principle; and the swordfight between the brothers over the hand of Lavinia represents the rising of the ithyphallos in the Puritan; their burial in the heart of Bassianus in the forest, the yoking of the ithyphallos to the unconscious, which dominates the Puritan's world-feeling. It is Aaron (negative libido) who therefore incites the brothers (Puritan sham nobility) to their mutilation of Lavinia (cutting out her tongue, to silence her, in the way of Cordelia: for the Queen of Hell does not speak through the written word to the Puritan ego; and amputation of the hands: to make doubly sure the words cannot be formed as an expression of Her).

Here is a sublime constellation of symbols. A hunt takes the principal characters to a forest. Chiron and Demetrius stab Bassianus in the presence of Tamora. They lower his body into a pit beneath a tree and, with the encouragement of Tamora, take Lavinia away to ravish her. Following the lead of Aaron, Martius and Quintus then fall into the pit, first the former, the latter as he

strives to extract his brother. Saturninus enters, beholds the pit, and is given a letter by Tamora, which he reads as Aaron digs up a bag of gold which he previously had buried there. He orders Martius and Quintus to be gaoled pending torture, and is deaf to the pleading of Titus for their release. Lavinia reappears with her tongue and hands chopped away.

The hunt recalls the inductions to the *Taming of the Shrew*, where the Lord is the philosopher (Sir Francis Bacon) who is engaging with Nature as represented by the written word (the forest), and following therein the spore of the Secret Cause (the will, unseen world) to where it lies hidden. The Puritan however is the polar opposite to the true Alexander that was Bacon; and in TitA all will go awry. The Puritan is now reading the page, and feeling threatened by the knowledge of the invisible world, the Faustian dimension, conveyed by it. Lavinia's mutilation would seem be to a gratuitous touch; but she is silent for the same reason as Cordelia, Hippolyta in the early acts of *MND*, and Hero in *MAN*: their lack of speech symbolising the subject's deafness to the Musical arts, which are desperately speaking to him of the Goddess. Mutius bore precisely this significance in Act I. Nature is now to be identified with surda Thalia (see fig.2), below the very lowest of the Muses: and the subject remains perfectly unenlightened. It was an appreciation of the Musical arts, with their fostering of the imagination, that Bacon began to instill in his patient in this first, emergency phase of his treatment (cf. the pens and ink that both Richmond and Richard demand, and the symbolism of Milford, in *RIII V*); and the later dagger-murder of Lavinia by her father will symbolise the ego-in-healing's new knowledge of the libido as a property of the Faustian dimension, now stripped of its negative mantle by imagination acting on the written word. Lavinia's death is therefore germane to Juliet's, and both are to be interpreted as transformations rather than extinctions.

The stabbing of Bassianus by the brothers represents the activation of the unconscious, manifest in an *ithyphallos* (the blades: cf. the murder of Polonius), against the will of the Puritan. The tree represents the written word; and the bag of gold (the same as found and then repudiated by Timon (Puritan

Shakespeare) in TimA), the riches to be gained by delving below the surface of the visible world, in the truest Faustian or high Western manner. The name "Martius" is formed from "Mars", the God of battle: - here the engagement with Nature (cf. Hal's French campaign in HV), - who will be invoked in IV, iii, 54, by the ego full-steam ahead on the way to healing. His fall into the pit symbolises the ideal of the ego's properly Gnostic engagement with the root of his troubles. His precipitation of Quintus into the pit after him is another instance in FF of the principle of referral, where the ithyphallos (Quintus) is now referred to the unseen word underlying it. Saturnine's reading of the letter concerning the stabbing of Bassianus represents the activation of libido on reading, say, the graphically described seduction of Lucius by Fotis in TGA. At this precise moment Aaron presents him with the gold he has disinterred from by the tree (the riches that Martius and Quintus would have gained for the murder). This icon of Martius and Quintus in the pit with the dagger-wounded Bassianus, with Aaron holding up the bag of gold, symbolizes the result of engagement with the written word in a positive way; but the Puritan's reaction is perverse:

Saturnine Two of thy whelps, fell curs of bloody kind,
Have here bereft my brother of his life.
Sirs, drag them from the pit unto the prison,
There let them hide until we have devised
Some never-heard-of torturing pain for them.

It will be the task of the ego-in-healing to reanimate the Martius and Quintus principles (Titus pleading for their release).

ACT III

The subject's psychic collapse has bottomed out, and he is now at the very beginning of his transformation, as is shown by the presence of Marcus (wisdom) and Lucius. Titus prostrate and crying into the dust is cognate with Lear on the heath. The Boar has charged, to shatter the security of the Puritan ego. Lucius with his rapier drawn symbolises the sufferer awakened from his darkness by the reassertion of the libido, about to begin his transformation

and healing by re-engagement with Nature and the written word (“To rescue my two brothers from their death...”: i, 49) - like Lucius in his incipient ass-phase in Apuleius. As yet the sufferer, ignorant of the Musical arts, has no purchase on the Nature that has stormed in to the fill the vacuum of his ego:

Lucius My gracious lord, no tribune hears you speak.
Titus Why, ‘tis no matter, man, if they did hear
 They would not mark me, if they did mark
 They would not pity me...

The principle of enlightenment offers escape: “Sweet father, cease your tears...” (Lucius, i, 136). The visual imagination is coming into play, after its long term of suppression: “Look, Marcus! Ah, son Lucius, look on her!” The handkerchiefs of Marcus and Lucius are symbolic of menstruation, and hence of the Goddess (and Lucius’ is held before Lavinia, to make the identification plain) – just as those in 3HVI, HAM, OTH, MND, and elsewhere. They have been long holding them at their own faces, for they are soaked in their tears (visual imagination working on Nature in the printed page).

What is all this business about the hand? The point being made is that the negative libido has prevented the fearful Puritan ego from proper engagement with the written word (Aaron chopping off Titus’ hand). The hand will later be returned to Titus, along with the heads of his sons. This is a characteristic way of signifying the re-assumption of the Musical arts and the Quintus and Martius principles by the ego-in-healing: the severed head bearing throughout the plays the symbolic value of psychic rebirth. Marcus and Lucius argue as to who will give his hand, then who will cut off Titus’: to make the identification between them. Aaron fulfils the same function with his “If that be called deceit, I will be honest...” (189). As yet, however, reason has not assumed the throne of the suffering ego (i, 119):

Marcus But yet let reason govern thy lament.
Titus If there were reason for these miseries,
 Then into limits could I bind my woes...

⁴ Baigent et al., *The Elixir and the Stone*.

- A situation that will soon be reversed with the return of the heads and hand (i, 265):

Titus Ha, ha, ha!

Marcus Why dost thou laugh? It fits not with this hour.

Titus Why, I have not another tear to shed.

The turning point is reached: "The vow is made" (i, 280)". This is precisely cognate with Richard's "Ah, Buckingham, now do I play the touch" (RIII, IV, ii, 8), - where Buckingham is the unconscious, whose negative contents are about to be transformed. Titus places, in a highly symbolic gesture, his severed hand between Lavinia's teeth. This is cognate with Lear's "We two alone will sing like birds i' the cage": for the written word has been transformed as a medium through which the Faustian dimension will speak. Just as Shakespeare as healed and resurrected is portrayed by Edgar in KL, so that the ending of this play is not at all the irredeemable psychic hell that Ted Hughes took it to be; so Titus will begin to dwell on the forms of his imagination, in the Gnostic though not the Puritan way ("He takes false shadows for true substances": ii, 80) and be redeemed, as was Shakespeare.

Lucius heads off to the Goths to raise a force to attack Rome (Gnostic ego crushing the Puritan, just as Pyrrhus pulverises Priam in Hamlet). The word "hand" is reiterated several times by Titus (ii, 23 ff.) to celebrate the ego's discovery of the way to rebirth.

Titus Thou shalt not sigh, nor hold thy stumps to heaven,
Nor wink, nor nod, nor kneel, nor make a sign,
But I of these will wrest an alphabet.

It could not be plainer. The boy Lucius is, of course, the principle of enlightenment reborn. He is sobbing in ii, 46, just like his aunt Lavinia; however this will soon be transformed as the field of enlightenment is entered, where the libido in negative aspect will be annihilated by the new-found "I" principle (Marcus stabbing fly, which Titus likens to Aaron). Lear and Cordelia again are

⁵ Barbara Thiering, *The Book That Jesus Wrote*.

anticipated:

Titus Come, take away. Lavinia, go with me:
 I'll to thy closet, and go read with thee
 Sad stories chanced in the times of old.
 Come, boy [Lucius fils] and go with me: thy sight is young,
 And thou shalt read when mine begins to dazzle.

ACT IV

Lucius fils running away from Lavinia with his books in his arms graphically portrays the early tendency of the ego-in-healing to dread raw Nature, with its threat of the Boar – the inveterately problematic libido – in the written word. However this is overcome, and he begins for the first time to reflect, and to recognise the true cause of his suffering (Lucius and Titus perceiving Lavinia's message – that Chiron and Demetrius are the culprits - as she turns the pages of Lucius' books with her stumps). Young Lucius delivers daggers wrapped in scrolls with verses upon them to the brothers (ego discovering the "I" principle in the written word, as worked on by the reasoning imagination, by the offices of which alone the transformation can be effected):

Marcus ... we will prosecute by good advice
 Mortal revenge upon these traitorous Goths,
 And see their blood, or die with this reproach.

Titus ...She's with the lion deep in league...
 You are a young huntsman, Marcus, let alone;
 And come, I will go get a leaf of brass,
 And with a gad of steel will write these words...

This is the first instance of the Lion motif in FF; while "gad" is also instanced in Gads Hill (1&2HIV), as the "I" principle of the unseen world. (A gad was a pointed tool).

Apulieus' The Golden Ass was central to Bacon's treatment of Shakespeare ("Now, what a thing it is to be an ass": Aaron, ii, 25); but the name Cornelia (ii, 41) of the midwife of Aaron's child by Tamora (the libido reborn in positive aspect) may indicate the

similar status of the writings of the great Renaissance magus Cornelius Agrippa (1486-1535) in this regard:

Marlowe's Faustus explicitly models himself on Agrippa, and Goethe is reputed to have said it was Agrippa, more than anyone else, whose background, personality, demeanour, adventures, and impact on his contemporaries provided him with a prototype for his dramatic poem's protagonist.⁴

Alternatively, "Cornelia" may be a reference to "Cornelius" as the personal name of St. Luke, Christ's "Beloved Physician".⁵ In any case, the nurse bears the symbolic weight of the healer.

The "tapers" of "the burning tapers of the sky/That shone so brightly when this boy were got" are the same precisely as lighted by Lucius (also the same) in the chamber of Brutus in JC, where Brutus represents the Tavern or pseudo-Alexandrian phase ego of Shaksper's mid-adolescence. The libido in negative aspect is transformed utterly by the Lucius principle, with the sanctity of the "I" principle being perceived anew; but at this point the libido reborn is still entwined with its character as anathematised by Puritanism; and if it were to touch, with its reaffirmation of the "I" principle, the sacred king immanent in the ego-in-healing, then his (the sacred king's) negative mantle would be removed:

[takes the child from the nurse, and draws
Aaron ...He dies upon my scimitar's sharp point
 That touches my first born son and heir!

With rebirth of the will(s)-to-survival and -eros (the latter in the foreground here), the visible world is also reborn (cf. marriages of Katherina (invisible world) and Bianca (visible world) in TOS), with the recognition of its roots in the will; and this enriches the subject, and makes possible his attainment of the highest level of enlightenment, with which the colour gold was associated in alchemy and the other mediaeval mystery religions:

Aaron Not far one Muly lives, my countryman,
 His wife but yesterday was brought to bed;
 His child is like to her, fair as you are:

Go pack with him, and give the mother gold...

The subject is in his ass-phase (Muly). The ass principle is identified with the underworld: for the nurse – who is identified with the mother of Aaron fils, cousin germane on the allegorical plane to the infant Muly - will be buried in a field (with the phallos-wound in her side), to identify her with Persephone as Queen of Hell. Enlightenment will not come immediately, but through continued application of reason and the imagination to the written word (the arrows – that immemorially ancient symbol, like the rays of the sun, of the light of reason - with letters superscribed on them, into the court of Saturninus).

Right on cue the Clown appears, yet another of the many Fools in FF, all with the same significance.

Tamora ...if Aaron now be wise,
 Then all is safe, the anchor in the port.

- An axiom that might stand as an epigram to FF. Saturnine orders the Clown to be hanged, which is symbolic here of the death of enlightenment in the Puritan ego (cf. TCE, where the rope is cognate in a negative sense with the golden chain, symbolic of the vulva of the Goddess). The name “Aemilius”, of the messenger who announces to Saturnine the imminent attack of the Goths, was undoubtedly stolen by Bacon from Plutarch’s Life of Paulus Aemilius:

...the house and family of the Aemilians in Rome, was always of the most ancient of the nobility, which they call Patricians. Some writers affirm also, that the first of the house that gave name to all the posterity after, was Marcus, the son of Pythagoras the wise... For he did not use to plead private mens causes in law, neither would creep into mens favour by fawning upon any of them... but he rather sought to win reputation by his honesty, his valliantness, and upright dealing...

ACT V

The ego-in-healing comes to a knowledge of the negative libido, as directed by the Puritan superego, to be at the root of his malady (Lucius listening to Aaron's admissions of guilt). Titus kills Chiron and Demetrius. Lavinia holding the basin full of their blood is a striking image of the Grail Queen Herself. This is a beautiful example of how the visual imagination – supraordinate to the literal sense of the words on the page – must so often be the first tool used in the explication of the plays as allegory.

There follows a series of stabbing murders at Titus' last supper, in all of which the body pierced by the blade represents the subject new-informed with knowledge of the *ityphallos* (unseen world), either as will or idea. This is a celebration of the deaths of old principles, and the births of new. The technique of Titus' stabbing of the veiled Lavinia is germane to Hamlet's of Polonius hidden behind the arras: the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, locked away in the Puritan's unconscious, now being liberated to be an active principle in the psyche, by his association of her with the unseen world described in the written word. Tamora is fed on her sons: so that her stabbing (cf. the death of Juliet) represents the transformation of the sham Goddess of Puritanism into the true Great Goddess (Nature divinised), and the sham Alexander into his true counterpart. Lucius' words over her body recall Timon's judgement of himself (as Puritan): "Some beast read this, there does not live a man":

Lucius No funeral rite, nor man in mourning weed,
 No mournful bell shall ring her burial;
 But throw her forth to beasts and birds of prey.
 Her life was beastly and devoid of pity,
 And being dead, let birds on her take pity.

This is all a powerful expression of Bacon's contempt for the Puritan world-view. Titus is stabbed by Saturnine (subject new-informed by knowledge of unseen world, to be reborn (as Lucius)); and Saturnine by Lucius (subject reborn into Gnostic nobility shedding his old Puritan self).

Lucius But, soft! methinks, I do digress too much,

Citing my worthless praise. O, pardon me,
For when no friends are by, men praise themselves.
Marcus Now is my turn to speak. Behold the child...

In a beautiful sophistication of the Lucius principle, Bacon has allocated to him knowledge of the phenomenal or visible world, and to Marcus the deeper knowledge of the unseen world: the partnership forming the true Gnostic ego: Aaron fils representing, of course, the libido or unseen world reborn into sanctity.

CHAPTER 17

THE COMEDY OF ERRORS

The Comedy of Errors is an allegory of a divided Self's recovery of its wholeness. It corresponds to the psychic events described in RIII; but whereas the latter follows from within every twist and turn of a psyche's disintegration and repair, TCE describes from without the principles concerned, in a way that suggests the pen of the healer rather than the patient. The most likely scenario is that TCE was written entirely by Bacon at the same time as Shakespeare was working on his contributions to the histories, after having developed his art with Mr. Arden of Feversham and Pericles I-II. As always, this scenario is supported by the style of TCE, and its double-identity allegoric strategy, - so typical of Bacon, - with its powerful mechanistic character, making great demands on the logical capabilities of cryptographer and cryptanalyst alike.

This sense of psychic resurrection is conveyed by "Solinus", the name of the Duke of Ephesus, as derived from the Italian solino, "collar", which bears here, as always in the plays, the symbolic weight of the vulva of the Goddess Nature through which the ego is reborn. The twins-named-the-same strategem, of which TCE is the consummate expression, - an intricate and powerful machine, testament to the inventiveness and colossal patience of its creator, - allowed Bacon to describe different aspects of a single divided psyche. Thus the mast to which Aegeon and his wife clung, with their younger son Antipholus strapped to the father's end together with the younger Dromio, and the elder Antipholus and Dromio to

Aemilia's end, represents this division in embryo. The elder pair are in the care of their mother: for they represent archetypal Man and the Goddess, or the Gnostic Christ and Isis, or Culture Man (to use Spengler's term) whereas the younger pair represent the historically later degradation of this wholeness into a particular type of City Man, – the Protestant Puritan, into which Shakespeare had stiffened aet.15- 23, from the time of his prosecution by the Puritan Sir Thomas Lucy and rustication from Stratford, – whose world-feeling derives from fear and scorn of the Goddess (who is Nature divinised), and who are rigidly, imagination-lessly, forever become, and thus fall tragically short of the true (Gnostic) Christian ideal.

Bacon derived the name of Dromio from the Greek *dromos* for racecourse (as in "hippodrome", an arena for horse-racing). The horse-and-rider represents throughout the plays the libido in action, as sourced by Bacon from Socrates' famous extended metaphor in Plato's *Phaedrus*: and this is the allegoric value of the *Dromios*. The name "Antipholus" is derived from the Greek *anti* ("against") and *pholos* ("hiding place of a hibernating bear", as used by Aristotle). It is fair to say that this could only have come from Bacon. The significance of the bear as a Gnostic symbol will be described at length in Chapter 40, where it will be found to explain the otherwise mystifying direction "Exit, pursued by a bear" in TWT; - and its symbolism here is plain: as the principle of the Gnostic Christ which lies dormant in the suffering subject, to his own perdition, until its awakening by the Musical arts (the abbey in Act V), with consequent redemption of the subject, and his attainment to divinity (pardoning of Aegeon). The term "Musical arts" refers principally to the written word, as defined by Socrates in the early pages of Plato's *Republic* (cf. Bianca's music lessons in TOS). The house of Antipholus of Ephesus is located, consistently, at the sign of the Phoenix, that immensely ancient symbol of Hermetic psychic rebirth and the Gnostic Christ (cf. HVIII V, v: "Nor shall this peace sleep with her; but as when/The bird of wonder dies, the maiden phoenix,/Her ashes new-create another heir..."). The name of Aegeon, father to the two Antipholuses, is taken from the Greek *agios*, meaning "holy": for he represents the divine nature of Man, which according to the Gnostic tradition is to be

attained in this life, on this earth (cf. the suppressed Gospel of St. Thomas: "He who has heard and assimilated my word is as I"). The pardoning of Aegeon in Ephesus thus represents the attainment by the stricken ego (Antipholus of Syracuse) to divinity through communion with the Triple Goddess as Divine Bride (Adriana, wife of Antipholus of Ephesus), Sacred Mother (Aemilia) and Queen of Hell (also Adriana). Adriana as Queen of Hell-Grail Queen is cognate with Kate of TOS, and all the other Grail Queens of FF: for example, Margaret in RIII, I, iii, whose rejection by the ego under the influence of Puritanism will precipitate its shattering:

Luciana[to Adriana] The beasts, the fishes, and the winged fowls
Are their males' subjects and at their controls...

- To recall the similar terms in which the newly wed Katherine describes her transformed condition in TOS:

Katherine Such duty as the Subject owes the prince,
 Even such a woman oweth to her husband
 And when she is froward, peevish, sullen, sour,
 And not obedient to his honest will,
 What is she but a foul contending rebel
 And graceless traitor to her loving lord?

- Which is all very well in the context of the contents of the subconscious – the underworld in negative aspect, which hitherto had gripped the ego to strangle it - now being brought into consciousness and stripped of its negativity, to restore the ego to health, and noble control over the underworld. Yet it strikes, for the ear attuned to the harmony of an ego in a state of becoming, a discordant note, suggestive of Buddha-like triumph and fixity. The more proper note is sounded in RIII IV, iv:

King Richard Say I, her sovereign, am her subject low.
Queen Elizabeth But she, your subject, loathes such sovereignty.

This is a statement of a truly high Western (Faustian) world-feeling, such as is symbolised by the Greek camp, and Ajax in

particular, in T&C (75% approx. by Shakespeare), which I have shown to describe Shakespeare's pendulation between a state of become (Troy: Classical) and becoming (Greeks: Faustian), the latter only being consistent with the production of art of the highest quality. This passage in TCE and its cognate in TS are therefore powerful indices to the hand of Bacon; while the passage from RIII quoted above was most likely by Shakespeare. Bacon despised heterosexual love, and evidently expressed his eroticism in gay relations with his serving-men and others. He was become, having brought the intellect to a triumphant hegemony in his psyche: a closure which is reflected in the Baconian (rather than Shakespearean) sonnet, with its final couplet, which was a departure from the history of this form, and in many ways a dead end. Yet Bacon was undoubtedly the genius of FF, who nevertheless needed to be informed by the immediacy and horrific authenticity of Shakespeare's tragic experience to bring it all to fulfilment.

ACT I

The Queen of Hell-Grail Queen aspect of the Triple Goddess is emphasised, for it is Her domain that is the unseen world (underworld/unconscious), the fear of which infects the Puritan ego with perversity. Bacon chose Ephesus as the site of the most famous temple of the Great Goddess (as Artemis or Diana) in the Graeco-Asian world. This Ephesus is truly the realm of the enchantress, the crucible of the Hermetic psychic transformation to be effected by recognition of Her divinity:

S. Antipholus They say this town is full of cozenage:

As, nimble jugglers that deceive the eye,
Dark-working sorcerers that change the mind,
Soul-killing witches that deform the body,
Disguised cheaters, prating mountebanks,
And many such-like liberties of sin.

Syracusan Antipholus (ego ailing under Puritanism) gives his Dromio his money to take to the Centaur inn to keep. Money bears always in FF the allegoric value of the power of a principle: which is

here being relinquished by the stricken ego, who has dishonestly acquired it, to his libido, in the first stage of transformation. The Centaur was half man, half horse: and the symbolic value of the eponymous inn is of Man-as-sublimated-animal (homo libidensis, or Dionysian or Falstaffian Man). Ephesian Dromio now enters, and S. Antipholus beats him for pleading ignorance about the money; and here the beauty and power of the twins-named-the-same strategem begins to be felt: for this assault represents the antipathy, as of old, of the ailing ego to the newly dynamic libido.

ACT II

Adriana, wife of Ephesian Antipholus, discusses with Luciana her husband's tardiness. Later he will be locked out of the house, in another contretemps with S. Antipholus (again, the twins-named-the-same strategem in action), to symbolise the Puritan ego's disjunction from the Goddess: for the subject is still in the very earliest stage of healing. The cognate episode on the part of S. Antipholus will end with his speech "There's none but witches do inhabit here,/And therefore 'tis high time that I were hence..." (III, i, 155). The ass phase of the psychic rebirth of Lucius in TGA was played out under the aegis of the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen; and now here She, and he, is again:

Luciana O, know he [E. Antipholus] is the bridle of your will.

Adriana There's none but asses will be bridled so.

The name "Luciana" is formed of course, as is "Lucius", from the Latin lux, lucis, for "light". She is the illumination deriving from Gnostic reflection on the unseen world, realm of the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, after Her liberation from the unconscious and its Puritan shackles. It is a constant theme of FF that the Holy Grail is the wisdom deriving from knowledge of the unseen world as described in the written word. This is the wisdom acquired by Lear as the unseen world begins to speak to him from the printed page as vector of the Gnostic tradition, as symbolised by the new volubility of Cordelia, who has remained silent throughout so much of KL. Ted Hughes was therefore wrong to place the silence of Cordelia at the very heart of the ethical system of FF. Rather, it is she in her volubility who deserves that honour; to whom in her

silence she is related as the roots of a rose bush are to its most glorious flower.

It is the will-to-eros in negative aspect which keeps the ailing ego from the light:

Adriana This servitude makes you keep unwed.

Luciana Not this, but troubles of the marriage-bed.

Now E. Dromio enters with a sore head, and receives another beating, this time from Adriana: for he represents here the libido in negative aspect, and She the Grail Queen, Who must always abominate it. S. Antipholus now gives his Dromio (who is also E. Dromio) a beating. Adriana mistakes him for E. Antipholus and invites him home; and he accepts, in lines from which reason is banished:

S. Antipholus What, was I married to her in my dream?

Or sleep I now, and think I hear all this?

What error drives our eyes and ears amiss?

[...]

Am I in earth, in heaven, or in hell?

Sleeping or waking? Mad or well-advised?

Known unto these, and to myself disguised?

I'll say as they say, and persevere so...

And in this mist at all adventures go.

ACT III

The identity of Adriana with Kate of TOS , and both with the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, is emphasised again:

E. Antipholus My wife is shrewish when I keep not hours.

Balthazar is cognate with the character of the same name in R&J, where he bears precisely the same symbolic value as witness to the (re-)birth of Jesus the (Gnostic) Christ: for Balthazar was one of the Three Wise Men. Here he accompanies E. Antipholus, the fully achieved Gnostic Christ (witness his tolerance of his Dromio-libido); and both will be locked, due to another contretemps, out of

the house of the latter, and therefore of the Grail Queen. Balthazar defends Adriana, and prevents E. Antipholus from entering by force, in an access of suspicion of her, - utterly consistently with his symbolic role. S. Antipholus and his Dromio inside will end their communion with Goddesses by fleeing, to make the point that the ailing ego cannot be healed by the unadorned Queen of Hell (contemplation of Nature unilluminated by the Musical arts). It can be healed, however, - the libido stripped of its negative mantle, - by the "vocal Cordelia" principle: which here is represented by the "wench of excellent discourse/Pretty and witty, wild and yet, too, gentle" (i, 110), to whom they now repair, to bestow on her a golden chain which had been intended for Adriana. She could only have received it, on the symbolical plane, if E. Antipholus had remained the inviolate Gnostic Christ; but his exclusion from her house signifies his historically later degradation into Goddess-less Puritanism, due ultimately to the suppression of the Gnostic tradition by St. Paul and his adherents: and thus identifies him with S. Antipholus. For this chain is symbolically cognate with the name of Rosencrantz ("garland of roses") as the vulva of the Goddess through which the stricken subject will be reborn into eternal life (albeit in HAM this fulfillment is repudiated). This Courtesan resides by the sign of the Porpentine (porcupine), whose prickles are symbolic of the ithyphallos-libido, more broadly the unseen world, as resumed elsewhere in the "I" symbol (see especially 1-3HVI). It is all a beautifully adroit piece of symbolism; and it is the twins-named-the-same stratagem that has enabled it.

On the steps of the house of Adriana, S. Antipholus meanwhile has denied his espousal to her (counterpart of the barring of the doors to E. Antipholus) and professed his love for Luciana (yearning of the suffering ego for enlightenment). His Dromio now flees the house, and the kitchen-wench who has been making love to him inside (will-to-eros recoiling from union with the Goddess, in Whom the Queen of Hell in negative aspect persists). The Queen of Hell aspect is emphasised ("Swart, like my shoe [...] that I, amazed, ran from her like a witch"). Her name is Nell (she tolls the petit-mort: cf. Nell Quickly in 1&2 HIV); and is a Gaia-like earth-goddess ("...she is spherical, like a globe" [...] "In what part of her body stands Ireland?" &c., &c.). In sum, in rejecting libidinous

association with the Goddess, the suffering ego is repudiating Her in all Her Triple wholeness: as Divine Bride, Sacred Mother, and Goddess of the Underworld (Queen of Hell).

Angelo, who indeed is a messenger from God, - the Divinity of Gnostic rather than Pauline Christianity, - gives S. Antipholus the chain, to initiate him on the way to rebirth.

ACT IV

E. Antipholus orders his Dromio to buy a “rope’s end” (a noose) for him to bestow on his wife for having locked him from the house: for the chain of rebirth which should have been hers is now transformed into its antithesis, the means of the ego’s death, by the “charge of the Boar” as described, for example, RIII III, iv, (curable) or HAM (incurable). In a contretemps over the chain, Angelo has E. Antipholus arrested by an officer. What is going on here? Angelo is the messenger of God who brings the means of psychic rebirth to the suffering subject; but what of the Merchant? A clue to his symbolic value is given by his demand to be paid in guilders, which he needs for his voyage to Persia. He therefore is Dutch, which in Bacon’s geographico-symbolic language represents the higher thought of the conscious ego, as being located north of England. Persia, as located in the Orient, symbolises the Goddess. It was conquered by Alexander the Great in his Asian campaign, which represents in HV the victory of the questing ego over the Goddess (Nature divinised), through engagement (“ford” symbol” e.g. Milford Haven in CYM), rather than contempt or denial, - as is the case, for example, with Aristotelian rationalism, - which is symbolised in FF by the “bridge” (e.g. Earl of Cambridge in 2HVI).

E. Antipholus orders S. Dromio to retrieve a purse of ducats from Adriana to procure his bail. Later this money will be given to S. Antipholus to symbolise the enrichment of the ego in the process of healing by knowledge of the Queen of Hell: for this is true ego-power, not the sham variety of the Puritan, as symbolised by the money possessed by S. Antipholus on his arrival, to be surrendered to Dromio in the Centaur Inn in the first stage of reassertion of the libido. It is Luciana, consistently, who will fetch the money for S.

¹ Book of the Twenty-Four Philosophers (anon.)

² Knight and Lomas, The Second Messiah.

Dromio.

The Queen of Hell now gives her opinion of the man who has repudiated Her, to his own (redeemable) perdition:

Adriana He is deformed, crooked, old, and sere,
 Ill-faced, worse bodied, shapeless every where:
 Vicious, ungentle, foolish, blunt, unkind,
 Stigmatical in making, worse in mind.
 [...] My heart prays for him, though my tongue do
curse.

The true work of art induces Platonic Ideas – the “Mothers” of Goethe’s *Faust* – to form in the ego lost in contemplation: for example, not this man or that woman, but Man, as an objectification of the unseen world. In Man it appears as the will(s)-to-survival, -eros, and -power: the adequacy or otherwise of which objectifications is revealed by the work of art. First, however, Nature in its rawness (*surda Thalia* (fig.2)) must be assimilated by the ego in transformation (lion jaws). In the case of Shakespeare, the subject would not willingly ingest Her truth (the wide open-eyed Christ on the Cross of the Gnostic tradition), but had to be force fed against his will (“charge of the Boar”: eyes-closed Christ of Pauline Christianity). The contents of this meal – the libido in negative aspect - it must find repugnant. Thus it is for Richard in *RIII III*, v, ff., and for Lear on the heath; and thus it is here:

S. Dromio No, he’s in Tartar limbo, worse than hell:
 A devil in an everlasting garment hath him;
 One whose hard heart is buttoned up with steel:
 A fiend, a fury, pitiless and rough...

The garment is “everlasting”, for the unseen world – finally, Schopenhauer’s “Universal Will”, which lies beyond any capability of human reason (what are mesons made of? or what lies beyond the boundary of the universe?) - is eternal; and the bell is an immemorially ancient symbol of Eternity, which flows into Time through the work of art:

S. Dromio A chain, a chain! Do you not hear it ring?

Adriana What, the chain?

S. Dromio No, no, the bell...

- To make the identification between the two. The clock has turned, for the subject, back to the time of his pre-Puritan state:

S. Dromio It was two ere I left him [E. Antipholus], and now
the clock strikes one.

With rebirth (albeit still incipient) of the subject through psychic transformation comes recognition of his essential unity with the whole of humanity: for it is predicated on perception of the unseen world firstly in himself, then in others. This is the divinity conveyed by the axiom "God is an infinite sphere whose centre is everywhere and circumference nowhere".¹ S. Antipholus wears the chain about his neck:

S. Antipholus There's not a man I meet but doth salute me
As if I were their well-acquainted friend,
And every one doth call me by my name:
Some tender money to me, some invite me;
Some other give me thanks for kindnesses;
Some offer me commodities to buy...

The officer who had bound E. Antipholus is identified with Adam (cf. Adam in AYLI; and the character of Protheus – Greek for "first man" - in TGV): for the subject's arrest before the work of art allows him to engage the unseen world at play in himself. It is the "picture of Adam" that is enquired of by Dromio. The truths of Nature are being acknowledged with the help of the visual imagination: the reference almost certainly being to "Thrice Perfect Father Adam" of the twenty-eighth degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry (the authentic Freemasonry, long suppressed), whose purpose was the indoctrination of truth.² (See Chs.1, 26, 44, for a fuller discussion of the influence on FF of Freemasonry). S. Dromio is out of breath

after running, to signify that the libido has been aroused (dromos = "racecourse"). He is identified with all the other Fools or Clowns of FF: "Well, sir, there rest I your foolery" (iii, 33).

To summarise: on the allegorical plane, the ego in its essential separation from the Goddess and enlightenment (the truth of Nature: Adriana–Luciana) refuses, therefore, to allow Her any value in his conscious mentation (withholding of payment from the Merchant), and is consequently tormented, in this very earliest phase of rebirth (head protruding from the vulva of the Goddess: chain worn by S. Antipholus) by the knowledge of the libido (Falstaff-Dionysius: Son and Consort of the Great Goddess) as operative in himself (Adam). The Boar (libido in negative aspect) has charged, to shatter the complacent ego, in a cruel but kind incision, without anaesthetic, with the aim of severing the sclerosis of Puritanism and setting the blood to flow freely once more. The scalpel will now (IV, iv) be handed to the chief surgeon Pinch (the Musical arts as descriptive of the unseen world (cf. Richmond in RIII)), who will gain the vessel after a long and patient exploration, and clear the blockage. E. Antipholus' arrest by the officer therefore is precisely cognate with Lear's moment (KL I, iv) of recognition of the falseness of Regan and Goneril and the worth of Cordelia (cor-de-lia = "heart of Lear": the true Goddess, the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen). The bounds that Pinch will put about E. Antipholus and his Dromio correspond to the prison wherein "We two alone will sing like birds i' the cage" (KL V, iii, 10), and surda Thalia (silent Cordelia) will be given her voice by the written word.

Ted Hughes revealed for the first time the significance throughout the tragic sequence of the mythic constant of the "charge of the Boar", and its accompanying "Shakespearean moment", when the stricken subject violently perceives the loved one as a whore (e.g. "Get thee to a nunnery": Hamlet III, i); and here it is now, in this early comedy:

S. Antipholus Avoid, thou fiend!...

Thou [Courtesan] art, as you are all, a sorceress
I conjure thee to leave me and be gone!

She now demands back either her ring, which E. Antipholus had

snatched from her in the Porpentine inn, or the chain which is rightfully hers. for the two are to be identified (cf. the King's ring in HVIII V). This is yet another instance of the Ring Motif in FF, to identify it as a Ring saga in the great tradition of King Solomon's Ring as told in the Talmud, the Volsung Saga, the Ring of the Nibelung, and so on. The Ring and Grail traditions are essentially the same. (See Ch.44 for a fuller explanation of this critically important aspect of FF).

E. Dromio returns with the "rope's end", maintaining that he has spent the money (given by Adriana-Luciana to S. Dromio) to buy it; and he is beaten by E. Antipholus. In other words, the newly awakened libido remains, in this "heath" phase of the psyche's rebirth, in negative aspect. It is also his "ass" phase (cf. Apuleius):

E. Dromio I am an ass, indeed – you may prove it by my long ears.

Pinch enters (cf. the pinching of Falstaff by the fairies in MWW V), utterly consistently, with Adriana and Luciana. The ego now begins to reflect painfully, yet therapeutically, on his essential separation from the Goddess:

E. Antipholus Dined at home! Thou villain, what sayest thou?

E. Dromio Sir, sooth to say, you did not dine at home.

[&c. &c.]

Adriana Is't good to soothe him in these contraries?

Pinch It is no shame. The fellow finds his vein,
And yielding to him humours well his frenzy.

Antipholus moves to assault Adriana, but is prevented by the assistants of Pinch, who bind him: for the Musical arts are about to begin their task of stripping him of the film through which he perceives her in negative aspect. E. Dromio offers to place himself in bond for his Antipholus (it is a question of the Falstaff – Consort/Son of the Great Goddess - principle in negative aspect). This is emphasised in the next episode, where S. Antipholus enters with rapier drawn, together with S. Dromio: for the rapier is symbolic of

the ithyphallos-libido, more broadly the unseen world, throughout FF (cf. especially Laertes, and the Bishop of Bayonne in HVIII II, iv). Adriana and Luciana flee (failure to assimilate the Goddess in conscious ego, due to ithyphallos-libido as cast in negative aspect by Puritanism or, more broadly, puritan Pauline Christianity). Adriana offers to pay the goldsmith to save the officer (Adam principle) from prosecution (psychic rebirth effecting integration of libido as idea into ego).

In another contretemps, S. Antipholus and the Merchant draw their swords to fight. This represents the battle of the ithyphallic principle in negative aspect (rapier of Antipholus) in conflict with that principle in positive aspect, as induced by the intrusion into consciousness of the Goddess. Adriana appears, with Luciana, and orders S. Antipholus to be disarmed and taken to her house. Antipholus and his Dromio take sanctuary in an abbey, where the Lady Abbess will later be revealed as the mother of the twins Antipholus, and foster-mother to the Dromios. The abbey thus is identified with the house of Adriana, and the Abbess with Adriana herself (Goddess as Sacred Mother with Goddess as Divine Bride and Queen of Hell: another beautiful piece of symbolism). The abbey is further to be identified with the bonds of Pinch, and Luciana (enlightenment) with the lighted brands borne by E. Antipholus and his Dromio, having burst their bonds (cognate with the cry of "Rescue!" in the very last scene of RIII), - as the ego emerges from its chrysalis, where it has been bathed in the Musical arts. The name "Pinch" recalls too the pinches applied to Falstaff (libido) by the fairies in MWW V: his cognate here being E. Dromio. The rebirth, painful but with a glorious result, has now been accomplished; but not before the Musical arts (Abbess, germane to Pinch) have identified the unseen world in negative aspect as the root cause of the ego's suffering:

Abbess The consequence is, then, thy jealous fits
 Hath scared thy husband from the use of wits.

Her name "Aemilia" is immensely significant, the reference

¹ Foreward to the Praetorius edition of the Quartos.

being to Plutarch's Life of Paulus Aemilius, wherein his clan is described, strikingly, as having descended from Pythagoras the Wise. Aemilia therefore represents the wisdom derived from the written word (cf. the character of Aemilius in TitA). The ego has attained to divinity (pardoning of Aegeon, and his recognition of E. Antipholus: "He who has heard and assimilated my word is as I"), and may now be represented by Hyperborean Apollo enthroned, with the Graces at his right hand (fig.2). The libido has shed its negative mantle, to the redemption of the subject (ultimately Shakespeare), who will now devote himself to the written word:

Antipholus of Syracuse and Antipholus of Ephesus pass through
the gate, arm in arm.

E. DromioNay then, thus: [they join hands
We came into the world like brother and brother:
And now let's go hand in hand, not one before
another.

[they enter the abbey

CHAPTER 18

KING JOHN

King John is yet another allegory, written from the clinician's point of view, of the Death and Resurrection of William Shakespeare, and is to be placed on that basis among the Bacon group of plays. Though this is the principal criterion for distinguishing these plays from the rest, it is, as it happens, not the only one: for there is a predominance in this group of blank verse, written in the "high style" of the corpus – metaphor and language rich, of immense philosophical depth, all derived from a powerfully vivid and active visual imagination: - so that we can be sure that these plays are, like the sonnets written to the male dedicatee (see Epilogue), pure and undiluted Bacon at his very best. KJ conveys a powerful sense also of Bacon's sheer enjoyment of the writing of it, as based on a subject – English history – in which he had a vital interest. Yet it is the allegory that is its *raison d'être*; and although

less intricate and convoluted than comedies such as TCE – for Bacon could give his inventive powers free rein in these, whereas in KJ he had to conform to the broad outlines of the given story – yet the allegory is as tight and closely wrought as ever.

The principal sources for KJ were Holinshed, and *The Troublesome Reign of King John*, an unattributed play written and performed in 1591. The latter does not, - in contrast to *Mr. Arden of Feversham*, the other extra-canonical play examined in these pages, - secrete the Shakespearean allegory in the way of the canonical plays, and therefore is unlikely to have come from Bacon or Shakespeare's pen: a conclusion which the uniform flatness of its writing would support. Perhaps it came from one of Bacon's atelier assistants, or a young protégé, so that the Master could commandeer it without any question of plagiarism, and reshape it to serve his purpose. 1595-6 is the date generally agreed on for the composition of KJ, and this is likely to be about right, given its consonance with the comedies written around that time.

The commentators have remarked, and been perplexed by, the changes effected by the reworking of TRKJ. F.J. Furnivall, for example, wrote thus:

...he degrades his first hero John into a skunk, also brings in a second hero, Arthur, and kills him, moreover develops Faulconbridge into a third hero, and last makes a monk poison John without showing any motive for the act... Every reasonable being must acknowledge that the playwright fails in these points.¹

Flaws they may be on the literal plane, yet they are blinding successes on the allegorical, as the argument to come will show. Yet Furnivall missed the variation from the sources that is startling most of all to the alert eye, namely, the presence of the arras in IV, i, as the hiding place for the henchman charged with putting out the eyes of Arthur. The figure concealed by the arras represents, in his every appearance in MWW, 2 HIV, and HAM, a principle repressed by the psyche, to anticipate modern depth psychology by some centuries. So it is here also, where the executioner emerging with the red-hot iron, ready to blind Arthur, represents

the negative libido and ithyphallos irrupting the ego from the unconscious: another “charge of the Boar”. Yet their fatal effect on the ego will be forestalled by, of course, the written word (Arthur reading the warrant). The question of the blinding, and its avoidance, enables Bacon to emphasise that it is the visual imagination, evoking its forms from the written word, which is vital to the healing of the Shakespearean condition. Arthur’s later death will represent, in contrast, a fatal “charge of the Boar” (Shakespeare’s definitive breakdown in Stratford in 1587, aet.23). This is a beautiful illustration of the principle, commonly found in the plays, of the constraints of a pre-existing plot giving the author the opportunity of amplifying his treatment of the subject, as an expression of the axiom dear to the true artist, “Form is the obstacle that brings creativity to birth”: the visual imagination acting on the written word being pinpointed as the factor that could have saved Shakespeare from his breakdown.

Hubert bearing away the dead Arthur in his arms in IV, iii, is a striking evocation of the timeless mythic theme of the *mater dolorosa*, of which Michelangelo’s *Pieta* – showing the mother of Christ cradling His dead body, before His Resurrection into glory – is the best-known example. As with the Resurrected Christ (and remember Crosby (“Cross-by”) House as the seat of Richard in RIII), so with the Arthur principle, which will be reborn in V, vii, as the new King Henry, after King John has expired in the orchard (ego reborn into Gnostic Christhood after the unconscious – King John – has been taken out of play (cf. eclipse of Buckingham in RIII IV-V) by the wisdom of the written word (cf. Alexander Iden in his garden in 2 HVI IV, x).

The ego once surviving the charge (thanks to activity of imagination), then succumbing to it (Puritan extirpation of imagination), is represented by Arthur’s reprieve from blinding, then death while hazarding a jump from the high walls of the castle. The intervening time is not covered in the sources; but Bacon grasped the golden opportunity to highlight again the factor predisposing to the coup. We could expect the libido in negative aspect to be liberated from the unconscious to irrupt the conscious ego, perhaps with the aid of a go-between, as represented most memorably by Catesby in RIII: and this is exactly what happens.

Philip the Bastard is another exemplary Ugly Dick figure, and so represents, of course, the negative libido; while Hubert is the ithyphallic principle. Thus does Bacon twice explicitly signify their kinship, quite apart from the obvious deduction from the action: in Hubert's entry with Peter of Pomfret, followed by the Bastard's exit with him; and their pairing as they speed to the King at the end of Act IV. The messenger sent after the peers in IV, ii, 178, is the Catesby figure: "...for perhaps he shall need/Some messenger betwixt me and the peers": where the peers represent, as so often elsewhere in FF, the faculty of reason.

IV, ii, opens with reason engaging with the unconscious whose contents have surged again (the nobles berating King John for suffering to be crowned a second time). This has been accompanied by an ithyphallos: "Since all and every part of what we would/Doth make a stand at what your highness will". Reason (as yet uninformed by the wisdom of the written word: this will have to wait until the death of King John in the orchard) yearns for the ship of the ego to stay afloat (nobles' suit for the pardoning of Arthur). The negative libido, as the contents of the unconscious (King and Hubert conversing apart), now enters the picture; and turmoil reigns, as reason is unable to forestall the coup, and the conscious ego crumbles, just as befell Shakespeare aet.23 (nobles quitting King John for the French camp, now at war with England). The peers represent the enfeebled reason of the Puritan mind, which is unable to engage the unconscious, and must ever be at war with it (just as the Puritans were hunters of the witch, priestess of the Queen of Hell: the microcosmic unconscious being cognate with the macrocosmic underworld). The French camp as a whole, including Arthur, represents the Puritan ego. If only the Puritan could have learnt the value of the visual imagination, then all this trouble might have been spared him! (Arthur's survival of the intent to blind him). Peter of Pomfret represents, like all the Peters without exception in the plays, the Roman (Pauline) Church. We have seen how the Roman Catholic Church, with its mutilation of the Great Goddess to form the Virgin Mary (misconception of Nature as susceptible to being rid of its underworld component by the Church), is identified, in the histories, as the root cause of the Puritan error (see, for example, the murder of Rutland in 2 HVII, iii).

The Bastard enters with Peter (the negative libido linked to the Christian puritan superego). The Bastard has been robbing the clergymen (libido overthrowing power of Church); and Bacon's juxtaposition of this information with the entry of Peter serves to underscore the latter's identity. Peter prophesies – following Holinshed – that King John will surrender his crown before noon on the next Ascension Day (power of the unconscious will be broken). This is precisely what will happen (V, i); but it will be to Rome (Cardinal Pandulph: the Puritan superego), and so remain, on the plane of allegory, a sham.

Now the Boar charges (King John sends the Bastard to the peers). There is a reiterated emphasis on haste, to make the point that this an allegory of thought (cf. MAN II, iii, 5):

King John Nay, but make haste!

Bastard The spirit of the time shall teach me speed.

The order of events in IV, iii, is crucial. Arthur dies – following Holinshed - in his attempt to flee the castle by jumping from the walls. The peers enter; but do not see the body until after the entry of the Bastard. This purpose of this interplay - not even hinted at in the sources - is to portray the "charge of the Boar". Hubert's swordfight with Salisbury represents the conflict caused by the irruption of the negative ithyphallos into the psyche which had thought to break its power by force of reason (the sword representing, as always, the "I" principle). The negative libido (Bastard) and ithyphallos (Hubert) remain properties of the unconscious (their flight to the king) as Puritan reason breaks off all engagement (peers flight to the French camp). Hubert (mater dolorosa) bears away the body of Arthur (Christ on the Cross with eyes closed, as a prelude to Resurrection (Shakespeare in London period)).

In V, i, King John hands over his crown to Cardinal Pandulph (Puritan superego), who then restores it to him, to initiate a particularly subtle piece of symbolism. The ideal outcome for the diseased ego would be that the overthrow of the Puritan influence, and its transformation into Gnostic nobility, should be undertaken voluntarily (Christ on the Cross with eyes open), with the help of

the written word. The Ascension Day of Peter's in his prophecy would then refer to the Gnostic Christ, as the power of the unconscious and its negative contents is broken; however Peter represents the Roman Church, and this Christ is a sham, whom tragedy will soon shatter. The Puritan ego (Shakespeare aet.15-23) thinks, in his delusion, that this is what has happened; but the libido, still negatively conceived, will have its way:

King John Is this Ascension Day? Did not the prophet
Say that before Ascension day at noon
My crown I should give off? Even so I have!
I did suppose it should be on constraint,
But, heaven be thanked, it is but voluntary.
Enter the Bastard
Bastard All Kent hath yielded...

One recalls Schopenhauer's famous axiom: "A man can do as he will, but not will as he will". The libido, welling from the unconscious, will precipitate the tragedy (Shakespeare's breakdown aet.23): "Have thou the ordering of this present time". Puritan reason is unable bring the psychic conflict to appeasement (Cardinal's failure in to bring peace between France and England). The name "Kent" is a near homophone of a colloquialism for the female genitalia, and refers to the Goddess as Woman (cf. his namesake in KL, who bears precisely the same value).

The Boar has charged; and now the healing begins (Shakespeare under tutelage of Bacon, taking religiously his medicine of the written word), as King John quits the battle, with a fever assailing him (sway of unconscious in decline). The peers return to King John (reason engaging the unconscious: Shakespeare reading, perhaps, Apuleius' *The Golden Ass*, with Lucius' libidinous adventures being engaged as idea rather than will). The Puritan tyranny is overthrown (sinking of Dauphin's navy: V, v, 13). The libido, newly conceived as noble ("I come one way of the Plantagenets": Bastard V, vi, 11) is perceived at the bottom of the ithyphallic principle (night dialogue between Bastard and Hubert), as ideas are supplanted by Platonic Ideas. The threat of the libido, as the Boar, to the psyche is now neutralised, although it will remain active,

now divested of its negative mantle: "...half my power this night,/Passing these flats, are taken by the tide" (39). The monk who has poisoned the King is the instrument of the healing power of the Gnostic world-view; is in truth Friar Francis of MAN: none other than Sir Francis Bacon himself. The newly noble ego deposes the unconscious with the help of the written word and its wisdom (Prince Henry ordering King John to be brought into the orchard (this is not mentioned in the sources), where he will die). Bacon puts it in a nutshell:

King John I am a scribbled form, drawn with a pen,
Upon a parchment, and against this fire
Do I shrink up.

Again, it is a psychic process that is being described: "O, I am scalded with my violent motion/And spleen of speed to see your majesty". The libido is appeased (Bastard's aggression denied by the peers) as the tyranny of the breakdown is overthrown. The period between the initiation of Bacon's therapeutic regime and final healing of Shakespeare's psyche was "two years and more" (as given in the final scene of MAF).

The Lion motif appears many times in the plays: in the names of Posthumous Leonatus, Leontes, and Leonato, in JC (I, iii), TitA (IV, i, 99), MND, and elsewhere, in all of which it bears precisely the same symbolic weight, of William Shaksper (as he was then) as Goddess-rejector; and so here in KJ, where the Archduke of Austria, an ally of France (Puritan ego) wears the lion-skin, as vanquisher of Richard Coeur-de-lion, who is to be taken as the true lion (Gnostic Christ, of whom the libido is a property, hence Richard's paternity of the Bastard), - whereas Austria is a superficial sham.

The symbolic values of the remaining cast are readily assigned. Queen Elinor is, of course, the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, or Goddess of the Underworld (macrocosm) or unconscious (microcosm), both of which are resumed in the term "invisible world", as so memorably identified by Oswald Spengler in his *The Decline of the West*. Her son King John is then the unconscious itself, whose negative contents (libido: the Bastard) irrupting into the Puritan ego-consciousness (conflict with French party) was the

precipitating factor of Shakespeare's breakdown. Lewis the Dauphin represents, like the English peers, the faculty of reason. Hubert's solution to the conflict – the marriage of Lewis and Lady Blanche, daughter of the Queen of Spain – represents the engagement of reason with the Queen of Hell (Spain bears this underworld significance throughout the plays). This will be frustrated, however, by Cardinal Pandulph, who represents, as an emissary from Rome, the Puritan principle (cf. A&C: this is the Rome of Augustus, patron of Virgil, whose Aeneas is the archetypal Goddess-rejector of FF (see for example TT II, i, 80 ff.)).

The siege of Angiers is a beautiful set piece of allegory, and almost completely an invention of the playwright's. We have noted that Hubert represents the "I" principle (ithyphallos, more broadly the unseen world: cf. Richmond in RIII); and it is he who appears on the high walls of Angiers. The purpose of the English, led by King John and including the Bastard, is friendly:

King John All preparation for a bloody siege
And merciless proceeding by these French
Confronts your city's eyes, your winking gates...
And let us in – your King, whose laboured spirits,
Forewearied in this action of swift speed,
Craves harbourage within your city walls.

- For the unconscious and the libido are naturally resumed in the "I" principle, which the Puritan anathematizes. It is the negative Queen of Hell-Grail Queen Who lies behind the coup:

Constance My Lord Chatillon may from England bring
That right in peace...
Enter Chatillon
King Philip A wonder, lady! Lo, upon thy wish,
Our messenger Chatillon is arrived.

The breakdown is sudden in its striking (beheading of Hastings in RIII, III, iv): "How much unlooked-for is this expedition!" (II, i, 79).

The peace of the Goddess-rejector is shattered by the irruption of libido:

Austria Peace!
Bastard Hear the crier!
Austria What the devil art thou?

The Bastard's insistent interruptions will continue, consistently, throughout the scene. The French wish Angiers to accept Arthur as rightful King of England; if not, then they will besiege them. In other words, the ego can only maintain its peace if the Puritan suppression of the unconscious (King John), on which their anathematisation of the "I" principle is based, would continue; otherwise, conflict will reign. The Bastard proposes that both armies besiege Angiers, the outcome of which would be that the French army destroy itself. This is to make the identification, again, between the libido and the unconscious; but its real purpose is to allow the Hubert solution, of the marriage of Lady Blanche and the Dauphin. Again, this marriage is not connected with the siege of Angiers in Holinshed; where, further, it is achieved, in contrast to KJ, where it is sabotaged by the Puritan principle, which primes the "charge of the Boar". Hence the Bastard's long expatiation on Commodity, in which he announces his intention to play the same game as the Kings, with their arrangement of the marriage of convenience: for it is, finally, the threat of the "charge of the Boar" that will turn the ego from its true path to appeasement, namely, the engagement of the invisible world by the faculty of reason (marriage of Lady Blanche and Lewis).

KJ is therefore another in the series of allegories of the Death and Resurrection of William Shakespeare. It is written from the clinician's point of view, which is overridingly the primary basis for its assignment to the hand of Sir Francis Bacon. Once again there is, fascinatingly, a clear series of further features which constellate about its nature as Baconian allegory: the predominance of blank verse, the richness of metaphor, the high philosophising, the knowledge of the high affairs of state, the relishing of their

¹ Plato, Republic.

portrayal; and so on. A sense of the writer's real enjoyment in its construction is powerfully transmitted, consistent with Bacon's exile from political life in England, almost certainly as the illegitimate son of Queen Elizabeth: as if this were a role for which he had been preparing all his life, and which could only be achieved, at this stage (mid-1590's), in art.

CHAPTER 19

THE MERCHANT OF VENICE

The Merchant of Venice was written to illustrate the transformation of a psyche from illness (the Puritan disease: Shylock) to health (Antonio restored to prosperity), without the intervention of the “charge of the Boar” (breakdown due to dissolution of Puritan ego in libido). Its style and allegorical content are powerful indices to the hand of Sir Francis Bacon alone. We remember that Shakespeare’s breakdown befell him after an eight-year period of enthrallment by Puritanism, when he came across an erotic passage in a book (almost certainly the seduction of Lucius by Fotis in Apuleius’ *The Golden Ass*) and surrendered to the lure of auto-erotism. In MOV, on the other hand, the subject (Antonio) comes across the erotic passage, feels the inrush of libido (Bassanio’s feast), along with the reek of the Boar, but keeps conscious control of it at all times, without surrender (quitting by Bassanio and company of the masque); is awakened to the truth of his pathology; then embarks on the therapeutic regime prescribed by Sir Francis Bacon, the central plank of which is the written word as vector of the Gnostic tradition (Jessica disguised as Page).

Let us examine the characters assembled for the allegory.

1) Antonio Sourced from Plutarch’s *Life Of Marcus Antonius*, with its famous account of the love of Antony and Cleopatra. Antonio is the lover of the Goddess Nature, in contrast to Augustus Caesar, who throughout the plays represents, - as patron of Virgil, creator of the archetypal Goddess-rejector Aeneas (see especially TT II, i, 78 ff.), - the Puritan ego. The recovery of his fortunes in Act V represents the restoration to health of the diseased ego, as was achieved by Shakespeare after “two years and more” (as given in the final lines of MAF) of intensive reading prescribed by his mentor. It is fascinating to compare the treatments of Antonio by Bacon in MOV and Shakespeare in *The Tempest*. The symbol is inherently will-less, and the Bacon Antonio is pure symbol, with the intense eroticism of Plutarch’s

Antony taken out of play. On the other hand, the libido was such an immediate, authentic and traumatic presence in Shakespeare's psyche that it was this aspect of Antony that most of all recommended him: so that he represents in TT (one of the ship's company, finally overthrown by Prospero) the erotic aspect of Shakespeare which surged as he contemplated the printed page on that fateful day in 1587. Antonio is an almost invisible character in MAN, where his significance is also Shakespearean, rather than Baconian. These differing treatments of Antonio are therefore another beautiful confirmation of the allocation of authorship determined on the basis of the dual primary evidence of style and allegorical content (the plays wholly from Bacon's hand lacking that element of intimacy, the point of view from the milieu intérieur).

2) Shylock The diseased ego, as enthralled by the Puritan error. The venom directed towards the Jewish race is therefore a reflection of Bacon's savage contempt for Puritanism.

3) Bassanio The unconscious (< Italian basso, "low", "downwards", "underneath": cf. Bassanius in TitA). The underlying problem for the psyche is the negative contents of the unconscious – the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, and Her Consort/Son the libido - as anathematised by Puritanism. The challenge will be to divest Her of this negative mantle to reveal Her in full glory (marriage of Bassanio and Portia). The feast given by Bassanio to which Shylock has been invited represents the flooding of libido into the Puritan ego to inaugurate the transformation.

4) Jessica Cognate with Bianca in TOS as the Goddess of the Visible World: the phenomenal world as misunderstood by the Puritan (Jessica as daughter of Shylock), then properly understood by the healthy ego (Jessica fled from Shylock's house into arms of Lorenzo). This development will depend upon the engagement of the reasoning ego with the Faustian depth of the invisible world, the Queen of which is

5) Portia Cognate with Kate in TOS, and all the other Queens of Hell-Grail Queens in FF. It is Portia who, disguised as a representative of the

² Laurence Gardner, *Genesis of the Grail Kings*.

³ Knight and Lomas, *The Hiram Key*.

⁴ Just as Dr. Faustus was Marlowe's: the volte face of the last Act being a necessary political compromise, which the commentators have generally failed to acknowledge.

Paduan Doctor Bellario (Musical arts, in the broad Socratic sense, as including the spoken and written word, recital, repetition, and so on:¹ cf. the Paduan Hortensio and Bianca's music lessons in TOS), will save the heart of Antonio: so that she represents the heart of the subject. We recall that Cordelia ("cor-de-Lear" = "heart of Lear", as Ted Hughes so memorably observed) has this same value: so that Cordelia is now to be identified as yet another Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, or Goddess of the Invisible World, in FF. Jessica's disguise as a Page represents Nature described in the written word; the torch she carries the light of reason acting thereon.

6) Lorenzo A reference to the famed Lorenzo the Magnificent, under whose patronage the Florentine Academy flourished in the final decades of the 15th century, to produce the earliest works of the new Renaissance Neoplatonism/Christian Cabalism, whose spirit suffuses FF. Chief amongst these were the books of Marsilio Ficino and Pico della Mirandola; and Lorenzo's elopement with Jessica as Page beautifully portrays the Christian Cabalist's engagement with the Goddess described in the written word.

7) Launcelet Gobbo A clown, who could plausibly represent the Fool principle; though it may be more accurate to assign to him the ithyphallic principle, as suggested by his name ("little lance"). He most plausibly represents both (cf. the Fool's cap). His defection from Shylock to Bassanio represents the restoration of the ithyphallic principle to its domination by the unconscious, now free of its control by the Puritan ego. His father represents that principle as a property of Dionysian or Falstaffian Man, Man-as-sublimated animal (cf. Adam in AYLI); and his failure to recognise his son as servant of Shylock the perversion of that principle by Puritanism. It is Gobbo père who gains his son his new employment with Bassanio.

8) Gratiano The libido. This assignation is confirmed by Bassanio's speech "Thou art too wild, too rude, and bold of voice,/...Pray thee take pain/To ally with some cold drops of modesty/Thy skipping spirit" (II, ii, 191 ff.), which recalls Hal's similar admonition to Falstaff after his coronation in 2 HIV ("I know thee not, old man"). Their significance is the same: the ego-in-

⁵ See Ted Hughes' *Winter Pollen* for a perceptive chapter on these lines.