

## PART 3

---

### THE SHAKESPEARE GROUP



---

## CHAPTER 20

---

### INTRODUCTION TO THE SHAKESPEARE GROUP

It was Shakespeare's Puritan phase that most concerned Sir Francis Bacon, for several reasons. It was in the throes of the crisis provoked by this phase that Shakespeare had presented to him, to stimulate his imagination to effect a treatment that is a wonderful story in itself, quite apart from the epochal significance it would have for Western culture. The Puritan sect had been steadily and inexorably forging an iron curtain that seemed certain in the near future to succeed, its integrity maintained by the bullet and the sword, in cutting England off from her own soul. Fascinatingly, his own mother (or foster-mother: the evidence is strong that he was an illegitimate child of Queen Elizabeth) Lady Anne Bacon was consumed by a schizophrenia-like illness in the last years of her life, and she too was an adherent of Puritanism: so that it was a monster charging in on all sides, threatening to destroy both state and family... and the mind of Will Shaksper (as he was then). The early appearance of the ur-Hamlet would suggest that Bacon had already been mulling over the nexus of Puritanism and mental illness for some time, and that the arrival of Shaksper provided the catalyst to their reaction, from which the luminous crystal of the works of Shakespeare then began to be born.

The aetiology, pathogenesis, crisis, and successful treatment of his patient's Puritan-induced condition is the subject of the Bacon group, and also of TN, R&J and MAN of the present group, which however have in addition a significant personal element indicative of the pen of Shakespeare rather than his doctor. The intimacy and brutal honesty – nothing less would have been adequate - of their description of the milieu intérieur, with the interplay of libido, ithyphallos, the "charge of the Boar", and so on, recalls the Falstaff episodes 1&2 HIV, where a similar division of labour is apparent,

---

with Shakespeare responsible for the personal element, in which the confession of auto-erotism is prominent, and Bacon for the courtly and noble scenes. Once again, the resounding consonance of style and allegorical content in these plays is a powerful index to the correctness of the theory.

It may be assumed then that TN, R&J, JC, and TimA, were driven by Bacon, with some doubt remaining about MAN, where the Shakespearean element predominates; and also MWW, which is almost entirely from the pen of pupil rather than master. This solves the problem – a large and ugly fly in the ointment of the solo-authorship Baconist position – of the frequency of local Stratford patois, and the presence of Justice Shallow as a reference to Sir Thomas Lucy, the persecutor of the adolescent Shaksper, in MWW. JC, TimA, and MWW, are all snapshots of Shakespeare's Welsh or Tavern or pseudo-Alexandrian phase of mid-adolescence, - albeit the latter two take the story into his Puritan phase, - taken from different angles, as siblings of HV, which treats of the same phase, - with MWW apparently the eldest. The defining quality of Shakespeare in this phase was a tendency to spiritualisation of the Journey of the Hero (for example, that of Lucius in TGA: it is only too easy to imagine him expatiating on the seduction scene to his roisterous companions). This quality is represented in MWW by the Welsh Pastor Evans, to capture beautifully the inveterate tendency of the Welsh intellectual to spiritualisation (cf. Fluellen in HV); in JC by the "lean and hungry" Cassius, his body mirroring the hard-edged Apollonist precision of his inner visualisation; and in TimA by Flavius, whose named is derived from the Latin flavus, "golden", to suggest golden-haired Apollo, god of healing and the visual principle. In this phase he remained erotically continent, and fond of wine and conversation, in the way of the young Alexander the Great as described by Plutarch (see Ch.8), and became an instant guru to his largely illiterate tavern companions, an expert on the Journey of the Hero without ever having taken it himself, to leave him still vulnerable to the "charge of the Boar". It is inconceivable that Bacon could have been unaware of the personal erotic dimension introduced in these plays by his pupil, with their detailed descriptions of auto-erotism (especially in 1&2 HIV) and so on: so that patient must have opened up to doctor in a remarkably frank way indeed.

---

The rogue plays of this group are T&C and Mr. Arden of Feversham. The latter is a comparatively low-key yet successful, even magical, tragedy, which will be shown to secrete the Shakespearean allegory in the way of the histories; and the reader will be here on very familiar ground indeed. The complete absence of the elements of the Baconian high style, its focus on the milieu intérieur, and its omission from the First Folio, are utterly consistent with it having been written by Shakespeare alone, at an early stage, after reader (Melancholy Jacques) had transformed himself into writer (Orlando). MAF gives, remarkably, a precise duration of his healing (Melancholy Jacques) phase: for the body of Arden (Shakespeare after the coup of 1587) is stated in the final lines to have left its impression in the field of Dick Reede (the printed page – perhaps the seduction of Lucius by Fotis in *The Golden Ass* - wherein the anathematised libido (Ugly Dick principle) was perceived and surrendered to, to precipitate the breakdown), for a period of “two years and more”. Shakespeare’s first creative effort – perhaps MAF, or the first two Acts of *Pericles* - may therefore plausibly be dated to 1589.

T&C (predominantly by Shakespeare) is totally sui generis in the Complete Works, though not in Western culture. For the student of literature will be utterly familiar with the principle of the Fall and Resurrection: the necessity felt by so many artists to let go of their accustomed habits of reason and plunge into the underworld of their own psyche. André Malraux put it most succinctly when he observed, in reference to *Don Quixote*, that the opposite of truth is not untruth, but reason. Robert Graves went so far as to proclaim this as the one theme of poetry: the continual and ineluctable decline of summer into winter, to be followed by the glorious resurgence of spring. The last and most powerful word on the subject was had, however, by James Joyce, whose *Ulysses* charts the Journey of the Hero away from the puritan Catholicism of his boyhood, through nighttown, into manhood, in the same way as *Ulysses* passed between Scylla and Charybdis (the opposites of the wakeful day: for example, the concepts of “good” and “evil” as set in stone by Christianity, and so memorably destroyed by Nietzsche)

<sup>1</sup> See Joseph Campbell’s *Creative Mythology* and *Occidental Mythology* respectively for beautiful discussions of Joyce’s *Ulysses* and Homer’s *Odyssey*.

---

to gain the Island of the Sun (enlightenment: poetic wisdom).<sup>1</sup>

It is a truism that one becomes eventually like the God one worships: and Shakespeare would approach as close as he was able to the genius of Bacon, so that Prospero is not only a portrait of Shakespeare at the close of his career, but also of his mentor and mystagogue as well. Bacon's characteristic striving for closure is expressed in the victory of Petruchio over Kate in TOS, at which so many modern readers are rightly taken aback; and also by the final couplet of the Baconian (rather than Shakespearean) sonnet, which was, one is finally forced to judge, an aberration and dead-end in the Western poetic tradition, with its victory of the sun numbers four (quatrains) and two (couplet) over the Goddess number three (sestet in the Petrarchian sonnet), - which mirrors the fate of Kate Minola. Inevitably, Thomas Hardy, Christopher Brennan, W.H. Auden, and so many other poets of the modern era, largely turned their backs on the Baconian sonnet, and embraced the completeness of the Petrarchian, with wonderfully successful results. Bacon's intellect was a glorious summer, from which he necessarily would decline into winter every night, with his young servingmen and other males (in the way, perhaps, of the Knights Templar, who were his models for so much else). This nighttown was not available to Shakespeare, however, who remained heterosexual. Ted Hughes has argued compellingly, on the basis of the last two sonnets, that Shakespeare at one stage contracted a venereal disease (for the Dark Lady sonnets were undoubtedly from his pen: see Epilogue): and the argument to come will show T&C to confirm this, with its seething portrayals of pander and tart, and the powerful note of disease. A likely scenario is that the way of the tart - the Dark Lady notwithstanding - was the way of Shakespeare's Winterreise in the early years, and, the fear of God having been put into him by disease, he later settled for auto-erotism, as so memorably described in HVIII. Shakespeare's high Classical (Baconesque) mode - his male world of arete and intellect - is represented in T&C by the city of Troy; his creative mode by Ajax, of the opposing Greek camp; and his entry into nighttown, by the victory of Achilles (the libido) over Hector (active intellectual principle of Baconesque mode).

The plays of this group have all a significant contribution from

---

Shakespeare, in contrast to those of the Bacon group. The plays of the tragic sequence could be divided between them; but I have preferred to leave intact the group so memorably sorted by Ted Hughes. Let us begin by examining some plays that will be very familiar to you; and finish with the two great surprises of the Shakespeare Group.

---

## CHAPTER 21

---

### TWELFTH NIGHT

The title refers to the feast of the Epiphany, January 6<sup>th</sup>, when the Three Wise Men followed the Star of Bethlehem to find the newborn True King. This Star has appeared before, in Hamlet, in the name Guildenstern (“Star of Gold”), which signifies, along with Rosencrantz (“Garland of Roses”), the path to rebirth into divinity of the shattered ego, which is repudiated by Hamlet, to hasten his descent, on the plane of allegory, into paranoid schizophrenia. In contrast, the subject once shattered (shipwreck), now becoming wise (Duke Orsino), will follow the Star in TN, finally to attain the divinity in himself, which will be predicated on his engagement with Nature (the Goddess: Viola): just as was achieved by William Shakespeare under the tutelage of Bacon. The paradigm for this transformation is, of course, Lucius’ descent into ass-phase, and education in the ways of the libido, before his glorious resurrection, in Apuleius’ magical masterpiece *The Golden Ass*, whose influence on the Complete Plays has long been acknowledged by the critics, though the extent of it far underestimated (see especially the discussion of MAN below). The numerous ass-references in TN are utterly consistent with this scenario.

This does not exhaust the significance of the carefully chosen title. The Gospel of St. Luke (2:14) tells us that the feast of the Epiphany is a time of “peace” and “good will”. In light of the allegorical weight of Malvolio, whose name may be translated “bad will”, with the inference that it is a portrayal of Shakespeare in Puritan phase aet.15-23 (see below), - the full meaning of “Twelfth Night” is made plain. This is the night when good Will (Gnostic Shakespeare) will be reborn from the ashes of bad Will (Puritan Shakespeare); when peace (Olivia, the Goddess: from the olive branch grasped by Noah in the Old Testament) will supplant the conflict of his breakdown, which was predicated on the negative Goddess (Nature anathematised by Puritanism). The subtitle *What You Will* may plausibly be interpreted

---

as "What you,Will?"

Let us look at the characters and places assembled for the allegory:

1) Illyria The lyre was, of course, a harp-like musical instrument to the accompaniment of which poems could be recited: hence the broad poetic sense of "lyrical". The Platonic Socrates gives, in the early pages of *The Republic*, a broad definition of "music" to include drama, the spoken and written word, and so on: the arts of the Muses, the study and practice of which was Bacon's core stratagem for the treatment of Shakespeare, his patient. "Illyria" is formed, therefore, from "ill" and "lyre", to represent state of the ego (Puritan: Malvolio) that rejects the Goddess Nature, along with the arts (Gnostic or Hermetic or Musical) that are a mirror to Her. This state has been brought to a forced termination – before the play begins - by irruption into the ego of the Goddess (Viola) and the libido (Sir Toby Belch) to precipitate the breakdown, as struck Shakespeare act.23 (shipwreck; death of Olivia's uncle).

2) Duke Orsino "Ors-in-O" contains both the bear (Fr. ours), whose significance in the Hermetic tradition will be outlined in the final chapter (cf. the stage direction Exit, pursued by a bear in *The Winter's Tale*); and "O": the cipher (etymologically a doublet of "zero", both having been derived from the Arabic sifr, "empty"), which is empty of meaning per se, and exists only to convey the truth. "O" as "cipher" was routinely used in this way by the Elizabethans. Duke Orsino is therefore "the Bear (e.g. Solomon or the Gnostic Christ) in a cipher". This Christ is the infant found by the Magi of the play's title: for the subject is already in healing mode when the play begins: "If music be the food of love, play on".

3) Viola The Goddess herself, who is cognate with

4) Olivia - "I, Viola". The irruption of the Goddess and Her Consort/Son the libido into the ego has forced the subject to acknowledge their presence. This is symbolised in JC by the stabbing of Caesar (where the daggers represent, as always without exception in the plays, the ithyphallos). Hence Viola's alias is

5) Cesario - the love of Olivia for whom is another way of representing that of Viola for the Duke. It will be the great task of the therapeutic psychic transformation to change Her from a demon to

---

a divinity.

6) Sebastian - provides one of the most memorable pieces of symbolism in the Complete Works. His rescue from the shipwreck is described in detail: "I saw your brother/...bind himself/...To a strong mast that lived upon the sea,/Where, like Orion on the dolphin's back,/I saw him hold acquaintance with the waves..." (I, ii, 10-15). The "strong mast" bearing its load suggests a crucifix: and there can be not the slightest doubt that the reference is to the martyrdom of St. Sebastian, a favourite theme of Renaissance artists, who invariably depicted him on a cross, transfixed by arrows shot by the surrounding crowd. The ithyphallic symbolism of these arrows has been noted by Ted Hughes:<sup>1</sup> and this is also their symbolic weight in 3HVI III, i. They are cognate, here, with the daggers that transfixed Caesar in JC, as representing the ithyphallic principle, more broadly the unseen world, which the subject upon the "charge of the Boar" is forced, against his will, to acknowledge. Thus is Sebastian accompanied by

7) Antonio who represents, like all the other Antonios and Antonys without exception in the plays, the Consort of the Goddess of Love (Who comprehends the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen), derived ultimately from the famous extended account given by Plutarch of the love of Mark Antony and Cleopatra (a Dido (rejected by Aeneas)-Isis (loved by Lucius in *The Golden Ass*) analogue).

8) Sea Captain Cognate with the Master and Boatswain in TT, as representing the unconscious, whose contents (the Viola, Antonio and Sebastian principles), will spill into the conscious ego at the instant of the coup.

9) Sir Toby Belch The libido, cognate with Falstaff and Polonius: drunkenness indicating, as always without exception in the plays, psychic dissolution in the libido (cf. Stephano-Trinculo in TT, and Borachio in MAN). Thus is Sir Toby accompanied by

10) Sir Andrew Aguecheek – who represents the ithyphallos: "He's as tall as any man in Illyria" (I, iii, 20); "...Sir Andrew, would thou mightst never draw sword again" (I, iii, 63); &c.

11) Maria Yet another Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, - cognate with Kate in TOS: "Bless you, fair shrew" (I, iii, 49), – as an aspect of the

<sup>1</sup> Winter Pollen

---

Great Goddess (she is chambermaid to Olivia).

12) Feste Yet another in the long line of Fools in FF, all derived ultimately from ass-phase Lucius in *The Golden Ass*, or the Fool card of the Tarot (see Chs. 1, 26, 44), on the principle of *kathodos* and *anodos*, down-going and up-coming, the harrowing of hell and the resurrection therefrom. Will Shaksper resisted the *kathodos* aet.15-23, like all good Puritans, only to have it thrust upon him by force; yet from this debasement he rose again, in a most spectacular way. As Schopenhauer memorably put it: "A man can do as he will, but not will as he will".

13) Malvolio The archetypal Puritan: "...sometimes he is a kind of Puritan" (II, iii, 153); &c. Bacon's joy in taking him down is palpable. He represents Shaksper aet.15-23; his humiliation, Shakespeare's psychic transformation under the therapeutic regime of Bacon.

14) Fabian The visual imagination, the suppression of which is a *sine qua non* of Puritanism. Hamlet expresses most powerfully the key role of this faculty in psychic transformation, in the failure of Hamlet to stab Claudius as he prays: "My words fly up, my thoughts remain below,/Words without thoughts, never to heaven go". Claudius here is the subject –Hamlet – as the Gnostic Christ in negative aspect, who is unable to be invaded by knowledge of the unseen world (blade), thanks to the Puritan tactic of the suppression of the visual imagination, which is no longer able to create the Goddess of Love (e.g. Fotis in TGA) in the mind. Now the descent into paranoid schizophrenia will be swift (death of Hamlet). The name "Fabian" was undoubtedly sourced from Plutarch's *Life of Fabius Maximus*, which mentions one Fabius Pictor, who consulted the Delphic oracle. Pictor in Latin means "painter"; and Fabian is cognate with the Painters in TimA and an Addition to TST (Appendix 1), who bear the same allegoric weight. The Delphic oracle, who prophesied outside the temple of Apollo, God of the visual principle, was also consulted in *The Winter's Tale*: so that we now know the precise significance also of that episode.

Let us now explicate the story of Shakespeare's illness and its healing as sung by the kaleidoscopic interactions of these characters.

---

## ACT I

i

“Music” represents here, as always in the plays, the Hermetic or Musical arts, especially the written word. The coup (shipwreck) has struck; and there are numerous indications in TN and elsewhere that that the occasion of it was the encountering by the Puritan Shaksper aet.23 of an erotic scene in a book (most likely Fotis’ seduction of Lucius in TGA), which resulted in an act of auto-erotism, to shatter his defences, and fragment his ego, as dramatically as would be the tower of Lear Inc.

Explication of the allegory reveals the tightness and extreme consistency of the opening speech, which on the literal plane otherwise is rather loose. “If music be the food of love...” records the inauguration of the psychic rebirth, when the temptation towards auto-erotism (“Give me excess of it...”) as presented by, for example, Apuleius’ magical masterpiece, is now rejected (“Enough, no more...”), for the rule of the unconscious and the blind libido to be supplanted by engagement by conscious reason. This “music” refers, of course, to the Musical arts, of which TGA is a glorious example. The strain had a “dying fall”: this is the petit-mort, the moment of climax, nothing less than the Fall of Man (kathodos) in little, whence the most glorious resurrection (anodos) is possible. The “cros[s]-” in “Crosby House”, Richard’s seat in RIII, is the libido on which Shakespeare was crucified in his personal Fall. The libido, in the broad sense of the unseen world or world-as-will, is the substrate of all phenomena whatsoever, and any ego not built in accord with it is destined to crumble: “...But falls into abatement and low price/Even in a minute”, - as Lear would tragically discover. Thus is the act of love the great leveller; yet the note of cheapness in “abatement and low price”, as referring to auto-erotism, is marked. In Shakespeare’s case, it was the visual imagination dwelling on an erotic passage that shattered his defenses: “So full of shapes is fancy/That it alone is high fantastical”. Now will the cure (Curio: “Cur-I-o”: “A cure I, in a cipher”) begin, as the reader resists the temptation offered by the episode of, say, Fotis’ vividly described seduction of Lucius in the early chapters of TGA, and proceeds, having escaped the “charge of the Boar”, to imbibe the

---

wisdom of the book, which will transform the Boar from a demon into a god:

Curio      Will you go hunt, my Lord?  
Duke        What, Curio?  
Curio      The hart.  
Duke        Why so I do, the noblest that I have.

This is the Duke's own "hart" (heart), as in Cordelia, "Cor-de-lia", the heart of Lear,<sup>2</sup> the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen Herself, Whom Puritanism has anathematised. This "hart" is therefore Olivia, the core of the Duke himself, whose torture at the hands of his libido ("And my desires, like fell and cruel hounds,/E'er since pursue me") is about to be soothed. This will be predicated on the unconscious being taken out of play, as represented by the silence of the Sea Captain (I, ii, 57-8), who represents here, as in *The Tempest*, precisely that principle (cf. eclipse of Buckingham in RIII).

Bacon gives a strong hint to the alert reader of exactly what is going on, with the reappearance of Valentine from *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. Valentine is yet another representation of the reborn Shakespeare in the Bacon group of plays; and it is he who announces to the Duke the reluctance of Olivia (cognate with Sylvia in TGV as the Goddess represented in the written word: cf. Sylvius in *As You Like It*) to see him: for the subject-in-transformation will be divided from Nature until his Puritan aspect be extirpated (eclipse of Malvolio). Olivia has vowed to remain cloistered away for seven years, to mourn the death of her brother, in whose care she was placed after the death of her father. Olivia ("I Viola") is cognate with Viola, whose brother is named Sebastian, like their late father: so that this is also the case with Olivia. Viola's father was a native of Messaline, for the significance of which we refer to *Julius Caesar* V, ii, where Messala bears the "bills" from Brutus (Shakespeare in Tavern or pseudo-Alexandrian phase, aet.15, about to succumb to Puritanism (Octavian)) - to his forces. The bills, and Messala, represent the written word, a mainstay of this phase, which will be repudiated by Shakespeare in Puritan phase. Olivia's father and brother, both dead,

<sup>2</sup> Ted Hughes SGCB



---

wins her over with his wit (Queen of Hell beginning to be discerned by reader: true Goddess in the ascendant). Finally, Olivia reproves Malvolio: "O you are sick of self love..." . This is the beginning of the end of the subject's enthrallment by Puritanism.

3) The Goddess returns to negative aspect for the purpose of illustrating a further point. Olivia sends Malvolio to refuse entry to Cesario (ego's Puritanism preventing him from engaging with true Goddess), and once again reproves Feste. Now Sir Toby arrives, drunk; and Olivia consents to see Cesario, whom Malvolio is unable to dissuade from his task. This is to link the libido and the Fool principle, and to reintegrate the Goddess.

4) Cesario enters to deliver a speech he (Viola) has learnt from the written page, in praise of Olivia's beauty (ego recognising beauty of Nature, as he has been taught by the written word). Olivia is initially veiled (Goddess not imagined by residually Puritan ego); then drops the veil, as the subject recreates Her in his visual imagination: "...but we will draw the curtain and shew you the picture".

## ACT II

i-iv

Sebastian sets off for the Duke's court; but Antonio is reluctant, fearing his life to be in peril in Illyria, due to his banishment after a previous sea battle in which he and Orsino were opposed (Puritan abjuring Consort of the Goddess of Love in himself). Malvolio presents Viola (as Cesario) with a ring, which she refuses; and Malvolio tosses it on the ground. This is the same ring as appears in ACE, R&J, HVIII, and so many other plays of FF: the same as possessed by King Solomon, and celebrated in *The Ring of the Nibelung*, *The Volsung Saga*, Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings*, and so on: a symbol of wisdom and ultimate power, granted to the devotee of the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, Who is also the Ring Queen.<sup>3</sup> It will shown (Ch.44) that Bacon's immediate source for the Grail and Ring motifs, and their identification, was Wolfram's *Parzival*, the earliest complete Grail saga. Here the ring comes, however, via the Puritan principle, and so the power it symbolises

<sup>3</sup> Laurence Gardner *Realm of the Ring Lords*.

---

is worthless (its repose on the ground identifying it with grossness rather than subtlety: cf. Constance's slumping to the ground in KJ III, i; and Aaron's interment in TitA). Sir Toby, Aguecheek, and Maria, hatch their plot to take down Malvolio through a fake billet-doux (Puritan will be subverted by the libido and Queen of the Unconscious as represented in the written word – e.g. in Fotis' seduction of Lucius in Apuleius - resonating with the same principles in himself, to elicit his Antonio aspect, which he has thought to deny). Orsino has found Feste's songs therapeutic, and bids Curio ("The cure, I, in a cipher") fetch him again. Feste is rewarded in coin for his art (Fool principle waxing in subject-in-transformation: cognate with entry of Lucius upon his ass-phase).

v

Here is recorded exactly what has been facilitating the psychic transformation described in the previous scene. The subject has been reading the printed page (billet-doux), and sublising the otherwise gross words with the help of his visual imagination (Fabian), in contrast to the kneeling Claudius in Hamlet III, iii. What is going on, precisely, as he is reading? The libido is, broadly, the will-to-life: the will(s)-to-survival, -eros, and -power, which humanity shares with the animal kingdom. It is the first two these that the Puritan denies in himself, the search for power being all-consuming, yet fatally sabotaged, as neglectful of the others. The will(s)-to-survival and -eros are born of the underworld, or the unconscious, just as Man-as-sublimated-animal (Dionysian or Falstaffian Man) is born of the Goddess Nature (Olivia-Viola). The Puritan has denied the play of Nature in himself; and this error must be addressed by any attempt to transform him. Thus Malvolio sees the letters "M.O.A.I.", written in the letter from the Queen of Hell (Unconscious), in that order. They are, superficially, foreign to him, for the correct order should be "M.A.O.I" (as in "MA-iv-O-I-I-o) if the meaning in truth be directed at himself; yet he interprets them as such: the reader initially seeing everything Natural as foreign to him, then deeply familiar. He comes to recognise, that is, the continuity of humanity with the natural world, as so memorably celebrated by Nietzsche, above all Western philosophers (with the notable exception, we now know, of

---

Bacon).

### ACT III

i

Once again, the Goddess represented in the printed page (perhaps The Golden Ass) stimulates the reader's wit, as he works to throw off his Puritan misconceptions (Feste's witty badinage with Viola). His wit and wisdom waxes under the influence of Nature (Viola rewarding Feste in coin). Bacon takes pains to emphasise the wisdom of the Fool:

Viola      This fellow is wise enough to play the fool;  
              And to do that well craves a kind of wit...  
              For folly that he wisely shews is fit,  
              But wise-men's folly fall'n, quite taint their wit.

- The last line being a pointed reference to the Puritan (Malvolio). Viola and Andrew greet each other in French (they speak the same language: to emphasise kinship of Goddess and Man-as-sublimated-animal). Wisdom accrues as the subject-in-transformation acknowledges his kinship with Nature (Olivia protesting her love for Cesario in the garden: cf. the garden of Alexander Iden in 2 HVI IV, x; and other gardens and orchards throughout the plays). This is not the Puritan way, but the Gnostic (Olivia's apology for ring sent per Malvolio).

ii

The challenge for Bacon was to show once again the subject's new-found resistance to the temptation to surrender to the libido, with its inevitable sequela of the "charge of the Boar". Again, the seduction of Lulus by Fotis in TGA provides a perfect fit.<sup>4</sup> The subject is dwelling on the libido (Sir Toby) and the ithyphallos (Andrew: Lucius' excitement is vividly described in Apuleius, as he watches Fotis undress) described in the printed page (Andrew's letter of challenge to Viola (Cesario)) - with his visual imagination (Fabian). This will be continued in scene iv, where the sword-fight between

<sup>4</sup> The English translation by Robert Graves is the only one to do justice to the explicitness of the Latin original.

---

Cesario and Andrew represents the conflict incited, as of old, by the rise of the ithyphallos in the ego-in-transformation; that between Sir Toby and Antonio, the conflict between the libido and that part of the ego that is Consort of the Goddess (as Mark Antony was to the Isis-figure Cleopatra: their carnal delights the temptation that is being offered to the subject, albeit with the Goddess recreated in the imagination); for Antonio is an aspect of Sebastian (he follows him surreptitiously). There, however, eros will be taken out of play by the newly armed ego (arrest of Antonio by the Duke's officers).

iii

The ego's aim has been to cast away his erotic nature during the process of transformation, which must be based on reason, with the unconscious taken out of play (Sebastian's previous insistence that Antonio not accompany him into town: cf. the half-starved dog in Dürer's *Melencolia I* (fig.1). This temptation is not so easily denied, however (Antonio catching up with him here). For the moment, the unconscious will remain out of play, and yield its power to the conscious ego (Antonio will stay at the Elephant inn, and gives his purse to Sebastian: money signifying, as always in the plays, the power of a principle). The name of the inn is significant: the elephant being renowned for its memory, which is where the Antonio principle will reside, unforgotten, ready to strike again.

iv

The Puritan is a sham Consort of the Goddess, based on his denial of the libido (Sir Toby or Dionysian or Falstaffian Man in himself) and Goddess of the Invisible World (Malvolio in yellow cross-garters &c, thinking he is attractive to Olivia, on the basis of the letter from Maria (the written word as revelatory of the invisible world), whose hand he does not recognise). Now the ego-in transformation is beginning to examine the Puritan world-view with the help of his visual imagination (Sir Toby and Fabian accosting Malvolio).

This meditation will not be corrupted by surrender to the libido, as the next episode begins to make clear. The subject is reading of the libido and the ithyphallos – perhaps in Apuleius – with the aid of visual imagination (Sir Toby, Andrew and Fabian concocting

---

Andrew's letter of challenge to Cesario (ego-in-transformation, as now acknowledging the invisible world of the will-to-life)). He puts down the book as the inundation of libido begins (Sir Toby deciding not to read the letter to Cesario, but speak the challenge to him personally). This sequence is repeated for the Goddess, as Olivia gives Cesario her picture, followed by the entry of Sir Toby and Fabian (subject imagining the Goddess of Love (naked Fotis), which opens the floodgates to libido). The subject feels the threat of erotic excitement, but wards off its dissolution (Cesario repudiating, for the moment, threat delivered by Sir Toby; exit of latter) with the help of the enquiring visual imagination: "I beseech you what manner of man is he [Andrew]?" (Cesario to Fabian). Sir Toby enters on Andrew's horse to threaten yet again: the horse and rider bearing, as always in the plays, the allegoric weight of the will-to-eros in action, as sourced by Bacon from Socrates' famous metaphor in Plato's *Phaedrus*. Cesario and Andrew draw; but the battle is taken up by Antonio, who draws on Sir Toby, as the former pair desist. Antonio is arrested by the Duke's officers (threat of dissolution averted, as the Antonio principle is suppressed). This point is reinforced by Antonio's failure to receive his purse (power of a principle) from Cesario.

#### ACT IV

i

So far the visual imagination has been shown to have plucked the ego from the flood of libido, which would have corrupted the ego's meditation on the contents of the printed page. This scene will tell us on what, exactly, the imagination is working. Sebastian (cognate, of course, with Viola-Cesario) gives Feste some coin (subject confirming ass-phase of his journey of the hero). Sir Toby and Andrew draw on him, in the presence of Fabian; but he gives them a beating; upon which Olivia appears, and takes him off in wonderment (reader meditating on the true Goddess Nature, an aspect of Whom is the Goddess of the Invisible World).

ii

<sup>5</sup> Laurence Gardner has shown (*ibid.*) that they are to be identified.

---

The playwright's task now was to depict the ignorance of the Puritan (dark room in which Malvolio is held) and the barrenness of the Puritan tract (letter from Malvolio to Olivia). The source of Sir Topaz the Curate is, of course, the tale of Sir Topaz in Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*. The quest of the knight Sir Topaz for the Elfin Queen (cf. Titania) is an exemplary Grail or Ring saga,<sup>5</sup> the hero being explicitly identified with the hero of Wolfram's *Parzival*, which was the single greatest influence on the allegoric strategy of *FF* (Ch.44). This is the ring which has appeared in *HVIII*, *TCE*, *R&J*, and elsewhere, as a symbol of wisdom and ultimate power, which is conferred on the wearer by engagement with the natural world (Elf Queen): the same that Shakespeare acquired, in a metaphorical sense, after his education from the darkness by Sir Francis Bacon. It is the same ring as Malvolio threw in the dust: to which insult the interruption in full flow of the Tale of Sir Topaz by the host in Chaucer is cognate. For this is its true significance in *TN*: Sir Topaz (Feste in disguise) being outside the darkened room, in the light (of reason), Malvolio inside it, in the darkness of ignorance. The truncation of the tale in Chaucer corresponds to Feste's dropping of his disguise, upon which Sir Toby exits (will-to-life identified as a property of the Ring Lord).<sup>6</sup> The tale is followed immediately in Chaucer by the Tale of Melibee, a deadly serious moral dialectic, - in prose, rather than the skipping poetry of the quest, - centring on the question of whether it is right to counter violence with violence, in which Job, Solomon, St. Paul, Ovid, Cato, &c. – all the usual suspects – are adduced. Malvolio now asks Feste (undisguised) for pen, ink, and light, and begins a letter to Olivia: which corresponds, on the plane of allegory, to the Tale of Melibee, and represents a typical Puritan moral tract, on the barrenness of which the newly transformed ego will have the final word in *V*, i. Feste's testing of Malvolio by his reaction to Pythagoras' theory of the transmigration of souls reflects the great importance of Pythagoras in the new Christian Cabalism which was so profoundly influencing the Elizabethans, through the works of Pico della Mirandola, Francesco Giorgi, and

<sup>6</sup> cf. the horn-ithyphallos of the unicorn, an ancient symbol of the Gnostic Christ.

<sup>7</sup> Dame Francis Yates, *The Occult Philosophy in the Elizabethan Age*.

---

Cornelius Agrippa, amongst others.<sup>7</sup>

iii

The true Goddess Nature supplants the false in the mind of the subject-in-transformation (marriage of Olivia and Sebastian).

ACT V

i

The resolution of the double-identity imbroglia will see Viola married to the Duke, and Olivia married to Sebastian: which two are precisely the same, as representing the assumption of the true Goddess (Nature) – as inclusive of the Queen of Hell (invisible component of Nature) – in the psyche of the subject. One recalls again *The Music of the Spheres* by Gafurius (fig.2), which shows the Goddess (Olivia/Viola) at the right hand of the Divinity (Sebastian/Orsino), as achieved through the Musical arts. The Queen of Hell-Grail Queen (Maria) is Goddess of the Unconscious: and it is this invisible essence that defines the true Goddess (Viola):

Duke     ...let me see thee in thy woman's weeds.  
Viola     The Captain that did bring me first on shore  
           Hath my maid's garments; he upon some action  
           Is now in durance at Malvolio's suit...  
Olivia    He shall enlarge him.

- For the Puritan has sundered the Goddess from her invisible aspect, to his ruin. The transformed subject now reads a Puritan text, which he judges to be pathological, with the help of his visual imagination (Clown reading letter from Malvolio, whom he judges to be mad; then passing the letter to Fabian). He now considers the case of the Puritan, again by the Fabian principle, and recognises that it is his anathematisation of the Queen of Hell, and hence of Nature Herself, that is at the bottom of his sickness (Malvolio brought forth; explanation by Fabian of false letter).

---

---

---

## CHAPTER 22

### ROMEO AND JULIET

Romeo and Juliet is a hybrid play, with the clinical clarity of Sir Francis Bacon prominent in the later Acts, and the “charge of the Boar [Tybalt]” presented in an intense and personal way in the mostly prose passages of Act I, to indicate the hand of Shakespeare. The precise dating of the plays remains problematic, but R&J was most probably written in 1596, some time between the appearances of 1HIV and 2HIV: so that it is clear that Shakespeare’s attention was not exclusively devoted to the histories in these years. The plays of the Bacon group are distinguished by their focus on Shakespeare’s Puritan phase, with the consequent breakdown, and on Bacon’s regime for treating it – the “Musical” Arts of reading and writing, speech and song, recital and repetition, as defined by Socrates in Plato’s Republic (e.g. Bianca’s music lessons in TOS; Dr. Bellario in MOV). So is it here, with Juliet as the negative Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, or Goddess of the Invisible World (which includes the unconscious), as conceived by Puritanism, and the death of Romeo in her tomb the occasion of the breakdown of 1587. Shakespeare’s great contribution was to extend the purview of the play to the other great phase which preceded it: his enthrallment to puritan Catholicism (up to aet.15: see RII, 1&2 HIV), whose mutilated Goddess the Virgin Mary is portrayed by Rosaline.

Let us examine the characters and places assembled for the purpose of the allegory.

1) Romeo The ego of Shakespeare from puberty to aet.23.

2) Juliet The Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, cast in negative mantle by Puritanism. Romeo’s captivation by her at the masque marks the beginning of his Puritan phase aet.15, which was almost certainly precipitated by his humiliation and prosecution by the noted Puritan Sir Thomas Lucy, consequent on his ill-fated

<sup>1</sup> Camille Paglia gives a beautiful discussion of the cat as Egyptian underworld symbol in her *Sexual Personae*.

---

association with a tavern crowd in his Welsh or pseudo-Alexandrian phase of mid-adolescence (see HV chapter for a fuller discussion). Her drugging represents her “murder” by the Puritan ego, who thinks to have taken the Goddess of the Faustian dimension completely out of play; her entombment, dead but alive, the persistence of this Goddess in the unconscious, to beautifully anticipate Freud. The dagger which kills her represents the ithyphallic principle, more broadly unseen world; its piercing of her side, the act of love: for eros is swelling again from the unconscious, centred on the reborn Goddess of Love. Juliet’s age is given variously as 16 and 18 in the sources; but Shakespeare was 15 at the time of his espousal of Puritanism, which prompted the reduction of her age to 13 in R&J.

3) Montague The ithyphallos, more broadly the unseen world, in negative mantle, as invested by the Christian puritan superego; or even that superego itself. Thus, his sword-fight with Capulet in I, i, represents the conflict going on in the mind of the subject.

4) Capulet < French capulet, “a Pyrenean hood or cap”, to suggest the ithyphallos. His daughter is Juliet; his nephew

5) Tybalt The Boar (libido in negative aspect irrupting the ego): although identified here explicitly with the cat (another ancient Underworld symbol):<sup>1</sup> for the name was taken from Brooke (“Tybalt” being a common cat’s name). His murder by Romeo is germane to the drugging of Juliet, as representing the repression of the troublesome libido by the Puritan ego, who thinks to have finally exorcised it. It remains alive in the unconscious, however (a neat legerdemain: it is Tybalt’s tomb in which Juliet lies drugged), ready to charge, or rather pounce, to effect the coup. The negative libido is a fearsome dragon who scares the Puritan from engaging with the Faustian dimension - the invisible world, underworld, unconscious – which in Classical myth communicates with the visible world through Hermes, or Mercury. The Mercury principle is represented here by

6) Mercutio Of the house of Montague. His murder by Tybalt represents just this error: the Puritan’s erection of an iron curtain between his ego and the unconscious: between the visible (e.g. Bianca Minola in TOS) and invisible (Kate Minola) worlds. It will be the

<sup>1</sup> Robert Graves The White Goddess.

---

great task of Bacon to show his patient that the visible or phenomenal world cannot possibly be understood without reference to the underworld (Lucentio-Bianca marriage, consequent on Petruchio-Kate).

7) Benvolio We have seen how Malvolio in TN (1601) represents “bad will” (Puritan Shakespeare), in contrast to “[peace and] good will” (Gnostic (London phase) Shakespeare), as implied in the title, which refers to the feast of the Epiphany, which St. Luke tells us is a time of “peace and good will”. This idea must have occurred to Bacon several years earlier, at or before the time of writing of R&J: for here we have Benvolio as “good will”, or rather “peace”: for he does not represent here the healed Shakespeare, but the impulse toward peace in the troubled ego. Thus can he part the combatants in I, i; and thus can he recommend Juliet to Romeo, albeit this will prove to be a tragic error.

8) Nurse Queen of Hell-Grail Queen; explicitly identified with Lady Capulet, Juliet’s mother. So that Juliet is another Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, or even a Goddess of Love (in whom the invisible world is most powerfully present).

9) Peter Yet another “Peter” in the Complete Plays, all of them without exception representing the Pauline (Roman) Church. His attendance on the Nurse signifies the anathematisation of the Faustian dimension by the Church, which is a precondition of the Puritan error – the reassertion of the will-to-power, however corrupt, in response to the vulnerability to Nature consequent on the Pauline mutilation of the Great Goddess (extirpation of Her underworld component) to leave the Virgin Mary.

10) Petruchio Friend to Tybalt. A magnificent character, especially in TOS, where he woos Kate, Queen of Hell. His name is formed, remarkably, from “Peter” and the Italian *ucciso*, “I kill”. He is the “Church-killer”, that aspect of the reasoning ego which engages the invisible world.

11) Paris That aspect of the ego which would commune with the invisible world of the libido, as Paris loved Helen (an archetypal Queen of Hell well before the Classical era<sup>2</sup>). His marriage to Juliet would strip her of her negative mantle, to reveal her as the true Goddess, as she would later be manifest, against the will of the Puritan ego, after her “death” in the tomb.

---

12) Apothecary The libido, immanent and undefeated in the Puritan (Mantuan) subconscious. His drug will kill Romeo (“charge of the Boar”: the coup of 1587).

13) Mantua - Bears, as always without exception in the plays, the allegoric value of the Puritan ego, as derived from the birthplace of Virgil, creator of the archetypal Goddess-rejector Aeneas (cf. Augustus, who was Virgil’s patron, in JC).

14) Page (to Paris) The printed page, descriptive of the libidinous hero (e.g. Lucius in *The Golden Ass*).

15) Balthaser Bears, like every other Balthaser (-sar, -zar) without exception in the plays, the allegoric weight of the Magus, one of the Three Wise Men who were witness to the birth of the Christ the True King. Thus will Romeo’s death in the tomb will be occasion, on the allegorical plane, for the subject’s (Shakespeare’s) resurrection into divinity, through the agency of

16) Prince Escalus - “scales”: the faculty of higher judgement and reason. The Watch who appear with him at the end, to determine the cause of the tragedy, represent the visual imagination, the primacy of which as an attribute of Gnostic nobility (Shakespeare as the Resurrected Christ) is often asserted in the plays (e.g. “My words fly up, my thoughts remain below;/Words without thoughts, never to heaven go”: *Hamlet* III, iii).

17) Friar Lawrence The “ghostly father”. The Puritan superego, as is the ghost of King Hamlet.

18) Abram Servant to Montague. The Jew Shylock represents the Puritan ego in *MOV*, written about the same time as *R&J*. Abram (Abraham) was the Father of the Jewish race: so that Puritanism is shown here to be latent, full of malignant potential, in the puritan Catholic ego that was the Shakespeare’s up to aet.15. Thus does he fight (as a servant of Montague, not yet enfranchised) with

19) Sampson The ithyphallic principle, as cast in negative aspect by puritan Pauline Catholicism, as represented by his companion.

20) Gregory A reference to Gregory XIV, Pontiff of the Roman

<sup>3</sup> The Forest of Arden in *AYLI* represents the printed page that was the object of Shakespeare’s study in the early years of his healing by Bacon (his Melancholy Jacques phase); and the vector of the poems and plays he subsequently began to write (Orlando phase), probably in 1589, two years after the beginning of his

---

Church 1590-1. No less than sixteen popes have taken the name Gregory. Sampson and Gregory are twinned, just as are the “I” principle and Winchester/Beaufort (Roman Church) in 1-3HVI: for the Catholic Church, in its brutal suppression of the Gnostic revival, has shunned engagement with the unseen world, and therefore remains at its mercy.

So there we have it, a group of the most exquisitely carved panels, to be assembled in kaleidoscopic array to tell yet another chapter in the rebuttal of the Pauline Catholic and Protestant Puritan errors which is the essence of the theme of FF.

## ACT I

i

It is of the highest importance to the understanding of R&J to appreciate that the events described in this scene refer, on the plane of allegory, to a conflict incited by an erotic episode described in the printed page (probably Apuleius’ *The Golden Ass*: see especially MAN): for the grove in which Romeo has been wont to wander alone in the hours before dawn (I, i, 121 ff.) represents, like Birnham Wood in *Macbeth*, the grove near Berkeley castle in RII, and most remarkably, the Forest of Arden in *As You Like It*,<sup>3</sup> the page bearing the written word. This is the Shakespeare of the mid-adolescent Tavern or pseudo-Alexandrian years, when he became an instant guru to his companions, paying lip service to the hero’s journey of Alexander into Asia, a metaphor for the ego’s conquering of Nature; or rather, that phase’s end-stage, when it had been forced to a termination by the re-irruption of libido – yet another “charge of the Boar” - to drive him, most plausibly, now demoralised, into criminal activity with his tavern companions, to provoke his prosecution by the Puritan Sir Thomas Lucy, and rustication as a country schoolmaster in lieu of gaol: which gross humiliation was soil for the desert cactus of Puritanism. It is inconceivable that this scene could have been written by anyone other than Shakespeare, such is its personal intensity, in the way of the histories: and this conclusion is supported by its style (see scene iv below).

In the very first lines of the First Folio R&J an important technical device is reprised: the use of the single letter “I” as a

---

homophone for “Ay”, to symbolise the ithyphallos. This symbolic value of “I” has long been recognised; but it is generally amended to “Ay” in the modern editions, although the Everyman Shakespeare does better than most in retaining at least some. It is of the highest importance that the First Folio spellings be adhered to, as in the following:

Sampson Gregory, on my word, we'll not carry coals.  
Gregory No, for then we should be colliers.  
Sampson I mean, an we be in choler we'll draw.  
Gregory I, while you live, draw your neck out of collar.  
Sampson I strike quickly being moved.

This is a clear reference to the tumescence of an uncircumcised phallos (see also HV II, i, 20). Gregory's “I” for “Ay” is striking. We have seen this device many times in 1-3HVI, where the Catholic Church is firmly associated with the “I” principle (ithyphallic principle, more broadly the world that lies unseen below the surface of things, object of study of the modern artist, scientist, and depth psychologist, though denied by the Church in its suppression of the Gnostic revival). The point being made is that the Roman Catholic world-view has never engaged the invisible world, and therefore remains at its mercy. This was the case with the early-adolescent Shaksper: and this is the point of these earliest lines of R&J.

Benvolio appears on the scene to part the combatants, but is himself challenged by Tybalt (the cat or Boar – libido in negative aspect – as enemy to psychic peace). Prince Escalus finally appeases them (troubled ego turning to high thinking as a means of suppressing libido: thus does the Prince summon to his presence Capulet first, then Montague).

Here is a beautifully adroit legerdemain. Benvolio has observed Romeo walking in the sycamour grove alone, seeking solitude, just as he himself was seeking it: so that he avoided Romeo's company there. The grove is as always the printed page, whence the Goddess of Love – or more broadly, Nature described in the written word (Rosaline, as she is in AYLI) - is always surging to provoke a “charge of the Boar”. Romeo loves Rosaline, but she has vowed to

---

remain chaste (ego conscious of libido rising to Goddess, yet knowing it must never again be consummated). Romeo's and Benvolio's mutual avoidance of each other's company signifies that peace has fled the ego. Romeo has been wont to return to his room just before dawn, and remain there in shadows (ego remaining unenlightened, in ignorance). It is this surge of erotism which the adolescent and resourceless Shaksper now blames for the torment of his inner life, and the gross humiliation of criminal prosecution by a Puritan; from which Puritanism itself now offers the only escape. Yet this peace will be built on sand. The problem is put in a nutshell:

Romeo Farewell, thou canst not teach me to forget.  
Benvolio I'll pay that doctrine or else die in debt.

- For the impulse to appeasement will drive his flight into Puritanism, with its complete suppression of the Goddess, who will yet remain unforgotten in the unconscious, ready to surge again in a classically Freudian way.

ii

It is of fundamental importance to appreciate that the letter represents here, as always in FF, the written or printed word; the masque to which it is an invitation, the forms of the imagination evoked therefrom. Capulet has urged Paris to woo Juliet at the masque (Goddess as Witch-Woman as described in the printed page threatening to seduce reader). This is the page contemplated by Shaksper as the new defence strategy of Puritanism takes hold in his mind. Initially the page stimulates the libido, as of old:

Servingman ...I pray, sir, can you read?  
Romeo I, mine own fortune in my misery.  
Servingman Perhaps you have learned it without book. But I  
pray, can you read anything you see?  
Romeo I, if I know the letters and the language.

<sup>4</sup> Knight and Lomas, *The Hiram Key*.

---

- Where "I" for "Ay" bears its usual meaning. What exactly are those forms of the imagination? And what psychological response will they provoke, as this momentous divagation is glimpsed? Let us look closely at the letter, not one detail of which will prove, as always in the plays, to be adventitious or fanciful.

1) "Signior Martino and his wife and daughters" refers to St. Martin, whose feast day was celebrated in Britain on November 11. This falls within the month of Peith, originally Ngetal, in the ancient Druidic tree alphabet, with which Bacon was certainly thoroughly familiar (see especially TimA and A&C). The tree of Ngetal was the canna-reed, which grows from a thick root like a tree; and its reeds were a symbol of royalty in the Eastern Mediterranean. Arrows were cut from them; and the Pharaohs of Egypt used reed sceptres, to symbolise their sovereignty as living sun-gods (arrows being an age-old representation of the rays of the sun, symbolic of the light of reason). This is just the sort of lore with which Sir Francis Bacon, as a Freemason, and inheritor thereby of the Egyptian Hermetic tradition,<sup>4</sup> would have been familiar. Signior Martino's arrows represent the light of reason, with which he diagnoses the Goddess, as is confirmed by

2) "County Anselm and his beauteous sisters". St. Anselm (1033-1109) was famous above all for his proof of the existence of God by reason. He insisted that faith should come first, and bring intellectual proof in its train. This is precisely what the adolescent Shaksper would have been doing in his Bolingbroke and genteel scholarly phases of early adolescence, when he was in thrall to Rome and the Virgin Mary, with his libido surging in conflict; whereas the Gnostic tradition emphasises the primacy of knowledge, - even that one cannot know, - as the only true basis for apprehension of the Divine. Yet from this printed page perused by the scholarly youth comes the siren-call of the Love Goddess, in whom the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen is immanent:

3) For the "Lady Widow of Utruvio" represents the Queen of Hell of the Road Less Travelled - at least by early-phase Shaksper. "Lady Widow" identifies the crone or witch; while "Utruvio" is

<sup>5</sup> Gardner, Bloodline of the Holy Grail.

---

formed from the Latin *utrum*, “whether” as used in disjunctive questions, e.g. *utrum an vestra an nostra culpa est*, “whether the guilt is yours or ours”, - plus the masculinisation of *via*, “road”. A choice is being offered to the reader. On the one hand lies

4) “Signior Placentio and his lovely nieces”, who represent pleasure (Latin *placere*, “to please”, present participle *placens*, *placentis*) in the arms of the Goddess. The Gnostic (libidinous) Christ, husband of Mary Magdalene, might have taken this road, along with his close companion Simon Magus (Zelotes), that prototype of the Western Faust; and so we have here

5) Valentine and his brother Mercurio, who represent the Gnostic Christ (as elaborated in TGV) and his Mercurial or Faustian aspect respectively; and

6) “Mine Uncle Capulet, his wife and daughters”: the *ithyphallos* and Goddess of Love, or maypole and May Queen (Mary Jacob, the Gypsy, companion of Mary Magdalene on her sea flight from the Holy Land to Western Europe in AD 35<sup>5</sup>). Here is also the Goddess in the printed page, Who resumes the Goddess of Love, namely

7) “my fair niece Rosaline”. Here is the fatal crux: for also at the masque will be the sham Goddess of the Puritan, - who is no Goddess at all, - as Juliet, or

8) “Livia”, wife of Augustus, patron of Virgil and his Goddess-rejecting hero Aeneas. Yet if this road be chosen the sham Gnostic Christ, - here

9) “Signior Valentino”, - will be accompanied by no Mercurio, but by his perversion the Boar, i.e.

10) “his cousin Tybalt”. What might it be that the tormented subject is actually reading? It seems Apuleius’ *The Golden Ass*, whose hero

11) “Lucio” is reduced in the presence of the Queen of Hell, here

12) “the lively Helena”, to the state of an ass, yet progresses through this foolishness to the highest divinity: which glory will not however belong to the Puritan.

The stakes for the adolescent Shakespeare therefore could not have been higher; and he would funk it, to sow the seeds of tragedy.

---

The contretemps between Lady Capulet and the nurse serves to make the identification between them, and the scene as a whole to identify the nurse, and therefore the mother of Juliet, with the Goddess of the Underworld (Queen of Hell-Grail Queen). Bacon underscores this identification by having the “Wife” of Lord Capulet suddenly become an “Old Lady” in mid-scene, and the Nurse as wet-Nurse to Juliet. If Lord Capulet and “I” are both the maypole principle, and the Nurse is an alias of Lady Capulet, then “I” should be identical with the Nurse’s husband; and this is just the point made here:

Nurse      And then my husband... took up the child...  
                 The pretty wretch left crying and said “I”!  
                 I warrant an I should live a thousand years,  
                 I never should forget it. “Wilt thou not, Jule?”  
                 Quoth he. And, pretty fool, it stinted and said “I”.

Lady Capulet as witch asks Juliet, consistently with the allegory, to consider as a husband Paris, that famed lover of Homer’s Helen, who was in Shakespeare’s mythos an archetypal Queen of Hell, as the analysis of T&C will show.

This scene is marked by the allegorical adroitness which we have come to associate with Bacon; but the other elements of Bacon’s high style (see below) are missing: and this is just the sort of expertise – the manipulation of symbols such as “I” - that Shakespeare could have come to acquire in the several years of his *vita nuova* in London.

iv

Suddenly we are presented with the high style of Bacon in full bloom, with its characteristic breadth of language, exquisiteness of metaphor, depth of wisdom, and endless variety of wit. His pen is as unmistakable here as is Shakespeare’s in scene i, with its quality of agony, and graphic descriptions of inner psychic events, wherein the “x” factor - surely the gift which Shakespeare gave to his master - is powerfully at work, transforming what could have been another *Two Gentlemen of Verona* – a superlative Baconian philosophical treatise as allegory, but an indifferent play – into an unforgettable

---

work of art.

The subject is reading the printed page; but now, with the new coping mechanism of Puritanism in the offing, the libido will be expurgated therefrom (Benvolio – the yearning for inner peace – urging Romeo and Mercutio to dispense with the Cupid theme of the customary introduction to the masque; Romeo refusing Mercutio’s exhortation to him to dance). The Queen Mab speech is a spectacular example of Bacon at his best. The ego has a striking premonition of the nemesis that would pursue him after the crime of his espousal of Puritanism:

Romeo I fear too early, for my mind misgives  
Some consequence yet hanging in the stars  
Shall bitterly begin his fearful date  
With this night’s revels, and expire the term  
Of a despised life clos’d in my breast  
By some vile forfeit of untimely death.

The suppression of libido is expressed in another way by the episode of the servingmen. The napkin is symbolic of menstruation, as always in FF, and hence of the Goddess as Woman (e.g. 3HVI I, iii; HAM V, ii; Desdemona’s handkerchief; and so on). They order the porter to let in Susan Grindstone and Nell. The latter is the Christian name of Mistress Quickly (1&2 HIV, The Merry Wives of Windsor), which signifies that she tolls the petitemort; and Paris specifically calls Helen “Nell” twice in T&C, where she has a similar symbolic value. The grindstone suggests the act of love. The Nurse’s daughter was named Susan, to make of her another Queen of Hell-Grail Queen. That is, the Goddess of the auto-erotist is taking form in the imagination. The name of one of the servingmen is “Antony”, to evoke Mark Antony. He fills here the same allegoric role as in TN, MAN and TT (Shakespearean-Baconian, as distinct from those written by Bacon solus), of the libidinous lover of the Woman-Witch Cleopatra (Isis), as distinct from his more exalted symbolic weight in the Baconian MOV, of the Gnostic Christ. The potential ithyphallos and its consequence of auto-erotism, and “charge of the Boar”, is taken out of play by the subject defensively for now, but crippling in the end:

---

2 Servingman    When good manner's shall lie all in one or two  
                         men's hands, and they unwashed too, 'tis a foul  
                         thing.

[...]

3 Servingman    I boy, ready.

1 Servingman    You are look'd for, and call'd for, and sought for  
                         in the great chamber.

[...]

Exeunt servingmen

Enter all the guests and gentlewomen to the maskers.

- Where "I" is the ithyphallos, and the "great chamber" the Kent principle, or even yoni, (much better than the sterile Latin "vagina"). What can be the point of this odd disagreement between Capulet and his cousin?

Capulet            'Tis since the nuptial of Lucentio,  
                         Come Pentecost as quickly as it will,  
                         Some five and twenty years: and then we  
masqu'd.

Cousin Capulet   'Tis more, 'Tis more, his son is elder, sir:  
                         His son is thirty.

Capulet            Will you tell me that?  
                         His son was but a ward two years ago.

Pentecost is the feast celebrating the descent of the Holy Spirit into the twelve apostles; and here it is specifically linked to the knowledge of the libido, or the invisible world, in a way that will be perfectly familiar to any reader of *The Golden Ass*. Lucentio is the Godhead himself; his son the Gnostic Christ, who rode into Jerusalem to begin his quest for kingship aet.30. This would be the fate of the subject on the Road Less Travelled. The contrary position is that the subject is now aet.23 (a ward being subject to his guardian's supervision till aet.21). This was precisely the age of Shaksper when the coup befell him (TOS Ind.1, 120; Ind.2, 113).

The subject in thrall to Puritanism now beholds the Goddess with Her lunar aspect supplanted (perversely) by a solar: "O, she

---

doth teach the torches to burn bright” (cf. “and Juliet is the sun”: II, i, 45). The “charge of the Boar” is taken out of play, forever, or so the ego thinks (removal of the threatening Tybalt from the hall); but this too will prove to be delusory, in a thoroughly Freudian way:

Tybalt I will withdraw, but this intrusion shall,  
Now seeming sweet, convert to bitt’rest gall.

Juliet puts it in a nutshell: “You kiss by the book”. The ego fears the ithyphallos (“I”) and defensively (Benvolio) wishes to disengage from the page; but now suppresses the ithyphallos-libido (more broadly the unseen world) in the Puritan way, which is inane of the Hermetic or Musical word (silent dismissal of Capulet):

Benvolio Away, be gone, the sport is at the best.  
Romeo I, so I fear; the more is my unrest.  
Capulet Nay, gentlemen, prepare not to be gone,  
We have a trifling foolish banquet afterwards.  
They whisper in his ear.  
Is it e’en so? Why then, I thank you all;  
...I’ll to my rest.

Romeo remains, along with the “son and heir of old Tiberio”, as “young Petruchio” departs. This is a beautiful and intensely powerful touch: for Petruchio represents here as in TOS, the “Church killer” (devotee of the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen: see above); while the heir of the Emperor Tiberius was, of course, the madman Caligula. So that the madness of Shaksper’s breakdown is already shown here as a potential, as the opportunity to deal with his fundamental psychic problem – the anathematisation of the Queen of Hell by puritan Catholicism - is forsaken.

## ACT II

i

Romeo is beneath Juliet’s window, in the orchard by her house, from which Benvolio and Mercutio are excluded: the former (defensive guard) having done his job, the Mercury or Faust principle

---

now repudiated by the ego as potential liberator of the libido:

Mercutio ...'Twould anger him [Romeo]  
To raise a spirit in his Mistress' circle  
Of some strange nature, letting it there stand  
Till she had laid it and conjured it down:  
That were some spight. My invocation  
Is fair and honest: in his mistress' name  
I conjure only but to raise up him.

- Where "I" is the ithyphallos, subject of the verb "conjure". The ego now eliminates the Goddess and puts the cold sun of rationalism on Her throne, and repudiates the Fool (Ass) principle, as do all of Bacon/Shakespeare's stricken subjects without exception:

Romeo It is the East, and Juliet is the sun.  
Arise, fair sun, and kill the envious moon,  
Who is already sick and pale with grief  
That thou her maid art far more fair than she.  
Be not her maid, since she is envious:  
Her vestal livery is but sick and green,  
And none but fools do wear it.

- Where green is the colour of Ireland, which symbolises the unconscious throughout the "historical" cycle. There follows the long love-dialogue between them, consistent in its every detail with the allegory. For example, this is not the love that proceeds from the invisible world, the unconscious, the libido, - realms of the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, - but a sterile, rational love, a love of rationalism itself:

Juliet ...And do not impute this yielding to light love  
Which the dark night hath so discovered.  
[...]  
O swear not by the moon...

<sup>6</sup> Gardner, *ibid.*

---

Bacon takes the opportunity (80) to spell out Montague's role as a cipher of a principle or "humour", as Shakespeare calls it in Richard's great speech in *Richard III*, V, v, - and his cipher strategy in general:

Juliet      What's Montague? It is nor hand nor foot,  
Nor arm nor face, nor any other part  
Belonging to a man. O be some other name.  
What's in a name? That which we call a rose  
By any other word would smell as sweet.

Juliet twice exits in response to calls from the Nurse, who remains in the background (repression of Queen of Hell, from Whom the Puritan's Goddess-who-is-not is sundered, yet to Whom she remains essentially bound).

ii

Friar Laurence represents the Puritan superego, as Romeo ("my ghostly father": 45) and Juliet ("my ghostly confessor": *Richard III*, V, 21) make clear: the ghost bearing here the same allegoric value as in Hamlet and Julius Caesar. His every utterance confirms it: "Virtue itself turns Vice being misapplied,/And Vice sometime by action dignified"; "God pardon sin, wast thou with Rosaline?"; "Not in a grave/To lay one in, an other to have"; &c..

iii

The letter sent by Tybalt to Montague, Romeo's father, is allegoric, of course, of the threat to the ego from the libido immanent in the written word. Romeo will challenge him in his own way (Puritan suppression), which Mercutio (printed page as guide to the underworld: and see Spengler, who identifies the written word as the definitive Faustian medium) – scorns, as he does the new (Puritan) fashion of gentility vis-à-vis the libido and maypole principle (Tybalt's sword):

Mercutio Any man that can write may answer a letter.

[...]

The pox of such antique lispng affecting phantacies,  
these new tuners of accent... O their bones, their  
bones.

---

Romeo suspends his battle of wits with Mercutio (a “tale against the hair”: i.e. the act of Love, “hair” being an old colloquialism for a whore) just as the latter is about to reach his conclusion; and immediately thereupon enters the Nurse accompanied by Peter (ego unwilling to access underworld due to Queen of Hell in negative aspect, as ultimately cast by the Pauline Church). Peter gives her a fan to hide her face, which is symbolic of the Church’s suppression of the true nature of the Goddess of the Underworld, in fact of Mary Magdalene as the wife of Jesus Christ, and mother of his children.<sup>6</sup>

                  He walks by them and sings  
Mercutio An old hare hoar,  
                  And an old hare hoar,  
                  Is very good meat in Lent.  
                  But a hare that is hoar  
                  Is too much for a score  
                  When it hoars ere it be spent.

What is the meaning of this? Here, “hair”(103) = “hare” = “hoar” = “whore”: the Goddess of Love being anathematised by the Church as a whore (“very good meat in Lent”). The underworld Goddess in negative mantle is waxing in the incipient Puritan ego:

Romeo    ...Here is for thy pains.  
Nurse     No truly, sir; not a penny.  
Romeo    Go to, I say you shall.

Romeo’s “Man” who will bring the rope ladder to the Nurse, will later be named as Balthasar, one of the Magi who were witness to the birth of Jesus. He is identified in R&J with the “I” principle of the ithyphallos-libido, the underworld, or world that lies unseen below the surface of things: “I warrant thee my man’s as true as steel” (206). The ascent of the rope ladder Balthasar will fetch is symbolic of the crescent libido during the act of Love; and it is of fascinating relevance that the Greek for “ladder” is klimax. This is just the sort of scholarship of which Bacon was master. Balthasar’s



---

it" refers to both the sham nature of the "no", and the Rosemary and Romeo principles. On the contrary, the ithyphallos is an inviolable property of the Queen of Hell: "I a thousand times": the Nurse's separation from Peter ("Peter?") signifying her return to positive aspect. Peter's "Anon" means that the Church is not recognised by the underworld Goddess, who yet follows close behind, even stalks, that belief which thinks to deny Her ("Before, and apace"). This divestment of Her negative mantle is continued in scenes

iv-v

- with "Peter, stay at the gate". This is the Nurse as the Goddess inviolate, who yet is ailing at the hands of Puritanism (Nurse's illness). These scenes describe a psychological process:

Juliet      Love's heralds should be thoughts  
                 Which ten times faster glides than the sun's beams...

This is now unmistakably the Queen of Hell: "Romeo, no not he"; "Go thy ways, wench; Serve God" (where the root "wen-" is derived from the Celtic wen or wyn, "white", denoting the White or Moon Goddess); "Beshrew your heart". Her "Where is your mother?" is another way of expressing this conflict of principles, for Lady Capulet is to be identified with the Nurse (as established in I, ii).

ACT III

i

The ego's yearning for all to be well is sabotaged by the pull of the unconscious (Benvolio's conflict with Mercutio about his intention to withdraw from any possible meeting with the Capulets). The Mercutio principle liberates the Church-killing will-to-eros (their encounter in the street with Tybalt and Petruchio). The subject becomes aware of the will-to-eros which comes cloaked in negativity courtesy of his puritan Catholic, now incipient Puritan superego, and erects in defence an iron curtain between his ego and his unconscious (Tybalt's murder of Mercutio, thrusting from under Romeo's arm). The result is that the libido has been (delusively) taken out of play (murder of Tybalt by Romeo). The ego's yearning

---

for peace (Benvolio's long speech) now leads his higher judgement (Prince Escalus) to deny the given world and embrace Puritanism (Romeo's banishment to Mantua, associated with the Goddess-rejector Aeneas).

ii

Juliet's confusion over the Nurse's news of Tybalt's death serves to identify the Romeo and Tybalt principles, to make the point that the ego kills himself that kills off his libido under the Puritan influence. Now the "I" principle is a mortal threat to it:

Juliet      Hath Romeo slain himself? Say thou but "I",  
                 And that bare vowel "I" shall poison more  
                 Than the death-darting eye of a cockatrice!  
                 I am not I if there be such an "I".

The Queen of Hell remains in positive aspect: "Shame come to Romeo". Still the Puritan Goddess denies Her: "Blister'd be thy tongue...".

iii

The incipient Puritan ego is initially troubled by his choice (Romeo in conflict with Friar Lawrence). The underworld surges and irrupts (knocking and entry of Nurse) the ego bent on denial of libido (Friar's adjuration of "stand" to Romeo, who refuses) with an ithyphallos in its train (Romeo threatening to stab himself). The ego now confirms himself on his path (Romeo's acceptance of Friar's counsel). The Friar is the very type of the Goddess-scoring Puritan:

Friar Lawrence    Thy tears are womanish; thy wild acts  
                         Denote the unreasonable fury of a beast.  
                         Unseemly woman in a seeming man,  
                         And ill-beseeming beast in seeming both...

The underworld is conquered (Nurse offers to go...), or so the ego thinks in his delusion (...and turns again): for he is indissolubly bound to it (Nurse's profferal to Romeo of a ring, which Juliet has asked her to give to him: this is Juliet in essence (true Goddess)

---

rather than character (Goddess-who-is-not of Puritanism), as yet another Ring/Grail Queen of the plays).

iv

The subject (Romeo become Paris, that aspect of the ego that makes love to the Queen of Hell) has an ithyphallos (Capulet: "...but for your company,/I would have been abed an hour ago") which for the moment he cannot escape (Capulet's recalling of Paris as he offers to go). Illumination is still a long way off for the ego (Capulet's insistence that his wife find out Juliet's mind before they retire). Juliet will not come down that night – for the incipient Puritan has set his mind against temptation (Lady Capulet being downstairs: so that Juliet's presence on stage with her would signify the re-assumption of her nature as Queen of Hell). This will culminate in the suppression of the Goddess in the unconscious, driven by the Puritan superego (Friar Lawrence's drugging of Juliet).

v

It is the dawn of the *nuit d'amour*. That this scene takes place in the mind of the subject – is notional rather than actual – has been affirmed by Juliet's "Love's heralds should be thoughts" (II, iv, 4; and cf. MAN II, iii, 5, where the Boy's "I am here already, Sir" bears the same allegoric value). The ego and unconscious are rehearsing the climax – the memory of which, with its sequelae of the "charge of the Boar" (driven by the Queen of Hell), and mental anguish, is constantly with him, whether in consciousness or not - which would follow on his yielding to the temptation described above.

Juliet first insists that it is still night; Romeo that it is day. Then the positions are reversed. One might call this technique "mutual reinforcement": the Goddess being enveloped in darkness, as the ego is desperate to convert to Puritanism; then that ego shown as being himself in the dark, and the Goddess in negative aspect driving him to convert. The ego shuns Gnostic illumination of the Goddess (the day); embarks on Puritanism to avoid the Queen of Hell (Romeo's departure before Lady Capulet arrives); and suppresses his visual imagination, which would only evoke Her, and destroy his new character (Romeo's avoidance of the Watch, who would arrest him and hand him over for execution). Yet

---

Shakespeare of course could not eliminate the Goddess, who would return with a vengeance in his twenty-fourth year to push him to the brink of psychosis (death of Christ on the Cross, with eyes closed in the Pauline rather than Gnostic way) and precipitate his flight to London, where he would recover by embracing Her (Resurrection of Christ), and examine his breakdown in the written word:

Juliet     O think'st thou we shall ever meet again?  
Romeo     I doubt it not, and all these woes shall serve  
              For sweet discourses in out times to come.

Only now does Lady Capulet enter (the ego having avoided the Queen of Hell and Her Consort/Son the libido, who still lives – Tybalt's knife wound signifying his internalisation of the "I" principle, as does Caesar's in JC – though suppressed in the unconscious (Tybalt's body lying in the Capulet tomb)). The Nurse's hurried warning of Lady Capulet's approach, followed by her quick exit, represents the first disturbance of the bush wherein the Boar lies secreted, as caught by the eye of the terrified ego.

Juliet at the window represents again the sham Goddess as sun; her decent to greet her mother the divestment of Her negative mantle. Her need to dissemble her love to her mother gives Bacon the opportunity for another beautiful touch. The hatred of Romeo she expresses is in truth not her property, but the maypole's:

Lady       That is because the traitor murderer lives.  
Juliet     I Madam, from the reach of these my hands;  
              Would none but I would venge my cousin's death.  
              [...]  
              Indeed I never shall be satisfied  
              With Romeo, till I behold him. Dead  
              Is my poor heart, so for a kinsman vexed.  
              Madam, if you could find out but a man  
              To bear a poison, I would temper it  
              That Romeo should upon receipt thereof  
              Soon sleep in quiet. O how my heart abhors  
              To hear him nam'd and cannot come to him

---

To wreak the love I bore my cousin  
Upon his body that hath slaughtered him.

This is the FF version, with the odd period (.) before “dead”. All four “I”s before it refer to the ithyphallos. So far, so good; but why does she not simply say “With Romeo till I behold him dead”, which would be perfectly consistent with her dissimulation? The period begs to be moved to the end of the line, to render the next line a question: “Is my poor heart so for a kinsman vexed?”. The kinsman now is not Tybalt, but Romeo: or rather, both. This is a beautiful way of expressing the Goddesses’ love for her fallen Consort (Romeo-Tybalt), trapped as he is in the Puritan tyranny. Would that She could make the libido re-irrupt his ego in a painless way! (Gnostic Christ on the Cross with eyes open: the ego willingly embracing transformation). For this, though, he would need his visual imagination, and consequent apprehension of Platonic Ideas, both of which are anathema to the Puritan; so he will be dragged to the Cross (the tree: itself a Goddess-symbol) kicking and screaming against his will (RIII, III, iv).

Pauline Catholic puritanism, graven deep in Shakespeare’s unconscious, means that he cannot admit knowledge of the underworld as a transforming principle in his psyche:

Juliet      Now, by Saint Peter’s Church and Peter too,  
                 He [Paris] shall not make me there a joyful bride.

The ithyphallos violently would pull him in that direction (Capulet’s fury at Juliet for not accepting Paris); but the incipient Puritan has suppressed the underworld, with its blindness and irrationality (Capulet’s cowing of Nurse and his wife into silence). Yet again in the plays, the Fool principle is denied: “Peace, you mumbling Fool” (Capulet to Nurse). The ithyphallos subsides (exit of Capulet), as the Goddess is sundered from Her underworld aspect (exits of Lady Capulet and Nurse), as the ego prepares to bury Her once and for all, in his delusion:

Juliet      I’ll to the Friar to know his remedy.

---

ACT IV

i

The ego senses the tyranny of the Puritan superego, but is defenceless to counter it, resourceless and inane of the Musical arts as he is:

Paris      Now you do know the reason of this haste.  
Friar      I would I knew not why it should be slowed.

The temptation to give in to the Goddess now recedes, with Puritanism in the ascendancy (exit of Paris, to leave Friar and Juliet alone). The aim is to neutralise Her as an object of the itthyphallos' desire:

Juliet      If in thy wisdom thou canst give no help,  
                 Do thou but call my resolution wise,  
                 And with this knife I'll help it presently.

It is the written word, with the concentration of words as ends in themselves, rather than secondary to the imagination, by which the Puritan will seek to confirm his delusory notion of a Nature without an underworld:

Friar      ...Shall Romeo by my letters know our drift,  
                 And hither shall he come, and he and I  
                 Will watch thy waking, and that very night  
                 Shall Romeo bear thee hence to Mantua.

ii-iii

The ego succeeds in suppressing the Goddess (drugged sleep of Juliet). The symbolism of these scenes is straightforward. The Friar puts perfectly the Puritan position on the murdering of the Goddess:

Friar      Peace ho, for shame, confusion's care lives not  
                 In these confusions. Heaven and your self  
                 Had part in this fair maid; now Heaven hath all,  
                 And all the better it is for the maid.

---

They strew rosemary (which begins with an “r”, the dog-letter: see above) on Juliet’s coffin. Bacon adds a nice touch at the end, with the arrival of the musicians, and Peter’s vituperation of them. He bears here, as always without exception in the plays, the allegoric value of the Pauline Church. This “music” is Platonic in nature, i.e. it represents the Hermetic or Musical arts, including reading and writing, speech and song, memorisation and recitation, and so on, as defined in the early pages of Plato’s Republic (cf. Bianca’s music lessons in TOS), which Bacon could not possibly have avoided studying at Cambridge: hence Peter’s scorn. The musicians refuse, of course, to play for him. The Nurse represents, in her sympathy with them, the Faustian (Western) aspect of the written word. The answer to Peter’s question –

Peter      When griping griefs the hart doth wound  
              And doleful dumps the mind oppress,  
              Then music with her silver sound –  
              Why “silver sound”? Why “music with her silver sound?”

- Is of course that silver is the colour associated with the moon, and hence the Great (Triple or Moon) Goddess - since time immemorial, and especially in mediaeval alchemy. Peter insults over Her grave: “... because musicians have no gold for sounding” (the “musical” Arts remain neglected, even despised, by the Pauline ego).

## ACT V

i-ii

Romeo’s Man here is Balthazar, who has been identified with the maypole principle (“...my Man’s as true as steel”: II, iii, 206). Balthazar’s bringing to him of pen and ink represents the “I” principle described in the written word (e.g. the intensely erotic scenes early in *The Golden Ass*) He is bearing them, just as the ithyphallos recreated in the visual imagination of the writer bears the words to describe it: words being always secondary to the images they evoke in the Gnostic mind (the contrary Puritan attitude being expressed by Claudius in HAM III, iii, 100). The

---

poison provided to Romeo by the apothecary is, of course, the libido. The Boar is preparing his charge (death of Romeo in tomb). The ego has a premonition of his forced communion with his unconscious (Crucifixion of Christ), where resides the Goddess and will-to-eros (Capulet tomb in Verona), and subsequent healing (Resurrection):

Romeo I dreamt my lady came and found me dead  
(Strange dream that gives a dead-man leave to think)  
And breath'd such life with kisses in my lips  
That I revived and was an Emperor.

- Who is the same as the Emperor of Milan in TGV that has the caused the commentators so much trouble, but who most plausibly was sourced from the Emperor card of the Tarot Major Arcana (see Ch.11 for a full discussion). This passage, together with Juliet's "Thy lips are warm" (V, iii, 169) serves to make the point that it is not physical death, but psychic transformation that is being described here: that the ego lives on, though changed forever. The letter from Friar Lawrence has failed to reach Romeo in Mantua (sabotage of ego's perception of written word as obedient to edicts of the Puritan superego). It will emerge (V, ii, 5) that the "Searchers of the Town [Verona]" had immured the bearers of the letter in a house, suspecting that they were carriers of a pestilence. The "Searchers" represent, like the "Watch" of the final scene, the visual imagination; and as "searching" is to "watching", so is the intensely visual though unreasoning imagination of the ego at this early stage, when it is visualising the love scene described on the printed page, to the instructed reasoning of its healing phase. The "pestilence" is, of course, Puritanism itself, which is powerless to resist the aroused libido.

iii

This final scene of the allegory is intricately choreographed. Paris' Page is the written word as illustrative of the Paris principle – the hero who makes love to the Goddess as Queen of Hell-Grail Queen (e.g. Lucio to Fotis in Apuleius' *The Golden Ass*) - with which the reader resonates, to arouse the principle in himself. R&J

---

provides in this way yet more confirmation that an erotic scene described in the printed page – perhaps TGA – was the trigger for Shakespeare’s breakdown aet.23. This “Page” will be positively identified with the letter written by Romeo with the ink and paper given him by Balthazar (“I” principle) in Mantua (see above):

Prince     Give me the letter; I will look on it.  
              Where is the County’s Page that raised the Watch?  
              - Sirrah, what made your Maister in this place?

Let us visualise exactly what happens. Paris asks his Page to give him the lighted torch he is holding – there would probably be a transition phase, when the torch is almost in Paris’ hand, or both are holding it – then orders him to put it out, and “hence and stand aloft” (FF version: not “aloof” as in modern editions). Then he has him lie down with his ear to the ground, to listen for approaching feet. Paris then melts into the darkness and bushes as Romeo approaches, crowbar in hand, accompanied by his Man Peter (FF version: not Balthazar). Romeo begins to prise open the tomb, whereupon Paris appears, and accosts him. Romeo tries to persuade him to go in peace, but Paris refuses, and they grapple at the entrance. Romeo drags the body down to place it in the tomb, with Tybalt and Juliet (drugged).

The lighted torch held between Paris and his Page symbolises the illumination by the written word of the libido and its communion with the Goddess: for example, as provided by the ass-phase of Lucio in Apulieus’ masterpiece, wherein he witnesses numerous libidinous encounters. It is by taking the route of engagement with the underworld and the unconscious that the ego can attain to divinity, - as did Lucio in the final chapters, - and no other. In this case, however, there is no illumination for the Puritan, for whom the printed page is dead (Page’s repose); and as soon as he begins, in his darkness, to access his unconscious (the tomb: and Paris is named explicitly as a kindred of Mercutio: 75), that aspect of himself which would commune with its contents (Queen of Hell and libido: Juliet and Tybalt) – surges, whereupon, having failed to dismiss it peacefully, he kills it off and suppresses it in the unconscious with the other two dead-but-living principles

---

(the knife wound in Paris signifying, not the extinction of his principle, but its activation by the “I” principle (cf. murder of Polonius).

The modern editor invariably names Romeo’s Man, who accompanies him to the tomb, as Balthazar. This would present a problem for the allegory, for Romeo expresses with extreme violence his desire for his Man not to follow him down to the interior: and the ithyphallic principle should surely be present in the unconscious with the “charge of the Boar”. FF is explicit, however, in naming this Man as Peter, not once, but three times:

Enter Romeo, and Peter

[...]

Pet. I will be gone, sir, and not trouble ye.

[...]

Pet. For all this same, I’ll hide me hereabout...

For with the irruption of libido (descent of Romeo into tomb) the influence of the Pauline Church on the psyche is violently abandoned. Yet it will remain an influence until brought to book by the reading and visually imagining ego in healing phase (“Man” renamed, in the First Folio, as “Boy” when confronted by Prince Escalus and the Watch: 274). Romeo gives him the letter he has written with the ink and paper provided by Balthazar in Mantua, to take to his father Lord Montague (ego under influence of Christian puritanism-Puritanism imagining libidinous encounter described in written word, to precipitate the coup). Consistently, he rewards Peter with money (waxing of his principle) just before his conflict with Paris. The following Man (unnamed) is however Balthazar:

Romeo    What said my Man when my betossed soul  
            Did not attend him as we rode? I think  
            He told me Paris should have married Juliet.

- The horse and rider symbolising, as always in FF, the libido in action (a metaphor borrowed by Bacon from Plato). Romeo illumines Juliet with a torch, and drinks the poison (ego imagining the Goddess of Love, and succumbing to libido). The Boar has

---

charged: the breakdown has struck. Now the Puritan superego ~~attempts to reassert the chastity of the Goddess, but to no avail~~ (Friar entering tomb, offering to take Juliet to a nunnery, and being refused). Juliet kisses Romeo's lips, whereon some poison sits, and stabs herself (hitherto chaste Goddess being invaded by libido and ithyphallos). This would most likely refer to an act of auto-erotism, consistent with the revelations of 1&2 HIV and HVIII.

What is the time now? This question and its answer occurred to me from a consideration of Capulet's decision to postpone the marriage of Juliet from Paris from Wednesday to Thursday (III, iv) which, on the basis of there being nothing superfluous or adventitious, nothing fanciful or supererogatory in the plays, stands forth and demands to be noticed; and this was surely its purpose, to make the alert reader ask "Why Thursday?" The marriage-day is Thursday. Juliet drinks the Friar's drug on Wednesday night; and she will sleep in the tomb for 42 hours, 6 hours short of 2 days. If she took the drug at 9 p.m., then the "deaths" of Romeo and Juliet would occur at 3 p.m. on Friday, which is precisely the time and day of Christ's death on the Cross (and a time when W.H. Auden used to feel depressed, for which he cited this reason). We remember Richard's seat of Crosby ("Cross-by") House in RIII; and there can be no doubt now that the events in the tomb refer to the "death" of Shakespeare aet.23 on the Cross of the libido.

Immediately the process of healing begins, as visual imagination works on the written word (entry of Paris' Page and the Watch). The faculty of reason is still groping ("search about the churchyard"); but finally lights on the Pauline Church ("Here's Romeo's Man") and Puritan superego ("Here is a Friar"). Now the higher judgement begins to work (entry of Prince). The dagger is firmly identified with the ithyphallos, Juliet's breast with the yoni:

Capulet This dagger hath mista'en, for lo his house  
Is empty on the back of Montague  
And it mis-sheathed in my daughter's bosom.

---

- Where Montague's back-sheathed dagger is symbolic of repression of the libido. More broadly, the underworld dimension has forced itself back into the sham Goddess of Puritanism, to transform her. The Friar now gives a long recitation of the tragic events to Prince Escalus (Puritanism, with its poverty of faculty of imagination, being identified by healing ego as principal culprit in his breakdown); Peter, now a "Boy", a briefer recitation (Pauline Church implicated also: albeit in terms of the aetiology and pathogenesis of the severe anxiety/depression neurosis which had stricken down Shakespeare at this time, to leave him a hair's breadth from psychosis, his latter Puritan phase was more immediately responsible). The ego in transformation, now letting his imagination work on the printed page (and Apuleius was certainly used as a therapeutic tool by Bacon: see MAN), realises that it is his repression of the Paris principle in himself that has been the problem:

Prince     Give me the letter; I will look on it.  
              Where is the County's Page that rais'd the Watch?  
              - Sirrah, what made your Maister in this place?  
Page        He came with flowers to strew his lady's grave...[&c.]  
Prince     This letter doth make good the Friar's words...

---

## CHAPTER 23

### MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING

Much Ado About Nothing focuses on the milieu intérieur, with the “charge of the Boar” (irruption of the libido in negative aspect into the Puritan ego, to shatter the psyche) - which Shakespeare had experienced in a prodromal, comparatively muted form throughout his early adolescence (Hal’s Falstaff phase; entry of Amazon dancers in TimA I, ii), before the final onset of the disease in full virulence aet.23 (TOS Ind.1, 120) – expressed with all the vividness and immediacy expected of a trauma experienced by the writer. This is in contrast to the generally detached and clinical tone of the plays of the Bacon group.

The deadliest “charge of the Boar”, corresponding to the events in Stratford in 1587, is allegorised in MAN in the episode of Claudio’s mistaking, under the influence of Borachio-Don John, of Margaret for Hero in III, ii-iii. Let us now briefly examine them, and the other main characters assembled for the allegory.

1) Claudio The single most remarkable piece of nomenclature in the plays. Claudio is Shakespeare himself, emerging from the “charge of the Boar” with a potentially fatal wound, to make a (not quite) full recovery under the care of Sir Francis Bacon. The Emperor Claudius succeeded Augustus and Caligula, and was a scholar and writer who, startlingly in the present context, walked with a limp. Ted Hughes argued compellingly for Shakespeare’s lameness, for which I have found further strong evidence in HVIII and The Winter’s Tale; while Augustus bears throughout the plays, as patron of Virgil, creator of Aeneas, the archetypal Goddess-rejector, the symbolic weight of the Puritan ego (see especially his portrayal in JC). Further, Caligula was famously mad: so that the line Augustus-Caligula-Claudius (omitting Tiberius, who nevertheless makes an appearance in R&J I, iv, 244) represents beautifully Shakespeare’s phases as Puritan (aet.15-23), nervous invalid (23), and scholar and writer, now recovered (25’): the interval of “two years and more” between inception of treatment

---

and recovery being given in the final lines of MAF. King Claudius in Hamlet bears exactly the same value: the principle of recovery being repudiated by the ego on its way to irreversible paranoid schizophrenia.

2) Leonato Yet another lion (leo- and -nato: "born a lion") in FF, all of them referring to Shakespeare as Goddess-rejector (see below).

3) Borachio The Boar: will-to-eros in negative aspect, as cast by Puritanism. The Spanish boracco means "drunkard", who represents at his every appearance without exception through the plays the ego dissolved in blind libido (cf. Sir Toby Belch, Stephano and Trinculo, Christopher Sly, &c.). Borachio's self-concealment behind the arras in I, iii, is precisely cognate with the similar actions of Polonius and Falstaff, all of them representing the repression of libido in the unconscious, which plane is represented here by

4) Don John The bastard brother of

5) Don Pedro Yet another Peter, who bears as always the allegoric weight of the Pauline (or Roman) Church, whose poisonous influence was acutely perceived by Bacon to lie at the bottom of Shakespeare's condition. The name "John" has been associated with the unconscious before, in the character of King John: yet another good example of the indefectable consistency of the First Folio as allegory. Petruchio, the "Church killer" of TOS and R&J, is associated with the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, Goddess of the Invisible World (Kate in TOS), whose denial by the Pauline Church is its fatal weakness. This Freudian vulnerability is realised here in the wooing by Borachio of Margaret, - another Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, as she is in the histories, - in collusion with Don John.

6) Antonio Brother of Leonato: for libidinous Shakespeare is pathologically associated with Goddess-rejecting Shakespeare, to illustrate Schopenhauer's famous axiom that "A man can do as he will, but not will as he will". All the Antonios of the plays are sourced from Plutarch's memorable account of the love of Antony for Cleopatra, in defiance of Augustus, in the Life of Marcus Antonius. Thus does he appear with the ship's crew in TT, as libido once again irrupts the consciousness of Shakespeare-as-magus. He appears as an old man in I, ii, with his son providing the music for

---

the wooing of silent Hero. We have met this technique before, in MOV II, ii, where Launcelot Gobbo père fails to recognise his son, who has been in the employ of Shylock (ithyphallic principle perverted by Puritanism): and so here, where Antonio's son represents the Musical Arts – chief among them the written word - misconceived by the Leonato principle.

7) Hero The visible or phenomenal world (cf. Bianca in TOS). Her silence is cognate with that of Cordelia and Hippolyta: for Nature does not speak to the Puritan, who has swept Her out of notice into the unconscious. Thus is Antonio's son in charge of the music at the mask, where Don Pedro woos (silent) Hero on behalf of Claudio (Shakespeare act.15 embracing Puritan sham Goddess).

8) Beatrice The Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, cognate with Kate in TOS. The new apprehension of Nature (Hero) by the ego-in-transformation will be predicated on his engagement with the unseen world, to perceive it anew - as stripped of its negativity as imposed by puritan Catholicism and Protestant Puritanism - to lie below the surface of apparent phenomena (such as, most immediately, the ithyphallos) - which falling of the scales is represented here by the marriage of Beatrice and

9) Benedick The ithyphallic principle. Their marriage is germane to that of Protheus and Julia in TGV, where Protheus (< Greek proteus, "first man": cf. Adam in AYLI) is Dionysian or Falstaffian Man, homo libidensis, of whom the will-to-life is a property.

10) Friar Francis A portrait, remarkably, of Sir Francis Bacon, who brought Shakespeare together with the truths of Nature, so long anathematised by Puritanism, just as the Friar brings together Claudio and Hero.

The overall allegorical strategy is familiar to us from the Bacon group; but it was not Bacon who wrote the lion's share of MAN, as an editor has acutely if unwittingly noticed:

Much Ado About Nothing has been described as the most down-to-earth of Shakespeare's romantic comedies. The universe it depicts is a familiar one (V.iv.70), devoid of implausible features such as the allegorical quests of *The Comedy of Errors*, the fairy-world metamorphoses of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, the magic

---

caskets of *The Merchant of Venice*, the cross-dressed pages of *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* and *Twelfth Night*, and the “strange events” (V.iv.135) of *As You Like It*. Through special effects that parody the seemingly miraculous reversals in other plays of the same genre, the obstacles that impede erotic and spiritual fulfilment in *Much Ado About Nothing* are ultimately dissolved in “Wonder”. But by permitting the audience to observe the contrivances that have been designed to produce a sequence of happy issues, Shakespeare ensures that none of us will depart from the theatre with any illusion that the “Amazement” we’ve witnessed (V.iv.67-71) is a phenomenon which must be ascribed to supernatural causes... Like *The Merry Wives of Windsor* but unlike most of the playwright’s other works, which tend to alternate between a major “verse plot” and a supporting “prose plot”, *Much Ado About Nothing* is predominantly in prose. Only rarely does its dialogue partake of the heightening of metre, let alone rhyme, and when it does so the characters defined by these dramaturgical media come across as comparatively “artificial”: reserved, formal, effete, or otherwise straitened by fashion’s norms.

John F. Andrews, *the Everyman MAN*

Two-and-a- half cheers for him! For in no other play – save, perhaps, for *MWW* - does the Shakespearean content (point of view of the allegory from the milieu intérieur) coincide so remarkably with what I have taken to be the Shakespearean style: predominantly prose, with evidence of an intellect of the highest order supported by a comparative poverty of resources, a feel for words expressed in an impressive yet limited (in comparison with the Baconian style) vocabulary, a talent for metaphor which is yet not realised as spectacularly as in the Bacon style, and so on: in sum, the work of an avid and talented pupil rather than the Master, who yet possesses the “x” factor – that sine qua non of the great work of Art - by the bucketload, derived from the immediacy and authenticity of his own horrific experience. Nowhere in Western

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Ignatius Donnelly in his *The Great Cryptogram Voll II*.

---

Art is the “x” factor more powerfully present than in the tragic sequence: and one must judge that the Stratfordians have been justified in rejecting the claims for Bacon’s sole authorship on the basis of the absolute primacy of the “x” factor – finally the will, which Bacon managed, with his characteristic striving for closure, to eliminate as a problem in his own life – in great Art. Yet, how could a scholar with any self-respect close his eyes so firmly to the cast iron evidence of Bacon’s involvement, so that the epochal work of Baconists such as William Moore merit not so much as a footnote in the modern editions?

## ACT 1

i

Don Pedro is called by his Anglicised name “Don Peter” only twice in the play, both here in the first lines: its purpose being to semaphore his ulterior meaning. He “hath bestowed much honour on a young Florentine called Claudio” (Shakespeare first coming under sway of Pauline Church). The name “Leonatus” is formed from the Latin *leo* and *natus*, and means “born a lion”. We have met this lion before: in *TitA IV, i, 99*, with reference to the Puritan-figure Saturninus; in *JC I, iii, 20*, with reference to the living Caesar, who represents Shakespeare in his Church-dominated phase aet.14-15 approximately; and in the names Posthumus Leonatus (“Now after death, he was born a lion”) and Leontes, those two great figures of Goddess-repudiation, then Death and Resurrection, in the culminating plays, both bearing the allegoric weight of Shakespeare himself.

## Origin of the Lion motif in the First Folio

Wolfram’s *Parzival*, the first complete Grail saga, will be shown in Ch.44 to have been, remarkably, the prime inspiration and model for Bacon’s allegoric strategy. It was from here that he derived the technique of splitting the questing hero into two, one bent on understanding the visible world, the other on engaging the invisible, as represented, for example, in *TOS* by Lucentio and Petruchio (the “Church-killer”) respectively: The marriage of the former with Bianca (white moon = visible world) represents, as sequent on that of Petruchio with Kate (Queen of Hell-Grail Queen),

---

the success of the quest, which is dependent on prior engagement of the unseen world. In Parzival, whose psycho-allegory is identical with that of FF, these two are represented by Parzival and Gawan respectively. One of the tasks set Gawan in the (underworld) castle before he may claim Orgeleuse is the slaying of a ferocious lion: and this is most plausibly a source for the “lion” in Leonatus, Posthumous Leonatus, Leontes; in MND; and implicitly in the “Andronicus” of TitA (a reference to Pliny’s tale): in all of which it bears the value of the Goddess-rejecting Puritan subject that was Shakspeare aet.15-23, the slaying of which abomination was the goal of Bacon’s therapy.

This is not the whole story, however: for another strong candidate is the lion torn to pieces by Samson on his way to a tryst with the Philistine girl in Judges 14:

And after some days, returning to take her, he went aside to see the carcass of the lion, and, behold, there was a swarm of bees in the mouth of the lion and a honeycomb. And when he had taken it in his hands, he went on eating: and coming to his father and mother, he gave them of it, and they ate. But he would not tell them, that he had taken the honey from the body of the lion.

Bacon referred to it in a petition to the House of Lords:

...if any of you will do posterity good, if out of the carcass of a dead and rotten lion, there may be honey gathered for the use of future times.<sup>1</sup>

It is of extreme relevance that Leontes and Posthumous Leonatus feature in the final two plays TWT and CYM, written almost entirely by Bacon; and that the final lines of the latter contain a summa of the philosophical intent of the FF allegory: so that the honey would represent the balm for posterity of the philosophy of the works of Shakespeare, which had their birth in the extirpation of the Puritan ego of his patient Shakespeare (slaying of the lion); and Samson’s deception of his parents the

<sup>2</sup> Lilith, from Poems 1913.

---

encryption of this true origin. Both sources may plausibly have operated: Parzival for the early lions in TitA and MND, the Book of Judges for the later.

It could be argued that the Puritan sect was itself a breakaway from the Pauline Church, even the Protestant mainstream; but it was part of Shakespeare's Bacon-inspired insight to recognise that it was the early influence of Pauline Catholic puritanism (from his mother, as seems likely) that had marked him for life. Thus the Claudio-Leonatus-Don Pedro axis of the early Acts is entirely internally consistent, and consistent further with Shakespeare's own inner life up to aet.23, when the coup befell him. The lion symbol yoked to the Pauline Church is beautifully captured in "he [Claudio] hath borne himself beyond the promise of the age, doing in the figure of a lamb the feats of a lion" (15).

\*

The defining property of the Goddess-rejecting "lion" is the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, whose realm is the unconscious, - and hence the will-to-eros, as well as the ithyphallic principle, - all in negative aspect, as cast by Christian puritanism. Beatrice and Benedict bear the allegoric weight of the first and last of these. Beatrice is a typical shrew, cognate with Katherine in TOS, Portia in MOV, and Adriana in TCE. She first refers to Benedict as "Signior Mountanto" (31), to confirm his value. Beatrice (derived surely from Dante's Goddess: a brilliant touch, this, to identify the Queen of the Mountain of Paradise with the Queen of Hell) - vehemently abjures marriage, like Benedict:

Beatrice He... challeng'd Cupid at the flight, and my Uncle's  
Fool reading the challenge subscrib'd for Cupid, and  
challeng'd him at the Burbolt.

This is yet another Fool to add to the already considerable list, all performing precisely the same function without exception. Who is the odd one out in Enter Don Pedro, Claudio, Benedick, Balthasar, and John the Bastard (98)? We have already met this Balthasar in R&J, ACE, and... the New Testament, as one of the Three Wise Men who were witness to the coming of Christ. Somewhere in this company is hidden a Christ: and of course it is Claudio, whose

---

resurrection will be predicated on the rehabilitation of the Queen of Hell and ithyphallic principle (union of Beatrice and Benedict in Act V).

### The Silence of Cordelia: a misjudgement by Ted Hughes

A striking feature of Hero is her silence. She is first acknowledged on stage in l. 107, but says nothing for the rest of the scene, indeed of the Act, until II, i, 6: a span of some 336 lines. In this she is cognate with Cordelia, as well as the Hippolyta of the early Acts of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Ted Hughes placed the silence of Cordelia at the very heart of Shakespeare's ethos, as symbolising the powerlessness of words and human reason to grasp the ultimate mystery of Nature. Quantum physics most recently has celebrated, of course, the same problem. We know that mesons are made of quarks; but what are quarks made of? Or, at the other extreme, which perhaps is to return to the quark (remember : "As without, so within"), what lies beyond the limits of the universe? This is where the ear is charmed by the sound of one hand clapping. The great Australian symbolist Christopher Brennan put it best:

Lilith, a name of dread: yet was her pain  
and loving to her chosen ones not vain  
hinted, who know what weight of gelid tears  
afflicts the widowed uplands of the spheres,  
...and whence the sybil-hints of song, that cease  
in pale and thrilling silence, lest they wrong  
her beauty, whose love bade live their fleeting throng...<sup>2</sup>

It certainly is a noble philosophy, which wholly accords with the Faustian or Western (e.g Neils Bohr) world-feeling, - rather than the Classical (e.g. Einstein), with its Greek-like concern only for the visible universe, - which made Shakespeare the artist he was (cf. the Ajax principle in T&C).

Yet it is not in truth what Bacon-Shakespeare intended, which was to represent Nature in Her unseen aspect as not speaking to the subject through the Gnostic written word; or rather, his deafness to Her, Who has been trying to make him listen for so

---

long. For the silence of Cordelia and the other mute Goddesses is based, as I have shown repeatedly during the course of this argument, on that of surda (“silent”) Thalia as depicted in *The Music of the Spheres* by Gafurius (Fig. 2), as symbolic of Nature in the raw, unilluminated by the Musical Arts, of which the written word was, in Shakespeare’s case, certainly the principal form, - and therefore likely to cause, in negative aspect, problems for the psyche. Nature at this stage did not speak to Shakespeare; and it was Bacon’s task to encourage his patient to swallow this negatively-conceived Nature (lion mouth at bottom of Fig. 2), which he had been spitting out all his life, and digest and assimilate it with the help of the Musical arts (in the Platonic sense: see above), and therefore to be resurrected as an Hyperborean Apollo (cf. the favourable reference to Pythagoras, a Hyperborean, in TN IV, ii, 55) or Gnostic Christ.

The symbol of the silent Goddess was almost certainly the idea of Bacon, the ultimate source being the silence of the women in Clinschor’s castle in Wolframs’ *Parzival* (see Ch.44). This is supported by the complete subjugation of Katherina in TOS, - which must have been written by the therapist rather than the patient, - which is another way of expressing exactly the same principle: her extreme, vehement volubility being the prelude to her taming. It accords with what is suggested of Bacon in contemporary accounts: that he was somewhat rigid and aloof, rather Classical in outlook (his personal Muse was Athena: hence the AA symbol in his works) – in other words, to use Goethe’s term, become, his inner life representing a triumph of the intellect. This must also have been true of Shakespeare in scholarly mode (the Trojan Hector in T&C), almost certainly poring over the works of his healer and inspiration. Yet he was continually declining from it under pressure of the libido (Achilles in T&C) to reprise the psychic torment (charge of the Boar (Diomed in T&C): albeit now mitigated) from which creativity was the only remedy (Ajax in T&C): hence the finding that no less than four of the plays are allegories of exactly the same phase of Shakespeare’s life: his Welsh or Tavern or pseudo-Alexandrian phase of mid-adolescence.

<sup>3</sup> Knight and Lomas, *The Hiram Key*.

---

Certain feminists have claimed that the silence of Cordelia and her kin is an example of the “silencing of women”; and in this they would be right. The commonly held Victorian belief that children should be seen and not heard is germane to this: for children are pure incarnations of the libido as the will-to-survival, which is an attribute of the Goddess. Hence the complete lack of children, or Mother-and-Child, in Greek Art, which is become - rather than becoming, in the Faustian sense – as was the typical Victorian. Yet to suppose that Shakespeare was in any way acquiescing to the “silencing”, even unconsciously, would totally and perversely to be in error. Nothing could be further from the truth: for it was the gift of speech to them that had given him a life.

ii

Here is a beautiful cryptographic miniature, of a type with which we have become so familiar in the histories. The “Old Man” Antonio, brother to Leonatus, has heard from a “good sharp fellow” that Don Pedro and Claudio have been walking in a “thick pleached alley” in Antonio’s orchard, wherein the former was overheard to profess his love for Hero. Leonatus’ response is to leave it in abeyance, “as a dream, till it appear itself: but I will acquaint my daughter withall, that she may be the better prepared for an answer, if peradventure this be true”.

This is yet another instance of the garden/orchard motif in FF. We remember that “paradise” is derived from the Persian for “garden”. Michael Baigent and Richard Leigh quote in their *The Elixir and the Stone* an illustrative passage from Prest’s *The Garden of Eden*:

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

The orchard is an inflection of this, with the emphasis on



---

hide what I am...

- Where Don John is the unconscious, where resides the libido. It is the central point of the plays that the will (whence the libido), and then the Universal Will, is inviolable and irreducible, and not to be ignored or anathematised or in any way denied ("I cannot hide what I am"), any more than the four fundamental forces of Nature (gravity, electromagnetism, weak and strong nuclear forces), the lowest crystallisations of the Will (which lies below the level of the quark, beyond the furthest star) in the field of space and time. It is precisely this denial – of the will in negative aspect - which the Leonato principle is attempting. His tool is the faculty of reason, which is incarnate in Conrade, who represents therefore not Reason, but rationalism ("moral medicine": 12), that sham perversity which thinks to fly free (like Icarus, in truth, and with the same result) of any constraint to Nature. The name "Conrade" may have a provenance in literature of which I am not aware. However a beautiful origin may be found by etymology alone, with "Con" being taken to suggest "to con", to study, to learn well enough to remember; and "-rade", formed from the Latin radere, to shave hair with a razor: the shaven or bald head representing (as in Noughties Man) the antithesis of the Beatrice or Katherina principle of the Queen of Hell with her abundant dark locks. This is just the sort of symbolic nuance that Bacon, and by inference his pupil, adored.

The Conrade principle is always working to counterfeit the Gnostic Christhood in the Puritan ego:

Conrade ...it is needful that you frame the season for your own harvest.

- But in vain:

John I had rather be a canker in a hedge, than a rose in his grace...

The result will be a rebound of the libido, still in negative aspect, with greater force than before, as the Borachio principle (the Boar). This is, of course, an illustration of Freud's theory of repression: and these three – the rejected Gnostic (libidinous) Christ, the sham

---

rationality, and the rebounding libido – form a distinct clinical syndrome:

John      You are both [Conrade and Boraccio] sure, and will assist me.

Conrade   To the death, my Lord.

This will be the death of the Puritan ego on the tusks of the libido in negative aspect (RIII, III, iv): of Shakespeare the Christ on the Cross of Crosby (“Cross-by”) House, the seat of Richard in RIII, whence he would be reborn into eternal life.

The initial repression is represented here too. We have seen how Shakespeare-Bacon stole the technique of Polonius and Falstaff hiding themselves behind arras from the numerous similar incidents in Apuleius’ *The Golden Ass*, to symbolise the repression of libido, some three centuries before Freud. Now here is Borachio reporting how he heard, as he was hiding behind an arras, Don Pedro (Church) telling Claudio (incipient Puritan) how he would woo (silent) Hero (sham Goddess) before handing her over. It could not be clearer.

## ACT II

i

The first ninety lines of this scene are marked once again by the silence of Hero. The exception is the early “He is of a very melancholy disposition” in the early line 6, which serves to highlight her presence, and the fact that she is indeed capable of speech. She is directly addressed by Leonatus in l.70, yet even then remains mute. Consistently, the long dialogue of Leonatus and Beatrice to which she is witness is not much more than amusing padding, which does not advance the allegory significantly.

The masque is a technique for establishing on the plane of allegory the identity of otherwise different characters. Margaret and Ursula (or Ursley: this variant is significant) are aspects of the (for now) sham Goddess Hero, and hence are both at this point negatively conceived. Margaret is the Queen of Hell (as in 1-3 HVI, RIII) and therefore is covalently bonded to Beatrice. The name

---

“Ursley” characterises the root “urs-” as an adjective. Chapter 40 will describe the significance of the bear as a key symbol in the Gnostic tradition (hence the otherwise enigmatic pursuit of Antigonus by a bear in *The Winter’s Tale* III, iii, and the reference to Sackerson, the tame bear, in *MWW* I, i); and “bear” in French is ours: and Ursley is the Goddess of the Gnostic tradition, – Isis, no less, who is cognate with Aeneas’ Dido (rejected) and Antony’s Cleopatra (embraced), - again negatively conceived. Don Pedro woos Hero. Benedict woos Margaret, to identify her with Beatrice. Consistently, she rejects him, and also Balthaser (from the Biblical Balthasar, one of the three Magi who were witness to the newborn Christ: hence also the Balthasars in *R&J* and *TCE*): for acceptance of the ithyphallic principle (Benedick) as will and idea would inaugurate a Gnostic Christhood. Ursley woos Antonio, who denies his identity: for the Antony principle is also a sham in the Goddess- (Cleopatra = Isis) repudiating ego. Benedict and Beatrice interact with barely suppressed acrimony.

The remainder of the scene is a long passage of several linked episodes whose purpose is to demonstrate the repudiation of the Fool principle by the Puritan ego. To the long list of Fools in *FF* we must now add the name of Benedick, for it is he who carries this weight, as ithyphallos-Fool combined, whereas in other plays the Fool principle is represented separately (e.g. Feste and Aguecheek in *T&C*):

Beatrice Why he is the Prince’s Jester, a very dull Fool, only his gift is in devising impossible slanders.

I. 142

Benedick Alas poor hurt fowl, now will he [Claudio] creep into sedges. But that my Lady Beatrice should know me, and not know me: the Prince’s Fool!

I. 209

These latter lines occur immediately after Claudio has quitted Benedick’s presence, which represents the epochal moment in question. Previously (161-189) Don John and Borachio (unconscious-libido) have addressed Claudio as Benedick, - to



---

must have evoked the Goddess of Love from the printed page, to excite the Boar to shatter the bars imprisoning it in the unconscious.

Don Pedro has announced his intention to act as matchmaker for Beatrice and Benedick. He will ensure that each that believes the other to be in love: and their meeting will be a “dumb show”. This means that the release of libido in the reader by Her evocation from the printed page, will be a trauma into which the ego lacks the insight which might have been provided by the Hermetic or Musical Arts. It will take place on the level of dream, unenlightened by reason and the written word.

Let us follow the sequence of events in the orchard. Benedick is expatiating on the horror of marriage, consistent with his allegorical value of the ithyphallic principle in negative aspect. He calls for his boy to fetch him a book. The boy answers, oddly: “I am here already, Sir”. Claudio, Leonato and Don Pedro now enter, with music playing. Benedick hides himself amid the trees. Balthaser appears: it is he who has been playing the music. He is requested to sing, and gives a song concerning the faithlessness of men, while yet protesting his poor voice. He agrees to sing in a similar vein, but in better voice, on the following night, below Hero’s window (when the substitution will take place). Benedick hears the trio warmly affirming Beatrice’s love for him; and he is convinced. Meanwhile, the boy has not returned.

The boy’s reply serves to indicate that the action to come is an allegory of internal thought-processes: his returning being “quick as a thought”, i.e. instantaneous: a simile that is used several times in the plays in just this connection. It is of the highest importance to appreciate that Benedick secreting himself in the bushes represents the ithyphallos-libido, - with the Goddess of Love implied, - perceived anew in the written word, to stimulate a like response in the reader (Shaksper, most likely reading the intensely erotic early episodes of Apuleius’ *The Golden Ass*: cf. the invitation to masque in *R&J*, which mentions “Lucio”): the orchard trees themselves representing the pages of the book (cf. all the other trees, groves, woods and forests in *FF*). Balthaser’s music announces the presence of libido, - more broadly the unseen world, as represented in the Gnostic text, - the recognition of which by the subject would make

---

of him a “True King”, or Gnostic Christ (cf. the implications of the title “Twelfth Night”): yet Balthaser is not in good voice, for here the lesson of the libido is rejected by the Puritan reader, its physical aspect rather predominating, negatively. Benedick now learns that Beatrice loves him, and he reciprocates. The balcony scene will be a look at the same psychic event (“charge of the Boar”) from a different angle. Benedick’s description of (Puritan) Claudio recalls (Puritan) Don Armado in LLL: “... and now he is turned ortography, his words are a very fantastical banquet, just so many strange dishes”. All is discord, which it will finally take the intervention of Friar Francis to bring to a harmonious resolution (Sir Francis Bacon’s education of Shaksper becoming Shakespeare from the darkness of Puritanism, to strip the Goddess, libido, and ithyphallos, of their negative mantles).

Awakening of the Benedick principle is concurrent with that of the sham Goddess. III, i, therefore takes place, on the plane of allegory, contemporaneously with II, iii.

### ACT III

i

In precisely the same orchard, Beatrice secretes herself in a “pleached bower/Where honeysuckles, ripen’d by the sun,/Forbid the sun to enter”. The Goddess of the Underworld is therefore being recognised by the reader in the text from which he had thought, in his thralldom to Pauline Christian puritanism, to banish her. Hero and Ursley are walking in an alley, their principles being born anew from the page into the ego. Hero represents the Goddess given form by the visual imagination, - the Goddess of the visible or phenomenal world, - and is therefore cognate with Bianca in TOS. Her volubility here signifies, in stark contrast to her erstwhile silence, that Nature is now beginning to speak to the ego. Her companion represents, consistently, Isis, the greatest of all Great Goddesses. It is Margaret – the Queen of Hell aspect of Hero – who has brought Beatrice to the orchard, to identify firmly Beatrice as herself an aspect of Hero.

The reader has imagined the Goddess of Love (Hero: visible world), in Whom the Queen of Hell (Beatrice: invisible world) now announces herself as a shadowy yet powerful presence (Beatrice

---

secreting herself in the bushes). He has identified with Her Consort (perhaps Lucius in *The Golden Ass*) as described by the words on the page (his seduction by Fotis), and is about to succumb to an inrush of libido. This is the “charge of the Boar”, which the following scenes will describe.

ii

The libido only gradually exerts its effect, as the subject is letting the imagined images work on him. This will culminate in an ithyphallos, but not until III, iii, 177: “We charge you in the Prince’s name, stand”. Benedick has a long conversation with Don Pedro, Claudio, and Leonato, on the theme of his new lovesickness (libido in gestational phase). Benedick draws Leonato aside to speak “eight or nine wise words” with him (libido in nascent phase, now manifest); and Don John the Bastard arrives to talk with Claudio and Don Pedro. On the plane of allegory these conversations are of course the same. The burden of Don John’s admonition is the unfaithfulness of Hero (pseudery of sham Goddess). The night to come, when Claudio will apprehend her wantonness, will represent, on the allegorical plane, the period of full ithyphallos, and consummation.

iii

Dogberry and Verges instruct the Watch to look out for vagrants, and bid them to stand “in the Prince’s [Don Pedro’s] name”. We have encountered this Watch before, in the final scenes of R&J, when they arrive at the scene of the tragedy accompanied by a Page. There they represent, of course, the visual imagination, and the Page the written word, which together will be called upon to rescue the stricken ego (death of Romeo), newly shattered by the collapse of his world with the sham Goddess at its heart (death of Juliet): and so it is in MAN. The Page does not appear here as a separate character, but as an attribute of the Watch (literacy of the Constables). This “musical” (in the Socratic sense) ability will not be called upon till somewhat later (III, v, 54), when Leonato will dismiss the uncommunicative Dogberry and Verges, and order them to bring him their examination of the culprits (Conrade and Borachio) in writing: for they represent at this stage the visual

---

imagination, which has given form to the Goddess of Love, and released the libido.

The names of Dogberry and Verges are wonderfully apt. The dogberry is the fruit of the dogwood plant; verjuice (whence “Verges”) the juice of an unripe fruit. The former is evidently the fruit of the orchard where Benedick and Beatrice lie secreted; his companion the juice derived therefrom to be imbibed by the reader, to his ultimate transformation. The root “Dog-” evokes this animal as an underworld symbol: for example, as in the black dog which the great Renaissance mage Cornelius Agrippa (1486-1535) – the recurrence of whose name in FF (e.g. Cornelia in TitA) suggests that Bacon-Shakespeare was aware of him – kept as his familiar (cf. “I would not hang a dog by my will”: 68).

Dogberry gives the Watch three examples of the work they are to do, each of which bears, - on the invariable principle of nothing fanciful, nothing adventitious, - great symbolic weight on the plane of allegory. At this stage the dream-image of the Goddess is unaccompanied by the insight provided by the Hermetic or Musical word:

Dogberry           ...for the Watch to babble and to talk, is most intolerable...

If they encounter a drunk, they are to let him go until he becomes sober; if a thief, not to lay hands on him; if a baby crying like a lamb, with the Nurse asleep, to ignore him. This advice is, to say the least, perplexing on the literal plane, wherein its significance does not however reside. The drunk is a clear reference to Borachio (libido); the thief to the Autolykus principle (cf. TWT) of the will-to-life at odds with the laws of the subject’s particular social group (as is the Gnostic’s in the community of the Pauline Church), - as justified by the Platonic Socrates in the Republic, with which Bacon must have been familiar. This lamb is the “Lamb of God”, the Christ, no less.

The Watch overhears Borachio telling Conrade of the deception (charge of the Boar) and orders them to “stand” (excitement of *ithyphallos*). They misunderstand one of the conspirators to be called “Deformed”. This is a clear reference to the Richard the Third

---

principle of the Boar that gored Shakespeare aet.23, and precipitated his flight from Stratford and his wife in search of healing in the metropolis.

iv

Hero asks Ursley to bid Beatrice to rise and come. She will rise, on the plane of allegory, from the honeysuckle bower (Goddess of the visible world becoming informed by the invisible, the world of the Church by that of Faust: Bianca by Katherina in TOS). Their follows a passage of witty badinage between Margaret and Hero whose every word is full of significance. Margaret is closely germane, remember, to Beatrice. Hero is dressing for her wedding. Margaret does not like ruff: an indication of the early transformation of the sham Goddess as ego concept under the influence of the Queen of Hell, an inviolable aspect of the Great Triple Goddess (Maiden, Woman, and Witch, as She was for the ancient pastoral-agrarian societies; Divine Bride, Sacred Mother, and Queen of Hell, for the more advanced). She believes the false hair in the headdress needs a little darker brown: a clear reference to the Kate Minola principle. Finally, she remarks that Hero's gown is like the Duchess of Milan's, only finer in every respect. Milan as a northern city of Italy represents, in the symbolic language of the plays, the higher reason of the ego that is become: i.e. self-delusively free of connection with Nature (cf. TGV). Hero is shocked by Margaret's earthy wit ("Twill be heavier soon by the weight of a man": 27). All in all, Hero is the sham Goddess par excellence, who will be rejected by the ego in transformation (Claudio). Beatrice and Margaret now engage in prolonged witty by-play (Queen of Hell becoming aspect of Goddess. Once again there appears the horse, symbol of the will-to-eros throughout the plays.

Beatrice What pace is this that thy tongue keeps?  
Margaret Not a false gallop.

v

Dogberry and Verges approach Leonato with news of their arrest of the suspects, but cannot get to the point (subject unable to commune with wisdom of the libido, or will-to-life, as a principle of

---

transformation). Leonato orders them to examine Borachio and Conrade, and bring him the results in writing; they call for the literate Constables (subject now able to commune with that wisdom, with the help of the written word, that art of especial predilection of the Faustian mind, as Oswald Spengler observed).

#### ACT IV

The final two Acts will see the ego cast off his unconscious as a dominant psychic principle (flight of Don John: cf. fate of Buckingham in RIII) and embrace the Goddess reborn (Hero) to become himself a Gnostic Christ (Claudio married to Hero); while Beatrice and Benedick are also married. The state of marriage represents here the completeness of being that Shakespeare achieved in his London phase, upon the remission of his disease (albeit in the acute phase: a subacute phase persisting, as is shown by HVIII and T&C).

His role in the rebirth of Hero, and therefore of Claudio (the limper: Shakespeare), and every word that he speaks, confirms the Friar's allegoric value as a representation of Sir Francis Bacon, Shakespeare's mentor and healer. It would make sense, a priori, if his speeches were to have been written by Bacon rather than Shakespeare; and their predominance of blank verse, the high philosophising, the richness of metaphor and language, all point to it. This coincidence of form and allegorical content suggests most powerfully the correctness of the theory of the division of labour between Bacon and Shakespeare advanced in these pages.

i

Friar Francis couches his introduction to the marriage service in deliberately neutral terms (objective enquiry of the therapist). Claudio asks "Stand thee by, Friar", before he repudiates Hero as a wanton, to anticipate the many "Shakespearean moments" of the tragic sequence, when the "double vision" of the beloved possesses the subject, to cast her as a whore (the first instance of which was RIII III, iv: "And this is Edward's wife, that monstrous witch,/Consorted with that harlot, strumpet Shore..."). Claudio here is Shakespeare newly acquainted, in his acute distress, with his healer, not earlier than 1587, the year of his arrival in London;

---

or more precisely, his reasoning mind that will engage the Goddess, while Leonato is the conscious ego as a whole. Bacon's first task was to rescue the Goddess from annihilation in the diseased ego:

Friar Francis [to Beatrice]     Have comfort, Lady.  
Leonato                             Dost thou [Hero] look up?  
Friar Francis                        Yea, wherefore should she not?

He then sets about divesting Her of the negative mantle she has worn in the diseased ego, using the written word, and his incomparable learning and philosophical acumen, as his prime therapeutic tool:

Friar Francis     Hear me a little,  
                          For I have only been silent so long,  
                          And given way unto this course of Fortune,  
                          By noting of the Lady... Call me a Fool,  
                          Trust not my reading, nor my observations,  
                          Which with experimental seal doth warrant  
                          The tenure of my book: trust not my age,  
                          My reverence, calling, nor divinity,  
                          If this sweet Lady be not guiltless here,  
                          Under some biting error.  
                          [...]  
                          Let her awhile be secretly kept in,  
                          And publish it that she is dead indeed...  
                          [...]  
                          Marry this well carried shall on her behalf  
                          Change slander to remorse, that is some good,  
                          But not for that dream I on this strange course,  
                          But on this travail look for greater birth...

Her rebirth, and with it Leonato's, is of course cognate with those of Hermione and Leontes, Imogen and Posthumus Leonatus, and Marina and Pericles, in TWT, CYM, and PER, those three magical dramas of Death and Resurrection; but the most striking relevance of MAN is to HAM, which represents the devouring hold



---

produced in the Nineties, - especially, of course, in MND, - which indicate the utter aptness of the journey of Lucius in Apuleius' magical masterpiece as a metaphor for Shakespeare's own breakdown and recovery, while stopping short of proving that it was in fact the trigger for the "charge of the Boar" that shattered his Puritan ego, with such dire results, aet.23. Now here we have evidence of a higher grade: for the written word in which the maypole and the Goddess unmistakably lay secreted would seem to be clearly identified with TGA (Dogberry – the fruit of the orchard, whence the juice (Verges) to be imbibed by the reader to transform him – as identified with Apuleius' ass, Lucius in his underworld phase, which corresponds to the rise of Beatrice principle (III, iv, 1) in the ego). Dogberry as ass is of course yet another Shakespearean Fool, as Conrade notes with derision: "Let them be in the hands of Coxcomb" (74). This cannot be writ down, for the reasoning ego has now left his Conrade (Puritan rationalist) period well behind; yet it should be (Dogberry's insistence): for the Fool principle in positive aspect is now being digested by the ego-in-transformation:

Dogberry I am a wise fellow... and a rich fellow enough, go to,  
and a fellow that hath had losses, and one that hath  
two gowns, and everything handsome about him.

The Fool-Ass principle has had losses at the hands of the Puritan, who has cast it in negative aspect (one of the two gowns). Nevertheless, there must remain some doubt that Dogberry as ass has an historical as well as metaphorical dimension in regard to the breakdown: for the orchard-fruit in theory could represent the hero, in whom both the Goddess and Her Consort are immanent, of any bawdy tale. TGA may have been the trigger for the coup, and later used as a therapeutic tool by Bacon ("O that I had been writ down as ass!"); or the latter only may be true. Yet its intensity and peculiar magic, and its Latin origin, which would have brought it to the notice of the Puritan (schoolmaster?) that was Shakespeare (albeit it had been available in a bowdlerised English translation since 1566), would commend its historical importance in the crucifixion of Will Shaksper:

---

The wine went to my head; but it also went to my thighs. I grew restive and, like a fallen soldier displaying a wound, pulled off my nightshirt and gave Fotis visible proof of my impatience. "Have pity on me," I said "and come quickly to my rescue. As you can see I'm well armed and ready for the merciless battle to which you challenged me, the sort of battle in which no herald can intervene to part the combatants. Since the first of Cupid's sharp arrows lodged in my heart this morning, I have been standing to arms all day, and now my bow is strung so tight that I'm afraid something will snap if the Advance isn't sounded pretty soon. However, if you want my battle-ardour to burn more fiercely still, you darling, let your hair down so that it ripples all over your neck and shoulders."

She snatched away the plates and dishes, pulled off every stitch of clothing, untied her hair and tossed it into happy disorder with a shake of her head. There she stood, transformed into a living statue: the love-Goddess rising from the sea. The flushed hand with which she pretended to screen her mount of Venus showed that she was well aware of the resemblance; certainly it was not held there from modesty.

"Now fight," she challenged me, "and you must fight hard, because I shall not retreat one inch, nor turn my back on you. Come on face to face if you're a man, strike home, do your very worst! Take me by storm, kill me, and die in the breach. No quarter given or accepted."

She climbed into bed, flung one leg over me as I lay on my back, and crouching down like a wrestler, assaulted me with rapid plungings of her thighs and passionate wriggings of her supple hips. My head swam. It was as though the apple-bough of love had bent down over me and I was gorging myself with the fruit until I could gorge no more; and at last with overpowered senses and dripping limbs Fotis and I fell into a simultaneous clinch, gasping out our lives.

However, after dosing ourselves with more wine, we presently revived and engaged in another style of unarmed

---

combat; and continuously renewed our sleepless struggle, with intervals for refreshment, until daybreak.

This was the first night of many that we spent in the same exhilarating though exhausting sport.

This passage occurs early (Chapter 3) in TGA, and it may well be imagined how it could have taken by surprise the Puritan reader, deluded as he was that he was embarked on another book of dry Latin philosophy. The above translation by Robert Graves captures beautifully the letter and spirit of the original, if it is the Latin that Shaksper was reading when the Boar charged. William Adlington's translation of 1566 spares the sensibilities of the reader. For example, *inguen*, *-inis* is Latin for "the groin", and *lacinia* "a flap of a garment": and Adlington translates *alioquin et petulans et iam saucius paulisper inguinum fine lacinia remota impatientiam Veneris Fotidi meae monstrans* as "...I showed to Fotis my great impatience..." (cf. par. 1 above). This is savage editing, which nevertheless cannot totally suppress the intense eroticism of the original. Either way, Hero-Beatrice in the orchard most plausibly could have been Fotis, and Benedick the contents of Lucius' *lacinia*, and TGA the trigger of the coup.

## ACT V

i

This scene consists of a series of tightly linked episodes portraying the crisis and remission of the subject's sickness. That way lies terminal schizophrenia (slaying of Claudio by Benedick, cognate with Hamlet's by Laertes); this way healing (victory of wit (Benedick's sword, with which he fails to kill Claudio) over sensibility, and recognition thereby of his error (deception of Don John and Borachio)).

Leonato's brother is the Old Man, the Adam principle of the truths of Nature – as based on the libido or unseen world - in negative aspect. He offers, in perpetuation of his negative value, the easy way out of the suffering ("If you go on thus, you will kill yourself,/And 'tis not wisdom thus to second grief/Against your old self"); but this would be to return to the past, when what is

---

required now is patience.

Leonato I pray thee cease thy counsaile...  
No, no, 'tis all men's office to speak patience  
To those that wring under the load of sorrow

This is underlined by the repetition of the Old Man's offer ("Make those that do offend you suffer too"), and its acceptance this time by Leonato, who however will shortly repudiate it ("No come, brother, away, I will be heard [by Claudio and Don Pedro]": 106). Claudio and Don Pedro have come in haste to Leonato (46), which signifies, in the language of the allegory, that this is describing a thought (cf. II, iii, 5). Yet it is Benedick to whom their visit intended (Benedick principle as a property of the ego). In other words, Leonato's repudiation of his brother is predicated, on the plane of allegory, on Claudio's of Benedick (ithyphallic principle as property of primal Man). Benedick's intent is neutralised by the witty talk of Claudio and Don Pedro: and we remember the brilliant observation by Oswald Spengler that sensibility prevails over wit in late-phase cultures, wherein the values of the City (economico-megalopolis) have corrupted those of Culture. Hence the immense contemporary appeal of Jane Austen (*Sense and Sensibility* &c.), the novelist the industrial revolution had to have, and a corruptive and utterly disabling influence on a generation of students. Her prevalence over the Brontes in modern education is a crime, the malign effects of which it will take generations to heal.

The Gnostic Christ in negative aspect has been banished as an active principle in the ego, and the Puritan Goddess recognised as a sham:

Benedick Your brother the Bastard is fled from Messina; you  
have, among you,  
kill'd a sweet and innocent lady...  
Exits

John the Bastard flees (libido divested of its negative mantle).

<sup>4</sup> Knight and Lomas, *The Second Messiah*.



---

Dogberry ...this plaintiff here, the defender, did call me ass.

---

ii

Wit and wisdom enliven this scene, as the ego-in-healing (Shakespeare act.23-5) understands anew the unseen world (Margaret) to lie below the surface of the visible (Benedick: ithyphallos). That is to say, the ithyphallos is being perceived anew as a Platonic Idea, and not merely an idea, as obtained in Shaksper's Tavern phase. This is being achieved through the written word: "Will you then write me a sonnet in praise of my beauty?" (Margaret to Benedick). The subject is acquiring divine wisdom, the Holy Spirit Herself, in learning to acknowledge the usages of the visible world as founded on the invisible:

Benedick Thy wit is as quick as the greyhound's mouth, it catches.

Margaret And yours as blunt as the fencer's foil, which hit, but hurt not.

Here is the sword again, as always in the plays, as symbol of the ithyphallos, which now is welcomed by the Queen of Hell: and we remember the character Sir Walter Blunt in 1 HIV who bears the same value ("Walter" being derived, as explicitly glossed in 2 HVI IV, i, from the French gaultier, "he who wields a long pole"). We remember also the Troilus principle in T&C, of the Goddess-repudiating ego who casts the Goddess of Love in aspect of a whore; and the sinking and magical resurrection of Antonio's ships in MOV (necessity for communion with underworld, of which the sea is an age-old symbol):

Benedick ...Leander the good swimmer, Troilus the first employer of pandars, and a whole book full of these quondam carpet-mongers... why they were never so truly turn'd over and over as my poor self in love.

iii-iv

---

Once again, the identity of the Friar with Sir Francis Bacon is confirmed: “Did I not tell you she was innocent?” Leonato, following his strategy, has told Claudio that he is to marry a daughter, whom we have never met, and remains unnamed, of the Old Man’s, his brother; whereas he will in truth be marrying Hero, who is therefore to be identified as the visible world newly recognised as born of the world as libido (Primal Man, homo libidensis) and closely germane to the underworld (Beatrice, the Old Man’s other daughter). Hero and Claudio are wed, along with Beatrice and Benedick (Shakespeare in London phase engaging with and honouring the truth of Nature, to bring about the healing of his shattered psyche through divestment of the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen and the libido of their negative mantles, as cast by Puritanism). Hitherto I have characterised Beatrice as a Queen of Hell; however, she is clearly revealing her true identity here as, rather, a Goddess of Love - a Fotis figure – in Whom the Queen of Hell is strongly immanent. Now the mantle of puritan guilt is removed from the act of Venus, and male and female principles are joined in the ego-in-transformation. This principle is celebrated in the Lovers card of the Tarot Major Arcana (see also Chs. 1, 26, 44). Bacon was a Freemason; and the Tarot, inherited from the Knights Templar,<sup>4</sup> was used in their program of instruction. It is he who has worked the miracle, with the help of the written word, and he who will come to analyse it all in FF, albeit with the early help of Marlowe and Kyd, the continuing help and seminal contributions of Shakespeare, and possibly the occasional contributions of others:

Benedick Friar, I must entreat your pains, I think.

[...]

Friar All this amazement can I qualify,  
When after that the holy rites have ended,  
I’ll tell you largely of fair Hero’s death,  
Meantime let wonder seem familiar,  
And to the Chapel let us presently.

[...]

Claudio ...For here’s a paper written in his [Benedick’s] hand,  
A halting sonnet of his own pure brain,  
Fashioned to Beatrice.

---

Hero      And here's another,  
          Writ in my cousin's hand, stol'n from her pocket,  
          Containing her affection unto Benedick.  
Benedick A miracle, here's our own hands against our hearts...

---

## CHAPTER 24

### THE MERRY WIVES OF WINDSOR

HV has been shown above to be a dramatisation of the troubled Will Shaksper's Welsh, or Tavern, or pseudo-Alexandrian phase of mid-adolescence. The Merry Wives of Windsor will be proven here to deal with the very same phase; as will Timon of Athens and Julius Caesar in later chapters. These four all have a significant Shakespearean component, in the case of MWW more than 90% of its content, to give a clear picture of the progression of his art since Mr Arden of Feversham.

The story is this. The solitary fastness of his bookish rationalist (Bolingbroke) phase of immediate post-pubesence having been shattered by the "charge of the Boar", and torturous auto-erotism; and its consequent phase of genteel sociability, with lengthy expatiations on religion, politics, war, and so on (HV I, i, 32: "Never was such a sudden scholar made...") having likewise been shattered by the Boar: then he finally admitted the libido as idea, not blind will (this is a crucial distinction), to enter his consciousness in positive aspect (Robin: see below), and, kicking over the traces, renounced his gentility and began associating with a tavern company, with much wine and conversation (the character of Burgundy in HV V), one-sided volubility (Hortensius in TimA, borrowed for his symbolic aptness from Plutarch's Life of Lucullus) on the lessons of literature (Lucullus in TimA, from Plutarch, *ibid.*), and glorying in the new role of spiritual advisor and prophet to his largely illiterate comrades (Flaminius in TimA, from Plutarch, *ibid.*). Yet he evidently paid only lip-service to the newly discovered libido (the fate of Falstaff in MWW: see below) – or rather, the Journey of the Hero as described in literature, particularly Plutarch's Life of Alexander, the goal of which was the libido in its broad sense of unseen world or Faustian dimension (cf. the "I" principle in 1-3HVI) - and continued to repudiate it as a transforming principle in his own psyche. He became, in defence against the underworld, source of the Boar, an expert on the Journey of the Hero without ever himself making it:

---

hence the essential fragility of this new coping mechanism. This phase was marked by intense visualisation and spiritualisation of his heroes and their underworld adventures (Fluellen in HV); yet he remained a mere onlooker, and failed to develop Platonic Ideas in the true hero's way. The character of Lucius in TimA brings more clearly into focus just what he would have talked about in those days: the graphically described seduction of Lucius by Fotis in Apuleius' *The Golden Ass* evidently being a beautiful example. Finally, with re-irruption of libido from the subconscious (TimA I, ii, 120), where it has remained in negative aspect, despite the cope of pseudo-Gnostic nobility provided by the ego, this phase is terminated (Timon's expulsion from Athens in TimA).

The various well-known but hitherto unverifiable Stratford traditions concerning the young Shakespeare find a perfect home in this scenario: that he was responsible for the satirical verses which were nailed to the gates of the notorious Puritan Sir Thomas Lucy; that he was a member of a Stratford drinking team which took on the Bidford Topers, and later spent all that night insensible under a crab tree which became known as "Shakespeare's crab"; and that he was rusticated from Stratford as an alternative to gaol after being convicted of poaching from Lucy's estate, and sent to work as a country schoolmaster. So then, was it the re-irruption of libido in negative aspect, or the conviction, or both, which brought to end Shaksper's Tavern phase? A likely scenario would be that the wine in moderation and conversation (as described by Plutarch of the young Alexander) of the early phase declined into drunkenness and criminal activity after the psychic upheaval of the re-irruption of libido ("charge of the Boar", albeit not at this point into an ego catastrophically disarmed by Puritanism, as later would occur aet.23). That the forced sundering from the tavern milieu befell him aet.15, as suggested by the histories, is confirmed by TOS Ind.2, 112 (see below). Hereafter the sham tonic of Puritanism would harden progressively in his veins, till their shattering by yet another "charge of the Boar" from the unconscious, aet.23 (also confirmed by TOS), – just as pulverised the ill-founded tower of Lear Inc.

One really interesting revelation of MWW as allegory is the utter centrality of the written word (this is the symbolic value of the Page

---

family, like all the other Pages without exception in the plays, as well as Birnham Wood in Macbeth, the grove near Berkely Castle in RII, Ariel's tree, and so on) to the inner life of William Shaksper from the time of puberty, and perhaps before. Shakespeare certainly was literate and relatively well-read, and a budding writer, in his Stratford phase, and his scholarship and art thrived later on the London milieu; yet Bacon was certainly the greater writer, - the master, - especially in the early years, as a comparison of his Titus Andronicus (written possibly as early as 1587, which would have been the first year of their relationship) with Shakespeare's Mr. Arden of Feversham (Quarto, 1592) will show; and if the latter's writing developed to such an extent that he became, as shown in these pages, a significant contributor to FF, then it would have been due to Bacon's inspirational example and teaching.

Was it the intensely erotic episodes of The Golden Ass which triggered the re-irruption of libido in negative aspect into the young (RII –HIV) Shakespeare, and which became important (in positive aspect) to the Welsh (HV) phase described in MWW? MAN strongly suggests so. What is absolutely certain, however, is its utter centrality to MWW as the cornerstone of its philosophy (and not merely as a source of comic episodes, such as Falstaff's distraintment in a buck-basket), in the same way as was Homer's Odyssey to James Joyce's Ulysses, the second greatest Journey of the Hero in Western literature.

With its focus exclusively on Shakespeare's mid-adolescent pre-Puritan period, the personal tone of the intimate examination of his milieu intérieur, the overwhelming predominance of prose, and relative absence of the high philosophical speculation, linguistic richness, and knowledge of the Court and Law, that are unmistakable traits of the high style of Bacon, - there can be no doubt that MWW came mostly from the pen of Shakespeare, albeit the guiding Baconian influence is strongly felt, for example, in the allegoric value of "Caius" as "keys", sourced from the pronunciation of Caius College Cambridge, his university. The frequency of the local Stratford patois in MWW indeed points to him as the author, as the Stratfordians so often adduce as a key plank of their solo-authorship position, their final conclusion being

---

yet far from the truth.

## ACT I

Justice Shallow (see 1&2HIV) is a Justice of the Peace. This is the peace that is founded on denial, repudiation or ignorance of the Faustian depth of Nature, over which rules the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen. This is the world that lies unseen below the surface of things, the elucidation of which we now take for granted in the work of the modern scientists, artists, and depth psychologists, yet which the Puritan and Roman Catholic world-views continue to deny, as they did even more powerfully in the 16<sup>th</sup> century. He represents the dominant aspect of Shakespeare's higher mentation in his bookish ascetic (Bolingbroke) and genteel phases, up to and including his Tavern or pseudo-Alexandrian phase, aet.15, which is the subject of MWW. This chronology is confirmed in the Induction to *The Taming of the Shrew*, where the term of estrangement of Christopher Sly (who represents Shakespeare) is given variously as 7, 15, and 30 years: corresponding to the year of the coup (1587: for TOS was written in 1594); the year of Shakespeare's forced sundering by Sir Thomas Lucy from his tavern companions and his pseudo-Alexandrian Journey of the Hero (aet.15); and the year of his birth, respectively. Shakespeare will solve the problem of how to represent the essential pseudery of this foredoomed new phase by having Shallow's cousin Abraham Slender (faculty of spiritualisation) in Act V marry and yet not marry Anne Page, the Goddess of Love as revealed by the written word. Shallow could further be associated, consistently with his allegoric value, with Shakespeare's Puritan phase (aet.15-23) which included the term of his employment as a country schoolmaster (as seems likely), his seduction of (RIII, I, ii) and marriage to Anne Hathaway, and the catastrophic breakdown aet.23 (RIII, III, iv) which precipitated his flight to London: and Shakespeare makes this explicit, with his choice of twelve white luces (freshwater pike) for Shallow's coat of arms. Twelve quartered gives three, the number of luces in the the coat of Shakespeare's erstwhile nemesis, the Puritan Sir Thomas Lucy:

Slender I may quarter, coz.

Shallow You may, by marrying.

---

Evans      It is marring indeed, if he quarter it.

That Act I, scene i, of this play is set in precisely the time frame of HV I, i, is supported by the presence of the Welsh parson Sir Hugh Evans, who will be shown to be cognate with Fluellen in the latter. Both represent the faculty, highly developed in the Welsh intellectual, of spiritualisation. To spiritualise is to render and hold exclusively in the visual imagination. Hence the fragility also of this peace, which blind Cupid in negative aspect, welling from the darkness of the unconscious, remains likely to irrupt. That the libido in negative aspect has remained a problem for the ego in its genteel phase is shown by the conflict between Falstaff (homo libidensis, Man-as-sublimated-animal, Dionysian Man) and Shallow, which Evans now offers to resolve:

Evans      ...If Sir John Falstaff have committed disparagements unto you, I am of the Church, and will be glad to do my benevolence, to make atonements and compromises between you.

This healing (ultimately a sham) will be predicated on the recognition (marriage) by the still-denying ego (of Abraham Slender, Shallow's cousin...) of the Goddess of Love, in Whom the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen is immanent, as most powerfully presented by the erotic early chapters of *The Golden Ass* (...to Anne Page: "Anne" being, as Robert Graves has shown, possibly the oldest all-inclusive name of the Goddess, and also, highly significantly, the name of Shakespeare's future wife; while Shallow is germane to Puritanism: so that the conflict described in *MWW* is essentially the same as returned to afflict Shakespeare in the terminal phase of his malady).

Evans      It were a goot motion if we leave our pribbles and prabbles, and desire a marriage between Master Abraham and Mistress Anne Page.

The name "Abraham" suggests here the notion of exile, albeit Abraham, the founder of the Hebrew race, lived many centuries

---

before the Jewish captivity. That this is the true symbolic value of Slender's first name is supported by Evans in III, i, 23: "Whenas I sat in Babylon", - in the context of the earliest stage of the ego's true and lasting healing, which however will be rejected (arrival of Page, Shallow, Slender, Caius, Host, and Rugby). Master Page represents the ideas generated from the printed word; Mistress Page, the Goddess (Nature) described therein, on which these ideas are founded. Ford and his wife serve as qualifiers of the allegoric value of the Pages: for the "ford" symbolises here, as always in FF, the engagement of Nature (cf. Joyce's Anne Livia Plurabelle) as the initiate crosses from the nearer bank of ignorance to the farther of enlightenment (this is an age-old metaphor of world myth with which Bacon would certainly have been familiar), - to be contrasted at all times in the plays to the principle of disengagement - denial, repudiation, ignorance - represented by the "bridge" (hence the symbolic opposition of Oxford and Cambridge: the latter the home of Puritanism). In a wonderfully intricate and faultless net of allegory, Falstaff's two humiliating episodes with Mistress Ford, in the context of the hostility of Master Ford, correspond to the (Freudian) repression from the ideating mind of the will-to-eros in negative aspect, by Shakespeare in his Bolingbroke and genteel phases; while the Fairy rite, which will end in Falstaff going off "to laugh this sport over by a country fire" (V, v, 235), - in the context of Ford's renewed trust in his wife, and the ruining of the Host, who represents Shakespeare's will to restrict the libido (like a garter: hence the Garter Inn) in his earlier phases, - represents the new integration of libido in positive aspect into the ego by its spiritualisation. This latter will be the dominant mode of the Tavern phase. Mistress Page-Ford then is the Great (Triple) Goddess in toto of the written word, and may be taken to be, as in negative mantle, the Virgin Mary - the true Goddess mutilated, Her Grail Queen aspect extirpated to leave the eternal maiden - in the first two bestings of Falstaff, and the Goddess Isis in the Fairy rite. Anne Page is the Goddess of Love, in Whom the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen is immanent (cf. Ted Hughes' metaphor of the hologram for the Triple Goddess - in which Her three aspects are continuously present, yet with one to the fore at any one time). Nicholas Fenton is Cupid or Eros (see below); and his true marriage to her in V, v, represents the

---

recognition of the libido – broadly, the will-to-life, or unseen world - as inherent in the Goddess. This was the great theme of the Cupid and Psyche myth in *The Golden Ass*, written around the time of barbaric depredations of Theodosius c. 400 A.D. in the name of the Pauline Church, whose message was (and continues to be) precisely the opposite.

The judgements of the ego-in-denial have informed these ideas; though not strongly enough, for the true Goddess and Her Consort/Son Dionysius have been released from their prison of repression by the written word:

Page ...I thank you for my venison, Master Shallow.

Shallow ... Much good do it your heart! I wished your venison better...

Page will continue to the final scene of the play to maintain his support for Slender as a husband for his daughter Anne. Slender will be described characterised as having a “little wee face, with a little yellow beard” (I, iv), to identify him with the husband falsely depicted by Psyche (who represents the eponymous principle) to mislead the wicked sisters (the inspiration here for the Mistresses Page and Ford) in *TGA*, whereas her true husband is in fact Eros (Cupid), with whom she will eventually be reunited, - as Nicholas Fenton is with Anne in *MWW*, - after an exemplary harrowing of Hell, like Odysseus, the Gnostic Christ, Dante, and so on, and Bottom in ass guise in *MND*.

The circumstances of the libido’s offence are now described; and here are the usual suspects: the ithyphallos-libido in negative aspect, the will to flaccidity, and the will to resist orgasm, in the context of auto-erotism (these last two constructions of the conscious ego): Pistol, Nym and Bardolph, respectively. They are accused of stealing from Slender (signifying the depowering of his principle) after getting him drunk (dissolution in libido, as always in *FF*) in the Garter Inn (conscious constriction of the libido). Yet they protest their innocence, as Falstaff does not: for the ego-in-denial has been ambushed by the ineluctable libido, without resulting in an ithyphallos and its consequence of auto-erotism, which would have been resisted in vain by the Bardolph factor, as of old (1&2

---

HIV):

Shallow Knight, you have beaten my men, killed my deer, and  
broke open my lodge.

Falstaff But not kissed your keeper's daughter?

Shallow Tut, a pin! This shall be answered.

Falstaff I will answer it straight. I have done all this.

Consummation evidently has not been achieved: the Bardolph factor prevailing, for now. Yet this recurring psychic trauma must end; another coping mechanism is called for.

Apuleius fits perfectly the description of the typical magus. He is mentioned several times by Augustine as being a miracle-worker; was held to have supernatural powers; grew his hair long (like the Merovingian kings); had a broad Attic schooling in natural philosophy, mathematics, dialectic, &c.; kept a sacred object which he would reveal to no-one; was prosecuted (unsuccessfully) for using magic powers for the purposes of carnal seduction; and so on. Certainly TGA, like the work of the greatest Hermetic artists such as Bacon, Coleridge, Mallarmé, and so on, possesses this miraculous power to effect psychic transformation; and its spirit infuses also the closing scenes of HVIII.

The point of the bear in *The Winter's Tale* as an Hermetic symbol (the soul of the great destroyer Set, or Typhon, in Egyptian religion was held to reside in the sign of *Ursus Major*, the Great Bear) will be described below (Ch.40). Here it appears in corrupt aspect as the tame bear Sackerson (Consort/Son of the sham Goddess from whose Triple wholeness the Queen of Hell has been excised), whose submission to Slender symbolises beautifully the relation of the underworld to the ever-spiritualising ego:

Slender [to Anne] That's meat and drink to me now. I have  
seen Sackerson loose twenty times, and have taken  
him by the chain.

One thinks irresistibly of the horse in Picasso's *Guernica*, which symbolises the death throes of the cavalier or gentleman, blasted into history by the Queen of Hell (the bombs of the Spanish Civil

---

War; and Slender is in fact referred to in II, iii, 67, as “Cavaliero”).

ii - iii

Evans asks Slender’s appropriately named servant Simple to ask Mistress Quickly to intercede on his master’s behalf with Anne Page. Simple’s name is Peter, who represents, like all his namesakes without exception in FF, the Pauline or Roman Church: for the ego is struggling to cope with the lure of auto-erotism and its consequent psychic torment (represented by Lovell – “love-hell” – in RIII and HVIII), - whose ultimate source is Christian puritanism. MWW records the breaking of this typical puritan cycle of lust and torment, in which the constriction of the libido (to correspond with the youthful Alexander’s celibacy as described in Plutarch’s Life) will be achieved by psychologically healthier means (spiritualisation), albeit every bit as futile in the end. Hence the host of the Garter Inn (the conscious will to constrict the libido) will part Bardolph from Falstaff, and Pistol and Nym will refuse to carry Falstaff’s libidinous messages to the Mistresses Page and Ford. Rather, it is Falstaff’s page Robin, who symbolises, like Robin Goodfellow in MND, the ithyphallic principle (unseen world) in positive aspect, as described by the written word, which will supply the images for the spiritualisation by the ego of the Grail Queen. The introduction of Robin at this point – while the ego is still in the grip of its habits of old (the first two bestings of Falstaff) - is a beautiful strategy, as showing the psyche to be in a process of transformation: the third humiliation of Falstaff in the Fairy rite being like the final breakthrough into light after the struggle (first two humiliations) of the tunnelling out of the gaol.

iv

The name of Dr. Caius is pronounced “keys”, as it is in Caius College Cambridge (Bacon’s university), and he employs Mistress Quickly as his housekeeper. Mistress Quickly is the Goddess of the auto-erotist, the Goddess of Love evoked in the imagination (as in 1&2 HIV). Her name “Nell” tolls the petit-mort; her surname needs no explanation. Dr. Caius therefore is the gaoler, and Mistress Quickly his prisoner, for the role of his principle is to keep the Goddess of the auto-erotist suppressed. She is accompanied by John Rugby, whose surname is

---

formed from “rug” and “by”, the former being the pubic hair: hence he represents the flaccid phallos, an interpretation reinforced by his keeping of his rapier (a ithyphallic symbol throughout the Complete Plays e.g in HAM V and HVIII II, iv) outside in the porch.

If Slender is cognate with the sham husband in the Cupid and Psyche myth in TGA, then Nicholas Fenton is the true husband, and thus bears the symbolic weight of Cupid or Eros himself. Mistress Quickly is cognate with Anne Page (Goddess of Love) in the context of auto-erotism: therefore “never a woman in Windsor knows more of Anne’s mind than I do” (124); but the context has changed:

Mistress Quickly	Farewell to your worship.
	Exit Fenton
loves	Truly, an honest gentleman. But Anne
well as	him not, for I know Anne’s mind as
What have I	another does. Out upon’t!
forgot?	

The answer is that she has forgotten, in service as she is to Caius, her allegoric role as the Goddess of the auto-erotist, and therefore the attraction of Anne Page to Fenton. Caius is therefore revealed as a sham: for the sundering of Eros from the Goddess is a mere delusion of the ego desperate for healing.

## ACT II

The libido had been denied during the few years of Shakespeare’s early adolescence, due to the inveterate negative mantle imposed upon it by Pauline Christian puritanism from his earliest years; and now it has swollen again (Falstaff’s advances to Mistresses Ford and Page for the purpose of solvency: money representing, as always in FF as allegory, the power of a principle). The resurgence in the ego of the will to ithyphallos confirms that this is so (Pistol’s account to Ford of Falstaff’s letters, which he accepts), while the conscious will to flaccidity (the reverse side of the coin), associated with genteel high thinking (Nym’s harping on “humours”), denies it (Nym’s similar account to Page, which he cannot credit). It is time now to

---

explain Nym's constant use, both here and in HV, of the word "humour": e.g. "...I like not the humour of lying. He hath wronged me in some humours. I should have borne the humoured letter to her...I love not the humour of bread and cheese – and there's the humour of it." (II, i, 120-8). Flaccidity is associated, in the ascetic and genteel minds, with principled, philosophical, subtle reasoning; whereas the ithyphallos is associated with grossness. Another way of putting it is that the former represents the immortal side of Man (Apollo or Castor), the latter the mortal (Dionysius or Pollux). It will be the task of the hero in his journey (Lucius in TGA, Hal in HV, Theseus/Lysander in MND, Nicholas Fenton in MWW) to thread this Scylla and Charybdis and attain to the Island of the Sun (apprehension of Isis, marriage to Katherine, marriage to vocal Hippolyta/Hermia, marriage to Anne Page, respectively); and then sail back, and in the everyday world to be both Apollo and Dionysius, or Castor and Pollux: just as Socrates recommended in Plato's Republic, which Bacon undoubtedly mined for its symbolic possibilities, just as he did Plutarch (cf. the significance of music in TOS, and of Autolycus in TWT, both taken from the Republic). In other words, the patient will finally attain to a state of Faustian becoming, rather than become (unlike the Buddha, who has attained to the Island of the Sun and stayed there); yet Troilus and Cressida, as a portrait of Shakespeare's (not Bacon's) creative mentation, with its recurring declension from become (city of Troy) to becoming (Greek camp; field of battle), shows by how far Shakespeare fell short of the perfect outcome (see HVIII; TT): on which comparative failure the sonnet "The expense of spirit in a waste of shame" is a poignant comment. The conscious will to restrict the libido (Host of the Garter Inn) is aware that the ideas generated by the erotism of written word (e.g. TGA) are about to flood the ego (Ford's request to the host to tell Falstaff that his name is Brook). Mistress Page puts the allegoric role of the Host in a nutshell in: "... and lead him [Falstaff] on with a fine-baited delay till he hath pawned his horses to mine host of the Garter": where the horse and rider symbolises, as always, the libido in action. The name "Brook" signifies this inundation: the symbolism being of the "ford" through the River of Life – the

---

conscious crossing from the nearer bank of ignorance to the farther of enlightenment - being subsumed by it: the world as idea regressing to the world as will; but here this threat will spawn a defence (later revelation of the true identity of Brook as Ford). This resurgence of libido threatens to end in auto-erotism, as always:

Mistress Page            You are come to see my daughter Anne?  
Mistress Quicklyl, forsooth; and, I pray, how does good  
   Mistress Anne?  
Mistress Page            Go in with us and see. We have an hour's  
   talk with you.

- For Mistress Quickly will be their messenger to Falstaff, albeit to the end of his suppression. "I" for "Ay" stands here, as always, for the ithyphallos, more broadly the unseen world. The will to restrict the libido is instantaneously stimulated by the ego's apprehension of its imminent flooding by it (Ford's request to the Host to pass him off as Brook to Falstaff).

ii

Falstaff refuses to pay Pistol (ego is now constructing a coping mechanism whereby the natural end of the resurgent will-to-eros in ithyphallos will be subverted). Robin introduces Mistress Quickly, who informs Falstaff that Mistress Ford will meet him for a tryst when her husband is away (the ithyphallic principle – unseen world - in positive aspect is now in the ascendancy, yet still is associated in the fearful ego with auto-erotism and its sequelae of torment and self-contempt, which will see suppressed the will-to-eros as a transforming principle in the ego, albeit it is celebrated on the spiritual plane: wherein lies the essence of the pseudery of this particular Journey of the Hero, and the seeds of its failure beyond the short term). The surging libido tempts the subject toward auto-erotism ("I pray your worship, come a little nearer this ways": Mistress Quickly, 48); and immediately the choice is given to the ego in turmoil of the ithyphallos in negative (as will) or positive (as idea) aspects (Falstaff indicating Pistol and Robin: 50): whereupon comes the strategy outlined above (inveigling of Falstaff by Mistress Quickly into the plot to do away with him).

---

iii

A duel between Caius and Evans is adumbrated: for the will to suppress the Goddess of the auto-erotist is at first threatened by the admission of Her and the ithyphallos in positive aspect into consciousness, albeit on the spiritual plane. However, Evans in the following scene will persuade Caius to embrace amity: for the still-suffering ego is constructing this new coping mechanism whereby both may be accommodated.

### ACT III

Here is another beautiful cryptographic cameo. Evans is musing in a field outside Frogmore. He orders Simple “most vehemently” to search out Caius in the town. He sings to himself Christopher Marlowe’s *The Passionate Shepherd* to his Love:

He sings

To shallow rivers, to whose falls  
Melodious birds sing madrigals.  
There wil we make our peds of roses,  
And a thousand fragrant posies.  
To shallow –

- Which brings him to tears. Page, Shallow and Slender enter, coming over a stile from Frogmore. Evans, on seeing them, hurriedly picks up a book and asks Simple to give him his scholar’s gown, or else keep it in his arms. Caius, the Host and Rugby now enter, and Evans and Caius move initially to begin their duel; but Evans sues for his friendship, which Caius accepts. Slender is all time expressing his longing for Anne Page.

What is going on here? The presence of Peter Simple from the start gives the key. The ego-in-healing (his Prince Hal or pseudo-Alexandrian phase) is recognising anew the will-to-eros in positive aspect. Yet herein lies a threat, founded on his inveterate Pauline Christian puritanism (Peter Simple), which prompts him desperately to maintain his habit of auto-erotism under lock and key (summoning of Caius). Marlowe’s poem is an affirmation of Man-as-sublimated-animal, or Dionysian, or Falstaffian Man -

---

where inheres the threat - and turns up the volume to the inward hearing of Schopenhauer's harmonious tetrachord (Ch.1). Emotion, as manifest here by Evans, is associated with engagement of the lowest chakras of Hindu Kundalini yoga: so that the ego is here at the first stage of enlightenment (corresponding to the pre-Harfleur Hal in HV, where Harfleur –“heart's flower” – represents the heart chakra). The ego's immediate reaction is to turn to studiousness (Evans taking up a book – possibly TGA, but certainly not the Bible, as the editor of one edition so confidently asserts – and demanding his gown, which is offered to him, significantly, by Simple, who bears the symbolic weight of the Church: for herein lies its unconscious cause), - wherein the quality of spirit is emphasised, though not soul. The symbolism of Frogmore is not hard to discover. The suffix “-more” is homophonous with the French mort, “death” (as in “Walter Whitmore”, 2 HIV IV, i); while “frog” is of course a colloquialism for “Frenchman” (referring here to Caius). The town of Frogmore is therefore where the will to keep himself secure from dissolving into blind libido, and its consequence of auto-erotism, would to cease to be relevant, if the ego in healing were only to keep his nerve and ascend through the stages of psychic transformation, for the first of which The Passionate Shepherd stands; but the connexion between eros and sin, writ deep in the tables of his subconscious, is too ingrained. Slender is thin for the same reason as is Cassius in Julius Caesar (who represents therein precisely the same principle): they think too much, in the Apollonian sense of vivid, hard-edged visual imagining (as is Evans, poring over his book), - to which their bodies conform, on the Hermetic principle of “As without, so within”. The new-found Evans-Caius friendship provides the quintessence of the new coping mechanism: the sweeping under a carpet of profound troubles, with the Queen of Hell in negative aspect at their root. This will later be symbolised by Ford's beating of Falstaff disguised as the witch of Brainford.

ii

It is emphasised that the ithyphallic principle as idea, new-stripped of its negativity, is in the ascendancy, albeit spiritualised:

---

Mistress Page You [Robin] were wont to be a follower [i.e. as Falstaff's diminutive Page] but now you are a leader.

Ford's prominent speaking role indicates that ideation is fully at work, perhaps on the lessons of TGA. Page makes crystal clear the identity of Nicholas Fenton as Eros or blind Cupid: "He kept company with the wild Prince and Poins. He is of too high a region, he knows too much".

Host What say you to young Master Fenton? He capers, he dances, he has eye of youth, he writes verses, he speaks holiday, he smells April and May.

iii

The Mistresses Page and Ford, with Robin prominent, will lead on Falstaff only to trick him and dispose of him. Master Ford is learnt to be approaching. Falstaff first hides behind the arras, a move precisely cognate with his similar actions in 1&2 HIV, and with Polonius' in Hamlet, as symbolising the psychic repression of libido (à la Freud). The new coping mechanism has achieved its purpose of suppressing from the written word the blind libido as an active principle in the psyche :

Evans If there be anypody in the house, and in the chambers, and in the coffers, and in the presses, heaven forgive my sins at the day of judgement.  
Caius By gar, nor I too. There is nobodies.

iv

The ego pins everything on his maintenance of hard-edged ideation, whose power blind Eros threatens to subvert:

Fenton He [Page] doth object I am too great of birth, And that, my state being galled with my expense, I seek to heal it only by his wealth.

Yet Eros still is linked to the Goddess of Love, despite His



---

iii

Bardolph announces to the Host that a party of Germans wish to ride his horses to the Court, to see their newly arrived Duke. The Host vows to charge them for it. Later (scene v) it will emerge that there is no Duke at all, and that the Germans have absconded with the horses. The horse-and-rider symbolises, throughout FF, the libido in action, as sourced from Plato's *Phaedrus*. The Host of the Garter Inn naturally wishes, on the allegorical plane, to appropriate their power (the fee) to himself; but in vain, for Shakespeare's new coping mechanism (spiritualisation) will allow the libido as idea to be honoured, though not succumbed to as blind will. Now the problem has been solved (or rather, swept under the carpet); and the sea-change is registered in the breaking of the power of the Host ("I am undone!" IV, v, 85), who in a volta-face will be paid by Fenton to arrange a priest for his marriage to Anne Page (recognition of libido by psyche: a development inspired by the Cupid and Psyche myth in TGA). Yet the essential pseudery of this new phase is allegorised in the absence of the Duke.

iv

The ego's accustomed repudiation of the libido in negative aspect as described in the written word is symbolised by Falstaff's expulsion, upon the entrance of Ford (ideas generated by engagement of Nature in the written word) from the house of Mistress Ford/Page (Goddess or Nature presented by the written word: e.g. the erotic scenes of TGA, from which the ego of old would have recoiled). Both times he has ended up in the Garter Inn; but the Host has now been "undone" by the ego's new-found pseudo-Alexandrian (-Gnostic) nobility (the Germans will be likened to "Dr. Faustuses" in IV, v, 65): and the libido's transformation into positive aspect, through the written word ("And did he send you both these letters at an instant?" 2), will be marked by the Fairy rite of Act V, from which the ego will emerge with the libido as idea integrated into its world-view ("Good husband, let us every one go home,/And laugh this sport o'er by a country fire,/Sir John and all": V, v, 234).



---

Host      Conceal them, or thou diest.

- Where "I" for "Ay" stands for the unseen world, which is manifest in the maypole ("I may not conceal them..."). The name of the card game primero is derived ultimately from the Latin primus, "first", with the connotation "one", or "alone"; and the symbolic value of the Duke of Suffolk in the historical cycle is of the ithyphallic principle: hence to play "primero with the Duke of Suffolk", - as the King (Shakespeare) was described as doing in HVIII V, i , - means to indulge in auto-erotism. The libido has been extinguished from the consideration of the subject since his suppression of the will to auto-erotism at puberty:

Falstaff    I never prospered since I forswore myself at primero.

Bardolph has been left behind by the Germans on horseback (the will to resist orgasm, in the context of auto-erotism and its torturous sequelae, is deposed as a ruling principle in the psyche: the temptatation having been defeated by spiritualisation. Consistently with the allegory, it is Caius and Evans who announce to the Host that the Germans have absconded. The will to sunder the libido from Nature subsides (ruination of the Host of the Garter Inn) as they are reunited per the written word (and offers to help Fenton in his marriage to Anne Page).

## ACT V

It is highly significant that Mistress Quickly is the Queen of the Fairies and Pistol a hobgoblin in the fairy rite: for it is the threat of auto-erotism and the maypole or ithyphallic principle in negative aspect which are driving the suppression of blind libido from the ego. Mistress Quickly's speech of exhortation to the elves (V, v, 54) has been explained as a topical reference by the commentators. Undoubtedly so it was; and as such was an ideal cryptographic cover (as was the episode of the three Germans) for a deeper meaning: namely, the persistence of the Garter principle as a restrictor of the will-to-eros, in a way germane to its restriction in Shakespeare's Host phase of immediate post-pubesence, albeit this phase has now passed into another, no more effective in the

---

long term.

The colour green is associated with the unconscious throughout FF (as is Ireland, whose colour is green); and white is the colour of the moon as symbolic of the phenomenal universe, whereas its blackness is symbolic of the will or unseen world. Hence the boy intended for Caius, as a decoy to enable Anne Page to be taken by Fenton (Cupid or Eros, to render her the Goddess of Love), will be dressed in green, for the will to suppress auto-erotism is acting on the unconscious plane; while Slender's will be in white.

Now the libido as idea will be cheerfully acknowledged by the ego in the written word, while at the same time being suppressed as the ego-dissolving principle of blind will:

Page        Yet be cheerful, knight [Falstaff]. Thou shalt eat a  
              posset tonight at my house, where I will desire thee to  
              laugh at my wife that now laughs at thee.

- A juggling act which never had a hope in the longer term. This new phase of Shakespeare's adolescence would indeed be marked by cheerfulness and conviviality (cf. the character of Burgundy in HV, V, where his allegoric value is of alcohol); and more, as the local tradition of his involvement in a Stratford drinking team who took on the Bidford toppers in a "scull", after which he and his teammates spent the night insensible under a crab tree which later became known as "Shakespeare's crab", - would attest. It would also be marked by oratory, even logorrhoea (Hortensio in TimA, taken from the orator of that name in Plutarch, a rich mine of symbols for Shakespeare or, as always, his healer and teacher Bacon).

---

<sup>1</sup> Life of Marcus Brutus.

---

## CHAPTER 25

### JULIUS CAESAR

Julius Caesar was written in 1599, not too long before HAM, with which it is often twinned. Yet the critics have failed to notice the real nature of their kinship, which lies in the status of the former as an allegory of Shakespeare's Tavern or pseudo-Alexandrian phase of mid-adolescence. The victory of Octavius at Philippi (Act V) represents the termination of this phase aet.15 (TOS Ind.2, 79, confirms this age precisely), and the beginning of the ascendancy of Puritanism as the young Shaksper's last coping mechanism against the "charge of the Boar", which phase would end aet.23 (TOS Ind.1, 120) with the catastrophic breakdown described in RIII III, iv. He would recover, albeit incompletely (cf. HVIII; T&C), under the tutelage of Sir Francis Bacon; yet the latter, who had evidently been mulling over for some time the problem of the Puritanism-psychosis nexus, would realise Shakespeare's anxiety-depression condition to be germane to, even an earlier stage in, the more severe disease that is now called paranoid schizophrenia, the aetiology, pathogenesis, crisis, and untreatable chronicity of which would form the subject of, first, the ur-Hamlet, written at a very early stage of their relationship, and later the magnificent final product.

JC would appear initially to be a faithful dramatisation of the relevant episodes in Plutarch, so that its primary status as allegory would seem to be doubtful. Yet a more careful second glance reveals some glaring departures, which would set the alert reader's antennae, by now thoroughly attuned to the underlying strategy of FF, positively to throbbing. The comparisons are scepticidal agents of high toxicity, which will be highlighted in the argument to come. To cite, for now, just three: most remarkably, there is the character of Lucius, boy servant to Brutus, who does not appear in this role in Plutarch, but is featured in TitA and other plays as the principle - sourced from Apuleius' magical masterpiece *The Golden Ass* - of Hermetic psychic transformation, such as Bacon effected in his

---

patient. His surrender to sleep in JC IV, iii, represents the withering of enlightenment in the impenetrable shadow of Puritanism. The apparition that appears to Brutus in IV, iii, is likewise taken from Plutarch's *Life of Marcus Brutus*, where it is not, however, identified with Julius Caesar, as it is, remarkably, in JC. In the sources, Antony twice presents Caesar with the crown, which is twice refused; whereas in JC this occurs three times, as a reference to Judas' betrayal of Christ. Many more variations from Plutarch will appear in the argument to come. Given the extraordinarily accurate information transmission of the FF, as the argument of these pages (from which the compositor, a favourite whipping-boy of the critics, emerges as a true hero) and the best of the Baconian cryptanalysts (especially William Moore) have shown, these sorts of minutiae demand the closest scrutiny.

So then, was JC written by Bacon alone, like LLL and its kin? Or was it a collaboration, like the histories, to which Bacon, as genius and principal strategist, undoubtedly contributed in the way of language, symbolism, expert information on the Court and the Law, and so on, yet which derive their organic structure and innate power from the immediacy of Shakespeare's own experience? *Troilus and Cressida*, written mostly by pupil rather than master, tells us explicitly of Shakespeare's driven need to create (in the character of Ajax, who represents the Faustian world-feeling accessed by Shakespeare after the irruption of libido (Achilles; cf. also HVIII II, ii, 61 ff.) has shattered his Classical control (city of Troy)); and this is confirmed in TT I, ii, 177:

Prospero ...By accident most strange, bountiful Fortune,  
Now my dear Lady, hath mine enemies  
Brought to this shore; and by my prescience  
I find my zenith doth depend upon  
A most auspicious star, whose influence  
If now I court not but omit, my fortunes  
Will ever after droop.

The "enemies" are, of course, the elements of Shakespeare's continuing psychological malady; and Prospero's isle his conscious, reasoning ego, that now had the resources to deal with it. With HV

---

in 1597 the historical cycle, to which Shakespeare had made a significant contribution, was completed; and his driven creativity would continue to be expressed in many of the plays – including JC - that would subsequently appear under the general aegis of Sir Francis Bacon. Certainly, the high style of Bacon dominates JC; yet there are many lower key passages, the author of which most plausibly was Shakespeare, given their intimate subject matter.

## ACT I

i

The tradesmen are not in their working clothes, but their Sunday best, to welcome Julius Caesar back to Rome after his victory over Pompey; and Flavius and Murellus berate them for it. The fundamental allegoric structure of JC was established as early as LLL (c. 1595), wherein Pompey the Great, - acted by the Clown Costard (cognate with all the other Fools in the plays) in V, ii, - is symbolic of the ithyphallic principle. So it is here in JC, where Julius Caesar represents Shaksper in his immediately post-pubescent bookish ascetic (Bolingbroke) and more recent genteel (2 HIV, V; HV I, i) phases, in both of which the “I” principle was suppressed, - albeit in vain, - as anathematised by puritan Christianity. The dagger represents, as always in FF, the “I” principle; and Caesar’s murder will symbolise its invasion aet.15 (as given in the induction to TOS) of Shaksper’s psyche to bring to an end his genteel phase, and inaugurate his Tavern or pseudo-Alexandran phase, based on the new defence mechanism of visualisation and spiritualisation (Cassius in JC; Fluellen in HV) of the Journey of the Hero (principally Alexander), and entailing erotic continence and wine and conversation in the way of the young Alexander, as described by Plutarch. Yet he would himself refuse this journey; or rather, there was as yet no Sir Francis Bacon to be his guide: so that, paying it mere lip-service, he would remain vulnerable to the siren call of the Goddess of Love in negative aspect (TimA I, ii, 120, records Her re-irruption, or rather that of Her Consort/Son the Boar, to terminate this phase (expulsion of Timon)), in defence against Whom he would finally espouse Puritanism, to predispose him to the coup of 1587.

Flavius represents here, as in LLL, the sun of enlightenment (<

---

the Latin flavus, “gold-coloured”), which illumines in Shaksper’s ego the Julius Caesar principle (his Bolingbroke-genteel phases) as a sham, and an assault upon the soul: for the principal tradesman is a “mender of bad soles [souls]”. Flavius’ adjuration to him to keep to his shop, and to pray for forgiveness for not mourning Pompey, marks the inauguration of psychic healing (albeit of the band-aid type).

ii

Calpurnia is the Goddess of Love as misconceived by the Julius Caesar-phase ego, to sunder Her from Her Queen of Hell-Grail Queen aspects, like a plucked flower: hence her sterility (10). Caesar will leave her against her will to go to the Pompey Porch in the Senate to his death (ego-in-healing abandoning erstwhile sham Goddess). Hence the soothsayer’s words of warning follow, utterly consistently with the allegory, straight upon Caesar’s order to Antony to touch his wife in Lupercal to relieve her barrenness. Mark Antony bears the symbolic weight of the Gnostic (libidinous) Christ: hence his love for Cleopatra (Isis; and Mary Magdalene, wife the Gnostic (true) Christ, was a priestess of Isis): but he remains in negative aspect throughout JC. Brutus represents the ego transformed by spiritualisation based on the written word; and Plutarch, as so often, was the source:

But this Marcus Brutus... having framed his manner of life by the rule of virtue and study of Philosophy, and having employed his wit, which was gentle and constant, in attempting of great things: me thinks he was rightly made and framed unto virtue.<sup>1</sup>

This principle of spiritualisation, based on intense and persistent visual imagining, is represented by Cassius. Like Abraham Slender in MWW, with whom he is precisely cognate on the plane of allegory, Cassius has a “lean and hungry look” (195). Fat is subconsciously associated with blind Nature; whereas the trim, taut and terrific body mirrors, - on the principle of “As without, so within”, that greatest axiom of the Gnostic tradition, - the hard-edged forms of the visualising imagination. Visualisation is a sine qua non of Greek Classicism, which will later explain Cicero’s

---

speaking Greek when Caesar collapses after being offered the crown of Rome by Antony (247). Cassius "...reads much,/He is a great observer, and he looks/Quite through the deeds of men" (202): to confirm the importance of the written word in this phase of Shaksper's adolescence.

What of Casca? He is the first to stab Caesar; and he will be characterised as "blunt" (295). We remember that Walter Blunt in 2 HIV was found to represent the ithyphallic principle: and so here does Casca. Spiritualisation will enable psychic transformation:

Cassius ..And since you [Brutus] know you cannot see yourself  
So well as by reflection, I, your glass,  
Will modestly discover to yourself  
That of yourself which you yet know not of .

Crossing a stream from the nearer to the farther shore is a metaphor, widespread throughout world culture and as old as the hills, for the attainment of inner enlightenment: hence Cassius' description of his rescue of Caesar in this situation (92 ff.). In the same speech he tells of Caesar's febrile cowardice in Spain, when he cried out to Titinius for water. Spain is throughout the plays an underworld symbol; and Caesar's recreancy represents the fear of it – and hence of the unconscious and the libido, as all in negative aspect – typical of Shakespeare in this early phase. It is germane to the fear felt by the Puritan ego before the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, as allegorised in York's tears in 3 HVI 1, iv. Titinius represents, as later will become clear, the principle of knowledge of eternal truths, as is suggested by the closeness of his name to the Latin tinnitus, "a ringing [of a bell]" – the bell, with its single, pure, prolonged note being an age-old symbol of eternity in all great cultures (hence the magic of church bells, and the carillon).

What is the point of Casca's story (216)? Brutus plucks him by the sleeve, and he tells of Antony's having thrice offered the crown to Caesar, who refused it, and then fell down, foaming at the mouth, when he heard the citizens' approval. Casca did not watch closely, and may as well "be hanged as tell the manner of it".

<sup>2</sup> Robert Graves, *The White Goddess*.

---

Caesar's refusal to accept the kingship offered by Antony (libido in negative aspect) marks the point at which Shaksper (as he was then) in genteel phase determined, under continuing stress of the libido, to adopt a different coping strategy. Casca's sleeve represents the prepuce. Immediately it is plucked, Caesar expresses his fear of Cassius ("Let me have men about me that are fat..."): it is the ithyphallic principle which is driving the change. "Hanging" has been shown 1&2HIV to represent detumescence: and so here, where acceptance of the kingship by Caesar would mean, on the allegorical plane, the plane of Shakespeare's true intent, the victory of flaccidity. Caesar's collapse represents the early stages of psychic transformation. This is the point of the following otherwise inexplicable dialogue, which is an index to the hand of the cryptographer, as has been shown repeatedly elsewhere in the plays so far examined (e.g. MWW I, iv, 158: "Out upon't! What have I forgot?")

Brutus 'Tis very like: he hath the falling sickness.  
Cassius No, Caesar hath it not: but you and I  
And honest Casca, we have the falling sickness.  
Casca I know not what you mean by that...

- For the fallen ego is now dominated by the Brutus/Cassius/Casca principle, and has left its Caesar character behind.

### Scepticide

Plutarch in his *Life of Julius Caesar* states unambiguously that Antony presented Caesar with the crown twice; and in this he is followed equally as clearly by North. The *Life of Marcus Antonius* does not specify a number, and this likewise was translated exactly. Yet Bacon-Shakespeare leaves absolutely no doubt of the crown being offered thrice: "And then he offered it the third time; he put it the third time by" (242). This can only be an allusion to Judas, with whom Caesar is here to be identified, as a betrayer of the (Gnostic) Christ. This is yet another instance of the symbolism of the new Christian Cabalism, whose spirit suffuses FF.

\*

---

Cicero, as the orator, represents the spoken or written word (cf. Plato's definition of "music" to include both, which Bacon stole (in the way of the true poet, according to T.S. Eliot) from his Republic, for the allegoric value, for example, of Bianca's music lessons in TOS). Casca cannot understand him after Caesar recovers ("it was Greek to me": 284), for the written and spoken word (cf. also Hortensius in TimA, another orator stolen from Plutarch's Life of Lucullus, to represent Shaksper's volubility in this sociable phase of his life) is as yet uninformed by the "I" principle in the still genteel ego. Yet in the very next scene Casca and Cicero will converse together, with the fire (Cassius principle of visualisation) dropping from heaven, and the portents all around. Once again, the utterly central role of the written word in this pseudo-Hermetic transformation is emphasised:

Cassius I will this night  
In several hands in at his windows throw -  
As if they came from several citizens -  
Writings, all tending to the great opinion  
That Rome holds of his name...

iii

Let us look closely at the portents:

Casca A common slave – you know him well by sight –  
Held up his left hand, which did flame and burn  
Like twenty torches joined; and yet his hand,  
Not sensible of fire, remained unscorched.  
Besides – I ha' not since put up my sword –  
Against the Capitol I met a lion  
Who glazed upon me, and went surly by  
Without annoying me. And there were drawn  
Upon a heap a hundred ghastly women,  
Transformed with their fear, who swore they saw  
Men all in fire walk up and down the streets.  
And yesterday the bird of night did sit  
Even at noonday upon the marketplace,  
Hooting and shrieking...

---

The left hand is controlled, of course, by the right brain, which is the side of instinct, intuition, music, sensual imagination, and so on: broadly, of Nature; whereas the left is the side of reason (with a small “r”). Thus does Michelangelo’s David look to the left, in anticipation of assault from his underworld foe. The essence of the new coping strategy here described is the subjection of the underworld Journey of the Hero, which has remained hitherto in darkness and negative aspect, to the fire of visualisation. This is also the meaning of the appearance of the owl at noon: and both are resumed in the name “Fluellen” (“Hell flew”: was held up to the sunlit sky) in HV. The lion is Caesar. It is symbolic here, just as in TitA IV, i, 99 (“She’s with the lion deeply still in league”) of Shaksper as Goddess-rejector, in his unenlightened, untransformed state. This is also the lion of Posthumus Leonatus (“after death” and “born a lion”: a clear reference to death and resurrection) in CYM, and Leontes in TWT; - albeit these two more broadly include Shakespeare’s later Puritan Phase, like the lion in TitA, though not JC (see Ch.23 for the source of the Lion motif in FF).

Casca is afraid of the portents, whereas Cassius is not: for he is in his element. The subject in this phase will attempt a state of becoming rather than become: to have the libido wrapped up and controlled through spiritualisation and the visual imagination. Yet he would be paying mere lip-service to it, and would be left still vulnerable to it, as the catastrophe of his twenty-fourth year would later show. This transcendence of libido is expressed in these lines of Cassius (whose moral victory over Casca is cognate with the subduing of Falstaff in the Herne’s Oak episode of MWW):

Cassius    You are dull, Casca, and those sparks of life  
              That should be in a Roman you do want,  
              Or else you use not. You look pale, and gaze,  
              And put o fear, and cast yourself in wonder,  
              To see the strange impatience of the heavens...

Cassius’ “Hold my hand” to Casca (116) is cognate with the final

---

lines of MWW:

Mistress Page    Good husband, let us every one go home.  
                          And laugh this sport o'er by a country fire,  
                          Sir John and all.

- For the libido (specifically, the will-to-eros), hitherto in negative aspect, is being rehabilitated. Cinna is, of course, the poet: to affirm yet again the foundation of this new phase on the written word. The single letter "I" here stands once again (cf. especially 1-3HVI) for the ithyphallos-libido, more broadly the unseen world (underworld), which is initially in negative aspect, and denied; then, with the operation of the spirit on the written word, is purified of this perversion and embraced ("stayed for"):

Cassius    Am I not stayed for, Cinna?  
Cinna      I am glad on't. What a fearful night is this!  
                  There's two or three of us have seen strange sights  
Cassius    Am I not stayed for? Tell me.  
Cinna      Yes, you are.

At this point Cassius gives Cinna, consistently with the allegory, letters (the written word: most plausibly Plutarch, Apuleius, perhaps others) for him to leave on Brutus' chair in the senate.

## ACT II

i  
The orchard or garden features prominently in FF: for example, in 2 HVI IV, x, where it is that of Alexander Iden, - whose name resumes the Gnostic Christ (cf. HV) and the visual imagination (< the Greek idein, "to see", "to form an idea"). The word "paradise" is derived from the Hebrew for "garden"; and the fruit – especially the apple – posed against the blue sky on the branches of its tree is an immemorially ancient symbol of wisdom.<sup>2</sup> Brutus is the suffering ego searching for enlightenment:

Brutus    Calling

<sup>3</sup> Laurence Gardner, Bloodline of the Holy Grail.

---

What, Lucius, ho!

Aside

I cannot by the progress of the stars

Guess how near it is to day

[...] Get me a taper in my study, Lucius.

[...] It must be by his death.

[...] Enter Lucius, with a letter

- Where the letter represents the written word, which is, as Oswald Spengler observed, the principal Hermes' wings of the Faustian ego. Bacon-Shakespeare could not have made it plainer.

Here is another beautiful piece of choreography. Brutus orders Lucius to go to bed again, and not rise till the day, which will be the Ides of March: for the path to full enlightenment will not be taken till the final relinquishing of the Caesar principle of denial of the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, whose realm is the unseen world. Lucius exits, and Brutus patiently struggles with the meaning of the letter; then Lucius returns, to confirm that the morrow will be the appointed day. This represents the first stirrings of enlightenment per medium of the printed page, and the dawning on the ego that here lies his future. Accordingly Cassius now enters, with his co-conspirators muffled and unrecognisable. The ego communes with his visual imagination, and the "I" principle appears, reborn into divinity:

Cassius and Brutus stand aside and whisper

Casca Here, as I point my sword, the sun arises.

The spoken word, symbolised by the orator Cicero, as characteristic of Shaksper's genteel phase ("Never was such a sudden scholar made..." HV I, i, 32 ff.), must be relinquished:

Brutus ...For he will never follow anything

That other men begin

Cassius urges the death of Mark Antony along with Caesar; but

<sup>4</sup> Knight and Lomas, *The Hiram Key*.



## Scepticide

This episode does not appear in Plutarch, but was an invention of Bacon's. Portia and Lucius are standing in the street where Caesar is to pass. She orders him to carry a message to Brutus in the Senate, but cannot tell him what, for she has been sworn to secrecy as to the plot: so Lucius remains. A soothsayer comes looking for Caesar, to warn him of the Ides of March, but complains of the suffocating crowd and moves off to a "void" to rather deliver it there. Portia now gives Lucius his message – that she is "merry" – and he exits.

Lucius' tarrying with Portia serves, on the plane of allegory, to yoke enlightenment to the Goddess. His leaving for the Senate is symbolic of its engagement by the ego in the earliest stage of transformation. It will begin once the subject has decided to develop a new world-feeling (Soothsayer's warning of Caesar's murder). - While all the time there is this suffocating sense of the street, symbolic of the birth canal of the Goddess (Portia: cognate of course with her namesake in MOV, that Grail Queen par excellence of FF) through which the ego will be reborn as Brutus, who is therefore to be identified, in his initial rejection of her (II, i, 233) with Caesar:

Soothsayer	Here the street is narrow. The throng that follows Caesar at the heels, Of senators, of praetors, common suitors, Will crowd a feeble man almost to death.
------------	---

Portia's "Say I am merry" identifies the Goddess, perceived anew, with Woman. However there is a fascinating gloss on "merry", of which Bacon would seem to have been aware. "Merrie" England was in truth derived from Mary Jacob, or Mary the Gypsy, who had accompanied Mary Magdalene, wife of Christ, and their children to Western Europe in AD 44, and whose cult was widespread in England in the Middle Ages. "Mary" is the English variant of the Hebrew "Miriam", which was associated with the sea (Latin mare); hence Mary the Gypsy was identified with Aphrodite, who was born from the waves (cf. Botticelli's *The Birth of Venus*).

---

Her oath of wedlock was called the “Merrie” hence, probably, the English “to marry”, and the colloquialism “marry” as used often in Shakespeare. Pauline Catholicism had changed the gender of the Holy Spirit for political reasons; but elsewhere She remained female, and was identified with water (hence the Biblical “the spirit that moved on the face of the waters” (Ophelia on the brook)): and Mary the Gypsy was the original merrimaide (mermaid), given the attributive name Marina (cf. Shakespeare’s *Pericles*). She appears as Maid Marian in the Robin Hood legends. She was ritually portrayed as the “May Queen”, and her dancers were known as “Mary’s Men” (cf. the modern Morris Men, and Robin Hood’s Merrie Men).<sup>3</sup>

All of this is of fascinating relevance to the works of Shakespeare.

### ACT III

i-ii-iii

#### Scepticide

Artemidorus’ confrontation of Caesar in the street with a written warning (II, iii) is taken from Plutarch; however their second meeting in this scene is not. The allegoric value of Artemidorus is to be found in Plutarch, where he is described in the *Life of Julius Caesar* as a “Doctor of Rhethoricke in the Greeke tongue”. It is to be remembered that Cicero, who represents the principle of the written word as misperceived by the Goddess-rejecting ego in Caesar phase, is mentioned as speaking Greek, after the recovery of Caesar in I, ii; and that Casca (ithyphallic principle) showed his scorn for it:

Cassius Did Cicero say anything?

Casca Ay, he spoke Greek.

Cassius To what effect?

Casca Nay, an I tell you that, I’ll ne’er look you in the face again.. . It was all Greek to me.

“I’ll ne’er look you in the face again” must refer to phallic flaccidity. Artemidorus must therefore represent the Cicero principle; with which attribution the behaviour of Publius and

---

Cassius is wholly consistent:

Publius To Artemidorus

Sirrah, give place.

Cassius To Artemidorus

What, urge you your petitions in the street?

Come to the Capitol.

They walk about the stage.

With the ego on the verge of transformation (murder of Caesar) the written word is subjected, for the first time, to the intensity of the new-found spiritualising imagination (Cassius walking Artemidorus about). What is the symbolic value of Publius?

\*

### Scepticide

This Publius (significantly, his patronymic is not given) does not appear in Plutarch. The brother of Metellus Cimber does, however, in the same context, as the subject of a petition to Caesar to have his banishment repealed. Yet Bacon names him as Publius Cimber, whereas Plutarch does not. The two Publiuses are therefore to be identified: but what is their principle? Publius is evidently an old man (93), and hence it is the Adam principle (cf. Adam in AYLI) of primal Man, in the same vein as “Ancient” Pistol: Man-as-sublimated- animal, Dionysian or Falstaffian Man, homo libidensis. It is this aspect of Caesarian Man, not dead but dormant, that will be wakened anew. The ultimate reference is almost certainly to “Thrice Perfect Father Adam” of the twenty-eighth degree of the Ancient and Accepted Rite of Scottish Freemasonry, whose purpose was the indoctrination of truth (see Ch.44). Bacon was formally received into the Brotherhood by King James in 1603.<sup>4</sup>

\*

The remainder of this Act is primarily concerned with the persistence of the libido in negative aspect beneath the activity of the Cassius principle in the conscious ego. The equivocation of Antony over the corpse, as described by Plutarch, with its sequelae of popular discontent and unrest, gave Bacon a beautiful scenario in which to allegorise it. The pseudery of this new coping mechanism of spiritualisation is emphasised by Antony’s offer of

---

his life to Brutus, which is refused (149 ff.). The common people represent here, as elsewhere in the plays (e.g the later Acts of RIII) the will, or libido: which here is incited by the persistence of its negative aspect (Antony's speech). Their rebellion will culminate, on the allegorical plane, in the tearing to pieces of Cinna the poet.

### Scepticide

The savaging of Cinna is described in Plutarch, who does not, however, record the acknowledgement by his attackers of his status as a poet, as here:

Cinna	I am Cinna the poet! I am Cinna the poet!
Fourth Plebeian	Tear him for his bad verses, tear him for
his	bad verses.

This seems on the surface to be an artistic misjudgement: the reason of his "bad verses" diluting the effect of what the uninformed reader would believe to be the prime reason for his murder, viz., his mistaken identity. "Stick to the point" was an axiom held dear by Christopher Isherwood. The "point" here is the murder of Caesar; and Bacon would seem to have been distracted from it by a fancy. However, it is clear that Cinna the poet represents, on the plane of allegory, the "Man of letters", instant guru to his illiterate copains, that Shaksper became in his Tavern phase of mid-adolescence. The dismemberment of Cinna therefore marks the beginning of the termination of this phase, and is precisely cognate with the entry of Cupid and his Amazon dancers in TimA I, ii, 120: the re-irruption of the Goddess of Love, and with Her the will-to-eros, expressing essentially the same principle (of libido) as the Plebeians here. It will culminate in the stricken ego playing his last card: the adoption of the doom-laden coping mechanism of Puritanism (victory of Octavius at Phillipi in JC). Bacon-Shakespeare has severely compressed, to the point of extinction, the span of this phase, - which TimA covers, of the other plays dealing with the same period, in the most revealing detail.

### ACT IV

i  
The arrival of Octavian in Italy marks the apprehension by the

---

stricken ego of this last life-line, which will prove to be woven of cotton wool.

### Scepticide

Lepidus demands that Antony sentence to death his sister's son Publius, as part of the program of proscriptions of the Roman nobility, as of suspect loyalty to the Triumvirate. However Plutarch mentions no nephew of Antony "pricked" in the proscriptions; although in the *Life of Marcus Brutus* one Publius Sicilius is mentioned, of no relation to any of them. This would seem to be more pointless extemporising by the author. However it is perfectly consistent with the allegory, for Puritanism is predicated on the extirpation of the Adam principle (Man-as-sublimated-animal) from the psyche. The suspicion arises that Lepidus may represent the libido in negative aspect; and this is soon confirmed:

Antony    He shall but bear them as the ass bears gold...  
          [...]  
          So is my horse, Octavius, and for that  
          I do appoint him store of provender.  
          It is a creature that I teach to fight,  
          To wind to stop, to run directly on,  
          His corporal motion governed by my spirit;  
          And in some taste Lepidus is but so...

This ass is of course a reference to the "ass" phase (underworld journey) of the psychic transformation of the hero Lucius of Apuleius' *The Golden Ass*, with its many erotic episodes; while the horse or horse-and-rider bears always in FF the value of the will-to-eros in action (e.g. "Was that the King that spurred his horse so hard/Against the steep-up rising of the hill?": LLL, IV, i, 1): the source of which was certainly Plato's *Phaedrus*, which Bacon would have studied at Cambridge, with its long Socratic metaphor of the soul as a charioteer with two horses.

ii

This long scene takes an intensely microcosmic perspective, in the way of much of the histories, and is blazoned with the

---

signature of William Shakespeare. The repetition of Brutus' order to "Stand, ho!" (1) by a soldier - "Give the word "ho", and stand" - would seem odd and supererogatory to the uninformed reader. However, we remember that ho in Italian (a language in which Bacon was proficient: and Shakespeare by this time had been studying with him for possibly 13 years) – means "I have"; while "stand" is used elsewhere (e.g. "...so I'll stand,/If the King please": Suffolk (who represents the ithyphallic principle throughout the histories), HVIII II, ii, 50) to suggest an ithyphallos. This marks, therefore, the moment of re-irruption of the will-to-eros in negative aspect in the subject (Shaksper aet.15) who had thought to conquer it by spiritualisation. This has arisen from the dwelling of the visual imagination on a printed page where the Goddess inheres (city of Sardis, where Cassius' troops are quartered: with the exception of the cavalry – again, the libido-in-action – who have ridden with him to Brutus, to provoke, on the plane of allegory, the "stand"). The quarrel between Brutus and Cassius, described in this scene, represents the betrayal of the still-vulnerable ego by the faculty he had thought would protect him.

The first cause of it is apparently Brutus' charge that Lucius Pella, of Cassius' company, has accepted a bribe from the Sardians. "Lucius" needs no elucidation; while Pella was the birthplace of Alexander the Great, the greatest Gnostic Christ-figure in FF (cf. especially HV); and money is the power of a principle in its symbolic language. This all means that acknowledgement of the libido, more broadly the unseen world (cf. the bedroom scene between Lucius and the witch early in Apuleius, before his ass phase) marks the inauguration of true psychic transformation, - as distinct from the pseudery of the Brutus-Cassius phase, - finally to produce a Gnostic Christ (Alexander, or Lucius as priest of Osiris in the final chapter of Apuleius). This engagement with the world that lies below the surface of things was absolutely the central pillar of Bacon's philosophy (see Ch.10).

## Scepticide

Plutarch explicitly states, in his Life of Marcus Brutus, that Lucius Pella was guilty of "robbery, and pilfering in his office". Bribery, as initiated by the other side, was adopted by Bacon-Shakespeare as

---

more suitable to the allegory: the Goddess arising from the printed page to arouse the will-to-eros in the reader.

\*

Joseph Campbell remarked that enlightenment involves not the driving out of demons, but the perceiving of them anew as gods: and this is precisely what Shakespeare as initiate will come to realise in his early years in London: the demon and the god here being shown as identical.

Lucillius represents the principle of enlightenment itself: his name, thoughtfully provided by Plutarch, being a near homologue of "lucile" (< the Latin lux, lucis "light"). Thus does Brutus confer closely with him as Cassius approaches: for the stricken ego is searching for help from the quarter that has sustained him hitherto. Once again, the single letter "I" symbolises the ithyphallos, more broadly the unseen world:

Cassius I am a soldier, I,  
Older in practice, abler than yourself  
To make conditions.

This is in the sense of the "I" principle as property of primal Man (Publius/Adam). The ego wants to be rid of the tormenting ithyphallos, by belittling it:

Brutus Away, slight man.

- And will not consider that it might be a prelude to divinity:

Cassius I said an elder soldier, not a better.  
Did I say better?  
Brutus If you did, I care not.

Cassius again is oddly superfluous:

Cassius When Caesar lived he durst not thus have moved me.  
Brutus Peace, peace; you durst not so have tempted him,  
Cassius I durst not?  
Brutus No.

---

Cassius    What , durst not tempt him?  
Brutus     For your life you durst not.

- For Caesar had, of course, repudiated engagement with the unseen world: Cassius' querulousness serving to introduce that principle once more as the letter "I". And here it is yet again:

Cassius    I denied you not.  
Brutus     You did.  
Cassius    I did not. He was but a fool  
              That brought my answer back.

- This in response to Brutus' reproval of him for failing to send gold to pay his soldiers (failure of spiritualisation to suppress libido), provoking an ithyphallos instead. This Fool is Yorick, and the Fool in King Lear, and all the other Fools of FF. Now the stricken ego turns to his last defense mechanism:

Cassius    Come, Antony, and young Octavius, come,  
              Revenge yourselves alone on Cassius...

-And his demons are appeased (They embrace); the "I" principle having once again been suppressed from consciousness (Brutus declining Cassius' offer to stab him in the breast with his dagger). This marks the crux of Shakespeare's life, when the conditions (Puritanism) are established for his Fall. Lucillius has been waiting outside during the argument (enlightenment failing as blind libido irrupts). Now he enters the tent with a poet, who is, in the plane of allegory, a reincarnation of Cinna. The poet's expulsion, and Lucillius' dismissal soon after, symbolise the irretrievable forsaking by Shaksper of his pseudo-Alexandrian journey.

The last section of this scene is tightly choreographed. Lucius (psychic transformation) is sent from their presence; and Brutus straight announces that Portia is dead (Puritan repudiation of the Grail Queen: "...young Octavius with Mark Antony/Have made themselves so strong – for with her death/That tidings came": 206). Lucius brings wine and tapers, and the two drink to their amity: whereupon Lucius again exits. Titinius and Messala enter: the latter representing a Puritan text ("Myself have letters..":223) ; the former the eternal truths the subject is trying to

---

elicit. He is not yet Puritan to the full, but is learning fast from the printed page:

Messala Octavius, Antony, and Lepidus  
Have put to death an hundred senators.

Brutus Therein our letters do not well agree.  
Mine speak of seventy senators that died...

The ego willingly seeks its new hegemony, with which spiritualisation is not compatible, - the sine qua non of Puritanism being a complete absence of imagination (Brutus' decision to engage enemy, against Cassius' wishes). Lucius brings Brutus his gown. This is the same scholar's gown as donned by Evans in MWW III, i, and for the same purpose; but the subject's study will here be cut short. The book (cognate with Evans') that Brutus will find in the pocket, having forgotten it (consistently with the allegory), is not the Bible, as the editor of the New Oxford Shakespeare MWW perversely asserts, - but an Hermetic text: perhaps TGA. He orders Varrus and Claudio to sleep in his tent. Lucius begins to play a tune, but falls asleep, and Brutus takes away his instrument (Puritan denying Lucius principle in himself) and begins to read his book; which study is cut short by the appearance of Caesar's ghost. This is the dead Caesar, with the dagger-wounds still fresh (ego invaded by ityphallos-libido), who is symbolic of the riven Shaksper about to embark on his Tavern phase; the book, of the library of its instant guru: and the reader, full steam ahead toward the harbour of Puritanism, now recoils from his former self: "Thy evil spirit, Brutus": (333).

### Scepticide

Varrus and Claudio are not mentioned in this context in Plutarch. They appear out of nowhere, and their sleep represents, like Lucius', the enfeeblement of their principles. Varrus must refer to the great philologist and librarian Marcus Terentius Varro (116-27 B.C.), who fought on Pompey's side at Pharsalia, and had written at least 55 works by the time of his death. Pompey represents, throughout the plays, the ityphallic principle; and Varrus' allegoric value must therefore be of the reader and writer on the way to Gnostic enlightenment.

---

The provenance of the name “Claudio” is a fascinating one, and of central importance to our understanding of MAN and HAM. We remember that Ted Hughes adduced the mention of lameness in four separate sonnets, and the tradition of Shakespeare’s walking stick, as evidence that he was lame; of which conclusion I have found two more supportive instances, in HVIII and TWT. The Latin *claudus* means “limping”, “halting”, “lame” (hence the medical condition of “claudication”); and the lame Claudius, a writer with a great interest in Roman history and religion, - was denied preferment by Augustus (Octavian), eventually to become Emperor in 41 AD. All of this would have commended the name Claudio (or Claudius) to Bacon as absolutely the perfect vector of the symbolic weight of the resurrected Shakespeare, a Gnostic Christ (albeit imperfect) who had come so close to repudiating, under the influence of Puritanism (Augustus), forever the Claudio principle (scholarship; written word), and declining into schizophrenia, as described in HAM . In MAN Claudio represents the Shakesper who fell, aet.15, in love with the sham Goddess of Puritanism (the Hero of the early Acts), only to be saved by his imagination (the Watch, as in R&J), and by the written word as vector of the true Goddess (Hero of the final Act).

The Varrus principle must be, because of its association with the Claudio principle, a property of Shakespeare in his London (Resurrected Christ) phase; and the two appear *de novo* because they have not been active thus far in Shaksper’s life. They have, in fact, been sleeping: hence Brutus’ immediate order to them to do so, along with Lucius. They are sent away to “Bid him [Cassius] set on his powers before”: for the visual imagination is a quality of both the spiritualising and Hermetically transmutating egos.

We are left with the question of why “Varrus and “Claudio” were used instead of the expected “Varro” and “Claudius”. The answer is, of course, that the chosen endings are, on the basis of the “Dardanius” principle, a semaphore from Bacon to the reader that these characters are not quite what they seem: that the endings of their names should in fact be transposed, to indicate their true meanings.

There is a further problem with regard to the sonnets: viz., that the four mentions of lameness occur in those addressed to a man,

---

which there are powerful reasons for supposing were written by Bacon; - their conjunction with the Dark Lady sonnets, - with their repeated mentioning of "Will" as the author's name, who must certainly have been so, - being the perfect cover (in a way germane to FF) for Bacon as the author of the remainder, which are addressed to his illegitimate son, William Herbert, Fourth Earl of Pembroke (hence "Mr. W.H." of the dedication). An answer to the problem which is utterly consistent with the argument of these pages, is that "lameness" was adopted by him as a metaphor, with its beautiful cryptographic aptness (its association with Shakespeare), for the crippling of his career in public life due to his status as the illegitimate son of Queen Elizabeth I, - unlike Essex, who was her second son, conceived in wedlock to the Earl of Leicester while immured in the Tower of London.

\*

The ego is now without visual imagination, as his Puritanism deepens:

Brutus ...Didst thou see anything?

Lucius Nothing, my lord.

[...]

Brutus Saw you anything?

Varrus No, my lord, I saw nothing.

The scenario of Shaksper's thriving in, and declination from, his Tavern phase would seem to be one of initial conversation and sociable drinking, without drunkenness (cf. Burgundy in HV), in the way of the young Alexander the Great, as described in Plutarch, who also notes – of immense significance to this argument - his "continence" (control of libido) at this stage; followed by the irruption, against his will, of blind libido ("Stand, ho!": JC IV, i, 1; entry of the dancers in TimA I, ii, 120); and the attempted drowning of this pain in alcohol (Stratford tradition of Shakespeare having taken part in a drinking competition against a team from another town, after which he spent the night insensible under a crab tree which later became known as "Shakespeare's crab"). With the failure of the higher control of his Cassius phase, he uninhibitedly embraces the Autolycus principle (cf. Plato's Republic; TWT), and

---

declines into petty crime (another tradition) against an admittedly worthy target: the notable Puritan Sir Thomas Lucy. He nails satirical verses to his gates, and takes part in poaching from his estate (probably, given his lameness, as an accessory after the fact); whereupon Lucy commences proceedings against him in court. However he is given a chance to redeem himself, and sent to work as a master – a fitting profession for one of his literary gifts – in a country school. The immense psychic trauma of all of this leads him to embrace Puritanism, as a hostage might the beliefs of his captors; into which he progressively hardens as the years go by, till the coup befalls him aet.23 (as given in induction to TOS).

## ACT V

i

This is in fact a battle being decided in a single psyche, with the Gnostic (libidinous) Christ in negative aspect (Antony) driving the conflict:

Antony    Tut, I am in their bosoms, and I know  
              Wherefore they do it.

In a beautiful legerdemain, Bacon describes the Puritan refusal to honour (make the sign of the Cross) the Gnostic Christ (Antony in essence rather than character), with the result that the libido will assert itself in his despite:

Antony    Why do you cross me in this exigent?  
Octavius  I do not cross you, but I will do so.

- The second “I” symbolising that principle; - which, tormenting him, drives him to expurgate the written word of the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen:

Brutus    They stand, and would have parley.  
Cassius   Stand fast, Titinius. We must out and talk.

The conversation between Brutus and Lucillius is, on the plane of allegory, identical to that between Cassius and Messala (67 ff.): the

---

ego searching for enlightenment in the written word, now finding  
~~his former capacity for spiritualisation fading in the Puritan storm.~~

Cassius Their shadows seem  
A canopy most fatal, under which  
Our army lies ready to give the ghost.

ii-iii

The drive toward Puritanism moves into top gear:  
Brutus Ride, ride, Messala, ride, and give these bills  
Unto the legions on the other side...  
Ride, ride, Messala; let them all come down.

Scepticide

Messala is not named in Plutarch as the bearer of the bills. His allegoric value as the Puritan written word invited his naming by Bacon in this connexion. Plutarch states that the bills were misunderstood, but is not followed here for obvious reasons.

\*

Again, the microcosmic nature of the conflict is emphasised:

Cassius Myself have to mine own turned enemy.  
This ensign here of mine was turning back;  
I slew the coward, and did take it from him.

Scepticide

This episode does not appear in Plutarch. It fulfils a clear allegoric function.

\*

The Gnostic Christ in negative aspect has irretrievably corrupted the Cassius principle:

Pindarus Mark Antony is in your tents, my lord;  
Fly therefore, noble Cassius, fly farre off.

Scepticide

---

Plutarch states explicitly, in his *Life of Marcus Brutus*, that Antony was absent from this incursion. His presence here is consistent with the allegory.

\*

The conflict is a psychic one:

Titinius I will be here again even with a thought.

Titinius is captured by Antony (knowledge of eternal truths crippled by Puritanism). Pindarus stabs Cassius at his request. ‘Pindarus’ is a near homophone of ‘Pandarus’ the pandar in T&C, which would suggest that he bears the same symbolic value, viz., the written word which conveys the Goddess to the reader.

### Scepticide

Plutarch explicitly states (*ibid.*) that Pindarus beheaded Cassius. Stabbing with a sword (the same as killed Caesar) is utterly consistent with the allegory, as symbolising the irruption and now constitutive presence of the blind will-to-eros in the spiritualising ego. Beheading is symbolic throughout FF of psychic rebirth (cf. Macbeth; beheading of York in 3HVI I, iii), and would therefore have been totally unsuitable in this context.

\*

Here is a particularly subtle piece of source manipulation.

### Scepticide

Titinius returns to Cassius wearing a laurel-wreath. He says “Did I not meet my friends?”; while Messala states: “It is but change, Titinius, for Octavius/Is overthrown by noble Brutus’ power,/As Cassius’ legions are by Antony”. Yet Plutarch asserts (*ibid.*) that he in fact met the troops of Brutus who had come there to help him. The force of this small but telling alteration to the source serves to underline that these are principles conflicting in a single psyche, where defeat can be victory, and victory defeat. To have faithfully followed Plutarch, and have Titinius returning crowned with a laurel presented from his own side, would have fatally comprised the effect. This is not all, however: for Titinius does indeed confirm that he received the laurel from Brutus, but not until l.85, some 35 lines after his entry. This delay serves to identify Antony with Brutus: as

---

indeed he is, the ego having not yet slid over the cusp into its Puritan phase, marked by the death of Brutus in the final scene. Titinius then kills himself; for the victory of his principle has been spurious (Puritan confidence in their apprehension of eternal truths is a delusion).

\*

iv-v

Cato fils enters the fray with Lucillius:

Cato I am the son of Marcus cato, ho!

Lucillius And I am Brutus, Marcus Brutus, I, Brutus,  
my country's friend. Know me for Brutus.  
Soldiers kill Cato.

O young and noble Cato, art thou down?  
Why, now thou diest as bravely as Titinius,  
And mayst be honored, being Cato's son.

Cato père was specifically dwelt on by Brutus in V, i, 100 ff. as a suicide. This Cato is to be identified with him, again to equate foe with self, murder with suicide. This is reinforced by the comparison with Titinius, who has just killed himself in the previous scene. Lucillius identifies himself with Brutus, and is captured by Antony, who spares him, out of esteem. This is another way of saying that the ego will die, yet persist. The Brutus-Cassius phase will give way to the Octavius, but it is the same ego.

v

Enter Brutus, Dardanius, Clitus, Strato, and Volumnius.

Scepticide

All of this company are mentioned in Plutarch; where, however "Dardanius" is spelt "Dardanus". This a highly significant variation, and not at all an error to be blamed on the compositor, whose long-suffering shoulders have borne much from the editors of centuries, in their ignorance of the allegory implicated in the plane of true intent of FF. The most concentrated and spectacular

<sup>1</sup> Ted Hughes, Shakespeare and the Goddess of Complete Being

---

example of Bacon's expertise is LLL, with its plethora of ciphers, whose meaning any error on his part would have destroyed. The substitution of "remuneration" for the intended "remuration" in LLL III, i, 133, is the compositor's sole mistake in a long and taxing play, and an exception which proves the rule. Further, the incorrect "remuneration" is found only in some First Folio copies, not all: his well-intentioned error evidently having been recognised and corrected by his overseers, the principal of whom undoubtedly would have been Sir Francis Bacon. This is precisely the sort of low-level engagement with the text that has been missing from the work of the commentators, and has led them seriously to misjudge the findings of, for example, the great cryptanalyst William Moore, whose "Shakespeare" (1934) should have earned him the highest honours, and the gratitude of scholars everywhere.

The names of four of the company are spelt as per Plutarch, "Dardanius" being the single exception. This serves as an index to his different role in the hands of the playwright, where he is given life as a character of history only on the literal plane, and has quite another significance on the plane of allegory.

\*

So then, what is the significance of the company? Plutarch's Dardanus was chosen as the indicative, since the Greek ending -eus (English "-ius") is a common one, and therefore an effective cipher; but it is Strato who bears the symbolic weight. Plutarch gives, in his Life of Marcus Brutus, two versions of Brutus' death: that he held his sword and fell on it, and that Strato held it. Bacon chose the latter as more fitting to his purpose. The episode of Strato falling asleep, then waking as Brutus approaches him for help, does not, I scarcely need tell you, appear in Plutarch. Strato clearly represents the "I" principle in negative aspect, dormant during Shaksper's Tavern or pseudo-Alexandrian phase, but which resurges to end it conclusively. Strato is therefore, on the plane of allegory, a property of the Antony principle (Gnostic Christ in negative aspect).

---

## CHAPTER 26

### TROILUS AND CRESSIDA

The bulk of Troilus and Cressida was undoubtedly written by Shakespeare, into whose inner life in his London (creative) phase it gives a precious insight. Its theme is the Trojan War to about the same extent that Orwell's Animal Farm is about animals. Rather, its primary concern is the interplay of the Apollonian or Classical world view (limited to the visible world, in the manner of the Periclean Athenians), which was characteristic of him in scholarly mode, and the Faustian or Western world feeling, whose concern is with the will, and illimitable space, the mode of Shakespeare's creativity, as it must be for any great artist. It is about the instability of the former, - which Shakespeare drew around him as a protective shield against the "charge of the Boar", which had shattered him, though not irredeemably, in 1587, - upon the irruption of libido, and dissolution of the hard-edged forms of his Apollonist mentation. With libido came the Boar (will-to-eros in negative aspect, as cast by puritan Christianity); and his sustained productivity at the highest level will be shown below to have been driven by its repeated charges throughout his London life (cf. also HVIII and TT). To live, to err, to fall, to rise again, to create life out of life... this is a common theme in the lives of so many of the great Western artists.

Oswald Spengler put it beautifully in his *Decline of the West*, which should be compulsory reading for all who care about the future of our Culture:

This very spatiality (Räumlichkeit) that is the truest and sublimest element in the aspect of our universe, that absorbs into itself and begets out of itself the substantiality of all things, Classical humanity (which knows no word for, and therefore has no idea of, space) with one accord cuts out as the nonent, τὸ ἤμῳ, that which is not. The emphasis of this denial can scarcely be exaggerated. The material, the optically definite, the comprehensible, the immediately present – this list exhausts the characteristics of this kind of extension.

---

It was the visual imagination which Shakespeare cultivated to the nth degree, along with Hermetic memory-training, after his flight to London, to remedy the imagination-less Puritanism of his late adolescence, which had predisposed him to the coup described in RIII III, iv. His inspiration for this Goddess (Nature)-based *vita nuova* was undoubtedly his doctor and teacher – his Gandalf - Sir Francis Bacon, whose Muse was Athena (hence the AA symbol in so many of his works). Athena was unusual in that, in terms of the pastoral-agricultural Great (Triple) Goddess as described by Robert Graves, She combined the Maiden and Witch, with the Goddess as Woman – lover and mother – not in the picture. This is an expression of the Greek yearning for independence of Nature; and the predominance of Athena is reflected in the extreme paucity of representations of the Mother and Child in Greek Art, and the tendency of the Classical mind to paint the love Goddess Aphrodite as a tart. The total subjugation of Kate Minola, at which so many readers are justly taken aback, is an index to the powerful background presence of Athena in FF; and *The Taming of the Shrew* was undoubtedly from the pen of Bacon solus, as we have seen.

Yet the Classical mind begs, against its will, to be invaded and transformed by the blind will-to-eros. This took the form, in the case of Bacon, of relations with his servingmen and others, which had the advantage of preserving his independence, as he saw it, from Nature. Shakespeare, on the other hand, often sought out tarts (albeit this a wholly unjust description of the Dark Lady), at least in the comparatively early period covered by T&C, although HVIII makes it clear that he later returned to his old habits of auto-erotism. The reason for this reversion may also be found in T&C, which positively seethes with disease and venereal decay. The contraction of syphilis or gonorrhoea may have put the fear of God into him as regards the “stews”, and left his old proclivity as the only alternative. Cressida incarnates the Goddess of Love in T&C, which will be shown to be an analysis of the psychological states which led to Shakespeare catching this venereal disease, as

<sup>1</sup> Gardner, *Bloodline of the Holy Grail*; Baigent et al., *The Holy Blood and the Holy Grail*.

---

described also in the last two sonnets.<sup>1</sup>

There are several keys which admit the receptive reader to successively deeper chambers of understanding of T&C. Ted Hughes has provided a perfectly obvious provenance for the association of Diomedes with the Boar. In Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*, one of the readily available sources, Cassandra tells Troilus the story of how Artemis, the Great Goddess, sent the Calydonian Boar to ravage Greece; and how it was slain by Meleager, who in this account took the boar as his armorial emblem, and passed it lineally to Tydeus, one of the "Seven Against Thebes", who then passed it in turn to his son Diomedes.

I have shown how HVIII describes the unsatisfactory nature of Shakespeare's love life in London, as centered around auto-erotism (and it is noteworthy that not in the brutally honest "historical" sequence, nor any other play examined in the course of this argument, is there the slightest autobiographical reference to homosexuality). Yet there is also in HVIII I, iii, an autobiographical reference to a disease of Venus:

Sands	'Tis time to giv 'em physic, their diseases Are grown so catching.
Lord Chamberlain	What a loss our ladies Will have of these trim vanities!

Pandarus represents therefore Shakespeare's will to seek out a tart, after the usual dissolution of his scholarly Apollonism in the flood of blind libido. Certainly, there is not a single reference in the plays I have examined to any long-term, mutually fulfilling relationship. For the Boar remained a problem, albeit never again as severely as obtained in 1587, his *annus horribilis*, yet an auspicious one for Western Culture. Yet it will be shown below that this collapse of his Classical world-view, bringing the Faustian world-feeling (Ajax principle) in its train, along with the Boar, was the stimulus of his creativity.

It is possible to be more specific about Shakespeare in Apollonist mode. He would have been reading, imagining, memorising: - poring over, perhaps, the published and unpublished works of his mentor Sir Francis Bacon; perhaps Pico della Mirandola, Giorgi,

---

Cornelius Agrippa, or some other of the great Neoplatonic/Christian Cabalist philosophers; perhaps The Golden Ass: at any rate, one of the cornerstones of the Gnostic tradition, which describe the unseen world, and demand for their understanding the reasoning imagination. This is also what King Henry (Shakespeare) would have been studying at his desk in HVIII II, ii, when broken in upon by the ithyphallos-libido as idea (Norfolk) and will (Suffolk). It was this continuing conflict that Shakespeare would leave behind him at the end of his creative life, to enable his escape from the Queen of Hell in negative aspect (divorce of Henry from Queen Katharine, cognate with Kate in TOS) and return to his wife (marriage of Henry to Anne Bullen, sc. Hathaway), the immediate cause of the coup of 1587, through not the slightest fault of her own. Here is exactly the same conflict, at a much earlier stage.

The play opens with his Apollonist mode already under threat.

## ACT I

i

The ego (ultimately Shakespeare's) cannot sustain its Apollonist mentation, with its intensity of visual imagination and hard-edged forms, when irrupted by the pull to dissolution of the will-to-eros:

Troilus                    Call here my varlet; I'll unarm again:  
                                  Why should I war without the walls of Troy...  
Pandarus                Will this gear ne'er be mended?

- Which it resists:

Troilus                    Have I not tarried?

- For he identifies the Queen of Hell, and Her Consort/Son the Boar, lurking within the tart, object of his will. Shakespeare achieves this by an adroit legerdemain. Pandarus initially (as the ego feels the first flush of the libido) rates his niece Cressida as fairer than Helen (spectre of Queen of Hell less powerful than pull to union with Venus). Troilus berates him, implying that his estimation of Cressida is, for all that, too low:

---

Pandarus            I speak no more than truth.  
Troilus             Thou dost not speak so much.

Pandarus misunderstands him, as implying that Helen is in fact the fairer of the two: by which means Shakespeare signifies the ascendancy of the fear of the Boar. Now Pandarus leaves in a huff (will-to-eros recedes). The ego is seized once again by the ancient conflict it knows too well; but, by now strongly Hermetically armed, in contrast to his earlier (Stratford) fragility, he calls on the great god Apollo, above the lintel of whose temple at Delphi was inscribed "Know Thyself", - just as does Leontes in TWT (III, i), and for precisely the same reason (and Delphic Apollo was Egyptian-Hermetic in origin):

Troilus    Tell me, Apollo, for thy Daphne's love,  
              What Cressid is, what Pandar, and what we?

The fabled Aeneas now enters. I have described at length the significance in FF of the rejection of Dido by Aeneas – the Puritan denial of the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen - as Shakespeare's personal myth, as first recognised by Ted Hughes. Now here he is, urging Troilus (the ego) back into battle (to embrace the world as Apollonian idea). It was the disaster of Shakespeare's Puritan phase that had stimulated his adoption, against the Boar, of the Baconian (Apollonist) defence mechanism. The magic of Apollo has blunted the "charge of the Boar":

Troilus    Let Paris bleed: 'tis but a scar to scorn;  
              Paris is gored with Menelaus' horn.  
Aeneas    Hark what good sport is out of town today!  
Troilus    Better at home, if "would I might" were "may".

"I may" once again signifies here the First of May, the feast-day of the maypole ("I" principle: ithyphallos), when the libido (Robin) ran wild, as sanctioned in the "greenwood marriages", to the fruitfulness of which the wide distribution of the surname

<sup>2</sup> Robert Graves, *The White Goddess*.

---

“Robinson” attests (cf. the similar technique in RIII I, iii, 91 ff., and HV II, i). The ego continues its contemplation (“Come, go we then together”).

ii

Cressida and Pandarus stand below the towers of Ilion (the highest point of Troy) whence Helen and Hecuba will watch the battle between Hector and Ajax. In Shakespeare’s symbolic language, Ilion represents the highest reaches of Apollonist thought, whence the Goddess of Love, object of the will-to-eros, has now been excluded, to be supplanted by the Goddess Nature (Hecuba) of Shakespeare’s meditation, as Classical idea. The ego has embarked on the Apollonist meditation adumbrated in I, i. Now not Ajax, nor any other of the Greeks, will rise to the challenge. Shakespeare’s scholasticism (and it is this, rather than his creative mode, which Troy represents, as we shall see below) was an oblique, rather than direct, assault on the negative libido, the knowledge of which, newly divested of its negativity, would have enabled him to let go of his ideas, and come to acknowledge the play of the will (unseen world; underworld) in himself, which is the truly Faustian virtue, and whence derived his creativity. The anathematised libido (broadly, the will-to-life) would remain constitutive to his psyche; the Boar would always be lurking; Bacon had offered him a defence: and he was simply responding in the best way he knew. This Classical obliqueness would ensure that he would continually, to some degree, be hanging on his Cross with eyes closed, after the flood of libido, rather than open, in the truly Gnostic way. This is the point of the characterisation of Ajax as “a gouty Briareus, many hands and no use, or a purblind Argus, all eyes and no sight”: for at this stage the will to psychic transformation is inert, and will only be actuated (as Achilles, the active aspect of Ajax) after the first of several “charges of the Boar” (which Troilus will escape, though strongly register) in IV, ii. Ajax is “valiant as the lion, churlish as the bear, slow as the elephant”: the lion suggesting the “lion of Judah”, an emblem of the Gnostic Christ; the bear the underground stream (Alph) of the Gnostic/Arcadian tradition;<sup>1</sup> and the elephant his connexion with Cressida (I, i: “Her bed is India; there she lies, a pearl”). The world that lies unseen below the surface of things, - the proper concern

---

of the Western or Faustian mind, - breaking through the clean lines of the Classical ideas of Shakespeare's creative mentation, is beautifully suggested by "[Ajax is] melancholy without cause": for causality is a property of the phenomenal world of space and time, to which the Will (whence the will), or the void, is anterior, as Schopenhauer observed in *The Fourfold Root of the Principle of Sufficient Reason*: to give yet another example of how Bacon-Shakespeare anticipated so much of the great German philosophy and depth psychology of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, an aspect of the *Complete Works* which hitherto has been given nothing like its proper acknowledgement. The melancholy of Ajax is precisely that of Melancholy Jacques in *AYLI*: this is the "inspired melancholy" which the new Neoplatonism/Christian Cabalism saw as an essential attribute of the Gnostically enquiring mind (cf. Dürer's *Melencolia I* (fig.1).

Pandarus naturally expresses his belief that Troilus is a better man than Hector, which Cressida will not accept: for at this stage the lure to communion with Aphrodite is resisted. Yet this will not always be so ("But more in Troilus thousandfold I see/Than in the glass of Pandar's praise may be"). What is all this business about Helen and Troilus and the hairs on his chin? Pandarus tells Cressida how Helen had sat Troilus down in a "compassed window" and tickled him under his "cloven" (dimpled) chin, where there were "two and fifty" hairs, fifty of them black, which he identifies as Priam's sons, with a forked one (making two) for Paris, and single white hair for Priam himself. This is straightforward moon symbolism, bread and butter to any Renaissance magus, as Shakespeare, under the aegis of Bacon, certainly was. The window is a bay window, with a semi-circular seat, representing the old moon (or new, in other circumstances). Helen's hand, which would have had to have been, to tickle under his chin, upturned and slightly curved, is the new moon, thereby identifying Troilus' chin, with its dark hairs, with the dark moon. This is a staple artistic symbol: witness, for example, the curved white hand cradling the sable elbow of the Black Prince in Ford Madox Brown's *Chaucer at the Court of Edward the Third* (Art Gallery of NSW); or the twin cupped hands framing the gaping mouth in Edward Munch's famous painting *The Scream*, to strikingly identify the face with the

---

dark moon, or invisible world, or Will, co-existent with and substrate of the visible (phenomenal) world. This is also the scream of the ego in T&C as the will-to-eros shatters its assiduously armoured Apollonist fastness. Paris, as that aspect of the ego which communes with the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, is worth a double hair, while King Priam's is white (radiant moon), for he represents the ego in Classical mode (concern for the visible world only). Pandarus initially refers to Troilus' "cloven" rather than "dimpled" chin to identify Troilus principle with Pan, or even the Devil himself of Pauline Christianity.

Pandarus and Cressida now observe the warriors returning to Ilion. They are all aspects of Shakespeare's psyche. First is Aeneas, the original principle of Puritan rejection of the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen; then Antenor, the principle of judgement, which is based on the examination of two or more concepts, which in turn are based ideally on intuitive perceptions of the given world, in accordance with Schopenhauer's principle of Sufficient Reason; then Hector, the will-to-Apollonism; Paris, with his thigh-wound now healed, as Shakespeare's was by Hermetic study, the lover of the Queen of Hell shattered by the "charge of the Boar" (the coup of 1587); the priestly Helenus, devotee of Helen, Queen of Hell, who yet does not commune with her; and finally Troilus, the "sneaking fellow", the principle of communion with the Goddess of Love (Cressida: Venus, Aphrodite), in Whom the Queen of Hell is immanent. This last arrival must be interpreted sequentially in time, with the will-to-eros breaking in upon the ego, after a period of Apollonist mentation, precisely as it did, in the person of the Lords Suffolk and Norfolk, in HVIII II, ii, where the 'King reading pensively' is Shakespeare himself. Troilus enters Ilion (conscious ego) immediately before the common soldiers ("Asses, fools, dolts! chaff and bran, chaff and bran! porridge after meat!) which in Shakespeare's symbolic language represent the will. The ego abandons its Apollonist meditation, as it is seized by the lure of the Goddess:

Boy	Sir, my lord [Troilus] would instantly speak with you.
Pandarus	Where?
Boy	At your own house; there he unarms him.

---

Agamemnon's use of a tree image to describe his camp on the plains of Troy is perfectly appropriate, for the tree is an immemorially ancient symbol of the Goddess, or Her Consort/Son (Adonis, Dionysius, Attis, and so on).<sup>2</sup> Here it would have been the oak, the tree of high summer in the Druidic tree-alphabet with which Bacon evidently was thoroughly familiar (see especially A&C). This scene, with its noble speeches and high philosophising, could only have been written by Bacon; and one senses his powerful architectonic presence behind T&C. Hence could it be included in FF, unlike the wholly Shakesporean MAF and PER.

The critics have noted, but never adequately explained in the context of the play, the philosophy of Ulysses' great speech. The sun therein refers to, in truth, the faculty of reason, which here has been found inadequate in the Classical ego (Shakespeare's) in question. The planets that "In evil mixture to disorder wander" are the concepts of the ego, defective as founded on corrupt perceptions of the given world (especially, in this case, the will-to-eros in negative aspect), but which nevertheless can be corrected by the application of Gnostic reason (gnosis in Greek means "the knowing"; hence the Gnostic tradition encompasses what can be directly known of the given world, and exalts knowledge over faith). One recalls the chakras of Hindu Kundalini yoga, the stations of the body (anus, genitalia, umbilicus, heart, larynx, forehead, crown) through which the contemplating ego ascends progressively, skipping none without exception, until final illumination is reached. Similar also is the meditative system of the Mithraic religion, or any number of other mystery religions with which Shakespeare, as of the circle of Bacon, and a magus in his own right, would have been familiar.

We can, in fact, be more precise about the nature of this tradition. As we have seen (Ch.1), Christopher Knight and Robert Lomas have produced, in their *The Second Messiah*, really conclusive evidence that Freemasonry was born of the ashes of the Knights Templar, who had inherited the Davidic tradition via the Jerusalem Church, the true Jesus Christ, and the Rex Deus line (Gnostic Church): Jacques de Molay, the last Templar Grand

---

Master, being the Second Messiah. This is the authentic Freemasonry, as based on the thirty-three degrees of the Ancient and Accepted Rite of Scotland, before its mutilation by the Duke of Sussex and his English followers in the early 18<sup>th</sup> century – an act of cultural vandalism that must rank, in quality though not quantity, with the burning by Pauline Christians of the library at Alexandria. The rituals of the thirty-three degrees in fact preserve and celebrate the teachings of Jesus himself – the true Jesus, rather than the confection of St. Paul's.

### The Ancient and Accepted Rite of Scotland in T&C.

T&C appeared in 1602; and Knight and Lomas tell us (ibid.) that Sir Francis Bacon was formally inducted into Freemasonry by King James, newly arrived from Scotland, in 1603. It is fascinating, therefore, to find clear evidence of the rituals of the thirty-three degrees in T&C, and elsewhere in FF, many, though not all, of the details of which we now know, in spite of the determination of the Duke of Sussex and the Grand Lodge of England to suppress them, thanks to the inspired and tenacious detective work of Knight and Lomas.

There can be no doubt that Ulysses' expatiation on degree in the great speech "Troy, yet upon his basis, had been down..." refers to the thirty-three degrees of the Ancient and Accepted Rite of Scotland; the sun in "the glorious planet Sol/In noble eminence enthroned... whose medicinable eye/Corrects the influence of evil planets..." referring in particular to the fourteenth degree. Knight and Lomas tell how their eyes leapt out of their sockets at finding for the first time the details of the lost rituals; and this was also my reaction to these words of theirs (ibid.):

The next degree [fourteenth], "Scotch Knight of Perfection", is set in a room which has at its centre the reassembled fragments of Enoch's pillar, inscribed with hieroglyphics. It is claimed that King Solomon created a "Lodge of Perfection" to rule over the thirteen lower degrees, and its members held their first meeting in the sacred vault of Enoch beneath the partly constructed Temple of Solomon.

---

Incidentally, this pillar must be the same as marvelled at by Parzival in Clinschor's castle in Wolfram's saga (see Ch.44). Fascinatingly, there is placed on the pedestal of this degree a gold ring for the newly admitted brother. A gold ring bearing a pillar, or two pillars, continues to be handed down from father to son of the Rex Deus line (founded by the priests of the Jerusalem Church after the diaspora that followed its brutal suppression by Rome). This is the same ring precisely as features in numerous plays of FF, which is revealed thereby as the greatest Ring saga of all.

There is more evidence of the influence of the thirty-three degrees on FF, in the character of Adam in AYLI and elsewhere. I have glossed Adam, also Protheus ("first man") in TGV, as representing primal or Dinoyasian/Falstaffian Man, or Man-as-sublimated-animal. This is true enough; but Knight and Lomas are more eye-opening specific:

The degree [twenty-eighth: "Knight of the Sun"] describes all the Masonic symbols, and the overall purpose is given as the inculcation of truth. A lecture on truth is given in sections by nine officers who are called Thrice Perfect Father Adam, Brother Truth, Michael, Gabriel, Raphael, Zaphriel, Camael, Azrael, and Uriel. Over the entrance to the chamber where the degree is conferred is written: "Ye who have not the power to subdue passion, fly from this place of truth".

The mention here of, as well as Adam, the archangel Michael, and the inscription, are all of the deepest resonance with respect to the plays; while the epithet "Thrice perfect" recurs time and time again in FF (e.g. T&C II, iii, 188): which is also associated, however, with Hermes Trismegistus. The name "Michael" is always associated with the the principle of truth, a beautiful example being Michael Williams in HV, where his value, more specifically, of the visual imagination, may be an index to its true meaning in this Knight of the Sun degree. It can only be hoped that further work by Knight and Lomas may illuminate details such as this; - another being the precise place of Hermes Trismegistus ("Thrice great") in the Masonic tradition, and his relationship to Adam. The inscription is especially powerful, suggesting as it does the repeated motif in

---

FF of the victory over the libido, more broadly the unseen world, - as effected, ultimately, by Sir Francis Bacon in the case of his patient Shakespeare, - as represented most powerfully in the complete subjugation of Kate in TOS, an episode which, like the treatment of the Jew Shylock in MOV, strikes a false chord with many readers, yet which is perfectly explained by reference to the allegory. One recalls also the shrunken dog in Durer's Melencolia I (fig.1), as well as the feeble nags in Parzival, Don Quixote, and The Lord of the Rings. This is the famous victory gained by the great modern scientists, artists, and depth psychologists, - and Bacon was godfather to them all. It has been an enduring theme in Western art, which the injection of a love story into the recent cinema adaptation of Tolkien has betrayed.

\*

Ajax represents the principle of Gnostic Christhood as evolved into the truly Western (Faustian) ego, with its concern for depth, and illimitable space, and its female wisdom, as most tellingly evoked by the Gnostic name "Sophia", - ultimately derived from Egypt, - which resumes the notion of the Holy Spirit, the "Spirit that moved on the face of the waters": and these are the unfathomable depths into which Ajax has insight. He will be shown below to represent, in fact, Shakespeare in creative mode. Achilles represents the ego as dissolved by the libido (world-as-will) from its clear-edged, brilliantly informed Apollonist imaginative mode into unreason and foolishness, where lurks its nemesis of the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen and Her Consort/Son the Boar in negative aspect. This Achilles-mode of consciousness is the vaunt-guard of the Ajax principle, with its female wisdom: the wisdom which underpinned Shakespeare's creativity, which therefore was inseparable from his frequent lapses into auto-erotism (HVIII), or the arms of a tart. Thersites is the Fool (II, iii, 52 ff.), whose principle, as in King Lear, is inseparable from this sort of psychic transformation: the source for him, and all the multitude of his kin in FF, almost certainly being the Fool card of the Tarot, a Templar invention (see Ch.1). The fear of libido, and its declension into foolishness, prevents the accession of Gnostic wisdom:

Nestor     And in the imitation of these twain,

---

Who, as Ulysses says, opinion crowns  
With an imperial voice, many are infect.  
Ajax is grown self-willed and bears his head  
In such a rein, in full as proud a place  
As broad Achilles[...]; and sets Thersites  
...To weaken and discredit our exposure.

It is the world as will (libido) which is threatening the ego, and crippling its receptivity to the world as idea (wisdom):

Ulysses    They... esteem no act  
              But that of hand; the still and mental parts  
              That do contrive how many hands shall strike-  
              ...Why, this hath not a finger's dignity.

The archetypal Goddess-rejector (Aeneas) fails to recognise the God (Agamemnon) in whom Sophia is resumed ("Which is that god in office, guiding men?"). The question of the Goddess as Aphrodite is at the heart of this psychic struggle ("If there be one among the fair'st of Greece...").

## ACT II

i

Thersites' railing against Ajax represents the Fool principle, or rather the threat of its ascendancy, casting the Faustian creator in negative aspect, - since there is secreted within him the Boar, - and preventing his transformation of the ego. Thersites therefore refuses to tell Ajax the nature of the proclamation delivered by Aeneas in their previous scene.

ii

The purpose of Apollonist scholasticism, with its powerful development of the visual imagination, is to lift the ego clear of the pit of the Queen of Hell in negative aspect. Hector therefore wishes the Trojans to be rid of Helen ("Let Helen go"). Helen represents the force, welling up from the lightless depths, which must drive on to orgasm: for she shares a Christian name with Nell Quickly ("Nell, he is full of harmony": III, i, 53; "...but my Nell would not have it

---

so": III, i, 138), - which signifies the tolling of the petit-mort.

The ego senses au fond that its wanted mode will crumble if it succumbs to the siren-call of the Goddess; yet its Troilus aspect drives it on:

Cassandra	Cry, Trojans, cry! A Helen and a woe: Cry, cry! Troy burns, or else let Helen go. [goes [...]
Troilus	...Her brainsick raptures Cannot distaste the goodness of a quarrel... [...]
Paris	Paris should ne'er retract what he hath done, Nor faint in the pursuit.

For Paris is the ego aspect that communes with the Queen of Hell. The result will be dissolution and descent into foolishness (defeat of Hector by Achilles):

Hector	I am yours, You valiant offspring of great Priamus. I have a roisting challenge sent amongst The dull and factious nobles of the Greeks...
--------	---

iii

The "Neapolitan bone-ache" wished on the nobles by Thersites for this "war for a placket" is precisely the same in essence (though not necessarily in character: whether syphilis or gonorrhoea) as Shakespeare describes himself as having suffered in sonnets 153 and 154. There are further insights into the divine principle enshrined in Ajax. Pride is a quality of the outward-turned ego which is actuated by the world as will, and is therefore an incarnation of the equation  $c = \# x$ , - as discussed by Joseph Campbell in *Creative Mythology*, - whereby a Man-as-sublimated-animal is exactly the same as every other Man-as-sublimated-animal, yet perceives himself to be essentially different; whereas the enlightened Gnostic man, informed by the female Holy Spirit, perceives himself and humanity as a whole as related to an ultimately indefinable divine principle (cRx). This is

---

also expressed in a quote from the mediaeval Hermetic Book of the Twenty-Four Philosophers: “God is an infinite sphere whose centre is everywhere and circumference nowhere”; and by Teilhard de Chardin, who wrote of the threefold property possessed by every consciousness of: 1) Centring everything partially on itself; 2) Being able to centre on itself constantly and increasingly; and 3) Being brought by this very super-centration into association with all the other centres surrounding it. The knowledge of the equation  $cRx$  therefore is predicated on love of the Self: and Shakespeare gives beautiful expression to this timeless principle:

Ajax        I do hate a proud man as I do hate the engendering of toads.

(Nestor    And yet he loves himself: is it not strange?

In a series of asides the association of Faustian man (Ajax) and libidinous man (Achilles) is established (“How he describes himself!”; “The raven chides blackness”; “He will be the physician that should be the patient”; &c.): so that the victory of Achilles over Hector in Act V will be also the victory of Ajax. Likewise, this reassertion of the will was also the point of the life’s work of Friedrich Nietzsche, who, like Shakespeare, suffered its anathematisation by Pauline Christianity; - and neither of them succeeded completely in resanctifying it in his own ego. Shakespeare sums up:

Ulysses    Thank the heavens, lord, thou [Ajax] art of sweet composure;  
              Praise him that got thee, she that gave thee suck;  
              Famed by thy tutor, and thy parts of nature  
              Thrice-famed beyond, beyond all erudition...  
              I will not praise thy wisdom,  
              Which, like a bourne, a pale, a shore, confines  
              Thy spacious and dilated parts.

The Self comprises, as Jung emphasised, the conscious ego and the unconscious. The will-to-eros proceeds from the unconscious; and love of this will therefore means love of the Self, a love that

---

was forced upon the Apollonist ego that was Shakespeare's by his admission, against his will, of the libido (communion with Cressida)

### ACT III

i

The transitional phase of hard-edged, brilliant Apollonism to libidinous foolishness is represented by the encounter of Pandarus with the servant of Paris, who at first does not recognise him, then misunderstands him, and finally arrives at full comprehension, a significant landmark on the low road to the Rubicon. The Troilus aspect of the ego (via the go-between) is enormously attracted to the Queen of Hell, who responds:

Pandarus	Fair be to you, my lord, and all this fair company! Fair desires, in all fair measure, fairly guide them! Especially to you, fair queen, fair thoughts be your fair pillow!
	[...]
Helen	My Lord Pandarus ; honey-sweet lord –

The ego attempts to banish the underworld, where lurks the Boar, from its libidinous encounter (“What says my sweet queen?... You must not know where he [Troilus] sups”) which will dissolve its Apollonism (“Well, I’ll make’s excuse”). Here is, yet again in FF, “I” standing for the ithyphallos. A physical change signals the point of no return (Pandarus’ music-making with Paris and Helen):

Paris	I spy.
Pandarus	You spy! What do you spy? Come, give me an instrument.

“I spy” is germane here to the more frequent “I may”. The Apollonist defenses against the libido are down (“Sweet Helen, I [Paris] must woo you/To help unarm our Hector”).

<sup>3</sup> The World as Will and Idea

---

ii

The boy, as elsewhere in the plays (HV IV, iv; 1HVI IV, v) is symbolic of the will (for the child indeed is closer to the raw will than the adult). It therefore is Troilus' boy servant who first meets Pandarus in the orchard. The orchard trees represent, like all the other woods, groves, forests, even single trees, in FF, the written word. Shakespeare describes the ego's fear of dissolution, and consequent vulnerability to the "charge of the Boar", as his Apollonist meditation on the printed page is threatened:

Troilus   ...and I do fear besides  
          That I shall lose distinction in my joys,  
          As doth a battle, when they charge on heaps  
          The enemy flying.

The subject apprehends the immanence of the Boar (Cressida's fears); and embraces the tart, who is Aphrodite incarnate, with misgivings (her shame). The shadow of the Boar (Diomed) is powerfully present:

Cressida I have a kind of self that resides with you,  
          But an unkind self that itself will leave  
          To be another's [Diomed's] fool...

iii

It is important, above all, to understand that this scene represents the dialogue which Shakespeare has with himself over his books, as the psychic transformation is adumbrated by the ithyphallos of Paris' "I spy" (III, i, 90). The crossing of Cressida to the Greek camp, announced here by Calchas, will symbolise the transformation of the Goddess as Aphrodite, - who was essentially a Greek hetaira or courtesan, and characteristic of Shakespeare's pantheon in his Classical Apollonist mode, - to a true Grail Queen, inspiration of the Gnostic written word, which shortly would begin to flow from Shakespeare's pen. It was this constant powerful reassertion in his creative psyche of the Faustian world-feeling, with its concern for the unseen world, over the claims of the

---

Classical, which to truly Western eyes is soulless, that made Shakespeare, in his own way, a true artist. The Boar as always will charge (the escorting to Troy of the exchange prisoner Antenor by Diomed), but will be depowered. The mechanism of this neutralisation is an index to the most fundamental properties of the Faustian ego. The Greek Generals pass by Achilles' tent without acknowledging him, to be followed finally by Ulysses, who has directed this behaviour, reading a book. Shakespeare is considering, in the shadow of the gathering flood of libido (Achilles), and the light of his by now impressive Hermetic learning (Prospero's isle), - the merits and demerits of the Western and Classical approaches to the libido (unseen world), or of Platonic Ideas and mere Aristotelean ideas, or of female wisdom and the blazing light of intellect (the male principle). To emphasise once again, Shakespeare never wholly succeeded in transforming from negative to positive the aspects of the contents of his unconscious – the Queen of Hell and her Consort/Son the Boar – which hence remained problematic for the whole of his creative life.

The Apollonist ego reduces everything to the immediately present. Care, which is the spiritual counterpoise of distance, is not to any degree its property. Look at the Apollo atop the Archibald Fountain in Sydney's Hyde Park – trim, taut, nude, with arm outstretched as the horizon to which his all-seeing eye penetrates, though no further (cf. the Hitlerian salute) – he does not care about you, but only his hard-edged, brilliantly formed ideas. Lacking the fluid or female principle he is, in Goethe's terms, become rather than becoming. At this point we may remark the limitation of the Temple of Apollo at Delphi, with the tomb of Dionysius in its heart: for with the will (Dionysius) buried, albeit with honours, this Apollo, like the Pythagorean religion as a whole, has exiled himself from the province of becoming. The tomb of Dionysius is essentially cognate with the half-starved dog in Dürer's *Melencolia I* (fig.1), Don Quixote's feeble nag Rosinante, and Bill the pony in Tolkien's *Lord of the Rings*: and Bacon, and his pupil Shakespeare, would have found this victory over the unseen world extremely appealing. We remember the ritual of the twenty-eighth ("Knight of the Sun") degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry: 'Ye who have not the power to subdue passion, flee

---

from this place of truth'. However, the crucially important thing for Shakespeare (as shown, for example, by the pilgrimage of Cleomenes and Dion to Delphi in TWT) is that Dionysius is there at all, thus enabling the fulfillment of the axiom "Know Thyself", inscribed over its lintel. The Hermetic rebirth described in the later Acts of RIII had a distinctly Classical character; and this is different *toto caelo* to the world-feeling of Pauline Christianity which is, as not proceeding from Nature, finally worthless. Shakespeare's innermost tendency, not to be denied, was, however, ineluctably towards the highest ideals of Western culture, and it is their force, in conflict with the negative contents of his unconscious, as cast there by puritan Christianity, which is the fingerprint of his work. What was needed for its accomplishment was for Dionysius – the unseen world - to be rather a living principle, transforming him into the truly Western state of continual becoming. For the various wills – to survival, eros, power – in Man-as-sublimated-animal, are to differing extents themselves invisible worlds, and further are indices to the final invisible world of the Will.

Oswald Spengler pointed out that Western Culture-man looks inwards, and his soul is pure Will. Western tragedy therefore is active, in contrast to the Attic, where all is stasis and ethos, and persona predominates over personality. This quality of stasis and Will-lessness is also sensed in Buddhism, which it is another of Spengler's great achievements to have demonstrated to be, as a degradation of the Indian Vedantic religion which preceded it, a symptom of a Culture in decline: a stigma of a Civilisation. This Apollonism was characteristic of Shakespeare in his London life, as essential to his psychological health: for the problem of the Boar was never finally solved; or, at least, not until his creativity was exhausted (the character of Sands in HVIII), when a return to his wife was the only direction left to him. Yet even here, "coped with" is perhaps a better description than "solved". The unmistakable voice of Sir Francis Bacon is evident in Ulysses' philosophical musings in this scene, to suggest, once again, his deep understanding of his patient's clinical history, and their close collaboration.

Ulysses    A strange fellow here

---

Writes me, that man, how dearly ever parted,  
How much in having, or without or in,  
Cannot make boast to have that which he hath,  
Nor feels not what he owes, but by reflection,  
As, when his virtues shining upon others  
Heat them, and they retort that heat again  
To the first giver.

Schopenhauer begs to be quoted:

By way of these reflections the reader may have gained a knowledge...of what everyone knows directly in concreto, i.e., as feeling... The reader... will find that it will automatically become for him the key to the knowledge of the inmost being of the whole of nature; for he now applies it to all those phenomena which are given to him, not like his own phenomenal existence in direct knowledge as well as indirect, but only in the latter, and so merely one-sidedly as idea alone. The will of which we are speaking he will recognise as the inmost nature not only in those phenomena which are closely similar to his own, in men and animals, but further reflection will lead him also to recognise the force which stirs and vegetates in the plant, and indeed the force by which the crystal is formed, that by which the magnet turns to the North Pole, the force whose shock he experiences from the contact between different metals, the force which appears in the elective affinities of matter as repulsion and attraction, separation and combination, and, lastly, even gravitation, which pulls so powerfully through all matter... all these he will recognise as different only in their phenomenal existence, but in their inner nature as identical... <sup>3</sup>

The immanence of the libido recognised afresh, leads him to the creativity of the theatre, whose tutelary deity indeed is Dionysius:

Ulysses I do not strain at his position-  
It is familiar- but at the author's drift  
...That no man is lord of anything...  
Till he communicate his parts to others...  
... I was much rapt in this,

---

And apprehended here immediately  
Th' unknown Ajax. Heavens, what a man is there!

The reason he strains is that this is, remarkably, precisely the same crisis as confronted Stephen Daedalus on Sandymount Strand, when he pondered if he would have the courage to save a drowning man: the origin of which selflessness is a philosophical problem solved by Schopenhauer in *The World as Will and Idea*, which Joyce had read avidly. Joyce was, too, the Classical scholar, lethal with the hard-edged forms of his imagination ("O, my name for you is the best: Kinch, the knife-blade": Buck Mulligan to Daedalus in *Ulysses*). Like Shakespeare's, his task was to delve below the merely visible, the province of Classical Apollonism, to discover the underworld (Nighttown), and the Will, and with it the depth and compassion of the Faustian, or Western creative, ego. The great Classical scholar but even greater symbolist poet Christopher Brennan (Australia, 1870-1932) suffered a strikingly similar conflict which, like Shakespeare, he was unable to resolve. His HVIII-T&C is the long autobiographical poem *The Forest of the Night*; while the moment corresponding to T&C I, i, 1, and HVIII II, ii, 61, is recorded in Poem 63 of *Poems 1913*: "There is a far off thrill that troubles me...", in which also the Pandarus principle appears: "...Where panic night lies stricken 'neath the curse/Exuded by the dense enormous hearse/Of some old vampire-god, whose bulk within/Lies gross and festering in his shroud of sin".

Shakespeare now sums up the *fons et origo* of the philosophy of the great Cultures in full bloom (whereas Greece-Rome represented the end-stage of its Culture), arrived at through contemplation of the Will and illimitable space.

Ulysses 'Tis known, Achilles, that you are in love  
With one of Priam's daughters.  
[...]  
There is a mystery, with whom relation  
Durst never meddle, in the soul of state,

<sup>4</sup> Robert Graves, *ibid.*

---

Which hath an operation more divine  
Than breath or pen can give expressure to...

The ego is reflecting here, with the irruption of libido imminent, on its wonted Classical Apollonist crystal-clear ideation (Priam's daughter) as a means of keeping the libido at bay (Achilles in his tent). He is about to dance (union with Cressida), yet recognises that there also is a "still point, where the dance is" (T.S. Eliot, *Four Quartets*): i.e., the dance as will (which must include, for him, the Boar) and idea ("We move above the moving tree/In light above the figured leaf/And hear upon the sodden floor/Below, the boarhound and the boar/Pursue their pattern as before/But reconciled among the stars": T.S. Eliot, *ibid.*). He is not there, but yearns for its peace to be achieved through creativity, which however will not indefeasibly come until the laying down of his pen (HVIII; TT):

Achilles ...I have a woman's longing,  
An appetite that I am sick withal,  
To see great Hector in his weeds of peace.

He wishes this to take place "after the combat": i.e., through creativity, without the irruption of libido (Achilles in his tent) and "charge of the Boar". Foolishness, with its loss of control over the Boar, now enters consciousness unbidden, beyond rational control, as the go-between:

Achilles Go call Thersites hither...  
enter Thersites  
... A labour saved.

Shakespeare describes his musings as an attempt to forestall union with the Aphrodite (courtesan)-figure (Ajax deep in thought on the battlefield); but the desired peace between the Achilles and Hector principles, actuated by the Fool principle, is doomed:

Patroclus Your answer, sir.  
Thersites Fare ye well, with all my heart.

---

Achilles    Why, but he is not in this tune, is he ?

- And union with the tart closing fast.

#### ACT IV

i

The union of Troilus with Cressida has been also with the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, as made clear by the identification of Troilus with Paris ("Had I occasion to lie so long/As you, Prince Paris..."). The Boar becomes visible ("That's my mind too": Diomedes). The potency of his charge is a function of the rejection of the Goddess (ultimately Isis) by the ego in which the Aeneas principle is dominant (mutual love between Aeneas and Diomedes). Now, however, in contrast to the coup recorded in RIII, the ego as the Gnostic Christ will look the Boar full in the face and escape it ("And thou shalt hunt a lion, that will fly/With his face backward"). Shakespeare puts the essence of his condition in a nutshell:

Aeneas            We know each other well.

Diomedes        We do; and long to know each other worse.

The ego yearns for psychic transformation, rather than the continued disjunction of its Apollonism and the Goddess, with whom the Boar must remain associated ("Troilus had rather Troy were borne to Greece/Than Cressid borne from Troy"). Diomedes makes this clear in yet another reprise of the "Shakespearean moment":

Diomedes        He, like a puling cuckold, would drink up  
The lees and dregs of a flat taméd piece;  
You, like a lecher, out of whorish loins  
Are pleased to breed out your inheritors...

What absolutely is missing here is any sense of the Goddess as Divine Bride, in whom the aspects of Sacred Mother and Queen of Hell are immanent: for the Classical Goddess as courtesan (Aphrodite) remains dominant.

---

ii

Pandarus is with the wakened lovers (awareness of Cressida as whore). The Apollonist ego when confronted by her becomes vulnerable to the Boar (Aeneas conversing with Pandarus with the lovers offstage; Troilus re-entering, to whom Aeneas announces the imminent arrival of Diomedes). The ego tries to dissociate itself from the Goddess (“...and, my Lord Aeneas,/We met by chance: you did not find me here”: Troilus).

iii

The ego knows that, for its own preservation, the Goddess must now be seen in the light of the Gnostic tradition, in which Wisdom (Sophia), whose reach goes far beyond the bounds of the merely visible Classical cosmos, as recreated in Shakespeare’s powerful visual imagination in Apollonist mode, above all is prominent:

Troilus I’ll bring her to the Grecian presently...

iv

Cressida I must then to the Grecians?

Troilus No remedy.

The ego fears Her association with the Boar (“But yet, be true”); but itself is indissolubly bound to Her (“Fear not my truth: the moral of my wit/Is “plain and true”; there’s all the reach of it”). The ego is fully armed (“For... I’ll cut thy throat”). The Hector principle (impulse to Apollonist mentation, driven by the underworld in negative aspect) notionally reasserts itself; but in the time frame of the allegory, is already dead:

Paris Hark! Hector’s trumpet.

Aeneas How have we spent this morning!

The prince must think me tardy and remiss,

That swore to ride before him to the field.

Paris ‘Tis Troilus’ fault.

v

---

The ascendancy of Shakespeare's creativity in the face of the Boar is adumbrated ("Give with thy trumpet a loud note to Troy": Agamemnon to Ajax); but he defers it, to amplify and deepen the initial stages of psychic transformation:

Ulysses            No trumpet answers.  
Achilles           'Tis but early days.  
Agamemnon       Is not yon Diomed, with Calchas' daughter?  
Ulysses           'Tis he, I ken the manner of his gait:  
                         He rises on the toe...

This is the gait of the Boar, not to mention the bull, goat, and so on, which is precisely the symbolic value of the high-heeled buskin worn by the sacred kings of the Goddess in pre-Hellenic times<sup>4</sup> (cf. the Cuban heel; and Germaine Greer's memorable comment about "fuck me" shoes). The Greek generals all kiss Cressida; except for Menelaus whom she refuses. Why? – Menelaus is identified with Paris ("... and he is even with you") as a lover of the Queen of Hell, who is repressed as will by the ego at this stage of pre-transformation. Ulysses, continuing his role of philosopher, foresees that Helen will never be returned to the Greeks (Shakespeare, with his constitutive Christian puritanism, will never see the Queen of Hell in wholly positive aspect, and hence will always be avid for the Apollonist mentation of his studious mode: his final victory to come only after the relinquishing of his pen, which is the premise of HVIII and TT). At this early stage the ego is trying to cope with the Boar by thinking it down. The Achilles principle (libidinous foolishness) will be the initial vector of the transformation; and it is recognised now by the hitherto dominant Aeneas principle:

Aeneas    If not Achilles, sir,  
                 What is your name?  
Achilles    If not Achilles, nothing.  
Aeneas    Therefore Achilles.

- Which however rejects it, still trying to preserve its "distinction" and invulnerability by rejecting the blind will-to-eros, as perfected by his teacher Bacon, with the help of his Muse Athena ("But securely

---

done,/A little proudly, and a great deal misprizing/The knight  
opposed". cf. "~~...you would swear directly/Their very noses had been~~  
counsellors/To Pepin of Clotharius, they keep state so": HVIII I, iii).

Aeneas    This Ajax is half made of Hector's blood;  
              In love whereof, half Hector stays at home;  
              Half hand, half heart, half Hector comes to seek  
              This blended knight, half Trojan and half Greek.

Diomedes (the Boar) stands with Ajax; Aeneas, consistently, with Hector. The new and accustomed psychic states grapple ("... a maiden battle": like a coupling with no libidinous foolishness); yet the Boar, released by the Ajax principle (Faustian creativity) from its confines without the limits of Classical mentation, causes the ego to withdraw into the latter, with the promise of protection, as of old ("You must no more [...] As Hector pleases": Diomedes). Yet union with the Cressida principle (Goddess) has made this regression impossible: and the ego seeks appeasement of its conflict (invitation to Hector to unarm and join the Greek generals in their tent, in amity). The fons et origo of Shakespeare's Apollonist scholasticism lies in the "charge of the Boar"; recurrent, though never again as catastrophic as in RIII III, iv:

Hector    Ah, sir, there's many a Greek and Trojan dead,  
              Since first I saw yourself and Diomed  
              In Ilion, on your Greekish embassy.

Yet there can be no escaping it: the ego must abandon the hard-edged forms of its Apollonist mode and allow itself to be at one with the will, with all that implies of subsequent compassion and depth, which provide the only possible basis for the greatest art:

Achilles    Tell me, you heavens, in which part of his body  
              Shall I destroy him [Hector]?

ACT V



---

mine oath"); yet the tendency is that way ("Hark, one word in your ear"). The ego must engage with the dreamworld of Nature, in a dimension where words are no help ("I will not speak a word"). Any attempt to describe the indescribable will incite the Boar ("One cannot speak a word, but it straight starts you"). The ego attempts to toss the diseased organ away: but the will-to-eros in negative aspect, as cast by puritan Christianity, evidently is a constitutive part of his psyche:

Ulysses    Why stay we then?

Troilus    To make a recordation to my soul  
            Of every syllable that here was spoke.  
            ...Sith yet there is a credence in my heart,  
            An esperance so obstinately strong,  
            That doth invert th'attest of eyes and ears.

The Goddess as Aphrodite of the Greeks – a courtesan – recedes before the Divine Bride, in Whom the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen is immanent:

Troilus    Think we had mothers. Do not give advantage  
            To stubborn critics, apt without a theme  
            For depravation, to square the general sex  
            By Cressid's rule; Rather think this not Cressid.

The ego locks into its creative (Ajaxian) mode ("Ajax your guard stays to conduct you home"); yet the Fool principle still secretes the Boar ("Patroclus will give me anything for the intelligence of this whore": Thersites). Soon Apollo will be abandoned for Faust (death of Hector).

iii

The ego is determined to conquer the Boar (Troilus' vehement intention to fight Diomedes). The victory of Apollonism would leave, on the other hand, the Boar unharmed (Hector's plea that Troilus should not fight). The old sequence of Apollonism?irruption of libido'union with tart, may now be broken (imminent death of Pandarus): for the ego in creative mode will now express the

---

Faustian dimension of heart (“Words, words, mere words; no matter from the heart”).

iv

Thersites (Fool) is allied with Achilles (libido); yet both ultimately refer to the Ajax principle (Faustian creativity): “No, you see, he is his argument that has his argument – Achilles”: II, iii, 95. The libido in negative aspect is a constitutive part of the psyche; therefore the ego, transformed by libido, cannot allow itself to descend into foolishness, wherein is secreted the Boar (Thersites’ railing against the “whore”), but must pursue its creativity (cf. Prospero: “I find my zenith doth depend upon/A most auspicious star, whose influence/If I court not but omit, my fortunes/Will ever after droop.” TT I, ii, 181-4).

v - vi

The combatants fight, according to their allegorical value: Troilus with Diomedes, Hector with Achilles, and so on. Faust will triumph over Apollo in the transformed psyche:

Troilus    Ajax hath ta’en Aeneas. Shall it be?  
              No, by the flame of yonder glorious heaven,  
              He shall not carry him; I’ll be ta’en too...

The Classical preoccupation with the merely visible is symbolised by the Greek in sumptuous armour (“I like thy armour well;/I’ll frush it and unlock the rivets all,/But I’ll be master of it...”: Hector). He will later be revealed to have, consistently, a “putrified core” (“Now is my day’s work done”: Hector).

vii – x

The Hector principle is extirpated, defenceless because of its lack of Faustian depth (“I am unarmed...”). The battle of the ego (Troilus) with its nemesis the Boar (Diomedes: torment consequent on inrush of libido, the most violent instance of which was the coup of 1587) is left unresolved. The ego is now prepared to face all the implications of Faustian creativity:

---

Troilus    You understand me not that tell me so;  
              I do not speak of flight, of fear, of death,  
              But dare all imminence that gods and men  
              Address their dangers in.

The Pandarus principle (impulse to seek out love-for-sale) will now die; but the subject (Shakespeare) will be left with a legacy of venereal disease, presumably the same as suggested in the last two sonnets.

---

## CHAPTER 27

### MR. ARDEN OF FEVERSHAM:

A play from the pen of Shakespeare

Why does the title specify “Feversham”, when in every other instance in the text without exception it is spelt “Faversham”? There is a precedent in LLL, where the First Folio, -which is remarkable for its extreme accuracy, and the high information content of even single letters which were copied meticulously from manuscript to print, - gives the header Actus Quartus to Act V, to semaphore to the alert reader an encryption. There are many other instances of this sort of sort of signal in the Complete Works: for example, in the no less than sevenfold reiteration of “Crispian” (a spelling unique to HV, instead of the accepted “Crispian”) and “Crispin”, by Hal in HV IV, iii. This was found (Ch.8) to be a reference to the participle *crispans* as used by Virgil in Aeneid I for the brandishing of spears, and hence to encrypt the name “Shakespeare”. The point of “Feversham” is that this is an allegory of a disease, a “fever”, that same malady as described in the histories as suffered by Shakespeare, whose name is lightly encrypted in “(Mr.) Arden”. “Black Will”, and “Shakebag” represent the libido in negative aspect which will irrupt the conscious ego to shatter it (murder of Arden) in that central pathogenetic event of the plays, the “charge of the Boar”.

MAF will be shown below to be perfectly of a piece with the histories as allegory and, further, to adumbrate many of the themes and symbols of the later plays. Yet it was not, unlike them, included in FF, which was undoubtedly published under the aegis of Sir Francis Bacon, from his own manuscripts, while he was still alive to ensure their accurate transmission, - to preserve for posterity his colossal contribution to Western philosophy, literature, and depth psychology. This would imply that MAF was written exclusively by Shakespeare, a fascinating glimpse of his outstanding literary talent at this early stage of his apprenticeship being given thereby. The further inference to be made is that Pericles, on the basis of its

---

exclusion from the FF, was likewise written exclusively by Shakespeare. This would support the theory that its first two Acts were Shakespeare's earliest literary production: - almost certainly, in view of their style, earlier than MAF. Yet Acts III-V, belonging to a much later time, must also have been written by him solus.

MAF is a true work of Art, with an element of magic, whose writing yet lacks the exalted tone – the high philosophising, extreme metaphoric and linguistic richness, expert information on the Court and the Law, and so on - associated with the high style of Bacon: and we can be sure it was written by Shakespeare alone, in the early years, when Shakespeare as reader (Melancholy Jacques phase) had evolved to Shakespeare as writer (Orlando phase). Fascinatingly, the last lines of MAF will give the duration of his Melancholy Jacques preliminary phase of intense and directed reading, under the guidance of Sir Francis Bacon, as “two years and more”: so that, if he arrived in London in 1587, the year of the coup, then MAF can be dated to 1589-90. Let us now take up the track of the allegory, which should by now be thoroughly familiar to you.

i

Mr. Arden represents the ego of Shakespeare in his Puritan phase, which lasted from the forced termination of his Tavern or pseudo-Alexandrian phase aet.15 to the occasion of the coup aet. 23 (these ages are given in the induction to TOS, where the term of Sly's (Shakespeare's) estrangement from his wife (the Goddess) is given variously as 7, 15, and 30 years, corresponding respectively to the year of the coup (TOS was written in 1594, Shakespeare having arrived in London in 1587, the year in question); the year of the inauguration of his thralldom to Puritanism; and his birth). Franklin is the faculty of Puritan reason, and is therefore cognate with York (the Duke as well as the city) in the histories. The play opens with the latter informing his master that he has been granted the Abbey of Faversham and its lands. This refers to the profiteering by the Lord Protector in the reign of Henry the Eighth (Arden was murdered in 1551) from the dissolution of the monasteries. Arden is therefore, on the literal plane, a false landlord, and his wealth is a sham. On the allegorical plane, the

---

Puritan's control over Nature is spurious and feeble, and is destined to betray him. Mosby is an Antonio figure, a Gnostic Christ (husband of Mary Magdalene, and father of three) in negative aspect. Alice Arden is the Goddess in negative aspect; and Mosby's wooing of her represents the stirrings of libido in the Puritan ego, against his will, ineluctably. Mosby and Alice Arden will both be put to death in the final scene (sham Antonio and Goddess transformed in process of healing) at the orders of the Mayor who, along with the Watch (visual imagination) will have precisely the same allegoric value (psychic transformation and healing) in the final Act of R&J.

Lord Clifford will countenance the dalliance (31). He bears in 2-3HVI (the first two of the trilogy to be written) the allegoric value of the "I" principle: the ithyphallos, more broadly the unseen world, where resides the libido; and so here, to point to the close contemporaneity of MAF and the earliest histories. Franklin's solution to Arden's problem is that he should travel to London and leave his wife to it, for "women when they may will not" (52). This indeed is unreasonable, as Arden recognises (54): as unreasonable as the Puritan notion that repudiation of engagement with Nature can be the basis of an effective relationship with Her, which is precisely what Franklin's strategy represents on the plane of allegory. The Ardens' servant Michael represents here, as always, the visual imagination as prelude to divinity, the source most plausibly being Michael, the "Angel of the Sun" in Trithemius' *De septem secundadeis*, herald of a new age of enlightenment and growth (see Ch.8 for a fuller discussion). It is he who will bring about the murder of Arden: for it was the imagination dwelling on an erotic episode in, say, *The Golden Ass*, that precipitated the breakdown of Shakespeare's twenty-fourth year (see below). Michael will take their horses to London, the horse representing here, as always without exception in the plays, the libido in action, as stimulated by the imagination; and it is the blind libido which is driving the flight into the refuge of Puritanism (London). The subject is attempting to leave behind the Goddess as Queen of Hell, whose realm is the unconscious, which will be represented by the character of Green. This strategy of course will fail, and unconscious and the libido (Black Will) and ithyphallic principle

---

(Shakebag) strike back with a vengeance, by a mechanism which Freud is mistakenly credited with first describing. The Painter also represents the faculty of the visual imagination (cf. Painter in TimA; Fabian in TN; as well as the Painter in an Addition to The Spanish Tragedy (see Appendix 1)). His identity with Michael is suggested by his rivalry with him for the hand of Susan (the Goddess), Mosby's sister. The trigger to Shakespeare's breakdown must have been a visualisation of the Goddess of Love - perhaps in one of the intensely erotic early episodes of Apuleius' *The Golden Ass* - and the consequent irruption of libido into the fragile fastness of his Puritan ego, of which the written word had been a central pillar (consistent with his employment as a master at a Puritan school, as I have posited). I have shown elsewhere that this was consummated by an act of auto-erotism.

Adam bears here, as in AYLI, the symbolic weight of primal or Dionysian or Falstaffian Man, homo libidensis, Man-as-sublimated-animal. It is he who brings news of Mosby to Alice. The initial refusal of Mosby to carry on the affair with Alice represents the outcome that the Puritan desires; his volte-face that outcome's adumbrated collapse. Mosby informs Arden (this episode was invented by Shakespeare, to an allegorical end) that the Abbey of Faversham has been offered to him instead, when he was in London; Arden denies Mosby, and takes his sword; whereupon his anger is appeased. On the allegorical plane, this means that the irruption of the Antonio principle into Puritan higher mentation (London) has threatened to disempower it; however the Puritan ego resists it, and removes for the time being the threat of the ithyphallos-libido to his psychic stability ("Now use your bodkin,/Your Spanish needle, and your pressing iron/For this [Mosby's sword] shall go with me": the sword bearing, as always without exception in the plays, the symbolic value of the ithyphallic principle).

Greene represents the unconscious. Ireland bears throughout the historical cycle the same symbolic value; and the colour of Ireland is green. Included in the Abbey lands acquired by Arden is one formerly granted to him: for the Puritan in his delusion thinks himself to be in control of his unconscious.

Lord Cheyne (“chain”) is the principle of rebirth from the Goddess by the Musical arts, where the “chain” symbolises Her vulva, and is cognate with the golden chain in TCE, and the drowning Ophelia’s garlands in HAM. His plate (wealth) has been stolen, and Jack Fitten, an intimate of Black Will, with whom he is to be identified, is named as the culprit. In other words, the casting of the libido in negative aspect by Christian puritanism has crippled the ego’s capacity for self-transformation and growth. Greene enlists Black Will and Shakebag to murder Arden while he is in London: for the libido (Black Will) and ithyphallic principle (Shakebag) in negative aspect will irrupt the Puritanically mentating ego to shatter it. Greene asks Bradshaw to carry a letter from him to Alice Arden. The letter represents, as it also does without exception in FF, the written or printed word, which was so central to Shakespeare’s inner life, whether diseased or healthy: and in this Puritan phase the Goddess remained suppressed in the unconscious as he read. Bradshaw is therefore also to be identified with the written word negatively perceived (his possession of the plate). Lord Cheyne threatens to hang him if the thief (Jack Fitten) is not discovered. Hanging is symbolic here, as in TCE, of the shattering (stillbirth) of the Puritan ego by what would be for the healthy ego a means to rebirth (Goddess and libido perceived in the printed page), and stands diametrically opposed to the chain principle. Yet this can be avoided if the ego in transformation (Lord Cheyne) has the insight to recognise its wonted negative perception of the libido as the root of its trouble (clemency shown to Bradshaw for his revelation to Lord Cheyne of the identity of the thief). This is therefore a wonderfully adroit piece of allegory, of which we see example after admirable example in the later plays, and which attests to the expertise Shakespeare had acquired at this early stage of his development. The virtuoso pen of Bacon he may not have had, but his intellect and imagination were undeniably of the highest order.

## iii-iv-v

The ego in thrall to the Puritan world-feeling anathematises the Goddess in the printed page and hence the birth of the divine

---

principle in himself (Arden/Franklin excoriating Michael for his billet doux to Susan Mosby). The printed page in service to Hermetic art, with its raising into consciousness of the troublesome negative contents of the unconscious, has the capacity to thwart the kind of breakdown suffered by Shakespeare (Greene leaving the murders; Black Will being cracked on the head by the closing window of a bookseller's stall in St. Paul's, and missing the chance to kill Arden). The page, with its evocation of the forms of the visual imagination (for Michael is to be identified with the Painter) will be vector for the libido in negative aspect:

Will           ...I am the very man  
                  Marked in my birth-hour by the destinies,  
                  To give an end to Arden's life on earth;  
                  Thou [Michael] but a member to whet the knife...

Michael leaves the doors of Arden's house in London open for the murderers; but he cries out in a bad dream, and Arden and Franklin are woken, to forestall the crime. Dream-images are the naked forms of the imagination, unadorned by the faculty of reason; and Schopenhauer observed that the capacity to dream is the first pre-requirement of the philosopher. This is therefore a variation on the same theme of prevention of the coup, which Shakespeare has used these scenes to portray.

vi-vii

Shakespeare must have had a premonitory dream of his breakdown, the contents of which were denied:

Arden       Sirrah, get you [Michael] back to Billingsgate  
                  ...Come to us in Paul's.  
                  Come, Master Franklin, you shall go with me.  
                  This night I dreamed...

It evidently left him in "quakes and shivers" (27). The denial of the dream, with its potential for healing, is allegorised in the dismissal of Michael, and the summoning of Franklin. Michael's rendezvous with them in (St.) Paul's churchyard, where the