

PART 4

THE HUGHES GROUP: THE TRAGIC SEQUENCE

CHAPTER 28

INTRODUCTION TO THE TRAGIC SEQUENCE

Ted Hughes deduced in SGCB a rational and coherent sequence for the tragedies, beginning with the inductive *As You Like It*, moving through tragedies of terminal psychic damage, to *King Lear*, where the chance of redemption is glimpsed then removed, and *Antony and Cleopatra*, which presents the true rebirth of the hero, to end in *Pericles*, *The Winter's Tale*, and *Cymbeline*, those ultimate dramas of resurrection and miracle, and finally *The Tempest*, which he characterised as a keyboard on which the various themes of the tragic sequence could be played. It was a compelling and inspiring argument, which however was flawed. For even such as *Othello*, *Macbeth*, and *King Lear*, where there is apparently no hope for the hero, are in truth allegories of redemption, as the argument to come will show: albeit the rebirth of the Goddess, and the consequent resurrection of the subject, - specifically Shakespeare in London phase, - is presented indirectly or symbolically, rather than epiphanically as in the tragicomedies; while *As You Like It*, though unique in its depiction of Shakespeare in healing (Melancholy Jacques) and creative (Orlando) phases, is by no means alone in its general theme, as the preceding pages have exhaustively shown. There is in fact abundant precedent for the main themes of the tragic sequence, as defined by Hughes, in the remainder of the corpus. The arguments of SGCB glimpse the final goal, often fleetingly, sometimes comparatively clearly though incompletely, rarely not at all. Still, they represent an intuitive and courageous giant step down the right path.

Yet I have retained Hughes' sequence for this section, for the purpose of showing both how far he strode toward complete elucidation, and by how much he failed to reach it. Mostly though, it is as a tribute to the truly epochal discoveries, product of his outstanding and irreplaceable poetical and philosophical genius, without which the present work would not have been conceived.

There will be no point-by-point comparisons with SGCB, with whose arguments I presume the reader to be familiar. If I am mistaken in this, in the individual case, then the argument to come should still be abundantly clear, while pointing back in an obvious direction to further enriching and inspiring reading. The relocation of T&C to the Shakespeare Group is the only departure from Hughes' sequence: for it is central to the understanding of Shakespeare's inner life in his London (creative) phase, and demanded an earlier treatment.

The one play standing outside of the general scenario of Fall and Resurrection in this group is, of course, *Hamlet*. There has long been a school of thought that the theme of *Hamlet* may be the descent into paranoid schizophrenia; and this will definitively be shown in the argument to come. This is the one and only play of the sequence where there is no redemption, no recovery. All chance of this is removed with the departure in the earliest lines of the play of Francisco, who is, remarkably, like Francisco in *TT* and Friar Francis in *MAN*, a depiction of Sir Francis Bacon himself, as master of the Gnostic tradition. For the theme of *Hamlet* is an extrapolation from Shakespeare's own condition, which approached so terrifyingly close to psychosis, without finally succumbing to it: close enough for the obvious extension to be made. Shakespeare saw the flames leaping from the pit below, felt them sear the soles of his feet, being suspended above it by the twin ropes of his imagination and great intellect, which had remained dormant but not dead for the eight years of his enthrallment by Puritanism. Bacon made the connection also, perhaps facilitated by his contemplation of the schizophrenia-like illness suffered by his mother (or foster-mother) Lady Anne Bacon: so that he clearly felt himself to be capable of preventing, if not curing, this most tragic and destructive of all psychiatric illnesses, in the same way as he successfully treated the severe anxiety/depression neurosis of William Shakespeare. Perhaps their feeling was that Shakespeare could well have gone down this path in years to come, had it not been for the former's intervention. Their story is a truly wonderful one; and there is much in it for the modern clinician to ponder.

We have seen that the allocations of the division of labour between Shakespeare and Bacon, based on the dual primary evidence of style and allegorical content, was supported in the case

of the histories and the mostly contemporaneous Bacon group by the dates of composition, the problem of the superhuman fecundity of their author being thereby solved. The same will be found to be true in the case of the tragic sequence. This begs a detailed and extended analysis of dates and allocations of authorship, which is beyond the scope of the present work; but we may briefly take the final four plays as an epitome: *Pericles* and *The Tempest* being Shakespeare's "babies", and written mostly by him (100% in the case of PER; somewhat less in the latter), and *The Winter's Tale* and *Cymbeline* approximately 98% by Bacon. This scenario is also supported by the point emphatically made in TWT about the primacy of the Hermetic/Neoplatonic/Christian Cabalist/ tradition, in the Bohemian bear and his curious dietary preference: the bear being a key symbol in this tradition, and *Antigonus*, his morsel, representing the principle of wisdom derived from engagement with the invisible world as described in the printed page. Bacon, the leading esotericist of his day, is asserting this tradition to be sustained by the wisdom, derived from the written word, of the Faustian dimension, against which the forces of reaction had decisively moved by this time. In *All's Well That Ends Well* he further identifies this word-derived wisdom with the goal of both the Grail and Ring traditions: the Fisher King motif predominating in the first Act, the Ring Quest thereafter. Bacon's model for this will be shown below (Ch.44) to have been Wolfram's *Parzival*, in which Ring and Grail are also identified. The Queen of Hell, Goddess of the Invisible World – Helena, Portia, Kate Minola, Perdita, Imogen, and so on – is identified thereby as nothing less than the Grail Queen Herself. Bacon affirms in the last lines of *Cymbeline*, the final play of the First Folio – to give him the last word, just as Shakespeare had the first word in *The Tempest* – that the twin themes of the plays have been the devastating effects of the Puritan error on the psyche and the broader society, and the capacity of Gnostic wisdom to remediate them. FF stands revealed thereby as the greatest Ring/Grail saga in literature: a ring indeed playing a central role in many of the plays, along with a diamond in 2HVI and CYM, undoubtedly a reference to King Solomon's Schamir, which he possessed in addition to his famous ring.

CHAPTER 29

AS YOU LIKE IT

Shakespeare seized upon the possibilities of Thomas Lodge's prose romance *Rosalynde* (1590) to fill in some crucial details in his life story. He had already stated in the closing lines of the very early MAF that it took "two years and more" to get over the acute anxiety and depression which had stricken him down in the coup of 1587. Now he makes clear in AYLI that this watershed corresponded to the time when, aet.25, he took up his pen as a creative artist. The grieving yet healing (through reading of the written word) Shakespeare of 1587-9 is represented here by Melancholy Jacques; Shakespeare the incipient writer by Orlando; with the Forest of Arden representing, - like Birnam Wood in *Macbeth*, the outlaws' forest in TGV, the grove near Berkely Castle in RII, and so on, - the written word. Further, he makes clear that this was occasion of the beginning of his quest for the scholarship, in the Baconian way, - philosophy, linguistics, history (Holinshed, Plutarch, &c.), and so on, - that would be necessary for his success as a writer. This is the point of the twenty-five year old William's insistence on his wit, though not his learning, in the Forest of Arden. This is the wit gained from consideration of his own condition, in the pages of Apuleius and elsewhere. William was born in the forest, "I thank God": for Shakespeare was born again in the reading prescribed him by Bacon. Now he had worked it all out, and it was time to join his doctor in putting it down for others.

Ted Hughes made a huge breakthrough in the understanding of AYLI when he observed that Jacques du Boys, the second son of Rowland du Boys, who had been sent away to school, where "report speaks goldenly of his profit", and makes his only appearance in the closing scene in the forest, - is to be identified with Melancholy Jacques. Jacques corresponds to Fernandyne in Lodge's *Rosalynde*. They are both scholars; and Fernandyne is most plausibly the source of Ferdinand in TT.

Let us now examine the main characters.

1) Rowland de Boys His surname indicates that he has something to do with the written word ("Boys" is from the French bois, "woods"). The epic *Chanson de Roland* celebrates Charlemagne's defeat of the Saracen army in the Pyrenees, thanks to his nephew Roland, who blew on his enchanted horn to summon the French. We remember that Aaron the Moor bears in the earlier TitA the allegoric weight of the libido. Rowland de Boys therefore represents the principle of victory over the libido, as achieved through the written word. He has three sons, who correspond to Shakespeare's different modes – more or less effective - of winning this triumph. The earliest mode – in the iron grip of which he had presented to Bacon - was that of Puritanism, as represented by

2) Oliver de Boys - the eldest of the sons. The second mode was the course of reading he undertook under the guidance of Bacon, the cornerstone of which was Apuleius' *The Golden Ass*. It was the libido, bursting the chains of Puritanism, which had precipitated the coup of his twenty-fourth year; and now Bacon would help him understand that pathogenetic process, and guide him from the headlights of the will-to-eros, which had held him transfixed as a rabbit through the whole of his post-pubertal life. Shakespeare in this second mode, aet.23-25, is represented by

3) Jacques de Boys - the second son, cognate with Melancholy Jacques. The wounded stag in the Forest of Arden is of course Shakespeare himself; its tears his own tears as the printed page provided him with insight into his own condition. The arrows of Duke Senior's party are the shafts of reason of the reading ego. Jacques' melancholy is here not the Galenesque melancholy, which was associated with poverty and failure, but the melancholy extolled by the new Christian Cabalism, - which so profoundly influence on the Elizabethans, principally through FrancESCO Giorgi's *De harmonia mundi* (1515), - as a precondition of the highest spiritual and intellectual achievement.¹ The third mode was of the artist, which is represented here by

4) Orlando de Boys - the third son. "Roland" appeared as

¹ Dame Francis Yates, *The Occult Philosophy in the Elizabethan Age*.

“Orlando” in the Italian romances derived from the Chanson. This is therefore the true son of Rowland du Boys, a magician like his father: a Prospero in fact. Orlando is Shakespeare as writer, his first productions including PER I&II, MAF, and sonnet 145.

5) Duke Senior The banished Duke. This is the Gnostic (lately Neoplatonic/Christian Cabalist) world-view. Jacques-Orlando is to Duke Senior as Oliver is to

6) Duke Frederick - the usurping Duke. This is the Puritan world-view. Oliver reappears in the forest as his alter ego Oliver Mar-text, to indicate that the printed page is to be associated too with Duke Frederick's court, in the Puritan way. Oliver himself will marry

7) Celia - in the forest. She represents the Goddess of the auto-erotist, cognate with Ophelia and Nell Quickly, who remains inseparable from Shakespeare as Puritan. The marriage will signify healing-phase Shakespeare's recognition, through the printed page, of this conjunction, which is cognate with that of the lion (Shakespeare as Goddess-rejector) and the Boar (inrush of libido in negative aspect). She will adopt the disguise of “Aliena”, for the Goddess of Onan is no longer manifest in the page examined by healing-phase Shakespeare, as in the process of being cured now of his Puritanism. Her name is derived from the Greek *kelai*, “black”, “dark”, “swarthy”, to indicate the colossal underworld/unconscious component in the Celia principle, whence her inseparable companionship with

8) Rosalind - yet another Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, or Goddess of the Invisible World. She will adopt the disguise of Ganymede, who in Geek mythology was cup-bearer to the gods: and one recalls Lavinia - cognate with Cordelia in KL, - who held the bowl filled with the brothers' blood in TitA, to identify her as a Grail Queen, nothing less (the Holy Grail was usually represented as a cup or chalice). Lavinia and Cordelia are both Queens of Hell, and both represent the heart of the stricken subject: and thus also does Rosalind the heart of Orlando, as a Grail Queen, Queen of the Invisible World.

9) Touchstone This character does not appear in Lodge. The touchstone was used for testing the authenticity of gold, which represented the highest level of enlightenment in the alchemical and broader esoteric traditions. This is an index to the quality now

attained by Shakespeare in the final stage in his healing. Touchstone is yet another in the long line of Fools throughout the plays: the True King being inseparable from his Court Jester.

10) Charles This is also the first name of the Duke of Suffolk (ithyphallic principle), as explicitly named by Shakespeare in HVIII, as if conscious in retrospect of the need to signpost it for the reader. Suffolk has been firmly identified with his principle in 2HVI IV, i. Charles is Duke Frederick's wrestler, whose overthrow by Orlando represents the final victory over the libido which had danced Shakespeare liked a puppet on a string for the whole of his post-pubertal life. This ideal was not in fact fulfilled completely, as HVIII and T&C make clear.

11) Silvius The principle of wisdom vis-à-vis the phenomenal or given world (Sylvia in TGV) provided by the written word. His name is of course derived from the Latin *sylva*, "woods". The Sylvia analogue here is

12) Phoebe Her namesake was the radiant moon (symbolic of the visible world) in Greek mythology. The Silvian wisdom can only be gained by referring constantly the visible world to the invisible which underlies it, with the help of the written word: which axiom is represented here by the letter written by Phoebe to Rosalind, and borne to her by Silvius.

13) Corin Appears as Corydon in Rosalynde, as derived from the Greek for "lark". The variation to "Corin" is, as always in the plays, where nothing is adventitious or fanciful, of great significance. The name is derived from the Greek root *korin-*, "budding out (as of a plant)": for the Silvian wisdom is putting out its shoots, along with Shakespeare as artist.

14) Adam Primal Man, Man-as-sublimated animal, *homo libidensis*, as described in the written word. It is an emphatically reiterated axiom of the plays that wisdom is associated with wit, both of which recognise the play of the invisible world (which includes the libido, broadly the will-to-life) beneath the visible. The will-to-eros (a subset of the libido), or ityphallos, bears always in FF the further symbolism of the invisible world. The Adam principle underlies humanity as a constitutive part of it; and Adam's gift of gold to Orlando, and Orlando's insistence that his companion be fed first at Duke Senior's table, represent Orlando's enrichment

with the wit and wisdom on which his writing will be predicated. The ultimate reference is likely to have been the ritual of the twenty-eighth ("Knight of the Sun") degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, whose purpose was the indoctrination of truth, and in which "Thrice Perfect Father Adam" featured prominently (see Ch.44).

As usual, there are numerous examples of the types of deft legerdemains that abound in FF. For example, Celia is first identified as the taller of the two daughters; then Rosalind's tallness is emphasised, as they are about to set out for the forest: for the Goddess of the auto-erotist wanes in the newly-reasoning ego, as the Goddess of the Invisible World waxes, as engaged now as idea rather than blind will – this distinction is crucial – in the printed page. Orlando is able to speak to Celia at their first encounter, but finds himself struck dumb with Rosalind: for the subject at this stage – Jacques-Shakespeare conflated with Orlando-Shakespeare, to make an important point, for this is the process that would have inaugurated his Melancholy Jacques phase, albeit it is Orlando who is at the forefront here – lacks the words to address the Faustian dimension, but knows exactly which words are associated with his inveterate problem. Rosalind's offer to buy the farm, therein to employ Corin and Silvius, is yet another example of the allegoric value of money as the power of a principle: the acknowledgement of the Faustian dimension feeding the budding of wisdom in the reader.

The tremendous debt of AYLI to Lodge's Rosalynde has, of course, long been acknowledged. What has not been realised is that the latter is also an allegory. Further, there is much remarkable evidence that it is a Shakespearean allegory, and that Lodge wrote it as a tribute to the glorious resurrection of William Shakespeare. It is the same allegory enacted in both; and the characters have a one-to-one correspondence: so that Saladyne-Oliver is Shakespeare as Puritan reader, Fernandyne-Jacques as Gnostic reader, Rosader-Orlando as writer. Torismond is cognate with Duke Frederick as the Puritan world-view: "Torismond" being formed from the Greek for "monstrous", along with "world" (<French monde). Gerismond is cognate with Duke Senior as the

broadly Gnostic world-view: “Gerismond” being derived from the Greek for “older”, and “world”. For the Puritan is an upstart novelty. These correspondences and etymologies can be pursued further with great success. The presence in *Rosalynde of the Forest of Arden* is also most remarkable, although it may be thought possible that the Shakespearean link is a chance one: this particular English forest being chosen at random, or for quite some other reason, by Lodge. The probability of this is reduced to almost zero, however, in light of the scene of Rosader’s encounter with Saladyne and the lion.

Rosader comes upon them sleeping in the forest, the lion waiting for his prey to wake, to prove that he is not dead, and therefore a suitable morsel. The lion sees Rosader, who kills him with his boar-speare; and Saladyne and Rosader are reconciled. It was Ted Hughes who first drew attention to the utter centrality of the Boar and its murderous charge, not only to V&A, but the whole of the tragic sequence as well. The argument of these pages has discerned the Boar on the hunt in every other play of FF without exception, albeit in some (especially of the Bacon group) it is subtilised to the point of near invisibility; while remarking, further, the tremendous importance of the Lion motif (Leontes, Posthumus Leonatus, Leonato, the lions in TitA, MND, JC, and so on) – as symbolic of Shakespeare as (usually Puritan) Goddess-rejector, from whom the Goddess storming in to fill the vacuum, in the form of Her Consort/Son the Boar (libido in negative aspect re-irrupting the conscious ego, to precipitate the crisis) is indivisible. Here is the icon again: Saladyne being identified with the lion, who is further yoked to the boar (it is the boar spear which kills him). Shakespeare’s taking up of his pen, now with such mastery of his material that he is able to convey it to others, has enabled to him to kill off the Puritan influence in himself, and embrace the representation in art of himself as Puritan in peace.

A further remarkable aspect of *Rosalynde* is the frontispiece to the original edition, which bears a highly stylised representation of a yoni, opened, in what doctors call the lithotomy position. We are looking into a womb. It is the womb where subtle Shakespeare gestated from the gross matter of Shaksper. Ted Hughes identified the Forest of Arden as the mother-forest, to which Shakespeare

returned in search of himself; and this is undoubtedly right, although only up to a point. For, like Ariel's tree, which Hughes similarly interpreted only half correctly, it is, specifically, the written word on the page: the womb of his rebirth into glory.

The Death and Resurrection of William Shakespeare is a wonderful and instructive story, so much so that Thomas Lodge evidently felt inspired to memorialise it in one of the most engaging and charming works of the Elizabethan age. Marlowe, Kyd (see App.1), Shakespeare of course... and now Lodge can be added to the list of "good pens" whom Bacon enlisted for the great task.

CHAPTER 30

ALL'S WELL THAT ENDS WELL

All's Well That Ends Well as allegory has strong affinities with King John, just as Measure for Measure will be shown to have with Romeo and Juliet: both bearing retrospective clues of immense importance to the explication of their allegories. Further, there is no doubt that AWT is to be sorted with the Bacon group of plays, as from that pen alone. There is, again, no inner dimension to this play, as there is to the closely contemporaneous MFM, with which it is generally twinned. The conflict that had riven Shakespeare's milieu intérieur, whose major combatants were the libido, the ithyphallos, the Boar, and so on, - is nowhere to be seen. Rather, AWT is another treatise – an inspiring one, in the way of Jung, albeit a quantum jump richer and more powerful – on the principles of Shakespeare's pathology and its treatment, written from the exterior point of view of the clinician. Once again, the style is totally consistent with this content, the majority of AWT being in the characteristic high style of Bacon – blank verse, of metaphorical and linguistic richness, extreme philosophical sophistication, often elliptical - which we have come to know so well in previous plays; while even the prose passages suggest that author, or perhaps one of his "good pens", like Kyd perhaps, rather than Shakespeare. This consonance of content and style is a powerful index to the correctness of the theory proposed in these pages. AWT, MFM, and T&C, are all considered to have appeared at about the same time, around 1604: and their authorship is certainly consistent with that dating, MFM being a joint creation, AWT entirely by Bacon, and T&C almost entirely by Shakespeare.

A remarkable aspect of AWT is its syncretism of the Grail and Ring traditions. Sir Laurence Gardner seemed to have been the first to emphasise their identification in Realm of the Ring Lords, the latest chapter of his magnificent life's work; but here is Bacon, anticipating him by four centuries. It will be demonstrated, in

Chapter 44, that Bacon's source for this identification was Wolfram's *Parzival*, the first complete Grail romance, and essentially a Templar text:¹ the Knights Templar having been the forerunner of Freemasonry, of which Bacon was a leading figure.² Bacon had already presented the Grail Queen in the figure of Lavinia holding the blood-filled basin in *TitA*; and this was also the significance of Rosalind's "Ganymede" disguise in *AYLI* (Ganymede was cup-bearer to the gods in Greek mythology): the reference of both being to the Grail Queen of *Parzival*. Now here we have the Fisher-King himself, in the person of the ailing King of France, whom Helena cures of his illness (a fistula, suggesting the cloacal region, closely germane to the Fisher-King's impotence). The Ring motif is of great significance in this play: for the King gives Helena his ring, to mark her as a Ring/Grail Queen: a Queen of Hell, Goddess of the Invisible World, like her namesake in *MND*, as well as Lavinia and Cordelia; while the ring of the Countess (another Queen of Hell) ends in the hands of Diana (Goddess of the Visible World: an Isabel analogue) via Helena. The two rings are clearly to be identified. The King is cognate with Bertram, who received his heirloom ring from his mother the Countess, who is therefore a Ring Queen; so that the King's ring must also have derived from a Ring Queen, as well as ending there, in the hands of Helena, as it should be.

KJ gives us several clues to the explication of AWT as allegory. Here we have again France representing Shakespeare-as-Puritan in the process of healing (King of France as Fisher-King). This is confirmed by the mention of the Duke of Austria, who is associated in KJ with the Lion motif (Shakespeare as Goddess-rejector: cf. Leontes, Posthumus Leonatus, the lion in *MND*, &c.). Bertram abandoning Helena to go off to the wars also represents Shakespeare-as-Puritan; yet even here his successful treatment is adumbrated, for he will fight on the side of the Florentines: Florence being renowned as the home of Marsilio Ficino and Pico della Mirandola, founders of the Gnostic revival as Renaissance Neoplatonism/Christian Cabalism, which had such a profound effect on Bacon and the Elizabethans.³ It is the Duke of Austria,

¹ Graham Hancock, *The Sign and the Seal*.

² Christopher Knight and Robert Lomas, *The Hiram Key*.

consistently with his allegorical role, who has forbidden France to take the Florentine's side; but the King, in a beautiful legerdemain, allows his nobles, including Bertram, to decide for themselves.

The nobles represent, again as in KJ, the faculty of thought; while the numerous letters represent the written word, vector of the wisdom of Apuleius and the new Christian Cabalism, both of which were vital to Shakespeare's resurrection in the early years in London. A turning point comes in III, ii, when the clown Lavatch gives the Countess a letter from Bertram. Lavatch emphasises Bertram's melancholy, and his own preference for "your Isbels o' th' court". The Countess opens the letter, in which her son tells of his flight. Helena and two French nobles then enter, she with a letter from Bertram, the latter with news of his siding with the Florentines. This is a reference to Shakespeare in his Melancholy Jacques phase, 1587-9 (his ass- or fool-phase), when he was studying the written word, and constantly referring the visible world described therein (Isabel bears this value in MFM) to the invisible which underlies it (Countess of Rossillon). Lavatch as vector of the letter is an expression of this principle of referral. So also is Helena's letter from Bertram; with the nobles signifying that a thought process is being described, founded on the printed page:

Countess Return you thither?

Second Lord I, madam, with the swiftest wing of speed.

The reference to swiftness confirms their allegoric value (cf. MAN II, iii, 5). A flood of "I"'s for "Ay"'s in this passage symbolise the ithyphallos, more broadly the invisible world, in the familiar way of 1-3HVI. The primacy of this Faustian dimension is, of course, the principal philosophical theme of the Bacon Group (e.g. Bianca and Kate in TOS) and, in effect, FF as a whole. This principle was central to Bacon's philosophy:

The knowledge of man (hitherto) hath been determined by the view or sight; so that whatsoever is invisible, either in respect of the fineness of the body itself, or the smallness of the parts, or of the subtlety of the motion, is little enquired.

And yet these be the things that govern nature principally; and without which you cannot make any true analysis and indication of the proceedings of nature.⁴

The villain is Parolles (< French paroles, “words”). His blindfolding and besting by the lords symbolises the victory of the ego-in-healing over the Puritan’s characteristic dearth of visual imagination vis-à-vis the written word. Again, the importance of this triumph is constantly emphasised in the plays: for example, in the role of the Watch in R&J, and (negatively) in King Claudius’ “My words fly up, my thoughts remain below,/Words without thoughts, never to heaven go” (Hamlet III, iii). Parolles is redeemed in the final scenes, just as the written word is for the ego reborn.

There is a beautiful legerdemain in the final scene. Bertram tells the King that Diana had thrown him the ring (the King’s, which he had given to Helen) wrapped in a letter, from a window. Yet we know that it was Helen who gave it to him, when she had taken Diana’s place in bed with him. Diana has a chance to deny this story, in answer to a supererogatory (on the literal plane) question from the King, but fails explicitly to do so:

King The story then goes false, you threw it him
 Out of a casement?
Diana I have spoke the truth.

This leaves an opening on the plane of allegory for both to be true. The meaning is that ultimate spiritual and earthly power, symbolised by the Ring, is to be identified with the wisdom gained from the written word (the chief example of which, at this early stage of Shakespeare’s redemption, was evidently *The Golden Ass*). Bacon will reaffirm this axiom most emphatically in his *Cymbeline*, the final play of the First Folio. Bertram, and therefore Shakespeare, would become a Ring Lord or Grail King. It is pertinent too, as always, that Diana comes of the Capilet family, and is therefore to be identified with Juliet, a Queen of Hell, albeit perceived negatively throughout R&J by Romeo (Shakespeare as

⁴ Natural History.

Puritan). The above legerdemain makes this identification (Diana with Helena) as well, for the story of the letter-enwrapped ring is true as allegory. Diana, Goddess of the Visible World, is therefore a Ring/Grail Queen, but only in so far as she is referred to the Goddess who accompanies her.

The precision and power of this allegorical mechanism should come as no surprise, given the Baconian pyrotechnics we have witnessed in previous plays. Yet the allegory itself is comparatively easy to follow, once the principles are understood, unlike that of the plays with a significant Shakespearean component – tortuous and personal - of interiority

CHAPTER 31

MEASURE FOR MEASURE

The events of the Measure For Measure allegory will come as not the slightest surprise to the fellow-travellers of these pages. MFM is, once again, a collaboration between the two authors, dealing with the liberation of William Shakespeare from the prison of Puritanism. Here again are the usual suspects:

1) Claudio Appears several times in the First Folio, always with the same value of Shakespeare himself in healing mode, or progressing towards it. His name derives from the Latin claudio, “I limp”, per the Roman Emperor Claudius, “the limper”, who was a scholar and writer. Shakespeare was lame and walked with a stick, as Ted Hughes argued, and for which I have found compelling supporting evidence in HVIII and TWT. Claudius succeeded the insane Caligula, who in turn succeeded (albeit with Tiberius intervening) the Emperor Augustus, who bears the value throughout the plays, - as patron of Virgil, creator of the archetypal Goddess-rejector Aeneas, - of Shakespeare as Puritan: so that this line is an apt representation of Shakespeare in Puritan, breakdown, and London phases respectively. Claudio’s unmasking in the final scene portrays the rebirth of Shakespeare under the therapeutic regime of Sir Francis Bacon. He is unveiled by

2) Lucio - who bears here, as at his every appearance (as Lucio or Lucius) without exception in FF, the value of the ego in the process of transformation by engagement with the unseen world as described in the written word, as sourced from the hero of Apuleius’ *The Golden Ass*, whose ass-phase underworld journey is the precondition of his ascent to the highest divinity. The primacy of this engagement with this unseen world, or underworld, or unconscious, which we now take for granted, but which continues to be denied by both Pauline Catholicism and Protestant Puritanism, was central to Bacon’s philosophy (see Ch.30). Lucio’s

continual harping on the libidinous adventures of the Duke is a reprise of the argument of *The Golden Ass*.

3) Duke of Vienna Cognate with Duke Senior in *AYLI*, as the Neoplatonic or Christian Cabalist – broadly Gnostic - world-view.¹ Thus his entry through the gates of Vienna at the beginning of the last Act symbolises the acquisition by Shakespeare of this new world-view, under the guidance of Bacon, with the written word as the chief therapeutic tool, to achieve the expurgation of Puritan disease – the chief aetiological factor of which is the feebleness of the Pauline Catholic world-view (cf. 3HVI, I, iii), as Bacon so brilliantly realised – from his psyche. Lucio's volubility during the final Act asserts the Apuleian significance of the Duke's deliberations.

4) Angelo Cognate with Duke Frederick in *AYLI* as the Puritan world-view. Thus his ascendancy coincides with the absence of the Duke, and the incarceration of Claudio (Shakespeare's Puritan phase). Also immured with Claudio is

5) Barnardine A drunk, and therefore representing dissolution in the libido (cf. Sir Toby Belch, Trinculo-Stephano, Christopher Sly, et al.). His confinement represents the anathematisation of the libido, and the invisible world in general, by the Puritan. It is he who is unmasked first, before Claudio, in a reprise of the Lucian journey through ass-phase to divinity. Behind it all there bulks large, of course, the figures of Jesus and Barabbas: for Elizabethan occultism achieved a synthesis between the Christian and magical philosophies² (cf. the resurrection of the Christ-figure Antony in *A&C V*, and the countless other Christian allusions, in a Gnostic rather than Pauline sense, throughout the plays). The death of the Christ of MFM had to be represented concretely, and this was achieved through a typically adroit legerdemain involving

6) Ragozine Beheading is symbolic throughout the plays of psychic rebirth, as Ted Hughes emphasised. The presentation of Ragozine's head to Angelo, who mistakes it for Claudio's, symbolises the transformation of Shakespeare's reasoning ego from Puritan to Gnostic. The derivation of "Ragozine" is a fascinating one. It is undoubtedly based on the Italian *ragione*, "reason"; with the

¹ See the writings of Dame Francis Yates for an attempt (largely successful) at disentangling the complicated strands of Elizabethan occult philosophy.

addition of “z”, the snake-letter,³ most plausibly to link this reason to the serpent or dragon lore of the Grail/Ring tradition (cf. the significance of the numerous rings throughout the plays).

7) Isabella The visible or phenomenal world (< Italian bella, “beautiful”) , which can only be understood with reference to the invisible world which underlies it, as represented here by

8) Mariana The root “mar-“, pertaining to the sea, that immemorially ancient symbol of the unconscious, has a rich history in world religion. Isabella and Mariana are therefore covalently bonded to Bianca and Kate in TOS, and the other cognate pairs of the plays. It is Lucio who fetches Isabella from the convent, to present her case for her brother Claudio’s reprieve to Angelo, who will fall in love with her. This represents Shakespeare in early ass-phase beginning to engage with the visible world, in the truly Faustian way, as with reference to the invisible world (later substitution of Mariana for Isabella).

9) Juliet A character of crucial importance to the understanding of MFM. The reference is to R&J, where Romeo’s tryst with her represents the espousal by Shakespeare act.15 of the Puritan sham Goddess (Nature). It is Claudio’s impregnation of Juliet that has brought him to the attention of Angelo. Claudio in prison is therefore cognate with Romeo in Mantua, both bearing the allegoric value of Shakespeare as Puritan; but whereas in R&J the “charge of the Boar” – the occasion of the coup of 1587 – is most powerfully depicted in the deaths in the tomb, in MFM it is invisible, for this is a representation of the ideal outcome, with the breakdown being prevented: the death of this Christ with eyes open, going to his death “like a bridegroom to his bride”. Thus does the Duke-as-Friar impugn and forgive her in II, iii: for she bears the Puritan guilt. Thus also does Angelo order her to be dismissed immediately before his first audience with Isabella in II, ii (true Nature beginning to supplant sham).

10) Escalus “The scales”: another R&J reference. This is the faculty of higher judgement, which tends to Claudio’s side throughout, just as it is the Prince Escalus and Watch (visual imagination) principles which enable the resurrection of the subject in R&J.

³ Robert Graves, *The White Goddess*.

11) Pompey “the Great” The ithyphallic principle, as in LLL and A&C (his son).

12) Friar Peter The Pauline or Roman (establishment) Church, as always in FF. His relationship to the Duke/Friar as his inferior here reflects the ideal position of the establishment Church to the new philosophy as promoted by the emergent Christian Cabbalist movement, which so deeply influenced the Elizabethan age through Bacon, John Dee, Robert Fludd, and others: their key inspiration being the Venetian friar Francesco Giorgi’s *De harmonia mundi* (1525).⁴ This was most plausibly the fons et origo of the idea of the Duke’s friar disguise in MFM.

13) Francesca The nun of Isabella’s convent, who gives her over to Lucio. We have seen that the Franciscos in Hamlet and TT represent, along with Friar Francis in MAN, none other than Francis Bacon himself: and so it is here. This is a beautiful representation of Bacon instructing the early healing-phase William Shakespeare in the phenomenal world, in the Faustian way (the Marian substitution is to be understood), per the written word.

14) Lodowick The alias of the Duke as friar. Milan represents in TGV and TT the principle of ideas and reason; and so it is here. The name was undoubtedly taken from the famous Ludovico il Moro, who became Duke of Milan in 1494, having married, remarkably, Beatrice d’Este in 1491. This would serve – to draw not too long a bow - to identify the Duke in MFM with the hero of the Divine Comedy. Milan underwent much building and reconstruction during his reign; while there lived at his court some 100 artists, scientists, painters, historians, musicians, poets, and printers. Milan under Ludovico was one of the richest cities in Italy, exporting tapestries, velvet, cotton and linen cloth, silk, wrought iron, gold and jewelry, and arms. There could not be a better name than “Lodowick” for the magus that was London-phase Shakespeare. As usual in the plays, no detail in MFM is adventitious or fanciful. For example, the topography of the tryst is full of significance:

Isabella He hath a garden circummur’d with brick,

⁴ Dame Francis Yates, *ibid*.

Whose western side is with a vineyard backed;
And to that vineyard is a planched gate
That makes his opening with this bigger key.
This other doth command a little door
Which from the vineyard to the garden leads.
There have I made my promise, upon the heavy
Middle of the night to call upon him.

Alcoholic disinhibition bears here, as always in the plays, the allegoric value of possession by the libido (cf. Barnardine); while the garden symbolises the wisdom gained from the written word, of which the prime example is the garden of Alexander Iden in 2HVI IV, x. The allegory is clear. The subject-in-healing is reading (probably *The Golden Ass*) and comes on a erotic passage (seduction of Lucius by Fotis, vividly described by Apuleius); but whereas the libido (large key = ithyphallos) would erst have prevailed, and the subject (Shakespeare) in his darkness surrendered to it, usually through auto-erotism, - now he holds on to his reason, and absorbs the lesson that Apuleius would impart: that knowledge of the invisible world, where resides the libido, is essential for wisdom concerning the visible. The small key of course represents the flaccid phallos, and victory over the libido, as wisdom is attained: this symbolism recalling the half-starved dog in Dürer's engraving *Melancholia I* (1514), a key work in the new Christian Cabalism,⁵ as well as Don Quixote's decrepit nag Rosinante, and Bill the Pony of Tolkien's *Lord of the Rings*. We recall also these words of the ritual of the "Knight of the Sun" degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, undoubtedly a definitive influence on FF (see Ch. 44): 'ye who have not the power to subdue passion, fly from this place of truth'.⁶

A scepticide of unusually deadly efficacy is the appearance out of nowhere of Valencius, Rowland, Crassus, Flavius, and Varrius, in IV, v. What on earth could these Latin and exotic names be doing in a play set in mediaeval Vienna? The first four are invoked by the Duke as he is about to re-enter the city; and their significance lies in their allegorical values, three of which we have encountered

⁵ Dame Frances Yates *ibid*.

⁶ Knight and Lomas, *The Second Messiah*.

before. We have seen that Rowland represents, in AYLI, the principle of victory over the libido, as derived from the hero of the *Chanson de Roland*, who defeated the Saracens at the gates of France. So far so good. The final name of the renowned triumvir Marcus Licinius Crassus Dives in Latin means “rich”. Flavius appears in TimA as the principle of the visual imagination: and the Duke emphasises that Flavius is to be summoned first. The provenance of Valencius is less readily discoverable; but it most plausibly derives from the famed university town of Valence in Spain, which is where the first printing press appeared in that country. Bacon had visited Spain in his Grand Tour aet.14-18, and was intensely familiar with the language. Marcus Terentius Varro (116-27 B.C.) was a famed librarian and scholar, who had edited some 490 books by the beginning of his 78th year. The variation of the ending “-o” to “-ius” in MFM was a nice touch, designed to positively associate him with Rome rather than any mediaeval context. It is all a beautiful picture of healing-phase Shakespeare: the books, the richness, the triumph over the Ugly Dick principle, the primacy of the visual imagination.

CHAPTER 32

OTHELLO

Othello is another examination of Shakespeare's Tavern phase of mid-adolescence, the subsequent Puritan phase, the breakdown of 1587, and its healing under the care of Sir Francis Bacon. Its closest twin is JC, which however truncates both the beginning and end of this sequence: and Michael Cassio represents here, just as does Cassius in JC, the principle of the visual imagination, which Shakespeare cultivated in his Tavern phase, then suppressed as a Puritan (dismissal of Cassio by Othello), and rediscovered in his London phase, where it was employed to Hermetic or Musical ends (survival of Cassio, although wounded by blade: imagination newly informed by knowledge of libido). The various Michaels in FF bear always this value, as most plausibly sourced from the Sun angel Michael in Trithemius' *De Septem Secundadeis*, whose ascendancy was predicted to herald a new world order, based on the arts and an expansion of human consciousness: the correspondence to the theme of FF being striking (see Ch.8). The perfection of Othello as drama has long been remarked by the critics; but it is also perfect as allegory, with major FF symbols of the island, the napkin, the sword, and so on, interplaying precisely and powerfully.

Bacon derived the name "Brabantio" (this sort of *recherché* mining of symbols would almost certainly have been beyond Shakespeare, even had he acquired some Greek by this stage – although Ben Jonson was convinced, of course, that he never did) from the Greek *brabeia*, "arbitration", "judgement". This is the high thinking of Tavern-phase Shakespeare; and Desdemona, his daughter, is the visible world (she is later identified with Bianca, a homologue of her namesake in TOS) as recreated in his visual imagination (Cassio). Othello's marriage to Desdemona represents the irruption of this peace by the libido (cf. entry Cupid and Amazons TimA I, ii), which was, as we have seen, the major precipitating factor in the collapse of this defence against the Boar.

Brabantio resists the marriage, consistently with this scenario, and later dies: for the mentation of this phase will be lost forever. The “charge of the Boar” is represented by the alerting of Brabantio to the marriage by Iago and Rodorigo, who represent the libido and ithyphallic principles respectively, both in negative aspect, as cast by Shakespeare’s constitutive puritanism (at this stage Catholic rather than Protestant). Iago is, of course, another Ugly Dick figure; while the name of the latter is derived from “rod” and the Latin *erigo*, “I erect”. This latter allocation is confirmed by an oddity of the First Folio. It is usual for the first word of the following page to be printed at the bottom of the current page, as an aid for the printer. The Folio Othello has on page 332 “Rodorigo I” – two words, unusually, to alert the reader to the identity of the Roderigo principle and the symbolic value of “I”, which throughout FF stands – often substituted for the expected “Ay” – for the ithyphallic principle, more broadly the unseen world.

The “charge of the Boar” is also represented by the Turkish fleet; and the defence against it of the espousal of the Puritan world-view, - the storm which destroys them, to land the main characters safely on the island of Cyprus, which is the Puritan reasoning ego. The storm and the island are thus cousins germanes to those in TT; but they are as dissimilar as it is possible for any cousins to be: for while Prospero’s Isle represents the Gnostic reasoning ego, Cyprus is the Puritan ego, its 180° perversion, the fragile peace of which is doomed to be destroyed (napkin imbroglio: reassertion of the Goddess as Woman in the Puritan ego). Drunkenness bears here, as always in the First Folio, the allegoric value of dissolution in libido; and Cassio’s represents, once again, the association of the libido and the Goddess of Love as formed in the imagination (perhaps on reading the vividly described episode of the seduction of Lucius in *The Golden Ass*: see MAN). Othello on Cyprus corresponds to Shakespeare as Puritan aet.15-23; his dismissal of Cassio, on account of his misdemeanour while in his cups, the characteristic suppression of the imagination by the Puritan, on account of its ability to elicit the libido as will or idea, which is a recurrent motif of the plays. Othello’s allegoric value of the Puritan is suggested early, in his description of Desdemona’s attraction to him as he was the recounting the story of his deeds, to recall the

similar circumstances of the growth of Dido's love for Aeneas, that archetypal Puritan figure of the plays, as described in Virgil's Aeneid I-IV. Augustus, as the patron of Virgil, bears precisely this value in JC; while the town of Mantua, which appears in so many of the plays, bears always, as birthplace of Virgil, the value of the Puritan ego.

Emilia, wife of Iago, is of course a Queen of Hell, or Goddess of the Invisible World, a Kate to Desdemona's Bianca – a Grail Queen, in fact. She is mostly silent in Cyprus, with Othello as Puritan (so that her silence is precisely cognate with that of Cordelia, Hero, and Hippolyta), but becomes more voluble as healing begins, especially in IV, iii, - an extended dialogue with Desdemona, which represents the recognition by the ego-in-healing of the Faustian dimension below the surface of the phenomenal world. Whence exactly this healing? The character of Lodovico, having performed his healing ministry in MFM, reappears here at the crucial point. He is a reference, as we have seen, to Ludovico il Moro, a 15th century Duke of Milan, renowned for his patronage of the arts and sciences, and the prosperity and health of the city under his guidance. He is accompanied by Gratiano, whom we have also met before, in MOV, where he represents the libido, or unseen world, new-stripped of the negative mantle imposed on it by Puritanism: and so here, where his ascendancy will coincide with the eclipse of Iago. The name "Emilia" was sourced, like her namesake's in TWT, and "Emilius" in TitA, from Plutarch's Life of Paulus Aemilius, whose clan was said, strikingly, to have derived from one Pythagoras the Wise. This is explicitly to identify the Grail Queen with the principle of Wisdom.

The various napkins of the First Folio bear always, as a reference to menstruation, the value of the Goddess as Woman, as repudiated by the Puritan. This symbolism is most vividly depicted here, where strawberries have been worked into the napkin. It is significant that it passes through the hands of Emilia: for there is a colossal invisible dimension to the Goddess of Love (and Cupid is blind). Othello's observation of Cassio with the napkin marks the occasion of the "charge of the Boar" which befell Shakespeare in 1587, when he let his newly-awakened imagination dwell, as seems likely, on the seduction scene in *The Golden Ass*, and surrendered

to his libido, and auto-erotism, as of old, to precipitate the crisis. The murder of Desdemona by Othello represents the repudiation of the sham Goddess of the Puritan by the ego-in-healing. There is a beautiful legerdemain in the final scene, where Othello mistakes the cries of Emilia to be let into the chamber, for the cries of Desdemona, still alive after the smothering. This serves to reassociate the Goddess reborn with Her aspect of Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, which had been suppressed during the Puritan tyranny. This is further emphasised by the dying Emilia's (again, dagger-wounded, to identify her with the libido: cf. death of Juliet) repose beside Desdemona. Othello's dagger-suicide represents the Puritan ego transformed by knowledge of the libido.

The name "Othello" was derived by Bacon from the Greek root oth-, which bears the meaning of "cast down", and "-hell", along with "-o" which signifies a cipher, as we have seen. The meaning is therefore "I cast down into hell". Aaron the Moor in TitA bears the value of the libido: so that Othello as Moor is a reference to the ominous immanence in the Puritan Shakespeare of the libido, which he has vainly thought to destroy as an active principle in himself. The name "Othello" is therefore utterly appropriate in the context. We recall Christ's harrowing of hell on the second day on the Cross; - which brings us to the significance of the name "Iago". This is of course the Italian form of "James". This is undoubtedly a reference to James the Just (also known as Joseph of Arimathea), the brother of Christ, a master miner and metal-worker, and founder of the Christian Church in Britain.¹ It was King Arviragus (cf. Arviragus in CYM) who received James the Just into Britain c. A.D. 37. The shrine of St. Iago de Compostella in Portugal was dedicated to him. Just as James the Just entered Britain to Christianise it, so the libido (Iago) irrupted the ego of the Puritan Shakespeare, to cast him down into hell, whence he would ultimately rise again, like Christ on the third day. However, the name "Iago" is perhaps meant more simply to define Othello as a Christ. This is a reflection of the spirit of Christian Cabalism, or Renaissance Neoplatonism, - an assertion of the Gnostic world-view, in truth, - which succeeded in reconciling Christianity with the ancient magic of the pre-

¹ Laurence Gardner, *Bloodline of the Holy Grail*.

Christian world, and had such a profound effect on Sir Francis Bacon and the Elizabethans, almost certainly via John Dee and his marvellous library.

Othello is full of the symbols, the types of legerdemains, the exquisitely choreographed entries and exits, which the preceding argument has exhaustively demonstrated elsewhere. It begs a detailed, low-level explication as allegory, which however remains beyond the scope of the present work. I would invite you to try. All the precedents are there, and there are no surprises.

CHAPTER 33

HAMLET

Why he attempted it at all is an insoluble puzzle; under compulsion of what experience he attempted to express the inexpressibly horrible, we cannot ever know. We need a great many facts in his biography... We should have, finally, to know something which is by hypothesis unknowable, for we assume it to be an experience which, in the manner indicated, exceeded the facts. We should have to understand things which Shakespeare did not understand himself.

These words of T.S. Eliot¹ have been echoed most recently by Harold Bloom;² while Stephen Daedalus, in the pages of Joyce's *Ulysses*, is just one of countless others to have put forward a theory of this most enigmatic of plays. At least, this is the prevailing response; but it is the purpose of this chapter to show that Hamlet is in truth completely comprehensible, as an examination of the aetiology, pathogenesis, and crisis, of the disease that is now called paranoid schizophrenia, that most destructive and tragic of all human psychiatric illnesses.

Shakespeare understood only too well the nature of the background to Hamlet, for he had suffered himself a condition, an anxiety/depression neurosis of acute and disabling severity, which had drawn him to within sight, all too vivid and terrifying, of the inferno described in the allegory of Hamlet. His arrival evidently acted as a catalyst to a reaction that had been brewing in Bacon's mind for some time, to do with the corruptive effect of Puritanism on the psyche: and the ur-Hamlet was the immediate result, to be refined and sophisticated over several years. Its astonishing child would appear in 1600 as undoubtedly the greatest tragedy in the Western tradition: and the difference in quality of Hamlet from the

¹ Hamlet, from his *Collected Essays*.

² Shakespeare and the Invention of the Human.

other plays that came from Bacon's pen in the Nineties – the comedies, *TitA*, *TGV*, much of the histories – suggests the continuing influence of Shakespeare, and the vividness and immediacy of his once disabling condition.

It must emphasised that Shakespeare did not succumb to psychosis, which, by definition, takes the patient out of touch of reality, in the way of hallucinations, delusions, and so on; whereas there is no mention in the histories, which are remarkable for their brutal, merciless honesty, of any episode of this nature. For anyone who understood so perfectly the nature of Shakespeare's illness, as Sir Francis Bacon and his pupil/patient certainly did, its continuity with schizophrenia would have been readily apparent: and Hamlet was a natural progression of their art. It was the twin pillars of his imagination and his intellect, - both of them of outstanding quality, albeit suppressed for so long during the eight years of his Puritan phase, - and the memory of the Journey of the Hero with which he had become acquainted (though not made himself: hence the breakdown) in his Tavern phase of mid-adolescence, - that would make all the difference between neurosis and terminal psychosis. The point is made clearly and forcefully in the character of Claudius (see below) that Hamlet's fate could have befallen Shakespeare, had he not come under the influence of Bacon.

The drowning of Ophelia will be revealed as one of the most remarkable pieces of symbolism in the First Folio. The Great Goddess Isis, foremost of all Her kind in the ancient world,³ had a strong underworld aspect, which was identified with the darkness, or the waters. The Goddess Sophia, or Wisdom Herself, whose female gnosis is the Holy Spirit – the “Spirit that moved on the face of the waters” of Genesis - was equally exalted in the Gnostic tradition: and it is She, precisely, Whom Ophelia represents afloat on the brook, supine and singing, clutching the garlands of flowers with erotic associations (vulva of the Goddess of Love through which the ego in transformation is reborn: cf. the chains in *TCE* and *MAF*); whereas her drowning will represent the eclipse of wisdom and the Holy Spirit in the mind of the developing psychotic.

To further illustrate the esoteric symbolism of Hamlet, I would

³ Apuleius, *The Golden Ass*

pose the following amusing questions:

1. In what reincarnation does Osric appear on the first page of James Joyce's *Ulysses*?
2. Puritan-phase Shakespeare is to London-phase Shakespeare as the Emperor Augustus is to the Emperor... who?
3. How can a Big Mac help elucidate the meaning of the line "Marry this is miching mallico, that mischief makes" (III, ii)?

- All of which you will shortly be able to answer. Paranoid schizophrenia is the most shattering of all human psychiatric disturbances, whose dramatisation could promise to be the greatest tragedy in literature: and Sir Francis Bacon, together with Shakespeare, would prove entirely adequate to the task. This is dark territory indeed, full of Jungian savagery, which Bacon took a decade at least to map; and we will not stint in noting the rich detail he discovered, all of which will be found to have its precise place in an utterly coherent whole.

ACT I

The background to the tragedy is that a long period of unchallenged dominance by Puritanism, with its fraudulent peace (reign of King Hamlet-suppression of Fortinbras), has been shattered by the re-irruption of libido (murder of King Hamlet by Claudius, with return of Laertes from France, and renewed threat from Fortinbras). The adoption of Shakespeare's condition as a point of departure is apparent. The stricken ego now searches for help; but rejects the only course which could effect a lasting recovery (Barnado replacing Francisco at the twelve a.m. Watch, where the latter represents Sir Francis Bacon in particular (cf. Friar Francis in *MAN*; Francisco in *TT*), and Gnostic or Hermetic enlightenment in general); - in favour of (doomed) Puritan reason (Horatio, who bears precisely the same value in *The Spanish Tragedy*: see Appendix 1).

Horatio and Marcellus often appear together. The preceding chapters have shown the allegorical sequence to be a cornucopia of esoteric symbolism. What then is the symbolic value of Marcellus? and how can we say that Horatio represents reason

(the sham Puritan variety)? Ted Hughes in *SGCB* has convincingly demonstrated that Shakespeare's personal myth was that of Dido and Aeneas, as described by Virgil in the *Aeneid*: specifically, the rejection by the pious Roman leader of the Egyptian incarnation of the Goddess, who in this context is Isis, as celebrated as the archetypal Great Goddess by Apuleius in *The Golden Ass*, which I have shown to be the pre-eminent literary inspiration of Shakespeare's Tavern or pseudo-Alexandrian phase of mid-adolescence. Virgil was a poet of the Augustan age; and the *Aeneid* was written to glorify and justify the Roman Empire as ruled over by Augustus. The assassination of Julius Caesar has been shown above to represent the rebirth of the ego of the early adolescent Shakespeare, suffering under the conflict incited by Christian puritanism, into knowledge of the libido in positive aspect: the swords of the assassins symbolising, as always in *FF*, the ithyphallic principle. Thus the words of Horatio appear right on cue:

Horatio In the most high and palmy state of Rome,
 A little ere the mighty Julius fell,
 The graves stood tenantless, and the sheeted dead
 Did squeak and gibber in the Roman streets.

- For the figuration of the clock-face at the time – one a.m. - of the appearance of the Ghost portrays the ithyphallos. So that the conflict adumbrated here is the familiar one of the libido versus the Puritan superego (Ghost of King Hamlet).

Marcellus is celebrated in a long passage (854-886) in *Aeneid VI* as a young man, as yet unborn, who will bring glory to Augustan Rome, but will die tragically young. He thus is cognate with the Adonis of *V&A*; with every one of the Goddess-rejecting subjects of the tragic sequence; with Edward IV/Hastings of Richard the Third: finally, with Shakespeare himself. His death represents, in this context, the "Shakespearean moment" as isolated by Ted Hughes, when the libido in negative aspect bursts into consciousness (the "charge of the Boar") to cast the Goddess-figure (Ophelia, Cordelia, Desdemona, Cleopatra, Isabel, &c) as a whore. The casting of Tony Lemmon as Marcellus in Kenneth Branagh's definitive four-hour film version of *Hamlet* was inspired, for he had previously played

the tragically doomed subject in *The Prisoner of Seventh Avenue*, set in New York. I have demonstrated the symbolism of the city of York as of the functional left (reasoning) side of the brain, which flies solo in Protestant Puritanism, the right (natural) side having been anathematised and cast adrift. This was not an invention *de novo* by Bacon, but rather a recognition of the inherent macrocosmic symbolism of York (to which New York is a more driven, intense, and neurotic big brother), as is also in FF the case with Ireland, Wales, Scotland, England, France, and Germany: their constellations of qualities resonating as they do with the collective unconscious of Man. The firing of Lemmon's character from his job, to precipitate a slide into irreversible mental illness, is thus germane to the death of Marcellus as conceived by Shakespeare.

The name "Horatio" in Shakespeare's symbolic language is formed from "ho-" and "-ratio", the latter the Latin for "reason", and ho meaning "I have" in any number of Indo-European languages. He has been studying in Wittenburg, the city where Luther pinned up his declaration of war against the Roman Catholic Church, to initiate the Reformation. I have shown that the character of Rutland represents in the allegorical sequence the enfeebled Pauline Catholic intellect, which was overthrown defensively by Puritanism in an attempt to inject some intellectual steel into the English mind. The Protestant Reformation was, however, originally Gnostic in character: i.e. based on engagement with the Great Goddess Isis as Divine Bride, Sacred Mother, and Queen of Hell. Only later did it degrade into its now familiar forms; and it is to the original uncorrupt Protestantism that Wittenburg in *Hamlet* symbolically refers. Germany was, of course, the home of Gothic, which, as Oswald Spengler demonstrated, decisively informed the Renaissance spirit; and Germany in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* represents the home of the Faustian world view. Horatio insists, however, that he is playing truant: for this Gnostic reason has remained not fully developed, and hence is vulnerable to overthrow by the Puritan superego. Thus can he say "A piece of him" to Barnado's "Say, what is Horatio there?"; and thus can Hamlet say "There are more things in Heaven and Earth, Horatio,/Than are dreamt of in our [not "your"] philosophy". Further examination of Horatio's part will confirm his symbolic

identity as Puritan reason (cognate with the Duke of York in 1-3 HVI). Thus Horatio and Marcellus are paired, and attached to Hamlet, as representing undeveloped Gnostic reason, the incipient Puritan ego, and the ego of the suffering subject respectively.

The ghost of the murdered King Hamlet is an image of the ideal Goddess-scorning Puritan as generated by the Puritan superego. Opposed to him is King Claudius, the provenance of whose name is a fascinating one, and of absolutely central importance to the plays. Tiberius Claudius Nero Germanicus (10 BC – AD 54), known simply as Claudius, became Emperor in 41 AD, in the years after the Augustan era (Puritan tyranny, in the allegoric language of FF). He was a scholar and writer (like Shakespeare), and lame. *Claudeo* in Latin means “to limp”: hence the medical condition of claudication, a lameness caused by atherosclerotic obstruction of blood supply to the calf muscle. Ted Hughes argued strongly in SGCB a case for Shakespeare’s lameness, on the evidence of four sonnets, and the tradition of his walking stick. I give strong confirmation to this theory by demonstrating the autobiographical references in TWT I, i, 36 ff., and HVIII I, iii:

Sands They have all new legs, and lame ones. One would take it,
That never see ‘em pace before, the spavin
Or springhalt reigned among ‘em.

- Where the spavin and springhalt were both conditions of lameness in horses. The names “Claudius” here, in JC as well, and Claudio in MAN, give the final proof: for all three represent, in their every appearance, none other than Shakespeare himself, mostly in healing phase, after the severe anxiety/depression neurosis which had terminated his Puritan (Augustan) phase had begun to be treated by Sir Francis Bacon, by the reawakening of his imagination and reason to Nature Herself, using the literature of the Gnostic tradition. Queen Gertrude is therefore his Goddess in this phase: the Great Goddess Isis Herself, for Shakespeare just as for Lucius in Apuleius’ *The Golden Ass*, which MWW and MAN prove beyond any shadow of a doubt to have been used by Bacon as a therapeutic tool, and to have provided the paradigm for his patient’s recovery.

The Ghost appears first to Marcellus, and then to Horatio. This sequence is important: for the ego is bringing defensively its faculty of reason into play. Minutiae such as this are of the highest significance time and time again. This coping mechanism initially has some success; but with Freudian inevitability is doomed to fail, as expressed by Bacon a full three centuries before the supposed inauguration of Western depth psychology:

Hamlet ...foul deeds will rise,
 Though all the earth o'erwhelm them to men's eyes.

The Ghost, remaining mute, initially retreats before Horatio (reason) and Marcellus (Aenean-classical world view); but finally talks to Hamlet to persuade him to pursue the guilty King Claudius (Puritan superego asserting itself, in spite of Gnostic reason, in the incipiently psychotic mind):

Marcellus You shall not go my Lord.
Hamlet Hold off your hands.
Horatio Be ruled, you shall not go.
Hamlet My fate cries out...

King Hamlet had defeated Fortinbras, King of Norway, and arrogated to himself all the latter's lands; but now the defeated King's son, young Fortinbras, is threatening to campaign to win them back. In Bacon's geographico-symbolic language, Norway represents the unconscious which, as seat of the libido, the Puritan superego has thought to vanquish. King Claudius sends Voltemand and Cornelius to the King of Norway, who is "impotent and bedrid", with "dilated articles", that he might disabuse Fortinbras, his nephew, of his plan. "Voltemand" is formed of "volte-", from the word for "turn about" in any number of Indo-European languages, and "-mand", a truncation of the Latin *mandare*, "to order". "Cornelius" in this context could plausibly be a reference to the colossally influential magus Cornelius Agrippa (1486-1535), whose masterpiece *De Occulta Philosophia* was translated by John Dee, and who was the model for Christopher Marlowe's *Faust*. The stronger possibility is that it refers directly to St. Luke, the "Beloved

Physician” of Jesus, whose personal name was Cornelius. Not only that, but he is mentioned in a letter of the Emperor Claudius, which was written in 45 A.D. to express his support for the Jews, and which Luke himself carried to Judaea.⁴ Given the symbolism of the name “Claudius” and the numerous letters and Pages in the Complete Plays, and the utterly central role that the written word played in Bacon’s treatment of Shakespeare, this must have struck Bacon forcibly, crying out “Use me!”. Could Bacon have read the letters of Claudius? A little too *recherché* perhaps; but this is exactly the way his mind worked, as the numerous examples of his symbolic adoptions from Plutarch demonstrate. The symbolic value of the name “Ophelia” as referring to the parable of the Sower in the gospel of St. Luke (see below), supports this latter hypothesis, and suggests that St. Luke was much on Bacon’s mind during the writing of Hamlet. In any case, Cornelius and Voltemand represent here the principle of healing and reversal of suffering through the written word, as is confirmed by: “...the scope/Of these dilated articles” (I, ii, 38).

It will emerge in Act II that their suit to old Fortinbras has resulted in his nephew abandoning his campaign against Denmark, and returning to suppressing the Polacks (ithyphallic principle: cf. Sir William de la Pole of 1-3 HVI), with his passing through Denmark in peace. In other words, this is the sham healing effected through the written word as misperceived by the Puritan, with his extirpation of the imagination, and fostering of Puritan reason (Horatio) which therefore remains fixated at the level of the word, without the phantasmata it should stimulate (cf. Hamlet’s “Words, words, words”: II, ii, 204). The result is that the Goddess of Love (Ophelia) is not formed in the imagination of the reader, and the libido not stimulated (suppression of Polacks).

The King of Norway, bedridden uncle of Fortinbras, represents the negative contents of the unconscious as suppressed by the conscious ego. With the renewed access of libido after the long tyranny of Puritanism (reign of King Hamlet), the unconscious has been de-suppressed (sickness of old Fortinbras), - a state which cannot be reversed, hence the progressive nature of the illness, -

⁴ Barbara Thiering The Book That Jesus Wrote

and has revealed its still-living skeleton to the traumatised ego (campaign of young Fortinbras).

Cornelius Agrippa wrote:

[A] custom spreading like some epidemic contagion, hath made it common to undervalue this [female] sex, and bespatter their reputation with all kind of opprobrious language, and slanderous epithets... Let us no longer dis-esteem this noble sex, or abuse its goodness... Let us re-enthroned them in their seats of honour and pre-eminence... and treat them with all that respect and veneration which belongs to such terrestrial angels.”⁵

The reassertion of the Hermetic superego will notionally be effected by the written word (“dilated articles”), to the surprise of no-one who has followed the argument of the previous chapters; but it will fail, Ophelia (sc. Aphrodite) will be anathematised, and Fortinbras (negative contents of the unconscious) will take possession of Denmark as the ego collapses into irreversible psychosis in V, ii.

The provenance of the name “Ophelia” is a startling and fascinating one. Her first mention in the First Folio is decidedly odd:

Scena Secunda

Enter Claudius King of Denmarke, Gertrude the Queene
Hamlet, Polonius, Laertes, and his Sister O-
phelia, Lords Attendant

Why should “Ophelia” have been split between two lines in this apparently clumsy way, when there is more than ample room for the “O” in the third line? This is, of course, a semaphore to the alert reader that the name is a cipher: the “O” (zero) commonly being used in this way in the Elizabethan era, as signifying the cipher’s absence of meaning in itself (“zero” and “cipher” have a common origin in the Arabic *sifr*, “empty”). This is undoubtedly the significance of the reference to the Globe Theatre as the “World

⁵ Female Pre-eminence.

O": for it was, for the duration of Bacon-Shakespeare's active period, the stage for the greatest continuous enciphered allegory in Art. What is the cipher here? In Greek (which Bacon had studied to a high level at Cambridge), phellia is a neuter plural of phelleus, "stony ground". We remember the prominence of auto-erotism in Shakespeare's tormented adolescence as encrypted in the histories; and the certainty that his final crack-up aet. 23, when he had been so totally in thrall to Puritanism for eight years, was precipitated by the description of an erotic act in the printed page (see especially MAN), associated with an act of auto-erotism on his part. Up until now this last conclusion has remained highly likely but unproven. Now here we have the definitive proof: for the "stony ground" must be that on which fell the seed of the Sower in St. Luke's gospel (another St. Luke connection), to render Ophelia cognate with Nell Quickly in 1&2 HIV, as the Goddess imagined in the mind of the auto-erotist. The prominence in Hamlet of the name "Claudius" demonstrates, of course, that it was Shakespeare's breakdown that provided the point of departure for its study of schizophrenia, - to which the extrapolation could be readily made, - and so many of the details of its aetiology, pathogenesis, and crisis. By way of confirmation, this typographical oddity is repeated in II, ii, 115:

To the Celestiall, and my Soules Idoll, the most beautified O-
phelia.

I would refer the sceptical reader to the writings of Freud, Jung, R.D. Laing, and the other great modern explorers of this wild, sunless territory, which have detailed the close connexion between eros and so many cases of psychosis. I have shown that the arras represents, in the symbolic language of the allegorical sequence, the mechanism of psychic repression, to anticipate Freud, and that Falstaff's refuges there in 1&2HIV and MW W portray the repression of libido. Polonius similarly will hide there, before he is killed by Hamlet (the incipiently psychotic ego) as he rails against his mother (the Goddess). His name in Greek would have been "Poloneus", the "-eus" suffix signifying its great antiquity; - and one recalls "Aunchient" Pistol, who I have shown to represent the

ithyphallic principle. "Polo-" similarly recalls Sir William de la Pole (Earl of Suffolk) who also represents that principle, and whose murder by Walter Whitmore in 3HVI IV, i, is symbolic of the self-extirpation of the ithyphallic principle from the Puritan ego. There is no doubt that Polonius is the libido, and that his blade-murder represents the activation of that principle in the form of an ithyphallos, to draw it from the unconscious into the conscious ego (Hamlet will stow the body upstairs in the attic (mind)), and precipitate a psychotic crisis: the murder being cognate in this respect with that of Romeo, and also Horatio and many another in *The Spanish Tragedy* (see Appendix 1). Thus can he say in III, ii: "I did enact Julius Caesar. I was killed i' th' Capitol. Brutus killed me": for their blade-murders represent the activations of closely germane principles repressed by the Christian puritan superego. Bacon in fact uses the same expression – "hugger-mugger" – as used by North in his translation of Plutarch's description of the concealment of Caesar's body (see discussion of Polonius' murder below). The ithyphallic principle will recur, in the histories, as the major component of Ugly Dick (Richard Duke of Gloucester, later Richard III), - catastrophically for the ego; and in Hamlet as Laertes, son of Polonius, with equally dire results: but in the latter, in contrast to RIII, irreversibly, with no subsequent psychic rebirth into Gnostic nobility (the means of which is represented in Hamlet by the doomed Rosencranz and Guildenstern, and the journey to England: see below). In I, iii, both Polonius and Laertes, before the latter's departure, will counsel Ophelia against giving her love to Hamlet: for the incipient psychotic here is repressing the ithyphallos (Laertes principle) and communion with the Goddess of Love, as imagined in the mind of the auto-erotist. Similarly, the extirpation of the libido from consciousness (though most certainly not from unconsciousness) will coincide in Hamlet III, iv, with the rejection by the ego of the Great Goddess as Sacred Mother (Queen Gertrude). Yet the integrity of the Goddess is inviolable; the Queen of Hell is an aspect of both Divine Bride and Sacred Mother: and, though unseen, it is Her curse which will loose the fury of the ithyphallos (Laertes) on the last remnants of the reasoning ego (Hamlet), precisely as the curse of Queen Margaret brought Ugly Dick to murder Hastings in RIII.

Laertes leaves Denmark for France, under the aegis of his father Polonius. In Bacon's geographico-symbolic language France is located south of Denmark and Norway, and represents the body as opposed to the mind; or in Schopenhaurian terms, the world as will as opposed to the world as idea; or in mythic terms, Dionysius and Apollo respectively. Laertes' French sojourn represents therefore the expulsion of the ithyphallic principle (as in negative aspect) as idea from the conscious ego; yet it remains, ominously, as will (II, i):

Polonius There was a' gaming, there o'ertook in 's rouse,
 There falling out at tennis, or perchance,
 I saw him enter such a house of sale;
 Videlicet, a brothel, or so forth.
 [...]
 ...And let him ply his music .

In IV, vii, Laertes returns from France (irruption of repressed idea into consciousness, to precipitate final psychotic collapse), - in the rearward of a reputation for excellence in swordmanship, as spoken of by a diabolical Norman master, whose name "Lamord" is derived from the French noun mordant meaning "bite", "keenness", "point":

King He made confession of you,
 And gave you such a masterly report,
 For art and exercise in your defence;
 And for your rapier most especially...

So that it is not quite true that the Queen of Hell is invisible in this play; for here She is:

King ...but this gallant
 Had witchcraft in't; he [Lamord] grew into his seat,
 And to such wondrous doing brought his horse,
 As had he been incorp's'd and demi-natur'd
 With the brave beast...

Hamlet's struggle with Laertes over the body of Ophelia in V, i, is

therefore highly symbolic in a way that has not been precisely recognised hitherto. The locus classicus in the Complete Works of the sword as symbol of the ithyphallos is of course HVIII II, iv, where the King confesses to Cardinal Wolsey (Apollonist mentation) a psychic terror that overcame him at the thought of the Bishop of Bayonne (< the French for "bayonet") intervening in a marriage between the Duke of Orleans (sacred king of the Goddess) and his daughter Mary (the Goddess as the Virgin of Pauline Christianity).

The scenario Bacon had in mind was this. The ego has been in thrall to Puritanism (reign of King Hamlet), which has provided him with (spurious) psychic peace (suppression of Fortinbras, absence of Laertes). Now the Goddess is imagined as he reads the printed page, and an ithyphallos stimulated, to provoke the censure of the Puritan superego (return of Laertes, Ghost appearing at one a.m.). The phase of peace has been shattered forever; now the ego readmits the libido as a transforming principle, and therefore partakes of the divinity of the Gnostic Christ that was the London-phase Shakespeare (anticipated by reign of King Claudius). This Christhood is vehemently resisted by the Puritan superego (Ghost of King Hamlet). The ego deals with the threat, not by invoking Gnostic healing (Francisco; return of Hamlet to Wittenberg, which would have been sanctioned by the King and Queen, had not their principles remained anathematised), but by suppressing the ithyphallos (return of Laertes to France) through its wonted Puritan reasoning processes (Horatio). The depth charge is therefore primed. The libido and "I" principle in negative aspect (Polonius, Laertes) cause the ego to suppress the Goddess of Love from the imagination (Ophelia, obedient to her father and brother, resisting Hamlet's advances). The Puritan negative misconception of Nature is behind everything: "I shall in all my best obey you, Madam" (I, ii, 122). The subject is troubled and deeply unhappy: "O that this too too sullied flesh would melt". This coping mechanism proves a sham, as an ithyphallos rises again to invoke in defence the Puritan superego, and part for the first time (an epochal moment in the play) the subject from his reason (Ghost of King Hamlet appearing at one a.m., beckoning Hamlet away from the reluctant Horatio, and speaking to him). This is the beginning of his madness. There is

worse to follow in

ACT II

- Where the subject will surrender to auto-erotism. T.S. Eliot could find “little excuse” for the scenes between Polonius and Laertes, and also Polonius and Reynoldo, concluding that they represent failed reworkings of earlier material by Thomas Kyd.⁶ Yet the theory of the Baconian Double Helix has revealed Hamlet thus far to be, on the contrary, a paragon of the Aquinian virtues of consonance, radiance, and integrity.

Ted Hughes (SGCB) has shown the utter centrality to the tragic sequence of the “charge of the Boar” motif (irruption of libido into the Puritan psyche), as first described V&A. I have shown that it is also central to the sequence of histories: indeed, that it is the centre of gravity of the nine plays, as symbolic of the breakdown that struck Shakespeare in the early years of his marriage, and precipitated his flight to London, and determined the subsequent course of his life. The problem in Hamlet (which Ted Hughes could not solve) is to locate the “charge of the Boar”. In RIII the Boar charges in III, iv; and the following scene opens with the direction: ‘Enter Richard and Buckingham, in rotten armour, marvellous ill-favored’ – to symbolise the shattering of the complacent Puritan psyche (Hastings) - and continues to describe psychic anxiety (“Come, cousin, canst thou quake and change thy color,/Murder thy breath in middle of a word,/And then again begin, and stop again,/As if thou were distraught and mad with terror”). The precisely cognate scene in Hamlet is II, i:

Ophelia My Lord, as I was sewing in my chamber,
 Lord Hamlet with his doublet all unbrac’d,
 No hat upon his head, his stockings foul’d,
 Ungarter’d, and down-gyved to his ankle,
 Pale as his shirt, his knees knocking each other,
 And with a look so piteous in purport,
 As if he had been loosed out of hell,
 To speak of horrors: he comes before me.

⁶ The basis of the Hamlet-The Spanish Tragedy connection is that both were directed by Bacon, albeit Kyd wrote most of the latter: see Appendix 1.

The Boar therefore has charged (will-to-eros shattered its fragile confines) shortly before, and after the assertion of the Puritan superego in the psyche ("And thy commandment all alone shall live/Within the book and volume of my brain...": I, v,), with the Queen of Hell, whose executor the Boar is, appearing in this speech of Ophelia's; but when exactly does it charge?.

Reynoldo My lord, I did intend it.

Polonius Marry, well said, very well said.

This exchange is, in the context, oddly supererogatory. "I" is in truth appearing here, as so often elsewhere, in its symbolic guise of the ithyphallos; with Polonius' emphatic reply serving to semaphore its significance to the reader. Reynoldo enquiring, at the behest of Polonius, after Laertes in France, and coming closer and closer to the truth of his life there, represents the gradual rise of the ithyphallos under influence of the libido. Finally, a climax is reached: " 'I saw him enter such a house of sale,/Videlicet, a brothel, or so forth" (II, i, 64); - sequent on an act of auto-erotism (since Ophelia bears the symbolic weight of the Goddess of the auto-erotist): which therefore is, precisely, the occasion of the "charge of the Boar".

It is the will-to-eros, cast in negative aspect by the Puritan superego, which has driven the psyche to anathematise the Goddess:

Ophelia ...but as you [Polonius] did command,
I did repel his letters, and denied
His access to me.

The long scene ii is an especial triumph of imagination and empathy, which faculties inform the approach to psychosis so well described by R.D. Laing in his masterpiece *The Divided Self*:

...the therapist must have the plasticity to transpose himself into another strange and alien view of the world... Only thus can he arrive at an understanding of the patient's existential position. I

think it is clear that by understanding I do not mean a purely intellectual process. For understanding one might say love. But no word has been more prostituted. What is necessary, though not enough, is a capacity to know how the patient is experiencing himself and the world, including oneself... No one has schizophrenia, like having a cold. The patient has not "got" schizophrenia. He is schizophrenic. The schizophrenic has to be known without being destroyed. He will have to discover that this is possible.

This last axiom is central in negative sense to this scene, and Hamlet as a whole: for Hamlet's reaction to the Players ("Oh what a rogue and peasant slave am I"), later the flight of King Claudius from the play, and Hamlet's slaying of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, will represent the schizophrenic's repudiation of it.

It is of fundamental importance to the understanding of this tightly choreographed scene that Hamlet's entry with a book is precisely the event anticipated earlier by Claudius:

King It likes us well:
 And at our more consider'd time we'll read,
 Answer, and think upon this business.

- In response to Cornelius and Voltemand's news that Fortinbras desires "quiet pass" through Denmark, having been dissuaded from his campaign, and returned to suppressing the Polacks instead (negative unconscious no longer threatening irruption of conscious ego ("charge of the Boar"), now returned to suppressing the ithyphallic principle in negative aspect).

The scenario Bacon had in mind is this. The hitherto Puritan ego has been shattered by communion with the Goddess of Love. Now his feeling for Nature (the Great Goddess: Gertrude, Mary Magdalene, ultimately Isis, also Cleopatra, Dido) is transformed, and he is become a potential Gnostic Christ (Claudius, also Lucius in *The Golden Ass*, and Antony, though certainly not Aeneas). This causes him great suffering. The possibility of psychic rebirth is near at hand (Rosencrantz and Guildenstern); but is repudiated (their exit, to meet with Hamlet). The libido negatively conceived

torments him, and will cause him to once again repress the ithyphallic principle from consciousness as he reads (entry of Polonius, his assertion of Hamlet's madness, tightly interwoven with news of the ambassadors). In the absence of Art, the ego is at the mercy of his demons ("I swear I use no art at all": Polonius). Now the subject returns to reading in the Puritan way, with no imagination ("Words, words, words"), and hence no possibility of evoking the Goddess, and becoming Her libidinous devotee (Exeunt King and Queen). The libido is for the time being successfully repressed: "You [Polonius] cannot sir take from me anything that I will more willingly part withal..." The possibility of psychic transformation (Rosencrantz and Guildenstern) remains yet inherent in the written word (plausibly *The Golden Ass*); but the subject will have to reason and imagine (play-within-the-play of Act III). For now, he gets the first inkling of this possibility (entry of players) and its potential to activate the Gnostic Christ or Alexander principle in him and smash the Puritan tyranny (murder of Priam by Pyrrhus in the player's speech). This fills him with disgust: "Oh what a rogue and peasant slave am I".

The only effective healing strategy in this situation would be to achieve psychic transformation by recreation of the tragically misconceived outer world in the inner, by means of the imagination, and with the help of Art, which stills the mind from its hectic flight from the will in negative aspect, and allows it to comprehend that will as a constitutive part of the given world, which can only be engaged, never denied. This is the point, for example, of the tale of Hansel and Gretel, which has its roots in a myth remotest antiquity, wherein the riches secreted in the witch's house in the middle of the forest (cognate with Shakespeare's Forest of Arden in *AYLI*) are made available to them only after her murder by Gretel (symbolic of the new moon, and therefore of rebirth sequent, as it must be, on death). Hamlet however will skirt the forest, and engagement with the Queen of Hell, to his own ruin.

Let us drill down further. With the knowledge of libido comes the possibility of redemption:

King Welcome dear Rosencrantz and Guildenstern.

Moreover, that we much did long to see you,
The need we have to use you, did provoke
Our hasty sending.

The symbolism of names “Rosencrantz” and “Guildenstern” can readily be discerned. The former is Dutch for “a garland of roses”; while the latter is formed from the Dutch guilder, the unit of currency of Holland, - whose significance lies however in its homophony with the English “gild”, meaning “to endow with gold”, - and stern, the German for “star”. Guildenstern symbolises therefore nothing less than the Star of the Magi; while Rosencrantz suggests rebirth (the garland is worn about the brows) through the vulva of the Goddess (the rose: cf. Dante’s “Rose of Heaven”); and together they symbolise rebirth through engagement and transcendence of Nature to achieve a state of Gnostic Christlikeness; or of the essence of Hyperborean Apollo, with the Three Graces standing at his right-hand side (fig.2); or indeed of Cornelius Agrippa (“And let not her [your wife] be subject unto thee, but let her be with thee I all trust and counsel...”: from The Commendation of Matrimony).

Polonius suggests that he and King Claudius should hide behind an arras as Hamlet confronts Ophelia, when his madness will be proved: for the will-to-eros, as expressed in the Gnostic Christ (cf. the marriage of the Jesus Christ of the Gnostic gospels to Mary Magdalene, which union alone can explain the extraordinary veneration in which she is held throughout Europe) - is repressed, as in negative aspect, by the mind in thrall to the Puritan superego. Hamlet now enters, reading a book, and identifies Polonius with a fishmonger. The fish here is the progenitor of the Pauline Jesus, whose name, - the initial letters of which (Jesus Christos Theos) spell out the root of the Greek ichthos, “fish”, - is derived from the Hebrew “Jehoshua”, meaning “son of the fish”. The fish is symbolic of coldness and erotic indifference, as Robert Graves describes in a memorable poem about nuns (cf. “Get thee to a nunnery!”) in The White Goddess:

Circling the circlings of their fish
Nuns walk in white and pray;

For he is as chaste as they
Who was dark-faced and hot in Sylvia's day,
And in his pool drowns each unspoken wish.

- "unspoken wish" suggesting here surda Thalia (fig.2), or silent Cordelia, Hippolyta, or Hero, as symbolising the unadorned dream-world of the imagination of the first stages of Gnostic enlightenment, as is being offered here to Hamlet, and which for whom, right from this earliest stage, never stood a chance. Polonius naturally disagrees; and now comes yet another image whose full significance has never up to now been explained:

Polonius	Not I my Lord.
Hamlet	Then I would you were so honest a man.
Polonius	Honest, my Lord?
Hamlet	For if the Sun breed maggots in a dead dog, being
a	good kissing carrion - Have you a daughter?

The "Sun" bears here its immemorably ancient symbolic weight of reason, based on the visual imagination. It is internalising here, for example, the powerfully erotic scenes in the night-world journey of Lucius in *The Golden Ass*. The dog which has died is same as the black dog which Cornelius Agrippa kept continually by his side, and which he claimed as his familiar, as symbolic of the unseen world, or will. The Puritan ego has thought to slaughter the will; yet the erotic imagination (here threatening to dwell on Ophelia/Aphrodite) may bring it to life, as symbolised by positively its lowest objectification in the animal world, namely the maggot. The ego confronted, therefore, by this Hermetically therapeutic work, right from this earliest stage is not embracing, but recoiling. It stops, in the Puritan way, at the level of the word itself, without imagining the Word behind them:

Polonius	What do you read, my Lord?
Hamlet	Words, words, words.

I have described at length the primacy of the imagination in the Hermetic tradition; and would only reiterate here the words of Pico

della Mirandola: 'Necesse est, eum, qui ratiocinatur et intelligit, phantasmata speculari' (He who seeks to understand the root causes of things must first picture them in the imagination). This philosophical principle will also be demonstrated to underlie the hitherto baffling procrastination of Hamlet over the killing of his uncle (see below). Hamlet is reading the will-to-eros - described, as may be, on the pages of Apuleius – and is trying to conceive it as something it is not:

Hamlet ...for the satirical slave says here, that old men have
 grey beards... for yourself sir, should be as old as I am,
 if like a crab you could go backward.

- As in negative aspect it torments him; but now vanishes: 'Exit Polonius'. The subject is now reading in the perfectly Puritan way, with complete suppression of imagination and the unseen world. The rest of this scene, and the play-within-the-play of Act III, will serve to show how he continues to shrink from the psychic transformation that may flow from engagement with the libido (cf. ass-phase Lucius in Apuleius' magical masterpiece). This possibility will bud, only to be stamped back into the sands:

Guildestern My honour'd Lord!
Rosencrantz My most dear Lord!

In response to Hamlet's badinage, they reply that they live in the "private parts" of Fortune. What does this mean? In the speech "The rugged Pyrrhus, he whose sable arms...", soon to be begun by Hamlet and finished, significantly, by a player, the "strumpet" Fortune is depicted in characteristic mythic guise as the Wheel. To live in the private parts of Fortune is therefore to occupy the precise centre of the Wheel, which nirvana is an ancient mythic symbol of transcendence of opposites – for example, reason and unconscious, body and mind, idea and will - of the phenomenal world. At one moment (twelve o'clock) Hamlet, chained to the Wheel of Fortune, will be ruled by his (Puritan) reason; at the next (six o'clock: V, v) drowned in his negative unconscious (Fortinbras): but Gnostic enlightenment, as

“idea” and “dream” interchangeably, as does Schopenhauer (although “representation” is a more accurate translation than “idea”); but they are really a first step in a journey, - to poetic or Gnostic enlightenment, - requiring also the help of reason, to produce higher ideas, or concepts, as succinctly put by Keats:

The poet and the dreamer are distinct,
Diverse, antipodes, sheer opposites:
The one pours out a balm upon the world,
The other vexes it.⁷

- A lesson that many a public figure with his facile “vision” would do well to consider. Yet, as Schopenhauer pointed out, the capacity to dream – to recreate the world precisely in the microcosm - is absolutely the first requirement for a true philosopher: and this will be the point of Hamlet’s speech “Speak the speech I pray you...” in III, ii. Hamlet warmly welcomes the Players; yet later will be filled with disgust (ego inducted into healing, only to be repelled by Claudius principle in himself). The inner castle must, to endure, be built on sure foundations, unlike that erected on the shifting sands of the boy players:

Rosencrantz ... these are now the fashion, and so berattle the
common Stages (so they call them) that many
wearing rapiers, are afraid of goosequills,
and dare scarce come thither.

The pre-pubertal boy, a model for the angel in the Pauline Christian tradition, is symbolic of anerotism (cf. Boyet in LLL). The rapier here is in its usual symbolic garb of the ithyphallic principle. In an eerie prediction of Goethe, and Oswald Spengler who called Shakespeare, entirely accurately, the “dramatist of the incidental”, meaning that not a single incident, however minor, is without relevance to the unfolding of the destiny, - which is a function of the will, as distinct from the causes and effects of Nature observed scientifically, - of the tragic heroes (and as I have also

⁷ See Ted Hughes’ wonderful discussion of these lines in *Winter Pollen*.

demonstrated for the Puritan figures of FF as a whole), Hamlet firmly links the symbolism of the company of boys to their cousin germane, the murdered King Hamlet:

Hamlet It is not strange: for mine uncle is King of Denmark, and those that would make mows at him while my father lived, give twenty, forty, a hundred ducats a-piece for his picture in little. 'Sblood there is something in this more than natural, if Philosophy could find it out.

Yet this particular dream will be aborted by the surge of the Gnostic Christ – the subject as a potential Shakespeare, capable of healing - in negative aspect, to precipitate the final catastrophe ("Give me some light! Away!"): for the Francisco (Francis Bacon) principle of Gnostic enlightenment has been spurned. The function of the Platonic Ideas of the dream (the Players) will be to reveal the immanence of the will in positive (finally, beyond positive and negative) aspect in Man-as-sublimated-animal. The will is to be identified with the body, which in Bacon's geographico-symbolic language is located south of Denmark (see above). Dionysius is the tutelary deity of the stage, and is to be identified with the world as will (with Apollo the world as idea). Norway is located east of Denmark, and is symbolic in Hamlet of the unconscious (see above); therefore the (Puritan) superego would have to be located, on the contrary, to the west; - and also to the north, as impinging on the ego (Denmark) from above: but especially to the north. The following hitherto baffling lines are now perfectly clearly explained, and are revealed, like every other line in the play, to bear immense significance:

Hamlet I am but mad north-north-west: when the wind is southerly, I know hawk from a handsaw.

Hamlet, standing between Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, now sees Polonius, with the arrival of the Players announced, as a baby: for the power of the libido (specifically, will(s)-to-eros and – survival) is broken in the Puritan ego in his delusion. Polonius as

homo libidensis is also primal Man (Dionysian or Falstaffian Man), cognate with Adam in As You Like It:

Hamlet That great baby you see there is not yet out of his
 swathing clouts.

Rosencrantz Haply he's the second time come to them: for they
 say, an old man is twice a child

- And therefore associated with the truths of Nature, as a reference most plausibly to the ritual of the "Knight of the Sun" degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, which featured "Thrice Perfect Father Adam", and whose purpose was the indoctrination of truth (see Ch.44).⁸ Polonius and the actors are identified with ass-phase Lucius in The Golden Ass (cf. "What an ass am I...": 592):

Hamlet My Lord [Polonius], I have news to tell you. When
 Roscius was an actor in Rome...
 [...]
 Then came each actor on his ass –

- For Dionysius (Polonius is primal or Dionysian Man) is the tutelary deity of the stage. The ideas generated by the imagination, as revelatory of the universality of the will, resonate with familiarity in the ego ("O my old friend..."). The south wind is now incarnate in Pyrrhus in the great speech of the murder of Priam. I have demonstrated exhaustively the symbolic significance in FF of Aeneas as the archetypal Goddess-(Dido-) rejecting Puritan. Priam may therefore be taken, as uncle of Aeneas, and King of Troy at the time of his flight, to symbolise the Puritan superego; and his murder by Pyrrhus the smashing of that superego by the libido, as conceptualised and relieved of its negative aspect by meditation on Platonic Ideas, - as provided, as may be, by Apuleius' Golden Ass. Pyrrhus conveys the libido in the way of the Christ of the Gnostic Gospel of Philip:

⁸ Knight and Lomas, The Second Messiah.

And the companion of the Saviour is Mary Magdalene. But Christ loved her more than all the disciples, and used to kiss her often on the mouth. The rest of the disciples were offended by it and expressed disapproval. They said unto him, Why do you love her more than all of us? The saviour answered and said to them, Why do I not love you like her?... Great is the mystery of marriage – for without it the world would not have existed. Now the existence of the world depends on man, and the existence of man on marriage.

This was also the symbolism of the unicorn, whose horn represented the phallic principle incarnate in the Gnostic Christ. It is for this reason that it was incorporated into the coat-of-arms of Scotland, that great haven for the Knights Templar after their dissolution by the Church in the early 14th century.⁹ Who exactly is this Pyrrhus? He appears, of course, in Virgil in precisely this role; but is, in truth, the Pyrrhus of Plutarch (*Life of Demetrius*):

... many of the Macedonians said, that of all the princes, it was in Pyrrhus only that they saw a lively image of Alexander's valour, whereas the other princes, especially Demetrius, imitated him only in a theatrical manner, by affecting a lofty port and theatrical air.

This discovery of this association must have been, for Bacon, serendipitous in the extreme. This is also the Demetrius of *MND*. The Demetrius Alexander ultimately is ineffective, a sham; but the Pyrrhus Alexander can smash the Goddess-rejector Priam, that Father of Troy whence, via Aeneas, the Roman (Augustan, in Shakespeare's mythos) nation was born.

Hamlet's hesitant assumption of the speech, and its completion by a Player, therefore represents the first uncertain receptivity of the ego to the therapy of the Hermetic imagination, whose wisdom he had long ago forgotten (cf. the life of Shakespeare: his pseudo-Alexandrian phase of mid-adolescence): a boon which, by the end of the Act, will have been flung back in the giver's face. Polonius'

⁹ Laurence Gardner, *Bloodline of the Holy Grail*

“This is too long” (509), following as it does the description of Fortune’s wheel being de-spoked (the spokes whereon the sufferer is bound to it) and bowled “down the hill of heaven,/As low as to the fiends” - is an expression of the vulnerability of Man as homo libidensis (Adam, Falstaff) to the vicissitudes of Fortune; whereas release from the spokes derives from Gnostic enlightenment, which it is the function of the Rosencrantz and Guildenstern principles to effect.

Here is an extraordinary cameo :

Player But who, O who, had seen the inobled Queene –
Hamlet The inobled Queene?
Polonius That’s good: Inobled Queene is good.

This is as per the First Folio. Modern editors without exception have replaced the unusual “inobled” with “mobled”; yet the thrice repetition of it, and Hamlet’s query, suggests that it is anything but a compositor’s error. The third instance gives the meaning: for this is “I” in its role as symbol of the ithyphallos, for which Polonius’ otherwise supererogatory concordance gives the occasion. The word “noble” is itself derived from the same Greek root as gnosis, or knowing. The “Inobled Queene” is therefore cognate with the knife-wounded Juliet in the Capulet tomb, as symbolic of the Goddess, formerly a Puritan sham (wife of Priam), now ennobled and identified with the Goddess of Love (the blade being symbolic, as always in the plays, of the ithyphallic principle; the wound therefore of the yoni (much better than the sterile Latin vagina)). Polonius therefore can only approve; while the as yet unenlightened Hamlet remains puzzled. He continues:

Player Run barefoot up and down, threat’ning the flames
With bissom rheum, a clout upon that head
Where late the diadem stood, and for a robe,
About her lank and o’erteemed loins,
A blanket in the alarm of fear caught up –

¹⁰ Robert Graves The White Goddess

This “clout” is symbolic of menstruation, and hence of the Goddess; its whiteness also suggestive of the moon, the White Goddess Herself ¹⁰ (cf. V, ii, 298; 3 HVI I, iii; Desdemona’s handkerchief in *Othello*; &c); while the blanket is the dark moon: so that the combined effect is to suggest the old moon, or Goddess as Witch or Queen of Hell. Hecuba as wife of Priam is thus cognate with the rejected Margaret of RIII, I, iii, the unwed Katherina in *TOS*, unloved Cordelia (“heart-of-Lear”), and so on: all of them ultimately with Carthaginian Dido who killed herself after being left by pious Aeneas en route to founding the Rome of Augustus, that pre-eminent symbol in *FF* of the Puritan ascendancy (see especially *JC*).

Here is another oddity:

Hamlet I so, God buy’ye.

Exeunt [Rosencrantz and Guildenstern]

Now I am alone.

O what a rogue and peasant slave am I!

Most editors have emended “I” to “Ay”. Yet “I” for “Ay” in *FF* is always symbolic of the ithyphallic principle, more broadly the invisible world, that aspect of Nature lying below the surfaces of things (see especially 1-3HVI). The renewal of the imagination in the service of potential psychic transformation therefore threatens, as always, to create the Goddess in the mind, and excite an ithyphallos in negative aspect, which trauma (“Prithee, no more!”: Polonius, 531) aborts the journey to enlightenment (“Now I am alone”). This psychic process will be amplified and intensified in Act III, where the play-within-the-play will be cut off midstream by King Claudius’ apprehension of his guilt (Gnostic Christ negatively misconceived by the incipient schizophrenic ego: this is adumbrated here, in “The play’s the thing/Wherein I’ll catch the conscience of the King”).

Apuleius’ magical *The Golden Ass*, which had been available in English translation for some 30 years before the flight of Shakespeare from Stratford in 1587, provides a perfect fit to all of this: the libidinous episodes witnessed by Lucius in ass phase, to enable his ascent to divinity as a priest of Isis in the final chapters, perceived as repugnant by the psychotic ego. More broadly, the concern of Gnostic literature is with the invisible and visible worlds

equally: the former wherein resides the libido, which cannot be denied or anathematised or ignored, only engaged: to the immense torment of the schizophrenic.

ACT III

The subject in his misery (for the defence mechanism continues to fail) now has thoughts of suicide, and damns the Goddess pictured in his imagination as a whore, as all the while his negative Gnostic Christ aspect and will-to-eros remain suppressed:

King How smart a lash that speech doth give my conscience!

Polonius I hear him coming, let's withdraw [behind the arras]
 my Lord.
 [...]

Hamlet To be, or not to be, that is the question...
 [...]

I have heard of our paintings too well enough. God has given you one face, and make yourselves another: you jig, you amble, and you lisp, and nick-name God's creatures and make your wantonness your ignorance...To a nunnery, go.

Ophelia is reading a book, to emphasise yet again that it is by means of the written word that the Hermetic journey is being attempted. Hamlet's obloquy is triggered by Ophelia's rejection of his gifts (prompted ultimately by Polonius), to highlight the barrier Polonius driven between them. Claudius determines to send Hamlet to England, which represents here an environment of idealised Gnostic healing. Thus will the gravedigger say in V, i: "...there the men are as mad as he": for he (the gravedigger) represents the principle – contrary to England - of active psychic repression (with the earth of the graveyard the unconscious), which has been a constitutive feature of the pre-schizophrenic psyche for so long. It is in this context that the possibility of healing will be extinguished (deaths of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern in England). The schizoid ego in his darkness remains unaware of the cause of his malady (in so far as tragedy can ever be said have a

cause), which we know can be found in the negative libido and Goddess of Love:

King There's something in his soul,
 O'er which his melancholy sits on brood
 And I do doubt the hatch, and the disclose
 Will be some danger..
Polonius It shall do well. But yet I do believe
 The origin and commencement of his grief
 Sprung from neglected love.

Bacon now sets the ground rules for an exemplary act of reflection, so that we should know exactly what the schizoid ego will be shirking. Hamlet enjoins the Players not to "o'erstep the modesty of Nature": for the external or alien (to use Spengler's term) world must be imagined precisely in the microcosm, for the work of the God Apollo, - the great healer, over the lintel of whose temple at Delphi was inscribed "Know Thyself", - to be achieved. He emphasises that the artistic integrity of the Clown's role should be respected, to adumbrate King Lear, and the vital work of the Fool on the heath. Laughter is an expression of the recognition of the pulses of Nature, - of Dionysius, or the will, - by the ego. It can be a reflection of the world as will as represented by the lowest stages of Hindu Kundalini yoga (chakras I, II, & III: the will(s)-to-survival, -eros, and -power); but as the mind begins to represent, in its vital work of healing, the world as idea (the play-within-the-play of Hamlet), the laugh is relinquished. Further, it is not permitted, once illumination has been achieved, to laugh at the Clown: for this laugh is the issue of an ego become (to use Goethe's term); whereas Hermetic meditation is above all a process of becoming: and the facile assumption of the former state is precisely that fault-line in the crust of Shakespeare's tragic heroes which is lurking to hurl the towers of their egos - like Lear's - to the ground.

With the conditions established, the meditation proper can now begin. It is the suffering caused to the ego by the libido in negative aspect which initiates it ("Bid the Players make haste" Exit Polonius); - in which is offered nothing less than rebirth into

(Gnostic) Christlikeness (“Will you two [Rosencrantz and Guildenstern] help to hasten them?”). Yet the ego will be reasoning, ominously, in the Puritan way (“What ho, Horatio?”), with the possibility of healing denied (Exit Polonius... Rosencrantz and Guidenstern). The reason symbolised by Horatio (ho + ratio) is a shadow of the real thing (Gnostic or Hermetic reason: cf. Gloucester in 1&2 HVI) in potency (money symbolising power, as in the “historical sequence):

Hamlet For what advancement may I hope from thee,
 That no revenue hast, but thy good spirits
 To feed and clothe thee?

His Puritan reason has suppressed the negative libido and the trauma it brings:

Hamlet ...For thou hast been
 As one in suffering all, that suffers nothing.
 A man that Fortune’s buffets and rewards
 Hath ta’en with equal thanks.
 ...Give me that man
 That is not passion’s slave, and I will wear him
 In my heart’s core: I, in my heart of heart,
 As I do thee. Something too much of this...

- Where “I” is symbolic of the ithyphallos, more broadly the unseen world, here totally (and spuriously, as has emerged) under the control of reason. The bud of libido will soon again be seen: “Something too much of this”. The ego will give way (to become a Claudius), as Puritan reason continues to anathematise the Gnostic Christ:

Hamlet And after we will both our judgements join,
 To censure of his [King Claudius’] seeming.

The Love Goddess is now pictured in the mind, to tempt it as of old: “Lady, shall I lie in your lap?”. The pronoun is repeatedly used symbolically:

Rosencrantz I my lord, they [the Players] stay upon your
 patience.
 [...]

Hamlet I mean, my head upon your lap?

Ophelia I, my lord.
 [...]

Ophelia You are merry, my lord.

Hamlet Who, I?

Ophelia I, my lord.

In other words, the pre-schizophrenic subject meditating upon, for example, an erotic scene in Apuleius, - which could have, as a whole, the power to lead him out of darkness, - has an *ithyphallos*.

The dumb-show and the play which follows it are routinely lumped together by the critics; but they are in fact significantly different in content. The former is a re-enactment in the mind, and an acknowledgement by it, of the pathogenesis of his malady: the forcible re-imposition of Nature on an ego that had thought to deny Her; the latter this same process being repeated, not forcibly, but willingly and in full understanding, by that ego on the way to healing. Hamlet's response signifies that the meditating ego is recognising, for the first time, the truth of its own pathology (equivalent, if you like, to "I am an alcoholic!"):

Hamlet Marry, this miching Mallico, it means mischief.

The letter "m" was linked to its proper phonic, at the very inception of the Roman alphabet, by its symbolic value of the maternal bosom. Hamlet here is inwardly humming "mmmm..." Metaphysically, it signifies a recognition of the truth beneath the skin of the phenomenal world, and is the third stage in the mystical apprehension of the natural world represented by the Buddhist syllable AUM, where it is equivalent to the principle of deep, dreamless sleep, where potentiality, or "what will become" resides. Here is what the Upanishads say:

¹¹ Mandukya Upanishad, trans. Joseph Campbell.

¹² Creative Mythology

Here a sleeper neither desires anything desirable nor beholds any dream. Undivided, he is an undifferentiated, homogeneous lump or mass of consciousness, consisting of bliss and feeding on bliss, his only mouth being spirit. He is here "The Knower": the Lord of All, the Omniscient, the Indwelling Controller, the Source or Generative Womb of All: the Beginning and the End of Beings.¹¹

Joseph Campbell continues:¹²

It is the dark into which Stephen Daedalus disappeared, following his kitchen conversation with Bloom in the basement of Bloom's castle, Bloom's temple, his home, where he lived with his Goddess Molly, who was at that hour in bed upstairs. It is the dark into which Bloom disappeared, when he had mounted to that second floor and in the grotto of his goddess mounted the bed, his Cross.

In the microcosm it is the darkness from which dreams arise; in the macrocosm, the Will (the quantum world, the cosmic sea) from which the phenomenal world is born. In RIII the seat of Gloucester (Ugly Dick) is named as Crosby ("Cross-by") House, which was taken from the source to signify the libido in negative aspect as the Cross of the ego's crucifixion, prelude to a glorious resurrection. Here is precisely the same Cross, from which, on the other hand, no resurrection will be possible: for "Words without thoughts never to heaven go".

Now the play proper begins, with the words symbolising Gnostic reason, the actions the forms of the imagination. The symbolism of the name of Rosencrantz ("garland of roses": rebirth through the Goddess, where "garland" = vulva, and "rose" = Goddess), now recurs, as applied to the Prologue of the play-within-the-play; yet this opportunity will be short-lived:

Hamlet Is this a Prologue, or the posy of a ring?
Ophelia 'Tis brief, my Lord.
Hamlet As woman's love.

Bacon goes to great lengths to contrast the King Hamlet of the play proper with that of the dumb-show: for here the old pathology will peacefully be healed, without resistance from an unwilling ego:

Player King And thou [Player Queen] shalt live in this fair
world behind,
Honour'd, belov'd and haply, one as kind
For husband shalt thou...

Hamlet compares the play to a story, written in Italian, of the murder in Venice of a Duke, Gonzago, married to Baptista. Vienna (north) is related here to Italy (south) as Denmark is to France (see above), as mind and body, or idea and will, respectively. This is a psychic transformation based on the imagination. The name "Baptista" is utterly appropriate, as suggesting both water (a Goddess symbol), or the fluid principle (of milk, sap, blood, amniotic fluid, &c.), and baptism into redemption. The name "Gonzago", which is twice pointed out by Hamlet, must refer to the Gonzagas, who were the ruling family of Mantua for some four hundred years from 1328: that city bearing the immense symbolic weight, - as the birthplace of Virgil, creator of the archetypal Goddess rejector Aeneas (cf. especially TT II, i, 74-98), - of the home of Puritanism.

Player King Full thirty times hath Phoebus' cart gone round...
Since love our hearts, and Hymen did our hands
Unite comutual in most sacred bands.

- For Hamlet is thirty years of age (V,v, 140-60). Ideally the subject should now be inducted on the road to psychic transformation and healing; however the Goddess of the auto-erotist is now vividly imagined: "It would cost you a groaning, to take off my edge". Lucianus ("son of Lucius") now enters and pours the poison in the sleeping King's ear, the reference being to an early stage Lucius, hero of The Golden Ass, whose libidinous encounters in his harrowing of Hell, like Odysseus, and Goethe's Faust, were to be the ground of his later rebirth. Lucius is also, of course, the reader, who communes in the reading of Apuleius'

masterpiece with a talismanic power as great as anything in literature; and the play-within-the-play represents just this transformation taking place in the suffering ego, with poison as the libido (cf. the Mantuan apothecary in R&J; the poisoned cup in V, ii), and the ear suggesting music, which represents always in FF the Gnostic written word as therapeutic tool.

Now is the turning-point, when the still Hermetically reasoning ego can free itself from its prison, as in the later Acts of RIII, and of PER, CYM, and TWT; but at the critical point the Puritan superego asserts itself to mantle the potential Gnostic Christ in sin:

Polonius Give o'er the play.
King Give me some light! Away!
Polonius Lights, lights, lights!

- As the blind libido irrupts. Were the ego to hold in the imagination the Scylla and Charybdis, or Eteocles and Polynices, of the Gnostic Christ in positive and negative aspects, and work on them with the tools of reasoning provided by the Gnostic tradition, a way might still be threaded beyond them, an escape from Thebes be found; and there the ego briefly totters:

Hamlet Why let the stricken deer go weep,
 The hart ungalled play:
 For some must watch, while some must sleep;
 So runs the world away.

 Would not this sir... get me a fellowship in a cry of
Players?

The cognate lines in RIII, to where we must turn for the origins of Hamlet in autobiography, are IV, iv, 431 ff., where the ego holds each successive step of the formerly unconscious reaction in the imagination, and there, by conceiving the will as idea, with the help of the Goddess (Nature divinised) of the Hermetic tradition ("Shall I go win my daughter to thy will?": Queen Elizabeth RIII IV, iv, 426), - escapes its destiny. Shakespeare's choice of verse here is significant: the rhythm an expression of time, which is space

internalised, and hence germane to Soul, a quality of the ego becoming rather than become, with an awareness of the tragic dimension in the Western (Faustian) rather than Judaeo-Christian way; the rhyme, in which the vowel, as an expression of the Goddess, is more important than the consonant (see Robert Graves' *The White Goddess*), - a principle of unification. This suggests the important role that the writing of poetry had in Shakespeare's rebirth, to which critical period Sonnet 145 (probably written in the earliest stages of his treatment under Bacon) most likely belongs:

Those lips that love's own hand did make
Breathed forth the sound that said "I hate"
To me that languished for her sake;
But when she saw my woeful state,
Straight in her heart did mercy come,
Chiding that tongue ever sweet
Was used in giving gentle doom,
And taught it thus anew to greet:
"I hate" altered with an end
That followed it as gentle day
Doth follow night who, like a fiend,
From heaven to hell is flown away.
"I hate" from hate away she threw,
And saved my life, saying "not you".

- Where the time referred to is not long after the coup, (RIII III, iv), when he tells his wife of his decision to leave his family and fly to London, in pursuit of healing through the written word and on the stage: - "hate away" being a simple encryption of "Hathaway". At this similarly critical point of Hamlet, however, the poetry remains unheard, and the degradation to psychosis begins:

Hamlet For thou dost know: O Damon dear,
 This realm dismantled was
 Of Jove himself, and now reigns here
 A very very pajock.
Horatio You might have rhym'd.

Hamlet ...I'll take the ghost's word for a thousand pound.

Rosencrantz and Guildenstern return, only to be rejected. Yet their entrance, though sequential in time to the play-within-the-play, on the mythic level of Bacon's intention, - like all the action from Hamlet's "Words, words, words" of II, ii, - in fact lies outside of time; for each episode has been (and there are more to come) a reiteration of the same psychological principle: the inability of the ego, as imagination-less, to lead the Gnostic Christ to a rebirth in positive aspect. This accounts for the character of compression, power, and mystery, of the play, as noted by T.S. Eliot and Ted Hughes, and so many other commentators; and one recalls Eliot's lines in *The Dry Salvages*: "But to apprehend/The point of intersection of the timeless/With time, is an occupation for the saint...": for the central Acts of Hamlet are a window into Eternity. The sense of arrested birth of the Gnostic Christ is suggested by a homophone of "collar", which symbolises here the vulva or cervix:

Guildenstern The King, sir...
 [...] Is in his retirement, marvellous distemper'd.
Hamlet With drink sir?
Guildenstern No my lord, rather with choler.

The two summon Hamlet to a meeting with his mother (the Goddess); and are straight rejected, as Gertrude will be. Robert Graves has beautifully elaborated on the wind as a Goddess-symbol, the imprint on the unconscious being of the breath of the mother as she leans close to her infant. The Greek *brizein* (whence "breeze") means "to enchant". Psychic transformation by way of magian Hermetism takes place by way of recognition and divination of Nature or the Goddess (the will: invisible, like the winds: this is the broad value of "I" for "Ay") as operant in one's self; hence the symbolism of the recorder:

Hamlet Why do you think that I am easier to be played on,
than a pipe? Call me what instrument you will, though
you can fret me, you cannot play upon me.

The cloud is symbolic of the Puritan superego, to which the ego

now has the libido conform, to be cast in negative aspect (cf. "Then I would you were so honest a man": II, ii, 188):

Hamlet Do you see that cloud? That's almost in shape like a camel.

Polonius By the mass, and it's like a camel indeed.

- In which it will persist, though repressed (Polonius behind the arras), to rebound with redoubled power, by a mechanism with which the work of Freud has familiarised us, to plunge the ego irredeemably into the abyss of psychosis (Laertes, son of Polonius, returning as the ithyphallic principle to do for Hamlet; ascendancy of Fortinbras in Denmark).

Claudius now sets in train yet another reiteration of the one psychopathological mechanism with which the play thus far has been preoccupied. If the audience with his mother is unsuccessful, Hamlet will be sent to England with Rosencrantz and Guildenstern (where England is symbolic of the goal of the Journey of the Hero); - which will give Bacon the opportunity to give final dramatic expression to the ego's savaging of the hand of healing. The loss of reason leads to the phenomenon, well recognised by clinicians, of disintegration of the ego (cf. RIII III, v; Hamlet II, I, 81 ff.):

Rosencrantz ...the cease of Majesty
 Dies not alone, but like a gulf doth draw
 What's near it, with it.

Now we are finally in a position to solve, in light of the theory of the Baconian Double Helix, the problem of Hamlet's procrastination of the killing of Claudius. It is very simple. The Puritan's suppression of the visual imagination is a defence against the libido or unseen world, apprehended as idea, or consequent, flooding the ego as blind will, to the creation therein of the Goddess of Love (e.g. Fotis in the seduction scene in TGA). This characteristic suppression of the imagination, and the consequent grossness of the subject, with no capacity for resurrection in the Shakespearean way, is the point of Claudius' "My words fly up, my thoughts remain below,/Words without thoughts, never to heaven

go". It is of critical importance to recognise that Hamlet and Claudius represent two aspects of the one psyche: the former as the waxing of the psychotic ego, the latter as the waning of the reasoning-imagining. The ithyphallos-libido, or unseen world, object of the Puritan's defensive suppression of the imagination, is represented, of course, by Hamlet's dagger, the blade bearing always this value in FF. The steel entering Claudius' flesh would represent his acknowledgement of the libido: its sudden activation in himself as will or idea, to precipitate a psychological crisis. The deaths of Polonius, Juliet, and the many characters in *The Spanish Tragedy* (Appendix 1), are all expressions of this same allegoric principle. However, the forms of the imagination have been ploughed under, and Claudius remains alive.

Let us return to the play within the play. We know, from the histories, the crucial role that the stage, whose tutelary deity is Dionysius (the demon of Puritanism become a god) played in Shakespeare's healing after his breakdown; and the symbolic value of the stage in Hamlet and elsewhere is of the imagination at work. Here is this remedy being offered to Hamlet, who however will reject it. Ferrante de Gonzaga was the son of the Duke of Mantua and Isabelle d'Este, one of Leonardo's most zealous patrons, and was a fervent esoterocist, either of which conditions could have recommended his name to Bacon. He was also, like Leonardo, Grand Master of the Prieuré de Sion, a shadowy organisation which seems to have preserved and transmitted the Gnostic tradition from the time of its persecution by Rome and the Catholic Church;¹³ and here he is in Hamlet, as the Gnostic ideal, which the play (visual imagination) would show to the pre-schizophrenic subject that he is murdering.

Rosencrantz and Guildenstern now enter, right on cue: for a chance of salvation is being offered to Hamlet. They convey that his mother the Queen wishes to talk with him privately: this will be the stage of the Journey of the Hero of the Meeting with the Goddess, who is also Queen Margaret, Queen of Hell-Grail Queen of the histories, whom Richard balked at meeting in RIII, I, iii, to precipitate the crisis of the suffering subject, from which he

¹³ Baigent et al., *The Holy Blood and the Holy Grail*.

however recovered. Robert Graves has described the mythic association of the Goddess and the winds; and indeed, the Greek brizein (whence “breeze”) means “to enchant”: and Hamlet now compares himself to a recorder which Rosencrantz and Guildenstern will attempt to play. In other words, the aim of the healing will be for the suffering subject to recognise the play of the Goddess (ultimately Isis) or the Will, as per Schopenhauer’s Principle of Sufficient Reason of Motivation, in himself. Claudius kneels, wracked with guilt and trying to pray, but the prayers will not come; instead his “words without thoughts” remain earthbound.

For the Puritan, words are an end in themselves; whereas the equivalence of words and the Word (the Logos: the creative principle of the universe) is a staple of Hermetism. The writer therefore can create himself anew, but only if the images are first born in the imagination. Schopenhauer observed that the philosopher must first of all be able to dream, and after that to reason; but if the outer world cannot be reproduced in the inner then there can be no wisdom. Psychic inadequacies cannot be addressed; and no sooner does Hamlet meet with Queen Gertrude in the next scene, than the repressed libido-ithyphallos surges, (murder of Polonius), and the developing psychotic damns the Goddess (Gertrude: Nature) for a whore under the influence of his Puritan superego (the ghost of King Hamlet), to seal his fate. The cognate scene in the histories is RIII, I, iii, where divine Nature (Queen Margaret, identified with Isis, the Triple Goddess with underworld aspect predominant) takes shape in the contemplating ego (King Edward) only to be thrust, full of cursing, back into darkness by the ascendant Ugly Dick.

Let us look at Schopenhauer in more detail:

The true kernel of all knowledge is that reflection which works with the help of intuitive representations [ideas]; for it goes back to the fountainhead, to the basics of all conceptions... Aristotle, however, went too far in thinking that no reflection is possible without pictures of the imagination. Nevertheless, what he has

¹⁴ The Fourfold Root of the Principle of Sufficient Reason.

to say on this point... νοεῖν οὐκ ἐστὶ ἀνεὺ φαντασματοῦ [It cannot be, that anything can be understood without the imagination] – made a strong impression on the thinkers of the 15th and 16th centuries, who therefore frequently and emphatically repeat what he says. Pico della Mirandola, for instance, says: *Necesse est, eum, qui ratiocinatur et intellegit, phantasmata speculari* [He who seeks to understand the root causes of things must first picture them in the imagination]. On the whole, all that can be affirmed is, that every true and primary notion, every genuine philosophic theorem even, must have some sort of intuitive view for its innermost kernel or root.¹⁴

This is precisely the point of Robert Graves' *The White Goddess*. Schopenhauer is being cautious here in qualifying Aristotle's categorical "no", while elsewhere upholding the primacy of the imagination. Pico della Mirandola seems to be using "picture" synechdochally: i.e. to stand for all the five senses as figured in the imagination. Yet it nevertheless would be just to emphasise the visual imagination, the noblest aspect of that faculty which is given completeness by the other four imagined senses, yet which absence of the visual element disables for the attainment of Gnostic nobility. In any case, it is Pico's enthronement of the imagination which Bacon would have thoroughly endorsed, and which lies behind this hitherto mystifying scene.

Bacon now sets in train a dramatic series of variations on the theme which will culminate fortissimo e tempestuoso in the return of Laertes in IV, ii. Hamlet vehemently and at length censures his mother for her moral laxity, in the course of which he stabs Polonius through the arras. This is the ego in Puritan mode, who has cut his imagination off at the roots to suppress the libido (Polonius behind the arras), where it there remains, identified with the ithyphallos (Polonius stabbed: cf. the murder of Caesar). Queen Gertrude stands here for the Great Goddess Nature Herself, Who is routinely anathematised by the Puritan and the schizoid. She stands ultimately for Egyptian Isis, just as Mary Magdalene, the wife of Jesus Christ, was a devotee of Isis, as belonging to the Judaic regional order of Dan, as her widespread veneration as the

Black Madonna shows, - the black representing the black vestments she would have worn, like the Egyptian priestesses, as symbolic of the primordial chaos from which the phenomenal universe was born, and hence symbolic of Wisdom (Sophia). Gertrude thus is to be identified with Bacon's Cleopatra, and with Dido, the Goddess of Shakespeare's personal myth, whose rejection by Aeneas is precisely cognate with Gertrude's by Hamlet. Mary Magdalene transmitted, according to Alexandrian lore, "the true secret of Jesus Christ"; and her vicious repudiation by Hamlet, as Queen Gertrude, signifies that the Gnostic Christ is now irredeemable from negativity (cf. "My mother: father and mother is man and wife, man and wife is one flesh, so, my mother": III, vii, 57). Ophelia, Isis' Aphrodite aspect, accordingly will perish from a similar rejection; and in her floating on the brook will symbolise the "Spirit that moved on the face of the waters": Sophia, the Holy Spirit Herself.

Rosencrantz demands of Hamlet that he reveal where he has hidden the dead Polonius, so they can "bear it to the Chapel": for the aim of meditative healing would be to resanctify the libido, or the unseen world. The connexion is now firmly made between Hermetic art and sin, and the gap between the doomed ego and its salvation becomes unbridgeable:

Rosencrantz Take you me for a sponge, my Lord?

Hamlet I sir, that soaks up the King's countenance, his rewards, his authorities.

Rosencrantz I understand you not my Lord.

- Where "I" for "Ay" stands, as always in FF, for the ithyphallos, more broadly the unseen world, here identified with Rosencrantz. The spirit in the earliest stages of healing has been compared to a beggar, the object of its ambition a king (II, ii, 265 ff.); now that ambition is shown, most powerfully, to be passed from the ego like excrement from the body, while the beggar principle remains:

King What dost thou mean by this?

Hamlet Nothing but to show you how a king may go a progress through the guts of a beggar.

ACT IV

Hamlet has exited, at the end of the previous scene, with the body of Polonius, to stow it in the lobby (attic). The King and Queen now hold the stage. The King's "soul is full of discord and dismay". The scenario Bacon had in mind is this: the sickening ego has defensively driven the libido into the unconscious (Polonius behind the arras). Now that libido re-irrupts consciousness as an active principle (Polonius in the lobby: "up the stairs" signifying the conscious ego). He therefore is now tormented by the re-assertion of the (libidinous) Gnostic Christ (Claudius) principle in himself, as the libido's Puritan cope is shredded. The potentiality of this mode as a prelude to psychic transformation and lasting healing is all the while denied (failure of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern to extract from Hamlet the whereabouts of the body). This long and intense Act will present the Claudius and Hamlet modes in conflict, until they become one (delivery of letter to Claudius from Hamlet via Claudio (sc. Claudius)). The impulse to healing manqué (survival of Hamlet; death of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern) will likewise be interwoven with these modes. Bacon's intention was to mirror the agonising of the reasoning ego as madness takes hold. He wishes desperately to be rid of his madness (Claudius sending Hamlet to England to his death), but cannot do it, and continues to need the Puritan cope of the written word (receipt of letters from Hamlet). Finally psychosis will begin to prevail, with the imagination killed off forever (death of Ophelia). Claudius ("the limper") represents Shakespeare himself, in whom reason prevailed, under the influence of Bacon (Francisco) to effect a healing. In this case, however, the Gnostic tradition is unavailable to the sufferer (early exit of Francisco), and reason deserts him (death of Claudius), as madness waxes dark. This is a thrilling and remarkable Act, for we are inside the mind of the ego as it declines into irreversible paranoid schizophrenia.

Hamlet ...The King is a thing...

Guildenstern A thing my Lord?

Hamlet Of nothing: bring me to him, hide Fox, and all after.

“Nothing” carries here the symbolic weight of the vulva of the Goddess through which the ego in Claudius mode is being reborn. The Fox and hounds refer to the hunt described in the Induction to TOS, where the fox is the libido hidden in the invisible world, as the object of enquiry of the Gnostic (Rosicrucian) philosopher (the Lord of the Hunt: Sir Francis Bacon himself, with Christopher Sly as Shakespeare). The Hamlet principle is about to re-assert itself in the tormented ego, which will however attempt a final healing (Hamlet and Guildenstern joining Claudius and Rosencrantz; Claudius determining to have Hamlet killed off in England). The ego in Claudius (libidinous) mode desperately wishes to be healed; yet the failure of Rosencrantz and Guldernstern to get Hamlet to divulge the whereabouts of the body, and Claudius’ subsequent “hugger mugger” burial of it (repression of libido) indicate that the road to healing is has been at the start.

The highest will fall the farthest and hardest: and Bacon now has the ego return completely to Puritan defensive mode, whence the declension will be the most shattering. Fortinbras and his army appearing in Denmark, asking for a peaceful transit as promised, represent the ego now reading in Puritan mode, with the negative contents of the unconscious securely rationalised. This is continued¹⁵ in the dialogue of Gertrude and Horatio (Puritan reason misconceiving of Nature, which it envelops in guilt: “...To my sick soul (as sin’s true nature is)”: Gertrude). This Goddess is a sham, as exclusive of the Goddess of Love (Ophelia); which severance is healed as the Puritan ego loses control, and the Ophelia-Goddess takes form in his imagination:

Gertrude I will not speak with her.

[...]

Gertrude ‘Twere good she were spoken with...

¹⁵ This scene was severely truncated, evidently for reasons of tightening, in the First Folio. Was it the work of Shakespeare, later cut by Bacon after his death? The great speech “How all occasions do inform against me” then would indicate what Shakespeare was capable of at that time, after so many years of instruction from Bacon. Prof. Gerry Wilkes in his edition for the Challis Shakespeare unwisely displaced the whole of this scene to the beginning of the Act, to the immense

The libidinous ego now invokes the old coping mechanism to be rid of the Goddess of the auto-erotist from his imagination (Claudius sending Horatio after the departed Ophelia to “give her good watch”); but he is beginning to get an ithyphallos, and is in torment:

King Last, and as much containing as all these,
 Her brother is in secret come from France...
 ...O my dear Gertrude, this,
 Like to a murdering piece in many places,
 Gives me superfluous death.

Full tumescence now supervenes (return of Laertes). The raving of Ophelia in its lewdness identifies her with the Goddess of Love (“O rose of May!”: IV, ii, 166: cf. RIII, I, iii, 91; HV II, i, 13). Laertes is initially hostile in the extreme to Claudius (ego tormented by ithyphallos); but will begin, by the end of the scene, to be reconciled with him in their common cause against Hamlet (ego grasping the chance of healing). Soon the rapprochement will be complete: “Now must your conscience my acquittance seal...”. In the very midst of this the Puritan mode however intrudes (letter given to Horatio from Hamlet). It is of the highest importance to the understanding of this Act to realise that this is where Horatio has gone after being sent by Claudius after Ophelia. Horatio giving “close watch” to her represents Puritan reason suppressing the Goddess from the printed page (the wonted defence mechanism). The letter’s ‘I have words to speak in your ear, will make thee dumb, yet are they much too light for the bore of the matter’ is a beautiful characterisation of the written word as misconceived by the Puritan. The pre-psychotic mode is beginning fully to reinstate itself “ .. And do’t the speedier, that you may direct me/To him [Hamlet] from whom you brought them”. Laertes and Claudius are plotting against Hamlet when given further letters from Hamlet, via “Claudio”, who is, of course, Claudius himself: the ego in tormented libidinous mode. This an extremely powerful dramatic technique, serving as it does to portray the ego being simultaneously in the two states of wishing to be rid of his Puritan superego and his torment, and being dominated by it.

The return of Laertes therefore is yet another “Shakespearean moment”, incited elsewhere by the “charge of the Boar”. In RIII this was a single charge, shattering the psyche and producing an acute onset of depression and anxiety: and, indeed, the presence of emotion has long been recognised to indicate a good prognosis, as was the case with Shakespeare. Hamlet on the other hand displays no emotion; and the Boar has charged repeatedly. Soon (V, v) he will charge again, most finally and fatally, to leave the ego caught on his horns, living but dead, in the hell of irremediable psychosis. This sense of emotionless irrecoverability, built on an utter dearth of the faculty of the imagination, is caught sublimely, and definitively, in Kenneth Branagh’s horrific full-length adaption of the play for the cinema.

‘These fellows’ of Hamlet’s letter to Horatio are the pirates who have raided the ship that was bearing Hamlet, with Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, to England. Hamlet boarded their ship, and has colluded with them to return to Denmark. They symbolise, therefore, the executive principle of the Puritan superego in consciousness, and so are cognate with Justice Shallow in 1 & 2 HIV. Their salutation “God bless you, sir!” to Horatio is utterly consistent with the symbolism of both parties.

The Queen of Hell shows Herself (“...but this gallant/Had witchcraft in ‘t”) and Laertes’ identity with the ithyphallic principle, as an expression of the libido (son of Polonius), is affirmed (“And for your rapier most especial...”). Queen Gertrude’s speech announcing Ophelia’s death has a talismanic power in itself: for this is the Goddess describing an aspect of Herself as the Holy Spirit. Ophelia’s garlands are symbolic, like the name of Rosencrantz, of the psychic rebirth that Divine Wisdom offers to the suffering ego. The crows of the garland suggest the Queen of Hell; the long purples Aphrodite; the nettles the psychic pain which must be suffered (e.g. for Christ on the Cross); and the daisies the sun peeping through with promise of success: all of which are correlate to stages of Apuleius’ *The Golden Ass*: the witch who transforms Lucius into an ass; the powerfully erotic scenes of the central chapters; Lucius as an ass; and his sight, after restoration of his

¹⁶ Life of Marcus Brutus.

human form, of the inspiring procession of Isis. Yet in Hamlet this Christ on the Cross is dead meat, no more. The death of Ophelia (Wisdom) is therefore immediately consequent on the murder of the pair in England.

Claudius' use of the expression "hugger mugger" in relation to the burial of the body of Polonius has fascinating implications. Polonius represents here the libido, or will-to-eros. A later chapter will show the blade-murdered Julius Caesar to represent the mid-adolescent Shakespeare born anew into his Welsh or pseudo-Alexandrian or Tavern phase through knowledge of the ithyphallic principle (symbolised by the dagger or sword), which had previously been denied (Julius Caesar in officio). Plutarch uses exactly the same expression in relation to the burial of Julius Caesar:

Then Antonius thinking good his testament should be read openly, and also that his body should be honourably buried, and not in hugger mugger, lest the people might thereby take occasion to be worse offended if they did otherwise...¹⁶

This must have been a deliberate touch by Bacon to indicate to the alert reader the possibility of a Polonius-Caesar equivalence on a plane of allegory (cf. "I did enact Julius Caesar": Polonius, III, ii, 104). It also strongly suggests that North's translation (via the French) of Plutarch would have been the source of the numerous symbols in FF, rather than the Greek original. This latter could have been accessible only to Bacon, while both he and Shakespeare could have read North: so that this finding at least does not rule out the possibility of their collaboration on the mining of Plutarch.

ACT V

The opening is the most extraordinary of any play covered this far outside of the histories; and only RIII III, iv, that dramatisation of the very moment of Shakespeare's breakdown aet. 23, which was certainly triggered by an erotic passage in a book – most likely Apuleius' *The Golden Ass* – followed by an act of auto-erotism, can

¹⁷ R.D. Laing *The Divided Self*

be ranked with it. It is in fact a detailed representation of a pre-schizophrenic episode – of terror, as seems likely, that libidinous thoughts are being discerned by an acquaintance – which however passes, as reason re-establishes itself (albeit temporarily, before the final decline):

Queen This is mere madness:
 And thus awhile the fit will work on him:
 Anon as patient as the female dove,
 When that her golden couplets are disclos'd,
 His silence will sit drooping.
 [...]
King I pray you good Horatio wait upon him.

- Where Horatio represents this principle of reason; King Claudius the totality of the ego, which is desperately trying to cope with its surgent Hamlet (psychotic) aspect. The transition from pre-psychotic to frankly schizophrenic is often hard to pin down; and there are many, many inflections of the basic problem:¹⁷ but the above description will do for now. The most striking and memorable image in the scene is of Hamlet and Laertes grappling in Ophelia's grave, with the latter's hands around Hamlet's throat. The ground here represents the unconscious; Laertes the ithyphallic principle in negative aspect: and the fight, the ego's life-or-death struggle with it. Let us look closely at the scene's unfolding, in as much detail as possible: for it will be found that, as always, the more unremittingly we question the minutiae, the more powerfully the allegory will hold together.

The scene has two phases, which are separated by the arrival of Laertes and the funeral party. The first phase has five stages, which correspond to an act of meditation which will progress ever more closely to the truth, until thwarted, to recall the similar technique of RIII, I, iii. They are:

1. The Clowns (gravediggers) alone in the graveyard.
2. Hamlet musing over the skulls thrown up by the Clowns.
3. Hamlet musing over the skull of Yorick.
4. Hamlet considering the case of Alexander.

5. Hamlet considering, in verse, the case of Julius Caesar.

Hamlet is accompanied in all of this by Horatio (ego using reason to deal with his problem). The Clowns insist upon the fact that Ophelia will have a Christian burial: for it is the Pauline Church which ultimately is behind this slaying of Wisdom and the Goddess. The First Folio is precise on the entry of Hamlet and Horatio:

Second Clown Who builds stronger than a mason, a shipwright, or a carpenter?

[...]

Enter Hamlet and Horatio afar off

First Clown ...say a gravemaker: the houses that he makes,
last till Doomsday.

The corpses therein are the principles that the ego has buried in the unconscious, as cast in negative aspect by Christian puritanism (Pauline Catholic originally, now Protestant Puritan). This Doomsday is, in a beautiful illustration of Freud, the occasion of the coup, when the libido in negative aspect will burst its bonds to destroy the sham peace of the ego. Hamlet and Horatio pondering the skulls represent the ego in incipient healing-phase considering how his ingrained habit of repression has killed off the libido in himself:

Hamlet Has this fellow no feeling of his business, that he sings
 at grave-making?

Horatio Custom hath made it in him a property of easiness.

- As the faculty of reason works on the longstanding problem. Here is yet another typically adroit cameo:

Hamlet ...whose grave's this sir?

First Clown Mine sir...

Hamlet I think it be thine indeed: for thou liest in't.

First Clown You lie out on't sir, and therefore 'tis not yours: for my part, I do not lie in't; and yet it is mine.

Hamlet Thou dost lie in't to be in't and say it is thine: 'tis
for the dead, not for the quick, therefore thou

First Clown Faith e'en with losing his wits.
Hamlet Upon what ground?
First Clown Why here in Denmark...
 [...]
 And your water is a sore decayer of your whoreson
 dead body.

- As the ego now realises that with the Fool principle has died all wisdom. The Goddess of Love (Ophelia buried), with Her companion of the "I" principle (Laertes in her grave) is therefore to be identified with the Goddess of Wisdom (Ophelia drowned). This is the lesson that Lucius in Fool phase learns so well in *The Golden Ass*, which Bacon had certainly used as a therapeutic tool in his treatment of the stricken Shakespeare (see especially MAN). Hamlet mourns Yorick, as final enlightenment comes within grasp. He is still, at this stage, imagining, to his great discomfort: "...how abhorred in my imagination it is, my gorge rises at it". This is the imagination that would have continued if only the Rosencrantz and Guildenstern principles had remained living. Further, with the Fool has died the possibility of true Hermetic nobility, or Gnostic Christhood (Hamlet mourning Alexander: see especially HV). The taper of enlightenment is now firmly grasped, as he realises that he will have to divest the will-to-eros of the negative mantle it has worn for so long, and admit it as a living principle in himself (Hamlet mourning the knife-wounded Caesar, who represents, in his death, the ego transformed by knowledge of the libido: see JC, which was completed not too long before Hamlet). The transformation begins (entry of Laertes and funeral party); but this flame will scorch the hand still guided by the unconscious, still vulnerable to the unseen world in negative aspect (grappling of Hamlet and Laertes in grave).

The subject will recover himself (scene ii), with the aid of reason: its last assertion in his life of sanity, whose end is almost come. He returns to the written word as an expression of Puritanism rather than the Goddess (Nature), which has been his defence against Her advances. The printed page will, however, betray him into Her arms. Bacon accomplishes this in a characteristic way.

Hamlet below deck in his cabin, then ascending with "his sea-gown scarfed about me" to have his "desire", then returning below to find

that the letters he has stolen bear instructions for his sudden beheading, - is clearly a representation of an act of auto-erotism, followed by detumescence, and the imminence of the "charge of the Boar" (beheading bearing in FF the allegoric value of psychic transformation), which bulked so large in Shakespeare's constitutively puritan psyche, at least until his retirement and return to Stratford. The "I" in the odd "Groped I" represents the ithyphallos. The Puritan word which supplants, as may be, Apuleius' magical and intensely erotic The Golden Ass, with its intense eroticism, - which yet could be a route to Gnostic nobility (Claudius principle, as exemplified by Sir Francis Bacon and his healed (albeit incompletely) patient), if only the sickening ego had the imagination and symbols to embrace it, - is represented by the new letter written "fair" by Hamlet. The "fairness" of the writing is precisely cognate with that of Bianca (< Italian "white") in TOS, in which play the ego will have to kill off the Pauline principle in himself and readmit the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen (marriage of Katherina and Petruchio preceding...) before the visible world can be understood (... marriage of Bianca and Lucentio). This is the autotherapeutic regime of which the incipient psychotic ego (Hamlet) here is incapable, resourceless as he is, and inane of the faculty of the imagination. The Goddess of Love, in whom the Queen of Hell is immanent, will not, however be denied ("I'll court his [Laertes'] favours"); and it is clear that Bacon must have drawn of the personal experience of his patient, whose breakdown was consequent on his surrendering to an erotic episode on the printed page (see especially MAN), from which the extrapolation to psychosis could readily be made. This scene is stamped with the hallmark of Bacon, whose expertise in this kind of encryption we have come to know so well in the Comedies, TitA, and R&J.

The name "Osrice" is formed from the Latin *os*, "mouth", and "ric[h]" ("He hath much land, and fertile"). It thus is cognate with the Greek *chrysostomos*, meaning "golden mouth" (cf. "All's golden words are spent": 136), - with which Joyce qualified Buck Mulligan (Oliver St. John Gogarty, the great Irish physician, classical scholar

¹⁸ At this point there follows in the Second Quarto a long and interestingly written passage which yet dissipates the tension of the episode somewhat, and Bacon certainly was right to excise it for the First Folio. It is fascinating to speculate whether it had been written by Shakespeare, with the lines retained by Bacon

and politician) on page one of *Ulysses* (and note also Mulligan's gift for bawdy: the kinship of Joyce and Bacon-Shakespeare has never been properly examined). Osric represents the printed page wherein the Goddess is immanent, which has been anathematised by the Puritan ego: "for 'tis a vice to know him". The act of Venus described on the page warms the blood, and chills the ego: "...it is very hot"; "No, believe me, 'tis very cold".¹⁸

Here is one of the more spectacular legerdemains in FF, again deeply graven with the unmistakeable hallmark of Bacon. Osric tells Hamlet that Claudius has wagered with Laertes that, in the coming duel, he will not exceed Hamlet by three touches of the sword. To this end six barbary horses have been impawned on Claudius' part, together with, from Laertes, six daggers and their rapiers, and their girdles and carriages (sheaths), of which three of the sheaths are richly ornamented and "responsive to the hilt" (when the sword is withdrawn), and three plain. The horses clearly represent the libido, and are not (as "barbarian") identified with Augustan Rome, which produced the myth (Shakespeare's own) of Dido and the archetypal Goddess-rejector Aeneas. Shakespeare makes a point of naming the carriages also as "hangers", to identify the sword ensheathed with the flaccid phallos (cf. "An it be not four by the day, I'll be hanged" &c., 1 HIV II, i). That the identification is with the sword rather than the sheath is affirmed by the magnification of the weapon principle:

Hamlet The phrase would be more germane to the matter if
we could carry a cannon by our sides.

The dozen elements of the wager correspond to the dozen passes. The daggers represent the ithyphallic principle in the sane ego; the swords that principle grown monstrous, as demonised by the Puritan superego. The supernumerary three in "He hath laid on twelve for nine" are the unadorned sheaths (Woman conceived utilitarianly – by the Puritan – merely as woman; and "sheath" in Latin is, of course, vagina); the ornamented sheaths, the Goddess as visualised in the Gnostic imagination, as most gloriously described by James Joyce in the Anna Livia Plurabelle chapter of *Finnegans Wake*. Claudius is betting that the incipient schizophrenic ego will not imagine the Goddess, but continue to conceive her as desacralised; Laertes, that

the imagination will fix on Her to stimulate the libido. Note that this hypothetical union with the Goddess would take place on the plane of dream, rather than reality: so that it is perfectly consistent for the onset of tumescence to be symbolised by the withdrawal of the sword from the sheath.

Shakespeare thus has used the “golden mouth” Osric as a vector for the ithyphallic principle – like Apuleius’ *The Golden Ass* – with which to expose the ego in its fragile castle of reason to the storm of psychosis. The coup has not yet fallen, but the reasoning ego knows it is doomed: “You will lose, my lord” (Horatio). Shakespeare now gives the most succinct possible summation of the pillar of Gnostic philosophy – the authenticity of personal experience, and the primacy of knowledge, - which however is rejected:

Horatio If your mind dislike anything, obey it.

Hamlet Not a whit, we defy augury.

The great god Reason is rejected; the ego embraces the Gnostic Christ and the libido, both in negative aspect: and the point of no return is reached:

Hamlet Give me your pardon, sir. I have done you [Claudius]
wrong.

...Sir [Laertes], in this audience,
Let my disclaiming from a purpos’d evil
Free me so far in my most generous thoughts
That I have shot my arrow o’er the house
And hurt my brother.

And the “I” principle lies coiled, ready to strike:

Laertes I am satisfied in nature...
But in my terms of honour
I stand aloof...

The chrysostome has been the catalyst for the final sinking of the

¹⁹ Chisholm A.R. and Quinn J.J. (eds.), *The Prose of Christopher Brennan*.

ark of reason:

King Give them the foils, young Osric.

“Those are pearls that were his eyes” (The Tempest) is an expression of an ancient mythic symbol, reprised also by T.S. Eliot in Four Quartets and Bizet in The Pearl Fishers, amongst others, of the riches to be won by a quest to the depths of the unconscious (the sea). It is in fact another variant of the Journey of the Hero, as so memorably celebrated by Joseph Campbell in his The Hero With a Thousand Faces. In the schizophrenic ego, however, this boon is deadly:

King If Hamlet gives first or second hit...
 ... in the cup an union shall he throw...

“Union” (pearl) is derived from “onyx”, the ancient death stone (see Mallarme’s great sonnet *Ses pur ongles très haut dédiant leur onyx*, and Christopher Brennan’s definitive exposition of it ¹⁹). The poison in the cup in which the pearl will be placed is precisely cognate with that obtained by Romeo from the Mantuan apothecary in R&J. It represents, here as in R&J, the libido, which has remained in negative aspect in the subconscious, ready to charge as the Boar. The contents of the cup are therefore to be identified, of course, with the waters of the brook in which Ophelia has drowned, and the earth of the graveyard in V, i, as well as, in a general mythic sense, with the sea, that immemorially old symbol of the unconscious. Queen Gertrude remarks of Hamlet that he is “fat and scanty of breath”. The word “fat”, which has puzzled the commentators, is possibly a corruption of “faint”. It would be perfectly consistent as it stands, however, with the Hermetic axiom “As without, so within”: the fluidity of obesity pointing to the mind unaccustomed to the sharp-edged forms of the visual imagination: as opposed, for example, to the “lean and hungry look” of Cassius in JC, where he represents the newly awakened imagination of Shakespeare in his pseudo-Alexandrian phase.

Let us follow closely the final sequence of events.

-
1. Osric presents the swords to the combatants.
 2. Laertes asks for a lighter one. They are both the same length.
 3. Hamlet hits Laertes.
 4. Hamlet refuses the poisoned cup.
 5. Hamlet hits again.
 6. The Queen takes out her napkin and offers it to Hamlet.
 7. Hamlet refuses it.
 8. Gertrude drinks from the cup.
 9. Gertrude wipes Hamlet's brow with the napkin.
 10. Laertes immediately challenges Hamlet, and fatally wounds him.
 11. They clash, exchange swords, and Laertes too is fatally wounded.
 12. Gertrude falls
 13. Osric cries: "Look to the Queen there, ho!"
 14. Osric exits to lock the door.
 15. Laertes falls, crying: "The King, the King's to blame".
 16. Hamlet slays Claudius.
 17. Hamlet adjures Horatio to: "Report me and my cause aright/To the unsatisfied".
 18. Hamlet prevents Horatio from drinking from the cup, then himself drains it.

This dance to the music of time was, needless to say, precisely choreographed. Its meaning is as follows. The subject is reading the printed page, in which an erotic scene is described (for example, the seduction of Lucius by Fotis in *The Golden Ass*). This immediately incites the divided ego to conflict (1). The libido, with its sequel of tumescence, is quick to be aroused; and the ego's defence is equally as strong (2). The ego initially succeeds in denying the libido (poisoned cup), and conquering the *ithyphallos* (3). The Goddess (ultimately Isis: Gertrude to Claudius' Lucius, as transformed in the later pages of Apuleius) continues to be denied (6, 7): the napkin bearing the symbolic value, as in 3HVI I, iii, and elsewhere, of menstruation, and hence the Goddess, with the effect being heightened by its whiteness (cf. the magic of the white

²⁰ Richard Ellman, James Joyce.

napkins in Cezanne's still-lives). Now the defence collapses, as She is vividly imagined in all Her libidinousness (13, 8, 9, 12). The ithyphallos rises, to mortally wound the ego (10). There is one defence only now left to the ego disappearing into the jaws of schizophrenia. He conquers the ithyphallos by casting away the written word and the imagination forever, as the doors of his prison clang shut (10,11, 14). The ego kills off in himself any chance of rebirth into Gnostic nobility (16), as he is parted from his reason forever (18). This faculty will be employed by Bacon (and Shakespeare) to elucidate in FF his tragic condition (17).

Which is what, exactly? The expressions of the fundamental conflict are varied in the extreme; but a good example would be the catatonia and involution of James Joyce's daughter Lucia, who spent the whole of her adult life in a mental institution, after many bizarre incidents as an adolescent.²⁰ For example, at the party for her engagement (which her brother Giorgio, seemingly the only one in the know, strenuously resisted) she lay down on the lounge and stayed there, in a textbook display of catatonia (which is, in the context of schizophrenia, a non-identical twin of paranoia), perfectly motionless for some hours, after which Giorgio's advice was heeded. This would have corresponded to the wrestle in the grave, with the libido (Laertes principle, to stretch the analogy slightly: for he is strictly speaking the ithyphallos, the product of libido) reaching from the unconscious to drag her down and strangle her. She recovered, like Hamlet, as reason was re-established; but it was temporary, and she would spend her adult life in a mental institution (victory of Fortinbras). There were theories that Joyce himself was schizophrenic, or at least schizoid. The former can definitively be ruled out, as his contact with reality

²¹ The Divided Self.

²² Myths to Live By.

was maintained at all times. The line between the latter and ~~normality can be blurred in the extreme, but the truth is certainly~~ that he was, as one commentator so aptly put it, diving while Lucia was drowning. These were in truth the waters of Ophelia's death, and the graveyard of her burial; and the object of his search was the pearl.

The approach of seeing the schizophrenic as perfectly comprehensible – the only one that can possibly bear fruit in a clinical situation – has been championed in our time by Jung, R.D. Laing,²¹ Joseph Campbell,²² and others; but Sir Francis Bacon did it first. He was able to apply himself immediately and effectively to healing Shakespeare's malady (the period of two years between the coup and his final healing – this was his Orlando phase - is given in the final scene of *Mr. Arden of Feversham*), - which, though not psychosis, was related to it, potentially its precursor: the reason possibly being his longtime pondering of a schizophrenia-like illness suffered by his mother (or foster-mother, as seems likely) Lady Bacon.

CHAPTER 34

MACBETH

Seeing Macbeth as the Boar, and seeing the Boar in this way, as a phenomenal, dramatic, mythic, poetic, “biological” creation, helps to explain why Macbeth is so often felt to embody the primal statement of Shakespeare’s inspiration. This strange creature is the infinite being, inseparable from the Goddess, that lives the uncontrollable life of the inner will itself – the tenant of that silent area at the heart of the tragedies.

After this, Shakespeare plunges him into outer darkness, unredeemable. He does not reappear at all in Act Four. In Act Five he emerges only to endure his death in weary despair, while Lady Macbeth kills herself.

I have not examined the work of Ted Hughes at any great length thus far. I had well and truly absorbed the epochal wisdom of Shakespeare and the Goddess of Complete Being by the time I came to write the present work; and it was not conceived as a point-by-point comparison of the two arguments. Yet to return to SGCB is to be reminded of his brilliance and philosophical genius, the span of that giant step towards the full understanding of Shakespeare, whose life and work have hitherto remained shrouded in seemingly intractable mysteries. The first quotation above illustrates this point: for Macbeth is indeed the Boar, the libido in negative aspect which irrupts the Puritan ego to shatter its vain-constructed peace. The second quotation illustrates, however, a further point: that this step, although massive, remains a first one, which falls some way short of the final goal of complete illumination of the works, and much of the life, of William Shakespeare. For the note struck in the final Act of Macbeth is, on the contrary, one of redemption: of the shattered, formerly Puritan subject, through the written word (Birnam Wood), by the Gnostic wisdom of which the libido (more broadly the unseen world) is

reborn into the ego's apprehension as idea, new-stripped of its negativity. All of the other woods or forests without exception in the plays, as well as the numerous Pages and letters, bear just this allegoric value, of the written word or printed page.

Ted Hughes also asserted that the character of Macbeth is unique in representing both the Boar and the Puritan Adonis figure shattered by its charge. This is only true up to a point: for he may be said, more precisely, to be lit from within by the light of the Boar, and from without by the light of the Puritan shone upon him by Bacon (for it was he who was overwhelmingly responsible for this play, most plausibly while Shakespeare was concurrently engaged on *Othello*, which bears all the stylistic and material marks of being his "baby"). Still, Macbeth remains in essence the Boar, his agony and denial of the compulsion to murder a reflection of the torment of the Puritan subject. The Puritan is in truth represented by King Duncan, with his murder the coup that struck Shakespeare in 1587; while Banquo is Puritan reason (shed with transformation of the ego: death of Banquo), with his son Fleance the new Gnostic reason (assumed with transformation of the ego: survival of Fleance). This is made clear in the murder scene, where father hands the torch over to son (cf. for example, the taper in *JC II*, i, and torch in *R&J V*, iii, which also bear this value of the light of reason, based on the imagination, as do all their kind in the plays).

Macduff bears the familiar value of the Fool, whose attributes are wit and wisdom; the murder of Macduff fils and his mother the repudiation of the Fool principle by the Puritan ego. This allocation is made abundantly clear by the witty dialogue of the murder scene (*IV*, ii), which is also notable for a typical Baconian legerdemain, wherein Lady Macduff's odd insistence on her son's father's death, although he is clearly still alive, serves to identify Macduff fils as the new Macduff: so that the witty dialogue of Macduff fils may be attributed to his father, whose flight to London will be left to represent, ultimately, the ass-phase journey into night of Lucius in *The Golden Ass*, which we have seen to have been used by Bacon as the prime therapeutic tool in his patient's recovery, and a paradigm for his psychic transformation.

The defeat of the rebels represents the termination of Shakespeare's Welsh or Tavern or pseudo-Alexandrian phase of

mid-adolescence, with Macbeth's sword in the skull of Macdonald, the irruption of the negative libido which precipitated it (cf. entry of Cupid and Amazon dancers in TimA I, ii; marriage of Othello and Desdemona). Bacon isolates and identifies the faculty of the visual imagination whose suppression is a *sine qua non* of Puritanism, by a mechanism which may seem at first a touch too *recherché*, until we remember the four years of his stay in Europe aet.14-18, and the mastery of the Spanish language evident in, for example, the character of Borachio in MAN, whose name he derived from *borracho*, "a drunkard", to identify him as the Boar, drunkenness bearing always the symbolic value of possession by the libido. For Holinshed gives the name of the King of Norway, who was defeated almost contemporaneously with the rebels, - an association which Bacon highlights, - as "Sweno"; and the Spanish *sueno* means "dream". The Thane of Cawdor is also identified with the Norwegians, so that he bears also this value: and Macbeth's assumption of his title signifies the role of the visual imagination, as dwelling on an erotic passage in the printed page, most likely the seduction of Lucius by Fotis in The Golden Ass, in inciting the libido, to precipitate the breakdown.

No sooner is the condition of Puritanism established, than the ego is threatened with the "charge of the Boar". For the Scots nobles Ross and Angus, and later Lennox, clearly represent the written word. The King is reading of Macbeth's exploits (Shakespeare reading The Golden Ass):

Ross	In viewing over the rest of the selfsame day, He finds thee in the stout Norweyan ranks...
Angus	We are sent To give thee, from our royal master, thanks; Only to herald thee into his sight, Not pay thee.

It could not be clearer. The libido has not been actively invoked by the Puritan reader (Shakespeare aet.23), but rises of itself, ineluctably, against his will, in response to the images described in the printed page (seduction of Lucius by Fotis), to fill him with dread:

Macbeth If good, why do I yield to that suggestion
Whose horrid image doth unfix my hair
And make my seated heart knock at my ribs,
Against the use of nature?
[...]
If chance will have me king, why, chance may crown me,
Without my stir.

The witches and Lady Macbeth are, of course, as Ted Hughes remarked, exemplary Queens of Hell, Goddesses of the Invisible World, precisely that aspect of Nature which is anathematised by the Puritan. The Puritan reader imagines the excitement of Lucius, so vividly described by Apuleius, and develops an ithyphallos in response (the formation of a dagger in Macbeth's imagination, followed by his drawing of a real one). All is tense with the lethal potential of the invisible world: "...witchcraft celebrates pale Hecate's offerings..." &c. Macbeth's plying of the grooms with wine represents the ascent of the libido, to shatter the Puritan ego. The libido is a property of the Queen of Hell:

Lady Macbeth That which hath made them drunk hath made
me bold;
What hath quenched them hath given me fire.
...I have drugged their possets.

The Fool principle now irrupts the ego, consequent on the charge of the Boar, as corresponding to the inauguration of the ass-phase journey of Lucius (entry of Macduff and Lennox). The Porter interlude was most plausibly written by Shakespeare. Malcolm and Donalbain represent the wisdom of the printed page, and the ithyphallic principle, respectively. Thus will Malcolm's victory symbolise the resurrection into glory of London-phase Shakespeare, a triumph in which the libido-as-will will take no part (Donalbain's absence from the Birnam Wood campaign: cf. the half-starved dog in Dürer's *Melencolia I* (fig.1), and Don Quixote's bony nag Rosinante, not to mention the feeble Bill the Pony in *The*

¹ Knight and Lomas, *The Second Messiah*; *The Hiram Key*.

Lord of the Rings, all of which represent the victory of the Gnostic tradition over the libido). The source for this is likely to have been the “Knight of the Sun” degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, in which the candidate is warned: ‘Ye who have not the power to subdue passion, flee from this place of truth’; Bacon having been formally received into the Brotherhood by King James in 1603.¹ (See Ch.44).

Puritan reason is now overcome by the libido:

Macbeth I wish your horses sure and swift of foot,
And so I do commend you to their backs.
Farewell. Exit Banquo

- Where the horses bear, as always in the plays, this allegoric value, as sourced by Bacon from Socrates’ famous metaphor in Plato’s Phaedrus. The various banquets and feasts throughout the plays signify the strengthening of a principle; and so it is in the banquet scene in Macbeth, where the ghost of Banquo sitting at table with the Scots nobles represents the feeding of Puritan reason on the written word. The presence of the ghost scares Macbeth from joining them: the point made being that the libido is suppressed from the written word as long as Puritan reason holds sway. We have seen that the lords represent, in KJ and COR, the faculty of reason; and so it is here, with Lennox as the written word:

Lennox My former speeches have but hit your thoughts,
Which can interpret farther...
Lord The son of Duncan
...Lives in the English court, and is received
Of the most pious Edward with such grace
That the malevolence of fortune nothing
Takes from his high respect.

For the stricken subject is now in the first stages of his resurrection (Malcolm) by the grace of the Gnostic tradition (King Edward). King Edward is thus an analogue of Lodovico in MFM and OTH. Specifically, this episode represents Shakespeare in the early

phase of his treatment under Sir Francis Bacon, whose apprehension of his patient's inherent nobility of spirit is in no wise diminished by the abject degradation of his present circumstances. The written word (Lennox) is of course the central plank of Bacon's therapeutic regime.

The episode of Malcolm's initial refusal to join Macduff in overthrowing Macbeth, citing his unworthiness, was taken from Holinshed. It represents here the encounter of the Fool with the wisdom of the invisible world (ass journey of Lucius, and Psyche's harrowing of hell, in Apuleius' *The Golden Ass*), which is initially perceived in its wonted Puritan guise of negativity, later embraced as stripped of it. The following was an invention of Bacon's:

Doctor I, sir. There are a crew of wretched souls
 That stay his [King Edward's] cure: their malady
 convinces
 The great assay of art; but at his touch
 Such sanctity hath heaven given his hand,
 They presently amend.

This identifies, of course, the King with the Lodovico principle. "I" for "Ay" stands here, as always, for the *ithyphallos*, more broadly the unseen world, the acknowledgement of which is central to the Gnostic philosophy. These two episodes, - one taken from the source, one created *de novo*, - therefore beautifully illustrate the principles, of which FF is a massive expression, that "Form is the obstacle that brings creativity to birth"; and that the innumerable variations from the sources, which have perplexed the commentators, can definitively be shown to find their provenance in the philosophical allegory.

Lady Macbeth is observed by the Doctor sleep-walking with eyes open, during which she writes on a sheet of paper, and compulsively washes her hands. This is of course the same doctor as appeared from Edward's court in London (see above citation); while the paper represents the written word as vector of the invisible world, the Faustian dimension, where resides the libido which, in its negativity, has danced Shakespeare like a puppet on a string. For the stricken subject is now reading the printed page, in

whose wisdom he finds illumination of his condition, with the ~~negative Queen of Hell vividly described, but no longer an active~~ principle in himself. She has, as Schopenhauer would have put it, been transformed from will into idea (cf. Alexander Iden in 2HVI IV, x), where the subject's newly acquired Christian Cabalist reason can work on Her, and his ailment. Her death is, of course, an epochal moment.

The historical death of young Seyward at the hands of Macbeth suggested to Bacon his identification with the visual imagination: the blade in his body being identified with the negative ithyphallic principle now apprehended by the inner vision. Beheading always signifies psychic rebirth: and Macbeth's means that the libido has been reborn as an attribute of the divine. There is a possibility of confusion here, with the entry of Macduff's blade into the body of Macbeth potentially bearing the same value as that of Macbeth into young Seyward. The obviation of this possibility is the reason for the otherwise unnecessary exit of the two off stage, and their re-entry a moment later, with Macbeth being slain: their absence allowing the sword-wound to be made out of sight.

The high style of Bacon is prominent throughout Macbeth; with Shakespeare most plausibly being responsible for the Porter scene (II, iii), as well as the speech of Hecate (III,v).

CHAPTER 35

KING LEAR

Ted Hughes took a giant step toward the understanding of King Lear when he identified Edmund as the Boar, Lear himself as the Puritan subject whose ego the Boar charges and wounds (long-repressed negative libido irrupts) to plunge into madness, and Cordelia as the soul of Lear, whose initial rejection by him has been the first cause of the pathology. Yet he was finally mistaken, in concluding that the death of Lear represents the failure of redemption of the subject: his plunge, perhaps, into irreversible paranoid schizophrenia, in the way of Hamlet. For the passing of Lear represents only the termination of the subject's Puritan phase, with the crowning of Edgar in the last lines representing the new ascendancy of Gnostic wisdom: the reference being, as always in the plays of redemption, to the rebirth of William Shakespeare from the hell of the Puritanism-induced severe anxiety/depression neurosis, which had befallen him like a thunderbolt in 1587, - into the empyrean of broadly Gnostic nobility, in London, under the tutelage of Sir Francis Bacon.

The interplay of the three story lines of Lear's loss and recovery of his daughter, the rival brothers imbroglio, and the subterfuges of the two sisters, makes for an allegory of exceptional richness and complexity; and this reader, for one, always puts it down with the feeling that he has been taken on a journey like no other in the plays. Yet the allegory is simple enough to follow, once the main identifications have been made; and we have encountered precedents aplenty for them thus far.

1) King Lear The Puritan subject, whose anathematisation and exile of Nature will bring Her storming back to fill the vacuum, to shatter the fragile vessel of his ego.

2) Cordelia Ted Hughes brilliantly analysed her name to "Cor-de-lia [Lear]", "heart of Lear", and identified her as his soul. There are

¹ The silences of all these characters are based, remarkably, on the silence of the women in Clinschor's castle in Wolfram's Parzival (see Ch. 44).

souls and souls, however: principally, in Western culture, the Classical soul (as exemplified by Mozart) and the Faustian (Bach), the latter characteristic of all the great cultures at their peak, the former a late-phase regression to its infancy (in the Western case, Classical Greece), which is succeeded by an inevitable underworld reaction (Mozart/Beethoven), whose purpose is the regaining of something vital which has been lost. Cordelia could be identified as the subject's Faustian soul; but she represents, more specifically, the Queen of Hell/Faustian Dimension/Invisible World: the Grail Queen, Who is suppressed, as in negative aspect, by the Puritan. The precedent is Portia in MOV, that Queen of all Queens of Hell in the plays, who is identified with the heart of Antonio. Much has been made of Cordelia's silence as a positive virtue, and the centre of Shakespeare's ethical system; but in truth it means, as we have seen, that Nature is not speaking to the Puritan subject through the Gnostic written word; or rather, that She is speaking, but he does not listen (cf. silences of Hippolyta and Hero).¹ Her death represents the rebirth of the Queen of Hell as identified with the libido, now stripped of its negativity. The precedent is Juliet's dagger-death in R&J: the dagger principle here being represented by Lear's sword that kills the Captain in the act of hanging her (not post factum). The Captain represents, of course, the faculty of thought, as the word "instantly" tells us.

3) Gloucester The Gnostic ideal, a Solomon/Alexander/Christ figure, just as in 1-3HVI. Thus it is he who brings the tormented Lear from the heath, and sets him on the road to Dover (engagement with the Goddess). His blinding serves to identify him as a Teiresias figure, master of the inward vision. The two products of the action of the visual imagination on Apuleius' magical masterpiece *The Golden Ass*, with respect to the life of Shakespeare, were the "charge of the Boar", when Fotis, Goddess of Love, was vividly recreated in his imagination, to provoke the libido, and his surrender to it (this was the coup of 1587); and the Gnostic wisdom he later acquired therefrom – which is the whole intention of TGA, rather than erotic stimulation – in his London phase, under the guidance of Sir Francis Bacon. These two flowers, one of evil, one of good, are represented in KL by

4) Edmund and Edgar Edmund is Shakespeare dominated by the

Boar, as he was after the coup; while Edgar is cognate with Malcolm in Macbeth, as the new Shakespeare, informed by Gnostic wisdom, new-risen like a phoenix from the ashes of the old, at the inauguration of his *vita nuova*. Thus will the kingdom be left in the hands of Edgar at the close, and Edmund be eclipsed. Edgar as Mad Tom represents Shakespeare up to 1589 approx., in which year the hell of anxiety/depression was finally shaken from him (cf. the last lines of MAF). Yet this was the Fall whose depth would match the height of the glorious Resurrection to follow (Edgar waiting to emerge from the disguise). Gloucester's blinding identifies him as a Teiresias, master of the inner vision. Edgar's quitting of his disguise will follow closely on Gloucester's rebirth in Dover (Shakespeare's cure, consequent on completion of his Journey of the Hero to his own unseen dimension, and understanding of the contents of his unconscious).

5) Goneril and Regan The visible or phenomenal world as misconceived by the Puritan, who would sunder it from the unseen world in which it is rooted. We have seen in Macbeth that Banquo represents the principle of Puritan reason. Here, it is

6) Albany and Cornwall who bear that value. The name of the former is derived from the Latin *alba*, "white" (feminine gender): a reference to the radiant moon (cf. Bianca Minola in TOS), an age old symbol of the visible world. The sun-yellow of a field of corn, as of Apollo's hair, is symbolic of the light of reason; while "wall" bears the value of a psychic defence mechanism (cf. Adrian – a reference to Hadrian's Wall - in COR and TT). The sum of the values of the two Dukes is therefore the dwelling of Puritan on the visible world alone, denying the invisible, as a defence against it. The central philosophical theme of the Bacon group of plays is that the invisible world must be engaged before the visible can be understood (e.g. marriage of Kate and Petruchio, followed by Bianca and Lucentio, in TOS). So it is here, where Albany's survival and change of sympathy to the King reflects the change in the reasoning ego's conception of the visible world that has come about from engagement with the Faustian dimension. Correspondingly, Cornwall's demise – consistently, from a sword thrust from a servant who is himself sword-wounded - signifies the collapse of the Puritan defence.

7) Duke of Kent "Kent" is a near-homophone of a colloquialism

for the yoni. He bears essentially the same allegoric value as the various napkins (symbolic of menstruation) throughout the plays, of the Goddess as Woman, object of the Puritan's contempt. Thus, for example, does he read a letter from Cordelia, who seems to have had a wondrous awareness of his degradation, as he lies in the stocks.

8) Duke of Burgundy This is a reference to Shakespeare's pseudo-Alexandrian phase of mid-adolescence, when his acknowledgement of the Queen of Hell was married to the wine and conversation of the tavern, in the way of the young Alexander the Great (cf Burgundy in HV). Burgundy's refusal of Cordelia's hand signifies the termination of this phase, and Shakespeare's espousal of Puritanism.

So much for the signposts to the spectacular views of KL. Now for some beaten paths along the way.

ACT I

The play opens with a clear and succinct statement of the Shakespearean complex: the erection of a wall of reason founded on the visible world alone (rise of Cornwall to equality with Albany in the King's favours); followed by the birth of the Boar, - the invisible world in negative aspect, object of the wall's vigilance, - which lies ready to shatter that defence and plunge the Puritan ego into turmoil (Edmund's plot against Edgar). France represents the unconscious, recipient of the Queen of Hell after her suppression by the Puritan ego. The letter wherein Edmund has forged Edgar's plot against his father, and which, read by Gloucester, will precipitate his rupture with Edgar, represents, of course, the written word (plausibly certainly Apuleius' *The Golden Ass*) as vector of the Boar which irrupts the Puritan ego. This is therefore the "charge of the Boar" (irruption of libido into Puritan ego); and Gloucester's extreme hostility toward Edgar is cognate with Lear's towards his daughters, as representing the Puritan's feeling of betrayal by the wisdom of the written word (the Edgar principle being in a negative sense here).

The "charge of the Boar" is now put in a different way. The carousing and drunkenness (always symbolic of dissolution in the libido) of Lear's retainers in the castle of Goneril and Albany, followed

by Lear's feeling of betrayal by his daughter, precisely corresponds to the Puritan's reaction to the invasion of his sanctuary of the written word by the truth of the underworld (Shakespeare encountering Goddess of Love in the pages of Apuleius, and vividly imagining Her, with stimulation of libido). Kent is this Goddess of Love; and his re-entry into the King's affections represents Her clarification in Shakespeare's imagination, on that fateful day in 1587. Lear's "Who is it that can tell me who I am?" (I, iv, 225) is cognate with King Henry's "Who am I, ha?" in HVIII (II, ii), as the unconscious, an inviolable component of the Self, as Jung tells us, comes in from the cold. He is accompanied of course by the Fool (ass-phase Lucius, full steam ahead towards enlightenment in *The Golden Ass*). We have seen that Osric in *Hamlet* bears the value of verbal richness, his name being derived from the Latin *os*, "mouth", and "rich", so that he is the equivalent of Buck Mulligan, the Chrysostome ("Mouth of gold") in James Joyce's *Ulysses*. Oswald, servant of Goneril, represents the word as defence, as formed from *os* and "wall". Thus he is the natural enemy of Kent, whose principle has shredded the defence-mechanism of Puritanism. Goneril's order that he ride to Regan (I, iv, 345) signifies the invasion of the word by the libido (the horse, as always in the plays). Lear's demand for horses in I, v, 45, bears a similar meaning

ACT II

Regan and Cornwall come to Gloucester's castle, and embrace Edmund. Outside, Kent and Oswald grapple, and Edmund enters with his rapier drawn. Kent is put in the stocks "until noon" by Cornwall, against Gloucester's wishes. Lear arrives, accompanied by the Fool, and sets Kent free. Regan reproves her father, in the way of Goneril. Lear is shattered, and heads for the heath. The meaning is clear: the Boar associated with the defence, the Goddess threatening the defence and bringing the Boar into view, the Goddess taken out of play by the defence ("noon" representing the ascendancy of reason), then released by subject-as-Fool. Lear's otherwise supererogatory argument with Kent (II, iv, 20) represents the rising of an *ithyphallos*, against the subject's will (First Folio spelling):

Lear No
Kent Yes
Lear No, I say.
Kent I say yea.
Lear No, no, they would not!
Kent Yes, they have.
Lear By Jupiter, I swear no!
Kent By Juno, I swear I!

- Where “I” for “Ay” stands for the ithyphallos, as always in the First Folio. The intimate nature of this dialogue as allegory is indicative, as always, of the hand of Shakespeare, a conclusion which the style supports. There is a personal element here which is deeply poignant:

Lear O, let me not be mad, not mad, sweet heaven!
Keep me in temper; I would not be mad!
I, v, 43

Lear I prithee, daughter, do not make me mad.
II, iv, 245

Edgar’s appearance from the hollow tree depicts the elicitation of wisdom from the written word (cf. Ariel’s tree in TT). This should signify the inauguration of healing of the shattered ego; and, sure enough, Lear departs soon after for the heath, where the storm will be closely germane to those in OTH and TT, as representing the furious, concerted action of higher reason to heal the wound of the Boar, who has charged from his lair of the unconscious.

ACT III

Shakespeare is taking his first steps on his journey. Kent is the Goddess Nature described in the printed page; the Gentleman, the faculty of reason which acts on Her. Kent’s “I know you” marks the first glimmer of illumination; while his volubility indicates that Nature is now beginning to speak to the subject. The conflict

² Laurence Gardner, Realm of the Ring Lords.

between Albany and Cornwall represents the transformation of the visible world, - its Faustian substrate newly acknowledged, - which is accompanied by the dissolution of the defence. Finally, he beseeches the Gentlemen to take a purse to Cordelia, who will take therefrom a ring, and reveal to him the true identity of Kent. This identifies KL firmly as another Ring saga, in the line of The Volsung Saga, The Ring of the Niebelung, Lord of the Rings, Lorna Doone, and so on,² - not to mention the several other Ring plays in the corpus (TCE, R&J, TWT, CYM, &c.). By the conclusion of this argument, the First Folio will stand revealed as the greatest Ring saga of all. The purse illustrates once again the principle of referral: the faculty of reason identifying the Goddess in the printed page with the Ring or Grail Queen (for the two traditions are identical, as most vividly portrayed in Wolfram's Parzival, the main inspiration and source for FF as allegory: see Ch. 44).

Lear on the heath is accompanied by the Fool (Lucius in ass-phase). Kent arrives, who promises to return to Gloucester's castle and get help. Lear remarks, epochally, "My wits begin to turn": for the visual imagination will be the prime therapeutic agent. Edgar emerging from his hovel represents the gaining of wisdom from the auto-therapeutic mentation of the subject. Gloucester and his letter represent, of course, the imagination acting on the printed page wherein the Kent principle is described. Gloucester's entry with a torch in III, iv, 117, the party's sheltering in an outbuilding near his castle, and his prospering of their journey to Dover, - need no comment. The Fool's "I'll go to bed at noon" (III, vi, 86) means that the ass-phase journey will be completed when full illumination is reached (Lucius' resumption of his human form). This will be at the moment of Lear's death.

The episode of Gloucester's blinding is an oddly intriguing dance, none of whose steps are without significance. One-eyed Gloucester, after ablation of the first eye by Cornwall, represents the Puritan's lack of wholeness in outlook (cf. the half-blinding of Salisbury in 1HVI). The right brain, seat of intuition, feeling, music, sensuality, and so on, is the side denied by the Puritan; it controls the left side of the body: so that the missing eye would have been the left (cf.

³ Knight and Lomas, *The Second Messiah*.

Michelangelo's David, who looks to the left in anticipation of a threat from the demon). If the eye is the pathway to the soul, then the Puritan's is located in his left brain only (side of reason). The second eye is removed by Cornwall after he has received the fatal wound from the servant, who represents the libido, as his own sword wound signifies. On the allegorical plane, Cornwall is dead already, even as he gives the wound. This means that the traumatic dissolution of the defence by the resurgent libido has driven the subject inwards into himself, wing-shod in the imagination, as another Teiresias, in an example of what Ted Hughes called the "emergency flight of the shaman", which is also a Journey of the Hero.

ACT IV

Gloucester being guided in his blindness by the Old Man is a vivid depiction of the Solomon/Alexander/Christ figure – the Gnostic ideal, master of the inward vision in the Teiresian way – following the spoor of the truths of Nature, as founded on the unseen world: the Old Man being a reference, like all the old men and Adams of FF, as well as Protheus in TGV, to the ritual of the "Knight of the Sun" degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, which features "Thrice Perfect Father Adam", and whose purpose was the indoctrination of truth³ (see Ch.44). Now Edgar joins his father for the journey to Dover; and Gloucester gives him his purse (enrichment of ego-in-healing by Gnostic tradition). The cliffs of Dover, soon to be descended by Gloucester, represent the unseen world:

Gloucester Dost thou know Dover?
Edgar I Master.

The visible world is being transformed by acknowledgement of its unseen dimension (Albany's turning from his wife); and Albany gives succinct and powerful expression to a guiding principle of the Baconian philosophy (see Ch.10):

Albany That nature which contemns its origin
 Cannot be bordered certain in itself.

She that herself will sliver and disbranch
From her material sap, perforce must wither
And come to deadly use.

The Gentleman's dialogue with Albany in IV, iii, signifies that the new reason is informing the ego's perceptions of the visible world. Edmund is no longer with Goneril, but at Gloucester's castle, as the Gentleman tells Albany (for the Boar is no longer yoked to the visible world as misconceived by the Puritan, but is now becoming subject to Gnostic wisdom of the ego-in-transformation). The Gentleman in the following scene is the same again: reason referring the Kent principle to the Queen of Hell. Kent must remain in disguise: for the final identification of Woman as the source of ultimate power and wisdom (this is the age-old symbolism of the Ring, which originated in Sumer c.4000 B.C.) remains to be made (for Cordelia is a Ring/Grail Queen). The re-entry of the Queen of Hell-Ring/Grail Queen into the reasoning ego will not be through the "charge of the Boar", but in peace, which is the point of the otherwise unnecessary supplanting of the King of France by Monsieur La Far at the head of the French invasion force.

Cordelia's Doctor, who will drug the King and wake him again, is cognate with the Doctor in Macbeth, who is of the court of the miracle-working King (Gnostic tradition, as mastered by Bacon). The letters from Goneril and Regan to Edmund, carried by Oswald, illustrate again the principle of referral, where the visible world, as misconceived by the Puritan, secretes the Boar, who remains primed for the charge, to shatter the imagining ego that would engage it (contents of Goneril's letter to Edmund: plot against Albany). Later, Edgar will kill Oswald and intercept the letters (new wisdom breaking the sequence).

Gloucester's "fall" from the cliff, from which he emerges unscathed, is a vivid portrayal of the Gnostic enquirer engaging the unseen world. As the ego-in-healing follows him, he too makes this journey, to emerge reborn from his madness, the root of his troubles being now understood:

Gloucester A poor unfortunate beggar [Edgar as Mad Tom].
Edgar As I stood here below, me thought his eyes
Were two full moons: he had a thousand noses,

Horns wealked, and waved like the enraged sea...

The inner journey has brought insight into the unseen world, and new understanding of the visible (Lear's pearls of wisdom on encountering the reborn Gloucester). The Puritan's iron distinction between good and evil, based upon his anathematisation of the libido, is now seen to be a sham. The debate on the nature of justice in the early pages of Plato's Republic is alluded to (this is the significance of Autolycus in TWT: for he bears the name of the thief adduced by Socrates). The laws of Puritanism are being broken, to the immense benefit of the individual and society; and the Puritan is revealed thereby as the real criminal:

Lear A man my see how this world goes with no eyes. Look
 with thine ears. See how yond justice rails upon yond
 simple thief. Hark in thine ear. Change places and, handy-
 dandy, which is the justice, which is the thief?

ACT V

The main lines of this final Act are the eclipses of the Boar (Edmund) and the sham Goddess to whom the Boar is linked (Goneril-Regan); the "death" (rebirth) of the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen (Cordelia); the death of the Puritan subject (Lear); and his rebirth into Gnostic nobility (Edgar). The choreography is, as usual, intricate and precise, and no step is without significance. There is a nice touch where Edgar leads a initially reluctant, finally willing Gloucester out from the shade of a tree, which represents the printed page, its shadow the unseen world described therein: for the ego-in-healing has derived his wisdom from the Gnostic written word. This corresponds to the termination of Lucius' ass-phase, and the final ascendancy of Psyche, in The Golden Ass. It is Albany who impeaches Edmund, consistently with their allegorical values.

Edmund's order to the Captain to hang Cordelia represents the Puritan's potential suppression of the Grail Queen through fear of the Boar, to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory. Lear's dagger-wounding of the Captain in the act bears, however, the same meaning as the dagger-death of Juliet in R&J, - of the activation of the dormant (as suppressed by the Puritan) Grail Queen, by Her

identification anew with the unseen word (blade): so that the Cordelia principle in truth does not die, but is reborn. Edmund finally sends his sword to vouch for her reprieve; but too late. Had she lived, in other words, she would have remained identified with the negative ithyphallos (Edmund's sword). There can be little doubt the Captain's promised high advancement would represent the re-ascendancy of Puritanism (for Edmund at no stage orders Lear to die). The Puritan tyranny is overthrown, however, just as it was in the life of William Shakespeare, never to return.

CHAPTER 36

TIMON OF ATHENS

A startling clue to the true significance of Timon of Athens is the decision by the senators in III, v, to excute an unnamed General of unimpeachable loyalty, for killing a compatriot in an excess of fury. Given the utterly central role of Alexander the Great in HV, from which it may be deduced that he must have been an inspiration to the young Shaksper in his Tavern or pseudo-Alexandrian phase of mid adolescence, this can only refer to an incident described in Plutarch's Life of Alexander. At a banquet where the wine has flowed, Clitus has been mocking the ineptitude of the Greek Generals against the barbarians:

But he [Clitus] came in again immediately at another door, very irreverently and confidently singing the verses out of Euripides' Andromache: "In Greece, alas! How ill things ordered are". Upon this, at last, Alexander, snatching a spear from one of the soldiers, met Clitus as he was coming forward... and ran him through the body.

This suggests that TimA may be, like HV as well as MWW, a snapshot of this phase, when the young Alexander, with his love of wine and conversation and (crucially) his continence towards women, was Shaksper's chief literary inspiration; and he was indeed well-read, to place well above the prevailing illiteracy of Stratford at this time. This suspicion is strengthened by the appearance of Philotus at a crucial point of the play, just before Timon's banishment. This must be a reference to the Philotas mentioned by Plutarch, as a conspirator against the life of Alexander. (This is also the source of Antigonus in TWT, Antigone being the girl who fled from Philotas to Alexander, to disclose to him the plot: Philotas'Alexander being cognate, as allegory, with Sicily'Bohemia). Timon evidently represents, therefore, Shaksper in

his pseudo-Alexandrian phase; the schism between Timon and Athens, the termination of this phase by (re-)irruption of blind libido into his false world of visualisation and spiritualisation: yet another defence mechanism against the Boar (libido in negative aspect), foredoomed because of its reliance on the visual imagination, and ideas rather than Platonic Ideas: "Th'ear,/taste, touch, smell, all pleased from thy table rise;/They [Cupid and the Amazons] only now come but to feast thine eyes" (I, ii, 123). Why are they Amazons? Plutarch tells us:

Here [at the river Orexartes] many affirm that the Amazon came to give him a visit. But [others] say it is wholly a fiction. And truly Alexander himself seems to confirm the latter statement...

This points beautifully to the essential pseudery of this phase. It is a sham, which will soon be exposed. The question must also be asked: If TimA is set in Athens, then why the preponderance of Roman names (Lucius, Lucullus, Ventidius, Flavius &c) which do not appear in the sources in association with Timon? The answer is, of course, that these characters work on the symbolic rather than literal plane, the plane of the author's true intent: and TimA is the most sustained and spectacular example of Bacon-Shakespeare's mining of Plutarch for symbolic purposes. With regard to authorship, TimA is fascinating for the obvious seams demarkating the patches worked by master and pupil. Shakespeare must have opened up to his Gandalf in a remarkably frank and detailed way, so that Bacon knew exactly what had been going on in his patient's psyche, and was able to tailor his contribution precisely. TimA is in truth a momentous play, and totally sui generis in FF: for Bacon took the opportunity to introduce, in the banquet scene and later Acts, the theme of the Ark of the Covenant, a central icon of the Davidic/Jerusalem Church/Knights Templar' Masonic tradition, whose philosophy so informs the plays (see especially Ch 44).

What exactly was the microcosmic scenario that Shakespeare revealed to his mentor? To recap: In response to the shattering by the Boar of the peace of his bookish ascetic (Bolingbroke) phase of early adolescence, Shaksper embraced, for the first time in his life, the Journey of the Hero to the pit of the unseen world, as

celebrated in the written word, for which Alexander's conquest of Asia, as well as Lucius' ass-phase journey in *The Golden Ass*, stands as a metaphor. Yet it would be only a pseudo-journey, not the real thing: for he would become an instant guru to his illiterate tavern copains, an expert on the Journey, or Ring/Grail Quest, without ever himself having made it. This would leave him still vulnerable to the "charge of the Boar", the irruption of blind libido into the ego who had thought to have engaged and conquered it, yet who had all the time been paying the Journey only lip-service.

We can be more specific. Apuleius' magical mystery masterpiece *The Golden Ass* was taken by the authors, here as in so many other of the plays (e.g. *MAN*), to represent the precipitating factor of the "charge of the Boar". (Further, the suggestion is powerful that this was in fact the text, with its graphic depiction of the seduction of Lucius by Fotis, that was the precipitator in life). We can be sure that this is so from the presence of the characters Lucilius ("Lucius-like") and Lucius, who are clearly yoked to the Lucius principle as celebrated in *TGA*. Thus, Timon's enrichment of Lucilius in the second scene signifies that Shaksper is becoming like Lucius: that, whereas before he had expatiated to his copains on the libidinous encounters in *TGA*, undoubtedly to their roaring delight, - now he is reading and imagining the seduction scene, and the libido and an ithyphallos (*Apemantus*) are being aroused in himself against his will, to provoke the Boar and shatter his peace. We know that Shaksper's next coping mechanism, also doomed, was the espousal of Puritanism: and this is allegorised in Timon's expulsion, with the death of Shaksper-as-Puritan to become Shakespeare, through the ministry of Sir Francis Bacon and the Gnostic tradition, represented by the passing of Timon, and the peaceful entry of Alcibiades into Athens.

Alcibiades clearly bears the value of the Boar, the libido in negative aspect which surges into the false harbour of the ego: "So soon we shall drive back/Of Alcibiades th'approaches wild,/Who like a boar too savage doth root up/His country's peace". He is thus cognate with Richard in *RIII*, Diomedes in *T&C*, Tybalt in *R&J*, and all their kin. The name of Phrynia, one of the tarts who visits him with Alcibiades in *IV, iii*, is derived from the Greek *phryne*, "toad", which was a nickname for a notable Athenian courtesan, as mentioned by

Plutarch. The name of her companion Timandra was taken from Plutarch, as a pre-existing name suited beautifully to the allegory. "Timandra" may be formed from "Timon" and a feminisation of the Greek *aner*, -"man". Timon, Alcibiades and the tarts therefore comprise the components of the "Shakespearean moment" when the libido in negative aspect, as cast by Puritanism, irrupts the complacent ego, and the "double vision" supervenes, when the Goddess of Love incarnate is perceived as a whore ("Damn her, lewd minx! O, damn her!" Othello III, iii, 533; "Get thee to a Nunn'ry!" Hamlet III, i, 128; and so on). Further, this "tart" principle is identified as, in truth, the female part of Timon, - just as Lavinia is of Titus, and Ophelia of King Lear, - as his soul, Queen of Hell, the Ring/Grail Queen Herself.

The land outside Athens, home of Timon in his exile, bears the twin micro- and macrocosmic values of the Puritan ego, and the world as misconceived by that ego, as divorced from the unseen world underlying it, like a flower cut off at the roots. Athens itself is the converse: so that Alcibiades' peaceful entry in the final scenes represents the new invulnerability of the ego to the "charge of the Boar", and of the world to Nature in destructive mode, consequent on the ascendancy of Gnostic wisdom in the governing ego. Timon's bitter execration of Athens and humanity represents the Puritan's deep loathing of his libidinous self, and of the human factor in general. The long IV, iii, is a trenchant examination of several aspects of the Puritan mind.

ACT I

i

The Poet, the Painter, the Jeweller, and the Merchant, converse about their work and the extravagantly munificent Timon. The Poet represents the written word – for example, TGA – which in this new phase has waxed so prodigiously in Shaksper's ego (patronage by Timon); the Painter, the images described therein, and created anew in the visual imagination of the reader. The Jeweller is a reference to the precious jewel, the Schamir, of King Solomon, as described in the Talmud (cf. the diamonds in 2HVI and CYM). The

¹ Robert Graves, *The White Goddess*.

presence of the Merchant indicates that the Jeweller is also a beneficiary of Timon's (ego is acquiring (Solomonic) wisdom, based on knowledge of unseen world as described in the written word). Yet the Merchant's "No my good Lord, he [Jeweller] speaks the common tongue..." indicates that it is all a sham: that the subject, supposedly newly noble, is in truth no better than the common herd, to whose state he will soon be returned, through the treachery of the printed page. This is also the point of the Poet's new work, which will describe the downfall of a hitherto fortunate man.

Timon's first act is to pay the debts of Ventidius, to enable his release from prison. This is the same Ventidius as mentioned by Plutarch (Life of Marcus Antonius) as a General of Antony's, that prime symbol in FF of the libidinous ego, as lover of Cleopatra and enemy of Augustus (Puritan ego). Ventidius may therefore, here as in A&C, be identified with Antony himself: the point being that the Shaksper's libidinous self, formerly repressed, is in the process of being released. Remarkably, Bacon uses the same technique as in A&C (can TimA therefore be dated to about the same year of 1606?) of substituting in later scenes (FF version) a "g" for the "d" to form "Ventigius", the original spelling obtaining only in his first appearance. This D ' G progression can only be a reference to the Druidic tree alphabet,¹ where the former is the letter of the month of high summer (sun of reason predominating in ego), the latter of the autumn month of Gort, whose animal is none other than the Boar (see Ch.38). This resumes beautifully the change that is about to overtake the ego. This does not exhaust the spellings in the FF TimA: for he will later appear, not once but twice, and in the space of three lines, as "Ventiddius", as Timon begs him for money. This is at a point (FF p.85) when Timon is desperately trying to prop up the *staus quo*. Money bears always in FF the value of the power of a principle: and the ego is here trying to suppress the Antony in himself, to return to the hegemony of reason, and forestall the Boar. There is a further variation (FF p.86) where Sempronius' "Has Ventidgius and Lucullus denied him?" indicates the "charge of the Boar". All the variations on "Ventidius" are thus utterly and beautifully appropriate to the theme.

Timon's second act is to enrich Lucilius (see above). Here is

another graceful touch from the pen of Bacon. The spelling “Apemantus” obtains throughout TimA, except in the banquet scene, and in his very first appearance here, on the heels of the Merchant’s reproof, where it is spelt “Apermantus”. On the very next page (FF p.82) it immediately reverts to “Apemantus”, where it is spelt thus no less than six times, in the first column. So much for that: the reader undoubtedly surmising a compositor’s error. Yet, to confound this assumption, “Apermantus” obtains in its first appearance in the subsequent banquet scene, and continues to be spelt thus repeatedly, with the supposedly correct version never in that scene appearing. Something strange is going on here; yet in truth not strange, but utterly familiar: for *aper* is the Latin for – you guessed it! – “wild boar”, while “-mantus” is a homophone of *mantis*, “seer”, “soothsayer”. Apemantus himself undoubtedly represents the *ithyphallos* (cf. especially 1-3HV1):

Apemantus I.

Timon Wherefore?

Apemantus That I had no angry wit to be a lord..

Art not thou a merchant?

Merchant I Apemantus.

The meaning is clear: that the *ithyphallos* is tempting toward auto-erotism (as detailed in the Gads Hill robbery scenes of 1HIV), and the trauma of the “charge of the Boar”. This episode is marked by the antipathy of Apemantus toward the Timon and the Poet and Painter: the “I” principle always tending to subvert the fragile confections of the Tavern-phase ego. Alcibiades enters, with “some twenty horse”: the horse bearing the value here, as always, of the libido in action, as sourced by Bacon from the famous metaphor in Plato’s *Phaedrus*. This is a potential “charge of the Boar”; yet at this early stage it is forestalled in the customary way, as Alcibiades exits, and Apemantus is sent packing by the lords (faculty of reason, as always in FF).

ii

Ted Hughes felt that TimA was fatally flawed by the absence of a Goddess figure; yet here She is, as the five Amazons who

perform, with Cupid, a masque at the banquet. The value in FF of the banquet is always the same as that of enrichment with money: namely, the strengthening of a principle. Let us look closely at those named in FF as present. Timon is here, of course, along with the lords (the faculty of reason). The status quo prevails, with reason ruling the ego; yet, ominously, Ventigius (with a “g”), Apermantus (with an “r”), and Alicibiades are present. Timon’s “O Apermantus, you are welcome” is odd, for we would certainly expect him, from the foregoing scene, to be anything but. “O” is clearly serving to draw our attention to a cipher, that of “Apermantus”. “O” commonly had this meaning in the Elizabethan era, the words “zero” and “cipher” being both derived from the Arabic *sifr*, “empty”: for the cipher is devoid of meaning in itself, its *raison d’être* being to disguise the truth.

Alicibiades speaks up, but then relapses into silence (Boar has not yet charged: this will be signified by his extreme volubility in the scene of his banishment from Athens). Now the Goddess – perhaps Fotis – enters the field, as engaged by reason (Amazons dancing with lords) and the imagination (“...to feast thine eyes”). The presence of Cupid here is significant, as erotic matchmaker. The ladies are taken away to “an idle banquet” (further waxing in power of Goddess of Love in ego); while the lords ask for their horses. It could not be clearer. We will see in II, i, that the Senators represent, as referring to the senate of Rome (as founded by Aeneas, the archetypal Goddess-rejector of FF), the principle of psychic repression of the Goddess. This is also the point of their entry so early in I, i. Thus they here have alighted from their horses, in contrast to the lords. The psychic conflict going on is plain. Meanwhile Flavius tries to warn Timon of his dearth of riches with which to maintain his munificence. “Flavius” is derived from the Latin *flavus*, “yellow”, “gold-coloured”, undoubtedly to refer to golden-haired Apollo, god of healing and the light of reason. Flavius is therefore the reasoning imagination that would maintain the status quo, but is being found wanting in the face of the flood of blind libido.

The visible moon (Graves’ “White Goddess”) is symbolically germane to the sun (reason: Apollo), as reflective of its light; while the dark moon is antithetical to it, and represents the unseen

world, realm of the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, where resides the libido. The action of the visual imagination alone on the printed page, to the exclusion of the libido, is portrayed beautifully in the servant's "Lord Lucius/...hath presented to you/Four milk-white horses, trapt in silver". In other words, the reader is imagining the seduction scene in TGA (whence Lucius), but not surrendering to libido. Yet Flavius will soon object, to signify the change overtaking the ego. Similarly, Timon accepts the invitation of Lucullus, by whom he later will be fiercely repudiated, as the Tavern phase ego irrevocably declines. The character of Lucullus as described by Plutarch (Life of Lucullus), gives us a beautiful glimpse of Shaksper in the high summer of this phase:

Lucullus was very eloquent, well-spoken, and excellently well-learned in the Greek and Latin tongues... For L. had studied humanity from his youth, and was well-learned in all the liberal sciences; but when he came to older years to refresh his wit (after great troubles) he fell to the study of Philosophy, which quickened the contemplative part of his soul, and mortified or at least betimes bridled the ambitious and active part, specially after the dissentious wars between him and Pompey. But... it is said, that when he was a young man, he laid a great wager with Hortensius the Orator, and Sisenna the historiographer... that he would write the breviary of the wars of Marsicum, in verse or prose, in the Latin of Greek tongue, which soever fell to his lot...

The outstanding features of Shaksper at this stage must have been his wide reading, volubility (Hortensius: and see Hortensio in TOS), and also creative writing. This accords with the Stratford tradition of his satirical poetry at this time against the Puritan Sir Thomas Lucy, a possible fragment of which survives, evidence of a raw but promising talent. Plutarch describes how Lucullus was warmly received by Ptolemy at the city named after Alexander, a Gnostic Christ figure in FF; and this identification with the Gnostic Christ is cemented in the final pages:

Nothing (in my opinion) made Lucullus more happy, than to die when he did, before he saw the change and alteration of the

commonwealth, which the fatal destinies plagued the Romans withall, with sedition and civil wars...

- For the consequence of this “change and alteration” was the ascendancy of Augustus, and therefore of Virgil, and his great Goddess-rejector hero Aeneas. The unreasoning unconscious promises to hold sway: “Well, would I were gently put out of office/Before I were forced out” (Flavius); but the wonted defence mechanism for the time being prevails (lords accepting Timon’s gifts).

ACT II

As in its every other instance in FF, the twice repeated “I go, sir” indicates that the object of the Senator’s order to Caphis to redeem the monies paid to Timon is, as allegory, the suppression of the ithyphallos. That the means to this would be the written word, as always, is signified by the naming of the other creditors as Varro and Isidore. The former is certainly a reference to Marcus Terentius Varro, the great author and librarian of late republican Rome (cf. JC IV, iii, where the character of Varro bears just this same value); while the latter most plausibly connotes the author and polymath Isidorus Hispalensis (602-36 A.D.), in whose entry the Oxford Classical Dictionary gives the apt direction “See Encyclopaedic Learning”. The printed page is also represented by the bonds borne by Caphis, and the handfults of unpayable bills about which Timon’s steward complains.

Timon refuses, of course, to satisfy the servants of the Senator, Varro, and Isidore. The defence mechanism of Shaksper’s Tavern phase is proving entirely inadequate to the challenge of the Boar; and, significantly, Alcibiades is accompanying Timon here, where the latter’s “With me, what is your [Alcibiades’] will?” expresses beautifully the state of play. The Fool accompanies Apemantus, just as the inauguration of Lucius’ (underworld) ass-phase journey in TGA was marked by his seduction by Fotis (this the point of Apemantus’ “Asses” to the servants). The origin of the numerous Fools in FF is likely to have been the Fool card of the Tarot Major Arcana, which was an innovation of the Knights Templar, inheritors of the tradition of the Jerusalem Curch and Gnostic Christ, and

forerunners of Freemasonry; and Bacon was formally inducted into Freemasonry by King James in 1603 (see Ch.1). In this tradition, the Fool was regarded as the first stage in the initiate's journey to enlightenment. Consistently, Apemantus and the Fool vilify the servants. A Page enters, and asks Apemantus to read to whom his two letters are addressed; and Apemantus tells him they are for Timon and Alcibiades. What is the meaning of this? The Page represents, of course, the written word, which here is being informed by the ithyphallos-libido, to provoke the Boar to shatter the subject from within.

ACT III

i

Lucullus, Lucius, and Sempronius, are to be approached for loans by Timon's servants Flaminus, Servilius, and Flavius. The names of all of these are highly significant, and not at all randomly chosen. Shaksper's constitutive Christian puritan superego has, from the time of puberty, drawn him to anathematise and suppress the libido in himself. The present Tavern phase is a reaction to this, an attempt to resanctify the libido as idea, and thereby escape the attentions of the Boar, while still suppressing the libido in himself: to have his cake and eat it too. The model and inspiration for this phase was Plutarch's Alexander, with his love of wine and conversation, and, crucially, his continence toward women. The constitutive Christian puritan superego is represented here by the Roman senate (in other plays the specifically Augustan senate bears the value of the Puritan superego); the continuing Tavern phase suppression, - the breaking of which, with Shaksper's consequent espousal of Puranism, is the subject of TimA, - by the Athenian senate. Thus, Sempronius here undoubtedly connotes Tiberius S. Gracchus, the one great Sempronius of Roman history, one of the famous Gracchi brothers who conflicted bitterly with the Roman senate on the issue of land reform, while Gaius Flaminus was the one great democratic leader before the Gracchi similarly to challenge the senate.

The Lucius, Lucullus, and Sempronius principles are knitted together by the character of Servilius, for whose provenance we turn, as so often, to Plutarch, whose Life of Lucullus mentions

Servilius as a soothsayer who charged Lucullus' father with embezzlement, and was cross-charged by Lucullus in return. Yet here it is Flaminius who approaches Lucullus, and conflicts bitterly with him after the refusal; while Servilius approaches Lucius, only to be rebuffed. Flavius must therefore be the servant to approach Sempronius (similarly to be refused); yet he makes no entry, and is not named by Sempronius. His absence is eloquent, however, of the flooding by the blind libido of the Apollo principle of the healing light of reason. This will shortly be reinforced by his appearance muffled in a cloak, symbolic of the obscured sun: "He goes away in a cloud".

The character of Titus, newly introduced among the creditors, is a fascinating one. He is most plausibly a reference to Titus Quintus Flaminius, subject of yet another life by Plutarch, who describes him thus, to give yet another precious glimpse of the guru-like character of Shaksper in this phase:

... they say of him thus: he would quickly be angry, and yet very ready to pleasure men again. For, if he did punish any man that had angered him, he would do it gently, but his anger did not long continue with him. He did good also to many, & ever loved them whom he had once pleased, as if they had done him some pleasure: and was ready to do for them still whom he found thankful, because he would ever make them beholding to him, and though that as honourable a thing, as he could purchase to him self. Because he greatly sought honour above all things, when any notable service was to be done, he would do it him self, and no man should take it out of his hand. He would ever rather be with them that needed his help, than with those that could help him, or do him good.

Remarkably, Plutarch (*ibid.*) refers explicitly to Alexander (Lysander), in terms that resonate profoundly with what we have seen thus far:

It is a very rare thing amongst men, to find a man very valiant, and wise withall: but yet of all sorts of valiant men, it is harder to find a just man. For Agesilaus, Lysander, Nisias, Alicibiades,

and all other the famous Captains of former times, had very good skill to lead an army, and to win the battle, as well by sea as by land: but to turn their victories to any honourable benefit, or true honour among men, they could never skill of it.

A succession of “I”’s for “Ay”’s indicates exactly the nature of the psychic change. Timon’s rage at being confronted by a flood of bills undoubtedly marks the moment of the “charge of the Boar”: “... these debts well may called desperate ones, for a madman owes ‘em” (Hortensius). This is confirmed by the volubility of Alcibiades in the next scene (Boar principle possessing the psyche, the tusks having struck deep), which ends in his banishment, and the execution of the unnamed General (death of pseudo-Alexander that was Tavern phase Shaksper: see introduction to this chapter above). Alcibiades’ exile refers to the subject’s espousal of Puritanism, the final coping mechanism, the point of which will be to deal once and for all with the problem of the Boar: a delusion, like all the rest.

In the scene of Timon’s last supper, TimA takes off into the stratosphere of symbolic richness and perfection. Here begins to be felt the massive weight of the Egyptian’Davidic’Templar’ Masonic tradition that so inspired Sir Francis Bacon, and so deeply informs his work. Chapter 44 will detail some of the background to this momentous symbolism. Briefly, the dishes uncovered by Timon to reveal stones in warm water, undoubtedly refer to the equivalence of the Ark of the Covenant (stones: the Tablets of Testimony, inscribed with the Word of God) and Holy Grail (dishes of warm water: the blood of the sang real (bloodline of Gnostic Christ)), as allegorised by Wolfram von Eschenbach in his Parzival, the first complete Grail romance, which will be revealed (Ch.44) to have been a colossal influence – the main architectonic influence, in fact – on FF as allegory. Timon’s hurling of the stones and water at his guests serves to identify their principles with the Word of God: as indeed they are identified, as the Gnostic written word in which is described the unseen world. The problem for Shaksper has not been their authenticity as such, but that, lacking a Gandalf, he has refused to make the Journey of the Hero described therein, remaining a mere barracker on the sidelines. The magician and

guide would be supplied much later, in his London phase, in the person of Sir Francis Bacon. The recognition of this Ark/Grail symbolism has momentous implications for the episodes of Timon's exile (Shaksper's retreat into Puritanism).

ACT IV

i-ii

The depth and endless invention of Timon's obloquy against the human race is an index to the contempt of the Puritan for Nature and, in turn, of Bacon-Shakespeare for the Puritan, which makes Timon's exile in TimA the tragic twin of the comedy of (Puritan) Malvolio's incarceration in TN, and every bit as memorable. We may surmise that Shaksper's loathing of himself is now complete, after his criminal prosecution and rustication in lieu of gaol, consequent on the re-irruption of blind libido to shatter his carefully constructed pseudo-Alexandrian ego, and drive him, at the utter nadir of demoralisation, into petty theft with the tavern crowd to whom he had formerly been a guru. He is captive to Puritanism in the person of Sir Thomas Lucy: and, as is so often observed in hostages, he develops a sympathy for his captor's beliefs, so that Puritanism, with its total suppression of the visual imagination – the basis of his Tavern phase mentation, after all – seems the obvious way forward. The visual imagination is represented by Flavius, whose gift of money to Timon's now destitute servants represents the weakening of his principle in the Puritan ego. Yet the imagination will remain, buried but still alive, ready to surge again on that fateful day in 1587, to recreate the Goddess of Love, and nail Shaksper to the Cross of the libido; and later it will emerge as the vital factor in his resurrection.

iii

Timon is in the woods, which represents, like all the other woods, forests, groves and trees in FF, the written word, the attitude to which of the Puritan and incipient Gnostic will be the concern of this Act. Given the explicit Ark/Grail symbolism in the previous Act, Timon's digging for roots must correspond to

² Knight and Lomas, *The Hiram Key*.

³ Knight and Lomas, *The Second Messiah*.

Parzival's similar act soon after leaving the Grail castle (see Ch.44). What exactly is the point of Timon's discovery in the earth of a hoard of gold? This represents, of course, the wisdom and richness to be gained from engagement with the unseen world as described in the printed page: a constant theme of FF, as we have seen. Indeed, this wisdom is the Holy Grail itself. Fascinatingly, the written word is also central to Parzival as allegory. Consistently, therefore, Timon (Puritan ego) buries it again.

We can be more specific. The rituals of the thirty-three degrees of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, into which Bacon was formally inducted by King James in 1603,² find their way explicitly into FF at crucial points. This was the authentic form of Freemasonry, which preserved the teachings of the true Jesus, the Gnostic Christ Himself, up until the time of its brutal suppression by the Grand Lodge of England in the early 18th century,³ an act of barbarism which must rank in quality, though not quantity, with the torching of the Alexandria library (see Chs.1, 26, 44). For the retrieval of significant fragments of the lost rituals, we owe an immeasurable debt to Christopher Knight and Robert Lomas, and their impeccably argued book *The Second Messiah*. The fourteenth degree, the "Scotch Knight of Perfection", is almost certainly the subject of Ulysses' famous speech on degree in T&C (Ch.26). Fascinatingly, the ritual of this degree memorialises the words of King Solomon with respect to those he had advanced to it, that they 'had wrought in the difficult and dangerous work of the ancient ruins, had penetrated into the bowels of the earth and had brought out treasures to adorn the Temple'. Their boon was reputed to have been the famed pillar of Enoch, on which was graven the scientific tradition of the ancient world, from before the flood. These words of Solomon's may also be taken to refer, by extension, to the Knights Templar, forerunners of the Masons, who retrieved, in the early years of the Christian occupation of Jerusalem, this Solomonic patrimony from beneath Herod's Temple, where it had been hidden by the early members of the Gnostic Church, or Rex Deus line, which perpetuated the priesthood of the Jerusalem Church. This, then, is the significance of the gold disinterred by the Puritan (Timon) who, however, is no Templar, no inheritor of the wisdom of Jesus.

The point is made time and time again through FF that this refusal to engage with the underworld, or Faustian dimension, leaves the world only more vulnerable to it (see Ch.10). This unseen world is, after all, the object of study of the great scientists, artists, and depth psychologists, without the boon of whose advances modern life would be unthinkable. This is the point of Timon's gift of gold to Alcibiades, the Boar, his encounter with whom is the first of a series in the woods: the power of the underworld being potentiated through neglect. Let us look at Timon's visitors in detail.

1) Alcibiades The "charge of the Boar" now threatens, in the shape of Alcibiades who bears, along with Timandra and Phynia, the potential of the "Shakespearean moment", when the will-to-eros in negative aspect may surge to shatter the Goddess-rejecting ego (see introduction to this chapter). This is ever the problem for the Puritan, that the journey into the invisible world may release the anathematised blind libido: so that he rejects the wisdom of the written word (Timon burying most of the gold), and potentiates thereby the underworld in catabolic mode (Timon giving some of the gold to Alcibiades), thinking in his delusion, by denying it, to have removed its threat (Timon sending Alcibiades away). This episode is graven deep with the hallmark of Bacon (albeit Shakespeare was most plausibly author of the prose linking passages); and micro- and macrocosmic elements are together upstage in this precisely placed "I" for "Ay":

Timon Warr'st thou 'gainst Athens?

Alcibiades I, Timon.

- Where "I" bears here, as so often in FF, the value of the broader unseen world. The mechanism described here is precisely the same as allegorised in the murder of Mercutio by Tybalt (threat of Boar killing ego's communication with underworld), and Tybalt by Romeo (ego therefore thinking to kill off the Boar), in R&J.

2) Apemantus The most noticeable aspect of this episode is its length. It seems over long, in fact. The explanation is to be found in

its dual authorship: for distinct seams run immediately before Apemantus' "Where liest a nights Timon?" and "If thou could'st please me", the intermitting fifty-two lines being in the prose style we have come to associate with Shakespeare, with the remainder in the unmistakeable high style of Bacon. This gives us a precious insight into their creative relationship, with Bacon as grand strategist, and Shakespeare the pupil of talent, adding his personal touch to the given design. Here is a poignantly reflective passage from Shakespeare, which sharpens markedly our picture of him in Tavern phase:

Apemantus The middle of humanity of humanity thou never knewest, but the extremity of both ends. When thou wast in thy guilt, and thy perfume, they mocked thee for too much curiosity: in thy rags thou know'st none, but art despised for the contrary.

Apemantus represents the ithyphallic principle, more broadly the unseen world (see above). The medler (a fruit with a resemblance to the yoni) offered by him to Timon also bears this value of the unseen world, - "I, though it look like thee", - and is therefore rejected by him. Timon's casting of a stone (a testis symbol) after Apemantus, whom he has spurned, portrays beautifully the Puritan's repudiation of the libido in himself.

In Timon's speech "Rogue, rogue, rogue" we have the turning-point of the play, when Shaksper begins to repudiate his Puritan self, and embrace the Gnostic ideal, to become Shakespeare, newly empowered with the "speare" against the Boar. For Timon's inscribed gravestone undoubtedly refers to the "Tablets of Testimony", which were graven with the Word of God, and secreted in the Ark of the Covenant (see below, and Ch.44). The words of God - the One True God of Freemasonry - in question are those housed in the pages of the First Folio, - Bacon's "baby", yet with a significant contribution from his pupil, - which describes, above all, the redeeming power of engagement with the unseen world.

3) The Bandits What can be the point of all this philosophising on the problem of theft? The answer is to be found in Plato's

Republic, which has already be shown to be the source of one of the key metaphors in the plays, namely, “music” as symbolic of the Musical arts, as defined by the Platonic Socrates, as including reading and writing, speech and song, recital and repetition, and so on (cf. for example Bianca’s music lessons in TOS). The bushranger Ned Kelly is an Australian folk hero, as is Arthur Daly of Minder in England; while the Ridd family shows remarkable affection for the outlaw Doones in R.D. Blackmore’s Ring saga Lorna Doone. There is evidently more to crime than is dreamt of by the average Calvinistic police commissioner. This is precisely the point that Socrates’ addresses in the Republic. His argument depends on the uncertainty of defining what is good and what evil, which depends on one’s point of view: whereas as the greatest wisdom is to be derived from that region “beyond good and evil”, which it was the life’s work of Nietzsche to celebrate. Robin Hood is another good example; also the notorious Kray brothers, who were given the equivalent of state funerals by the working-class communities they served. It is Autolycus, the thief in Homer’s Odyssey, who is adduced by Socrates; and Autolycus carries precisely this significance in *The Winter’s Tale*, - of the incarnation of the will-to-life who is convicted by Puritanism, but pardoned by the ego-in-transformation. The point is, that if the law is broken, then the law itself may be wrong. In this case, the law violated by the ego-in-transformation is that of Puritanism, which forbids engagement with the underworld. Consistently, then, the bandits are given gold and sent away by Timon.

4) Flavius This a subtle episode. The faculty of the imagination (Flavius) must absolutely to be fostered to enable the psychic transformation to be effected. This is the point of Timon’s recognising him as honest, and “born of Woman”, and of his enriching him. However, we are about to witness the momentous entry of the Poet and the Painter, as the written word and the forms of the imagination created therefrom; and Bacon returns us to square one, with the ego re-initialised as Puritan, to show how the transformation will take place: “Thou shalt build from men:/Hate all, Curse all...”

ACT V

i

5) The Poet and the Painter Their advent signifies the inauguration of the transformation of the Puritan ego, through the ministry of the written word (Poet) and the visual imagination wherein its images are recreated (Painter). The scene is initialised with Timon as Puritan. The cave wherein he hides is a reference to Bacon's philosophy of the "Idols of the Cave", as described in his *Novum Organum*, one of four groups of idols which are not symbols, but represent the fixed ideas of the misled individual, where the cavern represents the mind. Thus, the title page of Bacon's *New Atlantis* bears a depiction of winged Father Time raising a Goddess figure from a cave, as an allegory of the resurrection of truth from the intellect through the passage of time: as happened, for example, in the case of Shakespeare. Thus, the mind of the schoolteacher becomes fixed with the values of the schoolroom, and interprets the world in terms of them. Timon in his cave is therefore the subject (ultimately Shakespeare) as Puritan, still judging all behaviour by his perverted standards. Consistently, the Painter says he has nothing to offer him, for suppression of the imagination is a *sine qua non* of Puritanism; while the Poet says he will write a "satire against the softness of prosperity" (the Athenian condition, the opposite of Timon's): in other words, a Puritan tract, against Nature Herself, and poetry: "Wilt thou whip thine own faults in other men? Do so, I have gold for thee".

Transformation is in the offing, however, as signified by the Poet's "Nay, let's seek him", and Timon's critical "I'll meet you at the turn". This is the turning point, marked by Timon's emergence from the cave, where the life thread of the Puritan ego will be cut, and the Gnostic ego, to mix metaphors slightly, begin to rise from its ashes. That this is now the Gnostic written word, wherein is described the Faustian dimension, is signified by Timon's "I, you are honest men", where "I" for "Ay" stands, as always in FF, for the *ithyphallos*, more broadly the unseen world (see especially 3HVI).

What is all this business about the Poet and the Painter and the "arch-villain" that Timon supposes keeps each company? This is, of course, the libido in negative aspect: yoked to the Poet, as the

libido or unseen world described in the written word (for example, the graphically described seduction of Lucius by Fotis in TGA); to the Painter, that episode recreated in the visual imagination, to incite the libido of the reader (in the case of Shakespeare, the Boar). The Puritan's suppression of the imagination and the Gnostic written word is an attempt, of course, to deny the libido. Timon must return to his Puritan state before the entry of Flavius and the senators, to enable the same sort of progression as we have just seen, from Puritan'incipient Gnostic. He therefore beats the Poet and Painter off the stage, and returns to his cave; but not before this odd exchange:

Timon (To the Painter) If, where thou art, two villains shall not be,

Come not near him. (To the Poet) If thou wouldst not reside

But where one villain is, then him abandon.

This is Timon-as-Puritan, divorcing the imagination from the written word. Thus, the Painter will see neither villain, for the imagination cannot recreate what is not provided by the written word; and the Poet will see one only, for the libido is described in his words, while the imagination remains suppressed. Timon gives them gold, to signify that their principles are active, before dismissing them

6) Flavius and the Senators This is a momentous episode, signifying as it does Shakespeare's assumption of his pen to create FF (pupil standing here for both pupil and master (Bacon)). Athens stands here for both the macrocosm of the world, and the microcosm of the psyche; Alcibiades, the unseen world which threatens to destroy them. This is the point, the great gift of FF as allegory: the lesson of the primacy of engagement with the underworld, in the Gnostic way, - the way of the scientist, artist, depth psychologist, - though not the Puritan. The various lords represent throughout FF the faculty of reason: and so the senators here; while Flavius also bears this value: "Thou sun that comforts, burn!" This is the sun of Apollo. Timon is now emerged from his

cave (Puritan become incipient Gnostic). He invites the sun to burn him (~~ego seeking enlightenment, learning painful truths about his own condition~~ (Shakespeare's Melancholy Jacques phase)). At first he shuns their solicitations to return to Athens, to help them fight Alcibiades (ego still self-regarding); then accepts (Orlando phase of creative writing). Shakespeare's creation of the written word is represented here by the logs Timon is about to cut from the "tree, which grows here in my close" (cf. the logs cut by Ferdinand in TT; the similar episode in TST (Appendix 1)). Why, though, does he invite the citizens of Athens to hang themselves on the tree before he cuts it down? This is a beautiful touch: for of course they suggest, as such, Christ on the Cross; and Christ is referred to in the New Testament as the "Word of God". This theme is continued in the gravestone of Timon "upon the beached verge of the salt flood", as a reference to the Tablets of Testimony, which bear the words of God in the Ark of the Covenant: the Ark and Holy Grail being identified in Wolfram's Parzival, the major source and inspiration for the architectonics of FF (see Ch.44 for a fuller discussion of this important theme). The Holy Grail is repeatedly identified in FF as the wisdom derived from knowledge of the unseen world as described in the written word: and this is therefore the gift of Shakespeare's creative writing.

ii-iii-iv

What then of Timon's second grave in the forest? Which is the true one, which false? The playwright does nothing to help us. The answer is, of course, that they are to be identified: and this is later made explicit by the soldier (iv, 66-71). FF as allegory is a scathing indictment of the Puritan error, showing the devastation wreaked by it in Shakespeare's life, and how he was finally healed of it, through the ministry of Sir Francis Bacon and the Gnostic tradition. This is reflected in the words found by the soldier: "Some beast read this, there does not live a man": an index to Bacon-Shakespeare's loathing of Puritanism. Now Alcibiades offers to enter Athens in peace, taking out only the "the destined tenth": those, such as the Puritan, who have shunned engagement with

the underworld. The soldier enters precisely as the senators descend to receive Alcibiades, and gives to Alcibiades the words he has taken from Timon's grave. This is another instance of the principle of referral, where the world described in the written word is referred to the underworld underpinning it. The result is that the unseen world is engaged, and the Puritan error thereby annihilated:

Here lies a wretched corse, of wretched soul bereft.
Seek not my name. A plague consume you wicked caitiffs left!

CHAPTER 37

CORIOLANUS

Coriolanus is the surviving twin of the miscarried Timon of Athens, which the relative absence of a Goddess figure limits as art, as Ted Hughes observed. The dearth of the Goddess in TimA is not complete, as I have shown; yet Hughes' isolation of this pathogenetic principle remains a typically brilliant achievement. Another was his sensing of the reek and charge of the Boar, which he located, uniquely in the plays, implicit in the hero himself; whereas elsewhere it is depicted separately. In this topography he erred, however: for the Boar – the libido as negatively perceived by the broadly puritan ego – is in truth represented by Aufidius and the Volscians. COR is, like TimA, an examination of Shakespeare's Welsh or Tavern or pseudo-Alexandrian phase of mid-adolescence, the third of four mechanisms of coping with the Boar, which was doomed to failure, as was, far more shatteringly, his subsequent and final refuge of Puritanism.

Coriolanus' many victories over the Volscians represents Shakespeare's suppression of his troublesome libido, which he won by the strategy of spiritualisation (visualisation) of the Journey of the Hero, of which Lucius with his libidinous adventures in ass-phase in Apuleius' *The Golden Ass* evidently was a principal

example. In this period he became an instant guru to his tavern companions, whom he regaled in the convivial way of Alexander, as described by Plutarch. It is all too easy to imagine the uproar among his roisterous copains as the limping, learned outsider regaled them with, say, the seduction scene in Milo's house in TGA. Yet he was all this time paying only lip-service to the conquest of Nature (visible and invisible) which Alexander's victories symbolise; and spiritualisation is no defence against the blind libido: so that the strategy of this phase was corrupt from the start. The Queen of Hell-Grail Queen in COR is Volumnia, mother of the hero, who is the fons et origo of her son's will to achieve. Virgilia is, as his wife, the Goddess of Love, whose absence from his company, until the reconciliation scene in V, iii (Goddess of Love described in the printed page, and newly imagined by the reader, prelude to the fateful coup of 1587), - corresponds to the continency of the young Alexander, and Shakespeare's suppression of his erotic nature. Her refusal to join her husband in I, iii, is emphasised, to this end. She is in truth the invisible aspect of the Goddess of Love, which is capable of releasing the blind libido: this aspect being externalised and highlighted by the presence of Volumnia; while Valeria ("The moon of Rome chaste as the icicle": V, iii, 65) is Her visible aspect. It is this latter that corresponds to the Woman of Shakespeare's Tavern phase: spiritualised, demystified, harmless to dissolve the reasoning ego, and therefore powerless to release the Boar. The faculty of spiritualisation is represented by Menenius (cf. Flavius in TimA; Fluellen in HV). He names himself as "thy old father" (V, ii, 69): for spiritualisation has indeed been the generator of this phase. The citizens represent, as always in the plays, the raw will, or libido; their insurrection the surging of this principle again in the psyche which had thought to conquer it. Coriolanus pointedly leaves them behind in his entry into Corioles; yet the wounds he sustains therein, and in his encounter with Aufidius, signify that the Boar has charged, in spite of his will to the contrary.

Now Shakespeare's strategy has failed; his Tavern defence has collapsed: and he retreats into the final coping mechanism of Puritanism. This is represented by his banishment from the city, and his alliance with the Volscians (appeasement of his libido once again through Puritanism): his campaign against Rome bearing the

same allegoric value as Timon's execrations against Athens - of the Puritan's anathematisation of the human. Now the gun has been loaded - not a stun gun this time, but a Magnum: and we await the inevitable tragedy. This was precipitated by Shakespeare's coming across an erotic passage in a book – almost certainly the seduction of Lucius by Fotis in Apuleius' *The Golden Ass* - followed by his recreation of the Goddess of Love in his imagination, and surrender to auto-erotism, to shatter the tower of Lear Inc., whose roots were built in the arid sands of Puritanism. Implicit in the Goddess of Love is Her invisible, unconscious aspect, the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen: and their entry into the psyche of Shakespeare aet.23, ineluctably, against his will, is represented by the supplications of Volumnia, Virgilia, Valeria, and young Martius, to the banished Coriolanus in V, iii; while the inevitable "charge of the Boar" is, of course, his murder by Aufidius: the lethal blade being cognate with Laertes' sword in the final scene of *Hamlet*. Martius fils represents the new Shakespeare to be born from the Puritan. Volumnia's prophesy of Martius fils in V, iii, 67, signifies the coming redemption of the subject (London-phase Shakespeare).

The precise analyses of the variations from Plutarch are, once again, lethal and swift acting against the sceptic. Here are some of them.

Scepticides

1) Coriolanus' loss of his horse to Lartius in a wager (I, iv), and gaining of a "noble steed" from Cominius (I, ix), frame the scenes of the capture of Corioles. The latter is described in Plutarch; the former, supererogatory on the literal plane, is not. The horse is symbolic here of the libido, as always in the FF, as sourced by Bacon from Socrates' famous metaphor in Plato's *Phaedrus*. This bookend was inserted on purpose, to make a pair. For the subject is initially above the libido, which he has kept enchained in the unconscious, through the mechanism of the Menenius principle; then is taken by it (entry into Corioles, and circumscription by its walls: "charge of the Boar") to shatter his defences, and traumatise his psyche (wounds of Coriolanus).

2) Plutarch states explicitly that Coriolanus was accompanied by a small band of his soldiers on his entry into Corioles. COR depicts

him, equally explicitly, as entering alone. This modification of the ~~source was necessary for the allegory. for the city of Corioles is to~~ be identified with the citizens of Rome (both are execrated by Coriolanus), as representing the libido with which he is in conflict: the army being made up, of course, of a group of the citizens.

3) The characters of Nicanor and Adrian, and their encounter in IV, iii, do not appear in the Life of Coriolanus. There is a Nicanor in the Life of Phocion, a commander of the Athenian garrison, who swears revenge on the Athenians after being treacherously treated by them. So far so good. Adrian will reappear in TT bearing exactly the same allegorical value, of a psychological defence mechanism, his name being simply “Hadrian” without the Greek breathing: the reference being to Hadrian’s Wall in northern Britain. The meaning is clear: that Shakespeare’s Puritan phase aet.15-23 (Volscians appeased by Coriolanus), was yet another defence against the troublesome libido.

4) Plutarch describes in general terms the visit of certain ambassadors to the Volscians’ camp, but not specifically that of Menenius, who approaches Coriolanus in V, ii, and is hotly rebuffed, and given a letter to take with him. This represents the Puritan denial of the visual imagination. To reinforce this meaning, Menenius is accompanied into his presence by the Watch, who bear in R&J and elsewhere the same allegorical value. The letter represents here, as always in the plays, the written word. In Menenius’ hands it is identified with him: so that it is the Puritan’s rejection of the printed page as stimulator of the imagination – a motif of FF – that is specifically being referred to.

5) Plutarch does not mention the presentation by Coriolanus to Aufidius of the written peace treaty with Rome, as a prelude to his murder. The treaty represents, again, the written word: for we know that it was Shakespeare’s creation in his imagination of the Goddess of Love, as described in the printed page, that precipitated the coup of 1587.

6) The Volscian Lords’ regret at Coriolanus’ murder by Aufidius is not specifically mentioned in Plutarch. The Lords represent here, as in KJ and AWT, the faculty of reason, which is lost upon the charge

of the Boar: the coup of 1587 representing a victory of the unconscious.

- And so on. There are many other instances to be found in COR, and many of the types of legerdemains and allegorical nuances with which we have become so familiar.

CHAPTER 38

ANTONY AND CLEOPATRA

Antony and Cleopatra at first glance appears closely to follow the famous story as recounted by Plutarch. Yet there are many variations from it, whose low-level analyses in terms of the allegory are lethal against the sceptic. For textual minutiae are the flies in the balm with which the wishful thinker lies to soothe himself; and his theory is readily exploded by digging more deeply.

The most striking variation from the source is the scene on board Pompey's galley in II, vii, of the drunken carousing of Octavian, Antony, and Lepidus; - or, more specifically, the latter two, with Caesar's censoriousness bringing it all to an end. Plutarch's account has a different emphasis, "merriness" being an unremarkable early stage of the frank leglessness described in A&C, which also mentions Lepidus' hangover; while Octavian's intervention is not mentioned in Plutarch at all. This is, superficially, an excellent example of Shakespeare's "Invention of the human"; but where is the divine? Here is Balzac bulking large; but if the Mallarmé principle be lacking, then Shakespeare's claim to primacy must be weakened. This is the question which posed itself so forcibly to Tolstoy, among others, and which George Orwell's spirited riposte in his essay *Lear, Tolstoy and the Fool*,

finally failed to answer.

Yet the divine principle is demonstrably here in this scene, and to the highest possible degree: on the plane of allegory, in its depiction of the world-feeling of the Godless Puritan. For drunkenness bears, throughout the plays, the allegoric value of possession by the libido, - as we have seen in 1&2 HIV (Falstaff), TN (Sir Toby Belch), MAN (Borachio), among many others, - which the Puritan spurns. A&C is yet another theoretical look at the pathogenesis, crisis, and successful treatment, of Shakespeare's disease, from the pen of Bacon alone, as attested by the twin primary evidence of its point of view from the milieu extérieur of the clinician, and its style, with the unmistakeable Baconian predominance of blank verse, high philosophising, and linguistic and metaphorical richness. Antony's early quitting of Egypt represents Shakespeare's repudiation of his Welsh or Tavern or pseudo-Alexandrian phase of mid-adolescence; his marriage to Octavia his espousal of the sham Goddess of Puritanism (cf. Romeo's love for Juliet). Octavian (Augustus Caesar) bears throughout the plays, as Ted Hughes so memorably observed, - as patron of Virgil, creator of the archetypal Goddess rejector Aeneas, - the value of the Puritan ego (cf. the significance of Mantua, birthplace of Virgil, in R&J and elsewhere). He made a brief but telling appearance in this role in JC; and now, in A&C, at the very culmination of the tragic sequence, he moves to centre stage. Antony is the Gnostic Christ; his death in the final Act the crucifixion preceding a glorious resurrection: the reference being, of course, to the rebirth of Shakespeare in London under the tutelage of Sir Francis Bacon. Lepidus represents the Fool principle (II, v, 18), yet another in the great line which includes Feste, Yorick, and Lear's Fool: the reference being to the Court Jester as an incarnation of Lucius in Apuleius' *The Golden Ass*, whose Ass (Fool's) journey is the prelude to his most glorious rebirth into divinity.

Caesar's termination of the festivities therefore represents the Puritan's characteristic repudiation of the libido. We have seen that Pompey the Great represents the ithyphallic principle in Bacon's LLL; and now his son appears in A&C, bearing precisely the same value, as his central role in the carousing attests. Here is the

crisis: the troubled ego of Shakespeare can continue to suffer under the tyranny of the libido in negative aspect, or sweep that libido under the carpet of Puritanism, to provide a relief, ultimately delusory. This is represented by Menas' suggestion to Pompey that he cut the throats of the triumvirate, to make him sole master of the world. This was taken from Plutarch, where it was disposed of in a few words; but Bacon takes pains to emphasise it:

Menas Wilt thou be lord of the whole world? That's twice.
 [...]
 For this, Ile never follow
 Thy paul'd fortunes more...

The name "Menas" is derived from the Greek root mene-, "crescent-shaped" (cf. the Minola family in TOS); and the Latin crescere means "to grow": so that it is the temptation to tumescence that is offered, and refused. That this is indeed the allegoric value of "Menas" is confirmed by Pompey's explicit "My powers are crescent" in II, i, 13. Here also we have an instance of a recurring symbol in A&C, and FF in general (most spectacularly in 1-3HVI), as we have seen:

Lepidus Y'have strange serpents there [Egypt]?
Antony I, Lepidus.

- Where "I" for "Ay" stands for the ithyphallos. For Cleopatra is an archetypal Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, Goddess of the Invisible World: the world of the libido.

Let us now pursue closely the allegory of A&C.

ACT I

The fundamental conflict between the libido and the impulse to Puritanism is presented in the very first lines. Demetrius is the sham Christ or Alexander, as sourced from Plutarch, as we have seen in MND; his reproof of Antony's life in Egypt, the first stirrings of the Puritan ego. The various messengers represent throughout the play the faculty of thought: so that the messenger bearing news of Fulvia's death is the first assertion of Puritan reason. Fulvia

and Lucius have fought against Caesar, the meaning of which is clear:

Messenger Fulvia thy wife
 First came into the field.
Antony Against my brother Lucius?
Messenger I: but soon that war had end,
 And the time's state
 Made friends of them.

- Where Fulvia is Queen of Hell, a Cleopatra-analogue, and Lucius the ithyphallos, the reference being to ass-phase Lucius in *The Golden Ass*. This basic conflict is stated again in the victories of the Parthians in Asia: the famous Parthian dart being here yet another ithyphallic symbol. Enobarbus represents the libido; his later death the victory over that principle by the ego-in-transformation (early London-phase Shakespeare). We recall here the final subjugation of Kate in *TOS*, as well as the half-starved dog in Albrecht Dürer's *Melencolia I* (fig.1), and Don Quixote's skeletal nag Rosinante. Consistently with this value, he argues against Antony's quitting of Egypt.

The letter which Caesar reads in I, iv, represents, of course, the printed page; Antony's dalliance described therein, the invisible world portrayed in the book – say, the seduction scene in Milo's house in *The Golden Ass*. Caesar's censoriousness is that of the Puritan; his reproof of Lepidus for countenancing Antony in Egypt, the Puritan's characteristic attitude to the Ass or Fool principle. The subject will later be forced to take the Ass-journey against his will (the battle of Actium: the coup which struck Shakespeare in 1587, the "charge of the Boar"); and we recall the colophon to Spengler's masterpiece: 'Ducunt fata volentem, nolentem trahunt': "Fate leads him who would embrace it, drags him who would deny it". This is the point of the soothsayer's predictions in I, ii.

The "I" symbol again instantiates, utterly consistently with its allegoric value:

¹ Robert Graves, *The White Goddess*.

Cleopatra ...Met'st thou my posts [to Antony]?

Alexas I madam, twenty several messengers.

Why do you send so thick?

This is the thought of the Queen of Hell, as immanent in the Goddess of Love (say, Fotis in *The Golden Ass*), exciting the libido. The episode of the pearl – sent by Antony as gift to Cleopatra - was an invention *de novo* of Bacon's: its white sphericity symbolising the radiant moon, age-old symbol of the visible world, which the Puritan would impose on the invisible, to deny it. Yet the dark and radiant moons are an indivisible unit: hence the sequent marriages of Kate (dark moon: invisible world) and Bianca (radiant moon: visible world) Minola in TOS.

ACT II

Pompey's man Varrius is a reference to the renowned librarian and scholar Marcus Terentius Varro (cf. MFM IV, v), to make the association again between the *ithyphallos*, as a threat to the Puritan, and the printed page. The subject confronts his libidinous self (Antony's meeting with Caesar). The libido is suppressed:

Lepidus But small to greater matters must give way.

Enobarbus Not if the small come first.

Lepidus Your speech is passion: but pray you stir
 No embers up.

None of this appears, needless to say, in Plutarch. Antony's General Ventidius, who makes his first appearance at this meeting, represents Nature - conveyed by the written word - as misconceived by the Puritan, as sundered from the Her invisible component ("...thou wilt write to Antony": III, ii, 33). Ventidius' commission against the Parthians (Puritan's assault against the *ithyphallic* principle) will be granted after the arrangement of Antony's marriage to Octavia, the sham Goddess of Puritanism (cf. Romeo's love for Juliet, after his disappointment with Rosalinde, a Fulvia- analogue).

A fascinating feature of the FF A&C is the substitution of a large, clearly formed "g" for "d" in "Ventidius", to form "Ventigius", not

once but twice after the first “Ventidius”, to indicate that it may not be typographical error. We have noted in TimA and elsewhere the playwright’s mastery of the Druidic tree-alphabet; and the significance of this legerdemain is also to be found therein, where “D” is letter of the oak, tree of the midsummer month, and “G” (for “Gort”) that of the ivy in its flowering season, from September 30th to October 27th, when the boar of winter makes its first charge to shatter the peace of summer: and Gort is in fact specifically named as the month of the “ruthless boar” in the Druidic Song of Amergin.¹ The meaning of the substitution is therefore that the Puritan reasoning ego, arrested in fixity as it contemplates the written word, is to be supplanted by the tyranny of the negative libido, rushing to fill the void (the “charge of the Boar”). This D’G sequence will be extended in a remarkable way in Act IV.

Agrippa, the matchmaker, represents the principle of psychic repression, an allocation supported by the root “-grip-”: his later bonhomie with Enobarbus, the expulsion of the libido from Puritan consciousness. It is the soothsayer, once again, who minds Antony of the intention to leave Caesar (end of Puritan phase). The libido is neutralised, as the ego, recoiling in fear from the Faustian dimension, finds appeasement in the embrace of the sham Goddess (entry of Mardian the eunuch into Cleopatra’s presence; Cleopatra’s drawing of a knife, and haling the messenger away; the messenger returning in peace). The Enobarbus and Pompey principles are akin:

Pompey I know thee now...
[...]
I enjoy thy plainness,
It nothing ill becomes thee.
Aboard my galley, I invite you all.

The long dialogue of Enobarbus and Menas signifies the crescence of libido.

ACT III

This Act will see the “charge of the Boar” – the irruption of the libido into the Puritan ego which had denied it – represented in the

battle of Actium. It is prefigured in the first scene, with Ventidius refusing to pursue the fleeing Parthians (Puritan reason failing to “think away” the ithyphallos). Enobarbus and Agrippa bid farewell (lifting of suppression of libido). The sham Goddess speaks to the Puritan, though not to his suppressed libidinous side (Octavia whispering in Caesar’s ear, out of hearing of Antony and Enobarbus). The Puritan now reads the erotic passage on the fateful day (Shakespeare reading Apuleius in 1587) and perceives with the force of lightning the Queen of Hell beneath the surface of the sham Goddess, whence She was never caged, as the Puritan had trusted in his delusion (messenger coming to Cleopatra, to whom he describes in detail Octavia’s appearance).

Right on cue, Antony announces to Octavia that he is leaving her; and Enobarbus and Eros appear together, the latter’s allegoric value needing no further illumination. The libidinous aspect of the subject surging into dominance as he reads is represented by Antony in the orchard (cf. MAN, 2HVI IV, x, and elsewhere for other instances of this symbolism of the orchard or garden). Enobarbus adduces the horse symbol (of the libido) in reference to Antony, the reference being, as always, to the Socratic metaphor in Plato’s Phaedrus. He begs Antony to fight by land: for this is where the cavalry will be stationed. The “I” symbol appears again, right where it should:

Enobarbus So hath my lord dared him to single fight.

Camidius I, and to wage this battle...

- And later:

Enobarbus I, are you thereabouts? Why then goodnight indeed.

The length of the sea/land dispute as preamble to the battle is significant. Enobarbus’ identification of Antony and Cleopatra as horse and mare, and his later insistence that they fight on land, where their “twelve thousand horse” will be, serves to identify the two arenas. Octavian determines to fight by sea, and orders Towrus (Taurus) his land General, not to “exceed the prescript of this scroll”. The armies of Camidius and Towrus march contrary-

wise over the stage; the sea battle of Actium begins; and Cleopatra flies, followed by Antony.

What is going on here? The scroll clearly represents the printed page. A bull (Taurus) coming westward from Asia Minor can only refer to the "Bull from the sea" of Greek myth, who carried on his back the Goddess Europa from Phoenicia to Crete. We are to imagine, on the plane of allegory, the Goddess astride the bull. Octavian's order for Taurus not to engage the enemy therefore represents the Puritan's sundering of Nature represented in the written word from that aspect of himself which might respond to Her. Yet the crossing of the armies on stage indicates that this is vain. The libido has broken through his defenses; and the immediate off-stage din of the sea battle represents the psychic turmoil which has ensued. Antony's flight after Cleopatra represents the shattering of the subject, with his libidinous and Puritan selves separating irrevocably. Yet this is to be interpreted as a Death on the Cross, with a glorious Resurrection to follow: for the name of Scarrus, who now talks with Enobarbus, is derived from the Latin *scarus*, a type of fish: the reference being to Jesus (Iesus Christos Theos: ICHTH - the root of the Greek *ichthus*, "fish": thus was the fish a secret sign of the early persecuted Christians). This rebirth is prefigured in Enobarbus' "Ile yet follow/The wounded chance of Antony, though my reason/Sits in the wind against me".

We have seen that the burial of Aaron the Moor in the final Act of TitA serves to identify him with the earth: with unrefined grossness rather than subtlety. Constance (Queen of Hell) seats herself on the ground in KJ III, i, to signify the same; and now here is Antony slumping to the ground after the defeat. The negative libido has flooded the Puritan ego, which has ever denied it, and so never dealt with it in any effective way, to remain as defenceless and resourceless as Adonis before the Boar: a rabbit in the headlights. Yet even now the recovery is adumbrated:

Cleopatra What shall we do, Enobarbus?

Enobarbus Think, and die.

² Knight and Lomas, *The Second Messiah*.

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

Cleopatra Is Anthony, or we, at fault in this?

Enobarbus Anthony only, that would make his will
 Lord of his reason.

The conflict on the level of grossness is put another way, in Antony's challenge to Caesar to meet him in single combat, with swords (ithyphalloi); but Enobarbus knows better, and questions Antony's judgement. It is all leading up to his desertion and death (libido conquered by ego-in-transformation). Thidias immediately arrives from Caesar, with the demand that Cleopatra sever herself from Antony. Thidias represents Puritan thought; and Antony's order for him to be whipped, the inauguration of the transformation of the hitherto Puritan subject (Shakespeare in the hands of Bacon in London). Antony's invective against Cleopatra is precisely cognate with Petruchio's against Kate in TOS, both signifying the subduing of the Faustian dimension, realm of the libido. Again, this is characteristic of Bacon and his impulse toward control and closure, as is manifest also in the final couplet of the Baconian (rather than Shakespearean) sonnet, which is an aberration in the history of this form. The ultimate source was most plausibly the ritual of the "Knight of the Sun" degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, which warned the candidate: 'Ye who have not the power to subdue passion, fly from this place of truth'.² Appeasement gathers (Antony's reconciliation with Cleopatra).

Much is resumed in the phrase "my sad Captains" (III, xiii, 222). We have seen that the Captain who carries the death warrant to the imprisoned Lear and Cordelia in KL represents the faculty of ideation; and so here; while "sad" is a reference to "inspired melancholy" (cf. Melancholy Jacques in AYLI), which the new spirit of Renaissance Neoplatonism or Christian Cabalism recognised as a precondition of the highest spiritual and practical achievement.³ "Inspired melancholy" involves perceiving anew the invisible world – finally, the will - which lies beneath the surface of the visible; or, as Schopenhauer would have put it, transforming ideas into Platonic Ideas. This involved, for Shakespeare, understanding the libido, then Nature Herself, as negatively conceived in his Puritan error, to be at the bottom of his malady. Bacon puts this all

beautifully:

Cleopatra Call all his noble captains to my Lord.

Antony Do so, we'll speak to them,
 And to night Ile force
 The wine peep through their scars...

- Where wine bears here, as always, the value of the libido.

ACT IV

Antony takes his leave of his servingmen, begging them to stay with him but two hours more, that night, when they will drink cheerily as before. This brings them, and Enobarbus, to tears; which prompts Antony to modify his request, adding that they will "burn this night with torches". This episode was mostly taken from Plutarch, with Bacon adding the crucial touch of the torches. Enobarbus and the servitors represent the libido; their sadness is a reference, again, to "inspired melancholy". The ego-in-transformation will now bring the illumination of reason (the torches) to bear on the libido, which will remove it as a problem.

It is above all the visual imagination, newly brought into play after its long suppression by the Puritan ego, which will effect the healing, in its stimulation by the written word, that foremost of the Musical arts, as broadly defined by Socrates in the early pages of Plato's Republic. This is ever the allegoric value of music in the plays (cf. Bianca's music lessons in TOS). Bacon puts this again in a beautiful and memorable way, in the next scene, where the Watch (the visual imagination, as always: cf. the final scene of R&J) is disposed about the stage, and hears music coming from below ground (written word illuminating the Faustian dimension). The victory of Antony in his battle with Caesar will signify a continuation of the tyranny of the libido:

2 Soldier ...and if tomorrow
 Our navy thrive, I have an absolute hope
 Our landmen will stand up.

³ Robert Graves, *ibid.*

- Where “stand” bears, as always, the value of tumescence (remembering that the land army has been identified with the libido). Thus does Antony call upon Eros and Cleopatra to help arm him: whereas it is his flight from Caesar, and disarming, and dismissal of Eros, and his suicide, that will represent the final victory over Puritanism, with its tragic sequela of the tyranny of the libido. The battle will be portrayed initially as victory for Antony (and Eros), to make absolutely clear the point of the defeat: the two phases being separated by the death of Enobarbus (victory over libido).

Here is a beautiful piece of symbolism, which illustrates once again Bacon’s mastery of the Druidic tree alphabet:

Scarrus I had a wound here that was like a T,
 But now ‘tis made an H.

“T” stands for Tinne, the holly, which flowers in July. Its month was 10th July to 5th August, the first after the midsummer month of Duir (“D”), which included 24th June, the summer solstice. It has long been recognised that the crucifixion of Christ was taken over by Christianity from the ancient pagan religions; and the letter “T” is itself symbolic of the cross on which the sacred king of summer was sacrificed at the end of his reign.³ Similarly, the Greek tau, “τ”, represents in the esoteric tradition the Cross of the Gnostic Christ. Here it symbolises, however, the death of the Puritan ego, whose ascendancy is identified with the month of Duir (cf. the central “d” in the Ventidius, as explained above). So far so good. “H” stands for Uath (Greek breathing), the whitethorn or hawthorn or may, which flowers in May. This was considered a month of purification in Britain as in Greece, and there was a general abstention from love-making, which led to its being considered an unlucky month for marriage. The well-known maypole feast, and general orgiastic character of this month, was a later introduction of the second Belgic invaders of the 1st century BC. Uath was therefore the month of chastity: which corresponds precisely with the death of Enobarbus principle in the ego-in-transformation. There is thus a clear

sequence from VentiDius (height of Puritanism)'VentiGius ("charge of boar")'T (crucifixion of the Christ-figure)'H (his resurrection): a golden thread, exquisitely crafted and beautifully woven into the fabric of A&C.

The battle is lost. Antony rejects Cleopatra, and repeatedly calls for Eros, who does not come. The ego is full steam ahead on the way to healing. Cleopatra deceives him into thinking she is dead: which, on the plane of allegory, she indeed is. Mardian the eunuch represents the Puritan subject vis-à-vis the Goddess; which odd couple are now divorced:

Antony	Unarm Eros, the long days task is done,	
	And we must sleep... Go...	exit Mardian
	...From me awhile	exit Eros

The suicide of Eros, closely followed by that of Antony, needs no comment. Antony's death is to be interpreted like Lear's, as representing the passing of the old dispensation into the new, of broadly Gnostic nobility.

ACT V

We have seen that Diomedes in T&C represents the Boar; and so here. Bacon takes advantage of his mention at this point by Plutarch to depict the ego's victory over it. Diomedes comes upon the dying Antony, who immediately calls for his Guard, and orders them to take him to Cleopatra, who is shortly herself to die. The Boar charges, in other words, but is stopped short by the reborn ego's new resources (Guard), of the Hermetic or Neoplatonic or Christian Cabalist tradition, whose wisdom he has acquired through the faculties of reason and the imagination acting on the Gnostic written word – Apuleius, say, or Giorgi's *De harmonia mundi*, or Cornelius Agrippa's *De occulta philosophia*. This will be the allegoric meaning of Cleopatra's asp-death: the serpent being, in spite of its traduction by the Pauline Church, an immemorially ancient symbol of wisdom. The fatal asp will be brought by a clown, who is not named as such in Plutarch: to identify once more the Fool principle with the getting of wisdom. The updrawing of Antony to the tower is a powerful and beautiful reference to nothing less

first play of FF:

Caesar Go with me to my tent, where you shall see
How hardly I was drawn into this war,
How calm and gentle I proceeded still
In all my writings. Go with me, and see
What I can show in this.

- "In all my writings" being particularly remarkable, albeit retrospective. There is no doubt that it is the written word that is being referred to, as precipitator of the coup of 1587. This will be the story of Shakespeare's (and Bacon's) telling. Bacon's technique is now, as so often, to return to square one, to encapsulate the transformation that is being undergone. Antony has already advised Cleopatra to trust only Proculeius. This was taken from Plutarch, and emphasised by Bacon: for the ego-in transformation must trust to the process of rational thought, in which the visual imagination is paramount. The ego thinks on the invisible world, which threatens to plunge him into torment, as of old (Proculeius agreeing with Cleopatra on her retention of Egypt, which stands here for the Faustian dimension). Now the new resources – of the Christian Cabalist or Neoplatonic or Hermetic tradition - are brought into play, and the underworld is engaged and brought under control, as the Guard apprehends Cleopatra, who now threatens suicide (transformation of Queen of Hell: cf. death of Juliet in R&J). Dolabella enters; Proculeius is recalled to Rome, to the allegorical purpose of highlighting the victory over inner torment (transfer of Cleopatra to guard of Dolabella). The subject acknowledges the suffering of his breakdown as a Fall necessary for his Resurrection: hence the new-found sympathy of Dolabella for Cleopatra; and she will say "I shall remain your debter".

Cleopatra's kneeling, then rising before Caesar, is a familiar sign of grossness transforming into subtlety (see above). Now we return to square one, for another vignette on the same theme. The Puritan thinks to have conquered the Faustian dimension, but this remains a delusion, the Goddess of that realm retaining her power,

to be manifest, in the life of Shakespeare, as the “charge of the Boar” (Caesar’s negotiation with Cleopatra to hand over her riches, and abjure suicide; the discovery that she has kept some wealth back, at which Caesar winks). By the acquisition of Faustian wisdom (asp-transformation of Queen), which must entail a degradation from the high summer of Puritan reason (Clown as guardian of asp), the ego has gained insight into his own condition, and is now protected against the “charge of the Boar” (last lines belonging to Dolabella, then Caesar and the Guard). Shakespeare himself had a somewhat different tale to tell, of course, in which the Boar continues to feature, although largely distusked (see especially T&C).

CHAPTER 39

PERICLES

It of the highest importance to the understanding of Pericles to appreciate that the storm which leads to Thaisa's landing in Ephesus, and Pericles' safe return to Tyre, having left Marina in the care of Cleon and Dionyza at Tharsus, is precisely cognate with the tempest that first drove Prospero to his isle in TT. The storm represents here the brainstorm which rescued Shakespeare from the pit of hell after the breakdown of 1587: the furious action of the reasoning mind to overcome the tyranny of the unconscious, - more broadly, the invisible world, - which had been suppressed and ignored by the Puritan ego, caged as the Boar in the bars of the feeble Puritan world-view, and primed and ready to charge in to fill the vacuum. The instinct towards this healing is first announced in sonnet 145, where Shaksper takes an anguished farewell of his wife, on the eve of his flight to the metropolis, there to seek a *vita nuova*. The storm would continue for "two years and more", as the last lines of MAF tell us (his Melancholy Jacques phase); after which he would commence writing (Orlando phase), and feel himself to be cured. The assumption by Pericles of the kingship of Pentapolis after the death of Simonides, marks the inception of Shakespeare's Orlando phase, Simonides being a poet of renown of Periclean Athens: yet another example of the playwright's - Bacon's (generally) or Shakespeare's (perhaps here) - extensive symbol-mining of Plutarch.

There can be no doubt, on the basis of style and content, that Pericles was written entirely by Shakespeare: an allocation which is supported by its exclusion from FF, which was compiled by Sir Francis Bacon as a record of his investigations into psychiatry and the Puritan error, and a memorial of his greatest writing, to form Part IV of *Instauratio Magna*. For the same reason was MAF omitted, although both it and PER deal with the same theme as FF;

whereas MAN, predominantly Shakespearean, but with a small but significant Baconian component, was included. The quantum jump in quality from the first two Acts of PER to the remainder is striking; and the critics' conclusion that the former were resurrected by Shakespeare from his incunabula, as a prelude to the newly composed Acts III-V, seems to be correct.

What has not been recognised, however, is that Acts I-II form a perfect unity in themselves: so that there is no need to postulate the destruction of an earlier latter part. Pericles' marriage to Thaisa, daughter of Simonides, at the close of Act II, represents Shakespeare's new acknowledgement of the Goddess Nature per medium of the written word (Simonides principle), under the guidance of Sir Francis Bacon (Melancholy Jacques phase). The Antiochan episode of incest and Pericles' decline of the hand of the Princess, represents the ego's association of sin with the Goddess of Love-Queen of Hell (Grail Queen) which prevailed at the inception of Shakespeare's London phase; Pericles' enrichment of Tharsus, under King Cleon and Queen Dionyza, the new acknowledgement of the libido in the reasoning mind of Shakespeare-in-healing ("Dionyza" gives the clue); Pericles' marriage to Thaisa, his subsequent acknowledgement of the wholeness and sanctity of Nature at the root of all. Simonides' gift of a ring to him (V, iii) characterises PER as yet another Ring saga, and Thaisa as its Ring/Grail Queen. Helicanus (from the Greek helios, "sun") bears the value of the visual imagination; the Tyrean lords the faculty of reason (cf. the lords in KJ): their actuation of Pericles' flight to Tharsus, the primacy of these faculties in the ascent to Gnostic nobility (cf. HAM III, iii, 101; and the many other references throughout the plays).

The earlier PER can therefore be dated with reasonable precision to the year 1589. Shakespeare in truth returned to square one at beginning of Act III, with the purpose of extracting and highlighting the flies in the ointment of the idealised outcome described in the earlier Acts: the "charge of the Boar" which continued to assail him in his London phase, - albeit with far less disastrous results, - and which was linked in a vital way to his creativity (Orlando phase). Acts III-V are thus to be twinned with T&C, whose painful and intimate subject matter similarly points

unequivocally to the hand of Shakespeare (with the philosophically charged speeches of the Greek nobles undoubtedly courtesy of Bacon).

Much ink has been spilt over the question of Shakespeare's choice of the name of his hero. It should come as not the slightest surprise to you to learn that the answer is fact to be found in Plutarch, whose *Life of Pericles* describes several startling analogies to the life of William Shakespeare. The identification of Pericles' campaign against the island of Samos with Shakespeare's battle against the negative libido (the Boar), is suggested by the startling description by Plutarch of the *samaena*, the boat of the Samians, which had a boar's head design for its prow. Pericles first subdued the Samians (Shakespeare's Puritan phase), then complacently weakened his navy there, upon which they successfully revolted ("charge of the Boar" of 1587). Pericles now returned to wall the city in, and besiege them, his chief engineer being one Artemon, who was lame (as was Shakespeare, as Ted Hughes compellingly argued: and see here especially Claudius, "the limper", in HAM). The Samians are mentioned by Aristophanes as "a lettered people" (the printed page, almost certainly Apuleius' *The Golden Ass*, as descriptive of an act of erotism, as precipitator of the coup of 1587: cf. especially MAN). Pericles' wife was the courtesan Aspasia (a Goddess of Love-Queen of Hell), who was renowned for her political wisdom (cf. asp-death of Cleopatra). She was believed to have incited Pericles to the Samian campaign (Queen of Hell driving flight into Puritanism: cf. role of Margaret in 3HVI, I, iii, wherein the beheading of York marks the moment of birth of the Puritan ego). Pericles is earlier noted for his abstention from banqueting and merriment at the homes of his friends (Shakespeare's repudiation of his Tavern phase of mid-adolescence, and flight into Puritanism). The allegoric value of the name "Pericles" therefore represents the product of one of the earliest shafts dug by Bacon-Shakespeare into the rich symbolic lode of Plutarch's *Lives of the Noble Greeks and Romans*.

The Goddess Nature reborn into the ego-in-healing of Shakespeare, under the regime of intensive reading imposed by Sir Francis Bacon from 1587-9, is represented by Thaisa, daughter of Simonides; Bacon himself, or more generally the typical Hermetic

magus, by Ceremon of Ephesus, his name being derived from the Greek root *keram-*, which pertains to anything to do with pottery (whence “ceramic”). Thus does *keramos* mean potter’s earth or clay, or anything made from it. It is the Earth-Goddess Thaisa Whom the potter Ceremon has fashioned, the Goddess with Her roots in the invisible world, the polar opposite to the rootless travesty enshrined by Puritanism. The name of Ceremon’s man Philemon is formed from the Greek *philo-*, “I love”, and the root *mon-*, which always pertains to solitariness (whence “monad”). Philemon bears the value of Shakespeare’s love of solitary reading in his early London phase.

We have seen in T&C that Shakespeare continued to be afflicted by “charges of the Boar” throughout his creative life: the blind libido in negative mantle irrupting his solitary meditations, and intense visualisations, from the wound of which he would find a cure in creativity. This is represented in T&C by the victory of Achilles (libido) over Hector (Shakespeare in studious mode), bringing Ajax (creative mode) in his train; and in PER by the betrayal of Marina to a brothel, after her attempted murder by Leonine (cognate with Leontes, Posthumus Leonatus, &c, as the Goddess-rejector, an element of which remained constitutive to Shakespeare’s psyche during his London phase, despite the remarkable success of his healing). We may imagine him poring over Plutarch perhaps, or *De harmonia mundi*, or a philosophical tract of Bacon’s, visualising intensely in a Classical way, when his meditations are irrupted by the blind libido. Here in PER we have that libido (Pandar, reprised from T&C), the Queen of Hell (Bawd) and the *ithyphallos* (Boult). Yet there is a crucial difference, in that Marina retains her chastity, and turns her virtue back on her captors in a most remarkable way. T&C is suffused by an atmosphere of venereal disease and decay – “seething” being the mot juste; and we recall the final two sonnets, which show unequivocally that Shakespeare at one stage contracted a disease of this sort. Whereas Marina does not succumb, and comes to be a tutor to the nobles of Mytilene, giving the gold she receives to,

¹ Baigent and Leigh, *The Elixir and the Stone*.

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

CHAPTER 40

THE WINTER'S TALE

The consensus is that *Pericles* was composed in 1610 and performed in 1611; and we have established, on the basis of its style and content, and the secondary evidence of its exclusion from the FF, that it was written entirely by Shakespeare. The *Winter's Tale* as allegory is entirely consistent with this scenario: for it too dates to those years, and its style and content are predominantly Baconian. TWT deals, like its kindred plays, with the principles involved in the pathogenesis, crisis, and successful treatment by Bacon of the acute anxiety/depression neurosis which had stricken down Shakespeare in 1587, after eight years of enthrallment by Puritanism. Thus it is thematically of a piece with the other plays of the tragic sequence, - with the exception of *Hamlet*, - which also end in the resurrection of London phase Shakespeare into glory, and does not represent a departure from the great line of the tragedies. The great innovation in PER, TWT, and CYM, is not in theme – Death and Resurrection - but in technique, with the rebirth of the Goddess, on which that of the subject depends, being depicted epiphanically. This is likely to have been suggested to Bacon or Shakespeare by the legend of Trithemius, the renaissance magus who was said to have gratified the Holy Roman Emperor with a vision of his dead wife. John Dee was an ardent admirer of Trithemius, and was almost certainly the medium for the transmission of his work into Elizabethan England.¹ In TWT we are now inside the mind of the subject, and can participate in his miraculous healing: an empathy which will be magnified in CYM, as this new technique is taken to its perfection.

Let us examine the main characters of TWT:

1) *Leontes* Yet another “lion” in FF, where it bears always the value of Shakespeare as (mostly Puritan) Goddess-rejector: the Greek *leontes* being the first-person nominative plural of *leon*,

⁴ Baigent and Leigh, *ibid*.

“lion”. The reference is most plausibly, as we have seen (Ch. 23), to the lion slain by Samson on his way to a tryst with the Philistine girl in Judges 14. Remarkably, he returns the next day to find a swarm of bees and a honeycomb in its mouth, from which he eats, later giving some to his parents, without informing them of its provenance. Bacon mentioned this episode in a petition to the House of Lords.² The lion is Puritan Shakespeare; Samson on his way to the girl, the real Shakespeare about to enage the Goddess (Nature divinised), on which will be predicated his psychic rebirth, at the hands of Bacon; the honey, the healing balm of the wisdom of FF, as distilled from the destruction of the Puritan ego of Shakespeare (killing of lion); Samson’s parents, the reading public of future generations, who will largely remain in ignorance of the true nature of FF as allegory.

2) Hermione The visible or phemonenal world, which is as good as dead in the mind of the Puritan Goddess-rejector, having been sundered from its invisible, underworld component, represented here by

3) Perdita - another Queen of Hell-Grail Queen in the plays, and therefore cognate with Kate in TOS. Her name means, of course, “lost”, from the Latin, for it is its repudiation of the Faustian dimension that is the fatal flaw in Puritanism. Just as the marriage of Kate and Petruchio precedes that of Bianca and Lucentio (acknowledgement of Nature’s Faustian dimension creating visible world anew in the ego-in-healing), so does the renewal of Hermione-Leontes in TWT follow the marriage of Perdita with

4) Florizel - who represents the libido, more broadly the unseen world, as property of the reader. This is confirmed by the identification (V, i, 117) of Florizel with

5) Mamilius – the Boar (libido in negative aspect). Mamilius Tusculanus was the son-in-law of Tarquinius Superbus, which kinship (cf. The Rape of Lucrece) along with the root “tusc[k]-” signifies this allegoric value. Thus is Mamilius a favourite of Hermione and the Queen of Hell (“Yet black brows, they say...”: II, i, 7 ff.) on whom she depends. The winter’s tale in question is that whispered by Mamilius in the ear of Hermione, out of hearing of Leontes. It is the story of the libido, more broadly the world unseen below the surface of things, the acknowledgment of which was the

central pillar of Bacon's philosophy (see especially Ch.10), yet to which the Puritan (and they still abound in our times) remains deaf. The libido described in the written word, to which the reader's unconscious resonates (Florizel and Mamilius principles), is represented by

6) Autolycus - the thief from Homer, as adduced by Socrates in his discussion of justice in the early pages of Plato's Republic (cf. the outlaws in TGV). Socrates' point was that criminality is not always black and white: that those acting outside the law may in truth be benefiting their society. The vividly erotic passage of Fotis' seduction of Lucius in Apuleius' *The Golden Ass*, anathema to the Puritan, was almost certainly the trigger of Shakespeare's breakdown in 1587. More broadly, Bacon is almost certainly referring here to the book-burnings and numerous autos-da-fe being enacted at that time, a century or so after the inauguration of the Christian Cabalist movement in Florence (cf. AWT), with the reaction now firmly set in. This value of Autolycus will become apparent in the analysis of the shearing-party scene (IV, iv) below.

7) Paulina Can only be a reference to Paulinus of Nola (born c. AD 353), about fifty of whose letters survive, along with thirty three poems. The letters were addressed mainly to Ausonias and Augustine, and their subjects were, like those of the poems, Christian in nature. This Christianity is, as adapted by Bacon, not Pauline, but Cabalist or broadly Gnostic.³ Paulina represents the written word, vector of the garden of phenomena (Hermione) and the soil from which it grows (infant Perdita, presented by Paulina to Leontes, and rejected by him). It is her home in which Hermione is kept alive; her stone from which the "statue" is carved. She is married to

8) Antigonus - who is identified firmly as a Ring Lord, yet another in the plays: "...a handkerchief and rings of his that Paulina knows" (V, ii, 64): where the handkerchief represents, like Desdemona's in Othello, and all the other kerchiefs and napkins in the plays, the Goddess as Woman, the reference being to menstruation. He represents the principle of broadly Gnostic reason, which Bacon associates with the written word (Paulina). It is therefore the

³ Baigent et al., *The Holy Blood and the Holy Grail*; Knight and Lomas, *The Hiram Key*; Uriel's Machine; *The Second Messiah*.

Goddess described in the written word Who is identified here as the Ring or Grail Queen, guardian of the Holy Grail itself, which bore in the esoteric tradition the value of the womb which nourished the Christ: a powerful statement indeed of the nature of Leontes' rebirth. His encounter with the bear in Bohemia is of immense significance (see below). His name was taken, not from Antigonus in Plutarch's *Life of Dion*, but from Antigone in the *Life of Alexander*, who went to Alexander with news of a plot against his life by her lover Philotas. Antigone going from Philotas to Alexander therefore corresponds to Antigonus travelling from Sicily to Bohemia, where the latter enshrines the Alexander principle (see below). The story of Alexander evidently was close to the surface of Bacon's mind during the writing of TWT (V, i, 47).

9) Camillo The Gnostic written word. The name was taken from the Renaissance magus Giulio Camillo, a great influence on Bruno.⁴ Thus is he assailed by Leontes for failing to impugn Hermione (Puritan perversion of interpretation of written word); thus does he exile himself to Bohemia; and thus is he present with Polixenes at the shearing party (see below). It is said of him and Leontes reborn: "There was speech in their dumbness, language in their very gesture" (V, ii, 13). It is he who gives Florizel the written instructions before his return to Sicily.

10) Cleomenes and Dion These two bring the word of the oracle at the Temple of Apollo at Delphi to Leontes, which he rejects, yet afterwards is forced to accept. Plutarch tells how Cleomenes, a philosopher, assumed the throne of Sparta after the death of Leonidas ("son of the lion"), and determined to remedy the degeneracy he found there. His appropriateness to the TWT allegory is therefore plain. For the latter we must refer to Plutarch's *Life of Dion*, wherein the allegoric value of Polixenes is also to be found. The *Life of Dion* provides, in fact, the principal framework of TWT. Therein we read that Dion of Syracuse (in Sicily) was a philosopher, student of Plato, and renowned for his wisdom. His conflict with the Syracusan tyrants Dionysius the Elder and Younger forms the substance of the account. Dion's attempt to educate the latter into the ways of benevolence and sound

⁶ Peter Blake and Paul S. Bleazard, *The Arcadian Cipher*.

⁷ Laurence Gardner, *Bloodline of the Holy Grail; Genesis of the Grail Kings*.

judgement are thwarted, and he is sent into exile. Eventually he turns all his thoughts to war. A storm drives his fleet to the coast of Africa, whence he is driven by a south wind to southern Sicily. Synalus, a Carthaginian who controls that region, gives him aid. Letters from Syracuse to Dionysius, warning him of the threat, are stolen by a wolf. Finally, Dion prevails, and Syracuse is rid of the tyranny. This parallels, of course, the ascent of the Puritan tyranny in the ego of Shakespeare, and its eventual extirpation through the ministry of Sir Francis Bacon and the Christian Cabalist tradition. The storm is cognate with those in PER and TT, and elsewhere, as representing the brainstorm of Gnostic reason which assailed the Puritan stranglehold on the ego. Florizel describes just this African episode in V, i, where "Smalus", the King, father of Perdita (according to Florizel's tale), may plausibly be identified with "Synalus" in Plutarch. Wind direction is always meaningful in the plays; and the south wind is appropriately linked here to the Queen of Hell. The lost letters represent, of course, the written word as perversely interpreted by the Puritan.

11) Polixenes Dionysius the Elder (see above) had a sister Theste, whose husband Polyxenus became an enemy of the tyrant, and fled into exile, leaving his wife behind. This identifies the tyrant with Leontes; and further, on the plane of allegory, Hermione as wife also of Polixenes: the phenomenal world, properly honoured by Christian Cabalism, which the Puritan desecrates, as based on the Faustian dimension (Leontes' impeachment of Hermione).

12) Emilia - servant to Hermione. She represents the principle of wisdom, as sourced by Bacon from Plutarch's Life of Paulus Aemilius, whose clan was said to have derived from one Pythagoras the Wise (cf. TitA I). She corresponds therefore to the Goddess Sophia of the Gnostic religion, whose female gnosis is the Holy Spirit Herself, the "Spirit [or rather 'wind'] that moved on the face of the waters" (Ophelia on the brook).

What exactly is going on in the shearing party in IV, iv? We have encountered this scenario before. The subject encounters an erotic scene described in a book (in the case of Shakespeare, almost

⁸ Robert Graves, *The White Goddess*.

⁹ Baigent and Leigh, *ibid*.

certainly *The Golden Ass*: see above). This is represented by the presence of Camillo, and the printed songs of Autolycus, which he sells to the party, along with a vast amount of other merchandise: money indicating here, as always in the plays, the power of a principle. The reader imagines the love scene; and his libido resonates to it, and rises (incipient betrothal of Florizel and Perdita). The Boar shows his gruesome mien, tusks glinting in the twilight (dance of the satyrs); and the reader recoils in fear and disgust (Polixenes' rupturing of the betrothal). In Polixenes' hostility toward Florizel-Perdita, Bacon is here employing the familiar technique of returning to square one, to emphasise the point, and enable the completion of the allegory in Sicily. For the psychic transformation to be accomplished - Puritan world-view to be extirpated from the ego - it will be necessary for the subject to study the works in which the unseen world is described as the inviolable substrate of Nature, and identify his libido with that described (exchange of clothes between Florizel and Autolycus; marriage of Florizel and Perdita). He is to follow, that is to say, the precept "Know Thyself", which was carved into the lintel of the Temple of Apollo at Delphi: and Cleomenes reappears right at the crucial moment (V, i, 112). To return to the party: we have met the shepherd before, as father of Joan of Arc, another Queen of Hell-Grail Queen, in 1HVI; and the value of the Clown, or Fool, yet another in the plays, needs no further illumination. The shepherd-king transition of Perdita's father parallels that in 1HVI, and has the same allegorical significance, of the growth of understanding of the invisible world in the ego of the subject-in-healing, to enable his transformation from grossness to subtlety.

The low-level analyses of the departures from the source are, as always, swift and powerful against the sceptic, as are the long-standing, seemingly intractable problems that are satisfactorily solved in light of the allegory. The most important of these in TWT are the transposition of Sicily and Bohemia as they appear in Greene's *Pandosto*; and the odd entry of the bear in Bacon's *Bohemia*.

The bear symbol had a venerable association with the Hermetic

¹⁰ Dame Frances Yates, *ibid*.

esoteric tradition, from which the Neoplatonic/Christian Cabalist and Masonic traditions derived.⁵ The bear was the sacred totem animal of Arcadia; and the name itself is derived from the Greek *arkades*, “people of the bear”. The motto of renaissance Hermetism was “*Et in Arcadia ego*”, both in its geographical sense - the sacred river Alph, vector of the underground current of Hermetism, was believed to gather in Arcady, to surface in Sicily; and allegorical, cryptic sense: for ‘*et in Arcadia ego*’ is, famously, an anagram of ‘*i tego arcana dei*’: “Begone, I conceal the secrets of God”. This is the point of the painting “*Et in Arcadia ego*” by Poussin;⁶ and Goethe, for whom his own Faust was to remain a talisman, was a member of the Hermetic Academy of Rome, and adopted the motto as the epigram of the account of his journey there (Italian Journey). The Merovingian dynasty of the Franks almost certainly had its origins in Arcadia, in the Peloponnese, via the Sicambrian Franks. There is strong evidence that Sigisbert VI, known as “Prince Ursus” (< Latin *ursus*, “bear”), and a lineal descendent of the Merovingian King Dagobert II, led an insurrection against Louis II of France in an attempt to re-establish on the throne the bloodline of Christ, to whom he believed it rightfully to belong. The Merovingians carried this bloodline; and there is an extremely strong Egyptian link with Jesus Christ.⁷

The word “*Ormus*” had great significance in the Hermetic tradition as a symbol and device. It occurs in certain Zoroastrian texts, where it symbolises the principle of light. There is a strong tradition of an heresiarch Ormus in 1st century Alexandria, that great crucible of syncretism, who conferred on his followers the symbol of the red or rose cross: the cross finally of the Knights Templar, the Order of the Garter, and of Rosicrucianism. The word is an amalgam of the French *or*, *orme*, and *ours*, meaning gold, elm, and bear, respectively. The device is framed by the letter M, which bears the value, in the collective unconscious, of the maternal bosom: hence the power of the title of Peter Robb’s recent biography of Caravaggio, simply called *M* (he has also written *Midnight in Sicily*, to suggest the Queen of Hell); and of the logo of

¹ Joseph Campbell, *Creative Mythology*.

Macdonalds, that pseudo-maternal fantasy land where no harm can possibly fall, no-one ever ages, and the food is always there on demand. It symbolised in the Middle Ages the constellation of Virgo, the mother of Christ. Gold symbolised in alchemy the end-result of the psychic transformation from baseness to nobility; while the elm tree supported the vine in the later months of the year, and hence became the alma mater of the god Dionysius.⁸

The reason for Bacon's transposition of Sicily and Bohemia from their roles in Greene's *Pandosto* has eluded the critics thus far; but it can readily be found by reference to Gnostic history. Bohemia was from 1576-1612 the country of the inspirational Hermetist Rudolf II, the Habsburg Holy Roman Emperor who had set up his court in its capital Prague. He fostered there all the activities which are characteristically associated with such exemplary centres of Hermetism as 1st and 2nd century Alexandria and 13th century Sicily: the establishment of vast libraries, the fostering of philosophers and artists, and translators of texts from Hebrew, Arabic, Aramaic and other key languages, the patronage of magi, and so on. Rudolf's court was visited by Giordano Bruno, and, remarkably, also by John Dee, whose own library was almost certainly the principal conduit of the Gnostic inheritance into Elizabethan England. Had Sir Francis Bacon visited there on his Grand Tour aet.14-18? It seems highly likely. Bohemia therefore provided the perfect home for the still-ensouled Polixenes. Palermo, the capital of Sicily, had been an even more perfectly Hermetic centre under the Hohenstaufen Holy Roman Emperor Friedrich II, who commenced his reign in 1220. Like Rudolf II, Friedrich conflicted fiercely with Rome, which resulted in his excommunication in 1227. It was here, in the poetry contests he sponsored, that the sonnet was born. He established the University of Naples, one of the first in Europe, and his medical school at Salerno was far ahead of its time. By Elizabethan times, however, it had relapsed into orthodoxy, and therefore lent itself naturally to Bacon as the home of Leontes, who would lose his soul, only to recover it under the influence of Bohemia.⁹

The otherwise inexplicable episode of the devouring of

² Sir Laurence Gardner, *Realm of the Ring Lords*. See also Ch.44 for a demonstration of the Ring-Grail equivalence in Wolfram's *Parzival* as Bacon's immediate source.

Antigonus by the Bohemian bear is therefore found to be of the most fascinating significance. Antigonus represents, as we have seen, the principle of broadly Gnostic reason, derived from the engagement of the unseen world by the written word (Paulina). The point being made by Bacon is that the Gnostic tradition is sustained by the wisdom of the written word as descriptive of the unseen world, and that this wisdom is the Holy Grail, object of their Ring/Grail quest: and the Ring symbol yet again will appear most powerfully in CYM, the culmination of the predominantly Baconian group of plays. (See Ch.44 for a fuller discussion of this Ring-Grail equivalence). The bear had first seized Antigonus by the shoulder, and Autolycus too complains of his shoulder (IV, iii, 70), after the death of the former. The suspicion is that the two are related: and the Autolycus principle indeed is found to represent, on the plane of allegory, the principle of Gnostic reason reborn: for the ascent to Gnostic nobility is dependent on engagement with the outlawed Hermetic/ Neoplatonic/Christian Cabalist tradition, against which the reaction had well and truly set in by the turn of the century.¹⁰ Certainly, it had the strongest associations of guilt and sin for the still essentially Puritan Will Shaksper who had arrived in London in 1587, driven by a shadowy yet powerfully felt intuition to embark on his own Ring quest.

CHAPTER 41

CYMBELINE

The division of labour in CYM is Bacon 98%, Shakespeare 2%, approximately, as in TWT; whereas in the contemporaneous TT that proportion is about 50-50, with PER being 100% by Shakespeare (hence its omission from the First Folio). The high style of Bacon is unmistakeable; and the content of TWT and CYM accords with it, as lacking the agonising intimacy of the milieu intérieur, which was seared into the tables of Shakespeare's memory. Shakespeare was driven, having a need continually to be at work, as explicitly stated in PER V, i, 245, and TT I, ii, 180, and elsewhere, to keep his demons at bay: so that the attribution to him, rather than some other member(s) of Bacon's atelier, of, say, the gaoler episode in CYM V, gives the most plausible scenario.

CYM was Bacon's grand farewell to the works of Shakespeare. TWT was the first of his plays to incorporate the technical device of showing the rebirth of the Goddess physically, epiphanically on the stage, to enable the audience to share in the miraculous transformation of the ego, which had previously been represented indirectly or symbolically: for example, in the death of Lear-ascendancy of Edgar, or the dagger-death of Juliet. CYM takes this technique to its perfection, and becomes the non plus ultra of the allegories of redemption, in its depiction of the return from the dead of, not only the Goddess (Imogen), but the libido (Posthumus Leonatus), and the ideals of the mortal and divine aspects of Man (Guiderius and Arviragus). The Imogen-Guiderius-Arviragus triunity was undoubtedly suggested to Bacon by Helen-Castor-Pollux, the famous siblings of Greek mythology, who represent the Queen of Hell (like Imogen), and the mortal and divine aspects of Man, respectively.¹

In CYM are reprised many of the principal motifs of FF. The most important of them are:

1) The Lion "Posthumus Leonatus" should be construed as "born a lion, now after death". This is the death of Shaksper as Puritan

Goddess-rejector (Iion), to be reborn as Shakespeare into Gnostic nobility. The Lion motif most plausibly was sourced by Bacon, as we have seen (Ch.40), from the episode of Samson's killing of the lion in Judges 14.

2) Augustus Caesar The Puritan ego, as a reference to Virgil's Aeneas, who abandons Dido (= Cleopatra = Isis) on the shores of Africa: Augustus being Virgil's patron. The town of Mantua bears, as birthplace of Virgil, this same value throughout the plays. The peace concluded between Cymbeline and Augustus, in spite of the crushing victory of the former, represents Shakespeare's new understanding of his Puritan past, - the precondition of the tragedy which befell him aet.23, - and his vanquishing of it. The point being emphasised in the last lines of this last play of FF, by the soothsayer (principle of wisdom) Philarmonus ("lover of harmony"), is that the theme of the foregoing plays of Shakespeare (Cymbeline) has been, above all, the Puritan error.

3) The Ring The Ring and Grail quests are to be identified, as we have seen in AWT, where the Fisher King theme predominates in Act I, the Ring Quest thereafter. This is an ancient tradition, reaching back to Sumer and beyond; though it was most plausibly King Solomon's Ring that Bacon had in mind, as suggested here by the diamond, most likely a reference to Solomon's Schamir: the scintillating jewel being an alternative to the Ring in this tradition (cf. Tolkien's *Silmaril*).²

4) Lucius A reference, as always without exception in the plays, to the hero of Apuleius' *The Golden Ass*, who acquires, during his ass/fool phase – his harrowing of hell, like Psyche's – knowledge of the libido, more generally the unseen world, and attains thereafter to divinity. The "Caius" of Caius Lucius is to be pronounced "keys" as in the Cambridge college (Bacon had been educated, of course, at Cambridge): the point being made that familiarity with the Fool principle provides the keys to the kingdom of Gnostic nobility. Hence the role of the Court Jester; and hence also the numerous fools or clowns, such as Yorick, in the plays. Caius Lucius' alliance with the Roman (Puritan) side presented Bacon with a technical problem, which he solved by a series of adroit legerdemains (see below).

5) Milford Haven We remember that Richmond landed at

Milford in RIII, to mark the beginning of the ego's (Shakespeare's) resurrection. "Milford" combines the symbolism of the ford, which is opposed at all times in the plays to the bridge, as representing engagement with Nature rather than repudiation of Her (and Cambridge University was then, and remains, the spiritual home of Puritanism in England); and the mill, which is powered by the river (Nature) to refine the raw product, and turn the gross into subtle. "Milford" represents therefore the written word, as vector of the true Goddess rather than the sham of Puritanism, which bore the weight of Bacon's therapeutic strategy for the treatment of Shakespeare (cf. Birnam Wood, &c, &c). It is of the highest importance to appreciate that the events at Milford Haven represent the inner life of the ego-in-healing: specifically, Shakespeare in early London phase, 1587-9.

6) The napkin/handkerchief - sometimes bloodied, as here (V, i), or woven with strawberries as in OTH. This is a reference to menstruation, hence to the Goddess as Woman, Who is suppressed by Puritanism, and will surge back into the psyche to precipitate the Fall, from which a glorious Resurrection is born.

7) The sword/dagger The ithyphallos: hence the death of Posthumus' brothers with swords in their hands, at the same time as the death of their father, represents the anathematisation of this principle by Puritanism, the most powerful depiction of which is the murder of Suffolk by Sir Walter Whitmore in 2HVI IV, i. The ithyphallos stands here for the broader principle of the unseen world.

The broad lines of CYM are as follows. The Cymbeline of the early Acts is the Puritan: specifically, Shakespeare aet. 15-23. Posthumus' banishment to Rome represents the anathematisation of the libido by Puritanism: Augustus' Rome corresponding here, for example, to Mantua (birthplace of Virgil), Romeo's place of exile in R&J. Imogen's imprisonment represents, of course, the Puritan's suppression of the invisible aspect of Nature, which includes the libido. The Queen is this repudiated underworld: She is a typical negative Queen of Hell. Thus her death in the final Act will coincide with the hero's (Cymbeline's) renewal. The wager in Rome is made between Posthumus and

Iachimo, in the presence of Philario. Bacon helpfully glosses, in the final scene, “ario” as referring to the Goddess Herself; while “Iachimo” means “I cast down into hell” (see below). Iachimo in Imogen’s bed-chamber, writing down, by the light of a taper, its details, then uncovering her breast to expose the mole, represents Shakespeare reading almost certainly (cf. especially MAN) the seduction of Lucius by Fotis in *The Golden Ass*: imagining (the taper: cf. for example JC II, i, 7) the externals, from which the invisible world suddenly obtrudes as the blind libido, to shatter his defences, and precipitate the coup of 1587, that definitive moment in his life, and a turning-point for Western culture. Typically, CYM as a Bacon play does not describe the trauma of the “charge of the Boar” as Shakespeare does in such detail in, for example, RIII III-IV. Rather, we can infer the inner wound from its most grievous manifestation: Posthumus’ “double vision” (II, iv), when the loved one is perceived anew as a whore.

Imogen’s journey to Milford Haven represents the release of the unseen world into the purview of the reasoning ego, to enable its healing. Thus is she disguised as a Page, which represents here as always the written word. This corresponds to the inauguration of Shakespeare’s instruction in the Hermetic/Neoplatonic/Christian Cabalist written word (his Melancholy Jacques phase). Posthumus at Milford Haven represents Shakespeare poring over a book that Bacon has prescribed. Bacon makes the point that acknowledgement of the Faustian dimension through the written word is the foundation of the ideal of both the mortal and divine lives of Man (mutual love of Imogen and Belario-Guiderius-Argivarus). The events in the cave are therefore germane to the devouring of Antigonus by the bear in TWT. The beheading of Clothen, dressed as Posthumus, by Guiderius, represents the transformation of the negative libido by the printed page: beheading bearing here, as always in the plays, the allegorical value of psychic transformation. Imogen’s “death”, then awakening, needs no further illumination. Finally, Shakespeare is reborn into Gnostic nobility, both mortal and immortal, as the Complete Works abundantly attest.

Let us look in detail at some important characters.

1) Iachimo This name is derived from the Latin iaceo, “I cast”, “I

throw” and imus, “the lowest [depths]”. “Iachimo” therefore means “I cast down into hell”, and is cognate with “Othello”, where oth- is from the Greek rather than Latin. This is Puritan Shakespeare in breakdown mode, - the Fall that would enable his redemption, - coming across an erotic passage in a book, surrendering to libido, plunging his psyche into chaos. Iachimo and Posthumus are differentiated to enable treatment of the resurrection; whereas in OTH, which treats less fully of this phase, the Posthumus analogue does not appear.

2) Philario Formed from the Greek philo-, “I love”, and “-ario”, “a [musical] air”. Bacon glosses this “air” as referring to Imogen (V, v). Philario therefore represents that aspect of the Puritan Shakespeare which remained bound to the Faustian dimension – as a tree is to the soil which sustains it – in spite of his attempts of eight years to repudiate Her. Thus Philario is present at the wager between Posthumus and Iachimo: the first faint smell of Adonis reaching the nostrils of the lurking Boar.

3) Imogen Formed from the Latin imus, “the lowest [depths]”, and genero, “I beget”, “I bring to life” (whence “genus”, “generation”). She was “born in the depths”: a typical Queen of Hell-Grail Queen.

4) Pisanio We have seen that the ithyphallic/maypole principle is often depicted separately from the libido; and so here, where the reference is to the famous tower of Pisa. Thus does Posthumus give written instructions to him to kill Imogen: the written word inciting the ithyphallos, which destroys the sham Goddess of the Puritan, Whom he thinks to have sundered from Her underworld aspect. Pisanio’s murder of her would be cognate with Othello’s of Desdemona; or Juliet’s dagger-suicide. This technique would have been inappropriate to CYM, where the rebirth of the Goddess must be physically shown on stage. Bacon’s typically adroit solution was to introduce the poison, given by Pisanio to Imogen, but only to induce a sleep, not death. She sleeps on the literal plane; but on the allegorical, Pisanio does kill Imogen, as surely as Othello did for Desdemona: the subject being transformed forever by knowledge of the unseen world as implicit in Nature.

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

5) Belarius This character appears in Holinshed, along with his two sons; but his meaning is to be found by reference to Dr. Bellario of Padua in MOV, whom we have seen to represent the broadly Gnostic tradition (and Imogen is a Portia-analogue). So with Belarius here; but Bacon specifically identifies the “-arius” (“air”) component of his name firmly with the Queen of Hell-Grail Queen (V, v): the point being that the Gnostic tradition is characterised by its engagement with the unseen world as idea, as both Pauline Catholicism and Protestant Puritanism are not.

6) Guiderius Belarius states that he has called him “Paladour” (III, iii), then shortly after directly addresses him as “Polidore” (III, vii). The former is undoubtedly a contraction of the Spanish palabra, “word”, and oro, “gold”, with d['] meaning “of”. “Paladour” therefore means “words of gold”, and he represents the written word as vector of the Gnostic tradition. “Polidore” is a reference to Holinshed, who states that one Polydor called Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *Historia Regum Britannie* the “new history”, as opposed to Julius Caesar’s account of his conquest of Britain. The subject’s Gnostic phase will be his “new history”, as opposed to his former enthrallment by Puritanism (Caesar). This specifically refers to Shakespeare’s rebirth into Gnostic nobility in London, with Bacon as accoucheur. This transformation will be consequent on engagement with the Paladour principle. Guiderius’ younger brother is therefore

7) Arviragus - whom his father consistently calls “Cadwal”/“Cadwall”. This is a reference to Monmouth, who describes King Cadwallo – the penultimate Pendragon, in the Cymbeline line – as *nobilissimus... atque potentissimus... rex Britonum*, “the most noble and powerful of the British kings”. Fascinatingly, Monmouth relates how Cadwallo, after being taken by a storm, allied himself with the Armorican King Salomon, after which he defeated the usurping tyrant, his half-brother Edwin, and regained the throne of Britain. We have seen repeatedly (OTH, TT, &c) that the storm always represents the “brainstorm” of reason, in response to the wound of the “charge of the Boar”; while Posthumus’ diamond ring refers to King Solomon, that great figure

⁴ Baigent and Leigh, *The Elixir and the Stone*.

in the Masonic tradition. So that Bacon's choice of "Cadwall" for the name of Paladour's younger brother was exquisite and utterly apt.

8) Clothen The libido in negative aspect, as cast by Puritanism. Thus he is cognate with Posthumus in exile; and thus does his beheading in Posthumus' clothes at the hands of Guiderius represents the rebirth of the libido through the ministry of the written word.

The turning point of CYM as allegory occurs in III, i, where Lucius is warmly received by the King, who nevertheless refuses to pay tribute to Augustus. The Fool principle is being embraced by the ego-in-healing, as he begins to absorb the wisdom of the invisible word – as did Lucius in his ass-journey in *The Golden Ass* - as described in the printed page. Cymbeline will finally liberate Lucius, conquer Augustus, and agree to pay him tribute: Shakespeare's victory over Puritanism, which he and Sir Francis Bacon will bring to life again in the plays. This scene is one of those legerdemains by which Bacon resolves the allegorical conflict of Caius Lucius as friend (as sourced from Apuleius) and enemy (as allied with Puritanism (Rome)). The subject-in-healing now (III, ii) reads the printed page which had precipitated the ithyphallos, and the "charge of the Boar", and his breakdown (Pisanio querying Posthumus' letter instructing him to kill Imogen); and refers the ithyphallos to the negative Queen of Hell ('Enter Imogen') which he determines to strip of the obscene mantle with which Puritanism has perversely invested Her, by absorbing the lessons of the written word (Imogen's determination to travel to Milford Haven). The principle of Gnostic nobility is introduced in III, iii (Belarius and his sons); and immediately the subject acknowledges per medium of the written word (Guiderius principle) the invisible world as source of the libido (Imogen reading letter from Posthumus, proffered to her by Pisanio). This illustrates once again the principle of referral, which we have noted many times: the subject referring a principle described in the printed page to another underlying it. The description of the Faustian dimension in the printed page will be expressed another way by Imogen's Page disguise; its transformation from demon to divinity by her sleep

and awakening. Imogen's "Prythee away" to Pisanio, followed shortly by "Away, I prythee" III, iv) is yet another expression of the Christian Cabalist's victory over the libido (cf. the half-starved dog in Dürer's *Melencolia I* (fig1)).³ Pisanio's "I, my noble lord" in III, v, is another instance, of which there are many in this play, of "I" for "Ay" standing for the ithyphallos.

Imogen as Page gives her name as "Richard du Champ", on being discovered by Lucius after her awakening from the drugged sleep. "Richard" is a reference, of course, to the Ugly Dick principle: the negative libido, which was previously irremediably tied to the erotic scene described in the printed page (Lucius' seduction by Fotis in *The Golden Ass*); but which is now born again, as idea rather than will, the reader progressing through the seduction scene in Apuleius to Lucius' getting of wisdom, with the visual imagination predominating, without dissolution in blind libido. For "du Champ" refers, of course, to the Elysian Fields of Classical myth. Suffusing all this phase of transformation is the magic of music, which is to be taken, as always (cf. Bianca's music lessons in *TOS*), in its broad Socratic sense of reading, writing, memory, recitation, and so on, as sourced by Bacon from the early pages of Plato's *Republic*.

Lucius' "Away boy" to Imogen as they encounter the British (V, ii), is another legerdemain in response to the potential allegorical conflict: for the Faustian dimension reborn cannot be allowed to be identified with Puritanism. Yet she will remain in his service all this time, as Lucius' "Never master had/A Page so kind..." in V, v, makes clear. The narrow lane in which Belarius and the British encounter and defeat the forces of Augustus is mentioned in *Holinshed*, but emphasised at length here (V, iii): the reference being to the birth canal, in this scene of transformation and rebirth (cf. *JC II*, iv, 36: "Here the street is narrow..."). The Lord in V, v, represents the faculty of reason (cf. the lords in *KJ*); Posthumus' anger with him, the conflict of blind libido and reason: but the Lord has "put me [Posthumus] into rhyme": a beautiful touch, suggesting Shakespeare as writer (Orlando phase). Now, however, Posthumus returns to the

Roman side, as Bacon returns once again to square one. His enfranchisement by Cymbeline will represent, of course, the libido's rehabilitation by the transformed ego.

Posthumus' father Sicilius Leonatus and his mother and brothers appear to him a dream, accompanied by music, as he lies in gaol. This represents again a process of transformation, as the subject's true, pre-Puritan self reasserts itself. The name "Leonatus" was necessary for the father, to enable the allegoric value of the son: but it is Posthumus who is the true "lion". While "Sicilius" refers to Sicily as once the home of the glorious Hermetic court of Friedrich II, patron here of art, literature, philosophy, architecture, and so on, in the great magian tradition; but now, in the Elizabethan era, having long reverted to the tyranny of orthodoxy (cf. the similar significance of Sicily in TWT).⁴ The "aside" is a favourite technique of Bacon's to signify an intimate communication, which may be unavailable to the other characters on stage. This will be its final instance in FF, as Imogen as Page talks to Cymbeline out of hearing of Posthumus, Lucius, and Iachimo. Posthumus is still as Roman (libido misconceived by Puritanism), as is Lucius, for the process of empowerment of whose principle (Fool) Bacon returns to square one: "He is a Roman, no more kin to me..." (Imogen). The ego-in-transformation gets to the bottom of the pathogenesis of his breakdown (Iachimo's extended explanation of the events in Imogen's chamber). The transformation of libido (re-identification of Posthumus) coincides with the rebirth of the Faustian dimension (another "death" and awakening of Imogen, as Bacon returns yet again to square one). Now the subject attains to the mortal and immortal ideals of Man, through the ministry of the written word, as illuminative of the realm of the Queen of Hell (recognition by Cymbeline of Belarius and his sons). The printed page will continue to enshrine the Fool principle, by which the iron certainties of the ego fixed at high noon may be dissolved in knowledge of the winter of the invisible world (Imogen's enfranchisement of Lucius; her pledge to keep serving him).

⁴ Ted Hughes argues this strongly, on the basis of the final two sonnets, in SGCB.

The first word of the First Folio went, fittingly, to Shakespeare, in the words of the Master of the storm-stricken ship in TT. Now the last word lies, equally as fittingly, with Bacon, as he affirms the wisdom of FF, in its twin principal themes of the malign effects of Puritanism on the psyche and society, and the primacy of the broadly Gnostic world-view, through whose ministry the wounds of those effects may be healed. Let him have the last word here also.

Cymbeline Laud we the Gods,
 And let our crooked smokes climb to their nostrils
 From our blest altars. Publish we this peace
 To all our subjects. Set we forward: Let
 A Roman, and a British ensign wave
 Friendly together: so through Luds-Town march,
 And in the Temple of great Jupiter
 Our peace we'll ratify: seal it with feasts.
 Set on there: never was a war did cease
 (Ere bloody hands were washed) with such a
peace.

² Ted Hughes Winter Pollen.

CHAPTER 42

THE TEMPEST

It is of the highest importance to the understanding of TT to appreciate that the approach of the ship to Prospero's isle represents exactly the same threat as irrupts the King's consciousness in HVIII II, ii:

The King draws the curtain and sits reading pensively

Suffolk How sad he looks; sure he is much afflicted.

King Henry Who's there, ha?

Norfolk Pray God he be not angry.

King Henry Who's there, I say? How dare you thrust yourselves
 Into my private meditations?
 Who am I, ha?
 [...]
 Who's there? My good lord Cardinal? O my

Wolsey,

The quiet of my wounded conscience.

The King at his desk is Shakespeare in scholarly mode, poring over the works of, say, his master/doctor Sir Francis Bacon. He is visualising, understanding, memorising; when suddenly the libido, as still cloaked in negative mantle, breaks in to disturb his peace (another "charge of the Boar"). Suffolk is the ithyphallic principle (more broadly, the unseen world) as blind will, Norfolk that principle as idea: the Goddess of Love taking form in his imagination. This "charge of the Boar" is, of course, the same (in quality, though certainly not quantity) as effected the breakdown of his twenty-fourth year (RIII III, iv), when he had been under the sway of the Protestant Puritan sect for some eight years (as given in the Induction to TOS). HVIII makes it clear that this had been a repeated phenomenon during Shakespeare's creative life in London, consummated principally by auto-erotism: "I... left him [the King] at primero/With the Duke of Suffolk" (Gardiner: V, i, 6).

Yet the earlier *Troilus and Cressida* (c. 1603) makes it clear that at one stage this budding erotism had bloomed in the arms of a courtesan, or even common tart, to leave him with a venereal disease.¹ Perhaps this had frightened the life out of him, to remove henceforth this course as an option. T&C treats the “charge of the Boar” (assault by the Greeks on the Trojan camp) as a continuing problem, without as yet any resolution in sight (victory of Achilles). In contrast, in the late HVIII and TT the libido fails to triumph, and Shakespeare finally makes his peace with the Boar: an appeasement that could only come with the foresaking of his creative life, the nourishing springs of which had by now run dry (the character of Sands in HVIII), and return to his family in Stratford (marriage of King Henry to Anne Bullen, sc. Hathaway).

The tempest raised by Prospero to wreck the ship represents the intellectual defences, by now well-developed, erected by Shakespeare against the “charge of the Boar”, which would never again cripple him as it had done on that day, a fateful one for Western culture, in Stratford in 1587. Let us look at the ship’s company in detail.

1) Alonso King of Naples: the Boar. Milan and Naples represent, in the geographico-symbolic language of the plays, respectively the world as idea and will, or mind and body, or ego and unconscious, or seen and unseen. This sacred king of the Faustian dimension is of course the libido, or will-to-life, Consort/Son of the Queen of Hell, whose realm it is. He stands throughout FF for the unseen world as a whole. The name “Alonso” is most plausibly derived from the French *alénois*, “of Orleans” (-en is pronounced “on”), as used for the garden-cress *Cresson alénois*. Joan of Arc, the “Maid of Orleans”, is an exemplary Queen of Hell-Grail Queen in 1HVI; and the horticultural source is completely consistent with Bacon’s fascination for the subject of gardens.

2) Sebastian Brother of Alonso. We have met him before, in TN:

Captain ...I saw your brother,
Most provident in peril, bind himself
...To a strong mast that lived upon the sea,
Where, like Orion on the dolphin’s back,

The reference here is undoubtedly to the martyrdom of St. Sebastian, a favourite theme of Renaissance artists, who show him bound to a cross, transfixed by multiple arrows fired by the surrounding crowd. The arrows are, of course, phallic symbols; the suffering of the hero the torment produced by knowledge of the libido in the ego that had thought to deny it. This symbolism of his suffering meant a lot also to T.S. Eliot.² Shakespeare in this state is, of course, - like T.S. Eliot, - a St. Sebastian. The arrows have been fired from the unconscious by the hand of the libido, which has remained there in negative aspect, and are thus cognate with Hamlet's dagger as he contemplates the murder of Claudius. It is of the highest importance to note that Sebastian in TN is not consumed by the sea, as neither he is, with his company, in TT: for the Boar will not win, as he did in Stratford, but be engaged as idea, and vanquished.

3) Antonio Used repeatedly by Bacon in the Comedies to represent the Gnostic Christ, or Osiris, as derived from Mark Antony, whose love for Cleopatra (an Isis-analogue), in defiance of Augustan Rome (Puritan world-feeling), is so memorably described in Plutarch. Shakespeare had a somewhat different view however; for he knew, unlike the idealistic Bacon, by how much he continued to fall short of Gnostic Christhood: that, although Bacon's therapy had saved him, and given him a life, it had not succeeded completely in its object of extirpating the Boar from his psyche. The contrasting roles of Antonio in MOV and TN beautifully illustrate this difference. Antonio in TT is the usurping Duke of Milan. He represents, that is to say, that aspect of the conscious ego which communicates with the Goddess of Love; and there is no suggestion of divinity. The Osiris symbolism of the great final speech of HVIII is an expression of Shakespeare's later finessing of the Baconian symbol to make a clear distinction between the Antony and Osiris principles. Antonio and Sebastian are of course paired; and both will be thwarted in their attempt to take control of Prospero's isle (the reasoning ego of Shakespeare, newly informed by knowledge of the negative Queen of Hell (Sycorax) and libido (Caliban) as idea).

4) Gonzalo The most plausible source of the name tells us much about the nature of his principle. Gonzalo de Berceo (12–13C) was a secular cleric of the Benedictine monastery of S. Millan de la Cogolla in Spain, and one of the very earliest poets in the Castilian tongue. His most famous work was, not surprisingly, a history of St. Millan. Gonzalo in *The Tempest* represents, therefore, Shakespeare's full-frontal consideration of the history of his own Milan- (Troy- or scholar-) phase inner life, undertaken in defense against the defeat of his reason by the hell of the unconscious (Naples): a typical "emergency flight of the shaman" or Journey of the Hero. Gonzalo is cognate with Cardinal Wolsey in HVIII. He has been around for a long time:

Miranda How came we ashore?

Prospero By Providence divine.

Some food we had and some fresh water that
A noble Neapolitan, Gonzalo,
Out of his charity, - who being then appointed
Master of this design, - did give us; with
Rich garments, linens, stuffs, and necessities,
Which since have steaded much; so, of his gentleness,
Knowing I lov'd my books, he furnish'd me,
From mine own library with volumes that
I prize above my Dukedom.

- For he had been provided by Bacon for the healing of his newly stricken patient in 1587. It is clear from the last two lines above that, as has been demonstrated exhaustively elsewhere, Shakespeare's insight into the history of his ailment was gained through the written word, with Bacon as his guide. A crucial outcome of this investigation would be, in his London phase, though too late for the coup in Stratford, the erection of a defence against irruption of the Boar (Alonso). Hence the accompaniment of Gonzalo in TT by

5) Adrian - whose name can only refer to the Roman Emperor Hadrian ("Adrian" plus initial Greek aspirate), who was responsible for the famous eponymous wall in northern Britain, built as a defense against invasion from the Caledonian (Scottish) Picts.

Gonzalo is referred to as the “old cock”, Adrian as the “cockereel” in II, i, 80-1, for just this reason; and they both are heralds, in their slightly different ways, of the dawn of enlightenment of the suffering ego. The libido is always accompanied by the Fool principle (e.g. Thersites in T&C); hence the presence in TT of

6) Trinculo - the drunken butler and Jester. Insobriety in Shakespeare always indicates a state of dissolution in libido (see especially Borachio – boracco in Spanish means “drunkard” - in MAN, where he is the Boar). Hence also the toss-pot

7) Stephano - who represents the ithyphallic principle. The name “Trinculo” is clearly derived from the Greek triklinos, “butler”. This must be a semaphore from the writer that the origin of “Stephano” is also to be found in this language. The Greek stephane generally refers to anything encircling or surrounding the head. It is used of the rim of a helmet; but Homer in the Iliad uses it for the helmet itself, as does Plutarch. Bacon could not possibly have avoided studying the Iliad at Cambridge; and he was also deeply familiar with Plutarch, although the North translation rather than the original would seem to have been the source for the multiplicity of Plutarchian symbols in FF. The helmet is a beautiful symbol of the glans penis; and one thinks also of The Last Goon Show Of All (and Spike Milligan had poetic genius by the bucketful, as a classic Fool to Prince Charles’ King), where Eccles mistakes the phallos for a fireman with his helmet on.

8) Ferdinand The libido, newly divested of its negative mantle. Ferdinand therefore is to King Alonso (his father) as Aaron’s baby son is to Aaron in TitA.

9) The ship’s crew The unconscious.

This company opens the play, as an ithyphallos comes yet again upon the studious Shakespeare at his desk, to demand once again his intellectual dismantling (Ariel) of the complex. In the past it would have culminated in surrender to auto-erotism, with Ariel then invoked, and creativity renewed as therapy. This is a cycle with which the lives of some of the great writers have made us familiar: James Joyce for one, who held dear the maxim to live, to err, to fall, to create life out of life. The Fall is of course the great theme of Finnegans Wake, wherein Humphrey Chimpden

Earwicker commits an erotic misdemeanour and is tormented by it. Shem the Penman and Shaun the Postman represent the two constitutive, conflicting sides of Joyce's psyche: the aspect that is forever fallen and creative, or becoming (Goethe's term), and that which is all intellectual control, and is become. The latter was forever deliquescing into the former, as it was with Shakespeare: and this is surely the key to understanding the creative impulse behind his work. For Sir Francis Bacon undoubtedly tended towards the become, as is shown particularly in Katherina's last great last speech in TOS, which is an expression of total control of the Queen of Hell by the intellect. This was the cornerstone of his treatment of Shakespeare: and a fine job he did too, for he hauled him out of the mire of mental illness and gave him a life of the deepest meaning. Yet his patient continued to be haunted by Her in negative mantle (Queen Katherine in HVIII; Sycorax and Her son Caliban (the libido) in TT). It is an axiom that the devotee becomes, ideally, like the God he worships. In this sense, Shakespeare in studious mode was Bacon; yet his psyche was different in a fundamental way, because of the magnified presence of the Boar (Alonso-Caliban): and knowledge of this energy – Schopenhauer's "x" factor, on the presence of which a great work of Art depends – was surely his great gift to Bacon, and to the Complete Works.

By now, however, the great work was coming an end; the soil of his creativity had yielded its foison for summer after summer, and was declining, exhausted, into desert (Sands in HVIII). Now was the time to deal forever with the Boar, and assume a true Gnostic Christhood: to resume a lasting relationship with a woman, as Christ had with Mary Magdalene, - but of which he evidently had been incapable in London, - or, on the mythic plane, as Osiris had with Isis, or, on the historical as Antony had with Cleopatra: as Aeneas most certainly did not with Dido. His Baconesque scholarship would be abandoned, which would help the transformation. The complex would be taken to pieces and buried once and for all: on Prospero's Isle, the massively armed and resourceful battery of his ego, which was yet deserted and barren before his first lesson from Bacon.

Let us now examine in detail the occupants of Prospero's isle.

1) We are told a great deal about the provenance of Sycorax, all of which defines Her as a dark-moon Goddess or Queen of Hell. Prospero describes Her in I, ii as a "foul witch... who with age and envy/Was grown into a hoop" (crescent dark moon). She was banished from Argier (< Greek *argos*, "silver", the colour given to the radiant moon since time immemorial, most recently in alchemy). "...for one thing she did they would not take her life": which was what, exactly? We are told in the next line: "I, sir" (First Folio), where "I" is symbolic, as we have seen so often in R&J and other plays, of the *ithyphallos* (unseen world). This is a beautiful summary of the problem outlined above: the inveterate tendency of the libido in negative aspect to irrupt London-phase Shakespeare's higher mentation (Prospero's Isle), which had thought to have done away with its source in the unconscious (realm of Sycorax). She is cognate with Queen Katherine in HVIII.

2) Caliban is her son, the libido, specifically the will-to-eros, in negative aspect. He is slave to Prospero (Shakespeare healed and become), who yet threatens to slay his master in collusion with Stephano and Trinculo (Shakespeare threatened anew, and becoming).

3) Ted Hughes misjudges when he concludes that Ariel's tree is symbolic of the Goddess. This is only true up to a point: for it represents, in truth, the printed page (cf. Berkely and its castle "by yond tuft of trees": RII, II, iii, 53; and Birnam Wood in Macbeth) as revelatory of the unseen world. Ariel is the insight and wisdom derived therefrom in extremis, to deal with the threat of the complex. These qualities were, in Shakespeare's Puritan phase aet.15-23, totally subservient to the Puritan world view, founded on the Queen of Hell in negative aspect. Hence does Prospero make clear that Ariel was the slave of Sycorax before She was banished to the Isle, which coincided with Shakespeare's first lesson from Bacon. Then began the patient task of eliciting from the printed page, - The Golden Ass certainly, perhaps the great works of the Gnostic revival such as *De harmonia mundi*, or philosophical tracts of Bacon's, - the intellectual resources sufficient to Shakespeare's recovery from the acute phase of his

³ Robert Graves, *The White Goddess*

distress, which took about two years (as given by Shakespeare in the final scene of MAF). Prospero's freeing of Ariel from the tree is a beautiful symbol of this.

4) In Latin *miranda* means, of course, "she who is to be wondered at". *Miranda* represents Nature as formed in the (predominantly visual) imagination, of the transformed Shakespeare. The awakening of wonder in the child is taken as a matter of course by the modern educator; but Shakespeare had to do it all over again after his long enthrallment by Puritanism, during which it was largely dormant. Hence does *Miranda* only barely remember the time before she came to the Isle. Her marriage to Ferdinand will represent the final acknowledgement by Shakespeare of the libido as immanent in Nature: in other words, a super-cultivation of Platonic Ideas (which Goethe terms the "Mothers" in *Faust II*) rather than mere ideas (e.g. not birch or oak, but the Tree; not hound or terrier, but the Dog; not this man or that woman, but Man).

5) The Bacon camp have long claimed that Prospero is a portrayal of their champion. In so far as one becomes the God one worships, this is true; but he is, of course, firstly Shakespeare. His renunciation of his books at the end of TT marks Shakespeare's adandonment of his pen; the break had to be clean: and this surely accounts for the otherwise puzzling fact that he left no manuscripts or library in his will. It was Bacon who retained the manuscripts, perhaps already in preparation for the great task of publishing the First Folio.

The Golden Ass is massively present in TT, this last of the plays, as it is in so many of the others. For the Goddesses Who attend on the celebration of the marriage of *Miranda* and Ferdinand are none other than Juno, Ceres, and Iris, precisely those who performed the same function in the Cupid and Psyche myth, which forms the central part of Apuleius' magical masterpiece. To any student of Roman religion this must be an annoyingly puzzling conjunction. Why these three in particular, out of all the multiplicity of their kind? - but Apuleius gives the key. It is an indication of the utter centrality of Apuleius to his *vita nuova* in London that Shakespeare celebrated his own psychic transformation as a new Cupid and

Psyche. Perhaps it was to the pages of this great early European magus that Shakespeare turned at his frequent times of crisis.

The ship and the Isle... Let us now follow in detail their dance to the music of eternity.

ACT I

i

The Master and Boatswain represent the unconscious. The former is that aspect which would tend to collapse the reasoning ego into it unopposed; the latter, that aspect which may be opposed by the forces of insight and wisdom: hence the appearance on deck of the company (Alonso &c) only after the Master has exited. Their appearance above represents the crystallisation of their principles in the ego, which can now deal with them. The conflict of reason and unconscious is represented by that of the Boatswain and company: the former ordering the sails be let down, to avoid encountering the Isle (which is the Gnostically reasoning ego's – Prospero's - intent); the company the contrary. The ego must be patient in his absorbing of the lessons of the written word: "Nay, good, be patient" (Gonzalo). The Boatswain adjures them to "Silence!", which has here the same meaning as the silences of Cordelia, Hippolyta, and Hero. With the unconscious in the ascendancy, the principles do not speak to the ego; but the printed page will put its words in their mouths: hence it is Gonzalo who admonishes the Boatswain (18), and predicts that he will certainly be hanged rather than drown (the complex's survival in the ego as principle, rather than burial in the darkness of the unconscious).

ii

The stages of this scene as allegory are as follows.

1) 1-24: Shakespeare in scholarly mode is ideating to the extreme – reading, understanding, memorising, - upon (principally Baconian) philosophy (cf. the King at his desk in HVIII II, ii; the city of Troy in T&C), when the the clear-formed objects of his wonder (Miranda) are shattered by the irruption of libido; but this will not produce the breakdown as befell him aet.23 ("No harm": 15).

2) 25-169: He quits his books (Lays down his mantle) and begins, in defence, and as a matter of urgency ("Your tale, sir, would cure deafness": 106), to meditate upon the state of his inner life in Stratford and beyond. He can barely remember his Puritan higher mentation ("What seest thou else/In the dark backward and abysm of time?": 50). He recalls the coup which was made possible by his lack of enlightenment (overthrow of Prospero as Duke of Milan by Antonio-Alonso in the "dead of darkness": his surrender to auto-erotism after eight years of Puritan repression). The Platonic Idea as revelatory of the will (dark-moon Goddess) at the bottom of all, is beginning to form ("I should sin/To think but nobly of my grandmother:/Good wombs have borne bad sons": 118). Shakespeare was at this time almost defenceless against the negative contents of his unconscious (Prospero and Miranda on the sea in their "rotten carcass of a butt"); although not quite: for his capacity for wonder – his great intellect and faculty of the imagination, albeit dormant for so long – kept him from succumbing to psychosis ("Thou didst smile,/Infused with a fortitude from heaven": 153), and provided the climate in which the seeds provided by the written word could grow ("...he [Gonzalo] furnish'd me,/From mine own library with volumes that/I prize above my dukedom": 166).

3) 170-305: A different stage begins, as his wonder ceases (sleep of Miranda), and he takes up the principal book of his healing (summoning of Ariel) – most plausibly *The Golden Ass* – and begins to meditate on the complex itself, the components of which will be engaged, as idea, with vividness and strength ("Not a hair perish'd": 217). The afternoon of the day, or autumn of the year, has been symbolic of wisdom since time immemorial:³ hence the death of Christ at 3 p.m:

Ariel Past the mid season.

Prospero At least two glasses. The time 'twixt six and now
Must by us both be spent most preciouslly.

One recalls Shelley's axiom that poetic meditation is like a fading ember: the sun at two or three o'clock, the year in October (northern hemisphere). Six p.m. is the time of twilight, which in the

esoteric tradition is symbolic of psychic balance, or completeness of being: the equivalence of sun (reason) and moon (Nature): the Ideal based upon the Real, with no denial or repudiation (fig.3). Or, it is Shakespeare and his wife, reunited after the laying down of his books.

4) 305-497: Shakespeare trains his insight on his unconscious (Ariel as a sea nymph), where the libido will be divested of its negative mantle and acknowledged as a substrate, even property, of divinity ("Full fathom five thy father lies"). Note that Alonso (Ferdinand's father) has not drowned: his principle is meditated upon in the sunlight of Shakespeare's reason, which dwells upon its immanence in the unconscious, to effect a "sea-shange" (Alonso/Ferdinand). His ideas now become Platonic Ideas, with the will-to-life (invisible world) acknowledged as the basis of all phenomena (visible world) whatsoever (incipient love of Ferdinand and Miranda). This is the dawn of the new epoch ("I hear/The strain of strutting Chanticleer"). This transformation is dependent on his steadfastness against dissolution in his own libido (suppression of Caliban). Shakespeare gives a beautiful summary of the become nature of his London-phase ego:

Prospero I pitied thee,
 Took pains to make thee speak...
 ...I endow'd thy purposes
 With words that made them known: but thy vile race,
 Though thou didst learn, had that in't which good
natures
 Could not abide to be with; therefore wast thou
 Deservedly confin'd into this rock,
 Who hadst deserv'd more than a prison.

That is to say, in the two years after his first lesson from Sir Francis Bacon, Shakespeare learnt to listen to his libido, and found the words to reason with it; but then, having achieved this transformation, mistook it as a final triumph, and thought to lock the libido away in his unconscious, wherein it yet remained active and liable to re-irrupt as a "charge of the Boar", albeit now with less catatsrophic consequences. This new marriage of seen and

unseen worlds must not be hurried (Ferdinand's enchainment by Prospero), or a mere surrender to the libido will result ('He [Ferdinand] draws, and is charmed from moving': where the sword represents the ithyphallos). The Golden Ass gives a beautiful fit to all of this: the early, intensely erotic chapters needing to be engaged but not surrendered to, as a prelude to the psychic transformation represented finally by Lucius at the procession of Isis.

ACT II

i

We are now inside the mind of the sufferer, as in so much of the histories. Shakespeare examines his own life, to the peril of the Boar:

Gonzalo ...then wisely, good sir, weigh
 Our sorrow with our comfort.
Alonso Prithee, peace.

He considers his misery: "Dolour comes to him indeed: you have spoken truer than you supposed" (19). The defensive wall begins to rise, as the sun of enlightenment rises (the "cockerel" Adrian breaking his silence). The ego thus transformed has found new resources; while its untransformed state is associated with the Lion motif, which represents throughout the plays (in Leonato, Leonine, Leontes, Posthumus Leonatus, &c) Shakespeare as Goddess-rejector.

Gonzalo How lush and lusty the grass looks! How green!
Antonio The ground indeed is tawny.
Sebastian With an eye of green in't.

- Where "tawny" is an adjective classically associated with the lion. The moment of crisis, when the libido first arose in response to the Goddess of Love as newly formed in the imagination, is represented by the marriage of Claribel to the King of Tunis. The

⁴ See especially Laurence Gardner, *Bloodline of the Holy Grail*; and Alan J. Alford, *The Phoenix Solution*.

Boar now is faced with the wall, as the ego acknowledges the locus classicus of his condition in literature: the rejection of Dido by Aeneas in Virgil's Aeneid, that prime cornerstone of Shakespeare's personal mythos:

Adrian Tunis was never graced before with such a paragon to
 their queen.

Gonzalo Not since widow Dido's time.

Antonio Widow! a pox o' that! How came that widow in?
 Widow Dido!

Sebastian What if he had said, widower Aeneas too?

Here is a beautiful touch. Francisco represents Sir Francis Bacon (cf. Friar Francis in MAN; Francisco in HAM), whose influence Shakespeare invokes along with the Gonzalo principle. His "I saw him beat the surges under him/And ride upon their backs..." (110 ff.) is therefore a beautiful cameo of Bacon's high style, inserted in a generally Shakespearean scene.

The newly enlightened ego rails against the Boar; but then reaffirms that the only way to healing lies through the patient application of his insight: "The truth you speak does lack some gentleness and time to speak it in..." (Gonzalo, 134). Now is a time of pure being, not doing: "No occupation; all men idle, all..." (144 ff.). Now insight seems to be victorious: "What a blow was there given" (Antonio, 175); as Ariel enters, playing solemn music. Gonzalo (healing word) therefore sleeps (is put down), and the Boar subsides (sleep of Alonso). The suffering-libidinous ego subsides; or has it? – for Shakespeare goes to great pains to depict Sebastian-Antonio as both asleep and awake. The vulnerability of all become states is manifest in the renewed threat of the libido (daggers borne by Antonio and Sebastian...), invading the images evoked from the written word, which are now playing on the screen of the become ego's peace (... murdering Gonzalo: cf deaths of Julius Caesar, Juliet). The reading of the written word must continue (re-entry of Ariel, and her waking of Gonzalo). Again, this would provide a perfect fit to *The Golden Ass*, where the erotic adventures of ass-phase Lucius continue well through the middle stages of the book (cf. the comparable adventures of Falstaff in

MWW, which were certainly inspired by Apuleius). The sleep of Gonzalo produced a monster: the old lion ego (Goddess- rejecting, and hence suffering) that Shakespeare knew so well: "...sure it was the roar/Of a whole herd of lions" (310).

ii

Here begins the Caliban-Stephano-Trinculo subplot. Their besting will represent the vanquishing by the newly transformed ego of the principles of the libido (Caliban), ithyphallos (Stephano), and Fool (Trinculo), all in negative aspect. Trinculo and Caliban under the gaberdine in the thunderstorm represents, of course, the driving back into the unconscious of their principles by force of meditation upon (most plausibly) The Golden Ass ("The spirit torments me: O!": Caliban, 63). An ithyphallos – the same as represented by the daggers of Antonio and Sebastian in the previous scene - threatens to free them (Caliban vowing to serve Stephano). Once again, drunkenness in Shakespeare represents dissolution in the libido.

ACT III

i

Ferdinand is piling up logs under Prospero's injunction, as was Caliban. The grove, or forest, or even single tree, represents throughout FF the written word: and the logs are here the pages Shakespeare is turning (cf. "I have a tree which grows here in my close,/That mine own use invites me to cut down": Timon, Tim A V; and TST (Appendix 1)). In his scholarly mode, the libido in negative aspect (Caliban) is held in suppression; now, in transformation, the libido is being worked on by the Gnostic intellect, and stripped of this false mantle, to be acknowledged as a constitutive part of the phenomenal world, and beyond good or evil (growing love of Ferdinand and Miranda).

ii

The libido-Fool-ithyphallos conspiracy deepens; but it will be infiltrated and sabotaged by insight and wisdom (Caliban, Trinculo and Stephano set to fighting amongst themselves by Ariel). Ariel's "Thou liest" serves to refute the libido's capacity to dissolve,

through an act of auto-erotism, the ego in mid-transformation (most plausibly The Golden Ass half-read, to the graphically described scene of Lucius' seduction by Fotis). Although the final submission of the conspirators will not come until the end, the victory has already been won, as they exit to Ariel's tune, not their own.

iii

The first scene of this Act examined the progress of the ideal outcome; the second the suppression of the conspiracy to sabotage it. The present scene will turn to the third plot line, of the means by which that outcome is to be brought about.

The spirits who bring the table and banquet represent the forms induced in the imagination by the written word. Gonzalo (life of Shakespeare as contemplated by himself) and Alonso (the Boar) are tired because the outcome is in sight. The Hermetic tradition rears into prominence:

Sebastian A living drollery. Now I will believe
That there are unicorns; that in Arabia
There is one tree, the phoenix's throne, one phoenix
At this hour reigning there.

The importance of the unicorn (Gnostic Christ) and phoenix (Osiris: spiritual rebirth) in the esoteric tradition has been well documented by modern scholars.⁴ The appearance of both of these symbols at this point is utterly consistent with the allegory. If Francisco represents Sir Francis Bacon, then what can be the significance of his "They vanished strangely", the second of his only two speeches in TT? The spirit of Bacon was always hovering over Shakespeare in these renewals of the healing of the acute phase of his patient's condition that he had accomplished those long years ago, c.1587-9: hence his association with Gonzalo, Adrian, and the rest. The spirits of the banquet are those that he taught his patient to evoke, to feed and strengthen the representations of the psychological principles (Boar; suffering ego; wall; &c) in his

⁵ Robert Graves, *The White Goddess*.

reasoning ego. Once these forms of the imagination had for the last time done their work, then it was Shakespeare himself who took over. Shakespeare now was communing with his Self (ego plus unconscious), to which Bacon would be a stranger. For the first time he could live with his blind libido, without the defensive need for the intensity of the Baconesque visual mentation which had characterised his inner life in London. He had no choice: the Complete Works had reached their natural conclusion; now Stratford and his family lay ahead. Yet Francisco's bursting into speech out of nowhere shows the connexion between the two minds, and Shakespeare's determination that Bacon's seminal role in his healing and transformation should be memorialised.

Now Ariel however snatches the banquet away: for final insight and illumination has been achieved. Antonio and Sebastian held motionless by Ariel, with swords upraised, represent the extirpation of their principles, along with that of the ithyphallos in negative aspect, from Shakespeare's psyche. The book (most plausibly TGA) has done its work; and it only remains for Shakespeare-Bacon to portray the culmination of the main plot line, the marriage of unseen and phenomenal worlds (Fernando and Miranda).

ACT IV

The sense of the final stages of TT should now be clear. Shakespeare has embraced as inevitable his future with his family, away from the furnace wherein he forged his works, which yet continued to burn him painfully (the repeated "charges of the Boar"). Hence the otherwise remarkable absence of any library or manuscripts in his will. The Complete Plays have been allegory from beginning to end, wherein each character has represented a principle, or "humour" (RII, V, v), or "spirit":

Prospero Our revels now are ended. These our actors,
As I foretold you, were all spirits and
Are melted into air, into thin air...

The theatre has been the "World 'O'", a cipher of both macro- and microcosmic worlds, imagined vividly in the artist's mind:

Prospero ...And, like the baseless fabric of this vision,
The cloud-capp'd towers, the gorgeous palaces,
The solemn temples, the great globe itself,
Yea, all which it inherit, shall dissolve
And, like this insubstantial pageant faded,
Leave not a rack behind. We are such stuff
As dreams are made on, and our little life
Is rounded with a sleep.

One recalls Schopenhauer's axiom that the phenomenal world is a "dream dreamt by a solitary dreamer in which all the dream characters dream too"; and the famed AUM of Eastern religion, whose characters represent the visible world immediately perceived (state of wakefulness), that world interpreted through feeling and intuition (dreaming sleep), and the invisible world that supports it, the world of the will, finally impenetrable by even quantum physics (dreamless sleep). A whole book could be dedicated to the philosophy of this speech, which is an index to the philosophical and poetical genius of Sir Francis Bacon.

ACT V

i

To round off the play, Shakespeare had to represent the eyes being lifted from the book, never to return (the detail of the lack of a library or manuscripts in Shakespeare's will is highly significant here); and the intense meditation on the complex of his torment – the ship's company and Caliban – broken off for good, with the transformation completed, and the return to his family made safe, with no fear of the Boar (Alonso-Caliban) ever charging again. Finally – and here one detects the hand of Bacon - Prospero and the company repair to his cell, to hear the story of his life: which is a beautifully adroit segue into the remaining plays of FF – TT being positioned (deliberately) as the first – which are nothing less than the story of the life of William Shakespeare, as it has been the task of the present work exhaustively to show.

This solves, of course, the nagging problem of why exactly the play should end with the company in Prospero's cell, when the central theme all along has been Prospero's final repudiation of it. It can scarcely be doubted that this was the work of Bacon, at the