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Preface

Tutto mi transferisco in loro
(Machiavelli)

In his *Infinite Jest: Wit and Humor in Italian Renaissance Art* (Columbia, Missouri and London 1978), Paul Barolsky draws attention to a painting by the Ferrarese artist Dosso Dossi in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna. He remarks:

The picture, which is presumed to have astrological significance, conceivably alluding to the artist’s birthdate, and which is also perhaps based on a dialogue of Lucian, reveals to us the improbable image of the mighty, all-powerful *Jupiter tuonans* [sic] so absorbed in his painting of delicate butterflies that he is too busy to hear the pleas of the virtuous virgin. Meanwhile, Mercury mediates between the two figures by indicating to the virgin that she should maintain silence. The tone of the painting, notwithstanding its pathos, is delicately mock-heroic, like Ariosto’s poetry which gently parodies the pomp and prowess of chivalric heroes. In its mixture of pathos and comedy, Dosso’s painting seems almost to evoke the great comic mythologies later painted by Velasquez.

The allusion to Lucian here is not directly to a dialogue by the Greek satirist, but to the brief Renaissance work *Virtus Dea*, interpolated into the Latin translation of parts of Lucian by various hands first published in Venice in 1494. Virtue complains there to Mercury that although she has been assaulted in the Lower World by Fortune, who has left her “prostrate in the mud,” the gods have no leisure to listen to her complaints, since they are either busy making sure that the gourds bloom in time, or taking care that the butterflies have beautiful painted wings (*curare ut papilionibus alae perpulchrae pictae adsint*).

Mercury answers that even Jupiter fears to challenge Fortune.
Virtue despondently rejoins that she must go away "naked and despised" (*nuda et despecta ab eo*).

Dosso's imagination may or may not have been stimulated by this short dialogue. If it was, his painting goes far beyond its supposed original. The student of the Classics will immediately observe that a Jupiter painting butterflies is engaged in the task of creating souls, into whom enter all the colors of the rainbow, Iris, the messenger of the gods; according to one ancient poet, the mother of Eros. In the picture the rainbow seems to blend into the artist's canvas. Mercury, whose *caduceus* is prominently displayed, is in attendance in his capacity as *psychopompus*, because it will be his duty to escort these souls to the world of men. He bids Virtue fall silent, because "holy silence," a profoundly religious concept still surviving in Christian observance, is appropriate to Jupiter's sacred task. It is this liturgical gesture, to which the *Virtus Dea* makes no allusion, which becomes the center of the composition, and on it W. B. Yeats' poem *Long-legged Fly* forms the best commentary.

Virtue in the painting is not "naked and despised." She certainly does not look as if she has just lost a tussle with Fortune and her minions. Serious of expression, yet garlanded with flowers, she represents the other end of the time-scale. She arrives with news of victories won by heroic souls who have accepted her guidance. Yet even her *praeconia* must remain unspoken in the presence of the Demiurge. Past and future meet in the symbolic *now* of this still eternity, in which the painter glorifies his own art as the model of the Creator's.

What Dosso has done here is to offer the paradigm of Renaissance, and indeed all creative, response to antiquity. On the surface, his painting departs even further from whatever ancient content the parody of Lucian, found in the *Virtus Dea*, may embody. In fact, he has taken this ironic parable explaining the slights suffered by Virtue at the hands of Fortune, and re-interpreted it at a level which brings him into far profounder contact with classical antiquity than his scholarly, but essentially superficial, original.

Dosso could find this *point d'appui* for his imagination in classical antiquity because he was a Renaissance man.

The degree of commitment which Renaissance artists and thinkers felt to the Classics is for us moderns difficult to grasp. In the letter to F. Vettori from which the epigraph above is taken Machiavelli writes:

Venuta la sera, mi ritorno in casa, ed entro nel mio scrittoio; e in su l'uscio mi spoglio quella vesta cotidiana, piena di fango e di loto, e
mi metto panni reali e curiali; e rivestito condecentemente, entro nelle antique corti dell’antiqi uomini, dove, da loro ricevuto amorevolmente, mi pasco di quel cibo, che solum è mio, e che io nacqui per lui; dove io non mi vergogno parlare con loro e domandarlì della ragione delle loro azioni; e quelli per loro umanità mi rispondono; e non sento per quattro ore di tempo alcuna noia, sdimentico ogni affanno, non temo la povertà, non mi sbigottisce la morte; tutto mi transferisco in loro.

When evening comes, I return home, and enter my writing-room. At the door I take off these everyday clothes, full of mud and filth, and dress in royal, courtly garments. Clad fittingly, I enter the ancient courts of the men of old, and there find a kindly welcome. There I feed on that food which alone is mine, and for which I was born. There I am not ashamed to converse with them and ask the reasons for their actions. And they, in their humanity, give me answer, and for four hours I do not feel any vexation, I forget every toil, I do not fear poverty, I lose my dread of death. I transform myself entirely into them.

Machiavelli uses the word umanità in this letter of December 10, 1513, with good reason. Ten years later, Ariosto, in his sixth Satira, addressed to Bembo, offered one of the earliest examples of the noun umanista, which in its original meaning was interchangeable with “poet.” The Renaissance evidently believed in a human dialogue, which is also, as the author puts on new clothes at the threshold of his study, a religious dialogue, with the masters of the Greco-Roman past. He asks for reasons, and they answer him. The fruits of this courtesy are evident even today in our museums and libraries.

Machiavelli was not only a philosopher and historian, whose name even now commands our attention, but a literary artist, whose comedy La Mandragola is still holding the stage. It is the “humanist” and artist therefore who, with his power of creative transformation, sets the example for interpretation which Renaissance studies must learn to follow if they are really to penetrate to the heart of their theme. It is easy, in the first fit of enthusiasm, to see resemblances to classical antiquity in some favorite Cinquecento masterpiece. But then scholarship rightly introduces its qualifications, its demurrals. In the cauldron of that catalytic alchemy, the similarities evaporate, the two worlds are felt as hermetically sealed against any but their own peculiar values. Renaissance studies become a separate discipline, a separate department. The classicist, safe once more in his nest, breathes a sigh of relief at the departure of the intruding cuckoo. And is not the cuckoo for her part glad to get away?

It is necessary to introduce at this point a salutary word of Mikhail
Bakhtin: “The author may not remember, but the genre remembers.” Obviously, the greater the artist the greater will be his power to draw on the inherited and accumulated resources of his medium. At this level, he becomes an interpreter of tradition whose testimony is even more valuable than that of the scholar, since few scholars are geniuses to this degree. This truth was appreciated in Alexandria, when the foundations of scholarship in the modern sense were being laid. It was, at least in the first and second generations of the history of the Library, clear that poet and scholar were ideally one. It was appreciated in the Renaissance, while umanista meant the same thing as poeta. But even in the Greek world these related vocations were torn asunder. The unfortunate imitation of this worst side of the ancient legacy has had the present disastrous consequences for the study of the Classics. Never in the history of our civilization can so few have been able to read Latin and Greek with any degree of fluency and enjoyment.

Although therefore a richer explanation of the iconography of Dosso’s painting is available, the ethos of Paul Barolsky’s remarks is one that, in his turn, the classical scholar will do well to note. In his magnificent The Age of Humanism (London 1963) André Chastel has emphasized that the prevailing tone of Renaissance literature is comic or serio-comic, even in those engaged in the forefront of the controversies of their time, and here we need look no further than Erasmus and More. This has important implications for both its form and its content. Its form will so often be that of the dialogue, and hence the significance of Professor Barolsky’s mention of Lucian in the passage quoted. Its content will be fantasy; mock-heroic, ironically didactic, witty, ruefully (and sometimes joyfully) conscious of the gap between ideal and reality. It will juxtapose crudity and delicacy, secular and religious. It will forever be aware that the king and the clown have the same horoscope.

The prominence in the Renaissance tradition of symbols such as laughter, festivity, love, the common meal in all its bounty, dislocations of space and time away from the everyday, the three levels of heaven, earth and hell, crowning and uncrowning, death from life and life from death, the “grotesque body,” masking and unmasking, metamorphosis, utopia, the pastoral: these are tokens that the serio-comic, far from depending on the random association of ideas, exploits quite definite aspects of popular culture, sacred and profane in one.

Renaissance art evidently plumbs these deep wellsprings, whatever the courtly refinements which may at times disguise its humble origins. So does Dante’s Comedy, which because of language, theme, style and learning, should be regarded as the first major (and of course
unsurpassed) work of Renaissance poetry. Even Petrarch's Africa, the epic of the heroic struggle against Hannibal, is peculiarly in debt to Ovid, and comes alive only when it versifies a romantic episode in Livy.

But the serio-comic is also a major feature of the Greco-Roman imagination. If Lucian is relevant to Dosso's picture, so is Plato. The Symposium ends with the argument that the truly scientific poet will be just as good at comedy as he is at tragedy, which is a fairly broad hint about the tone which that particular dialogue is meant to strike. The mixed emotions of the myth of Er at the end of the Republic, like those of Pindar's first Nemean, find an echo in Dosso's painting in the Cini Collection Riso, Ira, Pianta e Paura where, as Professor Barolsky notes, "various emotions are comically mixed."

In late fifth-century Athens, Euripides' Pentheus had already been a figure of fun. Pentheus had laughed at the new god, and Dionysus had laughed at Pentheus' efforts to contain his power. And laughter is the ultimate reaction of Boccaccio's Penteo to all his sufferings in the Teseida (1341?), as it is that of the executed More at the conclusion of Ellis Heywood's dialogue Il Moro (1556). The dying Mercutio's punning self-mockery in Romeo and Juliet, like that of the dying John of Gaunt in Richard II, is part of the same tradition, of which Shakespeare is a supreme master. It is one of his closest links with the spirit of classical antiquity.

The serio-comic style, as we see from its deployment by the philosophers, does not surrender its claim to communicate some kind of truth. But it is a larger truth than that of the academic's abstractions, which is one reason why those undergraduate essays discovering that Socrates does not refute Thrasymachus in the first book of the Republic are so silly. Of course Socrates does not refute Thrasymachus at the theoretical level. But life is lived authentically—not by theorists, but by people making decisions. The ultimate question is one of character, ethical: would you want to be Thrasymachus or Socrates? At this level, the answer is obvious. Plato's form is not dispensable and even harmful sugar around some distasteful and ineffective philosophical pill. It is part of what he is trying to say, one of the reasons why he slept with the mimes of Sophron under his pillow.

If classical literature therefore is to speak to students faced with the ambiguities of the twenty-first century, it must be cultivated with a broader range of response in mind than that of simple admiration, or simple dislike. Its profound roots in the undifferentiated primitive must be traced, in a soil where either / or does not make too much sense. It must be re-assessed, not merely by the study of the great
scholars, but also by a civilized awareness of the artistic and literary tradition, particularly as that tradition was developed at the Renaissance.

The Renaissance had of course its pedants. Bernard Weinberg twenty years ago traced the melancholy history of their incomprenhension and dogmatism in the face of the masterpieces of their age. But it had too a series of brilliant artists whose works constitute an implied poetic. Ariosto, for example, evidently understood the ancient epic tradition and its paradoxical debt to Callimachus far better than his critics. His elegy De diversis amoribus and even his sixth Satira already mentioned are the proof of that. So did Tasso. Racine, who wrote Les Plaideurs as well as his great tragic masterpieces, knew more by poetic instinct about ancient tragedy than the French Academy. These names are excluded from histories of classical scholarship. It is time they were there, or at least time that a broad humane culture was regarded as more important to the budding specialist than the dim preparation for settling hoti's — or Vasari's — business.

The Editor of this present collection of papers about different facets of the Renaissance is a firm believer in the study of the Classics as an aspect of literae humaniores. In this regard, he would even enter a plea for the despised arts of Latin and Greek verse composition. At least they taught their practitioners how to scan. At best, they inspired some sort of feeling for Latin and Greek as vehicles of poetic thought. They were a last tribute to the original meaning of "umanista," a last vestige of the Alexandrian sensibility.

But the chief lesson to be learned from such a collection is the need to expand our horizons, whether we are classicists or Renaissance scholars. The greatest commentator on Virgil is Dante, the greatest commentator on Ovid — Shakespeare. But these are matters of mutual concern! It has been noted that Michelangelo in the Sistine Creation of Eve made the figure of God so big that He would burst the frame if He stood up. The art historian who tells us this seems to regard it as a flaw. "Michelangelo must have found it difficult to get a proper view of his work." Certainly she does not remind her readers that exactly the same was true of Phidias' statue of the seated Zeus at Olympia, who would have pierced the roof of the temple by rising to his feet. Both artists were trying to express the majesty of the Creator in physical terms by age-old methods. Did Michelangelo consciously know this? Does it matter? The genre remembered, even if he did not.

But the scholar must remember too! We need dialogue, between classicists who understand better the achievements of Greco-Roman
civilization, and Renaissance specialists who are less ready to separate the branch from the tree in the name of a scholarship too attentive to leaves and twigs. Michelangelo’s youthful Pietà in St. Peter’s could never have been sculpted in fifth-century Athens. But the student of Attic white-ground funerary lecythoi feels the kinship of spirit all the same.

When the author of Paradise Lost utters his prefatory strictures against the use of rhyme, he is taking sides as a scholar and theorist in a well-known Renaissance controversy. When, in spite of them, he uses rhyming lines to describe Eve’s plucking of the forbidden fruit, he is paying homage as a poet to a primitive religious assonance as old as, and older than, the Iguvine Tablets, or Bereshith bara. . . . Once again the genre has remembered.

This kind of learning ought not to be left to the comparatists. All study of literature is comparative literature. All study of literature must be continually cross-fertilized by reference to the arts of painting, sculpture, music. Every scholar must be able to say: “Tutto mi transferisco in loro.” The uomo universale remains a valid ideal even in our age.

In an important passage of his The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy Jacob Burckhardt remarks of Pico della Mirandola:

He was the only man who loudly and vigorously defended the truth and science of all ages against the one-sided worship of classical antiquity. He knew how to value not only Averroës and the Jewish investigators, but also the scholastic writers of the Middle Ages, according to the matter of their writings. He seems to hear them say: “We shall live for ever, not in the schools of word-catchers, but in the circle of the wise, where they talk not of the mother of Andromache or of the sons of Niobe, but of the deeper causes of things human and divine; he who looks closely will see that even the barbarians had intelligence (mercurium), not on the tongue but in the breast.’

There is not much danger of a one-sided worship of classical antiquity in our time. We are all barbarians, and so must hope that Pico della Mirandola’s words are true. It is to his ideal of learning and his view of the dignity of man that this collection is dedicated.

An unsere deutschen Leser ergeht folgender besonderer Aufruf: Es ist an der Zeit. Was noch immer an W. Jaegers Drittem Humanismus lebensfähig und lebensbejahend bleibt, das soll jetzt überprüft, vertieft und erneut werden.
Once again, I must thank Mrs. Mary Ellen Fryer for her labors in putting on line our contributors’ texts. Mr. Carl Kibler of the Printing Services Office, University of Illinois, supervised the PENTA side of our operations with his usual common sense and perseverance.

Frances Stickney Newman’s unceasing toil made the whole thing possible.

J. K. Newman
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Roman Jokes
and the Renaissance Prince,
1455-1528

BARBARA C. BOWEN

Louis XIV, France's Roi Soleil, is reputed to have made only one joke in his life, and a poor joke at that.¹ There seems, in more modern times, to be no essential connection between absolute power and a sense of humor, and yet as late as the early seventeenth century in Europe we can trace a tradition of the laughing Ideal Prince which originated in Imperial Rome. In this paper I propose to trace this tradition in outline, and then to focus on four Renaissance works belonging to it, which have much to tell us about Renaissance concepts of the ideal ruler.

I. From Suetonius to the Fifteenth Century

Suetonius tells quite a few jokes made by and about Julius Caesar, Augustus, Tiberius, Vespasian and Domitian, and of these he gives most space to the humor of Augustus. He was not the first to do so; Quintilian had already included, in his passage expanding Cicero's rhetorical theory of jokes,² nine witty sayings by, or directed against, Augustus. One of these, which seemed more memorble to the Renaissance than it does to us, and which may be the first recorded

² Institutio oratoria VI. 3.
elephant joke, has Augustus saying to a timid man holding out a petition to him: "noli, tanquam assem elephanto des" (59; Suetonius has "quasi elephanto stipem," Aug. 53).

Suetonius tells only two such jokes made by Augustus, but emphasizes his wit and his fondness for proverbs, Old Comedy, and jesting in general, especially at banquets: "nullo denique genere hilaritatis abstinuit" (98). Late Antiquity seems to have embroidered on this tradition, if we may judge by Macrobius, whose Saturnalia, well known and much imitated in the Renaissance, contain eight chapters which constitute what we would call an anthology of jokes (II. 1-7; VII. 3). Nearly all of these are attributed to real people, and although Symmachus twice stresses the pre-eminence of Cicero as a wit (II. 2 and 3), the anthology contains only 23 of Cicero's jokes versus 29 by, or against, Augustus. The later editor who gave titles to the chapters entitled II. 4 De jocis Augusti in alios, et aliorum rursus in ipsum, and he is indeed portrayed as that rather unlikely ideal, the absolute ruler who can take jokes at his own expense.

One of these is particularly interesting, for several reasons. Macrobius presumably found it in Valerius Maximus, who reports (IX. 14 Ext. 3) that Antiochus, when in Sicily, noticed a young man who looked remarkably like him. He was astonished at this resemblance, "cum pater suus in eam prouinciam numquam accessisset, 'at meus,' inquit 'Romam accessit.'" Macrobius (II. 4. 19) transfers this joke to Augustus, who asks the young man who resembles him: "Dic mihi, adulescens, fuit aliquando mater tua Romae?" and receives the answer No, "sed pater meus saepe." The speaker here emphasizes Augustus's good humor: "Soleo in Augusto magis mirari quos pertulit iocos quam ipse quos protulit, quia maior est patientiae quam facundiae laus, maxime cum aequanimiter aliqua etiam iocos mordaciora pertulerit." In the form given it by Macrobius, this joke has been the most enduring of all Classical witticisms, recurring in every century from the fourteenth to the twentieth and quoted by such diverse authors as Erasmus, Beaumarchais and Freud, and Macrobius's attribution of it to Augustus remains constant from Petrarch in 1345 to Guazzo in 1574.

The Middle Ages seem to have lost sight of this tradition of the humorous ruler. There are no jokes in Einhard's Life of Charlemagne, despite the fact that Einhard apparently knew Suetonius. Nor is there any humor in Joinville's Vie de Saint Louis. The serious moral purpose of the Christian King, defender of the Faith and scourge of the pagans, apparently precluded any light relief. But the Renaissance, which unearthed so much of Roman life and letters, naturally resurrected the Roman joke, and not surprisingly this must be credited,
along with so much else, to Petrarch. In his Rerum memorandarum libri of 1343-5, an obvious imitation of Valerius Maximus, he includes two subjects which Valerius had not treated: “De facetiis ac salibus illustrium,” and “De mordacibus iocis.” This separate category of mean or cutting witticisms he owes to Macrobius, who found it in Plutarch (Quaest. conv. II. 1 and VII. 8).

Petrarch follows Valerius’s division of anecdotes into Romana and Externa, and adds a third section: Moderna, referring not necessarily to living persons but at least to those who lived fairly recently. Although his two sections are essentially a joke anthology in the symposium tradition exemplified by Plutarch and Macrobius, he is also familiar with the rhetorical tradition which, beginning with Cicero and much expanded by Quintilian, attempted to classify rhetorically the humor suitable for the orator. In his very brief introductory remarks he refers to Cicero’s classification of the genus as facetiae, sales, or apothemata (sic), to the separate category of scomma (Plutarch’s word) which contains hidden contumelia, and to the distinction in the De oratore between cavillatio and dicacitas. He then launches directly into his first section, “De facetiis ac salibus illustrium.”

Of the famous people included in Petrarch’s two sections, Cicero this time is credited with 21 jokes made by him or against him, and Augustus with 18. But Augustus far outweighs the other rulers quoted, who include Philip of Macedon, Antigonus, Vespasian, Tiberius, Domitian, Nero, Mithridates and Azzo d’Este. The rulers in their turn outweigh the other famous people, among them Diogenes, Virgil, several Romans, Pope Boniface VIII and Dante. None of the romana or externa jokes is original; some of the moderna may be.

Renaissance humanists had, in Macrobius and Petrarch, two easily accessible examples of joke collections which stressed the wit and affability of the ideal ruler. In these collections the personality of the joker is important, while in the rhetorical tradition deriving from Cicero the rhetorical technique used in the joke is more significant that the personality of the joker. In the fifteenth century Italy produced two immensely popular and influential books of jokes, belonging to these two separate traditions. Poggio’s Facetiae, in Latin, were composed about 1438 but not published until the 1470s, and are brief witty anecdotes whose attribution is not usually essential. The Motti e facezie del Piovano Arlotto, first published before 1478, recount the witty and wise sayings, and sometimes the practical jokes, of a real country priest.
II. Real laughing princes: Alfonso and Cosimo

We might expect to find a number of Renaissance kings and princes portrayed as witty rulers, but this is not the case. Only a few princes seem to have been so depicted, and one of them stands out above the others very much as Augustus stands out above the other Roman Emperors: Alfonso the Magnanimous (1396-1458), ruler of Aragon, Catalonia and Valencia (1416) and of the Kingdom of Naples (1442). His reputation, until long after the fifteenth century, as the ideal ruler and modern equivalent of Augustus, probably owes less to his actual character than to his humanist biographer Antonio Beccadelli, usually known as Panormita. His De dictis et factis Alphonsi regis Aragonum, composed about 1455 and published in 1485, is an unstructured collection of brief anecdotes portraying Alfonso as wise, prudent, devout, merciful, generous, learned — and witty. By no means a biography in the modern sense, the book provides historical and political information only in passing, so that its readers must have been sufficiently familiar with the story of Alfonso’s life to know immediately what is meant by “bellum Neapolitanum,” “Cum Calacium obsideret Alphonus,” and scores of other such references. The emphasis is also more on things said than on things done, although specific actions which redound to Alfonso’s credit are mentioned.

If this work can be assigned to a literary genre, it must be to the collection of sententiae. Alfonso’s dicta, if by no means always witty, are usually pithy and sometimes memorable. He was, says the Proemium to Book II, “sermone admodum iucundus, breuis & elegans, uenustus & clarus,” and some of his motti have the satisfying brevity of proverbs: “Diem illam in qua nihil legeret se perdidisse dicebat” (II.16, misnumbered 19); “Adulatores autem lupus haud absimiles dicebat esse” (III. 17); “Foenus nihil aliud sibi uideri, quam animae funus dicebat” (III. 34). The punning touch in this last is fairly frequent.

Panormita’s glorification of Alfonso clearly presents him as the modern equivalent of Augustus, stressing his magnanimity, hatred of treachery and of flatterers, and the association between giving and taking jokes: “Alphonsus cum esset admodum facetus & urbanus,
mirari tamen magis licuit, quo animo quaque moderatione ipse aliorum sales pertulerit, quam quomodo ipse iocos protulerit” (IV. 27) — an obvious recollection of Macrobius’s admiration for Augustus. Not many of Alfonso’s jokes are hilarious by modern standards, though a few may cause a smile: when Jacopo Alamanni offered him a gold statue of St. John for quingentorum aureorum precium, Alfonso enquired how the disciple could be worth more than the master (I. 56); he feared that a knight constantly asking him for favors would end by asking for his wife (II. 40); he stated that the quietest marriage would be between a blind wife and a deaf husband (III. 7); or that one definition of crazy men was those who went looking for a lost wife (IV. 8). These are in a minority; most of the dicta are simply sententiae in the Classical wisdom tradition.

Before the end of the fifteenth century, there is one more candidate for the rôle of ideal witty ruler: Cosimo de’ Medici. Unfortunately we know nothing about the composition of the joke collection which contains his best-known motti. This work, usually known as the Bel libretto or the Detti piacevoli, has been attributed to Poliziano, on insufficient grounds. Dated by Wesselski about 1478, the collection is probably a mixture of anecdotes, proverbs and riddles from very different sources. The real people to whom motti are attributed include Piovano Arlotto, King Alfonso, and many characters in the milieu of Lorenzo the Magnificent. Oddly, however, while 18 jokes or pithy saying are attributed to or directed against Lorenzo, 37 are attached to his grandfather Cosimo, founder of the Medici dynasty and called by the Florentines Cosimo pater patriae.

Cosimo was not a ruler in the same sense as Alfonso of Aragon; where Alfonso ruled over seven kingdoms, Cosimo remained a private citizen who just happened to hold the reins of Florence in his hands. But he was often glorified, in his lifetime and especially in Lorenzo’s lifetime, by poets and humanists in very “kingly” terms, and I wonder if the author or compiler of this section of the Bel libretto was not consciously presenting Cosimo as the rival of Alfonso. We see him epigrammatically condemning gambling (2) and stupidity (4 and 16), recommending to an archbishop that he live honorably (129), preventing a brawl (135), exhorting a papal messenger by means of a story (139), stating that, for the great, one enemy is too many, and 100 friends too few (140), threatening his enemies with a reversal of the situation (162), demonstrating his scrupulous honesty as a banker.

4 There is only one edition: Angelo Polizianos Tagebuch (1477-1479), edited by Albert Wesselski (Jena 1929), who bases the attribution to Poliziano on very slender evidence. The original manuscript has disappeared.
(173) and his ability to forgive injuries (178), and showing generosity to a poor but wise man (264).

Most of these contain neatly-turned phrases which are not comic, but some are genuinely witty. Cosimo prefers the family house at Cafaggiolo to the one at Fiesole, because from the former everything to be seen is Medici property (3); when a peasant eating with him refuses wild pears with the remark "We feed them to the pigs" Cosimo retorts: "We don't; take them away" (45); when an extravagant friend asks to borrow money for a house he is building, Cosimo agrees with the proviso "keep me for the plastering" (serbami all'intonacare, 46); when told by some Siennese that on a certain occasion the Florentines had lost their wits, Cosimo retorts that that isn't possible (156); he claims that there is more point to crying out before you are hurt, than afterwards (192), and that it's a good sign if no one is aware that a man has been holding office (200).

Two of Cosimo's retorts were famous, and occur in many other collections. Rinaldo degli Albizzi, in exile from Florence, sent a message to Cosimo: "The hen is sitting on her eggs," to which Cosimo replied that it's hard for her to do that outside the nest (137). And when Cosimo himself was going into exile (in 1433) he said to Palla Strozzi: Hodie mihi, cras tibi (a prophecy fulfilled a year later). Like Alfonso, and Augustus before him, Cosimo is every inch the wise general as well as the good governor. One of his pithy retorts implicitly recalls Augustus, and another does so explicitly. When a Pistoian soldier boasts that he didn't flee from a battle, showing as proof the wounds on his face, Cosimo comments: "The man who wounded you must not have been fleeing either." This recalls the man with a scar on his forehead boasting to Augustus of his military prowess (Macrobius, Saturnalia II. 4.7); Augustus's comment is: "At tu cum fugies numquam post te respexeris." And à propos of one remark of Cosimo's the author explicitly recalls Augustus: "Cosmo di qualche huomo pronto et accerto soleva dire che egli haveva il cervello in danari contanti. E motto di Augusto: Ingenium habet ut Seneca" (268).

III. Alfonso from 1485 to 1646

Both Alfonso and Cosimo were seen, in their time and later, as powerful rulers; Alfonso over many kingdoms, Cosimo over enormous wealth and one of the most important city-states in Italy. There seems to be no reason why Alfonso rather than Cosimo should have caught the imagination of later fifteenth and sixteenth-century humanist writers and readers, but he clearly did. Motti by Alfonso can be found in the Arlotto collection already mentioned, in the roughly contem-
porary Facezie e motti attributed to Niccolò Angèli dal Bucine,\(^5\) in Gioviano Pontano’s *De sermone* of 1509,\(^6\) in Cortesi’s *De cardinalatu* (of which more in a moment), in Adrian Barlandus’s *Locorum veterum ac recentium duae centuriae* (Louvain, 1524), and in Castiglione’s *Libro del Cortegiano* (1528). The 1538 edition of Erasmus’s *Apophthegmata* contains 17 sayings by Alfonso towards the end of Book VIII (706-09). The 1550 Tübingen edition (and others) of Heinrich Bebel’s *Facetiae* includes selected jokes from Poggio, and assorted sayings of Alfonso, St. Bernard, Cardinal Giuliano, Bernardino of Siena, Isocrates, and the Emperors Sigismund, Rudolph, Frederick and Albert. But the title of this volume says only “his [Poggio’s *Facetiae*] additae sunt & Alphonsi regis arragonum,” without naming the others.

Perhaps the most striking evidence of Alfonso’s popularity is the work published in Venice in 1557 by Lodovico Domenichi (compiler of the century’s most popular Italian joke collection), called *Historia di Messer Lodovico Domenichi, di detti, e fatti degni di memoria di diversi principi, e huomini privati antichi, et moderni*. Of the twelve books of this work the first two are a careful translation of Panormita’s *De dictis et factis*. . . . Domenichi’s other ten books are a grab-bag of anecdotes about famous people, often tragic or depressing, many of which are taken from Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini’s commentary on Panormita’s work. There are more anecdotes about Alfonso, especially in Book XI, which includes a number of jokes taken from Pontano, some of which concern Alfonso. Well into the seventeenth century, the *De dictis* was still being re-edited as a model of princely conduct,\(^7\) as it had already been for the scholiast Jacob Spiegel, whose commentary (in the 1538 edition) on I. 9 includes the phrase: “Attendete, quisquis es θ rex imitator Alphonsinae uirtutis . . .” (p. 24).

Alfonso and Cosimo were not the only contemporary rulers to be held up as examples, but Alfonso in particular does seem to have been the model for idealized portraits of other rulers. The pattern appears to have been set by Piccolomini’s commentary on the *De dictis*, easily accessible in the Basel edition of 1538.\(^8\) This commentary is entitled *Aeneae Episcopi Senesis in libros Alphonsi Regis . . . Commentarius*, so that it can presumably be dated between 1450, when

\(^5\) *Facezie e motti dei secoli XV e XVI*, codice inedito Magliabechiano (G. Romagnoli, Bologna 1874).

\(^6\) Ed. S. Lupi and A. Risicato (Thesaurus Mundi, Lugano 1954).

\(^7\) *Speculum boni principis Alphonsus rex Aragoniae. Hoc est, dicta et facta Alphonsi regis Aragoniae . . . Ex Aeneae Sylvii commentariis . . .* (Elzevir, Amsterdam 1646).

\(^8\) I do not know whether this commentary was already in the 1485 edition, which is often mentioned but which I have never seen.
Piccolomini was named Bishop of Siena by Nicolas V, and 1458 when he became Pope Pius II.

The most common kind of "commentary" used by Piccolomini is the comparison between Alfonso's sententia as reported by Panormita, and a similar one uttered by a well-known person. Of these people quoted most are modern, and famous: the Emperors Sigismund, Frederick and Rudolph, and assorted humanists and politicians. Thus for instance Alfonso's comparison of flatterers to wolves (III. 17) is matched by Sigismund saying that he hated flatterers like the plague. In a few cases the matching sententia quoted by Piccolomini became more famous than the original; Alfonso was once asked whether he owed more to arms or to letters, and replied that from books he had learned about arms (IV. 19). Piccolomini recounts (247-48) Emperor Sigismund's comment that it is foolish to prefer arms to letters; he can make a thousand knights in one day, but could not make one doctor in a thousand years, an aphorism repeated in many sixteenth-century joke collections.

Attempts were made to set up various kings and princes as rivals to Alfonso in wisdom. Perhaps the most surprising candidate is Louis XII of France; to the 1585 Wittenberg edition of the De dictis is appended a brief Ludoici XII. Galliae Regis scite et facete dicta, consisting of 49 sententiae with marginal comments modelled on those of the De dictis, some using Greek as well as Latin (Misericorditer & νεμεσοπτικως). Not one of these sententiae is likely to cause a smile; we are now much closer in time to the Louis XIV who made one joke in his life. The wisdom of Augustus lives on, but not, apparently, his humor.

IV. Imaginary laughing princes: the Cardinal and the Courtier

Alfonso and Cosimo, Emperor Sigismund and Louis XII were all real people, even if we need not take too seriously the literary portraits of them penned by their admirers. But the same Renaissance humanists who loved to idealize real princes also enjoyed delineating the imaginary Ideal Prince. Indeed, rather than regard Panormita's "biography" of Alfonso and Guillaume Budé's Institution du Prince as belonging to two separate genres, we should probably classify them both as "Mirror-of-Princes" literature. I should like to discuss here two sixteenth-century "mirrors-of-princes," one very well known, the other virtually unknown.

The latter is a work by Paolo Cortesi, published once only in 1610,
called *De cardinalatu*. Cortesi was a well-known Roman humanist, and one of the most aggressive of the die-hard Ciceronians who refused to write a Latin word unless it could be found in Cicero. The *De cardinalatu* is a detailed manual in three books on how the ideal cardinal should think, speak, act and furnish his house. Most modern readers will be surprised to see that the chapter "De sermone" (II. 9) contains a section on the *Facetie et Ioci* considered suitable for this cardinal.

A Cardinal is a Prince of the Church, in some senses a ruler and in others a courtier, and Cortesi, like Castiglione a few years later, has Cicero’s ideal orator firmly in mind. This is particularly clear in the joke section, which consists of an anthology of 26 anecdotes told by famous people, preceded by a very brief introduction. Here (LXXXV) he explains why jokes are relevant: "nihil est. n. tam humanae naturae cognatum / quam aspersus dicendi urbanitati sal / nihilque tam proprium hominis / quam facietarium dicacitate delectari." *Urbanitas* and *festivitas* can dispel sadness, anger and hate, he claims, and force even the unwilling to laugh.

Like Panormita’s, Cortesi’s anthology has comments in the margin, possibly the contribution of Cortesi’s friend Raffaele Maffei. But whereas the *De dictis* comments qualified Alfonso’s state of mind while saying or doing (*Facetè, Iustè, Prudenter*), those in the *De cardinalatu* note the speaker, and also the rhetorical category exemplified by the joke, which is usually stressed in the text as well. Thus the first one, a well-known anecdote about Dante taken from Petrarch, is labelled *Ex inopinato* (the text uses Cicero’s *praeter expectationem*); the second, telling how Francesco Gonzaga, asked by a miserly wealthy man to suggest an unusual subject for a painting in his house, replied: "liberalitatem," is *ex admonitione*, and so on. A majority of these categories are variants on denying, accusing or reproaching, so that the modern reader receives some curious impressions about the general tone of conversation in the Curia.

Jokes are told by one Emperor, three Popes (plus the secretary of

---

10 As far as I know, the only copy of this work in the U.S. is in the Houghton Library at Harvard.


12 Weil-Garris and D’Amico, p. 68, note 75.
Julius II), two kings, one of whom is Alfonso, and Cosimo and Lorenzo de' Medici. About half of the jokes are known from other sources, but quite a number may well be personal recollections of Cortesi’s. As will be the case with Castiglione, there is nothing especially “courtly” about this humor; Cortesi re-tells, for instance, the very popular story of the obese traveller arriving at the city gate. When asked why “ante manticam gestaret / ita in ea urbe fieri oportere dixit / in qua tanta esset hominum multitudo furax.” Ex re criminione ex corporis uitio ad animi uitium, says the marginal note.

There is no indication here that the ideal cardinal should specifically imitate Augustus, who is not mentioned, or Alfonso or Cosimo, who are. Cortesi is thinking rather of the ideal orator portrayed by Cicero, whose skill in humor, and especially in the cut-and-thrust exchanges of the courtroom, seem to be better adapted to the sixteenth-century cardinal than Alfonso’s measured sententiae. Perhaps because of this imitation of Cicero, Cortesi’s jokes are much more humorous than most of those in the De dictis and the Bel libretto. They are all, in fact, recognizably comic, owing little or nothing to the wisdom tradition which partially inspired the two earlier authors.

Specialists have long known that the passage on joking in Castiglione’s Libro del Cortegiano (II. 42-93) is very closely based on Cicero’s De oratore (II. 54-71). Most readers, however, are certainly not aware of this, and are still less aware of the tradition of the laughing ruler outlined in this article. The Cicero-Augustus-Alfonso-Cosimo filiation helps to explain the size and importance of the joke section in the Cortegiano, and allows us to further evaluate both its links with the past and its originality.

Cicero’s rhetorical classification of the jokes necessary for the orator was based on a bipartite division between cavillatio (humor infused throughout a speech) and dicacitas (one-liners), and between humor in re and in verbo. Castiglione, like others before him, conflates these divisions, as though cavillatio were identical to humor in re, and dicacitas to humor in verbo. His two categories are festività or urbanità (comic narration), and detti or arguzie (one-liners). He added a third category, burle (practical jokes), which Cicero would not have approved.

Under in verbo Cicero had nine categories (as against 25 in re): ambiguity, the unexpected, puns (παρονομασία), quoting poetry, taking figurative expressions literally, allegory, one-word metaphors, antiphrasis, and a certain kind of antithesis. Castiglione will use all these, as well as Cicero’s in re categories, in his second and largest section, on humor in un detto solo. Under narrazione, the first section, he has only three categories, which I have seen nowhere else, and which
are all illustrated by non-Ciceronian jokes. The first is "il recitar con bona grazia alcuni diffetti d'altri" — that is, mocking the stupidity of others; the second is "certe affezazioni estreme," illustrated by the lady who wept every time she thought of the Last Judgment, because on that day everyone would see her naked; and "una grande e ben composta bugia," a well-developed lie, exemplified by the story of the frozen words.

Comic anecdotes are obviously less important to Castiglione than one-liners. In the longest passage of his joke section, he follows Cicero's categories, often word for word in the same order, but uses to illustrate them a mixture of Ciceronian and contemporary jokes. For instance, under "taking someone's words in the same sense and throwing them back at him" (II. 60; Cicero's "ex eo . . . in eum ipsum aliquid, qui laceravit, infligitur," II. 63) he first re-tells Cicero's example, of Catulus (= "little dog") asked by Philippus "What are you barking at?" and replying "Because I see a thief:" Castiglione omits the names, so that the joke is not as comic as it was in Cicero (II. 54). He then gives a modern example we have seen in Cortesi: the obese traveller asked why he's carrying his luggage in front of him.

Some of Castiglione's jokes have not been found elsewhere, which is certainly interesting — and unusual; but both by his rhetorical categorization of humor and by the illustrations he gives, he demonstrates his debt to the humorous-prince tradition. Like Cortesi he places each joke carefully into a rhetorical category, and like Panormita and the author of the Bel libretto he is concerned to portray an ideal courtier (who could equally well be a prince) who is both wise and witty.

V. Conclusion

From our point of view the four main works discussed here stand in chronological order of interest. Panormita's De dictis borders on hagiography; real wit is rare, and so much concentrated wisdom is indigestible. The Bel libretto contains more genuine jokes, but still too many sententiae for modern taste. The De cardinalatu is already astonishingly "modern": its jokes are nearly all witty, even if some of them must have seemed funnier to readers who knew the people mentioned than they do to us. And Castiglione's jokes are all witty, by our standards; the ones taken from Cicero, the ones about Alfonso and Cosimo, and the ones Castiglione discovered for himself. Not surprisingly, the two imaginary princes are more genuinely humorous than the two real ones.
All four of these works are members of the same literary family, but they belong to two different branches of it. Alfonso and Cosimo are the descendants of Suetonius’s emperors, whose humor is an integral part of the image of *humanitas* they wish to project. The enormous popularity of Alfonso’s jokes demonstrates that the Renaissance put, if anything, more stress on the necessity of humor than Antiquity had done. The cardinal and the courtier, while telling many of the same jokes, are descendants of the rhetorical tradition, and for them as for Cicero’s orator humor is an important persuasive technique. Cortesi’s statement that the cardinal’s humor will dispel sadness and anger (in his colleagues? in the Pope?) is not essentially different from Cicero’s description of the effects of the orator’s humor on the judge (*De or. II. 58*).

The subject of Renaissance *urbanitas* has been seldom discussed in detail, and would well repay further study. By the time we get to Louis XIV, the *urbanus* (*honnête homme*) no longer laughs; but he did laugh, from the fourteenth through the sixteenth century, and he liked to read about, and write about, real or ideal princes who also had a sense of humor.

*University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*
In one sense Botticelli's *Mars and Venus* [Figure 1] in the National Gallery, London, is perfectly intelligible.¹ The elegant young beauty is at ease and awake: her elegant young beau is asleep, and funny little satyrs are playing tricks on him. He is, to use late twentieth-century terms, "knocked out loaded"; she is "in control." There is a statement about love.

The problems begin when one asks why this painting should have been made in fifteenth-century Florence, and what more exactly the painting was about then. These problems are both general: what kind of object is it? — and particular: what are the satyrs doing? In what kind of slumber does the young man recline? Why the insects round the tree? Why the conch blown into his ear? And so on. These problems are the greater because nothing is known of the history or context of the picture before the nineteenth century.

The picture bears no more than an attribution to Botticelli, though the attribution has long been accepted.² There is a general consensus that the picture belongs to the early 1480s, which, purely on grounds

¹ This article has been improved after discussion with Michael Baxandall, Charles Hope, Jill Kraye, Amanda Lillie, Elizabeth McGrath and Letizia Panizza. This does not mean that they endorse its ideas; but that I thank them.

of style, remains possible, if not likely. However, the evidence by which this assessment is supported I intend to show to be false. There are hints in the linear mannerisms of the woman’s dress of the style of the 1489 Cestello Annunciation in the Uffizi, though the rhythms are here less rapid, less contrived. Horne found the “quality and accent” of the draughtsmanship close to that of the Bardi altarpiece of 1485. The modelling of the young man also seems much like the modelling of Botticelli’s St. Sebastian in the Staatliche Museen, Berlin, which has been identified with a St. Sebastian installed in Santa Maria Maggiore, Florence, in 1474. But the identification is supposition and I would prefer to suppose rather that the St. Sebastian was a quite different commission than that the National Gallery picture was painted before Botticelli’s visit to Rome in 1481-82. The picture first reappeared in Florence, and so was presumably painted there.

Gombrich suggested further that the patron might have been the prominent Florentine family of the Vespucci, for whom Botticelli painted his fresco of St. Jerome in Ognissanti in 1480, and that the picture might have been a marriage gift. His logic was that Piero di Cosimo painted a pair of pictures for the Vespucci illustrating Ovid, Fasti III. 725 ff., featuring therefore bees and hornets and also satyrs. He argued that Botticelli’s picture was “clearly an offspring” of cassoni or trousseau chests given on the occasion of a marriage, and often featuring coats of arms. The Vespucci coat of arms featured wasps (vespe). Botticelli’s picture featured wasps; and the picture probably had something to do with marriage because the games the little satyrs play are largely based on the games played by the erotes in Lucian’s description (in the work often called Herodotus) of Aëtion’s picture of the marriage of Alexander and Roxana, which picture, Lucian goes on to say, earned Aëtion himself a good marriage. The suggestion is plausible, though it is only a suggestion, and everything in this article should serve to support it. The kind of pun involved can be paralleled, for instance, in the Porcari of Rome having deliberately collected antique sculpture featuring pigs; or in the little stones

(sassetti) for David’s sling on the wall outside the Sassetti chapel painted by Ghirlandaio in Santa Trinità in Florence.7

I intend in the course of this article first to establish the genre to which Botticelli’s picture belongs; secondly to discuss the classical sources used in it; thirdly to point out its relationship to contemporary vernacular literature (in particular Dante’s Vita Nuova) and the way in which the classical sources have been used.

An interpretation of Botticelli’s picture should be aided by a very similar painting attributed to Piero di Cosimo [Figure 2] in the Staatliche Museen, Berlin: the similarity is not only of composition — two opposed figures reclining in a landscape, the male asleep, nude, with amori playing with his armor — but also of format and size.8 Unfortunately Piero’s picture is not documented before the nineteenth century, either, except that it almost perfectly accords with a description by Vasari of a picture by Piero.9

Dipinse ancora un quadro, dov’è una Venere ignuda con un Marte parimente, che spogliato nudo dorme sopra un prato pien di fiori; ed attorno son diversi amori, che chi in qua chi in là traportano la celata, i bracciali e l’altra arme di Marte. Evvi un bosco di mirto, ed un Cupido che ha paura d’un coniglio; così vi sono le colombe di Venere e l’altra cose di amore. Questo quadro è in Fiorenza in casa Giorgio Vasari, tenuto in memoria sua di lui, perchè sempre gli piaisser i capricci di questo maestro.

He also painted a picture where there is a nude Venus with a Mars likewise, who sleeps stripped naked in a meadow full of flowers; and about them are several loves, who — one here, one there — carry about Mars’s helmet, arm-guards and other armor. There is a grove of myrtle, and a Cupid who is frightened of a rabbit; in the same vein the doves of Venus and the other appurtenances of love are there. This picture is in Florence in the house of Giorgio Vasari, who has it as a keepsake of Piero, because he has always been fond of the fancies of this artist.

The only discrepancy appears to be Cupid’s fear of the rabbit, which is hardly possible in the Berlin picture, since he is pointing beyond it. However, he could appear to be drawing back from it, and I presume this caused misreading.

Vasari’s description is not much more than that, and where it is

more it may depend on inference: for instance that the protagonists are Mars and Venus (from which it has been supposed that Botticelli’s protagonists are Mars and Venus), or that Piero’s picture is a “caprice.” Is Botticelli’s also a caprice? What did Vasari mean by “capriccio”? 

The answer to this latter question at least is clear enough from the context: he means one of those inventions typical of Piero in Vasari’s characterization of him — charming, bizarre, original, not to be taken too seriously. Piero’s picture was therefore according to Vasari neither an ecphrasis or a relation of a classical event, nor an invenzione of a grand, high order.

Further, it is implicit in Vasari’s description that he thought the picture was about love. Two indications are his rather exaggerated “meadow full of flowers,” which surely derives less from what he saw than from the tradition with which he associated what he saw, and his relation of the various objects he describes — myrtle, rabbit, doves, etc. — to Venus and to love (“the other things of love”). It follows that this is an allegory: which is also virtually a corollary of its not being a story or an illustration. Hence these appurtenances are there not so much to identify the woman as Venus, as to make her a venerable personification. Some of her attributes — the butterfly, the rabbit — are not classical, and therefore all the more clearly moralize about love. It is something pretty, fluttery, insubstantial; something sexually frequentative and cuddly (for the rabbit does seem to be nudging Cupid with his nose). In the same way, though they have classical precedent, the turtle-doves may stand for love’s fervor and lovers’ inseparability (they were meant to pine to death if separated); and Cupid, as he is shown here, represents not only the fondness (in his relationship to his mother) and fondling of love

10 This is conjectural, but consistent both with what is said about love and with the role of butterflies in the Renaissance dialogue Virtus Dea interpolated into the selected Latin Lucian of Venice 1494 and Milan 1497; the gods paint their wings while keeping Virtue waiting for Justice. Cf. the flowers in the Raphael mentioned below. There may be an allusion to the amatory topos of the butterfly / moth which prefers to die in love’s flame. This was at least as old as the troubadours (e.g. Folquet de Marseilles), and is taken up by Petrarch (RS xix and cxli). Dante had made a characteristic adaption: Purg. x, 121 ff.

11 G. de Tervarent, Attributs et Symboles dans l’Art Profane 1450-1600 (Geneva 1959), s.v. Lapin / Lièvre.

12 Ibid., s.v. Colombe.

13 Cf. Leonardo Giustinian’s “Per gran forza d’amor commosso e spinto,” Cancionete (Venice c. 1472 etc.); this includes a sexual fantasy, in which from “Li dove il primo liquor il fantin piglia” he moves “alla dolcezza che avanza / tutti i piacer d’ogni triumpho e regno.” Cf. also on the one hand the image of Charity, on the other suckling satyr mothers.
(in his relationship to the rabbit) but also a certain double-edged jocularity. He grins and points, "mostra a dito," which is how Renaissance Italian society behaved towards lovers, at least sometimes. He refers then to the lover's individualization, a source not only of pride and joy but also of shame (cf. Petrarch, *Rime Sparse* i). The myrtle may be a specifically venereal qualification of the shrubbery that might anyway belong to a love garden.

What about the *amori* who play with Mars's armor? In one sense they continue and expand on Cupid's gesture. They hardly suggest the dignity of the young man's knightly calling, rather its abandonment or even defeat. Childishly they introduce disorder, scattering their toys "chi in qua chi in là." They fancifully elaborate the poetic metaphor of love overcoming the spiritual defenses (protecting armor) of the lover, who then, disarmed, despoiled, becomes the vassal and victim of the god (cf. Petrarch, *RS* ii, iii). The classical references of the *amori* amount to the same theme. In classical art they had appeared, for instance, heaving at the club of Hercules, or playing in one way or another round Bacchic sarcophagi. They had similarly manifested the sweet power of an ecstatic god, even over stalwart heroes.

In classical literature such *amori* had appeared in particular as the agents of Venus in epitaphia, busy or having been busy about the bridegroom (or also bride) in this same sort of way. With little doubt this is the convention which Piero has revived, or rather in the revival of which he has followed others. For he (or his purchaser) does not seem to have used a particular classical text. Nor need he have done so, since Botticelli's or other images might have been accessible to him, and the convention had already been revived in vernacular literature. Politian's *Stanze* for the Giotto of 1475 are a prime example. At one particular point (I, cxxii) Politian seems to have used Lucretius I. 31 ff., where Mars lies in Venus's arms, a passage that Panofsky suggested had a bearing on Piero's picture (Gombrich then suggested it had been used by Politian). Politian used the Lucretius, however, I submit, only in passing. A much more important source was Statius's epitaphium for Stella and Violentilla (*Silvae*, I. 2). The basis for the excursus on the realm of love (I, lxvii ff.) was


of course Petrarch's Trionfi. Politian used other sources again, but from the Silvae (on which his commentary survives) he could have taken at one and the same time Mars and Venus in the bliss of the morning after, and the amori who play such a fervid part in both poems. There seems in fact to be no visual or other reason to make a connection between Lucretius and Piero di Cosimo.

Politian's poem, for all its epithalamial imagery, celebrates not a marriage but chivalric love: developing the idea that love enhances prowess, the Stanze are a eulogy of Giuliano de' Medici's nobility. Piero di Cosimo's picture need not either perhaps be connubial, though it surely celebrates the sweets of achieved love. In calling it a caprice, Vasari seems to have responded accurately enough to its mood.

Horne also classed with Botticelli's picture two pictures of similar period and origin, called now "school of Botticelli," in the Louvre (M. I. 546) and in the National Gallery, London (no. 916), in which a woman, draped or semi-draped (Venus de Milo fashion), reclines similarly in a landscape with again amori festive about her. One could add the picture in the Ca'd'Oro in Venice (Fototeca O. Böhm no. 668) attributed to Bugiardini or (formerly) to Franciabigio, in which the nymph is entirely nude, sleeps, and is accompanied by a single amor who takes her by her right-hand index-finger and also points — like Piero di Cosimo's Cupid. Giorgione's sleeping Venus in Dresden, in which there was originally a Cupid, since painted out, presumably also belongs to this class, along with the later pictures which are related to the Giorgione, including Titian's Venus of Urbino in the Uffizi. All these images, including Botticelli's, are with little doubt about carnal love.

Both men and women reclining like this are also found in other kinds of object produced in late fifteenth-century Florence. First may be mentioned the inner lids of marriage cassoni: two pairs, each with a woman painted in one and a man painted in the other, survive (Schubring nos. 156, 157; 289, 290), and two isolated examples, one of a woman (Schubring 185), one of a man, inscribed Paris (Schubring

19 Several drawings of this theme are also cited by A. Novak, La Nympe Couchée (diss., Paris 1969).
184). All these recline, leaning on one elbow; some are awake, some are asleep; some are nude, some are clothed. Secondly, there is the series of early Florentine engravings mostly of circular format known loosely as the Otto prints (Hind A. IV). One print (Hind A. IV. 13) [Figure 3] shows a couple reclining in the same way opposite each other with their legs overlapping, rather closer together than in Botticelli’s picture: he holds out to her a flower (the mark of so many northern marriage portraits); another print (Hind A. IV. 20) shows a nude woman reclining similarly with three amori about her, one of whom blows a horn. Both these are subsidiary images, accompanying, in the main field, lovers plighting their troth on some object symbolic of their faith: they occur among other subsidiary images which emblematically or suggestively accompany the main image, and the other subsidiary images in the print with a couple consist of music-making amori. In the center of these prints was often left a blank space in which an individual coat of arms might be colored in, and it has been presumed that they were intended to be stuck onto circular boxes, such as might be or might contain lovers’ tokens. In several of the prints the motto “Amor vuol fè” (“Love needs faith”) occurs, sometimes continued “e dove fè nonne Amor non può” (“and where there is no faith Love has no power”). On one print (Hind A. IV. 6) the lovers are identified as Jason and Medea; another couple (Hind A. IV. 11) was believed by Warburg to represent Lorenzo de’ Medici and his courtly-beloved Lucrezia Donati, but the emblem on the coat of the man, a ring enclosing feathers, has been shown by Ames-Lewis to have been adopted by the Medici rather than to have belonged to them. This emblem presumably signifies hard faith binding the soft, the light, the luxurious — a variant on “Amor vuol fè.” Another variant is the “Ame droit” on the sleeve of the young man in the print with the reclining couple.

It is therefore obviously possible that Botticelli’s picture is not only sexual but also epithalamial, in the exact sense of celebrating a prospective marriage. Given the evidence formulated by Gombrich, we might say that it is certainly about “Amor” but may very well also involve “Fè,” or troth. Horne also adduced a gesso relief in the Victoria and Albert Museum (no. 5887-1859) [Figure 4] in which

20 P. Schubring, Cassoni (Leipzig 1915).
21 A. Hind, Early Italian Engraving (London 1948).
22 This connection also in Novak, op. cit. (above, note 19).
there are again reclining figures, again amori, and the man leans back asleep just like Botticelli’s figure.25 On the other hand the circular format, in particular with a blank center, and the motif of the ring repeat these features in the Otto prints; the coat of arms and the encircling ring again suggest the occasion of a marriage. This object surely confirms a connection between the Otto prints and Botticelli’s picture.

Given this much, the supposition by Tietze-Conrat that two reclining figures on the lid of a Bacchic sarcophagus not otherwise related to the picture constituted the specific source for Botticelli’s picture should be rejected.26 There is also no evidence that the sarcophagus to which she pointed was known to the Renaissance.27

Doubt may also be raised whether Botticelli’s figures are necessarily Mars and Venus. When the picture first came to light in the nineteenth century they were assumed to be Mars and Venus because all secular Renaissance pictures were assumed to be mythological. Later the assumption was buttressed by comparison with the Piero di Cosimo, which Vasari said to be Mars and Venus. But it is not certain to me even that Vasari was correct about the Piero di Cosimo. If Piero had intended no more than a generic knight — as it were a figure on the stage whose type is clear but whose name is never given — Vasari even so would still very likely have called the knight Mars, because Vasari did not expect in Italian paintings genre figures of the kind painted in the north.28 He expected literary or historical representatives or personifications.29 Not that the line between personifications and generic figures need be hard and fast: Marcantonio Michiel, for instance, described a picture by Palma Vecchio when he first saw it as “la Nympha,” when he saw it next as “la Cerere.”30 Despite Vasari,

25 J. Pope-Hennessy, Catalogue of the Italian Sculpture in the Victoria and Albert Museum (London 1964), catalogue no. 129. The center is presumed to have held a mirror. The object is dated to the third quarter of the fifteenth century — to the same period as the Otto prints.
29 Cf. Vasari’s criticism in his neighboring Life of Giorgione’s frescoes on the Fondaco de’ Tedeschi in Venice, ed. cit. (above, note 9), IV, p. 96: “che nel vero non si ritrova storie che abbino ordine o che rappresentino i fatti di nessuna persona segnalata antica o moderna.”
and despite the fact that many Renaissance representations of classical mythology exist, it may very well not have been necessary for Botticelli’s picture to have had named protagonists.31 It does not follow either that, because the woman is Venus, the knight in Piero’s picture need be Mars. He might be a sleeping knight like the one in Raphael’s Dream of the Knight in the National Gallery, London,32 who sleeps between the figures of Gravitas (?) and Voluptas, except that Piero’s knight has chosen Voluptas, figured in his picture as Venus. Piero’s knight looks too adolescent to be Mars. Further, rather than being a product of it, Piero’s picture would run counter to the epithalial convention if his knight were Mars, since Mars when he appears is half awake in Venus’s arms rather than fast asleep, and the amorì strip not Mars of his armor but the husband.

Piero’s picture is therefore not sufficient argument that Botticelli’s earlier couple are Mars and Venus; and here not only is the knight not particularly martial, but also the woman is not like Venus: her white robes would bear rather an association with virtue. In the still earlier Victoria and Albert relief, onto which the argument should logically impose these identities once again, the sleeping man has no armor whatsoever. It is anyway the more normal practice to follow developments forward. Therefore, I suggest, we see in the relief a representation of the joy of a wedding night. (The man’s pose has been supposed to have been taken from that of Endymion on sarcophagi,33 but why should one suppose their influence here? Surely a contemporary image of the Creation of Eve has been adapted.) In the Botticelli, the mocking games played with the young man’s armor by little satyrs indicate, I submit, more specifically the nature of that joy and of the young man’s feelings. This is the idea I intend to develop. In the Piero, the indications of the young man’s joy are less allusive, and there is no need here to elaborate on the explanation already given above.

Again, even if the protagonists of Botticelli’s picture were Mars and Venus, they would surely be so by mere antonomasia, in the same way that one of the Otto-print couples was dubbed Jason and Medea and one of the cassone-lid lovers was called Paris. These names are not going to explain what is happening to them. Whoever heard of little satyrs playing about Mars?

Why the little satyrs? Not this question, but the question, what

31 I argue this again in an article, “Of Antique and Other Figures: Metaphor in Early Renaissance Art,” forthcoming in Word and Image, 1.
32 Proposals that the knight is Scipio or Hercules fail: see C. Gould, The Sixteenth-Century Italian Schools (National Gallery, London 1975), pp. 212 ff.
33 So Pope-Hennessy, op. cit. (above, note 25).
they may be doing, can be answered partially by the passage from Lucian already referred to:


And on the other side of the picture other loves are playing in Alexander’s armor, two of them carrying his spear, aping bearers when they take the weight of the pole; another two drag a single one reclining on his shield — he too must be a king then — having taken hold of the straps of the shield; and one has gone inside the breastplate, which is lying upside down, and looks as if he is hiding so as to frighten them when they come up to him dragging the shield. Yet this is not empty playfulness, and Aetion has not expended his art on them to no purpose, for in fact they underline Alexander’s equal love for war, and tell us that at one and the same time he loved Roxana and had not forgotten arms.

Some of the details in the picture are so close to the Lucian that scholars generally have been persuaded that the artist must have had some sort of access to Lucian’s text. But that cannot be the whole story. There is nothing to do with the Lucian in the transformation of the erotes into satirelli, the conch being blown into the young man’s ear, the wasps, the tree, the laurel grove, the cushion on which she sits, her appearance, the cloak in which he is wrapped, the fruit or vegetable held by the satyr in the breastplate, the helmet over the head of one of the satyrs, the ululating tongues of two of the satyrs. Other details not in the Lucian seem rather to be divergent from it than extraneous to it, and may be explained as contingencies of its translation into contemporary terms — into contemporary armor, into the format of a contemporary lovers’ idyll. Even the way the satyrs carry the lance can be explained similarly. The two who drag a third on a shield — βασιλέα δήθεν καὶ αὐτῶν: this one, too, a king in little — might have recalled the amor who pull the shaft of the chariot (on which another amor is “king”) on the helmet of Goliath in Donatello’s bronze David in the Bargello, Florence. The lance-bearers may amalgamate and syncopate Lucian’s spear-carriers and shield-draggers.

The satyr blowing the conch may be in one sense part of the amorous convention, in so far as he repeats the amor blowing a horn
in the Otto prints, although blowing horns belongs of course to a broader tradition of pageantry, carnival and festival celebration in general. However, it is widely believed, following Duren, that the satyr and his conch reflect a report by a scholiast to Aratus that Pan during the Gigantomachy induced panic among the opposing host by blowing a conch-shell. The report was mentioned by Politian in his Miscellanea (Centuria Prima), no. 28, on panic terror; and it became known to him from a manuscript he purchased in 1483, thus providing a circumstantial date or at least a probable terminus post quem for Botticelli's picture. Duren's thesis was accepted for several reasons, primarily because such a direct connection between Politian and Botticelli seemed very attractive. Duren argues that virtually no one else could have known this text in 1483 except Politian. Secondly, however, it built on Panofsky's proof that Correggio used this source in providing his figure of Pan in the Camera di San Paolo in Parma with a conch. Thirdly, in the absence of other evidence, it seemed quite possible that the young man was having a nightmare. Indeed recently Dempsey in a public lecture connected this panic with Lucian's ὥς φοβησείν, "in order to frighten." I wondered then if the wasps might not represent the "bombus," or buzzing, of Pan's whip to which Politian went on to refer in Miscellanea no. 28. Even if this source were to be rejected, it seems to be a property of the conch, when blown, to induce terror, as in Aeneid X. 209-10:

hunc vehit immanis Triton et caerula concha
exterrens frena . . .

A Triton carries him, enormous, and terrifying the blue straits with his conch. . . .

This might look as if it supported the thesis. However, the idea of nightmare seems irreconcilably to conflict both with an amorous context and with the soundness of the young man's sleep in Botticelli's picture, and the whole construction can be dismantled as follows. Panofsky was incorrect in supposing Correggio to have used the scholiast to Aratus as a source for his conch-blowing Pan in the Camera di San Paolo. It is difficult to conceive any motive for resort to this text, except for "an almost compulsive propensity to cryptic

35 First printed Florence 1489.
allusion," a supposition to which Panofsky was forced by his own interpretation.\textsuperscript{38} On the other hand it is not difficult to see why Panofsky should have been led to think Correggio was using this source.

First, as he says, he knew of no parallel. Secondly, he assumed a fundamental Renaissance movement towards the "re-integration of classical form and classical subject matter."\textsuperscript{39} Thirdly, Cartari’s \textit{Imagini de i Dei de gli Antichi}, published in an illustrated edition in Venice in 1571, has an image of Pan with a conch, as the attribute with which he causes terror.\textsuperscript{40} Fourthly, the Aratus account is both unique and was demonstrably used by Cartari.

Let us be clear that references to panic terror abound in antique literature. Politian collected several, and Gyraldus, \textit{De Deis Gentium} XV, added more.\textsuperscript{41} Alciati, \textit{Emblemata}, no. cxxii, "in subitum terrorem," is proof of the diffusion of the idea.\textsuperscript{42} Most of these references are to panic in battle, and Alciati’s \textit{Emblem}, though it is improvised and does not depend on a specific source, reflects this fact:

\begin{quote}
Effuso cernens fugientes agmine turmas
Quis mea nunc inlat cornua? Faunus ait
Seeing the platoons flee with broken ranks
Says Faunus: Who is blowing my horns this time?
\end{quote}

Accordingly the image above shows the god with a large serpentine military-looking trumpet. Panofsky suggested that Pan had been changed to Faunus for no more than a metrical reason. In fact it seems to me clear that the Renaissance did not distinguish between the bestial gods.\textsuperscript{43}

Then came Cartari’s \textit{Imagini}, and Cartari here as elsewhere followed Gyraldus. He translated some of Gyraldus’s sources, and also, following Gyraldus’s precise reference, looked up Politian. Gyraldus first

\textsuperscript{38} \textit{Op. cit.}, p. 98.
\textsuperscript{39} Cf. E. Panofsky, \textit{Renaissance and Renascences in Western Art} (Stockholm 1960), p. 100 and \textit{passim}.
\textsuperscript{40} In this edition pp. 132 ff. Cartari was first published, without illustrations, in 1556.
\textsuperscript{41} Lilius Gregorius Gyraldus, \textit{Opera Omnia} (Lyons 1696), column 454; the \textit{De Deis Gentium} had been previously published in full at Basle in 1548.
\textsuperscript{42} Not one of the original collection of emblems, "in subitum terrorem" first appeared in the 1534 edition of Alciati. It is the 1534 woodcut, on which subsequent woodcuts in the period in question all seem to have been based, that I describe. See H. Green, ed., Alciati’s \textit{Emblemata} (Manchester 1870-71).
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reports that Politian has an entire chapter on the subject, then he says:

Sed et Theon in Arati comment. \( \text{\textit{\varepsilon_{XoN}}\text{\textit{\varepsilon}}} \text{\textit{id est sonitum hunc cochlea factum scribit\ldots}} \)

But Theon in his commentary to Aratus also writes that this echo, that is sound, was made by a conch.

Cartari certainly then looked up Politian, because his words follow Politian, not Gyraldus. Cartari writes:

overo perchè Pan fu creduto il primo, che trovasse di sonare quella gran conchiglia che portano i Tritoni, con la quale ei fece sì gran romore nella guerra contra i Titani\ldots (ed. 1571, p. 132)

or because Pan was believed to be the first to have discovered how to sound that great conch which Tritons carry, with which he made a great noise in the war against the Titans\ldots

Politian's note reads:

... militasse ait Pana deum adversus Titanas, primumque eum videri concham illam tortilem et turbinatam qua pro tuba utuntur invenisse, quae Graece cochlos appellatur.

... He says that the god Pan fought against the Titans, and that he seems to have been the first to have discovered that twisted, spiral conch which they use for a trumpet, which is called cochlos in Greek.

According to Panofsky, however, "Cartari, a mere compiler, apparently owed his information to the more scholarly Natale Conti," whose \textit{Mythologiae} was published in 1551.\textsuperscript{44} But Conti’s words (VI, xxi) are quite different. Panofsky never refers to Politian.

I submit therefore that the idea that Pan induced terror by blowing a conch had been registered, like a word in a dictionary, but had not circulated, had not as it were entered parlance, before Cartari. I think it significant that the connection to the conch blown by a triton is Cartari’s, not Gyraldus’s and not Politian’s. It would have helped the illustrator pick the reference up. If the notion were unknown to Correggio, the transmission Politian-Gyraldus-Cartari is clear; but if it were known to him, I do not see how one can explain Alciati, except by denying transmission to be linear. Others may. I think it is worth pointing out that in neither case is the process a “re-integration” of classical form and classical subject matter. There never had been known before the Renaissance an image of Pan blowing a conch. The Renaissance term \textit{invenzione} is accurate.

\textsuperscript{44} Panofsky, \textit{op. cit.} (above, note 36), p. 42.
What alternative explanation then is available for Correggio’s Pan? Duren has already found one parallel Panofsky overlooked. It seems to me it is one of very many. I submit that shells referred, if to anything at all, then to Venus.\textsuperscript{45} A shell was the object on which she was carried to the island of Cyprus after her birth from the genitals of Saturn. Although always such a meaning is corroborated by the context, the shell seems to have been a venereal symbol much as a vase was a symbol of the Bacchic. This will be so even for tritons when they appear in art.\textsuperscript{46} Transmission was undoubtedly through Fulgentius II, i. Thence it passes to Bernardus Sylvester’s allegorizing commentary to the first six books of the Aeneid. Explaining Aeolus’s storm and the calming of it by Neptune, Bernardus says:

Mare corpus humanum intelligitur quia ebrietas et libidines que per aquas intelliguntur ab eo defluunt et in eo sunt commotiones vitiorum et per ipsum ciborum et potus meatus fit. Secundum hoc legitimus Venerem ex virilibus Saturni natam fuisse in mari. Virilia enim Saturni qualitates temporis quibus creatur: calor et humor. Hec virilia in mare deiciuntur quoniam ciborum et potus superfluitates in corpore aguntur. Hec autem in corpore per cibos acta libidinem movent. Ideo dictum est: sine Cerere et Bacco friget Venus.\textsuperscript{47}

The sea stands for the human body because drunkenness and lust, which are to be understood by its waters, issue from the body and the disturbances of the vices are located in it and through it there is passage of food and drink. Accordingly we read that Venus was born in the sea from the genitals of Saturn. For the genitals of Saturn are the qualities of the season which give rise to Venus: heat and moisture. These genitals are thrown into the sea in reflection of the fact that the products of food and drink circulate in the body. These movements, however, produced in the body by food, stir lust. Therefore the saying: without Ceres or Bacchus Venus is cold.

Shells and vases, I suggest, are emblems of “libido” and “ebrietas” equivalent to their ossified personifications. Urged to find one for Ceres, I would suggest it was a bowl of natural produce, or a cornucopia; the personification Copia was more usual.

In the later development of the mythographical tradition, Venus emerges with the scallop or conch as her prime attribute: in Mythographus III; in Petrarch’s Africa, where she is so described (III. 212-13):

\textsuperscript{45} Except of course when the shell is the pilgrim shell of St. James.

\textsuperscript{46} This would be consistent with Raphael’s Galatea, for instance. The first deviation from the Bernardus Sylvester tradition (on which he depends) might be Cristoforo Landino’s in his Camaldulensi Disputationes (ed. Lohe, Florence 1980), p. 170.

nuda Venus pelagoque natans, ubi prima refertur turpis origo dee, concam lasciva gerebat

Venus naked, swimming in the sea (whence, we are told, in base circumstances she originated) bore, lascivious, her conch;

in Boccaccio's *Genealogia*, III. xxiii (Venus secunda); in the Ferrarese Tarocchi prints (Hind E. I. 43); in Botticelli's *Birth of Venus* in the Uffizi.

By the second half of the fifteenth century these easily comprehensible and familiar attributes have started to appear as it were adjectively in other contexts, so that in Mantegna's engraving, *Battle of the Sea-Gods*, the figure of Neptune is accompanied on his plinth by a vase and a shell. (The whole print is evidently founded on the idea in Bernardus Sylvester that the sea may stand for the "comotions" or passions.) Two other instances are Giovanni Bellini's *Allegories* in the Accademia, Venice, in one of which Bacchus appears, in another (I submit, its pair) porters carrying a conch, that is, laboring basely under the burden of lust; and a statuette by Riccio in the Bargello, Florence, of a naked woman holding in one hand a shell, in the other a drinking horn, while a child invites from her breast. I suppose her to be an image of Luxuria.  

In other images, for instance in Lotto's *Allegory* in the National Gallery, Washington, a vase occurs without Bacchus — here beside a satyr; and, clearly, by the context, meant to indicate his intemperance. So in the Botticelli I presume the shell to occur without Venus, in the hand of a satyr, and to be clearly shown by the context to indicate his concupiscence; and in the Correggio I presume it to occur similarly again, in the hand of an arch-satyr, although I cannot go into the details now. Linear transmission through Botticelli to Correggio is perfectly possible. Perhaps I may also reward the argument by the observation that the nymph in the lunette beside Correggio's Pan, whom Panofsky believed to be related to him and to be Hope against his terror, holds a dove. So all this also agrees with the Piero di Cosimo.

In fact it seems clear to me that semi-animal creatures were naturally interpreted in the Renaissance as base, as embodiments of the passions. This was either because they were all varieties of incubus or devil (if you believed in their existence) or (if you did not) because they


were products of the lower imagination—"velut aegri somnia," like the dreams of a sick man, to recall the opening lines of Horace’s *Ars Poetica* with its description of a painting of a centaur, of a chimaera, and of a satyr, if a satyr may stand described as a creature whose head and foot do not make one form ("ut nec pes nec caput uni / reddatur formae"). Similarly laughter, like the laughter Horace supposed such a painting would occasion, was a normal response to ungoverned lechery and infatuation; one also laughed at monkeys. Is not the satyr with the helmet over his head both comic and indicative of the kind of blindness which earned Cupid his blindfold? His companion blows venereal dreams with his conch into the young man’s ear, venereal dreams that after Horace one might characterize as "vanae species"; and does he not recall quite strongly the devil blowing the hot air of lust into other dreamers’ ears — for instance in Dürer’s print, *The Dream of the Doctor*? There, too, the amor is ridiculous on stilts. If one should wish to show a man inveigled by a sensual dream, to show satyrs leaping round him might seem a good way to do it. Certainly there are pictures in which Pan looms behind a ripe sleeping nude.

Of course it remains possible that Politian might have provided the Aratus scholion. But is it at all likely that if terror had been meant by the satyr’s conch, its proper possessor, a devilish adult Pan, should have been transformed into a childish satyrlet? And why should Politian recommend the conch as an indication of nightmare when it is clear from his discussion and citations in *Miscellanea* no. 28 that he understood it as a waking fear — something indeed from which philosophy may protect, as Cicero writes to Tiro (Ad Fam. XVI. 23), in the passage that the entry sets out to explain? Philosophy cannot protect against sleep. Nor is there reason to suppose he would think panic relevant to an amorous context, since there is no hint of it in the *Stanze*.

The connection between “bombus” and conch will also then fail, given that there is no association between Latin “bombus” and the

---

51 This is consistent with the theory expounded by Synesius, *De Somnii*, published in Florence in 1497 in Ficino’s translation; and with Ficino’s dedication (dated 1489) to the collection, in which he includes Proclus’s *De Daemonibus*.


54 Bartsch 76. The imagery was not new: cf. Petrarch, *RS* cxxxvi, 9-11.

noise made by a conch except in Miscellanea no. 28, where “bombus” translates Greek βομβος in fact not quite accurately (the Greek word, meaning in Homer always a crash or bang, is by no means parallel); and even Greek βομβος, meaning then more than a blast on the conch, is associated with a conch only in Nonnus.56

However, there are associations of Latin “bombus” with satyrs and with knighthood. The hypothesis that the wasps might also be there for the sake of the noise they make seems worth testing beside the venereal reading I have put forward. The association of Latin “bombus” is firmly and equally to bees and to horns.57 The passage in Pliny (Natural History XI. 10. 20 ff.) in which a hive is compared to a camp and bees’ buzzing to bugling was presumably well known in the Renaissance, given the circulation of Pliny. A horn was part of the equipment of a knight: its use recurs in Boiardo’s Orlando Innamorato, and the echo of that most moving tragedy of Roncisvalle had not yet died. The other satyrs play laughably and lasciviously with the rest of his armor. May not the one with the conch underline the knight’s condition by the implicit contrast between the lustful, nacreous dreams he blows and the mighty summons of a clarion? An association between satyrs and “bombus” can be found in at least three texts, provided that the satyrs are understood as followers of Bacchus. This, however, does not seem unreasonable, in view of the resemblance of both them and their antics to the satyrs who play on Bacchic sarcophagi. The motif of a snake underfoot in Donatello’s Atys-Amorino in the Bargello, which is surely kin to Botticelli’s “satyr-amorini,” proves such sarcophagi to have been observed.58

The texts are first Ovid’s Fasti III. 725 ff., in which the followers of Bacchus discover honey and Silenus, thinking to do the same, rouses a hornet’s nest: these two episodes were of course illustrated for the Vespucci by Piero di Cosimo.59 The second, which was illustrated by Titian in his Bacchus and Ariadne now in the National Gallery, London, is Catullus 64. 263:

multis raucisonos efflabant cornua bombos

The horns of many blew hoarse-sounding buzzes . . .

56 LSF⁹, s.v. βομβος; βομβών; ἐπιβομβών; Nonnus XL. 503.
57 OLD, s.v. bombus.
It is part of the description of the train of the god as he comes upon Ariadne. I see no reason to suppose that either of these is in any way involved in Botticelli’s picture, although the recurrence of Bacchic allusions in two supposedly punning Vespucci commissions may be significant.

The third text is Persius I. 99 ff.:

Torva Mimalloneis implerunt cornua bombis

They filled their rasping horns with Mimallonean buzz . . .

This is again a Bacchic description, inserted as an exercise in a particular style. The Persius might very well have been more to hand than the Catullus. Persius was more widely read, a favorite medieval author, frequently printed from the early 1470s; furthermore, this passage (unlike the Catullus) was often cited to illustrate Bacchic texts by Renaissance commentators, for instance by Landino to Horace, *Carmina* III. 18, and by Bernardino da Verona to Tibullus I. 7. All commentators of the period cite Persius to Catullus 64; on the other hand Catullus 64. 251 ff. was not cited to the Persius by anyone before Casaubon.

Further evidence of the circulation of the Persius is provided by sonnet no. cxxviii in the Milanese poet Gasparo Visconti’s *Canzoniere* of the mid-1490s, which includes the lines:

\[
\text{poi ch’èl tuo stil così suave bomba} \\
\text{che nectare et ambrosia par che versa}
\]

Since your tenor hums so suavely
that it seems to pour nectar and ambrosia

to which Visconti, explaining his use of the word (forced by the difficult “-omba” rhyme), glosses:

bomba: apum sonus dicitur teste Plynio libro XI, et est vocabulum factitium, unde plerumque etiam pro alio sonitus genere usurpatur. Persius de Bachis:

Torva Mimalloneis implerunt cornua bombis

bomba: said to be the sound made by bees, according to Pliny, Book XI. It is an onomatopoeic word; hence it is also commonly used for other kinds of sound. Persius on Maenads:

61 First published Florence 1482; Brescia 1486.
62 Antonio Parthenio, Brescia 1485, etc.: Palladio Fosco, Venice 1496; Battista Guarino, Venice 1521 (but made before 1492).
63 P. Bongrani, ed. (Milan 1979).
Visconti appears to have overlooked the fact that "torva" means "harsh, rough, fierce"; but Botticelli's patron, if he was using this text, did not, for he has replaced the "torva cornua" with a much more nectarous conch.

Visconti's gloss was necessary, not because "bombare" was a neologism, but because otherwise it would have meant "drink avidly, copiously and merrily," though "bombare" is apparently obsolete or dialect in modern Italian. This further sense of "bombing" accords with both the Bacchic and the venereal connotations of satyrs, with the drunkenness of epithalamia in general (a figure Lucian thinks might be Hymen lolls on Hephaestion's shoulder in Aetion's picture) and with the appearance of the young man himself. Confirmation that his general demeanor and situation would have been read as an intoxication like that of wine is available in an anonymous contemporary print representing the pedlar Pieterlin, drunk (so an inscription in one of the two versions) and set about by monkeys, two of whom play with his clothing (Hind A. I. 76, 77) [Figure 5].

This line from Persius could provide with the Lucian the ingredients that are unique to this picture. With the Lucian would come the satyrs with the lance and the one in the breastplate; with the Persius, the satyr blowing and the wasps to make a "bombus." In both allusions the satyrs ape or mimic, μυειοσθαι. This is the word used by Lucian for their games, and this is the etymological gloss put upon "Mimallonean" both by the scholiast and by Renaissance commentators to the Persius. Besides this, Bartolomeo Fonzio in his commentary (first published Florence 1477) says that the Mimallones imitated "father Liber"; so there would be logic from this in their being children. A spectator might even have been referred to the Persius by their being satyr-children. The possibility can be corroborated to some extent by the recurrence of a child-satyr in the foreground of Titian's Bacchus and Ariadne mentioned earlier, who is dragging the head of a bullock. It seems plausible that he is present in the Titian not because Catullus mentions such creatures, but because, to Catullus's "divolso iuvenco" of 64. 257, Persius's "raptum vitulo caput ablatura superbu" was cited. Whether there was between the Botticelli and

64 Grande Dizionario Della Lingua Italiana, S. Battaglia, ed. (Turin 1961-); Novissimo Dizionario, G. Folena, ed. (Milan 1980, etc.); s.v. bombare.
65 The story discussed by Janson, op. cit. (above, note 53), pp. 216 ff.
66 That is, Fonzio and Giovanni Britannico (1486); the fifteenth-century Italian ms commentary, British Library Harleian 3989, folio 19', has "Mimallones" only as "ministri Bacchi," and shows no knowledge of the scholiast.
the Titian some visual transmission, or whether the word “Mimal-
lonean,” understood as “imitating father Liber,” evoked child-satyrs, or both, it may be the same image connoting the same entity in both places.

It may be worth investigating the passage in which the Persius line occurs. Persius is arguing what kind of poetry he should be writing:

’sed numeris decor est et iunctura addita crudis.
clundere sic versum didicit “Berecyntius Attis”
et “qui caeruleum dirimebat Nerea delphin,”
sic “costam longo subduximus Appennino.”
“Arma virum”, nonne hoc spumosum et cortice pingui
ut ramale vetus vegrandi subere coctum?’
quidnam igitur tenerum et laxa cervice legendum?
‘torva Mimalloneis inplerunt cornua bombis,
et raptum vitulo caput ablatura superbo
Bassaris et lyncem Maenas flexura corymbis
euhion ingeminat, reparabilis adsonat echo.’
haec fient si testiculi vena ulla paterni
viveret in nobis? summa delumbe saliva
hoc natat in labris et in udo est Maenas et Attis
 nec pluteum caedit nec demorsos sapit unguis.
’sed quid opus teneras mordaci radere vero
auriculas? . . ‘(I. 92-108, Clausen)

‘But grace and counterpoint have been laid over raw meter. [The modern poet] has learned to round off a line with “Berecynthian Atys,” and with “the dolphin that clef the Nerean blue,” likewise “we have sloped a chine down tall Appennine.” Arma virum — isn’t this full of foam and with a thick bark like old branches from an enormous cork-tree cooked up?’ So what about something tender and to be read with a lolling neck? ‘They filled their rasping horns with Mimallonean buzz, and the Bassarid with a bellicose bullock’s ripped head and the Maenad in the act of entwining a lynx in ivy-clusters redouble euhion, euhion: there sounds back the boomeranging echo.’ Would this be going on if there were one drop of our fathers’ spunk alive in us? This eunuch stuff floats on the lips, on the surface of the spittle, and the Maenads and Atys are wet. This stuff makes no mark on the couch-back; it has no taste of the quick of nails.

‘But what need is there to score tender lobes with the bite of truth?’

Botticelli’s young man is certainly not bitten with the truth: he dreams vain delusions, if it was reasonable to cite the Ars Poetica. He lies back with a lolling neck somewhat enervately. Perhaps the satyrs who play about him may not only indicate that he is rapt in lustful dreams, but also serve to characterize the tenderness and luxuriance
of those dreams? Could the fruit or vegetable — is it a squash or a citrus? — that the satyr holds at bottom right be a further hint of their quality? It might well stand for things excessively soft, squasy, pulpy, empty, vain. The contrast in the Persius between an excessively lush style and the true, heroic, epic style might have been used to inform a contrast between the young man’s venereal rapture and the proper use of the arms with which the satyrs play.

Such a reading of the picture would be consistent with the way the Persius was read in late fifteenth-century Florence. The scholiast had remarked on Persius’s spoof lines, which are often attributed to Nero:

Dicitur ἐπωνυμοῖς, carmina poetarum illius temporis plena graecisationibus nullum habere intellectum, quae tamen nescio qua modulatione resonant.

He dissimulates, meaning that the poetry of that time is full of grecisms and has no matter, even though it sounds with an attractive musicality.

Bartolomeo Fonzio remarks in his commentary:

Hos autem maxime versus poeta posuit in eorum reprehensionem qui grandiorem sonum captantes rerum sensus nequaquam advertunt.

These lines in particular Persius intended as a jibe against poets who in striving after a finer sound fail to observe any real sense.

There is also some evidence that this particular passage excited interest at this period in the manuscript notes that erupt around these lines amid the otherwise clean pages of a Venice 1480 edition of Fonzio’s Persius in the British Library (IB 26730). The notator writes beside the text:

Carmina poetarum sui temporis mordit propter molitiem quam habebant in se . . .

He criticizes the poets of his time for their essential voluptuousness.

He then cites Quintilian XI ad finem (sc. Institutiones IX. 4. 142):

67 It may be a Florentine “cedro”; or alternatively a “zucca”; or a fig. 68 In the dialogue Virtus Dea (see above, note 10) the gods not only paint butterflies but also grow gourds (“cucurbitae”) while keeping Virtue waiting. The medieval sense of “cucurbita” as “adulterer” given by DuCange, Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis (Niort 1883-87), might also be relevant both to the pseudo-Lucian and to the Botticelli. 69 I have assumed these to have been written shortly after the publication of the book; it is evidently a Renaissance hand.
... in universum autem, si sit necesse, duram potius atque asperam compositionem malim esse quam effeminatam et enervem, qualis apud multos, et cotidie magis, lascivissimis syntonorum modis saltat ... 

... but in general, if need be, I would prefer the development rather to be harsh and rough than effeminate and flaccid, of the kind found in many authors, and increasingly today, writhing to the most luxurious zither rhythms.

Fonzio in his commentary had glossed Persius's "delumbe" to similar effect:


Such soft and flabby things we often read and have on our lips, he means. Now the seat of the generative seed is in the loins. Hence we are told in the Bible to gird our loins. But "delumbe" describes an effeminate man and one who has grown soft from too much Venus. Hence a poem is said by extension to be "delumbe," meaning lascivious and not at all virile.

Surely such a combination of unsexedness and oversexedness is precisely what we find in the Botticelli's ungirt youth.

The notator of IB 26730 goes on to quote Diomedes the Grammarian, indeed writes out at some length passages from Diomedes's discussion of the various kinds of hexameter line, beginning at the chapter "De pulchritudine heroici versus" (Keil, I, p. 494).

Versus heroicus is dignitate primus est et plenae rationis perfectione firmatus ac totius gravitatis honore sublimis . . .

The heroic line is that which is foremost in dignity and solid in the perfection of the fullness of its structure and lofty in respect of all its weight. . .

The same passage was quoted by Cristoforo Landino in his commentary to Ars Poetica 73-74 (on epic). In fact Diomedes was Landino's principal reference for the explanation of Horace's technical terms (for instance "tragedia"). He was a useful and popular source for commentators of the time; Politian, discussing satyrs in his Centuria Secunda, no. 28, remarks that contrary to the general belief "following

71 Printed with several other grammarians at Florence c. 1475.
Diomedes and others,” there were three different kinds of satyr. The notator of IB 26730, continuing to quote from Diomedes, passes to the chapter “De pedibus metricis,” in which hexameters are classified according to the disposition of the syntax through the feet (something perhaps subsumed in Persius’s “iunctura” at I. 92). One of them is the “smooth” line (“teres”) (Keil, I, p. 499, line 21):

\[
\ldots \text{teretes sunt qui volubilem et cohaerentem continuant dictionem, ut torva Mimalloneis inflatur tibia bombis } \ldots
\]

\[
\ldots \text{in the “smooth” type the sentence runs through the line fluently and without interruption, for example:}
\]

The fierce flute is puffed with Mimallonean buzzes.

It does not seem unlikely that a purchaser who knew Lucian should also have known Diomedes. Visconti’s “factitium” is a grammarian’s term.

At the risk of repetition, it might be as well to summarize the argument so far. Botticelli’s picture belongs to a general class of love pictures, some of which may refer to the bliss of the first night of marriage. It shares with other members of the group its setting, the disposition of its protagonists and the presence of love-creatures. It is individual in that its love-creatures are not straight amori, but are amori-satiri, introducing therefore Bacchic connotations. As a satyr, the one who blows has a precedent in Persius I. 99. As amori, those who carry the lance and the one in the breastplate have a precedent in Lucian’s Aetion. In both there is precedent for their being imitative, or apish. Either Botticelli evolved these child satyrs and their activities freely from the convention to which the picture belongs, or their activities were suggested to him, and an allusion was intended to the Lucian and to the Persius. If an allusion was intended to the Lucian, then the picture must have celebrated a marriage. If an allusion was intended to the Persius, then its point must have been the voluptuous feeling with which the young man is seized. Whether or not these classical texts were in play, the conch blown by the satyr definitely indicates his voluptuous feeling. The hypothesis first that the wasps pun on the coat of arms of the Vespucci, secondly that the allusion to Persius puns on the noise made by wasps, awaits documentary corroboration or dismissal.

An important difference between the Persius line and the Lucian excerpt is that the Lucian is part of a description of a picture; the

72 V. Branca and M. P. Stocchi, edd. (Florence 1972): “quamquam multa ex Diomede afferant aliisque.”
Persius is not. But they are both vignettes. The Lucian excerpt is an example of lovely ancient painting, the Persius excerpt an example of lovely ancient poetry. If there is an aural dimension to the picture — the buzzing of the wasps, the noise of the blown conch — the principle behind its incorporation seems to be identical with the principle behind the visual incorporation of the Lucian.

It is also significant that the Persius line — witness Visconti's citation — might have been a current tag. A tag would have a much wider circulation than the text from which it came. A telling example of this is close to hand. Twice I have found commentators to Bacchic texts including, among the lines they adduce from various sources, the pentameter:

Accedant capiti cornua: Bacchus eris . . .

Let horns grow on your head: you will be Bacchus . . .

This is "illud celebratum" or it is given to Sappho. The reason why it is cited is to show Bacchus had horns, this being typical of his libidinous nature, indicative of his "violentia cerebri." Another place where Bacchus is said to have horns is in Bartolomeo Fonzio's comment to Persius I. 99:

Mimallones dictas quod Liberum patrem imitarentur, et ad eius imitationem cornua ferunt. Unde etiam Cassandram Lycophron "Clari Mimallonem" appellat . . .

They say that they were called "Mimallonean" because they imitated father Bacchus, and they bear horns in imitation of him. Hence also Lycophron calls Cassandra "the Mimallon of Clarus" (sc. because she imitates the prophesying of Apollo's oracle there).

Fonzio says "aiunt" and his informant was presumably at first or second hand some Byzantine, who, having been asked what "Mimallonean" might mean, looked up Tzetzes's twelfth-century commentary on Lycophron where the word occurs twice. In the second place (to Lycophron 1464) Tzetzes gives the information about Clarus; in the first (Lycophron 1237) he has the information:

. . . αἱ ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ Βάκχαι αἱ καὶ μμαλόνες ἐκαλούντο διὰ τὸ μμαόθαι αὐτάς τῶν Δώνσων. κρεστοφορώσανε γὰρ καὶ αὐτάς κατὰ μήμους Διονύσου τευνόκρανος γὰρ φαυτάζεται καὶ ἐγγραφεῖται. καὶ Βιριπίδης [Bacchae 921]

73 So Beroaldo to Propertius III. 17. 19 (Bologna 1487); Landino to Horace, Carmina I. 18. 14 (Florence 1482).
74 So Beroaldo, ultimately from Porphyrio to Horace, Carmina III. 21. 18.
75 Lycophron, Alexandra (Oxford 1697), p. 127; Roscher, op. cit. (above, note 15), s.v. Mimallones.
... the Bacchants in Macedonia who were also called Mimallons because they imitated Dionysus. For they also had horns in imitation of Bacchus. For he is represented and shown in pictures as bull-headed: Euripides [Bacchae 921]. And horns have grown upon your head. He bears horns because when a great deal of wine is drunk it sends men into a frenzy to make advances towards the women of other men.

Bartolomeo Fonzio clearly enough repeats Tzetzes on horns, too: so is it not possible that "accedant capiti cornua: Bacchus eris" is a translation of Bacchae 921, and is another hearsay snippet of the same origin? To cite Bacchae 921 to a Florentine print featuring satyrs quite similar to Botticelli's (Hind A. II. 26) in order to explain the horns Bacchus bears there would be absurd, but this tag seems just as likely a source as Ars Amatoria I. 232 or III. 348, Diodorus IV. 4 or Philostratus, Imagines I. 15. In fact its association with cuckoldry and libidinousness tallies better with the embrace in which Bacchus clasps Ariadne.

In adducing the Persius to the Botticelli I presuppose some factor of hearsay, which is not measurable but which cannot be discounted. I resort to this first because I cannot see another explanation; secondly because even though the argument may be circumstantial it does at least explain. My position is just like Panofsky's before Pan and the conch. He knew only one parallel and therefore used it as an explanation despite its difficulties. I see only one satisfactory explanation of Botticelli's picture within the range of sources about Bacchus and satyrs I have found cited. Welcome to another who can find again a simpler, more substantial tradition!

Much remains unexplained. I would like to know very much more about what might have been appropriate on the occasion of a marriage. One point worth making is perhaps that, if this were an epithalamial picture, it would not necessarily have to be a gift from family to family, but could have been a gift from a friend, cousin or political ally. As such it would be more exactly an epithalamium in paint. Secondly, it may not be appropriate to look for its imagery in classical sources at all, even if the epithalamium was a classical genre. It seems reasonable on the basis of its imagery to identify the following sonnet by Politian (Rime Varie, iv: to an unknown addressee) as epithalamial:76

Spera, signor mio car, e ormai t'affida

76 B. Maier, ed. (Novara 1968), p. 234.
a l’alta impresa tua: el core nero
spogliato s’è, nè più l’abito fero
a suspirar il tristo cor diffida.
La Fede a la tua donna per te crida
e vuol mercede al tu’ servir sincero,
crida per te l’Amor tuo puro e vero,
e l’uno e l’altro a bon porto te guida.

Ecco ver te la vista tua divina
che in candido vestir si mostra lieta
e par che dica ormai: “Fede vol fede.”
Dunque la pena turbulenta accuesta:
vedo la tua salute esser vicina;
dopo la nube il sol chiaro si vede.

Take hope, dear sire, and now commit yourself
To your great adventure: your black heart
Has been stripped bare; fierce cladding no longer
Makes your sad heart hesitate to sigh.
Faith cries to your lady for you
And calls for favor on your guileless service;
Your own true, pure Love cries for you;
Together the one and the other lead you to haven.
Look, towards you comes your own divine vision,
Dressed in white, she reveals herself joyful
And she seems now to say: Faith will have faith.
So then, the pain and the storm quieten:
I see your salvation is close at hand;
After the cloud the sun shines brighter.

The sonnet may be Politian’s, but not the vocabulary. Correspondences to the imagery already discussed are the sun image, which recurs not only in the Otto prints but also all round the man and the woman in one of the cassone-lid pairs (Schubring 156, 157). The ship image is a standard image of Fortune or destiny, but also recurs in another Florentine epithalamial print of the period (Hind A. I. 6).77 “Fede vol fè” recalls “Amor vuol fè.” This sonnet therefore seems some evidence that the white dress of the woman in Botticelli’s picture stands not only for nubile purity but also for faithfulness. She watches over the young knight’s fortune just as the woman in the ship print sits at the tiller.

Particularly striking is the parallel between Politian’s metaphor “spogliato” and the condition of the knight in Botticelli’s picture.

77 Cf. A. Warburg, “Francesco Sassettis Letzwillige Verfügung,” op. cit. (above, note 23), pp. 149-50. The Cupid shows the print is about love, whether it refers to a Rucellai marriage or not.
The opening lines of the sonnet seem to refer to a period of endurance or discretion in the early phase of courtship, in which the beloved herself. This then would be the period of "black" or miserable, "triste," heart (the metaphor is fairly common in French poetry), in which the lover feels himself unworthy or is unwilling to profess himself. Dante, Vita Nuova v, 3, talks of the "schermo de la veritade," the "shield screening the truth." With the abandonment of dissimulation, when the committal has become frank, the lover enters on to his "alta impresa," a recurrent Petrarchan term that comes first at RS v: "Quando io movo i sospiri a chiamar voi." In both Petrarch and Dante the attempt at poetry follows immediately after spoliation (RS ii, iii; RS iv is about destiny; Vita Nuova xii, 3: "Fili mi, tempus est ut pretermictantur simulacra nostra"). Suppose that in Botticelli’s picture the lover is meant to be utterly despoiled of discretion, inebriately and voluptuously poetic over the beloved’s utterly seductive beauty. Is this a way in which it could be shown?

Quite possibly both Botticelli’s picture and Politian’s sonnet were epithalalimial, and drew upon a common stock of imagery. More specifically, all the metaphors of Botticelli’s picture except the buzzing can be found in the opening section of Dante’s Vita Nuova, that is, in chapters ii, iii, v, xi, xii, xiii, xiv, xv and xvi, after which there is a clear break; these chapters intimate the immediate effect of the revelation of the beloved. Buzzing is an alternative metaphor to the same effect, as can be shown from Petrarch’s "Aura che quelle chiome bionde e crespe" (RS ccxxvii).

The Vita Nuova has been recapitulated as follows.

When I fell in love,

Apparve vestita di nobilissimo colore umile e onesto, sanguigno —
She appeared dressed in most noble color, humble and honest, purple (ii, 3). . . .

When she spoke (iii, 1)

. . . presi tanta dolcezza che come inebriato mi partio della gente —
I took so great sweetness that like one drunk I left the crowd (iii, 2) . . . mi sopragiunse uno soave sonno, ne lo quale m’apparve una maravigliosa visione — there overcame me a suave sleep in which appeared a marvelous vision (iii, 3) . . . mi parea vedere una persona

79 For Politian’s “salute” see not only Dante (below) but also Cavalcanti, iv, 13 and Contini ad locum (G. Contini, ed., Poeti del Duecento [Milan — Naples 1960], ii).
80 Annotated edition by D. De Robertis (Milan — Naples 1980).
dormire nuda, salvo che involta mi parea in uno drappo sanguigno leggeramente — I seemed to see a person sleep naked, except that she seemed to be wrapped in a purple drape lightly (iii, 4). She was woken, and made to eat his heart, which she did doubtfully ("dubitosamente," iii, 6).

So in Botticelli's picture he dreams poetically how he will taste to her: she regards him lightly and doubtfully. He, not she, is wrapped naked in a purple cloak, but then he, not she, is asleep. (The way in which the cloak comes round his left foot marks him as wrapped in it, "involto").

The reference to chapter v is by contrast. One day she happened to be sitting, and he happened to be sitting looking at her; and a second woman happened to be sitting in the direct line of his gaze between them. Thence began the "schermo de la veritate" (v, 3; vi, 1); the "bella difesa" (vii, 1; ix, 1; ix, 5); "la difensione" (ix, 5), "lo simulato amore" (ix, 6). This has all gone in Botticelli's picture. He is uncovered, his heart is revealed.

After the loss of Beatrice's "salute / saluto" (x), Dante turns to its effect (xi), its overwhelming enlightenment ("redundava la mia capacitade" — "overflowed my capacity," xi, 3). In another dream he hears it is time to lay aside pretences ("simulacra," xii, 3), and that he is to send her a ballad, in which "tu non parli a lei immediatamente, che non è degno" — "you should not speak to her directly, which is not worthy" (xii, 8) "... ma falle adornare di suave armonia" — "but make your words be adorned with suave harmony" (xii, 8). Then follows the ballad, "Ballata, i' voi che tu ritrovi Amore."

After the ballad and an explanation of its "suave harmony," which consists in the use of figures of speech, Dante continues (xiii, 1):

Appresso di questa soprascritta visione, avendo già dette le parole che Amore m'avea imposte di dire, mi cominciaro molti e diversi pensamenti a combattere e a tentare, ciascuno quasi indefensibilmente: tra lì quali pensamenti quattro mi parea che ingombrassero più lo riposo de la vita.

Next after this above mentioned vision, after I had said the words that Love had charged me to say, there began many and various emotions to assail me and try me, each one almost irresistibly: among which emotions four seemed to me to embarrass the quiet of my life the most.

The emotions are, love is good because . . .; love is not good because . . .; then (xiii, 4):

Io nome d'Amore è sì dolce a udire, che impossibile mi pare che la
the name of Love is so sweet to hear, that it seems impossible to me that his proper working should be in most things other than sweet, in reflection of the fact that names follow from the things named, just as it is written: Names are consequent upon things. . . .

In the conch of Botticelli's picture and in the "Mimallonean buzz," if it is present, there is a corresponding suavity or sweetness, and a sweetness not only in fact but also in style.\(^1\)

The fourth emotion, however, is that Love is not sweet because it is so strong, because "Amore ti stringe così" — "Love binds you so" (xiii, 5). Between these emotions there is a battle (xiv, 1; xvi, 4), a battle that seems to recur in the activity of the satyrs in Botticelli's picture. These satyrs also reproduce Beatrice's "gabbare" (xiv, 7; xiv, 9; xiv, 11, line 1; xv, 7, line 12; xv, 8), her untouched teasing mockery of his "dischernevole vista" (xv, 1), his ridiculous figure.

Most particularly the games Botticelli's satyrs play relate closely to the sonnet "Tutti li miei penser" (xiii, 8):

Tutti li miei penser parlan d'Amore,  
e hanno in lor si gran varietate,  
ch'altro mi fa voler sua potestate,  
altro folle ragiona il suo valore,  
altro sperando m'apporta dolzore,  
altro pianger mi fa spese fiate;  
e sol s'accordano in cherer pietate,  
tremando di paura che è nel core.  
Ond'io non so da qual materia prenda;  
e vorrei dire, e non so ch'io mi dica:  
cosi mi trovo in amorosa erranza!  
E se con tutti voi fare accordanza  
convenemi chiamar la mia nemica,  
Madonna la Pietà, che mi difenda.

All my emotions speak of Love,  
And have in them such great variety  
That one makes me want his power,

\(^1\) The "dubitosamente" of iii, 6 is also picked up: the issue of "doubtful" words, that is figures of speech (xii; xxv) is both the problem of poetry and the problem of declaring his heart; or so I believe. The "tasting" of the heart amounts then to the fundamental poetic question, is it "utile" as well as "dolce"? This formulation (Horace, AP 334-35, 343) became virtually a slogan of members of Florence University such as Cristoforo Landino or Bartolomeo Fonzie. The Persius would have been understood in these terms.
Another proves that Love’s power is foolish;  
Another, hopeful, brings me sweetness;  
Another makes me weep frequently,  
And they agree with themselves only in begging kindness,  
Trembling with the fear that is in my heart.  
Hence I do not know from which to make my poem;  
And I would like to speak, and I do not know what to say;  
This is the amorous maze in which I find myself!  
And if with all I would make a harmony  
I would have to call on my enemy,  
My lady Kindness, to protect me.

The combination of defenselessness and combat, of intoxication and  
of ridicule, recurs in Botticelli’s picture. But also Dante’s “dolzore”  
offers a suitable reading for the conch-blower, and the line from  
Persius; and the fear in his heart for the satyr in the breastplate,  
though only via the allusion ως φοβηστει (“in order to frighten”) in  
Lucian. This fear is also drunk (“è per la ebrietà del gran tremore”;  
xv, 5, line 7). I hazard that the blabbering tongues of the satyrs are  
again a sign of drunkenness.

Into such a context the idea of wasps and buzzing would have  
fitted perfectly. Wasps are used as a metaphor of mental confusion  
by Petrarch at RS ccxxvii: there is also a correspondence between  
the wisp of the woman’s hair in Botticelli’s picture and the opening  
lines of this poem:

Aura che quelle chiome bionde e crespe  
cercondi e movi, e se’ mossas da loro  
soavemente, e spargi quel dolce oro  
e po’l raccoglie e ’n bei nodi il rinrespe,  
tu stai nelli occhi ond’ amorose vespe  
mi pungon si che ’n fin qua il sento e ploro  
e vacillando cerco il mio tesoro  
conme animal che spesso adombre e ’ncespe;  
ch’ or me’l par ritrovar, ed or m’accorgo  
ch’ i’ ne son lunge; or mi sollievo, or caggio,  
ch’ or quel ch’ i’ bramo or quel ch’ è vero scorgo.  
Aer felice, co’l bel vivo raggio  
Rimanti. E tu corrente e chiaro gorgo,  
Chè non poss’io cangiarteco viaggio?

Oh breeze, by whom that rippling blond hair  
Is circled and stirred, and who are stirred yourself by it  
Balmily, and scatter that sweet gold,  
And then again gather it and tether it again in tresses,  
You stick in my eyes, causing love’s wasps  
to sting me, so that deep inside I feel it and lament,
and unable to fix on it I hunt for my precious
like a frightened beast that shies and stalls;
For then I seem to have it, and then I come to the fact
That I am far from it; now I am uplifted, now I fall,
For now I see what I desire, and now I catch the truth.
Blest air, with your fair ray of life
Stay! And you, fluent and limpid stream,
Why cannot I change my course for yours?

At this point it will be useful to summarize the vernacular metaphors
I suppose to be present in Botticelli’s picture. First and foremost it
takes its cue from the metaphor of spoliation, of being laid bare
before and by the beauty of the beloved. This metaphor is alive both
in Dante and in Petrarch, and continues to be used in the fifteenth
century, for instance by Boiardo at Gli Amorum Libri I, lxxxii, or by
Politian in the sonnet quoted. More specifically Dante’s idea of being
“indefensibly” in “battle” has been developed, and her purple cushion
and his purple cloak, his sleep, his nudity, the obsession with suavity,
the sense of being ridiculous and the drunkenness also recur in
Botticelli’s picture. The same ridicule and the idea of a struggle to
find sweet words (which could be found far and wide elsewhere) are
associated with metaphorical wasps in the Petrarch sonnet.

In conclusion, I may state it as my belief that both the Persius and
the Lucian are present in the picture, though both have been curtailed
or altered in order to fit into a prior vernacular convention. For,
secondly, even if they were used, they were only flourishes: the
essential script of the painting is the representation of the sensual
effects of beholding the beloved.

Can one really have such powerful sensual effects merely from
beholding the beloved? In the Renaissance, undoubtedly one could;
in this its poetry is unanimous. Can one represent these powerful
sensual effects in the kind of figuration we find in Botticelli’s picture?
It seems in fact to share its figuration with other images that refer
by one means or another to these sensual effects. In particular, there
exist two earlier works of art, one literary, the other a painted relief,
that might have served directly as models for the picture: the painted
relief in the Victoria and Albert Museum and Dante’s Vita Nuova.
Taken over from the relief (or the convention to which it belongs)
are the form and disposition especially of the man, who is shown
asleep. Taken over from Dante (or the imagery which he also uses)
is the content of the man’s dream, which is “keyed” in the picture
by metaphors visualized either directly (the purple cloak, the unde-
fending armor) or in classical cipher like this: satyrs = Bacchic =
ecstatic, libidinous drunkenness; or, conch = Venus = voluptuousness; or, amor playing with armor = the joy of Alexander’s wedding night = the delightful mental confusion of the lover bare to his beloved; or, the noise of wasps plus the blowing of a wind instrument by a child satyr = Mimallonean buzzings = exquisite poetry.

I have tried to map out the classical and the vernacular coding of the picture with such materials as I could find to have been available. It is difficult to judge how available they were, but some of them were clearly in wide circulation. The last thing I propose is an “almost compulsive propensity to cryptic allusion.” It is therefore incumbent to explain why a classical motif has been adopted, why an allusion has been made. To assume pure antiquarianism, pure love of the classical ideal, is in effect to assume precisely a propensity to cryptic allusion. My intention in the first place is to establish a correct reading of the picture, as if I were footnoting a poem.

In the second place I wish to challenge earlier assumptions about the ways in which classical imagery was employed by the early Renaissance. The previous explanation of Botticelli’s picture had been that the couple represented Mars and Venus, and the point was essentially that love overcame ferocity. To associate this idea with Mars and Venus an astrological passage was cited from Marsilio Ficino.\(^2\) My objection to this mode of interpretation is not that the notion is impossible, but that it puts the cart before the horse. If the essential point of the picture is that love overcomes ferocity, then this is its starting point. Its starting point is not Mars and Venus. For the extremely widespread idea that love overcomes aggressive valor, one might find innumerable representations: Hercules and Omphale, or the loves of Jupiter or something else in the Metamorphoses, or a wildman and his wife, or a centaur and his family, or an amor riding a lion. Or Alexander and Roxana, conceivably. Or Mars and Venus. But whatever the terms used, they are used as embodiments of the qualities concerned: strength or savagery, tenderness or beauty. It is these that emerge through the figures. What one has to do therefore with the Botticelli is not first discover the figures represented, but first discover what the figures represent. Working from the action I see in the picture, controlled as far as possible by contemporary parallels, I do not see the logic that leads to the identification of these figures as Mars and Venus.

Until some better source is discovered, I propose instead that neither the man nor the woman should be taken as classical figures

at all. I propose that not every Renaissance secular picture is a mythological narrative or an adaptation from one. Classical sources may be used as it were not only as nouns and verbs, but also adjectivally or adverbially. So I believe them to have been used here, in a painting about sensual effects.

What then is the status of these figures? They are in a landscape; a wind must have lifted the stray wisp of the woman's hair. In a development that stems from Petrarch, the beloved has been envisaged as a nymph. He is therefore a "giovanetto." For this there are parallels. Not too distant perhaps may be a farsa written by the Neapolitan Antonio Ricco and performed in Venice in February 1508 in the house of the Magnifico Marino Malipiero "per la nobile Compagnia de' Fausti" — for one of the Venetian "compagnie della calza" who seem to have staged their festivals either on the occasion of a visit to Venice of an honored personage or — as here — on the occasion of the marriage of one of their members.\(^3\) Here "lo Amante" and "la Donna," as they appear in the dramatis personae, are called in the dialogue "la ninfa" and "lo giovanetto." Closer to Botticelli's picture is the relief in the cortile of the palazzo of the Florentine Chancellor Bartolomeo Scala attributed to Bertoldo (around 1479), figuring a scene adapted from one of Bartolomeo's Apologies or Fables. Here, the lover (anonymous) pleads against Cupid before a tribunal over the harm done him by his infatuation. The lover wears armor, and also is shown led in chains by a figure whose only attribute is a helmet covering his head — just like Botticelli's little satyr.\(^4\)

There is no question of Mars and Venus here. And yet does not the identification with Mars and Venus in Botticelli's picture ultimately depend on no more than the fact that the man has armor?

As a title for the picture I propose "Hypnerotomachia," describing not the figures but what is going on — a kind of battle in a dream occasioned by love. The picture seems also to share with the famous book of that name (published in 1499) the use of classical sources and even perhaps its interest in polysyllables.

It seems to me likely that the picture had an association with the Vespucci, since that remains the best explanation for the otherwise out-of-the-way motif of the wasps so far advanced. It is surely possible that it was a wedding-gift, given its precedents. Its successors were, I believe, not the ecphrastic mythologies of the sixteenth-century, but


its nymphs in landscapes and its Arcadian idylls — works such as Titian’s *Three Ages of Man* on loan to the National Gallery of Scotland, or the *Concert Champêtre* in the Louvre, as well as Piero di Cosimo’s *Venus and the Knight*. In fact I venture the idea that this is the earliest surviving *fête champêtre*.

*The Warburg Institute, University of London*
It seems ironic that Rabelais, with his humanistic reverence for ancient wisdom, should deviate constantly from the classical ideal, "moderation in all things." He combines one extreme: the grotesquely comic, with the other: the deeply religious. These opposite poles, frequently to be found in the same text, are nowhere more apparent than in his chapter on Gargantua's clothing and ornament, "comment on vestit Gargantua." This chapter, often taken merely as an illustration of the author's delight in description, does offer a coherent message beyond the mere amusement of grotesque exaggeration. In modern critical terms, it might be said that Rabelais' semiotics, though obscure to today's reader, point in directions decipherable by one familiar with certain ancient authorities, especially Plato, who provide much material for Rabelais' play and elaboration. The interpreter must also be aware of the vast importance of the Pauline tradition, interwoven at various levels of the author's writing. Any reader with only a casual acquaintance with Rabelais will readily recall how he uses Alcibiades' praise of Socrates / Silenus in Plato's Symposium in the Prologue to Gargantua; any reader familiar with the work of M. A. Screech is aware of Rabelais' extensive exploitation of St. Paul in, for instance, his Tiers Livre.

After a few lines of introduction in which we are told that Gargantua's livery is white and blue (explained in the following chapter as signifying "joye céleste"), and that the records of Montsoreau retain a description of how the young giant was dressed, the
author devotes a short paragraph each to the shirt, jacket and trousers. He has now arrived at the codpiece, an object of some fascination since he composes two paragraphs about it, one of them lengthy. Characteristically, he is poking fun at hallowed tradition; here at elaborate descriptions of a hero’s clothing or arms (Achilles’ or Aeneas’ shield, or Jason’s cloak) by choosing the most grotesque object on which to concentrate. There is a serious side to Rabelais’ bawdiness, however. To use Bakhtin’s term: if he “carnivalizes” serious texts or institutions by ridiculing them and turning them bottoms up, he likewise has a serious intent as he does so. It is the critic’s task to turn his text upside down again, in order to make clear just what the serious starting point may have been.

The main features of Rabelais’ description of the codpiece run as follows: The buckles that attach the codpiece to the trousers are adorned with two emeralds as large as oranges because (here Rabelais playfully cites Orpheus and Pliny) this stone has erectile and comforting power. The decoration is lavish. Its spiralling gold embroidery is garnished with diamonds, rubies, turquoises, emeralds and pearls; it is further compared to a cornucopia, since it is “tousjours gualante, succulente, resudante, tousjours verdyoyante, tousjours fleurissante, tousjours fructifante, plene d’humeurs, plene de fleurs, plene de fructz, plene de toutes délices. Je advoue Dieu s’il ne la faisoit bon veoin!”

However bizarre this enthusiasm may appear to us, one aspect of the description is clear: Rabelais is celebrating the superabundance, the plenitude of material nature, a nature that, in all its crudity, is still God’s creation. He therefore fondly portrays it in all its aspects. Material nature is the ape of heaven: it is raw and imperfect, perhaps—but it resembles the exalted sphere after which it is patterned. The ape is in a sense a travesty, and therefore can be ridiculed as grotesque and comic, but Rabelais never forgets what it resembles.

The emblematic gem for the codpiece is the emerald, sacred, according to near-contemporary authority, to Venus and symbolizing earth among the four elements, since earth (= material nature) is green and flowering, “tousjours verdyoyante.” From within this

1 François Rabelais, *Oeuvres complètes*, ed. Jacques Boulenger and Lucien Scheler (Paris 1962), p. 28: “always gallant, succulent, oozing, always green, forever flourishing, always fruitful, full of humors, full of fruits, full of all delights. I swear to God if it did not do one good to see it!”

2 Valeriano, one such near-contemporary, holds that the emerald is characteristic of virginity and the pure and heavenly Venus. If Rabelais knew the tradition from which Valeriano draws his information, his choice of the emerald as emblematic stone
codpiece will come the seed for the future giants who are to be the continuing rulers of Rabelais' "utopia" (the name he had given to their kingdom in Pantagruel). This Utopia is heavily inspired by Plato's Republic, in which Socrates expresses his deep concern that there be a succession of superior Philosopher Kings who could maintain the integrity of the Republic. The penis is the "emerald," as source of the material being of the future giants: upon this rock will be founded the ideal state. Simultaneously, the shape and decoration of the codpiece resemble the horn of plenty: the very one Rhea gave to the baby Jupiter's nurses Adrastea and Ida. On the grotesquely comic level, it contains delights aplenty for the ladies; on the serious level, a plenitude of seed for future generations. We are directed back in an ever-turning cycle to an identification of man's reproductive power, his seed, with the greening, flowering, fruiting capacity of the earth, our home and universal source.

The enthusiastic account ends on a note of self-restraint; perhaps Rabelais pretends to realize that he has gone on too long. He promises more information in a book he has written: De la dignité des braguettes. On the surface a comic topic, on second thought, it contains a lesson that can be inferred once one has peeled away the multiple layers of reference. Here is a passage that mentions a book. The book celebrates codpieces. Codpieces were part of a dress-code, semata, to draw attention to the penis, which can itself be seen as a symbol of the capacity of mankind (in this case, giantkind) to reproduce. Beyond this multi-leveled play with a bawdy topic, it can also be affirmed that reproduction is a serious matter, and one that greatly preoccupied Rabelais. Nothing is more important than continuation of the species and, in particular, the finest exemplars of the species. What more worthy topic could be imagined? Hence: de la dignité des braguettes.

The clothing description continues. The shoes and belt are described, then Gargantua's sword and poignard, neither of which is real: the sword is of wood rather than of Valentinian steel, and the

for the codpiece may indicate that he considered chastity and purity to be the true ideal for the young giant: "Sunt qui perpetuo claroque Smaragdi virore considerato, signum id esse virginitatis velint: idque insuper argumento addunt, in patranda re venerea, quod experimento compertum est, si quis lapidem attingat eum sponte frangi. Caeterum Astronomi Smaragdum Veneri coelesti dedicarunt, et ad impetrandum eius numinis afflatum perquam idoneum esse proficientur. Nihil autem coelitus non undecunque purum, honestum, et candidum, mortalium animis, si Platonii et veritati credimus, inspiratur." J. P. Valeriano Bolzani, Hieroglyphica, sive de Sacris Aegyptiorum Literis Commentarii (Basel 1556), p. 307A.

3 One can add to these layers. This is a remark in an article about Rabelais' chapter, "Comment on vestit Gargantua," and you are a reader reading this remark.
dagger of “cuir bouilly” (boiled leather), a detail that underscores the peaceloving nature of the giants. After the purse, robe and hat, Rabelais arrives at the hat-feather, a blue pelican plume, with a hat-medallion of enamel portraying an androgyne with the motto ΑΓΑΠΗ ΟΥ ΖΗΤΕΙ ΤΑ ΕΑΥΤΗΣ, “Charity seeks not its own advantage,” I. Cor. 13:5. If it were not for the obvious symbolism of the medallion-plus-motto (about which much has been, and continues to be, written),4 no one would pause over the pelican feather. Normally, however, one would think that a more appropriate decoration would be an ostrich plume, a pheasant or peacock feather; the oddity of a pelican plume, a blue pelican plume, gives the reader pause. It is used here because of the ancient belief that the mother pelican pierces her breast to feed her young on her own substance. This self-sacrifice was used in medieval Church symbolism to portray Christ’s redemptive sacrifice. The pelican signifies Christian charity. The feather is blue, whereas pelicans are white, brown, or grey. Since Gargantua’s livery is blue and white, we are reminded that blue signifies “choses célestes,” an appropriate color to accompany a symbol of Christian charity.

Rabelais’ androgyne-figure, which actually depicts the “beste à deux dos” (“un corps humain ayant deux testes, l’une virée vers l’aultre, quatre bras, quatre piedz et deux culz” — “a human body having two heads, one turned toward the other, four arms, four feet and two bottoms”), has long been recognized as comically different from the source that Rabelais claims to draw on, Plato’s description in the Symposium of the nature of man at its mystical beginning. The androgyne, according to Plato’s Aristophanes, had two heads turned away from each other:

The androgyne . . . partook of man and woman both. But the name is used now only as a reproach. Then also people were shaped like complete spheres. Their backs and sides made a circle. They had four hands, with the same number of legs and two faces — completely the same — on top of a circular neck. These two faces were set on opposite sides on one head, with four ears. And there were two sets of sexual parts, and whatever else one imagines goes along with this arrangement.5

A number of critics have noticed the difference between Aristophanes’ androgyne and Rabelais’, among them, Lazare Sainéan, Jean Plattard and Nan Carpenter. In the most recent study on this anomaly, Jerome


Schwartz argues that Rabelais may have been adapting Ficino's interpretation of the androgyne myth as the soul's desire for re-demption and renewed wholeness through love, a mystical union described in St. Paul's first Letter to the Corinthians (13:12): "For now we see in a mirror dimly, but then face to face." Schwartz's idea appears to be most likely, particularly since the motto "charity seeks not its own advantage," drawn from I Cor. 13:5, follows directly upon St. Paul's lengthy development:

For just as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, though many, are one body, so it is with Christ. For by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body. ... (1 Cor. 12:12-13)

As it is, there are many parts, yet one body. The eye cannot say to the hand, "I have no need of you," nor again the head to the feet, "I have no need of you." On the contrary, the parts of the body which seem to be weaker are indispensable, and those parts of the body which we think are less honorable we invest with the greater honor. ... God has so adjusted the body, giving the greater honor to the inferior part, that there may be no discord in the body. (I Cor. 12:20-25)

It is striking that the motto for Rabelais' androgyne should be drawn from a Pauline context that stresses the unifying of many bodies into one. The second quotation, on the dignity of the "less honorable parts" of the body (which is the Christian congregation), could be profitably applied as well to the celebrated codpiece; it all the more justifies Rabelais' enthusiastic description, and his promise to write "De la dignité des braguettes."

Marriage rhetoric in Rabelais' time dwells upon the unity between man and wife: "Marriage charnel ... (fait) non seullement de deux corps ung, mais qu'il n'y ait aussi entre eux que ung coeur, vouloir, désir et affection." Schwartz' presentation does not deny the presence of the "beste à deux dos," but underscores Rabelais' apparent wish to show that love is a continuum: the self-love of the androgyne is akin to the selfless agape of the motto. "The whole device is emblematic of the undifferentiated complex wholeness of experience, both physical and spiritual, which Renaissance man sought to achieve." Schwartz, in emphasizing serious meaning, necessarily somewhat neglects the comically grotesque side of the device, an aspect per-

6 Schwartz, pp. 271-72.
7 Quoted in Schwartz, p. 274: "Carnal marriage ... not only makes one of two bodies, but there also is only one heart between them, one will, one desire and affection."
8 Schwartz, p. 275.
ennially present in Rabelais, who always tests man's gravest and most exalted ideas by linking them to the grossly physical, as he had done with the codpiece. They are "carnivalized" in order constantly to remind us that our feet are of clay; our greatest inventions are owing to "Messer Gaster" ("Sir Belly"); the greatest philosopher was produced by the "vivificque union" of the "beste à deux dos" ("the life-giving union of the two-backed beast"). Rabelais here, as elsewhere, maintains balance by ambiguity: the deep and spiritually symbolic on one side, the grossly, earthily comic on the other. These are his polar deviations from his professed ideal: the golden mean.

Johann Fischart, whose translation-adaptation of Gargantua, the Geschichtklitterung, was first published in 1575, has made a number of contributions to this passage that can — as near-contemporary reception — enlighten and inform our own reading of Rabelais. Fischart, who often interpolates huge additions into the text he is "translating," renders this passage with only minor changes. He apparently understood Rabelais' androgyne-figure, which had become a commonplace by his time, to be a symbol of the perfect marriage that he had celebrated in an earlier chapter (five) of the Geschichtklitterung, especially since he emphasizes the physically loving union by translating "deux testes, l'une virée vers l'aulette" as "die Taubenschnebel stracks gegen einander kehrt" ("the dove-bills directly turned towards each other"), a description which employs the dove, once sacred to Venus and still favored to portray gentle, faithful (but physical) love. It is precisely this androgyne that figures in Holtzward's Emblemata Tyrocinia as the image of perfect conjugal love. Holtzward's little volume appeared first from Bernhard Jobin's press, with a foreword by Johann Fischart on the history and uses of emblems. Fischart must have seen the engravings for the volume before the publication date; at any rate, he shares the vibrant enthusiasm for the bond of matrimony expressed in emblem 35. The engraving depicts man and wife with one torso in a close but somehow chaste embrace, like the tree in the background being embraced by a grapevine. Tree and clinging vine traditionally signify male and female, respectively; here, the vine is a grape, which further symbolizes life (wine was thought to become blood immediately when drunk). The sun appears to be rising on the right: a good omen for the future of the loving couple, indicating the dawn of real Knowledge, if interpreted in Platonic terms [see Figure 1].

9 See Johann Fischart, Geschichtklitterung (Gargantua): Text der Ausgabe letzter Hand von 1590, ed. Ute Nyssen and Hugo Sommerhalder (Düsseldorf 1963).
10 Fischart, p. 171.
Vxor laetitiae consors simul atque doloris,
Tesine me feriant tela cruenta uelim.
Tesine me rapiant optem crudelia fata,
Et mea mors soluat membra repente necans.
Vt, quae iunxit amor communi foedere lecti,
Vrna etiam iungat corpora bina leuis,
Ossaque tumba olim uenerandi testis amoris
Iuncta eadem simili conditione tegat.

Figure 1
A very likely source for this emblem, as well as for the androgyne on Gargantua's hat-medallion, is the “second-stage” androgyne in Aristophanes' speech, where he speaks of loving couples:

Whenever the pederast, or any other sexual type, meets a half that is the same sort, they are overwhelmed with wonder by the affection, the joy of intimacy, and the love. They don't ever want, one might say, to be separated from one another, not even for a second. . . . Imagine Hephaestus standing over them as they were lying together in this embrace, with his tools ready, and he says: . . . "Do you want to be melded together as much as possible, and not have to leave one another, night or day? If this is what you want, I am willing to join you and weld you into one and the same being. You'll become one self out of two, and you can live as one, with the two of you sharing a life in common as a single being. And when you die, there in Hades, too, instead of two there will be one and you will share death. But look — is this what you want? Will you be satisfied if this should happen?" We know that not a single one of them would refuse such an offer.12

For some reason, this second androgyne has been neglected by critics of Rabelais. It would appear probable that Rabelais and his contemporaries used this passage extensively, although their Christian bias caused them to ignore Aristophanes' homosexual zeal, and to concentrate on the heterosexual union mentioned by him, which was the only one sanctioned by the Judeo-Christian tradition.

Fischart may not merely have been thinking of physical matrimony; he may have known of and approved the more spiritual implications that accompany the device, since he translates literally what Rabelais had to say regarding Plato in his "Sammenpausen oder Symposium." He cleverly parallels the Greek title with Germanic syllables that unfold the meaning of the original language: Sammen = together; pausen = pause (to drink and to converse). He also incorporates in his "Sammen" the idea of unity expressed by the androgyne. Samen = semen, seed; a "Samen-pause" is not only the joy of the marriage-bed, but also that moment where the seed for everything human was first sown, as Aristophanes' tale tells us: "im geheimnussamen Anfang die menschlich Natur einlebig gewesen sey": in its initial secret togetherness (or, equally possible, in its initial secret seeds [and -nuss (= nut) + -samen doubles the connotation in nuce]), human nature was single-lived; it existed in a single life. Infolded in Fischart's affirmation is the wholeness and unity of Adam before Eve was separated from him (from it), as the Fathers of the Church also

12 Plato, p. 65.
interpreted Aristophanes’ meaning. Among the Fathers, Clement of Alexandria believed that in Christ’s new kingdom man and woman would be reunited (cf. Gal. 3:28). Johannes Scotus Eriugena (De divis nat. II. 4) goes so far as to call the risen Christ the Androgyne, an idea that the gnostics had employed; the androgyne was a symbol for the One, the supreme God. Rabelais and Fischart both may have known some of these ideas; Fischart at any rate beautifully embodies the mystical origin of human nature in one word: his coinage “Geheimnussamen.”

Gargantua wears a golden chain around his neck “faicte en forme de grosses bacces (baies), entre lesquelles estoient en oeuvre gros jaspes verds, engravé et taillés en dracons tous environnéz de rayes et estincelles, comme les portoi jadis le roy Necepsos; et descendoit jusques à la boucque du hault ventre: dont toute sa vie en eut l’émolument tel que scavent les médecins gregoys.” The Pharaoh Necepsos, a great astrologer and magician, wore such a necklace, attributing his advanced age to the beneficent influence of the jasper. Rabelais’ text forges the link, especially important to the earlier humanists, between the new lore of emblems and devices and ancient Egyptian hieroglyphics and culture. The mention of King Necepsos brings up automatic associations with the superior lore of antiquity, its knowledge of one-to-one correspondences between signs (hieroglyphics, for example) and natural forces, its supposed ability to manipulate these forces through the use of such signs. Gargantua’s “dracons” are not the diabolical serpents of the Judeo-Christian tradition, but the more beneficent dragons of Egypt, Greece and Rome. Rabelais’ spelling, which transliterates Greek δράκων (= serpent or dragon), makes the classical context even clearer. In Egypt, the dragon was the symbol of fertility that decorated Pharaoh’s throne. In Greece it was a guardian spirit, a spirit of prophecy, and a sign for rebirth and immortality. As Ouroboros, the serpent / dragon biting its own tail, it signified eternity. In Roman iconography, the serpent accompanied Juno and Minerva when they went to war.

13 Engelbert Kirschbaum, Lexikon der christlichen Ikonographie (Freiburg 1968- ), I: 118.
14 Rabelais, pp. 29-30: “... made in the form of great berries, among which were worked huge jaspers, engraved and cut with dragons surrounded by rays and sparks, as King Necepsos used to wear them, and it hung down to the upper opening of the stomach, from which he enjoyed the benefit all his life long, as the Greek physicians know.”
16 On the dragon / serpent, see E. S. Whittlesey, Symbols and Legends in Western Art (New York 1972), p. 313.
Rabelais the physician, this necklace of gold and jasper with its dragon-devices is a talisman that protects the neck, chest and upper stomach of his prince, guaranteeing the healthy functioning of the most vital organs.

The giant's gloves are made of monster-hides: of "lutin" (= evil sprite) — skins bordered with werewolf pelts. They seem to signify that the wearer has triumphed over evil.

Gargantua wears three rings. The first is worn in order to renew the ancient sign of nobility (like the Roman *equites*). Johann Fischart's translation adds the authority of Pliny 33. 1 and of "de jure aureorum Annulorum" from the Codex Justiniani 6. 8 (Mommsen, p. 247). He apparently knew that only the *equites* had the right to wear rings, hence the term "jus annulorum" that expresses the dignity of the knight.¹⁷ This ring, worn on the left pointer finger, is also, from its position, a sign of authority. It is briefly described as a carbuncle the size of an ostrich egg, set in "seraphic" gold. This is not only the most noble metal and the worthiest stone; it immediately arouses thoughts of the throne of God surrounded by Seraphim. The carbuncle, considered to be its own source of light, was a medieval and Renaissance symbol for the love of God or for the word of God that enlightens the darkness.¹⁸ The nobility implied here is not merely that of the Roman knight, but one even more antique: of man before the fall, pure within himself and secure in the word of God and in his charity, a security and power that radiates outward from the pointer finger of the prince to his subjects.

The second ring is to be worn on the left ring finger (le doigt médical for Rabelais; the "Artztfinger oder Hertzfinger" — "the medical or heart finger" — for Fischart). This ring, rather than affecting the prince's subjects, touches the medical well-being of its wearer. As Fischart's translation makes clear, it was believed to be the finger leading to the heart and hence influencing "heart-felt" convictions, courage, and consequent behavior. This ring is made up of four metals: gold, silver, copper (or brass) and steel (iron), in such a magical way that the metals do not touch each other. These metals evoke multiple associations, first with Hesiod's *Works and Days*. They are, in descending order of virtue, the metals that characterize the ages of man: the Golden Age, first and best, where men knew no pain; the Silver, where men were more foolish, but still lived long


and largely untroubled lives; the Copper, a heroic age; and the Iron, our own miserable age of wars, pestilence and family discord. Plato in his Republic uses these metals to symbolize the four types of citizens of the ideal state: the rulers, guardians, artisans and worker-farmers (414a ff.), none of whom is to mingle with any other class. These metals are also linked by Plato with the four greatest virtues of wisdom, courage, temperance and justice. Plato’s most striking passage dealing with the four metals occurs in his description of the collapse of the ideal state. The rulers’ heirs, less cultivated than themselves, “will be unable to assay either the races of Hesiod or those born among you of gold, of silver, of brass and of iron; and the iron mingling with the silver, the brass with the gold will result in a mixture that lacks equality, justice and harmony. Wherever this happens, it engenders war and hatred” (Republic VIII. 546d-547a).

This ring that is most intimately to influence the giant’s behavior reminds him constantly as ruler of his ideal kingdom to keep the four metals apart; in other words, to prevent intermingling between the different social levels within the state, since Plato equated these levels with difference in quality. Any mixing would mean adulteration to him. The four metals also remind him to cultivate the virtues of wisdom, courage, temperance and justice. As already noted, the giant’s kingdom had been named Utopia in Pantagruel, after Thomas More’s idealized state; in Gargantua, the epitome of a perfect republic will be Thélème.¹⁹ Rabelais’ skepticism that such a harmonious republic could be possible is manifested in the problem of the ring’s manufacture: it requires a powerful captain and a great alchemist, Alcofribas, who has already done the impossible by extracting the Quintessence, to forge such a ring; it would require a much greater effort, perhaps by the Creator himself, to forge such a state!

There are still other meanings present in the four metals. In alchemical terms, Mars = steel, Venus = copper, the sun = gold, the moon = silver. These analogies were doubtless implicit in Rabelais’ text, since he calls himself Alcofribas the alchemist to remind the reader of them; certainly Fischart understands, and makes them explicit. In his version, Gargantua is to possess the strengths conveyed by the masculine sun, the feminine moon (the genders are reversed in German), warlike Mars and loving Venus — two masculine, two feminine forces — without any confusion among them. The citizens

---

¹⁹ For a recent study of utopian echoes in Rabelais, especially as they apply to Thélème, see Michaël Baraz, “Rabelais et l’Utopie” Études rabelaisiennes 15 (1980), pp. 1-29.
of his state, 50 percent men, 50 percent women, are to work in harmony without any bastardizing alloy.

The third ring, on the right "doigt médical," also exerts power over the giant's physical well-being. This ring, in the form of a spiral set with precious stones, combines the symbolism of the circle — the perfect or divine figure often used as a metaphor for God — with upward movement, clearly denoting aspiration toward the highest things. Since this is the medical finger, the spiral may represent a coiled serpent, symbol and avatar of the healing god of Greece and Rome, Asclepius. The finger about which the "serpent" twines resembles Asclepius' magical staff. Three stones are set within the spiral: "un balay en perfection, un diamant en pointe et une esmerault de Physon" (p. 30, "a perfect ruby, an exquisite diamond and an emerald of Physon"). The colors of the three stones signify several things at once. Red has traditionally meant divine love or charity, white means the purity of faith, green signifies hope; in other words, they symbolize faith, hope, charity, the three theological virtues, the greatest of which is charity (in yet another covert allusion to I Cor. 13, used in the androgyne device and its inscription). The colors also correspond to the colors of three of the four elements: red = fire (also the celestial spheres), diamond = air, green = earth. In choosing these elements, Rabelais implies the union of the highest and the lowest; the creation reflects God's love (the Divine Fire) through the medium of the air. Since the emerald comes from Physon, one of the four rivers of Paradise, the "earth" meant here is not the sad and sinful world we know, but the earth perfect and uncorrupted before the Fall, as God originally created it. Hence, the ring signifies the perfect union between Creator and creation — a Utopian union — and a promise of salus, health, salvation, in a restoration of prelapsarian wholeness.20

20 One of the finest passages on precious stones and their significance is in Goethe, Gedenkausgabe der Werke, Briefe und Gespräche, ed. E. Beutler (Zürich 1953): "Die aristotelische Lehre beherrschte zu damaliger Zeit (Cellinis) alles, was einigermassen theoretisch heissen wollte. Sie kannte nur vier Elemente, und so wollte man auch nur vier Edelsteine haben. Der Rubin stellte das Feuer, der Smaragd die Erde, der Saphir das Wasser und der Diamant die Luft vor. Rubinen von einiger Grösse waren damals selten und galten achtfach den Wert des Diamanten. So stand auch der Smaragd in hohem Preise. . . . Dass einige Steine im Dunkeln leuchteten, hatte man bemerkt. Man schrieb es nicht dem Sonnenlicht zu, . . . sondern einer eigenen inwohndenden Kraft, und nannte sie Karfunkel . . . " p. 873. ("At Cellini's time, Aristotle's teaching dominated everything that could roughly be called theoretical. This teaching recognized only four elements, and so the ancients also wanted only four precious stones. The ruby was the image of fire, the emerald of earth, the sapphire of water, and the diamond of air. Rubies of considerable size were rare at
By choosing three stones, Rabelais has picked the traditionally divine number (for Christians, the Trinity) for the medical finger of Gargantua’s right hand. On his left ring-finger he wears the earth number, four (earth has four seasons, four directions; in antiquity, four main rivers, four main winds, four elements, etc.); while on the right “medical” finger the three divine virtues have a vertical (upward-spiralling) movement relating creation to Creator, the medical associations underscoring healing and saving power. The earthly virtues on the left “heart” finger express the ideal “horizontal” relation among peoples. Thus the Socratic excellences and the theological and healing virtues are united in the giant who will become Rabelais’ next philosopher-king: not merely a Platonic figure, but a perfect Pauline-Christian Prince. His kingdom will unite its members in the one body of the state (cf. St. Paul on the Christian community, 1 Cor. 12), but without intermingling and thus bastardizing their functions. It is also significant that in all Gargantua wears three (not four or more) rings, doubly underscoring the essentially spiritual rather than bodily or earthly significance of this giant.

Fischart does not change the essence of these symbols, and both authors lighten their gravity by carnivalesque joking. Rabelais introduces Hans Carvel, who estimates the third ring’s extravagant worth. The name Carvel immediately diverts the mind to the bawdy story of his ring, told by Rabelais in his Tiers Livre. Fischart had already anticipated the actual naming of Carvel by calling the right “doigt médical” the “arsfinger der rechten hand.”

Through his carefree syncretism, drawing equally on Pauline and Platonic sources, Rabelais has outfitted his young giant in clothing that has serious significance. The codpiece celebrates his reproductive power, its dignity and necessity, in order to maintain the line of philosopher-kings in Utopia. The hat-feather, revealed to be yet another symbol for Christian charity, underscores the explicitly Pauline message on the hat-medallion: “Charity seeks not its own advantage,” and the androgynous figure, which echoes the same idea in pictorial terms, incorporates the idea of divine love (caritas) and perfect physical love: the marital union. As it was intended to be,

the time, and were valued at eight times the worth of diamonds. The emerald was also highly priced. . . . The ancients had noticed that some stones shone in the dark. They did not ascribe it to sunlight . . . but to their own indwelling power, and named them carbuncles. . . .” See also Kirschbaum, under Farbensymbolik, Ad. de Vries, Dictionary of Symbols and Imagery (Amsterdam 1976), under specific colors. For information on Asclepius’ staff, see Der kleine Pauly, ed. K. Ziegler, et al. (Munich 1979), 5, col. 335, in S. Oppermann’s article, “Stab.”
the medallion is emblematic of the giant’s ideals and moral principles. He has chosen charity as his emblematic virtue, since “the greatest of these is charity” (I Cor. 13:13). With the necklace, Rabelais returns to antiquity, borrowing the idea from the Egyptians that jasper is a semi-precious stone with protective powers over life and fertility, as its green color would indicate. From Egypt, Greece and Rome comes the idea that serpents or dragons have protective functions. As guardians they symbolize fertility, rebirth and immortality, and are prophetic (like Python at Delphi). The stones of the necklace and the design in which they are worked reinforce each other to form a potent device for the health and protection of its wearer. While the necklace, like the codpiece, seems to function in relation to the body, the rings, like the hat-medallion, are spiritual; they have moral (and some political) meaning. The ring on the pointer finger indicates that its wearer will rule with authority and with charity. Its power radiates from the wearer outward. The second ring on the “heart finger,” made of gold, silver, copper and iron, refers to Hesiod’s ages of man, to Plato’s discussion of the four virtues (wisdom, courage, temperance and justice) and to his ideas on the class system in the ideal republic. It also refers to the balance among marital, creative and venereal forces, the “masculine” powers versus the “feminine.” This ring’s power works inwardly. It also reminds its wearer that constant vigilance is necessary to maintain harmony within the state. The third ring, with its three stones whose colors signify faith, hope and charity, links the wearer with his divine source.

Rabelais has clothed and ornamented his future philosopher-king with all the artistry at his command, in the finest and rarest of materials. The key to the chapter lies not in the grotesque exaggeration of size and the insistence on the quantity of materials needed to make up the items of clothing — an aspect that has caught and held the attention of most readers — but in the details of ornament. Rings and pins are still thought to indicate much about the wearer’s personality and judgment; sometimes they are overtly symbolic. For Rabelais, they amount to a semiotic system of “body language” that provides a key to the character, ideals and intentions of his paradigm for a perfect ruler, the young Gargantua.

St. John Fisher College, Rochester
From History to Chronicle:  
Rabelais Rewriting Herodotus*

H. H. GLIDDEN

"Qu'il n'y ait hystoire que tu ne tienne en memoire presente. . . ."  
_Pantagruel_, viii

Renaissance writers of many sorts picked old chestnuts on favorite topics out of Herodotus' _Histories_. Philologists repeated the story of Psammetichus' experimental method for discovering the original race of mankind; physicians invoked the example of Croesus' son, who was cured of his muteness when he saw his father under attack and shouted a warning; moralists approved the wisdom of the Egyptian king Amasis, who claimed that a man must have leisure time for talking with friends as a bow must have time unstrung — too much tautness is not a good thing. There was a passage in Herodotus for every reader; and, of course, each passage looked different to different readers, for, as Montaigne noted, invoking Herodotus' insight, everything the Egyptians do looks backwards to non-Egyptians. Some readers found Herodotus a reliable guide, others found him a strain upon their credulity. When a French translation of the _Histories_ became available in the 1550s, the ranks of the disbelievers were greatly extended. The Hellenist Henri Estienne felt compelled to offer a vigorous defense of the great antique observer of cultural

* This article is an expanded version of a paper presented at the meeting of the South Central Modern Language Association held in San Antonio (October 1982). I wish to thank the Committee on Research of Tulane University for supporting research towards completion of the final draft.
diversity. His *Traité préparatif à l’Apologie pour Hérodot* (1555) was one of many works that used Herodotean evidence to argue for appreciation of the relativity of customs.

For his treatise on this topic, *De Legibus Connubialibus*, the jurist André Tiraqueau used a translation, now lost, of Herodotus prepared by François Rabelais. The Rabelais translation also provided Tiraqueau with many snippets of Herodotus that were useful for the support of the polemical thesis of *De Legibus* — namely, that women are innately inferior to men no matter what the evidence of customs. Whether Rabelais supported Tiraqueau’s side of the *querelle des femmes* or not is unknown. About his translation of Herodotus, little is known except that it was regarded as an advance over the Latin translation by Lorenzo Valla. The distinguished biographer of Rabelais, Jean Plattard, even seems uncertain about which book of the *Histories* was translated by “le plus érudit des Franciscains,” the learned monk Rabelais. In his *Adolescence de Rabelais*, Plattard indicates that Tiraqueau cited Rabelais as the translator of Book One, and added that the translation was undoubtedly made from Greek into Latin “puisqu’il se proposait de combler une lacune de la translation latine entreprise et laissée inachevée par l’humaniste italien Laurent Valla.”

If we turn to Rabelais’ own work, there is scant evidence to indicate either which book of the *Histories* he translated or how well he knew the entire text. Plattard notes a mere seven instances of borrowings from Herodotus in Rabelais’ *Gargantua, Pantagruel, Tiers Livre* and *Quart Livre*; these borrowings, taken from various books of the *Histories*, are scattered throughout the oeuvre. Some of the borrowings appear to be indirect, that is, quoted from texts by Rabelais’ contemporaries or by Roman anthologists. In only three of the borrowings is Herodotus mentioned by name.\(^1\)

---

1 A discussion of Rabelais’ contact with Tiraqueau is found in Roland Antonioli, *Rabelais et la médecine* (Geneva 1976), pp. 10-12. Antonioli also speculates on how the issues raised in the *querelle des femmes* may have shaped Rabelais’ comic art, p. 12.


3 Plattard, *L’Oeuvre de Rabelais (Sources, Invention, Composition)*, (Paris 1910), pp. 197-98. The passages Plattard attributes to acquaintance with Herodotus are the following: *Pantagruel*, xxiv, in which Panurge proposes to shave the head of the messenger to see if a secret message is written on his scalp (Herodotus, V, 35); *ibid.*, in which Panurge boasts that he belongs to the race of Zopyrus, keeper of the gates of Babylon (Herodotus, III, 153); *Tiers Livre*, xxiv, on the Argives who swore to shave
Because the textual evidence for Rabelais' encounter with Herodotus' Histories is so slender, scholars have either steered clear of the topic or settled for comparison of the two writers in very general terms (thus, for example, M. A. Screech suggests, without elaboration, that Herodotus' work "strangely prefigures" Rabelais' own"). But this situation means that one of the most intriguing possibilities for a "case study" of a Renaissance writer using classical material has not been made. Most of the Renaissance writers who sprinkled their works with classical borrowings were not, unlike Rabelais, fluent in both Greek and Latin, and most did not translate their sources from originals — they borrowed from others' translations and from compendia and anthologies. Our evidence for Rabelais' reading of Herodotus is not great, but it is enough to assert that this reading, unlike most made by Renaissance writers, was not piecemeal, eclectic, mediated.

There are, of course, many ways for a writer's encounter with another writer's text to be reflected in his text. Everything from an overall design — say, a journey or quest design — to a detail can be taken over more or less directly. The intertextual process can also be much more reactive or polemical: the read text can be parodied, inverted, distorted, deconstructed. The read text can be alluded to or emblemized, woven through the second text or encoded in a portion of it. The possibilities are legion. In this paper, I will try to argue that Rabelais did not use Herodotus' text directly (thus the scant references) but that he did, frequently and with his characteristic cleverness, use the Greek's text much as Freud says dreamers use the events and activities of their childhoods and their waking lives.

their heads until Tyrea was captured from the Spartans (Herodotus, I, 82); 

Tiers Livre, xix, concerning King Psammetichus and his search for the original race of mankind (Herodotus, II, 2); 

Tiers Livre, xxxiv, in which Rabelais cites the women of Mendes island as proof of female promiscuity (Herodotus, II, 46); 

Quart Livre, xx, where the Cabiri are mentioned (Herodotus, II, 52); and 


4 Screech, Rabelais (Ithaca 1979), p. 7. Screech speculates further: "it may be with an eye on Herodotus that Rabelais chose to call his comic tales by the name of Chronicles." Lucian is cited as the other Greek author whom Rabelais translated from Greek into Latin.

5 Among the compendia that served as a conduit for classical commonplaces were the Adages of Erasmus; the Officina of Ravisius Textor; the De honesta disciplina of Critinus; and the Moralia of Plutarch. Erasmus' Adages and his Apophthegmata were read widely by humanists of Rabelais' generation.
That is, by processes that resemble condensation, displacement and distortion, Rabelais drew heavily upon Herodotus' *Histories*. I will try to show that the precondition for this textual play was an affinity of *mentalité* between the two writers. To illuminate the *mentalité*, I will indicate three basic *topoi* — reflections of this *mentalité* — that both the writers employed in their works.

What follows, then, is frankly speculative, speculatively interpretive. From a bare list of borrowings like the one Plattard drew up, nothing about Rabelais' reading of Herodotus could be conjectured. A speculative account must look into the items on this list and then go forward guided by a sense of how these writers' imaginations worked and how their texts were made. So, let me begin by examining in detail the two significant items on Plattard's list and then using this examination to point to the *topoi* which will, I think, illuminate the imaginative encounter Rabelais made with the Greek text.

I. Rabelais' citations of Herodotus

Among the episodes in which Rabelais cites Herodotus by name is the celebrated death of Pan story (IV, xxviii). The Pantagruelists have alighted on the island of the Macreons ("long-lived ones") after a tempest had blown them off course. The landscape suggests antiquity: monuments and tombs, pyramids, obelisks and crumbling temples lie amidst the dense and shady trees. The vestiges are inscribed with lettering in hieroglyphic, Ionic and other venerable scripts. The silence of the forest and its noble markers recalls a graveyard in which the souls of great men dwell; in fact, the chief Macrobe tells of Demons and Heroes who live in this stately preserve, and of the greeting that such souls offer great men about to join them. He states the belief, attributed to the ancients, that nature conspires to alert the living that a great man is about to die: "Au trespas d'un chascun d'iceulx, ordinairement oyons nous par la forest grandes et pitoyables lamentations, et voyons en terre pestes, vimères et afflictions, en l'air, troublemens et tenebres, en mer, tempeste et fortunel" ("At the Death of every one of them we commonly hear in the Forest loud and mournful Groans, and the whole Land is infested with Pestilence, Earthquakes, Inundations and other Calamities; the Air with Fogs and Obscurity, and the Sea with storms and hurricanes").

---

calamities were thus construed as portents of earthly loss. Rabelais uses this occasion to praise his deceased patron, Guillaume Du Bellay, and then has Pantagruel assert that all ethereal souls ("toutes ames intelllectives") are exempt from death. As evidence of their immortality, he offers the story of the death of Pan (IV, xxviii, 617-19).

According to Robert Marichal, Rabelais translated the Pan episode directly from his favored source, Plutarch, whose De defectu oraculorum, xvii, includes the story of how a boatman named Thamous was instructed by voices from afar to announce Pan's death to the people of Paloda, who, on hearing the news, lament loudly, in chorus, like one voice. Tiberius Caesar, on hearing of Pan's death, sends for Thamous and questions him. He believes the boatman's story, but he also seeks corroboration by asking his scholars to confirm Pan's identity. They inform him that Herodotus held Pan to be "filz de Mercure et de Penelope" and that Cicero also reports this parentage. Rabelais then has Pantagruel offer an allegorical interpretation of the story in which Pan is identified with Christ, "Nostre Tout," the great shepherd, who "loves not only his sheep but his shepherds also," and who was lamented when he died not just by a town but by the whole universe.

At first glance, the reference to Herodotus seems minor and contained. But, if we look again at the allegorical interpretation Pantagruel offers, in which no mention of Herodotus appears, and examine it for Herodotean content, the whole episode takes on another dimension. In Herodotus' Book Two, the one Rabelais probably translated, we learn that the Egyptians refused to sacrifice goats, male or female, because they "believe Pan to be one of the eight gods who existed before the subsequent twelve" (II, 121). Most strict in this observance are the Mendesian peoples, who love all their goats, and one above all. As Herodotus explains: "when [the revered one] dies the whole province goes into mourning" (II, 121).

It is not possible to assert unequivocally that Rabelais had this Egyptian practice in mind as he constructed his allegory on the Pan story, or that he intended to place a layer of curious ethnography beneath the ultimately serious crucifixion story. We do know, however, that when he wrote his Tiers Livre he had remembered the Mendesians, for there he notes that the Mendesian women are so promiscuous that they find pleasure in goats (III, xxxiv, 451). On this point, Rabelais cites Herodotus and Strabo. But it is not likely that he

---

8 Herodotus II, 160.
consulted his writer's text anywhere but in his memory, for in Herodotus only one Mendesian woman, not the whole population, was given to pleasure with goats. It is, however, this passage on the Mendesians which also contains the report on their attitude toward goat sacrifice and their mourning for their most revered goat.

In Rabelais' Pan story and allegory, it is likely that Herodotus' text plays a larger role than the direct citation indicates — but this is not provable. The case for a wider net of reference is stronger in Pantagruel, xv, where Rabelais sets the scene for the battle with the Dipsodes. Pantagruel started off from Paris after hearing news that the Dipsodes had invaded the land of the Amaurotes. His hearty band has set out on their first expedition; before they advance to meet the enemy, Pantagruel enjoins them to pause and deliberate upon a strategy. The individuals swear allegiance to their prince and boast about how they will spy on the enemy. As war is not thinkable without reference to heroes of classical antiquity, his lieutenants Panurge, Epistemon, Eusthenes and Carpalim all prepare to go behind enemy lines by emulating venerable models. The choice his trickster Panurge makes is revealing:

Je (dist Panurge) entreprenons de entrer en leur camp par le meillieu des gardes et du guet, et bancqueret avec eux et bragmarder à leurs despens, sans estre congueu de nully, visiter l'artillerie, les tentes de tous les capitaines et me prélasser par les bandes, sans jamais estre descouvert. Le diable ne me affineroit pas, car je suis de la lignée de Zopyre. (II, xxv, 272-73)

"My self (said Panurge) will undertake to enter into their camp, within the very midst of their guards, unespied by their watch, and merrily feast and lecher it at their cost, without being known of any to see the Artillery and the Tents of all the Captaines, and thrust myself in with a grave and magnifick carriage, amongst all their troopes and companies, without being discovered; the devill would not be able to peck me out with all his circumventions: for I am of the race of Zopyrus." (II, 24, 273)

In the Histories III, 237-241, Herodotus had related the story of Zopyrus, who helped his King Darius defeat the Assyrians by mutilating himself and slipping into Babylon to feign friendship with the enemy. Panurge, too, sees himself as an infiltrator penetrating the enemy walls without, of course, suffering the horrible mutilations.9

On one level, the reference to Zopyrus is simple. On another — Rabelais' more characteristically complex one — it is a sign or emblem

9 The Zopyrus story is also found in Erasmus' Adages II, x, 64. Rabelais was acquainted with the Adages but also knew his Herodotus, as I shall attempt to show.
for the entire personality and purpose of Panurge. Consider the strategy of Zopyrus in its full Herodotean detail: he was to gain the confidence of the Assyrians and eventually be entrusted with the keys to the gates of the city. In fact, his deception was so thorough that "Zopyrus was now the one and only soldier in Babylon, the city's hero, and was created General in Chief and Guardian of the Wall" (Herodotus, II, 240). Zopyrus showed his cunning by eventually opening the city gates and admitting the Persians into Babylon. Zopyrus is remembered chiefly, then, as the keeper of the gates. Panurge is Rabelais' Zopyrus, both in his craft and in his role as sentinel. Was it not he who taught Pantagruel an original new way to build the walls of Paris?\(^{10}\)

In and around the Dipsodian War, Rabelais wove a texture of allusion to Herodotus' history of the Persian War. Plattard neglected to list one of the more revealing borrowings. The scene is the merry-making after the first skirmish with the invading Dipsodes. Panurge has felled the enemy by military and strategic cunning; the victorious Pantagruelists then boast of the sexual conquests they will make. Epistemon reassures his master that he will not fail to rally when military duty calls:

Je vous les rends à roustir ou boillir, à fricasser ou mettre en pasté. Ilz ne sont en si grand nombre comme avoit Xercès, car il avoit trente cens mille combatans, si croyez Hérodote et Troge Pompe. Et toutesfois Themistocles à peu de gens les desconfit. Ne vous souciez, pour Dieu. (II, xxvi, 279)

"Baste, (said Epistemon), enough of that, I will not faile to bring them to you, either to roste or to boile, to fry or put in paste; they are not so many in number, as were in the army of Xerxes, for he had thirty hundred thousand fighting men, if you beleve Herodotus and Trogus Pompeius: and yet Themistocles with a few men overthrew them all: for Gods sake take you no care for that." (II, 26, 279).

Panurge, not to be outdone by his mate, replies with a sexual / military sweep:

Merde! merde! (dist Panurge). Ma seule braguette espoussetera tous les hommes, et sainct Balletrou, qui dedans y repose, decrottera toutes les femmes. (Ibid.)

"Cobsminnie, Cobsminnie, (said Panurge) my Codpiece alone shall suffice to overthrow all the men; and my St. Sweephole, that dwells within it, shall lay all the women squat upon their backs." (II, 26, 279)

\(^{10}\) See below, p. 210 passim.
The source is the *Histories* VII, 70; but the source has much more to tell us about the genesis of the chapter than would appear. The chapter in Rabelais relates how Panurge ambushed the invading cavalry. What was his tactic? He enticed the horsemen into ropes laid on the ground. What this trick has in common with the text of Herodotus is the image of troops in a circle:

The counting was done by first packing ten thousand men as close together as they could stand and drawing a circle round them on the ground; they were then dismissed, and a fence, about navel-high, was constructed around the circle; finally other troops were marched into the area thus enclosed and dismissed in their turn, until the whole army [1,700,000] had been counted. After the counting, the army was reorganized in divisions according to nationality.

Rabelais' memory is inflated; he must have recalled that the army of Xerxes was large, that is all. Is it not likely that Rabelais was impressed with Herodotus' account of the measuring technique, as well? In the preceding chapter (xxvi), the narrator relates how a clever tactic brought the enemy cavalry to its defeat. To summarize: the Pantagruelists were spotted by the enemy Dipsodian cavalry which, to defend their land, comes riding toward their ship. Panurge refuses to go beneath the hull and takes charge of defending the ship. His strategy is to cast two ropes out onto the ground, at a distance from the ship and, using Eustenes and Carpalim as decoys, to lure the enemy cavalry into his net by pretending that his men will surrender. When the Dipsodian horsemen arrive, their horses slip and slide on the mud around the ship; when other horsemen arrive with reinforcements, Panurge gives the signal, and the ropes are hauled back toward the ship. In effect, he lassoes the enemy, bringing them to their knees. In what shape was the trap laid? In the shape of a large circle, with a second concentric circle inside it. The allusion to Herodotus and to the size of Xerxes' army, at the end of the chapter, is then the cue that the fuller context came to bear on the episode as well. Without recalling the detail of the Herodotean source, Rabelais may well have associated the peculiar mode of calculating with the size of the army; what remained was the image of troops herded together in a circle. That circle became the vehicle of Panurge's battle plan:

les deux cordes se empestrèrent entre les chevaux et les ruoyent par terre bien aysément avecques les chevaucheurs. (II, xxv, 275)

the two cables so entangled and impestered the legs of the horses, that they were all of them thrown down to the ground easily, together with their Riders. (II, 25, 275)
The three different borrowings from Herodotus cited so far are examples of the three *topoi* noted above as common to Rabelais’ and Herodotus’ texts. The two writers employed: (1) folklore, or folk stories, with roots in various cultures that indicate both the diversity of cultures and certain underlying samenesses; (2) scatological stories in which military conquests suggest sexual conquests either metaphorically or metonymically, and both kinds of conquests assert the place of the corporeal in any true view of the world; and (3) stories presenting complex quantifications, or measurements that at once survey terrain or human artifices and put this material world in a transcendent perspective. Let me now take these *topoi* one by one, starting with the last, to show how Rabelais read, and used, Herodotus in a way that involved no direct citations.

II. The World Quantified

In Herodotus’ *Histories*, as in the Rabelaisian chronicles, measurements serve to authenticate amazing tales. The strange is thus presented as if it were “natural” (i.e. quantifiable). What Herodotus displays as a story-teller is the instinct to map, inventory, measure — in short, to quantify the space of his historical world. Herodotus began Book Two, his Egyptian journey, by calculating the length and width of the Mediterranean coastline, the proximity of one city to another, the course of the Nile. His precision serves to inscribe the unknown within a fixed frame of reference, and thus to domesticate it. He writes of a pharaoh who had statues of himself built 40 feet high in Ethiopia; his son had obelisks built not less than 12 feet across; his successor erected statues measuring 38 feet high, and his successor, Cheops, ordered pyramids built towering 800 feet high. The list rambles on with marvel after marvel studiously calculated. Egypt is thus understood mathematically: its dikes form geometrical patterns (II, 141); its three hundred and forty-one generations of kings are reckoned at 11,340 years; its festivals number “as many as seven hundred thousand men and women — excluding children” (II, 126). Herodotus was overwhelmed by a labyrinth containing three thousand rooms arranged in upper and lower stories: “the baffling and intricate passages . . . were an endless wonder to me” (II, 161). Elsewhere Herodotus notes truly amazing statistics: blades of wheat that measure three inches across (I, 92) and a shrine that was fashioned out of twenty-two tons of gold (I, 87). His sizing-up has the ironic effect of poising his chronicle on the boundary between history and fantasy. Numbers are intended to counteract the myth-making of the poets, but in Herodotus’ hands the calculus has the effect of representing
size, rather than objects themselves. Height and weight signal a 
transcending of the quantification he intended and move the *Histories*
toward the mystification they are intended to eradicate.\textsuperscript{11}

Rabelais' chronicle moves in the same direction more self-con-
sciously: by stressing incredible heights and weights, he aims at mystical 
truths, transhistorical observations, idealized modes of living. His 
mockery is, ultimately, elevating. To achieve his purpose, Rabelais 
appears to be aping, more than once, the exaggerations of his 
predecessor. The genealogy of Pantagruel numbers some three dozen 
forebears; his father Gargantua numbers some nine hundred, 
fourescore fourty and foure years,” II, 2, 179), 
and numerous lists fill the book. The later *Gargantua* offers even 
sharper similarities. The genealogy of Gargantua was found in a field 
where diggers unearthed a huge, bronze tomb, “long sans mesure” 
(I, i, 8); compare this extraordinary tomb with Herodotus’ passage 
recounting a smith’s discovery of the body of Orestes: “as I was 
digging I came on a huge coffin — ten feet long. I couldn’t believe 
that men were ever larger than they are today, so I opened it — and 
there was the corpse, as big as the coffin” (I, 39). Note, furthermore, 
Rabelais’ precision in tabulating the survivors of the mock catastrophe 
that follows:

\begin{quote}
Lors, en soubriant, [Gargantua] destacha sa belle braguette, et, tirant 
sa mentule en l’air, les compissa si aigrement qu’il en noya deux cens 
soixante mille quatre cens dix et huyt — sans les femmes et petitz 
enfans. (I, xvii, 54)
\end{quote}

Then smiling, he untied his faire Braguette, and drawing out his 
mentul into the open aire, he so bitterly all-to-bepist them, that he 
drowned two hundred and sixty thousand, foure hundred and eigh-
teen, besides the women and little children. (I, 17, 54)\textsuperscript{12}

Compare, moreover, the intricacy of Herodotus’ three thousand room 
labyrinth with the mathematical complexity of Rabelais’ Abbey of 
Thelema:

\begin{quote}
Entre chascune tour, au mylieu dudict corps de logis, estoit une viz
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{11} François Hartog considers quantification to be a source of power over the 
unknown: “Les joies de l’arpentage, c’est aussi, l’indice d’un pouvoir. Comment mieux 
faire croire que l’on connaît un édifice ou un pays, surtout s’il est lointain, qu’en 
étant capable d’en fournir les mesures?” *Le Miroir d’Hérodote. Essai sur la représenta-

\textsuperscript{12} This stock comic device is thought to be a pastiche of biblical narratives in 
which reckoning excluded women and children; perhaps Herodotus’ formula “ex-
cluding children” should be added to Rabelais’ repertoire of comic sources as well.
brizée dédans icelluy mesmes corps, de laquelle les marches estoient part de porphyre, part de pierre numidique, de marbre serpentin, longues de xxij piedz; part l'espessure estoit de troys doigtz, l'assiete par nombre de douze entre chacun repous. (I, liv, 150)

Between every tower, in the midst of the said body of building, there was a paire of winding (such as we now call lantern) staires, whereof the steps were part of Porphyrie, part of Numidian stone, and part of Serpentine marble, each of these steps being two and twenty foot in length, and three fingers thick, and the just number of twelve betwixt every rest, or, (as we now terme it) landing place. (I, 53, 154)

The symmetry of the edifice, with its mathematical perfection, inspires awe, just as the labyrinth with its intricate passages provoked amazement in Herodotus. Rabelais is heir to an extensive Greco-Roman number symbolism, but it is tempting to find in his utopian structure an impulse similar to the Greek historian's for civilizing open spaces by measuring them. For what is a utopia if not an emblem of order representing the measured harmony of idealized human relations? From the cost of Gargantua's ring estimated at the value of "soixante-neuf millions huyt cens nonante et quatre mille dix et huyt moutons à la grand laine" (I, viii, 30: "threescore nine millions, eight hundred ninety foure thousand and eighteen French Crowns of Berrie," I, 8, 32), to the numerous attributes of the Lenten monster in Book Four, sizing-up mystifies, even as it purports to delimit. Rabelaisian lists slide from neat accumulations into monstrous fantasies.

III. Scatology in the Service of World-View

To a great degree, both Herodotus and Rabelais express curiosity, even lust, for the life residing beneath culture's more chaste, ceremonial exteriors. Their religious or myriad impulses were in constant and complex relation with their admiration for the corporeal world. Herodotus studied Egyptian festivals to find in them the origin of Greek ceremonies and gods; he was struck by the similarities in the worship of Dionysus, noting in particular that in both Egypt and Greece an oversized phallus is paraded in the god's honor. What I am suggesting is that Herodotus studied Egyptian culture the better to study his own.

Rabelais studied Herodotus, similarly, the better to identify the grotesque, bodily life that lay before him in its raw, chaotic immediacy. In festivals, disembodied organs have a ritualistic importance; in Rabelais' fiction, bodily parts stand in mockery of any airy mind that would claim its own virtue disembodied, in other words, that it is nobler than the carnal desires of its body. Rabelaisian personages
break wind before meditating on lofty subjects; the young Gargantua listens to the Scriptures while performing his bodily functions.

In Rabelais' text, festivals show the importance of the body, but so, too, do military conquests. Particularly in the episodes of the Dipsodian War — Rabelais' Persian War, so to speak — scatological tales present the relation of the key corporeal loci of virtue: all is bodily in love and war. I will examine two of these tales to show their Herodotean foundations.

In Pantagruel, xxvii, 280-83, both Pantagruel and Panurge raise trophies to mark their victory over the Dipsodes. Pantagruel, we recall, raises his monument to his troops. It consists of a huge trunk upon which the soldiers' gear is hung: saddles, harnesses, stirrups, and more. Then he recites memorial verses dedicated to his army's prowess. Pantagruel's rhetorical high style ("Ce fut icy qu'apparut la vertus / De quatre preux et vaillans champions" — "Here was the prowess made apparent of / Four brave and valiant champions of proof" II, 27, 280) is parodied by Panurge's comic low style ("Ce fut icy que mirent à baz culz / Joyeusement quatre gaillars pions" — "Here was it that four jovial blades sate down / To a profound carowing, and to crown . . ." II, 27, 281), and by the trophy he erects: a stake bearing numerous animal parts. Other debasing rejoinders follow: Pantagruel: "Il n'est umber que d'etendardz, il n'est fumée que de chevaux et clyquetys que de harnoys" ("there is no shadow like that of flying colours, no smoke like that of horses, no clattering like that of armour" II, 27, 282); Epistemon: "Il n'est umber que de cuisine, fumée que de pastez et clyquetys que de tasses" ("There is no shadow like that of the kitchin, no smoke like that of pasties, and no clattering like that of goblets" II, 27, 282); Panurge: "Il n'est umber que de courtines, fumée que de tetins et clyquetys que de couillons" ("There is no shadow like that of the courtaines, no smoke like that of womens breasts, and no clattering like that of ballocks" II, 27, 282). Now there was nothing unusual about raising monuments to celebrate victories. Rabelais' editors make the point and common sense tells us so. What lurks, however, is a shadow text — Herodotus' account of an Egyptian field general. To summarize: whenever Sesostris encountered a courageous army, he erected pillars on the spot inscribed with his own name and country, and a sentence to indicate that by valor his forces had won the victory. If, however, a town fell easily, without a struggle, he added to his inscription on the pillar the image of female genitalia. By this he meant that the people of that town were no braver than women (II, 102). As decorative genitalia signalled ignominious defeat in ancient
Egypt, two monuments mark the spot where the 660 Dipsodian knights went down, if not like women, at least “bien subtilement.”

Let us look again at the two trophies in Pantagruel, xxvii, as both echo and parody of a fragment from Herodotus’ Egyptian book. Pantagruel’s monument is martial and his verses are grounded in evangelical teachings. Panurge’s emulation shows a literal debasement (“Ce fut icy que mirent à baz culz’); his monument consists of edibles, and his verses celebrate the eating and drinking of the band. The symmetry of the speeches is evident; Pantagruel’s estrivieres, esperons and haubert are matched by Panurge’s aureilles de troys levraux, râble d’un lapin, mandibules d’un lièvre. But special attention must be paid to Panurge’s mocking monument, an emblem of erotica in its own right. Among its decoration are les cornes du chevreul . . . puis les aureilles de troys levraux, le râble d’un lapin, les mandibules d’un lièvre (“the horns of a roebuck . . . the eares of three levrets, the chine of a coney, the jaways of a hare” II, 27, 281). Is it not arguable that here Rabelais evoked the fair sex by metonymy, lapin being the sixteenth-century term for the middle French noun conin? The comment a nom remains chastely hidden beneath the code of references to game; but how much more explicit need Panurge be than to name levraux, lapin, and lièvre, all derived from the liby-iberian lapparo (yielding lapereau and the Latin lepus, lapin, lièvre) with its associations? Scatology is in this episode emblematic, taking off from the Herodotean image of genitals affixed to a victory monument. In Panurge’s structure, the genitalia are present by verbal association. Not so in the other chapter in which pudenda are not only evoked metonymically, but become the building blocks of the edifice itself.

In one of the most obscene chapters in Rabelais’ oeuvre, Panurge suggests a strange new way to build the walls of Paris: “Je vois que les callibistrys des femmes de ce pays sont à meilleur marché que les pierres. D’iceulx fauldroit bastir les murailles . . .” (II, xv, 233: “I see that the sire quo nons, kallibistris, or contrapunctus of the women of this Countray are better cheap than stones: of them should the walls be built . . .” II, 15, 237). He notes further that the walls will be tough and that they will not be struck by lightning (“ilz sont tous benists ou sacrez”). Panurge the city-planner spins out other refine-

---

13 E. Huguet, Dictionnaire de la langue française du seizième siècle, v. 2, gives conin as a diminutive mot libre denoting the female sex. According to Abel Lefranc, “l’ancien et le moyen français disent conin, encore courant au XVIe s. et que Rabelais lui-même emploie fréquemment.” The common word lapin would then be of more recent usage. See his critical edition, Œuvres de François Rabelais (Paris 1922), v. 4, p. 265.

14 Dictionnaire Robert (Paris 1966), v. 4, p. 41.
ments of building and design to a Pantagruel who finds his scheme is good fun: “Ho, ho, ha, ha, ha!”

Critics of Rabelais have kept their distance from this most grotesque of walls, preferring discussion of the Lion-Fox fable that follows to discussion of the wall’s sexual symbolism. The disembodied organs have proved, like the fortification they pretend to be, impenetrable. As an edifice, the walls stand mute, like an emblem, whose familiar picture conceals a hidden message. The walls could be studied from various angles (thematic, linguistic, sociological), but in this context I will view them as a sign, or icon, whose presence signals a network of intertextual reference: the walls of Paris have their analogue in the Histories of Herodotus.

Let us turn to Herodotus and to the tale he told about the building of the pyramids. In one account he reports that the pharaoh Cheops sent his daughter to a brothel when his finances got low. In addition to collecting the going rate, the daughter asked each client to contribute a block of stone to her own, private collection. The stones (so the story goes) produced a pyramid towering 150 feet high (II, 152). Herodotus relays this curiosity as is, without reflecting on it. He does not draw the connection, but we may, between the two elements of the story: sex and building stones. The individual stones collected by the daughter are reminders of her trade; the accumulated stones of the pyramid, piled high in their monumental mass, stand as an emblem of women’s alleged insatiability. At the very least, the parallel is drawn between an edifice and building stones, the latter representing the sex of which they are the sign.

That Panurge imagines the walls of Paris as pudenda is not then so disconcerting as it seems at first reading. Instead of the pudenda yielding up a massive stone edifice, as in Egypt, the pudenda of Paris are building stones transmutted into an organic edifice, reversing the Herodotean source. Rabelais underscores the balanced design of the whole: “. . . les arrengeant par bonne symmeterey d’architecture et mettant les plus grans au premiers rancz, et puis, en taluant à doz d’asne, arranger les moyens et finalement les petitz . . . .” (II, xv, 233: “ranging them in good symmetrie by the rules of Architecture, and placing the largest in the first ranks, then sloping downwards ridgewayes, like the back of an Asse. The middle sized ones must be ranked next, and last of all the least and smallest” II, 15, 237).

15 For François Rigelot, the walls are “la lourde facétie populaire dont le joyeux compagnon use et abuse de façon coutumière. Aucune trouvaille stylistique ne vient racheter ce comique ordurier un peu trop évident,” Les Langages de Rabelais (Geneva 1972), p. 116.
Panurge’s construction is rationally ordered, yet the image of a wall “à doz d’asne” would seem inappropriate, since the shape we would expect for a wall is rectangular, not triangular, as suggested by the verb “taluer,” and by the arrangement of small organs on top of larger ones. How fortuitously we cannot say, but does the symmetry of the projected wall not evoke the geometrical perfection of the pyramids, with its broad base and tapered sides? The wall so-designed is the organic analogue of the stone structure.

The two scatological stories I have presented — the victory monuments and the Walls of Paris — have common elements. They were also, it seems, consciously related by Rabelais. Rabelais’ editors have noted Erasmus as the probable source for the patriotic saying of Agesilas, Spartan king, that Pantagruel cites to open the topic of city walls: “Il n’est muraille que de os” (“there is no wall but of bones” II, 15, 235). By this he means that the city whose citizens are virtuous has no need for fortifications. How reminiscent of that wisdom, however, is the claim that Pantagruel makes when the victory monument is raised: “Il n’est umbre que d’estandardz.” The banqueting will end and the joyous band will set off again for new adventures. Both remarks express the Roman ideal of civic virtue, but more to our purpose is the structure of exchange between Pantagruel and Panurge. In both the Walls of Paris and the Victory monument chapters, Pantagruel prepares the comic ground with a sober dictum ripe for debasing by Panurge. Whereas this interplay repeats itself throughout the Pantagruel, it is only twice phrased in the terms quoted here: in the two episodes under study. Finally, it is worth repeating that what both chapters have in common is an edifice. Whether victory monument or city walls, trophy or fortification, the fantasy construct has as its foundation the relation of female parts to a standing structure.

The argument for the relatedness of these two episodes is enhanced by critics who find structural symmetry in the Pantagruel as a whole. When Floyd Gray notes that “les exploits de Panurge chez les Turcs et son plan pour les murailles de Paris annoncent le départ en Dipsodie et ses stratagèmes de guerre,”16 he identifies a balanced design that is confirmed by the link I have discovered in the specificity of two episodes. The link becomes apparent only by identifying the third term to which both have reference, the Egyptian tales of Herodotus.

IV. Folkloric Ordering

The third topos by which Rabelais structured his narratives is that of folklore. Herodotus, too, repeated many tales from Egyptian lore—some of which he declared nonsensical. In both texts, the folkloric elements establish temporal and spatial relations: they relate historical and mythical time, and they relate present geographical-political entities and wondrous divisions of the world made by less pedestrian means. Sometimes it seems that Rabelais echoes Herodotean sources as he goes about his folkloric accounting. For example:

... Le soleil bruncha quelque peu, comme debitoribus, à gauche, et la lune varia de son cours plus de cinq toyzes. ... (II, i, 171-172)

[in that yeare] the Calends were found by the Grecian Almanacks, there was that year nothing of the moneth of March in the time of Lent, and the middle of August was in May. ... The Sunne ... tripped and stumbled a little towards the left hand, like a debtor afraid of Serjeants, coming right upon him to arrest him: and the Moon varied from her course above five fathom. (II, 1, 174)

As the epic of origins unfolds, time is at odds with itself. In that time out of time, a race of giants is born, defying natural law and human precedent: "le premier fut Chalbroth, / Qui engendra Sarabroth, / Qui engendra Faribroth, / Qui engendra Hortali, qui fut beau mangeur de souppes et regna au temps du deluge . . ." (II, i, 174). The genealogy of Pantagruel includes biblical, mythological and fictional ancestors. Be they "real" or not, they constitute an authentic lineage, a past, that inscribes the giant in Time, a fictional Time. Listen now to Herodotus:

Up to this point I have relied on the accounts given me by the Egyptians and their priests. They declare that three hundred and forty-one generations separate the first king of Egypt from the last I have mentioned—the priest of Hephaestus—and that there was a king and a high priest corresponding to each generation. ... Four times within this period the sun changed his usual position, thrice rising where he normally sets, and twice setting where he normally rises. (II, 158)

The historian charts dynasties and nations, their rise and fall, and the fortunes of individual men. His chronicle is a means of truthtelling and yet he records the wonders that blur the distinction between history and fable.

Rabelais used folklore and, in particular, tales of origin, to amuse
and to poke fun at philosophers whose abstract speculating he found vain and useless. Geography is the privileged subject of such tales; the land and its features appear eternal, and without cause, except in terms of an extraordinary event. And so, Rabelais returned to the mythical reign of King Pharamond, among others, to explain why the leagues of France were so small in comparison with those of other countries. As the story goes, young and frisky lads were dispatched with fresh young maidens to chart the boundaries of the lands. A stone was supposed to mark the spot each time a couple stopped to frolic on the ground. The tale accounts for an apparently random fact of geography as it is meant to do: the leagues of France are shorter close to the capital (when the young were rested) and longer far from the capital (when they had become tired and frolicked only rarely). It also suggests the tie between sex and a modern kingdom: the land is divided along the lines of play, not of political expediency. Herodotus had a similar impulse for mythic geography. He explains, for example, that a floating island was formed when the goddess Leto saved Apollo by hiding him in its earth. "That is why it was made to float," he says with apparent credulity (II, 165).

Herodotus provided both the heroics and the farce to make folklore into history, and history into folklore. As a storyteller, he was a master of the art of digression, as was Rabelais, and often his most wondrous tales emerge spontaneously from the deliberate recitation of official history. The tales he tells he knows from hear-say reported to him by his informants, the Egyptian priests. In one tale, Herodotus tells how the Egyptian Cambyses dispatched an army of 50,000 men to reduce a warring tribe to submission. The troops left Thebes, but never arrived, disappearing somewhere in the desert around Oasis. The priests explained the disappearance thus: the men were swallowed up by "a southerly wind of extreme violence (that) drove the sand over them as they were taking their mid-day meal" (II, 185). Such a fact is stranger than most fictions, but not stranger than Rabelais' fiction about an entire army marching against King Anarche and taking shelter during a storm under the huge, beneficent tongue of Pantagruel.

We have seen already how Rabelais played with the device of gigantic dimensions. The device is sustained in context of the amazing folk tale of Pantagruel's mouth by a bizarre understatement. Rabelais' narrator claims moderately, without exaggeration, that Pantagruel extended his tongue "seulement à demy," only half way. As narrator and teller of such "veritables contes," he enters into the gigantic mouth to record what it contains. He asserts the novelty of his project: no one has ever seen this land of twenty-five kingdoms, "sans les
désers, et ung gros bras de mer” (“besides deserts, and a great arme of the sea” II, 32, 308). Chief among his discoveries is a countryside resembling French Touraine where a peasant is busy planting cabbage. There is nothing new under the sun — the narrator finds that the peoples of unknown, exotic lands live just like his neighbors at home.

This ironic discovery of sameness behind diversity is the one that Herodotus made in Egypt, in that land full of deserts and bordered by a big coastline.

The object of this article has been to study how two texts are related in the complex way that imitatio entails. If the relation has at times been coaxed out of particular textual loci, the affinity of imagination between the two writers would seem palpable. A nexus of techniques, from allusion to pastiche and borrowing, is involved in the homage Rabelais paid to Herodotus. Both writers possessed the immense gift of translating, without traducing, a reality most fully apprehended in art.

_Tulane University, New Orleans_
Medea and Imitation in the French Renaissance

DONALD STONE, Jr.

It is not possible to work in the Renaissance field for very long without encountering various authors' assurances that their adaptations and translations of classical poets were executed in order to revitalize an inelegant vernacular literature. As a result, the possibility has always existed for speaking of the Renaissance as, in part at least, a renewed and profound communion with classical letters. Certainly Petrarch intimates something of the sort when he writes to Guido Gonzaga of “How far the eloquence of other tongues / Is by our Latin eloquence surpassed” (“Itala quam reliquas superet facundia lingus”), giving, as an example of the vernacular best, the Roman de la Rose, and adds:

Ut tuus ille olim melius concius amoris
Explicuit sermone pathos, si fabula diues
Inspicitur frigiaque expirans cuspide dido.

How much more nobly, in the days of old
Your fellow citizen set forth the sorrow
Of passionate love, in his illustrious tale
Of Dido’s death upon her Phrygian sword!

In France, Du Bellay repeats the thrust of the comparison when he demands that his fellow poets abandon the medieval “episseries” in

1 Librorum Francisci Petrarche impressorum annotatio (Venice 1501), sig. 243r (punctuation modernized); the English translation is from Petrarch at Vaucluse; Letters in Verse and Prose, trans. Ernest Hatch Wilkins (Chicago 1958), pp. 39-40.
favor of the genres practiced by the ancients (*La Défence et illustration de la langue françoyse*, II, iv).

Unfortunately for the scholar who has to interpret the details that surround such pronouncements, defining the precise nature of the communion between modern and ancient writers proves to be a very frustrating task. The importance of classical letters for Renaissance poets can never be doubted, but it is far from clear that the commitment of Renaissance authors to the ancients equaled comprehension of the spirit or perspective of the writers they were imitating. To make this point, we examine below a number of texts from the French Renaissance based on Latin models. The texts are merely illustrative of the problem at hand; still, armed with such illustrations, we can feel better prepared to understand what actually happened when the humanists passed from their pronouncements about antiquity to the job of handling its verse.

Du Bellay's *Défence* did not appear until 1549; yet, when Paris printers decided in 1538 and 1539 to reissue Colard Mansion's prose translation of the fourteenth-century *Ovide moralisé*, updating the language and omitting from the text the allegorical glosses that were retained in the 1520 reprinting of the same translation, we may well infer that Renaissance humanism was already working its effect, banishing from a classical work such medieval excrescences as association of the golden fleece with worldly riches, King Aeëtes with God the Father, and Medea with the Virgin Mary (1520, f. lxviii').

Moreover, at the point in the text equivalent to *Metamorphoses* VII. 297 (Medea's deception of Pelias's daughters), the 1538 and 1539 printings suppress an interpolation that had been created to explain the magician's actions. Ovid speaks only of a "feigned hate" (v. 297) assumed by Medea regarding Jason in order to be received as a suppliant by Pelias. No further background for the episode is provided save an unexplained allusion to "doli": "Neve doli cessent" (v. 297). In reality, since Pelias had robbed Jason of his crown and exiled him, Medea was wreaking vengeance on her husband's enemy. The *Ovide moralisé* attributes to Medea a quite different motive, to wit, the desire to curry favor with Jason, who at the death of Pelias would rule the world.

It is interesting that this scholarly cleansing of the Ovidian tale is

---

also haphazard. Verses from the *Metamorphoses* left untranslated in the *Ovide moralisé*, such as VII. 350-93, are not restored; if the interpolation regarding Medea's attitude toward Pelias disappears, the addition at VII. 149 of the story of Medea’s dismemberment of her brother is allowed to stand. Even the suppression proves incomplete and botched. Having sketched Medea’s “fol penelement” according to which Jason would reward her for killing Pelias, the 1520 prose version adds,

Dune grande folie sappensa Medee pour occire le roy Peleus: dont elle la mort desiroit. (f. lxix’)

Very foolishly Medea conceived of the idea to kill King Pelias, whose death she desired.

In 1538 and 1539 the suppression stops just before this sentence for which there exists no equivalent in the *Metamorphoses* and whose preservation scarcely restores the passage to its original state. Perhaps those responsible for the 1538 and 1539 volumes did not know the complete story of Jason and Pelias. If so, that ignorance too should be noted; but more important still is the fact that a quick glance at Hyginus’s *Fabularum liber* would have revealed the essential: “Jason cum Peliae patrui sui iussu tot pericula adisset, cogitare cœpit, quomodo eum sine suspicione interficeret, hoc Medea se facturam policetur.” Evidently in 1538 eschewing the medieval allegorization of the *Metamorphoses* did not go hand in hand with informed or careful scholarship.

We may not be surprised, then, to find François Habert, the author of a credible — and successful — translation of the *Metamorphoses*, publishing in 1550 an “Epistre de Dieu le Père à la vierge Marie” as part of his *Epistres héroïdes tréssalutaires pour servir d'exemple à toute âme fidèle*. Again the problem arises as to what to stress: the presence of the word “héroïdes” in the title, alerting us to the influence of another Ovidian genre on Habert, or the remarkable incongruity between Ovid’s epistles and a companion piece addressed by God to the Virgin Mary.

By mid-century, however, impressive teachers had found impressive students, and yet even as we enter the realm of the more learned poets, comparable difficulties confront us.

When Jean de La Pérouse composed one of the earliest French tragedies in the classical mode, *Médée*, he chose to depict the princess’s

---

3 Hyginus, *Fabularum liber* (Basel 1535).
final hours with Jason and Creon. Available to inspire him were the versions of both Seneca and Euripides (in George Buchanan’s Latin translation). He opted to follow Seneca despite the verse in Horace’s *Ars poetica* which roundly censures a trait of the Senecan drama: “ne pueros coram populo Medea trucidet” (v. 185). La Péruse ignored the dictum and retained Seneca’s “fault.” Another principal source of dramatic theory in his day, the grammarian Diomedes, defined tragedy as encompassing “the fortune of heroes in adversity” and added, “sadness is the distinguishing mark of tragedy” (pp. 23, 25).

From the outset of French Renaissance tragedy, these statements were taken quite seriously, as can be seen from the following passage in Jodelle’s *Cléopâtre captive* (performed 1553):

```
Des hauts Dieux la puissance
   Tesmoigne assez ici,
   Que nostre heureuse chance
   Se precipite ainsi.

Quel estoit Marc Antoine?
   Et quel estoit l’honneur
   De nostre braue Roine
   Digne d’vn tel donneur?

Des deux l’vn miserable
   Cedant à son destin,
   D’vne mort pitoyable
   Vint auancer sa fin:

L’autre encore craintiue
   Taschant s’éuertuer,
   Veut pour n’estre captiue
   Librement se tuer.

... 

Telle est la destinee
   Des immuables Cieux,
   Telle nous est donnee
   La defaueur des Dieux.
   (vv. 421-36, 441-44)
```

The power of the mighty gods gives ample evidence here that our good fortune is cast down thus. What was Mark Antony? And what was the honor of our noble queen, worthy of such a bestower? Of the two, one, distraught, giving in to his destiny, has advanced his

---

end through a piteous death; the other, still fearful, trying to gather courage, wants of her own choice to kill herself in order to avoid captivity. Such is the immutable heavens’ destiny; in this way the gods’ disfavor is given us.

The Senecan Medea scarcely fits such a mold. To be sure, Jason’s marriage to Creusa introduces calamity into the life of the princess, but Medea meets that adversity with undisguised fury. She is neither “crainiue” nor brought to suicide. With her initial speech she cries for vengeance. Her allusion to the passion that brought about her ill-fated liaison with Jason (v. 136) is soon lost among outbursts against Creon and his new son-in-law. A description of fortune’s effect gives way immediately to the fierce pride that is Medea’s dominant stance:

Quamuis enim sim clade miseranda obruta,
expulsa, supplex, sola, deserta, undique
afficta, quondam nobili fulsi patre
auoque clarum Sole deduxi genus.
(vv. 207-10)9

Can we say, in view of La Pérouse’s preference for Seneca, that he reached back in time and willingly bypassed certain recognized canons in order to capture the full dramatic force of the Seneca play? The textual evidence offers us a less than conclusive answer.

When we first see the French Medea, she is a victim of Jason’s perfidy, a heroine in adversity who passes quickly to the vengeful tone so reminiscent of Seneca. Yet as her first words show, Seneca does not determine everything. Some of the most virulent verses he composed for Medea (e.g. vv. 25-55) do not reappear in Médée and new material is added. Medea’s (invented) final speech in Act I brings back the posture of the wrongfully treated, incomprehending wife. In the exchange between Medea and Creon as conceived by Seneca, Medea does not go beyond “fortasse moriens” (v. 290) and “miserae” (v. 293) when describing herself. Even Euripides, using the chorus, injects a more pathetic note at this juncture:

Infelix mulier, misera, malis
Miseris obnoxia, quò tandem
Te uertes? cuius amicitiam,
Cuius tectum, aut terram inuenies
Portum malis? (Buchanan, f. 11v)

La Pérouse outdistances both, introducing into Medea’s lines the traditional image of the Renaissance tragic hero:

Où iroy-ie, Creon, sans aucune conduite,
Pauure, seule, esplorée? où prendroy-ie la fuitte?
Bons Dieux! qui eust pensé qu'vne fille de Roy
Peut quelques fois tomber en vn tel desarroy?

(p. 49)

Where shall I go, Creon, without a guide, wretched, alone, tearstained, where shall I fly? Dear gods, who would have thought that a king's daughter could fall victim to such confusion?

La Péruse has been criticized for ignoring Seneca's first chorus (which contains a lyric description of Medea's beauty) in favor of the second-act chorus (reference to the perilous voyage of the Argonauts) but, again, as La Péruse develops his material, its relevance to a Renaissance tragedy becomes apparent:

Medée, trop heureuse
Et hors de tous regrets,
Si par mer fluctueuse
N'eusse suiuy les Grecs!

Encore plus heureuse
Si ton mal-heureux sort
Ne t'eust faict amoureuse
De l'aucteur de ta mort!

Encor plus fortunée
Si, sans plus long seiour,
Tu fusses morte et née
En vn et mesme iour! (p. 31)

Medea, too fortunate and free of all regret, if only you had not followed the Greeks across the foaming sea. More fortunate still if your ill-starred destiny had not made you love the agent of your death! More fortunate yet if, without any further delay, you had come into the world and left it the same day!

Given that so many changes effected by La Péruse seem calculated to achieve a balance between the fierce Medea in the Latin play and the pathetic figure required by dramatic theory, one cannot help wondering why La Péruse did not choose to make Euripides his model. The Medea we encounter in Euripides' tragedy immediately adopts a distraught posture: "Infelix ego, miseris curis / Confecta, hei mihi quomodo peril!" (f. 6'). Was La Péruse swayed by Seneca's portrait of the conjuring Medea? Certainly magic and magicians long
held the attention of the French public.\(^{10}\) Seneca’s language, too, must have played its part.

Horace had insinuated that the verses of tragedy contained “ampullas et sesquipedalia verba” (\textit{Ars poetica}, v. 97). Erasmus echoed him in his definition of “Tragicce loquii”: “Est uesti ut magnificentioribus. Est enim Tragicorum character sublimis, amatque tragœdia ampullas et sesquipedalia uerba.”\(^{11}\) In the Senecan version of Medea’s story La Pérouse found repeated examples of the rhetorical display referred to here as well as the “grandeur d’argumens, & grauite de sentences” considered by a fellow humanist as characteristic of the ways in which tragedies surpass all other works of literature.\(^{12}\) Although Euripides brings Creon and Medea into confrontation, Seneca, not Euripides, makes of that confrontation a moment for two distinct passages of stichomythia (vv. 192-202, 290-97). Similarly, when including in his play a portrait of Medea as magician, Seneca insisted upon making of the scene a monologue of considerable proportions (vv. 740-842).

In the face of Seneca’s powerful presentation of the Colchian princess, it is disturbing to think that La Pérouse was more likely drawn to the Latin play for reasons external to that presentation, and yet, just as (to the period) Seneca’s language made him the ancient dramatist to emulate, so contemporary thinking on the nature of tragedy clashed with the reality of the Senecan heroine and La Pérouse followed the wisdom of his day. In that regard, no passage from \textit{Médée} proves more telling than the close of the tragedy.

In Euripides’ version, the play ends as the chorus reminds us that the gods bring about many an unexpected event:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{spes euentu} \\
\text{Fraudent sæpe suo. quæ credas} \\
\text{Fieri haud posse, expediet deus ut} \\
\text{Finem hæc nunc sortita est fabula. (f. 32\textsuperscript{*})}
\end{align*}
\]

\textit{Medea} closes with the disappearance of the murderess into the clouds and Jason’s sarcastic commentary: “Per alta uade spatia sublimis aetheris / testare nullos esse, qua uelheris, deos” (vv. 1026-27). La Pérouse imitates neither text. In his play, Medea speaks the final lines (addressed to Jason):

\textit{Qui aura desormais de faux amant le blasme,}\(^{13}\)

\(^{10}\) Interest in magicians reappears in Jean de La Taille’s \textit{Saül le furieux} (1572) and in numerous secondary works catalogued by Jean Rousset in his \textit{La Littérature de l’âge baroque en France} (Paris 1953), pp. 266-67.

\(^{11}\) \textit{Adagiorum Opus} (Basel 1526), p. 466.

A l'exemple de toy se garde du danger  
Par qui l'apren mon sexe à se pouuoir vanger! (p. 76)

Whoever will henceforth be censured for infidelity, let him, following your example, protect himself against the peril by which I show my sex how to avenge itself.

Not the mystery of divine action in general nor the mystery of Medea's capacity to act with (presumed) impunity, but Jason's merited punishment completes the action of the French text. There is inconsistency in this last speech, which begins with Medea throwing at Jason the corpse of their murdered child; however, that inconsistency characterizes much of La Péruse's adaptation, where the demonic magician alternates with the unjustly betrayed wife, so clear was it in the day that tragedy treated of "the fortune of heroes in adversity."

Medea also provides the subject matter for a substantial work in rhymed couplets by Jean-Antoine de Baïf entitled "L'Amour de Médée," a poem that never rises above a very close translation of verses 5-99 from book VII of the Metamorphoses. Judging by Baïf's introductory lines, such fidelity derives from the desire of a patron, D'Angennes, marquis de Maintenon, to have the Ovidian passage made French, even though Baïf preferred to expend his energies in other ways:

Tv as voulu que je raconte en ryme  
Comme Medee en sa jeunesse prime,  
D'Angennes, sent du nouueau Cupidon,  
Premierement la fleche & le brandon:  
Je te complais, encore que bien rare  
Je prenne en main cette mode barbare,  
Me plaisant plus aux nombreuses chansons  
Des vieux Gregeois, qu'aux modernes façons.  

(II. 298-99)

You, D'Angennes, have wished that I tell in verse how in the flower of youth Medea feels for the first time new Cupid's arrow and torch. I obey you, even though I rarely take up this barbarous mode, finding more pleasure in the ancient Greeks' many songs than in the modern ways.

The last four verses are not easily understood and like many problematic passages they remain, as far as we can determine, without critical comment. The poet cannot mean: "I dislike imitating Ovid." Baïf went several times to the Metamorphoses for inspiration, and did

so from the beginning of his career as a published poet. Does he mean that he prefers the tone of his epigrams, taken from the Greek Anthology, to the cliché-ridden vocabulary of sighing lovers in the Ovidian, Petrarchan "façons" so often criticized in the century? It is possible and although the phrase "mode barbare" ill befits a style that poets censured for the insincerity of its rhetorical flourishes, Baïf's Amours (1552) do contain more examples of "gauloiserie" than can be found in comparable recueils of love poems published at that time by the Pléiade.

This reading of Baïf's problematic verses can be no more than a hypothesis but, if valid, it would highlight Baïf's own awareness that "L'Amour de Médée" is a set piece, a description of some of those many moments in the poetic transcription of loving that by mid-sixteenth century had become recognized literary commonplaces. Baïf's reluctance to repeat them one more time may strike us as admirable but it is noteworthy that his response says nothing about the intrinsic quality of the Ovidian passage, about its portrait of innamoramento which is also an inquiry into a particular mind, soon to conceive and execute astounding acts. By the poet's own admission the impetus behind "L'Amour de Médée" stems from a patron's wish. Ovid's fascination with the character (did Baïf know Ovid had written a tragedy about Medea?) appears not to have been contagious, and somewhat in the same fashion that La Péruse recasts Seneca's Medea as the Renaissance hero in adversity, Baïf permits the Ovidian Medea to exemplify a mind struggling between reason and love, achieving momentary release from passion and then succumbing utterly to it.

Before we judge Baïf, we should realize that his work, too, is "of its time." How does Medea's resolve to follow reason crumble? She sees Jason again:

Ainsi l'Amour qui t'eust semblé n'aguerre
Déjà languir, déjà tout adoucy,
Voyant Iason, par vn ardent soucy
De sa beauté qu'elle voit en presence,
Plus violent que deuant recommence. (II. 303)

Thus Love, which previously appeared to you to be already languid and subdued, seeing Jason, returns more violent than before through a burning heed for the beauty she sees in front of her.


15 However, his inspiration was by no means exclusively Greek. Second's Basia, for example, influenced Baïf to a significant degree.
No less a student of classical lore than Boccaccio found in the Latin original of these lines a basic truth about human behavior. Concluding his chapter on Medea in Concerning Famous Women, he observed:

Sed ne omiserim, non omnis oculis praestanda licencia est. . . . Eos quippe si potens clausisset Medea, aut aliorum flexisset dum erexit auida in Iasonem, stetisset diutius potencia patris, uita fratris, & suae uirginitatis decus infractum, quae omnia horum impudicitia periere. (De claris mulieribus [Bern 1539], f. xii')

Not to stop here, I will say that we must not give too much freedom to our eyes. . . . Certainly, if powerful Medea had closed her eyes or turned them elsewhere when she fixed them longingly on Jason, her father's power would have been preserved longer, as would her brother's life, and the honor of her virginity would have remained unblemished. All these things were lost because of the shamelessness of her eyes.16

Evidence abounds in French Renaissance poetry for a continued belief in the power of the eye as well as in the reality of the mental debate between reason and passion. Dizain 6 of Délie (1544) retells how through his eye the lady stunned the poet's soul and ended his independent ways; later, dizain 79 recounts the tug between reason and love. In Cléopâtre captive, the shade of Mark Antony laments:

O moy deslors chetif, que mon oeil trop folastre
S'égara dans les yeux de ceste Cleopatre!
Depuis ce seul moment ie senti bien ma playe,
Descendre par l'œil traistre en l'ame encore gaye.
(vv. 75-78)

Woe is me, miserable from the moment my too wanton eye lost its way in the eyes of this Cleopatra! From that very moment I felt my wound descend through that traitorous eye into my still happy soul.

Ronsard knew the same experience, if we may believe the second sonnet of his Amours (1552):17

Du ciel à peine elle estoyt descendue,
Quand je la vi, quand mon ame esperdue
En devint folle . . . (IV. 7)

She had scarcely descended from the sky when I saw her, when she drove my lost soul mad . . .

---


an experience which, like Medea’s, included a battle between reason and love:

Lors ma raison, & lors ce dieu cruel,
   Seulz per à per d’un choc continu
   Vont redoublant mille escarmouches fortes. (IV. 51)

Then my reason and this cruel god, equal against equal in continuous clash, keep intensifying a thousand fierce encounters.

These quotations — which could be multiplied many times — shed useful light on the unenthusiastic tone of Baïf’s introductory verses; by the same token, the capacity of contemporary thinking to color sixteenth-century responses to the classical world, too, emerges from Baïf’s same verses and warns of the distance back to antiquity that had to be bridged and yet often proved difficult to travel, even for France’s finest poets.

Joachim Du Bellay, for example, inserted in his 1552 volume, Le Quatrièsieme Livre de l’Eneide de Virgile, traduit en vers francoys, an adaptation of Ovid’s seventh epistle from the Heroides.18 The book opens with an épître-préface to Jean de Morel in which Du Bellay explains that he added the “Complainte de Didon à Enée, prinse d’Ovide” to the verses taken from Virgil, “tant pour la continuation du propos, que pour opposer la divine magesté de l’ung de ces auteurs à l’ingenieuse facilite de l’autre” (VI. 252: “as much because of the continuity in subject matter as to oppose the divine majesty of one of these writers to the inventive facility of the other”).

Du Bellay’s characterization of Ovid, which was repeated many times over in the sixteenth century,19 also proved decisive with regard to the poet’s choice of form: for his translation of Virgil, decasyllabic couplets; for the imitation of Ovid, heterometric sizains of seven-and three-syllable lines arranged 737737 and rhymed aabccb. Ronsard’s incomplete epic, the Franciade, composed likewise in decasyllabic couplets, assures us of the strong association in the period between that form and poetic grandeur. Every trait of the form of the “Complainte,” on the other hand, relates it to the lyric mode


19 Introducing his translation of the Metamorphoses (book I), Marot comments on “la grande douceur du stile” (Oeuvres complètes, ed. C. A. Mayer, VI, 113). Ronsard speaks of “Le doux Ovide” (XIV, 67) and of “l’ingenieux Ovide” (XIV, 77); Montaigne, of “sa facilité et ses inventions” (Essais, II, x). A Shakespearean character observes that “for the elegancy, facility, and golden cadence of poesy, . . . Ovidius Naso was the man” (Love’s Labor’s Lost, IV, i).
and to the tradition of the chanson in particular,\textsuperscript{20} even though whatever fluidity, wit, or \textit{suavitas} we may find in the \textit{Heroides} cannot disguise the fact that the letters remain highly artificial and rhetorical in nature. Moreover, in the \textit{Heroides} Ovid used the elegiac meter composed of distichs of hexameters and pentameters. For decades before Du Bellay wrote the "Complainte," poets had followed suit, employing in their elegies equally long lines, that is, the very form used by Du Bellay to translate Virgil and by Octavien de Saint-Gelais in the last years of the fifteenth century to translate the \textit{Heroides}:\textsuperscript{21}

Comme le cigne quant mort luy est prochaine
Doulcement chante et a voix tresseraine
Pareillement ie dido pour tout voir
Qui ne te puis par priere esmouoir
Et qui plus nay en ta vie esperance
Ores te faitz scauoir ma doleance. (sig. F5')

Just as the swan, when death is near, sings sweetly and with a tranquil voice, so, to show all, I Dido, who cannot move you with my entreaty, and who hold out no hope from you, now reveal to you my suffering.

Whereas Saint-Gelais twice calls upon the adverbial form in -ment, evoking thereby the rhythm of the Latin original, in Du Bellay's first stanza:

Comme l'oiseau blanchissant,
Languissant
Parmy l'herbette nouvelle,
Chante l'hymne de sa mort,
Qui au bort
Du doux Meandre l'appelle (VI. 307)

As the white bird, languishing among the new bladelets, sings his hymn of death, which, at the edge of the sweet Meander, calls him the rhyme "blanchissant / Languissant" thrusts at the reader an entirely new rhythm. The poet then emphasizes further his choice of the lyric mode through use of the diminutive "herbette" and the adjective "doux," neither justified by the Latin text. Moreover, with

\textsuperscript{20} See, for example, the texts reprinted by Brian Jeffery in his two-volume \textit{Chanson Verse of the Early Renaissance} (London 1971-76).

This is not to say that an elegiac tone was never heard in sixteenth-century lyric forms. Mellin de Saint-Gelais's famous "Laissez la verde couleur," which recasts Venus's lament on the death of Adonis, first appeared in a volume of chanson verse (1545). The poem is composed of isometric quatrains, however, and achieves thereby a solemnity not compatible with Du Bellay's heterometric pattern.

\textsuperscript{21} \textit{Sensuyt les xxi epistres dovide: translates d' latin en francais par reverend pere en dieu maistre Octovien de Saint Gelaix} (Paris 1525).
abandonment of Ovid's elegiac distich comes a comparable lack of concern for Ovid's artistry. This double play with past participles and gerundives, "facta fugis, facienda petis; quaerenda per orbem / altera, quaesita est altera terra tibi" (vv. 13-14), falls away completely in the French:

Le bien asseuré tu fuis,
    Et poursuis
Une incertaine entreprise.
Autre terre est ton soucy:
    Cete cy
T'est sans nulle peine aquise. (VI. 308)

Assured happiness you flee and pursue an uncertain enterprise. Another land preoccupies you. This one is yours for no effort at all.

We are left with a correlation, not between version and source, but between abstraction (Ovid's "facilité") and form into which only the content of Heroides 7 has been poured.

From such a small sampling of texts it would be foolish to draw any broad conclusions. However, these examples cannot fail to create in us an awareness that during the Renaissance classical letters are "reborn" into a period with its own past and perspectives, a period whose features emerge as much from its recasting of those reborn works as from its outspoken commitment to make their past glory live again.

_Harvard University_
Thomas Stanley, Caroline poet, translator, and popularizer of ancient learning, deserves a more complete exposition and evaluation of his practical criticism of Aeschylus than he has yet received. Since his folio text, translation, and commentary (London 1663) drew the praise of Isaac Casaubon’s son, Meric, shortly after publication; since Ezra Pound, much later, praised the strength and skill of the translation; and since Eduard Fraenkel has given a judicious account both of Stanley’s sources and of the increasingly perceptive manuscript notations Stanley added after publication,¹ this insistence may appear presumptuous. Before defending such a claim, a writer should cite Fraenkel’s praise for Stanley’s continued effort in annotating Aeschylus to “make the work worthy of its subject. What he here sets down as necessary elements of a commentary on a dramatic poet

goes far beyond the ideas of his own time: it anticipates conceptions of the nineteenth century.”

Why, then, should we return to examine Thomas Stanley’s thoughtful exposition of Aeschylus for his seventeenth-century audience? One motive is certainly the desire to develop and expand Fraenkel’s point beyond the major examples he cites. But other reasons are more cogent. Since Stanley presented the first Aeschylean text, translation, and commentary for a non-specialized audience, the ideas he communicated are important for students of later Restoration and eighteenth-century poets and translators. In fact, the circulation of Stanley’s work increased with Jan Cornelis de Pauw’s re-edition, which included the 1663 commentary (The Hague 1745), and, even later, with Samuel Butler’s Aeschylus (Cambridge 1809), which contained many of Stanley’s manuscript addenda as well as original notes.

Even more important than the influence Stanley’s ideas may have exerted, however, is the amplitude of the literary, historical, and philosophical exposition accompanying the edition. Quite simply, Stanley is the first editor of Aeschylus to undertake criticism on this scale. The great continental editors who preceded him wrestled with the problem presented by the mutilated text of a puzzling author; their introductions and notes do include critical evaluations but usually confine themselves to general observations about Aeschylus’ unique and obscure style. Petrus Victorius (Pier Vettori), whose 1557 edition first included the complete Oresteia, makes one of the most specific stylistic comments preceding Stanley, noting Aeschylus’ coining of new words and introduction of archaic and foreign terms. Francesco Robortello’s preface to his edition of the Aeschylean scholia (Venice 1552, pp. 1-8) provides the first practical criticism of one drama, the Prometheus Bound, in Aristotelian terms. Stanley not only supplies a broader context but implicitly suggests Robortello’s limitations. In a different area Willem Canter’s Aeschylus (Antwerp 1580) contains a supplement for the reader which, making no distinction between tragedy and history, arranges Aeschylus’ characters and plots in a chronology beginning with Prometheus, who “flourished at the time

2 Fraenkel, I, p. 41.

3 Petrus Victorius’ preface to his Aeschylus (Stephanus: Geneva 1557), “quò infinitis locis obscurae admodum sint, invenianturque in ipsis multa nomina valea consequutudine remota. Ille enim, ut undique ampli grandéque id poema efficeret, & plura quam alii eiusmod loci verba novavit & vetusta etiam peregrináque liberius usurpavit,” sig. a iv. I am omitting the lengthy Greek and Latin titles of the early editors when a brief citation identifies the work.
of Joshua and Cecrops," and concluding with the Persians.\(^4\) Stanley’s historical comments are more precise than Canter’s although he has not totally freed himself from the traditional allegoresis of pagan authors which Don Cameron Allen traces in *Mysteriously Meant: The Rediscovery of Pagan Symbolism and Allegorical Interpretation in the Renaissance* (Baltimore 1970).

Not only are Stanley’s interests broader than those of preceding editors; in addition, many of his emphases are new for an editor of Aeschylus, reflecting an effort to bring one of the most puzzling pagan authors into a literary and philosophic tradition Stanley can accept and defend to his audience. His notes are eclectic, drawing parallels with classical and patristic authors, citing earlier humanists, and even referring the reader to the contemporary history of volcanic eruptions. Three areas of emphasis, however, extend his analysis of Aeschylus beyond the comments of preceding editors to set the ancient tragedian in a context accessible to his readers. The first is a moral and mystical reading of Aeschylus, suggested first in Stanley’s dedicatory epistle to Sir Henry Newton Puckering (the same man who possessed the MS of Milton’s early poems):

\[\text{Pollet etiam tacita quadam, Pythagoricae affini, sapientia.}\]^5

He [Aeschylus] is strong in a certain secret wisdom, associated with Pythagorean wisdom.

Previous editors had called Aeschylus a Pythagorean because Cicero had done so, but Stanley’s commentary repeatedly demonstrates correspondences, ranging from individual word-choices to a shared conception of the structure of the universe. In the process of demonstrating Aeschylus’ Pythagorean qualities, Stanley also draws as many Biblical parallels as possible but, unlike Canter, he retains a clear historical perspective.

A second area of emphasis is more strictly “literary”: it includes

\(^4\) Willem Canter identifies the passage as Chapter 4 of his *Novarum Lectionum, Libro V* (printed in his edition of Aeschylus [C. Plantinus: Antwerp 1508], pp. 9-13). His chronology includes the tragedies of Sophocles and Euripides but begins and concludes with the Aeschylean plays cited.

\(^5\) Thomas Stanley, dedicatory epistle of his *Aeschylus* (J. Flescher: London 1663; repr. Samuel Butler 1809), VIII, xiii. Subsequent citations of Stanley are from this edition. Butler uses brackets to indicate passages from Stanley’s marginalia added after the 1663 edition. Butler’s quotations have been compared with Stanley’s 1663 edition and his MS material in the Cambridge University Library. Except for very brief passages, I have translated Stanley’s Latin and Greek to provide continuity in a discussion requiring citation of a text which is not immediately accessible to many readers.
the visualization of Aeschylean plays as dramas to be staged, a contribution well noted by Fraenkel (I, 44). Stanley supplements this visualization with a discussion of Horatian and Aristotelian precepts as they were understood in his time, often broadening the received definitions to justify his reading of a particular Aeschylean play. Further, Stanley provides the most thorough analysis of Aeschylean style by an early editor. A final dimension of Stanley's interest is political: his devoted Royalism is apparent when he discusses the Suppliants, although his conceptualization of national and international law is one we might expect to find in a seventeenth-century interpreter of a great pagan author.

I

When Stanley presents Aeschylus as a "Pythagorean" philosopher, the interpretation is often more nearly Neoplatonic. He is quite interesting when he considers the structure of the universe in these terms. For instance, lines 5-6 of the Agamemnon ("Those bright potentates conspicuous in the sky who bring winter and summer to man") prompt his consideration of universal order. This has the flavor of the Pythagorean school in whose teaching Aeschylus was immersed according to Cicero:

Ille enim primus coelum nuncupavit κόσμον a decore stellarum . . . οὐρων κόσμον προσηγόρευε, διὰ τὸ τίλεων εὕνα καὶ πᾶσι κεκοσμηθα, τῶς τε ζώως, καὶ τῶς καλωίς. Quam pulchritudinem participat a primo et intellectuali pulcro. (III, p. 140)

For he [Pythagoras] was the first to call the heavens a kosmos after the adornment of the stars . . . because it is perfect and adorned with all things which are alive and beautiful. He says that this beauty has a share in the first and intellectual beauty. (Italics mine.)

The conception of living, harmonious inhabitants of space and of

---


7 Fraenkel's translation of this line, I, p. 91. All references to plays and line numbers are to Aeschylis Septem quae Supersunt Tragoedias, ed. Denys Page (Oxford 1972). Subsequent translations of Aeschylean lines are my own.
a more perfect "idea" beyond them may be read in a Neoplatonic context familiar from various sources to Spenser, Sidney, and Milton. Stanley's own translation of Pico's "Platonick Discourse upon Love" subordinates the "idea," "minde," or "world-soul" to God.\(^8\) Similarly, in his early poem, "Pythagoras his Moral Rules," he observes "How nature is by general likenesse chained" (line 54) and, in his notes, adds the gloss: "By him who gave us Life, God" (p. 73). In the Aeschylean commentary Stanley is moving far from his dramatic context (the words of the Watchman in the Oresteia) to present Aeschylus as a philosopher approaching truth in terms which had attracted Renaissance men for several centuries. Equally interesting is his digression in the Eumenides to consider the mystic origin of the kosmos. Again, he expands upon one line, "[Marriage] is mightier than an oath, and is guarded by Justice" (Eum. 218):

Atque hinc etiam confirmari possit Aeschylum Pythagoreis jure an-numerandum; etenim apud illos jurisjurandi religio summa; quo fit ut aureorum carminum auctor primo praecepto de Diis colendis hoc adjungat, — καὶ οὕθων ὅρκον — ad quem locum vide sis Hieroclem, qui humanum jusjurandum quasi rivulum ac imaginem esse contendit magni illius jurisjurandi quo naturae totius universitas obstricta est eique obtemperare cogitur. (V1, p. 127)

From this source we can confirm that Aeschylus should rightly be numbered among the Pythagoreans, for they had the highest regard for an oath. For this reason the author of "The Golden Verses" adds this to the first commandment about worshipping the Gods: "And reverence your oath." On this passage, see Hierocles, who contends that a human oath is, as it were, a small derivative and a copy of that great Oath by which the whole order of Nature is bound and is forced to conform with it. (Italics mine)

Not only has he moved from his context to present a human oath as an imperfect "copy"; the idea that a mysterious oath binds created order (although Stanley does not make the idea explicit) is not inconsistent with belief in a divine Creator whose Logos is his "effectual might."

Stanley's Pythagorean reading may commend Aeschylus to a thoughtful Christian reader. He is careful to suggest moral and philosophic congruencies and to explain differences when they occur. He observes that the Pythagoreans subjected God to Fate, an opinion which the Stoics approved (Prom. 518, St. 517). After the comment, a commendable perception of the characters' lack of omnipotence,

\(^8\) The Poems and Translations . . . , ed. G. M. Crump, pp. 199-200. All citations of Stanley's work other than his Aeschylus are from this text.
he does mediate between the ancient philosophers and his reader: “Deum, i.e. Divinam providentiam, vel fortunam.” He is interested in the primacy the Pythagoreans assign to fire among the elements (Prometheus’ invocation, St. 88), the medicinal power of music (Ag. 17), the importance of memory, and the “purer” predictions of the Pythagoreans without the aid of blood and sacrifice (Se. 25, St. 27). Elsewhere he approves Pythagorean moral values: marital fidelity in the Suppliants and observance of the “mean” in wealth (Ag. 471, St. 479). Even the Aeschylean “kennings” (“winged hounds” for “eagles” in Ag. 135, St. 139) are attributed to Pythagoras’ search for teaching and for learning truth. He “used to say certain things in a mystical fashion, symbolically, of which Aristotle has given a fuller record”:

Nec minus cothurnum Tragicum quam Scholam Pythagorea sapit haec loquendi forma: de quo Porphyrius in Vitâ, ἐλεγε δὲ τινα καὶ μυστικῷ τρόπῳ συμβολικῷ, ἀ δὴ ἐπιπλέον Ἀριστοτέλης ἐνέγραψεν. (III, p. 169)

By documenting Aeschylus’ “Pythagorean” attributes, with the further citation of Neoplatonists such as Hierocles, Stanley associates the first great tragedian with the two ancient writers most highly respected by Renaissance Christians for their faith. Allen, for example, has demonstrated the acceptance of Plato and Pythagoras both by patristic writers and certain Cambridge Platonists (pp. 21 and 35). Aeschylus emerges as the representative of a philosophy with prophetic insight, the illustrator of an orderly and beautiful universe, the advocate of high moral values, and a participant in mystic approaches to truth, such as musical charms to heal and unusual word usages to provide insight.

Stanley’s Christianization of Aeschylus merges with his Pythagorean reading in his annotation of the Prometheus Bound. Although we might have predicted such an interpretation, we do not in fact receive it from other editors of the period:

Nonnulli e sanctis Patribus Promethei vincula fabulosa cum passione Domini nostri conferunt, hisce forsan aut similibus rationibus perducti: Christus est ὁ Λόγος, Σοφία Πατρός, quem et a Pythagora Σοφίαν dictum volunt aliqui: eo non abludit Promethei nomen; ambo φιλάθλουσιν. Causam δέσως Prometheae ab aliis novam et longe diversam statuit Aeschylus, sed huic analogiae valde congruentem. (l, 155)

9 The consideration of fire as the highest and noblest element is, of course, a familiar part of the “chain of being.” Stanley translates Pico on the subject in “A Platonick Discourse . . .” p. 202. Memory is the mother of the Muses, whom Pico allegorized as guardians of the spheres (p. 203). Music, concord, and harmony make up “Beauty in the largest sence” (p. 207).
Some of the holy Fathers compare the legendary chains with the passion of our Lord, perhaps being influenced by these or similar reasons: Christ is the Logos, the Wisdom of the Father, whom some people claim was called Sophia by Pythagoras also; the name of Prometheus is not inconsistent with this idea: both are philanthropoi. Aeschylus gives a reason for the binding of Prometheus which is original and quite different from other writers but quite relevant to this analogy.

He cites The Souda (Suidas) for a definition of λεωργος (knave, miscreant) as “one who dies for the people” and calls special attention to the “apparatus by which Prometheus is crucified.” Stanley leaves the relationship of Prometheus and Christ a limited analogy, however, and does not pursue it throughout the play. Hermes’ final advice to Prometheus, “and never say that it was Zeus who cast you into suffering unforeseen” (1073-75; St. 1072), provides an occasion for the justification of the ways of God to men with support from ancient and contemporary writers. Stanley relates his line to a similar sententia discussed by James Duport, professor of Greek at Cambridge, 1639-54, observing that Duport “says that this is a celebrated proverb and praised everywhere by the ancients, containing a defense of God and his providence regarding evil: whoever makes God the author of it acts impiously and unjustly” (“Celebris, inquit, gnome, et a veteribus passim laudata, continens apologiam pro Deo ejusque providentia, circa malum: cuius auctorem impie et inique Deum faciunt, quicunque faciunt” [I, 261]). The implication is that Zeus is not responsible for Prometheus’ suffering. Since Stanley has already observed that even Zeus lacks omnipotence, however, the interpretation can be more general. He and Duport are asserting that even the pagans considered men the authors of evil. Although Stanley has admired Prometheus earlier, the final comment is more reserved; Prometheus’ concern for mankind may have been Christ-like, but he is the author of his own torture. Further, he has foreseen the consequence of his actions.

Stanley’s parallels of pagan and Judaeo-Christian faith and ritual reveal a similar ambivalence. Sometimes he wants to show the similarity of ancient belief to the Biblical tradition. At other points, however, he corrects earlier commentators with an awareness of history: the pagan authors preceded Christ, and parallels should be

10 Stanley is reading the Aeschylean line as a proverb which resembles Duport’s citation and discussion of the Odyssey (I. 7; 32 ff.). Milton makes the same point with the same reference at the end of his chapter on Predestination in De Doctrina Christiana. See John Milton: Complete Poems and Major Prose, ed. Merritt Y. Hughes (New York 1957), p. 931.
regarded cautiously in this context. When he suggests Hebrew-Greek similarities, he is usually drawing Old Testament parallels; the greeting of Jacob to Joseph resembles, for example, the Herald’s first words to the Chorus in the Agamemnon (Ag. 539, St. 548). He sees similar ties between the Greeks and Hebrews when they attribute victory to God (or the Gods), in his comment on line 4 of the Seven against Thebes (“For should success be ours, we owe it to Heaven”):

Putabant Gentes victoriam a Diis suis esse, ad eosque referebant. . . . [Plane ut Moses apud Josephum, III. 2. θύσας δὲ ΧΑΡΙΣΤΗΡΙΑ βωμόν ἱδρύεται νικαίον ὑπομόσας τῶν θεῶν. Ιτα Graeci Troja direpta τὰ τῆς νικῆς χαριστήρια θύσαι, multa scilicet Diis sacrificia peragunt.] (IV, 158)

The pagans thought that victory came from their Gods and used to attribute it to them. [Josephus notes that] . . . Moses, having sacrificed thank-offerings, established a victory altar, calling upon the name of God. So the Greeks, when Troy was plundered, sacrificed thank-offerings for victory.

His choice of parallels is further justified by the “historical” idea continuing into the Renaissance that the Greeks derived some of their metaphors from the early Hebrews.11 The nets and snares of the Agamemnon, for example, he attributes to Hebraic influence, citing Ezekiel 12:13: “My net also will I spread upon him, and he shall be taken in my snare.”

In addition, Stanley emphasizes evidence for the immortality of the soul or for belief in God in “pagan” philosophy of any period. He explains Electra’s complaint that Agamemnon was not properly buried by referring to the historical context appropriate to the play, but expands the discussion of this scene to consider the existence of the soul and its judgment. Aeschylus’ lines further support the idea that “the funeral pyre consumes only the body, not the soul of the deceased person, which he proves to be immortal . . .” (“Rogus funebris absunit corpus tantum, non animam defunti [quam immortal esse, nec una cum corpore interire, ex eo probat]” V, 128).

Then, citing Plutarch’s “On Those Who are Punished Late by the Deity,” he concerns himself with that philosopher’s belief in reward and punishment after this life:

[ὁστε εἰ μηθέν ἐστι τῇ ψυχῇ μετὰ τὴν τελευτήν, ἄλλα καὶ χάριτος πέρας

11 Ernst Curtius, European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages, trans. W. R. Trask (New York 1953), traces the idea that the Hebrews were the true teachers of the Greek poets and philosophers to the writings of the Alexandrian Jews, p. 211. Allen demonstrates the survival of this idea into the seventeenth century. See especially pp. 30-37.
If there is nothing to the soul after death, if death is the end of all requital and punishment, one would rather say that the deity deals gently with those of the wicked who are quickly punished and who die.

To strengthen this point, Stanley links Aeschylus, the Psalmist, and the Stoics to consider briefly the value of belief in God. The Aeschylean line “But that men lacked reverence” (Ag. 372, St. 381) follows the Chorus’ consideration of mortals who trample “inviolable sanctities.” Stanley immediately cites Psalm 14:1, “The foolish man says in his heart there is no God,” and comments favorably, “Stoics ubique per sapientem virum probum intelligunt.”

As fully as possible, he is giving his reader the opportunity to consider Aeschylus and other virtuous pagans not only as men familiar with Hebraic customs but as believers in the tenets revealed by natural light before the Incarnation. It is interesting to a modern reader that Stanley is not disturbed by some of the attributes of God which horrified William Empson.

Stanley comments straightforwardly:

[Deus malorum ridet insaniam et poenam, Psal. ii. 4. Qui habitat in coelis irridebit eos; ἀγελάσεται αὐτοῖς, et Dominus subsannabit eos].
(V1, 151)

God laughs at the madness and the punishment of the wicked. Cf. Ps. 2:4, ‘He who lives in the heavens will laugh at them and the Lord will deride them’. (Eum. 560, St. 563)

Stanley often transcends the idea of a stern and punitive deity, however, to suggest that he considers the divine mind a mystery which men can never fully comprehend: he parallels lines 1057-58 (St. 1065) of the Suppliants, “Why should I attempt to look at the divine mind / A sight without depth” with the Psalmist’s “Thy judgments are a great abyss” (Ps. 36:6). The ancients (especially the

12 Although many scholars can be cited on this point, I prefer Thomas More’s discussion of these two central beliefs in Utopia. On natural revelation of a Creator, “They [the Utopians] think that like other designers He has exposed the workings of the world to the sight of man (whom alone He created with ability to understand it). . . .” On the afterlife, Utopus “issued severe and careful restrictions against anyone’s so falling away from the dignity of human nature as to believe that the soul dies with the body or that the world revolves by chance without divine providence.” Trans. by Peter K. Marshall (New York 1965), pp. 85 and 111.

"Pythagoreans" and Stoics) do resemble Stanley and his readers, but he emphasizes the beliefs Aeschylus and Renaissance Christians share: humans are responsible for evil fortune, here and hereafter; God laughs at the plight of those who oppose him; and His mind remains unfathomable.

With the possible exception of the Hebraic influence on ancient Greece, Stanley maintains his historical perspective. When he makes a verbal parallel with the Annunciation, the emphasis is simply upon "divine protection," not the Virgin Birth (VI, 180). He draws a careful distinction between pagan lustral rites and Christian baptism (on Ag. 1037, St. 1046), for example, concerning the "holy water" ($\chi\rho\nu\iota\beta\alpha\nu\nu$) which Clytemnestra invites Cassandra to share:

[Quanquam quod innuit Justinus Martyr, Apolog. 2. Ethnicos sc. ritum hunc aqua se aspergendi in ingressu templorum a Christianorum baptismo, daemonum instinctu didicisse, minus verisimile videatur, cum longe antiquior fuerit baptismo iste Gentilium ritus. . . . qui Christum natum saeculis aliquot antecessit]. (III, 247)

Although Justin Martyr, Apolog. 2, suggests that the pagans learned this custom of sprinkling themselves with water at the entrance of their temples from Christian baptism by the inspiration of devils, this seems unlikely since that ritual of the Gentiles was much more ancient. . . . [He goes on to point out that Justin's authority, Theophrastus,] preceded the birth of Christ by several centuries.

Stanley has chosen a long-disputed issue and resolved it with the awareness of historical distance which Allen suggests "... in due course fathered a shadowy form of cultural anthropology" (p. 241). The interest in placing unfamiliar customs within some historical context is, perhaps, predictable in sixteenth or seventeenth-century editions, but Stanley is far more meticulous in his historicity than Canter had been.

II

Stanley's interest in historical accuracy leads to his second major consideration, ancient tragedy as drama intended for performance, in his addressing the question of marriage between cousins in the Suppliants. He examines Danaus' argument to his daughters historically by citing Augustine (Civ. Dei XV. 16) and Livy, to conclude that "in fact marriages between cousins were not considered illegitimate" (Su. 225, St. 233). Having accounted for the historical question, he then explains Danaus' strong objections in terms of dramatic motivation: "This is spoken appropriately in the character of Danaus who knew well that these marriages would be fatal for him" ("[Apte
quidem sub persona Danai, quod fatales sibi fore has nuptias bene
noverat, hoc dictum est" (II, 116). In the same play Stanley thinks
that a dramatic motive is required to explain Pelasgus' ignorance of
Io's history when that king questions the Danaides (Su. 295 ff., St.
302): "It is astonishing that he makes the Argive king ignorant of
the history of Io. But the truth is that he is pretending to be ignorant
in order to discover whether the Danaides know the details thor-
oughly" ("Mire facit Regem Argivum ignarum historiae Ius. Sed
fingit potius se ignarum, ut sciat utrum Danaides rem ipsam probe
noverint" II, 124). This interest in the motivation of characters within
the context of the action recurs as he considers the appropriate
excuse for Orestes' absence at the end of the Agamemnon (877; St.
886) or for the Chorus' knowledge of the details of Agamemnon's
death (Choeph. 523, St. 521). This meticulous attention to the char-
acter who speaks to another and to his reasons for doing so leads
Stanley to the excellent insight praised by Fraenkel, that the Chorus,
not a messenger, perceives the entrance of Clytemnestra and salutes
her (Ag. 266):

Non lac lacti magis simile atque huic locus ille est in Persis, ubi senes
Persici, ex quibus constituitur Chorus, de expeditione Xerxis valde
solicitii, ut Graeci nostri de Agamemnone, longa adhibita oratione,
tandem ingredientem reginam, mutato genere carminis, salutant: quod
videntur non animadverterisse qui nuntium hic ingressum, et Trojae
expugnationem quam ab accensa face didicerat exponentem, commenti
sunt. Quo nihil a poetae mente magis absonum. (III, 182)\(^4\)

Milk is no more like milk than this passage to the one in the Persae
where the Persian old men who make up the Chorus, very troubled
about the expedition of Xerxes, give a long speech and finally salute
the queen as she enters, changing the style of the verse. This does
not seem to have been noticed by those who have wrongly contrived
that a messenger enters here describing the sacking of Troy. . . .
Nothing could be more discordant with the poet's intention. . . .

Here the careful attention to similarities in style and characteriza-
tion in a parallel passage clarify the dramatic interaction of Clytemnestra
with the Chorus so that her character — particularly her power,
initiative, and cleverness — is strengthened for future readers by the
contrast.

In this scene and elsewhere Stanley introduces another of his
literary interests: he visualizes the Chorus' behavior. Consistently, he
asks his reader to approach Aeschylean drama not only as an art
form for reading but as a spectacle actually staged; in fact, he is the

\(^4\) See Fraenkel's discussion of this passage, I, pp. 44-45.
first editor to ask this of his readers. He gives frequent "stage directions," for example, his note on the _Suppliants_, line 710 (St. 718): "Danaus had seen, from the place to which he has been led, the fleet of the Aegyptii pressing toward them" ("[Viderat Danaus a loco in quem deductus fuerat, instare classam Aegyptiorum,]" II, 150), or on the _Eumenides_, line 34: "We must understand that the Prophetess, having entered the temple, suddenly returned raving, terrified, and trembling" ("Intellegendum est vatem ingressam templum subito rediisse insanam, pavefactam, et trementem," VI, 110). He also wants his reader to visualize the prophetic garb of Cassandra, a matter important to the interpretation of a scene he admires not only for its _pathos_ but for its _technikon_. The reader is to hear her cries as appropriate for a person inspired by a deity and to observe the laurels and staff she will discard before she, too, becomes a victim. Stanley has even searched Strabo's geographical work to give his readers a description of the Furies: they wore black cloaks, tunics to the feet, and walked with staffs. Furthermore, other commentators notwithstanding, he insists that there were fifty of them "but the people, terrified by this number, thenceforth reduced the number to fifteen by law" ("sed consternatus hoc numero populus lege redegit exinde tragicum chorum ad quindecim," VI, 101). The accuracy of his authority, Pollux, may be questioned, but Stanley wants his reader to share the horror of seeing this Chorus. Stanley's concern with visualization of the drama does not appear in other textual editors; it is worth noting that William R. Parker admired the same quality in the work of Stanley's great contemporary, John Milton.¹⁵

In his application of dramatic theory, Stanley repeats some of the Aristotelian and Horatian ideas of his time; often, however, his careful reading of Aeschylus demands the clarification of a concept or outright disagreement with an earlier theorist. His definition of tragedy at the beginning of the commentary on the _Eumenides_ is worth citing because of its scope as well as its contradiction of such influential men as Joseph Scaliger and Daniel Heinsius:¹⁶

> Non est tragoeidiae necessarium ut semper habeat horrendos rerum exitus, et mortes et caedes et venena; Alcestis Euripidis in exitu omnia habet laeta; ostendit enim Alcestin Admeti uxorem a morte auxilio


¹⁶ Scaliger's definition of tragedy as "Imitatio per actiones illustris fortunae, exitu infelici, oratione graui metrica" is cited and evaluated by Bernard Weinberg, _A History of Literary Criticism in the Italian Renaissance_ (Chicago 1961), II, 746. For a discussion of Heinsius' idea that "the happy ending is undesirable," see Paul R. Sellin, _Daniel Heinsius and Stuart England_ (Oxford 1968), pp. 139-40.
Herculis liberatam. Quae vero tragoediam χαρακτηρίζωσι duo sunt. Primo, Personae, quas esse oportet aut Deos, aut heroas, aut reges, aut viros clarissimos, non vero e plebecula aut notae inferioris. . . . Secundo, Res quae representatur, quam non oportet esse e communi vita depromptam, sed grandem et severam. Haec si successant fabulae, quiscunque exitus sit, tragoedia est. Idem et de Supplicibus dicendum. (VI, 99)

It is not essential that tragedy always have dreadful conclusions, deaths, murders, and poisonings. The Alcestis of Euripides has an ending which is entirely happy, for it shows Alcestis, the wife of Admetus, freed from death by the help of Hercules. In fact, there are two things which characterize a tragedy: First, the characters, who should be Gods, heroes, kings, or distinguished men, but certainly not from the common people or of a lower rank. . . . Second, the events represented, which should not be drawn from common life but should be lofty and serious. If these things are in a play, whatever the conclusion is, it is a tragedy. The same must be said of the Supplices.

Stanley's first criterion appears in medieval interpretations17 but his applications certainly do not. A modern reader is surprised that he considers the Suppliants a completed tragedy rather than part of a trilogy in which bloodshed is yet to occur. However, Stanley seldom speculates about Aeschylean trilogies. He approaches the question when he calls the Oresteia a tetralogy whose central figure is Orestes (Choeph. 660, St. 666), but he examines each play separately and does not trace the progression throughout the sequence of plays.18 His application of the definition is thus to the Eumenides, rather than to the Oresteia as a whole. In the same decade Milton's preface to Samson Agonistes commends David Paraëus' discussion of Revelation as a "high and stately tragedy." Stanley's criteria, applied to either work, permit not only a "happy ending" but a renewed cosmic order to be termed "tragic."19 The ready admission of these works to the genre suggests that the tragic frontiers were wider for these men than for other theorists and, perhaps, for us.

Stanley also clarifies the concept of anagnorisis when he defends


18 Consideration of the trilogy problem is rare before the nineteenth century. A landmark is Friedrich G. Welcker's Die Aeschyleische Trilogie (Darmstadt 1824).

19 For a distinction between Aeschylus' plays and other Greek "tragedy," see C. J. Herington, "Aeschylus: the Last Phase," Arion iv, 3 (Autumn, 1965), especially pp. 399-402.
the frequently parodied recognition of Orestes and Electra in the Choephoroi. He quotes Aristotle: “The fourth type of anagnorisis [arises] from comparison or inference (ek syllogismou), as in the Choephoroi because someone similar has arrived and someone similar is no one but Orestes” (Poet. 1455a. 4-5, although Stanley places it in Chapter 11). To develop his own discussion of the concept, Stanley corrects the scholiast on Aristophanes’ Clouds to state that Aristophanes is indeed making fun of Aeschylus,

nec merito id quidem. Non enim Electra ex similitudine crinium statim colligit Orestem esse qui τὸν βόστρυχον dedicavit, sed satis apte rationis calculos ponit; neminem scilicet illic crines depositurum nisi qui Agamemnonem cognatione prope contigneret: non id facturam Clytemnemstram, nec a se factum esse, ideo ab Oreste Electae similis. (V, 119)

. . . although this criticism is not deserved. For Electra does not immediately gather from the similarity of the hair that it was Orestes who dedicated the lock, but she makes her deductions appropriately enough; she says that no one was likely to lay hair there unless he were close to Agamemnon in kinship; Clytemnestra would not do this and she had not done it herself; therefore it was Orestes, who was like Electra, who had done it.

In the process he has placed Electra’s reasoning into the form of a logical syllogism more precise than Aristotle’s words suggest. He then insists that this attention to reasoning is essential for properly interpreting Aristotle: “and this is what Aristotle means when he says that this anagnorisis occurred through syllogismos, not from comparison, but from logical argument,” an interpretation D. W. Lucas has accepted in his commentary on the Poetics, p. 63. In addition, Stanley disapproves the introduction of comic matters into tragedy when he mentions Euripides’ parody of Aeschylus’ scene in Electra, attacking him for twisting the earlier tragedian’s ὑφασμα (woven goods, such as the piece of handwork Orestes shows Electra) into “cloaks and robes. . . . This type of quibbling is more suitable to the witty style of Aristophanes than to the seriousness of tragedy” (“per πεπλοι et φάρεα explicans. Quod cavillationis genus Aristophanicae potius lep- iditati quam tragoediae gravitati convenit,” V, 122). Commenting thus upon a particular scene Stanley has clarified the “fourth type of anagnorisis” for critical theorists at the same time that he criticizes Aeschylus’ parodists, particularly Euripides who has violated tragic decorum.

Stanley’s careful reading of the text elicits the consideration of ἔθος as he defends the decorum of Cilissa’s rambling in her grief
about the care she gave Orestes in infancy (Choeph. 749, St. 747). He praises Aeschylus by comparing his treatment of a simple character of lower birth with Vergil’s similar treatment in his fifth Eclogue of “that simplicity which best characterizes a shepherd and country people. . . . Full of the same type of simplicity in this locus. Although the words may not seem sufficiently consistent with each other, nevertheless the passage must not be considered defective since it suits a doting old woman all the more for that reason”:

simplicitatem illam quae pastorem et rusticos χαρακτηριζει optime exprimit. . . . Ejusmodi simplicitatis plenus est hic locus, qui, licet verba non satis inter se congruere videantur, mutilus tamen non censendus, cum eo magis deliram anum deceat. (V, 153)

Stanley’s emphasis upon the suitability of speech for “a doting old woman” suggests that he sees the ἔθος of a character as the expression of a generalized type. He supports the idea further with Aristotle’s distinction (Rhet. 2. 12) between the relative volatility of young men and the mature hesitation of older men, applying the contrast perceptively to Vergil’s portrayal of Turnus and Latinus in the Aeneid (XII. 11 ff.). In his actual definition of ἔθος Stanley is willing to consider the uniqueness of the individual within certain limitations, “for ἕθη vary in accordance with age, sex, fortune, country, emotions and also the nature which is particular and individual to each person”:

variantur enim ἔθη pro ratione aetatis, sexus, fortunae, patriae, affectuum, et etiam naturae unicuique propriae et individuae. (V, 152)

His specific examples from Aeschylus usually emphasize the general type the character fits. His illustrations from the Agamemnon are interesting from this point of view; they are also interesting because he makes no suggestion that Agamemnon fell as the result of hubris or any character flaw:

sic alia est persona, aliud ἔθος senis, aliud juvenis; aliud viri generosi et candidi, qualis erat Agamemnon; aliud mulieris adulatricis et vafrae, qualis Clytemnestra. (V, 152)

so there is one persona and one ἔθος for an old man, another for a young man; one for a noble and open-hearted man, such as Agamemnon was; another for a fawning and cunning woman, such as Clytemnestra. . . .

Similarly, he accounts for the Chorus’ hesitation in the murder scene, appropriately considering the Chorus as “characters.” They are old men and senators; as a result they waver and do not act rapidly. In his discussion of the Seven against Thebes, however, Stanley is reluctant
to generalize his statements about a character to the point that he makes the “type” inconsistent with the individual variation the play itself reveals. The character who receives the most specific treatment is Amphiaraus, whose shield is pure and without a device “as he himself was,” and whose words, characterized as “wise and reverent,” are reserved for appropriate disclosures, including prophecy, “as if . . . Amphiaraus would not have used that dissuasion to his fellow soldiers unless he had foreseen that they would be conquered”:

[Ad orationem prudentissimam et piissimam Amphiarai, quam recensuerat nuntius, referenda haec sunt: quasi diceret Eteocles, Amphiaraus ad commilitones suos dehortatione illa non usus fuerat, nisi eos victos fore praevidesset]. (IV, 224)

Amphiaraus may still be generalized, but he is no longer simply the exemplar of “the prudent man” a previous editor had made him.  
In other applications of critical theory Stanley reflects the opinions common to his period. He corrects the hypothesis to the *Agamemnon* by pointing out that Aeschylus does not show the murder itself but removes violent action from the stage, a familiar enough Horatian interpretation. He is also concerned with a certain verisimilitude in dramatic time, especially in the speed of Agamemnon’s death and burial: “However, he makes a mistake, as was observed by G. Vossius . . . ‘When Agamemnon, according to Aeschylus, is killed and buried with such speed the actor is scarcely given time to catch his breath’ ” (“Peccat tamen, ut observatum est eruditissimo Ger. Vossio, Instit. Poet. I. p. 22 ‘cum apud eum Agamemnon tanta celeritate et occiditur et tumulatur, ut actores vix respirandi tempus detur’,” III, 270). Stanley’s desire to make dramatic time believable recurs when he adds that Aeschylus has been “deservedly” criticized for having Agamemnon return on the same day Troy was captured. On this point he expresses his preference for Seneca’s handling of time “more carefully” in his *Agamemnon*. It is the only “unity” which troubles Stanley, but he would like to see less compression in Aeschylus’ play. A concern for historical verisimilitude recurs throughout the notes on the *Persians* because Stanley continues to observe that Aeschylus’ Persians follow Greek rites and customs: “a fault, but nothing is more common in the poets, Homer not excepted”:

Hos ritus non ex more Persarum, sed Graecorum, describit. Αἵματημα, sed quo nihil poetis, Homerum non excipio, frequentius. (VII, 206)

---

20 Joannes Caselius, *Septem ad Thebas Duces Aeschylī Tragoedia* (Stephan Myliander: Rostock 1582), is the only preceding editor who discusses the characters of this play. Eteocles is the exemplar of the public man, the ruler (sig. A3); Amphiaraus is the prudent “private” man who “minimēque videri, sed bonus esse velit,” sig. A3.
In addition to his consideration of dramatic motivation and theory, Stanley provides a most thorough analysis of Aeschylean style by an earlier editor. In his dedicatory epistle he echoes earlier commentators to observe that Aeschylus is grandiloquus, but he adds that this style may sometimes be compressed or restrained (castigate) and be employed to convey weight and seriousness (pondus). His comments on specific passages develop each of these observations. He further affirms that the grand and lofty style is important for the tragedian’s art; for support he cites “Longinus,” an authority increasingly important in England but not mentioned by the earlier continental editors. Another justification of the elevated style, for Stanley, is the value of varying the choice of words in order to avoid tautology. His own careful reading, however, permits him to criticize the scholastic’s remarks (on Frogs 814) about the “lofty” style in the first six lines of the Prometheus Bound: “Certainly in the first four verses there is nothing particularly sonorous, nothing loftier than the style of Euripides or indeed of Sophocles” (“certe in quatuor prioribus nihil admodum sonorum, nihil quod supra Euripidem, nedum supra Sophoclem, se attollat,” I, 158, on line 1). Stanley’s careful textual reading, in addition, does not confine him to stylistic comments about Aeschylean grandiloquence without the examination of passages of brief but effective statement. He calls attention to the breviloquentia which emphasizes each word when Clytemnestra stands over her husband’s body and addresses the Chorus: “This is Agamemnon, my husband — a corpse, the work of this right hand . . .” (Ag. 1404-06, St. 1413). He also admires a section of the Eumenides (lines 45 ff.), suggesting that Aeschylus frequently follows rather long, harsh, or unfamiliar words (duriuscula) with those familiar to the common people.

We have already noted one of Stanley’s observations of stylistic qualities distinctive to Aeschylus: the “kennings” which he ascribes to Pythagorean obscurity. He also joins Petrus Victorius21 in admiring Aeschylus’ repeated paronomasia, citing not only names of characters but even such instances as line 717 of the Prometheus, “[the river] hybristes, not wrongly named.” Other rhetorical figures are noted and usually approved within the commentary: examples of tralatio, epi-

21 Stanley is citing Victorius’ Variae Lectiones, XXXVI. 24, “[Nam argumentum ab etymo non est leve aut contemnendum. . . Sed etiam Aeschylus, non poeta solum, sed doctissimus vir ac merito philosophus existimatus, utitur eodem argumento in eadem persona notanda, virtuque cui affinis erat demonstrando, in fabula cui nomen est Ἐντα εἰς Θήβας. Atque id non semel: unde etiam perspicitur ipsum id non leve nec nugatorium existimasse; neque enim tam crebro eodem se contulisset.]” IV, 220-21.
phonema, and sarcasmos. "Tautological" figures are defended by referring to Aeschylus as an imitator of Homer. The only rhetorical device Stanley disapproves is the anachronism of referring to Scythia in line 2 of the *Prometheus Bound* since the name is derived from a yet unborn descendant of Hercules. Criticism of this error is common, even in the scholia; in Stanley's case the meticulous attention he devotes to Greek history may account for his objection. One of the most interesting combinations of historical knowledge with legal rhetoric is Stanley's comment upon Orestes' defense before the Areopagus (Eum. 443, St. 446): "There is a great deal of the poet's skill (ars), and of his wisdom (prudentia), in this speech of Orestes; for in such a short speech he skillfully treats the arguments necessary in a capital case":

[Malta est in hac Orestis ἤσει tum ars tum prudentia poetae: fabre enim in tanta breviloquentia necessaria in causa capitali argumenta persequitur.] (VI, 144)

Throughout the commentary Stanley has confined his rhetorical discussion to the most familiar terms and emphasized particularly Aeschylean choices; here his comprehension of the effective use of Greek legal rhetoric within a drama anticipates a more sophisticated analysis, such as Bernard Knox has applied to the legal rhetoric of Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus*.

III

Stanley's political glosses are valuable as the observations of an educated and fervent Royalist three years after the Restoration. (His *Psalterium Carolinum*, rendering the *Eikon Basilike* in verse, may have been known to Milton.) In other notes he interprets Aeschylus according to national and international law, referring to his major European authority, Hugo Grotius (*De Jure Belli ac Pacis*), a man whom Milton also admired.

Before a consideration of these major emphases, it is valuable to examine one indignant exclamation which shows Stanley's understanding of the *Prometheus Bound*. He is moved by his reading of Zeus' seduction of Io to exclaim that power, now economic and political, still has its privileges in affecting young women's lives: "Rulers, sometimes by force, sometimes by gifts, sometimes by the

---

22 Pedantic attention to anachronismos is regular in the scholiasts: e.g., the Medicean scholia on *Prom.* 411 and 846 or *Eum.* 566.


24 Crump, p. liv.
magnificence of their royal apparel, easily dazzle the eyes of women, sway their minds, and overcome their chastity. *Sic et magnates!*”

[Reges qua vi, qua muneribus, qua etiam regalis cultus pompa, foeminarum oculos facile perstringunt, animos influnct, pudicitiam expugnant. Sic et magnates] (I, 249)

From a literary standpoint Stanley’s comment diminishes an objection directed at this play by Francesco Robortello, whose contribution to Aeschylean criticism is noted above. Stanley’s comment glosses line 901 ff. (St. 903), the Chorus’ reaction to the story of Io, expressing the desire to marry within their own rank and avoid the attention of the “mightier gods” — a passage Robortello considered outside the central action. Stanley appears quite willing to see that the choral observation is natural after Io’s story of torment and Prometheus’ prediction of future trials before she will find peace. Politically, however, he goes beyond the account of the play (consistent to this point with “sometimes by force”) to describe men who resemble Tudor or Stuart courtiers more nearly than they do Zeus.

In his quotations from Grotius, Stanley’s royalists sympathies are suggested by his emphases and omissions. He chooses for exposition the Danaides’ idea that Pelasgus is an absolute monarch, “You are the state; you are the people” (Su. 370, St. 375), by quoting the Dutch humanist’s juridical statement at length. Grotius is taking up an historical question about the presence of absolute monarchs in antiquity, but portions of the statement do Pelasgus an injustice in this play. According to the quotation, both Biblical and Roman precedents make anointed kings responsible only to God: “Hence the anointed king is said to be above the people, above the inheritance of the Lord, above Israel.” Grotius continues to assert the “truly kingly” authority in the Roman Empire: “Hence the dictum of M. Antoninus, the philosopher: ‘No one but God alone can be a judge of a princeps.’” Stanley further cites Grotius on the point that Aeschylus’ Argos, unlike Athens, was an absolute monarchy. Grotius had not accounted for, and Stanley does not choose to gloss, the passages Milton chose from the same play to refute Salmasius in the *Defensio Prima*: Pelasgus’ refusal to make an agreement on his sole authority (Su. 368-69) and his obligation to consult an assembly of citizens before he makes any decision concerning the suppliants (398-399).

---

25 The comment follows discussion of an emendation by Robortello.

Thus Stanley selects his evidence from the comments of the Danaides favorable to a strong monarchy and remains silent on the speeches revealing Pelasgus’ clear limitation of his own authority.

Stanley, Grotius, and Milton are closer to agreement when Stanley considers Pelasgus’ comment (Su. 390, St. 395) that the Danaides are subject to the law of their own country:

[Magnus vero Grotius . . . ‘quod si id cujus accusantur supplices non sit vetitum jure naturae aut gentium, res dijudicanda erit ex jure civili populi unde veniunt, quod optime ostendit Aeschylus Supplicibus’.] (II, 134)

The great Grotius . . . interpreted the passage thus: ‘But if the crime of which the defendants are accused is not forbidden by the law of nature or by international law, the case must be judged according to the civil law from which [the defendants] come, as Aeschylus shows very well in the Supplices’.

The concepts of the jus naturae and the jus gentium are familiar enough by the time Stanley is writing; he has already suggested that marriages between cousins would not violate basic moral absolutes. In a deceptively similar way Milton places the concepts into Samson’s rebuke to Dalila:

... if aught against my life,
Thy country sought of thee, it sought unjustly,
Against the law of nature, law of nations.
(Samson Agonistes 888-90)

Samson’s argument is more subtle, however, because his “civil” and “natural” law are Judaic; hence the Philistine government is not a moral or legal sovereignty to be obeyed. The Suppliants could raise a similar question in the argument of the Danaides (lines 395 ff.), but Stanley does not annotate their appeals to dike or to the gods in terms of the jus naturae.

Stanley, throughout his commentary, has considered both the predictability of the physical cosmos and the universality of the moral absolutes within “natural law.” But he places the miraculous on a different level of consideration. For example, he makes a Biblical

27 For Milton’s discussion of this play, I am referring to his Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio, ed. Clinton W. Keyes, in The Works of John Milton (New York 1932), VII, 307-11. The lines cited from this play are those he quotes and translates from Greek to Latin in his argument.

parallel to the dialogue of Prometheus and Hermes (*Prom.* 1001, St. 1000), but draws his distinction carefully:

Hinc apud Evangelistas, ut Matth. VIII. 27. "Ανεμοι καὶ ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακόουσιν αὐτῷ, non sine specie proverbiī, de re quae praeter ordinem naturae. (I, 256)

So in the Evangelist (Matt. 8:27) "Winds and sea obey him," not without the appearance of a proverb on a topic beyond the law of nature.

Stanley, then, has considered the "law of nations" and the "law of nature" as permanent concepts applicable to Aeschylus and his characters as well as to the seventeenth century. However, he retains his original reverence for Pythagorean and Christian "mystery" by suggesting that divine revelation cannot be limited by these laws.

Accepting as fact the survival and reprinting of Stanley's criticism into the early nineteenth century, how are we to assess its value? Not only did he provide the first popular edition of Aeschylus; he supplied a necessary transition in interpreting "pagan" tragedy. His Pythagorean allegoresis is tempered with the awareness of historical distance: he also wants to know what Greek and Roman geography, customs, and beliefs actually were. He begins the close analysis of Aeschylus' unique style, and challenges the poetic theory available to him when his author's text so requires. In many respects Fraenkel's commendation of a famous later scholar may be applied to Thomas Stanley's seventeenth-century endeavor: "For him there was no such thing as a watertight compartment of textual criticism, another of metre, another of history of religion, another of ancient law, and so forth: . . . they had all to be subservient and to co-operate to one purpose only, the adequate interpretation of the text in hand."^29

^29 Fraenkel is discussing Wilamowitz, whose stature in the history of classical scholarship certainly surpasses Stanley's. I cite only the comment evaluating the German scholar's literary criticism (I, 60-61), which summarizes an attitude and purpose applicable to Stanley in the seventeenth-century context discussed in this paper.
Myrrha’s Revenge: Ovid and Shakespeare’s Reluctant Adonis*

KAREN NEWMAN

In all the controversy over Shakespeare’s Venus and Adonis, commentators agree on one issue: “Shakespeare’s Adonis, contrary to the whole tradition, scorns love.” This fundamental change in the myth

* An earlier shorter version of this essay was presented at a Brown University conference on Ovid and the Ovidian influence, March 1979. I wish to thank Charles Segal, William Carroll, and S. Clark Hulse for reading this paper and making many welcome suggestions and comments.


The one exception is A. Robin Bowers, “‘Hard Armours’ and ‘Delicate Amours’ in Shakespeare’s Venus and Adonis,” Shakespeare Survey 12 (1979), who argues Adonis does acquiesce by kissing Venus and is, therefore, destroyed by the boar, a symbol of lust. Bowers’ allegorical reading fails to explain why, if Venus herself represents lust, she so vehemently opposes Adonis’ hunting of the boar; he also ignores Venus’ jealousy and confessed frustration in lines 597-98; 607-10; J. D. Jahn presents a more convincing argument that Adonis, though reluctant, nevertheless tempts Venus in “The Lamb of Lust: The Role of Adonis in Shakespeare’s Venus and Adonis,” Shakespeare Survey 6 (1972).

The willing Adonis of earlier myth can be found in Orphic Hymns, No. 56; Theocritus, Idyls, 1, 3, 15; Bion, “Epitaphium Adonidis”; Hyginus, Fabulae, 164, 271; and Fulgentius, Mythologia, III.

For a summary of earlier criticism and major issues raised by Venus and Adonis, particularly the debate as to its “seriousness,” see J. W. Lever, “The Poems,” Shakespeare Survey 16 (1962), pp. 19-22, and more recently, Keach, cited above.
has never been satisfactorily explained, for though Adonis complies with Venus' desires in the earliest versions, in the Ovidian account which is generally regarded as Shakespeare's primary source, we are told almost nothing of Adonis' response to her advances except that he does not reject them outright.²

Critics have advanced various biographical, historical and literary arguments to explain Shakespeare's unwilling Adonis. At the time Shakespeare wrote and published Venus and Adonis, the Earl of Southampton, to whom the poem was dedicated, was fighting an arranged marriage with Elizabeth Vere. Shakespeare must have known of the young earl's unwillingness to marry.³ Those interested in psycho-biographical causes explain Shakespeare's preoccupation with the motif of older women and young, inexperienced men by citing his own marriage at eighteen to Anne Hathaway who was eight years his senior.⁴

Panofsky proposes that Shakespeare's lover was influenced by the visual arts, specifically Titian's "Venus and Adonis" in which Adonis actively evades Venus' embrace. William Keach refutes his argument by pointing out first that Titian's virile young hunter is strikingly at odds with Shakespeare's effeminate Adonis, and then that "nothing in the painting proves that Titian thought of Adonis as having resisted Venus throughout the encounter."⁵ Adonis, after all, traditionally

² In Book X of the Metamorphoses, we learn only that Venus, grazed by an arrow of Cupid's, has fallen in love with Adonis and forgotten her usual haunts and occupations. Transformed by love, she goes about dressed like Diana and hunts animals, warning Adonis against the lion and wild boar. When he asks why, Venus stops to rest and tell him a story. Before beginning her warning tale of Atalanta, Venus places her head and neck in the lap of the reclining youth and interrupts her own words with a kiss ("inque sinu iuvenis posita cervice reclinis / sic ait ac mediis interserit oscula verbis" Metamorphoses X. 558-59). All quotations are cited from W. S. Anderson's Teubner edition, P. Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoses (Leipzig 1977). In Renaissance pictorial representations Adonis is always depicted with his head in Venus' lap, a change from Ovid which reflects the aggressive Venus of earlier as well as later versions of the myth.


⁵ Problems in Titian, Mostly Iconographic (New York 1969); Panofsky notes that "the painting ordered by Philip II remained in England for several years and was widely accessible in sixteenth-century prints by Giulio Santo (dated 1559) and Martino Rota (died 1583) . . ." p. 155; Keach, p. 56; see also David Rosand, "Titian and the 'Bed of Polyclitus';" Burlington Magazine 117 (1975), pp. 242-45; and John Doebler's recent article in Shakespeare Quarterly 33 (1982), pp. 480-90, "The Reluctant Adonis: Titian and Shakespeare."
ignores Venus’ warnings and evades her protectiveness. Neither biographical nor historical arguments provide a completely satisfactory explanation for Shakespeare’s unwilling Adonis.

Recent literary studies of *Venus and Adonis* have more often explored the psychology of Shakespeare’s reluctant lover than the sources for his reluctance. Wayne Rebhorn claims that Adonis is part of a long line of Renaissance epic heroes who fear being “reabsorbed symbolically into the womb of this seemingly benevolent but really quite deadly mother.” Adonis’ rejection of Venus’ advances, then, is positive and places him in the good, if surprising, company of Spenser’s Guyon and Tasso’s Rinaldo. For Coppélia Kahn, Shakespeare dramatizes the narcissism characteristic of adolescent boys who fear the devouring mother and project that fear outside themselves. She looks elsewhere in Ovid to explain Shakespeare’s resolute young man, to the myths of Hermaphroditus and Narcissus. T. W. Baldwin long ago pointed out that the common denominator of the Ovidian myths of Adonis, Hermaphroditus and Narcissus is “the irresistibly beautiful youth wooed by the over-ardent female.” Though Ovid’s presentation of these diffident young men certainly influenced Shakespeare’s portrayal of his reluctant lover, we should not jettison too hastily Ovid’s tale of Venus and Adonis. Preoccupation with Adonis’ predicament obscures rather than clarifies the mystery of the unwilling Adonis, for as classicists have long recognized, the main psychological interest in all three Ovidian tales is the frustrated female lover.

The active reluctance of Shakespeare’s Adonis can best be understood not by looking at other unwilling boys in Ovidian myth, but by looking at the structure of the *Metamorphoses*, at its later com-

8 Bullough notes the relationship between the Hermaphroditus and Narcissus myths and Shakespeare’s portrayal of Adonis, I, pp. 162-63; see also Allen, “On *Venus and Adonis;*” who suggests another possible source in the story of Hippolytus, the chaste hunter. He points out that “ancient poets and mythographers sometimes said that a jealous Mars or an avenger Apollo sent the boar that killed Adonis, but Passerat, a French contemporary of Shakespeare’s, invented a new, and perhaps more congenial legend. Diana sent the boar to revenge the killing of Hippolytus. . . .” In addition, there is a supporting hint in the interpolated tale of Atalanta and Hippomenes found in Ovid’s version of the myth. “Hippomenes (ὑπομένας; passion or strength of a horse) has a connection with Hippolytus and with Adonis’s stallion that [a poet] with ‘small Greek’ would notice,” p. 107; Donald G. Watson, “The Contrarieties of *Venus and Adonis;*” *Studies in Philology* 75 (1978), pp. 32-63, explains Adonis’ reluctance as a witty reversal of Petrarchan roles.
9 Baldwin, p. 84.
10 See, for example, Brooks Otis, *Ovid as an Epic Poet* (Cambridge 1970).
mentaries, and at Shakespeare’s Venus from whose point of view, after all, most of the poem’s action is recounted. This shift in perspective from Adonis’ unwillingness to Venus’ desire demands a re-evaluation of the poem in psychological as well as literary terms. What follows is first a reading of Ovid which suggests how Shakespeare’s contemporaries understood the tale of Venus and Adonis; next I consider the implications of a Renaissance reading for Shakespeare’s poem; and finally I re-evaluate traditional psychological interpretations of the myth in terms of a feminist analysis which offers a new perspective on Venus’ central position in the poem.

I. The myth of Venus and Adonis ends Book X of the Metamorphoses, but the central story recounts the incestuous passion of Myrrha for her father, Cinyras. Adonis is the son of their unnatural union which Venus has caused by enflaming Myrrha with desire for her father. Implicit in Shakespeare’s poem is the submerged irony that Venus’ love for Adonis is incestuous, like Myrrha’s for her father in Ovid. Myrrha’s revenge on Venus for inspiring her unnatural passion is worked out through Adonis’ rejection of the goddess of love.

Frustrated love motivates much of Ovid’s narrative, and in Books IX and X, unnatural love, particularly that generated by the female libido, causes situations which can only be resolved through death and metamorphosis. As Brooks Otis points out in his study of Ovid as an Epic Poet, the series of tales beginning with the story of Byblis and climaxing in the story of Myrrha recounts the vagaries of perverse love and sexual desire.11 The story of Caunus and Byblis, which begins with a warning “that girls should never love what is forbidden” (“ut ament concessa puellae” Met. IX. 454), initiates the themes of incest and frustrated love which link the two books. Byblis loves her brother, but her love, as Ovid emphasizes throughout the tale, is unnatural, not fitting between brother and sister. Inspired by an erotic dream of sexual pleasure with her sibling, Byblis writes him confessing her love. Caunus rejects her proposal and flees. She is driven mad and eventually her tears of grief are metamorphosed into a fountain bearing her name. The Byblis story, in which unnatural love remains unconsummated, occupies the central position in Book IX; it is paralleled by the tale of Myrrha in Book X whose incestuous love is actually satisfied.

Book X begins with the story of Orpheus and Eurydice, but its avowed subject, as Orpheus tells us, is boys beloved of gods and girls frantic with forbidden fires so as to merit punishment (“dilectos

11 Ibid., pp. 225 ff.
superis, inconcessisque puellas / ignibus attonitas meruisse libidine poenam,” *Met.* X. 154-55). The climactic episode and the center of the book is the story of Myrrha’s unlawful passion to which Ovid devotes 222 out of 735 lines. After her father discovers he has been tricked into incest with his daughter, Myrrha flees to escape his wrath. Praying to an unnamed goddess, she is changed into the myrrh tree from which the incestuously conceived Adonis is born. The tale ends with a brief parody of the epic genealogy: Adonis is born from his sister and his grandfather: “ille sorore / natus avoque suo” (*Met.* X. 520-21).

Ovid’s emphasis on the strange circumstances of Adonis’ birth should also remind us that Myrrha’s own father was the result of an unnatural union, for he is the grandson of Pygmalion and the statue which Venus had brought to life. Following the account of Adonis’ birth, Ovid describes his unnatural beauty by comparing him to the Amores (*Met.* X. 516), Cupid-like cherubs who appear frequently in Roman art with wings and quivers.\(^2\) The link between Adonis and Cupid is made explicit, however, in the medieval and Renaissance commentaries and translations: in the *Ovide moralisé*, for example, Adonis “le dieu d’amour ressemblant”; Golding translates Amores simply as “Cupids.”\(^3\)

Ovid begins Adonis’ own tale with yet another description of his beauty which pleases Venus, but more significantly, avenges the desires of his mother (“matrisque ulciscitur ignes” *Met.* X. 524). Ovid says outright that Venus’ love for Adonis avenges his mother’s unnatural passion, a passion which most versions of the myth attribute to Venus’ inspiration.\(^4\) The poet goes on in the next line to describe Venus as a mother herself: while giving his mother (“matri”) a kiss, Cupid wounds her accidentally with one of his arrows; the result of this wound is her love for Adonis. In two lines, the word *mater* refers first to Myrrha, then to Venus, and thereby implicitly joins their guilty passions. For if we remember that Adonis has been explicitly identified with the Cupid-like Amores, and in the medieval and Renaissance traditions with Cupid himself, we can recognize the irony


\(^{14}\) See W. Atallah, *Adonis dans la littérature et l’art grecs* (Paris 1966) and Marcel Detienne, *Gardens of Adonis: Spices in Greek Mythology*, tr. Janet Lloyd (New York 1977), both of whom review the ancient sources of the myth. Medieval and Renaissance commentaries also recognize Venus’ part in Myrrha’s love for her father (see below).
implicit in Ovid: Venus’ love for Adonis, like Myrrha’s for her father, is incestuous.\textsuperscript{15} Though Shakespeare does not refer specifically to the Myrrha myth, Baldwin points out that “In Shakespeare’s day, that knowledge could be assumed.”\textsuperscript{16} Both the \textit{Ovide moralisé} and its humanist successor, the Regius commentary (1492), make Adonis’ origins explicit:

\begin{quote}
Venus, la mere au dieu d’amours,
Le fil Mirre ama par amours.
(3703-04)
\end{quote}

Venus, the mother of the god of love, was in love with Myrrha’s son.

Adonis ex incesto patris ac filie coitu natus.\textsuperscript{17}

Regius goes even further in his gloss at the beginning of the tale by setting up a careful equivalence between Venus and Myrrha: Venus delighted in Adonis no less than Myrrha in her father (“Adonem cognominatus quem non minus Venus dilexit quam illa patrem Cinyram dilexerat beneficio Cupidinis”).

In his seminar on Poe’s “Purloined Letter,” J. Lacan demonstrates the importance of what is absent to psychoanalytic interpretation.\textsuperscript{18} Literary critics and theoreticians have transferred Lacan’s insights to literary analysis by showing how the not-said or silences of a text are analogous to the overdetermined details of dream or the analytic session. Such details make manifest what is absent or latent — a past trauma or event not overtly present in the patient’s discourse.\textsuperscript{19} Silences can signify, sometimes more eloquently than what is spoken aloud. In the case of Shakespeare’s \textit{Venus and Adonis}, what is absent shaped the Renaissance reader’s understanding of the poem in significant ways, for the poet undoubtedly recognized this submerged theme of incest and exploits its ironic potential.

When Venus presents her argument on behalf of procreation, her

\textsuperscript{15} Keach admits “there is a submerged suggestion of incest, a suggestion which glances at the story of Adonis’s mother Myrrha,” but he ignores the significance of his own glancing remark (p. 77); see also Rebhorn, who notes the incestuous implications of Venus’ role as mother (p. 3).

\textsuperscript{16} Baldwin, p. 4.

\textsuperscript{17} Raphael Regius, \textit{P. Ovidii Metamorphosis} (1526), sig. M6'. Baldwin quotes a similar \textit{argumentum} derived from Regius’s commentary, p. 87.


\textsuperscript{19} See for example the work of Pierre Macherey, \textit{Pour une théorie de la production littéraire} (Paris 1978); Terry Eagleton, \textit{Criticism and Ideology} (Atlantic Highlands, N. J. 1976); and Shoshana Felman’s introduction to the volume of \textit{Yale French Studies} entitled \textit{Literature and Psychoanalysis} 55-56 (1977).
allusions to Adonis' own begetting would inevitably have recalled to Shakespeare's audience, so familiar with Ovid, the unnatural circumstances of Adonis' conception and birth. "Sappy plants" she reminds him, are made "to bear" (165), certainly an odd end to the series which begins "Torches are made to light" (163), but a reminder to a knowing audience of Ovid's etiological tale which explains Adonis' birth in terms of the bole which exudes the myrrh tree's sap. Venus ends the stanza with the exhortation "Thou wast begot; to get it is thy duty" (168). She also chides Adonis for his reluctance by reminding him of his own mother's willingness, and obliquely links her frustration with Myrrha's:

"Art thou a woman's son, and canst not feel
What 'tis to love? how want of love tormenteth?
O, had thy mother borne so hard a mind,
She had not brought forth thee, but died unkind."

(201-04)

Shakespeare also wittily recalls Adonis' unnatural descent from Pygmalion and his statue when he has Venus characterize Adonis as

cold and senseless stone,
Well-painted idol, image dull and dead.
Statue contenting but the eye alone,
Thing like a man, but of no woman bred!

(211-14)

Venus is not only an aggressive masculine wooer; she is also from the poem's outset a loving mother. The notorious image of the goddess plucking Adonis from his horse and tucking him under her arm suggests not so much Venus as the "bold-faced suitor" of the first stanza, but Venus as a mother, lifting and carrying her small child. Shakespeare describes Adonis here as "the tender boy," thereby establishing our sense of him as a child. Later he is "like the froward infant stillled with dandling" (562). Venus' solicitous care for Adonis

20 Spenser's portrayal of Venus' relation to Adonis as maternal in Book III of the Faerie Queene (1590) must inevitably have influenced Shakespeare's characterization of Venus and Adonis. In the Garden of Adonis Spenser describes the goddess as "great Mother Venus" who "takes her fill" of a "wanton boy," an epithet which conflates Adonis and Cupid. For a discussion of Spenser and Shakespeare's different uses of Ovid, see Ellen Aprill Harwood, "Venus and Adonis: Shakespeare's Critique of Spenser," Rutgers University Library Journal 39 (n.d.), pp. 44-60; Rebhorn assembles the evidence for Shakespeare's maternal Venus, pp. 1-3; for an earlier classical account in which Venus' relation to Adonis is portrayed as maternal, see Charles Segal, "Adonis and Aphrodite, Theocritus, Idyll III, 48," L' Antiquité classique 38 (1969), pp. 82-88.
and her fear of his hunting wild animals, certainly inspired in part by Ovid's portrayal of Venus, suggest the motherly concern which critics often remark, but without noting its incestuous implications. Don Cameron Allen, for example, points out:

Adonis is a child with her. When she swoons, he fusses over her as a boy might over his mother. He will readily kiss her goodnight when it is time for bed. The goddess takes advantage of the filial-maternal relationship which is really all Adonis wants.\(^{21}\)

Venus, however, wants much more. Later in the poem she is described as a "milch doe" seeking to feed her fawn and, of course, a park which beckons Adonis to "Feed where thou wilt" (229-240). But the maternal-filial imagery is nowhere more obvious than in the poem's penultimate stanzas:

"Poor flow'r," quoth she, "This was thy father's guise —
Sweet issue of a more sweet-smelling sire —
For every little grief to wet his eyes;
To grow unto himself was his desire,
   And so 'tis thine; but know, it is as good
To wither in my breast as in his blood.

"Here was thy father's bed, here in my breast;
Thou art the next of blood, and 'tis thy right.
Lo in this hollow cradle take thy rest;
My throbbing heart shall rock thee day and night:
   There shall not be one minute in an hour
Wherein I will not kiss my sweet love's flow'r."

(1177-1188)

Venus crops the Adonis flower and her invocation of "thy father" reminds us of its direct, familial tie to Adonis. Having lost the father, she will have the son. Shakespeare alludes to Adonis' descent from Myrrha when he has Venus call Adonis "a more sweet-smelling sire." She places the flower in her breast which she calls "thy father's bed"; in "this hollow cradle" she will rock it "day and night."\(^{22}\)


\(^{22}\) Kahn (p. 357) claims that the comparison of the boy Adonis to a flower is unconventional and therefore emphasizes his youth and peculiar role with relation to Venus. On the contrary, the comparison of young men, particularly young men who die prematurely, to flowers dates from Homer and would have been well-known to Shakespeare from many sources including the story of Nisus and Euryalus in the \textit{Aeneid}. 
We can now see the significance of this imagery and its relationship to Shakespeare's Ovidian source: Adonis' rejection of Venus' advances is Shakespeare's self-conscious elaboration of Myrrha's revenge for her own disappointed love. He portrays Venus loving a mere boy in an incestuous relationship which wittily reverses the myth of Myrrha and Cinyras in which daughter loves father. For Shakespeare and the reader, mother Venus loves her unwilling "son" Adonis and his death is analogous to Myrrha's loss of her beloved father. The audience for which Shakespeare wrote his poem, the Earl of Southampton and his sophisticated coterie of friends, were sure to be amused by the deliberate working out of Myrrha's revenge which medieval and Renaissance glosses of Ovid make explicit:

Adonis a vengeance prise  
De la grant honte et du mesfait  
Que Venus à sa mere a fait  
Quant el li fist amer son pere  
Or revenche Adonis sa mere.

Adonis took vengeance for the great shame and wrong Venus did to his mother when she made Myrrha love her own father. Now Adonis avenges his mother.

William Barksted's Mirrha (1607), a poem generally agreed to be prompted by Shakespeare's Venus and Adonis, provides further testimony of this revenge motif:

Wel, wel (quoth she) thou hast reveng'd the spight  
Which from my accurst sons bow did fowly light  
On thy faire Mother, O immortall boy  
Though thou be faire, tis I that should be coy.  

Ovid's incestuous story of Myrrha informs the poem, acting as a witty and ironic subtext to the text itself.

II. By focussing on the incest theme and frustrated female desire, the Myrrha story, Ovid's tale and its later commentaries serve, in addition to psycho-biographical and historical arguments, to explain Shakespeare's reluctant Adonis. They also point to a central problem in the poem which has always disturbed commentators. The Shakespearean narrator's distance from Venus' desire, manifest in his often noted comic exaggeration of her size and ridicule of her overbearing lust, conflicts with a shift in our sympathies in the last section of the poem. After Adonis' departure to hunt the boar, the narrator, and

---

consequently the reader, becomes increasingly sympathetic toward Venus' feelings. This shift makes the poem more emotionally powerful than is often admitted. Modern archetypal and psychological interpretations identify Venus and the boar with opposing aspects of the Great Mother and Adonis with the figure of her son-lover who in adolescence begins to differentiate himself from the unconscious and affirm his masculine otherness. 24 As E. Neumann describes it in The Origins and History of Consciousness:

he is her lover as well as her son. But he is not yet strong enough to cope with her, he succumbs to her in death and is devoured. The mother-beloved turns into the terrible Death Goddess. . . . The masculine principle is not yet a paternal tendency balancing the maternal-female principle; it is still youthful and vernal, the merest beginning of an independent movement away from the place of origin and the infantile relation. 25

The boar is a complicated symbol in myth, its phallic character, according to Neumann, a trace from that period when masculine and feminine are united in the uroborus or Great Mother. It is associated in Ovid with the wood and the cave, the womb-like realms of the turrita Mater, and by implication, with Venus who causes the lovers Atalanta and Hippomenes in their interpolated tale within Ovid's Venus and Adonis story to copulate in Cybele's cave. Such an interpretation of the myth certainly fits Ovid's larger narrative structure, for this tale, which ends Book X, is followed by the death of Orpheus at the hands of the Maenads, the maddened, destroying matrons of Thrace.

Traditional psychological interpretations such as Neumann's adopt a peculiarly masculine perspective toward Venus' desire; they project male fears of female sexuality onto Venus by attributing the boar and its destructiveness to her. An alternative and less limited view is to see the boar as a symbol of male virility, both in physical appearance and in myth. A. T. Hatto in fact argues that Venus is jealous of the boar with whom she competes for Adonis' affections. 26 He documents


25 Ibid., p. 47; in his discussion of the Adonis myth, Atallah points out that Adonis' effeminacy and the phallic character of the boar probably date from the Alexandrian period, not from any so-called "primitive" past, pp. 48-49, 63-74.

26 Hunting the boar is traditionally associated with the hero's initiation. For a review of the medieval and Renaissance pedigree of the boar as a symbol of male virility, see A. T. Hatto, "Venus and Adonis — and the Boar," Modern Language Notes 41 (1946), pp. 353-61. Hatto also points to Shakespeare's own use of the boar as a sexual-phallic symbol in Cymbeline II, v.
the medieval and Renaissance identification of the boar with male sexuality and points out that in Shakespeare's poem mention of the boar inevitably leads Venus to discourse on jealousy. Her explicit sexual description of the slaying of Adonis supports his argument: the boar "thought to kiss him, and hath killed him so" (1110) and "by a kiss thought to persuade him there; / And nuzzling in his flank, the loving swine / Sheathed unaware the tusk in his soft groin" (1114-16). Adonis, who seeks to avoid sexual love with Venus, encounters it with the boar. The late classical and continental sources of this conceit reinforce such a reading, for in pseudo-Theocritus and the Italian versions, the boar himself describes his act as a kiss and thereby makes the rivalry between Venus and the boar explicit.

If Venus is cast as mother in this poem, and Adonis as son, the boar suggests not so much the Great Mother, as conventional psychological interpretations claim, but her rival, a kind of sexual father whose violence reinstates the sexual difference which Adonis' beauty and Venus' incestuous love endanger. Venus can avenge her wrong only by prophesying an endless chain of reciprocal male violence in love which will punish men:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{It shall be cause of war and dire events} \\
\text{And set dissension 'twixt the son and sire . . .} \\
(1159-60)
\end{align*}
\]

Shakespeare's poem, Ovid's tale and indeed the myth itself re-enact that primitive act of violence which René Girard describes in his Violence et le Sacré, but with a difference. Girard liberates desire from its specifically Freudian familial model by arguing that all desire is mimetic. The Oedipal desire of son for mother is generated not from some inherent sexual urge toward a particular object at an early

---

27 Hatto notes the boar's role as a usurper both in Venus and Adonis, and Richard III, III, ii, and V, ii. With amusing understatement, he calls the Venus-Adonis-boar relation an "unusual triangular situation," p. 361.

28 It has long been remarked that the sexual roles of Venus and Adonis are reversed to enable Shakespeare to describe a homosexual rather than heterosexual relation — obliquely enough, however, for the poem to have won the approval of the Archbishop of Canterbury who licensed it in 1593. For late classical and Italian examples of the boar justifying his "kiss," see Hatto, and Hulse, p. 104, who cites the pseudo-Theocritean "Death of Adonis," accepted as Theocritus, No. 30, in the Renaissance. Hulse notes that the poem was translated anonymously into English as Sive Idilia (1588; repr. London 1922); cited by Gregorio Giraldi, De Deis Gentium, and imitated by Ronsard and Minturno, "De Adoni ab Apro Interempto," in Epigrammata et Elegia, pp. 7a-8b, bound with Poemata (Venice 1564).

stage of development, but simply by the desire to imitate those with power. Men contend for a sexual object, or indeed any object, in endlessly reciprocal "mimetic desire" which leads to what Girard terms a crisis of difference. By desiring the same object, father and son lose their individual identities and become doubles whose rivalry leads to reciprocal violence. Girard contends that such violence can only be arrested by collective aggression against a surrogate victim, an outsider, whether slave, child, foreigner, or pharmakos, whose death restores difference and, therefore, order. The implied threat of incest in Venus' love for Adonis, present for author and audience, is deflected through his death and metamorphosis, thereby maintaining the incest taboo with its widely recognized, almost universal civilizing function.

But neither Ovid's tale nor Shakespeare's poem wholly conforms to Girard's model, for the conventional syntax of the Oedipal complex is inverted: mother, not father, is desiring subject, and Adonis, that epicene representative of sexual desire itself, the object of her desire. For Venus, the boar represents the father and phallic power which destroys her love object; by doing so he re-establishes the familial bonds upon which patriarchal culture depends. Both the boar and the narrator of the poem, like Orpheus in Metamorphoses X, are the bearers of patriarchal order.

By ending Book X not only with the death of Adonis, who rejects women, but also with the death of Orpheus at women's hands, Ovid subverts that patriarchal order. At the end of Book IX, we find the tale of Iphis and Ianthe in which both women are desiring subjects whose desire works within and across gender lines. In that tale, Iphis' mother, ordered to expose her female child, violates patriarchal command and instead obeys the Great Mother's behest to raise Iphis as a boy. She is eventually transformed into a man and thereby enabled to marry Ianthe. Throughout Books IX and X, Ovid counterpoints the overvaluation of love that crosses gender lines in the incest tales with the tales of Pygmalion and Orpheus who undervalue love by refusing women or loving boys; the tale of Iphis and Ianthe is subversive because it upholds and obliterates sexual difference.

Shakespeare's poem, unlike the Metamorphoses, contains and controls these subversive suggestions, for in Venus and Adonis, Venus is left with only the delicate purple flower which was Adonis, a flower which Shakespeare reminds us will "wither," a mere ornament instead of the flesh and blood object of her unnatural desire. In Venus and Adonis the witty conceit of Myrrha's revenge focusses our attention on Venus' frustrated love, a focus in keeping with Shakespeare's Ovidian source. This shift in perspective generates for the reader a
The Association of always seduction: effeminacy, posing makes lies, logic multiple father. together terms. the dietary, versions of individual; myth tradition. suggestion reading general seeks to, even punishment of, Venus’ desire.

III. In closing we should consider the nature of myth itself and what differentiates it from other narratives. Myth, unlike other stories, seeks to contain or overcome oppositions and improbabilities.\(^5^0\) A general theory of myth is perhaps as hard to formulate as a definitive reading of *Venus and Adonis*, but S. Clark Hulse makes a useful suggestion in his essay on Shakespeare’s poem and the mythographic tradition. Despite their differences, he remarks, all the various theories of myth are preoccupied with mediation. For Frazer and the ritualists, myth mediates between the sacred and profane; for Freud and Jung, between the unconscious and the conscious, the collective and the individual; for Lévi-Strauss and the structuralists, between the opposing terms and contradictions of a given social system.\(^5^1\) In classical versions of the ancient tale as well as in Shakespeare’s poem, Adonis mediates between opposites. In his fascinating book on the system of dietary, vegetable and astronomical codes attached to the ritual of the Adonia in ancient Greece, Marcel Detienne recognizes in Adonis’ erotic powers of attraction capable of bringing together opposing terms.\(^5^2\) As a mortal who attracts the goddess of love, he brings together heaven and earth; as the progeny of the union of Myrrha and Cinyras, he links those who should be poles apart, daughter and father. Adonis is not a husband, nor even a man, but a lover whose effeminacy, his mediating status between masculine and feminine, is always emphasized by the Greeks’ description of his appearance and his association with the perfume myrrh. In its ambivalence, in its multiple contrarieties and in Adonis’ role as mediator, Shakespeare’s

\(^{50}\) Lévi-Strauss argues that the function of primary myth is to bridge the gap between conflicting values through a “series of mediating devices each of which generates the next one by a process of opposition and correlation. . . . The kind of logic in mythical thought is as rigorous as that of modern science. . . . [T]he difference lies, not in the quality of the intellectual process, but in the nature of the things to which it is applied” *Structural Anthropology*, trans. Claire Jacobson and Brooke G. Schoepf (New York 1963), pp. 226, 230.


\(^{52}\) Detienne argues that the legend is not a fertility myth at all, but a myth about seduction: “The two episodes (Myrrha and Adonis) involve a double seduction, that of the mother as well as that of the son. . . . As in the story of Myrrha, seduction makes it possible to bring together two terms that are usually held apart,” p. 64.
Venus and Adonis resembles these earlier versions, for Shakespeare’s transformation of Adonis into unwilling lover, Venus into loving mother and boar into jealous father, rings another change on the mediated oppositions characteristic of myth.

Shakespeare’s use of antithesis in this poem has been often remarked: red and white is united in Adonis’ complexion and in the purple (purpureus, red, dark, violet) and white flower which is Adonis metamorphosed. Venus manifests the same antithesis because of the conflicting feelings of fear and desire he generates in her. Adonis’ beauty is androgynous: he is “rose cheeked,” “the field’s chief flower;” “more lovely than a man,” with a “maiden burning in his cheeks.” This sexual ambiguity is suggested even in the Ovidian tale, for in the story of Atalanta Venus emphasizes the young runner’s beauty by saying she was as beautiful as Venus herself, or Adonis “if he were a woman.” Adonis also plays a mediating role in joining the two hunts of the poem, for he is first the quarry of Venus’ sexual chase which begins the narrative; then a hunter in the literal hunt; and in a final reversal of roles, the victim of the boar. Adonis also mediates between the sun and moon, for his beauty shames “the sun by day and her [Cynthia] by night.” The sun, as classicists have pointed out, frequently suggests danger and destruction in the Metamorphoses. It is a masculine symbol of sexual power and energy “frequently represented as the unwelcome obtruder shunned by hunters and virgins.” And Adonis’ own words link Venus with the sun:

Fie, no more of love!
The sun doth burn my face — I must remove.
(185-86)

Both animals and gods act contrary to their natures because of Adonis: wild beasts are tamed by seeing his beauty and Venus is transformed from an ardentely sought object of love to an aggressor who “like a bold faced suitor ’gins to woo him.” But she is more frequently described not as a mortal, but as a beast of prey — a parodic elaboration of Ovid’s description of Venus as huntress. The effect of Adonis’ beauty, which from the first is described as unnatural, upsets the cosmological order; he threatens that order by endangering or abolishing the sexual, natural, familial and cultural distinctions upon which peace, order and fertility depend.

---

34 Both Detienne and Parry (p. 277) point out the powerful and dangerous qualities of the sun and its associations with sexuality.
The riddle of Shakespeare's reluctant Adonis can be solved not through the discovery of some new source, but by a more careful attention to the larger narrative structure of Books IX and X of the *Metamorphoses*. Ovid provides not only a source for the plot of this poem and its psychological configurations, but also a beginning for its most frequently cited stylistic feature, antithesis. And Shakespeare's use of antithesis and paradox in his portrayal of Adonis, though characteristic of the intellectual and rhetorical climate of his age, can also be better understood by considering the nature of myth itself which seeks to represent in language the multiple contrarieties and oppositions of human desire.

*Brown University*
The decorum of the moderns, generally implied rather than expressed — for the word itself is now considered indecorous — has condemned or refused to take seriously much that was sanctioned by ancient and Renaissance writers and painters. If we are to approach these works with the sympathetic understanding they deserve, we have to respond to them with a sense of the decorum which they respect and which no longer obtains in the modern world. My examples — and this paper is no more than a plea for what needs to be done for the sake of some great works of art — will be confined to the *Venus and Adonis* of Shakespeare and its parallels in the visual arts.

Decorum is a more subtle thing than any rules; the general notion of what it is for any era is not enough to create the right appreciation of such works as Shakespeare’s *Venus and Adonis*. For, in the fullest sense of the word, with each work of art a new kind of decorum is born; each recreates, as well as observes, the ideal of decorum.

My reference here to “the rules” echoes my title. I have borrowed the part in quotation marks — “the rules and compasses” of criticism — from Laurence Sterne, who in *Tristram Shandy* satirizes the standards evoked by ignorant critics, who unwittingly deny the essence of decorum by too literal an adherence to the rules when they judge
individual works of art.¹ That is a sure way to defeat poetry, both in literature and in painting, where we need above all to seek, as Thomas Wilson the sixteenth-century rhetorician said, "some thing that partaineth . . . to the knowledge of the trueth" or "to the setting forth of Natures work."²

As a partial context for my immediate examples, I would refer to the decorum of Ovid. In the Renaissance, his Metamorphoses might be viewed as breaking Aristotle's "rules," much as writers of romance epics, such as Ariosto, were breaking them. Giraldi Cinthio, however, in his essay On Romances, notes that a poet is given the same power as a painter, namely, he says, the power "of varying likenesses according to his own judgment as appears to him most to his purpose."³ He cites the example of Ovid, who "laid aside . . . the laws of Vergil and Homer and did not follow the laws of Aristotle given us in his Poetics . . . . This happened because he devoted himself to the writings of matter for which rules and examples did not exist, just as there were no materials on our Romances."⁴ This defense of the poet's power to invent according to his purpose goes right to the heart of decorum. Ovid did not hesitate to begin the Metamorphoses with the beginning of the world, "delivering himself," says Cinthio, "with admirable skill from Aristotle's laws of art" — Aristotle who advocated beginning in medias res in order to create a unified action.⁵ But we should define our art, not by arbitrary rules, but by the practice of great artists, just as Aristotle himself did. That, in essence, is Cinthio's defense of the Italian epic poets.

For modern critics of Ovid, the problem has similarly been to define his relationship to the epic tradition and, in so doing, identify his purpose in the Metamorphoses. According to his own statement of purpose, at the beginning of his poem, he will deal with the history of the world from the beginning to the present, and his theme will be change. Now this theme itself precludes epic unity and at the same time invites a tone not unlike Montaigne's who, in his Essays, was also dealing with change: "I cannot fix my subject," he says. Montaigne of course was not alluding to epic tradition, as Ovid was,

⁵ The phrase occurs of course in Horace's Ars Poetica 148-49, but cf. Aristotle, Poetics, chapter 23.
and hence needed no other unity than the unity of his speaking voice, talking about himself.

For Ovid, various critics have gone to great lengths to show a structural pattern in his poem, and in the earnest pursuit of this goal have done less than justice to the uniqueness of his tone. His seeming objectivity of narration does not preclude his absolute control over his materials. He is there, at our elbow so to speak, commenting not only indirectly, by his mode of description, but also directly, by interjection. When telling the story of Narcissus, for example, he sounds rather like Philostratus, who cannot help addressing figures in the pictures he describes; so Ovid says to Narcissus: “Why try to catch an always fleeting image, / Poor credulous youngster? What you seek is nowhere...” Such interjections belong, and are entirely fitting, to the poet’s apparent naiveté of description, that delight in pictorial detail which made him an inspiration to poets and painters alike.

If the older critics, such as Brooks Otis, have been more concerned with placing Ovid in the context of literary history and defining his genre, Richard Lanham, a leading light among rhetorical critics of the present day, denies Ovid any serious purpose at all. This poet, he contends, is “rhetorical man,” for whom style is all and content nothing. By means of this approach, Lanham effectively performs a surgical operation, removing any suggestion of heart from Ovid’s playfulness.

The real task of the critic of Ovid, however, is to recognize all that his humor implies: sympathy as well as detachment. Could one not see the poet’s genius as directing him to turn the ancient myths into an imitation of nature — in other words, to find and show forth the truth of these fantastic tales? It is this achievement that surely made the Metamorphoses a bible for Renaissance poets and painters — something a hollow style could never do.

Let us turn to Titian for an example of faithfulness to Ovid’s spirit, rather than the imitation which only copies. In illustrated editions of Ovid, the story of Venus and Adonis is represented usually by one of two scenes: the embrace of the lovers, or Venus’ lamentation over the dead Adonis — or a combination of the two [Figures 1, 2, 3]. It is noteworthy that these prints represent only one moment of the story at a time, unlike Titian’s great painting which concentrates

7 Richard Lanham, Motives of Eloquence (New Haven 1976), pp. 48-64.
into one moment the before and after as well [Figure 4]. Dramatically, his picture captures just that tension between the lovers that is implicit in Ovid's account, though not developed. This tension is implicit, for example, in the fact that Venus was driven by love to change her own nature when she went hunting with Adonis and that, though she warned him against hunting the boar, he insisted on doing so. Yet Titian, despite his truth to Ovid, received some criticism in his own time for "depicting Adonis fleeing from Venus, who is shown in the act of embracing him, whereas he very much desired her embraces." A similar demand for a precedent lies behind present day inquiries into the origins of Shakespeare's depiction of a "reluctant Adonis."

Criticisms, even "iconographic," which attaches itself to a supposed deviation from the text is based on a false notion of imitation, rather like the tyranny of the Ciceronian style which Erasmus rightly attacked because, as he said, the true imitation of Cicero consists in absorbing his spirit, not in copying details of his style. For a more grateful response to Titian's painting, we may turn to Lodovico Dolce's famous letter to Alessandro Contarini. He first describes the almost feminine beauty of Adonis, then his expression: "He turns his face towards Venus with lively and smiling eyes, sweetly parting two lips of rose, or indeed live coral; and one has the impression that with wanton and amorous endearments he is comforting Venus into not being afraid." Next, Dolce describes the beauty of Venus, with her back turned — "not for want of art . . . but to display art in double measure" — then proceeds to her expression: "Similarly her look corresponds to the way one must believe that Venus would have looked if she ever existed; there appear in it evident signs of the fear she was feeling in her heart, in view of the unhappy end to which the young man came." Far from deviating from Ovid's story, in Dolce's view Titian has succeeded in making visible the living truth of that story. If now we look at some other representations, we may agree that Titian is truer in his characterization of Ovid's figures than, for example, Spranger or artists of the School of Fontainebleau [Figures


5, 6]. He makes his picture tell the whole of the story, whereas the lesser painters illustrate only one scene, like the illustrated editions of Ovid, but of course with more elaborateness and, sometimes, grace.

If most people would agree that Titian’s is a great painting, the same cannot be said of modern criticism of Shakespeare’s poem on the subject. Evidently, the sensuous beauties of the picture carry an appeal that the conspicuously rhetorical qualities of the poem do not. Recent parallels drawn between the two have been mainly concerned with the so-called iconographic similarity, with even the suggestion of a possible influence from Titian, or prints after Titian, on Shakespeare. But in fact their treatment is not identical: in Titian’s painting, we see a fondness in the glance Adonis exchanges with Venus, as if he were sorry to leave her; Shakespeare, on the other hand, polarizes the relationship, making it one of opposition and conflict. Each artist has found and expressed one part of the truth in Ovid’s tale.

Yet if I were to draw a composite portrait of contemporary criticism of Shakespeare’s poem, I would have to show a continued lack of appreciation for it, based either on psychoanalytic grounds or on rhetorical grounds.

The two approaches may even be combined, as if to confirm doubly the impossibility that we as readers can sympathize with either of the characters. In the words of one critic, when Venus says that with the death of Adonis, “Beauty is dead,” this is not true for us; it is not beauty that is dead but rather “self-love.” But it appears not only that Adonis is narcissistic, but that he actually deserved to die: “The allegory of Adonis’s death seems clear. He is punished for an empty heart.” But if we read the poem as mimetic narrative, which this critic refuses to do, we must see Adonis through the eyes of Venus and must believe that he is beauty, that with him beauty dies. Though she alludes to Narcissus in her arguments with Adonis, we have to remember that no one had yet invented the concept of narcissism. Venus was not psychoanalyzing Adonis but trying to persuade him to love, which is exactly her role in the world: “O,

11 See, for example, Panofsky, Problems in Titian, pp. 153-54.
12 Lanham, p. 93.
13 Lanham, p. 92.
14 Interestingly, Freud distinguishes between the narcissistic man and the man of action on the grounds that the latter “will never give up the external world on which he can try out his strength.” Adonis is surely intent on proving himself the man of action. See Civilization and its Discontents, trans. Joan Riviere, in The Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud (London 1953), XXI, pp. 83-84.
learn to love; the lesson is but plain, / And once made perfect, never lost again” (407-08). In one of her arguments with Adonis, she herself echoes the words Ovid's Narcissus addressed to himself: “Why do you tease me so? Where do you go / When I am reaching for you? I am surely / Neither so old or ugly as to scare you, / And nymphs have been in love with me” (III. 454-56). Compare this with the words of Shakespeare's Venus:

I have been wooed as I entreat thee now,  
Even by the stern and direful god of war. . . .  
Were I hard-favour'd, foul, or wrinkled-old,  
Ill-nurtured, crooked, churlish, harsh in voice . . .  
Then mightst thou pause, for then I were not for thee,  
But having no defects, why dost abhor me?  

(vv. 97-98 and 133-34, 137-38)

But neither Shakespeare's Venus nor his Adonis suffers from Narcissus' particular form of tragedy. Adonis' love is not for himself but for hunting: “I know not love . . . nor will not know it, / Unless it be a boar, and then I chase it” (vv. 409-10).

Lack of sympathy with Adonis has been evenly matched with lack of sympathy for Venus herself. Her desire gives her the strength and courage to pluck Adonis from his horse and carry him under one arm; when she has him down on the ground, “Her face doth reek and smoke, her blood doth boil,/ And careless lust stirs up a desperate courage” (vv. 555-56). Can this possibly be “the golden Aphrodite?” asks C. S. Lewis in bewilderment, forgetting momentarily that love has its ridiculous, as well as sublime, side.\(^\text{15}\) Beautiful as Titian’s Venus is, she too has something of the ridiculous in her pose. But who else but Venus could continue to look beautiful in such an ungraceful position, as she tries to hold back Adonis? Shakespeare, similarly, has seen what love is when it comes down to earth, and he can smile, as his critics seem unable to do.

This brings me to the rhetorical approach to the poem. Curiously, critics who profess to take this approach generally deny the poem any mimetic intention; instead, they treat the mimesis as a strategy for upsetting narrative expectations. The poet pretends to be telling a straightforward story but at every turn is forcing us to examine the “rhetoric of love” by manipulating three different rhetorics within the poem: the narrator's, Venus', Adonis'. And outside all these, pulling the strings, is Shakespeare the puppeteer.\(^\text{16}\) The rhetoric then is not simply for pleasure, though that is there, but for revealing

\(^{16}\) Lanham, pp. 84-90.
love itself to be a subspecies of rhetoric. Now this argument is so sophisticated that it almost dazzles us into acceptance of both its premises and conclusions. Treating rhetoric as a game, like life itself, it gives due weight to the opposing points of view in the poem; it recognizes that Venus and Adonis have both a mythic character and a dramatic character, and that there may be a comic contrast between the two, as if the larger-than-life personages suddenly came down to earth and were like other people — something that, by the way, is in Ovid as well. Where I part company with this approach is in the conclusion drawn: "It [the poem] teaches seriously, but what it teaches is the suicidal incompleteness of seriousness, of the tragic Adonis-like self."\(^{17}\) How the comedy of Adonis can turn into "the suicidal incompleteness of seriousness" is difficult to understand. His boyish resistance is characterized in such lines as: "Give me my hand . . . why dost thou feel it?" To which Venus replies, "Give me my heart . . . and thou shalt have it" (vv. 373-74). Neither Venus nor Adonis persuades us, as readers, to accept a particular point of view. What we see, rather, is the life and humor of their debate. This is not the same as saying that the poem is characterized by "ambivalence," that favorite critical term of today, with its implication that there are no longer any accepted values to which the poet can point.

Given the fashionableness of "ambivalence" and the fact that it carries connotations of a new kind of value and truth, it is little wonder that decorum has become a dead issue. Lanham may again stand for the modern rhetorician when he says that when "we call a style inappropriate, we mean that we don't like the reality it creates."\(^{18}\) But Renaissance writers do not talk this way about decorum; rather they speak of the seemliness of suiting style to subject matter, picture to setting, everything to the occasion, just as dress and behavior should be appropriate — what George Puttenham, picking up on the beautiful in the word, calls "This louely conformitie, or proportion, or conueniencie betweene the sence and the sensible."\(^{19}\) He goes on to say that nature herself has observed this conformity in her own works. But surely this nature is the very objective reality the moderns reject; and the idea of decorum, and the link which Puttenham and others made between decorum and morality, has to fall by the wayside, along with other "positivistic" notions. If used at all today, the word will have a very limited sense of expectations fulfilled or disappointed;

\(^{17}\) Lanham, p. 94.  
\(^{18}\) Lanham, p. 28.  
it will not allude to an ultimate standard of what is fitting. For this reason, decorum is no longer popular either as a critical term or as a standard of behavior. And yet Milton went so far as to call decorum "the grand masterpiece to observe," and in so doing summed up the view of ancient and Renaissance rhetoric.  

When Shakespeare and Titian chose to represent the story of Venus and Adonis, they had in mind the pleasures of a copia on the Ovidian tale. They did not have a narrow concept of entertainment. There is a heart behind their smiling. For both, the picture they present is its own best commentary. When judged by any other standard — and here only our own deficiencies in a sense of decorum stand revealed — they may appear lacking in greatness. We no longer make an obvious demand that a poet or painter follow the letter of his text, as Raffaello Borghini demanded of Titian, but we can be equally demanding in requiring that an artist prove he is an artist by not imitating nature. He must distort; he must break up the very idea of accepted beauties. If Shakespeare's poem is allowed any merit today, apparently it must be on the basis of his assumed satire of the rhetoric of both Venus and Adonis. As for Titian, he as a painter is allowed some degree of mimesis, but it is not this that interests his commentators; it is either his iconography or his technique. Who today would dream of giving an appreciation of his painting such as Dolce's?

And so I return to Laurence Sterne's salutary remarks, as true now as when he wrote them down. After making fun of the "cant of criticism," he says that he would go fifty miles on foot to kiss the hand of that man whose generous heart will give up the reins of his imagination into his author's hands — be pleased he knows not why, and cares not wherefore.

Great Apollo, if thou art in a giving humour — give me, — I ask no more, but one stroke of native humour, with a single spark of thy own fire along with it, — and send Mercury with the rules and compasses, if he can be spared, with my compliments to — no matter.  

Could we revive the notion of a decorum that does not reside in rules only? It seems all but impossible, given the relationship the word implies to a propriety of life, as well as of art. But this propriety rests upon an exquisite sense of tact, a grace which cannot be taught.

21 Sterne, p. 193.
22 See Cicero, De Officiis, I. 27, where he says that decorum cannot be separated from moral goodness.
I like to think that Shakespeare's line at the end of *Love's Labor's Lost* alludes to the same freedom that Sterne was praising: "The words of Mercury are harsh after the songs of Apollo."

*University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*
Figure 1. Lodovico Dolce, *Le Trasformationi*, Venice, 1561, Canto 21, p. 224. The plate includes, besides the embrace of the lovers, the birth of Adonis and the race of Atalanta and Hippomenes.
Figure 3. Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, Venice, 1517, X, sig. CXv. The plate shows the birth of Adonis from the myrtle tree, the embrace of the lovers, and the killing of Adonis by the boar, with Venus overhead, mourning her beloved. It also includes, as a prologue on the left, the pursuit of Myrrha by her father Cinyras.
Figure 4. Titian, *Venus and Adonis*, Prado, Madrid, 1554.
Figure 5. Bartholomaeus Spranger, *Venus and Adonis*, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, c. 1595.
Senecan Tragedy and the Renaissance*

GORDON BRADEN

My title invokes an old scholarly topic, one whose venerability and general aura of dustiness do not prevent the periodic conviction that there is more, even much more to be looked into here. The recent Arden editions of Shakespeare's *Richard III* and, surprisingly, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* have found appreciably more room for Seneca in their commentary than those plays have known before, and the whole area of Elizabethan Senecanism has recently been certified a Research Opportunity in Renaissance Drama.\(^1\) The broader European field has received a dauntingly broad compilation whose separate chapters on Seneca's influence on Dutch, Scandinavian, and Slavic theater figure in a general sense that available scholarship on the question has been woefully tentative and unthorough.\(^3\) Yet alongside such continuing efforts we have also had developing, especially in the study of English and Spanish drama, a fairly sophisticated

---

* A version of this paper was presented at a conference on “Classical Traditions in Shakespeare and the Renaissance” at the University of Minnesota, April 1982. Many of the general arguments are developed more fully in my forthcoming book, *Anger's Privilege: Renaissance Tragedy and the Senecan Tradition.*


3 *Der Einfluss Senecas auf das europäische Drama,* ed. Eckard Lefèvre (Darmstadt 1978).
conviction that the whole question of Senecan influence is just possibly a ghost topic generated by the predispositions of the researchers, and if not that, at the very most a tertiary matter, of very little importance as far as our real interest in Renaissance drama and its development is concerned. That case for English has best been put by G. K. Hunter, whose article on “Seneca and the Elizabethans” has become a classic statement: “If Seneca’s tragedies had not survived, some details [in the history of Elizabethan drama] would have had to be changed — but the over-all picture would not have been altered.”  

Between these two traditions there has not been much in the way of contact and dialogue, so that the matter cannot really be said to have been decided; but one may have the impression that the better minds among working scholars tend to find Hunter’s stand by far the more sensible.

As things are now, so do I; and though I would probably in the long run dissent from Hunter’s conclusion as just quoted, I am not sure I would, at least insofar as it concerns claims that Elizabethan dramatists had in any significant numbers actually read Seneca’s tragedies themselves, whether in Latin or in translation, and that their dramatic craft was specifically altered by that experience. Those plays for which one can credibly make such a claim — Gorboduc, Gismond of Salerne, The Misfortunes of Arthur — are, dramaturgically, dead ends, while the “Senecan” moments in the plays that do count are brief sententiae or local rhetorical flourishes whose presence is far more convincingly explained by reference to a rather different kind of “classical influence.” Most practicing Renaissance writers, we are now aware, had much of their contact with classical literature through commonplace books and rhetorical manuals in which a very wide and confused mixture of Greek and Latin writers was digested into isolated sentiments and tricks of phrase. By way of this tradition, a Renaissance writer could easily produce “Senecan” passages in his text without ever having read Seneca, let alone intending some meaningful allusion to the original context — could produce “Senecan” passages in the same unconcerned way in which he could, without any sense of incongruity, produce Horatian or Ovidian or Valerio-Flaccan passages.

in the same paragraph. I am quite willing to concede that most of the apparent "Senecanism" in Elizabethan drama — and a good deal of the "Senecanism" even in the more self-consciously neoclassical continental theater — comes by this relatively anonymous route.

Nevertheless, I still want to argue that we do not entirely need to put quotation marks around Senecanism when talking about it: that we are still dealing with a specific and recognizable factor in the drama of the time that it makes sense to link with Seneca's name, and also that that factor is one to be seriously reckoned with in our general understanding of Renaissance tragedy. T. S. Eliot, of course, made a similar claim over fifty years ago in "Shakespeare and the Stoicism of Seneca," a famous essay but one whose suggestions have never been seriously followed up. That is unfortunate, I think, because Eliot is asking the right kinds of questions about this topic, questions in the face of which arguments such as Hunter's are not wrong, exactly, but certainly conceived with misleading narrowness. That is the tradition of discussion we have needed and not had; what I want to sketch here is a possible updating of Eliot's case. Like him, I am concerned not just with Stoicism, but also with the relations between Stoicism and a certain kind of dramatic speech. Consider, for instance, Lady Macbeth:

Come thick Night,
And pall thee in the dunnest smoake of Hell,
That my keene Knife see not the Wound it makes,
Nor Heaven peepe through the Blanket of the darke,
To cry, hold, hold.

Macbeth 1. 5. 50-54

This is not an isolated conceit; her husband had in the previous scene called in a similar way for the lights of heaven to avert their eyes:

Starres hide your fires,
Let not Light see my black and deepe desires . . .
1. 4. 50-51

And later, when he anticipates the murder of Banquo:

Come, seeing Night,
Skarfe up the tender Eye of pittifull Day . . .


I quote Shakespeare, with minor adjustments, from The First Folio of Shakespeare: The Norton Facsimile, ed. Charlton Hinman (New York 1968); line numbers are from The Riverside Shakespeare, ed. G. Blakemore Evans et al. (Boston 1974).
And it is part of the mood of the whole play that these appeals are in a rather literal way answered. "There's Husbandry in Heaven," Banquo had observed ominously before the murder of Duncan, "Their Candles are all out" (2. 1. 4-5); and after the murder we hear from Rosse:

Thou seest the Heavens, as troubled with mans Act,
Threatens his bloody Stage: by th' Clock 'tis Day,
And yet darke Night strangles the travailing Lampe:
Is't Nights predominance, or the Dayes shame,
That Darknesse does the face of Earth intombe,
When living Light should kisse it?

"'Tis unnaturall," the Old Man replies, "Even like the deed that's done" (2. 4. 5-11). This is all said, of course, with unmistakably Shakespearean flair; but what is being said is at base nothing more than standard Elizabethan theatrics. If we feel pressed to look for sources, we need go no further than the general bag of rhetorical tricks making the rounds among Shakespeare's colleagues; under Lady Macbeth's speech, for instance, Muir cites Anthony Munday:

Muffle the eye of day,
Ye gloomie clouds (and darker than my deedes,
That darker be than pitchie sable night)
Muster together on these high topt trees,
That not a sparke of light thorough their sprayes,
May hinder what I meane to execute.

1 Robin Hood 14/2387-92

But it is not hard to find other examples, or to see such speeches as elaborations of a hyperbole that had been second nature to English dramatic speech since the 1580s:

Weepe heavens, and vanish into liquid teares,
Fal starres that governe his nativity,
And sommon al the shining lamps of heaven
To cast their bootlesse fires to the earth,
And shed their feble influence in the aire.
Muffle your beauties with eternall clowdes . . .

Marlowe, 2 Tamburlaine 5. 3. 1-6

---


8 Quotations of Marlowe are from The Complete Works, ed. Fredson Bowers (Cambridge 1973).
That hyperbole informs what may well be the earliest line of Shakespeare’s that we have — “Hung be the heavens with black, yield day to night” (1 Henry VI 1. 1. 1) — and typifies its milieu enough to supply the concluding cliché for Beerbohm’s ‘‘‘Savonarola’ Brown’’: “In deference to this our double sorrow / Sun shall not shine today nor shine to-morrow. — Sun drops quickly back behind eastern horizon, leaving a great darkness on which the Curtain slowly falls.” As far as immediate genetics are concerned for a play like Macbeth, we have no particular reason to invoke Seneca; and indeed, none of the passages just quoted are usually so annotated.

Still, there it is:

non ibo in hostes? manibus excutiam faces
caeloque lucem — spectat hoc nostri sator
Sol generis, et spectatur, et curru insidens
per solita puri spatia decurrat poli?
non reedit in ortus et remetitur diem?

Seneca, Medea 27-31

Shall I not go against my enemies? I shall shake torches from their hands and the light from heaven. Does the Sun, father of my race, see this, and is he still seen, and sitting in his chariot does he travel his accustomed route through the pure heavens? Does he not return to his rising and take back the day?

So Seneca’s Medea, using one of the most common topics of Seneca’s own dramatic rhetoric. It can be paralleled in a dozen places in the Senecan corpus; and in what I would argue is Seneca’s best single work, Thyestes, the memorable final action includes a striking literalization of such an appeal:

Quo terrarum superumque parens,
cuius ad ortus noctis opace
decus omne fugit, quo uertis iter
medioque diem perdis Olympo?

Thyestes 789-92

Where, father of lands and gods, at whose rising all the splendor of dark night flees, where do you turn your course and destroy the day at noon?

The crime of Atreus has driven all the lights from heaven, and brought on what might as well be the end of the world:

10 The Latin for Seneca’s plays is taken from L. Annaei Senecae Tragoediae, ed. Giancarlo Giardina (Bologna 1966), with some typographical adjustments; translations are my own.
solitae mundi periere uices:
nihil occasus, nihil ortus erit.
... non succedunt
astra, nec ullo micat igne polus,
non Luna graues digerit umbras.
... in nos aetas
ultima uenit? o nos dura
sorte creatos, seu perdidimus
solem miseri, siue expulimus!

813-14, 824-26, 877-81

The accustomed cycles of the universe have ended. There will be no
more setting and rising. ... No stars return and the sky sparkles with
no fire, the moon does not dispel the deep shadows. ... Has the last
age come upon us? Oh, we were born to a harsh fate, whether,
wretched, we have lost the sun, or whether we have driven him out!

If, for one thing, we conceive of dramatic Senecanism in terms of
this kind of hyperbolic rhetoric, the catalogue of Elizabethan Senecan
moments immediately becomes much larger than most studies have
argued it to be; such moments are everywhere. I pick only one topic
out of several for which similar examples can be produced; we may
speak here not just of muffling the heavens, but more generally of a
cataclysmic rhetorical disruption of external reality in response to
the feelings and actions of the speaker:

Fall heaven, and hide my shame, gape earth, rise sea,
Swallow, overwhelme me . . .

Chettle, Hoffmann 5. 1/2066-67

Chettle might well be translating and elaborating Seneca’s recurring
“dehisce tellus” (Phaedra 1238, Troades 519, Oedipus 868); but such
speech is almost wholly naturalized on the Elizabethan stage, to the
point where it usually is not noticed as something that needs to be
accounted for. Yet just that pervasiveness, I think, argues for the
significant presence of Seneca in the background of Elizabethan
dramatic rhetoric: probably not, I admit, by purposeful readings in
Seneca by the important dramatists of the day, and certainly not
without an admixture, in the general anonymity of the rhetorical
tradition, of other, non-Senecan elements of a similar type (the Bible,
for instance, is a particularly rich source for the rhetoric of disrup-

11 Henry Chettle, The Tragedy of Hoffman, ed. Harold Jenkins, Malone Society
Reprints (Oxford 1951). Chettle may have made some contribution to Munday’s
Robin Hood plays, though he is no longer usually cited as a full collaborator.
The question of specific sources grades here into a larger question. Whatever the particular route of their continuity, Senecan tragedy and Elizabethan tragedy are bound together by the fact that such speech as I have been quoting is natural to them; and the study of Senecan tragedy impinges on our study of Elizabethan tragedy most significantly when it helps us to answer the question: What kind of drama is it in which people can get away with talking like this? They have not been able to get away with it too successfully since the Renaissance; we are concerned here with the kind of high Elizabethan fustian that dramatists from Dryden on imitate only with great caution, and usually with considerable irony and amusement (witness Beerbohm). To say that dramatic conventions have simply changed evades the question of what those conventions themselves mean; and I think in this case they do mean something that a fresh understanding of Senecan tragedy can help us pin down.

For there is another bracket to be put up here. In Seneca himself, this rhetoric offers a significant point of contrast with Greek tragedy: a theater no less bold with words than Seneca’s is, but in not quite the same way. Human crime there is very frequently dramatized as an almost physical affront to the outside world:

```
καὶ ταῦτα δρᾶσαι ἥλιον τε προσβλέπεις
καὶ γαϊνὼν τίλασι δυσσηβεστατον...
Euripides, Medea 1327-28
```

Even after doing these things you look on the sun and the earth, after daring a most unholy act!

Yet the onus in such talk on the Greek stage is with some consistency not on that exterior reality but on the human being who offends it; and what one cannot easily find in at least the Greek dramatic rhetoric we have is the wish or fantasy that the extra-human order should collapse in the presence of human outrage. Characters call to the earth and especially the sun for witness and possible vengeance —

```
ὦ γαϊὰ μὴ τερ ἥλιον τ’ ἀναπτυχαί,
ovn λόγων ἐρρητοι εἰσηκον’ ὑπα.
```

12 See, for instance, Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus*:

```
Mountaine and Hils, come, come, and fall on me,
And hide me from the heavy wrath of God.
No, no?
Then will I headlong run into the earth:
Gape earth; O no, it will not harbour me.
```

*Dehisce tellus* is here put on the same plane as what is clearly a borrowing from Revelation 6:16 (cf. Hosea 10:8, Luke 23:30).
Euripides, *Hippolytos* 601-02

Oh mother earth and expanse of sun, what unspeakable words I have heard.

— but not to hallucinate their disappearance:

        omnis impulsus ruat
        aether et atri nubibus condat diem,
        ac uersa retro sidera obliquos agant
        retorta cursus. tuque, sidereum caput,
        radiate Titan, tu nefas stirpis tuae
        speculare? lucem merge et in tenebras fuge.

    Seneca, *Phaedra* 674-79

Let all the sky fall by force and bury the day in dark clouds, and let the stars turned around run a twisted course backwards. And you, great star, radiant Titan, do you see the crime of your offspring? Drown your light and flee into the shadows.

No Greek *Thyestes* play has survived, but we have reason to think that even there heaven’s light was never seriously threatened. The sun of course was a powerfully literal presence in the Greek theater, while Senecan tragedy was very likely closet-drama, performed if at all in the shadows of indoors. But a more important difference also figures: Senecan dramatic rhetoric testifies, as Greek dramatic rhetoric does not, to a belief in the power of human evil to overawe or eclipse anything outside itself. Great crimes in Seneca characteristically prompt the gods not to vengeance, but rather to flee — to leave the criminal alone in his world. Guilt is the ultimate human weapon against the heavens.

Seneca’s greatest characters know that and act more confidently precisely in that knowledge. Their evil, their consciousness of that evil and their willingness to proclaim it, are part of their strength, a

---

13 The solar portent attested in the older Greek sources for the story is generally not that associated with the banquet, but the one by which Atreus had previously saved his throne from Thyestes’ usurpation; the sun in this version does not flee in horror, but simply reverses its course as a sign from Zeus that Atreus is indeed the lawful king. See Euripides, *Electra* 698 ff., *Iphigenia in Tauris* 811 ff., *Orestes* 995 ff.: Plato, *Statesman* 268E-69A; Apollodorus, *Epitome* 2. 10-12. Two possible fragments from the *Thyestes* plays of Sophocles (Nauck2 672) and Euripides (Nauck2 861) appear to refer to this version also. Statiliius Flaccus (*Palatine Anthology* 9. 98) and (less certainly) a Euripidean scholiast (on *Orestes* 812) have Sophocles using a version like Seneca’s, but in the absence of earlier evidence we may suspect them of assimilating the older work to what had by then become the usual, largely Roman telling. See *The Fragments of Sophocles*, ed. A. C. Pearson (Cambridge 1917), 1: 92-93 and 3: 5-6.

strength that Greek tragic characters neither have nor want. Even the greatest villains of the Greek stage are deeply even if erringly convinced of the correctness and justifiability of their course; Senecan tragedy, in contrast, centers most memorably on characters who embrace their villainy:

age, anime, fac quod nulla posteritas probet,
   sed nulla taceat.

Thyestes 192-93

Come, soul, do what no future age may approve, but none may ignore.

So Atreus; Seneca’s Medea says something similar (Medea 423-24). By the end of their respective plays each has made good on that boast. They are able to do so in great part because this very freedom from moral compunction allows them to go further than any reasonable person would expect; and we should perhaps best understand their evil as a form of radical freedom from any external restraint on individual will and action.

I think Senecan tragedy generally, despite its manifest deformities and shortcomings, makes important sense when we take this implication of its rhetoric seriously. If Greek tragedy is the tragedy of the failure of human will and pride in a moral universe that deals harshly with them, Senecan tragedy is the tragedy of the success of the human drive for moral and personal self-sufficiency, the drive for an autonomous selfhood that is subject to no order beyond itself. At their most genuinely harrowing, Seneca’s tragedies reveal that very success as a kind of horror. We can guess at some of the reasons for Seneca’s concern with that horror. The distance from Greek drama to his is the distance from the intensely local and highly pluralistic world of the Greek city-states to the far-flung, abstract rule of the Roman empire; among other things, this new political arrangement allowed one man to achieve something far closer to absolute power than classical civilization had previously been able to offer. The great drama of Seneca’s time was that that very possibility was also the possibility of limitless derangement; Seneca himself barely survived the reign of Caligula and eventually succumbed to the savagery of his pupil Nero. The principal resource in the face of such unchallengeable madness was aristocratic Stoicism, the philosophy of militant indifference to an external world over which one no longer has any control: a philosophy of some genuine moral heroism, but also a mirror-image of the imperial power against which it is set. “Imperare sibi maximum imperium est” (Seneca, Epistulae 113. 31) — empire over oneself is the greatest empire, but imperium remains the value
common to both emperor and Stoic. Both insist on absolute control; the one destroying whatever resists his conquest, the other surrendering all interest in whatever falls outside his power, they effectively divide the world between them. I think Senecan tragedy, dominated by versions of those two postures, is an exploration of their common ground: the self which will not deal with external reality except on terms of utter dominance.

I offer that formulation as a way of "placing" Senecan tragedy within the classical tradition, a way of defining what it does that Greek tragedy in comparison does not; and I hope that such a formulation can bestow on Senecan tragedy a sufficient sense of dignity and significance, of being about something worth our attention, that we can in turn think of the Senecan traces in Renaissance tragedy as being signs of an important Renaissance interest in a version of the same thing. To what extent, if any, Renaissance reading of the Senecan dramas themselves caused this interest is of far less moment than the common terrain itself, within which Renaissance dramatists would have a natural interest in the rhetorical style of Senecan tragedy, and would, however unknowingly, naturally seek out and reconstitute that style even from the homogenized scramble of the wider rhetorical tradition. The career of Renaissance individualism on the Renaissance stage is of course far more varied and in most of its range far more moderate than anything in the Senecan corpus; yet the character of that individualism is still such that at moments of extreme pressure, and indeed precisely in some of the landmark plays of the tradition, it seems both proper and essential for a character to say things like this:

Will all great Neptunes Ocean wash this blood  
Clean from my Hand? no: this my Hand will rather  
The multitudinous Seas incarnardine,  
Making the Greene one Red.  

Macbeth 2. 2. 57-60

These famous lines of Macbeth's have long been the showcase example of Shakespeare's Senecanism: the conceit looks very much as if it could have been assembled from two passages in Phaedra (551-52, 715-18) and one in Hercules Furens (1323-29). But these were among

the most popular Senecan passages for use in dramatic declamation, and may be considered by Shakespeare's time to be already part of an international repertoire of rant:

Ah, quando mai la Tana, o 'l Reno, o 'l Istro,
o l'inospite mare, o 'l mar vermiglio,
o l'onde caspe, o l'oceano profondo,
potrian lavar occulta e 'ndegna colpa
che mi tinse e macchiò le membra e l'alma?
Tasso, Il Re Torrismondo 1.3/234-38

Ah, when could the Don, the Rhine, or the Danube, or the Unwelcoming Sea, or the Red Sea, or the Caspian waves, or the deep Ocean wash away that hidden and unworthy fault that stained and polluted my limbs and soul?

Muir once again cites Munday: "The multitudes of seas died red with blood" (2 Robin Hood 7/1391). We will justify a concern with Seneca here less by trying to pin down specific filiations than by thinking about what is being presented: the soul's tranced sensation that all external reality is crumpling before its power, that it is filling the whole world with its influence — a sensation whose megalomaniac thrill is inseparable from the panicky sense of suffocation that waits when that process is complete.

The story that plays itself out in Macbeth is, in Rossiter's words, that of "the passionate will-to-self-assertion, to unlimited selfhood, and especially the impulse to force the world (and everything in it) to my pattern, in my time, and with my own hand." The witches tell Macbeth he will become king; his crime is that he cannot simply let it happen, but must make it happen by his own hand. The dynamic throughout is Macbeth's search for the decisive act, the one that will settle everything here and now:

If it were done, when 'tis done, then 'twer well
It were done quickly: If th'Assassination
Could trammell up the Consequence, and catch
With his surcease, Sucesse: that but this blow
Might be the be all, and the end all. Heere,
But heere, upon this Banke and Shoale of time,
Wee'ld jumpe the life to come.

What he finds of course at each step of the way is that something always slips through his grasp; yet his response is always simply to tighten his grasp, to berate himself for not having acted more quickly, more drastically, more decisively:

Time, thou anticipat'st my dread exploits:
The flighty purpose never is o're-tooke
Unlesse the deed go with it. From this moment,
The very firstlings of my heart shall be
The firstlings of my hand.

4. 1. 144-48

Animating each such step is a radical fear of incompleteness. "Fleans is scap'd," his hired murderer tells him, prompting:

Then comes my Fit againe:
I had else beene perfect;
Whole as the Marble, founded as the Rocke,
As broad, and generall, as the casing Ayre:
But now I am cabin'd, crib'd, confin'd, bound in
To sawcy doubts, and feares.

3. 4. 20-24

"Then comes my Fit againe": the uncontrollable, recurrent rage that rises at any encounter with what is outside his power, outside himself — "I had else beene perfect."

The dynamic of much of this can be witnessed in Seneca as well. Here in particular my own ear picks up a rhyme with Seneca's Medea: "perfectum est scelus" (Medea 986). The perfect crime is not the crime that is secret, but the crime that is done, its totality testifying to a union of will and action: "peracta uis est omnis" (843), all my power is now complete; "bene est, peractum est" (1019), it is good, it is completed. Macbeth's attempts to rouse himself to such a pitch of decisiveness resonate with the strenuous efforts with which Seneca's killers upbraid their own lethargy: "rumpe iam segnes moras," Medea tells herself (54), now break off slothful delay; or Atreus:

Ignau, iners, eneruis et (quod maximum
probrum tyranno rebus in summis reor)
inulte, post tot scelera, post fratris dolos
fasque omne ruptum questibus uanis agis
iratus Atreus? . . .
... quid stipes? tandem incipe
animosque sume: Tantalum et Pelopem aspe;
ad haec manus exampla poscuntur meae.

*Thyestes* 176-80, 241-43

Cowardly, idle, nerveless, and (what I think the greatest reproach to a tyrant in great affairs) unavenged, after so many crimes, after a brother’s deceit and all law broken, do you still make do with vain complaints, an angry Atreus? ... Why do you stand in a daze? Begin, and summon up your spirits. Look on Tantalus and Pelops; to their examples my hands are called.

And in this arousal both are haunted by fears of their own laxity, the possibility that they might not be doing enough:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{uulnera et caedem et uagum} \\
\text{funus per artus — leuia memoriai nimis:} \\
\text{haec uirgo feci; grauior exurgat dolor:} \\
\text{maiora iam me scelera post partus decent.}
\end{align*}
\]

*Medea* 47-50

Wounds and slaughter and death working its way through the body — I have been remembering trivial things. These I did as a virgin. Let a grief now rise up in weightier guise; greater crimes are fitting after giving birth.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{uidit infandas domus} \\
\text{Odrysia mensas — fateor, immane est scelus,} \\
\text{sed occupatum: maius hoc aliquid dolor} \\
\text{inueniat.}
\end{align*}
\]

*Thyestes* 272-75

The Thracian house has seen an unspeakable banquet — I admit that crime is great, but already done; let grief find something greater than this.

The destructive cycle thus spirals outward of its own logic to claim by the end something close to everything. The discovery that looms there is that to master life this way is to empty it.

We would probably want to say that Shakespeare is much more profound and clearer in showing that than Seneca is. Certainly that truth never comes home to Medea and Atreus as it does to Macbeth. The Senecan tragedies tend to end with still widening circles of conflagration reminiscent of the ἐκπύρωσις of Stoic philosophy, but which we catch on are still essentially within the hero’s unchallenged fantasies of vindictive fulfillment. Senecan drama never quite steps outside those fantasies. Shakespeare’s play, on the other hand, never loses touch with the reality that ultimately resists and circumscribes
any one man’s will: there is a world that will outlast Macbeth’s rage, however total. We need such a world to make the emptiness of that rage fully visible. The contrast here is one that holds for almost all Renaissance drama, even that written in conscious imitation of Seneca: the Renaissance stage and the Renaissance imagination are more intractably populous than Seneca’s, and always show the Senecan career playing itself out within some slightly larger, slightly tougher reality. Yet something like that career nevertheless remains, often quite memorably, the center of concern; and I would describe the results at best as, in effect, a meditation on the Senecan subject matter and its meaning, a meditation that precisely because it takes place in a fuller human context ends up telling us more about that subject matter than Seneca himself does. Macbeth is not, in any usual sense, an imitation of a Senecan play; but many of the reasons for saying that are also the reasons for saying that Macbeth is a high point, a moment of special fulfillment within the Senecan tradition. It is, I think, not hopelessly outrageous to say that Senecan tragedy unknowingly looks forward to the Renaissance for its articulation and completion. Thinking about Macbeth helps us understand Seneca.

Let me end with a more specific illustration of what I mean by that. Senecan tragedy, of course, takes almost all its stories from Greek tragedy, but within the choice of stories and the emphasis given to them we can detect somewhat elusive but still significant differences. In the family romances of Greek tragedy, the events that stand out most powerfully in the cultural memory tend to be the killing of parents: Oedipus, Electra, Orestes are among the most resonant names. All are characters at one point or another in Senecan tragedy; but in surveying the much smaller range of the Latin corpus, we may be struck by the particular prominence of stories about the killing of children. Seneca’s three most famous and, in the long run, influential plays are in fact specifically about the killing or worse of children by their own parents: Hercules Furens, Medea, and most powerfully Thyestes. Things might look a little bit different if a Greek Thyestes had survived; but as it is, there is in the Western literary imagination no more characteristically Senecan topic than the Thyestean banquet, the father’s devouring of his own offspring. What, if anything, might this mean?

It has long been noticed how the fear of children and the denial or perversion of parentage show up in the action and language of

---

Macbeth with special emphasis.\textsuperscript{20} Macbeth “ha’s no Children” (4. 3. 216), and fears “none of woman borne” (4. 1. 80). His wife has given suck, but would pluck the nipple from her child’s boneless gums and dash its brains out (1. 7. 54 ff.). It is the escape of Banquo’s son Fleance that brings on Macbeth’s “Fit again”; it is the later gratuitous killing of Macduff’s son that results from Macbeth’s vow to make the firstlings of his heart the firstlings of his hand, and that impresses us as Macbeth’s most viciously unnecessary single outrage; the only killing we see him perform in the final battle is of young Siward. “Pitty, like a naked New-borne-Babe” (1. 7. 21), prompts the vengeance that Macbeth fears even before murdering Duncan; the vision of a “Bloody Childe” (4. 1. 76) later gives him equivocal comfort, but only seems to intensify his fear of possessing a “fruitlesse Crowne” and a “barren Scepter” (3. 1. 60-61), with no dynasty of his own to inherit them. In the context of the play as a whole, these scattered details seem to add up: Macbeth, as Swan puts it, “has refused the terms that time and mortality impose on him, and his refusal destroys him.”\textsuperscript{21} Children are a pledge of commitment to and faith in a future that comes from us but also ultimately escapes our control and indeed displaces us. The ongoing business of life becomes possible only through such commitments. Macbeth would extend his control even to time itself, would bring even the future under his absolute reign: “Wee’ld jumpe the life to come.” But to try that is to kill one’s children, to ensure one’s sterility; and it eventually comes home to Macbeth that all he has accomplished has been to empty the future of any meaningful human content:

To morrow, and to morrow, and to morrow,  
Creepes in this petty pace from day to day,  
To the last Syllable of Recorded time:  
And all our yesterdayes have lighted Fooles  
The way to dusty death.  
5. 5. 19-23

I would not want to commit myself on exactly where those babies


\textsuperscript{21} Jim Swan, “Happy Birthday, Bill Shakespeare!” unpublished essay. Gohlke draws a similar lesson: “To reject the conditions of weakness and dependence is to make oneself weak and dependent” (p. 158).
came to Shakespeare's play from; as far as classical precedent is concerned, his imagination may have been led less by Seneca than by the later conflation, very popular in Renaissance mythography, of Chronos, time, and Cronos, the Titan who ate his children. And for credible immediate sources, of course, we do not have to go to the classics at all; a strong Kindermord motif runs through Shakespeare's history plays, with the English chronicles behind them. But once in Shakespeare's play, the topic constitutes an effective interpretation of Senecan pedophagy, the discovery of a layer of significance not made clear in Seneca himself, but highly relevant in retrospect. The killing of parents in Greek tragedy is a catastrophic but also a natural and necessary process, an address to the past that is also a looking forward. The killing of children in Senecan tragedy is a purposeful killing of the future, an attempt literally to ingest the time to come — the ultimate act of the self's imperium to ensure that nothing will happen without its consent. But this of course eventually means ensuring that nothing more will ever happen; and in refusing to surrender to what will outlast it, the self also and inescapably guarantees its own more total and awful extinction. We may find such an extinction at the end of most of the emotional trajectories in Seneca's writing; the apocalyptic fury of the Senecan madman, after all, mirrors cosmically the ultimate heroic act of Seneca's philosophy: suicide. We view their bleak common terrain in Macbeth's pursuit of his own radical integrity — an annihilation both of himself and of all around him, a suicide of the soul.
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22 I owe this suggestion to my fellow conferee John Velz.
Ovid’s Metamorphoses tell of spectacular changes worked upon human bodies in moments of extremity. The changes may represent punishments visited upon mortals by angry deities; they may serve as drastic rescues, aimed at delivering mortals from some impending danger; they may amount to deliverances from the sorrow and the pain of life. The metamorphosed shapes become part of nature: flowers, trees, birds, animals, insects, rocks, and — when occasion warrants — heavenly bodies. A powerful dynamism runs through all the tales in Ovid’s poem. People are driven by whatever force has them in its power (or would seek to have them in its power) until they have reached the limits of their own endurance, or until the arrogance or the irreverence that they exhibit exceeds the limits of the god’s tolerance; whereupon an end is decisively decreed to the old form of being which is now no longer tolerable to him or her who possesses it, or no longer acceptable to the powers that be. A new form — animate or inanimate — is decreed. In Ovid, the story usually stops here. The altered shape is absorbed into nature, or mixes forever with the elements, “rolled round in earth’s diurnal course,” as Wordsworth would say, and there we leave it.

The metamorphoses that Shakespeare’s principal characters undergo mark the crucial stages along the way to their dramatic fates. Here the transformations are spiritual and psychological, not physical as in Ovid. Shakespearean characters continue, for a time at least, to function in their altered states in the company of other men and
women. The point of contact between Ovid and Shakespeare that I want to explore in this paper is both poets' fascination with the fact of human nature's susceptibility to alteration: with the fact that an individual can be transformed into a nature so different from his or her original one as to be virtually unrecognizable. The powers of transformation in Ovid are basically external; in Shakespeare they are essentially internal. Ovid is primarily concerned with accounts of material transformations of a person's physical appearance; the emphasis in Shakespeare is on the no less spectacular transformations that can take place in a person's character: in his emotional attitudes, his motives, his vision of his world and his mode of perceiving those close to him in it. Shakespeare's familiarity with Ovid's Metamorphoses is well established, and his use of the poem is evident from the beginning to the end of his career: from the redaction of "the tragic tale of Philomel" in the story of the ravished and mutilated Lavinia in Titus Andronicus, where Ovid's book is brought on stage (in IV. i), to the adaptation of Medea's incantation (Met. VII) for Prospero's valediction to the spirits in the last act of The Tempest. But I am less concerned in this paper with specific Shakespearean allusions to the Metamorphoses than I am with Shakespeare's adaptation of the dynamics of Ovidian physical transformations to the dynamics of the emotional transformations that impel his characters to their comic, or their tragic, or their romantic ends.

Transformations in the comedies are of a merry sort, and occur in an atmosphere of festive gaiety. They always have reference to love: either to the changes love makes in the feelings of the lover, or to the disguises he or she (like Ovid's gods) must assume in order to gain the beloved. In Love's Labour's Lost, Berowne in his tree looks down on, first, the King, then Longaville, and then Dumaine as each, thinking himself to be alone, reads his declaration of love. He confronts the three of them with fine indignation for their violation of the oath they all have sworn to forego the company of women while they devote themselves to their studies. What a falling off he has witnessed. He runs through a catalogue of embarrassing metamorphoses:

To see a king transformed to a gnat!
To see great Hercules whipping a gig,
And profound Salomon to tune a gig,
And Nestor play at push-pin with the boys,
And critic Timon laugh at idle toys
When Berowne himself is exposed as one more lover, he confesses his guilt, and they all enthusiastically forget about their oath.

The design of _The Two Gentlemen of Verona_ is controlled by the changes that overtake the two young men of the title. Valentine at the outset views love with scorn and prefers to travel to advance his education. Proteus prefers to stay at home for the sake of his beloved Julia, who, he reports in soliloquy, has “metamorphos’d” him (I. i. 66): made him neglect his studies, lose his time, “War with good counsel, set the world at nought.” But in the event, it is Valentine, once he has met Silvia, who proves the faithful lover, while Proteus (true to his name) reveals himself a master of change by forgetting Julia once he has seen Silvia. Love’s symmetry is thus balanced in the latter half of the play while Silvia is wooed by two lovers and Julia is deserted. The balance is only restored when Julia resorts to what she terms “a disguise of love” (V. iv. 107): the page-boy masquerade by means of which she wins back her strayed lover.

The symmetry of lovers undergoes even more radical disturbance in _A Midsummer Night’s Dream_. Both young men, Lysander and Demetrius, love Hermia (and she loves Lysander), but neither loves Helena (though she loves Demetrius). In the middle scenes of the play, when Puck has botched Oberon’s effort to balance the symmetry of lovers, Lysander and Demetrius both woo Helena, and Hermia is deserted. Finally, Lysander’s affection is restored to Hermia, while Demetrius’ eyes (doctored by the juice of Oberon’s flower) remain true to Helena.

In all these early comedies, some sort of doctoring, some degree of alteration in a character’s vision or temperament, is necessary if love is to gain the day. The most flamboyant example is perhaps Petruchio’s reformation of Katherina in _The Taming of the Shrew_. A subtler version of this comic metamorphosis comes in the later _Much Ado About Nothing_, with the transformation of Beatrice and Benedick from noisy wranglers to lovers. Shakespeare’s most farcical treatment of the alterations love requires in order to encompass its design comes in _The Merry Wives of Windsor_. When, in the last act, Falstaff arrives at Herne’s oak for his assignation with Mrs. Ford, wearing the stipulated horns of a deer, he see himself in a great mythological tradition:

Now the hot-blooded gods assist me! Remember Jove, thou wast a

---

1 All quotations from Shakespeare’s plays in the present paper are from the Riverside Shakespeare (Textual Editor, G. Blakemore Evans, Boston 1974).
bull for thy Europa, love set on thy horns. O powerful love, that in some respects makes a beast a man; in some other, a man a beast. You were also, Jupiter, a swan for the love of Leda. O omnipotent love, how near the god drew to the complexion of a goose! (V. v. 1. ff.)

In *The Merchant of Venice*, Jessica takes on boy’s disguise in order to escape from the house of her father, Shylock, and go off with her lover, Lorenzo. Cupid, she says, would blush to see her thus transformed (II. vi. 38-39). Portia and her maid Nerissa disguise themselves as young men (a lawyer and his clerk, respectively) in order to save the friend of Portia’s husband from Shylock’s legal processes (and incidentally to test the truth of their men). Rosalind uses her male disguise in *As You Like It* as a covert means of getting to know Orlando, and of winning his love. Viola’s male disguise in *Twelfth Night* places her in the delicate role of intermediary between the man she loves and the woman he loves. The imbroglio that threatens when Olivia scorns the Duke’s love in favor of the disguised Viola-Caesario is an extended and refined version of the equally impossible passion that causes the haughty shepherdess Phebe to scorn her true love, Silvius, in favor of Rosalind disguised as Ganymede, in *As You Like It*. In the case of Viola, disguise lands her in a romantic limbo; she can neither affirm her love for the Duke, nor rid herself of Olivia’s unwelcome infatuation. The only solution is to provide a male version of Viola for Olivia, and one is conveniently at hand in Viola’s twin brother. He serves to round out the quartet of lovers in *Twelfth Night*, just as Orlando’s formerly wicked brother Oliver suddenly appears in the Forest of Arden near the end of *As You Like It*, miraculously reformed, to provide a husband for Celia.

Shakespeare’s work in comedy culminates in *Twelfth Night*. Viewed collectively, the comedies prior to this one provide a full repertoire of the guises under which love appears, the devices to be employed in securing it, the transformations it works on lover and beloved. Lovers in the comedies that follow *Twelfth Night* assume more disturbingly altered shapes than any that we have previously witnessed. The sense of Viola in a romantic limbo in the central scenes of *Twelfth Night* deepens in a play like *All’s Well that Ends Well* where Helena, after she has been abandoned by her husband, becomes — and remains until virtually the end of the play — “but the shadow of a wife . . . The name and not the thing” (V. iii. 307-08). She has a counter-part in the figure of Mariana in *Measure for Measure*, abandoned by Angelo to whom she was betrothed and so a decidedly equivocal figure in the eyes of society (neither maid, widow, nor
wife); thus her life of retirement at her moated grange. Angelo in this play is Shakespeare’s Pentheus (the Pentheus of Euripides’ *Bacchae* or of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, Book III), though in Angelo's case it is the rites, not of Bacchus, which he denies, but of Venus. He is a model of male continence until his austere gaze falls on the chaste Isabella, and then his repressed sexuality comes violently to the surface in one of Shakespeare’s most extraordinary confrontations: extraordinary for the perverse manner in which the effect of Isabella’s virtue on the puritanical Angelo incites him to lust. The metamorphosis of Angelo from puritan to sensualist, from dignified administrator of the law to exposed lecher, is the source of the play’s most impressive dramatic movement.

The transformations that love brings, as these are presented in Shakespeare’s purest comedies, are gently worked and entirely pleasing. Such stresses and strains as they occasion are in themselves exhilarating; and the principal effect of love’s metamorphoses in Shakespearean comedy is immense satisfaction at the emancipation from singleness: at the release of self into union with another. In Shakespeare’s comedies, the metamorphoses that love accomplishes are worked out in terms of the relationship of the lovers themselves and their surrounding society; they are conducted in an ambiance of good humor, good sense, and witty contrivance. In treating of the altered states occasioned by the experience of Shakespearean tragedy, we find ourselves focussing on the moments of extremity which are common to all Ovidian transformations: characters in the tragedies suddenly find themselves in the presence of something — an event, a disclosure — that will transform the terms of their existence; henceforth, things will never be the same, nor will they. We see this tendency to concentrate the essence of the transforming experience into a moment of intense confrontation beginning in those satiric and problematic comedies that Shakespeare seems to have written just after *Twelfth Night*. Angelo’s confrontation with Isabella, with its devastating consequences for his moral integrity, is an example. So is the scene in the last act of *Troilus and Cressida* when Troilus witnesses Cressida at her rendezvous with Diomed, realizes her faithlessness, realizes as well how naive his trust in her has been, and is transformed into the despairing, bloody-minded figure striding across the fields of battle seeking revenge in the play’s last scenes.

The desire for revenge is prominent in Ovid’s tales of metamorphosis; violated mortals pursue it no less than outraged deities. It is a recurrent motive to tragedy in Shakespeare, and not simply in *Hamlet*, though that is the most celebrated example. Hamlet’s encounter with the ghost constitutes one of those moments of extremity
out of which metamorphosed states issue; he is never afterwards the same, and everybody in the play is promptly talking about the change that has come over him. The first description of him we have after the encounter comes from Ophelia, and in it he resembles nothing so much as another ghost: his look

so piteous in purport
As if he had been loosed out of hell
To speak of horrors. . . . (II. i. 79-81)

But his principal mission is not to bring news from hell but (following the ghost's injunction) to seek revenge, which for one reason or another is what nearly all of Shakespeare's tragic protagonists seek. Iago, for his own obscure reasons, hates Othello, and it is not the least diabolical aspect of Iago's manipulations that he manages to infect Othello with a corresponding hatred for Desdemona. Hatred breeds a passion for vengeance in each case. As the agent of Othello's metamorphosis, Iago notes with satisfaction how his insinuations concerning Desdemona are having their effect: "The Moor already changes with my poison," he says (Othello III. iii. 325), and we witness the measure of the change later in the same scene when Othello calls Iago to witness that all his "fond love" for his wife is gone. He then launches an infernal invocation:

Arise, black vengeance, from the hollow hell!
Yield up, O love, thy crown and hearted throne
To tyrannous hate! Swell, bosom, with thy fraught,
For 'tis of aspics' tongues! (III. iii. 447-450)

The summons to love to yield its place to vengeance may be taken as an emblem of the opposing impulses that animate, respectively, Shakespearean comedy and tragedy, and which preside over the transformation worked upon the principals in each genre. The informing experience for tragic figures in Shakespeare is to look on something that is, for them, unimaginably terrible: some equivalent to a Gorgon's head. As a result, they are figuratively turned to stone, the power of feeling killed in them. Shakespeare has an early, uncomplicated example of this in the figure (not fully a tragic one) of Young Clifford, who at the end of Henry VI, Part 2, comes upon the corpse of his father, slain by Richard of York, and thereupon announces:

Even at this sight
My heart is turn'd to stone; and while 'tis mine,
It shall be stony. (VI. ii. 49-51)
Henceforth, he says, he will have nothing to do with pity; if he meet an infant of the house of York he will cut it "Into as many gobbets" as Medea did to the body of her young brother, Absyrtus. Early in 3 Henry VI, he carries out this pledge when he ruthlessly kills York's young son, Rutland.

The protagonist of Timon of Athens is a more complex product of this basic sort of confrontation with the terrible. What the death of his father at the hands of his enemies is to Young Clifford, the ingratitude of the Athenians whom he believed to be his friends is to Timon. The play's two halves show us, respectively, Timon in his prosperity when his generosity is boundless and he holds the most confident views of human benevolence; and Timon in adversity when those whom he has thought to be his friends desert him in his need, and he retires to the woods, firm in his conviction that there "he shall find / Th' unkindest beast more kinder than mankind" (IV. i. 35-36). His misanthropy persists to the end of his life, and his end presents one of Shakespeare's nearest approximations to an Ovidian metamorphosis: there is a sense in which Timon, in the extremity of his recoil from human society, dissolves into the elements. He prepares his grave, what he terms

his everlasting mansion
Upon the beached verge of the salt flood,
Who once a day with his embossed froth
The turbulent surge shall cover. . . . (V. i. 215-18)

His tomb is duly found where he has said it would be, symbolically situated in the context of its surrounding elements. Alcibiades, when he hears of the site of Timon's grave and reads its inscription, can appreciate its metaphoric appropriateness. Though Timon, in the bitterness of his disenchantment with mankind, scorned human sympathy, yet, says Alcibiades,

rich conceit
Taught thee to make vast Neptune weep for aye
On thy low grave . . . (V. iv. 77-79)

Timon's shattering confrontation with human ingratitude has often been compared to Lear's, and there are certainly similarities in the speeches of bitter denunciation which each utters when he realizes the unworthiness of those in whom he has put his trust. One of the things that makes King Lear a greater play than Timon of Athens, however, is the fact that the confrontation with ingratitude does not account for the whole of Lear's experience of the terrible. The sense of the terrible fully breaks over him when he is confronted with the
wretched Bedlamite (the disguised Edgar), asks himself the momentous question, "Is man no more than this?" (III. iv. 102-03), and goes mad. The fact of human ingratitude has, nonetheless, a crucial share in rendering the sight of Poor Tom so shocking to Lear. Ingratitude in King Lear first takes the face of Goneril (I. iv), to be joined a few scenes later by the face of Regan (II. iv). From the outset it is conceived as something monstrous; Lear personifies it as a "marble-hearted fiend," more hideous than the sea monster when it manifests itself in one's own child (I. iv. 259-61). As always in Shakespearean tragedy, the sense of injury issues in a call for revenge. When the passion for revenge is upon Lear, he advises Nature concerning the kind of affliction that might appropriately be visited on Goneril:

Hear, Nature, hear, dear goddess, hear!  
Suspend thy purpose, if thou didst intend  
To make this creature fruitful. (I. iv. 275-77)

If she must give birth,

Create her child of spleen, that it may live  
And be a thwart disnatur'd torment to her.

And this,

that she may feel  
How sharper than a serpent's tooth it is  
To have a thankless child!

By the time Regan has joined forces with Goneril, Lear is prepared to take revenge into his own hands, but he is powerless, and his sense of outrage can issue only in the grotesque fantasy that brings the daughters to the mock-arraignment that he conducts in the hovel in his madness.

The protagonists of Shakespeare's later tragedies (Macbeth, Coriolanus, Antony and Cleopatra) alter in relation to their circumstances in ways not quite like any of those who have gone before. Macbeth's tragic consciousness is comparable to that of the Medea of Seneca or of Ovid (Met., VII). He is not the kind of tragic protagonist who errs unknowingly (like Lear), or who is deceived by another (like Othello); there is no failure of self-knowledge in Macbeth. He could say with Ovid's Medea that desire persuades him one way, reason another; that he sees the better way and approves it, but yet follows the worse (Met., VII. 19-21). Those capable of this degree of moral discrimination in Ovid are generally women. In addition to Medea, one might cite the examples of Althaea, debating whether or not to kill her son, Meleager, who has caused the death of her brothers (Book VIII);
of Procne, debating (like Medea) whether to kill her child to avenge herself on her husband (Book VI); of Myrrha, lusting for her father but fearful of the sin of incest (Book X). Perhaps this is why Lady Macbeth is so scornful of her husband’s scruples, and persists throughout the first half of the play in raising unflattering queries about his manhood. But he steels himself to the deed of murder, and ultimately proves himself to be made of sterner stuff than his Lady, for all her ferocious rhetoric. Much of his strength consists in not seeing what he does; thus his fear to think what he has done once the murder of Duncan has been committed (II. ii. 48); his declaration that to know his deed, it were best not to know himself (II. ii. 70); his announcement as late as III. v concerning future plans:

Strange things I have in head, that will to hand,
Which must be acted ere they may be scann’d. (138-39)

The doubleness of this is of a piece with that contained in his appeal to the heavens before the murder:

Stars, hide your fires,
Let not light see my black and deep desires;
The eye wink at the hand; yet let that be
Which the eye fears, when it is done, to see. (I. iv. 50-53)

How much he has been altered by what he has done does not permit of a simple answer. Near the end of the play he says that he has “supp’d full with horrors” and he alludes to his “slaughterous thoughts” (V. v. 13-14), but by now he is inured to them; long ago he had realized there was no turning back (III. v. 135 ff.). One reason why it is not easy to assess the extent of his change is that it is not altogether clear just how innocent he ever was to begin with. Certainly at the outset of the play he has an heroic reputation and is esteemed by his King and by his peers; but the play strongly suggests that the propensity to evil was there from the outset. His rapt response to the encounter with the witches is suggestive, and his monologues and his conversations with Lady Macbeth make it clear that crime in itself is not repugnant to him if opportunity is favorable, and if he can keep the left hand from knowing what the right hand is doing. He does what his ambition drives him to do. He never denies that it is wrong, though he would prefer not to look at his deeds too closely. He alters to the extent that he inures himself to the horrors attendant on doing what, from the outset, virtually in spite of himself, he wills himself to do.

Both Macbeth and Coriolanus present somewhat parallel cases: once they have set their course, they cannot or will not vary it, and
so in effect they decree their ruin. Coriolanus indeed is given to making a virtue of his unalterable state. Much is made in the play of his inability to be other than he is. He cannot pretend, he cannot compromise; he is always himself, always the same. Ideally, this defines a high personal integrity (the motto of Queen Elizabeth I, we remember, was *semper eadem*). As an ideal, this lofty adherence to an undeviating code of personal honor is admirable; put into practice, the rigid behavior that issues from such a code is disastrous, as the play demonstrates with great clarity and deliberation, and considerable irony. We applaud Coriolanus for sternly eschewing the hypocrisy which Roman political life demands; yet a little hypocrisy would have saved him; and it is a caution to watch him preserve his honor by becoming a traitor. Rome banishes him — or, as he would have it, he banishes Rome — whereupon he goes straightway to the enemies of Rome, the Volscians, his thoughts bent on revenge. He finds nothing inconsistent in his leadership of the Volscian armies against Rome. The vulgar Roman populace rejected him; he turned his back on the place and went elsewhere, his honor and integrity intact. He serves the Volscian military endeavors as steadfastly as he had previously served the Roman ones. It is only when his mother, his wife and his child appear to him with a plea to spare his native city that his steadfastness collapses. The moment heralds an immensely poignant metamorphosis, as his natural feelings clamor for expression and he struggles to suppress them:

My wife comes foremost; then the honor'd mould
Wherein this trunk was fram'd, and in her hand
The grandchild to her blood. But out, affection,
All bond and privilege of nature, break!
Let it be virtuous to be obstinate.
What is that curtsy worth? or those doves' eyes,
Which can make gods forsworn? I melt, and am not
Of stronger earth than others. My mother bows,
As if Olympus to a molehill should
In supplication nod; and my young boy
Hath an aspect of intercession, which
Great Nature cries, "Deny not." Let the Volsces
Plough Rome and harrow Italy, I'll never
Be such a gosling to obey instinct, but stand
As if a man were author of himself,
And knew no other kin. (V. ii. 22-37)

The upshot of the long interview that follows is his yielding to his mother's intercession; the Volscian armies will turn back and Rome
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will be spared. But his uncharacteristic reversal of himself will be fatal for him, as he knows.

Coriolanus' deflection from his stony resolve for vengeance on Rome is exceptional. Affections are more often sacrificed to vengeance in Shakespearean tragedy. The example of Coriolanus has an interesting parallel in the other tragedy that Shakespeare wrote around the same time, Antony and Cleopatra. As that play enters its final phase, Antony, convinced that Cleopatra has betrayed him to Caesar, is swearing horrendous vengeance on her. This is a moment of extremity of the kind in which Ovid's Metamorphoses deal. Antony, in extremis, alludes appropriately to Ovid's account (Met., IX) of the suffering and final passion of the god Hercules, whom the play has already informed us Antony loved. He cries out after Cleopatra has left the scene:

The shirt of Nessus is upon me; teach me,
Alcides, thou mine ancestor, thy rage.
Let me lodge Lichas on the horns o’th’ moon,
And with those hands, that grasp’d the heaviest club,
Subdue my worthiest self. The witch shall die.
To the young Roman boy she hath sold me, and I fall
Under this plot. She dies for’t. (IV. xii. 43-49)

Cleopatra reports to her women in a rush of Ovidian allusions:

O, he’s more mad
Than Telamon for his shield; the boar of Thessaly
Was never so emboss’d. (IV. xiii. 1-3)

Under pressure of the fury produced by his sense of betrayal and defeat, he is disintegrating, as the play informs us when the scene shifts back to him in a passage of which the subject is changing shapes, here figured forth in the clouds that constantly re-form themselves from one moment to the next. Antony addresses his attendant, Eros:

Sometimes we see a cloud that’s dragonish,
A vapor sometime like a bear or lion,
A tower’d citadel, a pendant rock,
A forked mountain, or blue promontory
With trees upon’t that nod unto the world,
And mock our eyes with air. Thou hast seen these signs,
They are black vesper’s pageants... That which is now a horse, even with a thought
The rack dislimns, and makes it indistinct
As water is in water. (IV. xiv. 2-11)

He himself, he announces, is
Even such a body. Here I am Antony,  
Yet cannot hold this visible shape . . . (13-14)

He speaks of his previous commitment to Cleopatra, rages at the way she has "pack'd cards with Caesar's," swears she will "die the death," when word comes that she is dead. Antony's rage dissolves. "Unarm, Eros," he says to his attendant; "the long day's task is done, / And we must sleep"; and he promptly sets about plans for overtaking Cleopatra in his own death:

. . . I come, my queen! . . . Stay for me!  
Where souls do couch on flowers, we'll hand in hand,  
And with our sprightly port make the ghosts gaze.  
Dido and her Aeneas shall want troops,  
And all the haunt be ours. (IV. xiv. 50-54)

But Cleopatra, as the audience knows, is not yet in the other world; she is still in this one, the news of her death having been merely a trick to gain time until Antony's wrath has run its course. Antony, however, does not know this, and like another Pyramus, rashly jumping to conclusions at the sight of Thisbe's blood-stained scarf, he kills himself. Or rather, he tries to do so; the intended sword thrust misses its mark, and he is fatally wounded but still alive when Cleopatra's second messenger comes on to report the truth, that Cleopatra yet lives. Antony is not disturbed by the knowledge of her previous deception. He does not even allude to it. He merely asks to be taken to her, that he may die in her arms; and this, after much heaving on the part of the attendants as his body is hauled aloft to Cleopatra in her monument (she is afraid to come down lest she be taken captive by Caesar), is done. There are many things to wonder at in the last 800 lines of Antony and Cleopatra (from IV. xii to the end of the play), but among the most wonderful is the way in which Shakespeare transforms the impulse to vengeance to the impulse of love: transforms, in effect, the impulse to tragedy to the impulse of comedy (comedy, let it be understood in this case, of a resplendent kind). This is characteristic of a play which, throughout its course, has been all shifting alternation between opposing poles — of duty and pleasure, of reason and sensuality — subsumed under the opposition of Rome and Egypt. As for the two principal characters, change is the medium through which they define themselves. Their repertoire of forms seems inexhaustible; they could presumably go on ringing changes on them indefinitely. When circumstances make this unfeasible, they translate themselves to another sphere, and in doing so, define themselves for all time in their mutual relationship. The dying Antony has anticipated the sensation they will create when
they appear together in the realm of the dead (their “sprightly port” will “make the ghosts gaze”). Cleopatra’s anticipation of her reunion with Antony, and the metamorphosis that will make that possible, is even more impressive. She has “immortal longings” in her. She urges her waiting woman to hasten in the work of adorning her with robe and crown:

Yare, yare, good Iras; quick. Methinks I hear
Antony call: I see him rouse himself
To praise my noble act. I hear him mock
The luck of Caesar, which the gods give men
To excuse their after wrath. Husband, I come!
Now to that name my courage prove my title!
I am fire and air; my other elements
I give to baser life. (V. ii. 283-90)

The replacement of the impulse to vengeance with the impulse to love, together with the so subtly sophisticated mingling of tragic and comic attitudes and gestures in the finale of Antony and Cleopatra, heralds the full-scale intermingling of these opposing elements in the romances that Shakespeare wrote at the end of his career. Altered states are the very stuff of these last plays. Husbands are transformed by jealous rages to thoughts of murderous revenge, only to recognize the unworthiness of their suspicions and to repent of the misery they have caused (as in the cases of Posthumus in Cymbeline and Leontes in The Winter’s Tale); those supposed dead are restored to life (Thaisa in Pericles, Hermione in The Winter’s Tale); evil-doers confess their evil (Iachimo in Cymbeline, Alonzo in The Tempest). What chiefly alters the conditions of characters in these plays is the restoration of lost loved ones: wives (as in Pericles, Cymbeline, and The Winter’s Tale), daughters (as in those same three plays), sons (as in Cymbeline and The Tempest). Always of pre-eminent thematic importance is the transformation of the urge to vengeance to the capacity to love; this achieves its apotheosis in The Tempest, when Prospero recognizes that vengeance is transcended by a rarer quality, mercy.

The emphasis in all four of these last plays on forgiveness and mercy, on the need to bear sufferings patiently, and on the happy issue out of all afflictions that informs the repeated ritual of their endings: all of these qualities have caused the religious signification of these final romances to be stressed by many critics. The religious implications are certainly there, and Christian doctrine is echoed at many points, but these plays would not be what they are without the literature of classical Greece and Rome. Shakespeare’s late romances display in rich concentration the debt to classical literature that is on
exhibit at least to some degree in all his work. Specifically, there is the sophisticated mythology for which Ovid's *Metamorphoses* would have been Shakespeare's principal source. This informs the poetic imagery throughout the texts of all four of the last plays. It also furnishes the materials for the chief spectacles of the four: the epiphanies that comprise the climax of *Pericles* (in the vision of Diana) and of *Cymbeline* (Jupiter's appearance in Posthumus' dream vision), the pastoral scene with Autolycus and the shepshers and the dance of the twelve satyrs in *The Winter's Tale*, the masque featuring Iris and Ceres and Juno in *The Tempest*. Shakespeare is indebted to Greek and Roman literature for his sense of the classical pastoral tradition, which finds expression not only in the fourth act of *The Winter's Tale*, but in the scenes in the Welsh mountains in *Cymbeline*, to say nothing of the Forest of Arden in *As You Like It* of the previous decade. His debt to classical literature in the last plays must, finally, include his use of story materials from the Greek romances (particularly the *Aethiopica* of Heliodorus, and the *Clitophon and Leucippe* of Achilles Tatius), and from Plautine comedy: not the farcical Plautus of the *Menaechmi*, but the more serious, the more romantic Plautus of plays like the *Captivi* and the *Rudens*.

How closely the narrative materials of the Greek romances resemble the stories of saints' lives as related in such collections as *The Golden Legend* has been demonstrated by such a recent critic as Howard Felperin. It is not difficult to see how stories stressing the virtues of patience and forgiveness, and celebrating the reunion of loved ones after long separation, could serve as vehicles for demonstrating the rewards of faith, the benevolence of God's providence. Nor should it be difficult to see how the spectacular changes (for better and for worse) described in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* could accord with the humanistic spirit of an age which placed such emphasis on man's free power to make and mold himself: "to degenerate into the lower forms of life, which are brutish," or "to be reborn into higher forms, which are divine." The mythological resonances of Ovid's tales, the pagan mysteries that also affirm eternal psychological truths and which are adumbrated in these tales: these are the qualities that enabled Shakespeare to dramatize the transformations of human character and not simply to allegorize them. Ovid and the other great classical authors whom he knew (Virgil, Plautus, Terence,

---

Seneca) delivered him from parochialism in matters spiritual, and from provincialism in matters of the world. They also delivered him — as they did all his great contemporaries (Sidney, Spenser, Marlowe, Jonson) — from drabness in poetry.

*University of Rochester*
Small Latine and Lesse Greeke?
Shakespeare and the Classical Tradition*

J. K. NEWMAN

A Note on Methodology
This paper takes a wholly different line from T. W. Baldwin's two massive volumes dedicated to William Shakespere's Small Latine & Lesse Greeke. He is concerned with the precise question of what Shakespere's education at grammar school in Stratford may have taught him, and what traces the poet's reading of authors like Terence and Ovid may have left in his plays. That is of course a great work of scholarship. The debt to Terence and Ovid is particularly noteworthy, at least for anyone attentive to echoes of the European tradition, since Dante had already recommended Ovid's Metamorphoses to the budding poet in the De vulgari eloquentia, and it has been said that if Virgil had written dramas he would have written them like Terence.

These present remarks however are interested, not in exact reminiscence of one author by another, but in pattern and convergence. If the Greeks deserve the epithet "classical," it is because, thanks to

* This is a version of a lecture first presented at the conference on "Classical Traditions in Shakespeare and the Renaissance" organized with characteristic energy and dedication by Professor Thomas Clayton at the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, April 1982.
1 Urbana 1944.
3 Reuben A. Brower, Hero and Saint: Shakespeare and the Graeco-Roman Heroic Tradition (New York and Oxford 1971), has already emphasized that it is a question of kinship of imagination between the ancient authors and the modern.
their chronological priority, they defined certain classes. They estab-
lished the boundaries within which imagination and creativity will
tend to move among artists of the western family. Those who come
after them, and even those who do not in fact know too much about
them, will find that they bump against the same mental furniture as
they grope in the half-dark about the mind’s room. This is what is
meant by saying that the Greeks, and their successors the Romans,
are the architects — and even at times the interior designers — of
our particular version of civilization.

What Shakespeare may or may not have read is not therefore my
first enquiry. He was not a scholar in any usual sense, according to
Baldwin.\(^4\) No, he was an artistic genius of the first magnitude, and
therefore by methods not wholly those of discursive reason he knew
things which scholars overlook. My first point will be that he knew
something about dramatic poetry which was also known to Aristotle.

Shakespeare and Aristotle’s Poetics

To pronounce in the same breath the names of Aristotle and Shake-
speare is to be made aware of the riches of the European mind, and
yet to despair of ever finding a central focus or principle in that
mind beyond coincidence of time and space. Aristotle — it seems —
represents one extreme: that of order, rule, exclusion of the irrelevant,
insistence on category and genre. Shakespeare — it seems —
stands at the opposite pole, bounteous and ungovernable by rule as
Nature herself, laughing at categories and cramped definitions. Can
these two great geniuses be brought into some sort of relationship
other than the most distant of passing nods?

Those who would say “No” to this question have powerful academic
allies. Bernard Weinberg has traced at great length the melancholy
tale of critical reaction to the great masterpieces of Italian literature.\(^5\)
It is not a wholly uniform history, and sometimes individual critics
display unexpected flashes of insight. But the general tendency of
such criticism is towards the establishment of a poetic calculus, so
that a properly programmed computer, had one been available at the
time, could have told immediately whether a given work of literature
conformed to the Aristotelian / Horatian model, and have awarded
it a passing or failing grade on that score alone. Weinberg remarks
towards the end of his second volume that the rules there laid down
by Angelo Ingegneri were in all essentials the rules which in the next


\(^5\) A History of Literary Criticism in the Italian Renaissance, 2 vols. (2nd impression,
Chicago 1963).
century critics would be applying to French tragedy. We know what trouble was caused for Tasso by the late sixteenth-century devotees of Aristotle: and what problems would be raised by appeals to the same authority for the wayward genius of Corneille and the passionate brilliance of Racine.

It is as we pass under review the names of the great writers who fell foul of the classicizing critics — Dante and Ariosto as well as Tasso in Italy; in France, the masters of tragedy just mentioned, for works like Le Cid and Phèdre — that we are faced with a dilemma. We may indeed conclude, grasping one horn of that beast, that Aristotle was someone whose principles were so rooted in a particular Greek soil as not to survive transplanting. This is to postulate a radical discontinuity between the Greco-Roman world and our own which great geniuses like Dante, or in our own age Thomas Mann and James Joyce, belie. But, suppose we seize the other horn. Suppose we dare to suggest that the critics were more concerned with taking the intellect's revenge on art than with understanding what Aristotle was really trying to say: and that, if we find out what Aristotle was trying to say, his poetics could also have accommodated Shakespeare. It is for this second position that I will be arguing here.

Aristotle's Literary Criticism

Aristotle was the son of a doctor, imprinted by biology, called by Plato the "mind" of his school, and yet one who left Plato's school after the death of its founder because he objected to the turning of philosophy into mathematics. His universal genius did not respect the "arts versus science" compartmentalizations to which in our time we have grown accustomed. He wrote two elliptical volumes on the art of poetry, of which we now only possess the first. These were notes intended to guide the lecturer, who would flesh them out with explanation and example delivered viva voce. The more popular dialogues, in which Aristotle expounded his theories in a less crabbed style, using what Cicero calls "a golden stream of eloquence," have vanished.

What we have left to work with in this context is the famous book Περὶ Ποιητικῆς, devoted largely to epic and tragedy. Aristotle has an organic theory, as befits a doctor's son, of the relation between these two genres. Epic is the ancestor of tragedy, and the reason why Homer is the best of the epic poets is precisely that he is δραματικός,

The first point of contact between Aristotle and Shakespeare is now obvious. Paradoxically, and completely contradicting the easy notion that he was a backward-looking conservative, Aristotle asserts that the modern drama and not the long-established and prestige-laden epic is the highest kind of serious literature. Not surprisingly, he himself was in trouble with Renaissance critics for this lapse. The reason for drama’s superiority is that it makes a powerful and concentrated emotional impact, and it does that by not dragging out its story to undue length. Could the man of Stagira then, if he had witnessed one of the tragedies of the Jacobean period, and been presented, by contrast, with something like Ronsard’s Fransciade, have been entirely unsympathetic to the man of Stratford? It is indeed now a commonplace, since the work of Wolfgang Clemen, that, whatever Shakespeare’s inattention to the so-called dramatic unities (of which it will be remembered Aristotle says very little), he did attend to that overarching unity which is conferred by repetition of image and metaphor. The classical Athenian playwrights, of whom Aristotle is thinking when he advances his revolutionary theory of the primacy of drama, did exactly the same thing.

This is, I suppose, what Aristotle means when, in another famous passage of the Poetics, he defines the qualifications which the poet needs. He has been talking about poetic language, which must be an appropriate combination of the compound and the “gloss,” a topic to which we will return later. But the most important thing for a poet is to be μεταφορικός. This is probably another of those tools of literary criticism now taken for granted which were first forged by Aristotle. “For this quality alone cannot be taken from someone else, and is a sign of natural genius. To use metaphor well is to be able to see what is alike” (Poetics 1459 a 6). When we think of that extraordinary power enjoyed by Shakespeare of seeing the similar in the apparently disparate, can we argue that Aristotle’s criterion for

7 I. Düring, Aristoteles: Darstellung und Interpretation seines Denkens (Heidelberg 1966), p. 169, note 259. In fairness to Professor Düring however I should add that he and I disagree toto caelo over the general interpretation of the Poetics.

8 This is the argument of the final chapter (26).


10 Cf. De Subl. 40. 3 on Euripides, Her. 1245: τῷ πλάσει ἀναλογιών. The imagery is repeated from v. 631 (where see Wilamowitz’s note) and recurs at v. 1424.
great poetry is irrelevant or dated; or that Shakespeare fails to meet its demands?

A word is in order about Aristotle’s doctrine of poetic idiom. In the Poetics, he finds it difficult to sympathize with the idea that poetry can be written in everyday language, and he quotes with satisfaction a line of Aeschylus using the verb “eat” which was, he asserts, vastly improved when Euripides substituted for “eats” a word meaning “banquets upon” (1458 b 23-24). Although it displays a fondness for the “gloss,” the difficult and typically poetic word, this very example offers a most interesting case of Aristotle’s indifference to conventional literary stereotypes, since already as early as Aristophanes’ Frogs in the late fifth century it is Aeschylus who is distinguished by his grandiose vocabulary, and Euripides who is attacked for being too down to earth, too slick and modern. However in the Rhetoric, probably written after the Poetics, Aristotle has a somewhat different view. He speaks here of the orator’s need to persuade by using the art which conceals art. He compares the voice of the actor Theodorus with that of his rivals, and remarks that Theodorus has the advantage of appearing to use his own voice, while the others seem to have borrowed someone else’s. So with vocabulary: the orator will best cheat his hearers if he selects and combines his words from the common way of talking. “This is exactly what Euripides ‘does’ (the Greek is πωλεῖ as in ‘poetry’), and what he was the first to exemplify” (Rhetoric III. 1404 b 21-25).

Already in the Poetics Aristotle had said that Euripides, even if he does not involve his chorus as he should in the economy of his plays, is nevertheless “the most tragic of the poets” (1453 a 29-30). “Tragic” here seems to mean something like “tear-jerking,” or, less pejoratively, “heart-rending” (Lucas). In the Rhetoric, Aristotle had clearly come to understand something of that extraordinary mixture of the prosaic and the lyrical which contributed to Euripides’ success in capturing the sympathies of his audience.

At the same time, it must be recognized that Euripides was an artist far in advance of his age. His few victories in the state competitions in his lifetime, by contrast with his enormous posthumous popularity, are evidence of this. It is not surprising then that Aristotle himself should have had to struggle towards a theory of tragic effect which was at variance with his classical prejudice in favor of the rational, harmonious, elevated and symmetrical. He believed that the greatest of Greek dramas was Sophocles’ Oedipus Rex, that relentless search for self-destruction which is itself a powerful critique of the

centration. At the side of this belief was growing up another realization, that the most characteristic effect of tragedy in fact was exploited not by Sophocles, but by Euripides, and that in the famous definition of tragedy as the arouser of pity and terror, it was ultimately the pity of it which would make the most lasting impression.

Aristotelian Criticism after Aristotle

Some kind of poetic then might be deduced from Aristotle which would find room at the top for a dramatic, concentrated, metaphorically unified, "pitiful" poetry, drawing on the "customary dialect" for its effects. This is not such an anodyne conclusion as it sounds when it is remembered that the Poetics has been thought to have had so little influence on subsequent generations that elaborate theories of its disappearance have been advanced to explain why this work of the great philosopher passed so unregarded. The truth is that Aristotle wrote in a period of rapid change. The Greek world was about to be measurelessly altered by Aristotle's own pupil, Alexander the Great. The post-classical poetry, at which Aristotle had aimed only by innuendo, seemed disconnected from an Aristotelian poetic increasingly interpreted by modern critics as normative, negative, apodictic, backward-looking. But the best readers of Aristotle's meaning were in the first instance those who belonged to his school, the so-called Peripatetics.

The existence of a Peripatetic theory of history, which means in effect a Peripatetic theory of formal prose narrative, has been disputed. A literary historian is nevertheless compelled to take account of the prescriptions which may be gleaned from post-Aristotelian authors about how this kind of artistic prose should be written. The most important aspect of their theory was its pursuit of what the Greek rhetoricians call ἐναργεῖα and their Latin counterparts evidentia. A scene had to be visualized so powerfully by the writer that his description of it would work equally powerfully on the reader. This is indeed a theory which owes something both to the Poetics and to the second book of the Rhetoric, and perhaps also to the treatise on history written by Aristotle's pupil and successor as head of the

12 Lucas gives a succinct statement: "Introduction," p. x. See also footnote 19 below.
13 F.g. by B. L. Ullman, "History and Tragedy," Trans. Am. Phil. Ass. 73 (1942), pp. 25-55, an article which makes many acute observations, but fails to note that the theoretical arguments about their métier by hellenistic historians are all conducted in Aristotelian terms. This may be seen from the materials assembled by P. Scheller, De hellenistica historiae conscribenda arte (Leipzig 1911).
Lyceum, Theophrastus. What seems to have happened is that, stung by the master's criticisms of history in the ninth chapter of the Poetics as less universal than poetry, because it is too wrapped up with the particular, later historians determined to make their work as close to tragedy as possible, even though their medium was prose. When we read some of the arguments in favor of vivid and dramatic presentation by these historians and followers of the Peripatos, we seem to hear once again a criticism which could also do justice to Shakespeare's incredible power of concrete visualization, placed at the service of overwhelming tragic effect. The Greeks certainly appreciated such poetry.

We know that they appreciated it because these are the terms in which the ancient post-Aristotelian commentators — the scholiasts ("schoolmen") as they are called — praise the work of Homer. Curiously — at least, curiously to our modern and inflexible notions of literary decorum — both the Iliad and the Odyssey were regarded by the scholiasts as tragedies, though the Aristotelian notion was not lost that Homer was the founder of comedy too (a point to be taken up later). The supremely important criterion of poetic art for these commentators lay in its emotional appeal, and even the famous theory of catharsis has not entirely vanished. It was conceded that the emotions evoked by poetic art might at times be contradictory.

The scholiasts both regard Homer's stories as historically true, and yet speak of the poet as the free manipulator of his material. His technique is distinguished by the alternation of suspense and rest (what Formalist critics in our day have called "staircase structure"), and by a non-linear presentation. At one point we read: "The poet commonly turns his story topsy-turvy by bending back, and stuffs the beginning into the middle. Experts say that in longer narrative poems to proceed in orderly fashion from the beginning to the actual tale makes for hard listening, while to start from something more exciting gives greater pleasure and tension."

Homer, in the analyses of these critics, makes great use of anticipation and reminiscence, summing up in this way the whole of the story of Troy while only telling part of it. This at least is pure Aristotelian doctrine, drawn from the allegedly "lost" Poetics (1459 a 30 ff.). He found a particular successor here in Euripides. His use of connected imagery for this purpose was understood.

Renaissance critics made a great fuss about "verisimilitude," which became a handy stick with which to beat any author whose imagination soared. The scholiasts show that, in the ancient world, verisimilitude meant simply "persuasiveness." Homer is continually lauded for his ability to select just those details in a description which will convince his listener that he must have been there ("on the scene," as we might say). The poet's brevity is also commended, by which is meant his ability to say much in little. Brevity is aided by his use of multi-sensory metaphors, and of personifications which lend "emphasis" (i.e. concreteness: the noun is derived from φαίνω, not from φημι) to what is said so briefly.

"Fantasy" is another important term in this ancient criticism, of varying nuance. It can be used of the purely imaginative flight, as when Zeus holds his hand protectively over Troy (Il. IX. 420). But it can also be the vehicle which transports the listener vividly into a given scene, so that in places the scholiasts speak of Homer as himself a witness of what he describes. By a happy choice of expression, sometimes of the simplest kind, the poet's own fantasy\(^1\) is enabled in its turn to grip that of his audience.

Homer's narrative is especially vivid because it shows such closeness to painting. When the mourning Priam veils himself (Il. XXIV. 163), it is an anticipation of the veiled Agamemnon of the artist Timanthes. "Graphic" (i.e. "painterly") is a frequent term of praise.

But the poet's mastery of acoustic effects, of onomatopoeia and rhythm, is equally brilliant. All these devices contribute to the impressiveness and pathos of his story.

Homer avoids the banal, according to these ancient critics, but that does not mean that he writes in some monotonously "sublime" style. The very fact that ancient commentators discovered in him the models of all three of the later genera dicendi\(^2\) shows how little they believed that the epic poet at least should confine himself to some artificial elevation. Briseis' lament over Patroclus (Il. XIX. 282 ff.) is said, for example, to belong to the middle style. The episode is impressive in its narrative parts, and "graphic," while working on our feelings of pity.

Yet such impressiveness is combined in the poems with variety. Here, the similes are particularly noted. They have a psychological as well as pictorial element.

---

\(^1\) The word is picked up both by Dante and Michelangelo: all' alta fantasia qui mancò possa, Paradiso 33. 142; Onde l'affetuosa fantasia / che l'arte mi fece idol e monarca, Oxford Book of Italian Verse, p. 177, no. viii, 5-6, from a sonnet to Vasari written in 1554.

\(^2\) E.g. Quintilian XII. 10. 64; Aul. Gell. VII. 14. 7.
Aristotle had praised Homer for his knowledge of when it was suitable to write in his own person. Such personal writing had to be restricted, since that was not the kind of imitation proper to epic. The scholiasts find Homer engaged in his own poetry rather more often than Aristotle would have liked. Sometimes, they believe, he is showing covert sympathy with Greek fortunes. Sometimes he is alluding to his own art. His allegedly Greek sympathies allow him nevertheless to admit the faults of Greek heroes such as Achilles. He is not a poet of black and white.

Aristotelian Criticism and Shakespeare

The classical, Aristotelian and post-Aristotelian tradition of ancient criticism proves then on closer acquaintance not to be the monolithic, normative, unyielding set of prescriptions which it became in sixteenth-century Italy, at least when expounded by its worst interpreters. Their view of Aristotle entails all sorts of awkward consequences for ancient literary history. The “vanishing body” theory has already been mentioned, by which Aristotle’s papers are said to have been dispersed at his death and only recovered after three hundred or even seven hundred years. If in fact the Poetics had not disappeared, then according to another view it can have had no influence on the way in which subsequent poetry was written. But that is also implausible, since the very scholiasts or commentators on Homer’s epic poetry we have been summarizing seem to be familiar with Aristotelian principles, while the desperate efforts of the historians to acquire literary respectability both imply an awareness of Aristotle’s censures on historical writing, and try to answer those censures according to an Aristotelian program. What really seems to have happened is that the history of literary criticism both during and after Aristotle’s day has been, to use a crude term, a mess. Aristotle was misunderstood. The poetic experiments of the post-classical (“hellenistic”) period in Greek literature have been both divorced from the doctrines of the Poetics and dismissed as in some way “decadent.” Roman literary criticism has been distorted, notably in the case of Horace’s Ars Poetica, where scholars have been reduced to lamenting that Virgil’s closest friend says nothing which could illumine the student of Virgil’s masterpiece. In fact, Horace not only says much to illumine Virgil. He also illumines Shakespeare.

We can see this in his doctrine of the genres (AP 86 ff.). Although

18 Poetics 1460 a 5-8.
as a good teacher he lays down the theoretical importance of the differences between them, he is interested at the practical level in the occasional approximations which they show at moments of heightened tension. A comic character may express violent emotion, and so verge towards the tragic. In seeking to touch the heart, a tragic hero may resort to the simple language of everyday, abandoning the cumbersome and bombastic. A scholiast reminds us that here Horace is influenced by the Alexandrian poet Callimachus. Horace chooses his examples from Euripides, but he certainly also is close to Virgil’s Hecuba\(^{20}\) at this point, as he is to the Shakespeare who is able to extract a world of tragic pity from the monosyllable. What a disservice to the history of our civilization is performed by the scholar who, in discussing this passage of Horace, fails to mention Lear with the body of Cordelia in his arms!

Finally, after centuries of uncomprehended tradition, the *De Sublimitate* of “Longinus” has unaccountably been heralded as some sort of breakthrough, when in fact its chief theories, such as that concerning vividness, are inherited, and its novelty, the insistence on *ekplexis* or “knockout” as the principal criterion of great literature, is a dangerous simplification. Where, for example, would such a criterion leave that master of the European tradition, and a master diligently studied by Shakespeare, Ovid?

There is a great work of clearing away to be done in our time by the classical scholar who wishes to unite the divergent streams of ancient literary achievement and ancient literary criticism. When the dust has settled, we will be able to see that Shakespeare is a lot less anti-classical than has appeared. Some of the lines which this reconciliation will take are already visible: the recognition, for example, that drama is the greatest form of serious literature; the ability to extract the maximum in heart-rending emotion from simple language, valued by Aristotle in Euripides; the power of vivid imagination, auditory as well as visual; the gift for metaphor. But Aristotle has even more to contribute to the most modern analysis of Shakespearean art, and in explaining this I will redeem my promise to return to the Aristotelian theory that Homer is the fountainhead not only of tragedy but also of comedy.

Aristotle, Shakespeare and the Comic

What must be remembered here is that Aristotle did not merely attribute to Homer the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. He regards as homeric

\(^{20}\) Cf. R. G. Austin’s note on *Aen.* II. 523.
also the now lost work *Margites*, "The Madman."\(^{21}\) *Margites*, the hero of this burlesque epic, which looks as if it was written in a variety of meters, was a Simple Simon of his day, "a jack of all trades, and a master of none." On his wedding night, for example, he proved unwilling to rise to the occasion because he was afraid, as he explained to his frustrated bride, that she would snitch on him to her mother. Eventually that resourceful girl dreamed up the story that she was suffering from a terrible malady affecting a certain area which could only be cured by energetic measures. When the situation was explained to him in these terms, *Margites* agreed out of humanitarian sympathy that perhaps he and she could go ahead.\(^{22}\)

This silly story savors of the music-hall humor of my youth, the kind of folksy anecdote with which studies of British working-class life are permeated.\(^{23}\) What is amazing is that the allegedly conservative Aristotle was quite prepared to accept this sort of poem as homeric, and he did so because he was far more aware of the popular roots of great literature than has been allowed by critics. It is the same Aristotle who apparently declares that tragedy originated from the satyr play (1449 a 20), a rough and clownish performance more akin to the Roman Atellan farce than to anything we normally think of as Greek. But then we remember that, even in the classical period, it was normal for the three plays in tragic vein to be rounded off by a fourth in the competitions at Athens. And this fourth play was usually a satyr play. What Aristotle seems to be saying (following a hint dropped by his master\(^{24}\)) about both the epic and tragic artist is that he is likely to show an unexpected kinship with the comic. This may be attested at quite unexpected places in the undeniably classical tradition.

**The Comic in Racine and Virgil**

Who, for example, would expect to find a debt to the comic in so purely "classical" an author as Racine? If we take a tragedy like *Britannicus*, for example, where the arch-villain Néron forces Junie to reject her uncomprehending lover in order to save his life, while

\(^{21}\) *Poetics* 1148 b 36-40. Interestingly, Callimachus agreed with Aristotle: fr. 397 Pf.

\(^{22}\) The *testimonium* is to be found in *Homeri Opera*, ed. T. W. Allen (repr. Oxford 1965), p. 154.


\(^{24}\) He is of course here the true disciple of his teacher Plato, master of the serio-comic form, avid student of the mimes of Sophron, and proponent of the theory that the "scientific" poet will know how to write both comedy and tragedy (*Symposium* 223 D).
he himself is concealed behind a screen on stage to make sure that she says exactly what she is supposed to, do we not have a framework typical of Molière’s comedy, even of the Commedia dell’arte? And does not the whole structure of French classical tragedy, in which the hero or heroine is always attended by a largely characterless confident(e), whose purpose is to give the main character an excuse to pour out his feelings in a long and often exquisitely musical monologue, smack both of Greek New Comedy and of Euripides? It was after all Euripides who for Aristotle represented both the avant-garde and the “most tragic” of poetry.

If the ancient tradition made room for comedy at the side of tragedy in the same author, and even in the same work (a feature particularly striking, for example, in Euripides’ Bacchae), we can understand why Servius remarks at the opening of his commentary on the fourth book of the Aeneid, paene comicus stilus est: nec mirum, ubi de amore tractatur. This quotation has been the source of some puzzlement for the orthodox classical scholar. But Servius is not talking about “a laugh a line.” He is talking about the stilus, the mode of expression and even, I think, the structure of this book of Virgil. It is indeed a French seventeenth-century tragedy before its time. Dido relieves her feelings in long monologues with her sister Anna, and later in head-on confrontation with her lover Aeneas, and then again in talking with her old nurse (a particularly “comic” touch). But to deny the relationship of this sort of mise en scène to New Comedy, which is all that Servius means, is to ignore a fundamental feature of the whole ancient tradition.

Scholarly interpretation of the Aeneid in our time has slowly come to recognize the profound irresolutions which echo throughout this work, once thought to be simply and ultimately a loud blast on an Augustan propaganda trumpet. The whole final book, for example, is shot through with ambiguity, not least in the characterization of Jupiter, at once the sublime father of the gods and guarantor of Rome’s future greatness, and the heartless seducer of Turnus’ sister Juturna (“Le Roi s’amuse”). And book XII, with its reminiscences of Dido, is hardly unique in the poem.

What must be realized is that the popular origins of the dramatic tradition, shared by both the ancient writers and Shakespeare, carry with them the stamp of a certain way of looking at the world. The

25 E. Fraenkel, Elementi plautini in Plauto (Florence 1960), p. 203, note 2, emphasizes the debt of modern tragic technique not to Seneca, but to Plautus and above all to Terence, here the heirs of the Greek Middle Comedy, which flourished in the century following Euripides. See also T. W. Baldwin, op. cit. (above, note 1), I, pp. 641-42.
ordinary peasant, in his relentless struggle both with nature and his human enemies, cannot afford to take any one defeat as the final word, and still less any one triumph. Life must go on, and in the family and clan the circle of birth, maturity, death, birth has no finality. It is the lesson of the seasons, and of the crops and animals about the farm. Hard knocks are part of the game of life, and their recipient must grin and bear them.

What this means is that the prime genre is always comic, the conviction and assertion that things are never as bad or as good as they look, and ultimately the assertion of life. Tragedy, with its "reduced laughter," is a creation of special circumstances, and of an urban, sophisticated, reflective culture. It appears at certain periods, and than vanishes. But the comic persists, and it is from the comic (what Aristotle calls τὸ σατυρικὸν) that tragedy develops, and to which it returns at dissolution.

This can certainly be seen to be true in the ancient world, where tragedy is a creation of the Athenian fifth century, and in the France of Louis XIV, where the tragic moment ended when Racine, who had already written Les Plaideurs, turned towards history and operatic libretti, as carnival fare for the Court, in collaboration with Boileau. It is true of Marlowe's Doctor Faustus, where the absurd antics in the middle of the play go right back to the knockabout of medieval mystery plays, and find a parallel in some of the farce of Dante's Inferno, itself part of a Commedia.

The Comic in Shakespeare's Tragedies

But it is supremely true of Shakespeare, and accounts for those strange plays which end the canon, and which show the issue of the tragic genius in the comic. But even in earlier plays Robert Weimann⁵⁶ finds elements of folk-drama combined with an artistic profundity which raises such "topsy-turvy patter," as he calls it, beyond the trivial to the level of social and metaphysical criticism. Lear speaks:

What, art mad? A man may 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? Thou hast seen a farmer's dog bark at a beggar? (IV. 6. 149-155)

Weimann compares a fool’s speech from a Weston-sub-Edge play:

I met a bark and he dogged at me. I went to the stick and cut a hedge, gave him a rallier over the yud jud killed him round stout stiff and bold from Lancashire I came, if Doctor hasn’t done his part John Finney wins the game.

He comments:

Quite surely it is a coincidence that Shakespeare uses the same image of the barking dog. Most probably it is also coincidence that the mad Lear uses precisely this image to show the absurdity of the prevailing system of law. But the decisive similarity is that in Shakespeare too there echoes the theme of topsy-turvydom. Even his highly developed art draws on the dramatic possibilities of inversion.

(Weimann, p. 85: my translation)

Weimann goes on to point out that the motif of the unfair distribution of goods is basic to the play. “So distribution should undo excess,” says Gloucester, “and each man have enough.” Shakespeare’s tragedy too therefore is in debt to, or at least converges towards, a “satyr” play.

Part of the comic consciousness of ambiguity is shown by the use of puns, a device certainly enjoyed by the classical tradition since the days of Homer, and used to powerful effect, for example, in the puns on Helen’s name in Aeschylus’ Agamemnon. Weimann compares the two following passages (pp. 242-43). The first is from a play in the Dodsley collection:

Lust. My lady is amorous, and full of favour.
Inclination. (aside) I may say to you she hath an ill-favoured savour.
Lust. What sayest thou?
Inclination. I say she is loving and of gentle behaviour.

The second is from Richard III:

Gloucester. (Aside) So wise so young, they say, do never live long.
Prince. What say you, uncle?
Gloucester. I say, without characters, fame lives long.
(Aside) Thus, like the formal vice, Iniquity,
I moralize two meanings in one word.

(III. 1. 79-83)

It is possible to add to Weimann a scene from A. F. Grazzini’s comedy La Strega, from about 1550. The hero Taddeo, a modern version of the miles gloriosus, has entered in a home-made uniform. His helmet in particular is slyly mocked by his valet Farfancichio:
Taddeo: You're a rascal. Why do you say the plume of a jennet? Perhaps I ought to be a horse?

Far.: (aside) All you need to do is to eat straw [la paglia].

Taddeo: What are you saying?

Far.: I say that you are truly a man of battle [da battaglia].

This technique may be traced back to a scene in Aristophanes' Frogs (645 ff.), where Dionysus and Xanthias are both being flogged. The one who feels no pain will be the real god. Naturally, in the comedy, both characters react with shouts and protests to the blows they receive but, anxious not to betray their identities, they keep interpreting their cries as quite the opposite of what they appear to be. This illustrates the profound comic level from which this kind of word-play comes.

The Door in Macbeth and Tolstoy's War and Peace

One of the most obvious links which connects comedy and tragedy in Shakespeare is the porter-scene from Macbeth (Act II, scene 3). Ancient comedy in particular normally took place in the street, before a couple of house doors. But ancient tragedy made use of an odd device called the ekkyklema, whereby a revolving platform could show to the audience what had just been going on inside the house, as when Clytemnestra appears at the end of the Agamemnon with the dead bodies of her husband and his mistress, Cassandra. This phenomenon of showing and concealing, a feature of the most primitive art forms, most familiar perhaps from the continual popping up and disappearing of the puppets in a Punch and Judy show, has been investigated by O. M. Freudenberg.

The banging at the door therefore by Macduff and Lennox in Macbeth, and the accompanying protestations of the porter, are both comic, finding a parallel in the play of Aristophanes just mentioned, when Dionysus and Xanthias arrive at the door of Heracles and then at that of Hades, and tragic, since what enters through those doors is Death. Tolstoy makes powerful use of the age-old image:

He dreamt that he was lying in the room he really was in, but that

28 Poetika Syuzheta i Zhanra (Leningrad 1936), passim.
29 Which is “comic” and “tragic” ultimately of course because it springs from an as yet undifferentiated consciousness. Here the original ambivalence is resolved in different ways because Aristophanes is concerned with the comic theme of resurrection, while Tolstoy is removing Prince Andrei from the warm and exciting world of the living. Shakespeare maintains the primitive ambiguity.
he was quite well and unwounded. Many various indifferent and insignificant people appeared before him. . . . Gradually, unnoticed, all these persons began to disappear and a single question, that of the closed door, superseded all else. He rose and went to the door to bolt and lock it. . . . He was seized by an agonizing fear. And that fear was the fear of death. It stood behind the closed door. . . .

After a fearful struggle by Prince Andrei to keep the door closed:

Once again it pushed from outside. His last superhuman efforts were vain and both halves of the door noiselessly opened. It entered, and it was death, and Prince Andrei died.30

In the play, Macduff says to the comic Porter:

Is thy master stirring?

And answers his own question:

Our knocking has awaked him; here he comes.

Macbeth then leads Macduff to another door, behind which lies the murdered corpse of Duncan. After a moment, Macduff enters with the news that the king is dead. His language is that of "breaking and entering":

Confusion now hath made his masterpiece!
Most sacrilegious murder hath broke ope
The Lord's anointed temple, and stole thence
The life o' the building!

Three doors have been entered, that of the castle, that of the bedchamber, that of the king's own wounded body. By this, private space has been made public. The climactic sequence is religiously evocative, and a Roman Catholic would say that it ends with the discovery that the Blessed Sacrament is missing from its Tabernacle.

Aristotle would have said that Shakespeare was μετασφουρικός, able to see similarity in difference. He would not have been surprised that Shakespeare should draw his images from the deepest wells of folk-memory, since Greek tragedy, notably in Aeschylus, but also in the archaizing Euripides, had done the same.

The Leap into Another Dimension

Aristotle, we noted, was oriented towards biology, and it is from a biological work of his that we may derive another principle which

elucidates both the classical poetic and Shakespeare. In the *De Generatione Animalium* (768 a 27-28) Aristotle speaks of ἐκστασις εἰς ταύτικέμενα, "organic change into opposites," which he sees as a universal rule of life. The reader will recall the many changes (μεταβολαι) which he says tragedy had to undergo before it attained its own nature (*Poetics* 1449 a 14), and this in the passage where he has been speaking of tragedy's popular origins. Significantly, Weimann comes\(^1\) to the same conclusion about Shakespeare. Starting from an analysis of Shakespeare's characteristic use of anachronism, which forces the spectator to live in two contradictory worlds at once, as when the Porter in Macbeth's castle in Inverness is simultaneously abreast both of the Gunpowder Plot of 1605 and the bumper harvest of 1606, he generalizes this observation into a principle governing the poet's entire method of composition. So character is set against character, and each against tendencies within him or herself: reality and appearance contrast, truth and falsehood. Already Thomas Dekker had demanded now tears and now smiles from his spectators. It is an old principle, inherited from sources as diverse as the Morality play and even the agonistic style of forensic oratory with its arguments pro and con, going right back to the Greek Sophistic movement (Antipho). The *agon* is already found in Aeschylus' *Eumenides*. It recurs in the debates of which Euripides is so fond, and of course forms a notable part of the Greek comic tradition, for example in Epicharmus' *Land and Sea* and *Male and Female Logic*, as well as in Aristophanes' *Clouds* and *Frogs*. At another level, Corinna wrote a poem about two contending mountains.\(^2\)

But this polar technique is also inherited from the most classical period of Greek art, as we are informed by the Elder Pliny. In his famous chapters on the history of Greek painting and sculpture, Pliny describes a portrait by Parrhasius\(^3\) of the Athenian *demos*, "fickle, passionate, unjust, changeable, yet exorable, compassionate and pitiful, boastful, proud and humble, bold and cowardly, in a word, everything at once." Need we look further than Euripides' Medea to find a feminine and tragic counterpart to this painting? Contrast is indeed a basic feature of what has been called the "pathetic" or emotional style. Who does not remember from the *Iliad* (VI. 399 ff.) the parting of Hector and Andromache, where the counterpoint of


\(^2\) Page, PMG 654.

life and death, war and peace, feminine and masculine, adult and baby, evokes from Andromache "laughter and tears" (v. 484), exactly what Dekker wanted from his audience?

These contrasts are also Aristotelian, since what else are pity and terror, the prime effects of tragedy according to the famous definition given by the Poetics (1449 b 27), except contradictory emotions? Pity makes us feel for the other, and terror for ourselves. They are not of course exploited by the tragic writer for their own sake, since it is from their ultimate fusion that a larger comprehension and growth emerges. In its oldest form, this fusion may be triggered by the unexpected intrusion of the deus ex machina, here akin both to Punch and to Christ in the Upper Room in Jerusalem, as the Disciples were debating the story of his Resurrection. It is this which resolves the conflict in so many tragedies of Euripides (it is another proof of his archaizing tendency), the sudden lifting of the actors' conflicts into a new dimension of religious and prophetic explanation. Shakespeare normally ends with some sort of resolution, as when Fortinbras arrives from a more normal world at the end of Hamlet. Life goes on, a line is drawn under the past, provision is made for the future. But even in a smaller way this principle may be seen at work in individual touches in the plays.

Timanthes' Sacrifice of Iphigenia

Here, another analogy may be drawn with classical Greek painting. One of the most famous masterpieces of the late fifth or early fourth century was the Sacrifice of Iphigenia by Timanthes. The daughter of Agamemnon was shown before the altar at which she was to be sacrificed to placate the anger of Artemis. Among the onlookers was Calchas, the priest, perhaps reflecting that this was the will of the gods, and not therefore concerned in a direct and personal way. Ulysses was there, himself a reluctant warrior, more humanly involved. Menelaus watched. Was this not his niece, and was he not showing himself willing to sacrifice innocence for the sake of recovering an adulterous wife? There was evidently a crescendo of emotion, ranging from the regretfulness of the priest to the mixed emotions of the uncle. Last of all among the bystanders was Agamemnon, Iphigenia's own father, commander-in-chief of the assembled Greek forces. With what agony could he give the nod for the butchery to commence? How could the painter adequately crown his rising scale of involvement and sympathy? Timanthes solved his problem by a masterstroke, which made his painting celebrated throughout antiquity. His Aga-

54 Pliny, Nat. Hist. XXXV. 73: Cicero, Orator 22. 74.
memnon had turned away, and muffled his face in grief. Every spectator could supply the missing features to his own specification, and every spectator was therefore satisfied.

_Et tu, Brute_

This leap into a new dimension, which suddenly releases a tension constructed by the artist, explains why in Shakespeare's _Julius Caesar_, for example, at the moment of his death, Caesar speaks in Latin: _et tu, Brute_. One of the lessons of the play is that history is larger than people. At the human level, Brutus can kill the individual Caesar. But at the level of destiny, "Caesar" as a symbol of an inevitable evolution in the government of Rome cannot be killed, which is what Brutus finds out when the ghost of Caesar promises to meet him at Philippi. The last words of the play are to be spoken by another Caesar, Octavian. When Caesar the politician dies therefore, Caesar the historical symbol of Rome as it had been known for centuries takes over, and Shakespeare indicates this by making his character leap into Latin. Suddenly, even in the moment of his triumph, we are aware of the hopelessness of Brutus' cause. Timanthes would have saluted the brilliant simplicity of the artistic means which secured this end.  

_The Fool's Triumph: Antony and Cleopatra_

Something similar may be observed in _Antony and Cleopatra_. At the opening of the play, Philo notes with contempt that Antony has become a clown, enslaved to a gipsy: "The triple pillar of the world transform'd / Into a strumpet's fool." Antony for his part, as he makes his first appearance, is only too willing to accept this diagnosis of his condition. "Let Rome in Tiber melt, and the wide arch / of the ranged empire fall." After the defeat, this is the state of affairs which Cleopatra most dreads:

_Saucy lictors_  
Will catch at us like _strumpets_ and scald rimers  
Ballad us out of tune: the quick comedians  
Extemporally will stage us, and present  
Our Alexandrian revels; Antony  
Shall be brought drunken forth, and I shall see  
Some squeaking Cleopatra boy my greatness

---

35 The analysis is developed by Eisenstein, _op. cit._, III, p. 63. It is a good illustration of what may be called "vertical time," time which is superimposed on the present rather than awaited in a linear development.
Her way out is to commit suicide (i.e. to test the verdict of time, which in the earlier play seemed to have decided in favor of Julius Caesar). Shakespeare makes her receive the asp which is to poison her from "a clown," who engages with the queen in the most ancient of comic banter about death and womankind before he sets down his basket. Cleopatra now dresses in her royal finery for the last time. Her pathetic pretence suddenly acquires nobility, for now she is assuming her role with full awareness of what its mythologem entails.

It is Caesar, puritanically hostile to the comedy inherent in imperial pretensions, who is now to be fooled, metamorphosed into the typically carnival animal of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*:

.. poor venomous fool
Be angry and despatch. O couldst thou speak,
That I might hear thee call great Caesar ass
Unpolicied!

And the comment of the guard who discovers the death is: "Caesar's beguil'd."

Shakespeare has used the imagery of the topsy-turvy world of the fool and the clown to throw doubt upon the solemn realities of coolly calculated power. The entry of the clown with the basket of figs and the serpent — both potent and popular symbols of sexuality and death — suddenly shows Cleopatra how to outfool Octavius Caesar after all. Weimann\(^\text{37}\) had already pointed out the verbal reminiscence:

.. for his biting is *immortal*; those that do die of it do seldom or never recover.

Give me my robe, put on my crown; I have
*Immortal* longings in me.

The great speech picks up the clown's word. The clown's remarks in fact are the only piece of prose we have in the whole fifth act of the play, and the only prose since act III, when Eros told Enobarbus that, with the arrest of Lepidus, conflict between Caesar and Antony was now inevitable. This is the leap into a new dimension, aided by the use of the common dialect, which Aristotle's *Rhetoric* detected in Euripides, and which Shakespeare shares therefore with classical technique. A mediocre imagination might have sought to let Cleopatra die with dignity by muting or repudiating her chequered past. Shakespeare gives her clowning fresh status, a mythical aura of heroic


martyrdom and exaltation which exploits to the full all the tragic-comedy of what it means to be a queen.

T. S. Eliot has pointed out that every work of genius modifies the tradition to which it is added. There has been a failure on the part of classical scholarship to see the truth of this argument. An orthodoxy has filled the histories of Latin and Greek literature which passes for received and obvious, when in reality it is based on all sorts of uncritically made assumptions about what literature is or should be. The height of absurdity has been reached when, on the basis of this unscientific and unexamined orthodoxy, approval has been denied to authors whose classical credentials were in fact impeccable. An amusing corollary of this has been demonstrated in recent years. As archaeology throws up texts such as those of Menander's Dyscolus or the new fragment of the elegies of Virgil's friend, Gallus, the accepted attitude has become a sneer or a yawn. Menander's reputation has allegedly suffered by the rediscovery of his play; Gallus turns out to have been no great loss. The explanation is that the existing canon of classics has been accepted as great only by force of tradition. When something comes along which demands a re-assessment of the tradition, it is met, because we misunderstand that tradition, with incomprehension and rejection. But of course if Ovid had been lost and just now discovered, he too would be an author whose brilliant reputation was belied by his emerging achievements.

The remedy for this situation is dialogue. Shakespeare read the classics he knew with the heart, mind and intuition of transcendent genius. In this sense the poets are the best interpreters of their predecessors, something which Alexandria, with its ideal of the scholar / poet, knew well enough. And the poets who implicitly in their works make these interpretations continue an unbroken tradition, which is still worthy of being called "classical." Shakespeare is not a carbon-copy of any Greco-Roman author, any more than any Greco-Roman author is a carbon-copy of another. But as the master of dramatic form, of contrast, metaphor, of the serio-comic, of the resources of plain language, he could have found an appreciative audience in antiquity.

When Aristotle walked with his pupil Alexander in the royal palace at Pella, the mold of European history was being set in their conversations for the next thousand and more than thousand years, for

---

Scipio, for Caesar, for Constantine, for Charlemagne, for the Christian Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas, and his pupil, Dante. This is ultimately what the classical tradition is about, and from this company, from that royal palace, shall we exclude Shakespeare?

*University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*