Renaissance Literature: Critical Texts

1. Northrop Frye
2. Gilchrist Hall
3. Matus-Kassai
4. Klibansky, Raymond, Erwin Panofsky, and Fritz Saxl
5. Ryan
6. Fabiny
7. Matuska

Compiled by Sam Gilchrist Hall

THE MYTHOS OF SPRING: COMEDY

Dramatic comedy, from which fictional comedy is mainly descended, has been remarkably tenacious of its structural principles and character types. Bernard Shaw remarked that a comic dramatist could get a reputation for daring originality by stealing his method from Molière and his characters from Dickens: if we were to read Menander and Aristophanes for Molière and Dickens the statement would be hardly less true, at least as a general principle. The earliest extant European comedy, Aristophanes' *The Acharnians*, contains the *miles gloriosus* or military braggart who is still going strong in Chaplin's *Great Dictator*; the Joxer Daly of O'Casey's *Juno and the Paycock* has the same character and dramatic function as the parasites of twenty-five hundred years ago, and the audiences of vaudeville, comic strips, and television programs still laugh at the jokes that were declared to be outworn at the opening of *The Frogs*.

The plot structure of Greek New Comedy, as transmitted by Plautus and Terence, in itself less a form than a formula, has become the basis for most comedy, especially in its more highly conventionalized dramatic form, down to our own day. It will be most convenient to work out the theory of comic construction from drama, using illustrations from fiction only incidentally. What normally happens is that a young man wants a young woman, that his desire is resisted by some opposition, usually paternal, and that near the end of the play some twist in the plot enables the hero to have his will. In this simple pattern there are several complex elements. In the first place, the movement of comedy is usually a movement from one kind of society to another. At the beginning of the play the obstructing characters are in charge of the play's society, and the audience recognizes that they are usurpers. At the end of the play the device in the plot that brings hero and heroine together causes a new society to crystallize around the hero, and the moment when this crystallization occurs is the point of resolution in the action, the comic discovery, *anagnorisis* or *cognitio*.

The appearance of this new society is frequently signalized by some kind of party or festive ritual, which either appears at the end of the play or is assumed to take place immediately afterward. Weddings are most common, and sometimes so many of them occur, as in the quadruple wedding at the end of *As You Like It*, that they

suggest also the wholesale pairing off that takes place in a dance, which is another common conclusion, and the normal one for the masque. The banquet at the end of *The Taming of the Shrew* has an ancestry that goes back to Greek Middle Comedy; in Plautus the audience is sometimes jocosely invited to an imaginary banquet afterwards; Old Comedy, like the modern Christmas pantomime, was more generous, and occasionally threw bits of food to the audience. As the final society reached by comedy is the one that the audience has recognized all along to be the proper and desirable state of affairs, an act of communion with the audience is in order. Tragic actors expect to be applauded as well as comic ones, but nevertheless the word "plaudite" at the end of a Roman comedy, the invitation to the audience to form part of the comic society, would seem rather out of place at the end of a tragedy. The resolution of comedy comes, so to speak, from the audience's side of the stage; in a tragedy it comes from some mysterious world on the opposite side. In the movie, where darkness permits a more erotically oriented audience, the plot usually moves toward an act which, like death in Greek tragedy, takes place offstage, and is symbolized by a closing embrace.

The obstacles to the hero's desire, then, form the action of the comedy, and the overcoming of them the comic resolution. The obstacles are usually parental, hence comedy often turns on a clash between a son's and a father's will. Thus the comic dramatist as a rule writes for the younger men in his audience, and the older members of almost any society are apt to feel that comedy has something subversive about it. This is certainly one element in the social persecution of drama, which is not peculiar to Puritans or even Christians, as Terence in pagan Rome met much the same kind of social opposition that Ben Jonson did. There is one scene in Plautus where a son and father are making love to the same courtesan, and the son asks his father pointedly if he really does love mother. One has to see this scene against the background of Roman family life to understand its importance as psychological release. Even in Shakespeare there are startling outbreaks of baiting older men, and in contemporary movies the triumph of youth is so relentless that the moviemakers find some difficulty in getting anyone over the age of seventeen into their audiences.

The opponent to the hero's wishes, when not the father, is generally someone who partakes of the father's closer relation to es-

tablished society: that is, a rival with less youth and more money. In Plautus and Terence he is usually either the pimp who owns the girl, or a wandering soldier with a supply of ready cash. The fury with which these characters are baited and exploded from the stage shows that they are father-surrogates, and even if they were not, they would still be usurpers, and their claim to possess the girl must be shown up as somehow fraudulent. They are, in short, impostors, and the extent to which they have real power implies some criticism of the society that allows them their power. In Plautus and Terence this criticism seldom goes beyond the immorality of brothels and professional harlots, but in Renaissance dramatists, including Jonson, there is some sharp observation of the rising power of money and the sort of ruling class it is building up.

The tendency of comedy is to include as many people as possible in its final society: the blocking characters are more often reconciled or converted than simply repudiated. Comedy often includes a scapegoat ritual of expulsion which gets rid of some irreconcilable character, but exposure and disgrace make for pathos, or even tragedy. *The Merchant of Venice* seems almost an experiment in coming as close as possible to upsetting the comic balance. If the dramatic role of Shylock is ever so slightly exaggerated, as it generally is when the leading actor of the company takes the part, it is upset, and the play becomes the tragedy of the Jew of Venice with a comic epilogue. *Volpone* ends with a great bustle of sentences to penal servitude and the galleys, and one feels that the deliverance of society hardly needs so much hard labor; but then *Volpone* is exceptional in being a kind of comic imitation of a tragedy, with the point of Volpone's hybris carefully marked.

The principle of conversion becomes clearer with characters whose chief function is the amusing of the audience. The original *miles gloriosus* in Plautus is a son of Jove and Venus who has killed an elephant with his fist and seven thousand men in one day's fighting. In other words, he is trying to put on a good show: the exuberance of his boasting helps to put the play over. The convention says that the braggart must be exposed, ridiculed, swindled, and beaten. But why should a professional dramatist, of all people, want so to harry a character who is putting on a good show—*his* show at that? When we find Falstaff invited to the final feast in *The Merry Wives*, Caliban reprieved, attempts made to mollify Malvolio, and Angelo and Parolles allowed to live down their dis-

grace, we are seeing a fundamental principle of comedy at work. The tendency of the comic society to include rather than exclude is the reason for the traditional importance of the parasite, who has no business to be at the final festival but is nevertheless there. The word "grace," with all its Renaissance overtones from the graceful courtier of Castiglione to the gracious God of Christianity, is a most important thematic word in Shakespearean comedy.

The action of comedy in moving from one social center to another is not unlike the action of a lawsuit, in which plaintiff and defendant construct different versions of the same situation, one finally being judged as real and the other as illusory. This resemblance of the rhetoric of comedy to the rhetoric of jurisprudence has been recognized from earliest times. A little pamphlet called the *Tractatus Coislinianus*, closely related to Aristotle's *Poetics*, which sets down all the essential facts about comedy in about a page and a half, divides the *dianoia* of comedy into two parts, opinion (*pistis*) and proof (*gnosis*). These correspond roughly to the usurping and the desirable societies respectively. Proofs (i.e., the means of bringing about the happier society) are subdivided into oaths, compacts, witnesses, ordeals (or tortures), and laws—in other words the five forms of material proof in law cases listed in the *Rhetoric*. We notice how often the action of a Shakespearean comedy begins with some absurd, cruel, or irrational law: the law of killing Syracusans in the *Comedy of Errors*, the law of compulsory marriage in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, the law that confirms Shylock's bond, the attempts of Angelo to legislate people into righteousness, and the like, which the action of the comedy then evades or breaks. Compacts are as a rule the conspiracies formed by the hero's society; witnesses, such as overhearers of conversations or people with special knowledge (like the hero's old nurse with her retentive memory for birthmarks), are the commonest devices for bringing about the comic discovery. Ordeals (*basanoi*) are usually tests or touchstones of the hero's character: the Greek word also means touchstones, and seems to be echoed in Shakespeare's Bassanio whose ordeal it is to make a judgement on the worth of metals.

There are two ways of developing the form of comedy: one is to throw the main emphasis on the blocking characters; the other is to throw it forward on the scenes of discovery and reconciliation. One is the general tendency of comic irony, satire, realism, and

studies of manners; the other is the tendency of Shakespearean and other types of romantic comedy. In the comedy of manners the main ethical interest falls as a rule on the blocking characters. The technical hero and heroine are not often very interesting people: the *adulescentes* of Plautus and Terence are all alike, as hard to tell apart in the dark as Demetrius and Lysander, who may be parodies of them. Generally the hero's character has the neutrality that enables him to represent a wish-fulfilment. It is very different with the miserly or ferocious parent, the boastful or foppish rival, or the other characters who stand in the way of the action. In Molière we have a simple but fully tested formula in which the ethical interest is focussed on a single blocking character, a heavy father, a miser, a misanthrope, a hypocrite, or a hypochondriac. These are the figures that we remember, and the plays are usually named after them, but we can seldom remember all the Valentins and Angeliques who wriggle out of their clutches. In *The Merry Wives* the technical hero, a man named Fenton, has only a bit part, and this play has picked up a hint or two from Plautus's *Casina*, where the hero and heroine are not even brought on the stage at all. Fictional comedy, especially Dickens, often follows the same practice of grouping its interesting characters around a somewhat dullish pair of technical leads. Even Tom Jones, though far more fully realized, is still deliberately associated, as his commonplace name indicates, with the conventional and typical.

Comedy usually moves toward a happy ending, and the normal response of the audience to a happy ending is "this should be," which sounds like a moral judgement. So it is, except that it is not moral in the restricted sense, but social. Its opposite is not the villainous but the absurd, and comedy finds the virtues of Malvolio as absurd as the vices of Angelo. Molière's misanthrope, being committed to sincerity, which is a virtue, is morally in a strong position, but the audience soon realizes that his friend Philinte, who is ready to lie quite cheerfully in order to enable other people to preserve their self-respect, is the more genuinely sincere of the two. It is of course quite possible to have a moral comedy, but the result is often the kind of melodrama that we have described as comedy without humor, and which achieves its happy ending with a self-righteous tone that most comedy avoids. It is hardly possible to imagine a drama without conflict, and it is hardly possible to imagine a conflict without some kind of enmity. But just as love,

including sexual love, is a very different thing from lust, so enmity is a very different thing from hatred. In tragedy, of course, enmity almost always includes hatred; comedy is different, and one feels that the social judgement against the absurd is closer to the comic norm than the moral judgement against the wicked.

The question then arises of what makes the blocking character absurd. Ben Jonson explained this by his theory of the "humor," the character dominated by what Pope calls a ruling passion. The humor's dramatic function is to express a state of what might be called ritual bondage. He is obsessed by his humor, and his function in the play is primarily to repeat his obsession. A sick man is not a humor, but a hypochondriac is, because, *qua* hypochondriac, he can never admit to good health, and can never do anything inconsistent with the role that he has prescribed for himself. A miser can do and say nothing that is not connected with the hiding of gold or saving of money. In *The Silent Woman*, Jonson's nearest approach to Molière's type of construction, the whole action recedes from the humor of Morose, whose determination to eliminate noise from his life produces so loquacious a comic action.

The principle of the humor is the principle that unincremental repetition, the literary imitation of ritual bondage, is funny. In a tragedy—*Oedipus Tyrannus* is the stock example—repetition leads logically to catastrophe. Repetition overdone or not going anywhere belongs to comedy, for laughter is partly a reflex, and like other reflexes it can be conditioned by a simple repeated pattern. In Synge's *Riders to the Sea* a mother, after losing her husband and five sons at sea, finally loses her last son, and the result is a very beautiful and moving play. But if it had been a full-length tragedy plodding glumly through the seven drownings one after another, the audience would have been helpless with unsympathetic laughter long before it was over. The principle of repetition as the basis of humor both in Jonson's sense and in ours is well known to the creators of comic strips, in which a character is established as a parasite, a glutton (often confined to one dish), or a shrew, and who begins to be funny after the point has been made every day for several months. Continuous comic radio programs, too, are much more amusing to habitués than to neophytes. The girth of Falstaff and the hallucinations of Quixote are based on much the same comic laws. Mr. E. M. Forster speaks with disdain of Dickens's Mrs. Micawber, who never says anything except that she will never de-

sert Mr. Micawber: a strong contrast is marked here between the refined writer too finicky for popular formulas, and the major one who exploits them ruthlessly.

The humor in comedy is usually someone with a good deal of social prestige and power, who is able to force much of the play's society into line with his obsession. Thus the humor is intimately connected with the theme of the absurd or irrational law that the action of comedy moves toward breaking. It is significant that the central character of our earliest humor comedy, *The Wasps*, is obsessed by law cases: Shylock, too, unites a craving for the law with the humor of revenge. Often the absurd law appears as a whim of a bemused tyrant whose will is law, like Leontes or the humorous Duke Frederick in Shakespeare, who makes some arbitrary decision or rash promise: here law is replaced by "oath," also mentioned in the *Tractatus*. Or it may take the form of a sham Utopia, a society of ritual bondage constructed by an act of humorous or pedantic will, like the academic retreat in *Love's Labor's Lost*. This theme is also as old as Aristophanes, whose parodies of Platonic social schemes in *The Birds* and *Ecclesiazusae* deal with it.

The society emerging at the conclusion of comedy represents, by contrast, a kind of moral norm, or pragmatically free society. Its ideals are seldom defined or formulated: definition and formulation belong to the humors, who want predictable activity. We are simply given to understand that the newly-married couple will live happily ever after, or that at any rate they will get along in a relatively unhumorous and clear-sighted manner. That is one reason why the character of the successful hero is so often left undeveloped: his real life begins at the end of the play, and we have to believe him to be potentially a more interesting character than he appears to be. In Terence's *Adelphoi*, Demea, a harsh father, is contrasted with his brother Micio, who is indulgent. Micio being more liberal, he leads the way to the comic resolution, and converts Demea, but then Demea points out the indolence inspiring a good deal of Micio's liberality, and releases him from a complementary humorous bondage.

Thus the movement from *pistis* to *gnosis*, from a society controlled by habit, ritual bondage, arbitrary law and the older characters to a society controlled by youth and pragmatic freedom is fundamentally, as the Greek words suggest, a movement from illusion to reality. Illusion is whatever is fixed or definable, and reality

is best understood as its negation: whatever reality is, it's not *that.* Hence the importance of the theme of creating and dispelling illusion in comedy: the illusions caused by disguise, obsession, hypocrisy, or unknown parentage.

The comic ending is generally manipulated by a twist in the plot. In Roman comedy the heroine, who is usually a slave or courtesan, turns out to be the daughter of somebody respectable, so that the hero can marry her without loss of face. The *cognitio* in comedy, in which the characters find out who their relatives are, and who is left of the opposite sex not a relative, and hence available for marriage, is one of the features of comedy that have never changed much: *The Confidential Clerk* indicates that it still holds the attention of dramatists. There is a brilliant parody of a *cognitio* at the end of *Major Barbara* (the fact that the hero of this play is a professor of Greek perhaps indicates an unusual affinity to the conventions of Euripides and Menander), where Undershaft is enabled to break the rule that he cannot appoint his son-in-law as successor by the fact that the son-in-law's own father married his deceased wife's sister in Australia, so that the son-in-law is his own first cousin as well as himself. It sounds complicated, but the plots of comedy often are complicated because there is something inherently absurd about complications. As the main character interest in comedy is so often focussed on the defeated characters, comedy regularly illustrates a victory of arbitrary plot over consistency of character. Thus, in striking contrast to tragedy, there can hardly be such a thing as inevitable comedy, as far as the action of the individual play is concerned. That is, we may know that the convention of comedy will make some kind of happy ending inevitable, but still for each play the dramatist must produce a distinctive "gimmick" or "weenie," to use two disrespectful Hollywood synonyms for *anagnorisis.* Happy endings do not impress us as true, but as desirable, and they are brought about by manipulation. The watcher of death and tragedy has nothing to do but sit and wait for the inevitable end; but something gets born at the end of comedy, and the watcher of birth is a member of a busy society.

The manipulation of plot does not always involve metamorphosis of character, but there is no violation of comic decorum when it does. Unlikely conversions, miraculous transformations, and providential assistance are inseparable from comedy. Further, whatever emerges is supposed to be there for good: if the cur-

mudgeon becomes lovable, we understand that he will not immediately relapse again into his ritual habit. Civilizations which stress the desirable rather than the real, and the religious as opposed to the scientific perspective, think of drama almost entirely in terms of comedy. In the classical drama of India, we are told, the tragic ending was regarded as bad taste, much as the manipulated endings of comedy are regarded as bad taste by novelists interested in ironic realism.

The total *mythos* of comedy, only a small part of which is ordinarily presented, has regularly what in music is called a ternary form: the hero's society rebels against the society of the *senex* and triumphs, but the hero's society is a Saturnalia, a reversal of social standards which recalls a golden age in the past before the main action of the play begins. Thus we have a stable and harmonious order disrupted by folly, obsession, forgetfulness, "pride and prejudice," or events not understood by the characters themselves, and then restored. Often there is a benevolent grandfather, so to speak, who overrules the action set up by the blocking humor and so links the first and third parts. An example is Mr. Burchell, the disguised uncle of the wicked squire, in *The Vicar of Wakefield.* A very long play, such as the Indian *Sakuntala*, may present all three phases; a very intricate one, such as many of Menander's evidently were, may indicate their outlines. But of course very often the first phase is not given at all: the audience simply understands an ideal state of affairs which it knows to be better than what is revealed in the play, and which it recognizes as like that to which the action leads. This ternary action is, ritually, like a contest of summer and winter in which winter occupies the middle action; psychologically, it is like the removal of a neurosis or blocking point and the restoring of an unbroken current of energy and memory. The Jonsonian masque, with the antimasque in the middle, gives a highly conventionalized or "abstract" version of it.

We pass now to the typical characters of comedy. In drama, characterization depends on function; what a character is follows from what he has to do in the play. Dramatic function in its turn depends on the structure of the play; the character has certain things to do because the play has such and such a shape. The structure of the play in its turn depends on the category of the play; if it is a comedy, its structure will require a comic resolution and a

prevailing comic mood. Hence when we speak of typical characters, we are not trying to reduce lifelike characters to stock types, though we certainly are suggesting that the sentimental notion of an antithesis between the lifelike character and the stock type is a vulgar error. All lifelike characters, whether in drama or fiction, owe their consistency to the appropriateness of the stock type which belongs to their dramatic function. That stock type is not the character but it is as necessary to the character as a skeleton is to the actor who plays it.

With regard to the characterization of comedy, the *Tractatus* lists three types of comic characters: the *alazons* or impostors, the *eirons* or self-deprecators, and the buffoons (*bomolochoi*). This list is closely related to a passage in the *Ethics* which contrasts the first two, and then goes on to contrast the buffoon with a character whom Aristotle calls *agroikos* or churlish, literally rustic. We may reasonably accept the churl as a fourth character type, and so we have two opposed pairs. The contest of *eiron* and *alazon* forms the basis of the comic action, and the buffoon and the churl polarize the comic mood.

We have previously dealt with the terms *eiron* and *alazon*. The humorous blocking characters of comedy are nearly always impostors, though it is more frequently a lack of self-knowledge than simple hypocrisy that characterizes them. The multitudes of comic scenes in which one character complacently soliloquizes while another makes sarcastic asides to the audience show the contest of *eiron* and *alazon* in its purest form, and show too that the audience is sympathetic to the *eiron* side. Central to the *alazon* group is the *senex iratus* or heavy father, who with his rages and threats, his obsessions and his gullibility, seems closely related to some of the demonic characters of romance, such as Polyphemus. Occasionally a character may have the dramatic function of such a figure without his characteristics: an example is Squire Allworthy in *Tom Jones*, who as far as the plot is concerned behaves almost as stupidly as Squire Western. Of heavy-father surrogates, the *miles gloriosus* has been mentioned: his popularity is largely due to the fact that he is a man of words rather than deeds, and is consequently far more useful to a practising dramatist than any tight-lipped hero could ever be. The pedant, in Renaissance comedy often a student of the occult sciences, the fop or coxcomb, and similar humors, require no comment. The female *alazon* is rare: Katharina the

shrew represents to some extent a female *miles gloriosus*, and the *précieuse ridicule* a female pedant, but the "menace" or siren who gets in the way of the true heroine is more often found as a sinister figure of melodrama or romance than as a ridiculous figure in comedy.

The *eiron* figures need a little more attention. Central to this group is the hero, who is an *eiron* figure because, as explained, the dramatist tends to play him down and make him rather neutral and unformed in character. Next in importance is the heroine, also often played down: in Old Comedy, when a girl accompanies a male hero in his triumph, she is generally a stage prop, a *muta persona* not previously introduced. A more difficult form of *cognitio* is achieved when the heroine disguises herself or through some other device brings about the comic resolution, so that the person whom the hero is seeking turns out to be the person who has sought him. The fondness of Shakespeare for this "she stoops to conquer" theme needs only to be mentioned here, as it belongs more naturally to the *mythos* of romance.

Another central *eiron* figure is the type entrusted with hatching the schemes which bring about the hero's victory. This character in Roman comedy is almost always a tricky slave (*dolosus servus*), and in Renaissance comedy he becomes the scheming valet who is so frequent in Continental plays, and in Spanish drama is called the *gracioso*. Modern audiences are most familiar with him in Figaro and in the Leporello of *Don Giovanni*. Through such intermediate nineteenth-century figures as Micawber and the Touchwood of Scott's *St. Ronan's Well*, who, like the gracioso, have buffoon affiliations, he evolves into the amateur detective of modern fiction. The Jeeves of P. G. Wodehouse is a more direct descendant. Female confidantes of the same general family are often brought in to oil the machinery of the well-made play. Elizabethan comedy had another type of trickster, represented by the Matthew Merrygreek of *Ralph Roister Doister*, who is generally said to be developed from the vice or iniquity of the morality plays: as usual, the analogy is sound enough, whatever historians decide about origins. The vice, to give him that name, is very useful to a comic dramatist because he acts from pure love of mischief, and can set a comic action going with the minimum of motivation. The vice may be as light-hearted as Puck or as malignant as Don John in *Much Ado*, but as a rule the vice's activity is, in spite of his name, benevolent.

One of the tricky slaves in Plautus, in a soliloquy, boasts that he is the *architectus* of the comic action: such a character carries out the will of the author to reach a happy ending. He is in fact the spirit of comedy, and the two clearest examples of the type in Shakespeare, Puck and Ariel, are both spiritual beings. The tricky slave often has his own freedom in mind as the reward of his exertions: Ariel's longing for release is in the same tradition.

The role of the vice includes a great deal of disguising, and the type may often be recognized by disguise. A good example is the Brainworm of Jonson's *Every Man in His Humour*, who calls the action of the play the day of his metamorphoses. Similarly Ariel has to surmount the difficult stage direction of "Enter invisible." The vice is combined with the hero whenever the latter is a cheeky, improvident young man who hatches his own schemes and cheats his rich father or uncle into giving him his patrimony along with the girl.

Another *eiron* type has not been much noticed. This is a character, generally an older man, who begins the action of the play by withdrawing from it, and ends the play by returning. He is often a father with the motive of seeing what his son will do. The action of *Every Man in His Humour* is set going in this way by Knowell Senior. The disappearance and return of Lovewit, the owner of the house which is the scene of *The Alchemist*, has the same dramatic function, though the characterization is different. The clearest Shakespearean example is the Duke in *Measure for Measure*, but Shakespeare is more addicted to the type than might appear at first glance. In Shakespeare the vice is rarely the real *architectus*: Puck and Ariel both act under orders from an older man, if one may call Oberon a man for the moment. In *The Tempest* Shakespeare returns to a comic action established by Aristophanes, in which an older man, instead of retiring from the action, builds it up on the stage. When the heroine takes the vice role in Shakespeare, she is often significantly related to her father, even when the father is not in the play at all, like the father of Helena, who gives her his medical knowledge, or the father of Portia, who arranges the scheme of the caskets. A more conventionally treated example of the same benevolent Prospero figure turned up recently in the psychiatrist of *The Cocktail Party*, and one may compare the mysterious alchemist who is the father of the heroine of *The Lady's Not for Burning*. The formula is not confined to comedy: Polonius, who shows

so many of the disadvantages of a literary education, attempts the role of a retreating paternal *eiron* three times, once too often. *Hamlet* and *King Lear* contain subplots which are ironic versions of stock comic themes, Gloucester's story being the regular comedy theme of the gullible *senex* swindled by a clever and unprincipled son.

We pass now to the buffoon types, those whose function it is to increase the mood of festivity rather than to contribute to the plot. Renaissance comedy, unlike Roman comedy, had a great variety of such characters, professional fools, clowns, pages, singers, and incidental characters with established comic habits like malapropism or foreign accents. The oldest buffoon of this incidental nature is the parasite, who may be given something to do, as Jonson gives Mosca the role of a vice in *Volpone*, but who, *qua* parasite, does nothing but entertain the audience by talking about his appetite. He derives chiefly from Greek Middle Comedy, which appears to have been very full of food, and where he was, not unnaturally, closely associated with another established buffoon type, the cook, a conventional figure who breaks into comedies to bustle and order about and make long speeches about the mysteries of cooking. In the role of cook the buffoon or entertainer appears, not simply as a gratuitous addition like the parasite, but as something more like a master of ceremonies, a center for the comic mood. There is no cook in Shakespeare, though there is a superb description of one in the *Comedy of Errors*, but a similar role is often attached to a jovial and loquacious host, like the "mad host" of *The Merry Wives* or the Simon Eyre of *The Shoemakers Holiday*. In Middleton's *A Trick to Catch the Old One* the mad host type is combined with the vice. In Falstaff and Sir Toby Belch we can see the affinities of the buffoon or entertainer type both with the parasite and with the master of revels. If we study this entertainer or host role carefully we shall soon realize that it is a development of what in Aristophanic comedy is represented by the chorus, and which in its turn goes back to the *komos* or revel from which comedy is said to be descended.

Finally, there is a fourth group to which we have assigned the word *agroikos*, and which usually means either churlish or rustic, depending on the context. This type may also be extended to cover the Elizabethan gull and what in vaudeville used to be called the straight man, the solemn or inarticulate character who allows the

humor to bounce off him, so to speak. We find churls in the miserly, snobbish, or priggish characters whose role is that of the refuser of festivity, the killjoy who tries to stop the fun, or, like Malvolio, locks up the food and drink instead of dispensing it. The melancholy Jaques of *As You Like It*, who walks out on the final festivities, is closely related. In the sulky and self-centered Bertram of *All's Well* there is a most unusual and ingenious combination of this type with the hero. More often, however, the churl belongs to the *alazon* group, all miserly old men in comedies, including Shylock, being churls. In *The Tempest* Caliban has much the same relation to the churlish type that Ariel has to the vice or tricky slave. But often, where the mood is more light-hearted, we may translate *agroikos* simply by rustic, as with the innumerable country squires and similar characters who provide amusement in the urban setting of drama. Such types do not refuse the mood of festivity, but they mark the extent of its range. In a pastoral comedy the idealized virtues of rural life may be represented by a simple man who speaks for the pastoral ideal, like Corin in *As You Like It*. Corin has the same *agroikos* role as the "rube" or "hayseed" of more citified comedies, but the moral attitude to the role is reversed. Again we notice the principle that dramatic structure is a permanent and moral attitude a variable factor in literature.

In a very ironic comedy a different type of character may play the role of the refuser of festivity. The more ironic the comedy, the more absurd the society, and an absurd society may be condemned by, or at least contrasted with, a character that we may call the plain dealer, an outspoken advocate of a kind of moral norm who has the sympathy of the audience. Wycherley's Manly, though he provides the name for the type, is not a particularly good example of it: a much better one is the Cléante of *Tartuffe*. Such a character is appropriate when the tone is ironic enough to get the audience confused about its sense of the social norm: he corresponds roughly to the chorus in a tragedy, which is there for a similar reason. When the tone deepens from the ironic to the bitter, the plain dealer may become a malcontent or railer, who may be morally superior to his society, as he is to some extent in Marston's play of that name, but who may also be too motivated by envy to be much more than another aspect of his society's evil, like Thersites, or to some extent Apemantus.

In tragedy, pity and fear, the emotions of moral attraction and repulsion, are raised and cast out. Comedy seems to make a more functional use of the social, even the moral judgement, than tragedy, yet comedy seems to raise the corresponding emotions, which are sympathy and ridicule, and cast them out in the same way. Comedy ranges from the most savage irony to the most dreamy wish-fulfilment romance, but its structural patterns and characterization are much the same throughout its range. This principle of the uniformity of comic structure through a variety of attitudes is clear in Aristophanes. Aristophanes is the most personal of writers, and his opinions on every subject are written all over his plays. We know that he wanted peace with Sparta and that he hated Cleon, so when his comedy depicts the attaining of peace and the defeat of Cleon we know that he approved and wanted his audience to approve. But in *Ecclesiazusae* a band of women in disguise railroad a communistic scheme through the Assembly which is a horrid parody of a Platonic republic, and proceed to inaugurate its sexual communism with some astonishing improvements. Presumably Aristophanes did not altogether endorse this, yet the comedy follows the same pattern and the same resolution. In *The Birds* the Peisthetairos who defies Zeus and blocks out Olympus with his Cloud-Cuckoo-Land is accorded the same triumph that is given to the Trygaios of the *Peace* who flies to heaven and brings a golden age back to Athens.

Let us look now at a variety of comic structures between the extremes of irony and romance. As comedy blends into irony and satire at one end and into romance at the other, if there are different phases or types of comic structure, some of them will be closely parallel to some of the types of irony and of romance. A somewhat forbidding piece of symmetry turns up in our argument at this point, which seems to have some literary analogy to the circle of fifths in music. I recognize six phases of each *mythos*, three being parallel to the phases of a neighboring *mythos*. The first three phases of comedy are parallel to the first three phases of irony and satire, and the second three to the second three of romance. The distinction between an ironic comedy and a comic satire, or between a romantic comedy and a comic romance, is tenuous, but not quite a distinction without a difference.

The first or most ironic phase of comedy is, naturally, the one in which a humorous society triumphs or remains undefeated. A good

example of a comedy of this type is *The Alchemist*, in which the returning *eiron* Lovewit joins the rascals, and the plain dealer Surly is made a fool of. In *The Beggar's Opera* there is a similar twist to the ending: the (projected) author feels that the hanging of the hero is a comic ending, but is informed by the manager that the audience's sense of comic decorum demands a reprieve, whatever Macheath's moral status. This phase of comedy presents what Renaissance critics called *speculum consuetudinis*, the way of the world, *cosi fan tutte*. A more intense irony is achieved when the humorous society simply disintegrates without anything taking its place, as in *Heartbreak House* and frequently in Chekhov.

We notice in ironic comedy that the demonic world is never far away. The rages of the *senex iratus* in Roman comedy are directed mainly at the tricky slave, who is threatened with the mill, with being flogged to death, with crucifixion, with having his head dipped in tar and set on fire, and the like, all penalties that could be and were exacted from slaves in life. An epilogue in Plautus informs us that the slave-actor who has blown up in his lines will now be flogged; in one of the Menander fragments a slave is tied up and burned with a torch on the stage. One sometimes gets the impression that the audience of Plautus and Terence would have guffawed uproariously all through the Passion. We may ascribe this to the brutality of a slave society, but then we remember that boiling oil and burying alive ("such a *stuffy* death") turn up in *The Mikado*. Two lively comedies of the modern stage are *The Cocktail Party* and *The Lady's Not for Burning*, but the cross appears in the background of the one and the stake in the background of the other. Shylock's knife and Angelo's gallows appear in Shakespeare: in *Measure for Measure* every male character is at one time or another threatened with death. The action of comedy moves toward a deliverance from something which, if absurd, is by no means invariably harmless. We notice too how frequently a comic dramatist tries to bring his action as close to a catastrophic overthrow of the hero as he can get it, and then reverses the action as quickly as possible. The evading or breaking of a cruel law is often a very narrow squeeze. The intervention of the king at the end of *Tartuffe* is deliberately arbitrary: there is nothing in the action of the play itself to prevent Tartuffe's triumph. Tom Jones in the final book, accused of murder, incest, debt, and double-dealing, cast off by friends, guardian, and sweetheart, is a woeful figure indeed before all these turn into illu-

sions. Any reader can think of many comedies in which the fear of death, sometimes a hideous death, hangs over the central character to the end, and is dispelled so quickly that one has almost the sense of awakening from nightmare.

Sometimes the redeeming agent actually is divine, like Diana in *Pericles*; in *Tartuffe* it is the king, who is conceived as a part of the audience and the incarnation of its will. An extraordinary number of comic stories, both in drama and fiction, seem to approach a potentially tragic crisis near the end, a feature that I may call the "point of ritual death"—a clumsy expression that I would gladly surrender for a better one. It is a feature not often noticed by critics, but when it is present it is as unmistakably present as a stretto in a fugue, which it somewhat resembles. In Smollett's *Humphry Clinker* (I select this because no one will suspect Smollett of deliberate mythopoeia but only of following convention, at least as far as his plot is concerned), the main characters are nearly drowned in an accident with an upset carriage; they are then taken to a nearby house to dry off, and a *cognitio* takes place, in the course of which their family relationships are regrouped, secrets of birth brought to light, and names changed. Similar points of ritual death may be marked in almost any story that imprisons the hero or gives the heroine a nearly mortal illness before an eventually happy ending.

Sometimes the point of ritual death is vestigial, not an element in the plot but a mere change of tone. Everyone will have noted in comic actions, even in very trivial movies and magazine stories, a point near the end at which the tone suddenly becomes serious, sentimental, or ominous of potential catastrophe. In Aldous Huxley's *Chrome Yellow*, the hero Denis comes to a point of self-evaluation in which suicide nearly suggests itself: in most of Huxley's later books some violent action, generally suicidal, occurs at the corresponding point. In *Mrs. Dalloway* the actual suicide of Septimus becomes a point of ritual death for the heroine in the middle of her party. There are also some interesting Shakespearean variations of the device: a clown, for instance, will make a speech near the end in which the buffoon's mask suddenly falls off and we look straight into the face of a beaten and ridiculed slave. Examples are the speech of Dromio of Ephesus beginning "I am an ass indeed" in the *Comedy of Errors*, and the speech of the Clown in *All's Well* beginning "I am a woodland fellow."

The second phase of comedy, in its simplest form, is a comedy in which the hero does not transform a humorous society but simply escapes or runs away from it, leaving its structure as it was before. A more complex irony in this phase is achieved when a society is constructed by or around a hero, but proves not sufficiently real or strong to impose itself. In this situation the hero is usually himself at least partly a comic humor or mental runaway, and we have either a hero's illusion thwarted by a superior reality or a clash of two illusions. This is the quixotic phase of comedy, a difficult phase for drama, though *The Wild Duck* is a fairly pure example of it, and in drama it usually appears as a subordinate theme of another phase. Thus in *The Alchemist* Sir Epicure Mammon's dream of what he will do with the philosopher's stone is, like Quixote's, a gigantic dream, and makes him an ironic parody of Faustus (who is mentioned in the play), in the same way that Quixote is an ironic parody of Amadis and Lancelot. When the tone is more light-hearted, the comic resolution may be strong enough to sweep over all quixotic illusions. In *Huckleberry Finn* the main theme is one of the oldest in comedy, the freeing of a slave, and the *cognitio* tells us that Jim had already been set free before his escape was bungled by Tom Sawyer's pedantries. Because of its unrivalled opportunities for double-edged irony, this phase is a favorite of Henry James: perhaps his most searching study of it is *The Sacred Fount*, where the hero is an ironic parody of a Prospero figure creating another society out of the one in front of him.

The third phase of comedy is the normal one that we have been discussing, in which a *senex iratus* or other humor gives way to a young man's desires. The sense of the comic norm is so strong that when Shakespeare, by way of experiment, tried to reverse the pattern in *All's Well*, in having two older people force Bertram to marry Helena, the result has been an unpopular "problem" play, with a suggestion of something sinister about it. We have noted that the *cognitio* of comedy is much concerned with straightening out the details of the new society, with distinguishing brides from sisters and parents from foster-parents. The fact that the son and father are so often in conflict means that they are frequently rivals for the same girl, and the psychological alliance of the hero's bride and the mother is often expressed or implied. The occasional "naughtiness" of comedy, as in the Restoration period, has much to do, not only with marital infidelity, but with a kind of comic

Oedipus situation in which the hero replaces his father as a lover. In Congreve's *Love for Love* there are two Oedipus themes in counterpoint: the hero cheats his father out of the heroine, and his best friend violates the wife of an impotent old man who is the heroine's guardian. A theme which would be recognized in real life as a form of infantile regression, the hero pretending to be impotent in order to gain admission to the women's quarters, is employed in Wycherley's *Country Wife*, where it is taken from Terence's *Eunuchus*.

The possibilities of incestuous combinations form one of the minor themes of comedy. The repellent older woman offered to Figaro in marriage turns out to be his mother, and the fear of violating a mother also occurs in *Tom Jones*. When in *Ghosts* and *Little Eyolf* Ibsen employed the old chestnut about the object of the hero's affections being his sister (a theme as old as Menander), his startled hearers took it for a portent of social revolution. In Shakespeare the recurring and somewhat mysterious father-daughter relationship already alluded to appears in its incestuous form at the beginning of *Pericles*, where it forms the demonic antithesis of the hero's union with his wife and daughter at the end. The presiding genius of comedy is Eros, and Eros has to adapt himself to the moral facts of society: Oedipus and incest themes indicate that erotic attachments have in their undisplaced or mythical origin a much greater versatility.

Ambivalent attitudes naturally result, and ambivalence is apparently the main reason for the curious feature of doubled characters which runs all through the history of comedy. In Roman comedy there is often a pair of young men, and consequently a pair of young women, of which one is often related to one of the men and exogamous to the other. The doubling of the *senex* figure sometimes gives us a heavy father for both the hero and the heroine, as in *The Winter's Tale*, sometimes a heavy father and benevolent uncle, as in Terence's *Adelphoi* and in *Tartuffe*, and so on. The action of comedy, like the action of the Christian Bible, moves from law to liberty. In the law there is an element of ritual bondage which is abolished, and an element of habit or convention which is fulfilled. The intolerable qualities of the *senex* represent the former and compromise with him the latter in the evolution of the comic *nomos*.

With the fourth phase of comedy we begin to move out of the

world of experience into the ideal world of innocence and romance. We said that normally the happier society established at the end of the comedy is left undefined, in contrast to the ritual bondage of the humors. But it is also possible for a comedy to present its action on two social planes, of which one is preferred and consequently in some measure idealized. At the beginning of Plato's *Republic* we have a sharp contest between the *alazon* Thrasymachus and the ironic Socrates. The dialogue could have stopped there, as several of Plato's dialogues do, with a negative victory over a humor and the kind of society he suggests. But in the *Republic* the rest of the company, including Thrasymachus, follow Socrates inside Socrates's head, so to speak, and contemplate there the pattern of the just state. In Aristophanes the comic action is often ironic, but in *The Acharnians* we have a comedy in which a hero with the significant name of Dicaeopolis (righteous city or citizen) makes a private peace with Sparta, celebrates the peaceful festival of Dionysos with his family, and sets up the pattern of a temperate social order on the stage, where it remains throughout the play, cranks, bigots, sharpers, and scoundrels all being beaten away from it. One of the typical comic actions is at least as clearly portrayed in our earliest comedy as it has ever been since.

Shakespeare's type of romantic comedy follows a tradition established by Peele and developed by Greene and Lyly, which has affinities with the medieval tradition of the seasonal ritual-play. We may call it the drama of the green world, its plot being assimilated to the ritual theme of the triumph of life and love over the waste land. In *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* the hero Valentine becomes captain of a band of outlaws in a forest, and all the other characters are gathered into this forest and become converted. Thus the action of the comedy begins in a world represented as a normal world, moves into the green world, goes into a metamorphosis there in which the comic resolution is achieved, and returns to the normal world. The forest in this play is the embryonic form of the fairy world of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, the Forest of Arden in *As You Like It*, Windsor Forest in *The Merry Wives*, and the pastoral world of the mythical sea-coasted Bohemia in *The Winter's Tale*. In all these comedies there is the same rhythmic movement from normal world to green world and back again. In *The Merchant of Venice* the second world takes the form of Portia's mysterious house in Belmont, with its magic caskets and the wonderful cos-

mological harmonies that proceed from it in the fifth act. We notice too that this second world is absent from the more ironic comedies *All's Well* and *Measure for Measure*.

The green world charges the comedies with the symbolism of the victory of summer over winter, as is explicit in *Love's Labor's Lost*, where the comic contest takes the form of the medieval debate of winter and spring at the end. In *The Merry Wives* there is an elaborate ritual of the defeat of winter known to folklorists as "carrying out Death," of which Falstaff is the victim; and Falstaff must have felt that, after being thrown into the water, dressed up as a witch and beaten out of a house with curses, and finally supplied with a beast's head and singed with candles, he had done about all that could reasonably be asked of any fertility spirit.

In the rituals and myths the earth that produces the rebirth is generally a female figure, and the death and revival, or disappearance and withdrawal, of human figures in romantic comedy generally involves the heroine. The fact that the heroine often brings about the comic resolution by disguising herself as a boy is familiar enough. The treatment of Hero in *Much Ado*, of Helena in *All's Well*, of Thaisa in *Pericles*, of Fidele in *Cymbeline*, of Hermione in *The Winter's Tale*, show the repetition of a device in which progressively less care is taken of plausibility and in which in consequence the mythical outline of a Proserpine figure becomes progressively clearer. These are Shakespearean examples of the comic theme of ritual assault on a central female figure, a theme which stretches from Menander to contemporary soap operas. Many of Menander's plays have titles which are feminine participles indicating the particular indignity the heroine suffers in them, and the working formula of the soap opera is said to be to "put the heroine behind the eight-ball and keep her there." Treatments of the theme may be as light-hearted as *The Rape of the Lock* or as doggedly persistent as *Pamela*. However, the theme of rebirth is not invariably feminine in context: the rejuvenation of the *senex* in Aristophanes' *The Knights*, and a similar theme in *All's Well* based on the folklore motif of the healing of the impotent king, come readily to mind.

The green world has analogies, not only to the fertile world of ritual, but to the dream world that we create out of our own desires. This dream world collides with the stumbling and blinded follies of the world of experience, of Theseus' Athens with its idi-

otic marriage law, of Duke Frederick and his melancholy tyranny, of Leontes and his mad jealousy, of the Court Party with their plots and intrigues, and yet proves strong enough to impose the form of desire on it. Thus Shakespearean comedy illustrates, as clearly as any *mythos* we have, the archetypal function of literature in visualizing the world of desire, not as an escape from "reality," but as the genuine form of the world that human life tries to imitate.

In the fifth phase of comedy, some of the themes of which we have already anticipated, we move into a world that is still more romantic, less Utopian and more Arcadian, less festive and more pensive, where the comic ending is less a matter of the way the plot turns out than of the perspective of the audience. When we compare the Shakespearean fourth-phase comedies with the late fifth-phase "romances," we notice how much more serious an action is appropriate to the latter: they do not avoid tragedies but contain them. The action seems to be not only a movement from a "winter's tale" to spring, but from a lower world of confusion to an upper world of order. The closing scene of *The Winter's Tale* makes us think, not simply of a cyclical movement from tragedy and absence to happiness and return, but of bodily metamorphosis and a transformation from one kind of life to another. The materials of the *cognitio* of *Pericles* or *The Winter's Tale* are so stock that they would be "hooted at like an old tale," yet they seem both far-fetched and inevitably right, outraging reality and at the same time introducing us to a world of childlike innocence which has always made more sense than reality.

In this phase the reader or audience feels raised above the action, in the situation of which Christopher Sly is an ironic parody. The plotting of Cleon and Dionyza in *Pericles*, or of the Court Party in *The Tempest*, we look down on as generic or typical human behavior: the action, or at least the tragic implication of the action, is presented as though it were a play within a play that we can see in all dimensions at once. We see the action, in short, from the point of view of a higher and better ordered world. And as the forest in Shakespeare is the usual symbol for the dream world in conflict with and imposing its form on experience, so the usual symbol for the lower or chaotic world is the sea, from which the cast, or an important part of it, is saved. The group of "sea" comedies includes *A Comedy of Errors*, *Twelfth Night*, *Pericles*, and

The Tempest. A Comedy of Errors, though based on a Plautine original, is much closer to the world of Apuleius than to that of Plautus in its imagery, and the main action, moving from shipwreck and separation to reunion in a temple in Ephesus, is repeated in the much later play of *Pericles.* And just as the second world is absent from the two "problem" comedies, so in two of the "sea" group, *Twelfth Night* and *The Tempest,* the entire action takes place in the second world. In *Measure for Measure* the Duke disappears from the action and returns at the end; *The Tempest* seems to present the same type of action inside out, as the entire cast follows Prospero into his retreat, and is shaped into a new social order there.

These five phases of comedy may be seen as a sequence of stages in the life of a redeemed society. Purely ironic comedy exhibits this society in its infancy, swaddled and smothered by the society it should replace. Quixotic comedy exhibits it in adolescence, still too ignorant of the ways of the world to impose itself. In the third phase it comes to maturity and triumphs; in the fourth it is already mature and established. In the fifth it is part of a settled order which has been there from the beginning, an order which takes on an increasingly religious cast and seems to be drawing away from human experience altogether. At this point the undisplaced *commedia,* the vision of Dante's *Paradiso,* moves out of our circle of *mythoi* into the apocalyptic or abstract mythical world above it. At this point we realize that the crudest of Plautine comedy-formulas has much the same *structure* as the central Christian myth itself, with its divine son appeasing the wrath of a father and redeeming what is at once a society and a bride.

At this point too comedy proper enters its final or sixth phase, the phase of the collapse and disintegration of the comic society. In this phase the social units of comedy become small and esoteric, or even confined to a single individual. Secret and sheltered places, forests in moonlight, secluded valleys, and happy islands become more prominent, as does the *penseroso* mood of romance, the love of the occult and the marvellous, the sense of individual detachment from routine existence. In this kind of comedy we have finally left the world of wit and the awakened critical intelligence for the opposite pole, an oracular solemnity which, if we surrender uncritically to it, will provide a delightful *frisson.* This is the world of ghost stories, thrillers, and Gothic romances, and, on a more

sophisticated level, the kind of imaginative withdrawal portrayed in Huysmans' *À Rebours*. The somberness of Des Esseintes' surroundings has nothing to do with tragedy: Des Esseintes is a dilettante trying to amuse himself. The comic society has run the full course from infancy to death, and in its last phase myths closely connected psychologically with a return to the womb are appropriate.

THE MYTHOS OF SUMMER: ROMANCE

The romance is nearest of all literary forms to the wish-fulfilment dream, and for that reason it has socially a curiously paradoxical role. In every age the ruling social or intellectual class tends to project its ideals in some form of romance, where the virtuous heroes and beautiful heroines represent the ideals and the villains the threats to their ascendancy. This is the general character of chivalric romance in the Middle Ages, aristocratic romance in the Renaissance, bourgeois romance since the eighteenth century, and revolutionary romance in contemporary Russia. Yet there is a genuinely "proletarian" element in romance too which is never satisfied with its various incarnations, and in fact the incarnations themselves indicate that no matter how great a change may take place in society, romance will turn up again, as hungry as ever, looking for new hopes and desires to feed on. The perennially childlike quality of romance is marked by its extraordinarily persistent nostalgia, its search for some kind of imaginative golden age in time or space. There has never to my knowledge been any period of Gothic English literature, but the list of Gothic revivalists stretches completely across its entire history, from the *Beowulf* poet to writers of our own day.

The essential element of plot in romance is adventure, which means that romance is naturally a sequential and processional form, hence we know it better from fiction than from drama. At its most naive it is an endless form in which a central character who never develops or ages goes through one adventure after another until the author himself collapses. We see this form in comic strips, where the central characters persist for years in a state of refrigerated deathlessness. However, no book can rival the continuity of the newspaper, and as soon as romance achieves a literary form, it tends to limit itself to a sequence of minor ad-

Sam Gilchrist Hall, Shakespeare's Folly: Philosophy, Humanism, Critical Theory (London: Routledge, 2015)

5.2 Inhuman Allegories

> The more pity that fools may not speak wisely what wise men do foolishly.
>
> (*As You Like It*, I. 2. 72–73)

For G. K. Chesterton, the very title of *As You Like It* is 'an expression of utter carelessness, but it is not the bitter carelessness which Mr. Bernard Shaw reads into it; it is the god-like and inexhaustible carelessness of a happy man'.[9] Of course, Chesterton does not mean that the comedy is careless in the sense that it is badly constructed or slapdash in the way that Stultitia's citations sometimes are.[10] Rather, the 'inexhaustible carelessness' Chesterton perceives designates a playful attitude towards life, the sort of attitude that is apparent in Montaigne's wry comment: 'Our life consisteth partly in folly and partly in wisedome. Hee that writes of it but reverently and regularly, omits the better moitie of it' (*E*, Book III, Chapter 5, p. 498).

Such wisdom is apparent in Rosalind's opening dialogue with Celia, who enjoins her disenfranchised cousin to 'be merry' (I. 2. 15):

> ROSALIND: From henceforth I will, coz, and devise sports. Let me see, what think you of falling in love?
> CELIA: Marry, I prithee do, to make sport withal; but love no man in good earnest, nor no further in sport neither than with safety of a pure blush thou mayst in honour come off again.
> ROSALIND: What shall be our sport, then?
> CELIA: Let us sit and mock the good housewife Fortune from her wheel, that her gifts may henceforth be bestowed equally.
> ROSALIND: I would we could do so, for her benefits are mightily misplaced; and the bountiful blind woman doth most mistake in her gifts to women.
> CELIA: 'Tis true; for those that she makes fair she scarce makes honest, and those that she makes honest she makes very ill-favouredly.
> ROSALIND: Nay, now thou goest from Fortune's office to Nature's. Fortune reigns in gifts of the world, not in the lineaments of Nature.
>
> (20–36)

At this moment, love, the emotion around which the events of the comedy revolve, is not taken at all sincerely – not least because, as Rosalind later comments, 'Men have died from time to time and worms have eaten them, but not for love' (IV. 1. 91–92). Love, in other words, becomes a provisional proposition, a 'sport', which seems to reflect her counterpart's attitude towards love in the play's chief source, in which she considers it 'a toye, and fancie a momentary passion, that as it was taken with a gaze, might be

shaken off with a winck' (*NDSS*, 2, p. 172). This badinage reduces the grand concepts of 'Love', 'Fortune' and 'Nature' to mere playthings. Not only does this mockery of the 'good housewife Fortune' voice a longing for the 'benefits of fortune' to be 'bestowed equally', but it also demands a detached perspective, a perspective that entails a refusal to resign oneself to the idea that one 'must be circumstanced' (*Othello*, III. 4. 196) or hopelessly immured in the world as it is – in the manner of the prostitute Bianca in *Othello*.

Rosalind and Celia's pseudo-scholastic quibbling about the auspices of 'Nature' and 'Fortune' gestures towards the tension at the heart of *As You Like It*. This is the tension between sincerity and insincerity or between perceiving the world in prefabricated allegorical categories and the parody of such wisdom, which writes of life all too 'reverently and regularly'. The main problem with an allegorical understanding of the world, which is that it generalises and thereby stultifies, was not lost on John Donne, who suggests that such a way of understanding shoehorns the diversity of human behaviour and relationships into predetermined categories, regardless of whether they fit or not:

> When thou knowest a wife, a sonne, a servant, a friend no better, but that that wife betrayes thy bed, and that sonne thy estate, and that servant your credit, and that friend thy secret, what canst thou say thou knowest?[11]

Donne implies that such an understanding of the world actually bars any possibility of experiencing a new or unusual relationship with a person or the world. As Shakespeare's sceptical treatment of providential history's allegories attests, allegory both supports the status quo and interprets new events and ideas in the terms of the past. Ultimately, the allegorist remains, like Lot's wife, paralysed by the past.

From the very first scene of *As You Like It*, the danger of perceiving the present in the terms of the past is apparent. When Oliver uses the stock example of folly, the parable of the prodigal son, to justify his denial of Orlando's inheritance, his younger brother rightly questions the analogy. Echoing Luke 15, 16 – 'Shall I keep your hogs and eat husks with them? What prodigal portion have I spent, that I should come to such penury?' (*Geneva*, I. 1. 29–32) – Oliver evidently misses the point of the parable, which is used to explain God's foolishly gratuitous love for every human. But when Orlando rescues Oliver from the lion, it is just this sort of unwarranted, irrational love that he extends to his brother. In the parable, the elder son is angered by his father's joyous welcoming of his erring son with 'melody, and dancing' (Luke 15. 25), for he has 'done thee service, neither brake I at anytime thy commandment' (*Geneva*, Luke 15. 29). Oliver, however, has done his father a disservice by ignoring his behest to bequeath Orlando 'a thousand crowns' (I. 1. 2). In contrast to the prodigal son, Orlando is innately good: 'he's gentle; never schooled, and yet learned; full

of noble device; of all sorts enchantingly beloved' (141–42), and it is partly for this reason that his Canaanite brother despises him.

This mockery of allegory continues when the audience meets the lachrymose Jaques, albeit via a report of his passionate reaction to the injured animal. Here Shakespeare critiques allegory even as he employs one:

FIRST LORD: [...] The wretched animal heaved forth such groans
That their discharge did stretch his leathern coat
Almost to bursting, and the big round tears
Coursed one another down his innocent nose
In piteous chase. And thus the hairy fool,
Much markèd of the melancholy Jaques,
Stood on th'extremest verge of the swift brook,
Augmenting it with tears.
DUKE SENIOR: But what said Jaques?
Did he not moralize this spectacle?
FIRST LORD: O yes, into a thousand similes.
First, for his weeping into the needless stream;
'Poor deer,' quoth he, 'thou makst a testament
As worldlings do, giving thy sum of more
To that which had too much.' Then being there alone,
Left and abandoned of his velvet friend,
'Tis right,' quoth he, 'thus misery doth part
The flux of company.' Anon a careless herd,
Full of the pasture jumps along by him
And never stays to greet him. 'Ay,' quoth Jaques,
'Sweep on, you fat and greasy citizens,
'Tis just the fashion. Wherefore do you look
Upon that poor and broken bankrupt there?'
Thus most invectively he pierceth through
The body of the country, city, court,
Yea, and of this our life, swearing that we
Are mere usurpers, tyrants, and what's worse,
To fright the animals and to kill them up
In their assigned and native dwelling place.

(II. 1. 36–63)

Jaques's sustained prosopopoeia turns the Duke's earlier assumption that nature is insensible on its head. For Jaques, it is civilised men – especially the enfranchised 'citizens' of cities – who are insensible. They are content to cold-shoulder the suffering around them, with which they are complicit, so long as they can cram themselves with 'greasy' commodities.

Yet, this, like the rest of Jaques's sententious wisdom, is hardly insightful. Shakespeare clearly does not endow Jaques with the powers of divination associated with melancholia by Ficino and Agrippa; Jaques appears to be

the very opposite of 'a common type of Renaissance utopianist or Arcadian, who out of his own medically aberrant consciousness spins a tale of a better world'.[12] Because he shares the Duke's tendency to allegorise, his wisdom is decidedly short-sighted: even in the radically new or unusual, he can only ever see more of the same – his thought conspicuously fails to go 'beyond'. In fact, he does not so much 'moralize' as *allegorise* the spectacle of the deer, reducing it to yet another example of man's innate cruelty and even characterising it as a fellow melancholic, thereby muting physical suffering of this 'poor dappled fool' (II. 1. 22).

This is not altogether surprising, since this image of the weeping deer 'is the closest approximation we have in Shakespeare of an actual emblem',[13] and emblems were the primary way through which allegories were peddled in the Renaissance. This particular emblem hails from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and recalls the famous moment when Actaeon glimpses his reflection after he has been transformed into a stag:

> But when he saw his face
> And hornèd temples in the brook, he would have cried, 'Alas!'
> But as for then no kind of speech out of his lips could pass,
> He sighed and brayed; for that was then the speech that did
> remain.
> And down the eyes that were not his, his bitter tears did rain.
> No part remained (save his mind) of what he erst had been'.[14]

But Shakespeare employs this image to evoke Jaques's alienation from society rather than the alienation from personal identity apparent in Ovid. Moving in a heartbeat from sympathy to an aggressive attack on society – 'invectively he *pierceth through* | *The body* of the country, city, court' – Jaques is not passive in the manner of Actaeon; rather, this extended metaphor links the scoffing satirist's actions unequivocally to those of the hunters. He turns the 'native burghers of this desert city' (II. 1. 24) to his own uses.

5.3 Temporality and Allegory

In his first encounter with Jaques, Touchstone, who is absent from the play's sources, makes a mockery of the seriousness associated with this allegorical habit of mind. This mockery, however, is clearly lost on Jaques, who is simply delighted to find a fellow outsider, a homeless philosopher:

> JAQUES: A fool, a fool, I met a fool i'th' forest,
> A motley fool – a miserable world! –
> As I do live by food, I met a fool,
> Who laid him down and basked him in the sun,
> And railed on Lady Fortune in good terms,
> In good set terms, and yet a motley fool.

> 'Good morrow, fool,' quoth I. 'No, sir,' quoth he,
> 'Call me not fool till heaven hath sent me fortune.'
> And then he drew a dial from his poke,
> And looking on it with lack-lustre eye
> Says very wisely, 'It is ten o'clock.'
> Thus we may see,' quoth he, 'how the world wags.
> 'Tis but an hour ago since it was nine,
> And after one hour more 'twill be eleven;
> And so from hour to hour we ripe and ripe,
> And then from hour to hour we rot and rot;
> And thereby hangs a tale.' When I did hear
> The motley fool thus moral on the time
> My lungs began to crow like chanticleer,
> That fools should be so deep-contemplative,
> And I did laugh sans intermission
> An hour by his dial. O noble fool,
> A worthy fool–motley's the only wear.
>
> (II. 7. 12–34)

In a play otherwise characterised by logic chopping, role-playing, parody and disguise, Jaques remains unchanged by the bizarre course of events, remaining to the last a melancholic. Even when he laughs, crowing 'like chanticleer', his laughter does not distance him from the rigid identities of the sublunary world. It recalls the case of the melancholic in Galen,[15] who, in Garzoni's words, 'imitate[s] the crowing and noise the cocke made with his winges'.[16] And because he takes the fool's Janus-faced discourse at face value, the paradoxical wisdom or 'moral' implicit in Touchstone's meditation on time and decay is lost on Jaques. The fool, spread-eagled in the sun, travesties the behaviour of the depressive's fixation on lost time, on what could have been.

Touchstone implies that the spacialisation and calibration of time, which made modernity possible, is not without an irrational element. Comparable attitudes towards the time in the 'working-day-world' are apparent elsewhere in the play. For instance, when she chastises Orlando's tardiness, Rosalind contends that such an account of time is an abstraction, wholly at odds with lived experience, in which 'Time travels in divers paces with divers persons' (III. 2. 282–83):

> Break an hour's promise in love! He that will divide a minute into a thousand parts and break but a part of the thousand part of a minute in the affairs of love, it may be said of him that Cupid hath clapped him o'th'shoulder, but I'll warrant him heartwhole.
>
> (IV. 1. 39–44)

Precisely because 'There's no clock in the forest' (III. 2. 275), a temporality not based on the clock time of the quotidian world is possible – Celia, for

one, likes Arden and 'willingly could *waste* [her] time in it' (II. 4. 90) [my emphasis].

Allegory is a fragile thing, not least because, as Walter Benjamin contends, 'the parody of a form proclaims its end'.[17] This is apparent in the complex parody at work in Jaques's on-stage report of Touchstone's famous theatrical allegory:

> All the world's a stage,
> And all the men and women merely players.
> They have their exits and their entrances,
> And one man in his time plays many parts,
> His acts being seven ages. At first the infant,
> Mewling and puking in the nurse's arms.
> And then the whining schoolboy with his satchel
> And shining morning face, creeping like snail
> Unwillingly to school. And then the lover,
> Sighing like furnace, with a woeful ballad
> Made to his mistress' eyebrow. Then, a soldier,
> Full of strange oaths, and bearded like the pard,
> Jealous in honour, sudden, and quick in quarrel,
> Seeking the bubble reputation
> Even in the cannon's mouth. And then the justice,
> In fair round belly with good capon lined,
> With eyes severe and beard of formal cut,
> Full of wise saws and modern instances;
> And so he plays his part. The sixth age shifts
> Into the lean and slippered pantaloon,
> With spectacles on nose and pouch on side,
> His youthful hose, well saved, a world too wide
> For his shrunk shank, and his big manly voice,
> Turning again toward childish treble, pipes
> And whistles in his sound. Last scene of all,
> That ends this strange, eventful history,
> Is second childishness and mere oblivion,
> Sans teeth, sans eyes, sans taste, sans everything.
>
> (II. 7. 135–65)

On the face of it, this account of man's inexorable decline into senility seems to echo Stultitia's famous description of the innate foolishness of each age of man. Crucially, however, Jaques's melancholy skews her descriptions. For Stultitia, 'the first age of man' is 'most gracious and acceptable vnto all folks' (*PF*, p. 16). People delight in babies because of the 'allurement of Folie; all men put to theyr helpyng handes' to assist youths (*PF*, p. 16), whereas in the serious part of his life, 'Manhode', 'the floure of his beautie decaieth, his myrth fadethe, his grace waketh colde', and in 'Eld' man becomes 'not only vrksome to others, but hatefull also to himselfe'. But, at 'deaths dore', he

reverts 'back againe vnto childhode' (*PF*, p. 17). As a 'wasshying awaie [of] all the troubles and carefullnesses of the mynde', this sort of 'Obliuion' (*PF*, p. 17) is far from the abysmal state of non-being to which Jaques alludes. Instead, it is a gift that helps man to die well, maintaining his hope in the face of the brute facts of physical finitude. It could be said, therefore, that the essential difference between Stultitia's understanding of the Seven Ages of Man and Jaques's is that the former conceives it in essentially comic terms, whereas the latter regards life, aging and death with a sense of tragic inevitability.

Yet such a generalisation is at risk of ignoring the multiple layers of parody operating in this speech, layers through which Shakespeare makes a mockery of clear-cut standpoints. It is not insignificant that Erasmus puts his speech into the mouth of an unreliable narrator, the high priestess of folly, Stultitia. And her invocation of this allegorical conception of human development, itself based on the notion of linear progression of time, of which *As You Like It* is so suspicious, is very far from serious. Sincerely peddling the wisdom of both Touchstone and Stultitia, Jaques not only foolishly takes their word for gospel, but he also misunderstands it – his conception of the universality of folly is more akin to Sebastian Brandt's remorseless didactic satire than the vertiginous ironies of the *Praise*. As with the death of the stag, he understands the *theatrum mundi* topos, which is insistently invoked by Stultitia, in his own melancholic terms, in which it epitomises a world drained of meaning. Ironically, however, the world appears in this way to him precisely because he is certain about his own wisdom, which for the most part is sententious drivel – Orlando points out that this melancholic has 'studied' his 'questions' from a cheap wall hanging, 'a painted cloth' (III. 2. 251–52). Since he places his faith in the wisdom of the past, he is unwilling to take part in the possibilities afforded by the redeemed world that opens up at the close of the play – 'I am for other than for dancing measures' (V. 4. 182).

Jaques – like Leontes in *The Winter's Tale* – obstinately views the world through the lens of the past. He not only attempts to reduce every person's existence to an allegory of progressive disintegration, but also indulges in narcissistic reflection about his melancholy, which the rapier wit of Rosalind cuts down to size immediately:

JAQUES: Why 'tis good to be sad and say nothing.
ROSALIND: Why then, 'tis good to be a post.
JAQUES: I have neither the scholar's melancholy, which is emulation, nor the musician's, which is fantastical, nor the courtier's, which is proud, nor the soldier's, which is ambitious, nor the lawyer's, which is politic, nor the lady's, which is nice, nor the lover's, which is all these; but it is a melancholy of mine own, compounded of many simples, extracted from many objects, and indeed the sundry contemplation of my travels, in which my often rumination wraps me in a most humorous sadness.

ROSALIND: A traveller! By my faith, you have great reason to be sad. I fear you have sold your own lands to see other men's.

(IV. 1. 8–20)

It transpires that Jaques's almost Burtonian attempt at defining his melancholy is no less absurd then the relativism that Touchstone parodies in his extemporisation on the phrase 'in respect that' (III. 2. 13 ff).

5.4 True, False, Other: The Logic of Folly

In contrast to its source, *As You Like It* sets the static wisdom of the serious world into motion. The play's dazzling ironies subject positive knowledge, allegorical worldviews and any sincere endorsement of a particular standpoint or system of values to ridicule. For this reason, this chapter takes a very dim view of sincerity indeed – not least because those who are captive to sincerity equate seriousness with veracity, whereas all three of the plays considered imply that the opposite is true. Paradoxically, their philosophical seriousness lies in their artful playfulness.

When Touchstone deflates the rustic William's self-satisfied assertion – 'I have a pretty wit' – with his comment 'Why, thou sayst well. I do now remember a saying: "The fool doth think he is wise, but the wise man knows himself to be a fool"' (V. 1. 27–29), any kind of self-admiration, the *philautia* that Stultitia decries –and (since she is praising herself) simultaneously embodies – is debunked. Crucially, however, William's opinion of himself is not simply disproved and replaced with another fact. Rather, arguing along the same lines as Socrates, the fool suggests that any estimation of one's wisdom is an act of folly. Yet this insight itself oscillates in a state of ironic indeterminacy because the baffled rustic, William, shares his name with the creator of the play.

In eschewing the logical law of the excluded middle, which holds that either a proposition is true or the negation of it is true, Touchstone embodies a mindset that does not attempt to understand by creating universally valid categories and rigid identities. Early on in the play, this mercurial jester extemporises on a knight, who, contrary to what he avows to be the truth, claims that certain pancakes 'were good pancakes, and swore "by his honour" the mustard was naught' (I. 2. 54–55), but is not 'foresworn', 'for he never had any [honour]' (64) to lose in the first place, from which Kiernan Ryan concludes: 'Truth-claims are only as secure as the assumptions on which they rest.[18]

It was not lost on either Shakespeare or Erasmus, therefore, that the very notion of a wise fool gives the lie to the law of the excluded middle. He is a creature who is neither wholly wise nor essentially foolish, a creature that, by being wise in his folly, confounds any straightforward distinction between wisdom and folly, between being correct and being wrong. This resonates with the philosophical procedure of the play as a whole, which is far

less concerned with questions of truth and falsehood than with examining the ways in which such certainties are formed.

5.5 Love's 'Strange Capers'

Throughout his oeuvre, Shakespeare is critical of the aesthetic conceits commonly employed in the representation of love; such staid commonplaces are, for instance, memorably satirised in 'Sonnet 130': 'My mistress' eyes are nothing like the sun; | Coral is far more red than her lips' red' (1–2). And early on in his career, Shakespeare has Dromio of Syracuse debase the clichéd geographical analogies, commonly employed in the amorous verse of the early modern period. Of Nell, the kitchen wench, Dromio observes:

> She is spherical, like a globe. I could find out countries in her.
> [...]
> ANTIPHOLUS OF SYRACUSE: Where is her America, the Indies?
> DROMIO OF SYRACUSE: O, sir, upon her nose, all o'er embellished
> With rubies, carbuncles, sapphires, declining their rich aspect to the hot breath of Spain, who sent whole armadas of carracks to be ballast at her nose.
> ANTIPHOLUS OF SYRACUSE: Where stood Belgia, the Netherlands?
> DROMIO OF SYRACUSE: Oh, sir, I did not look so low.
> (*The Comedy of Errors*, III. 2. 113–14, 131–37)

In this bout of repartee, the 'Comparisons' are indeed 'odorous' (*Much Ado about Nothing*, III. 5. 14), as Dogberry's memorable malapropism has it.

In *Twelfth Night*, when Viola professes Olivia's singularity in thoroughly conventional terms and asks her not to 'leave the world no copy', Olivia mocks such Petrarchan posturing:

> O sir, I will not be so hard-hearted. I will give out divers schedules of my beauty. It shall be inventoried and every particular utensil labelled to my will, as, *item*, two lips, indifferent red; *item*, to grey eyes with lids to them; *item*, one neck, one chin, and so forth.
> (I. 5. 213, 214–18)

Her comment travesties the conventional descriptive techniques of amorous poetry by reducing them to a grotesque list of isolated body parts; the effect of this travesty is to show how an allegorical – or analogical – understanding of the world fails to inquire into the particular features of its object of discourse.

In *As You Like It* the self-regard latent in writing sonnets to one's lover is overcome through parody. Yet this parody eventually turns out to be a sincere attempt at a relationship based on a kind of reciprocity impossible for self-infatuated creator-lovers from Pygmalion onwards. While he refuses to be 'cured' (III. 2. 380) of his love melancholy, Orlando is more

than prepared to woo Ganymede in the guise of what he already is, a fool for love. Undercutting expectations of how a lover might appear, Ganymede catalogues the 'marks' of a true lover; a lover, s/he contends, must have 'A lean cheek, which you have not; a blue eye and sunken, which you have not; an unquestionable spirit, which you have not' (357, 337–40). This tension between performing and satisfying one's desires is also apparent in the way that the weddings at the end are structurally presaged by the travesties of the marriage ceremony performed by both Touchstone and Audrey and Ganymede and Orlando.

When Touchstone parodies Orlando's verses – "Sweetest nut hath sourest rind", | Such a nut is Rosalind' (III. 2. 98–99) – the fool's primary objection to them is not that they are hopelessly mannered, but that they lack technical skill. They are the 'very false gallop of verses' (102) and fail to display any mastery of poetic techniques. Playing the role of a literary critic, the fool reflects that such poetry is prone to be copious – 'I'll rhyme you so eight years together, dinners and suppers, and sleeping-hours excepted. It is the right butter women's rank to market' (85–87) – but, like the proverbially garrulous chitchat of milkmaids, it is ultimately vacuous. As with Rosalind's infatuated comment – 'my affection hath an unknown bottom, like the bay of Portugal', which Celia inverts: 'Or rather bottomless, that as fast as you pour your affection in, it runs out' (IV. 1. 177–81). Linguistic plenitude is often a cover for conceptual paucity.

In her parody of what someone outside love's sway might say, Rosalind contends, very much in the manner of Garzoni, that love is a universal folly: 'Love is merely a madness, and I tell you, deserves as well a dark house and a whip as madmen do; and the reason they are not so punished and cured is that the lunacy is so ordinary that the whippers are in love too' (III. 3. 359–63). But in contrast to Theseus's disenchanted comment that 'The lunatic, the lover, and the poet | Are of imagination all compact' (*A Midsummer Night's Dream*, V. 1. 7–8), Rosalind is not peddling the kind of wisdom that removes her from the other 'country copulatives' (*As You Like It*, V. 4. 53). Rather, she parodies the attitude of a disenchanted scoffer at the folly of lovers. Yet her treatment of Orlando's love melancholy through playful substitution, which turns out to be no substitution at all, is in turn debunked by Touchstone: when he describes the time when he was in 'love' (II. 4. 41) with 'Jane Smile' (43), he offers a grotesque replay of the self-dramatisations, substitutions and role-playing that lovers employ – be it carving poetry on trees, the wooing of Ganymede, or the token of the blood stained cloth:

> [...] I remember the kissing of her batlet, and the cow's dugs that her pretty chapped hands had milked; and I remember the wooing of a peascod instead of her from whom I took two cods, and giving her them again, said with weeping tears, 'Wear these for my sake'. We that are true lovers run into strange capers. But as all is mortal in nature, so is all nature in love mortal in folly.
>
> (43–49)

As in Rabelais, the production and consumption of food and human reproduction are gleefully and grotesquely conflated. The tautology of 'weeping tears' invokes the tears of 'true' lovers like Orlando, but this is wholly undercut by the fact that the gift to his beloved, a 'peascod', possesses overt phallic connotations.

Touchstone's detachment from explicit values inflects the sincerity of the marriage scene, with which the comedy concludes – even Jaques is wise enough to realise that this Jester's marriage, his 'Loving voyage', 'Is but for two months victualled' (V. 4. 180–81). It is no coincidence that Touchstone's extemporal travesty of duelling codes defers the crucial moment of recognition at the end of the comedy by discussing the 'degrees of the lie' (V. 4. 80):

> O sir, we quarrel in print, by the book, as you have books for good manners. I will name for you the degrees. The first, the Retort Courteous; the second, the Quip Modest; the third, the Reply Churlish; the fourth, the Reproof Valiant; the fifth, the Countercheck Quarrelsome; the sixth, the lie with Circumstance; the seventh, the Lie Direct. All these you may avoid but the Lie Direct; and you may avoid that too with an 'if' [...]. Your 'if' is the only peacemaker, much virtue in 'if'.
>
> (81–92)

Be it the hair-splitting of philosophical discourse, the details of love poetry or duelling etiquette, this professional fool has a remarkable command of the otiose systems of the serious world. In this respect, Touchstone could be said to speak 'wisely what wise men do foolishly'.

Moreover, Touchstone's praise of 'if' imbues the final scene with a sense of provisionality, emphasising how unlikely – even patently fictional – the events on stage are:

> ROSALIND [*to the* DUKE]: To you I give myself, for I am yours.
> [*to* ORLANDO] To you I give myself, for I am yours.
> DUKE: *If* there be truth in sight, you are my daughter.
> ORLANDO: *If* there by truth in sight, you are my Rosalind.
> PHOEBE: *If* sight and shape be true,
> Why then my love adieu!
>
> (V. 4. 105–10; [my emphasis])

'To you I give myself', evokes self-surrender, although, as Ryan contends, this is not simply submission to 'patriarchal conventions, since the premises on which these conventions rest have been kicked away in the course of the play'.[19] The conditional clause in '*If* there be truth in sight' estranges the audience; it reminds them that they are watching 'improbable fiction' (*Twelfth Night*, III. 4. 115) unfold upon the stage. What they see in the theatre is, by definition, not straightforwardly 'true', a point emphasised moments later, when the god Hymen introduces a note of uncertainty: he

will join the characters in marriage, '*If* truth holds true contents' (V. 4. 119). In Arden, it seems, even the gods are uncertain. Perhaps they too are under the sway of that magical conditional, "if", which is anathema to the serious, sincere and dogmatic, and is also the conditional with which we describe the relationship between events of the present and future possibilities.

As You Like It avoids being a 'Lie Direct', which avows things to be true, when they are manifestly untrue, by using 'if'. By not insisting upon the veracity of its own claims, the play renders the world conditional, deftly submitting any sincere worldview to parody. Perhaps the most significant moment of the play occurs when Oliver wakes up in the forest as his brother wrestles with a lion: 'in which hurtling | From miserable slumber I awakened' (IV. 3. 130–31). In saving his brother, albeit after some understandable hesitation, Orlando confounds the logic of self-preservation, of getting by in the world. In an inversion of what occurs in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, which suggests that the forest outside Athens was a mere dream, a theatrical illusion – 'If we shadows have offended, | Think but this, and all is mended: that you have but slumbered here' ('Epilogue', 1–3) – Oliver awakens from a nightmarish reality into a realm of fictional possibility. This realm is characterised by the possibility of generosity and reciprocity, a model of which is offered by servant Adam's gift to Orlando of 'five hundred crowns | The thrifty hire I saved' (II. 4. 39–40), rather than the 'bubble reputation' that motivates both the tyrant Duke's banishment of Rosalind, who thinks Celia 'wilt show more bright and seem more virtuous | When she is gone' (I. 3. 75–76), and Oliver's jealousy of Orlando.

In fact, *As You Like It* rehearses alternative endings to the two biblical tales that form the bedrock of common conceptions of fallen human nature. Adam does not transgress. Cain does not murder Abel. When Oliver wakes in the forest it signifies neither the nadir of his insanity, as it does in Chrétien de Troyes's *Yvain*, nor a period of spiritual anguish as in Dante. The wise fool's paradoxical comment to Audrey that 'the truest poetry is the most feigning' (III. 3. 15–16) resonates far beyond its immediate context. In this most manifestly fictional of plays, with its fragments from Ovid, romances, parables and the *Praise of Folly*, the injustices of the world as it is can be rendered visible and, concomitantly, risible.

In this respect, *As You Like It* epitomises a fact that Adorno formulates with great clarity in his essay 'Is Art Lighthearted':

> [A]rt is a critique of the brute seriousness that reality imposes on human beings. Art imagines that by naming this fateful state of affairs it is loosening its hold. That is what is lighthearted in it; as a change in the existing mode of consciousness, that is also, to be sure, its seriousness.
> (*NL*, 2, p. 248)

To indulge, for a moment, in a paradox almost worthy of a wise fool: the serious point of *As You Like It* lies in its playful exposure of the insincerity

at the heart of the serious world. The play's ironies clear the way for amazement – both in the modern sense of astonishment and in the early modern sense of confusion. Although the resolution of this comedy is so incredible that it is compared to the art of a 'magician' (V. 2. 54), the fact that the play fragments and rewrites the fictions that shape reality suggests that it is not wholly constrained by the ways of the world. Shakespeare's comic art is prepared to speculate in the conditional, adumbrate alternatives and embrace the hypothetical liberties of 'if'.

5.6 The World Turned Upside-Down

> Since, therefore, laughter is the principal sign of this frisky pleasure that we like so much, which counteracts old age, is common to all, and proper to man, I am most astonished that the diligent ancients, scrutinisers of causes, have omitted the investigation of its origin, working a great deal more to find the reasons behind the things which touch us less and in less far regard. Why do we not stop to consider the familiar, common miracles that we carry about, and are able to examine them closely and at leisure?
>
> —Laurent Joubert[20]

For August Wilhelm Schlegel, folly is central to the implicit philosophical vision of *Twelfth Night*. In his *Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature*, he contends that this play is structured around the contrast between the 'idealistic follies' of Orsino, Olivia and Viola, who are duped by the prevalent notion of what love is, with the 'naked follies [...] of the risible persons of the piece, [who are] likewise acting under the pretext of love'.[21] Far from being a theme, folly is of considerable structural significance to this play. Sir Toby, Maria and the other merry-makers not only embody the spirit of celebration alluded to by the first of the play's titles, which is the feast of the Epiphany, a 'brief, licensed period of festive release and frivolity on the last eve of the holiday season',[22] but they also suggest that the performance of the stereotypes, in which the more serious-minded citizens of Illyria indulge, is patently absurd. Unlike the Duke, Olivia and Malvolio, these revellers are not in thrall to an allegorical – or analogical – mindset. This analysis examines *Twelfth Night*'s representation of inappropriate festivity, arguing that it serves to unfix the constants from the seemingly sensible world; I then offer an analysis of Shakespeare's mockery of modish melancholy, before finally illustrating the structural integrity of mutability to this play. In fact, perhaps the most significant facet of *Twelfth Night*'s implicit philosophical vision is the way in which – much like a wise fool – its form, themes and structure serve to insist upon the provisionality and relativity of its insights.

Schlegel's analysis neither wrests the main action from the backstairs world, nor dismisses the overtly festive scenes as comic relief as Barber and Laroque's discussions of festivity do; rather, Schlegel suggests that 'These scenes are as exquisite and significant as they are delightfully and humorously

Gyöngyi Matus-Kassai

Rosalind and Celia.

Accepted for publication in *Anachronis*t)

Biblical and Renaissance Ideals of Friendship in Shakespeare's *As You Like It*

Shakespeare's drama, *As You Like It,* has received considerable scholarly attention. However, most of the interpretations focus only on the male protagonists, overshadowing the role which the friendship of Rosalind and Celia plays. This is also true in terms of analysing biblical echoes in the play: apart from examining shorter allusions to the Bible (Shaheen 214–229), larger biblical frameworks applied by critics to interpret *As You Like It* typically centre around brotherly rivalry between Oliver and Orlando, Duke Frederick and Duke Senior, featuring biblical brothers like Esau and Jacob.[1] Less attention is paid, however, to the female characters of the story; there is only one biblical model examined in literature in connection with this female friendship, the story of Ruth and Naomi.[2] This chapter examines a new link between the girls' friendship and the one between David and Jonathan from the Bible, which has not received appropriate scholarly attention yet. [3] The study presents similarities and argue that this analogue bears significance to the interpretation of the drama. Furthermore, it investigates how the concept of ideal friendship, *amicitia perfecta,* born in classical culture and revived in the Renaissance, relate to this Shakespearean friendship and its biblical model.

---

[1] See for example Montrose, Louis Adrian. '"The Place of a Brother" in "As You Like It": Social Process and Comic Form'. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 32, no. 1, 1981, pp. 28–54. and Fabiny, Tibor. 'Hymen's Truth. Atonement from Shakespear to Tyndale and from Tyndale to Shakespeare.' *Early Modern Communi(Cati)Ons*, edited by Kinga Földváry and Erzsébet Stróbl, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2012, pp. 132–51.

[2] See Julie Crawford's analysis in her article, "The Place of a Cousin in As You Like It".

[3] This biblical framework has not been discussed in scholarship yet. Shaheen in his seminal work does not mention the parallel with David and Jonathan among the biblical references to the play (214–229), and there is only one brief remark in Northrop Frye's notes to *Rosalynde. Euphues Golden Legacie* (1590) by Thomas Lodge which connects Rosalind and Celia with this biblical narrative: "David-Jonathan set-up with the two girls; in Shakespeare Celia just sneaks off with Rosalind, whereas in Lodge it's only a suggested possibility and the king actually banishes both" (Frye 148).

The first and probably most apparent parallel between the two stories is that in both cases the reigning king or duke is a father of one of the friends and the enemy of the other. The royal child defends his or her friend, confronting his or her own royal father, who in turn calls his child a traitor and reproaches him or her for supporting the friend, to the detriment of his or her own interests. Then he claims that the friend is a rival to his child, and as such, he or she should be eliminated. Both narratives suggest that the friend seems to be more popular with the people than the king's or duke's child,[4] which is a threat in terms of future royal succession. In the play, Duke Frederick announces that he banishes Rosalind, which provokes Celia to passionately argue that Rosalind is innocent and they are life-long friends. To this pleading Duke Frederick answers:

> She is too subtle for thee, and her smoothness,
>
> Her very silence and her patience
>
> Speak to the people, and they pity her.
>
> Thou art a fool. She robs thee of thy name,
>
> And thou wilt show more bright and seem more virtuous
>
> When she is gone. Then open not thy lips.
>
> Firm and irrevocable is my doom
>
> Which I have passed upon her. She is banished.
>
> (1.3.74–81)

[4] In the case of David and Jonathan, David's popularity is expressed by the song of his victory over Goliath, which arouses Saul's jealousy (I Samuel 18, 7–9), thus his fame must have obscured Jonathan's as well. In *As You Like It*, Duke Frederick points at Rosalind's popularity for banishing her (1.3.74-79). Just like Rosalind and David, Hamlet is portrayed as more popular than the king; this is emphasized by Claudius when pondering on how to punish him after killing Polonius. "How dangerous is it that this man goes loose, / Yet must not we put the strong law on him ; / He's loved of the distracted multitude, / Who like not in their judgement, but their eyes." (4.3.3-5)

In the Bible, Jonathan defends his friend David against the jealous contriving of his father, King Saul. Just like in the drama, the king answers by pointing out the fact that if the rival were gone, his son would have a great advantage.

> Then Saul's anger was kindled against Jonathan, and he said to him, ‘You son of a perverse, rebellious woman, do I not know that you have chosen the son of Jesse to your own shame, and to the shame of your mother's nakedness? For as long as the son of Jesse lives on the earth, neither you nor your kingdom shall be established. Therefore send and bring him to me, for he shall surely die.’
> (I.Sam. 20, 30–31)

In both cases, Jonathan and Celia are popular with the people, but not as popular as David and Rosalind, towards whom more sympathy is aroused by virtue of their being exiled and mistreated on the part of the king.

The second point which connects the two narratives is that the friendships are sealed by oaths, which contain the element of ceding the royal power: both Celia and Jonathan promise to give the throne to their friend in the future. This selfless attitude is characteristic of both figures, and both can be associated with the virtue of charity.[5] Shakespeare’s play includes two instances of this kind: the first vow is taken when Celia, daughter of the reigning Duke expresses her intent to give back the kingdom to Rosalind, the heiress of the lawful, but banished Duke:

[5] Celia’s name, ‘heavenly’, refers to Spenser’s *Faerie Queene*, in which the allegorical figure of “Dame Caelia” has three daughters: Fidelia (faith), Speranza (hope), Charissa (charity), alluding to the famous Hymn of Love in I. Corinthians 13 (Dusinberre 146). I would argue that Celia in the play represents all these characteristics, including charity or love, which is an essential force in the dynamics of the drama. Interestingly, Jonathan has also been associated with charity in the Christian tradition (source).

> You know my father hath no child but I, nor
> none is like to have; and truly, when he dies, thou
> shalt be his heir, for what he hath taken away from
> thy father perforce, I will render thee again in
> affection. By mine honor I will, and when I break
> that oath, let me turn monster. (1.2.17-22)

The aggressive seizing of the power by the brother "perforce" (1.2.20) is in sharp contrast with giving back the power by the quasi-sister "in affection" (1.2.21). That Celia refers to a "monster" (1.2.22) evokes unnaturality and beastliness, associated with the breaker of the oath.

The other instance which can be considered an oath can be found in Act 1 Scene 3 (93–102), after Rosalind's banishment. Celia refuses to be separated from her friend: "Shall we be sundered? Shall we part, sweet girl? / No, let my father seek another heir" (1.3.95–96). In these lines, Crawford (113) identifies an allusion to the liturgical text of the marriage ceremony in the *Book of Common Prayer*.[6] Celia ends her speech with the affirmation: "Say what thou canst, I'll go along with thee." (1.3.95–96, 102), which, as Dusinberre points out in the Arden Third Series edition of the play (185 n103), echoes the story of Ruth and Naomi: "For whither thou goest, I wil go" (1:16). Thus, Celia's words can be considered as a pledge of loyalty, corroborated by allusions to the marriage liturgy and the most famous female friendship narrative from the Bible (Crawford 113). Crawford, commenting on 1.3.70 ("We still have slept together,/ Rose at an instant, learned, played, ate together") suggests that although marriage is alluded to as well, the girls' relationship can be regarded as sworn

[6] "Those whom God hath joined together, let no man put asunder" (qtd. in Crawford 113).

sisterhood: “Celia and Rosalind’s bond is thus less marriage-like than a form of sworn kinship that carries a similarly potent social legibility and meaning” (113). Later, she adds concerning the importance of that kind of relationship: “There is abundant evidence that early modern women’s relationships with one another, much like those between men, were enmeshed in complex webs of avowed kinship” (126). Therefore, it seems that the kind of relationship and vows depicted by Shakespeare reflect contemporary social practices.

In the Book of Samuel, three vows can be detected concerning the friendship of David and Jonathan: the Geneva Bible (1560) translates them two times as “covenant” (I Sam 18, 3; 23, 18) and once as “bond” (I Sam 20, 16). The first one is right after David’s epic victory over Goliath: “Then Ionathán and Dauid made a couenant: for he loued him as his owne soule.” (I Samuel 18, 3). The second covenant is made between them at the New Moon feast (chapter 20): Jonathan promises to inform David about his father’s intentions and secures David’s good will towards his offsprings and kinship, acknowledging him as an equal and potentially more powerful person, whose protection and support is worth asking (I Sam 20, 13–16).

> So Ionathán made a bonde with the house of Dauid, *saying*, Let the Lord require it at the hands of Dauids enemies. And again Ionathán sware vnto Dauid, because he loued him (for he loued him as his owne soule).” (I Sam 20, 16–17).

The third covenant is made when David is hiding from Saul in the forest and Jonathan secretly meets him to encourage him. The prince acknowledges David’s rightful claim for the throne (by divine election), and envisions him as the future king, and himself as his loyal subject. After both promises, a covenant is made between the friends concerning their future.

> And Ionathán Sauls sonne arose and went to Dauid into the wood, and comforted him in God, And said vnto him, Feare not: for the hand of Saúl my father shal not finde thee, and thou shalt be King ouer Israel, and I shal be next vnto thee, and also Saúl my father knoweth it. So they twaine made a couenant before the Lord, and Dauid did remaine in the wood: but Ionathán went to his house. (I. Sam. 23:16-18)

Thirdly, the most striking and far-reaching similarity between the two accounts is the portrayal of a really strong friendship, entailing the unity of the two friends, often expressed with language reminiscent of matrimony. In both cases, this led to speculations about the homoerotic[7] nature of the relationships in question.[8] However, in the following I would like to propose that it is worth examining those relationships in the light of early modern friendship discourse which seems to account for the homoerotic overtones of the texts.

The David and Jonathan narrative has a longer and more complicated tradition of homoerotic interpretation than the Rosalind-Celia relationship; it has received considerable attention lately regarding homoeroticism and homosexuality, both in scholarly circles and in popular culture.[9] Although it lies outside the scope of this study to investigate the question in more detail, it should be pointed out that it was not until the nineteenth century that David and

---

[7] In my paper, I use the term 'homoerotic'based on Traub's rationale: "'Homoeroticism,' while somewhat cumbersome and etymologically predicated on gender sameness, conveys a more fluid and contingent sense of erotic affect than either 'lesbian' or 'homosexual'; neither a category of self nor normatively male, homoeroticism retains the necessary strangeness and historical contiguity between early modern and contemporary forms of desire" (16).

[8] In the case of Rosalind and Celia, the question of homoeroticism has been raised by scholars including Traub (171, 310) and Crawford. According to Traub, female homoerotic desire has been overlooked by critics and contemporary audiences in plays like *As You Like It*, "because the palpable 'femininity' of these characters blinds us – and, I suspect, may have blinded many of their contemporaries as well – to the eroticism evident in their language of desire." (182)

[9] The story of David and Jonathan has stirred up much interest in this respect recently; some commentators, mostly non-professionals, but including some professionals as well, argue for a homoerotic interpretation of the story; some of them claiming that David and Jonathan had a sexual kind of relationship (Olyan 7). However, the majority of the interpreters, mainly biblical scholars, reject the homoerotic reading, focussing on the close friendship of the heroes in the context of covenant discourse typical of ancient West Asian cultures (Olyan 7).Thus, the relationship of David and Jonathan, as presented in the Bible, is subject to a heated debate between conservative and liberal theologians (Wernik 49–50). As for the Biblical text itself, there is no definitive conclusion in literature whether it implies that David and Jonathan had homoerotic desire, let alone a sexual

Jonathan became synonyms for homosexuality (Harding, "Opposite Sex Marriage" 46), thus our contemporary concerns should not be projected unto sixteenth-century (or earlier) readers. Furthermore, the majority of biblical scholars today argue for a non-homoerotic reading of the story, although the two figures, taken out of their context, have become symbols for same-sex love.[10]

However, it was not the case in early modern culture: it seems that David and Jonathan were celebrated as biblical examples of perfect friendship. For example, Spenser in *The Faerie Queene* (1590) lists them among the classical heroes of friendship, which suggests that these biblical characters had found their way into the pantheon of classical friends by the sixteenth century. The Spenserian protagonist arrives to the garden of Venus, where, after seeing lovers, he catches sight of "another sort / Of louers lincked in true harts consent / Which loued not as these, for like intent, / But on chast vertue grounded their desire" (Book IV, Canto X, 48–51). David and Jonathan are praised as ideal friends among Hercules and Hylas, Theseus and Pirithous, Pyaldes and Orestes, Titus and Gesippus, Damon and Pythias (Book IV, Canto X, 55-60). This is not suprising, since their story seems to fit the patterns of *amicitia perfecta* well, and I would also suggest that in the Renaissance their friendship was read in the light of the classical tradition; thus, Biblical ideals of friendship were merged with, or rather, dominated by, classical ideas.

Therefore, it seems that the intertextual connection between Rosalind–Celia and David–Jonathan did not come *ex nihilo*: the latter has been viewed as a model for friendship for centuries. Furthermore, both seem to conform to the rules of ideal friendship celebrated by

---

relationship with each other. It seems to be rather a question of hermeneutics, highly depending on the interpreter's views and beliefs on divine inspiration, the unity and consistency of the Biblical text. For a summary of the different standpoints in scholarship, see for example Olyan, and the introduction to *The Love of David and Jonathan: Ideology, Text, Reception* by James E. Harding. Overall, it is a question beyond the limits of this study to present a detailed picture of this debate.

[10] This leads Harding to question whether "David and Jonathan are any longer 'biblical characters' at all, since they are detached from their 'original' biblical context and have ceased to be controlled by it ." (*The Love of David and Jonathan*).

humanists, which, in my interpretation, can account for elements implying a marriage-like unity in the text.

When investigating these instances in the context of the early modern *amicita perfecta* discourse, two pre-eminent texts serve as the basis for this inquiry, which exerted a huge influence on contemporary thinking. The first one is Cicero's famous treatise entitled *De Amicitia*, which, among other works by the author, formed part of the school curriculum (Gillespie 108). It was very popular in the second half of the sixteenth century, given the large number of printings of the Latin version, but it also reached the English reading public in translation, published in 1481, 1530, 1550, 1562 and 1577 as well (Stretter 348). The other work this analysis relies on is Montaigne's essay *On Friendship*, because he was the one who most concisely articulated the ideas of *amicitia perfecta* in the sixteenth century, heavily drawing on, and sometimes adding to, Cicero. His essay, which can truly be regarded as a cornerstone of early modern discourse on *amicitia*, was first published in French in 1580, and in English in Florio's translation in 1603 (Gillespie 343). Although concrete word-by-word textual links cannot be established between their works and *As You Like It*, my contention is that the friendship ideas expressed in them reflect the cultural context which the David-Jonathan narrative was read and the Rosalind-Celia one was written in, and thus, help understand this drama better.

Having established the source texts for the ideal friendship tradition, it is worth taking their ideas into consideration when analysing the two narratives in question, first, the Biblical model, then, Shakespeare's female friends. The friendship of David and Jonathan is famously characterized by the unity of souls in the First Book of Samuel: "And when he made an end of speaking vnto Saul, the soule of Ionathan was knit with the soule of Dauid, and Ionathan loued him, as his owne soule." (1 Sam 18,1) The knitting of souls is one of the metaphors in the Hebrew Bible denoting friendship (Ryken et al. 309), however, it seems also to bear a

resemblance to one of the most essential features of *amicitial perfecta*: the Platonic idea of the mixing of the souls. "In the amitie I speake of, they entermixe and confound themselves one in the other, with so vniversall a commixture, that they weare out, and can no more finde the seame that hath conjoined them" (Montaigne 92) True friendship according to this tradition is a harmony of character and thinking, which culminates in a kind of unity of the souls, the friend becoming *alter ipse*, another self. In Montaigne's famous words, friendship is „no other then one soule in two bodies, according to the fit definition of Aristotle" (Montaigne 93–94). The biblical element when "the soule of Ionathan was knit with the soule of Dauid" (1 Sam 18,1) thus does not only signal an exceptionally strong relationship, but it could also have been read in the Renaissance with the platonic blending of souls in mind, which provides a stronger reason for admitting David and Jonathan among exemplary friends.

Another well-known and often-debated passage about the two heroes' relationship is David's lament over Jonathan's death in the opening chapter of 2 Samuel. "Wo is me for thee, my brother Ionathán: very very kinde hast thou bene vnto me: thy loue to me was wonderful, passing the loue of women." (II Samuel 1, 26). Calling the friend a brother is not a surprising metaphor, and it must have been read as a commonplace in early modern England where the notion of sworn brotherhood had been familiar (Simonkay 159). However, ranking this relationship higher than "the loue of women" (II Samuel 1, 26) is one of the hot points nowadays in theological debates concerning homoerotic relationships.[11] On the contrary, it is essential to take into consideration that sixteenth-century interpretations of the passage do not share our postmodern concerns. The marginal gloss of the Geneva Bible, for example, explains to the contemporary reader that here David speaks about the love of women "Ether towarde their housbandes, or their children" (marginal note for II Sam 1, 26 in the 1560

[11] See for example Olyan's study,'Surpassing the Love of Women'; for a short summary of the arguments of both sides, see Wernik 54–55; for the main problems with the interpretation of the passage, see Harding 44–45. The well-known scholar and professor of Hebrew, Robert Alter in his recent commentary to the Old Testament dismisses the homoerotic interpretation of the passage (311).

Geneva Bible, my transcription), implying that women are not capable of the kind of love David shares with Jonathan.

Apart from implying women's inferiority, the debated phrase in question also contrasts "the loue of women" (II Samuel 1:26) with friendship, which is a typical feature of the early modern *amicitia perfecta* discourse as well. Montaigne explains why the ideal friendship between two men should be regarded as superior to love and marriage. Although love between men and women is chosen, as opposed to family ties, it is not as balanced, smooth and stable as love in friendship, and it has serious drawbacks as well.[12] Furthermore, love grows while it is fuelled by desire, but when it is realized, "having a corporall end" (91), it loses its intensity. As opposed to the "fleshly" sexual desire, friendship is spiritual. "On the other side, friendshippe is enjoyed according as it is desired, it is neither bredde, nor nourished, nor encreaseth but in jovissance, as being spirituall, and the mind being refined by use and custome" (91).

Marriage cannot compete with friendship either, because it is a bargain: "it is a covenant which hath nothing free but the entrance, the continuance being forced and constrained, depending else-where then from our will, and a match ordinarily concluded to other ends" (Montaigne 91). In addition, by assuming women's inferiority, it can be inferred from both Cicero and Montaigne that in marriage the two parties are not equal, thus true friendship cannot develop between them. On the contrary, friendship is presented as the utmost good in life, and the best kind of relationship one can have, and as such, it can be an example for married couples, who are yoked together in a less enjoyable and noble way. Montaigne, for example, mentions that gift-giving between husband and wife is prohibited by the law "to honour marriage with some imaginary resemblance of this divine bond" (141):

[12] "Hir fire, I confesse it […] to be more active, more fervent, and more sharpe. But it is a rash and wavering fire, wavering and diverse: the fire of an ague subject to fittes and stints, and that hath but slender hold-fast of us. In true friendship, it is a generall & vniversall heate, and equally tempered, a constant and settled heate, all pleasure and smoothnes, that hath no pricking or stinging in it, which the more it is in lustfull love, the more is it but a ranging and mad desire in following that which flies vs..." (91)

friendship, positioning it as a higher-level relationship than marriage. The same contrast can be found in religious texts as well. For example, Henry Smith, "the Silver-tongued Preacher", in his work entitled *A preparative to marriage* (1591) ends his admonitions, exhortations, and catalogue of the duties of husband and wife with the blessing: "that ye may love one another like David and Jonathan" (qtd. in Matz 1),[13] clearly placing friendship, and its biblical manifestation, David and Jonathan as examples for married couples.

The friendship of Rosalind and Celia, just like its biblical model, is presented in ideal and lofty terms in Shakespeare's drama, although, it is a noteworthy difference between the two narratives, that the Biblical one ends tragically, with the death of Jonathan, whereas the Shakespearean friendship is put in a comic setting; furthermore, by marrying brothers, the two ladies' friendship is strengthened (Crawford 102).

Another, more intriguing difference is related to gender: unlike David and Jonathan and the classical heroes of friendship, Shakespeare depicts a female friendship, which, according to the *amicitia perfecta* tradition, cannot exist. Early modern discourses of friendship, based on the classical tradition, held that women are not capable of having an ideal friendship at all, lacking moral and mental means to form this kind of relationship. According to Cicero, friendship cannot exist between people who are in need of help or lack independence, because it would be an asymmetrical relationship, and it would not be desired for itself. Cicero argues that if friendship were for defence and help, "women would seek the support of friendship more than men do, the poor more than the rich, the unfortunate more than those who seem happy" (37, caput 13); here he uses the word *mulierculae* for women, which is a diminutive form, showing contempt towards the status of women (37n2). Consequently, it becomes dubious whether women can partake in *amicita perfecta* at all.

[13] He certainly did not hint to them as an example of homosexual love – given his religious views and the fact that these biblical heroes were associated explicitly with homosexuality only from the nineteenth century (Harding, "Opposite Sex Marriage" 46) – but he did refer to the biblical friends as examples for the married couple.

Montaigne gives an unambiguous answer to this question; however, he supports his argument against female friendship differently, implying that women lack mental capacity and endurance needed for friendship, compared to men. “Seeing (to speake truly) that the ordinary sufficience of women cannot answer this conference and communication, the nurse of this sacred bond: nor seeme their minds strong enough to endure the pulling of a knot so hard, so fast, and durable” (91). Thus, this sex “by ancient schools rejected thence” (92), which seems disconcerting and unjust for the twenty-first-century reader. Nevertheless, Shakespeare presents this friendship following the rules of *amicitia perfecta*, emphasizing the perfect unity of the friends.

The first time they are mentioned is characteristic of who they are: two young girls, who grew up together, sharing each other’s life; Celia would have followed Rosalind into exile in the past, as she does later in the play. It is important to note that this characterization comes from Charles who can be regarded as an objective observer, and it is not in his interests to compliment the ladies. Rosalind and Celia are presented as highly similar throughout the play,[14] and as sharing the same status at the court (1.1.105–106): their depiction resonates with classical friendship ideals when the friend functions as *alter ipse*, another self.

> OLIVER Can you tell if Rosalind, the Duke's daughter, be
> banished with her father?
> CHARLES O no; for the Duke's daughter, her cousin, so
> loves her, being ever from their cradles bred together,
> that she would have followed her exile or have died to
> stay behind her. She is at the court and no less beloved
> of her uncle than his own daughter, and never two

[14] They only differ in hair colour: Rosalind is fair-haired, while Celia is brown (4.3.83–85). Rosalind is claimed to be “more than common tall” (1.3.112), however, there are some contradictions in the drama’s text concerning the girls’ height (177n162). In terms of personality, Rosalind seems to be more active and outspoken than Celia.

ladies loved as they do. (1.1.100-107)

The closing remark highlights the strong and affectionate nature of their friendship; as Crawford puts it, "From the outset, then, Celia and Rosalind are identified not only as cousins—a term, like 'friend,' that encompasses a wide range of relationships—but also as being *in excess* of that nomination…" (105). The kind of hyperbolic language used by Charles, singling out the friendship in question as unique, exceptionally close, and unprecedented, is a conventional feature in the *amicitia perfecta* tradition, and should not be taken literally as a sign of homoeroticism, as by some commentators. According to Cicero and Montaigne, a perfect friendship is hard to find, if it can be found at all; moreover, it seems that the most perfect one is always the one described by the speaker of the text. The authors emphasise in a similar vein how their friendship (Laelius and Africanus, Montaigne and Étienne de Boétie) is the best of all, in terms of rarity and unity as well, which seems to be exaggerating to the reader today, but must have been a tool in earlier times to prove that a friendship is eligible for being one of those rare, perfect ones. Montaigne claims that his friendship was "so sincerely, so entire and inviolably maintained" between them, "that truely a man shall not commonly heare of the like" (90). Furthermore, in order to elevate his narrative higher than previous examples, he adds later as someone speaking from real experience: "For, even the discourse, which sterne antiquitie hath left vs concerning this subject, seeme to me but faint and forcelesse in respect of the feeling I have of it" (95).

Another telling comment from Le Beau contrasts the girls' relationship with other types of bonds:

The other is daughter to the banished Duke,

And here detained by her usurping uncle

To keep his daughter company, whose loves

Are dearer than the natural bond of sisters. (1.2.262–265)

Although they are not sisters by birth (only cousins), they still have a stronger and closer relationship that might only be expected from siblings. To my mind, the expression "natural" here denotes the kinship ties between sisters in general, but also their kind attitude towards each other,[15] which is far outweighed by the girls' love towards each other, and not the "unnatural" quality of the girls' relationship.[16] This section also underscores the contrast between more-than-sisterly love and brotherly rivalry in the play, including the "usurping uncle" and the "banished Duke", but also the bitter conflict between Oliver and Orlando. Conceptualizing the friend as a brother or sister is inherent in other discourses of friendship as well, as it had been shown in the David-Jonathan narrative, together with the hyperbolic addition: "dearer than…" (1.2.265) Crawford also points at a biblical passage, Proverbs 18, 24 where the two relationships are contrasted. "A man that hathe friends, oght to shew him self friendly: for a friend is nerer then a brother." (105n18).

The friends' unity involves a certain interchangeability, and thus, sharing families as well. For instance, after Jonathan's death, David takes care of his children, especially the lame Mephiboshet (2 Sam chapter 9). In Shakespeare, Celia encourages Rosalind to be happy for her sake and to assume her own role as Duke Frederick's daughter, measuring their relationship with the help of this identification (1.2.8–16). The first line Celia speaks sums up her endeavours: "I pray thee, Rosalind, sweet my coz, be merry" (1.2.1). Crawford reads this passage as indicative of their homoerotic relationship: she cites Masten according to whom "sweet" carries homoerotic overtones, and argues that "coz" or "cousin" "carries a similar

[15] On the connection between the words kind, nature and their derivatives see Lewis *Studies in Words* pp. 24–74. Lewis hypothesizes a link between the Anglo–Saxon *kind* as an adjective and the Latinate *naturalis/natural*, arguing that although the two had a very similar scope of meaning, some meanings of *kind* "contaminated" the meaning of *natural* in the English-speaking environment. A prominent example for that is *kind* understood as *pius*, "one who does not good offices in general, but good offices to which close kinship or some other personal relationship binds him" (Lewis 36)

[16] See Traub: "Despite the fact that his words imply that their love is more dear than is natural, his tone is admiring, and presumably no one would have raised an eyebrow" (310).

erotic valence" (106). However, later she asserts that cousin meant in early modern times "next of kin" or "an intimate more generally" (107), and had several layers of meaning ranging from "familial, erotic, economic resonances" (108). To my mind, this expression aptly illustrates the ambiguities inherent in the discourses of *amicitia*, right on the thin line between the homosocial and the homoerotic, and while being potentially homoerotic, its meaning is not confined to this interpretation.

When Celia defends Rosalind to her father, she also claims their unity and inseparability in ways which can be read as homoerotic, but also as an example for the perfect unity of the ideal friends.

> I was too young that time to value her,
> But now I know her. If she be a traitor,
> Why, so am I. We still have slept together,
> Rose at an instant, learned, played, ate together,
> And whereso'er we went, like Juno's swans,
> Still we went coupled and inseparable. (1.3.68-73)

Celia totally identifies herself with her friend, who is another self according to the classical theory, and thus requires that she be traited the same way as Rosalind. In her speech, she recalls their common past, childhood memories, in very similar terms as Helena in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (Dusinberre, 183n68). [17]

The image expressing the harmony of the girls is that of "Juno's swans" (1.3.72), which, according to some scholars, "yokes the goddesses of sexuality and marriage into one powerful image of avowed same-sex love" (DiGangi qtd. in Crawford 113, see also Traub

[17] "So we grew together / Like to a double cherry, seeming parted, / But yet an union in partition, / Two lovely berries moulded on one stem; /So with two seeming bodies but one heart" (3.2.208–210). Here Helena also echoes the "one soule in two bodies" (Montaigne 93) theory.

171). In mythology, Venus' chariot is pulled by swans (Dusinberre, 183n72); if the phrase were about her swans, it would more obviously refer to sexual love. However, Juno was the goddess of marriage, and not always a very positive figure of ancient mythology; for the girls, and especially for Celia, who utters this sentence, the institution and thus the goddess of marriage probably was not the most positive one either as it threatened their unity as friends. I would suggest that the image might focus more on the unity and inseparability of the two swans, whether they be Juno's or Venus', than the sexual/non-sexual or marriage-like aspects of the girls' relationship, while bringing together the two goddesses whose "reconciliation [...] was part of Elizabeth's iconography" (Dusinberre, 183n72).

When her friend is actually exiled by the Duke, Celia claims that by banishing Rosalind, her father banished herself as well, and she stresses again their unity evoking the marriage ceremony from the *Book of Common Prayer* and the story of Ruth and Naomi (Crawford 112–119). Although the vows of Ruth and Naomi are frequently quoted by proponents of same-sex marriages nowadays, it should be kept in mind that holding up friendship as example for spiritual unity for (to-be-)married couples was in line with early modern thought, as it has been shown earlier in this study, thus, referring to Ruth and Naomi, just like Henry Smith in his sermon, did not carry the connotations of same-sex love (let alone marriage), beyond the – often blurry – limits of *amicitia*.

The same is true for handling the girls' claims and acts of showing an extraordinary unity and constant affirmation of parity in general. Crawford frequently underscores how they try to balance new, opposite-sex relationships, especially that of Rosalind and Orlando, with the existing old one: the avowed kinship they have with each other, which seems to be recognized both socially and legally (110-112). Considering that *amicitia* was thought to be the best and most enduring relationship, it comes as no surprise that the girls want to guard it. Crawford also indicates that although commentators usually interpret such parts as the one

when Celia warns her friend not to love any man "in good earnest" (1.2.27), as Celia's unrequited love for Rosalind, she is in fact "working in the service of female cousinship and female chastity more broadly" (109).

Crawford comments on the marriage scene at the end of the play as well, claiming together with Jeffrey Masten that "scholarly editions of *As You Like It* are particularly interventionist on behalf of heterosexuality" (123), for example, when inserting exact names as to whom Hymen's: "You and you are heart in heart" (5.4.130) refers to. Crawford states that "each ambiguous 'you and you' instead invites interpretive effort—the work, that is, of making each marriage thinkable and even" (123), including that of Rosalind and Celia, who entered together with Hymen at the beginning of the marriage scene. This reference to a possibly equal ("even" Crawford 123) marriage is unnecessary in case of Rosalind and Celia if we accept that they are already bound together by an oath and have been "inseparable" (1.3.72) throughout the whole play. Although marriage is the miraculous end of the play, accompanied by a *deus ex machina*, it should not be forgotten that it was considered a different, lower quality kind of relationship than *amicitia perfecta*, thus for the two girls, the ideal friends, marriage is not a relevant institution; it would be superfluous and would degrade their connection, according to the rhetorics of *amicitia perfecta*. However, the play does present marriage in a positive manner, but ensures that Rosalind and Celia can continue their relationship, as Crawford highlights several times. "If, as Stewart points out, the humanist *amicitia* story features men who resolve their conflict by marrying sisters, *As You Like It* takes a similar tack for women; in marrying brothers, Celia and Rosalind effect an outcome, not unlike that in the Book of Ruth, that ensures their continued kinship and the integrity and security of their inheritance" (121)

Thus, Crawford's frequent emphasis on balance between the relationships (opposite-sex and same-sex ones) and on the inseparable unity of the girls suggest a stronger homoerotic

reading (e.g. 122. paragraph 2); whereas, if the rhetorics of unity, so typical of *amicitia perfecta* is taken into consideration, the homoerotic overtone becomes only a possibility – one that cannot be totally excluded, but is not necessarily the only valid way of interpretation. The use of superlative or exaggerating terms like "never two ladies loved as they do" (1.1.106-107), stressing the extraordinary and unique nature of their relationship, the use of language evocative of marriage, emphasising the unity of the two people are all characteristic of the humanist friendship discourse. Although underscoring the spiritual blending of the two people, presenting friendship as more noble than "fleshly" marriage, this discourse on *amicitia* is often balancing on the thin line between what is considered homoerotic (or even homosexual in today's terms)[18] and what is not; and the story of David and Jonathan, regarded through the lens of classical learning, fit this pattern really well.

Considering all this, I would suggest a paradigm shift: instead of homoerotic desire, *amicitia perfecta* seems to be a more appropriate framework which accounts for potentially homoerotic resonances in the play. This kind of reading preserves an openness to a homoerotic reading, but only to such an extent that this kind of ambiguity is inherent in the *amicitia perfecta* tradition.

However, seeing the biblical patterns and the cultural context of this Shakespearean friendship still leaves the question open what the significance is of presenting this female friendship in the drama. As it has already been mentioned, women were thought to be excluded from the classical *amicitia*, lacking moral and mental means to form this kind of relationship, at least according to male authors. Considering women's exclusion from *amicitia* raises the question why Shakespeare's drama centres around a female friendship. Stretter argues that in early modern England there were two trends concerning dramas presenting friendships: they were either pedagogical, moralising, and dry like Richard Edwards' *Damon*

[18] Homosexuality as such did not exist as a separate concept in the sixteenth century (Traub 16).

and Pythias (cca. 1564), or they criticized and ridiculed the concept of *amicitia perfecta* as too idealized by representing the discrepancy between ideal and flesh-and-blood friends (346).[19] Shakespeare's engaging green-world comedy certainly does not fit into the first category, while it might be worth considering whether his play presents friendship as a twist on classical ideas.

To my mind, representing the ideals of *amicitia perfecta* by female friends in a cultural context where discourses of the true male friendship were predominant might be a manifestation of a comic feature, "the world turned upside down". In *As You Like It*, male and female stereotypes and conventions of the era are turned "upside down": Rosalind and Celia, the female friends are allowed to play a key role in the dynamics of the drama, actively managing their own life, while male protagonists are often passive, only lamenting their fate like Orlando or the melancholy Jacques. It is Rosalind who pulls the strings in the forest of Arden, and by the end, she is the one who "makes things even" (cf. 5.4.107)– apparently, Hymen only gives his blessing, because it would be "too much" to get everything resolved by the female protagonist. Celia is also actively involved in the plot, although not as much as Rosalind, but she is the one who supports and encourages her all the way long, and after all, it is her idea to flee to the forest of Arden. In sharp contrast with the female friends, "whose loves are dearer than the natural bonds of sisters" (1.2.265), there are also two pairs of real brothers in the plot who hate each other; thus, the contrast with the two girls' friendship is sharpened even more. Therefore, in the world of the comedy, the features traditionally reserved only for male characters like being the architect of one's own fortune, manipulating events, and having an enduring, mutual, "perfect" friendship seem to be bestowed upon women.

---

[19] See Shakespeare's *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, *The Two Gentleman of Verona*, George Peele's *The Old Wives Tale*, Beaumont and Fletcher's *The Coxcomb* (listed and analysed in Stretter 345, 350–351).

In conclusion, taking a closer look at the friendship of Rosalind and Celia seems to be a fruitful step in analysing the drama. The similarity of their story to that of the David and Jonathan narrative from the Bible is probably more than mere coincidence. Furthermore, as we have seen, both friendships can be better understood in the cultural context of the era when the classical notion of *amicitia perfecta* was given a special place. David and Jonathan were regarded as embodiments of the classical friendship, thus it is probable that their story was read through the lenses of the Ciceronian friendship tradition. Rosalind and Celia also seem to fit the same pattern; however, their case means an interesting twist on the original model, since they represent a female friendship, which, according to contemporary theories, was not recognized at all. This, in turn, can be viewed as a comic tool which turns usual roles upside down. In terms of homoeroticism, it is worth considering reframing our questions, and focusing on their *amicitia*, which, in line with the contemporary rhetorics on the subject, contain elements that may carry homoerotic overtones. Overall, this kind of subversion and ambiguity gives the play its special flavour.

Works Cited

Alter, Robert. *The Hebrew Bible: A Translation with Commentary*. W. W. Norton and Co., 2018.

Black, Joseph L. *The Martin Marprelate Tracts. A Modernized and Annotated Edition*. University of Massachusetts, 2011.

Bray, Alan. *Homosexuality in Renaissance Enlgand*. Columbia University Press, 1995.

Crawford, Julie. 'The Place of a Cousin in As You Like It'. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 69, no. 2, Sept. 2018, pp. 101–27. *Project MUSE*, doi:10.1353/shq.2018.0011.

Cicero, M. Tullius. *Cicero De Amicitia (On Friendship) and Scipio's Dream*. Translated by Andrew Peabody P., Little, Brown, and Company, 1887.

Fabiny, Tibor. 'Hymen's Truth. Atonement from Shakespear to Tyndale and from Tyndale to Shakespeare.' *Early Modern Communi(Cati)Ons*, edited by Kinga Földváry and Erzsébet Stróbl, Cambridge Shcolars Publishing, 2012, pp. 132–51.

Frye, Northrop. *Northrop Frye's Uncollected Prose*. Edited by Robert D. Denham, University of Toronto Press, 2015.

Gillespie, Stuart. *Shakespeare's Books. A Dictionary of Shakespeare's Sources*. Student Shakespeare Library, 2004.

Gosson, Stephen. *The School of Abuse : Containing a Pleasant Invective against Poets, Pipers, Players, Jesters, &c.* Edited by Arthur F. Kinney, University of Michigan, 1963.

Harding, James E. 'David and Jonathan Between Athens and Jerusalem'. *Relegere: Studies in Religion and Reception*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2011, pp. 37–92.

Harding, James E. 'Opposite Sex Marriage a Biblical Ideal? The Case of David and Jonathan'. *Pieces of Ease and Grace. Bibical Essays on Sexuality and Welcome*, edited by Alan H. Cadwallader, ATF Theology, 2013.

Harding, James E. *The Love of David and Jonathan: Ideology, Text, Reception*. https://books.google.hu/books?id=-brsCwAAQBAJ&pg=PT15&hl=hu&source=gbs_toc_r&cad=3#v=onepage&q&f=false.

“levirate.” Britannica.com, Web, 30 August 2019.

Lewis, Clive Staples. *Studies in Words*. Cambridge University Press, 1960.

Matz, Robert. *Two Early Modern Marriage Sermons. Henry Smith’s A Preparative to Marriage (1591) and William Whatley’s A Bride-Bush (1623)*. Routledge, 2016, https://books.google.hu/books?id=tvyQDQAAQBAJ&pg=PT35&lpg=PT35&dq=early+modern+sermon+on+friendship&source=bl&ots=IQn7oXrvP8&sig=ACfU3U2PHnqiUDWh22lfHU6Nane2Vv775g&hl=hu&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjOrIXX25PkAhVjsYsKHUalDWYQ6AEwAnoECAkQAQ#v=onepage&q&f=false.

Montaigne, Michel Eyquem de. ‘Of Friendship’. *The Complete Works of Montaigne: Essays, Travel Journal, Letter*, translated by Donald M. Frame, Stanford University Press, 1957, pp. 135–43.

Montaigne, Michel Eyquem de. ‘Of Friendship’. *The essayes, or, Morall, politike and millitarie discourses of Lo. Michaell de Montaigne, Knight of the noble Order of St. Michaell, and one of the gentlemen in ordinary of the French King, Henry the Third his chamber : the first booke*. translated by John Florio. https://archive.org/details/essayesormorallp00mont/page/90

Montrose, Louis Adrian. ‘“The Place of a Brother” in “As You Like It”: Social Process and Comic Form’. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 32, no. 1, 1981, pp. 28–54.

Noyes, Robert Gale. ‘Shakespeare in the Eighteenth-Century Novel’. *ELH*, vol. 11, no. 3, 1944, pp. 213–36. JSTOR, *JSTOR*, doi:10.2307/2871701

Olyan, Saul E. ‘Surpassing the Love of Women’. *Authorizing Marriage?*, edited by Mark Jordan, Princeton University Press, 2006, pp. 7–16.

"Rosalind." *collinsdictionary.com*. Collins Dictionary, Web, 30 August 2019.

Ryken, Leland, et al., editors. *Dictionary of Biblical Imagery*. InterVarsity Press, 1998.

Shaheen, Naseeb. *Biblical References in Shakespeare's Plays*. University of Delaware Pres, 1999.

Shakespeare, William. *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Edited by Reginald A. Foakes, Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Shakespeare, William. *As You Like It*. Edited by Juliet Dusinberre, London, Arden Shakespeare, 2006.

Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*. Edited by Edwards Philip, Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Sidney, Philip. *The Defence of Poesie ; Political Discourses ; Correspondence ; Translation*. Edited by Albert Feuillerat, Cambridge University Press, 1962.

Simonkay, Zsuzsanna. 'False Brotherhood in Chaucer's The Knight's Tale / Part 1: Sworn Brotherhood and Chaucer's Sources on Friendship'. *HUSSE 11: Proceedings of the 11th Conference of the Hungarian Society for the Study of English*, edited by Veronika Ruttkay and Bálint Gárdos, L'Harmattan, 2014, pp. 159–71.

Spenser, Edmund. *The Complete Works in Verse and Prose of Edmund Spenser*. Grosart, 1882.

Stretter, Robert. 'Cicero on Stage: Damon and Pythias and the Fate Pf Classical Friendship in English Reniassance Drama'. *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, vol. 47, no. 4, Winter 2005, pp. 345–65.

Traub, Valerie. *The Renaissance of Lesbianism in Early Modern England*. Cambridge University Press, 2002.

CHAPTER II

THE ENGRAVING "MELENCOLIA I"

If, despite these negative conclusions, we can still assert that Dürer's elaborately prepared engraving[1] owes a debt to the notion of melancholy propagated by Ficino, and would, in fact, have been quite impossible but for this influence, the proof of this assertion can be based only on internal evidence from the engraving itself.

I. THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF "MELENCOLIA I"

(a) Traditional Motifs

(i) *The Purse and the Keys*

All that Dürer tells us of his engraving is an inscription on a sketch of the "putto" (PLATE 8) giving the meaning of the purse and bundle of keys which hang from Melancholy's belt: "The key signifies power, the purse riches."[2] This phrase, brief though it is, has some importance in that it establishes one point of what would in any case have been a likely suspicion: namely, that Dürer's engraving was somehow connected with the astrological and humoral tradition of the Middle Ages. It at once reveals two essential traits of the traditional character, which, for Dürer as for all his contemporaries, was typical both of the melancholic man and of the Saturnine.[3]

Among the medieval descriptions of the melancholic there was none in which he did not appear as avaricious and miserly, and hence, implicitly, as rich; according to Nicholas of Cusa, the melancholic's ability to attain "great riches" even by dishonest means was actually a symptom of "avaritiosa melancholia".[4] If,

[1] The preliminary sketches have been discussed by H. TIETZE and E. TIETZE-CONRAT, *Kritisches Verzeichnis der Werke A. Dürers*, VOL. II, I, Basle 1937, Nos. 582–587; cf. also E. PANOFSKY, *Albrecht Dürer*, Princeton 1943, VOL. II, p. 26.

[2] LF, *Nachlass*, p. 394, 5; cf. also GIEHLOW (1904), p. 76.

[3] This is obvious, even without the remarks quoted above, text p. 281 (with which cf. GIEHLOW (1904), p. 67).

[4] See above, p. 120 (text).

in these descriptions of the melancholic, "power"—naturally associated with property, and here symbolised by the keys which we may take to open the treasure-chest—was a mere adjunct to "riches", both characteristics were expressly united in the traditional descriptions of Saturn and his children. For, just as the mythological Kronos–Saturn, who combined with all his other characteristics the attributes of a distributor and guardian of wealth, was in antiquity not only the guardian of the treasury and the inventor of coin-minting, but also the ruler of the Golden Age, so, too, Saturn was worshipped as ruler and as king; and accordingly, not only did he fill the role of treasurer, and author of prosperity, in the planetary hierarchy, but also, as in Babylon, he was feared and honoured as the "mightiest"; and then, as always happens in astrology, all these properties were transmitted to those who came under his dominion. In an antithesis worthy of Saturn himself, astrological sources inform us that together with the poor and humble, the slaves, the grave-robbers, Saturn governs not only the wealthy and the avaricious ("Saturnus est significator divitum", says Abû Ma'šar in his *Flores astrologiae*) but also "those who rule and subdue others to their sway"; and we read in the Cassel manuscript that the child of Saturn is a "villain and traitor" but is also "beloved of noble people, and counts the mightiest among his friends".[5]

It is not surprising, therefore, that in turning from the texts to the pictures we find the combination of the two symbols interpreted by Dürer as signs of "power" and "riches" less commonly in pictures of melancholics than in pictures of Saturn. In one early fifteenth-century manuscript (PLATE 28), Saturn not only carries a purse at his waist, but is holding two enormous keys, which obviously belong to the chests, some open, some still closed, on the ground beside his feet.[6] But Dürer's purse appears frequently in pictures of melancholics, for as an age-long symbol of riches and avarice it had become a constant feature of these pictures by the fifteenth century. One of the two corner

[5] See above, p. 192, note 204.

[6] Rome, Bibl. Vat., Cod. Urb. lat. 1398, fol. 11r. Saturn reckoning and counting his gold in Cod. Pal. lat. 1369, fol. 144v (PLATE 43) belongs to this realm of ideas (though this time without the key), and so does the remarkable figure in the top left-hand corner of the portrait of Saturn in Tübingen MS Md. 2 (PLATE 40), a seated king counting gold pieces on top of a large treasure chest with his right hand, but raising a goblet with his left (derived from a combination of the carousing King Janus with the reckoning Saturn, who rules January no less than December).

figures in the picture of Saturn in the Erfurt manuscript (PLATE 42) is reminiscent of the Saturn in manuscripts at Tübingen and the Vatican (PLATES 40 and 43), being placed in front of a coffer covered with large coins; and in the Tübingen manuscript (PLATE 73) the melancholic's similarity to his planetary patron goes so far that he is leaning on his spade in an attitude characteristic of the god of agriculture, about to bury his treasure-chest.[7] But in the second melancholic in the Erfurt manuscript, riches and avarice are symbolised no longer by a treasure-chest, but by a purse, and from now on this attribute becomes so typical that fifteenth-century examples of it are innumerable (PLATES 77, 78, 80 and 81),[8] while Cesare Ripa's *Iconologia*, which was still used in the period of the Baroque, would never have pictured the melancholic without his purse (PLATE 68).[9] This is the motif which induced the worthy Appelius to consider the apostle Judas a melancholic: "Melancholics, whose most noticeable feature is avarice, are well adapted to household matters and management of money. Judas carried the purse."[10]

(ii) *The Motif of the Drooping Head*

A considerable proportion of the above-mentioned portraits of melancholics[11] have a further motif in common with Dürer's *Melencolia*, which, to the modern observer, seems too obvious to require a study of its historical derivation; but Dürer's own preliminary design for the engraving, which deviates in this very particular,[12] shows that it does not simply owe its origin to the observation of the melancholic's attitude but emerges from a pictorial tradition, in this case dating back thousands of years. This is the motif of the cheek resting on one hand. The primary significance of this age-old gesture, which appeared even in the mourners in reliefs on Egyptian sarcophagi, is grief, but it may

[7] The caption explains the point of this comparison: "I trust no-one". In K. W. RAMLER's *Kurzgefasste Mythologie* (p. 456 in the 4th edn., Berlin 1820) the melancholic is still equipped with a treasure-chest as well as a dagger, rope and hat (see below, text p. 323).

[8] In one case the purse motif is even combined with the treasure-chest motif.

[9] CESARE RIPA, *Iconologia* (1st edn., Rome 1593), s.v. "Complessioni". The woodcut first appeared in the 1603 edition.

[10] See above, pp. 121 sqq. (text).

[11] J. LIGOZZI's *Allegory of Avarice* (H. Vos, *Die Malerei der Spätrenaissance in Rom und Florenz*, Berlin, 1920, VOL. II, plate 165) with its purse, treasure-chest and hand on chin could equally well stand for "Melancholy" were it not for the remaining motifs.

[12] F. HAACK (in *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst*, VOL. LX (1926–27), supplement, p. 121) has again shown that it really was a preliminary study.

also mean fatigue or creative thought. To mention medieval types alone, it represents not only St John's grief at the Cross, and the sorrow of the "anima tristis" of the psalmist (PLATE 62),[13] but also the heavy sleep of the apostles on the Mount of Olives, or the dreaming monk in the illustrations to the *Pèlerinage de la Vie Humaine*; the concentrated thought of a statesman,[14] the prophetic contemplation of poets, philosophers, evangelists, and Church Fathers (PLATES 61 and 63)[15]; or even the meditative rest of God the Father on the seventh day.[16] No wonder, then, that such a gesture should spring to the artist's mind when it was a question of representing a configuration which combined in an almost unique fashion the triad grief, fatigue, and meditation; that is to say, when representing Saturn and the melancholy under his dominion. In fact, the veiled head of the classical Kronos[17] (PLATE 13) rests as sadly and as thoughtfully on his hand as does the head of the melancholy Hercules on his in some ancient representations.[18] In medieval portraits of Saturn and melancholy, which had almost lost any direct links with ancient pictorial tradition,[19] this motif frequently receded into the background, but even then it was never quite forgotten[20]; see, for instance, the description of Saturn in King Alfonso's *Book of Chess* as a sad old man, "la mano ala mexiella como omne cuyerdadoso".[21] It was therefore the easier for it to regain its typical significance in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and

[13] According to ERNEST T. DE WALD, *The Stuttgart Psalter*, Princeton 1930, fol. 55 (for Psalm 42, 7: "Quare tristis es, anima mea"). Similar types occur in the same work, fol. 58ᵛ (for Psalm 45) and fol. 141 (for Psalm 118).

[14] See the examples mentioned above, p. 224, note 27.

[15] The prototype of this extremely widespread design of the "contemplative" person is, of course, the ancient portrait of philosopher or poet, the adoption of which for medieval portraits of the evangelists has been studied in detail by A. M. FRIEND (in *Art Studies*, VOL. V (1927), pp. 115 sqq., plate XVI being particularly instructive).

[16] Paris, Bibl. Mazarine, MS 19, fol. 3ʳ.

[17] See above, pp. 197 sqq. (text).

[18] Reproduced in W. H. ROSCHER, *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, Leipzig 1884, VOL. I, col. 2160.

[19] For pictures of Saturn, see above, text pp. 200 sqq.; of melancholics, below, pp. 290 sqq. (text).

[20] Cf. e.g. Modena, Biblioteca Estense, Cod. 697; for this MS and the Guariento frescoes in the Eremitani Chapel, Padua, cf. A. VENTURI, in *Arte*, VOL. XVII (1914), pp. 49 sqq., though the connexion between them is not quite correctly stated.

[21] F. SAXL, in *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft*, VOL. XLIII (1922), p. 233.

to undergo a renaissance[22] which sprang, indeed, from very different impulses in the north and in the south. In the north, an ever-growing interest in the life-like portraying of certain psychologically distinctive types of men revived this gesture of the drooping head in pictures of melancholics, though it was omitted for the time being from portraits of Saturn. In fifteenth-century Italy, where portraits of the four temperaments were practically unknown (the only example known to us is a copy of a northern cycle, of the type shown in PLATES 77 and 78, but slightly modified in accordance with the classical tradition),[23] it was a desire to characterise distinctive individuals rather than types, and, in particular, a desire to revive the ideal world of classical mythology, that led to the restitution of this classical gesture of Saturn. The melancholic resting his head on his hand, as he appears in German manuscripts and prints, is matched in Italy on the one hand by the figure of Heraclitus in Raphael's *School of Athens*, and on the other by the Saturn in the engraving B4 by Campagnola (PLATE 54)—the majestic embodiment of a god's contemplation, which only later influenced portraits of human contemplation in general.[24]

Whether he was influenced by the northern portraits of Melancholy, or by Italian models such as Campagnola's engraving,[25]

[22] How greatly the propped-up head was later considered a specific attitude of the melancholic can be seen, for instance, from the fact that Dürer's drawing L144 (in itself a harmless study for a portrait) appeared in an old inventory as the "Prustpild" of an old melancholy woman (cf. G. GLÜCK, in *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*, VOL. XXVIII (1909–1910), p. 4). The paper by URSULA HOFF quoted below (p. 392, note 54) contains an interesting collection of "melancholy" portraits with this gesture of the head-on-hand.

[23] The miniatures are illustrations to the above-quoted verses (p. 116, note 148) by LIONARDO DATI in Rome, Bibl. Vat., Cod. Chis. M. VII, 148, fols. 11^r sqq. (about 1460–70). Only the choleric is much altered; he has been transformed from a medieval warrior into a Roman one. The sanguinic is carrying a laurel-wreath instead of a hawk's hood.

[24] For Campagnola's engraving of Saturn, cf. HARTLAUB, *Geheimnis*, esp. p. 53 and plate 23; and the same author in *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft*, VOL. XLVIII (1927), pp. 233 sqq. For its relation to a river god on the triumphal arch at Benevento, as well as its interesting transformations into (1) a peasant Saturn in a picture by Girolamo da Santa Croce (PLATE 56) and (2) into a St Jerome in a portrait by Lorenzo Costa (published in *Arte*, VOL. V (1902), p. 296) see above, text p. 212. Campagnola himself some years later transformed the philosophical type of Saturn into a purely human, and, so to speak, anonymous type (engraving P12, reproduced in HARTLAUB, *Geheimnis*, p. 24). In the north, the type of Saturn resuscitated by Campagnola was not generally adopted until the late sixteenth century, and even then, significantly enough, not under his mythological name but as a melancholic (PLATE 126, for which cf. text, p. 379).

[25] Hartlaub may be right in stating that pictures such as the engraving B4 may have been directly familiar to Dürer (for a possible connexion between Dürer and Campagnola, see also below, p. 324, note 135), but the supposed dependence of Campagnola's engraving P12 on Giorgione seems to us as little susceptible of proof as the assumption that the engraving B19 by the "master of 1515" represents a figure of Melancholy. The figure inspiring the astrologer is more likely to be the Muse Urania, or, more probably still, a personification of Astrology—of whom, for instance, Ripa expressly states that she is to have wings "per dimostrar che ella sta sempre con il pensiero levata in alto per sapere et intendere le cose celesti."

Dürer was in any case obeying pictorial tradition when he replaced the lethargically hanging hands which characterise the seated woman in the preliminary study—a typical symptom of melancholy illness, according to medical authorities[26]—by the thoughtful gesture of the hand supporting the cheek in the final engraving.

(iii) *The Clenched Fist and the Black Face*

In one respect, it is true, Dürer's portrait differs fundamentally from those previously mentioned. The hand, which generally lies softly and loosely against the cheek, is here a clenched fist. But even this motif, apparently quite original, was not so much invented by Dürer as given artistic expression by him, for the clenched fist had always been considered a sign of the typical avarice of the melancholy temperament,[27] as well as a specific medical symptom of certain melancholy delusions.[28] In this sense, in fact, it had not been completely foreign to medieval portraits of the melancholic (PLATE 72).[29] But comparison with such a type of medical illustration merely emphasises the fact that similarity of motif and similarity of meaning are two very different things; what Dürer intended to (and did) express by this clenched fist has little more in common with what it meant in the cauterisation charts than the rather elusive nuance of rendering a spasmodic tension. This, however, is not the place to describe what Dürer made of the tradition, but merely to list the elements which he found in it and judged fit to incorporate in his work.[30]

[26] It is difficult to prove that the drawing L79 was a study of Dürer's wife; but even if it were, the artist could have observed her in a genuinely depressed state.

[27] In DANTE's *Inferno*, for instance (Canto VII, 56), we read of the avaricious man that "Questi resurgeranno del sepulcro, Col pugno chiuso, e questi coi crin mozzi"; according to CAELIUS CALCAGNINUS (*Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*, VOL. XXXII (1915), p. 169), "manus dextra expansa [denotes] liberalitatem, manus sinistra compressa tenacitatem." The originator of this conceit, which still persisted in Sandrart's *Iconology*, seems to have been DIODORUS SICULUS: ἡ δ' εὐώνυμος συνηγμένη τήρησιν καὶ φυλακὴν χρημάτων (III, 4, 3 ed. F. Vogel, Leipzig 1888, p. 272).

[28] For quotations, see above, p. 55 (text).

[29] Erfurt, Wissenschaftliche Bibliothek, Cod. Amplon. Q. 185, fol. 247^r (cf. K. SUDHOFF, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Chirurgie im Mittelalter*, VOL. I, Leipzig 1914, plate XXX).

[30] For the change by Dürer in the expressive value of these traditional motifs, see below, pp. 317 sqq. (text).

One last motif, perhaps of still greater importance for the emotional meaning of the engraving, should be mentioned, in view not of its quite untraditional significance, but of its traditional origin. This is the motif of the shadowed countenance, from which Melencolia gazes forth in an almost ghostly stare. We may remember that this "black face" was a far more frequently cited trait in tradition than was the clenched fist. Both the child of Saturn and the melancholic—whether melancholy through illness or by temperament—were by the ancients reckoned swarthy and black of countenance[31]; and this notion was as common in medieval medical literature as in astrological writings on the planets and in popular treatises on the four complexions. "Facies nigra propter melancholiam",[32] "nigri",[33] "mud-coloured",[34] "corpus niger sicut lutum",[35] "luteique coloris",[36] these are all phrases that Dürer may have read in the traditional texts, as many before him might have done; but, as also in the case of the clenched fist, he was the first to realise that what was there described as a temperamental characteristic, or even as a pathological symptom, could, by an artist, be turned to good account in expressing an emotion or in communicating a mood.

(b) Traditional Images in the Composition of the Engraving

Written in his own hand, Dürer's explanation of the symbolism of the purse and keys called our attention to various single motifs. We should now ask ourselves whether the picture as a whole also has its roots in the tradition of pictorial types.

(i) *Illustrations of Disease*

Medical illustrations proper, that is, representations of the melancholic as an insane person, had, as far as we know, neither

[31] For quotations, see above, pp. 59 sqq. (text).

[32] Thus Ibn Esra.

[33] Thus Albertus Magnus, quoted on p. 71, note 12.

[34] Thus e.g. the translation of the Salernitan verses in the work *De conservanda bona valetudine*, ed. Johannes Curio, Frankfurt 1559, fol. 237v: "Ir farb fast schwartz vnd erdfarb ist" ("their colour is almost black and earthy"). In view of the contradictory nature of this type of literature, and the contrasts inherent in the notion of melancholy itself, it is not surprising to find the melancholic occasionally described as "pale" in other writings on the complexions, e.g. in the verses on PLATE 81.

[35] Thus Johann von Neuhaus, quoted on p. 115 sq. (text).

[36] Thus the Salernitan verses, quoted on p. 115 (text).

evolved nor attempted to evolve a characteristic melancholy type. When there was an illustration at all, it was more a question of showing certain therapeutic or even surgical measures than of working out a general conception of the psycho-physical state.

The most common illustrations of this kind were the so-called "cauterisation charts", of which one (PLATE 72) has already been mentioned. They were to show how and where the various insane persons were to be cauterised, or trepanned. In the melancholic's case, the grisly operation was to be carried out "in medio vertice". He is shown, therefore, with a round hole in the top of his head, frequently as a single standing figure, sometimes sitting on the operating chair, occasionally, even stretched out on a kind of rack[37]; but only very seldom is some better than average illustrator ambitious enough to characterise the patient psychologically, that is to say, to distinguish him by specifically melancholy gestures.

As well as these cauterisation diagrams, there are also pictures of cures by means of flogging or by music (PLATES 67, 70 and 71)[38]: but even these (some of them quite attractive miniatures) could not be the starting point for a more general line of development, since they created no new types, but endeavoured to treat their theme by adopting forms of composition that were already fully developed (Saul and David, the scourging of Christ, the flogging of martyrs, and so on).

(ii) *Picture Cycles of the Four Temperaments. I: Descriptive Single Figures (the Four Temperaments and the Four Ages of Man)—II: Dramatic Groups: Temperaments and Vices*

On the other hand, an attempt at precise characterisation seems to have been made in portraits of the melancholic in the context of the four temperaments. It is true that here, too, no completely new types were coined; nor was this to be expected, since the problem of illustrating the complexions arose comparatively late. But, through the deliberate use of analogies at relevant points, these pictures grew at length into solid and striking portraits of character types.

[37] Cf. K. SUDHOFF, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Chirurgie im Mittelalter*, VOL. I, plate XXXVI; in some cases the physician operating is also shown, e.g. Rome, Cod. Casanat. 1382 (SUDHOFF, op. cit., plate XXV) and above, pp. 55, 94.

[38] With PLATES 67, 70 cf. e.g. the pictures of Saul and David; with PLATE 71 cf. a miniature like Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Cod. Hamilton 390, fol. 19r: "Iste verberat uxorem suam" (for this codex, see below, text p. 298).

Some late representations of the temperaments simply adopt the characteristics of the corresponding planet or children of a planet—a striking instance of this is the picture in the Tübingen manuscript of a miser burying his treasure (PLATE 73).[39] In certain isolated cases the melancholic follows the pose—familiar enough in a different context—of a writing evangelist or a scholar, with the mere addition of a treasure-chest[40]; a case in point is a sequence of miniatures dating from about 1480. If we leave these two exceptions aside, the pictures representing the four temperaments in a set or sequence can be divided into two main groups: those showing each temperament as a single figure, more or less inactive and distinguished mainly by age, physique, expression, costume, and attributes; and those in which several figures, preferably a man and a woman, meet in order to enact a scene typical of their particular temperament. Sets of the first group are very numerous; those of the second are fewer in number but more momentous in view of later developments.

The first example of a set of single figures—linked, as it were, with the old schema of the four winds in Dürer's woodcut illustrating Celtes's work—occurs in a crude outline drawing belonging to an eleventh- or twelfth-century treatise on the *Tetrad*, preserved in Cambridge (PLATE 75).[41] The quadrants of a circle contain four seated figures which, according to the caption, represent the "four ages of human life",[42] and are therefore all female. In addition to the caption, however, there are marginal notes which inform us that these figures represent also the four

[39] Also the two men with wooden legs, in a woodcut series of the vices (which will be dealt with later, text pp. 300 sqq.) from the Curio edition (quoted above, note 34), fol. 239ᵛ, our PLATE 74. For the Swiss drawing on PLATE 139, and the De Gheyn engraving on PLATE 143, where the assimilation of the melancholic to the Saturnine type takes place on a new, humanistic basis, see below, pp. 393, 398 (text).

[40] Berlin, Cod. germ. fol. 1191, fol. 63ᵛ, now in Marburg; cf. *Beschreibendes Verzeichnis der Miniatur-Handschriften der Preussischen Staatsbibliothek*, VOL. V, ed. H. Wegener, Berlin 1928, pp. 72 sqq. Here the sanguinics are playing the lute, the cholerics wrestling, and the phlegmatic is seated in a depressed attitude generally characteristic of the melancholic; on this, see below, p. 319, note 117.

[41] Cambridge, Caius College, MS 428, fol. 27ᵛ, cf. M. R. JAMES, *Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Gonville and Caius College*, Cambridge 1908, p. 500. Pictures like those discussed here can easily be accounted for as a synthesis of the abstract tetradic systems occurring from the ninth century onwards, first in Isidore MSS and then in illustrations to cosmological treatises (cf. E. WICKERSHEIMER in *Janus*, VOL. XIX (1914), pp. 157 sqq., and C. SINGER, *From Magic to Science*, London 1928, pp. 211 sqq. and plate XIV), with cognate figure representations from Graeco-Roman times, like the Chebba mosaics, etc.

[42] "Quatuor aetates velut hic patet atque videtur
Humanae vitae spatium conplere iubentur."

complexions, or, more precisely, that they personify the humours preponderating in them. "Childhood" represents also the phlegm, sharing in the elemental qualities cold and damp; warm and moist "Youth" represents the blood; warm and dry "Manhood" represents the yellow bile; and finally, cold and dry, "Decline" represents the black bile.[43] In later centuries there will be sets of pictures representing, primarily, the four temperaments, and only secondarily the four seasons, the four ages of man, and the four points of the compass; but these figures in the Cambridge miniature are meant primarily as portraits of the four ages of man, and in them the representation of the four humours is only of secondary interest.[44]

This is not surprising, at a time when the terms "phlegmaticus" and so on had not yet been coined for the notion of men governed by the phlegm and the various humours.[45] Nevertheless, with this reservation, the Cambridge cycle of four may be considered the earliest known picture of the temperaments; and so the question arises, from which source did the draftsman take the types which he embodies in his design? The answer is that these humorally characterised pictures of the four temperaments evolved from classical representations of the seasons and occupations.[46] But while a connexion made in antiquity was adopted, it was at the same time revised in the sense of its original—in this

[43] The series in this list is based (a) on the rule applying almost throughout to all systems, whether they begin with "sanguis", or, as here, with "phlegma"—namely, that the "cholera rubra" precedes the "cholera nigra", and (b) on the verbal usage whereby "decrepitas" denotes a greater age than "senectus". This, however, is contradicted by the pictorial sequence (while, e.g., the cycle of cardinal points shown on fol. 21ʳ of the same MS should be read clockwise starting from the top, the sequence here is irregular), and by the fact that "Decrepitas" is still spinning while "Senectus" is already winding the wool. The ancient tradition following the less customary system beginning with the "phlegma" (see above, text p. 10) was obviously largely eclipsed; fol. 22ᵛ shows a circular schema analogous to the two just mentioned, in which the sequence, though normal, begins from the bottom and runs anticlockwise (top, "cholera rubra" = warm and dry; right, "sanguis" = warm and moist; below, "aqua" = cold and moist; left, "terra" = cold and dry). It is also highly unusual to describe the warm and dry "choleric" age as "senectus", and to call the west "cold and dry" as compared with the "warm and moist" east. In the examples collected by Wickersheimer the cycle always runs in the usual sequence: "sanguis", "cholera rubra", "cholera nigra", "phlegma".

[44] Especially in these tetradic cycles it is not uncommon to find a double or even treble significance for each figure. Cf. the examples cited on p. 292, note 41, and the Rivers of Paradise on the Rostock baptismal font of 1291 (which, according to the inscription, also represent the four elements).

[45] See above, p. 103 sq. (text).

[46] Medieval portrayals of the four ages of man seem in fact to have evolved indirectly from representations of the four seasons, these being linked with antiquity by a continuous pictorial tradition.

case, abstract—form. For at first the seasons in classical pictures were distinguished only by attributes; in the mosaics of Lambaesis and Chebba[47] they had become girls and women differentiated according to their ages—and thereby individualized. The Cambridge artist reverts once more from the differentiation by natural, biological, signs of age to the differentiation by conventional attributes. Youth (blood), who in accordance with her youthful age is the only standing figure, is exactly like the well-known figure of the garland-laden Spring; which, in turn, is identical with Maius (May) in the cycles of the months.[48] In contrast with carefree youth, Decline (black bile) has to work, and (in accordance with her advanced age, and the cold season) she is holding a distaff[49]; while Old Age (red bile) is winding the spun wool. Only Childhood (phlegm) has to make do without attributes: she is characterised merely by legs crossed in a typical attitude of rest, which is probably meant to indicate the physical and mental indifference of both the phlegmatic temperament and the age of childhood: εἰς ἠθοποιίαν ἄχρηστος.

This attempt to illustrate the notion of the complexions, hitherto transmitted only in literature, by interpreting certain forms of pictures of seasons and occupations as pictures of the four ages of man, and then including in these the notion of the four humours, set a precedent for the future. By the fifteenth century (unfortunately we have no example of the intermediate period), when what we may call the orthodox pictures of the complexions had been evolved, the combination of the ages of man with his various occupations—a combination unskilfully drafted in the Cambridge miniature—had only to be further modernised in order to produce, as it were, automatically a series of those "single-figure" pictures of the temperaments which form, as we have said, the first and larger group.

[47] F. BOLL, "Die Lebensalter", in *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum*, VOL. XVI (1913), p. 103, plate I, 2.

[48] For this type of representation of Spring we need only refer to the above-mentioned Chebba mosaic or the *Chronicon Zwifaltense* mentioned above, p. 279, note 9. The corresponding representations of May are innumerable; the earliest example is the well-known Salzburg calendar of 818 (our PLATE 97). That "May" and "Spring" could be used synonymously in literature as well can be seen from the caption to the portrait of the sanguinic in PLATE 78: "das wirket mey und Jupiter".

[49] In the fully developed allegory of the ages of man, the distaff denotes the fifth stage in the cycle of seven, and the seventh decade in the hundred-year cycle (W. MOLSDORF, *Christliche Symbolik der mittelalterlichen Kunst*, Leipzig 1926, Nos. 1142 and 1143). Apart from this, spinning is the characteristic form of female activity, and the Cambridge miniature is concerned only with feminine occupations.

Since this further development aimed at a transformation of the abstract scientific diagram into the picture of a concrete character, the singularities both of the different ages and of the corresponding temperaments were now depicted with modern realism. Physique, dress and occupation were painted in livelier colours, sometimes almost in the style of a genre picture. The sanguine man generally appears as a fashionably-dressed youth going falconing; the choleric as an armed warrior; the melancholic as a sedate middle-aged gentleman; the phlegmatic as a long-bearded old man, sometimes leaning on a crutch. The psychological attitude is shown partly by the addition of distinguishing attributes but mainly by mimetic means, such as the morose expression and the head-on-hand attitude of the melancholic, or the grimace of rage on the face of the choleric, who draws his sword or even hurls chairs about.[50] If the Cambridge drawing had already represented the four humours in the guise of the four ages of man, it must have been even easier in the fifteenth century for the two sets of illustrations to be more closely associated; for by that time the four ages had preceded the temperaments in the realistic development of single types. A French cycle of about 1300 (PLATE 76)[51] is content to differentiate the various ages by reference rather to physiological than to psychological or occupational characteristics: but in the French miniature (PLATE 58) of the *Wheel of Life* a hundred years later, youth is shown as a young falconer, and the penultimate age of man as a thinker with his head on his hand[52]; and in two closely connected German designs, the older dated 1461 (PLATE 79), the representatives of the middle four of the seven ages are identical with the current types of the four temperaments—a falconer, a knight in armour, an older man counting money or holding a purse, and a frail old man. The only points in which the fifteenth-century pictures of the four complexions—in so far as they belong to the descriptive, single-figure type—differ from the contemporary series of pictures representing the four ages, are the inclusion of

[50] Broadsheet, Zürich, Zentralbibliothek (Schreiber 1922 m.); P. HEITZ, *Einblattdrucke des 15. Jahrhunderts*, VOL. IV, No. 4.

[51] London, Brit. Mus., Sloane MS 2435, fol. 31r.

[52] F. BOLL, "Die Lebensalter", in *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum*, VOL. XVI (1913), plate II, 3 and 4. It is obviously an error when, on p. 129, Boll says that the falconer is holding "a dove, the creature sacred to Venus."

the four elements (the sanguine man stands on clouds, the choleric in flames, the melancholic on the earth); and, in certain representations (for example, in PLATE 82), the addition of a symbolic beast, an ape for the sanguine, a lion for the choleric, a boar for the melancholic, and a sheep for the phlegmatic.[53]

Moreover, the form of these pictures shows little variation throughout the fifteenth century; the various types became so well established that, once defined, they intruded upon the illustrations of the "children" of the planets in astrological manuscripts[54]; and could even be included in illustrations to Aristotle's *Problems* (PLATE 77), the fourteenth chapter of which had nothing to do with the late medieval doctrine of the temperaments, but which is headed ὅσα περὶ κράσεις, or, in the French translation, "Qui ont regart a la complexion".[55] Even where the representatives of the four temperaments appear on horseback (PLATE 81), by analogy with a certain planetary type first occurring in the well-known Kyeser manuscripts they remain falconers,

[53] For animal symbolism as applied to the four temperaments, see above, text p. 102 sq. The works here in question (*The Shepherds' Calendar* in French and English, the latter edited by O. H. Sommer, 1892, and the printed Books of Hours by Simon Vostre and Thomas Kherver) form a special regional group derived from a single prototype, and distinguished by the fact that the phlegmatic, who occupies the third place, is characterised by a purse, while the melancholic, relegated to fourth place, has a crutch—perhaps because of a mistake which, once made, became traditional. The melancholic is also given fourth place in a few other cycles, though the relevant texts expressly correlate autumn with him (see also above, text p. 280).

[54] Cf. the corner-figures in the picture of Saturn in the Erfurt MS, our PLATE 42; in the picture of the sun in the same MS (A. HAUBER, *Planetenkinderbilder und Sternbilder*, Strasbourg 1916, plate XXIV) the "sanguine" falconer occupies the corresponding position.

[55] Paris, Bibl. Nat., MS nouv. acq. fr. 3371. A special instance, apparently, without analogy, but of some interest because of its early date, appears in a MS dated 1408 by JOHANNES DE FOXTON, *Liber cosmographiae* (Cambridge, Trinity College, MS 943, fols. 12ᵛ sqq.). Here the four temperaments appear as naked men, described as "prima ymago" etc., with the Salernitan couplets as superscriptions, and in the odd sequence sanguinic, phlegmatic, melancholic, choleric, though the phlegmatic is clearly the oldest. The choice of attributes, too, is somewhat singular. The choleric, as usual, is girded with a sword, but this stands out in odd contrast to his nakedness; the sanguinic, too, is brandishing a sword in his right hand, and holding a goblet in his left. The melancholic is holding a raven in his right hand (this, according to the *Fiore di Virtù*, is the companion of "tristizia") while with his left hand—as in portraits of "Ira" or "Desperatio"—he plunges a dagger into his breast (probably a reference to his suicidal leanings); and the phlegmatic, rather drastically shown as 'sputamine plenus", is standing with a book, his head on his hand. Moreover, the sanguinic is further distinguished by a plant across his chest, and a dove sitting on his right arm, and the choleric by a flower emerging from his mouth. No definite interpretation of these details has yet been arrived at—some of them were no doubt taken over from the pictorial types of the deadly sins; nor are the physiognomical descriptions, in each case appearing in the left-hand margin, comprehensible as they stand.

men in armour and so on[56]; and even the series of single figures representing the complexions in the middle and late Renaissance, with which we shall deal later, preserves in many respects a recollection of the fifteenth-century types.

The second group (that in which the different temperaments are represented by means of a scene in which several figures take part) has a very different character. The series so far discussed evolved from, and in combination with, illustrations of the four ages of man, which in their turn could be traced back to classical representations of seasons and occupations. It is therefore understandable that they should emphasise differences of age and occupation, while psychological traits such as the melancholic's avarice and depression, or the choleric's rage, only gradually appear, and then seem to be based as much on the respective ages to which they are allotted as on the respective types of temperament.

In the dramatic representations of the temperaments, on the other hand, difference in age fades as much into the background as difference in occupation or situation. Here, from the beginning, interest is centred so entirely on the humorally-given traits of character that the scene is limited to actions and situations revealing these traits: everything else is neglected; and only the introduction of the four elements (also lacking occasionally) distinguishes works of this type from morality paintings or illustrations to novels.

This difference in artistic intention corresponds to the difference in historical origin. The historical study of pictorial types—which is just as necessary and just as possible for the dramatic compositions as for the static single descriptive figures—takes us, not into the world of "speculum naturale", but into that of "speculum morale", not into the realm of the pictures of the four ages but into that of the illustrations of virtues—or rather, vices; for this realm was almost the only one in which (though under the menacing aspect of ecclesiastical moral theology) the

[56] Clm. 4394. PLATE 81, after a broadsheet in the Gotha Museum (Schreiber 1922 o; P. HEITZ, *Einblattdrucke des 15. Jahrhunderts*, VOL. LXIV, No. 8). For representations of planets on horseback (probably based on a convention in jousting and tournaments), cf. SAXL, *Verzeichnis*, VOL. I, p. 114. A curious connection between these riders and the Shepherds' Calendars and Books of Hours can be seen in the *Horae B. V. Mariae* printed by Marcus Reinhart, Kirchheim about 1490 (Schreiber 4573, Proctor 3209), fol 1ᵛ. Here the choleric appears as the Wild Huntsman, the sanguinics as a pair of lovers, also on horseback—the phlegmatic, however, as a simple standing figure with a sheep, and the melancholic (in the fourth place) as a standing figure with a pig.

undesirable, and therefore psychologically significant, characteristics of men were shown in brief, sharply defined scenes.

A curiously early example of the dramatic type—which, however, apparently remained quite isolated—may be seen in a famous Hamilton Codex in Berlin, compiled before 1300 in North Italy, which includes also the sayings of Dionysius Cato, the misogynistic outpourings of the "proverbia quae dicuntur super naturam feminarum", a moralised bestiary, and other writings of a similar trend, and endeavours to enliven all of these by innumerable small border miniatures, partly moral, partly didactic. The Salernitan verses on the complexions—with many mistakes in the text—are illustrated in the same style and with the same intention (PLATE 84).[57] The miniaturist introduces auxiliary figures for the purpose of coupling them with the representative of each temperament in a joint action which is designed to reveal the main characteristics listed in each couplet, and in general resembles closely the other illustrations in the manuscript. The sanguine is, above all, the *generous* man ("largus"), and his generosity is shown by his handing a purse to a minor figure kneeling before him.[58] The choleric—*angry* ("irascens")—is giving his partner a blow on the head with a club, which is exactly what the married man on another page, exasperated by contradiction, is doing to his wife.[59] The *sleepy man* ("somnolentus") of the phlegmatic's verses is illustrated by a sleeper being rudely awakened by a second man. Finally, the melancholic—*envious and sad* ("invidus et tristis")—is turning away with a gesture of contempt from a loving couple, and this figure too has its model (and its explanation) in an illustration at the very beginning of the codex, entitled "He shuns love-making" ("Iste fugit meretricem").[60]

These little miniatures are too idiosyncratic and the circumstances which gave them birth too exceptional, for them to have had any influence. In Italy, as already mentioned, no special interest was taken anyhow in pictures of the temperaments and, as far as we know, this was changed only under the influence of

[57] Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Cod. Hamilton 390, fol. 83ᵛ.

[58] For this group, cf. e.g. the illustration on fol. 20ʳ to Cato's epigram "Dilige denarium sed parce".

[59] Fol. 148ᵛ: "Hisque repugnando maior et ira furit".

[60] Fol. 4ʳ. The composition of the pair of lovers reappears in a similar form on fols 104ᵛ and 139ᵛ. The round object which the loving couple are holding up is difficult to interpret. By analogy with fol. 113ʳ, one might think it some sort of ornament.

mannerism, with its northern connotations. North of the Alps—apart from the fact that the Hamilton Codex could hardly have been known there—the conditions for the development and diffusion of scenic and dramatic pictures of the four complexions were not available until the birth of an artistic style which was to be realistic in expression and psychological in intent. The designs in the Hamilton manuscript, therefore, remained an interesting exception. The standard type did not arise until the middle of the fifteenth century, and then apparently in Germany.

The original sequence, which was to become almost canonical, arose in illustrated manuscripts,[61] imposed itself on the majority of almanac illustrations (PLATES 85, 87, 89A, 89B),[62] and underwent its first superficial modernisation as late as about 1500 (PLATES 90A–D).[63] It consisted of the following scenes: "sanguineus"—a pair of lovers embracing; "colericus"—a man beating his wife; "melencolicus"—a woman fallen asleep over her distaff,[64] and a man (in the background) also asleep, generally at a table but occasionally in bed; and "phlegmaticus"—a couple making music. The proverbial indifference of the phlegmatic was made the harder to illustrate by the fact that the motif of exhausted slumber had to be reserved for the melancholics, so that illustrators were forced to be content with a neutral group of musicians.[65] Hence as soon as in the sixteenth century the sleepy melancholic had been replaced by one doing intellectual work the now unemployed slumber-motif naturally reverted to

[61] Zürich, Zentralbibliothek, Cod. C 54/719, fols. 34ᵛ–36ʳ.

[62] The first German Calendar, Augsburg, about 1480. The same woodcuts reappear in later ones, e.g. Augsburg, Schönsperger 1490 (published in facsimile by K. Pfister, Munich 1922), 1495, etc.

[63] Strasbourg Calendar about 1500; Rostock Calendar for 1523. As one can see, the sanguine lovers are generally on horseback and going hawking; the representation is derived from a model like the pseudo-Dürer drawing in the Berlin Print Room (*Inv.* 2595, reproduced in H. TIETZE and E. TIETZE-CONRAT, *Der junge Dürer*, Augsburg 1928, p. 229, and elsewhere), while the portrait of the phlegmatics seems based on an engraving by E. S. (Lehrs 203; this observation was made by M. I. Friedländer). The scene of the choleric's cudgelling is now enriched by a horrified female onlooker; and a long-bearded monk, a figure which the average mind would probably still associate with the "vita contemplativa", enters the room of the two melancholics.

[64] Thus the Zürich MS, fol. 35ʳ. Here, as in a few other cases, a weakening of the original idea has resulted in the spinstress, so far from sleeping, being actually engaged in work.

[65] The choice of this motif, which in itself would suit the sanguine temperament far better (cf. PLATES 119 and 124, as well as the usual characteristics of "Voluptas" in the pictures of Hercules at the Crossroads), may have been based on the view that the phlegmatic dullness might be a little animated by "citharae sono" (cf. Melanchthon's account, quoted above, text p. 89 sq.).

the phlegmatic.[66] Apart from the phlegmatics, however, we may say that these scenes are nothing but pictures of vices which, having been taken out of their theological context, have been applied to the profane illustration of the temperaments; and some of these pictures of vices were directly related to the noble tradition of classical Gothic cathedral decoration. In order to see the connexion we need only compare the scene of the sanguine lovers (PLATE 85) with the relief of "Luxuria" in the western porch of Amiens Cathedral (PLATE 86), or the married discord of the choleric with the relief of "Discordia" in the same series (PLATES 87 and 88), or even, because of the knee-motif, with the relief of "Dureté" in the western façade of Notre Dame.[67]

But where is the prototype of the melancholic, who interests us most? (cf. PLATE 89B.) We have several times remarked that the Middle Ages equated melancholy with the sin of "acedia"[68]; but this particular sin was not represented in the great cathedrals. This leads us to a closer examination of the illustrated tracts dealing with the theme of the virtues and vices, of which the best-known example was the *Somme le Roi* of 1279, which was translated into almost every language and gained an extraordinarily wide dissemination.[69] And we do in fact discover "Accide, cest a dire peresce et anui de bien faire," illustrated

[66] I.e., in the work *De conservanda bona valetudine* disseminated in many Frankfurt editions, as editors signing, first, Eobanus Hesse and then Curio and Crellius. The complexion-sequence (1551: fols. 118 sqq.; 1553: fols. 116 sqq.; 1554: fols. 152 sqq.) is something of a patchwork. The portraits of the sanguinic and the choleric are taken from older cycles; the melancholic and the phlegmatic, however, are new, and very rough, the former a geometrician at a writing desk (see text figure 2, cf. text p. 395 sq.), the latter a pot-bellied man asleep in an armchair. A similar instance occurs in the Berlin Cod. germ. fol. 1191, now in Marburg, where the melancholic is shown as a scholar reading (though also, as a miser) while the phlegmatic appears as "homo acediosus". One can see that whenever the portrait of sloth or dullness is not used for the melancholic, it falls to the phlegmatic, as in the Hamilton Codex, PLATE 84, and, *mutatis mutandis*, in the Cambridge Foxton MS.

[67] The Amiens cycle of virtues and vices and the similar ones in Chartres (southern transept) and Paris (base of the western façade and the rose) form, of course, a group of their own. Moreover the complexion-sequences are by no means the only profane cycles derived from the types of vices; the "Luxuria" group, for instance, became a constant part of the astrological picture of Venus, just as, vice versa, the originally courtly picture of the couple hunting on horseback, which occasionally replaces the simple couple embracing, can appear in a moralising connexion (e.g. in a representation of the devotees of "Voluptas" in the Berlin Cassone picture of Hercules at the Crossroads, reproduced in E. PANOFSKY, *Hercules am Scheidewege*, (Studien der Bibliothek Warburg, VOL. XVIII), Leipzig 1930.

[68] See above, p. 78 (text) and p. 223, note 26.

[69] Cf. D. C. TINBERGEN, *Des Coninx Summe*, Bibliotheek van Middelnederlandsche Letterkunde, Groningen 1900–03, with bibliography; also H. MARTIN in *Les trésors des bibliothèques de France*, VOL. I, Paris 1926, pp. 43 sqq.

in a manner which proves almost beyond doubt the derivation of our picture of the melancholic from this series. Among the many sins included in the notion of "accidie", it was a question of choosing the one most suited to illustration, and this was the neglect of one's duty to work and to pray. The illustrations to the *Somme le Roi*, therefore, show a ploughman asleep with his head on his hand, having left his plough in the middle of the field, or letting his team graze unwatched in the field; while in contrast to him there is an eager sower—the image of "work" (PLATE 91).[70] And such a human being, "sleeping the sleep of the unjust", (modified in many ways, according to estate and occupation—or rather lack of occupation) became the typical representative of sinful sloth. A pictorial sequence of virtues and vices in the Antwerp Museum, dating from 1480 or 1490 and wrongly attributed to Bosch, represents sloth by a sleeping citizen who, instead of praying before his crucifix, has fallen asleep on his soft pillow ("Ledicheyt is des duivels oorkussen", says a Dutch proverb), and therefore comes under the sway of the devil (PLATE 93, closely similar in type to a tapestry showing "acedia" in person, PLATE 66).[71] The woodcut illustrating the chapter on "Sloth and Idleness" in the 1494 edition of Brant's *Ship of Fools*, retains the diligent sower of the *Somme le Roi* as a virtuous contrast, but for the sleeping ploughman it substitutes the familiar spinning-woman,[72] a figure already used on a broadsheet (probably from Nuremberg) which, thanks to its full text, presents itself, as it were, as a *Somme le Roi* for the plain man (PLATE 92).[73] The figure is here expressly called "Acedia" and can be explained primarily by the wish for a female personification. In the Latin edition of the *Ship of Fools* of 1572 we even find the now traditional spinstress combined in one picture with the sleeping ploughman of the *Somme le Roi* as a double example of the sin of sloth, differing from our pictures of melancholics merely by the circumstance that emphasis is laid on morality rather than on

[70] Cf. MARTIN, op. cit., p. 54 and plate XI; later manuscripts, e.g. Brussels, Bibl. Royale, MS 2291 (Van den Gheyn), fol. 88v (dated 1415), repeat this type faithfully. Our reproduction is from Brussels, Bibl. Royale, MS 2294 (Van den Gheyn), fol. 51r.

[71] See above, p. 223, note 26.

[72] Ch. 97, fol. T. iii. The rather inappropriate wood fire amidst the natural landscape is justified by the text:

"Vnd ist so träg, das jm verbrennt
Syn schyenbeyn, ee er sich verwennt."

[73] P. HEITZ, *Einblattdrucke des 15. Jahrh.*, VOL. XI, Strasb. 1908, plate 17 (about 1490).

characterisation.[74] It has been stated elsewhere that Dürer's engraving B76, the so-called *Doctor's Dream* (PLATE 96), is nothing but an allegory of sloth, original in conception but as a type clearly derivable from illustrations such as the Antwerp sequence of virtues and vices and the woodcut to the *Ship of Fools* of 1494, and to be interpreted, if one likes, as a moralising and satirical predecessor of *Melencolia I*.[75]

If, therefore, the sanguine pair in the dramatic series of the complexions appeared to be modelled on the "typus Luxuriae" and the choleric pair on the "typus Discordiae" or "Duritiae", the melancholics were nothing but the "Acediosi", whose outward appearance, as was natural, closely resembled that of certain children of Saturn. It may well be no coincidence that the rhymes attached to the pictures of melancholics in the almanacs, in which the type here in question was mainly represented, were also related to the morality tracts and, above all, to the Low German version of the *Somme le Roi*.

> Vnser complexion ist von erden reych,
> Darumb seyn wir schwaermuetigkeyt gleich.

or:

> Dat vierde [i.e. the sin of sloth] is swaerheit, dat een mensce also swaermoedich is, dat hem gheens dinghes en lust, dan te legghen rusten. of slapen . . . .[76]

This, then, was the way in which the two main types of illustration of the four temperaments arose. Portraits of characters were created in which either the personifications of certain ages of man, or the representatives of certain sins forbidden by the

[74] *Stultifera navis*, Basle (Henricpetri) 1572, p. 194.

[75] Cf. E. PANOFSKY, in *Münchner Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst*, new series, VOL. VIII (1931), pp. 1 sqq. See also ANDRÉ CHASTEL, "La Tentation de St Antoine, ou le songe du mélancholique", in *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, VOL. LXXVII (1936), pp. 218 sqq. We may mention that on the title engraving of the *Bericht von der Melancholia Hypochondria*, by Dr JOHANNES FREYTAG (Frankfurt 1644), the "hypochondriac melancholy" successfully overcome by the gallant physician is still shown as a sleeping woman with head propped on hand, into whose brain a bat-winged demon is blowing delusions by means of bellows, the delusions being symbolised by swarming insects.

[76] D. C. TINBERGEN, *Des Coninx Summe*, Bibliotheek van Middelnederlandsche Letterkunde, Groningen 1900–03, p. 253. This passage confirms—if confirmation is needed—the fact that in the Calendar verses the expression "Schwermütigkeit" does not mean the purely mental mood of depression, as it does in modern usage, but a very material heaviness of mind and body which might today be best described as indolence. The choice of the word, too confirms, on the linguistic level, the deeply-rooted connexion between the scenic representations of the temperaments and the portrayals of the vices (as does the term "high-stomached" applied to the sanguinic).

Church, were so far given concrete shape and individuality that they came to represent "real life" and, although still seen in a speculative framework, they tended to become self-sufficient. In the case of the illustrations of the ages of man, this process involved merely a transition from a schematic to a naturalistic type of picture, and an emphasis on the humoral aspect at the expense of the purely biological. In the case of the illustrations of the vices, however—and these of course were the illustrations which produced the infinitely more striking types—it also involved a transition from a moral and theological realm to a profane one. The sculptured or painted sermon against sin became a description of character which not only cancelled the former moral estimate but replaced it in part by another, almost an amoral one—for luxury is at least as immoral as sloth, but the "sanguine" figure which represents the luxurious type has "the noblest complexion". Out of the variety of human sins described in such detail merely as a warning, there emerged a variety of human characteristics worthy of interest purely as such. In this sense the development of the dramatic series acquires an almost symptomatic significance; many other examples could be cited to show how many astonishing achievements of modern realism can be put down to the very fact that medieval morality became secularised. It has, for instance, been suggested that Chaucer's penetrating and subtle characterisation, no less than the modest little illustrations of the complexions, evolved mainly from the descriptions of virtues and vices in sermons of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.[77]

If from all these pictures depicting temperaments we turn to *Melencolia I*, we receive the strong impression—an impression that is justified, moreover, by the form of wording in the legends—that Dürer's engraving signifies a fundamentally different level of allegory, and one, moreover, fundamentally new to the north. The figure of Decline in the Cambridge miniature, mainly characterised by a distaff, is a personification of the "black bile"; the figures of Weariness and Sloth in the fifteenth-century pictures

[77] H. R. PATCH in *Modern Language Notes*, VOL. XL (1925), pp. 1 sqq. The medieval representations of virtues and vices served as a basis for representations of the "Five Senses", so popular in the later sixteenth and, especially, the seventeenth century, as Hans Kauffmann emphasises in his informative review of W. R. Valentiner's book on Pieter de Hooch (*Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1930, pp. 801 sqq.). The birth of this type of the "Five Senses" denotes as it were, a second phase in secularisation: the originally moralistic representations, first transformed into objective and cosmological representations of the temperaments, were now drawn into the sphere of the subjective, sensual perception.

are examples of the "melancholic man"; but Dürer's woman, whose wings alone distinguish her from all other representations, is a symbolic realisation of "Melancholia".

To speak more precisely: the Cambridge miniature *embodies* an abstract and impersonal notion in a human figure[78]; the pictures of the complexion-series *exemplify* an abstract and impersonal notion by means of human figures: but Dürer's engraving *is the image of* an abstract and impersonal notion symbolised in a human figure. In the first case, the basic notion fully retains its universal validity; it cannot, however, be identified with the actual picture but can only be equated with it by means of an intellectual process—hence only the legend, or our familiarity with iconographic convention, informs us that the figure in question is meant to represent the "black bile". In the second case, the representation is directly and visibly linked with the basic notion (for any one can see that the choleric is angry, or the melancholic idle or sad), but by this the notion loses its universality, for it is shown in a special example which is only one of many, and can hence be recognised forthwith as the picture of an angry or a sad man, but not as the representation of the choleric or melancholy temperament. Here, too, a caption is necessary, but it no longer says to us, "imagine that this neutral figure *is* black bile," but "in this slothful couple you have a *typical example* of the melancholy temperament". In the third case, on the other hand, the basic idea is translated in its entirety into pictorial terms, without thereby losing its universality and without leaving any doubt as to the allegorical significance of the figure, which is nevertheless entirely concrete. Here, and here alone, can the visible representation completely answer to the invisible notion; here, and here alone, the legend (which at this stage of development begins to be superfluous) says to us neither "this is meant to represent the black bile," nor "this is a typical example of the melancholy temperament," but "melancholy is like this."[79]

[78] The function of such human figures in "standing for" a notion can of course be assumed by animals, plants or inanimate objects without the conditions governing the method of personification needing to be altered. In certain circumstances the pomegranate representing the notion of "concord" fulfils the same function as a human "Concordia", while in others it may appear simply as one of her attributes.

[79] The classification of allegorical forms of representation here attempted, which naturally leaves out many mixed or borderline cases, takes the term "allegory" in its literal sense ἄλλα ἀγορεύειν as a generic notion including the "symbolic" as well as the "substituting" (esp. the "personifying") and the "paradigmatic" form of representation. What is generally called allegory (in its narrower sense) is merely a more complicated form of substitution—more complicated, in that several personifications (i.e. living beings or objects denoting ideas) meet in a scene or a spatial relationship illustrating the connexion between various abstract notions. A typical example is Dürer's *Triumph of Maximilian*, or Goltzius's allegory (cited below, p. 343, note 202) of the relationship between "Ars" and "Usus".

Admittedly it was French fifteenth-century art that created the book illustrations in which, instead of the merely paradigmatic melancholic of the temperament-series, or the merely personified figure of the "black bile" in the Cambridge manuscript, the figure of Dame Mérencolye herself first appeared.[80] These French illustrations seem therefore to have anticipated the symbolic representation of Melancholy in Dürer's engraving (PLATES 60, 61, 64). They do certainly surpass any pre-Dürer designs in so far as they combine, to a certain extent, personification with exemplification; for if they share with the Cambridge manuscript the desire to represent the notion of melancholy in all its universality, yet they also share with the temperament-series the power of making an invisible notion visible. The main difference between them and Dürer's work lies in the fact that this combination did not as yet represent a synthesis, but merely a contact of the other two possibilities—in other words, the significance actually visible in these French figures does not really coincide, as yet, with the general notion of melancholy. What we see there, and what are really presented to us with more or less advanced realism, are lean and badly dressed old women in the context of a more or less dramatic scene, from which, at best, we receive the impression of a certain mournful atmosphere; but that these figures are meant to represent melancholy, or indeed anything except mournful old women, is as little expressed visibly, and can hence as little be suspected without knowledge of the literary texts as, say, the fact that we are expected to recognise a knight as "Burning Desire" and the page riding towards him as a messenger of "Love".

The figures in such romance illustrations, therefore, are not in the least degree "symbolic representations", but rather, in the term already used, they are still merely "personifications". In accordance with fifteenth-century style, these personifications are depicted with such a strong sense of reality that they function also as "paradigmata"; but, as yet, the contradiction between paradigm and personification is not resolved by any higher form of allegory. What is actually visible is still a single occurrence:

[80] For the special problems connected with the poetic personification of melancholy (and its pictorial illustration) see above, pp. 221 sqq. (text).

anything that lies beyond remains "in the text". It is, in fact, quite literally in the text, as the curiously indeterminate character of these illustrations shows. It is actually due to the fact that the texts illustrated had already anticipated pictorial art in its function of allegorical translation. In these romances such general psychological notions as "mistrust", "understanding", "honour", "sweet reward", "long hope" and even "melancholy", had already become, in the poet's own mind, so individualised and so concrete—so much progress along the road from the abstract to the visual had already been made—that the illustrator had only to translate the concrete particular figure or event described in the text into pictorial terms; and that there was, in his pictures, not the slightest reason for the spectator to revert in his turn from the particular to the underlying general concept. Situations which in literary form are already well-sustained allegories, that is to say, which provide dramatic connexions between personifications, are bound to become genre or history pictures if the attempt is made to illustrate them literally in all their details.

(iii) *Portraits of the Liberal Arts*

It is therefore a fact that Dürer was the first artist north of the Alps to raise the portrayal of melancholy to the dignity of a symbol, in which there appears a powerfully compelling concordance between the abstract notion and the concrete image. As may be readily understood from the foregoing, truly symbolic forms of representation were evolved by artists of the Italian Renaissance. For it was their achievement to express the ideal in terms of naturalistic art and the transcendental in terms of a rational world order; and (as for instance in Giovanni Bellini's allegories) to discover—or rather, to rediscover in the art of classical antiquity—the means of sublimation which Dürer also used, wings for the chief figure, the "putti", and so on.[81] If we looked for an earlier work of art in which the principle of symbolic

[81] On a plaque by Bertoldo, which has not as yet been fully explained, we even find a *putto* taking part with a child's earnestness in the adults' occupation (W. Bode, *Bertoldo und Lorenzo dei Medici*, Freiburg, i.B. 1925, p. 82). The putto seems to be modelling something, while the old man on the left is not, as Bode states, busied with measuring instruments, but is carving an elaborate piece of furniture; Mercury is working with plummet and compasses, the female figure with a triangle. Whether the partly illegible letters should really be interpreted as abbreviations of "Mathematica," = "Ars", "Ludus" and "Usus" remains an open question; such an interpretation would be in consonance with contemporary ideas (see also below, text pp. 339 sqq.).

representation was applied to the subject of melancholy, an analogy would be found, not in the illustrations to French romances, but in a lost painting by Mantegna, which Dürer may possibly have known. Unfortunately we know practically nothing about it: but we do know that it bore the title "Malancolia", and that it contained sixteen putti dancing and making music.[82]

All this naturally does not exclude the possibility that the general conception of *Melencolia I*—as soon as we look at it in the light of the history of pictorial types rather than in the light of a theory of allegorical forms—may also be related to the northern tradition of pictorial allegory; indeed, we may even be led to think that a connexion between the two is absolutely essential to Dürer's engraving. But the first stages are not to be found in the pictures of Dame Mérencolye. Despite their connexion with scientific and medical notions of melancholy, as far as artistic form was concerned, these led, as we have seen, their own life, and they developed according to their own laws. Quite apart from that, they could hardly have become known to Dürer.[83] The first stages are to be sought rather in a group of allegorical pictures representing the "Liberal Arts". These pictures have nothing in common, as regards content, with the pictures representing diseases and temperaments; however, in design they readily lend themselves to Dürer's own particular artistic intentions, the novelty of which they in fact underline. Among them, we are here concerned particularly with those which illustrate the fifth of the "Liberal Arts": that is to say, Geometry.

Art in classical Greece had almost completely neglected the realm of manual labour, and Hellenistic art had dealt with it in the

[82] "Un quadro su l'ascia di mano del Mantegna con 16 fanciulli, che suonano e ballano, sopra scrittovi Malancolia, con cornice dorata, alta on. 14, larga on. $20\frac{1}{2}$" (G. Campori, *Raccolta di Cataloghi ed Inventarii inediti*, Modena 1870, p. 328; cf. Giehlow (1903), p. 40). Giehlow is no doubt correct in saying that these playing and dancing putti should be interpreted as humanistic symbols of the musical and theatrical entertainments recommended as antidotes to melancholy. But of course it need not have been Ficino who transmitted the knowledge of this (at the time) obvious remedy to Mantegna. Moreover, one can say even less about Mantegna's picture, since from Campori's description it is not even certain that "Melancholy" was there in person. In all essentials we must fall back on Cranach's picture (Plate 130), which seems to reflect Mantegna's composition (see below, text p. 384); recently the Dürer drawing L623 has come to light, which might confirm Dürer's knowledge of the lost picture (cf. H. Tietze and E. Tietze-Conrat, *Kritisches Verzeichnis der Werke A. Dürers*, vol. I, Augsburg 1928, p. 21).

[83] The one iconographical trait in which the "Melancolia" of *Melencolia I* agrees with "Dame Mérencolye" (and then only in King René's romance) is in her dishevelled (*eschevelé*) hair, and even this sign of a desolate state of mind is too general a motif to justify the assumption of a connexion.

way of sentimental genre-painting of the pathetic poor or the hard-working peasants, rather than as a factual and natural portrait of reality.[84] Roman antiquity evolved from it, however, an almost inexhaustible variety of pictorial types.[85] Next to the purely descriptive pictures of trades, which remain firmly wedded to reality in a typically Roman manner and show us peasants and artisans at their daily work, there are the Hellenistic representations which playfully mythologise this concrete reality by making putti do the work; and there are, finally, countless tombstones, on which the occupation of the deceased is depicted by showing not the gestures, but, emblematically, the tools, of the trade in question (PLATE 50).[86] Sometimes these emblems of labour can be re-formed into the processes of labour, as is shown by a gilt glass, on which the figure of a ship-owner is surrounded by small scenes from the shipyard.[87] Sometimes, too, though not often, we encounter representations which really "personify" a trade, such as the Etruscan mirror (closely related to the emblematic tomb-stones) which shows a winged Eros surrounded by joiner's tools—as it were, "the spirit of joinery" (PLATE 51).[88]

Only the first of these types, the descriptive pictures of real workaday scenes, were handed down to the Middle Ages by direct pictorial tradition. In the almanacs and encyclopaedias

---

[84] The Hellenistic representations of the life of city populace, peasants, or even beasts are distinguished from the specifically Roman ones by an emotional emphasis arising from a keen sensitivity in regard to the unfamiliar. It may reflect a horror of degradation, as in the case of the *Drunken Old Woman*; or a sentimental interest in fellow-creatures or nature, as in the case of the *Black Boy making Music*, or the *Dam suckling her Young*; or, finally, a longing for the idyllic as in the case of the "peasant type" proper. In exactly the same manner Hellenistic portraiture contrasts with Roman by reason of its excitement and sense of triumph or suffering. The "holy sobriety" of the Latin artistic spirit, which, in educated circles, was often concealed under a mask of Hellenism, but revealed itself the more clearly in popular works, or in what we call provincial art, harked back, despite classicism and Hellenism, to the utter objectivity of the ancient Egyptian occupational portraits.

[85] OTTO JAHN, "Darstellungen des Handwerks und Handelsverkehrs auf Vasenbildern", in *Bericht über die Verhandlungen der sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse*, XIX (1867), p. 75–113. Cf. H. GUMMERUS, "Darstellungen aus dem Handwerk auf röm. Grab- und Votivsteinen in Italien", in *Jahrbuch des kaiserlich deutschen archäologischen Instituts*, XXVIII (1913), p. 63–126). More recently P. BRANDT, *Schaffende Arbeit und Bildende Kunst*, Leipzig 1927–1928 (two volumes with numerous plates).

[86] Occupational emblems could either be added to the figure of the deceased (this was the usual pagan custom, as in our PLATE 50), or replace it altogether (this naturally being a particularly popular form in the Christian catacombs).

[87] R. GARUCCI, *Storia dell' Arte cristiana*, VOL. III, 202, 3 = CABROL-LECLERCQ, *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et liturgie*, I, 2, col. 2918 (with more detail).

[88] E. GERHARD, *Etruskische Spiegel*, Berlin 1843–67, Plate 330, I.

we can see these scenes from Roman monuments adopted almost without alteration[89]; only in the later course of development were they modified and brought up to date. The personification of the Seven Liberal Arts, however, had still to be created—or rather, translated from Martianus Capella's lively and vivid description[90] into pictorially impressive terms—before they could assume the forms in which we so frequently see them in the great cathedrals and in illustrated manuscripts. There, they are often accompanied by a particular historical figure representing them—just as, in the mosaic pavements of late antiquity, the nine Muses are sometimes accompanied by representative practitioners of the nine arts—Calliope by Homer, Urania by Aratus,[91] and so on. Figures also of the Seven Mechanical Arts, represented mostly by paradigm rather than by personification, still had to be evolved.[92] And, without borrowing from antiquity, by a process of spontaneous re-creation, there arose a type of picture in which the skill of a man or of an allegorical being was indicated merely by the inclusion of a distinctive tool of his trade.

Centuries before the conscious reversion to the Roman type of monument for artisans or architects took place during the Renaissance,[93] the background of the archivolt reliefs showing

---

[89] To illustrate the continuity of this tradition we bring together on PLATES 97–99: (*a*) three pictures of the months from the Salzburg Calendar of 818 (G. SWARZENSKI, *Die Salzburger Malerei*, Leipzig 1913, pp. 13 sqq. and plate VII; H. J. HERMANN, *Die illuminierten Handschriften der Nationalbibliothek in Wien*, VOL. I, Leipzig 1923, p. 148), namely May holding flowers, June ploughing, and August reaping; (*b*) the three corresponding pictures from the Rabanus Codex in Monte Cassino, copied in 1023 from a Carolingian model (A. M. AMELLI, *Miniature . . . illustranti l'Enciclopedia medioevale di Rabano Mauro*, Monte Cassino 1896, plate LIII); (*c*) a Roman figure in relief of the type on which August was based (Lateran sarcophagus). The pictures in the Rabanus Codex retain the indications of ground formation which have already lapsed in the Carolingian calendars, though the disposition of the figures would demand them here too. Hence it follows that the Rabanus pictures (for which cf. A. GOLDSCHMIDT, in *Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg*, VOL. III, 1923–1924, pp. 215 sqq.) are independent of the Salzburg Calendar and are based directly on pictorial sources dating from before the ninth century.

[90] *Nuptiae Philologiae et Mercurii*, BK II sqq.; cf. E. MÂLE, "Les arts libéraux", in *Revue archéologique*, 1891, pp. 343 sqq.

[91] In these instances, therefore, personifications and paradigmata meet in a dual scene which, a few centuries later, could even be united in a single scene (cf. e.g. the "typus Arithmeticae" in GREGOR REISCH, *Margarita philosophica*, Strasbourg 1504, well reproduced in E. REICKE, *Der Gelehrte in der deutschen Vergangenheit* (Monographien zur deutschen Kunstgeschichte, VOL. VII), Leipzig 1900, plate 45.

[92] Cf. E. MÂLE, "Les arts libéraux", in *Revue archéologique*, 1891, pp. 343 sqq., and J. VON SCHLOSSER, in *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*, VOL. XVII (1896), pp. 13 sqq.

[93] Cf. e.g. ANDREA BREGNO's epitaph in Santa Maria sopra Minerva (H. EGGER, in *Festschrift für Julius von Schlosser*, Zürich 1927, plate 57) and the corresponding German examples,

the historical representatives of the seven arts had been furnished with a ruler on a nail and a board with pen, sponge and so on (PLATE 100); and architects' monuments show the profession of the dead master by compasses and set-square.[94] One typical example of this is the monument of the great Hugues de Libergier, which, incidentally, is also a wonderful witness to the veneration which in Late Gothic times (in some ways, at least emotionally, very much like the Renaissance) could be accorded to a brilliant architect. But there can be no doubt that the writing implements in the Chartres archivolts are meant to be realistic, while the tools on the tombstone of the Master of St Nicaise have the same purely emblematic significance as in the Roman monuments.

These were the two roots of the new iconography. It arose when fourteenth-century art—charged with contradiction as always—developed a highly abstract symbolism which was ideographic rather than representational, while at the same time it laid the foundations of naturalistic perspective. Thus, there could develop, on the one hand, those workshop-interiors of the reliefs on the Campanile in Florence which almost look like scenes from ordinary life; on the other, such abstract representations as the miniature of 1376 in which the Aristotelian τέχνη appears surrounded by the tools of the various mechanical arts, with small figures of a farmer and a shepherd at her feet (PLATE 101),[95] or the strange pictures of the "Observance of the Sabbath", in which

obviously later in date, discussed in P. BRANDT, *Schaffende Arbeit und Bildende Kunst*, Leipzig 1927–1928, VOL. II, pp. 137 sqq. The type of "Eros Carpenter", too, underwent a revival in the period of humanism, though with an intellectual and satirical refinement of meaning; cf. the putto surrounded by occupational symbols and striving to fly heavenwards, but hindered by terrestrial needs, which often appears in editions by Rivius, but is already influenced by Dürer's *Melencolia I*. That it was so influenced is shown by a comparison with its model in Alciato's *Emblemata*, which is still without any occupational symbols (cf. L. VOLKMANN, *Bilderschriften der Renaissance*, Leipzig 1923, p. 44). Of the use of implements to denote an occupation there are, of course, countless examples in emblem-books; they can replace long narratives or biographies. As a good example, cf. the reverse of the medallion for Tomasso Ruggieri, reproduced in G. HABICH, *Die Medallien der italienischen Renaissance*, Stuttgart 1922, plate LXX, 4.

[94] Cf. E. MOREAU-NÉLATON, *La Cathédrale de Reims*, Paris n.d., p. 33.

[95] The Hague, Mus. Meermanno-Westreenianum, MS 10 D 1 (the "small" Aristotle-Oresme MS of Charles V), fol. 110r (cf. A. BYVANCK, *Les principaux manuscrits à peintures de la Bibliothèque Royale et du Musée Meermanno-Westreenianum à la Haye*, Paris 1924, p. 114; replicas in J. MEURGEY, *Les principaux manuscrits à peintures du Musée Condé à Chantilly*, Publications de la Société française de reproductions de manuscrits à peintures, VOL. XIII–XIV, Paris 1930, plate LII and pp. 46 sqq., with bibliography). On the left, next to "Art", is "Science", reading; on the right is the three-headed "Prudence" (for the motif of the three heads, cf. E. PANOFSKY, *Hercules am Scheidewege* (Studien der Bibliothek Warburg, VOL. XVIII), Leipzig 1930, pp. 1 sqq.; it is remarkable, however, that here the three are

the "arma Christi" of the contemporary representations of the Man of Sorrow are replaced by implements of various crafts.[96]

Thanks to the progress of naturalistic perspective in the course of the fifteenth century, the distinctions observed in portraits of the arts between "personification", "paradigm" and "emblem" became less and less sharp. On the one hand, there were certain historical figures, such as Cicero, Euclid or Pythagoras, who had originally been added to the personifications of the various arts as their "paradigmatic" representatives. These portraits now became so independent, and were at the same time elaborated into pictures of professional activities which seemed so completely realistic, that the personified figure of the art could be dropped, and the individual portrait of a Pythagoras, a Euclid, or a Cicero, could illustrate at one and the same time both an actual activity and the general notion of the art in question. On the other hand, abstract personifications (on the lines of, for example, the Hague miniature) could now become so realistic that they, too, bear the appearance of genre pictures of an occupational activity. In either case the minor figures, and implements that in earlier pictures had been purely emblematic, could be turned into illustrative elements and unite themselves in the three-dimensional space of the picture—both with "Pythagoras" or "Cicero" (now raised to the level of general significance), and with "Rhetoric" or "Music" (now particularised to the extent of resembling a concrete genre scene).

Thus, to give an example of the first possibility, a German manuscript of the third quarter of the fifteenth century[97] illustrates the notion "Geometry" by means of a figure of Euclid sitting, accompanied by an assistant, at a table laden with measuring instruments, and holding a pair of compasses and a set-square, while in a special strip along the bottom another assistant is taking soundings (PLATE 102). In this subsidiary scene we have a sort of half-way house between the purely emblematic use of minor figures, as in the Hague miniature, and their inclusion in a common space with the main figure (as in PLATE 104).

death's-heads); below are "Entendement" in a pensive attitude, and "Sapience", illumined by the direct vision of God the Father and his angels. Dr B. Martens kindly brought this miniature to our notice. "Ars" as a smith appears in the Brussels Aristotle-Oresme MS 9505, fol. 115v, which is related to this both in time and manner.

[96] Cf. E. BREITENBACH and T. HILLMANN, *Anzeiger für schweizerische Altertumskunde*, VOL. XXXIX (1937), pp. 23 sqq.

[97] London, Brit. Mus., Add. MS 15692 (*De septem artibus liberalibus*), fol. 29v.

On the other hand, in a group of somewhat later French manuscripts real personifications appear, representing notions such as "Déduccion loable".[98] These personifications, incidentally, are metaphorical as well as allegorical, since actual working tools could only be attributed to such a sub-division of rhetoric because the text credited it with so strengthening the logical edifice of thought "que rient n'y reste trou ne fente."[99] Armed with a set-square, "Déduccion loable" sits in a room, overlooking two unfinished houses and filled with joists, beams, and carpenter's tools that are entirely realistic. Here we can either interpret the various instruments as emblems around which a room has been built, or regard the whole as a workshop and dwelling-room in which the emblems are distributed (PLATE 103).

After these examples we are in a position to understand a certain portrait of "Geometry" which is of the greatest importance for our subject, namely, a woodcut from Gregor Reisch's *Margarita philosophica*, Strasbourg, 1504 (PLATE 104).[100] "Geometria", once again a real personification, sits at a table full of planimetric and stereometric figures, her hands busied with compasses and a

[98] Munich, Staatsbibliothek, Cod. gall. 15. On this, cf. COMTE DE ROSANBO, "Notice sur Les Douze Dames de Rhétorique" (from MS fr. 1174 of the Bibliothèque Nationale), in *Bulletin de la Société française de reproductions de manuscrits à peintures*, VOL. XIII (1929). In the history of types these ladies (and also, for instance "Dame Eloquence") come very near to Dürer's "Melencolia".

[99] A similar "metaphorical" or "double" allegory also occurs in the "Artes" series probably from Alsace (SCHREIBER, *Manuel*, No. 1874, reproduced in P. HEITZ, *Einblattdrucke des 15. Jahrhunderts*, VOL. LXIV, No. 6, and in E. REICKE, *Der Gelehrte in der deutschen Vergangenheit*, Leipzig 1900, figs. 27–29). These portraits, despite their abstract titles such as *Arismetica*, etc. are, regarded as types, fully realistic occupational representations—so much so, indeed, that with one exception they show us not the paradigmatic representatives of the various sciences, but simple peasants and artisans, whose activity refers to the liberal arts either by way of metaphor (as in the case of *Déduccion loable*), or else by alluding to their practical application. Arithmetic alone is represented by a man actually counting; Grammar, Rhetoric and Logic, on the other hand, are represented by a sower, a miller and a baker (for Aristotle made bread out of the seed which Priscian had sown and Cicero ground), and Astronomy by a painter, a figure known from the pictures of the children of Mercury or of Luke's Madonna, except that here he is painting stars in the sky. Geometry, however, is represented not by a geometrician but by an "appareilleur" who is measuring a stone on a site, and the accompanying couplet runs

"Ich kan pawen vnd wol messen,
Darumb will ich Eclides (*sic*) nit vergessen."

The difference, in comparison with *Déduccion loable*, is, as in other cases, that there a lady easily recognisable as a personification is sitting in a carpenter's shop, whereas here ordinary peasants and workmen are really sowing, milling and baking.

[100] Reproduced in O. LAUFFER, *Deutsche Altertümer im Rahmen deutscher Sitte*, Leipzig 1918, plate 5.

sphere.[101] She is surrounded by scenes of activity, of which the smaller scale contrasts sharply both with the perspective of the picture as a whole, and with the size of the main figure. They are subordinated to it as dependent notions rather than co-ordinated with it as objects in a coherent space; that is to say, the relation of the tools to the main figure is something like that of the small occupational scenes in the Hague miniature to the figure of "Art", or those on the gilt glass already mentioned to the figure of the deceased ship-owner. Like these, they may be regarded as dramatised trade emblems. In an organisational sense, the toil of the ship-builders sawing and planing is "governed" by the ship-owner; and in an intellectual sense the activities shown here are "subordinated" to "Geometria"; for all the work that is going on is merely a practical application of her theoretical discoveries. On the ground floor of the house under construction (a huge block of stone is still suspended from a crane) the ceiling is being vaulted; hammer, ruler and moulding plane are lying on the ground; a kneeling man is drawing a plan with the help of a set-square; another is dividing a very naturalistic map into "iugera"; and with the help of a sextant and astrolabe two young astronomers are studying the night sky, in which, despite heavy cloud, the moon and stars are brightly shining.[102]

No one whose historical sense can bridge the gulf between a didactic picture and a great work of art can deny that this "typus Geometriae"[103] is extraordinarily akin to *Melencolia I*. We must

[101] Cf. MARTIANUS CAPELLA, *Nuptiae Philologiae et Mercurii*, VI, 575 sqq., esp. 580–81 (pp. 286 sqq. in A. Dick's edition, Leipzig 1925). Geometry's serving women are here carrying a "mensula" covered with a greenish dust, "depingendis designandisque opportuna formis"; the author describes the lady herself as "feminam luculentam, radium dextera, altera sphaeram solidam gestitantem."

[102] The groundwork for all this had already been laid by Martianus Capella's description. Geometry is wearing a "peplum", "in quo siderum magnitudines et meatus, circulorum mensurae conexionesque vel formae, umbra etiam telluris in caelum quoque perveniens vel lunae orbes ac solis auratos caliganti murice decolorans inter sidera videbatur"; and "in usum germanae ipsius Astronomiae crebrius commodatum, reliqua vero versis illitum diversitatibus numerorum, gnomonum stilis, interstitiorum, ponderum mensurarumque formis diversitate colorum variegata renidebat" (A. Dick (ed.), p. 289). Such a garment could naturally be dispensed with by our artist, as astral phenomena could be directly represented, though the peacock's feather in Geometria's cap is not without allegorical significance; the peacock according to Ripa, under the heading *Notte, seconda parte* (quoting Pierio Valeriano), signifies "la notte chiara, e stellata, vedendosi nella sua coda tanti occhi, come tante stelle nel Cielo".

[103] Already in the 1512 edition of GREGOR REISCH's *Margarita philosophica* (fol. o 1r) the portrait is simplified along these lines; Geometria is holding the sextant herself, and is measuring a barrel with a pair of compasses (a remarkable anticipation of Kepler's *Stereometria doliorum*); while a rule lies on the ground, and a ship is sailing in the distance.

not forget that, as has been frequently pointed out, trade tools and trade scenes are constantly interchanged, and, in certain instances, even combined. We are therefore justified in imagining that the illustrator of Gregor Reisch's book might have represented the tools as emblems instead of showing their application in the minor scenes[104]; and we have then only to add to them the implements that are in fact seen scattered about on the table and on the ground in the woodcut in order to be aware of an astonishing measure of agreement in the inventory of both designs. Dürer, too, still in accordance with Martianus Capella, shows a figure with a sphere and a pair of compasses engaged in construction; here, as in the woodcut, there are hammer, moulding plane and set-square on the ground. In the woodcut, Geometria has writing materials beside her on the table; in Dürer's engraving, also, there are writing materials on the ground near the sphere[105];

[104] Thus in the miniature, PLATE 103.

[105] There is no reason to doubt that this object is in reality nothing but a portable writing compendium, consisting of a lockable inkwell with a pen-case attached to it by a leather strap but unfortunately truncated by the left-hand margin of the picture. And yet after I. A. ENDRES (*Die christliche Kunst*, VOL. IX (1913), several instalments), had interpreted it as a spinning top, and F. A. NAGEL (*Der Kristall auf Dürer's Melancholie*, Nuremberg 1922) as a plummet, W. BÜHLER in (*Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für vervielfältigende Kunst*, 1925, pp. 44 sqq.) called it a paint-jar with a stick and with a thread wound round it in spirals to facilitate the drawing of a straight line (whereas these spiral effects are nothing but plaited leather, such as occurs not only on other pen-cases but even on knife-sheaths, cf. e.g. Breughel's drawing, Tolnai No. 77); while according to P. BRANDT (in *Die Umschau in Wissenschaft und Technik*, VOL. XXXII (1928), pp. 276 sqq.) it was even meant to be a cone-shaped plummet, with a case for the line standing on a saucer! To set all doubt at rest we may mention the analogous cases in Dürer's own works already pointed out by Giehlow and also by F. HONECKER (in *Zeitschrift für christliche Kunst*, VOL. XXVI (1913), col. 323)—the woodcut B60 and the prayer book of Maximilian I, plate 14, both representing St John on Patmos, and the woodcut B113 of St Jerome—and add a few others which might easily be multiplied: (1) the vision of St John by the brothers Limburg in Chantilly (*Les très riches heures de Jean de France*, ed. P. Durrieu, Paris 1904, fol. 17r, plate 14); (2) the vision of St John in the Coburg Bible; (3) Dürer's woodcut B70; (4) the Ruggieri medal already mentioned above, p. 310, note 93; (5) a portrait of St Augustine, dating from *c.* 1450, in a MS at Utrecht of his Confessions (reproduced by A. W. BYVANCK and G. J. HOOGEWERFF, *La miniature hollandaise et les manuscrits illustrés du 14e au 16e siècles aux Pays-Bas septentrionaux*, VOL. II, The Hague, 1923, plate 187); (6) a satirical woodcut in GEILER VON KEISERSPERG's *Sünden des Munds*, Strasbourg 1518 (reproduced in E. REICKE, *Der Gelehrte*, fig. 99); (7) Ghirlandaio's St Jerome in Ognissanti; (8) Hans Döring's woodcut (see below, text p. 335 sq. and PLATE 107) which is all the more important since he took the whole of his instrumentarium directly from Dürer's engraving. Giehlow's explanation (GIEHLOW (1904), p. 76) of the inkwell as a hieroglyph symbolising the sacred writings of the Egyptians does not seem to us tenable because the hieroglyph for the "sacrae litterae Aegyptiorum" (cf. *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*, VOL. XXXII (1915), p. 195) is not composed merely of the pen or of the inkwell alone, but of inkwell, stilograph and sieve, the accompanying text laying at least as much emphasis on the last component as on the other two: "Aegypciacas ostendentes litteras sacrasve aut finem, atramentum et cribrum calamum quoque effigiant. Litteras

while the relatively simple stereometric objects with which Geometria is busied find their more complicated counterpart in Dürer's much-discussed rhomboid.[106] When one adds that the clouds, the moon and the stars that are shown in the woodcut have their counterpart in Dürer's engraving, and that the putto scribbling on his slate was originally, in the preparatory sketch (PLATE 8), to have been working with a sextant like the boy (!) on the left of Geometria, one is bound to consider the connexion as more than probable. We may even consider as a possibility that the ladder should be interpreted as the implement of a building under construction. The *Margarita philosophica* was one of the most widely known encyclopaedias of the time; it even appeared in an Italian translation as late as 1600: and the connexion with Dürer's engraving is not invalidated by the fact that the latter also took over characteristics from non-allegorical representations of occupations—the less so as they belong to the iconography of portraits of scholars, who were at the same time the liberal arts personified. Thus, regarded historically, the sleeping dog is simply a descendant of the poodle or Pomeranian so often seen in the scholars' studies[107]; the wreath is a constant attribute of the "homo literatus", and Dürer himself (for we think that it was he) had crowned the young Terence with it,[108] while it distinguishes both Jacob Locher the poet,[109] and Marsilio Ficino the philosopher.[110]

equidem, quoniam apud Aegypcios omnia scripta cum his perficiantur. Calamo etenim ac nulla alia re scribunt. Cribrum vero, quoniam cribrum principale vas conficiendi panis ex calamis fieri soleat. Ostendunt itaque, quemadmodum omnis, cui victus suppeditat, litteras discere potest, qui vero illo caret, alia arte utatur necesse est. Quam ob rem apud ipsos disciplina 'sbo' vocatur, quod interpretari potest victus abundancia. Sacras vero litteras, quoniam cribrum vitam ac mortem discernit." It is highly improbable that anyone who intended making a hieroglyphic translation of certain notions should so arbitrarily have modified the symbols handed down by Horapollo. (From Vienna, Nationalbibl., MS 3255, fol. 47r.)

[106] Appendix I, pp. 400 sqq.

[107] Cf. Dürer's own engraving of St Jerome, the Darmstadt miniature of Petrarch reproduced in J. SCHLOSSER, *Oberitalienische Trecentisten*, Leipzig 1921, plate II), the woodcut in B. Corio's *Chronicle of Milan* of 1503 (reproduced in E. REICKE, *Der Gelehrte in der deutschen Vergangenheit*, Leipzig 1900, fig. 55) or the illustration of medical study in H. BRAUNSCHWEIG's *Liber de arte distillandi*, Strasbourg 1512 (reproduced in REICKE, op. cit., fig. 46).

[108] Cf. E. RÖMER, in *Jahrbuch der preussischen Kunstsammlungen*, VOL. XLVII (1926), plate I, p. 136.

[109] Woodcut in JACOB LOCHER, *Panegyrici ad regem . . .*, Strasbourg 1497 (reissued in H. BRAUNSCHWEIG's *Medicinarius*, 1505, fol. cxxxiv), reproduced in E. REICKE, *Der Gelehrte in der deutschen Vergangenheit*, Leipzig 1900, plate 66.

[110] H. BRAUNSCHWEIG, *Medicinarius*, 1505, fol. cxxxii v.

With regard to composition, an astronomical picture such as the woodcut on the title page of Johannes Angelus's *Astrolabium planum* may also have had some influence; it was published just at the time of Dürer's first visit to Venice, and in more than one direction it seems generally to prepare the ground for the spatial scheme of the engraving (PLATE 94).[111] However that may be, it cannot possibly be a coincidence that so many of Dürer's occupational symbols correspond with those in the "typus Geometriae", and that, as we shall shortly show, even those details that are lacking in the balder woodcut can be subsumed, almost completely, under the notion of geometry.

Is Dürer's "Melencolia" then really a "Geometria"? Yes and no. For if she shares the circumstances of her occupation with the lady with the peacock's feather in the woodcut, she shares the manner of her occupation, or, rather of her lack of occupation, with the portraits of melancholics in the German almanacs. While in the Strasbourg illustration all is energetic and joyous activity—the little figures drawing and measuring, observing and experimenting, and the patroness eagerly encompassing her sphere—the essential characteristic of Dürer's "Melencolia" is that she is doing nothing with any of these tools for mind or hand, and that the things on which her eye might rest simply do not exist for her. The saw lies idly at her feet; the grindstone with its chipped edge[112] leans uselessly against the wall; the book lies in her lap with closed clasps; the rhomboid and the astral phenomena are ignored; the sphere has rolled to the ground; and the compasses are "spoiling for want of occupation".[113] There is no doubt that in spite of everything this failure to employ things that are there to be used, this disregard of what is there to be seen, do link *Melencolia I* with the slothful melancholy represented by the spinstress asleep or lost in idle depression. The "Acedia" in the broadsheet (PLATE 92) with her head resting on her left hand, and her spindle lying idle in her lap, is the dull-

[111] JOHANNES ANGELUS, *Astrolabium planum*, Venice 1494 (lacking in the 1st edition of 1488). Cf., in a contrary sense, esp. the relationship of the figure to the plane of the picture and the diagonal composition of the whole as conditioned by this; even the attitude of the head, with one eye cut into by the outline of the profile, seems familiar. The same scheme, though with the figure given heightened activity and emotional expression, in typical Renaissance fashion, appears in the woodcut to CECCO D'ASCOLI'S *Acerba*, Venice 1524 (reproduced in HARTLAUB, *Geheimnis*, p. 38).

[112] For the significance of this, see below, p. 329 (text).

[113] H. WÖLFFLIN, *Die Kunst Albrecht Dürers*, 5th edition, Munich 1926, p. 253.

witted sister of Dürer's "Melencolia"; and we know how familiar Dürer was with this lower type of melancholy, from the fact that he accorded it a place in Maximilian I's prayer book.[114]

From the standpoint, therefore, of the history of types alone, Dürer's engraving is made up in its details of certain traditional Melancholy or Saturn motifs (keys and purse, head on hand, dark face, clenched fist): but, taken as a whole, it can only be understood if it is regarded as a symbolic synthesis of the "typus Acediae" (the popular exemplar of melancholy inactivity) with the "typus Geometriae" (the scholastic personification of one of the "liberal arts").

2. THE NEW MEANING OF "MELENCOLIA I"

(*a*) The new Form of Expression

The idea behind Dürer's engraving, defined in terms of the history of types, might be that of Geometria surrendering to melancholy, or of Melancholy with a taste for geometry. But this pictorial union of two figures, one embodying the allegorised ideal of a creative mental faculty, the other a terrifying image of a destructive state of mind, means far more than a mere fusion of two types; in fact, it establishes a completely new meaning, and one that as far as the two starting points are concerned amounts almost to a twofold inversion of meaning. When Dürer fused the portrait of an "ars geometrica" with that of a "homo melancholicus"—an act equal to the merging of two different worlds of thought and feeling—he endowed the one with a soul, the other with a mind. He was bold enough to bring down the timeless knowledge and method of a liberal art into the sphere of human striving and failure, bold enough, too, to raise the animal heaviness of a "sad, earthy" temperament to the height of a struggle with intellectual problems. Geometria's workshop has changed from a cosmos of clearly ranged and purposefully employed tools into a chaos of unused things; their casual distribution reflects a psychological unconcern.[115] But Melancholia's inactivity has changed from the idler's lethargy and the sleeper's unconsciousness to the compulsive preoccupation

[114] Prayer Book, fol. 48v. For the presence of the figure in the German *Ship of Fools* to the illustrations of which Dürer probably contributed, see above, p. 301 (text).

[115] H. WÖLFFLIN, *Die Kunst Albrecht Dürers*, p. 255.

of the highly-strung. Both are idle, Dürer's wreathed and ennobled "Melencolia", with her mechanically-held compasses, and the dowdy "Melancholica" of the calendar illustrations with her useless spindle; but the latter is doing nothing because she has fallen asleep out of sloth, the former because her mind is pre-occupied with interior visions, so that to toil with practical tools seems meaningless to her. The "idleness" in one case is below the level of outward activity; in the other, above it. If Dürer was the first to raise the allegorical figure of Melancholy to the plane of a symbol,[116] this change appears now as the means—or perhaps the result—of a change in significance: the notion of a "Melencolia" in whose nature the intellectual distinction of a liberal art was combined with a human soul's capacity for suffering could only take the form of a winged genius.

The creative power which generated this new conception naturally informs also the traditional details. Set pieces that seem to be entirely conventional play a curious part in producing that impression of casualness so typical of the engraving; the purse, for instance, instead of being attached to the belt by ribbons, has slipped carelessly to the ground, the keys hang crookedly in their twisted ring—very different from the house-wifely chatelaine of the *Madonna at the Wall*. And when even these inanimate details become eloquent, when the sleeping dog (which in the usual picture of scholars is enjoying the quiet of the study and the warmth of the stove) has become a half-starved wretch, curled up, dead-tired, and shivering on the cold earth, then how striking and how new those things appear which have always been significant in a specifically human sense. We know now that the motif of the clenched fist was a traditional one, already used here and there before Dürer (PLATE 72). For a medieval illustrator, the clenched fist was the sign of certain delusions, and he conceived it as an inevitable adjunct of the figure in question, as inevitable as the knife which St Bartholomew always carries. But in Dürer's *Melencolia I* the clenched hand also supports the head; it thereby visibly approaches the seat of thought, and, by ceasing to be an isolated attribute, merges with

[116] These stages of development, discussed above from a systematic point of view, can be shown in the example of *Melencolia I* to have been stages in an actual historical process; for the "symbolic" form of the engraving did in fact evolve from the combination of a purely "personifying" representation (i.e. the "typus Geometriae") with a purely "paradigmatic" one (i e. the portrait of a melancholic as in the calendars).

the thoughtful face into one area of compressed power, containing not only the strongest contrasts of light and shade, but also absorbing all there is, in the otherwise motionless figure, of physical and mental life. Moreover, the clenched left hand is in striking contrast to the lethargically sinking right hand; it is the hand no longer of an unfortunate madman who "thinks", as one text puts it, "that he holds a great treasure, or the whole world, in his hand"; but of a completely reasonable being, intent on creative work—and sharing none the less the same fate as the poor madman in not being able either to grasp or to release an imaginary something. The gesture of the clenched fist, hitherto a mere symptom of disease, now symbolises the fanatical concentration of a mind which has truly grasped a problem, but which at the same moment feels itself incapable either of solving or of dismissing it.

The clenched fist tells the same story as the gaze directed towards an empty distance. How different it is from the downcast eye formerly attributed to the melancholic or child of Saturn![117] Melencolia's eyes stare into the realm of the invisible with the same vain intensity as that with which her hand grasps the impalpable. Her gaze owes its uncanny expressiveness not only to the upward look, the unfocussed eyes typical of hard thinking, but also, above all, to the fact that the whites of her eyes, particularly prominent in such a gaze, shine forth from a dark face, that "dark face" which, as we know, was also a constant trait of the traditional picture of Melancholy, but in Dürer's

[117] Cf. Rufus' *κατηφεῖς* (above, text p. 50), probably to be understood as a psychological term, and numerous later texts, in which certainly the pose is intended as a means of expression: e.g. Raimundus Lullus: "Et naturaliter erga terram respiciunt"; Berlin, Cod. germ. fol. 1191, now in Marburg: "Sin [e.g. the melancholic's] Antlitz czu der Erden gekart"; also the text on Saturn printed in A. HAUBER, *Planetenkinderbilder und Sternbilder*, Strasbourg 1916, p. 23: "Sin [e.g. Saturn's child] angesicht alles geneiget zu der erden." It says something for the power of suggestion of such a tradition that a description of Dürer's engraving (*Pictura Melancholiae*) by Melanchthon—admittedly known to us only at second hand—says in obvious contradiction to the visible fact: "Vultu severo, qui in magna consideratione nusquam aspicit, sed palpebris dejectis humum intuetur." Thus Berlin, MS theol. lat. qu. 97, now in Tübingen, a composite MS which a certain Sebastian Redlich copied from notes by Conrad Cordatus, fol. 290r (rather poorly edited by H. Wrampelmeyer, *Ungedruckte Schriften Philipp Melanchthons*, Beilage zum Jahresbericht des Kgl. Gymnasiums zu Clausthal, Easter 1911, p. 8, No. 62). This description, an illuminating one in many ways ("Albertus Durerus, artificiosissimus pictor, melancholici picturam ita expressit . . .") is a mixture of minute observation and subtle psychological interpretation, and of pure fantasy. At the end, for instance, the author says "Cernere etiam est . . . ad fenestram aranearum tela", although neither a spider's web nor even a window is present. Here Melanchthon was probably thinking of another portrait of melancholy (cf. our PLATE 139 and p. 393 sq.) or of an engraving such as G. Pencz's *Tactus* (B109).

portrait denotes something entirely new. Here too, representing the "dark face" less as dark-skinned than as darkly shadowed,[118] he transformed the physiognomic or pathological fact into an expression, almost an atmosphere. Like the motif of the clenched fist, that of the dark face was taken over from the sphere of medical semeiology; but the discoloration becomes, literally, an over-shadowing, which we understand not as the result of a physical condition, but as the expression of a state of mind. In this picture, dusk (signified by a bat)[119] is magically illumined by the glow of heavenly phenomena, which cause the sea in the background to glow with phosphorescence, while the foreground seems to be lit by a moon standing high in the sky and casting deep shadows.[120] This highly fantastic and literal "twilight" of the whole picture is not so much based on the natural conditions of a certain time of day: it denotes the uncanny twilight of a mind, which can neither cast its thoughts away into the darkness nor "bring them to the light". Thus, Dürer's Melencolia (it is unnecessary to add that the upright figure in the preliminary study has been deliberately changed to a drooping one) sits in front of her unfinished building, surrounded by the instruments of creative work, but sadly brooding with a feeling that she is achieving nothing.[121] With hair hanging down unkempt, and her gaze, thoughtful and sad, fixed on a point in the distance, she keeps watch, withdrawn from the world, under a darkening sky, while the bat begins its circling flight. "A genius with wings

[118] This fact was questioned by W. BÜHLER (in *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für vervielfältigende Kunst*, 1925, pp. 44 sqq.) as the globe, the fist and the putto's face appear lighter, though they are in the same light. But these objects of comparison seem lighter only because they are merely partly in shadow, while Melancholy's face, turned much further to the left than the putto's, is fully in shadow, and should therefore be compared only with the shadowed portion of the objects named by Bühler (or perhaps with the right half of the collar round her shoulder).

[119] Ripa expressly describes this as an attribute of the "Crepusculo della Sera". Moreover, we know (see above, p. 11, note 24 and *passim*) that the third quarter of the day, i.e. the time between 3 p.m. and 9 p.m., is proper to melancholy.

[120] It seems hitherto to have been ignored that the sun could not possibly stand so high at the time of day indicated by the sky and the bat, as to cast, for instance, the hour-glass's shadow. The scene, therefore, if indeed such a realistic interpretation is desired, was imagined as by moonlight, once more in significant contrast to the sun-drenched interior in the St Jerome engraving (see below, p. 364, note 276).

[121] In Melanchthon's analysis, just quoted, the ladder motif in particular is interpreted in this sense, i.e. as a symbol of an all-embracing but often ineffectual, if not absurd, mental search: "ut autem indicaret nihil non talibus ab ingeniis comprehendi solere, et quam eadem saepe in absurda deferrentur, ante illam scalas in nubes eduxit, per quarum gradus quadratum saxum veluti ascensionem moliri fecit."

that she will not unfold, with a key that she will not use to unlock, with laurels on her brow, but with no smile of victory."[122]

Dürer defined and enhanced this impression of an essentially human tragedy in two ways by the addition of auxiliary figures. The dozing of the tired and hungry dog (the former owner of the preliminary drawing—see PLATE 4—rightly called it "canis dormitans", making use of the intensive form, rather than "canis dormiens") signifies the dull sadness of a creature entirely given over to its unconscious comfort or discomfort[123]; while the industry of the writing putto signifies the careless equanimity of a being that has only just learnt the contentment of activity, even when unproductive, and does not yet know the torment of thought, even when productive; it is not yet capable of sadness, because it has not yet attained human stature. The conscious sorrow of a human being wrestling with problems is enhanced both by the unconscious suffering of the sleeping dog and by the happy unself-consciousness of the busy child.

(*b*) The New Notional Content

The new meaning expressed in Dürer's engraving communicates itself to eye and mind with the same directness as that with which the outward appearance of a man approaching us reveals his character and mood; and it is in fact the distinction of a great work of art, that whether it represents a bunch of asparagus or a subtle allegory it can, on one particular level, be understood by the naïve observer and the scientific analyst alike. Indeed, the impression which we have just attempted to describe will probably be shared, to a certain extent, by almost everybody who looks at the engraving, though in words they may express their feelings differently.

But just as there are works of art whose interpretation is exhausted in the communication of directly experienced impressions, because their intention is satisfied merely by the representation of a "first-order" (in this case purely visual) world of objects,[124] so there are others whose composition embraces a

[122] LUDWIG BARTNING, *Worte der Erinnerung an Adolf Bartning*, privately printed, Hamburg 1929.

[123] Thus, too, in Melanchthon's description: "Jacet autem prope hanc ad pedes ipsius, contracta corporis parte, parte etiam porrecta, canis, cuiusmodi solet illa bestia in fastidio esse, languida et sominiculosa et perturbari in quiete."

[124] Cf. E. PANOFSKY, in *Logos*, VOL. XXI (1932), pp. 103 sqq.

"second-order" body of elements, based on a cultural inheritance, and expressing, therefore, a notional content as well. That *Melencolia I* belongs to the latter group is demonstrated not only by Dürer's note, which attributes a definite allegorical meaning even to the innocent appurtenances of a housewife's wardrobe,[125] but, above all, by the evidence—just adduced—that Dürer's engraving is the result of a synthesis of certain allegorical pictures of melancholy and the arts, whose notional content, no less than their expressive significance, did indeed change, but could hardly be altogether lost. It is hence inherently probable that the characteristic motifs of the engraving should be explained either as symbols of Saturn (or Melancholy), or as symbols of Geometry.

(i) *Symbols of Saturn or Melancholy*

We have discussed first the motifs associated with Saturn (or Melancholy)—the propped-up head, the purse and keys, the clenched fist, the dark face[126]—because they belonged to the personal characteristics of the melancholic, and because, with varying degrees of completeness, they had all been evolved in the pre-Dürer tradition. Besides these motifs there are others which are not so much essential properties as extraneous trappings of the figures represented, and some of them are foreign to the older pictorial tradition.

The first of these auxiliary motifs is the dog, which in itself belonged to the typical portraits of scholars. Its inclusion and the inversion of meaning by which it becomes a fellow-sufferer with Melencolia can, however, be justified by several considerations. Not only is it mentioned in several astrological sources as a typical beast of Saturn,[127] but, in the Horapollo (the introduction to the *Mysteries of the Egyptian Alphabet* which the humanists worshipped almost idolatrously), it is associated with the disposition of melancholics in general, and of scholars and prophets in particular. In 1512, Pirckheimer had finished a translation

[125] See above, pp. 284 sqq. (text). Among Dürer's unallegorical works showing figures with a purse and keys, we may mention the engravings B40, 84 and 90; the woodcuts B3, 80, 84, 88, 92; and, above all, the costume picture L463 with the caption "also gett man in Hewsern Nörmerck." A purse and keys also characterise the old nurse in the pictures of Danae by Titian (Prado) and Rembrandt (Hermitage).

[126] See above, pp. 289 sqq. (text).

[127] E.g. in Ibn Esra the "canes nigri", and, in a Greek MS, dogs in general (*Cat. astr. Gr.*, V, 1, p. 182, 10; quoted by W. GUNDEL in *Gnomon*, VOL. II (1926), p. 299, and BBG, *Sternglaube*, p. 114).

of the Horapollo from the Greek, and Dürer himself had supplied it with illustrations; and curiously enough, of this jointly produced codex, there survives the very page (Dürer's drawing L83) on which it is written that the hieroglyph of a dog signifies among other things the spleen, prophets, and "sacras literas"—all notions which, since the time of Aristotle, had been closely linked with the melancholic—, and that the dog, more gifted and sensitive than other beasts, has a very serious nature and can fall a victim to madness, and like deep thinkers is inclined to be always on the hunt, smelling things out, and sticking to them.[128] "The best dog", says a contemporary hieroglyphist, is therefore the one "qui faciem magis, ut vulgo aiunt, melancholicam prae se ferat"[129]—which could be said with all justice of the dog in Dürer's engraving.

The bat motif is quite independent of pictures. In fact, its invention is due purely to a textual tradition; and even in Ramler's *Shorter Mythology* it is still cited as the animal symbolic of melancholics.[130] It is mentioned, too, in the Horapollo as a sign of "homo aegrotans et incontinens".[131] Further, it served the Renaissance humanists (for better or worse) as an example of night vigil or nightly work. According to Agrippa of Nettesheim its outstanding characteristic is "vigilantia"[132]; according to Ficino it is a warning example of the ruinous and destructive effect of night study[133]; and (most remarkable of all, perhaps)

[128] On this cf. GIEHLOW from whose works we have frequently quoted, and to whom the credit belongs for having discovered the whole system of Renaissance hieroglyphics and for collecting all the most important material; cf. also L. VOLKMANN, *Bilderschriften der Renaissance*, Leipzig 1923, *passim*. G. LEIDINGER (in *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philol.-hist. Klasse*, 1929) has shown that Dürer knew, and even owned, the *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili*.

[129] Thus Pierio Valeriano, quoted in GIEHLOW (1904), p. 72.

[130] K. RAMLER, *Kurzgefasste Mythologie*, 4th edn., Berlin 1820, p. 456: "Some make bats flutter about him."

[131] K. GIEHLOW, in *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*, VOL. XXXII (1915), p. 167.

[132] AGRIPPA OF NETTESHEIM, *Occulta philosophia*, in the autograph of 1510 discovered by Dr. Hans Meier, Würzburg, Univ. Bibl., Cod. Q. 50 (for this, see below, text pp. 351 sqq.), fol. 9r. Hence a bat's heart was a talisman against sleepiness.

[133] FICINO, *De v. tripl.*, I, 7 (*Opera*, VOL. I, p. 500): "Spiritus fatigatione diurna, praesertim subtilissimi quique denique resolvuntur. Nocte igitur pauci crassique supersunt . . . , ut non aliter mancis horum fretum alis ingenium volare possit, quam vespertiliones atque bubones." Moreover Agrippa of Nettesheim mentions the bat as among Saturn's beasts: "Saturnalia sunt . . . animalia reptilia segregata, solitaria, nocturna, tristia, contemplativa vel penitus lenta, avara, timida, melancolica, multi laboris et tardi motus, ut bubo, talpa,

in ancient times its membranes were actually used for writing, particularly in setting down spells against sleeplessness.[134]

Finally, the seascape with the little ships can also be fitted into the context of Saturn and Melancholy. By classical and Arabian astrologers the god who fled across the sea to Latium was reckoned "lord of the sea and of seafarers", so that his children liked to live near water and to make a living by such trades.[135] Nor is this all. Saturn—and, more particularly, any comet belonging to him—was also held responsible for floods and high tides; and it can safely be said that any comet which figures in a picture of Melancholy must be one of these "Saturnine comets", of which it is expressly stated that they threaten the world with the "dominium melancholiae".[136] It is, then, scarcely a coincidence that a rainbow shines above Dürer's sea, and that the water has so flooded the flat beach that it is lapping round the trees between the two bright peninsulas; for even in Babylonian cuneiform texts it had been considered a definite fact that a

basiliscus, vespertilio" (the Würzburg MS, fol. 17ᵛ; from the printed edition also mentioned by W. GUNDEL, in *Gnomon*, VOL. II (1926), p. 290, and BBG, *Sternglaube*, p. 115). According to this, any incense offered to Saturn should contain bat's blood (the Würzburg MS, fol. 25ᵛ; from the printed edition quoted by GUNDEL, loc. cit.). In addition to these direct mentions there are indirect ones, crediting Saturn with night birds in general (τὰ τῆς νυκτὸς πετεινά, "omnia, quae noctu vagantur"): *Cat. astr. Gr.*, IV, 122 (quoted by GUNDEL, loc. cit.) and RANZOVIUS, *Tractatus astrologicus*, Frankfurt 1609, p. 47. The sixty-second emblem in Alciato's famous collection of emblemata is of particular interest:

"Vespertilio.
Vespere quae tantum volitat, quae lumine lusca est,
Quae cum alas gestet, caetera muris habet;
Ad res diversas trahitur: mala nomina primum
Signat, quae latitant, iudiciumque timent.
Inde et Philosophos, qui dum caelestia quaerunt,
Caligant oculis, falsaque sola vident . . . ."

These lines read like a list of the characteristics of the Saturnine and melancholy mind. The reference to a certain type of philosopher is significant.

[134] T. BIRT, *Die Buchrolle in der Kunst*, Leipzig 1907, pp. 286 sqq. (with references).

[135] See above, pp. 130, 138, 143 sqq. (text). LEONHARD REYNMANN's *Nativitet-Kalender* of 1515, too, states that the children of Saturn "deal with watery things" (fol. D. iiᵛ). Campagnola's engraving of Saturn, mentioned above, pp. 210 ff. (text), may have given Dürer the actual impulse to adopt the sea motif. This engraving, influenced in its turn by earlier Dürer engravings, can hardly have been unknown to the mature artist.

[136] Cf. BARTOLOMEO DA PARMA, ed. E. Narducci, in *Bulletino di Bibliografia e di Storia delle Scienze Matematiche e Fisiche*, XVII (1884), p. 156. Correlating individual comets to individual planets dates back to Nechepso-Petosiris; cf. BBG, *Sternglaube*, pp. 51 and 129, and W. GUNDEL in PAULY-WISSOWA, s.v. "Kometen", and in *Hessische Blätter für Volkskunde*, VII (1908), pp. 109 sqq. (The planet bequeathes its properties to the comet, "tanquam filio"; cf. A. MIZALDUS, *Cometographia*, Paris 1549, p. 91, the same author says (pp. 177 and 180) that Saturn's comet causes "melancholicos morbos" and floods, etc., and is particularly dangerous to the children of Saturn.)

comet with its head towards the earth pointed to high water; and it was the melancholic in particular who was able to foresee such misfortunes.[137]

However, these phenomena, partly sad, partly menacing, are countered by two other motifs[138] signifying palliatives against Saturn and against Melancholy. One is the wreath which the woman has bound round her brow. Although, in the history of types, this wreath is traceable to the adornment of the "homo literatus" and therefore proclaims Melencolia's intellectual powers,[139] nevertheless it must also be reckoned as an antidote to melancholy, because it is made up of the leaves of two plants which are both of a watery nature and therefore counteract the earthy dryness of the melancholy temperament; these plants are water parsley (*Ranunculus aquaticus*)—which Dürer had already associated with the combination of "Auster", "Phlegma" and "Aqua" in his woodcut[140] illustrating the work of Conrad Celtes (PLATE 83)—and the common watercress (*Nasturtium officinale*).[141] The other antidote is the square of the number four, apparently engraved on metal: thanks to Giehlow's pioneer research work there can no longer be any doubt that this is intended not only as a sign of the arithmetical side of the melancholy genius but, above all, as a "magic square" in the original sense of that expression.[142] It is a talisman to attract the healing influence of Jupiter; it is the non-pictorial, mathematical substitute for

[137] Cf. BBG, *Sternglaube*, p. 114 and below, pp. 357 sqq. (text).

[138] For the object which has formerly been interpreted erroneously as a clyster, see below, p. 329, note 151.

[139] See above, p. 315 (text).

[140] B130.

[141] According to Giehlow's unpublished notes, in the sixteenth century the melancholic was expressly advised to place damp (i.e. naturally damp) herbs on his brow, "like a plaster". The identification as water parsley, of the plant appearing in Melencolia's wreath, and in the woodcut B130, is given by W. BÜHLER, in *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für vervielfältigende Kunst*, 1925, pp. 44 sqq., and E. BUCH, in *Die medizinische Welt*, VOL. VII (1933), No. 2, p. 69. Mrs Eleanor Marquand, Princeton, whose help we gratefully acknowledge, points out, however, that Melencolia's wreath consists not of one plant but of two, the second being watercress (cf. e.g. G. BENTHAM, *Handbook of the British Flora*, London 1865). Apart from the fact that it establishes correctly an important detail, the discovery has a methodological significance: if Dürer made up the wreath of two plants having nothing in common save that they are both "watery" plants, this was not mere coincidence or purely aesthetic preference: the choice of these two plants must have been based on a conscious symbolic intention, which justifies our interpreting every detail in the engraving from the point of view of this symbolic intention.

[142] GIEHLOW (1904), pp. 16 sqq. W. AHRENS's counter-arguments (in *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst*, N. S. VOL. XXVI (1915), pp. 291 sqq.) were based on the assumption, which has since been decisively disproved, that the astro-magical significance of the planetary squares cannot be found in western sources before 1531 (see below, text p. 326 sq.).

those images of astral deities which were recommended by Ficino, Agrippa and all the other teachers of white magic. Of this "mensula Jovis", which comprised within itself all the beneficent powers of the "temperator Saturni", one fourteenth-century author wrote: "If a man wears it his bad luck will turn into good, good into better luck"[143]; and in Paracelsus we read: "This symbol makes its bearer fortunate in all his dealings and drives away all cares and fears."[144] Dürer was not an arithmetician, but he was thoroughly familiar with the significance of the magic square in iatromathematics, and that is perhaps the only aspect of this curious combination of numbers which could have attracted his attention and engaged his interest. This indeed is clear, not

FIGURE 1. The magical square of Mars. From a Spanish manuscript of about 1300. Bibl. Vat., Cod. Reg. lat. 1283.

only because the squares had been recognised as symbols of the various planets at a time when the arithmetical problems involved in them had not been gone into at all,[145] but also because, as it was recently discovered, one man with whom Dürer probably

[143] Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, Cod. 5239, fol. 147v: "Et si quis portauerit eam, qui sit infortunatus fortunabitur, de bono in melius efficiet [*sic*]" quoted in A. WARBURG, *Heidnisch-antike Weissagung in Wort und Bild zu Luthers Zeiten*, in *Gesammelte Schriften*, VOL. II, Leipzig 1932, p. 528).

[144] *Aureoli Philippi Theophrasti Paracelsi Opera omnia*, Geneva 1658, VOL. II, pp. 716. "Sigillum hoc si gestetur, gratiam, amorem et favorem apud universos conciliat . . . gestoremque suum in omnibus negotiis felicem facit, et abigit curas omnes, metumque." It was this constant depression due to worry and ungovernable anxiety (cf. Constantinus Africanus, "timor de re non timenda", and Ficino, "quod circa mala nimis formidolosus sum") that formed one of the worst and most significant symptoms of melancholy.

[145] The planetary squares were shown by A. WARBURG (*Heidnisch-antike Weissagung in Wort und Bild zu Luthers Zeiten*, in *Gesammelte Schriften*, VOL. II, Leipzig 1932, pp. 516 sqq.) to be in evidence as early as Cod. Reg. lat. 1283 (about 1300, from which FIG. 1 was taken), also in Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, Cod. 5239 (fourteenth century), and Wolfenbüttel, Cod. 17, 8. Aug. 4to. In the East they could no doubt be found considerably earlier.

came into personal contact was familiar with the planetary squares—Luca Pacioli, whom Dürer may easily have met at Bologna, even if he did not go there specially for the sake of meeting him. In 1500, Pacioli had in fact written a short treatise on the symbols of the planets. In it he cites Arabic sources; and a version of Jupiter's square is given which has the same—and by no means the only possible[146]—disposition of numbers as that which appears in Dürer's *Melencolia I*.[147]

But all these antidotes are merely a weak makeshift in the face of the real destiny of the melancholy person. Just as Ficino had already realised that selfless and unconditional surrender to the will of Saturn was after all not only the "ultima" but also the "optima ratio" for the intellectual man, so, too, Dürer (as we can see from the dark face and clenched fist) creates a Melencolia whose sad but sublime destiny cannot, and perhaps should not, be averted by palliatives, whether natural or magical. If the cosmic conflict between Saturn and Jupiter[148] ever came to a final decision, it could for Dürer not end in victory for Jupiter.

(ii) *Geometrical Symbols*

The motifs not yet accounted for are, as we have already hinted, geometrical symbols.

That applies without reservation to the tools and objects shown in the portrait of Geometria in the *Margarita philosophica*

[146] The square with 16 cells and the sum 34 can appear in 1232 different variations, cf. K. H. DE HAAS, *Frénicle's* 880 *Basic Magic Squares of* 4 × 4 *cells* . . . , Rotterdam 1935.

[147] LUCA PACIOLI's remarks on the seven planetary squares, written about 1500 (Bologna, Bibl. Univ. Cod. 250, fols. 118–122) were discovered by AMADEO AGOSTINI, who emphasises the likely connexion with Dürer: *Bolletino dell'unione matematica italiana*, II, 2 (1923), p. 2 (cf. W. WIELEITNER, in *Mitteilungen zur Geschichte der Medizin und der Naturwissenschaften*, VOL. XXII (1923), p. 125, and VOL. XXV (1926), p. 8). It is remarkable that Pacioli deals with the squares simply as a mathematical "jeu d'esprit", and merely mentions their astrological and magical significance without going into it: he therefore completely ignores any talismanic virtues of the various squares: "Le quali figure cosi numerose non senza misteri gli l'ano acomodata . . . . Le quali figure in questo nostro compendio ho uoluto inserere acio con epse ale uolte possi formar qualche ligiadro solazo . . . ." Agrippa of Nettesheim's works contain the planetary squares only in the printed edition (II, 22); they were lacking in the original version.

[148] Cf. A. WARBURG, *Heidnisch-antike Weissagung in Wort und Bild zu Luthers Zeiten*, in *Gesammelte Schriften*, VOL. II, Leipzig 1932, p. 529. However, we can associate ourselves with his description only with many reservations, since we cannot imagine the "demoniac conflict" between Saturn and Jupiter ending in a victory for the latter; nor can we accord it that prime significance for the interpretation of Dürer's engraving, which Warburg attributes to it. The "mensula Jovis", after all, is only one of many motifs, and by no means the most important. Despite Giehlow's and Warburg's acute arguments, the relevance of the engraving for Maximilian I cannot be proved; and even if it could, *Melencolia I* would have been a warning rather than a consolation to him.

(PLATE 104)—that is to say, the stars in heaven, the unfinished building, the block of stone, the sphere, the compasses, the moulding plane and set-square, the hammer, the writing materials; for the pictorial history of all these things shows them to be symbols of an occupation which practises "the art of measuring", either as an end in itself, or as a means to other ends, all more or less practical. The compasses in Melencolia's hand symbolise, as it were, the unifying intellectual purpose which governs the great diversity of tools and objects by which she is surrounded; and if we want to subdivide, we may say that, together with the sphere and the writing materials, the compasses signify pure geometry; that the building under construction, the moulding-plane, the set-square, and the hammer signify geometry applied to handicraft and building; that the astral phenomena imply geometry employed for astronomical or meteorological purposes[149]; and then, lastly, that the polyhedron represents descriptive geometry: for here, as in many other contemporary representations, it is both a problem and a symbol of geometrically defined optics—more particularly, of perspective (PLATE 95).[150]

---

[149] The reason why Dürer gave the notion of astrology a meteorological turn is explained below, text pp. 353 sqq. (For the combination of rainbow and stars, cf. e.g. *Denkmäler mittelalterlicher Meteorologie* (Neudrucke von Schriften und Karten über Meteorologie und Erdmagnetismus, ed. G. Hellmann, VOL. XV), Berlin 1904, p. 267.) It may be in connexion with this deviation that the sextant originally allotted to the putto (PLATE 8) was not adopted in the final version, for this was a specific symbol of astronomy; cf. our PLATES 94 and 104, as well as the portrait of Ptolemy in the *Margarita philosophica*, reproduced in E. REICKE, *Der Gelehrte in der deutschen Vergangenheit*, Leipzig 1900, plate 44.

[150] Cf. also the title woodcut to PETRUS APIANUS's *Instrumentbuch*, Ingolstadt 1533, and his *Inscriptiones sacrosanctae Vetustatis*, Ingolstadt 1534, initial fol. A. 1ʳ. PLATE 95 shows Flötner's title woodcut to VITELLIO's Περὶ ὀπτικῆς, Nuremberg 1535 (used again in RIVIUS, *Vitruvius Teutsch*, Nuremberg 1548, fol. cxcviii ᵛ). It is well known that the construction of absolutely regular or half-regular polyhedrons formed almost the main problem of practical geometry during the Renaissance. The finest example next to Dürer's own *Unterweisung der Messung* is probably WENZEL JAMNITZER's *Perspectiva corporum regularium*, Nuremberg 1548 and 1568, where the five Platonic bodies are brought into perspective in all possible permutations. Even Jan Boeckhorst's *Geometria* is seated on a polyhedron like Dürer's, which is the more remarkable since for the rest the figure is modelled rather on the woodcut of Doni's *I Marmi*, Venice 1552 (PLATE 131) or its engraved replica (see below); the painting is in the Bonn Landesmuseum, No. 14, our PLATE 132.

The stereometric form of the polyhedron, which Niemann described as a truncated rhomboid (cf. Appendix I, p. 400), and which is certainly not a truncated cube (thus F. A. NAGEL, *Der Kristall auf Dürers Melancholie*, Nuremberg 1922) gave rise, some time ago, to bitter controversy among Dutch scholars (H. A. NABAR and K. H. DE HAAS, in *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant*, Avondblad, 26 April, 29 April and 5 July 1932). While Nabar confirms Niemann's reconstruction and merely adds that the rhomboids are distinguished by a remarkable regularity (angles 60° and 120°), de Haas considers the surfaces of the polyhedron slightly irregular. This we do not believe, as the perspectival phenomena on which de Haas bases his remarks contradict one another; but we may well leave this question, which for us is of secondary importance, to the mathematicians. K. H. DE HAAS's attempt (*Albrecht Dürer's meetkundige bouw van Reuter en Melencolia I*, Rotterdam 1932) to trace the composition of both these engravings back to a detailed system of planimetric surface division is completely outside our sphere of interest. However, it is in any case wrong to say that the rhomboid is a "block still to be chiselled into regularity", and therefore, like the free-masons' "rough block," represents didactically "the human task of moral improvement" (thus HARTLAUB, *Geheimnis*, p. 78). Dürer's polyhedron, whatever its stereometric nature, is as carefully chiselled as possible, with its very exact surfaces, while the "rough block", like Michelangelo's *Pietra alpestra e viva*, must be imagined as a still amorphous mass yet to be shaped (cf. also E. PANOFSKY, *Idea* (Studien der Bibliothek Warburg, VOL. V), Leipzig 1924, pp. 64 and 119).

But all the other objects, too, can be easily associated with the "typus Geometriae" as shown in the Strasbourg woodcut. Plane and saw, nails and pincers, and perhaps the almost hidden object, which is generally called a clyster,[151] but is more likely to be a pair of bellows—all these objects serve simply to swell the inventory of builders, joiners, and carpenters, who use also the grindstone, rounded and smoothed by the stone-mason.[152] Some have even wished to attribute to them the crucible with the little tongs,[153] but we prefer to attribute these to the more delicate art of the goldsmith,[154] or to alchemy, the black art connected, not with geometry, but with Saturnine melancholy.[155] The book

---

[151] This interpretation, according to which the instrument in question is to be counted among the antidotes to melancholy ("purgatio ulvi" was to some extent the alpha and omega of anti-melancholy dietetics) has lately been challenged by Bühler, though without very good reason, for the disc- or bulb-like termination also appears in H. S. Beham's well-known woodcut, the *Fountain of Youth* (Pauli 1120; M. GEISBERG, *Der deutsche Einblatt-Holzschnitt*, VOL. XXII, 14) where a clyster is certainly intended. Moreover, though all the attempts at interpretation made so far must be rejected, for the colour spray which Nagel (op. cit.) sees in it occurs nowhere else, and a nail remover such as Bühler (op. cit.) suggests does not occur until the nineteenth century, we too now think that the mysterious object is more likely to belong to the class of occupational tools than to that of antidotes to melancholy. It may be either a glass-blower's pipe (such as is illustrated in G. AGRICOLA's famous work *De re metallica*, Basle 1556, new German edn. 1928, p. 507—this suggestion comes from Dr Schimangk, Hamburg), or, more probably, a pair of bellows: for this latter interpretation could bring to its support a contemporary pictorial statement, namely Hans Döring's woodcut (of which we shall speak in more detail later), which borrows its whole *instrumentarium* from *Melencolia I* and includes, in fact, a pair of bellows (cf. PLATE 107, and our text pp. 335 sqq.).

[152] On former occasions we left the question open as to whether it was a millstone or a knife-grinder's stone, though in view of the Salone frescoes (see above, text p. 204) we inclined to the latter interpretation. We are glad to find that P. BRANDT (in *Die Umschau in Wissenschaft und Technik*, VOL. XXXII (1928), pp. 276 sqq.) and, quite independently of any technical literature, W. BLUMENFELD (in *Idealistische Philologie*, VOL. III (1927–28), pp. 154 sqq.) now accept this.

[153] According to Bühler it served to melt the lead with which the joints were soldered.

[154] Cf. Schongauer's engraving, B91, or JOST AMMAN's *Eygentliche Beschreibung aller Stände auff Erden*, Frankfurt 1568—new edition Munich 1896—fol. H2.

[155] The main argument (originally Giehlow's) in favour of connecting it with alchemical operations is still based on the fact that later masters, such as Beham (PLATE 115), the Master "F. B." (PLATE 116) and M. de Vos (PLATE 140) endowed Melancholy with unmistakably alchemistic attributes, and that later on, the personification of "Alcymia"

expands the symbolism of compasses, sphere, and writing materials, in the sense that it emphasises the theory, rather than the application, of geometry; and it is obvious that, as instruments for measuring time and weight, the scales and the hourglass (with its attendant bell)[156] also belong to the general picture of "Geometria". Macrobius had already defined time as a "certa dimensio, quae ex caeli conversione colligitur" (thus showing its connexion with astronomy)[157]; and with regard to weighing, in a period which had not yet developed the notion of experimental physics, that was so positively accounted as one of geometry's functions that a famous mnemonic for the seven liberal arts quoted "ponderare" as Geometry's main task:

> Gram loquitur, Dia vera docet, Rhe verba colorat,
> Mus canit, Ar numerat, Geo ponderat, As colit astra.[158]

We know, too, from his own lips, that Dürer himself considered the purely manual activity of the minor crafts to be applied geometry, in exactly the same way as did the tradition represented

occasionally hold a pair of coal-tongs (e.g. the title woodcut to C. GESNER's *Newe Jewell of Health*, London 1576). The fact that Hermes Trismegistus in De Vries's series of alchemists (reproduced in HARTLAUB, *Geheimnis*, p. 46, text pp. 41 and 81) has a pair of compasses is proof neither for nor against, as he is holding the compasses not in his particular capacity as alchemist but in his general capacity as Hermes Trismegistus, who is also a cosmologer and astrologer, his second attribute being therefore an astrolabe.

[156] Thus GIEHLOW (1904), p. 65. In addition the bell, taken in the sense of the hermit's bell with which St Anthony is always endowed, might point to the Saturnine melancholic's leaning towards solitude; in F. PICINELLI's *Mundus symbolicus*, Cologne 1687, XIV, 4, 23, a bell still denotes solitude, and therefore, in remarkable concordance with the usual characteristics of the melancholic, "anima a rebus materialibus, terrenis et diabolicis remota". On the other hand, the belief that the pealing of bells could avert natural disasters (cf. W. GUNDEL, in *Gnomon*, VOL. II (1926), p. 292) implies large church bells.

[157] MACROBIUS, *Saturnalia*, I, 8, 7 (for this cf. the passage from Martianus Capella quoted above, p. 313, note 102). A drawing by Lucas van Leyden (Lille, Mus. Wicar) also characterises geometry by an hourglass.

[158] Printed e.g. in F. OVERBECK, *Vorgeschichte und Jugend der mittelalterlichen Scholastik*, ed. C. A. Bernoulli, Basle 1917, p. 29. In the face of such evidence and of the fact that the scales are not pictorially differentiated in any way from the other instruments (for after all, Dürer was no longer at the stage of the Tübingen MS brought in for comparison by SIGRID STRAUSS-KLOEBE, in *Münchner Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst*, new series, II (1925), p. 58, which mixed heavenly and earthly matters with a deliberately humorous intention), it is difficult to interpret the scales astronomically, i.e. as the zodiacal sign of the exaltation of Saturn (thus also W. GUNDEL, in *Gnomon*, VOL. II (1925), p. 293). If one nevertheless wishes to maintain the astrological interpretation, one may quote not only the passage from *Semifora* mentioned by Gundel, but also Melanchthon's view, brought to light by A. WARBURG, *Heidnisch-antike Weissagung in Wort und Bild zu Luthers Zeiten*, in *Gesammelte Schriften*, VOL. II, Leipzig 1932, p. 529, according to which "multo generosior est melancholia, si coniunctione Saturni et Iovis in libra temperetur" (thus also S. Strauss-Kloebe).

in the woodcuts just studied.[159] In the foreword to his *Instructions on Measuring*, on which he was at that time engaged,[160] he wrote:

> Accordingly I hope no reasonable person will blame me for my enterprise, for it is done with a good intention and for the sake of all lovers of art; and it may be useful not only for painters but for goldsmiths, sculptors, stonemasons and joiners and all who need measurements.[161]

Perhaps, too, it was not mere chance that in a draft of this same introduction Dürer coupled together "planing and turning", in the same way as the plane and the turned sphere lie together in the engraving.[162]

(iii) *Symbols of Saturn or of Melancholy Combined with Geometrical Symbols: in Relation to Mythology and Astrology—in Relation to Epistemology and Psychology*

So far, in accordance with the corresponding duality in the development of types, we have sought the notional content of *Melencolia I* along two completely separate paths. But it would be surprising, and it would make Dürer's achievement appear as something accidental, or at least arbitrary, if a duality which seems to have been so completely resolved in point of form, should not also be found to possess unity with regard to meaning; or if the bold undertaking to characterise Melancholy as Geometry,

[159] We must also mention a highly interesting page out of a Dance of Death dating from about 1430, where the usual groups are at the same time arranged according to the Seven Liberal Arts (Clm. 3941, fol. 17v). The judge is also subordinated to geometry, and is accompanied by figures with compasses, hammer, shears, etc. The accompanying texts say:

> "Gewicht vn mass ler ich dich
> des tzyrkels kunst die kenn ich",

and

> "Rerum mensuras et earum signo figuras",

and

> "Evclides der meyster an geometrey lert
> Der handwerck kunst, zal, wag, hoh, tyeff, leng vn preyt".

[160] Cf. the sketch, dated 1514, for one of the instruments for perspective drawing in book IV, in the Dresden Sketchbook, ed. R. Bruck, Strasb. 1905, plate 135.

[161] LF, *Nachlass*, pp. 181, 30 sqq.

[162] LF, *Nachlass*, p. 268, 12: "Will dorneben anzeigen, waraus die Zierd des Hobels oder Drehwerks, das ist durch die gereden oder runden gemacht werd." Against Bühler's denial that a turned wooden sphere is meant, we may point out that Cranach, who looked at the engraving with the eye of a contemporary, painted the spheres (on PLATES 128 and 129) quite distinctly as brown wooden spheres. We do not wish to insist on this point, but Bühler's statement that Dürer's sphere, which had been to some extent the symbol of geometry ever since Martianus Capella, represents the ball of a church steeple or even the apex of the Temple of the Holy Grail, of which the rhomboid was the base, is simply fantastic. If one insists on such an interpretation, it would have to be shown how such an object was to be fastened.

or Geometry as Melancholy, should not ultimately have revealed an inner affinity between the two themes. And such an affinity does in fact seem to exist.

The earliest (and, at the same time, most complete) western example of the previously mentioned series of pictures representing the "children of the planets"[163] was, as we may remember, the picture cycle in the Salone at Padua. Retaining the scientifically tabulated form of the Islamic manuscripts, but essentially western in style, it shows the occupations and characteristics of all the people whose birth and destiny are governed by a certain planet. Among those ruled by Saturn—who himself is represented as a "silent" king[164]—there are a man plagued with sickness and melancholy, and lame in one leg, with his head resting on his hand; then a scholar, seated, but with his arm in the same typical posture, its double significance—sorrow and reflexion—thus being divided between the two; and further, a tanner, a carpenter, a miser burying treasure, a stonemason, a peasant, a knife-grinder, a gardener, and numerous hermits (PLATES 32–33).

Thus we can see that most of those occupational symbols whose presence in Dürer's engraving of Melencolia has hitherto seemed explicable only in terms of the "art of measurement" find a place also in the world of Saturn; for in so far as they are practical and manual, the trades represented in Dürer's engraving belong not only to that group which we have seen illustrated in the woodcut of "Geometria" in the *Margarita philosophica*, but also to that which the writings on the planets label the "artificia Saturni": namely, the trades of the "carpentarius", the "lapicida", the "cementarius", the "edificator edificiorum"—all trades that are cited by Abû Ma'šar, Alcabitius, Ibn Esra and the rest as typically Saturnine,[165] since they more than others are concerned with wood and stone. Since it is the Salone series that shows not only stonemasons' and woodworkers' tools in action but also the grindstone (elsewhere very rare), it is conceivable that these frescoes exercised a direct influence on the programme of the engraving, especially as we know that Willibald Pirckheimer

[163] See above, pp. 204 sqq. (text).

[164] He appears for the second time as an old man with a pick-axe and a mirror, but this figure goes back to a restoration. The original probably occupied the panel now filled by a huge angel.

[165] References quoted above, pp. 130 sqq., 190 sqq. (text, with relevant footnotes).

spent over three years studying in Padua; and Dürer himself also apparently visited the town.[166]

However, it is not only (so to speak) a substantial relationship of materials, based on a preoccupation with stone and wood, which links the Salone's Saturnine trades with the corresponding trades in the non-astrological pictures of different types of work. The intellectual principle, too, the theoretical foundation underlying this practical activity—in other words, geometry itself—has been reckoned part of Saturn's protectorate; and the more scientific instruments and objects, no less than the more ordinary tools in Dürer's engraving, thereby acquire the strange ambivalence which sanctions—as it were—the link between geometry and melancholy.

When the seven liberal arts, which Martianus Capella had still considered the "ministrae" of Mercury, began to be apportioned among the seven planets, Saturn was first given astronomy because, as Dante expressed it, this was the "highest" and "surest" of the liberal arts.[167] This system, almost universally recognised in the Middle Ages, was later modified, so that instead of astronomy, Saturn acquired geometry, which had formerly had other planets for its patrons—Mars, Jupiter, and, especially, Mercury. When and where this occurred, and whether or not certain speculations in scholastic psychology[168] had any influence on it, are questions that cannot be definitely answered; but even without such influence the alteration would be understandable, for the old earth god with whom the measurement of the fields had originally been associated, the god in whose Roman temple the scales hung,[169] the god who, as "auctor temporum" governed the measurement of time[170] no less than of space—this old earth god could the more easily be credited with the patronage of

[166] Cf. G. FIOCCO, in *L'Arte*, VOL. XVIII (1915), pp. 147 sqq. (also G. GRONAU, in *Pantheon*, VOL. 1G (1928), p. 533), who points out a portrait of Dürer in Campagnola's frescoes painted between 1505 and 1510 in the Scuola del Carmine, Padua. Recently, however, the frescoes have been given a later date, cf. H. TIETZE, *Tizian*, Vienna 1936, pp. 68 sqq. Of course Campagnola may also have drawn Dürer in Venice. Further, cf. H. RUPPRICH, *Willibald Pirckheimer und die erste Reise Dürers nach Italien*, Vienna 1930, *passim*, whose conclusions, however, are much too sweeping in some cases (cf. the note by ALICE WOLF, in *Die graphischen Künste*, new series, I (1936), p. 138).

[167] DANTE, *Convivio*, II, 14, 230. Cf. also J. VON SCHLOSSER, in *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*, XVII (1896), esp. pp. 45 sqq.

[168] See below, pp. 348 sqq. (text).

[169] VARRO, *De lingua latina*, V, 183, quoted above p. 135, note 33.

[170] MACROBIUS, *Saturnalia*, I, 22, 8, quoted above, p. 155, note 96.

geometry in its wider sense, since the translations of Abû Ma'šar available in the West had given to the Arabic author's fairly vague statement, "he signifies the evaluation (or determination) of things", a much more precise meaning by translating it on one occasion, "significat . . . quantitates sive mensuras rerum", and at another time even "eius est . . . rerum dimensio et pondus".

In order to arrive at the point of equating Saturn with Geometry it was only necessary to apply such attributes consciously to the system of the seven liberal arts; and the odd thing is that not long before Dürer this equation had become generally familiar in word and picture, particularly so in Germany. Thus the picture of Saturn in the Tübingen manuscript (PLATE 40)—quite a normal portrait of "Saturn's children", characterising men born under Saturn in the usual way as poor peasants, bakers, cripples and criminals—actually attributes to the god, over and above his shovel and pick, a pair of admittedly somewhat ill-drawn compasses.[171] The same manuscript, in the pictures illustrating the relationship of the seven liberal arts to the planets, credits Saturn with governing geometry[172]; a somewhat later Wolfenbüttel codex actually includes among his followers a begging friar who is unmistakably equipped with a gigantic pair of compasses (PLATE 41).[173] An explanation of this figure is given in the heading. It reads as follows: "the planet Saturn sends us the spirit which teaches us geometry, humility and constancy" (the begging friar represents these three gifts); and an almanac printed in Nuremberg just a year after Dürer's engraving says of Saturn: "Of the arts he signifies geometry."[174]

[171] A. HAUBER, *Planetenkinderbilder und Sternbilder*, Strasbourg 1916, plate XIII. Hauber's attempt (p. 93) to interpret the compasses as an ill-drawn snake scarcely needs refuting, as the steel-blue points are in clear contrast to the brown wood.

[172] HAUBER, op. cit., plate VII.

[173] HAUBER, op. cit., plate XVI.

[174] LEONHARD REYNMANN, *Natiuitet-Kalender*, Nuremberg 1515, fol. D ii v. "Saturnus der höchst oberst planet ist mannisch, bös, kalt vnd trucken, ain veind des lebens vnnd der natur. Ain bedeuter der münich, ainsiedel, claussner, der ser alten leut. Melancolici, hafner, ziegler, ledergerber, Schwartzferber, permenter, der ackerleut, klayber, badreyber, Schlot-vnd winckelfeger, vnd alles schnöden volcks, die mit stinnckenden wasserigen vnsaubern dingen vmbgeen. Er bezaichet aus den künsten die Geometrei; die alten köstlichen vesten ding vnd werck der State vesst vnd hewser . . . ." Here too the survival of post-classical notions is remarkable, ranging from the attribution to him of monks—*σχῆμα μοναχικόν*—and the characteristic of hostility to life—Saturn, god of Death!—to the contradiction that he is dry by nature yet signifies people who deal with watery things. This passage is also marked in the notes left by Giehlow.

Thus from an astrological standpoint, too, Dürer (or his adviser) was justified in regarding everything included in the notion of geometry as Saturn's domain; and when he merged the traditional "typus Acediae" with the equally traditional "typus Geometriae" in a new unity, all these symbols of work could, within this unity, be regarded as symbols both of geometry and of melancholy, since it was Saturn who governed them both in their entirety.

Of course there is a vast difference between the occasional appearance of a melancholic or a geometrician among peasants, cripples and criminals in one of the pictures of Saturn's children, and the fusion, by Dürer, of the triad Saturn, Melancholy, and Geometry, in a unified symbolic figure. But once established, this synthesis influenced further development to an extraordinarily high degree, and even retained its force when, formally regarded, it was once more split up. Apart from the direct imitations and elaborations of which we shall speak later,[175] and apart, too, from the effect which an engraving, born of a fusion between portraits of the liberal arts and portraits of the four temperaments, was in its turn to exert on pictures of the arts,[176] the fact remains that even where we cannot prove Dürer's direct influence, we can trace the development of his thought: for instance, in the poor woodcuts to a compendium of the Salernitan rules of health—entirely unoriginal both in its wording and in its illustrations—which show the melancholic at a geometrician's drawing-board (Fig. 2, p. 395).[177] But Dürer's fusion of the notions Melancholy, Saturn and "Artes Geometricae"[178] is endorsed and illustrated in a remarkable way by a large woodcut designed by the Hessian painter Hans Döring and published in 1535 (PLATE 107).[179] This woodcut formed the title page of a book on defence works, and was therefore

[175] See also below, pp. 374 sqq. (text).

[176] Cf. Virgil Solis's *Seven Liberal Arts*, B123–129, or H. S. Beham's, B121–127. An etching by Christoff Murer (cf. E. PANOFSKY, *Hercules am Scheidewege* (Studien der Bibliothek Warburg, VOL. XVIII), Leipzig 1930, plate 46, p. 101) shows how even the "virtus" of a Hercules at the Crossroads could be influenced by Dürer's Melancholy.

[177] *De conservanda bona valetudine* (quoted above, p. 300, note 66) fol. 120 v. in the 1551 edn.; fol. 121r in the 1553 edn.; fol. 137r in the 1554 edn.

[178] For Jacob I de Gheyn's and Martin van Heemskerck's sequences of temperaments, in which this fusion is also clearly apparent, see below, text pp. 397 sqq.: PLATES 142–144.

[179] Cf. E. EHLERS, *Hans Döring, ein hessischer Maler des 16. Jahrhunderts*, Darmstadt 1919, pp. 14 sqq., with plates and a reference to the connection with *Melencolia I* as well as to Beham's woodcut of Saturn; for the attribution of this work (Pauli 904) to G. Pencz, cf. H. RÖTTINGER, *Die Holzschnitte des Georg Pencz*, Leipzig 1914, pp. 14 sqq.

intended to glorify the art of "castra moliri" and "loca tuta circumfodere". In order to accomplish his task, however, the artist could think of no better way than to reduce the content of Dürer's *Melencolia I* to a universally comprehensible formula, which involved both compressing and enlarging. His picture, which is expressly described as *Melankolya* on page 4 of the text, collects the tools in Dürer's engraving (omitting the grindstone, the block, the ladder, the magic square, the scales and the hour-glass, but adding a mallet and a soldering lamp)[180] on top of a moulded plinth, which probably represents the "loca tuta"; and on a sphere placed in the centre there sits a small winged figure who, on closer inspection, proves to be a synthesis of Melencolia and her putto—the position and childish air from the latter, the thoughtful gesture, the book and the compasses from the former. The sphere, however, bears the sign of Saturn, and above it all, copied exactly from George Pencz's set of planetary pictures of 1531 (formerly attributed to Hans Sebald Beham), the old child-devourer himself drives furiously past in his dragon chariot. Beneath is a board with an inscription which is intended still further to emphasise the picture's relationship to Saturn:

> Grandaeuus ego sum tardus ceu primus in Orbe
> omnia consternens quae jam mihi fata dedere
> falce mea, ne nunc in me Mavortius heros
> bella ciet: loca tuta meis haec artibus usus
> circumfossa iacent, sed tu qui castra moliris
> valle sub angusta circundare. Respice, quaeso,
> ordine quo posset fieri; puer ille docebit:
> hoc beo quos genui ingenio, hac uirtute ualebunt.

Martin Luther once said: "Medicine makes men ill, mathematics sad, theology wicked".[181] So far, at least, as mathematics is concerned, this epigram contains a germ of serious and well-authenticated psychology, for whereas Luther's jest against the other two sciences is limited to affirming that they attain the exact opposite of what they intend, he does not say, as one might expect of the schema, that mathematics makes men foolish or confuses them, but that it makes them sad. This striking

[180] We have not succeeded in detecting either the borax jar mentioned by Ehlers, or the symbol for lead in the smoke rising from the crucible.

[181] Quoted in W. AHRENS, "Das magische Quadrat", in *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst*, N.S., VOL. XXVI (1915), p. 301. Vasari, too (see below, text p. 386) says that the instruments shown in Dürer's engraving of Melancholy "riducono l'uomo e chiunque gli adopera, a essere malinconico."

declaration can be explained by the existence of a theory linking mathematics with melancholy—not a myth clothed in astrology, but a psychological theory founded on epistemology. The chief upholders of this thesis were the two great scholastics Raimundus Lullus and Henricus de Gandavo.

Raimundus Lullus, in his *Tractatus novus de astronomia* (1297),[182] drew his information from Arabic compendiums, so that Saturn—both earthy and watery in nature—is therefore essentially malevolent, and endows his children with melancholy through their heavy dispositions. On the other hand, he also gives them a good memory, firm adherence to their principles, deep knowledge, and readiness to undertake great works of construction—in short, everything that Abû Ma'šar and the other kindred astrologers had ascribed to Saturn. Raimundus, however, was familiar with Aristotle, and was not content with quoting these astrological predicates—the truth of which he did not for an instant doubt—but undertook to prove them scientifically down to the last detail. Thus, he attributed the Saturnine man's leaning towards "species fantasticas et matematicas"—as well as his good memory—partly to the fact that water was an impressionable substance, and earth a solid one which long retained all impressions received[183]; and partly to the quite special correspondence ("concordia") between melancholy and the imagination.

> They [the children of Saturn] receive strong impressions from their imagination, which is more closely related to melancholy than to any other complexion. And the reason why melancholy has a closer correspondence and relation to imagination than has any other complexion, is that imagination relies on measure, line, form and colour,[184] which are better preserved in water and earth, because those elements possess a denser substance than fire and air.[185]

[182] Clm. 10544; the chapter on Saturn, fols. 291v sqq. With this cf. *Histoire littéraire de la France*, VOL. XXIX, Paris 1885, p. 309; L. THORNDIKE, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, VOL. II, London 1923, p. 868, and *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, VOL. IX, 1926–27, col. 1107. There is a Catalan translation in a fragment in Brit. Mus. Add. MS 16434, fol. 8v sqq.

[183] "Et habent bonam memoriam, quia aqua est restrictiva, avara, et impressiva, et species fantasticas diligunt et matematicas. Et terra est subiectum spissum, in quo durat et pressio specierum, que memorate fuerant"; with this cf. the above-quoted passage from Albertus Magnus, and the other passage from Lullus, quoted above, p. 69, note 6.

[184] Cf. the statements from Abû Ma'šar and Alcabitius, quoted above, p. 130 sq.

[185] "Et a longo accipiunt per ymaginacionem, que cum melancolia maiorem habet concordiam quam cum alia compleccione. Et ratio quare melancolia maiorem habet proporcionem et concordiam cum ymaginacione quam alia compleccio, est quia ymaginacio considerat mensuras, lineas et figuras et colores, que melius cum aqua et terra imprimi possunt, quoniam habent materiam magis spissam quam ignis et aer."

One of the greatest thinkers in the thirteenth century, Henricus de Gandavo, was inspired by very different and far deeper reflexions. He too sets out from the assumption (dating back originally to the *Nicomachean Ethics*) that there is a substantial relationship between melancholy and imagination.[186] But whereas Lullus, thinking in astrological terms and interpreting melancholy according to the doctrine of the complexions, enquires as to the influence of a certain humoral disposition on an intellectual faculty, Henricus de Gandavo, arguing from purely philosophical premises and conceiving melancholy as a darkening of the intellect, enquires as to the influence of a certain state of the intellectual faculties on emotional life. The former asks why melancholics (in the humoral sense) are particularly imaginative and therefore designed for mathematics. The latter asks why particularly imaginative, and therefore mathematically inclined, men are melancholy; and he finds the answer to this question in the circumstance that a preponderantly imaginative disposition does in fact lead to a marked capacity for mathematics, but at the same time renders the mind incapable of metaphysical speculation. This intellectual limitation and the resultant feeling of imprisonment within enclosing walls, makes people hampered in this way melancholics. According to Henricus de Gandavo, there are two sorts of men, differing in the nature and limitations of their intellectual faculties. There are those endowed with the ability for metaphysical reasoning; their thoughts are not dominated by their imagination. And there are those who can conceive a notion only when it is such that the imagination can keep company with it, when it can be visualised in spatial terms. They are incapable of grasping that there is no space and time beyond the world, nor can they believe that there are incorporeal beings in the world, beings that are neither in space nor in time:

> Their intellect cannot free itself from the dictates of their imagination . . . whatever they think of must have extension or, as the geometrical point, occupy a position in space. For this reason such people are melancholy, and are the best mathematicians, but the worst metaphysicians; for they cannot raise their minds above the spatial notions on which mathematics is based.[187]

[186] *Eth. Nic.*, 1150 b 25; and esp. *Problem.*, XI, 38; both quoted above, p. 34 (text).

[187] HENRICUS DE GANDAVO, *Quodlibeta*, Paris 1518, fol. xxxiv^r (*Quodl.* II, Quaest. 9): "Qui ergo non possunt angelum intelligere secundum rationem substantiae suae, . . . sunt illi, de quibus dicit Commentator super secundum Metaphysicae: in quibus virtus imaginativa dominatur super virtutem cognitivam. Et ideo, ut dicit, videmus istos non credere demonstrationibus, nisi imaginatio concomitet eas. Non enim possunt credere plenum non esse aut vacuum aut tempus extra mundum. Neque possunt credere hic esse entia non corporea, neque in loco neque in tempore. Primum non possunt credere, quod imaginatio eorum non stat in quantitate finita; et ideo mathematicae imaginationes et quod est extra coelum videntur eis infinita. Secundum non possunt credere, quia intellectus eorum non potest transcendere imaginationem . . . et non stat nisi super magnitudinem aut habens situm et positionem in magnitudine. Propter quod, sicut non possunt credere nec concipere extra naturam universi, hoc est extra mundum, nihil esse (neque locum neque tempus, neque plenum neque vacuum) . . . sic non possunt credere neque concipere hic (hoc est inter res et de numero rerum universi, quae sunt in universo) esse aliqua incorporea, quae in sua natura et essentia carerent omni ratione magnitudinis et situs sive positionis in magnitudine. Sed quicquid cogitant, quantum est aut situm habens in quanto (ut punctus). Unde tales melancholici sunt, et optimi fiunt mathematici, sed pessimi metaphysici, quia non possunt intelligentiam suam extendere ultra situm et magnitudinem, in quibus fundantur mathematicalia." The *Commentator super secundum Metaphysicae* (VOL. II, A ἐλάττων, ch. III) is, of course, Averroes, who does in fact literally speak of those "in quibus virtus imaginativa dominatur super virtutem cogitativam, et ideo videmus istos non credere demonstrationibus, nisi imaginatio concomitet eas, non enim possunt credere" etc., down to "incorporea" (VOL. VIII, fol. 17^r of the edition of Aristotle with commentary, Venice 1552). But in Averroes this statement does not refer to mathematicians, but to the more poetic variety of the imaginative type, namely those who "quaerunt testimonium Versificatoris" before they believe anything; and there is no mention of melancholy (except for the statement that some become sad over a "sermo perscrutatus" because they cannot retain and digest it). The essential notion in this passage, therefore, must be regarded as belonging to Henricus de Gandavo.

(iv) *Art and Practice*

Geometry was the science *par excellence* for Dürer, as for his age.[188] Just as one of his friends, probably Pirckheimer, had said that God himself regarded measure so highly that he created all things according to number, weight and measure,[189] so Dürer, consciously echoing the same—platonising—words from Scripture (*Wisdom of Solomon* XI. 21),[190] wrote of himself the proud sentence:

[188] It is significant that now the artist, too, likes to portray himself with compasses in his hand; cf. A. ALTDORFER, in *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, LIII, 1 (1911), p. 113.

[189] LF, *Nachlass*, p. 285, 9.

[190] "Omnia in mensura, et numero, et pondere disposuisti." Platonic parallels in *Republic*, 602e, and esp. *Philebus*, 55e: οἷον πασῶν που τεχνῶν ἄν τις ἀριθμητικὴν χωρίζῃ καὶ μετρικὴν καὶ στατικήν, ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν φαῦλον τὸ καταλειπόμενον ἑκάστης ἂν γίγνοιτο. In illustration of the famous passage from the Bible, God the Father is frequently shown in the Middle Ages as architect of the world, holding a pair of compasses. This type is prefigured in a symbolic and abbreviated form in the Eadwi Gospels in Anglo-Saxon style (Hanover, Kestner-Mus.; beg. of eleventh century; our PLATE 105; cf. H. GRAEVEN, in *Zeitschrift des historischen Vereins für Niedersachsen*, 1901, p. 294, where, however, the compasses are not identified as such); it appears only a little later, and in a very similar form, in the same artistic milieu, as a full-length cosmological figure (London, Brit. Mus., MS Cotton Tiberius C. VI, fol. 7, our PLATE 106). Other pictures of God the Father with compasses and scales are: (1) an English psalter of about 1200, Paris, Bibl. Nat., MS lat. 8846 (reproduced as Italian by A.-N. DIDRON, *Iconographie chrétienne: histoire de Dieu*, Paris 1843, p. 600; (2) Montpellier, Bibliothèque de l'Université MS 298, fol. 300 (unpublished; Dr Hanns Swarzenski kindly brought this miniature to our notice); (3) Piero di Puccio's fresco in the Campo Santo, Pisa (reproduced by L. BAILLET, in *Fondation Eugène Piot, Monuments et Mémoires* VOL. XIX (1911), p. 147.

"And I will take measure, number and weight as my aim."[191]

The "aim" here mentioned was Dürer's book on painting, and the sum of what was to be based on measure, number and weight was what Dürer called "art" in its most significant sense, the "recta ratio faciendorum operum", as Philip Melanchthon, paraphrasing St Thomas Aquinas, had defined the notion of art.[192] After he had returned from his second visit to Italy, Dürer devoted himself to teaching German artists this "ratio", that is, the art of measurement, perspective, and the like; for he regarded it as that in which German artists had hitherto been lacking,[193] and which alone could succeed in excluding "falseness" from a work of art. It alone could give artists mastery over nature and over their own work. It alone saved them from the "approximate"; it alone—next to God's grace—gave that uncompromising quality to the artistic faculty which Dürer called "power". "Item, the other part shows how the youth is to be educated in the fear of the Lord and with care, so that winning grace he may grow strong and powerful in rational art."[194] So says Dürer in the first comprehensive scheme for his book on painting, written at a time when he could still have had no notion how in the course of the years this book was to shrink to two treatises in the strictest sense

---

with a sonnet quoting word for word from the *Wisdom of Solomon*, XI, 21). (4) (here God the Father is replaced by a personification of the cosmos!) the title woodcut to Albertus Magnus's *Philosophia naturalis* in the Brescia and Venice editions of 1493 and 1496 respectively (PRINCE D'ESSLING, *Les livres à figures vénitiens*, VOL. II, PT I, Florence 1908, p. 291). Far more often we encounter God the Father tracing the world with a pair of compasses but without scales, and this is typical of, and probably originated in, the "Bible moralisée": A. DE LABORDE, *Étude sur la Bible moralisée illustrée*, Paris 1911–27, our PLATE 108, after Laborde's plate I; also A. DE LABORDE, *Les manuscrits à peintures de la Cité de Dieu*, Paris 1909, plate VI; H. MARTIN, *La miniature française du 13e au 15e siècle*, Paris 1923, plates 34 and 74; G. RICHERT, *Mittelalterliche Malerei in Spanien*, Berlin 1925, plate 40; London, Royal MS 19. D. III, fol. 3 (dating from 1411–12), reproduced in E. G. MILLAR, *Souvenir de l'exposition de manuscrits français à peintures . . .*, Paris 1933, pl. 43; The Hague, Kgl. Bibl., MS 78 D. 43, fol. 3; Paris, Bibl. Ste-Geneviève, MS 1028, fol. 14, reproduced in *Bulletin de la société française de reproductions de manuscrits à peintures*, VOL. V (1921), plate XXXVII; Brussels, MS 9004, fol. 1; Paris, Arsenal 647, fol. 77; Paris, Bibl. Nat., MS fr. 247, fol. 1 (P. DURRIEU, *Les antiquités judaïques . . .*, Paris 1907, plate 1); and even in single woodcuts like that in P. HEITZ, *Einblattdrucke des 15. Jahrhunderts*, VOL. XL, No. 24. God or the Hand of God, with scales but without compasses, purely as a symbol of justice, appears e.g. in the Stuttgart Psalter, ed. E. De Wald, Princeton 1930, fol. 9v, 17v, 166v, also, with a cosmological meaning, on an apparently unpublished font in the Musée lapidaire in Bordeaux.

[191] LF, *Nachlass*, p. 316, 24.

[192] For this notion of art, cf. E. PANOFSKY, *Dürers Kunsttheorie*, Berlin 1915, pp. 166 sqq., and the same author in *Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft*, 1926, pp. 190 sqq.

[193] LF, *Nachlass*, p. 181, 1 and esp. pp. 207, 35 sqq.

[194] LF, *Nachlass*, p. 282, 13.

mathematical. He never tired of preaching that this creative "power", which he regarded as the essence of artistic genius, was bound up with the possession of "art"—that is to say, with knowledge based ultimately on mathematics.

> When you have learnt to measure well . . . it is not necessary always to measure everything, for your acquired art will have trained your eye to measure accurately, and your practised hand will obey you. Thus the power of art will drive error from your work and prevent you from making a mistake . . . and thereby your work will seem artistic and pleasing, powerful, free and good, and will be praised by many, for rightness is made part of it.[195]

"Power", therefore, is what Dürer considered the end and essence of artistic capacity; and thereby the apparently casual sentence "keys signify power" acquires a new and deeper meaning. If, as we have seen, the Melancholy of *Melencolia I* is no ordinary Melancholy but a "geometrical" Melancholy, a "Melancholia artificialis", is it perhaps the case that the "power" attributed to her is not the ordinary power of the Saturnine person, but the special power of the artist based on the "recta ratio faciendorum operum"? Is not Melencolia herself the presiding genius of art? We would like to think so, for it is essentially unlikely that Dürer should have wished to endow a being—clearly recognisable as a personification of geometry—with power in the sense of political might or personal influence. And in thinking so we are the more justified in that Dürer was accustomed also to associate riches—symbolised by the purse, the apparently still more "incidental" attribute of the Saturnine melancholic—with the notion of artistic achievement. Just as the possession of "power" is the ideal goal of the outstanding artist, so are "riches" his legitimate and God-given reward—a reward readily granted many hundreds of years ago to the great masters of the past, and one which artists of his own time should expect, and, in case of necessity, demand:

---

[195] LF, *Nachlass*, p. 230, 17 (cf. also the sentence, quoted above, from p. 228, 25, and preliminary drafts as in pp. 218, 22 and 356, 20). From these and other passages it is clear that the expressions "Gewalt", "gewaltig", and "gewaltsam" (generally translated as "ingenium", "potentia", and "peritus" in J. Camerarius's Latin translation) are not in opposition to the notions "Verstand", "rechter Grund", "Kunst", etc., stressing the rational aspects of artistic achievement, but include them. In the translation in LF, *Nachlass*, p. 221, 8 the term "gewaltsame Künstler" is rendered as "potentes intellectu et manu". The derivative form, "gewaltiglich" (LF, *Nachlass*, p. 180, 16), however, just because it is a derivative form, has something of the second-hand about it and becomes opposed to the notions of "Besonnenheit" and "rechte Kunst": "Gewaltiglich aber unbedächtlich" is rendered in Latin as "prompte [not "perite"], sed inconsiderate".

For they [mighty kings] made the best artists rich and held them in honour. For they thought that the very wise bore a resemblance to God.[196] . . . Item, that such an excellent artist shall be paid much money for his art, and no money shall be too great, and it is godly and right.[197]

Dürer therefore understood both power and riches in a specifically professional sense, and in a sense inseparably linked with the notion of Art, and therefore with mathematical education; for the true artist—one whose work is based on conscious insight into the theoretical principles of production—power is a goal, and riches a rightful claim.

But art based on measure, weight, and number, as embodied in the figure of Dürer's Melencolia, was for Dürer still only one requisite of artistic achievement, still only one condition of artistic power. However highly he rated "ratio", in true Renaissance fashion, he was no less a man of the Renaissance in affirming that no theoretical perception was useful without mastery of technique, no "good reason" without "freedom of the hand", no "rational art" without "daily practice". "These two must go hand in hand",[198] says Dürer in a preliminary outline of his doctrine of proportion; for although, like all Renaissance thinkers (one has only to remember Leonardo da Vinci's phrase "la scientia è il capitano e la pratica sono i soldati"),[199] Dürer recognised Art as the highest and governing principle of creative endeavour—so that practice without art seemed to him corruption and captivity—yet he had to admit that "without practice"[200] art, as he understood it, "remains hidden", and that theory and practice must go together, "so that the hand can do what the will intends."[201] Now, if the figure of Melencolia signifies Art *generating* power, a question arises whether her non-intellectual counterpart, Practice *revealing* power, has not also, perhaps, received its due in Dürer's engraving?

And so in fact it seems; for if, on the strength of our purely visual impression, we had to interpret the writing putto as a figure contrasted with Melencolia, we may now, so to speak,

[196] LF, *Nachlass*, pp. 295, 9, and 297, 19.

[197] LF, *Nachlass*, p. 283, 4; cf. also p. 285, 5.

[198] LF, *Nachlass*, p. 230, 5; cf. also p. 231, 3.

[199] C. RAVAISSON-MOLLIEN, *Les manuscrits de Léonard de Vinci*, Paris 1881, MS J. fol. 130r. Cf. also J. P. RICHTER, *The Literary Works of Leonardo da Vinci*, London 1883, § 19.

[200] LF, *Nachlass*, p. 230, 33.

[201] LF, *Nachlass*, p. 230, 1.

name this contrast and suggest that the child signifies "practice". This child sits in almost the same attitude as the woman, and yet—almost to the point of parody—reverses her appearance in its every detail: eyes not aimlessly gazing on high, but fastened eagerly on the slate, hands not idle or clenched, but actively busy. The putto (also winged, but for all that only a little assistant, offering mere manual activity in exchange for the power of the mind) may well be an example of activity without thought, just as Melencolia herself is an example of thought without activity. He takes no share in intellectual creation, but neither does he share the agony bound up with that creation. If Art feels herself faced with impassable limits, blind Practice notices no limitations. Even when, in Saturn's most inauspicious hour, "Ars" and "Usus" have become separated—such is the hour we see in the picture, for the main figure is too much lost in her own thoughts to heed the child's activity[202]—and even when Art herself is overcome with despondency, Practice still can indulge in pointless and unreasoning activity.[203]

That admirable etcher and engraver, Alexander Friedrich, has shown us that this is no mere arbitrary interpretation[204]; for he

[202] *Per contra* Hendrik Goltzius shows a happy and active association between "Ars" and "Usus" in his engraving B111 reproduced in E. PANOFSKY (*in Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft*, 1926, plate 11), where "Ars" appears as teacher and guide to "Usus".

[203] We have now been converted, though for different reasons, to H. Wölfflin's opinion, according to which the putto is not "a thinker in miniature" but "a child scribbling" (*Die Kunst Albrecht Dürers*, 5th edn., Munich 1926, p. 256). In this respect it is also important that Dürer gave a more specifically childish colouring to the putto's activity by replacing the mathematical instruments with the slate. The motif originally intended, like that in the engraving by the Master "A. C." (PLATE 114), would have provided a parallel rather than a contrast. Indeed, there are examples showing that a putto busy with mathematical instruments may mean the very opposite of mere "Usus"; cf. e.g. Hans Döring's woodcut (p. 335 and PLATE 107) as well as an engraving in JOACHIM SANDRART's *Teutsche Akademie* (new edition by A. R. Peltzer, Munich 1925, p. 307), showing a putto with rule and compasses, surrounded by other mathematical instruments, with the inscription "Ars", "Numerus", "Pondus", "Mensura". Hans Döring's "puer docens" provides a sort of *Gegenprobe* for our interpretation of Dürer's putto, in that, although developed from Dürer's, he is holding not a slate but the book and compasses of the main figure, and, instead of eagerly scribbling, has adopted the thoughtful pose of the adult. Dürer's putto could only change from a personification of mere "Practice" to a being embodying "Art" by taking over the attributes and attitudes of Melancholy. On the other hand, the interesting variations on the number four by Paul Flindt (*Quatuor monarchiae, Partes mundi*, etc., ed. Paul Flindt, Nuremberg 1611, No. 12) show the contrast between "Art" and "Practice" by means of two putti, one of whom, eagerly engaged with a chisel, is described as "phlegmaticus", the other, still reminiscent of Dürer, as "melancholicus" (cf. also below, pp. 349, note 217, and 380, note 16).

[204] Another interpretation of the putto, kindly mentioned to us by Dr G. F. Hartlaub, but in our opinion not altogether convincing, will be discussed later on in connexion with Lucas Cranach's portrait of melancholy (see below, text pp. 382 sqq.).

points out that the writing implement which Dürer's putto is plying so eagerly and thoughtlessly is really the artist's own specific tool, namely, a burin, with its own distinctive handle, and its groove for the insertion of the thin square graving point —here applied in a most unsuitable manner. Moreover, there is the fact that the connexion which we discern in Dürer's engraving of theory and practice with ideal and material success, can also be traced in other symbolic or schematic representations of artistic achievement, as for instance in Hendrick Hondius's engraved title-page to his well-known collection of portraits of Dutch painters, which might almost be taken as a more positive version of Dürer's programme (PLATE 109).[205] It shows two naked allegorical figures, one with palette, brushes, and wand of Mercury, signifying "Pictura", the other, with mathematical instruments, signifying "Optica"; though not sunk in depression like Dürer's Melencolia, the two women seem content merely to regard their own excellence, while above them we see two putti eagerly engaged in practical work, and representing "assiduus labor".[206] The two factors of creative achievement which Dürer conceived in the whole complicated tension of their relationship are here shown in friendly accord; but they are still the same two factors, and they still stand in the same relationship of higher and lower: theoretic Art (here split into two forms), and active, eager Practice. The analogy even goes a step further; for just as Dürer showed us the goal and reward of artistic endeavour in the form of keys and purse (an interpretation here reinforced), so Hondius shows us at the bottom of the picture the "fructus laborum". Admittedly there are two significant differences. What men in early baroque times thought the artist's highest goal, next to the riches signified by gold coins, was no longer the power given by God, but fame won in the world, as illustrated by the palm and laurels, and emphasised by Fame with her trumpet.[207] And whereas, in his optimism, Hondius considered the goal as unquestionably attainable, Dürer, in illustrating the unhappy moment when Practice and Art have become separated, questions—and momentarily even

[205] *Pictorum aliquot celebrium . . . effigies*, first published at the Hague about 1610.

[206] The crane allotted to the right-hand putto was a symbol of wakefulness already in late antiquity; the cock on the left (next to the putto), the care or assiduity closely connected with vigilance (cf. e.g. CESARE RIPA, *Iconologia*, 1st edn., Rome 1593, s.v. "Vigilanza" and "Sollecitudine").

[207] An allegory comparable in content is found on the engraved title to *Varie Figure Academiche . . . messe in luce da Pietro de Jode*, Antwerp 1639 (PLATE 110). On the left is "Disegno", a handsome youth with a mirror and compasses, on the right, "Labore", a labourer digging; above, "Honore" crowned with the laurel wreath of "Fama", and with "Abondança's" cornucopia. The inscription runs

"Door den arbeyt en door de Teeken-const
Comt menich aen eer en S'princen ionst."

Another equally vivid example of the allegories of Theory and Practice is the engraved title to the *Universa astrosophia naturalis* by A. F. DE BONNATTIS, Padua 1687: above reigns the victorious "Maiestas Reipublicae Venetae", to the left is an embodiment of "Contemplatione et Iudicio" in the person of an idealised youthful figure with astrolabe and compasses, to the right a personification of "Ratione et Experimento", represented as Mercury.

denies—the value of attaining success and being rewarded for it. That is the true significance of a pictorial feature which seems at first to be designed merely to communicate a certain mood—his giving, that is, to both the purse and the bunch of keys ("riches" and "power", as Dürer himself said) an air of confusion and neglect, in other words, of being unused or unattainable.

(c) The Significance of "Melencolia I"

There is no doubt that the idea expressed by Henricus de Gandavo brings us very close to the core of Melencolia's true meaning. She is above all an imaginative Melancholy, whose thoughts and actions all take place within the realms of space and visibility, from pure reflexion upon geometry to activity in the lesser crafts; and here if anywhere we receive the impression of a being to whom her allotted realm seems intolerably restricted—of a being whose thoughts "have reached the limit".

And so we come to one last vital question, namely, the basic attitude towards life underlying Dürer's engraving, with its endlessly complicated ancestry, its fusion of older types, its modification—nay, its inversion—of older forms of expression, and its development of an allegorical schema: the question of the fundamental significance[208] of *Melencolia I*.

The foundations out of which Dürer's idea arose were of course laid by Ficino's doctrine. The revolution which had reinstated the "pessima complexio" and "corruptio animi" as the source of all creative achievement, and made the "most evil planet" into the "iuvans pater" of intellectual men, had, as we have seen, been brought about in the Florence of the Medici. Without it, a northern artist, granted all the astrological likenesses between

[208] For this notion cf. K. MANNHEIM, "Beiträge zur Theorie der Weltanschauungsinterpretation", in *Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte* (formerly *Jahrbuch der k.k. Zentralkommission*), I (1921–22), pp. 236 sqq.; for our purposes it seemed necessary to replace the term "representational meaning" inserted by Mannheim between "expressional meaning" and "documentary meaning" by the term "notional meaning".

Saturn and Geometry, would yet have lacked the necessary impulse to demolish the barriers of revulsion and fear which had hidden "Melancholia generosa" from view for hundreds of years, to replace the picture of the idle spinstress by that of the Saturnine art of measurement, and to transform into expressions of feeling and into symbols of abstract ideas all the traditional signs of the melancholy disease and attributes of the melancholy temperament. But beyond this general connexion—one might almost say the "atmospheric" connexion—the *De vita triplici* can hardly have had any influence on the composition of the engraving, for the very idea which is most essential to Dürer's composition, namely the integral interpenetration of the notions of melancholy and geometry (in the widest sense), was not only foreign to Ficino's system, but actually contradicts it.

Ficino had taken an enthusiastic interest in many aspects both of the world of man and of the universe, and had included them in the structure of his doctrine; but there was one realm into which he did not enter and which in fact he really ignored—the realm of "visibility in space", which was the background both of theoretical discoveries in mathematics and of practical achievements in the manual arts. This Florentine, who lived at such close quarters with the art of the Renaissance, and with its theory of art based on mathematics, seems to have taken no part either emotionally or intellectually in the rebuilding of this sphere of culture. His Platonist doctrine of beauty completely ignored the works of human hands, and it was not until a good century later that the doctrine was transformed from a philosophy of beauty in nature to a philosophy of art.[209] His theory of cognition barely glances at mathematical knowledge, and the dietetics and morphology in his *De vita triplici* are the dietetics and morphology of a literary man of genius. As far as Ficino is concerned, the creative intellects —those whose efforts, in their beginning, are protected by Mercury, and, in their development, are guided by Saturn—are the "literarum studiosi", that is to say, the humanists, the seers and poets, and, above all, of course, "those who devote themselves ceaselessly to the study of philosophy, turning their minds from the body and corporeal things towards the incorporeal"[210]—in

[209] See below, pp. 360 sqq. (text).

[210] FICINO, *De v. tripl.*, I, 4 (*Opera*, p. 497): "Maxime vero literatorum omnium hi atra bile premuntur, qui seduló philosophiae studio dediti, mentem a corpore rebusque corpóreis sevocant, incorporeisque coniungunt."

other words, certainly not mathematicians, and still less practising artists.[211] Accordingly, in his hierarchy of the intellectual faculties, he does not place the "vis imaginativa" (the lowest faculty, directly attached to the body by the "spiritus")[212] under Saturn. As we read in the third book of the *De vita triplici*, the "imaginatio" tends towards Mars or the sun, the "ratio" towards Jupiter, and only the "mens contemplatrix", which knows intuitively and transcends discursive reasoning, tends towards Saturn.[213] The sublime and sinister nimbus which Ficino weaves about the head of the Saturnine melancholic does not, therefore, have anything to do with "imaginative" men; the latter, whose predominant faculty is merely a vessel to receive solar or Martial influences, do not, in his view, belong to the "melancholy" spirits, to those capable of inspiration; into the illustrious company of the Saturnine he does not admit a being whose thoughts move merely within the sphere of visible, mensurable and ponderable forms; and he would have questioned the right of such a being to be called "Melencolia".

The contrary is the case with Henricus de Gandavo. He considers only imaginative natures—in particular those mathematically gifted—as melancholics; and to that extent his view comes substantially closer to Dürer's. It is also by no means impossible that Dürer was affected by Henricus's ideas, for no less a person than Pico della Mirandola had revived these views in his *Apology*,[214] and thereby reminded many other humanists,

[211] In book I, ch. 2 Ficino emphasises explicitly and with considerable pride the fundamental contrast between what he calls the "Musarum sacerdotes" and all other, even artistic professions: " . . . sollers quilibet artifex instrumenta sua diligentissime curat, penicillos pictor, malleos incudesque faber aerarius, miles equos et arma, venator canes et aves, citharam citharoedus, et sua quisque similiter. Soli vero Musarum sacerdotes, soli summi boni veritatisque venatores, tam negligentes (proh nefas) tamque infortunati sunt, ut instrumentum illud, quo mundum universum metiri quodammodo et capere possunt, negligere penitus videantur. Instrumentum eiusmodi spiritus ipse est, qui apud medicos vapor quidam sanguinis purus, subtilis et lucidus definitur."

[212] See above, pp. 264 sqq. (text).

[213] Quotations above, p. 272 (text).

[214] PICO DELLA MIRANDOLA, *Apologia* (*Opera*, Basle 1572, VOL. I, p. 133): "Qui ergo non possunt angelum intelligere secundum rationem substantiae suae, ut unitatem absque ratione puncti, sunt illi de quibus dicit Commentator super secundo Metaphysicae, in quibus virtus imaginativa dominatur super virtutem cogitativam, et ideo, ut dicit, videmus istos non credere demonstrationibus, nisi imaginatio eos comitetur; et quicquid cogitant, quantum est aut situm habens, in quanto ut punctus; unde tales melancholici sunt, et optimi fiunt mathematici, sed sunt naturales inepti. Haec Henricus ad verbum; ex quibus sequitur, quod secundum Henricum iste magister sit male dispositus ad studium philosophiae naturalis, peius ad studium Metaphysicae, pessime ad studium Theologiae, quae etiam est de abstractioribus: relinquitur ergo ei solum aptitudo ad Mathematica . . . ." Cf. also M. PALMIERI,

Germans included, of them.[215] But if Ficino's theory does not accord with the trend in Dürer's engraving because his idea of melancholy bears no relation to the notion of mathematics, Henricus de Gandavo's does not accord with it because his idea of melancholy is related too closely to the notion of mathematics. From Ficino's point of view, the description "Melencolia" would not be justified, because he considered that in principle no mathematician had access to the sphere of (inspired) melancholy. From Henricus's point of view, the numeral "I" would seem pointless because he considered that in principle no non-mathematician descended into the sphere of (non-inspired) melancholy. Ficino, who saw in melancholy the highest rung of intellectual life, thought it began where the imaginative faculty left off, so that only contemplation, no longer fettered by the imagination, deserved the title of melancholy. Henricus de Gandavo, who still conceived melancholy as a "modus deficiens", thought that as soon as the mind rises above the level of imagination, melancholy ceases to affect it, so that contemplation no longer fettered by the imaginative faculty could lay claim to the title "philosophia" or "theologia". If an artist really wished to give expression to the feeling of "having reached a limit" which seems to form the basis of the close relationship between Henricus de Gandavo's notions of melancholy and Dürer's, he might certainly have called his picture *Melencolia*, but not *Melencolia I*.

It is assumed implicitly that what is lacking logically to

Città di Vita, I, 12, 48 (ed. M. Rooke, in Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, VOL. VIII, Northampton, Mass., 1926–27, p. 59), where the buildings appearing in Saturn's world and their architects are described as follows:

> "Tutto quello è nel mondo ymaginato
> per numeri o linee o lor facture
> convien che sia da questa impression dato.
> Fanno architetti queste creature,
> mathematici sono & fanno in terra
> & altri in ciel lor forme & lor figure."

Incidentally, the equation "Saturnus" = "Imaginatio", was also made in one of Bovillus's schemata, *Liber de sapiente*, cap. xi (ed. R. Klibansky, in E. CASSIRER, *Individuum und Kosmos in der Philosophie der Renaissance*, Leipzig 1927, pp. 326 sqq.) but this is too individual a construction to be treated here: it consists of an analogy between the seven planets and the mental faculties so that Sol equals "Ratio" while the six other planets correspond each to one instrument of "materialis cognitio".

[215] We know, for instance, that both Conrad Peutinger of Augsburg and Hartmann Schedel of Nuremberg had a copy of Pico's *Apologia* in their libraries (E. KÖNIG, *Peutingerstudien*, Freiburg i.B. 1914, p. 65).

complete the sequence started by *Melencolia I*[216] is neither a representation of the three other temperaments to make up a set of the "four complexions", nor yet a picture of disease contrasting "melancholia adusta" with "melancholia naturalis". What is lacking is, rather, the representation of an intellectual condition signifying the next highest rung of cognition in the scale of melancholy; a *Melencolia II* in contrast to *Melencolia I*, which should reveal not a state of complete derangement, but, on the contrary, a state of relative liberation. Herein lies the greatness of Dürer's achievement; that he overcame the medical distinctions by an image, uniting in a single whole, full of emotional life, the phenomena which the set notions of temperament and disease had robbed of their vitality; that he conceived the melancholy of intellectual men as an indivisible destiny in which the differences of melancholy temperament, disease and mood fade to nothing, and brooding sorrow no less than creative enthusiasm are but the extremes of one and the same disposition. The depression of *Melencolia I*, revealing both the obscure doom and the obscure source of creative genius, lies beyond any contrast between health and disease; and if we would discover its opposite we must look for it in a sphere where such a contrast is equally lacking—in a sphere, therefore, which admits of different forms and degrees within "melancholia generosa".

How then are we to imagine such a gradation?[217] The

[216] Interpretations such as "Melencholia, i" ("Go away, Melancholy!") or "Melancolia iacet" ("Melancholy lies on the ground", thus *Mitteilungen des Reichsbundes deutscher Technik*, 1919, No. 47, 6 December) are scarcely worth refuting. More recent but equally untenable is E. BÜCH's view (in *Die medizinische Welt*, VOL. VII (1933), No. 2) that Dürer's engraving was inspired by a prophetic vision of an epidemic of the plague (though nothing is known of one in 1514, at least not in Nuremberg), and that the figure I stood for the first stage of the disease.

[217] Like Alllhn, Thausing and Giehlow, we, too, formerly assumed that Dürer's engraving was intended to be the first of a temperament-series. The difficulties involved in such an assumption were not unknown to us, for we realised that it would have been highly unusual to begin the series with Melancholy, and that no fully analogous names would have been available for the other temperaments (cf. *Dürer's "Melencolia I"*, pp. 68 and 142; also H. WÖLFFLIN, *Die Kunst Albrecht Dürers*, 5th edn., Munich 1926, p. 253); we noticed further that artists under Dürer's influence, who did a complete temperament-series, returned for the sake of neatness to the description "melancolicus" and gave this "melancolicus" third or even fourth place in the series (PLATES 122 and 126). Gerard de Jode in his temperament-series after M. de Vos (PLATE 113), which is independent of Dürer, follows a new way of bringing the term "melancholia" into line with those denoting the other temperaments by treating it, by analogy with Greek usage, as the description of an actual humour, as an equivalent for "cholera nigra" or "atra bilis", and thus ranging it alongside "sanguis", "cholera", and "phlegma"; but here too, melancholy occupies third place and not first; cf. our PLATE 126. In these circumstances, however, the other view, postulating a plan for a *Melencolia II* as a picture of disease, or rather insanity (H. WÖLFFLIN, *Die Kunst Albrecht Dürers*, 5th edn., Munich 1926,

Neoplatonist Ficino, as we know, held inspired melancholy in such great honour that in the ascending hierarchy of the faculties of the soul, "imaginatio", "ratio" and "mens contemplatrix", he coupled it only with the highest, the contemplative mind. Henricus de Gandavo, on the other hand, rated uninspired melancholy so low that it could be coupled only with the lowest rank, the imagination. Ficino thought it impossible for the imaginative mind to rise to melancholy, Henricus thought it impossible for the melancholy mind to rise above the imagination. But what if someone were bold enough to expand the notion of inspired melancholy so as to include a rational and an imaginative as well as a contemplative form? A view would then emerge recognising an imaginative, a rational and a contemplative stage within melancholy itself, thus interpreting, as it were, the hierarchy of the three faculties of the soul as three equally inspired forms of melancholy. Then Dürer's *Melencolia I*, as portraying a "melancholia imaginativa", would really represent the first stage in an ascent via *Melencolia II* ("melancholia rationalis") to *Melencolia III* ("melancholia mentalis").

We know now that there was such a theory of gradation,[218] and

p. 253, and in *Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft*, 1923, p. 175; also K. BORINSKI, *Die Antike in Poetik und Kunsttheorie*, VOL. I, Leipzig 1914, pp. 165 and 296 sqq.), seem to us still less acceptable and we cannot imagine a representation of "melancholia adusta" such as to constitute a counterpart to Dürer's engraving as it stands. For such a representation, given the generally known doctrine of the "four forms", two possibilities would have lain open. Either all four sub-species of melancholy madness, i.e. melancholy "ex sanguine", "ex cholera", "ex phlegmate" and "ex melancholia naturali", could have been combined in one general picture —which would have resulted in a gruesome collection of madhouse scenes having no point of contact either in content or form with *Melencolia I* (we shall show in appendix II, p. 403, that the much-discussed etching B70 (PLATE 146) may give us an idea of what such a collection of the "quattuor species melancholiae adustae" would have looked like)—or else the one real analogy, i.e. "melancholia ex melancholia naturali", would have had to be chosen from among the four forms of diseases, and in that case it would scarcely have been possible to bring out the intended psychological contrast. Everyone is at least agreed that even the winged woman on the engraving, though she expresses the "melancholia naturalis" of the mentally creative man, has at the moment been overcome by a fit of depression in which the black bile has so far gained the ascendancy that, in Ficino's words, the soul "all too deeply entangled in Saturnine brooding and oppressed by cares" (FICINO, *De v. tripl.*, II, 16, *Opera*, p. 523), "evadit tristis, omnium pertaesa" (*A.P.T. Paracelsi Opera omnia*, Geneva 1658, VOL. II, p. 173); the depression differs from the pathological state of "melancholia ex melancholia naturali adusta" only by its transitory nature (thus, too, H. WÖLFFLIN, *Die Kunst Albrecht Dürers*, 5th edn., Munich 1926, pp. 252 sqq.).

[218] Such a possibility was considered by HARTLAUB, *Geheimnis*, pp. 79 sqq. He rightly criticises the interpretation of the *I* as the beginning of a temperament-series, but flies off at a tangent by introducing the freemasonic idea of the grades of apprentice, journeyman and master (the two latter possibly embodied in Dürer's *Knight, Death and the Devil* and *St Jerome*). But what Hartlaub, op. cit., p. 42, says is lacking, i.e. "literary evidence for a regular tripartite division of Saturnine development", appears abundantly in the *Occulta philosophia*, a German source, be it noted, whereas there is no evidence for any connexion with masonic ideas.

that its inventor was none other than Agrippa of Nettesheim, the first German thinker to adopt the teachings of the Florentine Academy in their entirety, and to familiarise his humanistic friends with them. He was, as it were, the predestined mediator between Ficino and Dürer.[219]

Karl Giehlow, in spite of being familiar with all the relevant parts of the printed *Occulta philosophia*,[220] somehow failed to notice what was essentially new in Agrippa's theory, or fully to grasp its special significance for the elucidation of the numeral in *Melencolia I*; in the same way, later interpretations have been equally inadequate by neglecting to follow up the line of research suggested by Giehlow. Admittedly, on Agrippa's own authority, the printed edition of *Occulta philosophia* which appeared in 1531 contained considerably more than the original version completed in 1510,[221] so that it appeared uncertain whether the relevant parts were not later additions: in which case it would be impossible to regard them as sources for Dürer's engraving. But the original version of *Occulta philosophia*, believed lost, did survive, as Hans Meier has proved, in the very manuscript which Agrippa sent to his friend Trithemius in Würzburg in the spring of 1510.[222] We are thus on firm ground; and in this original version the two chapters on the "furor melancholicus" approach the view of life implicit in Dürer's engraving more nearly than any other writing known to us; it was circulated more or less secretly in many manuscript copies[223]; and it was certainly available to Pirckheimer's circle

[219] On him, cf. P. ZAMBELLI, "A proposito del 'De vanitate scientiarum et artium' di Cornelio Agrippa," *Riv. Crit. di Storia della Filos.*, 1960, pp. 167–81.

[220] GIEHLOW (1904), pp. 12 sqq.

[221] "Addidimus autem nonnulla capitula, inseruimus etiam pleraque, quae praetermittere incuriosum videbatur."

[222] The dedication, in a slightly altered form, was used in the introduction to the printed edition, as was Trithemius's answer of 8 April 1510. The MS of the original edition (quoted above, p. 323, note 132) bears a seventeenth-century inscription "Mon. S. Jacobi" on the first page (Trithemius, of course, was the abbot of this monastery), and Trithemius himself wrote on the right-hand margin of the top cover: "Heinricus Cornelius Coloniensis de magia". See J. BIELMANN, "Zu einer Hds. der 'Occulta philosophia' des Agrippa von Nettesheim," *Archiv f. Kulturgesch.*, VOL. 27 (1937), pp. 318–24.

[223] "Contigit autum postea, ut interceptum opus, priusquam illi summam manum imposuissem, corruptis exemplaribus truncum et impolitum circumferretur atque in Italia, in Gallia, in Germania per multorum manus volitaret." The delay in issuing a printed edition was probably due mainly to fear of clerical persecution; Trithemius himself advised politely but firmly against publishing it: "Unum hoc tamen te monemus custodire praeceptum, ut vulgaria vulgaribus, altiora vero et arcana altioribus atque secretis tantum communices amicis."

through Trithemius,[224] and can now lay claim to being the main source of *Melencolia I*.

Agrippa's *Occulta philosophia* is, in the printed edition, a highly comprehensive but unwieldy work, encumbered with countless astrological, geomantic and cabbalistic spells, figures and tables, a real book of necromancy in the medieval sorcerer's style. In its original form, however, it was quite different, being rather a neat, homogeneous treatise, from which the cabbalistic element was entirely lacking, and in which there were not so many prescriptions of practical magic as to blur the clear outline of a logical, scientific and philosophical system.[225] This system was presented in a threefold structure,[226] was manifestly based entirely on Neoplatonic, Neopythagorean, and oriental mysticism, and presupposed complete familiarity with Ficino's writings, both as a whole and in detail.[227] It led from earthly matters to the stellar universe, and from the stellar universe to the realm of religious truth and mystic contemplation. Everywhere it reveals the "colligantia et continuitas naturae" according to which each "higher power, in imparting its rays to all lesser things in a long and unbroken chain, flows down to the lowest, while, vice versa, the lowest rises via the higher up to the highest"[228]; and it makes even the wildest manipulations—with snakes's eyes, magic brews, and invocations of the stars—seem less like spells than the deliberate application of natural forces.

After two introductory chapters which try, like Ficino, to distinguish this white magic from necromancy and exorcism,[229] and inform us that as a link between physics, mathematics, and theology, it is the "totius nobilissimae philosophiae absoluta

[224] That Trithemius and Pirckheimer had some connexion with each other during the years in question (1510–1515), in which occult matters also played a part, can be seen from a number of letters, the knowledge of which we owe to the archivist, Dr E. Reicke: P. to T., 1 July 1507, and T. to P., 18 July 1507 (Johannes Trithemius, *Epistolarum familiarum libri duo*, probably Hagenau, 1536, pp. 279–281 and Clm. 4008, fol. 11). P. to T., 13 June 1515 (concerning a work by Trithemius against magic), pointed out by O. CLEMEN in *Zeitschrift für Bibliothekswesen*, VOL. XXXVIII (1921), pp. 101 sqq.

[225] This difference between the two editions of *Occulta philosophia* is of course a vital symptom of the development which northern humanism had undergone between about 1510 and 1530; Dr H. Meier intended to edit the Würzburg MS, which would have facilitated an historical evaluation of his discovery.

[226] The printed edition covers almost three times as much space as the original version even apart from the apocryphal Book IV.

[227] See below, p. 356, note 253; pp. 358 sqq. (text).

[228] I, 29, fol. 22ᵛ.

[229] See above, p. 268 (text).

consummatio", the first book lists the manifest and occult powers of earthly things, and then, by means of the "Platonic" doctrine of the pre-formation of individual objects in the sphere of ideas,[230] interprets them as emanations of divine unity transmitted by the stars. As the effects of the "chain" here represented work upwards as well as downwards, metaphysical justification can be found not only for the whole practice of magic with its potions, burnt offerings,[231] sympathetic amulets, healing salves, and poisons, but also for the whole of the old astrological associations[232]; and even the psychological riddles of hypnotism ("fascinatio"), suggestion ("ligatio") and auto-suggestion can be explained by the fact that the influential part can become saturated with the powers of a certain planet and set them in action against other individuals, or even against itself.[233]

The second book deals with "coelestia", the general principles of astrology,[234] and with the manufacture of specific astrological talismans,[235] as well as with the occult significance of numbers (which, remarkably enough, however, are regarded rather from the point of view of mystical correspondence than of practical magic, somewhat in the same way as in the well-known treatises on the numbers seven or four)[236]; it treats also of the astrological and magical character of the stars,[237] and of the effect of music.[238]

[230] I, 5. A charming illustration of this doctrine of pre-formation occurs in a miniature in Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, Cod. Phil. graec. 4 (H. J. HERMANN, in *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*, VOL. XIX (1898), plate VI, text p. 166), where the "ideas" of men and beasts are vividly portrayed linked by rays with their earthly counterparts.

[231] Thus the above-mentioned (p. 323 sq., note 133) burnt-offering to Saturn.

[232] The correlations with the planets (with regard to those referring to Saturn, see the same reference) are given in ch. 16–23 (in ch. 16 add from MS fol. 15ᵛ, "conferunt Saturnalia ad tristitiam et melancoliam, Jovialia ad leticiam et dignitatem"). The localities governed by the different planets are listed in ch. 46, fol. 36ᵛ in astrological terms, but with a new, Ficinesque meaning, while ch. 45, fol. 35ᵛ, contains the mimic and facial characteristics of the children of the planets, whose behaviour both springs from, and evokes, the influence of the star concerned: "Sunt praeterea gestus Saturnum referentes, qui sunt tristes ac moesti, planctus, capitis ictus, item religiosi, ut genuflexio aspectu deorsum fixo, pectoris ictus vultusque consimiles et austeri, et ut scribit satyricus:

'Obstipo capite et figentes lumina terra,
Murmura cum secum et rabiosa silentia rodunt
Atque exporrecto trutinantur verba palato'."

[233] Thus, for instance, a man can calm or sadden others by suggestion, because he is the stronger "in ordine Saturnali" (I, 43, fol. 33ᵛ), or by auto-suggestion evoke Saturn's aid against love, or Jupiter's against the fear of death (I, 43, fol. 44ʳ).

[234] II, 1–3.

[235] II, 4–16.

[236] II, 17–29. Ch. 30 briefly mentions geometric figures, ascribing their efficacy to numerical relationships; we have already stated (p. 327, note 147) that planetary squares are still lacking.

[237] II, 31.

[238] II, 32–33.

Next, it deals in great detail with incantations and invocations, among which those invoking the aid of Saturn are once again distinguished by series of antitheses more numerous than anywhere else[239]; and finally it comes to the casting of spells by means of light and shadows,[240] and the different sorts of "divinatio"—from the flight of birds, astral phenomena, or prodigies, and by sortilege, geomancy, hydromancy, pyromancy, aeromancy, necromancy (much despised), and the interpretation of dreams.[241]

The work reaches its climax in the third book, which, as the introduction says, leads us "to higher things", and teaches us "how to know accurately the laws of religion; how, thanks to divine religion, we must participate in the truth; and how we must properly develop our minds and spirits, by which alone we can grasp the truth".[242] With this third book we leave the lower realm of practical magic and divination by outward aids, and come to that of "vaticinium", direct revelation, in which the soul, inspired by higher powers, "recognises the last fundamentals of things in this world and the next" and miraculously sees "everything that is, has been, or will be in the most distant future".[243] After some introductory remarks on the intellectual and spiritual virtues required to obtain such grace, and a detailed argument designed to prove that this form of mysticism is compatible with Christian dogma, especially with the doctrine of the Trinity,[244] this book enquires into the transmitters of higher inspiration, who are the "daemons", incorporeal intelligences, who "have their light from God" and transmit it to men for purposes of revelation or seduction. They are divided into three orders: the higher or "super-celestial", who circle about the divine unity above the cosmos; the middle or "mundane", who inhabit the heavenly spheres; and the lower or elemental spirits, among whom are also reckoned woodland and domestic gods, the "daemons" of the four quarters of the world, guardian spirits

[239] II, 34–38. The prayer to Saturn (ch. 37, fol. 70ᵛ–71ʳ) runs as follows: "Dominus altus magnus sapiens intelligens ingeniosus revolutor longi spatii, senex magne profunditatis, arcane contemplationis auctor, in cordibus hominum cogitationes magnas deprimens et vel imprimens, vim et potestatem subuertens, omnia destruens et conseruans, secretorum et absconditorum ostensor et inuentor, faciens amittere et inuenire, auctor vite et mortis." In the printed edition (II, 59, p. 205) this polarity, which we found affecting even Alanus ab Insulis (cf. text p. 186), appears equally clearly ("vim et potestatem subvertentem et constituentem, absconditorum custodem et ostensorem").

[240] II, 49.

[241] II, 50–58.

[242] III, 1, fol. 84ʳ.

[243] III, 29, fol. 103ʳ⁻ᵛ.

[244] III, 1–6.

and so on.[245] As these "daemons" fulfil the same function in the universal soul as the different faculties of the soul fulfil in the individual, it is understandable that the human soul, "burning with divine love, raised up by hope and led on by faith", should be able to associate itself directly with them and, as in a mirror of eternity, should be able to experience and achieve all that it could never have experienced and achieved by itself.[246] This makes possible "vaticinium", the power of "perceiving the principles ("causae") of things and foreseeing the future, in that higher inspiration descends on us from the daemons, and spiritual influences are transmitted to us"; this, however, can only happen when the soul is not busied with any other matters but is free ("vacat").[247] Such a "vacatio animae" could take three forms, namely true dreams ("somnia"),[248] elevation of the soul by means of contemplation ("raptus")[249] and illumination of the soul ("furor") by the daemons (in this case acting without mediators)[250]; and we are told, in terms unmistakably reminiscent of Plato's *Phaedrus*, that this "furor" could come from the Muses, or Dionysus, or Apollo, or Venus,[251]—or else from melancholy.[252]

As physical cause of this frenzy [says Agrippa in effect], the philosophers give the "humor melancholicus", not, however, that which is called the black bile, which is something so evil and terrible that its onset, according to the view of scientists and physicians, results not only in madness but in possession by evil spirits as well. By "humor melancholicus" I mean rather that which is called "candida bilis et naturalis". Now this, when it takes fire and glows, generates the frenzy which leads us to wisdom and revelation, especially when it is combined with a heavenly influence, above all with

[245] III, 7–10. The "daemones medii" inhabiting the spheres correspond on the one hand to the nine Muses (cf. MARTIANUS CAPELLA, *Nuptiae Philologiae et Mercurii*, I, 27–28, ed. A. Dick, Leipzig 1925, p. 19); on the other, to certain angels; it is typical of the survival of ancient mythology that the spirit of Mercury was identified with Michael, who had taken over so many of the functions of Hermes Psychopompus, while the spirit of the virginal goddess of birth, Luna-Artemis, was identified with Gabriel, angel of the Annunciation. We cannot here enter into Agrippa's demonology or evaluate the cosmology and highly interesting psychology contained in ch. III, 16–29.

[246] III, 29, fol. 103ʳ⁻ᵛ.

[247] III, 30, fol. 104ʳ. "Illapsiones vero eiusmodi . . . non transeunt in animam nostram, quando illa in aliud quiddam attentius inhians est occupata, sed transeunt, quando vacat."

[248] III, 38.

[249] III, 37.

[250] III, 31–36.

[251] III, 33–36.

[252] For the doctrine of "vacatio animae" and the possibility of its being caused by melancholy, see e.g. FICINO, *Theologia Platonica de immortalitate animorum*, BK XIII, 2 (*Opera*, VOL. I, p. 292).

that of Saturn. For, since, like the "humor melancholicus", he is cold and dry, he influences it constantly, increases it and sustains it. And as moreover, he is the lord of secret contemplation, foreign to all public affairs, and the highest among the planets, so he constantly recalls the soul from outward matters towards the innermost, enables it to rise from lower things to the highest, and sends it knowledge and perception of the future. Therefore Aristotle says in the *Problemata* that through melancholy some men have become divine beings, foretelling the future like the Sibyls and the inspired prophets of ancient Greece, while others have become poets like Maracus of Syracuse; and he says further that all men who have been distinguished in any branch of knowledge have generally been melancholics: to which Democritus and Plato, as well as Aristotle, bear witness, for according to their assurance some melancholics were so outstanding by their genius that they seemed gods rather than men. We often see uneducated, foolish, irresponsible melancholics (such as Hesiod, Ion, Tynnichus of Chalcis, Homer, and Lucretius are said to have been) suddenly seized by this frenzy, when they change into great poets and invent marvellous and divine songs which they themselves scarcely understand. . . .[253]

Moreover, this "humor melancholicus" has such power that they say it attracts certain daemons into our bodies, through whose presence and activity men fall into ecstasies and pronounce many wonderful things. The whole of antiquity bears witness that this occurs in three different forms, corresponding to the threefold capacity of our soul, namely the imaginative,

[253] III, 31, fols. 104ʳ sqq. (proper names corrected in the translation): "Furor est illustratio anime a diis vel a demonibus proveniens. Unde Nasonis hoc carmen:

'Est deus in nobis, sunt et commercia celi;
Sedibus ethereis spiritus ille venit.'

Huius itaque furoris causam, que intra humanum corpus est, dicunt philosophi esse humorem melancolicum, non quidem illum, qui atra bilis vocatur, qui adeo prava horribilisque res est, ut impetus eius a phisicis ac medicis ultra maniam quam inducit, eciam malorum demonum obsessiones afferre confirmatur. Humorem igitur dico melancolicum, qui candida bilis vocatur et naturalis. Hic enim quando accenditur atque ardet, furorem concitat ad sapientiam nobis vaticiniumque conducentem, maxime quatenus consentit cum influxu aliquo celesti, precipue Saturni. Hic enim cum ipse sit frigidus atque siccus, qualis est humor melancolicus, ipsum quotidie influit, auget et conservat; preterea cum sit arcane contemplationis auctor ab omni publico negocio alienus ac planetarum altissimus, animam ipsam tum ab externis officiis ad intima semper revocat, tum ab inferioribus ascendere facit, trahendo ad altissima scientiasque ac futurorum presagia largitur. Unde inquit Aristoteles in libro problematum ex melancolia quidam facti sunt sicut diuini predicentes futura ut Sibille et Bachides, quidam facti sunt poete ut Malanchius Siracusanus; ait preterea omnes viros in quauis scientia prestantes ut plurimum extitisse melancolicos, quod etiam Democritus et Plato cum Aristotele testantur confirmantes nonnullos melancolicos in tantum prestare ingenio, ut diuini potius quam humani videantur. Plerunque etiam videmus homines melancolicos rudes, ineptos, insanos, quales legimus extitisse Hesiodum, Jonem, Tymnicum Calcidensem, Homerum et Lucretium, sepe furore subito corripi ac in poetas bonos euadere et miranda quedam diuinaque canere etiam que ipsimet vix intelligant. Unde diuus Plato in Jone, ubi de furore poetico tractat: 'Plerique, inquit, vates, postquam furoris remissus est impetus, que scripserunt non satis intelligunt, cum tamen recte de singulis artibus in furore tractauerunt, quod singuli harum artifices legendo diiudicant'." It is evident throughout that Agrippa ollows Ficino.

the rational, and the mental. For when set free by the "humor melancholicus", the soul is fully concentrated in the imagination, and it immediately becomes an habitation for the lower spirits, from whom it often receives wonderful instruction in the manual arts; thus we see a quite unskilled man suddenly become a painter or an architect, or a quite outstanding master in another art of the same kind; but if the spirits of this species reveal the future to us, they show us matters related to natural catastrophes and disasters—for instance, approaching storms, earthquakes, cloudbursts, or threats of plague, famine, devastation, and so on. But when the soul is fully concentrated in the reason, it becomes the home of the middle spirits; thereby it attains knowledge and cognition of natural and human things; thus we see a man suddenly become a [natural] philosopher, a physician or a [political] orator; and of future events they show us what concerns the overthrow of kingdoms and the return of epochs, prophesying in the same way as the Sibyl prophesied to the Romans. . . . But when the soul soars completely to the intellect ("mens"), it becomes the home of the higher spirits, from whom it learns the secrets of divine matters, as, for instance, the law of God, the angelic hierarchy, and that which pertains to the knowledge of eternal things and the soul's salvation; of future events they show us, for instance, approaching prodigies, wonders, a prophet to come, or the emergence of a new religion, just as the Sibyls prophesied Jesus Christ long before he appeared. . . .[254]

This theory of melancholy frenzy occupied a central position in the original version of *Occulta philosophia*, for the "furor

[254] III, 32, fol. 105ʳ: "Tantum preterea est huius humoris imperium ut ferant suo impetu eciam demones quosdam in nostra corpora rapi quorum presentia et instinctu homines debachari et mirabilia multa effari. Omnis testatur antiquitas et hoc sub triplici differentia iuxta triplicem anime apprehensionem, scilicet imaginatiuam, rationalem et mentalem; quando enim anima melancolico humore vacans tota in imaginationem transfertur, subito efficitur inferiorum demonum habitaculum, a quibus manualium artium sepe miras accipit rationes; sic videmus rudissimum aliquem hominem sepe in pictorem vel architectorem vel alterius cuiusque artificii subtilissimum subito euadere magistrum; quando vero eiusmodi demones futura nobis portendunt, ostendunt que ad elementorum turbationes temporumque vicissitudines attinent, ut videlicet futuram tempestatem, terremotum vel pluuiam, item futuram mortalitatem, famem, vel stragem et eiusmodi. Sic legimus apud Aulum Gellium Cornelium sacerdotem castissimum eo tempore quo Cesar et Pompeius in Thessalia confligebant, Pataui furore correptum fuisse, ita quod et tempus et ordinem et exitum pugne viderat. Quando vero anima tota in rationem conuertitur, mediorum demonum efficitur domicilium. Hinc naturalium rerum humanarumque nanciscitur scientiam atque prudentiam. Sic videmus aliquando hominem aliquem subito in philosophum vel medicum vel oratorem egregium evadere; ex futuris autem ostendunt nobis que ad regnorum mutationes et seculorum restitutiones pertinent, quemadmodum Sibilla Romanis vaticinata fuit. Cum vero anima tota assurgit in mentem, sublimium demonum efficitur domicilium, a quibus arcana ediscit divinorum, ut videlicet Dei legem, ordines angelorum et ea que ad eternarum rerum cognitionem animarumque salutem pertinent; ex futuris vero ostendunt nobis, ut futura prodigia, miracula, futurum prophetam vel legis mutationem, quemadmodum Sibille de Jesu Christo longo tempore ante aduentum eius vaticinate sunt, quem quidem Vergilius spiritu consimili iam propinquum intelligendo Sibille Cumane reminiscens cecinit:

'Ultima Cumei venit iam carminis etas;
Magnus ab integro seculorum nascitur ordo,
Iam redit et virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna;
Iam noua progenies celo dimittitur alto'."

melancholicus" was the first and most important form of "vacatio animae", and thereby a specific source of inspired creative achievement. It therefore signified the exact point at which the process whose goal was the "vaticinium" reached its climax[255]; and this theory of melancholy enthusiasm reveals the whole variety of the sources merging in Agrippa's magical system. The 'Aristotelian' theory of melancholy, which had already been given an astrological turn by Ficino, was now also coupled with a theory of "daemons" which a late antique mystic like Iamblichus had considered incompatible with astrology[256]; and when Agrippa converted the hierarchy of the three faculties "imaginatio", "ratio" and "mens" into a hierarchy of melancholy illumination and of the achievements based on it, he also went back partly to Ficino,[257] partly to a very ancient gradation of human careers into mechanical, political and philosophical.[258] Again, in part, he was also indebted to the theory widely known after Averroes, in which various effects of the "humor melancholicus" were distinguished, not only as differing in kind, but also as affecting different qualities of the soul. It is true that this purely psychiatric theory had contemplated merely the destructive effect of melancholy and that in place of the ascending scale "imaginatio"—"ratio"—"mens" it had posited "imaginatio", "ratio", and "memoria" all on a footing of equality.[259] To this extent, Agrippa's view represents a fusion of Ficino's theory with other elements. This

[255] Ch. III, 39–56, following the "somnium" section, sets out and explains what is required of the magician in respect of purity, operational rites, "nomina sacra", etc., while the last chapter (III, 57) attempts to define the distinction between "religio" and unlawful "superstitio"—the latter, logically, being limited to the application of the sacraments to improper objects, e.g. the excommunication of noxious worms or the baptism of statues. Ch. III, 30–38, therefore really forms the core of the whole. How greatly this whole structure was dismembered in the printed edition can be seen from the fact that the two chapters on melancholy have, with minor alterations, been compressed into one section and placed in Book I (60), following ch. 59, on "somnium", which is preceded in turn by a chapter on cases of alleged resurrection from the dead and phenomena of stigmatization as well as by the chapter on geomancy formerly in Book II.

[256] See above, p. 152 (text).

[257] See the parallel passage quoted above, p. 271 sq. (text).

[258] Perhaps the most striking example is in the *Disciplina scholarium*, see above p. 282 sq., ch. V (P. L., VOL. LXIV, col. 1233): "Cum ad magistratus excellentiam bonae indolis adolescens velit ascendere, necessarium est ut tria genera statuum, quae in assignatione probabilitatis innuit Aristoteles, diligenter intelligat. Sunt autem quidam vehementer obtusi, alii mediocres, tertii excellenter acuti. Nullum vero vehementer obtusorum vidimus unquam philosophico nectare vehementer inebriari. Istis autem mechanica gaudet maritari, mediocribus politica."

[259] See above, pp. 92 sqq. (text).

very fusion, however, was what was most fruitful and impressive in Agrippa's achievement; the notion of melancholy and of Saturnine genius was no longer restricted to the "homines literati", but was expanded to include—in three ascending grades—the geniuses of action and of artistic vision, so that no less than the great politician or religious genius, the "subtle" architect or painter was now reckoned among the "vates" and "Saturnines". Agrippa expanded the self-glorification of the exclusive circle of the humanists into a universal doctrine of genius long before the Italian theorists of art did the same; and he varied the theme of the gifts of melancholy by distinguishing their subjective aspects from their objective effects; that is to say, by placing side by side the gift of prophecy and creative power, vision and achievement.

The three grades and the two ways in which, according to Agrippa, Saturnine and melancholy inspiration works is summarised in the following table.

Level	Instruments	Psychological Habitat	Realm of Creative Achievement	Realm of Prophecy
I	Lower Spirits	"Imaginatio"	Mechanical arts, especially architecture, painting, etc.	Natural events, especially cloudbursts, famine, etc.
II	Middle Spirits	"Ratio"	Knowledge of natural and human things, especially natural science, medicine, politics, etc.	Political events, overthrow of rulers, restoration, etc.
III	Higher Spirits	"Mens"	Knowledge of divine secrets, especially cognition of divine law, angelology and theology	Religious events, especially the advent of new prophets or the birth of new religions

Let us now imagine the task of an artist who wishes to undertake a portrait of the first or imaginative form of melancholy talent and "frenzy", in accordance with this theory of Agrippa of Nettesheim. What would he have to represent? A being under a cloud, for his mind is melancholy; a being creative as well as prophetic, for his mind has a share of inspired "furor";

a being whose powers of invention are limited to the realms of visibility in space—that is to say, to the realm of the mechanical arts—and whose prophetic gaze can see only menacing catastrophes of nature, for his mind is wholly conditioned by the faculty of "imaginatio"; a being, finally, who is darkly aware of the inadequacy of his powers of knowledge, for his mind lacks the capacity either to allow the higher faculties to take effect or to receive other than the lower spirits. In other words, what the artist would have to represent would be what Albrecht Dürer did in *Melencolia I*.

There is no work of art which corresponds more nearly to Agrippa's notion of melancholy than Dürer's engraving, and there is no text with which Dürer's engraving accords more nearly than Agrippa's chapters on melancholy.

If we now assume the *Occulta philosophia* to be the ultimate source of Dürer's inspiration, and there is nothing against such an assumption, then we can understand why Dürer's portrait of Melancholy—the melancholy of an imaginative being, as distinct from that of the rational or the speculative, the melancholy of the artist and of the artistic thinker, as distinct from that which is political and scientific, or metaphysical and religious—is called *Melencolia I*[260]; we can also understand why the background contains no sun, moon or stars, but the sea flooding the beach, a comet and a rainbow (for what could better denote the "pluviae, fames et strages" which imaginative melancholy foretells?), and why Melancholy is creative, and, at the same time, sunk in depression; prophetic, and, at the same time, confined within her own limits.

Dürer, more than anyone, could identify himself with Agrippa's conception; contemporary in thought with Agrippa, and opposed to the older Italian art-theorists such as Alberti or Leonardo, he, more than anyone, was convinced that the imaginative achievements of painters and architects were derived from higher and ultimately divine inspiration. While fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century Italians had waged war for the recognition of pictorial art as a liberal art purely in the name of a "ratio" which should enable the artist to master reality by means of his rational insight into natural laws, and thereby to raise his activity to the rank

[260] In itself the *I* does not necessarily mean that Dürer actually intended to draw the other two forms of melancholy; it is possible that in engraving this one he merely imagined the other two, and expected the educated spectator to imagine them as well.

of an exact science,[261] Dürer, despite his passionate championship of this very "ratio",[262] was aware of the fact that the deepest source of creative power was to be sought elsewhere, in that purely irrational and individual gift or inspiration[263] which Italian belief granted, if at all, only to the "literarum studiosi" and the "Musarum sacerdotes". Alberti's and Leonardo's speculations on the theory of art were totally unaffected by the Florentine Neoplatonists,[264] and laid the foundations of an "exact" science, as defined by Galileo. They assigned to pictorial art that place in culture as a whole which we to-day are accustomed to allocate to "sober science", and none of the classical art-theorists would ever have thought of considering the architect, painter or sculptor as divinely inspired; that did not happen until the birth of that mannerist school which inclined to northern conceptions in all things; which saturated the theory of art (until then wholly objective and rational) with the spirit of mystic individualism[265]; which conferred the adjective "divine" on the artist; and which tried—significantly enough—to imitate *Melencolia I*, which until then had been almost ignored in Italy.[266] But Dürer had known, by instinct, what the Italians learnt only later, and then as a matter of secondary importance: the tension between "ratio" and "non-ratio", between general rules and individual gifts; as early as 1512 or 1513 he had written the famous words in which he

[261] Cf. E. PANOFSKY, *Idea* (Studien der Bibliothek Warburg VOL. V), Leipzig 1924, pp. 25 sqq.

[262] See above, pp. 339 sqq. (text).

[263] For Dürer's individualism, cf. E. PANOFSKY, *Hercules am Scheidewege* (Studien der Bibliothek Warburg, VOL. XVIII), Leipzig 1930, pp. 167 sqq.

[264] Cf. E. PANOFSKY, *Idea* (Studien der Bibliothek Warburg, VOL. V), Leipzig 1924, pp. 25 sqq.

[265] For the transformation of Ficino's doctrine of beauty into a metaphysics of mannerist art, cf. E. PANOFSKY, *Idea*, pp. 52 sqq. For the protests against mathematical rules which had been the pride of the classical theory of art, cf. ibid. pp. 42 sqq.

[266] See below, pp. 385 sqq. (text). From this point of view it is understandable that, in spite of the remarks on Raphael quoted above, p. 232, note 44, a fundamental connexion between melancholy and figurative art, such as Agrippa had established at the beginning of the sixteenth century, did not appear in Italy until the mannerist epoch, though it was then used at once as an argument for the nobility of artistic activity. ROMANO ALBERTI's *Trattato della nobiltà della pittura*, Rome 1585, says (p. 17): "Et a confirmazione di ciò [i.e. the statement that painting deserved to be ranked as a liberal art] vediamo che li Pittori divengono malencolici, perchè volendo loro imitare bisogna, che ritenghino li fantasmati fissi nell'Intelletto: a ciò dipoi li esprimeno in quel modo, che prima li havean visti in presentia; Et questo non solo una volta, ma continuamente, essendo questo il loro essercitio: per il che talmente tengono la mente astratta et separata dalla materia, che conseguentemente ne vien la Malencolia; la quale però dice Aristotile, che significa ingegno et prudentia, perchè, come l'istesso dice, quasi tutti gl'ingegnosi et prudenti son stati malencolici."

elevated the "species fantastica" of the imagination to the rank of those "interior images" which are connected with Platonic ideas, and attributed the artist's powers of imagination to those "influences from above" that enable a good painter "always to pour forth something new in his work"[267] and "every day to have fresh figures of men and other creatures to make and pour out which no one has seen or thought of ever before".[268]

Here, in terms of German mysticism, and in phrases which are sometimes direct echoes of Ficino and Seneca,[269] a view is expressed which claims for the creative artist what the German mystics had claimed for the religiously illuminated man, Ficino for the philosophers, and Seneca for God. For this reason it harmonises with Agrippa's new doctrine. It is by no means impossible that it was the *Occulta philosophia* itself which brought the Florentine Neoplatonist doctrine of genius in a specifically German interpretation to Dürer who was not only the creator of *Melencolia I* but also the author of the *Four Books of Human Proportion*,[270] and thereby made it possible for him to formulate, in concepts and in words, the irrational and individualistic elements of his own views on art.

Both in his mind and in words—for there is no doubt that Dürer's words just quoted represent the personal experience of

[267] LF, *Nachlass*, p. 295, 13 (cf. p. 299, 1), and p. 297, 16.

[268] LF, *Nachlass*, p. 218, 16. The theory of genius held by Ficino and his circle, despite all the emphasis laid on increased self-awareness, is not really an individualistic one, in so far as the "Musarum sacerdotes" or "viri literati" are always conceived of as a class, and men of genius appear, as it were, in flocks. Recognition of an individual as original and unrepeatable ("desgleichen ihm zu seinen Seiten Keiner Gleich erfunden wirdet und etwan lang Keiner vor ihm gwest und nach ihm nit bald Einer kummt," LF, *Nachlass*, p. 221, 16) or of a work as original and unrepeatable ("das man vor nit gesehen noch ein Ander gedacht hätt") occurs in Dürer earlier than in the South. This also accounts for Dürer's deep aversion to self-repetition in his work. The man whose "economical habits" (Wölfflin) disposed him to re-use sketches or studies made many years earlier, did not once repeat himself in any of the works which actually left his studio, i.e. engravings, pictures or woodcuts; the monkey and the man with the gimlet, taken over from the engraving B42 or the woodcut B117 into the Dresden series of the Seven Sorrows of the Virgin, merely bear witness against the authenticity of the paintings; for the connexion between the St Paul at Munich and the engraving B46, see above, p. 302, note 75, the paper in the *Münchner Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst*.

[269] References in E. PANOFSKY, *Idea* (Studien der Bibliothek Warburg, VOL. V), Leipzig 1924, p. 70. The sentence concerning the "*oberen Eingiessungen*" was already mentioned in this connexion by GIEHLOW (1904).

[270] We have already mentioned (text p. 353) that Agrippa refers also to the Platonic doctrine of Ideas. We may further note in connexion with the specifically northern notion of the inspired artist that it was in late Gothic art in the north that "the Mother of God portrayed by St Luke" was first represented as a visionary image in the clouds; (cf. DOROTHEA KLEIN, *St Lukas als Maler der Maria. Ikonographie der Lukas-Madonna*, dissertation, Hamburg 1933, which, however, leaves unnoticed several important examples).

the creative artist—Dürer himself was a melancholic.[271] It is no coincidence that, clearly understanding his own nature (and anticipating an eighteenth-century custom in portraiture),[272] he painted his own portrait, even in youth, in the attitude of the melancholy thinker and visionary.[273] Just as he had his share of the inspired gifts of imaginative melancholy, so, too, he was familiar with the terrors of the dreams that it could bring; for it was the vision of a flood which so shattered him by its "speed, wind, and roaring" that, as he said, "all my body trembled and I came not to my right senses for a long time."[274] Then, again, an "all too stern judge of himself",[275] he recognised the insuperable

[271] We know this through Melanchthon's expression discovered by A. WARBURG (*Heidnisch-antike Weissagung in Wort und Bild zu Luthers Zeiten*, in *Gesammelte Schriften*, VOL. II, Leipzig 1932, p. 529) concerning the "melancholia generosissima Dureri". Independently of this discovery, M. J. FRIEDLÄNDER, in the course of a fine and judicious account of *Melencolia I*, had already posed the question whether Dürer himself had not been a melancholic (*Albrecht Dürer*, Leipzig 1921, pp. 146 sqq.), and the question can the more readily be answered in the affirmative as Dürer suffered from an illness which the physicians of his time reckoned definitely among the "morbi melancholici": the famous Bremen drawing L130, with the superscription "Do der gelb fleck ist vnd mit dem finger drawff dewt, do ist mir we", indicates an affection of the spleen. This drawing (PLATE 145) is usually associated with Dürer's last illness. But in this connexion we may point out that this view cannot be substantiated. The style of the faintly coloured drawing recalls the studies in proportion of 1512–13 much more than later drawings, while the writing—an important aid to chronology in Dürer's case—is very different from the superb regularity—manifest even in the slightest notes—of the 'twenties, and is only a little more developed than in the letters to Pirckheimer, the closest analogy being once again the theoretical drafts of 1512–13. Moreover, the body is that of a man in his prime, the hair is still fair, and the whole appearance of the head is closest to the self-portrait in the picture of *All Saints*. There is everything to be said for assigning the Bremen drawing to the third lustrum of the sixteenth century, i.e. to the years immediately preceding the composition of *Melencolia I*, and for regarding it as yet further evidence of Dürer's eminently personal interest in the subject. There is the less reason to refer the Bremen drawing to his last illness as he had frequently been ill earlier; in 1519 Pirckheimer wrote "Turer male stat" (E. REICKE in *Mitteilungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Stadt Nürnberg*, VOL. XXVIII (1928), p. 373), and in 1503 Dürer himself wrote on the drawing L231 that he had made it "in his illness". Since noting this, we find that two other scholars are inclined to give a new date to the Bremen drawing—H. A. VAN BAKEL in an essay called "Melancholia generosissima Dureri" in *Nieuw Theologisch Tijdschrift*, VOL. XVII, 4 (1928), p. 332; and E. FLECHSIG, in *Albrecht Dürer*, VOL. II, Berlin 1931, pp. 296, sqq., who for some reason wants to date it as far back as 1509.

[272] For this, cf. URSULA HOFF, *Rembrandt und England*, dissertation, Hamburg 1935.

[273] L429.

[274] LF, *Nachlass*, p. 17, 5. It is very typical of Dürer's nature that even in the disturbance attendant on this visionary dream he notices at what distance the waters meet the land and even attempts to infer from the rapidity of the rainfall the height from which it falls ("und sie kamen so hoch herab, dass sie im Gedunken gleich langsam fieln").

[275] Cf. Kant's account of the melancholic, quoted above, p. 123 (text), which was anticipated, to a considerable extent, by Camerarius's fine description of Albrecht Dürer: "Erat autem, si quid omnium in illo viro quod vitii simile videretur, unica infinita diligentia et in se quoque inquisitrix saepe parum aequa." (Introduction to the Latin translation of the *Theory of Proportion*, Nuremberg 1532.)

limits set by destiny to the possessor of the melancholy of *Melencolia I*, the melancholy of a mind conditioned solely by the imagination.

In mathematics, above all, to which he devoted half a lifetime of work, Dürer had to learn that it would never give men the satisfaction they could find in metaphysical and religious revelation,[276] and that not even mathematics—or rather mathematics least of all—could lead men to the discovery of the absolute, that absolute by which, of course, he meant in the first place absolute beauty. At thirty, intoxicated by the sight of the "new kingdom" of art-theory revealed to him by Jacopo de' Barbari, he thought he could define the one universal beauty with compasses and set-square; at forty he had to admit that this hope had deceived him[277]; and it was in the years immediately preceding the engraving of *Melencolia I* that he became fully aware of this new insight, for about 1512 he wrote "but what beauty is, I do not know,"[278] and in the same draft he said "there is no man living on earth who can say or prove what the most beautiful figure of man may be. None but God can judge of beauty."[279] In the face of such an admission, even belief in the power of mathematics was bound to falter. "With regard to geometry," wrote Dürer some ten years later, "one can prove that certain things are true. But certain things one must leave to the opinion and judgement of men"[280]; and his scepticism had now reached such a pitch that not even an approximation to the highest beauty seemed possible to him any longer.

> For I believe that there is no man living who can contemplate to the very end what is most beautiful even in a small creature, much less in man. . . . It enters not into man's soul. But God knows such things, and if He wishes to reveal it to someone, that person too knows it. . . . But I know not how to show any particular measure that approximates to the greatest beauty.[281]

And so finally, when his affectionate veneration for mathematics once more finds powerful and moving expression, he pays homage to mathematics as confined within, and resigned to, its limits, and the sentence "Whosoever proves his case and reveals the underlying truth of it by geometry, he is to be believed by all the world; for there one is held fast" is preceded by a sentence which might almost serve as a caption to *Melencolia I*: "For there is falsehood in our knowledge, and darkness is so firmly planted in us that even our groping fails."[282]

Thus, having established its connexions with astrology and medicine, with the pictorial representations of the vices or the arts, and with Henricus de Gandavo and Agrippa of Nettesheim, we hold none the less that those, too, are justified in their opinion who wish to consider the engraving *Melencolia I* as something other than a picture of a temperament or a disease, however much ennobled. It is a confession and an expression of Faust's "insuperable ignorance".[283] It is Saturn's face which regards us; but in it we may recognise also the features of Dürer.

---

[276] Only in this one respect is *Melencolia I* in fact a counterpart to the engraving of *St Jerome*. A. WEIXLGÄRTNER (in *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für vervielfältigende Kunst*, 1901, pp. 47 sqq.) shows that the idea of an external, formal *pendant* is here entirely out of place. Still less can one assume, as R. WUSTMANN does (in *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst*, new series, VOL. XXII (1911), p. 116), that the gourd hanging from the ceiling in the *St Jerome* engraving was originally intended to receive the inscription "Melencolia II". Nevertheless, Dürer almost always gave away these two engravings together (LF, *Nachlass*, pp. 120, 16; 121, 6; 125, 12; 127, 13, 17; 128, 17); and they have frequently been inspected and discussed together (cf. the letter to John Cochlaeus of 5 April 1520 printed, with others, by E. REICKE in *Mitteilungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Stadt Nürnberg*, VOL. XXVIII (1928), p. 375).

[277] For this change in Dürer's view of art, cf. esp. LUDWIG JUSTI, *Konstruierte Figuren und Köpfe unter den Werken Albrecht Dürers*, Leipzig 1902, pp. 21 sqq., and the same author in *Repertorium*, VOL. XXVIII (1905), pp. 368 sqq. Also E. PANOFSKY, *Dürers Kunsttheorie*, pp. 113, 127 sqq., and the same author in *Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft*, VOL. III, Leipzig 1926, pp. 136 sqq.

[278] LF, *Nachlass*, p. 288, 27. Dürer's ignorance naturally refers not to the idea of beauty, but to the visible conditions, esp. proportion, determining beauty (thus also H. WÖLFFLIN, *Die Kunst Albrecht Dürers*, 5th edn., Munich 1926, p. 368). So much is clear from what follows: "Idoch will ich hie die Schonheit also für mich nehmen: Was zu den menschlichen Zeiten van dem meinsten Theil schön geachtt würd, des soll wir uns fleissen zu machen." The sentence "was aber die Schönheit sei, das weis ich nit" is equivalent, therefore, to the statements quoted below, LF, *Nachlass*, p. 222, 7, or p. 359, 16.

[279] LF, *Nachlass*, pp. 290, 23 sqq. This is identical almost word for word with a draft dated 1512 (LF, *Nachlass*, p. 300, 9).

[280] LF, *Nachlass*, p. 363, 5.

[281] LF, *Nachlass*, p. 359, 3. The printed edition of the *Theory of Proportion* continues: "Das gib ich nach, dass Einer ein hübschers Bild . . . mach . . . dann der Ander. Aber nit bis zu dem Ende, dass es nit noch hübscher möcht sein. Dann Solchs steigt nit in des Menschen Gemüt. Aber Gott weiss Solichs allein, wem ers offenbarte, der wesst es auch. Die Wahrheit hält allein innen, welch der Menschen schönste Gestalt und Mass kinnte sein und kein andre . . . In solichem Irrtum, den wir jetzt zumal bei uns haben, weis ich nit statthaft zu beschreiben endlich, was Mass sich zu der rechten Hübsche nachnen möcht." (LF, *Nachlass*, p. 221, 30).

[282] LF, *Nachlass*, p. 222, 25 (from the printed *Theory of Proportion*).

[283] It was of course the Romantics who interpreted Dürer's "Melancholy" as a direct portrait of the Faustian character. Dr Hermann Blumenthal kindly pointed out the source in KARL GUSTAV CARUS's *Briefe über Goethes Faust*, VOL. I, Leipzig 1835, letter II, pp. 40 sqq. This remarkably fine analysis, which also strikingly emphasises the "contrast of the eagerly writing child with the idly meditating and sadly gazing larger figure", is the more admirable since the picture of a Dürer torn by Faust's emotions was—as Carus himself clearly felt and several times stated—in complete contradiction to the conception, originated by Wackenroder and at that time generally accepted, of the "otherwise so quiet and pious" master. It is especially significant that Carus, fascinated by the analogy with Faust which he had discovered, speaks of the main figure in the engraving as male.

(*d*) The "Four Apostles"[284]

"Further," says Joachim Sandrart of Dürer's so-called *Four Apostles* (PLATE III), which he had admired in the Electoral Gallery at Munich, "there are the four evangelists in the form of the four complexions, painted in oils in the very best and most masterly fashion."[285] This information, which earlier writers on Dürer had considered absolutely reliable,[286] fell into an ill-founded discredit among later historians. With the sole exception of Karl Neumann (who, however, drew no conclusions from it,[287]) it was spoken of merely as an "old tradition", which was sometimes denied completely, because Dürer "took the apostles far too seriously to use them merely as an opportunity for representing the temperaments"[288]; sometimes it was modified so arbitrarily that the whole point of the theory of the four complexions was lost,[289] and sometimes it was admitted only in so far as Dürer "in the course of his work made use of his view of the four

[284] In connexion with this section, see the essay already cited on p. 302, note 75, in the *Münchner Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst*, new series, VOL. VIII (1931), pp. 1 sqq. As both accounts deal with the same subject matter, though from a different viewpoint, it has been difficult to avoid overlapping; some phrases and even whole paragraphs have had to be repeated almost word for word for the sake of clarity and coherence.

[285] JOACHIM SANDRART, *Teutsche Akademie*, ed. A. R. Peltzer, Munich 1925, p. 67.

[286] Cf. e.g. J. HELLER, *Das Leben und die Werke Albrecht Dürers*, Leipzig 1827, VOL. II, 1, pp. 205 sqq.; F. KUGLER, *Geschichte der Malerei*, 3rd edn., Leipzig 1867, BK IV, § 240 (VOL. II, p. 498); A. VON EYE, *Leben und Wirken Albrecht Dürers*, Nördlingen 1860, p. 452; M. THAUSING, *Dürer*, Leipzig 1884, VOL. II, pp. 278 sqq.

[287] "Die vier Apostel von Albrecht Dürer in ihrer ursprünglichen Gestalt", *Zeitschrift für deutsche Bildung*, IX (1930), pp. 450 sqq., with reproductions of the inscriptions now reunited with the pictures and a detailed account of Dürer's relationship with Neudörffer. H. A. VAN BAKEL ("Melancholia generosissima Dureri", in *Nieuw Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1928) has also returned to the old, traditional interpretation of these pictures of the Apostles as portrayals of the temperaments, but wrongly regards St John as the melancholic, which makes his conclusions as to the spiritual complexion of *Melencolia I* somewhat questionable.

[288] Thus H. WÖLFFLIN, *Die Kunst Albrecht Dürers*, Munich 1926, p. 348 (and later T. HAMPE in *Festschrift des Vereins für die Geschichte der Stadt Nürnberg zur 400 jährigen Gedächtnisfeier Albrecht Dürers*, 1528–1928, Nuremberg 1928, p. 58). A similar note is sounded when a man of the eighteenth century rejects any attempt to classify the historical figures of the Apostles according to the complexions with the remark that he does not like it "when men of God, who are directly inspired by the Holy Ghost, are judged so completely with a philosophical yardstick like ordinary people, and when not only their temperaments but also the degree, usefulness and God knows what else of the smallest parts of them are detailed and precisely determined". (J. W. APPELIUS, *Historisch-moralischer Entwurff der Temperamenten*, Preface to the 2nd edn., 1737, fol. C. 42v).

[289] H. KAUFMANN, *Albrecht Dürers rhythmische Kunst*, Leipzig 1924, pp. 60 and 135 sqq. According to Kaufmann the descriptions of the four Apostles as the four types of complexion originally referred not to the difference in their humoral constitution but to the difference in their attitudes and gestures, and it was only from this that "the opinion gradually arose that these four complexions were the four temperaments". Kaufmann apparently did not notice that it was actually the oldest source which expressly described them as "sanguinicus, cholericus, phlegmaticus et melancholicus".

temperaments as well as of his other special artistic experience, as a help in his representation".[290] This "old tradition", however, goes back in fact to such a reliable witness that, had it been a question of authorship rather than an iconographical problem, it would never have been treated so disdainfully. This witness is Johann Neudörffer, who did the lettering of the subscriptions to the picture of the apostles in Dürer's own workshop, and stated, not without pride, that he often had the honour of confidential talks with the master.[291] Now Neudörffer says quite unequivocally that Dürer presented the counsellors of Nuremberg with four life-size "pictures" (that is, figures) "in oils . . . wherein one may recognise a sanguinic, a choleric, a phlegmatic, and a melancholic"[292]; and we cannot simply ignore such evidence.

There can, of course, be no question of Dürer's "using the apostles merely as an opportunity for representing the temperaments"; but that does not exclude the possibility that he may have regarded the temperaments as a basis for his characterisation of the apostles. He did not, of course, consider the nature of the apostles exhaustively expressed by the fact that each of them belonged to one of the four humoral types, but he could, to use Sandrart's admirable expression, have represented them "in the form of the four temperaments". They are sanguine or choleric in precisely the same sense and to precisely the same degree as they are young or old, gentle or violent: in short, inasmuch as they are individual personalities.

Dürer differentiated the most significant variants of religious behaviour according to the most significant variants of human (or, for him, temperamental) character; and far from lowering the apostles to mere examples of complexional types, he gave the complexions a higher meaning, which they were altogether fitted to acquire. Men had always been accustomed to couple the four temperaments with the seasons, the rivers of Paradise, the four winds, the four ages of man, the points of the compass, the elements, and, in short, with everything determined by the "sacred tetrad". In the fifteenth century artists ventured to

[290] E. HEIDRICH, *Dürer und die Reformation*, Leipzig 1909, p. 57.

[291] He says of Daniel Engelhart, the armorial sculptor and sealcutter, that he was so excellent "that Albrecht Dürer told me here in his room, as I was writing at the foot of the aforementioned four pictures and entering various sentences from Holy Writ, that he had not seen a mightier or more skilful armorial sculptor." (JOHANN NEUDÖRFFER, *Nachrichten von Künstlern u. Werkleuten Nürnbergs*, 1547, newly edited by G. W. K. Lochner in *Quellenschriften für Kunstgeschichte*, VOL. X, Vienna 1875, pp. 158 sqq.).

[292] NEUDÖRFFER, op. cit. (ed. Lochner), pp. 132 sqq.

place the Divine Face in the centre between the figures of the four temperaments, thereby showing the four humours as the fourfold reflexion of a single divine ray (PLATE 80).[293] It was the change from this schematic manner of representation to the particularising tendency of Dürer's time which made it possible to fuse the varieties of religious characters with the four temperaments in the persons of the apostles, thus combining veneration for the bearers of the "divine word"[294] with veneration for the variety of God's creatures.[295]

How then are the four temperaments to be apportioned among the four apostles? The order suggested by earlier writers (John melancholy, Peter phlegmatic, Mark sanguine, and Paul choleric)[296] derives from a specifically modern psychology not based on any historical sources, and a sixteenth-century copy which gives each figure its complexion is of no value because it mechanically follows the order given in Neudörffer's account.[297] Fortunately, however, we have numerous texts describing the four complexions according to their physical and mental characteristics, and positively connecting each of them with one of the four ages of man; and these texts enable us to put the order on an historical basis.

Anyone regarding the Munich portraits must be struck by the fact that the four apostles are shown as the most heterogeneous types possible—as compared, for instance, with Giovanni Bellini's four apostles (whose grouping Dürer may perhaps have remembered),[298] or even as compared with Dürer's own series of engravings of the apostles.[299] Each figure is as different as possible from the others, not only in age and in physical and mental disposition,[300] but more especially, in colouring, which played so important a

[293] London, Brit. Mus., Egerton MS 2572, fol. 51 v.

[294] LF, *Nachlass*, p. 382, 2.

[295] LF, *Nachlass*, p. 227, 4.

[296] Thus A. VON EYE, *Leben und Wirken Albrecht Dürers*, Nördlingen 1860; M. THAUSING, *Dürer*, Leipzig 1884; F. KUGLER, *Geschichte der Malerei*, 3rd edn., Leipzig 1867.

[297] According to this St John was the sanguinic, St Peter the choleric, St Mark the phlegmatic (!) and St Paul the melancholic. Prof. Mayer-Bamberg kindly informed us of the whereabouts of the picture mentioned by J. HELLER, *Das Leben und die Werke Albrecht Dürers*, Leipzig 1827 (Sacristy of St James in Bamberg), and obtained a photograph for us.

[298] Triptych of 1488 in the Church of the Frari; cf. KARL VOLL, in *Süddeutsche Monatshefte*, VOL. III (1906), pp. 74 sqq., and G. PAULI, in *Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg*, VOL. I (1921–22), p. 67.

[299] The Apostles in the engravings B48, 49 and 50 are approximately of the same age.

[300] Thus also H. BEEKEN, in *Logos*, VOL. XIX (1930), p. 225, although he denies any connexion with the doctrine of temperaments.

role in the doctrine of temperaments that the word "complexion" is now limited to that sense. The reserved John, a fine example of youthful sobriety, is a nobly-built young man some twenty-five years of age, in whose blooming complexion red and white are mingled. Mark, who is showing his teeth and rolling his eyes, is a man of about forty, whose bloodless hue carries almost greenish overtones. Paul, with his earnest and menacing yet calm regard, is fifty-five or sixty years of age, and the colour of his clear-cut features—he is the leanest of the four—despite a few reddish tinges, can only be described as dark brown. Finally, the somewhat apathetic Peter is an old man of at least seventy, whose weary and relatively fleshy face is yellowish, and in general decidedly pale.[301]

Whether we have recourse to post-classical or early scholastic texts, popular treatises on the complexions, or, above all, to the Salernitan verses,[302] we always find a substantially uniform system of apportioning the various characteristics and attributes, which can be summed up in the following schema:

1. YOUTH = Spring; well-proportioned body, harmoniously balanced nature, ruddy complexion ("rubeique coloris"); sanguine.
2. PRIME = Summer; graceful body, irascible nature, yellow complexion ("croceique coloris," "citrinitas coloris")[303]; choleric.
3. MIDDLE AGE = Autumn; lean body, gloomy nature, dark complexion ("luteique coloris", "facies nigra"); melancholic.
4. OLD AGE = Winter; plump body, lethargic nature, pale complexion ("pinguis facies", "color albus"); phlegmatic.

From this summary it is clear that the complexions can only be apportioned as follows: John is the sanguine, Mark (whose symbol, moreover, is the lion, the beast symbolic of the "cholera rubra") is the choleric, Paul the melancholic, and Peter the phlegmatic.[304]

[301] The authors' remarks on the colouring have been compared with a description made independently by Dr Erwin Rosenthal, to whom we owe our thanks.

[302] See above, pp. 3; 10; 114 sqq. (text).

[303] Thus CONSTANTINUS AFRICANUS, *Theorica Pantegni* (*Opera*, VOL. II, Basle 1539, p. 249).

[304] Incidentally Rubens, so far as comparison with Dürer's figures is possible (for only two of these are evangelists), followed the same sequence of age or, if one likes, of temperaments, in his picture of the four evangelists at Sanssouci (*Klassiker der Kunst*, ed. R. Oldenbourg, Stuttgart 1921, p. 68). St John is represented as a youth (sanguinic), St Mark as a youngish man (choleric), St Luke as an older man (melancholic), and St Matthew as an old man (phlegmatic). Here we may also remark that Steinmann's suggestion of equating Michelangelo's Hours of the Day with the temperaments can only be maintained, if at all, by following the traditional literary correlation of the hours of the day with the four humours (see above, p. 11, note 24). Thus we could not say: Dawn = melancholy, Day = cholera,

If further evidence is needed we have only to recall the woodcut illustrating the book by Conrad Celtes (PLATE 83). Here, it is true, since Celtes had transposed the qualities of two seasons,[305] the phlegmatic has—exceptionally—become the representative of autumn, and therefore is younger than the melancholic; but apart from this modification, which is required by the text, the division of the dispositions and ages corresponds throughout with that in Dürer's picture of the apostles, save that in the latter the biological characteristics have acquired a human or superhuman significance. In the woodcut, too, the "sanguine" person is the handsome youth; the "choleric" is the irascible man in the prime of life; the "phlegmatic" is the well-nourished man with the "pinguis facies"; and the "melancholic" is the bony bald-headed man with the long beard. Indeed, the "melancholic" of 1502 is positively an anticipatory caricature of the St Paul of 1526; or, vice versa, the St Paul of 1526 is the subsequent ennobling of the "melancholic" of 1502.[306] And if we enquire into the artistic means which Dürer employed in order to transform the representative of the "least noble complexion" (for so the melancholic still was in the Celtes woodcut) into one of the noblest figures in European art, we find that they were the means used in *Melencolia I*. Not only does the pure proportion of the features—which, in an artist such as Dürer, is also an expression of inner greatness—link the head of St Paul with that of Melencolia; but the two most essential elements of facial expression are the same

Dusk = phlegma and Night = sanguis, but "Aurora" = sanguis, "Giorno" = cholera, "Crepuscolo" = melancholy (E. Zola in his *L'oeuvre* happens to say "pénétré par la mélancolie du crépuscule") and "Notte" = phlegma. It is not impossible that such notions played a part in the artistic conception even of Michelangelo (particularly since there was no iconographical tradition for the hours of the day); and "Giorno's" ire, which is not intelligible in itself, could quite well be associated with the notion of choler. One must, however, remember that Michelangelo's world as a whole was far too much conditioned by melancholy to have room for a purely phlegmatic, let alone a purely sanguine nature. If one wished to draw a parallel between the temperaments and Michelangelo's Hours of the Day, one would have to consider the latter as a series of melancholy natures superimposed on a sanguine, choleric, natural melancholic and phlegmatic basis.

305 See above, p. 279 (text).

306 The melancholic's head of 1502 and St Paul's head of 1526 represent, of course, merely the two extremes of a series, the main intermediate figures of which are the Barberini picture, the Heller altar (esp. L510), the drawing L18, the woodcut B38 and the engraving B50. But when one compares all these, related in principle as they are, the Munich St Paul seems specially close, at least physiognomically, to the head of the melancholic in B132, despite all the differences of "ethos"—closer, at any rate, than to the head of the engraved St Paul on B50 with which F. HAACK wishes to connect it all too closely (*Mitteilungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Stadt Nürnberg*, VOL. XXVIII (1928), p. 313).

here as there: the "facies nigra" and, standing out in strong contrast to it, the glowing brilliance of the eyes. St Paul as a type is, so to speak, the melancholy type of the Celtes woodcut, but shot through with the colouring of *Melencolia I*. 1502, 1514 and 1526—these are three stages in the development of the notion of melancholy, three stages in the development of Dürer himself.

An attempt has been made elsewhere to prove that his portraits of the four apostles, long suspected of being the wings of an uncompleted altarpiece,[307] were in fact undertaken in 1523 as the wings of a triptych; that each of these panels was originally intended to include only one figure; and that the pair originally envisaged were not Paul and John, but Philip and (probably) James. It was not until 1525, the year of his drawing of John,[308] that Dürer decided to make the side-pieces independent, and worked out the new, final scheme, in the execution of which Philip, already complete, had to be changed into Paul. The left wing seems not to have been far enough advanced for there to be any signs of the original idea remaining.[309]

It was therefore one and the same act of creative transformation that gave birth to the idea of these four particular saints and of the four complexions in Dürer's mind. The ideas "John, Peter, Mark, and Paul", and "sanguine, phlegmatic, choleric, and melancholic", must have formed an inseparable union in his mind, finding expression the moment the plan arose of changing the original two figures into the present four: in particular, the moment Philip became Paul, he became also a melancholic. In other words—not until the former Philip had become a melancholic could he correspond to what Dürer understood by Paul. And from now on we have an answer to the problem of Dürer's later attitude to the problem of melancholy.

The four apostles, as we see them to-day, express a creed, and, as Heidrich's research has established beyond doubt, the polemical side of this creed (which is none the less a creed for having been prompted by a mere historical coincidence) is directed against the fanatics and Anabaptists, in whose minds "Christian

307 M. THAUSING, *Dürer*, VOL. II, Leipzig 1884, p. 288, and (with the illuminating suggestion that the centrepiece was to have been a "Santa Conversazione" in the style of the drawing L363) G. PAULI, in *Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg*, VOL. I (1921–22), p. 67.

308 L368.

309 For details cf. E. PANOFSKY, in *Münchner Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst*, new series, VOL. VIII (1931), pp. 1 sqq.

freedom" seemed to have degenerated into unlimited sectarianism. This rebuttal of fanaticism, however, as Heidrich has clearly proved, is based as a matter of course on an acceptance of the Reformation. Dürer explains that he is against Hans Denck and the "three godless painters"; and for that very reason he need not explain that he is in favour of Luther. Hence he had been certain since 1525 that of the four men bearing witness for him, two must occupy a dominant position: Paul, in whose doctrine of justification by faith the whole structure of Protestant doctrine was based, and John, Christ's beloved disciple, who was also Luther's "beloved evangelist".[310] And in the same way as these two figures, grown to majestic size, occupy the dominant positions in the composition of the picture (and the relegation of Peter to the background signifies something of an illustrative protest against the "primatus Petri" so strongly defended by the Catholics),[311] so, too, they are representative both of the most profound religious experience and of the most excellent temperaments. Compared with John's quiet but unshakable devotion, Peter's weary resignation represents a "too little", to use an Aristotelian term; while, compared with Paul's steely calm, Mark's fanaticism represents a "too much"; and so, compared with the other two complexions, the phlegmatic is inferior in power, the choleric in nobility. The sanguine temperament, which the whole of the Middle Ages had considered the noblest, indeed the only worthy one, and which of course even in Dürer's time was regarded as an enviably healthy and harmonious disposition, had been joined since the days of Ficino and Agrippa of Nettesheim by a disposition admittedly less happy, but spiritually more sublime, the "complexio melancholica", the rehabilitation of which was as much a work of the new humanism as the rediscovery of Pauline Christianity was a work of the Reformation.

Hence it is understandable, from several angles, that Dürer thought the best way of characterising the tutelary genius of Protestantism was to represent him as a melancholic. In making the apostle of the new faith a representative of the new ideal

[310] M. THAUSING, *Dürer*, VOL. II, Leipzig 1884, p. 279.

[311] Cf. JOHANN ECK, *De primatu Petri libri tres*, Paris 1521, and later. St Paul's prominence compared with St Peter may the more readily be interpreted as the result of an anti-papal attitude, as an iconographical tradition, established in early Christian times and never interrupted until the Reformation, required that the two apostolic leaders be placed on an exactly equal footing—a tradition which the Dürer of 1510 had followed as a matter of course on the outer wings of the Heller altar, and in the woodcut B38.

expressed by the notion of "melancholia generosa", he not only emphasised the asceticism so characteristic of the historical Paul, but endowed him with a noble sublimity denied to the other temperaments. In doing so, however, Dürer also affirmed that for his own part melancholy still remained such as it had been revealed to him through contact with the Neoplatonic doctrine of genius, the mark of the true elect, the mark of those illuminated by "higher influences". But the Dürer of 1526 no longer illustrated this inspiration by an allegorical figure of the Spirit of Art whose power flows from the imagination, but by the holy person of a "spiritual man"; he now painted the "furor", not of the artist and thinker, but of a hero of the faith, and thus expressed the fact that his notion of melancholy had, by this time, undergone a profound change. This change might, to use Agrippa of Nettesheim's classification, be described as an advance from the painting of *Melencolia I* to the painting of a *Melencolia III*, and was, in the last resort, a change in Dürer himself. In his youth he had striven after the heroic and erotic enthusiasm of classicising Italian art; in the second decade of the sixteenth century he had found the way to the great symbolical forms of *Melencolia I* and *The Knight, Death and the Devil*; in the last and greatest years of his life he applied his gifts almost entirely to religious subjects. In the years when Cranach, Altdorfer, Aldegrever, Vischer and Beham were drawing strength from the classicism which Dürer had brought to German art, and were never tired of "Judgements of Paris", "Labours of Hercules", and scenes of centaurs and satyrs—in these very years the aged Dürer was employing all the force left to him by his theoretical work and his portrait commissions, on holy subjects, and primarily on the Passion of our Lord. And we can understand that for the late Dürer, who had been deeply stirred by Luther's mission, and who, feeling himself mortally sick, had seen himself as the suffering Christ and had even dared to paint himself as such[312]—we can understand that for the late Dürer even *Melencolia I* no longer seemed an adequate expression of human grandeur.

[312] Cf. the fine Bremen drawing, L131, of the Man of Sorrows.

Kiernan, Ryan, Shakespeare's Comedies (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2009)

9

'Ducdame': *As You Like It*

Empowering the Audience

The title of *As You Like It* tips us the wink from the start about the tone the play intends to take and the response it expects to elicit from its audience. Like the titles of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *Much Ado About Nothing* and *Twelfth Night, or What You Will*, whose title closely echoes it, the throwaway phrase that encapsulates this comedy radiates insouciance. What follows, it implies, is a light-hearted confection, whose chief aim is to please the audience by giving them the sort of play the playwright knows they like. The direct address to the audience in the title, including them and anticipating their response, is unique to *As You Like It* and *Twelfth Night, or What You Will*, Shakespeare's last great romantic comedies, and is a testament to the extraordinary intimacy that had developed between the dramatist and his public, to whose tastes he could confidently appeal. Such intimacy inevitably entailed a licence to tease, which Shakespeare fully exploited in his titles for comedies of this kind. In the case of *As You Like It*, the title begs to be construed as deliberately ambiguous. If the stress falls on '*You*', it becomes the author's wry comment on the conventional yarn he's been constrained to spin, and an invitation to knowing spectators to approach the play in the same ironic spirit. But the whole phrase can also be read as a warrant to make of the play whatever we wish and an expression of the dramatist's indifference to our judgement.

The more one mulls over the title, the more slippery and elusive its connotations become. Whichever way one reads it, though, what's undeniable is the power it accords the playgoer and the attention it draws to the way the play is received, to the impact it has on its audience rather than to its subject matter. Indeed, insofar as the title does serve as an index of the theme, it suggests that how the audience responds to the play may be what *As You Like It* is really about. Unlike *The Two*

Gentlemen of Verona, *The Taming of the Shrew* or *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, *As You Like It* advertises its concern with its status as a work of dramatic art up front. It does so, moreover, by employing a casual, inconsequential phrase, which belies its innocence by equivocation and thus puts us on our mettle as an audience before the actors have set foot upon the stage. The title plainly holds out the promise of theatrical pleasure through the fulfilment of the spectators' expectations. It also intimates, thanks to the saucy double entendre lurking in '*It*', that libidinal delight will be inseparable from the pleasure we derive from the play. At the same time, the playful indeterminacy of the expression, which owes as much to the indefinite '*As*' as it does to the unspecified '*It*', leaves the way in which, and the extent to which, our desires will be satisfied uncertain. In fact, it remains to be seen whether we will like what *As You Like It* has in store for us at all. Whatever response we finally arrive at, the title has primed us to feel empowered by the authority it confers on the audience, but to be prepared for its import to change as our understanding of the play evolves.

Beyond Belief

The opening scene ensconces us in the familiar, fairy-tale realm of wish-fulfilment adumbrated by the title, establishing the twin stock predicaments from which the initial conflicts and the closing resolutions of the comedy will spring: the brutal repression of the noble young Orlando by his evil elder brother Oliver, and the banishment of the good Duke Senior to the forest of Arden, following the usurpation of his dukedom by his equally evil younger brother, Frederick. Duke Senior's beloved daughter Rosalind, we also learn, has been restrained from joining her father in exile only by the love of her cousin, Duke Frederick's daughter Celia, who has prevailed on her to remain at court. The key components and the entire trajectory of a plot as old as storytelling itself are already there in embryo. So are the staple features of characterization and topography required by such scenarios: the clear-cut extremes of oppressed innocence and irrational malevolence; the stark contrast between deadly fraternal enmity and idyllic female amity; and the parallel polarization of the treacherous court that must be fled and the sylvan sanctuary sought and found in the uncorrupted country.

Orlando begins the play in the midst of a speech bemoaning the fact that Oliver has inexplicably denied him the schooling his other brother Jaques enjoys, preferring to treat him like a common farm-labourer: 'He

lets me feed with his hinds, bars me the place of a brother, and as much as in him lies, mines my gentility with my education' (I.i.17–19). Within moments of Oliver's entrance, Orlando's urge 'to mutiny against this servitude' (I.i.21–2) has him literally at his brother's throat, demanding his just share of their dead father's will. The assault immediately provokes Oliver to conspire with the Duke's wrestler, Charles, to have Orlando crippled or killed during their bout before the Duke the next day. Yet what Orlando has done to deserve his sibling's murderous loathing Oliver is at a loss to explain:

> I hope I shall see an end of him, for my soul – yet I know not why – hates nothing more than he. Yet he's gentle; never schooled, and yet learned; full of noble device; of all sorts enchantingly beloved; and, indeed, so much in the heart of the world, and especially of my own people, who best know him, that I am altogether misprized.
> (I.i.154–60)

In Charles's account of the relationship between Rosalind and Celia we encounter the complete antithesis of this lethal male antagonism: 'being ever from their cradles bred together', Celia would have gone into exile with Rosalind rather than be parted from her cousin, 'or have died to stay behind her', for 'never two ladies loved as they do' (I.i.103–7). And in the wrestler's report of how Duke Senior is faring in the greenwood that now shelters him, we get our first rose-tinted glimpse of the pastoral realm to which Orlando, Celia and Rosalind will shortly be forced to resort as well:

> They say he is already in the forest of Arden, and a many merry men with him; and there they live like the old Robin Hood of England. They say many young gentlemen flock to him every day, and fleet the time carelessly, as they did in the golden world.
> (I.i.109–13)

Shakespeare's likening of life in Arden not only to the carefree, communal life of the legendary outlaw and heroic foe of tyranny, but also to the ancient classical myth of the Golden Age, when spring was perpetual, food abundant, toil unnecessary and peace universal, places it in direct opposition to life in Duke Frederick's regime, where injustice, violence, envy and slander hold sway.

Lest *As You Like It*'s cheerful compliance with the fairy-tale format escape us, the characters call attention to it in the following scene.

When Le Beau begins to recount the wrestling bout Rosalind and Celia have just missed by saying, 'There comes an old man and his three sons –', Celia chips in with the quip 'I could match this beginning with an old tale' (I.ii.110–11), which glances at the tale of the three sons of Sir Rowland de Boys with which *As You Like It* has begun. That Rosalind falls instantly in love with the youngest of those sons, as he prepares to grapple with 'The bonny prizer of the humorous Duke' (II.iii.8), and that Orlando is simultaneously smitten with her, chimes perfectly with the unlikely laws of this narrative universe. The play underscores the perfection of the match by stressing the symmetry of their situations and their dispositions. Duke Frederick's unexplained hostility to Rosalind's father, the brother whom he has ousted, is replicated in his unexplained hostility to Orlando's late father and consequently Orlando himself:

> I would thou hadst been son to some man else.
> The world esteemed thy father honourable,
> But I did find him still mine enemy.
> (I.ii.213–15)

Conversely, Duke Senior held Sir Rowland in the highest regard, as Rosalind is quick to attest: 'My father loved Sir Rowland as his soul, / And all the world was of my father's mind' (I.ii.224–5). And Rosalind, Le Beau reveals, has become the object of Duke Frederick's animosity with as little justification as Orlando has become the object of Oliver's:

> of late this Duke
> Hath ta'en displeasure 'gainst his gentle niece,
> Grounded upon no other argument
> But that the people praise her for her virtues
> And pity her for her good father's sake.
> (I.ii.267–71)

The gratuitous aggression Rosalind and Orlando attract from 'tyrant Duke' and 'tyrant brother' (I.ii.278) combines with the unqualified affection the people feel for both of them to confirm their moral affinity and seal their romantic fate.

Le Beau's prediction that Duke Frederick's 'malice 'gainst the lady / Will suddenly break forth' (I.ii.272–3) is fulfilled within minutes of his making it. Rosalind is banished from the court by her wicked uncle on pain of death and on a trumped-up charge of treason, for which the

Duke doesn't even pretend to adduce evidence: 'Thou art thy father's daughter', he declares to Rosalind's astonishment, 'there's enough' (I.iii.57). By the end of Act I, she and Celia are headed for the woodlands of Arden, having resolved to seek asylum there in the guise of Ganymede and Aliena, and in the company of 'The clownish fool' (I.iii.129) Touchstone. Three scenes later, Orlando and Adam, the family's faithful old retainer, are on the run and, unbeknownst to Rosalind and Celia, inexorably bound for Arden too, driven by 'the malice / Of a diverted blood and bloody brother' (II.iii.37–8) – now hell-bent on homicide – from the place they can no longer call home: 'this house is but a butchery', Adam warns Orlando, 'Abhor it. Fear it, do not enter it' (II.iii.28–9).

Act II, Scene i has already introduced us to the Arcadian haven that awaits the refugees, and to the exiled Duke and his entourage of loyal lords, who dwell there in rustic contentment. In Act II, Scene iv Rosalind, Celia and Touchstone arrive in Arden, making Rosalind's reunion with her father merely a matter of time, and in Act II, Scene vi Orlando and Adam turn up there too, making Rosalind's reunion with the youngest son of Sir Rowland de Boys a cast-iron certainty as well. For the rest of the play, apart from one fleeting flashback to Duke Frederick's palace, whence Oliver is dispatched to bring his brother back dead or alive, we remain in Arden, while its denizens converse, versify and sing about love and life, killing time with masquerades and battles of wit until the cue to conclude the comedy intervenes.

That cue takes the shape of Oliver's arrival in Arden at the end of Act IV, which triggers the final act's flurry of revelations, metamorphoses and multiple marriages, and thus the long-deferred resolution of the conflicts created in the opening scenes of the play. The means by which the resolution is achieved are as arbitrary and implausible as the problems it purports to solve just the way we like it. Magnanimously rescued by his noble younger brother from the jaws of a 'sucked and hungry lioness' (IV.iii.127), Oliver undergoes an instant transformation from murderous sibling into Aliena's devoted suitor. ''Twas I, but 'tis not I', he assures Rosalind in her guise as Ganymede. 'I do not shame / To tell you what I was, since my conversion / So sweetly tastes, being the thing I am' (IV.iii.136–8). Orlando's disbelief in the speed of his brother's bewitchment by Aliena is dismissed by Oliver with a plea for blind acceptance of their love and a promise to surrender their father's legacy to Orlando:

> Neither call the giddiness of it in question, the poverty of her, the small acquaintance, my sudden wooing, nor her sudden consenting; but say with me, 'I love Aliena'; say with her, that she loves me; consent with both that we may enjoy each other. It shall be to your good, for my father's house and all the revenue that was old Sir Rowland's will I estate upon you, and here live and die a shepherd.
> (V.ii.5–12)

The comedy's brazen resort to the incredible to induce a denouement is underlined by Rosalind's alter ego a dozen lines later, when she comments to Orlando:

> There was never anything so sudden but the fight of two rams, and Caesar's thrasonical brag of 'I came, saw, and overcame', for your brother and my sister no sooner met but they looked; no sooner looked but they loved; no sooner loved but they sighed; no sooner sighed but they asked one another the reason; no sooner knew the reason but they sought the remedy; and in these degrees have they made a pair of stairs to marriage, which they will climb incontinent, or else be incontinent before marriage. They are in the very wrath of love, and they will together. Clubs cannot part them.
> (V.ii.28–39)

The comical acceleration of Celia and Oliver's passage from wooing to wedding flaunts the play's conscription of shameless clichés to ensure an equal distribution of suitable spouses among the romantic protagonists.

All Rosalind has to do to dissolve her own romantic dilemma is drop the male persona she could have ditched much earlier, if verisimilitude had been what Shakespeare had in mind. In a trice the barrier both to marriage with Orlando and reunion with her father is removed, the quandary created by Phoebe's crush on Ganymede is unravelled, and the stage is set for a quadruple wedding as Phoebe settles for her doting swain Silvius, and Touchstone joins 'the rest of the country copulatives' (V.iv.55–6) by tying the knot with the goatherd, Audrey. The last vestige of plausibility vanishes when Hymen, the god of marriage, materializes from nowhere to conduct the nuptial ceremony and shift the whole denouement into another dimension. Not content with this flagrant capitulation to fantasy, however, Shakespeare crowns it with the advent of a further *deus ex machina* in the mortal form of Jaques de Boys, the hitherto unseen second son of Sir Rowland. The glad tidings he brings lift the last remaining shadow from the marital festivities and from the prospect of future happiness: the threat still posed by the villainous

Duke Frederick. While en route to Arden with 'a mighty power' (V.iv.154) and the aim of putting Duke Senior to the sword,

> to the skirts of this wild wood he came
> Where, meeting with an old religious man,
> After some question with him was converted
> Both from his enterprise and from the world,
> His crown bequeathing to his banished brother,
> And all their lands restored to them again
> That were with him exiled.
> (V.iv.157–63)

The sole obstacle to a cloudless fairy-tale finale succumbs as promptly to the miraculous powers of the 'wild wood' as his malign precursor, Oliver. To the restoration of identity, which released the possibility of fourfold wedlock and family reunion, is added the restoration of rank and lands, which secures the future of Duke Senior, Rosalind, Celia and their bridegrooms in the dukedom to which they are now free to return.

Rosalynde Revamped

The resistance that reality would otherwise offer collapses under the pressure of the play's need to keep the promise inscribed in its title. Antagonisms, estrangements, betrayals and injustices that would have proved insuperable in the actual world are effortlessly overcome in the fantasy world of Shakespeare's most amenable comedy. Far from masking the timeworn devices deployed to this end, *As You Like It* takes palpable delight in highlighting them and stretching credulity beyond breaking point over and over again. Indeed, after the unheralded, anachronistic theophany of Hymen and Arden's second Damascene conversion, it's hard to suppress the suspicion that the blatant improbability of the formulaic plot is crucial to the play's covert design.

That suspicion is confirmed by a glance at the amendments Shakespeare made to his source in order to heighten rather than mitigate the implausibility of the action. In Thomas Lodge's *Rosalynde or Euphues' Golden Legacy*, the Elizabethan prose romance that furnished Shakespeare with the core characters and basic storyline of *As You Like It*, the hatred of the eldest son, Saladyne, for the youngest son, Rosader, is strongly motivated by the fact that their father has bequeathed to the latter a larger portion of his estate, which Saladyne decides to annex. In *As You Like It* Shakespeare removes this motive by having Oliver inherit the bulk of the estate and having Orlando allotted 'but poor a thousand crowns' (I.i.2), in which Oliver displays little interest. Oliver is thus left baffled by his groundless detestation of his brother and forced back upon the afterthought that Orlando's popularity has put him in the shade. Shakespeare pulls the same trick when required to explain Frederick's abrupt banishment of Rosalind. 'The Duke is humorous' (I.ii.256) Le Beau has already warned Orlando, prompting us to ascribe whatever villainy Frederick is about to perpetrate to the caprice of a moody despot. Nor does the despot disappoint us. When Rosalind challenges him in the next scene to justify his charge of treason, he retorts that being Duke Senior's daughter is reason enough. In *Rosalynde*, however, Lodge supplies the usurping ruler, Torismond, with a perfectly credible political reason for getting rid of Rosalynde, the daughter of the man he has deposed: the fear that a peer of the realm may strike an alliance with her through marriage and stake a claim to the kingdom in his wife's name.

Lodge is likewise at pains to render the love that blossoms between the counterparts of Celia and Oliver understandable. In *Rosalynde*, Alinda falls more gradually and circumspectly in love with Saladyne, after he rescues her from a band of brigands who had planned to turn her over to the lecherous Torismond – her own father – to satisfy his lust. Her love for Saladyne is rooted partly in the gratitude she feels and partly in her growing admiration for his virtue and his gallantry. Saladyne in turn takes his time being captivated by Alinda, falling first under the spell of her wisdom before allowing her beauty to snare him. Shakespeare, in sharp contrast, insists on the suddenness and inexplicability of Celia's and Oliver's love, which flares up out of nothing and defies rationalization. He also strips Oliver's 'conversion' of the convincing explanation Lodge gives for the corresponding event in *Rosalynde* in order to make it more startling. Lodge's Saladyne comes to repent of abusing his brother not after his arrival in the forest, but after prolonged reflection while languishing in Torismond's prison. He vows to seek Rosader and do penance for his past transgressions, unlike Oliver, who reaches Arden still in the grip of fratricidal wrath and executes his moral *volte-face* after seeing Orlando risk his own life to save him. Shakespeare does provide an occasion for Oliver's change of soul, but the overriding effect of his revisions is to enhance rather than diminish the miraculous immediacy of Oliver's transfiguring epiphany. As for Duke Frederick's no less astounding conversion upon encountering 'an old religious man' in Arden, the incident is entirely Shakespeare's invention. Lodge disposes of Frederick's prototype more realistically and violently by having him defeated and slain in a climactic battle.

The impact of these deliberate deviations from the source of *As You Like It* is complex, pervasive and subtle. By reducing or destroying the psychological credibility of the characters' actions and rendering their behaviour surprising and inscrutable, Shakespeare rules out realistic criteria of believability as irrelevant to understanding *As You Like It*. To engage with this play is to enter a world where the laws of likelihood do not apply, or apply only until they are broken. Here the conduct of characters and the course of events are dictated by the benign laws of improbability, over which the *dramatis personae* have no control. Relieved of rational motivation and autonomy by the strictures of an omnipotent plot, the characters are likewise relieved of the moralism to which Lodge subjects their counterparts in *Rosalynde*. The 'golden legacy' of moral instruction that Lodge's narrator, Euphues, bequeaths with his tale holds no appeal for Shakespeare, who transmutes an edifying pastoral fable into the vehicle for another kind of vision altogether. The fabulous aspects of Lodge's romance are what ignite Shakespeare's imagination, because they license its detachment from empirical reality past and present, and its departures from the mimetic fidelity required to dramatize that reality convincingly. It's these aspects of his source that Shakespeare locks onto and intensifies, because in *As You Like It*, to an extent hitherto matched only by *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, his gaze is levelled at the far horizon of what could be, rather than fixed on the intractable facts of former times or the actual world around him.

Back to the Future

By purging Lodge's already far-fetched romance of its residual realistic psychology and humanly explicable events, Shakespeare frees the basic story to house a play tuned to the frequency of futurity. *As You Like It* becomes as a result a consummate instance of the way in which, to quote Dr Johnson, 'Shakespeare approximates the remote and familiarizes the wonderful; the event which he represents will not happen, *but if it were possible*, its effects would probably be such as he assigned' (my italics). In the course of its transformation from pastoral prose romance into pastoral romantic comedy, the plot of *As You Like It* acquires the power to make wonder seem familiar, by bringing what appears to be impossibly remote in time and space within the imaginative reach of the present; the power to make the *as yet* improbable imaginable, by treating it *as if it were possible* and inviting us to watch it transpire in the theatre before our very eyes. The comedy acquires that power not only from

the providential narrative arc built into romance, but also from its fusion of romance with pastoral, which resonates with echoes of the golden age and recalls the ancient dream of a *locus amoenus*, an Edenic elsewhere, sequestered from the tribulations of the court and urban life. In *As You Like It*, however, Shakespeare activates these utopian associations to underpin a *prospective* rather than a retrospective vision of alternative possibilities. The comedy harks back in order to look forward, discerning in past fantasies premonitions of a transfigured world.

The pastoral dimension of *As You Like It* also serves Shakespeare's purpose insofar as it solicits an active interpretive response from the audience. The virtue of pastoral from Theocritus and Virgil down to Spenser and Milton was its capacity to smuggle social critique into its refined pining for lost perfection and bucolic innocence. As Shakespeare's contemporary, George Puttenham, observed in *The Arte of English Poesie*, the aim of pastoral was 'not of purpose to counterfeit or represent the rusticall manner of loves and communication: but under the vaile of homely persons, and in rude speeches to insinuate and glaunce at greater matters, and such as perchaunce had not been safe to have been disclosed in any other sort'. The point is not that *As You Like It* is really a veiled political satire on contemporary Elizabethan mores, although satirical thrusts can certainly be discerned in it, but that Shakespeare's enlistment of pastoral invites us to expect this comedy to mean more than it affects to say, to 'insinuate and glaunce at greater matters', which we are required to decipher. In this respect it compounds the sense of mystery created by the characters' subjection to a genial destiny whose accomplishment is ultimately out of their hands. Even Rosalind, who takes the initiative both in courting and in deploying her masculine persona, and who plays such a pivotal role in orchestrating the denouement, must await the cue to conclude along with the rest of the cast, and bend her will to the subsuming design of the comedy.

Shakespeare's decision to call his version of Lodge's romance *As You Like It* rather than follow his source in naming it after the heroine accords with the quite different focus of the comedy. Like most of his Elizabethan comedies, notably *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *Much Ado About Nothing* and *Twelfth Night*, *As You Like It* takes for its title a phrase that focuses attention on the experience of the play as a whole and encapsulates the attitude it invites us to adopt to that experience. Unlike history plays such as *Richard III* or *Henry V*, tragedies such as *Titus Andronicus* or *Romeo and Juliet*, and comedies such as *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* or *The Merchant of Venice*, all of which spotlight an individual, or a pair of individuals, as the fulcrum of the play, *As You Like*

It reflects in its title a more diffuse concern with matters of common application. Its fundamental preoccupation is not so much with the lives of individuals at odds with their circumstances as with the overarching, collective pattern of development to which individuals' lives are subject. Nothing could be more alien to characters such as Rosalind or Orlando than the self-scrutinizing soliloquies in which Shakespeare's great tragic protagonists grapple with acute moral quandaries. The play is a perfect illustration of Charlie Chaplin's dictum, 'Life is a tragedy when seen in close-up, but a comedy in long-shot.' Rosalind's predominance among the cast and intimacy with the audience notwithstanding, the viewpoint of *As You Like It* remains emphatically external and detached.

In Shakespeare's hands, Lodge's moralistic fiction becomes a dramatic parable that prefigures the emergence of a new dispensation. Shakespeare exploits romance's phenomenal powers of abstraction and compression to trace within the compass of a comedy the transition from despotism to a time of true community, 'When earthly things made even / Atone together' (V.iv.107–8). The inconceivable means and tracts of time needed to accomplish this transition are condensed into the symbolic action of *As You Like It*. There is, after all, 'no reason', as Johnson reluctantly conceded, 'why an hour should not be a century in that calenture of the brains that can make the stage a field', since 'Time is, of all modes of existence, most obsequious to the imagination; a lapse of years is as easily conceived as a passage of hours.' The action proper of the play, however, is not continuous but split into two telescoped sequences, divided from each other by the long interlude of aimless talk and amorous tomfoolery to which most of *As You Like It* is devoted. Between the brisk unfolding of the events that banish the romantic leads to Arden and the swift succession of disclosures and conversions that conclude the play, the compressed, accelerated plot of *As You Like It* is put on hold, while the characters divert themselves with less oppressive problems, as if there were world enough and time for everything.

That protracted parenthesis is the catalyst that changes the significance of the plot, and the impact of the play, completely. By stranding the cast of the comedy in Arden, and leaving them in a state of suspended animation until the reformation of Oliver and Duke Frederick releases them, Shakespeare creates the time and space to undermine assumptions that would otherwise pass unchallenged, and thereby transforms the import of the ending and our understanding of *As You Like It*. During the privileged period of exile in Arden, beyond the jurisdiction of the state and normal social constraints, the comedy finds room to question the necessity of roles, relationships and beliefs that seem natural, and to reveal the potential for different, more desirable ways of living, loving and thinking.

As a consequence, when we return to the plot after this extravagant digression, its resolution is charged with a powerful utopian resonance, which it would not have possessed had the comedy not taken such a lengthy detour through the licensed domain of Arden. For the persons of the play, the denouement may signify a reinstatement of the *status quo ante*, the just restitution of lands and rights, and the reaffirmation of family bonds and sexual norms through nuptial celebrations; but for the audience watching those celebrations in the wake of what Arden has revealed, it means much more than that.

The Making of a Gentleman

Just how much more it means becomes apparent if we go back to the opening scenes of the play, which pave the way for the revelations that await us in Arden. In the first speech Orlando's complaint about Oliver's mistreatment of him raises the question of conditioning, of the parts played in a person's development by class, the patriarchal family and native disposition. Orlando's outrage at being denied the upbringing due to a man of his rank and forced to endure a servile 'keeping' which 'differs not from the stalling of an ox' (I.i.8–9) dramatizes the vital importance of nurture in the shaping of social identity. While his other brother, Jaques, profits 'goldenly' from being kept 'at school' (I.i.5–6), Oliver treats Orlando like a serf and thus, as Orlando laments, 'mines my gentility with my education' (I.i.19). The assumption on which Orlando's outrage rests is that his acquisition of the status of gentleman, to which his paternity entitles him, depends on his receiving the appropriate schooling, without which his claim to 'gentility', and hence superiority to the 'hinds' (I.i.17) he now feeds with, collapses. It's an assumption plainly at odds with the notion that 'gentility' is an inviolable quality bred in the bone. That notion surfaces too, however, in Orlando's allusion to 'the something that nature gave me' (I.i.16) which Oliver deprives him of, and again towards the end of the speech, when Orlando assures Adam that 'the spirit of my father, which I think is within me, begins to mutiny against this servitude' (I.i.20–2).

The same conflict between the claims of nature and culture breaks out again, when Orlando reproaches Oliver in person for letting the 'tradition' of primogeniture, a convention framed by 'The courtesy of nations', ride roughshod over 'the gentle condition of blood' they share as brothers (I.i.42–5). 'My father charged you in his will to give me good education', Orlando reminds the brother whose power over him derives from mere accidents of birth and custom: 'You have trained

me like a peasant, obscuring and hiding from me all gentleman-like qualities' (I.i.64–6). If Oliver isn't prepared to let him acquire those qualities, he should at least give him 'the poor allottery' their father left him. 'With that I will go buy my fortunes' (I.i.68–70), declares Orlando, complicating the scene's latent debate about the determinants of identity by pointing out that rank and position can be purchased, if they can't be secured by birth or education. The issue is further complicated by Oliver in the speech he delivers *solus* to close the opening scene. Oliver has submitted Orlando to systematic degradation: 'Yet he's gentle', a perplexed Oliver reflects, 'never schooled, and yet learned; full of noble device' (I.i.156–7). As even his worst enemy is forced to attest, Orlando's 'gentility' – the qualities of cultivation and refinement that distinguish him as admirable – appears to be innate.

The question of what qualifies a man to be a gentleman was undoubtedly close to the heart of the glover's son from the sticks, whose native talent had turned him into the nation's leading dramatist. In 1596 – just a couple of years before penning *As You Like It* – Shakespeare had applied successfully for the coat of arms his father had earlier failed to secure. Its half-defensive, half-defiant motto, '*Non sanz droict*' ('Not without right'), speaks volumes about how much the right to be called a gentleman meant to the self-made dramatist. Nor does it leave much doubt about his view of the idea that true gentlemen are born, not made, and that gentility can't be purchased. In the first scene of *As You Like It*, however, the question is posed but left open. Oliver may tilt the balance at the end in favour of native nobility and the notion that breeding will out, but he himself, like the wicked Duke Frederick, is the living proof that a noble pedigree is no guarantee of probity or distinction. Orlando repeatedly ascribes his refusal of servitude to his inheritance of his father's spirit, but rails at Oliver for depriving him of the 'good education' that would give him the very 'gentleman-like qualities' his brother believes him to possess already. Whatever one makes of these vexed issues, it's clear that Shakespeare has gone out of his way to start the play by driving a wedge between birth and worth, and between nature and nurture.

Mocking Fortune from her Wheel

Nor is Shakespeare disposed to let these matters drop. On the contrary, no sooner has Oliver left the stage than Rosalind and Celia enter to resume the debate in their first exchange and make its importance explicit. This ostensibly idle bout of badinage conceals the key to the

contention round which the rest of the comedy will revolve: that the way things happen to be now is not inexorably determined by nature or by culture, but contingent, fluid, and mutable. To Celia's plea that she 'be merry', notwithstanding her father's banishment, Rosalind replies, 'From henceforth I will, coz, and devise sports. Let me see, what think you of falling in love?' (I.ii.21–4). Her suggestion foreshadows what's about to become their chief preoccupation in the play: falling in love, yet taking love lightly and treating it as a game. Celia's riposte reminds Rosalind of the risks such games involve and prompts her to think again:

ROSALIND. What shall be our sport, then?
CELIA. Let us sit and mock the good housewife Fortune from her wheel, that her gifts may henceforth be bestowed equally.
ROSALIND. I would we could do so, for her benefits are mightily misplaced; and the bountiful blind woman doth most mistake in her gifts to women.
CELIA. 'Tis true; for those that she makes fair she scarce makes honest, and those that she makes honest she makes very ill-favouredly.
ROSALIND. Nay, now thou goest from Fortune's office to Nature's. Fortune reigns in gifts of the world, not in the lineaments of nature.
Enter Touchstone the clown
CELIA. No. When Nature hath made a fair creature, may she not by Fortune fall into the fire? Though Nature hath given us wit to flout at Fortune, hath not Fortune sent in this fool to cut off the argument?
ROSALIND. Indeed, there is Fortune too hard for Nature, when Fortune makes Nature's natural the cutter-off of Nature's wit.
CELIA. Peradventure this is not Fortune's work, neither, but Nature's, who perceiveth our natural wits too dull to reason of such goddesses, and hath sent this natural for our whetstone; for always the dullness of the fool is the whetstone of the wits. How now, wit: whither wander you?

(I.ii.29–54)

To 'sit and mock the good housewife Fortune from her wheel, that her gifts may henceforth be bestowed equally' is a perfect summary of what *As You Like It* sets out to do. The play deploys every means at its

disposal to loosen the grip of attitudes that prevent the equal distribution of the 'gifts of the world' to humankind at large and womankind in particular. Its first step towards achieving that goal is to fasten on the fundamental concepts of Fortune and Nature and undermine both by confounding the distinction between them. The notion that the unjust constitution of the human world, whose 'benefits' are 'mightily misplaced', is predestined gets short shrift as the goddess Fortune dwindles into a 'good housewife' ripe for debunking. Her power is further circumscribed by Rosalind's insistence on restricting it to the worldly circumstances in which people find themselves, and distinguishing it from the primary power of Nature to dictate the physical substance and form of people and things. But no sooner has this distinction between the province of Fortune and the province of Nature been drawn than it dissolves in the heat of the disputants' compulsive quibbling.

Inspired by the timely entrance of Touchstone, the dialogue takes another turn, as both parties conspire to argue that Fortune can change what Nature has made, but that what they are ascribing to Fortune should perhaps be attributed to Nature. The border between the two realms is blurred, making it impossible to tell where nature ends and nurture begins. The calculated confusion of the terms redefines them as inextricably implicated in each other, as they vie for control of human life. It's only too easy to slide like Celia 'from Fortune's office to Nature's' and back again, because the line that divides them is constantly shifting, and what might seem from one angle a natural creation might seem from another to be the work of culture, and vice versa. Things that appear stubbornly natural, moreover, can be transmuted by cultural intervention, while the transient contrivances of society are subject to subversion by the facts of nature. The upshot of this dizzying dialectic is that the forces forging the human condition emerge as flexible instead of fixed, which means that the prevailing ways of the world, and the beliefs that keep them in place, are equally malleable.

'Nature's natural'

The scintillating disputation with which Rosalind and Celia enter the comedy serves as a mock-philosophical preface to the main business of the play in Arden, where assumptions that hold in the cultivated sphere of the court lock horns with the laws that preside in the kingdom of nature. It's no coincidence that Touchstone, the licensed court fool, makes his debut in the midst of this dialogue, and that Rosalind's line,

'Fortune reigns in gifts of the world, not in the lineaments of nature', provides his cue, for the mercurial figure of the fool inhabits that fluid zone where the two realms collide and converge. At once 'Nature's natural' and the quintessence of theatrical artifice, the fool personifies the point at which the faultlines between Nature and Fortune, and thus the space for movement and change, appear. As such, he's the automatic choice to accompany Celia and Rosalind to Arden, where his privileged status and singular powers are enhanced: 'Ay, now am I in Arden; the more fool I' (II.iv.14).

The fool's name contains the clues to his principal functions in the play. The fact that 'stone' is Elizabethan slang for 'testicle', makes Touchstone a walking bawdy gag, a lewd pun that puts in a nutshell his job of boiling everything down to biology. But his brief is not confined to puncturing pretension and humbling the exalted by recalling the primal imperatives that make every member of the human species tick, regardless of rank or rearing. A touchstone is also a substance used to test the quality of gold and silver alloys rubbed upon it, and the fool in *As You Like It* serves figuratively as a touchstone for the credibility and value of the diverse viewpoints the play presents us with. His task, as the *spiritus rector* of the comedy, is to spearhead its endeavour to free the audience from the mind-forged manacles that chain them to the status quo and stop them from seeing and having things otherwise.

That much is already implicit in his first round of repartee with Celia and Rosalind. Touchstone's opening stab at a jest is routinely excoriated as a prime example of Shakespeare's outmoded wit at its worst. But on closer inspection it reveals concerns as crucial to the comedy as the debate about Nature and Fortune, and it shows Touchstone to be as adept as Rosalind and Celia at logic-chopping sophistry that plays havoc with received ideas. The fool tells Rosalind that he learned the inane oath he has just used 'Of a certain knight that swore "by his honour" they were good pancakes, and swore "by his honour" the mustard was naught'; but he offers to prove that 'the pancakes were naught and the mustard was good, and yet was not the knight forsworn' (I.ii.60–4). He offers to demonstrate, in other words, like the comedy that contains him, that what appears to be impossible is perfectly possible after all.

He begins the demonstration by asking Celia and Rosalind to do in fancy what Rosalind will shortly be doing in fact – pretend to be a man:

> TOUCHSTONE. Stand you both forth now. Stroke your chins,
> and swear by your beards that I am a knave.

CELIA. By our beards – if we had them – thou art.
TOUCHSTONE. By my knavery – if I had it – then I were; but if you swear by that that is not, you are not forsworn. No more was this knight, swearing by his honour, for he never had any; or if he had, he had sworn it away before ever he saw those pancakes or that mustard.

(I.ii.68–76)

The first scene's agitation about gentility resurfaces in a joke, whose punch-line is designed to puncture aristocratic self-aggrandizement by trivializing the knight's oath and then dismissing his claim to honour completely. The thrust of the joke is in line with the play's declared aim of mocking Fortune from her wheel, 'that her gifts may henceforth be bestowed equally'. It achieves its objective by transposing the matter into the realm of supposition ruled by 'if' and exposing the basic premise of the knight's superiority as false. Truth-claims are only as secure as the assumptions on which they rest; demolish those assumptions and the truth-claims collapse with them, clearing the way for propositions that might otherwise seem preposterous – such as women behaving, and being treated, as if they were men.

Touchstone's first comic turn serves as his calling card, anticipating the transvestite involutions of identity that await us in Arden and his own fifth-act aria on the virtues of 'if'. Above all, it displays the strategies that he and the play as a whole will employ to inculcate in us a radical scepticism about whatever seems self-evident, and a readiness to contemplate counterfactual realities, to give credence to what is not, or is not yet, the case. To put it another way, we are advised by Touchstone's impromptu overture not to mistake such absurd ratiocination for twaddle, but to take the hint dropped straight after it and prepare to be taught the topsy-turvy wisdom of folly. Warned by Celia that he'll be 'whipped for taxation one of these days' if he doesn't watch his lip, Touchstone laments, 'The more pity that fools may not speak wisely what wise men do foolishly'; and Celia is quick to concur: 'By my troth, thou sayst true; for since the little wit that fools have was silenced, the little foolery that wise men have makes a great show' (I.ii.80–6).

Semblances: Ganymede and Aliena

Celia's and Rosalind's budding impersonation of men for the sake of Touchstone's argument blossoms by the end of the first act into the

decision to transform their identities by masking their rank and Rosalind's gender for their own protection in Arden:

CELIA. I'll put myself in poor and mean attire,
And with a kind of umber smirch my face.
The like do you, so shall we pass along
And never stir assailants.
ROSALIND. Were it not better,
Because that I am more than common tall,
That I did suit me all points like a man,
A gallant curtal-axe upon my thigh,
A boar-spear in my hand, and in my heart,
Lie there what hidden woman's fear there will.
We'll have a swashing and a martial outside,
As many other mannish cowards have,
That do outface it with their semblances

(I.iii.110–21)

Swapping a gown for 'poor and mean attire' and daubing on a sunburnt complexion are all it takes to put a Duke's daughter on a par with the hinds Orlando has been forced to feed with. Switching gender, too, is all about manipulating 'semblances': to be suited 'all points like a man' and equipped with masculine accoutrements is to magically acquire the status and prerogatives of the male. Having already driven a wedge between birth and worth, Shakespeare now drives another between class and clothing, and yet another between sex and gender, exposing both class and gender as unstable fictions that can't be anchored in appearance or anatomy. By masquerading as a man, Rosalind sheds the subservience imposed on her sex, and is free to prove, as the masquerade proceeds, that 'the bountiful blind woman doth most mistake in her gifts to women' by proving herself more than a match for men.

As if unmasking the mobility of gender were not enough, Shakespeare gives Rosalind's transformation another twist by retaining the loaded alias conferred on her by Lodge: the name of 'Jove's own page' (I.iii.123), Ganymede, the beautiful youth carried off by Jupiter in the form of an eagle to become his cupbearer. In Shakespeare's day the word was a euphemistic term for a catamite, a boy who was the object of pederastic desire. So by adopting this name Rosalind activates associations that add erotic ambiguity to androgyny, associations that would have been amplified on the Elizabethan stage by the physical presence of a boy in the role of Rosalind. The homoerotic potential of

Rosalind's pseudonym is exploited fully in the convoluted love-games she contrives for Orlando later in the play. But by settling on 'Ganymede' for his heroine's alias Shakespeare is already serving notice that the spectrum of human desire displayed by *As You Like It* will not be exclusively heterosexual, and that heterosexuality itself need not be viewed as either innate or normative.

Celia's adoption of the name Aliena (I.iii.127), which Shakespeare lifted likewise from Lodge, is also highly charged. It underlines the alienation of both Celia and Rosalind from the court they grew up in and their prospective status as strangers in Arden. That their very next thought is 'to steal / The clownish fool' (I.iii.128–9) from the court to accompany them only confirms how vital Touchstone is to the comedy's wider project of estrangement. Revealing the strangeness of familiar ideas and normal behaviour in order to break their spell is, after all, the wise fool's forte, to which the alien milieu of the forest, unfettered by coercive social conventions, gives free play. The ringing exit-rhyme on which the first act ends makes the essential quality of Arden clear and its reversal of the court's perspective unambiguous: 'Now go we in content', declares Celia, 'To liberty, and not to banishment' (I.iii.136–7).

The establishment of Arden as a privileged zone, liberated from the rules that govern Duke Frederick's grim regime, had begun earlier in the act, when life in the forest was likened to that of 'the old Robin Hood of England' (I.i.111) and the carefree world of the golden age. The utopian note was struck again in Le Beau's pointed farewell to Orlando after the wrestling match: 'Hereafter, in a better world than this, / I shall desire more love and knowledge of you' (I.ii.274–5). And the antithesis between oppressive court and carefree countryside that forms the axis of the comedy is prefigured in the distinction Rosalind and Celia draw between 'this working-day world' which is 'full of briers' and the festive period of 'holiday foolery' (I.iii.12, 14) that they will shortly enter. So that by the time the first act's closing couplet, with its promise of freedom and contentment in exile, brings us to the threshold of Arden itself, the audience is primed for the perceptual revolution that awaits it in the following four acts.

'let the forest judge'

The indeterminate character of the forest of Arden is essential to the comedy's cultivation of a transfigured vision. *As You Like It* plays fast and loose with the spatial and temporal parameters of everyday experience in

order to create an environment in which the 'working-day world' can be viewed from a vantage point beyond its comprehension. On the face of it, the play's setting is plainly French: Oliver calls Orlando 'the stubbornest young fellow of France' (I.i.133–4), Robin Hood is referred to as 'the old Robin Hood of England', and characters like Le Beau and 'the melancholy Jaques' (II.i.41) who attends Duke Senior are addressed as 'Monsieur' rather than 'Master'. On the strength of such evidence, in a misconceived quest for consistency, The Oxford Shakespeare changes the 'Arden' of the First Folio to 'Ardenne' to fix the location of the forest in the Ardennes, on the border between modern France and Belgium. But the original Folio spelling highlights the geographical ambiguity of the play's greenwood, designating as it does a real stretch of woodland in Shakespeare's Warwickshire, and carrying, as it must have done for the dramatist, an affectionate echo of his mother's maiden name. The speech and characterization of the old shepherd Corin, and of the local yokels Audrey and William, strengthen Arden's partial anchorage in a palpably English rural milieu, in much the same way as the mechanicals in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* transport us from ancient Athens to Elizabethan England every time they appear. That said, one need only note that the flora and fauna of Arden include palm-trees (III.ii.171–2) and olive trees (III.v.76) as well as lions to realize that Arden is not confined to England either, but belongs to a never-never land not to be found on any map.

The denizens of this unlocatable land are equally anomalous. Corin dwells in a prosaic dimension of Arden where the hard realities of agricultural life prevail: 'I am shepherd to another man', he explains to Celia and Rosalind, 'And do not shear the fleeces that I graze' (II.iv.77–8). But, as his bucolic name suggests, he can also slip unfazed into the imaginary universe of pastoral poetry inhabited by the scornful shepherdess, Phoebe, and her tormented swain, Silvius. The transient inhabitants of 'this uncouth forest' (II.vi.6), those who have sought asylum within its bounds, must become equally adept at shuttling between incongruous domains. The Arden they encounter is in many respects a realistic woodland, where human flesh feels 'The seasons' difference, as the icy fang / And churlish chiding of the winter's wind' (II.i.6–7) and hunger compels them 'To fright the animals and to kill them up / In their assigned and native dwelling place' (II.i.62–3). But in other respects Arden is a frankly fictitious terrain cultivated by the literary imagination, and as such it requires virtually all its residents to compose or quote poetry, both romantic and ribald, off the cuff, or to break into song, both festive and plaintive, at a moment's notice. This Arden is the artificial

enclave in which one may see 'a pageant truly played / Between the pale complexion of true love / And the red glow of scorn and proud disdain' (III.iv.47–9), and in which a deity from ancient Greece can take command of the wedding rites without anyone turning a hair. The more familiar with the forest of Arden we grow, the harder it is to define its identity, and the plainer its symbolic, theatrical character becomes.

Touchstone's appeal to the audience when Rosalind ribs him makes a point of making it plainer: 'You have said; but whether wisely or no, let the forest judge' (III.ii.119–20). Arden is not so much a place as an imaginary space, coextensive with 'This wide and universal theatre' (II.vii.137) in which we sit and watch; an emancipated state of mind in which we dawdle with the *dramatis personae* for the rest of the play. This freedom from the customary constraints of a definite, stable location is inseparable from Arden's gift of freedom from the tyranny of strictly regulated clock-time, which governs workaday life beyond 'the purlieus of this forest' (IV.iii.77). There is indeed 'no clock in the forest' (III.ii.295), as Orlando reminds Rosalind at their first encounter, giving her the perfect excuse to expatiate on the way 'Time travels in divers paces with divers persons' (III.ii.301–2), a slave to circumstance and subjective perception. Her demonstration of the relativity of time by showing 'who time ambles withal, who time trots withal, who time gallops withal, and who he stands still withal' (III.ii.302–4) emphatically refutes the clock-bound conception of time to which the melancholy moralist Jaques is wedded, and which Touchstone, holding an actual 'dial' drawn from his 'poke' (II.vii.20), has already spoofed in the previous act:

> 'Tis but an hour ago since it was nine,
> And after one hour more 'twill be eleven.
> And so from hour to hour we ripe and ripe,
> And then from hour to hour we rot and rot;
> (II.vii.24–7)

Oblivious to the fact that the joke's on him, Jaques's reaction to seeing 'The motley fool thus moral on the time' is to 'laugh sans intermission / An hour by his dial' (II.vii.32–3). For Jaques, not even laughter, notoriously the most unruly of emotions, is allowed to escape precise temporal measurement. The moralistic mentality that makes Jaques mistake Touchstone for the satirist Jaques himself aspires to be – 'Give me leave / To speak my mind, and I will through and through / Cleanse the foul body of th'infected world (II.vii.58–60) – goes hand in hand with submission to the normative regime that clock-time is

contracted to enforce. The same mentality informs Jaques's reduction of human life, in the play's most famous speech, to 'seven ages', which he portrays as seven stages of inexorable decline from 'mewling and puking' infant to the senile decrepitude of 'second childishness and mere oblivion, / Sans teeth, sans eyes, sans taste, sans everything' (II.vii.139–66).

By setting the plot aside in Arden and stalling narrative progression, *As You Like It* creates a sense of timelessness designed to deliver the mind from the closed, deterministic outlook to which the clock consigns it. Relieved of the need to make decisions and take action to push the plot forward, and unfettered by their former identities, Arden's interlopers are at liberty to 'fleet the time carelessly' (I.i.112–13), to 'Lose and neglect the creeping hours of time' (II.vii.112) in chance encounters and unscheduled exchanges, which turn curbs and binds into pastimes that mock Fortune from her wheel. 'Caprice and fancy reign and revel here', remarks Hazlitt, 'and stern necessity is banished to the court'; as a consequence, in Arden 'the interest arises more out of the sentiments and characters than out of the actions or situations. It is not what is done, but what is said, that claims our attention.' The effect of what is said, moreover, is that 'The very air of the place seems to breathe a spirit of philosophical poetry', as Hazlitt puts it. For Arden provides a breathing space, a privileged interval of footloose detachment from the daily round, during which entrenched ideas and practices are exposed to playful questioning and sceptical critique.

'sit you down in gentleness'

From the natural perspective of the forest, where the seasons, not sovereigns, hold sway and quite different laws apply, nothing appears more unnatural than the divisive principles of social organization human beings have inflicted on themselves. The unequal distribution of Dame Fortune's gifts, which the powerful and propertied conspire to preserve, and which the powerless and dispossessed are constrained to endure, stands revealed as groundless and irrational when viewed from the vantage point of a life 'exempt from public haunt' and thus 'more sweet / Than that of painted pomp' and 'More free from peril than the envious court' (II.i.2–4, 15). Such sentiments are all the more striking for being uttered by a duke, in the speech which immediately follows the couplet with which Celia concludes Act I: 'Now go we in content / To liberty, and not to banishment.' Even more arresting, however, is

the opening line of that speech — the first words spoken in Arden — in which Duke Senior addresses the courtiers attending him as 'my co-mates and brothers in exile' (II.i.1). The use of the word 'co-mates' in this phrase is unique in Shakespeare, who employs it to signal the displacement of degree and the ethos it breeds in 'the envious court' by the communal ethos rooted in 'old custom' and fostered by life in 'these woods' (II.i.2, 3).

The Duke's allusion two lines later to 'the penalty of Adam, / The seasons' difference' (II.i.5–6), which he is happy to pay in Arden, reinforces this shift by evoking the Edenic epoch before the advent of class society and reminding us of our undivided origin in our common ancestor. As the legendary rhyme ascribed to John Ball, the leader of the Peasants' Revolt, puts it: 'When Adam delved and Eve span, / Who was then the gentleman?' The allusion to Adam at this juncture is by no means of merely incidental significance, since it also echoes the name of the loyal old servant addressed by Orlando in the first speech, indeed in the first sentence, of *As You Like It*. That Shakespeare intended the aged retainer to embody something of 'the old Adam' popularly believed to lurk in everyone, irrespective of rank, seems more than likely in light of his decision to drop the surname 'Spencer' (i.e., 'steward') attached to Lodge's Adam in *Rosalynde*. The levelling resonance of the name, latent though it may be to begin with, grows as the first scene's fixation on gentility unfolds. It's hardly an accident that Orlando's protest at the injustice of the law of primogeniture, which flies in the face of natural law, is directed, like his fury at being robbed of his rank, at a servant of humble birth who personifies not only 'The constant service of the antique world' (II.iii.58), but also common humanity. Adam's own outrage at Oliver's betrayal of his filial and fraternal obligations strengthens the moral authority of that protest: 'Your brother – no, no brother – yet the son – / Yet not the son, I will not call him son – / Of him I was about to call his father' (II.iii.20–2).

Given the symbolic significance of the 'good old man' (II.iii.57), Orlando's decision to bring Adam with him into Arden, whose very name carries an echo of Eden, is as apt as the decision of Rosalind and Celia to transport 'The clownish fool' (I.iii.129), their fellow flouter of Dame Fortune, into the woods where, as 'Nature's natural', he is free to be 'the more fool' (I.iii.129, I.ii.47, II.iv.14). The moment when Orlando returns to Duke Senior, bearing on his shoulders the 'old poor man / Who after me hath many a weary step / Limped in pure love' (II.vii.129–31), acquires added poignancy if Adam's fundamental identity is borne in mind. As critics routinely observe, Orlando's entrance

with Adam is a powerful visual refutation of the words that immediately precede it – Jaques's dismissal of old age as 'second childishness and mere oblivion, / Sans teeth, sans eyes, sans taste, sans everything' (II.vii.165–6). Exhausted and hungry he may be, but we've no reason to doubt Adam's earlier claim: 'Though I look old, yet I am strong and lusty' (II.iii.48). Far more important, though, are the egalitarian implications of seeing Orlando carry his 'venerable burden' (II.vii.167), the incarnation of our primal precursor, into Arden upon his back. These implications are accentuated by the image of the master carrying his servant, in an extraordinary reversal of the usual relationship.

That reversal springs from the tender concern for Adam shown by Orlando in the previous scene (II.vi), when he puts his servant's need for rest and sustenance before his own. The tenderness of his solicitude and the primacy of the old man's needs are stressed again when Orlando begs Duke Senior to delay the meal he has disrupted, 'Whiles, like a doe, I go to find my fawn / And give it food', because 'Till he be first sufficed, / Oppressed with two weak evils, age and hunger, / I will not touch a bit' (II.vii.128–9, 131–3). And after he has returned with Adam, and they have been invited by the Duke to eat, Orlando's expression of gratitude makes a point once more of putting Adam first: 'I thank you most for him' (II.vii.169).

In the course of this sequence Orlando enacts a new conception of 'gentility', of what it means to be 'gentle', that is quite different from what it meant at the start of the comedy. The word 'gentleness' occurs more often in *As You Like It* than in any of Shakespeare's plays, and most frequently in this first exchange between Orlando and the Duke. When Orlando bursts in on the Duke and his courtiers, sword in hand, as they are about to dine, crying 'Forbear, and eat no more!', the Duke subdues him by asking, 'What would you have? Your gentleness shall force / More than your force move us to gentleness', and welcomes him to their table (II.vii.88, 102–3). 'Speak you so gently?' (II.vii.106) replies the chastened Orlando, who asks their forgiveness for his discourtesy, and reaches for the comedy's favourite conjunction:

> If ever you have looked on better days,
> If ever been where bells have knolled to church,
> If ever sat at any good man's feast,
> If ever from your eyelids wiped a tear,
> And know what 'tis to pity, and be pitied,
> Let gentleness my strong enforcement be.
> (II.vii.113–18)

We have indeed done all these things, the Duke assures the abashed intruder, 'and wiped our eyes / Of drops that sacred pity hath engendered. / And therefore sit you down in gentleness' (II.vii.122–4).

What's fascinating here is the semantic sea-change the word 'gentle' and its derivatives have undergone by the end of this exchange. Initially 'gentleness' means essentially what Orlando meant by 'gentility' in Act I, Scene i: the possession of the 'gentleman-like qualities' (I.i.65–6) befitting his rank, which his lack of a 'good education' (I.i.63–4) has denied him. But, as it travels back and forth between Orlando and the Duke, the word sheds its class-bound connotations and is used instead to signify a compassionate disposition rooted in mutual empathy, the capacity 'to pity, and be pitied', which owes nothing to birth and everything to recognizing the claims our fellow human beings have upon our kindness, simply by virtue of being human. It's not by chance that the meaning of 'gentleness' undergoes this transmutation in a 'desert inaccessible' (II.vii.110), where 'The thorny point / Of bare distress' (II.vii.94–5) exposes the physical vulnerability that binds people together, regardless of their social station or their gender. Nor is it fortuitous that Adam disappears from the play at this point, never to be heard from or mentioned again, for the perspective he embodied outside Arden is fostered henceforth within Arden by diverse characters and dramatic strategies, which render Adam's role as its special avatar redundant.

Cross-Dressing and the Cure for Love

Patriarchal assumptions about the supremacy of the male in the family and society, about the inherent distinctions that divide the sexes, and about the inviolable norm of heterosexual love are subjected to the same process of sceptical subversion in *As You Like It* as the principles that underpin class division and social inequality.

The precedence over women ubiquitously enjoyed by men is turned upside down by Rosalind, who dominates the play to a degree unmatched by the heroines of the other comedies. (Charles I jotted 'Rosalind' beside the title on the contents page of his copy of the 1632 Folio.) Rosalind's is the longest female part in all Shakespeare's plays – longer even than Cleopatra's, and more than twice as long as Viola's in *Twelfth Night*. A full quarter of the lines in *As You Like It* are spoken by her. The fact that her part was originally taken by a boy detracts not one iota from the boldness of Shakespeare's decision to privilege his leading female character to such an extent, let alone endow her with such coruscating

wit and theatrical power. In the guise of Ganymede, Rosalind initiates the courtship of the man she loves, defines its terms and controls its course from start to finish. A self-styled 'magician' who 'can do strange things' (V.ii.57, 68), and thus a female prototype of Prospero, she orchestrates the denouement in such a way as to resolve the romantic dilemmas in which her androgynous identity in Arden has embroiled her. The temptation to view her as an authorial figure, a surrogate for the dramatist himself, becomes overwhelming when Shakespeare gives her the last word in the dazzling epilogue she delivers to the audience, and places the fate of the play in her hands. To create a stage heroine possessed of such charisma and authority at all at this time, and then put her in command of the comedy with the lion's share of the lines, constitutes in itself a provocative theatrical statement, which puts the thrust of the play's sexual politics beyond doubt.

But Shakespeare doesn't leave it at that. The male persona Rosalind adopts allows him to devise situations of vertiginous complexity, which undo the customary distinctions between masculine and feminine, and between homosexual and heterosexual, creating a space beyond them in which more fluid, less repressive forms of sexual identity and desire can be floated and explored. At its most involuted, *As You Like It* confronted its first audiences with a boy playing the part of a woman (Rosalind), who is posing as a young man (Ganymede), who is pretending to be a woman on whom Orlando can practise his courtship of Rosalind, and who is fending off the amorous advances of Phoebe, whose infatuation with the 'pretty youth' is clearly kindled by his feminine features – the 'pretty redness in his lip', 'the constant red and mingled damask in his cheek' (III.v.114, 121, 124) – rather than by any semblance of virility. The sexual confusion would have been compounded, moreover, by the confounding of class lines this pretty pass entails: an actor, commonly regarded as belonging to the same underclass as vagabonds and peddlers, playing the part of an aristocrat, the daughter of a duke, who is masquerading as a shepherd and winds up wedding another actor cast in the role of a knight's son, a *déclassé* gentleman, who is her social inferior by birth and education, despite the 'potent dukedom' (V.iv.167) he stands to inherit as a result of his marriage.

Shakespeare had already employed female cross-dressing as a theatrical strategy in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* and *The Merchant of Venice*, and he would employ it again to equally complex effect in *Twelfth Night*. Cross-dressed male characters had featured too, of course, in the Induction to *The Taming of the Shrew*, in 'Pyramus and Thisbe' in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and most memorably in *The Merry Wives of*

Windsor, when Falstaff is constrained to impersonate the old woman of Brentford. But what sets the use of sexual disguise in *As You Like It* apart from its use in Shakespeare's other plays is that Rosalind's assumed persona, Ganymede, provides her with a platform on which to perform *her own identity* as Rosalind. By detaching the character from her primary identity as exiled Duke's daughter and romantic heroine, and revealing it to be as much a role as Ganymede, Shakespeare prises open a dimension independent of both masculinity and femininity as they are currently perceived, and reducible to neither. Likewise, when the disguised Rosalind finds herself wooed as a woman by Orlando, who thinks she's a man, and wooed as a beautiful youth by Phoebe, who is unaware that she's really a woman, a current of desire flows between the three characters that is impossible to pin down, because it keeps both heterosexual and homosexual propensities in play, defying us to tease them apart.

Cross-dressing in *As You Like It* creates opportunities for the playful mimicking of both sexes in the throes of love, unfixing gender stereotypes and placing them between quotation marks that question their validity. It also contrives erotic quandaries which suggest that the sexuality of women and men is more various and volatile than the standard definitions and prescriptions can afford to admit. As a result, Rosalind's resumption of her original identity as the daughter of Duke Senior, and her formal submission of herself to her father and her husband at the wedding ceremony – 'To you I give myself, for I am yours (V.iv.114–15) – can't be so readily dismissed as a capitulation to patriarchal conventions, since the premises on which those conventions rest have been kicked away in the course of the play. The credit for kicking them away doesn't belong to the comedy's transvestite convolutions alone, though. Rosalind may end up giving herself in marriage to the man she fell in love with at first sight, but not before love between men and women, and the state of matrimony, have run the gauntlet of her blunt realism and Touchstone's lewd cynicism.

The cure for love that Rosalind administers to Orlando is designed to divest him of the clichéd postures and predictable discourse that make love 'merely a madness', which 'deserves as well a dark house and a whip as madmen do' (III.ii.386–8). She is equally scathing about the equally absurd 'pageant truly played' (III.iv.47) between Phoebe and Silvius. 'Who might be your mother', enquires Rosalind of Phoebe, 'That you insult, exult, and all at once, / Over the wretched?' (III.v.36–8). 'Sell when you can', she advises her with brutal frankness, 'You are not for all markets' (III.v.61). The pity Celia feels for Phoebe's forlorn suitor, Rosalind assures her, is wasted on Silvius, whom she scolds for tolerating

such abuse: 'Wilt thou love such a woman? What, to make thee an instrument, and play false strains upon thee? – not to be endured' (IV.iii.68–70). So much for the rarefied fantasies of pastoral romance.

Orlando fares no better when he declares that the imaginary Rosalind's rejection of him is his death warrant: 'Men have died from time to time, and worms have eaten them', retorts Rosalind, 'but not for love' (IV.i.99–101). She then persuades a reluctant Celia to conduct a make-believe marriage ceremony, in which she and Orlando pronounce the legally binding words and thus pre-empt the official, public wedding conducted by Hymen at the end of the play. (In Shakespeare's day, a declaration of intent to marry by two people before a third constituted a binding contract, provided it was made '*per verba de praesenti*', i.e., in the present tense.) Hardly have they uttered those potent words, whose full import escapes Orlando, when Rosalind dashes the romantic illusions they have conjured up in the mind of her unwitting spouse. Once his love has been consummated, it will last, Orlando pledges, reaching for the nearest cliché, 'For ever and a day'. To which Rosalind replies:

> Say a day without the ever. No, no, Orlando; men are April when they woo, December when they wed. Maids are May when they are maids, but the sky changes when they are wives. I will be more jealous of thee than a Barbary cock-pigeon over his hen, more clamorous than a parrot against rain, more new-fangled than an ape, more giddy in my desires than a monkey. I will weep for nothing, like Diana in the fountain, and I will do that when you are disposed to be merry. I will laugh like a hyena, and that when thou art inclined to sleep.
>
> (IV.i.138–48)

Well before the 'genuine', formal marriage of Orlando and Rosalind takes place, this cross-dressed rehearsal robs it of any unrealistic expectations they or the audience might have of it. Prefaced and qualified by this unclouded view of wedlock, the four weddings before Hymen in the final act are free to serve not only as versions of a repressive patriarchal institution, but also as symbols of the more desirable relationships that might supervene in a transformed reality, 'When earthly things made even / Atone together' (V.iv.107–8).

'That thou mightst ioyne his hand with his'

It's not just the implausible presence of Hymen that exhorts us to read the connubial climax of the comedy symbolically rather than cynically.

Because of Rosalind's disguise as Ganymede and Orlando's ignorance of Ganymede's true identity, their exchange of vows in Act IV also enacts, under the aegis of mere pretence, the marriage of a man to a man, a fact less likely to have been lost on the play's first audiences, who would have seen one boy dressed as a woman being married to an adult male playing a man by another boy dressed as a woman. The pervasive sexual ambivalence of the scene is betrayed by Rosalind's diction, too, when she warns Orlando that, as his wife, she will be more jealous of him than 'a Barbary cock-pigeon over *his* hen' (IV.i.141–2; my italics). Small wonder that the Puritan enemies of the stage perceived it as a hotbed of illicit proclivities devised to corrupt actors and audience alike. They would scarcely have been appeased, moreover, by the 'real' fifth-act marriage before Hymen, since there's every reason to conclude that the play's original audiences were meant to behold in it a mirror-image of the earlier mock-marriage.

Not for the first time in this study we find serious distortions inflicted on the original printed version of Shakespeare's text by meddling editors, anxious to correct what they mistakenly assume to be self-evident authorial errors, erroneous transcriptions of his manuscript, or misprints. The problem being that, once these emendations are generally accepted and regularly reproduced by subsequent editors, they displace the original text and obliterate the quite different interpretive possibilities it offered.

In the First Folio edition of *As You Like It* (1623) the last two lines of Hymen's song read as follows: 'That thou mightst ioyne *his* hand with his / Whose heart within his bosome is' (2689–90; V.iv.112–13; my italics). The Second Folio (1632) preserves this wording. From the Third Folio of 1664 onwards, however, editors have amended the first, and occasionally the second, 'his' to 'her'. Following the Restoration, women were permitted to play women's parts in the public theatre, as a result of which this amendment became set in stone in the productions of subsequent centuries – eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Rosalinds in particular being keen to conclude the performance in fetching feminine attire. The trouble is that a female Rosalind in a dress makes no sense of the line in the epilogue that begins 'If I were a woman' (16–17), which is consequently often cut in performance.

At no point in *As You Like It* does Orlando say anything to suggest that he realizes Ganymede, the youth he has been wooing in place of Rosalind, is really Rosalind herself. Julia in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* and Viola in *Twelfth Night* are both explicitly identified while still in masculine garb by Proteus and Orsino respectively, and in *The*

Merchant of Venice Bassanio and Gratiano finally grasp that the learned doctor and his clerk who saved Antonio were actually their own wives. But Orlando is given no such moment of recognition at which to draw a clear distinction between Ganymede and Rosalind, so that his line in response to the latter's reappearance with Hymen and Celia, 'If there be truth in sight, you are my Rosalind' (V.iv.117), leaves ample scope for visual ambiguity, which the conditional clause ('*If* there be truth in sight') underscores.

In the First Folio, the stage direction for Rosalind's re-entrance in the final scene reads simply: 'Enter Hymen, Rosalind, and Celia'. Having accepted the amendment of Hymen's song in the 1664 Third Folio, however, most later editors incorporated the revised version of the stage direction in Nicholas Rowe's 1709 edition: 'Enter Hymen, Rosalind, and Celia, *Rosalind in Woman's Cloths*' (my italics). This revision in turn provided further authority for what remains the standard approach to staging this scene down to the present day, notwithstanding the less prescriptive, more flexible formulations preferred by recent editions, including the Oxford Shakespeare (2005), which has Rosalind and Celia entering 'as themselves', and the Arden Shakespeare (2006), which adopts Edward Capell's phrase 'both undisguised'.

The First Folio, however, does not presuppose, let alone stipulate, that Rosalind sheds the doublet and hose of Ganymede offstage in order to re-enter in a gown that restores the character's primary gender. When Rosalind re-enters, the reactions of Duke Senior, Orlando and especially Phoebe make it clear that her female identity must be apparent to them at this point, although in all three cases that tell-tale conjunction 'If' betrays disbelief in the evidence of their own eyes. But their realization does not necessitate a complete change of costume by the actor or actress, who can readily indicate Rosalind's return by a change in posture, manner, voice and gait, or by the simple expedient of removing the hat that hides her hair. Indeed, the response of Phoebe – who literally doesn't know Rosalind from Adam because she has never met her – is inexplicable if Rosalind is not simultaneously recognizable to her *as Ganymede as well*: 'If sight and shape be true, / Why then, my love adieu!' (V.iv.118–19).

There's more than a scholarly quibble at stake here. If the pronouns in Hymen's song are allowed to stand as printed in the First and Second Folio, and Rosalind remains dressed as Ganymede throughout the recognition scene and wedding ceremony, then what we also witness in the latter is a re-enactment of the make-believe marriage between two male characters, Ganymede and Orlando. Performed like this, the celebration

of 'high wedlock' (V.iv.142) that crowns the comedy turns into an altogether more expansive grand finale, embracing as it does not only a quartet of couples who span the entire social scale, from Duke's daughter to goatherd, but also a richer, more diverse spectrum of sexual identity and desire than an unequivocally heterosexual marriage between Rosalind and Orlando allows.

The Last Word: 'If I were a woman'

Leaving Rosalind garbed like Ganymede has the further virtue of letting her segue seamlessly after the nuptial dance into her tantalizing epilogue, whose seductive wit and wording plainly depend on her possessing an androgynous appearance:

> It is not the fashion to see the lady the epilogue; but it is no more unhandsome than to see the lord the prologue. If it be true that good wine needs no bush, 'tis true that a good play needs no epilogue. Yet to good wine they do use good bushes, and good plays prove the better by the help of good epilogues. What a case am I in then, that am neither a good epilogue nor cannot insinuate with you in the behalf of a good play! I am not furnished like a beggar, therefore to beg will not become me. My way is to conjure you; and I'll begin with the women. I charge you, O women, for the love you bear to men, to like as much of this play as please you. And I charge you, O men, for the love you bear to women – as I perceive by your simpering none of you hates them – that between you and the women the play may please. If I were a woman I would kiss as many of you as had beards that pleased me, complexions that liked me, and breaths that I defied not. And I am sure, as many as have good beards, or good faces, or sweet breaths will for my kind offer, when I make curtsy, bid me farewell.
>
> *Exit*

In this astonishing valediction, addressed directly to the audience, we have the only instance in Shakespeare of a female character explicitly calling attention ('If I were a woman') to the male actor playing her part. In fact, what we are presented with, more precisely, is the character Rosalind *playing the part of the boy who has played her*, and delivering, as both 'the lady' and the boy actor, an epilogue in which she appeals to the women on behalf of the men, and to the men on behalf of the women. As the opening sentence of the epilogue makes clear,

Shakespeare is well aware that, by giving 'the lady', the heroine of the piece, the last word, he is breaking with theatrical convention. But his defence of his upending of the patriarchal pecking order on stage is couched in symmetrical syntax, whose perfectly balanced clauses enact the tacit aim of that upending, which is to make ladies equal with lords. Like his favourite philosopher Montaigne, Shakespeare recognized that, beyond the artificial discriminations that divide the sexes, 'both male and female are cast in one same moulde; instruction and custome excepted, there is no great difference betweene them' ('Upon Some Verses of Virgil'). The entire cross-dressed courtship of Rosalind as Ganymede by Orlando has been devoted to dramatizing this understanding in concrete, theatrical terms, and the epilogue is expressly designed to drive the point home before the audience leaves the theatre.

The epilogue's scrambling of gender distinctions and androgynous flirtation with both sexes converge with its flouting of the class-distinctions customarily observed in such speeches. With *As You Like It*'s transvaluation of 'gentility' in mind, the manner in which Rosalind addresses the spectators is revealing. In the only other Elizabethan play in which a female character delivers the epilogue, John Lyly's *Gallathea*, the eponymous heroine deferentially addresses the court audience, for which the play was written, as 'ladies and gentlemen'. In Lodge's *Rosalynde* the moralizing epilogue is directed solely at the book's 'gentlemen' readers. And at the end of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Puck, whom Rosalind resembles in many respects, not least in her capacity as onstage director of the play, addresses the audience in his epilogue as 'Gentles'. But Rosalind, in a move that epitomizes what Hymen meant by making matters 'even', speaks to them informally, whatever their station might be, as simply 'men' and 'women', and she makes a point of beginning with the women – putting them once again before the men – when she starts to 'conjure' each sex to find the play pleasing. In Rosalind's conjuring of the men, moreover, she slides slyly from heterosexual innuendo ('that between you and the women the play may please') into homoerotic coquetry, laying bare the boy beneath the role: 'If I were a woman I would kiss as many of you as had beards that pleased me'.

The epilogue reprises, in short, the key preoccupations of the comedy and projects them from the stage into the audience. Its aim is to conjure up in the audience the attitude its speaker incarnates and articulates: to infect them with its contagious theatricality and leave them in the unfettered frame of mind the play has been at pains to cultivate throughout. In so doing it reactivates, too, the complex connotations of the play's title, which it recalls when it charges the women 'to like as

much of this play as please you', and couples liking again with pleasure – this time of the erotic kind – in the phrases 'beards that pleased me, complexions that liked me'. By this point, though, it should be apparent that the principal pleasure *As You Like It* affords the audience is the pleasure of being endowed with a dramatically different perspective on their lives and times, a perspective liberated, for as long as the play's spell lasts, from the convictions and expectations that imprison their hearts and minds in the 'working-day world' to which they are about to return.

If

To put it another way: the epilogue completes the audience's induction into the wisdom of folly personified and promulgated by the play's own consummate wise fool, Touchstone, the first fully-fledged wise fool in Shakespeare. At the heart of that wisdom is a wry detachment from the ways of the world as it stands, a refusal to succumb to any one view of life it offers, and an awareness of the alternative views and ways of life that can materialize at any moment.

Jaques's delighted account of his first meeting with Touchstone pinpoints the distinctive stance the latter adopts towards the times in which he finds himself and the types of people the world throws in his path. 'A fool, a fool, I met a fool i'th' forest, /A motley fool', cries Jaques, 'a fool, / Who laid him down and basked him in the sun, / And railed on Lady Fortune in good terms' (II.vii.12–16). Being as implacable a foe of Lady Fortune as Rosalind and Celia, Touchstone is also 'an enemy to the prejudices of opinion', as Hazlitt puts it, since such prejudices serve by their very partiality to buttress the man-made causes of misfortune. He therefore wastes no opportunity to expose, by contradiction or by parody, the partiality, and hence the relativity, of whatever point of view confronts him. His parody of Jaques is lost, of course, on the latter, who mistakes the 'liberty' (II.vii.47) that wise fools enjoy for a licence to be merely satirical and indulge his own jaundiced penchant for castigating the vices of the day. Nothing could be further from Touchstone's mobile mind than such a righteous, inflexible objective. His mind is as motley as his multi-coloured costume because, like the comedy he inhabits, he prefers to shuttle back and forth across the play's spectrum of perspectives without coming to rest anywhere. Touchstone epitomizes the play's relaxed, amused detachment from the diverse perspectives it surveys, a detachment which it invites the audience to share.

Smack in the middle of the play, at the point on which it turns, Touchstone demonstrates the stance *As You Like It* commends to us in his reply to Corin's innocent query, 'And how like you this shepherd's life, Master Touchstone?':

> Truly, shepherd, in respect of itself, it is a good life; but in respect that it is a shepherd's life, it is naught. In respect that it is solitary, I like it very well; but in respect that it is private, it is a very vile life. Now in respect it is in the fields, it pleaseth me well; but in respect it is not in the court, it is tedious. As it is a spare life, look you, it fits my humour well; but as there is no more plenty in it, it goes much against my stomach. Hast any philosophy in thee shepherd?
> (III.ii.11–22)

Shakespeare compresses into Touchstone's compulsive catchphrase 'in respect of' and its variants the restless, multivocal dynamic of the entire play, which seeks to disengage us from unqualified commitment to any particular identity or standpoint we may be inclined to adopt. That structural dynamic is inherently democratic, inasmuch as it disperses authority impartially across the full range of *dramatis personae*, refusing to grant sovereignty to any of the positions dramatized. This is, perhaps, the most powerful way in which the comedy articulates its utopian commitment to the common interests of humanity, and to the prospect of a form of community that serves those common interests rather than the interests of one class or kind of human being at the expense of the others.

As You Like It's profound estrangement from the actual and imaginative absorption in the possible are reflected in its repeated deployment of that tiny but formidable word 'if'. It crops up far more frequently (138 times) in *As You Like It* than in any other Shakespeare play, acquiring so much prominence along the way that Touchstone feels entitled to treat it as a noun in his tribute to its potency. The fool's fondness for the word first becomes apparent, as we've seen, in his defence of 'a certain knight that swore "by his honour" they were good pancakes, and swore "by his honour" the mustard was naught' (I.ii.60–2). He resorts to it obsessively again at the end of the play in his absurd disquisition on the 'seventh cause' of quarrelling and 'the degrees of the lie' (V.iv.65–94), which concludes thus:

> All these you may avoid but the Lie Direct; and you may avoid that, too, with an 'if'. I knew when seven justices could not take up a quarrel, but when the parties were met themselves, one of them

thought but of an 'if', as 'If you said so, then I said so', and they shook hands and swore brothers. Your 'if' is the only peacemaker; much virtue in 'if'.

(V.iv.94–101)

Touchstone's eulogy focuses our attention on the syllable that floods the last three scenes of *As You Like It* and becomes, in effect, the watch-word of the play. Well before he launches into his encomium, Rosalind triggers a minor avalanche of 'ifs' in the ritualistic exchange between Orlando, Phoebe, Silvius and herself, which she initiates when she assures Orlando: 'if you will be married tomorrow, you shall; and to Rosalind if you will' (V.ii.69–70). Rosalind concludes the scene by promising to solve the problems of all four of them at a stroke by means of marriage the following day, and the pledge she makes to each in turn is prefaced by the same indispensable conditional conjunction. She enlists its services once again at the start of the final scene, when – still in the guise of Ganymede – she secures promises from Duke Senior, Orlando, Phoebe and Silvius that they will abide by their agreement to act as she stipulates, once she has made Rosalind materialize. When the 'real' Rosalind does appear, 'if' qualifies not only the responses in which Duke Senior, Orlando and Phoebe acknowledge her identity, but also Rosalind's replies to them and Hymen's conclusion of the formal wedding ceremony:

ROSALIND. (*to the Duke*) I'll have no father if you be not he.
(*to Orlando*) I'll have no husband if you be not he,
(*to Phoebe*) Nor ne'er wed woman if you be not she.
HYMEN. Peace, ho, I bar confusion.
'Tis I must make conclusion
Of these most strange events.
Here's eight that must take hands
To join in Hymen's bands,
If truth holds true contents.

(V.iv.120–8)

The cumulative impact of this barrage of conditional clauses, which continues right to the end of the epilogue, is to transpose the entire denouement from the indicative into the subjunctive mood. As it draws to a close, *As You Like It* confesses that a resolution in which 'earthly things made even / Atone together' – in which true equality and unity are realized – is as yet achievable only in the virtual reality of fiction. In so

doing, it reminds the audience of the vast distance that still separates the divisive dispensation they currently endure from the genuine community prefigured by the denouement.

To hasten the demise of that dispensation, *As You Like It* affords its audience a vision of the way they would like it to be, disguised as the way it had to be for those who were living at that moment in history, in late Elizabethan England. It allows the audience to view Shakespeare's world and time from the vantage point of a potential future that still lies beyond our world and time: a future in which Dame Fortune's gifts have at last been 'bestowed equally'. That vantage point is the vantage point of the wise fool, Touchstone, whose laughter is the laughter of the future at the past. In acquiring his perspective, which is the perspective of the play, we acquire the wisdom of folly: the wisdom of those who are fools in the eyes of the world as it is, because they are wise to the ways of that world and fooled by it no longer. As Touchstone remarks to Shakespeare's namesake, the rustic simpleton William (in whom we perhaps behold a mocking self-portrait): 'I do now remember a saying: "The fool doth think he is wise, but the wise man knows himself to be a fool"' (V.i.30–1).

When Amiens and the other exiled lords sing the first of the play's many exquisite songs, 'Under the greenwood tree', with its chorus summoning all who shun ambition to Arden –

Come hither, come hither, come hither.
Here shall he see
No enemy
But winter and rough weather.

(II.v.5–8, 39–42)

– Jaques can't resist supplying a sarcastic parody:

If it do come to pass
That any man turn ass,
Leaving his wealth and ease
A stubborn will to please,
Ducdame, ducdame, ducdame.
Here shall he see
Gross fools as he,
An if he will come to me.

(II.v.47–54)

'What's that "ducdame"?' asks Amiens, walking right into Jaques's trap along with the others now gathering round him. ''Tis a Greek invocation

to call fools into a circle', replies Jaques, springing the trap (II.v.55–6). But once again the joke is on Jaques, who yearns to be 'a motley fool' like Touchstone, but is doomed to spurn the 'dancing measures' of the denouement and 'To see no pastime' (V.iv.191, 193). For the fact is that, long before 'good Monsieur Melancholy' (III.ii.287–8) disappears into Duke Senior's 'abandoned cave' (V.iv.194) at the end of *As You Like It*, the audience has fallen, like the exiled lords, under the spell cast by the 'Greek invocation', having heard in the cryptic cry 'Ducdame, ducdame, ducdame' the play's summons to dwell as wise fools in 'the circle of this forest' (V.iv.34), the charmed circle of Shakespeare's 'wide and universal theatre' (II.vii.137), where the impossible comes to pass.

10

'Nothing that is so, is so': *Twelfth Night*

The End of the Affair

Probably written in 1601, either just before or just after *Hamlet*, *Twelfth Night, or What You Will* marks by common consent the end of Shakespeare's affair with the kind of comedy he had made his own during his first decade as a dramatist. After *Twelfth Night* his attention turned to other kinds of comedy, indeed to the creation of plays so different from his previous ventures into the genre that few critics have felt comfortable calling them comedies and they have become better known as problem plays and romances. Insofar as they mask the generic features these comedies share with their precursors, the aliases they have acquired are undeniably misleading. As the first chapter of this book began by pointing out, an unbroken genealogical line connects the concerns and conventions of Shakespearean comedy from *The Comedy of Errors* through to *The Tempest*, and plays as disparate as *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *Measure for Measure* and *The Winter's Tale* reveal at their core under close analysis the same dramatic DNA. From this point of view it might be more accurate to regard *Twelfth Night* as a turning point in the fortunes of Shakespearean comedy, a Janus-faced play which looks back to the farcical and the festive romantic comedies that preceded it, and forward to the darker, disenchanted vision of the problem plays and the romances' miraculous, bittersweet tales of shipwreck, grief and kindred reunited.

Be that as it may, from the standpoint of this study the first striking feature of *Twelfth Night* is its brazen plundering of virtually all Shakespeare's previous comedies for characters, predicaments, theatrical devices and motifs. Shakespeare almost certainly filched the main ingredients of the play's romantic plot from Barnaby Riche's story of

Fabiny Tibor
. „A »halálos« testvérgyűlölettől a »halálos« testvérszeretetig”,
in: *Hol van a Testvéred? Tanulmányok a társadalmi nemekről és a testvérszeretetről*, Orosz Gábor Viktor (szerk.), Budapest, Luther Kiadó, 2011, 283–204.

Az alábbiakban arra teszünk kísérletet, hogy rámutassunk egy motívumra, amelyre a példák bőséges tárházát találhatjuk mind a Bibliában mind Shakespeare drámáiban. Ez pedig a testvérrivalizáció, a testvérharc, s sokszor a gyilkosságba is torkolló testvérgyűlölet témája.[1] Először felvillantjuk a bibliai és a shakespeare-i példákat, majd tanulmányunk második felében egy drámai epizód elemzésével próbáljuk meg azt a bibliai és teológiai felismerést illusztrálni, hogy bármennyire is archetipikus, a génjeinkbe kódolt, s talán generációkon is keresztül átörökített, a tudatalattinkban hordozott indulatnak tűnik a testvérgyűlölet, az mégsem szükségszerűen irreverzibilis. A Shakespeare-dráma alábbiakban elemzett epizódja majd azt jeleníti meg, hogy a mélyről, alulról fakadó emberi, „természetes” gyűlöletet csak a „nem természetes”, felülről származó szeretet győzheti le; a „pneuma” hatalma ugyanis erősebb a „pszichikum”-nál. Erre a betegségre - mert arról van szó - ugyanis van gyógyulás, mert *egy* halál már legyőzte az utolsó ellenséget, a halált.

I. Testvérrivalizáció a Bibliában

Lássuk először a jól ismert bibliai példákat! Mózes első könyve, a Genezis tálcán nyújt számunkra egy archetipikus „drámasorozatot”. Amíg a bűneset az Éden-kertben vertikális jellegű volt, s az Isten-ember kapcsolatára vonatkozott, a Káin és Ábel történetben a bűn, immár a testvérgyilkosság formájában horizontális jelleget ölt. A testvérgyilkosságot megelőzte testvérrivalizáció, a testvéririgység és a testvérgyűlölet. A rivalizációból lett irigység, az irigységből gyűlölet, a gyűlöletből gyilkosság. Káin bélyeggel megjelölve bolyong a világban. A megölt Ábelt majd Sét helyettesíti, az ő utódai viszik tovább a kiválasztott emberi nemzetséget. De folytathatjuk a sort Nóé (ezúttal három) fiával: a megátkozott Hámmal (aki a kánaániták ősatyja volt), illetve Sémmel és Jáfettel; majd Ábrahám két asszonyától született fiaival: Izmaellel és Izsákkal, majd Izsák ikreivel: Ézsauval és Jákóbbal, akik már Rebeka méhében is tusakodtak (1 Móz 25,22). Jákób elsőszülöttje Rúben súlyosan vétkezett, mert apja feleségével hált (1 Móz 49,3), s ezért a családi vonalat Júda ill. József viszi tovább, aki előtt leborulnak majd a testvérei (1 Móz 49,8). Júdát (Jákób másik fiát) a magát prostiuáltnak álcázó menye Támár csábította el, aki tőle teherbe esvén ikreket fogant. Ám mégsem az jött ki anyja méhéből, akinek kinyújtott kezére a bába vörös fonalat kötött, hanem Pérec, s Zerák e méhen belüli küzdelemben sajnálatosan alul maradt (1 Móz 38, 29-30). József Egyiptomban született két fiát az elsőszülött Manassét és a második Efraimot az agg Jákób nem úgy áldja meg, amint az József elvárta: a másodszülött Efraim nyeri el az elsőszülött áldását.

E gigászi méretű testvérküzdelem tehát állandóan ismétlődik, újratermelődik, s a küzdelem végeredményeként mindig ott vannak az alulmaradottak, a „lúzerek”: Káin, Hám, Izmael, Ézsau, Rúben, Zerák, Manassé, s a (sokszor érdemtelenül) győztesek, a „bíborban születettek”: Sét, Izsák, Sém és Jáfet, Izsák, Jákób (azaz Izrael), Júda, Pérec, Efraim.

[1] Tibor Fabiny, “Brothers as Doubles. Birthright and rivalry a ‘brothers’ in Genesis and Shakespeare, In: Ittzés Gábor – Kiséry András (szerk.), *Míves semmiségek. Elaborate trifles. Tanulmányok Ruttkay Kálmán 80.születésnapjára. Studies for Kálmán G.Ruttkay on his 80th birthday*, Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem, Piliscsaba, 2002. pp.35-47

Miközben az egymással vetélkedő férfiakról beszélünk, talán első látásra azt mondjuk, hogy a testvérrivalizáció egy jellemző „férfibetegség”, s így hajlamosak vagyunk elfeledkezni az egymással vetélkedő nőkről, pedig versengenek ők is javából, kétségtelenül nem egy társadalmi státuszét, hanem *a* férfiért! A termékeny rabszolga Hágár és a terméketlen feleség Száraj - Ábrahámért (1Móz 16), Lea, a nagyobbik, de gyenge szemű, de apja által protezsált leány és a szép termetű húga Ráhel pedig - Jákóbért (1 Móz 29). Szegény Jákóbot Lábán, a nagybátyja rá is szedi: tudta nélkül először az idősebb, de nem oly szemrevaló leányával Leával fekteti össze, s majd újabb hét évnyi szolgálat után veheti el második feleségként a szeretett Ráhelt (1Móz 29,28).

Mi, vagy ki okozza ezt az állandóan újratermelődő, végtelenül ismétlődőnek tetsző ádáz testvérküzdelmet, a kiválasztás/kiválasztódás és elvetés/elvettetés egyszerre felemelő és tragikus ritmusát? Válaszunk: feszültség támad az elsőszülöttségi jog (és az azzal járó áldás) és annak gyakorlati megvalósítása között. Van egy törvény, de Isten fölülírja, sőt egyenesen szubvertálja saját törvényét! Az áldás megvalósulását megelőzi az Úr furcsa ígérete: „a nagyobbik szolgál a kisebbnek” (1Móz 25,23b)

De mit is jelent az elsőszülöttség joga és áldása? 2Móz 13,2-ben olvashatjuk, hogy „Nekem szentelj Izrael fiai közül minden elsőszülöttet”. Az számít elsőszülöttnek, aki „az anyja méhét megnyitja”. Lenkeyné, Semsey Klára írja, hogy „az elsőszülöttség egyrészt születésnél fogva adódó ténymegállapítás, másrészt e tényhez kapcsolódó rang, amely kiváltságot jelent…Az elsőszülött nyerte el az atyai áldást (1Móz 25,29kk; 27, 36; 48,18), és az örökségből kettős részt kapott (5Móz 21,17). Úgy tekintette Izrael az embernek, és az állatnak hímnemű elsőszülöttjét, mint az apa erejének zsengéjét (5Móz 22,17), éppen ezért különös megbecsülésben részesítette.”[2] Az elsőszülöttségi áldás ugyanakkor az Ábrahámnak adott ígéretre is vonatkozik: annak magja lesz az ígéret örököse, aki az áldást hordozza.

Az elsőszülöttség vagy a *primogenitura* kérdése/drámája a Genezis egyik meghatározó témája, négy nemzedéken át jelentkezik az ősatyák életében. Varga Gyöngyi eddig még kiadatlan, de igen értékes disszertációjában írja, hogy „az elsőszülöttség-áldás elsődlegesen az ősatyák/ősszülők narratívájához kötődik. Szorosan kapcsolódik azonban az áldás átfogó témája mellett az ígéretek témáját érintő kutatáshoz is. Mindezeken túl pedig Izrael kiválasztottságának teológiai kérdéskörét is érinti.”[3]

Northrop Frye mutat rá, hogy meglehetősen kétértelmű megtiszteltetés[4] a választott nép számára, amikor az Úr így szól hozzá: „Elsőszülött fiam az Izrael” (2Móz 4,22). Kétértelmű, hiszen láttuk, hogy sokszor az elsőszülött lett a második, vagy éppen a lúzer. Abban is igaza van Frye-nak, hogy az elsőszülöttség elsőségének és elvetésének témája a Genezisen túl kiterjed az egész Szentírásra. Ott van a honfoglalásnál, hiszen nem Mózes, hanem Józsué vezetheti be a választott népet az ígéret földjére, de ott van a királyság témájánál is: Saul a kiválasztott és az elvetett, Dávid lesz az új felkent: Ahogy az előbb neveztük: Saul a lúzer, Dávid pedig „a bíborban született”.

Frye joggal vonja be Milton *Elveszett paradicsom*át vizsgálódásai körébe, meggyőzően érvelve, hogy az eposz V. könyvében Milton e rivalizáció őstípusát, Sátánban, ill. Luciferben látja[5], akit mint az angyalok között a legtökéletesebbet, a kvázi „elsőszülöttet”,

---

[2] “Elsőszülött”, In, *Keresztyén Bibliai Lexikon* I. Budapest, A Magyarországi Református Egyház Kálvin János Kiadója, 1993, 367.old..

[3] Varga Gyöngyi, *Az elsőszülöttség áldása*. Doktori értekezés. Budapest, Evangélikus Hittudományi Egyetem, 2002.

[4] Northrop Frye, *Kettős tükör. A Biblia és az irodalom.* Budapest, Európa, 1996, 311.old. Ld. továbbá: Northrop Frye, „The Question of Primogeniture”, in, Northrop Frye and Jay Macpherson, *Biblical and Classical Myths. The Mythological Framework of Western Culture*, Toronto, Buffalo, London, The University of Toronto Press, 117-126.old.

[5] Frye, i.m., 304.old.

az idősebb testvért kimondhatatlan düh és féltékenység fogja el, amikor az Atya proklamálja és felkeni Krisztust: „Az én fiam vagy! Fiammá fogadtalak ma téged!” (Zsolt 2, 7). Miltonnál:

„E nap teremtettem, kit Egyszülött
Fiamnak nyilvánítok ím e szent
Hegyen fölkenve” (V. 603-605)[6]

Amíg az angyalok tökéletes egyetértésben, tánccal ünneplik a Fiú felkenetését, addig az eredetileg „Fényhozó”

„Sátán nem így virraszt - eképp nevezzük,
Mert régi neve nem csöndül az Égben.
Első főangyalok közül való,
ha épp nem első kegyben, hatalomban,
kiválóságban, mégis telve dühvel
Isten Fia ellen, mióta Atyja
tisztelte és fölkente Messiásnak.
Nem szenvedhette ezt sátáni dölyf,
S magát kisemmizettnek vélte csak.” (V.658-665)[7]

A kiválasztás és elvettetés témája természetesen az Újszövetségben is tovább él. Gondoljunk a két testvér példázatára (Mt 21, 28-32)! Egy embernek két fia volt. Az egyik megígérte, hogy elmegy dolgozni a szőlőbe és mégse megy el, a másik nemet mond apjának és mégis meggondolja magát. Ki teljesítette az Atya akaratát? Felette nagy misztérium rejtőzik e példázatban. De gondolhatunk a Tékozló fiú példázatára (Lk 15, 11-30): az irigy idősebb fiú elvettetésére és a tékozló „bíborba öltöztetésére”.

Meggyőződésem, hogy Júdás (a Jézus szeretetét eltékozló tanítvány) elvettetésének története is ide tartozik. Ady *Júdás és Jézus* címe verse is eszünkbe juthat: „én voltam a lelked, a másod”. Karl Barth, a hatalmasan hömölygő egyházi dogmatikájában ötven apró betűs oldalon (35.§ 4) foglalkozik Júdás-probléma teológiai aspektusaival „Az elvetett determinációja”[8] című alfejezetben, s rámutat, hogy az „elvetett” ember az, aki elszigeteli magát Istentől azáltal, hogy ellenáll annak a kiválasztásának, ami Jézus Krisztusban történt. Júdás nem tudott őszinte bűnbánatot tartani, hiába mondta ki hogy ártatlant árult el, ám mégsem a bűnbocsánat egyedüli forrásához, Jézushoz fordult. Ezért, amint Luther is írja, az Újszövetség csak a horror hangján tud beszélni róla.[9]

Egy érdekes jelenségre lehetünk figyelmesek: vannak párhuzamos korok, amikor különös emberi szeretettel és empátiával fordulnak a tragikusan elvetettek irányába. Irenaeusztól tudjuk, hogy gnosztikusok között voltak az Úr ellenfeleit imádó Káin-, és Ézsau-követők. A reneszánszban jelenik meg először a Luciferrel és Mephisztofelésszel paktumot

---

[6] John Milton, *Elveszett paradicsom*. Budapest, Európa, 1978. 188.old. Jánosy István fordítása. Eredetiben: „This day I have begot whom I declare / My only Son, and on this holy hill / Him have anointed” (John Milton, *Paradise Lost*, Longman, 1971, Ed. Alaister Fowler.

[7] „Satan, so call him now, his former name / Is heard no more in heaven, he of the first, / If not the first archangel, great in power, / In favour and pre-eminence, yet fraught / With envy against the Son of God, taht day / Honoured by his great father, and proclaimed / Messiah king anointed, could not bear / Through pride that sight, and sought himself impaired.”

[8] Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics II.2. The Doctrine of God*, London, New York, T&T International, 2004, 457-506.old.

[9] *The 1529 Holy Week and Easter Sermons of Dr.Martin Luther*. Translated by Irving L.Sandberg. Annotated with an Introduction by Timothy J.Wengert, , Saint Louis Missouri, Concordia Academic Press, 1999. 87.old.

kötő Doktor Faustus hősi alakja. Az irodalomtörténetből tudjuk, hogy a romantika mennyire kedvelte az Isten ellen lázadó Sátán figuráját, Byron 1821-ben Káinról írt drámát. Henry Melville *Moby Dick*-jének főhősét Izmaelnek hívják, s napjainkban pedig megjelenik és hódít a gnosztikus eredetű Júdás-kultusz.

Az Újszövetség testvérkapcsolatait pásztázva szóljunk még Pál apostolról, aki Gal 4,22-ben a rabszolga Hágár ill. Izmael és Sára ill. Izsák kapcsán az idősebb és elvetett, ill. a fiatalabb és kiválasztott testvér ószövetségi mintáját az ó-, és az újszövetség, a szolgaság és a szabadság, azaz a judaizmus és a kereszténység allegoriájaként interpretálja[10]. Nem egészen veszélytelen az a tipologizálás, amely a zsidóságot Hágár és Ismael, a krisztuskövetőket pedig Sára és Izsák lelki utódainak látja.

A bibliai primogenitura dinamikus drámájának megértését a tipologikus látásmód segítheti elő. Az egész Szentírást átjárja, sőt keretezi is az elsőszülöttség: a kiválasztás és az elvettetés. Ádám, az elsőszülött ember engedetlensége miatt veszítette el a paradicsomot, s így valójában ő az, aki az emberfaj történetében elsőként lesz lúzer, az elvetett[11]. Az első Ádám azonban Róm, 5,14 szerint előképe, kiábrázolása tüposza a második Ádámnak, azaz Krisztusnak, aki engedelmességével visszanyeri az emberiségnek a paradicsomot, s az emberen helyreállítja a bűn által eltorzított istenarcot. Itt is ugyanarról van szó mint az Ószövetségben: a másodszülött lesz az elsőszülött. Krisztus immár az „elsőszülött a sok testvér között” (Róm 8,29), feltámadásával ő az „elsőszülött a halottak közül” (Kol 1,18).

Érdemes itt megjegyeznünk, hogy Augustinus kortársa, a donatista Tyconius ekkléziológiailag értelmezi a testvérek rivalizációját: szerinte Ézsau és Jákób anyaméhen belüli küzdelme („duo in uno corpore”) Ábrahám leszármazottainak kettős vonalának képe („Figura est enim duplicis seminis Abrahae”). Az anyaméhben ugyanis szerinte a hamis és az igaz egyház küzdelme zajlik.[12] Augustinus *De Civitate Dei*-jében Káin és Ábel küzdelme (XV.V), ill. Ézsau és Jákób versengése (XVI.XXX) a *civitas diaboli* (ördög országa) és a *civitas dei* (Isten országa) (sőt, - sajnos – a zsidóság és kereszténység, a *synagoga* és az *ecclesia*) versengését is allegorizálja.[13]

A testvér-konfliktus René Girard-féle értelmezéséről, a mimetikus konfliktusról, a másikról mint önmagam tükörképéről, ill. megkettőződéséről, az „ikrek” problémájáról jelen keretek között nem tudok részletesen szólni, a kérdést már részint érintettem a fent említett angol nyelvű tanulmányomban.

II. Testvérrivalizáció Shakespeare-nél – megtérés a gyűlöletből

A következőkben Shakespeare-re fogok rátérni. A testvérkonfliktus mint vezérmotívum mintegy vörös fonalként húzódik végig a shakespeare-i életművön is: ott van a folytonosság kérdését állandóan firtató királydrámákban, a nagy tragédiákban. Például a *Hamlet*-ben, amelyben az imádkozni próbálkozó, de valóságban erre képtelen trónbitorló a „vérnősző barom” Claudius mondja ki magáról, hogy a káini ősbűnt a testvérgyilkosságot követte el, amikor megölte bátyját, az idős Hamletet. Ott van ez a motívum a fattyú Edmund és Edgar konflikusában a *Lear király*ban, vagy a gonosz testvér Antonio által száműzött tudós-uralkodó Prospero, Milánó hercegének történetében *A vihar*-ban. Mindegyiket részletesen elemezhetnénk, azonban előadásom címében megadott témát „A (halálos) testvérgyűlölettől a

[10] Balla Péter, „A rabszolgaság képének páli használata a Hágár-allegoriában”, in, *Lelkipásztor*, 2010/4, 162-168.old. Ford. Gáncs Tamás

[11] Frye, „The Question of Primogeniture”, i.m., 126.old.

[12] Fabiny Tibor, „Tyconius kettős egyházról alkotott elképzelésének ágostoni átvétele és/vagy félreértelmezése”, In, *Tyconius tanulmányok*, Hermeneutikai Füzetek 26. Budapest, Hermeneutikai Kutatóközpont, 2006. 8-9.old.

[13] U.o. és még „Tyconius hermeneutikája és ekkléziológiája”, In, Fehér Bence és Köncöl Miklós (szerk.) *Orpheus búcsúzik. Tanulmányok Sarkady János tiszteletére*. Budapest, Károli Egyetemi Kiadó, 2007.pp.101-116.

(halálos) testvérszeretetig" legszerencsésebben egy romantikus komédia, az *Ahogy tetszik* interpretációjával tudom illusztrálni.

Előrebocsátom: a következőkben nem kívánok komplex-drámaelemzést nyújtani, hanem e komédiának a témánkhoz szorosan kapcsolódó, ám nem lényegtelen szálát kívánom kibontani. Annyit azonban el kell mondani, hogy az *Ahogy tetszik*-et Shakespeare 1599-1600 környékén írta, éppen akkoriban, amikor Londonban a Temze partján megnyílt a Globe színház. A színház mottója „*Totus mundus agit histrionem*" (Az egész világ szerepet játszik) szorosan egybecseng a melankólikus Jaques híres monológjával: „Színház az egész világ" („All the world's a stage"). A vígjáték Shakespeare egyik híres „romantikus komédiája", amelyeket „zöld komédiáknak" is neveznek, hiszen az udvar, a civilizált világ képviselőinek konfliktusa, gyűlölködése miatt az alul maradottak, a jó emberek az erdőbe, a zöld világba menekülnek, ahol a természet és a szerelem gyógyító ereje előbb-utóbb helyreállítja az emberi kapcsolatokat. Igen, mint majdnem minden komédia, az *Ahogy tetszik* is a szerelemről, s annak különféle változatairól szól. Amíg a tragédiák főhősei (és okozói) általában mindig férfiak; a komédiákat a női nem bája, szépsége, életadó varázsa mozgatja. Az *Ahogy tetszik* főhőse is nő: Rosalinda, Shakespeare egyik, hacsak nem *a* legnagyszerűbb, s ha nem lenne elkoptatott szó, bátran mondhatnák legcsodálatosabb teremtménye. Ő maga a szerelem és a színház megtestesítője, tehát maga a nagybetűs élet.

Shakespeare ebben a komédiában különös derűvel éli, játssza és ünnepli a színházat. Rosalinda ugyanis fiúnak, Ganymedesnek öltözik, s amikor az erdőben szerelmével találkozik, nem fedi fel neki kilétét, hanem az ígéri, hogy azt fogja játszani, hogy ő Rosalinda, s bíztatja a szintén az erőben bolyongó Orlandot, csak udvaroljon hevesen neki, majd kigyógyítja őt a szerelem betegségéből. Shakespeare többszörösen is játékosan csavar a nemi szerepeken: tudjuk, hogy színházában férfiak játszották a női alakokat. Tehát egy férfi színész azt játssza, hogy nő (Rosalinda), Rosalinda azt játssza, hogy férfi (Ganymedes), s mint férfi (Ganymedes) pedig azt hogy nő (Rosalinda). Valóban „színház - és szerelem ! – az egész világ". Shakespeare az ardennes-i erdőben a pásztorköltészetből ismert falusi-idilli szerelem szellemét is megidézi, bár ironikus előjelet is ad neki. Különféle, néha komikusan inkongrens, néha a perverzitás határát súroló szerelmeket teremt, éltet és mozgat a színpadán, s a dráma végén Hymen, a házasság pogány istennője nem kevesebb mint négy szerelmespár boldog nászát ünnepli.

Irányítsuk figyelmünket a témánkra, a rivalizáló, gyűlölködő, a gyilkosságig is elmenő férfitestvérekre! Mondanám, hogy a mellékcselekményre, de nem mondhatom, ugyanis a testvérkonfliktus az *Ahogy tetszik*-ben – a shakespeare-i életműben is egyedülálló módon – egyszerre két szinten is jelentkezik. Először is ott van a kerettörténetben: a gonosz Frigyes herceg száműzte testvérbátyját az Idős herceget az udvarból (akárcsak *A vihar* Prosperoját száműzi Antonio Milánóból) , s az Idős herceg most számkivetésben, az ardennes-i erdőben él, de – jó ember lévén - mégsem boldogtalan, s még az erdei Robin Hood élet kedvesebb is számára mint a „festett pompa", „az irigy udvar", hiszen itt nem észlelhetni „Ádám büntetését". Szinte panteisztikus hittel vall a természet isteni erejéről:

„S életünknek, melybe közügy be nem tör,
Nyelve a fák, könyve a gyors patak,
Szónoklata a kő, és szíve minden:
Nekem tetszik itt." (II.1.15-18)[14]

[14] William Shakespeare: *Ahogy tetszik*. Ford. Szabó Lőrinc, Budapest, Európa Könyvkiadó- Magyar Rádió és Televizió, 1980. Angolul: „And this our life, exempt from public haunt, / Finds tongues in trees, books in the running brooks, / Sermons in stones, and good in everything." William Shakespeare, *As You Like* It, Ed. Agnes Latham. The Arden Shakespeare, London and NewYork, Methuen, 1984.

A testvérgyűlölet másik szála az Arany Jánoson nevelkedett magyar olvasóknak egészen ismerősnek tűnhet. Olivéről és Orlandoról van szó, akik nem véletlenül emlékeztetnek bennünket Toldi György és Toldi Miklós jól ismert konfliktusára. Megjegyezzük: a gonosz testvér megnevezésében Shakespeare nem részrehajló az idősebb javára vagy kárára. Amíg a kerettörténetben a Frigyes, a fiatalabbik testvér a gonosz; az Oliver és az Orlando testvérkapcsolatban (akárcsak a Toldiban) az idősebbik testvér nyomja el gonosz módon a fiatalabbikat. A hasonlóság, sőt egybeesés jelenségére a két mű geneológiájában találjuk meg a magyarázatot. Shakespeare közvetlen forrása Thomas Lodge 1590-ben megjelent próza-románca: *Rosaylinde. Eupheus Golden Legacie*. Arany Toldijának közvetlen forrása Ilosvai Selymes Péter (1520k-1580k) *Az híres neves Tholdi Miklósnak jeles cselekedeteiről és bajnokoskodásáról való historia*, amely Debrecenben jelent meg 1574-ben. Fest Sándornak a Toldi-mondáról szóló kutatásaiból tudjuk, hogy Ilosvainak ugyanaz volt a forrása mint a Thomas Lodge Rosalyndajának: a Chaucer-kéziratokból ismert 15. századi középangol költemény, a *The Tale of Gamelyn*. Tehát ez a mesés történet a Shakespeare-komédia és Arany költeményének a közös „nagypapája”. Fest Sándor csokorba szedi azokat a motívumokat, amelyek megegyeznek a középangol mese főhőse (Gamelyn) és az ifjú Toldi Miklós (és – tegyük hozzá azonnal: Orlando) között. 1. Az idősebb testvér (Tholdi György, Oliver) elnyomja a kisebbiket, 2. Véletlenül megölik bátyjuk szolgáját; 3. Hűséges öreg szolga kíséri útján a hőst (Aranynál: Bence, Shakespeare-nél Ádám); 4. A párviadal motívuma; 5. Királyi jutalom.[15] A testvérrivalizáció témája tehát a *The Tale of Gamelyn*-ből származik, ám Rosalynde alakját és az erdei kalandtörténetet Thomas Lodge találta ki. Nála a száműzött herceget Gerismondnak, s a Rosalynde beleszerető kisebb testvért Rosadernek hívják. Sir John of Bordeaux három fia (Saladyne, Fernandyne és Rosader) megfelelnek az *Ahogy tetszik*-ben említett Sir Roland de Bois három fiának (Oliver, Jakab, Orlando), s mindkét műben a középső fiú csak a történet legvégén bukkan fel.[16]

Shakespeare komédiája a kisebbik fiú, Orlandonak, s az őt elnyomó bátyj Oliver erőszakba torkolló konfliktusával kezdődik:

> „A törvény kedvezményekben részesít velem szemben, mert elsőszülött vagy; de ez a szokásjog nem foszt meg a véremtől…épp annyi van bennem atyámból: noha elismerem, hogy mint öregebb, közelebb vagy a rangjához.” (I.1.45-50)[17] Orlando panasza: „Atyám meghagyta a végrendeletében, hogy jó nevelést adj; te parasztnak neveltél, dugva, rejtve tőlem, mindent, ami úriemberi tudás. Atyám lelke kitör belőlem, és nem tűröm tovább ezt az állapotot.” (I.1,66-71)[18]

Oliver jellemére azonnal fényt vet, amikor a hűsége szolgát, az öreg Ádámot egyszerűen „vén eb”-nek („old dog”) nevezi.

A következőkben Olivér és a birkózó Charles párbeszédének vagyunk a tanúi. Amikor az udvar hivatalos birkózója feltárja, hogy suba alatt megtudta, hogy Orlando készül fellépni

---

[15] Fest Sándor, „A Toldi-monda”, in, *Budapesti Szemle*, 1938 (248.évf.), 305-337.old. Reprint kiadása in, Fest Sándor, *Skóciai Szent Margittól a Walesi Bárdokig. Magyar-angol történeti kapcsolatok. Anglo-Hungarian Historical and Literary Contacts*, Szerk. Czigány Lóránt és Korompay H. János, Budapest, Universitas Könyvkiadó, 2000. 187-209.old.

[16] Kenneth Muir, *Shakespeare's Sources I. Comedies and Tragedies*, London, Methuen, 1957,

[17] „The courtesy of all nations allows you my better, int hat you are the first born, but the same tradition takes not away my blood, were there twenty brothers betwixt us. I have as much of my father in me as you, albeit I confess your coming before me is nearer to his reverence.”

[18] „My father charged you in his will to give me good education: you have trained me like a peasant, obscuring and hiding me all gentleman-like qualities. He spirit of my father grows in me, and I will no longer endure it.”

ellene, aki „fiatal és gyengécske" s ezért Olivért arra kéri, térítse el fivérét, máskülönben vállalnia kell a megszégyenülést. A hazug és képmutatóan „testvérileg" („brotherly") módon beszélő Oliver erre azt válaszolja, hogy öccse „tele van becsvággyal, irigysége kikezdi mindenkinek az érdemét, alattomos és aljas cselekedet szól ellenem édestestvére ellen"[19] , s azt tanácsolja, hogy Charles ne kímélje őt. A birkózó Charles-ot tehát káini gyilkos céljainak eszközeként akarja felhasználni. Amikor Charles távozik Oliver így szól magában"

> „Most pedig felbizgatom a dali ifjút: remélem, megérem a végét; mert a lelkem, nem tudom, miért, semmit se gyűlöl úgy, mint őt. Pedig szelíd; iskolázatlan és mégis művelt; tele van neme törekvéssel, mindenki bűvölten rajong érte: valósággal bevette magát az embereknek, különösen az én házam népének a szívébe, amely engem legjobban ismeri, úgyhogy engem mindenki megvet: de hát ez nem tart soká; a díjbirkózó rendbe hoz mindent…" (I, 1, 162-169)[20]

A nagy birkózás azonban másképpen alakul. Az udvar színe-java s a bátor Orlandot Herkules oltalmába ajánló Rosalinda és a szintén neki drukkoló Célia előtt azonban másképp alakul, amint amire számítottak. Orlando úgy földre teperi Charles-t, hogy az nyekkeni sem tud. Orlando Charles-ot győzte le, őt magát pedig a szerelem. De amikor Frigyes megtudja, hogy Sir Roland, a győztes ifjú apja az Idős herceg embere volt, nincs maradása az udvarban. Megtudja még, hogy akibe beleszeretett a száműzött herceg leánya.

Frigyest hatalmába keríti a céltalan, s végső soron önpusztító gyűlölet: Rosalindát is száműzi, mert azt gondolja, hogy erénye és népszerűsége az udvarnál elhomályosítják saját leánya fényeit. Rosalinda és Celia kölcsönös szeretete és egymáshoz való hűséges ragaszkodása jól ellenpontozza a férfitársadalomban kialakult testvérgyűlöletet. „Két igazi testvér / Nem szereti úgy egymást, ahogy ők" (I.2.265-266)[21]- mondják róluk. Célia is így jellemzi kettejük kapcsolatát:

> „Együtt ébredtünk. Mulattunk, tanultunk,
> S mint Juno hattyui, bárhova mentünk,
> Egyek voltunk, választhatatlanok." (I.3.69-72)[22]

Jóban rosszban is egymással maradnak: Rosalinda férfiruhába, Célia pásztorlánynak öltözve az okosan szellemes bolond Próbakő társaságában elindulnak az ardennes-i erdőbe, s kezdetét veszi a komédia.

Orlando viszont a hűséges Ádámtól értesült, hogy a sikerei miatt a dühtől és irigységtől még inkább tomboló Olivér fel akarja gyújtani a házat, amelyben alszik, s ha ez nem sikerül, más tervei is vannak, hogy végezzen vele. „[M]észárszék ez a ház" (II. 3.26)[23] - mondja neki az öreg. Ők is menekülnek tehát – az ardennes-i erdőbe. Orlando nemeslelkűségére vall, hogy a fáradságtól és az éhségtől már majdnem halálán lévő Ádámban tartja lelket, s a testét pedig magára veszi, s amikor ő is kiéhezve az Idős hercegbe és

---

[19] „full of ambition, an envious emulator of every man's good parts, a secret and villanous contriver against me his natural brother." (I.1.141-143)

[20] "Now I will stir this gamester. I hope I shall see an end of him, for my soul – yet I know not why – hates nothing more than he. Yet he's gentle, never schooled and yet learned, full of noble device, of all sorts enchantingly beloved, and indeed so much in the heart of the world, and especially of my own people, who best I know him, that I am altogether misprised. But t shall not be so long, this wrestler shall clear it."

[21] „whose loves / Are dearer than the natural bond of sisters".

[22] „We still have slept together, / Rose at an instant, learn's play'd, eat together, / And whereso'er we went, like Juno's swans, / Still we went coupled and inseparable."

[23] „this house is but a butchery"

emberibe botlik, addig nem vesz magához táplálékot, amíg öreg társáról nem gondoskodik. Az ő sorsukat mélyen érti az Idősebb herceg, hogy

> „A nagy és egyetemes színpadon
> Búsabb darab is fut, mint amilyenben
> Mi játszunk." (II.7.136-139)[24]

Válaszként mondja el a melankólikus Jaques nagy monológot: „Színház az egész világ". S ami ezzel a cselekmény eljutott a tragikus mélypontra, ami ezek után következik az már valódi színház, mélységből fokozatosan kikácmálódó komédia: szerelem és szerep, szerep és szerelem; a szerelem szerepe és a szerep szerelme. S Rosalinda nemcsak szerepet játszik, hanem ő a nagy rendező, sőt az egész darabot is már ő írja tovább. Minden szépen halad egy boldog kifejlet felé.

De talán mégsem ennyire egyszerű. És mi van a gonoszokkal: Frigyessel és Olivérrel? Szövetkeznek vagy egymás ellen fordulnak? A III. felvonás elején egy pillanatra találkoznak, s Frigyes kilátásba helyezi, ha Olivér nem találja meg öccsét, bosszúja ellene fordul. Hiába mondja neki Olivér „Sose szerettem az öcsémet." (III.1.14)[25], Frigyes megvetéssel taszítja el őt magától: „Úgy hát / Még gazabb vagy." (III.1.16)[26]

S ők most egy hosszú időre eltűnnek a szemünk elől, mert eközben az erdőben zeng az ének, Ámor nyilai röpködnek s szerelmek születnek a legkülönbözőbb és legváratlanabb kiadásokban. Sylvius a pásztorfiú szerelmes az
őt kegyetlenül dobó Phoebe-be, aki viszont – bizonyára Freud nagy megelégedésére - a fiúnak álcázott Rosalinda iránt lobban szerelemre. A kifinomult udvari műveltséget sziporkázó Próbakő pedig Juciba, a tenyeres talpas parasztlányba szerelmes, s csak azért sóhajtozik, hogy „bár több poézist dugtak volna beléd az istenek" (III.3.13)[27] Orlando pedig játssza a Ganymede/Rosalinda által neki kiszabott szerepet: jár „udvarolni", mert úgy gondolja, egy ál-Rosalindának vall szerelmet, miközben Rosalinda eközben élvezettel , s a játéktól önfeledten habzsolja szerelmének bókjait. Orlando búcsúzik és esküvel ígéri, hogy két óra múlva visszatér.

Már csak egy személy van pártában: Célia. Nem sokáig. S most következik az a jelenet, aminek kedvéért „A (halálos) testvérgyűlölettől a (halálos) testvérszeretetig" című előadásra vállalkoztam. Rosalinda és Célia Orlandot várják, de helyette más érkezik: Olivér.

Méghozzá egy véres kendővel. S ekkor Olivér elmeséli, hogy Orlando miközben az erdőn át bolyongott egy tölgy alatt egy torzonborz alvó embert pillantott meg. Nyakára éppen egy kígyó tekeredett, ám az idegen érkeztével cikázott vissza a bokorba. Ott viszont egy nőstény oroszlán hevert, amely az alvó moccanására várt. S amikor Orlando közelhajolt hozzá, megpillantotta, hogy testvérbátyja az. Célia Orlando elbeszéléséből emlékszik, hogy e testvérbáty „a legelvetemültebb / Testvér a földön" (IV. 3.122-123)[28]. Rosalinda kérdésre, hogy otthagyta-e az embert az éhes fenevadnak Olivér így válaszolt:

> „Kétszer is elfordult, hogy veszni hagyja;
> De a jóság nemesebb, mint a bosszú,
> S a kísértésnél erősebb a vér:
> Birokra kelt az oroszlánnal és

---

[24] „This wide and universal theatre / Present more woeful pageants than the scene / Wherein we play in."
[25] „I never lov'd my brother in my life."
[26] „More villain thou."
[27] „I would the gods had made thee poetical."
[28] „The most unnatural / That liv'd amongst men."

Csakhamar leterítette." (IV.3.217-131)[29]

És ekkor az elbeszélő az egyes szám harmadik személyből átvált az elsőre:

OLIVÉR

„….A zajra

Ébredtem föl nyomorult szenderemből.

CÉLIA

Te vagy a bátyja?

ROSALINDA Akit a haláltól-?

CÉLIA

S aki annyiszor meg akartad ölni?

OLIVÉR

Az voltam; de már nem vagyok, nem is fáj

Bevallani, mi voltam: oly édes a megértés és ami most vagyok.

ROSALINDA

S a véres zsebkendő?

OLIVÉR Egy pillanat. –

Mikor elmondtunk mindent, hogy mi történt,

S könnyekben fürödtek szavaink,

Hogy például hogy jöttem e vadonba –

Ő, végül a herceghez vezetett,

Aki más ruhát és ételt adott,

És rábízott öcsém szeretetére.

Orlando rögtön barlangjába vitt,

S levetkezett; ugyanis itt, a karján,

Az oroszlán feltépte a húsát, mely

Mindeddig vérzett, ő ekkor eléjult

S ájultában téged szólongatott." (IV. 3. 132-156)[30]

A tekintélye méretű Shakespeare-szakirodalomban viszonylag kevesen[31] mutattak rá, hogy Orlando itt már nemcsak a mitikus Herkules, hanem a tipikus Krisztus, azaz Krisztus típusa is. Mert ki az akit az őt lihegve üldözőkért, a bűnösökért a gonosz, démoni erőkkel is birokra hajlani kész? Ki az az igaz ember, aki – amint a zsoltáros mondja - „Oroszlánon és

---

[29] „Twice did he turn his back, and purpos'd so. / But kindness, nobler ever than revenge, / And nature, stronger than his just occasion, / made him give battle to the lioness, / Who quickly fell before him."

[30] From miserable slumber I awaked. / **CELIA** / Are you his brother? / **ROSALIND** / Wast you he rescued? / **CELIA** /Was't you that did so oft contrive to kill him? / **OLIVER** / 'Twas I; but 'tis not I I do not shame / To tell you what I was, since my conversion / So sweetly tastes, being the thing I am. / **ROSALIND** / But, for the bloody napkin? / **OLIVER** / By and by. / When from the first to last betwixt us two / Tears our recountments had most kindly bathed, / As how I came into that desert place:-- / In brief, he led me to the gentle duke, Who gave me fresh array and entertainment, / Committing me unto my brother's love; / Who led me instantly unto his cave, / There stripp'd himself, and here upon his arm / The lioness had torn some flesh away, Which all this while had bled; and now he fainted / And cried, in fainting, upon Rosalind.

[31] Például Richard Knowles: „Myth and Type in As You Like It" , *ELH* 33 (1966), 1-22., Marsha S. Robinson, „The Earthly City Redeemed: The Reconcilaiton of Cain and Abel in As You Like It", In Batson, Beatrice (ed.), *Reconcilation in Selected Shakespearean Dramas.* Newcastle, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2008. 157-174.

áspiskígyón jársz, megtaposod az oroszlánkölyköt és a sárkányt" (Zsolt 91,13)[32]? Csak a *Christus Victor* az, aki harcol, küzd érettünk, ellenségeiért, s akinél „ a jóság nemesebb, mint a bosszú, S a kísértésnél erősebb a vér". Ő az aki bár győztes e küzdelemben, „az oroszlán mégis feltépi húsát" amint azt a protoevangélum megjövendölte: „Ellenségeskedést támasztok közted és az asszony közt: a te utódod és az ő utódja közt: ő a fejedet tapossa, te meg a sarkát mardosod." (1Móz 3,15). Bár a végső győzelem a Victoré, a kivívott győzelemért a győztes vére folyt. A „véres zsebkendő"-nek ebben az összefüggésben van emblematikus jelentősége.

És ezen a ponton válik nyilvánvalóvá Krisztus halálának értelme. Nem azért adta magát halálra Krisztus, hogy a haragvó Atyát kiengesztelje irántunk (az ember iránt az Istent kiengesztelni nem kell, hiszen szeret, a bűn iránt viszont nem lehet, mert szentsége a bűnnel összeférhetetlen). Véghelyi Antal helyesen mutatott rá, hogy Krisztus áldozata miatt nem Istennek kell megváltoznia az ember iránt, hanem a bűnösnek az Isten iránt: „Krisztus haláláért, de azt nem önmagában nézve, hanem a bennünk véghezvitt művéért engesztelődik ki irántuk Isten és csillapul le bűneink miatti haragja."[33]

Aki nem tompa az isteni kegyelemre, ha megérinti őt a megváltás misztériuma, akkor üldözőből követő lesz, azaz megtér. Ez történt a testvére haláláért Káinként lihegő Olivér életében is. Az (embertől származó) halálos testvérgyűlölet az (Istentől, ill. Krisztustól származó) halálos testvérszeretetet ha megérinti a bűnöst, akkor élete száznyolcvan fokos irányváltást vesz. Vajta Vilmos mutat rá Anders Nygren (1890-1978) svéd teológus világhíres könyve, az *Eros és agapé* alapján, hogy „az egyik legmegragadóbb pont Nygrennek az a gondolata, hogy Isten nem a szentség, hanem a bűn bázisán hozza létre a vele való szövetséget. Így az agapét ténylegesen 'halálos' szeretetként lehet, illetve kell jellemezni, hiszen Róm 6,10-ben az apostol az odaadást, az áldozatra vonatkozó képpel juttatja kifejezésre. Vagyis a szeretet legteljesebb mértékben Isten áldozatában, a kereszten valósul meg."[34]

Mert mi is a „megtérés" (Olivér az eredetiben is a „conversion" szót használja)? Olivér találó megfogalmazásában: „Az voltam; de már nem vagyok", az eredetiben ('Twas I; but 'tis not I"). A közelmúltban megjelent *Irányváltás. Humán értelmiségiek megtérése* című kötetben az egyik tanúságtevő is ugyanezekkel a szavakkal írja le megtérése lényegét: „ma nem az vagyok, aki egykor voltam. Egy irányra voltam beállítódva…de irányultságom megfordult, amit akkor izgalmasnak láttam, ma már nem értékes, s amit akkor lenéztem, ma számomra a legdrágább cél."[35]

És ekkor a darabban megtörténik a csoda: a szerelem nyilaitól mindezidáig megóvott Célia és Olivér ugyanúgy első látásra egymásba szeretnek mint a darab elején Orlando és Rosalinda. Igen nagy üzenete van ennek a történetnek: amíg önmagunk körül forgunk, s a gyűlölet hajt bennünket, addig alkalmatlanok vagyunk a szerelemre, s ilyenkor legfeljebb az eros hajt bennünket. Ám ha megtérünk, ha megtapasztaltuk az agapé, a halálos szeretet miben létét, akkor készen állhatunk az igazi szerelemre, mert ilyenkor nem nekünk kell futkosni a másik után, hanem Istentől ajándékba kapjuk azt, akit ő nekünk legjobbnak talál.

És mi lesz a testvérgyűlölő gonosz Frigyes herceggel? Shakespeare ezt a szálat is elvarrja, igaz, rövidebben, kevésbé kidolgozottan, mint Olivérét. A dráma végén megjelenik középső testvér, De Bois Jakab, aki arról számol be, hogy bár Frigyes „célja az volt, / Hogy

---

[32] Erre a bibliai utalásra Marsha S.Robinson a fent említett tanulmányában hívja fel a figyelmet. *Op.cit*, 167.

[33] Véghelyi Antal, „Krisztus halálának értelme", in, Béres Tamás – Kodácsy-Simon Eszter (szerk.), *Krisztusra tekintve hittel és reménnyel. Ünnepi kötet Reuss András 70. születésnapjára*, Budapest, Luther Kiadó, 2008, 141-156.old.

[34] Fabiny Tibor, „Vajta Vilmos teológiája", in, *Szótörténések. Hermeneutikai, teológiai és irodalomtudományi tanulmányok*. Budapest, Luther Kiadó, 2009. 315.old.

[35] In, Fabiny Tibor- Tóth Sára (szerk.), *Irányváltás. Humán értelmiségiek megtérése*. Budapest, Luther Kiadó, Hermeneutikai Kutatóközpont, 2009, 119.old.

bátyját elfogja és megölje. E vad erdő szélén azonban egy / Öreg remetével találkozott, / Aki néhány szóval eltérítette / Szándékától és a földi világtól: Trónját számkivetett bátyjára hagyta / És visszaadta minden vagyonát / A számkivetetteknek.” (V. 5.156-163)[36] A remete hatására tehát Frigyes is megtér, s talán az sem véletlen, hogy egyedül a melankólikus Jaques nem tér vissza az udvarba az Idős herceg társaságában, s ő inkább a megtért Frigyest választja, mondván: „az újhitüektől / Sok mindent lehet hallani, tanulni”. (V.4.183-184)[37]

Ez tehát az *Ahogy tetszik* kétszintes testvérrivalizációja, amelyet a komédia parabolikus szubtextusaként értelmeztünk. Természetesen az egész drámát nem foghatjuk fel keresztény allegóriaként, ám a komplex komikus cselekménybe Shakespeare finoman, sokak számára észrevétlenül, szőtte be ezt - a krisztushit szemüvegén keresztül érzékelhető és értelmezhető - fonalat.

Befejezésként már csak egy mondat kívánkozik ide. A dráma végén Rosalinda, a nagy művész és rendező, az élet nagy színpadán felvonultatja a négy szerelmes párt. Orlandot és önmagát, Olivért és Céliát; Sylviust és Phoebet, Próbakőt és Jucit. És ekkor Hymen, a házasság római istennője áldást mond…

„Az Ég is akkor boldog,
Midőn a földi dolgok
Jó véget érnek” (V. 4.108-110)[38]

Az angol eredetiben az „atone together” kifejezést olvassuk, amit az angol nyelv a bibliafordító William Tyndale-nek köszönhet. Az atonement, azaz „at-one-ment” kifejezést Tyndale 2 Kor 5, 18-21 fordításakor alkalmazta, ezzel adta vissza a görög *katallagé* igét: Isten Jézus Krisztusban békéltette meg, azaz forrasztotta ismét eggyé” önmagával a tőle a bűneset óta elszakadt világot, azáltal, hogy az embert önmagával a keresztfa oltárán „lecserélte”. Az Egyszülöttét bűnné, átokká tette érettem és helyettem, s ezért nekünk is adta a békéltetés szolgálatát. Az “at onement” két szóból származik, s ez a két fél eggyé válását fejezi ki. Feltételezi hogy e két fél korábban elidegenedett egymástól, a megbékélés révén ismét harmóniába kerülnek.

Az „atonement”, a rekonciliáció, megbékélés (Cserháti Sándor szerint: „kibékélés”[39]) Isten és a bűnös ember megromlott kapcsolatának helyrehozására, valamint a valamint testvérét gyűlölő ember gyógyítására vonatkozik. Ha az első földi bűn a halálos testvérgyűlölet volt, akkor ezt csakis az önmagát halálra adó tökéletes isteni szeretet teheti jóvá. A halálosan tökéletes isteni szeretet, a krisztusi agapé tudja egyedül testvérgyűlöletet testvérszeretetté alakítani. Ez az önmagát halálra adó isteni szeretet, - hitünk értelmében a kereszt - az egyedüli reménység, az egyedüli gyógyulás az emberi nemzetség halálos betegségére.

---

[36] “Duke Frederick…./ In his conduct, purposely to take / His brother here, and put him to the sword. / And to the skirts of this wild wood he came, / Where, meeting with an old religious man, / After some question with him, was converted / Both from his enterprise and from the world, / His crown bequeathing to his banish’d brother, / And all their lands restor’d to them again / That were with him exil’d.”

[37] “Out of these convertites, There is much matter to be heard and learn’d.”. Az Arden kiadás szerkesztője hozzáteszi, hogy V. Károly 1555-ös lemondása után kolostorba vonult.

[38] „Then is there mirth in heaven, / When earthly things made even / Atone together.”

[39] Cserháti Sándor, *Pál apostolnak a korinthusiaktól írt második levele*, Budapest, Luther Kiadó, 2009., 200-209.old.

EMLÉK-KONFERENCIA

Shakespeare 400
Szabadtéri Játékok 85

Konferenciakötet III.

A NEMZETI KULTURÁLIS ALAP TÁMOGATÁSÁVAL
SZEGEDI SZABADTÉRI JÁTÉKOK, 2016

EMLÉKKONFERENCIA

Shakespeare 400

Szabadtéri Játékok 85

Tudományos konferencia

Shakespeare emléke előtt tisztelegve halálának 400. évfordulóján, egyben megemlékezve a Szegedi Szabadtéri Játékok születésének 85. évfordulójáról

Szerkesztette:

Herczeg Tamás

SZEGED, 2016.

Szegedi Szabadtéri Játékok, 2016.
© Szegedi Szabadtéri Játékok
Minden jog fenntartva

Lektorálás, szerkesztés:
Ferwagner Péter Ákos, Jóni Gábor

nka

Ez a kötet ingyenesen jutott el a könyvtárba
a **Nemzeti Kulturális Alap** könyvtámogatási programja keretében.
2016

Felelős kiadó: A Szegedi Szabadtéri Játékok ügyvezető igazgatója
Tipográfia és nyomdai kivitelezés: Armadillo Kreatív Ügynökség
A kiadás éve: 2016.

Matuska Ágnes

„TOTUS MUNDUS....": A színház-metafora középkori és reneszánsz elemei Shakespeare drámáiban

A dolgozatom címében szereplő idézet, amely szerint „Totus mundus agit histrionem" – azaz az elterjedt magyar változatban „Színház az egész világ" –, a mai közönség számára annyira szorosan kapcsolódik Shakespeare-hez, hogy szinte a shakespeare-i színjátszás mottójaként tartjuk számon, attól függetlenül, hogy éppen van-e tudomásunk arról, hogy az idézett mottó latin változata a hagyomány szerint Shakespeare színházának, a Globe-nak volt a jelmondata.

A mottó másik, széles körben ismert shakespeare-i forrása természetesen a melankólikus Jacques monológja az *Ahogy tetszik*ből. A színházat a világgal, azaz a világot a színházzal azonosító retorikai alakzat, a színház-metafora elsődleges asszociációi során – különösen Shakespeare-rel kapcsolatban – leginkább a színház, a játék univerzális dicsőítésének képei merülnek fel. Ez az értelmezés manapság annyira elfogadott, hogy esetenként automatikus értelmezésként vetül rá az alakzat szövegszerű megjelenésére, annak ellenére, hogy a vonatkozó szöveghely esetleg nem egy ilyen értelmet, és semmiképpen sem ennyire pozitív jelentést sugall. Shakespeare drámáinak egyik legismertebb kritikai kiadása, az Arden harmadik sorozatában például az *Ahogy tetszik* vonatkozó monológját magyarázó lábjegyzet szerint Jacques „Színház az egész világ" kezdetű beszéde áttételesen a színházat ünnepli, és olvasható úgy is, mint a színház védelmében elhangzó érv a színházat támadó korabeli színházellenes vitában.[4] Míg ez az elgondolás valóban összhangban van azzal a közkeletű nézettel, amely egy ilyen ünnepélyes évforduló alkalmával még inkább felerősödik, nevezetesen hogy Shakespeare-nél a színház-metafora nyilvánvalóan az intézmény univerzális jelentőségét ünnepli, a szövegben nehéz olyan elemet találni, amely valóban ezt az értelmezést támasztaná alá. Jacques monológja, csakúgy, mint maga a szereplő, meglehetősen melankolikus, és az életet meghatározó szerepjátékot leginkább valamiféle sajnálatos börtönszerű kötöttségnek tartja, semmint felszabadítóan játékos lehetőségnek. Az ember végigjátssza az élet hét felvonását, a hét kor szerepeit a kisdedtől a nebulón, a szerelmes ifjún, a katonán, a tiszteletre méltó bírón keresztül az öregemberig, amikor má-

4 William Shakespeare, *As You Like It*. Juliet Dusinberre (szerk.) The Arden Shakespeare (third series), 2006, 227 (140-67. sorokra vonatkozó lábjegyzet).

sodik csecsemőkorát élve, fogatlanul, csak a „teljes feledés" marad számára. Nehéz feladata van az értelmezőnek, ha a szerepjátékról, a világról mint univerzális színházról alkotott efféle képben a színházat dicsőítő érveket keres. Az élet színház, és pontosan ez az elkeserítő. Az ember legfeljebb azzal vigasztalhatja magát, hogy van, akinek nálánál még búsabb szerep jut – ezt teszi az idősebb herceg, közvetlenül Jacques idézett monológja előtt, amikor így szól (Szabó Lőrinc fordításában):

„Lásd, kívülünk is van boldogtalan:
A nagy és egyetemes színpadon
Búsabb darab is fut, mint amilyenben
Mi játszunk".[5]

A színház-metaforának a bús, evilági életet modelláló változata valójában azt a magyarázatát adja a képnek, amely Shakespeare korában a legelterjedtebb értelmezése volt, és az evilági élet tünékenységére, az isteni örökkévalósággal szembeni hiúságára utalt.[6] Az emberi élet illuzórikus, ezért olyan, mint egy színház: múlékony és valóság nélküli. Ha megnézzük a metaforára történő szövegszerű utalásokat Shakespeare más drámáiban, nem kevésbé negatív hangulatú kép rajzolódik ki előttünk az életről, mint a színpaddal, színházzal, szerepjátékkal azonosítható kontextusról.

*A velencei kalmár*ban például Antonio szól a következőképpen (Vas István fordításában):

„A világ nekem nem több mint világ,
Színpad, melyen eljátsszuk szerepünket
S én búsat játszom".[7]

Ha éppenséggel vidám szerep jutott volna Antoniónak, szavai alapján azt gondolhatjuk, hogy a világ általános hiúságnak kontextusában azt sem venné komolyabban. A nagy tragédiák közül kettőben is rendkívül borús képet fest a világról

5 *Ahogy tetszik* (II.7.) *Shakespeare összes drámái. II. Vígjátékok.* Fordította: Szabó Lőrinc. Európa Könyvkiadó, Bp. 1988. p. 730.

6 Ezt a nézetet vallja az alakzatról írt monográfiájában Lynda Christian, aki a metafora történetét a nyugati gondolkodásban az ógörög kezdetektől a 16. század első feléig kíséri végig. Lynda Christian, *Theatrum Mundi: The History of an Idea.* New York, London, Garland Publishing, 1987.

7 *A velencei kalmár* (I.1.) *Shakespeare összes drámái. IV. Színművek.* Fordította: Vas István. Európa Könyvkiadó, Bp. 1988. p. 11.

a színpadiassága, színházzal való hasonlósága. A tébolyult Lear kiált fel így a negyedik felvonásban (Vörösmarty Mihály fordításában):

„Születésünkkor sírunk, hogy a bolondok
E roppant színpadára feljövünk".[8]

Az élet mint színpad: egy siralomvölgy, s akik megszületnek és játszanak rajta, bolondok. Nem kevésbé tragikus a kép a *Macbeth*ben sem, ahol szintén a címszereplő hozza összefüggésbe az életet a színházi kontextussal, és ezúttal nem a színházzal, hanem a rossz színésszel azonosítja, a cselekménynek azok a pontján, ahol a legutóbbi hír a Lady halála volt, a következő pedig az lesz, hogy beteljesül a rettegett jóslat: útban van felé a birnami erdő (Szabó Lőrinc szavaival):

„Az élet csak egy tűnő árny, csak egy
Szegény ripacs (az angolban *poor player* – egy rossz színész), *aki egy óra hosszat*
Dúl-fúl, és elnémul".[9]

A metafora áttételesen megengedné a nem ripacskodó, és nem csupán tűnő árnyként létező, hanem éppenséggel akár nagyszerű teljesítményt nyújtó színész lehetőségét, hiszen hangsúlyozza, hogy *rossz* színészhez hasonlít az élet, ám az ítélet tartalmán ez nem sokat segít. Nézhetnénk további példákat is,[10] de a negatív tendencia az eddigiek alapján is kirajzolódik. Mindez ugyanakkor nem azt jelenti, hogy a Theatrum Mundi alakzat pozitív értelme idegen lett volna Shakespeare korában, csupán arról van szó, hogy mint retorikai formula, valóban a korban domináns *vanitas* értelemben volt használatos,[11] és a drámákban a szövegszerű megjelenés a metafora részben sztoikus hagyományra támaszkodó középkori, keresztény értelmezését követi. Másszóval: ha a „színház az egész világ" mottó alatt azt értjük, hogy a színház

8 *Lear király* (IV.6.) *Shakespeare összes drámái. III. Tragédiák.* Fordította: Vörösmarty Mihály. Európa Könyvkiadó, Bp. 1988. p. 715.

9 *Macbeth* (V.5.) *Shakespeare összes drámái. III. Tragédiák.* Fordította: Szabó Lőrinc. Európa Könyvkiadó, Bp. 1988. p. 827.

10 Ezekről részletesebben Fabiny Tibor vonatkozó tanulmányában olvashatunk: Fabiny Tibor, Theatrum Mundi and the Ages of Man, In: Fabiny Tibor (szerk.), *Shakespeare and the Emblem.* Szeged: JATE BTK, 1984. p. 273-336.

11 Ennek Szőnyi György Endre fordításában magyarul is olvasható, szép kortárs példája a színház-metafora Sir Walter Raleigh által versben kifejtett változata. Szőnyi György Endre: *Mi életünk?* Helikon, 1982/1. p. 96-104.

az univerzum teljességének, az isteni világmindenség alapvető működésének eszszenciája, akkor nem a retorikai alakzat korabeli értelmére támaszkodunk.

Honnan származik azonban az ezzel szembenálló, látszólag téves értelmezés, és mennyiben tartható félreértésnek?

A színház-metafora pozitív interpretációinak hagyománya sokrétű. Shakespeare kapcsán megemlítendő, hogy a drámaíró, mint teremtő géniusz alakja elsősorban a romantikusoktól hagyományozódott ránk: Shakespeare, aki isteni ihletettségében hoz létre világokat. Victor Hugo például így fogalmaz: „Isten után legtöbbet Shakespeare teremtett"[12] – itt a drámai játék, a színház által létrehozott világ nyilvánvalóan nem az evilági hívságokhoz hasonlítandó illuzórikus voltában, hanem invenciójának nagyszerűségében a kozmikus világmindenség csodájához mérhető. Az sem tűnik életszerűnek, hogy Shakespeare Globe-jának feltételezett mottója, a „Totus mundus agit histrionem," amely szerint mindenki, az egész világ színészkedik, az intézmény elítélendő jellegét hirdette volna, és ezzel a korabeli színházellenesek malmára hajtotta a vizet.[13]

Ezekhez a példákhoz képest azonban sokkal konkrétabban rajzolódik meg a csodálatos, ünneplendő, esetleg a hétköznapi valósághoz képest egy igazabb valóságot megteremtő játék képe magukban a drámákban, nem a szoros értelemben vett színház-metaforában, de szintén a színpadi és a színpadon kívüli játék viszonyát modelláló eszközben, a metadrámában, többek között a drámán belüli drámákban.[14] Gondoljunk például a *Szentivánéji álom*ra, ahol a tündérvilág-színház allegória révén az utóbbinak a hétköznapi valóságot irányítani képes teremtőerőt kell tulajdonítanunk.[15] De maradhatunk akár az *Ahogy tetszik* példájánál, ahol Jacques kesergésével szemben Rozalinda a szerepjátékban nem bezártságot lát, inkább megvalósítja a benne rej-

12 Idézi Howard Felperin, *Shakespearean Representation: Mimesis and Modernity in Elizabethan Tragedy*. Princeton University Press, 1977. p. 87.

13 Elgondolkodtató, hogy a mottó meglétére nincs hitelt érdemlő történelmi bizonyíték. Tény azonban, hogy ennek ellenére a hagyomány így tartja évszázadok óta, ami szintén azt az értelmezést tükrözi, amely szerint Shakespeare intézménye, illetve potenciálisan a színház általában, univerzális érvényű bölcsességek és igazságok letéteményese. Tiffany Stern, Was *Totus Mundus Agit Histrionem* ever the motto of the Globe Theatre? *Theatre Notebook*, 1997/ 3, p. 122-127, valamint Richard Dutton: *Hamlet, An Apology for Actors*, and the Sign of the Globe. *Shakespeare Survey*, 1989/41, p. 35-43.

14 A Theatrum Mundi metafora, a metadráma és a drámán belüli dráma viszonyáról lásd: William Egginton, *How the World Became a Stage: Presence, Theatricality, and the Question of Modernity*, New York, SUNY Press, p. 74-80.

15 Erről bővebben írok szerzőtársammal, Karen Kettnich-kel *„Robin pajtás seprűje és a játék ontológiája a Szentivánéji álomban"* című tanulmányunkban. Kiss Attila és Matuska Ágnes (szerk.), *Ki merre tart? - Shakespeare Szegeden 2007-2011*. Kiss Attila és Matuska Ágnes (szerk.), JATE Press, 2013. p. 125-138.

lő teremtő lehetőséget, amellyel a környezetének életét képes saját invenciója szerint átformálni.

A színház képe tehát, mint a világokat teremtő játék csodálatos intézménye, megjelenik a shakespeare-i színpadon, de nem a hagyományos színház-metaforában. A korabeli alakzat, azaz a nyelvi formula és a középkori értelméhez képest forradalmian új jelentés találkozik, és az izgalmasan alakuló jelentés-hálóhoz hozzáadódnak még egyéb olyan verziók, amelyekben a színház-világ párhuzam valamilyen formában felmerülhet. Felmerül például kétféle reneszánsz hagyományban is, egyik a firenzei neoplatonikusoké, amely szerint az ember, mint mikrokozmosz az isteni univerzum mása, és istenhez hasonlóan önmaga is teremteni és a kozmikus világ színpadát szemlélni képes. A másik reneszánsz hagyomány klasszikus gyökerű – eszerint a színház épülete magát a kozmoszt (tehát nem a profán, mulandó világot) modellálja a maga teljességében.[16]

Mielőtt azonban ezek alapján azt a következtetést vonnánk le, hogy a Theatrum Mundi negatív középkori értelmére vetül rá, mintegy utólag, a színház új, reneszánsz jelentése, érdemes árnyalni a középkori hagyományt is. Az alakzat tárgyalt, meglehetősen negatív értelmén túl középkori öröksége a színháznak az a potenciális *funkció*, amelyet a középkori, vallásos-rituális színjáték tölt be, amely színházi épületet ugyan nem feltételez, de szerepjátékot igen. Ebben a kontextusban nem csak azért nem működhet klasszikus értelemben a színház-metafora, mert egyszerűen nem létezik a színház, mint intézmény,[17] hanem azért sem, mert ennek a szerepjátéknak a logikája nem köthető semmiféle hiúsághoz vagy színpadi illúzióhoz: amit a játszók előadnak, az maga a biblikus valóság. A játék ilyen értelmű, isteni valóságot megeleveníteni képes, potenciálisan mágikus hagyománya átörökítődik a reneszánsz színpadra, ahol viszont már kapcsolódhat a színház-metaforához. A középkori játékmodell attól függetlenül beépül a reneszánsz színjátszásba, hogy közben a színpadi reprezentáció logikájában egy új

16 Lásd Yates, Frances A., *The Theater of the World*. London, Routledge, 1969.

17 Meglepő, hogy még Shakespeare korában is hogyan küzdenek szerzők és fordítók a színházat, de sok egyebet, például a világról való tudás gyűjteményét jelentő theatre kifejezés magyarázásával. Az előbbihez lásd: Pierre Boaistuau francia humanista szerző *Theatrum Mundi* című értekezése angol fordításainak paratextusait, amelyekben fordító és kiadó megpróbálják bevezetni a *theatre* fogalmát az angol nyelvhasználatba, de a nézők okulásául szolgáló *látvány*, nem pedig a *színjáték* értelmében használják. Lásd főleg a kötet harmadik, 1581-es angol kiadását, ahol annak ellenére küzdenek a szerzők a *theatre* terminus magyarázatával, hogy ekkor már az első londoni kereskedelmi színházak már javában működtek. Pierre BOAISTUAU, *Theatrum Mundi: the Theater or Rule of the World*, London, Hacket, 1574, V v. A *theatre* másik korabeli jelentéséhez (amely szintén nem a színjáték helyszínéül szolgáló intézményt jelölte, hanem az ismeretek rendszerezett tárházát) lásd: William West, *Theatres and Encyclopedias in Early Modern Europe*, Cambridge University Press, 2003.

paradigma lesz uralkodó, a játéknak a középkori rituáléktól idegen, mimetikus változata.

A mimetikus színház tehát potenciális illúzió a színházon kívüli valósághoz képest, pontosan úgy, ahogy azt a színház-metafora is leírja, de az utóbbiban az illúzió valódi ellentéte nem a színházon kívüli világ, mint a reneszánsz színház esetében, hanem az isteni örökkévalóság. A reneszánsz, kereskedelmi színház, beleértve Shakespeare színházát is, nyilvánvalóan nem az elítélendő, illuzórikus színház képét kívánja magáról hirdetni, ugyanakkor nem is tehet úgy, mintha erről a nézőpontról, a szigorúan vett színház-metafora korabeli értelméről nem lenne tudomása. A reneszánsz színpadon a mimetikus játék reprezentációs logikája miatt – a világ, mint színház korabeli, egymással nem összeegyeztethető jelentésein túl – nem csak a Theatrum Mundi alakzat pozitív értelmezése ütközik nehézségekbe, de a színház bármiféle kozmikus jelentésének az ünneplése óhatatlanul önellentmondásos lesz.

Dolgozatom zárásaként *A vihar* néhány vonatkozó szakaszára támaszkodva arra szeretnék példát hozni, hogy a drámákban éppen ezeknek az ellentmondásos elemeknek az egymással szemben való kijátszása képes létrehozni nem csak rendkívül izgalmas jelentéseket, de olyan játékteret is, amely implikálja a közönség részvételét. Eddigi igyekezetemmel szemben tehát, amely arra irányult, hogy a vizsgált hagyományt megpróbáljam elemeire bontani, a példában azt mutatom be, hogy ezeknek a különböző elemek és hagyományoknak az összefonódása, egymásra vetülése, vagy éppen a közöttük levő feszültség ereje hogyan alakítja színház és világ viszonyát.

A vihar nyitójelenetében a közönség rögtön azzal szembesül, hogy amit a színpad világán belüli valóságnak gondoltunk, és amit a vihar elszenvedői is így élnek meg, az nem más, mint Prospero által rendezett varázslat. Prospero varázslata pedig önmagában kétarcú abból a szempontból, hogy hol csak a látványt, az illúziót teremti meg, és megtévesztő varázslást folytat, hol pedig a teremtő Isten, a gondviselő képében tetszeleg, például a Máté evangéliumára tett utalással:[18]

„... *bűbájammal úgy*
Rendeztem én, hogy nincs egy árva lélek –
Nem, nincs egy árva hajszál vesztesége..."[19]

---

18 „*Nektek pedig még a hajatok szálai is mind számon vannak tartva.*" Máté 10,30. A kontextust sajátos iróniával gazdagítják Gonzalo szavai, amelyekkel a játékot irányító istenségre utal: „*Legyen meg, amit odafönn akarnak*". (*A vihar*, I.2.)

19 *A vihar* (I.2.) *Shakespeare összes drámái. IV. Színművek.* Fordította: Babits Mihály. Európa Könyvkiadó, Bp. 1988. p. 805.

Ezáltal nem csak a szerepe kettős, hanem kétféle színházmodellt is megidéz. Egyrészt ceremóniamester, akinek szerepe a színházi illúziót teremtő rendezőhöz hasonlítható, másrészt pedig mágus és teremtő: nem illúziót hoz létre, hanem a valóságot irányítja. A mágikus, középkori színházmodellt úgy működteti a kereskedelmi színpadon, hogy a reneszánsz színház öntudatra ébredésével ötvözi. Ennek a kombinációnak természetesen mindkét eleme tökéletesen összeegyeztethetetlen lenne a Theatrum Mundi retorikájának korabeli értelmével, ha éppen nem maga Prospero idézné meg a színészek, mint tünékeny szellemek képét, akik a szertefoszló, anyagtalan világ modelljei:

„*E színészek*
szellemek voltak, mondtam, szellemek,
s a légbe tüntek, lenge légbe tüntek:
és mint e látás páraváza, majdan
a felhősipkás tornyok, büszke várak,
szent templomok, s e nagy golyó maga,
s vele minden lakosa, szertefoszlik,
s mint e ködpompa tünt anyagtalan,
nyomot, romot se hágy. Olyan szövetből
vagyunk, mint álmaink, s kis életünk
álomba van kerítve".[20]

A szakasz Prosperóhoz méltó trükk, jobban mondva varázslás. Ami a jelenetet megelőzi, az illúzió csimborasszója: a színészek a színdarabon belül egy maszkjátékot adnak elő, amelyben olyan szellemeket testesítenek meg, akik olyan színészeket játszanak, akik istennőket, nimfákat és aratókat alakítanak. A színház varázslata, bármilyen látványos is, a világmindenség mulékony illúziójába olvad bele: a színház metafora *vanitas*-hagyományát plasztikusan idézi meg a párhuzam, melynek egyik eleme a színészek, mint légbe tűnő szellemek, másik pedig a földgolyó (s vele együtt modellje, a Globe színház [21]) mint szertefoszló köd. A szakasz azonban pusztán a drámán belüli dráma epilógusa, nem a *Viharé*. Prospero trükkje az utóbbiban bomlik ki.

---

20 *A vihar* (IV.1.) *Shakespeare összes drámái. IV. Színművek.* Fordította: Babits Mihály. Európa Könyvkiadó, Bp. 1988. p. 862.

21 Nem tévedünk, ha a Vihar-ban a Globe-ot idéző sort közvetetten Shakespeare intézményére tett utalásnak olvassuk, nincs azonban bizonyítékunk arra, hogy a darabot valóban előadták volna a Globe-ban is, sőt úgy tűnik, kifejezetten a Blackfriars-ban való előadásra íródott. Andrew Gurr. „The Tempest's Tempest at Blackfriars". Shakespeare Survey. (1989) 41: p. 91–102.

„Bübájam szétszállt, odalőn,
s ha még maradt csekély erőm,
az már a magamé csak, és
Nápolyig vinni is kevés.
Országom visszanyertem én
s a csalót meg se büntetém:
ne hagyjatok hát tengenem
ezen a puszta szigeten;
sőt jertek e varázst a ti
varázstokkal megoldani.
Lágy lehetek röpitse vásznam,
máskép nehéz célt nem hibáznom.
Célom a tetszés volt. S ma már
oda a szellem, oda a báj,
s kétségbe kéne esni ma,
ha nem könnyitne szent ima,
mely a kegyelem kényszere,
s minden hibának gyógyszere.
Ha vártok hát bocsánatot,
nekem is megbocsássatok".[22]

Prospero különös dolgot kér tőlünk: tapsunkkal szentesítsük a játékát, azaz Babits találó fordításának leleményével vessük be saját varázserőnket, amelylyel egyszerre juttatjuk vissza a hatalmáról lemondott mágust a civil birodalomba, megbocsájtjuk a rendező Prosperónak, hogy mulandó illúziót teremtett, és feloldjuk a színészeket az illúzióteremtés terhe alól, hogy befejezhessék a darabot, és velünk együtt saját civil birodalmukba térhessenek. Ahogy Kállay Géza fogalmaz *A vihar*ról írt tanulmányában: "*Prospero – ahogy az Epilógusban láttuk – vállalja a kockázatot, hogy sorsát a közönség kezébe tegye le*".[23] Ennél azonban többet is tesz, ugyanis ha nem puszta illúzióba zártan kívánunk a világban élni, ha emberként a világ színpadán bocsánatot remélünk, akkor el kell fogadnunk, tovább kell görgetnünk, sőt nem csak tapsunkkal, hanem imánkkal kell szentesítenünk a játékot, belátva, hogy nem csak a döntésünkre, de a hitünkre is szükség van. Paradox módon ugyanis ez

22 *A vihar* (Epilógus) *Shakespeare összes drámái. IV. Színművek.* Fordította: Babits Mihály. Európa Könyvkiadó, Bp. 1988. p. 880.
23 Kállay Géza, A „leképezés logikája" és a „látás páraváza": *Wittgenstein Tractatusa és Shakespeare: A vihar.* In: *A nyelv határai:* Shakespeare-tanulmányok. E-könyv. Liget Műhely Alapítvány, 2014. p. 431-499, 498.

vezethet közös szabadulásunkhoz: az illúziót csak a teremtő játék varázslata tudja feloldani, amely viszont csak úgy működik, ha hiszünk benne, ha úgy döntünk, hogy működtetjük.

Így, a közönség tevékeny részvételével valóban létrejöhet a „dús, csodás, tengeri átváltozás": a Theatrum Mundi középkori *vanitas*-jelentését a színjátszás nem reflexív, de mágikus hagyományának mintájára az öntudatra ébredt reneszánsz színház közönsége képes átírni.