

Tibor Fabiny

LITERATURE AND EMBLEMS

NEW ASPECTS IN SHAKESPEARE-STUDIES

"the emblem is the last attempt to grasp  
spiritually the world in its totality in an  
exegetical manner"

(Jöns)<sup>1</sup>

This introductory paper will cover the following topics:

- O. Preliminary Notes on the Project
- 1. Language - and Imagery
- 2. Picture - and Iconology
- 3. Meaning - and Hermeneutics

O. *Preliminary Notes on the Project*

The purpose of the present paper is, on the one hand, to provide an informative introduction to an undeservedly neglected chapter of Renaissance Literature in English Studies pursued in Hungary and on the other hand, to outline a possible theoretical frame of reference of emblem-research.

This volume is the outcome of a project carried on at the English Department of the University of Szeged: "*Shakespeare's Imagery and Contemporary Emblem-Books. An Iconographical-Iconological Approach*". This approach is mainly, but not exclusively, derived from studying Shakespeare's imagery (C. Spurgeon, W. Clemen, G.W. Knight, K. Muir etc). Roland Mushat Frye in a paper on relating verbal and visual art in Shakespeare discusses two ways of utilizing contemporary iconographical lore for the inter-

pretation of Shakespeare. The first is *broadly literary* ("identifying different and relevant vocabulary of visual themes and subjects in ways comparable to the definition of words and phrases."<sup>2</sup>) and the other is *strictly theatrical* because "Shakespeare could also create images by the enactment of his plays on stage"<sup>3</sup>. The papers presented in this volume fall into both categories.

As for the case-history of the project, it is to be emphasized that the idea was conceived in literary seminars at the University of Szeged and the problem has grown out of "the reading of Shakespeare" rather than seeing his plays performed on stage. Those who do not speak English as their native language may have some difficulty in reading Shakespeare in the original even with a relatively good command of English. The disadvantages which such readers have, are obvious: their comprehension lacks spontaneity and the process of reading is rather slow. However, there are some latent advantages for the non-native readers: namely, it is unavoidable to pay sharp attention to the language, words and figures apart from the unfolding of the plot. The reader's mind is thus grasped by the vivid images and the particularities of the figurative language. What may sound archaic or appear as "dead metaphor" for the native-reader, might suddenly come to life in the non-native mind while it ponders the meaning of words and tries to decode them.

More than fifty years ago the literary historian Lajos Dézsi (1868-1932), Professor of the University of Szeged,

published an article on "Hungarian Influence on the Art of Shakespeare"<sup>4</sup>. Naive or anachronistic as the title may sound, Dézsi was probably the only Hungarian scholar familiar with Henry Green's book: *Shakespeare and the Emblem-Writers* (1870). Green's uncritical enthusiasm has piled up a vast amount of material and tried to establish correspondance between 16th century emblems and Shakespeare's text. Sometimes, of course, Shakespeare's plays became only targets for his source-hunting and thus his discoveries were partly arbitrary. For all that, his activity is deservedly appreciated as pioneering in this field. It was also Henry Green who edited the facsimile reprint of the first English emblem-book by Geoffrey Whitney (1586). Green attached to his edition some long "bibliographical essays"<sup>5</sup>, one of them entitled: "Shakespeare's References to Emblem-Books and to Whitney's Emblems in Particular" (pp. 233-312). Green pointed out that Whitney took almost fifty emblems from the Hungarian born Johannes Sambucus' *Emblemata*. Probably that was the motivation behind Dézsi's biased title of "Hungarian Influence on the Art of Shakespeare", which was, nevertheless, an important article.

This orientation of research was also motivated by Barbara K. Levalski's work on the poetics of the metaphysicals: *Protestant Poetics and 17th century Religious Lyric* (Princeton, 1979) where the author explored the poetic nature of the Bible proving how influential it was on 17th century poets. The texture of the Bible, its tropes and figures, typology as a symbolic mode, had contributed to the forming of new,

ancillary genres, such as *meditation*, *emblematics* etc. Together with the Bible these genres determined metaphysical poetry to a great extent, for they were both meditative and emblematic in nature.

It was obvious to assume that Shakespeare's poetic language may also have been influenced, if not by the religious then certainly by the secular iconographic-emblematic background of the age. The book of R.A. Fraser: *Shakespeare's Poetics* (1961) seemed to have proved that assumption.

Having learned from the *philological* discoveries of Green and Dézsi and having received *methodological* and *intuitiv* impetus from Lewalski and Fraser, a team was formed consisting of young teachers and some students to work on the project.<sup>6</sup> This project was given a grant by the University of Szeged.

The work of the team was given encouragement by Professor Clifford Davidson of Western Michigan University, who paid a short visit to the University of Szeged in November 1982 and Professor Peter M. Daly of McGill University, Canada, who will also visit our University in the summer of 1984 and give a series of lectures about further perspectives in emblematic studies. Without the financial help of the University of Szeged and without the regular supplies of material by the oversea scholars our project would have remained on an amateur-level.

### 1. *Language - and Imagery*

Literature and poetry are primarily the products of the language, for literature arrives at "meaning" by the special use of words. Language is the literary medium. In our age, when knowledge is mainly communicated via the natural sciences, it must be re-emphasized that the humanities also convey knowledge, though of a different nature. Unlike the fact-gathering, impersonal or objective and accumulative knowledge of the natural sciences the knowledge communicated by the humanities and poetry are basically "non-cumulative" for they always struggle with the perennial "big-questions" which are continually raised and perhaps never exhaustively answered. Some members of the *New Criticism* were well aware of the alternative knowledge in poetry, which, versus technical industrialization and scientific departmentalization aims at totality and penetrates into the essence of things by means of "comprehension" contrary to "explanation".

Literary language corresponding to the humanities is not a "logical discourse", a denotative-referential description, but an emotional, associative or connotative language. We are personally addressed by this language: it is the language of concern. As I.A. Richards once observed: unlike the statements of the natural sciences literature or poetry is the language of pseudostatements. By means of metaphors, symbols and myths, ambiguities, paradoxes and enigmas our mind and imagination are moved and stirred.

Northrop Frye, in his *The Great Code.*

*The Bible and Literature* (1982) has elaborated an

interesting theory on the three different phases of language. Essentially it is not much different from the dichotomy of scientific-literary uses of the language but he provides a more subtle and refined insight with his three-fold concept that goes back to Vico's three ages of mankind: the age of gods, the age of heroes and the age of the people. The first was for him the poetic, the second the heroic or noble and the third the vulgar age. In terms of language Frye labels them: 1. hieroglyphic or metaphoric phase, 2. hieratic phase, 3. demotic or descriptive phase, the latter beginning with the scientific revolution of the 17th century. The concept of the second phase seems to represent the transition between what we referred to as poetic and scientific language.

In the first, the *hieroglyphic phase* of language, before Plato and the pre-biblical cultures, "sign-language" dominates. The subject and the object are linked with a common energy. "All words in this phase are concrete"<sup>7</sup>, verbal abstractions and concepts like "mind", "courage", "emotion", "soul" were "solidly anchored in physical images connected with bodily processes or with specific objects"<sup>8</sup>. For example "kairos", the Greek abstract concept of time originally denoted the notch of an arrow. Prose in this phase is discontinuous or epigrammatic and the culture is mainly oracular. The statements or aphorisms are not to be argued about but rather to be pondered. In the mythic universe of the Pre-Socratic philosophy oral teachers and gurus were poets at the same time. With this we can associate Sir

Phillip Sidney's *Apology for Poetry* where the Renaissance poet similarly maintains that poetry precedes all learning, even philosophy and history. The poet, Frye suggests, has always been connected with something ancient and primitive in society and since the time of Orpheus and Hermes Trismegistus poetry has been understood as the repository of all wisdom, or as Shelley later said, the poet is "the unacknowledged legislator of the world". In each phase of the language poetry aims at recreating the first hieroglyphic or metaphorical phase. We shall see that the *emblem-tradition* is deeply rooted in this phase (concrete distinct images conveying a "meaning") and the Renaissance was permeated by an enthusiastic interest for ancient hieroglyphics.

But the question arises: why are the other two phases different and how has the metaphoric poetic mode of language been gradually forced to withdraw?

In the second, *hieratic or allegorical* phase we witness the victory of the "dialectical logos" over the "mythos". Language becomes the property of an individual elite, words become "expressions" of inner thoughts: analogy prevails, language is already the verbal imitation of reality. Instead of possessing wisdom we meet the attitude of observing it. With Plato, the discontinuous aphoristic prose is replaced by the continuous, the typical genre is commentary, instead of verbal magic we see the use of syllogism. Although Frye does not say this we can add that it was Friedrich Nietzsche in

the 19th century who protested against Socrates and Plato for they had, in the name of "logos", destroyed the life-giving power of "mythos". Nietzsche bitterly considered Plato as "the greatest enemy of arts who has ever lived upon the earth". Dialectical discourse and discursive reason killed the spontaneity and energy of poetry.

The third, the *descriptive-scientific phase* is only a culmination of the process of the previous phase. Bacon, Locke, Descartes, etc. mark this "demotic mode". Here subject and object are clearly separated or the subject has even withdrawn into neutrality. This neutral man is motivated to observe the objective world. The simple aim is the discerning of "scientific truth" and the method is fact-gathering and inductive. The central problem is the distinction between "illusion and reality". Symbol, metaphor, mythology are expelled as obscure, gloomy and mainly unreal because they lack the Cartesian ideals of "clear and distinct". Frye notes that in the age of Homer the word evoked things and in the descriptive phase things evoke words. Distinguishing, isolating and analysing are the key-words in this "mind-centered" universe. Frye says that in the first phase the "spirit" and in the second the "soul" were the organizing principles.

While discussing the importance of the poetic phase of language or *figurative language* we must mention some figures of speech that deviate from the standard significance of language.



hey           The *image* is not only a mental picture, a description of visible objects and scenes but we can also speak of auditory and other sensory images and the term *imagery* in general is used to signify figurative language, especially the vehicles of metaphors and similes. For the *New Critics* imagery was understood as an essential component, a major clue to poetic meaning and effect.

Y           The *metaphor* in its various kinds is a statement of identity while *symbol* is applied to a word or set of words that signify an object or event which signifies something else.<sup>9</sup> Ralph Berry in his *Shakespearean Metaphor* (1978) discusses the common origins of the metaphor and symbol and finds that both of them are rooted in the perception of association. "But the two seem to work in opposed directions. A symbol generates associations, while the metaphor grasps toward analogy. There is an element of passivity about the perception of the symbol, whereas the metaphor is an active attempt to grapple with reality. Metaphors are, or should be, striking. Symbols are, or should be, satisfying and inevitable. Metaphors are irritable, appetent: they seek an over-elusive fruiton, a state of definition."<sup>10</sup>

Austin Warren in *The Theory of Literature* (1949) describes *myth* as remarkably reminiscent of Frye's first phase: "the myth is the narrative story, as against dialectical discourse, exposition; it is also the irrational or intuitive as against the systematically philosophical: it is the tragedy of Aeschylus against the dialectic of Socrates"

And later he adds: "In some of its habitual oppositions, it is contrapunted to 'history', or to 'science', or to 'philosophy', or to 'allegory' or to 'truth'."<sup>11</sup> From this it can be seen that some thirty years before Frye Austin Warren stood for the same ideas.

Philip Wheelwright in his *The Burning Fountain* (1968) draws an interesting distinction between two kinds of imagination: *creative* and *interpretive*. The former he calls *metaphoric* which creates liveliness and freshness and the latter *archetypal* or *emblematic* which grasps particular idea in relation to something universal and perduring. The archetypal-emblematic mode of imagination creates "depth" in contrast to the "freshness" aspect of the metaphor.<sup>12</sup>

Wheelwright illuminates the significance of such archetypal or emblematic symbols as the "sun", the "wheel", the "four elements" the primal and the Christian "triad". He closes his chapter on emblems and archetypes by raising the question of how relevant they could have been to Shakespeare. His conclusion: "It is impossible to be sure how much of the archetypal meaning Shakespeare and the audience for whom he wrote were aware of, but I should think a good deal."<sup>13</sup>

## 2. *Pictures - and iconology*

### 2.1. "*Ut pictura poesis*"

In the previous section our concern was to illuminate the nature of poetic language. We have seen that the

different figures of meaning: imagery, metaphor, myth constitute what we call figurative language.

Figurative language may also be called "picture-language" and that thought has been suggested since the time of Horace's *Ars Poetica*. Horace's dictum *ut pictura poesis* ie. "as is painting so is poetry" or reversed: "as is poetry so is painting". The classical theory of art has emphasized the ability of the poet to make the listener see the object, and of the painter to make his viewer understand meaning.

In the Middle Ages Gregory the Great (6th century) and in the Renaissance Savonarola and Giulio Romano asserted that "paintings are the scriptures of the ignorant".

Renaissance neoplatonism re-emphasized the importance of pictures, images and symbols. As early as 1489 Pico della Mirandola in his *Heptaplus* submitted the idea "that the picture is a form of revelation, an incarnation of the word ... its emblematic mystery or complexity, by serving as a kind of vision lures and thrusts the viewer to meditating on truths".<sup>14</sup>

The idea of the poet and the painter competing with each other has also grasped Shakespeare's imagination. In the first scene of *Timon of Athens* the poet and the painter describe Fortune throned upon a "high and pleasant hill" waving to her favourites to climb the steepy mountain. But when she is in a change of mood she "spurns down her late beloved".

The painter's conclusion at the end of the picturesque dialogue:

"'Tis common:  
A thousand moral paintings I can show  
That shall demonstrate these quick blows of Fortune's  
More pregnantly than words"

(TA 1,1, 90-3)

This is an explicit allusion to the vast amount of iconographic mainly emblematic, representations of Fortune. Elsewhere, Shakespeare the poet again paints the portrait of whimsical Lady Fortune. Fluellen says in *Henry V.*:

"Fortune is painted blind, with a muffler afore her eyes, to signify to you that Fortune is blind, and she is painted also with a wheel, to signify to you, which is the moral of it, that she is turning and inconstant, and mutability, and variation: and her foot, look you, is fixed upon a spherical stone, which rolls, and rolls and rolls: In good truth, the poet makes a most excellent description of it: Fortune is an excellent moral"

(HV, 3,6, 31-40)

The emblems of Alciati, La Perriere, Whitney etc. vividly illustrate this "excellent moral".

## 2.2. Hieroglyphics

Frye labelled the first phase of language as poetic-metaphoric or hieroglyphic and he maintained that sign-writing preceded the articulate use of words. The Renaissance conception of hieroglyphics was based on misunderstanding: they took the hieroglyphics for ideograms, each picture representing a word.

In the Renaissance the neoplatonists revived the interest in Egyptian hieroglyphics which they considered to be the repository of ancient hermetic and esoteric wisdom. Their enthusiasm was motivated by the discovery of the 3rd cent.

AD Greek philosopher, Horapollo's *Hieroglyphica* in 1419, which they assumed to have been translated from Egyptian into Greek. A Latin translation of Horapollo's work was made in 1515. The neoplatonists: Pico della Mirandola and Marsiglio Ficino were convinced that it contained the true philosophy revealing the real and absolute of the divine principles and of the universe. These secret truths were hidden from the common people and the secret wisdom preserved by the ancient priests could only be deciphered by the initiated. Ficino wrote: "When the Egyptian priests wished to signify divine mysteries they did not use the small characters of script, but the whole images of plants, trees or animals, for God has knowledge of things not by way of multiple thought but like the pure and firm shape of the thing itself"<sup>15</sup>

Dieckmann (1957) observes two characteristics of Horapollo's hieroglyphics 1/ several symbols can stand for one and the same idea, 2/ symbols have a necessary relationship, there is a type of correspondance eg. between stars and metals. correspondance exists between symbols and idea.<sup>16</sup>

The discovery of Horapollo's *Hieroglyphica* initiated the wide-spread fashion for similar hieroglyphics: Fr. Colonna's *Hypernerotomachi* was published in 1499 and Piero Valeriano's *Hieroglyphica* in 1556. In England John Dee's *Monas Hieroglyphica*

was published in 1564. Dee believed that in the common contemplation of symbols (monas) he could understand the structure of the entire universe. Jakob Typotius' *De Hierographia* published posthumously in Prague in 1618, is an interesting exception in this tradition because he thinks that the fountainhead of hieroglyphics is not Hermes Trismegistus but God himself. The things of the world are signs created by God and God's sign-language is the creation itself.<sup>17</sup>

Dieckmann speaks about the boom of hieroglyphic literature between 1500 and 1700 and proves that the newly discovered genre found a sensitive response particularly in contemporary painting and literature. The popularity of enigmatic representations can also be pointed out on coins, coats of arms and printer's marks. She explains the cause of success with the unity of intellectual and aesthetic experience inherent in hieroglyphics. Soon we shall see that this twofold aspect is an important attribute of emblem-literature which is *representation and interpretation* at the same time.

Dieckmann shows the impact of Horapollo on Renaissance woodcut and drama. Dürer's portrait of *Maximilian I* with the symbolic animals and properties is perhaps the best example. Klibansky-Panofsky-Saxl's and Frances Yates' memorable analyses of *Melancholia I*<sup>18</sup> illuminate this tradition.

Around 1600 drama also shows the attributes of hieroglyphics: we can see it in contemporary pageantry and masque. Ben Jonson called the latter "court-hieroglyphics". The best examples are his *The Masque of Blacknesse* (1605) and *The Masque of Beauty* (1608).

When surveying the survival of hieroglyphics Dieckmann mentions the Rosicrucian pamphlets especially, Michael Meier's *Atlanta Fugiens* (1618) where the author considers Christ to be the greatest hieroglyphic symbol. In the meantime nature came to be interpreted as hieroglyphic written by God's hand. Dieckmann finds that the last figure in the tradition of hieroglyphics is the German mystic philosopher Boehme. Though he does not use this term, his lifework is nevertheless endemically hieroglyphic. Boehme already centuries before Frye speaks of the loss of the original, universal highly metaphoric language which perhaps "Adam spoke and nature breathed out."

The disappearance of enigmatic symbolism and hieroglyphics is explained by three factors. Dieckmann suggests that the first is the emancipation of the natural sciences in the 17th century which destroyed symbolism as obscure and "not clear and distinct". The second factor was the new interest in history and an anti-mystical tendency, a biased critical attitude against ancient Egyptian myth. And thirdly, aesthetic attacks were not long delayed: pictorial hieroglyphics and emblems were condemned by Lord Shaftesbury in his *Characteristics* as "false", "barbarous", "magical", "mystical", "monkish", "Gothic" etc.<sup>19</sup>

### 2.3 Iconology

Similarly to Horapollo's pioneering place in hieroglyphics, the same position is deserved by Cesare Ripa as the

founder of iconology.

D.J. Gordon quotes the recollection of the French art historian, Emile Male how he discovered Ripa: "I realized that with Ripa in my hand I could explain most of the allegories that adorn the palaces and churches of Rome"<sup>20</sup> Gordon comments on this episode: "the scholar wandering through the hundreds of churches, oratories, palaces of Rome, confronting those plastic riddles, realizing that there is before him a whole world speaking an unknown language, and suddenly in that musty library, by no tedious process of decipherment, but at one blow, indeed by chance, finding the one key to this language of art, not simply in post-Tridentine Rome, but in all of Western Europe, for, Male came to see, code and key were international"<sup>21</sup>

Ripa's *Iconologia*, this huge encyclopedia of symbols and mythology, a great Renaissance repository of allegorical information was first published in Rome in 1593 and with illustrations in 1603. Though the book was well-known in England, the English version did not appear until 1709.

Blaustocki writes: "With the publication of Ripa's work... the humanist system of allegorical iconography was established: classical gods and personifications, hieroglyphic signs and emblems, connecting words and images: this was the material used by the artists of mannerism and the baroque"<sup>22</sup>

After an extended pause our century is now witnessing a new and fresh revival of iconographical-iconological studies. (I shall discuss the distinction between the two terms later.)



An international school of art-history research appeared in scholarship in the 1920s with the presiding and pioneering activity of the Hamburg art-historian Aby Warburg. As early as 1912 he presented a sensational astrological interpretation of the frescoes at Ferrara. Not only did he solve the secret image-puzzles but he also emphasized the importance of his method which purposes "to throw light upon the dark spot, clears up at the same time great interconnected developments."<sup>23</sup>

During the Nazi period the Warburg Institute was transplanted to London under the directorship of Fritz Saxl. Here the Institute soon became attached to London University.

Besides Warburg and Saxl, Erwin Panofsky can be considered as one of the pioneering scholars in the field of iconology. He began his activity also in Hamburg where Ernst Cassirer's Kantian philosophy of symbolic forms served as a kind of background to his methodology.

In his famous *Studies in Iconology* (1939) Panofsky distinguishes three levels in the interpretation of a work of art.:

The first is the "*Pre-iconographical description*" where the primary and natural subject matter is the object of interpretation. Here the controlling principle of interpretation is the history of style (how objects and events were expressed by form). The next level is that of "*Iconographical analysis*" which is concerned with the world of images, stories and allegories. The controlling principle

here is the history of types (specific themes and concepts]. The third level is "Iconographical interpretation in a deeper sense"<sup>24</sup>.

In his *Meaning in the Visual Arts* (1955) he clearly distinguishes *iconography* and *iconology*. The former "concerns itself with the subject-matter of meaning of works of art... its domain is the identification of images, stories and allegories"<sup>25</sup>. *Iconology* on the other hand, "considers the basic underlying principles of the symbolical values"<sup>26</sup>. While the former is an analytical process, the latter is a synthetic mental activity elucidating the deep-structure of a work of art. The function of iconology is to unfold what Panofsky calls the "*intrinsic meaning*" of a work of art. (I shall return to the problem of meaning as a hermeneutical question in the last section of my paper.)

Another Warburg-scholar, the art-historian E.H. Gombrich in his *Symbolic Images* (1972) is concerned with the elusiveness of meaning. In discussing iconography and iconology he proposes that the iconologist can decipher the meaning if he can get access to the intentions of the author as manifested in the genre he chooses. For the iconologist interpretation becomes a reconstruction of the author's original programme or "libretto".<sup>27</sup>

On the historiography of iconography a detailed and yet concise study is provided by Ian Białostocki in the *Dictionary of the History of Ideas*.<sup>28</sup> His definition runs

as follows: "in modern usage iconography is a description and/or interpretation of the content of works of art. "He proposes to distinguish between "*intended iconography*" and "*interpretive iconography*". By the first he means "the attitude of the artist or contemporary observer toward function and meaning of visual symbols and images". Interpretive iconography aims at "identification and description of the content of the works of art". I understand that his first attitude considers iconography from the author's perspective and the latter from that of the audience or the critic.

Now the question arises, how we can relate iconographical and iconological research to Renaissance drama in general and to Shakespeare in particular.

One approach has been outlined by John M. Steadman who, in his article on iconography and Renaissance drama (1970) has shown that "literary critics have turned to the iconographers for support over the last quarter century"<sup>29</sup>.

To the problem of how literary historians obtain support in interpreting literature from iconographical methods the author provides a four-fold answer.

1. Renaissance painters and poets had inherited the same ethical and mythological traditions.

2. Renaissance poets and painters held basic aesthetic principles in common. They find that the cause of both arts was "to teach and delight". Writers and painters used such poetic concepts as "imitation of action", "verisimilitude" or "decorum", conversely, pictorial terms were used in poetics and rhetorics, such as "vividness", "ecphrasis", "enargia" etc.

Horace's dictum *ut pictura poesis* was completed by Simonides' saying that poetry is "speaking picture" and painting is "silent poetry".

3. Poetry and painting not only treated the same subjects but utilized the same technical devices, eg. "exemplum", "personification", "enigma", "metaphor", "notatio" allegory etc.

4. In these "synaesthetic" art-forms we can clearly see the convergence in literature between written text, hieroglyphics and emblems, and also in drama: pageant, masque, procession, dumb-show are similarly akin.

Steadmann concludes: "In the complex mythographical tradition of the Renaissance it is almost impossible to draw a sharp line between painting and poetry, iconography and literature. Both of the sister-arts served as channels for transmitting and elaborating the same concepts and symbols and images"<sup>30</sup>

William Heckscher (1971) is concerned with Shakespeare's relation to the visual arts. He shows that though the only artist mentioned by name in Shakespeare is Giulio Romano (*The Winter's Tale*), nevertheless he assumes that the implicit impact of painters can be detected in his works. He approvingly quotes Panofsky in saying that Titian inspired Shakespeare with a new version of the Venus and Adonis story".

Heckscher has two theses which he then elaborates:

1. Shakespeare had a way of alluding to very real works of art in vaguely hinting references.
2. Shakespeare described in minute detail works of art which existed in his imagination.

To demonstrate his theses Heckscher first examines a *work of art explicitly described* ie. "a piece of skilful painting" in the scene about the Fall of Troy in *The Rape of Lucrece*. For Shakespeare painting is a mirror which helps us to learn the emotions which acted upon Lucrece. Heckscher contrasts Shakespeare's text with a 16th century French miniature.

Secondly, he speaks of "*works of art obliquely cited*" and quotes "Patientia" twice alluded to in Shakespeare's dramas. (*TN* 2,4, 109-114, *Per.* 5,1, 134-9). He juxtaposes the vast amount of iconographic material known in Shakespeare's age, one of them (*Hoefnage, 1569*) representing patience in stocks - which might be an interesting allusion to Kent in *King Lear*. Further examples are demonstrated by Breughel and Ripa. The author concludes that these are unmistakable references to specific works of art."<sup>31</sup>

Ewbank (1971) writes about the uses of iconography in literature but at the same time she is fully aware of the limitations of visual symbolism: "if we were to try to say how this theatre poetry works, we could have to admit that it is both by asserting the pregnancy of words and yet also by creating on stage an image more pregnant than words. A thousand moral paintings could not do that."<sup>32</sup>

R.M. Frye (1980) in a recent article declares that the "relating of the visual and verbal arts is one of the exciting and productive efforts in contemporary scholarship". In the article he discusses the relationship between portraiture and painting and characterization in literature. In the second part he turns to iconography which he defines as "vocabulary of visual images where we can discover semantic cores of meaning."<sup>33</sup>

His discussion of the 16th century innovation of iconography "that mannerist and baroque omnium gatherum"<sup>34</sup> - ie. the *emblem* has already been alluded to. I propose to write on the identity of, and the critical theories about this genre in the following section.

#### 2.4 *Emblem*

##### 2.4.1. *Modern Definitions of the Emblem*

I shall start with a fairly old "modern" critic in order to contrast his pioneering definition with some current and more up-to-date views.

E.N.S. Thomson (1924) gave a brief definition of the emblem: "a combination of motto, picture, and short poem, used collectively to expound some moral or ethical truth"<sup>35</sup> Searching for the predecessors of the emblem he finds that "the earliest known use of picture for the enforcement of moral truth... is the *Tablet of Cebes*. This painting was designed to illustrate a moral treatise, written possibly by that Cebes, a pupil of Socrates in the fourth century whom Plato and Xenophon mention"<sup>36</sup> Another work to prepare readers

ems was Sebastian Brandt's *Narrenschiff* (1495), in *The Ship of Fools* (1509). Thirdly, of course, Harpocration's *Pyrrhic* was relevant. Further on medieval bestiaries, the *Physiologus* (2nd century AD), the *Biblia Pauperum* and *seculum Salvationis*.

Turning to the present criticism of the emblem I shall propose two recent views about the identity of the emblem. Lewalski, the American and Daly, the Canadian scholar seem to be unaware of each other's fresh insights in the field of emblem-criticism. Both of them published their monographs on the subject in 1979. Daly even published two books in the same year.

Barbara K. Lewalski of Princeton arrived at emblematics by studying 17th century religious lyrics and the emblem as the store-house of poetic images and metaphors that had been a source of information for the metaphysical Protestant poetics. Peter M. Daly, Professor of McGill University (Montreal) relates that he arrived at emblem-literature by writing a dissertation on a German baroque poetess. Daly's outstanding significance is that he has brought to the notice of an English-speaking audience the recent German contributions to the characterization of the emblem-genre, mainly in the works of A. Schöne (1964) and D.W. Jöns (1966).

Lewalski (1979) defines the emblem as follows: "Emblems - curious amalgams of picture, motto and poem - are a minor literary kind which contributed significantly to the theories about, and particular formation of, poetic language and symbolism in the 17th century religious lyric."<sup>37</sup>

We should note that Lewalski considers emblems as "minor literary kinds" while - as we shall see - Daly insists on the emblem **to be** discussed as individual genre .

Daly (1979a) trying to create an order in the vast amount of material he is working with, differentiates between two groups of emblem-critics. The first group considers the emblem basically as an illustrated literary form, the essence of which is the *symbolic value of the object*, scene and the action, and this is a *verbal phenomenon*: the association of the pictured motif and abstract concepts is a *function of language*. "Those who regard the emblem primarily as a literary form, recognize the allegorical-symbolical potentialities of language as the basis of the emblem. "Such critics, of course, search and recognize "emblematic structures" in literature.<sup>38</sup> Schöne and Jöns belong to this group and let me add that so does Lewalski; and it is also the channel into which I have so far attempted to direct my understanding of the problem of literature and emblems.

The other group, however, considers emblems as a hybrid and mixed form, a kind of "Gesamtkunstwerk". They speak of emblems as a "synthetic art" which constitutes a branch of the pictura-poesis tradition (Sulzer and Homann).

Daly's merit is that on the basis of Jöns and Schöne he defends the genre-status of the emblems against former criticism which had considered it as enigmatic, arbitrary, "degenerate form of allegory", "allegory's bastard children", "secondary cultural phenomenon", "irritated sort of learned



...cessive baroque  
...naissance Emblem-C  
... Before proceeding with  
...nd Daly's emblem-literature.  
... reflections on emblem-theory let me tur

Samuel Daniel (1585) In his transl  
*Della Imprese* addresses the "friendly reade  
and illuminates the difference between *impresa*  
nd emblem.

"The mot of an *impresa* may not exceed thre  
*Emblems* are interpreted by many verses. An *im*  
is not garnished with many different images,  
*Emblems* are not limited; In *Devices* it is enacted

the figure should not interpret the mot or the mot without  
figure is more libertie and fewer lawes. *Impreses*  
the special purpose of Gentlemen in warlike  
chamber tournaments. *Emblems* are generall  
her of moral matters then credit to the  
veale the secretes of the minde". 39

hat contrary to this Renaissance  
hat the three parts of the  
The picture is not an  
text the illustration  
*qual elucidation of*

Putthenam in  
whole chapter

to the description of devices or emblems. Unlike Samuel Daniel he makes no difference between *impresa* or *emblem*: "The Greek call it *emblema* the Italians *impresa*, and we,<sup>a</sup> *Device*. For though the terms be divers the use and intent is but one..." Their function is to "insinuatesome secret, wittie morall... either to recreate (the beholder's) eye, or please his phantasy, or examine his judgement, or occupie his braine, or to manage his will either by hope or by dread"<sup>41</sup>

Francis Bacon in his *De Augmentis Scientiarum* (1623; *Bk. V, Ch.V.*) provides the following definition: "Emblems reduce intellectual conceptions to sensible images, and that which is sensible more forcibly strikes the memory and is more easily imprinted on it than that is intellectual."<sup>42</sup>

In the 17th century Thomas Blount translated from French Henry Estienne's *The Arte of Making Devices*. This short work of about 68 pages is divided into 23 chapters, such as: "Of Hieroglyphics", "Of Symbols", "Of Aenigma", "Of Emblems", "Of Parables and Apologues" etc. The author appreciates the sacred science of the Egyptians and presupposes that their wisest priests might even have influenced the greatest of the Hebrew ancestors (*Moses, Abraham etc.*). He holds that symbol, aenigma, emblem, fable and parable - these genres all depend upon the sacred science of hieroglyphics.

Writing of emblems Estienne differentiates three principle kinds: 1/ of manners, 2/ of nature, 3/ of history. "The chief aim of the emblem is, to instruct us. If the picture is mystic or obscure, the words clearly inform us."<sup>43</sup>

We can appreciate Estienne's localizing the genesis of emblem-literature in the "hieroglyphic-metaphoric phase of language." True, contemporary emblems often deteriorated into popular vulgarity in their moral didacticism but nevertheless the "true" or "original" emblems were determined by the sacred sciences. I tend to think that when Shakespeare potentially turns to the books of the emblem-writers he does not consider them as simple sources or repositories of his imagery but via the emblem he immerses himself in the same phase of the language: the "proto-language" of poetry.

#### 2.4.3. Lewalski's Classification of Emblem-Books

Though Lewalski's perspective is the 17th century religious lyric she is therefore mainly concerned with religious emblem-books. Nevertheless, it seems relevant to quote her, for she sets up categories useful for the classification of the most important emblem-books. After Rosemary Freeman's *English Emblem-Books* (1948)<sup>44</sup> this is the most concise attempt at grouping the emblem-books mainly on the basis of their subject-matter.

These categories are as follows:

1. General collections of discrete emblems of diverse objects
- Geoffrey Whitney's *A Choice of Emblems* (1586) is the first and most important compilation. The volume contains the most representative emblems of the age. Whitney distinguished between: 1/ natural, 2/ historical, 3/ moral emblems.

Altogether 248 plates are involved in the volume, out of these 23 were Whitney's own, 86 from Alciati, 32 from Paradin, 48 from Sambucus, 20 from Hadraian Junius, 16 from Gabriel Faerno, and 23 were related to ideas common in all these books. As Thomson remarks, it was a "book for all classes of people. A wide awake child could learn a good deal of its pages, and for mature readers, it was history, literature and sermon combined."<sup>45</sup>

- Henry Peacham's *Minerva Britannia* (1612) openly declares its heroic and moral purpose: "to feed at once both the minde and the eye."

- George Wither: *A Collection of Emblems* (1635)

The author took over plates without verses from the German emblem-book of Gabriel Rollenhagen.

2. Discrete emblems and literal renderings of biblical metaphors. Lewalski mentions only foreign emblem-books in this category.

3. Discrete plates around a central theme with a constant element.

- Francis Quarles' *Hieroglyphikes of the Life of Man* (1638)

The different "ages" of human life are represented by a candle which will be lit by God's hands.

4. Secular love-emblems of Eros and Anteros transferred into Christian imagery which illustrate the stages of the pilgrimage of spiritual life.

The Dutch Otto van Veen's *Amoris Divini Emblemata* (1615) and Hermann Hugo's *Pia Desideria* (London, 1686) fall into this

category and their English rendering:

- Francis Quarles' *Emblemes* (1635)

5. The "Schola Cordis" or the "School of the Heart" tradition, where the human heart is the permanent element in the pictures, represented as undergoing progressive purgation from sin via illumination to union. The Dutch Jesuit Benedict van Haeften's *Schola Cordis* (1629) and the German Lutheran Daniel Cramer's *Emblemata Sacra* (1624) influenced the English

- Christopher Harvey's *Schola Cordis* (1647)

Though these latter emblem-books take us far into the 17th century, Lewalski's classification clearly demonstrates the gradual development from discrete, discontinuous emblems to the appearance of the organizing narrative elements. These continuous didactic stories, however, completely lack the original enigmatic hieroglyphic hermetic nature of the early 16th century emblems, they seem to have abandoned their fresh originality by the end of the 17th century and they simply became illustrations of the religious doctrine.

#### 2.4.4. *Daly's Emblem-Theory*

Daly distinguishes three approaches of emblem-description.

##### 1. *The historical-chronological method*

This method a/ analyzes the content and the origins of the *pictura*, b/ observes the origins and the content of the *inscriptio* (motto, lemma), and c/ studies the relation between the *pictura* and the *scriptura*.

Since there is no necessary likeness between the image and the meaning, it is emphasized that there is a *tension* between these elements. Jöns' work can be included in this method.

### 2. *The selective-comparative method*

This method searches for the common characteristic features of the different emblems and "it is based on an overview of the developing emblem tradition" and "the individual emblems are analyzed in order to give a generic description from the essential features that they have in common... no limits are set upon analysis itself. Form, content, semantics, ontology and function may, in fact must, all be examined"<sup>46</sup>

According to Daly this is Schöne's approach.

### 3. *The formal method*

This method confines itself purely to questions of form and to the functional relationships of words and picture within the tripartite emblem. The formalist in his definition of the genre tends to exclude all aspects of content, theme and *Weltanschauung*, since he considers them non-defining.<sup>47</sup> In fact, this is Daly's own approach which he outlines in the last chapter of his *Emblem Theory* (1979a). His utmost concern is the most accurate descriptions of all emblems. He lays down the foundations and principles of his great international team-project in his *The European Emblem Towards an Index Emblematicus* (1980)

But the question arises: how can we benefit from the different orientations of emblem-criticism? Since the ultimate aims of our project and research are not the emblems themselves

but Shakespeare's emblematic language and stage, our purely literary motivations use emblems not as an end but as means. That makes us "go back" to Schöne's selective-comparative method and to a certain extent to Jöns' historical-chronological approach, but this is highly appreciated and thoroughly discussed by Daly in his criticism.

Both Dietrich Walter Jöns and Albert Schöne began to work on the emblems in the early sixties and both of them were motivated by *medieval typological thought* and the tradition of *biblical exegesis*.<sup>48</sup>

Both of them started to analyze emblems in terms of the tripartite distinctive forms: *motto* (inscriptio or lemma), *pictura* and *subscriptio*. Jöns differentiates between the *art-form* (Kunstform) and *mode of thought* (Denkform) of the emblems while Schöne assumes a unity but with a twofold function. He maintains that the emblem is the genre where *representation and interpretation coincide* involving both description and explanation.

Jöns emphasizes the hidden enigmatic relationship, the so-called "tension" between the epigram and the picture.

Schöne dwells on "the potential facticity" and "the priority of the idea in emblematic picture". He finds that the basis of this *emblematic mode of thought* is deeply rooted in (1) Renaissance hieroglyphics, (2) in medieval exegesis, typology and allegory, (3) in Neoplatonic theory. Both Jöns and Schöne agree "in regarding medieval typological and exegetical tradition as the essential root of the emblem"<sup>49</sup>.

Schöne writes that the emblematic picture hides a kind of "higher meaning" and it can be traced back "to the typological exegesis and the allegorical procedures of medieval theology which understood everything created as a sign, an indication of the Creator."<sup>50</sup> Appealing to the patristic-scholastic tradition of the four-fold meaning (4 senses) Schöne emphasizes the *sensus tropologicus*, which refers "to the significance of things and facts for the individual and his destiny, for his path to salvation and his conduct in the world. In this sense the emblematic mode still conceives of all that exists at the same time embodying significance."<sup>51</sup> Jöns understands that the emblem is not primarily art (*ars*) but knowledge (*cognitio*).

Daly concludes that "one of the signal contributions of Schöne and Jöns to emblem-theory is the revaluation of the mode of thought that derives from medieval pattern of thinking"<sup>52</sup>. They agree that the "emblematic sense" is "an illustrate form of literary allegory" where the twofold function of representation and interpretation results in the "illumination of the teaching through picture and the text,"<sup>53</sup>

Besides medieval symbolism the Renaissance hieroglyphic mode of thought (including the mode of animal-, and plant-symbolism)<sup>54</sup> manifests itself in those emblems where a strange inorganic combination of individual motifs can be observed. They are "assembled to represent a general notion"<sup>55</sup>.

On the whole in summing up his train of thought Daly finally evaluates the importance of Schöne and Jöns as follows:



"the "art-form" of the emblem may be used for variety of contents, serve a variety of purposes, and embody a variety of modes of thought, however it reaches its highest development in the interpretation of reality when working within typological patterns of thought."<sup>56</sup>

The principles of the Daly's emblem-theory are applied in his other book: *Literature in the Light of the Emblem* (1979b)

The above allusions to "typological patterns of thought" "sensus tropologicus" or "exegesis" already signal and anticipate that our ultimate concern is rather the deciphering of the "meaning" in literary works of art in general and in Shakespeare in particular than evaluating artistic techniques. This approach is not primarily motivated by the traditional "value-judgement criticism" but it is an attempt at "digging" into the deepest bottom in search for "meaning", which is knowledge. I consider it to be a "new" cognitive approach in Shakespeare-criticism. Motivated by the *New Critics* we start with scrutinizing the text, but the text itself unfolds a "deeper structure" (a "skeleton") which is more than the texture itself, something to do with the author's perhaps unconscious intention or "mind". This "mind" is not only anchored in the context of the age but in the context of "simultaneous existence", which we may call *tradition*.

This approach is *hermeneutical*.

### 3. *Meaning - and Hermeneutics*

In Part 1, I began my train of thought by suggesting that literature is language and it addresses the reader personally, as a language of concern. In Part 2, I arrived at the conclusion that the different types of figurative language convey "meaning", a kind of knowledge that can be exegetically explored. The emblem is perhaps the best example of what T. S. Eliot called "unified sensibility" - the unity of aesthetic and intellectual perception. Emblem, as we have seen was both representation and interpretation: both art and cognition.

All these principles have guided us to the recognition that the interpretation of the emblematic nature of Shakespeare's language is mainly a hermeneutical-exegetical approach.

The main assumption of the German philosopher Hans Georg Gadamer is that the 19th century historical or "philological" approach to literary texts was essentially scientific in terms of the natural sciences and presupposed the neutrality of the reader or interpreter thus fully neglecting the reader's own concern or involvement. However, literature and the arts constitute not dead documents but living monuments, they address the reader as "*language*", it is a personal discourse and the reader is also involved in the communication. "Language is the fundamental mode of operation of our being-in-the-world and the all-embracing form of the constitution of the world"<sup>57</sup>

The humanities treat the text as a "living person" and Gadamer calls it: *Tradition*. "Literature is

rather a function of spiritual conservation and tradition, and therefore carries into every present its hidden history"<sup>58</sup>.

I have not yet come across any interpretations of Gadamer which recognize the striking similarity between his thoughts and T.S. Eliot's famous ideas on tradition. Eliot in his *Tradition and the Individual Talent* (1919) speaks about a historical sense which "involves a perception, not only of the pastness of the past but of its presence. This historical sense involves both timeless and temporal and it emphasizes the simultaneous existence of the whole of the literature of Europe. Therefore "no poet, no artist of any art, has a complete meaning alone. His significance is... his relation to the dead poets and artists".<sup>59</sup>

According to both Eliot and Gadamer tradition is the personal and simultaneous power permanently irradiating its vitalized "message". But Eliot relates "meaning" to the past tradition while Gadamer's focus is on the reader or interpreter who can grasp this message only if he is involved in it. Understanding is not a process of cognition but participation, and application (*ars applicandi*) determines understanding (*ars intelligendi*).

Gadamer's theory of "authentic understanding" is firmly rooted in the existentialist philosophy and theology of Heidegger and Bultmann. Some of his critics maintain that his theory is mainly an extension and codification of the hermeneutical theories of Heidegger and Bultmann.

But the problem arises: if there is no stable meaning and if it is the interpreter or reader who determines this meaning, how can we find the principle which makes our interpretation valid? Readers and interpreters differ not only in the course of the succeeding ages but at the same time and place as well. There can be various readings and interpretations of the same work of art or text. If so, misreadings or misunderstandings will easily be justified. How can we arrive at a static identity of meaning behind the diversity of individual evaluations and readings? Or shall we go as far as to maintain that "meaning" as such simply does not exist? Is there no objective meaning behind the individual readings of Shakespeare? Does this way of thinking not lead us into the delicate grounds of relativism?

These questions have been raised by Gadamer's most relevant critic, the American E.D. Hirsch Jr. Hirsch's *The Validity of Interpretation* (1967) begins with the defence of the author's intention against the "heavy and largely victorious assault of those who maintained the autonomy of the text saying eg. that "It does not matter what an author means - only what his text says". In Hirsch's opinion this literary and philosophical relativism (*New Criticism*, Eliot, Pound etc. and the *New Hermeneutics* of Gadamer and Bultmann) have destroyed the principles of validity. Value-oriented criticism and personal-experience-oriented philosophy could only tackle the questions: "how do I find it beautiful" and "Why it is true for me".. Thus hermeneutics became the field of rather subjective and

relative, perspectivist approaches seeking only *significance* and giving up to find *meaning*. "The objective of hermeneutics," says Hirsch, "is not to find the 'significance' of a passage for us today but to make clear its verbal meaning."<sup>60</sup>

Finally, let us examine, Hirsch's famous distinction between *meaning* and *significance*. "Meaning is which is represented" *significance*, on the other hand names the *relationship* between that meaning and a person or a conception, or a situation, or indeed anything imaginable"<sup>61</sup>.

Gadamer maintains that we can never reconstruct the author's original meaning and thus hermeneutics should be concerned exclusively with the reader's experience and participation. Hirsch on the other hand neglects the subjective process of understanding and for him hermeneutics, strictly speaking, is "the modest, and in the old-fashioned sense, philological effort to find out what the author meant", and this is the only "proper foundation of criticism"<sup>62</sup>.

In his other book, *The Aims of Interpretation* (1979) Hirsch elaborates his sharp criticism on the "dogmatic relativists" and "cognitive atheists" and he defends the "stable determinacy of meaning", for "without the stable determinacy of meaning there can be no knowledge in interpretation, nor any knowledge in the many humanistic disciplines based upon textual interpretation".<sup>63</sup> The structuring principle of this book on "meaning" and "significance" corresponds to the distinction between "*knowledge*" and "*evaluation*". Meaning or knowledge can be gained by appealing to the author's inten-

tions. But how to find the author's intentions? Hirsch argues that it can be grasped in the category of the *genre* or the "programme" of the writer. Cognition thus plays an important role: it even precedes value-judgement. Hirsch acknowledges the importance of evaluative criticism but he is firmly convinced that "without *scientia* humanistic evaluation is empty and pointless."<sup>64</sup>

How to find a way out of the labyrinth of the Gadamer-Hirsch controversy, why is it relevant and how is it related to our iconological-emblematic approach of Shakespeare?

First of all we cannot but appreciate Gadamer's significance in hermeneutic theory: his idea of the tradition addressing the reader as "language" and the reader's response via participation in the "hermeneutical circle" suggest the importance of understanding as *authentic knowledge*.

Hirsch is right in elucidating how easily hermeneutical theory grounded on the reader's experience may degenerate into dangerous relativism: misunderstandings and misreadings will become legitimate. Instead of the vague existential idea of "authentic" knowledge, Hirsch clearly demands "correct" knowledge.

Emblem-literature also constitutes what we called "tradition" or a special "language" that was made to address the reader. We must keep in mind the original twofold function of the emblem: representation and interpretation. It both delights (*delectare*) and teaches (*prodesse*) the reader. In responding to the delighting-representive function the reader

is motivated by the aesthetic experience. However, when surrendering ourselves we listen to the author's meaning, intention, genre or programme. Gombrich's theory of iconology is also anchored in the hermeneutical genre-theory of Hirsch.<sup>65</sup>

But even if we acknowledge the hermenetical nature of the emblem that "it is the last attempt to grasp spiritually the world in its totality in an exegetical manner"<sup>66</sup> - is it not an illegitimate approach to Shakespeare?

Since the present paper is a theoretical essay I have not been concerned with applying methodological principles to practical examples. Some of the papers presented in this volume will illustrate these principles.

However, it is not impossible to hint at the hermeneutical significance of Shakespeare both in terms of Gadamer and Hirsch.

On the one hand, when we simply utter the name of "Shakespeare" we associate not only a huge amount of diverse plays in our minds but we understand him in terms of "tradition". We are addressed by his plays and thus they constitute an organic part in our cultural heritage: his pastness is present, his dramas transcend the barriers of time and place by having a simultaneous existence. Shakespeare is both a *Living Monument* (Bradbrook) and *Our Contemporary* (Zotz). This is the "authentic" understanding of Shakespeare, this is his significance.

This recognition, however, should not entail a necessary abandoning of the "stable determinacy of meaning" of the author.

But how do we reconstruct the original meaning? Are we naive in supposing we can find the "intention of the author"? There is some truth in the fact that it would be absurd to hunt for external evidence or documents that potentially contain references by the author revealing his own intentions. Of course, this is not a path to follow.

However, as suggested above, the meaning as the intention of the author can be grasped in the genre he chose for his "programme".

A recent Shakespeare-critic, Stephen Kastan (1982) argues that "Shakespeare's dramas are not merely literary conventions but ethical categories" and for Shakespeare "the individual genre stands for a complete though hypothetical model of the world... genre becomes a way of imagining him as it shapes and is shaped by humankind."<sup>67</sup>

Besides the programme of the genre, intention or knowledge is also revealed in Shakespeare's poetic language. Caroline Spurgeon suggests that someone's speech, imagery and the figures he uses are much more informative than an autobiography. Imagery is a kind of revelation of the author's mind.

I have come to see that "meaning" can, even if not exhaustively, be explored from a close-reading and exegetical analysis of the text. In the preliminary introduction to this paper I alluded to the fact that as non-native speakers of English we had difficulty in understanding the meaning of the text. But the painstaking labour of "decoding Shakespeare's plays" has resulted in gaining "knowledge" even beyond the



verbal level. Thus this close-reading is both an aesthetic and an intellectual experience. The meaning of the text, as Hirsch suggests, has more to do with the author's intention than with the reader's. The author's intention is the reflection of his own mind. But what do we mean by Shakespeare's *mind*? Is it only his "own"? T.S. Eliot would probably give a negative answer. Shakespeare's mind carries, and is carried by, tradition.

Besides adding that Shakespeare was not only a talented craftsman as a playwright we can perhaps invite the romantics' distinction between "talent" and "genius". In the words of a 19th century American critic: "*Talent* is that which is in man's power; *genius* that in whose power man is."<sup>68</sup>

Shakespeare was from the very beginning considered as a "genius", even if an untutored one. He had been touched by the *enargia* of poetry and so he was an inspired poet.

If we want to "reconstruct" the meaning of his text we must naturally raise the question: whose "intention" are we searching for? The poet is more than William Shakespeare the man. The inspired poet is even more: he is possessed by the intensive spirit of poetry. Who, or what then is the author? The author is more than Shakespeare himself: it is language, poetry and tradition. The first phase of language, the hieroglyphic-metaphoric stage is revealed in his dramas. And here we are back again at Eliot. The genius, the great poet is "only" a medium, a catalyst because he exists only when he surrenders his personality by escaping from himself in perfect humility and concentration. Thus he will arrive at the border of existence, saying: "The rest is silence".

## NOTES

- 1 Quoted in Daly (1979a) p. 77.
- 2 R.M. Frye (1980) p. 16.
- 3 *ibid.*
- 4 L. Dézsi (1928)
- 5 H. Green (1866)
- 6 The team consists of the following members: Dr Tibor Fabiny (leader of the project, University of Szeged); Dr József Pál (University of Szeged), Dr Zoltán Szilassy (University of Debrecen); Dr Gy.E. Szónyi (University of Szeged); Dr Imre Téglásy (City Library of Szeged) and the students who regularly attended our weekly Sambucus-Whitney seminars: Agnes Kovács, Brigitta Lazur, Edit Nyúl, Klára Valentinyi, Erzsébet Vársai.
- 7 N. Frye (1982) p. 6
- 8 *ibid.*
- 9 M.H. Abrams: *A Glossary of Literary Terms* Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, Chicago etc. 1981 (1957) p. 63-6.
- 10 R. Berry (1978) p. 2.
- 11 Wellek-Warren (1949) p. 120
- 12 Ph. Wheelwright (1968) p. 124
- 13 *ibid.* p. 146

- 14 Quoted in: *The Dictionary of the History of Ideas*  
Charles Scribners Son NY. (1973 Vol IV. p. 466.
- 15 Quoted in: Lewalski (1979) p. 180
- 16 Dieckmann (1957) p. 308
- 17 Daly (1979a) p. 54
- 18 R. Klibansky, E. Panofsky, F. Saxl; *Saturn and Melancholy*  
(London, 1969) and; Frances Yates; *The Occult*  
*Philosophy in the Elisabethan Age*, London (1979) Routledge  
and Kegan Paul
- 19 Dieckmann (1957) and R. Freeman (1948) p. 3.
- 20 Gordon (1975) p. 53.
- 21 *ibid.* p. 54.
- 22 Quoted in *The Dictionary of the History Ideas* Vol II. p. 531.
- 23 *ibid.* p. 536.
- 24 Panofsky (1939) pp. 5-7.
- 25 Panofsky (1955) p. 51.
- 26 *ibid.*
- 27 Gombrich (1972) pp. 6-7.
- 28 cf. notes 22. pp. 524-41.
- 29 Steadmann (1970) pp. 73-122.

- 30 *ibid.* p. 113.
- 31 Heckscher (1970)
- 32 Ewbank (1971) p. 118.
- 33 R.M. Frye (1980] p. 11.
- 34 *ibid.* p. 17.
- 35 Thomson (1924) p. 29.
- 36 *ibid.* p. 39.
- 37 Lewalski (1979) p. 179
- 38 Daly (1979a) p. 16-7.
- 39 Samuel Daniel (1585)
- 40 Dieckmann (1957) p. 313.
- 41 Quoted by Lewalski (1979) p. 183.
- 42 Quoted by Thomson (1924) p. 32.
- 43 Estienne (1646)
- 44 Freeman (1948)
- 45 Thomson (1924) p. 50.
- 46 Daly (1979a) p. 15.
- 47 *ibid.*

- 48 *ibid.* p. 21.
- 49 *ibid.* p. 51.
- 50 Quoted *ibid* p. 52.
- 51 *ibid.*
- 52 *ibid.* p. 55.
- 53 *ibid.* p. 71.
- 54 Cf. R. Wittkower: *Allegory and the Migration of Symbols*  
London Thames and Hudson (1977)
- 55 Daly (1979a) p. 82.
- 56 *ibid.* p. 82
- 57 Quoted in Bleicher (1980) p. 128.
- 58 Quoted in Hirsch (1967) p. 250.
- 59 Eliot 1919 in. eg. Frank Kermode - J. Hollander ed. :  
*Modern British Literature* Oxford UP (1973) pp. 505-11.
- 60 Quoted in Palmer (1969) p. 61.
- 61 Hirsch (1967) p. 8.
- 62 Palmer (1969) p. 62.
- 63 Hirsch (1979) p. 1.
- 64 *ibid.* p. 158.

- 65 Gombrich (1972) pp. 6-7
- 66 Cf. Note 1
- 67 Kastan (1982) p. 174
- 68 Quoted in *The Dictionary of the History of Ideas ...*  
Vol II. Under: *Genius*

## R E F E R E N C E S

- Berry, R. 1978. *The Shakespearean Metaphor* (Repr. 1980) Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Bleicher, J. 1980. *Hermeneutics, as a Method, Philosophy and Critique* Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Daly, Peter M. 1979a. *Emblem Theory Recent German Contributions to the Characterization of the Emblem Genre*. KTO Press Nendeln (Liechtenstein, Wolfwenbütteler Forschungen. Herausgegeben von der Herzog August Bibliothek. Band 9)
- Daly, Peter M. 1979b. *Literature in the Light of the Emblem Structural Parallels between the Emblem and the Literature in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* University of Toronto Pr.
- Daniel, Samuel tr. (1585) *A Worthy Tract of Paulus Iovius Containing a Discourse of rare inventious...* London
- Dézsi, L. 1928. *Magyar hatások Shakespeare művészetében (Hungarian Impact on Shakespeare's Art)* *Irodalomtörténet* 1928
- Dieckmann, Lieselotte, 1957 "Renaissance Hieroglyphics", *Comparative Literature* 9 (1957), 308-321.
- Estienne, H. 1946. *The Art of Making Devices* Translated by Thomas Blunt London (1646)
- Ewbank, I-s. 1971. "More Pregnantly than Words. Some Uses and Limitations of Visual Symbolism" *Shakespeare Survey*, 24 (1971) pp. 13-8.
- Fraser, R.A. 1961. *Shakespeare's Poetics In Relation to King Lear* London Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Frye, N. 1982. *The Great Code. The Bible and Literature* Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Frye, R.M. 1980 "Relating Visual and Verbal Art in Shakespeare" In: *Conference of College Teachers of English Proceedings* Vol. XIX. Sept 1980 pp. 11-28.
- Gombrich, E.H. 1972. *Symbolic Images Studies in the Art of the Renaissance* N.Y.

- Gordon, D.J. 1975. *The Renaissance Imagination Collected Essays* Ed. by Stephen Orgel University of California Press
- Green, H. 1866. "Shakespeare's References to Emblem Books and Whitney". In: *Whitney's Choice of Emblems A facsimile reprint* London, 1866 pp. 233-312.
- Green, H. 1870 *Shakespeare and the Emblem Writers*  
An exposition of their Similarities of Thought and Expression. London: Trübner Co.
- Heckscher, W.S. 1970. "Shakespeare in Relation to the Visual Arts A Study of Paradox  
*Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama* XIII-XIV. pp. 5-71.
- Henkel, P. - Schöne, A. 1967. *Emblemata. Handbuch zur Sinnbildkunst des XVI und XVII Jahrhunderts* Stuttgart
- Hirsch, E.D. Jr. 1967. *Validity in Interpretation*  
New Haven Yale UP
- Hirsch, E.D. Jr. 1979. *The Aims of Interpretation*  
The University of Chicago Press
- Jöns, Dietrich Walter 1966. *Das "Sinnen-Bild" Studien zur allegorischen Bildlichkeit bei Andreas Gryphius*  
Stuttgart
- Lewalski, B.K. 1979. *Protestant Poetics and Seventeenth Century Religious Lyric* Princeton UP.
- Palmer, R.E. 1969. *Hermenentics* Worwestern UP. Evanoton



- Panofsky, E. 1939. *Studies in Iconology: Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance* New Y. (The Icon Edition, Harper and Row 1972).
- Panofsky, E. 1955. *Meaning in the Visual Arts* New York
- Praz, Mario *Studies in Seventeenth Century Imagery*  
Ind ed. (Rome, 1964)
- Schöne, A. 1968. *Emblematik und Drama im Zeitalter des Barock*  
2nd rev. ed. Munich.
- Spurgeon, C. 1935. *Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us*  
Cambridge UP (1982)
- Steadmann, J.M. 1970. "The Iconography and Renaissance Drama  
Ethical and Mythological Themes  
*Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama*  
XIII-XIV pp. 73-122.
- Thomson, E.N.S. 1924. *Literary Bypath of the Renaissance*  
Yale UP, New Haven
- Wellek, R. - Warren, A. 1949. *The Theory of Literature*
- Wheelwright, Ph. 1968. *The Burning Fountain A Study  
in the Language of Symbolism*  
Indiana UP Bloomington.