Notes

For full references, see the first mention of books. Where not otherwise indicated, the place of publication of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century books is London.

INTRODUCTION


4. *Venus*, 525; *R. III*, II.iii.2; *Merch.*, I.i.7; *A.V.L.*, III.v.57; *Ham.*, V.ii.139; *Meas.*, II.ii.219; *Lear*, I.i.203, Liv.251; *Mach.*, II.ii.73, IV.ii.19, IV.iii.163; *Ant.*, II.i.95; *Cor.*, II.i.62; *H. VIII*, II.ii.208; III.ii.378.

5. The first, and so far only, systematic use of nosce teipsum tracts for Shakespeare interpretation is by Paul A. Jorgensen, *Lear's Self-Discovery* (Berkeley, Calif., 1967).


7. Wilhelm Dilthey, "Weltanschauung und Analyse des Menschen seit Renaissance und Reformation," in *Gesammelte Schriften* (Leipzig, 1914), 2:18. For an argument on the vis inertia of the earlier Renaissance, see Herschel Baker, *The Dignity of Man* (Cambridge, Mass., 1947). Simplistically, Shakespeare's thought was identified with the medieval humanistic synthesis by E. M. W. Tillyard, *The Elizabethan World Picture* (London, 1943). Tillyard himself came to modify this position somewhat, admitting that "it is then, on balance, no fiction that the conception of man changed from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance" (*The English Renaissance: Fact or Fiction* [Baltimore, Md., 1951], p. 20). That the pendulum has swung away from the medievalizing of Shakespeare is indicated by the recent.


CHAPTER ONE

1. Andreas Alciatus, Emblemata (Lyon, 1550), p. 200; Geoffrey Whitney, A Choice of Emblems (1586), p. 130. The use of the mirror for gaining self-knowledge had a number of classical precedents. The idea was associated with Socrates, who recommended that young men take frequent looks into a mirror so that handsome men acquire a behavior corresponding to their appearance and ugly ones conceal their defects by the development of their inner beauty. See Diogenes Laertius, Vitae Philosophorum, 2:33. A similar contrast is made in Phaedrus, III.8. The recommendation to use the mirror for self-knowledge was also ascribed to the Seven Sages of Greece; their sayings were often attached to the sentence collection called Cato, a standard book for parsing in Renaissance grammar schools. Seneca has some remarks on the use of the mirror for self-knowledge, introduced by "Inventa sunt specula ut homo se ipse nosceret" (Naturales Questions, I.xvii.4).

2. Desiderius Erasmus, Enchiridion Militis Christiani, trans. [William Tyndale?] (1533), sig. C7r. Cf. Sol. 1:7. The Elizabethan English bibles do not convey the idea of self-knowledge here (and neither does the King James version), but the Genevan side-note explains that Christ commands those who "are ignorant to go to the pastors to learn"—an injunction that may be taken as a plea for self-education. The idea of self-examination is expressed in 2 Cor. 13:5. Seneca, De Providentia, iv,3 ff., compares the acquisition of self-knowledge to the testing of a soldier in battle.

3. Francis Seager, The School of Virtue (1957), sig. B8r.


5. Leonhardus Culman, Pueriles (Augsburg, 1546), sigs. A2r, A2v, A6v, etc.; Catonis Disticha (1562), sigs. H1r, H5v, etc.


9. For an analysis of the book, see Foster Watson, The ZODIACUS VITAE of Marcellus Palingenius Stellatus (London, 1908), and Rosemond Tuve's introduction to The Zodiac of Life, trans. Barnabe Googe, Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints (New York, 1947). For the influence of Palingenius on Shakespeare, see John E. Hankins, Shakespeare's Derived Imagery (Lawrence, Kans., 1953). Sources other than Palingenius for Sir John Davies's Nosce Teipsum have been suggested by G. T. Buckley, "The Indebtedness of Sir John Davies' Nosce Teipsum to Philip Mornay's Tristes of the Christian Religion", MP 25 (1927): 67-78, and...
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Louis Bredvold, "The Sources Used by Davies in Nosce Teipsum", PMLA 38 (1923): 745-69. Sir John was traveling a familiar route. He may, as T. W. Baldwin has suggested, have been putting his lecture notes to good use during his penitential year at Oxford when he composed the poem.


12. For "mind" or "soul," see Caes., I.i.310, II.i.322; Ham., III.i.160, 150; I H. IV, V.iv.20; R. II, II.i.57; H. VIII, I.i.146; Somn., 115, 116. For "self," see Err., II.i.122; Per., II.iv.37; Ant., IV.xii.47; W. T., I.i.79, IV.iv.7; H. VIII, II.i.92, III.i.335.

13. The first to notice the parallel appears to have been Charles Wordsworth, On Shakespeare's Knowledge and Use of the Bible (London, 1864), pp. 111-12.


15. The difference between these two kinds of decorum is noted by Marvin T. Herrick, Comic Theory in the Sixteenth Century (Urbana, Ill., 1950), p. 140.


18. John Woolton, A Treatise of the Immortality of the Soul (1576). Concerning Woolton's claim to have been the first to have written on the soul in English, it should be said that the subject had not been passed by in theological works, e.g., in John Rastell's A New Book of Purgatory (ca. 1530), and in John Calvin's Institution of Christian Religion, trans. Thomas Norton (1561). Woolton appears to borrow from Bullinger's sermon on the soul in Decades (which had its first English translation in 1577). There were many Latin humanistic works in the de anima tradition; a long list is in Conrad Gessner's Pandectarium (Zurich, 1574).

19. Thomas Rogers, A Philosophical Discourse Entitled the Anatomy of the Mind (1576). Probably induced by Rogers's book, John Woolton published A New Anatomy of Whole Man: As Well His Body as His Soul (1576). The equation of self-knowledge with knowledge of mind and body was general; e.g., it is in Timothy Bright, A Treatise of Melancholy (1586); Juan Huarte de San Juan, Examen de Ingenios: The Examination of Men's Wits, trans. Richard Carew (1594); Sir John Davies, Nosce Teipsum (1599); Thomas Walkington, The Optic Glass of Humors (1609); and Pierre Charron, Of Wisdom, trans. Samson Leard (1612).


22. Deut. 32:29; Psalms 8:4; Isa. 1:3; Jer. 23:20, 30:24; Eccl. 3:18; Heb. 2:6. Some Elizabethan and Jacobean tracts were still very much in the tradition of consideratio, e.g., Andrew Kingsmill, A View of Man's Estate (1594) and The Anatomy of Sin (1603), attributed to Thomas Lodge.
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25. Full treatments of Calvin's attitude toward man are in T. F. Torrance, Calvin's Doctrine of Man (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1947), and Leroy Nixon, John Calvin's Teaching on Human Reason (New York, 1960).


27. See L. L. Schüting, The Puritan Family (New York, 1969; German edition, 1929); for the Elizabethan manuals, see Louis B. Wright, Middle Class Culture in Elizabethan England (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1935), part 2, chap. 8: "Guides to Godliness."


30. Sir Thomas Elyot, The Book Named the Governor (1531), fol. 176 [Bk. III, chap. 31].


34. Sir James Perrott, The First Part of the Consideration of Human Condition (Oxford, 1600). My attention was drawn to this very rare book by Professor Robert Dent at the Huntington Library. I have found it very useful for illustrating the patterns of self-knowledge in Lear. Sir James's ambitious plan was to follow up the First Part, devoted to moral consideration, with three more parts on political, natural, and metaphysical consideration. He seems to have had in mind a kind of "English Academy" to rival the French Academy of La Primauyaye. But Sir James became involved in politics and abandoned his philosophic consideration.


36. William Baldwin, A Treatise of Moral Philosophy (1564; 1st ed. 1547), fol. 76. These verses appear to be Thomas Palfreyman's, who competed with Baldwin in augmenting the Treatise. The 1564 edition has a long section, "Of Man and What he is," full of notable nosce teipsum sayings, some of them credited to certain philosophers without foundation in fact. The medieval wisdom literature, from which Baldwin's collection descends, was evidently under pressure from the humanistic nosce teipsum trend.

CHAPTER TWO

1. "Counter-humanism," as Paul Kristeller has suggested, is a more appropriate term for the intellectual tendencies incongruous with the Erasmian synthesis than "counter-Renaissance," which has been given currency by the provocative study of Hiram Haydn, The Counter-Renaissance (New York, 1950).


5. Ibid., 1:48 [chap. 10].

6. Ibid., 3:297 [chap. 12].

7. Ibid., 3:339 [chap. 13].


11. “The old-fashioned and simple opinion, according to which Machiavelli was a teacher of evil,” is very effectively defended by Leo Strauss, *Thoughts on Machiavelli* (Glencoe, Ill., 1958).


13. Ibid., p. 136 [chap. 18].

14. Ibid., 137 [chap. 18].

15. Ibid., 140 [chap. 18].


17. Ibid., p. 148.


20. Bacon’s ideas of self-knowledge are discussed by Sidney Warhaft, “Bacon and the Renaissance Ideal of Self-Knowledge,” *Personalist*, 44 (1963): 454-71. I am indebted to Warhaft’s analysis. For a precedent to Bacon’s utilitarian interpretation of self-knowledge, one could point to the ancient Sophists, who thought that to know oneself was to know his need.


22. When Bacon spoke in the corresponding passage of *De Augmentis* (IV.1), of the theme of the “triumphs of man,” which had not been sufficiently investigated, he evidently thought of a subject different from the humanists’ orations on the “dignity of man”; he presumably wanted to see man’s control over his environment glorified.
CHAPTER THREE


2. Bacon criticized the microcosmic theories of Paracelsus and the alchemists; see Conger, Macrocosms and Microcosms, p. 67. For the criticism by Calvin and Montaigne, see above, chap. 2.


4. The earliest unmistakable meaning of "frame" in the sense of border or case listed in OED is from 1660. It is true, OED cites "frame" in Shakespeare's sonnet 24 as an example, but, as I am arguing in the present chapter, the word should be taken to refer to the structure of man.


7. Arthur Golding, Epistle Dedicatory, Metamorphoses, sig. BT.


11. For the pictorial conception of Hamlet's speech on man (II.ii.295 ff.), see Baldwin, Compositional Genetics, pp. 301 ff. Cf. below, Appendix C.

12. Sir Thomas Elyot, Of the Knowledge Which Maketh a Wise Man (1533), fols. 44-46.


14. "Ne meritum praelustre tuum, dignissima mundi / Pars Homo, servili conditione premas; / In te tota patet coelorum atque orbis imago, / Hinc decus, hinc dotes noscere disce tuas" (Florentius Schoonhovius, Emblemata [Gouda, 1618], Emblem 1).

15. All's W., III.i.12, IV.ii.4; sonnet 59; R. III, I.ii.243; Oth., II.iii.330.

16. "Homo natus de muliere brevi vivens tempore repetur multis miseriis" (Lauren's van Haecht Goedtsenhoven, musponimus, Parvus Mundus [Frankfurt, 1618], Emblem 1). This is the emblem depicted on the dust jacket. Courtesy of the British Museum.


21. The pregnant phrase "muddy vesture of decay" strikes one as a Christian
accent. Yet it might be noted that, in a passage on the soul's knowledge of itself, which may well be a source of Lorenzo's speech, Cicero asks the rhetorical question whether the soul was formed out of this "earthy, mortal, and decaying" substance (*terrena mortalique natura caduca*). See *Tusculan Disputations*, I.62.


23. "Shakespeare and the Thought of His Age," p. 188.


26. Ibid., p. 6. Cf. Homer, *Iliad*, VIII. The *aurea catena* was identified with a chain of order, reaching from God to the bottom of the universe, in the Commentary of Macrobius on Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis*. For the development of this idea, see Arthur O. Lovejoy, *The Great Chain of Being* (Cambridge, Mass., 1936). There is much to object to in the popularization of the concept in Tillyard's *The Elizabethan World Picture*. Tillyard's claim that it would be easy to accumulate texts describing the great chain of being in Elizabethan literature is misleading. The Elizabethans seem to have been reluctant to use the metaphor in the manner of Macrobius. One reason appears to be that the Stoics identified the golden chain with an inexorable fate that transcended even the will of the gods, a notion that conflicted with the Christian idea of divine providence (see Baldwin, *Compositional Genetics*, p. 139).

27. Wylie Sypher, *Four Stages of Renaissance Style* (Garden City, N.Y., 1954), p. 62. Sypher here summarizes the concepts of artistic composition basic to the Renaissance style according to the fundamental study of Heinrich Wölfflin, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe* (1915), translated as *Principles of Art History* (New York, 1922). Wölfflin's concepts are: (1) linear vision: the stress is on the outlines, the "limits" of things; (2) plane organization: the parts of a total form are reduced to a sequence of planes; (3) closed form: a clear, "tectonic" form is established by rules and ratios that govern the relations of the parts; (4) multiple unity: the parts maintain a certain independence in a composition that aims at a harmony based on multiplicity.

28. For an exposition of Renaissance natural law and its influence on drama, see George C. Herndl, *The High Design: English Renaissance Tragedy and the Natural Law* (Lexington, Ky., 1970). Herndl sees Shakespeare as an apologist of natural law; but I shall in later parts of this book argue that Shakespeare developed doubts about this concept as he did also of other Renaissance orthodoxies.


32. E.g., Boethius, *De Consolatione*, II, m. 8; III, m. 10; *Romance of the Rose*, 1685-88; Chaucer, *Knight's Tale*, A 2985-88; *Troilus and Criseyde*, III, 1744-72; Spenser, *Colin Clouts*, 841-52; *Faerie Queene*, IV,i.xxx; *An Hymne in Honour of Love*, 85-92.


34. Sig. A2r.

35. *Zodiac*, p. 110 [Libra].
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37. Philippus Beroaldus, Commentary on Cicero's Quaestiones Tusculanae (Paris, 1562), fol. 34: "Homo autem cognoscit seipsum, si originis natalisque ordina prima resperexit: ... et hoc intelligi vult esto in loco M.T. ... anima cognoscit semetipsam, quando scrutamur utrum corpora vel incorpora, utrum simplex ex pluribus composita, utrum facta an ommno a nillo sit facta, utrum origo ejus pariter cum origine corporis traducatur, quod se traducem fieri dicitur an perfecta extrinsecus veniens parato jam et formato inter viscera muliebra corpore indicatur et multa hoc genus."

38. "Participate" appears to have here a more active meaning than indicated in Schmidt's paraphrase 'to have in common with others.' In its transitive use, the verb has the connotation of the translation of participere in Thomas Cooper's Thesaurus (1578) "to give part, to make partner or of counsel."

39. Bartholomaem Anglicus, De Proprietatibus Rerum (Nürnberg, 1519), sig. 3r.

40. Oth., III.iii.378; T. N., IV.iii.9.

41. Rom., I.iii.28; Caes., II.1.66.

42. Sir John Davies, Nosce Teipsum, p. 86.


45. It could be said, of course, that the universe was "full" in a physical sense at least below the moon because all voids were filled with air; but theologians objected to the idea that no world more filled with objects and creatures was conceivable. This objection to plenitude is the same as noted for the Middle Ages by Arthur Lovejoy, The Great Chain of Being (Cambridge, Mass., 1936), pp. 99 ff. Thus one of the key concepts of the "great chain of being," as some modern critics have used the term, was decidedly unorthodox in Shakespeare's time. Lovejoy, contrary to Tillyard, does not claim that the great chain of being was a familiar image or idea for the Elizabethans.


48. Laws [VIII.2], ed. Hanbury, 3: 263.


CHAPTER FOUR


3. Cf. sonnet 74; Macb. V.viii.18.

4. See Laurence J. Mills, One Soul in Bodies Twain (Bloomington, Ind., 1937).
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6. Immortality (1576), fol. 74.

7. For the five-act formula, see T. W. Baldwin, Five Act Structure. An example of a strong passion in Terence analyzed as being close to tragicus furor is Geta's outbreak of anger in Adelphoe III.ii; the term is that of Willichius in his commentary on Terence, Fabulae (Zürich, 1550), pp. 401-2.


9. See Richard Henze, "The Comedy of Errors: A Freely Binding Chain," SQ 22 (1971) : 35-41. This metaphorical use of the chain has nothing to do with the great chain of being; see above, chap. 3, n. 25.


12. E.g., Peter Martyr [Pietro Vermigli], Commonplaces, trans. Antony Marten (1583), I, 124: "... woman, compared unto man, as touching the actions and affairs of this life, she is not in the image of God, because she was created to be the helper of man." Luciana's argument was also a properly legal one. See above, chap. 3, n. 29.


15. Cf. Rom., II.vi.37, Caes., II.i.273, H. P., V.ii.357.


Chapter Five


4. Virgil Whitaker, Shakespeare's Use of Learning (San Marino, Cal., 1953), p. 84.

5. Sigs. A'–A2v. Subsequent references to this edition in this chapter are in the text.


8. French Academy, p. 41. For an example of the transmission of the distinction
between active and contemplative philosophy in a grammar school of Shakespeare's time, see Baldwin, Shaksper's Small Latine, 1:325: a Winchester student recorded the division in his notebook from the dictation of his master.

12. Ibid., 96, 98.
13. Ibid., p. 98.
14. Castiglione, Courtier, sig. Ce3” [Bk. IV].
15. Alexander Nowell's Catechism warns against abusing the name of God “either with forswearing or with swearing rashly, unadvisedly, and without necessity” (A Catechism, trans. Thomas Norton [1571], sig. Da5).

Beroaldus, Commentary, Quaestiones Tusculanae (Paris, 1549), fol. 257: “Caeterum Hieronymus, Lactantius, Augustinus, ecclesiastici doctores reprobant aegritudinem Stoicorum, approbantes mediocritatem Peripateticorum: quod et ratio demonstrat, et sensus communis exposcit: namque exiptare radicitus affectus est hominem ex homine tollere, et in corpore constitutum esse sine corpore, et optare potius quam docere. Meritoque scripsit Flaccus in satyra: ‘Nam vitiiis nemo sine nascitur... Naturalia enim haec sunt, non voluntaria quae peripatetici providenter et necessaria nobis insita esse demonstrant.” The Horace quotation is from Satires, I.iii.69. In Drant's translation, it reads: “For faultless, doubtless, born is none, / And he is even best / Whose life sincere admitteth few / And with the least is pressed” (Horace, trans. Thomas Drant [1567], sig. k4).

17. Cf. La Primaudaye, French Academy, p. 30: “Reason, by the means of God's grace, can both easily constrain, master, and compel all passions in such sort that they take no effect and also bring to pass that whatsoever is rashly desired shall be overcome by the discourse of prudent counsel.” Also, Woolton, Anatomy (1576), fol. 31: “The devil... without God's especial and wonderful grace is able to do much against silly and weak man.” Similarly, Barckley, Felicity of Man, p. 472: “A contented and quiet mind, void of sorrow and fear,... cannot be obtained without God's special grace and gift and his alliance to our endeavors.”

18. “Facile precor gelida quando pecus omne sub umbra/Ruminat” (IV.ii.89-90). Most modern editions, including Alexander, restore Holofernes's “Facile” to the “Fauste” of “good old” Mantuan. This emendation eliminates a joke: the pedagogue's Latin is a little rusty.

19. For an examination of the recurring speculation that this passage is a satirical barb at an alleged “School of Night,” see Ernest A. Strathmann, “The Textual Evidence for ’the School of Night,'” MLN 56 (1941): 176-86. Among the emendations suggested, “suit of night” is attractive. On the basis of the Palingenius passage quoted above, “owl of night” might be appropriate, but it would be difficult to believe that it could lead to the misreading of “school of night.” At any rate, the object of comparison must be of a dark hue and must fit into the context of contrasts between dark and light, night and day, which is conventional for the twin themes of spiritual warfare and courtly love. A satirical reference of the kind suggested by the adherents of the “School of Night” theory would be merely confusing.

20. Berowne's words echo as late as The Tempest (IV.i.52-53): “The strongest oaths are straw / To th'fire ith'blood.” Cf. also Merck, Lii.20.

21. The repetitive nature of the subsequent lines indicates that Shakespeare revised the passage and that both the original version (IV.iii.291-313) and the revision (314-61) remained standing. In my analysis, I shall use this latter passage, which Shakespeare presumably wanted to take the place of the earlier lines.

Thomas Bowes (1594), p. 8: 'All things created have their proper motion, which they follow according to that love that every one of them beareth to his natural disposition. . . . And as the fire and air naturally love to be above and therefore draw thitherward without ceasing, so the water and earth love to keep below so that they always bend that ways.' Shakespeare developed this idea at length in a conceit he carried through two of his sonnets (44 and 45).

Chapter Six


2. Some key images are earth, blood, weeping, tongue, sickness, blot, sun, and moon; see Richard Altick, "Symphonic Imagery in Richard II," PMLA 62 (1947): 339-65. Most of these illustrate grief or give it cosmic dimensions. The up-and-down movement in the imagery has been noted by Paul Jorgensen, "Vertical Patterns in Richard II," Shak. Ass. Bull. 23 (1948): 119-34. Again, this imagery illustrates grief, considered by the physiologists a "heavy" passion, dragging down the afflicted person. For the variations of the theme of grief in contrasting patterns, see Rolf Soellner, "The Four Primary Passions: A Renaissance Theory Reflected in the Works of Shakespeare," SP 55 (1958): 549-67.


4. See Bullough's Introduction to the sources of the play, and Willard Farnham, The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy (Berkeley, Calif., 1956). Froissart, whose Chronicle Shakespeare may have read in the translation of Lord Berner, expressed considerable pity for Richard. Other French sources, such as, for instance, the Chronique de la Tra'ison et Mort de Richard Deux Roy Dangleterre, were even more decidedly anti-Lancastrian.


6. Ibid.


8. Governor, fol. 177 [Bk. III, chap. 3].

9. I disagree with the argument that Shakespeare conceived Richard as a "mercurial humor" made by J. W. Draper, "The Character of Richard II," PQ 21 (1942): 228-36. Mercurial humors were thought to be of Protean instability, changing from one mood to another. But the earlier Richard is not quite as unstable or "stupid" as Professor Draper finds him.


11. Ibid., fol. 148.

12. Ibid.

13. Ibid., fols. 90-91.

14. These features are noted by Timothy Bright, Treatise (1586), pp. 100-101.

15. Consideration of Human Condition, p. 5.


18. The first to suggest that Holbein’s woodcut influenced Shakespeare seems to have been Francis Douce, *Illustrations of Shakespeare* (London, 1807), 1:140.

19. The well-worn commonplace of the theater of the world was, in its association with consideratio, familiar to the Elizabethans by the titular image of Boaistuau’s popular *Theatrum Mundi*, in its first and longest part, a *contemptus mundi* tract.


21. Richard’s inability to separate his sacral role from his profane existence is discussed by Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *The King’s Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton, N.J., 1957).


23. Diego de Estella, *A Method unto Mortification* [De Contemptu Mundi], trans. Thomas Rogers (1586; ed. 1608), pp. 381-82. Peter Ure, in the introduction to the New Arden edition, examines the veritas-vanitas convention and gives further references. Ure notes that Queen Elizabeth is said to have asked for a mirror on her deathbed, then rejected the “flattering glass” and demanded a “true” one. Cf. also Shakespeare, sonnet 62.


25. The association between the mirror symbol and books conducive to self-knowledge was well established. Thomas Bowes introduced his translation of *The French Academy*, Pt. II, by calling the book a “mirror” so the reader could “know himself the better” by it (La Primaudaye, *Second Part*, sig. A5r). Pierre Charron, *Of Wisdom*, said in his preface to Part I, that “we have no clearer looking glass, no better book, than ourselves.” There was of course, above all, *The Mirror for Magistrates*, into which Elizabethans might have wished Richard II to have looked.


31. The incomplete self-awareness of Richard is well described by Robert Heathman, *Tragedy and Melodrama* (Seattle, Wash., 1968), pp. 180 ff. Heathman suggests that this lack of completeness is a major reason why the play is a melodrama rather than a tragedy. But I do not think that intellectual self-awareness is a prerequisite for a tragic hero; Othello and Lear (not to speak of Macbeth) possess little of this commodity, and I shall subsequently argue that the processes of self-knowledge in Shakespeare’s later tragedies are not primarily intellectual. For Richard II setting a pattern for Shakespeare’s tragedies, see Peter G. Philias, “Richard II and Shakespeare’s Tragic Mode,” *TSLL* 5 (1963): 344-55, and Travis Bogard, “Shakespeare’s Second Richard,” *PMLA* 70 (1955): 192-209.
CHAPTER SEVEN


2. Lemnius, Touchstone (1581), fols. 33 ff.

3. Huarte, Examen de Ingenios, pp. 239 ff.


9. Lemnius, Touchstone, fols. 34-35.


12. As is noted by Walter in the introduction, Henry's "consideration" is religious as well as secular and amounts to a total change of personality. The program is of the kind outlined by Perrott, Consideration of Human Condition. Cf. below, chap. 16.


18. Governor, fols. 176-77 [Bk. III, chap. 3].

19. This is the judgment of E. M. W. Tillyard, Shakespeare's History Plays (New York, 1944), p. 308.

20. Peter Martyr, for instance, went so far in his metaphysical optimism as to prove the wisdom of the divine plan by the argument that "there would be no life of lions if there were no slaughter of sheep wherewith the lions be fed; neither would there be patience of martyrs unless the cruelty of tyrants were permitted by God." (Commonplaces [1583], I, 200).

21. Touchstone, fol. 51.

Chapter Eight

1. *Julius Caesar* is considered Shakespeare's first problem play by Ernest Schanzer, *The Problem Plays of Shakespeare* (1963; rpt. New York, 1965), p. 10. There has been no unanimity on the definition of "problem play" and on the question of which particular plays should be thus designated. F. S. Boas, who applied the term for the first time to Shakespeare (in analogy to Ibsen's social dramas), included *Hamlet, Troilus and Cressida, All's Well That Ends Well*, and *Measure for Measure* (*Shakespeare and his Predecessors*, New York, 1896). E. M. W. Tillyard accepted the same grouping (*Shakespeare's Problem Plays*, London, 1940). W. W. Lawrence restricted the term to the three comedies and found *Cymbeline* to have similar qualities (*Shakespeare's Problem Comedies*, New York, 1931). Peter Ure took Boas's group, but added *Timon of Athens* (*William Shakespeare: The Problem Plays. Writers and Their Work, Pamphlet No. 140*, London, 1961). Schanzer's choices are *Julius Caesar, Measure for Measure*, and *Antony and Cleopatra*. Schanzer points out the difficulty of defining what a problem play is, but his own definition is also open to criticism. A problem play is for him one "in which we find a concern with a moral problem which is central to it, presented in such a manner that we are unsure of our moral bearings, so that uncertain and divided responses to it in the minds of the audience are possible or even probable." Moral centrality is too subjective a term to bear such heavy weight in deciding the designation of genre.

2. The discussion of the use and the limitations of "mannerism" in art and literature is inextricably tied up with the controversy about the baroque. For the application of the latter term to literature, see René Wellek, "The Concept of the Baroque in Literary Scholarship," in *Concepts of Criticism* (New Haven, Conn., 1963). Wellek makes an appeal for the use of "baroque" in "more general terms of a philosophy or a world-view or even merely an emotional attitude toward the world" (p. 63). This general principle seems to me also valid for "mannerism." It is basic to Wylie Sypher's use in *Four Stages of Renaissance Style*; but unfortunately Sypher marred his literary analyses by metaphorical uses of terminology more proper to art history. Discussions on the literary side of the controversy are in *Colloquia Germanica, 1* (1967) and in *Literaturwissenschaftliches Jahrbuch*, N. F., 2 (1961): 174 ff. Major accounts of mannerism that also include literary analyses are: Jacques Bousquet, *Mannerism: The Painting and Style of the Late Renaissance* (New York, 1964); Arnold Hauser, *The Social History of Art*, vol. 2 (New York, 1960), and *Mannerism*, 2 vols. (London, 1955); John Shearman, *Mannerism* (New York, 1957). My claim for the occurrence of mannerist features in Shakespeare is more limited than that of most others who have used the term. Hauser considers all of Shakespeare mannerist, and so, it appears, does Freiherr Kleinschmit von Lengefeld, "Der Manierismus in der Dichtung Shakespeares," *SJ* 97 (1961): 62-99. Sypher finds *Hamlet, Measure for Measure, Lear*, and the romances mannerist. Some stimulating ideas on *Julius Caesar* and *Hamlet* as transitional plays between Renaissance and baroque are in Max Deutschbein, "Individ-
uum und Kosmos in Shakespeares Werken," SJ 69 (1933) : 6-26. For the applicability of “mannerism” to the problem plays (defined as the three comedies), see Jewell K. Vroonland, “Mannerism and Shakespeare’s Problem Plays: An Argument for Revaluation” (Ph.d. diss., Kansas State University, 1969).

3. It is arguable that the contradiction between the title of the play and the person of its protagonist stems from Shakespeare’s still writing in the pattern of the histories. See Moody E. Prior, “The Search for a Hero in Julius Caesar,” Renaissance Drama N. S., 2 (1969) : 81-101. But the histories that are clearly tragedies, Richard II and Richard III, have both their heroes and their centers of gravity in the same person, and there is no question about the appropriateness of their titles.


6. Ernst Gombrich, “Zum Werke Giulio Romano’s,” Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien, N. F., 8, 9 (1934/35) : 79-104, 121-49. Julio Romano is, of course, the artist referred to in WT., VI.i.95, as the alleged creator of the statue that turns out to be Hermione. Shakespeare was familiar with more homely forms of mannerist art, such as in late Elizabethan costumes and portraits.

7. Shakespeare’s Problem Plays, p. 3.


9. The distinction of πάθος and φόβος is made by Quintilian, Institutio Oratoria, VI.ii.9 ff. In De Oratore, II.iii.212, Cicero argued, much like Hamlet, that the more vehement emotions should be mingled with the milder ones in temperate speech; some inflow of mildness should reach the fiercest passion, and some energy must also kindle this mildness.


12. Mannerism, p. 28.


15. Sypher, Four Stages, p. 120. The literary style of Montaigne is defined as “mannerist” by Helmut Hatzfeld, “Per una definizione dello stile di Montaigne,” Convivium 22 (1953) : 284-90, and in Estudios sobre el Barocco (Madrid, 1964), pp. 308-17.


17. Essays, 1 : 288 [chap. 10].

18. Palingenius states the position emphatically: “But yet it forceth not if that the dunghill cock do guess / A precious stone as nothing worth, this makes not it the less / Of value” (Zodiac [1588], p. 99 [Virgo]).

19. See Don C. Allen, Doubt’s Boundless Sea; George T. Buckley, Rationalism in Sixteenth Century English Literature (Chicago, 1933) ; Paul H. Kocher, Christopher Marlowe (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1946).
NOTES TO PAGES 143-54

20. Cf. Woolton, Anatomy, fol. 2: "The philosophers, entreating of the excellence of man's nature, did guess and, as it were, dream of the divine qualities and operations of man's soul in the state of innocence." Quoting Luther, Woolton (fol. 5) says that Genesis gives "an evident and plain description of perfect nature, whereof the philosophers did rather divine and dream than know anything effectually."


22. Essays, 2:147 [chap. 12].

23. Ibid., 2:144 [chap. 12].

24. M. Johann Mannich Diaconus, Sacra Emblemata (Nürnberg, 1624), "Nosce Teipsum": "Ales, Juno, tuus gemmantes explicat alas, / Conspectis vero, dejicit has pedibus. / Dotibus ingenii fisus sic tollit in altum / Christas: ac meditans, de­primit has, homo, humum." ("Your bird, Juno, extends its brilliant feathers; but when it has seen its feet, it lets them fall to the ground. So man, trusting his mental powers, lifts his crest up in the air; but when he meditates, he lowers it to the earth.")


26. Ibid., 2:6 [chap. 1].


CHAPTER NINE


2. On the ambiguities in the character portrayals, see Schanzer, The Problem Plays, pp. 14 ff. Schanzer delineates well Shakespeare's technique of engaging and disengaging the sympathies of the audience; he seems to me, however, somewhat too generous to Caesar. The difficulties critics have had in interpreting the play and its characters are surveyed by Mildred Hartsock, "The Complexity of Julius Caesar," PMLA 81 (1966): 56-57.


4. Michael Drayton, The Barons' Wars (1603), p. 61 [Bk. III], echoed this passage in characterizing Mortimer: "Such one was he.../In whom in peace the elements all lay/So mixed as none could sovereignty impute/...His lively temper was so absolute,/That't seemed when heaven his model first began,/In him it shou'd perfection in a man." The edition of 1619 (which has slight alterations in the text of the passage) has the marginal note: "In the person of Mortimer, the pattern of an excellent man." Drayton recognized a pattern of perfection when he saw one.

5. This is a biblical term. Cf. Rom. 6:12-13 (Bishops): "Let not sin reign therefore in your mortal body that ye should thereunto obey by the lusts of it. Neither give you your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin."

6. Cf. Cooper's Thesaurus (1578): "Genius: The good or evil angel that pagans thought to be appointed to each man; the spirit of man."


17. Shakspeare, p. 283.

18. Caes., IV.iii.148 ff.: For the opinion that there was no revision and that the text as it stands is correct, see Warren D. Smith, "The Duplicate Revelation of Portia's Death," SQ 4 (1953) : 153-61. The argument appears strained, particularly in view of the fact that there is not only a repetition of the news of Portia's death, but there are two very admiring comments by Cassius on Brutus's fortitude. One of them is surely redundant.

19. In De Amicitia, Cicero said, "Take away the motions of the mind, and tell me what difference there is—I will not say, between a beast and a man, but even—between a man and a stone or a log or any other such like thing?" (Four Several Treatises, fol. 22). Bullinger spoke of the Stoics as men who "of patience do make a kind of senselessness and, of a valiant and constant man, a senseless block or a stone without passions" (Sermons, 1587, p. 302). Cf. Shrew, I.1.31.


CHAPTER TEN


2. Ham., V.ii.136-38: these lines are only in Quarto 2, not in the Folio; but since they dovetail with the rest, one can assume that they are not extraneous additions.

3. La Primaundaye, French Academy, pp. 10-12. Similarly, Castiglione, Courtier, sig. o6v [Bk. II].
6. Cf. E. E. Stoll, Hamlet: An Historical and Comparative Study (Minneapolis, Minn., 1919). Stoll also makes the claim in other studies.
12. Ibid., p. 136 [Bk. I, chap. 38].
13. Essays, 1:7 [chap. 1].
14. Ibid., 2:10 [chap. 1]. The vacillations of Hamlet’s character are reflected in his way of speaking and gesturing. As Maurice Charney notes, Hamlet has no single identifiable style (Style in Hamlet, p. 258). Charney distinguishes four major styles used by the prince: self-conscious, witty, passionate, and simple.
16. The Dream of Learning, p. 96.
17. See OED, “Passion.” Richard Lever, The Art of Reason (1573), p. 172, noted: “Some take passion for affection, be it great or small; but in our English speech we use the term when we express a vehement pang, either of the body or the mind.” The first example of “passion” as a passionate speech or outburst quoted in OED is from 1582.
18. Cf. Estella, Mortification (1608): “If thou have a desire to know who thou art, take a glass and behold thyself in it. The glass that a man may best behold himself in is another man.” Similarly, Thomas Wright, Preface, Passions of the Mind (1601). The humanists generally assumed that man could see in this glass the general features of humanity; with his contemptus mundi emphasis, Estella thinks of the dead body of man.
19. The ghost’s lack of specificity is discussed by Robert H. West, Shakespeare and the Outer Mystery (Lexington, Ky., 1968), chap. 4. As West argues, this lack is not due to Shakespeare’s ignorance of ghost lore but rather to dramatic reasons.
21. Ribner, Patterns, p. 83. Ribner speaks of a “symbolic” level on which this is true. But the context of the passage is secular and not symbolically Christian.
22. Essays, 3:207, 339 [chaps. 12, 13].
25. See D. G. James, The Dream of Learning, pp. 58 ff.
27. Ham., II.i.253 ff: I have followed the Folio version rather than Alexander and Quarto 2. For a defense of this preference and an analysis of the speech in general, see below, Appendix C.
29. E.g., La Primaudaye, Second Part, pp. 155 ff.


31. A contrary claim—that is, that the play-within-the-play already served the purpose of discovery in Ur-Hamlet—is made by Fredson Bowers, Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy 1587–1642 (Princeton, N.J., 1940), pp. 85 ff. But Bowers's argument seems to me unconvincing; the genesis and the execution of the device of the play in Shakespeare is all of a piece, and Kyd is not generally noted for inventing refined psychological stratagems.

32. This form of audience reaction to tragedy was much discussed in the Renaissance. O. B. Hardison calls it "moral catharsis": "Three Types of Renaissance Catharsis," Renaissance Drama, N. S., 2 (1969) : 3-22.


34. Essays, 2 : 428 [chap. 27].

35. Ham., V.ii.216: I am following Q2; the Folio has "Since no man has ought of what he leaves." This sentence looks like a simplification of Hamlet's skeptic thought according to the losing-finding antithesis in I Tim. 6:7 (a verse read in the burial service). Alexander emends: "Since no man owes of aught he leaves." But Hamlet's problem does not lie in any possessions he has or may leave behind.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

1. P. 261. This use of the figure is related to the vanitas as well as veritas convention. See above, chap. 6.

2. Persius, Satires, IV.23-24: "Not a soul is there—no one—who seeks to get down into his own self; all watch the wallet on the back that walks before" (Juvenal and Persius, ed. and trans. G. G. Ramsey, Loeb Classical Library [Cambridge, Mass., 1940], p. 360). For Shakespeare's evolving the figure from Persius, see Baldwin, Shakspere's Small Latine, 2 : 544-45. Wright's version is from Erasmus's Adagia, which in turn derives from Catullus, xxii, 21: "Sed non videbatur manticae quod in tergo est."


8. Essays, 2: 332 [chap. 12].


12. For the concept of invisibility as the highest kind of beauty, cf. Tommaso Buoni, *Problems of Beauty and All Human Affections*, trans. Samson Lennard (1606), p. 48: "Why doth the beauty of the mind make us like unto things heavenly, and that of the body many times like unto earthly? Perhaps because the chief good, which is the First Fair, is invisible like a fair mind."

13. Losing distinction was thought to be a danger inherent in *voluptas*, as Lambinus (Commentary to Horace, Ode I.18) explained: "Libido enim omnium rerum discrimen ac delectum tollit resque maxime inter se disjunctas ac diversas conjungit et exaequat" (Horatius Flaccus, *Satyrae* [Paris, 1568], p. 57).

14. In Montaigne's "Of the Force of the Imagination" (*Essays*, 1: 9 ff. [chap. 10]), the discrepancy between desire and execution is illustrated by the sexual act to which Troilus also alludes (III.ii.79).


16. *Of Wisdom*, p. 59 [Bk. I, chap. 14]. The contradictions of human logic were, of course, commonly attacked by the skeptics.

---

**Chapter Twelve**


4. I am assuming that *Measure for Measure* followed rather than preceded *All's Well*. Since *Measure for Measure* improves some of the themes of *All's Well*, this sequence is probable. See Lever's Introduction.


7. On the legal and human aspects of the marriages in the play, see Ernest Schanzer, “The Marriage Contracts in Measure for Measure,” *SLS* 13 (1950) : 81–89. A counterargument to Schanzer is made by S. Nagarajan, “Measure for Measure and Elizabethan Betrothals,” *SQ* 14 (1963) : 115–19. Nagarajan claims that Claudio’s and Juliet’s is a *de futuro* promise, Angelo’s and Mariana’s a *de praesenti* betrothal. But clearly, Claudio and Juliet consider their pledge to each other binding in a way that Angelo and Mariana do not, and the ratification of the latter couple’s marriage depends on its consummation.

8. Ovid, *Ars Amatoria*, 498–502: “‘Preceptor of wanton love,’ he [Apollo] said to me, ‘come, lead my pupils to my shrine, where there is a saying renowned in fame all over the world, which bids each to be known by himself. Only he who knows himself will love with wisdom and perform all his tasks according to his powers’” (The Art of Love and Other Poems, ed. and trans. J. H. Mozley [London, 1929], p. 101).


10. I do not think that Shakespeare showed Isabella as “idealistic” in contrast to a society that is not, as is argued by Eileen Mackay, “Measure for Measure,” *SQ* 14 (1963) : 109–13. There is certainly no suggestion that the order she is about to join is corrupt.

11. The term “glassy essence,” according to J. V. Cunningham, “Essence and the Phoenix and Turtle,” *ELH* 19 (1952) : 265, describes man’s intellectual soul, which is in the image of God; hence “glassy” because it reflects Him. Mary Lascelles, “‘Glassie Essence’: *Measure for Measure*, II.ii.120,” *RES* 2 (1951) : 140, notes the medieval tradition of the soul as a vessel of glass.


13. For a comparison of the roles of Vincentio and Prospero, see Harold S. Wilson, “Action and Symbol in Measure for Measure and The Tempest,” *SQ* 4 (1953) : 375–84. Wilson assumes, however, that Shakespeare adopted identical designs for both plays, which, I think, is not true. See below, chap. 18.


16. Strong claims have been made for the resemblance of the duke to James and for the influence of Basilicon Doron. Schanzer, *Problem Plays*, pp. 123 ff., asserts that the play deliberately turns on themes that were of special interest to James. The parallels, for all they are worth, are emphasized by David L. Stevenson, *The Achievement of MEASURE FOR MEASURE* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1966), pp. 144 ff., and by Josephine W. Bennett, *MEASURE FOR MEASURE as Royal Entertainment* (New York, 1966), pp. 78–104.
CHAPTER THIRTEEN


2. For the conception of the heroes of the two plays, the dramatic pattern of Hercules was influential; see Eugene M. Waith, *The Herculean Hero in Marlowe, Chapman, and Dryden* (New York, 1962). For remarks on the connection between the grandiose character of Antony and the baroque style, see E. M. Roerecke, "Baroque Aspects of Antony and Cleopatra," in *Essays on Shakespeare*, ed. Gordon R. Smith (University Park, Pa., 1965), pp. 182-95.


4. Hauser, *Social History*, 2: 178. For general works on baroque and mannerism, see above, chap. 8, n. 2. The criteria of distinction between Renaissance and baroque were established by Wolfflin, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe*; but some of Wolfflin's criteria for the baroque are better applicable to mannerism. Stimulating ideas on the baroque style in Shakespeare's tragedies are in L. L. Schücking, *Shakespeare und der Tragödienstil seiner Zeit* (Bern, 1947), and in Schücking's earlier *The Baroque Character of the Elizabethan Tragic Hero*, Annual Shakespeare Lecture of the British Academy (London, 1938). Some of the features I have labeled "baroque" could also be called "anti-humanist" or "counter-Renaissance," but baroque appears to me a more useful term for literary analysis because it is free from the misleading implication that there was a conscious reaction to the Renaissance and because it applies better to artistic matters and is also becoming increasingly accepted for ideological phenomena.

5. P. 145.


est in Jesuit techniques is shown by the reference to equivocation in the porter scene in *Macbeth* and in other allusions to equivocation and prevarication in the play. See Frank L. Huntley, “*Macbeth* and the Background of Jesuitical Equivocation,” *PMLA* 79 (1964), 390–400.


21. Cf. the parallels between Shakespeare and Wright quoted above, chap. 11, and below, chap. 14. Wright dedicated the second edition of *The Passions of the Mind* to the earl of Southampton, Shakespeare’s patron. Because John Florio, the Montaigne translator, was also one of the earl’s protégés, the chances are good that Shakespeare knew two leading propagators of anti-humanistic ideas of self-knowledge in England.


CHAPTER FOURTEEN


9. *Anatomy*, fol. 44.

10. *Oth.*, I.i.66: as has often been pointed out, Iago suggests that he is a kind of anti-God by denying the "I am that I am" (Ex. 3:14).


12. La Primaudaye, *Second Part*, p. 361. For the balance figure, cf. Justus Lipsius, *Two Books of Constancy*, trans. John Stradling (1595), pp. 15-16: "For whereas the quietness and constancy of the mind resteth, as it were, in an even balance, these affections do hinder this upright poise and evenness" [Bk. I, chap. 7].


14. Sermons, p. 301 [Dec. 3, Serm. 1]. Cf. Calvin, *Institutes*, III.viii.9. One would have difficulty in finding an advocate of such unrestrained voluntarism among the neo-Stoics of the Renaissance. Even Lipsius, who in *Of Constancy* extols the power of man's will to overcome passions and fortune, adds the proviso that the will of man must aim at virtue and be made to conform to the will of God. William Elton notes that Iago's insistence on complete freedom of will parallels the Pelagian heresy (see *King Lear and the Gods* [San Marino, Calif. 1966], p. 137). Interestingly, Bacon, an eminent student of the will, appears to have echoed Iago's imagery; among the 1625 additions of his essay "Of Nature in Men" is the following ending: "A man's nature runs either to herbs or to weeds; therefore let him seasonably water the one and destroy the other."

15. Sermons, p. 303 [Dec. 3, Serm. 3].


17. The self-dramatization of Othello is considered to be the tragic flaw of Othello as well as that of other tragic heroes by Matthew N. Proser, *The Heroic Image in Five Shakespearean Tragedies* (Princeton, N.J., 1965). But if Shakespeare's later tragic heroes did not dramatize themselves, we would not take such extraordinary interest in them.


19. Ibid., p. 184.


21. To quote two extreme positions on Othello's subjection to Iago: G. Wilson Knight goes so far as to say that the Iago spirit never envelopes Othello (*The Wheel of Fire* [London, 1936], p. 118); F. R. Leavis claims that Othello is an egotist, whose nature is not shaped, but merely stimulated by Iago (*The Common Pursuit* [London, 1952], pp. 136 ff.).


**CHAPTER FIFTEEN**

1. *King Lear and the Gods*.

2. Sig. Aa4r. The even more orthodox William Baldwin thought similarly; cf. *A Treatise of Moral Philosophy*, fol. 73.
7. Rosalie Colie, *Paradoxa Epidemica: The Renaissance Tradition of the Paradox* (Princeton, N.J., 1966). Professor Colie works out some of the major paradoxical strands of *Lear* (pp. 451-81); my intention is to show Shakespeare's indebtedness to specific patterns associated with the self-knowledge of perspective.
13. Commentaries on the materialistic and the ecclesiastical attitudes toward "nihil ex nihilo" are, for instance, in Persius, *Satyræ* (Cologne, 1522), fol. 32, and *Satyræ* (Basel, 1551), p. 497.
18. Pp. 34, 39.
20. P. 73.
22. See W. B. D. Henderson, "Montaigne's Apologie of Raymond Sebond and King Lear."
25. Lipsius sought to defend the Stoics against the accusation that they believed in an "indissoluble chain and linking of causes which bindeth all persons and things," but he had to admit that some such phrase may have passed from some of them in the vehemence of their disputes and writings. Cf. *Of Constancy* (1595), p. 45.
NOTES TO PAGES 300–317

29. *The Mirror of Madness or a Paradox Maintaining Madness to be Most Excellent*, trans. from the French by James Sanford (1576), sig. Av.
32. Sig. Grv.

CHAPTER SIXTEEN

2. Sir James Perrott, *The First Part of the Consideration of Human Condition* (Oxford, 1600). References to this work in this chapter are in the text.
7. Montaigne, *Essays*, 2: 184-85 [chap. 12]: "Truly, when I consider man all naked... and view his defects, his natural subjection, and manifold imperfections, I find we have had so much more reason to hide and cover our nakedness than any creature else. We may be excused for borrowing those which nature had therein favored more than us with their beauties to adorn us and under their spoils of wool, of hair, of feathers, and of silk, to shroud us... Whereas in other creatures there is nothing but we love and pleaseth our senses, so that even from their excrements and ordure we draw not only dainties to eat but our richest ornaments and perfumes." Montaigne uses "sophisticated" in a different passage, but in similar context: "Wherewith [with nature] men have done as perfumers do with oil; they have adulterated her with so many argumentations and sophisticated her with so diverse far-fetched discourses that she is become variable and peculiar to every man" (*Essays*, 3: 310 [chap. 12]).
9. Sig. B5.
10. *Anatomy* (1576), fol. 75.
11. P. 86.
sunt anima atque corpus, hoc quidem servire atque subesse natura jubet, hanc vero praeesse atque dominari."

13. Immortality, fol. 80.


15. Nosce Teipsum, p. 11.


20. Treatise, p. 115.

21. Lear, V.iii.17: I have substituted the more likely reading "gods'" for Alexander's "God's."


23. Zodiac, p. 162 [Sagittarius]. The idea of ebbing and flowing, which is in Lear's speech, occurs briefly before in Palingenius.

24. King Lear, pp. 249 ff.


27. Ibid., p. 24 [Gemini]; p. 191 [Capricornus].

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

1. Cf. Max Lüthi, Shakespeare's Dramen, p. 385: "Shakespeares Tragik ist wesentlich eine Tragik des Selbstverlustes." For the roots of this conception in Shakespeare's comic art, see above, chaps. 4 and 5.


4. Macb., III.1.66-68: "Jewel" signified the peace of mind provided by a clear conscience in William Worship's The Christian's Jewel (1617). In the Dedication to Francis Bacon, Worship said: "This peace of God, so much magnified in Scripture, is better known by feeling than by discourse; and, being the fairest jewel under heaven, is peculiarly given to the elect" (sig. A3r). Worship's chapter 29 is entitled "That Peace of Conscience is an Inestimable Jewel."
5. *Macb.*, I.iii.14–25: The sailor's story told by the first witch appears to foreshadow ironically the fate of Macbeth and of Scotland. Her prediction that the sailor's bark cannot be lost seems to refer to Scotland. The "pilot," Macbeth, will be lost, but the "bark" will be saved.


10. Ibid., p. 148.


13. *Macb.*, III.i.51–53: Macbeth's lack of true courage may also be implied by "courage" being among the "king-becoming graces" listed by Malcolm (IV.iii.91). Macbeth lacks such graces.


18. Lady Macbeth evidently aims at a total self-transformation through the evil power of magic. This was believed to be possible, as is evidenced by Woolton, *Immortality* (1576), fol. 75. The fact that the Lady models herself on Medea also suggests transformation through magic as her aim. Cf. Inga-Stina Ewbank, "The Fiend-like Queen: A Note on *Macbeth* and Seneca's *Medea*," *ShS* 19 (1966): 82–94.

19. The fallacy of the argument that the Lady feigns the fainting spell is pointed out by Schücking, *Character Problems*, pp. 228 ff.


---

**Chapter Eighteen**


7. See Baldwin, Shakespere's Small Latine, pp. 443 ff.

8. Since Ariel is at times immanent in the elements, he can be thought of as representing Aristotle's quinta essentia, the "quintessence" or fifth element extracted from the other four and identified with the mind. For this concept, see Appendix C.

9. Sir Francis Bacon, A Brief Discourse Touching the Happy Union of the Kingdoms of England and Scotland (1603), sig. A3"v.


15. Shakespere, p. 418.


20. Sig. D7v.

APPENDIX A


2. Cf. Ambrosius Calepinus, Dictionarium (Lyon, 1559) under Ratio: "Accipitur et pro ipsa ratione, hoc est, pro discurso animi ad investigandum rerum."

3. Xystus Betuleius, Commentary, Cicero, De Officiis, fol. 15: "Nefandumque dictu est, animantium quodque in suo genere legem sibi a sua praescriptam, sine exactore non negligere; hominem vero ne conscientiae quidem stimulis ad officium excitari."

4. Hankins, Shakespeare's Derived Imagery, pp. 121-23, cites Palingenius (Zodiac, 1588), p. 114. Robertson, Montaigne and Shakespeare, pp. 62-63, cites Montaigne, whose version he preferred to Cicero because he thought there were no parallels between Shakespeare and Cicero, but many between Shakespeare and Montaigne. Yet the parallel to Cicero is much closer.

5. Theodore Spencer, Shakespeare and the Nature of Man, p. 94.
APPENDIX B


2. La Primandaye, Academy (1589), p. 220. Further references in the text to La Primandaye are to this edition.


5. Cf. Bullinger, Sermons, p. 589 [Dec. 4, Serm. 16]: "Since this will doth follow a blind guide, God wot, that is to say, corrupt affection, it is unknown to no man what foolish choice it maketh and whereunto it tendeth. And although the understanding he never so true and good, yet is the will like to a ship tossed to and fro with stormy tempests, that is, of affections."


8. In his commentary on De Officiis (Paris, 1560), fol. 90, Betuleius lists the following factors of prudence: ratio, intellectus, circumspectio, providentia, docilias, cautio. Cooper's Thesaurus (1578) gives "regard" and "respect" as translations of ratio. For Shakespeare's association of these terms with prudence and temperance, see Cae. III.i.224, Ham. III.i.66-69, Macb. II.iii.14-17.

9. De Officiis, I.102. The image is Plato's in the parable of the horse-drawn chariot of reason in Phaedrus, 253-54.

10. Institution, p. 55.

11. For the general convention, see C. L. Powell, "The Castle of the Body," SP 16 (1919): 197-205. Powell cites analogues to Spenser's allegory from medieval and Renaissance works, that is, Robert Grosste's Le Château d'Amour, Sawles Warde, Piers Plowman, and Du Bartas's Divine Weeks. In his preface to The Second Part of the French Academy (1594), Thomas Bowes, the translator, explained self-knowledge as a knowledge of body and soul and illustrated it by a lengthy allegorical description in the tradition of the castle of the body.


13. La Primandaye distinguished theoretically between incontinence and intemperance, but, like most moralists, disregarded the distinction in practice.

APPENDIX C

1. See Baldwin, Compositional Genetics, pp. 297 ff.
2. Similarly, Cicero, De Natura Deorum, II.iv.15, 90, 98. Cf. Plato, Timaeus, 47, 49.
3. French Academy, p. 9.
6. Treatise, p. 41. Bright’s chapter 13 explains “How the soul by one simple faculty performeth so many and diverse actions.”
7. Anatomy, fols. 6-7.
12. Cf. Cicero, Tusc. Disp., I.22. This explanation was sometimes used by Renaissance moralists to illustrate the essential difference of body and mind.