Peter M. Daly

SHAKESPEARE AND THE EMBLEM:

THE USE OF EVIDENCE AND ANALOGY

IN ESTABLISHING ICONOGRAPHIC AND

EMBLEMATIC EFFECTS IN THE PLAYS[1]

A Note on Terminology

Literary historians now use the terms "emblematic",
"iconographic", "iconological" and even "iconic" to describe
visual effects in drama and literature. Since all these terms,
with the possible exception of "iconic", were developed by
art historians and have been appropriated by their literary
colleagues, it behoves us to be careful in their application
to literary works. Improper usage of terms leads to their
debasement; our intellectual currency is devalued through
inflationary spending.

Unfortunately, some critics employ these terms as
though they were virtually synonymous; before observing their
application to literary studies, it might be as well to begin
by reminding ourselves what in fact they do mean in the study
of art history.

We can hardly do better than return to Panofsky[2] for
a definition of terms. Iconography is, properly speaking,
the identification of motifs, stories and allegories, with
their associated themes and concepts. Thus the female figure
holding a peach in her hand is the personification of Truth

(see p. 54). Iconographical analysis "presupposes a familiarity with specific themes or concepts as transmitted through literary sources, whether acquired by purposeful reading or by oral tradition" (p. 61). In general, iconography depends on "a stable connection between object and meaning, and requires shared knowledge about the symbolic meanings of physical objects and their arrangements."[3]

The mere discovery of iconographical motifs or representations in a Shakespearean play does not necessarily lead to a better understanding of that play. Assuming that the literary scholar has correctly identified an iconographical motif he must still integrate his discovery into an interpretation of character, theme or the play as a whole.

The application of critical terms such as "emblem" to literary works can only be of value if there is a consensus on their meaning and if their application enriches our understanding of the literary work in question. "Emblem" derives, of course, from Alciatus' invention of a tripartite form that combines a brief motto, a picture and an epigram into a single structure. On this there will be general agreement, but thereafter much disagreement. Basically, my conception of the emblem derives from the work of Heckscher and Wirth, Albrecht Schöne, Dietrich Jöns[4] and a number of other scholars who have refined these theories or applied them to particular emblem books. My views can be found in *Emblem Theory* (Nendeln, 1979) and *Literature in the Light of the Emblem* (Toronto, 1979).

When reading emblematic interpretations of literature
I always ask myself two elementary questions. Firstly, am I
convinced that the subject under review is emblematic?
Secondly, have I learned anything new from the emblematic
discovery?

The first question assumes a coherent theory of the
emblem and its analogue in literature. German scholars view
the emblem as both an art form and a mode of thought. As an
art form it properly denotes the combination of graphic
picture with verbal text. This combination is based upon
the symbolic value of the object, figure, scene or action
depicted by the picture. As a distinct mode of thought
the emblem has its intellectual origins in medieval tradi-
tions of exegesis on the one hand and in the Renaissance
fascination with hieroglyphics on the other; and like icono-
graphy, it depends upon a shared knowledge of concepts
associated with motifs and things. For a visual and symbolic
effect in literature to be emblematic in the proper sense of
the term the passage must be both strikingly visual and bear
a meaning which can lay claim to a general validity that
transcends the immediate, concrete and particular situation.
Whether the concept or meaning associated with the emblematic
eagle or snake is explicitly stated is neither here nor there.
The full emblem will state the concept, whereas frequently
the poet leaves the meaning unsaid, implied by the context.
Such contracted word-emblems belong to the subtler uses of
emblematic image and argument. Because unexplicit such emblems

sometimes go unnoticed; their discovery can be revealing.

Forms and Functions of the Emblem and Iconograph in Drama

Generally speaking the function of emblematic and iconographical details in a work of literature is to clarify, deepen and even complicate the contexts in which they appear. Emblems may enrich the meaning of a character, theme or dramatic grouping on the stage.

Since the emblem is a mode of thought as well as an art form, combining picture and word, it is natural that drama, itself a combination of the visual and the verbal, should reflect the influence of iconography and emblem in many ways. For ease of identification, however, these various manifestations may be subsumed under four general headings. Firstly, there is the emblem as we find it in emblem books, used as a *stage property* and incorporated into the dramatic and thematic action. Secondly, there is the emblematic *word*, which may function as image or rhetorical figure, argument or exemplum, sententia or even stichomythia. Thirdly, *characters* and personifications may be emblematically conceived. Fourthly, the *stage* itself can be emblematic with its backcloth, setting, stage and hand properties, its costumes, gesturing and staging, its dumb shows, mimes and tableaux. It is tempting to try to organize Shakespeare's use of emblem and iconograph under these headings for such an approach will demonstrate the extra-ordinary versatility of iconographic and emblematic forms. Thus the torch that Othello carries as he walks towards his

wife's bedroom, intent on murdering her, is a thematic device
with its implied comment on life and death, but it may also be
regarded as a reflection of the paradoxical nature of Othello's
love for Desdemona, which alternates between love and admira-
tion on the one hand, and hatred and jealousy on the other.
But when we recall that Othello is not merely talking about
a torch, but actually carrying one in his hand, it becomes
clear that the character on stage is holding an emblematic
stage property. As an object the torch is comparable with
the picture in an emblem book, and Othello's commentary func-
tions as an epigram to the motif.

While there is no doubt that Shakespeare's plays reveal
visual, indeed, iconographical and emblematic elements,
critics continue to disagree about the extent to which emblem
and iconography shaped his words and his stage patterns.
Certain critics may even question the usefulness of these
discoveries, some of which are real, some supposed.

It is well known that in the 1870's, with the uncritical
enthusiasm of a pioneer, Henry Green[5] drew attention both to
many examples of what he considered to be emblematic imagery
and to the use of emblematic sources in the plays of Shakes-
peare. Then, in the 1930's, Mario Praz[6] provided a broader-
-based study of emblematic imagery in Elizabethan literature.
Rosemary Freeman's[7] monograph on English emblem literature,
which dates from the later 1940's, remains, however, the only
study on the subject to this day. During the last two decades
a goodly number of articles and books has been dedicated to

various aspects of the emblem tradition, which have a bearing on Elizabethan literature in general and Shakespeare in particular. This growing interest is also reflected in the *New Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature, 600-1660*, published in 1974. Whereas the first edition (1940) dedicated only two columns to the subject, the new edition devotes six columns to primary and secondary literature, which include the standard works in German by Albrecht Schöne,[8] and Heckscher and Wirth,[9] as well as an expanded version of Freeman's bibliography.

The most recent general work on Shakespeare is probably the *Shakespeare Handbuch*, edited by Ina Schabert and published by Kröner Verlag, Stuttgart, in 1978. The reader seeking an introduction to Shakespeare's use of iconography and emblem will, however, be disappointed with the *Handbuch*. Although one thousand pages in length and dedicated to the times, Shakespeare's personality, the works and the history of Shakespeare influence and reception, the *Handbuch* has virtually nothing to say on Shakespeare and iconography. Since some of the most important developments in emblem theory and in the application of that theory to literature have come from German scholars, it is all the more surprising that this work is not reflected in the new German *Shakespeare Handbuch*.

If the *Shakespeare Handbuch* says too little, then the *Reader's Encyclopedia of Shakespeare* (New York, 1966) says too much. In her article on "stage imagery", Martha H. Fleischer rightly stresses the importance of emblem books in the trans-

mission of imagery and the emblematic "habit of mind", but she asserts far too much in suggesting that all stage imagery and indeed the stage plays themselves are emblems. She makes the very large claim that "all of the basic stage action of each of Shakespeare's plays is not only significant but emblematic, as a whole and in parts" (p. 819). She explains this further by saying that "each *scene* ... each *stage property* ... each particular *gesture* is emblematic - any *tableau* or *movement* may be emblematic ..." (p. 819). Such expansive claims are based either on too broad and flexible a definition of the emblem, or on no definition at all. Imprecise categories are unhelpful; the value of any critical term is at least partly determined by its precision, which alone allows us to make useful distinctions. Lacking a definition, the term "emblematic" means different things to different people.

Critics have used their knowledge of emblematic tradition and iconographical conventions in order to elucidate many aspects of Shakespearean plays. These include: source hunting in emblem books for the use of words, the actual use of the term emblem, impresa and icon, the significance of emblematic images and arguments, the use of stage properties, the creation of stage tableaux, groupings of characters, dumb shows and mimes, the use of personifications, the creation and use of characters, the meaning of whole scenes,

the meaning of whole plays.

In the space available I can only comment on some of these.

The Emblem Book as Source

Source hunting was a major pre-occupation of critics from the time of Henry Green well into the first half of this century. Especially during the last two decades, however, the search for sources has lost much of its attraction, partly because source hunting was usually carried out in a rather positivistic, indeed at times naive, manner, and partly because wider questions have proven both more interesting and more fruitful. The problems involved in establishing evidence and proof are too wellknown to merit rehearsing here.

Still in the spirit and tradition of Henry Green, Joan Larsen Klein in 1976 published a note on Shakespeare's supposed source for Hamlet's reference to the sponge and ape in his conversations with Rosencrantz and Guildenstern.[10] Whitney is suggested as the source because of similarities both in motif and interpretion. Somewhat uncritically Klein cites the five Whitney emblems that Green associated with *Hamlet*, to which she adds four more that "seem to be closely related" and yet another seven that seem to be "related somewhat to Hamlet" (p. 158, n. 2). The relationships would appear to be super-ficial at best. Although her discussions of the sponge and ape image in Whitney and Shakespeare are plausible, the parallels can hardly constitute evidence of a source relationship.

Joseph Kau is on safer ground in suggesting that Samuel

Daniel's *The Worthy Tract of Paulus Jovius* (London) is the

source for the emblem of an inverted torch in Act 1, Scene 2

of *Pericles*.[11] Shakespeare quotes the Latin motto "Quod me

alit, me extinguit". This wording provides the evidence of

a precise source. Whereas Henry Green had proposed that

Whitney's emblem book was the source, where the motto begins

with the word "Qui", Daniel not only describes the inverted

torch, but begins the motto with "Quod ..." If the critic is

going to hunt for sources, then this is the kind of evidence

that is convincing.

Although the impresa of an inverted torch is but a detail,

there is an interesting implication. It seems to indicate

that Shakespeare knew and used the Giovio tract, which might

suggest that Daniel, and therefore also Giovio, were more

important influences than has hitherto been suspected.

The Emblem as Parallel or Analogue

Most critics, however, consult emblem books in search

of parallels rather than sources, using the emblematic or

iconographical tradition to elucidate the meaning of verbal

images and stage effects. In some instances, where the

passages have remained obscure or controversial, the emblem or

iconograph supplies a solution to the puzzle or disagreement.

John W. Velz discusses "two difficult passages" in *Julius

Caesar* where Brutus contemplates the assassination of Caesar

and later in conversation with the three conspirators commits

himself to that action.[12] Meditating on Caesar and the corrupt-

ing influence of power, Brutus considers the ambitious Caesar

a "serpent's egg" and concludes that it were better to "kiss

him in the shell" (II.i. 32-34). Earlier in the same monologue

Brutus had observed that

> It is the bright day that brings forth the adder,
>
> And that craves wary walking.
>
> *(II.i. 15)*

D.J. Palmer has argued that this "metaphorical language" shows

that Brutus has abandoned reason for passion.[13] As Velz points

out, the snake metaphor has "emblematic implications" and

"a richer suggestiveness for Shakespeare's audience than for

us" (p. 308). More than that, I would suggest that Shakespeare

is using here the form of emblematic argument, designed to

appeal through so-called facts of nature to valid notions,

higher truths, which transcend the immediate situation. In all

emblematic argumentation truth is established by reference to

authority, whether that be an appeal to nature as God's second

book, to the Christian fathers or classical tradition. In

Shakespearean usage and in received tradition the serpent and

adder are emblems for evil masquerading under a fair disguise,

and because of their proverbial deafness they signify "un-

repentant men" (Topsell, cit. Velz, 311, n. 12). The point is

not only that there are indications that Brutus' fear of

a potentially tyrannous Caesar is well founded, but also that

the references to adder and serpent's egg are, in fact an
appeal to emblematic truth, which supports the other evidence
in the text.

In the case of Brutus' reference to Caesar as an adder
and a serpent's egg, the passage had been misinterpreted
because the emblematic implications had not been recognized.
It is, however, not only in connection with cruxes, riddles or
apparently incomprehensible passages that the iconograph and
the emblem can be of assistance. Many images in Shakespeare
appear deceptively simple, even unimportant. For example, we
recognize the surface meaning when Tubal tells Shylock that
his daughter has bought herself a monkey with a ring that the
Jew treasured. But is the monkey no more than a chance purchase
indicating the girl's frivolity? Similarly, Banquo's speech
on approaching Macbeth's castle, where amongst other things
he points to the "temple-haunting martlets", has long been
praised as an atmospheric piece, an interlude not without its
ironies. But does the martlet add nothing more to the context
than notions of creativity?

R.B. Waddington[14] suggests that the monkey is more than
an exotic pet; it conveys to Shylock's suspicious mind the
thought that his daughter has abandoned the life of "religious
austerity for one of hedonistic luxury" (p. 93). The ape's
proverbial sexuality was well known to Shakespeare, and
Renaissance iconography frequently employed the ape as an
iconograph for sin, so much so that the ape can supplement and
even replace the serpent in the Garden of Eden (see p. 94).

Thus the medieval association of ape and woman with misogynous undertones is well documented and relevant here. It matters little whether Jessica bought a monkey or not; what is important is to recognize that Shylock reacts in accordance with his perceptions of his daughter's character. The iconographically loaded reference to the monkey becomes, then, an aspect of characterization.

In other contexts an emblem or iconograph may have no association with character, but it may be relevant to a theme which threads its way through the play. It is my contention that Banquo's martlets have such a thematic significance.[15] Arriving at Macbeth's castle, King Duncan comments on the pleasant situation and Banquo points to nesting martlets, which he takes as a good sign. Unknown to both, Macbeth and his ambitious wife harbour treacherous ambitions. What strikes Duncan and Banquo as wholesome is in fact a place of evil. The positive values of order and good governance, of justice, trust, honour, nobility and loyalty rewarded, are about to be overturned by Macbeth. It seems to me that within this wider thematic context Banquo's martlets play a significant, if not fully appreciated role. Renaissance ornithology is a conglomeration of diffuse information deriving from many different sources, and emblem books are a repository of much of that information. Camerarius' emblem 85 in his *Symbolorvm et emblematvm ex volantibvs et insectis* (1596) bears the title "Concordia Regni", which is illustrated by a swallow or house--martin feeding its young. The epigram exhorts the ruler to

"cherish [his] subjects with the same trust [and love]"
that the adult bird bestows upon its child. The ruler who
does this will achieve "harmony in the hingdom", as stated
in the motto. Henkel and Schöne see in this emblem an
exemplification of "justice" (col. 873). Reusner's emblem
37 in book 2 of his *Emblemata ethica et physica* (1581) has
the title "Fide sed cui, vide", suggesting prudence in the
exercise of trust (see Henkel/Schöne col. 874). In the picture
the nesting activities of the bird exemplify that meaning.
Finally, another emblem of Camerarius shows the swallow or
martlet sitting on the roof of a cage, the door of which is
open to entice the bird inside. The motto "Amica non serva"
is extended in the brief epigram, which explains that the
bird accepts hospitality and protection but avoids man,
since servitude is hateful to her (see Henkel/Schöne, col.
875).

The nesting activities of the martlet may be regarded
as an emblem of prudent trust, a virtue Duncan and Banquo
will need if they are to survive (see p. 36). The emblem
stresses "the need for justice and protective caring, which
will ensure harmony in the realm; but safety demands that one
exercise prudent trust" (p. 37). The martlet becomes, in short,
an emblem of Duncan's world and the values which Macbeth will
shortly destroy.

A little iconographical knowledge, however, can at times
be dangerous, leading to the discovery of iconographs and an
iconographical dimension of meaning where none exists. With

Panofsky's discussion of Titian's painting "The Allegory of Prudence" in mind, Anthony J. Lewis goes off in pursuit of dogs, lions and wolves in Shakespeare's description of night.[16] Titian's painting depicts the three heads of, respectively, an old man, a middle-aged man and a young man, beneath which the heads of a wolf, lion and dog are grouped. Lewis begins with a number of assertions for which he never supplies supporting evidence. We are told that "the three animals appear with conspicuous frequency in descriptions of night-time" and this "only partly because they are predators" (p. 1). It is, however, a mistake to call the dog a predator; furthermore, the lion is not primarily considered a preditor in emblemat and iconographic tradition. Lewis looks for evidence of dog, lion and wolf in Shakespearean descriptions of time and we are told that "Shakespeare, like his colleagues, found the animals useful only when describing night-time, and only those nights during which death was either present or a distinct possibility" (p. 3). I should like to pause here not only to consider the implications of that statement, but also to make some comments on scholarly method. A critic usually starts with a hunch, an intuition, or an idea, which he must then translate into the terms of a proposition. Lewis's proposition is that dog, lion and wolf denote time, and specifically night-time. This statement contains, in fact, two propositions and each needs to be followed through in terms of image and meanings, even if the results are finally negative. The images present no problems; concordanoes

provide acoess to words in context, and it requires diligence
but not ingenuity to categorize the contexts and meanings for
lion, dog and wolf. On the other hand, in order to demonstrate
that these animals denote night-time it would be necessary
to complement the image use with an investigation of these
concepts "time", "day" and "night". Naturally one would
assume that these concepts would be clear in the context in
which the animals figure. But none the less, as an added safe-
guard the concepts themselves should be investigated in their
contexts to see whether there are not indirect allusions to
the animals concerned. Lewis leaves the reader with the
impression that investigation of "time" and "day" yielded
negative results as far as lion, dog and wolf are concerned.
However, in a careful scholarly piece, that information
should be provided at least in a footnote.

In the construction of a proposition or hypothesis,
the wording is important and should be as neutral as possible.
In suggesting that Shakespeare uses the animals "only when
describing night-time", Lewis encourages the reader to assume
that the animals do not simply occur *in* a night context, but
in fact carry with them the meaning of "time" or "night", and
that they occur nowhere else.

And now to Lewis's demonstrations. In *Henry VI, Part 2*
both dog and wolf appear in speeches about night. Bolingbroke
refers to "screech-owls" and "ban-dogs" (I. iv. 13) when
describing "deep night, dark night", and later the piratical
Captain refers to "loud-howling wolves" in his description

of "tragic melancholy night" (IV. i. 1). In neither context,
and in no other context that Lewis is able to cite, do dog,
lion and wolf appear together as they do occasionally in
hieroglyphical tradition as either a three-headed monster or
as three animals in a tight group. Only such a threesome
would allow us to hazard the iconographical equation of these
animals with time or night-time. Lewis then proceeds to
a speech by Antonio in John Marston's *Antonio's Revenge* in
which the speaker invokes wolf, lion, toad and "night-crow"
as the prelude to his murder of Julio. Again Lewis tells us
"the animals were traditionally associated with time and
night" (p. 4) and proceeds to a tentative conclusion which
is a non sequitur: "Antonio would seem to say that lions
(though not the wolf) are creatures of the night-time because
they too destroy life" (p. 4).

For Lewis, the animal images create a "compelling identifi-
cation of Richard as time, night-time" (p. 5). Of course,
Richard III as Duke of Gloucester has been associated with
winter and night from the beginning. However, that does not
establish dog, lion and wolf as images for time and night.
When Shakespeare describes Richard III as a "hell-hound"
(IV. iv. 48) and "dog" (l. 49) and "carnal cur" (l. 56) the
references are to evil and sensuality. Lewis has not succeeded
in establishing them as "part of the pagan conception of time"
(p. 6), and therefore his assertion that Richard III is a
"time figure" (p. 6) lacks foundation. Lewis's discussion of
Macbeth is equally unconvincing and for the same reasons.

Lewis attempts to place Richmond's epitaph for Richard "the
bloody dog is dead" (V. v. 2) in the context of summer, time
and night. This, however, like the other dog references, has
little if anything to do with "time" and "night" but rather
should be seen in the context of the dogs of war, which in
late medieval warfare, were trained to wreak havoc. It is
the dog as destroyer, not predator or time-figure, that is
important here.

Iconography applied to Shakespearean plays in this
manner is not only unhelpful, but misleading. Dog, wolf and
lion may, indeed, occur in night-time scenes of munder and
destruction, but they underscore death and evil rather than
notions of time and night. Lewis asserts but does not establish
that the animals in themselves connote time and night. David
Kaula[18] offers what he calls "an emblematic reading" of
Edgar's speech on Dover Cliff in *King Lear*. This is the speech
that precedes Gloucester's imagined suicidal plunge and
apparently miraculous salvation. The speech reads:

> Come on, sir; here's the place. Stand still.
>   How fearful
> And dizzy 'tis to cast one's eyes so low!
> The crows and choughs that wing the midway air
> Show scarce so gross as beetles. Halfway down
> Hangs one that gathers sampire - dreadful trade;
> Methinks he seems no bigger than his head.
> The fishermen that walk upon the beach
> Appear like mice; and yond tall anchoring bark,
> Diminished to her cock; her cock, a buoy

Almost too small for sight. The murmuring surge
That on th' unnumbered idle pebble chafes
Cannot be heard so high. I'll look no more,
Lest my brain turn, and the deficient sight
Topple down headlong.

(IV. vi. 11-24)

It is the meaning of the images - the birds, the samphire-
-gatherer, the fisherman, the boat and the unnumbered pebbles -
that concerns Kaula. He seeks to establish a spiritual, indeed,
scriptural interpretation for all the visual details in
Edgar's speech. Unfortunately, the argumentation is thin and
the evidence insubstantial. The interpretation depends on
an initial act of faith. We are told that the three central
images of the samphire-gatherer, the fisherman, and the bark
are "most clearly biblical in origin" (p. 379), and that,
because of the similarity that exists between Edgar's
description of "the fishermen that walk upon the beach" and
the New Testament account of Jesus walking by the sea of
Galilee (Matt. 4-18). However, this hardly suffices to establish
a Biblical origin. The connection between Christ and Edgar's
fisherman is supposedly "reinforced by the samphire"
(p. 37) by virtue of the implied reference to St. Peter.
Although Kaula can show that Elizabethan herbalists were aware
that the word "samphire" derives from Saint Peter's name, this
only establishes the possibility of a verbal association.
To be communicati effective, however, such etymological associa-
tions need to be signalled in some way in the text. Kaula

continues to build up his Biblical interpretation, one image
upon the other, by suggesting that the "spiritual connota-
tions of the samphire" (p. 380) may be relevant to the figure
that in Edgar's description is hanging "Halfway down ... no
bigger than his head". The words "hangs" and "head" suggest
to Kaula an allusion to Christ. The "tall anchoring bark"
becomes the "familiar emblem of the Church" (p. 381) since
it follows the samphire-gatherer and the fishermen. The
"crows and chough that wing the midway air" although "not as
clearly scriptural in origin as the other three" (p. 381)
are integrated into the religious reading. Like the birds
of Revelation that will eat of "the fleshe of mightie men",
Edgar's birds also fly "by the middes of heauen". This
Biblical reference to Armageddon suggests to Kaula that crows
and choughs are particularly significant because they are
scavenger birds elsewhere associated with the kite.

We have now come a long way from Dover Cliff. Instead
of allowing Shakespeare's context to determine the meaning
of images, Kaula has allowed his initial Biblical association
to establish a new context, the prelude to Armageddon, to
establish the meaning supposedly implied by Shakespeare's
birds. But crows and choughs are not only scavengers. In
Macbeth the crow which, "Makes wing to th'rooky wood" (III.
ii. 51) belongs to the "Good thing of day" rather than
"Night's black agents".[19] Crows, as I have shown elsewhere,
were praised for their conjugal fidelity, parental love, and
harmony. Alciatus, as Topsell observes, employs the crow as

an emblem of harmony in the realm. My point is that birds,
like any other object of nature, could be interpreted *in bonam
partem* and *in malam partem* and the immediate context, whether
dramatic or thematic, will determine which of the potential
meanings are relevant. I find no "ominous overtones" (p. 382)
in the bird images and also none in the image of unnumbered
pebbles. Edgar's comparison of the fisherman with mice may
possibly dehumanize them although the primary reference is
surely to their tiny size. However, the suggestion that the
simile may have "diabolical connotations" (p. 383) strikes
me as fanciful and in no way supported by Doebler's inter-
pretation of the devil's mousetrap, which Kaula cites. The
mouse may not have enjoyed a particularly good press, but
not every Shakespearean mouse is diabolical. For the Clown
in *Twelfth Night* Olivia is a "mouse of virtue (I. v. 61).
On the basis of the religious interpretation of the images
in Edgar's speech Kaula concludes that "the orthodox means
of salvation - Christ, the apostles, the church - are totally
inaccessible to one who desperately needs them, the
despairing man at the top of the cliff. The two surrounding
images of the scavenger birds and the 'unnumbered pebble' add
a premonition of apocalyptic catastrophe" (p. 383). Whether
or not one accepts this Christian reading, it is difficult
to see in what sense either Edgar's speech or Kaula's inter-
pretation is emblematic.

Stage Properties

Occasionally the Elizabethan or Jacobean dramatist may introduce into the dramatic action of the play an actual emblem or *impresa* as a functional element. In Webster's *The White Devil* an emblem depicting a stag that weeps for the loss of its horns is the anonymous revelation of cuckoldry (II. ii. 5f.). Marlowe succeeds in weaving two heroic *imprese* into the tense action of *Edward II:* Mortimer and Lancaster reveal their hatred of Gaveston through their choice of *impresa* to celebrate the "stately triumph" (II. ii. 12) decreed by the king to mark Gaveston's return. In *Pericles* Shakespeare does something similar. Before entering the lists in honour of Princess Thaisa the six knights each express their love for her, displaying on their shields a visual device accompanied by a brief motto in a foreign tongue. These devices fulfill the conditions set down by Giovio for the perfect *impresa*.

While the number of actual emblems and *imprese* incorporated into Elizabethan and Jacobean drama may be extremely small, there are count less instances of stage and hand properties, the full meaning of which will only be discovered when seen in the light of iconographical and emblematic traditions. Readers will find a useful compendium of information on iconographic stage and hand properties in the dissertation "The Iconography of the English History Play" (Columbia, 1964) by Martha H. Fleischer (née Golden). The unrevised text, accompanied by new indices and a selective

bibliography of works appearing up to 1974, was published
under the same title in Salzburg in 1974. The author is
concerned primarily with the "stage image" as opposed to
verbal iconographical images, focusing attention on such
settings as the garden, such stage properties as the tree[20]
and such hand properties as book and sword. The value of
Fleischer's book lies in its compilation of material rather
than in its interpretations, which, by the very nature of
the undertaking, remain piecemeal. In Panofsky's terms the
book is a collection of iconographical information rather
than iconological interpretations. The elucidation of meaning
conveyed by the motifs tends to broaden into such sweeping
generalizations as the assertion that in garden scenes
"Gethsemene is invoked through the posture of prayer" (p. 99).
Finally, because she lacks a firm theory of the emblem, every-
thing visual that appears to embody some meaning or other
becomes iconographic or emblematic for the author.

Some of the "iconic stage images" discussed by John
Doebler in his book *Shakespeare's Speaking Pictures* (Albuquerque.
1974) centre on iconographically significant stage properties
such as the cauldron and the head in Macbeth, and the caskets
and rings in *The Merchant of Venice*.

The cauldron is not only a piece of equipment essential
to witchcraft, but also as Doebler reminds us, "an emblem of
hell-mouth" (p. 124), which appears frequently in medieval
paintings and illustrations. The cauldron is, in fact, the
entrance to hell through which both the damned and the devils

pass. This iconographic association of cauldron with hell-mouth
is activated in Act IV, Scene I when Macbeth demands to know
the future of the witches, and the answers to his questions
are given by apparitions that appear from the cauldron.
The armed head, the bloody child and the child with a crown
and tree in its hand appear from the cauldron and "descend"
after delivering their ambiguous prophecies. The stage direc-
tion "descends" suggests that they return the same way as they
came, through the cauldron, which was presumably an empty
bottomed cauldron set over the trap door in the stage.

Some scenic properties, required by the stage setting or
implied in the text, become the focus of iconographical or
emblematic meanings that sometimes pass unnoticed. I would
argue that the mole hills upon which the Duke of York is
forced to stand and upon which King Henry sadly sits (*Henry
VI, Part 3*) are a case in point. Although not actually mentioned
in the stage directions, these mole hills are named in the
speeches of Queen Margaret and King Henry, thus becoming an
important aspect of the staging of these scenes.

In *Henry VI, Part 3,* the defeated Duke of York is <u>forced</u>
to sit upon a mole hill and wear a paper crown on his head.
The indignities are compounded with an inhuman act of vengeance
when Queen Margaret takes a napkin covered with the blood of
his youngest son and wipes its across his face. It has
frequently been noted that the mistreatment of York is reminis-
cent of the persecution of Christ before Pilate. Indeed, it
could be argued that the association of York with Christ is

reinforced by an association with the crucifixion deriving from Margaret's act of covering the father's face with the blood of the son. The mystery of the Trinity requires that the believer recognize God in the "person" of Christ, so that the shedding of the blood of the Messiah, and His death, involve both Father and Son.

However, no one appears to have noticed the symbolic reverberations of the mole hill. The contrast of mole hill with throne is obvious, but equally important are the meanings which were traditionally associated with the mole, namely its blindness, lowly status, humility and helplessness. Inwardly cowed by his defeat and capture, the Duke of York none the less challenges Northumberland, Clifford and the rest to one last fight rather than surrender. Clifford regards this challenge as the desperation of the coward:

So cowards fight when they can fly no further;

So doves do peck the falcon's piercing talons. (I. iv. 41).

Rather than fight they simply overpower York who struggles in vain to free himself, which prompts from Clifford the response: "Aye, Aye, so strives the woodcock with the gin" (l. 61), and Northumberland tauntingly adds: "So doth the cony struggle in the net" (l. 62). Not to be outdone, York replies in similar vein: "So triumph thieves upon their conquered booty" (l. 63). In the mouth of the victors "woodcock" and "cony" are images of cowardice and weakness. The single line exchanges are almost emblematic stichomythia. At this point Queen Margaret forces York, the man "that would be England's king" (l. 70),

to "stand upon this mole hill". She proceeds to rub the napkin
stained with the blood of his son, Rutland, across his face
after her earlier attempt to "mock" (l. 90) him does not
produce the rant and grief that would nake her "merry" (l. 86).
Queen Margaret completes the insult by crowning York with
a paper crown.

The weakness, helplessness and blindness of the mole
were proverbial;[21] they form a grouping of concepts that is
a relevant comment on York's present situation and are under-
scored by the other animal images, woodcock, cony and dove.
However, one further association may be relevant if nowhere
explicitly required. In the emblematic imagination of the
period, the mole was also associated with the eagle,[22] but not
necessarily in a predatory fashion. There is, of course,
a contrasting pattern in that the eagle was proverbial for
its sharpness of sight and the mole for its blindness, the
eagle for its high flight and power and the mole for being
a humble burrower. Furthermore, in the heraldic and hierarchi-
cal sense the eagle is the king of the birds and the mole the
lowliest of earth-born creatures. We recall that York is
the man that would be king. At the end of the first scene,
King Henry anxiously meditates on

> ... that hateful Duke
> Whose haughty spirit, winged with desire,
> Will acost my crown and, like an empty eagle,
> Tire on the flesh of me and of my son!
> (*I. i. 270*)

In referring to York as an eagle, King Henry is not merely
pointing to the predatory instincts of his adversary -- the
vulture or "hell-kite" would be more appropriate -- he is
also recognizing York's strength, ambition and perhaps
potential kingship. In Scene 4 with his armies routed,
overcome by his enemies, York the eagle has become York
the mole. There are other contrasting patterns in Shakespeare
that include the mole. In *Cymbeline* Shakespeare contrast
"Olympus to a mole hill" (*V. iii. 30*). York, the "proud
Plantagenet" (1. 30) has fallen from his greatness as did
"Phaethon" (1. 33), frequent emblem of ambition and
superbia, and the fall of kings.[23] At the end of the scene
Clifford and Queen Margaret stab the helpless York to death.

Later in the same play, in Act II, Scene 5, King Henry
is sent off the battle field by Queen Margaret and, as
personally powerless as York was in the earlier battle scene,
King Henry sits on a mole hill to meditate dejectedly on his
lot. The ironic parallel has frequently been noted. However,
those meanings associating the mole with weakness and
helplessness, a reflection of King Henry's situation, have
passed unnoticed.[24]

In her essay on *Titus Andronicus* Ann Haaker[25] sets out to
analyse "the emblematic nature of the spectacle" which for
"an alert audience" gradually unfolds the "unified and total
conception" (p. 143) of the play. Shakespeare's emblematic
method is said to consist in presenting his pictures (a tableau,
setting or descriptive passage), having a character "voice

the motto" (p. 144), which is then followed by a juxtaposi-
tion of commentary and symbolic action. Haaker seeks to
demonstrate the emblematic quality of this dramatic method
by citing emblems as evidence of a similar mode of thought
and presentation. The emblematic method emerges already in
Act I, where three Roman buildings, the Senate House, the
Pantheon and the tomb of the Andronici function as a back-
drop to the action. Whether a "painted cloth"[26] depicting
these buildings was visible to the audience or not, as is
the case with many German Baroque dramas where they are
called "stille Vorstellungen", or whether the only references
are in the speeches of the characters, the buildings may,
none the less, be regarded as representing ideals of civic,
spiritual and personal worth. These ideals are transcendent
and universal values, against which the "pageant of human
affairs" (p. 146) is played out and the concrete particulars
of men's actions are judged. Although the general argument
is appealing, Haaker's comparison of stage directions, group-
ings of characters and action in the first scene with
Alciatus' emblem on the good prince and his senate appears
forced.[27] The descriptions of other emblems by Paradin, Ripa
and Rollenhagen (see pp. 146-48) contribute little to the
elucidation of the scene. Similar reservations must be
expressed with regard to Haaker's interpretation of the
funeral rites staged before the open tomb of the Andronici
family. Although the monument, which may have been a stage
property, can symbolize man's pride in his family, nothing.

is gained by comparing it with Ripa's Fame and Honour (see
p. 153).

Haaker's essay opens promisingly, arousing in the reader
the expectation that she will investigate Shakespeare's
emblematic method in the thematic structuring of the play.
Unfortunately, we are offered little more than emblematic
parallels that neither make the verbal and visual effects of
the play more understandable as emblems, nor reveal dimensions
of meaning hitherto inaccessible.

Hand Properties

By far and away the most frequently used and interesting
theatrical properties are those carried or worn by characters
on stage. Hand properties often fulfill several functions at
the same time. It is, however, the iconographical or emblematic
implications with which we are concerned. With the two excep-
tions of Fleischer's catalogue of the use of such properties
in history plays, and Doebler's discussions of a few examples
in some Shakespearean plays, there is, to my knowledge, only
one monograph devoted entirely to the subject. That is the
study of Hans-Günther Schwarz, entitled *Das Stumme Zeichen.*
Der Symbolische Gebrauch von Requisiten (Bonn, 1974). Although
it is a comparative work focusing on English and German drama
from the seventeenth to the twentieth centuries, Schwarz none
the less devotes about one third of the book to "the emblematic
use of properties" in Marlowe and Shakespeare (see pp. 33-76).

Unfortunately, Schwarz is content with a rather superficial

reading of emblematic stage properties. It is odd that he

should make virtually no comparisons with emblems and devices

and it therefore comes as no surprise to find that Schwarz

ignores the iconographical interpretations published in the

Warburg Journal and by such English scholars as Chew,

Steadman and Wickham. Whereas many English literary critics

blithely apply the term "emblem" to various effects in

Shakespearean drama, without ever attempting either to

define the term or to refer to a coherent theory of the

emblem and its analogue in literary works, Schwarz has, if

anything, oversimplified Schöne's theory of the emblem, at

least with regard to the semantics of the emblem. Whilst it

is true that the emblematic stage property both is and means,

that is, transcends its value as an object, it is surely an

oversimplification to suggest that even in the earlier

stages the property is "eindeutig", i.e. simple, univalent

or single in its meaning. Schwarz insists that the stage

property which conveys a plurality of meanings ("Mehrdeutig-

keit" p. 35) is no longer an emblem but has become a symbol

(see pp. 35, 60, 63, 74). He is led to this conclusion because

he holds too narrow and rigid a view of the emblem and its

semantic workings. An emblematic motif such as the inverted

torch carries a number of meanings, interpretations or applica-

tions that are well established in emblematic and iconographic

tradition. In a context such as the scene in which Othello

comes on stage, light in hand, to murder the woman he believes

has betrayed him, the Moor's words "Put out the light, and then put out the light", refer firstly on the surface to the extinguishing of a real light producing darkness and secondly to the extinguishing of the light of life in Desdemona. This is the single signation ("eindeutig") that Schwarz finds in the speech, although afterwards he mentions the "psychological refinement" (p. 38) and the "psychologizing elements" (p. 38) without giving us any indication what they might be. By contrast, Alan Young,[28] in calling to mind the many emblems in which this motif occurs, establishes a relevant tradition associating the motif with "the power of love and beauty either to give joy or lead to despair" (p. 3). Young's reading is more sensitive and finely tuned, as well as more firmly based in iconographical tradition, when he suggests that "we are presented not only with an emblem of the fragility and transience of human life but also with an emblem of the paradoxical powers of love" (p. 4). Throughout the play Othello has alternated between love and hatred of Desdemona, between admiration and jealousy of the woman.

Although Schwarz suggests that stage properties sometimes take on the function of commentary (see p. 65), he seems to recognize such commentary only when it is explicit. Hence, he overlooks the iconographical implications of Falstaff donning a cushion to represent the crown and using a "leaden dagger" as a sceptre in that key scene where Prince Hal parts company from his fat friend. This reveals one of the limitations in Schwarz's approach, namely that he is concerned only

with explicit interpretative statements in the texts. Frequently
the dramatist uses an emblematic motif of which the meaning
or meanings remain unstated but none the less evident from
the controlling context if one is aware of the iconographic
tradition.

When Hamlet picks up Yorick's skull, or Lear gives his
crown to his "sons", the audience immediately recognizes the
inherent meaning of these stage properties. No iconographical
detective work is necessary to establish that the skull
denotes death and vanitas, and that the crown embodies ideas
of power and splendour. Furthermore, there is no need to argue
that these symbols are in some special sense archetypal or
"iconic". The skull and crown are essentially little different
from other emblems, which would not be readily recognized
today, such as the colewort, mouse, ape and partridge, all
connoting lechery. Semantically, the skull and crown emblems
may differ in so far as each object in its entirety is
associated with one or two closely related concepts, whereas
with the mouse and ape one aspect or attribute gives rise to
the concept.[29] A veritable network of meanings surrounds such
objects when used as emblems. Thus the snake could denote
treachery, slander, sin (the Garden of Eden) and death, but
also wisdom (New Testament), prudence and medicine (Aesculapius);
swallowing its tail, the snake signifies eternity; and shedding
its skin, it may denote spiritual rebirth. In each instance,
a specific aspect or attribute of the snake becomes the basis
for the concept which is then associated with the whole

·creature. Since the emblematic mode of thought is closely
related both to Renaissance hieroglyphs and those modes of
medieval exegesis that Christian tradition passed on to the
sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it is natural that motifs
from the world of nature were interpreted both *in bonam partem*
and *in malam partem*.

Even though a modern audience may identify the basic
meanings of skull and crown without the aid of historical
research, iconographical tradition will frequently enrich our
understanding of a subject we already basically recognize.
As a *memento mori* the skull is indeed a commonplace, but in
the graveyard scene in *Hamlet* the several Saturnian allusions
to various occupations from grave-digging to law, suicide,
hanging and such animals as dog and cat suggest a pattern of
references to melancholy which has been largely overlooked,
as Lyons observes.[30] Yorick's skull, then, is more than an
emblem of transcience, *vanitas* and death, it becomes in
addition a focal attribute of melancholy in its double sense
of imagination and insight, as well as a dangerous mental and
emotional condition. Our understanding of Shakespearean plays
is often enriched by the discovery that Shakespeare was
working within established iconographic traditions now largely
lost to us. The assumption is, of course, that Shakespeare's
contemporaries, or some of them, responded to those dimensions
of meaning now laid bare by iconographic research but no longer
directly accessible to the innocent modern reader of theatre-
-goer. Shakespeare's use of daggers and swords may be a case

in point. A number of critics have discussed these weapons
in so far as they are associated with Macbeth, Shylock,
Brutus, Othello, Hamlet and Laertes. Both Martha H. Fleischer[31]
and Clifford Davidson[32] regard Macbeth's daggers as emblematic.
Whereas Davidson is primarily concerned with their iconographic
significance as the instrument of death and thus essential to
tragedy, Fleischer makes the broad claim that Macbeth's
daggers identify him with Cain and also with despairing
Suicide (p. 820). In my opinion Fleischer jumps around too
much here, from an allusion to Cain, which is nowhere supported
by the text, to Suicide, which is irrelevant in the immediate
context of Macbeth's vision of a dagger that becomes spotted
with blood before his eyes. The immediate context is a planned
murder. While Macbeth may later have moods of despair he does
not commit suicide and so cannot properly be related to that
personification; his death comes at the hands of MacDuff in
battle. The visionary dagger is, as Davidson suggests, an
iconographical motif for both murder and tragedy (pp. 78f.).
And this because of the "gouts of blood". The vision of
a bloody dagger, then, underscores iconographically the theme
of murder and its tragic consequences.

Neither of these writers has attempted to show the
significance of the dagger within Renaissance iconographic
traditions, and I believe this is best done by contrasting
it with the sword.[33] Panofsky (pp. 63f.) has discussed the
iconographic implications of the sword, which has a heroic
and honorific application. The sword is an attribute of

Judith, of many martyrs and of such virtues as Justice and
Fortitude. By contrast the dagger is unheroic, base, even
evil. In Ripa's *Iconologia*[34] - quoted because the collection
was influential in both summarizing and transmitting received
traditions - the dagger is an attribute of Despair and
Suicide (1603, p. 106), Revenge (1603, p. 494), Treason
(1603, p. 489), Tragedy (1603, p. 489) and Theft (1603, p. 121).
These are base or evil personifications. Ripa elaborates the
dagger of Tragedy as a "bloody, naked dagger" ("un pugnale
ignudo insanguinato"). On the other hand the sword is an
attribute of Justice (1603, pp. 187-9), and Constancy (1603,
p. 86). The sword is also wielded by Rage, Contention and
Murder, but in all these cases the personifications are
accompanied by other attributes, such as a red cloak, which
clearly single them out as the personification of evil.
Dessen also points to the important role played by dagger and
sword in late morality plays, where the figure of Vice
carries a dagger of lath and the ministers of God's justice
a "sword of vengeance" (see pp. 36-40).

It is in this context of iconographically contrasted
weapons that Shylock's scales and knife take on an added
emblematic meaning of which the modern theatre audience may
be only dimly aware. On one level, namely from the point of
view of Shylock, the knife and scales mean cutting the pound
of flesh and weighing it. Shylock insists upon the letter
of his agreement and he considers himself as justly executing

the details of the contract. He has cloaked his revenge in
the legalistic trappings of justice. But whereas Justice
carries scales and the honorific or heroic sword, Shylock
carries the base and unheroic knife. Thus, as S.C. Chew[35] has
observed, Shylock becomes emblematic of perverted justice.
Shylock's knife and scales have then a second level of meaning
which transcends the immediate context of dramatic action.
Unlike the daggers in *Macbeth* which at most associate Macbeth
with other murderers who use the same base instrument - and
this is a horizontal association of like with like - Shylock's
knife and scales associate him vertically with a different
dimension of meaning, with another concept that actually
undercuts Shylock's legalistic stance. The stage property
provides an ironic commentary on his actions. It is, then,
iconographically consistent that Macbeth should murder his
king with a dagger after earlier defending king and country
with his sword against both the enemy and the treacherous
Cawdor. John Doebler summarizes: "as a conventional iconic
stage image the dagger is the consistent Shakespearean symbol
of defeat and treachery, of assassination and ambition,
standing in contrast to the nobility and justice of the
sword..." (p. 128). It is probably with a dagger, or with
a small concealed knife that Othello finally kills himself,
recognizing that he is at best "an honourable murderer"
(*V. ii. 294*) but certainly not the "sword" of "Justice"
(*V. ii. 17*). The jealous vengeance he wreaks upon Desdemona
takes the form of unheroic stifling. And Othello dies in

despair associating himself with "a malignant and turban'd Turk ... the circumcised dog" (*V. ii. 356*) whom he had earlier killed. Seen within the context of Christian theology and the "ars moriendi" tradition,[36] and underscored by the iconographic significance of the dagger, Othello's turning the knife against himself cannot be construed as "tragic justice directed against oneself" (Davidson, p. 80), nor penance,[37] -ut as an act of self-murder perpetrated in despair.

By way of contrast the audience regards the suicide of Brutus, who falls upon his sword, as a heroic death consonant with Roman conceptions of stoic virtue, rather than an act of self-murder. However, whether one necessarily interprets that suicide in the light of the emblems of Alciatus and Whitney for whom Brutus' exemplifies "Fortuna virtutem superans" is another matter.[38]

The emblematic stage property may take on special significance by association with other motifs within its dramatic context. When Falstaff plays the role of king wearing a cushion on his head, it is a leaden dagger that substitutes for the sceptre. Fleischer observes that this "emblematic dagger" reinforces "the irreverence of his deceptive good humor" (p. 153). It does more than that. The baseness of the weapon is underscored, and in fact extended by reference to the base metal lead, which seems to be a variation on the wooden dagger assigned to Vice figures in morality plays.[39] Dessen calls Vice's dagger of lath "the

best known prop in the late morality plays",[40] and he reminds

us of the role it plays in *Twelfth Night* and *Henry IV, Part I*,

where Falstaff threatens to beat Hal "with a dagger of lath,

and drive all thy subjects afore thee like a flock of wild

geese, ..." (*II. iv. 136-39*).

Conclusions

The Use of Terms, and the Absence of Definition

When descriptive terms are transferred from one art form

to another, there is always the risk that they will lose some-

thing of their precision in the process. Panofsky and others

have provided a sound theoretical discussion of the iconograph,

documented by many excellent interpretations. The literary

critic who cautiously and sensitively applies such insights

derived from art history to the Shakespearean text can enlarge

our understanding of the plays.

The situation is perhaps more complicated with the

emblem, which, composed as it is of picture and text, belongs

both to art history and literature. Literary historians are

almost exclusively interested in printed emblems. It is

perhaps understandable that they devote little attention to

those emblems that played such a large role in the graphic

arts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, notably

portraits and paintings, wall decorations (painted cloths

and tapestries), embroidery, stained glass, carving, jewelry

and the like. These manifestations of the emblem art were
probably more numerous and influential than were the books of
emblems, especially in England. Such emblems have much briefer
textual parts; they frequently lack even a motto. This may
help to explain the lack of interest of literary critics,
who are often primarily interested in the text, and who tend
to regard the emblem as an illustrated form of allegory[41].
Furthermore, English scholars rarely define the term emblem
when they apply it to purely literary texts. The tacit
assumption seems to be that we all know what an emblem is,
and that we are agreed upon the definition of this hybrid
genre. Nothing could be further from the truth. Art historians
such as Heckscher and Wirth[42] have a conception of the emblem
that differs in some important respects from that held by
literary scholars and especially by Albrecht Schöne, whose
theory has given a new impetus to emblem studies and to the
interpretation of drama in the light of the emblem.

Opinion also seems to be divided among literary scholars
on the inclusiveness of the term emblem book. Should it
embrace collections of *emblemata nuda* which may account for
as many as one tenth of all published emblem books? Should it
include books of emblematically embellished meditations by
such representative writers as Joseph Hall, Henry Hawkins,
Jeremias Drexel and Hermann Hugo? Are the *biblia pauperum*
and those mythological works cast in the emblematic form also
emblem books? And when it comes to the description of emblematic
analogues in the purely literary work, the matter can become

quite confusing. The mere presence in a text of a visualizable
motif, even a motif that also appears in an emblem book, does
not necessarily warrant designating that motif emblematic.
Yet, some critics even regard mythological allusions as
emblems, which can be highly problematic[43].

In the absence of definition the term can be used so
widely that it includes an actual impresa or emblem in the
literary text or used on stage; an object endowed with special
significance, such as Desdemona's handkerchief[44]; verbal
images and arguments; a character striking a pose, or indeed
a whole character such as Ophelia; character groupings,
actions and tableaux; whole scenes, acts and even whole
plays[45]. The spectrum of usage ranges from the precise
through the vague and general to the metaphorical and the
fanciful. All too often, the term is applied to visual
effects, whether of language, action or staging, which can be
known to have some conceptual or thematic implications.
Martha Fleischer makes such expansive statements in her
often-quoted article on stage imagery. John Doebler can
suggest that the off-stage music in *The Tempest* is "emblematic
music" (p. 18), which translates the term into a different
medium that is neither verbal nor visual. David Kaula concludes
that the images in Edgar's speech on Dover Cliff are Biblical
in origin, and "emblematic" although he offers no definition
of terms, nor argument by analogy to support the assertion.

Not everything that is visual and significant is emble-
matic. Many of the supposed emblematic entrances, exits,

character groupings and actions in *King Lear* may be strikingly
visual and highly significant, but they are not emblematic,
either in content or in form. When Lear sees in the naked
Edgar an image of himself -- "Didst thou give all to thy
daughters? And art thou come to this?" (III. iv. 49)-- he
tears off his clothes to become such a "poor, bare, forked
animal" as Edgar appears. Although this action expresses "more
pregnantly than words" the reduction of king to commoner and
extravagant man to essential man, the scene is neither
iconographic nor emblematic. Words or concepts have been
transformed into starkly visual terms to the point where the
verbal has been translated directly into the visual[46].

Problems and Pitfalls: Emblems as a Source of Information

The literary scholar is venturing into territory where
his own training is frequently inadequate, and his knowledge
is limited. We should be aware of the possible pitfalls in
consulting emblem books. In the first place, some English
scholars restrict themselves to English emblem books, which,
as is well known, are an extremely small, derivative and
unrepresentative sample of the European emblem tradition[47].
In his unpublished dissertation on *Macbeth* E. Ninian
Mellamphy[48] asserts that the martlet "has no place in emblem
books" (p. 140, n. 67). Perhaps the author did not find the
martlet or swallow or house-martin -- there is a terminological
problem here -- in the English emblem books he consulted, but
he would certainly have discovered the bird in the Henkel/Schöne

Emblemata. That the number of extant English emblem books is small is more a reflection of the state of the English book trade and the art of engraving than an indication that the emblematic mode was less pervasive in England than on the Continent. The emblem in its printed form is only one manifestation of a mode of thought, which combines visual motif with abstract meaning.

Those who read German and consult the Henkel/Schöne *Emblemata*, invaluable though the collection may be, are not always aware that they are dealing with an extremely limited cross-section of the European emblem. Opinion is divided on the question whether the forty-seven[49] emblem books that form the basis of the *Emblemata* are representative or the thousand or more titles published during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Religious emblems are certainly under--represented, and no examples of Jesuit emblems are printed at all. The omission of the latter is all the more surprising since according to best estimates the Jesuits account for one-fifth of all extant emblem books[50]. What I am suggesting is that caution must be exercised when consulting individual emblem books or the Henkel/Schöne *Emblemata*. The fact that one may not find a certain motif or its use in these sources is no proof that the motif or its meaning played no role in emblematic or iconographical tradition. Furthermore, the absence of the motif in the *Emblemata*, does not mean Shakespeare was necessarily an innovator[51]. Finally, if we do find the motif in the *Emblemata*, we cannot necessarily

extrapolate on its importance or distribution since the
Emblemata is hardly representative of the European tradition
as it expanded during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries[52].

Difficulties in Interpreting Emblematic Meaning

Thus far my reservations have to do solely with the
reliability of information, but care must also be exercised
in applying emblematic meanings even when these are clearly
established by the emblem book. Given the fact that an em-
blematic motif can convey a plurality of meanings, the
controlling literary or dramatic context must be considered
if we are to guard against capricious or subjective readings.
Difficulties do exist, but in my view Lyons'[53] generalization
about the complicated way in which iconographic allusions
function in *Hamlet* is something of an exaggeration, and more
of an extrapolation from the character of Ophelia than it is
a valid statement about the play as a whole. She suggests
that these allusions are complicated "because the world of
Denmark ... cannot sustain any of the public agreement about
the values and significances of physical objects on which
iconography depends" (p. 63). If Ophelia is confused, this
is partly because she is mad and also partly because she
represents, as Lyons herself has established, the contra-
dictory Flora. I would suggest that the ambiguity here is
not so much "the gap between an ordered world of shared
symbolic meanings and the murky world of intrigue and mental

disorder that exists in Denmark" (p. 63), as it is a result
of the conflation of Flora the goddess with Flora the
courtesan in the person of the now mad Ophelia. There is still
considerable "public agreement" about such telling icono-
graphical details as the solitary Hamlet with his book
denoting philosophical speculation, and the solitary Ophelia
with her book denoting religious devotion. The sex -- sexist?--
difference is interesting.

Some English scholarship still pays too little attention
to the exegetical tradition which was one of the most
important intellectual roots of the emblem and which will help
to explain the semantic workings of this highly visual form
or miniature allegory. Lyons rightly stresses that the
meanings read out of flowers and the like are "not idiosyncratic"
but are "rooted in social custom and common understanding"
(p. 66). However, when she goes on to suggest that "the same
plant can have different meanings for different people, or
that it can have double meanings, perhaps sacred and profane
ones" (p. 66), the author has only touched the surface ot
the matter. The objects of nature were interpreted, as I have
stressed elsewhere, both positively, *in bonam partem* and
negatively, *in malam partem*. Thus, to take the example from
Ophelia's speeches cited by Lyons, the columbine could indeed
stand for cuckoldry, or the forsaken lover, while in other
contexts its connotation of melancholy drew it into the
association with the Sorrows of the Virgin. There is no
ambiguity here, nor confusion, since the context in which

the flower appears will normally filter out the irrelevant
meaning. Strawberries, as Lawrence J. Ross[54] has shown,
could connote both virtue (they were also frequently
associated with the Virgin Mary) and illicit love. Nor is
there any Empsonian ambiguity about the strawberries on
Desdemona's handkerchief either. At the beginning of the
play the strawberry-spotted handkerchief is for Othello
a symbol of love, chastity and faithfulness; later when she
loses it, it becomes for the Moor a sign of her faithlessness
and adulterous lust.

*Difficulties with the Iconograph: The Obvious and
the Impressionistic*

My reservations concerning the use of iconography in
the sense of paintings and illustrations, are of a slightly
different order. No literary historian falls into the trap
of offering a painting as a source for a verbal effect in
a Shakespearean play. The contention is always that a
significant parallel exists. The parallels, however, have to
be established both in terms of visual subject matter and
the conceptual meaning associated with it. It is difficult
to imagine agreement on the specificity required as adequate
demonstration of an analogy. At one end of the scale, the
visual analogues adduced tell us nothing new (e.g. Frye's
discussion of Hamlet holding Yorick's skull[55]); at the other,
we may not be persuaded that an analogy exists at all (e.g.
Doebler's interpretation of Orlando in the light of Donatello's

statue of David[56]. The use of an iconograph can be impression-
istic.

The Iconograph is not an Infallible Code

In our enthusiasm for the new insights into dramatic
configurations provided by iconography and the emblem tradi-
tion, we should be careful not to exaggerate their importance,
nor should they be regarded as an infallible code for the
deciphering of a text, gesture or stage property.

In many instances the iconograph or emblem will provide
a clear indication of the meaning of the character or action
in its specific context. Once we have recognized the meaning
of Shylock's knife in the combination knife and scales, then
the meaning of perverted justice is clearly established.
Similarly Falstaff's leaden dagger casts the fat knight in
the role of a Vice figure once the origin of that dagger has
been recognized. Perhaps it should be stressed that the icono-
graphic or emblematic meaning applies to character and action
within its immediate context. To what extent that newly
established significance changes the interpretation of character
as a whole, or theme is another matter. The recurrent use of
an emblem or icon would tend to encourage the reader to see
the character as at least in part embodying the significances
of that emblem. This could lead to an oversimplification.
Hamlet's sword is a case in point. While the sword may
generally help to emphasize Hamlet's role as an avenging
- revenging? -- figure, it would be a mistake to allow the

avenging sword to simplify our understanding of the character
of the prince. Indeed, iconographic appearance may even be
at odds with inner complexity. Hamlet is called to an act
of vengeance, and the drawn sword, especially in the hands
of a figure dressed in black, would seem to underscore that
significance. But, as Dessen[57] has shown, the meaning of the
sword depends in some measure on the context in which it
appears and the gestures that it is used to make. A "quasi-
-holy object" (p. 57), it marks perhaps ambiguously the
oath Hamlet swears in the first act. It is certainly the
avenger's sword which is held above Claudius' head, and
which penetrates the arras to kill the spying Polonius.
Finally it is the poisoned sword of Laertes, a revenge figure,
with which Hamlet kills Claudius. It is, then, not always
the same sword with the same meaning that we see in Hamlet's
hand; consequently, it would be a false simplification to
equate the sword and its bearer with either revenge.

The iconographic interpretation of Perdita at the
sheep-shearing festival is an instructive illustration of
how two critics may apply the same iconograph to the same
character in the same scene and arrive at somewhat different
conclusions. Both Bridget Gellert Lyons[58], and Douglas L.
Peterson[59] apply the iconographic traditions surrounding
Flora to Shakespeare's character in this scene. For Lyons
Perdita is a "straight-forward evocation of Flora, the
nature goddess" (p. 65) and has nothing to do with the urban
courtesan. Perdita's very language conveys "a sense of

sexual pleasure and of fruitfulness that is in harmony with social refinement" (p. 68). Lyons, however, makes no reference to the earlier study by Peterson for whom Perdita is no goddess, nor is rural Bohemia to be equated with pastoral innocence (see p. 170), as the presence of Autolycus will indicate. Citing an Elizabethan commentator's gloss on Flora as "a famous harlot" Peterson suggests that sixteenth-century England had come to associate Flora with "grossly sensual love" (p. 178) and that by donning Flora's robes, Perdita evoked the goddess's "shady reputation" (p. 212 n. 14). The ambiguities of Flora the goddess and the harlot pervade the entire scene, although Peterson is careful not to impute adventuring or sexual license to Perdita.

While it is true that in this scene the love of Perdita and Florizel is put to the test by the passion of the prince himself, by the differences in their social station, and by the angry intervention of the king, I find no evidence to suggest that Flora, as the goddess-cum-harlot, colours the presentation of Perdita in any way. Nothing Perdita does or says contributes in itself to the ambiguity mentioned by Peterson. Peterson uses the iconographic reference to Flora to buttress an argument for audience response. In other words, he does not compare the figure of Perdita in this scene with iconographic or mythological accounts of Flora in order to establish similarities between the two, which would lead to a certain interpretation of character, but rather he suggests how an audience responded

to the goddess of flowers. The problems here are two-fold.
Firstly, describing audience response is always difficult,
and strictly speaking inferential. Secondly, as Lyons'
discussion shows, the figure of Flora found three distinct
representations in Renaissance tradition, as the goddess,
as the harlot, and finally as the goddess-cum-harlot. To
fasten on to one interpretation as evidenced by an Elizabethan
commentator is not enough.

The Iconograph must be Integrated into the Larger Interpretation
    The discovery of iconographical meanings will modify our
perceptions, but they must also be integrated into a larger
understanding of the drama. Doebler's elucidation of Hamlet's
mouse-trap as a trap for the devil is illuminating but is must
be incorporated into an interpretation of both the characters
of Hamlet and Claudius, and of the other larger thematic
movements in the play. Doebler does this only to a limited
extent. Given the fragmentary nature of most literary scholars'
knowledge of art and iconography, it is unlikely that Doebler
would be able to fulfill the purpose stated in his introductory
chapter, which was to offer a "critical re-interpretation of
an entire play assisted by an historical awareness of the
conventions of Renaissance iconography, especially as those
conventions affect our understanding of a stage event" (p. 10).
That is a large ambition. But to return to the mouse-trap.
If the mouse-trap as a snare for the devil casts Claudius in
the role of devil, this may accurately represent Hamlet's

perception of his enemy without necessarily being a true
reflection of the king himself. Claudius knows both guilt and
remorse as his various asides and monologues demonstrate.
Furthermore, there is a sense in which Hamlet is caught in
the mouse-trap just as much as is Claudius. The play within
the play reveals not so much the king's guilt as it does
Hamlet's desire to rack his victim, and to effect vengeance on
the very soul of his adversary.

Seeing Claudius in the role of devil, by virtue of the
iconographic mouse-trap, also tends to direct attention
away from the fact that Hamlet himself falls victim to the
very evil in Denmark that he seeks to punish. There are
"hellish"[60] implications in Hamlet's reaction to the success
of his play:

> ... Now could I drink hot blood,
> And do such bitter business as the day
> Would quake to look on.
>
> (III. *ii.* 408-10)

"Hot blood" carries overtones of the black mass. In the very
next scene Hamlet decides against killing Claudius, who
appears to be in a state of grace kneeling at prayer, because
he is determined to send Claudius' soul, "damned and black"
(l. 94) to hell. Hamlet would seem to be about the devil's
work here as well as in the Closet Scene where, without
compunction or remorse, he kills Polonius. That having been
said, however, the fact remains that Hamlet is the only person

in his world capable of redeeming it, as shown in his dealings
with the travelling players and the newly arrived Rosencrantz
and Guildenstern. Flashes of love, generosity and forgiveness
illuminate, if but briefly, the contagion that is Denmark.

The Fragmentary Nature of Interpretations

Iconographical or emblematic interpretations of literature
are invariably fragmentary. That is, a specific image or
theatrical prop, a tableau or at most a pattern of repeated
words or actions, are placed in an iconographic or emblematic
context. No matter how perceptive the individual critic may
be about the subject under immediate review, he is often blind
to the iconographical implications of a neighbouring phrase or
stage image. It is as though the critic were at once sharp-
-sighted and myopic. Let us take Paul Hamill's[61] interpreta-
tion of the Closet Scene in Hamlet, where the author deals
at length with the iconographical and emblematic implications
of Hamlet's remorseless analysis of his mother's two husbands.
Hamill's discussion ranges convincingly through mythological,
Christian and morality play traditions; he dwells on the Dance
of Death implications, which are both vividly visual and
morally didactic. And yet, sure though his grasp may be of
these traditions when he discusses Hamlet and his juxtaposi-
tion of the two kings, Hamill's comment that Ophelia is "a nymph
too innocent for the world" strikes one as a sentimental
simplification if we concur with Lyons' interpretation.
According to Lyons, the creation of Ophelia owes much to

Flora, Rome's goddess-cum-harlot. Lyons employs Renaissance
iconographical traditions to elucidate Ophelia's ambivalence,
indeed, ambiguity.

Examples of the fragmentary and at times haphazard nature
of interpretations could be multiplied. Lyons[62] suggests in
passing that Orlando carrying old Adam on his back reminded the
audience of Aeneas' *pietas*, thereby adding "a dimension of
epic seriousness to a scene from pastoral romance" (p. 62).
The iconographical overlay, however, does more than add "epic
seriousness," it has important thematic implications explored
by Doebler in his chapter on *As You Like It* (pp. 33f.). In
this same chapter, however, Doebler can virtually dismiss the
famous exit in *The Winter's Tale* "Exit pursued by a bear" as
intended "to convey a sense of romantic amazement" (p. 27).
This stage business involving a destructive storm and a savage
bear, which spares the swaddled infant Perdita in order to
pursue and kill the fleeing Antigonus, is a piece of dramatic
action that underlines the movement from destruction to
rebirth. As Dennis Biggins[63] has shown the action of the
bear is credible when seen in the light of emblematic
traditions.

Velz has much of interest to say about Brutus' emblematic
argumentation involving snakes and their eggs, and he also makes
a valuable contribution to the understanding of the stage
image in which Casca strikes a dramatic pose, pointing his
sword in the direction of the rising sun. But his reference
to Banquo's speech invoking the "temple-haunting martlets"

as "a quiet interlude amidst excitement" (p. 313) misses the

point, if, as I have argued elsewhere, the martlets were

associated in emblematic tradition with notions of justice,

prudent trust and caring.

It would appear from these examples that iconographical

interpretations are fragmentary largely because the knowledge

of the literary historian is limited, even accidental.

Furthermore, critics at times overlook the recent contribu-

tions of others. I have indicated above that Lyons (1977)

makes no reference to Peterson (1973), who used the same

Flora iconograph to slightly different purposes. Dessen

(1977)[64] has some valuable comments on Falstaff's rising from

the dead to stab the dead body of Hotspur (see pp. 78f.) but

he makes no reference to the emblematically important

configuration of the hare and the lion, a subject discussed

earlier by Hoyle (1971)[65] Kaula (1979) omits any reference to

Dessen (1977) and Reibetanz (1974) in his emblematic reading

of the Dover Cliff scene in *King Lear*. Finally Frye (1979), in

what is admittedly termed an "abbreviated part" of a larger

study, recognizes•Lyons' and Davidson's contributions in

a footnote, but makes no acknowledgement of Dessen's important

article on Hamlet's sword published in 1969.

Leaving aside such bibliographical problems, iconograph-

ical and emblematic interpretations tend to be focused on

isolated particulars. What we see depends largely upon what

we are looking for. Literary scholars who have read their

Whitney, frequently through the eyes of Henry Green, or who,

at times incautiously, have consulted the Henkel/Schöne
Emblemata, or who have studied their Panofsky, bring this
knowledge to bear upon Shakespearean texts both as literature
and theatre. But there is something haphazard about it.
Thus Lewis, having studied Panofsky's interpretation of
Titian's painting "The Allegory of Prudence," goes in pursuit
of various Shakespearean dogs, lions and wolves, which he
then interprets as representations of night in that icono-
graphical tradition.

Since it is unlikely that any literary historian will
ever bring with him a sufficiently broad knowledge of
Renaissance art to recognize all the possible iconographic and
emblematic dimensions in a given play, the contributions of
literary scholars are likely to remain somewhat piecemeal.
It would be a rewarding if demanding task to attempt to
integrate the various fragmented details, facts and insights
and to make of them a coherent pattern. This would be a
Herculean task, possibly an Icaran temptation, since such
an undertaking would have to merge art history with an
exploration of the text. The critic would have to establish
an overall reading of the play as literature and theatre into
which the emblematic and iconographic interpretations would
be integrated. Frye appears to be working on such a study
with particular reference to *Hamlet.* Although his essay
does little more than assemble iconographical treatments of the
motif of a man holding a skull to document the well known
theme of the effective life lived within the knowledge of

death -- "readiness is all" -- Frye's full study will presumably offer much more.

The Emblem and Iconograph Mediating between Page and Stage

It is the purpose, and often the passion, of literary critics to understand more fully what moves us in the literary work, by getting the text into sharper focus. Those of us who are not content to remake Shakespeare in our own image, but wish rather to expand our consciousness to embrace his work are prepared for the historical effort that is required. The literary historian is keenly aware that Hamlet does not inhabit some universal vacuum, but in a sense the England of Elizabeth I. It is necessary to explore historically the linguistic, intellectual and cultural context within which the work stands, if the text is to come alive and communicate its meaning, which has become partially silted over with the deposits of time. The iconograph and the emblem represent one dimension in that context, a set of allusions, sometimes explicit but more often implicit, a pattern of meanings that must be raised to the level of consciousness, which we assume they held for Elizabethan audiences and readers. The monkey (purchased by Shylock's daughter), the martlet (observed by Banquo), the adder and serpent's egg (referred to by Brutus) and Hamlet's mousetrap are words, motifs, animal references, which mean much more than they are. Like emblems they embody a significance established by tradition and shared by the linguistic community. However, those associated meanings are

not expressly stated in the text, nor are they underscored
visually by any stage action of which we have a record.
Historical research has uncovered, or re-established, the
association of the monkey with licentiousness, the martlet
with justice, prudent trust and protective caring, the adder
and serpent's egg with the need for decisive action to avert
evil. The assumption is that Shakespeare's audience or at
least some of them responded to the meanings associated with
these references in the same way that today in a discussion
of environmental problems the mention of "Three Mile Island"
suffices to call to mind a near disaster in a nuclear power
plant.

Since the emblem always represents to the mind more than
it presents to the eye, we can expect to find scenes in which
the words and allusions, the characters and physical objects
on occasions work together in such a way as to produce a
veritable nexus of meanings that underlie the surface action.
Lyons has shown how in the Graveyard Scene in *Hamlet* many
of the verbal references carry an allusion to Saturn or
melancholy. At the lowest level the gravediggers themselves
represent one of the occupations over which Saturn presided.
Similarly, the gardeners and ditchers, the mason, shipwright
and carpenter, the gallows-maker and tanner were all regarded
as Saturn's children. At the other end of the scale Hamlet
himself speaks of the loftier professions subject to Saturn:
the politician, lawyer and great commanders. Even the cat and
dog were commonly associated with Saturn and melancholy.

The themes of time, mutability and death were closely
associated with Saturn and melancholy in its double sense;
they are the subject of Hamlet's meditations, and in
a different key they also reverberate through the songs of
the clown. The point is that many verbal and visual allusions
in this scene indirectly reinforce various aspects of the
theme of melancholy. The modern reader and viewer will
doubtless miss most of these hints.

This close attention to the emblematic and iconographic
implications of the text has also led to the re-evaluation of
characters in the plays. Some of the difficulties presented by
such characters as Ophelia, Cordelia and the heroes and
heroines of the later plays are resolved when it is appreciated
that an emblematic mode, rather than a concern for psycho-
logical and historical realism, shapes the plays in which they
appear. Similarly, Falstaff, Hamlet and Richard II reveal
characteristics unrecognized until they are seen in relation
to emblematic and iconographic traditions.

Whether we accept the iconographic and emblematic
readings will depend on a number of factors, not the least of
which is our own open-mindedness. But the critic must be able
to persuade the reader, both by his argument and use of
definition, or reference to a reliable theory of the emblem
and its analogue in literature. Finally, the evidence adduced,
both from art history and from the Shakespearean text must be
convincing. In these observations, I have been speaking of
the play as text.

It has become something of a commonplace to complain
that some interpretations of Shakespeare's imagery are too
subtle and too literary, that they overlook the fact that the
plays were intended to be staged for an audience. The reader
can dwell on an individual word or action, relating it to
earlier and later episodes, while the theatre audience is swept
along by the experience of the play[66]. The iterative patterns,
which the reader can pursue backwards and forwards at will,
may modify the perceptions of the viewer, but we can only
guess at their effect. The guesswork becomes more unreliable
as we go back in time to the Elizabethan theatre. Similarly,
there is no doubt that emblematic and iconographic motifs,
and their attendant meanings, belong to the web and weft of
a Shakespearean text; but to be effective in the theatre the
audience must be able to respond immediately to what it sees
and hears. The theatre does not allow for a replay, and an
audience does not know the text by heart. Some iconographical
and emblematic interpretations tax both the knowledge and
perceptive abilities of the audience beyond what may be
reasonably expected. Most of the entrances, actions and scenes
in *King Lear* that Reibetanz considers emblematic would come
under this category. Werner Habicht[67] considers that the oak
and the palm tree in *As You Like It* when taken together
indicate the "impossibility of hope for a Golden Age on earth"
(p. 89) as found in Camerarius. However, as I have argued
elsewhere[68], the emblematic meaning latent in the combination
of oak and palm is only realized where the two trees appear

together, either verbally or visually. In Shakespeare's play
the trees are separated by whole scenes. Habicht's inter-
pretation makes too great a demand on the memory of the audience.

It would appear that the perspectives and even the
experiences of readers are at times irreconcilable with those
of viewers. The literary critic speaks primarily to readers
when he discusses the texts of Shakespeare the poet,
especially when he deals with the meaning of words, images,
patterns and structures. Some of his discoveries may be of
value to the stage historian, who, however, is primarily
concerned with the realization of the text on stage, the
translation of the printed word into the combination of speech,
action and visual effect that characterizes the theatrical
experience.

For the critic concerned primarily with Shakespeare as
theatre, the play must provide the evidence. However, given
the paucity of authentic stage directions, and our limited
knowledge of how Elizabethan and Jacobean plays were actually
staged, the theatre critic must rely on inference, i.e.
implicit stage directions in the texts and imagination,
supported by the historical knowledge often provided by the
literary scholar. None the less, in the theatre the stress
falls upon the visual experience. At its simplest, this may
be the use of costume and hand property, such as Shylock's
knife and scales, Falstaff's cushion and leaden dagger. The
action may also bear iconographical or emblematic meanings
as in the case of Casca pointing his sword at the rising sun,
Orlando carrying the old man on his back, or Falstaff stabbing
the dead Hotspur. Action merges with emblematic stage property

when Richard II dashes his mirror to the ground. In all such instances, we assume that Shakespeare was conscious of the iconographic and emblematic traditions that he was employing, which must also have been understandable to at least the discerning members of his audience[69].

Literary historians and interpretative critics, stage historians and contemporary directors have become increasingly aware of the visual quality of Elizabethan theatre generally, and of Shakespeare's plays in particular. Part of this renewed interest in the visual has led to a re-discovery of iconographic and emblematic structures and motifs in the plays. Although the conflict over Shakespeare as literature and theatre is far from resolved, this interest in the iconograph and the emblem can help to bridge the gap between page and stage.

NOTES

1 This is a much expanded version of an essay that
   appeared in the *Utrecht Renaissance Studies* 1 (1982),
   37-56. I am grateful to the editors for permission to
   use material. This work on Shakespeare and the emblematic
   tradition is part of a larger on-going study of various
   aspects of the European emblem, which has been generously
   supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research
   Council of Canada. The SSHRCC also provided the necessary
   travel grant to enable me to participate in the Szeged
   meetings.

2 Erwin Panofsky, *Meaning in the Visual Arts* (Harmonds-
   worth, Middlesex, 1970)

3 Bridget Gellert Lyons, "The Iconography of Ophelia",
   ELH 44 (1977), 62

4 Dietrich Walter Jöns, *Das "Sinnen-Bild" Studien zur
   allegorischen Bildlichkeit bei Andreas Gryphius*
   (Stuttgart, 1966).

5 Henry Green, *Shakespeare and the Emblem Writers* (London,
   1870)

6 Mario Praz, *Studies in Seventeenth Century Imagery* (Rome
   1939), 2nd ed. 1964

7 Rosemary Freeman, *English Emblem Books* (London, 1948),
   repr. 1967.

8 Albrecht Schöne, *Emblematik und Drama im Zeitalter des
   Barock*, 2nd rev. ed. (Munich, 1968)

9   William S. Heckscher and Karl-August Wirth, "Emblem",
    "Emblembuch", in *Reallexikon zur Deutschen Kunstge-
    schichte* (Stuttgart, 1959) vol. 5, cols. 85-228

10 Joan Larsen Klein, " 'Hamlet', IV.2.12-21 and Whitney's
    'A Choice of Embleme" NQ (April 1976), 158-161

11 Joseph Kau, "Daniel's Influence on an Image in *Pericles*
    and Sonnet 73: An *Impresa* of Destruction," SQ 26 (1975),
    50-54

12 John W. Velz, "Two Emblems in Brutus' Orchard", RQ 25
    (1972), 307-15

13 D. J. Palmer, *"Tragic Error in Julius Caesar"*, SQ 21
    (1970), 403

14 Raymond B. Waddington, "The Merchant of Venice III.i.
    108-113: Transforming an Emblem", ELN 14 (1976-77),
    92-98

15 Peter M. Daly, "Of Macbeth, Martlets and Other 'Fowles
    of Heauen'", M 12 (1978), 23-46

16 Anthony J. Lewis, "The Dog, Lion, and Wolf in Shakes-
    peare's Descriptions of Night", MLR 66 (1971), 1-10 .

17 The dog emblems in the Henkel/Schöne *Emblemata*, cols.
    556-83 derive from over twenty different emblem writers
    and denote over twenty different meanings, some positive,
    some negative, but none with the meaning preditor.

18 David Kaula, "Edgar on Dover Cliff: an Emblematic
    Reading", ESC 5 (1979), 377-387

19 Peter M. Daly, "Of Macbeth, Martlets and Other 'Fowles of Heauen'", M 12 (1978), 42f.

20 For more recent studies of tree properties, see Werner Habicht, "Becketts Baum und Shakespeares Wälder", SJ (West), 1970, 77-98, also "Tree Properties in Elizabethan Theatre", RD NS 4(1971), 69-92.

21 See Henkel/Schöne Emblemata, cols. 489f., and Horapollo II. 63. Shakespeare refers to the blindness of the mole in Cymbeline I.i.199, and I.i. 102; The Winter's Tale IV. iv. 836 and Hamlet I.v. 162

22 See Sambucus in Henkel/Schöne, Emblemata, cols. 489f.

23 When Richard II descends at Bolingbroke's command, he likens himself to "Glist'ring Phaethon" III.iii. 178

24 Marha Fleischer makes no comment on these aspects in her lengthy discussion of the scenes, pp. 169-174

25 Ann Haaker, "Non Sine Causa: The Use of Emblematic Method and Iconology in the Thematic Structure of Titus Andronicus" RORD (1970-71), 143-168

26 Painted cloths, frequently emblematic in design and purpose, were used extensively to decorate homes, inns, ale houses and public buildings. See H.R. Fairchild, "Shakespeare and the Art of Design," University of Missouri Studies, L" (1937), 147-50, and Ralph Edwards and L.G.G. Ramsey, The Connoiseur, The Tudor Period 1500-1603 (London, 1956).

27 The edition referred to is Toutes les Emblemes (Lyons, 1558), pp. 179f.

28 Alan R. Young, "Othello's 'Flaming Minister' and Renais-
    sance Literature," ESC 2 (1976), 1-7

29 For a fuller discussion of the semantic workings of the
    emblem, see Daly Emblem Theory, pp. 52-59

30 Bridget Gellert Lyons, "The Iconography of Melancholy
    in the Graveyard Scene of Hamlet," SP 67 (1970, 57-66)

31 Martha H. Fleischer [Golden], "Stage Imagery" in the
    Reader's Encyclopedia of Shakespeare (New York, 1966),
    pp. 819f.

32 Clifford Davidson, "Death in his Court: Iconography in
    Shakespeare's Tragedies," SI 1 (1975), 74-86

33 Martha H. Fleischer mentions briefly the "favourable
    association" of the drawn sword noted by Panofsky. See
    The Iconography of the English History Play (Salzburg,
    1974), p. 188, n. 7.

34 The edition of Ripa referred to is the Dover reprint of the
    Hertel text. The references to the 1603 edition derive
    from the Dover edition.

35 Samuel C. Chew, The Virtues Reconciled (New Haven, 1962),
    pp. 47f.

36 Betty Ann Doebler, "Othello's Angels: Ars Moriendi,"
    in John Doebler, Shakespeare's Speaking Pictures.
    Studies in Iconic Imagery (Albuquerque, 1974), pp. 172-85

37 R.N. Hallstead, "Idolatrous Love: A New Approach to Othello,"
    SQ 19 (1968), 107-124.

38 Davidson, p. 80 and Mehl in "Visual Imagery in Shakespeare's
    Plays," *Essays and Studies*, 1972, p. 89. See also my
    discussion in *Literature in the Light of the Emblem*,
    p. 216, n. 33.

39 See Heinz Zimmermann, *Die Personifikation im Drama
    Shakespeares* (Heidelberg, 1975), p. 125

40 Alan C. Dessen, *Elizabethan Drama and the Viewer's Eye*
    (Chapel Hill, 1977), p. 36.

41 Daly, *Emblem Theory*, pp. 16f.

42 See Edward D. Johnson, "Some Examples of Shakespeare's
    Use of Emblem Books," B 29 (1945) 145-56, and 30 (1946),
    68-8

43 See Lloyd Goldman, "Samuel Daniel's *Delia* and the Emblem
    Tradition," JEGP 67 (1968), 39-63; see also Daly,
    Literature in the Light of th4 Emblem, p. 58

44 John A. Hodgson, "Desdemona's Handkerchief as an Emblem
    of Her Reputation," TSLL 19 (1977) 313-22

45 See Glynne Wickham, "Romance and Emblem: A Study in the
    Dramatic Structure of *The Winter's Tale*" in *The Elizabethan
    Theatre* III (Toronto, 1973), ed. David Gallaway, pp. 82-99.

46 Dieter Mehl speaks of "the very literal use of the clothes
    metaphor" in this scene. See Mehl, "Visual and Rhetorical
    Imagery in Shakespeare's Plays," *Essays and Studies* 1972
    p. 96.

47 Up to the end of the seventeenth century, emblem books
    printed in the English language account for only about
    forty-three of the known thousand or more European emblem
    books.

48 E. Ninian Mellamphy, *"Riddles and Affairs of Death":
    Equivocation and the Tragedy of Macbeth,* unpublished Ph.
    D. dissertation, University of Manitoba, 1975

49 Of the forty-seven emblem books contained in the
    Emblemata twenty-six are complete (but for one, two or
    three emblems), whereas the other twenty-one emblem
    books are represented through selections. Cf. Forward
    xxi.

50 See the hibliographical surveys of Jesuit emblem literature
    compiled by G. Richard Dimler published in the *Archivum
    Historicum Societatis Jesu,* 45 (1976), 129-38; 377-87; (1978),
    240-50 and 48 (1979), 298-309

51 Veltz, p. 314 n. 2. Similarly Michael Thron assumes that
    the "traditional emblem" of the wounded stag has a meaning
    or moral from which Shakespeare's Jaques departs. See
    Michael Thron, "Jaques: Emblems and Morals," SS 30 (1979),
    p. 85

52 I am working on an Index Emblematicus which will produce
    some small amelioration of the situation. See Peter M.
    Daly, *The European Emblem. Towards an Index Emblematicus*
    (Waterloo, 1980). The first volume of the Index will be
    dedicated to *The Emblems of Andreas Alciatus* and it will
    contain the two hundred and twelve Latin emblems and
    representative translations into German, French, Spanish
    and Italian. These sixteenth century translations into
    the vernacular are themselves translated into modern
    English for the purposes of the Index. There are several
    indexes containing keywords from the mottoes and epigrams
    in both the original languages and English translation,
    as well as an index of pictorial motifs. These volumes
    are being published by the University of Toronto Press.

Thereafter, it is my intention to devote the next volumes to the English emblem tradition.

53 Bridget Gellert Lyons, "The Iconography of Ophelia," ELH 44 (1977), 60-74

54 Lawrence J. Ross, "The Meaning of Strawberries in Shakespeare," SR 7 (1961), 225-40

55 Roland M. Frye, "Ladies, Gentlemen and Skulls: *Hamlet* and the Iconographic Traditions." SQ 30 (1979), 15-28

56 John Doebler, *Shakespeare's Speaking Pictures*. Studies in Iconic Imagery (Albuguergue, 1974), pp. 28-30

57 Alan C. Dessen, "Hamlet's Poisoned Sword: A Study in Dramatic Imagery," SS 5 (1969), 53-69

58 See note 53

59 Douglas L. Peterson, *Time, Tide and Tempest* (San Marino, Cal., 1973).

60 Dessen, *Elizabethan Drama and the Viewer's Eye*, p. 97

61 Paul Hamill, "Death's Lively Image: The Emblematic Significance of the Closet Scene in *Hamlet*," TSLL 16 (1974) 249-62

62 See note 53

63 Dennis Biggins, "'Exit Pursued by a Beare': A Problem in *The Winter's Tale*," SQ 13 (1963) 12f.

64 Dessen, *Elizabethan Drama and the Viewer's Eye* pp. 78f.

65 James Hoyle, "Some Emblems in Shakespeare's *Henry IV*
    Plays," ELH 37 (1971) 512-527

66 Dessen, *Elizabethan Drama and the Viewer's Eye,* pp. 84f.

67 Werner Habicht, "Becketts Baum und Shakespeares Wälder,"
    DSGW 10 (1970) 89. This interpretation is repeated in
    his English essay, "Tree Properties in Elizabethan
    Theater," RDNS 4 (1971(85

68 Daly, *Literature in the Light of the Emblem,* p. 156

69 See Dieter Mehl, "Visual and Rhetorical Imagery in
    Shakespeare's Plays," 97; "Emblematic Theatre," 132f;
    Daly, "Of Macbeth, Martlets and other 'Fowles of
    Heauen'," 27. n. 13; Levin, "Hotspun, Falstaff, and the
    Emblem of Wrath in *Henry IV,*" 44

R E F E R E N C E S

Bagby, Albert I. Jr., and Carroll, William M. 1971. "The
    Falcon as a Symbol of Destiny: De Rogas and
    Shakespeare," RF 83, 306-10

Daly, Peter M. 1978. "Of Macbeth, Martlets and Other
    'Fowles of Heauen'," M 12, 23-46

Daly, Peter M. (Toronto, 1979) Literature in the Light of
    the Emblem

Daly, Peter M. (Nendeln, 1979) Emblem Theory. Recent German
    Contributions to the Characterization of the Emblem
    Genre

Davidson, Clifford 1975. "Death in his Court: Iconography
    in Shakespeare's Tragedies," SI 1, 74-86

Dessen, Alan C. 1969. "Hamlet's Poisoned Sword: A Study in
    Dramatic Imagery," SS 5, 53-69

Dessen, Alan C. 1975. "Two Falls and a Trap: Shakespeare
    and the Spectacles of Realism," ELR 5, 291-307

Dessen, Alan C. (Chapel Hill, 1977) Elizabethan Drama and
    the Viewer's Eye

Doebler, John (Albuquerque, 1974) Shakespeare's Speaking
    Pictures. Studies in Iconic Imagery

Fleischer, Martha Hester [Golden] (Salzburg, 1974) The
    Iconography of the English History Play

[Fleischer], Martha Hester Golden (New York, 1966) "Stage
    Imagery" in the Reader's Encyclopedia of Shakespeare,
    ed. O. Campbell, pp. 819f.

Frye 1979. "Ladies, Gentleman and Skulls: Hamlet and the
    Iconographic Traditions," SQ 30, 15-28

Haaker, Ann 1970-71. "Non Sine Causa: The Use of Emblematic
    Method and Iconology in the Thematic Structure of
    Titus Andronicus," RORD, 143-168

Habicht, Werner 1971. "Tree Properties and Tree Scenes in
    Elizabethan Theater," RD, NS 69-92

Hamill, Paul 1974. "Death's Lively Image: The Emblematic
    Significance of the Closet Scene in Hamlet," TSLL
    16, 249-62

Hodgson, John A. 1977. *"Desdemona's Handkerchief as an Emblem of Her Reputation,"* TSLL 19, 313-322

Houser, David J. 1971. "Armor and Motive in *Troilus and Cressida,"* RD NS 4, 121-134

Kau, Joseph 1975. "Daniel's Influence on an Image in *Pericles* and Sonnet 73: An *Impresa* of Destruction" SQ 26, 50-54

Kaula, David 1979. "Edgar on Dover Cliff: an Emblematic Reading," ESC 5 377-387

Klein, Joan Larsen   (1976) " 'Hamlet', IV. 2 12-21 and Whitney's 'A Choice of Emblemes'," NQ 158-161 (April)

Levin, Lawrence L. 1977. "Hotspur, Falstaff, and the Emblem of Wrath in Henry IV," SS 10 43-66

Lewis, Anthony J 1971. "The Dog, Lion, and Wolf in Shakespeare's Descriptions of Night," MLR 66 1-10

Lyons, Bridget Gellert 1970. "The Iconography of Melancholy in the Graveyard Scene of *Hamlet*," SP 67 57-66

Lyons, Bridget Gellert 1977. "The Iconography of Ophelia," ELH 44 60-74

Lyons, Bridget Gellert 1978. " 'Kings Games': Stage Imagery and Political Symbolism in 'Richard III'," C 20 17-30

Mehl, Dieter 1972. "Visual and Rhetorical Imagery in Shakespeare's Plays," *Essays* and Studies 83-100

Mehl, Dieter 1977. "Emblematic Theatre," A, 95 130-38

Peterson, Douglas L. (San Marino, Cal. 1973) *Time, Tide and Tempest*

Reibetanz, John (Toronto, 1974) "Theatrical Emblems in *King Lear," Some Facets of King Lear. Essays in Prismatic* Criticism. Ed. Rosalie L. Colie and F.T. Flahiff, pp. 39-57

Reibetanz, John (Toronto, 1977) *The Lear World.* A study of *King Lear* in its Dramatic Context

Schwarz, Hans-Günther (Bonn, 1974) *Das Stumme Zeichen.* Der Symbolische Gebrauch von Requisiten

Steadman, John M. 1970-71. "Iconography and Renaissance Drama: Ethical and Mythological Themes," RORD, 13/14 73-122

Velz, John W. 1972. "Two Emblems in Brutus' Orchard," RQ 25 307-15

Viebrock, Helmut "Die Erdbeeren im Garten des Bischofs von Ely," DSGW Jahrbuch 1971. pp. 14-33

Waddington, Raymond B. 1976-77. *"The Merchant of Venice III. i. 108-113: Transforming an Emblem,"* ELN 14 92-8

Wickham, Glynne (Toronto, 1973) "Romance and Emblem: A Study in the Dramatic Structure of *The Winter's Tale*," in the *Elizabethan Theatre*, ed. David Galloway

Young, Alan R. 1976. "Othello's 'Flaming Minister' and Renaissance Literature," ESC 2 1-7

Zimmermann, Heinz (Heidelberg, 1975) *Die Personifikation im Drama Shakespeares*

A B B R E V I A T I O N S

A	Anglia
DSGW	Deutsche Shakespeare Gesellschaft West
ELH	English Literary History
ELN	English Language Notes
ESC	English Studies in Canada
ES	English Studies
M	Mosaic
N&Q	Notes and Queries
PQ	Philological Quarterly
RD	Renaissance Drama
RES	Review of English Studies
RF	Romanische Forschungen
RORD	Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama
RQ	Renaissance Quarterly
SI	Studies in Iconology
SP	Studies in Philology
SQ	Shakespeare Quarterly
SR	Studies in the Renaissance
SS	Shakespeare Survey
TSLL	Texas Studies in Literature and Language