https://doi.org/10.14232/lh.2025.2.41-58

David Graham
Xenops Consulting, Inc., Kingston, Canada

Assembling, Being, Embodying: Early Modern Emblem and Device as Body, Soul, and Metaphor

In his *Imagination poetique* (Aneau 1552a, 9), the erudite French humanist Barthélemy Aneau published a clever personal device (Figure 1), whose point sprang from a witty pun on the names of his parents. The device consisted of a ring ("anneau" in French, represented as an ouroboros) and a rose with the motto "Pardurable, peu durable."[1] In an accompanying sonnet, Aneau advises his reader that not having been born into the nobility, he had had no alternative but to construct arms for himself in order to have any device whatsoever. My contention in this article is that Aneau's device is deliberately transgressive and subversive, socially and semiotically. As will become apparent, it is also a highly sophisticated metaphorical, polymorphic, and polysemous construction that neatly recapitulates, encapsulates, and anticipates some key developments in early modern theories of intermediality, and specifically those that concerned the function of text and image in those related bimedial genres, the device and the emblem. In concretizing the metaphorical fusion of body and soul on several levels (as lexical and visual, corporeal and spiritual, parental and filial, material and immaterial), Aneau's personal device, in fact, gradually transforms itself into a generalized "emblem of the device."

To understand how and why Aneau undertakes this transformative process, it will first be necessary to review some of the fundamental distinctions between

1 A rough attempt to capture the flavor of this motto in English might give "Everlasting, ever passing" (all translations are my own). The *Imagination poetique* is a vernacular French translation of Aneau's Latin emblem book *Picta poesis*, which had appeared earlier the same year. (Aneau 1552) His personal device appears there as well, with the Greek motto "B. Anuli Σφραγίδιον. Αιώνιον, καὶ Πρόσκαιρον" [the mark of B. Aneau. Eternal, and transient; note that all translations in this article are the work of the author unless otherwise indicated].

emblem and device, the two closely related genres cherished by early modern humanists. Both emblem and device are bimedial, combining pictures and textual fragments into a single coherent whole. The device, arising from the Italian *impresa*, is normally a bipartite form, with a single image accompanied by a short motto, while the canonical form of the emblem, the so-called *emblema triplex*, is usually tripartite, since the visual image normally has both a motto (often called the *inscriptio*), and a short text, usually in verse, called the *subscriptio*. Despite this apparent clarity, and despite a great deal of after-the-fact theorizing, both forms are in practice marked by a much higher degree of diversity than these simple formulae would suggest, and recent scholarship has been more inclined to see the emblem in particular as structurally indeterminate or multiform.[2]

Socially, however, matters are somewhat simpler: the device is considered a noble genre relative to the emblem; bourgeois or common, the latter is the province of learned moralizing humanists such as Andrea Alciato, whose *Emblematum liber*, published without authorization by the Augsburg printer Heinrich Steyner in 1531 from a manuscript copy of Latin epigrams written by Alciato and circulated to a few of his friends, laid the foundation for what became a pervasive fad that lasted through the seventeenth century and into the eighteenth. Both emblem and device are part of a context of bimedial genres related both to medieval heraldic practice and to such common punning forms as printers' devices and the rebuses commonly deployed by tradesmen.

Whatever their differences in origin, status, and form, however, the two genres are functionally quite distinct. The device encapsulates the history or aspirations of a noble individual, while the emblem develops and asserts a generalized moral lesson. In other words, the device is personal, aspirational, and self-contained, while the emblem is didactic, generalizing, and moralizing: it "breaks its own referential frame" in order to speak directly to the reader, who is thereby enlisted in a moralizing project of continuous self-betterment. (Graham 1993, passim)

2 Much has been written since the seventeenth century about the form of these genres, and scholars still disagree about many of the fundamental requirements. As will be clear, however, my own strongly held view is that while the forms of emblem and device are highly variable, they differ functionally in fundamental ways. While the emblema triplex is still frequently considered the standard form, actual authorial and publishing practice varied considerably, with emblems having as few as two parts (as in Guillaume de La Perrière's *Theatre des bons engins*) or sometimes many more: multiple titles, several commentaries, and so forth. For more on this topic, see Graham 2005, and Mödersheim 2005. For the most recent version of my definition of the emblem as a "unique bimedial (hybrid) moralizing polyform", see Graham 2016, 31.

These distinctions will be crucial to an understanding of how Aneau's personal device fits into the functional context of his own emblem book and of the emblem as a European genre.

Functionally, emblem and device are read and experienced very differently, as Daniel Russell and others have demonstrated. (Russell 1985; 1995) In the device, a short motto and simple visual image immediately combine or fuse into a gestalt symbol intended to stand ever after for the individual who bears the device. In the emblem, which is structurally and semiotically more complex, a lengthier, iterative, recursive reading of a picture and multiple textual fragments results in the gradual crystallization of an intended meaning, derived from the newly created whole that has been assembled (by author, by printer, then by reader) from the textual and visual fragments. Socially, the device—descending in a direct line from heraldic tradition—is associated with the nobility, and the most famous devices are those of kings and princes: the "Cominus et eminus" [From near and far] porcupine of Louis XII (easily seen at the Château de Blois), François Ier's salamander engulfed in flame with the motto "Nutrisco et extinguo" [I nourish and extinguish] (at Chambord and elsewhere), and Charles V's two pillars of Hercules with the words "Plus ultra" [Farther beyond] (now the national emblem of Spain) all come to mind immediately.[3] The device is thus associated with and expressed the aspirations of an individual; it displays these aspirations for all to see, and thus exalts its bearer in the public eye, but has nothing to teach. The emblem, on other hand, generalizes and moralizes its lesson, which is open to anyone who cares to read it. Structurally, as we have seen, the device is normally deemed to be not only bimedial but bipartite, with an image and a motto only;[4] the canonical form of the emblem is the *emblema triplex*, where these two parts are accompanied by a second short text (often called the *subscriptio*), usually in verse, which interacts with motto (or *inscriptio*) and the image or *pictura* to form a complex whole. From the point of view of the reading process, too, emblem

3 The latter two may be found in Paradin's well-known *Devises heroiques* (first published 1551, then again in 1557, with the addition of explanatory texts). For François Ier, see <http://www.emblems.arts.gla.ac.uk/french/facsimile.php?id=sm815_b1r> (1551) or <http://www.emblems.arts.gla.ac.uk/french/facsimile.php?id=sm816_p016> (1557); for Charles V, <http://www.emblems.arts.gla.ac.uk/french/facsimile.php?id=sm816_p029> (1557).

4 As noted above, the first edition of Paradin displays the 118 devices in this form, with a motto and image on each page; the second edition, expanded to include 162 compositions, includes for each a prose commentary that in some cases acts to transform the device into an emblem, in a way entirely analogous to Aneau's treatment of his own device.

and device are experienced very differently by the reader: the device is perceived in an instant, as a gestalt in which image and text immediately fuse to create the stylized expression of noble aspiration; in the emblem, an image that is often far more complex and heterogeneous, interacts iteratively and at length with the textual components in a process of reading that acts in such a way as to resolve the tensions inherent in an enigma posed by the initial impression created by the first sight of image and motto.

Barthélemy Aneau was an erudite early modern humanist whose *Emblemes d'Alciat* (1549) was one of the first vernacular translations of Alciato's Latin epigrams. He was also a prototypical emblem theorist whose keen interest in emblem and device theory is demonstrated in his prefaces to Alciato and to his own works, and the author of emblem books and works of illustrated natural history, among others *Imagination poétique* (1552), itself a vernacular translation of his own emblematic *Picta poesis*, which had appeared in Latin a few months earlier. In both the Latin and the French editions of his emblems, Aneau includes near the front of the volume a witty personal device, designed, he says, by himself: the image consists of a ring (in the form of an Ouroboros) interlinked with a rose, and is accompanied by the punning, rhyming motto "Pardurable, peu durable." As with all puns, the motto is untranslatable, strictly speaking, though a rough English analogy might be "Everlasting, ever passing": "pardurable" means "everlasting," while "peu durable" means "ephemeral." Structurally, the device is anomalous, in that Aneau appends to it an explanatory sonnet (in the French version): functionally, it thus has three rather than the canonical two parts, and contemporary readers would have noted its structural resemblance to other emblems of the period.

In assembling an emblem from the components of his personal device, Aneau deploys a range of compositional, rhetorical, and intertextual techniques. As we have seen, the fundamental structural difference between device and emblem turns on the fact that the device is normally considered bipartite and the emblem tripartite, and Aneau uses this difference to advantage. As we shall see, however, his approach is far more sophisticated than this simple structural variation would immediately suggest. His use of self-referential rhetoric allows him to signal the status of his device as a rhetorical construct, not an inherited quasi-heraldic token to which he has any right by birth. His device thus calls out for validation, which he achieves through a multi-layered and multi-level process of intertextual embedding, in which his composition progressively achieves added

status through iconic (that is to say pictorial resemblance), indexical (the use of "pointers" embedded in image or text), and symbolic (or metaphorical/theoretical) means.[5]

He thus begins his sonnet which is clearly to be read in conjunction with the image and motto—note the use of deixis to refer to the two visual components of the image (the ring and rose) through the typographical emphasis given in the first quatrain to the equivalent names of his father and mother: "Aneau" (homophone of "anneau" [ring]) and "Rose" (his mother's first name, metaphorically represented by the image of the flower):

> EXTRAICT de gens non gentilz, n'apparens,
> Armes je n'ay nobles de mes parens.
> Mon pere eut nom ANEAU, ma mere, ROSE.
> Du nom des deux ma marque je compose.
> [Born of common folk, undistinguished, I have no noble arms
> from my parents. My father's name was Aneau, my mother's, Rose.
> From both their names, my mark I do compose.]

He thus deliberately and subversively appropriates the noble genre of the personal device, to which—as he is at pains to signal in the first two lines—he has no right by birth. Unlike the devices of kings and princes, which as we have seen represent aspirations and expressions of power, and which may be transmitted from generation to generation by line of descent,[6] Aneau's thoroughly bourgeois device is a new sign ("marque") derived from and punning on the names of his parents (l. 3), thus transferring effectively their immaterial names to the material dimension, and so presumably immortalizing them. Rather than being inherited, or granted, Aneau's device is thus invented, appropriated, and made or assembled ("je compose") from found fragments. Lacking the authority bestowed by history and familial status, it must therefore be validated somehow if it is to have any credibility beyond the mere claims asserted by its author.

5 I use these terms in the sense intended by the American philosopher and founder of semiotics C. S. Peirce, insofar as it is possible to discern his intention; for clarification, see below, and Graham 2011.

6 The porcupine device of Louis XII and its motto were thus derived from a device originated by his grandfather, Louis Ier, duc d'Orléans, who had founded an "Order of the Porcupine" with that motto at the time of his son's birth in 1394.

Aneau achieves this validation, gradually transforming his anomalous "device" into an emblem, through an intricately progressive series of intratextual and intertextual cultural insertions. It is worth noting that Aneau's emblem of marriage appears almost immediately after his device in his emblem book. The sense of the marriage emblem (Figure 2) is that man and woman become one in marriage, as is symbolized by the visual metaphor of the hermaphrodite. The ring, which, as we have seen, is an essential component of Aneau's device, reappears in this emblem where it is presented by the male half of the Hermaphrodite (or Androgyne) to the female half as a token of eternal union. The complicated knot visible in the center of the emblematic image conceals not only the hermaphrodite's female sex, but also the paradoxical ideal fusion of male and female itself, which is analogous to and reminiscent of the fusion of Aneau's own parents in his device, and thus of his own origins as their offspring. His marriage emblem thus takes up the themes previously articulated in his device, compounding and reinforcing them, as male and female, visual and textual, concrete and abstract, noble and bourgeois categories are united to give birth to a new, vigorous emblematic hybrid.

His next step, in the second quatrain of the sonnet, is to stake an implicit claim to ancient authority by inserting his device into an intertextual allegorical symbolic web, using the symbol of the ring as the focal point.

> L'Aneau, Serpent en soy se retordant,
> Par cercle rond, queüe en teste mordant:
> Et en figure Hieroglyphicque, Note
> Qui en Aegypte Aeternité denote.
>
> [The Ring, Serpent on itself bent back, in a round circle, biting tail with head: and in a Hieroglyphic figure, note which Eternity in Egypt denotes.]

By asserting this "hieroglyphic" authority, he immediately removes any need to claim originality or noble lineage for his device, which is thereby exempted from any further substantiation of its connection to any noble or heraldic context of origin—normally required, but absent here—and reinserted into a new metaphorical and symbolic framework, at whose center lies the Ouroboros that forms the wedding ring in his device. The Ouroboros has plenty of counterparts in the emblematic and symbolic literature. For Horapollo, the Ouroboros represents

both Time and the "machinery of the world": in the 1543 Kerver edition of the *Hieroglyphica*, it appears as the very first hieroglyph (A2v); the Basilisk covering its own tail represents eternity. As Christian Bouzy has pointed out in relation to emblematic frontispieces, however, these images—the Basilisk and the Ouroboros—soon become fused in the Renaissance, in what he calls

> ...la codification iconographique de l'époque, diffusée par Valeriano et dérivée de manière frelatée des *Hieroglyphica* d'Horapollon. En effet, il s'agit d'une confusion devenue habituelle à la Renaissance entre l'hiéroglyphique du serpent qui se mord la queue et l'hiéroglyphique immédiatement antérieur de l'*Uraeus* (le Basilic qui couvre sa queue). A l'origine, la forme du serpent circulaire qui prend dans sa gueule l'extrémité de son corps représentait l'univers."[7] (Bouzy 2009, 388)

> [...the iconographical encoding of the age, disseminated by Valeriano and derived in an adulterated way from the *Hieroglyphica* of Horapollo. In fact, we have here a conflation that had become habitual in the Renaissance, between the hieroglyphic of the serpent biting its own tail and the immediately prior hieroglyphic of the *Uraeus* (the Basilisk covering its tail). In the beginning, the shape of the circular serpent taking the extremity of its own body into its jaws stood for the universe.]

As Bouzy intimates, Horapollo had indeed devoted not one but two of his "hieroglyphs" to these images, but the two soon fused, and in emblem books, it is typically the Ouroboros, and not the basilisk or Uraeus, that is taken to represent eternity.

The image is common in the early emblematic literature, beginning with Alciato, who included an epigram on the subject of literary immortality in the original version of his emblem book, first published in un unauthorized edition by

7 See Valeriano: "Mundum universum Aegyptii sacerdotes scribere volentes, Anguem qui caudam propriam depasceretur, eúmque variis insignem maculis pingebant...." [Wishing to write the universe, the priests of Egypt would paint a serpent that consumed its own tail, distinguishing it with various spots] (f. 102v). In Horapollo, the Baslisk and Ouroboros are the first two hieroglyphs cited (1543, A2v-A3r), and the distinction noted by Bouzy is indeed respected.

the Augsburg printer Heinrich Steyner in 1531. Aneau himself provided a French translation of Alciato in 1549, in which this emblem appears under the title "Par les estudes des lettres immortalité est acquise" [Through the study of letters, immortality is acquired]. (Figure 3) Following his translation of Alciato's epigram, Aneau adds the following brief explanation of the emblem: "Le Triton marin designe haulte eloquence, & profonde science, le rond & en soy revolu serpent, aeternité, la conque ou il corne. [sic] Renommée. Par lesquelles choses est signifiée aeternelle renommée de science, & d'eloquence" [The marine Triton designates high eloquence and deep learning; the round serpent bent back on itself, eternity; the conch or horn, renown.] Well before the publication of his own emblem book, then, Aneau had clearly grasped the significance of the ouroboros ring.

Alciato and Aneau were by no means alone in this: the ouroboros appears in one form or another in several other emblem books of the time, including La Perrière's *Le theatre des bons engins* (1540. Figure 4), Guillaume Gueroult's *Premier livre des emblemes* (1550), Pierre Coustau's *Le Pegme* (1555. Figure 5), Adrien le Jeune's *Emblemata* (1565), and Claude Paradin's book of "heroic devices" (1557. Figure 6). In most of these cases, as in Alciato, the Ouroboros stands for eternity,[8] and Aneau was thus by no means alone in using it as a visual metaphor to link his father's name with the kind of eternal glory promised by the study and practice of letters, his chosen trade. In doing so, he not only neatly circumvented his lack of noble antecedents (since belonging to a noble family would normally confer its own eternal glory), but once again subversively undermined the status of his device, transforming it from something usurped to something he fully owned.

> LA Rose aussi, qui flaistrit, & perit:
> Des le jour mesme auquel elle florit:
> Mortalité represente.
> [The Rose too, which withers and dies: on the same day on which it flowers; stands for Mortality.]

8 The exceptions are La Perrière, where the serpent symbol is attributed to the Phoenicians as a sign of prudent self-knowledge, and Guéroult, who takes up the traditional tale from popular natural history of the viper taking the snake's head in its mouth in order to conceive. Guéroult's image, though reminiscent of the Ouroboros, thus in fact deviates significantly enough from it to be set aside; La Perrière's is more akin to that of Alciato, though the focus is different. Coustau gives the image a neat twist of his own by making the point that the ancient Egyptian symbol of eternity might equally well be applied to the never-ending court cases of his own day!

Aneau's treatment of the rose in the first tercet of his sonnet is similar in some respects to his filtering of the ouroboros image, though in this case the intertextuality is poetic and literary rather than emblematic. The image of the rose "withering and dying in a single day" would have been immediately familiar to Aneau's readers as a contemporary commonplace. A famous ode by Pierre de Ronsard, the "Ode à Cassandre," neatly encapsulates the metaphor in its allegory likening the fleeting nature of female beauty to the rose which blooms and withers in a single day. As Paul Laumonier showed more than a century ago (Laumonier 1909, 113), Ronsard's use of the metaphor underwent rapid evolution between 1550, when he deployed it in the first book of his odes, and 1553, when the famous ode to his young lover Cassandre de Salviati first appeared in print: the early odes were inspired primarily by the aesthetic of Horace, while by the time he published the later ode, he was leaning far more heavily on other sources, including the Greek Anthology, Ausonius, and Catullus. In this, of course, Ronsard was drawing inspiration from some of the same sources as Alciato, and Aneau's use of the rose metaphor, like Ronsard's ode, was thus perfectly in tune with both the literary and learned climate of his time. By resorting to it, he seamlessly embedded his personal device into a literary and cultural matrix, derived from both contemporary and ancient literary practice that added substantially to its moral and intellectual authority.

> Et pourtant
> Que d'ame, & corps est mon estre constant:
> D'UN corps mortel, & d'une ame immortelle:
> Armes des noms je porte, en marque telle.
>
> [And yet, my being is constant in soul and body: from a mortal body, and immortal soul; arms from [their] names I bear, as a mark thereof.]

The final step in Aneau's sonnet, in which the second tercet is solidly linked to the first through the use of *enjambement*, fuses father and mother, body and soul, mortality and immortality, into his own personal device ("marque"). As the author performs his own device and merges with it, achieving the union of body (image) and soul (text), Aneau summons up a third intertextual web, namely that of contemporary early modern emblem theory, in which the body/soul met-

aphor occupied pride of place. Aneau's own commitment to this metaphor is quite explicit: in his preface to the *Imagination poetique*, he recounts how the work originated in his discovery of a set of woodcuts, owned by the printer Macé Bonhomme, which had no texts to accompany them: "Alors je estimant que sans cause n'avoient esté faictes, luy promis que de muetes, & mortes, je les rendroie parlantes, & vives: leur inspirant ame, par vive Poësie" [So I, reckoning that they had not been fashioned without cause, promised him that from mute and dead I would render them vocal and alive: instilling in them a soul through living poesy] (Aneau 1552a, 14). In other words, Aneau's texts, in his conception of the emblem, function to give both voice and life—and thus a soul—to the "dead body" of the visual images.

As evidence of the malleability of sixteenth-century emblem theory, it is worth noting that the prefaces to the first and third editions of La Perrière's *Theatre des bons engins* (1540, ca. 1542) contain at least one significant revision (Graham 2005, 71); the volume contains either "cent Emblemes moraulx, accompaignez de cent dixains uniformes, declaratifz, & *illustratifz d'iceulx*" [one hundred moral emblems, accompanied by a hundred ten-line verses that are uniform, declaratives, and *illustrative of them*] (1540), or "cent Emblemes, auec autant de dizains declaratifz, & *illustrez d'iceulx*" [a hundred emblems, with as many declarative ten-line stanzas *illustrated by them*] (1542; emphasis added). Do the texts illustrate the images, or vice versa? Even La Perrière, who wrote the texts, seems uncertain of this key point. Given this uncertainty, Aneau's device may provide important insights into the status of early emblem theory. Writing of Aneau's device, François Cornilliat has pointed out that at this stage, emblem theory was still in its infancy: "L'idéologie de l'emblème — encore balbutiante à cette date — se plaît ainsi à dessiner, entre le verbe et l'image, une symétrie « pour l'œil », dont la séduction ne va pas jusqu'à remettre en cause l'avantage spirituel du texte" [The ideology of the emblem—still in its infancy at this date—is thus pleased to sketch, between word and image, a symmetry "for the eye," whose seductiveness does not go so far as to call into question the spiritual advantage of the text]. (Cornilliat 1990, 26–27)

This metaphorical linking of text and image with body and soul in the device, and of related bimedial genres such as the emblem, would in fact become axiomatic, an uncontested commonplace of seventeenth-century Jesuit thinking on the subject; in fact, one might legitimately claim that the concept lies at the very heart of their theoretical treatises. Ultimately derived from Paulo Giovio

(1483–1552),[9] their oft-repeated analogy treats the image as the "body" and the text as the "soul" of the two main bimedial genres; as in human beings, the fusion of body and soul allows these genres to create new meanings from existing fragments. A glance at the works of the prolific Jesuit theorist Claude-François Ménestrier (1631–1705) quickly demonstrates just how widespread and deeply embedded this metaphor was. In his original *Art des Emblemes* of 1662,[10] Ménestrier describes the device as follows:

> LES DEVISES, sont des peintures ingenieuses, qui sous les proprietez des choses naturelles, ou artificielles & leurs representations accompagnées de quelques mots qui servent d'ame à ces corps, nous expriment les sentimens Héroïques des personnes illustres. (Ménestrier 1662, 11)
>
> [Devices are clever paintings which, under the properties of natural or artificial things, and their representations accompanied by a few words that serve as soul to these bodies, express for us the heroic feelings of illustrious persons.]

In *La Philosophie des Images* (1682), Ménestrier lists nearly 50 theorists of the device and emblem, of whom the earliest is Giovio. Ménestrier summarizes the rules that Giovio had articulated in his *Dialogo dell'Imprese* (1555),[11] of which the first, he writes, is: "qu'il y ayt une juste proportion entre le corps & l'ame; ce que l'Embleme demande aussi bien que la devise" [that body and soul should be proportionate; something the emblem requires as well as the device]. He then quotes Giovio's fifth rule as requiring that the motto of devices should normally be in a language other than that of the bearer: "La cinquième, qu'il y ait un mot, qui soit court sans estre obscur, et qu'il soit dans un [sic] autre langue que celle de la personne qui porte cette Devise" [The fifth, that there be a motto, which

9 For an interesting assessment of the French context for Giovio's *Dialogo*, first posthumously published in 1555, but presumably in circulation well before that date, see Maffei 2007, 35–38.
10 Ménestrier published two works under the same title, in 1662 and 1684: despite this superficial similarity, they differ entirely in their content, and should not be confused.
11 Though first published in 1555, the Dialogo was written earlier, as Giovio died in 1552; a French translation was published in 1561 by the prolific Lyons publisher Guillaume Rouillé under the title Dialogue des devises d'armes et d'amours. Rouillé also published a number of emblem books.

should be short without being obscure, and which should be in a language other than that of the person who bears this device].[12]

In his 1662 *Art des emblemes*, Ménestrier cites many other theorists, including Emanuele Tesauro. Ménestrier quotes Tesauro's *Cannocchiale Aristotelico* of 1654 as saying that any bimedial genre must be:

> composé d'un corps & d'une ame, c'est à dire de figures & de mots, & certes, quoy qu'en ayt dit au contraire Ruscelli. Les simples figures des choses naturelles, historiques, fabuleuses, ou artificielles, ne font jamais Embleme ny deuise, si ce n'est lors qu'on les explique, & cette explication leur tient lieu d'ame & de mot, autrement ce sont des representations simples d'une chose. Les seules figures Allégoriques peuvent estre Emblème sans mots, comme quand on represente la Fortune sur une boule ou sur une roue, pour apprendre qu'elle est inconstante. (Ménestrier 1662, 26)
>
> [composed of a body and a soul, which is to say, of figures and words, and most certainly despite whatever Ruscelli may have said to the contrary. The simple figures of natural, historical, fabulous, or artificial things never make an emblem or device, unless they are explained, and this explanation takes the place of their soul and motto, for otherwise they are simply depictions of a thing. Only allegorical figures can be an emblem without words, as when Fortune is depicted on a globe or a wheel, so as to teach us that she is inconstant.]

Ménestrier thus echoes Aneau's much earlier assertion that the images remain lifeless until the text breathes life into them. He was far from alone in this; in his *Elogia sacra* of 1664, for example, the Jesuit Pierre L'Abbé writes as follows:

12 In the *Dialogo dell'Imprese*, Giovio had articulated these principles somewhat differently. Speaking of them as "conditions," he suggests that they are as follows: "Prima, giusta proportione d'anima & di corpo; ...Quinta, richiede il motto, che è l'anima del corpo, & vuole essere communement d'una lingua diversa dall'Idioma di colui, che fa l'impresa, perche il sentimento sia alquanto più coperto..." (1555, 12) [First, correct proportion of soul and body; ...Fifth, the motto requires, that it be the soul of the body, and commonly expects to be in a language other than that of the person who creates the impresa, so that the feeling may be somewhat hidden...]

> Emblema picturis, & verbis constat plerunque, et totum corpus allegoricum est, aliud ostentans, & aliud adumbrans; admittit plures figuras humanas & divinas, easque integras; & plura carmina & verba allegoriam explicantia; Et pati potest lemma aliquod aut Epigramma, quod adumbratam personam appellet, eique emblema applicet; atque haec apodosis quamvis extranea emblemati, juvat tamen lectorem ne emblem quod videt, aenigma putet. (L'Abbé 1664, 427)
>
> [The emblem consists for the most part of pictures and words, and its entire substance [lit. "body"] is allegorical, both revealing and sketching in; it admits of several complete human and divine figures, and of several verses, and words expounding the allegory; and it may suffer some *lemma* or epigram, which may make known the person being sketched, may apply the emblem to him; and this *apodosis* however extraneous to the emblem, nevertheless delights the reader, lest he suppose the emblem that he is seeing to be an enigma.]

L'Abbé goes on to add that "Symbolum pictura et lemmate constat, seu ut loquitur vulgus corpore et anima" (L'Abbé 1664, 429) [The symbol consists of a picture and an epigram, or as people say, of a body and a soul]. In his second *Art des Emblemes* (1684), Ménestrier loosely translates L'Abbé as follows, making the body-soul metaphor more apparent and explicit in the process:

> Le Père l'Abbé donne ces quatre parties aux Emblêmes. La Peinture, qu'il nomme le Corps Allegorique; le Mot, qui applique l'Allegorie ou les Figures à un sujet particulier; les Vers, qui explique & les Figures & le Mot pour en faire un sens complet; & le Titre, qui marque la fin ou l'occasion de l'Emblême, ou qui en est l'adresse à une personne particuliere: & quelque fois au lieu de ce titre il veut que l'on y mette une Apodose ou une application plus expresse. (Ménestrier 1684, 170)
>
> [Father L'Abbé attributes these four parts to emblems. The painting, which he calls the allegorical body; the motto, which applies the allegory or figures to a particular subject; the verses, which

> explain both figures and motto so as to provide their complete meaning; and the title, which marks the end or occasion of the emblem, or which addresses it to a particular person; and sometimes, instead of this title, he wants it to have a *apodosis* or more express application.]

For Dominique Bouhours, in *Les Entretiens d'Ariste et d'Eugène* (1671), the device is simply an extended metaphor "qui represente un objet par un autre avec lequel il a de la ressemblance" [that represents one object by another with which it shares a resemblance]. (Bouhours 1671, 279) Like Pierre L'Abbé, Bouhours treats the body-soul metaphor for image and text as a well-established commonplace: "On a donné à la Figure le nom de Corps, & aux Paroles celuy d'Ame, parce que comme le corps, & l'ame joints ensemble font un composé naturel, certaines figures, & certaines paroles estant unies font une devise" [The figure has been given the name of body, and the words that of soul, because as body and soul conjoined make up a natural composite, certain figures and certain words, being united, make up a device]. (Bouhours 1671, 283)[13]

Aneau thus transforms his device in three phases. He begins by assembling the (existing) visual and (new) textual parts of his device to fuse image and text (body and soul), and by ironically and self-referentially appropriating a noble genre to which he acknowledges he is not entitled (thus cancelling it). As he then becomes the subject of his own device (as his parents' offspring), and as he explains, generalizes, and validates it through intertextual insertion, the device becomes a meta-device or emblem of the device (structurally and functionally). Both he and his device embody and thus actualize the polysemous body-soul metaphor used by theorists to characterize both form and process in the two bimedial genres, anticipating Aneau's own emblem of marriage as well as much later developments in emblem theory.

The analogy linking soul and body to text and image is in fact but the final facet of a complex series of extended metaphors. As the human being springs from the fusion of body and soul, so does the emblem and device arise from their in-

13 Many other antecedents for this tradition could readily be quoted, including Henri Estienne's well-known L'Art de faire les devises; among the most widely known theorists, Girolamo Ruscelli's Le imprese illustri of 1566 provides a rare exception to the general rule established in the wake of Aneau by Giovio and his successors, as Ménestrier acknowledges. On Ménestrier's emblem theory and the question of body and soul in particular, see especially Loach 1987 and 2002 and Graham 2016b.

trinsic bimediality (or fusion of text and image). Just as the human being proves to be a complex and frequently paradoxical creature—fusing the heavenly with the diabolical, the immortal with the mortal, and immaterial with material, the emblem and device inherit, through the body/soul metaphor, this inherent complexity and richness. Situated at the intersection of multiple conflicting and indeed diametrically opposite but inherent characteristics, the human being—like the device and emblem—is thus a fusion of opposites, combining the divine and the diabolical, the immortal with the mortal, and the immaterial with the material. Beginning with the strictly personal (his own father and mother, his humble origins, his lack of any entitlement to a noble device), he contrives to progress iteratively, with his next step being the material realm (the visual representation of those antecedents through the image of ring and rose, thus making the abstract concrete for his reader). He then manages to embed the physical objects that stand metaphorically for his parents in a higher and more abstract plane, moving smoothly to give them luster and legitimacy through repeated referential validation arising from the ancient (the "hieroglyphic" Ouroboros of eternity, the literary rose of ephemeral human beauty), all the while maintaining the fundamental tensions between male and female, noble and common, physical and immaterial, earthly and heavenly. The final step is for him to move the discussion away from himself completely by making clear that the construction of his "personal device" is in fact but one example of a widespread humanist phenomenon of bimedial composites, in which "body" and "soul" no longer stand for two individuals only but for the component parts of a new androgynous text-image composite whose significance extends far beyond the transient frame of his own existence.

Aneau's apparently simple "device" is thus in reality an astonishingly rich and complex emblematic construction. It begins by elevating biography to a symbolic level; lacking historical authority, it meticulously self-validates through multiple intertexts. Aneau not only ingeniously embodies himself and his parents in the device, but embodies the device itself by transforming it into an emblematic recapitulation of how his own body-soul picture theory actually works in practice, thereby brilliantly anticipating subsequent theoretical developments. He enacts and concretizes the transformation of ephemeral word/soul to durable text/soul, breathing corporeal reality ("life") into the "dead body" of the device image, transforming the "peu durable" to "pardurable," making what was mortal, immortal. In standing as bimedial symbol not just of one individual (and his parents), however gifted, but of the device itself and its place in contemporary so-

ciety, Aneau's ring, rose, and sonnet thus become a true emblem that generalizes and validates the entire Renaissance Humanist project.

References

Alciato, Andrea. 1531. *Viri Clarissimi D. Andreae Alciati Iurisconsultiss. Mediol. ad D. Chonradum Peutingerum Augustanum, Iurisconsultum Emblematum liber*. Augsburg: Heinrich Steyner.

--- 1549. *Emblemes*. Trans. Barthélemy Aneau. Lyons: Guillaume Rouille [Printed by Macé Bonhomme].

Aneau, Barthélemy. 1552a. *Imagination poetique, Traduicte en vers François, des Latins, & Grecz, par l'auteur mesme d'iceux*. Lyon: Macé Bonhomme.

--- 1552b. *Picta poesis. Ut pictura poesis erit*. Lyon: Macé Bonhomme.

Bouhours, le P. Dominique. 1671. *Les entretiens d'Ariste et d'Eugène*. Paris: Sebastien Mabre Cramoisy.

Bouzy, Christian. 2009. "Pouvoirs de l'image dans les frontispices des livres d'emblèmes des XVIe et XVIIe siècles." In Marie Couton, Isabelle Fernandes, Christian Jérémie, and Monique Vénuat eds. *Pouvoirs de l'image aux XVe, XVIe et XVIIe siècles: Pour un nouvel éclairage sur la pratique des Lettres à la Renaissance.* Clermont-Ferrand: Presses de Université Blaise Pascal, 361–92.

Cornilliat, François. 1990. "Physiologie du mariage et de l'emblème." *Littérature* no. 78, "Anatomie de l'emblème," 22–45.

Coustau, Pierre. 1555. *Le Pegme de Pierre Coustau, mis en Francoys par Lanteaume de Romieu Gentilhomme d'Arles*. Lyon: Macé Bonhomme.

Estienne, Henry, sieur des Fossez. 1645. *L'art de faire des devises*. Paris: Chez Iean Pasle.

Giovio, Paulo. 1555. *Dialogo dell'imprese militari et amorose*. Rome: A. Barre.

--- 1561. *Dialogue des devises d'armes et d'amours*. Trans. Vasquin Philieul. Lyon: Guillaume Rouillé.

Graham, David. 1993. "'Voyez ici en ceste histoire...': Cross-Reference, Self-Reference and Frame-Breaking in Some French Emblems." *Emblematica* 7, no. 1: 1–24.

--- 2005a. "Emblema multiplex: Towards a typology of emblematic forms, structures and functions." In Peter M. Daly ed. *Emblem Scholarship:*

Directions and Developments. A Tribute to Gabriel Hornstein. Imago Figurata, Studies, 5. Turnhout: Brepols, 131–58.

--- 2005b. "Pictures Speaking, Pictures Spoken To: Guillaume de La Perrière and Emblematic 'Illustration'." In Alison Saunders, and Peter Davidson eds. *Visual Words and Verbal Pictures: Essays in Honour of Michael Bath.* Glasgow Emblem Studies (special number), 69–87. Glasgow: University of Glasgow.

--- 2011. "'Born Under a Bad Sign': Semiotics of Gender in French Emblem Books." In Laurence Grove, and Alison Saunders eds, and assisted by Luís Gomes. *Trans-migrations: Essays in Honour of Alison Adams and Stephen Rawles.* Glasgow Emblem Studies. Glasgow: University of Glasgow, 63–82.

--- 2016a. "«Piece out our imperfections with your thoughts»: Lessons from the History of Emblem Studies." *Emblematica* 22: 1–42.

--- 2016b. "Claude-François Ménestrier: The Founder of 'Early Modern Grounded Theory'." In *Jesuit Image Theory*, ed. Walter S. Melion, Karl Enenkel and Christan Peters. Leiden : Brill, 125–44.

Guéroult, Guillaume. 1550. *Le Premier Livre des Emblemes*. Lyon: Balthazar Arnoullet.

Horus Apollo. 1543. *De la signification des notes hiéroglyphiques des Aegyptiens, c'est à dire des figures par les quelles ilz escripvoient leurs mystères secretz et les choses sainctes et divines*. Paris: J. Kerver.

Junius, Hadrianus [Adrien Le Jeune]. 1565. *Emblemata*. Antwerp: Plantin.

La Perrière, Guillaume de. 1540. *Le Theatre des bons engins, auquel sont contenus cent Emblemes*. [Paris]: Denis Janot.

L'Abbé, Pierre. 1664. *Petri L'Abbé e Societate Iesu Elogia sacra theologica et philosophica, regia, eminentia, illustria, historica, poetica, miscellanea*. Gratianopolis [Graz]: Phil. Charuys.

Laumonier, Paul. 1909. *Ronsard, poète lyrique étude historique et littéraire*. Paris: Hachette.

Loach, Judi. 1987. "Menestrier's Emblem Theory." *Emblematica* 2, 2: 317–36.

---. 2002. "Body and Soul: A Transfer of Theological Terminology into the Aesthetic Realm." *Emblematica* 12: 31–60.

Maffei, Sonia. 2007. "Giovio's Dialogo delle imprese militari e amorose and the Museum." In Donato Mansueto ed, in collaboration with Elena Laura Calogero. *The Italian Emblem: a Collection of Essays.* Glasgow Emblem

Studies 12. Glasgow: Glasgow University, 33–64.
Ménestrier, Claude-François. 1662. *L'Art des Emblemes*. Lyon: Benoist Coral.
--- 1684. *L'Art des emblèmes, où s'enseigne la morale par les Figures de la Fable, de l'Histoire, & de la Nature*. Paris: R. J. B. de la Caille.
--- 1682. *La philosophie des images*. 2 vols. Paris: R. J. B. de la Caille.
Mödersheim, Sabine. 2005. "The Emblem in the Context of Architecture." In Peter M. Daly ed. *Emblem Scholarship: Directions and Developments. A Tribute to Gabriel Hornstein*. Turnhout: Brepols. 159–75.
Paradin, Claude. 1551. *Devises heroïques*. Lyons: Jean de Tournes and Guillaume Gazeau.
--- *Devises heroïques*. 1557. Lyons: Jean de Tournes and Guillaume Gazeau.
Ruscelli, Girolamo. 1566. *Le imprese illustri, con espositioni et discorsi del Sor Ieronimo Ruscelli*. Venice.
Russell, Daniel. 1985. *The Emblem and Device in France*. French Forum Monographs. Vol. 59, Lexington, KY: French Forum.
--- 1995. *Emblematic Structures in Renaissance French Culture*. University of Toronto Romance Series. Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press.
Valeriano Bolzani, Gian Pietro. 1556. *Hieroglyphica sive de sacris aegyptiorum literis commentarii*. Basel.