THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

THE ANATOMY OF MELANCHOLY AS PROSE SATIRE

by

Eric P. McCormack

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA

OCTOBER 1973

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THESIS

THE ANATOMY OF MELANCHOLY AS PROSE SATIRE

(Summary)

Robert Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy has been interpreted in a variety of ways by three centuries of critics, but only lately has emphasis been placed on its relationship to satire. Analysis shows that the Anatomy is deeply indebted to the classical satiric tradition, and, equally, is one of a group of peculiarly English prose satires that flourished in the sixteenth and earlier seventeenth centuries.

Satire itself is a literary kind the theory of which has been full of contradictions; but in Renaissance England there existed a very precise notion of what satire--in its formal verse manifestation at least--ought to be. Satire was thought to be etymologically related to the "satyr," the shaggy woodland deity, and, accordingly, a decorum demanding crudeness and obscurity was attached to it. A second mark of this formal verse satire was the recurrent use of the image of anatomical dissection, appropriate enough in satire of a virulent sort. The product of these characteristics is clearly visible in such formal verse satires as the notorious Scourge of Villainie by Marston, the relatively milder Virgidemiarum of Joseph Hall, or the waspish, anonymously-written Whipper Pamphlets.

During the same period, however, a body of extremely popular prose works was being produced, including extravaganzas like Harington's Metamorphosis of Ajax, and the vituperative tracts of Nashe and Harvey. These prose works are strikingly similar to the formal verse satires both in tone and technique; they, too, have as their speaker a persona in the satyr-mold; they display an even greater ingenuity in their use of linguistic crudities, colloquial obscenities, and veiled personal references, than their verse counterparts; significantly, also, they employ the image of anatomical dissection with great frequency, in some instances making it the dominant motif. It is to this group of prose satires that Robert Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy belongs.

The Anatomy of Melancholy, first published in 1621 in a relatively compact form, achieved a widespread fame immediately, and went through five editions, all corrected and enlarged, in its author's life; the sixth edition, the last to be proofed and expanded by Burton, was published posthumously in 1651. The Anatomy has unmistakable links with the other prose satires of the day: it is, for example, dependent upon the anatomy-image, and its speaker, Democritus Junior, is a satiric persona with many of the attributes of the satyr. But the Anatomy is also an offshoot of the classical European tradition of satire, and makes abundant use of the great

satirists of antiquity, particularly Lucian, as well as of the modern representatives of the tradition such as Aretino and Rabelais.

That Burton's aim was to produce a satire as early as the 1621 edition can be seen from an analysis of that not-easily-available work. Lacking many of the embellishments of the 1651 edition (it is some 60% shorter), its vision is all the more readily grasped. It reveals a mastery of the techniques of satire that its author had displayed in his first publication, the satiric drama Philosophaster, but it also embodies a philosophy that had darkened with the passing of time: Burton, unlike his persona, is no ingenuous pedant full of unfounded admiration for the human race; rather, one sees him mercilessly dissect the great institutions of Western civilization, as he knew them, and exhibit their futility. Significantly, suicide is defended at several climactic points in the Anatomy, and the first edition closes with a "Conclusion of the Author to the Reader" that reinforces the pervasive satiric vision.

A study of the post-1621 editions consolidates the view that the Anatomy is satire. The additions and revisions, especially to the preliminary matter and the Preface, leave the reader in no doubt as to the tone of what he is reading and the intent of what is to follow; even the apparently "scientific" passages have their function within the overall satiric pattern. Everywhere, the post-1621 editions reveal Burton polishing with loving care, endlessly interpolating the ironic phrase, the incongruous allusion, or weaving long satiric passages to enhance further the original effect.

CHAPTER I

THE VAGARIES OF BURTON CRITICISM AND A THEORY OF SATIRE

There has been a great diversity of critical opinion over the exact nature of Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy. It has been categorized as the disorganized rambling of a pedant who was old-fashioned even in his own day, as a major scientific treatise, as a great Renaissance religious work, or, more commonly, as a hotch-potch whose aim is either confused or confusing.[1] The problem of ascertaining Burton's aim and the nature of his Anatomy, however, is compounded by the lack of a definitive edition of the work. Burton supervised the revision and publication of the first five editions, and had personally

[1]In these introductory pages (1 - 7), I am providing only the barest outline of the variety of critical opinions. Later in the chapter, they will be considered rather more fully. As for the four views exemplified here: a typical proponent of the notion that Burton was an erratic pedant is the anonymous essayist who, in Cornhill Magazine, April 1880, p. 490, patronises the Anatomy by suggesting that it is "a patchwork, stuck together with scissors and paste, a queer amorphous mass, in spite of its ostensible plan." Still, he does find "a real charm in the old gentleman." Foremost among those who suggest that the Anatomy is an important scientific work is Sir William Osler, "Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy," Yale Review, III (Jan., 1914), 252, asserting that it is "a great medical treatise." A number of critics have attached themselves to the opinion that the Anatomy is essentially a religious work; the most recent of these is Miss Patricia Vicari, who has delivered a paper before the 1971 meeting of the Association of Canadian University Teachers of English, entitled "Robert Burton: The Anatomy as Sermon, and the Sermon as Anatomy." The most useful Burton critic, in many senses, Lawrence Babb, Sanity in Bedlam (Michigan State University Press, 1959), considers that there is "serious disunity" in the Anatomy, and suggests a confusion in Burton's mind.

prepared the sixth edition, which was unfortunately not published till 1651, eleven years after his death. Yet the modern standard edition of the Anatomy, Shilleto's, is a version of the error-ridden seventh edition, which Shilleto assumed to be a faithful copy of the sixth.[1] Nor does any modern edition, for logistic reasons, attempt to cope with the problem of somehow illustrating the gradual development of the text, which is some sixty per cent longer in the sixth edition than it was in the first.

The two problems--critical indecision and lack of a comprehensive text--are closely interlinked in the case of the Anatomy, for readers have been deprived of an opportunity to study the growth of the work and the author's continuing preoccupations. Yet a sound critical approach can only be enhanced by such a study, and, conversely, through it, improper emphases stand a good chance of being exposed.[2] With respect to the present thesis, a study of the additions and revisions to the 1621 edition lends weight to the contention that the Anatomy of Melancholy is basically a work whose unity lies in its satiric character.

[1]The dates of publication of the six editions are as follows: first, 1621; second, 1624; third, 1628; fourth, 1632; fifth, 1638; and sixth, 1651. The Shilleto text (George Bell and Sons, London, 1896) was based on the 1660 edition.

[2]R. G. Hallwachs, "Additions and Revisions in the Second Edition of Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy" (Diss. Princeton 1942), casts doubt on Osler's interpretation in this way, showing that Burton makes no effort to expand the much-mooted "scientific" areas in the second edition.

Many readers have detected the presence of satire in the Anatomy, to be sure, and one group has gone so far as to describe it as "Menippean satire." This term, however, comes to be a specialised label for a form of extended essay, and lacks the connotations of "satire" in the orthodox sense.[1] Burton's Anatomy, in any case, is satiric in a much more basic sense than has been hitherto proposed. Not only does it have the characteristics of satire (in the commonly accepted sense), but it also has specific affinities with a whole school of Renaissance prose writers who certainly regarded themselves as satirists, but whom scholars have generally been loath to classify. The writers of formal verse satire in the Renaissance, on the other hand, have been studied much more intensively, and their work has been shown to contain a number of notable distinguishing features:[2] it uses the "loose" satura form;[3] it employs a satyr-figure as its speaker;

[1]Northrop Frye is the leader of this group. His suggestions as outlined in the Anatomy of Criticism (New York: Atheneum, 1966), will receive a more detailed evaluation later in this chapter. A more "orthodox" (in my view) definition of satire is proposed below, p. 53.

[2]Chapter II is devoted to the study of Renaissance prose satire. Works dealing with the formal verse are: R. M. Alden, The Rise of Formal Satire in England (Philadelphia, 1899); O. J. Campbell, Comicall Satyre in Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida (San Marino, 1965); A. Kernan, The Cankered Muse (New Haven, 1959); and John Peter, Complaint and Satire in Early English Literature (Oxford, 1956).

[3]I am indebted to Irvin Ehrenpreis, The "Types" Approach to Literature (New York: King's Crown Press, 1945), for the terms "kind," "form," and "mode," as they will be used throughout this thesis. Northrop Frye, Anatomy, and René Wellek and Austin Warren, Theory of Literature

it is distinguished, accordingly, by excessively crude language; its main image comes from medicine, and particularly from the practice of anatomical dissection; it is frequently virulent in its onslaughts despite its protestations of humane concern--so much so, apparently, that in 1599 formal verse satire was outlawed and many volumes of it were consigned to the fire.

The works of the prose satirists of the sixteenth and earlier seventeenth centuries in England can be characterised in the same way as the formal verse satire. Prose works like Nashe's Anatomie of Absurditie (1589), Harvey's Pierces Supererogation (1593) and Sir John Harington's Metamorphosis of Ajax (1596)[1] contain features similar to some in the most virulent outpourings of the least savoury of the verse satirists, Marston. They usually have as their speaker a satyr-persona who is inclined to vilify his unfortunate enemies with unflagging zest and

---

(New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1942) denounce the word "genre" as "an unpronounceable and alien thing," and "kind" seems an acceptable English equivalent for what we normally understand by "genre." "Form" is used to describe the literary vehicles (such as "novel," "short story," "anatomy") for the various "kinds." "Mode" means "the manner characteristic of a kind"; we may find several "modes" operating within one such complex work as King Lear.

[1]In Chapters II and III of this thesis, there is an analysis of the major prose-works of these writers, in which the close relationship between their satires and those of the formal verse satirists is shown. A scrutiny of the revealing "flyting" between Nashe and Harvey makes it clear that each was a master of the satiric arts of invective and abuse.

abundant moral indignation--saeva indignatio is the pass-word; they tend to use the satura form because of the opportunities it provides for tangential abuse of all and sundry; the major metaphor they employ is the pervasive anatomical one; and their language is frequently as crude as their imaginations can make it.

Burton's Anatomy seems to me to be a member of this group of prose satires, and would quite probably be recognized as such by the majority of his contemporary readers. Its speaker, Democritus Junior, is a satiric persona, sublimating the functions of doctor and priest in that of the satirist.[1] The Anatomy is written in the satura form, and parodies the medical treatise which very aptly supplies the basic medical image, the signature of Renaissance satire. It is an epitome, too, of the most sophisticated and explicit satiric devices,[2] assailing multitudes of targets in keeping with its stated aim of examining a universal disease.

The Anatomy's affinities with Renaissance prose satire appear more clearly from an examination of the relatively compact first edition.

[1]For information and speculation upon the origins of satire, I shall rely heavily upon R. C. Elliot's The Power of Satire (Princeton, 1960), the only major work dealing exclusively with the roots of the satiric mode.

[2]Sister Mary Claire Randolph, "The Medical Concept in English Renaissance Satiric Theory," SP, XXXVIII (1941), supplies us with a list of the popular satiric tools of the day, including catalogues, mini-anatomies, mock-odysseys, mock-encomia, irony, ridicule, diminutio, invective, and many others. Burton makes use of them all with superlative effect.

As an analysis of this edition indicates, there was no confusion in Burton's mind, at least, over his aim: it is a satire on the widespread proportions of human folly, and is no more a scientific work than Gulliver's Travels is an authentic traveler's tale. The technical passages are as often as not merely parodic, for they are the crutch upon which the satura must lean, and are not an end in themselves. The first edition also contains exclusively the "Conclusion of the Author to the Reader," a satiric apologia at the end of the work, which brings the Anatomy full circle from the "Satyricall Preface," and shows the consistency in the vision that has informed the entire work. Throughout the first edition, one can see the careful shaping of the persona's character, sometimes as the satirist himself, sometimes as the satirised; and one can savour Burton's mastery of the whole range of satiric devices, from the dominant mock-odyssey motif to the sophisticated irony that marks the interplay between author, persona, and subject.

In the editions after 1621, Burton continues to sharpen and deepen his satiric vision. Passages with potential for further satiric development he augmented with zest, and often, when the satire was not sufficiently explicit, as in the title and preliminary matter of the first edition, he added large gobbets of material to remedy the defect. The early editions were remarkably successful, and Burton, whilst still keeping up the pretence of a scientific purpose, made virtually no additions to the "technical" material after 1621.

Two factors of importance, then, seem to indicate that Burton's Anatomy is a satiric work whose aim is by no means confused: its relationship to the group of prose satires that was popular in England during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; and the evidence supplied by a study of the additions and revisions to the post-1621 editions of the Anatomy, which suggests that Burton's vision was satiric. Since, however, the bulk of Burton critics over three hundred years have not considered the Anatomy to be satire, it becomes necessary and illuminating to examine their opinions more closely, to assess their conclusions, and to ponder whether, in fact, the label "satire," no matter how contentious, is not the most appropriate for a work like the Anatomy.

It is always a rewarding pursuit for the student of literature to scrutinize the critical treatment meted out to a particular writer over the years, though it is a well-warranted platitude that, as often as not, one learns more about the critic than about his author from such a study. In the case of one who, in the course of three hundred years, has received a great deal of critical notice, it is all the more illuminating.[1] Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy has run the gamut;

[1]William R. Mueller, in The Anatomy of Robert Burton's England (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1952), and Richard L. Nochimson, in "Robert Burton: a Study of the Man, his Work, and his Critics," Diss. Columbia 1967, have both given rather selective outlines of major trends in Burton criticism, Nochimson's being apparently very much indebted to Mueller's. Mueller shows that the critical trends do indeed mirror the ages in which they occur, Nochimson demonstrates that some very superficial work on the part of biographers has led to misconceptions about Burton. My concern in examining the critics is to evince the notion that it is confusion over the essential nature of Burton's major opus that has led to the conflicting interpretations of it.

on the one hand he is charged, like that unfortunate don of Lord Macaulay's "whose natural spark of wit was smothered by his pedantry," with collecting "the sweepings of the Bodleian,"[1] and on the other hand he is lauded as the foremost exponent of a recently rediscovered literary genre.[2] An examination of the meanderings of the stream of Burton criticism, however, shows little in the way of "progress" in critical appreciation that would give rise to any complacency about the superiority of modern critical approaches, but it does demonstrate effectively the perennial problems which the Anatomy has presented to all who have endeavoured to draw that leviathan out with a hook; from such a realization it is hoped that certain positions will emerge, upon which the superstructure of this thesis will rest.

Critics of the Anatomy of Melancholy have been divided over the true nature of the work. Broadly speaking, there are three main approaches to it, each with the "by streams and rillets" beloved of Burton. The first school has tended to emphasize the utilitarian function of the Anatomy, though often, as with each of the other schools, not completely ignoring all other aspects of the book. The "utilitarians" feel that the Anatomy is, by design, a scientific or educational text-book;

[1]Quoted in F. P. Wilson's amusing and interesting Seventeenth Century Prose (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1960), p. 33.

[2]Northrop Frye, The Anatomy of Criticism is the main propounder of the view. Its merits will be discussed below, p. 22, and throughout.

the more sympathetically inclined of them suggest that it is rewarding reading for the student seeking to amass information on an encyclopedic scale. This "utilitarian" group is counterbalanced by a second, for whom the personality of the author is most important. This school finds the Anatomy to be a mirror of an erratic but attractive representative of a once-vital way of life now defunct; also, this group sees in the personality of the author a more positive unifying principle that permeates the Anatomy and explains the book's apparent diffuseness. Finally, there is a group of critics who have concentrated their attention on the literary form of the Anatomy, attempting to define it in terms of its literary affinities; it is upon the approach of this last group that this thesis depends, as I have hinted in the opening pages. I will deal first, however, with the "utilitarians."

The utilitarian approach to Burton, whilst predominating amongst the earlier critics, has had its atavistic modern support. In its original manifestation it appears as either an awe-stricken regard for Burton's erudition, or as a slighting and often spiteful contempt for his "damnable iteration." The Anatomy is called "a book of philology," in which Burton has "piled up a variety of much excellent learning."[1]

[1]Thomas Fuller, The Worthies of England, ed. J. Freeman (London: Allen and Unwin, 1952), pp. 320-21. Unfortunately, one has to suspect Fuller's authority: for instance, in describing Burton's work, he says cryptically and parenthetically, "None to the native to describe a country," and one has a nasty suspicion that he is confusing Robert with William, his brother, and author of A Description of Leicestershire (London: Jaggard, 1622).

Anthony à Wood, the validity of whose information is often questionable, may in this instance be taken safely to reflect the opinion of his age when he tells us that the Anatomy is a book "so full of variety of reading that Gentlemen who have lost their time and are put to a push for invention, may furnish themselves with matter [from it] for common or scholastic discourse and writing."[1] This is a striking foreshadowing of Lord Byron's comment, "If the reader has patience to go through [Burton's] volumes, he will be more improved for literary conversation than by the perusal of any twenty other works with which I am acquainted"[2] --a rather back-handed compliment. Doctor Johnson's comment on Burton is well known, and whilst we may have reason to doubt that he rose two hours earlier in the morning to read the Anatomy--according to Boswell, he never rose early for anything--his remark that it was "overloaded with quotation"[3] strikes the familiar chord and corresponds too much with other contemporary estimations to be dismissed: many critics have

[1]Anthony à Wood, Athenae Oxoniensis (London, 1721), quoted in Paul Jordan-Smith in his edition of Philosophaster (Stanford, 1931), p. 282. à Wood is notoriously inaccurate and speculative in his pseudo-history. One gets the impression that he has read the Anatomy, or at least the Preface, and has taken literally all apparently personal remarks that are there and applied them to the author.

[2]George Gordon Byron, Letters, ed. T. More (London, 1930), I, 98.

[3]J. E. Brown, ed., The Critical Opinions of Samuel Johnson (Princeton University Press, 1926), p. 300.

felt since that the Burtonian rifts contain too much ore. Amongst the more modern holders of the view, this damning statement is found: "no book bears a closer resemblance to the works of marginal Prynne,"[1] a remark calculated to offend the memory of the Burton who launched the bitter attack upon Prynne and his ilk in the Third Partition.

It is, however, an aficionado of Burton's (and there are many from Lamb onwards--a group who make no notable critical contribution), Paul Jordan-Smith, who makes the definitive statement on Burton's erudition:

> It covers almost every field of human interest: medicine, dietetics, psychiatry, climatology, ethics, education, theology, government, magic, astrology, travel, horticulture, and both the pleasures and pains of love. Add to all this the fact that on every subject the greatest masters of his own and every previous age are summoned to give their testimony; that the whole is enlivened by the poets of England, Greece and Rome, and by a multitude of droll, Decameronian stories, and even then one gets but a slight notion of the inclusive nature of this old book.[2]

[1]Arthur W. Fox, A Book of Bachelors (A. Constable and Co., 1899), p. 434.

[2]Paul Jordan-Smith, Bibliographia Burtoniana (Stanford, 1931), p. 4. Jordan-Smith's critical statements are, to put it mildly, impressionistic: for example, he informs us that given a choice of books to take to a desert island, he would opt for the Anatomy--not the best recommendation for it, one takes leave to suggest. At times, however, in defence of his idol, he becomes witty, as when he dismisses the idea that Bacon is the real author of the Anatomy (p. 67): "It would seem that Bacon, taking a day off from the production of Don Quixote, Montaigne's Essays, Shakespeare's poems and plays, The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia, The Faerie Queene, and other odds and ends of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century literature, on both sides of the Channel, not to make account of the works bearing his own name, did first the Treatise (1586), and then, thirty-five years later, enlarged and revised it into the Anatomy of Melancholy."

Such catalogues of the Anatomy's "ingredients" are the staple of most of the literary histories.

In general, the twentieth-century version of the "utilitarian" approach envisages the Anatomy as primarily an example of Renaissance scientific writing--a view adumbrated as early as 1730 by Thomas Hearne, who, in commenting upon the declining popularity of Burton in the eighteenth century (the nadir of his reputation), voices the standard view we have already noticed: "it hath been a common-place book for filchers" (like Sterne). His next comment is however of more interest to us:

> now, tis disregarded, and a good fair perfect copy (although of the 7th impression), may be purchased for one shilling, well bound, which occasioned a Gentleman yesterday . . . to say that Sir Isaac Newton (he believed) would also in time be turned to waste paper, an observation which is very likely to prove true.[1]

The analogy with Newton the scientist has proved false, in that the reputation of Burton has grown since the doldrums of the eighteenth century, and is now fairly established--a course of events which may indicate that it is not to Burton's scientific contribution that one ought to look in search of his real worth. But the critics with whom

[1]Thomas Hearne, Reliquiae Hearnianae; the Remains of Thomas Hearne, M.A. of Edmund Hall; ed. J. Buchanan-Brown (London: Centaur Press, 1960), p. 409. Again, it has to be admitted that Hearne, picturesque as he may seem is not a reliable source, except insomuch as he reflects eighteenth-century opinion. His comments, with the exception of the ones above, seem to be from à Wood, down to the very language; for example, that Burton was a "most facetious and pleasant companion;" indeed, so careless is he that he mentions à Wood in his next sentence, thus confirming one's suspicions, albeit unwittingly.

I shall now deal are determined that the basis for our continuing to read Burton rests not on his literary merits, but on his importance in the history of scientific advance. And the greatest proponent of this line is the formidable Sir William Osler, who pontificates:

> The Anatomy of Melancholy is a great medical treatise, orderly in arrangement, serious in purpose, and weighty beyond belief with authorities.[1]

The area of Burton's scientific effort has been even further delimited by another observer, who describes him as a pioneer

> who devoted his life to the study of mental aberration, and was concerned with no other branch of medicine, except in so far as it bore on his central interest.[2]

Burton is acclaimed as one of the founders of modern psychiatry in this view.[3]

[1]Osler, "Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy," 252.

[2]Bergen Evans, The Psychiatry of Robert Burton (New York, 1944), p. 1.

[3]Evans' book indulges in the dangerous if once popular practice of explaining the psyche, and thereby the "intention" of the author, through unconscious admissions made in his creative work. Often this method shows nothing more than the insensitivity of the critic to the artistic consciousness of a writer. So we find such irrelevancies as this: "The assumption that she [Burton's mother] was domineering and unaffectionate towards him--or at least that he thought she was--is supported by the intensity of feeling with which he so often alludes in the Anatomy to the cruelty and indifference of parents" (p. 6). Evans continues, "He [Burton] makes it quite clear, in the course of his book, that he had suffered an unhealable narcissistic injury in his childhood, that left him resentful, envious, scornful of himself and of others." The literary value of such comments is very difficult to ascertain, and their psychoanalytical validity seems doubtful, since they rest upon a very imperfect notion of the nature of the work.

Perhaps the most aggressive and uncompromising statement of this scientific branch of the utilitarian school is as follows:

> A scholar who wrote in Latin was assured of an international reputation, and Burton's aim was to write a medical text-book. Burton would be much surprised to find out that his book is read only by those who find it amusing . . . .[1]

Since Burton did not write in Latin anyway, the point is not well taken.

This large and prominently represented group of critics who tend to treat Burton as scientist, or encyclopedist, or commonplace collector, is counterbalanced by a group of critics who are primarily interested in some aspect of the personality of Burton, which, they feel, pervades the work. Some of them regard the Anatomy as a case-book which shows what an odd creature its compiler was, others suggest that Burton's personality is that evasive unifying principle in the Anatomy which caused so much head-scratching.

One of this group's favourite and most bizarre attitudes has been a protective and possessive feeling towards the "fantastic old great man."[2] Lamb, for example, was full of righteous indignation at the resurrection of his protegé in modern-looking editions--he associated the Anatomy's peculiarly Burtonian flavour with the very appearance of the volume which encompasses his effort, seemingly preferring that he should be dead than read. When, in the present century, we find an

[1] E. L. Black, "Burton the Anatomist," English, VII (1949), 26.

[2] Charles Lamb, Works, ed. E. V. Lucas (London, 1903-5), V, 27.

article entitled "Quaint Old Treatise of Love," we are sufficiently warned not to be surprised at Burton's being described as "this strange old pedant" or at his work being discussed with good-humoured though misplaced superiority.[1]

An extension of this viewpoint became more popular in the twentieth century, when emphasis was laid on Burton's attractive "personality" as the dominating force and saving grace in the whole "amorphous mass:"

> The Anatomy of Melancholy, like Southey's The Doctor, is essentially a cento, an immense collection of quotations from a very wide reading, moulded into a book by the strong personality of the compiler.[2]

The Anatomy is also referred to as

> The multifarious expression of a nature as quaint, fantastic, various and mocking as that which created, stone by stone, with infinite labour, that great edifice [Notre Dame].[3]

[1]Gamaliel Bradford, "Quaint Old Treatise of Love: Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy," Sewanee Review, XIX (April, 1911), 183.

[2]Richard Aldington, "Burton the Anatomist," Nation and Athenaeum, XXXVI (March 21, 1925), 861. The comparison between the Anatomy and The Doctor is of interest, since there is an implicit recognition of the generic similarity involved. The Doctor bears many resemblances to the picaresque novel, but also has the ingredients of the Menippean satire that Frye prescribes. Southey's doctor, however, is much more akin in temperament to Sir Thomas Browne, and, indeed, one of the chapters is headed, "Points of Similitude and Dissimilitude between Sir Thomas Browne and Doctor Dove." The book might almost be read as the development of a nineteenth-century Thomas Browne. It was about this time that Burton was coming back into favour.

[3]F. Mortimer Clapp, Scribner's Magazine, LXXXVII (1930), 221; This kind of analogy between the arts reaches its apotheosis in Wylie Sypher's work. Burton's Anatomy has some of the characteristics that Sypher would associate with baroque.

The critics who make such statements, since they see the personality of Burton as the unifying principle in the Anatomy, devote much of their attention to speculating upon Burton's character. A typical example of this tendency can be found in Middleton Murry's comments; he too finds the personality of the man to be the pervasive force, and, for him, the fascination of the work rests in extricating from it the psyche of its author, who is "always ready to gallop off with the dictionary thundering along behind him."[1]

This attitude can be detected in much more recent critics. One of them, for instance, finds the Anatomy to be the work of a collector and humanist--characteristics that he feels are of value no longer; but, once again, the saving grace is in the man: "Time cannot dull the principal achievement of the Anatomy, that of the raconteur."[2] Richard L. Nochimson, in his dissertation, still finds the personality of Burton and not the dissemination of erudition to be the key factor, and one that so comes to dominate the whole work that "he becomes more openly ambitious and (as the book progresses) shows an increasing lack of respect for

[1]John Middleton Murry, Countries of the Mind, First Series (Oxford, 1931), p. 77. Murry's perspective is essentially that of don looking at fellow-don; he is not aware of any tradition other than that of the frustrated academic operating in Burton.

[2]Siegbert Prawer, "Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy," Cambridge Journal, I (1947-48), 687. Prawer sees Burton as clergyman, doctor and social commentator, each role being played separately and unsuccessfully; he is not aware of a possible harmony behind the apparent fragmentation, one that we will discuss when we come to talk about satire and its traditions.

respected and revered figures of the past." Nochimson, too, spends much of his efforts on biographical study, and is intent on challenging the traditional notion of Burton as the man incapable of any self-expression and utterly reliant upon the secondhand advice of "ancients" or "pedants".[1] The converse of Nochimson's approach is found in the view that the "failure" of the Anatomy stems from the inability of the author to find himself: Burton lacks personal vision, the argument runs; his grasp of the world is "untamed, unfocused;" and ultimately:

> His was the trying experience of more than one sensitive scholar of the Renaissance who grappled with mammoth problems, failed to make the necessary reconciliations, and lived out an uncommitted career with an unsettled mind.[2]

The third group of critics consists of those who are concerned with the literary form or formlessness of the Anatomy; they have been attentive to Burton the social critic or satirist, the attacker of the corruptions of his own society, and of mankind in general, through his literary art. Many of the commentators I have already mentioned have shown an awareness of a certain satirical tone in specific passages, but have evidently felt that it was a relatively unimportant aspect of the total work. In the twentieth century, a reawakening interest in the study of genre (or "kinds") has led some of the Burton critics to examine

[1] Nochimson, p. 246.

[2] James Roy King, Studies in Six Seventeenth Century Writers (Ohio University Press, 1966), p. 91.

the Anatomy for the characteristics of the satiric mode. Early in the century we find references to the "lightness" of Burton's vision:

> Did Burton take himself so seriously? Of solemnity he was incapable, and time after time, when he is treading the skirts of gravity, and is on the point of being tripped up, he dances off lightly and cracks his jest as he passes on to his next sleight of hand. He plays with his subject, plays with his folly, plays with his observation of man and his inordinate acquaintance with books, and plays incessantly with his own extravagant sensations.[1]

Such opinions are refreshing in that they allow Burton a sense of humour; but they stop at that, and make the Anatomy into a rather pedantic piece of entertainment. The critic runs away, in this case, with the extensions of his own metaphor and the work of art is an excuse for it. This, however, is progress, and similar statements with a similar bent, crying out for amplification, begin to emerge:

> . . . Burton's theme is as little to his main purpose as Rabelais' fable. Each is a mere excuse for humour and rhetorical embroidery. His attempts to cure the disease which he detected in every manifestation of human folly, are neither serious nor seriously meant. He was less intent to find a remedy for others than to indulge his own genius, and merely rejoiced that he had chosen a subject which should express his erudite fancy.[2]

The analogy with Rabelais marks a significant advance in comparative thinking, but is explored no further. Douglas Bush, with typical

[1] John Freeman, "Burton the Anatomist," Spectator 5073 (Sept., 1925), 451.

[2] Charles Whibley, Literary Portraits (New York, 1920), p. 282.

insight, talks about the omnipresence of the satire, yet is unwilling to accord it major importance: "But though Burton is here and everywhere a realistic satirist, a detached observer of the human comedy, he is much more than that."[1] This final phrase reveals a view of satire by Bush which is full of implied reservations about the merits of satire, a traditional attitude which will be discussed later.

Certain of the critics have concentrated their efforts upon the "Satyricall Preface" of Democritus Junior to the Reader, a satire in a fairly recognizable format. Burton's "utopia" is seen as not just a "witty fancy," but as a clear denunciation of "the idleness of an exploiting class maintained at the cost of the suffering of poor workers," and advocating

> direct pleading before judges, uniformity of buildings, education of children in their fathers' trades, provision of hospitals for the sick, and abolition of pillage and devastation of enemy lands.[2]

Mueller, in three excellent pieces on the Preface, thinks of it as a satire and of the three following Partitions as a serious effort on Burton's part to cure the ills that he has exhibited there. He is in essential agreement with Patrick, reiterating that Burton is no mere

[1]Douglas Bush, English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), p. 297.

[2]J. Max Patrick, "Robert Burton's Utopianism," PQ, XXVII (1948), 345-58. Patrick proceeds to contend that Bacon's utopian vision (as articulated in The New Atlantis) is heavily indebted to Burton.

literary dabbler, enjoying the exercise of his own virtuosity, and quite unconcerned about the abuses he treats of:

> Burton's satire is direct . . . he describes the world as he sees it, hoping to awaken less perceptive and less thoughtful people to its evils. He is neither subtle nor oblique; he demands no suspension of disbelief. His satire bears a marked distinction from Swift's "Voyage to Lilliput," for example. The reader accepts Lilliput as Lilliput before he accepts it as England or as the world of the six-foot man; Burton raises his curtain on the six-foot man. Swift, particularly in the first two voyages of his Travels, places between the reader and the world a naive Gulliver initially impressed by the splendid achievements of the Lilliputians and distressed by the Brobdingnagian Emperor's narrow views on government and warfare. As the reader becomes increasingly aware of the distinction between the sophistication of Swift and the naivete of Gulliver, the gap between the reader and the real world closes. In Burton's satire, there is no gap to close. If there is any obliquity at all in his approach, it lies in his viewing all the world as a stage, as a Comedy of Errors, and himself sometimes as actor, sometimes as spectator and sometimes as director, once removed from the world itself.[1]

The most recently published, extensive treatment of the Anatomy in English[2] is Lawrence Babb's Sanity in Bedlam, a title that is not only

[1]William R. Mueller, "Robert Burton's 'Satyricall Preface'," MLQ, XV (1954), 32. Whilst it is satisfying to those who take the Anatomy as satire to see it treated seriously in this way (and the comparison with Gulliver's Travels is a particularly apt one), yet there are a number of limitations to Mueller's view. He omits any treatment of the satiric persona, Democritus Junior, the complexity of whose role he does not appear to notice, although such distancing of author from reader is the very point of his analogy. I shall be treating the matter at length later in this thesis.

[2]I emphasize "English," for there is a more up-to-date work on the Anatomy in French, Jean Robert Simon's Robert Burton (1577-1740) et l'Anatomie de la Mélancolie (Paris: Didier, 1964). It is a lengthy treatment of almost every aspect of Burton's life and works, clearing up biographical matters, and examining the Anatomy from the historical

applicable to Burton's own position in his society, but to Babb's attempt to decipher the Anatomy's form. As such, his effort is successful, but Babb also proposes his solution to the problem of deciding upon the true nature of the work by attributing a deficiency to the Anatomy. Such a solution surely has to be justified in terms of the individual reader's response to the work's totality; Babb asserts:

> The Anatomy is not just the book which Burton originally planned to write. In the book which he actually produced, a purpose is superimposed upon a purpose. He has written something which is both a psychiatric treatise and a commentary upon men and manners. Many readers have doubtless been confused by the resulting duality, and some may have felt that disunity was a serious weakness in the book.[1]

Yet in the final analysis, Babb's is the most useful piece of introductory criticism that has been produced so far, and helps to fill the gaps that are inevitably left in the absence of a definitive edition of the Anatomy.

---

perspective. Simon sees Burton as belonging to the line of Renaissance thinkers that includes Ficino, Pico, Erasmus and Montaigne, all of whom show the same tendency to copia, and who are often distinguished by inconsistency and even apparent negligence. Though extremely formal himself, Simon has little to say on the form that Burton adopts.

[1]Sanity in Bedlam, p. 28. Babb himself is not at all put out by "duality" and "disunity;" he consoles himself thus: "It may be that Burton should have done it differently. But if he had planned and written more rationally and differently, his book might have lacked a good deal of the spontaneity and the peculiar flavour that it has. It is doubtful in any case that the author, being Robert Burton, could have written otherwise than he did." We may find Babb's contention that Burton's strength lies in his weakness to be a bit specious, and his finding that Burton could not have written other than he did is surely an odd kind of literary judgment.

At last we come to what we may perhaps feel to be the most enlightened and enlightening group of contributors to the "literary" school--and they are by far the smallest offshoot. They are principally interested in a re-examination of many of the least clear but most dearly held critical approaches and pieces of jargon in the field of literature. Northrop Frye, the foremost amongst them, sets out to demonstrate the vagueness of much traditional thinking on literature, holding that in questions of genre especially there is a conveniently euphoric haze that generations of critics have been, somehow, reluctant to dissipate:

> Asked what form of prose fiction Gulliver's Travels belongs to, there are few critics who, if they could give the answer 'Menippean satire,' would regard it as knowledge essential for dealing with the book, although some notion of what a novel is is surely a prerequisite for dealing with a serious novelist.[1]

Having introduced the term "Menippean satire," Frye goes on to speak of the Anatomy of Melancholy thus:

> This creative treatment of exhaustive erudition is the organizing principle of the greatest Menippean satire in English before Swift, Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy.[2]

Frye is thus the first English critic to place the Anatomy in its entirety within the category of satire. Menippean satire is a special breed with

[1]Frye, pp. 1-14.

[2]Ibid., p. 311.

its own peculiarities; it is said to have been the invention of the Greek cynic, Menippus, whose own works are lost. Fortunately, however, Lucian, the Greek, and the Romans, Varro, Petronius, and Apuleius (all of whom are frequently cited by Burton) carried on the tradition. Its most notable stylistic idiosyncrasy is the way in which verse and prose are intermingled, and its method is twofold: the heaping up of tremendous gobbets of information about its themes, and the attack on its pedantic targets with volumes of their own jargon.[1] But its major target is not so much individuals as widespread mental attitudes: "Pedants, bigots, cranks, parvenus, virtuosi, enthusiasts, rapacious and incompetent professional men of all kinds, are handled in terms of their occupational approach to life as distinct from their social behaviour."[2]

Frye, however, with a rather disconcerting stream-of-consciousness-like effect (especially puzzling in that it emanates from one who is interested in making criticism a much more scientific business), having mentioned the term "Menippean satire," decides to withdraw it:

[1] Ibid., 311.

[2] Ibid., 309.

> The word "anatomy" in Burton's title means a dissection or analysis, and expresses very accurately the intellectualized approach of his form. We may as well adopt it as a convenient name to replace the cumbersome and in modern times rather misleading "Menippean satire."[1]

The reason for Frye's decision to scrap his earlier label seems to be, in part, his awareness of the unsatisfactory state of the word "satire" today, a problem I shall have to discuss later. But Frye shows a welcome understanding of the position of satire in the past, and grasps the fact that the problem in attempting to grapple with it is the result of the associations and mutations that have come to affect the word itself:

> The word "satire," in Roman and Renaissance times, meant either of two specific literary forms of that name, one (this one -- Menippean satire) prose and the other verse. Now it means a structural principle or attitude, what we have called a mythos.[2]

In a more recent theoretic discussion of "The English Renaissance Prose Anatomy,"[3] Frye's categories are employed, and in the case of Burton, their implications are investigated rather more fully. The Anatomy of Melancholy is classified as not only an "anatomy," but a "satiric anatomy" that has a good deal in common with a number of other prominent "non-fictional" works of the period; in addition, some

[1]Frye, pp. 311-12.

[2]Frye, p. 310. I hope to demonstrate in this thesis that Burton's Anatomy is a satire both formally and in terms of Frye's mythos--that is, in both the Renaissance and the universal sense.

[3]Thomas Edward Wright, Diss. Washington University 1963.

interesting points are made about the structure of the Anatomy and its persona, which, however, owing to the theoretic nature of the thesis and the large number of works considered in evidence, remain suggestive rather than definitive. In this thesis I will be able to deal more fully with the Anatomy's satiric attributes and will use the additions and revisions in the five editions after 1621 to add weight to the case.

All of the critics I have considered so far, with the exception of Babb, have tended to treat the Anatomy as an unchanging monolith. Of course, this is a very understandable phenomenon and parallels the attitudes towards the work already noted; since the Anatomy is placed in the "non-fiction" category, it is felt that any changes that occur simply add to its already impressive intellectual weight, but contribute nothing fresh to our appreciation of its intent. Yet it is surely significant that

> The composition of the Anatomy continued for nearly twenty years after its initial publication. The length of the first edition (excluding the marginalia and the minor introductory pieces) is between 300,000 and 310,000 words. The length of the sixth is between 480,000 and 490,000 words, an increase of about sixty per cent.[1]

In view of the length of the Anatomy and the time required for a careful reading of it, we cannot be too suprised that scholars have tended to eschew any attempt at a comparative study. One dissertation has been

[1]Babb, p. 15.

written on the first and second editions,[1] but it is chiefly concerned with the "content" and not the nature of the work as evidenced by the changes. As I have already mentioned, important work has been done on the Preface, and attention paid to the additions made there. A critical edition has been compiled, too, of part of the Third Partition, the section on "Religious Melancholy,"[2] which gives some interesting insights into the tremendous problems that would arise in the compilation of a definitive edition, as well as providing a method for setting about such a task, and a hint at the value such a work would have for literary scholars. Bensly and Wright did embark upon the job:

> In 1910 Edward Bensly published the information that "W. Aldis Wright has made a collation of all the editions [of the Anatomy] from 1621 to 1676; his work is not yet published." Wright died in 1914. In 1927 Bensly announced that "the collations and other materials of the late Dr. W. Aldis Wright . . . have been kindly lent me by the Council of Trinity College Cambridge, for the preparation of an edition of the Anatomy of Melancholy by Dr. Wright and myself." Bensly died in 1938. There has been no further announcement concerning a definitive edition.[3]

No one since then seems to have been interested in continuing the task. The only relics of the Bensly-Wright project are a number of errata and emendations to existing texts of the Anatomy which have been contributed by them to Notes and Queries and other journals as

[1]Hallwachs, "Additions and Revisions in the Second Edition of Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy."

[2]D. G. Donovan, "The Anatomy of Melancholy: 'Religious Melancholy', a Critical Edition," Diss. Illinois 1965.

[3]Babb, p. 29.

preliminaries to the projected definitive edition. It appears that for the forseeable future we shall have to make do with those editions we have.[1]

Of the various schools in Burton criticism, therefore, I would suggest that the "literary" group has been the more fruitful, and that the movement towards an appreciation of the place of the Anatomy of Melancholy in the canon of satire seems the most promising of the literary approaches. This is a claim that the body of this thesis will attempt to substantiate. As I have indicated, however, there has been a vagueness about the notion of satire and its modern implications that makes its attribution to a piece of work only vaguely informative. The matter is further complicated by the fact that Renaissance satire, of which the Anatomy is an example, has an added set of special characteristics which merit a close examination of their own. Such an examination is provided in the next chapter of this thesis from the point of view of Burton's near-contemporary practitioners of the mode, and through the pronouncements of Renaissance theorists. But before undertaking that analysis of a specific age's attitude towards satire, it is necessary in view of the many problems surrounding the term to propose a definition that singles out the universal characteristics of the mode, shared by satire both ancient and modern.

[1]See Gilbert H. Doane, "A Checklist of the Editions of the Anatomy of Melancholy," The American Collector, V (1928), 247-249.

The dangers involved in attempting a definition of satire (rather like the better-known problems attached to trying the same with regard to tragedy) are adequately demonstrated by a glance at the various theories that have been propounded throughout the ages. Benjamin Franklin made a remark about satirists: "Strange! that a man who has enough wit to write a satire should have folly enough to publish it." The same might well be said of those who write theories of satire; they are frequently open to the same kind of analysis as the artists they discuss, and perhaps merit the appellations "schizomythic" and "cyclomythic" even more.[1] We are well-warned: "The writer on satire, like Bunyan's Christian, is confronted at the very outset by a slough: the Slough of Terminology."[2] Richter's amusing remark on the subject is only too memorable: "Definitions of the comic serve the sole purpose of being themselves comic." One of the authoritative works on the matter gives this timely admonition:

> The incongruity inherent in satiric and humorous writing and the elasticity of critical terms in common usage will convert any rigid system into a bed of Procrustes.[3]

[1]"Schizomythic" satirists are egotistical and display a "narrowing of the mind;" whilst "cyclomythic" satirists show "uncharitableness and lack of sustaining moral background" according to W. A. Pannenborg, Satirische Schrijvers: Karakter en Temperament (Assen, 1953). This, and other rather incredible information, including tables in which statistical analyses are drawn up, are to be found in Leonard Feinberg's extremely amusing and useful The Satirist, His Temperament, Motivation, and Influence (Iowa State University Press, 1963).

[2]Peter, p. 2.

[3]David Worcester, The Art of Satire (New York: Russell and Russell, 1960), p. 48.

With due deference to all such words of wisdom, the student must proceed with trepidation at least to look at the problem. The very names "satire" (the form) and "satiric" (the mode) do not have altogether identical connotations. Whereas it is granted that Burton's Anatomy has much in it that is "satiric" there is great unwillingness to call the work a satire: this is not altogether different from the approach of the Irish bishop who said of Gulliver's Travels: "I don't believe the half of it." I have suggested earlier that a comparison with Gulliver's Travels can be very fruitful, and I hope to demonstrate that the notion that some of the Anatomy of Melancholy is satire is a very unsatisfactory literary judgment.

One of the problems in attaching the label "satire" to a literary work arises out of the way in which the meanings of "satire" and "satiric" have developed over the centuries. One has to accept that the terms mean different things to different people, especially in the twentieth century. The looseness of the terminology surrounding satire has developed since the time of "the last great practitioner of the formal verse satire," Lord Byron--through no fault of his. Previously satire had had an honoured and well-defined place in Western literary culture, stretching back into the mists of time--mists I shall be attempting to dispel, or partially dissipate in the next chapter. The word is still used with frequency and in the most unexpected places: "If satires are no longer in fashion, satire is perennial as an attribute

in Western Literature."[1] We may, with impunity, refer to such prose works as Animal Farm, Catch Twenty-Two, and Candy, as satires; plays like Pygmalion and Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf, and products of the "Theatre of the Absurd" generally, court the title; of late, the motion picture has become a very popular and successful vehicle for "satire:" The Graduate, Petulia, and Goodbye Columbus have all been called satires for one reason or another. One recent movie, M.A.S.H., consciously or unconsciously adheres with astonishing precision to those criteria for the "anatomy" form that I shall be discussing later. Fountains of blood gush forth and dissected bodies abound in an aura of gleeful abandon, and the whole cenum tradition is epitomized in one amusing parody of Leonardo's painting of the "Last Supper". Fellini's adoption of the loose satiric form of the Satyricon has also dazed many of his critics.

In poetry, Roy Campbell is the most prominent modern exponent of the traditional formal verse satire (it is possible that his unpopularity politically has helped discourage any emulation by younger poets). It has been said (of poetry at least), that this simply is not an age of satire: yet satire seems to be flourishing in other non-poetic forms, and that may be more revealing about the state of modern poetry, than

[1]Oliphant Smeaton, English Satires (London: Blackie and Son, n.d.), p. xiii.

indicative of the approach of the long-forecast "death of satire."[1] In the last hundred years, the cartoonist (especially the politically-minded practitioner) has ensured the vitality of the satiric mode in its visual form at least. But always it remains hard to pin down: varium et mutabile semper satura; "Satire, to take a metaphor from music, is not a simple melody on the G string, but a symphony in discord."[2] A brief glance through any of the more reliable handbooks of literary terms or dictionaries gives adequate proof of the variety and vagueness of currently held notions on satire.[3]

[1]See such articles as H. Scheffauer, "The Death of Satire," Living Age (July 12, 1913), 82; or, Gilbert Seldes, "The Death of Satire," New Republic (Jan. 5, 1927), 193.

[2]Arthur Melville Clark, Studies in Literary Modes (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1958), p. 33.

[3]I include a few examples at this point from Webster's Dictionary which is substantially the same as definitions in NED and Thrall and Hibbard's Handbook:

"(a) Orig.: in the history of Roman literature, a rambling composition in verse devoted to censure of some prevailing vice or folly.

(b) A literary composition holding up human or individual vices or follies or abuses or shortcomings of any kind, to reprobation by means of ridicule, derision, burlesque or other methods of intensifying incongruities, usually with an intent to provoke amendment.

(c) The branch of lit. ridiculing vice or folly.

(d) The use of trenchant wit, irony, or sarcasm, for the purpose of exposing and discrediting vice or folly."

It is clear that (a) gives a very incomplete notion of the history of satire as I shall show in my next chapter. It is sufficient, at this

Many of the best-known literary theorists--such as Eliot and Read--have given short shrift to satire, or have chosen to ignore its problems completely. But it must be observed that those theorists who have dealt with comedy, have tended to include satire amongst the comic forms. In their view, satire has traditionally had the same nature and identical aims, and differs from other comic forms only in method.[1] For this very reason, students of satire have assumed it to be a part of comedy, and have indulged in description of satire rather than definition, on the supposition that the latter consideration had

---

point, to note that (b) gives us very little information about the kinds of composition, and contains a rather dubious statement about "intent." (c) refers to satire as a "branch" of literature, but gives little indication of the debate upon what that branch precisely is. The last category, (d) removes the necessity for confining the term to literature, as I have already noted, and begs the question the remainder of this chapter sets out to answer.

[1]See various works on the theory of comedy, such as Paul Lauter, ed. Theories of Comedy (New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1954); Robert W. Corrigan, Comedy: Meaning and Form (Chandler Publishing Co.; San Francisco, 1965); and, perhaps, most valuable, James K. Feibleman, In Praise of Comedy: A Study of Its Theory and Practice (Horizon Press: New York, 1970). In the latter, the theories of comedy are analysed; Feibleman himself insists that satire is simply a branch of comedy: he defines comedy according to his own tastes, and maintains that satire is one of the major ways of achieving "the comic effect" (p. 179).

already been sufficiently dealt with.[1] All of the theorists I am about to examine here take it as given that satire is a form of comedy.

In the later nineteenth century, George Meredith had already made an attempt at a literary analysis of the comic in his "An Essay on Comedy," reviewing the progress of the Comic Muse through Western culture as a preliminary to defining its particular characteristics; he comes to this conclusion:

> . . . whenever they [men] wax out of proportion, overblown, affected, pretentious, bombastical, hypocritical, pedantic, fantastically delicate, whenever it sees them self-deceived or hoodwinked, given to run riot in idolatries, drifting into vanities, congregating in absurdities, planning short-sightedly, plotting dementedly; whenever they are at variance with their professions, and violate the unwritten but perceptible laws binding them in consideration one to another; whenever they offend sound reason, fair justice; are false in humility or mined with conceit, individually, or in the bulk; the Spirit overhead will look humanely malign, and cast an oblique light on them, followed by volleys of silvery laughter. That is the Comic Spirit.[2]

[1]In addition, since the problem has stimulated the interest of "non-literary" thinkers, there has been one noticeable tendency amongst them: "Theories of comedy focusing on the ends of the art run more towards psychology and philosophy than towards literary criticism per se--a fact attested by the number of psychologists (e.g. Lipps and Freud) and philosophers (e.g. Schopenhauer, Bergson, Langer) who have written on the subject from this viewpoint." Lauter, p. xx.

[2]George Meredith, "An Essay on Comedy" in Comedy, ed. Wylie Sypher (Doubleday Anchor, 1956), p. 48.

This is the most frequently expounded theory of satire one comes across: that satire pursues vice and hypocrisy, and has a generally moralistic aim. Meredith feels that in the case of satire the laughter is less "silvery," a qualification that we may find cause to be thankful for. But what is essential to his theory is the necessarily corrective nature of the comic or satiric. There is also the implication that the satirist "strips off" the disguises of men in order to make them confront the essential simplicity of life--a process that is paralleled in tragedy, in which the protagonist is forced ultimately to face up to the basic realities, denuded of the trappings that have been placed around them. In this way, Meredith and the other theorists demonstrate what they feel to be the affinity between the two modes, and account for our suspicion that ultimately, there may not be much between them. One may suspect such reasoning, however. In satire, the "stripping off" may occur, not to reveal a simplicity of vision, but to <u>get rid of</u> simplicity or over-simplification: for example, what vision of life could be more simple than that seen through the eyes of a miser, or of anyone who evaluates by tangible, obsessive, yardsticks? One may feel that the satirist or comedian, whose own artistic productions often display an almost chaotic complexity, is intent upon destroying the masks which simplify life in the eyes of the wearers and upon showing the involved nature of life which men have to confront squarely if they hope to come to terms with it. Nor do the satirists or comedians present any facile solutions: whereas the tragic hero must die, and therefore has no need to struggle

with the problem any further, the hero of the comedy or the satire (Everyman) must live and must do so somehow without his illusions.[1]

The Bergsonian theory on the comic and the satiric in Laughter, has been the most influential upon theorists in this century. It is attractive in its simplicity, and yet is inadequate for the same reason. Bergson sees a formula behind the comic that we immediately feel is an advance on anything that has gone before: after giving us a rather basic example of a man stumbling in the street, he comments:

> He should have altered his pace or avoided the obstacle. Instead of that, through lack of elasticity, through absentmindedness and a kind of physical obstinacy, as a result in fact of rigidity or of momentum, the muscles continued to perform the same movement when the circumstances called for something else. That is the reason for the man's fall, and also for the people's laughter.[2]

[1]This theory about the complexity of the comic resolution is quite important to an understanding of Burton's satire; it will be elaborated upon in the treatment of the Anatomy. At this point, we may feel sympathy for Pasternak's character in Doctor Zhivago who eschewed discussions of the metaphysics because his doctor warned him that they would lead to ulcers. J. Y. T. Greig's Psychology of Laughter and Comedy (London: Allen and Unwin, 1923) lists three hundred and sixty-six titles on the subject, and introduces the student to the most widely held theories about satire and humour such as "the theory of degradation" which involves a sadistic pleasure at someone's animality; and the "theory of incongruity," which is concerned with the discrepancy between modes of thought and of behaviour. Max Eastman in The Enjoyment of Laughter (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1936) has a much less technical approach and deals with such theories with great zest. I shall be looking at the ideas put forward in Bergson, Freud, Lucas and Koestler in the next few pages as the bases for most of the important work that has gone on, and because from them we get some fascinating insights into the social and artistic nature of satire.

[2]Henri Bergson, Laughter, trans. Cloudesley Brereton & Fred Rothwell (London: Macmillan, 1911), p. 9.

Bergson contrasts this comic inertia, this mechanical rigidity of our machine-like physical motion, with our minds, which he feels to be capable of subtle gymnastics which the body can never emulate: it is that discrepancy which we recognize when we laugh. But the laughter is not an end in itself:

> . . . society holds suspended over each individual member, if not the threat of correction, at all events the prospect of a snubbing, which, although it is slight, is none the less dreaded. Such must be the function of laughter.[1]

And Bergson never allows us to forget the "corrective" function of laughter. He pays a great deal of attention to disguises, and we are not surprised when even nature is included as a possible disguise (p. 42), one that the satirist constantly attacks. But for him morality is at the back of it all, for the didactic role is the major one of the humorist:

> A humorist is a moralist disguised as a scientist, something like an anatomist who practises dissection with the sole object of filling us with disgust. (p. 128)

Aside from the rather inappropriate use of "disguised" in the sentence, which raises extraordinary problems in the light of Bergson's own ideas on "disguise," his analogy with the anatomist is an interesting one for students of satire.[2] There is a long and interesting peroration to Laughter in which Bergson rhapsodizes on "art," but it is rather misleading:

[1] Laughter, p. 135.

[2] Again, a discussion of the implications of the word is reserved for the next chapter.

> So art, whether it be painting or music or sculpture or poetry, has no other object than to brush aside the utilitarian symbols, the conventional and socially accepted generalities, in short, everything that veils reality from us, in order to bring us face to face with reality itself.[1]

I say "misleading," because the reader assumes that comedy is an art-form, and that Bergson is leading us up to it. But he then makes the rather damning remark, as a sequel to his reflections on art: "Altogether different is the object of comedy;" and goes on to remove comedy (and satire)[2] from the field of art, to some kind of subsidiary social mechanism, although he tries to avoid the commitment thus:

> . . . comedy lies midway between art and life. It is not disinterested as genuine art is. By organizing laughter, comedy accepts social life as a natural environment, it even obeys an impulse of social life. And in this respect it turns its back upon art, which is a breaking away from society and a return to pure nature.[3]

[1] Laughter, p. 157.

[2] For Bergson, the ridiculous seems to be the major ingredient of both comedy and satire, and so I lump the two together. The examples of the comic that he chooses are frequently from satire: he uses Don Quixote, the plays of Molière, and the novels of Dickens and Twain. Paul Lauter points out that such an identification of satire and comedy is nothing new: ". . . as long ago as the rise of Roman practicality and Christian moralism critics found they had to devise a more social and ethical function for comedy than raising a laugh. Comedy bowed in as a schoolmaster whose stern task it was to teach men virtue. How this most desirable goal was achieved then became the focus of critical debate. Some pictured comedy brandishing a whip wherewith to scourge evil-doers; others saw him (emphatically a male "Muse") earnest behind his mask mocking fools, deviants from accepted norms, to ridicule. And at the same time, comedy was to hold up models of honorable behavior, right rhetoric, and proper duty for emulation by the young and impressionable. In short, the function of comedy was identified, confused, with that of satire" (p. xix). Of course, Lauter's implication about the nature of satire is being challenged in this chapter.

[3] Laughter, pp. 170-71.

Bergson thus effectively demonstrates his feeling that comedy and satire depend upon the mechanical, both as the material they work upon, and as the basis for their function: they are not art forms but institutions that serve first and foremost a social purpose, and that is their major end. Of course Bergson pays too much attention to the stated purpose of the comic writers, and tends at the same time to transfer the implications of real happenings into the values underlying an artistic performance. At one point, it seems as though he is aware of another level of the comic:

> So there is a logic of the imagination which is not the logic of reason, one which at times is even opposed to the latter,--with which, however, philosophy must reckon, not only in the study of the comic, but in every other investigation of the same kind. It is something like the logic of dreams, though of dreams that have not been left to the whim of individual fancy, being the dreams dreamt by the whole society.[1]

But he pursues the notion no further, unwilling to examine the vista that his comment on dreams (a striking anticipation of Freud) opens up. He simply leaves the comic more or less beyond the pale of art.

I have spent rather more time on Bergson than may have seemed warrantable for the simple reason that any theories since are similar to his though perhaps emphasizing aspects of the problem that Bergson may only have glanced at. Freud's position is essentially of this nature.

[1] Laughter, p. 41

He is more interested in the role of the emotions in the comic than is Bergson. We laugh, he feels, from an economy in imaginative energy[1] which leads to a surplus of psychic energy that releases itself in laughter--a release of tension that becomes (theoretically) a raucous outburst. But the "corrective" notion that Bergson stressed is very much involved in what Freud feels to be our sense of superiority in comic situations to those who are worsted. Freud pays virtually no attention to the comic as art, but does remark once that its aim "is to draw pleasure from mental processes;" he excuses himself from further comment on the basis of a self-confessed ignorance about aesthetics.[2]

With Arthur Koestler and F. L. Lucas, the comic writer or the satirist is restored to that pedestal upon which he had stood throughout the centuries; they refuse to see the comic as a mainly didactic pursuit, and expand Freud's suggestion about the deliberately structured aesthetic

[1]Sigmund Freud, Wit and Its Relation to the Unconscious, trans. A. A. Brill (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1916), pp. 180-81. One fairly clear explanation of what he means comes in a passage in which he describes the effect upon us of seeing some comic action: "In the case of an immoderate or inappropriate movement on the part of the other [person], my greater expenditure for understanding becomes inhibited statu nascendi during the mobilization as it were, it is declared superfluous and stands free for further use or for discharge through laughing. If other favourable conditions supervened this would be the nature of the origin of pleasure in comic movement--an innervation expenditure which, when compared with one's own motion, becomes an inapplicable surplus." (Freud, pp. 311-12).

[2]Freud, p. 137.

nature of the comic in art. Koestler's theory of bisociation[1] as fundamental to great art significantly broadens the function of comedy; he insists that it is indeed art, and he shows the fragility of the division between it and the tragic:

> the artist . . . experiences the trivial in the perspective of the tragic, in the light of eternity "looking through time." And therein can probably be found the essence of the artist's approach. This interlacing of the Tragic and Trivial planes is implicit in all great works of art; it is the ultimate quality of the creative mind by means of which it is able to transcend the narrow limits of the self.[2]

This, of course, denies the Bergsonian evaluation of the comic and elevates the mode to its traditional heights. Lucas in his remarks upon wit, having disagreed with Freud quite vehemently over its "corrective" function, goes on to assert:

> Wit seems to me . . . a kind of extempore artistry, employing many devices--epigrammatic brevity, symbolism, allusiveness, ambiguity, comparison; and all this with a nuance of comedy. The result is something that suddenly challenges the hearer's intelligence by its compression and pleases him by its artistic economy, its simplification, its juxtaposition of unexpected ideas. The challenge is easily met if it is a good witticism--for good wit is neither muddy nor cloudy; the mental energy the hearer has summoned up, but now finds he does not need, may then be resolved into laughter; especially if there is a marked comic collapse, or if inhibited aggressive or sexual impulses are simultaneously released. But there need not always be laughter: wit can be mordant or melancholy. The hearer is

[1]Arthur Koestler, Insight and Outlook (London: Macmillan, 1949), p. 37. He defines that rather difficult concept as, "any mental occurrence simultaneously associated with two habitually incompatible contexts." We can easily see how this is related to Bergson's notion about rigid body and subtle mind: but Koestler widens its application much more meaningfully.

[2]Insight, p. 380.

> more likely to laugh than the utterer; the utterer may laugh also, but his essential pleasure remains that of a minor form of artistic creation.[1]

Lucas feels that the literary formulation of such a sensation is art of the highest form, the result of the artistic impulse. If this bears any relation to Hobbes' "sudden glory", it is not the glory of self-satisfaction or superiority, but the glory of the creative perception that informs all great comedy and all great satire, which possibly results, in the case of the latter, in our enjoyment of those bouts of invective, or those cutting remarks, which, without losing their potential malevolence become amusing rather than malicious.

The development from Bergson to Lucas in modern theory on the comic, therefore, has been significant, for, traditionally, theorists of the comic, including those we have examined, have attempted to take satire (which they deemed to be a specific form of the comic) into account in their analyses. It was generally felt that satire, because of the devices it employed, was the most emphatically didactic form of comedy, though, as we have just seen, many theorists justified all comedy as being essentially didactic and corrective. The psycho-philosophical analysts have discarded the punitive, corrective concept of its nature, and substituted for it the much more positive, artistic one. The attribution to comedy, and, hence, especially to satire, of a merely "didactic"

[1]F. L. Lucas, Literature and Psychology (London: Cassell and Co., 1951), pp. 163-64.

role has been challenged, and satire restored to the corporate body of art. However, the matter has been debated by many theorists and practitioners of art over the centuries. As early as 1718, Edward Bysshe was making a claim for as much latitude in theories about satire as was permitted in the less "direct" modes:

> As no thought can be justly said to be fine, unless it be true, I have all along had a great regard for truth; except only in passages that are purely satirical, where some allowance must be given: For Satire may be fine and true Satire, tho' it be not directly and according to the letter, true: 'Tis enough that it carry with it a Probability or Semblance of Truth.[1]

This indicates the importance that the satirist attaches to his art: satire must not only "teach", for genuine art, in Bysshe's eyes, must teach and delight; satire's function to Bysshe is exactly the same as that of the other arts and its "Truth" is a by-product of its art.

De Quincey, at a time when the "art for art's sake" feeling was abroad, made a telling statement about the notion of didacticism in

[1]Edward Bysshe, The Art of English Poetry (London, 1718), i, sig. *A4. Bysshe is not an altogether impressive figure, according to A Literary History of England, III, ed. A. C. Baugh (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967), p. 845. He is placed amongst the minor critics and there is some skepticism as to his influence: "The Art of Poetry [of Charles Gildon] was for a time kept in memory by a couplet in The Spleen by Matthew Green, who asserts of his Muse that she

Draws from the spring she finds within;
Nor vainly buys what Gildon sells,
Poetic buckets for dry wells.

Such buckets, however, had a market; for one Edward Bysshe had brought out the Art of English Poetry in 1702, which ran to ten editions by 1739."

poetry that is all the more true for satire in the light of that mode's unfortunate reputation:

> What is didactic poetry? What does 'didactic' mean when applied as a distinguishing epithet to such an idea as a poem? The predicate destroys the subject; it is a case of what logicians call contradictio in adjecto--the unsaying by means of an attribute the very thing which is the subject of that attribute you have just affirmed. No poetry can have the function of teaching. It is impossible that a variety of species should contradict the very purpose which contradistinguishes its genus.[1]

De Quincey allows the didactic element to function only secondarily in a genuine work of art.[2] For him, therefore, it would be absurd to claim that the Anatomy of Melancholy was a medical or educational textbook (the claim made by some of the "utilitarian" school of Burton critics) and at the same time a work of art. To those theorists of the comic who emphasize the didactic element (especially in the satiric form), De Quincey would be just as hostile, suggesting that art simply cannot teach in the way that they imply.

Such assumptions about the satirist's "intention," which have raised a furore in the study of other artists, have gone virtually unchallenged in the satirist's case. Mark Twain says:

[1]The Collected Writing of Thomas De Quincey, ed. David Masson (London, 1890), XI, p. 88.

[2]Peter, p. 10, makes a similar claim when considering the effects of satire: ". . . Satire tends to be scornful, often reflecting only a token desire for reform, whereas Complaint is corrective and clearly does not despair of its power to correct. In reading satires our reaction is one of pure 'enjoyment': we appreciate the satirists' virtuosity and the trimming of the butts he chooses. In reading complaints we ourselves are trimmed, for the simple reason that all men are."

> Humour must not professedly teach, and it must not professedly preach, but it must do both if it would live forever. By forever, I mean thirty years . . . I have always preached. That is the reason that I have lasted thirty years.

There is so much irony even in his "confession" that one is inclined to consider it as another example of his satiric bent rather than as an indication of the motivation behind a satire. Nor ought too much credence be given to such early avowals as Hall's:

> The satyre should be like the Porcupine,
> That shoots sharp quills out in each angry line,
> And wounds with blushing cheeks, and fiery eye
> Of him that heares, and readeth guiltily.

In terms of motivation, is it not possible that his boast of being England's first satirist is much more to the fore in his scale of values?[1] Yet critics have tended to take these men at their word, claiming that the satirist's purpose "can only be described as moral."[2] Sometimes even common goodness is not enough:

> He [the satirist] must fully possess, at least in the world of the imagination, the quality, the lack of which he is deriding in others.[3]

Swift, however, made a great deal of the subject. In A Tale of a Tub, this rather bitter comment on satirists appears:

[1] Collected Poems of Joseph Hall. ed. A. Davenport (Liverpool U.P.: 1949): "I first adventure: follow me who list,
And be the second English Satyrist."
(Prologue to "Virgidemiarum").

[2] Ellen Leyburn, Satiric Allegory: Mirror of Man (New Haven, 1956), p. 13.

[3] Rebecca West, The Strange Necessity (London, 1928), p. 275.

> Now, if I know anything of mankind, these gentlemen might very well spare their reproof and correction; for there is not, through all nature, another so callous and insensible a member as the world's posteriors, whether you apply to it the toe or the birch.[1]

And we remember the rather ironic phrase in his letter to Pope: "I have finished my Travels; they will wonderfully mend the world;" or the words put into Gulliver's mouth in the letter to "his cousin Simpson," which precedes Gulliver's Travels, where the insanely misanthropic Gulliver, who is being ridiculed for his pride, expressed his disappointment:

> I do in the next place complain of my own great want of judgement, in being prevailed upon by the intreaties and false reasonings of you and some others, very much against mine own opinion, to suffer my travels to be published. Pray bring to your mind how often I desired you to consider, when you insisted on the motive of public good, that the yahoos were a species of animals utterly incapable of amendment by precepts or examples, and so it hath proved; for, instead of seeing a full stop put to all abuses and corruptions, at least in this little island, as I had reason to expect: behold, after above six months warning, I cannot learn that my book hath produced one single effect according to mine intentions . . .[2]

Much of Swift's ironic emphasis upon the mission of the satirist closely resembles, both in language and sentiment, Burton's own rather pompous remarks upon the aim of his book:

> . . . I had a just cause to undertake this subject, to point at these particular species of dotage, that so men might acknoledge their imperfections, and seek to reform what is amiss.[3]

[1]Jonathan Swift, A Tale of a Tub, ed. Herbert Davis (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1957), p. 29.

[2]Jonathan Swift, Gulliver's Travels, ed. Herbert Davis (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1959), p. 6.

[3]The Anatomy of Melancholy, p. 137. Later, I shall be speaking about eighteenth-century plagiarism, and I hope to show that there is much in Swift that is very similar to his predecessor's work.

The whole apologetic nature of the remark is in fact a part of the satirist's traditional equipment. Even Dryden, in the Essay on Satire, so qualifies his statement on the aim of satire that it becomes difficult to consider it as principally moralistic; he uses the words of Heinsius:

> Satire is a kind of poetry, without a series of actions, invented for the purging of our minds; in which human vices, ignorance, and errors, and all things besides, which are produced from them in every man, are severely reprehended; partly dramatically, partly simply, and sometimes in both kinds of speaking; but for the most part figuratively and occultly; consisting in a low, familiar way, chiefly in sharp and pungent manner of speech; but partly also, in a facetious and civil way of jesting; by which either hatred, or laughter, or indignation is moved.[1]

The "purging of our minds" to which Dryden refers is no more "moralistic" a notion to a classicist than Aristotle's tragic catharsis, and anyway, the aim is then subsumed in the rather more interesting comments he makes upon the artistic techniques involved: it is these, not the "aim," that, in the eyes of the Augustan, separate the satirist from other artists.

Dryden, again after an obeisance to his master, Aristotle, sets us off on another line of approach to the nature of satire:

> Aristotle divides all poetry in relation to the progress of it, into nature without art, art begun, and art completed.[2]

If, indeed, there is any truth in Aristotle's contention, then an examination of the origins of the satiric art may prove to be an extremely

[1] Essays of John Dryden, II, ed. W. P. Ker (New York: Russell & Russell, 1961), p. 26.

[2] Dryden, p. 45.

useful pointer to both its aims and its methods.[1] Dryden, ironically, finds its origin in the Garden of Eden; with mock gravity, he admits that hymns of praise may have come first, then

> After God had cursed Adam and Eve in Paradise, the husband and wife excused themselves, by laying the blame on one another.[2]

Thus the depravity which the satirist is supposed to be attempting to eradicate is, according to Dryden, part of man's fallen condition, and beyond cure. At the same time, it is implied that part of the satirist's motivation stems from his own fallen nature which uses satire as an expression of an integral vindictive urge: the satisfaction that comes from the well-wrought manifestation of it is aesthetic and not moral (and this is what Lucas implies).[3]

An extension of Dryden's argument appears in the notion that satire "kills symbolically;"[4] the oft-mentioned Archilocus[5] is the archetypal "killer" in the mode. His name recurs frequently in satiric

[1]Nor has the approach been ignored; Worcester, Highet, and Kernan have used it; but perhaps the most interesting work on the subject is Robert C. Elliot's The Power of Satire.

[2]Dryden, p. 44.

[3]See above, pp. 40-41.

[4]R. C. Elliot, p. 4.

[5]Archilocus is said to have lived in the seventh century B.C. and to have invented the mordant iambic poems. He fell in love with Neobule, daughter of Lycambes, but her father would not allow them to marry. Archilocus avenged himself with such biting satires that father and daughter, according to tradition, hanged themselves. Hence his position in the history of satiric "slaying".

works as a precedent in "nature" for what the satirist is doing in art--"art completed" in Dryden's phrase. We meet him in Jonson's Poetaster:

> I could doe worse
> Arm'd with Archilocus' fury, write Iambicks,
> Should make the desperate lashers hang themselves.
> Rime 'hem to death, as they doe Irish rats
> In drumming tunes.[1]

Originally, the satirist, through his power over words in a society that was not fully articulate, could and did kill,[2] and the image of the satirist, however moderated and de-fanged by time, retains its power in the collective unconscious:[3] we have strong evidence as to how cautiously men like Aretino and Pope (miles apart in method, yet very close in achievement) were treated by their contemporaries; writers like

[1] Ben Jonson, eds. C. H. Herford and Percy Simpson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1932), IV, 322. The significance of the "rhyming of Irish rats" is fascinatingly unveiled for us in Sister Mary Randolph's "The Medical Concept in English Renaissance Satiric Theory," SP, XXXVIII (1941), 135-57.

[2] Elliot and Sister Mary Clair Randolph, amongst others, deal with this notion of the satirist's origin.

[3] Elliot's reference to the concept of a "collective unconscious" might not be acceptable to many readers, yet it is a useful way of accounting for the effect of satire. "I am arguing," he says (The Power of Satire, p. 92), "that it [satire] is a sublimation of magic. Not until concern shifts from ritualistic efficacy to aesthetic value does art become free and the individual artist a maker."

Hugh MacDiarmid and Roy Campbell[1] still write as though their power were as strong in reality as it may be symbolically--though Chesterton assures us that the age of satire has gone forever because we are no longer capable of hating our enemies with the vigor of our ancestors.[2] It is noticeable that often the words used to describe satire are redolent with ideas of physical violence, such as "blistering," and "scathing." Modern medical researchers have suggested that satire may still have the ability to inflict actual physical damage.[3]

In these preceding pages, I have tried to analyse the fundamental nature and function of satire, and to show the difficulties involved in producing a definition that would be generally acceptable. These difficulties are nowhere more apparent than in the very question of satire's supposed didactic approach; it, therefore, seems clear that one must go along with Lauter's remark, ". . . nothing would be more ludicrous . . . than to claim that some new formulation will reconcile

[1]Two contemporary British satirists. Campbell was born in South Africa. He supported the fascists in Spain in the Thirties--a stance from which his reputation has never recovered. He wrote vicious, reactionary satires, notably Terrapin and the Georgiad. MacDiarmid (Christopher Grieve) is, of course, well-known, both for his political sorties, and for his poetry, satirical and lyrical.

[2]Gilbert Keith Chesteron, Twelve Types (London, 1906), p. 58.

[3]This extraordinary idea comes from the book: Emotional Factors in Skin Disease (New York, 1953), in which Doctors Witt, Rower, and Russell see a direct connection between satire and physical ailments of its victims.

the schools of criticism that have been so long beating at one another like Punch and Judy."[1] Before attempting, then, to supply a definition, I will consider that one aspect of satire over which critics have been most in agreement--its methods. They, at least, are much more self-evident, and writers on satire, from the early rhetoricians to the most modern theoreticians have always been much more secure in this approach: "Rhetorical devices . . . are all important for the study of satire. The skill with which they are employed serves as a criterion between good and bad satire."[2] The characteristics of the mode have been catalogued with a great deal of thoroughness:

> Satire is a continuous piece of verse, or prose mingled with verse, of considerable size, with great variety of style and subject, but generally characterized by the free use of conversational language, the frequent intrusion of the author's personality, its predilection for wit, humour and irony, great vividness and concreteness of description, shocking obscenity in theme and language, an improvisatory tone, topical subjects, and the general intention of improving society by its vices and follies.[3]

All of this is rather general but gives an accurate picture of the satiric vista. Other critics are a little more specific: satire contains

> Miniature dramas, sententious proverbs, and quotable maxims, beast fables (often reduced to animal metaphors), brief sermons, sharp diatribes, series of vignettes, swiftly sketched but

[1] Lauter, p. xv.

[2] Worcester, p. 14.

[3] Gilbert Highet, The Classical Tradition (Oxford, 1949), p. 305.

> painstakingly built up satiric "characters" or portraits, figure-processions, little fictions and apologies, visions, apostrophes, and invocations to abstractions.[1]

Devices that are employed to give satire its own rather special tonal flavour are, "Wit . . . Ridicule . . . irony . . . sarcasm . . . cynicism . . . the sardonic . . . invective."[2] And as a guide through all of this we may usefully think in terms of a satiric "scene, character and plot."[3] The usefulness of such terms to the subject of this thesis will be demonstrated when we come to discuss the place of the Anatomy in the satiric mode.[4]

In the course of this chapter, I have touched upon various theories in the hope that thus the ground might be paved for a generally acceptable definition of satire. It is unlikely, as I have shown, that any definition is going to be completely satisfactory; the very nature of the problem seems to prohibit absolute comprehensiveness despite the sanguine words of Lauter:

[1]Mary Claire Randolph, "Formal Verse Satire," PQ, XXI (1942), 373.

[2]Clark, pp. 46-49.

[3]The Cankered Muse, p. 7.

[4]In chapters X, XI, and XII of Peri Bathous, there is an interesting and amusing satire on the methods of writing poetry misused, which by inference we may take to be the methods of the satirist, who often "misuses" conventional techniques for his own ends. In a more serious vein, Rosemond Tuve considers the decorum of satire in Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery (University of Chicago Press, 1947), pp. 238-43 and elsewhere.

> . . . when all is said and done, writing about comedy and comic theory is not an exercise in literary ingenuity, nor a make-work for lean and hungry critics. One likes to think that theorizing has at least the virtue of helping readers to understand and enjoy works of art and, even, of aiding artists to exploit most fully the forms with which they are engaged.[1]

This may be so, but in the case of satire much remains to be done. The terms "satire" and "satiric" have not even the same etymological roots (an oddity which I shall be discussing in the next chapter), and things are labelled "satire" today with a generosity that is confusing for the student. The subject of satire is given only sparse treatment by the major literary theorists of our day, who find it an awkward, hybrid species, and seem to doubt its respectability; it has been regarded in the past mainly as a corrective mode, though such an assessment of it is in conflict with what for many is a major canon of art, that it should not have a didactic aim as its principal end. I have suggested that rather than being a form that presents an ultimately "simple" view of life, it unveils in fact a complexity that one tries to avoid. Despite the influence of Meredith and Bergson, more recent treatises on the comic have restored it to its former glory by insisting that it is one of the major manifestations of art available to us.

A lot of the misapprehensions about satire come from the claims made by its very practitioners, which ought to be regarded with

[1]Lauter, pp. xxvi-xxvii.

some suspicion. Satirists often avow themselves to be much more "moral" than proves to be the case under objective appraisal; satire itself stems from a ritualistic origin to which little trace of morality seems to have clung. It is much simpler to describe than to define it; it is a task more appropriate to the practical critic than to the aesthetician. Bearing in mind, however, what appear to be the key issues, I have formulated the following definition:

> Satire is a literary mode or kind which has the apparent and often stated aim of arousing ridicule or concern in order to amend, reprehend or castigate some deficiency, real or imagined; but whose achievement depends primarily upon its evoking a response that is aesthetically and psychologically satisfying, rather than morally affecting.

I have deliberately mentioned "mode", since I hope to show that Burton's Anatomy is permeated by the mode for the good reason that it is a sample of a satiric form. The reason for the phrase "real or imagined" is to allow the inclusion in our definition of such seemingly disparate efforts as Burton's highly practical social critique (in the "Preface") which reflects some rather grim contemporary grievances, and works like Gulliver's Travels which would be more suited to Frye's ironic category, "fiction." I have stressed "aesthetic," since it is to this nebulous commodity that the art of the satirist must finally make its appeal; and "psychological," because I have indicated agreement with the theory that the implicit aggression of the satirist is not stirred by some external evil, but by a universally shared relish for

such abusiveness;[1] hence, I have placed the traditionally-stressed "moral aim" of satire last, since, by common consent, satirists admit their work has no noticeable effect anyhow.

Whilst the above formula may have universal application, the vision of satire in some ages emphasized particular aspects of the mode which led to the neglect of other perfectly valid manifestations of satire. This is a not-unfamiliar phenomenon in the arts generally,[2] and one of the major contributions of the historical approach lies in its power to demonstrate that the fashionable and the contemporary may indeed be very confining too. In Renaissance England a particular form of satire was popular and has so absorbed the attention of modern critics that they have paid scant attention to the symptoms of satire in works that do not conform to the pattern that was prevalent. In the next chapter I shall deal with the satiric tradition and the more immediate reasons for the flourishing of satire in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, paying particular attention to the abundant satiric crop that grew apart from the fashionable pasture.

[1]One thinks of the old "flytinges" of, say, Dunbar and Kennedy.

[2]We see it especially in the tendency of individual artists to break away from the fashion and revert to some almost forgotten technique which has the effect of re-invigorating a whole movement; one thinks of Wordsworth, who attempted to restore the "common language of men" to poetry; Hopkins, who found a fresh vision in Anglo-Saxon and Medieval poetry; Picasso, who claimed he was trying to remember how he painted as a child in order to cut through the fashions that had suffocated him; all these and other more apposite examples might be summoned to show the tyranny of fashion in art as well as life--hence the archetypal genius confined in the garret.

CHAPTER II

SATIRE IN THE RENAISSANCE

During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in England, there existed a form of verse satire whose characteristics were very pronounced, and whose existence scholars have long acknowledged. This formal verse satire has a respectable origin in antiquity and claims to share the commonly-accepted aim of all art in the Renaissance, the double goal of teaching and delighting. During this period too, however, there flourished a body of prose which seems to share the characteristics of the formal verse satire, but which has received relatively little critical attention. Of this group, the Anatomy of Melancholy is a member. What exactly Renaissance theorists thought about the function of all satire, verse or prose, is, in fact, summed up early in the Anatomy:

> Though a man be liable to such a jest or obloquy, have been overseen, or committed a foul fact, yet it is no good manners or humanity to upbraid, to hit him in the teeth with his offence, or to scoff at such a one; 'tis an old axiom, turpis in reum omnis exprobatio. I speak not of such as generally tax vice, Barclay, Gentilis, Erasmus, Agrippa, Fishcart, &c., the Varronists and Lucians of our time, Satirists, Epigrammatists, Comedians, Apologists, &c. but such as personate, rail, scoff, calumniate, perstringe by name, or in presence offend.
>
> Ludit qui stolida procacitate,
> Non est Sestius ille, sed caballus;
>
> 'tis horse-play this, and those jests (as he saith) are no better than injuries, biting jests, mordentes & aculeati; they are poisoned jests, leave a sting behind them, and ought not to be used.

> Set not thy foot to make the blind to fall,
> Nor wilfully offend thy weaker brother:
> Nor wound the dead with thy tongue's bitter gall,
> Neither rejoice thou in the fall of other.[1]

This pronouncement of Burton's constitutes the classical reaction of the learned Renaissance scholar to the satiric tradition, and occurs in an important section of the Anatomy of Melancholy, where an implicit justification of Burton's own contribution is made; it is very much the consequence of a theory of literature's purpose and value that is much mooted in the period.

In this chapter I shall attempt to establish the links between the formal verse and the prose satires, and the place of each in the Renaissance scheme of literature. But, because satire is most frequently, and, in my view, wrongly, regarded as the most didactic form, it is important to examine the concept of the "useful" function of literature as it seems to have been understood in the Renaissance.

Omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci runs the motto of the third edition of the Anatomy. The phrase is from Horace, and the tradition goes at least as far back as Aristotle; it permeates the quite appreciable number of works on literary theory written in the Renaissance, both in England and on the Continent.[2] Certainly, the

[1]The Anatomy of Melancholy, I, 395-6

[2]See Elizabethan Critical Essays, ed. G. Gregory Smith (Oxford University Press, 1904) and Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century, ed. Joel E. Spingarn (Indiana University Press, 1957). The introductions of Spingarn and Gregory Smith to their respective collections bear ample

Christian Humanists, whether one stresses their "Christianity" or their "humanism", avowed their commitment to the maxim. The Dutchman Gerhard Geldenhauer for example prefaced the revered Utopia of More thus:

> Dulcia lector amas? sunt hic dulcissima quaequae.
> Utile si quaeris, nil legis utilius.
> Siue utrunque uoles, utroque haec insula abundat,
> Quo linguam exornes, quo doceas animum.[1]

Much later, in Discoveries, Ben Jonson, who is much more "humanist" in the pagan sense, says that "A man should so deliver himselfe to the nature of the subject whereof hee speakes that his hearer may take knowledge of his discipline with some delight . . ."[2]. Throughout the sixteenth century, the extremely influential preface to Terence by Donatus insists that art, and especially comedy, has the prime function of demonstrating "what is of use in life . . . and what may be avoided."[3]

---

testimony to the validity of this observation; and it may be of some interest to this thesis to notice that the same motto is attached to Robert Greene's Arbasto, The Anatomie of Fortune . . . Wherein also Gentlemen may find pleasaunte conceytes to purge Melancholy (London, 1584). Burton was familiar with Greene's work.

[1]The Complete Works of St. Thomas More, ed. E. Surtz and J. H. Hexter (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965), p. 30. Translated it reads: "Reader, do you like what is pleasant? In this book is everything that is pleasant. Do you hunt what is profitable? If you wish both the pleasant and the profitable, this island abounds in both. By them you may polish your expression and improve your mind."

[2]Ben Jonson, VIII, 566.

[3]Donatus, "On Comedy and Tragedy," European Theories of the Drama, ed. B. H. Clark (New York: Crown, 1947), p. 43.

This same didactic view of art was propounded by Boccaccio and Cinthio, both of whom had considerable influence on the English theorists of the day.[1] Boccaccio claimed that the aesthetic pleasure serves simply as the sugar-coating on the pill,[2] while Cinthio assured us that "good morals" is the aim of art.[3]

Sir Philip Sidney, in the Apologie for Poetrie, is the first major proponent of the concept in Elizabethan critical theory:

> Poesie therefore is an arte of imitation, for so Aristotle termeth it in his word Mimesis, that is to say, a representing, a counterfeiting or figuring foorth--to speak metaphorically, a speaking picture: with this end, to teach and delight.[4]

That English writers throughout the Renaissance appeared to take the dictum seriously is clear from such statements of intent as we find prefixed to works like The Faerie Queene, whose purpose is to "fashion

[1]Men like Sidney, Harington and Daniel, according to G. G. Smith, were indebted to them, down to the very phraseology they used.

[2]Boccaccio, "The Life of Dante," Literary Criticism, ed. A. H. Gilbert (New York: American Book Co., 1940), pp. 209-11.

[3]Cinthio, "On the Composition of Comedies and Tragedies," Literary Criticism, p. 252.

[4]Smith, I. 158. We find, too, in such apparently independent works as Webbe's Discourse of English Poetrie (Smith, I, 295-6), such statements as: "The ende of Poetry is to wryte pleasant thinges and profitable. Pleasant it is which delighteth by beeing not too long, or uneasy to be kept in memory, and which is somewhat likelie, and not altogether forged. Profitable it is which styrreth up the mindes to learning and wisedome."

a gentleman or noble person in vertuous and gentle discipline."[1] Nor ought we to forget Milton's desire of writing for the "honor and instruction" of his country.[2] The theorist Puttenham (if he is indeed the author), in the Arte of English Poesie, is equally explicit, claiming that comedy, tragedy and satire have as their aim "the reprehension of vice."[3] Sir John Harington is not speaking of satire alone when he insists on poetry's function of "reproving all vices,"[4] though his own Metamorphosis of Ajax, a Rabelaisian revel, shows little sign of corrective zeal. Ben Jonson claims that the function of art is "the correction of manners," and adds, in the Introduction to Volpone, that it is "to imitate justice and instruct to life."[5] Marston makes no distinction between his comedy and his satires; he follows Juvenal's advice:

> Quidquid agunt homines, votum, timor, ira, voluptas,
> Gaudia, discursus, nostri farrago libelli est. (I, 85-6)[6]

It is evident that this disparate collection of writers is in essential agreement on several matters; they all claim, first, that poetry is designed to teach morality; secondly, that the giving of

[1] The Works of Edmund Spenser, ed. E. Greenlaw, C. G. Osgood, and F. M. Padelford (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1966), I, 167.

[2] The Works of John Milton, ed. Frank A. Patterson (New York: Columbia University Press, 1931), III, i, 236.

[3] Smith, II, 32.

[4] Smith, II, 209.

[5] Ben Jonson, V, 21; and III, 208-9.

[6] Juvenal, Satirae XIV, ed. J. D. Duff (Cambridge University Press, 1957), p. 3.

pleasure must be subordinated to that moral aim; and thirdly, that there is no clear distinction in aim between the various modes. Satire is no different from the others in these respects. Gregory Smith's words are apposite:

> Poetry (in the Renaissance) is the sugar coating on the pill, the candy with the dose of rhubarb; the sugar coating of the candy is there because there is the necessary pill or rhubarb; In other words, the allegorical usefulness of poetry is its rationale, and for that reason it is defended as a good thing.[1]

Smith's last words, "defended as a good thing," reinforce the idea that much Renaissance theory is in reaction to Plato's condemnation of the poet in his Republic:

> . . . therefore we shall be right in refusing to admit him into a well-ordered State, because he awakens and nourishes and strengthens the feelings and impairs the reason.[2]

There is no doubt, then, that for the majority of writers in the Renaissance, art has a clear didactic purpose, all other functions being secondary. In an age, however, that could find Odysseus to be a Christian hero, and the Metamorphoses to be a moral tract, one must consider the possibility that such philosophic discussion of the utility of art is only of theoretic significance to the writers, and that their actual performance is based upon other criteria that consciously or sub-consciously have dominance. One hesitates to propose such a view, as it has frequently been regarded as little more than romantic twaddle,

[1]Smith, I, xxiv.

[2]The Dialogues of Plato, tr. Benjamin Jowett (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1875), III, 501.

or at best, misguided, anachronistic twentieth-century criticism; yet those who suggest that the stated aims we have been discussing really were vitally significant to the Renaissance artist are left to explain that inevitable discrepancy between what they claim is the intention, and what they admit is the achievement of art in the period. Milton himself is charged with being guilty of the paradox in his chef d'oeuvre, Paradise Lost; in addition, we may feel that Spenser's Bowre of Blisse oversteps the mark of Christian modesty. The satirists of the decade before 1600 enjoyed their "reprehencioun" far too much for some of their contemporaries: indeed, as we shall see, even the Puritans denounced the enthusiasm of their own champion, "Martin Marprelate", preferring the dull sobriety of the unsuccessful opposing divines--an idea that must surely give us pause. How much of the moralizing is mere lip-service to the orthodox ideal? In the case of satire, which has, if anything, the most overtly didactic aim (indeed, as I shall show later, the frequency with which the satirist makes his claim may be suspicious in itself) there is a corresponding dearth of "morality" in the execution. As early as Webbe's Discourse (1586) we find proof that even some of the theorists are making pleasure the foremost aim of art.[1] When the

[1]Such a view had, of course, already been anticipated by continental writers. Spingarn shows the relationship between theory at the beginning and at the end of the English Renaissance: "Another writer of the sixteenth century, Bernardo Tasso, tells us that in his poem Amadigi, he has aimed at delight rather than profitable instruction. 'I have spent most of my efforts,' he says, 'in attempting to please, as it seems to me that this is more necessary, and also more difficult to attain; for we find by experience that many poets may instruct and benefit us very much, but certainly give us very little delight.' This agrees with what one of

Puritans attacked art, they claimed that their hostility was aroused by this very "abuse"--namely, the establishing of "delight" as more important than "profit" within contemporary art--and in order to avoid any misunderstanding in the matter, Stephen Gosson felt constrained to defend his theses in the Schoole of Abuse by appending an "apologie" later in which he clarified his position:

> My Schoole of Abuse, hath met with some enemies, bicause it correcteth unthrifty Schollers; Demosthenes orations smelt of lampe oyle, because his candle burnt brightest, when theeves were busiest. They that are greeved, are Poets, Pipers and Players: the first think that I banish Poetrie, wherin they dreame; the second judge, that I condemne Musique, wherein they dote; the last proclaim, that I forbid recreation to man, wherein you may see, they are starke blinde. He that readeth with advise the book which I wrote, shal perceive that I touche but the abuses of all these.[1]

The most forceful statement and logical climax of the orthodox didactic view appears in Milton's opinion that a man cannot hope to be a good poet without first being virtuous; yet Milton's own "virtue" has not gone unchallenged: for instance, by Matthew Arnold:

> If there is a defect, which, above all others, is signal in Milton, which injures him even intellectually, which limits him as a poet, it is the defect common to him with the whole Puritan party to which he belonged--the fatal defect of TEMPER;

---

the sanest of English critics, John Dryden (1688), has said of verse, 'I am satisfied if it caused delight, for delight is the chief if not the only end of poesie; instruction can be admitted but in the second place, for poesie only instructs as it delights.'" Literary Criticism in the Renaissance (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1963), p. 35.

[1]Stephen Gosson, The Schoole of Abuse, ed. E. Arber (Westminster: Constable & Co., 1895), p. 65.

> he and they may have a thousand merits, but they are unamiable. Excuse them how one will, Milton's asperity and acerbity, his want of sweetness of temper, of the Shakespearian largeness and indulgence, are undeniable.[1]

Ironically, much of that Romantic "sweetness of temper" has palled too, and we recognize "virtue" to be a commodity that changes from age to age. In one of Milton's own pronouncements on satire, he paradoxically displays the implicit contradictions in his position; he is discussing Hall's contributions to the satiric "kind" and launches into a diatribe worthy of full quotation, as it demonstrates the flagrant contradiction between the academic debate on the function of art, and the traditional practice of the satirist who pays lip-service to his didactic aims and then proceeds to ignore them:

> For this good hap I had from a carefull education, to be inur'd and season'd betimes with the best and elegantist authors of the learned tongues, and thereto brought an eare that could measure a just cadence, and scan without articulating: rather nice and humourous in what was tolerable, then patient to read every drawling versifier. Whence lighting upon this title of toothlesse Satires, I will not conceale ye what I thought, Readers, that sure this must be some sucking Satir, who might have done better to have us'd his corall, and made an end of breeding, ere he took upon him to wield a Satirs whip. But when I heard him talk of scouring the rusted swords of elvish Knights, doe not blame me if I chang'd my thought and concluded him some desperate Cutler. But why his scornefull muse could never abide with tragick shoos her ankles for to hide, the pace of the verse told me that her maukin knuckles were never shapen to that royall buskin. And turning by chance to the sixth Satyr of his Second book, I was confirm'd; where having begun loftily in heavens universall Alphabet, he fals downe to that wretched poorenesse and frigidity, as to talke of Bridgestreet

[1]Matthew Arnold, Mixed Essays (London: Smith and Sons, 1903), p. 243.

> in heav'n, and the Ostler of heav'n, and there wanting other matter to catch him a heat (for certaine he was in the frozen Zone miserably benummed), with thoughts lower than any Beadle betakes him to whip the signe posts of Cambridge Alehouses, the ordinary subject of freshmens tales, and in straine as pittifull. Which for him who would be counted the first English Satyr, to abase himselfe to, who might have learnt better among the Latin, and Italian Satyrists, and in our own tongue from the vision and Creed of Pierce plowman, besides others before him, manifested a presumptuous undertaking with a weak and unexamin'd shoulders. For a Satyr as it was born out of a Tragedy, so ought it to resemble his parentage, to strike high, and adventure dangerously at the most eminent vices among the greatest persons, and not to creepe into every blinde Tap-house that fears a Constable more than a Satyr. But that such a Poem should be toothlesse I still affirme it to be a bull, taking away the essence of that which it calls it selfe. For if it bite neither the persons nor the vices, how is it a Satyr, and if it bite either, how is it toothlesse, so that toothlesse Satyrs are as much as if he had said toothlesse teeth. What we should do therefore with this learned Comment upon teeth and horns which hath brought this confutant into his Pedantick kingdome of Cornucopia, to reward him for glossing upon hornes even to the Hebrew root, I know not. . . .[1]

In this passage, many of those complexities that were discussed in Chapter One concerning the nature of satire and the satirists' motivations are illustrated. Milton, ostensibly, has set out to attack Hall as a man unworthy of the powerful position he holds. He will do this by ridiculing the "eminent vices" of this "great person" (Hall); in the process, he will "teach" his audience about such vices, and will "delight" them (obviously not Hall) by his artistry; perhaps, even, he will convert Hall himself to a more upright life. His satire will thus satisfy the major critical stipulations of "teaching and delighting."

[1]"Apology for Smectymnuus," Works, III, i, 328-9.

In fact, however, Milton chooses to vilify Hall, not by pillorying his great vices, but by ridiculing his abilities to write satire (abilities which many later readers have admired); simultaneously, Milton seems to relish the opportunity of indulging his personal vindictiveness and displaying his wit. This, in my view, is a concise example of that abuse complained of by Renaissance theorists of literature; even the non-precisian Webbe writes:

> . . . as the very sum of chiefest essence of Poetry did always for the most part consist in delighting the readers or hearers with pleasure, so, as the number of Poets increased, they still inclined this way rather than the other, so that most of them had special regard to the pleasantness of their fine conceits, whereby they might draw men's minds into admiration of their inventions more than they had to the profit or commodity that the readers should reap by their works.[1]

Nor is there any sign of compliance, in Milton's passage, with the obligations a satirist ought to have to charity, which he elsewhere feels to be a necessary component of satire. The passage strikes one, ultimately, as a vicious, though amusing personal aside, in an otherwise rather serious thesis; its moral purpose is, at least, obscure, and though it may "delight" the reader, it satisfies its perpetrator even more. It deviates from the classical caveat against personal attacks in satire, and violates Milton's own criteria. It is almost as though Milton, whilst adept at

[1] Elizabethan Critical Essays, I, 235-6. Gregory Smith's very valuable introduction to these essays deals at some length with the pleasure-profit dichotomy in Renaissance literature, and cites numerous instances of contemporary awareness of it. Pleasure, it seems, far from being the "sugar coating" on the moral pill, becomes the complete aim of many of the writers whom the Puritans attacked.

theorising on one thing (satire in the general, classical sense) practices something quite other which he knows to be anathema in terms of his own Christian beliefs, and contrary to the most respected theory. In this, he is no exception, as the remainder of this chapter will illustrate. The danger, however, lies in taking too seriously the satirist's professed aims: though Milton's practice may conflict with his theory, we can scarcely attest that the scathing attack here is not a considered and deliberately contrived one. With this kind of qualification in mind, it is of considerable importance to re-examine the various notions about satire and "satyre" that are to be found in the writing of the period.

There is an abundance of information in Renaissance verse and prose about satire: more often than not it refers specifically to the so-called formal verse satire--"satyre";[1] but descriptions of the attributes of "satyre" (and, as I shall show, the word has wider use in the Renaissance than specialists in general have been willing to concede) tell the student a lot incidentally about satire generally, as both writers and commentators conceived of it. The power of satire seems to have been regarded in the Renaissance with suspicion, and its reputation for salacity (or some such thing) was responsible for its "prohibition" (though it is hard to see any notable decline in output) in June, 1599.

[1]The form is variously spelt "saytyre", "satyr", "satyre" and "satire" (less frequently); I shall distinguish them from satyr, the woodland deity, and satire in its modern, inclusive sense, by the use of quotation marks.

As a result of the ban, satire fled to the drama to escape annihilation.[1] Yet the fact remains that it was an important enough kind in the Renaissance to merit stringent prescriptions--as the plethora of opinions amongst practitioners and theorists indicates. The first appearance of "satyr" as a literary label in English is in Alexander Barclay's Ship of Folys of the World in 1509. The work is a translation, however free, of Sebastian Brandt's Narrenschiffe and the term appears in a Prologue annexed by Barclay himself:

> This present Boke myght have been callyd nat inconvenyently the Satyr (that is to say) the reprehencion of foulysshnes, but the neweltye of the name was more plesant unto the fyrst actour to call it the Shyp of foles: For in lyke wyse as olde Poets Satriens in dyvers Poesys conjoyned repreved the sinnes and ylnes of the peple at that tyme lyvynge: so and in lyke wyse this our Boke representeth unto the iyen of the redars the states and condicions of men.[2]

The word "satyr" as Barclay uses it does not apply only to so restricted a form as the verse satire. The latter, however, has so gripped the attention of scholars since as to lead to the relative neglect of other interesting manifestations of the kind in the English Renaissance.

[1]There is a lot of speculation about what exactly did cause the ban of 1599, whether the salacity, personal abuse, libel, or the atheism of the satirists. Works dealing with this matter and with satire in the Renaissance generally, are: R. M. Alden, The Rise of Formal Satire in England (Philadelphia, 1899); O. J. Campbell, Comicall Satyre and Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida (San Marino, 1965); A. Kernan, The Cankered Muse; G. R. Owst, Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England (Cambridge, 1933); and J. Peter, Complaint and Satire.

[2]Ship of Folys of the World, quoted in Alden, p. 19. There is general agreement amongst scholars that this is the first use of "Satyr" as a literary term.

Whereas, in his Preface, Barclay traces the origins of satire to Aristophanes and later, the New Comedians,[1] there was another more widely acknowledged source, to be found in Aelius Donatus' discussion of the history of the kind, which was often attached to Elizabethan grammar-school editions of Terence, and hence, presumably, was fodder for every schoolboy. Donatus also penetrates beyond the New Comedy, and suggests that the scandalous Old Comedy, which was apparently suppressed because of its excesses--so much for the aesthetic liberalism of the ancients--was replaced in effect by a kind of satyr-play in which the same vicious personal attacks (for no good "moral" reason) occurred, but this time under the mask of the satyr, the uncouth and priapistic woodland deity of mythology. This satyr-play too was prohibited, and the New Comedy became its even more diluted substitute;[2] hence, satire had acquired the kind of "respectable" background (no matter how seedy), the search for which was so dear to the hearts of Renaissance men. (A similar phenomenon was the desire, no matter how perverse, to find roots for England in the mythical soil of Troy.)

[1] I am not so much interested in showing the actual historical or etymological sources of "satyre"--a problem cleared up since the time of Casaubon--as in exploring the connotations of the word itself in the Elizabethan artists' minds.

[2] Most of this material has already been suggested in Alden, Campbell, Peter, and Kernan; I am indebted to them. It is interesting to note, however, how "history" has a habit of repeating itself: the hypothetical flight of "satyre" into drama in 1599, bears a striking similarity to Donatus' theory about the dramatic origin.

Barclay and Donatus indicate the nature of the central tenets of most Elizabethan theory on the verse-"satyre": a hypothetical dramatic origin, a moralistic purpose, and a crude methodology. Thomas Langley's formulation is typical of those current throughout the century:

> A satire is a Poesie, rebuking vices sharpely, not regarding anye persones . . . [it] is very railing, onely ordained to rebuke vice . . . The Satires had their name from uplandyshe Goddes, that were rude, lassivious, and wanton of behavior.[1]

Despite the fact that variants in etymology were considered, there was a preconception about the fundamental qualities of satire which ensured the propagation of a rather circumscribed view of its nature. Thomas Drant's prefatory poem to Horace's first two satires (1566) bears testimony to the ingenuity and learning of the Renaissance scholar, and shows a great deal of insight into the possibilities of satire:

> A Satyre is a tarte and carpyng kynd of verse,
> An instrument to pynche the prankes of men . . .
>
> A name of Arabique to it they gave:
> For Satyre there, dooth signifie a glave. . . .
>
> Or Satyra, of Satyrus, the mossye rude,
> Uncivile god: for those that wyll them write . . .
>
> Satyre of writhled waspyshe Saturne may be namde . . .
>
> Or Satyra of Satur, thauthors must be full
> Of fostred arte, infarst in ballasde breste.[2]

[1]Thomas Langley, An Abridgement of the Notable Works of Polidore Vergile (1570), sigs. cii-ciii.

[2]Thomas Drant, Medicinable Morall (London, 1566), sig. A4^{v}.

The suggestions of an Arabic origin are especially interesting, as we shall see, and the reference to "satur" seems to be the first step towards Casaubon's definitive findings. The "glave" or "butcher's cleaver" that the "arabique" etymology suggests can obviously be tied in with the notion of the "anatomist",[1] and in view of Elliot's contention about the historical relationship between satirist, priest, and doctor ("medicine man"), is not to be discounted too easily.[2]

Thomas Lodge takes the more orthodox view of the origins of satire in his Reply to Gosson's School of Abuse; he returns to the drama as its source. Anticipating Milton, he sees the archetypal drama as being a tragedy.[3] Tragedy in ancient times was merely a thanksgiving to the gods--a notion, he avers, to which even Gosson cannot object. But "as the dayes wherein it was used dyd decaye"--the passing of the

[1]Cf. Peter, Complaint, p. 303.

[2]See Elliot, p. 154. Mary Claire Randolph would partially support Elliot's stance, as we can infer from her article "The Medical Concept", p. 157, where she says that though "No attempt has been made to prove that there exists any positive generic affiliations between Celtic and English satire," yet "certain similarities have been noted." And she does not preclude similarities that may be even more universal regarding the whole kind. Drant's theories are implied in Burton's Anatomy too: there we have the melancholiac, born under Saturn, anatomizing with his cleaver in a literary form that is replete with variants in the "pudding" manner; and at the same time, we have a persona who claims to bring medicine for the spirit. These are some of the aspects of Burton's Anatomy that will be dealt with in the next chapter.

[3]Above, p. 66.

Golden Age, presumably--and "witt" developed (a consequence of the Fall?), the tragedy became a drama in which were depicted "the sower fortune of many exiles, the miserable fal of haples princes, the reuinous decay of many cou[n]tryes," and the lives of satyrs were presented "So that they might wiselye under the abuse of that name, discover the follies of their folish felow citesens."[1] Lodge describes his satyr to us in the Discontented Satyre which is appended to Scillaes Metamorphosis (1589):

> Stearne were his lookes, afflicting all the feelds
> That were in view; his bushie lockes undrest
> With terror hang, his haviour horror yeelds . . .[2]

This is the standard description of the melancholiac that merges with that of the satyr-persona in many Renaissance satires.[3]

Puttenham is the best-known exponent in the sixteenth century of the traditional view--but with a difference; in the Arte of English

[1] Complete Works, ed. E. W. Gosse (New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1966), I, 36.

[2] Ibid., I, 32.

[3] There is an important factor in those satires that are not simply crude and vicious; the mingling of satyr and melancholiac can be used to account for the puzzlingly composite personae of such satires as Burton's and Donne's Anatomies, the latter of which is represented to us by Paulson as the best of the Renaissance satires (in The Fictions of Satire: Johns Hopkins Press, 1967). G. L. Hendrickson, in "Archilocus and the Victims of his Iambicks," AJP, XLVI (1925) adds fuel to the fire by claiming that "satire" and "satyr" stem from two different roots, and that our word "satire" stems from "satura" whilst "satirize" and "satirical" come from "satyre".

Poesie (1589), he indicates that the satyr-play is the source of both comedy and tragedy. Puttenham's preference is the converse of Lodge's and, later, Milton's theories, and indicates that, for him, the didactic element is the most fundamental in the literary arts.[1] Nor does he neglect to mention the father of English satire, the author of Piers Plowman:

> There was yet another kind of Poet, who intended to taxe the common abuses and vice of the people in rough and other speaches, and their invectives were called Satyres and them selves Satyriques. Such were Lucilius, Juvenall, and Persius among the Latines, and with us he that wrote the booke called Piers plowman.[2]

Passages in the satirical writing of the period seem to indicate that the satirists took the theories seriously: they assert repeatedly that they speak as satyrs, "rag'd and bare," emerging from a "hollow vast desertful den," with faces "rough and hayrie like a goat."[3] The stereotype appears again and again with monotonous predictability.[4]

[1]George Puttenham, The Arte of English Poesie, ed. G. D. Willcock and A. Walker (Cambridge University Press, 1936), p. 31 ff.

[2]The Arte, p. 26. John Peter in Complaint and G. R. Owst in Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England have some interesting things to say about the native element in English satire in their respective works, though later investigators like M. C. Randolph and Elliot have discovered a universality in the attributes of the kind that are of more striking significance.

[3]These phrases are from Hall, Virgidemiarum (London, 1597), I, 76; Rankins, Seaven Satyres (London, 1598), I, 1-4; Wither, Abuses Whipt and Stript (London, 1613), I, line 6.

[4]I will show later that the prose satirists present an image of their role that is even more unprepossessing than this.

To conclude this part of the treatment of the influential theories proposed about satire, it might be wise to deal briefly with those seventeenth-century writers apart from Burton (whose contribution will be treated separately) who had something to say on the matter. Their positions tend to emerge in the practice of satire rather than in theoretic statements. They still acknowledge the tradition but inveigh against its abuse--another tradition. Ben Jonson, who "quarrelled with Dekker, quarrelled with Marston, quarrelled with Inigo Jones, quarrelled with everybody,"[1] protested that his Epigrammes would not conform to the expected malignant norm:

> It will be look'd for, booke, when some but see
> Thy title, Epigrammes, and nam'd of mee,
> Thou should'st be bold, licentious, full of gall,
> Wormewood, and sulphure, sharpe and tooth'd withall;
> Become a petulant thing, hurle inke and wit,
> As mad-men stones: not caring whom they hit.[2]

This very claim of innocence imputes guilt to others. But, like all his satirical forbears, he proceeds to ignore his own precept in many of the poems that follow. He comments upon virulent satire in Discoveries, too, when discussing poetry's decline:

> Hee is upbraydingly called a Poet, as if it were a most contemptible Nick-name. But the Professors (indeed) have made the learning cheape. Rayling and tinckling Rimers, whose Writings the vulgar more greedily reade; as being taken with the scurrility, and petulancie of such wits. Hee shall not

[1] A. H. Cruickshank, Ben Jonson (Durham, 1912), p. 18.

[2] Works, VIII, 27.

> have a Reader now unless he jeere and lye. It is the food of men's natures: the diet of the times! Gallants cannot sleepe else. The Writer must lye, and the gentle Reader rests happy, to heare the worthiest workes misinterpreted; the clearest actions obscured; the innocent'st life traduc'd; And in such a licence of lying, a field so fruitfull of slanders, how can there be matter wanting to his laughter? Hence comes the Epidemicall infection. For how can they escape the contagion of the Writings, whom the virulency of the calumnies hath not stav'd off from reading?[1]

The charges of "railing" and "scurrility" are familiar-sounding, as is the protest against "calumny"; these, of course, are all forgotten as he mounts his own attack on John Taylor, the unfortunate "Water-Poet". The image of an "epidemical infection" is one that occurs often in satire, and the related image "contagion" takes us squarely into that debate that raged on the double effect of satire: it may be seen as the curer of vice and as infector or inciter to vice, in that it inculcates into its readers vices previously unknown to them. The "Coney-Catching" pamphlets, for example, were thought to be teaching confidence tricks whilst claiming to expose them.

There are other interesting but not entirely novel contributions to the debate about satire in the earlier part of the seventeenth century. But, in its later stages, according to Randolph, much of the fury has gone:

> Man's critical attention is fastened for the most part on his reason, his will, the workings of his mind, and his place in and relation to society; and satire acquires a new and quieter vocabulary of comparatively exact philosophical and psychological terms.[2]

[1] Works, VIII, 572.

[2] Medical Concept, pp. 125-6.

Men like Milton (in his comments on Hall), and Michael Drayton (in his remarks on Nashe), however, show a keen appreciation of the attributes associated with the kind. Etymologically, Isaac Casaubon gave definitive grounds in theory for what had been the practice for centuries anyway. He recognized that satire was originally a Latin word "satira" anciently "satura" (medley, hotch-potch) and was certainly not from the Greek σάτυρος "a satyr".[1] J. Wight Duff sums up succinctly:

> The supposed connection with the Satyrs of Greek mythology, countenanced by ancient grammarians, but exploded by Casaubon's famous essay of 1605, led to a great deal of confused thinking and fanciful speculation in the past, and died all the more slowly in England because the old spelling of 'satire' was 'satyr'--Dryden's form in fact spelt and pronounced indistinguishably from the English form of the Greek word with which it has no kindred. It is noteworthy that the derivative adjectives 'satiric' from 'satire' and 'Satyric' from 'Satyr' still sound exactly alike to the ear. This confusion led in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to the curious notion that the half-bestial woodland demons, the Satyrs, were endowed with the gift of censoriousness.[2]

Whether as a direct result of the "satyr" concept or no (and, after all, Juvenal, a major acknowledged influence upon all the satirists, fits pre-eminently into the "satyr" category though his age did not share the etymological confusion), certain attributes were looked for in the satirists' work that showed compliance with accepted satiric

[1]Cf. Isaac Casaubon's De Satyrica Graecorum Poesi et Romanorum Satira Libri Duo (Paris, 1605).

[2]J. Wight Duff, Roman Satire (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1936), p. 3.

decorum. Barclay suggested that "mery speche" must be used, and that his satyr must be "eloquent" and "jocunde"--necessary tools for the proper arousing of "reprehencioun." But since there was a heavy dependence upon the Aristotelian notion of mimesis, any treatment of base matter (especially by a satyr), plumbing the depths of folly and error, requires an appropriate style. As Spenser says in Mother Hubberd's Tale:

> No Muses aide me needes heer to call:
> Base is the style, and matter meane withall.[1]

Whilst there are many contemporary comments upon the decorum,[2] it is Marston who makes the most interesting statement in defence of his own work, which incidentally reveals a lot about the decorum of the kind:

> Know I hate to affect too much obscurity, and harshnes, because they profit no sence. To note vices so that no man can understand them is as fond as the French execution in picture. Yet there are some (too many) that thinke nothing good, that is so curteous as to come within their reach. Tearming all Satyres (bastard) which are not palpable darke, and so rough writ, that the hearing of them reade would set a man's teeth on edge. For whose unseasoned pallate I wrote the first Satyre in some places too obscure, in all places mislyking me . . . Persius is crabby, because antient, and his ierks (being perticulerly given to private customes of his time) dusky. Juvenall (upon the like occasion) seemes to our judgement, gloomy. Yet both of them goe a good seemely pace, not stumbling, shufling. Chaucer is hard even to our understandings: who knowes not the reason? How much more those old

[1] Works, II, 108.

[2] For example, Adrianus Junius, Nomenclator, tr. John Higins (London, 1585), p. 11: "Satyra, invectum in mores poema σάτυρα a Satyrorum petulantia dicta. Un esguillon des vices. A nipping kind of poetry tawnting and sharplie showing men their faults."

> Satyres which expresse themselves in terms, that breathed not long even in theyr dayes. But had we then lived the understanding of them had beene nothing hard. I will not deny there is a seemely decorum to be observed, and a peculier kind of speech for a Satyres lips, which I can willinglier conceave then dare to prescribe; yet let me have the substance rough, not the shadow. I cannot, nay I will not delude your sight with mists; yet I dare defend my plainnes against the veriuyce face of the crabbed'st Satyrist that ever stuttered.[1]

For his own part, Marston scrupulously avoided one kind of "obscurities" to the extent of naming names, and his satires do more than just hint at the vices they claim to analyse. Yet he does point to the ancients as exemplars of this "difficult" aspect of the satiric art, finding the satyr-figure in them also, though its existence was a Renaissance illusion. The mention of Chaucer is important--the English satirists did not see him as the originator or perpetuator of some specifically "native" satiric strain,[2] but place him with Langland in the European tradition of the satiric kind, to which lineage a universality is attributed. The "obscurity" of Chaucer and Langland stems from the "tearmes" they employ--colloquial, non-literary language which has been one of the attractions as well as one of the stumbling-blocks of satire. (Marston himself, Nashe, and renowned figures like Rabelais have suffered

[1]John Marston, The Scourge of Villainie, ed. G. B. Harrison (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1966), pp. 9-10.

[2]Owst and Peter would have us believe in the native strain--as would such extravaganzas as Cazamian's Development of English Humor (New York, 1965).

as a result of their employing so many colloquialisms and slang. In Chaucer's case, the subsequent development of the English language has not helped matters). As for Marston's comment on "substance" and "shadow", we have to decide for ourselves whether the former is his main concern. Certainly the Augustans felt that Marston was enjoying himself just a little too much to be taken seriously as a reprehender of vice.[1]

The entire idea of the need for "difficulty" sounds more odd to us today than to those in the pre-modern era; over-affection for obscurity is a criticism that might be applied to the whole system of ancient rhetoric if we can credit the tale of the old rhetorician who encouraged his pupil, "you're writing so well now I can hardly understand it myself." The tradition that demanded obscurity was a hallowed one, even outside satire.[2] But there was some debate as to how far it should be tolerated; Gascoigne, for instance, felt that whilst "obscure and darke phrases" might be all right in their place, they are gravely indecorous "in a pleasant sonet." It may be that the inability to grasp the personal references in Horace, Persius or Juvenal was responsible for the notion that satire was deliberately obscure.[3] But countering this there

[1]See A. Jose Axelrad, Un Malcontent Elizabéthain: John Marston (Paris, 1955), pp. 313-330, for a survey of Marston's reputation after his death.

[2]See Arnold Stein, "Donne's Obscurity and the Elizabethan Tradition," ELH, XIII (1946), 98-118.

[3]Stein, p. 105.

was a feeling that does more credit to the intellect of the Elizabethan artist--namely, that the difficulty would lead the reader to ponder more deeply the import of what was being said, and profit the more from it. On the other hand, the device could be abused, and obscurity could be utilised to cover lack of content. There was too, a notion that popularity ought to be eschewed as something plebeian and undesirable, and deliberate obscurity was a sure means of avoiding universal approbation. Donne has been assessed from both points of view in the context of this debate; Ben Jonson avowed that he would go unread because of his difficulty, yet Arthur Wilson praised him for it:

> Thou dost not stoppe unto the vulgar sight,
> But, hovering highly in the aire of Witt,
> Holdst such a pitch that few can follow it.[1]

This feeling about the need for difficulty is shared by T. S. Eliot, who claims in our century, perhaps for different reasons, "poets in our civilization as it exists at present must be difficult."[2]

In prose, one can see the move towards the Senecan or "Hopping Lipsian" style--rather unsatisfactory labels, but indicative of a frame of mind that tended away from the often mellifluous complacency of Euphuism to a more tortured and tortuous mode of expression.

[1]John Donne, Poems: 1633 (Menston: Scolar Press, 1969), p. 394, lines 14-16.

[2]T. S. Eliot, Homage to Dryden (London, 1924), p. 31.

It has been observed, "There is noticeable towards the end of the sixteenth century a growing taste for difficulty in art, and this, like the basic attitude towards expression and the changing taste in sound, first becomes evident in prose."[1] It is entirely possible that in studying the development of satire, too, we may learn much from the prose of the period that would indicate its precedence to poetry in terms of significant change, in time if not in quality.

Another contemporary of Marston, Guilpin, makes this provocative assertion about the nature of satire:

> No, No, avaunt bace Feare, it cannot bee,
> Tell him, the Satyre may not be deposd,
> So long as Trueth sings his Apologie:
> Nor is he of so bace a mould composd,
> As to be subject to a slight impression,
> For a true Satyre's guyltles of transgression.[2]

One becomes rather skeptical about the satyr's "guyltles" pursuit of "Trueth" when other motives for writing appear with conspicuous regularity: Hall writes not least for fame, Lodge for exercise, Harvey for spite, Nashe for fun. Campbell makes an interesting comment on what he feels may be the real aim of many of the satires: "In writing them, their authors were consciously devising an antidote to the influence of the popular poetic cult of Petrarchism and its manifold developments."[3] It might not be

[1]Stein, p. 115.

[2]The Whipper Pamphlets, ed. A. Davenport (Liverpool University Press, 1951), II, 48, lines 223-8.

[3]Campbell, p. 33.

irrelevant in the context of this argument to consider the escalation of philosophic skepticism generally in the era and the other intellectual and religious upheavals; they seem pertinently related to the emergence of satire as a potent force (correspondingly later in England than elsewhere--witness the earlier appearance of Aretino and Rabelais on the continent). This involves a paradox; satire may be regarded as a conservative reaction against these phenomena--and this would be Campbell's stance--or it may be taken as expression of the liberty or licence that must have seemed to accompany them.[1]

Many sixteenth- and seventeenth-century men of letters in England had spent time in Italy in the pursuit of culture or worse, and in addition to contracting the somewhat novel disease of melancholy[2] had fallen under the influence of such men as Minturno and Cinthio. The latter was concerned amongst other things with the mixed emotions that satire arouses in its readers. It is "rappresentata a commovere gli animo a riso, ed a convenevole terrore e compassione . . .".[3] This notion about the laughter, pity and fear that we are supposed to feel relates satire again to its origins in the drama. But often we are

[1]Again, a topic for later consideration.

[2]Babb, The Elizabethan Malady, p. 73: "The vogue of melancholy began to make its mark upon Elizabethan literature about midway in the reign of Elizabeth."

[3]Quoted in Campbell, p. 33.

left with an impression of "railing for railing's sake" that is very difficult to dislodge, and that may be the final antithesis to the Petrarchan "love for love's sake;" both were perpetrated in the name of Charity.

The Italian Pietro Aretino's name is so formidable that it is one to be almost literally conjured with amongst satirists in England:

> We want an Aretine here among us, that might strip these golden asses out of there gaie trappings, and after he had ridden them to death with railing, leave them on the dunghill for carion.[1]

Aretino reminds the satirists of the power that the word still has; in the tradition of Archilocus, he could so terrorize his victims that they would pay "protection money." The "killing" tradition (as I shall show later) was not yet forgotten, and some scholars see the obscure fate of Gabriel Harvey as indicative of its potency.

John Davies, the satirist, considers one of the crimes of which his profession is accused:

> As couterfeit coyning is put upon Alchemists,
> So labelling lightly is set upon satyrists.[2]

However "lightly" the "labelling" was done, there are a number of topics, set pieces, as it were, that recur in satire throughout our

[1] The Works of Thomas Nashe, ed. R. B. McKerrow (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1966), I, 242.

[2] John Davies of Hereford, The Complete Works, ed. A. B. Grosart (1878; rpt. Hildesheim: George Olms, 1968), p. 5.

period.[1] On questions of morals, women, with their traditional treachery and frailty (they were, after all, responsible for the Fall), are the subject of constant abuse and amusement--as often as not the same thing. But other prominent abuses put on display are avarice, cheating, usury, slander, hypocrisy, gluttony, bribery, over-ambition, drunkenness, and gambling: in short, all of the follies and sins of humanity.[2] Amongst fashions that the satirist attacked most frequently was the habit of theatre-going, and theatres and players generally; the most sustained attack was the vituperative Histriomastix by "marginal Prynne," the man who roused Milton's wrath, though since the time of Gosson the subject was grist for anyone's mill. The use of tobacco was a convenient new topic for the satirists' attack,[3] as was the general behaviour of gallants, which was ruthlessly exposed in the "coney-catching" pamphlets.

[1]Alden has paved the way for this work in his treatment of the verse satire: he has pretty thoroughly catalogued the various topics that arise with frequency in the work, for example, of such men as Gascoigne, Donne, Hall, Marston, Guilpin, and Rowlands. I have discovered amongst the prose-satirists too, the same farrago of subjects.

[2]Some notable prose works on these topics are: Thomas Nashe's Anatomie of Absurditie, which has as part of its running title, 'Conteining a breefe confutation of the slender imputed praises of feminine perfection, with a short . . .' (this work will be examined later in the chapter); Stephen Gosson's Quip for an Upstart Gentlewoman (a corollary to Greene's earlier work); Joseph Swetnam's Arraignment of Women; Thomas Lodge's Alarum against Usury; Thomas Adams' The White Devil, or the Hypocrite Uncased.

[3]In such works as King James' Counterblast to Tobacco--an amusing document today.

Perhaps the major problem in what we might call social affairs was the enclosures question, which also gave most scope for the utilization of the Piers Plowman tradition. But official corruption generally, and such public disasters as plague and famine were recurrent topics.[1]

Amongst the classes in society, the predictable targets were principally the lawyers, doctors, and clergymen (still sitting-ducks today, all three); the poor pedant and the ivory-tower scholar were mocked as always. The soldier and his relative the courtier were abused; also we might include the Puritans and the Papists with their respective tenets, who were the butts of the "liberal" majority.[2] But the satirists reserved their most vicious and effective attack, appropriately enough, for the class to which they themselves belonged--the artists and the abusers of art, in particular the abusers of satire. Only contempt, they felt, is good enough for such parasites, and they lard it on with unstinted generosity. The controversy between Nashe and Harvey is one of the major examples of this internecine strife, and will be dealt with later in this chapter.

[1]The enclosure problem was dealt with in such utopian schemes as More's Utopia and Burton's "Preface", but there are more blunt suggestions proposed in efforts like Robert Crowley's Informacion and Petition against the Opressours of the Pore Commons of this Realme (1548). Dekker's Wonderful Yeare (1603) is an impressive chronicle as well as a powerful satire about the plague.

[2]Amongst the more interesting satires on such matters are Barnaby Riche's Farewell to the Military Profession (1581), and Thomas Powell's Tom of all Trades. Or the Plain Man's Path-way to Preferments (1631). There are innumerable attacks on Puritans and Papists; for example, William Bradshaw's English Puritanisme (1605), and Robert Abbot's The Mirrour of Popish Subtilties (1594).

There is a very large body of "uncategorized" prose lying about in the Renaissance, and it becomes clear, on examination, that much of it is a close relative of the formal verse satire, characteristics of which we have examined above. Contemporary theorists never say very much about the mechanics of the formal verse satire; what they say about its nature, however, is often applicable to the prose satires too. These are in the satura tradition, consciously contrived it seems to me, in the awareness of certain broad guide-lines, foremost amongst which is the acknowledgement of their satiric precedents.[1] In the next few pages, I hope to elicit from some of the prose satires of the period the characteristics according to which they are composed and to show that they are chiefly differentiated from the formal satire in a formal way: they are productions of the satiric kind and their writers are just as aware of that as the creators of the shaggy satyrs of the formal verse pieces. I intend to concentrate this analysis on the works of Nashe, Harvey, and Dekker, straddling as they do the decades on either side of 1600, and preparing the way for "the greatest Menippean satire in the English language," the first edition of Burton's Anatomy in 1621.[2] After

[1]Gilbert Highet, The Anatomy of Satire (Princeton, 1962), pp. 15-16, suggests as a sure sign of the conscious satirist at work, what he calls "pedigree," and the repeated reference to satirical precedent either by allusion, or by quotation.

[2]The phrase is Frye's. A brief glance at Burton's library list (by no means an exhaustive catalogue of his reading) shows his familiarity with two of the writers in question: of Dekker's output he had The Magnificent entertainment given to King James, A Knight's coniuring, Westward Hoe,

examining their theory and their practice, I hope to show the basis on which that edifice was constructed.

The word "satyre" did not take on any delimiting connotation of a rigidly formal structure till late in the century--a point that has been neglected in discussion on this subject. Barclay uses the word to describe his Ship of Folys, as we saw earlier, and Lindsay quite unabashedly calls his play A Saytyre of the Thrie Estates. Even in 1576 George Gascoigne in the introductory epistle to The Steele Glas does not feel obliged to follow any predetermined regulation, and calls his poem "a satyr without rime," whose aim is "to give a ribbe of roast" to his enemies.[1] Indeed, in The Whipper Pamphlets, Jonson's plays and Guilpin's epigrams are considered as "satyres" along with Marston's more orthodox efforts. In the Stationer's Register of June 1st, 1599, it is commanded that "noe Satyres or Epigrams bee printed hereafter," and this is followed by the remark that "all Nasshes bookes and Doctor Harvyes bookes be taken

---

The Belman of London, The deade Tearme, The Guls Horne-booke, The Ravens Almanacke, If it be not Good the Divel is in it, O per se O; under Nashe only Summers Last Will is noted, and it is part of an incomplete volume containing others of Nashe's work. Familiarity with Nashe implies knowledge of Harvey, and one assumes a man of Burton's reading and curiosity was aware of the problems his fellow-scholar had encountered--as he is aware of other squabbles of the sort, for example, the Scioppus-Scaliger controversy in Europe. (Information on Burton's library comes from the Oxford Bibliographical Society Proceedings and Papers, I (1922-6).)

[1] Steele Glas (London: English Reprints, 1901), p. 45.

wheresoever they may be found and that none of their bookes be ever printed hereafter." The implications are that they belong to the same category.

All of this seems to indicate only one thing: that the formal verse satire was regarded as being only one outgrowth of the satiric kind, not comprehensive, and certainly not exclusive; although its avowed aim (like all literature) is moral, its implied and indeed sometimes stated motive is often personal and joyously vindictive; frequently there is a confession that the writer is simply trying his hand at another form:

> . . . I have thought good to include Satyres, Eclogues and Epistles: first by reason that I study to delight with varietie, next because I would write in that forme, wherein no man might challenge me with servile imitation, (wherewith heretofore I have been unjustlie charged). My Satyres (to speak truth) are by pleasures, rather placed here to prepare and try the eare, than to feede it: because if they passe well, the whole centon of them, already in my hands shall sodainly be published.[1]

Lodge's admission certainly removes us far from the field of moral aims: he wants to indulge his reader's desire for variety, to show that he is not a plagiarist, and to gauge the potential for a further edition by noting the reception that this one gets. By no stretch of the imagination can we convert this into a declaration of moral indignation: rather it connotes commercial prudence and something of hurt pride. Like many of his fellows, Lodge writes in the morally indignant "railing"

[1]Thomas Lodge, A Fig for Momus, III, 6.

style as part of his artistic apprenticeship, and not out of conviction that he can amend the corruptions of his society.

It might be charged that there is a certain invalidity to such a conclusion. I appear, basically, to be accepting some statements of the satirist as genuine reflections of his motivation, and high-handedly discarding the others as mere convention. So that, for example, I choose to believe Lodge's avowal that he is simply trying out his satires to assess public response to them, but I do not take seriously his protestations of moral indignation within them. This is a fundamental objection, and one to which, in anticipation, I have laid the basis of an answer throughout the early part of this thesis, where I have dealt with the motivation and origin of satire, with particular reference to the Renaissance. I shall try, briefly, to recapitulate.

In claiming a moral end for his work, the satirist is identifying himself with the traditional aim of all literature, whose purpose, following the Renaissance interpretation of Horace's famous and ambiguous line "aut prodesse volunt aut delectare poetae," was, first of all to teach, and only secondly to delight. Many modern theorists (and some not so modern) feel that the performance of Renaissance artists runs quite counter to this claim in many instances, in that they very obviously make teaching a secondary part of their work. In the case of the satirist especially, there is, at any rate, an insoluble moral dilemma, a clear conflict of end and means. The satirists often make only token attempts

to disguise the impression that for them the pursuit is much more enjoyable than the edification of the reader; nor do they show very much concern for the conversion of their victim, as I hope this chapter will demonstrate--particularly the treatment of the Harvey-Nashe dispute. Milton, as I tried to show earlier, in advocating an impersonal, "Christian" approach to satire, very deliberately and premeditatedly attacks Hall in the most savage personal terms; and Nashe and Harvey seem to be egging each other on, in the traditional way, to fresh outbursts of vitriol rather than to repentance. Such instances lead one to assume that these satirists are consciously (they often admit to it) acting in violation of the moral principles which they otherwise claim to advocate. If one feels that it is at such moments that they excel as satiric artists, the conclusion is surely inevitable that disregard for the moral niceties seems to be one of the major requirements for the best satire. The final appeal can be made to the satiric tradition which presents innumerable examples of the _apologia_ of the satirist, many of them included, it seems, for the sole purpose of showing how radically the writer can deviate from the moral boundaries which he therein sets himself.

As I discuss each of the writers following, I shall not attempt to veil the apparent clash between theory and practice in their works. It occurs with such overriding frequency that it can scarcely be excused as an occasional lapse; indeed, it seems somehow to be the very _raison d'être_ of their satires, the tension upon which they build to such effect.

Stephen Gosson's School of Abuse (1579) is often (and possibly wrongly) praised backhandedly for incurring Sidney's wrath sufficiently to provoke the famous Defence of Poesie; but it is a tour de force in its own right, and represents the use of the prose satire to attack, paradoxically, the validity of literature itself (or, as he later claims, the abuse of art). One feels that the School, judged as a piece of literature, is as fine a production in artistic terms as the much-vaunted Defence: Gosson knows the tradition in which he writes, and besides, there is much in his case that seems original as opposed to Sidney's derivativeness. We are bound to think that it is the unpopularity of what he is saying that relegates his work to an inferior position in the eyes of students of literature. Yet the whole is tinged with irony, by the use of which Gosson seems to ask us not to take his words too seriously. The running title describes his effort as "an pleasant invective"--a word that recurs frequently to label the prose satire of the Renaissance (Harvey and Nashe employ the term often to abuse each other's productions, and there is an insulting connotation attached to it throughout the period). Gosson claims to be concerned with the misuse of literature even in its most elevated functions as reprehender of vice: he very perceptively observes the paradoxical results that may arise out of over-zealous description of vices:

> And so wading too farre in other mens manners, whilst they fill their Bookes with other mens faultes, they make their volumes no better than an Apothecaries shop, of pestilent Drugges; a quacksalvers Budget of filthy receites; and a huge

> Chaos of foule disorder. Cookes did never long more for great markets, nor Fishers for large Pondes, nor greedy Dogges for store of game, nor soaring hawkes for plentie of fowle, then Carpers doe nowe for copye of abuses, that they might ever be snarling, and have some Flyes or other in the way to snatch at. . . . he that loves to be sifting of every cloude, may be strooke with a thunderbolte, if it chaunce to rent; and he that taketh upon him to shew men their faults, may wounde his own credite if he goe too farre.[1]

This is directly related to the Platonic problem, and Gosson knows that he himself is subject to the very criticism that he is attacking in others. The satirist is teacher in two ways--he teaches the necessity for moral behaviour, but also illustrates (in order to be effective) in detail the practice of immorality; satire is seen as a double-edged weapon, and such reasoning may possibly be related to the eventual banning of satire in 1599. Yet at the same time as he launches out at all plays, he rather coyly defends his own contributions:

> The last [one of his own plays] because it is knowne to be a Pig of my own Sowe, I will speake the lesse of it; onely giving you to understand that the whole mark at which I shot . . . was to show the reward of traytours in Catalin . . . These playes are good playes and sweete playes, and of all playes the best playes and most to be liked, worthy to bee sung of the Muses, or set out with the cunning of Roscius himself . . .[2].

Yet even the best plays (like his own) are "not fit for every man's diet: neither ought they commonly to be shewen." Thus he neatly shifts his ground from the viciousness of art to the depravity of some human

[1] Schoole, pp. 53-54.

[2] Ibid., pp. 40-41.

beings, and even implies that a good artist (himself) will never be appreciated by the general run of play-goers. Confusions are thus confounded, and the appended Apologie becomes a patent denial of some sentiments in the original work. Re-examined, the Schoole appears so tinged with wit and irony that we have to suspect Gosson's avowed motive; the dedication to Sidney is so obviously inappropriate and ironic that it must be considered as deliberate provocation or as a satiric stroke.[1] The validity of this reading is further suggested by the fact that in the Apologie, he indulges in a shower of personal abuse against the hypothetical nonsense that his potential answerer--who turns out to be Sidney--will be forced to use to defeat Gosson's own logical case.

Gosson's Schoole seems to be an early, clear example of the use of a satiric speaker who is not just the gruff satyr of the formal verse; he has, indeed, his "satyric" moments, but is also a witty, intelligent, erudite man who manipulates his assumed character for deliberate effect; he is aware of the contradictions in his position and his resolution of it is specious, for ultimately there is no philosophic solution, only an artistic one. For deliberate "obscurity" of language, he substitutes confusion in ideas and the satura structure: his satiric speaker is, in

[1]C. S. Lewis, English Literature in the Sixteenth Century (Oxford, 1944), p. 394, feels that it would be folly to take Gosson's Schoole too seriously: "In the Schoole he is still the artist, still indeed the commercial artist, catering for a well established taste in rhetoric."

my view, a forerunner of the persona of the Anatomy of Melancholy.[1] It is of some interest that in addition to the Schoole, Gosson is also responsible for a pleasantly satiric poem in the Speculum tradition.

It is, however, from the writings of Thomas Nashe and Gabriel Harvey, both men of considerable erudition, that we learn most about the theory and the practice of satire in Renaissance England. The "sharply satirick" Thomas Nashe[2] dwells with immodest frequency upon his function

[1]An archetypal example in the debate about satire's unfortunate double effect is St. Jerome, who had the additional problem of reconciling his satire with the doctrine of Christian charity: "The ambiguity of St. Jerome's attitude towards vitriolic ridicule reveals that as a Christian satirist he faced a problem which had not confronted the pagans: he was keenly aware that malevolent backbiting was unchristian and he consequently experienced a feeling of deep guilt over his irrepressible penchant for abuse. The result of this feeling was that throughout his works, he inserted warnings against the evil of malevolence even while himself continuing to indulge in invective" (David S. Wiesen, St. Jerome as a Satirist, Cornell University Press, 1964, p. 258). Wiesen's comment reflects my own feelings about the reiterated moral aim of Renaissance satirists: the more it is repeated, the more one suspects its sincerity. Wiesen's book contains some interesting material on the whole history of Christian satire, and in particular on the emergence of the prose form; Jerome was known as "satiricus scriptor in prosa", and, though he leaves no verse compositions, "refers to himself as a satirist in the larger sense of a penetrating and vituperative critic of human behaviour. Since Jerome himself did not restrict his concept of the satiric to its narrower and more formal meaning, he provides justification for regarding as satire and studying as a unit those elements in his writings which express caustic, scurrilous, and abusive judgements of society in general or of individual men" (pp. 2-3). Jerome himself, apparently, believed firmly in the concept of the prose satire, and Wiesen demonstrates quite clearly his ready familiarity with the traditions of the great satirists of antiquity.

[2]So described by Drayton in his Epistle to Henry Reynolds; Spingarn, I, 137.

as a writer and identifies himself not only with the producers of "satyrs", but also with the great satiric writers of the Western tradition. That he regards his work as satire is clearly implied in his statement in the Anatomie of Absurditie:

> What I have written, proceeded not from the penne of vainglory but from the processe of that pensiveness which two Summers since overtooke mee: whose obscured cause, best knowne to everie name of curse, hath compelled my wit to wander abroad unregarded in this satyricall disguise, and counsaild my content to dislodge his delight from traytors eyes. (Works, I, 5)

With conscious irony he leaves the precise nature of his disease unnamed: we imagine he means melancholy, though Harvey would have it something just as common, but contracted outside the area of spiritual conflict. Nashe claims that he has deliberately adopted the persona of the satyr for his particular purposes, and it is of some interest to us to see what they may be. He wishes to "anatomize Absurditie",

> to take a view of sundry mens vanitie, a survey of their follie, a briefe of their barbarisme, to runne through Authors of the absurder sort, assembled in the Stacioners shop, sucking and selecting out of these upstart antiquaries, somewhat of their unsavery duncerie, meaning to note it with a Nigrum theta, that each one at the first sight may eschew it as infectious to show it to the world that all men may shunne it. (Works, I, 9)

He constantly shows himself to be a past-master of the satirist's "rough" language, but, like Marston later, he attacks the kind of "obscuritie" for its own sake that was sedulously contrived by some satirists and sought after, for various reasons, even by men like Donne; and he is ever

ready to turn to the traditional butts of satire.[1] Like the verse satirists, he is most vindictive against those who misuse his own art:

> . . . who make the Presse the dunghill whether they carry all the muck of their mellancholicke imaginations, pretending forsooth to anatomize abuses and stubbe up sin by the rootes, when as there waste paper beeing wel viewed, seems fraught with nought els save dogge daies effects, who wresting places of Scripture against pride, whoredome, covetousness, gluttonie, and drunkennesse, extend their invectives so farre against the abuse, that almost the thing remains not whereof they admitte anie lawfull use. (Works, I, 20)

Melancholy and satire are thus associated again, and Nashe attacks the extremists, especially the Puritans "wresting places of Scripture." The juxtaposition of "abuses" and "stubbe" makes it clear that he is referring to such outpourings of precisians as Stubbes' Anatomy of Abuses, to which his own work is an indirect reply. The passage is thus an example of how, not too subtly, personal references may be included. Such writers, claims Nashe, are no true "anatomists", but vultures:

> And even as the Vultures slay nothing themselves, but pray upon that which of other is slayne, so these men inveigh against no new vice, which heeretofore by the censures of the learned hath not been sharply condemned, but teare at that peecemeale wise, which long since by ancient wryters was wounded to death, so that out of their forepassed paines, ariseth their Pamphlets, out of their volumes, theyr invectives. Good God, that those that never tasted of anything save the excrements of Artes, whose thredde-bare knowledge beeing bought at the second hand, is spotted, blemished, and defaced, through

[1]For example, in the Anatomie, he starts with women (always fair game,) and he goes on to inveigh against a number of the other conventional targets such as pride and hypocrisy that were the topics of "satyr." In Piers Supplication, which I shall be examining next, he goes through a kind of medieval pageant of the vices.

> translators rigorous rude dealing, shoulde preferre their fluttered sutes before other mens glittering gorgious array, should offer them water out of a muddie pit, who have continually recourse to the Fountaine, or dregs to drinke, who have wine to selle. (Works, I, 20-21)

Such second-hand efforts constitute an abuse of art and are therefore reprehensible; by his own interpretation, "Such kind of poets were they that Plato excluded from his Common wealth, and Augustine banished ex civitate Dei, which the Romans derided, and the Lacedaemonians scorned who would not suffer one of Archilocus bookes to remaine in their countrye." Naturally, he himself having been compared to Archilocus, he later defends his prototype "that with the meere efficacy of thy incensed Iambicks, thou madst a man runne and hang himselfe that had angerd thee," and protests that what his generation needs is an Aretino (another of his favorites). The occasionally voiced sentiment that only Donne of the Elizabethan and Jacobean satirists in verse is of any significance, is one that is not denied by the prose satirists of the time--they certainly do not go out of their way to compliment their other rhyming counterparts.

In Pierce Penilesse his Supplication (1592), we have a fine example of Nashe's most sustained satiric power. In his own defence of that work in a later piece, Foure Letters, he tells us about the form and mood of his earlier effort:

> First, insomuch as the principall scope of it is a most livelie anatomie of sinne, the divell is made speciall supervisor of it, to him it is dedicated; as if a man shoulde compile a curious examined discoverie of whoredome, and dedicate it to the quarter Maisters of Bridewell, because they are best able to punish it. (Works, I, 306)

He then goes on to explain the plight (financial) that led Pierce to such a pass, and attacks Harvey's misreading of his work. It is noteworthy that he calls his work a "livelie anatomie", and his explanation for the point of view or perspective taken is similar to that of Erasmus in the Praise of Folly.[1] Pierce (pronounced "Purse") Penilesse, of course, is a name carefully chosen to evoke memories of the universally acclaimed earlier English satire, Piers the Plowman. Nashe has deliberately allied himself with the tradition of the classical satire in his technique; in the choice of his character's name, he has identified himself with all that is best in the native tradition. Bearing in mind Nashe's association (by himself and by others) with Archilocus and Aretino, one is not surprised at the following ironic assertion:

> Write who wil against me, but let him look his life be without scandale: for if he touch me never so litle, Ile be as good as the Blacke Booke to him and his kindred. Beggerly lyes no

[1]In the Praise, too, Erasmus gives the kind of traditional justification for his work that would have been very familiar to Nashe, who knew Erasmus' work well: "Let those whom the whimsy and foolery of my argument offends remember that mine is not the first sample of such a work, but that many famous authors in the past have written in the same vein. Homer long ago, had his fun with a battle between frogs and mice. Virgil, the gnat and a salad; and Ovid, a nut. Polycrates eulogized Busiris; and Isocrates, a severe critic of Busiris did the same. Glaucon praised injustice; Favorinus, Thersites and the quartan fever; Synesius, baldness; Lucian the fly and the parasite. Seneca amused himself with a deification of the Emperor Claudius; Plutarch, with a dialogue between Gryllus and Ulysses; Lucian and Apuleius, with an ass; and someone else as told by St. Jerome, with the last will and testament of Grunnius Carocotta, a hog" (The Essential Erasmus, ed. J. P. Nolan, Mentor-Omega, 1964, p. 99).

> beggerly wit but can invent: who spurneth not at a dead dogge? but I am of another mettal, they shall know that I live as their evil Angel, to haunt them world without end, if they disquiet me without cause. (Works I, 155)

This is certainly not that detached, impersonal attitude that Nashe claims elsewhere: such ironic vindictiveness is an integral part of his technique. Typical of it is the gleeful announcement at the beginning of Foure Letters Confuted:

> Heere beginneth the fray. I upbraid godly predication with his wicked conversation, I squirt inke into his decayed eyes with iniquitie to mend their diseased sight, that they may a little better descend into my schollership and learning. The Ecclesiastical duns, instead of recovery, waxeth starke blind thereby (as a preservative to some, is poyson to others): hee gets an olde Fencer, his brother, to be revengd on me for my Physicke; who, flourishing about my eares with his two hand sworde of Oratory and Poetry, peradventure shakes some of the rust of it on my shoulders, but otherwise strikes mee not but with the shadowe of it, which is no more than a flappe with the false scabberd of contumelie: whether am I in this case to arme my selfe against his intent of injurie, or sitte stille with my finger in my mouth, in hope to bee one of simplicities martyrs? (Works, I, 262-63)

Nashe regards the ensuing work as a "fray", and makes no pretence of turning the other cheek in the name of charity; it is significant that the imagery is that of individual combat rather than of more general war. This tradition of personal vindictiveness contradicts somewhat the protestations of morality claimed by the satirist for his own work (a paradox which, as I have said, satirists frequently acknowledge); yet these personal outbursts, of which a writer like Nashe makes capital, may give us more real insight into the nature of satire than all the

expressions of piety that obscure them.[1] Nashe, like Jerome and all the other satirists, shows himself to be aware of the traditional dilemma as he attacks Harvey:

> Tell me, what doe you thinke of the case? am I subject to the sinne of Wrath I write against, or no, in whetting my penne on this blocke? I know you would fain have it so, but it shall not choose but be otherwise for this once. Come on, let us turn over a new leafe, and heare what Gluttonie can say for her selfe, for Wrath hath spet his poyson and full platters doe well after extreame purging. (Works, I, 199)

He treats the problem with typical levity; it is not one to worry him too much.

In Strange News of the Intercepting Certaine Letters, often called Foure Letters Confuted (a pamphlet in which he employs both the techniques of the Martin Marprelate pamphlets and of Harvey himself, whereby each debatable remark of the opponent is taken out of context, and "refuted"), there is a recurrence of the conventional claim that his works are not aimed at persons:

> Poore Pierce Pennilesse have they turned into a conjuring booke, for there is not that line in it, with which they doo not seeke to raise up a Ghost, and, like the hog that converts the sixth part of his meete into bristels, so have they converted sixe partes of my booke into bitternes. (Works, I, 259)

All this comes rather paradoxically in a pamphlet whose avowed intention is to destroy the character of Gabriel Harvey. He claims ironically that Piers Pennilesse contained nothing abusive to any person: "I say, in Pierce

[1]In dealing with Lodge, pp. 87 ff., I have dwelt on this aspect of satire at some length.

Pennilesse I have set downe nothing but that which I have had my president for in forraine writers, nor had I the least allusion to any man set above mee in degree, but onely glanc'st at vice generallie" (Works I, 320). He has already mentioned his precedents, including Aretino, who did not avoid the mentioning of names, but rather revelled in it. He does claim other major satirists of Western literature as his models (Tully, Horace, Archilocus, Aristophanes, and Lucian) most of whom did not flinch from naming their victims. He insinuates that he has affinities with them, putting himself in a company whose reputation in the Renaissance places them almost beyond criticism. Not content, he concludes with a perversity which only helps once more to make us rather suspicious about the sincerity of his moral aim: "I protest, were you ought else but abhominable Atheistes [his erstwhile classical comrades!] I would obstinately defende you onely because Laureate Gabriell articles against you" (Works, I, 285). He accepts the charge of railing as a compliment:

> Scolding and railing is loud miscalling and reviling one another without wit, speaking everything a man knows by his neighbour, though it bee never so contrary to all humanitie and good manners, and would make the standers by almost perbrake to heare it. . . . Tully, Ovid, all the olde Poets, Agrippa, Aretine and the rest are all scolds and railers and by thy conclusion flat shrewes and rakehels: for I doe no more than their examples do warrant mee. (Works, I, 324)

This is quite a comprehensive definition of the "flyting" technique, and the point is strengthened by a statement of Nashe's at the beginning of the rather scurrilous Have With You to Saffron Walden (1596), a brilliant

parody of the anatomy form, in which he again tells us that his books are not written from any kind of moral conviction:

> I protest I doo not write against him [Harvey] because I hate him, but that I would confirme and plainly shew, to a number of weake beleevers in my sufficiencie, that I am able to answere him . . . . (Works, III, 19)

Whilst there was originally some justification for his onslaughts, it would appear that to Nashe, the challenge and the opportunity to demonstrate his powers meant most of all.[1] That his opponent, the learned Doctor Harvey, had not dissimilar motives I will try to show by a brief scrutiny of the aims and motives he claims for his work.

Gabriel Harvey has, without any doubt, come off worst in the eyes of most critics and readers in the duel with Nashe.[2] One feels

[1]Brooke and Shaaber, Renaissance, pp. 437-8, say even of his earlier works: ". . . the author who most delighted in the fray was apparently young Tom Nashe [who] had shown an undiscriminating desire to be witty at the cost of Euphuistic writers, women, hypocrites, bad poets, students, gluttons, and anything else . . . and all in the spirit of clean sport." McKerrow lists a few contemporary references, observing by the way that "Harvey was anything but a dull, old-fashioned pedant" (V, 65), a view which I hope my treatment of the quarrel will substantiate somewhat. Contemporaries were obviously caught up in the competitive spirit of the contest, and many of them egged the combatants on to fresh assaults, in which one must "beat" the other.

[2]A typical appraisal of the contest appears in G. R. Hibbard, Thomas Nashe (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962), p. 211. Hibbard praises Nashe for his successful attack on Harvey in Strange News, and goes on to describe Harvey's Four Letters: "Any personal animus Nashe may have felt is subdued to a point where it does not conflict with the jeering, mocking technique he perfected to carry his purpose out. By comparison, the Four Letters, with its multitude of targets and its inability to control and discipline the bitter resentments which gave rise to it, is not a work of art at all. Harvey does not dramatise his personality, as Nashe does, extending his humour even to himself; instead

again that satire stands so low in the scale of art in the eyes of academic critics that they judge a scholar like Harvey to have demeaned himself in attempting the combat with Nashe. Harvey is, however, an accomplished satirist in his own right, and being conversant with the tradition in which he is working utilizes it to the full. He enjoys the contest with Nashe, as I hope to demonstrate, and his pleasure in participating tempers any personal rancour to a great extent; his attitude towards Nashe is more often patronizing than malicious. Harvey in the Foure Letters (1592), tells us the method by which he intended to counter the "railing" style of his opponent, coolly and deliberately:

> It was my intention, so to demeane myselfe in the whole, and so to temper my stile in every part: that I might neither seme blinded with affection, nor enraged with passion: nor partiall to frend, nor preiudiciall to enemy: nor iniurious to the worst, nor offensive to any: but mildly and calmely shew, how discredite reboundeth upon the autors: as dust flyeth back into the wags Eyes, that wil nedes be puffing it up. Which, if I have altogether attained, without the least

---

he pours out his feelings in the manner of one obsessed by them. He is all too like the bear at the stake, deprived of freedom of movement by his emotional involvement in the things he writes about, and, therefore, all the more vulnerable to the taunts of the skilful baiter." One might well take issue with many of the critical criteria that lie behind these remarks--indeed much of what Hibbard describes as being harmful in Harvey's style is used as a description of the "Juvenalian" satirist generally. Harvey as I hope we shall see, was very much in control of what he was doing, and works always on structures that are set by his opponent, even to the extent of parodying his style--features which require a consideration and consciousness that Hibbard along with others will not grant him. Interestingly, in the eyes of at least one well-qualified contemporary judge, Sir John Harington, the prize went most definitely to Harvey. (See McKerrow, V, 146.) We will also discover that Harvey had a wide knowledge of the traditions in which both he and Nashe were operating.

> oversight of distempered phrase, I am the gladder: if failed in some few incident termes, (what Tounge, or Pen may not slipp in the heat of discourse?) I hope, a little will not greatly breake the square, either of my good meaning with humanity, or of your good acceptation with indifferency.[1]

This of course is an ironic ex post facto comment: he is well aware of the "heat" that he has allowed to obtrude--and a rather disproportionate amount too, for one who was supposed to be doing things "mildely and calmely." He is quite specific about the faults of his opponents, and is a master of the same devices he accuses them of:

> Invectives by favour have bene too bolde: and Satyres by usurpation too presumptuous: I overpasse Archilocus, Aristophanes, Lucian, Julian, Aretine, and that whole venemous and viperous brood, of old and new Raylers: even Tully, and Horace otherwhiles overreched: and I must needs say, Mother Hubbard, in heat of choller, forgetting the pure sanguine of her sweete Feary Queene, wilfully over-shott her malcontented selfe: as elsewhere I have specified at larg, with the good leave of unspotted friendshipp. Examples in some ages doe exceeding much hurt. Salust, and Clodius learned of Tully, to frame artificiall Declamations, and patheticall Invectives against Tully himselfe, and other worthy members of that most-florishing State: if mother Hubbard in the vaine of Chawcer, happen to tel one Canicular tale: father Elderton, and his sonne Greene, in the vaine of Skelton or Scoggin, will counterfeit an hundred dogged Fables, Libles, Calumnies, Slaunders, Lies for the whetstone, what not, and most currishly snarle, and bite where they should most kindly fawne, and licke. Every private excesse is daungerous: but such publike enormities, incredibly pernitious, and insuportable: and who can tell, what huge outrages might amount of such quarrellous, and tumultuous causes? (Foure Letters, pp. 15-16)

[1]Foure Letters, ed. G. B. Harrison (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1966), p. 9. This kind of "apology" is discussed, and placed in the tradition of satire by R. Steno, "The Satirist's Apologia," University of Wisconsin Studies, XV (1922), 10-28.

This may appear to be no more than a display of erudition, but it demonstrates Harvey's familiarity with the satire of past and present, and shows his awareness of how satire can be used vindictively. Yet one of his own most amusing gambits in Foure Letters is to boast of his own charitable disposition whilst uncharitably delineating the sins of others; for example, of Greene he says this:

> Alase, that anie shoulde say, as I have heard divers affirme: His witte was nothing, but a minte of knaverie: himself a deviser of jugling feates: a forger of covetous practises: and Inventour of monstrous oathes: a derider of all religions: a contemner of God, and man; a desperate Lucianist: an abhominable Aretinist: an Arch-Athiest: and he arch-deserved to be well hanged seaven yeares agoe. Twenty and twentie such familiar speeches I over-passe: and bury the whole Legendary of his Life and Death, in the Sepulchre of eternal Silence.
> (Foure Letters, pp. 40-41)

Such a public "burial" serves his purpose very well. The rest of the letters are full not only of reported abuse, but of open, personal attack upon the dead Greene. This renders all the more effective such devices as the claim to restraint, which follows on the heels of an extraordinary piece of invective, the kind of thing that Nashe is supposed to be the master of, and not Harvey. Whilst recognising the possible repercussions of Greene's exposé of the coney-catchers--"I pray God, they have not done more harm by corruption of manners, then good by quickening of wit"--he quite deliberately passes over the fact that his own work is liable to the same charge.

In Pierces Supererogation (1593), a much-maligned work, Harvey shows his mastery of the satiric traditions and techniques. His chief

pose is of the man who cannot hope to reach the same heights of railing and invective which Nashe has attained (an ironically manoeuvred condemnation of his opponent, based on an inversion of values); but in the process of playing humble idolater of the master abuser, Harvey shows himself to be eminently qualified for the same role:

> She doth him no wrong that doth him right, like Astrea, and hath stiled him with an immortal penne; the Bawewawe of Schollars, the Tutt of Gentlemen, the Tee-heegh of Gentlewomen, the Phy of citizins, the Blurt of Courtiers, the Poogh of good Letters, the Faph of good manners, and the whoop-hoe of good boyes in London streetes. Nash, Nash, Nash, (quoth a lover of truth and honesty) vaine Nash, Railing Nash, craking Nash, Bibbing Nash, Baggage Nash, swaddish Nash, rogish Nash, Nash the bell-weather of the scribling flock, the swish-swash of the Presse, the bumm of Impudency, the shambles of beastliness, the poulkat of Pouls churchyard, the schrichowle of London, the toad-stoole of the Realm, the scorning stock of the world, and the horrible confuter of foure Letters.[1]

The work is full of such brilliant invective, manipulated with humour and wit. In the introductory poem to the piece, he tells us that he intends to write in prose:

> If dreery hobbling Ryme hart-broken bee,
> And quake for dread of Danters scarecrow Presse:
> Shrew Prose, thy pluckcrow implements addresse,
> And pay the hangman pen his double fee.
> Be Spite a Sprite, a Termagant, a Bugg:
> Truth feares no ruth, and can the Great Div'll tugg
> — Ultrix accincta flagello. (Works, II, 18)

This work, therefore, is to be permeated with the principles of the "satyre"--as indeed we discover to be the case. "Parthenophil," the

[1] The Works of Gabriel Harvey, ed. A. B. Grosart (London: The Huth Library, 1884), II, 272-73.

author of a rather nasty introductory "sonet" (which also displays all the characteristics of the "satyr"), rails at Nashe and praises Harvey's "invective." Harvey himself seems to feel that Nashe's attacks on him are not dissimilar to the kind of self-criticism in which every decent man ought to indulge in the quest for perfection; but he very strongly objects to the source from which they are emanating:

> Even he that loveth not to be his own defender, much lesse his own prayser, . . . And although he be the subject of his own contempt, and the argument of his own Satyres: (surely no man lesse doteth upon himselfe, or more severely censureth his own imperfections:) yet he in some respects disdayneth to be reviled by the abjects of the world. (Works, II, 33)

Nashe's pamphlets are the "Satyres" he objects to so much, and his own replies will be the counter-"satyres" to them; although he professes to find it a painful task for one of his charitable and modest disposition, he goes to rather elaborate lengths (300 pages) in a mere preliminary statement to a projected full reply to Nashe's attacks: the running title reads "A Preparative to certain larger Discourses intitled Nashe's Fame," and in view of the length of the Supererogation, we can only assume that he is indulging his satiric wit, much as Swift has Gulliver tell us that he intends to expatiate at a later date upon other aspects of his travels; we know that nothing further remains to be said.

Harvey goes on to describe the two most potent kinds of satiric methods:

> I looked either for a fine-witted man, as quicke as quicke-silver, that with a nimble desterity of lively conceit, and exquisite secretaryship, would outrun me many hundred miles

> in the course of his dainty devices; a delicate minion: or some terrible bombarder of tearmes, as wilde as wild-fire, that at the flash of his fury, would leave me thunderstricken upon the ground, or at the last volley of his outrage, would batter me to dust and ashes. A redoubted adversary.
> (Works, II, 41)

These are what are most commonly known as the Horatian and the Juvenalian styles respectively; the former, Harvey himself was attempting in the Foure Letters; it is the latter he employs now, vying with Nashe, who, he says, is deficient in both styles. Harvey could speak with authority about satire; in the early stages of the Supererogation, he presents us with one of the most interesting surveys of satire and disputation in the Renaissance, showing an intimate knowledge of his subject. He refers to the tradition of dispute amongst ancient writers, all of whom, he protests, are inferior to Nashe:

> Old Archilochus and Theon, were but botchers in their rayling faculty: Stesichorus, but a gross bungler: Aristarchus but a curious and a nice foole: Aristophanes and Lucian but merry jesters: Ibis against Ovid; Meuius against Horace; Carbilius Pictor against Virgil; Lavinius against Terence; Crateva against Euripides; Zoilus against Homer but ranke confuters.
> (Works, II, 43)

He is well aware of the "flyting" tradition he and Nashe are competing within. Of the frequency of such battles, he has this to say:

> . . . examples are infinite: and no exercise more auncient, than Iambicks amongst Poetes; Invectives amongst Oratours; Confutations amongst Philosophers; Satyres amongst Carpers; Libels amongst factioners; Pasquils amongst Malcontents; and quarrels amongst all. (Works, II, 43)

This list of terms shows the possibilities available to the Renaissance

writers in the satiric kind.[1] Harvey waxes ironically eloquent in describing Nashe's relative position as an explorer of hitherto unexplored modes of abuse:

> a newfoundland of confuting commodities [has been] discovered, by this brave Columbus of tearmes, and this onely marchant venturer of quarrels; that detecteth new Indies of Invention, and hath the winds of Aeolus at commaundement. (Works, II, 45-6)

He describes his own and Nashe's work as "a hotch potch for a gallimafry," whose important ingredients are: "a stinginge tonge; a nippinge hande, a bytinge penne; and a bottomlesse pitte of Invention, stoared with never failing shifts of countefeite cranckes" (Works, II, 59). And, in keeping with a tradition we have already noted, he bewails his lack of success in converting Nashe:

> I still hoped for some grasses of better fruit: but this graund confuter of my letters, and all honestie, still proceedeth from worse to worse, from the wilding tree to the withie, from the

[1] I am not suggesting that these satirists were shackled by the traditions of the kind any more than were dramatists of the period (indeed, men like Marston and Greene wrote dramas too, and satire itself is said to have fled into the unconventional post-1600 plays). In an age that was very conscious of tradition, however, there was a great and frequently acknowledged familiarity with satire of the past, and a desire to emulate, if not surpass, the great satirists of previous ages. We may note the adulation, for example, of Burton for Erasmus and Lucian, which is accompanied by a fair amount of imitation in technique. Nor is Nashe's admiration for Aretino and Archilocus restricted to mere namedropping; he was setting out to rival them in the very art of abuse. There are so many similarities in technique between the moderns and the ancients that it would be unwise to consider as coincidental, for instance, the use of the apologia (Cf. Steno above, p. 103), the anatomy, the mock-odyssey, etc. I hope that this chapter will establish clearly the recurrence of certain patterns which indicate that more than lip service was paid to the past.

> dogge to the goate, from the catt to the swine, from Primrose hill to Colman hedge: and is so rooted in deep vanitie, that there is no end of his profound follie. (Works, II, 110)

The Trimming of Thomas Nashe (1597) is similar technically to Have With You. Harvey (if he indeed wrote it) uses a persona as his speaker, Don Richardo de Medico Campo (Richard Lichfield) who is a "Barber Chirurgeon"; we can, therefore, expect an anatomy. The imagery of the form does appear, though, since it is an elaborate parody on that convention, it is somewhat different in effect:

> I will stirre thee up and make thee seething hot, and when thou art in thy heet, I will then quell thee by moving of thee more and more, as when a pot seetheth if we lade it and moove the liquor up and down, even while it seetheth we shall make it quiet. Thou little wottest of what a furious spirite I am, for I keeping amonge such spirits in this place, as thou sayst, am myself become a spirit, and goe about with howling cries with my launce in my hand to tortour thee, and must not returne home, till Ignatious-like, thou shalt be carbonadoed, and I shall carrie on my launce point thy bones to hang at my shoppe window, in steed of a cronet of rotten teeth as the trophies of my victorie: and this shall be done, commest thou never so soone into my swinge. (Works, III, 41-42)

By making his anatomist a barber-surgeon, Harvey reduces his opponent's stature as a serious contender in the debate: the implication is that a real professional is not required to deal with him. More important though, is the apparent fact that as late as 1597 Harvey is issuing the warning that, far from being out of the contest, he anticipated more action; he tells his readers, "and if perhaps in this trimming I have cut more parts of him than are necessary, let me heere your censures, and in my next

cut I will not be so lavish . . ."; there is more to come if Nashe so wishes.[1]

Nashe and Harvey, then, serve as important reference points in the continuing tradition of prose satire in England. Nashe, in Christ's Teares, apparently renounced his "fantastical satirism"; that may have been his sincere wish at the time, but the fact of his unrestrained later efforts cannot be denied. Both he and Harvey, as I have shown, were certainly familiar with the history of satire, and their whole "flyting" seems to me to represent an affirmation of the lively condition of the prose satire in those years about the turn of the century.

Sir John Harington's Metamorphosis of Ajax (1596) combines the apparently anarchic elements of the "anatomy" form, the satiric style and persona, and the flamboyant language which was notable in Nashe and Harvey, and which has led to speculation about Harington's familiarity with, and use of, Rabelais' Gargantua and Pantagruel.[2] The mock-encomium, for instance, a favourite satiric ploy, is at the heart of his technique, and he cites his precedents with some precision:

[1]The Trimming is however, one of those pamphlets over which there is uncertainty of authorship; some critics, for example Tucker Brooke and Shaaber in The Renaissance, p. 439, claim it is not really Harvey's.

[2]Though a prose work, the Metamorphosis is castigated amongst other "satyrs" in the Whipping, I, 606. As for the Rabelaisian elements, especially in Nashe and Harington, valuable information is to be found in Huntington Brown, Rabelais in English Literature (Cambridge, Mass., 1933).

> Sure I am that many other country men, both Dutch, French, and Italians, with great prayse of wit, though small of modestie, have written of worse matters. One writes in prais of follie. 2. an other in honour of the Pox. 3. a third defendes usurie. 4. a fourth commends Nero. 5. a fift extolls and instructs bawderie. 6. a sixt displayes and describes Puttana Errante, which I here will come forth shortly in English. 7. A seventh, (whom I would guesse by his writing, to be groome of the stoole to some Prince of the bloud in Fraunce) writes a beastly treatise onely to examine what is the fittest thing to wype withall, alledging that white paper is too smooth, brown paper too rough, wollen cloth too stiffe, linnen cloth too hollow, satten too slipperie, taffeta too thin, velvet too thick, or perhaps too costly: but he concludes, that a goose necke to be drawne betweene the legs against the fethers, is the most delicate and cleanly thing that may be.[1]

Such a list of antecedents places him in the tradition of the satirist immediately, and, parrotting Rabelais, he launches the expected attack on his audience, if they should dare to react unfavorably:

> . . . to him that would deny me that kindnesse, I would the paper were nettles, and the letters needles for his better ease: or like to the Friers booke dedicated as I take it to Pius Quintus; of which one writes merrily, that his holiness finding it was good for nothing else, imployed it (in steed of the goose neck) to a homely occupation, and forsooth the phrase was so rude, the style so rugged, and the latin so barbarous, that therewith as he writes, scortigavit sedem Apostolicam. He galled the seat Apostolicke . . .[2]

[1] The Metamorphosis of Ajax, ed. E. S. Donno (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962), pp. 63-64. Erasmus is responsible for the Praise of Folly, Aretino is held responsible for a work on bawdry and for Puttana; the seventh reference of course is to Pantagruel's demonstration of the fruits of a humanistic education in Rabelais. So, Harington has chosen as his exemplars three of the major influences in contemporary satire: Erasmus, the subtle schoolman and wit; Aretino, the slayer; and Rabelais, the creator of fantasies; the mixture is one that will recur in Burton's Anatomy.

[2] Ibid., pp. 65-66. This passage resembles the ending of the Prologue to the Second Book of Gargantua and Pantagruel.

The hero of Harington's book, Ajax (replete with pun), suffers a significant transformation early in the work:

> [He] became a perfit mal-content, viz. his hat without a band, his hose without garters, his wast without a girdle, his boots without spurres, his purse without coyne, his head without wit, and thus swearing he would kill and slay; first he kild all the horned beasts he met, which made Agamemnon and Menelaus now, more affrayed than Ulisses, whereupon he was banished the townes presently, and then he went to the woods and pastures, and imagining all the fat sheep he met to be kin to the coward Ulisses, because they ran way from him, he massacred a whole flock of good nott Ews.[1]

The connection between the notion of the malcontent and the figure of the satyr has already been noted; indeed, Marston is often regarded as the embodiment of both. The dishevelled Ajax, banished to the country, preys upon life there with a vengeful intent, becoming a virtual satyr himself; thus the crudeness of Harington's language and subject is wittily justified.

The Whipper Pamphlets (1601) tell us a great deal about the more generally accepted connotations of "satyr" and "satire" in the Renaissance. In the Whipping of the Satyre, John Weever condemns Marston (for his "satyres"), Guilpin (for his epigrams), and Ben Jonson (for his plays); this is a clear indication that the word "satyre" itself is a much more comprehensive term than is allowed by those who confine it to the verse manifestation of the form alone. In addition the faults of which these three are accused are those about which the prose satirists

[1] Ibid., pp. 67-68.

have had so much to say; Weever very neatly shows that satirists have very little interest in the moral improvement of their victims, and he presents us with a parody of the satyr at work, spiced with his own feelings on the matter. Imagine, he asks us, reprimanding a friend for some offence in the manner of the satyr-poem:

> My friend, you are a vild whoremongring knave,
> A lecherous Rogue, a brabbling Quareller,
> A drunken Tos-pot, and a swearing Slave,
> A selfe-exalting second Lucifer,
> The very sucke-dugge of iniquity,
> I all become that ill becometh thee.

Weever comments:

> You see my course; now say, for Gods sake say,
> Whether you think this will reclaim my friend,
> Or may not straight incense him, at that may,
> To badder course, and I well courst in the end,
> That in this bitter raging fitte begonne,
> More like a fiend, then like a friend hath done.[1]

In addition to the generally admitted problem of slipping into vengefulness himself, or of revealing the path of vice to the innocent, Weever introduces another element--the danger of so angering the victims that they become even less susceptible of amendment. No Whippinge (by Breton) contains a reply to Weever's attack:

> Let us our causes with more care discusse:
> Not bite, nor claw, not scoffe, nor check, nor chide:
> But eche mend one, and ware the fall of pride.[2]

[1] The Whipper Pamphlets, I, p.31 lines 547-558.

[2] Ibid., II, 9, lines 110-112.

Breton's advocacy of mildness and charity reminds us of Harvey's tactical promise of the same at the commencement of Foure Letters, and of Milton's denial that such a thing was possible in satire. However, it is significant that Breton makes no distinction between verse and prose as "satyr", appealing,

> Good writers then, if any suche yee bee,
> In verse or prose take well what I doe write.[1]

Whether his advice was taken or not is something that will emerge as I come to discuss the major prose satirist of the first decade of the new century, Thomas Dekker.

All the prose writers so far considered were "scholars" of one sort or another, very conscious of their classical precedents, and aware too of the domestic tradition behind them, as embodied particularly in Piers Plowman.[2] Thomas Dekker, no scholar, expounds his theory of his work in the familiar medical imagery. At the beginning of The Wonderfull Yeare, he disclaims any identity with the writers of the "satyre":

> If you read, you may happilie laugh; tis my desire you should, because mirth is both Phisicall, and whole some against the Plague: with which sicknes (to tell truth) this booke is (though not sorely) yet somewhat infected. I pray, drive it not out of your companie for all that; for (assure your soule)

[1] Ibid., II, 8, lines 57-58.

[2] Chaucer also was thought of as a "satyrist" partially because his language appeared so rough and craggy to the Elizabethans, and Spenser's Mother Hubberd's Tale was also regarded as being so "obscure" that Harvey felt compelled to reproach its author.

> I am so jealous of your health, that if you did but once imagine, there were gall in mine Incke, I would cast away the Standish, and foresweare medling with anie more Muses.[1]

That there is indeed gall in his ink, however, he proves to us immediately; he scoffs at the usual flatteries given to readers:

> . . . to maintain the scurvy fashion, and to keepe Custome in reparations, he [the writer] must be honyed, and come over with Gentle Reader, and Learned Reader, though he have no more Gentilitie in him than Adam had (that was but a gardner) no more Civilitie than a Tartar, and no more Learning than the most errand Stinkard, that (except his owne name) could never finde anything in the Horne-book.

Then he moves on, predictably, to his fellow-writers:

> . . . those Goblins whom I am now conjuring up, have bladder-cheekes puft up like a Swizzers breeches (yet being prickt, there comes out nothing but wind) thin-headed fellows that live upon the scraps of invention, and travell with such vagrant foules, and so like Ghosts in white sheetes of paper, that the Statute of Rogues may worthily be sued upon them because their wits have no abiding place, and yet wander without a passe-port. Alas, poore wenches (the nine Muses!) how much are you wrongd, to have such a number of Bastards lying upon your hands? But turne them out a begging; or if you cannot be rid of their Riming company (as I thinke it will be very hard) then lay your heavie and immortal curse upon the, that whatosever they weave (in the motley-loome of their rustie pates) may like a beggers cloake, be full of stolne patches, and yet never a patch like one another, that it may be such true lamentable stuff, that any honest Christian may be sory to see it. Banish these Word-pirates, (you sacred mistresses of learning) into the gulfe of Barbarisme: doome them everlastingly to live among dunces, let them not once lick their lips at the Thespian bowle, but onely be glad (and thanke Apollo for it too) if hereafter (as hitherto they have always) they may quench their poeticall thirst with smalle beere.[2]

[1]The Non-Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker, ed. A. B. Grosart (1884-6; rpt. New York: Russell and Russell, 1963), I, 76.

[2]Works, I, 77-80.

The entire Wonderfull Yeare (1603) is full of the satiric touch, and the realistic chronicle only makes the satire more effective. But Dekker associates himself with the best practising prose satirists of his day. Nashe, in Lenten Stuffe, had confessed that Aretino was his literary hero; Dekker harks back to Nashe's Piers Pennilesse in his own News from Helle (1606) and avows his respect for Nashe:

> . . . thou, into whose soule (if ever there were a Pithagorean Metempsuchosis) the raptures of that fierie and inconfinable Italian spirit were bounteously and boundlesly infused, thou sometimes Secretary to Pierce Pennylesse, and Master of his request, ingenious, ingenuous, fluent, facetious, T. Nash: from whose aboundant pen, hony flow'd to thy friends, and mortall Aconite to thy enemies: thou that madest the Doctor a flat Dunce, and beat'st him at two tall sundry weapons, Poetrie, and Oratorie: Sharpest Satyre, Luculent Poet, Elegant Orator, get leave for thy Ghost to come from her abiding, and to dwell with me a while, till she hath carows'd to me in her owne wonted full measures of wit, that my plump braynes may swell, and burst into bitter Invectives against the Lieftenant of Limbo, if hee cashers Pierce Pennylesse with dead pay.
> (Works, II, 102-3)

It is Aretino's "Italian Spirit" that inspired Nashe; one of his "weapons" is "Poetrie." This is not just a reference to those parodies of Harvey's verses in Foure Letters, but means "poesie", that Elizabethan catch-all term, amplified as Nashe is hailed as "satyre", "poet", and "orator". Nashe is quite simply Dekker's idol; like Nashe he is not impressed by rank and profession, and his values are much more akin to those of the lower classes than to the "aristocratic" writers of his day; like him he writes prose satire which includes the qualities of the formal verse "satyre," but gives more scope to its user.

Jests to make you Merie (1607), which, following the fashion, has a lengthy running-title (With The Conjuring up of Cock Watt, the walking Spirit of Newgate, to tell Tales. Unto which is Added the miserie of a Prison, and a Prisoner. And a Paradox in praise of Serieants), adopts the traditional protest that the author is not a bitter, railing satirist:

> . . . with such a tickling Itch is this printed Ambition troubled, that some are never at better ease then when they are scratching upon paper, and finde no sweetnesse but in drawing blood. Of those sharp-toothed dogs you shall finde me none. I hould no whip in my hande, but a softe fether, and there drops rather water than gall out of my quill. If you taste it and finde it pleasing, I am glad; If not, I cannot be much sorry, because the Cooke knew not your dyet, so that his error was his ignorance, and ignorance is a veniall sinne to be pardoned. (Works, II, 272)[1]

This kind of avowal is all too frequently encountered amongst the prose satirists. Dekker paints an ironic picture of the kind of writer from whom he claims he wishes to dissociate himself, when he describes a young gallant who is rightfully imprisoned, but who objects strongly to the wounds thereby inflicted upon his pride:

[1]This protestation of moderation is dismissed by Benjamin Boyce, The Theophrastan Character in England (Harvard University Press, 1947), p. 212, who has this to say about later "characters" that are directly indebted to this early work: "In five other sketches, 'A Prisoner,' 'Creditor,' 'Sergeant,' 'His Yeoman,' and 'Jailor,' Dekker uses the Overbury models of humble and contemptible types . . . . Dekker's pity for the prisoner and his burning hatred of creditors and jail-keepers and all their tricks and heartlessness distinguish these Characters from the rest in the Book. They are not to entertain, they are to arouse indignation."

> The instruments of Learning being set before him, and the roome cleared, after five or six paire of oathes were spet forth (like wild fire) to thinke how hee was taken like a woodcocke (beeing in the company of the onely gallants) and how he was dragde along, and how scurvily he was used in words: hee sharply began to rayle against Sergiants . . . as for Marshals men, the blacke booke did never so tickle them as he would . . . Against them would he write Invectives, Satyres, Lybals, Rimes, yea cause such Iambicks as Archilocus made against Lycamber, or such stuffe as Hipponas the painter of Ephesus: his very inke should be squeazed out of the guts of toads: His pen should be cut out of Indian Canes after the heads of them were poysoned, and his paper made of the filthy linnen rags that had been wrapped about the infected and ulcerous bodyes of beggers that had dyed in a ditch of the pestilence. (Works, II, 347-8)

No satyr could have described more vividly his putative avocation. Of course, this gallant's plight is full of symbolic overtones about the satirist: he is not concerned about the reformation of society, but about the accomplishment of his own selfish aims; the "instruments of Learning" are open to misuse just as any others--they are not the perquisites of one who is "a true Poem" only; hence the satirist may spew forth personal venom without any objective distancing; his views are as changeable as his moods:

> And whereas before their comming into his roome, he had a foolish humor to pistoll them with paper bullets shot out of pen and inkehornes, he professeth (with his eyes lifted up to heaven, higher then his heade) that now he will write Palinodes Recantations, and Retractions, yea he will presently eate his owne words, though he were sure like Earle Goodwines drinke, they should choake him. (Works, II, 350)

This represents a scathing commentary on the traditional motives and effects of satire: the modernized weapons of the satirist, the "paper bullets", are innocuous; the grudging admission of a heaven "higher

then his heade" is redolent of his own egotism; and the admission that he will consume his own words, even with difficulty, ironically dismisses the traditional concept of satire's poisonous effects, for Dekker implies that, when written by a parasite, the greatest physical power it has is the negative one of indigestibility. When the moodiness and vacillation of the satirist's moral position are taken into account also, what we are left with is a very low opinion of the didactic function of the kind, something that Dekker's satyr-figure, Cock-Watt, is very quick to note.[1]

Dekker's statement of intent (always subject to suspicion, of course) about the Belman of London (1608) is of considerable interest; his aims, it seems, are those of the verse satirist, except that he is not writing in verse:

> . . . my Bell shall ever be ringing, and that faithfull servant of mine (the Dog that followes me) be ever biting of these wilde beastes, till they be all driven into one heard, and so hunted into the toyles of the Lawe. Accept therefore of this Night-prize (my Grave and worthy Patrons) drawne rudely and presented boldly, because I know the colours laide upon it, are not counterfeit, as those of borrowed beauties: but this is a picture of Villany, drawne to the life, of purpose that life might be drawne from it. None can be offended with it, but such as are guilty to themselves, that they are such as are enrold in this Muster booke, for whose anger and whose stab, I care not. At no mans bosome do I particularly strike, but at the bodie of Vice in Generall: if my manner of Fight (with these dangerous Maisters of the Ignoblest Science that ever was in any kingdome) doe get but applause; the Belman shall shortly bid you to another Prize, where you shall see him play at another kind of weapons. (Works, III, 67)

[1]In a later work, The Dead Tearme (1608), Dekker uses the "pistoll" image in a more serious context to describe the satirist's work: "The Pen is the piece that shoots, Inck is the powder that carries, and Wordes are the Bullets that kill." (Works, IV, 65)

The night is the "obscure" time, and therefore a completely decorous time for the subject of vice to be examined; the darkness accounts for the "rudeness" of Dekker's style. The plea that the "biting" is aimed at vice in general is also conventional, as is the appeal to right, and the promise of more to come, provided the Belman proves popular (no insults to the reader this time). Yet the Belman, Dekker's persona, tells us that "at another time would I have written Satyres against the impietie of the world," implying that this is not one, and that what we have here is a more appropriate form which nonetheless can incorporate the traditional characteristics of the satyr-poem. The direction in which he moved was towards the "anatomy", and his work is an important step in the development of that form.[1]

In the course of this chapter, then, certain facts have emerged to demonstrate the lively status of the prose satire in England around 1600. As a form, it exhibits all those characteristics that have been claimed for the formal verse "satyre", a label used with much wider application in Renaissance England than is commonly supposed; the satiric persona (who, to our surprise, includes even so urbane a commentator as Horace) emerges recurrently in the prose as a rough, straightforward, often crude speaker, who sometimes, for effect, claims to be moderate.

[1]In the next chapter I will show, amongst other things, the frequency with which the "anatomy" image is employed by Dekker in his pamphlets; I have already drawn attention to Burton's familiarity with his work.

The ambivalent satiric aim appears in both verse and prose; that is to say, there is always a mooted moral end that somehow comes into conflict with the means used; indeed, often it contrasts vehemently with less edifying motives which are deliberately paraded. Despite such "adverse" circumstances, the writers show great zest for their work. The loose design of satura is notable in both verse and prose, with certain topics recurring with a frequency that impresses upon us the omnipresence of vice (or whatever the satirist is attacking). Prose- and verse-satirists conceive of themselves as "anatomists", a notion I shall deal with in the next chapter; but the prose satirist has an additional string to his bow, for he has a much greater variety of form at his disposal. In fact, any form can be adopted and parodied by the prose satirist. It may be the philosophic or theological treatise (as in the Martin Marprelate pamphlets), the eulogy (as in Pierces Supererogation, or the Metamorphosis of Ajax), the chronicle (as in the Wonderfull Yeare), the epistle (as in the Foure Letters), or the travel book (as in Pierce Pennilesse and the Belman's two journeys).[1] The satiric kind, as I attempted to show earlier, like all the other kinds, transcends particular forms. Satire takes whatever form seems best suited to the particular task in hand, and transforms

[1]This adoption of conventional forms may in part account for the hostility aroused by some of the satires: real animosity in the case of Martin Marprelate, from the conservatives on his own side; hypothetical animosity, as in Burton's case, from certain medical and ecclesiastical bodies who objected to his wandering outside his own field.

it through the employment of its own peculiar techniques; through a combination of effects, including even the use of formal verse, the *satura* appears. In the next chapter, I hope to show that Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy* is one of the last major products in the Renaissance of a tradition whose source is as ancient as literature, and whose subsequent history will include even recent works which have been difficult to place in the artistic canon because of the lack of critical terms to describe them.

CHAPTER III

ROBERT BURTON'S ANATOMY OF MELANCHOLY

Up till now in this thesis, some essential groundwork for the present chapter has been laid. Too often in the past, criticism of the Anatomy of Melancholy has been, however understandably, inadequate, and there has been, for example, no close examination of the satire in the work, in spite of the many admissions that it does indeed have satiric parts.[1] However, as I have tried to show, the Anatomy is not the only work whose satiric possibilities have been overlooked; though there have been some important studies of the verse satires of the

[1]Women are in the forefront of the most recent research upon Burton: Joan Webber, The Eloquent I: Style and Self in Seventeenth-Century Prose (Madison, 1968), and Rosalie Colie, Paradoxia Epidemica (Princeton University Press, 1966), have made interesting contributions to the understanding of the Anatomy, but from very specialized points of view which involve paying little attention to the satiric elements within it. Two papers delivered lately (1971) before the Association of Canadian University Teachers of English, the one by E. Patricia Vicari, "Robert Burton: The Anatomy as Sermon, and the Sermon as Anatomy," and the other by Orlene Murad, "Robert Burton's Philosophaster," are samples of the growing interest in Burton studies; the former paper, especially, provides some fine insights into the affinities between Burton and that strangely Burtonesque preacher, Thomas Adams, a relationship suggested by Douglas Bush in his Earlier Seventeenth Century, and vigorously pursued by Miss Vicari; she stresses, however, the fact that they are both clerics rather than that they are both satirists. Miss Murad thinks it important to emphasize that Burton's only play is satiric, a point I shall endorse later in this chapter.

Renaissance, there remains an amorphous heap of prose that has been too often neglected, and which scholars, when they have considered it at all, have categorized with a great deal of discomfort. It surely is important to take into account the fact that the characteristics of the formal verse satire are to be found in these apparently unrelated prose works; this leads to a suspicion that they consciously belong to a literary kind--satire--that has not so far received satisfactory analysis. Comedy and satire in particular have lacked the kind of protracted attention that their more striking partner, tragedy, has received, though of late scholars like Northrop Frye have recognized their importance in the literary spectrum, and have tried to supply the want.[1] This chapter will attempt to show that the Anatomy of Melancholy has close affinities with the group of prose satires that flourished around the turn of the sixteenth century, and that were dealt with in the last chapter.

The remainder of this chapter will consist in a general survey of the first edition of the Anatomy. It is important to place such emphasis on the edition of 1621, for it acts as the foundation for the five subsequent editions; however much these may have been expanded or revised, they never deviate seriously from the basic aim and nature of the original. Since the latter is sixty per cent shorter than the sixth

[1]This was discussed rather more fully, above, pp. 22ff.

edition, there is a relative succinctness of expression and a clarity of vision in it that can be more readily grasped than is perhaps the case with the sixth, which is, unfortunately, the only edition that most modern readers and critics of Burton have had the opportunity to read. There is, therefore, a mutually illuminating function served by an analysis of the first edition followed by an examination of the later editions: the additions highlight Burton's preoccupation with the satiric vision of the first edition; simultaneously, they indicate the areas in the first edition where Burton felt there was still a satiric potential to be exploited.

The first edition of Burton's Anatomy is not simply a lengthy book that contains, among other things, a number of satiric passages; its major aim is satiric, and when it is read with this in mind, the notion that it is amorphous, disorganized, and incomprehensible in its bulk, as a number of its early critics suggested, disappears.[1] In Chapter One, the following definition of satire was established:

> Satire is a literary mode or kind which has the apparent and often stated aim of arousing ridicule or concern in order to amend, reprehend or castigate some deficiency, real or imagined; but whose achievement depends primarily upon its evoking a response that is aesthetically and psychologically satisfying, rather than morally affecting.

The applicability of this definition to the Anatomy can readily be shown without sleight of hand. In the Anatomy, Burton makes the claim that

[1]For examples, see above, pp. 7 ff.

his intent is to "amend and cure" the nebulous disease he calls melancholy, and the method he most frequently employs in so doing is ridicule, in all its various forms. But he also makes it clear, with insistence, that the cure he is concerned with is either impossible of fulfilment, or, indeed, undesirable. He takes great care, on the other hand (and this may be indicative of his real motives), in his major passages of invective and general abuse, to satisfy that aesthetic sense which the definition suggests is one of the driving forces behind the writing of satire, or any other endeavour that merits the name of "art," and makes artistic execution of the work seem much more important than the effecting of a cure for the universal disease. From the later examination of the additions, it will emerge clearly from some striking passages that Burton added material for aesthetic reasons, especially in cases where his "moral" point, such as it was, had been more than adequately made in 1621. Frequently the lesson is only obscured by the ensuing additions--as for example in the phantasmagoric description of the mistress in the Third Partition.[1]

The first edition of the Anatomy has undoubted affiliations with that group of contemporary prose works which were examined in part in Chapter Two. The butts of its irony, the methods of attack it uses, the satura form, and, most noticeably, the medical-image itself, link

[1]See below, pp. 259 and 348-349.

it to those prose works that are marked by the characteristics of the formal verse satire, which received little analytic attention from literary theorists of the age in which they were composed (so many were mere "pamphlets"), and not much more serious consideration from modern students of the age. The medical image is a very important part of these satirists' armoury, and helps identify them--especially in their use of the notion of anatomical dissection.

In keeping with the very "physical" aim that satire often pretends to have, the idea of dissecting the body of a would-be patient has obvious potential for being a vital part of its metaphor. Physical anatomizing may be undertaken to discover the causes of disease; the satirical anatomist, using to advantage the known aims of his medical forbears, pries into the "body" of his victim in quest of the offending part. A glance through the Short Title Catalogue reveals twenty-six formally entitled "anatomies" published between 1560 and 1650, of which fifteen are satires that employ the medical image, whose prevalence in the formal verse satire and satiric drama of the period has been clearly shown by M. C. Randolph.[1] In a significant number of other Renaissance

[1]Wright and Babb, however, see little significance in the existence of so many satiric anatomies. Babb, for instance, whilst admittedly showing little interest in satire, says off-handedly that "None of these anatomies bears any close resemblance to Burton's work" (Sanity, p. 11), and dismisses them from consideration.

prose satires, there is a similar recurrence, a fact which seems to indicate another relationship in technique and stated aim between the verse satire and its prose neighbour.

Stephen Gosson's use of the medical image in one of his prose tracts is an early instance:

> A good Phisition when the disease cannot be cured within, thrusteth the corruption out in the face, and delivereth his Patient to the Chirurgion: Though my skill in Phisicke bee small, I have some experience in these maladyes, which I thrust out with my penne too every man's viewe, yeelding the ranke fleshe to the Chirurgeon's knife, and so ridde my handes of the cure, for it passeth my cunning to heale them privily.[1]

The satiric use of the image here gives a hint of the spirit in which Gosson's work ought to be taken, as I suggested in the last chapter.

The medical image is used by Thomas Nashe frequently, his first major work being entitled The Anatomie of Absurditie. He suggests, too, that his Pierce Pennilesse is a "livelie anatomie of sinne" (p. 320). Explicit examples of the use of this image may be found, as in this attack on John Penry:

> My L. Archb. of Cant. hath so brused the Faction, and cut them in the scull, that they have lyen groning and panting, breathing and bleeding ever since; many as blinde a Chururgion as Penrie, endevoring to close up their woundes hath made them wider, and left them all desperate upon their death bed. Considering how weake his Purgation is, let us examine his Reformation, and try whether that be any stronger.[2]

[1]Gosson, p. 17.

[2]Works, I, 117. This is from Pasquils Apologie, and the irony lies in the accusation that Penry, the Martinist (sometimes said to be Martin himself), and therefore a satirist, is so ineffective that he wounds those on his own side rather than the enemy.

In Have With You, as I have noted previously, there is a parody of the whole medical concept; the physician there needs only to be a barber-surgeon for the simple task of stripping Harvey's rather contemptible faults. For the parody to be completely successful, however, familiarity with the more conventional satiric use is implied:

> Phlebothomize them, sting them, tutch them . . . play the valiant man at Armes, and let them bloud and spare not; the Lawe allowes thee to doo it, it will beare no action; and thou, beeing a Barber Surgeon, art priviledgd to dresse flesh in Lent, or anie thing.[1]

Gabriel Harvey, as his work clearly shows, was steeped in the tradition of letters of the period. It is not surprising then to note that he makes considerable use of the medical image in his satiric work. He employs it, for example, with great success in Pierces Supererogation to describe the purpose of that work:

> In the cure of a canker, it is a generall rule with Surgeons: It never perfectly healeth, unlesse the rootes and all be utterly extirped; and the fleshe regenerate. But the soundest Principle is: Principiis obsta: and it goeth best with them, that never knewe, what a canker, or leper meant.[2]

The Trimming, like Have With You, also parodies the more serious tradition of the "anatomy," with a considerable amount of success, as I have tried to show.

[1] Works, III, 9.

[2] Works, II, 109-10.

Sir John Harington, the "protesting Catholick Puritan," embodies the supreme example of the satirical use of the "anatomy" and the medical image in his Metamorphosis of Ajax; he offers this apology for the topic he embarks upon:

> I feare the homely title prefixed to this treatise (how warlicke a sound so ever it hath) may breed a worse offence, in some of the finer sort of readers; who may upon much more just occasion condemne it, as a noysome and unsavory discourse: because, without any error of equivocation, I meane indeed, to write of the same that the word signifies. But if it might please them a litle better to consider, how the place we treat of (how homely soever) is visited by them selves, once at least in foure and twentie houres, if their digestion bee good, and their constitution sound; then I hope they will do me that favour, and them selves that right, not to reject a matter touching their own ease and cleanlinesse, for the homelinesse of the name; and consequently, they will excuse all broade phrases of speech, incident to such a matter, with the olde English proverbe that ends thus; For Lords and Ladies do the same.

Having thus justified the choice of topic and excused the crude language that will be necessary to discuss it (an ironic reference to the "fundamental" decorum of the work), he goes on to attack in advance those who will find his book objectionable:

> I know that the wiser sort of men will consider, and I wish that the ignorant sort would learne; how it is not the basenesse, or homelinesse, either of words, or matters, that make them foule and obscenous, but their base minds, filthy conceits, or lewd intents that handle them. He that would scorne a Physition, because for our infirmities sake, he refuseth not sometime the noisome view of our lothsomest excrements, were worthy to have no helpe by Physicke, and should breake his devine precept, that saith; Honour the Physition, for necessities sake God hath ordained him. And he that would honour the makers of Aposticchios, or rebatoes, because creatures much honored use to weare them, might be thought, perhaps full of curtesie, but voyed of wit.[1]

[1] Ajax, pp. 82-3.

Here, the role of the satirist is compared overtly with that of the physician, the one healing the infirmities of the soul, the other, those of the body. Thus the traditional connection between doctor and satirist is maintained. The second part of the Metamorphosis of Ajax is also in the tradition of the medical usage: "An Anatomie of The Metamorphosed Ajax. Wherein by a tripertite method is plainly, openly and demonstratively, declared, explaned, and eliquidated, by pen, plot, and precept, how unsaverie places may be made sweet, noysome places made wholesome, filthie places made cleanly," and he proceeds to supply an actual drawing of the dissected jakes (p. 195). There is much in Harington's "anatomy" that is similar to Burton's, from the elaborate parodic title, to the ingenuousness of the persona.[1]

Dekker's writing also contains many instances of the employment of the medical image. Lanthorne and Candle-Light provides some notable examples of its use:

> Some perhaps wil say, that this lancing of the pestilent sores of a Kingdome so openly, may infect those in it that are sound, and that in this our schoole, (where close abuses and grose villanies are but discovered and not punished) others that never before knew such evils, wil be now instructed (by the

[1]Harington uses the mock-encomium as his basic motif, informing it with an incredible Rabelaisian scurrility and ingenuity; he also, like Burton, constantly emphasizes the "practical" value of what he is undertaking: after all, toilet facilities in Elizabethan England were quite shocking. But, even more clearly than in Burton, it is only a cover for what he is really doing. He uses great variety of style in his work, from popular to erudite, "digressing" occasionally, though always to the point, and makes multitudinous allusions to classicial and contemporary satire. His Anatomy was part of Burton's library.

> booke) to practise them . . . The letting therfore of Vice blood in these severall Veines, which the Bel-man hath opend, cannot by any Iudician rules of phisicke, endanger the Bodie of the Commonwealth, or make it feeble, but rather restore those parts to perfect strength, which by disorder have ben diseased.[1]

This is an ingenious extension of the image to resolve the satirist's own moral dilemma. In A Strange Horse-Race, Dekker even compares himself to Democritus, the archetypal anatomist-satirist; and in the Ravens Almanacke he includes a drawing of the human figure dissected, for a purpose not unlike le Blon's later frontispiece to the Anatomy of Melancholy.

The medical image is, of course, at the very core of the Anatomy: its title, the origins of its persona, the very methodology and structure of the work (ideas which will be discussed at some length later in this chapter), constantly make use of the image for satiric purposes. At the end of the Preface, for example, Democritus Junior concludes:

> And if hereafter in Anatomising this sirlie humour, my hand slip, and as an unskilful prentise, I launce too deepe, and cut through skinne, and all at unawares; or make it smart or cut awry, pardon a rude hand, an unskilful knive, 'tis a most difficult thing to keepe an even hand, a perpetuall tenor, and not sometimes to lash out; difficile est Satyram non scribere . . . . (p. 72)

The combination of the anatomy-image and the well-know Juvenalian saw highlights the synthesis that occurs in the satire of the sixteenth and earlier seventeenth centures. But whereas Nashe, Marston, and Dekker do not openly apologize to their readers for their anatomizing bent, Democritus Junior, in keeping with Burton's ironic view that the satirist

[1] Works, III, 179.

may satirize himself, does repent. He does not let this weakness interfere, however, with the activities of his knife, which is allowed to slip at will throughout the Anatomy, Burton's further use of the image of dissection will be explored as it occurs in the close analysis of the work that comes later in this thesis; it is a sophisticated use, for he was no novice at the satirist's trade, as I would now like to show.

Since the impression has often prevailed that Burton is the writer of only one work, it is worth noting that he had served a form of apprenticeship in producing satire long before the Anatomy was published, and did not come to it cold. His other major piece of work is a satiric play, Philosophaster, which was written in 1606; it is a play that contains bitter satire combined with Jonsonian irony, and hardly suggesting that its creator was the ingenue so many critics felt was the author of the Anatomy. A brief outline of the play will give some indication of the rather "black" vision that dominates it, and perhaps show an aspect of Burton's temperament that has been all too often ignored.

The play concerns the machinations of one Polupragmaticus, an unscrupulous swindler and a Jesuit to boot; it is an indirect comment upon university life and learning, the abuses of which are embodied in Pantomagus, a physician-alchemist, Amphimacer, a poetaster, Pedanus, a pedant, and Theanus, a theologian; they are a set of "humour" characters. The play exudes bitterness, but is filled with the same variety of style that we find in the Anatomy, as well as a deep concern for the scandalous exploitation of learning and scholars. The limitations of academic

erudition untempered by humanitarian feelings are everywhere shown; "love" is stripped of its romantic trappings; two rare and honest scholars (the somewhat muted "virtuous" protagonists), Polumathes and Philobiblos, do not succeed in their quest to find a wise man--the implication being that such a quest is hopeless--and have to accept that unpleasant fact. There are many thematic similarities to the Anatomy, but the whole is imbued with an atmosphere that is only one of the staples of the later work. Yet it is the vision of the same artist revealing less optimistic facets of his art, the existence of which many readers of the Anatomy have been hesitant to acknowledge.[1] The writer of such a play is hardly likely to emerge as the bumbling scholar, Democritus Junior, yet the identification has almost invariably been made.

Since this thesis contends that the Anatomy of Melancholy is a satiric work, the method of analysis will involve in the first instance an over-view to establish the pervading satiric vision and the immediately noticeable attributes of the satiric kind; this will be followed in the last two chapters by a close reading of the Anatomy, in

[1]The play was written in 1606, altered, revised, and completed in 1615. It was performed on February 16th, 1617. Jordan Smith, who translates it, suggests "the Alchemist" in the Colloquies of Erasmus as the possible source. He also feels there are echoes of Plautus, Terence, Ovid, Ausonius, Juvenal, Cicero, Seneca, Virgil, Horace, Quintilian, Porphyrius, Plato, Palingenius, and the satires of Hall. Jonson's Alchemist has a similar subject matter, but that is all; the fact that Jordan Smith associates the play with so many satiric sources is indicative of its nature.

which an endeavour will be made to deal with the detail of the work, and to account for the effect it has, considering both those parts that are obviously satiric, and those much less evidently so. This closer analysis is vital if it is to be established that even those seemingly non-satiric passages are part of the over-all satiric scheme of the work, and have both precedent in other satires, and a necessary function within the Anatomy. The method also enables the reader to penetrate to the roots of the satiric form it uses--the satura--which, though fiction, lacks plot in the accepted sense, yet is made viable by a superficial adherence to the "scientific" structure of the Anatomy, and is unified throughout by the dominance of the persona and by Burton's utilization of the satiric mode in all its diversity.

The satiric vision of the Anatomy of Melancholy, it must immediately be noted, is not markedly different from that of Philosophaster, and the twenty years of revising the already lengthy prose work do little to brighten its outlook. The opinions of the persona, Democritus Junior, are hardly cheering: for example, he derides the efforts of science, new and old, to improve the human lot; philosophy and religion he shows to be neighbours to superstition and idolatry; and the putative dignity of man he proves to be a sham. Even love, the great last hope of the species, is scrupulously examined in the Third Partition and is seen to be perverted or deluded. In proposing such cynical views, Democritus Junior seems to speak for his author; but, additionally, Democritus Junior is himself the butt of Burton's pen. The persona, and a host of other much more famous

satirists, are held up to ridicule for their pretentiousness in thinking that they have either the right to castigate their fellow-men, or the vision to prescribe an alternative path worth taking.

Most important, therefore, to an understanding of Burton's satiric stance in the Anatomy, is the repeated demonstration, through Democritus Junior, that man's flaws are incurable: there is no way of ameliorating one's human condition, except through a kind of stoic resignation, for human nature is unalterably prone to folly; so perverse is man that even an appeal to God becomes contaminated and futile.[1] All that is left to supply a modicum of consolation is the ability to laugh rather than weep at the commingling of the trivial and the tragic which makes up the life of man. One can readily see in this vision the ingredients of what Koestler was later to call "bisociation", the major constituent of his theory of the comic.[2]

Throughout the Anatomy, Burton utilizes his power as a satiric writer to transmit this rather pessimistic vision, and one of the reasons for his success is his easy familiarity with the traditions and techniques of satire. Such factors certainly had a great deal of influence on the formulation of his own satiric outlook, and as a result, it is both

[1]In "Religious Melancholy".

[2]See, above, pp. 39-40.

traditional and unique. The dark vision goes back at least as far as Juvenal amongst satirists whom Burton was familiar with, but the cynicism underlying it is a perennial phenomenon. Burton's targets, too, are traditional in the main, but still as susceptible to attack as ever in the seventeenth century; his uniqueness, however, lies in his creation of Democritus Junior, the voice which assails them. The persona is a recognisably seventeenth century eccentric, and it is Burton's conception of him that makes the Anatomy a triumph.

Burton shows a preoccupation with the art of satire in several notable discussions of the kind and in his innumerable gleanings from the works of satirists of all ages, even in the most apparently incongruous places in the Anatomy. Theorists on satire have often suggested that the presence of these twin characteristics is a sure sign that the work containing them is itself satiric.[1] If this proposition were universally accepted, there could be no question whatever that the first edition of the Anatomy of Melancholy is a satire from beginning to end. Doubters might suggest that it is so encyclopedic that inevitably such ingredients, along with many others, are to be found there; yet Burton gives the theory of satire and its close relative, comedy,

[1]Cf. The Anatomy of Satire, pp. 15-16, where, for example, Gilbert Highet asserts that only the writer of satire displays such an interest.

a disproportionate amount of space, while citing satirists more frequently than any other authors. In quantitative terms alone, then, there can be no doubt of Burton's reliance upon satirists, and his statements about the kind become very significant for their possible bearing upon his own practice.

Near the end of the First Partition, Burton makes his most sustained statement about satire, showing an intimate knowledge of its traditions and potential, and by implication putting forward a defence of his own work. He is well acquainted with the "killing" power of words (indeed, he adds another killer to our list, the satirist Hipponax, who "so vilified and lashed two painters in his iambics . . . [that they] both hanged themselves" [I, 425]).[1] Democritus Junior is considering the causes of Melancholy, and suggests that words themselves are often principally responsible:

> It is an old saying, a blow with a word strikes deeper than a blow with a sword: and many men are as much galled with a calumny, a scurrile and bitter jest, a libel, a pasquil, satire, apologue, epigram, stage-plays, or the like, as with any misfortune whatsoever. (I, 391)

[1]For this examination of Burton's major statement on satire I am using the Shilleto edition, partly for the convenience of the reader, but principally because I feel it would be advantageous at this point to confront Burton's most comprehensive statement on the nature and function of his art. I shall quote from the first edition thereafter.

To give greater authority to this notion of the power of satire, he turns to Plato for advice as to how one should approach the genus irritabile vatum: Socrates advises his friends "to stand in awe of poets, for they are terrible fellows, can praise and dispraise as they see cause" (I, 392). In discussing the list of offensive verbal weapons, Burton allows his own techniques to operate:

> Princes and Potentates, that are otherwise happy, and have all command, secure and free, quibus potentia sceleris impunitatem fecit, are grievously vexed with these pasquilling libels and satires: they fear a railing Aretine more than an enemy in the field, which made most Princes of his time (as some relate) allow him a liberal pension, that he should not tax them in his satires. (I, 391)

Of course, the "quibus . . . fecit" represents Burton's own subtle satire to good effect; his sympathy is apparently with the princes, "secure and free," but the reversal comes in the Latin phrase, and betrays his real allegiance in the matter; indeed he seems to find Aretino's use of his power amusing rather than reprehensible. He continues:

> The Gods had their Momus, Homer his Zoilus, Achilles his Thersites, Philip his Demades: The Caesars themselves in Rome were commonly taunted. There was never wanting a Petronius, a Lucian in these times, nor will be a Rabelais, an Euphormio, a Boccalini in ours. (I, 391)

He thus takes us from the mythical antecedents of satire, to the great satirists of antiquity, and finally to the satiric writers of his contemporary Europe.

It appears that unwarranted personal attacks (unlike those above, against kings) are the kind to which Burton most seriously objects; like his satiric predecessors, he reproaches those who misuse their abusive powers:

> . . . for many are of so petulant a spleen, and have that figure sarcasmus so often in their mouths, so bitter, so foolish, as Balthasar Castilio notes of them, that they cannot speak but they must bite; they had rather lose a friend than a jest; and what company soever they come in, they will be scoffing, insulting over their inferiors, especially such as any way depend upon them, humouring, misusing, or putting gulleries on some or other, till they have made by their humouring or gulling, ex stulto insanum, a mope or a noddy, and all to make themselves merry:
>
> — dummodo risum
> Excutiat sibi, non hic cuiquam parcet amico.
>
> Friends, neuters, enemies, all are as one; to make a fool a madman is their sport, and they have no greater felicity than to scoff and deride others; they must sacrifice to the god of laughter, with them in Apuleius, once a day, or else they shall be melancholy themselves; they care not how they grind and misuse others, so they may exhilarate their own persons. Their wits indeed serve them to that sole purpose, to make sport, to break a scurrile jest, which is levissimus ingenii fructus, the froth of wit, as Tully holds, and for this they are often applauded; in all other discourse, dry, barren, stramineous, dull and heavy, here lies their Genius; in this alone they excel, please themselves and others. (I, 392)

This is very similar to the sentiments that Nashe, Harvey, and other satirists voiced concerning the abuses of satire, whilst implying that they themselves were innocent of the charge of malpractice; others, even those scholars who (like the Harveys) should be above it, are guilty of petulance, moodiness, and "byting":

> Scarce two great Scholars in an age, but with bitter invectives they fall foul one on the other, and their adherents; Scotists, Thomists, Reals, Nominals, Plato and Aristotle, Galenists and Paracelsians, etc. It holds in all professions. (I, 309)

This tactic of the satirist of sacrificing others to scorn so that he himself may escape melancholy reminds the reader of the reason Democritus Junior proposed for composing the Anatomy: "I writ of melancholy, by being busy to avoid melancholy" (I, 17). His concluding remarks upon the "moral" aim of much satire is also illuminating: the satirist writes to "exhilerate" himself, using his sole gift, that creative power of wit that Koestler and Lucas describe.

Once again though, one has to be careful not to be over-impressed by the apparent sympathy shown towards the victims; the tale about Leo X that follows refers to the butts of that Pope's wicked humour quite gratuitously as "stark noddies," one of them in particular being "indeed a ninny" (I, 393). Burton also is aware of the stigma of lack of charity levelled against the perpetrators of such personal affronts, and has Democritus Junior maintain:

> Although they peradventure that so scoff do it alone in mirth and merriment, and hold it optimum aliena frui insania, an excellent thing to enjoy another man's madness; yet they must know that it is a mortal sin (as Thomas holds) and, as the Prophet David denounceth, they that use it shall never dwell in God's tabernacle. (I, 394)

This was the very problem that worried St. Jerome, but Democritus Junior does not seem over-concerned. Though he asserts that "such scurrile jest ought not to be used," since it may cause melancholy, he proceeds to give three anti-climactic examples that conflict with the serious effect he had seemed to be struggling for; of the stories he tells, one is most notable for achieving this confusion:

> Tiberius the emperor withheld a Legacy from the people of Rome, which his predecessor Augustus had lately given, and perceiving a fellow round a dead corse in the ear, would needs know wherefore he did so; the fellow replied, that he wished the departed soul to signify to Augustus, the commons of Rome were yet unpaid: for this bitter jest the Emperor caused him to be slain, and carry the news himself. (I, 395)

So, the merely "scurrile jest" is punished, producing a more devastatingly serious one.

Ultimately, then, it seems as though the major stipulation in the Anatomy about satire is that it should not single out particular people as victims, a position well summed-up in these lines:

> . . . 'tis an old axiom, turpis in reum omnis exprobatio. I speak not of such as generally tax vice, Barclay, Gentilis, Erasmus, Agrippa, Fishcart, etc., the Varronists and Lucians of our time, Satirists, Epigrammatists, Comedians, Apologists, etc., but such as personate, rail, scoff, calumniate, perstringe by name, or in person offend. (I, 343)

The statement is a commonplace. The most vicious personal attackers (like Nashe, Harvey, or Marston) claimed that they also only "generally tax vice" and are misread by those with guilty consciences, since even the most well-meaning general satire is not exempt from hostile personal interpretation. Even those whom the Anatomy names as the exemplars of the "general" style were, in their time, accused of being too personal--indeed the "Lucians" are notorious for it. Nor does Democritus Junior always avoid naming names himself, as when he is considering special enemies like particular papists. Neither is he loth to expose scholars past and present to ridicule, considering them fair game. It might be felt, at any rate, that certain classes which he constantly abuses in

blanket terms (for example, lawyers and doctors) as being almost without exception corrupt, might feel that this "general" abuse heaped on them is comprehensive and much more damaging than the other kind.

Numerous other statements are made about satire both in the "Satyricall Preface" and throughout the Anatomy; in general they seem to fall in line with the relatively non-committal opinion we have just examined, and indicate more than anything else an awareness of the problems inherent in satire rather than a fixed position. In a similar vein to this major statement, for example, there is a condemnation of "long libels and pasquils, defaming men of good life" (I, 53). But, as if to illustrate the contradictions in Democritus Junior's opinions, there later comes a very significant denial of what has been praised elsewhere:

> They that laugh and contemn others, condemn the world of folly, deserve to be mocked, are as giddy-headed, and lie as open as any other. Democritus, that common flouter of folly, was ridiculous himself, barking Menippus, scoffing Lucian, satirical Lucilius, Petronius, Varro, Persius, etc., may be censured with the rest . . . (I, 127)

Some of the foremost exemplars of the "general" satiric art are now relegated to the ranks of the absurd themselves.

The ending of the Preface is an embodiment of the equivocal vision of satire; Democritus Junior is providing himself with an escape-hatch:

> I acknowledge that of Tacitus to be true . . . a bitter jest leaves a sting behind it: and as an honourable man observes, They fear a Satirist's wit, he their memories. I may justly

> suspect the worst; and though I hope I have wronged no man, yet in Medea's words I will crave pardon,
>
> . . .
>
> And in my last words this I do desire,
> That what in passion I have said, or ire,
> May be forgotten, and a better mind
> Be had of us, hereafter as you find. (I, 140-41)

Despite the fact that his own work appears to be as "generall" as possible, Burton realizes that it may well be taken much more personally than he claims to have intended (witness Democritus Junior's later affected fear of offending physicians to the extent that they will neglect him in sickness); hence the double edge of satire is apparent again--it cuts even its own practitioner; indeed the general satirist injures more people than the mere "flyter" of individuals and so has more reprisals to fear. The choice of Medea as an apologist is deliberately ironic, signifying the futility of apologies after irreparable damage has been done. Democritus Junior concludes with another appeal to precedent and a re-affirmation of purpose:

> I earnestly request every private man, as Scaliger did Cardan, not to take offence. I will conclude in his lines . . . if thou knewest my modesty and simplicity, thou wouldst easily pardon and forgive what is here amiss, or by these misconceived. If hereafter, anatomizing this surly humour, my hand slip, as an unskilful prentice I lance too deep, and cut through skin and all at unawares, make it smart, or cut awry, pardon a rude hand, an unskilful knife, tis a most difficult thing to keep an even tone, a perpetual tenor, and not sometimes to lash out; difficile est satiram non scribere, there be so many objects to divert, inward perturbations to molest, and the very best may sometimes err . . . I hope there will be no such cause of offence given; if there be, Nemo aliquid recognoscat, nos mentimur omnia. I'll deny all (my last refuge), recant all, renounce all I have said, if any man except, and with as much facility excuse as he can accuse; but I presume of thy good favour, and gracious acceptance (gentle reader). Out of an assured hope and confidence thereof, I will begin. (I, 141)

The selection of "modest" Scaliger (who wrote two books in praise of himself) as another apologist is also ludicrous--Scaliger's attacks on his rivals were famous for their failure to be "general". Democritus Junior, despite all his avowed caution and charity, will, like Juvenal, find it difficult to avoid writing bitter satire, and his knife will slip with deliberate regularity. This destructive quality is far removed from the "corrective" notion of satire as propounded by Bergson and Freud.

The examination of the Anatomy that comes later in this thesis will, amongst other things, demonstrate whether Burton's work does in fact exemplify the only kind of satire he seemed to feel was morally justifiable. It is certainly clear that he is very familiar with the complexities of the satiric kind as well as with the variety of approaches used by its major practitioners; this intimacy is an important guide to the nature of the Anatomy. Satire is so vital for Burton, I feel, that it merits discussion by him at important moments in his work, and its spirit so permeates the entire Anatomy that apparently incongruous gobbets taken from satire appear in places that might otherwise be regarded as the domain of science. Such occurrences are deliberately disruptive of any impression that he is attempting to write a diffuse scientific treatise, and are indicative of the author's attitude towards it.

When Burton's preoccupation with the satiric kind has been noticed, the ubiquitous presence of the mode becomes apparent, nowhere more so than in the disguise he adopts--the elusive satiric persona. Not that there is universal acceptance of the presence of a persona in the

work, as I have noted. Burton's most recent editor claims that his priestly function has not received sufficient attention in the past: "His religious commitment remained always a significant influence in his life and thought; and it is the sincere expression of a sensitive, competent minister which informs the true spirit of the Anatomy of Melancholy."[1] Such a claim, when not qualified by a separation of author and persona, leaves Burton once again open to the traditional condescension that stems from a lack of appreciation of his subtlety and his craft. Democritus Junior, it cannot be too often stressed, is not to be mistaken for Burton. As persona, he is as frequently the butt of the satire as he is dissector and satirist himself. He is Burton's mask, suggestive of ideas that lead to the very roots of satire itself, and to the origins of the anatomy-form.

When Burton entitled his analysis of the "symbolizing disease" of melancholy, he was aware of the tradition to which he was conforming, and through his persona he acknowledged with his accustomed accuracy the twin sources of the concept; from the respectable depths of antiquity, he took the anatomist figure (Democritus of Abdera), and from contemporary literary practice, the anatomy title and image (he lists Zara's Anatomy of Wit, the Anatomy of Popery, and others). Of late, there has been some illuminating work done on the hypothetical cultural origins of satire that has helped clear the mists surrounding the significance of the

[1]Donovan, "Religious Melancholy," p. xiv.

anatomy form.[1] The roots of art seem to rest in primitive ritual, and often in the earliest art the traces of ritual are only incompletely erased; early Greek tragedy has, for example, that noticeably ritualistic aura that is so strikingly seen in the incantatory function of the Chorus, with its highly formalized verbal patterns and physical movements. Noticeable also are the frequently repeated themes and plots and the patently sacrificial nature of the unfortunate protagonists' fate.

In the Christian era too there is a relationship apparent between ritual and art; hence the almost exclusively religious themes in medieval drama and lyric poetry, and the litany-effect in many of the macaronic laments. For centuries, the Catholic Mass, an example of ritual hovering on the brink of art, has been an image dear to artists; but it is not quite a pure art-form, for, according to Elliot, art "is a sublimation of magic. Not until the concern shifts from ritualistic efficacy to aesthetic value does art become free and the individual artist a maker."[2] The particular relevance of such considerations to the understanding of the development of satire as one manifestation of ritual-turned-art is alluded to by Elliot in his description of the ancient phallic songs:

> The ceremonial had two aspects, as it were: the invocation of good influences through the magical potency of the phallus, the expulsion of evil influences through the magical potency of abuse.[3]

[1]The contributions of Randolph and Elliot have been particularly helpful to the student of satire.

[2]Elliot, p. 92.

[3]Elliot, p. 5.

The ancient priest had power, real or imagined, but effective, both to heal and to kill through the might of his words.[1] This is the notion that informs the story of Archilocus. The office of priest, then, develops in several directions in the course of time: he may continue as spiritual priest, directing his efforts to influencing the progress of the soul; he may become a physician, concentrating his skill upon healing the physical person without the mediation of the spirit; he may become some odd combination of both, for malevolent or benevolent ends, like the witch-doctor amongst primitive peoples, or like the seventeenth-century alchemist, or his kinsman the scholar-clergyman whose province is all knowledge; lastly, his functions may become sublimated into art, especially satire: for the satirist claims that his job is to remove spiritual or physical evil for the ultimate good of spirit, through the cathartic power of his words. He is a destroyer who uses words instead of weapons to kill; his aims, being spiritual, are priestly, his achievement, if any, is the betterment of man's physical and spiritual condition. The satirist thus combines, artistically, the non-artistic roles of priest and physician.

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, even though social sanctions had "replaced the deadly powers once commanded by the poet [satirist],"[2] there was still a strong awareness of the legendary powers attributed to the satirist. I have already mentioned the universal awe

[1]It should be observed here how relevant this fact is to the rôle played by the Old Testament prophets. Below, p. 214ff., their influence on <u>literary</u> satire is discussed.

[2]Elliot, p. 18.

that was attached to Aretino; for Englishmen, even stronger evidence of the satirist's latent powers was available in nearby Ireland, where "an intimate and essential relation seems to exist" between satire and magic.[1] Irish satire shows strong traces of its origins in ritual:

> The Celtic satirist, a sorcerer and magician up to a relatively late date, was one of the classes of poets; and as such, his training was long and arduous and his position important. Tribal arrangements gave him by hereditary right certain comprehensive powers and authorities; he was feared, flattered, obeyed, and extravagantly bribed and rewarded above all men, even the druids, whose powers at times seem almost identical with his. We can say that this 'satirist' is no more than a befeathered medicine-man and that his verses are but chanted mumbo-jumbo; but even preliminary studies indicate that here may be one source, at least, of a native tradition in English satire.[2]

This is the kind of anthropological research that can be illuminating about the very sources of art. Of course, the most obvious literary antecedents of English satire seem to be through Aretino and the great European classical stream after the Renaissance; but here, much closer to home, we have evidence of an origin that, whilst it may antedate the art form, may nonetheless give us a clue to one reason for the durability of the vehement "flyting" tradition in English. Randolph continues:

[1]F. N. Robinson, "Satirists and Enchanters in Early Irish Literature," Studies in the History of Religions (New York, 1912), pp. 95-130. Both Randolph and Robinson give numerous instances of references to the Irish satirists by sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English writers, showing how conversant they were with the phenomenon.

[2]Randolph, "The Medical Concept," p. 129.

> The Celtic satirist was frankly out for actual blood or "word-death." In many instances he meant to destroy his victim, flesh, bone, nerve, and sinew; his victim's hounds, cattle, horses, pigs, wife, and children (and even their children's children); his trees and grain and pasture-lands, the very fish in his streams. In other cases, he meant to mutilate the victim's face so shamefully that, if it were a man, he could hold no high tribal office; and if it were a woman, she would be repulsive to those who might love her. Few satires or fragments of satires preserved to us fail to include the idea of physical mutilation or destruction, an idea which the early Irish terms for satire and satirists persistently stress.[1]

Writers in Renaissance England were fully cognisant of the Irish tradition of "riming" enemies to death (amongst others, Sidney, Reginald Scot, and Shakespeare exhibit their awareness of it); Ben Jonson explicitly associates it with the story of Archilocus:

> . . . I could doe worse,
> Arm'd with Archilocus' fury, write Iambicks,
> Should make the desperate lashers hang themselves,
> Rime 'hem to death as they doe Irish rats
> In drumming tunes.[2]

Numerous writers of and on satire over the years have shown in the language they use to describe its effects some familiarity with its ancient goal of inflicting physical violence; for example, they say it is "blasting," "stinging," "blemishing," "virulent," and a satirist may "brand," "flail," and "whip," whilst his victim may "blench," "quail," "wilt," or simply "waste away."[3]

[1] Ibid.

[2] Works, ed. Herford and Simpson, IV, 322.

[3] "The Medical Concept," p. 142 has a list of such terms.

This account, reconstructed in parts, of how the satirist came into being, supplies some fascinating insights into the nature of Burton's persona, Democritus Junior. The persona makes a very deliberate effort to show, in the Preface, that the roles of priest, satirist, and doctor are indeed compatible; at first he is defensive, promising that in the future he will write some great theological work to satisfy those who feel he is wandering out of his area of specialty, theology. But, on the other hand, he suggests that the roles of social critic and psychological healer are not alien to the priest's calling. His very name, Democritus Junior, implies just such a combination of functions: the ancient Democritus was the "laughing philosopher" (the satirist), who by his study of anatomy (the province of the doctor of medicine) hoped to effect some spiritual improvement (the goal of the priest) in his patients.[1] Elliot has contended that in satiric literature the satirist holds the supreme position within the triad, for the "aesthetic value" has become dominant; there may be, however, traces of the other two roles left. In analyzing

[1]It is conceivable that the prohibition of 1599 was instrumental in causing Burton to choose a pseudonym. There are other more literary reasons for his choice, as I hope to show, but Kenneth Burke remarks: ". . . conditions are 'more favourable' to satire under censorship than under liberalism--for the most inventive satire arises when the artist is seeking simultaneously to take risks and escape punishment for his boldness, and is never quite certain himself whether he will be acclaimed or punished" (quoted in Elliot, p. 265). I feel that whatever worries he may have had about the reception of his work, they are not related to the ban, since the enacting of which a large number of virulent satires and twenty-two years had intervened.

the Anatomy of Melancholy, one feels that all three elements are in evidence throughout; Siegbert Prawer was the first Burton critic to observe this phenomenon, but felt that the overlapping of the roles was due to faulty technique.[1] I would contend, with Elliot's thesis for support, that there was no confusion on Burton's part, but that Democritus Junior is a satiric persona who reflects his archetypal origins.

Nor is the matter of the satirist's "killing" power irrelevant to the Anatomy. Aside from the fact that Democritus Junior frequently calls upon such noted "killers" as Archilocus, Hipponax, Aretino, and Nashe, it seems important to me that this destructive element in satire which I discussed at length in Chapters I and II should be noted in the Anatomy also. Democritus Junior's self-identification with the killers and with the Old Testament prophets who mouthed precisely the kind of curses later found amongst the Irish satirists, his abundant use of the image of medical dissection and of the satiric caveat, his apparent advocacy of such horrors as burying deformed children alive and the employment of "menstruous rags" to deter ardent lovers, all put him in the "killing" category. His frequent use of the "idea of physical mutilation or destruction" puts him on a different plain from that considered by Meredith,[2]

[1]See, above, p. 16.

[2]See, above, p. 33.

but associates him closely with Marston, Nashe, and those other virulent contemporaries. Other elements of that association will emerge as this chapter develops.

The most consistent characteristic of Democritus Junior is his inconsistency, for he is no mere "innocent eye" narrator. Simplistic, pedantic, cruel, given to copia, on the one hand, perceptive, down-to-earth, generous, and pithy, on the other, he presents quite a problem of comprehension to the reader. But when, in addition, he must be disentangled from his author, Burton, almost insurmountable obstacles prevent a firm grasp of the point of view. At times, it appears, Burton mocks his persona much as his persona mocks the rest of the world--an understandable state of affairs, for, it is made clear, the greatest mockers may also be the greatest fools. Burton retreats so frequently behind a whole series of masks that it is often difficult to know what to think. An example of the complexity resulting from this practice occurs in the first edition, in the last few pages of the Preface:

> If I have overshot my selfe in this which hath bin hitherto said, or that it hath bin, which I am sure some will object too light and Comicall for a Divine, too Satyricall for one of my profession, I will presume to answere with Erasmus, in like case, 'tis not I, but Democritus, Democritus dixit, you must consider what liberty those old Satyrists have had, 'tis a Cento collected from others, not I, but they say it. (p. 70)[1]

[1]All quotations from now on are from the first edition, unless otherwise indicated.

Here one encounters tremendous difficulty in establishing the point of view. Burton has his persona, Democritus Junior, cite Erasmus, who is speaking through his character, Folly, who in her turn is quoting Democritus of Abdera, the renowned ironist and anatomist. Such a complex of satirical masks has to be disentangled before the implications of the defence can be deduced. To crown it all, the statement is supposed to be one that disclaims responsibility for what has been said--if one can ever see clearly enough to tie any responsibility to anyone, anyway. Democritus Junior places himself at least three removes from what was ultimately said, theoretically leaving Burton rather safely out of it all. But of course the pose of distancing does not clear him of actual responsibility: at best, all we can say for sure is that he is deliberately parodying the revered tradition of appealing to authority.

In the first edition, there is the advantage of a "Conclusion of the Author to the Reader," in which the author, Burton, purports to reveal himself; its presence suggests that Burton was not the speaker in the rest of the work, and adds support to the case of those who insist that there ought to be a distinction made between Burton and his persona. In fact, however, it is impossible to spot any difference in tone between this part of the Anatomy, and what has preceded. The ironic vision combined with the ingenuousness are still very much in evidence;

the speaker in these last few pages remains the familiar satiric persona, belittling the rest of humanity, yet the butt of the author's own wit at the same time.

Miss Vicari, in her excellent paper on Burton, is nonetheless unwilling to allow this much subtlety to him as an artist: ". . . when a modern writer does adopt a persona he does so for complex artistic purposes. We must beware of supposing that Burton's aim was necessarily that complicated. It is true that printing was no longer in its infancy in Burton's time. Yet in many ways Burton was behind the times, and either consciously or unconsciously prolonged the stylistic traits and rhetorical devices of earlier times."[1] It is clear from even this statement that Miss Vicari is not persuaded that Burton's vision is predominately ironic, nor that his use of conventional rhetoric is most often parodic. She suggests that there is in fact a variety of unsubtle personae in the Anatomy, and she relates this to her own particular thesis, namely that the Anatomy is a product of the informal, oral tradition, that is adopted eventually in the sermon, of which Burton's work is a rather lengthy example. She neglects the tradition that

[1]Vicari, p. 4. Miss Vicari, whose thesis is at the publisher's, is one of the most stimulating Canadian students of Burton.

satire too stems from an oral dialogue,[1] of which Lucian (whose influence on Burton she is willing to admit) was the supreme master, and as a result she underestimates Burton's capabilities as a creative writer in the satiric mould. In the more detailed analysis of the first edition which follows later in this thesis, I shall examine very closely the relationship between author and persona as it emerges in the work.

Democritus Junior embodies, in my view, a mass of contradictions, and nowhere does his inconsistency more readily appear than in what he claims is the very intention of his treatise. The aim of the Anatomy is often taken to be a serious attempt to cure melancholy, for that is the persona's declared intention. It is not really as clear-cut as all that. At one moment Democritus Junior says he wishes to cure only the grievous forms of a deadly disease, at another he wants to rid the world of its inherited folly; at some moments he writes for no other reason than to relieve his boredom and thus cure himself, and once, in the Second Partition, he suggests with a great deal of good sense that to cure the disease at all in any of its manifestations would be the greatest act of folly; nor are his reasons for the latter posture

[1]C. A. Van Rooy, Studies in Classicial Satire and Related Literary Theory (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965), one of the best studies of the dramatic origins of satire, postulates that the oral dialogue can be traced back to the outlawed Old Comedy.

unconvincing. First, he contends that as diseases go, melancholy is by no means one of the worst (thus reversing the whole basis of his thesis), and takes an analogy from Erasmus, who, "when he was grievously sick of the stone," decided that

> it was no whit offensive to others, not lothsome to the spectators, gastly, fulsome, terrible, as plagues, Apoplexies, leprosies, wounds, sores, tetters, pestulent agues are, which either admit of no company, or terrify or offend those that are present. (p. 429)

Secondly, melancholy has some very useful side-effects, such as inducing proneness to contemplation, wariness, "which is a necessary humour in these times," and leading to excellence in many other ways--Aristotle's contention, according to Babb.[1] Thirdly, the melancholic is often highly esteemed (hence the popularity of the disease). And so, "In a word, as they are distressed, so are they pittied, which some hold better than to be envyed, better to be sad then merry, better to be miserable then happy: of two extreames it is the best" (p. 430).

It seems clear that Burton is deliberately obfuscating the issue by emphasizing the inconsistencies of his persona's character, allowing them to degenerate into confusions in the stated aims of the work. His intention is to satirically discredit the persona, and thus ensure that the wide-awake reader is skeptical about any mooted "scientific" aim. The apparently incongruous mingling of the persona's

[1] Melancholy: The Elizabethan Malady, p. 47.

characteristics is evident in other regions too, and constantly keeps the reader on the hop.

Perhaps the most confusing facet of Democritus Junior's character is the fact that one who can be so frequently lucid and perceptive in analysing the deficiencies of the world around him can be so blind to his own shortcomings. In this he is like very many other of the satyr-figures of the verse and prose satires of his age. They also "whip" and "strip" abuses in a way that is well-directed and unobjectionable--except to their victims; but often in their frenzy they show great unawareness of their own limitations. As in so many other instances, Democritus Junior resembles most closely the persona of Erasmus' In Praise of Folly; like her, he scrutinizes the flaws of his society with an unerring eye, but like her also, his own complacency leads him to neglect the mote or perhaps the beam in his own eye that prevents self-knowledge. So, whilst he frequently lambasts lackeys and flunkeys, Democritus Junior is, for instance, quite incongruously circumspect regarding his own best interests, and becomes the complete sycophant when they are endangered. He condemns other scholars' lack of originality, but cites "authorities" himself to justify even the most trite cliché. He is forever recommending what he has just finished damning, to the absolute confusion of the casual reader, or, what is worse, the potential sufferer; for instance, he attacks the medical profession with unfailing vigor throughout the Anatomy as being a

collection of quacks and poseurs, yet he demands the complete faith of the patient in his doctor if he hopes to be cured of melancholy. One of the most hilarious instances of his self-interested caution arises out of a feeble attempt, near the end of the Second Partition, to squirm out of the consequences of his protracted attack upon the medical profession:

> . . . but I will urge these cavilling arguments no farther, lest some Physitian should mistake me, and deny me Physick when I am sick: for my part, I am well persuaded of Physick, I can distinguish the abuse from the use, in this and many other Arts and Sciences. I honor the name, and magnify the calling, as I am enjoyned to honor the Physitian for necessities sake. The knowledge of the Physitian lifteth up his head, and in the sight of great men he shall be admired. The Lord hath created medicines of the earth, and he that is wise will not abhorre them . . . . (pp. 433-34)

His very suspicion that he may be discriminated against belies this statement of personal faith in doctors and the profession of medicine generally. Burton thus makes his persona's blundering attempt to placate some future physician into an even greater implied indictment of the profession, as well as of Democritus Junior's lack of principle. There are innumerable instances of such spinelessness and lack of consistency on the persona's part, and Burton emphasizes them throughout the Anatomy, as I shall try to show later, in the close examination of the first edition.

The pedantry and copia of Democritus Junior are everywhere to be seen; when he promises to be brief, the reader does not believe he is capable of such restraint, as when, in the Third Partition, he assures

us, "I will not here insert any consolatory sentences, or forestall any mans invention, but leave it every man to dilate and amplifie as he shall thinke fit himselfe . . . only this will I adde . . ." (p. 690). Predictably, several pages are then filled with such dicta, not all of them, however, being very consoling to the sufferer. Much more characteristic, however, than this verbosity, is his frequent advocacy of methods of treatment that can only be described as extremely inhumane; the cruelty he often shows may be an offspin of his famed ingenuousness, but it is noticeable and objectionable, for Burton seems to emphasize this facet of his persona's character. In the Third Partition, for example, when dealing with the intractability of men in the grips of love-fever, he suggests that a concerned friend of humanity, recognizing the situation, may resort to any means to rectify the matter:

> Tell him but how he was scoffed at behind his backe, that his love is false, and entertaines another, caresnot for him, or that she is a foole, a nasty queane, a slut, a fixen, a scolde, a divell, or which Italians commonly doe, that he or she hath some lothsome filthy disease, gout, strangurie, falling sicknesse, the Poxe, that he hath three or foure incurable tetters, issues: that she is balde, her breathe stinkes, she is mad by inheritance, and so are all the kinred, an harebrane, with many other secret infirmities, which I will not so much as name, belonging to women. (p. 636)

In this case, and as will become clear throughout, there is apparent an obsession on the part of Democritus Junior with the things that he pretends to despise; he Latinizes his advice at this point, and though repulsive, it is an amusing reflection of the depths to which he will

sink.[1] The whole seems to be a deliberate effort on Burton's part to show Democritus Junior's disregard for rudimentary ethics in his attempt to treat the disease of love; the persona takes a great deal of pleasure in dabbling in these forbidden fields: he is willing to go beyond the bounds of common decency and morality in his admonitions to those who err, and the pursuit fascinates him. This sort of vicarious Peeping-Tomism forces him to ignore the humanitarian approach except as a last resort; after advocating, for example, some other drastic cures for love-melancholy, he admits, "As there be many causes of this burning lust or heroicall love. So there be many good remedies to ease and helpe, amongst which is good council and perswasion, which I should have handled in the first place, are of great moment, and not to be omitted" (p. 638, italics mine). Thus he gives the game away quite openly. Democritus Junior is not guilty of simple disorganization; like the mad lovers, he "dotes" and is preoccupied, swayed by his passions when he comes into contact with love's allurements; he, like his lovers, loses his head.

Burton's persona is, then, a fascinating character whose relationship to his creator is complex yet comprehensible. Like Swift's

[1]Floyd Dell and Paul Jordan-Smith, The Anatomy of Melancholy (Tudor Publishing Co., 1941), p. 776, translate the passage thus: "Gordonius adviseth in this manner: and having brought secretly a menstruous rag, if these things will not persuade, draw forth on a sudden, flourish it before the face, crying out, Such is thy beloved; and if this will not cure him, he is not a man but a devill incarnate. Avicenna saith the same: let some old woman tell of filthy things concerning women."

Gulliver, he is a puppet: at one moment he is the indignant, amusing railer in the satyr-mould, assailing a corrupt society, seeing through all the veils of respectability that cover it; at another, he is the poet-priest-doctor, acting as a mask for his author, protecting him from would-be critics, for Burton can always protest, "It is not I but Democritus Junior who says so." Or again, the persona is himself a fool, the embodiment of the very folly he is seeking to cure; he is ingenuous, cowardly, egotistical and quite paranoid, with his repressions frequently showing through. Whilst capable of seeing the faults in others, he is blind to his own, and Burton, with poetic justice, strips him and leaves him exposed. An understanding of his function is vital, and only a close reading of the work shows adequately the sophistication of Burton's conception of him; like Erasmus' "Folly," the accomplishment is, in the end, a satiric tour de force, worthy of a great satirist.

Another important indication of the Anatomy of Melancholy's membership of the satiric kind can be received from an examination of its form. Whether it be called an "anatomy" or a Menippean Satire,[1]

[1]T. E. Wright characterizes the form thus: "The principal aim of the anatomists, which distinguishes them from writers of openly discursive works, was the representation of ideas. And, for this purpose, they utilized literary forms that had served the writers of non-fictional discursive works. Some of these non-fictional forms are

it is clear from the apparently amorphous shape of the Anatomy that its kinship is with the satura; its "scientific" framework is a thin disguise for the reality of its achievement, and generations of critics have been impressed by its encyclopedic range, one of the chief characteristics of the satura form. The satura does have a pattern--as was the case with the formal verse satire--but it is the loose one of the extended essay (Montaigne's influence upon Burton is everywhere to be seen in the Anatomy). It is not ordered chronologically, as in a narrative, and its purported subject is often an excuse to allow the author to get down to his real business. Since Burton has provided deliberately misleading though elaborate "Synopses" of the three Partitions, I shall supply an omission by presenting a similar schema of the Preface, for it is a relatively brief example of the satura at work, apparently diffuse, seemingly repetitious, but really under the control of Burton:

I. "A reason of this name, title, subject."
   1. Justification of the pseudonym, 1-5.
   2. Reasons for the title of the book, 5-6.
   3. Defence of the matter and manner of the book, 6-10.
      (a) Personal involvement.

---

the diatribe, the encomium, the formal essay, and the character. In the anatomy, these forms are utilized in fiction. In addition, the writers of the anatomy utilized literary forms that had already served the purpose of fiction. Some of these forms are the debate, or council, the journey, the dialogue, and the letter collection . . . . In all cases, the anatomy is marked by the subordination of the fictive elements to the direct presentation of ideas" (pp. 14-15).

(b) Macaronic form.
(c) Style.
(d) Language.

4. Why "a divine meddles in physicke," 10-13.
   (a) Inclination.
   (b) Utility.
   (c) Precedent.
   (d) Common sense.

II. "The generalitie of the Disease, the necessitie of the cure, and the comoditie or common good."

1. Universality of disease, 13.
   (a) Ancient philosophers, 17.
   (b) Christians, 18.
   (c) All men, 18-21.
2. Story of Democritus of Abdera, 21-26.
3. How Democritus would react to modern "madness," 26-27.
   (a) Religion, 27-28.
   (b) Wars, 28-31.
   (c) Other forms, 31-36.
4. The lack of concern over a cure, 36-38.
5. "Kingdomes, Provinces, Families" mad, 39-43.
   (a) Vegetals and sensibles, 43.
   (b) Kingdoms, provinces and political bodies, 44-50.
      i. England, 50.
      ii. Unfavorable comparison with rest of world, 51-55.
      iii. Burton's Utopia, 56-61.
   (c) Madness in families, 61-63.
   (d) Assorted madness: princes, great men, philosophers and scholars, lovers, covetous, prodigals, angry, 63-67.

III. 1. General Summation, 67-68.
2. Return to justification of self, 68-72.

The first thirteen pages of the Preface supply vital information about the character and aims of the persona: he must appear attractive, for Burton has to ensure that he will hold the readers' attention right from the start. The tone is, therefore, bantering, ironic, and urbane, but it is underscored by that element of conceit and disregard for logic that is to be the trade mark of Democritus Junior's pronouncements throughout, and which makes his display of erudition somehow less

frightening. In these first pages, there are many other indications of the satiric nature of the work, and the satiric precedents out of which the persona grows; these will be analysed more scrupulously in the later part of the thesis.

Pages thirteen to sixty-seven mark a shift to a more serious and impersonal tone. This is only fitting, as Democritus Junior now outlines the subject of the Anatomy, insisting that what he calls melancholy is in fact tantamount to all human folly and frailty that result from the Fall, and from which no age, no man, is exempt. This is highlighted by a practical scheme to show that, imperfect as men are, they can construct by the aid of common-sense a much better world than this; yet Democritus Junior is cynically confident that such a plan will be ignored, classified as "utopian," or scoffed at: this is perhaps the greatest indictment of human folly, though it is implied, not spelt out as the others are.

The last five pages of the Preface mark a return to the whimsical and sardonic tone of the earlier part. Again the persona reveals more about his own fluctuating character, and the "scene" is set for the lengthy dissection of human frailities that is to follow in the Anatomy proper.

As a pace-setter, the Preface is of tremendous value to Burton, and the amount of adding he did to it, as will be seen later in this thesis, is proof of his appreciation of its potentialities. It represents

a very useful example of the satura in operation; though superficially it is no more than the rather odd introduction to a serious medical work, it introduces us to a satiric persona who is to be the butt of satire himself, and it assembles a strongly traditional array of topics under the guise of describing the symptoms of a particular human disease.

The catalogues of topics dealt with in the Preface are forerunners of those that are analysed in the major part of the Anatomy, though vastly expanded and amplified there. It is fitting that the subject of books themselves gives him most ammunition. Books and their authors are everywhere the butt of Burton's satire in the Anatomy; their vanity, their pretensions, their inconsistencies, their lack of originality, and their redundance are pilloried--though, sometimes, they supply more practical wants than they intended: ". . . not onely Libraries and Shoppes, are full of our putid papers, but ever closestoole and iakes; they serve to put under pies, to lappe in spice, and keepe rostemeat from burning" (p. 8). Nor does Democritus Junior exempt his own book from the rubbish heap, suggesting that only the reader "who employs his leisure ill" will take the trouble to read it. Contemporary satirists like Nashe and Marston show precisely this affected diffidence in some of their writings, but it is part of the tradition of satire, and not to be taken too seriously.

Other more traditional butts of satire are not neglected. Since ancient times, lawyers, doctors, and scholars (philosophers and divines fall into this category) had been berated by satirists for one reason or another, and Burton sees little evidence of any improvement in their conduct that might cause him to deviate from an honoured tradition. Lawyers, for example, are so circumscribed by the very nature of the law that few men of ability enter that profession:

> . . . the Civill Law with us [is] so contracted with prohibitions, so few causes, by reason of those all devouring municipall Lawes, quibus nihil illiteratius, saith Erasmus, an illiterate and barbarous study (for though they be never so well versed in it, I can hardly vouchsafe them the name of Schollers, except they be otherwise qualified), and so few courts are left to that profession, so few offices, and those commonly to be compassed at such rates, that I know not how an ingenious man shall thrive amongst them. (p. 176)

This is the kind of attack he launches throughout the Anatomy, showing very little faith in the system of law that discourages honest students and induces universal melancholy.

Another traditional target of satire in the Anatomy, and one that is especially noticeable in a "medical" work, is the medical profession itself. One has to contend, of course, with the many self-contradictions of Democritus Junior in this area, but in general his opinion of doctors, whether they be followers of Galen or of Paracelsus, is rather low:

> Now for Physitians, there are in every Village so many Mountibanks, Empiricks, Quacsalvers, Paracelsians, as they call themselves, Wisards, Alcumists, poore Vicars, cast Apothecaries and Physitians men, Barbers, and Goodwives that professe great skill, that I know not how they shal maintaine themselves, or who shall be their Patients. (p. 176)

It is odd how Democritus Junior can expect a patient to have faith in his doctor--yet he says it is vital the sufferer should--when he harasses the profession so much, and exposes the bogus practitioners with such comprehensive abuse.

In the Anatomy, scholars, philosophers and divines are often closely associated as products of, and connivers in, the universal folly; Burton, a combination of all three himself, is particularly harsh in his treatment of them, once again following the path of tradition. It is in the famous "Digression of Aire" that Democritus Junior most pointedly examines the inexplicable contradictions amongst the wise, but throughout the Anatomy he bemoans the lack of virtuous priests, attacks the rout of dishonest and spineless scholars, and denounces the rubbish that is touted as wisdom by philosophers. Yet, for much of this, he faults the niggardliness of those who ought to assist the men who struggle for wisdom, insisting that the system of patronage that was the chief means of aiding the poor divine or scholar was defective. Satirists in the past, like Petronius and Lucian, had shown the irresponsibility of those amongst the rich who neglected their duties towards learning. Nowhere in the Anatomy is Burton's agreement with the traditional satirists more evident than on this question; Democritus Junior gives numerous striking instances of the reliance of men of erudition upon the ignorant rich to prove his point. He provides, for example, an insight into the humiliation involved in such utter dependence:

> If after long expectation and much and earnest suit of our selves and friends, we obtaine a small benefice at last: our misery begins a fresh, we light upon a crackt title, or stand in feare of some precedent Lapse, or some litigious people, that will not pay their dues without much repining, or compelled by long suit; all they thinke well gotten that is had from the Church, and by such uncivill, harsh dealings, they make their poore Minister a weary of his place if not of his life: and put case they be quiet honest men, make the best of it, as often falls out, hee must turne rusticke, and dayly converse with a company of Idiots and Clownes.
> (pp. 185-86)

This is a gloomy picture of the lot of a scholar in seventeenth-century England; at best, mere atrophy of the spirit is his reward, at worst, utter starvation. Critics like Bergen Evans have suggested that all of this is simply the neurotic outpourings of Burton's own wounded psyche, but they fail to recognize it as being very much a part of a tradition that had begun many centuries before, and part of the stock-in-trade of the writer of satire. Burton was not an unsuccessful scholar anyway: he had achieved a large measure of fame and had much less to complain of than the majority of his fellows. A fuller examination of his position will be made later in this thesis, when it will become clear that many of the most apparently personal grievances were introduced in the editions after 1621, when the Anatomy had become a best-seller, and Burton a man of stature.

The list of topics that Burton analyses seems endless--as is only proper in satura. Religion, and especially popery, the horrors of war, the discrepancy between appearance and reality, poverty, suicide, and of course, women (who are abused for almost one entire Partition)

are amongst the subjects that are satirised in page after page of the Anatomy. Like Juvenal, one of his many satiric masters, the only thing that silences Burton is time:

> His alias poteram et plures subnecter causas,
> Sed jumenta vocant, et Sol inclinat, eundum est.

> Many such causes, much more could I say,
> But that for provender my cattle stay:
> The Sun declines and I must needes away. (p. 219)

Whilst all these signs would, in themselves, indicate the presence at least of large chunks of satire in the Anatomy of Melancholy, there are, inseparably linked to them, abundant examples of the techniques peculiar to satire, of which Burton is a master, and of which the Anatomy is a vast amalgam. Indeed, as must be clear already, one of the problems in establishing the author's point of view stems from this very technique of citing so many other satirists; the context of the original author's work, or at least its ironic tone has to be taken into account, then modified by the context in which the persona, Democritus Junior, cites him; and all this has to be balanced against Burton's reasons for allowing him to do so at that particular point in the work.

The Anatomy of Melancholy utilizes a number of satiric devices which can best be examined in the next chapter, where they may be studied in their contexts, though here, at least, an outline of their multiplicity might be in order. Latin, for example, is used throughout the Anatomy for satiric purposes at important moments, and Democritus Junior's claim that he would have preferred to have it published in Latin in the first

place is suspect accordingly. "Digressions," which are really quite integral to Burton's use of the satura form occur with apparent casualness, though they always prove to be vitally related to the context in which they appear. More obviously the tools of the satirist are the numerous "catalogues" and mini-"anatomies," words heaped upon words with seeming carelessness. The mock-odyssey, which is the guiding motif of the "Digression of Aire," and the mock-encomium are also major structural devices in the Anatomy. All the standard devices of satire are to be found as important tone-setting factors; ridicule, irony, sarcasm, invective, diminutio, and such characteristics as vignettes and miniature dramas, are there in abundance. In short, all of the features that are described by theorists as being integral to the satiric kind can readily be detected in the Anatomy. Unless the underlying satiric bases for the use of such mechanisms is sensed by the reader, however, he can easily start to identify Burton with his persona, transforming a writer of wit and subtlety into an ingenuous old man whom it is convenient to patronize. In the later part of this thesis, specific instances of the mastery of the satiric techniques will appear, clearing Burton of the identification.

This over-view of the Anatomy, then, surely suggests that the work has a sufficient number of the characteristics of satire to merit a serious study to determine whether or not it is satiric in its entirety, and not just an encyclopedic hotch-potch, obscure in its aims, and

lacking a coherent vision to guide its author through a morass of culture. To sum up: it has often been conceded that the Anatomy does have its satiric moments, and thus far in this chapter I have tried to show just how extensive these are, and from what diverse areas in the Anatomy they can be drawn. The fact that the work has so much in common with that large body of equally hard-to-categorize Renaissance prose works with which it is contemporary, and that it contains so many easily discernible characteristics of the satiric mode is the basis for the inquiry that this thesis undertakes. Most critics of the Anatomy have had their problems in presenting a coherent picture of it, and this indicates that a closer examination of the original, less weighty edition, followed by an analysis of the additions and revisions, might unveil much that has hitherto gone unrecognised about its nature. Having inferred from the over-view just given that the Anatomy has all the ingredients of satire, I shall proceed, in Chapter Four, to that closer analysis, to show, if possible, how the pieces fit together and how the apparent exceptions are integral to the general satiric aim. Through this examination I hope to show that the Anatomy of Melancholy is a satiric work, written in the satura form by a master of the various techniques of the satiric mode, who steers his persona, Democritus Junior, with skill and artistry through that "Irish Sea" of folly that is the book's subject.

CHAPTER IV

THE FIRST EDITION

A close reading of the first edition of the Anatomy of Melancholy gives added weight to the contention that Burton was consciously writing a satiric work in 1621. There is a great deal of evidence that the form he employs is that of the satura, a traditional vehicle for the satirist; that he utilises exhaustively the techniques of the satiric mode, ranging from the introduction of a satiric persona to the pervasive but less easily detectable use of irony; that he attacks without let a multitude of targets which are by tradition and contemporary practice closely associated with the conventions of satire; and, finally, that even those parts of the Anatomy that seem most distant from the satirist's territory, and most appropriate to a more scientific work, often have notable affiliations with the traditions of satire, and have important roles within the overall satiric scheme of the Anatomy. In this chapter, I shall examine the form of the first edition of the Anatomy, its techniques and the targets of its attacks, and I shall pay special attention to those areas that seem least suited to satire, beginning with the innocuous title and preliminary matter, which are important indicators of its potentially satiric nature, particularly in the expanded, later editions. It is with the first edition version of the preliminaries that this analysis opens.

The title and preliminary matter of the first edition of the Anatomy of Melancholy, though relatively unassuming, contain a number of suggestions as to the satiric nature of the work they precede, and deserve careful consideration. The title-page reads as follows:

> The / Anatomy of / Melancholy, / What it is. / With all the Kindes / Causes, / Symptomes, Prog- / nostickes, and seve / -rall cures of it. / In Three Maine Partitions / with their severall Sections, Mem- / bers, and Subsec / tions. / Philosophically, Medici- / nally, historically, ope- / ned and cut up. / By / Democritus Iunior. / With a Satyricall Preface, conducing to / the following Discourse. / Macrob. / Omne meum, Nihil meum. / At Oxford, / Printed by Iohn Lichfield and Iames / Short, for Henry Cripps. / Anno Dom. 1621.

There is here none of the elaborate machinery developed in the later editions to give clearer indications of what the reader might expect to find within; on the basis of a familiarity with the traditions of satire, however, there are hints aplenty in the title alone. Yet, Sir Edward Bensly, a major Burton scholar, comments:

> To the modern reader, "Anatomy of Melancholy" may seem a quaint title . . . But both before and after 1621 anatomy was sufficiently common in the sense of the systematic dissection of a subject. It is not always realized that another part of the title is on extremely conventional lines. I suggested this in the Modern Language Review, iv, 233, and it has since been asserted much more strongly by Professor J. L. Lowes of Harvard in Modern Philology, vol. xi, p. 541. 'The categories enumerated on Burton's title-page . . . are those which are found almost uniformly in mediaeval medical works. . . . There is no question whatever of a borrowing from this that or the other particular treatise. The divisions there enumerated are as conventional as the five acts of a play.'[1]

[1] OBS, 199.

Whatever may have been the case in the middle ages, there had developed by the late Renaissance period a whole tradition surrounding the anatomy-concept that led the reader to expect something other than a medieval medical work. In addition, the title does not stop at "cure of it," but goes on to parody the very kind of title page to which Bensly and Lowe refer, by its wordiness and pretentiousness.[1] Burton himself, I feel, would be amused at their erudite, but misplaced, acceptance of his title; in the Anatomy proper, the title is claimed to be deliberately 'quaint':

> Howsoever it is a kind of policy in these dayes, to prefixe a phantasticall title to a booke which is to be sold, for as larkes come downe to a day-net, many vaine Readers will tarry and stand gasing like silly passengers, at an Anticke picture in a painters shoppe that will not looke at a judicious piece. (p. 5)

It is surely unwise to ignore these observations on the choice of title; it is "phantasticall" rather than conventional on purpose, and acts as a snare to catch unwary readers, much as the satyr traps his victims.

The name Democritus Junior also is suggestive, as I have indicated, and Burton has his persona go out of his way early in the Preface to "dispel" any misapprehension that might have arisen from seeing it there. The pseudonym recalls, amongst other things, In Praise of Folly, in the Dedication to which Erasmus compares his friend

[1]The same technique is used in the titles of Nashe's Anatomie of Absurditie, and Harington's Metamorphosis of Ajax.

More to Democritus,"because you usually enjoy jokes of this kind that are not unlearned." Democritus, the laughing philosopher, is frequently used as a touchstone by satirists throughout the Renaissance.[1]

Finally, the Latin tag from Macrobius, the fifth-century satiric author of the Saturnalia, is indicative of the nature of Burton's work, and is an implicit commentary on the satura-structure--the patch-work quilt. Burton employs the works of countless satirists ancient and modern throughout the Anatomy, tying them together in his inimitable fashion. As a result, one always has the sensation that one is reading a compilation of gobbets from other writers, yet at the same time one appreciates the method whereby they are filtered to the reader.

These indications of the satiric nature of the work to follow can be elicited from a rather sparse title-page, upon which, in subsequent editions, Burton takes care to elaborate at length. A close examination of "Democritus to the Reader" yields similar fruits, showing how ingeniously Burton manipulated the complexities of his satiric vision in preparation for the work to follow.

The "Satyricall Preface" itself is composed of two major parts: in one, Democritus Junior defends himself and his qualifications for the

[1]Once again, Babb, Sanity, p. 32, paves the way in this matter, giving many examples of the practice; it is interesting to note that Milton, another great prose satirist, makes use of the distinction in his Sixth Prolusion, Works, XII, 207.

job he is attempting; in the other, he defends his thesis. The Preface may seem rather loosely organized, as satura often does, but there is a very firm pattern as was demonstrated earlier,[1] and only the reader who skims (a very tempting approach at first prospect) finds it repetitious. Passages that seem mere rehashes of what had gone before turn out to be complementary, not redundant, and contribute to the over-all satiric scheme. In its opening pages, a number of important pointers as to the nature of the Anatomy of Melancholy emerge, the most notable of which is Burton's conscious use of the satiric tradition: the "anatomy" concept is the framework of operation, a persona is used so that the satiric ends may be pursued unhampered, and the reader is constantly referred to satiric precedent in the work of the famous satirists of antiquity and the present. Most important, however, Burton endorses a conception of the satirist that combines and yet transcends the functions of priest and physician; they are sublimated, or "sunk" in the satiric art. This is the pattern that is to dominate the whole Anatomy, the roles of physician and divine always being controlled by the satiric over-view. On those rare occasions where they seem, momentarily, to overpower the satiric, Burton "makes amends" for the lapse with passages of undisguised satire. To appreciate this, it is vital to understand the role of the persona in the Anatomy, and it is in the

[1]See above, p. 163.

"Satyricall Preface" that Burton has the best opportunity of displaying him to the reader. The persona's personality, therefore, dominates the entire Preface, and from an examination of this part of the work, a clear picture of his function may emerge.

Democritus Junior opens the first part of the Preface by setting the "scene" for himself. Here and throughout, he calls himself an "actor", and the world "this common theatre", linking himself with the tradition that takes the origins of satire back to the drama.[1] But, most importantly, as we saw in Chapter Three, he dwells upon the pseudonym "Democritus Junior" and the conjunction of roles that it suggests.[2]

Yet another connection between the persona and the origins of satire occurs near the beginning of the Preface, when Democritus Junior avows, "Saturne was the Lord of my geniture." There was, throughout the Renaissance, an apocryphal though meaningful association made between Saturn and "satire" which led to the belief that one born under Saturn is fated to be not just a melancholic, but a satirist. Democritus Junior later confirms this view of the link between the two in other terms:

> . . . I did for my recreation now and then walke abroad, and looke into the world, & could not choose but make some little observation, not as they did to scoffe or laugh at all, but with a mixt passion, . . . I did sometime laugh and

[1]See above, p. 156.

[2]See above, pp. 150-51.

> scoffe with Lucian, and Satyrically taxe with Menippus, weepe with Heraclitus, sometimes againe I was petulanti splene cachinno, and then againe urere bilis jecur, I was much mooved to see that abuse which I could not amend. (pp. 4-5)

These references to the great satirists of antiquity by the persona imply that his vision is like theirs: the Latin phrases are from Persius and Horace respectively, and the affinity he sees between himself, Lucian, and Menippus (the "saturnine" satirist) are indicative of his purpose.

One of the most significant things we learn, however, about the persona from his satiric apologia (for that is what the entire Preface is), is transmitted through the deliberately confusing way in which he tells the reader about his aims in writing such a work: from his conflicting claims we discover much about his erratic logic and about the satiric intentions of the work. Early in the Preface he employs the evasive tactics that are frequently used in satire; he avers ironically that his intent is not so much to cure others' melancholy as it is to keep himself busy:

> I write of Melancholy, by being busie to avoid Melancholy. . . . Which I was very desirous to be unladen of, and could imagine no fitter evacuation than this. Besides I could not well refraine, for ubi dolor ibi digitus, one must needs scrat where it itcheth. (p. 6)

There follows a secondary, conflicting aim, which is rather more philanthropic than the one above: "I wil spend my time and knowledge which are my greatest fortunes for the common good of all" (p. 7). This is the traditional satiric ploy, and by it Burton indicts his persona for

his inconsistency: the explicit contradiction revealed in Democritus Junior's thinking is typical of many of his contentions throughout the Anatomy, where the innocently expressed personal motive is seemingly at odds with the altruistic general avowal of good.

A similar inconsistency appears later, when Democritus Junior gets down to the consideration of which kinds of melancholy he will be attempting to cure. It has been customary amongst those who wish to make the Anatomy a scientific rather than a satiric work to claim that it attempts a serious cure only of those who have a specific, severe form of melancholy.[1] These critics assert that Burton really intended, in the words of Democritus Junior, "to say no more of such as are improperly Melancholy, or metaphorically mad, lightly mad, or in disposition," and that in the Anatomy he concentrates upon the advanced forms of the disease. Such a view is extremely difficult to maintain in the face of what happens later in the Anatomy. Democritus Junior goes on to speak about the generality of even the apparently more chronic aspects of the disease, borrowing a remark from Claudius that "scarce one of a thousand is free from it." The subject of the Three Partitions, at any rate, turns out to be that same "universal" malady of the Preface--we find discussions upon all the same general manifestations of folly, in the context of Causes, Symptoms, and Cures of melancholy; the famous Third

[1]See above, pp. 13ff.

Partition on love is based entirely upon the idea that all the world, except, perhaps, the "expert" Democritus Junior himself, has been caught in its snares. Certainly such a contradiction must instil caution into the reader: the words of Democritus Junior must always be regarded circumspectly, with no undue weight being attached to any one of his many conflicting pronouncements.

Democritus Junior, having stolen his very name, therefore, advances to face the charge of plagiarism, and in so doing, truculantly reveals another paradoxical trait in his character, a mixture of timidity and wilfulness. The former quality makes him appear often as a spineless creature, the latter impels him frequently to attack the most respected social groups with bravado. With respect to the issue of plagiarism, the mixture is in evidence; he confesses his own derivativeness with apparent diffidence, but simultaneously launches an attack by implication on scholars with whom he may be confused:

> Yea but you will inferre, that this is actum agere, an unnecessary worke, cramben bis coctam apponere, the same againe and againe in other words: How many excellent Physitians have written just Volumes and elaborate Tracts of this subject? no newes at all, all that which I have is stolne from others, Dicitque tibi tua pagina fur es. I hold up my hand at the barre amongst the rest, and am guilty of fellony in this kind, habes confitentem reum, I am content to be pressed with the rest. (p. 7)

Ironically, this is precisely the charge that has been laid against Burton himself over the years, and it stems from a failure to distinguish

between him and his persona, who in this instance, "confesses" in order to attack.

The same satiric illogic that he displays throughout is illustrated when Democritus Junior takes the opportunity to attack the book trade,which is so indiscriminate as to publish such books as the Anatomy. He consigns the Anatomy to the universal rubbish-heap, yet at the same time defends the uniqueness of his method: ". . . we can say nothing but what hath been said, the composition and method is ours onely, and shew a scholler" (p. 9). He reiterates that if critics should charge him with plagiarism he will show that others have acted just as disgracefully, and he becomes humorously adamant on the matter in a way reminiscent of Nashe's attitude towards Harvey: "Oppose what thou wilt, I solve it thus" (p. 9). His self-acclaimed method is, paradoxically, no method at all:

> And for those other faults of Barbarisme Doricke dialecte, extemporean stile, Tautologies, apish imitation, a rapsodie of severall rags gathered together from severall dunghills, and confusedly tumbled out: without art, invention, judgement, witte, learning, harsh, absurd, insolent, indiscreet, ill composed, vaine, scurrile, idle, dull, and drie; I confesse all, thou canst not thinke worse of me then I do of my selfe. (p. 9)[1]

[1]Wesley Trimpi, Ben Jonson's Poems, A Study of the Plain Style (Stanford University Press: 1962), pp. 35-36, cites this passage, and associates Burton with those seventeenth-century satirists who "described their style in similar terms, and boasted of their lack of composition."

His crowning argument is, "Thus as when women scold, have I cried whore first," a typical abnegation of logic on his own part, yet an insight into the techniques of scholarly debate.

In this defence against the charge of plagiarism, therefore, Burton manages to exhibit the irrationality of his persona, and at the same time uses him to attack the vanity of authors and the uselessness of many of the works being published. Throughout the Anatomy, the persona is utilised in this way: one moment Democritus Junior reveals an abuse in society, and in the next, shows serious flaws in his own character of which he is made to seem blissfully unaware.

A similar, though more humorous instance of the persona's ingenuous honesty occurs later in the Preface shortly before the utopian scheme is proposed. He has been extremely daring on this occasion, challenging, amongst other things, the integrity of the professions and the credibility of governments. Here, it might be claimed, if anywhere, political caution is the reason for Burton's employing a persona, or for the persona's using a pseudonym, for Democritus Junior makes some telling and incisive criticisms of abuses in England itself. He confesses his fears of reprisals with characteristic openness:

> I could here justly taxe many other neglects, abuses, errours, defects amongst us and in other countries, depopulations, riot, drunkennesse, etc., and many such . . . but I must take heed . . . that I doe not overshoote my selfe. I am forth of my element, and sometimes veritas odium parit, as he said, verjuice and oatemeale is good for a Parret. (p. 54)

He implies that he has further knowledge he dare not print, but this may be no more than a way of rousing the reader's interest. As for the idea of his being out of his element (something that has not worried him in his undertaking so far), it is discredited by the accuracy of the acute observations he has so far made. His final schoolboy-ish translation of the self-admonitory phrase so relevant to the realities of the satirist's position may be read as mere juvenile nonsense, but perhaps it suggests something about his own parrot-like function as utiliser of others' words, for words themselves are the tools of fools, and can be twisted to mean anything by just a little malevolent ingenuity.[1]

Another indication in the Preface of the persona's "flexibility" appears when he comes to consider the general lack of genuine concern about the cure of melancholy. Just as, earlier, he had suggested that he wrote to avoid melancholy himself, so he now takes another amusing tack, saying: "I will doe as I have done, as my predecessors have done, and as my friends now doe: I will dote for company" (p. 38). This claim strikingly indicates the depths of folly to which men will plunge in the interests of social conformity, and shows Democritus Junior's own quite paradoxical stance with respect to the task he has undertaken:

[1]At the same time it is an indication of Burton's capability of mistranslating or taking words out of context to suit his own purposes. His later distortion of Virgil's lines about the liar, Sinon, suggests another interesting parallel to Swift's use of the lines in Part IV of Gulliver's Travels.

> I am of Democritus opinion for my part, I hold them worthy to be laughed at, a company of disards, that they may goe ride the asse, or all saile along to the Anticyrae, in the ship of fooles for company together. I need not much labour to proove this which I say otherwise then thus, or make any solemne protestation, or sweare, I thinke you will beleve me without an oath, say, at a word, are they fooles? I referre it to you (though you be likewise fooles your selves.) Il'e stand to your censure, what thinke you? (pp. 38-39)

This passage ironically suggests Democritus Junior's awareness of the impossibility of ever finding a cure for the disease. He has identified himself and his audience with the fools whom he has just described, appealing therefore to fools for a judgement which, by definition, they are incapable of giving. The direct and intimate appeal, however, effectively instils in the reader the impression of a persona who is a mixture of the incisive and the ingenuous.

In the final pages of the Preface, comes Democritus Junior's ultimate statement about the aims of the Anatomy and about the responsibilities he carries as "author." These final pages again reveal Burton's awareness of the tradition of satire, and make it palpably improbable that such a persona as Democritus Junior should be the narrator of a work with a serious scientific intent. The persona sets about making a hypothetical but appropriate occasion for the composition of such a work as the Anatomy:

> It was written by an idle fellow, at idle times, about our Saturnalian or Dionysian feasts, when as he said nullum libertati periculum est, servants in old Rome had liberty to say and doe what them list. When our Countrimen sacrificed to their goddesse Vacuna, and set to turning an apple with a pot of ale and a toste by their Vacunall fires, I writt this and published this. (p. 71)

As one of the "lords of misrule," free to indulge himself as a "satyr," he can justify the putative liberties that he has taken in the composition of the Anatomy. His recollection of the appeal for the licence which is required by the very decorum of satire ends with mock-defiance: ". . . so why may I not then be idle with others? speake my minde freely, If you deny me this liberty, upon these presumptions I will take it: I say againe, I will take it" (p. 71).

Firmness such as this would, however, be uncharacteristic of Democritus Junior. Since he must always leave himself a way out of any commitment that might injure him, he immediately reverses his attitude with that typical Uriah Heep-ish gesture of diffidence that the reader has come to expect:

> No, I recant, I will not, I confesse my fault and acknowledge a great offence, I have overshot my selfe, I have spoken foolishly, rashly, unadvisedly, absurdly, I have anatomized mine owne folly. (p. 71)

This is an intriguing ploy. It suggests that the satirist, in analysing the "faults" of others, betrays his own predilections, and is diagnosing himself; this leads Democritus Junior to promise a "more sober discourse in my following Treatise." Confusion abounds here, for this is a palpable misrepresentation of what in fact does follow, especially when he goes on to ascribe his motives for writing not to any moralistic intent, but to his own "weakness, folly, passion, discontent, ignorance." Burton has no wish to make his persona a reliable and consistent "scientific" analyst.

In the Preface, then, the persona serves a number of important satiric purposes: Democritus Junior is both satirist and satirised, epitomising a world where no one is exempt from folly; by the confusions he introduces into the matter of the Anatomy's composition and aim, he bewilders the readers who are expecting a scientific work of which he is putative author; but most important of all, he gives the work that peculiarly half-ironic, half-sincere tone that has delighted readers of the Anatomy over the years. Apart from this central function of the persona in the Preface, however, there are a host of other satiric techniques operating in it which are worthy of examination, and I shall now pass to them.[1]

The Preface itself is a splendid example of the satiric apologia, and is linked to the preface to the Third Partition and to the "Conclusion of the Author to the Reader," with both of which I shall be dealing later. In general, the tradition of the satiric apologia involves the satirist's "coming clean," and humbly telling his audience what his true intention is. Usually it is spoken by a satiric persona, and is as misleading as misunderstood irony can be. In this case, the apologist is the confusing figure Democritus Junior, and his conflicting aims and ambitions with respect to his book effectively befuddle the reader whilst preparing the way for the satire to follow.[2]

[1]See above, p. 171 for a summary of such techniques.

[2]Cf. pp. 153ff.

Another major feature of Burton's technique which adds to the "obscurity" of the satire becomes evident even from the first pages: the wealth of quotation, especially from satiric sources. The first two verse citations in the Preface, for example, are from Martial and Juvenal respectively, and a list of the satirists used as authorities in the Anatomy would constitute a comprehensive catalogue of all the best (and many not so good) satiric writers of western culture.[1] The appeal to satiric precedent and tradition is one of the clues that the writer is employing the satiric mode himself, even though it is often bewildering to the reader, who must consider the spirit of the originals and question the motive behind their use. The clearest example of the complexity resulting from the practice occurs in the passage examined in the last chapter, where the unveiling of a series of satiric masks becomes well-nigh impossible.[2]

One other important satiric device which appears in the Preface, and throughout the Anatomy, and which has distinct affinities with the "loose" form of the satura, is the so-called "digression." Just as most of the satiric techniques used by Burton and by the other satirists of his day had been codified by the rhetoricians, so this one, formally called parecbasis, was assigned its place and function. Thus Thomas Wilson describes it:

[1]A few of the prominent satirists he cites are: Aretino, Chaucer, Erasmus, Horace, Jonson, Juvenal, Lucian, Martial, Persius, Petronius, and Rabelais.

[2]See above, pp. 153ff.

> . . . we swarve sometimes from the matter, upon just considerations, making the same to serve for our purpose, as well as if we had kept the matter still. As . . . when I shall . . . declame against a hainous murtherer, I may digresse from the offence done, and enter in praise of the dead man, declaring his vertues in most ample wise, that the offence done may be thought so much the greater, the more honest he was, that hath thus bene slaine.[1]

An equally tricky problem is involved in ending digressions, as Wilson warns:

> When we have made a digression, wee may declare our returne. . . . I knewe a Preacher that was a whole hower out of his matter, and at length remembring himself, saied well, now to the purpose, whereat many laughed, and some for starke wearinesse were faine to goe away.[2]

The intent of the digression is clear: it is to allow the satirist to change course rapidly to explore some other aspect of folly that he feels is important though not immediately appropriate to the particular subject he has been considering. The digression turns out to be an extremely useful tool in the Anatomy, where the central target is no less than the universal folly of man, making all his actions in some way interlinked.

The first major digression in the Anatomy, like all the others, is not at all irrelevant, but springs from the informing satiric vision of the total work. It comes early in the Preface, and it concerns the ancient Democritus, the satirist who laughs in order not to weep, from whom the persona has taken his name. The dialogue-format of this

[1] The Arte of Rhetorique (London, 1585), p. 181.

[2] Ibid., p. 182.

digression (important for its links with the hypothetical origins of satire[1]) is significant: in a world of fools, there are only two wise men available, Hippocrates, the renowned medical doctor, and Democritus, the spiritual surgeon and anatomist of the soul. In other words, both form and participants take us to the very roots of satire. In a series of bitter passages that give a foretaste of Swift, Democritus tells Hippocrates the reasons why he laughs at man's folly:

> To see men so empty of all vertuous actions, to hunt so farre after gold, having no end of ambition, to take such infinite paines for a little glory, and to be favored of men, to make such deepe mines into the earth for gold, and many times to find nothing, with losse of their lives and fortunes. Some to love dogges, others horses, some to desire to be obeyed in many provinces and yet themselves will knowe no obedience. Some to love their wives dearely at first, and after a while to forsake and hate them, begetting children with much care and cost for their education, yet when they growe to mans estate, to despise them, neglect and leave them naked to the worlds mercy. Doe not these behaviors expresse their intolerable folly? When men live in peace they covet warre, detesting quietnesse, deposing kings and advancing others in their stead, murdering some men to beget children of their wives. (p. 22)

This consideration of human perversity moves him to link his own concern for "anatomizing" with an attempt to cure such spiritual disorders:

> I doe anatomise and cut up these poore beasts, to see the cause of these distempers, vanities, and follies, yet such proofe were better made on man's body, if my kinde nature would endure it. Who from the houre of his birth is most miserable, weak and sickly, when he sucks he is guided by others, when hee is growne great practiseth unhappinesse, and is sturdy, and when old a child againe and repenteth him of his life past. (p. 25)

[1]See above, p. 153.

This perceptive lament is followed by the final, vindicatory judgement of Hippocrates. His verdict is, symbolically, an assessment of the art of the satirist, and represents Burton's wishful vindication of the Anatomy, and of the brotherhood of satirists upon whom he makes Democritus Junior call with such frequency to bolster his vision. The words of Hippocrates are unequivocal: "The world had not a wiser man, a more learned, a more honest man, and they were much deceaved to say that he was mad" (p. 26).

Besides accounting for the choice of the persona's name, the Democritus-Hippocrates digression is important in that it epitomizes the vision and methods of the Anatomy. Burton presents a persona who differs in many ways from the benign Democritus Senior, but the intent of the Anatomy could be generally held to be that of the old philosopher, and the hope of a cure as forlorn as his was. There is an additional point to the digression: if in some less corrupt age the ancient Democritus could be so cynical about the condition and behaviour of men, things are surely that much more lamentable in the Iron Age of seventeenth-century England.

The most important digression used in the Preface, however, is the one that contains the utopian scheme that is the satiric centre of the Preface itself.[1] The subject has been tantalisingly postponed by

[1]W. Mueller, p. 344, and J. Max Patrick, pp. 347-8, have shown satisfactorily that, far from being an unrealistically euphoric scheme, it is a very practical and positive piece of social theory. Burton

Democritus Junior in a number of preparatory remarks, but he finally states his major point: "Kingdomes, Provinces, and Politike bodies are likewise sensible and subject to this disease" (p. 44). Once again the reader is made fully aware of the satiric precedents for the scheme that is to be broached, and Burton has his persona approach the plan circumspectly to make it appear all the more surprisingly relevant.[1] Democritus Junior introduces his utopia boldly by laying the blame for a country's problems squarely on the shoulders of its government:

> For as the Princes are, so are the people, qualis rex, talis grex. If they be lascivious, riotous, Epicures, factious, covetous, ambitious, illiterate, so will the Comons most part be. Idle unthrifts and prone to lust, drunkards, and therfore poore and needy and upon all occasions ready to mutine and rebell; discontent still, complaining, murmuring, grudging, apt to all outrages, thefts, treasons, murders, innovations, in debt, cosoners, shifters, outlawes, Profligata fama ac vita. It was an old Politicians Aphorisme, They that are poore and bad, envie rich men, hate good men, abhorre the present government, wish for a new, and would have all turned topsie turvie. When Catiline rebelled in Rome, he got a company of such deboshed rogues together, they were his familiars and coadiutors, and such were all your rebells most part in all ages, Jack Cade, Tom Straw, Kette and his companions.
> (pp. 47-48)

This analysis of English society's ailments is blunt, and puts the political situation in a most unfavourable light compared to the rest of the known world.

---

knew that such patently sane thinking would be unquestionably rejected--the ultimate proof of man's irremediable folly. The construction of utopias had been a satiric practice for centuries, and Burton is familiar with the greatest.

[1]Henry Peacham, The Garden of Eloquence (London, 1577), p. 196,

The utopian scheme itself is proposed with an affectation of self-indulgence, and a defiant challenge is issued to those who would reject Democritus Junior's credentials for the job--though it is he himself who has constantly reiterated that he is operating out of his depth:

> I will yet to satisfie and please my selfe, make an Utopia of mine owne, a poeticall commonwealth of mine owne, in which I will freely domineere, build citties, make lawes, statutes, as I list my selfe. And why may I not? Pictoribus atque poetis, etc. You knowe what liberty Poets have ever had, and besides my predecessor Democritus was a Polititian, a Recorder of Abdera, a law maker, as some say, and why may not I presume as much as he did? (p. 56)

He thus identifies himself with the poet, not the scientist, and claims that his is a personal utopia--the rest of the world can mind its own business. In fact, however, his utopia is a very practical one, and by implication, a direct positive criticism of the England he has just described, though permeated with humour. In order, for instance, to

---

fits such utopian schemes under the figure schematismus: ". . . When the Orator propoundeth his meaning by a circuite of speech, wherein he would have that understoode by a certaine suspicion which he doth not speake, and that for 3. special causes. 1. For safetie sake: As when it is dangerous to speake directly and openly. 2. For modestie and good manners sake: As when it is undecent to be spoken plainly. 3. For delectation sake and grace of the hearer, as when it may bring greater delight under the figurative shadow, then by the plaine report and open shew. 1. If some good man for the love of justice should take upon him to reprehend a tyrant, he should venture upon a verie dangerous enterprise. Except the manner and forme of his handling the cause be circumspectly delivered. The Oratours speech may be shadowed two manner of waies, either by reproving another person, in whom the same evils are, or by commending such persons in whom the contraries are, by reprehension of that crueltie and tirranie in Phalaris, he may make a most bright and resplendent glasse wherein Dionysius (the King of Sicilia) must needs behold himself and his deformed tirannie."

leaven the somewhat serious passages, he tells us: "the longitude for some reasons I will conceale," and in his realistic technical description of the non-existent haven, he parodies the travellers' tales for which there was such a burgeoning market since the first explorers went to the New World.

It is certainly, however, no earthly paradise he envisages, but involves the sensible use of the only viable system he knew, containing a just monarch, a responsible aristocracy, a system of law that is not confounded by its own officers, just rewards for scholars, welfare provisions for those who cannot maintain themselves, a wise law of marriage, and, as the foundation of all, a more equitable economic structure. The whole concludes with the usual apology for the "digression:" "I have been over tedious in this subject, I could have here willingly ranged, but these straights wherein I am included, will not permit" (p. 61). His "straights" are the all-encompassing folly, and are as inclusive as he wishes to make them, and his utopia has been a very vital part of the entire satiric scheme, as well as being a bitter commentary upon the actual situation in seventeenth-century England.

Why is this utopian set-piece included in the Anatomy of Melancholy? Does it imply that Burton seriously hopes that he can effect some reform in a corrupt society? Does it change the reader's attitude towards the persona in view of the perceptiveness he here displays? Is it indeed the focal point of the Preface, coming as it does at this

climactic point? Upon the answers to important questions such as these, raised by the central position of the utopia, depends an understanding of much that is to follow in the Anatomy.

In the first place, the utopian digression is very much a part of the satiric tradition, and Burton follows numerous honoured precedents, ancient and modern (cited in the first and later editions) in including it. Secondly, of all forms of satire, the utopia is the most constructive and creative, demanding both imagination and foresight of a kind that the merely negative, railing satirist is frequently said to lack. But, again, it seems questionable that Burton's (or perhaps anyone else's) utopia is created for the purpose of reforming society; rather, it is an artistic exercise in the formulating of a delightful though not necessarily impractical vision, and, indeed, much of its effectiveness depends upon the fact that though it seems so desirable, readers know there there is too much folly amongst men for it to be accepted as a feasible suggestion. Two things, therefore, emerge from this kind of utopian vision in a satiric work: the artist is allowed to use his prophetic imagination; but also, secondarily, society at large, by examining such a practical, yet, in the nature of things, unrealizable scheme, may become aware of the extent of its debilitating folly. As for Democritus Junior, the reader's view of him is changed very little by the utopian passage. He has already shown his gift for perceiving the flaws in others whilst being blind to his own, a situation that obtains throughout the utopian section.

In sum, it seems that in this digression the general implications of the Preface are brought home with a vengeance, especially to seventeenth-century readers, for they are localized in a way that dramatises the perceptions already made in the Preface. In this sense, the digression not only becomes the focal point of the entire Preface, but also prepares the reader for several other major digressions later in the work.

Another established technique which Burton employs in the Preface with great effectiveness is the use of Latin for satiric purposes. Throughout the Anatomy Latin appears with great frequency, to the annoyance of some modern readers, and Burton took advantage of the opportunity it offered to provide translations of many of the quotations from the ancients, to broaden the conception of the persona, by making it appear that Democritus Junior deliberately mistranslates when the occasion calls for it. In the Preface, the most notable and amusing example of his mistranslating appears when he juggles with "veritas odium parit." One comes to believe that Democritus Junior's claim that the Anatomy was originally meant to be written in Latin must be taken with a pinch of salt. One suspects that Burton had no intention of writing in Latin in the first place, and that the claim is simply made to give added prestige to the supposedly scientific aims: the implication is that this is the sort of book that really ought to be in Latin. It has been felt, nonetheless, that there is quite enough Latin in the book to satisfy all but the most classical tastes.

The ironic summary is another satiric technique used frequently in the Anatomy.[1] A typical instance comes near the end of the Preface, when Democritus Junior is finishing his analysis of the universal folly. Despite his avowal that to continue "were an Herculean task," he summarises and cites evidence for several more pages. The reader is thus bombarded with yet more evidence, in the guise of a conclusion of the overwhelming supply of proofs of human folly. Democritus Junior admits, for instance, three tactical exceptions to his general pronouncement that "Kingdomes, Provinces, and Politike bodies are likewise sensible and subject to this disease," and, of course, by their proven absurdity, they bolster his earlier generalization:

> I should here except that omniscious, only wise fraternitie of St. Roses Crosse, if at least there be any such: as Hen. Neuhusius makes a doubt of; and Elias artifex their Theophrastian master; For they are all betrothed to wisedome, if we may beleeve their disciples and followers. (p. 68)

He must also count out Lipsius and the Pope; the former, because

> he saith of himselfe, that he was humani generis quidam paedagogus voce et stilo, a grand Segnior, a Master, a Tutor of us all, and for thirteene yeeres he bragges, how he sowed wisedome in their Lowe-countries . . . . (p. 68)

The Pope must be excluded, on the other hand, we are ironically informed, because he is "more than a man, as his parasites often make him, a

[1]Edward P. J. Corbett, Classical Rhetoric (Oxford University Press, 1965), pp. 302-303, instances a number of terms used by rhetoricians to describe the figure employed here; they are, epilogos, recapitulatio, peroratio, and enumeratio. The names suggest the several functions which the summary serves in the Anatomy.

demigod, and besides, he cannot erre" (p. 68). Democritus Junior eventually concludes these general findings with resignation and a touch of humourous resolution: "What remaines then, but to send for Lorarios officers to carry them altogether for company to Bedlam" (p. 69). These summaries, then, often show precisely the incalculable numbers of sufferers from the universal malady, and the irremediable nature of the disease.

Democritus Junior also mocks those outward shows that belie the inner truths, exposing the real by contrast to the ideal. This technique of juxtaposing antithetical things is employed in a depressing passage early in the Preface:

> To see a man turne himselfe into all shapes like a Camelion, or, as Proteus, to act twenty parts at once for his advantage, to temporize and vary like Mercury the planet, good with good, bad with bad; of all religions, humors, inclinations, to fawne like a Spaniel, rage like a Lion, barke like a Curre, fight like a Dragon, sting like a Serpent, as meeke as a Lambe, and yet againe grinne like a Tygre, weepe like a Crocodile . . . To see a man to weare his braines in his belly, his guts in his head, an hundredth Okes on his backe, to devoure an hundred Oxen at a meale, nay more, to devoure houses, or as those Anthropophagi, to eat one another. . . . to see a man roll himselfe up like a snowe ball from base beggery . . . To see wise men degraded, fooles preferred, horses ride in a Coach, men drawe it; dogges devoure their masters; Towers build Masons; Children rule; old men goe to schoole; women weare the breeches, sheepe demolish townes, devoure men, etc. And in a word, the worlde turned upside downward. (pp. 33-35)

In this final phrase is summed up the approach of Democritus Junior to so many of his satiric targets. His technique is to take what is rational and humane, invert it, and show in the resultant inversion a truer image

of human behaviour. Hence the bitterness with which the Anatomy pulsates at such moments.

The entire Preface rounds off with a final, conventional satiric technique, the caveat. It is in Latin, and ironically entitled, "Lectori Male Feriato"--an irony compounded by the earlier assertion that even to read the Anatomy would be "to employ one's leisure ill."[1] Shilleto translates the passage as follows:

> Whoever you are, I warn not to insult the author of this work, or to cavil and mock at him. Nay, do not silently condemn him (to speak in a word) because of the censure of others, nor ineptly and sarcastically disapprove of him, nor make up false tales about him. For if Democritus Junior is really what he professes to be, at least akin to the older Democritus, or smack ever so little of his genius, it is all up with you, he will act the part of your censor and accuser, being of a petulant spleen, will inundate you with jokes, crush you with witticisms, and sacrifice you to the God of Laughter. (I, 143)

The warning tinged with humour, is redolent with hints both of the satirist's extraordinary powers of perception and of his ritualistic origins. The threat is rather significant in the light of Democritus Junior's claims to be setting out to cure melancholy of the most ingrained kind; such a warning of mysterious punishment for even tacit

[1]The Garden of Eloquence, p. 78 puts the caveat under the figure cataplexis: "Cataplexis is a forme of speech by which the Orator denounceth a threatening against some person, people, citie, common wealth or country . . . declaring the certaintie or likelihood of plagues, or punishments to fall upon them for their wickednesse, impietie, insolencie, and generall iniquitie."

antagonism would do little to benefit the already stricken reader. As the foreward to a "serious scientific treatise" or grave, medical work it would be completely absurd; but as a part of the preliminaries of a satiric work, adopting the traditional gambits of the kind, and revealing a persona appropriate to the satiric design, the "warning" appears as another clear indication of the nature of the literary effort which is to follow.

These, then, are some of the major satiric techniques employed in the Preface, examples of which abound not only in the Anatomy of Melancholy, but in traditional and contemporary practice.[1] In addition, however, the Preface is permeated with that very nebulous, hard-to-analyse tone of satire, embedded in such devices as irony and ridicule in their broadest sense; later in this thesis, in the examination of the three Partitions, I shall again draw attention to those devices that play an important part. Burton used his satiric techniques most effectively when dealing with the major targets of his satire; an examination of these targets shows how much Burton is indebted to the great satirists of antiquity and how his innovative approach transformed them.

The butts of Burton's satire are traditional in the main, though some have been updated to suit his era (e.g., tobacco and

[1]From the findings of one notable Renaissance scholar, Sister Miriam Joseph, we may ascertain a large number of the rhetorical tricks so vital to the writing of satire. I am dealing here with the most notable devices used in the Anatomy, but Burton employs the widest possible range, showing himself master of them all.

publishing houses, both relatively new vices, are now targets). It is in the nature of such an encyclopedic satiric work that scarcely any subject escapes the lash at some time or other in the Anatomy, yet some targets recur more frequently than others because Burton sees in them major causes of or contributors to folly, or Democritus Junior has a grudge to bear against them; in the Preface, a number of such targets are assailed.

As might be expected from so scholarly a satirist as Burton (and from so pedantic a persona as Democritus Junior), scholars themselves in their various guises--teachers, philosophers, authors, or clerics--are amongst his principal butts. Early in the Preface, when he sets out to show the universal folly of humanity, he especially indicts "all those great Philosophers, the world hath ever had in admiration, and whose work we doe so much esteeme." He is willing to be more specific so that we may labour under no illusion about the inclusiveness of his statement:

> Those seven wise men of Greece, those Brittan Druides, Indian Brachmanni, Aethiopian Gymnosophists, Magi of the Persians, Apollonius of whom Philostratus, non doctus sed natus sapiens, wise from his cradle, Epicurus, so much admired by his scholler Lucretius . . .
>
> Whose wit exce'ld the wits of men as farre,
> As the Sunne rising doth obscure a starre.
>
> And all those of whome we read such Hyperbollical elogiums, as of Aristotle that he was wisedome itselfe in the abstract, a miracle of nature, breathing libraries, as Eunapius of Longinus, lights of nature, gyants for wit, quintescence of wit, Divine Spirits, Eagles in the clouds, falne from heaven, Gods, Spirits, Lampes of the world, Dictators, Monarches, Miracles, Superintendents of wit and learning, etc. (p. 17)

This ironic catalogue of euphemistic titles highlights the contempt Democritus Junior frequently displays for the great. He follows by mocking the inability of those traditionally honoured as "enlightened" to agree upon what is truly valuable: Alexander admires Homer, Scaliger does not; Mycillus, Cognatus, and Erasmus admire Lucian, Scaliger does not; everybody loves Socrates--except Lactantius and Theoderet; Plutarch idolizes Seneca, yet Seneca regards himself as being the supreme fool; and so it goes on, with Democritus Junior taking obvious delight in showing the eternal contradictions amongst the wise. This recurrent demonstration of the foolishness of those who have a reputation for wisdom reaches its apotheosis in the Second Partition, in the "Digression of Aire."

The Preface also assails, with predictable frequency, the non-scholarly professions such as medicine and law. In them Burton apparently sees great danger, because of their real power, as opposed to the self-deluding, merely academic pretensions of other professions. Such attacks on the professions are saved from being utterly boring and repetitive by that element of sheer exuberance that pervades them all; a subject that gives so much pleasure to the writer is hardly likely to pall for the reader.

The abuse of religion is another of the major butts of the Preface and throughout the Anatomy, and again it is a traditional one. In the Preface it is assailed frequently, giving a foretaste of the

tremendous assault on particular religious organizations that is to come in the final part of the Third Partition. Early on, Democritus Junior suggests that though things have changed since the days of his renowned ancestor ("We have new Actors"), folly remains a constant, and nowhere more so that in the area of religion. In this instance, as in most of those to come, it is the Church of Rome that has to bear the brunt:

> If Democritus were alive now, and should but see the superstition of our times, our Religious madnesse . . . If he shoulde meete a Cappuchine, a Franciscan, a Jesuite, a shavedcrowned Monke in his robes, a begging Frier, or threecrowned Soveraigne Lord the Pope, poore Peters Successor, servus servorum dei, to depose kings with his foote, to treade upon Emperours neckes, make them stand bare foote and barelegged at his gates, hold his bridle and stirrupe etc. If he should see a Prince creepe so devoutly to kisse his toe, what would he say . . . Had he met some of our devout Pilgrimes going barefoote to Jerusalem, Rome, Saint Iago, Saint Thomas Shrine, to creepe to those counterfeit and maggot-eaten Reliques, had he beene present at a Masse, and seene those kissing of paxes, crucifixes, cringes, duckings, their severall attires and ceremonies, pictures of Saints, Indulgences, ceremonies, Pardons, Vigils, fasting, feasts, praying in gibberish, and mumbling of beads. . . . (p. 27)

The charge of hypocrisy and the abuse of temporal power by the Church of Rome recurs in these attacks; the persona accuses that institution of being the cause of much of the world's melancholy, and contrasts its corruptions with the pristine innocence of the original Christians.

Another favourite attack of the Anatomy is upon the mob, bestial in its mindless behaviour, vicious in its individual components. Again Democritus Junior envisages the horror of the ancient Democritus had he lived to see the mass madness of future ages:

> . . . had he but observed the common people followe like so many sheep, one of their fellows drawne by the hornes over a gap, some for zeale, some for feare, ready to dye before they will abjure any of those ceremonies, to which they have been accustomed; other out of hypocrisie frequent Sermons, knock their breasts, turne up their eyes, pretend zeale, desire reformation, and yet professed usurers, gripes, monsters of men, harpyes, divels, in their lives to expresse nothing lesse. (p. 28)

This contagious melancholy is the least susceptible to reformation, for it is caused, as he has told us earlier, by the natural instinct to emulate our peers; it is doting "for Company." There are some terrible side effects of the same instinct that he will also consider.

Democritus Junior's diatribe is at its most effective when he deals with another traditional satiric prey resulting from the universal folly in its group manifestation: the horrors of warfare and bloody slaughter, the logical physical culmination of the madness of the mob. In a frightening catalogue of human viciousness, the chaotic internecine horrors of warfare are outlined:

> . . . infinite treasures consumed, townes burned, florishing citties sacked and ruinated, goodly countries depopulated and left desolate, olde inhabitants expelled, maids deflowred, etc., and whatsoever torment, misery, mischiefe, the divell, fury and rage can invent, to their owne ruine and destruction. . . . I omit those French Massakers, Sicilian Evensongs, the Duke of Alvas tyrannies, our Gunpowder machinations, and that fourth fury, as one calls it, the Spanish Inquisition, which quite obscures those ten persecutions. (p. 29)

It is at such moments that the Juvenalian quality of Burton's satire emerges, and a bleak vision of mankind, unmodified by irony, predominates.

For tactical reasons, two of Democritus Junior's special quarries appear late in the Preface: the institution of the family, and the satirist himself. In the first case, he delivers a somewhat prejudiced diatribe against marriage that is really directed at women:

> A good honest painefull man many times hath a shrew to his wife, a sickly, dishonest, a slothfull, foolish, carelesse woman to his wife, a prowd peevish flurt, a liquorish prodigall Queane, and by that meanes all goes to ruine: or if they differ in nature, he is thrifty, she spends all, he wise, she sottish and soft, what agreement can there be, what friendship? Like that of the thrush and the Swallow in Aesope, Insteed of mutuall love, kinde compellations, whore and thiefe is heard, they fling stooles at one anothers heads. (p. 62)

This rather biased approach to the partnership is a forerunner of his attitude towards women in the Third Partition.

Finally, of satirists themselves, many of them his heroes on other occasions, he says this:

> . . . they that laugh and contemne others, and condemne the world of folly, are as ridiculous, and lie as open as any other. Democritus that common flowter of folly, was ridiculous himselfe; and barking Menippus, scoffing Lucian, satyricall Lucilius, Petronius, Varro, Persius, etc., may bee censured as well as others. (p. 64)

This inclusion of satirists amongst the targets of satire is a significant indication of the prevailing vision of the Anatomy. Nothing is safe not even the persona, who is obliged to confess that he is "mad with the rest."

In sum, a number of what turn out to be the major targets of the Anatomy's satire are thus pilloried in the Preface. Burton has

given himself ample scope by denouncing the folly of all humanity, and he may manipulate his persona to lash out in any direction he chooses. But there are, as will become clear in the remainder of this analysis of the first edition, a number of areas that attract him obsessively, so that he never seems to run out of zest or ammunition with which to conduct the attacks upon them. Even in the five post-1621 editions his enthusiasm and his vindictiveness never flag.

Certain conclusions may be drawn from this examination of the Title, Preliminary Matter, and Preface of the first edition. It can be seen that even in the detail of the Anatomy, in its warp and woof, Burton adheres to that satiric scheme whose pervasiveness was outlined in Chapter Three. The multifarious techniques and the traditional subject-matter of generations of satiric writers are used by him, and intermingled with the new; but most important of all, his persona is presented to us in all his complexity, and is seen to be a tool of his author. The realization that Democritus Junior is both satirist and subject of satire adds a dimension of irony to the work that has not always been appreciated. Far from being a merely superficial mask for an erudite but essentially ingenuous pedant, Democritus Junior appears as a semi-independent creature, used by his creator to indict as well as to embody the flaws of society. Throughout the Anatomy, Burton makes use of this anomaly in his persona to add humour and realism to his book; the didactic element comes to take on a fresh colour, for it is percolated

through to us by means of the eccentric Democritus Junior, whose personality dominates all that is to follow. The entire Preface is, of course, easily identifiable as satire, and provides enough hints to make the reader approach the ensuing three Partitions with the suspicion that so surprisingly incongruous an introduction to an apparently scientific tome may in fact be a guide to the Anatomy's real nature. In the examination of the three Partitions which will now follow, it becomes evident that the satiric vision and techniques continue to dominate and the incongruity of the Preface is seen to be only apparent.

The satire in the First Partition emerges much more cautiously than was the case in "Democritus Junior to the Reader;" Burton now seems to be trying to give the impression that Democritus Junior is indeed the scientist presenting a serious medical treatise. The seemingly "scientific" opening pages, however, provide numerous suggestions of the satire that will pervade the rest of a Partition which assails the traditional subjects of satire in apparently endless diatribes, and which introduces various satiric devices into the work for the first time--for instance, the satiric cena and the elaborate use of Latin for satiric purposes. At the same time, other, more sinister elements in the character of the persona will be further unveiled in this Partition. Strangely, too, the First Partition reaches a climax with another defence of suicide; this may be a rather ominous inclusion in a work that pretends to contain an antidote for such desperate acts, but it is an

indication of the Anatomy's true nature. One also observes that the medical image, which had so clearly a satiric use in the Preface, is more literally appropriate here, for this is supposed to be the medical thesis proper; its use is at first ambiguous, and then more obviously satiric as the Partition progresses.

Such ambiguity of effect is also to be found in the preliminary "Synopsis" which may be regarded either as the perfectly orthodox introduction to a medical work, or as a misleading and parodic device. It is just like the "Synopses" to the other two Partitions; superficially, they are meticulously accurate in terms of the apparent contents of the work, outlining the analytical structure of the material corpus of the Anatomy in a methodical fashion that is both respectable and traditional. The wit (and, hence, the parody) depends upon the contrast between our expectations of what ought to follow such scholarly schemata, and what Burton eventually does with the material therein summarized. These elaborate tables thus become ironic in retrospect, leading one to expect a formal "scientific" treatise, rather than the satire that is, in fact, provided. In this respect they serve an important visual function too: in the first edition they take up eight pages, thus providing a sizeable physical barrier between the Preface and what is to follow; they seem to indicate that we are indeed to have the promised "more sober discourse," and momentarily we may be lulled into forgetting the satiric caveat that preceded them. But not for long.

It is the personality of the satiric persona that once more dominates the First Partition and gives the tone to the work. Just as in the Preface, he fluctuates here between perceptive insights and blind ingenuousness, sometimes satirist supreme, sometimes the epitome of folly. In this most "scientific" part of the Anatomy, therefore, it is vital to understand the persona's role, for only then can one assess any pretensions to a serious scientific aim that the work might have.

A hint of a certain proneness to cruelty on the persona's part is introduced in the First Partition. His short-sighted "kindness" often leads him to place ends before means; having spoken of the old Scottish custom of burying alive those who are mentally or physically diseased so that they might not proliferate, he proclaims:

> A severe doome you will say, and not to be used amongst Christians, yet more to be looked into then it is. For now by our too much facility in this kinde, in giving way to all to marry that will, our too much liberty and indulgence in tolerating all sorts, there is a vast confusion of hereditary diseases, no family secure, no man almost free from some grievous infirmity or another, when no choice is had, but still the eldest must marry, as so many stallions of the Race, or if rich, be they fooles or disardes, lame or maimed, unable intemperate, dissolute, exhauste through riot . . . they must be wise and are by inheritance, it comes to passe that our generation is corrupt, we have many weak persons both in body and minde, many ferall diseases raging amongst us, pocky families, our fathers bad, and we are like to be worse.
> (p. 85)

The implications of this rather cryptic pronouncement he leaves for the reader to extract. Such cruelty, unmitigated by irony, is an aspect of the character of Democritus Junior that has been ignored in the past,

but which might be seen as a natural consequence of his attitude. It seems clear that Burton, in such instances, is satirizing his persona by showing the dangerous consequences of his simplicity; Democritus Junior's suggested cure is more premeditatedly vicious than the disease.

But it is not only on the occasion where a new insight into the persona's character is provided that we take fresh notice of him; rather, it is where he plays the familiar game. I suggested in the analysis of the Preface that the persona causes a great deal of confusion in the reader's mind because of the way he deals with the putative aims of the work. The problem is compounded throughout the First Partition, in which the reader is led a merry dance. The First Partition starts out to define, in an almost uninterruptedly serious vein, the traditional approach to the study of disease, laying stress upon the notions of "sympathy" and "correspondence," so that in the case, for instance, of those afflicted with hydrophobia, "some say little things like whelps will be seen in their urine" (p. 14). Democritus Junior reiterates his earlier claim that his interest lies in curing those who are habitually in a melancholy state (which is the curse of the few), not the universal <u>disposition</u> towards it, from which, he says, "no man living is free." As he comes to treat of melancholy, however, he will deliberately expand his analysis till it becomes, like the Preface, a vision of the universal aspect of the disease. This is an important point, and on it hinges a deeper understanding of the book; if he does indeed treat of nothing more

than chronic melancholy, then the Anatomy might well be seen as, in the main, a medical treatise. If, on the other hand, the claim is deliberately misleading, the reader must look for some other motive for its composition. It seems clear that, as in the Preface, the persona contradicts himself at appropriate moments over the aim of the book; he appears to reiterate his claim that his is a tract about chronic melancholy in order to penetrate the defences of the general reader, who approaches the book out of passing curiosity and discovers, as readers have for centuries, that he himself is the subject.

Near the end of the Partition, when considering the symptoms of melancholy, Democritus Junior again suggests that it is the universal disposition he is trying to cure; he avows that these symptoms are so manifold as to be beyond scientific grasp:

> . . . to speake in a word, there is nothing so vaine, absurd, ridiculous, extravagant, impossible, incredible, so monstrous a Chymera, so prodigious and strange, such as Painters and Poets durst not attempt, which they will not really feare, faine, suspect and Imagine unto themselves. All extreames, contrarieties, and contradictions, and that in infinite varieties. (p. 241)

Though he later tells us that "Proteus himselfe is not so diverse," he continues his dissection undaunted; his repeated insistence upon the impossibility of the goal, together with his persistence in pursuing it, is itself a part of the pattern of heroic folly to which all contribute.

The confusions over aim continue to the end of the First Partition, which closes with "Prognostics of Melancholy," and, rather ominously,

one might think, for a book whose aim is supposed to be the cure of the disease, with a defence of suicide. Democritus Junior first of all quotes from "scoffing Lucian," admitting that what that writer said jokingly of the inexorability of gout, "I may truly affirm of melancholy in earnest" (p. 273). The incongruity of his application of such a notorious skeptic's comment is characteristic and makes the reader once again strongly aware of the gullibility of the persona who claims he is going to cure the disease. Unabashed, he appeals to another satiric precedent, Sir Thomas More, who, in his Utopia, did not show the orthodox revulsion for the idea of suicide; Democritus Junior concludes:

> Who knowes how he may be tempted? it is his case, it may be thine; we ought not to be too rash and rigorous in our censures, as some are, charity will judge the best. God be mercifull to us all. (p. 277)

Though this is a proper, and, for his time, progressive Christian thought, it must be a disturbing one for all those melancholiacs who supposed that the aim of the Anatomy was to find a cure for their afflicted spirits. It is his final word in the First Partition.

In this matter of the Anatomy's putative aim, therefore, there are a number of red herrings in the First Partition. The persona keeps changing his view as to whether it is chronic or general melancholy he is to treat, and indeed, often identifies the two, suggesting that original sin is the real and incurable disease. His insistence, too, upon the infinite variety of its symptoms, and his reiterated implication

that suicide may be the cure make his own "cures" less and less credible.

On the question of his method, he also continues to be ambivalent. He suggests that it will consist in proceeding as circuitously as possible in the hope of stumbling upon truth--a way that is hardly scientific. In support, he shows the "ambages" of most other scholars in their research, demonstrating his own wide reading in the process,[1] and again referring to the universality of the disease to justify his wide ranging approach: "I cannot except any of any condition, of any complexion, sexe, or age, but fooles and Stoicks, which, according to Sinesius, are never troubled with any manner of passion" (p. 49).

Even the impressive "authorities," then, are full of contradictions about the kinds of melancholy, and Democritus Junior finds it useful to appeal to them as his precedents for proceeding:

> In such variety of Symptomes, causes: How difficult a thing it is to treat of severall kinds apart; to make any certainty amongst so many casualties, distractions, when seldome two men shall be like affected per omnia? T'is hard I confesse, yet neverthelesse I will adventure through the midst of these perplexities, and led by the clewe or thred of the best writers, extricate myselfe out of a labyrinth of doubts and errors, and so proceed to the causes. (p. 54)

[1]He cites the views of Bruel, Donatus, Altomarus, Salvianus, Fracastorius, Melanelius, Galen, Ruffus, Aetius, Hercules de Saxonia, Fuchsius, Arnoldus, Guianerius, Paulus, Halyabbas, Aretaeus, Mercurialis, Aelianus Montaltus, Laurentius, Piso, Valesius, David Crusius, and others; all this in a short passage for "most mens capacity."

The commentary on the futility of the traditional body of knowledge and on the "authority" of the ancients has been explicit enough in Burton's satire so far, but Democritus Junior makes no effort to pretend that he has found any better basis for a "cure;" on such shaky methodology rests this "serious scientific work." The satiric methodology, on the other hand, is impressive. The First Partition, like the Preface, is a virtual encyclopedia of satiric devices from the most traditional to the most contemporary. It is significant that there are so many of the signs and tools of satire in a Partition that at first glance seems dedicated to science. The reader's suspicions are roused, and with good reason, right from the start.

The Partition opens with a fine purple passage upon man's condition before and after the Fall. It uncovers for us the sources of traditional Christian satire in those ringing biblical comminations upon depraved humanity: "The Lord shall smite thee with the botch of Aegypt, and with Emrods, and with Scab and Itch, and thou canst not be healed. And with madnesse, blindnesse and astonishing of heart" (p. 4). These phrases give an indication of the inherent attractions of the "anatomy" concept for the Christian satirist; the prophet speaks like a Nashe or a Marston belabouring his victim, or, even more, like the unknown Irish satirist cursing his hapless prey:

The feet may you lose from the knees down,
  The sight of the eyes and the movement of the hands,
The leprosy of Job may it come down upon you,
  Farcy, erisipilas, and the king's evil in the neck.

A shaking ague, hiccough, and gravel on you,
  May that come quick, and the disease of death,
May your head fall off from your sullen forehead,
  And may there be no ear on you, but only the place of them.

Disgust and hardship, lameness and corruption on you,
  Running and rout and hatred for you amongst your kin,
Whitlow under the nails, and disease of the eyes upon you,
  And neither marrow nor sap may there be in your bones.[1]

Critics have noted how in the case of virulent satirists like Swift, many of the most abusive images (the so-called "coprophilic" type, for instance) come from the Bible and the Fathers; detractors, on the other hand, have pounced upon such imagery as proof that the individual satirist is an abnormal man in his rather crude obsessions. Democritus Junior certainly shows a great command of such biblical invective throughout the Anatomy, appropriately, in view of his profession and his purpose.

Amongst other satiric devices, the "digression" is again an important weapon in the Anatomy's armoury, and is put to use early in the First Partition. The "Digression of Spirits" gives Burton an opportunity to make several important satiric points: it reveals the paradoxical nature of the persona's position in a sometimes scathing, sometimes hilarious exposure of the superstitions of Renaissance

[1]Quoted in "Medical Concept," p. 134.

England. The digression reaches a climax of absurdity under the guise of Democritus Junior's growing credulity, though, at times, hints appear of a more subtle perception on his part: certain spiritual phenomena are caused, he says, by "obsession or possession" (p. 69), two quite irreconcilable states, the observation of which shows his acuteness. This leads him to conclude his examination with tales of witchcraft told in a way that certainly implies his creator's skepticism if not his own; for example: "A Nunne did eat a lettice without grace, or signing it with the signe of the Crosse, and was instantly possessed" (p. 70). The discrepancy between crime and punishment is quite starlingly ludicrous, as in the case of the woman who ate an "unhallowed Pomegranet" and had to suffer the visitation of two devils as a result. One tale, however, which crowns all the others, shows best Burton's attitude towards superstition, as it is filtered through his persona in this "Digression of Spirits:"

> Cornelius Gemma . . . relates of a young maid, called Katherine Gualter a Coupers daughter, A° 1571. that had such strange passions and convulsions, that three men could not sometimes hold her, shee purged a live Eele, which he sawe a foot and a halfe long, and touched himselfe, but the Eele afterward vanished, shee vomited after some 241. of blacke stuffe of all colours, twice a day for foureteene dayes: and after that she vomited great balls of haire, peeces of wood, pigeons dung, parchment, Goose dung, coles; and after them 2 pound of pure blood, and then againe, coles and stones, of which some had inscriptions, bigger then a walnut, some of them peeces of glasse, brasse, etc. Besides strange paroxismes of laughing, weeping, and extasies, etc. (p. 70)

The catalogue of objects that Katherine spewed out is so interestingly varied in itself that the reader's incredulous anticipation of what will appear next tends to destroy the effectiveness of the story as an awe-inspiring example of possession, and makes it a satire upon the credulity of those who would accept such fantasies as truth. The satire on such superstitions is expanded throughout the Anatomy, but nowhere does Burton make a better use of the opportunity to ridicule them than in this "Digression."

Shortly after the "Digression of the Nature of Spirits," in a passage that deals at length with the hereditary aspects of melancholy, that "symbolizing disease," there appears one of the first examples in this Partition of the technique of using Latin for satiric effect. Democritus Junior is considering the question of coition with women in menstruation, an unsavoury subject, and he switches into Latin. He subsequently remarks: "I spare to English this which I have said," and a marginal note reads, "Good Master Schoolemaster, doe not english this" (p. 83). This is ironic on several counts; his earlier apology for publishing in English is now parallelled by an implied apology for the content of this Latin section. Since most if not all of Burton's readers knew Latin anyway, they would understand the section without any trouble. If, on the other hand, some of them did not, then it is surely odd that the author wishes to prevent them from ascertaining some pertinent "scientific" data. The remark on schoolmasters is

ironic, since one imagines that the Anatomy would most certainly not appeal to schoolchildren, even those prodigious Renaissance products. The main effect, however, is to broaden or harden our conception of Democritus Junior's character. Here is a persona, who, with a stereotyped kind of pedantry, can contemplate in Latin what embarasses him in English; as "scholar," he is protected from the brutal truth of what he says by the language that makes such unpleasantnesses palatable, and he recoils from the idea of translating some things into the more immediate and mundane framework of the vernacular. The implications of relying upon such scholarly buffers from reality are explored throughout the Anatomy. The pedant's endless appeal to authority, his dependence upon elaborate systems of thought which are only vaguely, if at all related to truth, and his desire to disguise his real meaning by presenting his ideas in a dead language, all of these aspects of Renaissance scholarship are mercilessly revealed.[1]

Another instance of the use of Latin for satiric purposes occurs later on in the Partition, after an extremely virulent tirade on the "miseries of scholars;" the lengthy Latin passage that follows is

[1]The dangers of underplaying the satiric aspects of the Anatomy are evident in the analysis made by Hardin Craig in The Enchanted Glass, pp. 243-51; he sees Burton, not as a critic of the same "Idols" as Bacon, but as one of the anachronistic scholars who worship them. I hope that this thesis demonstrates that Burton would agree with Bacon's criticisms, but would be very skeptical about over-attachment to the Baconian view itself. Such certitude would, in Burton's view, be yet another aspect of the universal folly.

equally abusive of the system whereby men of the cloth are produced. This time, the shift into Latin does not protect Democritus Junior, since those most liable to take offence, the clergy themselves, can easily read the tirade. Nonetheless, it is another interesting example of the series of masks that are used in the Anatomy: Burton may be said to employ the figure of Democritus Junior for purposes of caution; Democritus Junior, misguidedly it seems, uses Latin in this instance to protect himself from reprisals from those who know Latin well enough to understand his attack clearly. Once again, it appears, Burton is exposing the folly of his persona whilst at the same time pursuing a satiric tradition, for Democritus Junior pulls no punches, attacking the universities for their part in the farce, the patrons who are responsible for the bartering of souls, and the clergymen themselves for their weakness and corruption; he concludes:

> hinc illae lachrymae, lugubris musarum habitus, abjectum atque haec ubi fiunt, ausum dicere, et putidum putidi dicterium usurpare, Putidum vulgus, inops, rude, sordidum, melancholicum, miserum, despicabile, contemnendum.[1] (p. 89)

Ironically, the Latinized attack is no more virulent than the diatribes in English against clergy, papists, doctors, lawyers, and many other sectors of society, made by that other "vulgar fellow" Democritus Junior himself.

[1]Holbrook Jackson translates thus: "And in view of these facts, I venture to repeat the abusive expressions which some vulgar fellow has applied to the clergy, that they are a rotten crowd, beggarly, uncouth, filthy, melancholy, miserable, despicable, and contemptible." (I, 330)

Diminutio, a method of ridiculing by minimizing, is nowhere used to more advantage in English literature than by Swift in the voyages to Lilliput and Brobdingnag; Burton is also a master of the technique, and throughout the Anatomy he subtly "belittles" many of the most dearly maintained, but false, human values by means of the "diminishing" image. In the First Partition it is employed with great irony, as Democritus Junior devotes his attention to "Discontents, Cares, Miseries, etc." as causes of melancholy, when he comments: "Our whole life is like an Irish Sea, wherein there is nought to be expected but tempestuous stormes, and troublesome waves" (p. 145). By suggesting that the struggles in a man's life have more similarity to the minor turbulence of the Irish Sea than to the upheavals of great oceans, he reduces man's romantic view of himself and his tragic struggle against fate.[1]

The satiric catalogue, another forceful device, is used to great advantage in this Partition. It is most effective in a terse indictment of selfishness:

> . . . we maul, persecute, and study how to sting, gaule and vexe one another, with mutuall hatred, preying upon, and devouring one another, as so many ravenous birds, and as juglers, panders, bawdes, cosening one another, as so many

[1]Cf. p. 647, "An Irish Sea is not so turbulent and raging as a litigious wife." Here again, the "Irish Sea" image is used to mock the (in Democritus Junior's opinion) unjustifiable insubordination of an inferior, not to indicate the dangers that spring from it. It is a petty annoyance, not a catastrophe.

> wolves, tigers, divels: men are evill, wicked, malicious, treacherous, and naught, not loving one another, or loving themselves, not hospitall, charitable and sociable as they ought to be, but counterfeit dissemblers, ambodexters, all for their owne ends, hard-hearted, mercilesse, pitilesse, and to benefit themselves, they care not what mischiefe they procure others. (p. 147)

Such is the traditional complaint of the satirist at the human condition and man's inhumanity to man. The catalogue continues, seemingly interminably, throughout this section, sometimes frightening, sometimes ludicrous, each word making the maximum impact: Burton is always a master of such devices.

The First Partition, then, contains innumerable instances of Burton's control over the techniques of satire, particularly of that irony that is one of the major characteristics of the mode. He cites other satirists with great frequency and employs ridicule and invective with ingenuity. The effect of these is such that the entire Partition seems a parody of its stated scientific intent.

The Partition also attacks the various quarries singled out in the Preface, concentrating upon some of them with an unrelenting ferocity. Burton has apparently inexhaustible ammunition for his onslaughts, and shows his virtuosity in the variety of language and tactics he uses to conduct them. The attacks on the professions, for example, are often grouped together in the Anatomy: one leads naturally to another along the traditional path. In the First Partition, Democritus Junior deals frequently with lawyers, doctors, the clergy, and scholars

in close proximity. When discussing the causes of melancholy, for example, he points to the injustices perpetrated in the name of law, and follows with associated onslaughts upon doctors and clergy (pp. 176-180).

In this Partition, too, he indicts some of the early influences on the shaping of a child's character: "There is more choice of nurses than mothers," he remarks drily, and cites pre-university schooling as an instrumental cause of melancholy (pp. 192-3). All this is closely related to the digression on "the miseries of scholars" and to the satire upon academic life generally that is presented throughout the Anatomy; the unpleasant implication is that the scholar is prepared for his spineless existence from the womb, and that Democritus Junior speaks from first-hand experience.

Poverty and deprivation are other traditional subjects of satire, and once again, Burton has his persona analyze them. Far from attributing them to the will of God, or the innate faults of the stricken, Democritus Junior belabours economic injustice as the root cause, epitomized in the inhumanity of the rich who ought to alleviate the burdens of the less fortunate:

> We have no Aristocracies but in contemplation, all Oligarchies, wherein a few rich men domineere, and doe what them list, and are priveledged by their greatnes. They may freely trespasse and doe what they please, no man dare accuse them, no not so much as mutter against them, there is no notice taken of it, they may securely doe it, and live after their owne Lawes, and for their mony, get pardons, indulgences, redeem their soules from Purgatoury and Hell, clausum possedet arca Jovem.
> (p. 205)

He thus indicts the distortion of values that encourages men to believe that they may purchase their spiritual necessities (a major bone of contention in the Reformation); it has been a subject for English satire since the time of Chaucer. Those who are exploited are "footestooles for rich men, to tread on, blocks for them to get on horseback on, walls for them to pisse on, or as new gravel for dogs to scumer on" (p. 206). In keeping with the laws of decorum, the satirist must use appropriate language to describe their fate, for they are most definitely "low:" "their discourse is scurrility, their summum bonum, a pot of ale" (p. 206).

Two bitter and appropriate lines from one of his satiric masters, Juvenal, sum up Democritus Junior's attitude towards the multiplicity of human folly that he has so far arraigned:

> His alias poteram et plures subnectere causas,
> Sed jumenta vocant, et Sol inclinat, eundum est.
> Many such causes, much more could I say,
> But that for provender my cattle stay:
> The Sun declines, and I must needs away. (p. 219)

The appeal to the classical satirist is an important device, implying a shared vision of humanity's shortcomings: it is no lack of abuses to whip and strip that halts them, but rather a conspiracy of the elements, a shortage of time that prevents their further outcry. The First Partition of the Anatomy has dissected human folly, as promised, but just as the sun must set at the end of the day, so the satirist must at least pause to draw breath for the nonce.

As I have attempted to show already, a number of apparently non-satiric passages in the First Partition do have their place in the overall satiric plan, and are, indeed, conventional satiric usages; evidence of the satiric vision of the Anatomy appears even in passages which seem entirely technical. Section i, Member ii, for example, pretends to be a traditional, "scientific" analysis of the various parts of the body and soul. Yet even in such seemingly barren territory,[1] we find the ever-present satiric commentary when, for example, Democritus Junior discusses the question of metempsychosis: he appeals to one of his favourite satiric predecessors, Lucian, whose cock was "first Euphorbus a Captaine, a Horse, a Man, a Sponge" (39); later he becomes Juvenalian as he assails men for giving way to their lusts "like so many beasts." There is the usual irony in this member too, as when he deliberately avoids dealing with the sexual organs "because they are impertinent to my purpose." Nothing could be more pertinent, however, as we gather from the mighty onslaught on things sexual in the Third Partition. When it seems, finally, that this Member will never end, the persona affirms that there is still much more that could be said, "which for brevity I omit." Such a statement does not ring sincere in a work that has always had a justified reputation for paying little regard to the

[1]One has only to thumb through Timothy Bright's Treatise of Melancholy (London, 1580), to realize how unorthodox Burton's treatment of such scientific areas is.

strictures of length, and coming from a persona who is usually the epitome of verbosity. It may serve, however, to indicate Burton's own inclination not to spend too much time on these "scientific" parts, which, necessary as they are in the overall satiric plan, do not seem to give him as much satisfaction as does the more satiric commentary.

Apart from such interspersed comments, however, there are more fundamental connections with satire in the most seemingly serious parts. Dietary abuses as a cause of melancholy, for instance, are included in Democritus Junior's analysis, and this topic constitutes an important link with the traditions of satire, remote as it first may appear; the descriptions of the various delicacies and recipes are very much in the satiric cena stream.[1] Indeed, Burton makes his satiric precedents all the clearer by the frequently unscientific way he has Democritus Junior describe his foods; fowl, for example, "Though these be faire in feathers, pleasant in taste, and have a good outside, and like hypocrites, white in plumes, and soft, their flesh is hard, blacke, unwholesome, dangerous melancholy meat" (p. 89) [italics mine]. In addition, he cites Plautus and Horace in support of his statements, and he proceeds to satirize the traditional concern with food:

[1]The cena of Petronius (who is mentioned by Burton in this context) is the archetype of the tradition; Ben Jonson uses it in his Inviting a Friend to Supper, and Milton, whose acquaintance with the satiric traditions has recently been more widely acknowledged, uses the same device in his Sixth Prolusion.

> And yet for all this harme which apparently follows surfeiting and drunkennesse, see how wee luxuriate and rage in this kinde, quam portentosae caenae, prodigious suppers, what Fagos, Epicuros, Apitios our times afford? Lucullus Ghost walkes stille, and every man desires to sup with Apollo: Aesops costly dish is ordinarily served up, and if they be witty in anything it is ad gulam. If they study anything atall, it is to please their pallat, and to satisfie their gut. (p. 97)

Gluttony was, of course, a well-worn butt of the satirists' wit, and Democritus Junior does not neglect his duties in that area; he delivers an up-dated attack which includes all the most modern titillations, "Sausages, and Anchoves, Tobacco, Caveare, pickled Herrings" (p. 98), voicing his sympathy with the ironic Montaigne's sentiment that "custom is all in all" in the matter of eating.

A related "serious" topic amongst the causes of melancholy which allow Democritus Junior freedom for his satiric muse is "immoderate or no use atall of Venus," a subject which will hold his attention for the bulk of the Third Partition. Here, however, Democritus Junior describes with considerable zest the various effects of the frequency and infrequency of "chamber-work." He waxes eloquent especially on the matter of "infrequency," and describes the melancholy that results--an unnatural desire for solitude:

> . . . most pleasant it is at first to such as are Melancholy given, to walke alone in some solitary grove, betwixt wood and water, by some brooke side, and to meditate upon some delightsome and pleasant subject, which shall affect him most, amabilis insania, and mentis gratissimus error. A most incomparable delight to build castels in the aire, to goe smiling to themselves, acting an infinite variety of parts, which they suppose, and strongly imagine they act, or that they see done. (pp. 115-116)

There is a double sting in this passage: the two Latin phrases (translated by Shilleto as "a pleasant dotage, a most flattering delusion") conflict ironically with the smooth romantic flow, and insinuate that the melancholiac is as much an actor as a sufferer, his disease as much histrionic as it is chronic.

When, shortly after, Democritus Junior considers the function of imagination, he again chooses ironic examples to bolster his contention:

> Jacob the Patriarke by force of Imagination made peckled lambs laying peckled roddes before them. Persina, that Aethiopian Queene in Heliodorus, by seeing the picture of Perseus and Andromeda, insteed of a Blackemoore was brought to bed of a faire white child. And if wee may beleeve Bale, one of Pope Nicholas the thirds Concubines, by seeing of a Beare was brought to bed of a Monster. (p. 124)

The list of rhetorical questions that follows pursues the same line, and contains the amusingly bathetic one that upsets the pretentious cart: "Why must one man's yawning make another yawne? One mans pissing provoke a second many times to doe the like?" (p. 127). But he produces a shattering instance of the powers of imagination in conclusion:

> A grave and learned Minister, and an ordinary Preacher at Alcmar in Holland, was one day (as he was walking in the fields for his recreation) suddenly taken with a laske or loosenesse, and thereupon compelled to take the next ditch; but being surprised at unawares, by some Gentlewomen of his Parish wandring that way; was so abashed, that he did never after shew his head in publike, or come into the pulpit, but pined away with melancholy. (p. 135)

Democritus Junior himself, appearing to miss the ludicrous aspects of the story, launches into a serious diatribe that seems quite incongruous in conjunction with the tale of the minister, yet is very characteristic of the persona's penchant for uniting sublime and ridiculous in all apparent innocence. Just such a discord is frequently to be found in the "serious" passages in this First Partition.

Once again, in Member v, the reader is apparently in the deceptively calm, unruffled waters of science; reason reigns, passion is exiled--it is a welcome relief from the catalogues of folly that have dominated the book so far. Yet the introductory paragraph has a familiar ring to it that signals merely a momentary change of tactics, not of purpose:

> As a purly hunter, I have hitherto beaten about the circuit of the forrest of this Microcosme, and have followed only those outward adventitious causes; I will now break into the inner roomes, and rip up the antecedent immediate causes which are there to be found. (p. 220)

The medical image is still there, coupled with the notion of the hunter in search of prey, for Democritus Junior is preparing even further disillusionment for the reader. If what has preceded was only skirting the edge of the problem, the outer rim of the forest of folly, one imagines, what monumental confusion must reign within? That revelation must keep, however, and from now till the end of this Partition, he walks the line between bitter irony and intimations of his capability of bombarding us with science if he so wishes. The whole section closes

with a mocking glance at the reader which at the same time reveals Democritus Junior's own blindness:

> . . . now go and bragge of thy present happines whosoever thou art, bragge of thy temperature, and of thy good parts, insult, triumph, and boast? thou seest in what a brittle state thou art, how soone thou mai'st be dejected, how many severall waies, by bad diet, bad aire, a small losse, a little sorrow, or discontent, an ague, etc., how many sudden accidents may procure thy ruine, what a small tenure of happynes thou hast in this life, how weake and silly a creature thou art. . . . thou knowest not what stormes and tempests the late evening may bring with it. Be not secure, Be sober and watch, fortunam reverenter habe, if fortunate and rich: if sicke and poore, moderate thy selfe. I have said. (p. 229)

"Be sober and watch" is an admonition from Compline, the evening ritual of the Church, a warning about the impending darkness; in such a context, the final phrase, "I have said," is deliberately arrogant. This pomposity of Democritus Junior himself does not invalidate his abuse of the rest of men, but it does very surely place him within that universal cortege of fools he had described at length in the Preface.

Even these apparently "scientific", or "technical," or "serious" passages, therefore, are just as integral to the satire as are the more "literary" parts of the Anatomy, where blatant abuse is directed against clearly satiric targets. These less recognizably satiric passages frequently draw upon a tradition that employs its weaponry in all quarters, and borrows freely from more innocuous human endeavours.

It appears, in sum, that the First Partition of the Anatomy of Melancholy maintains the satiric tone and techniques of the Preface. The major change is in the visible structure of the work; now Burton has a conventional framework within which his persona can operate--that of the scientific thesis. But clearly, the work could hardly be called a scientific thesis so far. It has given him the perfect justification for his use of the medical image, and supplied just enough ambiguity to his "anatomy" to cause the confusions in interpretations of his aim that have bedevilled the work since. The targets are the same as in the Preface, but now he has had time to analyze them in more detail, from every angle, in a quasi-scientific manner; the persona has grown more complex, and become a little more clearly distinguished from his author; and his stated purpose has been shown to be impossible of fulfilment. After the Second Partition, even the pose of writing a scientific treatise is abandoned, but, amongst other important developments in that Partition, the path of the satura is highlighted by one of the major satiric digressions of the Anatomy, and by the preparing of the ground for the final onslaught in the Third Partition.

The Second Partition itself contains the last of the more "technical sections" of the Anatomy, but they also adhere to the overall satiric vision. In comparison, the "Digression of Aire," in which the inconsistencies of Renaissance science are exposed, the mock-odyssey through the world of books, the further exposure of Democritus Junior's

own insecurity, and the final confession that it might perhaps be erroneous to attempt to cure melancholy at all--these are the most obviously satiric elements in the Partition.

Again it is the personality of the persona that permeates the Second Partition. From the most daringly perceptive observations in the "Digression of Air," to the most cautious self-interest in his attitudes towards potential personal dangers, he retains that paradoxical position that has marked his path so far. Though it is everywhere to be seen, this characteristic is nowhere more noticeable than in his relationship with doctors.

Democritus Junior makes a plea to potential patients, near the beginning of the Partition, that is astonishing in the light of the case he has already made against that degenerate profession: "A third thing to be required in a patient, is confidence to be of goode cheare, and have good hope that his Physitian can help him" (p. 301). This is a quite improbable request, following as it does his iconoclastic exposure of medical incompetence and the refusal of doctors to follow the most rudimentary code of ethics. To add to the confusion, moreover, he warns the sufferer to be careful not "to try conclusions, if he read a Receipt in a Book, for so many grossely mistake, and doe themselves more harme then good" (p. 303). Yet the Anatomy is supposed to be aimed at "curing" melancholy. When, therefore, Democritus Junior confounds matters further by appealing to an authority who states that "to work

out of books is a most dangerous thing," those who read the Anatomy for medicinal purposes might well be confused. Thus, in the course of a very few pages, he has effectively destroyed the readers' confidence in the practitioners of medicine, urged the necessity of such confidence nonetheless, and has undermined any hope that resorting to a book such as the Anatomy will bring a cure. Later, of course, the persona retracts the indictments he has issued against doctors, apparently becoming afraid that the consequences of his attacks might become less than pleasant for himself.[1]

A similar display of amusing self-interest occurs somewhat later in this Partition. Democritus Junior has just spent a great deal of effort in denouncing both the corruptions of the gentry and the notion of innate nobility, when he decides once more that he had better cover himself: "I doe much respect and honor true gentry and Nobility, I was borne of worshipfull parents my selfe" (p. 394). As though struck by the idea of his own nobility, he goes on:

> So much in the meane time I doe attribute to gentility that if he be well descended of worshipfull or noble Parentage, he will expresse it in his conditions.
>
> . . . nec enim feroces
> Progenerant aquilae columbam.
>
> he will be more affable and courteous, gently disposed, of fairer carriage, better temper; of a more magnanimous, heroicall and generous spirit, then that vulgus hominum, those ordinary boores and pesants . . . . (p. 394)

[1]See above, p. 158.

Such undisguised fawning on the nobility when he feels he may have overstepped the mark of caution is an unendearing though amusing attribute of Democritus Junior, and again helps diminish him in the eyes of the reader. He is made guilty of that same spinelessness for which he had earlier indicted other scholars.

In this Second Partition, whenever Democritus Junior becomes serious, Burton frequently contrives to spoil the effect by having the persona make some incongruous lapse, either by some personal admission, as above, or by having him cite some example that makes his whole case seem ludicrous. For instance, one of the chief methods of curing melancholy involves "driving out one passion with another," the efficacy of which tactic is demonstrated by this amusing exemplum:

> The pleasantest dotage that ever I read, saith Laurentius, was of a Gentleman of Senes in Italy, who was afraid to pisse, lest all the towne should be drowned, the Physitians caused the bels to be rung backward, and told him the town was on fire, whereupon he pissed, and was immediately cured.
> (p. 371)

By this and the other extreme cases he gives, even though they may be actual, the seriousness of the suggested cure is once again cast in doubt.

There is a most important development in this Partition with respect to Democritus Junior's attitude towards the cure of melancholy, which is, after all, the putative aim of the work. After concluding a lengthy piece of advice on how to drive out one disease with another, with an admonition to all to be merry, he switches abruptly to warn,

"As good be melancholy still as drunken beggers" (p. 380). He continues in this somewhat less enthusiastic vein, and laments lyrically even the quest for merriment: "And so, [men] like Grassehoppers, whilst they sing over their cuppes all summer, they starve in winter, and for a little vaine merriment, shall finde a sorrowfull reckoning in the end" (p. 380). This suggestion that melancholy is not the worst human state gives us a foretaste of what is to follow.

This new tack is begun with an assertion that happiness is not to be found easily, and that the wisdom of the ancients is of little help in the search. Indeed, in the digression "Remedies Against all manner of Discontents," having analysed the perennial problem of envy as a cause of melancholy, Democritus Junior seems to deny the possibility of any positive action against the dictates of a cruel destiny:

> . . . but now as a mired horse that struggles at first with all his might and meane to get out, but when hee sees no remedy, that all his beating will not serve, lies still, I have laboured in vaine, and rest satisfied,
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Mine haven's found, fortune and hope adue,
> Mock others now for I have done with you. (p. 420)

The overtones of hopelessness and resignation to injustice abound: man is the victim of a vicious fortune and only that Stoic resolution which Democritus Junior elsewhere mocks can sustain him. But such a despondent line does not satisfy him for long, and he defiantly changes it:

> As a curre that goes through a Village, if he clap his taile between his legs, and run away, every curre wil insult over him, but if he brisle up himself, and stand to it, give but a counter-snarle, there's not a dog dare meddle with him: much is in a mans courage and discreet carriage of himself. (p. 426-27)

Yet the comparison does little to dignify man; he is still a cur, and his show of courage a deception.

The digression continues in this self-contradictory vein and, having shown the folly of his own effort to cure what is incurable, Democritus Junior supplies a list of proverbs which advocate circumspection as a means to avoid disappointment in life. The proverbs ask for silence, caution and thrift; typically, therefore, Democritus Junior advocates, "Live as merrily as thou canst," though he has just admonished us to avoid the means of attaining merriment. He supports this changed view of things even further by suggesting, "Yield to the time, follow the stream"--an idea particularly dear to the persona, against whose lack of consistency the satire is often directed.

The final lines of this digression represent one of the most amusing examples of Democritus Junior's penchant for the quick reversal and also give an indication of the eclectic nature of his author's learning. Having listed reams of advice upon how to console ourselves out of the works of all the great philosophers, and theologians, and the books of Revealed Truth, and having noted the traditional words of wisdom of the people in their proverbs, he closes thus: "Look for more in Seneca, Plutarch, Epictetus, etc. and for defect, consult with cheese-trenchers and painted cloathes" (p. 428). The statement implies that as much consolation can be derived from such popular trivia[1] as from the

[1]O.E.D. cites many examples of the use of "painted cloathes;" they were hangings for rooms, "painted or worked with figures, mottoes, or texts."

leaders of Western thought. Whilst this position reflects the ingenuousness of Democritus Junior, it also shows Burton's scorn for the accumulated wisdom of the ages in the face of the misery of the human lot, one of the major themes of the Anatomy.

In the course of this Partition, however, having shattered the faith of sufferers in their doctors and in books such as the Anatomy of Melancholy, and having suggested that perhaps there are worse things than melancholy, he now makes a suggestion that is not entirely unpredictable in a satiric work, but contradicts the Anatomy's putative aim: Democritus Junior advises his readers that it might be unwise to seek a cure of melancholy at all, since it may indeed be one of the least noxious of human predicaments.[1] At this point, it seems clear that one can hardly continue to look upon the Anatomy as a serious medical work. The contradictions in aim have come to the stage where the Anatomy serves the purpose of being an apology for melancholy rather than a "sovereign remedy" against it.

This last Member, therefore, helps dispel the notion that the aim of the Anatomy of Melancholy is scientific. The ending of the digression, "Remedies Against Discontents," at any rate, appears to confirm the contention that the persona, Democritus Junior, has been deliberately made to appear gullible, that he is not always to be taken seriously.

[1]See above, pp. 156-7.

Hence his frequent self-contradictions. The inconsistency of his position is highlighted at this point, where he not only denies the feasibility of the aim he originally claimed for himself, but even suggests that to attempt to cure the illness would be a disservice to his patients. Ironically, the malady has become a desirable social attribute.

In the Second Partition, once again, the use of the digression is one of Burton's chief satiric devices, the "Digression of Aire" being one of the best-known sections of the entire Anatomy. It takes the form of a mock-odyssey, as does the consideration of the joys of scholarship that comes later in the Partition, and it constitutes a major satiric statement in the work. Because of its importance, therefore, it deserves a fuller treatment than some of the less central parts.

The mock-odyssey, or fantastic journey, has been one of the favourite devices of satirists from Lucian onwards (Alice in Wonderland is a notable modern example of its use), and Burton is an admirer of the tradition. He makes Democritus Junior begin:

> As a long-winged Hawke when he is first whistled off the fist, mounts aloft, and for his pleasure fecheth many circuits in the Aire, still soaring higher and higher, till he be come to his full pitch, and in the end when the game is sprung, comes down amaine, and stoupes upon a suddein: so will I, having come at last into these spatious fields of Aire, wherein I may freely expatiate and exercise my selfe, for my recreation a while rove, and wander round about the world, and mount aloft to those aetheriall orbes and celestiall spheres, and so descend to my former elements againe. (pp. 317-18)

The hawk image, like that earlier reference to the "purly hunter," is more than just a romantic gambit; the hawk is the predator-bird (the satirist), and even in its most lyrical moments of flight, its intent, like Democritus Junior's, is to swoop upon its quarry. By rising to the loftiest heights, the satirist may escape from the morass of petty vice, corruption, and folly through which he has been wading, to take a more cosmic view of human affairs. Yet, even from above, the scene is not a pretty one--cosmic folly seems no more attractive than those human foibles already examined under the microscope. The change of perspective, however, is refreshing for both reader and satirist.

This "Digression" makes deferential reference to other mock-travel books such as the Utopia and the Icaromenippus. It contains an impressive array of Renaissance learning, yet by mockingly displaying the scholarly contradictions of the age, it provides the ultimate illustration of the futility of the pre-Baconian method of ever arriving at ascertainable truth. The digression pays particular attention to the folly whereby oversimplification or systematization confounds truth, and leads to even more chaotic complexity:

> Fracastorius will have the earth stand still as before, and to avoid that grosse supposition of Eccentrics and Epicicles de [sic] hath coyned 72 Homocentrickes, to solve all appearances. (p. 328)

None of the other "solutions" that were advanced is any more simple, and Burton concludes with a memorable passage:

> In his own hypothesis, he [Helisaeus Roeslin] puts the Earth as before, the universal Centre, the Sun Center to the five upper Planets, to the eighth Spheare he ascribes diurnal motion, and Eccentricks and Epicycles to the seven Planets, which hath bin formerly exploded, and so dum vitant stulti vitia in contraria currunt, as a tinker stops one hole, and makes two, he corrects them, and doth worse himself; reformes some, and marres all. In the mean time, the world is tossed in a blanket amongst them, they tosse the Earth up and down like a ball, make her stand and goe at their pleasures; one saith the Sun stands, another he moves, a third comes in, taking them all at rebound, and lest there should any Paradox bee wanting, he finds certain spots or clouds in the Sun, by the help of glasses, by means of which the Sun must turne round about his owne center, or they about the Sun. (p. 329)

Democritus Junior thus satirically arraigns the universal folly of men; they disregard their own very obvious limitations, and attempt to adjust the whole of the physical world to fit their own deluded predilections.[1]

A further sign of man's egocentric madness, his attempts to comprehend divinity, is illustrated in the digression:

> But why should the Sun and Moon be angry, or take exceptions at Mathematicians or Philosophers? when as the like measure is offered unto God himselfe, by a Company of Theologasters, they are not contented to see the Sun and Moone, and measure their site and biggest distance in a glasse, calculate their motions, or visite the Moone in a Poeticall fiction, or a dreame, not in jest, but in good earnest, they will transcend Spheares, Heaven, Starres, into that Empyrean Heaven, soare higher yet, and see what God himself doth, and his Angels, about what he busies himself. (pp. 329-30)

[1]This situation reminds one of that joke of Bergson's about the eclipse: "Take as an instance the remark made by a lady whom Cassini the astronomer had invited to see the eclipse of the moon. Arriving too late, she said, 'M. de Cassini, I know, will have the goodness to begin it all over again to please me'" (Bergson, p. 30).

This leads Democritus Junior to an onslaught on all philosophers, theologians, and religious dogmatists who create their God in their own image. He concludes this very significant digression upon the folly of man's cosmic view by protesting his own "innocence" about these problems:

> But hoo? I am now gone quite out of sight, I am almost giddy with roving about, I could have ranged farther yet, but I am an infant, and not able to dive into these profundities, not able to understand, much lesse to discusse: I leave the contemplation of these things, to stronger wits, that have better ability, and happier leisure to wade into such Philosophicall mysteries: my melancholy spaniels quest, my game is sprung, and I must come down and follow. (p. 330)

He closes thus with the hunting image that had opened the digression, making it clear that he has indeed "sprung" the game (folly) from above, just as easily as from below. It is ironic, however, that despite his disclaimer, Democritus Junior himself has shown precisely the capability for such vast scholarly quests, and sufficient ingenuousness to proceed upon such fruitless pursuits; indeed, his conception of the Anatomy itself is equally arrogant, undertaken upon just such a specious, scientific basis.

This digression has revealed, therefore, the tremendous breadth of knowledge of the persona's creator and has exposed the numerous dichotomies that afflicted the learning of his day; Democritus Junior has satirized others and been the butt of Burton's satire himself. The persona can clearly see the massive contradictions amongst scholars and pillories many, yet he gives undue credence to other conflicting

opinions, and delights in their speculative confusions. He is, to this extent, a fool: his inclination compels him to participate in their folly, though his intellect warns him of their delusions.

Later in the Partition there comes another important satiric digression that has been touched on before.[1] This "Consolatory Digression containing the Remedies for all maner of Discontents" lasts for almost one hundred crammed pages: its application is universal, and its theme is the one that Burton has been at pains to emphasize throughout--the universality of folly. All the problems that can afflict the spirit are represented in the form of a vast procession, the familiar parade of the vices: bodily deformity, baseness of birth, poverty, slavery, death, envy, slander, and a multitude of others are displayed in the pageant with devastating precision of observation; in such a cavalcade, the satirist finds an embarrassment of material. Though Burton's techniques are by now familiar, he rarely repeats himself in such a passage. Clearly, the implication is that with so much material to choose from, the satirist need never be at a loss.

Equally important, the mock-encomium and the mock-commination are two of Burton's most frequently used satiric devices, which together will become the major structural principles of the final Partition. There is a minor example of their use in the Second Partition that is

[1]See above, pp. 234-5.

worthy of note, indicating as it does the possibilities of the technique. It occurs when Democritus Junior has been discussing purgatives generally, and comes to the subject of tobacco:

> Tobacco, divine, rare, superexcellent Tobacco, which goes farre beyond all their Panaceas, potable gold, and Philosophers stones, a soveraigne Remedy to all diseases. A good vomit I confesse, a vertuous herbe, if it be well qualified, opportunely taken, and medicinally used, but as it is commonly abused by all men, which take it as Tinkers doe ale, t'is a plague, a mischiefe, a violent purger of goods, lands, health, hellish, divelish, and damned Tobacco, the ruine and overthrowe of Body and Soule. (pp. 462-63)

Here, there is a steadily improvised descent from the concept of tobacco as the supreme good, to the abomination of it as the ultimate evil; the satire lies, of course, in the distorted nature of either view.

The Second Partition, then, is yet another compendium of satiric techniques, the whole bound together by the informing ironic vision of the author transmitted through his erratic persona. Ridicule, parody, and invective are everywhere to be found, and these are aimed against the subjects that have been attacked earlier in the Anatomy, with a zest and variety that sustains the reader's interest.

In the "Digression of Aire," the follies of scholars generally had been denounced, but it is the medical profession especially that bears the brunt of Democritus Junior's ire throughout the Second Partition, which opens with a jibe at the "unlawful cures" of melancholy and their advocates. The persona taunts those who practice medicine selfishly, reminding them the "Divell is an expert Physician" (p. 289), and hinting

at an unholy alliance throughout the Partition.[1] He is unrelenting in his attack, except where, as I showed earlier, he is trying to protect himself.

Superstition, a subject to be explored in depth in the final Partition, under "Religious Melancholy," is attacked here too (pp. 295-6), in diatribes against all kinds of religious fanatics. For example, he remonstrates with particular vigour against the Puritan precisians:

> Dancing, Singing, Masking, Mumming, Stage-Playes, howsoever they be heavily censured by some severe Catoes, yet if opportunely and soberly used, may justly be approved. Melius est fodere quam saltare, saith Austin, but what is that if they delight in it? Nemo saltat sobrius. But in what kind of dance? I knowe these sports have many oppugners, whole volumes writ against them, and some againe because they are cold and wayward, past themselves, cavell at such youthfull sports in others, as he did in the Comedy, they think them Illico nasci senes, etc., Some out of preposterous zeale object many times triviall arguments, and because of some abuse, will quite take away the good use, as if they should forbid wine because it makes men drunke, but in my judgement they are too sterne . . . . (p. 348)

The examples of "abuses" of such relatively innocent pleasures that he goes on to cite are, as we would expect, the most exaggeratedly absurd, and do little to make the precisians' strictures sound reasonable:

> William the Conqueror in his younger yeares playing at Chesse with the Prince of France. (Dauphine was not annexed to the Crowne of France in those dayes) loosing a Mate knocked the Chess-board about his pate, which was a cause afterward of much emnity betwixt them. (p. 347)

[1]See, for example, Anatomy, p. 431.

Such evils he ironically suggests, spring out of something as harmless as a game of chess.

In this Partition, too, he continues to attack worthless books and authors,[1] sustaines his onslaught against the corrupt gentry of England (pp. 389-90), and introduces for a preliminary treatment the major quarry of the entire Third Partition--women. This latter topic occurs in "Remedies against Discontents," when Democritus Junior is considering death and its appurtenances. At first, he seems suitably muted, but this attitude does not last for long; the subject of dead wives arises, and he cannot contain himself, since neither the satiric tradition nor his own prejudice allows room for a sympathetic attitude towards the female sex:

> Another he complaines of a most sweet wife, such a wife as no mortall man ever had so good a wife; I reply to him in Senecaes words, if such a woman at least ever was to be had, he did either so finde her, or make her, if he found her, he may as happily finde another; if hee made her, as Critobulus in Xenophon did by his, he may as good cheape informe another, he need not despaire, so long as the same matter is to be had. But was she good? had shee beene so tried peradventure as that Ephesian widdow in Petronius, by some swaggering souldier, she would not have held out. Many a man would willingly be rid of his: before thou wast bound, now thou art free, and tis but a folly to love thy fetters, though they be of gold. (p. 416)

His authorities in this case are again satirists with little expressed fondness for women. Even more striking, however, is the implication

[1]In the entire "Digression of Aire," for example.

that sorrow for a dead woman cannot be really deep: it is too easy to alleviate the burden of bereavement by simply replacing the spoilt commodity--such is the notion behind the reference to Critobulus, a Pygmalion-figure.

As the preceding discussion shows, Democritus Junior has continued the satiric attack in the Second Partition against a wide variety of targets, some of them traditional, some contemporary. At the same time, he has given a forewarning of what is to come in the Third Partition, especially in his onslaught against women and superstition, for there they are to bear the brunt of the satire. Likewise, he has shown the inexhaustible amount of material left to deal with subjects he has already pilloried; the classics of the satirical tradition appear everywhere to bolster his salvoes, current and universal problems provide the material, and the ironic eye of Burton surveys all through the idiosyncratic Democritus Junior.

In this Second Partition, there are, however, as in the earlier parts of the Anatomy so far examined, a number of passages that might appear to be "serious and scientific," or at least overwhelmingly technical. Once again, an examination shows them to be integral parts of the overall satiric vision of the work.

"Exercise Rectified" gives just such an appearance of "seriousness," but is in fact strongly related to the "Digression of Aire," which is a mock-odyssey in the Lucianic tradition. In "Exercise

Rectified," man's mercenary pursuits are put in a clearer perspective when compared with the simple quest for the beauty and harmony of nature.[1] Indeed it is as though in this passage a clear answer is given to the complexities Democritus Junior elsewhere parades, anticipating works like Walton's "Menippean Satire," The Compleat Angler, in such passages as this sequel to an eulogy upon fishing:

> But the most pleasing of all outward pastimes is that of Aretaeus, deambulatio per amaena loca. . . .
>
> To see the pleasant fields, the Christall fountaines,
> And to take the gentle ayre amongst the mountaines.
>
> To walke amongst Orchards, Gardens, Bowers, and Arbors, arteficiall Wildernesses, and greene thickets, Arches, Groves, Pooles, Fishponds, betwixt wood and water in a faire Meddowe, by a river side disport in some pleasant plaine, or runne up a steepe hill, or sit in a shady seat, must needs be a delectable recreation. (pp. 342-43)

This short summary of nature's beauties makes a striking contrast to the lengthy catalogues of folly and vice that we are accustomed to in the Anatomy, but its very brevity makes it all the more effective, for such momentary tranquillity serves merely to intensify the contrast with man-made chaos.

[1]Northrop Frye, Anatomy of Criticism, p. 312, has something significant to say about this aspect of the "anatomy" form--though once again de-emphasising the satiric side of it, when he talks about the Compleat Angler: "[It] is an anatomy because of its mixture of prose and verse, its rural cena setting, its dialogue form, its deipnosophistical interest in food, and its gentle Menippean raillery of a society that considers everything more important than fishing, and yet has discovered very few better things to do."

Another instance of this seemingly entirely "serious" tack comes near the end of the Partition, where the reader is given a fascinating description of the herbs and metals that can be used to aid the melancholiac. This section seems free at first of any satiric taint, but is integral nonetheless to the overall pattern, since the implication is clearly there, that Nature, uncorrupted by man's viciousness, has been spared the lash, and is, in this instance, a credible teacher. At the same time, the passage provides an opportunity for Democritus Junior to enter upon an ironic discussion of the respective merits of Paracelsians and Galenists, and experimenters generally with their "nonsense-confused compounds" (p. 444). He comments upon the whole mass of medical theorizing with bitterness, but again disguises the place of the attack in his plan, by apologizing for the "digression." Similarly, he finds space for a mock-encomium upon wine, and blithely suggests the most ludicrous remedies for his patients: "Amatus Lusitanus . . . for an hypocondriacall person, that was extreamely tormented with winde, prescribes a strange remedy, Put a paire of bellowes end in a Clyster pipe, and putting into the fundament, open the bellowes, so drawe forth the winde" (p. 486). This is one of the final remedies suggested in the Second Partition; it is very like the method described by Gulliver, whereby the scientists at the Academy of Lagado were attempting to cure a similar problem, and it seems an equally innocent parody of science by an equally gullible persona, acting as the mouthpiece and also the butt of his creator.

In this fashion, the Second Partition closes; due lip-service has been paid to the purported scientific aim, but the "scientific" passages, as I have shown, have all had an ulterior motive. The satire has advanced inexorably, the gullibility of Democritus Junior emerging clearly, together with certain indications of his ruthlessness in the pursuit of his goal, and cautious self-interest regarding the consequences of his attacks on powerful sectors of his society. The Third and last Partition, which now follows, drops the scientific camouflage utterly, its purpose outlived. Whether the illusion was successfully maintained or not is now of no consequence; the prey has been flushed, and it is pursued with unflagging zest.

The Third Partition reads like a complete satire in itself. It has a preface of its own, and the "Conclusion of the Author to the Reader" ends it quite appropriately (though the "Conclusion" is meant for the entire Anatomy). Although it deals with all the other targets of the satire in some shape or form, the major butt of the Third Partition is love and its perversions, from which no man, except possibly Democritus Junior, is exempt. The persona's character is further revealed: he comes across again as a frustrated pedant, who, under the guise of analysing the flaws in society (which he does with great incisiveness), wallows in the vicarious pleasure of dabbling in forbidden fields through the written word. Notable in the Partition is the pervasive use of the mock-encomium, and the further amplification of the

Rabelaisian note which is perfectly fitted to many sections of the Partition. Ominously, once more, suicide is defended by the persona, and the incurable disease is no nearer to a cure.

Burton felt, moreover, that it was necessary to include a separate preface to this Partition; like "Democritus to the Reader," it is ostensibly a justification of the nature of the Anatomy, and like that first Preface, it is a satiric apologia. As in "Democritus to the Reader," for example, Democritus Junior is made to cite Erasmus' Praise of Folly as a precedent:

> There will not bee wanting, I presume, some or other that will much discommend some part of this treatise of Love Melancholy, and object (which Erasmus in his Preface to Sr. Thomas Moore suspects of his) that it is too light for a Divine, too Comicall a subject to speake of Love Symptomes, and fit alone for a wanton Poet, or some such idle person. (p. 495)

Indeed, one of the major devices in the Anatomy from now on will be the mock-encomium of Love, an emotion Democritus Junior feels to be tantamount to Folly itself. Whereas, however, the first Preface was written in defence of the entire undertaking, this preface is a special plea for the Third Partition particularly.

As he had done in "Democritus to the Reader," Democritus Junior attacks his readers by implication, before they can assail him--a sound satiric principle--on the grounds of their "affected gravity" and "dissembling." As in the earlier Preface, he feels obliged to list precedents for what he is doing: he calls upon "Plato, Plutarch,

Plotinus, Avicenna, Leon Hebraeus," and others; ironically, the illustrious-sounding first precedent is not the academician this time, but the comedian. Democritus Junior considers Plato's name itself to be valuable, and leaves the readers to discover the reference. But it is also implied that one finds as much truth in the comedian as in the philosopher, an idea that has been hinted at frequently throughout the Anatomy.

He now suggests that up to this point he has given us our money's worth in tedious facts, and asks: ". . . give me leave then to refresh my muse a little and my weary Readers, to season a surly discourse, with a more pleasing aspersion of love matters" (p. 497). The two Partitions preceding have certainly not been "surly" in the implied sense, but, rather, in their often Juvenalian bitterness; this Third Partition turns out to be no different in kind from what has gone before. As in "Democritus to the Reader," for example, he suggests that if we feel the Partition is not sufficiently dignified, we ought to look to the great satires of antiquity. We might care to remember Martial: "Lasciva est nobis pagina, vita proba est." As a further step, he indulges in the classical justification of his satire: "I speake it only to taxe and deterre others from it, not to teach it, but to apply remedies unto it" (p. 497). Thus the persona again shows his awareness of the moral problem that had taxed the ingenuity of so many satirists before him, and he tries to defend his motives, as they had done.

Ironically enough, this Partition demonstrates unequivocally the obsession that Democritus Junior has with matters sexual; he cannot long tear himself away from a subject which swamps at times both his intellect and his code of ethics. Burton makes his persona stoop to behaviour comparable to the worst folly of his "lovers:" Democritus Junior is often immoral in what he thinks is a good cause, showing that same inability to separate means from end that was apparent in the first two Partitions.

Even apart from the preface, however, it is most clear that in the Third Partition proper the speaker in the Anatomy is a persona, a fictional creature, and not Burton himself. Again Democritus Junior emerges as the container of a mass of contradictory attitudes, one moment full of insight and humour, the next, displaying himself as a fool blinded by his own prejudices and obsessions; at one moment he is the pious cleric, at the next, a vicious hypocrite, and the object of Burton's satire.

This constantly wavering stance of Democritus Junior's is very much in evidence in his attitude towards women, against whom much of the Third Partition is directed. Yet, despite the multitude of virulently anti-feminist passages throughout the Partition (which merely echo and reinforce Democritus Junior's expressed opinions of the previous Partitions), he protests several times that he has simply been recording the opinions of others, or well-known "facts," he himself being of another opinion:

> I will say nothing of the vices of their minds, their pride, envy, inconstancy, weakenesse, malice, selfe will, lightnesse, insatiable appetite, jelousie . . . I am not willing to prosecute the cause against them; let Mantuan, Platina, in dial. and such women haters beare the blame, if I have said amisse, I have not said an halfe of that which might be urged out of them and others. (p. 646)

Again the device is transparent: it is his attempt to clear himself (as he had done in the Second Partition with respect to doctors and the nobility) of responsibility for the abuse he has heaped on women throughout. For Democritus Junior has shown that he himself is a "women hater," and especially in this Partition; women are, it seems, the real cause of that disastrous Fall he describes so movingly at the beginning if the first Partition, and their influence is pernicious and all-pervasive.

This absurd attempt to appear sympathetic towards the major subject of the entire Partition is nowhere more evident than in the story about the immorality of nuns, taken from the historian Mapes; he apologizes for its inclusion thus: "This story I doe therfore repeat, that you may see of what force such enticements are, if they be opportunely used, and how hard it is even for the most averse and sanctified soules to resist such allurements" (p. 585). Yet throughout the Anatomy he has been at pains to show his utter contempt for nuns who are, for him, the worst of all women. The evidence for such self-contradiction, is surely quite incontestable by this stage in the Anatomy.

Later, though Democritus Junior has stated with as much conviction as he can muster that he will not pursue the "obvious" case

against women, he is not to be easily distracted from his target. He soon finds a chance to utilize that favourite image of his in yet another attack on women: "An Irish Sea is not so turbulent and raging as a litigious wife" (p. 647). The choice of the Irish Sea again "diminishes," and he pursues the image further in giving a rather amusing but discriminatory example of the Syracusan who, having to lighten his ship in a storm, threw the most expendable piece of merchandise overboard--his wife: "quia maximum pondus erat;" again he hurries on to excuse the seeming prejudice involved in his choice of anecdote: "But this I confesse is Comically spoken, and so I pray you take it" (p. 647). To further compound the absurdity of his attempt to excuse his obvious bias, he indulges in a last-minute eulogy of the married state, deferring to the ironic Chaucer and Ovid for more "expert" advice on the subject of romantic love.

That mixture of insight into the folly of others and blindness with respect to his own faults appears most forcibly in this Partition also. He "reassures" cuckolded men, for instance, by showing the universality of adultery, and therefore the universality of women's infidelity. Then he follows with a favourite device of his: having confirmed the suspicions of those who are worried about their wives' fidelity, he strikes a blow against any who are so complacent that they think they have nothing to fear in the matter. He gives a double-edged example of the unsuspicious mind that is free from the pangs of jealousy:

"S. Francis by chance seeing a Frier familiarly kissing another man's wife, was so far from misconceaving it, that hee presently kneeled down and thanked God there was so much charity left" (p. 693). Thus, under the guise of Democritus Junior's admiration for the saint, Burton seems to demonstrate the folly of both. Democritus Junior continues in this vein to provide exempla that show the blindness of the deceived rather than the innocence of the suspected participants: "A good fellow when his wife was brought to bed before her time, bought half a dozen Cradles before hand for so many children, as if his wife should continue to beare children at every two months" (p. 695). Again the example is ambiguous, but there is the suggestion that Democritus Junior has not detected the possibly irony of the husband's gesture.

Another instance of this ambivalent approach occurs when, as the ultimate cure for jealousy, Democritus Junior suggests that a very jealous man ought to marry an ugly woman, and thus allay his apprehension somewhat. But with typical self-contradictory candour, Democritus Junior immediately confesses: "I had rather marry a faire one and put it to the hazard, then be troubled with a blouze, but doe as thou wilt, I speak only for my self" (p. 703). This is an implied evaluation of much of his own advice, and occurs at a point when there is an even more noticeable absurdity creeping into his remedies:

> If none of all these meanes and cautions will take place, I know not what remedie to prescribe, or whither such persons may goe for ease, except they can get into that same Turkie paradice, Where they shall have as many faire wives as they

> will themselves, with cleare eyes, and such as shall looke on none but their owne husbands, no feare, no danger of being cuckoldes. (p. 705)

Such fantasies apart, his final solution is, ironically, the most practical though least admissible (in the eyes of his contemporaries) of all the remedies he has proposed: "Or else sue for a divorce."

In this Third Partition, Democritus Junior has his final opportunity to achieve that "aim" that has been so difficult to pin down throughout the Anatomy. But, again, the Partition ends with a plea for the toleration of suicide. He is unwilling to condemn those who turn to self-destruction and defends them against rigorous judgement: "If a man put desperate hands upon him selfe, by occasion of madnesse or melancholy, if hee have given testimony before of his regeneration, in regard hee doe this not so much out of his will, as ex vi morbi, we must make the best construction of it, as Turkes doe, that thinke all fools and madmen goe directly to Heaven" (p. 782). This echoes a similar note in the conclusion to the First Partition: suicide and madness often seem like the final solutions that Democritus Junior has to offer. He introduces a closing supplication for the desperate, though extending little hope that finally they, or anyone else, will be saved from "the chops of hell and out of the Divells pawes."

The treatment of Love Melancholy and Religious Melancholy by Democritus Junior also turns out to be satiric. In the course of it, however, the persona has shown himself to be a fascinated but ingenuous

researcher, and has virtually denied the existence of any worthwhile human love as a quagmire of perversions is unfolded. The distinction between Burton and his persona is here most clear: even when Democritus Junior has been at his most lucid, examining the follies of humanity, he has been proportionately blindest to his own shortcomings. To the very end of the Anatomy he has been unable to solve his own problems, remaining the satirist satirized.

This Partition also helps settle the question of whether he writes about chronic or general melancholy. The whole of this Partition deals with men in general, with the possible exception of Democritus Junior himself. He makes it clear that all humanity suffers from the affliction of love, even in its extreme forms. There is, moreover, no attempt to pretend that this Partition is aimed at a special group, for the satire encompasses all men, since "heroic lust" acts as a universal leveller.

In this Partition, as has already been evident, Burton utilizes his stock of satiric techniques. Much of the analysis of Love Melancholy, for instance, consists in a protracted use of the mock-encomium and the mock-commination (in the "flyting" tradition). But within the larger vista there are numerous examples of the device used on a smaller scale. Early in the Partition, for instance, there is a discussion of gold that involves both encomium and commination. Its purpose is quite clear within the scheme of things; Democritus Junior suggests that the

unhealthy love of gold is no different in kind from the love of man for woman:

> Our estate, and bene esse ebbes and flowes, with our commoditie, and as we are endowed and enriched so are we beloved: it lasts no longer then our wealth, when that is gone and the object removed, farwell friendship; as long as bounty and good cheere and rewards were to be hoped, friends enough; and they were tied to thee by the teeth, and would follow thee as Crowes doe a carcasse: but when thy goods are gone and spent, the lampe of their love is out, and thou shalt be contemned, scorned, hated, injured . . . but touch our commodities, wee are most impatient, faire becomes foule, the graces are turned to Harpyes, friendly salutations to bitter imprecations, mutuall feastings, to plotting villanies, minings and counterminings, good words to Satyrs and invectives, we revile, econtra, nought but his imperfections are in our eyes, he is a base knave, a divell, a monster, a caterpillar, a viper, an hogrubber etc, the sceane is altered on a sudden . . . .
> (pp. 508-09)

Thus the personal, immoral motive for satire is exemplified and the supposed origins of the kind made evident in the use of the dramatic image.

A better-known illustration occurs shortly thereafter, when Democritus Junior, discussing the physical manifestations of human love, considers the dreadful dangers involved in kissing, and allows the subject to carry him away. In this mock-eulogy, mock-execration, the enthusiasm of the persona is significant:

> There be honest kisses, I denie not, osculum charitatis, friendly kisses, modest kisses, officious and ceremoniall kisses, etc., but there are too lascivious kisses . . . they cling like Ivy, or an Oyster, bill as Doves, meretricious kisses, biting of lips . . . such kisses as shee gave to Gyton innumera oscula dedit non repugnanti puero cervicem invadens, innumerable kisses, etc. More then kisses, or too

> homely kisses . . . with such other obscenities, that vaine lovers use, which are abominable and pernitious. If as Peter de Ledesmo cas. cons. hold, every kisse a man gives his wife after marriage, be mortale peccatum, a mortall sinne, what shall become of all such immodest kisses and obscene actions, the forerunners of brutish lust, If not lust it selfe? what shal become of them, that often abuse their owne wives? but what have I to doe with this? (pp. 582-83)

Thus he draws himself up with a start; he obviously enjoys contemplating what he is supposed to be discommending, and, therefore, dissociates himself from any practical knowledge of his subject.

The Third Partition, moreover, even more than the others, invokes satirists of ancient and modern times in its ironic analysis of love, the great leveller, to whom all are subject (except, as I suggested earlier, the persona himself). A related technique appears here also: Democritus Junior attacks other satirists and scholars, implying that he himself is innocent of the abuses they display:

> Prayse and dispraise of each other do as much, though unknowne, as Scoppius by Scaliger, and Casaubonus, mulus mulum scabit. Who but Scaliger with him, what Encomions, Epithites, Elogiums . . . but when they began to varie, none so absurd as Scaliger, so vile and base as his Bookes de Burdonum familia, and other Satyricall invectives may witnesse, Ovid in Ibin, Archilocus himselfe was not so bitter. (pp. 511-12)

Although here and elsewhere he claims to be averse to using satire to attack specific persons, he frequently refers mockingly to the Scaliger controversy, and pillories dead scholars as well as living papists. Similarly, he is quite willing to specify the time and place to which his satire refers, especially when driving home those points which he regards

as having particular contemporary relevance. When dealing with hypocrisy, for instance, Democritus Junior locates the "flattering Gnathos" in his own "temporizing age."

In this Partition also, the abusive catalogue, which has been such a prominent weapon in the Anatomy's armoury, takes on another subtle overtone: it becomes, in part, a parody of the Petrarchan "anatomy" of the ideal mistress,[1] and is particularly apposite in the circumstances in which he uses it. The most famous instance (relatively brief in this first edition) of this kind of amusing parody comes when, having satirically analyzed the causes of love, the Anatomy moves on to consider the symptoms that betray its presence. In a fantastic piece of abusive writing, Democritus Junior demonstrates the blindness of those who fall:

> Every lover admires his mistris, though she be very deformed of her selfe, ill favoured, crooked, bald, goggle-eyed, or squint-eyed, sparrow mouthed, hookenosed, or have a sharpe foxe nose, gubber-tussed, rotten teeth, bettle-browed, her breath stinke all over the roome, her nose drop winter and summer, with a Bavarian poke under her chin, lave eared, her dugges like two double jugges, bloodi-falne-fingers, scabbed wrists, a tanned skinne, a rotten carkase, crooked backe, lame, splea-footed, as slender in the middle as a cow in the waste, goutie legges, her feete stinke, she breeds lice, a very monster, an aufe imperfect, her whole complectioun savours, and to thy judgement lookes like a marde in a lanthorne, whom thou couldest not fancy for a world, but hatest, lothest, and wouldest have spit in her face, or blowe thy nose in her bosome, remedium amoris, to another man doudy,

[1]This kind of "anatomy" is the "blazon" of Renaissance poets. I prefer to call it "anatomy" because of its clear relationship to the medical image, and because of its potential for parody in such a work as Burton's giant "anatomy."

> a slut, a nasty, filthy, beastly queane, dishonest peradventure, obscene, base, beggerly, foolish, untaught, if he love her once, he admires her for all this, he takes no notice of any such errors or imperfections, of body or mind, he had rather have her then any woman in the world. (pp. 608-609)

This whole passage is a product of the "satyre" tradition with similarities to the "flyting" form which is its offshoot. It is a tour de force structurally and linguistically, in its Rabelaisian vitality. It is the focal point of page after page of heaped-up examples of the absurd behaviour of those who are in love: "it would not grieve him [i.e., the lover] to be hanged if he might be strangled in her garters" (p. 614). The classics, mythology, history, and contemporary life and customs are raked over for examples to fill a tremendous catalogue of folly. At this juncture the dichotomy between ideal and real becomes most evident: the ideal is that perfect Renaissance woman, the reality is the harridan Democritus Junior describes; the ideal is true love, the reality is blind lust; the ideal elevates the mind, the reality vulgarizes and degrades it; the ideal is represented by the decorous, heightened language of love, the reality to which it is applied makes that language a parody of its true intent. The Petrarchan "anatomy" of woman's perfections is reversed: Democritus Junior makes her anathema in his philippic. Yet so that we may not feel that he has exhausted the possibilities, he ends on that note of pretended frustration in the face of the infinite number of examples that are still available to the satirist: "But I conclude, there is no ende to Loves Symptomes, 'tis a bottomless pit, Love is

subject to no dimensions; and not to be survayed by any art or engine" (p. 622). He does not conclude, he continues his malediction without let.

Shortly after, the technique is used again in another parody of the Petrarchan "anatomy":

> Or be she faire indeed, golden haired, as Anacreon his Bathillus, blacke eyed, of a pure sanguine complection, little mouth, white teeth, soft and plumpe body, hands, feet, all faire and lovely to behold, composed of all graces, elegances, an absolute piece: her head from Prage, pappes out of Austria, belly from France, backe from Brabant, hands out of England, feete from Rhine, buttockes from Swisserland, let her have the Spanish gate, the Venetian tire, Italian complements and endowments . . . . (p. 642)

To counter this popular "romantic" vision of universal feminine charm, he goes to Chrysostom and invokes the patristic prejudice against women:

> Take her skinne from her face, and thou shalt see all loth-somenesse under it, that beautie is but a superficiall skinne, and bones, nerves, and sinewes: suppose her sicke, now revil'd, hoarie-headed, hollow-cheeked, old; within she is full of filthy fleame, stincking, putide, excrementall stuffe: snot and snevill in her nostrils, spittle in her mouth, water in her eyes, what filthe in her braines. (p. 645)

Once more, in this example from Chrysostom, we are made aware of the roots of much of Renaissance satire. It is by making use of such precedents that the "Christian" satirist can justify his apparent neglect of the principle of charity, and place himself amongst the ranks of the unassailable.

In a related manner, parody of the Petrarchan "anatomy" is used most effectively once again in the Anatomy, in "Religious Melancholy," where an eulogy appears (p. 708ff.) that employs the language of the Petrarchan poet praising female beauty, but in fact this time it is an "anatomy" of God. The language used there to describe "His Beauty" is justified by its object, and is an implied commentary upon the absurdity of such superlatives when applied to women. Once again, all is "topsie turvy."

Whilst dealing with this matter of religious perversity, Democritus Junior introduces a technique that has not been used since the Preface; he once more invokes the shade of his ancestor, Democritus of Abdera, to corroborate his judgement upon the state of affairs in seventeenth-century England. The topic is Religious Melancholy, and Democritus Junior's pronouncement in many ways prefigures the famous indictment by the King of Brobdingnag in Part Two of Gulliver's Travels. The persona assesses the whole problem from his own namesake's standpoint and from the point of view of his alter ego, Heraclitus. It is notable that though their superficial reactions differ, the vision of each is satiric:

> when I see two superstitious orders contend, pro aris et focis, with such have and hold, de lana caprina, some write such great Volumes to no purpose, take so much paines to so small effect, their Satyrs, invectives, Apologies, dull and grosse fictions, me thinkes tis pretty sport, and fit for Calphurnius and Democritus to laugh at. But when I see so much blood spilt, so many murders and massakers, so many cruell battells fought, etc., tis a fitter subject for Heraclitus to lament. (p. 739)

Both literature and life, in this judgement, give little reason for hope. The appeal to the past for support on the matter brings the reader full circle, for he is obliged to remember the perennial nature of the disease as the two great ancients had shown in the Preface: universality and incurability are its most notable characteristics.

It is fitting, therefore, that the Third Partition should abound in satiric caveats, as often as not following moments of apparent optimism about the human condition. The closing dictum is a concise instance of this. The first edition ends on a note that is, like the work itself, as much threatening as it is consoling:

> Sperate Miseri,
> Cavete Foelices.

The reason for the warning has been made plain throughout: both states, happiness and misery, are delusions, and their common characteristic is their underlying folly.

This Partition does, then, employ some of Burton's most effective satiric techniques. Indeed this final part of the Anatomy is, as I have suggested, satire with little or no attempt at a "scientific" camouflage: Democritus Junior zeroes in on an undeniably universal human characteristic, which he calls lust, and makes it clear that we are chronic sufferers from its effects. It turns out that "love", in its debased or "fallen" form, is in fact the basis for all human failings, and so the way is left open in this final part to conduct the clinching attacks on most of the satiric butts that have appeared elsewhere in the Anatomy.

Though he makes at least glancing attacks on all his favourite quarries in this Partition, he singles out for special attention women, the Church of Rome, and superstitions generally. His choices are, in some degree, imposed upon him by his subject-matter (Love and Religious Melancholy), but it is clear that he does not feel cramped by such limitations. As in all his previous satiric attacks, the ammunition seems to be unlimited.

The first occasion for his onslaught on women arises after he has reduced "heroicall love," one of the most revered concepts in Western culture, to the stature of "burning lust" (p. 539). As he warms to his subject, he cannot help lambasting the arousers of such lust, openly: "Of womens unnaturall, unsatiable lust, what countrey, what village, doth not complaine" (p. 541). Though old men are absurd enough in their senile love affairs, old women in love appall him:

> Worse is it in women then in men, when she is so old a crone, a beldame, she can neither see, nor heare, goe nor stand, a meere carcasse, a witch, and can scarce feele; yet she catterwoules, and must have a stallion, a Champion, she must and will marrie againe, and betroth her selfe to some young man, that hates to look on, but for her goods, abhorres the sight of her, to the prejudice of her good name, her owne undoing, griefe of her friends, ruine of her children. (pp. 541-42)

Amusingly, he once again slips into Latin to describe various costly aphrodisiacs; we can scarcely see how the information will be any the less harmful to the kind of academics that he has consistently depicted than to the rest of humanity.[1]

[1]Burton's caution in having his persona use Latin here can

Young women are no better, and perhaps a little more mercenary than the dotards:

> So on the other side, many a young maid will cast away her selfe upon an old doting disarde, that hath some twentie diseases, one eye, one legge, never a nose, no haire on his head, nor wit in his braines, nor honesty, if he have money she will have him before all other suiters. (p. 574)

One certainly cannot claim that it is only the "unnatural" combination of extremes in age that repels Democritus Junior. For throughout this Partition he seems to permit no possible conjunction. It is only with reluctance that he accepts St. Paul's advice that it is "Better to marry than to burn."

For Democritus Junior, marriage is, in general, absurd, principally because it involves a permanent relationship with an unreliable species. He goes so far as to suggest that perhaps a temporary licentiousness is a preferable alternative. Ironically, he cites the same examples in admonition as he had elsewhere presented as paragons of marital bliss: Helen of Troy, for instance, who, up to this point, has been used to exemplify both bestial lust and marital happiness, now becomes the symbol of connubial misery.

When the matter of Religious Melancholy is under consideration, Democritus Junior finds ample opportunity to attack one of his favourite

---

be justified in a seventeenth-century moral context, but it is difficult to understand the reason for the tacit censorship that Burton's editors have practiced over the years; Shilleto and Jackson do not translate the more erotic parts--presumably afraid that schoolboys might read it and attempt to procure "cubebs steeped in wine, or Surax Roots."

enemies, the Church of Rome. This he does in a variety of ways, from the slighting reference, to the scurrilous tirade. A notable instance appears early in "Religious Melancholy;" the prime mover of the disease is, he contends, Satan, and therefore, a parody of the Prime Mover of all things. With vicious incisiveness, he tries to show that politicians, and more especially priests, are the Devil's lackeys, and abuse true religion for their own ends; there is a Machiavellian ruthlessness about their methods: "No way better to curb then supersition, to terrifie mens consciences, and to keepe them in awe; they make new lawes, statuts, invent new religions, ceremonies to their own endes" (p. 723). He has no doubt, however, who the worst of the politician-priests is: ". . . above all others, that high priest of Rome, that three-headed Cerberus hath plaid his part" (p. 725). The very analogy provides him with yet another convenient opportunity to conduct a diatribe against the Pope and the Catholic Church generally, a topic which gives him endless pleasure and which seems to contain infinite possibilities: "And for their authority, what by auricular confession, satisfaction, penance, Peters Keyes, thundrings, executions, etc, roaring bulls, this high Priest of Rome, shaking his Gorgons head hath so terrified the soule of many a silly man, and insulted over majesty itself, and swaggered generally over all Europe, for many ages and still doth to some, holding them as yet in slavish subjection, as never tyrannising Spaniards did by their poore Negroes, or Turkes by their Gally-slaves" (p. 727).

In a subsequent attack on the Church of Rome, Democritus Junior asserts that the use of Latin in its liturgy is a sign of its desire to impress the superstitious. This is an ironic charge, both in the light of his own earlier claim that the Anatomy was originally meant to be in Latin, and in view of the passages in which he slips into Latin for logistical reasons; but he continues undaunted:

> What else doe our Papists but by keeping the people in ignorance, vent and broch all their new ceremonies and traditions, when they conceale the Scriptures and read it in Latin, and to some few alone, feeding the people in the meane time with tales out of legends, and such like fabulous narrations. Whome doe they begin with, but collapsed ladies, some few tradesmen, or sooner circumvent. (p. 731)

The tirades against the Church of Rome in this Partition are amongst the more sustained and virulent in a period where they are prolific. Yet behind it all one has the feeling that, on Burton's part, there is more delight in the ingenuity with which his persona sets about the enemy, than malevolence towards the target.

In "Religious Melancholy" Democritus Junior has an abundance of scope to develop his earlier onslaughts on superstition. The universality of the matter is manifest, and is of relevance to the overall satiric scheme: it is in no way an appended piece, but another area of that troublesome ocean over which Democritus Junior sails:

> He . . . that shal but consider that superstition of old, and those prodigious effects of it, as in his place I will shew the severall furies of our Sybills, Enthusiasts, Pseudo-prophets, Heretikes, and Scismatickes, in these our latter ages, shall instantly confesse, that all the world againe cannot afford so much matter of madnesse, so many stupend

> symptomes: as superstition, heresie, scisme hath brought out, that this species alone may be parallelled to all the former, hath a greater latitude, and more miraculous effects, that it more besotts and infatuates then any other above named whatever, doth more harme, wrought more disquietnesse to mankind, and hath more crucified the soule of mortall men (such hath beene the divells craft) then warres, plagues, sicknesses, dearth, famine, and all the rest. Give me but a little leave, and I will set before your eyes in briefe a stupend, vast, infinite ocean of incredible madnesse and folly: a Sea full of shelves and rockes, Sands, gulfes, Euripes and contrary tides, full of fearefull monsters, uncouth shapes, roring waves, tempests, and Siren calmes, Halcyonian Seas; unspeakable miseries, such Comedies and Tragedies, such absurd and ridiculous, ferall and lamentable fitts, that I know not whether they be more to be pttied or derided, or may be believed, but that we daily see the same still practised in our dayes, fresh examples, fresh spectacles, nova novitia, fresh objects, of misery and madnesse in this kind that are still represented unto us, abroad, at home, in the midst of us, in our bosomes. (pp. 707-708)

There is a recurrence in this passage of some of the favourite images used in the Anatomy to describe the universal folly, always with the effect of emphasizing the permeating nature of the disease; once again, the satirist in all ages is confronted by an ocean of madness whose surface he can only skim.

One passage on the gargantuan dimension of such folly is reminiscent of the Rabelaisian grotesque:[1] Democritus Junior is talking

[1]Perhaps the most thorough treatment of the phenomenon of the grotesque is the study by Wolfgang J. Kayser, The Grotesque in Art and Literature, tr. U. Weisstein (University of Indiana, 1963). The principles he detects in the grotesque can be seen to describe much of Burton's Anatomy, and to operate clearly in the additions and revisions which will be analyzed in the next chapter of this thesis.

about the superstitions of Jews (for whom, throughout, he shows only patronizing contempt):

> As the first course [at the feast on the Last Day] shal be served in that great Oxe in Job. 4. 10. that every day feeds on a thousand hills, Psal. 50. 10. that great Leviathan, and a great Bird, that laid an egge so bigge, that by chance tumbling out of the neaste it brake down 300 tall Cedars, and breaking as it fell, drowned 300 villages: This bird stood up to the knees in the sea, and the sea was so deepe, that a hatchet would not fall to the bottome in seven yeres. Of their Messias wives and children; Adam and Eve, etc., and that one stupend fiction amongst the rest. When a Roman Prince asked of the Rabbi Jehosue ben Hanania, why the Jewes God was compared to a Lion; he made answere he compared himself to no ordinary Lion, but to one in the wood Ela, which when he desired to see, the Rabbine praid he might, and forthwith the Lion set forward, But when he was 400 miles from Rome, he so roared that all the great bellied women in Rome made aborts, the citty walls fell downe, and when he came an hundred miles nearer, and roared the second time, their teeth fell out of their heads, the Emperour himselfe fell downe dead, and so the Lion went backe. (p. 748)

Democritus Junior, as I have noted throughout, often echoes the Rabelaisian manner, but in this instance, Burton seems to transport him directly to the tradition from which writers like Rabelais himself spring. Accordingly, the fantastic list of follies continues still, until, in despair at the dimensions of the problem he is analyzing, Democritus Junior concludes, "They are certainly far gone with melancholy, if not quite mad, and have more need of physick then many a man that keeps his bed, more need of hellebore, than those that are in Bedlam."

A large number of the targets that have appeared throughout the Anatomy, therefore, are attacked once more in the Third Partition. With minor exceptions, there is a consistency about these attacks from

their appearance in "Democritus Junior to the Reader," to the end of the first edition version of the Third Partition, that indicate a uniformity in approach and aim that has not always been granted the work. The Third Partition, in fact, represents the apotheosis of the satiric vision of the entire Anatomy of Melancholy. It pictures a world of madness, centring upon a concept of love that is honoured in Western culture, and shows that ideal to be a hollow sham from the effects of which "no man living is exempt." The persona again plays the dominant role, and makes no real pretence of having as his aim the cure of any limited form of melancholy. That disease is, in the Third Partition, the incurable universal human condition. The methods used to portray the disease are those of a consummate satirist. Burton is master of all the techniques and uses them with zest, percolating all through his erratic narrator who is, once again, a major traget. The satura form again proves to be a satisfactory vehicle for the task in hand, its seeming looseness in no way suggesting that it has escaped the control of its author. In the revisions and additions, which will be examined in the next chapter of this thesis, the satura's usefulness as a base for the ever-expanding work will appear all the more clearly.

At the end of the first edition, there appears a "Conclusion of the Author to the Reader," that is omitted from all later editions. Significantly, it is explicitly satiric, and reinforces the idea that the path Democritus Junior has traversed in the first edition, from the

Preface to the Conclusion, has been a consistent and consciously-devised one, with the author, Burton, always in command. Like that brief preface to the Third Partition, it acts as a link with "Democritus Junior to the Reader," and, in later editions, it is subsumed into the latter. Important parallels abound between them, as, for instance, when the role of the speaker is discussed, and reflections are made upon the style ("satiric" and "comic"), in terms that relate the prefaces to each other, bringing the reader full circle.

In these last few pages of the first edition, a claim appears with respect to the persona that is vital for the purposes of this thesis. Let me briefly recapitulate the steps I have taken so far. First, I have stressed throughout that the speaker in the Anatomy is not Burton himself, but a persona who is manipulated by Burton for satiric purposes. Secondly, I have examined the passages in the Preface in which that persona tells us that he has assumed the name "Democritus Junior", and in which he gives us reaons for so doing (antecedents, caution, etc.); the satiric nature of these passages has been demonstrated. Thirdly, I have shown that it is a characteristic of the persona to be self-contradictory and unreliable. In the light of these points, the "Conclusion of the Author to the Reader" becomes all the more significant.

The "Conclusion" opens with the statement: "The last Section shall be mine, to cut the strings of Democritus visor, to unmaske and shewe him as he is." It appears, then, that someone (the author, Burton,

or the satiric speaker who has called himself Democritus Junior) is to reveal his true identity. But the fact of the matter is that no new identity is revealed; Burton himself does not even admit to the authorship of the Anatomy till the second edition, some years later, by which time this "Conclusion" has been eliminated. The flavour of the entire "Conclusion" and the characteristics of its speaker are recognisably the same as those of the Anatomy which has preceded it, as I shall now demonstrate.

The constantly wavering stance that we have come to expect from the speaker in the Anatomy proper is parallelled in the attitude of the speaker in the "Conclusion." This is nowhere more apparent than in his statement about those who will dare to criticise the Anatomy:

> I feare good mens censures, and . . . as the barking of a dogge, I securely contemne the malitious and scurrile obloquies, flouts, calumnies of those railers and detractors, I scorne the rest. (Sig. Ddd)

In this way he gets in the first blow at potential adverse critics of the work, and when he suggests that he scorns "the rest", we wonder if this also includes the "censures of good men". Yet he now goes on to confess that there may indeed be parts of the Anatomy that are worthy of such hostile criticism:

> Howsoever, I am now come to retract some part of that which I have writ:
>
> . . . . . .
>
> When I peruse this tract which I have writ,
> I am abash't, and much I hold unfit.
>
> I could wish it otherwise, expunged, and to this end I have annexed this Apologetical Appendix, to crave pardon for that

> which is amisse. I doe suspect some precedent passages have bin distastfull, as too Satyricall and bitter; some againe as too Comicall, homely, broad, or lightly spoken. (Sig. Ddd)

This is ironic; sandwiched as the body of the Anatomy is between two "recantations", one apparently made in advance (at the end of the Preface), and this one in the "Conclusion", it is hard to believe that the apology for the "distastfull" parts is at all genuine, or that the speaker had any wish to "expunge" them.

The "Conclusion" continues in this vein, drawing upon such unlikely authorities as Scaliger to support the speaker's claim to modesty and diffidence, and citing other favourite satirists of the Democritus Junior who is speaker in the rest of the Anatomy. But we also see evidence all through this final part of the verbosity and delight in language that typified Democritus Junior. This facet of the persona appears in a passage which might well be taken as a description of the satura form itself, suggesting its apparent shapelessness and its inevitability:

> So that as a river runs precipitate and swift, and sometimes dull and slow; nor direct, now per ambages about; nowe deepe then shallow; now muddy then cleere now broad, then narrow doth my style flowe, now more serious, then light, now more elaborate or remisse, Comicall, Satyricall, as the present subject required, or as at the time I was affected, And if thou vouchsafe to read this Treatise, it shall seeme no otherwise to thee, then the way to an ordinary traveller; sometimes faire, sometimes foule, here Champion, there inclosed; barren in one place, better soile in another; by woods, groves, hills, dales, plaines, etc. I shal lead thee per ardua montium et lubrica vallium, et roscia cespitum, et glebosa camporum, through variety of objects, that which thou shalt like and dislike. (Sig. Ddd2)

The carefully calculated effect of a passage that is supposed to demonstrate the lack of system in the speaker's work is what we have come to expect from the pen of Democritus Junior himself.

Certain conclusions emerge from all of this, which must be examined. It is arguable that, despite the opening declaration of the "Conclusion," a change of heart on someone's part occurred, even in so few pages. Burton, perhaps, still worried about the kind of reception his book would be accorded, decided not to reveal his true identity by appending his own name (and this is a vital point, for no name is in fact revealed). It might be contended, too, that there was no persona in the work, but simply Burton using a pseudonym; so that, even though he does not reveal his own name, we could infer that the tone and flavour of the work was Burton's throughout--and this indeed has been the contention of the pre-20th century critics of the Anatomy.

A final position, and the one that this thesis supports most fully, is this: that the promise in the "Conclusion" to cast off the mask is utterly typical of the persona's behaviour throughout. It is parallel to other unkept, ironic promises within the Anatomy proper, such as an earlier one with respect to the location of his utopia, or a later regarding the final cure for jealousy. In other words, the "promise" is very much a part of the satiric technique, by which the author manipulates his persona throughout for satiric purposes and from which he does not deviate in this final part; the speaker in these final

pages is still the changeable, ironic, apologetic, indecisive persona whose character has dominated the entire work.[1]

Robert Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy is, in sum, a consciously-contrived satiric work, both in terms of its precedents and in the light of its own organic nature. This assessment is warranted not only by the examination undertaken in Chapter Three of the general bases of the work, but by the closer analysis in this chapter. The three quasi-explanatory sections, "Democritus to the Reader," the preface to the Third Partition, and the "Conclusion to the Reader," seem to have been used by Burton to indicate the integral unity of the satiric vision that is the raison d' être of the Anatomy, the clear signals of its kind. The persona, Democritus Junior, is conceived in such a way as to link him closely with the hypothetical origins of satire, subsuming, as he does, in his satiric vision, the roles of priest and doctor; he is distinct from his author, Burton, and is used frequently as the butt of the satire, in addition to serving as satirist or "satyr" himself. The professed "scientific aim" of the work is a necessary satiric facade which is refuted as often as it is invoked as the Anatomy's "cause." Permeating the whole Anatomy are clear technical signs of the presence of satire:

[1]In satire, such "unveilings" and related techniques are common. In Gulliver's Travels, for example, there appears the introductory "Publisher to the Reader," in which "Richard Sympson" gives us a thumbnail biography of Lemuel Gulliver, his "antient and intimate Friend;" this is followed in later editions by "Gulliver's" own letter of disenchantment.

the work is in the apparently loose satura form of which the "anatomy" concept seems to be a by-product. As in any coherent structure, all of the parts appear as intrinsically related provided the reader is aware of the unifying feature. The medical image itself, as I have tried to show, is related to the origins of satire, and is a consciously-employed satiric metaphor in many prose satires of Burton's age. Throughout the Anatomy, he utilizes a multitude of traditional satiric devices such as diminution, invective, the mock-odyssey, the mock-eulogy, and the satiric cenum. Not least important, he calls upon all of the great satirists of antiquity, and their modern successors as his precedents and "authorities." Underlying all, and least amenable to definition, is the ironic vision of Burton himself, imparting shape to his creation, forever probing the foibles of humanity, and of his persona, Democritus Junior. The five editions which followed this first edition of 1621 were corrected, revised, and considerably augmented by Burton; but that permeating vision remains the same, as I shall attempt to demonstrate in what follows.

CHAPTER V

THE POST-1621 EDITIONS OF THE ANATOMY OF MELANCHOLY

The Anatomy of Melancholy was no static monolith, but a work that received the continuing attentions of its author over a period of twenty years, from the publication of the first edition in 1621 till Burton's death in 1641. The first, second and third editions, "suddenly gone, eagerly read," appeared in 1621, 1624, and 1628 respectively. The fourth edition was published in 1632. Problems arose over publication of the fifth edition causing a delay in its appearance till 1638.[1] Unlike the reception accorded those enormously popular early editions, there seems to have been no desperately keen market for the sixth, which was the very last one to be revised by Burton himself, and was not published till eleven years after his death. This chapter, will consist of an examination of the additions made by Burton to the Anatomy of Melancholy throughout the six editions which he supervised.

[1]Some nefarious dealings seem to have occurred here, and despite his disclaimer, Burton may have been involved in them, according to the evidence presented by Duff, "The Fifth Edition of Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy," Library, 4th Series, IV (1923-24), 81-101. Though he expresses his disgust with the situation in a Latin note at the end of the edition, he appears to have been in touch throughout with Robert Young, the printer who was attempting to pirate the work in Edinburgh. Anyhow, Henry Cripps, who had published all the previous editions, acquired the sheets that Young had printed, finished the rest, and published it at Oxford.

I tried to show, in Chapters III and IV, how the Anatomy was related to the satiric tradition, and by the analysis of the first edition demonstrated that, from the beginning, Burton was consciously writing a satire. It might still be objected, however, that whilst most of the Anatomy is satiric, there are, surely, non-satiric parts that simply cannot be classified under the blanket term satire. Such a criticism would be very difficult to maintain in the light of what has already been adduced; throughout Chapter Four I was at pains to analyse the most apparently "scientific" or otherwise "serious" passages and to show that they belied their appearances, serving, for one reason or another, a vital function within the satire.[1] Such features as the very title and the synopses that introduced each Partition were shown to be parodic camouflage, mere equivocal gestures towards the science to which the whole of the Anatomy was supposed to be dedicated; the lengthy passages on diet, for example, unlikely as first seemed to be the case, were shown to be related to the cenum tradition, whose source is at least as ancient as the Satyricon; and such a scholarly digression as "Exercise Rectified" was seen to be a venture parallel to the more evidently satiric "Digression of Aire."

The apparently "technical" passages, then, without exception, have a purpose within the satiric scheme of the Anatomy. They do provide

[1]For example, see above, pp. 207-209; 224-29; 245-48.

that illusion that Burton sometimes requires in the early Partitions, namely that the Anatomy is indeed a work of science, and their effectiveness depends upon the credibility of the illusion. Such a technique is by no means extraordinary in satire, a literary kind very much dependent upon a parasitical use of other literary forms. One immediately thinks of a work like Gulliver's Travels, which convincingly uses the techniques of the book of travels, with detailed descriptions of such things as the handling of ships and the latitude and longitude of the various places visited.[1] In much of the best satire in English it is precisely this attempt at verisimilitude that accounts for its success; in retrospect, often, the irony of the device becomes clearer. It would, as a result, be difficult to assert that certain passages of a satire are non-satiric when they do serve a satiric function, and that an essential one. To attempt to lift them out of their proper context would be (and I must revert to a previously-invoked instance) to emulate the Irish bishop who remarked of Gulliver's Travels, "I don't believe the half of it."

One other related problem remains to be observed: Why does Burton, as I shall show later in this chapter, ignore these "technical" parts in the additions and revisions to the first edition? The answer, I think, is fairly clear: such passages have, in his view, served their

[1]Swift may have been indebted to the travel-books of William Dampier (1652-1715); an earlier instance of the same parasitic technique is More's Utopia, a later, Aldous Huxley's Island.

purpose and they continue to do so adequately without further expansion. They acted as the props, whilst it is the satiric superstructure that retains Burton's interest over the subsequent decades, as the examination of the post-1621 editions will show.

As a corollary, the suggestion might be made that Burton simply changed his mind about his book; that, having composed a work made up of a number of different elements in its first edition, he decided as he revised it to emphasise in the later editions only the satiric potential of the earlier work. The answer to this objection hinges, as it must, on one's interpretation of the first edition, and that is why I have placed so much stress upon a close reading of that work. In Chapter Four, I tried to make it clear that the Anatomy, from its first publication, was a satire; that purpose is not changed in the later editions, as this chapter will demonstrate.

There are, in the post-1621 editions, a number of major themes and topics upon which the expansions centre. They are all areas that were satirically anatomized in the first edition, and there are clear relationships between them. The role of the persona, for example, is further delineated, though it is made to deviate in no major way from its first-edition function. Books (especially the Anatomy) and their authors again receive caustic treatment, and the "topsie-turvie" world is further exposed in a procession of the vices that is more grotesque than ever, especially in the Third Partition, where the perversion of

love epitomizes the degeneracy of humanity. War, the economic structure (which impoverishes so many of the deserving, and most notably the scholars), and the frailty of the system of patronage are more blatantly uncovered, while the mysogyny of Democritus Junior and the superstitions of the papists are everywhere pilloried to an even greater degree.

In terms of sheer comparative bulk, there is a huge difference between the first edition and the sixth. The former is about 300,000 words long, the latter some 480,000 words long--an increase of approximately sixty per cent. The biggest enlargement takes place between the first and the second editions, decreasing steadily thereafter, till changes between the fifth and sixth editions are, though still significant, relatively minimal.[1]

The first edition of the Anatomy of Melancholy is that rather thick quarto so dear to the heart of Charles Lamb.[2] The Preliminary Matter is quite scant, as I noted in my treatment of the first edition.[3]

[1]I have dealt earlier (pp. 24ff.) with other research on comparison of the editions and noted the apparently insuperable technical difficulties inherent in the task.

[2]Paul Jordan-Smith gives details on all of the seventeenth-century editions in Bibliographia, pp. 80-92. Here I am only interested in pointing out the major differences between them.

[3]Above, pp. 171ff. Babb considers it "pleasantly uncluttered:" this is quite in keeping with his theory about the "confused" nature of the Anatomy, but seems to me not to take into account at all the satiric intent of the work, and its adherence to the traditional satura pattern.

Also, the edition concludes with a six-page postscript containing the author's name. Obviously delighted at the book's success, Burton speedily went to work on a second edition.

The second edition, a folio, published in 1624, is twenty-five per cent longer than the first. From it, the "Conclusion of the Author to the Reader" has been dropped--the only major omission in all the six editions--but most of it is zealously incorporated into the satirical Preface. To counterbalance, as it were, this transmutation, a large continuous passage is added on the cure of despair, together with a rather slim index.

The third edition, published in 1628, is a folio, like the second and all the remaining editions, and contains a number of significant additions to the Preliminary Matter and to the corpus of the work itself. One complete sub-section is included, "Symptomes of Maids, Nuns and Widowes Melancholy." Burton says in the Preface that he is "now resolved never to put this Treatise out againe. Ne quid nimis, I will not hereafter add, alter, or retract, I have done." But a fourth (1632) and a fifth (1638) edition appear. They contain numerous additions to the Preliminary Matter, and elsewhere, which are in accord with the satiric design that emerged in the first edition.

Burton died only two years after the publication of the fifth edition, but in the intervening time, he revised his magnum opus yet again. His publisher, Cripps, says that Burton submitted the work to

him "exactly corrected with severall considerable Additions by his owne hand . . . with directions to have those Additions inserted in the next Edition," and further claims to have acted, in the edition of 1651, according to Burton's wishes.

There has been, as I have suggested, very little comparative work done on the six editions because of the lack of a definitive edition to provide the variants, omissions, and additions over twenty years of revisions. Hallwachs, in his pioneer study of the first and second editions, finds no evidence to show that "[Burton's] attitude towards his book, or his fundamental ideas and opinions in general change in any significant way between 1621 and 1624."[1] Babb, in his more general comments upon all six editions, based upon a relatively small selection of samples says:

> A general conclusion emerges from the foregoing study-by-sample of the changes in successive editions of the Anatomy: Burton's modification of his text is almost altogether amplification. He discards extremely little. He makes comparatively few phraseological changes. Even in making an insertion, he disturbs the existing text little, or not at all. In the 1624 preface he writes: "Some things are heere altered, expunged in this Edition, others amended; much added," and he allows this statement to stand in subsequent editions . . . . It is easier to find the additions than the deletions and alterations he says he has made.[2]

Babb's opinion holds good for the totality of the work: but Babb still maintains that the purpose of the Anatomy is a confused one. As a result,

[1]"Additions and Revisions," p. 170.

[2]Sanity, pp. 26-27.

he finds the additions provide evidence of simple elaboration, confirming his earlier view:

> It is not surprising that he failed to develop new interests and opinions after 1620, for in that year he reached the age of forty-three. Both his view of life and his book, however, might have reached their relatively final form considerably earlier. The expansion through elaboration that one can trace all through the successive editions of the Anatomy could have been going on for some years before 1620. At some indeterminable earlier date, the author worked out his plan, wrote his outlines, and arranged the material already at hand. From that time forward, the book changed little except by accretion. It became longer, livelier, and richer, but not fundamentally different.[1]

Only if one regards the book as an encyclopedia of oddities would one look for any "novel" points of view, but it is a satire and the demand in the additions is for consistent adherence to the satiric aim. If one wishes to speculate, like Babb, on that earlier stage when the Anatomy was conceived, one might choose with some justification that fertile period when Philosophaster was written, and thus account for the later work's satiric bent.

In this chapter then, material will be chosen mainly from those areas which are most heavily expanded in the later editions; when taken together with a large number of smaller but still significantly satiric expansions, they add considerable weight to the contention that the work is a deliberately-conceived prose satire. A double purpose, therefore, is served by this examination of the heavily augmented parts.

[1] Ibid.

In retrospect, they illuminate the purpose of the first edition itself; that is to say, the expansions frequently clarify rather ambiguous parts of the 1621 edition. At the same time, these additons emphasize the satiric nature of the expanding work, by being satiric themselves.

Problems of presentation arise in any effort to compare the editions, as the reader will notice all too soon. Once again, Babb has a consolatory word: "The fact that the Anatomy exists in six versions, or stages of amplification, makes the preparation of a definitive scholar's edition unusually difficult. The simultaneous presentation of all the texts is a problem of format which is possibly beyond solution. There would also be the task of annotation. To trace all of Burton's quotations and citations to their sources, to correct all of his errors, and to explain all of his obscure references would require years of dedicated labour (and generous funds for travel)."[1] Despite the possibility of wishful thinking in the final parenthesis, what Babb says of a definitive edition is applicable to the task of a comparative study, and I would whole-heartedly endorse it.

The Preliminary Matter of the post-1621 editions is worthy of careful consideration, for the additions seem to have a specific purpose. In them Burton has gone to great lengths to emphasize the satiric nature of the book as a whole. The overtly satiric content of le Blon's frontispiece, with its accompanying "Argument," and the poems, all show that

[1] Sanity, p. 28.

Burton intends us to grasp quickly the purpose of his work. The very change from the terse, "scientific" Preliminary Matter of the earlier editions shows, not a change in the outlook of the work, but the author's wish for a more direct intimation of what is already there; we are now made fully aware that this is not another run-of-the-mill pedantic tome from its opening pages. Burton knows that the first impression is important; by the fourth edition of the Anatomy, we have a version of the Preliminary Matter that is unmistakably satiric.

The second edition differs in no significant way from the first in its Preliminary Matter. There is the added information that it has been "corrected and augmented by the Author," and there has been a slight readjustment to the titular position of his patron, George, Baron of Berkley. There are, however, three important additions to the Preliminary Matter of the third edition; the Latin elegiacs "Democritus Junior ad Librum Suum," "The Authors Abstract of Melancholy, Διαλογικός,"

Le Blon's frontispiece is so fashionably emblematic that it cries out for a commentary (suitably provided in the next edition), but its relevance to the satiric purpose of the Anatomy is clear enough even in the third edition, from the prominence it gives to the original satiric anatomist, Democritus of Abdera, and his "ironic" disciple, Democritus Junior.[1] At the same time, the juxtaposing of the foolish-looking

[1]William R. Mueller, "Robert Burton's Frontispiece," PMLA, LXIV (1949), 1074-87, shows the clear connection between the subject-matter of the Anatomy and the objects portrayed in the frontispiece; so far as he is concerned it is functional for not quite the same reasons

"Inamorato" and the unduly worried "Hypochondriacus" is deliberate: they both illustrate the extremities of that tendency to elevate things human out of all proportion, in Burton's view, to the realities of the human condition; such distortions were satirized throughout the first edition of the Anatomy. The leaning posture of the hypochondriac is premeditatedly similar to that of Democritus of Abdera. The latter, however, has good reason to be disturbed, since he sees the real folly of humanity; but instead of a grimace, he has a smile on his face. "Superstitiosus" and "Maniacus" are placed together for a similar purpose; the madness which superstition represents is one of the principal butts of the satire in the Third Partition, and throughout. The motto has also been changed from the Lipsian "omne meum nihil meum,"[1] to the

---

as those I shall propose: "Burton's frontispiece is not merely decorative; it is illustrative of the text of the book. It is, in a sense, a preview in which we have the two leading characters, the Democrituses Senior and Junior, two representative scenes, the landscapes of jealousy and solitude, and four of the supporting players, each contributing his part to the study of melancholy. Either le Blon had a detailed knowledge of the Anatomy, and of the subject of melancholy, or, as seems far more likely, he received explicit instruction from Burton in regard to what plates would most appropriately introduce the Anatomy of Melancholy."

[1]Burton had wrongly ascribed the tag to Macrobius; but even the attribution to Lipsius is not quite correct, if we may believe Bensly; "On comparing the title of the first two editions with those that followed, you will see that the motto is not the same. It was 'Omne meum nihil meum,' ascribed by Burton to Macrobius. Why was the change made? Possibly because the words were not to be found in Macrobius, though Burton had doubtless read the introduction to the Politica where Lipsius writes that his work is such that he can truly say omnia nostra esse et nihil" (OBS, 200). This is not entirely convincing reasoning, since Burton still retains the phrase and attribution to Macrobius in the body of the text.

familiar line from Horace, "Omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci." The later phrase might be seen to apply much less to the form (or "formlessness") of the Anatomy than does that of Lipsius, and more to the satiric mode in which it is written, with Horace as antecedent.

One thing is immediately clear to the peruser of all six editions: there is an astonishing contrast between the title-page of the sixth and those of the first two editions, which were relatively stark and quasi-scientific. The new Preliminary Matter, catering as it does to the whims of those who desire "a fine frontispiece, enticing pictures," helps counteract the notion that Burton is attempting to write a "technical" work. Through the satiric nature of le Blon's caricatures, and the evocative new motto, the proper motif of the Anatomy is now being strongly suggested.

The ninety-line "Democritus Junior ad Librum Suum" concludes in this way in Shilleto's translation:

> Be this the preface to my book, for this
> Is what its master wished to say on issuing it.

It is a satirical poem, in which barbs are directed against both Democritus Junior himself, and all the other targets which the first edition itself had attacked.

The "genius" of the author, which the book is advised to follow, is the spirit of sycophancy pure and simple. This is in keeping with the attacks on authors throughout the Anatomy:

> Yet go where'er you please, through whate'er quarters,
> And imitate the genius of your author.
> Go 'mongst the gentle Graces, and salute
> Whatever votary of the Nine will read you.
> Pay court to town and country, and king's palaces
> Enter with deferential humble reverence.
> If nobleman or great man shall inspect you,
> Obsequiously let him read ad libitum.

This is a portrait of the author as lackey: he is advocating that the book act in its author's spirit, soliciting important readers and patrons by dint of being inoffensive and servile. In fact, there is a three-fold implication in the poem which examination of the first edition of the Anatomy bore out: that Democritus Junior himself is often rather spineless; that the general run of readers is spoon-fed by most writers; and that the path to financial success as an author is through flattery of the rich.

He also turns his attention in this poem to another favourite target of the Anatomy, those who are prominent politically, and he describes them, as he does throughout the Anatomy proper, in abusive terms. We feel that one who has been depicted as a "stern Cato" or a "gloomy senator" is hardly likely to be flattered at being described as an eagle looking down at that rather over-blown fly, the Anatomy, since the image seems calculated to describe the predatory nature of the observer rather than a lofty perceptiveness.

Women, lawyers, and critics, major targets in the Anatomy itself, are all attacked in the poem. The onslaught on the critics is especially significant, for their adverse comments on the Anatomy seem

to have had some effect on the author. The poem is very traditional in its language at this point:

> Come some critic,
> Some frothy bitter censor, rabid band,
> Some Zoilus or Momus, snarl and growl,
> And open not to such a mocking set.
> Flee if you can, if not, despise such fellows,
> And silently bear all their envious scoffings.
> Care not if such bark, snarl, and fill the air
> With yelping, 'tis a crime to please such persons.
> But if some pure stranger should turn your way,
> One who dislikes jokes, jests and witticisms,
> And should upbraid you with coarse wanton writing,
> Say that your master's vein's jocose and wanton,
> And yet not wanton, duly weighed; yet be it so;
> His life is honest if his page be wanton.
> If rude uncouth spectator thrust himself
> Into your garner, drive him out with a cudgel.
> Expel too dolts, for what have I in common
> With dolts?

This is truly awful stuff--in the translation at any rate--yet there are significant satiric references in it. Zoilus and Momus, in addition to their fault finding propensities, may be regarded as archetypal satyr-figures of the censorious type to whom satirists of the period appealed. They are described in the poem in terms of the traditional satyr-image as "rabid," complete with "snarl and growl," "bark" and "yelping," setting upon their (in this case) very vulnerable victim. The "coarseness" of which Democritus Junior sees himself accused is another characteristic of the mode deliberately introduced by all satiric writers. His self-exoneration is taken from Martial, a writer who epitomized the techniques of the satyr-poets in his own works.

The last four lines contain the satiric reversal of the earlier implied appeal to tolerance and precedent. He now asks his

book to act in the very manner he had deprecated, "drive him out with a cudgel." The satirist's frequently-invoked threat, veiled so far, is here made quite open, and the final rhetorical question is pointed, in that the similarities between the persona and the "dolts" whom he scorns have been evident throughout the Anatomy proper in the previous editions.

This added introductory poem, then, in many ways sets the satiric tone that prepares the reader for the Anatomy itself; it parades before us, ironically, a number of the topics that are to be treated satirically in the body of the work, thus giving a foretaste of what is to come. Its inclusion on the third edition seems symptomatic of Burton's desire to emphasize the satiric nature of the ensuing book.

"The Authors Abstract of Melancholy" also has a strong satiric leaning, presenting a preliminary picture of those grossly distorted visions that inform the states of mind that were examined in the Third Partition of the Anatomy.[1] The Greek title, "Dialogicos," is an apt description of the exercise the poem is based upon: it delineates the violently contrasting moods into which fallen man may slip. The speaker is at

[1]In his Earlier Seventeenth Century, Douglas Bush suggests Burton's poems are "passable verses that Milton may have read," and are possible sources of L'Allegro and Il Penseroso. I would contend that these introductory poems are deliberate doggerel, and are supposed to emanate from the persona. On the other hand, it has been recognized that parts of the two Milton poems are satiric, and so perhaps Milton did learn something from Burton.

times enchanted by solitariness such as that envisaged by Walton, and, as I indicated earlier, classified by Frye as "Menippean satire:"

> When to my selfe I act and smile,
> With pleasing thoughts the time beguile,
> By a brooke side or woode so greene,
> Unheard, unsought for, or unseene,
> A thousand pleasures doe me blesse,
> And crowne my soule with happinesse.
> All my joyes besides are folly,
> None so sweet as Melancholy.

This is that blessed state that he describes in the Second Partition; it consists in peace of mind beyond the whirl of the universal folly.

Now comes one of his minor mock-odysseys, this time, a journey through delight:

> Me thinkes I heare, me thinkes I see,
> Sweete musicke, wondrous melodie,
> Townes, Pallaces, and Citties fine,
> Here now, then there; the world is mine,
> Rare Beauties, gallant Ladies shine,
> What ere is lovely or divine.
> All other joyes to this are folly,
> None so sweet as Melancholy.

Such contentment, however, is in harsh contrast to the realities of human existence, as seen for instance in the case of those afflicted by the extremes of religious folly, about whom he has spoken at length in the Third Partition:

> Me thinkes I heare, me thinkes I see
> Ghostes, goblins, fiends: my phantasie
> Presents a thousand ugly shapes,
> Headlesse beares, blackemen and apes,
> Dolefull outcries, and fearefull sightes,
> My sad and dismall soule affrightes.
> All my griefes to this are jolly,
> None so damn'de as Melancholy.

He also provides a foretaste of his treatment of the illusory nature of love and of the delusions that afflict lovers; such dreams become the "Paradises" that are inhabited by those fools who appear in such droves in the Third Partition.

As the poem draws to a conclusion, the speaker assumes the bestial form of a satyr:[1]

> I am a beast, a monster growne,
> I will no light nor company
> I finde it now my misery.
> The scene is turn'd, my joyes are gone;
> Feare, discontent and sorrowes come.
> All my griefs to this are jolly,
> Naught so fierce as Melancholy.

Once again the connection is made between the concepts of satyr and the saturnine melancholic; like the Ajax of Harington's Metamorphosis, the melancholiac is de-humanized, and wanders abroad like a beast of prey.

These important additions and revisions to the Preliminary Matter of the third edition suggest strongly Burton's intention of stressing the satiric vision of the work that prevailed in the first edition. He did not suddenly become aware of satiric potential in the work, to which he had not previously given emphasis. Hence, there is no dramatic switch of focus in the additions, but, from the second edition onwards there are vast expansions to the more patently satiric material, and a virtual neglect of the "technical" camouflage. In the

[1]See above, p. 72ff. for the standard descriptions of the satyr-figure.

last chapter, it was suggested that even within the first edition one may observe Burton's unwillingness to linger over the "scientific" passages, his desire to get them over with as rapidly as possible, and his resultant abandonment of even a scientific pretext throughout the Third Partition. These changes in the Preliminary Matter of the third edition indicate Burton's desire to make clear, right from the start, the kind of book he has written. He has made sufficient adjustments in the opening alone to cause one to hesitate before assuming that his intention was to present the world with a serious scientific treatise; from the third edition on, certainly, what we have in the first few pages are the signs of an impending satire.

The final adjustment to the Preliminary Matter occurs in the fourth edition, published in 1632, with the inclusion of the "Argument of the Frontispiece"--a natural addition, as I suggested earlier, since le Blon's emblematic creation seemed to be begging for elaboration.[1] Burton supplied the covering stanzas in this edition, once again stressing whatever satiric possibilities lay in the frontispiece, and hence in the book to which it acts as sign-post.

[1]There is virtually nothing known about le Blon, except that his first name is "Christian," and that he was responsible for this frontispiece. The landscape of Jealousy is supposed to contain "two roaring bulls," but they are not there. This is an odd omission, and the fault seems to be Burton's, if anyone's, since le Blon made the engraving four years before Burton added the covering verses. Bearing in mind all those cryptic statements about things we would have to ask the author personally to satisfy our curiosity, the omission may have been deliberate--especially in view of the fact that he <u>did</u> change the picture of himself in later editions.

Stanzas two and three are appended to the representations of Jealousy and Solitude, two of the major causes of melancholy. As it happens, the emblems are quite difficult to make out in the third and fourth editions, thus possibly explaining the omission of the two bulls, but Burton makes Democritus Junior intrude with a doggerel excuse:

> Marke well: If't be not as't should be,
> Blame the bad Cutter, and not me.

This departure from what has been till that moment quite a serious explication of the frontispiece sets him off on a much more ironic line, and he concludes stanza four (on the foolish-looking "Inamorato") by implicating the reader:

> If this doe not enough disclose,
> To paint him take thyselfe by th'nose.

The implied universality of the condition is here explicit enough; to understand the folly of love, we need only examine ourselves.

Democritus Junior describes the other pictures (the hypochondriac and the religious fanatic) pithily, and when he comes to the madman, "Maniacus," he reverts again to the subject of the widespread nature of the disorder:

> Observe him, for as in a glasse,
> Thine angry portraiture it was.
> His picture keepe still in thy presence,
> Twixt him and thee, ther's no difference.

The relationship between the picture and the "glasse," the *speculum*, is frequently utilized in the *Anatomy*, and comes up again and again in the

satiric literature of the period; even a cursory perusal of the Short Title Catalogue shows that, as a title of satires, it is extremely popular.

The "Argument" concludes with a description of the picture of the author himself:

> It was not pride nor yet vaine glory,
> (Though others doe it commonly)
> Made him doe this: if you must knowe,
> The Printer needs would have it so.
> Then doe not frowne nor scoffe at it,
> Deride not nor detract a whit,
> For surely as thou dost by him,
> He will doe the same againe.
> Then looke upon't, behold and see,
> As thou likest it, so it likes thee.

The very doggerel in which the poem is composed is more an indication of the personality of the persona than of Burton's limitations as a poet. The threat (and there are a number of such threats, even before the First Partition begins) is a satiric ploy, and would obviously be out of place in any work with more "serious" pretensions. The whole poem gives precise hints as to what we might expect in the Anatomy of Melancholy itself.

The additions to the Preliminary Matter, therefore, are not at all haphazard. They contribute to strengthening the impression that the Anatomy of Melancholy is satiric, and show Burton intimating its nature right from the start. This is no pedantic medical tome, we are immediately assured, but a satiric work whose nature has not changed

from the first edition: Burton is not re-vamping the Preliminary Matter to suit a work whose vision has been modified and has become satiric after an abortive start as a scientific treatise. The Preliminary Matter after 1624 is, rather, a clearer indication of what the reader will find in the Anatomy, a work that is essentially the same as it was in 1621; the next major quantitative additions to the Anatomy, which occur in the "Satyricall Preface," have a similar function. That lengthy introductory essay is expanded by some seventy per cent, and once more for the purpose of emphasizing and deepening the satiric quality of the work.

The extensive revisions and additions to the Preface demonstrate both the apparently inexhaustible stock of Burton's knowledge, and the area of his interest--satire--in this unabashedly "satyricall" part of the work; for the Preface is undisguised satire, as I attempted to show in the examination of the first edition. It is not inappropriate, then, that he should add most to that part of the Anatomy that is most clearly satirical, since it provides him with most scope for augmentation.

The earliest major quantitative addition in the Preface consists of some five hundred words; an analysis of any part of it quite adequately demonstrates the complexities of producing an entirely accurate and exhaustive definitive edition. Babb's attempt to make such an analysis with some selected passages is only partially satisfactory and demands

six different type-faces.[1] The method I have decided upon for the rest of this chapter is as follows.[2] After each added word or group of words, square brackets will be used to indicate the edition in which the extra or changed material was incorporated. The editions will be designated thus: A, the first; B, the second; C, the third; D, the fourth; E, the fifth; and F, the sixth. The Arab numerals will indicate the page numbers of the editions referred to by the letters. In the passage following, for example, "A mere spectator of other mens fortunes and adventures" was included on page 3 of the second edition, and is thus presented as [B3]. In the passage, as in all of the others, there are numerous changes in spelling, punctuation and phraseology, not simply to accommodate the new material, but even in otherwise unchanged material from the first edition; such changes are often arbitrary and puzzling. I am not setting up a definitive version of these passages, but I am presenting them as they were, in the editions where they first appeared, in order to show how the work developed conceptually. I shall note, therefore, any significant variants in an apparently settled

[1]See Sanity, pp. 22-23. Denis G. Donovan, "The Anatomy of Melancholy: 'Religious Melancholy,' a Critical Edition" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1965), has done the best work so far in this field, in his incredibly bulky edition of a small part of the Third Partition.

[2]In an Appendix to this thesis I have reproduced the six versions of the passage under consideration so that the reader may grasp for himself the problems involved for aspiring editors of the Anatomy.

word or phrase which may perhaps indicate a change of mind on Burton's part about any earlier material. In the case of variants in punctuation, I think it wise to go along with Holbrook Jackson, who finds the fifth edition "superior in point of typography," which suggests the possibility that much more care was taken with it to ensure accuracy than is the case with the posthumous sixth edition.

The first significant addition to the Preface, then, proceeds as follows:

> A mere spectator of other mens fortunes and adventures [B3], and how they act their parts, which me thinks are diversely presented unto me, as from a common Theater or Sceane [C3]. I heare new newes every day, and those ordinary rumors of warre, plagues, fires, inundations, thefts, murders, massacres, meteors, Comets, spectrums [B3], prodigies [C3], apparitions, of townes taken, cities besieged in France, Germany, Turkey, Persia, Poland, etc., dayly musters and preparations, and suchlike, which these tempestuous times afford, battels fought, so many men slain, monomachies, shipwrackes, Piracies, and Seafights, Peace, Leagues, Stratagemes, and fresh alarums. A vast confusion of vowes, wishes, actions, edicts, petitions, law-sutes, pleas, lawes, proclamations, complaints, grievances, are dayly brought to our eares, new bookes, every day, pamphlets, currantoes, stories, whole Catalogues of bookes of all sorts, new paradoxes, opinions, schismes, heresies, controversies in Philosophy, Religion, etc. Now comes tidings of weddings, maskings, mummeries, entertainments. Jubilies, Embassies, tilts, and tournaments, trophies, triumphes, revels, sports, playes, then againe [B3], as in a new shifted sceane [E4], treasons, cheating tricks, robberies, enormous villainies, of all sorts, funerals, burials, death of Princes; new discoveries, expeditions; now Comicall, then Tragicall matters [B3].

One can immediately see the kind of adjusting that is typical of the additions. The theatre image is introduced once again, appropriately for a satire of this kind. No matter how fallacious its etymological connection with satire, it is highly effective as a metaphor for life, related

perhaps to the speculum image, the play-within-a-play convention, and similar in purpose. "All coherence" is indeed gone from Burton's stage; he witnesses disasters coming from the four elements themselves, the very heavens providing omens of what is to come. All the world suffers in its state of fallen innocence, order is attacked on all sides, the spirit and the flesh are bruised. The appeals to justice and faith are equally vain, for no secular court could ever adequately deal with the vices that proliferate, and the upheavals in religion make faith itself shaky. Granted that there are such things as "revels, sports, plays," these are countered quickly in the "shifted sceane," the comic being inevitably followed by the tragic. This is a comprehensive description of that chaos through which Burton's odyssey must be undergone. It is a journey through madness, sometimes despair, yet the ever-changing landscape of the satura form enables him to proceed without boring, enlarging from edition to edition throughout the Anatomy.

This first notable passage in the additions gives us a reliable foretaste of what is to come; throughout the expanded work, it is this chaotic world, without reprieve, that Burton further describes. Nor does he envisage his book as some kind of miraculous cure for the madness, for it is clearly put amongst those whole "Catalogues of bookes of all sorts" that are so much a part of the universal malady. Through an examination of how the satura form is expanded, of the way in which such important devices as the persona are developed, and of the treatment meted

out in the additions to satiric targets, we may assess the effect of the additions to the entire Anatomy.

The satura form, of course, is a fine vehicle for an author who constantly adds, and its satiric potential is shown by the facility with which material from earlier editions may be shifted around. In the examination of the first edition, in Chapter IV of this thesis, for example, it was shown that "The Conclusion of the Author to the Reader" was a satirical adjunct of the main text, serving as a final link in the chain from the satirical "Preface" to the end of the Anatomy. The fact is, however, that in the second edition he moved the bulk of the "Conclusion" to a place which was appropriate immersing it neatly into "Democritus to the Reader." This indicates the flexibility of the satura form, but it also shows a desire on Burton's part to emphasize the satiric opening of the work by enlarging it--as he had the Preliminary Matter--with some of the most forceful material he had. Any attempt to argue that Burton's vision of his work changed in the later editions must come to grips with this switch, which seems to indicate further the fact that the first edition is a satiric work, and that the expansions and changes tend to reinforce that aspect of the Anatomy rather than to suggest any overall change in the author's vision. The incorporation, therefore, into the "Satyricall Preface" of Scaliger's description of Vergil's verse, and the elaboration of it, are important indications of the view Burton has of his own book:

> [I] was therfore enforced, as a Beare doth her whelpes, to bring forth this confused lumpe, and had not time to lick it into forme, as she doth her yong ones, but even to publish it, as it was first written, quidquid in buccam venit, in an extemporean style, as I doe commonly all other exercises, effudi quicquid dictavit genius meus, out of a confused company of notes, and writ with as small deliberation as I doe ordinarily speake, without all affectation of big words, fustian phrases, jingling termes [B9], tropes [C12], strong lines [B9], that like Alcestas arrows caught fire as they flew [D12], straines of wit [B9], brave heats [C12], elogies [B9], hyperbolicall [C12] exornations [B9], elegancies [C12], etc., which many so much affect [B9].

One might easily detect a relationship between the bear with its "confused lumpe," and the satirist-satyr producing his shapeless satura, but it is chiefly an interesting example of the effort and care that Burton put into the satiric content of the revisions. He kept working with them till he ended up with something consistent with the satiric character of the work. He makes the form deliberately contradict the meaning, so that "hyperbolicall exornations" sounds strange after Democritus Junior's denial that he uses "big words," and his whole sentence becomes a catalogue that parodies all the extravagances of style in his own age, of which he lists a few.

From the "Conclusion" Burton retains the incongruously well-developed analogy about the river (incongruous, since the persona is trying to tell us that his writing is shapeless), yet he makes it look so contrived that we are inclined to scoff at these protestations and, in the midst of so much re-writing, to doubt the veracity of the assertion that it was published "as it was first written." In the course of

his later revisions, the contradictions are epitomized, when, in the third edition, Democritus Junior is made to pronounce almost petulantly: ". . . I am now resolved never to put this treatise out againe; Ne quid nimis, I will not hereafter add alter or retract; I have done." As we have already seen from the number of additions after the third edition, that was another empty, but ironic, promise: the satura form is too inviting.

The persona had been quite fully developed in the first edition, and there are no remarkable new insights given into his character in the major expansions to the Preface. As always, he is the scholar and the fool, the attacker and the attacked, separate from yet often speaking for his author. As in the first edition, too, his characteristic manner pervades all that is added, used by Burton as that "amphibium" who straddles sanity and madness.

It is evident, however, that, amongst the major additions to the Preface, many of the chief satiric techniques employed in the first edition are further amplified. One of the surest signs, for example, that an author is writing a satire is the number of overt or veiled references he makes to satiric precedent. In the third edition, therefore, it is notable that a comparison is made between the reception given to Persius' satires and that accorded the Anatomy:

> At the first publishing of this book, which Probus of Persius Satires, editum librum continuo mirari homines, atque avide deripere coeperunt, I may in some sort apply to this my work; the first and second edition were suddenly gone, eagerly read, and, as I have said, not so much approved by some as scornfully rejected by others [C9].

The juxtaposition with Persius is more than simply coincidental; Burton is deliberately associating his work with one of the great satirists of antiquity for two main reasons: first, he is indicating the kind to which the Anatomy belongs; and second, he is suggesting that it is precisely because the Anatomy is a satire that it has been subject to abuse that would not be directed against a scientific work.

This analogy-game is continued rather boastfully by Democritus Junior in another passage shortly after, where he compares his work to that of Seneca, the "renowned corrector of vice;" at the same time, he castigates him because "he jumbles up many things together immethodically" (a fair description of the apparent shapelessness of the satura), and goes on, in the third edition, to invoke the support of Erasmus, Horace, Juvenal and Ovid, all renowned satirists. This name-dropping technique of satire is utilized to advantage throughout the additions.

Another of Burton's favourite satiric devices is expanded in the Preface--the ironic inversions that were so important in the first edition. One of the key passages in the 1621 edition was that in which Democritus Junior, in a lengthy jeremiad, indicated how the normal order of affairs had been overturned as a result of man's folly. It comes as

no surprise, therefore, that he expands that whole passage considerably--by some six hundred and thirty words in all. Once again, there seems to be correlation between the size of the addition and the satiric potential of the original. The first addition here concerns the discrepancy between appearance and reality, one of the perennially favourite themes of satire:

> To see so much difference betwixt words and deeds, so many parasanges betwixt tongue and heart, men like stage players act other mens parts, give good precepts to others, sore aloft, whilst they themselves grovel on ground [B29].[1]

[1]These passages fit into the category of "complaint" as defined by John Peter, but in Renaissance rhetoric they are associated with three figures that are particularly appropriate for the satirist. Henry Peacham describes them thus:

> Anamnesis is a forme of speech by which the Speaker calling to remembrance matters past, doth make recitall of them. Sometime matters of sorrow, as did Dido a litle before her death . . .
>
> An example . . . of the prodigall sonne: Then he came to himselfe and said, how many servants at my fathers house, have bread inough, and I die for hunger. Luke. 15.17. (Peacham, p. 76)

> Threnos is a forme of speech by which the Orator lamenteth some person or people for the miserie they suffer, or the speaker his owne calamitie. . . . The greatest part of Jeremies lamentations, is framed by this forme of speech. . . . O that my head were full of water, and mine eyes a fountain of teares, that I might weepe day and night, for the slaine of the daughter of my people. Jeremy 9. (Ibid., p. 66)

> Apocarteresis is a forme of speech by which the speaker signifieth that he casteth away all hope concerning some thing, & turneth it another way. Job . . . signifieth that that he hath no more hope of worldly propseritie and comfort, and therefore he turneth the eye of his hope to heaven, saying: I know that my redeemer liveth, &c. Whereby he comforteth himself the better to indure & suffer so great and heavy a burthen of misery. Job 19.25. (Ibid., p. 83)

In this instance, then, Democritus Junior does not envisage himself alone as the "personate actor;" instead, all men are players, and the world is their stage: they play the parts of honest men, but are in fact hypocrites, the outward show disguising their internal corruption. Such "soaring aloft" as Democritus Junior himself practices in the "Digression of Air" is no guarantee of accompanying spiritual elevation.

Burton's first-edition fascination with this concept of the reversal of values and its potential for lamenting the transformation of humanity leads him to re-examine and reinforce it throughout the later editions. A fourth-edition augmentation deals with the transformation of upstarts, thus:

> To see an hirsute beggars brat, that lately fed on scraps, crept and whind, crying to all, and for an old Jerkieg [sic] runne of arrands, now ruffle in silk and satten, bravely mounted, Joviall and polite, nowe scorne his old friends and familiars, neglect his kindred, insult over his betters, domineere over all [D37].

The satirist is often accused of being a conservative, defending ancients against moderns, attacking change; but in this case, it is not a deviation from the status quo that is being bewailed, but the effects of mere material advance upon the attitudes of the nouveaux riches.

I suggested in Chapter Three that the major satiric device used in the Preface was the construction of the digression containing the utopian scheme, and it is therefore important to see what has been done with it in the additions. If it was Burton's major aim to enlarge further

the satiric content of his work in the post-1621 editions, then this is the place where one would expect to find the greatest evidence of his efforts. Nor is one disappointed, as this glance at the additions will show.

The preliminary analysis of English and European society that appeared in the 1621 edition is supplemented by some 1,400 words. The criticisms are again very practical, with such typical additions as this acid comment upon the unjust economic system of the day:

> Wee send our best commodities beyond the Seas, which they make good use of to their necessities, set themselves aworke about, and severally improve. sending the same to us backe at deare rates, or else make toyes and bables of the Tayles of them, which they send to us again, at as great a reckoning as they bought the whole [C54-55].

The concept of the self-supporting nation, as proposed by More in the Utopia, was very popular and logical, and this plea in the Anatomy is typical of many at the time.

As in the first edition, it is the focal point of the satire on socio-political ills,[1] and is shown to be one of the areas of intense continuing interest for Burton by the lengthy and careful expansions he makes to it throughout the post-1621 editions. It is almost three times its original length by the sixth edition, testifying to Burton's desire to keep his satire immediate for a contemporary audience whilst at the same time showing his mastery of the tradition of the utopian essay.

[1] J. Max Patrick, "Robert Burton's Utopianism," PQ, XXVII (1948), 345-58, testifies to the political import of this section.

His familiarity with more recent utopian works is evident in the references to Bacon's New Atlantis [C59], Andreas' Respublica Christianapolitana [C61], and Campanella's City of the Sun [D63], as well as old favourites like Lucian's Fortunate Isles [B49].

Apart from specific proposals, the universal appeal of the utopian satire is expanded in exhortations like this:

> If it were possible, I would have such Priests as should imitate Christ, charitable Lawyers should love their neighbours, as themselves, temperate and modest Physicians, Politicians contemne the world, Philosophers should know themselves, noblemen live honestly, tradesmen leave lying and cozening, magistrates [B52] corruption [C63], etc., but this is impossible, I must have such as I may [B52].

The change from the hypothetical "if" to the definitive "this is impossible," is bitterly ironic; men, it is suggested, reject the first principles upon which their professions depend, and adhere to their opposites: the inversion of values is everywhere. The heavy proportion of additions to the whole utopian passage shows how important Burton thought it to the Anatomy as a whole: in it, one can see an endeavour to combine an ironic treatment of the "symbolizing disease" in its contemporary manifestations, with an erudite familiarity with the satiric tradition.[1]

[1]Rosalie Colie, Paradoxia Epidemica, p. 441, remarks upon the importance of this "utopia" to the whole Anatomy: "In the ancient metaphor, the body politic is likened to the human body: society is seen as diseased or disordered, its diseases and disorders are diagnosed, remedies are prescribed. By extension of this metaphor, political analysis is part of the physician's correspondent task."

Throughout the additions, just as he had developed his satiric devices, Burton seizes every opportunity to expand his attacks upon all his favourite targets, as revealed in the first edition. Much of the heaviest augmentation in the Preface is found in passages where he amplifies an already powerful first edition attack. This is most readily seen where he discusses his book: a lengthy addition concerns his "macaronicon," and consists of approximately 3,500 words. Invoking numerous satirists in support of himself, Democritus Junior defends his style and his borrowings, criticizing others for their improper use of the same technique:

> I have laboriously collected this Cento out of divers Writers [A9], and that sine injuria, I have wronged no Authors [B7], but given everie man his owne; which Hierom so much commends in Nepotian, he stole not whole Verses, Pages, Tracts, as some doe now adayes, concealing their Authors names, but still said this Cyprianus, that Lactantius, that Hilarius, so said Minucius Felix, so Victorinus, thus far Arnobius: I cite and quote mine Authors [C8], (which, howsoever some illiterate scriblers accompt pedanticall, as a cloake of ignorance, and opposite to their affected fine style, I must and will use) [D8] sumpsi, non surripui [C8]; and what Varro . . . speaks of bees, minime maleficae nullius opus vellicantes faciunt deterius, I can say of my selfe, whom have I injured? the matter is theirs most part [B7], and yet mine, apparet unde sumptum sit (which Seneca approves), aliud tamen quam unde sumptum sit apparet, which nature doth with the aliment of our bodyes incorporate, digest, assimulate, I do conquoquere quod hausi, dispose of what I take [C8], I make them pay tribute to set out this my Maceronicon [B7].

This is the kind of defence that has been proposed for the apparent plagiarism in Jonson's Discoveries, and the sentiments are not very different from Jonson's or Bacon's on the use of the ancients. Burton,

too, has made them his own; he uses them but he is different from them. At the same time, one is frequently aware that the "authorities" cited are men whose words are suspect, for they are satirists themselves--in this case, for instance, Jerome and Varro--and there is a clear relationship between "macaronicon," "cento," and satura. The irony of Democritus Junior's protestation of innocence ("whom have I injured?") lies in what is hereafter done with the authorities, for they are often used against themselves.

This addition on books goes on to describe the varieties of style available to each writer ("Our writings are as so many dishes, our Readers guests [B8]"), mocking those who admire authors in direct proportion to their reputations, rather than because of their abilities. Such blindness is attacked in an ever-expanding addition of which the following passage is typical:

> Some understand too little, some too much [B8], qui similiter in legendos libros, atque in salutandos homines irruunt, non cogitantes quales, sed quibus vestibus induti sint, as Austin observes, not regarding what, but who write, orexin habet auctoris celebritas, not valuing the mettle, but stampe that is upon it, Cantharum aspiciunt, non quid in eo [C10]. If he be not rich, in great place, polite and brave, a great Doctor, or full fraught with grand titles, though never so well qualified, hee is a Dunce [D10]; but as Baronius hath it of Cardinal Caraffas works, he is a meere hog that rejects any man for his poverty [F11].

Though Bergen Evans, always trying to find the man behind the work, would see in such an addition the paranoia of the scholar who feels that the world is unfair to him, the phenomenon that Burton describes

is surely a perennial one, and a fitting subject for the pen of the satirist. At any rate, Evans surely must take into account both the success of Burton's own career, and the traditional satiric complaint about the scholar's lot before making his charges.

In the first edition, one of the major butts of the satire had been the "presumed wise," and in the additions to the Preface, that attack is expanded with vigour. A typical second-edition passage suggests the kind of treatment accorded this group in the remainder of the additions to the Anatomy:

> Of these and the rest of our Artists and Philosophers, I will generally conclude they are a kinde of madmen, as Seneca esteemes of them, to make doubts and scruples, how to read them truly, to mend old Authors, but will not mend their own lives, or teach us ingenia sanare, memoriam officiorum ingerere, or rectifie our manners. Numquid tibi demens videtur, si istis operam impendero, is not he mad that draws lines with Archimedes, whilst his house is ransacked, and his city besieged, when the whole world is in combustion, or wee whilst our soules are in danger, (mors sequitur, vita fugit), to spende our time in toyes, idle questions, and things of no worth [B59].

Thus the perennial question of "relevance," for the Renaissance man, the "utile," is broached and it is suggested that researches that do not lead to a moral improvement in the researcher are useless. Ironically, it has often been felt that Burton (or Democritus Junior, at least) is one of those who "draws lines with Archimedes . . . when the whole world is in combustion," obsessed with the ideal in the midst of

a devastating reality. But though we are meant to infer at this point that the Anatomy is of that valuable kind that instructs and rectifies, Democritus Junior more usually abandons as useless the qualitative distinction between works of art and avows that the Anatomy also is futile and its author mad, since folly is the universal condition, and all human endeavours vain. Along with all of the other seemingly-wise, authors and critics alike ought to be confined to Bedlam with "Rabelais to be their physitian" [C74], an interesting addition which is possibly indicative of new reading, and of a new master who receives recognition several times thereafter.[1]

A final example of this expanded attack on the wise comes at that point in the Preface where Democritus Junior has been dealing with the self-contradictions of the apparently wise; in the third edition this two-hundred-word passage is included:

[1]Although there is no record of Burton's owning a copy of Gargantua and Pantagruel, he obviously was well aware of its existence through others if not from personal acquaintance. Cotgrave's lusty Dictionary, also, may have been the source of some of his earlier "Rabelaisian" language: it was published in 1611. Burton, as we saw, was also very familiar with the German satirist, Johann Fischart, who used Rabelais as his model. Leo Spitzer describes a process of Rabelais' that suits both Fischart's and Burton's techniques: "He creates word-families, representative of gruesome fantasy-beings, copulating and engendering before our eyes, which have reality only in the world of language, which are established in an intermediate world between reality and irreality, between the nowhere that frightens and the here that reassures" (Quoted in Kayser, p. 157). Burton's additions often seem to grow in just this way; the most impressive example of his use of the technique is his picture of the horrendous "ideal mistress" which I discuss below, pp. 361 ff.

> Cardan in his 16 booke of Subtilties, reckons up twelve supereminent, acute Philosophers, for worth, subtilty, and wisedome: Archimedes, Galen, Vitruvius, Architas, Tarentinus, Euclide, Geber, that first inventor of Algebra, Alkindus, the Mathematician, both Arabians, with others. But his triumviri terrarum farre beyond the rest are Ptolemaeus, Plotinus, Hippocrates. Scaliger . . . scoffes at this Censure of his, cals some of them carpenters and mechanitions, hee makes Galen fimbriam Hippocratis, a skirt of Hippocrates; and the said Cardan himselfe, elsewhere condemnes both Galen and Hippocrates for tediousnesse, obscurity, confusion. Paracelsus will have them both meere idiots, infants in Physicke and Philosophy. Scaliger and Cardan admire Suisset the Calculator, qui pene modum excessit humani ingenii, and yet Lod. Vives calls them nugas Suisseticas: and Cardan, opposite to himself in another place, contemnes those ancients in respect of times present, majoresque nostros ad praesentes collatos juste pueros appelari [C44].

This expansion offers a typical early instance of the tactics used in the "Digression of Air." It groups together Cardan, Paracelsus and Scaliger, who are amongst the most frequently-invoked figures in Burton's representation of the internecine strife that is waged amongst the wise, and it shows clearly his stance vis-à-vis scholarship generally: the preferences of scholars can be as subjective as anyone else's, and their opinions, when examined circumspectly, often turn out to be ludicrous.

In the Preface of the first edition of the Anatomy, warfare, and the brutality that surrounds it had been analysed. Such strife is also one of the major topics of expansion in the post-1621 editions, for it represents, as it were, the externalization of the interior corruption. In the first edition, Democritus Junior had shown his abhorrence of the needless slaughter amongst the participants in battle, and had presented

a list of the statistics of military casualties throughout history; he bolsters these facts in the later editions with a sixteen-hundred-word addition upon the futility of warfare. That the subject remained one of abiding interest to Burton is clearly shown by the reworking he did of it throughout the six editions, as for example in this short passage on the glories of battle which is representative of the additions:

> Sicinius Dentatus fought in a hundreth battels, eight times in single Combat he overcame, had 40. wounds before, was rewarded with 140. Crownes, triumphed nine times for his good service. M. Sergius had 32. wounds; Scaeva, the Centurion, I know not how many; every nation hath their Hectors, Scipio's, Caesars, and Alexanders [C29]. Our Edward the Fourth was in 26 battles afoot: and as they doe all, he glories in it, tis related to his honour [B25]. At the siege of Hierusalem, 1,100,000 died with sword and famine [C30]. At the battel of Cannae, 70,000 men were slain, as Polybius records, and as many at Battle Abbey with us; and tis no news to fight from sun to sun, as they did, as Constantine and Licinius, etc [F32].

The expansion is Rabelaisian in its effect: the incredible becomes the commonplace. Yet this is no imaginative flight, and these are not distortions or exaggerations; in such instances as this, the correlation between literary device and actual fact is extremely appropriate. Burton shows here a great deal of artifice, the applicability of the literary grotesque to a factual situation suiting well with the contention of the Anatomy that folly is not a figment of the poetic imagination, but a real, universal sickness.

This satiric treatment of war leads to an attack upon soldiers themselves, a task Democritus Junior undertakes with zest. The ironic

first edition description of the military man, for example, is expanded:

> They commonly call the most hairebraine bloodsuckers, strongest theeves, the most desperate villaines, treacherous rogues, inhumane murderers, rash, cruell, and dissolute caitiffes, couragious and generous spirits, heroicall and worthy captaines, brave men-at-armes, valiant and renowned sooldiers, possessed with a brute perswasion of false honour, as Pontus Heuter in his Burgundian History complaines [A30]. By meanes of which it comes to passe that dayly so many voluntaries offer themselves, leaving their sweet wives, children, friends, for 6^{d} (if they can get it) a day, prostitute their lives and limbs, desire to enter upon breaches, lye sentinell perdue, give the first onset, stand in the fore-front of all the battell [C32], marching bravely on, with a cheerefull noise of drummes and trumpets, such vigor and alacrity, so many banners streaming in the ayre, glittering armours, motions of plumes, woods of pikes and swords, variety of colours, cost and magnificence, as if they went in triumph, now victors to the Capitol, and with such pompe as when Darius army marched to meete Alexander at Issus [D32]. Voide of all feare, they runne into imminent dangers, cannons mouth, etc., ut vulneribus suis ferrum hostium hebetent, saith Barletius, to get a name of valour, honor and applause, which lasts not neither, for it is but a meere flash, this fame, and like a rose, intra diem unum extinguitur, 'tis gone in an instant [C32].

This is another instance of that complete overturning of values, leading to the defrauding of the innocent and the gory celebration of death; simple men are persuaded that in war lies the path to glory, and they desert what is truly valuable for a shadow. The fourth-edition insertion, particularly, amplifies the tragic note of the whole expanded passage, stressing the irony of the soldier's existence that causes him to march towards brutal death as to a festival of life. From it emerges a truth that Burton emphasizes in the additions: that the vicious have

great success in contaminating the virtuous, whilst the opposite, more desirable influence is seldom witnessed.

Naturally, Burton does not miss a further chance to pillory the rich, who, in the first edition, were made responsible for much of the misery of humanity. The sequence of inversions was heavily expanded in the later editions, as in this typical one where Democritus Junior attacks the rich:

> To see a poore fellow, or an hired Servant, venture his life for his new Master that will scarce give him his wages at yeres end [C39]; a country colone toil and moil, till and drudge for a prodigal idle drone, that devours all the gain, or lasciviously consumes with phantasticall expenses [F43].

This sympathy for those who have to serve irresponsible masters was frequently expressed in the first edition. The whole group of additions here, therefore, is in keeping with a line of attack that was initiated in the first edition of the Anatomy--the niggardliness of the rich in their behaviour towards the meritorious poor, their passionate lavishness in the pursuit of their own self-interests, and their utter inability to separate true from false ends.

But, as in the first edition, even though there are individual groups within society that call for particular abuse from Democritus Junior, the main target is the folly of all men, and Burton does not ignore that aspect of his satire in the additions. He includes, therefore, a five-hundred word diatribe against contemporary madness, containing this analogy: ". . . as a river, we see, keepes the like name and

place, but not water, and yet ever runnes, Labitur et labetur in omne volubilis aevum; our times and persons alter, vices are the same, and ever will be" [B23]. Folly, like this river, marches incessantly, yet is paradoxically difficult to pin down. In these revisions and additions though Democritus Junior protests that he is no misanthropist ("I hate their vices not their persons" [C76]) he has missed no opportunity to reinforce the attack on contemporary vices, whilst the anatomy of the universal abuses has been expanded further.

A number of conclusions emerge from this necessarily brief treatment of the additions and revisions to the Preface. The pattern is distinctive: it seems clear that the post-1621 editions are faithful to the aims of the first edition; that part of the first edition which is most commonly accepted as being indisputably satiric, the Preface, is accordingly heavily augmented. There is no indication of a gradually developing interest on Burton's part in the Anatomy's satiric capabilities; on the contrary, he expands those parts where the satire was already present, explicitly or implicitly, in the first edition. In the rest of this chapter, I shall attempt to establish the prevalence of this pattern by comparison and analysis of the remainder of the post-1621 editions; for there is, it seems to me, no qualitative change throughout the six editions, and the evidence simply directs us towards a truer reading of the first edition itself.

In the First Partition itself, the major expansions occur in areas that were already notably satiric in the first edition, and the "technical" sections are left virtually untouched.[1] It is when he is dealing with such traditional satiric topics as the Deadly Sins, poverty, the lot of scholars, or the Church of Rome, that he expands in successive editions, or when he is dealing, for instance, with satire itself, as he does in one heavily extended passage in this Partition.[2]

The satura-form, itself, however, once again supplies him with ample scope to enlarge without inhibition. In the later editions of the Anatomy, when Burton comes across an opportunity to take advantage of the rather loose structure of the satura, and wander in almost any direction he chooses, he seizes it. This is most clear in the First Partition expansions. The subsection "An heap of other Accidents causing Melancholy, Death of Friends, Losses, etc.," for example, is

[1]The major additions, from which are drawn most of the passages I will cite, are to the following areas of the First Partition whose satiric leanings were made clear in Chapter Three: "Quantity of Diet a Cause" (first edition, 970 words; sixth edition, 2,100 words); "Philautia, or Self-Love" (first edition, 2,440 words; sixth edition, 3,600 words); "Digression on the Miseries of Scholars" (first edition, 7,170; sixth, 10,600); "Poverty and Want" (first edition, 3,150; sixth, 5,000); "An Heap of Other Accidents" (first edition, 2,900; sixth, 6,500); "Symptoms or Signes in the Mind" (first edition, 2,680; sixth, 5,000). One entirely new section, also satiric, is added (the only one in the entire Anatomy), "Symptomes of Maids, Nuns and Widows Melancholy" (2,150 words). Figures are approximate.

[2]This passage was analyzed above, pp. 137-39.

a very epitome of the method of satura, and is significantly expanded by an addition of thirty-five hundred words. The page-headings include "The losse of Friends," "The losse of Goods," "Feares of the Future," "Superfluous Industry," "Unfortunate Marriage," "Disgraces, Infirmities," and "Various Accidents" for good measure; his satiric bent is given full scope in such areas. Amusingly, in the course of this exhaustive catalogue, he admits: "Seventeene particular causes of anger and offence Artistotle reckons them up, which for brevities sake I must omit [C162]." This is ironic, for brevity never seems to trouble him over much in this ever-expanding work, and is not inherent in the satura form.

Another of the satiric parts of the first edition indicates the flexibility of the satura. It is entitled "Symptoms or signs in the Mind," which is also given lengthy additions--two thousand words are added to the twenty five hundred of the 1621 edition. One representative passage from it in particular gives us an insight into the method of Burton's expansions:

> The tower of Babel never yeelded such confusion of tongues, as this Chaos of melancholy doth variety of Symptomes [D190]. There is in all melancholy similitudo dissimilis, like mens faces, a disagreeing likeness still [C180]; but as in a River we swimme in the same place, though not in the same numericall water: as the same Instrument affordes severall lessons, so the same diseese yeeldes diversity of symptomes. Which, howsoever they bee diverse, intricate, and hard to be confined [B165-66], I will adventure yet in such a vast confusion and generality to bring them into some order; and so descend to particulars [A141].

These images of confusion might be said to reflect a feeling on the part of many modern readers about the Anatomy itself, and as a corollary,

about the satura form. Burton's odyssey, from the outset of the first edition, is that of all writers of satura: he confronts an apparently amorphous heap of experience, and shapes it subtley, without ever allowing the artificiality of form to become so noticeable that the sense of adventure is lost.[1] Such deliberate "chaos" is also symptomatic of the non-scientific nature of his book, from its first publication.

In the additions to the First Partition, as to the Preface, the persona remains that enigmatic creature whose ingenuousness is pervasive. In the one entirely new subsection added to the Anatomy in the third edition, he appears in his characteristic role. The subsection, under the heading "Symptomes of Maids, Nuns and Widows Melancholy," consists of some two thousand words. Again there is a correlation between quantity and satiric content. The subsection is heavily satiric and acts as a forerunner of the treatment that is to be given these female sufferers in the Third Partition. Democritus Junior has to protect his own good name of course, by disavowing any practical knowledge of the subject under discussion:

> But where am I? Into what subject have I rushed? What have I to doe with Nunnes, Maids, Virgins, Widowes? I am a bacheler my selfe, and lead a Monasticke life in a College, nae ego sane ineptus qui haec dixeram, I confesse tis an indecorum,

[1]To the charge that the satura form is simply an excuse for rambling, Rosalie Colie, Paradoxia Epidemica, p. 430, replies: "Jonathan Swift is the culprit responsible for the vulgar error that Burton's Anatomy is an amorphous literary creation, an infinite digression upon an infinity of subjects. Actually, the paradox can be defended, not only that the book is composed of very carefully constructed parts, but also that the parts are disposed in the decorum suitable to Burton's material." Throughout this thesis I have tried to show that the direction of Burton's writing is in no way haphazard.

> and as Pallas, a Virgin, blushed when Jupiter by chance spake of Love matters in her presence, and turned away her face; me reprimam, though my subject necessarily require it, I will say no more [C195].

Such rigorous self-analysis could be applied to his treatment of love in the entire Third Partition also. However, this is another chance for Burton to expose further the character of the persona he had created in the first edition, and, therefore, he has him immediately disregard the implications of his admission: "And yet, I must, and will say something more, add a word or two . . . ." The "word or two" amounts to some six hundred words of advice, reassuring the reader that Democritus Junior has lost none of his prolixity.

The First Partition expansions allow Burton to strengthen the effectiveness of many of the first-edition satiric techniques and also to include fresh instances of them. One such example occurs as late as the sixth edition, when as one would expect, the chief of the Deadly Sins, Pride, inspires the satirist's pen; it is dealt with specifically in the section called "Philautia, or Self-love, Vainglory, Praise, Honour, Immoderate Applause, Pride, overmuch Joy, etc., Causes." This is another of the most noticeably expanded passages, eleven hundred words being added to the two thousand four hundred of the first edition. His subject-matter allows him to strike home by treating amongst other things the vanity of authors. With obvious delight, Democritus Junior expands upon the magnitude of their folly by suggesting how miniscule is their place in the totality of the universe, in spite of their

inflated egos; he accomplishes this in a passage that presents a striking example of the technique used so effectively later in the Anatomy, in the "Digression of Air:"

> And yet every man must and will be immortal, as he hopes, and extend his fame to our antipodes, whenas half, no not a quarter of his owne province or citty neither knowes nor heares of him: but say they did, whats a citty to a kingdome, a kingdome to Europe, Europe to the world, the world itselfe that must have an ende, if compared to the least visible star in the firmanent, eighteene times bigger then it? and then if those stars be infinite, and every star there be a sunne, as some will, and as this sunne of ours hath his planets about him, all inhabited, what proportion beare wee to them, and wheres our glory [F250]

The progression towards a climax, from a humble province to multitudes of unknown planets in unknown universes, is balanced by the proportionately diminishing fame of the author, for this is a satiric journey, a mock-odyssey of fame.[1]

An instance of Burton's introducing a fresh example of one of his favourite techniques, the mock-eulogy, occurs near the end of the First Partition. "Poverty, and Want, Causes of Melancholy," is a satiric subject in the best tradition; Burton once more makes extensive revisions, and, to the first edition three-thousand words, he adds fifteen hundred more. The mock-eulogy is employed in this instance upon the subject of gold:

[1]The major figure employed here is incrementum, again a figure most appropriate to satire when the process of "diminishing" is underway.

> Get mony enough and command Kingdomes, Provinces, Armies, Hearts, Hands, Affections; thou shalt have Popes, Patriarks to be thy Chaplains and Parasites: thou shalt have (Tamberlin-like) Kings to draw thy Coach, Queenes to bee thy Landresses, Emperours thy footstooles, build more townes, Citties, then great Alexander, Babel Towers, Pyramides, and Mausolean Tombes, etc., command heaven and earth, and tell the world 'tis thy vassal; auro emitur diadema, argentum caelum panditur, denarius philosophum conducit, nummus jus cogit, obolus literatum pascit, metallum sanitatem conciliat, aes amicos conglutinat. And therefore not without good cause, John Medices, that rich Florentine, when he lay upon his death-bed, calling his sons Cosmus and Laurence before him, amongst other sober sayings, repeated this, Animo quieto digredior, quod vos sanos et divites post me delinquam. It doth me good to thinke yet, though I be dying, I shall leave you, my children, Sound and Rich; For wealth swayes all [F307].

The Latin passage in particular is bitter, implying as it does that even those non-material goals--heaven, truth, justice, learning, health and friendship--which ought to be beyond price, have been so perverted by mankind that they appear as marketable commodities. Hence, both the spiritual and the physical aspects of the human condition have been so debased by men as to stand equally for sale in the marketplace.

So, in the additions to the First Partition, there are countless instances of the inclusion or amplification of the techniques of satire that were used in the first edition. Equally, Burton elaborates upon attacks on various of his favourite first edition targets, or contrives completely fresh ones to invigorate the reader of all six editions. The first heavily expanded part of the First Partition, for example, is that in which Democritus Junior considers the Seven Deadly Sins, especially, in this instance, gluttony; to the nine hundred words of the first

edition on gluttony, eleven hundred words are added in the course of the next five editions. Burton's interest in expanding this part in particular is very significant, for the subject-matter is one of the most frequently treated of all those traditional topics of the satirist,[1] and this extension follows immediately upon the heels of the satiric cena section that I examined in Chapter Four.[2] A number of prominent satirists are called upon for evidence, including Juvenal and Horace; Petronius and Heliogabalus are cited, as might be expected on such a topic, and this evocative passage is inserted: "So they triumph in villainy, and justifie their wickednesse with Rablais, that French Lucian; drunkennesse is better for the body then physicke, because there bee more old drunkards then old Phisitians. Many such frothy arguments they have" [C69]. The premeditated juxtaposing of Lucian, the ancient master, and Rabelais, the Renaissance virtuoso, is important because of their obvious similarities to the Anatomy's own technique and style. That particularly apt epithet to describe the drunkards' contentions--"frothy"--is perhaps as good an example as any of the irreverence and earthiness he has learnt from each.

One of the favourite butts of Burton's satire in the first edition was the state of affairs which led to the degradation of scholarship. As one might expect by now, this subject receives lengthy

[1]Alden, in listing the topics of Renaissance satiric verse, finds it to be an almost universal theme.

[2]Above, p.225ff.

elaboration in the post-1621 editions. Having dealt with the disproportionate vanity of authors, Democritus Junior comments upon the miserable lot of scholars generally; three thousand five hundred words are added in the later editions to the first edition total of seven thousand: this gives an indication once again of his double interest, for the affairs of the scholars are especially important to him, as is the satiric treatment to which they leave themselves wide open. As before, the major concern is with the disadvantages to which the scholar is exposed because of the impractical nature of his education, which leaves him prey to all kinds of dangers: for example,

> . . . they [scholars] can measure the heavens, range over the world, teach others wisdome, and yet in bargaines and contracts they are circumvented by every base Tradesman. Are not these men fools [D128]? and how should they be otherwise? <u>but as so many sotts in schools, when</u> (as he well observed) <u>they neither heare nor see such things as are commonly practiced abroad</u>? how shoulde they get experience, by what meanes [C120-21]?

The quotation, from Petronius, indicates how ancient is the fashion of pillorying the scholar. Again the comparison is used to diminish: scholars become masters of other-worldly knowledge, but are incapable of handling the practical realities of mundane existence. Yet there is also a vision of the true worth of a scholar--emphasized in the additions--that makes his profession a potentially noble one:

> . . . if they approve him not, (for usually they doe but a yeere or two, as inconstant as they that cried "Hosanna" one day, and "crucifie him" the other) [B115], serving-man like, he must goe looke for a new master; if they doe, what is his reward [A173]? . . . Like an Asse, he weares out his time for provender, and can shew a stumpe rod, <u>togam</u>

> tritam et laceram, saith Haedus, an old torne gowne, an ensigne of his infelicity [B115]; he hath his labour for his paine, a modicum to keepe him till he be decrepit, and that is all [A173].

This is an illuminating and bitter extension. In the second edition, Burton introduces the idea of the scholar as Christ-figure; but there is also the suggestion that this Christ is a Fool, one who is a source of amusement for a short time, at the disposal of ignorant but powerful men.

In this Partition, Burton also expands the attack on the gentry and the idle, irresponsible rich, paying particular attention to the foibles of patrons. But it is, predictably, on the Church of Rome that he dwells with most vehemence: Democritus Junior arraigns, for example, "those superstitions and rash vows of popish monasteries," and the abominations that occur within them.

> . . . it troubles me to thinke of, much more to relate, those frequent aborts and murdering of Infants in their Nunneries read Kemnisius and Others, their notorious fornications [C196], those spintrias [D205], Tribidas, Ambubias, etc., those rapes incests, adulteries, mastuprations, Sodomies, buggeries of Monkes and Friars [C196].

In view of the multitude of his attacks on the Church of Rome, and the delight he takes in exposing its vices, it is hard to believe that he is reluctant to pass such information on to his readers. Yet, with a threat that in future editions of the Anatomy he will pillory all who

indulge in, or condone, such behaviour, he ends the passage with another ingenuous denial of any personal experience of all such matters, or any wish to discuss it.

A pattern, therefore, seems to have emerged thus far in the additions to the Preface and to the First Partition. I have been suggesting that the first edition was a satiric work; the evidence up to this point indicates that in the post-1621 editions Burton took every available opportunity to expand upon the satiric aim of that original effort, paying little or no attention to the so-called "scientific" ingredients. The passages I have examined were selected purely on the basis of the relative bulk of the expansions in which they occur; these were the parts of the Anatomy on which Burton seems to have expended most of his efforts of revision.[1] I have tried to show in the analysis so far that there is a powerful correlation between their size and their satiric content; for it seems that all of these passages are satiric, adhering closely to the tone of the original. The rest of this chapter will try to show that the most heavily expanded areas of the Second and Third Partitions follow the same path.

In the additions and revisions to the Second Partition, the emphasis is again upon those parts that contained the most exploitable satiric potential in the first edition.[2] The great digressions, the

[1]Above, p. 318, footnote 1 for details.

[2]The most heavily expanded areas in this Partition are, the "Digression of Aire" (first edition, 3,740 words; sixth, 11,000);

mock-odysseys, the attacks upon the established targets are once more amplified, and the satura form shows its flexibility.

The major device used in the Second Partition is the digression. The way in which that technique is handled in the expansions is epitomized in "Air Rectified. With a Digression of the Air," probably the most widely-known part of the Anatomy of Melancholy. Like the utopian vision of the Preface, this digression occupies a highly important place in Burton's satiric scheme; one would expect, therefore, that he would expend a great deal of energy in expanding so significant a part of his work, and indeed he does. To the approximately four thousand words of the first edition he adds seven thousand in the additions and it is revealing to see how the digression is enlarged. As before, there is a crescendo-like pattern. Democritus Junior has risen to his hawk-like position, from which, like Gulliver in Lilliput, he can scrutinize the greater follies of men. In the additions he expands the sections dealing with Earth, the underworld and the heavens, saving for this last area his most ironic onslaught upon the futilities of speculative science.

Amongst the more interesting aspects of his expanded discussion about the nature of the universe in the "Digression of Air" is his treatment of the much-debated question of the structure and physical

---

"Exercise Rectified" (first edition, 6,800 words; sixth, 13,000); and finally, the huge "Consolatory Digression" which is greatly expanded. Figures are approximate.

location of Hell.[1] Democritus Junior calls upon Antony Rusca, "one of the society of that Ambrosian College in Milan, in his great volume de Inferno," who is "stiff in this tenent;" he cites Surius and many of his followers who would have Tierra del Fuego as the portal of Hell, and notes that Kornmannus, Camerarius, and Bredenbachius opt for the Pyramids as "the mouth of Hell." He then goes on to mock Bonifacius, Bishop of Salzburg, who thought that the concept of a round earth contradicted the traditional teaching of the Fathers upon the location of Hell:

> But that scruple of Bonifacius is now quite taken away by our latter Divines: Franciscus Ribera . . . will have Hell a materiall and locall fire in the center of the earth, 200 Italian miles in diameter, as he defines it out of those words, "Exivit sanguis de terra . . . per stadia mille sexcenta" etc. But Lessius will have this locall hell far lesse, one Dutch mile in Diameter, all filled with fire and brimstone: because, as he there demonstrates, that space, Cubically multiplyed, will make a Sphere able to hold 800,000 millions of damned bodies (allowing each body sixe foot square), which will abundantly suffice; cum certum sit, inquit, facta subductione, non futuros centies mille milliones damnandorum [E246].

This emphasis on "Italian" and "Dutch" miles is deliberately parodic: it underlines his first edition contention that each man sees God in his own image. Lessius is particularly laughable, for not only can he predict the size of Hell, but he can also give a fairly accurate estimate

[1]Robert Browne, "Robert Burton and the New Cosmology," MLQ, XIII (1952), 131-148, gives the best survey of Burton's familiarity with the speculations and discoveries of the new science.

of the potential number of occupants. The scruple of Boniface is no more absurd than the pseudo-scientific certainty of his answerers.

Democritus Junior attacks the mixed motives of divines in the additions to the "Digression" when he comes to consider the relationship between religion and science:

> Others freely speake, mutter, and would perswade the World (as Marinus Marcennus complaines) that our moderne Divines are too severe and rigid against Mathematitians, ignorant and peevish, in not admitting their true Demonstrations and certaine observations, that they tyrannize over arte and science, and all Philosophy, in suppressing their labours, forbidding them to write, to speake a truth, all to maintaine their superstition, and for their profits sake [C240].

Burton himself is the living contradiction of any assertion of intolerance on the part of divines towards matters scientific; but, as in the first edition, skepticism about "true demonstrations" such as those given to Bonifacius abounds, and bitterness about those divines for whom profit is the driving force is everywhere manifest.

When discussing the variety of conditions and climates in the world in the course of this extended mock-odyssey, Democritus Junior is profuse; but, as in the 1621 edition, the discussion acts only as a stepping stone to pondering the varying theories about the nature of the heavens, and to demonstrating ironically how the nonsense is elevated to appropriate heights. He does this in a pithy display of erudition of which the following fifth-edition passage is typical:

> . . . thus they disagree amongst themselves, old and new, irreconcilable in their opinions; thus Aristarchus, thus Hipparchus, thus Ptolemaeus, thus Albateginus, thus Alfraganus, thus Tycho, thus Ramerus, thus Roeslinus, thus Fracastorius,

> thus Copernicus, and his adherents, thus Clavius, and Maginus, etc., with their followers, vary and determine of these celestiall orbes and bodies [E257].

The dizzying arguments of such authorities (many of them impressive-sounding rather than notable in achievement perhaps) is equalled only by the complexities of the heavens themselves. Indeed, human researches, it is suggested, only render that harmonious if incomprehensible element into a chaos that reflects the human condition itself.

As in the first version of 1621, the path of this satiric digression has run in a clear, crescendo-like pattern: Democritus Junior, from his elevated position as bird of prey, has reviewed man's concern with matters physical and spiritual, and shown how pitiful is the equipment the human being uses to examine them; now he enlarges upon that climactic topic into which man is least fitted, but most willing to inquire--the nature of the deity itself.[1] From the symbolic heights, Democritus Junior can see clearly the utter folly of human endeavour in that realm; in the post-1621 editions, he adds to his ridicule of the mass of spiritual speculators, passages such as this:

> Some againe curious phantasticks, will knowe more then this, and enquire with Epicurus, what God did bifore the world was made? was he idle? where did he bide? what did he make the world of? why did hee then make it and not before? If he

[1]Such a topic was, of course, legitimate if properly pursued. But all through this period there are numerous warnings against "the aspiring to over-much knowledge [which] was the original temptation and sin" [The Proficience and Advancement of Learning]; it was against such a prejudice that Bacon had to contend in advocating freedom of research in natural philosophy.

> made it new, or to have an end, how is he unchangeable, infinite, etc. Some will dispute, cavell, and object, as Julian did of old, whom Cyril confutes, as Simon Magnus is fained to doe, in that dialogue betwixt him and Peter [C242], and Ammonius the philosopher in that dialogicall disputation with Zacharias the Christian [E258]. If God be infinitely and only good, why should he alter or destroy the world? if he confound that which is good, how shall himselfe continue good? If he pull it downe because evill, how shall hee be free from the evill that made it evill? etc., with many such absurde and brainesicke questions, intracacies, froth of humane wit and excrements of curiousity, etc., which, as our Saviour told his inquisitive disciples, are not fit for them to knowe [C242-43].

Thus, the Anatomy continues to mock the Faustian ambitions of men. Human frailties have been exposed throughout the various editions, and the suggestion has been consistently made that, confronted by the most difficult problems affecting his state, man can be relied upon to come up with the most preposterous answers. The essentially Baconian stance in the "Digression of Aire" has been emphasized in the additions without qualification; Democritus Junior suggests that to approach spiritual problems with scientific techniques or ratiocination renders both science and theology absurd. The whole digression is concerned with epistemological questions: in natural philosophy, man's tools of inquiry are not yet perfect enough, and his experience is too limited; in spiritual matters, man's blindness makes him stubbornly follow the wrong paths, ignoring the obvious in favour of esoteric intellectual tit-bits.

In the post-1621 editions, therefore, Burton broadens, but does not essentially change the direction of the "Digression of Air" as it was originally conceived in the first edition. Unsound scholarship is still shown to be a part of that ocean of folly, bringing man

no nearer to a harmonious view of his place in the universe; instead, it transforms the universe and even its creator, into a chaotic mirror-image of man himself. The lengthy additions to this digression once again illumine the overall satiric plan of the work, and as in all the other major expansions, the correlation between their size and the satiric aim of the Anatomy emerges.

Another instance of the mock-odyssey occurs in "Exercise Rectified in Body and Mind," which is, as I tried to show in Chapter Three, a parallel satiric venture to the better-known "Digression of Air." It certainly provokes vast additions from its author--to the first edition's seven thousand words, he adds another six thousand. A number of instances of the kind of additions made to "Exercise Rectified" will appear later on in this chapter, in the discussion of the "targets" of satire in this Second Partition. Suffice it to say at this point, that, like the "Digression of Air," it lends itself easily to expansion, and is a major weapon in Burton's satiric armoury in the Second Partition.

He finds an opportunity to augment another mock-odyssey in the Second Partition; it is the strategically placed journey through the kingdom of letters which is in violent contrast to some of the more unkind remarks he has made about scholarship in the "Digression of Aire." The following excerpt is typical of the kind of addition he makes:

> For what a world of bookes offers it selfe, in all subjects, arts, and sciences, to the delight and sweet capacity of the Reader. In Arithmeticke, Geometry, Perspective [B233], Optickes [C260], Astronomy, Architecture [B233], Sculptura Pictura, of which so many and such elaborate Treatises are of late written, In Mechanicks, and their misteries [D275], Military matters [B233], Navigation, riding of horses, fencing, swimming, gardening, planting, great Tomes of husbandry, cookery, Fawconry, Hunting, Fishing, Fowling, etc., with exquisite pictures of all sports, games, and what not? In [D275] Musicke, Metaphysicks, naturall and morall Philosophy, Philology, in Policy [B233], Heraldry, Genealogy, Chronology, etc., they afford great tomes, in [C260] those studies of Antiquity, etc [B233]; et quid subtilius arithmeticis inventionibus, quid jucundius musicis rationibus, quid divinius astronomicis, quid rectius geometricis demonstrationibus [C260]? What so sure, what so pleasant? He that shall but see that Geometricall Tower of Garezenda at Bologna in Italy, the steeple and clock at Strasburrough, will admire the effects of art, or that Engin of Archimedes, to remove the earth itselfe, if he had but a place to fasten his instrument: Archimedes Cochlea and rare devises to corrivate waters, musick instruments, and Trisillable Echo's againe, againe and againe repeated, with miriades of such. what vast Tomes are extant [D276], In Law, Physicke, and Divinity, for profite, pleasure, practise, speculation, in verse or prose, etc. Their names alone are the subject of whole volumes, we have thousands of Authors of all sorts, many great Libraries full and well furnished [B233], like so many dishes of meat served out for several palates [C260]; and he is a very block that is affected with none of them [B233]. Some take an infinite delight to study the very languages wherein these books are written, Hebrew, Greek, Syriacke, Chaldee, Arabicke, etc. Me thinkes it would please any man . . . [C260].

This long mock-odyssey, containing the obverse of many of the sentiments expressed in the "Digression of Aire," has obviously been developed with a great deal of attention. The additions made in the fourth edition, for example, are clearly intended to show the useful and pleasant aspects of learning to men for whom philosophy and philology would be simply repellent;

in such ways he counters the emphasis he had placed upon the futility of learning in the more remarkable digression.

One of Burton's most effective techniques in the Anatomy is the ironic speculation upon how wonderful life would be if people conformed even minally to the standards at which they pretend to aim. In the second edition, he includes another such appeal near the end of the heavily-expanded satiric "Consolatory Digression," which is again related to the inversion-of-values theme:

> In fine, if Princes would doe Justice, Judges be upright, Cleargiemen be truely devout, and so live as they teach, if great men would not be so insolent, if souldiers would quietly defend us, the poore would be patient, rich men would be liberall and humble, Cittizens honest, Magistrates meeke, superiours would give good example, subjects peaceable, young men would stand in awe: if Parents would be kinde to their children, and they againe obedient to their Parents, brethren agree amongst themselves, enemies be reconciled, servants trusty to their Masters, Virgins chaste, Wives modest, Husbandes would be loving, and lesse jealous: If we could imitate Christ and his Apostles, live after Gods laws, these mischiefs would not so frequently happen amongst us; but being most part so irreconcileable as we are, perverse, prowd, insolent, factious and malicious, prone to contention anger and revenge, of such fiery spirits, so captious, impious, irreligious, so opposite to virtue, void of grace, how should it otherwise be? [B292]

Again, the implication, stressed in the Preface to the first edition and throughout the rest of the Anatomy, is that such expectations would be fond in reality. Man is perverse, and bears little resemblance in practice to the theoretical, unfallen man presented at the beginning of the First Partition.

In the additions and revisions to the Second Partition, therefore, Burton takes the opportunity to amplify satiric techniques that had already been functioning in the first edition, and to introduce fresh examples of some of his favourite methods. The satura lends itself pre-eminently to such adjusting, and is revitalized rather than submerged by it.

The post-1621 editions gave Burton fresh opportunities to expand his attacks upon his chief targets, and many of the most interesting of these expansions occur in this Second Partition. Some of these attacks, such as the onslaught against the supposed wise, have already appeared in the treatment of the expanded "Digression of Air," earlier in this chapter. Once more, however, the gentry and the system of patronage which rewards the undeserving are critically scrutinized. The spurious reputation that goes hand in hand with good family is indicated in the very long "Consolatory Digression, containing the Remedies of all manner of Discontents" which had an important place in the first edition; a passage is added which denies that any glory ought to be attached to noble birth: "It may be his [i.e. father's] heire, his reputed sonne, and yet indeed a priest or a serving-man may be the true father of him; but wee will not controvert that now; married women are all honest; thou art his sonnes sonnes sonne, begotten and born intra quattuor maria, etc" [C318].

The system of patronage, with its inevitable hardships for scholars and clerics, had been a major target in the first edition. The attack was expanded throughout the later editions, but nowhere to better effect than in the exemplum provided in the third edition:

> In Moronia pia, or Moronia felix I know not whether, nor how long since, nor in what Cathedral Church, a fat Prebend fell voide. The carcasse scarce cold, many sutors were up in an instant. The first had rich friends, a good purse, and would out-bid any man before he would lose it, every man supposed hee would carry it. The second was my Lord Bishops chaplin (in whose gift it was), and he thought it his due to have it. The third was nobly borne, and he meant to get it by his great parents, patrons, and allies. The fourth stood upon his worth, he had newly found out strange misteries in Chimistry, and other rare inventions, which hee would detect to the publicke good. The fift was a painefull preacher, and he was commended by the whole parish where hee dwelt, he had all their handes to his certificate. The sixt was the prebenderies sonne lately diseased, his father died in debt (for it, as they say), left a wife and many poore children. The seaventh stood upon faire promises, which to him and his noble friends had beene formerly made for the next place in his Lordships gift. The eight pretended great losses, and what he had suffered for the Church, what paines he had taken at home and abroad, and besides he brought noblemens letters. The ninth had married a kinsewomen, and he had sent his wife to sue for him. The tenth was a foraine Doctor, a late convert, and wanted meanes. The eleaventh would exchange for another, he did not like the former's site, could not agree with his neighbors, and fellowes upon any tearmes, he would be gone. The twelfe and last was (a sutor in conceipt) a right honest, civill, sober man, an excellent scholler, and such a one as lived private in the University, but he had neither meanes nor mony to compasse it; besides, he hated all such courses, he could not speake for himselfe, neither had he any friends to solicite his cause, and therefore made no sute, could not expect, neither did he hope for, or looke after it. The good Bishop amongst a jury of competitors thus perplexed, and not yet resolved what to doe or on whom to bestow it, at the last, of his own accorde, meere motion, and bountiful nature, gave it freely to the University student, altogether unknown to him but by fame; and to bee briefe, the Academicall scholler had the Prebend sent him for a present. The newes was no

> sooner published abroade, but all good students rejoyced, and were much cheared up with it, though some would not believe it; others, as men amazed, said it was a miracle; but one amongst the rest thanked God for it, and said, Nunc juvat tandem studiosum esse, et Deo integro corde servire. You have heard my tale, but alas it is but a tale, a meere fiction, t'was never so, never like to bee, and so let it rest. [C324-25].

The tale suggests effectively not only the devious practices underlying the granting of benefices in Renaissance England, but the kind of injustices that confronted the scholar, so frequently presented since the first edition of the Anatomy; the ending of the story is a masterpiece of Burtonian irony. The underlying expectation throughout is, plainly, that the prebend, which ought theoretically to be awarded to a deserving man, will go to some one who least approximates to the ideal but who is qualified in a more worldly sense. From experience, the unworthy suitors are justified in assuming that one of their number would be the eventual benefitters, and the one eminently well-suited man for the position supposed he need not even apply. The Bishop, acting in defiance of all known precedents, awarded the prebend to him. The response of the people to what should have been a normal case of justice done, was one of utter incredulity--the event was hailed as a supernatural sign, and the prayer of thanks is reminiscent of those bibilical attestations of a divine intervention. Burton is on his mettle, and the effect of all this is quite hilarious. The immediate switch into the heaviest of irony is predictable; the skeptical comments are skilfully introduced to balance those swift satiric strokes with which he has just delineated the suitors.

The message is the one Democritus Junior has preached since the Preface of the first edition: there is an utter reversal of values operating in the world; virtue is so infrequently rewarded, that on those occasions where it is, the miraculous is suspected; men are so used to corruption that they inadvertently promulgate it by complying with its demands, at least in their expectations. This amusing addition sets the seal on many of the major satiric themes of the first edition of Anatomy and contains that mixture of wit and savage irony that is typical of Burton's best satiric writing.

Once again, therefore, as I have tried to show with the other parts of the post-1621 Anatomy, the most extensive additions to the Second Partition are satirical. Burton has expended his major efforts in attempting to make his satire upon the universal folly of man even more forceful. There is no detectable change in intent after 1621, but simple added weight to the indictment already made there.

After "Democritus to the Reader," the most extensively augmented section of the Anatomy of Melancholy is the Third Partition. This is significant in the light of the contention in Chapter Four--namely, that apart from the Preface, the final Partition is the most undisguisedly satiric part of the Anatomy in its first-edition version. Once again, as this examination will make clear, there is no deviation from the pattern already noted in the additions: the satiric content is expanded,

and there is correlation between quantitative and qualitative.[1] The persona particularly gives the dominant tone to the Third Partition, and in the additions and revisions his attitudes remain pervasive. More instances of his inconsistency and deviousness are included, and they have an overall effect of casting doubt upon the credibility of his case, an effect at which Burton has aimed throughout the six editions.

One of Burton's favourite ploys for revealing the persona's instability is to display Democritus Junior's interior struggles as he tries to convince himself of his qualifications for the task he has undertaken. After an exhaustive analysis, early in the partition, of the signs whereby love may be detected, the persona protests:

> . . . and besides, I am of Haedus minde, no man can discourse of love matters, or judge of them aright, that hath not made triall in his owne person, or that as Aeneas Sylvius addes, hath not a little doted, been made or love sicke himselfe. I confesse I am but a novice [B425], a Contemplator only, Nescio quid sit amor nec amo, I have a tincture, for why should I lye, dissemble or excuse it? [D545] yet homo sum, etc., [C495] not altogether [D545] inexpert in this subject, non sum praeceptor amandi, and what I say is meerely reading [B425], ex aliorum forsan ineptiis [D545], by mine owne observation, and others relation [B425].

[1]Major additions occur in: the introductory preface (first edition, 1,190 words; sixth, 3,400); "Heroicall Love" (first edition, 1,900; sixth, 2,700); "How Love Tyrranizeth" (first edition, 1,500 words; sixth, 3,000); "Causes of Love" (first edition, 7,150 words; sixth, 13,000); "Artificiall Allurements" (first edition, 9,950; sixth, 16,000); "Symptomes or Signs of Love Melancholy" (first edition, 11,650; sixth, 22,000); "Cure of Love Melancholy" (first edition, 12,910; sixth, 28,000); "Causes, Symptomes and Cures" of Religious Melancholy (first edition, 12,600; sixth, 19,000); "Religious Melancholy in Defect" (first edition, 1,740; sixth, 5,000); "Causes of Despair" (first edition, 2,080; sixth, 3,500). Figures are approximate.

The usual farrago of contradictions is apparent in this deliberate heaping-on of phrases in the post-1621 editions. Democritus Junior seems diffident about his ability to discuss the matter of love, but he then defiantly asserts that he has been tainted himself. This boastful avowal that he has indeed experienced the pangs, is immediately modified by the information that all he knows comes from books. Such additions help maintain the first-edition impression of the persona's ingenuousness.

In another of the lengthy additions to the Third Partition, Democritus Junior reveals once again the humorous inconsistency of his position. He has been indulging with great gusto in a long tirade against women, and suddenly feels constrained to apologize for the clear prejudice of his convictions:

> I am not willing [A646], you see [B444], to prosecute the cause against them [A646], and therefore take heed you mistake me not, matronam nullam ego tango, I honour the sex, with all good men, and as I ought to doe, rather than displease them, I will voluntarily take the oath which Mercurius Britannicus took . . . Me nihil unquam mali nobilissimo sexui, vel verbo, vel facto machinaturum, etc. [B444] Let [A646] Simonides [C516], Mantuan, Platina [A646], Peter Aretine [B444], and such women-haters bear the blame, if aught be said amiss; I have not writ a tenth [1st ed: "said a half"] of that which might be urged out of them and others [A646]; non possunt invectivae omnes, et satirae in feminas scriptae, uno volumine comprehendi [C516]. And that which I have said, (to speak truth) no more concerns them than men, though women be more frequently named in this Tract; (to Apologise once for all) I am neither partiall against them, or therfor bitter; what is said of one, mutato nomine, may most part be understood of the other. My words are like Passus picture in Lucian, of whom, when a good fellow had bespoke an horse to be painted with his heeles upwards, tumbling on his backe, he made him passant; now when the fellow came for his piece, he was very angry, and said, it was quite opposite to his mind; but Passus instantly turned the picture upside downe,

> shewed him the horse at that site which he requested, and so gave him satisfaction. If any man take exception at my words, let him alter the name, reade him for her, and tis all one [B444].

The implication of the first part of his "apology" is that there is much more ammunition available for attacking women if one were willing to use it. Indeed, whereas in the first edition he claims that he has touched upon less than half of the potential case against them, in later editions he reduces the figure drastically and says that he has left at least nine-tenths unpursued, yet there has been a huge number of additions made. The example from Lucian (always suspect as a reliable authority) to demonstrate how the same case may be argued against men, is, of course, fraught with irony, since it suggests that Pauso's painting reflects the reality of life, which the buyer may pervert if he so wishes. By analogy, the diatribe is correctly aimed, but if anyone is foolish enough to wish to misapply it, he may. At any rate, Democritus Junior demonstrates his unwillingness to deflect his attack towards men soon after; for when the opportunity arises, he escapes thus:

> . . . I will say nothing of dissolute and bad husbands, of batchelors and their vices; their good qualities are a fitter subject for a just volume, too well knowne already in every village, towne and citty, they need no blazon; and least I should marre any matches, or dishearten loving maides, for this present I will let them passe [C519].

This desire not to "dishearten loving maides" is symptomatic of his prejudice: he has spent the most of the Third Partition, up to this point, in attempting to dissuade men from having anything to do with maids, and the bulk of the additions has been devoted to abusing them.

There are many other instances in the additions and revisions of how Burton consolidates the first-edition impression of the satiric persona. One last instance, in the third-edition conclusion to the section "Causes, Symptomes and Cures of Melancholy," is typical yet significant, for it shows an adherence to the aims of the first edition, and a similarity in technique and in perception of his persona's role:

> One other soveraigne remedy I could repeat, an especiall Antidote against Jealousie, an excellent cure, but I am not now disposed to tell it, not that like a covetous Empiricke I conceale it for any gaine, but some other reasons, I am not willing to publish it, if you be very desirous to knowe it, when I meet you next, I will peradventure tell you what it is, in your eare [C574].

This device had been used several times before, most notably when Democritus Junior refused to give the exact location of his utopia (though he did suggest on that occasion that it might be available for a small fee). In this case it provokes humour whilst pretending to arouse curiosity (this cure is "especiall," "excellent," "soveraign"), but we infer, and are meant to do so, that if it does exist it is ribald. So much for the "scientific aim" of the Anatomy.

One of the important satiric devices in the first edition version of the Third Partition was the short preface, a satiric apologia, with which it opened. It contained 1,190 words in the first edition, and there is an addition of some 2,200 words thereafter, indicative of Burton's desire to ensure that the satiric tone of this Partition is quite unmistakeable to his readers. The additions to this apologia are significant and worthy of examination.

As he had done in "Democritus Junior to the Reader," Democritus Junior does not go out of his way to encourage us even to read his book, adopting the provocative advice of Mercerus: "If I have spent my time ill to write, let not them be so idle as to read," [B333] a time-honoured satiric ploy. Since their approach is in keeping with his theme of universal folly, he agrees with the Platonists' indictment of the absurdities and immoralities in Homer; then with his accustomed perversity, he immediately launches an attack on Socrates and Plato too:

> . . . what can be more absurde then for grave Philosophers to treat of such fooleries, to admire Autolycus, Alcibiades, for their beauties as they did, to runne after, to gaze, to dote on faire Critobucus, delicate Agatho, young Lysis, fine Charmides, haeccine philosophum decent? Doth this become grave Philosophers? [C377]

In matters of love, as he had suggested in the first edition, the supposedly wise demonstrate the same symptoms as the acknowledged fools.

The classical Renaissance statement of intent, applicable to all literature (but here couched in the medical image to give it a satiric direction) is introduced:

> . . . but mine earnest intent is as much to profit as to please, non tam ut populo placerem, quam populum juvarem; and these my writings, I hope, shall take like guilded pilles, which are so composed as well to tempt the appetite and deceave the pallat, as to helpe and medicinally worke upon the whole body, my lines shall not onely recreate but rectifie the minde [D414].

The expansions, like the first edition, indicate that the "profit" here is not a reference to some "scientific" knowledge to be garnered from the Anatomy; the gambit is one of the accepted defences of satire's function.

Besides giving pleasure, the satirist claims that he hopes his work "will amend the world". Taken together with the medical image, therefore, the expanded statement may be seen as consciously in the satiric tradition.

In an ironic anticipation of one of the flaws in criticism of the Anatomy itself (perhaps in response to early attacks upon it) the persona insists that author and work must not be identified, adding Ovid's "Vita verecunda est, musa jocosa mihi." [D415] to the better-known epigram of Martial. It is an author's plea for freedom to have his persona speak consistently, sometimes immorally, without having him identified with his creator. This qualification having been made, he claims that his work is "not scurrile" [C378], apparently in answer to a charge to that effect, and claims that it is with reluctance that he goes about the job of revising his work, "etsi non ignorarem novos fortasse detractores novis hisce interpolationibus meis minime defuturos" [C379]; the reasons for his pretended apprehension seem clear: the additions in no way moderate the satiric nature of the Anatomy, but rather strengthen it, and thus invite even more of the hypothetical animosities than before.

Typically, however, he places the burden for finding the Partition lewd squarely on the shoulders of his readers:

> Omnia munda mundis, a naked man to a modest woman is no otherwise than a picture, as Augusta Livia truly said, and mala mens, malus animus, tis as tis taken [B335].

Of course this turns all pejorative criticism of his book back upon itself, and is an effective deterrent. He concludes with typical aggression:

> I am resolved howsoever, velis, nolis [B335], audacter stadium intrare, in the Olympicks, with those Aeliensian Wrastlers in Philostratus, boldly to show myselfe in this common Stage, and

> [D416] in this Tragecomedy of Love, to Act severall parts, some Satyrically, some Comically, some in a mixed Tone, as the subject I have in hand gives occasion, and present Sceane shall require or offer it selfe [B335].

The problem that pervades the Anatomy from the first edition onwards--the establishing of point of view--is highlighted in this apologia. Burton has deliberately obsfuscated things: is one to see, for example, the mask being lowered, and the author speaking in his own voice, or is one still confronted by the persona, defending his hypothetical work as he has already done? Since this satiric apologia bears so much resemblance to "Democritus Junior to the Reader," we may infer once more that it is the persona who is speaking, in this instance deliberately distancing himself from responsibility for his words, by claiming that he will be acting "severall parts" and is therefore in an unimpeachable position personally. It is yet another instance of that "caution" of which the persona is the possessor, and which, in the first edition, led him to assume the defensive whenever potential trouble appeared.

It is fitting that in an analysis of the fantastic perversions of human love one of the major devices used should be the satiric exaggeration, or magnification. In the additions, as in the first edition, there are frequent instances of the employment of this device. One unforgettable fourth-edition example of the attractions of the artificial (extended in this case to mean the "artistic"), is, significantly, related to the theatre:

> At Abdera in Thrace (Andromeda, one of Euripides Tragedies, being played), the spectators were so much moved with the object, and those patheticall love speeches of Perseus amongst the rest, O Cupido, Prince of God and men, etc., that every man almost a good while after, spake pure Iambickes, and raved still on Perseus speech, O Cupido Prince of God and men. As Carmen, Boyes and Prentises, when a new song is published with us, goe singing that new tune still in the streets, they continually acted that Tragicall part of Perseus, and in every mans mouth was O Cupido, in every street, O Cupido, in every house almost, O Cupido Prince of God and men, prauncing still like stage players, O Cupido, still they were so possessed all with that rapture, and still of that patheticall love-speech, they could not a long time after forget, or drive out of their mindes, but O Cupido Prince of God and men [D490].

Aside from the propensity of the Abderites to becoming emotionally wrought up, as they did over Democritus Senior himself, it is the exaggerated nature of the scene that is so amusing; this device of reportage is one that Burton always adopts to good effect.

A later, related example of this device occurs when he considers the inevitable fate of female beauty, the ravages of time upon the most fetching examples of feminine grace:

> One growes to fat, another to leane, etc.; modest Matilda, pretty pleasing Peg, sweet singing Susan, mincing merry Moll, dainty dancing Doll, neat Nancy, Jolly Jone, nimble Nel, kissing Kate, bouncing Besse with blacke eyes, fair Phillis with fine white handes, fidling Francke, tall Tib, slender Sib, etc., will quickly loose their grace, grow fulsome, stale, sad, heavy, dull, soure, and [D565] all at last out of fashioun [B441].

The very rhythm of the passage indicates the movement towards decay; it travels from abounding energy in those delightful names, to a halting, abrupt ugliness in the concluding monosyllables. It is clear that in this passage, there is a carefully contrived and absolutely appropriate

quality to the expansions. They are not mere addenda or afterthoughts, included at a later date with abandon, and simply to add bulk to an already ponderous work, but rather, they contribute powerfully to the satiric design of the first edition.

Some of the most memorable instances of the Anatomy's satiric powers in the first edition are the mini-anatomies, of which Burton shows a supreme mastery in the Third Partition. One of the finest examples of the device is enlarged greatly in the later editions: it is in "Symptomes and Signs of Love-Melancholy;" and to the 11,650 words of the first edition, 10,810 are added in later editions. Like most of the other passages of major importance in the added material, many references are to the best known satirists of antiquity and the near past, such as Horace, Juvenal, Martial, Lucian and Aretino. This famous passage upon the attractions of the mistress shows signs of loving care having been lavished upon it; it was not carelessly dashed off, but its effects were contrived as the cunning placing of the many additions shows. This kind of Rabelaisian passage is figuratively described by Leo Spitzer as "copulating and engendering before our eyes."[1] I shall quote the first edition also to show how Burton has gone about this piece of interpolation:

> Every lover admires his mistris, though she be very deformed of her selfe, ill favoured [A608], wrinkeled [B410], pimpled, pale, red, yellow, tand, tallow faced, have a swoln Juglers [C477] platter face [D514], or a thin, leane chitty face [C477], have clouds in her face, be [D514] crooked [A608], dry [B410], bald, goggle-eyed [A608], bleare eyed [C477], or with staring

[1]The phrase is quoted in Kayser, p. 204.

> eyes, she looks like a squisd Cat, hold her head still awry [D514], heavy, dull, hollow-eyed, blacke or yellow about the eyes [C477], or squint-eyed, sparrow mouthed [A608], Persian [E515] hookenosed, or have a sharpe foxe nose [A608], a redde nose [B410], China [E515] flat[C477] great nose [B410], nare simo patuloque [D514], a nose like a promontory [B410], gubber-tussed, rotten teeth [A608], black, uneven, brown teeth [C477], bettle-browed [A608], a witchs beard [B410], her breath stinke all over the roome, her nose drop winter and summer with a Bavarian poke under her chin [A608], a sharpe chin [B410], lave-eared [A608], with a long cranes neck [C477], which stands awry too [F516], pendulis mammis [B410], "her dugges like two double jugges" [A608], or else no dugges, in that other extreme [D514], bloodi-falne-fingers [A608], she have filthy, long unpared nailes [B410], scabbed [A608] hands or [B410] wrists, a tanned skinne, a rotten carkasse, crooked backe [A608], she stoops, is [B410] lame, splea-footed, as slender in the middle as a cowe in the waste, goutie legges [A608], her ancles hang over her shoes [B410], her feete stinke, she breeds lice [A608], a meere changeling [D514], a very monster, an aufe imperfect, her whole complection savours [A608], an harsh voice, incondite gesture, vile gait [B410], a vast virago, or an ugly tit [C477], a slugge, a fat fustilugs, a trusse, a long leane rawbone, a skeleton, a sneaker [E515], (se qua latent meliora puta) [B410], and to thy judgement lookes like a marde in a lanthorne, whom thou couldest not fancy for a world, but hatest, lothest, and wouldest have spit in her face, or blowe thy nose in her bosome, remedium amoris, to another man, a doudy, a slut [A608-609], a scold [C477], a nasty [A609], rank, rammy [E515], filthy, beastly queane, dishonest peradventure, obscene, base, beggerly [A609], rude [C477], foolish, untaught [A609], peevish [B410], Irus daughter, Thersites sister, Grobians scholler [C477], if he love her once, he admire her for all this, he takes no notice of any such errors or imperfections, of body or mind [A609],
>
> Ipsa haec
> Delectant, veluti Balbinum polypus Agnae; [F517]
>
> he had rather have her then any woman in the world [A609].

So, what had been in the first edition a relatively short and effective parody of the Petrarchan "anatomy" is compounded to become a mountain of amusing abuse: the kind of vituperatio that was prominent in Harvey

and Nashe is emulated, and the whole has, once more, a Rabelaisian flavour. The pleasure that Burton derived from writing in this vein seems to me to be demonstrated in his repeated efforts to expand this amusing passage. Although there is no significant difference in the kind of addition made from one edition to the next, he tries to make his exaggerations as gross as possible without allowing them to bore. He takes the Petrarchan method of praising each part of the mistress's body and simply inverts the purpose of the catalogue; so that his "imperfect lover" is as ideally monstrous as the most perfect woman conceived by the poets.

The mock-odyssey is again an important vehicle in the additions to the Third Partition. Hints as to the kind of journey that the Anatomy has taken its readers upon appear in the additions to Member V, on the "Cure" of Love Melancholy. This section is packed with additions, 15,900 words being added to the first edition's heavily satiric 12,900 words. The opening passage, for example, from Virgil, gives an ironic indication of the nature of the odyssey that has been undertaken:

> Facilis descensus Averni;
> Sed revocare gradum, superasque evadere ad auras,
> Hic labor, hoc opus est: [B428]
>
> It is an easy passage down to helle,
> But to come backe, once there, you cannot well. [C499]

The infernal journey in this case is through the temptations and dangers of Love--again an inversion of the usual celestial conceit of the

love-poet--and Burton's rather pointed rendering of the well-known Latin lines strips the experience of any glory. The adventurer in love is no Aeneas, a fabulous hero, whose fate is to be the founder of a great civilization; but rather, he is a madman, doomed to the pit of eternal folly.

The ironic inversion was another of the major devices in the first edition. A fresh instance is introduced in the fifth-edition version of "Religious Melancholy in Defect" which has 1,740 words in the first edition, with another 3,240 words added in the course of the next five editions. Amongst the irreligious, Democritus Junior says, are those who make a god of their own person, or a goddess of their lady:

> The Idoll which they worship and adore is their Mistris; with him in Plautus, Mallem haec mulier me amet quam dii, they had rather have her favour then the Gods. Satan is their guide, the flesh is their instructor, Hypocrisie their Counsellour, Vanity their fellow-souldier, their will their law, Ambition their captaine, Custome their rule; temerity, boldness, impudence their Art, toyes their trading, damnation their end [E684].

This contrast between the ideal and the real is one that recurs in such passages, laden as they are with savage irony, from the first edition onwards.

Parody is to be found, of course, everywhere in the Anatomy; not only is it the raison d'être of its format, but it is the source of

many amusing passages throughout the work. In the additions to the Third Partition, there is one particularly amusing fourth-edition inclusion which shows Burton's powers of parody and his continuing interest in using it to advantage in the additions. The insertion occurs in Section Two, whose title, "The last and best Cure of Love Melancholy is, to let them have their Desire," is ironic enough in itself in the light of Democritus Junior's previous efforts to disprove the point. He tells us about the "twelve motions to mitigate the miseries of marriage," propounded by Jacobus de Voragine, answered by Burton's own twelve antiparodia:

1 Hast thou meanes? thou hast one to keepe and increase it.
2 Hast none? thou hast one to helpe to get it.
3 Art in prosperity? thine happinesse is doubled.
4 Art in adversity? sheele comfort, assist, beare a part of thy burden to make it more tolerable.
5 Art at home? sheele drive away melancholy.
6 Art abroade? she lookes after thee going from home, wishes for thee in thine absence, and joyfully welcomes thy returne.
7 Theres nothing delightsome without society, no society so sweet as Matrimony.
8 The bande of Conjugall love is adamantine.
9 The sweet company of kinsmen increaseth, the number of parents is dobled, of brothers, sisters, nephews.
10 Thou art made a father by a faire and happy issue.
11 Moses Curseth the barrennesse of Matrimony, how much more a single life?
12 If Nature escape not punishment, surely thy Will shall not avoide it.

All this is true say you, and who knowes it not? but how easy a matter it is to answere these motives, and to make an Antiparodia quite opposite unto it. To exercise my selfe, I will Essay:

1 Hast thou meanes? thou hast one to spende it.
2 Hast none? thy beggery is increased.
3 Art in prosperity? thy happinesse is ended.

4 Art in adversity? like Job's wife sheele aggravate thy misery, vexe thy soule, make thy burden intolerable.
5 Art at home? sheele scould thee out of doores.
6 Art abroade? If thou be wise, keepe thee so, sheele perhaps graft hornes in thine absence, scowle on thee comming home.
7 Nothing gives more content than solitarinesse, no solitarinesse like this of a single life.
8 The band of marriage is adamanture [sic], no hope of loosing it, thou are undone.
9 Thy number increaseth, thou shalt be devourd by thy wives friends.
10 Thou are made a Cornuto by an unchast wive, and shalt bring up other folkes Children instead of thine owne.
11 Paul commends marriage, yet hee praeferres a single life.
12 Is marriage honorable? What an immortall crowne belongs to virginity? [D591-92]

No matter how amusing the parody, that same consistent onslaught against women that first appeared in the 1621 edition is behind the exercise; even praise of women from a respected source is parodied in the traditional satiric manner, and made the excuse for a fresh diatribe against them.

So far as the objects of attack in the Anatomy are concerned, I suggested in Chapter Three that Burton had introduced into the Third Partition a vehement attack upon what had been generally regarded as a major force in Western Culture--heroic love. There are, therefore, as we might expect, many major additions to the Third Partition in this area. "Heroicall Love causing Melancholy. His Pedigree, Power, and Extent," has an additional 780 words, and "How Love tyrannizeth over men. Love, or Heroical Melancholy, his definition, part affected," is expanded by some 1,500 words, with numerous inclusions in the lengthy Latin

passage upon perversions, and in the diatribe against aged lovers. The whole attack of course turns out to be principally against women, who are the major cause of "love." But early on, Democritus Junior gives an appearance of fairness, singling out as instances of the folly of love in old age, for example, the man with "a continuate cough, his sight fayls him, thicke of hearing, his breath stinkes" [B364], and the woman, "an old widawe, a mother so long since (in Plinys opinioun), she doth very unseemely seeke to marry" [B364]. These targets are elaborated upon thus throughout the early part of the Third Partition.

To those "Causes" of love, which, in the first edition, gave him the perfect excuse for satirical treatment, Burton added all through the later five at great length, 5,750 words being added to the original 7,150. He includes numerous anecdotes about the lengths of folly to which men are driven under the spell of beauty, and when he ceases, it is for reasons other than the lack of further instances: "Many more such could I relate which are to be believed with a poeticall faith" [C422]. Yet many of the previous examples are taken from poetry (such as the tales of Hero and Leander, Venus and Adonis), and Democritus Junior seems to suggest that they are not to be lightly disregarded. In affairs of the heart, as he stresses throughout this Partition, the absurd becomes the commonplace.

"Artificiall Allurements of Love, Causes and Provocations to Lust" is also considerably extended--quite predictably, in view of the

observed pattern in the additions so far--for it is one of the traditional subjects of satire, and was especially prominent in the seventeenth century amongst Puritan moralists. To the 9,950 words of the first edition, 6,390 are added, and, in this context, women once more are the major victims of the comments, as in this typical addition:

> For generally, as with rich-furred conies, their cases are farre better than their bodies [C438], and like the barke of a Cinnamon tree, which is dearer then the whole bulke, their outwarde accouterments are farre more pretious than their inwarde endowmentes. [D480]

At the root of most of this cynicism about the artificial allurements used by women is the old antithesis between appearance and reality which the satirist loves to display; the "acting", this time of women in their various guises, arouses his ire: they must be stripped and exposed.

One final revelation about the attitude taken in the Third Partition towards women in love occurs at the conclusion of this section: ". . . as much pitty is to be taken of a woman weeping, as of a Goose going barefoot" [C498]. Democritus Junior sees this kind of display as being purely histrionic. It is a part of a woman's adopted habit, necessary only as a prop and unworthy of any serious attention. His position with respect to women, then, scarcely can be said to change since the first edition, for he is simply expanding upon that early display of contempt by fresh examples.

The first edition attack on the blindness of lovers is driven home as in this typical added passage that once again shows signs of very careful adjusting:

> . . . and as when a country fellow discommended once that exquisite picture of Helena, made by Zeuxis, for hee saw no such beautie in it, Nichomachus, a love-sick spectator, replied, Sume tibi meos oculos et deam existimabis, take mine eyes and thou wilt think she is a Goddesse, dote on her forthwith, count al her vices, vertues, her imperfections infirmities, abolute and perfect [C479]; if she be flat-nosed, she is lovely; if hooke-nosed, kingly; if dwarfish and little, pretty; if tall, proper and manly [D526], our brave British Bunduica [E517], if crooked, wise; if monstrous, comely; her defects are no defects at all, she hath no deformities [D526]. Immo nec ipsum admicae stercus foetet, though she be nasty, fulsome, as Sostratus bitch, or Parmeno's sow [C479]. . . .

This reprehensible blindness is everywhere pilloried in the expansions, in view of the inordinate lengths to which those under the spell of love will go:

> If once therefore enamoured, he will [C482] goe, runne, ride many a mile to meet her, day and night, on a very darke night, endure [B414] scorching [C482] heat, cold, wait in frost and snowe [B414], raine [C482], tempests [B414], till his teeth chatter in his head, those Northern winds and shoures cannot cool or quench his flames of love. [C482]

Such passages heighten the first edition parody of the whole concept of romantic love. The efforts lovers will make in such a contemptible quest are scorned throughout. Shortly after the above passage, for instance, Democritus Junior tells us that a lover has such endurance that he will keep an appointment, "though it raine daggers with their points downward" [E520]; and likewise, when drinking his mistress's

health, "though it were a mile to the bottom (no matter of what mixture), off it comes" [C484].

Throughout the first edition of the Anatomy of Melancholy, the Church of Rome was a major satiric target. In the additions, Democritus Junior demonstrates an ambivalent attitude towards that body that may be a reflection of his author's view, for one often feels that Burton himself derives great pleasure from the contriving of these virulent attacks, and that fabricating them is an end in itself. In the post-1621 editions, the major Third Partition onslaught against the Church of Rome, in "Religious Melancholy", is expanded considerably. It ranges, in the additions, from light irony to bitter invective. Of the former, an instance occurs when Democritus Junior observes: ". . . if I shall see a monk or a friar climb up a ladder at midnight into a widows or virgins chamberwindow, I shall hardly thinke he then goes to administer the sacraments, or to take her confession" [C650]. An example that is much more typical of the attitude of Burton's more virulent contemporaries towards the Church of Rome occurs later in "Religious Melancholy," where he assails that body on doctrinal matters:

> And yet for all these terrors of conscience, affrighting punishments which are so frequent, or whatsoever else may cause or aggravate this fearfull malady in other religions. I see no reason atall why a Papist at any time should despaire, or be troubled for his sinnes; for let him bee never so dissolute a Caitife, so notorious a villaine, so monstrous a sinner, out of that Treasure of Indulgences and merits of which

> the Pope is a Dispensator, he may have free pardon and plenary remission of all his sinnes. There be so many pardons for ages to come, 400000. yeares to come, so many Jubilies, so frequent Jayle-deliveries out of Purgatory for all soules now living, or after dissolution of the body so many particular Masses daily said in severall Churches, so many Altars consecrated to this purpose, that if a man have either mony or friends, or will take any paines to come to such an Altar, hear a Masse, say so many Pater-nosters, undergoe such and such a penance, hee cannot doe amisse, it is impossible his mind should be troubled, or he have any scruple to molest him. Besides that Taxa Camera Apostolica which was first published to get mony in the dayes of Leo Decimus that sharking Pope, and since divulged to the same ends, sets down such easie rates and dispensations for all offences, for perjury, murder, incest, adultery, etc., for so many grosses or dollers (able to invite any man to sinne, and provoke him to offend, me thinkes, that otherwise would not) such comfortable remission, so gentle and parable a pardon, so ready at hand, with so small a cost and sute obtained, that I cannot see how hee that hath any friends amongst them (as I say) or mony in his purse, or will at least to ease himselfe, can anyway miscarry or be misaffected, how hee should be desperate, in danger of damnation, or troubled in minde. Their ghostly fathers can so readily apply remedies, so cunningly string and unstring, winde and unwinde their devotions, play upon their consciences with plausible speeches and terrible threats, for their best advantage settle and remove, erect with such facility and deject, let in and out, that I cannot perceave how any man amongst them should much or often labour of this disease, or finally miscarry. [D701]

The satire is heavy and the subject traditional, for, long before Luther, the whole question of indulgences was one that had evoked the wrath of satirists and reformers alike. Despite the facility with which "pardons" can be arranged, however, Democritus Junior points to Catholics, and especially nuns, as the major sufferers from Religious Melancholy. God is not mocked, he suggests, and an easy conscience cannot be purchased.

In the first edition, the Puritans specifically had come under attack also, and in the additions that area is expanded, often with much less of the humour that accompanies the attacks upon the Church of Rome. One of the major causes of despair lies in the perversions of organized religion, Democritus Junior suggests, and he is relentless in his pursuit of "those thundering ministers," the martial spirits within the Christian Church who make many lives miserable, since they

> . . . speake so much of election, predestination, reprobation ab aeterno, subtraction of grace, preterition, voluntary permission, etc., by what signs and tokens they shall decerne and try themselves, whether they be Gods true children elect, an sint reprobi, praedestinati, etc. with such scrupulous pointes . . . [B625].

The very pseudo-scientific terminology of the Puritans, which Burton reproduces with so much implied contempt, places them alongside all the quack-scientists and philosophasters he had mocked in the "Digression of Air."

A closely related target is superstition generally, a major cause of melancholy, and an area where Burton's satiric pen has had full scope in the first edition. A heavily expanded section that deals with this matter is "Symptoms" of Religious Melancholy. To the 7,100 words of the first edition he adds another 4,080 in the subsequent five editions. There are additions made to all the passages dealing with the absurdities performed in the name of religion which were noted in

Chapter Four; in "Prognostickes" of Religious Melancholy, for instance, Burton introduces this charming and typical tale of the folly of superstition:

> Anno 1270, at Magdeburge in Germany, a Jew fell into a privy upon a Saturday, and without helpe, could not possibly get out; he called to his fellows for succour, but they denied it, because it was their Sabbaoth, non licebat opus manuum exercere, the Bishop hearing of it, the next day forbad him to be pulled out, because it was our Sunday. In the meanetime the wretch died before Monday. [B528]

In this case, the satiric implications are subsumed in the humour of the story, no matter how sympathetic one might ordinarily feel towards the poor victim. The almost syllogistic, tripartite tale is in full accord with that devotion to the letter of the law of his potential helpers: yet there is a tremendous discrepancy between their academic nicety and the ghastly fate of the victim. The contrast is one that Burton has made clear in numerous ways since the first edition.

In the additions to the Third Partition, then, it is clear that Burton is always on the watch for an opportunity to expand the attacks upon the various subjects that he had launched out against in the first edition. As in the rest of the later editions, we feel that he has unlimited supplies of ammunition, and that the satiric approach is unchanged by the additions and revisions. They often read as happy after-thoughts, but change the original essence in no significant way.

I suggested in Chapter Four, in the analysis of the first edition, that "Democritus to the Reader" and the Third Partition were

the most obviously satiric parts of the Anatomy. Significantly, it is to these two parts of the total work that Burton made the most extensive additions. But everywhere the pattern is the same: the heaviest additions are to the passages with the greatest satiric impact and potential for expansion. The aim of the additions has been consistent throughout, to show that man's attempt to subvert those few human principles of value signalizes his madness and is the cause of his grief. Burton and his persona have exposed the plight of humanity through a multitude, an "Irish Sea," of examples, without trying the reader's patience. Always one is left with the impression that only the surface has been touched.

The preceding analysis, then, of those parts of the Anatomy of Melancholy upon which, quantitatively at any rate, Burton expended the greatest efforts in the five editions from 1624 to 1651, has been undertaken in an effort to show that they were satiric, and that they give further emphasis to the satiric implications of the first edition. One may infer from them that Burton himself envisaged the major aim of that first edition as being a satiric one--those parts of it that seemed "scientific" are left virtually untouched, having fulfilled their subsidiary role in the satire, and he is content to let them stand.

So far as I can establish, there is no "development" or "evolution" in the course of the six editions towards its final satiric shape. The first edition itself is satire, and the post-1621 editions

expand or intensify the satiric material already there. The satura form lends itself to expansion by its very nature, but Burton lengthens nothing as an end in itself. All is strictly related to the satiric scheme. The character of Democritus Junior is not modified in any significant way, though our understanding of his role is deepened, and he still remains the mocker, sometimes the mocked, as in the first edition. Amongst other things, the proportion of added citations from recognized satirists impresses one as being very high, and one is always aware of the expanding of the attacks on a number of targets established in the first edition, and the continued use and re-introduction of a variety of satiric techniques. Burton, steeped in the traditions and lore of satire, took advantage of an opportunity that not too many authors have, to "amend and augment" his Anatomy, always with relish, for as long as he had an audience; never, in the post-1621 editions is there any major deviation from, or confusion in, his original satiric aim.

CONCLUSION

The argument of the preceding five chapters arose from the feeling, after preliminary readings, that Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy had been inadequately dealt with in existing Burton scholarship on several important scores. In an attempt to demonstrate these deficiencies, it was necessary to examine previous critical approaches to the Anatomy, showing their virtues and their limitations, and suggesting that perhaps the key to a fuller understanding of the nature of the Anatomy lay in a consideration of its satiric qualities. This thesis has undertaken that task.

The contention that the Anatomy is, in fact, a satiric work seems to me to stand up to close scrutiny, and to accommodate with consistency the more apparently "serious" scientific and religious elements that undeniably exist within the work. Even Burton's confessed indebtedness to satiric writers before him is another important guide to his own conscious leanings, but it has been only partly appreciated because of the lack of a definitive edition in which the multitudes of references to other satires and satirists would be noted.

In undertaking this thesis I also detected the need for some authoritative scholarship on Renaissance satire, particularly in its prose form. So little research has been done in this area that one feels quite overwhelmed by the huge output of the writers of the prose

satires in proportion to the small body of scholarly examination of their work. Granted that the study of satire has not been a popular pursuit amongst scholars, it does seem dangerously lopsided to neglect such a vast body of admittedly "minor" prose in favour of the more widely-known forms of literature. The resemblances between the verse and the prose forms of satire during the period are striking: both tend to use a satyr-figure as their persona, both employ the medical image as their major metaphor, and both adhere to the rambling satura structure. The chief difference seems to lie in the fact that one is in verse (a distinction, as we saw, that appears to be of little importance to Renaissance theorists and practitioners), and, as a result, tends towards brevity. In addition, it does seem from contemporary evidence (on the Nashe-Harvey quarrel, for instance) that some prose satire, at least, was more popular and commanded a much larger following than its verse counterpart. By paying such scant attention to the prose satirists, scholarship has passed over a very remarkable element amongst the phenomena of English literature in the Renaissance.

Burton's Anatomy, a best seller in his own day, seems to me to be one of these prolific prose satires. It makes use of the satyr-persona, the medical image, and the satura-form, and an analysis of the first edition and the later editions gives added support to the contention that Burton was consciously writing in the mode. It is unfortunate that a sound modern edition that takes all six original editions into

account is not available. Rarely in English studies, I would suppose, do scholars rely upon so confessedly poor a text (Shilleto's) of an influential work that in its final edition was sixty per cent longer, without paying serious attention to the growth of the work, the nature of the extra material, and its relation to the earlier editions. The examination of the post-1621 editions undertaken in this thesis supports the idea that the Anatomy is a satiric work by demonstrating Burton's continuing efforts to expand those passages of the first edition which might be construed as satiric, and by noting his obdurate neglect of any sections which might be labelled as "scientific." Obviously, however, one's interpretation of these expansions depends upon one's understanding of the first edition, and, concomitantly, upon one's definition of satire. It seems to me nonetheless, that no assessment of the Anatomy can be construed as valid that has not carefully considered the growth of the text.

Having seen, then, the kinship of Burton's Anatomy to the Renaissance prose satire, one can legitimately proceed to examine the important aspects of Burton's satiric vision. That vision, in the Anatomy, is filtered to the reader through the personality of the erratic Democritus Junior, a persona who seems, at times to mock every aspect of what is regarded as being of worth to humanity.[1] From Democritus Junior's

[1]Jordan-Smith and other biographers of Burton have recorded the tradition that Burton took his own life; they suggested that he shared his persona's skepticism, which ultimately developed into despair.

viewpoint, there seems to be very little about which one ought not to be thoroughly skeptical: science is a mass of contradictions, philosophy and religion a deadly morass of superstitions, the "dignity" of man a laughable affectation. Nor does he advocate a retreat into the security of some past Golden Age of which, at least, we may be proud: Democritus Junior's attitude towards accepted authority from the depths of antiquity is Baconian. He differs considerably from Bacon, however, both in his lack of faith in scientific progress, and in his expressed lack of confidence in man's rational capacity.

At the same time, as I have tried to show, Democritus Junior himself is not entirely devoid of imperfections. Quite the contrary; he exposes himself to ridicule, for example, by his own inconsistent views and frequent lack of moral fortitude in the face of potential dangers to himself redounding from his incautious criticisms of powerful sectors of his society. But Democritus Junior, the satirist, is not alone in his folly: the other great satirists and philosophers of antiquity are abused time and again for being as foolish as the rest of humanity. In effect, the Anatomy leaves us with very few human beings worthy of respect, let alone emulation.

Having shown, then, the unreliability of systems of philosophy, religion, and science as props for man, Democritus Junior, in the final Partition, demonstrates the utter perversion of humanity's last hope--love. The reader, confronted with a vast amalgam of examples of man's

incapacity to love, without blemish, either his fellows (in "Love Melancholy") or his creator (in "Religious Melancholy"), can have little room for optimism about the human condition. Democritus Junior's assault upon almost every branch of human endeavour, his insistence upon man's inability to remedy his lot, and his ridicule of futile and self-destructive efforts to approach the deity, leave only the pious hope for his readers that in some inexplicable way a path through the mire may be found.

Thus the persona; where, however, does Burton stand in all of this? Democritus Junior's attacks are persuasive, and we assume that in many of them he is his author's spokesman. The fact that Democritus Junior himself is subject to ridicule suggests that it was Burton's feeling that no human being is in a position where he can condemn or correct the folly of others, since all men are equally human, equally guilty. Indeed, it seems that "melancholy" is the equivalent of "original sin," and synonymous with incurable degeneracy. In Chapter III, I outlined the vision--and a dark one it was--of Burton's earlier satiric drama, Philosophaster. I would suggest that the Anatomy represents only a minor modification of that view. Burton still feels that humanity is doomed by its innate folly, but implies that, even whilst contemplating folly and being aware of its ineradicable nature, some consolation remains in laughter; perhaps in laughing at one's condition (Democritus Senior's prescription) there may be something salutary, even if it is merely the prevention of tears.

This refusal by Burton to offer a solution to the wretchedness of man's state relates his satire to the rather general definition of the satiric kind I proposed in Chapter One, a definition based upon an analysis of the theories of Bergson, Freud, and various other major modern theorists on humour. The Anatomy of Melancholy fits all of the criteria suggested there. The entire Anatomy has the "stated aim" of curing melancholy by such various methods as arousing "ridicule, or concern, in order to amend, reprehend, or castigate some deficiency, real or imagined." As I showed in the final chapters, it would be difficult to contend that the Anatomy sets out to cure anything; Melancholy is in fact the human condition, and Democritus Junior makes no bones about showing that it is, in his view at least, incurable.

What then is the accomplishment of the Anatomy, that it should continue to be highly regarded within the canon of "great" works in English literature? My earlier definition of satire suggested that the achievement of satire "depends primarily upon its evoking a response that is aesthetically and psychologically satisfying, rather than morally affecting." Theorists such as Koestler and Lucas conceive of satire as being art: the satisfaction for the satiric artist lies in his perception of certain relationships (between, for example, the tragic and the comic); the satirist, like all other artists, derives pleasure from his successful construction of a work of art out of that perception.[1] A

[1]Burton's continued pleasure in his art can be seen in such passages as the one on the ideal mistress (above, pp. 348-9) where he carefully polishes and expands over a period of twenty years.

concomitant sensation may also exist in satire, vengeance; this is often apparent in the "flytings" that were so popular in the Renaissance (as in the Harvey-Nashe altercation I examined in Chapter II). Even in the flytings, however, one can easily overestimate the stimulus of a vengeful desire on the part of the combatants; frequently the energetic delight in the fray seems to supersede any personal animosity.

The Anatomy is, then, a typical satire in many ways: its didactic purpose, the cure of melancholy, is admitted to be impossible of fulfilment, and the whole work is imbued with a vision of life that combines the tragic and the trivial. Similarly, an examination of the post-1621 editions such as that undertaken in Chapter Five indicates that, above all, Burton was a man who delighted in working with words, elaborating and expanding in a manner which clearly illustrates his fascination with the literary sartist's tools. Like the flyters, he lets off steam by indulging in various vitriolic outbursts, and thus finds psychological relief. The least important aim of the Anatomy, in my view, is the effecting of any kind of moral response in his victim, or, for that matter, in Burton himself; when the disease is incurable, there can be no hope of amending it, as he knows only too well.

Burton's sensations, then, according to my definition, would be: aesthetic satisfaction at the construction of his work, and at the constant opportunity to enlarge and perfect it; and psychological satisfaction at expressing his vision in an artistic form, perhaps getting back

at a few of what he apparently considers to be his enemies, such as the Church of Rome, doctors, lawyers, or patrons, all of whom he attacks recurrently. But the reactions of Burton's readers to the Anatomy are also interesting in the light of that definition proposed in Chapter One, and I would like, finally, to turn to them.

Very few people, I imagine, take to reading satire for their moral health, or are morally affected by it even when they picked it up for some other reason. Those of the readers who already agree with the satirist's position find pleasure in either seeing it well expressed, or in seeing their foes lacerated with a skill that the readers themselves could not command. Those readers who disagree with the satirist's views, on the contrary (and in a work like the Anatomy it is possible to be totally in accord with the persona as he lashes, let us say, lawyers and priests, and to be a little less enthusiastic when he attacks scholars and budding authors), tend to be annoyed and distraught rather, and, I would speculate, very rarely "amend" their lives thereafter. This latter reaction, particularly, was one that Renaissance satirists and theorists were very much aware of,[1] and certainly things have not changed much today when libel actions rather than reformation result from a writer's public chastisement of enemies.

There is, of course, as much difficulty involved in ascertaining why the reader reads as in discovering why the artist creates in the first

[1]See above, Chap. II.

place, though it is the latter problem that has tended to preoccupy the theorists. I. A. Richards is prominent amongst those, however, who consider the former question the more vital, and he is appalled at the lack of an organised attempt to analyse its implications. All that we have, he suggests, are "A few conjectures, a supply of admonitions, many acute isolated observations, some brilliant guesses, much oratory and applied poetry, inexhaustible confusion, a sufficiency of dogma, no small stock of prejudices, whimsies and crotchets, a profusion of mysticism, a little genuine speculation, sundry stray inspirations, pregnant hints and random apercus."[1] Amongst these "pregnant hints" a typical modern instance is Kenneth Burke's conception of poetry as "symbolic action . . . the adopting of various strategies for the encompassing of situations,"[2] which the reader in turn incorporates into his own experience. Nor have the aestheticians entirely neglected the problem of why we read literature; Monroe C. Beardsley, for example, has attempted an authoritative catalogue of the reasons, but in a manner that justifies Richards' contention, and shows how impressionistic must be the final judgements in the present state of our understanding.[3]

[1] Principles of Literary Criticism (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1924), p. 6.

[2] The Philosophy of Literary Form (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1941), p. 447.

[3] Aesthetics (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World Inc., 1958), pp. 574-579. Beardsley suggests that literary (and other) art "relieves tensions and quiets destructive impulses . . . refines perception and discrimination . . . develops the imagination . . . is an aid to mental health . . . fosters mutual sympathy and understanding . . . offers an ideal for human life."

I have no wish to add at length to the plethora of views already abroad on this subject; I would simply revert to the definition of satire upon which this thesis depends, arguing that the qualities there described attract the reader of satiric literature: pleasure in sharing in the creative vision of another (the aesthetic satisfaction), and, in satire, sharing in the relief of various emotions, such as anger, when our point of view is so well expressed (psychological satisfaction). These are the major achievements of the Anatomy from the reader's standpoint, and they account for its success over the centuries.

One other important consideration in this thesis has been the problem of whether the Anatomy of Melancholy is a satire in its totality, or simply an amalgam of various elements, one of which happens to be satire. Chapters Four and Five supplied strong evidence for suggesting that the Anatomy is indeed a satire, and that this categorisation would include all of those so-called "technical" and "scientific" parts. Their function within the work is clear: they are the camouflage that helps disguise the true intent of the Anatomy in its early stages, but a closer examination shows them to be satiric also. It is the same vision that binds the entire Anatomy together, that of Robert Burton, the satirist.

In this thesis, then, an attempt has been made to grapple with several related matters in Burton studies: first, with the mass of conflicting critical opinion on the work; secondly, with the understanding

of the nature of satire, and especially with that idiosyncratic Renaissance variant of which the Anatomy may be said to be a member; thirdly, with the first edition of the Anatomy itself, which, because of its relative lack of bulk, lends itself more easily to analysis; and, finally, with the subsequent additions and revisions to that first edition. I am persuaded that those critics who stressed the satiric elements in the Anatomy came nearest to a full understanding of its nature, and that an examination of the six editions indicates that the work is in fact a member of that large group of prose satires that flourished in Elizabethan and Jacobean England.

APPENDIX

Much of the latter part of this thesis could have been much more satisfactorily researched and presented had there been a definitive edition of the Anatomy of Melancholy that takes into account the six editions published from 1621 to 1651 which were "augmented and corrected" by Burton himself. As it is, the student must go to the six uncollated originals and attempt to assess the development of the Anatomy by dint of hard labour over micro-film readers and unwieldy notes. Babb has already suggested how difficult it would be, even with the best will in the world, to assemble a readable comparative edition, and a glance at the passage reproduced below should suffice to convince the reader of the problems.[1] Aside from the simple addition of words and phrases, and the necessary accommodations that Burton had to make in syntax and punctuation, there are numerous apparently arbitrary but nonetheless significant alterations in such things as spelling and style generally. To incorporate these things into one readable definitive text seems beyond the capacities of the most ingenious

[1] I have attempted here to reproduce faithfully the versions of the passage dealt with earlier in this thesis (p. 307) as they appear in editions one to five. I have not reproduced the sixth edition version, as in this instance it seemed to be a faithful imitation of the fifth in every way.

publisher or the most sophisticated computer. Perhaps the only answer lies in having the six texts fairly cheaply reproduced and easily available, as in the most recent reprint of the 1621 edition.[1] The following passage is representative of the mutations which occurred in the editions after 1621 as Burton expanded his streamlined first version.

First edition:

Preferment I could never get, although my friendes providence care, alacritie and bounty was never wanting to doe me good, yet either through mine owne default, infelicity,want or neglect of opportunity, or iniquitie of times, preposterous proceeding, mine hopes were still frustrate, and I left behind, as a Dolphin on shore, confined to my Colledge, as Diogenes to his tubbe. Saving that sometimes . . . . (p. 4)

Second edition:

Preferment as I could never get, so am I not in debt for it, although my friends providence, care, alacrity, and bounty was never wanting to doe mee good, yet either through mine own default, infelicity, want or neglect of opportunity, iniquity of times, preposterous proceeding, my hopes were still frustrate, and I left behind, as a Dolphin on shore, confined to my Colledge, as Democritus to his garden, Diogenes to his tubbe, where I still continue, and lead a Monastique life, mihi et musis, sequestered from those tumults and troubles of the world, Et tanquam in specula positus (as he said) I heare what is done abroad, how others runne, ride, turmoile, and macerate themselves in court and country, farre from those wrangling Law sutes, aulae vanitatem, fori ambitionem, ridere mecum soleo: I laugh at all, onely secure, lest my sute goe amisse, my shippes perish, I have no wife nor children, good or bad to provide for. A mere spectator of other mens fortunes and

[1]The reprint was issued by the Da Capo Press, New York and Amsterdam, 1971.

adventures, I heare new newes every day, and those ordinary rumors of warre, plagues, fires, inundations, thefts, murders, massacres, meteors, Comets, spectrums, apparitions: of townes taken, cities besieged, in France, Germany, Turky, Persia, Poland, etc. dayly musters and preparations, and such like, which these tempestuous times afford, battels fought, so many men slain, monomachies, shipwrackes, Piracies, and Seafights, Peace, Leagues, Stratagemmes, and fresh alarums. A vast confusion of vowes, wishes, actions, edicts, petitions, law-sutes, pleas, lawes, proclamations, complaints, grievances, are dayly brought to our eares, new bookes every day, pamphlets, currantoes, stories, whole Catalogues of bookes of all sorts, new paradoxes, opinions, schismes, heresies, controversies in Philosophy, Religion, etc. Now comes tidings of weddings, maskings, mummeries, entertainments. Jubilies, Embassies, tilts and tournaments, trophies, triumphes, revels, sports, playes, then againe treasons, cheating trickes, robberies, enormous villainies of all sorts, funerals, burials, death of Princes; new discoveries, expeditions, now Comicall, then Tragicall matters. To day wee heare of new Lords and officers created, to morrow of some great men deposed, and then againe of fresh honors conferred, one is let loose, another imprisoned, one purchaseth, another breaketh, hee thrives, his neighbour turnes banckrupt; now plenty, then againe dearth and famine; one runnes, another rides, wrangles, laughes, weepes, etc. Thus I daily heare, and such like, both private, and publike newes, privus privatus, as I have still lived, and so now continue, statu quo prius, left to a solitary life, and mine owne domesticke discontents: Saving that sometimes . . . .
(p. 3)

Third edition:

Greater preferment as I could never get, so am I not in debt for it, I have a competencie (Laus Deo) from my noble and munificent Patrons, though I live still a Colleageat Student, a Democritus in his Garden, and lead a Monastique life, sequestered from those tumults and troubles of the world, Et tanquam in specula positus (as he said) I heare what is done abroad, how others run, ride, turmoile, and macerate themselves in Court and Countrey, far from those wrangling Law suits, aulae vanitatem, fori ambitionem, ridere mecum soleo: I laugh at all, onely secure, lest my Suit goe amisse, my Ships perish, Corne and Cattle miscarrie, Trade decay, I have no Wife nor Children, good or bad to provide for. A meere spectator of other mens fortunes and adventures, and how they act their parts, which me thinks are diversly presented unto me, as from a common Theater or Sceane. I heare new newes everie day, and those ordinarie rumors of War, Plagues, Fires, Inundations, Thefts, Murders, Massacres, Meteors, Comets, Spectrums, Prodigies, Apparitions: of townes taken, cities besieged in France, Germany,

Turky, Persia, Poland etc. daily musters and preparations, and such like, which these tempestuous times afford, Battels fought, so many men slaine, Monomachies, Shipwracks, Piracies, and Sea-fights, Peace, Leagues, Stratagems, and fresh Alarums. A vast confusion of Vowes, Wishes, Actions, Edicts, Peticions, Law-suites, Pleas, Lawes, Proclamations, Complaints, Grievances, are daily brought to our Eares. New Bookes everie day, Pamphlets, Currantoes, Stories, whole Catalogues of Volumes of all sorts, new Paradoxes, Opinions, Schismes, Heresies, Controversies in Philosophy, Religion, etc. Now come tidings of Weddings, Maskings, Mummeries, Entertainments, Jubilies, Embassies, Tilts and Tournaments, Trophies, Triumphes, Revels, Sports, Playes. Then againe Treasons, Cheating trickes, Robberies, enormous villanies in all kinds, Funerals, Burials, Death of Princes, new Discoveries, Expeditions; now Comicall, then Tragicall matters. To day we heare of new Lords and Officers created, to morrow of some Great-men deposed, and then againe of fresh Honors conferred; one is let loose, another imprisoned; one purchaseth, another breaketh; he thrives, his neighbour turnes banckrupt; now plentie, then againe dearth and famine; one runs, another rides, wrangles, laughes, weepes, etc. Thus I daily heare, and such like, both private, and publike newes, privus privatus, as I have still lived, and so now continue, statu quo prius, left to a solitarie life, and mine owne domesticke discontents: Saving that some times . . . . (pp. 3-4)

Fourth edition:

Greater preferments as I could never get, so am I not in debt for it, I have a competencie (Laus Deo) from my noble and magnificent Patrons, though I live still a Collegiat Student, as Democritus in his Garden, and lead a Monastique life, ipse mihi Theatrum, sequestered from those tumults and trobles of the world, Et tanquam in specula positus (as he said) I heare what is done abroad, how others run, ride, turmoile, and macerate themselves in Court and Countrey, far from those wrangling Law suits, aulae vanitatem, fori ambitionem, ridere mecum soleo: I laugh at all, onely secure, least my suit goe amisse my ships perish, Corne and Cattle miscarry, Trade decay, I have no Wife nor Children, good or bad to provide for. A meere spectator of other mens fortunes and adventures, and how they act their parts, which me thinkes are diversly presented unto me, as from a common Theater or Sceane. I heare new newes every day, and those ordinary rumors of War, Plagues, Fires, Inundations, Thefts, Murders, Massacres, Meteors, Comets, Spectrums, Prodigies, Apparitions, of townes taken, cities besieged in France, Germany, Turkey, Persia, Poland, etc. daily musters and preparations, and such like, which these tempestuous times

afford, Battels fought, so many men slain, Monomachies, Shipwracks, Piracies, and Sea-fights, Peace, Leagues, Stratagems, and fresh Alarums. A vast confusion of Vowes, Wishes, Actions, Edicts, Peticions, Law-suits, Pleas, Lawes, Proclamations, Complaints, Grievances, are daily brought to our Eares. New bookes every day, Pamphlets, Currantoes, Stories, whole catalogues of Volumes of all sorts, new Paradoxes, Opinions, Schismes, Heresies, Controversies in Philosophy, Religion, etc. Now come tidings of weddings, Maskings, Mummeries, Entertainments, Jubilies, Embassies, Tilts and Tournaments, Trophies, Triumphes, Revels, Sports, Plaies: Then againe Treasons, Cheating trickes, Robberies, enormious [sic] Villanies in all kindes, Funerals, Burials, Death of Princes, new Discoveries, Expeditions; now Comicall, then Tragicall matters. To day we heare of new Lords and Officers created, to morrow of some Great men deposed, and then againe of fresh honours conferred; one is let loose, another imprisoned; one purchaseth, another breaketh; he thrives, his neighbour turnes banckrupt; now plenty, then again dearth and famine; one runs, another rides, wrangles, laughes, weepes, etc. Thus I daily heare, and suchlike, both private and publike newes, amidst the gallantry and misery of the world; jollity, pride, perplexities and cares, simplicity and villany; subtelty; knavery, candor, and integrity, mutually mixt and offering themselves, I rub on privus privatus, as I have still lived so I now continue, statu quo prius, left to a solitary life, and mine owne domesticke discontents: Saving that some time? . . . . (pp. 3-4)

Fifth edition:

Greater preferment as I could never get, so am I not in debt for it, I have a competency (Laus Deo) from my noble and munificent Patrons, though I live still a Collegiat student, as Democritus in his garden, and lead a monastique life, ipse mihi theatrum, sequestered from those tumults and troubles of the world, Et tanquam in specula positus (as he said) I hear what is done abroad, how others run, turmoile, and macerate themselves in court and countrey, far from those wrangling law suits, aulae vanitatem, fori ambitionem, ridere mecum soleo: I laugh at all, only secure, lest my suit go amisse, my ships perish, corn and catell miscarry, trade decay, I have no wife nor children, good or bad to provide for. A meere spectator of other mens fortunes and adventures, and how they act their parts, which methinks are diversly presented unto me, as from a common theatre or scene. I hear new news every day, and those ordinary rumors of war, plagues, fires, inundations, thefts, murders, massacres, meteors, comets, spectrums, prodigies, apparitions, of towns taken, cities besieged in France, Germany, Turky, Persia, Poland, etc. daily musters and preparations, and such like, which these tempestuous times afoord, battels fought, so

many men slain, monomachies, ship-wracks, piracies, and sea-fights, peace, leagues, stratagems, and fresh alarums. A vast confusion of vows, wishes, actions, edicts, petitions, lawsuits, pleas, laws, proclamations, complaints, grievances, are daily brought to our ears. New books everie day, pamphlets, currantoes, stories, whole catalogues of volumes of all sorts, new paradoxes, opinions, schismes, heresies, controversies in philosophie, religion, etc. Now come tidings of weddings, maskings, mummeries, entertainments, jubilies, embassies, tilts and tournaments, trophies, triumphs, revels, sports, playes: Then again, as in a new shifted scene, treasons, cheating tricks, robberies, enormous villanies in all kinds, funerals, burials, death of princes, new discoveries, expeditions; now comicall, then tragicall matters. To day we heare of new Lords and officers created, to morrow of some great men deposed, and then again of fresh honors conferred; one is let loose, another imprisoned; one purchaseth, another breaketh: he thrives, his neighbour turns bankrupt; now plentie, then again dearth and famine; one runs, another rides, wrangles, laughs, weeps, etc. Thus I daily hear, and such like, both private, and publike news, amidst the gallantrie and miserie of the world; jollitie, pride, perplexities, and cares, simplicitie and villanie; subtletie, knaverie, candor and integritie, mutually mixt and offering themselves, I rub on, privus privatus, as I have still lived, so I now continue, statu quo prius, left to a solitarie life, and mine own domestick discontents: saving that sometimes . . . .

(pp. 3-4)

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbot, Robert. The Mirrour of Popish Subtilties. London, 1594.

Adams, Thomas. The White Devil, or the Hypocrite Uncased. London, 1614.

Alden, Raymond M. The Rise of Formal Satire in England. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1899.

Aldington, Richard. "Burton the Anatomist." Nation and Athenaeum, XXXVI(March 21, 1925), pp. 860-861.

Anonymous. "The Anatomy of Melancholy." Cornhill Magazine, XLI (1880), 475-490.

Arnold Matthew. Mixed Essays. London: Smith and Sons, 1903.

Axelrad, A. Jose. Un Malcontent Elizabethain: John Marston. Paris, 1955.

Babb, Lawrence. Sanity in Bedlam: A Study of Robert Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy. East Lansing: Michigan State Univ. Press, 1959.

_____. The Elizabethan Malady: A Study of Melancholia in English Literature from 1580 to 1642. East Lansing: Michigan State Univ. Press, 1951.

Bergson, Henri. Laughter. Tr. C. Brereton and F. Rothwell. London: Macmillan, 1911.

Black, E. L. "Burton the Anatomist." English, VII(1949), 266-270.

Boyce, Benjamin. The Theophrastan Character in England. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1947.

Bradford, Gamaliel. "Quaint Old Treatise of Love: Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy." Sewanee Review, XIX(April 1911), pp. 172-184.

Bradshaw, William. English Puritanisme. London, 1605.

Bright, Timothy. Treatise of Melancholy. London, 1580.

Brooke, Tucker, and Matthias A. Shaaber. The Renaissance. Gen. ed. A.C. Baugh. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.

Brown, Huntington. Rabelais in English Literature. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1933.

Brown, J. E., ed. The Critical Opinions of Samuel Johnson. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1926.

Brown, T. E. "Robert Burton (Causerie)." New Review, XIII(1895), 257-266.

Browne, Robert. "Robert Burton and the New Cosmology." Modern Language Quarterly, XIII(1952), 131-48.

Burton, Robert. The Anatomy of Melancholy. London: 1621, 1624, 1628, 1632, 1638, 1651.

_____. Anatomy of Melancholy. 1621; rpt. New York: Da Capo Press, 1971.

_____. Anatomy of Melancholy. Ed. Holbrook Jackson. London: Everyman's Library, 1932.

_____. Anatomy of Melancholy. Ed. A.R. Shilleto. London: George Bell and Sons, 1896.

_____. Anatomy of Melancholy. Ed. Floyd Dell and Paul Jordan-Smith. New York: Tudor Publishing Co., 1941.

Burton, William. A Description of Leicestershire. London: Jaggard, 1622.

Bush, Douglas. English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.

Byron, Lord George Gordon. Letters. 2 vols. Ed. T. Moore. London: John Murray, 1830.

Bysshe, Edward. The Art of English Poetry. London, 1718.

Campbell, Oscar J. Comicall Satyre in Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida. San Marino: Huntington Library, 1965.

Casaubon, Isaac. De Satyrica Graecorum Poesi et Romanorum Satira Libri Duo. Paris, 1605.

Cazamian, Louis. The Development of English Humor. New York: AMS Press, 1965.

Chesterton, Gilbert Keith. Twelve Types. London, 1906.

Clapp, F. Mortimer. "The Anatomy of Melancholy." Scribner's Magazine, LXXXVII(1930), p. 221.

Clark, Arthur M. Studies in Literary Modes. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1958.

Clark, B.H.,ed. Literary Criticism. New York: American Book Co., 1940.

Colie, Rosalie. Paradoxia Epidemica. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1966.

Corbett, Edward P. Classical Rhetoric. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1965.

Craig, Hardin. The Enchanted Glass. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1950.

Crowley, Robert. Informacion and Petition against the Oppressours of the Pore Commons of this Realme. London, 1548.

Cruickshank, Alfred H. Ben Jonson. Durham, 1912.

Davenport, A., ed. The Whipper Pamphlets. Liverpool: Liverpool Univ. Press, 1951.

Dialogues of Plato. Tr. Benjamin Jowett. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1875.

Doane, Gilbert H. "A Checklist of the Editions of the Anatomy of Melancholy." The American Collector, V(1928), 247-249.

Donne, John. Poems. 1633; rpt. Menston: Scolar Press, 1969.

Donovan, Denis G. "The Anatomy of Melancholy: 'Religious Melancholy,' a Critical Edition. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Illinois, 1965.

Drant, Thomas. Medicinable Morall. London, 1566.

Duff, E. Gordon. "The Fifth Edition of Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy." Library, fourth series, IV(1923-24), 81-101.

Duff, J. Wight. Roman Satire. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1936.

Eastman, Max. The Enjoyment of Laughter. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1936.

Ehrenpreis, Irvin. The Types Approach to Literature. New York: King's Crown Press, 1945.

Eliot, Thomas S. Homage to Dryden. London: Leonard and Virginia Woolf, 1924.

Elliot, Robert C. The Power of Satire. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1960.

Evans, Bergen. The Psychiatry of Robert Burton. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1944.

Feinberg, Leonard. The Satirist, His Temperament, Motivation, and Influence. Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1963.

Fox, Arthur W. A Book of Bachelors. London: A. Constable and Co., 1899.

Freeman, John. "Burton the Anatomist." Spectator 5073(Sept 1925), p. 451.

Freud, Sigmund. Wit and its Relation to the Unconscious. Tr. A.A. Brill. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1916.

Frye, Northrop. Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1957.

Fuller, Thomas. The Worthies of England. Ed. J. Freeman. London: Allen and Unwin, 1952.

Gascoigne, George. The Steele Glas. London: English Reprints, 1901.

Gilbert, A. H., ed. Literary Criticism. New York: American Book Co., 1940.

Gosse, E. W., ed. The Complete Works of Thomas Lodge. 3 vols. New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1906.

Gosson, Stephen. Quip for an Upstart Gentlewoman. London, 1595.

_____. The Schoole of Abuse. Ed. E, Arber. Westminster: Constable and Co., 1895.

Greig, J. Y. T. Psychology of Laughter and Comedy. London: Allen and Unwin, 1923.

Grosart, A. B., ed. The Complete Works of John Davis of Hereford. Rpt. Hildesheim: George Olms, 1968.

_____. The Non-Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker. 2 vols. Rpt. New York: Russell and Russell, 1963.

_____. The Works of Gabriel Harvey. 2 vols. The Huth Library, 1884.

Hall, Joseph. Virgidemiarum. London, 1597.

Hallwachs, Robert G. "Additions and Revisions in the Second Edition of Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Princeton University, 1942.

Harington, Sir John. The Metamorphosis of Ajax. Ed. E. S. Donno. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962.

Harvey, Gabriel. Foure Letters. Ed. G. B. Harrison. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966.

Hearne, Thomas. Reliquiae Hearnianae; The Remains of Thomas Hearne, M.A. of Edmund Hall. Ed. J. Buchanan-Brown. London: Centaur Press, 1960.

Hendrickson, G. L. "Archilocus and the Victims of his Iambicks." American Journal of Psychology, XLVI(1925), 247-49.

Herford, C. H., and Percy Simpson, eds. Ben Jonson. 11 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1932.

Hibbard, George R. Thomas Nashe. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962.

Highet, Gilbert. The Anatomy of Satire. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1962.

_____. The Classical Tradition. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949.

Jordan-Smith, Paul. Bibliographia Burtoniana. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press, 1931.

Joseph, Sister Miriam. Rhetoric in Shakespeare's Time. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1962.

Junius, Adrianus. Nomenclator. Tr. John Higins. London, 1585.

Juvenal. Satirae XIV. Ed. J. D. Duff. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1957.

Kayser, Wolfgang J. The Grotesque in Art and Literature. Tr. U. Weisstein. Bloomington: Univ. of Indiana Press, 1963.

Ker, William P., ed. Essays of John Dryden. 2 vols. New York: Russell and Russell, 1961.

Kernan, Alvin. The Cankered Muse. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1955.

King, James R. Studies in Six Seventeenth Century Writers. Ohio: Ohio Univ. Press, 1966.

Kinloch, T. F., ed. The Life and Works of Joseph Hall. London: Staples Press, 1951.

Koestler, Arthur. Insight and Outlook. London: Macmillan, 1949.

Lamb, Charles. Works. Ed. E. V. Lucas. 7 vols. London: Methuen and Co., 1903-05.

Langley, Thomas. An Abridgement of the Notable Works of Polidore Vergile. London, 1570.

Lauter, Paul, ed. Theories of Comedy. New York: Doubleday, 1964.

Lewis, C. S. English Literature in the Sixteenth Century. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1944.

Leyburn, Ellen. Satiric Allegory: Mirror of Man. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1956.

Lucas, F. L. Literature and Psychology. London: Cassell and Co., 1951

McKerrow, R. B., ed. The Works of Thomas Nashe. 5 vols. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1966.

Marston, John. The Scourge of Villainie. Ed. G. B. Harrison. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966.

Masson, David. The Collected Writings of Thomas de Quincey. 14 vols. Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black, 1890.

Meredith, George. "An Essay on Comedy." Comedy. Ed. W. Sypher. New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1956.

Mueller, William R. "Robert Burton's Frontispiece." Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, LXIV(1949), 1074-87.

_____. "Robert Burton's 'Satyricall Preface.'" Modern Language Quarterly, XIV(1954), 28-35.

_____. The Anatomy of Robert Burton's England. Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1952.

Murad, Orlene. "Robert Burton's Philosophaster." Unpublished Paper presented to the Association of Canadian University Teachers of English, 1971.

Murry, John M. Countries of the Mind. First Series. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1931

Nochimson, Richard L. "Robert Burton: A Study of the Man, his Work, his Critics." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1967.

Osler, Sir William. "Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy." Yale Review, III(1914), 251-271.

Owst, Gerald R. Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England. Cambridge; Cambridge Univ. Press, 1933.

Patrick, J. Max. "Robert Burton's Utopianism." Philological Quarterly, XXVII(1948), 345-58.

Patterson, Frank A., ed. The Works of John Milton. 18 vols. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1931.

Paulson, Ronald. The Fictions of Satire. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1967.

Peacham, Henry. The Garden of Eloquence. London, 1577.

Peter, John. Complaint and Satire in Early English Literature. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956.

Pope Alexander. Peri Bathous. Ed. E. L. Steeves. New York: King's Crown Press, 1952.

Powell, Thomas. Tom of All Trades. Or the Plain Man's Path-way to Preferments. London, 1631.

Randolph, Sister Mary C. "Formal Verse Satire." Philological Quarterly, XXI(1942), 368-384.

_____. "The Medical Concept in English Renaissance Satiric Theory." Studies in Philology, XXXVIII (1941), 135-157.

Riche, Barnaby. Farewell to the Military Profession. London, 1581.

Robinson, F. N. Studies in the History of Religion. New York, 1912.

Scheffauer, H. "The Death of Satire." Living Age, (1913), 82.

Seldes, Gilbert. "The Death of Satire." New Republic, (Jan 1927), p. 193.

Simon, Jean R. Robert Burton (1577-1640) et L'Anatomie de la Melancolie. Paris: Didier, 1964.

Smeaton, Oliphant. English Satires. London: Blackie and Son, n.d.

Smith, G. Gregory. Elizabethan Critical Essays. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1904.

Spingarn, Joel E., ed. Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1957.

_____. Literary Criticism in the Renaissance. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1963.

Stein, Arnold. "Donne's Obscurity and the Elizabethan Tradition." English Literary History, XIII(1946), 98-118.

Steno, R. "The Satirist's Apologia." University of Wisconsin Studies, XIV(1922), 10-28.

Swift, Jonathan. A Tale of a Tub. Ed. Herbert Davis. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1957.

_____. Gulliver's Travels. Ed. Herbert Davis. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1959.

Trimpi, Wesley. Ben Jonson's Poems, A Study of the Plain Style. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press, 1962.

Tuve, Rosemond. Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1947.

Van Rooy, C. A. Studies in Classical Satire and Related Literary Theory. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965.

Vicari, Patricia. "Robert Burton: the Anatomy as Sermon, and the Sermon as Anatomy." Unpublished paper presented to the Association of Canadian University Teachers of English, 1971.

Webber, Joan. The Eloquent I: Style and Self in Seventeenth Prose. Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1968.

Wellek, Rene, and Austin Warren. Theory of Literature. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1942.

West, Rebecca. The Strange Necessity. London, 1928.

Whibley, Charles. Literary Portraits. London: Macmillan and Co., 1920.

Wiesen, David S. St. Jerome as a Satirist. New York: Cornell Univ. Press, 1964.

Wilson, Frank P. Seventeenth Century Prose. Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1960.

Wilson, Thomas. The Arte of Rhetorique. London, 1585.

Wood, Anthony a. Athenae Oxoniensis. London, 1721.

Worcester, David. The Art of Satire. New York: Russell and Russell, 1960.

Wright, Thomas E. "The English Renaissance Prose Anatomy." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Washington University, 1963.