



The Rare Italian Master and the Posture of Hermione in *The Winter's Tale*

Bette Talvacchia

The princess, hearing of her mother's statue, which is in the keeping of Paulina—a piece many years in doing and now newly performed by that rare Italian master, Julio Romano, who, had he himself eternity and could put breath into his work, would beguile Nature of her custom, so perfectly he is her ape. He so near to Hermione hath done Hermione that they say one would speak to her and stand in hope of answer.

The Winter's Tale (V. ii. 93-101)¹

It is with this curious speech of the Third Gentleman that Shakespeare introduces into his play the name of Giulio Romano, an artist famed as Raphael's heir and honored as a member of the Gonzaga court in Mantua.² The content of the speech is curious, in part because it is less ekphrasis than allusion: the sculpture is not so much described as evoked, its qualities defined in terms of the virtues of the artist who created it. Another puzzling matter, which has caused extensive discussion, is that Shakespeare seems to have misidentified the only artist whom he ever mentioned by name. With his characterization of Giulio Romano as a sculptor, the playwright presents him in the single capacity for which twentieth-century criticism has no terms of reference. Contemporary

Bette Talvacchia is associate professor of art history at the University of Connecticut. She specializes in the Italian Renaissance and was involved in the 1989 Giulio Romano exhibition in Mantua. This article was originally published in LIT, Vol. 3, #3, 1992. Reprinted with permission of the author. Copyright Gordon & Breach Science Publishers S.A.

architectural history of the Renaissance features Giulio as a major force; art historians try to fathom the artist's undeniable prominence in his own day, sometimes begrudgingly attributing it to fame-by-association with Raphael, sometimes to an era of decadent tastes. As a sculptor, however, Giulio Romano is non-existent. Scholarship has not constructed a corpus of three-dimensional works for the artist, and so criticism presumes the mention of sculptural work by Giulio Romano to be a mistake. If, however, we change the orientation and assume that Shakespeare consciously introduced the reference, based on what Elizabethan culture has made of Giulio Romano (whether it agrees with our own construction of him or not), and in response to needs of the play, then attention to the function of the cypher "Julio Romano" within the framework of the drama may help to elucidate and justify its presence there.

A close reading of Shakespeare's language in the passage cited reveals that the word "sculptor" is never explicitly applied to Giulio. The term is apparently not of much interest to the author, who instead presents his character in the much more inclusive terms of "that rare Italian master." At this point it is useful to recall that during the Renaissance, artists—and court artists in particular—vaunted their skill in the various manifestations of the Fine Arts, which were all linked by their common source in *disegno*. Giulio Romano, who in real life attained sovereignty over the unfolding of the arts within Federico Gonzaga's Mantua, would have been at home in the courtly surroundings of Leontes' "Sicilia."

Shakespeare's less specific and loftier identification of Giulio Romano is in fact instructive: as the prestigious master of a large workshop, the artist was in a position to call into being works that came from his ideas, but were executed by others. In his position as originator and overseer of the vast programs of decoration for the residences of the Duke of Mantua during the 1520s and '30s, Giulio incorporated a great deal of sculpture, in the form of friezes and bas-reliefs made of stucco, modeled upon classical prototypes. Thus Shakespeare was accurate when he allowed that Giulio could have been involved with the production of a statue. His focus on the artist from this isolated perspective, however, causes enough distortion that further explanation is required.

Some elucidation comes from carefully considering the description of the statue as “a piece many years in doing and now newly performed.” Shakespeare makes a clear distinction for his audience between two separate phases in the realization of the sculpture: first, the long period of carving or modeling, and afterwards, the bravura touches that complete the work, which constitute the “performance” by the master. The choice of the word “perform” is a precise clue as to how Shakespeare imagined Giulio Romano’s contribution to the production of the statue: a contemporary usage of that verb connoted “completion by painting” (Chew, 11). The finished piece, brightly painted to render contrasts among the various fictions of skin, hair, and fabrics, was thus made to conform to the popular Elizabethan predilection for polychrome sculpture.³ Clearly, the statue of Hermione as envisioned by Shakespeare belonged to a particular genre of fully painted three-dimensional funeral effigies, and the type would be both appropriate as a monument to the dead queen, and well known to the contemporary audience. In addition to providing a rational visual basis for the homologous appearance of Hermione both as a statue and as a living presence, the differentiated surfaces of the sculpture, colored to imitate life, also acknowledge Giulio Romano’s mastery as a painter.

The designation of two processes that combined to produce the final work of art accurately represents a system in which the director of a highly organized *équipe* would oversee and then touch up the work of assistants as they executed his designs. Giulio’s art, like Shakespeare’s, was ultimately a collaborative affair. The reference to the working methods of the statue’s maker may stem from this, and points to the question of what Shakespeare might have known about Giulio Romano, and from where his information would have come.

The essential source for details about the life of Giulio Romano is found in the monumental compilation of artists’ biographies by Giorgio Vasari, *Le vite dei più eccellenti pittori, scultori, ed architettori*. Vasari first published his multifaceted work in 1550, and then greatly amplified it and modified the contents in the second edition of 1568. A biography of Giulio appeared in both, with differences especially in the introductory and final passages. Since the full series of the *Vite* did not exist in a

complete English translation until the nineteenth century, any hypothesis of Shakespeare's consultation of Vasari will introduce the inconclusively debated issue of the playwright's ability to read Italian.⁴ And while a scholar immersed in the reconstruction of Renaissance England's reading habits has told us that "Almost every cultivated Elizabethan had at least a smattering of Italian" (Lievsey 1984, 9), in order to glean effectively from Vasari, the reader would need a polished level of Italian to match the sophistication of the writer's prose. This problem notwithstanding, lengthy discussions have posited Shakespeare's knowledge of Vasari as central. One in particular that takes up aspects of *The Winter's Tale* finds "common ground" in Vasari's anecdotes about Michelangelo's sculpture for the Medici Chapel, and Shakespeare's approaches to the statue of Hermione (Barkan, 648-49).

Even more compelling is the echo from Vasari that resonates in the phrase of the Third Gentleman when he proclaims "had he himself eternity and could put breath in his work, [Giulio] would beguile Nature of her custom." These ideas follow closely the epitaph on Giulio's lost tomb in Mantua, which Vasari recorded at the close of Giulio's *Life* in the 1550 edition:

Videbat Iuppiter corpora sculpta pictaque
Spirare, et aedes mortalium aequarier Coelo,
Iulii virtute Romani. Tunc iratus,
Concilio divorum omnium vocato,
Illum et terris sustulit; quod pati nequiret
Vinci aut aequari ab homine terrigena.

Jupiter saw sculpted and painted bodies breathe and the homes of mortals made equal to those in heaven through the skill of Giulio Romano. Thus angered he summoned a council of all the gods, and he removed that man from the earth, lest he be exposed, conquered, or equalled by an earth-born man.⁵

This source would instantly explain, without the need for elaborate discussion, why Shakespeare set the character "Julio Romano" within his

play as a sculptor—the lines praise the artist's flagrant ability to counterfeit both "sculpted and painted bodies." Indeed the compact epitaph holds all of the concepts that are crucial to Shakespeare's dramatic use of Giulio Romano: he was an artist of such renown that he attracted the attention of Jupiter; his art was so considerable that his sculptures and paintings lacked only the breath of the living; Giulio's deftness at simulation threatened the divine prerogative of creation (so the artist was removed from earth).

The reason to insert Giulio Romano into *The Winter's Tale* was to present him as the epitome of the artist who could deceive the beholder's eye into mistaking plaster and pigment creations for nature's moving and living beings. Later on, of course, one of the play's *coups de théâtre* will hinge on the acceptance of just such a confusion of art and reality when the statue of Hermione comes to life. The existential status of the figure of Hermione—is it the living woman imitating a sculpture, or is it art that copies life with wondrous success—is never clarified, and the statements of the characters who disclose information about the statue only confirm the ambiguity. Hermione may never have died, but was hidden and sustained by her faithful friend, as implied by the words of the Second Gentleman with regard to Paulina's action:

I thought she had some great matter there in hand, for she hath privately twice or thrice a day, ever since the death of Hermione, visited that removed house.

(V. ii. 104-106)

Thus is the possibility established that Hermione was really alive and hidden throughout the sixteen years that passed before her reintroduction to life at court in the guise of a statue. A further clue that sustains this theory is that the sculpture does not represent the young queen at the moment of her death, but appears to have aged at the same rate as the living woman would have. Picking up the leit motif of the artist's ability to duplicate nature to perfection, Paulina avers that Giulio Romano could even reproduce its systems:

LEONTES. But yet, Paulina,
Hermione was not so much wrinkled, nothing

So aged as this seems.

.....
PAULINA. So much the more our carver's excellence,
Which lets go by some sixteen years and makes her
As she lived now.

(V. iii. 27-31)

By employing the conceit of art's aping nature, so insisted upon throughout the play, Paulina can provide a reason for the otherwise inexplicable conundrum presented by the statue: it is the portrait of a woman who never lived to the age at which she is represented. If this is indeed the case, Giulio Romano, as characterized by Shakespeare, is the artist capable of such a feat. If, on the other hand, the ploy of the sculpture is taken to be a mere feint, then the explanation would be that the mature Hermione stands before us.

This second reading would be supported by Hermione's own statement to her daughter at the end of the play when she promises to recount the story of her preservation:

For thou shalt hear that I,
Knowing by Paulina that the oracle
Gave hope thou wast in being, have preserved
Myself to see the issue.

(V. iii. 125-128)

Hermione's postponed explanation is not to be delivered on stage. But her prefatory remarks, however summary, are straightforward and claim active responsibility in having made provision for her own survival. The amazing statement of self-determination is never explored within the structure of the play; indeed, Paulina quickly tells the queen not to bore everybody with a long-winded explanation at a time of such rejoicing. The lack of a clear resolution to the mystery allows for a rich ambiguity that calls into play the mystifying powers of art, and even permits the suggestion of the darker forces of magic, traditionally also linked to artistic creation.

A direct evocation of magical powers springs to the lips of Leontes, "O royal piece, / There's magic in thy majesty" (V. iii. 38-39), as he struggles to control his emotions when he first sees the statue. The

princess Perdita immediately furthers the reference by disavowing superstition, even though she wants to kneel before the statue and ask its blessing. Paulina later vaunts that she can make the statue move, and at the same moment protests that this may give the appearance of being in league with evil powers, which she vehemently denies. The most solemn tone of awe in the presence of supra-human accomplishment is struck by Leontes when he is moved to question "what was he that did make it?" (V. iii. 65). This voices both the admiration and fear with which the artist's capacity to create has been traditionally received in society. When an artist imposes human form on inert matter, the act of divine creation is mimicked with perhaps too much audacity. The perilous nearness to transgression is recorded in ancient myths, and certainly Pygmalion's ability to give form to a figure that was later vivified, albeit with celestial intervention, puts him a stone's throw from divinity himself. The use of the motif of the statue that becomes a woman in *The Winter's Tale* certainly recalls Pygmalion's story, and with it conjures an atmosphere in which the artist's power to rival nature is a major consideration.

Before it could be animated, Hermione's statue had to be "performed" by an artist whose work inspired praise for being life-like. Based on the characterization in the epitaph quoted by Vasari, Shakespeare could have been convinced that he found the perfect symbol of the artist who rivalled nature, especially if he did not know much else about Giulio, and in particular if he had not seen his work. It is this more than anything else that leads me to doubt that Shakespeare had read extensively about Giulio Romano; certainly not the amount that Vasari, who knew the artist, conveyed in his full texts.⁶ "Jupiter saw sculpted and painted bodies breathe...through the skill of Giulio Romano;" this single excerpt from the tomb's inscription is sufficient, and a sufficiently striking formulation, to have swayed the playwright to select the artist thus memorialized as the symbol in his play. Giulio Romano's potent skill called forth the envy of the heavens when his configurations seemed to breathe—to which master could Shakespeare have better attributed a carved and painted likeness of Hermione? Or, in Leontes' formulation, the artist whose "chisel / Could ever yet cut breath" (V. iii. 78-79).

I think it more probable that Shakespeare knew, not Vasari's ample biography, but the epitaph alone, from a source independent of the Italian editions of the *Vite*. It is important to recall that Vasari chose not to include Giulio's epitaph in the 1568 edition, making the earlier version of 1550 the only possible source for the hypothesis that Shakespeare read Vasari directly. It is arguable that Shakespeare's acquaintance with facts about the artist was of a more general sort, information that might circulate verbally, that would catch the popular interest and therefore be repeated and spread. Thus he might have known that Giulio had been connected to Raphael's shop in Rome; that he worked as artist-in-residence to the Gonzaga court; that Mantua was full of his fanciful inventions. A traveller could have easily brought back a record of the evocative epitaph transcribed directly from the artist's tomb, which found its way to Shakespeare's attention. Within this context the patterns of travel followed by Elizabethan Englishmen are significant. In the early seventeenth century Mantua was a powerful draw, with its courtly culture in the full flower of a "second golden age."⁷

When Shakespeare first mentions the statue, then, he links it inextricably to Giulio Romano, as the true-to-life object created by the artist who rivalled nature. In the following scene the audience gets its first view of the statue, along with Leontes, whose immediate words of recognition form the exclamation "Her natural posture!" (V. iii. 24). The convincing apparition of his dead wife elicits Leontes' shock, and the statue's close imitation of her semblance excites the King's desire for Hermione; his words soon convey erotic longing. The figure's stance is itself alluring, so that it recalls to Leontes the early days of the couple's love:

O thus she stood
Even with such life of majesty—warm life,
As now it coldly stands—when first I wooed her!
(V. iii. 34-36)

The recollection of the flush of existence contrasts with the gelid statue, and yet the figure's posture vivifies the stone. Leontes is finally so overcome by desire that he makes a move to kiss the statue, which is denied

him, with the excuse that he will ruin the painted surface that is still wet. The reference to a lover's kiss bestowed upon a statue evokes forcefully the obsessive love and avidity for sexual fulfillment upon which Pygmalion's story hinges, and in this way prepares the audience for the statue's coming to life. The miracle of regeneration is implicitly tied to the physical drive of generation as the passions of Leontes are aroused. Since the error of Leontes was a reckless surrender to the force of unbridled jealousy, a crime of passion gone wrong, it is appropriate that at the moment of forgiveness the positive side of that passion should be in play. The appearance of Hermione is such that it rekindles Leontes' erotic impulses—the statue is a representation of his legitimate desire. This reading is in keeping with the import of the drama, for the erotic nature of the scene, though highly charged, is not smutty: Hermione's voluptuousness and Leontes' yearning are sanctioned within the bonds of married love. At the moment when the burden of an unjust imputation against Hermione's chastity has been lifted, the sensuousness and desirability of her living presence is reconfirmed.⁸

The "natural posture" of the sculpture arouses Leontes' lust; the figure must therefore be understood as disturbingly erotic in its simulation of real flesh. The emphasis on the pose of the statue and the appearance of the word "posture" at this key moment in the play's denouement introduce considerations about the function of the erotic in the tormented relationship of Leontes and Hermione, and give further indication that the connection of Giulio Romano to the sculpture was a loaded calculation.

The deliberateness with which Shakespeare chose to use the word "posture" can be deduced from the fact that it appears only six other times in the corpus of plays.⁹ The word consistently makes reference to artifice and a contrived presentation of the human form, as when Norfolk tells Henry VIII of the cardinal's curious behavior: "in most strange postures / We have seen him set himself." In another instance, the contrivance is linked to physical allure that comes by means of divine intervention: Brutus is amazed at the tumultuous popular reception of Marcius, and observes that it seems "whatsoever god who leads him / Were slyly crept into his human powers / And gave him graceful posture."

When put into the mouth of Cleopatra, the enunciation of “posture” reverberates with salacious overtones, and its setting has to do with the stage. Cleopatra imagines a future theatrical production that takes the story of her tragedy for its plot:

Antony

Shall be brought drunken forth, and I shall see
Some squeaking Cleopatra boy my greatness
I th’ posture of a whore.

Antony and Cleopatra (V. ii. 219-221)

The connection made between posing and imitating, between posture and imposture, is as strong in this scene as it is in *The Winter’s Tale*, while the erotic connotations are even more pronounced. The character voices concern that her greatness—which includes potent and seductive sexuality—will be degraded into the semblance of common prostitution by the vulgarity of the acting in some future theatrical production. In part this will be due to the fact that, following conventions of the stage, Cleopatra’s role will be played by a youth. In the queen’s disdainful assessment, the young man’s mimicry of her mature sexuality could only render an ignoble and farcical spectacle. The boy’s tawdry best efforts might, for example, drain passion of all but its lust and demote love to sex; his every gesture and each raffish pose would give the appearance of, or take the posture of, a whore. In performance there may have been a further implication about a young male prostitute, and gender confusion abounds, since the actor to utter the lines bemoaning such imposture would, on the Elizabethan stage, have himself been a boy. So would the actor who impersonated Hermione, striking the pose of her “natural posture.”

Postures are also described in *Cymbeline*, a play written probably within a year of *The Winter’s Tale*. The context again has to do with artifice and the statues of female figures: the Italian Iachimo recalls “The shrine of Venus or straight-pight Minerva, / Postures beyond brief nature” (V. v. 164-165). In this case the figures, frozen in the postures fixed by art, will outlive the cycles of nature. The endurance of artistic representation becomes an equivalent for the immortality of the god-

desses. It is less clear whether Shakespeare intends the postures in this case to be suggestive, although images of the goddess of love would inherently carry the possibility. These citations of the word “posture” in Shakespeare’s plays indicate a possible association of ideas that works to reinforce a specific reading. Repeatedly, “posture” signals thoughts about impersonation and the eroticism of the female form. The association, however, was not Shakespeare’s alone.

The loading of the word “posture” with provocative sexual implications occurred during the Renaissance in that arena where high culture met more popular vehicles of expression, and it originated in a group of works by none other than Giulio Romano. Shakespeare’s rare Italian master had been responsible for designing a set of drawings that showed imaginative variations on the positions taken by couples during the sexual act, therefore known in Italy as *I Modi*.¹⁰ Sometime around 1524, the engraver Marcantonio Raimondi transformed the drawings into a series of prints and put them into circulation in Rome, causing an uproar. The prints were suppressed, and the printmaker landed in prison. The poet Pietro Aretino used his influence with Clement VII to help liberate Raimondi, and then joined the mêlée himself by writing sixteen sonnets of a very lubricious nature, one for each engraved position. Vasari knew about the combined product of words and images, and remonstrated in his most gentlemanly fashion:

And, what was worse, for each position Messer
Pietro Aretino wrote a most obscene sonnet;
so that I do not know which was more offensive:
the sight of Giulio’s designs or the sound of
Aretino’s words.¹¹

Not surprisingly, the expanded version of *I Modi*, which appeared in book form as early as 1527,¹² redoubled the scandal, for if Giulio’s couples were composed of elegant lines, those in Aretino’s couplets lacked any touch of delicacy. The banned work nevertheless became a valued collector’s item, and gave rise to a legacy of legends and copies. The scandal around *I Modi* and versions of the poems and prints were widely

known, and many references, both direct and covert, were made to them. Ariosto alludes to the erotic drawings in the second version of his prologue to *I Suppositi*; Brantôme avers that he talked with a Parisian bookdealer who sold fifty copies before a year had run its course; and eventually a copy made its way into Rembrandt's personal art collection. The diffusion of *I Modi* through northern Europe is unexpectedly documented. The *Modi* were dispersed in several ways: as independent engravings, bound together with the sonnets, and eventually in many other versions, including woodcut copies and pirated editions. It would have been easy for Shakespeare to have come upon this less flattering reference to Giulio Romano in the whispered and largely unrecorded gossip around forbidden books.

A few traces of the notoriety of *I Modi* survive in the literature of Shakespeare's world. Ben Jonson injects a snicker about the erotic postures in *Volpone*, when Lady Wouldbe mentions Aretine, whose "pictures are a little obscene" (III. iv. 96-97); and in *The Alchemist*, Sir Epicure Mammon fantasizes about decorating his chambers "with such pictures, as Tiberius tooke from Elephantis: and dull Aretine But coldly imitated" (II. ii. 44-46). Ariosto, in his reference to *I Modi*, links the pictures of Elephantis with "the prints, more beautiful than modest" that are renewing the ancient tradition in his contemporary Rome. It is interesting to speculate if Jonson's equation found its source in the earlier play.

That Jonson also knew explicitly about Giulio Romano is recorded in two other words, *The Under-wood*, LXXVII and *Discoveries*. In both of these instances the writer names Giulio Romano in the company of the most outstanding Italian artists. In each case the group is select, with at maximum a half-dozen others sharing the situation with Giulio. In *The Under-wood*, "Romano" heads the list, while in *Discoveries*, Giulio is placed along with Raphael, Michelangelo, and Titian in a selection prefaced by the description: "There liv'd in this latter Age six famous Painters in Italy: who were excellent, and emulous of the Ancients."¹³

Jonson's plays, dating from 1606 and 1610, are exactly contemporary to *The Winter's Tale*. If Jonson took for granted his audience's under-

standing of the references to Aretino and erotic images, Shakespeare may well have intended an allusion to the *Postures* in Leontes' exclamation of recognition at his first glimpse of the statue of Hermione. Given his specific introduction of Giulio Romano, Shakespeare could have calculated the outcry of the word "posture" to carry a spark of recognition to the *cognoscenti*, reinforcing the erotic undercurrent in Leontes' relation to the statue of Hermione.¹⁴ For in their English diffusion the *Modi* became the *Postures*. This is apparent in an incident that took place at Oxford in 1675, when students at All Souls College tried to employ the university press to print an edition of *Aretins Postures*. The project failed, but its attempt left for us a record of the topic of interest, and the title used.

A slightly earlier source also indicates frustrated interest in having copies of the *Postures*, whose unavailability had clearly become as legendary as its content. In 1666 an Italian publisher who lived and worked in London, Giovanni Torriano, presented his *Piazza Universale*. The book is a copious bilingual compilation of proverbs with an addendum of lively dialogues, through which he intended to pass an understanding of Italian culture on to his new countrymen. Among other models, Torriano devised a conversation between an Italian bookseller and an English tourist to give the flavor of the spoken word, and as an exercise to increase the foreigner's proficiency in the Italian language. Torriano's scheme was to present vignettes that offered amusement, practicality, and topicality as a means of making the acquisition of a foreign tongue more compelling. The entertaining encounter takes place as follows:

Il Forastiere discorre con un Libraro Romano

Vo cercando le opere di A.

V.S. puo cercar da un Capo all'altro della Strada che nolle
trovera.

E perche?

Perche sono proibite, le *Figure* e li *Raggionamenti*, quel braccicare d'huomini e Donne con artifici ricercati mette scandalo, et il Sant'Officio non sopporta tal cosa, anzi condanna tutte le cose brutte e sporche, per fin a gl'Amorosi Avvenimenti de'Romanzi condanna.

A Stranger discourseth with a Roman Bookseller

I am seeking the works of A.

You may seek from one end of the Row to the other, and not find them.

And why?

Because they are forbidden, both the *Postures* and *Discourses*, that imbracing of men and women together in unusual manners, begets a scandal, and the Inquisition permits no such matters, it condemns all such sordid things, nay not so much, but the Amorous [sic] Adventures in Romances it condemns. (Torriano, 80)

After this introduction, the dialogue goes on to cover, through the feigned conversation, aspects of serious book purchasing such as the relative value of first editions, emended editions, and translations versus editions in the original language. The necessary vocabulary for seeking out and discerning all of these refinements is thus provided at the same time that the information is given—a nice touch from a professional of Torriano's standing. It is striking that such a discussion should be introduced by chat about the censored works of Aretino—a name too hot to write out in full, and thus inevitably recognizable behind the lone initial. The reference to Aretino and mention of the *Postures* as an ostensibly random example of conversation between a Stranger and a Roman Bookseller was Torriano's way of getting the attention of his readers before proceeding to the language lesson. Clearly this topic engaged the sort of interest that could be counted upon to entice an audience.

The comprehension of the audience is a central concern for the performance of a play. Shakespeare's introduction of a real artist's name into the unfolding of *The Winter's Tale* would function only if it furthered the dramatic action of the play, through some predictable range of associations in the context of shared contemporary culture. The effect of Giulio's name was not contingent upon everything that history yields about the artist and his work, but upon what Elizabethan culture might have conjured up for the cypher "Julio Romano." In my opinion, Shakespeare counted on his audience's recognition of an Italian master who was reputed to have brilliantly blurred the boundary between art and life, yet who, from another frame of reference, could spiritedly evoke the

passage from cold stone to warm life, with all of its vivid eroticism.



Notes

My inquiry into this subject began in 1986, after a conversation with James Shapiro of Columbia University, and for a while we researched the topic jointly. Despite the fact that the project has taken on a completely different form over the intervening years, I would like to acknowledge James Shapiro's remarks as the original impetus for this study, and to thank him for turning the material that we shared over to me. Most recently I have presented ideas contained in this article at the Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities. I would like to thank Dr. Kurt W. Forster, the Center's director, for the invitation to give the talk.

¹ All quotations from Shakespeare are from the Arden edition of *The Works of William Shakespeare* (1990).

² For overviews of Giulio's life and work see Carlo D'Arco, *Storia della vita e delle opere di Giulio Pippi Romano* (1838; reprint, Mantua, 1986), and Frederick Hartt, *Giulio Romano*, 2 vols., (1981).

³ In "Painted Statues," 250, B. J. Sokol reminds us that "The Globe theatre stood near the masons' yards that supplied all of England with richly painted funeral effigies," which stresses the topicality and conspicuousness of the genre of painted sculpture. I am not necessarily convinced by Sokol's deduction of a "novel attitude" of disparagement for painted statues from the citations given, which often are merely descriptive of sculpture seen, without particular judgmental emphasis on the fact that they are not painted. With reference to *The Winter's Tale*, I believe that Shakespeare's use of a painted statue was not concerned with questions of the modernity or archaism of the type, but with a theme of his play that centered on art being capable of imitating nature. Thus, Sokol's example of Paulina's insistence on the wet, freshly painted surface of the statue has nothing to do with contempt for this way of making a sculpture, but with key elements of the plot, which I will discuss further on. On the other hand, a consideration very much worth taking up is Sokol's musing that "the *paragone* discussions of Benedetto Varchi and others about painted surfaces, sculptural forms, and love, are alluded to" in the whole treatment of the device of the painted sculpture.

⁴ There was, however, an English translation of the *Vita* of Giulio Romano in 1685, in a selection with ten others, rendered by William Aglionby. Although this is too late to have been a help to Shakespeare, it points out the enduring interest in the personality and work of Giulio Romano in England in the seventeenth century. See Borenus.

⁵ This translation is taken from Barkan, 656, who also discusses the strong link between the epitaph and Shakespeare's allusions to the artist.

⁶ Easy access to the volume itself is dubious. Editions of Vasari do not surface in accounts of Italian books readily available in England during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. See Lievsay 1969, and Scott.

For a recent, informative essay about the array of contemporary literary sources that mention or give notices and criticism of Giulio Romano, see Severi. The article is particularly good in its collection of the manifold citations of the artist. The author posits that Shakespeare's primary knowledge of Giulio came from Richard Haydocke's translation of Giovan Paolo Lomazzo's *Treatise*, and Robert Peake's English version of five of Sebastiano Serlio's *Books on Architecture*. While the hypothesis demonstrates the wide-ranging references to the artist available in the late sixteenth century, in my opinion it places too much emphasis on the necessity of highly specialized reading, in the form of treatises on art and architecture. In fact, the crucial analogous points outlined by Severi—aspects of the imitation of nature—were based on established paradigms, and were in general circulation, easily available outside of the meticulous consultation of expert theoretical tracts.

⁷ The phrase is used by Martinet, 265, who makes a strong point about Mantua's interest for early seventeenth-century England. The impact of Mantuan culture on Shakespeare is glaring enough that it prompted one scholar to hypothesize, although not convincingly, a visit by the playwright to the city during his youth, and further that a series of frescoes by Giulio depicting the Trojan War influenced descriptions in the *Rape of Lucrece*. See G. Sarrazin, "Shakespeare in Mantua?" *Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft* (29-30) 1894, 249-254.

⁸ If the certainty of Hermione's blamelessness is challenged, then the eroticism of her "posture" and the images conjured by the reference take on diverse tones, or multiple "suppositions." Howard Felperin poses such questions of what we can know about the queen's state of guilt or innocence in a provocative and scintillating reading of the play's "condition of interpretive uncertainty" in "Tongue-tied our queen?"

⁹ *Julius Caesar* V. i. 33; *Coriolanus* II. i. 210; *Cymbeline* III. iii. 94; V. v. 165; *Antony and Cleopatra* V. ii. 221; *Henry VIII* III. ii. 118.

¹⁰ The history of the prints is complex, and is just beginning to be clarified in the art historical literature. For aspects of the subject see Henri Delaborde, Giorgio Lise, Henri Zerner, Lynne Lawner, Manfredo Tafuri, and Bette Talvacchia.

¹¹ Vasari, 418. The translation is my own.

¹² The volume is mentioned in a letter from Pietro Aretino to Cesare Fregoso in November, 1527. Ettore Camesasca, ed., *Lettere sull'arte di Pietro Aretino*, vol. 3 (Milan, 1957), 18.

¹³ C. H. Herford et al., eds., *Ben Jonson*, vol. 8 (1947), 260, 612.

14 Terence Spencer parenthetically “forebears from suggesting” that the name of Giulio Romano was meant to have erotic innuendo in association with Hermione’s posture, considering that it would be “an appalling jest.” My reading sees it as something considerably more sophisticated. Spencer’s conclusion that “Giulio Romano” was used as a generic name to indicate “Italian artist” is not a convincing alternative in my opinion.



Works Cited

- Artino, Pietro. *Lettere sull'arte*, vol. 3. Edited by Ettore Camesasca. Milano, 1957.
- Ariosto, Ludovico. “I Suppositi.” In *Le Commedie*. Edited by Michele Catalano. Bologna, 1940.
- Barkan, Leonard. “Living Sculptures’: Ovid, Michelangelo, and *The Winter’s Tale*.” *ELH* 48 (1981): 639-667.
- Borenus, Tancred. “An Early English Writer on Art.” *The Burlington Magazine* 39 (1921): 188-95.
- Brantôme (Pierre de Bourdeille). *Les Dames galantes*. Edited by Maurice Rat. Paris, 1960.
- Chew, Samuel C. *The Virtues Reconciled*. Toronto, 1947.
- Delaborde, Henri. *Marc-Antoine Raimondi*. Paris, 1888.
- Fairchild, A. H. R. “Shakespeare and the Arts of Design.” *University of Missouri Studies* 12 (1937): 71-76.
- Felperin, Howard. “‘Tongue-tied our Queen’: the Deconstruction of Presence in *The Winter’s Tale*.” In *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*, edited by Patricia Parker and Geoffrey H. Hartman, 3-18. 1985.
- Lancaster, H. Carrington. “Hermione’s Statue.” *Studies in Philology* 29 (1932): 233-238.
- Lawner, Lynne. *I Modi. The Sixteen Pleasures*. 1988.
- Lievsay, John L. *The Elizabethan Image of Italy*. 1964.
- _____. *The Englishman’s Italian Books 1550-1700*. 1969.
- Lise, Giorgio. *L’incisione erotica del Rinascimento*. Milan, 1975
- Martinet, Marie-Madeleine. “*The Winter’s Tale* et ‘Julio Romano’.” *Études Anglaises* 28 (1975): 257-268.
- Scott, Mary Augusta. *Elizabethan Translations from the Italian*. 1916.
- Severi, Rita. “What’s in a Name. La fortuna di Giulio Romano nel periodo shakespeariano.” In *Giulio Romano*. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi su “Giulio Romano e l’espansione europea del Rinascimento.” Mantova, 1-5 ottobre 1989. Mantua: 1989, 403-415.
- Sokol, B. J. “Painted Statues, Ben Jonson and Shakespeare.” *Journal of the*

Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 52 (1989): 250-253.

Spencer, Terence. "The Statue of Hermione." *Essays and Studies* 30 (1977): 39-49.

Tafuri, Manfredo. "Giulio Romano: linguaggio, mentalità, committenti." In *Giulio Romano*, 15-63. Milan, 1989.

Talvacchia, Bette. "Figure lascive per trastullo de l'ingegno." In *Giulio Romano*, 277-280. Milan, 1989

Torriano, Giovanni. *Piazza Universale di Proverbi Italiani. Or, A Common Place of Italian Proverbs*. London, 1666.

Vasari, Giorgio. "La vita di Marcantonio Bolognese." In *Le vite dei più eccellenti pittori, scultori, ed architettori*, vol. 5. Edited by Gaetano Milanesi. Florence, 1906.

Zerner, Henri. "L'estampe erotique au temps de Titien." In *Tiziano e Venezia*, 85-90. Convegno Internazionale di Studi. Vicenza, 1980.

