

warrior-like, there is no embarrassment. Coriolanus, in Shakespeare's play, compares his embrace of his comrade Cominius to his honeymoon night; Aufidius' greeting to Coriolanus is in the same vein. Coriolanus is said to usurp the place of the maid Aufidius married, but he does not become feminine<sup>13</sup>. It is submitting to the Citizens that risks that, and to his mother. "Thou boy of tears", Aufidius accuses (V.vi.101). The taunt means not that Coriolanus has become a homosexual, but that he has submitted to his mother. This shifts his relations with men out of the heroic friendship model and into the Ganymede model.

\*\*\*

Engaging in same-sex practices, then, didn't make you either a homosexual or effeminate; in certain circumstances it made you specially masculine. The early-modern organisation of sex and gender boundaries, simply, was different from ours. And therefore Shakespeare couldn't have been gay. However, that need not stem the panic, because, by the same token, he couldn't have been straight either. In practice, the plays are pervaded with erotic interactions that strike chords for lesbians and gay men today, as they did for Symonds. Friendships are conducted with a passion that would now be considered suspicious; language of sexual flirtation is used in circumstances where we would find it embarrassing; and all the women's parts may, legitimately, be played by young men (I grant that this may not, immediately, be good news for women). It is not, necessarily, that Shakespeare was a sexual radical; rather, the ordinary currency of his theatre and society is sexy for us. Shakespeare may work with distinct force for gay men and lesbians, simply because he didn't think he had to sort out sexuality in modern terms. For approximately the same reasons, these plays may incite radical ideas about gender, class, race and nation.

So perhaps neither *Venus and Adonis*, nor Symonds' response to it, are as strange and remote as they may seem. Perhaps Symonds' reading is and was valid –not as the one, true reading, but as a haunting possibility that may be ignored or repudiated, but will not go away.

These arguments are developed in Alan Sinfield, *Cultural Politics – Queer Reading* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, and London: Routledge, 1994).

<sup>13</sup> Shakespeare, *Coriolanus*, ed. Philip Broackbank, New Arden edn (London: Methuen, 1976), I.vi. 29-32, IV.v. 114-19.

## DR. FAUSTUS AND DON JUAN, TWO BAROQUE HEROES

Dionisia Tejera Llano  
Universidad de Deusto

Renaissance had a different echo in the different countries of Europe. In France, for example, the continuous contacts with Italy, owing to the wars against Charles V on Italian soil, were to be the cause of the quick break with Medieval thought and forms; but, on the other hand, the wars of Religion were a handicap for the full development of Renaissance splendour, and, literally speaking, the country did not reach the highest point of Renaissance mood until the time of Louis XIV.

In England, the development of economic activity was to be accompanied by a parallel process in the artistic and intellectual fields. Perhaps owing to the natural, insular isolation, the Renaissance entered the country much later than on the continent, as a result, it could profit fully from French, Italian and Spanish influences. In fact when the new mood made its way into England it was more Baroque than pure Renaissance. By universal agreement no writer has ever been able to portray all kinds of passions in the human heart better than Shakespeare: faith, love and happiness, but also revenge, violence, hate and pain. He is not just the writer of the Renaissance but of the exaggeration of passions which would be the most outstanding characteristic of the Baroque, but all these ingredients were already present in his most important forerunner: Christopher Marlowe, himself a flamboyant, baroque character.

Like in England, in Spain the period between the 16th Century and the beginning of the 17th Century is, without doubt, the most important period of Spanish culture, both for the quantity and quality of scientific and literary works and the influence that Spanish thought had in all literary genres, expressing Spanish originality and depth of thought.

The Religious revolution which stirred the Europe of the Renaissance followed different paths in the two countries which, nevertheless, continued having a kind of love-hate relationship. The first part of the 17th century is perhaps the time in which England and Spain reached, on the one hand, the greatest degree of understanding while, at the same time, an antagonism was developing between them that would not end for a long time.

In England, the Religious revolution –which ended with the separation from the Church of Rome– had been more related to State. This resulted in a good political and economic solution for the impoverished crown, which was fortified by the "injection" of wealth from monasteries and bishoprics. The result was a very thankful aristocracy who shared with the crown the ownership of the states belonging to the church: abbeys, monasteries and the lands annexed to them, as well as the property of the recusants. Most of the religious controversies of this part of the Renaissance aimed at justifying this despoiling of Church property.

In Spain the Revolution had been more purely religious. Monastic reformers had been visiting convents trying to purify them of secular, deprived ways. St. Theresa's reformation added to that of Cisneros's. Important divines were bringing up theological topics for discussion, the philosophers took part in controversies which obliged the supreme authority of the Church at Rome to take them into consideration. The most influential orders of the church; the Jesuits and the Dominicans were Spanish-born and, from this country, they controlled the purity of the Catholic faith, which made many writers and politicians of the times accuse them of being spies for the House of Austria. Dominican friars and Jesuits were being condemned to death in England not only on religious but political grounds as well<sup>1</sup>. Juan Reglá writes:

Pero las tentativas del Emperador y del humanismo Erasmista fracasaron con la radicalización de posiciones. El protestantismo fue adaptado a la mentalidad capitalista y burguesa por el francés Calvino, mientras el catolicismo sintetizaba la tradición cristiana y las conquistas del humanismo por obra del español S. Ignacio de Loyola<sup>2</sup>.

At the end of the 16th Century the so-called "controversy of Auxiliis" started the theological debate about the salvation or damnation of human souls all over Europe. To the basic tenets of Protestantism: the exclusive authority of the Bible and the sanctity of the individual conscience, Calvin had added the doctrine of predestination.

In Spain, the controversy was held between the Molinists (the supporters of the Dominican Pedro Molina) and the Suarezists (from the Jesuit philosopher Suarez). On the other hand Neoplatonism, which had had its origins in Italy, influenced all Europe. At the end of the 16th Century and all through the 17th Century, Ovid's *Metamorphosis* replaced the Petrarchan tradition in more than one aspect. Otis H. Green writes:

1 See Folley *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus*. ed. by Rochampton. London 1877.

2 Juan Reglá, *Introducción a la Historia de España: Edad Moderna*. Editorial Teide, 1965.

...germinan promiscuamente los elevados conceptos neoplatónicos del amor con los conceptos del amor puramente terrenos<sup>3</sup>.

The same could be applied to England at the same time.

Fire (in the shape of a flame that reaches for higher regions), and earth, could be the key words to describe Baroque plasticity. I cannot think of better painters than El Greco on the one hand and Rubens on the other to depict through painting the idea of the time about Man; flesh –earthy flesh– that wants to soar above itself to higher regions where the spirit has its abode, "polvo enamorado" in the words of Quevedo or "so death does touch Resurrection" in Donne's Hymne.

Both heroes, Dr. Faustus and Don Juan, are the literary answer to the philosophical and religious concerns of their age. Both plays deal with the situation of man upon this earth with relation to the other creatures and to God. The two heroes defy the power of God, and in doing so, bring about their downfall; they are condemned for eternity. The Great Doctor and The Great Don are aware that they have a soul capable of salvation or condemnation: life in the next world depends on their lives upon this earth, but they are more concerned with the life of the body, than of the consequences upon their souls.

Faustus claims: "This word damnation terrifies not him"<sup>4</sup>, and in comparison with his worldly interests, Dr. Faustus speaks of his soul as: "Those vain trifles of men's soul" (I.iii.62). Faustus believes in the Neoplatonic unity of body and Soul, to Mephistophelis reminder: "Thou hast given thy soul to Lucifer" (I.i.133), he answers: "Ay, and body too, but what of that?" (II.i.134). But his interests, after all, are more the life of pleasure than the acquisition of deeper knowledge as could only be expected from the Great Doctor. Faustus exchanges his soul for the acquisition of worldly matters. His first wishes are "I will have them fly to India for gold" (I.i.83) "for pleasant fruits and princely delicacies" (I.87) "the secret of foreign kings" (I.88) "wall all Germany with brass" (I.89) "fill the public schools with silk" (not with wisdom) (I.91). And in the actual compact he stresses on the wish to be given "twenty and four years" (I.iii.62) upon this world after which he is not interested any longer. So he is ready to give "body and soul, flesh, blood or goods into their habitation whatsoever" (II.i.110-111).

Faustus is very conscious of the passing of time, which causes him to want to live more intensely:

3 Otis H. Green. *España y la Tradición Occidental*. Editorial Teide, 1965.

4 See *Dr. Faustus a 1604 –version edition*, ed. by Michael Keefer, Canada 1991. Act I, scene iii, line 59.

Faustus: Now Mephistophelis the restless course  
That time doth run with calm and silent froth...  
Therefore, sweet Mephistophelis  
Let us make haste....  
(V.ii.1-6)

He realises the vanity of his wishes when he is taking leave of his fellow scholars: "For the vain pleasure of four and twenty years hath Faustus lost eternal joy and felicity" (V.ii.36). For a doctor this seems really base and shallow, only in the context of the baroque concern for the passionate life of the senses is he to be understood. The great scholar, in fact, very soon forgets that he has not received any answers to his intellectual demands:

Faustus: First will I question with thee about Hell  
Tell me, where is the place that men call hell?  
(II.i.1-6)

Mephistophelis: Under the Heavens.  
(II.i.118)

This could be a very good example of one of the other non-answers he receives from Mephistophelis.

Don Juan is reminded time and again, by several characters, that he will be punished for his evil ways. The spirit, the eternity, is placed before Don Juan in opposition to that longing to possess reality, to live in the present. Every time the "Burlador" (the mocker) hastens upon reality, he is reminded that the present and reality are not the only things for man, that the soul is eternal and he is gambling in a game he is going to lose. Tragedy comes forth (in both plays) from this contrast between transience and eternity. Don Juan received admonitions from his father, Catalinon, and Tisbea, but he disregards their warnings. For instance Catalinon, tells him:

Los que fingís y engañáis  
las mujeres de esta suerte  
lo pagaréis con la muerte<sup>5</sup>

and Tisbea:

Advierte mi bien, que hay Dios y que hay muerte<sup>6</sup>

Don Juan's philosophy of life and death is perfectly portrayed in his famous verse "que largo me lo fiáis" which he repeats five times throughout the play.

5 Alfredo Rodríguez López-Vázquez, *Andrés de Claramonte: El Burlador de Sevilla atribuido tradicionalmente a Tirso de Molina*. Kassel Edition Reichenberger 1987. p. 182, vs 901-3.  
6 Ibid. p. 184, vs 943-44.

Their interest in the life of the flesh is so outstanding that they seem quite unconcerned with the consequences of their acts, but in fact they are also preoccupied with the life to come. Thus, all Faustus's soliloquies are not just "flashes" which illuminate his character, but the natural outbursts of a complicated character, who is both the good angel and the bad angel, but that transcends them both and is *A Man*. Faustus generally speaks of himself in the second person: "Now Faustus, must thou needs be damn'd" (II.i.1). What ensues after this monologue does not change in mood so it can naturally be taken as a development of the idea inside Faustus's mind:

Good Angel:	Sweet Faustus, leave that execrable art"
Faustus:	Contrition, prayer, repentance: what of these?
Good angel	O, they are means to bring thee unto heaven
Evil angel:	Rather illusions, fruits of lunacy That makes men foolish that do trust them (II.i.15-20)

And Don Juan, the Great Don, who is completely unconcerned with the results of his actions upon this earth (what happens to all the women which he debauches?) is nevertheless worried about how a dead man can hurt him: his visits to the church where Don Gonzalo's tomb is and his invitation to "El Convidado de Piedra" are proof that he is aware of the parallelism of life in this world and in the next. The Ghost of Don Gonzalo de Ulloa moves freely from one world to the other, thus reminding Don Juan that the separation of body and soul is but a surmise of our limited earthly minds.

Faustus and Don Juan are condemned, they do not have a chance because they have committed the sin of the Holy Ghost that is the greatest offence of their age. Faustus first wish had been "to become a spirit" and Don Juan is equated with the devil himself: "Pienso que el demonio en él tomó forma humana"<sup>7</sup>, says Catalinon who plays the role of D. Juan's conscience throughout the play.

Don Juan as a fallen angel is given the qualities of a noble man: he perverts the ranks to which he belongs. Américo Castro in his famous Prologue in 1952 states:

"El invento de Tirso (he believes there is no doubt that Tirso was the author of the play) consiste en haber personalizado en un alma audaz la oposición a los principios morales y sociales y haberlo hecho con tanta intensidad que los reyes se estremecen al contacto del protervo galán y la Justicia Eterna tiene que recurrir a sus más eficaces rayos. Para un "debouche" habría bastado con un alguacil y varios corchetes"<sup>8</sup>.

7 *Andrés de Claramonte: El Burlador...* vs 299-301.  
8 Ibid. Prólogo: p. XXIII.

The same could be said about Dr. Faustus. There is no question of the belief in God of the two heroes. Neither in England nor in Spain could there be any possibility of questioning this. So the rebely and audacity of the heroes questioning this are more outstanding and intense. In spite of their awareness that they are receiving warnings from another world they remain unconcerned, their beliefs are determined by their tremendous vital impulse. This is the tragic aspect of "el burlador" or of "the Doctor" who turns into a magician; they are both heroes of the moral transgression. Their redeeming feature is in the human relationship with their friends: Don Juan puts his life in danger to save that of his servant who later on will say about him:

Como no lo entreguéis vos  
moza o cosa que lo valga  
bien podéis fiaros del:  
que en cuanto en esto es cruel  
tiene condición hidalga<sup>9</sup>

and in the case of the Doctor, his concern for his friends when he is reaching the end of this life proves that he is still capable of some moral values. Their condemnation at the end is the results of their baroque characterization, their exuberant transgression. Faustus cannot be saved because he despairs, not of the possibilities of the human soul, but of the merits of Christ, which cannot help him. Mephistophelis himself stresses Faustus's faith "His faith is great" (V.i.79).

Don Juan is an individualist in his morals, that is his sin; he has no doubt that his problem is not that of faith. He believes he will always have time for repentance. His problem is not of faith but of moral choice, and his salvation does not depend on his faith or the merits of Christ: he obviously believes in Grace so deeply that, in his mind, he has always had it clear that he would be given time for repentance. He believes in the sacrament of penance but finds out too late that he had overlooked the gospel advice to beware because we know neither the place nor the time.

Don Juan's weakness is obviously indiscriminate lust, this flaw is not in itself the cause of his ultimate downfall. He, in fact, dies and is condemned to hell because he dares to defy the world of the spirit from the tirany of the flesh. Of course the superiority is so obvious that Don Juan must, out of necessity, lose the battle. There is another very interesting angle to Don Juan's sin; it is a social offence and therefore he has debased his whole rank in society:

La desvergüenza en España  
se ha hecho caballería<sup>10</sup>.

This social sin is to be understood in the light of Catholicism which does not believe in the supremacy of the individual conscience separated from the social one and has always considered the communion of the Saints as one of the dogmas of faith. The cause of Don Juan's downfall therefore must be related to a being that is a symbol of reconciliation between Don Juan's rank in society and the world of the spirit: the Ghost of a "caballero". Thus Don Juan's death is both a sacrifice and a purgation.

But it is my belief that ultimately the Great Doctor condemns his body and soul for eternity, for the sin which should, more naturally, be the Great Don's: lust. We cannot overlook the fact that Faustus speaks about himself in several scenes of the play; but the only definition he gives of himself, the only time he uses the first person, is when he entertains Mephistophelis to give him a woman:

...for I am wanton and lascivious, and cannot live without a wife.  
(II.i.141-43)

Helen's second appearance is the cause of Faustus's death: the separation of his soul from his body. After his encounter with her, Faustus's soul departs from this world and he dies. One must remember that the verb "die" has, in the Baroque, a sexual meaning also, so Faustus's address to Helen (besides being one of the most beautiful pieces of poetry ever put on the English stage) has a very profound and, I believe, literal meaning.

Her lips suck forth my soul, see where it flies!  
Come Helen, come, give me my soul back.  
(V.i)

So Faustus has, after all, given his soul because he is wanton and exchanged it for a moment of sexual pleasure.

Both plays are about two characters who had the aspirations of free spirits. These aspirations are checked by law –by moral and social laws in the case of Don Juan, and by divine in the case of Dr. Faustus<sup>11</sup>. They are rebels who despise established rules and morals and break them consciously by using their free will. In their daring bravery they defy divine justice but they are ultimately powerless to confront God's designs. They are very far from the serenity of the

9 Ibid. Jornada 2 p. 161-6.

10 *El Burlador...* p. 222.

11 *El Burlador...* p. 13.

classical heroes. It is their Baroque concern with the human body which is as essential a part of man as is the human spirit, but with that imbalance that had made the ascetics of the time mistrust the Neoplatonic concept of human love as much as they distrusted Spanish Illuminism.

**WORKS CITED**

- Dr. Faustus a 1604-version edition.* Ed. by Michael Keefer. Canada: Broadview press, 1991.  
 GREEN, Otis H.: *España y La Tradicion Occidental.* Madrid: Gredos, 1969.  
 RIERA FORTIANA, Enric. *Las claves de la Hegemonía Española.* Ed. Planeta, 1993.  
 RODRÍGUEZ LÓPEZ-VÁZQUEZ, Alfredo. *Andrés de Claramonte: El Burlador de Sevilla atribuido tradicionalmente a Tirso de Molina.* Reichenberger: Kassel Edition, 1987.

**REMARKS ON THE CHRONOGRAPHY  
 OF TRANSITION:  
 Renaissance - Mannerism - Baroque**

**Claus Uhlig**  
 University of Marburg, Germany

It happens most naturally of course that those who undergo the shock of spiritual or intellectual change sometimes fail to recognise their debt to the deserted cause: —How much of their heroism, or other high quality, of their rejection has really been the product of what they reject?

Walter Pater, *Gaston de Latour* (1896)

For quite a while now the human mind has been trying to stem the unbounded tide of becoming in time through principles of order designed to stop time, as it were, and to divide it into readily surveyable epochs. This endeavour is not so much a product of short-lived scholarly fashions as of the temporality of human existence itself, which in passing through its various stages experiences its own history subdivided as it is into epochs<sup>1</sup>. In the same way our understanding seeks insight into history as such, seeing that every individual is imbedded in it. Therefore it would seem necessary and legitimate in every generation to question again our epochal concepts and to re-examine their validity in scholarly discourse<sup>2</sup>. In the following this will be attempted with special regard to the time-honoured discussion of the transition from the Renaissance to the Baroque. What has been achieved so far will have to be presented briefly and with a view to pointing up possible alternatives.

I

Surveying the scholarly literature in the field according to the style of argumentation and the methods employed, one cannot but notice quite disparate results. While older art historians like Alois Riegl<sup>3</sup> and Heinrich Wölfflin<sup>4</sup>, for instance, used to describe the epochal transition in question as one between two

1 Cf. Hans-Georg Gadamer, "Die Zeitanstauung des Abendlandes" (1977), in H.-G.C., *Kleine Schriften*, vol. IV (Tübingen, 1977), pp. 17-33, esp. p. 28.  
 2 Cf. August Buck (ed.), *Renaissance und Barock*, vol. I; *Neues Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft*, vol. IX (Frankfurt/Main, 1972), p. 2; Alastair Fowler, "Periodization and Interart Analogies", *New Literary History*, 3 (1972), 487-509, esp. pp. 487ff.; and Ulrich Weisstein, *Comparative Literature and Literary Theory: Survey and Introduction* (Bloomington-London, 1973), pp. 66-98, esp. p. 67.  
 3 Alois Riegl, *Historische Grammatik der bildenden Künste* (1897/98), edd. K.M. Swoboda and O. Pächt (Graz-Köln, 1966), p. 58.  
 4 Heinrich Wölfflin, *Renaissance und Barock* (1888), ed. H. Rose (München, 1926), pp. 74-88.