“I NEVER KNEW HIM OTHER THAN A MAN”:
MASCULINITY AS ORNAMENT IN
SIR PHILIP SIDNEY’S ARCADIA

The present article aims at showing how Sir Philip Sidney’s two versions of the Arcadia deal with the issue of masculinity. Patricia Fumerton’s propositions about the parallels between Hilliard’s miniatures and Sidney’s sonnets are here confronted to the two pastoral romances, which seem to have retained a rather similar approach to the idea of ornament. The issue of disguises and ornamental attributes of one’s sex in the old and new Arcadia, compared with the limner’s vision of the same, thus turn to prove central in understanding the fascinating complexities of sex in Sidney’s original and revised works.
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Though the 1563 Homily Against Excess of Apparel “sets out to chastise both men and women,” a significant part of the sermon was devoted to the threat that some Elizabethan “effeminate” men posed to good order:

Yea, many men are become so effeminate, that they care not what they spend in disguising themselves, ever desiring new toys and inventing new fashions. Therefore a certain man that would picture every countryman in his accustomed apparel, when he had painted other nations, he pictured the Englishman all naked, and gave him cloth under his arm, and bade him make it himself as he thought best, for he changed his fashion so often, that he knew not how to make it.

The text shows how despite the queen’s own cunning manipulation of gender roles and boundaries, Elizabethans were expected to know of and follow some visible rules common to their sex in order to both secure stable ontogeny and undermine superficiality. The (in)visible dimension of gender differences is here central: the homily’s reference to “a certain man that would picture every countryman in his accustomed apparel” is most certainly a reference to Ghent-born painter and sculptor Lucas de Heere (1531-84), who spent a number of years in England as a...
Protestant refugee at the end of the 1560’s and beginning of the 1570’s. Around these years, he developed a pictorial style very similar to the one found in illustrations for “Books of Habits and Customs,” a genre “often linked to travellers’ ethnographies.” Proto-ethnographic pictures were fast developing in Elizabethan England, as a result of the increasing number of voyages made by English explorers. Once he travelled back to France, where he would spend the rest of his life, he started or continued working on a costume book documenting each and every known nation’s sartorial trends and stereotypes in a bid to illustrate his most ambitious work thus far, later published under the title _Théâtre de tous les peuples et nations de la terre, avec leurs habits et ornement divers, tant anciens que modernes, diligentement dépeints au naturel par Luc Dheere, peintre et sculpteur gantois._ The very last watercolour of this theatre shows a bearded man standing in the nude, except for a small white loincloth wrapped around his hips. He is shown with a pair of scissors in his right hand, and a large piece of yellow fabric is rested on his left arm. The short poem on the page opposite does not mention the nationality of the naked man, but De Heere’s pupil, Van Mander, offers a detailed explanation for the watercolour in _Het Schilderboeck_ (1604):

It once happened that when [Lucas de Heere] was in England he obtained a commission to paint in a gallery for the Admiral in London [the Lord High Admiral, Edward Clinton] in which he had to paint all the costumes or clothing of the nations. When all but the Englishman were done, he painted him naked and set beside him all manner of cloth and silk materials, and next to them tailor’s scissors and chalk. When the Admiral saw this figure he asked Lucas what he meant by it. He answered that he had done that with the Englishman because he did not know what appearance or kind of clothing he should give him because they varied so much from day to day; for if he had done it one way today the next day it would have to be another—be it French or Italian, Spanish or Dutch—and I have therefore painted the material and tools to hand so that one can always make of it what one wishes.

Van Mander’s suggestion that the red-haired bearded man is indeed English seems most plausible given that the picture bears a striking resemblance to a much earlier one, appearing in _The Introduction of Knowledge_ by Andrew Boorde (which was published in the 1550’s but written around 1542). Boorde’s own naked man was meant to illustrate the following verse:

I am an Englishman, and naked I stand here,  
Musyng in my mynde what rayment I shal were;  
For now I wyll were thys, and now I wyl were that;  
Now I wyl were I cannot tel what.  
All new fashyons be pleaantaunt to me;  
I wyl haue them, whether I thrue or thee.

“New fashions,” “toys” and “disguises” were therefore associated in both Boorde’s text and in the later homily with the changing tastes of fickle English men. Yet how much were visible devices or apparel considered a defining part of manhood and/or effeminacy in Elizabethan England?

In a recent article about the Renaissance beard, Will Fisher has argued very con-
vincingly that the morphology of genitals in the Renaissance was only one among many other equally important sex-defining features:

[S]ex was materialized through an array of features and prosthetic parts. A list of some of these parts would have to include the beard and the genitals, but would also have to include clothing, the hair, the tongue, and weapons such as swords or daggers (to name just a few).10

Clothing, like genitals or facial hair, may have been historically equally important in determining someone’s sex, sharing a common “prosthetic” function with them. Yet in materializing sex, some “features and prosthetic parts” may be used as mere props, disguises or, conversely, as clues. As such, the visible materialization of these features on the representational stage of Elizabethan literature reveals the complex and at times undecidable role they play in revealing or concealing sexual identities. I would here like to use the example of one central passage in Sir Philip Sidney’s revised *Arcadia* to try and see how much some pastoral characters in the romance, toying with disguises, may be read as performers of their own sexual identity, forever delaying the unveiling of visible evidence.

**Ornaments of Sex**

Bearing Fisher’s visible features of Elizabethan sexes in mind, I would first like to go back to the formerly extremely wide-ranging meaning of *ornament*, which, in early modern English, could be applied to describe any single one of these “features and prosthetic parts” and was also recurrently used in Sidney’s prose works and correspondence.

In early modern days, the word ornament retained a truly animistic dimension. In Walter J. Ong’s words:

The terms *ornamentum* or *ornamentatio* have certain definite synonyms which come from Cicero and Quintilian; An “ornament” of rhetoric is also indifferently styled a “praise” (laus) or an “honor” (honos or honor) or a “light” (lumen) of words or of speech. […] The whole field over which *laus*, *honor*, *lumen*, and *ornamentum* play is obviously one where the distinctions between persons and objects now made automatically at least by English-speaking persons are more or less blurred.11

Philip Sidney knew his Cicero and Quintilian intimately, and he was also one of England’s most prominent Ramists: the Latin meaning of “ornament” could not have escaped him in any way, as well as the many ambiguities of the word.

Sidney’s varying uses of the word show that the degree of subject/object incorporation is never settled, and ornamental visibility thus continually hovers between essentiality and superficiality, ostentation and concealment. *The Defence of Poesie* is fraught with such contradictions. The first occurrence of *ornament* is in the following passage:

He said soldiers were the noblest estate of mankind, and horsemen the noblest of soldiers. He said they were the maisters of war, and ornaments of peace, speedy goers, and strong abiders, triumphers both in Camps and Courts.12
Sidney’s avowed goal was to defend poetry by showing that “Poetrie is the Companion of Camps”\textsuperscript{13}: the reader is thus led to understand this one use of “ornament” as the expression of necessity and the prolongation of manly strength.\textsuperscript{14} This may further be due to the Latin etymon of “ornament,” referring to a warrior equipment, including armour and weapons, themselves “prosthetic parts” of the man sporting them. Reflexively, this also means that soldiers are the very condition of peace, or, in other words, its “equipment,” much in the way early modern “hands” were thought to equip the body:

Because it conceives of ornament as equipment rather than as decoration solely, the fifteenth century can conceive of the hand as ‘a great help and ornament to the body’, and the sixteenth century of tackling as the ‘ornaments of a ship’.\textsuperscript{15}

The war imagery may also have been a way for Sidney to answer the then current view that poetry was an unmanly, effeminate art. We know that The Defence was meant partly as an answer to Stephen Gosson’s School of Abuse (1579), which reiterated Plato’s strictures on poets: “No marvel though Plato shut them out of his school and banished them quite from his commonwealth as effeminate writers, unprofitable members, and utter enemies to virtue.”\textsuperscript{16} To which Sidney replied:

Again, a man might ask out of what commonwealth Plato doth banish them. In sooth, thence where he himself allows community of women. So as belike this banishment grew not for effeminate wantonness, since little should poetical sonnets be hurtful when a man might have what woman he listed.\textsuperscript{17}

In Sidney’s Defence, poets become manly ornaments essential to courtly and soldierly life. Yet only moments after the ornamental soldier example, Sidney reverts to another definition of ornament:

[T]he greatest part of poets have apparelled their poetical inventions in that num- brous kind of writing which is called verse—indeed but apparelled, verse being but an ornament and no cause to poetry, since there have been many most ex- cellent poets that never versified.\textsuperscript{18}

Here on the contrary ornament becomes the antonym for “cause.” Provided that Sidney was very well versed in Aristotelian concepts,\textsuperscript{19} which he mentions and analyses throughout the whole Defence, he may here have meant “cause” in its es- sential meaning (as opposed to substantial). Verse does not belong to the essence of poetry and is only accidental: this “grammatical”\textsuperscript{20} view of ornament is therefore the exact opposite of the “equipment” version of ornament.

This division is made even clearer in Sidney’s dedication of The Countess of Pembroke’s Arcadia to “his dear lady and sister.” In this short text, the loving brother describes the pastoral romance as an “idle work”: Sidney described most of his own literary works as toys, which he thought were most likely to blemish his reputation and fame, should they have been published.\textsuperscript{21} Philip had indeed no intention of circulating the Arcadia around anyone outside the close circle of friends his beloved sister would deem trustworthy and benevolent enough to lay eyes upon it:
Now it is done only for you, only to you; if you keep it to yourself, or to such friends who will weigh errors in the balance of goodwill, I hope, for the father's sake, it will be pardoned, perchance made much of, though in itself it have deformities.²²

The all too reluctant begetter of the allegedly misshapen offspring goes on to compare his unwanted progeny to frivolous sundries:

And so, looking for no better stuff than, as in a haberdasher's shop, glasses, or feathers, you will continue to love the writer who doth exceedingly love you, and most heartily prays you might long live to be a principal ornament to the family of the Sidneys.²³

Here again two kinds of ornaments come to clash: feathers and other props cannot be put on a par with the ornamental Countess who makes the Sidney family proud. Are the ornamental “prostheses” of sex in the Arcadia on the side of the essence or of the artificial?

**Chinese Boxes**

I would here like to turn to Patricia Fumerton’s comparison of what she calls a “literary locket,” i.e. “the ‘case’ of prefatory letters speaking the convention of ‘secrets bewraide’”²⁴ to the “ornamental picture case [of miniatures] richly decorated for all to see.”²⁵ Though Fumerton’s article deals with sonnets rather than with the pastoral romance, I do think that the case she makes for the comparison between the poetic and visual ornaments (Hilliard’s miniatures) also helps better understanding some major ambiguities relative to the display and performance of manhood within the Arcadia.

Sidney’s 1590 Arcadia, otherwise known as the “new” Arcadia, tells the long and eventful story of two princes as they try and make their strenuous and winding way back home through Arcadia after they have been shipwrecked. At one point in the course of their progress, Pyrocles, one of the two heroes, becomes obsessed with the table²⁶ of an exceptionally beautiful woman that is exhibited in the picture gallery at old Kalander’s country lodge. He thus embarks upon another journey to conquer young Philoclea, the mesmerising princess shown in the portrait. Upon arriving at her kingly father’s court, Pyrocles dresses up as an Amazon in order both to avoid arousing suspicions in her father and to be granted the right to spend more time with Philoclea than his real sexual identity would have allowed. From then on, Pyrocles calls himself Zelmane, after the name of a young woman who we learn died in his service long before he and Musidorus were marooned on the Arcadian shores. The original Zelmane -whose story is told in the revised version of the Arcadia²⁷- falls in love with Pyrocles and takes on the appearance of a page to escape her father and follow the object of her affection without him knowing. The narrator eventually has her confess her true identity to Pyrocles on her deathbed:

For your sake myself have become of a princess, a page, and for your sake have put off the apparel of a woman, and (if you judge not more mercifully) the modesty. [...] And I pray you, said she, even by these dying eyes of mine [...] and by
these polled locks of mine (which, while they were long, were the ornaments of my sex, now in their short curls, the testimony of my servitude) and by the service I have done you […] think of me after my death with kindness, though you cannot with love.  

The obvious parallel between the two episodes, made explicit by the circulation of Zelmane’s name, highlights the overall theatrical dimension of amorous ploys, hinges upon the hiding and/or revealing of the “ornaments” of the characters’ sex. This is only one of the many dramatic twists and turns in the new Arcadia, which most critics agree is mainly about performing one’s identity: “[w]ithout distortion the entire conduct of Pyrocles and Musidorus in Arcadia can be called a performance, an act.” The two Zelmane stories differ in one significant respect. Even though Pyrocles is not killed by the narrator and gets to unveil who he really is under seemingly better circumstances, the new Zelmane proves only relatively luckier than his namesake. Indeed, young Philoclea, upon discovering Pyrocles’s real name and sex, fails to fully acknowledge the change in her lover’s identity and is torn apart between Pyrocles and Zelmane:

Alas, how painful it is to a divided mind to make a well-joined answer! How hard it is to bring inward shame to outward confession! And what handsome-ness, trow you, can be observed in that speech which is made one knows not to whom? Shall I say, “O Zelmane”? Alas, your words be against it. Shall I say “Prince Pyrocles”? Wretch that I am, your show is manifest against it.

Following the revelation scene, the narrator deliberately prolongs the confusion further by keeping on referring to Pyrocles as Zelmane and using feminine pro-nouns whenever mentioning him. After having divested himself of his womanly ornaments, Pyrocles still attempts to provide multiple proofs of his sex to the ever incredulous Philoclea:

Pyrocles […] presented her with some jewels of right princely value, as some little tokens of his love and quality; and withal showed her letters from his father, King Euarchus, unto him, which even in the sea had amongst his jewels been preserved. But little needed those proofs to one who would have fallen out with herself rather than make any contrary conjecture to Zelmane’s speeches […].

The validity or impact of the proofs is therefore never really tested, provided that Philoclea would not dare contradict Pyrocles for fear of losing Zelmane: “O Zelmane,” Philoclea exclaims, “for so I love to call thee, since in that name my love first began […]” Schwarz sees in this confession the perfect illustration that Pyrocles’s revelation “enables Philoclea to confess her love for a woman.” Yet it does remain telling that Pyrocles should brandish the aforementioned letters as proof. The insignia of birth, implicitly aristocratic (“his father, King Euarchus”), is the social ornament that Pyrocles thinks Philoclea needs, thus confirming that the romance, much like Astrophel and Stella, shows lovers resorting to public and courtly forms of expression to show and tell their true selves: “The lovers are readers of each other whom they at the same time write. And because they can only express their private love through public or conventional conceits and poses, they each become ‘wrapt’ in a fictional case,” or, in this particular example, in an ornamental case.
full of jewels and letters miraculously preserved from a shipwreck. Instead of the rhetorical ornaments found in the sonnets, the letters serve as social tokens of one’s identity.

The revelation does not put an end to the ornamental logic the reader may have thought was only part of the disguise. Behind the disguise stand yet further ornaments—be they jewels or letters—whose link to the characters’ true identity remain undecided. Much like the heart according to Fumerton, Zelmane-Pyrocles’s sexual identity “exists more in ‘Idea’ than in actuality, like the generic ‘She’ that stands for the real-life Stella. It lies […] beneath the […] convention, hidden in the white ‘ground of the page’.”35 The reader, like Philoclea, never catches a glimpse of the bottom of the “Chinese box of ornament”36 where sex materializes in Arcadia.

DEFERRING SEX

Kathryn Schwarz, analysing the endless deferral of the proof of Pyrocles’s manhood explains how “The [old] Arcadia deploys female pronouns, importunate parents, unruly peasants, and a great deal of occasional poetry to hold the conditions of speaking as as and acting like a man.”37 She then goes on to quote Kinney on the deferral of sexual intercourse: “In the narrative present of Arcadia, immediate—and in particular erotic—action is repeatedly deferred as Sidney’s lords and ladies demand (and supply) additional narrative performances.”38 In this quotation again, performance is said to screen or delay action and to postpone the erotic encounter between Pyrocles and Philoclea. Later on in the romance, when the two lovers finally get an opportunity to consummate their love, the rhetorical ornament of convention prevails, once again:

When Pyrocles’ seduction of Philoclea finally takes place, we do not see it. Instead, the text presents an intensely conventional love poem that Pyrocles once heard from a friend. Rather than reading about the triumph of manhood, we contemplate a blazon that […] displaces sexual consummation.39

Rather significantly, the blazon - which Catherine Bates sees as a form designed to promote “male poetic display”40 - is said to have circulated between men beforehand, so that even within the privacy of the chamber, “one is left with the conventional artifice of rhetoric, the verbal mirror to Hilliard’s limning ornament.”41 The blurred distinction between body and ornament, inner truth and outward show is also made manifest within the blazon itself whose speaker marvels at his lover’s beauty in the following terms: “The tip no jewel needs to wear / The tip is jewel of the ear.”42 The difference between the jewel and the lover’s body becomes unclear, thus embodying the dual nature of ornaments. Conventions, as ornaments, screen the lover’s body from the reader’s view, and one is left to guess what is hinted at beyond or behind the narrator’s words.

MINIATURES

The blazon also features in the new Arcadia, except at a different and rather telling stage in the narrative. In the second version of the pastoral, the poem is uttered by Zelmane, before she reveals her true identity to Philoclea. While Philoclea, Pamela and female friends go and bathe in the Ladon river, Zelmane decides to follow
them. She is then so moved by the vision of the naked Arcadian nymphs that she starts “quivering” and thinks “it more wisdom to lean herself to a tree and look on.”

Why has the blazon been placed in such new context? First of all, one of the main differences between the two versions is that “in the New Arcadia’s bathing scene, the blazon does not simulate a sex-act as it specifically does in the Old.” Erotic action is not just delayed in the new Arcadia but replaced by more of less subtle suggestions of Pyrocles’s physical arousal. Besides, in lieu of the erotic encounter, the reader is presented with a miniature:

But as the ladies played them in the water, sometimes striking it with the hands, the water (making lines in his face) seemed to smile at such beating, and with twenty bubbles, not to be content to have the picture of their face in large upon him, but he would in each of these bubbles set forth the miniature of them.

This is generally thought to be the first written use of the word « miniature » in English, and may be an echo of Sidney’s familiarity with this pictorial genre:

Sidney’s opportunity to view limnings by Hilliard would have been great. [...] Everyone who was anyone at court was limned by Hilliard, including Elizabeth, Drake, Leicester, Raleigh, Essex and Sidney’s very own Stella, Penelope Rich. Sidney’s uncle, Leicester, and friend, Essex, were both patrons of Hilliard, and through them Sidney may have met Hilliard. Or he may have met him during their joint participation in the Alençon marriage negotiations. That they did meet is certain: Hilliard in his Treatise reports a long conversation with Sidney. Considering their different social status, this exchange probably occurred at a sitting for a miniature, although no authentic limning of Sidney has yet been found.

Roy Strong has argued that Sidney may have sat twice for Hilliard and that the sittings may have occurred between 1578 and 1585, at which time he was also revising his Arcadia. The juxtaposition of the blazon and the miniature therefore points to the Chinese box logic of sex ornamental materializations in the Arcadia. Though sex can be made manifest through “an array of features and prosthetic parts,” these parts and features, turned ornaments, both point to and conceal the true ground of the characters’ sex. The comparison that Patricia Fumerton draws between Sidney’s sonnets and Hilliard’s miniatures may thus be extended to encompass the representation of sex within the new Arcadia. Indeed, as Catherine Bates writes, the new Arcadia further destabilizes the masculine writing subject by taking “the querying of that subject to a whole new level,” and I would add, to a whole new layer of ornament. The romance turns into a speaking miniature, bodies turn into ornaments, tips of the ear turn into jewel, as though the distinction between inward “truth” and outward show could not be solved but by exhibiting their interlocking curls, as gender-ambiguous as the River Ladon where the bathing scene is set.

**The Idea of Sex**

Pyrocles’ sex therefore never acquires actuality in the Arcadia and is consequently both displayed, exhibited and concealed through the changing ornaments the Prince chooses to conjure up. As Duncan-Jones suggested about *Astrophil and*
Stella’s true identities, the truth of the (sexual) matter in the Arcadia probably lies in the hidden “Idea” of sex rather than in its outward show. In explaining what he meant by the Idea or “fore-conceit” of representation in the Defence, Sidney tellingly used yet another pictorial comparison:

There is such a kind of difference [between right and meainer poets] as betwixt the meamer sort of painters, who counterfeit only such faces as set before them, and the more excellent, who having no law but wit, bestow that in colours upon which is fittest for the eye to see: as the constant though lamenting look of Lucretia, when she punished in herself another’s fault, wherein he paints not Lucretia whom he never saw, but paints the outward beauty of such a virtue.51

Likewise, Pyrocles’s identity is never seen except through the outward ornaments of sex. Coincidently, the painted image of Lucretia is also the example chosen by Derrida in The Parergon to exemplify the fluidity of the notion of ornament in relation to the body:

For example, Cranach’s Lucretia holds nothing but a flimsy transparent veil over her sex: where is the parergon? Must we also consider a parergon—not part of her nude body, au naturel—the dagger which she points at herself and which touches her skin (only the point of the parergon touches her body, in the middle of a triangle formed by her two breasts and her navel)? Is her necklace also a parergon? It concerns the objectifying, representational essence, its inside and outside, the criteria used in this definition, the value attributed to the natural, and, either secondarily or principally, the privileged position of the human body.52

That Derrida chose the same picture as Sidney to discuss “representational essence” is of course fully accidental, yet his study of Cranach’s painting may offer a most interesting way of beginning to understand the amazing complexity of the representation of sex in the Arcadia.
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fence, 104)

21 Elsewhere in The Arcadia, Sidney also calls it a “toyfull booke.” The same happens with his other works: in The Defence of Poesy, he refers to his apology as “this ink-wasting toy of mine” (Defence, 106) and Astrophil and Stella sonnet 18 has the speaker regret that “My youth doth waste, my knowledge brings forth toys,” (Philip Sidney, Astrophel and Stella in The Major Works, ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 160.
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26 “In the Arcadia the word “table” is most often found instead of pictures whenever the narrator describes paintings. This was common lexical usage in Elizabethan England.

27 There are two known versions of the Arcadia: one commonly referred to as “the old Arcadia” and the newer yet unfinished second version which Sidney was still in the process of revising at the time of his untimely death.
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