

University of North Dakota UND Scholarly Commons

Theses and Dissertations

Theses, Dissertations, and Senior Projects

January 2019

On Satyrs: Brutes, Monsters, And Demons: Of Their Nature And Worship: François Hédelin's Des Satyres As A Defense Of God And Humankind

Danielle Skjelver

Follow this and additional works at: https://commons.und.edu/theses

Recommended Citation

Skjelver, Danielle, "On Satyrs: Brutes, Monsters, And Demons: Of Their Nature And Worship: François Hédelin's Des Satyres As A Defense Of God And Humankind" (2019). *Theses and Dissertations*. 2865. https://commons.und.edu/theses/2865

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, and Senior Projects at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact zeineb.yousif@library.und.edu.

ON SATYRS: BRUTES, MONSTERS, AND DEMONS: OF THEIR NATURE AND WORSHIP: FRANÇOIS HÉDELIN'S *DES SATYRES* AS A DEFENSE OF GOD AND HUMANKIND

by

Danielle Mead Skjelver Bachelor of Arts, University of North Dakota, 2010 Master of Arts, University of North Dakota, 2012

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty

of the

University of North Dakota

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Grand Forks, North Dakota December 2019 Copyright 2019, Danielle Mead Skjelver

This dissertation, submitted by Danielle Mead Skjelver in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy from the University of North Dakota, has been read by the Faculty Advisory Committee under whom the work has been done and is hereby approved.

	Chairperson, Dr. Hans Peter Broedel
	Dr. Ty Reese
	Dr. William Caraher
	Dr. John K. Cox
	Dr. Amanda Boyd
	Dr. Jeanne Hageman
This dissertation meets the standard for apperequirements of the Graduate School of the University	
Chris Nelson Dean of the Graduate School	
Date	

PERMISSION

Title On Satyrs: Brutes, Monsters, and Demons: Of Their Nature and

Worship: François Hédelin's Des Satyres as a Defense of God and

Humankind

Department History

Degree Doctor of Philosophy

In presenting this dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a graduate degree from the University of North Dakota, I agree that the library of this university shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor who supervised my dissertation work or, in his absence, by the chairperson of the department or the dean of the Graduate School. It is understood that any copying or publication or other use of this dissertation or part thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of North Dakota in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my thesis.

Danielle Mead Skjelver 10 September 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
ABSTRACT	xii
INTRODUCTION	
PART I: TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE	1
PART II: A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF FRANÇOIS HÉDELIN	6
PART III: A HISTORIOGRAPHICAL INTRODUCTION TO THE	
EARLY MODERN MONSTROUS	13
PART IV: BEYOND THE EDGES OF HUMANITY: DES SATYRES	
AS PRE-PRIMATE PRIMATOLOGY	33
PART V: MONSTER AS MIRROR: THE SATYR AS THE	
ANTI-HÉDELIN	95
THE TREATISE	126
FRONT MATTER	127
TABLE OF SUBJECTS	1381
BOOK I	146
BOOK II	170
BOOK III	181
BOOK IV	199

¹ In the Table of Subjects, the numbers correspond to the original text. These page numbers are in brackets throughout the text.

BOOK V	240
BIBLIOGRAPHY	265

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Australian ultrarunner Perce Cerutty believed that "You only grow as a human being if you're outside your comfort zone." Ultrarunners and academics have several things in common: an internal drive to do what others might find a little strange, if admirable; a desire to push their limits; and an insatiable curiosity about what more is out there to discover and achieve. It is also true of academics and people in general that we only grow when we are outside of our comfort zone. My dissertation supervisor, Dr. Hans Peter Broedel, seems to know this well, for from the start, this project has pushed me outside my comfort zone. Before this project, I was an ardent empiricist whose greatest theoretical achievement was a paper on sixteenth-century clerical masculinity. Monsters are by their nature heavily theoretical, and I had to become comfortable with this. Dr. Broedel's patience and persistence pushed me to a much richer experience of doing history, and that will enable me to contribute more substantively to the field in teaching and research.

I would like to thank my committee, particularly Dr. Amanda Boyd, Dr. John K. Cox, and Dr. Ty Reese for their willingness to serve on my committee and for their many hours reading and commenting on this work, helping me to improve it both as a dissertation and eventually as a book. Dr. Jeanne Hageman's stunning generosity of time and spirit made the translation possible. Her expertise not only in early modern French, but also in theater, provided

2

² Scott Jurek with Steve Friedman, *Eat & Run: My Unlikely Journey to Ultramarathon Greatness* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2012), 82.

invaluable insights. Her sense of humor brought levity to the numerous revisions. It is impossible to overstate the value of Dr. Hageman's comments, which were thorough, clear, and copious. For nine years, Dr. William Caraher has served as my mentor in a variety of areas from teaching to publishing to writing to course design. His optimism and example have inspired me to go in directions I never expected, which have been a boon to this project and to my professional life. I am infinitely grateful for his generosity with his time, most notably with regular meetings that keep me always looking forward to the next project.

Thanks as well to the 2019 Scientiae Conference attendees, specifically Dr. Richard Raiswell and Dr. David Winter, who offered comments on preliminary research for Part IV of the Introduction. My gratitude goes as well to my writers group for their ready ear.

I owe thanks to many people at the University of Maryland Global Campus (UMGC), but three colleagues stand out. My chair, Dr. Damon Freeman, has provided boundless support, most tangibly in the form of coordinating my teaching schedule to allow for periods of intense focus. His interest in this project and suggestions as to future projects stemming from this dissertation have inspired me and have kept the momentum strong. Dr. Linda Ruggles first reached out to me when I was an undergraduate to encourage presenting my work at conferences. She has read numerous abstracts, writing samples, papers, as well as drafts of fiction work over the years. Of tremendous and immediate value to this project, Dr. Ruggles stepped in to serve as interim executive editor for an open access textbook project that I began as a direct result of Dr. Caraher's encouragement and Dr. Broedel's support (I am proud to say that Dr. Broedel also serves on the editorial board for this textbook.). I can not imagine anyone else who could have done the job — and also would have done the job. She has relieved me of a great worry, allowing for focus on the dissertation. Dr. Ruggles also mentored me as a new faculty member at UMGC.

Likewise Dr. Jeff Glasco served as a mentor when I first taught the capstone series at UMGC. He supervised my undergraduate capstone paper, which caused a sea change in my approach to historical evidence, and he was the first to urge me on to graduate school.

I am infinitely grateful to my husband and our children for their patience with my absent-mindedness, and my nose so constantly in a book or on a computer screen. They have not only endured this process; they have embraced it. All of them revel in history, and they have savored the many opportunities that my research has afforded them. Their positivity and relentless certainty that I would finish kept me going. In the wisdom of my daughter, Elizabeth, "If you want to write a dissertation, you have to write a dissertation."

For Joan Elizabeth Wilson

My Mother, My Foundation

ABSTRACT

Best known for his 1657 *La Pratique du Theatre*, François Hédelin was a cleric with a keen interest in the stage. As the abbé d'Aubignac, he wrangled in debate with the most respected scholars of his day, and Hédelin's contacts extended to the crown itself. His *Des Satyres, brutes, monstres et démons* is an attempt to do with a species what he did with the stage - to bring disorder and immorality to heel.

This dissertation provides historical context, analysis, and translation of François Hédelin's 1627 *Des Satyres, brutes, monstres et démons. De leur nature et adoration Contre l'opinion de ceux qui ont estimé les Satyres estre une espece d'hommes distincts & separez des Adamicques.* Coming to us from an age of wonders, Hédelin's work is itself something of a wonder. To the modern eye, the most startling thing about it is that it never asks whether or not satyrs exist. Today's readers might find such a bluff acceptance of the existence of half-man half-goat creatures astounding. But this was not unusual in seventeenth century Europe. In the medieval and early modern world, the term 'satyr' applied to what were likely chimpanzees, orangoutans, and baboons. The term *papio*, meaning baboon, was often synonymous with satyr in the classical world. Further, in the minds of many early modern people, Pliny's monstrous races, of which satyrs were but one species, were still traipsing about the wilds of the Americas, Africa, and India.

This study argues that there were two reasons why Hédelin wrote this treatise: First, he wished to join the scholarly discourse on what makes us human. Second, he wished to reject overtly what satyrs represented: lechery, deception, drunkenness, and disorder. There were indeed those who thought that satyrs were descendants of Adam or were another species of human. For Hédelin, such assertions put the very dignity of both God and man at risk, and his treatise would sharply separate both mankind and God from these creatures.

INTRODUCTION: PART I

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE

François Hédelin's *Des Satyres, brutes, monstres et demons*.1 *De leur nature et adoration Contre l'opinion de ceux qui ont estimé les Satyres estre une espece d'hommes distincts & separez des Adamicques* has seen three editions: the original in 1627; an 1888 edition published by Alcide Bonneau, consisting of 500 copies of which the translator has one uncut copy; and Giles Banderier's 2003 modern French edition.2 Banderier notes that there are two copies of the 1627 original, one in the Bibliothèque Municipale de Besançon and one at the Bibliothèque National (BNF) in Paris.3 Banderier finds these two "rigoureusement identiques" with only the manner in which errata are noted being different.4 Where there are differences, they are generally minor, and they are noted in the text. Like Banderier's edition, this translation is of the version in the Bibliothèque Nationale (BNF), using it as the authoritative source. However there is a digitized version as well, which allowed for clarifying, by means of magnification, any areas where the

¹ There is no accent on the title page.

² Hédelin d'Aubignac, *Des Satyres brutes, monstres et démons*, ed. Isidore Liseux (Paris: Isidore Liseux, 1888), frontispiece. This printing may have been meant to coincide with Charles Arnaud's biography of Hédelin, *Les Théories dramatiques au XVIIe Siècle: Étude sur la vie et les ævres de l'abbé d'Aubignac*, also produced in 1888; Giles Banderier, "Introduction," in Hédelin d'Aubignac, *Des Satyres brutes, monstres et démons*, ed., Giles Banderier (Grenoble: Éditions Jérôme Millon, 2003), 30.

³ Banderier, "Introduction," in Hédelin, *Des Satyres*, ed., Giles Banderier, 31.

⁴ Banderier, "Introduction," in Hédelin, Des Satyres, ed., Giles Banderier, 31.

BNF copy was unclear. This translation has followed these two copies which are not identical, has noted each discrepancy in the text, and has given preference to the BNF version wherever it was clear.5

There are, disappointingly, no images in any of the editions or printings of *Des Satyres*, unlike his grandfather's *Des Monstres et prodiges*, which is lavishly illustrated.6 Amy Wygant speculates that this is because of a ban on depictions of monsters following the Council of Trent.7 However, Hédelin himself may not have wished for images even had they been available, for his is a work of argument. He has a singular purpose from start to finish: to demonstrate through argumentation that none of the three kinds of satyrs (ape, monster, demon) are related to mankind.

On balance, the book is a somewhat difficult read for its many pronouns with unclear antecedent. It is perhaps partly for this reason that Giles Banderier, in his 2003 edition of *Des Satyres*, describes *Des Satyres* as "a work of youth and scholarship" by a "second rate" writer.8 Hédelin's prose is a clearer and more fluid in Book IV than in any

⁵ François Hédelin, *Des Satyres, brutes, monstres et demons. De leur nature et adoration* (Paris: Nicolas Buon, 1627). https://play.google.com/books/reader?printsec=frontcover&output=reader&id=GDGD5wsuCFcC&pg=GBS.PP5

⁶ See Ambroise Paré, Des monstres et prodiges, ed. Jean Céard (Geneva: Droz, 1971).

⁷ Amy Wygant, "D'Aubignac, Demonologist, I: Monkeys and Monsters," *Seventeenth-Century French Studies*, 23:1 (2001), 159. Wygant cites Gilbert Lascault, *Le Monstre dans l'art occidental* (Paris: Promodis, 1982), I, 501-29. Though the reasoning is unclear from the note, it appears to have been a result of the Second Decree, *On the Invocation, Veneration, and Relics, of Saints, and on Sacred Images*, at the Twenty-Fifth Session. This decree required art to be worthy of veneration, and free of anything remotely lascivious. "In fine, let so great care and diligence by used herein by bishops, as that there be nothing seen that is disorderly, or that is unbecomingly or confusedly arranged, nothing that is profane, nothing indecorous, seeing that holiness becometh the house of God." This is not a direct ban overtly naming the monstrous but seems to have been interpreted that way. *Canons and Degrees of the Council of Trent: Original Text in English*, tran. H.J. Schroeder (St. Louis: B. Herder, 1941), 215-216.

^{8 &}quot;l'ævre d'un écrivain intéressant, mais de second rang, une ævre de jenuesse et d'érudition." Banderier, "Introduction," in Hédelin, *Des Satyres*, ed., Giles Banderier, 20. This edition brings the text into modern French.

other, offering potentially moving turns of phrase. This is the book on demonology, a topic which either brings out the eloquent in Hédelin or is perhaps an area where, as a man about to take holy orders, he is most comfortable. Indeed Books IV and V are quite different in style from Books I, II, and III, which are more disciplined. Book IV is passionate and reads with a building momentum of enthusiasm and confidence. Book V is rather free with fragments and reads almost as though it were written by a different person, though Hédlin's voice is the voice here. Certainly Book V is marked by a Hédelin in a different frame of mind than the other four books. Of the five, Book V is the most challenging to read.

For scholars of the seventeenth century French Stage, this treatise offers insight into Hédelin's fears, certainties, and values – particularly fears of hypermasculinity and its potential within the average man, including perhaps himself. Hédelin's treatise is important because it may have been responsible for his appointment as tutor to Cardinal Richelieu's nephew, setting Hédelin on his way to a position where Richelieu would commission him to write his great work of dramatic theory, *La Pratique du théâtre*. It will also be of interest to scholars of early modern demonology, as well as to those interested in the early modern debate on what separates the human from the animal or the monstrous. This treatise will illuminate the degree to which a self-educated young scholar outside the fields of natural philosophy and medicine might have known of the species debates. For scholars of natural philosophy, it reflects early modern values, assumptions, expectations, perceptions, and norms, as well as thought about the question of humanity, which has recently been demonstrated to have been as varied as individuals.9 In this

⁹ See for example Gerhild Scholz Williams, Ways of Knowing in Early Modern Germany: Johannes

respect, Hédelin's treatise is a text of far reaching significance. *Des Satyres* reflects the dominant themes in seventeenth century attempts to define clearly, authoritatively, and unassailably what is human and what is un-, non-, or inhuman. This question was fraught with anxiety as the world became smaller, challenging ancient and medieval certainties of the defining features of humanity, thus challenging the position of human beings as God's most beloved creation. This is of maximum importance to Hédelin; reclaiming humankind's unique place in the light of God's favor is the primary purpose of his treatise.

As early modern Europeans ventured further into the unknown parts of their world, they met utterly different human beings in their respective worlds as well as apes who were animal and yet so puzzlingly similar to humans. With the premise that humankind was God's favorite creation, uniquely chosen to receive the imprint of his image and the gift of eternal life, it was a vital struggle to determine how to integrate these newly encountered people and human-like animals into the early modern European cosmos. Hédelin's treatise clearly highlights the essential criteria upon which a designation of humanity depended, and how a conscious, sentient being could be excluded, and for these reasons his work bears particularly strongly upon discourses of racial and ethnic difference.

He is in the mainstream of seventeenth century thinkers who urgently engaged the question of the human, all drawing on nearly identical defining characteristics. The reader sees him working to bring a firmer, clearer order to bear on this question. Folk

Praetorius as a Witness to his Time (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2006); and Lorraine Daston and Katherine Park, *Wonders and the Order of Nature 1150 - 1750* (New York: Zone Books, 1998).

taxonomies based on a common-sense evaluation of difference and similarity could not cope with the alien human beings and eerily familiar animals newly encountered. Overtly declared and fleshed-out criteria were now required to accommodate the alarmingly unfamiliar and familiar. In the eighteenth century hard and fast definitions grew out of the work of seventeenth century scholars, and grew increasingly artificial and rigid.

The urgency of this struggle to carve away the nonhuman from the human intermingled with the wide ranging early modern discourse on monsters. Whether defining national character, God's favor for a particular Protestant sect or Roman Catholicism, norms of behavior or appearance, the monstrous reflected understandings of what was valued and what was rejected. If God wrote messages to his people on his creation, then monsters demanded interpretation, particularly if they were aberrant births. Hédelin's revulsion for both the monstrous, bestial means by which monster satyrs were created and for their hybrid nature, refusing to fit neatly into either the human or animal category, mirrors the anxieties of his era. The universal tendency in all cultures to regulate sexual practices appears in Hédelin's approach to monster satyrs. More particular to his era is his concern over hybridity itself. In terms of the nature of hybridity, Hédelin offers readers not only a seventeenth century view on the fertility of hybrids – a view that was not without debate – but also a perspective that only he can offer. Having read widely in Biblical and classical texts, the future abbé who would one day be tapped to bring order to the French stage, brings to this text a reflection of the pervasive angst of an age defined by disorder and foundation-shaking, even foundationshattering moments.

NOTES ON WORD CHOICE, SYNTAX, ETC.

As R. Po-Chia Hsia observes, "the language of monstrosity... is essentially unstable and slippery..." 10 So I have been deliberate in my choice of terms. To clarify for the reader the meaning of the first portion of the title, there are a variety of ways of presenting it that might assist the reader in understanding Hédlin's meaning:

- On Satyres: Brutes, Monsters, and Demons
- On Brute Satyrs, Monster Satyrs, and Demon Satyrs.
- On Satyrs, Which Are Animals, Monsters, and Demons11

The term *brut* conveyed in early modern French not only the meaning that it carries today - crude, violent, rough - but also served as a near synonym for animal, hence forms of the English "animal" and "bestial" are generally used for *brut*.

Where the term "human" or its forms appear in the translation, Hédelin has specifically used *humain* or one of its forms. Throughout I have chosen to translate *homme* as "man" rather than "human" for two reasons. First, Hédelin was writing in a world where male was the default, and so, for Hédelin, when using the term *homme*, even when it was intended to extend to all humankind, there is no reason to think that he would have been out of step with his contemporaries who thought of man as the default, hence *homme* could mean humankind whereas *femme* could only mean womankind. Second, when writing about satyrs and challenging their relationship to humans, he is writing

¹⁰ R. Po-Chia Hsia, "A Time for Monsters: Monstrous Births, Propaganda, and the German Reformation," in *Monstrous Bodies / Political Monstrosities in Early Modern Europe* ed. Laura Lunger Knoppers and Joan B. Landes (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004), 80.

¹¹ Amy Wygant argues that while there is a comma after *Satyres* on the title page of the 1627 edition *privilège*, the argument of the treatise itself is "that there are no satyrs as such, but only *satyres brutes* (apes), *satyres monstres*, and *satyres demons*." Wygant, "D'Aubignac, Demonologist, I: Monkeys and Monsters," 152, note 11.

specifically about male humans because satyrs were nearly always depicted as male. Masculinity and femininity mattered a great deal to him. Resisting the temptation to render Hédelin more palatable to modern readers by changing *homme* to human would distort Hédelin's intent. There is no reason to bring Hédelin into the twenty-first century by making his work gender neutral. 12 He was a seventeenth century figure, and the reader is best served by going back into his world to encounter him there.

Hédelin only occasionally personifies nature and rarely capitalizes the word, despite capitalizing numerous other nouns. It is unclear the degree to which he saw nature as personified, and so I have noted in the footnotes the few instances of seemingly intended personification. Where place names and names of classical figures are as yet unidentifiable from Hédelin's orthography, they were left in the original French and italicized with a note indicating that the term is unidentified. Punctuation remains as true to the original text. Changes have been relatively few and only to assist the twenty-first century reader. In the treatise and in all quoted text throughout the introduction, any words in italics are true to the quoted material.

¹² The contents of Part V of this Introduction would suggest that he would have gone out of his way to reject a gender neutral term.

INTRODUCTION: PART II

A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF FRANÇOIS HÉDELIN

Born in Paris on August 4th, 1604, into an esteemed family as one of twelve children, 13 François Hédelin would strive all his life to achieve the notoriety that he felt he deserved. Still famous today in some circles for his work of dramatic theory, which was commissioned by his patron Cardinal Richelieu to bring order to the then chaotic French stage, Hédelin came of age in a Europe on fire. 14 The Thirty Years War began its long, savage march through central Europe when Hédelin was thirteen years of age, and France joined the fight in 1635 when he was thirty-one. His was a world of religious and political instability, with the Thirty Years War, the English Civil War, the Fronde, and the Franco-Spanish War, all of which raged during his life time. It seems impossible that the decapitation of England's king in 1649 would have had no effect on Hédelin. It is understandable that in such a world, order, rank, and propriety meant a great deal to Hédelin. Perhaps the need for order was part of his personality; perhaps it was his training in his family and at school; and perhaps it was symptomatic of the chaos across Europe. In any event, order was what he brought, at the request of Cardinal Richlieu, to

¹³ Banderier, "Introduction," in Hédelin, *Des Satyres*, ed., Giles Banderier, 8.

¹⁴ Bernard J. Bourque, *All the Abbé's Women: Power and Misogyny in Seventeenth-Century France, through the Writings of Abbé d'Aubignac,* (Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto Verlag, 2015), 14.

the stage in France with his 1657 *La Pratique du theâtre*, which provided a much needed framework for French playwrights and actors.

Hédlin's other works include fiction which are the subject of Bernard Bourque's study of the abbé's views on women. Finding him to be misogynistic, Bourque obvserves that Hédelin lived through the rules of Marie de' Medici and Anne of Austria. Thus he sees Hédelin as navigating political needs as one might, with his sensibilities about women in power as not only somewhat mercurial but also or perhaps convenient, in that he wrote positively about women in power only when there were women in power. Bourque notes that the abbé's "novelist' decade" (the 1660's) provides insight into Hédlin's views on women, since, after all, every one of his fictional works centers on the private lives of women.15

He had considerable influence on the French stage, and in fact was sought out as the best man to give shape to the amorphous structure of many plays, to bring morality to the libertine lives of professionals associated with the stage, as well as to eliminate the crude and ill disciplined behavior of the audience and the common sort in the gallery. 16 He was welcome in the most fashionable intellectual salons of Paris. His sermons were sought out, and he was chosen to deliver eulogies at the funerals of the great, including that of a Princess of Condé. 17 His work on Homer was quite admirable, although it was ridiculed in its day, for he was well ahead of his time in asserting that Homer was not one

15 Bourque, All the Abbé's Women, 12.

¹⁶ Bourque, All the Abbé's Women, 19, 128.

¹⁷ Charlotte-Marguerite de Montmorency, as well as Josias de Rantzau, maréchal de France, Cardinal de Retz, among others. Bourque, *All the Abbé's Women*, 15; Charles Arnaud, *Les Théories dramatiques au XVIIe Siècle: Étude sur la vie et les ævres de l'abbé d'Aubignac*, (Paris: Alphonse Picard, 1888), 21.

author but four or as many as five, something that would not be accepted as a legitimate scholarly perspective until the nineteenth century. 18 He had many admirers in the intellectual spheres in which he ran, and he seems to have had friends as well. Indeed between his withdrawal from the world until his death, the society that he launched in competition with the *Academie Française*, 19 which would not have him, faithfully persisted. 20 Hédelin's *Académie des Belles Lettres* was a widely respected enterprise and brought true value to sophisticated Parisian culture.

And yet, he brought the brilliant, much admired edifice of his identity crashing down through the barbs he lobbed at his peers and even at the family of his most valued ally, his patron, Cardinal Richelieu. Much of Hédelin's success was due to Richelieu's favor. Arnaud theorizes that it was the young scholar and newly minted *avocat au Parlement's Des Satyres* that decided the question for the cardinal as to who would tutor his nephew.21 Hédelin, had already taken holy orders the year after *Des Satyres* was published, and his tutorial work proving up to standard and likely above standard, Richelieu promoted him in 1631 to Abbé d'Aubignac, with the security of its associated income.22 So trusted and valued did the man now known as D'Aubignac become that, "In 1637, at Richelieu's request, d'Aubignac accompanied the cardinal's niece, Marie-Madeline de Vignerot, duchesse d'Aiguillon, in her visit to Loudun's 'possessed' Ursuline

¹⁸ Arnaud, Les Théories dramatiques au XVIIe Siècle, 66; Bourque, All the Abbé's Women, 46, n. 81.

¹⁹ Banderier, "Introduction," in Hédelin, Des Satyres, ed., Giles Banderier, 18.

²⁰ Arnaud, Les Théories dramatiques au XVIIe Siècle, 44-48; This Académie des Belles Lettres, begun in 1654, never received royal protection. Bourque, All the Abbé's Women, 41-42.

²¹ Arnaud, Les Théories dramatiques au XVIIe Siècle, 15-16.

²² He also received the abbacy of Meimac in 1665. Bourque, All the Abbé's Women, 15, 19.

nuns."23 Arnaud calls this moment "the chief event of his life," marking his "entry....into Richelieu's house."24 The nephew whom Hédelin tutored would later be responsible for D'Aubignac's rise to the rank of *conseillier du roi*.25

As Arnaud argues, it was in the service of Richelieu, that Hédelin "developed the personality and vanity, the blooming of which had already been so favored by his early upbringing." 26 Described now by Arnaud as having joined that "irritable race of writers," his responses to people were spiky, arrogant, and petulant.27 Few of these friendships could withstand the open battle that D'Aubignac provoked and lost with Pierre Corneille, whom Hédelin had once admired and counted as a friend. In this miniature war of pens, Hédelin attacked Corneille, which was an unmerited act, and then rather than waiting for Corneille's response and responding only to it, he responded to Corneille's underlings who mocked D'Aubignac mercilessly. The fact that the *abbé* responded to inferiors in the rigidly stratified and ritualized seventeenth century French society reduced him

²³ Bourque, *All the Abbé's Women*, 13. It seems that demonic possessions of convents in part or in full was the possession form "du jour" in the seventeenth century. More than once, the possession of several nuns in one location would end in the execution of an unpopular priest whom the nuns accused of bewitching them. In the case of Loudun, the possession of eight nuns began with the possession of its mother superior, Jeanne des Anges. Possession could be (and was in this case) seen as a form of martyrdom. God's allowing a person to be possessed by one or more demons allowed them to suffer in holy torment, doing battle with demons as Christ had done in the wilderness. The nuns of Loudun blamed their possession on a local parish priest, Urbain Grandier, who was apparently devlishly attractive. Des Anges and others spoke of torments from impure thoughts and lust. Despite the intervention of clerical and secular leaders from around France and in Loudun, Grandier was burned in August of 1634. Sarah Ferber, *Demonic Possession and Exorcism in Early Modern France* (New York: Routledge, 2004), 71, 135-147.

^{24 &}quot;l'evenement capital de sa vie," which was his "entrée dans la maison de Richelieu." Arnaud, Les Théories dramatiques au XVIIe Siècle, 16.

²⁵ Arnaud, Les Théories dramatiques au XVIIe Siècle, 24.

^{26 &}quot;développèrent en lui la personnalité et la vanité dont sa première éducation avait déjà tant favorisé l'éclosion." Arnaud, Les Théories dramatiques au XVIIe Siècle, 16.

²⁷ Arnaud, Les Théories dramatiques au XVIIe Siècle, 39.

significantly in the eyes of his peers, superiors, and inferiors.28 But this was only one of many precipices that Hédelin erected for himself in order to throw himself down. Acting with an appalling lack of judgment combined with insecure arrogance, in 1640 he "publicly and in a pamphlet" insulted the taste of Richelieu's niece in regard to the play, *Roxane*, which both she and the cardinal enjoyed.29 He would never recover from this false step, because all that he had achieved was due to Richelieu's favor. Without it, he was never accepted into the *Academie Française*, where he could have made an admirable and useful stamp, and his own *Academie des Belles Lettres* was never approved by the king.30

Why on earth would he take such an ill advised course of action? This was not an isolated event, merely the most egregious. Hédelin had long been irascible and willing to insult where it was undeserved or at least where it was unwise. Bourque describes him as characterized by a "customary argumentative manner."31 One theory might be that Hédelin was under considerable pressure to make something of himself. Being the son of Catherine Paré, he was the grandson of Ambroise Paré, surgeon to two kings, and author of a variety of sought-after works. His father, Claude Hédelin, was a figure of some consequence himself, having served as *avocat au Parlement*, a station to which Hédelin

²⁸ Bourque, All the Abbé's Women, 179-185; Arnaud, Les Théories dramatiques au XVIIe Siècle, 55.

²⁹ Arnaud, Les Théories dramatiques au XVIIe Siècle, 39-40.

³⁰ Cardinal Richelieu founded the *Académie française* in 1635; Hédelin criticized *Roxane* in 1640 and in the same year sought admission to the *Académie française*; he founded his own academy in 1654. Bourque, *All the Abbé's Women*, 41. Banderier argues that Hédelin's characteristic ascerbity in general when describing something of which he disapproved may have been among the reasons why Hédelin was never admitted to the *Académie française*. Banderier, "Introduction," in Hédelin, *Des Satyres*, ed., Banderier, 13.

³¹ Bourque, All the Abbé's Women, 105.

would himself rise. The elder Hédelin, sieur de Chaffour, stemmed from an old, if dispossessed, noble line and also rose to lieutenant général de Nemours. At the same time, he was a respected writer as well as a translator of Ovid, and conseiller en la chambre du trésor.32 In other words, there was likely pressure, if not overtly impressed upon him, then imposed by his own inner drive, and he may have resented anyone who did not appreciate his talents quite as much as he thought they should. Or perhaps he thought he had the right to say what others knew better than to say, simply because of a perceived innate excellence.

Arnaud postulates that the arrogant and proudly self-educated Hédelin may have developed an inflated view of his intelligence because his father may have thought he was more intelligent than he actually was, and because as a pre-pubescent youth, he spent much time in the presence of the educated women of Nemours, where Hédelin grew up, with these women fawning over his precociousness.33 The Hédelin household was the center of society in Nemours, and this shaped Hédelin.34 Might it also have caused him to expect an entitled and unchallenged rise to greatness? Later in his analysis, Arnaud notes an artificiality in Hédelin's work and letters.35 This could reflect insecurity stemming from failing to meet his own expectations. If he was aware of this artificiality in his

³² Arnaud, Les Théories dramatiques au XVIIe Siècle, 10; Banderier, "Introduction," in Hédelin, Des Satyres, ed., Giles Banderier, 7.

³³ Arnaud, Les Théories dramatiques au XVIIe Siècle, 14-15, 27-28. See also Bourque, All the Abbé's Women, 37, 168; Banderier, "Introduction," in Hédelin, Des Satyres, ed., Giles Banderier, 8-9.

³⁴ Bourque, All the Abbé's Women, 37.

³⁵ Arnaud, Les Théories dramatiques au XVIIe Siècle, 39, 47.

projected identity, that might account for some of his focus on *vray-semblance* in *Des Satyres* and again in *La Pratique*.

By the time of his death on July 27th, 1675, Hédelin had achieved much, but in his need for the kind of respect and recognition that he thought he deserved, he drove his own fall from favor. His insecurity and belligerent arrogance undermined what could have been far greater influence than he achieved, and yet he did indeed achieve much in his lifetime. His theory of the stage is studied to this day. This early work of his that we are about to embark upon offers us insight into Hédelin's interests, his values, and his fears. It also invites us into the world of Hédelin, with its questions about what makes something human, questions made ever more urgent by the travels of Europeans to parts of the world that they had never before encountered, with disturbingly human-like creatures. The young scholar, theological, classical, and natural philosophical interests in hand, enters the fray.

INTRODUCTION: PART III

A HISTORIOGRAPHICAL INTRODUCTION

TO THE EARLY MODERN MONSTROUS

Why would someone set on making his mark in the world as a person worthy of rank, distinction, and learned company write a treatise on satyrs that took the existence of satyrs as a given and sought to prove that satyrs were not human? This dissertation argues that there were two reasons why Hédelin did this: First, that he wished to join the scholarly discourse on the boundaries of the human, into which, from our perspective nearly four hundred years later, Hédelin's treatise appears to fit rather neatly. Second, Hédelin wrote *Des satyres* to assert to those whom he wished to impress with his erudition, piety, and moral rigor what he was *not*.

The early modern period was one of crisis where longstanding traditions were turned on their heads, potentially offering insight into Hédelin's personality, or at least into his need for order. For example, the Reformations across Europe with their concomitant political and theological upheaval shook the foundations of the continent. This period of earthly uncertainty and fear coupled with theological confidence lent itself to interpretations of the Other as monstrous and to interpretations of monstrous births as signs of God's displeasure – generally with the other side. People were exploring what it meant to be human, and in the fields of natural philosophy and medicine, scholars were

beginning to explain monsters as something other than – perhaps in addition to – prodigies.

Several things were occurring in early modernity causing a heightened interest in the monstrous. Challenges to long held confessional certainties, the Italian Wars, the Thirty Years War, the French Wars of Religion, the English Civil War were among the catastrophic calamaties that caused people to seek explanations for the instability of the present and to seek clues about the future. The printing presses across Europe were churning out pamphlets and broadsides offering answers from prodigious portents such as ghostly armies in the sky, comets, and, of course, monstrous births. 36 As Europeans ventured further afield and did not encounter the expected monstrous races of Pliny's Natural History, these monstrous races migrated, if you will, in the minds of European thinkers, from their Plinian homelands of India and Africa to the Americas and Asia until eventually they were not found there either.37 There was also a continued defining of ethnic and "national" character, in which monsters proved to be a useful medium with which to declare those that did not fit to be outside the normative bounds. In the world of natural philosophy, we find a shift from monstrous races to classification of humans by race, and a further shift from climate to biology as the explanation for differences among the races.38 Concerns about what it meant to be human vexed the minds of those

³⁶ For more on the link between political and confessional instability on the one hand and prodigious (phenomena that are interpreted with the view that God writes on nature, sends messages to his people) events on the other, see Ottavia Niccoli, Prophecy and People in Renaissance Italy, tran. Lydia G. Cochrane (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990). Note that monsters close to home tend to be teratological in nature, although there are the monsters of folk lore as well living in hidden areas nearby, whereas the monstrous races lie further afield.

³⁷ John Block Friedman, The Monstrous Races in Medieval Art and Thought (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1981), 1.

³⁸ Peter Burke, "Frontiers of the Monstrous: Perceiving National Characters in Early Modern Europe," in

confronted by monstrous births, monstrous races, new cultures and hues of human beings, and more encounters with different species of primates. Satyrs, apes, orangoutangs, and chimpanzees played a significant role in defining the boundaries of human identity.39

This historiographical introduction will first examine the historiography of the semiotic utility of monsters. The area of greatest relevance to this study will be the utility of monsters in constructing identities as they constituted the Other against which cultures shaped themselves. Second, in exploring the historiography of monstrous races and what constituted a human being, a key theme running through this discourse will be that there was no straight, linear trajectory in the gradual, halting shift from an interpretation of

Monstrous Bodies / Political Monstrosities in Early Modern Europe, ed. Laura Lunger Knoppers and Joan B. Landes (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004), 25-39; Friedman, The Monstrous Races in Medieval Art and Thought, 4; Debra Higgs Strickland, "Monstrosity and Race in the Late Middle Ages," in The Ashgate Research Companion to Monsters and the Monstrous, ed. Asa Mittman with Peter J. Dendle (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2013), 365-386; Chet van Duzer, "Hic sunt dracones: The Geography and Cartography of Monsters," in The Ashgate Research Companion to Monsters and the Monstrous, ed. Asa Mittman with Peter J. Dendle (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2013), 387, 390-391; Andrew Curran, "Afterword: Anatomical Readings in the Early Modern Era," in Monstrous Bodies / Political Monstrosities in Early Modern Europe ed. Laura Lunger Knoppers and Joan B. Landes (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004), 227-245; See the whole of Andrew Curran's study on this topic, especially 1-6, Andrew S. Curran, The Anatomy of Blackness: Science & Slavery in an Age of Enlightenment (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013). For the shift from African to black to slave based on biological arguments, see Chapter 1, "'Some Could Suckle over Their Shoulder': Male Travelers, Female Bodies, and the Gendering of Racial Ideology," in Jennifer Morgan, Laboring Women: Reproduction and Gender in New World Slavery (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2004), 12-49.

³⁹ Friedman, *The Monstrous Races in Medieval Art and Thought*, 3; Richard Nash, *Wild Enlightenment: The Borders of Human Identity in the Eighteenth Century* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2003), 19; Nicolaes Tulp referred to the chimpanzee he dissected as an Indian Satyr, Homo Sylvestris, and Orang-outang. Nicolaes Tulp, *Observationes Medicae*, vol 1., 2nd ed. (Amsterdam: Ludovicum Elzevirium, 1652), 283-284; The term chimpanzee did not emerge in English until 1738 when it appeared in the magazine, *London Mag*, Sept 465. *Oxford English Dictionary Online.*, *s.v.* "Chimpanzee." (Oxford: Oxford University Press, December 2018).

http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.library.und.edu/view/Entry/31730?redirectedFrom=chimpanzee#eid (accessed 31 Jan 2019).

monsters as supernatural prodigies to later views of the aberrant as natural and instructive in understanding what is normal in nature.40

THE SEMIOTIC UTILITY OF MONSTERS

In the historiography, we find that monstrosity, animality, and humanity were entwined in disturbing ways that needed disentangling in order to rescue and define the human. With Foucauldian utility and Bakhtinian grotesqueness,41 monsters define normality in form and behavior, "polic[ing] the boundary between civilization and the wild".42 It was widely held that God communicated through nature and that such communication was best understood through Neoplatonic ways of knowing.43

E.H. Gombrich and Jean Céard are among the many scholars who explain that early modern Europeans believed that God wrote on nature, and that if one possessed the skill, one could determine what the divine had to say to you or, more likely, to mankind as a whole.44 This skill, however, was not always assured even for the most confident of

⁴⁰ This will prepare us to move on to Introduction Part IV: Beyond the Edges of Humanity: *Des Satyres* as Pre-Primate Primatology, which situates Hédelin's treatise in the historical context of the discourse on what distinguished the human from the non-human.

⁴¹ Monsters define the limits of normality in both physical form and behavior. Michel Foucault argues that the defining of normal is never neutral but always informed by political power. Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison,* 2nd ed. (New York: Vintage Books, 1995), 135-194.; For example, Joan Landes puts these theories into practice as she observes images from the French Revolution of both the *sans coulottes* and the aristocracy engaging in anthropophagi. These propagandistic depictions ask the question: Can one be cannibal and human? Their Bakhtinian grotesqueness of form answers the question: No. This is monstrous. Joan B. Landes, "Revolutionary Anatomies," in *Monstrous Bodies / Political Monstrosities in Early Modern Europe* ed. Laura Lunger Knoppers and Joan B. Landes (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004), 158-161. The Spanish at the height of their power were called inhuman for metaphorically or perhaps literally being blood suckers. Burke, "Frontiers of the Monstrous: Perceiving National Characters in Early Modern Europe," 36.

⁴² Nash, Wild Enlightenment, 29.

⁴³ See E.H. Gombrich, *Gombrich on the Renaissance*, vol. 2, 3rd ed. (London: Phaedon Press Limited, 1993) and 1977.

⁴⁴ See Jean Céard, *La nature et les prodiges: L'insolite au XVIe siècle*, 2nd ed. (Geneva: Librarie Droz S.A., 1996).

divines. Many scholars, including Martin Luther, who believed that God could be found everywhere in nature, were reluctant to attempt to interpret these messages for two key reasons as described by Peter Soergel. First, it would be very easy to get such a message wrong, and Scripture was a much more reliable and direct source of communication. Second, how could one be certain that it was God sending the message and not the Devil to throw God's faithful into error?45 This would be one of Hédelin's chief concerns with Saint Jerome's account of the satyr whom Saint Anthony encountered in the wilderness.46

These were not the only scholars to view the Book of Nature this way, and yet there would emerge in the religious strife of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries great certainty in the interpretation of signs and wonders as specific messages from the Divine. Even so, the ease with which one could be wrong and the growing disgust from seventeenth- and eighteenth-century natural philosophers for what they increasingly viewed as the credulity and gawping wonder of plebeian intellect, conspired to discourage people from interpreting these signs and wonders. 47 This tendency marks a shift away from neoplatonic ways of viewing the world toward something more familiar to moderns. This was not a smooth process, and as Lorraine Daston and Katherine Park,

⁴⁵ Peter Soergel, Miracles and the Protestant Imagination: The Evangelical Wonder Book in Reformation Germany (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 33-36. See also Daston and Park, Wonders and the Order of Nature, 162. R. Po-Chia Hsia observes that Catholics were less willing than Protestants to stamp a monstrosity as a sign for fear of contributing to apostasy through perpetuating potentially incorrect interpretations. Hsia, "A Time for Monsters: Monstrous Births, Propaganda, and the German Reformation," 84.

⁴⁶ See [61-63], [137-187] of the treatise.

⁴⁷ Daston and Park, Wonders and the Order of Nature, 318-9, 330-361.

as well as Gerhild Scholz Williams have demonstrated, scholars often held in their minds a wide array of seemingly contradictory interpretations of the world around them.

In Hédelin's chaotic Europe, the practical function of monsters in making sense of the world is quite clear. For example, in the English Civil War, which occurred during Hédelin's lifetime, when political goals were quite often religious in source, aim, and expression. Whether monsters appeared in the form of monstrous births, or were imagined for the sake of propaganda, such as Cromwell defeating the Whore of Babylon who was often depicted as a dragon with human head and breasts, or Cromwell as the Whore of Babylon, they allowed confessional opponents to associate their enemies with sin, the devil, and God's outrage.48 David Cressy examines the numerous reports of headless infants born during the English Civil War and Cromwell's rule.49 Accounts proliferated on both sides, signifying blasphemous defiance of those who declared a preference for a baby born "without a head than a Roundhead". 50 On the other side, pamphlets told of those who would refuse infant baptism and interpreted anencephalitic infants as signs of God's displeasure at an England that would behead its true head, the king. Such births were also attributed to women who refused to submit to the head of her

⁴⁸ Laura Lunger Knoppers, "The Antichrist, The Babilon, The Great Dragon': Oliver Cromwell, Andrew Marvell, and the Apocalyptic Monstrous," in Monstrous Bodies / Political Monstrosities in Early Modern Europe ed. Laura Lunger Knoppers and Joan B. Landes (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004), 102-121.

⁴⁹ David Cressy, "Lamentable, Strange, and Wonderful: Headless Monsters in the English Revolution," in Monstrous Bodies / Political Monstrosities in Early Modern Europe ed. Laura Lunger Knoppers and Joan B. Landes (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004), 43.

⁵⁰ Cressy, "Lamentable, Strange, and Wonderful," 40-63.

household, her husband.51 In any event, monsters were useful in defining opponents as outside God's will and as unnatural.

The printing press, as Stephen Greenblatt argues enabled the spread of visual representations of what people should and should not be, what society did and did not value. 52 This is not to say that publications featuring monsters were necessarily prescriptive by design, but the effect may have been prescriptive.53 In other words, a depiction of Oliver Cromwell, for example, standing over the Whore of Babylon intentionally conveys a message of Cromwell bringing order and triumphing over faction and error, which are inscribed on two of the tentacles spilling out from under her skirts.54 However, while the monstrous whore disgusts the viewer with her reptilian lower appendages, she is anything but unattractive from the waist up. The image of Cromwell, with his foot between the breasts of this uncomfortably provocative and prostrate body may have carried a message – perhaps intentionally, perhaps unintentionally – to viewers that decadence, potentially conveyed by her necklace, and beauty are to be treated with caution. That is to say, women should avoid vanity, which was a common theme in sermons and advice books, and men should steer clear of temptation for its dangerous potential. Commonly accepted signs embedded in an image with a goal of conveying one

⁵¹ For more on these births, most likely anencephalitic neonates, see below under From Signs to Tools of Science. Cressy, "Lamentable, Strange, and Wonderful," 40-63.

⁵² Stephen Greenblatt, "Introduction to *Marvelous Possessions*," in *Wonders, Marvels, and Monsters in Early Modern Culture*, ed. Peter G. Platt (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1999), 109.

⁵³ Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, ed., *Monster Theory: Reading Culture* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 6-16.

⁵⁴ Charles Turner, Lord Protector (Trampling on the Whore of Babylon and protecting the peace of Britain), Date Unknown, National Galleries Scotland https://www.nationalgalleries.org/art-and-artists/27121/oliver-cromwell-1599-1658-lord-protector-trampling-whore-babylon-and-protecting-peace-britain

message would potentially have also conveyed other messages that reinforced norms against proscribed behavior.

Such publications also set the prototype for the style of what would become cheap prints on monsters and marvels, which proliferated in times of conflict, such as the English Civil War. Christopher Hill argues that for twenty years from roughly 1640 – 1660, England had almost no censorship because of the chaos of war followed by a rather ineffective Parliamentary rule. This allowed for the explosion of ideas written by people of nearly all classes, and reports of monsters together with other anomalies easily attributed to God abounded virtually unchecked.55 Similarly, a profusion of publications had occurred in the sixteenth century throughout Europe,56 though on a more limited scale in Catholic lands after the Council of Trent's restrictions on profane and indecorous visual images.57

Numerous scholars such as Gerhild Scholz Williams and Jerome Friedman link the expansion of printed materials with the rising interest in monsters in the early modern era.58 Monsters were suddenly available for cultural consumption and construction on a scale that had never before been possible. Being tailor made, so to speak, for the press, monsters were scintillating and virtually demanded illustration. So accounts and

⁵⁵ Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution* (London: Penguin Books, 1972), 17.

⁵⁶ This has been well established by many scholars. See, for example: Elizabeth Eisenstein's *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe*, 2nd ed. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005) and R.W. Scribner's *For the Sake of Simple Folk: Popular Propaganda for the German Reformation* (New York: Oxford University Press), 1-13.

⁵⁷ See above: page 2, note 7 for the relevant section of the Council of Trent.

⁵⁸ See, for example, Scholz-Williams, Ways of Knowing in Early Modern Germany and Jerome Friedman, The Battle of the Frogs and Fairford's Flies: Miracles and the Pup Press During the English Revolution (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993).

accompanying images spread quickly. But this only enabled the circulation of accounts of monsters. The accessibility to a profusion of accounts may or may not have been the primary cause of interest. Most scholars see the primary cause as the enormous upheaval of early modernity - the toppling of traditional hierarchies, the radical changes in the calendar as a result of the removal of feast days, the stripping of churches of everything associated with idolatry, the killing of a king, the regency of powerful women in France, the reigns of women in England and in Scotland, the extreme violence of the religious wars across Europe, the discovery of the New World, and the list could go on.59

Monsters were very useful in contextualizing chaos, uncertainty, and breaches of boundaries. For example, Hsia argues, "the high water mark of interest in prodigies in Italy between 1494 and 1530 coincided with the crises of the French invasion and the Valois-Habsburg struggles." 60 In the German and English Reformations, Hsia, David Cressy, and Laura Lunger Knoppers see monsters as useful to opposing sides. 61 As mentioned above, the Whore of Babylon might be the Roman Church, or it might be Oliver Cromwell. 62 Likewise, in the case of the Monk Calf, a calf born with a flap of skin that resembled a monk's cowl, the same monster was used by opponents to convey opposing messages. 63 Luther claimed that this prodigy was a sign of God's outrage at

⁵⁹ For an excellent study of the impact of these women on François Hédelin, see Bourque, *All the Abbé's Women*.

⁶⁰ Hsia, "A Time for Monsters: Monstrous Births, Propaganda, and the German Reformation," 71.

⁶¹ Hsia, "A Time for Monsters: Monstrous Births, Propaganda, and the German Reformation," 80-83; Cressy, "Lamentable, Strange, and Wonderful," 40-63; Knoppers, "The Antichrist, The Babilon, The Great Dragon'," 102-121.

⁶² Knoppers, "The Antichrist, The Babilon, The Great Dragon'," 102-121.

⁶³ Hsia, "A Time for Monsters: Monstrous Births, Propaganda, and the German Reformation," 80-83. This calf is reported as both being found in its mother's womb upon her butchering and having been born. Niccoli, *Prophecy and People in Renaissance Italy*, 127.

monasticism while Catholics claimed it as a sign of God's outrage at Luther.64 Hsia sees in these dueling responses Catholic repugnance and Lutheran fear. In other words, Catholics were disgusted by what Lutherans were doing while Lutherans took a more apocalyptic view.65

Monsters comforted people in a strange way, argues Jerome Friedman.66 People value continuity and fear change. When monstrous events occur and someone satisfactorily explains them, they assure people that justice prevails, that God is active in the world and will punish wrong doing. Likewise, prodigious signs from God in Nature affirming that the reader or hearer was on the right track – by demonstrating that their opponents were not – were reassuring. Monstrosity and the ability to read God's messages in nature provided security in an incomprehensibly tumultuous and radical period.

Diane Purkiss notes a proliferation of tracts, and a belief during the English Civil War that there were more witches, prodigious meteorological events, and monstrous births than in times past. These signs confirmed for people that God was no more happy with what was going on than they were. For example, the King's standard falling in the mud could be seen as God foretelling defeat, or in retrospect as God's sign of disfavor when the King's army lost a battle.67 Purkiss cites an instance of monstrous behavior in a

⁶⁴ This calf was seen by some as an admonishment for the decadence of Catholic clerics and by others as symbolizing Luther, a heretical monk. Scribner, *For the Sake of Simple Folk*, 127-128.

⁶⁵ Hsia draws on "the three emotions that Daston and Park suggest were provoked by monsters," those being pleasure, fear, and repugnance. Hsia sees only fear and repugnance during the German Reformation. Hsia, "A Time for Monsters: Monstrous Births, Propaganda, and the German Reformation," 71.

⁶⁶ Friedman, The Battle of the Frogs and Fairfield's Flies, 12-13, 42-43, 239-253.

⁶⁷ Diane Purkiss, The English Civil War: A People's History (New York: Harper Perennial, 2007), 140.

publication mocking William Laud. Called *Canterbury's Change of Diet*, this work asserted that the archbishop could not be satisfied without eating the tippets of ears of men like William Prynn who had written plays and tracts mocking the archbishop.68 This depiction of monstrous behavior prefigured those that would follow with portrayals of Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette consuming the blood of their people at table or Napoleon eating the young men of France.

FROM SIGNS TO TOOLS OF SCIENCE

Jean Céard argues that over the course of the sixteenth century, monsters transitioned from prodigies imprinted with a message from God to uninterpreted, though not necessarily neutral, phenomena. Hédelin's grandfather, Ambroise Paré typifies this shift. While God is mentioned as a cause of monstrous astronomical events, it is primarily excess or lack in nature that is the cause of abnormal births. It seems likely that Paré had some influence on Hédelin's view of the natural world in that Hédelin offers two natural explanations – apes and hybrids – for what precisely satyrs are.

68 Purkiss, *The English Civil War*, 99. The term "monstrous" applied in English primarily to form until ca. 1500, meaning a form that seemed to be against nature. The term's meaning meant something that was a sign in the 1568 Bishop's Bible. "There are monstrous persons." The relevant portion of the same passage in the New International Version reads: "...you and your associates seated before you, who are men sybolic of things to come..." Zechariah, 3: 8. By 1578, behavior loathed or feared in the community is described as monstrous, such as a woman loving a bull or person rejecting the extistence of God. *Oxford English Dictionary*, Online Edition., s.v. "monstrous."

https://www-oed-com.ezproxy.library.und.edu/view/Entry/121759?redirectedFrom=monstrous#eid (accessed 31 Jan 2019)

The behavior of Laud's clerical followers was described as monstrous elsewhere. Cressy observes that in the 1640s, "More than simply an abomination of tissue, monstrosity pointed to social pathology and religious failing, a disturbance of the natural order. The word provided another weapon with which to beat opponents. 'Sure ye be monsters,' claimed enemies of the Laudian bishops, who vilified the prelates as 'ravenous harpies' or monsters 'metamorphosed into ravenous wolves.' The bishops were judged guilty of a 'monstrous design' against the Church." Cressy, 47.

As other scholars have argued, this transition was informed in part by a caution born of the awareness that demons were adept at deceiving the faithful with false signs and wonders.69 Ottavia Niccoli sees the Counter-Reformation as the driver of this shift as it happened in Italy quite abruptly around 1550. While Europe was largely united theologically, there was some "unity of prophetic knowledge...and divinitory science." 70 Such unity vanished as Protestants and Catholics began using the same monsters with opposing interpretations to attack each other. Further, as Counter-Reformers suppressed Reformation teaching, they also derided the prophetic act of interpretation as female and plebian. Thus, an aberrant birth that would in 1510 have stirred whole regions into pious introspection and concern over impending judgement in the form of flooding or famine, by 1550 was merely curious phenomenon. A monster now pointed to parental sin, so its meaning was not meant for everyone, and it was merely a curiosity.71

Zakiya Hanafi sees a similar transformation, though stemming from different causes. She sees monsters as "partak[ing] of divinity," in that the monstrous was often seen as a portent, a message from God for his people.72 For Hanafi, it was both the mechanistic Cartesian view of the human body and the growing number of moving machines that caused the desacralization of monsters. She argues that "machinelike and monstrous are synonymous" in the period between 1550 and 1750.73 This is because what

69 Jean Céard, *La Nature et Les Prodiges*, 31. This is a common understanding among historians. See, for example, Daston and Park, *Wonders and the Order of Nature*, 162, 361; Soergel, *Miracles and the Protestant Imagination*, 33-36.

⁷⁰ Niccoli, Prophecy and People in Renaissance Italy, xvi, 189-190.

⁷¹ Niccoli, Prophecy and People in Renaissance Italy, xvi, 190.

⁷² Zakiya Hanafi, The Monster in the Machine (Durham, NC: Duke, 2000), x.

⁷³ Hanafi, The Monster in the Machine, x.

makes a machine monstrous is that it is both inanimate and self-propelled. It has no soul to inform its matter, and yet it moves. This was monstrous.74 And if humans are essentially machines, then the human too becomes monstrous. Further, and moving into today, because we define ourselves by the monstrous in that the monster tells us what we are not, then as our world becomes more technological and as "we model our self-image on computer metaphors, so our monsters become more computeristic."75 In other words, as the self-propelled machines in human lives transform, so too do our monsters.

In much scholarship from before the twenty-first century, monsters move along a trajectory in the shift from supernatural to natural. For example, this is Céard's interpretation.76 Likewise, Katherine Park and Lorraine Daston in 1981 were among those scholars arguing that a more scientific and secular view of monsters, such as that of Ambroise Paré who sought always to find natural explanations for the unusual, developed gradually.77 Similarly, in response to monstrous births, both Montaigne and Sebastian Brant responded without fear. For example, Sebastian Brant saw a two-headed infant with one body as a sign that the leaders at a diet would come away unified in purpose.78 Montaigne avoids interpretation altogether and avoids moralizing difference and aberration in the manner of Pierre Boaistuau and most of his contemporaries. Rather

74 Hanafi, The Monster in the Machine, 54.

⁷⁵ Hanafi, The Monster in the Machine, 218.

⁷⁶ Céard, La Nature et Les Prodiges, 60-83.

⁷⁷ Katherine Park and Lorraine J. Daston, "Unnatural Conceptions: The Study of Monsters in Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century France and England," *Past & Present*, no. 92 (August 1981), 23-25, 40, 50-54.

⁷⁸ Hsia, "A Time for Monsters: Monstrous Births, Propaganda, and the German Reformation," 67-70.

Montaigne looks for similarities between the normal and the monstrous and does so with compassion and empathy for their shared humanity.79

Park and Daston argue that in early modernity, monsters were a fashionable topic of discussion, but such superficial approaches fueled annoyance in the *Academie des Sciences* and *Royal Society of London for Improving Natural Knowledge*.80 The likes of Frances Bacon (1521 – 1626) and Robert Boyle (1627 – 1691) found themselves perturbed that fairly well educated people were not talking about these monsters in any way that mattered. For the scholars of the *Academie des sciences* it was a matter of collecting and studying aberrations in order to understand normality.81 Wonder was beside the point. For these scholars, wonder got in the way of getting down to the hard work of learning how better to read nature, not for prodigious signs but to understand the workings of nature.

Given how it appears obvious today that a clear path to modern epistemological approaches existed, it is easy to see how most twentieth century scholars viewed this transformation in ways of knowing as a straightline trajectory with wonder at the beginning and science at the end. In 1991 Lorraine Daston published "Marvelous Facts and Miraculous Evidence" which defined this trajectorial view rather nicely. Through both an unwillingness on the part of the religious to interpret a prodigy and to be proven wrong through subsequent events, and the growing scorn with which natural philosophers

79 Timothy Hampton, "Signs of Monstrosity: The Rhetoric of Description and the Limits of Allegory in Rabelais and Montaigne," in *Monstrous Bodies / Political Monstrosities in Early Modern Europe* ed. Laura Lunger Knoppers and Joan B. Landes (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004), 179-199.

⁸⁰ Park and Daston, "Unnatural Conceptions," 39-40.

⁸¹ Park and Daston, "Unnatural Conceptions," 52-53.

met stunned wonder, increasingly seen as plebian, prodigies came to be reported without interpretation.82 Miracles became prototypes of things to persuade, as one would today use evidence.83 Similarly Paula Findlen finds a transformation in the role of Nature as a queen ordained by God to an instrument of God whose personification ends and reification begins.84 So Nature herself as personified takes part in this discourse. Nature jokes, playing tricks in such ways as placing miniature cities inside rocks to surprise people. Nature interacts with people of her own will, not exclusively as an instrument of the Almighty.85 Findlen argues that Robert Boyle is where the joke ends. With him, Nature is no longer funny because she no longer has autonomy.86

In 1998, Daston and Park published *Wonders and the Order of Nature* in which they reevaluate their earlier view and argue that there is no neat linear progression but rather a gradual and halting but growing prevalence of one set of ideas about nature over others. There is overlap; there are individuals holding supernatural, preternatural, and natural ideas in their minds at the same time.87 Hédelin fits well with this more nuanced view. In him, we see a willingness to engage with monstrosity as a communication from God. Even if he dismisses the possibility of satyrs as potential messengers of God, he

⁸² Lorraine Daston, "Marvelous Facts and Miraculous Evidence," *Critical Inquiry* 18, no. 1 (1991): 93-124. www.jstor.org/stable/1343717; Park and Daston, "Unnatural Conceptions," 24, 53-54.

⁸³ Daston, "Marvelous Facts and Miraculous Evidence in Early Modern Europe," 77.

⁸⁴ Paula Findlen, "Jokes of Nature and Jokes of Knowledge: The Playfulness of Scientific Discourse in Early Modern Europe, *Renaissance Quarterly* 43, no. 2 (Summer, 1990): 292-331.

⁸⁵ Findlen, "Jokes of Nature and Jokes of Knowledge," 296-300.

⁸⁶ Findlen, "Jokes of Nature and Jokes of Knowledge," 325.

⁸⁷ See 121-122 of Daston and Park's *Wonders and the Order of Nature* for an overview of Aquinas' "three types of physical occurrences." Daston and Park, *Wonders and the Order of Nature*, 121-122, 176.

does not rule out the possibility of praeter- or supernatural creatures communicating God's messages.88 Hédelin likewise accepts the existence of human-animal hybrids, which are monstrous but entirely natural or rather preternatural. He, like his grandfather Paré, rejects the idea that demons were capable of generating any life form, and yet holds firm to the idea of a very active demonic presence in the world.89 There are in all of these early modern thinkers kernels of medieval and modern thinking and most of them carry both side by side.90 Similarly, Gerhild Scholz Williams examines the phenomenon of super-, preter-, and natural notions coexisting in Johannes Praetorius' (1537 - 1616) thinking. In Praetorius, there is no tension, only delight. Praetorius can enjoy the natural, preternatural and supernatural at once in the same publication.91 While this may seem like a form of cognitive dissonance to us, the entertaining of old and new theories at the same time enhanced and expanded what Scholz Williams calls ways of knowing. Further, there was often no choice because the immeasurable profusion of written and spoken ideas in this period, "encouraged, even demanded, the simultaneous beholding and understanding of dissimilar explanatory models."92

We see the influence of Daston and Park in the preface to Laura Lunger Knoppers and Joan B. Landes' edited collection. This collection centers on the uneven movement

88 See treatise, Books III and IV.

⁸⁹ See treatise, Books III and IV.

⁹⁰ Daston and Park, *Wonders and the Order of Nature*, 176. For an excellent exploration of the need to avoid separating "the political, polemical, and juridical" power and influence in the shift from religious to scientific categorization / discourses of the monstrous, see Laura Lunger Knoppers and Joan B. Landes, "Introduction," in *Monstrous Bodies / Political Monstrosities in Early Modern Europe* ed. Laura Lunger Knoppers and Joan B. Landes (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004), 8-11.

⁹¹ Scholz-Williams, Ways of Knowing in Early Modern Germany, 7-14.

⁹² Scholz-Williams, Ways of Knowing in Early Modern Germany, 8.

toward a scientific understanding of the unusual, exemplified by the fact that a century after Bacon had encouraged a more scientific view of monsters in 1627, monsters are still appearing in tracts.93 The essays in *Monstrous Bodies/Political Monstrosities in Early Modern Europe* all demonstrate the varying degrees to which early modern writers of accounts of the monstrous straddled the line betwen scientific and theological or political interpretations. Many early modern authors appeared to strive for objectivity even as they slip, betraying the challenge of recording an account without any interpretation.94 Even the choice of whether or not to include the interpretations of others in an objective account was also an act of interpretation. The essays in this collection all explore "the shift from omen and fable to comparative anatomy and embryology, [wherein] the monster came to be tamed, analyzed, dissected, and ordered."95

This same discomfort with interpretation, this desire not to appear credulous, recurs throughout the eighteenth century. Dennis Todd's study of Mary Toft, an eighteenth-century English woman who claimed to give birth to rabbits, analyzes the varied responses of individuals in the general public, at the royal court, and among physicians. Todd's early moderns are ill at ease with such ambiguity. There is, as with Knoppers and Landes's eighteenth century accounts, a tension in the minds of those who cannot believe what they are seeing, who are certain that it is a hoax, and yet are drawn in to investigate it as a miracle.96

93 Knoppers and Landes, "Introduction," 1-6.

⁹⁴ Knoppers and Landes, "Introduction," 8.

⁹⁵ Knoppers and Landes, "Introduction," 7.

⁹⁶ Dennis Todd, *Imagining Monsters: Miscreations of the Self in Eighteenth-Century England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 1-2.

Monsters were popular because they usefully contextualized events of the day in light of God's will. They were also useful because they were compelling, and they carried the news because people bought tracts with monsters in them. Monsters fascinated.

Indeed they were useful because they posed numerous puzzles about what it meant to be human and how the divine interacted with the world. Daston and Park assert that cultural constructs "are as real as bricks." 97 And yet these bricks crumble in the presence of the monstrous. In other words, monsters challenged cultural notions such as that the meaning of "male" and "female" are fixed. They alarmed with the potential that a five-legged calf, for instance, could be born and could survive. What did such a living creature say about the fixity of species, which was the idea that species have not changed in any way since Creation? If species were not fixed, then what did that mean for the Great Chain of Being. 98 Introduction Part IV addresses this question more particularly about hybrids, monstrous races, and primates. We will briefly explore this question in terms of aberrant births here.

Referred to today as teratological births, monstrous births or misbirths were neonates of any species born lacking or possessing too many normative properties, such as limbs, parts of the head, or possessing aberrant attributes like having an attached sibling. The presence of an immortal soul or a soul of any kind was the chief conundrum. R. Po-Chia Hsia observes that German secular and religious authorities often viewed teratological births as "occupying a liminal space between human and inhuman.99"

⁹⁷ Daston and Park, Wonders and the Order of Nature, 11.

⁹⁸ For more on the Great Chain of Being, see Introduction, Part III, pages 36-37 in this Disssertation.

⁹⁹ Curran, "Afterword," 231.

Martin Luther saw such children as animal rather than human. 100 But not all theologians consigned misshapen human infants to a non-human state. Cardinal Achille Grassi in 1514 baptised the Monster of Bologna. 101 The question generally came down to the presence of a soul, the evidence of which was usually accepted as the presence of rational thought as evidenced by rational speech. 102 Katherine Park and Lorraine Daston observe that experts of both civil and canon law debated whether or not hermaphrodites could marry "and whether both heads of Siamese twins" should be baptized, both sacraments requiring an immortal soul and thus fully human status. 103

Even those who doubted the existence of monsters did not hesitate to use them to rhetorical effect. This appears to have been the case with François Rabelais (ca. 1483 – 1494 to 1553). Rabelais as a moderate humanist Catholic undermined the existence of monsters by undermining the authority of monster accounts when his narrator who had hitherto seemed quite credible started rattling off ancient villains all the way back to the snake in Eden who were, in Rabelais' account, a ridiculous monstrous race called the

100 When consulted about the necessity or obligation to baptize monstrous infants, Luther responded that they were a *massa carnis*, lumps of flesh. Martin Luther, *D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe, Tischreden*, vol. 1 (1912; repr. Weimar, Germany: Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger, 2000), no. 323; Martin Luther, *D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe, Tischreden*, vol. 5, (1913; repr. Weimar, Germany: Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger, 2000), no. 5207. Luther was not alone in such views. See also Locke on the imprecision of the boundaries of the human in footnote 217 under how

Hédelin on reproduction.

¹⁰¹ Niccoli, Prophecy and People in Renaissance Italy, 53.

¹⁰² This uncertainty continued well beyond our period of study. Zakiya Hanafi observes that as late as 1826, teratological human births were not always considered human. Hanafi, *The Monster in the Machine*, 1. For more, see Introduction Part IV: Beyond the Edges of Humanity.

¹⁰³ Park and Daston, "Unnatural Conceptions," 22.

Sausages. 104 Timothy Hampton asserts that Rabelais' absurd accounts of the Sausages mocked those who believe in them, even as he uses monsters to make a point. 105

Among creatures that resemble humans, how does one determine who is human and who is not? Monsters are about defining the limits of what is normal, what is acceptable in both physical form and behavior. Michel Foucault argues that the defining of normal is never neutral. 106 It is always informed by political power. This fits with Jeffrey Jerome Cohen's view that monsters are born at the crossroads of culture where differences and anxiety are most visible. In early modernity, scholars were puzzling about what it meant to be human. Questions and anxieties about human nature centered on behavior and form. 107 John Block Friedman and Asa Simon Mittman argue that we can read back from monsters what the cultures that created them valued. 108 In other words, by examining what a culture portrayed with contempt and revulsion, we can make a fairly clear sketch of what the creators of the monster valued – as a negative of the monster, its inverse if you will. By parsing the "inchoate fears of losing human status" as expressed in visual and verbal illustrations of the monstrous, we can cut away feared behavior and

104 Hampton, "Signs of Monstrosity, 188-190, 193-196.

¹⁰⁵ Hampton, "Signs of Monstrosity, 184-196.

¹⁰⁶ Foucault, Discipline and Punish, 135-194.

¹⁰⁷ See Introduction: V in this dissertation.

¹⁰⁸ John Block Friedman, "Foreword," in *The Ashgate Research Companion to Monsters and the Monstrous*, ed. Asa Mittman with Peter J. Dendle (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2013), xxv-xxxix; Asa Mittman, "Introduction: The Impact of Monsters and Monster Studies," in *The Ashgate Research Companion to Monsters and the Monstrous*, ed. Asa Mittman with Peter J. Dendle (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2013), 1-14.

physical traits, leaving a desired norm that includes at least and, in many cases, only members of the community that has created the monster or defined the monstrous. 109

For example, anthropophagous cultures new to Europeans alarmed travelers, colonizers, missionaries, and imperialist conquerors. So disturbing, so monstrous and extra-normal, so outside the bounds of the acceptable, was cannibalism that pamphleteers used it to dehumanize enemies, as noted above in the example of William Laud. Ottavia Niccoli likewise demonstrates how the Monsters of Ravenna, Bologna, and Rome among others reflected the fear and chaos of Charles VIII's (1470 - 1498) and Charles V's (1500 - 1558) invasions. These monsters may have had a human misbirth as the germ of the fully grown rumors, propaganda, and salacious images that grew from them. However, by the time these monsters became images printed on broadsheets and in books, their bodies were made of signs intentionally rooted in propaganda designed to bring the public around to the desired agenda. 110 For example, the Monster of Ravenna's missing arms were signs of a lack of charity on the part of church leaders, and its scaly leg reminiscent of predatory bird indicated the grasping clerical corruption. 111

Returning to the headless infants of the English Civil War, a time when the head of state literally lost his head, we can read that the metaphorical head was perceived as both threatened and vitally important. For example, in the 1642 case of Mary Wilmore of

109 Friedman, "Foreword," xxv; Mittman, "Introduction: The Impact of Monsters and Monster Studies," 9-14.

Popes, and their arch enemy Luther, among other leaders directed or redirected interpretation of monstrous births in order to further their respective causes. Niccoli refers to monsters as "a polemical weapon." (121) Niccoli, *Prophecy and People in Renaissance Italy*, 37, 59-60, 121-122.

¹¹¹ Niccoli, *Prophecy and People in Renaissance Italy*, 46, 35-51. Examples abound, particularly when intending to depict a foe as monstrous, cannibalism served as a sign of greed, indifference, and inhuman monstrosity.

Northamptonshire, who gave birth, according to a pamphlet, to "a childe without a head," the mother was Baptist and thus would have rejected the idea of baptism for her infant well before it was born. 112 In 1646, a Mrs. Houghton of Lanscshire bore an infant. The published account describes the child as having, "the face of it upon the breast, and without a head (after the mother had wished rather to bear a Childe without a head than a Roundhead) and had curst the Parliament."113 Both of these women were seen as defying their God-appointed male heads of house by being outspoken, and defying their religious and secular heads with what was seen as heresy.114 Arguments that it is possible to read back from monsters what cultures valued and rejected rest on the foundation laid by Cohen who asserts that monsters offer a new "modus legendi, a way of reading cultures."115 It is in locating the differences and anxieties, which we find at the aforementioned cultural crossroads, that we can determine what the monsters' creators feared and rejected, and also much of what they craved.116

In William Burns' work on John Bulwer (1606 - 1656), we have a concrete illustration of these principles. For Bulwer, the monstrosity of Charles I (1600 - 1649) and of England as a whole is based on both physicality and behavior. 117 Bulwer wrote against what he had heard and read of fashions around the world. He was keenly

```
112 Cressy, 41-42.
```

113 Cressy, 41, 43.

114 Cressy, "Lamentable, Strange, and Wonderful," 40-63.

115 Cohen, Monster Theory, 3.

116 Cohen, Monster Theory, 4, 16-20.

117 William Burns, "The King's Two Monstrous Bodies: John Bulwer and the English Revolution," in *Wonders, Marvels, and Monsters in Early Modern Culture*, ed. Peter G. Platt (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1999), 187-199.

interested in the fashions in Europe, everything from shaving one's beard to wearing corsets, cosmetics, or *Pluderhosen*, which he saw as distorting the body and thereby an act of treason against Nature, who was a monarch ordained by God, just like the English king.118 Charles I also had a penchant for dressing in what Bulwer sees as unnatural and therefore monstrous ways, but he certainly did not merit beheading.119 This was a monstrous act of treason against the secular king ordained by God and against Nature.120

In summary, from the medieval to the early modern world, we see an enormous transition from monsters as supernatural signs from a God who writes messages to his people on the Book of Nature, to monsters as preternatural judgements on the aberrant and sinful behavior of their parents, to monsters as natural deviations from the norm that

118 John Bulwer, Anthropometamorphosis, Man Transform'd, Or the Artificial Changeling Historicall Presented, in the Mad and Cruell Gallantry, Foolish Bravery, Ridiculous Beauty, Filthy Fineness, and Loathsome Loveliness of Most Nations, Fashioning and Altering the Bodies From the Mould Intended by Nature (London: William Hunt, 1653), 193-216, 253-273, 327-344, 425-432, 529-559.

119 In Anthropometamorphosis, Bulwer only uses the word "monstrous" once, and that is to describe a people who shape their children's heads into squares by means of boards. However he exhibits such disdain for the English penchant for artificially reshaping their bodies by means of clothing that he devotes an entire appendix to the topic. See "An Appendix Exhibiting the Pedigree of the English Gallant" in Bulwer, Anthropometamorphosis, 529-559. Following is part of his introductory address in which he argues that the current fashions of sugarloaf hats, pluderhosen, corsets, codpieces, and bare shoulders are unnatural, frivolous, and share a pedigree with, for example, "those square headed Gallants of India." 531. He continues, "Freely to deliver my opinion of this vanity of Apparell, I conceive it to be the same itch, and the same spirit of Contradiction and Phantasticalnesse working in the Children of vanity, and the same abuse put upon Nature; only à tergo, being a kind of back-biting mockery, proceeding from mans petulant wit and invention. Neither do I thinke it difficult, out of the preceding Treatise to produce a pedigree of our English Gallants; The Design being the same in both, to wit, to labour to ground a perswasion in others that they are so shaped by Nature, as they would appeare; although their affected shapes makes them seeme far from that they really are. And I think it were not impossible to prove, that there was never any conceit so extravagant, that ever forced the Rules of Nature; or Fashion so mad, which fell into the imaginations of any of these indited Nations, that may not meet with some publike Fashion of Apparell among us, and seeme to be grounded upon the same pretended reason. Hence spring those Fashions that are in Credit among us; and what is out of Fashion is out of the compasse of reason, as we (God knows how for the most part unreasonable) judge. And verily one might wonder at such distance of time and place there should be a sympathy, similitude, correspondency and jumpings of so many wild and popular opinions in this matter of Extravagancy, which no way seeme to hold with our naturall discourse; and therefore the worser vices, because they shock our naturall knowledge, and give such a blow to the ordinary sottishnesse of our judgement." Bulwer, Anthropometamorphosis, 530-531.

120 Burns, "The King's Two Monstrous Bodies," 187-199.

can clarify what precisely is the norm. Always useful, they transform from useful as signs from a God who loves, warns, and punishes his people to clues about standard forms in nature. Individuals in this period commonly drew more than one of these interpretations at the same time. In other words, there was a shift from reading the book of nature as a kind of hard allegory in which people could confidently make declarative statements on the meaning of a sign, to a softer and allegery where people offered one of many potential meanings that God would allow for the sign, and finally to an experience of the wondrous as needing no more interpretation than that God was creative and abundantly powerful. This transition generally corresponds to the shift from medieval theologies to the natural theology of the seventeenth century. In the midst of this process, puzzling out the meaning, purpose, or utility of monsters was not confined to teratology but expanded to whole species.

MONSTROUS RACES

Geographically most often outside Europe, monstrous races were humanoid but aberrant in a manner peculiar to each specific race. For instance, cynocephali had human bodies with canine heads, barked to communicate, and generally wore clothing of some kind even if only animal skins. 121 By the middle ages, they were also known to breathe fire. 122 Similarly, satyrs had human torsoes, arms, and heads, but goat bodies and usually small horns on their heads. Amy Wygant discusses the great lengths to which D'Aubignac went to determine what in fact satyrs are. Ultimately for D'Aubignac, they

121 Pliny the Elder, *The Natural History of Pliny*, translated by John Bostock and H.T. Riley, vol. 2 (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1855), 130.

122 Friedman, The Monstrous Races in Medieval Art and Thought, 15.

38

were not human, like other monstrous races which John Block Friedman explores in *The Monstrous Races in Medieval Art and Thought*. Friedman's Plinian cosmographical and ethnographical approach discusses the ways that medieval views of monstrous races affected European views of human races encountered in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. For the most part, Europeans found "new" peoples lacking, and this continues to inform Western views of non-Europeans to this day.₁₂₃

Foundational to all discourse on monstrosity and all defining limits on humanity was the Great Chain of Being, which Arthur Lovejoy laid out in the 1933 William James lectures on Philosophy and Psychology at Harvard University. It is worth taking a moment to explain the great chain for a clearer understanding of why monstrous races and newly encountered species vexed Hédelin. Lovejoy is interested in the Great Chain of Being for its power in Western thought, its longevity, and its transformation over time. For the purposes of our study of Hédelin's *Des satyrs*, this Great Chain of Being was a cultural premise that informed thinking about humanity and therefore about monstrosity. This premise had several key points. First, God is good, and goodness is not the goodness which one today generally equates with kindness, but a generative goodness, meaning abundance. God as the Creator is perfect and so abundant, so overflowing, that He can and indeed must, by His very nature, produce every possible thing. This explains the presence of evil in a world controlled by an omnipotent God, for if a creation, even an

123

¹²³ See the epilogue to John Block Friedman, *The Monstrous Races in Medieval Art and Thought*, 197-207; In the epilogue just noted, Friedman observes that in the 16th and 17th centuries, the monstrous races were condensed into one figure, the Wild Man, as unfamiliar non-Europeans did not meet the expectations of, for example, one-footed Sciapods or the Apple Smellers who nourished their bodies solely through smelling fruit. See also Roger Bartra's study, which examines how European views of the Wild Man contributed to a discourse of inferiority centering on newly encontered humans in early modernity. Roger Bartra, *Wild Men in the Looking Glass: The Mythic Origins of European Otherness*, tran. Carl T. Berrisford (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994).

evil creation, is possible, God must produce it. Evil was a necessary part of goodness, for without it, how would we know pleasure or joy.

Further, this good, generative god has created a chain of being from the angels down to the lowliest form. This chain is not neutral. Where a creature stands on the chain is a rank; above is superior and below is inferior, and man was created just a little lower than the angels. In this chain of being, there can be no gaps, for otherwise God would not be perfectly good. Since he can and by his nature must create every possible thing, gaps would indicate a missing possibility, which is impossible for a god who must and does create every possible thing. The necessity to create every possible thing also explains the presence of monsters.

There is continuity from created thing to created thing but each is separate and distinct. This supports the idea of the fixity of species – that species are the same today as at their creation in Genesis. Continuity with distinction explains similarity in form or behavior between two different species. For example, it was not terribly uncomfortable to see elephants as next in line after angels and man since elephants were so different in form, and their behavior in living in communities and caring for their young was so close to human. 124 Difference in form rendered the gulf between humans and elephants safely unbridgeable. It would have been much more disconcerting to notice the similarities in behavior between non-human primates and humans since they so closely resembled human form. There was no question as to whether elephants might be a kind of human that had degenerated, but that was a distinct possibility with non-human primates. There

124 Nash, Wild Enlightenment, 27.

were significant concerns about what exactly non-human primates were in relation to humanity. 125 Might they in fact be human?

This is not to say that all scholars were in lock step with every aspect of this framework of thought. It was, however, a premise, something so taken for granted that it was as common to intellectual thought as was the idea that there were powerful unseen forces at work all around. For example, as Dennis Todd has argued, even the most skeptical saw the human imagination as a powerful unseen force in that imagination was believed to shape a fetus in its mother's womb, which served to explain many monstrous births.126

Roger Bartra's work on the European wildman analyzed people wrestling with whether wildmen were a separate species or feral humans.127 Bartra argues that Europeans created the wildman in his many varieties including satyrs, sylphs, centaurs, etc., as a necessary foil against which to build their own civilized identities.128 Further, because Europeans expected to encounter wildmen and Pliny's monstrous races, Europeans often perceieved them when encountering hitherto unknown people in Sub-

125 Arthur Lovejoy's explanation is distilled down to three key premises:

^{*}plenitude: God must create all things possible because he is good.

^{*}continuity: There are no gaps in the chain of being.

^{*}gradation: Each creation is as close as possible to the creations above and below it without actually being either of them, and retaining its own difference. See Arthur O. Lovejoy, *The Great Chain of Being: A Study of the History of an Idea* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1964).

¹²⁶ Todd, *Imagining Monsters*, 45-63, 106-139.

¹²⁷ Bartra, *Wild Men in the Looking Glass*, 149-170. For a study on the transition from the Wildman as a threat to the Wildman as a family man – traced to Dürer – see Lynn Frier Kaufmann, *The Noble Savage: Satyrs and Satyr Families in Renaissance Art* (Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Research Press, 1984).

¹²⁸ Bartra, Wild Men in the Looking Glass, 8.

Saharan Africa and the New World. 129 Enlightenment era taxonomy would come to classify species in various gradations of human and primate. Such classifications drew on both behavior that was unfamiliar and seen as bestial, and on form or appearance that were different from supposedly normative European bodies. 130

As Cohen argues, monsters defy boundaries even as they police them, demarcating the acceptable from the unacceptable, the controlled and civilized from the excessive and savage. 131 This is abundantly clear in questions of humanity. Zakiya Hanafi sees the monstrous as a useful defining tool, "erect[ing] the limits of the human at both its 'lower' and 'upper' threholds: half-animal or half-god, what is other is monstrous." 132 This applies to everything oppositional to human identity, from foreign cultures to deformed humans to human-animal hybrids, which were monstrous not only in form but in the wanton disregard for prohibitions against bestiality. The monstrous of all these varieties was useful because it assisted people in affirming their own humanity. Hanafi declares, "I know I am human because I am not *that*." 133

129 Columbus's admiral reported to him that he had heard reports of "men with one eye, and others with dogs' noses who were cannibals, and that when they captured an enemy they beheaded him and drank his blood." Christopher Columbus, *The Journal of Christopher Columbus (During His First Voyage, 1492-93) and Documents Relating the Voyages of John Cabot and Gaspar Corte Real*, ed. Clements Robert Markham (London: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 68; Bartra observes that Columbus expected to find monstrous races, but Columbus ultimately recognized that he had not in fact encountered them. Bartra, *Wild Men in the Looking Glass*, 162.

¹³⁰ For more on the historiography of pre-primate primatology, see Introduction Part IV. For a medieval example, see Giraldus Cambrensis' description of the Irish. In it, the English were the norm set against the aberrant Irish, whose monstrosity merited and even required conquest. Cohen, *Monster Theory*, 11.

¹³¹ Cohen, *Monster Theory*, 6-12-16; Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, *Of Giants: Sex, Monsters, and the Middle Ages* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), xiii-xv, 142-183.

¹³² Hanafi, The Monster in the Machine, 2.

¹³³ Hanafi, The Monster in the Machine, 2.

Richard Nash argues that in the Enlightenment, key markers of humanity were living socially and the ability to communicate with spoken language. He presents a variety of ways of knowing in the seventeenth - nineteenth centuries that in no way mark out a clear or inevitable trajectory. 134 Nash argues that "the discourse of pre-primate primatology was a discourse of monstrosity, monsters, and alterity."135 Nash introduces the term pre-primate primatology, noting that it was not until Carolus Linnaeus' (1707 -1778) tenth edition of Systema Naturae in 1758 that the term 'primate' was established as a taxonomic category. He expands on this to note that orangutans and pygmies and satyrs likely all described the same non-human primates, and frequently, these were probably chimpanzees.136

As stated in the opening of this Historiography, this dissertation argues that Hédelin had two purposes in writing *Des Satyrs*: to enter the scholarly fray in the discourse on the boundaries of the human, and to make very plain what he rejected and what he himself was not. In Part IV, we shall occupy ourselves with the question of where Hédelin's treatise would have fit in the discourse on humanity occurring in early modernity. Part V of the Introduction to this translation argues that by examining the contempt with which Hédelin viewed satyrs, it is possible to sketch what he valued most highly, or at least what he wished to be seen as valuing most highly.

¹³⁴ Nash too followed the path of Daston and Park. Nash, Wild Enlightenment, 135. Interestingly this view of a halting and non-linear path that was anything but inevitable appears in Sarah Ferber's discussion of early modern acceptance and skepticism of exorcism and witchcraft. Ferber, Demonic Possession and Exorcism, 148-150.

¹³⁵ Nash, Wild Enlightenment, 19.

¹³⁶ Nash, Wild Enlightenment, 15-41.

In preparation for this exploration, this historiography has established that historians find that monsters had semiotic value. Among their many uses was their value in establishing the identities of the cultures that created them and of the people within those cultures. This will serve as a premise for Part V. This historiography has also established that within the discourse on what it is to be and not to be human, historians no longer see an inevitable and straight trajectory from the interpretation of monstrosity and monstrous races as supernatural prodigies to scientific interpretations of aberration as natural. This will serve as a premise for Part IV, to which we now proceed.

INTRODUCTION: PART IV

BEYOND THE EDGES OF HUMANITY:

DES SATYRES AS PRE-PRIMATE PRIMATOLOGY

"The Monster Is the Harbinger of Category Crisis." 137 Evidence from early modernity abounds to support this third thesis of Jeffrey Jerome Cohen's *Monster Theory*. This was an era of European encounters with people across the world, encounters made with expectations of the cynocephali, sciapods, and blemmyae of Pliny's *Natural History*. 138 While there were some accounts of these monstrous races, for the most part, travelers described meeting people strikingly different from Europeans in dress, belief, appearance, culture, and language. In finding traits particularly alien to European norms, the question arose: Are these people fully human? By its nature, this question contained within it another: What is not human? At the same time that Europeans were coming upon human beings with unfamiliar traits, they were also encountering anthropoid animals with bodies that were disturbingly familiar in their humanoid form and often

¹³⁷ Cohen, Monster Theory, 6.

¹³⁸ Pliny places the satyr in his book on man but calls the satyr an animal. He discusses satyrs between monocli / sciapods and struthopodes also in India. "Among the mountainous districts of the eastern parts of India, in what is called the country of the Cahardcludi, we find the Satyr, an animal of extraordinary swiftness. These go sometimes on four feet, and sometimes walk erect; they have also the features of a human being On account of their swiftness, these creatures are never to be caught, except when they are either aged or sickly. Tauron gives the name of Choromandæ to a nation which dwell in the woods and have no proper voice. These people screech in a frightful manner; their bodies are covered with hair, their eyes are of a sea-green colour, and their teeth like those of the dog." Pliny the Elder, *The Natural History of Pliny*, 131. For an overview of medieval monstrous species, see Karl Steel, "Centaurs, Satyrs, and Cynocephali: Scholarly Teratology and the Question of the Human," in *The Ashgate Reserach Companion to Monsters and the Monstrous, ed. Asa Simon Mittman with Peter J. Dendle* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2013), 257-274.

humanesque behavior. Many wondered: Could these creatures be human? And if not, what precisely separates the human from the non-human?

This discourse on the defining qualities of humanity was not so much a discourse of inclusion as exclusion. Travelers' narratives, popular exhibitions of non-human primates and of perfectly human non-Europeans, works of fiction, and scholarly works parsing the human question abounded in the early modern era. This introduction will focus on scholarly works. Syntheses of pre-modern and early modern studies of apes find that, with some outliers such as Paracelsus, Monboddo, and Rousseau, the discourse on the traits that limit the boundaries of human definition was generally a paring away of the undesirable and dividing the animal or ethnic Other from the human. 139 The author of our treatise, François Hédelin, is no outlier; he fits neatly into this discourse, his treatise setting out from the very title to exclude satyrs from Adam's descendants.

There is no category crisis for François Hédelin, except insofar as some are willing to categorize satyrs as a species of human. If there is a crisis for Hédelin beyond the polygenesists themselves, it is what Justin Smith discusses in his examination of the anxieties sparked by the erosion of certainty in the fixity of species. 140 Smith examines

139 See for example, C.D. O'Malley and H.W. Magoun, "Early Concepts of the Anthropomorpha," *Physis: Rivista di storia della scienza*, 4 (1962): 39-63. O'Malley and Magoun argue that scholars were constantly intrigued by and looking for similarities between anthropoids and humans whereas Janson argues that scholars were alarmed by the similarities. The underpinning of O'Malley and Magoun's argument is that the reason it is intriguing that there are similarities is because anthropoids are animals. See also H.W. Janson, *Apes and Ape Lore in the Middle Ages the Renaissance* (London: The Warburg Institute, 1952)

especially his chapter entitled "The Coming of the Anthropoids."

^{140 &}quot;Speculatively, it may be suggested that cross-species reproduction is so offensive to our sense of what is right and decent, and monsters have such a power to disrupt social order, precisely because such phenomena would threaten to obliterate those boundaries between species that have evidently given all human cultures a sense of stability and regularity in the world around them." Justin Smith, "Degeneration and Hybridism in the Early Modern Species Debate: Towards the Philosophical Roots of the Creation-Evolution Controversy," in *Monsters and Philosophy* edited by Charles T. Wolf (London: College Publications, 2005), 116.

the concerns around the ability of humans and apes to interbreed, a view that was increasingly common as it became apparent that some apes and humans were very close in kind indeed. 141 The non-humanity of the satyr was far from a settled question. Edward Topsell's (1572 - 1625) paraphrase translation of Conrad Gesner's (1516 - 1565) *Historia Animalium* is uneasy with Gesner's skepticism that there was a human species of satyr. Arguing with Gesner in his translation, Topsell asserts that, "it is likely that there are Men also like Satyres inhabiting in some desert places," offering two examples. 142 First, he describes the satyr who conversed with Saint Anthony and, second, he notes that in the time of Constantine, there was "such a man" who was "seen alive," displayed as "a publick spectacle to all the Word," and preserved in salt for the emperor. 143

In Book I of his treatise, Hédelin responds to the Paracelsian cosmos which contains five species of rational "men," only one of which is descended from Adam. 144 (See below for Paracelsus' theory of how nymphs can become fully human.) He also rejects the view of Pico della Mirandola that there were two kinds of men: satyrs, who were not descended from Adam, and humans. Likewise, Vadian's view that satyrs are "truly men" is wrong. 145 Reaching back to classical sources, Hédelin rejects Xenophon's view, as described by Hédelin, that there were people inside the sun and moon, as well as

¹⁴¹ Justin Smith, "Degeneration and Hybridism in the Early Modern Species Debate: Towards the Philosophical Roots of the Creation-Evolution Controversy," in *Monsters and Philosophy* edited by Charles T. Wolf (London: College Publications, 2005), 126-127.

¹⁴² Edward Topsell, Historie of Four-Footed Beastes (London: 1607), 12.

¹⁴³ Edward Topsell, *Historie of Four-Footed Beastes* (London: 1607), 12. See Book IV of the treatise where Hédelin discusses Saint Anthony's satyr encounter at length.

144 See [4] of the treatise.

¹⁴⁵ See [5] of the treatise.

that of Diodorus and Pliny whom he reads to have considered satyrs men. Hédelin takes even the venerated Saint Jerome to task for calling satyrs men and not overtly refuting the idea that they were neither Adamic nor non-Adamic men. Incidentally, Edward Tyson also attributes the confusion about the human status of satyrs to the ancients using the term "man" to describe them. (See below.) Hédelin sees it as his duty to "defend nonetheless the dignity of man," from association with such creatures, regardless of the authority of "so many great figures whose writings will be read for eternity." 146

Hédelin's categories are firmly bounded and invite no overlap, no ambiguity. The animal is animal; the monstrous is monstrous; the demonic is demonic; and the human is human. 147 Hédelin has laid out his defining characteristics for each of these categories. Some readers may find his line of argument a little less than clear and perhaps weak where he sets up unnecessary straw men to knock them down. However, much of his reasoning makes sense given the epistemological tools available to a budding scholar in the early decades of the seventeenth century.

True to his form throughout his life, Hédelin endeavors to convey his own resolute confidence in the unassailability of his line of thinking, which is that in the great chain of being, humanity sits just below the angels. 148 God fashioned Adam and his descendants alone in his image. Hédelin argues that this right and obligation to bear the image of the Creator is proof of God's favor. There is no one like man in God's creation,

146 See [6], [4-7] of the treatise.

¹⁴⁷ It may be worth noting that in Book V of *Des Satyres*, the line between ape satyrs and demon satyrs is not quite as clear as Hédelin believes that he is making it.

¹⁴⁸ This concept in Western thought, is briefly summarized in Introduction Part III. For a thorough explanation, see the foundational study, Lovejoy, *The Great Chain of Being*.

no creature so highly esteemed by the Almighty as His Adamic man, which is the only species of men in Hédelin's view. There is therefore no room for any other creation between the angels and man; nor is there any room within the human category for any creatures other than Adam's descendants. That some would dare to put forth such theories is not only ridiculous to Hédelin but blasphemous. That anyone would take seriously the idea of any species of man other than those descended from Adam, or that satyrs might in fact be among those descended from Adam, offends the future *abbé's* sensibilities. 149 And so it is as a champion of mankind and of God that Hédelin urgently addresses this question in one of his earliest works. 150

Wanton in their displays of masculine excess in all its threatening potential, satyrs repulsed the pious, orderly young scholar. Without appearing to doubt their existence, Hédelin asks: What are satyrs? In asking this question, Hédelin drew on the same characteristics that many of his contemporaries used to define what was human. This chapter will argue that, as mentioned above, the discourse seeking to define what is and what is not human was a discourse of exclusion, and that François Hédelin's treatise ran with the main current in this wider conversation in its stated objective to exclude satyrs from Adam's descendants.

149 That the New World was peopled by non-Adamic hominins offered an explanation for Europeans for customs that they found too far from the European idea of normal to be human. Van Duzer, "*Hic sunt dracones*," 423-424.

¹⁵⁰ Long thought to be his first published work, Banderier points out that *Des Satyres* was his second. His first published work was the six page *Explication d'un tableau énigmatique proposé en la ville de Nemours*, published in 1625. These *tableaux* were games of wit, puzzles, so to speak, for the *beau monde*. Banderier, "Introduction," in Hédelin, *Des Satyres*, ed., Giles Banderier, 9-10. Arnaud calls *Des Satyres* his first work. Arnaud, *Les Théories dramatiques au XVIIe Siècle*, 58; Wygant, "D'Aubignac, Demonologist, II: St Anthony and the Satyr," 72; Bourque, *All the Abbé's Women*, 38.

¹⁵¹ The next chapter, Introduction Part V, focuses primarily on satyrs as demons. This chapter will focus on satyrs as brutes (or beasts) and monsters. The term *brut* often meant beast, specifically quadrupeds. Primarily it meant a creature lacking reason, often paired with beast, as in *une beste brute*. See

HISTORIOGRAPHY OF DES SATYRES

Scholars of dramatic theory have generally been silent on Hédelin's first work. Likewise scholars of natural philosophy and medicine have kept any observations they may have made to themselves. 152 Little has been written about this work either in the early modern period or since. 153 While Hédelin's biographer, Charles Arnaud, notes that this treatise may have been responsible for the young scholar's selection as tutor to the nephew of Cardinal Richelieu, that may have been the extent of the work's utility. 154 Amy Wygant asserts that "It is safe to say that d'Aubignac's satyr treatise has been very little read." 155 It is peculiar that *Des Satyres* seems to have gone so thoroughly unnoticed. Embarrassed silence for a work that may have been seen as unworthy of attention does not seem to make much sense either. Hédelin's combative approach to anyone with whom he disagreed attracted enemies, so surely if this treatise had been seen as poor scholarship, someone would have lampooned him with it. But this did not happen. Since

Dictionnairees d'autrefois (Chicago: ARTFL Project, the University of Chicago, 2001) http://portail.atilf.fr/cgi-

bin/dico1look.pl?strippedhw=brut&dicoid=ACAD1694&headword=&dicoid=ACAD1694

The word does not appear in Randle Cotgrave's A French and English Dictionary.

¹⁵² Janson argues that it was anatomists and physicians, not natural philosophers who made the early strides in establishing the foundation of primatology. Janson, *Apes and Ape Lore in the Middle Ages the Renaissance*, 335.

¹⁵³ Richard Nash coined this term. Nash, Wild Enlightenment, 19.

¹⁵⁴ See [73] of the treatise. Hédelin emphasizes modesty and restraint in the opening lines of Book III on monster satyrs, which is a lascivious topic, given the necessity of addressing bestiality. His careful approach may have persuaded Richelieu that entrusting his nephew's mind to Hédelin was a safe choice.

¹⁵⁵ Wygant, "D'Aubignac, Demonologist, I: Monkeys and Monsters," 152. She says the same in Amy Wygant, *Medea, Magic, and Modernity in France: Stages and Histories*, 1553–1797 (New York: Routledge, 2007), 115.

speculation is of little use, this historiography will set aside the reason for the silence, and focus on what has been said of this work.

The scholar to devote the most attention to *Des Satyres* is Amy Wygant who wrote a two-part series of articles on this work, tellingly titled "D'Aubignac, Demonologist, I: Monkeys and Monsters" and "D'Aubignac, Demonologist, II: St Anthony and the Satyr." It is demonology that receives the bulk of Wygant's focus, and indeed the bulk of Hédelin's focus. 156 The first of Wygant's articles argued that *Des Satyres* is worthy of study because it shows continuity from one of Hédelin's first works to his last. That continuity is his need "to bring the non-standard into the sphere of the monstrous" which he does with both the natural order and the stage. 157 In the world of the stage, when an actor overacts, "to appeal to the vulgar" he is "ape-like" in his clumsy imitation. 158 His performance is not plausible; it is not *vray-semblable*. We see the beginnings of this interest in vray-semblance in Des Satyres as well. 159 It is implausible to Hédelin that God would allow an ape to talk even though loquacious animals, such as the snake in the Garden of Eden or Balaam's Ass, occasionally appear in the Scriptures. 160 It is implausible that there could be a species of hybrids because hybrids such as the mule, for example, are infertile. 161 Thus true hybrid half-goat / half-man creatures can only be

¹⁵⁶ Part V of the Introduction to this dissertation explores the demonological in Hédelin's treatise.

¹⁵⁷ Wygant, "D'Aubignac, Demonologist, I: Monkeys and Monsters," 154, 151-171.

¹⁵⁸ Wygant, "D'Aubignac, Demonologist, I: Monkeys and Monsters," 157.

¹⁵⁹ Amy Wygant argues that for Hédelin, the monster "is not specifically nature and its order and laws. Rather, the monster is outside of the notion which is just as overwhelmingly constructed as that of 'nature', and which will be absolutely central to d'Aubignac's later theorisation of the theater: the monster is 'hors de vray-semblance' (p. 77)." Wygant, "D'Aubignac, Demonologist, I: Monkeys and Monsters," 159.

¹⁶⁰ Genesis 3:1-6, Numbers 22:28-35.

¹⁶¹ Infertility in hybrids was not a certainty. See page 60 of this dissertation.

monsters, the product of bestiality. They are each a one-off, if you will; there can be no species of sterile hybrids. Likewise a play that attempts to "mix together two things which should not be mixed, an epic subject and tragic form" is an example of "the monstrous stage." 162 In both his early and later work, Wygant argues, Hédelin seeks to bring order to disorder and to exclude the unnatural as monstrous, for it is "that which must be ejected." 163

In his *Monsters and their Meanings: Mighty Magic*, Wes Williams analyzes what he calls, Hédelin's "strange thought expriment about the difference between satyrs and humans." 164 Williams provides a thorough overview of the work, paying particular attention to metaphors, such as for example, the book-as-child metaphor which Hédelin uses in the dedication where he pleads for the protection of his work as a vulnerable child. 165 Williams also observes that while Hédelin's purpose in writing the work is to demonstrate that while satyrs can not be human, they are not without their uses. They do serve "very well ... as symbols of drunkenness and lascivity." 166 This is partly why the very suggestion that satyrs could be human threatens human dignity and merit Hédelin's attention. 167 Williams concludes (as does this disseration) that exclusion is an essential feature of defining the human - exclusion being, in Aristotelian category theory, neessary

¹⁶² Wygant, "D'Aubignac, Demonologist, I: Monkeys and Monsters," 161.

¹⁶³ Wygant, "D'Aubignac, Demonologist, II: St Anthony and the Satyr," 72, 71-85.

¹⁶⁴ Wes Williams, *Monsters and their Meanings in Early Modern Culture: Mighty Magic* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 238.

¹⁶⁵ Williams, Monsters and their Meanings in Early Modern Culture, 289-240.

¹⁶⁶ Williams, Monsters and their Meanings in Early Modern Culture, 241.

¹⁶⁷ Williams, Monsters and their Meanings in Early Modern Culture, 241.

to defining any category. Hédelin's case "rests on the logics of distinction, separation, and exclusivity." 168 This is particularly pronounced in *Des Satyres*' examination of the rational soul, which is exclusively human, for "Christ did not die to save satyrs." 169 Williams argues that Hédelin is writing against those who believe that there may have been humans before Adam and against others, such as Paracelsus, who spoke of different kinds of men, who were not necessarily all human, but whose purported existence ran counter to Hédelin's order in which only Adam and his descendants were human. Further, it is not only absurd to think that there have been a variety of strains of humanity, but it is blasphemous. 170

Stuart Clark includes Hédelin's *Des Satyrs* in his study of early modern demonology. Specifically he notes that Hédelin's Book IV, which treats demon satyrs, insisted on the unity of the Bacchanal and the witches sabbat which Hédelin believed was occurring in Europe during his lifetime. They were "one rite....presided over by the same figure, 'Bacchus' being really a devil, in the same form, the form of the goat." 171 Similarly Ernest Martin's interest lies in the book on demon satyrs. Martin's *Histoire des monstres depuis l'antiquité jusqu'à nos jours* devotes a paragraph to Hédelin's work on satyrs, observing chiefly "the problem of incubi's ability to procreate." 172 Martin observes

¹⁶⁸ Williams, Monsters and their Meanings in Early Modern Culture, 242.

¹⁶⁹ Williams, Monsters and their Meanings in Early Modern Culture, 246.

¹⁷⁰ Williams, Monsters and their Meanings in Early Modern Culture, 241-243.

¹⁷¹ Stuart Clark, *Thinking with Demons: The Idea of Witchcraft in Early Modern Europe* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 23.

^{172 &}quot;le problème de l'aptitude génératrice des incubes." Ernest Martin, Histoire des monstres depuis l'antiquité jusqu'a nos jours (Paris: C. Reinwald et Cie, Libraires - Éditeurs, 1880), 59. (accessed 10 January 2019)

 $https://books.google.com/books?id = c8oZAAAAYAAJ\&dq = ernest + martin + histoire\&hl = fr\&source = gbs_navlinks_s$

Hédelin's aversion to goats in general as filthy beasts used by the devil to carry out his wishes, and describes Hédelin's view on the incubus' ability to produce offspring as "obscure," leaving it to the reader to decide. 173 Karl Steel's interest, which boils down to a single sentence, lies in Hédelin's characterization of two satyrs, one as an ape, and the other as demon. 174 Beyond this, two French works mention this treatise in a footnote: a 1982 thesis on reason among early modern French writers and a 1987 work on imaginary beings. 175

Hédelin's biographer, Charles Arnaud, devotes three pages to *Des satyres*, with a tone of seemingly playful derision. Arnaud respects Hédelin's positive impact on the French theater and sees him as having loyal and devoted followers in the intellectual and social milieu of Paris at the height of his career and even after his fall. 176 However Arnaud suffers from no adoration of his subject, seeing him as petulant and both unnecessarily and self-destructively quarrelsome. He sees this tendency already in *Des Satyres* as Hédelin: "For want of other adversaries, he will argue against Pico della Mirandola and he will argue in the tone and form of the bad lawyers of the era." 177

¹⁷³ Martin, Histoire des monstres depuis l'antiquité jusqu'a nos jours, 59.

¹⁷⁴ For the first satyr, see Book II of the treatise. For the second see Book IV, which addresses Saint Anthony and the Satyr. Steel, "Centaurs, Satyrs, and Cynocephali," 265.

¹⁷⁵ According to Banderier, the 1987 work is Jorge Luis Borges, *Livre des êtres imaginaires* (Paris: Gallimard, 1987). No page number is mentioned. I was able to obtain this work, however I was unable to find any mention of Hédelin. Banderier names the thesis, which is unavailable in the United States, so according to Banderier, it is: Robert Martinot, "De l'usage de la rison chez les écrivains français entre Montaigne et Descartes" (Lille University, 1982), 354. Banderier, "Introduction," in Hédelin, *Des Satyres*, ed., Giles Banderier, 21-22.

¹⁷⁶ Arnaud, Les Théories dramatiques au XVIIe Siècle, 44-48.

^{177 &}quot;À défaut d'autres adversaires, il plaidera contre Pic de la Mirandole et il plaidera sur le ton et dans la forme des mauvais avocats du temps." Arnaud, Les Théories dramatiques au XVIIe Siècle, 59.

Arnaud provides a summary of Hédelin's argument and its subarguments in each of the treatise's five books. Curiously he is careful to avoid the use of the term *démon* even when discussing Book IV.178 One wonders why Hédelin's biographer shies away from this term when he gives the appearance of such objectivity in his exposition of Hédelin's life and work. Arnaud concludes by saying that this is little more than the project of a schoolboy endeavoring to prove his erudition.179

Giles Banderier, the editor of the modern edition of *Des Satyres*, states that the book "drew attention to him," and yet he does not explain how, and later he describes the book as "very rarely read". 180 Perhaps he is drawing on Arnaud's speculation that the treatise may have been partially or even largely responsible for Richlieu's appointing Hédelin to tutor his nephew even as he acknowledges the work's obscurity. Banderier observes that the work appears on the surface to reflect the "disenchantment of the world," as Hédelin draws on reason to explain the satyrs of antiquity as apes and as the monstrous offspring of beasts or demons. 181 However, this is the point at which resemblance to the coming Age of Reason ceases, for the treatise abandons rationalism and enters the world of demons. 182 I would argue that the very contradictions between the foray into what we would see as primatology and the retreat back into spiritual

¹⁷⁸ Arnaud, Les Théories dramatiques au XVIIe Siècle, 59-60.

¹⁷⁹ Arnaud, Les Théories dramatiques au XVIIe Siècle, 61.

^{180 &}quot;Ce livre attira l'attention sur lui." "On ne le pardonnera pas à l'abbé d'Aubignac, dont l'ouvrage, parfois cité, très rarement lu, ne peut être consulté que dans quelques grands bibliothèques patrimoniales." Banderier, "Introduction," in Hédelin, Des Satyres, ed., Giles Banderier, 10; 21.

^{181 &}quot;...désenchantement du monde..." Banderier here quotes Céard, La nature et les prodiges, 458-459 ; Banderier, "Introduction," in Hédelin, Des Satyres, ed., Giles Banderier, 28.

¹⁸² Banderier, "Introduction," in Hédelin, Des Satyres, ed., Giles Banderier, 29-30.

explanations for the natural perfectly qualifies *Des Satyres* as a work squarely in the midst of the disenchantment of the world. As discussed below, this was a process which included not solely those who rigorously pursued natural explanations but also those who found both old and new explanations useful.

This treatise offers us a medium through which to understand its author and the current strands of discourse in the decades leading up to Nicolaes Tulp's dissection of what was likely a chimpanzee in 1641. Hédelin's view that satyrs were a kind of ape, for example, was quite common, so much so that Tulp would list "Indian Satyr" among the names for his subject. Hédelin's Des Satyres may have been a foray into natural philosophy, or it may have served other purposes for our scholar. It seems clear that an if not the – aim of this treatise was to highlight man's unique place in the order of things. Thirty years before his most famous work, which is still studied today, La Pratique du théâtre, Hédelin established a truth for himself: Satyrs are not men. 183 Both La Pratique and Des satyres, as well as Les Conseils d'Ariste à Célimène sur les moyens de conserver sa réputation and Amelonde, histoire de nostre temps ou l'on void qu'une honneste femme est heureuse quand elle suit un conseil sage et verteux, published in 1667 and 1669 respectively, put things in Hédelin's world to right. 184 They set things in order - order in the moral sense of decorous, proper behavior; order in the natural philosophical sense; and theological sense of establishing what God did and did not create with Adam; and in

...

¹⁸³ The impact of *La Pratique* can scarcely be overstated, Wes Williams describing Hédelin as « the Hercules of 'neo-classical' poetics, clearing all the monsters, demons, satyrs, tragi-comedies, and other hybrid forms of the French stage." Williams, *Monsters and their Meanings in Early Modern Culture*, 238.

¹⁸⁴ François Hédelin, *La Pratique du théâtre* (Paris: Antoine de Sommaville, 1657); François Hédelin, *Amelonde: Histoire de nostre temps* (Paris: Baptitste Loyson, 1669); François Hédelin, *Les Conseils d'Ariste à Célimène, sur les moyens de conserver sa réputation* Paris (V. Pepingue and Jacques le Febvre, 1692).

the instructive sense of how a play should best serve its audience and its state. We shall see that, with the exception of his emphasis on demons, which were less frequently explored in natural philosophy than in theology, *Des Satyres* had much in common with most works on the boundaries of the human category.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF DES SATYRES

This section of the introduction focuses primarily on satyrs as apes and as monsters. For the purposes of this discussion, we leave teratological monsters to the side since misbirths (excepting hybrids) do not figure in Hédelin's treatise. 185 The term "monster" and its forms in this chapter applies to hybrids, a cross between two species. We will use Hédelin's definition:

... one sees frequently enough two animals of different species, stepping outside of some of the limits that have been prescribed to them, give birth to some beasts which hold elements from both, resembling neither the one nor the other, and remaining incapable of [76] regeneration: and these are called monsters. 186

In Hédelin's view, however, these were the minority; most were demons who had assumed the satyr form in order to deceive human beings into worshiping them. These, Hédelin believes, are the vast majority of satyrs. They are, so to speak, shape-shifting demons in the service of the devil in a variety of settings, most commonly in the entourage of Bacchus or Dionysus but also in the service of Osiris. *Des Satyres* also devotes some time to the question of whether or not incubi can generate monstrous

86 See [75-70] of the fleatis

57

¹⁸⁵ This is in part due to the close association of demons with teratological births: "With bodily deformity and moral depravity unproblematically identified, and with demons everywhere begetting monsters, monsters were demons and demons were monsters. So when d'Aubignac then writes in his fourth chapter, the longest and most elaborately argued in the book, that some satyr monsters are in fact satyr demons, it is not epistemologically surprising." Wygant, *Medea, Magic, and Modernity in France*, 116.

¹⁸⁶ See [75-76] of the treatise.

offspring, so as we move now into the exploration of satyrs as monsters, we will touch on the question of demonic hybrids.187

MONSTER SATYRS₁₈₈

It is difficult to draw a sharp line between demonic monsters and preternaturally occurring monsters, particularly in the case of hybrids because in early modern Europe, even if no incubus were involved, the very act of a human begetting a hybrid was against God's will (though not necessarily unnatural) and therefore a sin of great magnitude, easily associated with demonically sourced desires. 189 So the exploration of monstrous hybrids in this chapter will combine the two discourses.

The belief in human-animal hybrids was, it seems, universal. These could be mermaids, satyrs, centaurs, creatures that were half-dog and half-human, half-sheep and half-human, etc. The only unresolved question was whether they were animal or perhaps human. The qualifier for this was generally whether or not they could be saved from damnation, which depended on an immortal (human) soul. Did they have the *capacity* for salvation? The evidence for this was generally the ability to speak.

187 Alexander Ross finds the idea of the incubus far fetched: "Some take the night-mare of *Incubus* for a spirit, but indeed it is a feculent humor adhering to the vital parts, and with its black or melancholy fume troubling the Diaphragma, Lungs, and Brain, and distempering the Imagination with horrid shapes." Alexander Ross, *Arcana Microcosmi : or, The hid Secrets of Mans Body disclosed ; First, In an Anatomical Duel between Aristotle & Galen, About the Parts thereof. Secondly, By a Discovery of the strange and marvellous Diseases, Symptomes, and Accidents of Mans Body. With A Refutation of Doctor Browns Vulgar Errors, And the Ancient Opinions vindicated. (London: Thomas Newcomb, 1651), 121.*

188 Following a discussion of monster satyrs, this chapter will devote the bulk of its space to situating Hédelin's work in one of the most pressing questions of early modernity, the question of species and humanity. This will be the exploration of ape satyrs.

189 Given the profusion of accounts of human-animal hybrids, it was widely believed that human-animal pairing could produce offspring. Such offspring represented the sin of their human parents, but they were were also wondrous because they "blur[red] the lines of separation between animal and human." Scholz-Williams, *Ways of Knowing in Early Modern Germany*, 51.

The foundational view from Augustine (354-430) was that everything in the world was created by God and part of the divine order, so the monstrous is not against nature:190

For we say that all portents are contrary to nature; but they are not so. For how is that contrary to nature which happens by the will of god, since the will of mighty a Creator is certainly the nature of each created thing? A portent therefore, happens not contrary to nature, but contrary to what we know as nature.

In other words, the wondrous is wondrous, causing us to marvel because we have not seen it before. But because we have not seen it before does not mean that it is rare, only that we in our limited experience have not seen it. While Augustine does not address hybrids specifically, he does include the sphinx as a beast in his commentary on monstrous races. 192 But not all monstrous races are animal; for Augustine, any creature descended from Adam is human.

But whoever is anywhere born a man, that is, a rational mortal animal, no matter what usual appearance he presents in colour, movement, sound, nor how peculiar he is in some power, part, of quality of his nature, no Christian can doubt that he springs from that one protoplast. 193

He qualifies his argument as follows: "...either these things which have been told of some races have no existence at all; or if they do exist, they are not human races; or if they are

¹⁹⁰ Montaigne marveled at the similarity more than the difference in the monstrous. Michel de Montaigne, "On a Monster Child," in *The Complete Essays*, trans. and ed. by M. A. Screech (London: Penguin Books, 2003), 807-808.

¹⁹¹ Augustine, *City of God*, tran. Marcus Dods (1950; repr., New York: The Modern Library, 1993), XXI, 8, p. 776. We see this view as well in Montaigne. See Tristan Dagron, "Nature and its Monsters in the Renaissance. Montaigne and Vanini," in *Monsters and Philosophy* edited by Charles T. Wolf (London: College Publications, 2005), 37-59.

¹⁹² Augustine, City of God, XVI, 8, p. 531.

¹⁹³ Augustine, City of God, XVI, 8, p. 530.

human, they are descended from Adam."194 While it is not clear how one would determine which creatures are men and which are beasts, speech is a key qualifier for the Cynocephali.195

Thomas Aquinas believed it was possible that the devil could transfer semen from a human male via the incubus's assumed material body to a human. He cites Augustine when he addresses the question of whether or not angels or demons can beget offspring:

Still if some are occasionally begotten from demons, it is not from the seed of such demons, nor from their assumed bodies, but from the seed of men taken for the purpose; as when the demon assumes first the form of a woman, and afterwards of a man; just as they take the seed of other things for other generating purposes, as Augustine says (*De Trin.* iii.), so that the person born is not the child of a demon, but of a man."196

Pierre Boaistuau (1517 - 1566) argued that demons could not conceive with human beings. 197 Rather, demons can join sexually in human form with humans, "but that from

194 Augustine, *City of God*, XVI, 8, p. 531. There were those, such as Johann Lassenius (1636-1692) who believed that some human-animal hybrids were in fact human. Scholz-Williams, *Ways of Knowing in Early Modern Germany*, 50.

195 Augustine seems not disinclined to include sylvans and fauns, and potentially by extension satyrs, among demons. "There is, too, a very general rumour, which many have verified by their own experience or which trustworthy persons who have heard the experience of others corroborate, that sylvans and fauns, who are commonly called 'incubi,' had often made wicked assaults upon women, and satisfied their lust upon them; and that certain devils, called Duses by the Gauls, are constantly attempting and effecting this impurity is so generally affirmed, that it were impudent to deny it." Augustine, *City of God*, Book XV, 23.

196 Thomas Aquinas, *The Summa Theologica of Saint Thomas Aquinas*, tran. Fathers of the English Dominican Province, Vol. I (Chicago: William Benton, 1923), 277-8. https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.126741/page/n1

While this translation is the one recommended by Oxford University Press, OUP also notes that it is not always reliable.

 $\frac{\text{https://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195326093.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780195326093-miscMatter-47}{\text{(accessed 5 September 2019)}}$

Alfred J. Freddoso is in the midst of producing a translation recommended by Hans Peter Broedel. It is not yet complete. https://www3.nd.edu/~afreddos/summa-translation/TOC.htm (accessed 12 September 2019)

197 See Chapter VII of *Histoires prodigeuseses*, the title of which promises to answer this question: "Prodiges d'un horrible Monstre de nostre temps, sur le discours duquel la question est decidée, si les diables peuuent engendrer & exercer les æuvres de nature." Perhaps of particular interest to the reader, Boaistuau notes Merlin among those reputed to have been conceived by demons on 19v, and refutes this on 20r.-20v. Pierre Boaistuau, *Histoires prodigieueses les plus memorables qui ayent esté observés, depuis la*

such conjoining it is possible to engender anything, as we have predicted, this is not only false, but against our Law. 198 He writes against the infinite examples from philosophers and ecclesiastics, in that they offer examples like those of Martin Luther, who fully accepted the devil's ability to beget human children, and these children were generally not seen as human. 199

Paracelsus took a broader view. While none of his four species of man were themselves human, some could attain humanity through marriage to humans. Nymphs were human animals, so to speak, in that they were human in all things but the soul. But through marriage, they could gain this feature that they lacked, and, assuming that the nymph was female and the human was male, their children would be human:

Because the father is a man from Adam, a soul is given to the child, and it becomes like a regular man, who has an eternal soul. Furthermore, this also is well known and must be considered, that such women also receive souls by becoming married, so that they are saved before God and by God like other women. It has been experienced in many ways that they are not eternal, but when they are bound to men, they become eternal, that is, endowed with a soul like a man.200

Nativité de Iesus Christ, iusques à nostre siecle: Extraictes de plusieurs fameux autheurs, grecz & latins, sacrez & prophanes: mises en nostre langue (Paris: Vincent Sertenas, 1560), 18v-21r.

198 "....par la permission de Dieu, ou pour punition de noz pechez, peuvent ainsi abuser des hommes & des femmes : mais que de telle coniunctiō il se puisse engēndrer quelque chose, cōme nous avōs predict [The ct has a connection rounded line above the two letters for ez, with ez being é in modern French.], cela n'est pas seuelement faulx, mais contraire à nostre Loy." Pierre Boaistuau, Histoires prodigieueses les plus memorables qui ayent esté observés, depuis la Nativité de Iesus Christ, iusques à nostre siecle: Extraictes de plusieurs fameux autheurs, grecz & latins, sacrez & prophanes: mises en nostre langue (Paris: Vincent Sertenas, 1560), 20r.

199 As noted above, for Augustine, anyone born of a human is human. For Thomas Aquinas, an incubus can beget a human by transferring human seed using the demon body as a medium.

²⁰⁰ Paracelsus, "A book on nymphs, sylphs, pygmies, and salamanders, and on the other spirits," in *Four Treatises*, edited by Henry E. Sigerist; translated by C. Lilian Temkin, George Rosen, Gregory Zilboorg, and Henry E. Sigereist (1941; repr. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), 238.

This could not have been further from Hédelin's view, and Hédelin uses Paracelsus as his foil in Des Satyres, which was written after all to exclude, not include. It should be noted that neither Montaigne nor Hédelin's grandfather strove to exclude the monstrous. There is compassion in Montaigne's response, and an objective interest in the natural causes in Paré.201 The bulk of Paré's analysis – twenty-seven of thirty-nine chapters – addresses monstrosities with perfectly natural causes. Hermaphrodites, for example, are not to be feared; they are not a portent of some evil to come. They have a perfectly natural explanation, "Now as to the cause, it is because, proportionately, the woman provided as much seed as the man ... that in the same body are found sometimes two sexes, called Hermaphrodites." Paré further expresses disagreement with the ancients for banishing a girl whose sexual organs changed to those of a male as she began to mature, deserting her on an uninhabited island. "It seems to me that these diviners had no occasion to do this... nonetheless they reckoned that something monstrous was a bad augury..." Where the hermaphroditic trait of possessing both forms of genitalia occurs in creatures who are otherwise not recognizably human, such as the Monster of Ravenna, this is the wrath of God. Yet it is not the hermaphroditism itself that makes the creature a product of or a sign of the wrath of God.202

For Hédelin, God's favorite creation, humankind, requires a wall around it protecting its purity from any defilement through intimate connection with the non-human, whether that be demon or animal. Human-animal hybrids bore "in their body the human form mixed with the bestial, revealing by a just judgement of God the shame and

201 Montaigne, "On a Monster Child," 807-808.

202 Paré, Des monstres et prodiges, 6-8, 24, 30.

the vileness of their parents."203 Hédelin's views on hybrids begotten by spiritual means, demons known as incubi, match his grandfather's thinking on the subject.204 Ambroise Paré's 1573 *Des monstres et prodiges* was a heavily illustrated work on monsters and wonders. Paré is keenly interested in what demons can and cannot do. They can deceive people, and demons can place foreign objects such as bones, thorns, nails, glass, rock, twisted hair, snakes, and pieces of wood to issue from the womb.205 But they cannot cause a child to emerge from a womb because they have not the matter (semen) necessary to spark life in the womb: "Also you should not believe in any way that the Demons or devils, who are by nature spiritual, can carnally know women; because for the execution of this act, flesh and blood are required, which spirits do not have."206

Paré's view is that people only imagine copulation with incubi and succubi, "proceeding from an illusory impression of Satan." 207 Nor can spirits take semen found in the bath or on the floor or anywhere else and plant it in a womb to bring forth life, for when semen is exposed to air, it cools and loses its generative effect. 208 Paré further argues that Nature prevents the desire for copulation where increasing the population is

²⁰³ See [77] in the treatise.

²⁰⁴ For example, see Hédelin's view of Pan on [79-80] of the treatise.

²⁰⁵ Paré, Des monstres et prodiges, 86.

²⁰⁶ Paré does provide an example of a woman who claimed to be pregnant via the devil, and gave birth to stones, nails, glass, and hair. Paré, *Des monstres et prodiges*, 87-89. It would seem that if the devil could place nails and glass in the womb that did not contain an embyro, why could he not do so to a womb containing an embryo, thereby deforming it and causing a monster? There are a number of opportunities for Paré to tell his readers that this is how demons cause monsters, but he does not. He is more interested in natural causes.

^{207 &}quot;procedante d'une impression illusoire de Satan." Paré, Des monstres et prodiges, 88.

²⁰⁸ Paré, Des monstres et prodiges, 87-88.

unnecessary. In the case of Demons, who are "immortal and eternal; what necessity have they thus of such regeneration"?209 So it neither makes sense for Demons to want to procreate, nor have they – or Angels, for that matter - the ability to impregnate a human because they have no seed, and they cannot use the seed of a person or animal because by the time it has become available to them, it has lost its procreative power.

Whether or not demons could procreate with human beings was by no means a settled question in Hédelin's world, nor it seems was the question of the humanity of such offspring. However, most of those scholars who argued that demons could obtain and maintain the vitality of semen, using it to conceive children, also argued that demons actually produced human children because the incubus was nothing more than a medium for the transfer of human matter.

Demons were not the only suspected means of producing hybrids. There were natural means as well, or rather præternatural since the method of producing hybrids stepped outside the bounds of nature. Animals who crossed the species line in sexual acts produced hybrids, mules being a quotidian example. Likewise humans who transgressed natural laws and joined their bodies to those of, say, a dog, sheep, or goat, were known to produce hybrid creatures. There were many early moderns such as Juan Eusebio Nieremberg who saw hybrids as fertile. For example, Nieremberg saw the Bacrtrian camel as a hybrid of a camel and a boar, which was indeed able to reproduce.210

Aristotle's (384 BCE - 322 BCE) view, which informed much medieval and early modern

209 "immortels et eternels: qu'ont-ils donc necessité de ceste generation" Paré, Des monstres et prodiges, 88.

210 Karl Enenkel, "The Species and Beyond," in Karl Enenkel, et al., *Early Modern Zoology: The Construction of Animals in Science, Literature and the Visual Arts* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 100.

thought, was that while mules could not reproduce, most hybrids could reproduce, at least with others of the same crossing.211 That is to say, most hybrids of the same kind – camelboars, camelopards, etc. – could reproduce normally.

The view that hybrids were fertile explained the unfamiliar animal life of the New World and Africa as hybrids of familiar European fauna. After the Biblical flood, God had used angels to transport some of the surviving species to barren lands, and these progenitors of new species crossbred. Thus these hybrids were fertile.212 However, hybrids were also believed by many to be sterile. Hédlin takes great pains to note that this is why a whole species of monster satyrs is impossible.213

For Hédelin, there is no doubt that human-beast hybrid creatures are not human because they have no immortal soul. They have only the soul of an animal, the mortal soul that exists only within the body of an animal. In Hédelin's conventional view, the mortal soul of animals and their bodies are dependent on one another for life, the soul quickening when the animal's body quickens, and once the life of the animal expires, the soul is no more.214 The immortal soul, however, has a life of its own.215 It is not dependent on a body for its existence, and it is peculiar to God's favorite of all created beings, humankind, who are descended exclusively from Adam, Augustine's sole protoplast.

²¹¹ Andrea Falcon and David Lefebvre, *Aristotle's Generation of Animals, A Critical Guide* (New York: Cambridge, 2018), 159.

²¹² For more on hybridity and fertility, see Enenkel, "The Species and Beyond."

²¹³ See [82] of the treatise.

²¹⁴ See [86-87] of the treatise.

²¹⁵ See [88-89] of the treatise.

In brief, the Aristotelian theory of souls that informs our author's thinking is that the soul is "the form of a living thing." 216 There are three kinds of soul: nutritive, sensate, 217 and rational. The nutritive soul informs the body of plants while the sensate informs the body of animals, and the rational soul informs humans exclusively. Plants have the qualities of only the nutritive soul while animals have the qualities of both the nutritive and sensate soul. Humans have the qualities of all three kinds of souls. The soul is what gives life to the form, and the soul is what makes the thing what it is. 218 In other words, the soul carries the horseness of a horse into the body and makes the living being a horse. The soul does not exist independent of the body. They are inseparable. "We should not then inquire whether the soul and body are one thing, any more than whether the wax and its imprint are," says Aristotle on the unity of body and soul. 219 The Christian adaptation of Aristotle's soul theory, established by Thomas Aquinas, was that the soul could exist independent of the body. At least this was true of the rational soul, giving it its immortal, immaterial nature. 220

216 Kevin S. Seybold, *Explorations in Neuroscience, Psychology and Religion* (New York: Routledge, 2016), 48.

217 One generally sees "sensitive," however this term's more common use could prompt confusion. For "sensitive," the Oxford English Dictionary gives "Having the function of sensation or sense perception" and "Of, relating to, or deriving from the senses or sensation" as this word's first definitions. However sensitive suggests empathy with others, a quickness to take offense, or easily wounded emotionally. This is not what the sensate soul should conjure. Sensate in the OED means "Having the power of sensation; sentient." Merriam-Webster gives "relating to or apprehending through the senses." This suggests that a sensate soul draws information from the senses.

https://www-oed-com.ezproxy.library.und.edu/view/Entry/175988?redirectedFrom=sensitive#eid https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/sensate Accessed 4 September 2019.

218 Aristotle, *De Anima (On the Soul)*, tran. Hugh Lawson-Tancred (New York: Penguin, 1986), 156-158.
219 Aristotle, *De Anima*, 157.

220 Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae (Summa Theologica)*, Questions 76, 89. https://www3.nd.edu/~afreddos/summa-translation/TOC-part1.htm (accessed 12 September 2019) Hédelin follows the belief that one kind of soul can not infuse the form of another kind of creation.

Nature, guided by the hand of God, does almost the same; she221 has diverse substances, which are like the proper places of the different forms; In some of this matter, she usually places nothing, and in other matter, other things, without ever troubling the arrangement by sending a form into a matter that is not destined to receive it. It is impossible that the form of a carnation could be placed into a flower born from a rose seed and prepared for that form. One never sees that an animal produced [90] from a Lion's matter and disposed to this form, receives its form from a horse. Likewise, it cannot be done in these Satyrs, that the parts conceived of a bestial matter, conceived from a beast and prepared for the soul that is natural to them, would be capable of being vivified from the form of a man, and united in a spiritual being with which they have no conformity. For those who could believe such a convergence of two things so contrary, it would be easy to persuade that the soul of Pelops gave form to his ivory shoulder, and that of Pythagorus to his thigh of gold: For these animal parts of a monster Satyr are just as incommensurate to the spiritual soul as ivory and gold are.222

Hédelin takes an extremely dualistic view of hybrids, despite his almost certain awareness of mules. Following Hédelin's logic, any hybrid would have discrete halves from each parent. Hédelin limits God's power with his insistence that only humans can have an immortal soul, that God, who, in early modern thinking, was capable of all kinds of wonders just to give humanity yet more cause to marvel at his creative power, could not decide to give an immortal soul to, say, a tree or a rabbit. Lest there be any question of a human soul to inhabit the human half while the mortal soul inhabits the animal half, in the vein of Xenophon's proper places might lead one to wonder, our author clarifies adamantly:

221 While Hédelin does not capitalize nature, and therefore does not seem to personify nature as his contemporaries do, "she" seems the appropriate pronoun.

²²² See [89-90] of the treatise.

... wherever it is, it cannot be there halfway or only to a certain degree, but according to the totality of its nature. This spiritual form has this specifically and by divinity over the others, that it not only releases into [93] the mass of their body and fully into the entirety: but still fully entire in each part, with such equality, that it is not more in the greater parts nor less in the lesser.223

Here Hédelin seems in line with Aristotle's view of reproduction as the reproduction of a form.224 For Bacon, Locke, and others, a kind of bleeding of boundaries between species explained a host of things such as animals and plants that appeared to be hybrids and organic matter like moss that appeared to have degenerated. There were those as well who saw apes as degenerated humans whose ancestors had abandoned civil life and had thus deteriorated in culture and language.225 Where Locke discusses the fixity of species, or rather the lack thereof, he cites the examples of children drowned rather than baptized because they did not fit the entirely non-essential definitions of humanity. "And yet, I think, I may say, that the certain boundaries of that species [man] are so far from being determined, and the precise number of simple ideas, which make the nominal essence, so far from being settled, and perfectly known, that very material doubts may still arise about it: and I imagine, none of the definitions of the word *man*, which we yet have, nor descriptions of that sort of animal, are so perfect and exact, as to satisfy a considerate inquisitive person; much less to obtain a general consent, and to be that which men would

223 See [92-93] of the treatise.

²²⁴ For more on this, see Dagron, "Nature and its Monsters During the Renaissance," 44-45. See also Smith, "Degeneration and Hybridism in the Early Modern Species Debate," 110-111. Smith explores Descarts' later *bête-machine* doctrine of a mechanistic generation process, which allowed for hybridization and for a kind of fluidity from type to type, rather than a reproduction of form, a fixity of species.

²²⁵ Smith, "Degeneration and Hybridism in the Early Modern Species Debate," 114-115.

everywhere stick by, in the decision of cases, and determining of life and death, baptism or no baptism, in productions that might happen."226

Returning to Hédelin and his Aristotelian view of reproducing the species form, whatever the creature, it requires a soul to vivify it. But why not the human, immortal, immaterial soul for the half-human hybrid? For Paracelsus, if the hybrid is born of an animal, it has an animal's soul. If born of a human, it has a human soul.227 John Bulwer takes up this question and stops short of providing his own answer, but he cites Juan Eusebio Nieremberg (1595 - 1658) who asserted that a woman and a beast might be able to conceive "a true man....if the womans seed be efficacious." 228 Similarly,

"he thinks, perchance according to the Physitians, it will be poßible after that hainous coition a man may be cherished in a beasts wombe, the seed of man being before cast therein: but if any thing hath been produced in shape like unto man, it is never without some gage of an irrationall nature.229

Hédelin's answer is less than clear even where he embarks on his discussion of original sin. Christian theology traces the root of sin back to Adam and Eve, the first man and the first woman. Together they committed the first sin. Crafted from the earth with God's own hands, Adam received the breath of life from God's own mouth. Created fully formed as an adult, Adam was given a help-meet formed from one of his ribs.230 Together

69

²²⁶ John Locke, An Essay Concerning Human Understanding (New York: Penguin Books, 1997), 406.

²²⁷ Smith, "Degeneration and Hybridism in the Early Modern Species Debate," 125. Although elsewhere Paracelsus says that the soul follows the father. "Of the children, we know that they follow after the father." See above where Paracelsus discusses how the children of nymphs can be human.

²²⁸ Bulwer, Anthropometamorphosis, 449.

²²⁹ Bulwer, Anthropometamorphosis, 449.

²³⁰ Genesis 2:21-22.

they lived in the Garden of Eden which met and exceeded all their needs. They knew no shame because they knew no sin, and thus they did not bother to clothe themselves. All was harmony and bliss until the Devil in the form of a serpent appeared to Eve and urged her to eat fruit from the tree that stood in the middle of the garden. Eating from the fruit of this tree was the only thing forbidden to Adam and Eve. God had told them that they would die if they partook of its fruit. The snake told Eve that she would not die and that the reason God did not want them to eat from this particular tree was because God knew that it would make them like gods, giving them knowledge of good and evil. She found the snake's argument compelling, and taking fruit from the tree, offered it to Adam who immediately regretted eating it. When God came calling for them, they both hid their naked bodies from him, and he promptly ejected them from the garden, knowing that they could only be aware of their nakedness if they had eaten of the forbidden fruit. The Almighty cursed both them and their descendants with lives of toil and sorrow, subjecting women to their husbands and to pain in childbirth. The serpent and all his kind were cursed to eat dust, condemned always to travel on their bellies. Snakes and humankind were forever to be enemies.231

In his discussion of original sin, the soul, and the hybrid, Hédelin holds that the animal would clearly not choose to sully itself with original sin, which is transmitted "by infusion at the convergence of the body," so the reader might think that in theory any creature born of just one of Adam's descendants would carry this stain unless *both* parents must possess the stain in order to transmit it.232 This is something Hédelin does

231 Genesis 3: 3-19.

232 See [95] of the treatise.

not seem to notice as a possibility or else takes for granted that both bodies must carry the stain in order to transmit it.233 In other words, it is implied that original sin must be transmitted by two parents in order to take effect. This is something Hédelin does not seem to notice as a possibility, or else he takes for granted that both bodies must carry the stain in order to transmit it.

The reader is left wondering: Would the possibility of immortality and salvation not be worth the stain of original sin? Whatever the creature, it requires a soul to vivify it, and why not the human soul for the totality of the hybrid? Hédelin argues that the animal would clearly not choose to sully itself with the original sin transmitted in an immortal soul. Ultimately Hédelin, while not addressing the question specifically, removes the possibility, for any brute beast is simply too foul and would desecrate the sacraments necessary for salvation, and thus would never credibly have the option to take on an immortal soul. But he does entertain the possibility of an immortal soul for the satyr, if only to dismiss it. He argues that the bestial matter would refuse the immortal soul because it carries the stain of Adam, supposing that the animal would prefer to remain "fully pure" than to take the chance at immortality in heaven (or hell), argues that the animal could not have an immortal soul anyway because there is no way that God would allow "the venerable Sacraments" to "be profaned through the irreverence of being transmitted to brute beasts," this" heavenly and living Bread prepared only for the Angels and for men, who are only a little less than them, would be received (disgraceful thing to think) in a beast's body," and "given truly to the dogs."234 Even if the hybrid could

233 See [95] of the treatise.

234 See [96] of the treatise.

choose the human soul, any animal is too foul and would desecrate the sacraments necessary for salvation merely by receiving them, and thus would never credibly have the option to take on an immortal soul.235 Furthermore in order for a satyr's body to join in the perfection that Augustine declares all bodies will enjoy in the resurrection, the goat half would require annihilation, and thus "half of their body, even if it had received the Sacraments and participated in the work of the other half, would not accompany it in the reward."236 This is in contrast to Augustine's great embrace of any creature descended from Adam.

While Hédelin did not believe that satyrs could constitute a species unto themselves because of hybrid satyr monsters' infertility, that did not mean that there were not sizable if limited numbers of satyrs produced in this manner.237

"the coarse and bestial reason of the shepherds who frequented these uninhabited places, being unable to resist the immoral passion which aroused them, rendering them fathers of these Satyrs, of whom we only saw a few living among them."238

Such creatures are not human because their bodies, being half animal, are incompatible with the immortal human soul.239 On the contrary, humanity is marked with God's image: "Following the paths of the purity of this [16] same doctrine, we will say that God, pulling the human nature from the void in order to place it in the world, wanted to create

235 See [98] of the treatise.

236 See [100-101] of the treatise.

237 See [75-76] of the treatise.

238 See [81] of the treatise. Gods and goddesses too were known to cheapen themselves with their couplings with humans. See [208-209] of the treatise.

239 See [86-94] of the treatise.

72

it in his likeness, and mark its soul with the image of his Divinity."240 This uniqueness of Adamic man's standing in the eyes of God was foundational to Hédelin. And yet, foundational and unquestionable, certain and sure though Hédelin and his contemporaries would argue that it was, this uniqueness required defense. It was in fact fraught with anxiety, and defending man's uniqueness was the very purpose of this very treatise.

The idea that there could be other kinds of men, that they might share God's favor, or share the same rank on the chain of being required attention. Curiously, if satyr men did exist, Hédelin argues that they would be incapable of sin because sin would not exist for them without the stain of Adam's first sin. Satyrs are distasteful because of their base and lascivious behavior, yet it is not truly sin because God did not bother to command them not to sin.

But what could one say of the souls of Satyr men, when they would abandon their monstrous limbs? What could they become? Which torments could they fear, [30] and for what glory hope? Because according to the true doctrine of our holy Books, neither Hell nor Paradise will be for them. As for the torments of Hell, only those who can sin have cause to fear them, and the only ones who can sin are of the race of Adam: for in him only was sin born, and through him only did it creep among the human type.241

Yet, although stained, Adamic man is God's favorite, and thus all other creatures are excluded from mankind even through illicit hybridization. While to some modern readers, it might seem infinitely preferably to have a mortal soul because the mortal soul is not subject to eternal punishment,242 this was not the case for most pre-moderns and early

73

²⁴⁰ See [15-16] of the treatise. For more on the importance of Adamic man's unique standing before God, see Introduction: Part IV.

²⁴¹ See [29-30] of the treatise.

²⁴² See [94-105] of the treatise.

moderns, and certainly not for our author. The immortal soul is what sets humanity apart and gives Adamic humanity its standing just below the angels.

It is taken as a given that one body, even a hybrid body, can not contain more than one soul. It is apparent that Hédelin assumes that a half-human body is not a human body, and because the animal portion of the hybrid body can not contain an immortal soul, and a human body could not contain a mortal soul, the only possible fit for a hybrid is a mortal soul.

Hédelin goes on to address the legal complexities of violence against a satyr, the absurdities of which make the satyr's mere existence monstrous, defying order, category, and bounds. If the fatal cut of a knife to a satyr struck the human half, the assailant would be guilty of homicide and would be pay with his life, whereas if the fatal wound occurred in the goat half, the assailant would simply pay a fine. The reverse too would be a conundrum. if the human or goal half of a satyr committed a crime, the penalty would be different because the degree and kind of competence and guilt would be impossible to determine.243

Though Hédlin does not include speech as reliable evidence of an immortal soul, many scholars took it as the best evidence, and speech would remain a mark of the human in part for its necessity to salvation. How can one call on the name of the Lord if one has no speech?244 This is perhaps why Hédelin placed so much emphasis on the legend of the satyr who appeared to Saint Anthony in the wilderness: in order to indicate that speech was not sufficient. In the account attributed to Saint Jerome, Saint Anthony is

243 See [102-103] of the treatise.

244 Romans 10: 9-13.

traveling by foot through the wilderness on his way to see Saint Paul the Hermit.245 A centaur appears to him, and Anthony asks him for directions, but the centaur immediately vanishes. As quickly as this centaur disappears, a satyr appears, announcing himself to the holy man and claiming to be an emissary from his nation. The satyr claims to be "a mortal being" sent to request the prayers of Anthony, that he would "entreat the favour" of "your lord and ours." 246 Anthony is moved to tears of joy and proclaimed:

Woe to you, Alexandria, who instead of God worships monsters! Woe to you, harlot city, into which have flowed together the demons of the whole world! What will you say now? Beasts speak of Christ, and you instead of God worship monsters.247

Immediately the satyr fled, and no more is said of Saint Anthony's reaction to this apparition. Jerome describes the satyr as both a "wild creature" and a "man of that kind" when noting that a member of this species was displayed alive in Alexandria. 248

Hédelin, like many medieval and early modern theologians, concludes that this satyr was a demon was because God rarely uses speaking animals, and thus it could not be an ape, a beast. Furthere, there could be no such thing as a nation or tribe of satyrs because if satyrs were a species, they would have to be a species of monstrous hybrids, which are by definition sterile and unable to generate a species unto themselves. Satyrs could not be a separate species of people because they were not created male and female,

²⁴⁵ Jerome, "The Life of Paulus the First Hermit," in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Second Series, vol. 6, tran., W.H. Fremantle and W.G. Martley, ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. *New Advent, The Catholic Encyclopedia*, ed. Kevin Knight (http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/3008.htm) (accessed 16 September 2019).

246 Jerome, "The Life of Paulus the First Hermit."

247 Jerome, "The Life of Paulus the First Hermit."

248 Jerome, "The Life of Paulus the First Hermit."

75

for if they were, we would be stumbling across them every day instead of hearing about rare sightings.249 This leaves no alternative but a demon sent to deceive the unsuspecting saint in typical demon satyr fashion – through astonishment.250

APE SATYRS

Hédelin's ape satyrs seem to be akin to what we would know as the chimpanzee. In most of his treatise when he describes them, they are half goat, except in Book V where he notes that in the early sources, they are described as having horse hooves and horse tails.251 Since this was before Nicolaes Tulp's 1641 dissection, his awareness of the varieties of apes was as muddied as that of many early seventeenth century thinkers.252 Here we will see that Hédelin's *Des Satyres* addresses problems that will remain active questions through the eighteenth century, and his argument illuminates his own seventeenth century intellectual milieu just as later thinkers do in the eighteenth century.

The purpose of Hédelin's treatise, as stated on its title page, is to challenge "the opinion of those who have judged Satyrs to be a distinct species of men." Hédelin's concern comes from the polygenesist arguments that were prevalent in his lifetime, arguments to explain the existence of monstrous races; human beings with customs or appeareance alien to Europeans; or of species that were similar human beings, such as the animal that we would call the chimpanzee today. In other words, Adam is not necessary

²⁴⁹ This argument comes after Hédelin's argument that they are not descended from Noah. See [20-21] of the treatise.

²⁵⁰ See [157-159] in the treatise.

²⁵¹ See [59], [202] in the treatise.

²⁵² See [54-61] of the treatise. In this long passage, Hédelin demonstrates that the accounts of satyrs with which he was familiar varied, commonalities being hairiness, human resemblance, and violent lust.

the only ur-man. There could be species of humans with other origins. Such claims alarm Hédelin's sensibilities. He argues:

We hold that Satyrs are not a species of rational animal, distinct & separate from ours, which is to say that they are not men, & that there can not be another species of man than Adamic man, to speak of our Paracelsus. And that if one has seen certain animals to have in their form some relation to the human body, they are only [7] genuine species of brute beasts, to which it is only a sacrilege to give the name of man...253

Based on these reasons, the argument against polygenisist possibilities is that since the Great Chain of Being does not allow two species to hold the same place, man satyrs could not be above man because man satyrs are impious, nor could they be lower than man and yet still be man because, being lower than man would render them beasts.254

This superiority above beasts is a critical component to humanity's humanity.

Dominion over animals, a dominion given to man by God at Creation, is essential to human nature:

"If therefore the nature of the Satyr was inferior to ours, how could he be man and be inferior to another man? How could he be man & be deprived of commanding in this world, which is the characteristic of man, and the incomparable mark of his Divinity?"255

The view that commanding is another qualifier for humanity sets Hédelin apart from the crowd throughout the early modern period in that his qualifiers of the human go above and beyond form, speech, and reason with the latter two being evidence of an immortal soul. The problem with these standard measures is that by using form, speech, and reason

254 See [7-11] of the treatise.

²⁵³ See [6-7] of the treatise.

²⁵⁵ See [11] of the treatise. Incidentally, in Euripides' *Cyclopes*, the satyrs that Polyphemus has enslaved have the duty of tending his sheep. This includes herding them and forcing them to go where Polyphemus wants them to go. This would mark satyrs performing dominion over at least one species of animal. Carl A. Shaw, *Euripides: Cyclops, a Satyr Play* (Oxford: Bloomsbury, 2018), 36.

alone as the measures, "one could maintain that Satyrs are men," for "they are not so particular to the human nature that all the creatures who are endowed with them must form a species of man, who alone deserves to bear the name." 256

Form is not adequate because mere appearance is not enough. If it were, then, "Monkeys, Apes, Cynocephalies, and other such animals who have so great a relationship to our body, would have had something of man," as would specters that appear in human form.257 Neither is speech a reasonable qualifier.258 Where there are claims of ape satyrs speaking, these are nothing more than "a simple accident, that eminates from the body's organs," and if we admit that they are human, then birds that can imitate the human voice would have to be admitted, and likewise Balaam's ass and Achilles' horse, and no one argues for this, so why would one argue that apes that can perhaps utter some malformed words might be human?259

With regard to reason, it is specifically "perfect reason" or "the perfect discourse of reason" that is evidence of the immortal and immaterial soul.260 And it is the immateriality of the soul that allows for reasoning beyond that of brute reasoning, which is actually fairly extensive. For example, he cites that monkeys can be taught to play chess; that "the history of the Elephants full of sensible actions is worthy of admiration;"

256 See [38-39] of the treatise.

257 See [39-40] of the treatise.

258 See [40-41] of the treatise.

259 See [41], [157-158] of the treatise. Amy Wygant argues that according to Hédelin's treatise, animals simply can not speak, that it is implausible that God would give human language to animals. She points out that he disagrees with most theologians who accepted that, for example, God did indeed cause Balaam's Ass to speak to Balaam. See [79-80] of the treatise. Wygant, *Medea, Magic, and Modernity in France*, 119-121.

260 See [42-48] of the treatise.

and "the keenness of the Fox appears to be the effects of a sensible spirit," but remarkable as these are, they are sensate reasoning only. It is the reasoning of a mortal soul, which is quickened by the mortal body, which likewise vivifies it in a symbiotic manner.261 The mortal soul is "completely corrupt, dependent entirely on the matter of its being, and whose faculties cannot be beyond the body, can only be a simple material perception, bestial and very imperfect, which is born and dies in their feelings."262 The "principal effect of human reason," which is perfect reason, is "society" and "cities" far beyond the grasp of simple, mortal souls.263 Hédelin was among others such as John Bulwer in these seventeenth century views which anticipated the debates over the humanity of people in the Americas, sub-Saharan Africa, and elsewhere in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.264

It is impossible to Hédelin that satyrs could share a savior with Adamic man because the gift of immortality and salvation was exclusive to Adam's descendants, and "another Jesus Christ and another Paradise would be necessary for them." 265 Hédelin sees man as being:

composed of two parts, entirely different in nature, in origin, and in objective - the animal body which is a substance of corruption, born of the earth, and which returns to the earth; and the celestial Soul, [35] which is created by God returns to God.₂₆₆

261 See [42-46] of the treatise. For the mortal soul, see [86-89].
262 See [45] of the treatise.
263 See [47] of the treatise.
264 Bulwer, *Anthropometamorphosis*, 441-443.
265 See [32] of the treatise.
266 See [34-35] of the treatise. DS 34-35.

Whether or not a satyr is capable of full humanity was its own argument in early modernity. Often these arguments centered on what would become known as primates. 267 Satyrs, chimpanzees, the European wild man, pygmies, and orangoutangs, among others, were often conflated in the early modern discourse of humanity. 268 Hominids were slow to be seen by post-classical Europeans, with sightings beginning in the sixteenth century, notably by a physician named Jacob de Bondt (1592 - 1631), who used the term orang-outang to describe what may have been a chimpanzee or an orangutan. 269 The term orang-outang was used by Nicolas Tulp who famously dissected what was also likely a chimpanee. Tulp also used the term Indian Satyr and noted that orang-outang meant *Homo sylvestris*, or man of the woods. 270 There were earlier sightings, but the descriptions in travel

²⁶⁷ Paracelsus would be a notable exception with salamanders, the "fire people." Nymphs one might call primates in the way that Paracelsus imagined them, and his pygmies, also called "mountain manikans" and "gnomi," may well have been chimpanzees. It is difficult to determine precisely how he envisioned sylphs. Paracelsus, "A book on nymphs, sylphs, pygmies, and salamanders, and on the other spirits," 217, 231-235, 240.

268 Nash, Wild Enlightenment, 16, 722-23; For an exploration of the idea that it was not natural historians but anatomists who were responsible for making headway in identifying species, see H. W. Jansen, Apes and Ape Lore in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance (London: Warburg Institute, University of London, 1952), 335. Peter Marshall notes that early modern English scholars of the Bible and of classical literature held that the satyrs of antiquity were the fairies of contemporary England. Peter Marshall, Invisible Worlds: Death, religion and the supernatural in England, 1500-1700 (London: SPCK, 2017), 184-185. Peter Marshall also includes the dramatist John Webster (1578-1626) among the many holding the view that "creatures which for centuries had been called satyrs....were in reality most likely a rare kind of ape." Marshall, 185. Praetorius had a category of inhuman kinds called Waldmänner/Satyren, meaning Forest Men / Satyrs. Forest Men here would be Wild Men. Scholz-Williams, Ways of Knowing in Early Modern Germany, 40. Richard Bernheimer argues that the European wild man was "no other than the demons of lower mythology, the centaurs, satyrs, and Pan, the fauns and sylvans and Silenus." Richard Bernheimer, Wild Men in the Middle Ages: A Study in Art, Sentiment, and Demonology (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1952), 93. See [142] of the treatise where Hédelin notes that Jerome calls fauns and sylvans forest men.

269 John van Wyhe and Peter C. Kjærgaard, "Going the whole orang: Darwin, Wallace and the natural history of orangutans," in *Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences*, Vol. 51 (June 2015): 54-55. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.shpsc.2015.02.006 (Accessed 23 April 2019).

270 Nash, Wild Enlightenment, 19.

accounts are vague and often fanciful enough that it is difficult to determine what was actually seen.

The satyr as ape was seen by most as an animal; by some as a degenerate form of human; 271 and by others as an early kinsman of human beings that needed only time (possibly generations), care, and instruction to learn to speak and acquire civilized habits. In nearly all arguments, as noted above including Augustine's, speech was a defining marker of humanity because speech was necessary for salvation, and if God gave his only begotten son to save humanity from damnation, then if one is human, one is capable of salvation, which requires the ability to understand and to confess one's faith.272

Between c. 1625 and 1775, this discourse evolved so that by the middle of the eighteenth century, there were those who argued that some apes were human, or were a form of degenerated humans, or had the potential to achieve humanity through improvement. The degeneration debate about humans was rather widely embraced by the likes of Walter Raleigh (ca. 1552 – 1618), for example.273 In the vein of improvement, it is worth mentioning that while perfection was possible for humans because they possess

²⁷¹ Perhaps this is a stretch, but it is not impossible that apes might have been perceived as bearing some envy toward humans for any who may have seen them as degenerated humans. For example, in Francis Bacon's discussion of "Deformity," he argues that deformity "stirreth in them industry to watch and observe the weakness of others, that they may have somewhat to repay." Francis Bacon, *Essays and New Atlantis* (Roslyn, NY: Walter J. Black, 1942), 182-183.

²⁷² Again, Paracelsus is an exception in that nymphs, which are not human, do have the capacity to become human in part because they can speak. They "are men, but on the animal side alone, without the soul." Paracelsus, *Four Treatises*, edited by Henry E. Sigerist; translated by C. Lilian Temkin, George Rosen, Gregory Zilboorg, and Henry E. Sigereist (1941; repr. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), 238, 237-241. Curiously Paracelsus holds that while they are rational, they have no soul. This must explain how they can become human through marriage to a human. It should also be noted that there were many anti-Paracelsans in hi day and well beyond. Scholz-Williams, *Ways of Knowing in Early Modern Germany*, 42, 48.

²⁷³ Curran, The Anatomy of Blackness, 21-26.

a rational soul, very few actually achieve it due to the rigors required. There are indeed many human beings who are not only imperfect but incomplete, according to Plato (ca. 428 BCE - 347 BCE), for example, who saw women as not fully human; Marcellus Donatus (1538-1602), for whom peasants were between animal and human; and Praetorius included the mentally ill, students, gluttons, so-called sodomites, drunks, and the people of Pomerania among the incompletely human. For Praetorius, the incompleteness of one's humanity seems to be tied primarily to moral failings, for even those with a lack of charity, the vain or violent, or those obsessed with the ever changing fashions of the day were not fully human.274

More than a century later, Carolus Linnæus saw apes as separate species from human beings, but when he first produced his *Systema Naturae* in 1735, which is often credited with creating the taxonomizing standard which would become the foundation of much in modern scientific understanding of the natural world, humans were included with apes in a category under *Quadrupedia* called primates.275 It was only in response to outrage that, nine editions later in 1758 this was scrapped in favor of a revision where human beings stood on their own.276 Published in ten editions, with the first in 1735 and the last in 1758, the first edition categorized primates as follows:

274 Scholz-Williams, Ways of Knowing in Early Modern Germany, 35-39.

²⁷⁵ Richard Nash cites the example of John Ray's 1693 *Synopsis methodica animalium quadrapedum et serpetini generis* as the norm in "a longstanding practice of simply omitting humans from its description of the brute creation." Nash, *Wild Enlightenment*, 15; Carolus Linnaeus, *Systema Naturae* (Leiden: Johann Wilhelm de Groot for Theodor Haak, 1735), 6v. https://archive.org/details/mobot31753002972252/page/n1.

²⁷⁶ The Systema Naturae was published in ten editions, with the first in 1735 and the last in 1758.

Under Quadrupedia with quadrupeds characterized as having hairy bodies, four feet, living in pairs, and lactating, the 1735 edition of *Systema Naturae* categorizes anthropomorpha as follows in the rough translation below:

Human: Know thyself.
White European.
Red American.
Dusky Asian.
Black African.

Ape: Having 5 fingers / toes on the front and hind, and they are the same in the front and back legs / arms.

Apes Without a Tail: Papio. Satyr.
Cercopithecus (Long Tailed Monkey).
Cynocephalus (dog headed apes, so this would be a baboon presumably).

Sloth: 3 or 2 toes on the front legs / arms, and 3 on the hind.

Ai. *Lazy*. Tardigradus.277

Linneaus was unusual in including humans in any animal category. His including apes and humans together was roundly rebuked because it demeaned humanity, particularly because it dropped humans down rather than raising apes up.278 Nash argues

```
"ANTHROPOMORPHA. Dentes primores 4. utrinque: vel nulli.
Homo Nosce te ipsum.
H Europæus albsc.
```

H Americanus rubesc. H Asiaticus fuscus. H Africanus nigr.

Simia. Digiti ANTERIORIES. 5. POSTERIORES. 5.

Posteriores anterioribus similes.

Simia cauda carens.
Paio. Satyrus.
Cercopithecus
Cynocephalus

Bradypus. Digiti ANTERIORIES. 3. vel 2. POSTERIORES. 3.

Ai. Inavus. *Tardigradus*"

Carolus Linnaeus, *Systema Naturae* (Leiden: Johann Wilhelm de Groot for Theodor Haak, 1735), 6v. https://archive.org/details/mobot31753002972252/page/n1

278 Nash characterizes this as "introduced the categories of 'mammals' and 'primates." However it appears that it is a single category of *Mammalia Primates*. Nash, *Wild Enlightenment*, 16.

that after the 1758 edition that acquiesced to public concerns, "Privately, Linnaeus continued to maintain that bipedalism was an acquired cultural train rather than an innate natural condition." 279 In a private letter, Linnaeus wrote, "If I called man an ape or vice versa, I would bring together all the theologians against me. Perhaps I ought to have, in accordance with the law of the discipline." 280 Linnaeus clearly separates apes from humans, but he does not separate humans from animals. It should be noted, however, that while Linnaeus sees significant structural similarities between all primates and humans, he sees humans as spiritually and cognitively unique.

Those who believed that apes, to include ape satyrs and thus chimpanzees, were human, descended from creatures who had once been human, or who had the potential to achieve humanity, were, despite their notariety and respected status accorded to some of them, outliers in this debate. 281 For those who held this view, for example, Linnaeus's contemporaries, Jean Jacques Rouseau and James Burnet, Lord Monboddo, the capacity to improve, to become more like European humans, was also a qualifier.

In Roussau's analysis of the qualities of a human, the ability to develop oneself was a twin requirement with speech. Here he speaks of Pongos, which may have been the creature we know today as the orangoutang, and of Orang-Outangs, which were likely chimpanzees:

"But tho' the Difficulties, in which all these Questions are involved, should leave some Room to dispute on this Difference between Man and Beast, there is another very specifick Quality that distinguishes them, and a Quality which will admit of no Dispute; this is the Faculty of

279 Nash, Wild Enlightenment, 109.

280 Linnaeus as quoted in Nash, Wild Enlightenment, 109.

²⁸¹ The degeneration debate about humans, however, was more widely embraced. See Curran, *The Anatomy of Blackness*, 21-26; See also Steel, "Centaurs, Satyrs, and Cynocephali," 257-274.

Improvement; a Faculty which, as Circumstances offer, successively unfolds all the other Faculties, and resides among us not only in the Species, but in the Individuals that compose it; whereas a Beast is, at the end of some Months, all he will ever be during the rest of his Life; and his Species, at the End of a thousand Years, precisely what it was the first Year of that long Period.282

.... it is evident that the Monkey does not belong to the Human Species, not only because he wants the Faculty of Speech, but above all because his Species has not the Faculty of improving, which is the specifick Characteristic of the Human Species. But it does not appear that the same Experiments have been made with the *Pongos* and the *Oran-outang* carefully enough to afford the same Conclusion. There is however a Method, by which, if the *Orang-Outang* or such other Animals were of the Human Species, the most illiterate Observers might make themselves sure of it; but besides that a single Generation would not be sufficient for such an Experiment; it must be considered as impracticable, because it is necessary that what is now no more than Supposition should be proved a Fact, before the Experiment requisite to ascertain the Reality of it could be innocently made.283

Rousseau follows this with wondering about those who rigidly require speech as a human trait. What of mutes? And what of the 1699 example of a feral child who did not walk upright and exhibited no reason or speech? However, found by human beings, this child learned to speak and behave as a human being. This child demonstrated the Faculty of Improvement in part by developing the ability to speak, and thereby showed his humanity, which Rousseau asserts might have been dismissed out of hand. 284

282 John James Rousseau, A Discourse upon the Origin and Foundation of the Inequality among Mankind, translated by (London: R and J Dodsley, 1761), 37. Note: No translator is noted.

283 Rousseau, A Discourse upon the Origin and Foundation of the Inequality among Mankind, 228-229. Rousseau goes on to explain that the animal that was likely the chimpanzee, called a variety of things in this period, was the satyr of the ancient world. "Our Voyagers make Beasts under the Name of Pongoes, Mandrills, and Orang-Outang, of the very Beings, which the Antients exalted into Divinities under the Name of Satyrs, Fauns, and Sylvans. Perhaps more exact Enquiries will shew them to be Men. In the mean time, it appears to me as reasonable to abide by the Account of Merolla, a learned Religious, an ocular Witness, and who with all his Candour was a Man of Genius, as by that of Battel a mere Merchant, or those of Dapper, Purchass, and other mere Compilers." Rousseau, A Discourse upon the Origin and Foundation of the Inequality among Mankind, 229-230.

²⁸⁴ "Had the Child had the Misfortune of falling into the Hands of our Travellers, they would certainly on account of his Silence and his Stupidity have turned him loose in the Woods again, or shut him up in a

In his 1773 work, *On the Origin and Progress of Language*, James Burnett, Lord Monboddo (1714 - 1799) devotes a chapter to addressing the positions of Buffon and Linnaeus. 285 In this chapter, his view lines up with that of Rousseau in that he too sees language and the ability to improve as key demarcators of humanity. Further, he is willing to see much more that is already potentially human in apes than are many of his contemporaries. He sees some apes as "having some sense of justice as well as honour." 286 This is counter to some of his contemporaries. For example, Monboddo's source, an English surgeon whom he calls Mr. Bell, proposed a "hypothesis" which was "quite different from" Monboddo's, specifically that "the Orang Outang is not a man, but a species betwixt man and monkey." 287 This is Monboddo's assessment of Bell's view:

For a negroe having shot a female of this kind that was feeding among his Indian corn, the male, whom our author calls the husband of this female, pursued the negroe into his house, of which having forced open the door, he seized the negro [sic] and dragged him out of the house, to the place where his wife lay dead or wounded, and the people of the neighbourhood could not rescue the negroe, nor force the Chimpenza to quit his hold of him, till they shot him likewise. If he had severely beaten or killed the negro, it was nothing more than what might have been expected from the brutal fury and revenge; but the dragging him to the place where his mate lay dead could not, in my apprehension, be with any other design, but to shew him what he had done, and then, perhaps, offer him up to the *manes* of the dead.288

Monastery; and then have published very learned Relations of his, as of a very curious Beast, and not very unlike a Man." Rousseau, A Discourse upon the Origin and Foundation of the Inequality among Mankind, 230-231.

285 See "Of the Orang Outang—The Account Buffon and Linnaeus give of him examined," in James Burnett, Lord Monboddo, *Of the Origin and Progress of Language*, Vol I, 2nd ed. (1774; repr. New York: AMS Press, 1973), 279-313.

²⁸⁶ James Burnett, Lord Monboddo, *Of the Origin and Progress of Language*, Vol I, 2nd ed. (1774; repr. New York: AMS Press, 1973), 287.

287 Burnett, Of the Origin and Progress of Language, 289.

288 Burnett, Of the Origin and Progress of Language, 287-288.

Notice that Monboddo seems to accept Bell's employment of terms of marriage. Monboddo uses the term "wife," assuming a kind of intention toward civic institution if not spiritual. There were those then and are still those today who remark on what they see as Monboddo's credulity, for after noting accurately that they are communal, he says of the "Chimpenzas" that they "build little towns or villages" and "are governed by a king that does not work".289

Where Monboddo and his contemporary Georges-Louis Leclerc, Comte de Buffon (1707 - 1788) seem to differ is that Monboddo accepts the *potential* for speech in the vocal apparatus as the qualifier, not the existence of speech itself.290 This is why the ability to improve was key because if one had the potential for speech and the ability to improve, then over time, perhaps generations, the Chimpenza could demonstrate its humanity. It may even be possible to read into Monboddo's comments that speech is not actually necessary, so much humanity does he see.291

289 Burnett, Of the Origin and Progress of Language, 288.

²⁹⁰ Alan Barnard, "Orang Outang and the Definition of Man: The Legacy of Lord Monboddo," in *Fieldwork and Footnotes: Studies in the History of European Anthropology*, ed. Han F. Vermeulen and Arturo Alvarez Roldan (London: Routledge, 1995), 97-101.

291 But Monboddo is cautious: "Now, I think it is impossible, as I have said, to believe that an Animal, who behaved in the away that Buffon has described, with so much understanding, docility, gentleness of nature, and who, like a dumb man, had the capacity of speech, having all the organs of pronunciation, though not the actual use of it, was not a Man, but an Animal of a species that never before was heard of, that is, an Animal betwixt a Monkey and a Man. It would be but going one step further, if we should suppose, as Linnaeus does, that an animal might think, reason, form opinions, and speak, and yet not be a Man, at least not such as we are.

If the Oran Outan is admitted to be a Man, it will not be denied that he is more the Man of Nature than any that have hitherto been discovered living together in numbers and in any kind of society; and, therefore, from his size, we may just be size of Man in the perfect natural state." Burnett, *Of the Origin and Progress of Language*, 135.

This view could be monogenesist as indicating that such creatures were descended from Adam but had declined over time, or that they had simply never learned to use their vocal apparatus as humans had.

For Buffon the ability to improve does not seem to sway him. He speaks of apes that closely resemble humans. Having himself seen alive only "the little orang-outang or the jocko," as opposed to the "great orang-outang or pongo," he must rely on the veracity of travelers' accounts.292 It is such an account of the seventeenth century Bontius,293 that Buffon uses here to clarify his view:

Bontius who was a doctor and chief at Batavia, and who has left us good observations on Natural History of this part of India, says expressly that he has seen with wonder some individuals of this species walking around on their feet, & among others a woman (whom he depicts) who seemed to have modesty, who covered with her face with her hand from men whom she did not know, who wept, moaned and made other human gestures, in a manner that it seemed that nothing was missing other than speech. 294

M. Linnaeus says according to Kjoep and other travelers, that even this faculty is not missing in the orang-outang, that he thinks, that he speaks & expresses himself by whistling; it is called *nocturnal man*, & gives it at the same time a description, by which it will be not be found possible to decide if this is an animal or a man.295

I can assure, having seen it many times, that not only does he not speak nor whistle to express himself, but even that he never did anything beyond

"Must the orang-outangs still be accounted brutes because they have not yet fallen upon the method of communication by articulate sounds?" Burnett, *Of the Origin and Progress of Language*, 299.

292 Georges-Louis Leclerc, Comte de Buffon, *Histoire Naturelle, Générale et Particulière*, Volume 14 (Paris, 1766), 44.

https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k1067258w/f11.image.r=tome%2014%20tome%2014 Accessed 24 April 2019

293 Jacob de Bondt.

294 "Bontius qui étoit Médecin en chef à Batavia, & qui nous a laissé de bonnes observations sur l'Histoire naturell de cette partie des Indes , dit expressément qu'il a vu avec admiration quelques individus de cette espèce marchant debout sur leurs pieds, & entr'autres une femelle (dont il donne la figure) qui sembloit avoir de la pudeur, qui se couvroit de sa main à l'aspect des hommes qu'elle ne connoissoit pas , qui pleuroit , gémissoit & fasoit les autres actions humaines , de manière qu'il sembloit que rien ne lui manquât que la parole." Leclerc, Histoire Naturelle, Générale et Particulière, 44-45.

295 "M. Linnæus dit d'après Kjoep & quelques autres Voyageurs, que cette faculté même ne manque pas à l'orang - outang, qu'il pense, qu'il parle & s'exprime en sifflant; il l'appel homme nocturne295, & en donne en même temps une description, par laquelle il ne seroit quère possible de dédecider si c'est un animal ou un homme." Leclerc, Histoire Naturelle, Générale et Particulière, 45.

what a well trained dog could not do: & incidentally he differs almost entirely from the description that M. Linnaeus gives of the orang-outang, & conforms better to that of the *satyr* by the same Author: I doubt therefore much the truth of the description of this *nocturnal man*; I even doubt his existence, & this is probably a white Negro, an albino that the Travelers, cited by M. Linnaeus, have poorly seen and poorly described. Because these albinos have in effect, like the *nocturnal man* of this Author, white, wooly & curly hair, red eyes, weak vision, &c. But they are men, & these men do not whistle & are not Pygmies of three inches high; they think, speak, and behave like other men & are also of the same size.296

It is speech that is key for Buffon.

Such opinions were not our author's nor were they the opinions of most in the seventeenth century. Hédelin was firmly in the main in his belief that those satyrs that were apes or monsters were not human. Among the monogenesists, there was no possibility for Hédelin or for a number of scholars that chimpanzees were from a strain of human beings that had degenerated from lack of contact with other human beings.

Indeed, there were many respected figures who argued that no other primates or creatures like primates could be men.297 In 1650, John Bulwer took up the question in his

Anthropometamorphosis. He describes Nicolaes Tulp's "Angola Satyr" and other such

^{296&}quot;.... Je puis assurer, l'ayant vu plusieurs fois , que non-seulement il ne parle ni ne siffle pour s'exprimer, mais même qu'il ne fait rien qu'un chien bien instruit ne pût faire : & d'ailleurs il diffère presqu'en tout de la description que M. Linnœus donne de l'orang-outang , & se rapporte beaucoup mieux à celle du satyrus296 de ce même Auteur: je doute donc beaucoup de la vérité de la description de cet homme nocturne; je doute même de son existence, & c'est probablement un Nègre blanc, un chacrelas296 que les Voyageurs , cités par M. Linnœus , auront mal vu & mal décrit. Car ces chacrelas ont en effect , comme l'homme nocturne de cet Auteur , les cheveux blancs , laineux & frisés , les yeux rouges , la vue foible , &c. Mais ce sont des hommes , & ces hommes ne sifflent pas & ne sont pas des pigmées de trente pouces de hauteur; ils pensent, parlent & agissent commes les autres hommes , & sont aussi de la même grandeur." Leclerc, Histoire Naturelle, Générale et Particulière, 46.

²⁹⁷ Janson argues that "The most 'natural' assumption to explain the existence of such creatures was that they must have descended from men who had failed to heed some Divine injunction and in punishment for their hybris had been debased to the infra-human level." Janson, *Apes and Ape Lore in the Middle Ages the Renaissance*, 14. For more on degeneration or devolution theory, see Smith, "Degeneration and Hybridism in the Early Modern Species Debate," 109-130; "Early Concepts of the Anthropomorpha," *Physis: Rivista di storia della scienza*, 4 (1962): 39-63.

creatures as having "proceeded from the wicked copulation of man and beast, the Devill Cooperating, and Divine revenge (without all doubt) ensuring thereupon". 298 Bulwer quotes Caesar Scaliger (1484 - 1558) in describing what were likely chimpanzees as "rational Bruits," and Bulwer himself notes the "rationall actions these kind of Creatures will do." 299 Despite their "man-like properties" including living in communities and building shelters, they are not human.

Bulwer protests against those who see man as "a meer Artificiall creature, and was at first but a kind of Ape or Baboon, who through his industry (by degrees) in time had improved his Reason up to the perfection of man."300 Yet one of Bulwer's chief concerns in writing *Anthropometamorphosis* is that man is ever in danger of *losing* the very traits that separate man from ape. In "A Letter directed to the Author from a worthy Friend of his, fully discovering the ground of all *Mans* Prevarications," appearing in the front matter of *Anthropometamorphosis*, R. Mason laments the state of man's vanity and other moral failings, saying that humanity is "the now little better then [sic] the perfecter sort of ape called *Man*."301 Characteristic of this fear, Bulwer cites, "a modern poet," as bemoaning that:

When men began to grow unlike the Gods, Apes grew to be like men ----302

298 Bulwer, Anthropometamorphosis, 440.

299 Bulwer's reference is to Scaliger's *Exercitationes* against Girolamo Cardano (1501-1576), from which he cites page 213, no edition named.

300 Bulwer, Anthropometamorphosis, 20r, 442-443.

301 Bulwer, Anthropometamorphosis, 10r.

 ${\tt 302} \ Bulwer, {\it Anthropometamorphosis}, \ {\tt 443}.$

This was not a fear that Hédelin shared, for the gulf between man and ape was deep and wide. In 1651, Alexander Ross would write similarly to what Hédelin had argued, that the soul of man matches no other creature.

As God hath bestowed upon Man the most excellent Soul of all others; so hath he fitted him with a Body answerable to such a Soul, of which no other Body is capable...303

Nor did John Locke in his 1689 Essay Concerning Human Understanding admit any possibility of human essence in an ape, with the rational soul as the defining factor. 304

Just as with Hédelin, while speech is not overtly stated as the evidence of a rational soul, the connection between speech and reason was nearly absolute, with the exception of some question with mutes. 305 Likewise, Tulp in his 1641 Observationes Medicae detailing his dissection – the first in Europe – of what was a chimpanzee, saw the ape as not human. 306 As noted above, in 1607 Topsell produced a paraphrase translation of Gesner's Historia Animalium, which was published from 1551 to 1558. In this translation, Gesner argues for reason among many other qualifiers. He says of Pygmies and apes, "they have no perfect use of Reason, no modesty, no honesty, nor justice of

³⁰³ Ross, Aracana Microcosmi, 23.

³⁰⁴ Locke, An Essay Concerning Human Understanding, 404-406.

³⁰⁵ Locke and many others expressly made provision for mutes who had been born without the ability to speak, or who had lost it in the course of their lifetimes. Being mute did not exclude one from humanity if one otherwise met the requirements. Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, 156. Form, however, is key. Locke clarifies elsewhere, "I think I may be confident, that whoever should see a creature of his own shape and make, though it had no more reason all its life, than a *cat* or a *parrot*, would call him still a *man*; or whoever should hear a *cat* or a *parrot* discourse, reason, and philosophise, would call or think it nothing but a *cat* or a *parrot*; and say, the one was a dull irrational *man*, and the other a very intelligent rational *parrot*." Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, 300.

³⁰⁶ Susan Wiseman argues that for most, it, "signal[ed] the divide between man and beast," in the Great Chain of Being. Susan Wiseman, "Monstrous Perfectibility: Ape-Human Transformations in Hobbes, Bulwer, and Tyson," in *At the Borders of the Human: Beasts, Bodies and Natural Philosophy in the Early Modern Period*, ed., Eric Fudge, Ruth Gilbert, and Susan Wiseman (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999), 217.

government, and although they speak, yet is their language imperfect; and above all they cannot be men, because they have no Religion, which (*Plato* saith truly) is proper to every man."307 However, it is important not to overstate the alienation of the ape to the human, for these authors also represent apes as in many ways human in their mannerisms and display of human traits. For example, Tyson's observes that chimpanzees drink from cups, and he has depicted his chimpanzee as using a walking stick in his illustration.308 Such remarkable humanesque or humane traits were emphasized in this period even as the differences were also highlighted.

Edward Tyson in his 1699 *Orang-Outang, sive Homo Sylvestris* saw "great Agreement" between his *Orang-Outang* "and a Man," and with Hédelin was of the mind that the satyrs spoken of in Greek and Roman religion were in fact the creature that he had dissected, thus excluding the chimpanzee from the human. 309 While earlier in the century, Hédelin sees this error as the work of demons deceiving the unfortunate masses into worshipping satyrs as gods, Tyson does not speculate on demons but does see these creatures as potentially offering "some Real Foundation for their *Mythology*". Did this "great agreement," he wondered:

afford the Occasion to the Ancients, of inventing the many Relations, which they have given us of several *sorts* of *Men*, which are no where to be met with but in their Writings. For I could not but think, there might be some Real Foundation for their *Mythology*; which made me more strictly enquire into their records; and examining them, I always found something

³⁰⁷ Topsell, Historie of Four-Footed Beastes, 3.

³⁰⁸ Edward Tyson, Orang-outang, sive homo sylvestris: or, The anatomy of a pygmie compared with that of a monkey, an ape, and a man. To which is added, a philological essay concerning the pygmies, the cynocephali, the satyrs, and sphinges of the ancients. Wherein it will appear that they are all either apes or monkeys, and not men, as formerly pretended (London: Thomas Bennet and Daniel Brown, 1699), Fig. 1, 30.

³⁰⁹ Tyson, Orang-outang, sive homo sylvestris, 4r.

new, that insensibly lead me on far beyond what at first I intended: and if I do not deceive my self, I have at last gained a clearer Light in these Matters, than any that has hitherto appeared. For what created the greatest difficulty, was their calling them Men, but yet with an Epithet for distinction sake, as the Ἄνδρες Ἄγριοι, Μικροί, Πυγμαῖοι, Μέλανες; so the Ἄνθρωποι κυνοπρόσωποι, &c. i. e. the Wild Men, the Little Men, the Pygmæan Men, the Black Men, the Men with $Dogs\ Faces$, &c. yet at the same time I find that they made them θηρία, $Wild\ Beasts$ ' and if so, no doubt but they were of the Quadru-manus kind; i. e. either Apes or Monkey. And such were likewise the Satyrs, the Fauni, Pan, Egipan, Sylvanus, Silenus, and the Nymphæ, as also the Sphinges of the Ancients."310

The confusion lay, thought Tyson, in "calling them *Men*" with some kind of qualifier such as wild, little, etc., when in fact they were quadrumanus.

While Tyson made no secret of the fact that his pygmy had been heard to "cry ... like a Child" and express "the *Passions* of Joy and Grief" as well as anger, and the vocal apparatus appeared to be just like that of a human being, he did not find this compelling enough to categorize this creature as human.311 Rather while the pygmy appeared to have the physical apparatus necessary to speak, Tyson "was never informed that it attempted any thing that way."312 Nor does he think it likely that such a thing will ever occur because birds might have the ability to mimick human speech, but "*Quadrupeds* never" nor "this *Quadru-manous Species of Animals*, that so nearly approaches the Structure of *Mankind*," excepting of course the "*Romances* of *Antiquity*" wherein these animals do speak, but they are not to be taken at face value.313 This was the view in the main among anatomists, theologians, and natural philosophers - that apes were not human, and it was

93

³¹⁰ Tyson, Orang-outang, sive homo sylvestris, 4r.

³¹¹ Tyson, Orang-outang, sive homo sylvestris, 25, 49, 51.

³¹² Tyson, Orang-outang, sive homo sylvestris, 51.

³¹³ Tyson, Orang-outang, sive homo sylvestris, 51.

the rational, immortal soul as represented by speech, that separated humans from all animals, no matter how similar to humans they may be in form or behavior.

Hédelin was firmly in the main in his belief that those satyrs that were apes or monsters were not human. Among the monogenesists, there was no possibility for Hédelin or for a number of scholars that chimpanzees were from a strain of human beings that had degenerated from lack of contact with other human beings, and among the polygenesists, Hédelin had no place at all.

CONCLUSION

We can observe that that satyr as ape and apes of all kinds were seen by most as animal, by some as a degenerate form of human, and by others as an early kinsman of human beings that needed only time, care, and instruction to learn to speak and acquire civilized habits. As noted earlier, with the exception of a few such as James Burnet, Lord Monboddo, this was a discourse of exclusion. Parsing out what was human meant parsing out what was not, and that was sometimes contested when dealing with the familiar, but the majority of scholars rejected the idea that apes were human. For Hédelin, his treatise is clearly a defense of humankind and God as he excludes that which offends him.:

Still, one would not know how, without an impious irreverence, to give to [46] a fully mortal and monstrous creature, the name of man, a name so holy and so venerable: Moses forbade giving to foreign Gods the names of the living God, and the Jews did not dare to write fifteen by *Iod he*, ten and five, because the great name of God, *Iehoua*, began with these two letters, thus they wrote *Theth vau*, nine and six. Could we suffer this name of man, so sacred, divine, and mysterious, to be common to both a brute beast and God: The Eternal Word has been no other name more pleasing than the son of man, this is the name that David, enraptured by the prophetic spirit, gave him: In the Gospel, he himself was glorified by this name, and when we want to bear witness wholeheartedly to his love and his charitable humility, we sing, He is made man.314

314 See [46] of the treatise.

94

Hédelin will not brook with any degredation of the species of mankind as a whole, for that would drag God down with it. Preserving the purity, nobility, and unique status of man was of great urgency to our author, for the very honor of the Almighty was at stake.

Hédelin's Des Satyres raises and attempts to resolve problems with which scholars in his generation and all through the eighteenth century would grapple. His assertions about how one separates the non-human from the human shed light on intellectual culture of his own era just as Monboddo's work helps us understand his. In most ways, in the exploration of the problems of humanity debated throughout Hédelin's lifetime and all through the eighteenth century, Hédelin stood with early modern scholars as he untangled the untidy animal, monstrous, and demonic cords from the uniquely privileged human knot. There were exceptions such as Montaigne and Paracelsus.315 Like virtually everyone participating in this discourse, Hédelin anthropoorphized his subjects even as he denied their humanity. For example, Tyson depictions of the creature that he claimed was not human included a walking stick, which it certainly did not use in reality. For most and for Hédelin, to be human, one must have an immortal and immaterial soul. the evidence of which are rational thought and speech, which meant living in communities. For Hédelin, necessary evidence of this soul is dominion over God's creation. It is how humans rank above animal life in the Great Chain of Being. How could a demon, monster, or ape be above man since a demon is morally inferior; a

³¹⁵ Montaigne did not reject teratological births as inhuman, and Paracelsus, saw in other species of man the potential to become human. Montaigne, "On a Monster Child," 807-808; Paracelsus, *Four Treatises*, edited by Henry E. Sigerist; translated by C. Lilian Temkin, George Rosen, Gregory Zilboorg, and Henry E. Sigereist (1941; repr. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), 237-241.

monster is a hybrid and thus has no clear place in the chain; and an ape has no dominion over other animals, being an animal itself?

A bit tautological and muddled at times, his treatise is a spirited defense of humankind and God. Preserving the purity, nobility, and unique status of man through the exclusion of all that represents immorality, deception, disorder, hybridity, and the animal was of great urgency to our author. He may have reacted with a less disciplined and rigorous argument than, say, Locke, but he was not alone among his contemporaries in rejecting any kinship of any kind with a satyr. If his argument has holes, it demonstrates the moral outrage that Hédelin may very well not have been alone in feeling upon hearing that he was kin to what he saw as a foul, reeking creature. 316 This kind of response to shifts in thinking about the natural world may have been rather common around the dinner table or in the salons, and might not have been particular to Hédelin, who was not an Enlightenment philosophe. Hédelin's treatise offers us insight into how at least one early modern educated French youth responded to the debate on the human.

This discourse on apes did not take place in a vacuum. It was closely related to the idea of species or varieties within humanity, which became more markedly associated with degeneration theory in monogenesist thought.317 The very pessimistic and inaccurate traits of deception and lasciviousness associated apes and satyrs would be applied to people in the Americas and sub-Saharan Africa, and would be used to question their human status and to justify their commodification - excluding not only animals from

316 Examples of holes in Hédelin's argument would be the idea that souls must stop at the halfway point in a hybrid body, even though we can assume that he was aware of mules. In other words, does the horse soul vie with the donkey soul somewhere in the middle of the mule body? Another would be the idea that humans must rank above animals in order to rank above animals.

³¹⁷ Curran, The Anatomy of Blackness, 20-23, 74-166.

humankind but other human beings from humankind. Where Hédelin stood on this question is unknown. But certainly he sought out to build a wall of definition and to bring what he saw as order to that he saw as disorder. In his later writings, there is a stark bifurcation between male and female, with the male capable of only so much self-control, and the female responsible for her own safety and honor because of the very brute nature of the human male that Hédelin so stridently denies. In Part V of the Introduction, we shall see that in Hédelin's mind, the seventeenth century French woman had much to fear from the seventeenth century man. The very creature he has taken such pains to exclude seems to be lurking within the precisely human male.

INTRODUCTION: PART V

MONSTER AS MIRROR:

THE SATYR AS THE ANTI-HÉDELIN

As noted above, thirty years before he wrote the foundational La Pratique du

théâtre, the future Abbé d'Aubignac published Des Satyres, brutes, monstres et démons.

This 1627 treatise displays François Hédelin's adherence to order and piety. Satyrs -

wanton in their displays of masculine excess in all its threatening potential - repulsed the

pious, orderly young scholar. Hédelin's concern is not existential but ontological - not if

they are but what they are. The future abbé methodically parses the possibilities of what

exactly satyrs are - beasts, monstrous hybrids, or demons? His conclusion is that some are

apes; some few are hybrids; and most are demons. Above all, there is no possibility that

any of the varieties could be human beings descended from Adam.

In their sixth century classical origins, satyrs bodies were human with only horse

tails, chronically erect phalluses, and pointed ears like a horse to differentiate them from

men.318 In the Hellenistic era and by the time Romans had adopted satyrs, these creatures

had become more overtly monstrous in their half-goat half-man iteration, no longer

resembling humans as closely as did their forebears.319 Silenus was known as the father

of the satyrs, and he tended Dionysus / Bacchus in his infancy. Satyrs served as Dionysus'

318 On vases, they did occasionally appear with horses hooves. Shaw, Euripides, 3.

319 Kaufmann, The Noble Savage, 1.

98

retainers, accompanying him in his entourage, drinking with him, dancing, and generally making merry. They were, according to Carl A. Shaw, "both more animal than man, but also more divine." 320 They were known as liars, tricksters, and cowards. However, satyrs were not always cowards, for in their role as retainers to Dionysus, they served him as troops in his successful military campaign to force the inhabitants of India to worship him and to drink wine. Pythagoras also held that satyrs served as hosts to transmigrating human souls, meaning that some satyrs were capable of great wisdom and could see into the future. 321 Notoriously and sometimes violently libinous, satyrs regularly attempted to seduce nymphs and human women, settling for rape where seduction failed. Satyrs were associated with both religion and games, providing music with flutes and pipes associated with Pan who shared the satyr trait of goat legs. 322

In their association with tragedic plays, satyr plays served a key purpose in the Greek theater, in particular during the Athenian festival called the City Dionysia, also known as the Great Dionysia. 323 After each tragedy play, a satyr play would be performed, in which the tragedy would be turned on its head, restoring levity and cheer to the stage before sending the audience on its way. François Lissarague calls the satyr play a "fun-house mirror" of the events within the tragedy. 324 Because they "operate[d] at the

320 Shaw, Euripides, 3-4.

³²¹ Giovan Francesco Straparola, *The Pleasant Nights*, vol. 1 ed. Donald Beecher (Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 2012), 516, n. 2.

³²² Kaufmann, The Noble Savage, 2.

³²³ Shaw, Euripides, 1.

³²⁴ François Lissarague, "Why Satyrs Are Good to Represent," in John J. Winkler and Froma Zeilin, eds., *Nothing to Do with Dionysus?* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), 235.

boundaries of the human and animal worlds, drawing upon exaggerated humour to critique those very institutions and rituals that define the human sphere," satyr plays were uniquely suited to poke fun at Odysseus, for instance.325

Des Satyrs was to be the first treatise in a proposed series on monstrous races.326

There was a debate about Pliny's monstrous races at the time, but Hédelin preceded most of the proto-scientific discourse on this particular creature, which as we saw in Part IV of the Introduction was conflated with the wild man and many species of ape. So if the entire suite of monsters was his intent, why choose the satyr as the starting point? It is possible that his keen interest in the satyr may have developed from an interest in classical drama. But might Hédelin have started with satyrs because they were particularly representative of what Hédelin found intolerable, moreso than the centaur or cynocephalus, for example? Might they have touched a little more often those inchoate fears that Friedman explores?327 If to understand is in some sense to control as Edward Said has argued, might this pious, theologically minded young man have seen an opportunity to cordon off a threat to order, not just a threat in the world but in himself?328

Drawing on the work of Amy Wygant and Bernard Bourque as well as the monster theory of Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, John Block Friedman, and Asa Mittman, this chapter argues that by examining the contempt with which Hédelin viewed satyrs, it is possible to sketch out what he valued most highly. Visible in the negative of the monsters'

³²⁵ Carol Dougherty, *Prometheus* (New York: Routledge, 2006), 56-57.

³²⁶ See [à v v.] in the front matter of the treatise.

³²⁷ Friedman, "Foreword," xxv. See Monstrous Races under Introduction: Part III.

³²⁸ Edward W. Said, *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979), 32.

reflection, these satyrs that so exercised the future abbé, we see what he feared and rejected: masculine excess, disorder, indecorum, false piety, drunkenness, violence, deception, and libidinal excess. Hédelin's creator would never make the ignoble satyr kin to Hédelin. The future abbé's man, the descendant of Adam, is "the most holy and admirable ornament of the Universe".329

And yet in his later fiction work, he appears to believe that the satyr potentially lurks in every man. The satyr is the ultimate id, described by Freud as "a chaos, a cauldron full of seething excitations," driven by the instincts with the sole aim of pleasure.330 Hédelin's *Des Satyres* in conjunction with his writing on and to women resolutely, ardently reject the instinctive drives of the id. These written works are manifestations of the Freudian ego, filtering the id and the parental controls of the superego into a display of self-control that allows Hédelin to portray himself as not only acceptable but admirable – an unattainable man desired by women, a man of piety and intellectual prowess. Peter Gay observes that, "Man, for Freud, is a creature of contradictions and concealments....The firmest postures and most doctrinaire convictions mask doubts and anxieties."331

This early work, *Des Satyrs*, is such a posture, and there is reason to think that there is another side to his fear that the satyr lurks in every man: desire. Cohen argues that "fear of the monster is really a kind of desire," which he based on the fact that in its function as a normalizing force, the "monster is continually linked to forbidden

329 See [233] of the treatise.

330 Sigmund Freud, *New Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis*, Standard Ed, (New York: W.W. Norton, 1965), 91-92.

331 Peter Gay, Freud for Historians (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 76.

practices."332 While Hédelin prided himself on knowing and following the rules of decorum and wanted all to know that he would never indulge in lust or physical intimacy, which he claimed to find repellant, he would also have all the world know that he was *capable* of breaking hearts.333 He wanted his fiction readers to know that he was desired, and that he was above desire. The satyr is the Anti-Hédelin, or so Hédelin would have his readers believe.334

THE SATYR WITHIN

The satyr within is the foil against which Hédelin asserts his identity as a respectable, sophisticated, refined, and desirable yet unavailable predatory man. In Hédelin's mind, every man potentially has satyric drives that are beyond the man's control once aroused.335 Indeed every man poses an acknowledged danger to women precisely like the danger posed by the satyr. The man in Hédelin's seventeenth-century mind is designed with a character flaw that is at once rejected and celebrated. As Bernard Bourque has demonstrated, men in Hédelin's mind are untrustworthy and are unable to control themselves. If the monster is a mirror, then in that mirror we see Hédelin's man as a satyr. As much as Hédelin strives to prove otherwise, much of his life's work shows that he deeply suspects this to be true.

- 332 Cohen, Monster Theory, 16.
- 333 Bourque, All the Abbé's Women, 98.

335 Bourque, All the Abbé's Women, 125.

102

³³⁴ The section entitled Intro III: Historiography of the Monstrous established that monsters have semiotic value. Among their many uses is their value in establishing the identities of the cultures that created them and the identities of the people within those cultures. As François Lissarrague argues, with their characteristic excess of lust, debauchery, and drunkenness, it is "as if satyrs were a means to explore human culture through a fun-house mirror; the satyrs are antitypes of the Athenian male citizenry and presents us with in an inverted anthropology (or andrology) of the ancient city State." Lissarrague, "Why Satyrs Are Good to Represent," 235, 234-236.

In Bourque's work, Hédelin, like many other early modern European men, believed that every woman was responsible for her own honor as well as responsible for the behavior of men who, as subject to intense passions, could not be expected to control themselves beyond an unspecified point of provocation.336 The "man's desire for conquest," as Bourque describes it is presumably understood to be either somehow exempt from moral judgment, which seems unlikely; outside the norms of behavior and therefore monstrous and yet acceptably monstrous as a manifestation of current norms of masculinity; or it is intrepid and outside the man's control, unstoppable, as a force of nature acting upon him, akin to a storm.337 Notwithstanding protestations to the contrary in the form of his treatise, Hédelin appears to have believed that he and his fellows had more in common with satyrs than Hédelin would have been willing to claim outright. This makes the satyr the perfect place to start as a young man fresh from his studies, wishing to show off his erudition, piety, and adulthood. The satyr allows Hédelin to begin his adult life having marked out where he stands, firmly rejecting everything he should reject, and championing order. This treatise expresses a young man's desire to be taken seriously.338 It appears to have served him well in at least one crucial area. As stated above, Arnaud speculates that this work jettisoning the satyr from the family of man, together with its natural philosophical bent contributed to Cardinal Richelieu's confidence in the young Hédelin to serve as tutor to his nephew.339

336 "The onus, therefore, is on the female to avoid being trapped." Bourque, All the Abbé's Women, 198.

337 Bourque, All the Abbé's Women, 181.

338 Arnaud, Les Théories dramatiques au XVIIe Siècle, 159.

339 Arnaud, Les Théories dramatiques au XVIIe Siècle, 15.

Written in 1627 when Hédelin was a twenty-three year-old lawyer in Parlement, Des Satyres is the medium by which Hédelin attempts to transform himself from precious and precocious to a serious scholar.340 By this point in his life, he has educated himself and spent much time in the company of women, in salons as a youngster and playing the kinds games of wit at which he excelled. In this treatise as well as in his later fiction work, he is interested in innocence and morality as well as deception.341 In 1667, he would publish his widely read Les Conseils d'Ariste à Célimène: sur les moyens de conserver sa reputation. 342 This book was a fictionalized autobiographical advice book to young women on how to preserve their reputations in the face of masculine deception and the universal male drive for conquest. The fictional Ariste is Hédelin himself, and he writes as an older man with valuable experience as a predator in his younger days, writing now to Célimène, who in his younger days would have been his prey.343 To be clear, Ariste / Hédelin claims never to have been looking for physical consummation but rather to cause women fall in love with him, which would generally lead to lost reputations through their careless allowances of private audiences or favoring him over a balance of male acquaintanceship.

DISORDER

³⁴⁰ Arnaud, Les Théories dramatiques au XVIIe Siècle, 15.

³⁴¹ See Arnaud for more on Hédelin as a moralist from a young age. Arnaud, *Les Théories dramatiques au XVIIe Siècle*, 15.

³⁴² Bourque, *All the Abbé's Women*, 11; "Son petit livre, *Les Conseils d'Ariste à Célimène*, publié en 1666, fut accueilli avec un faveur marqué qui due lui adoucir l'amertume de l'insuccès de *Macarise*." Arnaud, *Les Théories dramatiques au XVIIe Siècle*, 55.

³⁴³ Bourque, All the Abbé's Women, 114-125, esp 125.

Before exploring the immorality of satyrs, it is worthwhile to spend a few moments on the disorder that they represented and which Hédelin rejected. Like all good monsters, the satyr defies categorization, and for the monstrous hybrid, the creature is made outside the boundaries of acceptable sexual norms.344 This very defying of categories vexes Hédelin. As discussed in Part IV of this Introduction, in the young abbé's mind, as in the minds of many of his contemporaries, there can be no sanctioned hybridity of man with any other creature because no species or individual creature outside a species can hold a place between man and angel in the Great Chain of Being.345

Beyond this, what about the legal and theological consequences? Amy Wygant neatly addresses the essence of these problems as presented in Hédelin's treatise. She writes of the satyr monster, that is to say the satyr that is either a monstrous species, which Hédelin asserts is impossible because of the infertility of hybrids, like mules, or an individual monstrous hybrid creature, which may be possible but is against the will of God.346 In theological terms, the monster as half-human is contamined through the taint of original sin, and yet it is the bestial nature of the goat half that contaminates the sacraments if – God forbid – they were ever administered to a satyr. They further disturb

344 This phrasing "the monster ... defies categorization" comes from Sue Bakh's review of Cohen's *Monster Theory*. Sue Bakh, "The Final Judgement in 'Monster Culture," *The Morningside Review* (2011/2012) https://morningsidereview.org/essay/the-final-judgement-in-monster-culture/; See also Wygant's elegant closing lines to Part I of her study of Hédelin's *Des Satyres*. "The monster is what happens textually in the face of an overwhelming libidinal drive, an historical breaking point, a situation impossible to represent, a career gone wrong. Sex, time, passion and the self: d'Aubignac's monsters are, indeed, the stumbling block of modernity, its *topos*, the satyr-monster pulls a curtain aside to reveal a sleeping nymph and the play begins." Wygant, "D'Aubignac, Demonologist, I: Monkeys and Monsters," 166

³⁴⁵ Lovejoy's work on this is explored in Introduction: Part IV.

³⁴⁶ As noted in Part IV of this Introduction, the infertility of hybrids was not taken as fact by all of Hédelin's contemporaries. See Enenkel, "The Species and Beyond."

divine order with the conundrum of what would happen to the animal parts of their bodies in the restorative process of physical resurrection, which, according to Hédelin, is a privilege awarded only to human bodies. And then there is the question of civil order. How would crimes be adjudicated when they are committed against a body that is hybrid? A fatal blow to the goat half still kills the human half, and yet it would not be murde What of a satyr that commits a crime? If the human hand wielded the blade that murdered a human, the satyr is guilty. But if the goat's hoof struck and killed a human, it is nothing more than the wildness of an irrational beast.347 The hybrid is disorder incarnate. It is not a unity of two species; it is the neither-ness of both, forced to inhabit a single monstrous body.

This kind of defiance of any efforts to fit the satyr neatly into a category of human or animal, this persistence in bleeding over into both categories while exempt from both, meant for Hédelin that no satyr could be sanctioned by God, for God would not create anything so disorderly, so outside and so prone to extruding beyond the bounds of order. The satyr is Cohen's "harbinger of category crisis," and for Hédelin this means that it can not possibly be from God.348 Rather it is an error of ignorance to "confess to some Divinity in these abominable monsters" that were the product of "incest and adultery" as was Pan, the supposed "son of Penelope and Mercury [190] changed into a goat, or of Jupiter and Hybris".349

³⁴⁷ Wygant, "D'Aubignac, Demonologist, I: Monkeys and Monsters," 159.

³⁴⁸ Part IV maintains that there was no category crisis for Hédelin, and this is true where satyrs relate to humanity. They are not in any way part of the human category. Cohen, *Monster Theory*, 6-7.

³⁴⁹ See [189-190] of the treatise.

Hybridity resists reason and signifies chaos. John Block Friedman sees the "cosmological encounters and wars between monsters and gods, and later between monsters and men" as "an archetype of reason and beauty in eternal conflict with the irrational and chaotic." 350 In other words, disorder and unreason pit civilization against wilderness, the dwelling place of satyrs. Hédelin like his contemporaries, the Puritans of New England, saw the untamed as demonic. 351 For Hédelin, disorder is demonic because God is unity, and Demons or the Devil are fragments. As Amy Wygant observes, during the seventeenth century, the meaning of the term 'demon' had undergone a transformation so that "its meaning is less 'fiend' than 'frenzy'…" 352 Hédelin observes that among the names for God, Place was one such name. 353 Amy Wygant interprets this to mean:

In one dense move, d'Aubignac manages to appeal firstly to the cult of unity, the worship of a single God, in a single Church, through a single faith. Secondly, etymology furnishes an un-problematically convincing argument. If the word for 'God' in fact means 'place', then God must be the place, the site of all sites. ... If God is a unity, then the devil must be multiplicity.354

As the servant of a pagan god, the satyr represents not only disorder and chaos but the demonic, so this coupling of God with unity and order, and the devil with multiplicity and disorder converges in the figure of the satyr. As mentioned earlier, while Hédelin finds that some satyrs are apes, and a few are monstrous hybrids, the vast majority are demons

³⁵⁰ Friedman, "Foreword," xxviii.

³⁵¹ Roderick Frazer Nash, *Wilderness & The American Mind*, 4th ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 36-40.

³⁵² Wygant, "D'Aubignac, Demonologist, II: St Anthony and the Satyr," 82.

³⁵³ See [106-107] in this treatise.

³⁵⁴ Wygant, "D'Aubignac, Demonologist, II: St Anthony and the Satyr," 73.

who take on the form of the satyr in order to stupefy and terrify upon sight. The demonic satyr is a deception, curiously able to convince the ignorant and credulous in spite of its absurdity.355 It makes perfect sense to Hédelin that satyrs would be demons. This is plausible because the goat is rightly associated with the demonic. "Of all the appearances with which the [132] Demons are adorned, that of the goat, foul and reeking animal, and hieroglyphic of all filth, has always been the most agreeable to them..."356 The demon satyr's absurd existence has *vray-semblance*, which I translate as plausibility, because of "the likeness that there is between goats and Demons".357

Much of what disturbs Hédelin in the hybrid is not just the sexual immorality that produces it, but the multiplicity, implausibility, and discontinuity that Amy Wygant explores, finding discontinuity "fundamentally ... connected to the demonological" for Hédelin in both Des Satyres and La Pratique.358 The satyr does not closely resemble anything other than a demon, and so, with the exception of those that are apes and those that are monstrous hybrids, it is only plausible that the vast majority of satyrs recorded in human history are demons. The demon is deception, and the demon is fragmentation of unity. At the time when he was commissioned to bring order to the stage, the older Hédelin writes in *La pratique du théâtre* that the demon of trouble, turmoil, and disorder

³⁵⁵ As Amy Wygant notes, "illusion....was demonic." Wygant, Medea, Magic, and Modernity in France, 115.

³⁵⁶ See [132-133] of the treatise.

³⁵⁷ See [132] of the treatise. Bourque defines vraisemblance as verisimilitude. Bourque, All the Abbé's Women, 181.

³⁵⁸ Wygant, "D'Aubignac, Demonologist, II: St Anthony and the Satyr," 79.

reignes on the stage.359 This is the continuity of the monstrosity of chaos that Wygant sees from *Des Satyres* to *La Pratique*, and the satyr is ideally situated to track this trajectory.

It is in Book IV, *Of Demon Satyrs*, where Hédelin's writing is most comfortable for the reader for its flow and confidence. It is exquisite at times. Theology, or rather demonology in this case, seems to be his home ground.

But what was this other than the Demons who came to assist in the ceremonies and honors which were rendered to them by the Magicians under shadow of Religion, taking that form of Satyrs, as it is said that they do still today in the nocturnal gatherings of the Sorcerers, that one calls Sabbat, yielding obligingly to their dances and to their depravities. Because it is certain that the Trieterica, and these great mysteries of Bacchus, these outrageous Orgies, as Orpheus calls them, from which the uninitiated were chased away and only the initiated admitted, were the same thing as these conventicles of night where only those who have made a pact with the Devil can be admitted, and who hold their mouths [129] closed to their secret impieties in the midst of the most terrible torments.360

Chaos, disorder, indecorum, subversion of natural law, these are the media of the satyr's service to the devil. Whether the shocking and abominable lifestyle of satyr demons or the abominable actions that begot satyr monsters, they were all counter to God's will. They damaged Adamic humanity through deception, seducing the ignorant to worship false demi-gods, and through foul sexual excess that defiled both man and beast.361

PREDATION

359 Wygant, "D'Aubignac, Demonologist, II: St Anthony and the Satyr," 81. For the Hédelin quote, "où regne le Démon de l'inquietude, du trouble & du desordre," see Hédelin, La Pratique du théâtre, 400-401.

360 See [128-129] and [134-135] of the treatise.

361 See [112-113] and [115-116] of the treatise.

109

While much beyond the sexual excess disturbs Hédelin about the satyr, sexual excess and violation of taboos and all of God's sexual laws seem to disturb him most. It is the argument of this chapter that Hédelin chose to focus first on the satyr rather than the centaur because this particular creature most thoroughly and overtly represented what he claimed to reject. 362 Richard Nash's description of the satyr is useful to understanding what it may have represented to Hédelin:

For the legendary figure of the satyr, half-man and half-beast, is a figure of (especially sexual) predation lurking in the shadows of the forest who polices the boundary between civilization and the wild, threatening to carry off those woman and children who do not participate in their own domestication.363

There is no reason to doubt Hédelin's sincerity in his rejection of all of the satyr's evils. However, in one area, his later writings would indicate that he may harbor some of the pleasure that Daston and Park describe in encounters with the monstrous. 364 That area is masculine predation, which in seventeenth century France involved deception and loss of control.

OTHER REJECTED BEHAVIOR

Before examining this particular vice, it would be wise to explore the many kinds of behavior that Hédelin uses this treatise to reject, not just for himself but for all descendants of Adam. For example, the three qualities associated with ape satyrs are beneath human dignity.

362 Given the period and that Hédelin is an abbé, the temptation is to use the term "sins," however Hédelin has made it clear that the satyr can not sin because he is not under God's laws, for he is not a descendant of Adam.

363 Nash, Wild Enlightenment, 129.

³⁶⁴ Daston and Park assert that encounters with the monstrous provoke three emotions: "horror, pleasure, and repugnance." Daston and Park, *Wonders and the Order of Nature*, 176.

As for the nature of Ape Satyrs, we have noted three qualities that are characteristic and particular to them, the habitation of forests and wildernesses, the flexibility of their limbs in clownish dances, and an excessive fury of love: all of which are common to Demon Satyrs in the books of the Ancients.365

Dwelling in the wilderness rather than in civilization, indecorous behavior, and libidinal excess bordering on rage are all beneath human dignity.366 This does not mean that there are not individual humans who sully humanity with bestial behavior. Certainly Hédelin does not accept that such behavior is God's will for his favorite creation. As one would expect, demon satyrs also do not hold themselves to human standards. Wild, violent, utterly undignified thrashing characterizes their dancing. On the other hand, there is a Satyr dance portrayed as the "little stomping of the God Pan, [which] conforms to the gait of Apes when they go on their two hind legs.367 In other words, the demonic conforms more to the bestial than to the human. It is beneath the human in every way.

As discussed above, Hédelin also rejects hybridity, not just for its unruliness and defiance of categorization, or for its spiritual conundrums, but for the lawless lust that produces it.368 This is true not just of monster satyrs but of ape satyrs and demon satyrs. Hédelin argues that most satyrs associated with ancient gods were demons.369 Thriving on lasciviousness, "Demons in the form of Satyrs have caused a lust so fierce to appear that

365 See [204] of the treatise.

³⁶⁶ See [186] of the treatise. Certainly Hédelin's response to the satyr, the monstrous hybrid, matches the repugnance noted by Daston and Park among Catholics during the interconfessional wars of the monsters. Daston and Park, *Wonders and the Order of Nature*, 176. Exceptions for dwelling in the wilderness would presumably be made for hermits.

367 See [204-205] of the treatise.

368 Wygant, "D'Aubignac, Demonologist, I: Monkeys and Monsters," 156.

369 Some were apes. See [66] of the treatise.

they have held the name of Incubi..."370 Sexuality, particularly in excessive forms, is rejected. Bourque argues that Hédelin finds human sexuality always problematic but does not expound on this.371 For our purposes, we will take Hédelin at his word on matters of sexual transgression.

And yet, Cohen's sixth thesis of his monster theory is that "fear of the monster is really a kind of desire." This is not a stretch. For Hédelin, there is no evidence that his desires were extreme on the physical spectrum. Rather they were the desire to be desired and to trap women into wanting him, the unavailable yet intellectually attractive man. His was a desire to be a successfully deceptive predator. Bourque's conclusion is based not on *Des Satyrs* but on his later fictional writing, all of which centered on women. 373

MASCULINITY & HÉDELIN

The contained body, control of oneself and of others, and the knowledge and proper execution of elaborate manners had emerged in the Renaissance as expressions of elite masculinity, and this continued as a cultural and political phenomenon in Hédelin's lifetime.374 He appears to have endeavored to embody this type as a man serving the

370 See [206-208] of the treatise.

371 Bourque, All the Abbé's Women, 98, 124.

372 Cohen, Monster Theory, 16-20.

373 For example, Bourque notes a passage in *Le Roman des letters* where Hédelin describes physical intimacy as "fol amour" and "mauvais plaisirs." Women may not have been his counterpoint as much as the satyr was. Hédelin's feminine ideal is "graceful, dressed in clothes that befit contemporary style and is properly adorned for genteel society. Her personality is not that of a stick-in-the-mud, but rather one that is pleasant and polite. Although she is completely virtuous and opposes vice in all its forms, she takes part in enjoyments that do not offend decorum." Bourque, *All the Abbé's Women*, 98, 44, 173.

374 Christopher Forth draws on sixteenth century manuals of decorum such as Baldassare Castiglione's *Il libro del Cortegiano* and Desiderius Erasmus' *De Civilitate morum puerilium* in noting the growing social and political value of "self-regulation" as masculinity came to mean self-containment and self-control.

King's right-hand, Cardinal Richelieu,375 and seems to have been successful in this endeavor except in containing rage which frequently shamed him.376 Christopher Forth argues that masculinity is unstable, constantly requiring cultural reinforcement.377 I would note that masculinity is no more unstable than say, femininity, race, or ethnicity. Easily threatened whenever their less than natural, fundamental, or nominal natures are exposed, all cultural constructs face resistance and require reinforcement. Cohen claims that "The monster's destructiveness is really a deconstructiveness: it threatens to reveal that difference originates in process, rather than in fact (and that 'fact' is subject to constant reconstruction and change)".378 In other words, if masculinity, like any other

Indeed, "Control of one's gestures, emotions, and bolidy functions were public performances that strengthened the body politic." Christopher Forth, *Masculinity in the Modern West: Gender, Civilization and the Body* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 26-27. See also Norbert Elias, *The Civilizing Process: The History of Manners*, vol. 1, translated by Edmund Jephcott (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978).

As pertinent to the discussion of satyrs, Forth argues that even as the masculinity of uncontainable emotion lost value, "court societies that were supposedly centers of civilized conduct were also rampant with drunkenness, gambling, gluttony and sexual excesses" as men found the more intensely and overtly forbidden satyr-like behavior all the more enticing. Forth, *Masculinity in the Modern West*, 28-29.

Reason became salvation, separating man from beast, and enabling men to exercise self-discipline. Forth, *Masculinity in the Modern West*, 30.

375 Arnaud, Les Théories dramatiques au XVIIe Siècle, 16, 46. As François Lissarrague argues, "The world of the satyrs around Dionysos is a world turned upside down, displaced, reversed." François Lissarrague, "Why Satyrs Are Good to Represent," 234, 232-234; Hédelin certainly did not find a world turned upside down amusing. He had a fondness for authority, whether the textual authority of the ancients or the hierarchical authority of his social milieu. He did not find eruptions in the calm surface of rank amusing, nor mocking superiors – unless it was he doing the attacking. See, for example, Bourque, All the Abbé's Women, 17-19.

³⁷⁶ For example, a contemporary described him in 1659 as "certainly the most hot-tempered and most violent man in his passions that you have ever known." Bourque, *All the Abbé's Women*, 18.

377 It should be acknowledged that Forth's theory is focused on a period that begins twenty-four years after his death and seventy-three years after the publication of *Des Satyres*, however it is not without relevance to the meaning of masculinity during Hédelin's lifetime. Forth, *Masculinity in the Modern West*, 18. Forth, *Masculinity in the Modern West*, 5.

378 Cohen, Monster Theory, 15.

cultural construct, requires constant reconstruction and reestablishment by the individual and on a cultural level, then those monsters that expose what masculinity must reject will be the most important to those who fear what such monsters represent. The satyr exposes a masculine excess and unruliness, an uncontainable passion that, at least on the surface, Hédelin rejects. And yet, as we will see, his *Les Conseils d'Ariste à Célimène sur les moyens de conserver sa reputation* attests that Hédelin not only is convinced of the presence of these qualities in men, he seems to celebrate their potential, if only for its power over women. As Surekha Davies observes, "one need not be born a monster; one could choose to become one."379 This possibility magnifies the threat.

There may have been a desire in our author for the freedom of the libidinous and ungovernable satyr, but that does not seem likely. Rather, the ape satyr's and demon satyr's predation, combined with the demon satyr's deception are alive and well in seventeenth century elite French masculinity, as in Hédelin himself as a young man.380 As Bernard Bourque demonstrates, in seventeenth century French society, it is the woman's responsibility to keep men from acting on their innate, dangerous impulses.

...this message is a recurring one in d'Aubignac's works. Because of the unchangeable nature of the male sex, it is the responsibility of the female to avoid words and actions that will activate the man's desire for conquest. Should sexual depravity occur, the fault lies with the woman for not having prevented the situation in the first place.381

379 Surekha Davies, "The Unlucky, the Bad, and the Ugly," in *The Ashgate Research Companion to Monsters and the Monstrous*, ed. Asa Mittman with Peter J. Dendle (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2013), xxv.

114

3

³⁸⁰ See [79-80] of the treatise.

³⁸¹ Bourque, All the Abbé's Women, 181, 144-5.

Later in life, Hédelin appears to wish us to believe that, although he is exempt from the physical side of this desire for conquest, he had fully participated for much of his life in the intellectual and emotional game. One cannot help but wonder if Hédelin would have accepted physical intimacy had it been available to him. And perhaps if it was never offered to him, he constructed a safe satyr, so to speak, in himself, as a safe predator, safe from physical desire from within, and not posing a physical threat to women, only a threat to their reputations that would bolster his as a virile male.

Les Conseils d'Ariste à Célimène sur les moyens de conserver sa reputation,

Hédelin's 1666 popular advice book to a fictional young woman from a fictional himself
by the name of Ariste, counsels the young Célimène that men are universally

untrustworthy, except for himself of course, and a few other honest and nearly impossible
to identify men.382 And yet he speaks from his own experience as a former heart breaker,
experience that makes his book valuable for its first-hand wisdom. It is presumably age
that makes him safe now, although age is no guarantor.383 The author as Ariste recalls
Cain's murder of Abel, his brother. Abel, trusting Cain, had gone for a walk with him
only to be murdered by Cain. Making a connection to Célimène and her like, Hédelin
observes that there is a lesson to be drawn here:

...on those occasions when Ladies of your age and your beauty, who are commonly called young Suns, some of whom have lost the life of their honor from their very first walk through the devices of those who appeared to be the most attached to them....384

382 Bourque, All the Abbé's Women, 82, 87-88, 90-91, 112, 198-9.

"Men are free-ranging and unable to control themselves; even the oldest, wisest and most well-intentioned among them are not completely trustworthy." Bourque, *All the Abbé's Women*, 125.

^{384 &}quot;...c'est peut-estre vn enseignement de ce qui peut arriver dans ces occasions aux Dames de vostre aage & de vostre beauté, que l'on nomme ordinariement de jeunes Soleils, dont quelques vnes ont perdu la vie de l'honneur dés vne premiere promenade par l'entreprise de ceux qui paroissoient leur estre les plus affectionnez..." François Hédelin, Les Conseils d'Ariste à Célimène, sur les moyens de conserver sa

A key danger for women lies is the fact that by nature they have a weakness for flattery which causes them to believe men when they should not. There is a bewildering array of ways by which women might unintentionally awaken the satyr in any man, including receiving one man more often than another, looking at him once too often, and she must always be on her guard lest she fall in love where she should not.385 Without using the term *satyre*, it seems clear that Hédelin believes that all men are satyrs inside:

[...] all form these desires, all prepare their methods; all strive to succeed; this is the conquest that all undertake, believing that it is glorious even to have thought of it when it will not be accomplished."386

This is the lust of both the ape satyr and demon satyr, and Hédelin also warns against the deception of those men who claim to be honorable. Bourque notes Hédelin's selection of terms: "déguise[r]" (to disguise) and "un piège" (a trap), which "reinforces the predator-victim theme." 387

In *Des Satyres*, Hédelin dwells at length on Saint Anthony who is deceived by what Hédelin argues is a demon satyr claiming to be pious in seeking the saint's prayers for him and, selflessly, for his nation.388 Attempting to entrap the good holy man in this deception, the demon satyr in the wilderness shares a likeness with Hédelin's contemporaries in the homes, salons, and gardens of French society. 'Trust me,' they both

116

réputation, 2nd ed. (Paris : V. Pepingue, 1667), 120-121. https://archive.org/details/lesconseilsdari00aubi/page/120

385 Bourque, All the Abbé's Women, 114-115, 116-117, 137-8, 124-146.

386 Hédelin, Les Conseils d'Ariste à Célimène, 30.

387 Bourque, All the Abbé's Women, 115.

388 See [137-187] of the treatise.

beseech their prey. 'I have only the best of intentions, and you are my only hope.' The physical appearance may be different, but the behavior is little different: flattery, professions of honorability, expressions of good intentions, and claims a wish to learn more from the prey.

In *Les Conseils*, the lack of intent to engage in sexual relations may be due to the older Hédelin's position as *abbé*. Or it may be Hédelin's way of imagining that he has many conquests of the heart without risking rejection which would be the unwanted proof that he is a tiresome pedant with little appeal.389 As Bourque argues:

His Ariste is adept at manipulation and takes great enjoyment in toying with young female hearts. He has no intentions of having sexual relationships, for that would label him as a womanizer of the worst sort. He maintains his virtue by staying well clear of the physical world. The fact that all is well at the conclusion of the novel, with the three remaining potential mistresses having a positive feeling about what was going on, and indeed feeling honored if they above all women were chosen for this game, is clearly an indication of the fantasyland nature of the plot. The sun-king Ariste, surrounded by his chosen ones, dangles his potential mistresses by making use of his superior intellectual powers, all for his own amusement.³⁹⁰

While Hédelin could control *hims*elf because he is above physical desires, he seems to believe or at least suspect that many, if not most, Adamic men are not unlike satyrs in clothing. They deceive, and they are predatory. It is up to women not to awake the satyr potentially within every man.

Twenty-one of the twenty-nine chapters in *Les Conseils* instruct readers how young women should behave in the presence of men in order to protect themselves from giving the wrong impression to any interested parties, such as

390 Bourque, All the Abbé's Women, 98-99, 101, 163, 165, 197.

117

³⁸⁹ Bourque, All the Abbé's Women, 9-67, 197-198.

society, other male friends, or to a man who would take liberties.³⁹¹ For example, Ariste warns Célimène that however well-meaning, kind, and innocent a woman's intentions may be, she must always be aware of the potential of her actions to encourage a man. Speaking of women he has known in the past, he explains:

....they mixed together some actions which were in no way blameworthy and some which could nonethless be considered signs of favor, they were accompanied by games, liberties, and ways of behavior or speaking that were sufficiently courteous, although always with restraint without reproach; I admit to you that this was not approved. This conduct causes a man to believe that he is pleasing; and there is no great journey between pleasing and causing someone to love him; that is to awaken his hope, rekindle his desires, and stir his boldness...392

The responsibility lies with Célimène and her sex. Célimène must be particularly wary of young men at court whose "hot-bloodeness" leads them to a wantonness seemingly beyond their control.393 At a masked ball, no matter how blameless a woman may be, no matter how respected, if she hides her face behind a mask in a situation where men likewise have the shelter of anonymity, "no one will ever believe that men would be capable of containing themselves..."394 In other words,

³⁹¹ Hédelin, Les Conseils d'Ariste à Célimène.

^{392 &}quot;.... elles y mesloient des actions qui n'auoient rien de blâmable, & qui pouvoient neantmoins estre considerées comme quelques faveurs, elles les accompagnoient de jeux, de libertez & de façons d'agir ou de parler assez galantes, quoy que tousiours dans vne retenuë sans reproche ; je vous advouë que cela n'estoit pas approuvé. Cette conduite fait croire qu'vn homme plaist ; & entre plaire & se faire aimer, il n'y a pas vn grand trajet ; c'est réveiller son esperance, réchauffer ses desires & r'animer sa remerité..." (The long s has been converted due to typography limitations.) Hédelin, Les Conseils d'Ariste à Célimène, 192.

^{393 &}quot;... les boüillons du sang ... inspirent ... l'aveuglement de leur raison qui les emporte aux volumptez les plus criminelles... " Hédelin, Les Conseils d'Ariste à Célimène, 226-227.

^{394 &}quot;on ne croira jamais que les hommes soient capables de se renfermer..." Hédelin, Les Conseils d'Ariste à Célimène, 156-157.

her reputation would be in tatters, because it is assumed by society at large that there is a point beyond which, men can not control themselves.

Some of Hédelin's need to portray himself as a predatory and appealing man may have simply been a product of his life in the literary salons where the practice of capturing hearts was admired.395 And perhaps this need found its source in a well of insecurity.

Only a few of his fictional works were well received during his lifetime. 396

This is not to say that he was a man of little consequence or that he did not have his intellectual admirers, for he was quite well regarded as a resource for much of his life. For example, his Académie des Belles-Lettres, which he founded when it became clear that he would never be admitted to the newly formed Acadédmie Française, had a coterie of devoted followers even after his death, and his La Pratique was and still is a great resource for the French stage. 397 While Arnaud frequently sounds peeved by Hédelin's quarrels and self-destructive arrogance, there is no question the Hédelin achieved much that was and is worthy of admiration. Arnaud's biography of Hédelin is entitled Les Théories dramatiques au XVIIe siècle: Étude sur la vie et les œures de l'abbé d'Aubignac (The Dramatic theories of the seventeenth century: Study of the life and wors of the abbé d'Aubignac). In other words, it is a biography of Hédelin because he is seventeenth century dramatic theory in France. There is no one else who comes

395 Bourque, All the Abbé's Women, 150-151.

396 Les Conseils d'Ariste à Célimène was among the more favorably received. Bourque, All the Abbé's Women, 112; Arnaud, Les Théories dramatiques au XVIIe Siècle, 51.

397 Bourque, All the Abbé's Women, 42.

close to his impact. He was, for example, the only scholar to write a book length work providing guidance for the field. Arnaud summarizes his success in brief:

Respected critic, well received preacher, advisor of poets and socialites, consulted by some on the art of directing theatrical plays, and by others on the means of preserving both their reputation and their pleasures, D'Aubignac was in effect a person of importance. He achieved every kind of literary success and success in society; he had friends and admirers; he even had imitators: *Zénobie* and *Macarise* drew plagiairists!398

And yet these successes did not stop him from self-sabotage. Arnaud finds his insecurities self-defeating, calling him "the arrogant and vain pedagogue of the French theater, the completely self-important adversary of our great Corneille."399 Arnaud finds him vain and monstrous, *un grotesque*, himself, "The abbé d'Aubignac has a bad reputation; that is as one 'scorned,' a 'grotesque;' his name is synonymous with conceitedness and with a meanness of spirit...."400 If we take his vanity, arrogance, and quarrelsome personality as evidence of insecurity, then we might suspect that Hédelin felt artificial.401 Perhaps Hédelin's plays, novels, and *Les* Conseils were the "later works" in which Arnaud saw

³⁹⁸ "Critique considéré, prédicateur écouté, directeur de poètes et de femmes du monde, consulté par les uns sur l'art de conduire une pièce de théâtre, et par les autres sur les moyens de conserver leur réputation et leurs [to 3] plaisirs, d'Aubiganc fut en effet un personnage important. ... Il obtint toute sorte de succès littéraires et mondains; il eut des amis et des admirateurs; il eut même des imitateurs: *Zénobie* et *Macarise* firent des plagiaires!" Arnaud, *Les Théories dramatiques au XVIIe Siècle*, 2-3.

³⁹⁹ Arnaud, *Les Théories dramatiques au XVIIe Siècle*, 14. "il est devenu lui-même le pédagogue arrogant et vain du théâtre français, l'advairsaire plein de suffisance de notre grand Corneille." Arnaud continues later on the result of this fight:

[&]quot;Nous aurons à raconter ailleurs cette triste querelle; disons seuelement ici qu'elle ne tourna pas à son honneur. Publiquement attaqué, raillé et inurié dans sa personne, ses infirmités, ses prétentions, ses insuccès, d'homme de cour et d'homme de lettres, il eut à se défendre, lui qui s'était cru assez fort pour attaquer, et à se défendre, non pas contre Corneille..." Arnaud, *Les Théories dramatiques au XVIIe Siècle*, 55.

^{400 &}quot;L'abbé d'Aubignac a mauvaise réputation; c'est un 'dédaigné,' un 'grotesque;' son nom est synonyme de pédantisme et d'étroitesse d'esprit; il est avec celui de Zoïle, un des plu compromis de l'histoire littéraire." Arnaud, *Les Théories dramatiques au XVIIe Siècle*, 1.

⁴⁰¹ Arnaud, Les Théories dramatiques au XVIIe Siècle, 39.

artificiality.402 He may have feared that he himself lacked the very *vray-semblance* that he so valued in *La pratique*. Perhaps such a suspicion that he was inauthentic led him to value the appearance of authenticity in *vray-semblance*. Just as it seems that Hédelin's interest in *vray-semblance* may have come from an awareness of his own artificiality, this professed rejection of the satyr may stem from a fear of his own libidinal impulses.

CONCLUSION

The argument here is that an important function of this treatise is to allow Hédelin to announce what he rejects, what he finds repugnant, and what he implicitly claims not to be. Hédelin, as not subject to physical desires, could safely toy with women whom he imagined to adore him, the pedantic, arrogant, quarrelsome abbé who should not have been toying with anyone as an abbé. Perhaps it was his vows, and perhaps he had no difficulty remaining chaste. Or perhaps physical desire was intensely present, and the risk of humiliation was intolerable. If one does not really venture, one does not really risk. If he pretends to be above libidinal impulses, then he did not risk rejection. All of his claimed predation is theoretical. It is not a stretch to imagine that *Des Satyres* was written as a way to assert to himself and to those he wished to impress with his erudition, piety, and moral girding, that he utterly rejected the deviant and excessive actions associated with the satyr.

It is equally possible that Hédelin perhaps feared his ability to resist physical temptation, and so knowing the satyr thoroughly made sense. As noted earlier, Said argues that "To have … knowledge of … a thing is to dominate it, to have authority over

402 It is equally possible that Arnaud was referring to the plays that Hédelin wrote, for which he was ridiculed as they appear to have been models of the proper form for a play more than works of art.

121

it, to deny autonomy to it."403 Hédelin masters the satyr, if only for himself, in this treatise. He confines it and denies it any claim to kinship with himself or with any of God's Adamic relations.

Identity formation requires a counterpoint or foil. Richard Bartra claims that Europeans created the wildman in his many varieties including satyrs, sylphs, centaurs, etc., as a necessary foil against which to construct their own civilized identities. 404 If we are to take Hédelin at his word in *Les Conseils d'Ariste a Celimène*, he is of the view that the monster, specifically the satyr, lurks within every man. The satyr lives in the male body, circumscribed and contained or at least constrained by *politesse* and the rules of civilization, but there is only so much the man can do. 405 Woe to the woman who wakes the sleeping satyr. For if the satyr wakes, he is hers to deal with. She must contain him if she can, and that is unlikely, for he is after all, monstrous. Hédelin seems to take pleasure in his constant warning, as though feminine responsibility and ultimately helplessness are about masculine power as Bourque argues.

Coding his identity in opposition to the satyr allows Hédelin to say who he is not, and therefore who he is. And yet, he clearly takes pleasure in this monster - not here in this treatise where the rejection is plain - but later in his fictional autobiographical work,

403 Said, *Orientalism*, 32. The quote in full reads: "To have such knowledge of such a thing is to dominate it, to have authority over it, to deny autonomy to it." Said is speaking here of knowledge as a justification for power as Balfour justifies British power in Egypt. "Knowledge to Balfour means surveying a civilization from its origins from its prime to its decline — and of course, it means *being able to do that*. Knowledge means rising above immediacy, beyond self, into the foreign and distant. The object os such knowledge is inherently vulnerable to scrutiny; this object is a 'fact'...." While Said refers to objectification and imperialization, Hédelin is taming what he fears with his claims of knowledge. By

404 Bartra, Wild Men in the Looking Glass, 8.

writing the satyr, he tames it; he limits it and its power.

405 For the idealization of self-containment and control of all drives, see Elias, The Civilizing Process.

122

the satyr that so repulses him here lurks within a gleeful Hédelin. We need the monster to define who we are, and the satyr is the Anti-Hédelin just as the Greek satyr was the anti-type of the Athenian male.406 It is entirely outside the bounds of the *vray-semblable* to imagine that Adamic man, "the most holy and admirable ornament of the Universe," is related to the wanton, cruel, and deceptive satyr. 407 And yet there he is, lurking in the French court and within François Hédelin himself.

406 Lissarrague, "Why Satyrs Are Good to Represent," 234-6; See also Christopher Forth: "If there is a 'zero degree' to the civilizing process -- that is, a state of absolute wildness -- it is surely an imagined one; yet even fantasies about wildness play a part in this process. As Robert [sic] Bartra suggests, 'The very idea of a contrast between a wild natural state and a civilized cultural configuration forms part of an ensemble of myths serving to sustain the identity of the civilized West.' The projection of wildness is thus an essential ingredient of civilization itself..." Forth, *Masculinity in the Modern West*, 23-24. Forth's quotation comes from Bartra, *Wild Men in the Looking Glass*, 147.

407 See [233] of this treatise

THE TREATISE

ON SATYRS: BRUTES, MONSTERS, AND DEMONS.

OF THEIR NATURE AND WORSHIP

Against the opinion of those who have judged Satyrs to be a distinct species of men.

Dedicated to Monseigneur le Maréchal de Saint-Géran.

By F. Hedelin, Avocat en Parlement.

Not all true things have yet been said; there remains a fair amount for those who come

after us.2 – Seneca

Paris,

Nicolas Buon, rue Saint Jacques, at the Sign of Saint Claude and the Wild Man.

MDCXXVII

With the Permission and Approval of the King

¹ Titles will remain in the original language.

² This is a paraphrase of Seneca, not a French translation of the original quote which follows. Moral Epistle 33.11: "Quid ergo? non ibo per priorum vestigial? Ego vero utar via vetere, sed si propiorem planioremque invenero, hanc muniam. Qui ante nos ista moverunt non domini nostri sed duces sunt. Patet omnibus veritas; nondum est occupata; multum ex illa etiam futuris relictum est. Vale." My thanks to Christopher S. Mackay for the English translation: "Well then. Will I not walk in the footsteps of my predecessors? As for me I'll use the old path, but if I find a closer and flatter one, I'll pave it. Those who raised these issues before us are not our masters but our guides. The truth is open to everyone, and it's not yet occupied. Much of it is left for even people of the future. Farewell."

To Monseigneur,

Monseigneur Le Maréchal de Saint-Géran.

Monseigneur, the Spartans long practiced a custom regarding small children, worthy only of the austerity of such a people. As soon as they were born, they were placed in the hands of a certain officer appointed to examine them, who [á ij v.] after having rigorously judged them, if he found them deformed in their members, or feeble in their constitution, tossed them into the Apotheke or Depository, a place designed for this inhumanity because they considered it to be unworthy of their honor, to³ nourish monsters who would disgrace their parents, or delicate infants who would be useless to their Republic. Now just as books are the children of the mind, what verdict can I expect in presenting to you today this treatise, the title and subject of which is so monstrous and the discourse so feeble? Will you say that it must be cast into some Depository, and close my mouth in eternal silence? [á iij r.] But when I recall that even you, no matter how strange the deformity of the Satyrs may be, this very thing which has given me the courage to undertake this small work, confirms my believe that you will not find it disagreeable. It is not that I dare to promise to resolve all the doubts that can be encountered in this matter, and give a complete understanding of it. The awareness of my

³ In the Bibliothèque Nationale Française (BNF) version, the d is an a, thus: *ae nourir* ... In the digital version, it appears: *de nourir*.

https://play.google.com/books/reader?printsec=frontcover&output=reader&id=GDGD5wsuCFcC&pg=GBS.PP5

inability removes my presumption and the difficulty of the subject with the hope of being able to do it. But only so that taking this occasion to offer you, with the beginnings of [á iij v.] my studies, the wishes of serving you, that are natural in the family from which I come, I can receive the honor of being admitted with as much affection as with birth, Monseigneur,

Your very humble, very obedient, and very affectionate servant,

F. Hédelin.

FOREWORD

The title of this book will perhaps seem no more strange than the method I followed in this matter is extraordinary. This question is so new that to start, hearing talk of brute Satyr beasts, many will find themselves perchance surprised, like most of those to whom I have communicated my design before bringing it to light. But after the accounts of so many authors so well-known with which we have composed the second part of this book, there is no longer any doubt that true Satyrs are brute beasts. We [à iiii] v.] have arranged them and joined together in the form that we have judged the most practical to make so many citations flow imperceptibly and render them less tedious. As to the order, the methodical and most common was, it seems, to discuss the name of Satyr and its definition. But this word being ambiguous and fitting to more things of fully diverse nature, I was working in vain for this clarification: and then to quarrel about names is a discourse so insubstantial and of so little edification that I preferred to attend to the substantial and more important things. I have taken this question head on, and from the start combatted the opinion of those who have unreasonably imagined that Satyrs were men, so as to dispose the reader, by this means, to receive more easily the division that I make of them into three species. Those who will do me the honor [à v r.] of reading the book in its entirety, will know that the title is equal and fully commensurate to the things that I treat, and the order that I have adhered to necessary: And I dare to vow that if their curiosity is not entirely satisfied, at least their benevolence could not refuse a

favorable reception of my efforts, principally in a matter so new, so difficult, and so neglected. One might raise the question why I have not entered thoroughly into the discourse of all the monstrous men, to which the door has been opened only too widely by this dispute on Satyrs. But being particularly obligated to treat this subject, I believed that I must lead none astray. It will even be that I have omitted many fables of Satyrs with which I could have enlarged this volume because they concern nothing of their nature, and the [à v v.] knowledge that we seek. This small work however will be the deposit for a more grand one to which I am now committed: because if my hope has satisfied so little the judgement and the curiosity of the public, I will finish as I have begun: and advancing on the routes that I myself mapped, I will put forward what I have been able to garner about Hippocentaurs, Tritons, Nereids, Giants, Pygmies, Acephales, Arimasps, colored Men, and so many other monsters of which History makes mention. Above all, I pray the reader to pardon the vast faults which have occurred in printing. I have noted some of the more apparent; for the others, I will have to replace them, and excuse them due to the haste or negligence of the printer.

IN THE BOOK ON SATYRS BY D. HEDELIN

Hédelin's text shows that, indeed, satyrs are not humans, but certainly beasts. Hence, likewise he considers sirens to be reckoned fish by the ranking of the gods, or, better, demons. But if Marsyas shall have dared to contend with Apollo, and to put his flute before the sweet lyre, and endured in the name of his punishment his skin flayed, believe me, the satyr was a great beast.4

G. Cheneav, Advocatus

ISSE quidem Satyros Hedelni pagina monstrat Non homines, verum certius esse feras. Hinc quoque Sirenes numeratas ordine Diuûm Pesces, aut potius Dæmones ese, docet. Sed si ausus fuerit contenderé Marsia Phœbo, Et calamos dulci præposuisse lyrae, Sensit & excussam pænæ sibi nomine pellem, Crede mihi, Satyrus bestia magna fuit.

⁴ My thanks to Hans Peter Broedel for this translation. The Latin reads: *IN LIBRUM DE SATYRIS D. HEDELINI*.

TO MONSIEUR HÉDELIN, ON HIS BOOK OF SATYRS

We would not know how to reward appropriately

The gifted minds of this century where we are,

Whose work endeavors to amass

In the writings of infinitely learned men,

These beautiful first flushes which show Christians

The error in which the Pagans were.

How much, after having endured so many evils,

And such blood spread on the arena,

We must be at present assured

In our faith, without having to trouble ourselves

To seek within the obscurity

Of Paganism, another truth.

So many villains endeavor to obscure

[à vii r.]

The clear rays that Heaven sends down to us,

And with a false appearance darken

This beautiful Sun which guides belief,

In the end, one sees many feeble minds

Inside these snares intertwined and surprised.

In order to show how many are ignorant

All these versions which within nature,

Have searched for other living men

That those who from Eve have taken their nourishment,

And to show the Sylvans and Tritons,

To have been only Beasts and Demons.

This book here, the first young child

Of this Author, will elucidate,

Teaching us by sure reason,

About the rough malevolence of these cunning ones,

Who go around saying that we do not know

All the mortals that live on earth.

G. Chesneav, Advocat

TO MONSIEUR HÉDELIN, ON HIS BOOK OF SATYRS

Those who prepare us to laugh,

And were too insulting,

Who made the Satyrs, Gods:

But who concede that the Satyr man,

Is more unbearable than they.

Because this was the ruse of the Demons

Who promoted the worship

Of these Sylvans, & the action

Is even more worthy of justification,

in that it was from religion.

But he destroys nature,

Who, concluding on a false note

By some shadow of reason,

By his bearing, & by his face,

Constructs a man in this style.

Hédelin, your book is the Sphynx,

Which lifts all obscurity,

[à viii r.]

And revealing the truth,

Show that the Satyr is an Ape,		
And is neither man nor Deity.		

TO THE BOOK

Go forth, learned writing, already a sweet interview,

From the most learned hands, Go: if the Satyr,

Is a brute beast, & has nothing of man:

Fear not the wrath of a Satyr-like mind.

Oson, Prévôt de Nemours

[à viii v.]

Copy of the Privilege of the King

By the Grace & Privilege of the King, given in Paris on the 10th day of April, 1627. It is permitted to Nicolas Buon having right of creation from Mes François Hédelin, Avocat en Parlement, to print a book entitled *Des Satyrs, Brutes, Monstres, & Demons, &c.*, composed by the aforesaid Hédelin, With interdictions to all persons to print it, without the consent of the aforementioned Buon, for a period of six years, under pain of

confiscation and fine to the transgressors. Given on the day & year above, & signed,

Versoris

Approval

⁵ This signifies *Maître*, which would be akin to Esquire.

TABLE OF SUBJECTS CONTAINED IN THIS WORK6

BOOK I.

That many have judged Satyrs to be men of a different species from Adamic man.	3
That the Satyrs could not be more nor less than Adamics, & be men	7
That there have not been any Satyr men created	12
That there were none in Noah's Ark	17
That they could not be immortal in their entirety.	20
That they could not be it [immortal] in [only] one part	27
[f. é i v.]	
That if they are wholly mortal, they are not men.	33
BOOK II.	
That the true Satyrs are brute beasts with the nature of apes	53
Of two Satyrs taken in Slavonia.	55
Of Silenus taken in Phrygia by Midas.	57
Of the Pans of India, according to Megasthenes.	58

https://play.google.com/books/reader?printsec=frontcover&output=reader&id=GDGD5wsuCFcC&pg=GBS.PP5

Nor is there a Table in the 1888 version. Hédelin, *Des Satyres*, ed. Isidore Liseux (Paris: Isidore Lieseux, 1888).

⁶ The page numbers here correspond to the original text. These numbers are in brackets throughout the text. This Table of Subjects Contained in This Work comes solely from the BNF version. There is no Table in the digital version, despite a very clear transition from the verso on which the *Extraict du Privilege du Roy* appears to the title page for the treatise. In other words, the Table does not appear to have been removed or dislodged. It was simply not printed in the digitized version.

Of the horse-footed men of Herodotus.	59
Of the Satyr brought dead to Constantine.	61
Of the Pan of Nicéphore sent to Constantius.	62
Of the Satyr killed by Argus.	64
Of the Satyr led to Sulla.	65
Of the Satyrs leading the Entourage of Osiris or Bacchus	66
Specific description of the Satyr Apes/Ape Satyres.	64
That such Satyrs are not men.	70
BOOK III.	
On the errors of nature.	73
[é ii r.]	
That Monster Satyrs are a product of these errors.	79
That there are a few such Satyrs.	81
That they can not conceive.	82
That they are not men, that is to say that they do not have a spiritual & immortal s	oul.
	85
That the spiritual soul could not inform the animal parts	87
That it cannot be that it could inform the human parts & the sensate the bestial part	rts.
	101
BOOK IV.	
Of the plurality of Gods among the Ancients.	106
That Poetry has given birth to this error.	107

That the devil confirmed it.	1127
On Fawns, Pans, & Satyrs, Forest Gods.	
That the oracles of these false demi-Gods, & the Panic terrors, were artifices of Demo	
to cause them to be adored.	113
That Pan & the Demon of Noon are the [é ii v.] same thing	118
Of the apparition of the Demons in the form in which they were adored	121
On their appearance as Satyrs.	123
Of Pan who appeared at Philippides.	125
On the Satyr who caused himself to be seen by Magister Videns, under Charles Qu	iint.
	125
Of the Satyrs who appeared at the Bacchanales.	125
That the Bacchanales were in no way different from the Sabbats of the Sorcerers.	
	128
On the Satyr who appeared to St. Anthony in the Thebaid	137
That he was not man.	142
That he was not a Monster Satyr.	148
That he was not a brute beast, contrary to the opinion of Baronius	150
That he was a Demon.	158
On some considerable circumstances in the apparition of this Satyr	158
That the Hyppocentaur who appeared to the same Hermit was a Demon	159
That Demons live always in the deserts.	1268

 $_{7}$ In the Table in the BNF version, "That the devil confirms it" is listed on page 112, while the following section, "On Fawns, Pans, & Satyrs, Forest Gods" is listed on page 110.

⁸ In the BNF version, this page number, 126, appears before the section preceding it in the Table, 159.

[é iii r.]

That Demon Satyrs have loved them above all the other places	
On the deceptions & truths blended in the discourse of the Satyr to St. Anthony.	
	168
On the visit of David which he claimed.	171
That the words he used were more evil than religious	174
That Pic & Fawn stopped by Numa were Sorcerers.	183
That the Satyrs of whom Philostratus wrote were mythical	184
BOOK V.	
That the Idols of the Sylvan demi-Gods have been made in the image of the Ape Sa	atyrs.
	190
Superstition of the Egyptians.	Ibid
That the Ape Satyrs whom Osiris had lead his entourage, gave rise to the worship of	of the
goat9 demi-Gods.	192
That Bacchus is always followed by Satyrs.	195
That the Satyrs adored by the Pagans were alike in all things, according to the fable	es, to
the Ape Satyrs.	196
[é iii v.]	
That they were considered half goats, & horned like those apes	Ibid
That they were called the hairy ones.	197
That the Fawn demi-Gods were reputed to have red faces	201
A horse tail	202

To be of small stature.	203
When dancing, supple with grotesque movement.	204
Extremely lascivious.	206
If Incubi could conceive.	208
On the explanations in the Fables.	211
That Pan has been considered the image of speech.	213
That he has been taken for the form of man	214
That many have interpreted him as the principle of generation	216
Of Pan's love for Nymphs.	220
That the Idol of Pan, according to some, represented the world	224

THE END

Faults Occurring in the Printing1

Page 2. line 3. listed2 de leur Createur.

- p.3 4. 1.4 1. 1.5 dans.
- p. 5. 1.6 8. 1. *laissez*.
- p. 15. l. 9. l. Rabinisme.
- p. 18 l. 17. l. de mesme
- p. 19. l. 16 l. luy
- p. 24. .8 10 l. but.
- p. 28. l. 19 l. ou aux.
- p. 38. 1. 5. 1. rendus à son.
- 1 In the text that follows, I refer to these as errata. These appear in a block paragraph in the text. For the reader's sake, I have separated each entry on a new line. This list, like the Table of Contents does not appear in the digital version. They appear in the BNF version.
- 2 This reads lis. which I take to mean listé, listed.
- ³ Page is abbreviated *Pag*. and abbreviated p. thereafter.
- ⁴ Line (*ligne*) is abbreviated *lig*. the first time and *l*. thereafter.
- 5 Listed (*listé*) is abbreviated *lis*. the first time and *l*. thereafter.
- ⁶ Periods after the l. and after numbers are often missing. I have included them for visual clarity for the reader. Without them, in a case like that on the errata reference for page 15 below, with modern typography, it appears to read p 15 l 9, making difficult for the reader to discern whether line 9 or 19 is intended.
- 7 I have inserted spaces where it appears that they are missing only due to justified formatting.
- 8 There is not an *l* here.

- Ibid. l. 16. l. dont l9 elle est.
- p. 58. l. 13. l. forests. D'ou.
- p. 64. l. 17. l. de ius.
- p. 70. l. 1. l. & Silene.
- p. 72. l. 12. l. ses.
- p. 74. l. 24. l. ensanglantees.
- p. 76. l. 10. l. tracees.
- p. 92. l. l. 11. l. contact.
- p. 98. l. 1. l. sacree.
- p. 101. l. 13. l. qu'elle.
- p. 121. l. 8. l. affligeast.
- p. 129. 1. 22. 1. Cinedes.
- p. 133. l. 1. & 2. l. que, 10
- Ibid. 1. 3. ostez un autre boucq.
- p. 138. 1. 7. 1. discourut.
- p. 144. l. 16. par nos idees intentionelles, l. par diuerses coniectures.
- p. 153. l. 24. l. comices.
- p. 154. l. 2. l. auoient.
- p. 192. l. 2. l. Ægypt soubs.
- p. 193. l. 5. l. à sa.
- p. 217. l. 2. l. Biarcee.

⁹ This *l* may be a typo in the errata because *dont elle est* makes sense and is how the phrase has been hand corrected in the BNF version.

¹⁰ There is a comma here rather than a period, presumably because the next item is on the same page.

p. 222. l. 23. l. sont.

ON SATYRS: BRUTES1, MONSTERS, AND DEMONS.

ON THEIR NATURE AND WORSHIP2

Against the opinion of those who have judged Satyrs to be a distinct species of men.

BOOK I.

That Satyrs can not be men.

The sovereign governor of the world put into execution the eternal decree of the establishment of the Universe, desiring to give to each of the creatures a degree of particular [2] advantage, in order that, in the admiration of their nature, all creatures together would be able to carry some marks of the Majesty of their Creator. To the Earth he gave firmness over the void; to the heavens a movement without ceasing; to the Stars a splendor in itself inextinguishable; and to the animals life. But seeing that the perfection of the great Whole seemed to require another more perfect creature who could enjoy the inestimable treasures that he had divided among the infinite number of these new beings, & to rule over all the rest; he selected that which was most admirable and holy in all the members of the world and gathered them together in the nature of man whom he created. And his desire, not finding itself satisfied with having placed such marvelous riches in

¹ A useful way of reading this would be: Beast Satyrs, Monster Satyrs, Demon Satyrs. While no early modern French or French-English dictionary offers 'beasts' as a translation for *brutes*, this word refers to the Ape Satyrs that make up one of his three kinds of satyrs.

² Cotgrave gives 'adoration' as the first definition, however 'worship' is Hédelin's focus. It is the deception of demon satyrs that brings the ignorant to worship them.

³ As noted in the errata, this should be *de leur Createur*, whereas it appears *du Createur* in both versions.

this small piece of work, he still wished to fulfill the immensity of its glory, to increase his own Divinity; and by imprinting upon his most noble part the [3] holy and venerable image of his being & of his grandeur, he made man him the little God of the Universe. There is nevertheless so much disregard for this infinite grace, so many enemies of its excellence, that they endeavor to extend this divine humanity to brute beasts, and elevate them to the degree of man's perfection, or else, acting injuriously to themselves, reduce the eminence of their nature and render it equal to the bestial. Paracelsus, among his other imaginings no less ungodly than audacious, decreeing by these works & by the hand of God, has even dared to establish five different species of men, the first of which he calls Adamic, that is to say children of Adam, and the four others whom he makes spiritual and mortal in their entirety, on the creation of which God never thought, he assigned them their places within the Elements, supposing that in each live certain rational creatures, which he [4] calls in the fire Salamanders & Vulcans, in the earth Pygmies, in the waters Nymphs & Tritons, and in the air Satyrs. Still I certainly am astonished that he did not take it further, and as in the example of Xenophon, build cities and carry on the wings of his dreams whole peoples in the belly of the Sun and of the Moon, filling them according to the Philosophy of the Pythagoreans, with men and animals fifteen times larger than those of this world. Some years ago François Pic, Comte de la Mirande, developing on the views of a similar doctrine, left in his writings an opinion unworthy, in my opinion, of his name: because he maintains that the definition of man, a rational animal, is neither natural to him nor distinct, and that Satyrs also being rational animals, it is necessary to allow two species of men, one of which will be man Satyr and the other man not Satyr.

⁴ As noted in the errata, this should be *dans*, whereas it appears *dane* in both versions, however the e has been struck out by hand and a long s: f written above it in the BNF version.

[5] Vadian in his *Commentaries on Mela*, strongly resembles this opinion when he makes Satyrs truly men. Diodorus & Pliny in several places, the Author of the Genealogy of the Gods, and an infinite number of other Historians, little concerned with the truth, alloweds themselves to be carried off in this belief. Even some whose stronger reasoning supports them a bit better, can not say that there are no Satyrs, especially given that History furnishes too many examples to doubt it, and not daring however to refute absolutely that they be men, because those of which the Authors make mention, have been presented as too similar to us in body and mind₆. And what has astonished even more and on the topic of beginning this discourse, is that this great eye of the Holy Scriptures, Saint Jerome, seems himself to have stumbled on this stone, and without taking heed of the consequences, [6] to have negligently allowed himself to follow this vulgar error: because no matter what species of Satyrs he speaks of in his works, he always calls them men. But even though so many great figures whose writings will be read for eternity, and whose shadows will be adored for centuries to come, have held this opinion, to defend nonetheless the dignity of man, in which it seems that they want to include monsters, who have nothing that we wish to attribute to them, & to give a full understanding of what they are: We hold that Satyrs are not a species of rational animal, distinct & separate

⁵ As noted in the errata, this should be *laissez*, whereas it appears *laissé* in the digital version. It appears *laisse* in the BNF version, however a z has been written below the e.

⁶ Hédelin consistently uses *ame* for the soul. Here he uses *esprit*, which can be mind or spirit. In order not to confuse readers who might conflate the spirit and the soul, I have used mind. The term *esprit* had numerous meanings in the seventeenth century - wit, for example. Benedetta Craveri describes *esprit* as "That word, so impresice, so hard to define, and so changeable in its meaning, appeared everywhere in seventeenth-century usage. In the second half of the century, it was the subject of intense consideration and applied to a whole camut of human intellectual activity. These problems of definition did not belong in dictionaries and treatises alone but fascinated the whole of society." Benedetta Craveri, *The Age of Conversation*, translated by Teresa Waugh (New York: New York Review of Books, 2006), 343.

from ours, which is to say that they are not men, & that there can not be another species of man than Adamic man, to speak of our Paracelsus. And that if one has seen certain animals to have in their form some relation to the human body, they are only [7] genuine species of brute beasts, to which it is only a sacrilege to give the name of man; which one can easily prove by these reasons so natural & so holy, that there is no other response than impiety.

Firstly, if the Satyr species were formed by a difference, that is to say by a nature that is particular and distinct from Adamic man in his essence, either this nature would be noble and excellent or reduced below and much less than the composition of his being. Yet it could not be that neither one nor the other could be in the Satyr species, or in any other creature, and that it also be man: because if he were more perfect in his nature, and he were raised above the true man, he would have without doubt attained the point of Angelic nature, and would be adorned with all the spiritual qualities which accompany the being of the Angel, because true man is so little inferior to the Angel, and [8] our nature is so near to those of the celestial understandings, that there can not be any being that holds the middle of these two others. This was pointed out to David: that God has crowned man with honor & glory, having made him only a little lower than the Angel, and to Saint Thomas that the human Hierarchy is placed just under the top Hierarchy of supernatural understandings. It follows that the Satyr could not be more than man, if he were not an Angel, the Satyr being an object that offends our thoughts, and one that could only be found in the imagination of common souls: and those same people would have the Satyr be a man, not wanting to say that a creature of corporeal & earthly substance, breathing an animal life and lascivious as one can imagine, and subject to death, was

equal in his being to those wholly spiritual substances, which have no other life but the life which they draw directly from God, [9] fully holy in their operations, & from their origin, endowed with eternity. Likewise it could not be that the Satyr was less perfect than the children of Adam, and the qualities of his nature be reduced below our being, which make the Satyr our inferior, and that he could remain man: Because then it would only be a species of beast, who would have nothing in common with humanity but life, a body and sensation, just as with other animals. For as much as man approaches the being of the Angels by the nobility of his spirit, equally on the other side, he approaches the bestial: and as there can not be a creature in between man and Angel, neither can there be any between man and beast, our nature being, as Saint Augustine says, the middle and the point which separates the Angelic and brutal nature, there being nothing less than the Angel, apart from the physical sense [10] nor anything more than the beasts apart from the spiritual understanding. What the Platonists mean to convey, by saying that man is in the middle between the beasts and the Gods, & Seneca writing, that the best of man is the reason by which he goes before the other animals, & closely follows behind the Gods: because by these Gods, it must be understood that they were naming *Æuiternes*, or *Æuintegres*, which are none other than the Angels & spiritual substances, of whom eternity, says Saint Thomas, is the measure. So if the Satyr is deprived of this intelligence, nothing is left for him but the animal nature, that is to say true brutality. Further, all the parts of the great universe are of such a composition subject one to another, that the more noble are served by their inferiors, who become their subjects without any repugnance of their nature. The Heavens, the Stars, & the Elements, are subjugated to the generation [11] and maintenance of living beings. Among the living,

plants produce food and are useful to animals, & the animals with all the rest of the world, serve man just as he pleases: man alone lives free and emancipated from all bondage, to the point where his desires are in his hands, without even being subject to the ordinary power of God. So it pleased the Creator of the world to create him lord & master of all things, and from the beginning honor him with this Empire, saying to him, I make you the Lord of all that life causes to move on the earth, in the water, and in the air. If therefore the nature of the Satyr was inferior to ours, how could he be man and be inferior to another man? How could he be man & be deprived of commanding in this world, which is the characteristic of man, and the incomparable mark of his Divinity? And [12] how could the Satyr live under the Sky and not be counted among the brute beasts: since there is no other man than he who must command him?

The second reason will be able quite properly to draw from the first birth of the animals: for if it was true that the Satyrs constitute a particular species of man, God would have to have created them male and female at the origin of the world, as he did with all the other species. We are no longer in the state of ignorance of imagining that men at the beginning could be produced from dead oak trees, from the miry swamps of Egypt, from the gourds of Corinth, from the soil as Empedocles says, from the Ocean according to Crates, from fish per Anaximander, or from the egg of Wisdom from which some Egyptians hatched our first parents. And apart from the creation all that one can tell of [13] their first birth, and of all the other parts of the Universe, is recognized by us as folly and deception. Now, there have never been any Satyr men created by God, the Scriptures, which carry within them their reason, and the condemnation of those who reject them, teach us this too obviously to be doubted.

After this great and effortless work, which sent forth from the hand of God this beautiful work of five days, God desired to create man, and for his creation, he used the full sixth day in its entirety. And so that his nature could proliferate and perpetuate his species, he made them male and female, Adam and Eve. Yet in the whole of this sixth day, he made no mention of Satyrs. And when the day would have been (as Empedocles stated) as long as is ten months today, nothing was written saying that one of them was created. So it is necessary to say that there [14] are none at all, or, if there are any, they were created on the fourth or fifth day, when God placed on Earth all species of serpents and brute beasts, among which the Satyrs must necessarily have been included, if they had been created: because he created only man on the sixth day, and on that day none other than Adam and Eve: for after God had made them, says Moses, he blessed them, and then rested. If perhaps one wished to have recourse to the fabled antiquity of the Arcadians, which were said to have been born before the moon, and imagine that the Satyrs had been created before the great lights of the Firmament: or else to receive as truth the folly of Rabbi Abraham, who as if he had anticipated this reason, wrote that Satyrs were created, as none have wanted to say, of woman, on the seventh day; and that God, aware of the coming night, could not give them [15] their full perfection; as a result, they keep themselves hidden all day long and the night of the Sabbath. But to all of this we have nothing to say except that this fiction of the Arcadians is an invention of Greeks, that is to say, of young people, as Plato wrote, and ignorant on the one hand of antiquity and on the other of Rabbinic⁷ teaching, that it to say a Milesiac fable, and an account in loss of perspective: Both are far from logical, lacking common sense, and contrary to the

⁷ As noted in the errata, this should be *Rabinisme*, whereas it appears *Rabimsme* in the digital version. In the BNF version, which is the version containing the list of errata, the word is spelled correctly.

truth, which teaches us, that no living creature was made before the Stars, and that the seventh day the hand of God refrained from all work. That is to say that he accomplished on the sixth (as the Greek and Hebrew scholars explain) all the plans that he had launched into eternity, and as soon as the Sabbath began, he ceased the creation of all new species.

Following the paths of the purity of this [16] same doctrine, we will say that God, pulling human nature from the void in order to place it in the world, wanted to create it in his likeness, and mark its soul with the image of his Divinity. Thus he was firm in the uniform harmony of the three divine persons, as it is easy to learn through the text of Moses where God says: We create man in our likeness. Yet there has been no other creature in the origin of the world, than our first father, to whom God had bestowed the gift of placing on his forehead the portrait of his being and of his light, only he has been formed in the image of his Creator, to him only has been given this spirit of life, which, as Philo wrote, caused whoever received it to resemble the one who inspired it: For as soon as Adam and Eve had been created, God put an end to the creation of the world. Truth requires us to believe that Satyrs could not have imprinted in their nature [17] this image of the Divinity, since this grace had been granted to Adam onlysand how without this mark could they be men, since God in creating man wished to give him this glorious and divine mark?

But if it were also true, as it is very false, that the Satyrs were created male and female in the first age of the world, the species would not have been able by the

⁸ There is a question mark between only and & in both of the editions used for this translation: ...puisque cette grace a esté octroyee à Adam seulement? & comment sans cette marque pourroient ils ester hommes ... This appears to be a typo, and it does not appear in later editions.

propagation to descend as far as to us, and the Greaty Flood would have stopped the course of their generation, and suffocated all their seed in those whom it had submerged. Because we learn from an indisputable doctrine, that in Noah's Ark, which was built for the preservation of all the creatures that God saved for the renewal of the Universe, there were not any other men than Noah and his children, and all the rest being brute beasts. Therefore Satyrs [18] were not in the Ark, if they were men, or even if their pair was received there in order to avoid this common disaster, they would have to have been brute beasts. Beyond this, Scripture states that the human type 10 was spread and renewed by the children of Noah: and from their line come all the people of the Earth. This would not be true if the Satyrs were another species of man: because not being of the race of Adam, they could not be of the race of Noah. Saint Augustine seems to favor this reason in the discourse that he gave on monstrous men, who were described in the square of Carthage, overlooking the sea, and made in the same 11 fashion as these nooks that are today found in great houses. There one saw Centaurs, Cynocephales, Sciapodes, and thousands of other phantoms of the Poets and Historians, such as Herodotus. This Scholar questioned [19] whether such monsters are born of the seed of Noah and Adam, and decided it in this fashion: either there are no such monsters or they are brute beasts, or if they are men, they necessarily come from Noah and Adam. And on this last conclusion, by counterargument, I will say that if the Satyrs and these wonders of the Fables, from which some

⁹ Literally the universal flood; le Deluge universel.

¹⁰ *Genre* is the word Hédelin uses here rather than species, *genre* meaning type or kind. In this sentence, type is a little awkward, however on page 19 of the original text (further down this page), type works well. It might be worth noting that Hédelin uses *espece* elsewhere, generally associated with Satyrs and less often associated with humanity apart from the title.

¹¹ As noted in the errata, this should be *de mesme*, whereas it appears *du mesme* in both versions. However the *u* has been struck out by hand and a *e* written above it in the BNF version.

would like to make imaginary men, are not descended from Noah, then it is necessary to conclude that they are not men, because the entirety of the human type, as Scripture says, has been extended through him:12 whereby this word type should be noted: Because Moses, in order to give us to understand that there are no other men than the Adamic, has included the species under a generic word.

But to close nearer to this opinion that we are combatting, and to get to the details of the nature of [20] these supposed Satyr men, it is necessary for us to come to the immortality, or mortality, of their being: Because this discourse will show us before our very eyes that such men are pure chimeras, and they do not exist other than in the imagination of who have forged this ungodliness.

Everything that can be said to be immortal must be by its nature, entirely like the Angels, or, in some way, like man, who, half surviving on his own, enjoys partial immortality, until God, through the powerful miracle of the Resurrection in the eternal Word, returning life after death to his body, gives it to him completely for all eternity. But the Satyrs can in neither way be immortal. To say that from their creation they would have been blessed with immortality in accordance with the totality of their being, and that they would be in the same [21] state of life as the children of Adam could have hoped for without the sin of their father, this simply cannot be imagined. Because growing and multiplying their species, as God commanded to all creatures that he put on Earth, and never touching the end of their days, the stars in the sky, and the sands in the sea would be easy to number compared to their infinity. There is no longer any doubt about Satyrs being men, because the all too frequent and common encounters one would have with

12 As noted in the errata, this should be *luy*, whereas it appears *eux* in both versions. However *eux* has been struck out by hand and *luy* written above it in the BNF version.

them would have given us a complete and certain understanding of what they are. It would no longer be necessary to go in search of them in the caves of the forests and the deserts, because all those who had been born, surviving in all the centuries of the past, could scarcely find the expanse of the Earth spacious enough to contain them. So much that, to defend a falsehood, it would be necessary to commit an impiety, and to say that they are [22] truly these Pans, Ægypans, 13 and demi-Gods of Paganism, which could only be seen (according to Servius) when the mood struck them, and who would only give up their oracles if they were surprised drunk, asleep, and bound with strong restraints: Because then only would they be constrained like a Proteus, to allow themselves to be freely seen and to speak. In this way, the Silenus of Virgil was stopped by Chromis and Mnasylus, when he breathed the vapors of wine that had calmed him, and in the same way, Picus and Faunus were assaulted by Numa, when he wanted them to tell him the expiation qualities of lightning. But without stopping at such Fables too weak to introduce an opinion that common sense itself would not oppose, we will proceed to other reasons which show very clearly that Satyrs can not be immortal in their entirety.

Everything in the world has [23] its final end, and nothing could survive under the Heavens eternally. Everything created, says the Philosopher, is corruptible, that is to say that the end of each thing depends on its origin, and that everything that takes its birth from reproduction, will find its end in corruption. The wisest Romans, says Plutarch, considered the Goddess Libitina, Goddess of death, to be Venus, attributing, not without cause, the superiority of what concerns the beginning and the end of the life of man, to

13

¹³ One might say fauns in English. For *aegipan* or *aegipan*, Oxford gives "a goat-like creature similar to a satyr. Also: (the name of) a Greek god resembling, and sometimes considered to be identical to, the god Pan." https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/aegipan

the same power of the Divinity. Because the Heavens which are the fathers of all things created, do not allow their works to endure long, and everything that they have produced for the day through the mixing of the four Elements, they reduce it immediately to its first principles: resembling in this those small children who, playing on the beach, build many small sandcastles, then [24] straight away topple them with volleys of stones, only to build them up and knock them back down again: they themselves undo everything that they do, and with the scythe of Saturn, destroy all that they build. And even if there were something among their works, to whom, as by a particular privilege, they grant a longer duration than to all the rest, still in the end, its course finds a point 14 where it must stop. Nestor counted three full centuries of his life on the fingers of his right hand, and still he is dead: the Phoenix could even live a thousand years, but at the end of this time he reaches the end of his days: and the sepulchers, monuments that one erects for eternity, do they not have their end marked out by the fates? In short15 everything to which nature gives birth, this same nature causes it to die. The greater part even of the Demons, among which are the Fauns and the Pans of antiquity, were believed to be mortal, because they [25] were believed elemental creations, and after a long revolution of the centuries obey the universal law of all the world. And of their death the cries and the high groanings, as of people who lament their deceased parents, heard many times in the wind have been received for evidence: just as with the news of the death of that great Pan that the Pagans interpreted as the son of Mercury and Penelope, and the Christians as the crucifixion of

14 As noted in the errata, this should be but, whereas it appears bout in both versions. However the o has been struck out by hand in the BNF version.

¹⁵ Assuming that this is an editorial typo, this is not capitalized and is missing a space between the sentences in both of the editions used for this translation: ... par les destins?bref tout...

the Divine Word. The Satyrs therefore could not be under the Heavens and not be subject to their power, they could not be born according to the common laws of nature, and be exempted from the death that she orders for everything to which she gives birth. It is impossible that the body of Satyrs made of nerves and bone, as they have many times been seen to be, made out of earth and blood, uncivilized and simpleminded material, would not be subject to corruption, and being [26] composed of the four Elements, does not turn into the same Elements. Pagans did indeed believe in the immortality of the soul, but for the body, although their doctrine was wrong in many things, they could not imagine it; And what we are told about the end of Romulus and others, who these deceived people said had been taken body and soul into the Heavens, was reputed as fable among the scholars of these ancient times. It was even a crime among them to reject the Divinity of virtuous souls: but to send with them cumbersome and earthly bodies to be immortalized, they held it for nonsense, and it comes from this that Pindar says:

All bodies must die. The soul alone

always

Would live, in spite of death, drawing out its days.

What impertinence therefore would it be for us, who are more enlightened in this truth, to maintain the [27] immortality of the bodies of Satyrs, given the monstrous deformity of their parts? Because this exterior resemblance which they have with the goat, a foul and completely degenerate animal, seems to me a natural enough proof of the deprayedness of their bodies. But without searching for other evidence of their death than

16 *Matériel*, literally material, but in the fourth edition of the Dictionnaire de l'Académie française, the term also carries the figurative meaning of a person with an uncivilized and ponderous mind to the point that the mind is even material.

experience, if the Satyrs that history mentions are those that one wants to declare to be men, it cannot be doubted that they would be mortal since they have been seen to die, and the dead bodies embalmed, carried from country to country in order to show them to Princes and to Kings, and there was, according to Pausanias, and there were some sepulchers of Sileni and Satyrs, among the Hebrews and the people of Pergamon.

As for the partial immortality of which we have spoken, that is to say, by which a creature is rendered immortal in accordance with one of its qualities only, it cannot be given to the Satyr man any more [28] than can be the previous due to the risk to a very energetic and saintly logic. Because this immortal part of the Satyr (which we will call Soul since we have no other word to explain it) by which he would survive death, could not find any sanctuary in the other life, and one could not through any plausible discourse explain its condition after the separation of the body. The Pythagorians were even of this opinion, that souls, after death, found in Metempsychosis the punishment or the bliss of eternal life, in assuming new, perfect bodies, or imperfect ones with some conformity to the virtues or 17 the vices that they practiced on Earth. 18 Orpheus, Hesiod, and a few others, said that the souls of good people were transformed into good Angels, and those of bad people into evil demons. Plutarch, as was the [29] general opinion, thought that the souls of virtuous men became saints; Saints became demi-Gods; and demi-Gods, after having been perfected in the Sacrifices of purgation, cleansed and freed from all susceptibility to pleasure or pain, full and perfect Gods, receiving a very happy and very

17

¹⁷ As noted in the errata, this should be ou, whereas it appears & in both versions. However the & has been struck out by hand and ou written above it in the BNF version.

¹⁸ Literally "in the world": au monde.

glorious end: and that the souls of the evil, after the sentence of the infernal judges, were dragged by the furies, to a place of torture to be eternally tormented. In short, there has never been either a Philosopher nor nation, who would not believe his natural feelings, that some exalted happiness or some pain awaits men in the eternity of the second life.

But what could one say of the souls of Satyr men, when they would abandon their monstrous limbs? What could they become? Which torments could they fear, [30] and for what glory hope? Because according to the true doctrine of our holy Books, neither Hell nor Paradise will be for them. As for the torments of Hell, only those who can sin have cause to fear them, and the only ones who can sin are of the race of Adam: for in him only was sin born, and through him only did it creep among the human type. 19 Through the side20 of Adam, says a gloss of Genesis, all men have sinned, and by a single man, says Saint Paul, wishing to speak of Adam, iniquity and sin have entered into the world. How therefore could Satyrs, who would not be of the lineage of Adam, like men, fall into sin? And taking part in the sins of the father, whose sons they are not, deserve death like culprits of a crime which would not have descended to them?

[31] And for the gaze of eternal glory, it is promised only to those whom the Divine Word, through its Incarnation, made capable: and for this, only the posterity of Adam is named. The Messiah came only to restore to the children of Adam the glory that they had lost through the sin of their father; and neither the Satyrs, nor some other creature as may be, can claim any participation on the merits of its humanity. This

19 While humankind would flow better in English, this is *genre*, and Hédelin is parsing species before there was a proper form for doing so.

20 *Dans les reins d'Adam* - literally In the kidneys or lower back of Adam. Historically this seems to apply to the idea of Eve coming from the side of Adam.

158

mystery would require that it make itself entirely similar to the man he wanted to make worthy of a glorious eternity: the Word, says Saint Augustine, completely covered over Man, and took nothing else, neither more nor less, than him. Anything one would desire therefore to imagine of the human nature of Satyrs, Jesus Christ not wanting to receive their humanity, they could not claim their share of the immortal blessings that he came to distribute to men: [32] another Jesus Christ and another Paradise would be necessary for them.

What if someone decided to say that these men being irreproachable in their nature, or remaining in the state of their original innocence, would have had no need of a Savior, but only the children of Adam. We will respond that because the Angels who were created of a substance purely spiritual, and the refinement of which has never had anything in common with the earthly material, have sinned little after their creation: they, I would say, who have been created in grace, formerly being confirmed, have trespassed against their Creator. What impertinence it would be to maintain a perfection in Satyrs? And that their soul would be able to keep itself clean of vice, being joined to a body not only coarse and material, but half bestial, since all the passions, that is to say the vices, are born of [33] the earthliness of the body. One knows too well that the Satyrs are always used as an example and perfect symbol of drunkenness and lasciviousness. And indeed, Polixena, to make both these vices visible in her painting, represented them as three Satyrs cup in hand.

What remains to consider is the mortality of Satyrs. Some, to establish the opinion that Satyrs are men, could say, perhaps (like the Prince of the Mirandola seems to have heard), that they would be mortal in their whole being, as are other animals, but that

having the human form, distinct and articulate speech, and internal discourse of reason, they would constitute another species of men, from which the Adamics would differ by the nobility and immortality of their soul.

Cicero said of the Philosopher Epicurus, who portrayed the Gods without action [34] and in no way vigilant of the Universe, that this was to recognize Gods when speaking, but actually it is to say that there were none: In this way one could say of those who will declare the total mortality of the Satyr man, that it is, so to speak, giving him human nature, but in effect to take it away from him entirely: For whatever degree of perfection a creature can be honored with, whatever excellence can make him remarkable and admirable, whatever conformity he might have with human nobility, if an immortal soul is denied him, it is not longer necessary to look for its humanity, and the word man is less fitting for him than for a statue.

Man is composed of two parts, entirely different in nature, in origin, and in objective - the animal body which is a substance of corruption, born of the earth, and which returns to the earth; and the celestial Soul, [35] which is created by God, returns to God. Now in this body, man resembles brute beasts, and all the physical actions and sensations he has them in common with them, and for this, he bears the name of animal, as much as the animality, or animal nature, which consists of faculties of the sensory life, is equally distributed to man and beasts. The stag can live eight times as long as as man; the eagle has such excellent sight, says Homer, that from the Sky, it discovers a hare hidden in the thick of a bush; the wild boar has very subtle hearing: and every other animal has an unknown excellence in the senses above man. The Ancients, to teach us that man is by body a true brute beast, represented him in the [36] form of a monster, or

half-man and half-horse, or half-man and half-goat, intending that the soul was represented by the human parts, and the body by those of the beast. Plato made this distinction by a portrait of another kind; he places our soul with wings in a chariot drawn by two horses, representing the two appetites that we share with the brutes - anger and lust. Ronsard alludes to both of these symbols:

Man is Centaur, below he is horse,

And man on top, from below comes all evil,

If reason, which is man, does not guide

This animal, & does not grip him by the bridle.

And perhaps this Scylla concealed in the midst of barking dogs, would signify again this same soul, situated in the animal parts of the body, with its natural dispositions to the brutality, which are like the dogs always barking around her: but the [37] immortal soul is so particular and inexpressible to all other creatures that by the soul alone man is made man. Plato in the errors of his Paganism, even recognized and taught this truth, when he wrote that the soul differs so much from the body that we are not at all what we are, except by the efficacious virtue of our soul, the body being only some sort of imaginary thing that follows us: Hence comes what Socrates, according to this same Author, says to Axiochus, that a dead body is no longer man, especially as each of us is only his immortal soul enclosed in the body like in an ugly and tiresome prison. And Plotinus goes even further, that the body is not at all part of man, thus only a tool and instrument, that the soul, which is the true man, uses for awhile. Scipio Africanus, did he not say in a dream to [38] his nephew, that one must not believe that man is what one sees on the exterior, but the soul hidden within: and that, after having rendered great

services rendered to21 his country in this world, he enters into the ranks of demi-Gods in the Heavens, being only human? Thus, the soul alone is the entire essence of man, without which all that he possesses is common to brute beats, having nothing in the sensibility of the body that is not bestial. So Satyrs being deprived of this celestial and divine part, in which consists all the essence of the man, and of which it22 is the form, would also be deprived of all that makes man, and all the actions of their life being attached to the substance, and proceeding from a bodily and mortal principle, they would have nothing more that is human23 than all the other animals.

But in order to come to these three measures of excellence: form, speech, and [39] reasoning, by which we have said that one could maintain that Satyrs are men: Except that these are not attributes that make up the essence of man, they are not so particular to the human nature that all the creatures who are endowed with them must form a species of man, who alone has the right to bear the name. First the human form is only an exterior appearance. Mitropaustes responded quite fittingly one day to Demaratus, who asked Xerxes' permission to wear the royal hat in the city of Sardis: This hat that you request, O Demaratus, would hardly cover your head, because even if Jupiter gave you his lightning bolt to carry in your hand, you would not be Jupiter. Likewise Satyrs, though they bear this resemblance of man outwardly, are not men, and this human appearance covers nothing [40] human in their nature. Would one want to say that statues of bronze were men? That Monkeys, Apes, Cynocephales, and other such

21 As noted in the errata, this should be à, whereas it appears en in both versions. However the en has been struck out by hand and an a without an accent written above it in the BNF version.

²² As noted in the errata, *elle* is missing in both. It has been added by hand in the BNF version.

²³ De l'homme, literally of man.

other animals who have so great a relationship to our body, would have something human.24 The specters that take the human form, these shallow likenesses of man which appear suddenly in the deserts of Africa, and vanish in the same way, and these wonders, which in the appearance of men of fire astonish all the world at their appearance, are they just as much the species of men because they resemble him?

The articulate voice is still less adequate than form to prove this humanity:

Because that species of Ape, mortal animals, which are the true living Satyrs, as we hope to show hereafter, do not speak at all: and we hold that all those that are said to have spoken were demons. But if they would have [41] would have distinctly formed speech, this is not the inner nature of man, or even a property that flows from his essence, but only a simple accident, that emanates from the body's organs, which deteriorate and change, which can be, or not be, without any damage, or diminishment of being human: otherwise it would mean that those who have lost the power of speech, due to the callousness of nature or an unfortunate event, would have lost something of their humanity, and they would have become less men than others. These birds that one sees, such naive imitators of the human voice, are they yet men? And the Ass of Balaam having spoken so reasonably in order to have discoursed so reasonably, was it anything other than beast? And for all I know, if fables are accepted as truth, would one not imagine Achilles' horse, who announced his upcoming death to him, to have been man?

[42] As for the reasoning of the Satyrs: it is nothing new to recognize that the brute beasts reason in some fashion: the history of the Elephants full of sensible actions is worthy of admiration, the keenness of the Fox appear to be the effects of a sensible

24 Literally of man: ... de l'homme.

163

spirit, and one that frees itself from various consequences: And when, after having recounted several tricks of Monkeys, someone just said that he had seen them playing chess, there is no longer any doubt that they have some internal form of discourse. However only man bears the name of rational animal, because he is alone perfectly rational: and the other animals are called non-rational, 25 because the imperfection of their nature denies them this perfection. The perfect discourse of reason alone is the aspect and the difference that makes the man, and all other reasoning other than this [43] is in no way human: Someone who is only a league from some town is no more in the town than someone who is twenty leagues away: and the middle of a circle is at one point only; all the other points, though they be near this one, are not more the middle: likewise only perfect reason makes man, and, to the degree that it can approach perfection in a mortal creature, it is animalistic, and it is nothing other than the understanding of an animal endowed with sensory faculties: In other words, if the Satyr having a mortal soul, did not allow us to form a species of rational animal because he uses reason, however imperfect, it would necessarily follow that all the other brute beasts, because they reason, would constitute as many species rational animals, different only, [44] according to whether their senses, more or less skilled, would permit to them to reason, more or less perfectly: as if the more or the less sufficed as a difference in the creation of species. But so that one could concede the perfection of the internal discourse in a mortal creature: only reason that is spiritual and independent of all this coarseness, together with the assumptions and the cause from which it proceeds, is perfect. Now man alone enjoys

25 *Irraisonnables* – literally irrational. However in this discourse on rational thought as a qualifier for humanity, rational vs non-rational was the terminology.

such a perfection of discourse, because to him only has been given a soul of incorporeal substance, from which the actions, fully free, hold nothing of the earthliness of the body, principally the rational discourse, which is a pure action of intelligence, the most noble faculty of this form. But in all the other creatures whose form is mortal, the discourse of reason [45] proceeds from a soul completely corrupt, dependent entirely on the matter of its being, and whose faculties cannot be beyond the body, can only be a simple material perception, bestial and very imperfect, which is born and dies in their feelings. Now just as if there were no Sun, said Heraclitus, we would be in a perpetual night, despite all the other Stars in the Firmament: likewise if we still agree that the Satyr would be deprived of an immortal soul, and surviving in the body, it is impossible that he would be man, which is to say a perfectly rational animal, and any other perfections will not be adequate for him to merit the name: so this is not like the paintings, to which we give the name of the things that they represent. Still, one would not know how, without an impious irreverence, to give to [46] a fully mortal and monstrous creature, the name of man, a name so holy and so venerable: Moses forbade giving to foreign Gods the names of the living God, and the Jews did not dare to write fifteen by *Iod he*, ten and five, because the great name of God, *Iehoua*, began with these two letters, thus they wrote *Theth vau*, nine and six. Could we suffer this name of man, so sacred, divine, and mysterious, to be common to both a brute beast and God: The Eternal Word has been no other name more pleasing than the son of man, this is the name that David, enraptured by the prophetic spirit, gave him: In the Gospel, he himself was glorified by this name, and when we want to bear witness wholeheartedly to his love and his charitable humility, we sing, He is made man.

Among all these reasons, I still can not forget, if the Satyrs were [47] men, using the discourse of reason just as Adamic man, they would live by his example in true likeness₂₆ in society, and would have some cities with shared housing: because this is the principal effect of human reason, in fact, even the only end for which God has made men rational, hence Juvenal writes:

The common Creator of all things born,

Has only ordered life to the beasts

In the sense of the body: But men more holy,

Have received of his hands a heavenly reason,

Reason which scorns the forests more ancient,

Has arranged their houses inside a city wall,

Raising houses whose roofs were inhabited

As they expanded and touched, they built cities

Where each of the neighbors can fittingly await [48]

A timely assistance, and likewise to render it,

From a just hand lifting the oppressed,

With arms to avenge those who are hurt,

To assure the repose of those who sleep,

And to sleep in his bed with an equal security.

Those who have believed that they were men, should have at least taught us something of their fine deeds, their ways of living, their laws, their law enforcement, and

26 *Vray-semblance* – generally I am translating forms of *vray-semblance* as plausibility since this appears to be his meaning elsewhere in this treatise and throughout *La Pratique du théâtre*, however in this case a literal rendition seems best.

in what country such an extraordinary people would dwell: Because there is no part of the world that we have not visited; there is neither region, province, nor town of which we do not have an exact knowledge; there are neither streams, woods, deserts, nor rocks where the most singular marvels have not been discovered, and yet nothing of these purported men. One does not read that one has ever seen troops of Satyrs from whose actions showed the effects of [49] their humanity, no one has ever been able to observe that these people were on the Earth: True likenesses, which could pass for accurate reasons in this matter, and legitimate proofs to affirm that that there has never been a man Satyr and that there could not have been in the world another species of man than those who descend from the first that pleased God, from the beginning of the world, to create in his likeness, immortal and perfectly rational.

BOOK II

Of Satyrs: Brute Beasts

After having discussed what is related to the supposed humanity of Satyrs, the next order of discussion seems to be that we determine what they could be, since they are not men: Because we would have passed this strait in vain, if being near to entering a more open sea, we returned to port. There are very many things where it is much easier to be heard by discussing what they are not, than in wanting to explain what they are, like first matter, the essential forms of beings, and the nature of God, [51] according to Denis the Areopagite. But for the Satyrs we hope to show with such facility what they are that we believe that we have proven what they are not.

Shortly after the death of Julius Caesar, the people of Rome searching everywhere for those who had assassinated him, a man named Casca, fearing, not without reason, being taken for another Casca who was involved in this ill-fated plot in the way that Helvius Cinna had been taken and killed as the Cinna who had been one of the conspirators, had it proclaimed in a loud voice and publicly displayed which family was his, and that he was named Caius Casca and not Servilius Casca: Likewise in order to reduce easily all Satyrs each to his own species without the resemblance of the names bringing darkness or confusion to the knowledge we are seeking, and without our mistaking them one for the other, it [52] seems to be necessary to treat them according to their nature, and show clearly in what they differ.

All Satyrs, generally speaking, should be separated into three principle headings, and divided into three species. The first group is those that are known to be non-rational animals, of the nature of Apes. The other, of those monsters of abomination conceived by man and goat. And under the last should be included all the specters that have taken on this appearance, by which Demons have astonished so many people, and have been adored as Gods by the Pagans. And it is these three kinds of Satyrs – Apes, Monsters, and Demons – that we will be discussing in this work. What if one met as could happen, some wonders born of man and woman, whose face was taken in some way from the hideous body of these half-goats, 27 no one, [53] I think, would place them in the category of Satyrs, but only of the monstrous men, those which although conceived according to the common rule of their species, are yet corrupted in the structure of their limbs. That is why, being beyond my subject, we will leave the investigation and the discussion to those who should be conversant with the nature of such monsters and should decide what one should believe.

Among all the brute beasts, there are none that bear on their bodies a more true image of the human form, nor in their actions a more natural imitation of rational animals, than Apes: And among all the diverse species of Apes, there is none that approaches human nature more closely, nor is more human than those that one calls Satyrs. Thus Galen, to whom it seems Nature had [54] revealed herself, directed those who desire to educate themselves in the knowledge of the parts of man, rather than dissecting a human body, to dissect as an Ape, a Cynocephalus, or a Satyr. Now those

²⁷ Hédelin alternates between forms of bouc and chevre. On the chance that there might be a reason behind when he chooses the male over the female, I have noted throughout which form is used. Here it is demiboucquins.

who have only seen these Satyrs from afar, and who have neglected to examine them more carefully or to contemplate the spirit more carefully, instead stopping at the exterior form, have even dared to say that they are men. But to allay all misgivings and give a full and uncomplicated knowledge of these beasts, it is necessary to portray them according to all the defining features that curiosity has made us see among the Natural Philosophers. Albert the Great will be the torch who will illuminate our way to the first step on the path. The Hairy One, said he, (for this is what he called Satyrs in several places) is an animal of the Ape kind, but quite monstrous. It is half man and half goat, has the brow [55] armed with horns, and sometimes stands and walks upright, and easily leaves his bestial dignity, and it is said that these Apes live in the deserts of Ethiopia. It is not that they are not found elsewhere: because this same Author recounts that formerly two were taken, one male and one female in the forests of Saxony (or according to some Slavonia), of which the female was killed with the hunters' weapons and dogs' teeth, and the male captured alive: Afterwards, this Satyr being tamed, it was seen to that he grew accustomed to walking only on the two hind feet, and to pronounce some phrases, yet quite imperfectly and very difficult to understand: and this Author remarks that as soon as he came into heat, he was roused by a fury of love so excessive toward women that he endeavored - even publicly – to rape some of them. Ælianus gave no name to these Satyrs, but wrote only that in the mountains [56] of India toward Corude,28 there are certain beasts which are completely hairy, strongly resembling Fauns and Satyrs, and which have large tails, a little like that of a horse; they usually make their lair in the caves and in the more dense areas of the forests, which they do not leave except when they

28 This might be a typo for *Caradules*, which is a region in India where Satyrs were believed to live.

sense that they are pursued by hunters. In this case, they immediately run with agility up high in the mountains, from where they push so many and such large stones down upon the hunters, where they entrench themselves sometimes that there remain no dead or casualties on the battlefield, and they can be captured with great difficulty, except when illnesses caused them to be found alone in some corner of the wood, or when pregnant, the weight of their stomach slowing the speed of their course. Aside from these two hindrances which allow these animals fall into the hands of the hunters, Pliny adds old age as well, when he writes, [57] that in the land region of the Cartadules in the mountains of India, there are Satyrs who are beasts of human form, running sometimes upright and sometimes on four feet, that could not be captured in not aged or ill, such that they flee without effort: where this Naturalist is more Philosopher, and more on the right path, when he entertained himself by saying, that the Egyptians are from the people living on the River of the Nile. This should lead us to believe that the Silenus who was taken in Phrygia by King Midas out hunting, was one of these Ape Satyrs, that frail and late old age caused to fall into the hands of the hunters: For Silenus, as we learn from Pausanias, means none other than an old Satyr. Thus Melanthius, when questioned about what seemed to him to be a Comedy from Dionysus, answered that he could not see it such as it had been obscured by words: likewise we can say [58] that the Fables have so well covered this Silenus, so thoroughly disguised his nature, and recounted so many marvels that he is rendered unrecognizable to posterity. And as for the Apes of Paulus Venetus, entirely resembling man, who are found in the Province of Comare, there is no doubt that they are of the number of these animals of Ælianus and these Satyrs of Pliny, that both

place in the mountains of India. Because Comare is a region of Indian full of forests.29 Hence one can understand, as Strabo is mistaken in having accused Dimachus and Megasthenes of untruth and of ineptitude in saying that in the Indies, there are some Pans who have the pointed head and looking something like a quince, being easy to judge, that these Historians wanted to see these Apes as Satyrs, which were usually found in this region, and, because of the shape of their heads, say they are horned: since the words horn, [59] point, and quince are ambiguous. And in fact, because some of the ancients thought that Pan had long ago been a Captain who was the first to propose the placement of the armies pointed left and pointed right, that one calls horns and corners, it is said that on statues of him, they gave him two horns on the front. These animals flourish in cold regions as well as India, and Ethiopia, as Herodotus distinctly asserts, when he recounts that in the mountains of Scythia toward the Agryppæes, live half-goat30 or goat31-footed men: describing in his fashion a population of these half-men and half-goat32 Apes, just as he has done with the Cynocephales, which are other Apes having a head of dog. In the past, the Satyrid Isles were named for these Apes, if we want to believe what Pausanias has left us, in the report of a Euphemus, a Carien. Thus Euphemus [60] told him that they sailed with a fine troupe to Italy, the storm carried them to certain Isles called the Sayrids, where, as soon as they had landed, the monsters that lived there ran down to the shore.

29 As noted in the errata, there should be a period after *forests*, and a capital D for beginning a new sentence: D'ou. In the digital version, it appears *forests*, d'où. In the BNF version, it appears *forests*; d'où with a verital line drawn between the semi-colon and the d.

30 bouc

31 chevre

32 chevre

They were all covered in a red hair, and with tails no smaller than those of a horse, which without pronouncing a single word, were throwing themselves with all their might onto the women in a fury of love so enraged, that to deliver them from such violence, they were forced to abandon in the midst of these monsters, a foreign woman whom they had on board the vessel, and to retreat the high seas. To which we will add only that the Apes, just as Nicephore teaches us, have a face of a strong red color, and supple and deft limbs to move themselves in various ways.

Now this kind of Satyr, in my opinion, were the sort that Archduke Philip [61] took to Genoa in the year 1548, one of which was already old and the other still quite young, and he wished to display them among the other splendors that accompanied his entrance in that city, reckoning that the monstrous form, and the rarity of these animals would not diminish the pomp but would astonish all the people. Among these same animals one must include this Satyr that Saint Jerome writes was carried alive into Alexandria, where it served a long time as a spectacle to the entire population, and once dead and embalmed, was carried to Antioch to the Emperor Constantine. Albert also places it among these Apes that he calls the hairy ones. And with all due respect to some moderns, who have wanted to make us believe that this Satyr was the same one who was seen by and spoke to Saint Anthony in the deserts of the Thebaid, the [62] text of Saint Jerome teaches us completely the contrary, and the chronological order of events alone renders this excess too obvious. Because Constantine the Great, on whose orders the body of this Satyr was carried dead and embalmed to the city of Antioch, had been deceased since the year 337. And the other Satyr, that we will show hereafter to have

been a Demon, only appeared to Saint Anthony in the year 343, under the Emperors Constans and Constantius.

What we read in Nikephoros of that mad half-goat33 and half-ape animal, whom he calls Pan, sent by the King of the Indies to Constantius, conforms well to the history of the Ape Satyr of Saint Jerome, if by chance this is not the same thing. For both were long kept alive, and once dead were able to be embalmed in order to be seen by the Emperor. But Nikephoros, finding himself not only disagreeing with the name given by the Emperor, thus making the Pan a different species, form, and nature from the Ape Satyrs, it is likely that either he is mistaken, or the Pan was different from Saint Jerome's Satyr, and the two are different stories. This would be confirmed with two good reasons. First by the description of this Pan: for he made him with his upper parts similar to the goat,34 and not to man like the Satyr. Second, from the ferocity that forced him to be locked up. Because Satyrs are not so furious, thus to the contrary we will affirm with Pliny, that while the Cynocephales are fierce and wild, so are Satyrs by nature gentle and accommodating. No matter what we might want to say about this situation, it still seems that Nikephoros was not on the right path when he said in this same work that the ancient Greeks made this Pan the guardian God of shepherds [64] and flocks, like the Apes, Satyrs, the Fauns, and Sylvans: For the God Pan and the Fauns were in no way different, not having been formed in divergent examples, and it is very false that this God was portrayed as half-goat35 and half-Ape like this Pan of Nikephoros, but instead as half-man

33 chevre

34 chevre

35 chevre

and half-goat,36 exactly like the other Satyrs: And on the other hand, it is very true that the color red in which that Historian brightly paints the face of the Satyr only, was also common to the God Pan: Thus Virgil:

The God Pan was there, whose complexion we saw

Bloody from 37 the juice of danwort, and from cinnabar paint.

Long ago, one of these Satyrs was seen in Arcadia, who quite tormented the shepherds of the Province, and took pleasure, with an Ape-like malice, in diverting the livestock and scattering them in the nearby woods: [65] Argus Polyoptes delivered the land from their violent and troublesome acts, having put them to death. Since then another was taken when it was found sleeping in a park sacred to the Nymphs near the city of Apollonia, and led before Sulla;38 yet some, against all reason, have determined that it was one of those supposed and imaginary men, and others, without any justification, have placed it among the number of Demon Satyrs. But in addition, in the text, we do not see that it did or said anything verging on the powers of phantoms. Sulla had had it interrogated by his interpreters in every language, it never responded with anything we could understand, having only a coarse voice, mixed with the whinnying of a horse and the bawling of a goat. From this we recognize that these brute beasts are of the species of Ape Satyr, which belong to both of these animals. [66] Those Satyrs that Osiris, who is the same God39 as

³⁶ chevre

³⁷ As noted in the errata, this should be *de ius*, whereas it appears *du jus* in both versions. However the *e* has been struck out by hand and a *u* written above it in the BNF version.

³⁸ Sylla

³⁹ The BNF printing has no *Dieu*. It reads *Ces Satyres qu'Osiris, qui est le mesme que Bacchus...* The digital version has *Ces Satyres qu'Osiris qui est le mesme Dieu que Bacchus...* https://play.google.com/books/reader?printsec=frontcover&output=reader&id=GDGD5wsuCFcC&pg=GBS.PP5

Bacchus, led with him in his armies, were they anything other than these Apes? Diodorus writes that they were hairy, and were loved by that Prince, because they were amusing in their snickering and agile feats of buffoonery, about which even the Indians, as Lucian says, took the opportunity to scorn them: and by their nature, Satyrs, in the fashion of the other Apes, are thus jesters. We also read in Solinus that they are quite amusing to see, being unable to stand still without moving around, and always jumping40 and making merry gesticulations. That is why we see today that the great lords usually include the selfsame animals in their retinue. This was no less common among the Princes of antiquity, just as it is well known in the example of Solomon, who had them brought to him from [67] Tharshish41, every three years. And if one looks only at the name, the Cercopes, which Plutarch describes as having been the flatterers of Hercules like the Satyrs of Bacchus, were common Apes with which he passed the time as Bacchus did with Ape Satyrs, and which the Fables in allegory have said were men like the demi-God Satyrs.

The Satyrs then, in order to draw the abridged portrait, are non-rational animals of the species of Apes, all of them hairy and covered with a thick coat of russet colored fur, because of which they are called the hairy ones; for this very thing, they have been called

⁴⁰ The BVF version spells this *soubresaults* whereas the digital version uses *soubresots*. Hédelin, *Des Satyres*, (Paris: Nicolas Buon, 1627).

https://play.google.com/books/reader?printsec=frontcover&output=reader&id=GDGD5wsuCFcC&pg=GB. S.PP5

⁴¹ The BNF version reads *Tharsis* whereas the digital version reads *Pharsis*. Both are from the block letter printed on the page, not modified afterward, and neither appears to be marred. The P appears to be a typographical error. Tharshish is in 1 Kings: 10:22. Hédelin, *Des Satyres*, (Paris: Nicolas Buon, 1627). https://play.google.com/books/reader?printsec=frontcover&output=reader&id=GDGD5wsuCFcC&pg=GBS.PP5

the hairy ones. Their upper parts - the head, the hands, and the body - are similar to those of the man, with only some slight difference: For they have a red face and horns on each side of the forehead: and their lower parts - from the stomach down - they take after the goat, 42 with the sole exception of the tail which in form and [68] size resembles that of a horse. They walk sometimes upright like a man and more commonly on four feet like the other beasts. When they run, they are light and quite quick, and their limbs flexible and adapted to making many merry, frolicking gestures and movements: And although they are furiously lascivious when their natural desire to procreate arouses them, they are however by nature gentle and easy to tame. Their retreat is always in the deserts in the dark hollows of caves, or in the deepest recesses of the thick forests. And as for the articulate voice that some have wanted to say is as well known in Satyrs as in men, this is not found in these animals; because by their nature they do not speak, casting only a raspy voice, combined with the whinnying of a horse and the bawling of a goat.43 It is even true that they have [69] this trait over other Apes, that with great difficulty over a long period of time, one can teach them two or three words; still they are not able to speak as intelligibly as the birds that know how to speak; thus they get upset that they cannot make themselves understood, the way that small children who are beginning to jabber do.

Behold then the form and nature of these Apes, for which the name of Satyr astonishes more than all the rest, because the Pagans have thus named their bucolic Gods. But through the etymology of the word Satyr, it is easy to recognize that this name was given first to these animals with proper reasoning according to their nature and by

42 chevre

43 bouc

comparison to all the other things that resembled them: Because the word Satyr is derived, according to some, from the Greek name that signifies the element that defines man, being given to the Apes to denote their [70] prodigious lascivity, and Sylene44 from the Greek verb that means to grind one's teeth: That is to say, they make faces or laugh or growl, they pull their lips back above and below, exposing their teeth and gums.

Now to restate in passing the principle question of all this discourse, there is no one so little versed in the knowledge of himself who would wish to say that these Satyrs were men, nor so unreasonable as to call them rational animals. Because it is without doubt all too clear that these are truly brute beasts, who live in deserted places just like others, according to the simple motions that nature gave them, lacking any reason other than the senses and that natural instinct common to all the non-rational animals. And without losing time to prove something manifestly obvious, we will ascertain that of all these Satyrs, the one about which Albert the Great writes is the one that was caught in the forests of Slavonia, that they employ no discourse of reason, possessing nothing human, as Mela says, other than I know not which outward appearance, for even that varies completely in its monstrousness.

⁴⁴ As noted in the errata, this should be & Silene, whereas it appears ou Sylenes in both versions. However the ou has been struck out by hand and a Et written above it in the BNF version. In the same version, the s has been stricken.

BOOK III

Of Monster Satyrs, and that they are in no way men.

If it is true that the Roman Orator Antonius Julianus was praised for, when he had something on the subject of some secret mysteries of love, he covered his face with a veil. What must I expect in this encounter when I am not dealing with a passion that nature has made licit but the monstrous effects of sacrileges committed against its45 holy Laws? Should I not only cover my face, but also search for some shadows darker than the Cimmeriansin order to hide myself fully, or even sacrifice, myself, [73] my hand and my quill on the spot to the wise Harpocrates? But since the subject undertaken does not permit me to immure such an important topic in silence, I will endeavor to cover the deformities of this passage quite discretely under the shade of a restrained style, and to render it so innocent that even the most religious souls will find in it as much satisfaction as the discourse is new to them, and the knowledge necessary.

Once again this nature, that is to say, God, at the creation of all the creatures, would have given them some specific and regulated inclinations, and in the course of which they produced some effects conforming to their being, and that all the parts of the Universe function, each one amid the others, without disrupting their operations, nor

45 As noted in the errata, this should be ses, whereas it appears les in both versions. However the l has a handwritten hook in the BNF version added to the top making it a long s: f.

undertaking that to which they are not ordained. However, it occurs often that the natural factors, transgressing this general law, [74] are themselves subverted from the ordinary course of their actions; and going outside their natural state, have produced some things despite their innate character, and contrary to the state of their nature: what we call prodigies. Thus the Heavens being themselves unable to reproduce,46 according to common Philosophy, due to their perfection, have generated amid them some comets, as the Mathematicians⁴⁷ would have us believe, even those that, in these last years, struck terror in all Europe. The Sun, which uniquely is the image of the Divinity, has appeared double, even triple sometimes. The Moon has left its place to collide with another Moon, and the Stars have seemed to be torn as under from the Firmament to fall here to Earth below. Like the skies, the Elements also have adhered to the violence of this disorder: The air has made Irises appear bloody 48, and made it rain [75] stones and blood. The seas have opened up, the fire has lost its heat and the earth its firmness. In short, there is not one cause in the world, which, either by clashing with itself, or forced by a superior power, has not suffered some diversion in its ordinary actions. The nature of living creatures no more than the rest, does not find itself exempt from these malfunctions. For although God has placed in the senses of all animals, and placed inside their very core,

⁴⁶ Generation is a key word in the discourse on satyrs and on humanity, however for the sake of clarity reproduce is used in this sentence. ... Ainsi les Cieux ne pouuant receuoir au une generation en eux mesmes...

⁴⁷ The BNF text reads: *Mathematicies*. A reverse curved line is written above the second -e- to the effect that it looks like it may be a minim. The digital text reads: *Mathematiciés*. https://play.google.com/books/reader?printsec=frontcover&output=reader&id=GDGD5wsuCFcC&pg=GBS.PP5

⁴⁸ As noted in the errata, this should be *ensanglantés*, whereas it appears *ensanglantés* in both versions. However another *e* has been added by hand in the BNF version. In the digital version, *ntés* is underlined, perhaps denoting the error.

some very specific inclinations and limited them to joining themselves each to their own kind in order to perpetuate its species, and to keep it always the same as it is. Nonetheless one sees frequently enough two animals of different species, stepping outside of some of the limits that have been prescribed to them, give birth to some beasts which hold elements from both, resembling neither the one nor the other, and remaining incapable of [76] regeneration: and these are called monsters. Moses, that great Prophet and Legislator to whom God revealed the most secret laws of his will, with a specific Law forbade the Jews from participating in such illicit mixings, as it is a matter contrary to all rational obligations to cause nature to deviate from the paths that God himself has mapped49 out and commanded all to follow.

Ana was the one who first found a way to create mules: where the standard translation is, *The hot waters*, the Hebrews use, *The mules*, and the paraphrase, *The strong ones*, because of the force of the mules. A feat worthy of Ana and his origins to be sure: For being born of the incestuous embrace of Sebeon and his mother, he had motive to seek the means to render all of nature incestuous, in order to cover the shame of his birth. Still it would seem that these lawless actions [77] would not be particularly reprehensible, indeed even taken into consideration at all in brute beasts, in which the life and the works are indifferent to vice and to virtue. But in Man, who through reason assumes control of the Earth, and considers himself equal to God, to see so odious a deviation of nature and spirit, this seems not only beyond believability, but a sacrilege to imagine it. It is nonetheless as certain as it is unbelievable that it does occur in some that

⁴⁹ As noted in the errata, this should be tracees, whereas it appears tracez in both versions. However the z has been struck out by hand and 'es written above it in the BNF version.

the desires have been so disordered, the humanity so bestial, and the reason so mad that they seek to satisfy their inflamed appetites outside outside the natural inclinations of their species: and who have, in this way, given birth to these abominable creatures, the horror of Heaven, the terror of the Earth, and who bearing in their body the human form mixed with the bestial, reveal by a just judgement of God the shame and the vileness of their parents. This is what [78] the clever inventors of Fables wished to convey when they say that in the war of the Giants against the Gods, while the Moon was diverted from its ordinary movement, rising from the other side of the horizon from where it usually rose, monsters and many strangely formed animals were born here on Earth. Having wanted under this diversion of the Moon, to understand the deranged desires and the passions of love contrary to the ordinary course of nature: for the Moon is none other than the Goddess Venus. 50 Thus the Egyptians appealed to it in their passing romances, and Isis, who is the same Moon, presides over, as Eudoxus said, and governs love.

Who does not know the origin of this Minotaur, more dishonorable to the Cretans, than detrimental to the Athenians? And what will you not presume of the prodigious births of Alcippe and Glaucippe? This half-man [79] and half-dog monster, filled all of Italy under Pius V with no less awe than this adulterated dog filled the Roman Judges with shuddering, shuddering, and that Hipocentaur newly born at the home of Periander filled the Philosophers of Greece with admiration. Satyrs are of this kind of monsters that we understand under the second species, in whom the limbs, different in two natures, are very certain clues to their origin. The Goatherd Crathin, whose death was not only the effect of a new jealousy, thus the witness of a heavenly wrath, was the father of a monster

⁵⁰ This is a sentence fragment in both editions.

Satyr, half man and half goat,51 which the inhabitants of the region placed among their Gods, and adored under the name of Sylvain, or Napaios. Such, without doubt, was this God Pan to whom Penelope gave birth, placing his honor in the shadow of the goats2 disguise of a supposed Mercury, just like Philyra,53 who hid the infamous birth [80] of Chiron in the horse-like form of Saturn54 and also Ixion convinced the world that the Centaurs were conceived in the clouds, and not in the stud farm of Magnesia. And if it is permitted of philosophize on history, it must be said that Valerie, who threw herself from a cliff for the horror of her crime, preferred to confess to incest with her father, than to admit an impiety less human and natural, which made her give birth to a child whom the Latins called Sylvain, (of the same name as the son of the Goatherd Crathin) and the Greeks Ægypan: Because, as Plutarch says, the Ægypans derive from these unions so prodigious and unnatural. The prodigious lewdness of the goats55 of Mendes, recounted by Pindar and Herodotus, who made some take them for incubi,56 and the solitary life of the greater part of the inhabitants of this country who are almost all goatherds, could have plausibly given [81] rise to some of these monstrous Satyrs: And Virgil seems to have

⁵¹ chevre

⁵² *bouc* – Here since Pan was male, there seems to be a clear reason for *bouc* vs. *chevre*. Otherwise, the alternation seems to be random. Perhaps it is aesthetic.

⁵³ The BNF text reads: *Philire*. The digital text reads: *Phisire*. https://play.google.com/books/reader?printsec=frontcover&output=reader&id=GDGD5wsuCFcC&pg=GBS.PP5

⁵⁴ The BNF version readsde Saturne, & encore.... The digital version reads:de Saturne. Et encore.... https://play.google.com/books/reader?printsec=frontcover&output=reader&id=GDGD5wsuCFcC&pg=GBS.PP5

⁵⁵ boucs

⁵⁶ The BNF text readspour incubes, & la vie.... The digital text reads: pour incubes. Et la vie.... https://play.google.com/books/reader?printsec=frontcover&output=reader&id=GDGD5wsuCFcC&pg=GB S.PP5

wanted to touch in passing the reproduction57 of these half-man58 and half-goat59 monsters, when he sings of the forests where Evander built his city:

Long ago Satyrs inhabited these deserts,

Natural citizens of this wild land,

Among the men born of gaping oak trees

Who in truthfulness did not know the custom.

As if he wanted to say that the coarse and bestial reason of the shepherds who frequented these uninhabited places, being unable to resist the immoral passion which aroused them, rendering them fathers of these Satyrs, of whom we only saw a few living among them. I say some only, because to think that there could have been whole peoples and a great number of these monstrous Satyrs would be ridiculous; because [82] being Hybrids, that is to say, born of animals of two different species, they are fully incapable of conceiving and extinguish their race in themselves, without being able to regenerate any being resembling in any way those from which they originated. Alexander of Aphrodisias asking why mules do not conceive, conclusively determines that it is because they are born of animals of different species. The reason is that through the confusion of these two natures of different wonts and qualities, a third being is created which is neither one nor the other, destroys in its creation all the reproductive abilities of both: as we see in the

⁵⁷ la generation

⁵⁸ This is hyphenated in the BNF version but not in the digital version. https://play.google.com/books/reader?printsec=frontcover&output=reader&id=GDGD5wsuCFcC&pg=GBS.PP5

⁵⁹ *chevres* – Here the feminine makes sense since these goats are mothers to monstrous satyrs. Also the second is hyphenated while the first is not in both versions of the text.

⁶⁰ Again *generation* is the term. To prevent confusion between definitions of the English form, I have used creation here - destruict en sa generation toutes les facultez productiues de l'vn & de l'autre....

mixing of white and black, a brown color emerges through the total corruption of these two essences, and it can no longer be either black or white. Some will say perhaps of these half-man and half-goat61 Satyrs [83] and of those other monsters in which humanity is not involved, thus belong only to the bestial, the two species not being mixed the way they are with mules, Leopards, and other such Hybrid animals, the natural dispositions necessary to maintain the species would themselves be preserved entirely in both parts of these monstrous bodies: However, it does not follow that Satyrs would have been capable of producing offspring. Because the matter seeping down from the upper parts, which are human, would bring with it some habits and qualities specific to the creation 62 of man: and coming down to stew in the lower parts, which are goat, and inclined to have other results, it would lose these same human qualities in this mixture, and would be rendered incapable of all action. And for that matter the wonts of those lower parts inclined to the production [84] of a goat,63 working on a material that is barren and repugnant to their operation, would destroy themselves without producing anything. Thus although the designated productive parts, which are in the two different natures of these Satyrs, would not be corrupted in the matter with which they are begotten, they would always annihilate the very thing necessary for them to conceive.

The Jews, driven by a just and holy fear of seeing the birth of these monsters, levied the pain of death against both of their parents, which is still observed today. And the Pagans, stirred by a pious astonishment when they were born, after certain sacrifices

61 chevres

62 generation

63 bouc

of propitiation buried them alive or threw them in the expiatory waves of the sea. But as the Christian Religion grew, and such ceremonies little by little came to an end and were finally abolished, the Historians, as [85] Ammian writes, have since then neglected to make mention of the monsters that they have seen born.

Now these Satyrs, despite being abominable in their origin and so strange in the conformation of their nature, nevertheless, oblige us to debate their humanity: not to know if they comprise a species of man different from the Adamics: Because we have sufficiently discussed that there could not have been such a species: but simply if they are men (although they were born in part from the seed of Adam), which is to say, if such half-goat64 monsters can have a spiritual and immortal soul equal to that of true men who are whole and perfect. The question perhaps will seem large to some, but in my opinion, very easy to resolve. It is very true that, at first, the three main parts of their life which are nothing if not human, seem to bear witness to the immortality of the essence that [86] brings them to life; And this would be quite considerable if the immortal soul, in the example of other natural forms, drew its power from the substance65 when these capacities are implanted in it. But coming from elsewhere and falling from the hands of God into a body appropriate to receive it, this proof drawn from the material principles of a clearly natural life, is too weak in this situation: in a similar light, one can see the powerful reasons making it easy to counter against it. Therefore, in order to facilitate the certainty of this truth, we will establish the discourse on this division that the subject

64 demy-bouquins

⁶⁵ *matiere* – Matter being a key term in early modern natural philosophical discourse, it seems worthwhile to note where it is an alternative term. I use matter and substance interchangeably.

seems to require of itself: either the immortal soul of the monster Satyr, conjoining in its fullness, would inform even the parts of his body begotten by the brute beast, or only those that proceed from the man. Having shown clearly that both are impossible, and no less repugnant to [87] Religion than contrary to nature, it will be necessary to conclude that these monsters, having nothing more than life and the senses, are totally subject to death.

As for the first member of our division, it is not solely a maxim of philosophy that natural forms cannot give life to substances other than to those which are precisely commensurate to them and that a mutual inclination makes proper to this formation: as such, an incontestable and constant rule from which nature never deviates. For in these Satyrs, the parts of their bodies conceived from the goat₆ cannot have any rapport with the spiritual soul, and some tendencies which could be introduced here, they can only be vivified by a bestial and mortal soul; Especially since it is not possible that a body receive its essence from a different species than that [88] which is appropriate. In brute beasts, as soon as the matter is prepared for life, a soul naturally arises from the matter, giving it form immediately, and to which only it is commensurate. But in man, the body being formed of all its parts expects something greater than a principle of sensation, and receives a spirit by whose creation he has only one legitimate inclination. Also God created the body and the soul of the brute beasts at the same time in order to show us that wherever their body is, there does their soul incline. But in order to create man, he prepared him of substance and arranged this matter into the limbs, then imparted into it the breath of life, that spirit which puts us in motion so that we could be able to know that

66 chevre

this fragment of the Divinity, the immortal soul, has nothing in common with the body of beasts, and that it will be infused only in those who are born of the same soil with which [89] he made the first man, and will be formed from the same model. It reminds me here of Xenophon when he says that the good householder has in his home a proper place for the utensils destined for use in sacrifices, and another for the dishes: while elsewhere are the instruments of war, and elsewhere the tools of labor, and thus he never confuses them and takes nothing from its place. Nature, guided by the hand of God, does almost the same; she67 has diverse substances, which are like the proper places of the different forms; In some of this matter, she usually places nothing, and in other matter, other things, without ever troubling the arrangement by sending a form into a matter that is not destined to receive it. It is impossible that the form of a carnation could be placed into a flower born from a rose seed and prepared for that form. One never sees that an animal produced [90] from a Lion's matter and disposed to this form, receives its form from a horse. Likewise, it cannot be done in these Satyrs, that the parts conceived of a bestial matter, conceived from a beast and prepared for the soul that is natural to them, would be capable of being vivified from the form of a man, and united in a spiritual being with which they have no conformity. For those who could believe such a convergence of two things so contrary, it would be easy to persuade that the soul of Pelops gave form to his ivory shoulder, and that of Pythagorus to his thigh of gold: For these animal parts of a monster Satyr are just as incommensurate to the spiritual soul as ivory and gold are. But concerning Pythagorus, that Philosopher who taught the transmigration of the human

⁶⁷ While Hédelin does not capitalize nature, and therefore does not seem to personify nature as his contemporaries do. Even so, she seems the appropriate pronoun.

souls into new bodies after death, never thought however that the spiritual soul of man would have entered into the body of a [91] brute beast in order to give him life. As all his doctrine was concealed from the people in enigmatic communications, he also taught through this metempsychosis,68 in accord with the good Authors, that flaws imprint some of the blemishes and earthly qualities in the souls, which remain in them even after death, are like a body that follows them everywhere, and which serves as a coarse garment for their contaminated spirituality. But if we were to admit that the immortal soul gives life to the bestial parts of the Satyrs, there would be no secret explanation to look for; and dazzled in the holy light which enlightens us, we would be bound to admit this genuinely and as fact; the human soul would be and would animate the body of a beast, even though this Pagan only taught it through enigma.

What if someone by chance, dared to say to this: that the immortal soul [92] would inform only the animal parts of these Satyrs, such as the sensory parts, and that stopping itself at the appropriate degree of the sensitivity, it would convey to them a life such that their nature could expect to live: it would be easy to respond in a word that this does not hold with what we say of the incompatibility of the bestial parts to the human form. For the soul is not among those causes that behaves through contact69 with virtue, which is to say, where they are not, or through the qualities emanating from their power, but only where it is and on the things it touches. In some way, it70 would instruct the bestial parts, it would be present there and substantially; wherever it is, it cannot be there

68 Greek for the transmigration of the soul in reincarnation.

⁶⁹ As noted in the errata, this should be *contact*, whereas it appears *contract* in both versions. However the *r* has been struck out by hand in the BNF version.

⁷⁰ quelle – This appears to be a typo in both versions and appears to be intended to be qu'elle.

halfway or only to a certain degree, but according to the totality of its nature. This spiritual form has this specifically and by divinity over the others, that it not only releases into [93] the mass of their body and fully into the entirety: but still fully entire in each part, with such equality, that it is not more in the greater parts nor less in the lesser. For with respect to the diversity of its actions, some of which are higher and the others lower, they originate in the placement of the organs, which it is compelled to use in order to have an effect on this life, and not because of any irregularity that is in its forming. It feels, in all, says Saint Augustine, a pin prick in living flesh at an imperceptible place, although the pain does not circulate through the bodily senses, but remains in the place where it made itself felt. So much that being united to these goat71 members to animate them, the soul would be there according to the totality of its being, the entire spirituality of its substance, and all the other faculties that adorn it: and without any difference would give form to this matter [94] although bestial and incapable of this form, with the same powers as the more noble parts of the human body: which we declare to be contrary to all appearance of reason and to the regulated course of nature.

This reason will be followed by reflections on a consideration so powerful that they should be received for legitimate arguments in this matter. The original sin which all men have inherited from their first father, and for the purgation of which the waters of Baptism are ordained by God, has long held some 72 Doctors of the Church in a place of doubt, without daring to determine unequivocally if the souls were drawn and descended from Adam up to us, spreading this original stain from one to the other, or if they were

71 bouquins

⁷² Quelques appears in the BNF version but not the digital version.

created by God in the generation of each man. For on the one hand, it was difficult to understand how these spiritual substances were able thus to reproduce themselves, and [95] for that matter it seemed to them as unjust that the soul of an infant dying before receiving Baptism was eternally punished for this fault in which it had not participated. But in the end these Doctors enlightened by the Holy Spirit, have condemned the error of the Palagiaians and Luciferiaians, who made all souls descend from that of Adam, and recognized that the soul received the stain of original sin by infusion at the convergence of the body which transferred to him this stain, for being born of a disobedient father: and as Saint Cyprian says, by the contagion of this ancient death, because it comes from the flesh of Adam. Thus Saint Thomas decided it in his Theological questions, naming the flesh the instrumental cause of this sin: And Saint Augustine at last resolving his uncertainty, writes that the lust attached to the body's limbs, born with small infants, [96] renders them culpable of the sin of their first father, and that we are corrupted, one in another, as in a rank and moldy vessel. This thus set down as true, it would follow that the immortal soul of these Satyrs coming to be infused and to unite itself to parts created from the bestial material, would be exempt from this original stain natural to man. Because this bestial matter not having come from Adam, could not contaminate it with a sin that it has not contracted. And nevertheless this same soul would avoid being sullied by this same sin, through the conjunction of the other parts that would originate from man: and being completely in every part of the body, it would follow that a single thing would be fully pure and fully defiled, according to the numerous parts that it would inform.

This original sin brings [97] to mind Baptism and the Baptism of the other Sacraments. There is no one so lacking in Religion who would say that the venerable Sacraments of the Church, instituted by the Word Eternal to the salvation of the man only, for the wiping away of his iniquities, and the vivification of his soul, should be profaned through this irreverence of being transmitted to the brute beasts. And yet if the soul of these Satyrs were immortal, a beast's body would receive the sanctification of the holy Baptism, and the consecration of the holy Oils. And furthermore that heavenly and living Bread prepared only for the Angels and for men, who are only a little less than them, would be received (a disgraceful thing to think) in a beast's body, and against which we sing out loud, given truly to the dogs. The Romans considered everything enclosed within their walls to be [98] sacred,73 apart from the gates, because, being destined for the passage of many profane things which entered the city, they did not believe that they could be sanctified: And by counter reason one could say that the body being like the gate and the passage through which the Sacraments are transmitted to the soul, should in itself be of some sanctity, and not be reduced unto animality. For even though grace and the effect of the Sacraments would be transfused into the soul, it is the body, however, that receives them, and shares with it the effective merits from the beatitude. The flesh, says Tertulian, is the foundation of the salvation, and that which enlists the soul under the signs of God. The flesh is washed so that the soul is cleansed. The flesh is anointed to the end that the soul be crowned. The flesh is marked with the sign of the cross so that the soul is fortified. The flesh is protected by the hand so that the

73 As noted in the errata, this should be *sacree*, whereas it appears *sacrees* in both versions. However the *s* has been covered in some manner, perhaps paint or even celophane tape in the BNF version.

soul be illuminated by [99] the Holy Spirit. The flesh is filled with the body and blood of Jesus Christ, to the end that the soul be filled with God. This is why, finding themselves conjoined in the work, they can not be separated in the reward. Far away therefore from the application and the effect of these mysterious Sacraments, a bestial body conceives and brings forth a beast.

The words of the Scholar just discussed above give me the opening to a rationale for which they will be the foundation, because since the same flesh that has during the course of life received the Sacraments and assisted the soul in its works, should follow it in its resurrection, and accompany it, in glory: Likewise Job witnesses, saying:

I know well that myself, and without being changed,

Must on the last day in the grave I would leave,

And putting on my flesh the same skin that I have, [100]

I will see my Savior with these two eyes that I bring.74

It would follow in these Satyrs a thing that is prodigious and full of impiety. For their souls coming together in their resurrection with their bodies, carrying them along into Heaven, would this not be a body of beast glorified, and enjoying being the possession of God? It is certainly true, and Saint Augustine himself teaches us this, that in the general resurrection, all bodies will be reduced to a proper proportion, the superfluities cast away, the defects made right, and all the deformities restored to man's natural structure. But this cannot legitimately pertain to these Satyr monsters: because all

⁷⁴ This seems to be Job 19:25-27. The King James Version reads:

[&]quot;For I know that my redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth:

And though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God:

Whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; though my reins be consumed within me."

the deformities of the human body are simply flaws in the form, and in the matter which is itself naturally human, and inclined, even eager to see this [101] perfect restoration. But the monstrosity of these Satyrs is not only a defect in the external appearance, but in the interior of the substance from which such deformed parts are procreated: and such modification as could miraculously occur, they will always be bestial. So that it would be necessary to render the bodies of these Satyrs capable of resurrection, that such parts would have been entirely destroyed: and so half of their body, even if it75 had received the Sacraments and participated in the work of the other half, would not accompany it in the reward.

The second member of our division is no less averse to reason for the peculiar absurdities that would follow it. For if the rational soul that would be in these Satyrs only vivified the human parts, and the sensate the bestial parts, a single creature would be composed of different [102] substances, and animated by diverse forms: a single whole would have two beings, and a single life two souls. The Egyptians have even had the opinion that there were three souls in a single man, each subordinate to the power of the other; but nature shows us every day that a single subject can only receive one form, and the truth commands us to believe that there can be only one soul in each animal. Or else we say on the contrary, that this would not be a single body, not a single life, but as it is very-true, the upper parts being human and informed by the human soul, this would be a perfect half-man, joined to a perfect half-beast. But what agent could be strong enough in nature to conjoin two things so different as the body of a human and of a beast, and to do

⁷⁵ As noted in the errata, this should be *qu'elle*, whereas it appears *qu'il* in both versions. However the *elle* has been written around *il* in the BNF version.

so in such a way that two beings so dissimilar [103] in their matter, so unequal in their life, and so contrary in their souls, could unite themselves, attach themselves so tightly together without any challenge from either part? And what ridiculous problems would not follow from this conjoining? He who would kill such a monster by stabbing the upper parts of his body, would be a murderer and guilty of death: and in stabbing the lower parts, he would kill a goat, 76 and would be let off with an obligatory fine. And in the very same way, the life of Meleager depended on that fatal (or poisoned as some say) firebrand the length of time that it would burn having been measured: Likewise the life of the man who would be in those upper parts of the satyr, would depend on the life of the goat77 who would be in the lower parts: and the life of this half-goat,78 on that of the halfman. And when this rational soul would come [104] to separate itself from this human body, it would be necessary that a sensory soul to which no violence had been done, would cease bringing the bestial body to life: and likewise the reverse. The smallest actions against rational justice which this Satyr would do through the human parts, would render it culpable, and the greatest crimes through the bestial could cause him to be called debauched. And a thousand other such impudent absurdities that it would be easy to argue, if the immortal soul in the monster Satyr were to animate only the limbs he received from man, then consequently those parts born of a bestial substance are so disgusting and find themselves naturally unfit for the spiritual soul, and those from the human on the contrary in the state of the animality are not disgusting, and are naturally

76 chevre

77 chevre

78 demi-chevre

disposed to the sensate: We will conclude that these Satyrs and all the other [105] monsters cut from the same cloth, are deprived of this spirit of life, which is immortal, rational, created and breathed from God into the limbs of man at his generation, and that those monstrous bodies are given form and vivified only by a corporeal soul, mortal, and extracted from the power of those two matters, to which it is equally suited and appropriate. And that God permits the birth of these prodigies and debaucheries of nature here below, not only in order to accuse and demonstrate together for the universal Justice of the world, the depravity and ungodliness of their parents: But also for other reasons specific to his supreme knowledge.

BOOK IIII Of Demon Satyrs.

The first Order established by God in this Universe, remaining after so many centuries always the same, and the eternal and inexhaustible work of Nature, 79 have all too manifestly witnessed to all the peoples of the Earth, that one Divinity, the Holy Spirit and all-powerful, intrinsic to the members of this great body, dwells in all his beings, and maintains the actions in the same state as they were at the point of their creation. The Hebrews called God Machom or Hamachom, that is to say, Place, as all things being in him, and he in all things. And for the same reason the [107] Stoics made him of round shape, in the example of the Universe. Because surely God is this Platonic circle whose center is universal and the circumference without limit, which fills all things, says Symmachus, and which is present, says the Psalmist, even in the underworlds. The Pagans, educated in simple humanity, have even held the belief that there was neither a part nor a place in the great totality, that was not aided by the presence of the Divinity. But their Religion having always broken through the limits of truth, in which they have followed the image and shadow only, as if a single God could not exist and act entirely and only through himself, they confessed to many gods, to which they attributed numerous powers, limited to the various parts of the world where each had charge, and to the governing of which they were separately ordered.

79 In a rare instance, Hédelin capitalizes Nature here.

Poetry was the Nauplian torch [108] whose unlucky light making them lose the true way of reason throwing them into the error where they met their end; Because the learned men of the first age, just as Maximus of Tyre writes, seeing that the name of Philosopher80 was odious to the masses, and that the marvels that they would teach about God seemed impossible to the ignorance of the uncouth, were compelled to play the part of the Poets and sing of the effects of the Divinity in parables and enigmatic notions. This was the reason why the people, focusing on their verses and not on their mystical understanding, received that infinite number of Gods that they honored so religiously. Herodotus very much wanted to persuade us that before Hesiod and Homer, no one had heard tell of the race and genealogy of such Gods: But Orpheus however (if the hymns that we have are of this ancient Thracian Singing Bard [109] long before the age of these two firsts) had already glorified with his verses, the plurality of the Gods who were revered at this time. Therefore, from these mysterious Poems, three brothers emerge to divide among themselves the universal Empire of this splendid machine,81 along with an inheritance, the shares of which were divided and measured by an anvil of iron rolling for three full days from the summit of Olympus to the chasms of the Earth. From the errors of this same doctrine have come all those other divinities that they call Demi-Gods, whose power they consider to be subordinate to three sovereigns who have assigned them to their places here and there throughout the world to govern some part of it. Thus the Naiads to take special care of the waters, Pomona of the fruits, and Flora of the beauties

80 *Philosophe* does not translate precisely to philosopher, encompassing scholarship more broadly, particularly Natural Philosophy.

⁸¹ the universe

of the prairies: The mountains were given to the Oreads; the Dryads fomented [110] the reproduction of the trees; and a thousand other such reveries carried them away in the false belief of the multiplicity of the Gods.

Numbering among these small divinities were those bucolic Gods, who long ago were worshipped under the names of Pans, Ægypans, Fauns, Sylvans, Satyrs, and Tytires, whose Idols were portrayed by a monstrous half-man and half-goats2 figure, whom they claimed to have been charged with guarding the forests and wilderness, and whom they honored through Priests, Temples, and Sacrifices, following the custom of how they honored those whom they esteemed their greater Gods: as one can see abundantly in the Authors who discussed the Gentiles' Gods, their Images, Feasts & Sacrifices. And although these fables, confused with certain historical events seem to have rendered these Gods different from each other, differentiated [111] these names, and varied their Feasts with some minor ceremonies, it is however certain that all the Satyrs have been renowned for the same powers, that all these names are common to them, and that some learned Representatives have striven to reduce all this to a single Divinity. We learn that the Emperor Severus, after having accumulated all sorts of honors, and having savored all the delicacies that can kindle the cupidities of man, had the habit of saying, I have been all that a man could be, I have experienced all things, and I am still not content. Likewise it has occurred in Pagan religion: they have worshipped all the Gods they dreamed up, received all those from foreign lands, and even erected alters to those whom they did not know, and whose name they did not know; however they could never be satisfied, and their ignorance seems always to have [112] awaited the knowledge of a God more holy

82 chevre

and more powerful than all those whom they honored. The Devil by his cursed artifices was the one who held them blind in the light of their own Philosophy, by which they learned on their own the unity of the one true God, which charmed and put an end to their impious reverence of so many Deities so that worshipping more than one God, they would not have been worshipping any at all. For this spirit of pride and jealousy, stirred into a rage at the loss of the men of these first centuries whom he tyrannized with his advantage of their blindness: as soon as the Sacrifices with which they were honoring the memory of some wise and virtuous Prince, or through an extraordinary action in nature, which seemed miraculous to them in their stupidity, he saw them inclined to the veneration of some new Deity; he thwarted it, [113] taking possession of the suitable places in the abode of these imaginary Gods, And by some dubious oracles and effects of a supernatural power, deposited into their soul the misinterpretation of what it was: rendering in this notorious way this prophetic truth, in which we learn that all the Gods of the Pagans were unscrupulous Demons, who under the shadow of the darkness of their ignorance, have stolen the name, the honors, and the pretended authority of Gods.

What has this Prince of lying not done in the cult of the Fauns and Satyrs? And what power has he not usurped in the shadow of this religious belief? It is said that the Archers of Saul going from his camp to capture David in his house, found only a useless statue coiffed with a goats3 skin, which Michal, his wife, had cleverly made in his bed. In this way the Pagans, instead of [114] Gods which they thought to have found in the Forests and Wilderness, in effect worshipped nothing more than phantoms of half-goats84

83 chevre

84 boucs

and rank Demons, who, following their ambitious design of making themselves equal to the Most High, caused themselves to be adored as Gods.

Who does not know the oracles that the God Pan gave long ago to Arcadia, in that Temple of which the Magician Erato, whom they called Nymph, was the Priestess? And who has not heard tell of the oracles of Faun in Italy, whose responses announced to the Latin King sleeping on the skins of sacrificed goats,85 that the fates were saving his daughter for a foreign Prince? Who has not read that, in the days of old, Pan was the one who taught Apollo of Delphi the science of divination? And who can ignore that, according to Servius, the name of Faun is drawn from the Greek *phoni*, which signifies the voice, or rather from the Latin, *fari*, which is to say, to speak even about him who was called *Fatuus*, [115] and his wife *Fatua*: Because these goats6 Demons formerly rendered their oracles in the Wildernesses out loud, in verse, which were named *Saturnians*? But who will not say that the Prophecies sometimes inexplicable and always fraudulent, were the effects of wicked tricks of Satan?

The sudden terrors, which are called Panics because the God Pan was reputed to be the author of them, usually stirred up by Demons appearing as Satyrs – was this not another invention of Satan to vanquish the peoples by fear, and throw them into a timid respect for the power that he appropriated? Sometimes these same Demons stimulated these vain fears by some noises resembling the raspy sounds made by a cornet of bronze, that these poor Idolaters, on this theme, put in the hand of Faun in his representations: and frequently by a horrifying voice that a thousand trumpets [116] can not equal, and

85 chevres

86 boucquins

from which the terror, says Valerius87, which far surpasses the rattled helmet of the God Mars, the serpentine horses of Eumenides, and the gaping maw of the proud Gorgon. Sometimes they contented themselves with frightening the herds, and opening their stables, driving them into the recesses of the Forest where they are hidden: and often terrifying towns, armies and whole provinces. The fables say that the Giants were more defeated by these vain fears than by the weapons of the Gods; and that the Pans & Satyrs who lived in the area of the town of Chemmis, heralding to the peoples the death of Osiris, threw such dread into their hearts with this news that since then, all the sudden frights were called Panics from the name of the Pans, who stirred them up. History teaches us that the ancient Gauls were long ago repelled from Delphi by the Diabolical surprises that threw the city of [117] Carthage into disarray, confused the army of Antony, and sent the flotilla of Philip fleeing, even though such frights would be rare at sea. The Romans found themselves in great distress not knowing who had the upper hand in their battle against the Tuscans, a voice was heard in the night, which announced to them that there was one more among the dead on on the side of the Tuscans, from which merriment soon spread throughout the camp of the Romans, and a secret terror in that of the enemies that brought about their defeat. Where else did this voice arise than from a Demon? and who would be able so rapidly and so precisely to count twenty-three thousand bodies, who were dead on both sides in that contest, if not one of those spirits who saw and apprehended everything in an instant? In an act of thanksgiving, the Romans erected an Altar to the God who [118] had thus favored them, the inscription of which was in their language, To Jupiter Faun, and according to the Greek, To Jupiter the

87 Valere – unsure here.

Terrifier: Because all the Fauns and Satyrs were not only known as demi-Gods, which is to say just like Demons, but Pan and Jupiter were not any different: We know this through the inscription of that sacred Altar to the God author of the Panic terrors, and by the verses of Orpheus, who calls Pan, Horned Jupiter, and author of the sudden fears that he sends even to the farthest ends of the Universe.

Must I forget, at the moment, what Theocritus said to his goatherd about the harsh irascibility and cruelty of the God Pan in the middle of the day.

No Herdsman, it is not necessary to recite our songs

At the hour of midday, Pan is to be feared,

Who at that time goes out with abandon, delivering himself of an evil rage [119]

The anger that hangs always in his nostril.

What we can say with reason about what we read in the Psalmist about the Demon of midday, is to say that the Pan of the Pagans was the Keteb of the Hebrews, with whom an encounter was considered dangerous in the middle of the day contrary to ordinary Demons, who being burrowed in the eternal darkness, execute their evil intent in the obscurity of the night. In this passage, the scholars interpret this word 'Midday' in various ways: Some say that these terms 'Wilderness & midday,' are sometimes used interchangeably in the holy Scriptures, and that in the Demon of midday it is necessary to hear the Demon of the wilderness. And the others, who do not wish to explain this time of midday as the highest hour of the day, take it for an audacious rage of the Demon, who dares to do evil in broad daylight, and go mad for all to see: some even have interpreted [120] this text of Zephaniah in this way, *They will hunt at midday*, as if it said, they will

vanquish in open war, and not in secret. Yet both of these explanations are not only consistent with our opinion, but also fully confirm it. Because Pan and all the troupe of the Sylvans were Demons of the wilderness as we will show hereafter. And this God Satyr usually exercised his cruelties and demonic depravities in broad daylight, and tormented men and women in view of everyone, such as the death of these nine people whom he killed in Caria, simply because they crossed paths with him, will serve as sufficient proof. Porphyry writes that Faun was called cruel and pestilent God: which is what the various translations of this passage of the Psalmist, seem to have wanted to point out. Because the Hebraic carries the meaning, 'The exterminator of noon' [121] and the new way of expressing it, 'The pestilence of midday:' and the Hebrew word 'Meririm,' according to some scholars, signifies Demons of noon, or even pestilent air: Thus, the Pagans honored the God Faun, like the *Eumenides*, Febriss8 fever and *Pluto*, only in order to mollify his pride, and out of fear of some gruesome calamity.89

Now it was an old Roman custom that a person having been elevated to Royal dignity by the common vote of the people, he climbed up to the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, where after the offerings were made to the Gods, he put on the Royal robe and took up the magnificent emblems of the sovereignty that had been granted to him: then in this magnificent attire, he came back down to be seen by the people who received him with great applause: thus we read that it was done in the person of the Religious and peaceful Numa, and [122] since in the election of the Captains and Magistrates of Rome.

⁸⁸ Aussi les Payens honoroient le Dieu Faune, comme les Eumenides, la fievre & Pluton ... This appears to be a missed capitalization in both the BNF and digital versions. Fievre would be the goddess Febris.

^{89 ...}qu'il affligeast les peuples de queque funeste mal'heur. As noted in the errata, this should be affligeast, whereas it appears n'affligea in both versions. However the n' has been struck out by hand and a st written above the end of affligea it in the BNF version.

It seems that one could reasonably say that the same occurred for all the Demons who have been revered by the ancients with such sacred ceremonies. For as soon as the superstition through a tacit endorsement of the people exploited by some Religious innovations, had made Gods of them, they withdrew into the Temples, and the other places consecrated to their honor: then taking on the outward appearance of the figure in which they were worshipped, and with the suitable ornaments of the power that was attributed to them, presented themselves in this manner in all places and on all occasions to these poor blind [people], who, caught up in this artifice, became certain in the belief that they had of these false Divinities. In this way, the false Divinity of Castor and Pollux was established in Rome, having appeared near the city as specters dressed as [123] two mounted young menno covered in blood and dust, on the same day that Perseus was vanquished by Paulus Æmilus in Macedonia: and this serpentine Demon which was transported from Greece to Italy, obligated the Romans to worship a false God of Medicine.

By these same tricks and lures, the cunning spirits hiding at every encounter their invisibility in this mixed form of man and goat,91 to all encounters and, so disguised, doing many miraculous things beyond human power and intelligence, in keeping with what fables recounted of the Fauns and Satyrs, bolstered the foundations, reserved to God alone, of the divine honors that the Pagans rendered with such devotion to these false demi-Gods inhabiting the wilderness and keepers of their flocks. And these Demons thus

90 Chevaliers – literally knights

91 bouc

cloaked in this misshapen form, and this appalling monstrosity, constitute the last species [124] of Satyrs that we have to discuss.

But so as not to dwell too long on an account as long as it would be dull, of all that the Authors have written about the appearance of Demons in the form of the Satyrs, and of the endless examples that Histories mention, we will content ourselves for authority with what our Ronsard, that genius of French Poetry, in whose soul is revived the sacred science of the ancient Poets, has written about them in the Hymn that he wrote about Demons, according to doctrine of Orpheus, and of all antiquity.

They sometimes transform themselves into Fairies,

Into Dryads of the woods, into Nymphs, and Napæeae,

Into Fauns and Sylvans, into Satyrs and Pans,

Who have hirsute bodies, patterned like Fauns,92

They have the cloven hooves of a goat, 93 and of a deer the ear,

The horn of a chamois, and the vermillion face

Like a red crescent moon, and dance all night [125]

In a crossroads or near water that babbles.

And it will suffice for us to relate only two examples, the first of the which will be drawn from ancient History. That good runner Philippides,94 being sent by the Athenians to Lacedemon, a little before the day of Marathon - there appeared suddenly to him a specter who declared himself to be the God Pan, and commanded him to inform

93 bouc

94 A variation of Pheidippides.

⁹² In both the BNF and digital versions, *Fans* is clear. It may be spelling for a rhyming effect with the preceding line, which ends with *Pans*.

the Athenians to revere him henceforth more than they had been doing in the past, promising to help them, by his grace, aiding their weapons against the terrible power of the Persians. Thus the Athenians after the happy success of this war, raised a Temple in honor of Pan, at which, among other ceremonies, they consecrated an eternal flame.

The other example is of that Satyr who appeared in the time of the Emperor Charles Quint, that famous Magician of Germany who was called Magister Videns, appropriating perhaps this [126] ambitious title because the ancient Hebrews called a Prophet by the name of Videns, as seeing the future a long time before it would occur. This Magician therefore having promised to recover all the treasures that were lost along the coasts of Holland and Ireland and in the strait that separates France and England, and in order to accomplish this, cast a number of conjurations and spells with three others of the same profession who were associated with him; a Demon to whom the guard of these riches had been commissioned, approached them in the form of a Satyr, and presenting them with a barrel full of gold, beseeched them to be content with this; but the Sorcerers persisting in order to have it all, the Demon vanished immediately and stimulated in the serenity of the most beautiful day, a storm so strange in the air and on the sea that the inhabitants of the surrounding area suspected what was happening, and the Magicians, realizing this, spread out [127] each one going his own way, among whom one, having become a cleric in the city of Paris recounted since then to many all that happened to them in this quest.

Therefore leaving aside all that one could cite touching the appearance of the Satyrs that certainly one knows to have been Demons, we will come to some Satyrs whom it seems that some have doubted that they were Demons. And of those, we have

judged that it was appropriate in order to allay all misgivings, and to make known what they were, to treat them more fully.

What one finds the most prodigious about them, is from these Satyrs who mingled long ago unexpectedly among the men and the women, during the celebration of the feast of Bacchus on the mount of Parnassus: because they appeared in a group, some of them carrying cymbals and others carrying drums, their voice was human and clearly [128] articulated, and no one knew from which location on the mountain they could have come because no one had ever seen such inhabitants on that mountain. But what was this other than the Demons who came to assist in the ceremonies and honors which were rendered to them by the Magicians under shadow of Religion, taking that form of Satyrs, as it is said that they do still today in the nocturnal gatherings of the Sorcerers, that one calls Sabbat, yielding obligingly to their dances and to their depravities. Because it is certain that the Trieterica, and these great mysteries of Bacchus, these outrageous Orgies, as Orpheus calls them, from which the uninitiated were chased away and only the initiated admitted, were the same thing as these conventicles of night where only those who have made a pact with the Devil can be admitted, and who hold their mouths [129] closed to their secret impieties in the midst of the most terrible torments. The congress that one could summarize in a few words about both of these mysterious assemblies will be easily recognized. Who does not know that the Sabbat is nothing but a heap of murderers, poisoners and shameless people who abandon themselves to the abominations of the succubi and incubi? And who has not read in Titus Livius, that the society of Bacchus was the dispensary of all corruption, and the boutique whence came the murders, the poisonings, the falsities/duplicities, and unnatural rapes of all sex and all age. This is

because the Sorceress Canidia reproached Horace because he had dared reveal the secrets of the licentious love that was practiced in the shadow of darkness at the feast of Cotytto, whom Suidas calls the God of the Cinedes95 and depraved women, and who is known to have been revered by the same solemnity [130] as Bacchus. But is it not more than sufficient evidence of the abomination of the Bacchanals, that Hyspale, 96 who, having recoiled in horror upon hearing his friend Ebuce97 say that he wanted to be part of this confraternity, responded to him, now God forbid, and would that we both die sooner than I see you abandoned to these aversions: and about which the Romans used such a strict inflexibility towards those whom they found to have gotten themselves involved in this treachery, in order to return to Greece its impieties. For it was Orpheus, whose songs, that is to say, magic verses, could cause the shadow of Eurydice to return from Hades, to move the trees, soften the rocks, and to tame all sorts of wild animals, except for the women, who instituted the first such assemblies, or only reproduced them according to some, in Thrace where they were called [131] Orphea, and the Priests Orpheotelestes: from which one must gather that these must have been the brothers of this ceremony, of which such a great and famous Magician has been the author. The profession that these initiates must renew every month by swearing in the hands of the *Orpheotelestes*, and the five days arranged in each month by *Proculle Minie*98 for the celebration of these

95 As noted in the errata, this should be Cinedes, whereas it appears Cinæides in both versions. However the a part of the æ and the i have been struck out by hand in the BNF version.

- 96 Unidentified
- 97 Unidentified
- 98 Unidentified

mysteries, is this not the homage and the attendance that the Sorcerers must give to Satan every month? The God whom they invoked during this ceremony was the goat99 of the Sorcerers, and of that we have an irrefutable witness by the name Attes 100 that they went calling and repeating at the top of their lungs: Because the Phrygians, who are considered to have been the authors of this feast, called the goats 101 Attes, deriving it perhaps from the Herbrew *Hathais*, which signifies goat. 102 Of all the outward appearances in which the [132] Demons dressed themselves, that of the goat, 103 foul and reeking animal, and hieroglyphic of all filth, has always been the most agreeable to them: The beautiful Simonis of Jamblic found herself solicited for love by a phantom in this form in the wilderness: That all-black goat who appeared to the Earl of Cornwall, carrying on his back the soul of William Rufus, King of England, which he admitted to be taking to the judgement of the great God, was this anything other than a Devil? And who is not aware that that the Sorcerers in their Sabbats worship them under no other form? Even Zoroaster, who has known them better than any other, does not call them otherwise, as it is easy to understand through the words of Giovanni Pico della Mirandola¹⁰⁴ who says that anyone who reads the book entitled Baïr, the likeness that there is between goats 105

99 bouc

100 Unidentified

101 boucs

102 bouc

103 bouc

104 Iean Pic

105 chevres

and Demons will be able to know what Zoroaster means by goats;106 and what was this [133] 'Azazel' or goat107 in Leviticus, which108 the great Priest sent into the wilderness109 with all the sins of the people, if not the Prince of the Demons Satan? That was why the Demons were pleased to appear as Satyrs, whose form had such a connection to that of the goat,110 and why the God Pan was called by the Egyptians, Mendes, and the Fauns by the *Foliens*,111 *Tityres*,112 which would say goat113 in either language.

The other name, *Evie*, 114 Evan, 115 or Evoe, 116 that was ever on the lips of the Bacchantes, again attest fairly strongly that this was the Devil whom they invoked and worshipped. Because that word is drawn from *Hevia*, which means, among the Hebrews

106 chevres

107 bouc

108 As noted in the errata, this should be que, whereas it appears auquel in both versions. However the l has been struck out by hand in the BNF version.

109 The BNF text has the below printed as in the digitized version, but has scratched out syllables and words to read as follows, and this is what I have translated.:Leuitique, quelle grand Prestre enuoyoit dans le desert auec tous les chez du peuple... The errata reads ostez un autre boucq. However it is unclear where this should go.

Digitized text: Leuitique, auquel le grand Prestre enuoyoit dans les desert vn autre bouc https://play.google.com/books/reader?printsec=frontcover&output=reader&id=GDGD5wsuCFcC&pg=GBS.PP5

110 bouc

111 Unidentified

112 Unidentified

113 bouc

114 Unidentified

115 Unidentified

116 Unidentified

a serpent. Now the serpent was the symbol that those initiated to the Orgies carried in their hand, and which was thrown into their breast in making their profession, and removed, as *Arnobe*117 says, from below: and the serpent is none [134] other than the Devil. In this form he seduced the first man, and the Prince of these Demons, whom Pherecides 118said to have been thrown from the Sky by Jupiter, called himself *Ophionee*,119 which is to say snakelike. What were the Pythiases in Scripture, and those seers who carried Pythons in their bellies, if not Sorcerers possessed and filled with the serpent Python, which is to say, with Satan?

Further, the burning candle that the Sorcerers held in their hand, having lit it with the one that that goat 120 their master carries between his horns, that he lights by drawing it from underneath his tail, as we learned by the confession of that Sorceress who was executed by Order of the Parlement of Bordeaux in the year 1594; And this lustration by fire with which they purify themselves from their infancy, are these anything but ceremonies that the Demons have transferred from the Bacchanals to the Sabbats?

Orpheus [135] calls Bacchus, spreading fire, and that name Hyes, by which the Bacchantes called in loud voices the diabolical power that they honored, is not derived, according to the interpretation of some Moderns, from the Greek word Hydor as Plutarch wanted, but the Hebrew *haes*, which is to say fire. In fact Zoroaster commands those who see a sudden eruption of fire without form leaping in the air, to worship it and to

117 Unidentified

118 In both the BNF and digital versions, this appears to be *l'herecides*, however in the 1888 edition, it is Pherecides.

119 Unidentified

120 bouc

harken the voice because, he says, it is a Demon. That was why the Bacchantes had the custom of carrying a burning torch in their hand: Thetis who by a supernatural science took on any form that he pleased, wanted to purify the little Achilles being still in the cradle, by passing it every night through the middle of the flames, in order to make him equal to the Gods the Fables said, but in effect to consecrate him to the Demon whom she served: And Isis, who was no [136] less learned in the Magic art, who killed with her gaze, like the Telchines, the Tybiens, and those fascinators of Illyria, 121 and who changed form when it pleased her strove to purge in this way through fire all that was fatal to the grandson of the Queen *Athenaide*, 122 long having nourished him by having him only to suck the end of her finger.

Beyond this, that mysterious cry of the Orgies, "Saboe, Saboe," And the surname of Sabazien given by the Phrygians to the God that was revered there, or Sabadien123 by the Thracians, for whom the accomplices of Bacchus were called Sabees,124 and the secret places for the celebration of these rites Sabos.125 All these words are derived from the Greek Sabzein, which means to dance, due to the raving and fanatical dances, that those of this brotherhood convulsed, agitated by the evil spirit. And who has not heard it said that Sorcerers always go about calling out [137] to each other in their modern

121 Hédelin's *l'Illyrie* seems to be less specific that Illyria, so it may limit the area that Hédelin intends to convey.

- 122 Unidentified
- 123 Unidentified
- 124 Unidentified
- 125 Unidentified

Trieteriques, 126 "Sabbat, Sabbat," a Demonic name, whose etymology is not different than those others spoken among the Pagans? For in drawing it from the Hebrew Sabaoth, which means rest, this would be an antiphrasis too coarse and full of impiety, given that by the Sabbats, one means specifically the damnable dances and back to back of the Demons and Sorcerers all together, that the peoples of Denmark call dances of the Hellues, from the Danish name Helfuede, which signifies hell. It was not therefore without reason that the Demons in that form of Satyrs or half-goats,127 which they enjoyed so much, clearly came to assist in the celebration of those ancient Sabbats, and joined in with those old Sorcerers who honored them so religiously.

Among all the Satyrs whose History astonishes posterity, there were none [138] who, assaulted with such effort, the belief of those, for whom holy and true reason can not concede a species of Satyr man like the one that Saint Jerome writes to have shown himself to Saint Anthony, in the deserts of *La Thebaïde*. Because he spoke 128 so rationally, spoke in such a holy manner, and played so well the role of man, the Count of Mirande, Vadian, the Author of the genealogy of the Gods, and the others who are of this opinion relied on no other rationale than on this example. I recall that Alcyon in Ovid, strolling on the seashore, quite concerned about the absence of her husband Ceyx, caught sight of something far away floating on the waters, which soon after she realized was the body of a man without being able to tell who this poor drowned sailor was, and without

126 Unidentified

127 boucs

128 As noted in the errata, this should be *discourut*, whereas it appears *discourt* in both versions. However, in the BNF version, there is illegible writing about the *t*, and the *t* appears to be stricken.

realizing that is was the body of her husband until the sea had thrown him close to her against the [139] shore. Likewise those who have only seen this Satyr from afar have not been able to discover what it was, and all those Authors stopping at the simple text of this History, and not having considered it close up, have been mistaken in the recognition of this Satyr: But like that Ape, which covered its head and shoulders with only a rich piece of scarlet, made it easy to recognize what it was, having the backside fully uncovered, and this was only an act of kindness from the Ape. In the same way, this Satyr, even if he had taken the form, the voice, the discourse of man, will make it easy for us to see if we turn it around to the behind, that this was a trick from Satan, the Almighty's mischievous Ape, and that this exterior appearance covered a Demon, whose guile endeavored to surprise the believes, and astonish the sanctity of this good hermit. But in order to treat this matter with a clearer and simpler understanding [140] we will recount the entire Story through the text of Saint Jerome, without omitting anything, nor obscuring anything for the sake of brevity: in order touch with finger and eye the manifest and enduring proofs that we will draw as much from the author's words as from rational discourse.

Saint Anthony having had a revelation in the night that there was in the wilderness a Hermit (who was Saint Paul) whose holy life was pleasing to God above all the men of the world, touched with an extreme desire to see it see him, starting off in the morning from his cell, made his way among thickets, shrubs, and precipices, and wandering here and there, takes by chance, the pathless path to the Hermitage, which he did not know. The first encounter that he had on this journey was with a Hippocentaur, a half-man and half-horse monster, with whom he did not have long conversation because

he spewed only unknown [141] inarticulate and barbaric words, and because with a short run he disappeared suddenly before his eyes. This Hermit being astonished and thinking about what he had seen, suddenly noticed a small homunculus in front of him, with a pointed noise, a forehead armed with two horns, and whose lower parts were similar to those of a goat:129 Then, without trembling at this new spectacle, he adorned himself like a valiant champion with the breastplate of hope and the shield of faith, and this monstrous animal offered him some dates, as an offering of peace, which Saint Anthony having noticed, he moved forward, and having asked him who he was, he received this response. I am a mortal among the inhabitants of the wilderness, whom the Gentiles, misled by their superstitions, have devoutly worshiped under the name of Fauns, Incubi, and Sylvans. I am sent to you as Ambassador on behalf of all my company. We ask you to pray for us to the common God [142] whom we know to have come for the salvation of the world, and his voice has run through all the world. From these words, the good old man took the opportunity to hate the Idolatry of the Alexandrians, who worshipped as Gods all sorts of prodigious and strange monsters, and suddenly with winged speed, this hideous beast stole away from before his eyes. That is in brief what this Satyr was, and the remarks with which he kept this holy man.

Now, even though so many learned people having thought that he was man, and that Saint Jerome, even above Isaiah, seems to have held that the Fauns and Sylvans were forest men, as he calls them, if it is so, however, in this case, I can not on this occasion add my calculation and my bean to their votes, and subscribe to their opinion; And although it can suffice to prove clearly that this Satyr could not be a man, to say

129 chevre

[143] that there is no other species of man than the Adamics, as we have discussed, again it is easy to draw it from the interior of this History, some infallible evidence, and I am astonished how so many scholars and Religious figures have passed over this without noticing, having certainly occurred to them as it did to the Athenian Epizelus, who on the day of Marathon saw a specter before him, which, drawing nearer and crossing his person took away his sight: Because this Satyric phantom seems to have blinded them, and passing into their thoughts, to have removed the recognition of what he was.

If it was true that this Satyr was man, how would it be possible that he had been sent from his troupe130 to St. Anthony as an ambassador? An ambassador, certainly, from an extraordinary assembly, and from a new entourage. How could these men know from whence he must [144] have come to this place, to find him with such good timing? What Prophets had told them? Which Angels had heralded them? And which Demons had informed them? Because this good Hermit had decided to take his journey on a revelation that he had had the preceding night, and had not communicated his intention to anyone, because he spoke to no one. The forewarning and knowledge of such a secret resolution so promptly executed, shows that in this Satyr, there was something more than human, and that he was of those spirits whose perfect knowledge learns our thoughts through our various Ideas, 131 and that he was sent truly from his troupe in order to seduce this Hermit, and to prevent or delay his pious pilgrimage. Also how would this Satyr man

¹³⁰ troupe - Wygant translates this as "his fellow creatures" and "troupe" when paraphrasing Hédelin's account of this legend. Amy Wygant, "D'Aubignac, Demonologist, II: St Anthony and the Satyr," *Seventeenth-Century French Studies*, 24:1 (2002), 74-75.

¹³¹ It appears from the erratat that *par diverses coniectures* (by various speculations) should be inserted after *par nos idees intentionelles* but this is unclear as the erratum note reads: p. 144. l. 16. *par nos idees intentionelles*, l. *par diverses coniectures*. Both versions read *par nos idees intentionelles*, & *qu'il fut .deputé vertablement de sa trouppe...*

have been able to understand so easily Saint Anthony's language, and to respond to him in his language? Languages [145] are only learned over a long period of time, and by much use. Themistocles, held to be one of the best, and of the strongest minds of Greece, is admired for having learned in a year, in the middle of Persia, to speak Persian. And how many times had this Satyr man visited with such Egyptians?

But still who would have taught these men, the death of the humanized Eternal Word, and taught the Psalms of David to this Satyr, so that he could quote them here appropriately, as he did, having concluded his address with the fourth verse of Psalm 18? It is well known which Apostles, which Disciples, and which Clergy have preached the Evangelical doctrine, in the more remote countries. If one heard a Chinese person discoursing on some mysteries of Christianity, there would be no need to marvel, their ceremonies and their Idols feeling some effects of our [146] Religion, demonstrate clearly that they have heard about it. There is no doubt that Saint Thomas and Saint Bartholemew132 have run and spread the Gospel through all the Orient, and it is said that the body of Saint Thomas is visible even to this day in the Province of Maabar, that the frequent miracles and the pilgrimages of the Christians have made famous through all the country. But no one has ever preached to the Satyrs; these half-goat133 people have never received Evangelical instruction from any Christians, that is not seen because it has never been.

Furthermore, those who consider that Satyr to have been man, base this on his having said it, and myself entirely to the contrary, because he said it, I hope to show

132 Bartholemey

133 bouc

before your eyes that he was not man, but an imposter and a Demon. For how could he be a man and be among the Fauns and Sylvans that the Gentiles [147] worshipped, given that Gentiles have never worshipped any such men. There is no one so little versed in the knowledge of Antiquity, who would not be aware that the Pans, Fauns, and Satyrs of the Pagans were not men, and thus some supernatural powers and certain demi-Gods, which they said were not visible to men unless they chose to be, and who made themselves visible in this figure of half-man and half-goat, 134 which was particularly enjoyable, like these other imaginary powers of the sea, the Nereids, those of half-man and half fish. In fact the Egyptians, in Herodotus' account, thought that the God Pan, one of the first eight Gods whose origin was lost in the distance of the ages, was of the same nature as the other Gods, such as the one they represented in their Idols. So much that if this Satyr was one of the Fauns and [148] goat135-footed demi-Gods, worshipped by the Gentiles, as he said, it is necessary to conclude along with the Prophet David that he was an evil Demon.

Because the Gods of the Gentiles are all cunning spirits.

Someone, perhaps in order to save or to give color to the opinion of these serious Authors, who have considered this Satyr to have been man, could say that he was one of these monsters that we have placed in the second species of Satyrs. But only taking into consideration of the birth of such Satyrs, which are Hybrids and incapable of conceiving, will be evidence to the contrary, and it is impossible that there has ever been on Earth an entire population of these monsters, in order to send this one. What is more, in addition to some reasons by which we have proven that this Satyr was not a man quite suitable and

134 bouc

135 chevre

natural in this place, like the knowledge of the journey of Saint Anthony, [149] and the understanding of his language by these monsters unknown to all the rest of the world, it is irrefutable, if there had been a nation of such Satyrs, that they would have been common. And how could it be that Saint Paul, Saint Anthony, Saint Hilarion, and the other Hermits, who have grown old and built so many Monasteries in the wilderness of the Thebaïde, and had wandered in the most remote places in this hinterland, without having discovered any other of these Satyrs, and recognized their home if they had been in such great numbers? It is said that Saint Anthony walking through these separated places, where he was always watchful for the ambushes of the Devil, caught sight of, before his eyes, a great plate of silver, the brilliance of which could invite and titillate the eyes and the spirit of a less perfect piety, and that suddenly recovering himself, he said to himself: from whence came this wealth in this [150] wilderness, this is the path of only birds, no evidence is seen of man; it does not appear that anyone has ever passed this way. Ha! Spirit of temptation, this is a trick of your malevolence to deceive me! It seems to me that one could say nearly as much of this monster Satyr: because from where would he have come in this wilderness, this is the dwelling only of wild beasts, no one has ever seen any herders of flocks, other than the faithful and the Saints, never has man set foot here, is it not easy to judge that this was an artifice by which Satan endeavored to catch this good Hermit?

The Cardinal Baronius, person of a very singular doctrine, whose writings must live for more centuries than there are years, recognizing all these absurdities, seized on another point of view as diverse as the first two are distant from the truth. Because he says that this Satyr was [151] a non-rational animal, that is to say, one of these Apes

about which we have spoken, and that the voice of the man and the rational discourse that he used, was given to him by miracle, as is often the case with God's permission, as animals have done all sorts of human and rational actions, in order to help meet the needs of the first Anchorites and Saintly people in places isolated from all companionship. But although this opinion seems acceptable, and more religious than the first two, this person will yet permit me (without offending his glory) to quit his party in order to follow the truth, that each must prefer as his best friend even above the names even of Aristotle and Plato. Cicero had no better reason to show that Cecilius was not capable of accusing Veres, without claiming that he had to plead against Hortensius. I know well [152] that one could say the same to me, that I should leave this dispute to some quill which can follow more closely the flight of Baronius. But whoever will want to weigh the opinion of that author and the one I subscribe to on the same scale, like Homer's Jupiter does with the destinies of Europe and Asia in order to give victory to the heaviest, I do not doubt that he admits freely that the stronger truth gives an advantage to my side of the balance, and one need not be surprised if on this long and difficult path, one takes a few missteps, and if the good Homer makes a small summary in a great work.

The first reason and which can on its own persuade in this matter, is that if this Satyr had been a brute beast sent by God to Saint Anthony, he would not have said that he was sent by his troupe in order to come to find him. It is said that Trajan girding one of his [153] captains with his sword, said to him, In just matters use it for my service, and in the unjust, I permit you to use it against me. And what form that God, the supreme Truth, had given human speech to the animal nature of this Satyr in order to speak against the truth, and what thing so miraculous and divine this Satyr had used this gift of speech

against its proper purpose, against its true mission, and against God himself? That he had denied having been sent from God, and had imagined on his own a ridiculous and impertinent lie? I am astonished how it is possible that Cardinal Baronius would have been able to imagine this extraordinary Ambassador of nonrational animals. What business could they have with Saint Anthony? In what time, In what place, did this council take place? What herald? what sergeant? what Trumpet assembled them in these new assemblies?136 Who [154] was the first among them to have spoken to propose the matter they must deliberate,137 and who among them was able to speak in order to resolve it, since all of them are deprived of speech? It is no longer necessary to doubt what we read from Apollonius *Thyaneen*, from *Melampe*, and from so many others who claimed they could understand the gabbling of the beasts and the birds, and that their cries, howls, and warblings were as many intelligible languages among them and to the learned soothsayers. Could one not gather the Fables of Aesop for as many stories? Could one not believe that the frogs gathered long ago in order to have a King? that the birds came to ask the crow for their feathers back? and that long ago the dogs sent Ambassadors to Jupiter, in order to deliver them from the servitude of men? But who has ever thought that beasts could have had care for their eternal salvation and prayed to the saints [155] to appeal to them for mercy, and to implore the assistance of Jesus Christ? And nonetheless if this Satyr was a nonrational animal, as Baronius judges, one could not deny it absolutely: because he did not say that he was sent to Saint Anthony for another matter. It

¹³⁶ As noted in the errata, this should be *comices*, whereas it appears *conuices* in the digital version. It is *comices* in the BNF version.

¹³⁷ The errata reads "p. 154. l. 2. l. *auoient*." However, it is unclear where *auoient* is intended to go. The section reas as follows in both versions: ...pour proposer la matiere dont ils deuoient a deliberer...

would no longer be necessary to struggle to explain metaphorically, as reason and piety require, the passage from David which states that God will save the men and the beasts; And when the Word eternal has said through the mouth of the Psalmist, that he resembled a beast or packhorse, it seems that one could say, and risk blasphemy, that he made beasts similar to men, wanting to render both capable of his glory.

And what demonstrates quite clearly how greatly mistaken Baronius is in this opinion, for not having processed it long and hard, is that [156] this Satyr could not be a non-rational animal, since he was of the number of the Fauns and Sylvans which the Gentiles revered. Because there is no one, not even Baronius himself, who wished to say that the Pans and Satyrs of the Pagans were brute beasts: this is contrary to the authority of all scholars, to the doctrine of superstitious Antiquity, and to what the Arcades thought of Pan, revering him as a divine power, who has the prerogative to mete out the reward of the virtuous and the punishment of the wicked. It is indeed true that God, who in his righteous goodness always assists those in the most extreme abandonment and distress who put their trust in him, and who in his omnipotence is a shield of defense, a tower of hope, and a rock of assurance, has often given miraculous impressions to inanimate things, and human motion to the most ferocious beasts, [157] in order to rescue saintly people and to minster to them in their most dire need. The rocks have vomited fountains, the dew is transformed to manna, the rain into fine meat: A raven never neglected to carry to Saint Paul his daily pittance, to present to him double wheny someone was visiting him in his hermitage: and the Lions did the office of grave diggers as soon as it was time to bury his body. But what miraculous aid did this good Hermit receive from the visit from this Satyr, if not the terror and dread toward those he was compelled to bear the arms of

the master that he served? and by what speeches was he detained, if not by lies and blasphemies that could reduce a weaker spirit to very dangerous doubts? It is beyond all plausibility and contrary to piety, to think that by means of a miracle, God wanted to give the human voice and rational discourse to [158] some beasts in order to say that they have concern for their salvation, and that they have held counsel in order to pray to the Saints to favor them with their devotions.

It therefore remains to conclude that this Satyr was a Demon, and to draw the proofs from the individual of this apparition.

It is a common artifice of Satan, never to attack a solid and determined spirit, while he has his feet solidly on the ground, thus, like a woodcutter usually cuts a tree halfway through at the base before pushing it to the side where he wants it to fall, this shrewd spirit foresees the steadfastness of the man, and weakens him by amazement, then making full use of his pernicious maliciousness, causes him to stumble where he pleases: knowing full well that the mind floating in uncertainty, it is easy to make him vacillate from side to side and persuade him [159] of this or that. In this way, we see that he controls it with the apparition of this phantom: because having resolved to blow out some scruple in the devout soul of Saint Anthony, in order to cool his good works, and divert him from his perfect life, he sent one of his satellites in the figure of a Hyppocentaur so that, the scene being prepared by the terror of the first Spectre, he could play his role more dexterously: Because it is indubitable that this Hyppocentaur was none other than a Demon. Thus we see in the text of Saint Jerome that in the middle of his errand, he fainted all of a sudden: and we can learn from Zoroaster, through a particular familiarity that he had with this subject, that in normal circumstances, Demons appear as half-man,

and half-horse monsters. It is said that the parrots of India, the first time that they saw men, [160] were was so astonished that, amusing themselves by watching and considering attentively what they were seeing, they allowed themselves to be taken by the hand: The Devil hoped that he would likewise reach this saintly person, and that while preceded by astonishment and admiration, he would ponder deeply what this monster could be; he would fall into his snare through this new excess, and would allow himself to be caught in doubts by means of the lies and impieties that necessarily follow the doctrine of which the Devil wanted to persuade him about his supposed species of Satyr men. But Saint Anthony, veteran of such encounters, from the moment he felt the astonishment slip into his soul meeting this second phantom, suspecting ambushes of his enemy, had recourse to hope and faith, hardened weapons and equal to the blows of Satan. [161] Now as the time that this Satyr chose for this apparition is evidence of what he was, the person to whom he appeared is yet another no less considerable: because as soon as Saint Anthony embraced the contemplative life, he had to deal with this common enemy of humankind whom it was necessary to fight with no less patience than courage. Satan employed all the torments that man can endure, and all the horrors that his rage can devise he took the form of the inanimate things, he took the appearance of man and of woman, of dwarf and of Giant, he transformed himself into all sorts of ferocious beasts, sometimes alone and sometimes in prodigious and appalling company, then finally covering himself with the human and bestial form together, he attacked him under the form of *Onocentaur* or Onoscelide half-man and half-donkey as [162] Saint Athanasius writes, of Hippocentaur half-man and half-Horse, and of Satyr, half-man and half-goat.138

138 chevre

What is more, if one judges the mood of men and the capacity of their nature by the places of their birth and from their abode, the uninhabited wildernesses where this Satyr appeared cause us to recognize clearly that it was a Demon. Saint Athanasius writes that the coming of the Messiah caused the Devil and all his retainers to withdraw into the abysses in the wildernesses and inaccessible places. Which was perhaps meant by the Demon killer of the seven husbands of Sara which the Angel Raphael bound in the wilderness of the *Thebiaïde* where this Satyr appeared; because that place seems to have been chosen over all others by the Demons. But what is the purpose of looking for more proof since God through the mouth of the Prophet Ezekiel, has assured us, when he says, speaking of his own, being [163] in agreement with them, I will cause the beasts of the Earth to cease, and without fear of them they will live in the wildernesses and dwell in the forests: because the beasts of the Earth, like us, learn from Zoraster in his oracles, and Saint Gregory on the fifth chapter of Job, are Demons: and where the Psalmist writes that the beasts of the forest will walk by night, the same Saint Gregory and the Venerable Bede read Demons. The books of the sages are full of authorities who confirm it to us, and the histories of examples: Which one sees especially in those who have brought back news of the New World, where Satan has held his great days, and reigned for so many centuries. Because all the uninhabited places, the inaccessible chasms, and the remote forests are occupied by Demons who hold them as their rightful possessions. Immediately one hears voices, cries, howls that are beyond [164] human, immediately the harmonious concert of a pleasant music: in some locations they begin the night in the middle of the most beautiful day, and in other places they carry the passers-by inside large scales raised above the precipices, forcing them in this manner to confess their sins in a loud voice, and if they retain something on their conscience, they send them tumbling across the points of the rocks.

But what is still more than just pitch and of more vigorous consideration in the circumstance of the place where this phantom takes the appearance of a Satyr, is that the wildernesses and uninhabited places, have always been particularly frequented by these Demons in the form of Pans, Sylvains, or Satyrs, taking a singular pleasure in astonishing the ignorance of the Pagans, to appeal to their credulity, and to divert them from the worship of the Creator common to all [165] the world. Those lights that the Egyptians kept illuminated all night on the mountain of Atlas, according to Pliny, and that of Ethiopia nicknamed according to Mela, the Chariot of the Gods, the cymbals, the flutes, the cornets of bronze, and the voices beyond human, combined with dreadful, reverberating howls, were artifices of the Demons who frequented those remote places, in order to legitimize the opinion that the people had of their Divinity; because far away in the fields of the surrounding area, say these Historians, nothing cultivated, no trace of man or beast, no places capable of being inhabited, and only an immense solitude full of an impenetrable astonishment, a serene silence, and a secret Religion. The Satyrs are called in Greek *Napees*, and in Latin *Sylvains*, which mean foresters in both languages, and the Gauls even called them *Drusiens*, that is to say those who dwell [166] among the oaks: because it is necessary to read thus in Saint Augustine, and not *Dusiens*: and this can serve as proof, that Pan according to some, was the son of *Dryope*, whose name is drawn from the word *Drys* which means oak. We read in Homer that this God shared the forests with the mountains and the uninhabited valleys: This is why the fables have said that this was he who found Ceres in these isolated places, where she had hidden herself in

order to weep for the loss of her daughter, as he alone had full knowledge of this. And what understanding could one search for under the veil of the legendary loves of this God who so ardently cherished the romantic Echo, Goddess of the rocks, and the Nymph *Pythys*, whom the jealousy of *Boree* transformed into a pine tree, a common denizen of the mountains, if not how much pleasure this God found in solitary places? And for what other reason would the Poet Horace have named Faun [167] protector of Mercurial men, which is to say born under the Star of Mercury, which, according to Ptolemy, makes learned men, if not that they love the solitude? The Pagans who recognized the singular contentment that this God took in living in the wilderness performed the greater part of his sacrifices there: This oracle of Faun so famous in Italy and the Lupercal Temple so renowned of the God Pan, were built in ancient times in places distant from visitation.

But let us at last leave the Wilderness in order to consider the dates that this Satyr offered to Saint Anthony: because from where did this charity proceed, in this enemy of all charity?

Beware of Greeks bearing gifts.

It is the custom of Satan to strike men on their weakest side, and to capture them in their faults. So being well aware of Saint Anthony's great austerity, who abstained sometimes from [168] all nourishment three whole days, he presented to him this exquisite and delicate fruit, in order to tempt him and to violate, if he was able, his long abstinences: as he had other times tried to do, when in the appearance of one of his monks he brought to him some bread, showing him again, that he must with the food repair his strength for a new task in order to be more robust in the service of God. And was this not the method that he followed to tempt our Lord in the desert, presenting stones to him with

these words: If you are the son of God, change these stones into bread, rather than allowing yourself to weaken from a hunger so long and so tiresome.

Socrates was quite correct it seems to me, to say to that young man who was brought to him, speak so that that I see you: because through discourse one recognizes not only the capacity but the mood of the one who speaks. We recognize therefore through the harangue that this Satyr, this [169] Ambassador so poorly equipped, that he was one of the retainers of the eternal adversary of man. It is a stratagem of the good Orators, says Quintilian, to bestow with grace what they can not deny, in order to persuade with subtlety those who themselves could be suspected of lying. Demons usually do the same; they always combine the false with the true, they confess the public truths, in order to legitimize and convince of their secret lies: because they have nothing but frauds in their discourse, they would be identified from the very first as seducers. The courtesan Rahab of the city of Jericho confessed that Jewish spies came to her house, in order to cause them to believe that they had left as she said. Such was the oration of this Satyr, containing something true and something false, but all full of artful deceptions. Because [170] to say that the deceived Gentiles worshiped these Fauns and Sylvans, and that God had suffered death for the salvation of the world, those were true that were convincing on their own: but that he was man, and sent by a people of same form and same nature as he appeared to have, those were absurd and ungodly deceptions which he wanted to make this person believe: so that having consumed his spirit with the opinion that there was a species of man-Satyrs, he could leave him to the doubts and pernicious consequences that follow this maxim contrary to natural reason and the sanctity of the Religion. How many other times had the Devil attacked this Hermit through the artificial mixing of truths and

falsehoods? By what reason did he hope one time, in the form of a Giant, to persuade him that he was the providence of God, if not because a little earlier he had spoken [171] truth to him, having recognized in the appearance of a small black child, that it was the spirit of fornication? And why when he appeared to him touching his head against the Sky, confessed to him that he was Satan, if not in order to make him believe that the monks must leave the wilderness which had been left solely as a retreat to the Demons: Jesus Christ being honored, said he, throughout all the habitable land?

This passage of the eighteenth Psalm of David, in which that Satyr finished his specious discourse, is a visible record of the cunning of Satan, and brings to mind what we read in Athenee of those who sold horse meat, who in order to soften and correct the bad and unpleasant odor of this rank animal, commonly usually carried in their mouths a small branch of myrrh. Because that capital enemy of man, when he wishes to proffer his deceptions [172] for truths through an artifice a little like these vendors of horse meat, usually places his unscrupulous interview which he well knows always to be suspected of untruth, under cover of some sacred text of the Scripture, and tempered his stinking frauds with the pleasant balm of holy doctrine. He makes artful traps of them to capture the spirit of the man who receives it as not only being true but worships it as divine: doing as King Cambyses, who, attacking the city of Pelusium in Egypt, risked slinging in front of his people the animals worshiped as Gods by the Egyptians, such that it came to pass that these superstitious people, not daring to defend themselves against their Deities which they saw before their eyes, allowed the city to be taken without any resistance whatsoever. Was it not with the Prophesies of the Psalmist that the Devil wanted to

persuade [173] our Lord to throw himself from the height of the pinnacle of the temple? saying to him that it was written:

For he shall give his angels charge over thee,

to keep thee in all thy ways.

They shall bear thee up in their hands,

lest thou dash thy foot against a stone.139

And this same Saint Anthony was he not many other times waylaid by Satan with passages from the Bible? How many times as well did he say to his Monks, has he closed his ears upon hearing Demons around him discussing Scriptures, fearing, not without reason, getting lost in the scholarly but dangerous interpretations that they can bring?

But unto the wicked God saith,

What hast thou to do to declare my statutes,

or that thou shouldest take my covenant in thy mouth?

Seeing thou hatest instruction,

and casteth my words behind thee. 140

It will seem perhaps to those who take everything at face value, who accept the superficial for the solid, and who do not remove the bark to reveal what kind of wood it contains, that have begged Saint Anthony to offer his devout prayers to God in favor of his troupe suffers too much for his penitent spirit to have come from Satan, whose distress in good Theology is not capable of contrition, whose heart, says Job, became harder with every day like a stone and which never soften, says Saint Gregory, through

139 Psalm 91: 11-12.

140 Psalm 50: 16-17.

the water of penitence. And further, this acknowledgement of the coming of the Word eternal in the mouth of this Satyr is too Christian and devout to have been proclaimed by this avowed enemy of the [175] glory of God, this envious impotent of his power, and this malevolent adversary of all good works. But as the courtesan Nannium who, covered by her clothes, appeared to be one of the most beautiful women of Athens, but stripped of her accoutrements and cosmetics, was deformed, ugly, and not at all agreeable to the least selective of lovers, thus can we easily recognize that the sanctity of these words is only in the exterior appearance, and that the meaning only hides surprises, traps, and unscrupulous deceits of Satan. Because firstly the prayer of this Satyr is not addressed directly to God, and to ask another to pray, this is not to pray, if one is incapable of making such prayers himself, as one says that the prayers of the devout on Earth and of the Saints in Heaven, are but a supplement of strength that joins [176] together with ours, increasing the favor of them, rendering them effective to the one whom we address. And the indirect and torturous path in the discourse of this Satyr, is not only suspect of untruth, but also was only an appropriate subject to understand only that in this Maze there was some monster whose cavernous and famished maw was searching for whom to devour. If all the beautiful speeches of Satan, visible signs of piety, had to be received in good faith, what could one not believe of this Demon who in the Gospel says to our Lord, I implore you by the great God to leave me in peace! The Demons can recite the holy Scripture, teach it, explain it eruditely, but they are scorpions who carry the venom in their tails, and who cover their simulations and malice under such veils. It does not belong only to the Mohametans to believe that a company of Demons, having heard the

Koran [177] from the mouth of their great Prophet, converted and made themselves Saracens.

As for this recognition of the death of the Word Eternal, how many times have the Demons been compelled in their oracles from on high to praise his humanity confess, says Saint Augustin, that he was the true God? That oracle over which the Demon presided at Delphi under the name of Apollo rendered to Augustus shortly after the Nativity of Jesus Christ so celebrated among all the Authors, likewise enough faith, while being forced by the violent magical conjurations of those Priests and *Pythies* through whose mouths he spoke, He responded.

A young Hebrew infant, sovereign of the great Gods,

Being more powerful, forced me to abandon these places,

And held me silent in the diabolical lair:

Leave therefore my Altars, and learn to keep quiet. [178]

Still such recognition of this Satyr is not so simple and pious in the words which he used, one does not see them here clearly as duplicitous and questionable from the spirit of untruth: because he does not say, "Pray for us to the one whom we profess to have died for our salvation," just as would have been necessary to say if he had been man; but he says, "Pray to the common God that we know to have died for the salvation of the world." Now this word, 'We know,' is commonplace in the ungodly mouths of Demons, and attests only to their great knowledge, knowledge without goodness however say the Scholars, and not piety either: so we see that this shrewd spirit, whom the sons of Scæva wanted to conjure up on the name of Jesus of Saint Paul, responded, "I know Jesus and know who Paul is."

And through a dubious sense of these terms *common God*, this supposed Satyr strove to persuade Saint [179] Anthony, as it is easy to see, that the death of the Word divine was shared and equally efficacious for the one who was speaking as for the one to whom he spoke, and that there were men of identical nature to this Satyr, to whose salvation it must apply just as to that of the children of Adam. But in good Grammar, the understanding of this word *common* must not extend beyond the word *God* to which it corresponds. And in good Theology, one must receive the words of this Satyr as a recognition that Demons are forced to act in spite of themselves, that God is their common Creator, from whose hand they have received their being as well as all the things of the world. Indeed, all things considered, there is neither animal or inanimate creature on the Earth, that must pronounce them as well as the malicious Demon, and confess the common God who has died for the [180] salvation of the world. Likewise, do we not learn from the holy books that the Heavens, the Elements, and all that is here below, of their nature and in their proper movements, sing the glory of God and bless his name? It is true that there is that difference, as Saint Jerome remarks, that all creatures, in their inner sense of what they are, laud the benevolence and the immensity who gives them life by professing it: But Demons despite being compelled to worship God as their Author, cannot themselves, however, honestly and without evil intent praise the Lord: and the more perfect knowledge they have of his grandeur, the more excessive is the envy they carry for his power. In a word, to conclude all that we have gleaned from this Satyr to explain the words that he declared, so holy in appearance, we will say about this the [181] same Saint Jerome writing about these Demons who acknowledged JESUS-CHRIST as the son of the Most-High, writes that this is not a voluntary and commendable

confession to God: but an extortion of a feigned malice or of a necessary violence, like a poor fugitive serf, who after a long time coming to see his master again, is forced to confess that he is his slave, and fears nothing as much as his just severity. Now these Demons thus disguised, have given rise to the difficulties and the darkness that have enveloped this topic; they have been the Sophists whose misleading subtleties have rendered the Satyrs unrecognizable. But as the two Seruiliens, for their close resemblance, were often taken one for the other by those who saw them only in public, were easily discerned by their servants: The Satyrs likewise, are so much alike in the description of their form [182] that those who will only see them while leafing through books will be surprised by everything, but those who consider the actions more closely will glimpse some differences so significant that it will be easy to recognize those which must be judged as Apes, Monsters, or Demons.

I would certainly fear that the truth can justly accuse me of prevarication, and of having sinned against my proper design if, through silence I allowed in uncertainty what one must believe of these two Satyrs, Faun and *Pic*, 141 by whose favor Numa knew the suitable sacrifices to pacify the fulgurations: and what Philostrate in the sixth book of the life of *Apollonius Thyaneen* 142 tells us about two others, one of whom with an unbridled lust assaulted Ethiopian women until they died, and the other, covering his [183] shoulders with a deer skin, accustomed himself to going to see a woman of Lemnos.

141 Unknown

142 Unknown

Strabo teaches us in many places in his Geography, that long ago there were certain Priests of Bacchus called Satyrs and Silenes, perhaps in memory of the Ape Satyrs, inseparable companions of this god. They were his great Ministers, the Masters of the dances that were observed in his honor, and renowned to be similar to the Corybantes. But what is to say that they were anything other than his Orpheotelestes, the supervisors of the dance in these old Sabbats, the *Trieteriques*, 143 and also great Magicians rather than Corybantes! Now of the number of these Satyr Priests and Sorcerers, these spirits of the Latin countries, Faun and Pic, were perfect men and not half-goats, like true Satyrs are. We also see that they often made themselves invisible, and sometimes assumed other appearances; and that following the [184] example of the Sorcerers of Thessaly, who through magic drew the Moon from the Sky, they forced a false Jupiter from the height of Olympus, that is to say a true Demon of the pit of hell, who, upon his arrival, made the foundation of Aventius collapse and froze the marrow of Numa in terror, speaking only in halting and uncertain terms. What they did, not with this herb Osirite 144 which, with its natural property according to Pliny, calls back to Earth the shadows of the dead, but through ineffable media, and by the conjurations that Ovid does not say in order not to know them. To what Plutarch does not give light authority when he writes, that Faun and Pic went through all Italy performing the same miracles by drugs, charms, and magic arts, as the *Idæes Dactyles* who are the Corybantes.

- 143 Unknown
- 144 Unknown

But what say we of the Satyrs of Philostrate? Someone perhaps, through [185] this fanaticism of love of both, in keeping with what is recounted about the Incubus Satyrs as we will see later, and by the actions and secret threats with which Apollonius used against the one from Ethiopia, could imagine that they were demons. But it is certain that all the discussion of the life of this Magician is only an imposture, and that the sixth book particularly is filled with only lies, just as Eusebius teaches us against the sacrilege of calumniator against God, Hierocles; which he proved by means of the Pygmies, the Anthropophagies, and even this Satyr of whom Philostrate made mention. At the same time, the lie that can never be made the same, is found out on its own in this case; one can recognize what one must believe of all the rest of this story, by what this Author has invented against the truth, and even against the Fables, that Apollonius having poured [186] wine into a pit where livestock drank and got drunk, through the force of his knowledge, compelled this Satyr to come there to drink, he lost the cunning arrogance of his nature, and the ardor of his lust in this beverage, without doing further wrong nor pursuing the women of that country. Because never has anyone said that Satyrs extinguish their malevolence and their lascivity with wine, and the Fables represent them always drunk and always furious with love, which is whence comes what those who want to explain mystically this farcical company of good Father Bacchus, saying that it shows us that *Priape* is son of Bacchus, and that wine is the true fire of love. This tale, made for the pleasure of these Satyrs who never were, could be augmented by much that the Poets have invented with what they have discussed: such as this Marsyas who lost his skin for having impudently preferred his wooden flute to the harp [187] of Apollo; such as that legendary Satyr by whom the Nymph Amymone was

pursued from love having awakened him accidentally by the javelin that she thought she was throwing at a Buck; such as the one who, ravished by the beautiful of the fire the first time that he saw it, would have thrown himself onto it to embrace it if Prometheus had not prevented him, and so many others that it is simple, even too simple, to differentiate in the Fables, among the three species of true Satyrs of which we have been speaking.

BOOK V.

On the error causing the belief that there were false demi-God Satyrs, and causing the worship of idols: and some explanations of the figure of Pan.

Although in the preceding book we have spoken of the false divinity of the Satyrs and Sylvans, and for the individual who worships them, referred the curious minds back to those who have expressly written about it; we have yet judged that it will not be irrelevant to treat at this point separately two things concerning the monstrous form of these demi-God goats:145 The first, from which [189] the erroneous belief that there were such celestial spirits in this grotesque and chimeric form has crept into the souls of the people, and the other, through which learned mythologies the Philosophers more enlightened on the nature of God have discoursed on the Idol of these Pans. Of which the former, which will not be found elsewhere, causes me to think that the novelty will give it some favor; the latter where we have assembled what the authors have written about it in various places, and enhanced their creativity with what they have omitted, will perhaps not be disagreeable. It seems plausible that the Greeks, caught in the error popular during the first centuries, all the Gods from whom were born of incest and adultery, and monstrous in their form, would have to create these demi-God goats in the image of these monsters of horror conceived against nature's wishes. What one could endorse by the

145 boucquins

birth of Pan, who they said was the son of Penelope and Mercury [190] changed into a goat, 146 or of Jupiter and Hybris, that is to say, out of shame. But besides that, it is against reason to believe that they would have confessed to some Divinity in these abominable monsters, and that the worship of Satyrs is much more ancient than these Fables. It is certain that Egypt, unfortunate womb of Idolatry, having gathered them first in its bosom, fashioned Idols in the form of the Ape Satyrs, and that the Greeks having brought them across the sea, increased the false Divinity with mysteries that they themselves did not understand.

The Egyptians, more bizarre in their superstitions than enigmatic in their Doctrine, had so little curiosity about the truth, that they made all of their civil laws into Religious ceremonies: and allowing themselves to be carried away by the fabrications of the Poets who have always been well received among them, they forgot the original reason [191] for such institutions, and gave themselves over to certain mysterious venerations, which it was forbidden to seek to understand. The homage they paid with such reverence to animals proceeded from this erroneous custom. Because war leaders, in order to prevent unrest in their armies, which at every occasion snatched victory from their hands, invented the emblems called *Saurites*, 147 which were halberds at the top of which certain animals were fastened, and according to their variety distinguished the soldiers. And this command having happily succeeded in many encounters, the people carried from the beginning some honor to the animals of which their emblems were composed; and ever since then, the Fables, having persuaded them that the Gods were

146 bouc

147 Unidentified

chased from the Sky by the Giant Tyhpoon or by the villains who were in far greater number [192] than they, who had come to Egypt under 148 the skins of various animals, they raised altars to these beasts and worshiped them in the end even as Gods. Which caused Juvenal to say.

All worship the dog and no one Diana.

So then, after the death of Osiris, or Bacchus, having instituted some Feasts and Sacrifices to the eternity of his glory, they did not forget among the required ceremonies the dances and antics of these Ape Satyrs that this Prince always brought along in his entourage; and in the area surrounding the statues that they erected to him in his Temples, depicted there images of these animals. So much so that with the succession of time, these Feasts being distanced from their establishment, what Saint Cyprian writes of all Pagan religious ceremonies happened, which at their birth having been only a comfort of the peoples at the loss of their Prince, were received by the following generations as [193] true sacrifices and divine honors. Osiris, in whose memory these solemnities were performed, was held as a God, and the Satyrs who accompanied the pomp participated in his 149 divinity. And as the courtiers of Ethiopia customarily tried to make all their words and actions like those of their King, for whom they were the true Apes, appearing blind in one eye if he had only one eye and stammering if he had no gift for language. Likewise the Ape Satyrs, with whom the Court of Bacchus was filled, became, with the passage of time, so similar to their Prince, that the people, in the end, preoccupied by

¹⁴⁸ As noted in the errata, this should be Ægypt soubs, whereas it appears Egypte, & sous in both versions. However the, & have been struck out by hand in the BNF version.

¹⁴⁹ As noted in the errata, this should be \grave{a} sa, whereas it appears \grave{a} la in both versions. There may be a line drawn over the top of the l in the BNF version to render it a long s: f. However it is difficult to tell as the top of the l and the bottom of the p from the line above run together in the BNF printing.

thousands of false ideas, worshipping his idol like a powerful God, were easily persuaded that those they saw depicted near him were celestial spirits and great Demons, which in this bizarre figure, in the example of Adonis of Venus, and the Atys 150 of [194] Cibele, 151 always assisted his feigned divinity by their presence. This belief was confirmed by the authority of the Poets, who, not daring to contravene the rules of their art which forbade them from speaking according to the naked truth, have written of Bacchus, as of some God, of those Apes as of demi-Gods, and of all that was memorable in his high deeds like miraculous and divine things. And to these fictions, the long period of grieving of these people who had the custom after the death of their King, of having a funeral poem recited twice a day for eighty days to celebrate his memory and to call his soul back from hell, gave a great opening and authority. And who will not conclude that the Idols of these Apes depicted around Bacchus made the Egyptians believe that he was assisted by such demi-Gods and celestial Spirits, just like the dog who [195] followed him through everything as a faithful guard of his person, whipped up their blind superstition unto the point of feigning themselves and adoring a half-dog God? But if these Apes followed Bacchus in the reveries of his Apotheosis, as they had done in his life, one can give two reasons. The first is that in all his Temples, in all his ceremonies, and in all that the Poets write, he152 has never been seen without a fine troop of Satyrs. In his great feast in Greece, when he found honey in Thrace, and taking Ariadne as wife, Ovid gave him as a companion only mocking and amusing false demi-Gods. Was it not

150 Unidentified

151 Unidentified

152 This appears to be a typo (unnecessary -s at the end of il) in both versions: ils ne s'est iamais veu.

also the custom to give them the soldier's tunic153and the Thyrsus in his hand (which was a pike encircled with leaves of vine or of ivy) in memory of their having accompanied Bacchus on his military expeditions? And [196] Pausanias remarks as something quite extraordinary, that in the country of Elis the old man Silenus had a Temple, not like everywhere else, shared with the God Bacchus, but specific and consecrated to his Deity only, which they did perhaps in recognition of his debauchery in Phrygia.

The other reason is drawn from the accurate resemblance that there was between those false Gods and the Ape Satyrs. Because everything we have written about their form and their nature was given to the idols of these Pans; and the Demons knew well to omit nothing when they wanted to appear in this form. From their form, no one can doubt it. Because firstly, they were represented with the lower parts of a goat, 154 which caused them to be called Goat 155-feet by Horace, and half-Goats 156 by Ovid: and with two horns on their foreheads, which was why [197] Deriades in seeing them from afar, said that they had a bull's head? Because to think that Nonnus would have made them resemble bulls would be against the authority of all those who have written on the subject.

But if the Satyr Apes are covered in long hair, which caused them to bear the name of Velus, as we have shown; who does not know that it was commonplace, just as Philostratus says, to paint the Fauns hairy? which is why Apuleius calls Marsyas a Bear

153 saye, which would be saie, in modern French.

154 bouc

155 chevre

156 boucs

243

with two feet. The Ancients represented Satyrs in the theater by means of tunics covered with long hair on two sides, and the Silenes covered with moss and tow. And in the holy Scripture they have no other name than the Hairy Ones. Isaiah foretelling the desolation of Jerusalem, writes that the savage beasts and the phantoms will inhabit the ruins, and [198] the Hairy Ones will dance and cry out with terrifying howls to one another, which the greater part of these scholars, says Eucherius, interpreted as Fauns and Sylvains. And in Leviticus where God forbids the Israelites from sacrificing their children to the Demons, the Hebrew text contains *Seirim*, this is to say, hairy Demons, which the Greeks called, Trichiones (because Sear means hair, for which the goat 157 is called Seir because of the long hair that covers it.) Which is the way these Pans and Sayrs of Antiquity are naively represented to us. Which is rendered unequivocal to us through the translation of the Septuagint, which has called these Demons Mateous, that is to say Fatuous, which is the proper name of the Fauns, as we have said elsewhere: and through this ban that God gave to the Israelites of sacrificing their children. Because just as the Pagans had a custom of honoring human victims, Saturn of the Carthaginians [199] Jupiter of the Latins, Mars of the *Thulites, Theutates* of the Druids, Viracocha of the Mexicans, and a thousand other such Demons greedy for blood and the eternal loss of men; they also revered the Fauns as *Alastores* and *Palamnæes* Gods, which is to say, evil and homicidal, and sacrificed living men to them, just as with the Arcades to Pan their great God, in the Temple where it is said that the bodies made no shadow, in memory perhaps of that Faun who sacrificed his guests to his father Mercury. Also from the moment women had given birth, they invoked *Intercidone Pilumne & Deuerre*, and with certain ceremonies prayed

157 bouc

to Sylvain that he would remain in the forests and take care of the agriculture, whom they considered one of the more powerful Gods, and sacrificed to him, in this regard, the porpoise, inventor of agriculture. Which was [200] not practiced, as some have thought, because of the opinion that they had that Sylvain was this nocturnal phantom, or rather that illness called sleep paralysis, but for fear that this evil Demon would do harm to newborn infants. Because in the homes of Rabbis, the Demons called *Lilithim*, that is to say, Fauns and Sylvans, whose births being so shameful according to their tales that I close my mouth, endeavored through all means to do evil to small children at their birth. Which one can still learn from the Lyrical Poet in his Odes, where he says:

You who go pursuing with an eternal love

The Nymphs, whom you often cannot catch:

Pass through my fields, Faun, without spoiling anything,

Neither do evil to the children who are at the breast. [201]

That bursting redness with which the face of the Ape Satyrs is brightly illuminated, was not forgotten on the Idols of these Demons. Nonnus also writes that Satyrs painted themselves with vermillion before fighting: and in Virgil we see the Nymph £glé,158 who smeared the juice of blackberries on the temples and forehead of the sleeping Silenus: because blackberries or the grains of Danewort were reputed by the Poets, to be the standard paint of Fauns. Which gave cause to the people who believed that Pan and Jupiter were one and the same divinity, to paint also the face of Jupiter with the same color. From which came the victorious people to Rome, who adorned themselves with the robe, scepter, and other emblems of Jupiter *Capitolin*, also painting

158 Unidentified

their faces red in order to give the appearance that their power was a true image of that of God, which was practiced primarily in the person of Camille. 159 [202] Since then, following their sovereign, all the other Gods in Ethiopia wore this color; on the day of the Feasts in Rome all the Images were colored, and the Censors at the accession of their office, repainted all the Gods of the Capitol. In the end, vanity carrying man to all that is great and divine, the Kings of Assyria and Medes, and the Princes of Ethiopia colored their faces with cinnabar.

But returning to the connection between the form of these Apes to the Satyr Demons: Philostrate writes that one must usually portray the Satyrs with the back end of horse, that is to say, with long tails, because they all had them, says Lucian: and Pan, according to the same, coming to greet Mercury as his father; What would you do, my son, Mercury answered, with this long tail that you have? That is why the Fables said that Silenus was [203] formerly a King of Nysa, whose origin was unknown, who, having had naturally a long tail, transmitted this mark to all the Silenes that are said to be of his race, and that Catullus calls natives of Nysa.

And for obvious proof that the Idols of the Satyrs were nothing more than the portrait of these Apes represented standing on their two hind feet, is that all the Fauns and Silenes, as Lucian writes, were of small stature, and the Simulacrum of Pan extremely small, as one sees in Pausanias. In the country of Attica, a certain stone was pointed out, says the same Pausanias, low enough to serve as a chair for a small man, on which it was said that Silenus rested when he came into this region with Bacchus, and the painter *Thiamante*, 160 in order to demonstrate the scale of a Cyclopes by comparison

¹⁵⁹ After finding out Camille's story, revisit premierement as first/primarily. Chiefly? 160 Unidentified. Potentially Fra Diamante.

to small men, painted some Satyrs, measuring the [204] size of his thumb with a javelin; even the Demons who took on the appearance of Satyrs always appeared, as one could call them, in the manner of Saint Jerome, small homunculi.

As for the nature of Ape Satyrs, we have noted three qualities that are characteristic and particular to them, the habitation of forests and wildernesses, the flexibility of their limbs in clownish dances, and an excessive fury of love, all of which are common to Demon Satyrs in the books of the Ancients. We have elsewhere sufficiently discussed their habitation in remote places so all that is left for us are their grotesque dances and their deceptive indecent acts, which have exploited the simplicity of so many poor ignorant people.

We see in Homer the fairies thrash out their caroles and writhe violently to the sound of Pan's flute, and in myriad places in [205] the other Poets, he himself starts the dances with all his troupe. Yet the Nymphs in Philostrate quarrel seeing him dance so reluctantly and mock him for only hopping up and down, stamping his feet without rhythm. And perhaps this variety of Satyric dance called Sicinnis, which is why Satrys are called Sicinnis, was an image of this little stomping of the God Pan, conforms to the gait of Apes when they go on their two hind legs. The same Poets, to whom the Gods are never concealed, wandering through the wilderness were customarily in the party, just as Horace knows well, saying of himself.

The goat-footed Fauns lightly stepping, 161

Carolling in the cool shade

161 Formatting retained from both versions.

247

With the Nymphs of the forests

Often retains me far from the masses.

What we can say, if these gatherings were really true, of [206] the dances of Sorcerers with Demons, is that they called the days of their ceremonies Sabbats, Because the oldest and most famous Poets were all Magicians, and these Satyrs Demons.

But if it is true that the dances to the sound of the cymbals, as says a Poet, would be the weapons and matchsticks of Venus, how could the Satyrs dance at any given opportunity to the sound of their cymbals with these beautiful Nymphs without supplicating them for love? and is it surprising that they ran after these fugitives through the fields so many times? The Satyrs are always represented in Fables with a lasciviousness so prodigious that Ovid reproached Silenus as though it were a crime that he was not yet old at his age. Likewise this word Satyric is interpreted in Theocritus and Plutarch to mean lascivious. And the herb that Theophrastus valued as an efficacious one to stimulate an appetite, or rather a fervor of love [207] over and above human forces, and it is said that Hercules used it when in one night, he impregnated the fifty daughters of Thespius, not having had a more suitable name than Satyrion. What can one judge about the God Pan, who upon being interrogated by his Father Mercury asking if he was married, responded that he could never be because he could not be content with only one woman? Is it not true that those desires were never halted, and that he had always endeavored to surprise some Nymph surreptitiously? But if he boasts about having deceived the Moon under the white fleece with which he covered his deformities, the flute that he carries in his hand will serve as a reminder that he was himself deceived by more powerful Gods who made him kiss some reeds in place of the beautiful Syrinx: and the

nudity of young people who celebrate the Lupercalias was not only a mark of the passion that burned in him for [208] Iole, but also of the poor treatment that he received from Hercules whom he had mistaken, when he dressed as Iole, for Iole herself. But what good are such Fables? Demons in the form of Satyrs have caused a lust so fierce to appear that they have held the name of Incubi: similarly in Greek Pan was called, *Ephialte*, in Latin, *Inus*, and in Aramaic, *Ennus*.

Now to discuss these Incubi: if, deprived of the organs of emotion, can they feel the tickling of an action outside the bounds of their nature, and if they can, on their own, give birth to some men: in addition to the problem that this would take us further from our subject, honesty seems to forbid us from it; And in order only to touch on something in the shadow of the Fables, we will content ourselves with saying that it was common among these Ancients, to believe that the Gods came from the Sky to Earth to seek [209] their satisfaction in the arms of mortal women, and for Goddesses to subject their divinity to the men whom they loved; and that from these divine adulterers Heroes were born, placed between the Gods and men. Likewise in Babylon, in Thebes, and in Patare, 162 at certain feasts, they imprisoned a women in the Temple of Jupiter, convincing themselves that this God came to pass the night with her. But these supposed Gods were either Demons, who in order to authorize debauchery, maintained the people in these dishonest ceremonies: or men who sought the effects of their lustful desires under the mantel of Religion. That if they were men they could have given existence to other men, that error caused us to believe were sons of these supposed God: thus Olympias allowed herself to be persuaded that Alexander was the son of Jupiter Ammon,

162 Unidentified

and not of Nactendabor Egyptien, who [210] deceived her in the clothes of this God: and Sylvia that Mars had gotten her pregnant with the founder of Rome and his brother, and not her uncle Amulius who came to see her all ready to go. If they were Demons, it is certain according to the Pagan scholars, that they would not have been able to have descendants; indeed the Egyptians were not able to admit, says Herodotus, what the historian Hæcatæus himself recounted, that a God can beget a man; and Plutarch held this doctrine, that a divine essence would not know how to to take pleasure in the beauty of a woman, and cause to grow in her body some beginning of progeniture. But in order to finish this first point, everything that the Religion of the Pagans teaches us of these half-goat₁₆₃ Gods, has such connection to what Natural history writes of Ape Satyrs, that an egg resembles nothing more, says the proverb, than another egg. One reads in Pliny that Marc [211] Antony once purchased as twin brothers two young children of different nations, they were so much alike, but he perceived well that he had been deceived as soon as he heard them speaking in different languages: The Pagans in the same fashion even allowed themselves to be deceived by this vain resemblance of the Demons with these animals; but more foolishly, they were never able to disabuse themselves and recognize them by their speech. Because although they had seen the obvious shams, the prodigies and the hatreds of these false and misleading divinities, they gave themselves over to their preposterous belief, and inadvertently obstinate in their blindness and ignorant superstitions.

The Poet Lucilius used to say of the Satyrs of Persia, that the ignorant people there were not able to comprehend anything, and that Scholars there reached some

163 bouquins

curious understandings that this same author would never have [112] thought to describe. The same can be said about all of the Fables of Antiquity. Because debased minds whose ignorance limits their wisdom to the exterior of the meaning, accepted the Poetic fictions as straightforward accounts, and, as if the mantel of obscurities that enveloped them had not been sufficient to remove them from true understanding, they added the one from Religion, so that they were not permitted to research it. But those whom a better nature guided to a higher speculation, not content to reveal the rational sense hidden there, have looked for the secrets that even the inventors had not imagined; and from there have proceeded all these mythologies, and learned explanations of the Fables that the sages have transmitted to posterity, and which by their great number are rendered less intelligible than the Fables themselves. What we have written [213] about the form, nature, and divinity of the god Pan, and about the Satyrs has not made the mistake of these learned commentators. Plato first said that Pan was the image of speech, daughter of elegance, being the son of Mercury, God of eloquence, and that his name signified All because speech contains in itself all things through the discourse that it can accomplish, given that it is all things: as if he had known through the natural efforts of his insight what no one has taught him, that speech has drawn from the void all the beings of the world: He has only spoken, writes David, and immediately they have been made: and that in the beginning this word which was in God, and which was God himself, created in things so many subjects of great delights. And in the varied natures of the Idol of Pan, this Philosopher said that it was possible to recognize easily that there [214] are two kinds of speech, of which the first, represented by the face of man lifted always toward the Sky, resides in Heaven among the Gods, for whom words are equal to irrevocable

judgements which are never vain, and eternal oaths from which they can never repent.

And the other kind, that the lower parts and strolling on Earth placing before our eyes, is what, covered by lies that are impossible to discern, amuses men with its faults and appearances, as one does a child with jacks.

Others have tried to find the portrait of man in the image of Pan, causing us to believe that of his two parts, the more noble, that is to say the soul, which has no other object than God, which in his breast strives to return from where it has fallen, that is to say painted in the upper parts of this Pan; and in the lower parts, which are bestial [215] and attached to the ground, the animal and corruptible body whose awkward ponderousness incessantly weighs the refinement of the soul down toward the Earth. Even though the name of this God which signifies All, teaches that man is a smaller world and another All, in the smallness of which all the marvels of this great Universe are enclosed in marvels. It seems that Saint Gregory would not want only to bring clarity to this explanation, but to give it authority: Because in the passage of Scripture which our Lord commands his Apostles to preach the Gospel to every creature, it is written that this must relate only to man because he alone is every creature for which God has formed the world and who contains in him all things, not only the fundamental natures, but also supernatural essences, having the being of the stones, the life of the trees, the feelings of the animals, and the [216] intelligence of the Angels.

But the more common opinion is of those who, knowing that their predecessors, in order to make themselves appealing to the people, as we would say, had written the incomprehensible effects of God in sacred letters and mysterious hieroglyphics, endeavored to search in all the Fables (true Silenis of Alcibiadis) for some image of the

supreme divinity. And although the worship of Fauns and Satyrs was not a mystical invention of scholars, but an error of the people who accepted the Statues of Ape Satyrs for Images of demi-Gods, they have never tired of philosophizing about the Idol of the God Pan, and through the force of a fine discourse have shown that it could have been the portrait of the universal principal of all generations, and from this efficacious virtue which produces, maintains, and incites all the things of the world. And in fact, Orpheus [217] names Pan All-Conceiving all, and author of things, and Suidas Biarcé 164 as giving life: we also see in the Latin Comedy that Silenus calls himself God of Nature:165 that Virgil makes him sing about the birth of the Universe, being unable to add anyone who had more perfect knowledge than the one who has created it. The learned Grammarian Servius writes that the Latins were mistaken in having given to this God the name of Sylvain, and this error proceeds from the double meaning of the Greek word: Because the Greeks called him God of Hylé, and Hyle not only means a forest, but rather the sediments and the putrefied matter of the Elements specifically characteristic of generation. Even better, the Arcades 166 heard more in this word of Hyle all matter of generally any sort, which is to say, heavenly or earthly, which is subject to the power and to the government [218] of Pan. And for this reason *Macrobe*₁₆₇ made him the same God as the Sun: which Cicero seems to give to understand, saying that Pan was the son of the

164 As noted in the errata, this should be Biarcee, whereas it appears $Biar\acute{e}e$ in both versions. However the first e has been turned into a e by hand, an accent placed over the second e, and another e written at the end of the word so that it reads: $Biarc\acute{e}e$ in the BNF version.

165 Here Hédelin capitalizes Nature.

166 Unidentified

167 Unidentified

Sky because Helios was son of Ouranos. This is why the Greeks in all those temples, customarily kept a perpetual fire and a lamp always burning: Because fire is the primary and beginning of all things, on the grounds that it is the most moving substance that exists in all nature, and that generation does not happen without movement: and one sees that all other matter, when heat leaves, it lives idle and immobile, craving and seeking the vigor of fire as its soul. The Pythagoreans also wanted the middle of the world to be the seat and the proper destination of fire, which they call *Vesta*, and say to be unity, thinking that the Earth stays, remains suspended near the fire like the center of the [119] world. By which Numa, a man of great knowledge, consecrated it, and wanted the Vestals to preserve it without allowing it to extinguish, neither more nor less than a brilliant image of the eternal power that rules and governs all: which the Greeks and this great Roman person had learned from the Egyptians, who adorned the Idols of Osiris, worshiped as the same principle and generative germ of things, with clothing gleaming like fire. The fire of love with which this Deity burned incessantly, opened the way to this more Philosophical than Religious belief: Because they considered it necessary to grasp in this lust the perpetual generations of Nature, which 168 never ceases to grow in a single instant in all the parts of the world, an infinity of new beings: Which Plutarch seems to suggests when, by the principle of Nature 169 which Hesiod calls [220] Love, he wants to signify Osiris. And the Egyptians, as Diodorus teaches, did not discuss any other sort of Pan's love, from which came what they were worshiping at Mendes in the

168 Unlike many of his contemporaries, Hédelin does not seem to personify nature, hence I have chosen which rather than who. Either fits grammatically for *qui*.

169 He has capitalized Nature twice in this book, and I believe only once in the rest of the treatise. One might argue that Hédelin is personifying in this book.

form of a goat, 170 and the Idols which they have elevated, and all the other Satyrs, bearing the part serving for generation, large and erect, in order to feature their property of begetting perpetually and without rest. Thus Osiris was painted among then, and Priapus among the Greeks, which same divinities garnered identical understandings: the Satyric symbols of which Pliny made some sovereign amulets, were these Phalluses and Obscenities hanging on the collars of young children, in order to protect them from the bewitching evil eye and beguiling words.

This explanation of Pan's love makes all the more likely and natural that his passionate ardor caused him to search for a particular affection [221] in the sweet embrace of the Nymphs, that is to say, of the waters. Because under the veil of this invention, the expectation was to hear that this hot and energetic principle, craving by its natural inclination a wet substance, the close union with which gives being to all things: because heat and wetness₁₇₁ are the two principles, male and female, of all that exists in the Universe. Which made the Stoics believe that the Stars, which they thought to be of fire by nature, were maintained and nourished by the humid vapors from the Earth, and that in the end this nourishment being gone, the machine of the world would perish and would be consumed by fire. According to which Philosophy one must hear these verses from Ovid speaking of Jupiter,

But then it reminds him that one day the fire must seize172
(As destiny who will make everything die wants) [222]

170 bouc

171 humidité – In the discourse in English, this is generally humidity.

172 There is a period here that is both versions that I am using for this translation but that is not in later editions.

On the Earth and in the Heavens in order to reduce them to ashes,

And that this machine will have much to suffer.

That is why the Egyptians solemnized in the Kalends during the month Phamenoth, the Festival that they called the entrance of Osiris in the Moon Queen of humidity, saying that she slept with him, for which reason they called her the mother of the world, and want her to be of double nature, female in that she is impregnated by the Sun, and male in that she once again scatters in the air the seeds and principles of generation. Which they wanted to signify again naming Isis (who is the same as Thetis, that damp nourishment of the world) sometimes Mouth, and sometimes Athiri, of which the first signifies mother, the second, the place of generation and gathering. And why did they pretend that the Sun and the Moon are not driven in chariots, but in boats, which 173 they [223] sail all around the world, if not to show that the productive heat from the Stars and from the Skies is nourished by humidity, the basic cause of generation? And this Bacchus or Osiris whom they called Hyes, as some would say, master and Lord of the wet nature, was this anyone other than the God Pan who burned with a violent love for the beautiful Nymphs? Even the men were reputed by some Greeks to have taken their birth from wet substance: and for this reason the Hellenists sacrificed to Neptune Progenitor, and the Syrians worshiped fish as being both creation and nourishment to them. That is why the Fables teach us that Thyphon was the chief enemy of Osiris, of Isis, and of Horus their child, having sought every means of causing them to lose their empire and lives. Having secretly let us174 know that all [224] desiccating virtue, all heat

173 This appears to be a typo in both versions: esquels for lesquels.

174 The erratum line reads: p. 222. l. 23. l. *sont*. It is unclear where *sont* should go. Line 23 reads in both versions: ...*l'empire & la vie. Nous donnant.*..

from violent fire, and all arid intemperateness symbolized by Thyphon is contrary to the union of heat and humidity, and the enemy of all generation and to Horus' glory, which is to say, to the beauty of the world. And what they added, that Thyphon threw the Phallus of Osiris in the river, tends to instruct us that the genital and productive property of God, writes Plutarch, had wetness for its first substance, by means of which he blended together the things that were needed to participate in generation: or that Pagan seems to have explained what we read in Moses, that at the point of the creation of the world the spirit of God was carried on the waters.

In addition, there are others among the savants with the more sensible doctrine but no less believable, seeking knowledge of the God Pan when considering his [225] image, was persuaded that he represented this great Universe. And putting everything together, the deft hand of Archimedes knew how to portray artistically and enclose the immensity of the Heavens and of the Stars with their movements, in the small space of a piece of glass: they had even raised the Idol of this God as a miniature portrait of all the parts of this incomprehensible world: Either he portrayed all things in order to bear witness that he was the author and custodian of it, or in effect they adored, in this image, the Universe in its simple and external appearance. Because many, even some Philosophers, as is seen at length in Cicero, have esteemed and worshipped the world thus as a God eternal, manifest and spinning without considering the first cause. Nevertheless, the divinity of this great body is not only reproved but also mocked [226] by *Velleius*, in so far as God must not be occupied with the eternal

movements, like a King knew how to respond correctly to these new barbarian lands who wished to persuade him that the Sun was God. Now the name of this Satyr God seems first and foremost to confirm the explanation of those who take him to be the Universe, not only because this word of Pan signifies All, but also because it is derived, according to Plutarch, from Pénte, which means five. Because in the Egyptian Triangle, hieroglyphic of the world and of its principles, the line which makes five represent the world, and the two others, which are three and four, the two universal principles male and female: Because just as five is similar in nature and in power to these two other numbers, being composed of three and of two, which doubled make four: likewise the world relates to [227] the nature of the two principles which compose it. This opinion is not so new that it would not be authorized by Orpheus the most ancient of all the Poets who have survived the voracity of time, when he sings in his hymns, that the Sky, the earth, the sea, and the fire, are the limbs of Pan. Which becomes still more clearly comprehensible through the link that one can make from his image to all the Universe.

Because firstly, as the Philosophers have not doubted to place the Deprivation of existence between the principles of the things that are. Likewise we will not cause any problems by narrating this imaginary space and supra-celestial void which is nothing but a modest light between the parts of the world, and can we say that it was represented by the baldness of Pan, the top of whose head was nothing but a vagueness and a simple luminous whiteness. [228] Because this God and all of his followers have always been painted bald and holding their hand high on their brow, for fear that the too intense heat

from the Sun would boil their brains, which led the learned Scaliger to correct in the Priapes the verse which called the Fauns long haired. The number and the harmony of the Heavens was noted by the flute of seven pipes that he carried in his hand, because the seven different tones of this instrument bore witness that the Ancients judged that there were only eight Skies; because the two which touch each other are making one single resonance, the eight were able by their movements and frictions against each other to produce only seven tones, whose harmonious consonance proceeded from the distance and disproportion of these great bodies. Hence the first Musicians imitating these celestial harmonies gave their instruments [229] only seven strings, and in all Music, even to the present seven tones.

The crook and shepherd's staff hooked at the top in several circles containing one in the other, would this not be Time, oldest son of the Sky, who, like a serpent folded in on itself in many twists, never ends but to begin again? Or more accurately the year, I do not say the Solar, but this total revolution of the Heavens to the origin of their motion, which after many circuits around and journeys back, faster or more slowly according to their irregularity will perfect in a single instant of rest, this great year composed of many millions of years, and in the accomplishment of their actions will perhaps mark out the course of the world, and the life of nature? And what would have been meant by the horns of Pan if not light? Jupiter Ammon, who is no other than the Sun called Hamma by the Hebrews, had two ram's horns on his [230] head, and Isis and Diana those of a Bull: And in the Hebrew language the word for light and for horn is ambiguous: We also read in Exodus, according to the common translation, *That the face of Moses, descending from Mount Sinai, was horned, and according to the story, luminous:* Actually Moses,

desiring to speak to the people, covered his face with a veil because their eyes, which were too weak, would not have been able to withstand the glorious splendor that he had acquired through proximity to and involvement with God; and Saint Paul in interpreting these horns of Moses, says that he was entirely covered in glory.

In his vermillion color, the face of Pan bore the image of fire or ethereal region: and the wrinkles which gave him a disagreeable face, and all grubby, as Homer says, represented the damaging variabilities of the air. The long hair and density of his beard, about which Philostratus writes that it made such a great [231] story, featuring the productive influences that these two first elements shed below from a perpetual abundance so that they were mixed with the lower parts in the bosom of the nature, they give being to all things of this world. What the Poets obscurely suggest to us when they pretend that in springtime Jupiter (which they take for ether) comes down along with the sweet rains in the bosom of the Earth his wife, and impregnates her with diverse seeds of all things: and that Juno, that is to say the air, is suspended and bound by the hands with a chain of gold, having two heavy anvils fastened to her feet, the weight of which pulls her by force toward the Earth.

No other part in the figure of this God, could in my opinion to represent the sea with more energy than the abdomen. Because entirely thus, this part is the bowels and cesspit of the human body, the receptacle of the excrements, the heap of the [232] trash of superfluities, in short a cowshed Trough in our nature: Likewise the Egyptians thought that the sea had been produced by the fire leaving the sphere of its activities, being a corrupted superfluity, and sickness against nature; and Plutarch made of the world neither more nor less than the bladder of an animal. For this reason the Monsters, the

Androgynes,175 the Fulgur the Parricides, and similar abominations, were cast into the sea, as this was the only appropriate place in the world to receive such impurities. And those who were contaminated by some unworthy misconduct believed that being immersed in the sea with some certain rituals, there to leave their crime, as those wounded by enraged beasts go there to shed the mortal contagion of that venom. And we read in the Histories of the new world, that the Incan176 King of Peru had the customary habit while bathing in a river, of confessing [233] to the Sun out loud all of his sins, and then commanding the waters to carry them into the sea, so that no one can ever again have knowledge of them. So much that the Pythagorians named it quite appropriately, the tear of Saturn, desiring to say beneath these mysterious words that it was wholly impure and tainted.

As for the firm and immutable Earth on the indivisible point that supports it, and interrupted mountains, it was figured by the hard horn and half-open₁₇₇ goat feet of the God Pan. The plants and the trees that adorn it, by the great hair, and the green lawns with which his thighs were covered and the animals by the animality of these parts.

Perhaps the human form with which the other half of this God was honored, could represent man, the most holy and admirable ornament of the Universe. But we say rather [234] that the old Proneia of the Stoics was represented by it, that is to say that sage reason and eternal providence which governs all nature. Reason, which the

175 Unidentified

176 Ingua

177 entr'ouverte des pieds – Hédelin could have said sabots fendus for split hooves. Perhaps the idea of half open sounds more monstrous, which might contribute to the image he conveys throughout of the goat as an unappealing creature.

Platonics said to be descended from the proper substance of God, and a participant in understanding, in order, and in harmony, and which circulates in the matter, as into a body that it informs, not only animates it and vivifies all the parts of this grand Whole, but also regulates them with pounds and measures according to the eternal orders of nature.

What remains is the solitude that this God so cherished, by which the unity of the world was proven against the reveries of Democritus, of Anaximander, and of their sectarians, who gave rise to an infinity of worlds, producing others among them, and of those that perished outside this one were often caused by pestilences and extraordinary mishaps. Who could concede the extravagances of that Heraclides who [235178] established on each of the stars a parallel world to this one here, and the imaginary triangle of *Petron179* composed of 183 worlds, continuing to exist like those who are in a dance? Reason, public doctrine, and even the divine opinion of Plato also teach us also us certainly that there was only one sole world, created and loved by God, composed of all nature, having one body entire and content in itself, without having need of anything else.

It is a fairly common metaphor and Aristotle likewise teaches it to us in his problems, that all human affairs move in a circular fashion, and that returning to the point of their origin, they join their end to their beginning. Wherein *Philon*₁₈₀ agrees quite subtly, saying that good men, after having rotated their compass on all the acts of

178 The top of 235 in the BNF has a misprinted page number of 435. It is correct in the digital version.

179 Unidentified

180 Unidentified

262

this world, will go finish an admirable circle in the Sky, in the very place where they [236] began. Now either the nature of the things here below are in effect such, or a fortuitous encounter set us down into this philosophical circle, this treatise having gradually folded around itself and returned to the same discourse on the Universe from which we have drawn its beginning, We think that in order not to contradict this general course of all affairs, it is sensible to finish in this place, and to set up for Altars and columns to this little voyage that we have undertaken on an unknown sea, the hope that the novelty of the subject will cause it to be received with the same good measure as the complexities are great and thorny.

THE END

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

- Aquinas, Thomas. *The Summa Theologica of Saint Thomas Aquinas*. Translated by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province. Volume I. Chicago: William Benton, 1923. https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.126741/page/n1
- ----. Summa Theologiae (Summa Theologica). Translated by Alfredo Freddoso. University of Notre Dame. https://www3.nd.edu/~afreddos/summa-translation/TOC-part1.htm
- Aristotle, *De Anima (On the Soul)*. Translated by Hugh Lawson-Tancred. New York: Penguin, 1986.
- Augustine, *City of God.* Translated by Marcus Dods. 1950. Reprint. New York: The Modern Library, 1993.
- Bacon, Francis. Essays and New Atlantis. Roslyn, NY: Walter J. Black, 1942.
- Boaistuau, Pierre. Histoires prodigieueses les plus memorables qui ayent esté observés, depuis la Nativité de Iesus Christ, iusques à nostre siecle: Extraictes de plusieurs fameux autheurs, grecz & latins, sacrez & prophanes: mises en nostre langue.

 Paris: Vincent Sertenas. 1560.
- Bulwer, John. Anthropometamorphosis, Man Transform'd, Or the Artificial Changeling Historicall Presented, in the Mad and Cruell Gallantry, Foolish Bravery, Ridiculous Beauty, Filthy Fineness, and Loathsome Loveliness of Most Nations, Fashioning and Altering the Bodies From the Mould Intended by Nature. London: William Hunt, 1653.
- Burnett, James, Lord Monboddo. *Antient Metaphysics: or, The Science of Universals.* 6 Volumes. London: T. Caddell and J. Balfour, 1779-1799.
- -----. *Of the Origin and Progress of Language*. 6 Volumes. 2nd Edition. 1773-1792. Reprint, New York: AMS Press, 1973.
- Canons and Degrees of the Council of Trent: Original Text in English. Translated by H.J. Schroeder. St. Louis: B. Herder, 1941.

- Columbus, Christopher. *The Journal of Christopher Columbus (During His First Voyage, 1492-93) and Documents Relating the Voyages of John Cabot and Gaspar Corte Real.* Edited by Clements Robert Markham. London: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Hédelin, François, Abbé d'Aubignac. *Amelonde: Histoire de nostre temps*. Paris: Baptitste Loyson, 1669.
- ----. Des Satyres, brutes, monstres et demons. De leur nature et adoration. Paris: Nicolas Buon, 1627. Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, France.
- ----. Des Satyres, brutes, monstres et demons. De leur nature et adoration.

 Paris: Nicolas Buon, 1627.

 https://play.google.com/books/reader?printsec=frontcover&output=reader&id=G
 DGD5wsuCFcC&pg=GBS.PP5
- ----. Des Satyres brutes, monstres et démons, edited by Isidore Lieseux (Paris: Isidore Lieseux, 1888).
- ----. *Des Satyres brutes, monstres et démons*, edited by Giles Banderier (Grenoble: Éditions Jérôme Millon, 2003).
- ----. *La Pratique du Theatre*. Paris: Antoine de Sommaville, 1657.
- ----. Les Conseils d'Ariste à Célimène sur les moyens de conserver sa reputation. 2nd edition. Paris: N. Pepingué, 1667. https://archive.org/details/lesconseilsdari00aubi/page/n9
- ----. Les Conseils d'Ariste à Célimène, sur les moyens de conserver sa réputation. New Edition. Paris: V. Pepingue and Jacques le Febvre, 1692.
- Leclerc, Georges-Louis, Comte de Buffon. *Histoire Naturelle, Générale et Particulière*. 44 Volumes, Paris: 1749-1804.
- Linnaeus, Carolus. *Systema Naturae*. Leiden: Johann Wilhelm de Groot for Theodor Haak, 1735. https://archive.org/details/mobot31753002972252/page/n1
- Locke, John. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. New York: Penguin Books, 1997.
- Luther, Martin, D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe, Tischreden. 6 vols. 1912-1921. Reprint, Weimar, Germany: Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger, 2000.
- Montaigne, Michel. "On a Monster Child." In *The Complete Essays*. Translated and edited by M. A. Screech. London: Penguin Books, 2003.

- Paré, Ambroise. Des monstres et prodiges. Edited by Jean Céard. Geneva: Droz, 1971.
- Paracelsus, "A book on nymphs, sylphs, pygmies, and salamanders, and on the other spirits." In *Four Treatises*, edited by Henry E. Sigerist; translated by C. Lilian Temkin, George Rosen, Gregory Zilboorg, and Henry E. Sigereist. 1941. Reprint. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.
- Pliny the Elder. *The Natural History of Pliny*. Translated by John Bostock and H.T. Riley. 2 Volumes. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1855.
- Ross, Alexander. Arcana Microcosmi: or, The hid Secrets of Mans Body disclosed; First, In an Anatomical Duel between Aristotle & Galen, About the Parts thereof. Secondly, By a Discovery of the strnange and marvellous Diseases, Symptomes, and Accidents of Mans Body. With A Refutation of Doctor Browns Vulgar Errors, And the Ancient Opinions vindicated. London: Thomas Newcomb, 1651.
- Rousseau, John James. A Discourse upon the Origin and Foundation of the Inequality among Mankind. London: R and J Dodsley, 1761.
- Topsell, Edward. Historie of Four-Footed Beastes. London: 1607.
- Tulpii, Nicolai *Observationes Medicae*. 2nd Edition. Amsterdam: Ludovicum Elzevirium, 1652.
- Turner, Charles. Lord Protector (Trampling on the Whore of Babylon and protecting the peace of Britain). Date Unknown. National Galleries Scotland. https://www.nationalgalleries.org/art-and-artists/27121/oliver-cromwell-1599-1658-lord-protector-trampling-whore-babylon-and-protecting-peace-britain
- Tyson, Edward. Orang-outang, sive homo sylvestris: or, The anatomy of a pygmie compared with that of a monkey, an ape, and a man. To which is added, a philological essay concerning the pygmies, the cynocephali, the satyrs, and sphinges of the ancients. Wherein it will appear that they are all either apes or monkeys, and not men, as formerly pretended. London: Thomas Bennet and Daniel Brown, 1699.

DICTIONARIES USED IN TRANSLATION

- Centre National de Resources Textuelles et Lexicales. Ortolang: Outils et Ressources pour un Traitement Optimisé de la LANGue. https://www.cnrtl.fr/
- Cotgrave, Randle. *A French and English Dictionary*. London: Anthony Dolle, 1673. https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=9EI_AAAAcAAJ&pg=GBS.PP5
- Dictionnaire d'ancien Français: Moyen age et renaissance. Paris: Librairie Larousse,

- Dictionnaires d'autrefois. The Project for American and French Research on the Treasury of the French Language. http://portail.atilf.fr/cgibin/dicollook.pl?strippedhw=brut&dicoid=ACAD1694&he adword=&dicoid=ACAD1694
- Dictionnaire de l'Académie française. The Project for American and French Research on the Treasury of the French Language. http://artfl.atilf.fr/dictionnaires/ACADEMIE/PREMIERE/search.form.fr.html
- Dictionnaire Français-Anglais. WordReference. https://www.wordreference.com/fren/
- Littré, Émile. *Dictionnaire de la langue française*, *Supplement*. Paris: L. Hachette, 1878. Electronic version created by François Gannaz. https://www.littre.org/
- Oxford English Dictionary. Online Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, December 2018.

 http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.library.und.edu/view/Entry/31730?redirectedFrom=chimpanzee#eid

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Arnaud, Charles. Les Théories dramatiques au XVIIe Siècle: Étude sur la vie et les ævres de l'abbé d'Aubignac. Paris: Alphonse Picard, 1888.
- Bakh, Sue. "The Final Judgement in 'Monster Culture'." *The Morningside Review* (2011/2012). https://morningsidereview.org/essay/the-final-judgement-in-monster-culture/
- Barnard, Alan. "Orang Outang and the Definition of Man: The Legacy of Lord Monboddo." In *Fieldwork and Footnotes: Studies in the History of European Anthropology*. Edited by Han F. Vermeulen and Arturo Alvarez Roldan. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Bartra, Richard. Wild Men in the Looking Glass: The Mythic Origins of European Otherness. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, 1994.
- Bernheimer, Richard. Wild Men in the Middle Ages: A Study in Art, Sentiment, and Demonology. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1952.
- Bourque, Bernard J. *All the Abbé's Women: Power and Misogyny in Seventeenth-Century France, through the Writings of Abbé d'Aubignac*. Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto Verlag, 2015.

- Borges, Jorge Luis. Livre des êtres imaginaires. Paris: Gallimard, 1987.
- Burke, Peter. "Frontiers of the Monstrous: Perceiving National Characters in Early Modern Europe." In *Monstrous Bodies / Political Monstrosities in Early Modern Europe*. Edited by Laura Lunger Knoppers and Joan B. Landes. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004.
- Burns, Williams. "The King's Two Monstrous Bodies: John Bulwer and the English Revolution." In *Wonders, Marvels, and Monsters in Early Modern Culture*. Edited by Peter G. Platt. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1999.
- Céard, Jean. *La nature et les prodiges: L'insolite au XVIe siècle*. 2nd Edition. Geneva: Librarie Droz S.A., 1996.
- Clark, Stuart. *Thinking with Demons: The Idea of Witchcraft in Early Modern Europe*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- Cohen, Jeffrey Jerome. *Of Giants: Sex, Monsters, and the Middle Ages.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.
- -----, ed. *Monster Theory: Reading Culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.
- Craveri, Benedetta. *The Age of Conversation*. Translated by Teresa Waugh. New York: New York Review of Books, 2006.
- Cressy, David. "Lamentable, Strange, and Wonderful: Headless Monsters in the English Revolution." In *Monstrous Bodies / Political Monstrosities in Early Modern Europe*. Edited by Laura Lunger Knoppers and Joan B. Landes. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004.
- Curran, Andrew. "Afterword: Anatomical Readings in the Early Modern Era." In *Monstrous Bodies / Political Monstrosities in Early Modern Europe*. Edited by Laura Lunger Knoppers and Joan B. Landes. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004.
- ----. Andrew. *The Anatomy of Blackness: Science & Slavery in an Age of Enlightenment.*Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013.
- Dagron, Tristan. "Nature and its Monsters During the Renaissance: Montaigne and Vanini." In *Monsters and Philosophy*. Edited by Charles T. Wolf. London: College Publications, 2005.
- Daston, Lorraine. "Marvelous Facts and Miraculous Evidence in Early Modern Europe." *Critical Inquiry* 18, no. 1 (1991): 93-124. www.jstor.org/stable/1343717;

- Daston, Lorraine, and Katherine Park, *Wonders and the Order of Nature 1150 1750*. New York: Zone Books, 1998.
- Davies, Surekha. "The Unlucky, the Bad, and the Ugly." In *The Ashgate Research Companion to Monsters and the Monstrous*. Edited by Asa Mittman with Peter J. Dendle. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2013.
- Doughterty, Carol. Prometheus New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Eisenstein, Elizabeth. *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe*. 2nd Edition. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Elias, Norbert. *The Civilizing Process: The History of Manners*. 2 Volumes. Translated by Edmund Jephcott. New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.
- Enenkel, Karl. "The Species and Beyond." In Karl Enenkel, et al. *Early Modern Zoology:* The Construction of Animals in Science, Literature and the Visual Arts. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Falcon, Andrea and David Lefebvre. *Aristotle's Generation of Animals, A Critical Guide*. New York: Cambridge, 2018.
- Ferber, Sarah. *Demonic Possession and Exorcism in Early Modern France*. New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Findlen, Paula. "Jokes of Nature and Jokes of Knowledge: The Playfulness of Scientific Discourse in Early Modern Europe." *Renaissance Quarterly* 43: 2 (Summer, 1990): 292-331.
- Forth, Christopher. *Masculinity in the Modern West: Gender, Civilization and the Body*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. 2nd Edition. New York: Vintage Books, 1995.
- Freud, Sigmund. *New Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis*. Standard Edition. New York: W.W. Norton, 1965.
- Friedman, Jerome. *The Battle of the Frogs and Fairford's Flies: Miracles and the Pulp Press During the English Revolution*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993.
- Friedman, John Block. "Foreword." In *The Ashgate Research Companion to Monsters and the Monstrous*. Edited by Asa Mittman with Peter J. Dendle. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2013.
- Gay, Peter. Freud for Historians. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

- Gombrich, E.H. *Gombrich on the Renaissance*. Volume 2. 3rd Edition. London: Phaedon Press Limited, 1993.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. "Introduction to *Marvelous Possessions*." In *Wonders, Marvels, and Monsters in Early Modern Culture*. Edited by Peter G. Platt. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1999.
- Hampton, Timothy. "Signs of Monstrosity: The Rhetoric of Description and the Limits of Allegory in Rabelais and Montaigne." In *Monstrous Bodies / Political Monstrosities in Early Modern Europe*. Edited by Laura Lunger Knoppers and Joan B. Landes. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004.
- Hanafi, Zakiya. The Monster in the Machine. Durham, NC: Duke, 2000.
- Hill, Christopher. *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution*. London: Penguin Books, 1972.
- Hsia, R. Po-Chia. "A Time for Monsters: Monstrous Births, Propaganda, and the German Reformation." In *Monstrous Bodies / Political Monstrosities in Early Modern Europe* edited by Laura Lunger Knoppers and Joan B. Landes. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004.
- Jansen, H.W. *Apes and Ape Lore in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*. London: Warburg Institute, University of London, 1952.
- Jerome. "The Life of Paulus the First Hermit." In *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Second Series, Volume 6. Translated by W.H. Fremantle and W.G. Martley. Edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. *New Advent, The Catholic Encyclopedia*, ed. Kevin Knight. (http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/3008.htm)
- Jurek, Scott, and Steve Friedman. Eat & Run: My Unlikely Journey to Ultramarathon Greatness. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2012.
- Kaufmann, Lynn Frier. *The Noble Savage: Satyrs and Satyr Families in Renaissance Art.*Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Research Press.
- Knoppers, Laura Lunger. "The Antichrist, The Babilon, The Great Dragon': Oliver Cromwell, Andrew Marvell, and the Apocalyptic Monstrous." In *Monstrous Bodies / Political Monstrosities in Early Modern Europe*. Edited by Laura Lunger Knoppers and Joan B. Landes. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004.
- Knoppers, Laura Lunger, and Joan B. Landes, eds. *Monstrous Bodies / Political Monstrosities in Early Modern Europe*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004.
- Landes, Joan B. "Revolutionary Anatomies," In Monstrous Bodies / Political

- *Monstrosities in Early Modern Europe*. Edited by Laura Lunger Knoppers and Joan B. Landes. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004.
- Lissarague, François. "Why Satyrs Are Good to Represent." In *Nothing to Do with Dionysus?* Edited by John J. Winkler and Froma Zeilin. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- Lovejoy, Arthur O. *The Great Chain of Being: A Study of the History of an Idea*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1964.
- Martin, Ernest. *Histoire des monstres depuis l'antiquité jusqu'a nos jours*. Paris: C. Reinwald et Cie, Libraires Éditeurs, 1880.
- Marshall, Peter. *Invisible Worlds: Death, religion and the supernatural in England,* 1500-1700. London: SPCK, 2017.
- Martinot, Robert. "De l'usage de la rison chez les écrivains français entre Montaigne et Descartes." PhD Dissertation. Lille University, 1982.
- Mittman, Asa. "Introduction: The Impact of Monsters and Monster Studies." In *The Ashgate Research Companion to Monsters and the Monstrous*. Edited by Asa Mittman with Peter J. Dendle. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2013.
- Morgan, Jennifer. *Laboring Women: Reproduction and Gender in New World Slavery*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2004.
- Nash, Richard. Wild Enlightenment: The Borders of Human Identity in the Eighteenth Century. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2003.
- O'Malley, C.D., and H.W. Magoun. "Early Concepts of the Anthropomorpha." *Physis: Rivista di storia della scienza*, 4 (1962): 39-63.
- Niccoli, Ottavia. *Prophecy and People in Renaissance Italy*. Translated by Lydia G. Cochrane. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- Park, Katherine, and Lorraine J. Daston. "Unnatural Conceptions: The Study of Monsters in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century France and England." *Past & Present*, 92 (August, 1981): 20-54.
- Purkiss, Diane. *The English Civil War: A People's History*. New York: Harper Perennial, 2007.
- Gerhild Scholz-Williams, Gerhild. Ways of Knowing in Early Modern Germany: Johannes Praetorius as a Witness to His Time. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2006.

- Scribner, R.W. For the Sake of Simple Folk: Popular Propaganda for the German Reformation. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Shaw, Carl A. Euripides: Cyclops, a Satyr Play. Oxford: Bloomsbury, 2018.
- Smith, Justin. "Degeneration and Hybridism in the Early Modern Species Debate." In *Monsters & Philosophy*. Edited by Charles T. Wolfe. London: College Publications, 2005.
- Soergel, Peter. *Miracles and the Protestant Imagination: The Evangelical Wonder Book in Reformation Germany*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Steel, Karl. "Centaurs, Satyrs, and Cynocephali: Scholarly Teratology and the Question of the Human." In *The Ashgate Reserach Companion to Monsters and the Monstrous*. Edited by Asa Simon Mittman with Peter J. Dendle. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2013.
- Straparola, Giovan Francesco. *The Pleasant Nights*. 2 Volumes. Edited by Donald Beecher. Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 2012.
- Strickland, Debra Higgs. "Monstrosity and Race in the Late Middle Ages." In *The Ashgate Research Companion to Monsters and the Monstrous*. Edited by Asa Mittman with Peter J. Dendle. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2013.
- Todd, Dennis. *Imagining Monsters: Miscreations of the Self in Eighteenth-Century England.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- Van Duzer, Chet. "Hic sunt dracones: The Geography and Cartography of Monsters." In *The Ashgate Research Companion to Monsters and the Monstrous*. Edited by Asa Mittman with Peter J. Dendle. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2013.
- Van Wyhe, John and Peter C. Kjærgaard. "Going the whole orang: Darwin, Wallace and the natural history of orangutans." *Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences*. 51 (June 2015): 53-63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.shpsc.2015.02.006
- Williams, Wes. *Monsters and their Meanings in Early Modern Culture: Mighty Magic.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Wiseman, Susan. "Monstrous Perfectibility: Ape-Human Transformations in Hobbes, Bulwer, and Tyson." In *At the Borders of the Human: Beasts, Bodies and Natural Philosophy in the Early Modern Period.* Edited by Eric Fudge, Ruth Gilbert, and Susan Wiseman. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999.

- Wygant, Amy "D'Aubignac, Demonologist, I: Monkeys and Monsters." *Seventeenth-Century French Studies*, 23:1 (2001): 143-164.
- Wygant, Amy. "D'Aubignac, Demonologist, II: St Anthony and the Satyr." *Seventeenth-Century French Studies*, 24:1 (2002), 71-85.
- Wygant, Amy. *Medea, Magic, and Modernity in France: Stages and Histories, 1553–1797.* New York: Routledge, 2007.