

# Introduction

Allegorical imagery abounded in the physical spaces of early modern Europe and the colonial “New World.” It shaped courtly and civic ritual, circulated on medals, in print images, frontispieces, and cartouches on maps; it appeared in monumental painting and sculpture created for the reception halls of royal patrons, the homes of humanist merchants, and for display in the public square. Thus while allegory was often the preferred mode of official discourse promulgated by church and state, it was also widely available to multiple audiences within a range of contexts. As a vehicle of political or moralizing meaning, allegory could function as an ideal instrument of ideology, fashioned to instruct its viewers regarding their proper roles and to identify them as citizens and subjects. On the other hand, these same makers and viewers were not only interpellated by allegory but they were also interpreters of it, capable of discerning meanings outside of its authorized content. Indeed, the dynamic function of allegory might be situated most fundamentally in its mobilization of the intersecting energies of interpellation and interpretation. Visual allegories engage these energies with distinct force, for as objects designed for particular settings and as images that represent abstract ideas in embodied form, they operate in the physical world of the senses.

Alert to these potentialities of visual allegory, that is, to its sensual *and* discursive powers, the essays in this collection seek to examine allegorical imagery in light of the material, contextual, and methodological questions it raises: how is allegorical meaning constructed; for whom; and for what purposes? Spanning imagery produced in Italy, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Peru, and “New Spain” from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, these essays represent new ways of thinking about allegory that augment a burgeoning body of scholarship on literary allegory.<sup>1</sup> The rethinking of allegory demonstrated here is compelled in part by the expanding range of materials that these scholars investigate as art history has, with increasing vigor, broadened its scope from the “fine arts” to visual or material culture. Equally vital to this rethinking are the methodological shifts in art history that have transformed the frameworks through which visual allegory might be apprehended and analyzed. While iconography has provided a model for the “decoding” of visual allegory, the scholars gathered here engage in a productive revision of iconography’s methods and theoretical foundations. This anthology thus makes salient for *all* scholars of allegory—visual and literary—the particular contribution of historians of visual culture to our understanding of how allegories produced and disseminated meaning to early modern audiences. Our focus upon allegory in the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries offers rich material for the on-going interdisciplinary exchange that has

made early modern studies a lively and thriving intellectual arena. But the findings and methods offered here are not narrowly specific to the early modern period: these essays readily engage with on-going discussions in the field of medieval studies on the complex functions and polysemous structures of allegory in culture. Indeed, rather than insisting upon a sharp distinction between medieval and early modern uses of allegory, or between early modern and modern allegory, this anthology demonstrates how the Janus-like dynamic of allegory always invokes an authorizing past that is ever remade for present purposes.<sup>2</sup>

“Allegories are far less often the dull systems that they are reputed to be than they are symbolic power struggles.”<sup>3</sup> This assessment by Angus Fletcher, in his seminal study of allegory from 1964, rings ever more true today. In the forty-plus years that have elapsed since the publication of Fletcher’s *Allegory: The Theory of a Symbolic Mode*, allegory has been more fully elaborated as a struggle, between figure and conceit, between coherence and multivalence, and between closure and deferral.<sup>4</sup> As a privileged mode of signification in medieval and early modern visual and literary traditions, allegory might be understood as the site of a methodological struggle being enacted within and across disciplines. At stake in this struggle are theoretical issues concerning competing concepts of how allegory works as a structure of signification; disciplinary issues regarding the types of materials that historians of early modern culture attend to; and ideological issues concerning the function of allegory as a form of persuasive representation. These theoretical and interpretive debates evince not only the fluid state of our current interests in allegory, but they also reflect the ubiquitous presence and varied role of allegory in the pre-modern tradition. Critical theory focused upon problems of textual meaning has been a key catalyst for the re-evaluation of allegory, especially in deconstruction’s embrace of allegory as a form that is paradigmatic of all literary interpretation.<sup>5</sup> Broadly speaking, the impact on literary studies of postmodern reconceptions of allegory has been considerable, and the debates it has spawned remain vigorous.<sup>6</sup> Allegory as a visual and material phenomenon has, with notable exceptions, largely remained ancillary to these discussions, even as scholars and critics engaged in them have gestured toward images as a ripe area of inquiry.<sup>7</sup> Within art history, the theorization of allegory has been largely subsumed by the re-evaluation of iconographic method that was a central feature of the “New Art History” as it emerged in the 1980s and 1990s.<sup>8</sup> During this period a growing body of scholarship demonstrated the limitations of iconography as a practice of “decoding meaning” while also investigating the philosophical foundations of the work of Erwin Panofsky, who first developed, demonstrated, and disseminated the iconographic method.<sup>9</sup>

The changing fortunes of iconography for the study of pre-modern art were marked by a conference in 1990 held at Princeton University, which, as the American institution that welcomed Panofsky when he fled Germany, and as the home of the Index of Christian Art, a major iconographic archive, might be understood as a particular bastion of Panofsky’s method. An anthology of the papers presented at that conference, aptly titled *Iconography at the Crossroads*, represents an accurate view of a particular “turning point in its (iconography’s) own history.”<sup>10</sup> This turning

point pivoted importantly upon questioning the role of texts as privileged sources for the explanation of images; it promoted the investigation of broader contexts through which images generate meaning; and it called for a more flexible hermeneutics admitting multivalence in the operation of symbolic meaning and the possibility of disjunction between “official” programs and the interpretive practices of viewers.<sup>11</sup> These ideas, gathered collectively under the aegis of semiotics, were championed in several publications of this period as a means of revitalizing what had become an increasingly rigid and often misapplied method.<sup>12</sup> Indeed, one powerful trajectory indicated among several essays in *Iconography at the Crossroads* was the debate over the embrace of semiotics as a visual and specifically art historical method as well as a textual one.

The intervening years have seen the spread and refinement of these ideas as the basis for new modes of thinking about visual allegory. Semiotics, as distinct from iconography, offers a broad and flexible theoretical grounding for inquiry into *how* as well as *what* allegorical images signify; semiotics, in other words, has importantly opened up questions about visual allegory as a dynamic structure of signification that operates within a multiplicity of cultural codes.<sup>13</sup> It has also broadened and sharpened the definition of “meaning” in visual formations: the concept of the sign extended to the formal elements of images enables new ways of considering the production as well as the reception of visual allegory.<sup>14</sup>

The essays gathered here participate in the on-going project of interrogating iconography and its legacy while also inflecting the discussion in new directions. The approaches to allegory demonstrated in these essays stand as a timely counterpart to the anthology resulting from the Princeton conference: while *Iconography at the Crossroads* showed how productively art history could engage with textual theory, this current collection demonstrates the significant contribution of historians of visual culture to the larger discussion of allegory as a structure of meaning. Semiotics has insisted upon the role of convention in proscribing the meaning of signs, with language as its model. Historians of visual culture, on the other hand, are uniquely positioned to contend with the materiality of the sign, with its powerful denotative as well as connotative effects as it is apprehended through the senses and experienced in a tangible form.

This brings us to the second aspect of this anthology, one addressed in our subtitle, for most of the scholars included here interrogate allegory with a particular emphasis on the problematics of embodiment. What does it mean to allegorize the human figure; what pressures bear upon and shape personifications; what kinds of meaning escape or exceed allegorized bodies?

In this respect we can see the work collected here as exemplifying what has recently been called the “new materialism of allegory,” a fresh engagement with the stuff and substance of allegory’s reliance upon the figural.<sup>15</sup> In the scholarly tradition forged by Panofsky and elaborated by Ernst Gombrich, allegory’s visible form was primarily a vehicle for abstract or transcendent meanings.<sup>16</sup> Allegories were understood as stable, if sometimes elusive, constructs designed to articulate fully formed ideas to their ideally receptive audiences. The role of figure to uphold and demonstrate the

allegorical conceit relied upon the operative assumption that abstract concepts could seamlessly be wedded to incarnate forms. While his contemporaries Panofsky and Gombrich were elaborating the iconographic method, Walter Benjamin anticipated the understanding of allegory as both arbitrary and yet infused with nostalgia for a lost totalizing meaning.<sup>17</sup> The poststructuralist notion of allegory, following upon the work of Paul de Man, emphasizes allegory's bifurcated structure, finding its most powerful and essential characteristics in the gap between figure and conceit, this gap itself taken as analogous to the foundational gap in language between signifier and signified.<sup>18</sup> In this critical tradition based on the work of Jacques Derrida and Jacques Lacan, allegory's defining attribute is its instantiation of difference. In the words of Barbara Johnson, "'Allegory' is the recognition of the difference between signifier and signified, of the relation between any use of language and its linguistic or cultural past, and of the difference between self and other."<sup>19</sup> Allegory is, in this view, "at odds with itself," exposing and exploiting the irreconcilable rift at its center.<sup>20</sup> In this formulation allegory's instability arises from its failure to cohere and its reliance upon a regressive series of preceding signs. Figure, or signifier, no longer viewed as capable of securing meaning, becomes a radically recessive and epistemologically weak form.

More recent attention to allegory's figural basis builds upon over a decade of intense interdisciplinary focus upon the body as a site of cultural meaning. Those of us who deal with the physical stuff of images have much to contribute to this project. The "materialist" interest in allegory foregrounds the concept, well established in Renaissance mythography, that in visual allegory—including its related form, the emblem—its tangible aspect is the "body" from which the "spirit" emanates.<sup>21</sup> Allegories, in other words, operate within the dense network of cultural codes in which both actual and represented bodies become sexed, classed, racially defined and rendered desirable or repellent, safe or dangerous, kin or foreign. In the iconographic and poststructuralist traditions summarized above, allegory invites our interpretation, directing us away from *figura* and toward what have been characterized either as transcendent truths or the regressions of semiosis. Conversely, the materialist notion of allegory ascribes to it an additional and dynamic force which arises specifically from the unruly, less readily-controlled bodily meanings that *figura* mobilizes.<sup>22</sup>

\* \* \*

The essays comprising this anthology are divided under four headings, "Making Allegory," "Allegories of Place," "Allegory and Audience," and "Allegory as Carnal Knowledge." While these rubrics delineate particular commonalities among the texts, they are not meant to limit the crosscurrents and dialogues operating throughout the collection as a whole. We encourage readers to undo our categories and to make their own groupings, whether by geography, chronology, genre, or topic. The essays by Laura Agoston, Christiane Hertel, and Oscar Vázquez can be read together productively since they each explore allegory as a fraught mode, struggling against

incomprehensibility and resistant or disfigured meanings. Agoston draws on the work of Marcel Proust, Paul de Man and Walter Benjamin to explore the function of language to secure meaning in allegory. She argues that Michelangelo was acutely aware of this problem in his figurative sculpture, particularly in those works designed for tombs since they lacked inscriptions but nevertheless elicited allegorical interpretation from viewers. Michelangelo's tomb sculpture merges the process of mourning for the deceased with mourning the demise of meaning *per se*.

According to Hertel, Johann Winckelmann's *Essay on Allegory* of 1766 is situated between an unstable past and a resistant present. While he wished to locate the origins of allegory in archaic Greece, he nevertheless had to turn to Hellenistic examples that belied his temporal claims. His search for an allegorical mode based on the natural adequacy of sign and signified was frustrated by the easy accommodation of allegory in rococo style with its arbitrary, unfixed, and mobile formal qualities. And, for this Enlightenment thinker, even nature itself refused to offer a secure paradigm for order since the volcanic eruption of Mount Vesuvius in 1767 showed Winckelmann how easily memory and meaning could be obliterated.

Vázquez looks at the genre of *casta* paintings in colonial New Spain, arguing that these complex images are situated between traditional and emergent discourses on race. Vázquez draws on de Man's work on allegory to avoid explaining such paintings in the mutually exclusive terms of mimesis on the one hand, or ideology on the other. The images appear to freeze racial categories in a totalizing scheme, yet the very selectivity and seriality of the pictures undermine any attempt at a unitary reading. Realism itself, as a visual strategy, collapses or breaks down under the pressure of capturing minute differences between the supposed "races" in colonial society. Understanding *casta* painting as an allegorical mode that by definition maintains distance from metanarratives of origins should help viewers avoid premature closure and allow them to resist reductive readings.

Paul Kaplan, Cristelle Baskins, and Medina Lasansky each examine the role of personification and spectacle in specific case studies from Renaissance and modern Italy. Kaplan argues that a little-known lost picture by Giorgione refers to the city of Bergamo since it appears to illustrate an event involving one of the city's famous heroines. The potential violation of a woman's chastity forms an allegory of political violation and resistance. Kaplan is able to show that inhabitants of the Veneto would have been attentive readers of such allegorized narratives given their ubiquity in both public and private spaces.

Baskins, similarly, explores sixteenth-century personifications of the city of Pisa. Giambologna's idiosyncratic representation of "Pisa" as a male figure, rather than a more traditional and expected female, calls attention to what might have motivated the change of gender. Baskins argues, after Derrida and Lacan, that the association of Pisa with the female is "under erasure," subtending the entire conception of Giambologna's sculpture despite the gender switch. In contrast to scholars who propose an iconographic reading that would harness meaning to a particular, telling detail, Baskins concludes that Giambologna's experiment with personification exposes allegory's provisional and fugitive effects.

Lasansky looks at the city of Siena and the way in which its historical past was allegorized under the Fascist regime. Whereas contemporary tourists and students alike turn to Siena for a glimpse of “authentic” medieval Italian civic life, Lasansky argues that this vision was actively constructed according to the dictates of Fascist ideology. The *palio*, or horse race, and even the cult of Siena’s local saint Catherine, were all revived or reinforced in order to serve mass culture, nationalist fervor, and regional economies. Forms of spectacle and consumerism that created consensus and civic pride in early modern Siena reappeared in “period dress” to lend legitimacy to the modern Fascist state.

Evelyn Lincoln, Margit Thøfner, Jane Kromm, and Erika Naginski each consider allegory in terms of audience responses located in specific interpretive communities. This set of essays emphasizes the inherent tension between fixed, conventionalized readings and the ever-present potential to shape meaning according to contingent, localized practices or events. Lincoln examines illustrated books of the life of St Benedict produced for both monastic and lay readers in late sixteenth-century Italy. She argues that the layout of the books forces the reader to negotiate between the literal, direct narration of the text and the indirect, visionary, or mysterious content of the illustrations. The process of wandering in a search for meaning is then thematized by the images themselves since they contain meandering paths and tempting details that threaten to halt the reader’s progress toward comprehension and, thus, salvation.

Thøfner compares the function of saints in civic allegory in two different cities, the municipality of Antwerp and the court at Brussels. The Habsburg Archdukes, Albert and Isabella, were associated with various saints who stood for virtues like masculine militancy or feminine charity; these saintly virtues could then be strategically transposed to political registers with differing results. Allegorical imagery involving saints allowed each city to define its ideal political leadership in an indirect rather than confrontational manner. Yet, despite such diplomatic understatement, “consenting and colluding” audiences in the respective cities registered nuances of meaning according to their specific historical and political formations.

Kromm is also interested in the relation of allegory to sovereignty, especially the case of women rulers and their problematic use of martial imagery. Scholars have been quick to dismiss the bellicose dimensions of Minerva when analyzing Peter Paul Rubens’ Marie de Médicis cycle for example, yet Kromm argues that early modern viewers were adept not only at the “learned deciphering” of iconography but also at humoral theory and proto-psychology. Such viewers knew that the warlike Bellona, closely associated with anger and fury, could not be divorced from the wise Minerva. By the eighteenth century, however, the destabilizing potential of this amalgam was no longer acceptable in northern European political allegory.

Naginski examines the debates surrounding personification and allegory in French sculpture of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries by focusing on the Romantic sculptor, Félicie de Fauveau, and her proposed project to commemorate Clémence Isaure, a fifteenth-century lady who promoted troubadour poetry in Toulouse. If Isaure personified Languedoc pride in the historical significance and

regional origins of the French poetic tradition, she likewise offered a more universal conflation of gender and the art of the past. It was on precisely such a conflation that Fauveau drew not only to propose a civic monument celebrating the place of Toulouse in French cultural history but also to lay visual claim to the place of women in the world of art.

In the final set of essays, Rosenthal, Sheriff, and Dean each focus on the female body as vehicle of allegorical meaning. Rosenthal takes us to early seventeenth-century Flanders, the site of iconoclastic destruction, counter-Reformation Catholic rule, and Neostoic philosophy; in this context she argues that visual allegory heightened debates over the relation of the body and its physical senses to the acquisition of knowledge and virtue. Rosenthal examines a painting by Otto Van Veen, related to works by Rubens, in which Venus and Minerva actively compete for the attention of a male youth. The goddesses appear to stand for the opposition of sensuality and rationality. But if the educated male viewer understood Minerva to be the winner of the contest, he was also a *liefhebber*, or lover of art, who could not ignore the carnal, erotic appeal of painting itself embodied by the lactating Venus at the center of the composition.

Sheriff looks at eighteenth-century French images that wrap the body of naked Truth in material as well as allegorical veils. In the frontispiece to the *Encyclopédie* edited by Diderot and d'Alembert, Reason attempts to remove Truth's veils while Imagination rushes forward to embellish her. If the frontispiece was meant to announce the text's systematic and hierarchical distinctions between mind/body, spirit/matter, and wisdom/pleasure, Sheriff argues that incarnate Truth confounds the intentions of the male authors by inciting desire. Sheriff goes on to describe how a particular *femme savante*, the Marquise du Châtelet, used the visual language of allegory to merge the symbolic search for Truth with the practical pursuit of scientific knowledge.

In the final essay, Dean considers an anonymous eighteenth-century Peruvian painting that features America suckling Hispanic babies while indigenous and African children are not allowed to partake of her nourishment; the racial types represented here recall the discussion of *casta* painting as an inherently allegorical mode. Dean also reflects on the predicament of real Andean women employed as wet nurses in colonial Peru whose labor was less valued than that of maids or peons. Wet-nurses were encouraged to view their service to colonial families in terms of the cult of the Virgin and her spiritually elevated lactation of the Christ Child. Dean concludes that the Andean lactating breast—unlike the idealized allegory of America—was not just a symbol of Spanish conquest and exploitation, but the very embodiment of it.

The embodied meanings of allegory, explored by all thirteen authors, confirm Barbara Johnson's suggestion that allegory is fundamentally structured as a difference between self and other. Difference, of course, is embedded within the etymology of the word "allegory" deriving from *allos*, "other" and the verb *agoreuein*, "to speak in the *agora*, that is, the assembly or the public square." Allegorical speech is thus indirect, it is "to speak otherwise," saying one thing by means of another, and it is public.<sup>23</sup> As representatives of the new materialism of allegory, these essays acknowledge

that allegory's abstraction nevertheless depends on concrete political, public or ideological matters; moreover, the abstraction of allegory draws on the specificity and dynamism of gender. While the authors included here consider a range of questions about allegorical interpretation, differing types of objects and images, and contexts of reception, they share an interest in analyzing allegory's negotiation of manifold forms of difference.

## Notes

- 1 Recent scholarship on allegory and related topics that mainly, if not exclusively, treats literary materials includes Maureen Quilligen, *The Language of Allegory: Defining the Genre* (Ithaca, 1979); James Paxson, *The Poetics of Personification* (Cambridge and New York, 1994); and Theresa Kelley, *Reinventing Allegory* (Cambridge and New York, 1997).
- 2 Rosemond Tuve, *Allegorical Imagery: Some Mediaeval Books and their Posterity* (Princeton, 1966) promoted the idea that medieval allegory was inherently simpler than its later formations. A key impetus to the current approaches to medieval visual allegory has been the work of Michael Camille: see, for example, *The Gothic Idol: Ideology and Image-Making in Medieval Art* (Cambridge and New York, 1989).
- 3 Angus Fletcher, *Allegory: The Theory of a Symbolic Mode* (Ithaca, 1964), 23.
- 4 This notion of a struggle at the center of allegory is most thoroughly developed by Gordon Teskey, *Allegory and Violence* (Ithaca, 1996).
- 5 The *locus classicus* for this notion is Paul de Man, *Allegories of Reading: Figural Language in Rousseau, Nietzsche, Rilke and Proust* (New Haven, 1979). For responses to these ideas consult *Reading De Man Reading*, ed. L. Waters and W. Godzich (Minneapolis, 1989), and T. Cohen, *Ideology and Inscription: Cultural Studies after Benjamin, De Man and Bakhtin* (Cambridge and New York, 1998).
- 6 See for example, Craig Owens, "The Allegorical Impulse: Toward a Theory of Postmodernism," *October* 12 (Spring 1980): 67–86 and 13 (Summer 1980): 59–80; and Gail Day, "Allegory: Between Deconstruction and Dialectics," *Oxford Art Journal* 22 (1999): 103–18. A magisterial overview of the varying fortunes of allegorical interpretation, including both modern and postmodern approaches can be found in *Interpretation and Allegory: Antiquity to the Modern Period*, ed. Jon Whitman (Leiden and Boston, 2000).
- 7 A number of anthologies on allegory have included token articles on visual material. For example, an important early anthology containing what have become often-cited essays featured only one article that focused on works of art among the seven contributions; see *Allegory and Representation*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt (Baltimore and London, 1981). *Enlightening Allegory: Theory, Practice, and Contexts of Allegory in the Late Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, ed. Kevin Cope (New York, 1993) treats emblems and a suite of illustrations to Diderot's *Encyclopédie* among articles on drama, poetry, and philosophical texts. More recently, two of the twenty chapters in *Allegory and Interpretation* deal with images: Charles Dempsey on Renaissance hieroglyphics and Peter Daly on emblem books and *imprese*.
- 8 For an overview of the "New Art History" as a phrase describing a set of methodological shifts in the field see Jonathan Harris, *The New Art History: A Critical Introduction* (London and New York, 2001), 1–34.

- 9 Panofsky's key text laying out his iconographic method is "Iconography and Iconology: An Introduction to the Study of Renaissance Art," *Meaning in the Visual Arts* (Garden City, 1955), 26–54. Notable instances of the critique of iconographic method from this period include Svetlana Alpers, *The Art of Describing: Dutch Art in the Seventeenth Century* (Chicago, 1983) and W.J.T. Mitchell, *Iconology: Image, Text, Ideology* (Chicago, 1985). The most thorough analysis of the sources and impact of Panofsky's theories remains Michael Ann Holly, *Panofsky and the Foundations of Art History* (Ithaca and London, 1984). But work on Panofsky continues to grow; see, for example, Silvia Ferreti, *Cassirer, Panofsky and Warburg: Symbol, Art, and History* (New Haven, 1989).
- 10 *Iconography at the Crossroads*, ed. Brendan Cassidy (Princeton, 1993), 3. In her review, Liz James faults the collection for not being critically aware; see *Oxford Art Journal* 18:1 (1995): 143–6. The 1990 conference was followed up by a second event, *Meaning in the Visual Arts: Views from the Outside. A Centennial Commemoration of Erwin Panofsky (1892–1968)*, ed. I. Lavin (Princeton, 1995).
- 11 See, for example, the contributions of Keith Moxey, Michael Camille, and Craig Harbison in Cassidy.
- 12 See especially Mieke Bal and Norman Bryson, "Semiotics and Art History," *Art Bulletin* 73.2 (1991): 174–208. Representative examples include Donald Preziosi, *Rethinking Art History: Reflections on a Coy Science* (New Haven, 1989); and the contributors to *Calligram: Essays in New Art History from France*, ed. N. Bryson (Cambridge and New York, 1988).
- 13 Bal and Bryson, especially 184–7.
- 14 This formalist, visual semiotics is developed in the work of Meyer Schapiro. See, for example, "On Some Problems in the Semiotics of Visual Art: Field and Vehicle in Image Signs," in Meyer Schapiro, *Theory and Philosophy of Art: Style, Artist and Society* (New York, 1994), 1–32 (originally published in *Simiolus* 4/5.1 [1972–73]: 9–19); and *Words, Scripts and Pictures: Semiotics of Visual Language* (New York, 1996).
- 15 The phrase "new materialism of allegory" comes from James Paxson, "(Re)Facing Prosopopeia and Allegory in Contemporary Theory and Iconography," *Studies in Iconography* 22 (2001): 1–20.
- 16 Ernst Gombrich insists upon the careful consideration of decorum, context and genre in the process of interpreting allegories in "The Aims and Limits of Iconology," *Symbolic Images, Studies in the Art of the Renaissance* (London and New York, 1975), 1–22. In the essay "*Icones Symbolicae*" from the same collection, Gombrich outlines the philosophical tradition informing allegory as a dominant form of Western art. See also Rudolf Wittkower, *Allegory and the Migration of Symbols* (New York, 1977).
- 17 Walter Benjamin, *Origins of German Tragic Drama*, trans. J. Osborne (New York, 1985). See Bainard Cowan, "Walter Benjamin's Theory of Allegory," *New German Critique* 22 (Winter 1981): 109–22; and Matthew Rampley, "Mimesis and Allegory. On Aby Warburg and Walter Benjamin," *Art History as Cultural History: Warburg's Projects*, ed. R. Woodfield (Amsterdam, 2001), 121–50.
- 18 See de Man, *Allegories of Reading* and "The Rhetoric of Temporality," in *Blindness and Insight* (Minneapolis, 1983), 187–228.
- 19 Barbara Johnson, "Women and Allegory," *The Wake of Deconstruction* (Oxford and Cambridge, 1994), 52–75. Quotation on 63.
- 20 See Jon Whitman, *Allegory: The Dynamics of an Ancient and Medieval Technique* (Cambridge, MA, 1987), 2.
- 21 On this tradition see Whitman (2000), 276 ff.

- 22 Marina Warner, *Monuments and Maidens: The Allegory of the Female Form* (New York, 1985; reprinted Berkeley and Los Angeles, 2000) remains a model of this type of materialist and interdisciplinary work.
- 23 See “On the History of the Term ‘Allegory’” in Whitman (1987), 263–8.