

John Barclay (1582-1621) wrote works in several genres. His first was a commentary on Statius, followed by a book of laudatory verse and other poems, several dedicated to his patron King James of England. Barclay entered King James's service in 1603 and remained with the King until 1615.¹ While in London Barclay wrote two books of satire in the style of Petronius (*Euphormio's Satyricon* - the King appears as a character in this satire). Barclay also wrote a controversial work defending his father's view on the divine right of kings. Barclay's best known work, the political romance novel *Argenis*, appeared in 1621, the year of his death. These three genres, celebratory verse, satire, and novel, were much cultivated by writers of the 17th century, during Barclay's lifetime.

Another genre began to flourish around 1600, in England at any rate; this was the writing of characters, the concise description of a type of person, such as the miser, the bad-tempered man, and so on. Barclay wrote in this genre as well in his book *Icon Animorum* (1614), translated by Thomas May as *Mirror of Minds* (1633). This work has three parts: a description of four ages of man (with particular emphasis on childhood), secondly the character of the European nations, and last, the character of men. In many ways the *Icon* is the most personal of Barclay's works: he had seven children, he traveled widely in Europe on King James's service, and he became acquainted with a wide variety of personalities while trying to make a living at the court. The three parts of the *Icon* match these three aspects of his life.

This paper will describe the character genre as it developed in the first two decades of the 17th century and will outline some similarities and differences between Barclay's character sketches and the more common type of contemporary character sketch. I will then briefly discuss the development of the character genre and the rise of the novel, with parallels from Barclay's works. I will cite English examples, because the genre first began to flourish in England, but it did become popular in France as well in the later decades of the 17th century. The discussion will be organized around three points: the type of character portrayed, the genre's purpose, and its style.

1. The character genre (or *charactery*, to use a 17th century word) was very specifically defined. A *Scholars Guide* of 1665 says it is "a witty and facetious description of the nature and qualities of some person or sort of person." [Ralph Johnson *The Scholars Guide* 1665] It is a short essay in prose about a person whose presiding vice (sometimes virtue) is manifest in a number of tell-tale traits and gestures [Beecher 34]. It is not the portrait of a specific living individual. As you know, the primary source of the genre was Theophrastus, whose *Characters* present us with some 30 brief descriptions of how certain types behave. All the characters are portrayed in somewhat negative terms; they are at least flawed if not, sometimes, downright bad human beings: the officious man, the flatterer, the unscrupulous, the chatterer, the late-learner. The descriptions themselves follow the same pattern: a one-sentence definition of the vice, then examples. Example:

¹ King James called himself a "prentice in the divine art of poesie", and David Hume said of him that he was a rival of the Psalmist both as king and poet. So it was actually in hopes of commendation by a connoisseur that Barclay dedicated his poems to the King. Flattery such as David Hume's is, of course, satirized in the notorious *Corona Regia* of 1615. I owe this reference to my colleague Paul McGinnis.

"Distrustfulness is a presumption that all men are unjust", then the text shows what the distrustful man will do: he will send a slave to do the shopping and another slave after him to see how much the first one paid; he will carry money himself and sit down every 200 yards to count it; he will do this and that, and so on. Everything is external, motives or thoughts are never mentioned, the subject is always "he", sentences are short and to the point. English characters of the 17th and 18th century exemplified this same style with only minor modifications.

2. Theophrastus's purpose in writing these characters is debated: these are humorous sketches, a comedy of manners; they are a source for drama - indeed some titles of Menander's plays match the characters (*Kolax-The Flatterer*, *Dyskolos-The Bad-Tempered Man*, *Misoumenos-The Man She Hated*); they are a source for orators - Quintilian assigns the student to write sketches of a rustic, a miser, a coward (6.2.17); perhaps they are part of a scientific classification of human personalities - on this assumption there would have been good types as well, which have not survived. But when Theophrastus was translated in the 16th century, there was no debate about his purpose. Isaac Casaubon, whose translation in 1592 became the standard, said that Theophrastus's purpose was the portrayal of virtues and vices so as to encourage the listener to seek out the good life and to flee from evil ways. The first writer of a character book in England, Joseph Hall, follows Casaubon and says that his characters are "speaking pictures whereby the ruder multitude might learn to know virtue and discern what to detest" [1608]. His characters were in this regard like those portrayed in a morality play or sermon. As a result Hall, unlike Theophrastus, included virtuous types: the Wise Man, the Honest Man, the Valiant, the Penitent, as well as vicious types. Some are the same as in Theophrastus (the Flatterer); others derive from sermons (the Slothful, the Envious). Hall gave the whole collection a moral and religious dimension entirely missing in Theophrastus. Hall's *Characters* were published in England while Barclay was at the court - not that I am implying that Barclay saw or read it, which I doubt. Most of the other English character writers do not display Hall's strong moral purpose, but such a purpose is often in the background.

3. Something has been said about Theophrastus's style, concise and to the point. What about later writers? In 1614, while Barclay was preparing to leave England, the first edition of the best known character collection appeared, Sir Thomas Overbury's *Characters*. Subsequent enlarged editions appeared for several decades, eventually including 83 characters plus other materials.² Overbury himself did not write most of the characters circulating under his name, but the notoriety of his fate doubtless helped the sale of his book. Some of the characters were written by the playwrights John Webster and Thomas Dekker; one was by John Donne; several were by women, the Countess of Bedford and perhaps the Countess of Dorset.

² Overbury himself was an interesting person. A courtier, he was imprisoned in the Tower in 1613 on obscure charges and was poisoned there by Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset, for whom Overbury had been secretary, and Francis Howard, Countess of Essex. Carr and Francis Howard then married as soon as she was divorced from Lord Essex. The happy couple was then promptly arrested and convicted of Overbury's murder, but were pardoned by King James. This spectacular case poisoned the atmosphere at the court and was notorious throughout Europe. Barclay even mentioned it in his novel *Argenis*.

In his 83 characters Overbury included most of those in Theophrastus and Hall, such as the Flatterer, a Wiseman, a Dissembler, but he added professions (a Tailor, a Soldier, a Judge) and national types (a Dutchman Resident in England, A Buttonmaker of Amsterdam, a Braggart Welshman). Conceits (like riddles) and puns are typical of his style. Here is part of a Mere Scholar:

A mere scholar is an intelligible ass, or a silly fellow in black that speaks sentences more familiarly than sense... But if he ever get a fellowship, he then has no fellow... In a word he is the index of a man, and a title page of a scholar, or a puritan in morality; much in profession, nothing in practice.

A more extreme example is the Pedant:

He treads in a rule, and one hand scans verses, and the other holds his scepter. He dares not think a thought, that the nominative case governs not the verb, and he never had meaning in his life, for he traveled only for words... be brief, he is a heteroclite for he wants the plural number, having only the single quality of words.

Another example of a conceit: "Prison is a little commonwealth, although little wealth be common there" (Mynshul 1618). These sketches are full of puns, conceits, alliteration and balance, are very brief with one epigrammatic sentence after another, and very exaggerated, which is the whole point. The character isolates an idiosyncratic quality and makes it the whole picture. Other collections of characters in this style appeared in England during the succeeding decades, the last major collection by Samuel Butler, written in the 1660's, but not published until 1759. The genre had lost its audience by then and had morphed into the novel, of which more later. It is hard to see a moral purpose in Overbury, and many of the later writers of characters aim at pure entertainment.

What about Barclay considered against this background? Barclay wrote many of the same types of characters as the contemporary writers. His *Icon Animorum*, composed right at the time when character writing flourished, contains portraits of many of the same types of characters as did Hall or Overbury. These include the Slow-Thinker, the Wastrel Youth, the Timid Man. His experiences at King James's court led him to include a collection of court characters: the Tyrant, the Elected King, the King by Inheritance, plus portraits of some typical personalities among courtiers. He also wrote depictions of a Religious Controversialist, a Founder of a Religion (probably thinking of Mohammed), a Reformer, a Poor Man at Court. However, Barclay's purpose in writing seems quite different from that of the other authors, and his style is quite different. I'll deal with the three points in order.

First point 1, the types. Like other characters Barclay's portraits are not of living individuals, but of types. Let's look at some passages from the *Icon*. In chapter 10 Barclay classifies men according to how quick-witted they are:

De ingeniis ad subitos iocos aut sententias valentibus. De aliis qui spontanea eloquentia diffunduntur. De hominibus tardioris lentiorisque prudentiae. Perfectos demum esse qui inter haec duo genera sunt positi.

Of wits that are strong at sudden jests and sentences. Of others that flow in a natural and facile eloquence. Of men of a slow and deliberate wisdom. That they are most perfect which are placed betwixt those two.

Some are prone to sudden jests, others have a ready eloquence, others are slower to speak. Barclay makes some pointed comments:

Sed cum omnia animalia id quo potissimum valent arcano impetu sentiant et eo uti ament, tum isti maxime sua eloquentia delectati, qua una insignes sunt, haud facile modum tenent, quamcumque rem dicendi libido rapuerit; ut mirari iure possis, in tanta imprudentia tam commode dici posse. Solutis deinde colloquiis, quae importune produxere, cum illos, quos loquendo fatigaverunt, laetae et porrectae frontis vident, non cogitant ab intempestivae orationis fastidio dimissos gaudere, sed ut perfusos magnifica voluptate, eo omine sinunt abire ut, si in se rursus inciderint, de eodem cibo gustent.

But as all living creatures by a secret instigation love to be doing of that thing in which they are most able, so these men, especially delighted in their own eloquence wherein they excel, can hardly contain themselves within a mean when all occasions of discourses are; so that you may justly wonder that such absurd men should speak so well. When their tedious discourse is done and they see those men whom their discourse hath wearied look cheerful, they do not consider that the other are only glad to be dismissed from the trouble of their tedious talk, but think them ravished with a pleasant admiration, and go away resolved to entertain them in that manner again the next time they meet.

This is very much the sort of image given by Overbury, except that Barclay always says "they", not "he". A second example: Men tardy in speech, not facile and fluent, but not stupid, are often harassed by the quicker-witted:

Hi igitur, cum subito loquendum est, tardam aegriusve sequentem orationem habent, haerentque saepissime blandimentis lacessiti vel iocis, quae subiti et expediti ingenii homines in quotidianis colloquiis tamquam levia tela contorquent. Neque autem sola verba aegre expediunt, sed sicubi etiam dicenda sententia quaerunt quid sentiant neque statim inveniunt.

These men when there is occasion to speak suddenly, have a speech tardy and hard to come off. They do often stick and are squibbed with jests and taunts, which like little darts, are in daily discourse thrown against them by those sudden and nimble witted men. Nor do their words only come slowly off; but when their opinion is required, they are to seek and do not suddenly find what to determine.

Barclay's chapter 11 contrasts the valiant and the timorous nature. Here is the timorous man:

Quos autem haec imbecillitas fregerit scire, nisi cum pericula instant, idcirco est arduum, quia sibi conscii turpissimi metus diligenter illius indicia tegunt, etiam adornatis ad audaciam verbis et discrimina quodammodo lacescentes, cum utique illa absunt. Ceterum iniurias, contumeliam, cladem quam timere tam pati idonei, ad omnem speciem minantis fortunae horrescere; neque haec mala, quae tantopere metuunt, forti constantique studio sed deiecto ac ignobili declinare; virtutem singulorum atque vim ne quidem temptatam expertamve supra suam timide ducere; cunctosque et odisse et invita ingrataque apud se veneratione mirari. Cum impune autem licet, effusi in crudelitatem, sive quo audaciam simulent sive foeda et angusta natura in vindictam imminente, denique futurum timorem occupantes, subrutis quos metuere in posterum possent. Benigni tamen vultus sunt et ab innata ferocia dissidentes, ut Syrtibus arenisque similes esse credideris, quae brevibus ac placidis undis tectae, tamen vestigiorum impatientes in immensum subsidere solent et haurire calcantes.

But it is hard to know such cowards except only when dangers are at hand, because, knowing in themselves this base fear, they strive with diligence to hide the signs of it and cunningly counterfeit bold speeches challenging (as it were) all dangers, when they see they are far from them. But injuries, affronts, and reproaches they can put up [with] as well as fear. They tremble at every show of threatening fortune; nor do they strive to decline those evils which they fear so much by a valiant and constant endeavour, but by a dejected and ignoble way. They esteem the virtue and force of every man, although untried, above their own. They hate all men, and yet admire them with a secret veneration, which is not only against their wills but unpleasing to them. But when they may safely, they are very cruel, either to counterfeit courage or that their base and narrow natures are prone to revenge, or else to prevent their future fear by destroying those that might afterwards threaten them. But their countenances are kind and much different from their inward cruelty; so that you may think them like quicksands, covered with still waters, but deep and devouring in a storm.

With this sketch we can compare Hall's Vainglorious Man, who recounts "what challenges he has made and answered, what exploits he did at Calais or Nieupoort", i.e. far away; or compare with Overbury's Vainglorious Coward in Command, who rails "openly against all the commanders of the adverse party, yet in his own conscience allows them for better men." His cowardice "makes him think better of another man than himself."

Barclay then contrasts steadiness and inconstancy, what we might call manic behavior. Here is the inconstant man:

Est aliud ingeniorum genus, paene ceterorum omnium discrimina mira quidem sed illaudabili varietate complectens, tamen in primis egregium, si quam illi impetum tam frenum natura addidisset. Illud est hominum, ut quique affectus impulerint, ad extrema ruentium. Si pietas serio illis placet et Numinis cultus, quasi nulla hilaritas intercedere tam sanctis officiis possit, fronte deiecta et ad omnem remissionem irascente supercilium induunt non duraturae sanctitatis. Alienae etiam vitae superbi

censores ceterorum probitatem ex sua extemporanea severitate metiuntur. Tunc priorum amicitiarum delicias solent abiicere, etiamque innocentem iucunditatem non ferunt, quae in sapientium vita ad oblivionem vel patientiam laborum solet interseri. Mox nimia intentione fractum animi robur, ubi odisse incipit hanc ipsam cui inconsulte incubuit pietatem, non per gradus et reciprocantis aestus vices sed in contrarium acto torrente repetit quem omiserat luxum. Tunc vero tam immodice in voluptates solvi quam eas inepte refugerant; tunc etiam ipsum nomen severitatis odisse iocisque et omni libertate cultoribus subhorridae illius pietatis, quam modo reliquerunt, illudere. Dum haec agunt, ecce tibi! revocata pietas adest tristisque paenitentia lasciviam rursus expellit, donec etiam illius paenitentiae inceperit paenitere.

There is another kind of disposition which contains in it almost all these, howsoever different, with a wonderful but not laudable variety. Yet a brave disposition it were, if nature had allowed it a bridle as well as spurs. And that is of men that run into the extremes of whatsoever their affections lead them to. If they would be religious, presently as if it were not lawful to interpose any recreations among those holy duties, they put on a mortified face, brooking no remission, and a look of such holiness as cannot last. They are proud censurers of other men's lives, and measure all men's honesty by their own sudden severity. Then they shake off the pleasure of their old friendships and cannot brook innocent mirth, which wise men mingle with their cares, as an help either to forget them or overcome them. Anon, when the strength of their minds is broken by too much intention, when they begin to be weary of this rigid piety which they so unadvisedly followed, turning back they run again to their former course of riot not by degrees and ordinary turning tides (as it were) but like a torrent. Then they let themselves loose to pleasures as immoderately as before they had forsaken them foolishly. Then they hate the very name of severity, and with all manner of jests scoff at the professors of that rigid piety which themselves have lately left. While they are thus busied, behold, religion comes upon them again and with a sad repentance drives away that wantonness, until they begin again to repent themselves of that repentance.

With this we can compare Hall's Unconstant Man, especially in regard to religion: Hall's Unconstant Man "loved simple truth; thence diverting his eyes, he fell in love with idolatry; these heathenish shrines had never any more dotting and besotted client; and now of late he is leaped from Rome to Munster and is grown to giddy Anabaptism." Note the specific, colorful detail missing in Barclay. We can see that the types of characters are similar in Barclay and the contemporary English writers, with the exception that Barclay included far more court types.

Barclay's special interests appear in chapter 13, the dispositions of tyrants, kings, noblemen. He portrays the character of different types of kings: tyrants (those who have seized power in a state), elected kings (such as the holy Roman Emperor), and kings by inheritance (such as King James). Tyrants trust no one and favor the mob and are ready for anything; elected kings make extraordinary efforts to win fame for themselves,

sometimes to the detriment of the state; the character of kings by inheritance should perhaps not be too closely investigated, since they rule by decree of heaven. Barclay continues the discussion of the court in chapter 14, the character of favorites, courtiers, and other hangers-on. One example is the youth who lets sudden advancement go to his head. Barclay emphasizes the telling moment:

Ceterum eadem aut illic non videt aut peiori quam caecitatis malo iuventus inconsulta aspernatur et saepe parentum indigna laboribus, a quorum opulenta modestia luxurioso et mox egeno ambitu divertit. Illis pulchrum ipsum regiae nomen et in proceribus numerari — credo maxime quia haec prima libertas est a scholis aut magistrorum supercilio exeuntium. Neque desunt qui hos novitios ad inexperta vitia propellant. Quod si illos perfunctorio principis nutu aut verborum comitate beari contigerit, tunc vero solutis superbo gaudio articulis paene labare: qui adfuerint, quos tantae gratiae testes habuerint, vix se tenentibus oculis perlustrare. Sed maxime lasciviae ludorumque famam amant quasi in nobilitatis — et quidem iam virilis — indicium. Nec pro sua se fortuna, sed ex magnatum sumptu regunt. Ita cursum supra se euntium aemulati, nec vestigiis tantis pares exhausto spiritu deficiunt. Hinc interim alieni acerbitas aeris et indigni questus in principes ab his ipsis qui peccarunt, quasi suorum omnium ingeniis sapientiam possint infundere, debeatve sacrum aerarium et per hoc respublica tantae libidinantium insaniae poenas dare.

But these things are either not discerned or else despised by the more than blinded young courtiers, who oftentimes unworthy of their parents' careful pains fall away from their wealthy modesty in a luxurious (and afterwards needy) ambition. It is enough for them to be named courtiers and numbered among men of honour, maybe because it is the first liberty that they taste after they are freed from the jurisdiction of their schoolmasters, and there are enough there to draw these novices into debauchment. But if they chance to receive the least grace in countenance or words from the prince himself, they are scarce able to bear so proud a joy, but with ravished eyes look about them to see who are by, to witness this great honour. But especially they seek after the fame of revelling and wanton courtship, as a note of nobility and manly virtue; nor do they moderate themselves according to their own estates, but to the expenses of great men, so emulating the course of those that are above them, and not able to keep pace with them, they run themselves out of breath and faint. From hence they grow heavily in debt, and complain against the prince, where themselves are in fault, as if the prince could infuse wisdom into all his servants, or that his sacred treasury, and through that, the commonwealth, should suffer for the profuse madness of these wanton fools.

Much indeed of chapter 14 consists of instructions on how to succeed at court, a topic dear to Barclay, who scraped out a living by his wits at King James's court from 1603 to 1615.³ Barclay portrays the successful courtier, the poor courtier who can barely make the necessary show, the wastrel youth, and so on. While Overbury wrote a character The Courtier, his description is entirely outside the court, how the courtier appears in public:

³ Several passages in the British State Papers refer to Barclay's petitioning for his salary.

"he puts more confidence in his words than meaning... If you find him not here, you shall in Paul's, with a picktooth in his hat, a cape-cloak, and a long stocking."⁴ Contemporary character writers also wrote of kings. Nicholas Breton (1616) wrote *A Worthy King and An Unworthy King*. The former is "a figure of God...the chief of men...the Church's champion" and so on. Simply a list of abstract qualities. In contrast with Barclay, Breton gives no reasons for any king's behavior and certainly no classification of kings other than good or bad. In a similar manner Lord North (1645) wrote a character of the King, again more a list of what a king should be, rather than a study like Barclay's or a satirical description a la Overbury - not that such a description would have been safe to write. But Barclay, in the safe obscurity of a learned language, did not hesitate to portray kings and nobles in some detail. Indeed he liked it so much that a great part of the descriptions in chapters 13 and 14 reoccur in his novel *Argenis*, where he reports a debate about the nature of kingship, (Bk. 1) and on the difficulty of finding competent men for court service (Bk. 1).

What about purpose, our point 2 above? Barclay aimed at more than entertainment. He suggests ways to improve one's defects. For example in the case of the slow-speaking men who are "squibbed with jests and taunts" by their quick-witted fellows, Barclay suggests that they perform daily exercises to stir up their slow wit. No such suggestions ever occur in proper character sketches. In the case of the cowardly man, Barclay suggests that by prudence and wisdom he can overcome this defect and become worthy of admiration. He also discusses what should be done if a prince has this cowardly nature, and then narrates an incident from the French defeat at Pavia in 1525 in which (apparent) cowardice was overcome. In addition Barclay has a theoretical framework for his descriptions, the Aristotelian mean between two extremes. As Barclay says right after the passage just quoted: "Between these inconvenient extremes of gravity and levity, is the most worthy disposition and fit to reach the height of human dignity" i.e. those of a steady intelligence and a clear discourse.

I have compared Barclay's types and purpose to contemporary practice. There is little to say about style. Barclay shows none of the conceits, puns, and paradoxes so loved by the English character writers. In this respect Barclay maintains the decorum appropriate to his Latin style.

My final point concerns the later history of character. The character sketch has long been considered one of the sources of the English novel. Character added critical realism (even if exaggerated) to the stock figures of romance; it added a touch of the real world. In the 18th century characters became a type of short story, especially in *The Tatler* and *The Spectator*, where the figures portrayed took on names and were treated like characters in a novel. (Sir Roger de Coverly, the very picture of a country squire, was a recurring character in *The Spectator*.⁵) A century later, George Eliot, perhaps the

⁴ Paul's = St. Paul's; the toothpick, cloak, and long stocking are foreign affectations.

⁵ "The first of our society is a gentleman of Worcestershire, of ancient descent, a baronet, his name is Sir Roger de Coverley. His great-grandfather was inventor of that famous country-dance which is called after him. All who know that shire are very well acquainted with the parts and merits of Sir Roger. He is a gentleman that is very singular in his behaviour, but his singularities proceed from his good sense, and are

greatest of the Victorian novelists, wrote a long character "Impressions of Theophrastus Such", an old bachelor.⁶ Dickens of course is well known for the character sketches included in his novels.

But Barclay was already a novelist when he published *Icon Animorum* (having published *Euphormio's Satyricon*) and he anticipated this development in his own works. In his earlier *Euphormio* Barclay had given a portrait of a Puritan (*Euphormio* 2.31). The Puritan characterizes himself in his own words: his grief at Euphormio's desecration of the Sabbath ("largos profundere fletus coepit"); his self-righteousness ("pure heavenly doctrine" "purior quaedam doctrina caeli" flowed into him alone); his confidence in heaven; his lusty enthusiasm for his wife; and so on. This portrait is not a real character sketch, neither is it a portrait of a real person, but it combines the realism of the character with the plot and dialog of the novel, the very combination found in the later English novel. Likewise at the end of chapter 14 of *Icon Animorum*, after his description of the various types of courtiers, he recounts the story of Caepio and Mella, two schoolfriends who meet later in life, after each has gained some success. Mella travels to Germany to meet Caepio, only to find that his friend has become a first-class snob thanks to his success at court. This little narrative and the dialog between the two give a more vivid picture than the author's previous catalog of types. Barclay's desire to include character sketches in the novel and in a general work on the nature of society caused him to write a type of sketch that differed from those of his contemporaries, who treated the character as a free-standing genre either of exhortation or of entertainment.

contradictions to the manners of the world, only as he thinks the world is in the wrong. However this humour creates him no enemies, for he does nothing with sourness or obstinacy; and his being unconfined to modes and forms, makes him but the readier and more capable to please and oblige all who know him." [The De Coverley Papers from 'The Spectator', Joseph Addison and Others. ed. Joseph Meek 1920]

⁶ George Eliot, *Impressions of Theophrastus Such* (2nd. edition 1879) - Why should I expect to be admired, and have my company doted on? I have done no services to my country beyond those of every peaceable orderly citizen; and as to intellectual contribution, my only published work was a failure, so that I am spoken of to inquiring beholders as "the author of a book you have probably not seen." (The work was a humorous romance, unique in its kind, and I am told is much tasted in a Cherokee translation, where the jokes are rendered with all the serious eloquence characteristic of the Red races.) This sort of distinction, as a writer nobody is likely to have read, can hardly counteract an indistinctness in my articulation, which the best-intentioned loudness will not remedy. Then, in some quarters my awkward feet are against me, the length of my upper lip, and an inveterate way I have of walking with my head foremost and my chin projecting. One can become only too well aware of such things by looking in the glass, or in that other mirror held up to nature in the frank opinions of street-boys, or of our Free People travelling by excursion train; and no doubt they account for the half-suppressed smile which I have observed on some fair faces when I have first been presented before them. This direct perceptive judgment is not to be argued against.