



Historicizing the Embodied Imagination in Early Modern English Literature

Mark Kaethler · Grant Williams

palgrave
macmillan

Historicizing the Embodied Imagination in Early
Modern English Literature

Mark Kaethler • Grant Williams
Editors

Historicizing the
Embodied
Imagination in Early
Modern English
Literature

palgrave
macmillan

Editors

Mark Kaethler
Department of Arts
Medicine Hat College
Medicine Hat, AB, Canada

Grant Williams
Department of English
Carleton University
Cantley, ON, Canada

ISBN 978-3-031-55063-8 ISBN 978-3-031-55064-5 (eBook)
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-55064-5>

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2024

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use. The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG.

The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Paper in this product is recyclable.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This volume began during conversations and sessions at the Renaissance Society of America's 2019 meeting in Toronto. While the editors unfortunately could not continue these at the RSA's 2020 meeting due to the global pandemic, they are thankful for those contributors who carried on with the work as well as to those who joined the project later to bring this volume to fruition.

Kaethler would like to thank their fellow faculty at Medicine Hat College, especially Nicole Burnett and Diane Gall, for sharing cross-disciplinary insights about the embodied imagination as well as Williams for all the great conversations that led to this book, for his wisdom, and for initially suggesting this collaboration after reconnecting at the 2017 RSA in Chicago—it has been a pleasure and a privilege. They would also like to thank their family for general support, especially their companion sensitive souls (Arlo, Dido, and Virtute) and their fellow intellectual soul in this life (Katie).

For inspiring conversations on the imagination, Williams would like to thank Donald Beecher, Amy Cooper, Travis DeCook, William Engel, Rebeca Helfer, and Daniel Lochman. Most of all, he wants to express gratitude to his co-editor, whose professionalism, Zoom-forgiveness, intellectual energy, and sharp scholarly insights made this collaborative project a pleasurable and edifying one.

CONTENTS

1	Introduction: The Imagination and Image in Premodern Faculty Psychology	1
	Mark Kaethler and Grant Williams	
Part I	The Visual Imagination	23
2	The Imagination in Distress: Amoret's Brain and the Busyrane Factor in Spenser's <i>Faerie Queene</i>, Book 3	25
	Donald Beecher	
3	"If all the world could have seen't": Imagination and the Unseen in <i>The Winter's Tale</i>	45
	Darryl Chalk	
4	The Iconoclastic Imagination: John Donne's Metaphysical Conceits	67
	Amy Cooper	
Part II	Sensory and Affective Imaginings	87
5	The Phenomenal Imagining Body in Shakespeare	89
	Susan Sachon	

6	Infected Fancies and Penetrative Poetics in <i>The Rape of Lucrece</i>	109
	Catherine Reedy	
7	The “Imagination of Eating”: The Role of the Imagination in Appetite Stimulation and Suppression	129
	Jan Purnis	
Part III Artifice and the Mnemonic Imagination		149
8	Confronting Imagination in Langland, Spenser, and Bacon	151
	William E. Engel	
9	The Feudal Art of Memory and the Treacherous Imagination: Coveting the Golden Phantasm in Mammon’s House of Trade	173
	Grant Williams	
10	Seeing God Through Spectacles: Donne’s “Engines” of the Imagination	195
	Pavneet Aulakh	
11	“A Work of Fancy”: World-Making Imagination as an Art of Memory in Margaret Cavendish’s <i>Blazing World</i>	215
	Rebecca Helfer	
Part IV Higher Imaginings		235
12	Fantasy and the Imagined Music of the Spheres in <i>Pericles</i>	237
	Deanna Smid	

- 13 Reconciliation and Recreation at the Meeting Place for
Opposites: Revisiting Donne’s Imagined Corners** 259
Anton E. Bergstrom
- 14 “I think h’as knocked his brains out”: Unhealthy
Imagination in *The Atheist’s Tragedy*** 281
Mark Kaethler
- 15 From the Image of Christ to the Imagining of the
Sovereign: Donne, Hobbes, and the Eclipse of
Participation and Transformation** 301
Travis DeCook
- Index** 321

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Pavneet Aulakh is a Senior Lecturer in the Department of English at Vanderbilt University. He has published on Francis Bacon in *English Literary History* as well as *Paradise Lost* and Bacon's natural philosophy in *Milton and the New Scientific Age: Poetry, Science, Fiction* (Routledge, 2019). Together with James Kearney, he is currently co-editing the collection *Experiential & Experimental Knowledge on the Early Modern English Stage* (under contract with Edinburgh University Press).

Donald Beecher is an Emeritus Professor of the Department of English at Carleton University, Ottawa, and a fellow of the Royal Society of Canada. His publications range from translations of early French, Italian, and Spanish plays to a study of Renaissance literature and the cognitive sciences, as well as several editions of early English prose fiction. His articles and introductions include studies of pharmacology, sixteenth-century Italian theater, fairy tales and folklore, the inquisition, lovesickness, sex changes, trickster cycles, early museology, nostalgia, and suspense. In his leisure time he plays the viola da gamba and has edited 60 editions of early music.

Anton E. Bergstrom teaches first-year communication and analysis seminars at the University of Waterloo on such topics as originality and plague and pandemic narratives. He received his PhD from Wilfrid Laurier University in 2020 for his dissertation titled "Holy Estrangement: The Poetics of Estrangement in John Donne's Divine Poems and Sermons." While he remains active in Donne studies and continues to research the

history of defamiliarization, he is also currently exploring plague literature, including Donne's verse letters alluding to plague.

Darryl Chalk is Senior Lecturer in Theater at the University of Southern Queensland and Treasurer of the Australian and New Zealand Shakespeare Association. He is co-editor of *Contagion and the Shakespearean Stage* (with Mary Floyd-Wilson, 2019), *Rapt in Secret Studies: Emerging Shakespeares* (with Laurie Johnson, 2010), and has published a range of articles and book chapters on contagion, emotion, and theatricality in Shakespearean drama. His current project is *Caregiving in Shakespeare's Changing World*, a volume for Arden Shakespeare, co-edited with Rebecca Totaro.

Amy Cooper is Assistant Professor of English and Creative Arts at the United States Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs. Her essays have appeared in *English Literary History* and *Studies in Philology*. Her work focuses on premodern theories of sensory cognition, the history of aesthetics, and early modern poetics, and she is currently working on a book about the visual aesthetics of early modern poetry.

Travis DeCook is Associate Professor of English at Carleton University, Ottawa. He is the author of *The Origins of the Bible and Early Modern Political Thought* (Cambridge University Press, 2021), and co-editor of *Taking Exception to the Law* (University of Toronto Press, 2015) and *Shakespeare, the Bible, and the Form of the Book* (Routledge, 2011). His essays have appeared in such journals as *Literature and Theology*, *Political Theology*, *Religion and Literature*, and *Studies in Philology*.

William E. Engel is the Nick B. Williams Professor of Literature at The University of the South, in Sewanee, Tennessee. He has published ten books on literary history including collaborative volumes with Rory Loughnane and Grant Williams, *The Memory Arts in Renaissance England* (Cambridge 2016) and *The Death Arts in Renaissance England* (Cambridge 2022), as well as a co-edited collection, *Memory and Mortality in Renaissance England* (Cambridge 2022), and *The Shakespearean Death Arts* (Palgrave 2022) co-edited with Grant Williams.

Rebeca Helfer is Associate Professor of English at the University of California-Irvine. She is the author of *Spenser's Ruins and The Art of Recollection*, which examines Edmund Spenser's mnemonic poetics throughout his career. Rebeca Helfer is currently completing a book about

early modern poetics of memory as literary theory-in-practice, entitled *Art of Memory in Early Modern England: Poetics of Ruin and Recollection*.

Mark Kaethler is Academic Chair of Arts at Medicine Hat College; they work on research teams with the *Map of Early Modern London* and *Linked Early Modern Drama Online* at the University of Victoria; and they are a Book Review Editor for *Early Theatre*. They are the author of *Thomas Middleton and the Plural Politics of Jacobean Drama* and a co-editor of *Shakespeare's Language in Digital Media: Old Words, New Tools*. Their work has been published in several journals and edited collections.

Jan Purnis is Associate Professor of English at Champion College at the University of Regina. She has published on autoscapy, out-of-body experiences, mind-wandering, and early modern consciousness; the belly-mind relationship and early modern “second brain”; the stomach and early modern emotion; and the gendered stomach in *The Taming of the Shrew*. A chapter on Sanctorius’s self-weighing experiments is forthcoming.

Catherine Reedy is a Visiting Assistant Professor at Lake Forest College where her teaching and research interests include English Renaissance drama, medical and religious practices, and narratives of revenge. Her work has been published or is forthcoming in *Early Modern Literary Studies*, an essay collection on *Religion and Medicine in the Transatlantic World*, and the *Map of Early Modern London*. She received her doctorate from Harvard University and is at work on a book-length study on contagion and performance, titled *Pestilent Congregations: Drama and Devotion in the Early Modern Theater*.

Susan Sachon is Honorary Research Associate at Royal Holloway, University of London, UK. She completed her PhD at Royal Holloway University of London, in 2013, and her book, *Shakespeare, Objects and Phenomenology: Daggers of the Mind* was published by Palgrave Macmillan in 2020. She has directed over 40 productions locally, including Shakespeare plays, and runs Shakespeare workshops, where she also coaches students for exams and auditions.

Deanna Smid is Associate Professor of English at Brandon University. She completed a SSHRC Postdoctoral Fellowship at the Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies at the University of Toronto, and Brill Rodopi published her monograph, *The Imagination in Early Modern English Literature*, in 2017. Her recent research on emblems, on the

imagination, and on music in early modern English literature has been published in journals such as *Shakespeare*, *Early Modern Literary Studies*, *Cahiers Élisabéthains*, and *Emblematica*.

Grant Williams is an Associate Professor in the Department of English at Carleton University in Ottawa, Canada. With William E. Engel, he has co-edited the essay collection *The Shakespearean Death Arts* (Palgrave, 2022), and, with Engel and Rory Loughnane, co-edited the collection *Memory and Mortality in Renaissance England* (Cambridge, 2022). With Donald Beecher, he is co-editor of Henry Chettle's *Kind-Heart's Dream and Piers Plainness: Two Pamphlets from the Elizabethan Book Trade* (CRRS, 2022).

LIST OF FIGURES

- Fig. 8.1 Johann Horst von Romberch. *Congestorium artificiosae memoriae*. Venice: Melchiorre Sessa, 1533. Image used courtesy of The Huntington Library 155
- Fig. 12.1 Frontispiece to George Wither, *A Preparation to the Psalter* (London, 1619). Generously provided by the Harry Ransom Center, The University of Texas at Austin, Pforz 1086 PFZ 247
- Fig. 12.2 Closer view of Fig. 12.1's upper half. See Fig. 12.1 for details on source and supplier 248



Introduction: The Imagination and Image in Premodern Faculty Psychology

Mark Kaethler and Grant Williams

This collection of essays reconnects the literary imagination to the study of faculty psychology¹ in light of recent scholarship on the early modern cognitive environment.² The imagination as a psycho-physiological faculty has until recently been neglected, obscured in traditional scholarship for several reasons, not the least of which is the cloud of significations and values accompanying it. “Imagination” has been used less as a term or concept than a synecdochal mantra, an abbreviated incantation for representing and defending literary activity.³ This popular usage channels aesthetic values established by eighteenth-century German idealism, which associated the genius of individual subjectivity with originality and creativity.⁴ During that period, philosophers and poets held Shakespeare up as having the quintessential “romantic imagination,” and thus there has been a long

M. Kaethler

Department of Arts, Medicine Hat College, Medicine Hat, AB, Canada

G. Williams (✉)

Department of English, Carleton University, Ottawa, ON, Canada

e-mail: grant_williams@carleton.ca

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature
Switzerland AG 2024

M. Kaethler, G. Williams (eds.), *Historicizing the Embodied
Imagination in Early Modern English Literature*,

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-55064-5_1

history of romantic aesthetic values being projected backward onto the bard and other early modern writers, eclipsing culturally specific questions about the imagination's influence on literature.⁵ Nowadays, "imagination" has been used in another notable way that continues to muddy the waters. The word may go beyond the jurisdiction of literature and aesthetics altogether to designate a large set of discursive or cultural concerns completely detached from psychology. For instance, there is a political imagination, a historical imagination, and a cartographic imagination as well as an English imagination and a cultural imagination in general.⁶ While important in their own right, these different post-romantic and contemporary inflections of the word have diverted scholars from understanding how writers experienced the culturally specific faculty when devising their literary works for readers. The premodern imagination was neither a genius's free-standing, transcendent disposition for creativity, nor a free-floating collective memory/unconscious hovering above cultural activity, but a faculty functioning within a humoral brain attuned to its inner and outer ecosystems and involved closely in image production.

In this Introduction, we will first explain our historicist approach to the embodied imagination. Our basic argument is that the imagination, far from being isolated or autonomous, conducted its tasks alongside other psycho-physiological processes that it influenced and was, in turn, influenced by, and thus neither it nor the literature it informed can be fully understood without considering its close relations with the senses, the affections, the memory, the intellect, and other faculties. We will then argue for the importance of historicizing the embodied imagination by situating it between medieval scholasticism and the emergence of modern science, noting how it can be distinguished from Cartesianism. We will turn next to the question of why the volume's topic, indebted to several general and specific trends in contemporary criticism, is significant for the study of early modern literature. Our second argument is that, given the currency of faculty psychology, poets and playwrights regarded the literary image not as an objective picture but as an extension of thought itself that enabled writers to make visible and explore inner thinking and to intervene in the interiority of their readers. Attention to the embodied imagination thus gives us new perspectives on image production and reception in the period's literature. Finally, we will describe each of the volume's four sections along with how the essays fit into them and then conclude with thoughts on potential future directions of this newfound approach, which lie outside the scope of the volume's chapters.

By “embodied imagination,”⁷ we refer to a premodern view of imaginative thinking not only believed to be located within corporeality, but also considered to function within what has come to be called faculty psychology, a complex cognitive environment that spans both the physical and the metaphysical. Taking George Lakoff and Mark Johnson’s philosophically inspired study of embodied cognition into account, we too challenge Cartesian dualism and perceive that cognition “is inherently embodied,”⁸ while turning instead to literary representations of thought processes in fiction, theater, and poetics as well as their interpretative and phenomenological implications. Though inspired by Aristotle’s *On the Soul*, faculty psychology really first emerges from the classical and Arabic commentaries on his works,⁹ and, later on, from the scholastic debates of medieval theologians building upon this earlier textual tradition. It presupposes a tripartite anthropology in which a body is, by means of spirits,¹⁰ conjoined to the soul. According to this scheme, most famously elaborated by Thomas Aquinas, the soul was thought to be composed “of a set of powers (*potentiae*), forces (*virtutes*), or faculties (*facultates*), each directed to a specific category of objects and responsible for certain kinds of operations.”¹¹ The soul possessed three primary kinds of faculties or powers: the vegetative faculty, which dealt with the fundamental functions of life (growth and reproduction); the sensitive faculty, which covered the powers of movement, emotion, and outer and inner sensation (lower cognition); and the rational or intellectual faculty, which consisted of the will, intellectual memory, and the intellect (higher cognition).¹² Individual physicians and theologians would divide and sub-divide each of these three main faculties further, devising their own complicated psychophysiological systems.¹³ Under the faculty system, the imagination belonged to what was sometimes called the “organic soul,”¹⁴ which comprised the vegetative and sensitive powers proper to the human and animal body but external to the immortal soul, which possessed the intellectual powers.¹⁵ Since cognition circumscribed all the relevant powers in the sensitive and rational faculties, the imagination’s activities could influence not only embodied but also ensouled operations.

The approach taken by this volume may be characterized as historicist in that its chapters attempt to recuperate the early modern cognitive characteristics of the embodied imagination exhibited in the period’s literature. To achieve its historicist ends, the volume minimizes as much as possible anachronistic theorizing.¹⁶ Traditionally overwritten with Cartesian, post-romantic, and modernist assumptions about psychology

and literature, the early modern literary imagination and the imagery it supposedly conceived deserve to be grafted back into their proper cognitive environment. That said, it is our belief that such historicist work on how literature implemented and challenged the preconceptions of faculty psychology can also ground, facilitate, and enhance future theoretical interventions—not displace them.

Each of the volume's chapters falls somewhere along a spectrum stretching between one pole we can call "historical cognitive studies" and an opposite pole commonly known as "historical phenomenology." Historical cognitive studies seize upon linguistic, textual, and discursive depictions of psycho-physiological processes, at times accounting for these representations by means of the social institutions or larger discourses in which they are embedded. Primary examples include Stuart Clark's contextualization of the imagination within the framework of a cultural history of vision and Todd Butler's examination of the substantial debts that seventeenth-century political discourse and culture owed to mobilizing the imagination for political action.¹⁷ Historical phenomenology, exemplified by the work of Bruce R. Smith on the senses and Gail Kern Paster, Katherine Rowe, and Mary Floyd-Wilson on the passions and the humors, adjusts the balance more toward materiality, human experience, and cultural scripts than toward the hermeneutic and Foucauldian archive with its language-based emphasis upon recovering the meaning or power-relations behind psycho-physiological processes.¹⁸ Historical phenomenology enables contemporary scholars to give the embodied experiences of early modern writers their due without dismissing their pre-scientific attitudes and beliefs as simply quaint, superstitious, or empirically wrong. Understanding these experiences in turn provides the grounds for grasping cultural differences and disclosing the horizons of the early modern "life-world." Historical cognitive studies and historical phenomenology are by no means mutually exclusive, for the two related methods are often blended, as in Suparna Roychoudhury's *Phantasmatic Shakespeare*.¹⁹

Part of the scholarly work to be done in historical cognitive studies on the imagination is to articulate the cultural discontinuities between medieval and early modern brain-work. Sixteenth-century faculty psychology underwent less a single epistemic break than a gradual tectonic slide. Thinkers increasingly questioned the Aristotelian truisms of the scholastic-oriented faculty system as more and more classical sources became available, thanks to the exertions of humanist scholars who recovered and distributed alternative texts from Neoplatonic, stoical, and skeptical

philosophical traditions.²⁰ By the 1530s, anatomists returning to the original texts and systems of Aristotle and Galen had discarded the ventricular theory of the brain,²¹ while the faculties and powers slowly gave way to the organs as the structuring principle of cognition.²² Between the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, there was, as Katharine Park notes, an overall trend of simplifying the byzantine schema of psychological operations theorized by the schoolmen.²³ The last and most significant change involved the gradual shift in emphasis from the intellectual to the organic soul, initiating the slide from the spiritual to the material that reaches its clearest expression in the work of Hobbes. According to Park, the early modern imagination benefited from these “widespread shifts” in faculty psychology.²⁴ The streamlining of the inner senses led to the imagination subsuming more cognitive roles and gaining a dominance it had not hitherto enjoyed. Two recent refinements of Park’s thesis productively sharpen the distinctiveness of the early modern imagination from its medieval precursors. Stuart Clark argues that during the Renaissance the ocularcentric imagination, because of its growing importance to cognition, acquired the reputation of being “an unreliable and undisciplined faculty” that needed to be governed by reason.²⁵ Its cultural centrality was caught up with the rise and fall of the visual paradigm in faculty psychology.²⁶ Clark’s careful scholarship confirms for us once again that recuperating the historicity of the early modern imagination requires parsing its interconnections to other faculties as well as its involvement in widespread trends. With a more focused approach, Roychoudhury considers how Shakespeare seizes upon “the epistemological and epistemic shifts” in the discourse of the imagination to exploit its “endless generativity as a source of aesthetic creation.”²⁷ In Roychoudhury’s account, the messy and disorderly dynamism of scientific change enables Shakespeare to go “beyond the original purview of faculty psychology.”²⁸ As important as the rise of seventeenth-century natural philosophy may be for grasping the innovative imagination,²⁹ we should not lose sight of its transitional state that in no way diminished its debts and allegiances to the longstanding faculty system. After all, the other side to the scholarly work to be done in historical cognitive studies on the imagination concerns recuperating its distinctiveness from post-Enlightenment discourses on psychology. The deep-rooted language of the faculties reverberates throughout representations of the seventeenth-century imagination. As we will see, even Descartes abides by these parameters in his philosophizing on cognition.

The paradigm of the three-faculty soul does not present a view of the imagination congruent with modern attitudes inherited from the German idealists and Romantic poets. In the wake of Blake, Wordsworth, and Coleridge, the imagination for literature became a dominant, if not the preeminent, power of the mind.³⁰ In contrast, the premodern imagination belonged to the body for it was strongly affiliated with sensation, being classified as one of the inner senses which performed the necessary operations in the cognitive interval between the five external senses and the higher thinking of intellection.³¹ For that reason, as some scholars observe, the concept of the mind did not exist in faculty psychology after the manner that it does for modernity.³² Put a little differently, one cannot map the mind-body axis of Cartesianism onto the faculty system, since the cognition conducted by the inner senses was already embedded in the corporeal. This volume counteracts Cartesian assumptions about the “mental” imagination and strives, in Deanna Smid’s words, “to trace a sort of ‘body-imagination’ or ‘imagination-body’.”³³ Doing so means stubbornly preserving some semblance of the psycho-cultural difference of pre-Cartesian cognition.³⁴ The editors of *Embodied Cognition and Shakespeare’s Theatre* further complicate the question, because gendered, racialized, and classed bodies by no means validate a single totality of bodily sameness, while the mind, too, is a “wildly heterogeneous” assemblage of capacities: what contemporaries might regard as the mind-body problem is not a problem at all in the early modern period, but an “open,” “contingent,” and “fluid” assortment of psycho-physiological phenomena.³⁵ We agree, only adding for the sake of historical precision that pluralizing premodern mentalities and corporealities must not forget that thinking was thought to straddle both the body and the soul; otherwise, combatting Cartesianism may take one more into the speculative fleshy realm of Merleau-Ponty than into the pre-Cartesian epoch of the incorporated *anima*. Indeed, Johnson, Sutton, and Tribble’s conception of a “body-mind” does well to rethink the hegemony of mind over body perpetuated by Cartesian dualism, but in the process of rightfully challenging that understanding, the volume’s cognitive-science scope does not have room and time to explore the multifaceted dimensions of faculty psychology. Our collection of essays returns to the problem anew to do just that.

For literary scholars studying premodern cognition, bringing the soul into the modular mix may appear to reintroduce a dualism of sorts. Philosophers have long associated monotheism’s binary of body and soul with Cartesian dualism.³⁶ Nevertheless, Aquinas, whose

Aristotelian-inspired faculty system remains behind early modern beliefs on cognition, distinguished his outlook from Platonism, which regarded the human being as a soul merely using a body, its *de facto* prison. For Aquinas, a person is a hybrid, a composite of both the physical and the metaphysical.³⁷ Explaining the ways in which these two substances actually worked together became the central issue of medieval and early Renaissance debates on the subject: how do the material inner senses and the immaterial intellect interact with one another? Since the imagination belonged to the inner senses, its inferior cognitive abilities would die with the mortal body, not belonging to the soul as did, for instance, the intellective memory. Because the phantasm or sensible species could not be simply impressed upon the intellect, the focus of medieval and early Renaissance debates was on how the immaterial intellect could produce an intelligible species by receiving and acting upon the sense-based phantasm.³⁸ Another way of negotiating the split between lower and upper thinking is to acknowledge what Charis Charalampous terms the “bisected and bi-subjective self,” in effect designating the double cognition that encompasses body and soul. Charalampous’s work foregrounds the “intelligent body,” which grants corporeality’s ability to understand and reason. Coming at the problematic from the opposite direction, Caroline Bynum has drawn out the “somaticization of the soul,” since medieval theology described the soul as having body parts, such as spiritual eyes and ears and, when dealing with purgatory, considered the self to be a psychosomatic unit.³⁹ Intelligent bodies and corporealized intellects challenge further Cartesian dualist accounts.

And yet, to insist on an unqualified Cartesian break, like a distinct scientific rupture, is to court historical exaggeration and inaccuracy when studying the early modern imagination.⁴⁰ What we mean by Cartesianism is the reception of Descartes—less so the sum total of his philosophical writings, which evince ambiguous continuities and discontinuities. In the *Meditations*, Descartes by no means rejects wholesale faculty psychology and actually excludes the untrustworthy imagination from the cogito, equating the intellect, not the inner senses, with the mental.⁴¹ At the same time, in his earlier work, Descartes assigns to the faculty a higher—and, according to Dennis L. Sepper, a “revolutionary”—cognitive role in imposing geometrical models onto the world for harnessing mathematical thinking.⁴² The founder of the “New Philosophy” himself thus looks both backward and forward when it comes to conceiving the imagination. Embodied by Descartes, the two epistemic shifts we want to acknowledge

situate this early modern faculty within a double historical dialectic, which at once distinguishes it from the past and from the Enlightenment. Backward looking, it continues Aristotelianism with Platonic shadings while detaching itself from the quibbling rigors of Aquinas; forward looking, it begins to adapt itself to the emerging new science, while not dispensing entirely with the faculty system.

We thus could do much worse for an image of the premodern imagination than Bacon's invocation of two-faced Janus, the Roman god of time and transitions as well as gates. Bacon's personification not only captures the faculty's doubleness from a historical angle but also describes its ambivalence from a spatial perspective. In *The Advancement of Learning*, he calls the imagination an agent or nuntius, who travels between the two jurisdictions of the "minde," on the one hand the "judiciall" (understanding and reason) responsible for establishing the decree and on the other hand the "ministeriall" (will, appetite, and affection) charged with acting upon that decree. More like a courtier or ambassador than a deity, "this *Ianus of Imagination*," Bacon asserts, "hath differing faces; for the face towards *Reason*, hath the print of Truth. But the face towards *Action*, hath the print of Good."⁴³ Working well within the bounds of faculty psychology, Bacon has writ large a common observation made by today's critics: the imagination holds a liminal position amongst the other mental powers.⁴⁴ In Bacon's description, it mediates between the intellect and the inner senses, between the reason and the will, and between truth and goodness, in other words, between epistemology and ethics. This volume likewise seeks to understand the early modern imagination through its powers relative to other faculties. One of the legacies of post-romanticism is that we have lost sight of the mutual interdependence of the literary imagination and faculty psychology. The literary imagination yields its meanings according to its multiple relations with a constellation of premodern conceptual nodes: the body, the soul, spirits, senses, intellect, will, memory, desire, emotions, and so on.

The chapters, for the most part—and for good reason—concern themselves with the incorporation and implementation of the imagination in romances, plays, and poems rather than focusing exclusively on medical or theological theorizing. The highpoint of innovations in faculty psychology's development occurred between 1200 and 1400 and, although the legacy of medieval scholasticism was being challenged by the time of the sixteenth century, England's writers, rehearsing basic scholastic issues, did not make any substantive philosophical contributions to understanding

the imagination until the seventeenth century with Hobbes and Locke.⁴⁵ Neither do we have definitive theoretical overviews of faculty psychology in English after the manner of, for example, Gregor Reisch's and Philip Melancthon's influential Latin textbooks.⁴⁶ Relevant passages on the imagination and cognition that may have been read by English writers are scattered throughout homegrown compendia, commonplace books, essays, and medical handbooks as well as translations of similar continental books.⁴⁷ Where exciting and innovative experimentation does occur is in poetry, romances, and plays, simply because English literature during the period was coming into its own as a vernacular force through the growth of the printing press and the development of the theater. With the professionalization of these creative industries—albeit still within a patronage system—poets and playwrights increasingly reflected upon *poesis* to scrutinize their own processes of creation and to justify their performances in light of theology's longstanding suspicions of the imagination, particularly Protestantism's apprehension of the image's associations with Catholicism, superstition, and idolatry. It is no accident, then, that in order to defend their respective poetics, Philip Sidney and George Puttenham strategically posit a firm distinction between a corrupt and a healthy fantasy.⁴⁸ Poets and playwrights continually needed to demonstrate control over their image-making capacities so that readers could trust that their works would not lead their thoughts astray with unruly cognition. Consequently, mental and corporeal self-governance became the subject matter, as well as the *raison d'être*, of many literary works, which were not only guided by the imagination in their creation and reception but also devised allegorically embodied figurations of the faculty.⁴⁹

Literature offers scholars some of the most fertile material on how the early modern imagination pragmatically worked and how writers understood its role within culture. But it also gives them another entry point into faculty psychology through its preoccupation with the embodied image. By foregrounding this preoccupation, the volume's chapters break with a dominant trend in twentieth-century criticism, which, heavily influenced by modernism and post-romantic aesthetics, has treated imagery as a formalist literary element, a verbal building block that contributes to an overall product or object of creativity, centered on the communication of meaning and emotion.⁵⁰ New Criticism would take this methodology to new heights by discouraging readers from committing the affective fallacy, thereby completely emptying figurative language of its psychological import.⁵¹ Needless to say, such a formalist approach to Renaissance

literature is anachronistic, for, as Rosemond Tuve clearly argued during New Criticism's heyday, Renaissance writers held the image up to a criterion of rhetorical efficacy that took into account the mental make-up of their readers for purposes of persuasion.⁵² The period's revival of rhetoric and oratory in education impressed upon preachers, poets, and playwrights the power of the image to persuade and move readers to accept their arguments, attitudes, and beliefs. In recognizing pre-Cartesian embodiment, the collection pursues the cognitive implications of rhetorical imagery with greater resolve. Rhetorical images had an overwhelming impact on the psycho-physiological because thought itself was deemed to be an image generated and manipulated by cognition, which would start with a sensible, continue with a sensory impression and phantasm, and end with intellection, abstraction. And so, emblems, icons, ekphrases, theatrical spectacles, and allegories could directly intervene in and modify the thinking of readers and auditors. Thus the period's rhetorical image is not just a creative product, engendered by and confined to the jurisdiction of the imagination—as romantic writers believed. It was a site of collaboration, competition, and conflict among all the faculties and bore ethical and social consequences for those who conceived it and those who received it. As this volume's chapters demonstrate, literature reflected upon the imaginative processes of cognition by mapping out faculty psychology, and modeled self-governance by exploring character motivation, and yet it also rather significantly marshaled the rhetorical image as a cognitive artifact that allowed authors to sculpt—for better or worse—the interiorities of their readers.

While periodically in conversation with Bacon, Hobbes, and Cavendish, the chapters predominantly deal with the works of Spenser, Shakespeare, and Donne. Two major reasons may account for their prominence in a volume on imagination. First, these three authors are highly skilled at fashioning images, putting into practice Sidnean poetics, which judges literary activity to be a matter of forming a "speaking picture." Outperforming its rival disciplines, poetry for Sidney yields to "the powers of the minde an image" that strikes, pierces, and possesses "the sight of the soule" more effectively than does the abstract precept of philosophy or the unethical exemplum of history.⁵³ Second, these three authors each establish an innovative corpus of work committed to exploring and grasping how interiority determines the trajectory of human experiences and behaviors: Spenser's *Faerie Queene* uses baroque allegorization to dramatize the inner contests of faculty psychology behind his knight's quests; Shakespeare

complicates the soliloquy with introspective ambiguity in order to enrich the portrayal of embodied motivation on the stage; and Donne elaborates over his career as a poet and preacher a sophisticated meditative practice that, caught between Catholicism and Protestantism, finds novel ways of harnessing the power of the conceit to contemplate the divine.

Taking a historicist perspective blended at times with historical phenomenology, the chapters investigate the ways in which early modern literature considers the imagination's interactions with embodied and ensouled processes, as well as manifesting it in various cognitive artifacts, such as allegory, conceits, icons, food, musical instruments, memory theaters, and theatrical properties and persons. This volume's chapters are not limited to the narrow constraints of their subsections, even though these categories serve well to highlight their central arguments. Emphasizing that imagining and fantasizing belonged to a greater cognitive ecosystem, the volume's organization reflects the imagination's interdependence upon and friction with faculty psychology's other operations. The subsections, arranged according to the hierarchy of the faculties, move from the external senses, through memory, the most dominant inner sense, and then to the intellect or understanding, that is, spiritual cognition, while individual chapters regularly nuance, if not problematize, this hierarchy by identifying interdependencies.

"The Visual Imagination" refers not just to the external sense of sight, which, since antiquity, had been "the most privileged of the senses in Western culture"; it more importantly acknowledges Clark's assertion that "the workings of the early modern imagination were conceived of primarily as visual processes," further complicated in the period by the literary tradition of allying poetry with painting, which Sidney integrates into his poetics.⁵⁴ Donald Beecher begins the volume with a close examination of the House of Busyrane, Spenser's allegorical rendering of the imagining faculty in which the rapid succession of embodied images envisages the sequential singularity of Amoret's consciousness, distracted and distressed by lovesickness. Darryl Chalk continues this focus on how the ocularcentric fancy is prone to ill health by turning to *The Winter's Tale*, where Shakespeare manipulates the seen and unseen onstage to heal the rift between the veracity of the external senses and the delusions of the imagination. Amy Cooper, like Chalk, capitalizes on what cannot be seen in order to argue that Donne's response to Protestant iconophobia is to craft images that resist imaginative visualization.

“Sensory and Affective Imaginings” reveals how sensory experiences form the basis of the imagination’s phantasms but can also manipulate them, sometimes in dangerous ways. As part of the inner senses, the imagination connects to and relies upon the sensory impressions filtered by the common sense and upon past experiences stored and revisited in the memory. And yet the imagination could also access the memory’s treasury to hypothesize affects toward actual things and events that had not yet been experienced. Literature simulates this imaginative process of hypothetical affect to instruct interpreters to exercise vigilance when it comes to the senses’ generation of pleasure, thereby stimulating desires which could lead the imagination astray and with it the will. However, as Susan Sachon argues, writers could also instrumentalize this process to guide audiences’ affective responses. Her chapter takes a phenomenological approach to Shakespeare’s violent, embodied language in *King Lear* and *Othello*; his metaphors prompt the audience’s imaginations to conjure familiar sense memories to help them comprehend that which their bodies have not physically known. Catherine Reedy’s chapter on *The Rape of Lucrece* explores Tarquin’s infected imagination as well as its production of falsely objectified images of Lucrece alongside poetic discussions of *raptus* as an embodied affect. And Jan Purnis raises questions of taste—specifically how it can generate imagined affect with respect to appetite—in order to historicize the neglected “imagination of eating”; her chapter shows how this process generates personal, as well as cultural, affective responses that can result in social stigma, illustrated by examples of disgust selected from Shakespeare’s *Pericles* and Ben Jonson’s *Bartholomew Fair*.

The volume’s third section turns to the memory, the imagination’s closest rival and collaborator within the inner senses. The interrelationship between the two types of cognition can be keenly discerned in the art of memory, originally the fourth rhetorical canon that exploits the spatial and visual orientation of Aristotelian faculty psychology in order to enhance the orator’s remembering and recollection.⁵⁵ Expecting its practitioners to craft evocative imagery, the art of memory depends upon the visual imagination so much so that it may be equally deemed an art of the imagination. Bearing this in mind, the chapters unravel the imaginative implications of mnemonic artifice and architecture in literature. William E. Engel grapples with articulating the barely expressible, often evanescent power of the premodern poetic imagination, whose reflective and generative processes he locates in the memory palaces of Langland, Spenser, and Bacon. Considering a less salutary side to imagining, Grant Williams demonstrates

how Spenser's cave of Mammon deforms the classical memory palace to warn courtiers about the treacherous state of mind induced by the mercantile environment's proliferation of golden phantasms. Looking ahead to the last section "Higher Imaginings," Pavneet Aulakh traces through Donne's sermons the ways in which the preacher's imagination and memory implement together a "gallery" of pictures to correct the congregation's erring understanding and wayward will. Rounding out the section, Rebeca Helfer explains how Cavendish's work of fancy establishes a distinctive *poesis* for fictional world-building, based upon, yet ingeniously surpassing, the memory theaters of the male-dominated art of memory tradition.

Lastly, "Higher Imaginings" follows the common view that the imagination was entwined with the sensitive soul, but it pairs this view with the long tradition, stemming as far back as Averroes, "that the agent intellect was God."⁵⁶ The intermediary imagination connects the other faculties with the intellectual soul, and it participates in faculty cognition, which for Aquinas's influential philosophy is both embodied and ensouled. The contributors explore works that accordingly recognize the imagination as the vehicle that operates between the intellect and sensory experience to facilitate higher cognition. Smid explores the distinction between the musical fantasy our senses hear in Shakespeare's *Pericles* and the music of the spheres that our souls, guided by Pericles, access through our imagination. In Donne's poetry Anton Bergstrom explores similar meeting places that beckon readers to bridge the gap between the sensory and spiritual. Also showing how God cannot be fully known, Mark Kaethler explains how Tourneur's characters model, for his audience, the imagination's important role in discerning sensed reality to achieve enlightenment, an ability that the titular Calvinist reprobate of *The Atheist's Tragedy* lacks. Travis DeCook, returning us to Donne and bookending the section, compares his Christological *poesis* with Hobbes's sovereign to argue that modernity signals a shift to a new secular model of the imagination.

The embodied imagination's connectedness to different faculties and modes of thinking, its healthy and sickly involvement in many levels of textual and cultural production, and its varied characterizations by preachers, physicians, poets, playwrights, and other types of early modern authors invite new directions for scholars working in sexuality, gender, class, and other fields. For instance, historical cognitive studies can bring to bear on the embodied imagination timely and germane questions raised by pre-modern critical race studies. Given David Sterling Brown's recent

discussion of Hamlet,⁵⁷ how might Galenic accounts of the imagination harbor humoral presuppositions that stigmatize blackness as a source of the white body's pathological states? Considering Benedict S. Robinson's examination of Phantastes's swarthinness in *The Faerie Queene*,⁵⁸ what other ways might early modern literature personify and racialize the imagination? How might the cognition of such racialized imaginations construct phantasms threatening to English thinking and how might its representations foster xenophobia around invasive images, emotions, and desires, reinforcing idealized notions of white bodies and white minds? Establishing the historicist contexts of the early modern imagination and its mediating roles within the faculty system provides a firm starting point for further interrogations into the social, political, and ethical ramifications of this ubiquitous way of thinking in early modern English literature and culture. In other words, there is still much work to be done in recovering early modern imaginings.

NOTES

1. Although classical times distinguished the imagination from the phantasy, the words "phantasy," "fantsie," and "fancy" were "used interchangeably with 'imagination'" during the early modern period. Rosky, "Imagination in the English Renaissance," p. 50, n. 4. Over the last 15 years, there has been a surge of interest in the cognitive side to the premodern imagination with important studies written by Clark, Butler, Karnes, Smid, and Roychoudhury.
2. A major collection of essays in this area is Mary Floyd-Wilson and Garrett A. Sullivan, Jr.'s volume, in which they challenge the Cartesian dualism "between 'inside' and 'outside'" by showing how "an ecological perspective highlights their mutual penetrability"; their collection remains focused on the body and its environs rather than how the processes understood in faculty psychology influence embodiment within the world. Floyd-Wilson and Sullivan, Jr., "Introduction," p. 3.
3. Helen Gardiner, for instance, can entitle her Harvard lectures *In Defence of the Imagination*, while not really discussing the psychological faculty whatsoever.
4. Daston, "Fear and Loathing of the Imagination in Science," p. 81.
5. Pechter, "The Romantic Inheritance," p. 58.
6. These different imaginations may correspond to a collective memory or a cultural "imaginary" as loosely used after Lacan's notion. See Philip Goldfarb Styr, *Shakespeare's Political Imagination: The Historicism of*

Setting; Chloe Wheatley, *Epic, Epitome, and the Early Modern Historical Imagination*; D.K. Smith, *The Cartographic Imagination in Early Modern England: Re-writing the World in Marlowe, Spenser, Raleigh and Marvell*; Eva Johanna Holmberg, *Jews in the Early Modern English Imagination: A Scattered Nation*; and Jeanne Shami, *Renaissance Tropologies: The Cultural Imagination of Early Modern England*.

7. We recognize the wide range of exciting work on embodiment that is being done in the fields of feminism, gender, sexuality, and race, for we must not forget the term's capaciousness and plasticity: "embodiment as a critical concept bridges the material and the discursive, the experiential and the analytical, the sensory, the affective, and the cognitive." Traub, "Introduction," p. 32.
8. Lakoff and Johnson, *Philosophy in the Flesh*, p. 5.
9. Park, "The Organic Soul," pp. 467–68; Clark, *Vanities of the Eye*, p. 43. Katharine Park's landmark essay on the organic soul has had an influential role in setting the parameters of scholarship on faculty psychology. Over the last few decades there has also been a growing attention to the topics of memory, the senses, and affect, within the larger horizon of the body. By way of a few examples, see Engel, Loughnane, and Williams, *The Memory Arts in Renaissance England* on the natural memory; on the external senses, see Woolgar, *The Senses in Late Medieval England*, and Milner, *The Senses and the English Reformation*; and on affect, see Mullaney, *The Reformation of Emotions in the Age of Shakespeare*. This growing attention has generated renewed interest in the cultural and theoretical significance of the premodern faculty system.
10. Milner, *The Senses and the English Reformation*, p. 18.
11. Bakker, "The Soul and its Parts," p. 63.
12. Park, p. 467.
13. Bakker, p. 64.
14. Park, p. 464.
15. On the intellectual powers, see Kessler, "The Intellective Soul."
16. Kaethler has noted the various issues that can stem from anachronistic applications of cognitive science, and while there is merit to their point that 4E cognition is more conducive to literary studies, this volume avoids taking a cognitive lens to the literature in order to instead explore the previously neglected historical dimensions of faculty psychology in cognition and phenomenology. See Kaethler, "Shakespeare and Cognition: Scientism, Theory, and 4E."
17. Clark, *Vanities of the Eye*, pp. 39–77; Butler, *Imagination and Politics in Seventeenth-Century England*.
18. Smith, *Phenomenal Shakespeare*, p. xvii; Paster, Rowe, Floyd-Wilson, "Introduction," pp. 13–18. Historical phenomenology must not be

confused with Husserlian phenomenology, although the former loosely draws upon different features of the latter. The former is a practical enterprise informed in part by the latter, which encompasses a major twentieth-century school and method that goes beyond philosophy into the social sciences and sciences.

19. Roychoudhury, *Phantasmatic Shakespeare*, p. 18.
20. Park and Kessler, "The Concept of Psychology," p. 461.
21. Clark, p. 43. For a history of the ventricular doctrine, see Bennett and Hacker, "The Motor System in Neuroscience," pp. 1–52. Quite often the two systems are lumped together, when major differences exist, the chief of which might be that Aristotle approaches the image/phiasm from the starting point of the world, whereas Galen regards it from the cauldron of humors within the body.
22. Park, p. 479, p. 481.
23. *Ibid.*, pp. 480–81. One of the casualties was the doctrine of the species, a source of contentious debate in medieval times. See Spruit, *Species Intelligibilis*.
24. On the significance of Park's dissertation, see Clark, p. 43.
25. *Ibid.*, pp. 49–50.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 20.
27. Roychoudhury, p. 13, p. 15.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 16.
29. For the ways that the imagination influenced the rise of visualized or pictured images in transmitting and understanding scientific knowledge, see Bakker, Lüthy, and Swan, "Introduction," pp. 1–2.
30. For Coleridge, "the human mind can be heightened nearly to god-like state through the Imagination." Jang, "The Imagination 'Beyond' and 'Within' Language," p. 509. See also Schlutz, *Mind's World*, p. 12, and Brann, *The World of the Imagination*, p. 505, p. 509.
31. Park, p. 471.
32. Milner, p. 39. For the difficulty of defining the nature of Aristotelian psychology, see Aho, "The Status of Psychology as Understood by Sixteenth-Century Scholastics."
33. Smid, *The Imagination in Early Modern English Literature*, p. 6.
34. We recognize with the editors of *Embodied Cognition and Shakespeare's Theatre* that the label "mind-body" "bears traces of the two connected dichotomous assumptions that our contributors seek to combat." Johnson, Sutton, and Tribble, "Introduction," p. 1. Inevitably, our terminology and inclinations, which are determined by our own historical placement, may erect conceptual barriers and blind spots, thereby making the retrieval of the unadulterated pre-Cartesian an unobtainable ideal.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 3, p. 6. See also Kaethler.

36. Stump, *Aquinas*, p. 191.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 193. See, as well, Milner, p. 20. When Ficino entered the picture, his philosophizing revised the Aristotelian model, although even this change might not be said to be dualist. See de Boer, “Dualism and the Mind-Body Problem,” pp. 223–24.
38. See Spruit, vol. 1, pp. 7–8, and Milner, p. 38.
39. Charalampous, *Rethinking the Mind-Body Relationship in Early Modern Literature, Philosophy and Medicine*, p. 1, p. 2. Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity*, pp. 291–302.
40. We should not overprivilege the shorthand of “pre-Cartesianism.” See Johnson, Sutton, and Tribble, p. 2.
41. See, for example, Schlutz, p. 4.
42. Sepper, “Descartes,” p. 33. See Nikulin, *Matter, Imagination and Geometry* for Descartes’s contribution to the intellectual history of understanding the relation of mathematics to intelligible matter and the imagination.
43. Bacon, *The Advancement of Learning*, pp. 105–6.
44. Clark, p. 43; Schlutz, pp. 3–4, p. 5; Nauta and Pätzold, “Introduction,” p. ix; Smid, p. 14; Roychoudhury, p. 15.
45. “Theories of cognition were debated with more passion in the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries than they had been since the time of Aristotle and than they would be until the seventeenth century.” Karnes, *Imagination, Meditation, and Cognition in the Middle Ages*, p. 3. See also Park, p. 464. As Milner summarizes, there’s little work done on the fifteenth century probably because of a “vast historiographical lacuna” in this period. Milner, p. 46.
46. Park, p. 465; Kessler, p. 517.
47. For example, see Smid’s list of the motley range of medical, philosophical, natural historical, and theological treatises that she makes use of in her book. Smid, pp. 8–9.
48. Sidney, *Defence of Poesie*, pp. 112–13; Puttenham, *The Art of English Poesy*, p. 110.
49. Although Spenser’s Phantastes—besides Langland’s Imaginatif—is discussed in several chapters, some other examples include Thomas Tomkis’s *Lingua*, with *Phantastes* assisting *Sensus* alongside *Memoria*, and Jonson’s masque *Vision of Delight*, which tempers its allegorical figuration of Fant’sy through the powers of Peace and Wonder.
50. According to Caroline F.E. Spurgeon, it is “the little word-picture used by a poet or prose writer to illustrate, illuminate and embellish his thought.” Spurgeon, *Shakespeare’s Imagery and What it Tells Us*, p. 9.
51. Wimsatt and Beardsley, “The Affective Fallacy.”
52. Tuve, *Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery*, pp. 180–83.
53. Sidney, p. 91.