Ecologies of Thought in Early Modern English Drama

by

Andrew Jonathan Bozio

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(English Language and Literature)
in the University of Michigan
2013

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Michael C. Schoenfeldt, Chair
Associate Professor George P. Hoffmann
Associate Professor Steven G. Mullaney
Professor Theresa L. Tinkle
Professor Valerie J. Traub

© Andrew Bozio

2013

Acknowledgements

Like any work that develops over the course of several years, this dissertation has been shaped and supported by many extraordinary individuals, and I'm very pleased to be able to thank them there. I've had the good fortune to work with an incredible dissertation committee, whose contributions to this project have left me deeply humbled. One of the greatest pleasures of graduate school has been working with Michael Schoenfeldt, whose enthusiasm and support for this endeavor has been unflagging. Mike's warmth, generosity, and piercing intellect have made him universally beloved within the profession, and I feel very grateful to have learned so much from him while at Michigan. Steven Mullaney has been instrumental in shaping this project. Our shared interest in cognition and in theories of space provided early encouragement in undertaking this research, and he helped to excavate aspects of the argument that remained invisible to me, guiding our conversations with deeply astute questions that challenged me to rethink the terms of this project. Similarly, I owe an incredible debt to Valerie Traub, whose careful reading of this work helped to give the argument shape and solidity. From the beginning of this project, she pushed me to clarify my thinking, and that precision of thought saved the dissertation from becoming mired in abstraction. George Hoffmann consistently left me humbled by his generosity and his insightfulness, and his encyclopedic knowledge of the early modern period added nuance and depth to many of the claims made here. Finally, Theresa Tinkle's enthusiasm and

generosity renewed my commitment to higher education. Her wit and warmth sustained me through the most challenging moments of completing this dissertation.

In writing this dissertation, I benefited from several institutions and individuals, each of whom supported the development of a particular aspect of the argument. Much of my research was funded by grants from the Rackham Graduate School, the Program in Medieval and Early Studies, and the Making Publics Project at McGill University, and I am very pleased to able to thank those institutions, as well as the research staff at the British Library, the Folger Shakespeare Library, the Wellcome Library, the Newberry Library, and the Cambridge University Library. At Michigan, I benefited enormously from exceptional faculty members, especially Sara Blair, Alison Cornish, Gregg Crane, Danny Hack, David Halperin, Barbara Hodgdon, Diane Owen Hughes, Kerry Larson, Adela Pinch, Cathy Sanok, Karla Taylor, Doug Trevor, and Ralph Williams. I am also grateful to Barbara Rosenwein, of Loyola University Chicago, for her seminar at the Newberry Library, which allowed me to begin the work that would become chapter two. Portions of this dissertation were presented or circulated at the Premodern Colloquium, the MEMS Dissertation Colloquium, the Mellon Dissertation Seminar run by William Paulson, and at annual meetings of the Shakespeare Association of America and the Renaissance Society of America. I'm grateful to my audiences and interlocutors there, and in particular to the many scholars who, in extended conversation, helped the argument to take its present shape: Erika Lin, Marissa Greenberg, Cary DiPietro, Kurt Schreyer, Gina Bloom, and Evelyn Tribble.

While a graduate student, I have been supported by fantastic colleagues and by exceptional institutional resources. My thanks, in particular, go to my cohort and to my fellow early modernists, including Chris Barnes, Katherine Brokaw, Carolyn Dekker, Ari Friedlander, Tim Green, Sarah Linwick, Alice Keane, Adam Mazel, Ben Pollak, Rebecca

Porte, Amy Rodgers, Stephen Spiess, Leila Watkins, Kathryn Will, Rebecca Wiseman, and Cordelia Zukerman. I am also deeply indebted to the wonderful staff in the English Department, especially to Jan Burgess, whose patience and guidance have shaped my graduate career from the very beginning, and to Senia Vasquez, Karly Mitchell, Bonnie Campbell, Lisa Curtis, and Linda Deitert. In their capacity as jobseeker coordinators, Melanie Yergeau and Sidonie Smith offered insightful feedback on the abstract for this dissertation, and their comments helped to reframe the intellectual scope of the project. I am also grateful to the many individuals who have influenced my approach to teaching. With their enthusiasm and their insight, they reminded me of both the pleasure and the political urgency of our work within the academy, and I know that I will be in their debt for as long as I am in the classroom. In particular, I would like to thank Theresa Tinkle, Jennifer Bryan, Justin Kolb, Tershia Pinder-Grover, and all those who contributed to the 2011 Preparing Future Faculty Seminar.

Finally, whenever the pleasant solitude of writing this dissertation lost its charm, I was fortunate to have a wonderful community of friends, family, and loved ones, without whom I simply could not have completed this project. They include Melanie Adams, Daphna Atias, Brent Beam, Catherine Bozio, Joe Breakey, Michelle Fortin, Lisa Gottlieb, Justin Joque, Michael-Salomon Jost, Eric Kampe, Dan McAdams, Jeff McCabe, Caroline Miller, Rebecca Pallmeyer, Dan Vernia, Jörg Zeller, and Cordelia Zukerman. To Ruth McAdams, I owe everything – her love and support have made these years the happiest and most fulfilling that I have known.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements ii

Introduction
Cognitive Ecologies on the Early Modern Stage 1

Chapter One
Amatory Cognition and the Shape of Cosmos in John Lyly's *Endymion* 20

I. Amatory Cognition and the Neoplatonic Cosmos 32

II. The Displaced Soul and Endymion's Place in the Universe 58

i. Endymion in Extracosmic Space 64

ii. Cynthia's Rule over Intramundane Place 77

III. The Spatial Politics of Cynthia's Court 84

Chapter Two
The Ecology of Remembrance: Memory, Place, and Affect in *Dido, Queen of Carthage* 102

I. Moving through Memory: Troy's Destruction and the Arts of Memory 106

II. Ecological Memory and the Reconstruction of Troy 121

i. Aeneas's Hallucination before the Walls of Carthage 121

ii. *Translatio Imperii* as a Form of Memory 128

III. Troynovant and the Place of Memory in Early Modern London 138

Chapter Three
Embodiment and the Perception of Place in *King Lear* 144

I. Early Modern Phenomenology and the Perception of Place 147

II. Phenomenology and the Space of Dover Cliff 155

III. Cognition in the Wild: Lear's Emplacement in the Storm 162

IV. The Performativity of Space 177

Chapter Four
Bartholomew Fair and the Performativity of Space 182

I. "When't comes to the fair once": Performativity and the Theatrical Conception of Smithfield 187

i. The Performative Constitution of Space 187

ii. Performativity and the Displacement of Memory 192

II. "I'the heart o'the fair": Thinking Smithfield 196

i. The Captivation of Bartholomew Cokes: The Fair as *Umwelt* 200

ii. Zeal-of-the-land Busy and the Disenchantment with Space 209

III. Emergence and Smithfield 215

Conclusion
The Poetics of Emplacement 219

Bibliography 224

Introduction

Cognitive Ecologies on the Early Modern Stage

In the Induction to John Marston's *The Malcontent*, Will Sly stages a complex meditation on the relationship between memory and space within early modern performance.[1] Posing as a playgoer, Sly refutes the stagehand's complaint that one cannot sit onstage at the Globe, arguing that "We may sit upon the stage at the private house," and he further justifies his tactical displacement of performance space by claiming that he must aid the playgoers: "I am one that hath seen this play often and can give them intelligence for their action."[2] *The Malcontent* was first performed by the boy actors at Blackfriars, and Sly implies that his memory of this previous performance will enable him to correct whatever discrepancies appear when Burbage's company enacts it within the Globe.[3] Suggestively, he claims to supplement his memory with two forms of cognitive scaffolding, the one an object, the other a practice. "I have most of the jests [performed at Blackfriars] here in my table-

[1] Of the three quarto versions of *The Malcontent* to appear in 1604, the first two list John Marston as the sole author, with the third including John Webster and noting that augmentations have been made. The Induction only appears in this third quarto, and although there have been questions regarding its authorship, Charles Cathcart notes that "a certain consensus has been reached" favoring Webster as the author of the Induction. See Cathcart, "John Marston, *The Malcontent*, and the King's Men" *The Review of English Studies*, New Series, 57.228 (2006): 43. Nevertheless, I follow convention in using Marston's name when speaking of the play.
[2] John Marston, *The Malcontent* in *English Renaissance Drama*, David Bevington, Lars Engle, Katharine Eisaman Maus, Eric Rasmussen, eds. (New York: W.W. Norton, 2002), Induction.2, 14-5. All further references are from the Induction and will be cited parenthetically.
[3] Sly and the actors – Richard Burbage, John Lowin, and Henry Condell – comment explicitly on this appropriation of *The Malcontent*. When Sly asks with regard to Marston's play, "I wonder you would play it, another company having interest in it," Condell figures it as recompense for the boy actors' theft of *The Spanish Tragedy*, correlating an actor's age and height with the size of a page: "Why not Malevole in folio with us, as Jeronimo in decimo-sexto with them? They taught us a name for our play; we call it *One for Another*" (75-9).

book," Sly states in reference to his writing-tables, and he later adds that, "for one that never studied the art of memory," he can nevertheless perform feats indebted to this technique: "I'll lay a hundred pound I'll walk but once down by the Goldsmith's Row in Cheap, take notice of the signs, and tell you them with a breath instantly" (15-6, 101-6). In short, Sly gestures to two ways in which his mind becomes spatialized, claiming that this distribution of thought, and the feats of memory that it enables, will be partially constitutive of the performance.

Although Sly's intervention is ultimately rejected – the actor John Lowin guides him offstage "to a private room," at which point the Italianate revenge tragedy begins – his comments gesture to a foundational premise of early modern performance (124-125). That is, without suggesting that early modern playgoers were aided by table-books and the memory arts, I want to argue that Sly's staging of remembrance is symptomatic of cognitive experience in early modern playhouses, in that it suggests that cognition must be distributed across space for the performance to succeed. As Evelyn Tribble has argued, "our understanding of the playing system, particularly of the mnemonic demands that the repertory system made on its participants, has been consistently distorted by a tendency to view cognition as individual rather than social," to the degree that we have obscured "the effects of cognitively rich environments on the actor operating within that system."[4] To overcome such limitation, the theory of cognitive ecology locates thinking in the extension of the mind into the environment, following Andy Clark's assertion that cognition has never been bound within "the ancient fortress of skin and skull."[5] Rather, according to the theory

---

[4] Evelyn Tribble, "Distributing Cognition in the Globe" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 56.2 (Summer 2005): 135, 142.
[5] Andy Clark, *Natural-Born Cyborgs: Minds, Technologies, and the Future of Human Intelligence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 5. Building upon Clark's claim, John Sutton has argued that "We are cyborgs *by nature*," suggesting the possibility of historicizing distributed cognition. See "Exograms and Interdisciplinarity: history,

of cognitive ecology, one must locate thought in the interplay between internal and external mechanisms, between the constitutive elements of the self and those of the environment.

Within the early modern playhouse, cognition was both distributed and localizable. Thought extended across a vast system that included the space of the performance, the material artifacts of the playing company (the costumes, the stage properties, and so forth), and the bodies of the actors and playgoers alike. Together, these elements bear witness to the fact that cognitive ecologies are historically and geographically specific. As John Sutton has argued, "The cognitive skills which individuals roam round with, more or less successfully, have histories which are just as much cultural and developmental as biological," a point that Sutton develops in reading the arts of memory as a form of distributed cognition.[6] Indeed, the materials of Renaissance drama, and of early modern culture more broadly, might be usefully reinterpreted in light of the theory of cognitive ecology, as Tribble and Sutton have recently demonstrated.[7]

But whereas Tribble considers the significance of distributed cognition within the "playing system," using the double sense of actor as player and as agent in a cognitive network, I argue that cognitive ecology can deepen our understanding of the relationship between environment and embodiment within early modern drama. That is to say, cognitive

---

the extended mind, and the civilizing process" in *The Extended Mind*, ed. Richard Menary (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2010), 192.

[6] Ibid., 209.

[7] Evelyn Tribble and John Sutton, "Cognitive Ecology as a Framework for Shakespearean Studies," *Shakespeare Studies* 39 (2011): 94-103. For examples of such application, see in particular Sutton, "Body, Mind, and Order: Local Memory and the Control of Mental Representations in Medieval and Renaissance Sciences of Self" in *1543 and All That: Image and Word, Change and Continuity in the Proto-Scientific Revolution*, ed. Guy Freeland and Anthony Corones (Dordrecht and Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2000), 117-50; Sutton, "Spongy Brains and Material Memories" in *Environment and Embodiment in Early Modern England*, ed. Mary Floyd-Wilson and Garrett A. Sullivan, Jr. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007) 14-34; Tribble, *Cognition in the Globe: Attention and Memory in Shakespeare's Theatre* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011); Tribble and Nicholas Keene, *Cognitive Ecologies and the History of Remembering: Religion, Education and Memory in Early Modern England* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011). In *Supersizing the Mind: Embodiment, Action, and Cognitive Extension* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), Clark also cites Tribble's "Distributing Cognition in the Globe" as an example of how cognitive extension can change our understanding of the past (63-64).

ecology offers a theoretical model for interpreting the ways that characters think through the spaces around them. By shedding light on this phenomenon, I hope to accomplish two goals: one, to foreground the experiential quality of place within early modern drama, a relationality between embodied thought and the environment that recent criticism has often overlooked; and two, to argue that, as plays stage the mutual reconstitution of selves and spaces, they become a kind of cognitive technology for remapping, reimagining, and resignifying the various topographies of early modern England.

The turn towards cognitive ecology in early modern studies has foregrounded questions of historicity, in part because the appropriation of cognitive science as cultural theory risks a number of anachronisms.[8] But within this discussion, the topic of space has ultimately been overlooked. Although Tribble and Sutton suggest that cognitive ecology has the potential to transform our understanding of space, noting that "Bodies, spaces, artifacts, and environments are all coordinated in a cognitive ecological model," their conclusion reduces the environment to a topography of objects, an inert collection of things, as they add that "agents both shape and are in turned shaped by their manipulation of objects" within this coordinated domain.[9] Indeed, for Tribble and Sutton, cognitive ecology implies "a system-level mode of analysis," wherein the system is "dynamic, material, and non-

---

[8] For an example of such anachronism, see Arthur F. Kinney's *Shakespeare and Cognition: Aristotle's Legacy and Shakespearean Drama* (New York: Routledge, 2006), where Kinney uses John J. Ratey's discussion of the amygdala to explain "what is happening" when Shylock learns of Jessica's departure (54). In *Shakespeare's Brain: Reading with Cognitive Theory* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), Mary Thomas Crane offers a more historically rigorous account of early modern drama than Kinney's, but her interest lies in the relationship between cognition and metaphor, rather than in deploying cognitive theory to offer a historicized reinterpretation of Shakespearean drama. In her account, contemporary cognitive theory may shed light on the early modern period – "These cognitive theories of meaning may, in fact, accord with early modern linguistic understanding and practice more closely that does a Saussurean model, much as the cognitive concept of an embodied mind seems closer to early modern humoral physiology than the radically dualistic post-Cartesian paradigm" – but such illumination is ultimately supplemental to Crane's project (14). Finally, Amy Cook's *Shakespearean Neuroplay: Reinvigorating the Study of Dramatic Texts and Performance through Cognitive Science* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010) uses cognitive theory to offer an ahistorical account of Shakespearean drama.
[9] Tribble and Sutton, "Cognitive Ecology," 99.

localizable," a claim that further displaces cognition at the moment that it is distributed.[10] In contrast, I use cognitive ecology to foreground the spatiality of thought on the early modern stage. Not only are the cognitive ecologies of the early modern period spatially specific in their reliance upon particular sites, but they also intervene within the construction and imaginative reconstitution of other environments across Renaissance England.

During the height of early modern drama, London was itself undergoing a series of profound transformations. As Karen Newman has noted, "London may have quadrupled its population between 1550 and 1650, from more than 80,000 to some 400,000 or more; by 1700 its population was well over half a million."[11] As a result of this demographic shift, the urban fabric was continually being reconstituted, with incursions upon open space being increasingly necessary to accommodate the influx of new arrivals from the countryside and abroad.[12] Early modern drama played an important role in mapping this increasingly unfamiliar space, a point that Jean Howard has developed in exploring the relationship between city comedy and urban practice. In *Theater of a City*, she argues that the plays were partially constitutive of early modern London: "in invoking the places of the city and filling them with action, the plays also *construct* the city and make it intelligible for those *un*familiar with its places or the uses to which they can be put, and they parse the permissible and impermissible actions attendant on those places."[13] In describing the ways that early modern

---

[10] Ibid., 95.

[11] Karen Newman, *Cultural Capitals: Early Modern London and Paris* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007), 2.

[12] For critical accounts of these transformations, see John Schofield, "The Topography and Buildings of London, ca. 1600" in *Material London, ca. 1600*, ed. Lena Cowen Orlin (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), 296-321; Laura Williams, "'To recreate and refresh their dulled spirites in the sweet and wholesome ayre': Green Space and the Growth of the City," in *Imagining Early Modern London: Perceptions and portrayals of London 1598-1720*, ed. J.F. Merritt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 185-213; and Rachel Ramsey, "The Language of Urbanization in John Stow's *Survey of London*" *Philological Quarterly* 3.4 (2006): 247-70.

[13] Jean E. Howard*, Theater of a City: The Places of London Comedy, 1598-1642* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), 23.

drama resignifies space, I share Howard's belief that the plays were partially constitutive of London's topography. But her account places considerable emphasis on the relationship between narrative and social practice, evidenced in part by her claim that, "Through their place-based dramatic narratives, playwrights helped representationally to construct the practices associated within specific urban spaces, directing audiences to the uses to which city spaces could be put and to the privileged modes of conduct and the cultural competencies associated with each."[14] Howard's account thereby alludes to the particularities of performance, to the way that certain practices might be staged, but the focus of her analysis is primarily discursive. It overlooks the degree to which perception, cognition, and affect – brought together within the framework of cognitive ecology – defined the contours of space. Environments are experienced before they are described, and one of the essential features of early modern drama is that it remains, in Steven Mullaney's apt characterization, "a form of embodied social thought."[15] To fully understand how drama altered the spaces of early modern England, we must also examine moments of emplacement within dramatic literature. These instances in which the embodied mind apprehends and resignifies the environment function both discursively and metatheatrically. They theorize the relationship between space and subjectivity in ways that are often unprecedented in early modern culture, and they suggest how performance harnesses the intimacy between these two entities in its efforts to conjure forth the dramatic fiction.

Indeed, I situate this discussion upon the early modern stage precisely because drama relies upon a complex resignification of elements within and beyond the playhouse to realize

---

[14] Ibid., 3.

[15] Steven Mullaney, "Affective Technologies: Toward an Emotional Logic of the Elizabethan Stage," in *Environment and Embodiment in Early Modern England*, ed. Mary Floyd-Wilson and Garrett A. Sullivan, Jr. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 73.

a fictional topography. That is to say, playgoers became aware of the drama's location only by translating what was readily apparent to their senses into something grounded in the imagination. The performances themselves presumed a vast cognitive ecology, insofar as playgoers were required to grasp both the few material signifiers of space – stage props, suggestive costumes, occasional furniture – and the language that supplements these signifiers to recognize the setting of the drama.

But this process of conceptual and perceptual translation, I argue, is also the way that subjects apprehend non-dramatic space. To return to *The Malcontent*, Sly gestures to a particular, if often implicit, relationship between theatrical space and the spaces of early modern London, a relationship mediated through cognitive ecology. Although Sly presents himself as "one that never studied the art of memory," his ability to "walk but once down by the Goldsmiths' Row in Cheap, take notice of the signs, and tell you them with a breath instantly" attests to his indebtedness to that very art. Specifically, it recalls the architectural model of memory, a practice that I discuss at length in chapter two. But whereas practitioners of the memory arts often emphasize the alteration of remembered spaces, transforming the memorial topography so as to facilitate memory in other forms, Sly implies that his memory is exceptional in its fidelity to the remembered space. Specifically, Sly relies upon a cognitive ecology that binds the practice of the arts of memory together with the space of Goldsmiths' Row, wherein signifying images have a peculiar and pronounced force.

In the street as onstage, these images bring space into being and ensure its preservation in memory. Michael Camille has argued that signs, both those marking houses and those announcing businesses, participated in the production and navigation of

premodern urban space, insofar as these signs help to differentiate one street from another.[16] Offering a casual reference to the signs of Goldsmiths' Row, Sly implies that they are indeed the signs of businesses, with his claim that "They begin as the world did, with Adam and Eve" playing upon an image of the prelapsarian couple that advertised a tavern (108-9). The emergence of space through signs was not particular to early modern cities, however; it distinctly echoes the signification of space onstage. As Philip Sidney complains that playing violates the Aristotelian unity of place, he laments that it is on the basis on signifiers – verbal and visual – that a playgoer must recognize the place invoked by the performance: "Now you shall have three ladies walk to gather flowers, and then we must believe the stage to be a garden. By and by we hear news of shipwreck in the same place, and then we are to blame if we accept it not for a rock."[17] For Sidney, the signification of theatrical space relies upon particular artifacts, upon pieces that function synecdochically to translate the stage into the place of performance. Through its reference to a similar translation, Sly's claim to a spatial literacy of the urban street implies his cognitive capacity to recognize and remember performance space.[18]

Indeed, Sly associates the practice of the memory arts with his playgoing experience, implying that it supplements his skill in remembering performances. Immediately after asserting his knowledge of signs in Cheapside, he states by way of addition, "I do use to meditate much when I come to plays, too" (109-110). With "use" implying habit, "meditate" in this context stands for Sly's reliance upon cognitive scaffolding to apprehend the

---

[16] Michael Camille, "Signs of the City: Place, Power, and Public Fantasy in Medieval Paris" in *Medieval Practices of Space*, ed. Barbara A. Hanawalt and Michael Kobialka (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000), 1-36.
[17] Philip Sidney, *An Apology for Poetry*, ed. Peter C. Herman (Glen Allen: College Publishing, 2001), 114.
[18] For the term "spatial literacy," I am indebted to Steven Mullaney, "What's Hamlet to Habermas? Spatial Literacy, Theatrical Publication and the Publics of the Early Modern Public Stage," in *Making Space Public in Early Modern England: Performance, Geography, Privacy*, ed. Angela Vanhaelen and Joseph P. Ward (New York: Routledge, 2013), 17-40.

performance, to do at "plays, too" what he does in the Goldsmiths' Row. To a degree, the structure of the Globe was analogous to a memory theater, a point that Frances Yates develops in her influential study of the memory arts. There, Yates suggests the Globe provided the model for Robert Fludd's memory theater, given that Fludd wanted his conceptual topography "to be based on a real stage."[19] More recently, however, Lina Perkins Wilder has critiqued the immobility that Yates assigns to the Globe stage in aligning it with a memory theater: "Early modern memory theaters seem to have more in common with tableaux than they do with plays," insofar as the images placed within them do not "develop into narrative."[20] Wilder adds, "Shakespeare's memory theater, in contrast, places memory in a narrative context," suggesting an important point in the way that performance harnesses embodied thought.[21]

In what follows, I use cognitive ecology to examine moments of emplacement within early modern drama, to suggest the way that theater functions as a kind of medium for reimagining space. But I also invoke this method to foreground a historically nuanced understanding of space within the early modern period. The definitions of "space" and "place" were being reconceptualized in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, owing to a series of transformations that have been amply documented by the historian Edward Grant and by the philosopher of physics Max Jammer.[22] Within this intellectual genealogy, the early modern period represents the moment in which theories of an *a priori* and infinite

---

[19] Frances Yates, *The Art of Memory* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966), 348.
[20] Lina Perkins Wilder, "Toward a Shakespearean 'Memory Theater': Romeo, the Apothecary, and the Performance of Memory" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 56.2 (Summer 2005): 162. Wilder continues her analysis of the relationship between the memory arts and Shakespeare's theater in *Shakespeare's Memory Theatre: Recollection, Properties, and Character* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).
[21] Wilder, "Toward a Shakespearean 'Memory Theater'," 162.
[22] Edward Grant, *Much Ado About Nothing: Theories of Space and Vacuum from the Middle Ages to the Scientific Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981). Max Jammer, *Concepts of Space: The History of Theories of Space in Physics*, third edition (New York: Dover Publications, 1993).

dimensionality, the domain that we define as "space," ultimately supplanted a more ancient understanding of place as the intersection of bodies and locations. In Grant's words, "the idea that an infinite void space existed beyond our spherical, finite cosmos took hold in the fourteenth century and, by the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, won widespread acceptance," as philosophers and theologians came to align the idea of infinite space with God's immensity, the one being a correlative of the other.[23] But whereas Grant's and Jammer's narratives foreground what might be called the early modern invention of space, Edward Casey has more recently drawn our attention to another aspect of this process, specifically the contested status of place within Renaissance discourse. For Casey, modernity's investment in the idea of space has obscured both the historical and phenomenological primacy of place. In a strange and suggestive set of pairings, he notes: "Both Archytas and Aristotle proclaimed that place is prior to space, and, more recently, Bachelard and Heidegger have reembraced that conviction. All four thinkers subscribe to what could be called the Archytian Axiom: 'Place is the first of all things,'" suggesting that contemporary theory may shed light on a pre-Cartesian understanding of the environment.[24] Indeed, my hope for this project is that, by bringing contemporary theory into dialogue with early modern culture, it allows us to recover a more historically robust understanding of space in early modern England.

Two methodological questions stem from this effort, the one historiographical and the other philosophical. First, if the early modern period witnessed a shift in the conceptualization of space, where the idea of an infinite and expansive dimension gradually

---

[23] Grant, *Much Ado About Nothing*, 260.
[24] Edward S. Casey, "How to Get from Space to Place in a Fairly Short Stretch of Time: Phenomenological Prolegomena" in *Senses of Place*, ed. Steven Feld and Keith H. Basso (Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, 1996), 16.

supplanted a belief in the primacy of place, how should we interpret this transformation in relationship to early modern culture? As Grant suggests, arguments in favor of the existence of space developed unevenly, across a vast archipelago of academic sites and philosophical schools, and they were most often articulated at great remove from the spaces of the early modern stage.[25] How, then, do we write a genealogy of place, in the Foucauldian sense of the word, that acknowledges the significant lag between Renaissance theories of location and their eruption within early modern culture?[26] In *The Fate of Place: A Philosophical History*, Casey undertakes precisely such a genealogy as it pertains to philosophical discourse. But Casey's work, as it moves from the classical period through poststructuralist thought, ultimately reinforces the isolation of these concepts, suggesting their remove from other, non-philosophical domains.[27] In contrast, one of my aims in this dissertation is to suggest how untimely theories of place and of embodied location emerge within early modern culture, where culture is less a site for receiving philosophical ideas than a domain wherein these ideas are tested, transformed, or rejected in favor of more organic claims. In other words, my hope is that this project adds nuance and depth to our understanding of space in the early modern period, in part by foregrounding the role of drama as a site for thinking through the paradoxes of embodied location.

---

[25] There are a few intriguing exceptions to this distance, most notably in the fact that Ben Jonson owned a copy of Lucretius's *De Rerum Natura*. In *The Swerve: How the World Became Modern* (New York: Norton, 2011), Stephen Greenblatt speculates that Shakespeare may also have been familiar with Lucretius, either through Jonson or through Montaigne's *Essais* (243-244).

[26] It is worth noting that Foucault gestures to the history of space in his essay, "Of Other Spaces," translated by Jay Miskowiec and published in *Diacritics* 16, no. 1 (Spring 1986): 22-27. Foucault argues "that in the Middle Ages there is a hierarchic ensemble of places: sacred places and profane places; protected places and open, exposed places; urban places and rural places," and he contrasts this episteme, dominated by "the space of emplacement," with early modern theories of "an infinite, and infinitely open space" (22-23). In short, for Foucault, "starting with Galileo and the seventeenth century, extension was substituted for localization" (23).

[27] Casey, *The Fate of Place: A Philosophical History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997).

Second, with regard to the phenomenological primacy of place, how do we account for its presence and its constitutive force within an episteme that continually seeks to obscure the significance of the concept of place? In the *Discours de la Méthode*, for example, René Descartes lays the foundation for the *cogito* by separating the mind from its immediate environment, diminishing the importance of place in determining: "that I was a substance, whose whole essence or nature was only in thinking, and which, in order to be, *has no need of any place*, nor is dependent upon any material thing."[28] For phenomenologists and contemporary theorists alike, Descartes's assertion misrepresents the relationship between embodied thought and the environment.[29] Rather than acknowledging the constitutive role of place in providing the grounds of personhood, Descartes's account of being articulates a fantasy of a disembodied, and thus displaced, subjectivity. It is, in Slavoj Zizek's apt characterization, a form of madness.[30] Although Descartes himself does not fully succeed in realizing this fantasy, even within the limited space of his own philosophical project, this account is symptomatic of certain trends within early modern thought, specifically of a desire to view the self as separate from its elemental and environmental foundations.[31] Thus, it

---

[28] René Descartes, *Discours de la Méthode*, in *Oeuvres de Descartes* VI, publiées par Charles Adam & Paul Tannery (Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1965), 33. Both the translation and the emphasis are my own.

[29] See, for example, Edmund Husserl, *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology*, trans. David Carr (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1970), and Casey, *Getting Back into Place: Toward a Renewed Understanding of the Place-World* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993).

[30] In *The Ticklish Subject: The Absent Centre of Political Ontology*, 2nd ed. (New York: Verso, 2008), Zizek characterizes Descartes's retreat into the *cogito* as a form of madness; he attributes this formulation to Derrida, but Zizek himself usefully suggests that the *cogito* is a form of madness because it removes the subject from the environment (figured here as the *Umwelt*): "Does not this withdrawal, on the contrary, designate the severing of the links with the *Umwelt*, the end of the subject's immersion in its immediate natural surroundings, and is it not, as such, the founding gesture of 'humanization'? Was not this withdrawal-into-self accomplished by Descartes in his universal doubt and reduction to *cogito*, which, as Derrida pointed out in his 'Cogito and the History of Madness', also involves a passage through the moment of radical madness?" (36).

[31] In *Philosophy and Memory Traces: Descartes to Connectionism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), Sutton establishes a relationship between Descartes's conception of the soul and early modern theories of animal spirits and the humors, suggesting the difficulty of fully achieving a disembodied subjectivity within the Cartesian system. Timothy J. Reiss, in *Mirages of the Selfe: Patterns of Personhood in Ancient and Early Modern Europe* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003), also argues that the Cartesian *cogito* was less displaced than Descartes himself claims; indeed, for Reiss, the *cogito* is itself a space: "Neither *ego* and its cognates nor *res*

becomes essential to ask how we understand and engage this tension between space and place, between an imperceptible domain of ideas and the more immediate realm of sensations, within the early modern period, existing at once on the discursive level of the history of ideas and in the more localized sphere of human subjectivity.

To address these interpretative problems, I use the concept of emplacement. Emplacement foregrounds both the experiential quality of being-within-a-location and the temporal drag of that quality, the fact that feelings of emplacement are formed through the gradual accumulation of different sensations.[32] In this sense, emplacement relies upon a particular cognitive ecology. Again, as a framework, cognitive ecology foregrounds "the rich interconnectivity of the brain, body, and world," as Edwin Hutchins describes it in his seminal work on the concept, encompassing "the multidimensional contexts in which we remember, feel, think, sense, communicate, imagine, and act, often collaboratively, on the fly, and in rich ongoing interaction with our environments."[33] In this way, cognitive ecology provides a theoretical framework for interpreting the way that disparate elements – from embodied sensations to the qualia of an ambient environment – conjoin to form a sense of place. As I deploy the concept here, cognitive ecology restores our understanding of the historical particularity of early modern spaces, in part by suggesting that experiences of

---

cogitans were at this stage [of the second Meditation] any sort of agent. They were names given to the 'place' where thinking (as any form of mental activity) went on or, better yet, they were simply the referents *subjected to* that thinking process" (482).

[32] My conceptualization of emplacement owes a great deal to Casey's theory of implacement, a term that he deploys in *Getting Back into Place* in order to foreground the phenomenological and experiential quality of being within a particular location.

[33] Edwin Hutchins, "Cognitive Ecology," *Topics in Cognitive Science*, 2 (2010): 711; Tribble and Sutton, "Cognitive Ecologies," 94. In *Being There: Putting Brain, Body, and World Together Again* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1997), Clark also invokes cognitive extension as a means of relocalizing the embodied mind within a larger environment. Moreover, Clark returns to this idea in *Supersizing the Mind*, where he elaborates on the concept of a "cognitive niche construction" within space by citing David Kirsch's "The Intelligent Use of Space," *Artificial Intelligence* 73 (1995): 31-68 (64).

emplacement, more so than the concept of expansive space, defined the environments of Renaissance England.

As a theoretical model, cognitive ecology is deeply capacious. Its virtue is tied to its ability to bring together disparate elements from different ontological categories – material and immaterial, sentient and insentient, real and imagined – within a larger system of thought. But for this reason, I often supplement the theory of cognitive ecology with other theoretical and philosophical models, from phenomenology and performativity to theories of emergence and captivation, in order to address the constitutive forces of a particular cognitive ecology. In chapter one, for example, I rely upon an early version of the theory of cognitive ecology – that of cognitive extension – to trace the relationship between desire and the shape of the cosmos in John Lyly's *Endymion*. Because desire, like thought, extends beyond the self, entering into a complex circuit with bodies and artifacts within the world, it is deeply productive to think of this drive in terms of cognitive ecology.[34] The reconceptualization of what I call amatory cognition – that is, a form of contemplative thought deeply inflected by yearning – foregrounds the relationship between desire and space in *Endymion* and within the discursive realm of Neoplatonism. These approaches allow me to develop and add nuance to the insights of cognitive ecology, particularly as I endeavor to historicize these claims and to make their implications specific to early modern drama. The purpose is, on the one hand, to foreground the historical particularity of early modern cognitive ecologies and to suggest how this historical awareness can guide new interpretations of Renaissance drama. But it is also to develop the theory of cognitive ecology, to suggest that the distribution of thought across space does not simply transform

---

[34] See, for example, Jacques Lacan's discussion of the partial circuit of the drive in *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Norton, 1998), 174-186.

our understanding of the mind, but that it must also change the way that we interpret that environment.

Indeed, one of the central arguments of *Ecologies of Thought* is that cognitive ecology reframes our understanding of the ontology of early modern space. Specifically, it draws our attention to what might be called the micro-territorialities of early modern culture. I have adapted the term "micro-territorialities" from the work of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, who posit the territory as the organization of disparate flows, rhythms, and affects within a particular domain: "The territory is in fact an act that affects milieus and rhythms, that 'territorializes' them. The territory is the product of a territorialization of milieus and rhythms."[35] Animals produce their own territories in resignifying the environment around them, by signaling a kind of possessiveness over the space and thus making themselves consubstantial with it: "Bird songs: the bird sings to mark its territory," but humans are territorial as well: "Radios and television sets are like sound walls around every household and mark territories (the neighbor complains when it gets too loud)."[36] In this sense, the territory is an environment known only through emplacement; it is a space that emerges when the feelings and signifying forces of the *Umwelt* or milieu have been grasped, apprehended, or transformed by the organism.[37]

Defined in this way, territories appear to lack the ideological significance of larger political entities, such as states and empires, even as they recall the environments posited by

---

[35] Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Brian Massumi (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987), 314.
[36] Ibid., 313, 311.
[37] This figuration of the territory anticipates Deleuze and Guattari's later discussion of the difference between smooth and striated space. Ventriloquizing the composer Pierre Boulez, they argue: "in a smooth space-time one occupies without counting, whereas in a striated space-time one counts in order to occupy" (Ibid., 477). In other words, smooth space, like the territory, is known only by being embedded within it, by occupying the space; in contrast, striated space is mapped, or counted, from a distance or from a position of exteriority. I discuss the concept of the *Umwelt* and its relationship to space at greater length in chapter four.

cognitive ecology. But, as Deleuze and Guattari suggest, these molar aggregates of political organization come into being through the reorganization of smaller spaces, including that of the territory. In this sense, "every politics is simultaneously a *macropolitics* and a *micropolitics*," insofar as one must attend to both the existence of a particular political entity, on the macro-level of the state, and the minor, even molecular, shifts that subtend and support the formation of that entity.[38] In the two volumes of *Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, Deleuze and Guattari regularly use this distinction between macropolitics and micropolitics to examine the relationship between fascism and the desires subtending that ideology.[39] But one might easily appropriate these terms to examine the flows of energy and affect that support early modern political formations. For example, to understand the political organization of Elizabeth's court, one might examine the structural contours of the early modern monarchy, its relationship to the aristocracy and to Parliament, as well as the social and economic conditions that gave shape to the second half of the sixteenth century. But, in a micropolitical approach, it would also be necessary to consider a discursive entity like Neoplatonism, which aided in the construction of Elizabeth's court by locating her courtiers within a schema of contemplative desire.

Thus, I invoke these concepts in order to foreground the critical, and perhaps political, significance of examining the spaces produced through cognitive ecology. Within

---

[38] Ibid., 213. Significantly for my work, Deleuze and Guattari argue that micropolitics concerns the perceptual, the affective, and the unconscious, each a particular domain that cognitive ecology helps us to theorize: "Take aggregates of the perception or feeling type: their molar organization, their rigid segmentarity, does not preclude the existence of an entire world of unconscious micropercepts, unconscious affects, fine segmentations that grasp or experience different things, are distributed and operate differently. There is a micropolitics of perception, affection, and conversation, and so forth" (213).

[39] Indeed, in his preface to *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane (New York: Penguin, 1977), Foucault argues: "the major enemy, the strategic adversary," for Deleuze and Guattari, "is fascism. ... And not only historical fascism, the fascism of Hitler and Mussolini – which was able to mobilize and use the desire of the masses so effectively – but also the fascism in us all, in our heads and in our everyday behavior, the fascism that causes us to love power, to desire the very thing that dominates and exploits us" (xiii).

early modern studies, larger topographies of nation and empire have been subjected to rigorous ideological critique, in part because specific historical forces – whether in Elizabeth's efforts to colonize Ireland, in the tenuous unification of England and Scotland under James, or in the expansion of England's naval and imperial power over the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries – have foregrounded the contingent nature of these entities at the very moment that Shakespeare and his contemporaries staged their constitution and dissolution.[40] But the questions that Deleuze and Guattari pose – how do territories become absorbed within states, and how do states sustain themselves through the production and transformation of territories – require further consideration. Within early modern England, how can imagined topographies and cognitive maps deepen our sense of fictional and physical environments staged by Shakespeare and his contemporaries?

The works that I consider – Lyly's *Endymion*, Christopher Marlowe's *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, William Shakespeare's *King Lear*, and Ben Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair* – each concern themselves with a political and geographic entity, whether as enclosed as Elizabeth's court or as expansive as the British empire. Because these larger topographies have often already received considerable critical attention, I focus instead on the more intimate spaces of the plays, seeking to foreground the relationship between embodied thought and the environment within each work.

---

[40] For a few representative examples, see Richard Helgerson, "The Land Speaks: Cartography, Chorography, and Subversion in Renaissance England," *Representations* 16 (Autumn 1986): 50-85; John Gillies, *Shakespeare and the Geography of Difference* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); and Bernhard Klein, *Maps and the Writing of Space in Early Modern England and Ireland* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001). For accounts that situate the spaces of nation and empire in relation to early modern drama, see in particular Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), Emily C. Bartels, *Spectacles of Strangeness: Imperialism, Alienation, and Marlowe* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993), and Jean E. Howard and Phyllis Rackin, *Engendering a Nation: A Feminist Account of Shakespeare's English Histories* (New York: Routledge, 1997).

The first chapters of the dissertation examine the representation of the ecological mind in early modern drama. John Lyly's *Endymion* (chapter one) stages the Ovidian myth of a shepherd's infatuation with the moon, theorizing a relationship between the cosmos and contemplative desire. When, late in the play, the moon abruptly metamorphoses into a human monarch, Endymion's experience of contemplative desire changes in its significance. The cognitive ecology that once tied his thoughts to the cosmos, I argue, now signals his embeddedness within the early modern court, effectively politicizing the contemplative desire envisioned in Neoplatonism. Christopher Marlowe's *Dido* (chapter two) stages the intersection of urban space and affective memory. Aeneas experiences memory as a profoundly spatial phenomenon, shown both in his complex narration of the fall of Troy and his brief hallucination of Priam before the walls of Carthage. I argue that the deeply parodic tone of *Dido* empties Aeneas's ecological memory of significance. Diminishing the importance of the remembered Troy, the play severs the connection between the city that Aeneas has lost and the imperial center that he intends to found, while simultaneously mocking London for figuring itself as "Troynovant."

Later chapters trace the processual nature of space on the early modern stage, as they show how drama attempts to manage the experience of embodied cognition in creating a sense of place within the playhouse. Shakespeare's *King Lear* (chapter three) stages a performative constitution of space, where perception and cognition gradually reshape the contours of a place, and the play uses Gloucester's blindness and Lear's madness to make the disruption of this phenomenology the foundation of its tragedy. Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair* (chapter four) locates this performative constitution in an urban context, staging the fair and its ability to alter the space of northern London. At the same time that the Induction allows *Bartholomew Fair* to theorize the relationship between theater and the production of

space, the play mocks those characters, like Busy, who assume a clear separation of embodiment and environment.

By excavating the relationship of place to personhood in early modern drama, *Ecologies of Thought* provides a new template for reading the work of Shakespeare and his contemporaries. It advances a historically sensitive methodology for interpreting the representation of thought on the early modern stage. More specifically, in drawing attention to crises of emplacement on the early modern stage, this project argues that these moments of disorientation enable drama to reveal the transactional and mutually constitutive relationship between environment and embodied thought. Indeed, through its ability to represent and to manipulate the ecological nature of cognition, early modern drama became a conceptual and imaginative means of reconstituting space across Renaissance England.

Chapter One

Amatory Cognition and the Shape of Cosmos

in John Lyly's *Endymion*

"My thoughts, Eumenides, are stitched to the stars, which, being as high as I can see, thou mayest imagine how much higher they are than I can reach."[41] With this utterance, Endymion explains to Eumenides the reason for his love-melancholy, the early modern disease that takes unrequited love as the cause of sighs, sweating, and other physiological signs of desire's discontents. But rather than draw attention to the humors that were believed to cause the symptoms of melancholy, Endymion turns from the body to the soul. He suggests that he suffers because his cognition, comprised of both his "thoughts" and the erotic charge attached to them, is distended, in a sense. Endymion's soul becomes located in the cosmos at the moment that it fixates upon the stars, apprehending those celestial bodies in the same manner as his eyes do; but, in another sense, his soul remains within his body, animating the flesh that looks upon what it cannot "reach." Endymion plays upon the dual significance of the soul as both the collection of sensory faculties and the seat of reason, imagination, and memory, suggesting that one remains within his body while the other moves beyond it as a result of his erotic ardor. While Endymion remains on the ground and

---

[41] John Lyly, *Endymion*, in *English Renaissance Drama*, ed. David Bevington, Lars Engle, Katharine Eisaman Maus, and Eric Rasmussen (New York: Norton, 2002), 1.1.4-7. All further citations are from this edition.

his thoughts move into the cosmos, his soul becomes elongated, stretched across the universe, in an extreme form of cognitive extension.

In contemporary neurophilosophy, cognitive extension typically denotes the mind's ability to attach itself to objects, to couple with things and with places that provide a foundation for thinking. As Andy Clark puts it, cognition has never been bound within "the ancient fortress of skin and skull," but rather the mind takes the world as its structural foundation.[42] In a seminal essay on the extended mind, Clark and David Chalmers use the example of a notebook to suggest how our memories become located beyond our bodies and how our ability to interface with prostheses like notebooks renders cognition a complex circuit, interlacing embodiment with environment.[43] Notebooks do less to store memories than to provide the foundation for remembering as a process, as quite literally a re-membering of scattered fragments. Because some of those traces lie within the brain, while others are located in the notebook, recollection does not happen in isolation; rather, it emerges when the embodied subject couples with the prosthetic device, and the disparate traces are at last conjoined. We rely upon objects and spaces as the scaffolding for higher level processing, whether in remembering past experiences or in longing towards futurity, and Clark has speculated that even more rudimentary processes depend upon the mind's ability to move beyond the body.[44] Even when we are not thinking about our world, then, we are thinking through it.

---

[42] Andy Clark, *Natural-Born Cyborgs: Minds, Technologies, and the Future of Human Intelligence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 5.

[43] Clark and David Chalmers. "The Extended Mind" *Analysis* 58.1 (January 1998): 7-19.

[44] Where thought appears to be bound within the brain, it is often the result of complex processes that were once external and have since been internalized, like the effort to think through language. In *Being There: Putting Brain, Body, and World Together Again* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1997), Clark theorizes language as a form of cognitive scaffolding. Whatever innate structures of language cognitive linguists have located within the brain, the assumption of a particular system of words requires the mind to internalize grammatical systems, sets of definitions, and idioms before the subject can think through words; even after this internalization, language

The conceptual effort to extend the mind across its environment was already at work in the early modern period, as John Sutton notes in asserting that the theory of animal spirits figures a distribution of cognition within and beyond the body.[45] Indeed, in terms remarkably similar to Clark's model of an intersection of embodiment and environment, Sutton argues: "If there are multiple channels by which brain, body, and world interact and dynamically couple – material and bodily, cognitive and informational, emotional and phenomenological, interpersonal and cultural – then in early modern England these channels were unusually open, at an unusually high bandwidth."[46] This distribution occurred both within the body, as animal spirits and humoral fluids would circulate thought throughout the flesh, and beyond the somatic, insofar the elemental sympathy between the body and its environment ensured further distribution. In another sense, however, distributed cognition was already a part of early modern culture, not because the discourse of humoral theory posited the mind's extension but because theatrical practice depended upon it. As Evelyn Tribble has shown, actors in the Globe theater used a system of distributed cognition that included "the playhouse, the plots, actors' roles, the plays' verbal structures, and the apprentice system and the organizational practices of the companies," as well as the players' own embodiment to ensure that repertoire texts were retained in memory.[47] Insofar as cognitive extension was

---

remains uneasily poised within and beyond us, as its status as a collective medium ensures that it is always, to some extent, outside the individual who uses it.

[45] Cf. John Sutton, *Philosophy and Memory Traces: Descartes to Connectionism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), especially the claim: "Animal spirits theory, like possible dynamical cognitive models, fits Tim van Gelder's description of a class of possible dynamical cognitive models, in which cognitive systems are 'complexes of continuous, simultaneous, and mutually determining change' (1995: 373):

the cognitive system is not just the encapsulated brain; rather, since the nervous system, body, and environment are all constantly changing and simultaneously influencing each other, the true cognitive system is a single unified system embracing all three … interaction between the inner and the outer is … a matter of coupling, such that both sets of processes continually influence each other's direction of change." (5).

[46] John Sutton, "Spongy Brains and Material Memories" in *Environment and Embodiment in Early Modern England*, ed. Mary Floyd-Wilson and Garrett A. Sullivan, Jr. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 15

[47] Evelyn Tribble, "Distributing Cognition in the Globe" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 56.2 (Summer 2005): 142.

operative in the early modern period, both its discursive circulation and its proximity to theatrical practice would, I suggest, have enabled its eruption within a play like Lyly's.

Endymion's experience of cognitive extension fascinates in part because of the way that it thematizes this act of thinking through the world. Endymion's desire locates his thoughts amid the stars, making the cosmos a scaffold for the shepherd's mind as it extends from his body. But, as Endymion explains, his desire also takes the cosmos as its object in the shepherd's longing for the moon. This suggestion confuses Eumenides, who counsels Endymion: "If you be enamoured of anything above the moon, your thoughts are ridiculous, for that things immortal are not subject to affections; if allured or enchanted with these transitory things under the moon, you show yourself senseless to attribute such lofty titles to such lows trifles" (1.1.7-12). Either Endymion desires an impossible object in the form of a celestial body, or he improperly elevates a terrestrial being to heavenly status. But Eumenides ignores the possibility that Endymion could love the very object that he uses to distinguish the sub- and superlunary: the moon itself. When Endymion responds affirmatively to Eumenides' question, "Do you love the moon, Endymion?" and names that celestial body as the object of his affection, he foregrounds the cosmological investment of the play (1.1.20). Endymion's statement limits the possibility of a purely metaphorical reading of his claim that his thoughts are among the stars and suggests instead that the shepherd quite literally locates his cognition in the cosmos.

In Lyly's *Endymion*, love takes one to the moon and back. Or, rather, it brings the moon closer to those who love that lunar body, translating the heavenly reflector into human flesh. For Endymion himself, the shepherd who loves this celestial body in the form of Cynthia, such desire risks madness, even as it enables an ecstatic flight of the soul from the body. His longing locates his thoughts and his affections beyond their material

foundations in the elements of the flesh and of the world. In this regard, his erotic fixation on the moon quickly acquires the contours of philosophical contemplation, with Endymion's ardor dimly representing his desire to move beyond what is immediately present to him. Erotic ambition, in other words, takes the place of philosophical rigor in the play, in a move that owes much to Neoplatonic thinking. In both *Endymion* and in the Neoplatonism from which it draws, the coupling of desire with contemplative thought represents a kind of hybridization of the soul's disparate functions, an overlap that I call amatory cognition. But the cosmological stakes of Endymion's desire become even more apparent when the play sets his longing for Cynthia in contrast with his former love for Tellus, a woman whose name of "Earth" suggestively renders her a planetary competitor with the moon. Endymion's repudiation of Tellus in favor of Cynthia thereby concerns much more than triangulated desire; it suggests a rejection of the Earth in preference for the Moon. Endymion's love for Cynthia would be largely unremarkable within the history of early modern eroticism, were it not for the fact that the play grafts this desire onto the cosmos and uses it to position the human subject midway between heaven and earth.

Endymion's love hovers between the celestial and the terrestrial, making its status as a political emotion late in the play both surprising and discursively disruptive. Cynthia does not remain an embodiment of the moon for the entirety of *Endymion*; rather, in the midst of the action, she transforms from that lunar body into a monarchical figure, gracing the stage with her corporeal presence. Cynthia's alteration transforms Endymion's relationship to her: he ceases to contemplate her philosophically and becomes instead her courtier. But this shift also implicates the nature of Endymion's desire, which once signified a longing to participate in the heavenly spheres and now demonstrates his embeddedness within an earthly court. The play effectively transfers the locus of Endymion's desire, divesting that love of its

previous, cosmological potential and rendering it instead an effect of political organization. Thus, Cynthia's transformation recasts the thematic investment of the play and alters the relationship of each character to one another; it is surprising, then, that not one of them comments on the fact that the moon has come down to earth.

As Robert S. Knapp has asserted, the play represents "a notorious enigma" in its efforts to stage a philosophical allegory in the context of a commentary on early modern court culture.[48] Flattery was by no means uncommon in court performances, but *Endymion* struggles to the degree that its figures are overdetermined, existing simultaneously and to that extent uneasily in their transcendent and terrestrial spaces. Most critics accept as axiomatic that Cynthia allegorically "figures both Elizabeth and some aspect of divine virtue,"[49] but they are at a loss as to the identity of the drama's other, equally allegorical and yet suggestively topical, figures.[50] Endymion may represent a soul in contemplation, a kind of Neoplatonic Everyman, as Joseph Da Crema suggests,[51] but the shepherd's eventual subjection to Cynthia makes him a courtier in equal measure. If Cynthia represents Elizabeth, does this make Endymion the Earl of Oxford, as Josephine Bennett has asserted,[52] or perhaps the Earl of Leicester, as in David Bevington's reading?[53] Or, following Michael

---

48 Robert S. Knapp, "The Monarchy of Love in Lyly's 'Endymion,'" *Modern Philology* 73, no. 4 (May 1976): 353.
49 Ibid.
50 Derek B. Alwes, in "'I would faine serve': John Lyly's Career at Court" *Comparative Drama* 34, no. 4 (Winter 2000/2001), makes a similar point: "That Cynthia ("the myracle of Nature, of tyme, of Fortune" [1.4.36-37]) in many ways represents Elizabeth is indisputable, but efforts to identify other characters in the play with real persons have inspired some rather elaborate mental gymnastics" (410). Whereas Alwes gestures towards the problems of topicality in order to interpret the play through Lyly's career, I note these problems to emphasize the play's discursive work in theorizing an epistemology of space.
51 Joseph J. Da Crema, "The Neoplatonic Element in John Lyly" (doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1968), 20.
52 Josephine Waters Bennett, "Oxford and *Endimion*," *PMLA* 57, no. 2 (June 1942): 354-69.
53 David Bevington, in *Tudor Drama and Politics: A Critical Approach to Topical Meaning* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968), notes the possibility of this identification, while asserting that because "Elizabeth did not like to be reminded of that disloyalty" that lay within Leicester's secret marriage, it is unlikely that the play actively engages this topicality (178).

Pincombe, might we read Endymion as Lyly himself?[54] For that matter, does Tellus adequately assume the qualities of her name to signify "Earth," or does her subject position draw her, like Endymion, from the allegorical to the historical? Is she a dim cipher of Oxford's paramour, Lady Anne Vavasour, as Bennett would have it?[55] Or is she the more political than erotic rival of Elizabeth, Mary Queen of Scots?[56] As should be clear from these efforts to "apply" the matter of play in topical readings, a move that works against the prologue's recommendation, critics have largely assumed the predominance of one mode of discourse within the play, to the exclusion of other tropes and signifying processes (Prologue.8).[57] Most often, this assumption means taking the end of *Endymion* as its culmination and interpreting Cynthia's monarchical presence as inevitable, rather than as something that emerges as a result of dramatic action. In doing so, these critics have tacitly ignored the play's enactment of a tension between philosophical transcendence and the immanence of political order.

Of course, it may be extreme to suggest such tension between the conceptual ascent that allegory enables and the embeddedness of historical application. Both, as Peter Weltner points out, work to displace meaning from an apparent signifier onto the real of the signified,

---

[54] Michael Pincombe, *The plays of John Lyly: Eros and Eliza* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996), 82.
[55] Bennett, "Oxford and *Endimion*," 361. In *John Lyly: The Humanist as Courtier* (London: Routledge, 1962), however, G. K. Hunter suggests that the scandal of Vavasour's marriage would have been addressed in 1583, when "Oxford is climbing back into royal favour, and is no doubt anxious to do all he can to win back again the lost ground" (73).
[56] David Bevington, "Lyly's *Endymion* and *Midas*: The Catholic Question in England" *Comparative Drama* 32:1 (Spring 1998): 34.
[57] Moreover, it is worth noting the unlikelihood that *Endymion* gestures toward a single courtier. As Hunter notes, the Master of Revels, responsible for selecting the plays to be performed at the court, would have been inclined to avoid the topical specificity that such an allusion would required, if for no other reason than political safety: "On what artistic grounds did the Office of the Revels select and reject? No doubt the danger of offence to her Majesty or other powerful persons was always present" (91). Bevington, too, asserts that it is difficult to read *Endymion* as pleading the case of a particular courtier; see *Tudor Drama and Politics*, 10.

"whether that 'real' be considered an historical individual, say, or an ideal."[58] Endymion's desire is not necessarily antinomian, but in its potential to draw the soul from the body, it risks taking political subjects out of the court wherein they should reside, to place them in the cosmos. The paradox then lies not in the proximity of these two strands – the one ascending toward the spheres, the other embracing an earthly monarchy – but in the nature of their relation.

To privilege either the play's investment in Neoplatonism or in political organization is to ignore the complex negotiation of space, place, and cognition that conjoin these dual concerns. For although, as I argue, the Neoplatonic and the political elements of *Endymion* parallel one another in theorizing a contemplative constitution of space, they remain divergent in the places taken under consideration. Neoplatonism envisions a universe in which the contemplative soul may throw off its embodiment and ascend, through a kind of cognitive extension, towards the divine mind that animates the cosmos; in this regard, thought has the potential to locate the mind beyond the world as well as the body, in what Edward Grant has termed the "extracosmic" space lying outside the firmament.[59] Here, we find a set of terms for conceptualizing Endymion's soul and its expansion into a circuit linking the earth-bound body to cosmological cognition. In contradistinction to the Neoplatonic ascent, the positioning of subjects with regard to the monarch occurs within worldly or "intramundane" place.[60] The political ecology of the early modern court was such that it was defined by the presence of the monarch. "The Court was a movable institution," E. K. Chambers notes, "constituted by the actual presence of the sovereign," rather than

---

[58] Peter Weltner, "The Antinomic Vision of Lyly's *Endymion*," *English Literary Renaissance* 3, no. 1 (Winter 1973): 6.
[59] Edward Grant, *Much Ado About Nothing: Theories of Space and Vacuum from the Middle Ages to the Scientific Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981). The distinction between extracosmic and intramundane spaces, and their relationship to both Ficino and *Endymion*, will be further theorized below.
[60] Ibid.

delimited through an architectural site or with reference to a national space.[61] Because the court exists through the monarchical body, it remains within the only realm that human bodies can inhabit, the intramundane collection of places that is the world. Despite Cynthia's initial appearance as the moon itself, in other words, her gradual transformation into a monarch signifies her management of Endymion and others as strictly sublunary. Whereas Neoplatonism treats the movement of a soul through the cosmos, the court of *Endymion* exists only among the microcosms of ensouled corporealities, those "little worlds" that are a monarch's subjects.[62] Implicit in the invocation of these discourses, then, is a question of the relation between cosmic and courtly space, the crux of which is the place of the soul within those particular spheres.

In suggesting this tension between the play's dominant discourses, I acknowledge that the early modern period theorized a relation between the microcosm of the human subject and the macrocosm of the universe on multiple registers and that these registers should reduce the apparent paradoxes governing Endymion's experience.[63] But each of these models presumes a particular means of interlacing the corporeal with the cosmic, none of

---

[61] E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923), 7.

[62] The trope of the human body as a little world circulates widely in the early modern period but is perhaps rendered most literal in the title of Helkiah Crooke's anatomical treatise, *Mikrokosmographia: A Description of the Body of Man. Together with the Controversies Thereto Belonging. Collected and Translated out of all the Best Authors of Anatomy, Especially out of Gasper Bauhinus and Andreas Laurentius* (London: William Iaggard, 1615). In the preface to the work, Crooke figures the human as "*The little world*. For his body is, at it were, a Magazine or Store-house of all the vertues and efficacies of all bodies, and in his soule is the power and force of all liuing and sensible things" (3).

[63] In *Nature's Work of Art: The Human Body as Image of the World* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975), Leonard Barkan lists four models that thread the macrocosm of the universe through the microcosm of the human body, each indebted to Plato: "the chemical geocosm, envisaging a world composed of the four elements; the astral geocosm, presupposing a heavenly cosmos that is both physical and spiritual; a numerical geocosm made up of abstract mathematical relations; and a natural geocosm comprised of the objects of this world as immediately beheld by the senses" (14). Of these models, only the first has implications for *Endymion*. The play does not represent a connection between Endymion and the cosmos through elemental sympathy as such, but the fact that his cognition is embodied at the same time that it extends into the cosmos means that his thoughts substantiate a connection between the two spheres and that they are subtended by the same elements in both locations. The second model obtains for Ficino, as Thomas Moore suggests in *The Planets Within: Marsilio Ficino's Astrological Psychology* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1982), but not for *Endymion*.

which adequately explains the play's efforts to move Endymion between contemplative space and the court. Foucault famously theorizes this interlacement through an analogical system, noting that the assumption of resemblance worked both as "a *category of thought*" and as "a *general configuration* of nature," as a conceptual model that assumed continual sympathy between elements of the microcosm and of the macrocosm and as a practical limit on such sympathy.[64] For Foucault, this system of analogy obtains largely on a discursive level; insofar as his work here concerns the rise of the human sciences, the emphasis lies on the epistemic changes that serve to differentiate the early modern period from the centuries that follow. Of course, as Gail Kern Paster has noted, analogy finds a material foundation in the belief that the human body and the natural world were composed of the same elements.[65] Beginning with a recapitulation of the Foucauldian position, Paster quickly turns to the humoral and elemental foundation of early modern embodiment to suggest that the passions enact this very interlacing of microcosm and macrocosm: "the passions actually *were* liquid forces of nature, because, in this cosmology, the stuff of the outside world and the stuff of the body were composed of the same elemental materials."[66] In addition to the discursive and affective means of aligning the body's materiality with the world, there was also a political unification of the microcosm and the macrocosm in the figure of the monarch,

---

[64] Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (New York: Vintage, 1994), 31.
[65] Gail Kern Paster, *Humoring the Body: Emotions and the Shakespearean Stage* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004). Paster, Katherine Rowe, and Floyd-Wilson also note that affect establishes a connection between the body and its environment in their introduction to *Reading the Early Modern Passions: Essays in the Cultural History of Emotion* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 15-18. In *English Ethnicity and Race in Early Modern Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), Mary Floyd-Wilson also notes that elemental sympathy enabled the environment to influence embodiment in what she terms geohumoralism. But whereas Paster gestures towards elemental sympathy to argue for "a premodern ecology of the passions," Floyd-Wilson traces the disruption of another ecology, in which the body's permeability in geohumoralism is closed in the service of racialized discourse: the emerging "rift between sexual passion and physiology perversely anticipates the Cartesian split between the mind and body, for it is a disavowal of both environmental and somatic influences on the mind that will allow for the formation of the autonomous – and white – subject. Indeed, I am suggesting that the construction of bounded selves goes hand in hand with the construction of racial boundaries" (47).
[66] Paster, *Humoring the Body*, 4.

whose two bodies effectively intertwined the courtly with the cosmic. Kantorowicz notes that there was a drive to render the king an instantiation of a connection between the earthly and the heavenly in an early theorization of the King's two bodies: "the yoking of two seemingly heterogeneous spheres had a peculiar attraction from an age eager to reconcile the duality of this world and the other, of things temporal and eternal, secular and spiritual."[67] Although the concept of the monarch's two bodies was by no means static, this ability to manage the distance between the here and now and the transcendent remained an important, if occasionally tacit, function. The microcosm and the macrocosm were therefore connected in multiple, often overlapping means, such that the space that separates embodiment from its larger environment could be traversed in a number of ways: discursively, elementally, affectively, and politically. Each model for connecting the microcosm to the macrocosm is, in effect, a means of conceptualizing and managing space in its radical indeterminacy.

But if the cosmos and the court matter in *Endymion*, they matter precisely as spaces for cognitive extension, in that the distribution of the mind across an environment is both the method for constituting these spheres and for traversing them. In the instance of the former, Endymion becomes distributed across the universe when his soul dilates to span the terrestrial and the celestial, animating the earth-bound body at the same time that desire locates the soul among the stars. Through the elongation of his soul, in other words, Endymion moves through the cosmos, with his desire extending forth from his body to return by way of the moon. Paradoxically, I argue, this movement is not simply the act of passing through a preexisting space, but rather a means of constituting the cosmos through cognitive extension. In the Neoplatonic tradition, the amatory cognition that Endymion

---

[67] Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957), 43.

experiences concerns a dialectic between a desiring subject and a desired body, a kind of reverberation of erotically-charged contemplation. As this reverberation moves from the divine mind to the various spheres of His creation – the Angelic Mind, the World Soul, the Body of the Universe – it creates the cosmos a second time; or rather, it participates in a continual oscillation between contemplated and contemplating bodies that gives the Neoplatonic universe its shape. Endymion takes part in this oscillation, as I suggest by reading his earliest articulations of a longing for the moon through the Neoplatonic co-text of Marsilio Ficino's *De Amore*. Ficino theorizes amatory cognition as a means of moving beyond the body in ecstatic contemplation, and his arguments help to illuminate the particularity of Endymion's desire, at once embodied and spatially distended.

But because amatory cognition distributes the mind beyond the body, it also raises the question as to where thought becomes located when it dissevers itself from the flesh. Using Grant's distinction between extracosmic space and intramundane place, I turn in the second section of the chapter to the question of Endymion's location: specifically, when Endymion falls in his contemplative slumber and the body's hold on the soul weakens, where does the shepherd's soul become located? Does his embodiment maintain his presence in place, i.e., within the world, or do his thoughts enable him to move beyond the cosmos, into space? How, in turn, does Cynthia's metamorphosis into a monarch implicate Endymion's location, given his investment in her as the moon? Meditating upon the questions will, in turn, provide a foundation for considering the contours of Cynthia's court in the final section of the chapter. There, I examine the stakes of awakening Endymion and returning him to his place within Cynthia's court, to suggest the play's negotiation of a tension between space and place. To place Endymion within Cynthia's court requires an elevation of intramundane place over extracosmic and contemplative space.

I. Amatory Cognition and the Neoplatonic Cosmos

By "amatory cognition," I mean a coupling of contemplative thought with erotic desire, in which the highly rational pursuit of the Good in a Neoplatonic cosmos coincides with one's drive for the Beautiful. Just as the Good and the Beautiful are coterminous and are often used interchangeably in Platonic and Neoplatonic philosophy, the drive that orients the contemplative soul towards that most celebrated of Forms is a hybrid, erotic in its charge and intellective in its reasoning.[68] Because of this hybridity, I suggest, amatory cognition maintains a paradoxical relationship to embodiment and to extension. In one sense, cognition remains rooted in the body, both as a site of resistance (the mind struggles to liberate itself from its fleshly prison) and a means of potentiality (the carnal appreciation of beauty should anticipate and dimly reflect the eros that leads one towards the Beautiful).[69] In another sense, cognition extends beyond its somatic framework to move towards the object of its desire, in a kind of ecstatic flight from the flesh. Because of this movement, amatory cognition is also distributed, existing as a kind of circuit between contemplated and contemplating bodies, rather than as an experience bound within the brain of an individual

---

[68] In the *Symposium*, trans. Walter Hamilton (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1951), for example, Plato asserts that Love constitutes a longing for the Beautiful and the Good. This alignment appears within Socrates's response to Agathon's speech, when he asks Agathon if "what is good is the same as what is beautiful" and receives immediate assent (201c). This, in turn, structures Socrates's own speech, which begin with his corrective at the hands of Diotima on Love's lack of the beautiful and the good and ends with Diotima's assertion that both are achieved in the ascent of desire; when amatory cognition leads the contemplative subject from the love of bodies through the love of moral beauty and the beauty of knowledge, he reaches the intersection of the Beautiful and the Good in the divine: "Do you not see that in that region alone," Diotima asks Socrates, "where he sees beauty with the faculty capable of seeing it, will he be able to bring forth not mere reflected images of goodness but true goodness, because he will be in contact not with a reflection but with the truth?" (212a). Diotima's ladder culminates in absolute "beauty" and in "true goodness," suggesting their ontological proximity.

[69] Again, in Diotima's theory of ascent, the contemplative subject moves from adoring bodies to loving the beauty of morals and of knowledge. "The man who would pursue the right way to this goal [of apprehending absolute beauty] must begin, when he is young, by applying himself to the contemplation of physical beauty" (*Symposium*, 210e).

corporeality. Amatory cognition is thus of a body that it often repudiates, enamored with a space of belonging that it does not fully inhabit. In the section that follows, I argue that *Endymion* reproduces these tensions governing embodiment and extension in its representation of the shepherd's love for the moon. Cynthia's dual status as the moon and as an allegorical virtue establishes Endymion's desire as a form of amatory cognition, as a longing that is both erotic and intellective. But precisely because the object of Endymion's desire is cosmological, *Endymion* gestures to a lacuna within Neoplatonic philosophy and, more specifically, in Ficino's influential commentary on Plato's *Symposium*, the principle theorization of amatory cognition in the early modern period. When the contemplative soul extends in amatory cognition, and its philosophical ardor takes it beyond the world, where does it become located? Through its references to the moon and to the earth, *Endymion* poses this question as to the soul's locus with greater urgency than Ficino admits into his discussion of contemplative desire and, in doing so, the play underscores the ontological ambiguity of the medium through which the soul travels in its ascent towards the divine. To suggest the importance of this ambiguity for *Endymion*, I first show that the shepherd's longing for Cynthia constitutes a form of amatory cognition and carries with it the same multiple and intersecting tensions between embodiment and extension suggested above. Then, through Ficino's *De Amore*, I argue that amatory cognition plays a constitutive role in the creation of the Neoplatonic cosmos and that the spatial implications of this erotically charged contemplation extend well beyond the soul's relationship to its own body; but I also acknowledge that Ficino gestures towards this question of space without adequately addressing its implications for his argument. Because the traces of this creation can be glimpsed in *Endymion*, I return to Lyly's play as an artifact that performs the very tensions of the Ficinian universe. Both Endymion's and Tellus's subjugation to Cynthia replicate a

distribution of cognition and desire through which the divine mind animates the universe, demonstrating the play' discursive investment in Neoplatonism. Indeed, the eruption of these topoi within the first half of *Endymion* helps to locate that section of the play within a Neoplatonic universe, and it is through such localization that we begin to recognize the play's invocation of the soul as the mediator between court and cosmos.

When Endymion locates his thoughts among the stars, he figures his erotic investment in Cynthia as highly contemplative and articulates a trope that will conjoin the qualities of amatory cognition throughout the play. Later, well after assuring Eumenides that he desires the moon, Endymion begins an apostrophe to Cynthia with cries reminiscent of his earlier assertion: "O fair Cynthia, O unfortunate Endymion! Why was not thy birth as high as thy thoughts, or her beauty less than heavenly? Or why are not thine honors as rare as her beauty? Or thy fortunes as great as thy deserts?" (2.1.1-4). Endymion continues to locate his thoughts beyond himself, but here he supplements his claims to Eumenides with a more precise articulation of Cynthia's status with regards to him. Her beauty is "heavenly" and thus of the very stars that Endymion names as the scaffold for his cognition. This cognitive ascent towards the lunar Cynthia is both erotic and contemplative. In one instance, Endymion offers himself to Cynthia as an abject lover,[70] the quasi-Petrarchan victim of unrequited love: "Desirest thou the passions of love, the sad and melancholy moods of perplexed minds, the not-to-be-expressed torments of racked thoughts? Behold my sad tears,

---

[70] I acknowledge Cynthia Marshall's point in *The Shattering of the Self: Violence, Subjectivity, and Early Modern Texts* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002), that the discourse of Petrarchanism conceals a kind of pleasure within itself at the moment that it appears to articulate the pain of an abject lover: "We could perhaps understand Petrarchan poetry analogously to be the expressive form taken by more creative victims of lovesickness. Yet the self-defeating mechanism built into the Petrarchan structure complicates this interpretation, for the Petrarchan poet does not merely confess and convey pain or describe and praise a remote beloved. Instead, the Petrarchanist wins (poetry) by losing (the beloved)" (67). My point is not that Endymion is abject in his devotion to Cynthia, but rather that he presents himself as abject.

my deep sighs, my hollow eyes, my broken sleeps, my heavy countenance" (2.1.9-13). These somatic signifiers of tears and sighs further mark Endymion's desire as being of the body, as a passionate, even humoral, expression of eros. The coupling of "racked thoughts" and "perplexed minds" to the experience of desire, however, functions as a pivot for turning towards the cognitive and contemplative aspects of Endymion's longing. Almost immediately, he shifts from fashioning himself as an abject lover to claim his status as a hermetic devotee of Cynthia: "Remember my solitary life almost these seven years. Whom have I entertained but mine own thoughts and thy virtues? What company have I used but contemplation?" (2.1.15-17). In place of Cynthia's celestial beauty, Endymion here emphasizes her virtuous status. The proximity does not suggest that he replaces one category with the other, but rather that he considers them conjoined. As before, his "thoughts" provide the fulcrum for moving towards the values that Cynthia embodies. His contemplation of Cynthia encompasses both an impassioned and acute attraction to her beauty and an intellective appreciation of her virtuous qualities; it constitutes, in other words, a form of amatory cognition.

For Endymion, this hybridization of erotic and contemplative potential means that his soul becomes distributed across two spaces simultaneously: his cognitive faculties course through the body at the same time that they extend into the cosmos. Endymion testifies to the former in his claim that he suffers from love-melancholy. Signifying himself as the victim of lovesickness, "settled either to die or possess the moon herself," Endymion presents himself to Eumenides as vexed by a humoral imbalance. He invokes a classic trope of love-melancholy, the localization of desire within bodily fluids, to explain why his desire must culminate in death if not in satisfaction: "My thoughts have no veins, and yet, unless they be let blood, I shall perish" (1.1.17-8, 30-1). By gesturing towards a humoral foundation for his

impassioned thoughts, Endymion acknowledges one of the means by which cognition could be said to be distributed in the early modern period: the workings of the mind, enabled by the animal spirits and humoral fluids, moved with those spirits and liquids throughout the body, extending thought at the moment that they animate the flesh.[71] Indeed, because such physiological components constituted "the cognitive wing of the vast early modern pneumatic ecologies of spirit and fluids," as Sutton puts it, the mind was not bound within the brain but rather was distributed across the somatic framework.[72] In acknowledging that his melancholia may be relieved through bloodletting, Endymion seems to affirm this quasi-humoral foundation of thought, to admit that, in his experience, amatory cognition is both embodied and distributed.

But Endymion seems equally aware that such distribution implies that the mind is as material as the flesh within which it inheres, as corruptible as the body itself. The accusation is already nascent within Eumenides' recommendation of medical attention: "That melancholy blood must be purged which draweth you to a dotage no less miserable than monstrous" (1.1.27-29). The dotage of which Eumenides speaks, what Robert Burton will gloss as the madness that comes "*when some one principall facultie of the minde, as imagination, or reason is corrupted, as all Melancholy persons have*," has a humoral foundation, and the passage from an excess of black bile to the cognitive impairment of dotage manifests the ease with which physiology could alter the workings of the mind.[73] For this reason, Endymion distinguishes between an embodied, affective cognition and the implication that

---

[71] Paster traces the dissemination of animal spirits through what she calls "neural pathways" as well as the veins and arteries of the body in "Nervous Tension: Networks of Blood and Spirit in the Early Modern Body" in *The Body in Parts: Fantasies of Corporeality in Early Modern Europe*, ed. David Hillman and Carla Mazzio (New York: Routledge, 1997): 107-125.
[72] Sutton, "Spongy Brains," 19.
[73] Robert Burton, *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, ed. Thomas C. Faulkner, Nicolas K. Kiessling, and Rhonda L. Blair, 6 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989-2000), 1:163.

embodiment reifies the mind; his "thoughts have no veins," are not of the body, even as embodiment yields a functional symbiosis between the flesh and the spirit: "unless" those thoughts "be let blood, I shall perish." Here, Endymion affirms that the soul as a collection of cognitive faculties remains separate from the corporeality that that same soul animates; but this conceptual separation, I would venture, arises from the ontological proximity of the two natures of the soul. The anima becomes distributed throughout the body at the moment that it endows that flesh with the faculties of perception and motility, but because this distribution risks rendering the mind an effect of temperament, Endymion must apotropaically invoke the soul's independence from the flesh to ward off the specter of a too-embodied mind. Notwithstanding this effort, Endymion transitions from one form of cognitive extension to the other, from the mind's distribution within the body to its extension across the cosmos, in asserting a distinction between thoughts and veins.

And yet, in his conversation with Eumenides, Endymion prefers to conceive of cognitive extension as an expansion, rather than simply a distribution, of the soul. That is, in contrast to his paradoxical utterance that his thoughts are not of the body, and yet course through it, Endymion articulates in emphatic terms the privilege that he places upon the soul's flight. First, he mocks his friend for allowing desire to rest on the level of embodiment: "Vain Eumenides, whose thoughts never grow higher than the crown of thy head! Why troublest thou me, having neither head to conceive the cause of my love nor heart to receive the impressions? Follow thou thine own fortunes, which creep on the earth, and suffer me too to fly to mine, whose fall, though it be desperate, yet shall it come by daring" (1.1.78-84). Endymion thus begins by contrasting himself with Eumenides with regards to embodiment and spatial extension. Whereas the shepherd's thoughts ascend to the stars, his friend's contentment to accept a more terrestrial locus of thought condemns

him. In Endymion's extended pun, that is, "Vain Eumenides" is vain because he allows his thoughts to reside within the "veins" of the body; he embraces a distribution of cognition within the body, the same distribution that Endymion accepts but ultimately supersedes in locating his thoughts among the stars. When he orders Eumenides to follow his "own fortunes, which creep on the earth," Endymion contrasts his experience of amatory cognition and the cosmic flight that it enables with his friend's more terrestrial concerns, distinguishing them through the motility that each possesses with regards to the universe. As this verbal jousting between Eumenides and Endymion suggests, the play theorizes cognitive distribution through a matrix that distinguishes between materiality and the mind, between embodiment and the soul that informs the soma. But his utterance renders on a cosmological level what Endymion's other claims located on a corporeal register, affirming that the distinction between the shepherd and his friend Eumenides lies in the distribution of their desires.

However sudden this transition from the corporeal to the cosmic may seem, it follows the peculiar logic of cognitive extension in the early modern period, whether that extension was articulated through humoral theory or through less material figurations of the body-soul nexus. Embodiment, for humoralists, involved the soul's distribution across the somatic structure; because animal spirits served as the physiological foundation of the soul's embeddedness within the body, they also worked to circulate thoughts throughout the flesh. Spirits functioned as the ontological connection between anima and soma, in other words, such that they "were requisite theoretical entities in accounts not only of muscular motion, but also of memory, dreaming, and imagination, and of emotion, moods, and madness."[74] They were, in short, the conceptual apparatus through which early modern thinkers would

[74] Sutton, *Philosophy and Memory Traces*, 46.

"embed cognitive function in the body."[75] Although spirits were the material means for extending the soul throughout the body, their fragile dependence upon the fluids of the humoral body also meant that they were subject to vicissitudes, that their workings fluctuated in tune with the world around them. "The humoral subject's interwoven medical, mental, mnemonic, moral, and metaphysical plight," Sutton argues elsewhere, "can't be understood by considering the vulnerable humoral body and the fleeting spirituous brain in isolation from the world," because the elemental sympathy between the body and its environment meant that the subject was, in a sense, always already extended.[76] When Endymion chastises Eumenides, he appears to be cognizant of this elemental sympathy and its potential to distribute the mind across the cosmos as easily as within the body. His qualified acceptance of embodied cognition in the fact that bloodletting may ease his melancholy suggests his awareness of the instability of the humoral body.

Perhaps for this reason, Endymion values Cynthia as an emblem of constancy, endeavoring to preserve the moon as a sign of immutability against popular perception: "O, fair Cynthia, why do others term thee inconstant whom I have ever found unmovable? Injurious time, corrupt manners, unkind men, who, finding a constancy not to be matched in my sweet mistress, have christened her with the name of wavering, waxing, and waning! Is she inconstant that keepeth a settled course, which since her first creation, altereth not one minute in her moving?" (1.1.34-40). Much like Spenser, who theorizes Constancy through Mutability's subjugation to Nature in the "Two Cantos of Mvtabilitie," Endymion asserts the moon's sempiternal status as its management of apparent alteration. In a sense, then,

---

[75] Ibid.
[76] Sutton, "Spongy Brains," 20.

Endymion's movement from the corporeal to the cosmic evinces a belief in elemental sympathy and the distribution of cognition that it allows.

But Endymion asserts the immateriality of thought in such a way as to admit an alternative to elemental sympathy: the psychic flight that characterizes Neoplatonic amatory cognition. Against a general understanding of Neoplatonism as a discourse invested in the soul's emancipation from the body, *Endymion*'s citation of Neoplatonism distinguishes itself in postulating an intimate relationship between desire and the movement of the soul in contemplation: as Da Crema has noted, "Lyly's platonism" in *Endymion* as in other works "revolves around the subject of love," such that it stands in contrast to "the platonism of Spenser or Milton, for example, which is grounded in metaphysical erudition."[77] This same theorization of desire as a thread drawing the self out of the body, towards the forms that animate cognition, constitutes Ficino's primary contribution to Neoplatonism, in that, as Sears Jayne asserts, "he made of Plato a philosopher of love and beauty, which he had never been before."[78] *Endymion* and Ficino's text are thus discursively similar in their presentation of amatory cognition.[79] Rather than postulate Lyly's familiarly with the *De Amore*, I argue that these parallel articulations of contemplative desire enable us to use Ficino's text to illuminate the status of amatory cognition in *Endymion*; at the same time, the play, in its displacement of

---

[77] Da Crema, "The Neoplatonic Element in John Lyly," 16.

[78] Sears Jayne, "Ficino and the Platonism of the English Renaissance," *Comparative Literature* 4, no. 3 (Summer 1952): 225.

[79] In aligning them, however, I acknowledge that Ficinian philosophy was less pronounced in England than other manifestations of Neoplatonic thought and that the treatise's conceptualization of love as a means of cognitive extension came to be influential in its dissemination through literary channels. Despite her claims regarding Ficino's contribution to Neoplatonism, Jayne argues against the primacy of Ficino's influence in England, noting that English Neoplatonism was more literary than philosophical and that its history anticipates Ficino in numerous aspects. My invocation of the *De amore* is thus not to suggest influence but rather to appropriate the discursive nuance that Ficino's work can offer with regards to *Endymion*. Moreover, as C. C. Gannon asserts in "Lyly's *Endimion*: From Myth to Allegory" *ELR* 6 (1976), the myth of Endymion had already acquired Neoplatonic contours in England through the works of John Dee and Giordano Bruno (226).

Ficinian concepts onto the early modern court, reveals the spatial politics implicit within Neoplatonism.

In recognition of the difficulties marking any effort to establish Lyly's familiarity with Ficino, I devote critical attention to Guy Le Fevre de la Boderie's *Discours de l'honneste amour sur le Banquet de Platon*, the French translation of Ficino's text that, Jayne notes, "was mainly responsible for the influence of the *De amore* in England," rather than to Ficino's original claims.[80] The language in which Neoplatonic concepts were articulated upon their arrival in England would significantly influence their subsequent dissemination.

In la Boderie's translation of Ficino, amatory cognition distinguishes itself from other forms of desire through its management of embodiment and extension. Whereas certain drives reflect the impropriety of a "desir libideneux," or libidinous desire, Love itself constitutes a longing for the Form of the Beautiful; as Ficino instructs the reader, "quand nous disons Amour, ente*n*dez le desir de Beauté" ("when we speak of Love, understand it as the desire of Beauty").[81] But the distinction between Love and libidinous desire appears not simply in the nature of the drive, nor in the particular object of such longing, but principally in the means by which the soul apprehends the object of its desire. In Ficino's taxonomy of Beauty, it becomes clear that Love, as the soul's extension towards Beauty, occurs only through certain channels of the body-soul nexus:

> Donques la Beauté est de trois manieres, c'est à dire, des ames, des corps, & des voix. Celle de l'Ame se cognoist seulement auecques l'entendement: Celle des corps auec les yeux. Celle des voix ne se comprend point auec autre chose qu'auec les oreilles. (24)

---

[80] Marsilio Ficino, *Commentary on Plato's Symposium on Love*, trans. Sears Jayne (Dallas: Spring Publications, 1985), 21-22.
[81] Guy le Fevre de la Boderie, *Discours de l'honneste amovr svr le banqvet de Platon* (Paris: Jean Macé, 1578), 25, 23. The translations are my own. All further citations will be made parenthetically.

> Thus Beauty is in three manners, which is to say, of souls, of bodies, and of voices. That of the Soul is known only with the understanding; that of bodies with the eyes. That of voices is not understood at all with anything but the ears.

Here, the soul's embeddedness within the body does not signify a limit to its contemplative potential, in contrast to what one might expect form a Neoplatonic disquisition on embodied experience. Rather, as the soul animates the body, it apprehends particular manifestations of the Beautiful through cognition and through sensation, turning from one modality of experience to the other as befits the object to be apprehended. For Ficino, these modes of apprehension constitute the only way of experiencing Beauty, while the other faculties of the embodied soul lead one back to the flesh:

> On ioüit de ceste Beauté auecques celle partie seulement par laquelle elle est cognue: par l'entendement, par la veue, & l'ouye nous la cognoissons. Donques aueques ces trois nous en pouuo*n*s ioüir auec les autres sens, non la Beauté, laquelle desire Amour, mais plustost nous possedons quelque autre chose dont le corps a besoing. (31)

> One enjoys this Beauty with only that part by which she [the Beauty] is known: by the understanding, by sight, and by hearing we know her. Thus with those three other senses [of taste, touch, and smell] we are able to enjoy not Beauty, which Love desires, but rather we possess something else, of which the body has need.

Further asserting Love as the desire for Beauty, Ficino here implies that the apprehension of the Beautiful depends upon the contemplative subject's affirmation of certain senses. Whereas understanding, sight, and hearing constitute the faculties of Love, the remaining senses of taste, touch, and smell return the subject to embodiment and to libidinous desires.

In its negotiation of embodiment, amatory cognition in the Ficinian universe moves towards extension; in the same way that Endymion affirmed a circulation of cognition

throughout the body, only to emphasize its supersession of that body at the moment that cognition extends into the cosmos, Ficino privileges thought that moves past the flesh. Later in the treatise, Ficino invokes a hierarchy of sensory experience that depends upon distance and extension:

> Dont aduient que le toucheme*n*t, le goust, & l'odorat sentent seulement les choses qui leur sont fort prochaines: & en les senta*n*t souffrent beaucoup. Bien q*ue* le flairement apprehende choses plus elongnees que le goust, ny le toucheme*n*t. Mais l'oüye apprehe*n*de encor choses plus elo*n*gnees, & n'est pas tant offensee. La veuë agist & oeuure encor plus au loing: & fait en vn mome*n*t ce que l'oüye fait en temps, d'autant qu'on void premierement l'esclair qu'on oye le to*n*nerre. La raison co*m*prehend les choses de tresloing: parce que non seulement elle apprehende les choses qui sont au monde, & presentes, comme faict le sens, mais aussi celles qui sont sur le ciel, & celles qui on esté, ou seront. (136-7)

> Thus it comes that touch, taste, and smell feel only those things which are very near them and, in feeling them, suffer greatly (although smell apprehends things more removed than taste or touch). But hearing apprehends things still more removed and is not so offended. Sight acts and works still at a greater length and does in a moment what hearing does in time, to such extent that one sees lightning before one hears thunder. Reason comprehends things from a great distance: because not only does she apprehend things which are in the world and present, as the senses do, but also those which are above the heavens, and those which have been or will be.

Significantly, Ficino's taxonomy does not rest upon a separation of mind and body, as the powers here are understood to be the "six puissances & facultez de l'ame" or the six powers and faculties of the soul, a claim that binds sensation and reason together as constitutive attributes of embodied subjectivity (137). Rather, these faculties distinguish themselves in their capacity for extension, signifying not only that distance separates the most valued faculties from their objects of apprehension but, more tellingly, that this distance is itself constitutive of the faculty's value. Increase – the progression from "things still more

removed" to "at a greater length" – renders distance isomorphic with greatness, spatially as well as temporally. For whereas sight obtains preeminence among the senses, doing "in a moment what hearing does in time," the work of the eyes remains subservient to reason, unable to extend its apprehension to "those [things] which have been or will be."

When Endymion asserts that his thoughts are amidst the stars, he invokes a hierarchy of embodied experience that follows Ficino in privileging extension. Those stars, "which, being as high as I can see," exist at a spatial remove from Endymion himself, who remains on the ground gazing upon that which is "much higher" than he "can reach" (1.1.5-7). In other words, Endymion makes a distinction between the visual and the tactile that plays upon that possibility of cognitive extension; his "thoughts" move concomitantly with his vision to locate themselves among "the stars," while Endymion himself remains on the level of an embodied subject, relegated to the sphere of touch (emphasized in his awareness of what he can "reach"). This distension on the level of sense experience is what leads Eumenides to question the nature of Endymion's desire. Either, as his friend notes, Endymion desires an impossible object in the form of a celestial body or improperly elevates a terrestrial being to heavenly status: "If you be enamoured of anything above the moon, your thoughts are ridiculous, for that things immortal are not subject to affections; if allured or enchanted with these transitory things under the moon, you show yourself senseless to attribute such lofty titles to such lows trifles" (1.1.7-12). The moon that Endymion will shortly reveal to be the true object of his desire functions here, in Eumenides' conceptualization, as a kind of median, separating the transitory from the immortal, the lofty from the low. Indeed, in its liminal positionality, the moon appears to partake of both sets of qualities, to conjoin the very categories that Eumenides believes should remain disparate. Strangely, however, the crossing of this median – that which signifies Endymion's failure to

desire properly – is not cosmological in its nature but rather must be traced through the faculties of an embodied subject; the "thoughts" that appear "ridiculous" in cathecting desire upon an entity "not subject to affections" demonstrate a longing that, in turn, reveals Endymion to be "senseless." These multiple failings of perception, affect, and their synthesis in cognition ultimately lead Eumenides to conclude that Endymion suffers from a profound disturbance: "Is Endymion mad, or do I mistake? Do you love the moon, Endymion?," to which Endymion can only respond in affirmation, "Eumenides, the moon" (1.1.19-20). But Eumenides' critique ignores the privilege placed upon extension in the Neoplatonic tradition, and in doing so, it ignores what matters to Endymion. The distance of the object ensures that, as the soul extends beyond the body to apprehend its love, it relies upon senses (like vision, in contrast to touch) that sever the anima from its somatic foundation. Far from a demonstration of the shepherd's folly (as Eumenides would have it), Cynthia's distance from Endymion is what bestows value upon his desire in the Neoplatonic schema from which his longing for transcendence derives.

Given that Endymion's experience of amatory cognition parallels Neoplatonism in its negotiation of embodiment and extension, a return to Ficino via la Boderie reveals the degree to which the spatial contours of Endymion's desire implicate our understanding of the soul's location in the cosmos. For Ficino, Beauty is woven into the fabric of the universe as a constitutive force, such that when amatory cognition apprehends Beauty, it causes the contemplative soul to retrace God's first emanation through the cosmos. Ficino asserts that Beauty represents an emanation of divine form through the four concentric circles of the Neoplatonic universe:

> La Beauté est le Rayon de Dieu infus en ces quartre Cercles, qui enuiron Dieu se retournent. Ce Rayon depeint en tous ces quatre Cercles toutes les especes de toutes les choses: & nous nommons ces especes en la Pensee Angelique, Idees: en

> l'Ame, raisons: en la Nature, semences: & formes en la Matiere. (47)

> Beauty is the Ray of God infused into the four Circles, which, surrounding God, return to Him. This Ray is painted in all of the four Circles, in all types of all things, & we call these types in the Angelic Mind [the First Circle], Ideas: in the Soul [the Second Circle], reasons: in Nature [the Third Circle], seeds: and forms in Matter [the Fourth Circle].

Beauty manifests itself as the substance of the cosmos through this emanation or infusion. By "substance," I mean to suggest that, for Ficino, Beauty represents a hybridity of Form and Matter, in a Neoplatonic citation of Aristotelian tradition. In the last stage of Ficino's emanation, the painting of forms within the fourth circle of Matter acts as an explicit citation of Aristotle and effectively reproduces the hylomorphic schema in which the impression of Form upon the substrate of Matter brings a body into being. This model clarifies the kind of constitution that Ficino envisions here. The emanation of Beauty manifests itself as the impression of an immaterial form – Ideas, reasons, seeds, or forms – upon an inferior and, occasionally, material substrate.

Theorizing this processual construction, Ficino develops the implicit sense of emanation, of the dissemination of form through the universe, to articulate a constitution of space through cognition. In the first stage of emanation, God extends Himself in creating the Angelic Mind, itself a manifestation of divine cognition that, although immaterial, is substantive:

> Au commenceme*n*t Dieu crea la substance de la Pensee Angelique, laquelle nous aussi appellons essence. Ceste-cy au premier moment de sa creation est sans forme, & tenebreuse. (15)

> In the beginning, God created the substance of the Angelic Mind, which we also call essence. This, in the first moment of its creation, is without form and dark.

For Ficino, divine cognition distributes itself across God and the Angelic Mind, initiating a process of spatialization that will result in the cosmos. In this regard, Neoplatonic conceptualization locates God in the space beyond the cosmos – that is, in the extracosmic void – although the nature of that space (its ontological reality, its dimensions, and so forth) was continually retheorized over the course of the late medieval and early modern periods. Putting aside this question of extracosmic space for the moment, however, we see that Ficino further theorizes the distribution that results in cosmic construction, to illuminate the means by which form extends into the universe. This extension is necessitated by the fact that the initial construction of the Angelic Mind leaves it "without form and dark." As the Angelic Mind awaits a concomitant process of informing and illumination, it becomes the inaugural site of the desire that will animate the Ficinian universe:

> mais d'auta*n*t que elle est née de Dieu, par vn certain appetit enné, elle se retrourne & employe à Dieu son principe: se retournant à Dieu, elle est illustree de son rayon, & par la splendeur de tel rayo*n* s'e*m*brase son appetit: embrasé, il s'approche tout de Dieu: approché, il pre*n*d les formes. (15-6)

> but to the extent that she [the Angelic Mind] is born of God, infused with a certain appetite, she turns and devotes herself to God, her origin; turning to God, she is illuminated by His ray, and by the splendor of that ray, embraces her desire; embraced, he [the desire itself] approaches God; approached, he takes the forms.

Here, the impression of forms within the Angelic Mind proceeds from, and in turn parallels, an instantiation of desire. This desire, lodged within the Mind at the moment of its birth, functions as a kind of mechanism for turning this extension of divine cognition back upon

its origin; peculiarly, that is, Ficino figures the Mind as a substance turned away from God, requiring an infusion of "appetite" to be subjected to His command. Perhaps more peculiarly, this infusion extends desire between the Angelic Mind and God in such a way as to spatialize it, as the gendered pronouns of la Boderie's translation attest. Desire, the masculine antecedent of *il*, moves toward God to receive the forms, while the feminine referent of *elle* – the Angelic Mind or *la Pensée Angelique* – retains a proprietary relationship to that desire. Concomitant with the extension of the divine mind across the universe, then, the desire lodged within the Angelic Mind becomes distributed between that Mind and its divine origin. In Ficino's consideration of amatory cognition, in other words, desire acquires a peculiar ontological foundation, one that grafts it onto the cosmos as both a sign and a reiteration of an originary oscillation between contemplated and contemplative bodies.

At the same time that the emanation of Beauty creates desire within the universe, this distribution of divine power enables cognition within subsequent layers of creation. Reiterating his claim that Beauty impresses itself upon a series of concentric circles much later in the treatise, Ficino supplements his initial assertion with a claim regarding human cognition, suggesting the emanation of Beauty entails an impression of precepts within the human subject, against which the world is to be judged.

> La diuine Puissance surparoissante à l'Vniuers, aux Anges, & aux ames d'elle creez, benignement infond, ainsi qu'à ses enfans, ce sien rayon, dans lequel est la vertu, feconde à creer quelconque chose. Ce ray diuin en ceux-cy, comme plus prochains à Dieu, depeint l'ordre de tout le mo*n*de beaucoup plus expressement qu'en la matiere mondaine. Pour laqeulle chose ceste peinture du monde laquelle nous voyo*n*s toutes és Anges, & és Ames, est plus expresse, que on pas deuant les yeux. … Ces Peintures se nomme*n*t és Anges exemplaires & Idees: és ames, raison & notices: en la matiere du monde, images & formes. (149-50)

> Divine power, most powerful in the universe, benignantly infuses within the Angels and the souls of its creation (as though into its children) its own ray, in which there is a virtue, fecund for creating whatever thing. This divine ray paints the order of the entire world in these [the Angels and the souls], as those nearest to God, more expressively than in worldly material. For this reason, this picture of the world which we see in Angels and in Souls is more expressive than that which passes before the eyes. … These paintings in Angels are called exemplars and Ideas; in souls, reason and notions; in the matter of the world, images and forms.

Through the emanation of divine power, the soul receives a "picture of the world" that makes itself "more expressive than that which passes before the eyes." This ensouled image, established through the "reasons and notions" that reside within the embodied soul, may not accurately correspond to what the eye apprehends, but for this reason cognition takes the form of a judgment, comparing the mind's understanding with the body's perceptions. Ficino grounds this assertion in his explanation of human beauty; the fact that cognition constitutes a comparison between what lies within the in-formed soul and what it perceives:

> C'est pourquoy l'image de l'ho*m*me exterieure prinse par les sens, passant en l'ame, s'elle discorde de la figure de l'homme, laquelle l'ame de son origine possede, soudain elle se deplaist: & comme laide & deforme engendre haine. Si elle s'y concorde, elle plaist en effect, & comme belle s'aime (157).

> It's why if the image of the external man, taken by the senses, passing into the soul, exists in discord with the figure of Man, of which the soul possesses from its origin, suddenly she [the soul] is displeased: & as though ugly & deformed, engenders hate [within the soul]. If she [the image of the external man] accords with it [the form within the soul], it pleases in effect, & is liked as beautiful.

Insofar as cognition is an act of comparison in the Neoplatonic schema, it depends upon the Forms that God's emanation infuses within the soul and which the soul, in turn, uses to

evaluate its perceptions. Cognition is thus always inflected through Beauty, and the erotic charge that accompanies the impression of Forms lays the foundation for amatory cognition.

In Ficino's theorization of amatory cognition, contemplative desire traces a distribution of the ensouled self across a cognitive and perceptual environment – at once proximate and distant, depending upon the apprehended object – and thereby retraces the emanation of the divine mind as it informs the embodied subject. There is, in other words, a return to the divine mind through amatory cognition:

> Pourautant que les formes des corpes se reduysent à Dieu par les semences: les semences par les Raisons: les Raisons par les Idees: & aueques les mesmes degrez de Dieu se produisent" (50).
>
> Nevertheless, that the forms of bodies return themselves to God by the seeds [that are located in Nature, in the Second Circle]: the seeds, by Reasons: Reasons, by Ideas, and with the same degree that God produced them.

Ficinian Neoplatonism thereby offers an ontological foundation for the relationship of cognitive extension to space in *Endymion*. Through Ficino's definition of Love as the desire for Beauty, we find a model of desire that orients the contemplative subject towards an aesthetic object. The feeling at the root of this *aesthesis* combines an erotic drive with an intellective investment in the divine power that animates the cosmos; it leads one towards the Beautiful as well as the Good, and in so doing it manages an ascent through the spheres. The emanation of Beauty instantiates the cosmos as such. It constitutes the universe through a series of concentric circles, spatializing the human self as a soul embedded within a body, and lodges within those spheres a desire that continually turns creation back upon its creator in contemplative ardor.

Admittedly, because Endymion begins the play already enamored with Cynthia, there is little evidence to suggest that the shepherd became fully constituted through his desire for the moon, that he existed, formless and void, in anticipation of her beauty. Certainly, Endymion figures himself as transformed through his devotion, but the claims that he makes to Cynthia emphasize a continual, atemporal ardor and, at the same time, the gradual manifestation of that ardor within the world. Neither, in short, invokes the sudden turn that Ficino locates in the constitution of the cosmos through desire:

> I am that Endymion, sweet Cynthia, that have carried my thoughts in equal balance with my actions, being always as free from imagining ill as enterprising; that Endymion whose eyes never esteemed anything fair but thy face, … yea, that Endymion who, divorcing himself from the amiableness of all ladies, the bravery of all courts, the company of all men, hath chosen in a solitary cell to live only by feeding on thy favor, accounting in the world (but thyself) nothing excellent, nothing immortal. (2.1.36-46)

Endymion previously figures this retreat into contemplative solitude as having occurred almost seven years ago, standing in sharp contrast to his assertion that he has "always" retained a purity of devotion to Cynthia, that he "never" glimpsed beauty beyond her visage. The temporal paradoxes that govern these utterances disrupt the possibility that Endymion was brought into being through his longing for Cynthia. In a reading that seeks to recover Endymion in his constancy for Cynthia, one might suggest his claim represents devotion as a continual process of desiring, in which Endymion's contemplative ardor for the moon is always already renewed, as fresh as it is constant. But Endymion's own admission that he desired Tellus before Cynthia complicates that reading and gives his cries to Cynthia a more desperate tone. Still addressing Cynthia, he attempts to excuse himself by claiming that: "With Tellus, fair Tellus, have I dissembled, using her but as a cloak for mine affections, that others, seeing my mangled and disordered mind, might think it were for one that loveth me,

not for Cynthia, whose perfection alloweth no companion nor comparison" (2.1.24-28). Thus Endymion, far from staging the constitutive turn towards the divine in his desire for Cynthia, appears as the potential effect of such a turn. The distribution of cognition and desire across the cosmos offers a parallel to Ficino's theorization of the universe, but the constitution itself, if it occurs, remains unseen.

Endymion's experience of amatory cognition does not manifest an ontological foundation for the relationship of extension and embodiment that we see in Ficino's text; but with this turn to Tellus, *Endymion* reasserts this ontology. Cynthia's power as a distributed and constitutive force, an emanation of Beauty throughout the cosmos, lies in her dominion over the earth, represented by Tellus. Early in the play, Tellus signifies herself as an allegorical embodiment of that terrestrial sphere, noting: "Is not my beauty divine, whose body is decked with fair flowers, and veins are vines, yielding sweet liquor to the dullest spirits, whose ears are corn to bring strength, and whose hairs are grass to bring abundance?" (1.2.20-4). Tellus eroticizes herself by figuring her corporeality through the plenitude of an herbaceous land; her rhetoric, however, contains within it the misprision of taking the elements of that corporeality as the source of her ostensibly divine beauty. For Ficino, however, beauty is indeed divine, in the sense that it originates with God and follows the emanation of cognition to extend across the World:

> Et ceste espece diuine, c'est à dire la Beaulté, a procreé en toutes choses l'Amour, c'est a dire, desir de soy. Parce que si Dieu rauit le Monde, & le Monde est rauy de luy, il y a vn certain continuel attrait entre Dieu, & le monde: qui commence de Dieu, & passe par le monde, & finalement se termine en Dieu & comme par vn certain Cercle retourne d'où il est party (35).

> And this divine being, which is to say Beauty, has created within all things Love, which is to say a desire for itself. Because if God ravishes the World, and the World is ravished

> by Him, there is a certain continual attraction between God and the World – which begins with God and passes through the World and finally terminates in God – that as by a certain Circle returns to where it left.

Following the same emanation that binds the Angelic Mind to divine cognition, this desire moves along a circuit, lodging within the World a desire for divine beauty (the antecedent of "itself" in the above quotation) that returns the World to God through longing. In *Endymion*, both Tellus' name and self-identification figure her as the earth, against which Cynthia emerges as the representation of the divine; Floscula suggests as much in correcting Tellus's misprision: "Your grapes would be but dry husks, your corn but chaff, and all your virtues vain, were it not Cynthia that preserveth the one in the bud and nourisheth the other in the blade, and by her influence both comforteth all things and by her authority commandeth all creatures" (1.2.29-33). Floscula underscores the degree to which Tellus depends upon Cynthia, in such language as to implicitly theorize the World's indebtedness to God. Both Cynthia's influence and her authority stand as immaterial disseminations, extensions that mirror the Neoplatonic emanation of the divine mind, that are constitutive of the realm of her dominion. Like the extension that Ficino theorizes, in other words, Cynthia's power is the supplement that renders Tellus desirable. Thus, while Tellus glorifies her materiality, translating her veins into vines, Floscula reminds her that these boasts are indeed "vain," or at least that they would be so in the absence of Cynthia's puissance. Glimpsed through Tellus's beauty, then, Cynthia's dominion is both ontological, in its ability to bring the earth's defining characteristics into being, and inchoately political. As Floscula pithily asks of Tellus, in a harbinger of the decrees to come when Cynthia manifests herself as a human monarch, "know you not, fair lady, that Cynthia governeth all things?" (1.2.28).

Because Tellus figures an embodiment of the Earth and helps to represent Cynthia's emanation through the cosmos, her status as another of Endymion's erotic objects further locates the opening of the play in a Neoplatonic universe. Through Endymion's displacement of his desire from Tellus onto Cynthia, from the earth onto the moon, the play metonymically figures the soul's ecstatic flight into the cosmos. But Endymion's repudiation of Tellus is hardly perfect. Shortly after claiming that he dissembles with Tellus, concealing his adoration of Cynthia through her, Endymion performs this deception onstage by stating: "You know, fair Tellus, that the sweet remembrance of your love is the only companion of my life, and thy presence my paradise, so that I am not alone when nobody is with me, and in heaven itself when thou art with me" (2.1.58-62). The rhetoric through which Endymion endeavors to persuade Tellus of his affection functions on the same spatial register as Endymion's prior articulation of his desire for Cynthia. Where his thoughts once located themselves among the stars, proximate to Cynthia's heavenly beauty, Endymion now finds himself through Tellus: her presence places him "in heaven itself." The irony, of course, is that Tellus represents the least heavenly of all the planetary bodies.

Throughout her dialogue with Endymion, in which she endeavors to force him to admit his affections for the moon, Tellus finds herself unable to persuade the shepherd to name the true object of his desire. When she chastises him, as Eumenides once did, against the ambitiousness of his desire, Tellus warns the shepherd: "Take heed, Endymion, lest, like the wrestler in Olympia that, striving to lift an impossible weight, catched an incurable strain, thou, by fixing thy thoughts above thy reach, fall into a disease without all recure. But I see thou art now in love with Cynthia" (2.1.97-101). Endymion, in turn, denies the accusation and figures his desire through a series of organic metaphors for the space separating him from Cynthia:

> No, Tellus. Thou knowest that the stately cedar, whose top reacheth unto the clouds, never boweth his head to the shrubs that grow in the valley; nor ivy that climbeth up by the elm can ever get hold of the beams of the sun. Cynthia I honor in all humility, whom none ought or dare adventure to love, whose affections are immortal and virtues infinite. Suffer me therefore to gaze on the moon, at whom, were it not for thyself, I would die with wondering. (2.1.102-109)

Endymion's response effectively reverses the terms of Tellus's reproach. Whereas she invokes the image of a human subject grounded upon the earth, injuring himself in the effort to lift his thoughts into the cosmos, Endymion envisions the impossibility of union from Cynthia's perspective, claiming that "the stately cedar" would not reach so low as to acknowledge the shrubs. The directionality is inverted, tracing a movement from Cynthia to Endymion, rather than from the shepherd to the moon. But Endymion's second image more pointedly suggests his plight: if the "ivy" represents his thoughts, extending towards the heavens by means of the "elm" that is his body, they will nevertheless fail to apprehend the celestial body that represents the object of their desire. Endymion, for all his dissembling in this moment, gestures to an ontological fact when he affirms the importance of Tellus in anchoring his contemplation of Cynthia. Because Tellus represents the earth, Endymion's desire remains grounded upon her, even as it navigates beyond her in its imperfect ascent towards the heavens. Endymion's entanglement with Tellus locates on an erotic register the cosmic ontology that undergirds Neoplatonic contemplation: howsoever the shepherd may endeavor to ascend through amatory cognition, his embodiment maintains his presence upon that last of the concentric circles, the world itself.

Endymion's erotic entanglement thereby stages his imperfect placement between the terrestrial and celestial spheres.[82] When alone, Endymion confesses to finding some attraction to Tellus, and it is only through recourse to supplementarity that he finds a means of distinguishing her from Cynthia:

> O Endymion, Tellus was fair! But what availeth beauty without wisdom? Nay, Endymion, she was wise. But what availeth wisdom without honor? She was honorable, Endymion, belie her not. Ay, but how obscure is honor without fortune? Was she not fortunate, whom so many followed? Yes, yes, but base is fortune without majesty. Thy majesty, Cynthia, all the world knoweth and wondereth at, but not one in the world can imitate it or comprehend it. (2.3.12-19)

Notably, Endymion first praises Tellus's beauty as that which attracts him, citing the Neoplatonic virtue that Tellus herself has already thematized within the play. Perhaps unconsciously, Endymion's progression through this list of attributes functions as a means of progressing towards the source of the beauty he locates within Tellus, which Floscula has already named as Cynthia. Certainly, he reaches the same conclusion as Floscula, that Cynthia possesses a kind of "majesty" that gives her dominion over the world. For precisely this reason, Endymion oscillates in his location: fixated upon Tellus, grounded on the earth through his embodiment, while amatory cognition locates his thoughts among the stars. Aptly, Endymion appears to acknowledge this spatial ambiguity in locating himself: "On yonder bank never grew anything but lunary, and hereafter I will never have any bed but that

---

[82] It is something of a critical commonplace that Endymion's bifurcated desire stages a Neoplatonic distinction between earthly and divine love, but the implications of this desire for Endymion's location have been overlooked. Da Crema, in "The Neoplatonic Element in John Lyly," notes that Endymion and Eumenides articulate this distinction in the first moments of the play, but he does not dwell on Cynthia's status as a lunar body, located in the space of the cosmos (20-21). Knapp maps the split between earthly and divine love onto Tellus and Cynthia in "The Monarchy of Love," but he views Endymion's investment in Tellus as "part fault and part inevitable condition of fallen humanity," rather than as an affect with spatial implications (360). Finally, in "Allegory of Love," Huppé assumes that both forms of desire are bound within Endymion and thereby overlooks the interplay between earth and moon entirely (103).

bank" (2.3.10-11). The lunary to which Endymion refers is either the biennial *Lunaria biennis*, a plant that grows leaves the first year and flowers the second, or more likely *Botrychium Lunaria*, the fern popularly called moonwort and understood to have magical powers.[83] Regardless of the particular species, the plant metonymically locates the moon upon the earth, perhaps through a kind of astral infusion, by which the moon bestows its powers upon the plant. This eruption of Cynthia's influence within the place that Tellus represents suggests the ambiguous positioning of Endymion at the moment: physically present, while through a quasi-occult transference, psychically absent. Moreover, Endymion's words function as the first signifiers to define the performance space of *Endymion*. Whereas the exchange between Endymion and Eumenides introduces cosmic space, a vastness further thematized through Tellus's presence, this gesture to the lunary bank constitutes the first effort within *Endymion* to signify the stage upon which the play is performed. Through this signification, the gesture aptly locates the drama within the discursive paradigm that has hitherto been articulated: upon an earth that also appears onstage (in the form of Tellus), partly extended into the cosmos (unrepresented onstage, save for the lunary bank).

In Endymion's adoration of Cynthia, then, amatory cognition functions as both an embodied and a distributed means of thinking. It is rooted in the body at the same time that it extends beyond the somatic framework in its apprehension of the object of its desire. In this regard, amatory cognition involves a kind of expansiveness, on the level of the senses as well as in the experience of thought. But when the object of desire is the moon rather than another human body, the spatial qualities of such desire are brought to the fore. Endymion's

---

[83] "lunary, n.1". OED Online. June 2011. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/view/Entry/111173?rskey=SHCW8D&result=1&isAdvanced=false (accessed July 07, 2011). The editors of *English Renaissance Drama* gloss this as "Lunary ('of or having to do with the moon') is moonwort or some such fern, popularly supposed to embody magical properties. Here it symbolizes Endymion's constancy toward Cynthia" (95, n.1).

desire spatializes the body-soul nexus in ways that parallel Ficino's conceptions of the mind-body relation. Furthermore, such spatialization participates in the construction of the Neoplatonic universe, where contemplative desire functions as the pivot that turns bodies towards divine power and that thereby establishes the cosmos in its ontological fixity. Finally, the emanation of Cynthia's power and its distribution across the world within *Endymion* helps to articulate the spatial uncertainty that undergirds the opening of the play. Certainly, Lyly's play reproduces the schema of the Neoplatonic universe, awarding an ontological dominion to Cynthia by rendering her the originary site of beauty, a site that Endymion, in his longing, seeks to possess. But Tellus's presence onstage and Endymion's erotic attachment to her forestall any effort to locate the play precisely within that universe. Because this uncertainty owes much to Endymion's (in)ability to extend fully into the cosmos, to his ambiguous location within and beyond his body, the play registers the spatial paradoxes governing cognitive extension and renders them in the circuit connecting the moon to the earth. That is, as Endymion moves between Tellus and Cynthia in his experience of amatory cognition, the play performs a tension between embodied cognition and its extension in erotic investment.

II. The Displaced Soul and Endymion's Place in the Universe

As we have seen, cognitive extension locates the soul at once within the body and beyond it, creating a distribution of the self that acquires cosmological importance in Lyly's play. Endymion adheres within his flesh and remains thus grounded upon the earth, both through the facticity of embodiment and his imperfectly realized desire for Tellus. But as his thoughts ascend into the stars, Endymion also becomes displaced as a result of amatory cognition, located somewhere between earth and moon in his desire for Cynthia. This

displacement becomes exacerbated when Endymion falls under Dipsas's curse and slumbers for forty years, during which time his soul's relationship to his body is altered. Sleep entails a diminution of the body's abilities, though whether this attenuation means that the soul is effectively sealed within the slumbering somatic structure or liberated from its embodiment depended upon which theorist one read in the early modern period. If sleep suspends the soul's perceptive faculties, as Aristotle suggests, then one must wonder whether slumber, in effect, contains the soul within the body, binding Enydmion within embodiment. Or, in keeping with the play's initial Neoplatonic investment, does sleep loosen the ties of the body-soul nexus and enable a disembodied Endymion to ascend more freely towards the moon? The irreducibility that governs Endymion's slumber threatens to displace his soul by simultaneously positing its being lodged deep within the body and unmoored into the cosmos. Whereas cognitive extension once ensured that Endymion's soul was distributed across both places concomitantly, his slumber makes his dwelling in either rather tenuous; insofar as the play hesitates to reveal where precisely Endymion's soul lies, sleep moves it from the places of the body and the moon and disgorges it into an unknown space. By effecting such displacement, the forty-year slumber that befalls Endymion in the midst of his devotion for Cynthia deepens the question of the play's location. If Endymion's soul moves the play from Tellus to Cynthia, from earth to moon, its expansion in cognitive extension can be said to locate the events of the drama. To become uncertain as to the place of Endymion's soul, ultimately, is to lose the play's orientation within the cosmos, since in deracinating Endymion's soul from its somatic foundation, the play disrupts that very entity through which it locates itself between terrestrial and celestial spaces.

But Endymion's slumber is not the only event that exacerbates the spatial ambiguities of the play. Cynthia, as we have seen, initially defines the space of the play as

structurally similar to the Neoplatonic universe. As the moon, she offers a planetary counterpart to Tellus and thereby establishes the cosmological contours of the play's events. Located beyond the world, Cynthia emanates through it in the form of divine Beauty, and her ability to infuse Tellus with this virtue suggests both the immanence of her influence and the transcendence of her being; she constitutes the world in its substance, while crucially remaining apart from it. These qualities, of course, illuminate the contemplative ambition of Endymion's desire for Cynthia, at the same time that they establish Cynthia as otherworldly in her lunar status. As Eumenides puts it, in chiding Endymion: "There was never any so peevish to imagine the moon either capable of affection or shape of a mistress" (1.1.22-24). Thus, when Cynthia enters the play immediately following Endymion's collapse into sleep, her transformation represents a stunning reversal of the play's logic; but it also redefines the space within which the events of *Endymion* unfold. She is no longer beyond the world, animating the earth through an infusion of beauty, but rather located upon it as a human monarch. This transformation implicates the definition of place within *Endymion* to the same degree that Endymion's psychic flight invokes an uncertainty with regards to the possibility of space. If Endymion's somnambulism of the soul raises the question of spaces beyond cosmos, then Cynthia's transformation articulates with greater precision the places that exist within the world.

Before suggesting more precisely the effects of Endymion's slumber and Cynthia's transformation for the location of the play, I want to return to the distinction between extracosmic space and intramundane place that I put forth in the introduction to this chapter. Intracosmic or intramundane space refers to the dimensionality of the world as well as the firmament surrounding the earth; in contrast, extracosmic space signifies the void that exists beyond the firmament, what supersedes the utmost limit of the universe. In the late medieval

and early modern periods, this distinction enabled natural philosophers to theorize extension and dimensionality as attributes of the cosmos alone, laying the conceptual foundation of a theory of *a priori* space. Within the earlier episteme, however, extension was defined solely in terms of material bodies. According to Grant, Aristotle's theory of place implies that "spatial modes are restricted to differentiations of a plenum filled everywhere with extended material bodies," in the sense that every place is defined through the body that occupies it.[84] To grasp the influence of this alignment on the history of the concept of space, we might consider the paradox that the philosopher Archytas articulates in attempting to conceptualize a space beyond the cosmos. In an ancient thought experiment, he asks: "If I am at the extremity of the heaven of the fixed stars, can I stretch out my hand or staff? It is absurd to suppose that I could not; and if I can, what is outside must be either body or space."[85] For Archytas, the problem hinges upon the relationship between bodies and places; if "place" is "anywhere a body can be," then the threshold of the firmament must also represent the limit of place, unless it is possible to extend a material body beyond the edge of cosmos. Premodern philosophers often invoked a version of Arychtas' problem in their attempts to theorize extracosmic space, suggesting that the ancient alignment of bodies and places was profoundly influential upon later thought.[86] Indeed, on a theoretical level, this formulation anticipates phenomenology and cognitive ecology in making embodiment coterminous with

---

[84] Grant, *Much Ado about Nothing*, 4.

[85] Translated by F. M. Cornford, "The Invention of Space," in *Essays in Honor of Gilbert Murray* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1936), 233, quoted in Grant, *Much Ado about Nothing*, 106. With regard to the passage, Grant notes: "Because the works of Archytas have not survived, the translation was made from fragment 30 of Eudemus, presumably as quoted by Simplicius in the latter's commentary on Aristotle's *Physics*, 108a" (322, n. 10).

[86] In his history, Grant discusses John Buridan's version of the problem, describing it as "a version of the old Stoic argument derived from Simplicius" (122). He also offers a brief commentary of the place of the paradox within Stoic thought (322, n. 12). In *Concepts of Space: The History of Theories of Space in Physics*, third edition (New York: Dover Publications, 1993), Max Jammer also cites Archytas' articulation of this problem. With regard to Lucretius's innovation upon the paradox, Jammer adds: "This argument, and in particular the idea of a man placed at the supposed boundary of space stretching out his hand or throwing a spear, is a recurrent idea in the history of natural philsophy" (13).

emplacement, wherein there is a kind of homology between the habitus of the body and its habitat.[87]

But if, in the early modern period, "place" retains its status as an intramundance locale, "space" represents a posited entity, an effect of the mind's extension into the world. Because the void was defined through its inability to admit bodies, it was initially theorized as an "imaginary space," constituted through as a kind of thought experiment: "even though on other grounds we are convinced that no place, void space, or body lies beyond [the firmament], yet by extrapolation from mundane experience we can imagine spatial dimensions extending ad indefinitum beyond the world, or imagine bodies, and therefore places, beyond the last sphere."[88] The extracosmic void is thus imaginary space in the sense that it comes into being through the imaginative faculty. At the same time, this sense of space anticipates the more contemporary formulation of cognitive extension, wherein mental activity reconstitutes space. When cognition becomes distributed across a thinking subject and that subject's environment, it moves beyond embodiment and, in turn, beyond the place that immediately surrounds the soma.[89] Cognitive extension thereby posits thinking between two places in such a way that what matters is not the emplacement that emerges through embodiment so much as the space that the mind traverses in connecting these sites. In amatory cognition, when contemplation takes a subject like Endymion beyond all

---

[87] Casey suggests this intersection of habitus and habitat in *Getting Back into Place: Toward a Renewed Understanding of the Place-World* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993), 292, but his emphasis lies on the instantiation of a connection at the end of a journey. The arrival re-places one within an environment and, in Casey's phenomenological reading, the pleasure at such embeddedness encodes the habitat within one's habitus. For my purposes, however, a relationality between the habitus and the habitat need not depend upon a return home.
[88] Grant, *Much Ado About Nothing*, 119.
[89] Casey distinguishes among the various senses of place that emerge through one's embodiment, including the *Here of my body proper* that constitutes the embeddedness of my entire body within a place and the *Regional here* that represents the multiplicity of places through which I might move. Casey also notes that the body can give rise to a sense of being *Here in part* in one's sense of specific corporeal locations, the *Here of my by-body* when the body is used instrumentally, and an *Interpersonal here* when I sense another body entering my space. See *Getting Back into Place*, 52-4. Cognitive extension admits another sense of place, one that is perhaps less phenomenological than the senses that Casey lists, but which nevertheless emerges in relation to embodiment.

intramundane objects of devotion, this space finds its analogue in the extracosmic void beyond the firmament. The tensions between embodiment and extension that we saw in amatory cognition thereby acquire an ontological foundation in the distinction between intramundane place and extracosmic space; these concepts help to establish the means by which early modern cognition extended beyond the body by theorizing the medium through which that thought moved.

This distinction between intramundane place and extracosmic space illuminates the spatial implications of cognitive extension in *Endymion*, suggesting how our sense of the play's location shifts with Endymion's contemplative potential. Given that Endymion's initial experience of amatory cognition depended upon his investment in Cynthia, I first consider her transformation, showing how the object of Endymion's desire redefines the space of the play when she metamorphoses into a human monarch. Her presence upon the earth and her metonymic management of it through the figure of Tellus deepens the specificity of intramundane places within *Endymion*. But because Cynthia functions as the object of Endymion's desire and the prompt for his extension into the cosmos, her transformation also resignifies Endymion's movement in amatory cognition. In contrast to Cynthia's deepening of intramundane place, Endymion's slumber gestures towards the existence of extracosmic space in posing the question of the dimension through which the soul moves in its extension beyond the body. In reconstituting the place and the space of *Endymion* respectively, the dual events of Cynthia's transformation and Endymion's slumber not only exacerbate the spatial ambiguities of the play, but they also ensure the processual constitution of these spheres through amatory cognition.

i. Endymion in Extracosmic Space

When Endymion falls asleep for the span of forty years, his body remains upon the lunary bank, but the location of his soul remains unclear. Tophas, whose own slumber offers a pastiche of Endymion's experience, aptly asserts that "Sleep is a binding of the senses, love a loosing," suggesting that while sleep and desire alter the body's sensations in disparate ways, they parallel one another in disrupting the function of those senses (3.3.134-5). Here, sensation functions as a corollary to embodied cognition, as the same soul that bestows the faculties of perception upon the somatic structure distributes thought through that flesh as well. Binding these sensations in sleep thereby effects a partial disruption of the soul from the body, halting its animation of the flesh and thus enabling the anima's flight through the Neoplatonic cosmos. Amatory cognition, on the other hand, invokes affect in such a way as to distribute the soul through the body and, indeed, beyond it, "loosing" the senses to the extent that they extend the anima into the beloved. Slumber thereby parallels amatory cognition in effecting an attenuation of the body's power over the soul, but whether this weakening works to entrap Endymion's anima within the soma or to liberate it remains uncertain.

When Dipsas casts Endymion into slumber, she figures her curse as binding the shepherd in death-like sleep. The lunary bank upon which he lies becomes akin to a tomb, from which Endymion may never rise: "Little dost thou know, Endymion, when thou shalt wake; for hadst thou placed thy heart as low in love as thy head lieth now in sleep, thou mightest have commanded Tellus, whom now instead of a mistress thou shalt find a tomb" (2.3.26-30). Dipsas's curse works explicitly to counter Endymion's ascent in amatory cognition. When Dipsas asserts that this punishment could have been avoided had his "heart" remained "as low in love" as his sleeping form, she gestures suggestively to the earth upon

which Endymion sleeps; the gesture invokes Tellus as the former object of Endymion's affection, reminding the sleeping shepherd of where his affections should lie, but it also works to rearticulate the cosmological quality of Endymion's longing. His desire, Dipsas suggests, should have remained within the world, not among the stars towards which his head and thoughts once moved. Finally, Dipsas's claim reiterates Tellus's status as the earth in subtly moving between her status as an erotic object and her allegorical figuration as a planet. She converts Tellus, once a "mistress," into the "tomb" upon which Endymion languishes in his death-like slumber and thus introduces her curse through a rearticulation of Tellus's platial importance. Dipsas therefore claims to relocate Endymion within his body and upon the earth, but with such force that his experience of being re-embodied in sleep resembles disembodiment in death.

Dipsas's claim proves to be more than rhetorical, as subsequent encounters with Endymion's sleeping form reiterate the suggestion that his body's lack of animation recalls death. Cynthia, in her first words of the play, asks: "Is the report true that Endymion is stricken into such a dead sleep that nothing can either wake him or move him?" (3.1.1-3). Beyond the reference to "a dead sleep," Cynthia's inquiry gestures towards Endymion's possible disembodiment in emphasizing his lack of motility. In addition to bestowing the faculties of perception and cognition upon the body, the soul ensures that the flesh has the ability to move, and Endymion's slumber has so compromised his capacity to do so that no one can move his sleeping form. Indeed, Tellus plays upon this impossibility as a means of managing Corsites's affections for her; in response to his overtures, she instructs: "If you will remove him from that place [Endymion from the lunary bank] by force, and convey him into some obscure cave by policy, I give you here the faith of an unspotted virgin that you only shall possess me as a lover" (4.1.60-63). Tellus articulates this demand for a further

displacement of Endymion with full knowledge of its impossibility, and Corsites's failure to move the shepherd a few scenes later offers confirmation of both Endymion's profound lack of animation and the resulting emplacement of his body. Corsites's confusion at his inability to move Endymion – "What, stone-still? Turned, I think, to earth, with lying so long on the earth" – contains within itself the humorous and yet troubling suggestion that Endymion's insentient flesh has fused with the very place his thoughts once strove to transcend (4.3.12-13).

The repeated assertion that Endymion's body remains upon the earth, however, does little to suggest whether the shepherd's soul has been bound within that flesh or liberated from it with the diminution of somatic function. In its theorization of erotic displacement, Castiglione's *The Covrtyer* offers a possible answer to this question of the locus of the slumbering, contemplative soul. As Da Crema has noted, *The Covrtyer* remained a key text for theorizing desire in early modern Neoplatonism; indeed, Hoby's translation of Castiglione may help to explain the presence of a Neoplatonic theory of amatory cognition in England, beyond the limited circulation of la Boderie's translation of Ficino.[90] With regards to Ficino's theory of amatory cognition, Hoby's translation extends the circuit along which the soul must move in order to access the celestial sphere, further expanding the space of the soul's motility, and thus helps to resolve the uncertainty of a soul within or beyond the body. Whereas Ficino renders the heavens a sphere beyond the body, Castiglione appears to invert this relationship by locating it deep within the self. Contemplative introjection, in contrast to cognitive extension, removes the thinking self from the terrestrial plane: "instead of goinge

---

[90] Da Crema notes in "The Neoplatonic Element in John Lyly" that "Bembo's speech in Book IV of the *Courtier*" is one of the texts that "undoubtedly represent to the generality of students of Renaissance literature the standard treatment of Italian Renaissance neoplatonism. Indeed, these writings, along with Ficino's commentary on the *Symposium*, contain virtually every neoplatonic motif which all but the most determinedly metaphysical of later writers, both continental and English, were to employ" (6).

out of his witt with thought, as he must do that will consider the bodilye beawty, he may come into his witt, to behoulde the beawty that is seene with the eyes of the minde, which then begin to be sharpe and thorough seeinge, whan the eyes of the body lose the floure of their sightiynesse."[91] Fixation upon "bodilye beawty" draws the subject from itself and into the world, a movement marked by madness as much as by cognitive extension insofar as this is "going out of" one's "witt with thought." In contrast, "he may come into his witt" only when his senses retreat from the world, to see with cognitive rather than perceptual faculties. For Castiglione, this retreat enables the soul to grasp its own being as consubstantial with the heavens, in that the soul's isolation works by:

> tourninge her to the beehouldyng of her owne substance, as it were raysed out of a most deepe sleepe, openeth the eyes that all men haue, and fewe occupy, and seeth in her self a shining beame of that light, which is the true image of aungelike beawtye partened with her, whereof she also partneth with the bodye a feeble shadowe: Therefore wered blinde about earthlye matters, is made most quicke of sight about heauenlye.[92]

The contemplation of the soul's "owne substance" leads the anima to glimpse not the depths of interiority, but rather that which "heauenlye" and consubstantial with the "aungelike beawyte" that the divine mind infuses within the self. "By going inward, I am drawn upward," as Charles Taylor renders this motion in the consideration of another Neoplatonic thinker, whose establishment of the trope of extended interiority would help to theologically inflect the idea of psychic flight in the early modern period.[93]

---

[91] Baldessar Castilio [*sic.*], *The Covrtyer*, trans. Thomas Hoby (London: Wyllyam Seres, 1561), sig. Xx2v.
[92] Ibid.
[93] Charles Taylor, *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989), 134. Taylor develops his discussion of Augustine to posit an ethical dimension of extended interiority, by which the illumination at the heart of Augustine's Neoplatonism leads the contemplative to orient itself towards God: "The experience of being illuminated from another source, of receiving the standards of our reason from beyond ourselves, which the proof of God's existence already brought to light, is seen to be very much an

With regards to *Endymion*, Castiglione's emphasis on sleep, that this extension through inwardness becomes easier when "the stirringe vertues of the body are withdrawen alone through earnest behouldinge, eyther fast bounde through sleepe, whan she is not hindred by them," further suggests that the slumbering Endymion finds his soul unmoored from the body, located somewhere between the depths of contemplative interiority and the heavenly substance of which such inwardness partakes.[94] Indeed, in Castiglione's praise of "most holy loue," he affirms that this emanation of the divine mind functions as a circuit, binding the celestial and the terrestrial in a manner that recalls Ficino's philosophy: "Thou the most sweete bonde of the worlde, a meane beetwext heauenlye and earthlye thynges, wyth a bountifull tempre bendest the high vertues to the gouernment of the lower, and tourninge backe the mindes of mortall men to their beeginning, cooplest them with it."[95] Like Ficino, Castiglione theorizes love as both a constitutive force within the cosmos and the mechanism for hailing contemplative selves as cognitive subjects before the divine mind. But in extending the circuit to include the depths of the soul, which the self must plumb before ascending through the cosmos, Castiglione's model of erotic contemplation does more to complicate than resolve the initial question: in the flight of amatory cognition, through what medium does Endymion's (potentially dilated) soul move?

Returning to the concept of amatory cognition with the concepts of intramundane place and extracosmic space in mind, it becomes clear that Ficino's theorization of psychic flight also raises the question of location without fully disclosing the dimension through which the soul moves in its extension beyond the body. Although the distribution of

---

experience of inwardness" (135). This ontology of the self ultimately leads to an ethics of orientation, in which the subject's failure to turn towards God (or, in Althusserian terms, its refusal of interpellation) becomes the sign of evil: "for Augustine, it is not reflexivity which is evil; on the contrary, we show most clearly the image of God in our fullest self-presence. Evil is when this reflexivity is enclosed on itself" (139).

[94] Castilio, *The Covrtyer*, sig. Xx2v.

[95] Ibid., sig. Xx8r.

amatory cognition principally occurs when the contemplative subject becomes oriented towards the Beautiful and the Good, desire can also attach itself to human bodies; when this occurs, amatory cognition displaces the soul of the lover and locates it instead within the body of the beloved. Ficino's conceptualization of erotic extension would seem to suggest that Endymion, in the throes of his ardor for Cynthia, would be located somewhere along this circuit, imperfectly poised between the object of his desire and the reason for that object's brilliance. But Ficino also notes that such desire fragments the lover, making it too difficult to establish the precise location of the soul:

> La maison du Penser humain est l'ame: la maison de l'ame est l'esprit: la maison de l'espirt est le corps. trois sont les habitateurs, trois les maiso*n*s. Chascun de ceux-cy pour l'Amour sort de sa maison. Parce que tout pe*n*ser de l'amour, l'amant se retorne plustost au seruice de l'aymé, qu'à son bien propre. Et l'ame laisse en arriere le ministre de son corps, & s'enfforce d'outrepasser au corps de l'aymé. L'esprit qui est chariot de l'ame, pendant que l'ame est ententiue ailleurs, luymesme aussi s'enuolle ailleurs: de sorte q*ue* le penser sort de sa maison, l'ame en sort, & en sort l'esprit (244-5).

> The home of human thought is the soul; the home of the soul is the spirit; the home of the spirit is the body. Three are the inhabitants, three homes. Each of them, out of Love, leaves its home. Because thinking completely of love, the lover returns himself rather to the service of the beloved, … And the soul leaves behind its ministry of the body and attempts to extend itself into the body of the beloved. The spirit that is the chariot of the soul, while the soul is elsewhere, is itself flying elsewhere: in this way, thought leaves its home, the soul leaves its home, and the spirit leaves its home.

Although Ficino's initial comments on a psychic flight through the cosmos imply that the soul travels intact, his efforts to theorize the implications of this experience for embodied cognition disrupt that sense of unity. For the soul, incorporeal in its essence, remains distributed across the body through spirits, and this multiplicity suggests that fragmentation

accompanies any erotic extension beyond the lover's body. The indeterminacy that governs these statements attests to the difficulty of locating a lover's soul in a discrete location. Ficino develops this concept to align the soul's motility with its ability to think:

> S'il ne pense point de soy, certainement il ne pense point en soy: & pourtant telle ame n'agit en soy mesme: comme ainsi soit que la principalle actio*n* d'Amour[96] soit le Penser. Celuy qui n'agit en soy, n'est point en soy (66).

> If he [the lover] doesn't think at all of oneself, then certainly he doesn't think in himself. And therefore such a soul does not act within itself, as the principal action of Love is to Think. That which does not act in itself is not in itself.

Here, cognition functions as a capacious category, containing within itself both the purpose and the essence of the contemplative subject. Insofar as the "principal action of Love is to Think," desire defines the lover in the act of cognition. But more suggestive than this implicit alignment of longing with ensoulment is Ficino's suggestion that the object of cognition determines the location of that cognition. To think ardently is to displace one's self onto the object of thought, in other words, such that one becomes lodged within another's body at the moment of desiring it.

In his claim that a lover's soul becomes located within the body of his beloved, Ficino theorizes amatory cognition in such a way that it acquires the overtones of early modern Petrarchanism. Because this discursive re-presentation brings his model of the soul into greater proximity with *Endymion*, it helps to demonstrate the spatial ambiguity governing

---

[96] Here, la Boderie's text has "d'Amour," in place of the "d'Ame" that one might expect. This may be the result of la Boderie's efforts to align cognition with desire, but it is more likely the result of an error. Jayne, in her English translation of the *De amore*, assigns the action to the soul, rather than to Love: "If he does not about himself he certainly does not think *in* himself. And therefore a soul thus afflicted does not function *in* itself, since the special function of the soul is thought itself" (55). Beyond the fact of this apparent indeterminacy, however, the possible conflation of "d'Amour" and "d'Ame" gestures to what I have argued is an important element of early modern Neoplatonism: the intersection of amorous desire and cognition within the soul.

the shepherd's desire for Cynthia. The discourse of Petrarchanism organizes itself around an ostensibly cold or otherwise inaccessible woman and thus maintains itself through a certain topos, that the lover's heart or soul (an elision richly suggestive of amatory cognition) resides within the body of the beloved. As long as his love is unrequited, the lover experiences a kind of melancholy or lovesickness as a result of this absent anima.[97] Certainly, for Ficino, the lover's soul may inhere within the beloved's body only when that beloved consents to this desire in the form of reciprocal love; in the absence of such consent, the lover's soul hovers in a kind of limbo, exiled from its initial corpus and from the locus of its desire. But Ficino articulates the platial implications of that displacement in asking where the soul of a rejected suitor resides:

> L'Amour simple est où l'Aimé n'aime point l'Ama*n*t. Là l'Amant est du tout mort, par-ce qu'il ne vit point en soy, comme nous auons monstré, & ne vit point aussi en l'Aimé estant de luy mesprisé. Où est ce donc qu'il vit? Vit-il en l'Air, or en l'Eau, or au Feu, or en la Terre, ou au corps d'vn animal irraisonnable? Non, par-ce que l'ame humaine ne vit point en autre corps que l'humain. (67-8)

> Simple Love is where the Beloved does not love the Lover at all. There, the Lover is completely dead, because he does not live in himself, as we have shown, and does not live in the Beloved, being in contempt of her. Where, then, does he live? Does he live in the Air, or in Water, or in Fire, or in the Earth, or in the body of an irrational animal? No, because the human soul does not live in a body other than a human.

In claiming that the soul can only inhere within a human body, either the body of the lover or that of the beloved, Ficino implicitly asserts that the desire that enables cognitive

[97] I justify the use of the masculine pronoun by the fact that, with the significant if late exception of Lady Mary Wroth's *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus*, English sonnet sequences largely reproduce Petrarch's gender binary, in which a male lover addresses a female beloved. Of course, Shakespeare's sonnets notably depart from this model, not the least in exhorting a young man to procreation and considering the putative promiscuity of a female beloved, but the speaker is nevertheless male.

extension must be erotic in its charge and normative in its attachment. In other words, Ficino's thesis privileges an eroticism of sentient bodies and thereby stands in contrast to his claims elsewhere in the text, that an attraction to Beauty suffuses the cosmos and draws subjects through a series of concentric circles towards the divine mind. Beyond the fact that Ficino's assertion seems to obviate the very form of desire that he lauds elsewhere, his claim leaves the question of the soul's location unresolved. For, if the human soul can inhere neither within the elements nor within animality, one must wonder what space that soul inhabits when it transcends the body in contemplation.

At another point in the treatise, Ficino hints at a means of resolving this conceptual confusion. Offering a taxonomy of the various echelons of being, from the divine mind through the earth into the body of an individual subject, Ficino renders all of these entities exempt from place, save for corporeality:

> L'Ange a nombre de parties, ou bien de formes, mais est libre de mouuement & de lieu. L'ame a multitude de parties & d'affections, & se mue au discourir de la raison, & aux perturbations des sens, mais elle est libre & franche des termes du lieu. Le corps est soumis à toutes ces choses. (297)
>
> The Angel [or Angelic Mind] has a number of parts, or rather of forms, but is free from movement and from place. The soul has a multitude of parts and affections and moves itself with the discourse of reason and the perturbations of the senses, but she is free and uninhibited in terms of place. The body is subject to all these things.

Rendering the body subject to place, Ficino reiterates the existence of an intimate relationship between embodiment and emplacement, in such a way as to affirm that the concept of "place" is isomorphic with intramundane locales. Bodies cannot exist within the extracosmic void, by definition, and the limiting of their possible locations to within the cosmos ensures that place is a symptom of the physical world and of nothing else. Whereas

phenomenologists like Casey emphasize the primacy of place, however, Ficino's argument works to delegitimize that category, presenting it as abject because of its relation to materiality. This presumes the existence of another dimensionality, an immaterial space through which the soul moves, in contrast to the physical sites that are the demesne of the body. Indeed, the concept of an imperceptible sphere, existing beyond the cosmos, had already begun to disrupt the primacy of place in premodern thought; as Grant notes, the "actual existence of such a spirit-filled extra-mundane void space would be affirmed in the fourteenth century," a century before Ficino theorized the site of amatory cognition in the *De amore*.[98] Thus, although Ficino's efforts to articulate an amatory form of cognitive extension contain within them a lacuna with regards to space, this uncertainty appears symptomatic of a wider disruption within the early modern episteme regarding the possibility of space beyond the cosmos. Ficino's denigration of place reflects the growing discontent with Aristotle's legacy in the premodern period, as Grant suggests in noting that Ficino joined a number of other philosophers in citing Plato "in opposition to the dominant Aristotelian natural philosophy and cosmology of medieval and early modern scholasticism."[99] Even though Ficino hesitates to posit the existence of extracosmic space, his emphasis on the soul's transcendence of place ensured that his works were among those authoritative texts "invoked in defense of God's omnipresence in an imaginary space" that extended beyond the firmament.[100] Thus, in his rejection of place and in his assumption of an immaterial dimension through which the soul moves, Ficino participates in a wider effort to theorize the existence of an extracosmic void.

---

[98] Grant, *Much Ado about Nothing*, 115.
[99] Ibid., 183.
[100] Ibid., 160-161.

Endymion, in turn, parallels this aspect of Neoplatonic discourse in initially theorizing emplacement as embodiment and in representing the limit of embodiment as a void. Moreover, the play appears to register Ficino's denigration of place through the comedic subplot of Sir Tophas. An allusion to Chaucer's boy knight, Sir Thopas, whose diminutive exploits comprise the first narrative in *The Canterbury Tales* halted for its poor construction,[101] Tophas appears as a braggart, an adult version of his predecessor who has gained nothing with his advancing age. In his early articulation of an unrequited love, and in the sleep that will shortly overtake him, Tophas functions as a comedic inversion of Endymion in his longing for Cynthia, reifying what the shepherd locates in the celestial as a telluric, even carnal, desire. Tophas thereby represents – and embraces – the very abjection that the Neoplatonism mobilized elsewhere in the play would reject, making him an appropriate site for affirming emplacement as embodiment. His articulation of this relationship comes in Tophas's caveat regarding his friendship with Dares and Samias, who are much shorter than the knight. Distending Aristotle's claims that friendship obtains only among equals, Tophas articulates this equality on the level of corporeality; "Because *amicitia*, as in old annuals we find, is *inter pares*," and Dares and Samias are but half his height, Tophas rejects a total friendship with them, offering instead that "you shall be my half friends, for, reaching to my middle, so far as from the ground to the waist I will be your friend" (1.3.31-2, 33-5). This humorous displacement of equality onto the materiality of the body anticipates and, indeed, enables Tophas's rejection of space beyond corporeality. In response to Dares's query, "what shall become of the rest of your body, from the waist to the crown?," Tophas asserts that

[101] In *The Canterbury Tales*, the pilgrim Chaucer offers the tale of Sir Thopas as his first story, but the Host cuts him off after a mere nine hundred lines, complaining of his prosody that "Thy drasty rymyng is nat worth a toord!" (Geoffrey Chaucer, "Sir Thopas" in *The Riverside Chaucer*, ed. Larry Benson, 3rd ed. [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987], 930). The tale itself concerns a boy knight who parodically figuring himself as an apt subject of the romance genre, an ironic self-fashioning that culminates in his mock-heroic encounter with Sir Olifaunt (an elephant).

"*quod supra vos nihil as vos* [that which is above is nothing to you]," and affirms that "you must think the rest immortal because you cannot reach it" (1.3.36-9). In aligning the transcendental with the "immortal," Tophas echoes Endymion at the moment that he theorizes Cynthia's divinity through distance from him, as another entity that he "cannot reach." But whereas Endymion values the celestial precisely because it remains inaccessible, Tophas denigrates it in his Latin aphorism, signifying that space as literally "nothing." Tophas's jokes build upon one another, and the effect of this accumulation of meaning is to affirm that embodiment constitutes emplacement; that which remains beyond the body is "nothing" to it and is thus consubstantial with the void of extracosmic space. Insofar as all place is of the body and thus intramundane, the knight's assertion parodically affirms Ficino's subjugation of the platial to the corporeal.

The conceptualization of embodiment as emplacement leaves the question of extracosmic space unanswered; it posits the need for such a dimension without affirming the existence of such space, forcing one to inquire as to the medium through which a soul moves at the moment of contemplative transcendence. In Ficino's assertion that the body alone is subject to place, he notes that the soul "se mue au discourir de la raison, & aux perturbations des sens, mais elle est libre & franche des termes du lieu. Le corps est soumis à toutes ces choses" or "moves itself with the discourse of reason and the perturbations of the senses," while the Angelic Mind remains "libre de mouuement & de lieu" or "free from movement and place" (297). Through what medium, then, does the soul move when it dissevers itself from the body and from place? Although Tophas inserts Neoplatonic discourse into the play, his claims neither resolve the spatial paradox at the heart of Ficino's argument nor explain how Endymion's reproduction of this paradox functions onstage.

Where, then, does the shepherd find himself in his desire for Cynthia? The play declines to furnish an answer to this question, but the inability to locate Endymion's soul already gestures towards space. Given that the discourse of Neoplatonism overwhelms the play up to the moment of the shepherd's collapse, it is likely that Endymion's slumber represents a psychic flight of his soul beyond the cosmos.[102] To support this reading, Gannon cites Giordano Bruno's description of contemplative slumber:

> If [the soul] is carried aloft through the power of contemplation or is transported above the horizon of the natural affections, seeing the difference between one life [spiritual] and the other [material] and conquered by lofty thoughts as though dead to the body, it aspires to what is superior. Although living in the body, it vegetates there, present in the act of animation but absent in the act of operation – not that it stops functioning while the body is alive but rather that the operations of the composite are deferred, enfeebled, and suspended.[103]

Prior to his sleep, Endymion's soul had already partially ascended "above the horizon of the natural affections," as his experience of amatory cognition combined "contemplation" with desire to locate his thoughts among the stars. When he collapses, still longing for Cynthia, Endymion "aspires to what is superior," and one can even read Dipsas's curse upon him as a punishment for his constancy in this contemplation. Slumber thereby exacerbates Endymion's extension in amatory cognition when understood through a Neoplatonic framework. And although Bruno's description recalls Aristotle's conceptualization of the

---

[102] Indeed, Knapp acknowledges the possibility that Endymion's sleep can be "a deathlike state enchaining him" or "a visionary state which liberates him," before asserting that "most authorities" who considered the Endymion myth in the early modern period "conclude that Endimion's was a sleep of the senses which freed his mind for higher contemplation" ("Monarchy of Love," 357). Gannon cites Giordano Bruno to demonstrate the validity of interpreting Endymion's sleep as a psychic flight in "Lyly's *Endimion*," 227 (see above for a more detailed discussion). Da Crema also notes that Endymion's sleep enacts a Neoplatonic trope, in which age purifies the soul in liberating it from the body (*The Neoplatonic Element in John Lyly*, 42). This, admittedly, fails to explain why Cynthia restores Endymion's youth, but I suggest an alternative strategy at work in Endymion's awakening in what follows.

[103] Quoted in Gannon, "Lyly's *Endimion*," 227.

soul "suspended" in sleep, Endymion ultimately surpasses this model, in that his soul is not even "present in the act of animation," as Bruno would have it.[104] Corsites's inability to move Endymion from the lunary bank manifests this lack of animation and thereby foregrounds the absence of Endymion's soul from his body, present perhaps in a kind of vegetation but "absent in the act of operation." As I have suggested, the play itself gestures towards this possibility, and although it leaves the location of Endymion's soul undisclosed, this uncertainty already bestows upon the shepherd's soul a kind of placelessness. The attenuation of the body's hold over the soul, whether in an Aristotelian suspension of somatic power or, more likely, in a Neoplatonic contemplative ascent, unsettles Endymion's placement and thereby dislocates him within space.

ii. Cynthia's Rule over Intramundane Place

At the moment that Endymion's cognitive extension threatens to dislocate him, the play registers this disruption through the search for a cure for the shepherd's slumber. The effect, I suggest, is that Endymion's flight into extracosmic space enables a deepening sense

---

[104] The belief that sleep seals the soul within the body owes much to Aristotle's theorization of slumber. As Daniel Heller-Roazen argues in *The Inner Touch: Archaeology of a Sensation* (New York: Zone Books, 2007), sleep, for Aristotle, "plays an important role in the Peripatetic doctrine of the soul, where it constitutes the necessary, if temporary, suspension (*dialusis*) of the sensation to which no animal can be immune: an 'affection' (*pathos*) of the perceiving power, in which a period of inactivity inevitably comes to follow on the heels of activity, as the otherwise sensitive being withdraws into a state of mere self-conservation and organic growth close in the form to that of the nutritive life of plants. According to the classical theory, it is at once a physiological and a psychological process" (66). The effect of this diminution of the body's abilities is that the soul ceases to perceive through the body but remains active as it works to organize the residuum of disparate sensations in the common sense. For Aristotle, this residuum constitutes the stuff of dreams, and the soul's ability to apprehend its oneiric experience without full perceptual capacity testifies to the ambiguity regarding its embodiment. Of course, as Garrett A. Sullivan, Jr. suggests, sleep can also work through the body, rather than against it, to transport the self from one environment to another. See Sullivan, Jr., "Romance, Sleep, and the Passions in Sir Philip Sidney's *The Old Arcadia*" *ELH* 74 (2007): 735-757. The slumber that Sullivan theorizes, however, is intimately related to the genre of romance, in which sleep "functions much as metaphor does: it transports the sleeper from one (subjective and/or physical) place to another)" (752). Moreover, the emphasis on transport between physical places gestures to the fact that the sleeping figures in Sidney's *Arcadia* can be moved, as Sullivan notes (749), in a way that the inanimate Endymion cannot.

of intramundane place within the play and of Cynthia's monarchical dominion over those places. Cynthia's first words upon entering the play concern the partial disserving of Endymion's soul from his body, the fact that his flesh lies unresponsive and inanimate upon the lunary bank. Receiving confirmation of this fact, Cynthia demonstrates her political dominion over place by sending emissaries throughout the world, with her command offering the first (and significantly, the only) geographic hint as to the location of the play's events:

> Eumenides, if either the soothsayers in Egypt, or the enchanters in Thessaly, or the philosophers in Greece, or all the sages of the world can find remedy, I will procure it. Therefore dispatch with all speed: you, Eumenides, into Thessaly; you, Zontes, into Greece (because you are acquainted with Athens); you, Panelion, to Egypt, saying that Cynthia sendeth and, if you will, commandeth. (3.1.47-53)

These directives are tantalizing in their suggestion that Cynthia's kingdom might be located with reference to the lands of Thessaly, Greece, and Egypt, as though with further pronouncement Cynthia might state which of these lands touch her realm, which are connected through trade routes, and thereby reveal over which country (fictional or otherwise) her rule extends. But these commandments fail to offer anything more precise than the names of potentially distant lands. Cynthia's utterance is fascinating not because it defines her kingdom with geographic specificity, but because it locates that kingdom upon the earth. Previously, Cynthia's absence from the stage and her lunary status positioned her transcendentally, with her dominion over the earth manifesting itself in her ability to infuse Tellus with beauty. Here, the play posits Cynthia's kingdom within the world and brings it into being through other, intramundane places.

In her articulation of concern for Endymion, Cynthia implies that the nature of her power has shifted, even if the location of that puissance remains constant. Cynthia

dominates the earth as a monarchical power, rather than as a cosmological force located beyond the earth. Indeed, Eumenides acknowledges this alteration in his response to Cynthia's commands. Eumenides's utterance should contain within itself some of the disbelief that he once voiced to Endymion, his suspicion that the moon would never appear in the shape of a mistress, but his words work instead to elide Cynthia's transformation and to recognize her monarchical status: "Your Highness, on whose hands the compass of the earth is at command (though not in possession), may show yourself both worthy of your sex, your nature, and your favor, if you redeem that honorable Endymion" (3.1.1-3, 28-32). Eumenides' response plays upon Cynthia's oscillation between a celestial body and a human ruler, working to distinguish the kinds of power that these various ontologies enable. Whereas Cynthia's status as the moon once enabled her dominion over the earth, Eumenides notes that Cynthia as a ruler may "command" the world without being said to possess it, a subtle demarcation of her authority as political rather than cosmological.

The increased specification of intramundane place within the play and the transformation of Cynthia's dominion over the world further manifest themselves through Tellus, whose oscillation between an allegorical embodiment of the earth and a lady of the court registers the complex imbrication of space and subjectivity in *Endymion*. Prior to Cynthia's appearance onstage, Tellus appeared subjected to Cynthia on a cosmological register, her beauty owing more to an emanation of divine love than to the base qualities of Earth itself. With the moon's metamorphosis into a monarch, however, Tellus's status as the Earth becomes attenuated through the loss of her allegorical counterpart, and she finds herself politically subservient to Cynthia. In one sense, Cynthia surrounds Tellus, insofar as her monarchical presence creates a court, within which Tellus is located. This spatialization of power, as it were, contains within itself a peculiar inversion: Cynthia's presence upon the

planet that Tellus once represented does not signify her subjection to Tellus, but functions as the means of ensuring Tellus's deeper subjectification to Cynthia, now on a political rather than cosmological register. In another sense, Cynthia's transformation disrupts Tellus's spatial and allegorical potential in locating her within a physical place. When Tellus's snide remarks regarding Endymion's slumber anger Cynthia, she deepens the platial specificity of the play in banishing Tellus, ordering Corsites to "carry her to the castle in the desert, there to remain and weave" (3.1.42). This utterance names the only dramatic location, apart from the lunary bank and Geron's fountain, to be named in the course of *Endymion*, and the fact that the castle remains "in the desert" further demonstrates that Cynthia now rules over an intramundane place. But more fascinating is the potential paradox of the scene, that Tellus is now divested of her allegorical status and confined to a specific location upon the earth. The containment of Tellus within the castle effects her displacement from Cynthia's presence to a discrete site, likely contained with Cynthia's kingdom but not within her court. Because both sites function as intramundane places, however, they effectively circumscribe Tellus within the circle of Cynthia's influence. Tellus, in short, is contained within the very places that she once comprised. Through her subjection to Cynthia and her imprisonment within the castle, Tellus metonymically figures the subjugation of the earth to political power. With this subjugation, Cynthia's rule establishes her governance over the totality of place, insofar as all places are of the world that Cynthia now rules.

Cynthia's political dominion over place, however, does not succeed in locating Endymion's soul. The search for a means of awakening Endymion deepens our sense of intramundane place (Egypt, Greece, and Thessaly), but this quest does little to resolve our uncertainty regarding the location of the shepherd's soul. Whether slumber has indeed enabled a kind of psychic flight, allowing Endymion to extend into the void beyond the

firmament, or whether sleep has sealed the soul within the body and thus ensured Endymion's utter lack of animation, the shepherd's imperfect embodiment disrupts his emplacement and threatens to locate him within an indeterminate, and possibly extracosmic, space. The deepening specificity of place within *Endymion* and the entanglement of these sites with Cynthia's rule work to counter the loss of place that occurs in Endymion's slumber, as though the transformation of Cynthia into a sublunary figure might circumvent the play's investment in the cosmos and ground the drama within a discrete location. But Endymion remains displaced as a result of amatory cognition, and in the efforts of the courtiers to find a cure for his slumber, the question of where Endymion resides becomes less an inquiry into his location than an effort to return him to embodiment and thus to move him from space to place.

The spatial ambiguity that undergirds Endymion's desire and the play's efforts to relocalize him parallel a larger uncertainty regarding the diegetic locales within which the drama of *Endymion* unfolds. Although the prologue and epilogue allude to the performance at Greenwich on Candlemas 1588 and thereby firmly ground the production within Elizabeth's court, the dramatic locations encompass only the lunary bank upon which Endymion sleeps, the castle to which Tellus is banished, and the fountain near Geron's hermitage. That is to say that, with few exceptions, there is what Peter Saccio has termed a "curious placelessness" about the play, in which location emerges suggestively rather than definitively.[105] Although this placelessness should accommodate the play's Neoplatonism, enacting Endymion's flight from the body and from the world by leaving questions of geographic specificity unanswered, the fact that Endymion's desire is cosmopolitical, i.e.,

---

[105] Peter Saccio, "The Oddity of Lyly's *Endimion*," in *The Elizabethan Theatre V*, ed. G. R. Hibbard (University of Waterloo, 1975), 98.

takes part of the cosmos and of the political order, makes such a reading untenable. His longing shifts from Cynthia as moon to Cynthia as monarch, and because the orientation of Endymion's desire changes with the metamorphosis of the love object, the locus of his soul changes too. As Saccio suggests, Cynthia's status is crucial for defining the place of the play: "where does Cynthia rule? Over all the earth, as long as she is called the Moon. Over a specific country, one assumes, when she sends her courtiers to Egypt, Greece and Thessaly, but that country is as placeless as Spenser's Faerie Land, and nameless to boot."[106] Cynthia's shape-shifting thereby frustrates one's efforts to locate the play with much specificity. In his edition of *Endymion*, George P. Baker bemoans: "To place satisfactorily the scenes of this play is practically impossible."[107] Baker's concerns largely turn towards the performative, however, and his frustration lies in the fact that there remains little within Lyly's text to articulate the place of a particular scene. For this reason, he suggests, the audience was required to parallel Endymion's flight in the expansion of their own cognitive faculties: "Lyly's audience was to follow in imagination where he led."[108] Similarly, Alexander Leggatt acknowledges that the play represents a spatial paradox, but he somewhat dismissively resolves that paradox by appealing to performance conditions: insofar as "we are in an acting area, and a place of the mind," we are placed in the same sphere of the imagination that Baker proposes. But in these critical appraisals, the question of a cognitive discernment of locale is displaced from the performance onto the playgoers; it leaves the paradox of dramatic location unresolved.[109] Ultimately, the placelessness of Endymion's soul reflects a problem of place that suffuses the entire play, and although playgoers participate in this

[106] Ibid., 95-6.
[107] John Lyly, *Endymion*, ed. George P. Baker (New York: H. Holt, 1894), 5.
[108] Ibid., 6.
[109] Alexander Leggatt, *Introduction to English Renaissance Comedy* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), 20.

problem, gesturing towards them does not resolve the tensions between space and place within *Endymion*.

Implicit in these concessions, however, is the recognition that Cynthia functions as part of the crux of the play's placelessness. Her ambiguous status, oscillating between moon and monarch, implicates the potential location of Endymion's soul at the moment he desires her; to the extent that she is the moon, Endymion has little chance of extending his soul into that lunar entity, while her potential figuration as a human monarch might allow him the chance at a re-embodiment, insofar as she becomes the Beloved within which his soul may dwell. At the same time, Cynthia's oscillation between a Neoplatonic virtue and an embodied monarch is itself a negotiation of the play's space, insofar as her status translates the stage, alternatively, into the cosmos or into a court. For these reasons, an inquiry into the play's consideration of space must attend to the means by which *Endymion* shifts its discursive focus from Neoplatonism into a theorization of monarchical power. Indeed, Cynthia's transformation from moon to monarch occurs at the same time that Endymion's desire renders him asleep, suggesting the degree to which political power is predicated upon its management of Neoplatonic discourse. This discursive shift illuminates a stunning, if inadequately theorized, crux in the play: if Endymion's sleep represents the liberation of his soul from his body, itself a fulfillment of the Neoplatonic dream, why does the play devote such energy to rescuing the shepherd from this triumph? The answer, I suggest, lies in the terms under which Endymion emerges from his slumber. As his articulation of his awakening (and Cynthia's resignification of that experience) testify that the shepherd returns to embodiment and thus to emplacement, *Endymion* recalls the spatialization of desire that Ficino theorizes as constitutive of the cosmos, at once distending Neoplatonism to advance a spatial politics of the early modern court and revealing the latent ideological gesture that

animates Ficino's universe. Finally, insofar as this recovery plucks Endymion from an extracosmic space of contemplation and recathects his desire onto the monarch, Cynthia's efforts to return her adoring shepherd to place figure the final articulation of the spatial politics of *Endymion*.

III. The Spatial Politics of Cynthia's Court

Although Neoplatonism shapes the allegory that will in turn structure *Endymion*, Ficino's philosophy appears inadequate as an interpretive paradigm once Cynthia enters the scene in the form of an embodied monarch. If Eumenides mocks his friend for adoring Cynthia as a celestial body, noting that few are so foolish as to "imagine the moon either capable of affection or shape of a mistress," it is notable that, upon Cynthia's entrance at the beginning of the third act, neither Eumenides nor other characters (or critics) pause to wonder at her transformation, demonstrating that which had hitherto been deemed impossible (1.1.22-3). Implicitly, this alteration has suggested to some that the play's investment in Neoplatonism is limited or "conventional," resulting in historicist explorations of *Endymion*.[110] This, however, requires a refusal to recognize the play's initial invocation of Neoplatonism and its theorization of amatory cognition that, if not indebted to Ficino's writing, is nonetheless illuminated by the *De amore*. Not withstanding this, critics have struggled to sustain a Neoplatonic reading in the face of the play's shift towards a more political relationship between Endymion and Cynthia. The moment in which Cynthia's kiss awakens Endymion, for example, represents a kind of supplementarity that, in turn, exposes

---

[110] Pincombe argues in *The plays of John Lyly* that "the Platonic or Neoplatonic element *is* present in *Endymion*; but mainly as incidental rhetorical ornament, or, at most, as a conventional structure of thought to which Lyly's play sometimes leans, although its foundation is quite different" (97).

a lacuna in the play's Neoplatonism. C. C. Gannon makes the strongest case for this reading, noting after an excursus on the Neoplatonic tradition of a *mors osculi*, or a death by a kiss, that Cynthia's gesture liberates Endymion from his body: "The *excessus* that results, one which separates man's soul from his body (Endymion's sleep), is represented in the moon goddess' kiss bestowed upon the sleeping Endymion (*mors osculi*)."[111] For Gannon, as for others who seek to rescue the play's Neoplatonism, this moment is overdetermined – both Endymion's sleep and his awakening signify the soul's liberation from the body – but that very act of overdetermination exposes the unstable center of the argument. For if Endymion's soul leaves his body at the moment of his slumber, how can it depart when he awakes, except through a second, indeed supplementary, flight? Moreover, as Ficino asserts in his description of the exchange of souls between lover and beloved, this Neoplatonic reading depends upon an equality established through reciprocity, a point that Castiglione affirms in meditating upon the transmigrational capacity of a kiss. A man:

> hath a delite to ioigne hys mouth with the womans beloued with a kysse: not to stirre him to anye vnhonest desire, but bicause he feeleth that, that bonde is the openynge of an entry to the soules, which drawen with a coveting the one of the other, power them selues by tourn, the one into the others bodye, and be so mingled together, that ech of them hath two soules, and one alone so framed of them both ruleth (in a maner) two bodyes.[112]

Philip Dust invokes this passage to offer a Neoplatonic interpretation of Cynthia's kiss: "In the perfect kiss, there is a mysterious union of the souls of both lovers. And at its highest perfection, the souls are actually drawn out of their bodies," such that one can speak of mystical union of Endymion's soul with Cynthia's, in which the kiss re-localizes Endymion

---

[111] Gannon, "From Myth to Allegory," 224.
[112] Castilio, *The Covrtyer*, sig. Vv1^{v}.

within the world.[113] But these readings obscure the political nature of the kiss, bestowed upon a recumbent subject by a bending monarch, who actively figures her gesture as regal: "I will not be so stately, good Endymion, not to stoop to do thee good; and if thy liberty consist in a kiss from me, thou shalt have it" (5.1.20-22). Cynthia's emphasis on Endymion's "liberty" hardly makes sense in a Neoplatonic schema, in which the shepherd's soul, freed from his body in sleep, will be returned to the prison of the flesh at the moment of his awakening. Why, then, does a play that begins with an investment in Ficinian Neoplatonism devote so much energy to saving Endymion from the fate of a contemplative disembodiment?

One answer lies in the fact that Cynthia's political order is predicated upon, and emerges through, Endymion's amatory cognition. The pivot between its early figuration of Cynthia as the moon and her later manifestation as monarch occurs with striking proximity to the moment that Endymion begins his forty-year slumber. Furthering the play's distinction between celestial and terrestrial bodies, Endymion affirms Cynthia's status as the moon immediately before he sleeps: "Thy majesty, Cynthia, all the world knoweth and wondereth at, but not one in the world that can imitate it or comprehend it" (2.3.17-9). Here, Cynthia's ontological domination of the world, previously seen in her power over Tellus's beauty, only inchoately signifies a political order, as "majesty" encodes a monarchical puissance within Cynthia's beauty. Falling into a slumber under the influence of Dipsas's magic, moreover, Endymion experiences a vision, represented onstage by a dumb show that he later describes as a political allegory of Cynthia's rule. Tellingly, in the narrative that fixates on an insertion of mercy into the righteous anger of a female monarch, Endymion pauses at the moment in which "there appeared in her heavenly face such a divine majesty,

---

113 Philip Dust, "The Kiss in Lyly's 'Endymion,'" *English Miscellany* 25 (1976): 95.

mingled with a sweet mildness, that I was ravished with the sight above measure, and wished that I might have enjoyed the sight without end" (5.1.101-4). On the one hand, Endymion's description signals a Neoplatonic ecstasy, in which his contemplation of a "heavenly" body, celestial in the same manner as the moon, renders him rapt with attention. That this investment remains primarily ocular, as it is the "sight" of the heavenly subject that captivates him, revisits Endymion's initial claim that his amatory cognition is "stitched to the stars," in such a way that he remains transfixed, gazing upon that which, "being as high as I can see," remains distant (1.1.4-6). On the other hand, Endymion's narrative signals a shift towards a political figuration of Cynthia, its invocation of "a divine majesty" referring back to Endymion's initial praise of Cynthia's magisterial beauty. Significantly, this description of Endymion's vision illuminates the transformation that the play effects in the midst of his sleep, as Cynthia ceases to signify moon and becomes, instead, the monarch who enters immediately following the dumb show. Through the sleep that liberates Endymion's soul from his body and furthers his erotic contemplation of the celestial Cynthia, the play performatively reconstitutes Cynthia, locating the divine mind that animates the cosmos at the center of a terrestrial court.

Despite her sudden appearance in the play, Cynthia's reconstitution is temporally complex, mediated at once through the vision that instantiates Endymion's slumber and through the subsequent narration of that vision. That is to say, the figuration of moon as monarch is as proleptic as it is processual, with the utterances that determine Cynthia's transformation frequently looking ahead to later moments in her gradual resignification. In the stage direction that begins Endymion's vision, an obscure pantomime of vengeance forestalled lays the foundation for Cynthia's monarchical transformation: "*Three ladies enter, one with a knife and a looking glass, who, by the procurement of one of the other two, offers to stab*

Endymion as he sleeps, but the third wrings her hands, lamenteth, offering still to prevent it, but dares not. At last, the first lady, looking in the glass, casts down the knife" (2.3.63 s.d.). For playgoers and readers unfamiliar with the events of subsequent acts, this triad might dimly figure Tellus, whose anger at Endymion dominates the play's opening, and her servants, Floscula and Dipsas. In this interpretation, the woman carrying a knife and mirror would represent the sorcerer Dipsas, who casts Endymion into his slumber "*by the procurement of one of the other two*," or at the behest of Tellus. Floscula, who initially warns Tellus that "love gotten with witchcraft is as unpleasant as fish taken medicines unwholesome," might then stand as the referent of the third figure, whose protestations save Endymion's life (1.2.80-2). The trouble, of course, is that Floscula fails in her efforts, and Endymion languishes in his sleep for the next forty years, awaking to scarcely remember himself. The inadequacy of this reading gestures to another interpretation of the dream, provided by Endymion upon his awakening. I have already argued that Endymion's vision effects a performative reconstitution of Cynthia, but Enydmion's narration of that experience extends the reconstitution to implicate Cynthia's nature as a monarch, beyond her provisional status as ruler. In Endymion's subsequent narration, this section of the dream functions as a dialectic of vengeance and forgiveness; the armed lady, "passing fair but very mischievous," is mollified by the woman carrying the mirror, "wherein seeing how ill anger became ladies, she refrained from intended violence" (5.1.84-5, 87-8). Indeed, Endymion describes the emergence of divine majesty in the heavenly face as a moment in which "mercy overcame anger," such that the monarch manifests herself through another affect (5.1.100-1).

In their discussion of the play, critics tend to ignore the conditions under which Endymion's vision reconstitutes Cynthia and therefore forget that it is her transformation that effectively refracts the discursive investment of the play, bending it from Neoplatonic

allegory towards a commentary on Elizabeth's court. Bennett, furthering her identification of Endymion with Oxford, interprets this part of the vision as a struggle between Floscula and Semele, respectively representative of Oxford's friends and enemies, to influence the monarch. For Bennett, the visions owe their intelligibility to the topicality of the play, since "if Endymion is not Oxford, then they remain unexplained, for they certainly do not fit into any interpretation of the play as physical or philosophical allegory."[114] Although Bennett's critique aptly suggests the dream's distance from Neoplatonism, it presumes a strict distinction between allegory and historical topicality, making *Endymion* the epiphenomenon of historical events. In other words, it does little to illuminate the play, working instead to reduce it to the level of a symptom. The excavation of historical analogues for each character obscures, among other things, the fact that the scene represents the final phase of Cynthia's reconstitution, what Saccio identifies as "the real development" of the play: "She is identified at first merely as the Moon; gradually we discover her also to be a human queen; only in the final scene is her sovereignty fully exercised."[115] Indeed, if Cynthia's transformation occurs in tandem with – and indeed, may be said to actualize – the play's shift from the discourse of Neoplatonism to questions of governance, then it matters in part because it reminds us that Cynthia's status is not constant, that she remains neither moon nor monarch for the duration of the play. In this regard, Gannon's claim to Cynthia's liminal status, her oscillation between human and divine, appears more accommodating: "Cynthia is not God in his essence, but she performs divine functions in the last act as she judges, dispenses mercy, uncovers truth, rewards, cures, and orders."[116] Arguing that Cynthia does not replace but adopts the subject position of God, Gannon suggests the politics that inhere within a

---

114 Bennett, "Oxford and *Endimion*," 368.
115 Saccio, "Lyly's *Endmion*," 94.
116 Gannon, "From Myth to Allegory," 241.

divinity's dominion over the earth. Moreover, his emphasis on these preternatural abilities accords with a more mystified understanding of monarchical privilege, appropriate in both the contexts of Cynthia and of Elizabeth, whose reigns are legitimated with reference to divine sanction. Endymion's vision thereby works to place Cynthia in a position of mercy, which – as Knapp admirably notes – effects a challenge to Elizabeth to misrecognize herself in the reconstituted monarch. The mirror upon which the lady of the vision gazes becomes a mirror in which Elizabeth must view herself, such that the entire play becomes "a mirror in which ruler and subjects alike should seek their better selves."[117] Indeed, as Bevington notes, the admonition of the dream implicates Endymion as much as his beloved Cynthia, in that the disparate threats represented in the dream "are not political rivals whom Endymion would like to see crushed for his own advancement, but the generic disturbances of court peace which he too must avoid."[118]

Because the vision implicates Cynthia as much as Endymion, offering a mirror to monarch and subject alike, I would argue that it disrupts the rather facile reading of sleep as a sign of political disfavor, which many critics of the play, particularly those invested in topical readings, have advanced. Certainly, this trope has precedence, and there is at least one example of a performance that, with some proximity to Lyly, represents sleep as a kind of languishing outside the monarch's pleasure. Sir Henry Lee's Woodstock entertainments of 1592 feature a "knight in perpetual sleep," seemingly in punishment for having "failed to guard the pictures left in his care." That he "can be awakened only by the relenting Queen" works to suggest, as Bevington asserts, that "the sleep is royal disfavor."[119] But Bevington

---

[117] Knapp, "The Monarchy of Love," 366.
[118] Bevington, *Tudor Drama and Politics*, 183.
[119] Ibid., 169. With regards to topicality, the disfavor that Lee incurred stemmed from his relationship with Anne Vavasour, the woman taken by Bennett to be the figure behind Tellus in Lyly's play.

himself suggests the difficulty of applying this reading to *Endymion*, where "Cynthia is at first unaware of Endymion's tribulations" and "once she hears of her courtier's sad absence, she resolves compassionately and pragmatically to relieve his distress."[120] More radically, I would suggest that sleep cannot signify royal displeasure in this instance because, at the moment that Endymion enters into his slumber, Cynthia does not exist as a political monarch; rather, in her absence from the play, she retains the status of a celestial body. Given the vision that Endymion encounters, this temporary flight of the soul from the body that sleep represents implicates the shepherd-courtier more than the Cynthia he desires. If we accept the proposition of *The Covrtyer* that sleep aids the soul's isolation, "tourninge her to the beehouldyng of her owne substance," Endymion's vision reveals the substance of his contemplative soul to be the court within which he and Cynthia inhere.[121] When his soul turns upon itself, in other words, Endymion glimpses a vision that concerns neither the Neoplatonic hybrid of the Beautiful and the Good, nor indeed any transcendent truth; rather, what he sees concerns Cynthia's court, suggesting that this place constitutes the very substance of his soul.

Cynthia's transformation, then, occurs through Endymion's reconstitution as a contemplative subject, although the processual nature of this alteration ensures that the shepherd, too, changes through the monarch that he brings into being. Endymion's gradual awakening is, I argue, the slow descent of his soul into his body, and it depends upon gradual stages of recognition, in which Endymion finds himself through Cynthia before he remembers either his name or, even, the feel of his own corporeality. Eumenides hails the shepherd repeatedly – "Speak, Endymion, Endymion, Endymion!" – only to be met with

---

[120] Ibid., 179.
[121] Castilio, *The Covrtyer*, sig. Xx2^{v}.

misrecognition, shown by Endymion's inability to accept himself as the referent of that signifier: "Endymion? I call to mind such a name" (5.1.37-9). Here, Cynthia shifts her position from standing behind the recumbent shepherd to locating herself within his line of sight, and this vision offers Endymion an object towards which he may orient himself; although tentative in his first appraisal – "Oh, heavens, whom do I behold? Fair Cynthia, divine Cynthia?" – Endymion finds her to be the foundation of his certitude: "Only divine Cynthia, to whom time, fortune, destiny, and death are subject, I see and remember, and in all humility I regard and reverence" (5.1.58-60). Endymion's memory of Cynthia stands before his recognition of his own subjectivity, manifested in Eumenides's incredulous question, "Hast thou forgotten thyself, Endymion?" (5.1.40). The shepherd's refusal to assent to the sound of his name suggests an inability to incorporate that signifier of his identity into his body, to register his subjectivity on the level of embodiment. Indeed, Endymion's rapid transition from this foreign sign to his equally uncanny body testifies to the proximity of the two discourses, that Endymion lacks self-presence as a result of his disembodiment: "Endymion? What do I hear? What, a gray beard? Hollow eyes? Withered body? Decayed limbs?" (5.1.50-1). Recovering his body, ultimately, proves the last stage of Endymion's self-recognition, subsequent to his rapture at the sight of Cynthia and his eventual acceptance of himself through Eumenides: "Ah, sweet Eumenides, I now perceive thou art he, and that myself have the name of Endymion. But that this should be my body I doubt; for how could my curled locks be turned to gray hairs and my strong body to a dying weakness, having waxed old and not knowing it?" (5.1.68-72). With this as yet unconquered uncertainty, Endymion's body only inchoately his own, Cynthia inquires as to the visions Endymion might have seen during his forty year slumber, in effect hailing him as a political subject as a means of solidifying his embodiment. For the visions that Endymion recounts

are those of the dumb show that separates his sleep from Cynthia's transformation, gesturing to the moment at which the shepherd's dreams performatively reconstitute the moon as monarch; Cynthia's power here is, on the one hand, predicated upon this transformation and affirmed, on the other, by her ability to extract the narrative of those events from her courtier-shepherd.

The political import of this moment works not only on the level of Endymion's somatic structure, but also registers the question of space that suffuses the play, insofar as the conceptualization of embodiment as emplacement renders the two concerns coterminous. When Endymion's slumber separates his soul from its corporeal locus, the location of that unmoored anima remains unarticulated within the play; the psychic flight that Ficino's conceptualization of love would enable stops short of allowing the lover's soul to inhere within an insentient being, and thus amatory cognition seems unable to transpose Endymion's soul into Cynthia, so long as she remains the moon. Ostensibly, Endymion's soul extends into the cosmos, ascending through his desire to reach, however inadequately, the divine mind animating the universe. As Ficino suggests, the beauty that instantiates desire emanates from God and moves through the universe to radiate from individual bodies, such that the subject ascends through amatory cognition:

> elle [l'ame] le tire auec soy à son mesme lieu: duquel il [le ray de la beauté, c'est à dire le desir] descend par certains degrez, premierement au corps de l'aimé, secondement à l'ame, tiercement à l'Ange, quartement à Dieu, qui est premiere origine de la splendeur susdite. (254)

> she [the soul] draws it with itself to its own place: through which he [the ray of beauty, theorized by Ficino as desire] descends by certain degrees, first to the body of the beloved, secondly to the soul, thirdly to the Angelic Mind, fourthly to God, who is the first origin of the aforesaid splendor.

Ficino's conceptualization of erotic extension provides grounds for assuming that Endymion, in the throes of his ardor for Cynthia, would be located somewhere along this circuit, imperfectly poised between the object of his desire and the reason for that object's brilliance. But Ficino's assertion that the concept of "place" only obtains with regard to bodies complicates this question as to the location of his soul, insofar as it becomes difficult to know through what medium his disembodied thoughts move. Thus, the conceptual indeterminacy that hovers behind these statements attests to the difficulty of locating a lover's soul, such as Endymion's, in a discrete location. Not only does the anima exist independent of place, but its complex relationship to the spaces within the body and beyond the cosmos make it an analogue to the "curious placelessness" of Lyly's play.

With Endymion's awakening, however, the shepherd becomes re-located in two senses. On the one hand, his gradual re-embodiment enables a sense of emplacement. This relationship between the body and its embeddedness in place manifests itself in Ficino's cosmology as a sign of material abjection, and the fact that *Endymion* articulates this baseness through the figure of Sir Tophas is no surprise, given that character's uninspired carnality. But that Endymion should mirror the braggart knight, whose presence in the play serves largely as a foil to the shepherd's aspirations, functions as a kind of rupture, a sharp qualification of *Endymion*'s initial investment in Neoplatonism. In the second instance, Endymion's awakening re-locates him on the lunary bank, by far the most defined place in the play and one that metamorphoses through Cynthia's resignification, laying the foundation for the play's politics of space. The lunary bank, where Endymion succumbs to Dipsas's spell, initially stands as the place from which the shepherd contemplates Cynthia as a celestial body; once Cynthia ceases to function as the moon, however, the contemplative site becomes resignified as the court. Like Elizabeth, Cynthia finds her court wherever she is

present, and her appearance at the lunary bank translates that location into a political sphere, into which she hails Endymion – "the flower of my court" – through a kiss (5.4.18-9). In disrupting its initial investment in Neoplatonism, rescuing Endymion from the fate of contemplative disembodiment, the play performs a preference for place over transcendental space.

With this return to place, Endymion's desire no longer distributes him across the cosmos but rather becomes resignified as a sign of his political subjection. In the final scene, Cynthia asks Endymion to recount the visions that, in the psychic flight of his slumber, he must have encountered: "tell what hast thou seen in thy sleep all this while? What dreams, visions, thoughts, and fortunes? For it is impossible but in so long time thou shouldst see things strange" (5.1.74-77). This inquiry into Endymion's cognitive experience becomes a means of relocating the shepherd's thoughts within a political sphere; in assenting to Cynthia's request, Endymion recounts his visions within her court and shows that his thoughts bend, however humbly, towards the monarch. Indeed, Endymion qualifies his affection for Cynthia with the same recognition of her greatness that marked his adoration of the moon, telling her that: "The time was, madam, and is, and ever shall be, that I honored Your Highness above all the world; but to stretch it so far as to call it love, I never durst" (5.4.150-2). The affirmation that Endymion's desire places the monarch "above all the world" neatly recalls the play's opening, when Cynthia's dominance located her above the earth. Coming on the heels of Endymion's repudiation of Tellus, moreover, this utterance affirms the play's initial articulation of allegory through affection; Endymion's desire mediates between heaven and earth, between a spiritually transcendent conceptualization and an embodied subject. But here, in keeping with the play's transposition of Neoplatonic principles into a court context, Endymion qualifies his desire as political: "Such a difference

hath the gods set between our states that all must be duty, loyalty, and reverence; nothing, without it vouchsafe Your Highness, be termed love" (5.4.156-9). This subjection differs significantly from Endymion's previous utterances to Cynthia as the moon, before whom he figures himself as possessed by an antinomian desire, one that would remove him from the political sphere:

> Endymion who, divorcing himself from the amiableness of all ladies, the bravery of all courts, the company of all men, hath chosen in a solitary cell to live only by feeding on thy favor, accounting in the world (but thyself) nothing excellent, nothing immortal. Thus mayest thou see every vein, sinew, muscle, and artery of my love. (2.1.42-7)

In contradistinction to his subsequent utterance before Cynthia, where the monarch elevates loyalty to love, Endymion affirms that his affection for the moon is love by citing his isolation; his devotion is such that he has removed himself from "all courts" and from the men and women who constitute courtiers. Endymion's apostrophe to the moon remains for the moment rhetorical; he remains within society, conversing with Eumenides and dissembling with Tellus. But the slumber that befalls him instantiates the very isolation that he praises. It launches Endymion into the space from which Cynthia must wrest her courtier. Endymion's gradual re-embodiment, then, renders the shepherd a political subject and locates his desire not within the stars but upon the monarch herself.

For her part, Cynthia affirms that Endymion's affect signifies his subservience and, ultimately, implies the degree to which her political power depends upon such desire. Whereas Ficino theorizes love as an illumination, drawing the contemplative soul towards God, Lyly's play transposes this conceptualization onto Cynthia herself; she instantiates Endymion's love as such, offering it as a performative utterance: "Endymion, this honorable respect of thine shall be christened 'love' in thee, and my reward for it 'favor'" (5.4.169-70).

This asymmetrical circuit of feeling – in which love emanates from the courtier, to be reflected as political favor in the monarch – reproduces the power structure of Ficino's universe, insofar as Endymion is hailed into being by the force of his desire. Ficino grounds the structure of the cosmos on such spatialization, but *Endymion* appropriates this concept to position the political subject with regard to the monarch. As Cynthia notes in her encouragement of Endymion, this affect serves as the true substance of the realm: "Persevere, Endymion, in loving me, and I account more strength in a true heart than in a walled city" (5.4.170-2). For Cynthia, amatory cognition locates her subjects within a political place.

Ultimately, this management of affection does more to politicize Neoplatonic desire than its deployment within Castiglione's *The Covrtyer*, where Pietro Bembo describes amatory cognition without sufficiently articulating its relationship to the early modern court. Like Ficino, Castiglione's Bembo presents love as "*nothinge elles but a certein couetinge to enioy beawtie*." Because beauty, insofar as it manifests itself within bodies, is "*an influence of the heauenlie bountifulness*, the whiche for all it stretcheth ouer all thynges that be created (like the light of the Sonn)," love comes to signify a subject's efforts to retrace the effervescence of beauty back to its divine origin.[122] But Bembo's discourse on the matter does not explain the potential efficacy of such desire within the court; rather, his claims are offered (at the explicit request of the Duchess Elisabetta Gonzaga) to counter Pallavicino Gasparo's assertion that love distracts a courtier from his duties. Mocking the example of Aristotle instructing Alexander as a model for a courtier's instruction of a prince, Gasparo notes: "in case this your *Aristotel* an old Courtier were a louer, and practised the feates that yong louers do (as

---

[122] Castilio, *The Covrtyer*, sig. Xx1^{v}.

some that we haue sene in our daies) I feare me, he woulde forgete to teach his Prince."[123] Bembo's task, in this regard, is to assert the usefulness of this love within a political order, but his discourse on the etiology and ethics of desire does less to address this problem than to enable his apolitical conclusion, that "Yt is not therfore out of reason to say, that olde men may also loue without sclaunder and more happily, then yong men."[124] With further prodding, Bembo develops his point to suggest that, although proper love can ensure that "oure Courtier be most acceptable to his Lady," he would be happier still if his desire led him towards the stars:

> Whan oure Courtier therfore shall be come to this point, although he maye be called a good and happye louer, in respect of them that be drowned in the miserye of sensuall loue, yet wil I not haue him to set his hart at rest, but bouldlye proceade farther, folowinge the high way after his guyde, that leadeth him to the point of true happinesse.[125]

Although Castiglione's text may be said to perform an insertion of love in the political order of the court, insofar as Bembo offers his Neoplatonic theory of desire at the behest of the Duchess, it fails to accommodate the implicit antinomianism of the soul's flight. It concludes with a celebration of divine love that, as Bembo's argument for a contemplation of the soul for the sake of achieving the heavens suggests, locates the political subject beyond, rather than within, the court that he should serve.

In contrast, the spatial politics of *Endymion* emerge through the play's appropriation of Neoplatonic discourse, its redeployment of a relationship between thought and desire, on the one hand, and of the implications of such amatory cognition for space, on the other. Ficino's treatise illuminates the degree to which embodied and impassioned thought can

---

[123] Ibid., sig. Ss4^{v}.
[124] Ibid., sig. Tt3^{r}.
[125] Ibid., sig. Vv3^{v}, sig. Xx2^{v}.

distribute an individual soul across the cosmos, tracing through ascent the universe's origin in the divine mind. Both the *De amore* and *Endymion* appear as symptoms of an effort to wrestle with the locus of an embodied and yet spiritually transcendent soul; they discursively illuminate one another, with Ficino's claims working to evince the implicit negotiations of embodiment and extension in Endymion's longing, and the play itself appropriating that discourse to politicize the distribution of desire that lies at the heart of the Neoplatonic cosmos. Wherever Endymion goes in his slumber, he is absent from Cynthia's court for the duration of his sleep. Amatory cognition is antinomian in precisely this sense. Both in its expansiveness and in the indeterminacy of its location, Endymion's experience of cognitive extension is incompatible with the rootedness of political subjectivity. Like the passions, which "characterize the microcosm's shifting interaction with a continuously changing macrcosm," cognition is a means of negotiating the soul's place within the world.[126] When Cynthia apprehends Endymion in his experience of amatory cognition and ensures that his desire attaches itself to her, she does so as a means of putting Endymion in his place. This maintenance of intramundane place within the play comes at the expense of space, for when Endymion becomes cognitively extended into the monarch, his movement into the extracosmic void ends with the localization of his soul within the world. Endymion becomes re-placed within the sphere of Cynthia's rule. Dilating to the space of the universe and contracting to the site of a fictional court, *Endymion* concerns itself, ultimately, with neither site, except insofar as it works to represent a spatial homology between the two; both the cosmos and the court emerge as distributions across unequal subjects, the divine mind and the contemplative subject on the one hand and the monarch and courtier on the other. In the articulation of this homology, however, *Endymion* demonstrates that the soul's expansion

---

[126] Paster, Rowe, and Floyd-Wilson, *Reading the Early Modern Passions*, 18.

in amatory cognition moves the mind beyond an emplacement within the body and enables it to reconstitute space by distributing thought and desire.

There are many ways to theorize a connection between the microcosm and the macrocosm. But *Endymion* departs from the dominant models of the early modern period in two specific ways. It grounds the relationality of microcosm and the macrocosm upon the contemplative soul and, in turn, emphasizes the spatializing potential of that soul: when it inheres within the body, the soul gives rise to a sense of emplacement, while its capacity to move beyond the flesh in thought and desire allows it to constitute space. That this constitutive potential threatens Cynthia and that it appears to be suppressed by her in the final moments of the play does not, in my view, mean its ultimate subjection to political power. To politicize amatory cognition is to make cognitive extension subject to one of the many things that it enables (here, the relationality between subject and monarch). But in attempting this very act of delimitation as part of a larger effort to subjugate Endymion, Cynthia does not succeed in resolving the spatial paradoxes of the play. To the question, "where does *Endymion* occur?," these efforts offer the rather limited answer of "Cynthia's court" and thereby elide the rich ambiguity that suffuses Lyly's play. Despite Cynthia's rhetoric and the rhetoric of her courtiers, the negotiation of the cosmos and of the world is more complex than can be suggested through recourse to the monarch. It is not simply that the conceptual work of establishing the contours of the cosmos (and, later in the play, of the world) require cognitive extension; it is equally true that cognitive extension creates the space of negotiation, of potentiality, of dynamic and conflicted significations through which these other sites emerge. This is not to refute the early modern distinction between (intramundane) place (as a function of embodiment) and (extracosmic) space (as a void) but rather to bring them into dialogue with contemporary theoretical formulations of these

concepts and to suggest that both space and place depend upon particular processes in order to come into being. With Michel de Certeau, we can believe that power instantiates place, that practice, in turn, produces space; with Henri Lefebvre, we can assume the work of the social in producing space.[127] But in *Endymion*, cognitive extension is precisely that process through which space and place emerge: thinking, feeling, and desiring through embodiment establishes the shepherd's place within the cosmos, even as those thoughts, feelings, and desires extend beyond the world to constitute the rich potentiality of space.

---

[127] In *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. Steven Rendall (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), Michel de Certeau argues that places are instantiations of power, that they exist in anticipation of the signifying power of individual subjects: "The law of the 'proper' rules in the place: the elements taken into consideration are *beside* one another, each situated in its own 'proper' and distinct location, a location it defines" (117). As this passage implies, strategy defines the place in terms of the proper, always already existing before the individual subject, ready to assign that subject to his or her "proper" location. Space, on the other hand, is produced as a result of the practice that constitutes individual negotiation: "Space occurs as the effect produced by the operations that orient it, situate it, temporalize it, and make it function in a polyvalent unity of conflictual programs or contractual proximities" (117). As an effect of operations, space does not anticipate the individual subject; rather it emerges from the operations, or practices, of that subject, negotiated with the same agency as tactics are mobilized. To say, as de Certeau does, that "*space is a practiced place*," is to invert the relationship of space to place both on the level of temporality and of potentiality (117). Henri Lefebvre, in *The Production of Space*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (Malden: Blackwell, 1991), argues that the production of space depends upon the ability of subjects to apprehend and to signify particular places; it is only through the triad of the perceived, the conceived, and the lived that one's encounter with space aligns the physicality of a place with the praxis that makes a site meaningful. As Lefebvre articulates this relationship in a definition of spatial practice, there is "a close association, within perceived space, between daily reality (daily routine) and urban reality (the routes and networks which link up the places set aside for work, 'private' life and leisure" (38). That is to say, the organization of space as the "urban reality" of a built environment, a built environment that one must perceive in order to experience, constitutes and is reconstituted by the "daily reality" that is the practice of everyday life. Rather than a frame that contains quotidian experience, then, space emerges through an oscillation between the perceived physicality of a place and the practice of that physicality, of which perception and cognition are a part. Although Lefebvre's interest lies with a Marxist understanding of practice as labor, I find his claim to an oscillation between perception and praxis useful.

Chapter Two

The Ecology of Remembrance:

Memory, Place, and Affect in *Dido, Queen of Carthage*

Shortly after his arrival upon the Carthaginian shore, Marlowe's Aeneas hesitates to name himself, claiming that the loss of his home has bereft him of identity.[128] To Dido's question, "What stranger art thou that dost eye me thus?," he answers: "Sometimes I was a Trojan, mighty Queen. / But Troy is not, what shall I say I am?"[129] Aeneas's response is unnerving, for its brevity and for the peculiar relationship that it implies. Despite Aeneas's insistence upon the importance of place in this moment, the roughness, even rudeness of his claim, implies that he is deeply unaware of the social space around him and its sense of decorum. Moreover, Aeneas's claim not to know himself remains strange for the ontology that it presumes: an intimate relationship between place and personhood, such that the

---

[128] Although the earliest edition of *Dido* names Thomas Nashe as one of the authors, I follow the current critical consensus that Nashe's contributions to the play were "minimal, or perhaps even non-existent," as Sara Munson Deats has argued ("*Dido, Queen of Carthage* and *The Massacre at Paris*," in *The Cambridge Companion to Christopher Marlowe* , ed. Patrick Cheney [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004], 194). For example, Richard Proudfoot has claimed that Nashe was responsible for publishing *Dido* in 1594, a year after Marlowe's death, noting that this would have given Nashe both opportunity and reason to name himself on the title page, regardless of his contribution to the play itself ("Marlowe and the Editors," in *Constructing Christopher Marlowe*, ed. J. A. Downie and J. T. Parnell [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000], 49). Similarly, Lisa Hopkins has argued in *Christopher Marlowe, Renaissance Dramatist* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008) that the play "bears no obvious traces of another hand" and that "Nashe elsewhere accepts the alternative version of Dido as perpetually chaste," a fact that may "make it improbable that he would be partly responsible for the lustful Dido of Marlowe's play" (39).

[129] Christopher Marlowe, *Dido Queen of Carthage and The Massacre at Paris*, ed. H. J. Oliver (London: Methuen & Co., 1968), 2.1.74-76. All further citations are from this edition and will be made parenthetically.

destruction of the former can cause a disruption of the latter. Dido herself works to undermine this relationship, entreating Aeneas to: "Remember who thou art: speak like thyself," as though his misprision were the result of a willful forgetfulness (2.1.100). From this initial suggestion, *Dido Queen of Carthage* evolves into a complex meditation on the relationship between embodiment and environment in early modern culture. Throughout the play, Aeneas maintains a memorial relationship to the fallen city of Troy, navigating and reencountering its spaces in remembrance. This compulsion to recollect implies not simply the centrality of Troy to Marlowe's play, but more broadly the importance of ecological memory to *Dido*'s consideration of empire, territoriality, and nomadic subjectivity.

With the phrase "ecological memory," I mean to foreground a particularly spatial form of remembrance, where place is both the object and the medium of memory. On the one hand, place provides the setting of remembrance, offering what Edward Casey calls "a *mise en scène* for remembered events precisely to the extent that it guards and keeps these events within its self-delimiting perimeters." This establishment of a boundary means that "place *holds in*" the contents of a given memory "by giving to memories an authentically local habitation: by being their place-holder." On the other hand, the particularity of place ensures that a location can invoke certain traces of the past: as Casey goes on to argue, "*place is selective for memories*," in the sense that "a given place will invite certain memories while discouraging others."[130] Ecological memory thereby maps an internal, psychological topography onto the environment. These two spaces, mental and material, become conjoined with one another, establishing a circuit of influence and mutual reconstitution. At the same time that the mind incorporates place within itself, cognition is continually distributed, prompted and contained by the external environment. Accordingly, through

---

[130] Edward S. Casey, *Remembering: A Phenomenological Study* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987), 189.

ecological memory, I want to underscore the importance of specific locations in anchoring and shaping the mind.

Throughout *Dido*, ecological memory transforms the environment into a complex and deeply contested domain. Whether in Aeneas's compulsion to rebuild Troy or in Dido's efforts to reshape Carthage, the concept of platial reconstitution is central to Marlowe's play. It is this centrality, I argue, that critics have overlooked in considering the peculiar topographies of *Dido* and of Marlowe's works in general. In *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*, for example, Stephen Greenblatt argues that "Marlowe seems to be battering against the boundaries of his own medium," shifting the scenes of *Tamburlaine* so rapidly "as if to insist upon the essential meaningless of theatrical space."[131] *Tamburlaine* and other works repeatedly show the ease with which spaces may be resignified, representing in a dramatic context what Greenblatt calls the "secularization of space" in early modern culture, in which abstraction deprives the environment of its mythic potential: "Space is transformed into an abstraction, then fed to the appetitive machine."[132] But, as other critics have argued, Greenblatt's account misrepresents the relationship between spatiality and human subjectivity within Marlowe's plays. For Emily Bartels, it is "not that space is meaningless, but that the differences assigned to it are empty, overdetermined, or arbitrary, at best," a point that Bartels develops in offering a postcolonial reading of *Dido*, together with other works by Marlowe.[133] For

---

[131] Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 195.
[132] Ibid., 196. Significantly, Greenblatt overlooks *Dido* in developing his theory of Marlovian space, focusing instead on *Tamburlaine*, *The Jew of Malta*, *Edward II*, and *Doctor Faustus*. Perhaps because of this omission, Greenblatt reaches the troubling conclusion that the concept of place is ultimately insignificant within Marlowe's plays. He argues that the only exception to this principle lies in *Doctor Faustus*, where, "at the close of the twenty-four years," Faustus "feels a compulsion to return to Wittenberg" (196). For this reason, Greenblatt observes, "it is ironic that when a meaningful sense of place finally emerges in Marlowe, it does so only as a place to die" (196).
[133] Emily C. Bartels, *Spectacles of Strangeness: Imperialism, Alienation, and Marlowe* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993), 15. Although this claim provides an important conceptual foundation for Bartels' study, which brings colonial and postcolonial concerns to bear upon Marlowe's plays, it is worth noting that her work is more sympathetic to Greenblatt's than this comment implies. In *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*,

Garrett Sullivan, Greenblatt's emphasis on geopolitical space partially obscures the significance of more intimate locations within Marlowe's plays, the importance of what Sullivan calls "affective geography."[134] Indeed, as I will argue here, Aeneas's investment in the lost city of Troy reveals that spaces within *Dido* are neither meaningless nor arbitrary, but rather shaped through complex negotiations of memory and affect.

In *Dido*, Aeneas experiences memory as a profoundly spatial phenomenon. His description of the fallen city of Troy subtly mirrors the arts of memory in using specific architectural features to navigate the ruined landscape. But whereas this indebtedness to the *ars memorativa* might imply a degree of mastery on Aeneas's part, his brief hallucination of Priam before the walls of Carthage shows that, even in the absence of volition, Aeneas's memory is driven by a tendency towards extension and spatialization. Locating these moments within the wider context of Marlowe's play, I will argue that the deeply parodic tone of *Dido* empties Aeneas's ecological memory of significance.[135] Diminishing the

---

Greenblatt concludes that the meaningless of space prompts men, whether Marlovian characters or Elizabethan explorers, to commit violence as a way of making the environment meaningful: "For experiencing this limitlessness, this transformation of space and time into abstractions, men do violence as a means of marking boundaries, effecting transformation, signaling closure" (197). In this regard, Bartels follows Greenblatt in situating Marlowe's plays within the historical matrix of colonial power, as Bartels herself suggests in presenting her work as a corrective to Greenblatt's: "As important and enabling, and as grounded in history, as this story of self-fashioning is, Greenblatt's argument moves away from the context of imperialism, suggesting that what the characters face and what the plays address is a sort of existential crisis, an awareness that identity is itself an invention, that we are all, in fact, homeless and alienated and must construct ourselves in order to exist" (*Spectacles of Strangeness*, 13).

[134] Sullivan argues that "it is not only *world* geographies that matter; the *affective* geography of the household, for instance, can serve a crucial function in Marlowe's exploration of the interrelatedness of space and identity" (see Garrett A. Sullivan Jr., "Geography and identity in Marlowe" in *The Cambridge Companion to Christopher Marlowe*, ed. Patrick Cheney [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004], 237). He defines affective geography as "a physical site that functions as important ground for the identity of a character who perceives himself as being in some way connected to that site and/or the social relationship emerge on or around it" (Ibid.). My analysis here is deeply indebted to Sullivan's argument, although we differ in our understanding of the relationship between affective and world geographies within the early modern period. Citing the work of John Gillies, Sullivan foregrounds a tension between poetic and cartographic representations of space in the early modern period, between what he calls the old and new geographies (Ibid., 232-233). In contrast, I consider affective geographies to be more local, more the result of a particular cognitive ecology than the effect of a larger, poetic mapping of the world.

[135] As many critics have noted, Marlowe's Aeneas lacks the heroic qualities that we find in previous versions of the character. In "Marlowe's 'Theatre of Cruelty,'" in *Constructing Christopher Marlowe*, ed. J. A. Downie and J. T.

importance of the remembered Troy, the play disrupts the memorial connection between the city that Aeneas has lost and the imperial center that he intends to found, also figured as "Troy" throughout the play. And through Iarbus's brief allusion to Elizabeth, *Dido* extends this parodic denunciation of the ecology of remembrance to London, mocking the place of its first performance for figuring itself as Troynovant, or "New Troy." Placing Aeneas's memory in this way allows us to recognize the importance of location and embodied cognition for what may be Marlowe's earliest play.

I. Moving through Memory: Troy's Destruction and the Arts of Memory

Shortly after Aeneas claims that the destruction of Troy has bereft him of identity, Dido asks him "to discourse at large, / And truly too, how Troy was overcome," offering the observation that "many tales go of that city's fall / And scarcely do agree upon one point" as an explanation for her curiosity (2.1.106-109).[136] Aeneas initially responds by resisting her

---

Parnell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), Janet Clare argues that "Marlowe first undermines Aeneas' heroism and imperial aspirations" in his revision of the *Aeneid* (80). For example, Marlowe's Aeneas displays little bravery during the siege of Troy, as Clifford Leech notes in "The Hesitation of Pyrrhus," in *The Morality of Art: Essays Presented to G. Wilson Knight by his Colleagues and Friends*, ed. D. W. Jefferson (London: Routledge, 1969), 44-5. Leech also argues that Marlowe has "written independently of his source" to make Aeneas appear more culpable than he is in Virgil's text ("Marlowe's Humor," in *Marlowe: A Collection of Critical Essays* [Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1964], 170). For similar reasons, in "'By Shallow Riuers': A Study of Marlowe's *Dido Queen of Carthage*" in *Studies in Medieval, Renaissance, American Literature*, ed. Betsy Feagan Colquitt (Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1971), 73-94, John P. Cutts devotes most of his critical attention to critiquing Marlowe's Aeneas in comparison with Virgil's. See also Don Cameron Allen's assertion that, when Aeneas encounters Dido for the first time, "he is a far more humble and self-depreciating hero than he had ever been before" (*Essays on Shakespeare and Elizabethan Drama in Honor of Hardin Craig*, ed. Richard Hosley [Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1962], 65).

[136] As several critics have noted, Dido's questions implicitly gestures towards medieval accounts of the fall of Troy, where Aeneas joins Antenor in betraying the city. Raoul Lefèvre's *The recuile of the histories of Troie*, first translated into English by William Caxton and reprinted throughout the early modern period, reproduces this version of the event (see, for example, the 1553 edition of the *Recuile* [London: William Copland, 1553], sig. G3v-G6r. Hopkins notes that Aeneas's betrayal is briefly described in William Alexander's *Jvlius Caesar*, bearing witness to at least one citation of this version on the early modern stage (*Christopher Marlowe: Renaissance Dramatist*, 130). Nevertheless, Oliver is right to note in his Revels edition that *Dido* alludes to such complicity without actually staging it: "Marlowe knew his medieval authorities – but he was dramatizing Virgil," as Oliver

inquiry, claiming that grief would interfere with his memory, disrupting the very faculties upon which his narrative depends: "A woeful tale bids Dido to unfold, / Whose memory, like pale death's stony mace, / Beats forth my senses from this troubled soul" (2.1.114-116). For Aeneas, the affective charge of his memory risks rendering his body senseless and unfeeling, a peculiar disruption where the forcefulness of embodied thought temporarily suspends the mind's ability to think through the body. Assenting to Dido's request, Aeneas endeavors to harness this disruption, commanding himself to "speak, Aeneas, with Achilles' tongue," as though the circulation of Trojan memories within a Greek body might protect him from the destabilizing potential of remembrance (2.1.121). Similarly, Aeneas recommends that his audience fortify itself within the hardened bodies of Troy's enemies:

> And, Dido, and you Carthaginian peers,
> Hear me, but yet with Myrmidons' harsh ears,
> Daily inur'd to broils and massacres,
> Lest you be mov'd too much with my sad tale. (2.1.122-125)

In these utterances, Aeneas repeatedly figures affect as a mediating force between the body and the soul, a means of configuring the distribution of thought across a somatic structure. Within the context of Aeneas's narrative, these references to ecological thought foreground a particular problem for *Dido*, the difficulty of navigating a remembered environment. As Casey has argued, the fact that places are partially constitutive of memories means that "*in remembering we can be thrust back, transported, into the place we recall*," in such a way that memory can be conceived as a "*re-implacing*."[137] For Aeneas, who feels that the loss of Troy deprives him of identity, this reimplacement carries with it an incredible affective charge, an emotive force that his comments about "pale death's stony mace" ultimately anticipate.

---

puts it, and this alternative version of Troy's destruction haunts Aeneas's account, contributing to what I will argue is the play's devaluation of his ecological memory.

[137] Casey, *Remembering*, 201.

Aeneas's conceptual reimplacement within Troy underscores the delicate relationship between the environment and ecological memory within *Dido*. Through the narrative of Troy's destruction, Marlowe's play reimagines memory as a profoundly spatial phenomenon, as a force distributed across different facets of a location, while it also endows remembrance with the ability to transform and resignify the environment. Aeneas's narrative moves through four distinct spaces – the Greek camp outside the walls of Troy, the walls themselves, the streets within the city, and the royal palace – with each space providing a frame for memory. Organized in this way, Aeneas's memory suggestively recalls certain precepts from the arts of memory, or more specifically what Mary Carruthers has termed the "architectural" model of artificial memory.[138] The architectural model encourages the rememberer to incorporate a place – such as a church or a marketplace – into memory and to use that space as a mental background for retaining distinct images.[139] Because this model proposes a cognitive exchange between space and the remembering self, I invoke it here as a means of historicizing the relationship between memory, affect, and environment that we see in Aeneas's remembrance of Troy.

The architectural model of memory was indebted to the pseudo-Ciceronian *Ad Herennium*, which codified the relationship of the mental background to the memory-image by asserting the importance of using uncrowded spaces for memory, the need to imagine oneself at a certain distance from the background, and so forth. As the architectural model was disseminated in early modern England, the precept of a physical background was

---

[138] Mary Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*, second edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 89.

[139] Carruthers notes that these spaces may be real or imagined; what matters more than the particular ontology of the place is that it be experienced in memory as a physical location. "These backgrounds should be viewed from about thirty feet away, 'for, like the external eye, so the inner eye of thought is less powerful when you have the object of sight too near or too far away'" (90). In other words, they must be visually apprehended in a manner analogous to the eye's perception of an environment.

retained, while the quality of memory-images was developed with greater specificity. In Peter of Ravenna's *The art of memory, that otherwyse is called the Phenix*, acknowledged by Carruthers and Frances Yates to be among the most influential of the memory treatises, the architectural model depends upon the incorporation of a physical space; Ravenna states that "I take than the churche greatly knowen by me, the partyes wher of I do co*n*syder, and go into it walkynge it. iii. or. iiii. tymes, and tha*n* retourne home to my house, & there I tourne in my thought to remembre the thynges by me sene."[140] Having gazed upon the church with his bodily eye, Ravenna returns to his home to remember the space through his mind's eye, refashioning as a mental background with the precision glimpsed in the *Ad Herennium*: "I gyue the begynnyng of the work to ye places on ye ryght syde of the gate fro the whiche men go in the ryght pathe or yle to the hygh auter ther I fyx and ordayne the fyrst place, and the seconde on ye walle next to it a. v. or. vi. fote of."[141] Within these places, Ravenna locates memory-images that, following the precepts of earlier, non-architectural models of memory, must be affectively charged.

In this regard, Ravenna articulates what Carruthers asserts is a medieval development of the *Ad Herennium* tradition, an interest in the quality of the memory-image: "Because the memory retains distinctly only what is extraordinary, wonderful, and intensely charged with emotion, the images should be of extremes – of ugliness or beauty, ridicule or nobility, of

---

[140] In *The Art of Memory* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966), Yates asserts that "The *Phoenix, sive artificiosa memoria* (first edition at Venice in 1491) by Peter of Ravenna became the most universally known of all the memory text books" (112). Carruthers also describes the *Phoenix* as "A late but important description of memory-work by the fifteenth-century Italian jurist, Peter of Ravenna," noting its status as "one of the works on the art of memory most popular in the Renaissance" (*The Book of Memory*, 137). Peter of Ravenna, *The art of memory, that otherwyse is called the Phenix, A boke very behouefull and profytable to all professours of scyences. Grammaryens, Rethoryciens Dialectyke, Legystes, Phylosophres & Theologiens*. Trans. Robert Copland (London: Wyllyam Myddylton, 1545), sig. A3^v.
[141] Ibid., sig. A3^v-A4^r.

laughter or weeping, of worthiness or salaciousness."[142] For Ravenna, this affective charge is inchoately signified through the movement of particular memory-images. Having included humans and animals in his memory-images, he emphasizes movement in noting that inanimate objects stir memory only insofar as they are placed in the hands of one who will move them: "And yf it can nat moeue to be moeued with another, put such a thynge in the hande of mouer, bycause that by the mouynge the memory be moued to the naturall."[143] The movement of the memory-image is correlative to the movement of memory itself, as it "by the mouynge" of the image that memory is "moued to the naturall" process of recollection. The animate quality of memory-images thereby stands in contrast to the stability of the mental background. Although the mental background functions as a contained space insofar as it has been incorporated into the subject's cognition, its function as a containing locus obviates the possibility of movement that the background bestows upon the objects placed upon it.

With William Fulwood's translation of Guglielmo Gratarolo's *De Memoria Reparanda*, the architectural model of memory acquires a more explicit association of movement with affect in the English vernacular. To articulate the architectural model of memory, Fulwood's *The Castle of Memorie* cites the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, following the early modern belief that the text had been written by Cicero: "(as Cicero saith in his seconde to Herennius) it consisteth or [pla]ces as it were of waxe or tables, and of Images of as fygures & letters," to which end "Cicero inuented a certeine familiar house, seuered or parted into many places."[144]

---

[142] Carruthers, *The Book of Memory*, 166-7.
[143] Peter of Ravenna, *The art of memory*, sig. A6^r-A6^v.
[144] Willyam Fulwod, *The Castel of Memorie: wherein is conteyned the restoring, augmenting, and conseruing of the Memorye and Remembraunce, with the safest remedies, and best precepts therevnto in any wise apperteyning: Made by Gulielmus Grataroluss: Bergomatis Doctor of artes and Physike* (London: Rouland Hall, 1562), sig. G6^v, sig. G7^r. The passages are underlined in the British Library shelfmark C.31.c.45, suggesting the importance of the architectural model for at least one early modern reader.

According to Fulwood, the first precept of this model is that the memory-images placed upon the background are affectively striking: “The firste is, that the fygure doe moue either to laughter, compassion or admiration: for one maye soone fynde a fygure that dothe styre vp and moue the affection of the soule.”[145] Whereas Ravenna implicitly locates this affect in the movement of the memory-image, suggesting that the image’s movement prompts a movement in recollection, Fulwood explicitly states that it is the affective charge of a particular image, irrespective of the image’s movement, that enables a movement of the soul: “Again you shall not forget that in placing or setting of ye images or figures in their places the thing is alwaies to be placed wt a mery, a merueilous or cruel act, or some other vnaccustomed maner: for mery, [cr]uell, iniurious, merueilous, excellently faire, or excedi*n*gly foule thinges do change & moue ye senses, & better styre vp ye Memorie.”[146] Although the claim that the memory-image represents an “act” implies a degree of movement, Fulwood emphasizes the movement of the soul in its apprehension of the affective image, in such a way as to suggest that feeling has a motility of its own. Whereas Ravenna would argue that the strangeness of the image should help to move one through the memorial space, Fulwood assumes that the rememberer can move of his own accord: the importance of the affective charge lies in its ability to inspire remembrance, not movement. Affect, itself a kind of movement, become the force that enables the soul’s remembrance.

As articulated in the English vernacular, the architectural model of memory thereby posits an incorporation of space into the self, by which that self is induced to remember through the affective charge of the memory-image. Although it would be tenuous to suggest that Aeneas has actively structured his memory through the architectural model, the practice

---

[145] Ibid., sig. H3r.
[146] Ibid., sig. H6r.

of artificial memory renders explicit the cognitive processes implicit in natural memory, thereby articulating the means by which a perceived space becomes embodied within a subject's remembrance. As Fulwood suggests in a passage that distinguishes natural and artificial memory on the basis of intentionality, the two depend on the same faculties of inward impression: "Artificiall Memorie is a disposyng or placing of sensible thinges in the mynde by imagination, wherevnto the natural Memorie hauing respect, is by them admonished that it may be hable to call to mynde more easely and distinctly such thynges as are to be reme*m*brede."[147] As "natural Memorie" depends upon an ordering of "sensible thinges" in the common sense, which allows disparate perceptions to appear as a unified image before the "imagination," the "Artificiall Memorie" works through the same cognitive faculties, its particularity emerging only in the implicit claim that "the disposying or placing" of these images is an intentional incorporation. In the case of Aeneas, one need not posit a familiarity with the arts of memory to suggest that the architectural model reveals the cognitive processes at work in his incorporation of Troy. As will become clear in the foregoing discussion, Aeneas's narrative amply reveals that his memory functions according to the precepts of the architectural model, albeit without the intentionality that Fulwood posits as the distinguishing factor between natural and artificial memory.

In response to Dido's question, Aeneas begins his narrative outside the city walls, using the suburban space as a mental background in which the image of the Greek army is placed. At what Marlowe imagines is the Trojan port of Tenedos, the Greek army prepares to depart, its soldiers having previously declared, "'Let us unto our ships, / Troy is invincible, why stay we here?" (2.1.127-8). As becomes evident in the narrative's concern for the destruction of Troy, this claim to Troy's invincibility is primarily spatial, referring to the city

---

[147] Ibid., sig. G6^{v}.

walls that the Greek army has been unable to penetrate. Aeneas remembers the space of Tenedos through its natural qualities, constructing the space as a background within which Ulysses, speaking to the disgruntled soldiers, appears as the memory-image:

> Ulysses on the sand
> Assay'd with honey words to turn them back;
> And as he spoke to further his intent,
> The winds did drive back huge billows to the shore,
> And heaven was darken'd with tempestuous clouds. (2.1.136-40)

Here, the affective charge often associated with the memory-image extends to the spatial frame, as the rough winds and "tempestuous clouds" of the natural space evince the violence implicit in Ulysses's "honey words" regarding the fall of Troy. Within this affective space of Aeneas's memory, Ulysses enlists Sinon and Epeus to construct the Trojan horse, whose progress toward the city walls enacts a transition from the first memorial background to the second. Both the movement of Tenedos in wind and tempest and of the horse towards the city walls tie the affect of Aeneas's memory to the mobile oscillation between the background and the memory-image.

Through the movement of Trojan horse, Aeneas shifts from the suburban space to the liminal point that distinguishes urban from suburban, the city walls. Aeneas locates himself immediately before the city walls, where having witnessed Laocoon's death as an ostensible punishment for impiety towards the horse, Aeneas and other Trojans prepare to bring the object into the space of Troy: "we were commanded straight / With reverence to draw it into Troy; / In which unhappy work was I employ'd: / These hands did help to hale it the gates" (2.1.167-70). In a memorial background that encompasses the liminal space surrounding the walls, the wall itself oscillates between a locus for the memory-image of the horse and as a memory-image itself. As Aeneas notes, the city walls cannot accommodate the immense size of the horse: "it could not enter, 'twas so huge" (2.1.171). For this reason, the

city wall is fractured, with the Greeks achieving through deceit what they were unable to accomplish through force: "Priamus, impatient of delay, / Enforc'd a wide breach in that rampir'd wall / Which thousand battering-rams could never pierce, / And so came in this fatal instrument" (2.1.173-6). Insofar as the walls function as a memorial background, containing the memory-image of the horse and the Trojan soldiers who bring it within the city, this breach suggests the violent effect of such a memory for Aeneas. It is not simply that the horse functions as a metonym for the city's destruction, as Aeneas suggests in crying "O had it never enter'd, Troy had stood," locating the physicality of Troy, as that which would have "stood," in the now fractured walls (2.1.173). Rather, the breach of the walls implies a fracturing of Aeneas's mental background, the space that Ravenna and Fulwood theorize as stable in contradistinction to the affective charge of the image contained within the space. As in the memory of Tenedos, where the movement of the background intersects with the movement of the horse as memory-image, the city walls evince a motility in the space of Aeneas's memory. For this reason, Aeneas stumbles in his narrative as he traces the movement of the horse toward the city walls, overcome with affect in crying out, "And then – O Dido, pardon me!" and continuing only when Dido demands, "Nay, leave not here; resolve me of the rest" (2.1.159-60). Aeneas's lament performs his prior claim regarding the memory that constitutes his narrative, what he previously describes as "A woeful tale … / Whose memory, like pale death's stony mace, / Beats forth my senses from this troubled soul" (2.1.114-6). In Aeneas's narrative, the physical space of Troy and the function of that space as a memorial background appear indistinguishable in their affective charge, a claim given ontological foundation by the fact that Troy no longer exists, its space only emergent in Aeneas's memory of it. Here, the violence of the memory-image, as the destruction of the

wall that distinguishes Trojan space from other spaces, folds back upon the mental background, the space itself moving Aeneas in affective remembrance.

With this initial fracturing of Trojan space, Aeneas traces the movement of Greek soldiers into the city, following the narrative's centripetal logic to move from suburban to urban space. The horse's entrance has already staged the incorporation of Greek soldiers into the city of Troy, an incorporation made explicit as "From out his [the horse's] entrails Neoptolomus, / Setting his spear upon the ground, leapt forth, / And after him a thousand Grecians more" (2.1.183-5). The movement of these soldiers, from Tenedos to Troy, is paralleled by the remainder of the Greek army, as Sinon "caus'd the Greekish spies / To haste to Tenedos and tell the camp," which follows the horse's transgression of the city walls to enter the space of Troy: "By this, the camp was come unto the walls / And through the breach did march into the streets" (2.1.180-1, 188-9). Although the movement of the Greek soldiers facilitates a progression through the multiple backgrounds of the narrative, from the suburban space of Tenedos to the interurban sphere of the city, Aeneas's memory shifts from these figures to fixate upon a different series of memory-images, a series that locates the imagined community of Troy within the physicality of that space.[148] Looking from his turret into the streets, Aeneas sees:

> Young infants swimming in their parents' blood,
> Headless carcases [sic] piled up in heaps,
> Virgins half-dead dragg'd by their golden hair
> And with main force flung on a ring of pikes,
> Old men with swords thrust through their aged sides,
> Kneeling for mercy to a Greekish lad,
> Who with steel pole-axes dash'd out their brains. (2.1.193-9)

---

[148] I borrow the phrase "imagined community" from Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, revised edition (London: Verso, 2006). Although Anderson uses the term to suggest how nations emerge from ideas of simultaneity, I invoke it here in order to foreground the cognitive underpinings of political communities, as implied in the word "imagined."

The description of these figures fragments the massacre of the Trojan population into a series of *tableaux vivants*, into violent images that often occupy no more than a single metrical line. Contained within the locus of the Trojan street, these memory-images evince the affective quality that Fulwood asserts is requisite for memory, each a kind of "a mery, a merueilous or cruel act, or some other vnaccustomed maner."[149] Although the space of Troy has already been fractured, with the breach of the walls metonymically signifying the city's collapse, that space is temporarily preserved in the form of the street in order to enable Aeneas's memory of Troy's imagined community. In this instance, space not only shifts between the physicality of the street and the function of that physicality as a memorial locus, but it also extends to encompass the individuals who constitute the Trojan community. Moved by the sight of Troy's murdered citizens, Aeneas prepares to defend the town, only to be warned by Hector's ghost that "Troy is a-fire, the Grecians have the town!" (2.1.208). Appearing immediately after the description of Troy's murdered population, Hector's statement functions as a gloss on the spectacle that Aeneas has just witnessed, interpolating the murdered individuals within the definition of Troy as a "town." As in Aeneas's memory of the wall's destruction, the sense of Troy as space oscillates between the physicality of the mental background and the memory-image contained within that background.

Progressing from the street to the royal palace, Aeneas's narrative traces the movement of Neoptolomus into the most intimate of Trojan spaces, the final mental background of Aeneas's memory. Aeneas escapes an encounter with Neoptolomus through the intercession of his mother Venus, only to see that the Greek soldier "then ran to the palace of the King, / And at Jove's altar finding Priamus," prepared to kill the Trojan king (2.1.224-5). Given that Neoptolomus remained hidden within the horse, having "leapt forth"

---

[149] Ibid., sig. H6^{r}.

as the first Greek to attack Troy, his movement eclipses that of the wooden equine used to breach the city's wall; Neoptolomus's progress, albeit implicit in the first backgrounds of Aeneas's memory, is constant, emerging explicitly in his place within the street and the royal palace. In terms of affective violence, the most striking memory-image within the background of the royal palace is the wounded Priam's response to the torture of Hecuba. Seeing that the Greek soldiers "pull'd her by the heels, / And swung her howling in the empty air," Priam is affectively moved to the point that he forgets that Neoptolomus has struck off his hands with a sword: "he lifted up his bed-rid limbs, / And would have grappled with Achilles' son [Neoptolomus], / Forgetting both his want of strength and hands" (2.1.247-8, 250-2).

Before this moment, however, Aeneas remembers Priam's impassioned plea to Neoptolomus, a plea that stages the very incorporation of space that Aeneas will perform in his memory of Troy:

> 'Achilles' son, remember what I was:
> Father of fifty sons, but they are slain;
> Lord of my fortune, but my fortune's turn'd;
> King of this city, but my Troy is fired –
> And now am neither father, lord, nor king.' (2.1.233-7)

Priam articulates his identity through a series of incorporations, evincing what Timothy J. Reiss has termed the passibility of the premodern self. Passibility refers to "experiences of being whose common denominator was a sense of being *embedded in and acted on by* [a series of concentric] circles – including the material world and immediate biological, familial and social ambiences, as well as the soul's (or 'animate') and cosmic, spiritual or divine life."[150] In passible selfhood, "these circles *preceded* the person, which acted as *subjected to* forces working

[150] Timothy J. Reiss, *Mirages of the Selfe: Patterns of Personhood in Ancient and Early Modern Europe* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003), 2.

in complicated ways from 'outside.' But because of the embedding, that 'outside' was manifest in all aspects and elements of 'inside' – of *being* a person."[151] Beginning with the familial circle, Priam figures himself as father of fifty sons, experiencing the externality of his children as a sign of the inwardness of his identity. Moreover, the death of these sons in the course of the war recalls on a causal level the massacre of the Trojan population that Aeneas has just witnessed. Through this recollection, the claim anticipates Priam's assertion that he is king, folding the imagined community of Troy into Priam's identity as patriarch and as ruler. Through the loss of this imagined community and of the physical space of Troy, Priam articulates a loss of identity, being now "neither father, lord, nor king." Priam's incorporation of both the physical and imagined spaces of Troy as constitutive of his identity thereby anticipates Aeneas's own lament, that "Sometimes I was a Trojan, mighty Queen; / But Troy is not; what shall I say I am?" (2.1.75-6). The parallel assertions suggest that Aeneas's claim to an imbrication of self and space lies in his identification with Priam. To the extent that Priam embodies Troy, this identification serves to incorporate the lost space of Troy, insofar as it exists within the king, into Aeneas's own subjectivity.

Aeneas's incorporation of Troy emerges not only through this identification, but also through the memorization of physical and imagined spaces that give rise to his narrative. Insofar as the narrative begins with a centripetal logic, moving from the suburban space of Tenedos to the interurban space of the city streets before entering the royal palace, Aeneas's memory of Troy's destruction concludes centrifugally, successively exiting these spaces in order to suggest the loss of the city. This movement completes the fracturing of Trojan space initially suggested in the breach of the city walls, working to destroy the mental backgrounds that Aeneas employs in remembrance of place. Within the royal palace,

---

[151] Ibid.

Neoptolomus kills Priam, the embodiment of Trojan space, and "took his father's flag, / And dipp'd it in the old King's chill cold blood, / And then in triumph ran into the streets," inaugurating the centrifugal movement of the narrative (2.1.259-61). Following Neoptolomus into the streets, Aeneas sees that the Greek soldier "stood stone still, / Viewing the fire wherewith rich Ilion burnt," and it is through this temporary identification with Neoptolomus's gaze that Aeneas witnesses the destruction of Troy's physicality (2.1.263-4). Having lost the space that previously functioned as a memorial locus, Aeneas gathers his family and flees the city for the ships at Tenedos, returning to the initial space of his narrative.[152] There, the space that once contained the memory-image of the horse's construction is marked with traces of the city's destruction, as Aeneas witnesses the death of Polyxena at the hands of Neoptolomus, here called Pyrrhus after his mother Pyrrha: "she, standing on the shore, / Was by the cruel Myrmidons surpris'd / And after by that Pyrrhus sacrific'd" (2.1.286-8). With this final image, Aeneas concludes his narrative in the space beyond Troy, the only space that survives the Greek attack upon the city and its embodiment in the figure of Priam. To the extent that the spaces of Troy function as memorial backgrounds for Aeneas, their successive destruction within the narrative implies a violence contained within Aeneas's memory, a violence inaugurated by the Greek attack but perpetuated through Aeneas's incorporation of the ruined space.

In recounting the fall of Ilium to Dido, Aeneas is distributed across a vast cognitive system. This system comprises the memorial background of the city and the affective images

---

[152] It is worth noting that, in Marlowe's version of these events, Aeneas flees the city after learning that Priam has died, an event that he does not witness. Indeed, as H. J. Oliver notes in his Revels edition of the play, *Dido* inverts the sequence of Aeneas's flight and Priam's death that appears in Virgil's text: "In the *Aeneid* Venus prevents Aeneas from slaying Helen in the temple of Vesta and bids him escape with father and wife rather than make the hopeless attempt to fight the very Gods" (31, n.221). At the point of her appearance, Priam is already dead, and this fact, together with signs from Jove, persuade Aeneas to flee. In Marlowe's version, Venus effectively prevents Aeneas from witnessing the death of Priam; her appearance separates Pyrrhus from Aeneus and leaves the former to approach the royal palace while the latter disappears from the narrative.

Aeneas places there, images that include the Greeks soldiers, the Trojans in the midst of their suffering, and Aeneas himself at the moment of the siege. This oscillation between loci and images subtly recalls the precepts of the arts of the memory, foregrounding what I have argued is the essentially ecological nature of Aeneas's memory. As Garrett Sullivan has suggested, "recollection is a performance that occurs across 'inside' and 'outside' and thus reveals the blurriness in praxis of any distinction drawn between the two."[153] Aeneas's continual traversing of the internal and the external in his narrative is thus not supplementary to the act of remembrance, but rather constitutive of it. Aeneas navigates this tension between the internal and the external, between a psychic topography and a physical space, largely through affect, as grief and terror propel him through the different spaces of his memory.

Through this act of remembrance, Aeneas finds himself partially displaced. His absorption within the narrative suggests a profound detachment from the environment of Dido's court, in favor of a brief and almost hallucinatory reimplacement within the city of Troy. Whereas Dido first entreats Aeneas to speak of the city's destruction, she later finds herself unable to command him, first entreating him to "end, Aeneas, I can hear no more!" and later exclaiming, "I die with melting ruth; Aeneas, leave!" (2.1.243, 289). In both instances, Aeneas ignores Dido's plaintive cries, stopping only to direct another warrior to conclude the tale: "Achates, speak; sorrow hath tir'd me quite" (2.1.243, 289, 29). Where Aeneas's attentiveness to his surroundings once allowed Dido to interrupt him with questions and commandments, here we find that Aeneas's captivation with his narrative removes him from his immediate environment, relocating him within memory.

---

[153] Garrett A. Sullivan, Jr., *Memory and Forgetting in English Renaissance Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 8.

II. Ecological Memory and the Reconstruction of Troy

i. Aeneas's Hallucination before the Walls of Carthage

Aeneas's narrative foregrounds a tension within ecological memory, the ease with which recollection might dislocate or displace a person from their immediate environment into a conceptual or imaginative space. In this regard, the account of Troy's destruction sheds light upon an earlier instance in the play, where Aeneas and Achates find themselves before the walls of Carthage. There, Aeneas oscillates between memory and hallucination, mistaking a statue of Priam for the king himself and resignifying Carthage as Troy. As I will argue, this hallucinatory moment deepens our understanding of the relationship between memory and place within *Dido*, showing Aeneas's recollection to be something unbidden, a force drawn out by the environment rather than deployed intentionally, as the arts of memory might imply.[154] After examining the cognitive ecology that underpins Aeneas's hallucination and the spatial implications of his confusion, I will argue that this moment also sheds light on the principal source of dramatic tension within *Dido*, the desire to rebuild the city of Troy. In its treatment of this drive, the play reveals a profound investment in remembrance as a kind of reconstruction, in which memory becomes less the recollection than the re-membering of disparate artifacts and shattered pieces.[155] Because this alignment

---

[154] As John Sutton has argued, the arts of memory betray a deep anxiety about the inability to control one's memory, making questions of will and intention central to their role in distributing cognition. See "Body, Mind, and Order: Local Memory and the Control of Mental Representations in Medieval and Renaissance Sciences of the Self," in *1543 and All That: Word and Image in the Proto-Scientific Revolution*, ed. Guy Freeland and Anthony Corones (London: Kulwer, 2000), 117-150.

[155] In *The Medieval Theater of Cruelty: Rhetoric, Memory, Violence* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999), Jody Enders argues that memory begins "with the need to *re*member what had been *dis*membered," and I am

maps a topographic imaginary onto a physical space, blending the mental and the material, it also brings Aeneas's ecological memory into greater proximity with the *translatio imperii* that constitutes the central problem of the play.

Standing before the walls of Carthage, Aeneas confuses his fellow Trojans by claiming to be uncertain of where they find themselves. His hesitation – "Where am I now? These should be Carthage walls" – baffles Achates, who asks, "Why stands my sweet Aeneas thus amaz'd?" (2.1.1-2). In their last appearance onstage, Achates hears the goddess Venus inform her son Aeneas that they have landed upon the shores of Carthage, where Dido "will receive ye with her smiles," and so his question implicitly concerns the fallibility of Aeneas's memory (1.1.234). But Aeneas responds with melancholic awareness, gesturing towards a statue of Priam that underscores both the similitude between Carthage and Troy and the fact that the cities are not identical to one another: "Methinks that town there should be Troy, yon Ida's hill, / There Xanthus stream, because here's Priamus – / And when I know it is not, then I die" (2.1.7-9). Through the statue, Aeneas imaginatively resignifies his environment, translating the arid landscape into the river Xanthus, the walls into Troy's defenses, and the city itself into his memory of Ilium.

While reimagining the space around him, Aeneas maintains an affective relationship with the statue, engaging it as a kind of cognitive scaffolding. For cognitive theorists, scaffolding refers to a material prompt that lies outside the embodied mind but which nevertheless aids in thought, a thing or a system that works to "allow types of operations not readily (if at all) performed in the inner realm."[156] The statue elicits and transforms Aeneas's memory, shaping his recollection of Troy as part of an ecological system that spans the walls

---

indebted to her claim that the arts of memory emerge from this need to re-assemble what has been rent asunder (69).

[156] Andy Clark, *Being There: Putting Brain, Body, and World Together Again* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1997), 65.

of Carthage, the statue itself, the discrete memories of Priam that Aeneas briefly describes. Seemingly aware of this relationship, Aeneas indulges in a fantasy:

> O, yet this stone doth make Aeneas weep,
> And would my prayers, as Pygmalion's did,
> Could give it life, that under his conduct
> We might sail back to Troy, and be reveng'd
> On these hard-hearted Grecians which rejoice
> That nothing now is left of Priamus! (2.1.15-20)

In this fantasy, Aeneas endows his affect with strangely animate powers, obscuring the role that his tears and his words play in manifesting grief in favor of a kind of vivifying potential. But it is within the space of this fixation that Aeneas begins to hallucinate. He contradicts those Greeks who "rejoice / That nothing now is left of Priamus," declaring instead, "O, Priamus is left and this is he! / Come, come aboard, pursue the hateful Greeks!" (2.1.21-22). Aeneas's utterances are deeply ambiguous, seeming to acknowledge that Priam is dead, "left," and that all that remains of him is the statue ("this is he"), while also suggesting the opposite, that he lives, standing before Aeneas and Achates, and is prepared to lead them into battle ("this is he").

Indeed, Achates entreats Aeneas to explain himself, whereupon Aeneas acknowledges that his thoughts oscillate between an imaginative fantasy and a recognition of the reality before him. Aeneas figures this tension as a split between perception and cognition, wherein the objects of bodily sight differ from what the mind's eye apprehends:

> Achates, though mine eyes say this is stone,
> Yet thinks my mind that this is Priamus;
> And when my grieved heart sighs and says no,
> Then would it leap out to give Priam life. (2.1.24-7)

In this moment of distancing between embodied experience and the flights of desire, affect is what provides the transversal thrust, as Aeneas's "grieved heart" moves to make what he

sees synonymous with what he imagines to be there. Aeneas displays an uncanny awareness of the fact that his emotivity surges beyond his embodiment, admitting that his heart "would" "leap out to give Priam life," to render the statue human, if it could.

Almost immediately, Aeneas begins to hallucinate, crying out: "Achates, see, King Priam wags his hand; / He is alive; Troy is not overcome!" (2.1.29-30). As Anthony Dawson has noted, Aeneas's vision dramatically alters a similar moment in the *Aeneid*, where Aeneas, after landing upon the shores of Carthage, stumbles upon a frieze depicting the fall of Troy. There, Aeneas's grief stems from his contemplation of the sculpture, with Virgil's *ekphrasis* suggesting the reason for this sorrow. By contrast, the same scene in Marlowe's play contains "no external, visible record of the past traumatic events, no frieze, only an elusive mental image," making Aeneas's unstable mental state, his distraction in grief and uncertainty, the prompt for this sudden recollection of Troy.[157] For Achates, Aeneas suffers from a distension of embodied thought: "Thy mind, Aeneas, that would have it so / Deludes thy eyesight: Priamus is dead" (2.1.31-32). Here, perception fails to apprehend the external environment, and rather than conveying the sensory contours of that space to the mind, it directs the mind outward, seeing the imaginary objects (a living Priam, an edified Troy) in the world.

Indeed, in this substitution of cognition for perception, Aeneas stages a kind of spatial melancholia, as Robert Burton defines it in his encyclopedic text on the subject.[158]

---

[157] Anthony B. Dawson, "Priamus is Dead: Memorial Repetition in Marlowe and Shakespeare" in *Shakespeare, Memory and Performance*, ed. Peter Holland (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 64.

[158] Melancholia, as Carla Mazzio has argued, had the potential to spatialize the early modern self, functioning as "a vehicle for translating that without to 'that within.'" See her "The Three-Dimensional Self: Geometry, Melancholy, Drama" in *Arts of Calculation: Quantifying Thought in Early Modern Europe*, eds. David Glimp and Michelle R. Warren (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 61-2. Freud also suggests that melancholia has expands the subject; in successful mourning, the subject responds to loss by displacing the cathectic energy invested in the object onto another; failing to do so, the subject enters into melancholia and renders itself an object of this investment. In Freud's remarks on a clinical case of melancholia, one finds that "the shadow of

Burton theorizes melancholy through its ability to disrupt the cognitive processes of an individual, as "Wee properly call that *Dotage*, as *Laurentius* interprets it, *when some one principall facultie of the minde, as imagination, or reason is corrupted, as all Melancholy persons have*."[159] In keeping with early modern faculty psychology, Burton locates the imagination within the second ventricle of the brain, where it functions as the mind's eye, gazing upon the perceptible objects presented by the common sense or upon the images impressed into memory. Burton notes: "In *Melancholy* men this faculty is most Powerfull and strong, and often hurts, producing many monstrous and prodigious things, especially if it be stirred up by some terrible object, presented to it from common sense, or memory."[160] The strengthening of imagination in melancholy thereby helps to explain the quality of Aeneas's memory, which if unstructured by the art of memory remains acute through the affective alteration of his cognitive faculties.

In his discussion of the loss of temporal goods, Burton articulates the relationship of melancholy, as an affective state in the absence of an appraised object, to the destruction of space. Taking as an example the 1527 sack of Rome, Burton recounts that "the common souldiers made such spoile that faire Churches were turned to stables, old monuments and bookes, made horse-litter, or burned like straw," shifting from the attack on the physicality of the city's space to note the massacre of Rome's population: "Senators and Cardinals

---

the object fell upon the ego, and the latter could henceforth be judged by a special agency, as though it were an object, the forsaken object."[158] In melancholia, then, the subject's self-fashioning as an object disrupts the distinction between interiority and exteriority, as the outer becomes constitutive of the inner, an inner that appears external in its status as object. Paradoxically, the introjection that characterizes melancholia spatializes the subject, since the subject becomes the space within which the object of the self is contained. See "Mourning and Melancholia," in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume XIV (1914-1916): On the History of the Psycho-Analytic Movement, Papers on Metapsychology and Other Works* (London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-analysis, 1957), 249.

[159] Robert Burton, *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, ed. Thomas C. Faulkner, Nicolas K. Kiessling, and Rhonda L. Blair, 6 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989-2000), 1:163.

[160] Ibid., 1:152.

themselves, dragd along the streets, and put to exquisite torments, to confesse where their mony was hid; the rest murdered on heapes, lay stinking in the streets; Infants braines dashed out before their mothers eyes."[161] Burton's description figures the destruction of Roman space in terms that parallel Aeneas's account of Troy's fall. Moving from the attack on the physicality of urban space, Burton's narrative turns to the streets, where the destruction of Rome's imagined community recalls Aeneas's memory of the carnage he witnessed in Troy: "Young infants swimming in their parents' blood, / Headless carcases [sic] piled up in heaps" (2.1.193-4). Moreover, in prefacing this example, Burton articulates an imbrication of space and self, noting that the loss of the former prompts a fragmentation of the latter: "Be it by suretiship, shipwracke, fire, spoile and pillage of souldiers, or what losse soever, it boots not, it will worke the like effect, the same desolation in Provinces and Citties, as well as private persons."[162] What Burton figures as a melancholy stemming from the loss of temporal goods thereby provides an affective foundation for the intersection of space and subjectivity, as "what losse soever" that befalls the space of "Provinces and Citties" is experienced as the inward "desolation" of "private persons." Melancholia thereby signifies a form of spatial affect, since it extends across the inwardness of self and the external environment to unify the two spheres.

Aeneas stages this distension of the imagination in mapping a particular memory of Troy onto the space of Carthage, translating the remembered sphere into a place that he can physically inhabit. Significantly, Aeneas's vision of a moving statue recalls a particular moment in the destruction of Troy, which Aeneas will later recount to Dido and her court. After Pyrrhus enters the Trojan palace, he strikes off Priam's hands, watches as his soldiers

---

[161] Ibid., 1:361.
[162] Ibid., 1:360-1.

swing Hecuba "howling in the empty air," before splitting Priam in half: "from the navel to the throat at once, / He ripp'd old Priam; at whose latter gasp / Jove's marble statue gan to bend the brow, / As loathing Pyrrhus for this wicked act" (2.1.248, 255-258). Aeneas's hallucination seems to engage this scene in deeply ambiguous ways, made only more complex by the fact that he recounts the moment of Priam's death only after his vision of the moving statue. Nevertheless, the hallucination seems to resignify this previous vision, translating a supernatural event at the moment of Priam's death into a miracle that restores Priam to life, however briefly and phantasmagorically. Perhaps more troublingly, Aeneas's hallucination risks being parodic, or parasitic upon, the earlier vision, insofar as the "wag" of the hand that Priam's statue performs is far less solemn than the gesture of "bend[ing] the brow." Still, the two visions inform one another, with Aeneas's hallucination resignifying and being resignified by the events that he will narrate before Dido.

Like his narrative, Aeneas's hallucination invokes the precepts of the arts of memory, realizing them within a physical, rather than intrapsychic, environment. Appearing on what Dawson rightly describes as "the blank wall of the theatre/city," the vision of Priam's statute functions like a memory-image: animate, charged with affective significance, and placed upon the memorial background of a physical space.[163] The distinction, of course, is that the memorial background exists not within Aeneas's mind, as something remembered and incorporated, but rather through the walls of Carthage. This instance of cognitive extension (or, perhaps more accurately, of cognitive projection) becomes another sign of Aeneas's instability, of the dotage that seems to disrupt his thoughts and distribute those memories that should be seen intrapsychically by the imagination across Carthaginian space.

---

[163] Dawson, "Memorial Repetition in Marlowe and Shakespeare," 64.

Indeed, within the perverse cognitive ecology of Aeneas's hallucination, Carthage ceases to function as a particular place and becomes, instead, a screen for recalling the lost city of Troy. In this regard, Aeneas's hallucination anticipates his later, colonialist enterprise within the play, where his commitment to rebuilding Troy leads him to overlook the specific qualities of the locations in which he finds himself. For this reason, Lisa Hopkins has read Aeneas's hallucination as reproducing certain tropes of early modern colonialism, considering it "a powerful emblem of how new lands can only ever be understood, for the Renaissance mind, in terms of the old."[164] However successful this account is at foregrounding the discursive situatedness of Marlowe's play, Hopkins' account overlooks a crucial difference between colonialism and Aeneas's experience; whereas colonialism proceeds through a logic of aggrandizement, in which extension is invoked in the service of empire, Aeneas's memory is predicated upon the loss of space and thereby depends upon a logic of substitution. The projection, in effect, enacts on a cognitive level precisely what Aeneas will propose to do to the materiality of Carthage: reduce the place before him into a template for remembrance, upon which he can reconstruct the lost city.

ii. *Translatio Imperii* as a Form of Memory

In *Dido*, ecological memory transforms the environment into a space for remembrance, a transformation that culminates in the desire to memorialize the lost city of Troy by building it once again. Although Aeneas most often embodies this desire, it is important to note that the intention to reconstitute the Trojan empire anticipates Aeneas's appearance within the play. In the first scene, Venus criticizes Jove for "toying there / And

---

[164] Hopkins, *Christopher Marlowe: Renaissance Dramatist*, 95.

playing with that female wanton boy," the playful Ganymede, while her son "Aeneas wanders on the seas / And rests a prey to every billow's pride" (1.1.50-53). Jove responds by promising that, although "thy Aeneas' wand'ring fate is firm," his "weary limbs shall shortly make repose / In those fair walls I promis'd him of yore" (1.1.83-5). More specifically, Jove offers a stunningly detailed account of Aeneas's future triumph in Italy, describing a three-year struggle against the Rutuli in which Aeneas eventually triumphs, becoming "the lord of Turnus' town" before beginning another three-year effort to subdue "those fierce barbarian minds" that he has defeated in battle (1.1.87, 92). According to Jove's prophecy, this struggle will culminate in the rebirth of Troy: "once perform'd, poor Troy, so long suppress'd, / From forth her ashes shall advance her head, / And flourish once again that erst was dead" (1.1.93-95). Figuring Troy as a kind of phoenix, rising from its own ashes, Jove alludes to the very conflagration that consumed the city as a means of envisioning its eventual resurrection. Through a *translatio imperii*, the glory of Troy will be reconstructed, the city itself rebuilt, upon the shores of Italy.

In contrast, Venus displays a surprising indifference as to the site of Aeneas's future triumphs. When she instructs Cupid to turn Dido's affections towards Aeneas, Venus is principally concerned with securing Dido's aid, regardless of whether that aid leads Aeneas to Italy or keeps him within Carthage. Cupid must entrance Dido, in such a manner:

> That she may dote upon Aeneas' love,
> And by that means repair his broken ships
> Victual his soldiers, give him wealthy gifts,
> And he at last depart to Italy,
> Or else in Carthage make his kingly throne. (2.1.327-331)

Venus mentions Carthage almost as an afterthought, as though recognizing that the translation of empire from one space to another is arbitrary, to a degree. Should Venus's plot succeed, as indeed it will over the course of the play, Aeneas will be well equipped to depart

from Carthage and to found a new empire in Italy. But as Cupid takes hold of Dido's desire, the Carthaginian queen will also offer to share her throne with Aeneas, making him the king that Venus envisions and providing him with a new site for reconstituting the Trojan empire. In short, Venus implies that the two sites are equally hospitable to this project, and her indifference as to which location will provide the foundation for New Troy makes Jove's insistence upon Italy seem somewhat capricious, all the more so for the fact that his reasons for doing so are not stated within the play.

As the figure who must initiate the reconstruction of Troy, Aeneas is caught between Jove's insistence upon a particular place and Venus's belief that the site of Troy's rebirth is less important than the act itself. After Dido bestows her affections and her country's resources upon Aeneas, the Trojan warrior prepares to bid farewell to Carthage, claiming that "destiny doth call me from the shore" and citing the fact that "Hermes this night descending in a dream / Hath summon'd me to fruitful Italy" (4.3.2-4). Building upon this sense of a "destiny" that he cannot resist, Aeneas locates the desire to leave Carthage in the gods and the sempiternal sphere that they represent, saying of his impending departure: "Jove wills it so, my mother wills it so" (4.3.5). With these words, Aeneas divests himself of agency, figuring himself instead as a vehicle for realizing Jove's prophecy. His claim underscores the complexity of the *translatio imperii* within *Dido*, the fact that the site of Troy's eventual reconstruction is profoundly arbitrary, selected by Jove rather than by a human agent. Certainly, many Trojans celebrate Aeneas's decision to depart for Italy. Achates encourages Aeneas to forget Dido, warning that Carthage effects a strange corruption of Trojan thought, as "wanton motions of alluring eyes / Effeminate our minds inur'd to war" (4.3.34-35). Similarly, Ilioneus argues that desire has a corrosive effect upon the Trojan

warriors, but he also suggests that Carthage lacks the proper infrastructure to remember and reconstruct Troy:

> Why, let us build a city of our own
> And not stand lingering here for amorous looks.
> Will Dido raise old Priam forth his grave?
> And build the town again the Greeks did burn? (4.3.37-40)

Here, Ilioneus builds upon Achates's assertion that desire and affective attachment are ultimately debilitating, but he focuses upon their relationship to what I have been calling ecological memory. In his account, Dido's "amorous looks" stand in sharp contrast to her inability to "raise old Priam forth his grave," suggesting that Dido's compassion in the face of Aeneas's tale is ultimately insufficient as a form of memorialization. Rather, the Trojans must "build a city of our own," a claim that emphasizes not only a proprietary relationship to urban space, but also a subtle reversal of Aeneas's initial claim that the fall of Troy has deprived him of an identity. If, in Aeneas's figuration, the destruction of space has implications for the self, Ilioneus reverses that trajectory, suggesting that selves can reconstitute space, insofar Trojans must build their own city for it to be a new Troy. That is to say, there is a curious synecdoche within *Dido*, where places and persons are used to signify one another. When Venus entreats Jove to guard Aeneas's ships, for example, she worries that "Poor Troy must now be sack'd upon the sea," locating the lost city within the few warriors to have escaped its conflagration. So, too, does Aeneas figure himself as the continuation of Troy. After Dido persuades him to stay, he declares: "Then here in me shall flourish Priam's race," creating a patrilineal foundation for the new empire (4.4.87). Ilioneus's critique of Dido works according to a similar logic, envisioning new Troy as a space created and defined by the Trojans alone.

When Dido stops Aeneas from leaving, she counters these assertions by offering the constitutive elements of her kingdom as the raw material for rebuilding Troy. Dido first crowns Aeneas king of Carthage, and in response to Anna's uncertainty – "What if the citizens repine thereat?," refusing to accept Aeneas as their lord – Dido claims a kind of supernatural control over the very elements of the earth, suggesting that her dominion extends through these substances to touch all aspects of her subjects' lives: "The ground is mine that gives them sustenance, / The air wherein they breathe, the water, fire, / All that I have, their lands, their goods, their lives" (4.4.70, 74-76). Dido articulates this biopolitical fantasy as a way of ensuring her country's fidelity to Aeneas, but her words also suggest the degree to which the environment, from its very elements to the social organizations that it sustains, might be transformed as part of the effort to rebuild Troy. Indeed, after Aeneas agrees to this coronation, he envisions destroying Carthage in order to build a new city upon its foundations. According to the stage direction, he enters "*with a paper in his hand, drawing the platform of the city*," a gesture that materializes the relationship between remembering and rebuilding Troy (5.1.1.s.d.). Speaking to Achates, Ilioneus, and other Trojans, Aeneas declares:

> Triumph, my mates, our travels are at end;
> Here will Aeneas build a statelier Troy
> Than that which grim Atrides overthrew;
> Carthage shall vaunt her petty walls no more,
> For I will grace them with a fairer frame (5.1.1-6)

With this reference to Troy's destruction, Aeneas foregrounds the violent transformation of the urban fabric that he narrated before Dido and her court, the destruction of the city's walls and the conflagration which "burnt the toplesse Towers of *Ilium*," as Marlowe will

describe it elsewhere.[165] The parallel between Troy's destruction and the promised transformation of Carthage, whose walls will also be torn down, excavates the implicit violence of Aeneas's fantasy, his readiness to destroy an urban environment in order to recreate a city that has been lost to him. Moreover, Aeneas's willingness to undertake this project in Carthage reinforces what I have argued is a profound indifference to the site of Troy's eventual reconstitution. In contrast to Jove, whose prophecy insists that Italy will provide a foundation for the new Trojan empire, Aeneas betrays little concern for the particular place. His ecological memory directs itself more to the past, displaying a profound investment in Troy as the home he has lost, and less an interest in the relationship between place and futurity at the moment of Troy's reconstruction.

Indeed, as Aeneas moves closer to realizing this *translatio imperii*, Troy moves farther from his thoughts. When Ilioneus asks, hearing of Aeneas's plans for Carthage, "But what shall it be call'd? Troy, as before?," Aeneas hesitates in naming the new city: "That have I not determin'd with myself" (5.1.18-19). This remark is strange and somewhat unsettlingly, given that the lost space of Troy structures not only Aeneas's grief and hallucinatory recollections within the play, but also the drive to reconstruct the empire, articulated by Jove and Venus while being embodied in Achates, Ilioneus, and the other Trojan warriors. Cloanthus and Sergestus offer patrilineal names for the new city, suggesting that "it be term'd Aenea, by your name," or "Ascania, by your little son" (5.1.20-21). But Aeneas decides upon "Anchisaeon, / Of my old father's name," in a curious move that invokes the recent past while obscuring the place that binds these figures together (5.1.22-23). In this

---

165 Christopher Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus*, in *The Complete Works of Christopher Marlowe*, ed. Fredson Bowers, vol. 2, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 5.1.1769.

way, the remembrance of Troy gradually disappears from this project of reconstruction and imperial expansion, in what should function as a materialization of Aeneas's memory.

Perhaps for this reason, Hermes intervenes within the plan to rebuild Troy, reminding Aeneas of his supposed destiny to found a new empire in Italy: "Why, cousin, stand you building cities here / And beautifying the empire of this Queen, / While Italy is clean out of thy mind?" (5.1.27-29). In its reference to Dido, Hermes' critique rehearses the same argument that Achates and Ilioneus had previously offered: re-edifying Troy upon the stones of Carthage ultimately fails as a form of remembrance, since it serves an ornamental "beautifying" of Dido's realm rather than as the construction of a new Trojan city. Significantly, Hermes figures his reproach in terms of remembrance, chiding Aeneas for being "Too too forgetful of thine own affairs" while endeavoring to restore the thought of Italy to his "mind" (5.1.30). The reason for Hermes's insistence remains unclear, although it is likely, given his subsequent references to the "good hap" of Aeneas's son and to Aeneas's own dreams of a "monarchy," that Jove has fixated upon Italy for patrilineal reasons (5.1.31, 34).

But regardless of the reason, it is this insistence upon a particular place that leads Aeneas out of Carthage, moving the play closer to its conclusion with the suicides of Dido, Iarbas, and Anna upon the same funeral pyre. Still complaining that he travels to Italy against his will, Aeneas submits to Jove's commandment, with thoughts of Troy at the forefront of his mind:

> Now will I haste unto Lavinian shore
> And raise a new foundation to old Troy.
> Witness the Gods, and witness heaven and earth,
> How loth I am to leave these Libyan bounds,
> But that eternal Jupiter commands! (5.1.78-82)

In this struggle, *Dido* figures ecological memory as the material connection between the two spaces of the play's *translatio imperii*. The ruined Troy bears little relationship to the "new foundation" that Aeneas will erect upon Italian soil, save for the fact that he and his compatriots consider that act of reconstruction to be a form of memory.

At the same time, *Dido* stages the limitations of ecological memory in order to foreground the implicit arbitrariness of the play's *translatio imperii*. If Aeneas's memory constitutes a material connection between the old Troy and its reconstruction as the Roman empire, then the limits of this memory, in Aeneas's hallucination or in his willingness to rebuild Troy as Carthage, severely weakens the sense of a purposeful transition from one space to another. For this reason, *Dido* would seem to affirm Emily Bartels' claim that space is not "meaningless" within Marlowe's plays, but rather that these struggles of conquest and displacement reveal that "the differences assigned to it are empty, overdetermined, or arbitrary, at best."[166] But while this observation sheds light on the status of new Troy within the play, on the tension between Jove's selection of Italy and Aeneas's willingness to build the city in Carthage, it overlooks the conceptual and affective significance of the environment for Aeneas. Place remains deeply significant within *Dido*, the object as well as the medium of memory. The fact that this significance is conditional and constructed, that it comes into being through a gradual formation, does not mean that it remains arbitrary, particularly within an early modern episteme that aligned the sense of emplacement with personhood.

In "Of Solitude," for example, Montaigne foregrounds this relationship between environment and embodied subjectivity, even as he endeavors, over the course of the essay, to find solace in the idea of a conditional and temporary separation from the world. Here,

---

[166] Bartels, *Spectacles of Strangeness*, 15.

Montaigne famously suggests the need to cultivate an *arrière-boutique*, or "back shop," within the self, a place to which one can occasionally retreat. But his argument remains haunted by an inchoate awareness of the impossibility, or at least unsustainability, of maintaining this distance. In one classical anecdote, Montaigne notes an extreme separation of the self from its environment.

> After Stilpo escaped the burning of his city, in which he had lost wife, children, and property, Demetrius Poliorcetes, seeing him unperturbed in expression amid the great ruin of his country, asked him if he had not suffered loss. No, he replied; thanks to God he had lost nothing of his own.[167]

In Montaigne's version of these events, Stilpo undergoes a series of losses that are strikingly similar to Aeneas's: a conflagration that consumes his city, the destruction of his property, and the death of his wife. But, in contrast to Aeneas, who figures himself as consubstantial with the city of Troy, Stilpo refuses such an alignment, claiming to suffer no loss. Montaigne ultimately argues in favor of Stilpo's position, offering a slightly more moderate version of his conclusion in declaring: "We should have wife, children, goods, and above all health, if we can; but we must not bind ourselves to them so strongly that our happiness depends on them."[168] Still, through its very existence, Montaigne's essay implies the difficulty of achieving that distance. Its argument in favor of the *arrière-boutique*, where one "must talk and laugh as if without wife, without children, without possessions, without retinue and servants," implies that the separation of one's self from a social and physical environment is ultimately an aspirational feat within early modern culture.[169]

---

[167] Michel de Montaigne, *The Complete Works*, trans. Donald M. Frame (New York: Knopf, 2003), 214.
[168] Ibid.
[169] Ibid., 215.

Indeed, *Dido* figures an intimate relationship between embodied thought and the environment, staging a form of ecological memory in Aeneas's continued efforts to think through the spaces of Troy and of Carthage. In positing this intimacy, however, the play explores a more subtle and vexed relationship between affective space of Aeneas's thoughts and the larger political entity of Troy, or between what Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari have termed the territory and the State. In *A Thousand Plateaus*, Deleuze and Guattari define the territory as the spatialization or distribution of a particular organism, "an act that affects milieus and rhythms, that 'territorializes' them" within a particular space.[170] In the sense that "the bird sings to mark its territory," animals are adept at creating territories, but one can also interpret the spatialization of thought, in Aeneas's hallucination of Priam for example, as another act of territorial formation.[171] In contrast, Deleuze and Guattari figure the State as a geopolitical entity, the result of a sudden reconstitution of spatial entities, including the territory.[172] Their distinction thereby poses an essential question: how do cognitive and affective spaces, like the territory, become absorbed, incorporated, or reconstituted within larger and explicitly political domains like the State? In the gap between Aeneas's memory and his intention, in the Troy that he remembers and the empire that he promises to found, Marlowe's play stages the vexed oscillation between the territory and the State. Moreover, it is through this oscillation that *Dido* traces the geopolitical implications of ecological memory, revealing the ease with which a political domain can resignify the effort of thinking through the environment.

---

[170] Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Brian Massumi (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987), 314.
[171] Ibid., 312.
[172] They argue that the State functions as an "apparatus of capture," generating and sustaining itself through the organization of raw materials. Specifically, they argue that rent, profit, and taxation are essential components of the State, as it transforms – in Deleuze and Guattari's formulation – territory, activity, and exchange into land, work, and money. See, in particular, their discussion on pp. 440-445.

III. Troynovant and the Place of Memory in Early Modern London

The effort to stage and to critique an ecological form of memory situates *Dido* at the heart of early modern English culture, in no small part because of the particular place that Marlowe's play endeavors to remember. In many topographical, literary, and historical renderings, London was called Troynovant, or "New Troy," a name intended to acknowledge the role of Aeneas's great-grandson Brutus in founding Britain upon an uninhabited island.[173] Brutus's exile and eventual resettlement upon the island parallels Aeneas's own narrative of displacement and spatial reconstitution, and this repetition serves to legitimate the British empire as a continuation of Troy's dominion. Indeed, in chronicling Aeneas's movement through the Mediterranean, *Dido* alludes to this *translatio imperii*, in such a way that it touches directly upon the topographical imaginary of early modern England.[174]

The Agas map of London, for example, introduces its subject, the "antient and famous City of London," as being "first founded by *Brute* the Trojan, in the year of the World two thousand, eight hundred thirty & two, and before the Nativity of our Saviour

---

[173] Lawrence Manley discusses the origin and the development of this myth in *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), esp. 182-185. He argues: "While they supported the Tudor image, and reflected the late-feudal arrangements that enabled London to function as a 'collective seigneur' through royal charter and privilege, the foundation-myth and its chivalric associations also had a wide appeal among the members of London's citizen class" (184). Nevertheless, as I argue, historians and chorographers such as John Stow and William Camden began to undermine the legend of Troynovant in gesturing toward other foundational myths.

[174] I borrow the phrase "topographical imaginary" from Karen Newman, who uses it in *Cultural Capitals: Early Modern London and Paris* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007) to theorize a relationship between physical space and innersubjective experience. In Newman's own words, her second chapter "argues for what I call in this study the *topographic imaginary* by considering one of the most prominent images of modernity in early modern Paris, the Pont Neuf," and her method foregrounds the interplay between the materiality of that space and the ideas and representational idioms that it generated: "Demographic growth and the reconfiguration of urban space effected by the Pont Neuf had aesthetic, cognitive, psychic, and social effects traced in visual and verbal representations that make legibile the actions, practices, and experience of urban life in early modern Paris" (8, 39). In other words, the topographic imaginary refers to the fact that ideology and environment are mutually constitutive of one another.

Christ, one thousand, one hundred and 30."[175] The map radically simplifies the *translatio imperii*, making Brutus himself a Trojan and thus obviating the need for Aeneas to effect a translation of the empire through Rome. In the incredible economy proposed by the map, in other words, Aeneas's stay in Carthage and Rome is elided and the line of descent from Troy to London becomes direct. Perhaps for this reason, when the Agas map gives voice to London, it places the myth of origin within the city's mouth and thereby elides its role in constructing a line of direct descent: "New Troy my name: when first my fame begun / By Trajon Brute: who then me placed here."[176] Here, London remembers its own foundation at the hands of the "Trajon Brute" only by forgetting Brutus's Roman heritage.

In his *Survey of London*, John Stow recalls precisely what the Agas map forgets in its peculiar economy of empire. But his efforts to remember Rome serve the rather critical function of undermining the myth of Brutus's appearance. "As the Romane writers to glorifie the citie of *Rome* drew the originall thereof from Gods and demie Gods, by the Troian progenie," Stow writes, "so *Giffrey* of *Monmouth* the Welsh Historian, deduceth the foundation of this famous Citie of *London*, for the greater glorie therof, and emulation of *Rome*, from the very same originall."[177] The penchant for grounding urban splendor upon "Troian progenie" is itself a Roman inheritance, according to Stow. The "emulation of *Rome*" thereby doubles. One, it manifests itself as a fantasy of origins, wherein London follows Rome in descending from Troy; two, it represents a historiographical impulse, wherein the descent from Troy becomes a means of valuation. Indeed, it is in this critical context that Stow recounts Brutus's descent from Aeneas and his arrival upon the island, where

---

[175] *Civitas Londinvm* (The Agas Map), ed. Janelle Jenstad (Victoria: *MoEML*, 2012), map D2.
[176] Ibid., map D7, D8.
[177] John Stow, *A Survey of London, by John Stow, Reprinted from the Text of 1603*, ed. Charles Lethbridge Kingsford, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908), 1:1.

Monmouth claims that he "builded this city neare vnto the riuer now called *Thames*, and named it *Troynouant* or *Trenouant*."[178] Stow's reinsertion of Rome into the translation of empire thereby returns the very term that the Agas map elides, but to different ends. Rather than severing London's relationship to Rome through a suppression of the Italian city, Stow invokes it to suggest a Roman impulse within English historiography, an impulse that he avoids in interrogating the myth that Brutus founded London. Stow's *Survey* thereby registers a growing uncertainty with regard to the myth of Brutus's foundation, suggesting a split between London and the lost space that *Dido* remembers.[179]

Indeed, Marlowe's play briefly interrogates its relationship to the English capital in a stunning eruption that shifts *Dido* from Carthage to Elizabethan England. When Iarbas despairs that Dido's affections have shifted from him to Aeneas, he prepares a sacrifice to Jove and intones: "Hear, hear, O hear Iarbas' plaining prayers, / Whose hideous echoes make the welkin howl, / And all the woods 'Eliza' to resound!" (4.2.8-10). The cry is almost non-diegetic, in that it seems to come from beyond the narrative, from Marlowe's own world rather than from the Carthage that he endeavors to stage. The moment, as Bartels suggests, makes manifest "an embedded parallel between Carthage's queen (whose Phoenician name

---

[178] Ibid.

[179] Lister M. Matheson, in *The Prose Brut: The Development of a Middle English Chronicle* (Tempe: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1998), notes that although the incorporation of the *Brut* chronicle into "the works of the sixteenth-century historians such as Stow and Holinshed" ensured the continued circulation of the myth of Brutus, "the version of early British history presented in the *Brut* (and in its ultimate source, Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britannie*) was challenged and ridiculed" with increased intensity in the early modern period (27). Indeed, in "Early British Chorography," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 17:4 (Winter 1986): 459-481, Stan Mendyk notes that William Camden, in his *Britannia*, diminished the importance of Troy in the foundation of Britain, but for the purpose of elevating Rome: "The *Britannia*, by presenting to the world the Roman antiquities of Britain, was designed to entrench the author's native land amongst those European nations which claimed the mighty Roman Empire as their origin. The attempt to dispel the myth of the Trojan Brutus aided this cause to a large extent" (473). Jonathan Gil Harris, in *Untimely Matter in the Time of Shakespeare* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), notes Stow's dismissal of the Brutus myth and suggests that it is part of a larger strategy: "Stow refuses to countenance any one myth of 'first foundation' and instead recounts several tales of London's beginning; in this way, he reads difference and multiplicity into the city's very moment of origin" (105).

was 'Elissa') and England's."[180] Moreover, the line subversively parodies Spenser's refrain in the *Epithalamium*, which also culminates in Spenser's famed meditation on the three Elizabeths of his affection – his mother, his wife, and his queen – to suggest a certain pagan fetishization.[181] Marlowe's appropriation of the line critiques both the desire to fetishize the queen – Iarbas' instability will lead him to follow Dido into the flames – and the object that fetishization (as Hopkins argues, the "ruling queen" is presented as an unstable and unreliable victim of passion).[182] But, regardless of the implications for Elizabeth, the eruption suggests less that the play "announces the resemblance between its African landscape and England" than the fact that the two locations are incommensurate; the knowledge that Iarbas "is an African king complaining to a pagan god and invoking a name that is otherwise suppressed emphasizes the incongruity, as ours and theirs suggestively collide in a space that excludes neither."[183] The binding together of these disparate locations within one conceptual or performative "space" does not, however, succeed in equating the one place with the other. If anything, the multiple tragedies of *Dido* depend upon the irreducibility of one place to another. With Aeneas's departure for Italy, Dido underscores the space that separates Carthage and Rome, claiming that geographical fact as a metaphor for affective distance: "Betwixt this land and that be never league," she declares, before throwing herself into the fire (5.1.309).

---

180 Bartels, *Spectacles of Strangeness*, 15.

181 Patrick Cheney analyzes this relationship in *Marlowe's Counterfeit Profession: Ovid, Spenser, Counter-Nationhood* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997), esp. 99-114, and he discusses Marlowe's relationship to Spenser more generally in "'Thondring Words of Threate': Marlowe, Spenser, and Renaissance Ideas of a Literary Career," in *Marlowe, History, and Sexuality: New Critical Essays on Christopher Marlowe*, ed. Paul Whitfield White (New York: AMS Press, 1998), 39-58.

182 Hopkins, *Christopher Marlowe: Renaissance Dramatist*, 40. Hopkins also alludes to another topical subtext within the play, a celebration of Elizabeth's virginity through a critical representation of Dido's passion; as she argues, however, "it is hard to believe that Marlowe would have much time for 'the cult of Elizabeth', most notably exemplified in Edmund Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*" (158).

183 Bartels, *Spectacles of Strangeness*, 15-16.

Through its invocation of ecological memory, *Dido* offers a radical critique of the conceptual and affective ties that merged London with the Trojan empire. The play presents the relationship between Troy and Italy as the result of a *deux ex machina*, where Jove, in his only appearance onstage, foresees an intimacy between the two spaces that is neither explained nor shared by other characters. Moreover, the tone of *Dido*, as Clifford Leech has argued, is humorous, even campy, in such a way that "the affairs of men and gods are seen as a spectacle engagingly absurd" throughout the performance.[184] Although Leech's account ignores the tonal complexity of *Dido*, it rightly foregrounds the hermeneutic difficulty of determining the play's stance toward the literary events that it depicts. In a sense, *Dido*'s quasi-parodic tone undermines the significance of Aeneas's memory, making it superficially incongruous with the play's more satirical representation of desire and divine intrigue. Furthermore, the fact that *Dido* was first enacted "by the Children of her *Maiesties Chappell*," according to the 1594 quarto, may have deepened the play's critique of Aeneas and the putative heroism of his intention to rebuild Troy. From the play's first scene, where Jove and Ganymede engage one another with flirtatious banter, "the metamorphosis of the boys and their master into the luxurious pagan gods provides self-conscious satire," as Jackson Cope has claimed.[185] In other moments, as Michael Shapiro noted, the play seems to offer a metatheatrical apology, implying that its use of boy actors to depict an epic tragedy verges on the absurd.[186] Together with its tone, *Dido*'s resignification of its earliest performance conditions allow the play to deepen its critique of ecological memory, blending Aeneas's

---

[184] Clifford Leech, "Marlowe's Humor," in *Marlowe: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Clifford Leech (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1964), 169.
[185] Jackson I. Cope, *Dramaturgy of the Daemonic: Studies in Antigeneric Theater from Ruzante to Grimaldi* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984), 65.
[186] Michael Shapiro, *Children of the Revels: The Boys Companies of Shakespeare's Time and Their Plays* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1977), 166. Crucially, for Shapiro as for Cope, these moments exist in elaborate tension with the play's more serious moments, contributing to the complexity of tone that I noted above.

need to remember the space of Troy with a satirical treatment of the ends to which that need is used.

The complexity and strangeness of *Dido*, then, stems in part from a tension within its treatment of ecological memory. The play begins with a tragic meditation on the relationship between memory and environment, foregrounding the intimacy between the two spheres in Aeneas's brief hallucination, in his narrative of Troy's fall, and in his claims that he has lost his identity. In particular, Aeneas's memorial navigation of the space of Troy reveals the role of place in providing a conceptual and affective foundation for early modern personhood. With regard to the tonal complexity of *Dido*, that moment also works to legitimate Aeneas's grief, as his narrative moves Dido and her courtiers to suffer compassionately with Aeneas, to experience within themselves the devastating effects of displacement. But, in contrast to this moment, *Dido* repeatedly figures as arbitrary the relationship between the lost city of Troy and the empire that Aeneas must found. In Jove's insistence upon Italy, and in Aeneas's eventual willingness to accede to this demand, the play suggests that ecological memory is insufficient to justify a fixation upon one space over another in the construction of empire. Through these scenes, *Dido* offers a subversive, and occasionally satirical, critique of ecological memory, weakening the relationship between the lost city of Troy and its eventual reconstruction, between new Troy and London, and between the affective space of the territory and the larger political domain of the state. Marlowe's play exposes a gap between environments remembered and imagined, using this gap to undermine the politicization of ecological thought.

Chapter Three

Embodiment and the Perception of Place in *King Lear*

When Lear asks the blinded Gloucester if he can "see how this world goes," there is a peculiar and haunting quality to Gloucester's response: "I see it feelingly."[187] To "see it feelingly" is, on the one hand, to grasp the world through the layering of sight and touch; the hands extend to take the part of the eye's now dormant rays, mapping the contours of space. But as Gloucester's plight makes readily apparent, to "see it feelingly" is also to conflate sensation with sentience, to claim to know the world through the pain that it inflicts upon the body. Gloucester's rhetoric thereby grounds an epistemology of the world upon a sensing and suffering corporeality. In doing so, his quasi-synesthetic claim encodes within itself the many modes of spatial apprehension that suffuse *King Lear*. Lear himself responds to Gloucester's invocation of sight and touch by offering another sense: "A man may see how this world goes with no eyes; look with thine ears" (4.5.142-43), and there is a similar eruption in Regan's cruel imperative to let Gloucester: "smell / His way to Dover" (3.7.91-92). This multiplicity, I want to suggest, gestures towards an early modern phenomenology of the environment, in which places emerge through an oscillation between different modes of perception and cognition.

---

[187] William Shakespeare, *The Tragedy of King Lear*, in *The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean Howard, and Katharine Eisaman Maus, 2nd ed. (New York: Norton, 2008), 4.5.141. All further citations of Shakespeare's works are from the Norton edition and will be made parenthetically.

Guided by Lear's imperative, "Give me the map there," critical work on the spaces of *King Lear* has been dominated by interest in cartographic representation, in monarchical power and questions of nationhood, and in the vexed translation of land into property (1.1.35).[188] These efforts have shown space to be an inherently political dimension, a domain that both contains and recapitulates the tensions between power and violence that set the play's tragedies in motion. But this interest in cartographic and representational space has also overlooked, and partially obscured, *Lear*'s investment in the phenomenological dimension of the environment, in the way that places are imagined, experienced, and disrupted.[189]

Gloucester's claim directs us toward a more nuanced understanding of the nature of place within *King Lear*, and in the early modern period more broadly. The sixteenth and

---

188 See, for example, Terence Hawkes, *Meaning by Shakespeare* (New York: Routledge, 1992); John Gillies, "Introduction: Elizabethan Drama and the Cartographizations of Space" in *Playing the Globe: Genre and Geography in English Renaissance Drama*, ed. John Gillies and Virginia Mason Vaughan (Madison: Associated University Press, 1998), 19-45; Bernhard Klein, *Maps and the Writing of Space in Early Modern England and Ireland* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001); Gillies, "The Scene of Cartography in *King Lear*" in *Literature, Mapping, and the Politics of Space in Early Modern Britain*, ed. Andrew Gordon and Bernhard Klein (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 109-37; Jerry Brotton, "Tragedy and Geography" in *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works, Volume 1: The Tragedies*, ed. Richard Dutton and Jean E. Howard (Malden: Blackwell, 2003), 219-40; Peter Holland, "Mapping Shakespeare's Britain" in *Shakespeare's Histories and Counter-Histories*, ed. Dermot Cavanagh, Stuart Hampton-Reeves, and Stephen Longstaffe (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), 198-218; and Gavin Hollis, "'Give me the map there': *King Lear* and Cartographic Literacy in Early Modern England" *The Portolan* 8 (Spring 2007): 8-25, as well as other works that I will engage in greater detail. In addition to several of those cited here, Richard Dutton's "*King Lear*, *The Triumphs of Reunited Britannia*, and 'The Matter of Britain'" *Literature and History* 12:2 (Autumn 1986): 137-151 and Leah S. Marcus's *Puzzling Shakespeare: Local Reading and its Discontents* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988) focus on *Lear*'s interest in reimagining the space of the nation. Finally, on land, property, and labor, see Francis Barker, *The Culture of Violence: Tragedy and history* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993) and Garret A. Sullivan, Jr., *The Drama of Landscape: Land, Property, and Social Relations on the Early Modern Stage* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998). Valerie Traub also notes these critical trends, among others, in "The Nature of Norms in Early Modern England: Anatomy, Cartography, *King Lear*," *South Central Review* 26, no. 1 & 2 (Winter & Spring 2009): 42-81, where she moves beyond this fixation on the play's cartographic imaginary by offering "less a reading of the play's anatomical and cartographic consciousness than the excavation of a "style of reasoning" that *King Lear* shares with these two scientific endeavors" (45).

189 A notable exception to this trend is Gillies's "The Scene of Cartography," which anticipates my work here in offering a phenomenological approach to the spatiality of the play. As suggested in his claim that "the major spatial idiom in *Lear* is built around the bodily opposition of housedness and unhousedness, accommodation and nakedness," Gillies's use of phenomenology is deeply indebted to the work of Gaston Bachelard and Yi Fu Tuan (123). In contrast, I take a Heideggerian approach to the relationship between embodiment and environment, using phenomenology to suggest that ontology and epistemology are inseparable from one another.

seventeenth centuries witnessed a profound shift in the conceptualization of space and place, a gradual rejection of the quasi-Aristotelian belief that nature abhors a vacuum in favor of the empty and infinite dimension that we call space. Caught in the midst of this shift, *Lear* registers the tension between a plenitudinal cosmos and empty space with exceptional sensitivity, as Henry S. Turner has shown.[190] But rather than locating the events of *Lear* within a void, as Turner does, I argue that the play's emphasis on feeling highlights the phenomenological significance of place within early modern culture. Prior to the conceptualization of space as an *a priori* sphere, the drama of *Lear* shows that emplacement, or the feeling of being within space, defined the contours of the environment, and that this constitutive power enabled place to provide a foundation for early modern subjectivity.

To excavate these relationships, and to foreground *Lear*'s interest in reimagining them, I blend insights from cognitive ecology with historical phenomenology. Stemming from the work of Bruce R. Smith, Jonathan Gil Harris, and others, historical phenomenology denotes an emerging critical movement within early modern studies, one that examines theories and experiences of perception in Renaissance culture in order to foreground what Smith has called "the ambient quality of knowing-in-place-in-time."[191] Together with cognitive ecology, this approach to perception, feeling, and thinking reveals that places are created and shaped through conceptual and affective signification, realized in the most literal sense by the embodied mind.

---

[190] Henry S. Turner, *The English Renaissance Stage: Geometry, Poetics, and the Practical Spatial Arts 1580-1630* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).
[191] Bruce R. Smith, *The Key of Green: Passion and Perception in Renaissance Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009), 8. For other examples of historical phenomenology in early modern studies, see Smith, *The Acoustic World of Early Modern England: Attending to the O-Factor* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999) and Jonathan Gil Harris, *Untimely Matter in the Time of Shakespeare* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), especially 119-139.

In Gloucester's approach to Dover cliff, and in Lear's encounter with the storm, *Lear* stages this phenomenological approach to the environment. Foregrounding what I will argue was a foundational assumption within the early modern episteme – that place provided the grounds of personhood – the play suggests that the embodied mind and its immediate environment were mutually constitutive of one another. Gloucester's claim to see the world "feelingly" and his multisensory navigation of that world depend upon this intimate relationship. In the approach to Dover cliff, Edgar's efforts to convince his father that they stand at the edge of a precipice (when, in fact, they do not) transform these issues of embodiment and emplacement into a performative crux, allowing the scene to locate the proto-phenomenology of the early modern period on a spatial register. In this way, Gloucester's confusion illuminates something implicit in other instances of disorientation within the play, most notably Lear's wandering in the storm. Like Gloucester, Lear struggles to locate himself within a vast and dimly perceptible environment, and the fallen monarch's effort to grapple with this dislocation shows the same interlacement of environment and embodiment that Gloucester's blindness evinces. In these scenes, *Lear* reimagines space as coextensive with the self, as less of an *a priori* sphere than an ambient and strangely labile environment.

I. Early Modern Phenomenology and the Perception of Place

As a philosophy that seeks to allow sensory apprehensions to appear in the manner of their unfolding, phenomenology locates subjects and space on a kind of continuum. Whether in Husserl's work on the showing of objects or in Heidegger's theorization of being as Being-There (*Dasein*), phenomenology "reminds us that spaces are not exterior to bodies," as Sara Ahmed puts it, but that these environments actually emerge out of somatic and

psychic experience.[192] This investment in a processual unfolding, however, is by no means exclusive to the philosophy of the early twentieth century. In the 1615 edition of the *Mikrokosmographia*, Helkiah Crooke evinces a similar interest in interpreting sensation as a process, and his claims effectively anticipate phenomenology in describing embodied thought as a gradual and distributed achievement. In the preface to a chapter on the organs of the head, for instance, Crooke begins with the sense organs and moves towards the faculties of cognition, asserting that:

> The eye receiueth the visible formes, the eare the audible, the nose such as cast an odour from them; and so of the rest. All these indiuiduall formes receiued by the sences, are by them resigned vp in token of foealty to the Common sense or priuy-chamber of the soule from whence they receiued their faculties: and then out of those formes the soule gathering phantasmes or notions doth eyther lay them vp in the Memory, or worke vpon them by discourse of Reason.[193]

Crooke's description usefully suggests the means by which disparate sensations appear before the common sense, a faculty akin to the imagination, which unifies these impressions into a single, cognitive object. The thing perceived is, in a way, not readily apparent to the mind; rather, the idea must be created through a complex interplay between perceptual and cognitive faculties, an interplay that makes the embodied mind partially constitutive of the world that it encounters

Crooke's writings on this point are less particular than symptomatic of dominant medical theories on the relationship of perception to cognition in the early modern period. With some variation, the phenomenology that Crooke articulates also appears in André du

---

[192] Sara Ahmed, *Queer Phenomenology: Orientations, Objects, Others* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), 9.
[193] Helkiah Crooke, *Mikrokosmographia: A Description of the Body of Man. Together with the Controversies Thereto Belonging. Collected and Translated out of all the Best Authors of Anatomy, Especially out of Gasper Bauhinus and Andreas Laurentius* (London: William Jaggard, 1615), 432.

Laurens's *A Discovrse of the Preservation of the Sight* and Timothy Bright's *A Treatise of Melancholie*, among many other treatises on humoral physiology to circulate within England.[194] Together, these writers assume a thoroughly embodied mind, anticipating Crooke in describing a profound intimacy between perceptual and cognitive faculties (indeed, Crooke draws many of his claims from previous writers, as the subtitle of the *Mikrokosmographia* – "*Collected and Translated out of all the Best Authors of Anatomy*" – suggests). In this regard, early modern philosophers of embodiment evince what Deborah Shuger has described as a profound indebtedness to "Aristotelian theory, in which knowledge derives from sense-perception."[195] That is to say, they reproduce Aristotle's claim in the *De anima* that "the objects of thought are in the sensible forms" and that, for this reason, "no one can learn or understand anything in the absence of sense."[196] For Aristotle, and his early modern adherents, one might say that one thinks through the body, or not at all.[197]

Similarly, these writers follow Aristotle in assuming that thought has a visual component. In the *De anima*, Aristotle proposes that: "when the mind is actively aware of

---

[194] André du Laurens, in *A Discovrse of the Preservation of the Sight: of Melancholike diseases; of Rheumes, and of Old age* (London, 1599), cites Aristotle in claiming that "nothing (as saith the Philosopher) can enter into the vnderstanding part of our minde, except it passe through one of these fiue doores" that are the external senses (9). Timothy Bright anticipates Crooke in figuring the brain as a site that organizes disparate senses into thought by virtue of the common sense; see *A Treatise of Melancholie* (London: Thomas Vautrollier, 1586), 47.
[195] Deborah Shuger, "The 'I' of the Beholder: Renaissance Mirrors and the Reflexive Mind" in *Renaissance Culture and the Everyday*, ed. Patricia Fumerton and Simon Hunt (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), 21-41, esp. 33.
[196] Aristotle, *On the Soul*, in *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation* Vol. 1, ed. Jonathan Barnes (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), 432^{a}1.5-7.
[197] Of course, many early modern writers distinguished embodied cognition from the workings of the immortal soul. In *The Examination of mens Wits. In whicch, by discouering the varietie of natures, is shewed for what profession each one is apt, and how far he shall profit therein* (London: Adam Islip, 1594), Juan Huarte cites a conversation between the souls of Abraham and a sinner in order to demonstrate that the soul does not require a body to think (101). Nevertheless, as long as the soul remains within the body, it maintains an instrumental relationship with regard to that corporeality, thinking and working through the flesh. As Huarte reasons, "if vnderstanding were seuered fro*m* the body, and had nought to do with heat, cold, moist, and drie, nor with the other bodily qualities, it would follow that al men should partake equall vnderstanding, and that all should equally discourse. But we see by experience, that one man vnderstandeth and discourseth better than another" (75). Huarte thus concludes that the soul must think through the body when the two are conjoined.

anything it is necessarily aware of it along with an image."[198] When Crooke theorizes the imagination as that which "conceyueth, apprehendeth and retaineth the same Images or representations which the common sense receiued," his claim affirms these precepts.[199] Thus, for many early modern philosophers, what Hamlet refers to as the "mind's eye" was considered to be the principle cognitive faculty (1.2.184).

This claim of visual primacy, however, obscures the degree to which early modern cognition was figured in terms of other senses, most notably that of touch. Daniel Heller-Roazen has argued persuasively that the common sense, as it came to be theorized in the late medieval and early modern periods, was understood to be a form of touching, in which sensory data was pressed into the materiality of the body.[200] Crooke himself affirms this point in explaining that the humoral brain requires a certain softness: "The reason of the softnesse is because it is to receiue all of the species or representations of the outward senses, as also of the imagination and vnderstanding."[201] So, too, does Levinus Lemnius assert that the brain must be moist and soft enough to receive impression: "a dry Constitutio*n* of the Brayne maketh a very weake and ill memory; by reason, that it will not easely admit any impression."[202] Here, the spongy brain absorbs what the disparate sense organs have rendered as a unified object, and the fact that the brain can incorporate such

---

[198] Aristotle, *On the Soul*, 432[a]1.7-8. Shuger also notes that, for early modern writers indebted to Aristotle, "cognition is invariably conceived on the model of vision" ("The 'I' of the Beholder," 33).
[199] Crooke, *Mikrokosmographia*, 502.
[200] Daniel Heller-Roazen, *The Inner Touch: Archaeology of a Sensation* (New York: Zone Books, 2007).
[201] Crooke, *Mikrokosmographia*, 455.
[202] Levinus Lemnius, *The Touchstone of Complexions. Generallye appliable, expedient and profitable for all such, as be desirous and carefull of ther bodyly health* (London, Thomas Marsh, 1581), sig. 120[v].

"representations" from the imagination suggests the degree to which the common sense is a kind of an inner touch, intimately related to the sense of sight.[203]

This inner touch is where Gloucester's "see it feelingly" directs us. Certainly, as I initially suggested, the claim to "see it feelingly" implicates the hands with which Gloucester navigates the world in blindness. But it also expands to encompass the many other senses invoked to encourage his spatial apprehension. The imperatives to "look with" his "ears" and to "smell / His way to Dover" seem absurd, and indeed cruel in their absurdity. But these utterances rehearse and reframe something already articulated within early modern cognitive theory, that thought is deeply embodied and that the mind engages a complex layering of sensations to apprehend its immediate environment. Gloucester's touching-sight stages this layering with incredible vividness, creating a strange and ultimately haunting allusion to early modern theories of the embodied mind.

If the proto-phenomenology of early modern period illuminates the peculiar, synesthetic production at the heart of Gloucester's experience, then the referent of his "see it feelingly" – that is, the world itself – directs us towards the relationship between perception and place. Indeed, as Edward Casey has argued, "a phenomenological account" of the environment begins with the recognition that "the crux of matters of place is the role of perception."[204] For embodied subjects, perception represents the means by which we discern the contours of our location. Located within the world, in other words, the body provides a material connection between the mind and its environment; in Casey's words, "the body is

---

[203] I have taken the phrase "spongy brains" from Sutton's "Spongy Brains and Material Memories" in *Environment and Embodiment in Early Modern England,* ed. Mary Floyd-Wilson and Garrett A. Sullivan, Jr. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 14-34.
[204] Edward S. Casey, "How to Get from Space to Place in a Fairly Short Stretch of Time: Phenomenological Prolegomena" in *Senses of Place*, ed. Steven Feld and Keith H. Basso (Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, 1996), 13-52, esp. 17.

the specific medium for experiencing a place-world."[205] Just as we saw in Crooke's progression, places do not immediately appear before the mind; they must, in a sense, be assembled from disparate impressions. Speaking phenomenologically, we create an idea of place only out of the deeply corporeal experience of emplacement, of feeling specific aspects of the world around us. To claim that places preexist perception is to overlook the central contribution of phenomenology, the fact that ontology and epistemology are ultimately inseparable from one another.[206] From the perspective of embodiment, the manner in which places reveal themselves is identical to the metaphysical nature of those things.

In underscoring the importance of embodiment, then, phenomenology gives us critical purchase on the nature of space and place, both as these spheres were theorized in the early modern period and as we have come to conceptualize them today. While we might think of space as an imperceptible dimension, anticipating and containing specific environments or places, these definitions were far less operative in the early modern period. Indeed, as I suggested in chapter one, the concept of space as a dimension unto itself, existing within the world as well as beyond the firmament, came into being through theoretical and philosophical developments in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Prior to this, the dominant understanding of the extendedness of the physical world was mediated through the idea of place. For Aristotle, the idea that an empty space could exist within the world entailed a number of absurdities, not the least of which was the impossibility of having

---

[205] Ibid., 24.

[206] Here, I have in mind Martin Heidegger's explanation of the etymology of "phenomenology" as the letting-show (*logos*) of things as they show themselves (as *phainomenon*), in such a way that the being of things, ontology, is identical to this process of showing. As he notes in *Being and Time*, trans. Joan Stambaugh (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996), "*Ontology is possible only as phenomenology*. The phenomenological concept of phenomenon, as self-showing, means the being of beings – its meaning, modifications, and derivatives" (31). Heidegger aligns ontology, or "the being of beings," with the phenomenological showing of these beings to a subject, such that a phenomenological understanding of space depends upon the means by which one grasps the external perceptually and retains the contours of that space in cognition.

two bodies exist within one site at a time. Conceiving the expanse of the world as plenitudinal, that is, Aristotle assumed that a void would have a material presence and that it could not exist without the displacement of another materiality, much as a wooden cube placed within water displaces the liquid in equal measure of its volume. "Because the interpenetration of material medium and material cube is impossible," the historian Edward Grant states in his reading of this paradox, "so also is it impossible for the dimensions of an alleged void space to interpenetrate with the dimensions of a material cube."[207] Where we might conceptualize space as an immaterial dimension, able to accommodate the eruptions of discrete materialities within it, Aristotle and his intellectual descendants aligned dimensionality with materiality, ensuring that place was coterminous with bodies and that space, therefore, had no place in the world.

Although Aristotle's philosophy of place was not the only means of conceptualizing locality in the premodern period, this rejection of the void became a central tenet of late medieval epistemology, best represented in the assertion "nature abhors a vacuum."[208] What Casey describes as the "fate of place," that is, the diminution of place's importance with regards to the concept of space, was both extended over the course of the early modern period and overdetermined, such that the motor of this epistemic shift cannot be localized in one individual, whether that individual be Galileo, Descartes, or Newton.[209] Greek atomism,

---

[207] Edward Grant, *Much Ado About Nothing: Theories of space and vacuum from the Middle Ages to the Scientific Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 5.

[208] Grant affirms the plurality of this idea at the same time as its ubiquity: "Few dicta are more inextricably linked with the Middle Ages than the declaration that 'nature abhors a vacuum.' Although the full significance of this famous principle would be described and explicated only in the fourteenth century, it had already emerged in the thirteenth, when expressions such as *natura abhorret vacuum*, *horror vacui*, and *fuga vacui* began to appear" (67).

[209] Casey, *The Fate of Place: A Philosophical History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997). Although Casey focuses on these individuals, his work is invested in tracing a larger shift in the transformation of thinking about place. Max Jammer, in *Concepts of Space: The History of Theories of Space in Physics*, third edition (New York: Dover Publications, 1993), demonstrates somewhat more forcefully that a number of thinkers contributed to the shift in emphasis of space over place.

for example, had already offered a counter-narrative of spatial ontology, but the Christian aversion to the void proposed in this model, as distinct from comparative plenitude of natural philosophy, limited the efficacy of atomism in qualifying Aristotelian precepts. According to Grant, only when "Lucretius' *De rerum natura* was published in 1473, after having been 'rediscovered' earlier in the fifteenth century by Gian Francesco Poggio, did natural philosophers once again pay serious attention to atoms and the void."[210] At the same time that atomism forced early modern philosophy to confront the possibility of a void within nature, the rise of Newtonian physics and Cartesian geometry asserted space as the very *a priori* horizon of potentiality that anticipates specific locations.[211]

Prior to this conceptualization of space, in other words, environment and embodiment were understood to continually inform one another, and by reasserting the primacy of place over space, phenomenology sheds light on this relationship, this experience of emplacement. Suggesting that we come to an awareness of place as the medium around our own corporeality, phenomenology turns embodied location into the foundation for our knowledge and experience of larger environments. It intervenes within the critical history of space to excavate one of the foundational assumptions of the premodern period, that bodies and places were aligned with one another in ways that were as conceptual as they were material. As we saw in the *Mikrokosmographia*, acquiring a sense of the external environment is a complex process, and the distribution of this process across a vast cognitive ecology, spanning perceptual as well as conceptual faculties, gives us a foundation for theorizing how emplacement might have been understood in the early modern period.

---

[210] Grant, *Much Ado About Nothing*, 4. The importance of this discovery, as Grant notes elsewhere, was that "Lucretius offered a rigorous defense of the concept of innumerable worlds randomly dispersed throughout the endless extent of an infinite void" (183).
[211] See Casey, *The Fate of Place* and Casey "How to Get from Space to Place," 20.

II. Phenomenology and the Space of Dover Cliff

If theories of early modern emplacement suggest how embodiment and environment came to depend upon one another, it tells us comparatively little about the disruption, or temporary suspension, of that relationship, what happens when blindness or madness leads to a feeling of profound displacement within the world. For this understanding, we must return to *Lear*. In the approach to Dover cliff, Gloucester and Edgar struggle with one another in attempting to describe the feeling of the environment around them, with Edgar's deceitful claims working to create a sense of place when the place itself is curiously absent. This contested negotiation between father and son effectively stages the phenomenological construction of place, the passage from an inchoate set of feelings about the environment to a unified, conceptual idea of what that environment is. But Gloucester's experience also reveals something missing from Crooke's proto-phenomenology: the fact that early modern subjectivity depends upon the very places that it creates. Gloucester's fate within the play bears witness to this facet of early modern culture, as his tenuousness emplacement at Dover cliff gives way to a larger, conceptual displacement within the world of *Lear*, where embodied thought no longer furnishes a clear sense of its surroundings. In this regard, Gloucester's uncertainty sheds light not only upon the relationship of embodiment to environment in *Lear*, but also upon Lear's own oscillation between emplacement and disorientation in the scenes surrounding the approach to Dover cliff.

As has often been noted, Edgar's efforts to persuade Gloucester of their approach to Dover cliff have a metatheatrical quality to them, offering a complex allusion to the way that dramatic places were imagined and perceived in the English amphitheater. Jonathan Goldberg has neatly excavated the problem of the scene: that playgoers depend upon

Edgar's description as much as Gloucester does, insofar as "Shakespeare's stage would have no way of representing the event [of their arrival at the cliff] save in the language" of description; this language, of course, is reserved for Edgar here, because "only Edgar could report the evidence of sight."[212] For Goldberg, this problem lends the scene to a poststructuralist reading of the (in)ability of signifiers to render the signified. Although his arguments are persuasive, by turning from the linguistic implications of the scene to consider Dover cliff's mediation of sensation and space, we find that the visual signifiers that Goldberg notes as integral to the scene are not the only means by which the arrival at Dover cliff is rendered. The scene, in fact, begins by staging a tension between Gloucester and Edgar with regards to their sensory experience:

> Gloucester   When shall I come to th'top of that same hill?
> Edgar   You do climb up it now. Look how we labour.
> Gloucester   Methinks the ground is even.
> Edgar   Horrible steep.
> Hark, do you hear the sea?
> Gloucester   No, truly. (4.5.1-4)

Father and son claim to feel the place differently, the divergence rendered here on the level of touch and sound. Taking issue with Goldberg's argument that Edgar's description is persuasive, Stephen Orgel has read this disjunction as gesturing us towards Gloucester's position; for while, as playgoers in the Globe, we apprehend places through linguistic description, the bare stage confirms that "the ground is even" and that there is no sea to be heard.[213] It is only with Edgar's long description, essentially an *ekphrasis* of a painting that exists only in his imagination, that we, with Gloucester, arrive at the cliff:

---

[212] Jonathan Goldberg, "Dover Cliff and the Conditions of Representation: *King Lear* 4:6 in Perspective," *Poetics Today* 5, no. 3 (1984): 537-547, esp. 539.
[213] Stephen Orgel, "Shakespeare Imagines a Theater" *Poetics Today* 5:3 (1984): 549-561, esp. 556.

> Come on sir, here's the place. Stand still. How fearful
> And dizzy 'tis to cast one's eyes so low!
> The crows and choughs that wing the midway air
> Show scarce so gross as beetles. Halfway down
> Hangs one that gathers samphire, dreadful trade!
> Methinks he seems no bigger than his head.
> The fishermen that walk upon the beach
> Appear like mice, and yon tall anchoring barque
> Diminished to her cock, her cock a buoy
> Almost too small for sight. The murmuring surge
> That on th'unnumbered idle pebble chafes
> Cannot be heard so high. I'll look no more,
> Lest my brain turn and the deficient sight
> Topple down headlong. (4.5.11-24)

This description, as Philip Armstrong and others have noted, owes much to perspective painting and appropriates much of the spatial politics implicit in such images to establish the cliff. With Edgar's efforts to locate Gloucester at a particular point – "here's the place. Stand still" – he places his father at what should function as a position of mastery, on the axis of the image's vanishing point, where the perspective of that vision coheres. But Edgar offers his narration as a means of establishing the eye's hegemony over the other senses and, in doing so, his gesture does less to lend Gloucester the agency that should accompany his position than to divest him of whatever remnants of certitude he possesses at this moment. In the fiction, Edgar's eyes measure the space, noting the diminishment that marks the crows and choughs, as well as the samphire-gatherer, before asserting the very relationship between distance and apparent size that characterizes the *techne* of perspective: "yon tall anchoring barque / Diminished to her cock, her cock a buoy / Almost too small for sight." This continual recession, in its reproduction of perspective, ultimately persuades Gloucester

to trust Edgar's sight over his own sensations, and to enter into what appears onstage as another cruel manifestation of an absurd theatricality.[214]

Significantly, however, the tension between Edgar's deception and Gloucester's growing credulity, between Goldberg's affirmation and Orgel's disbelief, rests on the register of perception. Within the drama, as well as within the playhouse, feeling has a constitutive power, making it impossible to separate the conception of the environment from the sensory means by which that conception is created. Indeed, the dramatic tension of the scene derives from this indissolubility. Gloucester's feel of the ground and his experience of silence rather than the sea confirm our sight of the bare stage; and yet Edgar's claim to vision and Gloucester's aural assent to his description render the space of the cliff real, however temporarily. These fissures with regards to the place of the early modern stage, in other words, turn on the question of perception: do we "see" the cliff, or the stage itself? Obviously, uneasily, the answer is both. We reside within the paradox of "see[ing] it feelingly," and our position within the synesthetic assemblage that constitutes phenomenology largely determines our sense of where we are.

In this creation of the space of the cliff, Edgar's ekphrastic description acquires its efficacy in part because it divests the blinded Gloucester of all other means by which he could discern his location. In echolocation, for example, sound provides a means of measuring distance. This method of navigating space through acoustic information offers an important alternative to modes of movement that require vision. As A. Roger Ekirch has

---

[214] Like Goldberg, Armstrong reads Edgar's description in terms of perspective painting, adding that, in Gloucester's failed suicide, the scene becomes anamorphic, staging the gaze that Lacan locates in Holbein's *The Ambassadors*. See Armstrong, "Uncanny spectacles: psychoanalysis and the texts of *King Lear*" *Textual Practice* 8, no. 3 (Winter 1994): 414-434. Turner, building upon James Elkins' *The Poetics of Perspective* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994), argues that the Dover Cliff scene reproduces perspective painting, but argues that, in the scene as well as in painting, one can only perceive objects, never space itself. See *The English Renaissance Stage*, 166-168.

suggested, echolocation was one of many inventive sensory-practices that helped individuals in preindustrial Europe find their way in the night, when the lack of a torch or a candle would deprive their environment of any visual signification.[215] Gloucester, condemned to a world "All dark and comfortless," might benefit from this acoustic approach to the world, and indeed his objection, that the sea in its putative proximity makes no sound, seems to rely on such an attention to the ambient environment (3.7.99). But when Edgar notes that "The murmuring surge / That on th'unnumbered idle pebble chafes / Cannot be heard so high," he deprives Gloucester of the sensory foundation of such an objection. His effort to render Gloucester immobile with the imperative "Stand still," moreover, contravenes the motility with which the father once recognized that the ground was even. Having informed his father that "your other senses grow imperfect / By your eyes' anguish," Edgar proceeds to enact this disabling assertion by depriving Gloucester of what senses he has left. Edgar's persuasion of space, as it were, succeeds in part because visual discernment comes to dominate echolocation and proprioception as modes of knowing the environment.

Gloucester's blindness complicates the oscillation between space and place in *Lear*, underscoring how the scene at Dover cliff invokes competing notions of subjectivity and location to structure its dramatic work. There, Gloucester perceives space more readily than Edgar does, precisely because he perceives place imperfectly. As Turner puts it, "even as Gloucester's blindness makes it impossible for him to perceive the specific location of the 'cliff' …, this same blindness is precisely what will allow him to perceive 'space' while Edgar

---

[215] A. Roger Ekirch, *At Day's Close: Night in Times Past* (New York: Norton, 2006). As an example of echolocation, Ekirch cites Rousseau's *Emile*, where the philosopher claims to use clapping to place himself in a room: "You will perceive by the resonance of the place whether the area is large or small, whether you are in the middle or in a corner" (Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Emile: or On Education*, trans. Allan Bloom [New York, 1979], 133, quoted in Ekirch, *At Day's Close*, 110). Ekirch also notes the use of hearing, touch, and smell to determine one's location outdoors (132-34).

cannot."[216] Rather poetically, Edgar knows that the place he describes is, in fact, no place. At the same time, he fails to grasp the limit of this fiction, the fact that a vast and terrifying openness threatens to overwhelm the place that his words have conjured. By contrast, precisely because he remains unaware of the precise contours of his location, Gloucester feels the space of the play as a kind of empty dimensionality.

Thus, if phenomenology lends itself to the historiographic project of recovering the interlacement of embodiment and emplacement in the early modern period, then Gloucester's place in this project of recovery remains highly paradoxical. Before his approach to Dover cliff, Gloucester claims that blindness diminishes his sense of the world, functioning as a kind of dislocation that Gloucester despairingly embraces moments before asking Edgar to lead him to his suicide: "I have no way, and therefore want no eyes" (4.1.18). Gloucester figures himself as displaced, moving through a sphere in which ideas of specific location are no longer operative. In other words, by interpreting his blindness as a weakening of embodiment as well as a diminishment of place, Gloucester finds himself condemned to recognize the void of space, even in advance of the approach to Dover cliff.

What Edgar presents as a kind of spatial catharsis in his aside to the playgoers – "Why I do trifle thus with his despair / Is done to cure it" (4.5.33-34) – ultimately exacerbates his father's loss of embodiment and emplacement, and this act of going through the fantasy of suicide, far from purging his father of despair, allows Gloucester's sense of a void to become more expansive in its ontology. Through the violence inflicted upon the microcosm of his body, first at the hands of Cornwall and Regan and then through Edgar's *ekphrasis*, Gloucester comes to doubt his orientation within the entire cosmos, no longer knowing which way to turn. When Edgar attempts to lead his father offstage after the defeat

---

[216] Turner, *The English Renaissance Stage*, 169.

of Lear's army and is met with Gloucester's refusal – "No further, sir; a man may rot even here" (5.2.8) – he responds by managing his father's spatial and cognitive orientation concomitantly: "What, in ill thoughts again? Men must endure / Their going hence even as their coming hither. / Ripeness is all. Come on" (5.2.9-11). Edgar locates his father not where he originally left him, in the "shadow of this tree," but "in" a melancholic mindset of "ill thoughts." Privileging Gloucester's mindset rather than his physical location, Edgar proffers what will become the Cartesian line well in advance of Descartes' own writings: thought is its own "space," with no real place in the world.[217] But while Edger urges movement through the world, he also advises a Stoic passivity with regards to these peripatetic thoughts: one "must endure" their movement, traveling in body with the retreating army while remaining motionless in thought. At the moment of Edgar's negotiation of this tension, Gloucester's isolation as a thinking subject does not restore him to a position of (proto-Cartesian) certitude; rather, it signifies his ultimate disorientation within the world, a displacement that he implies in assenting to Edgar with "And that's true too" (5.2.11). This claim does less to affirm one orientation among many possible directions than to accept an impossible, and ultimately directionless, plurality. Disembodied, and therefore displaced, cognition forces Gloucester into a void, and although nature abhors a vacuum, to quote the medieval dictum, Gloucester's plight suggests the means by which such a void might be introduced into the world and assigned a tragic ontology. His fate, ultimately, is the fate of the play itself, in which the "nothing" that haunts the speeches of

[217] In the *Discours de la Méthode*, Descartes separates the mind from its immediate environment in concluding: "that I was a substance, whose whole essence or nature was only in thinking, and which, in order to be, *has no need of any place*, nor is dependent upon any material thing" (*Discours de la Méthode* in *Oeuvres de Descartes* VI, publiées par Charles Adam & Paul Tannery [Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1965], 33; the translation, as well as the emphasis, is my own). Insofar as extension "is the core concept in Descartes' view of space," in Casey's words, this split divorces thought from physical location and renders it placeless at the moment that it becomes immaterial (*The Fate of Place*, 153).

Lear, Cordelia, the Fool, and other characters overwhelms *Lear* to place its dramatic action in an imperceptible space.

In contrast to this horror, however, stands Gloucester's initial recognition of synesthetic thought. To see the world feelingly, I have suggested, is to acknowledge that space is not an *a priori* sphere but an emergent entity, that it cannot be grasped by one sense but rather depends upon the assemblage of disparate perceptions. What Henri Lefebvre would term the "production of space," *King Lear* presents as more of a performative constitution of place; it is an oscillation that occurs between the multiple, often overlapping faculties of perception and cognition, the interpenetrations of which ultimately establish the place, as well as our sense of it.[218] The scene at Dover cliff stages precisely this performativity, and although its implications for the playhouse have long been established, its relationship to Gloucester's spatial apprehension suggests that the production is not simply the plight of a blind father in the service of a fallen monarch; rather, in Gloucester's imperfect placement between early modern phenomenology and Cartesian dualism, the scene reveals that to see feelingly locates us firmly in the gradual unfolding of place as experience.

III. Cognition in the Wild: Lear's Emplacement in the Storm

Like Gloucester in his approach to Dover cliff, Lear struggles to locate himself after being thrust out of doors. The two figures are dim ciphers of one another, and among the multiple resonances that critics have noted between these patriarchs, it is significant to note that they follow the same spatial trajectory within the play: being thrust out of Gloucester's

---

[218] Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (Malden: Blackwell, 1991).

castle, both Lear and Gloucester undergo a disabling experience of disorientation, finding themselves utterly lost in their approach to Dover cliff. While their experiences differ from one another in significant ways – Gloucester must entreat Edgar to guide him to the cliff, but Lear moves in that direction barely aware that others desire him to do so – they nevertheless converge upon emplacement and its ultimate dissolution. In the strange perceptual environment of the storm, Lear becomes partially displaced. It is not simply that his grief and self-pity distract him from the shape of the world around him, but also that his exposure to the elements paradoxically renders him insensitive to their significance. As the duration of his exposure increases, Lear becomes numb to the cold and the rain, and his inability to apprehend these signifiers renders his temporarily displaced. Thus, whereas Gloucester evinces a partial disruption of the progression that Crooke describes, with his blindness qualifying the body's sensory access to the contours of space, Lear's madness represents a profound undoing of those very mechanisms. The king's cognitive dysfunction thereby signifies a further extension of the play's investment in questions of epistemology, embodiment, and location.

By attending to Lear's sense of emplacement, we might also gain a more nuanced understanding of where the storm might be said to occur. Somewhat ironically, the storm's ability to dissolve all points of orientation has implications not only Lear and his followers, but also for those editors and critics who have attempted to place the scene upon "*A Heath*." As F. T. Flahiff has shown, this scenic designation appears neither within the Quartos nor the Folio, but rather owes its origin to Nahum Tate, whose 1681 production of *Lear* claims "*A Desert Heath*" as the site of the storm.[219] When Nicholas Rowe printed his 1709 collection of Shakespeare's dramatic corpus, which Flahiff notes was "the first edition of Shakespeare's

---

[219] F.T. Flahiff, "Lear's Map" *Cahiers elisabethains* 30 (Octobre 1986): 17-33, esp. 22.

plays after the Folio edition," he adopted Tate's suggestion of "*A Heath*" as the storm's place and thereby ensured the profound influence of this effort to combat the play's resistance to cognitive mapping.[220] These editorial decisions have the effect of extending the storm's platial specificity; that is, they localize the scene more forcefully than the play's own suggestion that the scenes occur near Gloucester's castle, which is evidenced by Gloucester's own ability to traverse the distance between his home and the encampment at the hovel (and by Kent's claims that he will do the same).

But this editorial amendment obscures the play's more forceful investment in questions of space and location, as Turner has argued. In his efforts to remove the Heath from our conceptualization of *Lear*, Turner invokes the history of concepts of space to assert that "the 'nothing' of the storm could be said to perform the quasi-scientific space of the 'vacuum' or 'void'."[221] Turner's gesture to the conceptual history of place and spatiality rightfully suggests that *Lear* stages a series of tensions within the early modern period's effort to reimagine the ontology of the environment. Turner finds that the storm, and its invocation of theatrical space, performs "a moment of transition in spatial thinking that we can also see operating at the most rarified levels of Renaissance academic argument, between a neo-Aristotelian scholastic philosophy that could conceive *only* of container or 'place' and the emergence of a distinct notion of 'space' understood as a homogenous, extended medium that precedes and receives all bodies and their movements."[222] By contrast, I find history, and the play itself, to be more resistant, more readily characterized by eruptions of

---

[220] Ibid.
[221] Turner, *The English Renaissance Stage*, 177.
[222] Ibid., 177-8. Turner acknowledges that the history he sketches is somewhat limited, noting in an earlier version of the argument that "the conceptual history is more complicated than my schematic comments do justice to here" ("*King Lear* Without: The Heath" *Renaissance Drama* 28 [1997]: 161-193, esp. 178). My disagreement comes not with the details of his history, but rather in our understanding of how the play invokes that particular history. As I argue here, *King Lear* gestures to an earlier moment in the conceptualization of the ontology of space than Turner has claimed.

alternative spatialities, and thus more accommodating to a genealogy of the loss of place than a clear "transition" would imply. Environment and embodiment continue to inform one another in the early modern period, making emplacement, rather than space as such, a more operative category for thinking about how location is understood and experienced. In the storm, Lear's ability to suffer the chill and Kent's profound attentiveness to the acoustics of the landscape belie their ejection into a vacuum; indeed, they remain deeply attentive to an environment that continually eludes their efforts to grasp it. One might say that the tragedy of Lear's confusion in the storm is not that he finds himself within the vacuum, where there is no place to be felt, but rather that his growing insensitivity to the world around him makes him unable to know and to feel that place for what it is.

For Lear, the feeling of being outdoors comes principally through a sense of coldness. "How dost, my boy?" Lear asks the Fool, "Art cold? / I am cold myself" (3.2.67-68). Before Lear's madness takes hold, he remains sensitive both to the elements around him and to their effect upon other bodies. Indeed, Lear's inquiry represents a rare moment of concern for the experience of others and seems designed to ward off his sense of isolation and psychic fragility. Turning inward, he declares that "My wits begin to turn," as though sensing that his grief and his exposure are leading him towards cognitive dysfunction. Lear's sudden transition from a dim apprehension of his coming madness – "My wits begin to turn" – to his meditation on the feeling of exposure – "How dost, my boy? Art cold? / I am cold myself" – implies an almost causal relationship, where the body's sensitivity to cold renders the mind susceptible to cognitive malfunctioning. In *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, Robert Burton acknowledges precisely this susceptibility in including climatological threats among "the instrumentall causes of these our infirmities;" in particular, he cites the "Aire with his Meteors, Thunder and Lightning, intemperate heat and cold, mighty windes, tempests,

unseasonable weather" as elements responsible for the body's suffering and the mind's distraction in melancholy.[223] According to Lemnius, one reason for this sympathy lies in the fact that the body is consubstantial with the cosmos, both being composed of the same elements; thus, "eue*n* as heat bei*n*g diffused into ech part of ye body imparteth his quality vnto ye humours & maketh ye body, & ye parts therof to be of colour ruddie: so cold imperteth his quality vnto ye me*m*bers & humours, & maketh ye body of colour plate and vnsightly."[224] Lear's transition acknowledges this relationship, however unconsciously. The context of his comments suggests that a heightened sensitivity to exposure – a profound feeling of one's place – allows for a strangely disorientating incorporation of environment into embodiment. The paradox is that this sensitivity to temperature reminds Lear and the Fool of their exposure, of their emplacement out of doors, even as it threatens to render them insensitive to that very knowledge.

In his experience of the elements, the figure of Poor Tom shows precisely how the force of the external world can imprint itself destructively upon the self. Although Edgar's performance of madness remains instrumental to a larger purpose, and suggests more about the early modern discursive construction of mental illness than about its etiology, his enactment of cognitive failure is significant precisely because it represents an imaginative figuration of insanity. His refrain of "Poor Tom's a-cold," repeated in some form or another throughout the scene, reasserts that place, experienced through the tactile medium of cold, can define the mind's constitution. Indeed, the Fool reads Poor Tom's madness as the effect of exposure, remarking, "This cold night will turn us all to fools and madmen" (3.4.72).

---

[223] Robert Burton, *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, ed. Thomas C. Faulkner, Nicolas K. Kiessling, and Rhonda L. Blair, 6 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989-2000), 1:125.

[224] Lemnius, *The Touchstone of Complexions*, sig. 63r. In *English Ethnicity and Race in Early Modern Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003), Mary Floyd-Wilson offers a comprehensive study of this relationship, using what she calls "geohumoralism" as a model for understanding the relationship of environment to embodiment in the early modern period.

Edgar's disguise thereby stages a link between corporeal suffering and cognitive dysfunction, one that would have been legible to early modern playgoers given its status as a commonplace in humoral theory. In repeatedly signifying cold as an effect of exposure, moreover, this link makes place a crucial factor in the mind's preservation.

Gradually, Lear's exposure to the elements renders him insensitive to the contours of the world around him. Like Gloucester, he becomes partially displaced, unable to locate himself within an increasing illegible environment. And the tragedy of this disorientation is the ease with which it compounds itself: as Lear and Poor Tom suggest, a heighted sensitivity to place can lead to madness, but that madness effects a more profound dislocation, as it shatters the very mechanisms by which a location comes to be known. The next time he appears onstage, Lear alludes to this insensitivity in asserting a sensory indifference to the storm. When Kent entreats him to enter the hovel, Lear resists, stating:

> Thou think'st 'tis much that this contentious storm
> Invades us to the skin. So 'tis to thee;
> But where the greater malady is fixed,
> The lesser is scarce felt. (3.4.6-9)

Figuring embodiment as a tremulous enclosure, one that must protect an inwardness from the storm's invasion, Lear claims to remain impermeable with regards to the external world.[225] The reason for this seeming strength lies not in Lear's ability to withstand suffering, but rather in his prior subjection to it; finding a "greater malady" within himself, what he glosses later as an apprehension of "filial ingratitude," Lear's soul becomes concentrated

---

225 On the history of this figuration, see Michael Schoenfeldt's *Bodies and Selves in Early Modern England: Physiology and Inwardness in Spenser, Shakespeare, Herbert, and Milton* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999) and David Hillman's *Shakespeare's Entrails: Belief, Scepticism, and the Interior of the Body* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).

upon this affect, and in lessening its distribution throughout the body, the *anima* leaves the flesh unfeeling. He explains:

> When the mind's free,
> The body's delicate. This tempest in my mind
> Doth from my senses take all feeling else
> Save what beats there: filial ingratitude. (3.4.11-14)

For Lear, the soul extends into particular places within the body, directed there almost volitionally as the mind directs its attention to disparate sites of feeling. Given the soul's bipartite function in enabling thought and sustaining sensation, Lear proposes a cognitive economy, an exchange between two points of the soul's cathexis: the mind and the body. In fact, his comments describe the recalibration of an innersubjective ecology. The physicality of Lear's sense of "filial ingratitude," its introjection into his body, makes the affect acquire the characteristics of a heart, the thing that "beats there" and sustains a cognitive fixation, in what Lear actively figures as his "mind." The affect that prompts this localization of the mind deep within the body pulls the soul's faculties away from the extremities and renders the feeling flesh insensible to its surroundings: "senses," or the organs themselves, lack the sensation that the soul should provide. In other words, as grief pulls the focus of Lear's soul from his flesh toward his thoughts, his insentient body leaves the former monarch exposed and unaware of his place within the world. This displacement is less metaphorical than one might imagine; for although Lear's "place" as monarch and as patriarch enables a certain fantasy of omnipotence that is irrevocably shattered in the storm, it is also his experience of emplacement through embodiment that suffers. Lear's complementary displacements – his disorientation within geographic space, the placelessness of thought within his body – prove to be a final prompt to madness.

At the same time, these displacements give some stability to Lear's madness and guarantee its continuation until the fallen monarch is reunited with Cordelia. Although exposure and grief make Lear insensitive to his emplacement, he retains a conceptual grasp of the importance of location; that is, Lear retains a purely cognitive understanding of place at the moment that his senses begin to fail him. Addressing the "Poor naked wretches, wheresoe'er you are, / That bide the pelting of this pitiless storm," Lear looks to these individuals in a moment of failed identification, seeking to comprehend their tolerance of the inclement elements by asking "How shall your houseless heads and unfed sides, / Your looped and windowed raggedness, defend you / From seasons such as these?" (3.4.28-32). Recognizing the crucial difference between his temporary exposure to the elements and their more or less ceaseless placement out of doors, Lear undertakes to treat himself with exposure and so entreat his body to greater insensitivity: "Take physic, pomp, / Expose thyself to feel what wretches feel, / That thou mayest shake the superflux to them / And show the heavens more just" (3.4.33-36). This desire for greater insensitivity and its efficacy in leading Lear to praise the exposed Edgar only deepen Lear's madness, however. Looking upon Edgar, Lear celebrates the bedlam beggar for his ability to withstand exposure: "Thou wert better in a grave than to answer with thy uncovered body this extremity of skies," Lear begins, before determining that Edgar's virtue lies in his exposure and attempting to mimic him: "Unaccommodated man is no more but such a poor, bare, forked animal as thou art. Off, off, you lendings! Come, unbutton here" (3.4.91-92, 95-98).

I have argued that the attenuation of a sense of place is both the beginning of Lear's madness and the final thrust of grief. His distraction lies not simply on the level of affect, although the play often suggests excessive sorrow as the reason for Lear's psychic fragmentation (when the disguised Kent informs Gloucester that Lear's "wits begin

t'unsettle," Gloucester justifies this turn by reasserting the reason for Lear's affective state: "Canst thou blame him? / His daughters seek his death" [3.4.144-46]). Nor can Lear's madness be imagined as a purely geohumoral disposition, a melancholia induced by exposure to the cold. Rather, embodiment and affective experience become elements within a larger system, in which a sensing and suffering corporeality becomes one element of a cognitive ecology required to establish a sense of place. The disruption of this ecology severs a sense of emplacement from the experience of embodiment and thereby ensures Lear's profound displacement within the play. Although the play represents the role of grief and self-pity in fracturing Lear's psyche, it also stages his displacement through madness. In doing so, these scenes underscore the intimate relationship of emplacement to embodiment in the early modern period.

That cognitive dysfunction effects a kind of displacement, and that this inability to perceive the contours of one's location, in turn, sustains a sense of delirium, are crucial points for understanding the formation and maintenance of early modern subjectivity. Perhaps there is no more telling a testament to this relationship than in Michel de Montaigne's letter to his father on the death of Estienne de la Boétie. One of the principal sites of inquiry in "De l'Amitié," the friendship between la Boétie and Montaigne was of such intensity that Montaigne himself endeavors to explain its charge through the famous and cryptic utterance: "Because it was he, because it was I."[226] Recounting la Boétie's final moments in the letter, however, Montaigne writes movingly of his friend's ardent desire for assurance that he remained emplaced:

> Then, among other things, he began to entreat me again and again with extreme affection to give him a place; so that I was afraid that his judgment was shaken. Even when I had

[226] Michel de Montaigne, *The Complete Works*, trans. Donald M. Frame (New York: Knopf, 2003), 169.

> remonstrated with him very gently that he was letting the illness carry him away and that these were not the words of a man in his sound mind, he did not give in at first and repeated even more strongly: 'My brother, my brother, do *you* refuse me a place?' This until he forced me to convince him by reason and tell him that since he was breathing and speaking and had a body, consequently he had his place.[227]

This dialogue, the last that Montaigne records in his letter, is surprisingly philosophical for being the final exchange between two intimates, particularly friends whose souls, as Montaigne writes in "De L'Amitié," "mingle and blend with each other so completely that they efface the seam that joined them, and cannot find it again."[228] But even acknowledging Montaigne's reticence to such philosophy, specifically his implication that la Boétie's infirmity was responsible for the tone ("he forced me to convince him by reason"), the scene demonstrates with great pathos the constitutive role of place in early modern personhood. La Boétie's final thoughts concern a space of belonging, and his repeated demand for such a location implies the degree to which he has lost sense of his embodied place within the world. For Montaigne, these thoughts repeatedly signify a kind of cognitive dysfunction; la Boétie's "judgment was shaken," "he was letting the illness carry him away," and his claims reveal that he is not "in his sound mind." But Montaigne's syllogistic proof of la Boétie's emplacement within his body, even as it aims to restore cognitive probity to a dying man, ultimately misses the point of la Boétie's terror. "'True, true,'" la Boétie remarks in response to Montaigne's argument, "'I have one [that is, a place], but it is not the one I need; and then when all is said, I have no being left.' 'God will give you a better one very soon,' said I. 'Would that I were there already,' he replied. 'For three days now I have been straining to

---

227 Ibid., 1288.
228 Ibid., 169.

leave.'"[229] Montaigne's proof lies upon what I have argued is a foundational relationship in the early modern period, the emergence of place from an experience of embodiment. But la Boétie seeks to transition from that sense of embodied location to an experience of dwelling, a kind of early modern *Dasein*, which Montaigne himself seems unable to recognize. This tension between the two conceptualizations of place is nicely captured in the original text of Montaigne's letter, where la Boétie repeatedly speaks of "vne place," in contrast to Montaigne's claim that his friend's body is proof of "son lieu."[230] Although both terms designate a "part of space," the former more readily implies a site "where one finds oneself," and so easily slides into metaphors of location, in the sense of a "place of honor" or "being in one's place."[231] For la Boétie, Montaigne's figuration of emplacement through embodiment is accurate if inadequate, and he concludes their discourse by imagining a deeper sense of localization, marked by the social, spiritual, and affective experiences of belonging more so than questions of sensation and cognition.

Because la Boétie aligns this sense of belonging with death, Montaigne's letter cannot follow its protagonist to discover the contours of some new and disembodied location, the "undiscovered country" of Hamlet's musings, and so it concludes at the moment of la Boétie's passing (3.1.81). After Lear's consumption in grief and madness, however, Kent and Cordelia play Montaigne to his la Boétie and manage to persuade the fallen king of his emplacement, first within his body and then within the world by translating an ambient environment into a geography of discrete locations. Or rather, if Kent and Cordelia's efforts

---

[229] Ibid., 1288.

[230] *Oeuvres Complètes d'Estienne de la Boétie. Édition nouvelle augmentée en deux volumes*. II, Introduction, bibliographie et notes par Louis Desgraves (William Blake and Co. Édit, 1991), 179.

[231] "Place" and "lieu" are defined respectively as "Partie d'un espace ou d'un lieu" and "portion déterminée de l'espace" ("Place, II" and "Lieu, I.1" *Le Grand Robert de la Langue Française*, deuxième édition, Tomes VII et V [Dictionnaires Le Robert, 1985]). But this is qualified in the case of the former as: "Endroit où on se trouve," with a series of examples that includes "Place d'honneur" and "Être à sa place" ("Place, II.1, II.3, III.3").

are as limited in their efficacy as Montaigne's, they at least bear witness to Lear's gradual recovery of his sense of location. Cordelia's first entreaties of her father – "How does my royal lord? How fares your majesty?" – find Lear still unable to apprehend his place within the world (4.6.37). Like la Boétie, Lear finds himself hovering in the liminality between this world and the next, claiming that "You do wrong to take me out o'the grave," and furthering this misprision in asking Cordelia: "You are a spirit, I know. Where did you die?" (4.6.38, 42). But Lear's apparent certainty of his position gives way to confusion: "Where have I been? Where am I?" (4.6.45). Questions of location obsess Lear at this point, with this repetition of "Where." As the recognition of his displacement begins to wash over him, questions of embodiment follow hard and fast upon this sense of dislocation: "I know now what to say. / I will not swear these are my hands," Lear claims, before he attempts to quell doubt with experiential proof: "Let's see: / I feel this pin prick" (4.6.47-49). I pause here at the semantics of Lear's confusion, at the specific utterances he offers in the midst of his uncertainty, because these claims imply the substance of Lear's struggle at this moment: coming to terms with his embodiment, recognizing his soul's place within the body rather than its distribution into the ether at the moment of death, is a prerequisite to Lear's understanding that he remains within his former kingdom and so to the dissipation of his distraction in grief. Indeed, in making the tremulous confession that "I fear I am not in my perfect mind," Lear uses objects of platial importance as evidence for his continued infirmity:

> Methinks I should know you, and know this man;
> Yet I am doubtful for I am mainly ignorant
> *What place this is*; and all the skill I have
> Remembers not these garments; nor I know not
> *Where I did lodge* last night. (4.6.56-61. Emphasis added)

Neither endowed with the memory of his previous location nor fully able to apprehend his current emplacement, Lear claims these limitations as a sign of cognitive dysfunction. Even in the slow process of recovery, Lear distrusts his sense of place, and his doubt underscores his profound reliance upon the spatial awareness of others. His first question after recognizing Cordelia concerns his location – "Am I in France?" – but when Kent attempts to emplace Lear by supplementing his feeling of emplacement with an understanding of his current location, explaining that Lear is "In your own kingdom, sir," Lear retains a kind of fearful skepticism towards this answer. He cries, "Do not abuse me," emphasizing that in his imperfect cognitive state, he could be told anything, conceptually emplaced anywhere, and that his sense of location is firmly dependent upon Kent and Cordelia, just as Gloucester's awareness was once grounded upon Edgar (4.6.69-71).

Lear's displacement and gradual recovery underscore the role of embodied cognition in establishing the contours of a location. The perceptual elements that readily offer themselves up to a receiving body must be organized within the mind for a sense of the ambient environment to take hold. But these elements, too, must be linked with other, more conceptual signifiers of location in order to "place" that location in a wider sphere, as geographic coordinates or cardinal directions allow us to recognize this feeling as that space. For these reasons, Lear's placement in the storm partially aligns with what Turner calls the "quasi-scientific space of the 'vacuum' or 'void'," to the degree that Lear's inability to perceive the contours of place locates him in the interstices between different elements of matter.[232] But Lear and his followers experience the spatiality of the storm, not as "nothing" but as a weakening or attenuation of embodied location. And the sense that this attenuation

---

[232] Turner, *The English Renaissance Stage*, 177.

unfolds as a fragmentation, as a repeated shattering of the self into smaller and smaller pieces, evinces the tragic dimension of the company's displacement in the storm.

Moreover, to claim that "Lear ends up in this space because he has suddenly become aware of it," as Mary Thomas Crane asserts in an otherwise persuasive argument, is to mistake the nature of Lear's displacement. Her claim makes the void an *a priori* dimension that anticipates our knowledge of it and thereby presumes that Lucretian physics was more successful in replacing a conceptualization of emplacement through embodiment than the experiences of Lear and la Boétie suggest.[233] The terms of Lear's madness and recovery suggests the opposite, in fact. Far from discovering the spatial dimension that subtends all perceptual experience of place, Lear becomes mad because he loses the capacity to know his location.

For Gloucester and for Lear, achieving a sense of location depends upon the successful manipulation of a vast cognitive system. Their thoughts are distributed both through their bodies and across certain elements of the external world, including Edgar's deceptive language, the cold and sound of the storm, and Cordelia's repeated efforts to answer her father's question of "Where?" The play thereby suggests how cognitive ecologies might be felt and understood experientially. Without sacrificing what Tribble and Sutton rightly view as one of the strengths of cognitive ecology – the explanatory power it brings to systems that exceed the individual – I want to emphasize that this model changes our view of individuals and environments in equal measure. Instead of imagining an "isolated,

---

[233] Mary Thomas Crane, "The Physics of *King Lear*: Cognition in a Void" *Shakespeare International Yearbook*, Vol. 4, ed. Graham Bradshaw, Tom Bishop, and Mark Turner (2004): 3-23, esp. 14-15. Crane makes this point as a part of a larger discussion, however, and her claim that the play stages "a world in which the 'fit' between perception and reality has been questioned" and that, "as a result, human beings feel radically dispossessed," accords with my argument that the tragedy of *Lear* involves a partial disruption of emplacement and embodiment (19). Whereas Crane suggests that the play's invokes atomistic physics, I find its treatment of embodied experience to be more reliant upon an earlier paradigm.

unsullied individual," whose "mind is then projected outward into the ecological system," this approach forces us to recognize that cognition has an ecological foundation "from the start."[234] Thus, in *Lear*, we see how place functions as the scaffolding for thinking, remembering, and desiring. But the play also suggests that this act of thinking through the environment can actually establish, alter, or otherwise reconstitute that very entity. Neither upon a heath nor within a quasi-scientific void, Lear and his retinue find themselves in an ambient and peculiarly labile place, an effect of the fact that embodied thought largely determines our sense of where we are.

Indeed, Lear's refutation of a common space in which he and Kent suffer the storm together underscores the contested status of location in the play. The slow formation of an environment, by the very fact of its temporal drag, gives space and time for a struggle over the precise meaning of that place, and Lear's experience suggests how readily this complex negotiation may occur within an individual's conceptual and perceptual sense of being-in-the-world. Thus, although cognitive ecology most often denotes a complex system exceeding and anticipating the individual, it is useful to imagine Lear's distribution across faculties of cognition and perception as a manifestation "of the rich interconnectivity of brain, body and world" that Edwin Hutchins describes in his pioneering work on cognitive ecology.[235] For Lear, as well as for Gloucester, this interconnectivity between environment and embodiment makes place a constitutive element of personhood, at the same time that it allows places to be created and reshaped through embodied thought. *Lear* thereby foregrounds what might be called the affective significance of place within early modern culture. In Lear's madness, as well as in Gloucester's blindness, the play meditates upon the profound fragility of

---

[234] Tribble and Sutton, "Cognitive Ecology," 96.
[235] Edwin Hutchins, "Cognitive Ecology," *Topics in Cognitive Science*, 2 (2010): 705-715, esp. 711.

emplacement, the ease with which the perceptual and conceptual mechanisms for locating oneself might be disrupted. The result is a chaotic and cruel separation of space and subjectivity, where deracination leads to madness, despair, and ultimately death.

IV. The Performativity of Space

Reading *King Lear* through the framework of historical phenomenology and cognitive ecology foregrounds the play's interest in emplacement and in the tragic consequences of its dissolution. But this approach might also shed light on our understanding of the places of early modern performance. As I previously suggested, *Lear* remains deeply metatheatrical in its consideration of the relationship between perception and place, and a critical approach that underscores this relationship should also encourage us to recall the importance of place on the early modern stage, a fact that otherwise historically attentive critics have sometimes overlooked. In *Elizabethan Stage Conventions and Modern Interpreters*, for example, Alan Dessen implies that an investment in the place of dramatic fiction represents a highly modern concern, the result of editorial decisions, like that of Nicholas Rowe to localize Lear's encounter with the storm on "*A Heath*." In Dessen's words, "modern readers have thereby been conditioned to *expect* placement of a given scene ('where' does it occur?), regardless of the fluidity or placelessness of the original context or the potential distortion in the question 'where?'"[236] Dessen's critique extends and explicitly cites the work of Gerald Eades Bentley in his influential *Shakespeare and His Theatre*, where he asserts that "productions at the Globe were basically *placeless*, and Shakespeare composed all his plays with far less attention to the

---

[236] Alan C. Dessen, *Elizabethan Stage Conventions and Modern Interpreters* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 84.

place of the action than modern readers assume."[237] In evaluating the technologies of the early modern stage, then, Dessen and Bentley trace the opposite trajectory that Edward Casey notes in his study of philosophical treatments of space and place. Casey asserts that "place" came to be subordinated to "space" over the course of the early modern period, suggesting a historical tension between the two concepts that I have tried to foreground with the idea of emplacement.[238] In contrast, Dessen and Bentley find in the decades following the early modern period an anachronistic fixation on locale, where Shakespeare's editors placed greater emphasis on theatrical setting than Shakespeare himself ever did.[239]

This tension between theory and praxis, between philosophical speculation and theatrical work, invites us to reconsider the Globe's role in mediating between these different approaches to the environment. The opposition that Bentley notes – that Shakespeare "wrote a drama of persons, not a drama of places" – overlooks the degree to which persons and places were coterminous or consubstantial with one another in the early modern period.[240] In *Lear*, this intersection is not simply a question of Edgar and Gloucester in a recently divided country, nor that of a fallen monarch contending with the elements; it also functions as a metatheatrical event, a consideration of the relationship between playgoers and their place in the Globe. Far from being uninterested in questions of locale, Shakespeare's use of a proto-phenomenological approach to place in *Lear* suggests not only

---

[237] Gerald Eades Bentley, *Shakespeare and His Theatre* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964), 53.
[238] See Casey, *The Fate of Place*.
[239] Here, Bentley rightly acknowledges that this shift owes much to transformations in theatrical practice: "In the early eighteenth-century theatres, sets were commonly used, and so Nicholas Rowe invented places in which he thought the scenes of Shakespeare's plays should take place, and for early eighteenth-century readers and playgoers these suggested settings (since they conformed to the accustomed place convention) seemed not only normal, but inevitable" (*Shakespeare and His Theatre*, 56). But noting that scenery would be anachronistic with regards to Shakespeare's plays, Bentley forgets that early modern performance had its own means of constituting space and place.
[240] Ibid., 57.

that the stage was invested in spatial reconstitution, but that it strove with equal vehemence to perform this constitution through its playgoers.

Indeed, if emplacement furthers our understanding of the relationship between environment and embodiment in *Lear*, then it also has the potential to illuminate the generation or representation of places within the playhouse. In a seminal work of spatial theory, Henri Lefebvre argues that what he calls "the production of space" depends upon the ability of subjects to apprehend and to signify particular places. Through a triad of the perceived, the conceived, and the lived, the physicality of a place becomes aligned with the praxis that makes a site meaningful: there is, in other words, "a close association, within perceived space, between daily reality (daily routine) and urban reality (the routes and networks which link up the places set aside for work, 'private' life and leisure)."[241] The organization of space as the "urban reality" of a built environment constitutes and is reconstituted by the "daily reality" that is the practice of everyday life. Rather than a frame that contains quotidian experience, then, space emerges through an oscillation between the perceived physicality of a place and the practice of that physicality, of which perception and cognition are a part.

Although Lefebvre's interest lies with a Marxist understanding of practice as labor, his claim to an intersection of perception and praxis neatly parallels the production of space within theater, as Lefebvre himself briefly suggests. If "theatrical space" is marked by an "interplay between fictitious and real counterparts," then "such theatrical interplay" means that "bodies are able to pass from a 'real', immediately experienced space (the pit, the stage) to a perceived space – a third space which is no longer either scenic or public."[242] The third

---

[241] Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, 38.
[242] Ibid., 188.

space of theater announces itself as the liminality between what playgoers perceive in the playhouse and the scene they imagine as an effect of the performance. Insofar as this imaginative work is a kind of practice, theatrical space emerges through the same intersection of the perceived, the conceived, and the lived that, for Lefebvre, produces social space; performance solicits a particular spatial practice from the playgoers, one of translating the perceived space of the playhouse into the conceived locus of the drama. In this way, the phenomenology of theatrical space parallels the production of space, suggesting that places within and beyond the early modern playhouse come into being through the same invocation of perception and cognition.

While *Lear* foregrounds the role of experience in shaping the environment, it invokes this intimacy between place and personhood precisely in order to stage its dissolution. Throughout the play, disorientation within physical and social space is both tragic and the foundation for subsequent loss. In this manner, *Lear* extends its meditation on embodied thought in order to show the obverse of place's dependence upon psychic production, namely the role of the environment in establishing and grounding subjectivity. As Martin Heidegger argues in *Being and Time*, fragmentation can actually bring the constitutive properties of a thing into focus, by defamiliarizing a particular object and forcing us to consider what makes it functional.[243] So too does *Lear*'s dramatic insistence upon displacement allow it to affirm the psychic work, the perceptual and conceptual assemblage, that defines space as a phenomenological dimension. The claim that space is ultimately

[243] Heidegger makes this claim as part of a larger discussion of the phenomenological formation of things, of their translation from handiness or ready-to-hand (*Zuhandenheit*) to objective presence or presence-at-hand (*Vorhandenheit*). In the breaking of an object, we pass from the latter to the former: "presence-at-hand is given when there is a *disruption* of the totality of reference which constitute the Being of the ready-to-hand" (*Being and Time*, 173). To put this more clearly through a concrete example, we can say that when a hammer breaks, it loses its status as a functional object – its presence-at-hand – and the broken handle and hammerhead revert into a materiality full of potential, ready to become a hammer again (if fixed) or to remain a handiness that we might use for something else.

phenomenological means both that places come into being through the body and that we, in our embodiment, rely upon this sense of emplacement. *Lear* transforms the precariousness of this experience into a kind of ecological thought, a haunting meditation on the indissolubility of environment and embodiment.

Chapter Four

Bartholomew Fair and the Performativity of Space

Ben Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair* begins with a debate about spatial representation. Given its title, the play will ostensibly stage the fair of St. Bartholomew, held annually in Smithfield. But "When't comes to the fair once," the Stage-keeper bemoans, "you were e'en as good go to Virginia for anything there is of Smithfield."[244] Jonson, it seems, has failed to capture the flavor of the festival: "He has not hit the humors; he does not know 'em. He has not conversed with the Barthol'mew birds, as they say" (Induction. 12-13). In sharp contrast, the Scrivener argues for a certain similitude between Smithfield and the Hope Theater, claiming that "though the fair be not kept in the same region that some here perhaps would have it, yet think that therein the author hath observed a special decorum, the place being as dirty as Smithfield and as stinking every whit" (Induction.154-158). Between the Stage-keeper and the Scrivener, then, the Induction articulates two forms of spatial representation, the one dependent upon the persons who populate a place, the jugglers and little Davies that one might expect to find at the fair, and the other tied to phenomenological experience. For the Scrivener, the feeling of a place aligns the Hope Theater with Smithfield more palpably than geographic region, and it is this feeling, I will argue, that Jonson's play continually invokes in its efforts to stage Bartholomew Fair.

---

[244] Ben Jonson, *Bartholomew Fair*, in *English Renaissance Drama*, ed. David Bevington, Lars Engle, Katharine Eisaman Maus, and Eric Rasmussen (New York: Norton, 2002), Induction.10-11. All further citations are from this edition.

Bartholomew Fair poses a series of questions regarding theater's ability to represent space, and the metathearical Induction establishes what will be a central concern in Jonson's invocation of Smithfield. How can performance craft a particular space, when the bare stages of the public amphitheaters make mimetic representation impossible? Moreover, when a space like Smithfield is known to the playgoers, how does performance cite its spatial referent, coupling the theater's methods for creating space – through description, signs, and the occasional prop – with the playgoers' memories of that place? Through its Induction and through its representation of Smithfield, *Bartholomew Fair* stages what might be called a performative constitution of space, where thinking and feeling become the means of creating space in its full phenomenological force.

Theories of performativity, as Judith Butler has argued, trace the gradual formation of things, their slow coming into being through "reiterative and citational practice."[245] For certain ontological categories, most notably that of embodiment, Butler has shown that an assumed facticity, a belief in the immutable materiality of a thing, obscures the way that the constitutive elements of a particular entity are gradually formed. We must reconceptualize "the notion of matter, not as site or surface, but as *a process of materialization that stabilizes over time to produce the effect of boundary, fixity, and surface we call matter*," and this materialization, Butler argues, is "a kind of citationality, the acquisition of being through the citing of power."[246] If performativity reminds us that matter must be materialized, then my interest here is that it might illuminate the ways in which spaces are made material and consequential.

Acknowledging Butler's own assertion that theatricality and performativity are distinct though sympathetic to one another, I first wish to establish a framework for

---

[245] Judith Butler, *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex"* (New York: Routledge, 1993), 2.
[246] Ibid., 9, 15.

understanding the performativity of space on the early modern stage.[247] As the Scrivener reminds us, early modern performance relied upon embodied experience as a means of creating space, of translating the bare stage of the public amphitheater into a dramatic setting. For this reason, I also argue for the importance of cognitive ecology in understanding *Bartholomew Fair*'s performance of space. As I suggested in the Introduction, cognitive ecology was an essential element within the early modern playhouse, where, as Evelyn Tribble has shown, acting companies transformed the built environment into "a vehicle of thought," manipulating that space as part of a larger mnemonic system.[248] The success of the performance, however, depended not only upon the players and their ability to harness the ecological nature of cognition. As the argument between the Stage-keeper and the Scrivener suggests, the playgoers also held a crucial role in shaping the performance, as their readiness (or refusal) to assemble the disparate elements of the play defined the success of *Bartholomew Fair* in staging Smithfield.

Blending cognitive ecology and performativity helps us to understand how early modern drama reimagines and reconstitutes space. More specifically, it reveals the generative relationship between environment and embodiment within *Bartholomew Fair*, a relationship that criticism of the play has continually obscured. Insofar as critical studies of the play have considered space, they emphasize Jonson's relationship to what Peter Stallybrass and Allon

---

[247] In "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory," *Theatre Journal* 40:4 (December 1988), Butler suggests that theatrical performance and the performativity of gender might illuminate one another, but she also cautions against the assumption that the two are, essentially, the same. For Butler, theatrical performance may be bracketed, in a sense: "In the theatre, one can say, 'this is just an act,' and de-realize the act, make acting into something quite distinct from what is real. Because of this distinction, one can maintain one's sense of reality in the face of this temporary challenge to our existing ontological assumptions about gender arrangements" (527). The phenomenology of performativity in social contexts, however, is quite different.
[248] Evelyn B. Tribble, *Cognition in the Globe: Attention and Memory in Shakespeare's Theatre* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 3.

White have called the "symbolic domain of 'authorship.'"[249] This investment in authorship, in individual production, and in metaphorical space has obscured the play's interest in reimagining the physicality of space through its representation of Smithfield. Thus, while Stallybrass and White rightly argue that *Bartholomew Fair* cannot be understood in terms of mimetic representation – "there can be no question of understanding that play either as a homology of the 'real' Bartholomew Fair, or as a mere thematic pillaging of popular custom by an aloof and appropriative high culture" – they overlook the play's capacity to form a matrix, or cognitive system, wherein readers and playgoers think through the production of space.[250] Rather, Stallybrass and White displace agency from the play to its author, concluding that Jonson "tried to define a new role in which authority was invested in authorship itself" and that this conceptual redefinition "was an act performed *on* and *against* the theatrical script, so as to efface its real conditions of production."[251] More recently, James Mardock has shown *Bartholomew Fair*'s investment in the relationship of space to subjectivity, noting that "place is intrinsic to identity and selfhood" within the play.[252] But rather than examine the play's investment in rethinking the materiality of space, Mardock follows Stallybrass and White in focusing on questions of authorial production. In doing so, he reimagines the play as a kind of rigged game: "Just as *Epicoene* and *The Alchemist* stage competitions between the playwright and his characters over interior theatrical spaces, *Bartholomew Fair* becomes an explicit contest of urban literacy, of how to read the city, and it is another contest that Jonson is guaranteed to win."[253] These accounts presume a metaphorical space within and around the play, a site in which discursive formulations of

---

[249] Peter Stallybrass and Allon White, *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression* (London: Methuen, 1986), 61.
[250] Ibid.
[251] Ibid., 74-75.
[252] James D. Mardock, *Our Scene is London: Ben Jonson's City and the Space of the Author* (New York: Routledge, 2008), 98.
[253] Ibid.

authorship, theatricality, and literacy become organized in a new conceptual topography. As a result, they overlook the play's engagement with the materiality of space, its effort to conceive and to reimagine the formation of space through the invocation of Smithfield.

Bartholomew Fair imagines space as an emergent entity. By figuring Smithfield as a site in which individuals and ideologies repeatedly collide with one another, the play reconceptualizes space as an environment that stems *from* those interactions rather than anticipating and creating them. In doing so, *Bartholomew Fair* foregrounds the productive and generative potential of bodies within space. Like the atoms of the Lucretian universe, which shape the cosmos through continual swerving, the characters of *Bartholomew Fair* transform Smithfield through their collective movement. At a time when London itself was being transformed, its streets and suburbs being rebuilt to accommodate a growing population, *Bartholomew Fair* seems to direct itself at the philosophical problems latent within this urban transformation.[254] Specifically, the play meditates on the relationship between mental and material reconceptualizations of space, asking how competing ideologies conflict with one another and, in conflicting, produce a new material domain?

In what follows, I argue that *Bartholomew Fair*'s contribution to this debate lies in its interest in cognitive ecology. From the Induction to Leatherhead's puppet play, *Bartholomew Fair* traces the relationship between conceptualizations of the environment and the material

---

[254] John Schofield examines the material transformation of London, as well as the discourses surrounding such change, in "The Topography and Buildings of London, ca. 1600" in *Material London, ca. 1600*, ed. Lena Cowen Orlin (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000): 296-321. Laura Williams also demonstrates that the urban fabric of London was dramatically reshaped in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, with her claims focusing on green space in and around the city; see "'To recreate and refresh their dulled spirites in the sweet and wholesome ayre': green space and the growth of the city," in *Imagining Early Modern London: Perceptions and Portrayals of London 1598-1720*, ed. J.F. Merritt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 185-213. Finally, Rachel Ramsey argues that the Elizabethan period was marked by a particular "discourse of building," which "collapsed distinctions between London's material and social topography, using alterations in the former to understand and control the alarming transformations in the latter" ("The Language of Urbanization in John Stow's *Survey of London*," *Philological Quarterly* 3.4 (2006), 249).

transformation of that space. First, I show that the Induction attempts to codify certain cognitive practices, certain ways of imagining space within the playhouse, as part of the play's larger meditation on captivation and emplacement. I then establish a set of connections between the Induction's theorization of space and the play's representation of Smithfield. Specifically, in the contrast between Cokes's profound absorption into the fair and Busy's disenchantment with the place, *Bartholomew Fair* envisions competing ideologies about the relationship of environment and embodiment in the early modern period. Locating these ideologies within Smithfield, the play shows they affirm, negotiate, and undermine other forms of spatial apprehension at the fair, colliding to produce new topographies. These interactions, between conception and navigation, between movement and the materiality of space, show *Bartholomew Fair* to be deeply invested what I have called the performative constitution of space. But perhaps more suggestively, *Bartholomew Fair* imagines the production of space through displacement and disorientation, a kind of negative ontology in which disruption actually brings space into being.

I. "When't comes to the fair once": Performativity and the Theatrical Conception of Smithfield

i. The Performative Constitution of Space

Performativity assumes a continual and mutually informative relationship between the materiality of a body and its signification. According to Butler, bodily morphology comes into being through the layering of matter and meaning, where the substance of the body has to be made to signify for it to be incorporated into a psychic and social framework. "The

materiality of the body is not to be taken for granted," Butler notes, "for in some sense it is acquired, constituted, through the development of morphology," with morphology representing the psyche's distribution throughout the somatic structure.[255] In this process of engendering the materiality of the body, signification plays an essential role in apprehending the shape and sensations of the flesh, incorporating those fragments into a coherent morphology. "Bodily contours and morphology are not merely implicated in an irreducible tension between the psychic and the material," as Butler argues, "but *are* that tension."[256] From this foundation, we can better understand Butler's claim that the gendered body is the result of melancholia, the grief over a lost attachment that can neither be acknowledged nor relinquished in mourning; the materiality of the gendered body is very much shaped and stabilized in a particular morphology through this psychic signification.[257] So too can we recognize the subversive potential of performativity, where the repetition of difference allows the gendered body to become other than what it was, to resist heteronormativity by refusing identification.[258]

In privileging the constitutive relationship of signification and materiality, performativity is uniquely poised to illuminate the ways in which space – social space as well as physical space – comes into being. The critical geographers Nicky Gregson and Gillian Rose have already argued for this illuminative potential, asserting that Butler's "radical

---

[255] Butler, *Bodies That Matter*, 69.
[256] Ibid., 66.
[257] See, in particular, Judith Butler, *The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997), 132-150.
[258] In *Bodies That Matter*, Butler argues that "The task is not, as a consequence, to multiply numerically subject-positions *within* the existing symbolic, the current domain of cultural viability," but rather to rethink the symbolic order and thereby reconstitute it: "it will be crucial to find a way both to occupy such sites [i.e. "a variety of dynamic and relational positionalities within the political field"] *and* to subject them to a democratizing contestation in which the exclusionary conditions of their production are perpetually reworked (even though they can never be fully overcome) in the direction of a more complex coalitional frame" (114-115).

antifoundationalism provides a crucial critical tool for denaturalising social categories and for destabilising dominant forms of social reproduction" with regard to social space.[259] Indeed, because performativity reveals that materiality is not a given, but rather an accomplishment, it functions as a critical tool for tracing the continual renegotiations that produce social and physical space. As Rose asserts elsewhere, it is the fact "that space is also a doing, that it does not pre-exist its doing," which makes performativity a useful means of examining the production of space.[260] Gregson and Rose focus primarily on social space, tracing the disruption of "the hierarchies embedded in physical location" without demonstrating that physical location is itself transformed through citational practice.[261] Building upon their work, then, I want to demonstrate that performativity can shed light upon the materialization of space. Specifically, performativity illuminates the means by which physical space is apprehended, signified, and produced as a material dimension.

Within the early modern playhouse, space represents a collusion between the materiality of the environment – the architectural features of the amphitheater, the stage properties, the language of the play, and so forth – and the signification that can be mapped onto that materiality. As I noted in the previous chapter, theatrical space is defined by "interplay between fictitious and real counterparts," in the words of Henri Lefebvre.[262] The success of this interplay depends upon the performance's ability to continually resignify its environment, to make artifacts that would otherwise distract from the play a meaningful component of that fiction. Through this imaginative resignification, Lefebvre argues, the "bodies" of the playgoers "are able to pass from a 'real', immediately experienced space (the

---

[259] Nicky Gregson and Gillian Rose, "Taking Butler elsewhere: performativities, spatialities and subjectivities" *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 18 (2000): 438.
[260] Gillian Rose, "Performing Space" in *Human Geography Today*, ed. Doreen Massey, John Alen, and Philip Sarre (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999), 248.
[261] Gregson and Rose, "Taking Butler elsewhere," 446.
[262] Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (Malden: Blackwell, 1991), 188.

pit, the stage) to a perceived space – a third space which is no longer either scenic or public."[263] In this way, the third space of theater emerges from a series of oscillations: between perception and conception, between materiality and signification, and between the physicality of the playhouse and the imagined import of those environmental features. To see this process in terms of performativity is to bring these oscillations together, reinterpreting them as the repetitive acts that produce theatrical space.

The Scrivener's seemingly offhand remark, that the playhouse is "as dirty as Smithfield and as stinking every whit," thereby suggests that *Bartholomew Fair* is deeply invested in the performative constitution of space. The phenomenological contours of Smithfield are regularly invoked in the play as a means of establishing the shape and sense of that place. For instance, one of the "stinking" elements that helped to overlay the space of the play with the space of the fair was the residual presence of animals. Smithfield was known throughout the year as a market for livestock, and this practice was so integral to the identity of the place that trade of animals was allowed to continue even when the outbreak of plague brought all other activities to a halt. In 1593, for example, Elizabeth issued a proclamation forbidding the observance of St. Bartholomew's Feast, owing to the concern that it might "increase and disperse the infection of the sicknesse;" but the pronouncement makes an explicit exception for the "sale of horses & cattell, & of stall wares."[264] One of the reasons that the playhouse was "as dirty as Smithfield and as stinking every whit," then, seems to have been the lingering scent of animals in both locations.[265] The Hope Theater,

---

[263] Ibid.
[264] Elizabeth's proclamation appears in *A Booke Containing All Svch Proclamations, as were pvblished dvring the Raigne of the late Queene Elizabeth, collected together by the industry of Humfrey Dyson, of the City of London Publique Notary* (London: Bonham, Norton, and Iohn Bill, 1618), 319.
[265] Indeed, Eugene M. Waith takes this to be the substance of the Scrivener's allusion ("The Staging of *Bartholomew Fair*," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 2:2 [Spring 1962], 183-4). Andrew Gurr makes a similar

where *Bartholomew Fair* was first performed on October 31, 1614, represented an architectural innovation as being "the first dual purpose arena" in early modern London, with a stage that could be removed to accommodate bear baiting.[266] The Book-holder alludes to this dual purpose in the Induction, when he chastises the Stage-keeper for offering his judgment of the play to the audience: "Your judgment, rascal? For what? Sweeping the stage? Or gathering up the broken apples for the bears within?" (Induction.50-52). Even without this reference, the lingering odor of the animals would have been noticeable within the Hope, compounded by the fact that the bears were kept close to the amphitheater itself.[267]

The Scrivener's reference to dirt furthers this sense of a phenomenological similitude between Smithfield and the Hope Theater. Dirt, or dust, seems to have been an essential part of Bartholomew Fair, cited in many of intriguing etymologies of the Piepowder Court, the ad hoc juridical system used to punish petty theft and other minor transgressions committed at the fair. The name derives from the French *pied poudre*, "so called from the dusty feet of the suitors" to the court, according to a nineteenth-century historian of the fair, or alternatively "because justice is done there as soon as dirt can fall from the foot."[268] The ostensible democracy of the court, its promise of swift and impartial justice, was thus embodied in the fairgoers, who could not have escaped being besmirched with dirt while navigating the unpaved space of Smithfield. In the Hope Theater, those playgoers standing

---

point in *The Shakespearean Stage 1574-1642*, fourth edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 145. Neither, however, considers the relationship of this phenomenology to memory.

266 Gabriel Egan, "The Use of Booths in the Original Staging of Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair*," *Cahiers elisabethains*. 53:4 (1998): 49, citing Oscar Brownstein, "Why didn't Burbage Lease the Beargarden? A Conjecture in Comparative Architecture," in *The First Public Playhouse: The Theatre in Shoreditch 1576-1598*, ed. Herbert Berry (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1979), 81-96. 49. Waith also notes that the Hope Theater had a removable stage ("The Staging of *Bartholomew Fair*," 182).

267 Leah Marcus, *The Politics of Mirth: Jonson, Herrick, Milton, Marvell, and the Defense of Old Holiday Pastimes* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), 43.

268 *An Historical Account of Bartholomew Fair, containing A View of its Origin, and the Purposes it was First Instituted For. Together with a Concise Detail of the Changes it hath undergone in it Traffic, Amusements, &c. &c.* (London: John Arliss, 1810), 7-8.

in the yard might have felt an immediate and tactile relationship to the space being evoked. For them, the Piepowder Court of Jonson's play was strangely palpable, while for those playgoers in the upper tiers, the Scrivener's comment offers a call to bear witness, to observe the "special decorum" of dirt that ties the playhouse to the fair.

Finally, certain architectural features further aligned the Hope Theater with the fair at Smithfield. As I have suggested, the playhouse had a removable stage to accommodate bear-baiting, and this kind of scaffolding strongly resembled the temporary structures used for the various spectacles at Bartholomew Fair. The two platforms visually reinforced one another, as Eugene Waith has noted in arguing that "the stage on which Smithfield is to be presented is also somewhat the kind of stage one might see at Smithfield."[269] The smell, feel, and appearance of space, then, become essential elements within what may be called the particular cognitive ecology of *Bartholomew Fair*. Synthesizing disparate sensations into a unified impression, the Induction creates this cognitive ecology in order to align Smithfield with the Hope Theater. In emphasizing this perceptual similitude, moreover, the play suggests that the embodied experience of space – what one might call a sense of emplacement – constitutes the real substance of a location. More so than any reference to the geographic "region" of Smithfield or of the Hope Theater, it is this sense of emplacement that enables *Bartholomew Fair* to translate the one into the other.

ii. Performativity and the Displacement of Memory

In endeavoring to create new associations, however, the Induction must contend with the memories that playgoers already have of Smithfield. Once again, the Stage-keeper's

---

[269] Waith, "The Staging of *Bartholomew Fair*," 184.

resistance to the performance provides a means of thematizing this work. One of Jonson's principal failures in the play, according to the Stage-keeper, is that some of the best sights of Bartholomew Fair are missing: "He has ne'er a sword-and-buckler man in his fair, nor a little Davy to take toll o'the bawds there, as in my time" (Induction.13-15). This reference to the past, to the fair as it was "in my time," shows that the Stage-keeper's memory of Bartholomew Fair provides the foundation for his critique of the play. In this metatheatrical moment, Jonson seems to be wrestling with a real problem of performance, the potential for memory to afford the playgoers a comparative perspective, through which they will determine his play to be lacking. Among the many clauses of his contract with the audience, the Scrivener devotes one to such remembrance, attempting to banish it from the playhouse: "It is further covenanted, concluded, and agreed that, how great soever the expectation be, no person here is to expect more than he knows or better ware than a fair will afford, neither to look back to the sword-and-buckler age of Smithfield, but content himself with the present" (Induction.112-116). The Scrivener initially mediates the relationship of the fair to the play in suggesting proper proportion; memory should afford no greater "expectation" of what the theater can stage than is strictly reasonable. But the Scrivener's conclusion goes further and, in addressing the "sword-and-buckler age of Smithfield," directs itself at the Stage-keeper's complaint: playgoers must forget the fair that they know, divest themselves of particular memories, and embrace "the present" that is this particular performance.

In another instance, the Scrivener proposes a series of memorial exchanges, explaining that Jonson has replaced some of the fair's attractions with specific dramatic figures: "Instead of a little Davy to take toll o'the bawds, the author doth promise a strutting horse-courser, with a leer drunkard, two or three to attend him in as good equipage as you would wish" (Induction.116-119). These substitutions bear a curious fidelity to the Stage-

keeper's comments regarding the "humors" of the fair, despite the fact that the Book-holder and the Scrivener are absent when the Stage-keeper offers his judgment to the playgoers. The similitude between the complaints and the contractual substitutions implies a deliberate strategy; rather than wait for playgoers to remember their favorite elements of Bartholomew Fair and then to bemoan their absence from the play, the play endeavors to prompt such memories with the Stage-keeper's complaints and to resolve this disjunction between memory and performance before it manifests itself. Together, the Stage-keeper and the Scrivener form a cognitive system for managing memory within the playhouse, to the specific end of creating a theatrical Smithfield.

Discursively, then, the Induction relies upon a tension between experience and expectation. On the one hand, it encourages the playgoers to recall the specific contours of Smithfield, to remember the smell, feeling, and appearance of that place, in order to recognize the many affiliations between Bartholomew Fair and its performative counterpart in the Hope Theater. This "special decorum," as the Scrivener calls it, depends upon memory, insofar as thought furnishes a material connection between a playgoer's experience of the fair and their subsequent encounter with its representation in the Bankside playhouse. On the other hand, the Induction proscribes specific forms of remembrance from the playhouse. The Scrivener's contract directs the playgoers to think on "the present," to forget the fair as they have experienced it and to fixate, instead, upon the pleasures of the performance. In short, the Induction invokes an embodied and preconscious form of memory, in contrast to the spatial and episodic memory that sustains whatever cognitive map playgoers may have of Smithfield. The intimate relationship between remembrance and sensation becomes another means of merging the performance with its spatial referent.

In its efforts to invoke and to reimagine the space of the fair, then, the Induction envisions a complex and strangely hierarchical cognitive ecology. Its valuation of embodied memory bears witness to the fact that thought processes are often "unevenly distributed across the physical, social, and cultural environments," as Tribble and John Sutton have argued, and that "some systems will place more or less weight on central control, or on particular forms for cognitive artifacts and social systems."[270] While cognitive distribution is thus often uneven in practice, the Induction theorizes an asymmetry between types of memory – a memory of feelings, rather than of figures – in order to place the playgoers within a particular cognitive framework. That is to say, the Induction imagines the playgoers and the performance as elements within a wider cognitive system, elements that couple unevenly with one another in realizing the dramatic fiction of *Bartholomew Fair*.

Within this ecology, disruption has a strangely generative power. As I have argued, the play relies upon embodied thought to disrupt or displace whatever cognitive maps the playgoers might hold of Smithfield, substituting its own staging for those conceptual representations of space. It is not a question, then, of the performance's mimetic fidelity to Bartholomew Fair, but rather of the play's investment in disrupting a sense of the fair itself.[271] If performativity helps us to recognize that locations are always saturated with signification, that memory continually invests the materiality of place with meaning, then it also suggests that these intersections transform space into a contested domain. Because spaces blend "the real and the imagined," they become "the terrain for the generation of

---

[270] Evelyn Tribble and John Sutton, "Cognitive Ecology as a Framework for Shakespearean Studies," *Shakespeare Studies* 39 (2011): 95, 98.
[271] For example, Thomas Cartelli claims that "Jonson promises to present, if not 'reality' itself, at least a theatrical facsimile which, however distorted, essentially remains faithful to its model or source" ("*Bartholomew Fair* as Urban Arcadia: Jonson Responds to Shakespeare" *Renaissance Drama* 14 (1983): 158). More recently, Marcus argues for what she calls a "symbolic equivalence" between the space of the performance and the space of the fair (*The Politics of Mirth*, 44).

'counterspaces,' spaces of resistance to the dominant order," as the critical geographer Edward Soja has argued.[272] *Bartholomew Fair* reimagines Smithfield as precisely such a terrain. Its topography is constituted through the complex layering of remembrance and repression, where certain memories are invoked and others displaced.

One of the reasons that performativity illuminates the generation of Bartholomew Fair is that the fair itself lacks a stable ontology. Although the Stage-keeper repeatedly insists that the play little resembles the fair, there is, of course, no "Bartholomew Fair" at all; rather, there are only different iterations, unique performances of the fair once a year, which coalesce to form a unified idea of what constitutes the feast of St. Bartholomew at Smithfield. Through the Induction, *Bartholomew Fair* engages this performative reconstitution. Invoking the memories of the playgoers, the performance inserts itself within the processual formation of the fair, becoming another memorial layer within the (re)signification of Smithfield. Again, *Bartholomew Fair*'s peculiar ontology lies in creating a Smithfield only through displacing and disrupting the Smithfield already known to playgoers. Turning to the staged fair, we will see how experiences of disorientation and disruption define the feel of Smithfield, in both Cokes's enthrallment and Busy's disenchantment with the space.

II. "I'the heart o'the fair": Thinking Smithfield

In its representation of Smithfield, *Bartholomew Fair* shows that the substance of space, the very ontology of location, lies in performativity, in sensory experience, and in cognitive mapping. Onstage, the fair is not simply created through physical spaces – through Ursula's booth, Leatherhead's puppet theater, the stocks, and so forth, which anchor the

---

[272] Edward W. Soja, *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996), 68.

performance within a particular section of Smithfield – but also through the physical movements of Bartholomew Cokes, Busy, Overdo, and several other characters through Smithfield. The passage of these figures across a staged terrain, and their continual resignification of the places in which they find themselves, encourages us to consider the relationship of thought to space. For if embodied cognition and mental mapping work together to define the phenomenological contours of space, then attending to this hybridity is essential for grasping how early modern drama stages and transforms spatial experience. It encourages us to think beyond the representational power of early modern drama, where "place-based dramatic narratives" produce space simply by showing them. While it is certainly true, as Jean Howard has argued, that "playwrights helped representationally to construct the practices associated with specific urban spaces," these practices depend upon a second, cognitive system of work, which performance elicits at the same time as staging it.[273] It is essential, then, to think about thinking as its own kind of practice, with its own normative constraints.

In his study of *insulaires*, or atlases of islands, Frank Lestringant has remarked that "space, and more precisely topography, is a form of thought."[274] Space represents the material organization of information and knowledge, whether in architectural features, urban design, or in the preservation of an ostensibly natural environment. Because this organization extends across a time, it anticipates the individual actors who appear within a particular location, shaping their movements and their apprehensions in deeply subtle

---

[273] Jean E. Howard, *Theater of a City: The Places of London Comedy, 1598-1642* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), 3.
[274] Frank Lestringant, *Le Livre Des Îles: Atlas et Récits Insulaires de la Genèse à Jules Verne* (Librairie Droz, 2002), 31. My translation. The original text reads « l'espace, et plus exactement la topographie, est une forme de pensée. »

ways.[275] Thus, as Lestringant argues, our problem "is not that of thinking space," since, on the contrary, "it's space that thinks" in storing and deploying certain forms of knowledge, well in advance of our interactions with it.[276] In *Bartholomew Fair*, the performativity of Smithfield is tied to the space's ability to function as the medium of thought, to assert itself through and upon a vast cognitive system composed of individuals, elements of the built environment, and practices within space. In what follows, I trace the movements of two characters, Cokes and Busy, through the fair, in an effort to show how their agency is circumscribed by the spatiality of the fair. While both figures display a considerable amount of agency in their approach to the fair, and in doing so manifest antithetical attitudes towards the relationship of environment and embodiment, their movement is profoundly constrained by the space of the fair. This constraint, in turn, reshapes the space of the fair. Busy's conceptual efforts to distinguish himself from his environment will eventually manifest themselves as a material gesture. He tears down Trash's booth, upsetting her wares, and this spectacle of violence persuades Leatherhead to dismantle his own shop as a protective gesture. As we shall see, the disappearance of the booths leaves Cokes utterly disoriented within the fair. Through this interaction, Smithfield acquires agential power, as the booths mediate not only the relationship between Cokes and Busy but also their respective investments in the environment. *Bartholomew Fair* figures space as both an emergent entity

---

[275] In *Emergence: The Connected Live of Ants, Brains, Cities, and Software* (New York: Scribner, 2001), Steven Johnson argues that cities learn in the sense of storing information within their physical organization (101-113). His discussion usefully suggests how a built environment extends ideas and thoughts across time, becoming a form of thought in and of itself.

[276] Lestringant, *Le Livre Des Îles*, 31. The original text reads « Le problème n'est pas de penser l'espace; c'est l'espace qui pense. » Although it seems counter-intuitive, this conceptualization of space might be usefully compared with the poststructuralist understanding of language, which literary criticism has readily engaged. For poststructuralist theorists like Jacques Derrida and Jacques Lacan, language anticipates the subject, in the sense that it has been generated, shaped, and defined by populations and cultural systems well in advance of a particular individual's encounter with that language. Speaking phenomenologically, in other words, language is always prior to us; it is a system that we enter into and reshape through our use of it. Although they are ultimately distinct, one might imagine space in similar terms, given that every environment that an individual encounters has been constituted, built, or transformed, prior to their engagement with that site.

and a cognitive system, a site that shapes and is, in turn, reshaped by the thoughts of individual actors.

Performativity usefully theorizes agency at the intersection of the subject and social space. In Butler's theorization, performativity continually concerns itself with the displacement or disruption of an external order, a medium like the Lacanian symbolic order, which reproduces itself within and through an individual psyche.[277] Although Smithfield lacks the amorphous, and therefore insidious, constitutive power of the symbolic order, the agency in its performative (re)production lies at the intersection of the individual and the environment. As we shall see, Cokes' captivation with the sites of Smithfield enables *Bartholomew Fair* to stage the cognitive ecology that binds environment and embodiment together. It also manifests the peculiar constitutive power latent within their dissolution, the degree to which space and subjectivity emerge in their full ontological clarity only in being severed from one another. Busy's navigation of the fair bears further witness to this point.

Through and around these characters, Smithfield realizes itself as a space. The fair's self-generation, as it were, recalls the principle of emergence, wherein a "self-organizing system" establishes itself through "the interactions of multiple simple components without the benefit of a leader, controller, or orchestrator."[278] In some forms of emergence, the agency of such interactions shifts from the individual actors to the environment itself, where "these interactions," in the words of Andy Clark, are "mediated by active and often quite

---

[277] In *Bodies That Matter*, Butler argues that the subject and the external order are mutually constitutive of one another; the latter acquires its shape and stability only through the former's continual identification with its demands: "The imaginary practice of identification must itself be understood as a double movement: in citing the symbolic, an identification (re)invokes and (re)invests the symbolic law, seeks recourse to it as a constituting authority that precedes its imaginary instancing. The priority and the authority of the symbolic is, however, constituted *through* that recursive turn, such that citation, here as above, effectively brings into being the very prior authority to which it then defers" (108-9).
[278] Andy Clark, *Being There: Putting Brain, Body, and World Together Again* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1997), 73.

complex environmental structures."[279] Such structures might include a booth, which constitutes a particular environmental feature at the same time that it generates other features, such as the various pathways through the fair that characters trace in their search for that particular booth. The emergent properties of the fair, then, include the particular movements of Cokes and Busy, but they properly contextualize these individual efforts as constitutive of a larger entity, namely Smithfield itself. Early in *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression*, Stallybrass and White ask, "How does one 'think' a marketplace?" Their conclusion, that "Only hybrid notions are appropriate to such a hybrid place," affirms the importance of turning from the subjective signification of a place to the emergent organization of those significations as the materiality of space, as the site that characters and playgoers readily recognize as Bartholomew Fair.[280] Indeed, in understanding the fair as a kind of Thirdspace, or what Soja calls the layering of the real and the imagined within a particular environment, we can recognize how movement, attention, and disenchantment combine as a cognitive system to reshape Smithfield in *Bartholomew Fair*.[281]

i. The Captivation of Bartholomew Cokes: The Fair as *Umwelt*

At the house of John Littlewit, Cokes and Busy anticipate their coming dissolution within the fair, the deterritorialization of their desires and their subjectivities within the space of Smithfield. Cokes, in a typically foolish assertion, suggests his intimate relationship to the

---

[279] Ibid., 73-74. See also Johnson, *Emergence*, 101-113.
[280] Stallybrass and White, *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression*, 27.
[281] Soja proposes the concept of Thirdspace in order to disrupt the distinction between an objective, physical space and the subjective meanings that might attach themselves to that site: "*Everything* comes together in Thirdspace: subjectivity and objectivity, the abstract and the concrete, the real and the imagined, the knowable and the unimaginable, the repetitive and the differential, structure and agency, mind and body, consciousness and the unconscious, the disciplined and the transdisciplinary, everyday life and unending history" (*Thirdspace*, 56-7).

fair in calling it his own. The only purpose of his journey to Smithfield, he tells Littlewit and his guests, is "to show Mistress Grace my fair. I call't my fair because of Barthol'mew: you know, my name is Barthol'mew, and Barthol'mew Fair" (1.5.63-65). Cokes' flair for asserting an obvious parallel as though its discovery were innovative continually wears upon the characters of the play, most notably his ward Wasp. But while his utterance mistakes the relationship between self and space as one of ownership, Cokes rightly implies that he is, to an extent, coextensive with his environment. Wasp has already complained that Cokes's utter captivation with his environment makes it impossible to journey with him: "Why, we could not meet that heathen thing all day but stayed him," Wasp asserts, recalling a recent tour of London. "He would name you all the signs over, as he went, aloud," as though the signs for taverns and shops called forth something from Cokes, unbidden and autonomic, "and where he spied a parrot or a monkey, there was he pitched, with all the little long coats about him, male and female; no getting him away!" (1.4.112-117). It is not simply that Cokes reads the signs aloud, externalizing what decorum demands remain internal apprehension, but his fascination also renders him immobile; he becomes "pitched," like a tent, becoming, as it were, another feature of the environment that he should navigate.

Cokes' captivation with the space of London is paradoxical, for his excessive enthusiasm continually risks arresting the very activity that his interest should inspire: namely, that of consumption. As Karen Newman has noted, navigating the early modern city was an act already imbued with proto-capitalist potential: "Walking the city was undertaken for myriad purposes – to carry on business, to shop and consume," and thus, "in short, to absorb the social knowledge offered in streets, shops, by criers and street sellers, in outdoor

theaters, by passersby."[282] But Cokes' overidentification with the ideal consumer threatens to render him immobile, contravening the very movement upon which commerce depends. This captivation is paradoxical, however, insofar it risks a profound and unproductive stasis. At the fair itself, Cokes finds himself enraptured with the wares of Leatherhead and Trash, and his interest is no impediment to consumption. Although Wasp complains that the group has become fixed within space – "Why the measles should you stand here with your train, cheaping of dogs, birds, and babies?" – Cokes demonstrates himself to be surprisingly diffuse within the space of Smithfield (3.4.27-28). When Joan Trash entices him, asking "Will Your Worship buy any gingerbread, very good bread, comfortable bread?," the stage direction reads: "*He runs to her shop*" (3.4.92-93, s.d.). Cokes's captivation, then, evinces a peculiar spatial logic. Whereas Wasp imagines a linear progression through space, governed by discrete and deliberative decisions about movement, Cokes's approach is almost aleatoric. He passes from one site of consumption to another, as a bee passes from flower to flower, or in Wasp's own metaphor, as a bird drawn into a trap: "He's flown to another limebush; there he will flutter as long more, till he ha' ne'er a feather left" (3.5.17-18).

Cokes's profound investment in the landscape offers one way of understanding the emergence of space and spatiality from organism-environment relations. Captivation, as Giorgio Agamben has shown in *The Open*, concerns an animal's utter absorption into its environment, an investment so profound that it dissolves the psychic and signifying differences between the animal and the landscape. At this moment, the animal does not exist within a world, but rather in what Agamben calls, drawing upon the work of Jakob von Uexküll, the *Umwelt*: "the environment-world that is constituted by a more or less broad

---

[282] Karen Newman, *Cultural Capitals: Early Modern London and Paris* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007), 60.

series of elements that [Uexküll] calls 'carriers of significance' (*Bedeutungsträger*) or of 'marks' (*Merkmalträger*), which are the only things that interest the animal."[283] Translating an environment into a set of signifying elements, the concept of the *Umwelt* effectively proliferates the number of spaces within a given place: "There does not exist a forest as an objectively fixed environment," Agamben writes, but rather "there exists a forest-for-the-park-ranger, a forest-for-the-hunter, a forest-for-the-botanist," and so forth, until we reach the more radical, non-anthropocentric instance of the forest-for-the-tick.[284] For that animal, the *Umwelt* of the forest is defined by odor, temperature, and a typology of surfaces. The tick's investment in the warmth and scent of mammalian skin represents its captivation, its apprehension of these features to the exclusion of other signifying elements within space. This investment also suggests how perception and preconscious thought, as elements of captivation, can define the contours of space.

For Agamben, captivation distinguishes the animal from the human, the *Umwelt* from the environment. Insofar as boredom signals our disinterest in the world around us, this affect of inattention and listlessness becomes, in Agamben's words, "the metaphysical operator in which the passage from poverty in world to world, from animal environment to human world, is realized; at issue here is nothing less than anthropogenesis, the becoming Da-sein of living man."[285] But Cokes never arrives at this state. A bird flitting to a limed bush, Cokes does not become bored with the space of Smithfield, but rather his captivation continues even when the signifying elements of his *Umwelt* no longer exist. After Busy's outbursts prompt Leatherhead and Trash to leave their booths, Cokes finds himself unable

---

[283] Giorgio Agamben, *The Open: Man and Animal*, trans. Kevin Attell (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004), 40.
[284] Ibid., 41.
[285] Ibid., 68.

to locate these vendors, and this minor disorientation figures Cokes's utter confusion within the space of the fair. "By this light," he complains, "I cannot find my gingerbread-wife nor my hobbyhorse-man in all the fair, now, to ha' my money again. And I do not know the way out on't, to go home for more" (4.2.23-26). Without the booths, Cokes finds himself unable to navigate the fair; it is not simply that those architectural features provided landmarks within the vast and undifferentiated space of Smithfield, but also that the booths and the goods contained within them constitute the signifying elements of Cokes's *Umwelt*. They are markers of his captivation, defining the environment and the individual simultaneously. Cokes himself figures this intimacy in revisiting the name he shares with the fair, complaining that "the fair should not have used me thus," as it did in his recent cozening, if for no other reason than "for my name's sake" (4.2.76-77).

More significantly, when Trash and Leatherhead disappear from the stage, effectively transforming the topography of the fair, Cokes claims to have lost himself as well as his bearings within Smithfield. "Friend, do you know who I am, or where I lie? I do not myself, I'll be sworn," he tells Troubleall, testifying to the intersection of space and subjectivity, of embodiment and emplacement, in the early modern period (4.2.79-80). Cokes' inquiries invoke a foundational assumption of the early modern episteme – that knowing one's place was a means of knowing one's self – and hence he entreats Troubleall to lead him back to his estate: "Do but carry me home, and I'll please thee; I ha' money enough there" (4.2.80-81). There, the familiarity of space coincides with the familiarity of a particular place in society, and Cokes's ability to dispense money, as he has done so throughout the fair, becomes a means of guaranteeing his identity. Margaret Tudeau-Clayton has rightly noted that Cokes articulates the loss of himself through the loss of objects and other people, with his complaint – "I ha' lost myself, and my cloak and my hat, and my fine sword, and my

sister, and Numps, and Mistress Grace" – showing a peculiar logic of accumulation, where "the only distinction made is to the loss of the bargain of hobby horses and gingerbread," the very things that Cokes buys from Leatherhead and Trash, which "is prioritized as 'the worst of all'" (4.2.81-83).[286] Cokes's readiness to define himself interrelationally, to ground his subjectivity upon a network of material, economic, and affective ties, shows both his continued captivation within the external world and the relationship of that captivation to an ecology of the self. These relationships, in other words, reveal that Cokes is inchoately aware that he is coextensive with the fair, an intersection of space and subjectivity that he continually misconstrues as proprietary (the name of Bartholomew implying ownership).

Although Cokes's permeability figures a real ontological relationship, the intersection of space and subjectivity within the early modern period, it is continually signified within the play as a mark of idiocy, another indication that Cokes's last name, meaning "fool" or "coxcomb," is the perfect aptronym. In the midst of another plot to rob Cokes, Edgeworth remarks that "A man might cut out his kidneys, I think, and he never feel 'em, he is so earnest at the sport," to which Nightingale concurs in adding, "His soul is halfway out on's body at the game" (4.2.44-46). Together, the thieves suggestively figure the soul as both contained and diffuse, material in its compactness and liquid in its flow. In his rejoinder to Edgeworth, Nightingale figures the equivalence of the kidneys to the soul; the one may be drawn out of the body with the same blend of distraction and invasion as the other, both being things that a thief can take and hold. But Nightingale's jest also implies that the soul is a physical force, something that might be drawn out of the body with enticement or intense

---

[286] Margaret Tudeau-Clayton, "'I do not know my selfe': the topography and politics of self-knowledge in Ben Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair*," in *Textures of Renaissance Knowledge*, ed. Philippa Berry and Margaret Tudeau-Clayton (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003), 186. Alexander Leggatt also suggests that Cokes figures his identity through the accumulation of objects in *Introduction to English Renaissance Comedy* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), 141.

concentration, and so his comments seem to rely upon a humoral understanding of embodiment, where corporeal fluids and animal spirits establish the soul's immanence within the body and its immediate environment.[287] Attention to the environment, in being "earnest" at what one finds there, can fixate the soul so firmly upon the space of its dwelling that it has no mechanisms left for sentience, for the "feel" of a thief's knife in the back.

For Edgeworth and Nightingale, then, the ecological nature of Cokes's cognition is a sign of his idiocy. Their rhetoric conflates the distribution of the soul with its dispersion. Indeed, Edgeworth goes further in his critique of Cokes's cognitive capacities, rebuking Nightingale for the implication that their target has a mind at all:

> Talk of him to have a soul? Heart, if he have any more than a thing given him instead of salt, only to keep him from stinking, I'll be hanged afore my time, presently. Where should it be, trow? In his blood? He has not so much to'ard it in his whole body as will maintain a good flea, and if he take this course, he will no ha' so much land left as to rear a calf within this twelvemonth. (4.2.55-61)

Edgeworth's critique of Cokes first plays upon the soul as a bifurcated entity; at the same time that the embodied soul functions as the seat of reason, imagination, and memory, it sustains the body's vital functions. Edgeworth radically suggests that this animating force has been supplanted within Cokes. In place of a soul, Cokes's body is sustained, or preserved, by nothing more than the "salt" that keeps meat from rotting. But Edgeworth's efforts to locate the soul – "Where should it be, trow? In his blood?" – more readily suggest the relationship of thought to space, and they mediate the abrupt transition in Edgeworth's critique from Cokes's idiocy to his land. Cokes' inability to maintain his soul within his body, the fact that

---

[287] Gail Kern Paster argues for this ecological understanding of early modern humoral theory in *Humoring the Body: Emotions and the Shakespearean Stage* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004). In *Philosophy and Memory Traces: Descartes to Connectionism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), moreover, John Sutton demonstrates that early modern humoral theory can be understood as a form of distributed cognition.

he “has not so much to’ard it in his whole body as will maintain a good flea,” prefigures his eventual displacement: “if he take this course, he will no ha’ so much land left as to rear a calf within this twelvemonth,” being turned out of his estate for insolvency.

Edgeworth’s inquiry into the place of Cokes’s soul furthers the play’s interest in a spatial configuration of consciousness. More specifically, it builds upon Wasp’s prior claim that the mind of Cokes and the fair already contain one another:

> Would the fair, and all the drums and rattles in’t, were i’your belly for me! They are already i’your brain. He that had the means to travel your head, now, should meet finer sights than any are i’the fair, and make a finer voyage on’t, to see it all hung with cockleshells, pebbles, fine wheat straws, and here and there a chicken’s feather and a cobweb. (1.5.90-95)

Wasp contrasts two forms of consumption here, wishing that the fair had been integrated into Cokes’s belly, where presumably, its nutrients being absorbed, the residua would be excreted. In contrast, Cokes has incorporated the fair into his mind, where there is no such process of digestion. That fair, defined primarily through objects and strange artifacts of Cokes’s imagination, mirrors the Bartholomew fair that Cokes himself will later navigate, in that both are constituted through tchotchke, through “drums and rattles” and similar ephemera. As Jonas Barish has noted, Wasp figures “the interior of Cokes’s head as a kind of idiot wasteland,” transforming the mind into an environment: “the void implies a physical space which might be filled with more substantial matter than it is.”[288] The problem, for Wasp as well as Edgeworth, is that Cokes’s captivation produces its own economy of attention and absorption, where the soul ceases to be concentrated within the brain and becomes, instead, reconstituted through the artifacts that lie within and beyond the body.

---

[288] Jonas A. Barish, “*Bartholomew Fair* and its Puppets” *Modern Language Quarterly* 20:1 (1959): 4.

Cokes's thoughts, then, are repeatedly figured in environmental terms. Either his mind represents a space unto itself, a kind of *Wunderkammer* of London commodities, or it does not exist, and the proof against its immanence within the body lies in Cokes's continual captivation with the world. Through cognitive ecology, we can see how this captivation, this investment in the external, stages a real relationship between organism and environment, one that is continually overlooked or overwhelmed when we operate on the level of higher cognitive processes. "Biological cognition is highly selective," according to Clark, "and it can sensitize an organism to whatever (often simple) parameters reliably specify states of affairs that matter to the specific life form."[289] In other words, as Clark later suggests, environments are always realized through complex cognitive processes, and the idea of the *Umwelt* readily illuminates the way that human perception and embodied thought interact with one another to produce a sense of the external world.[290]

In *Bartholomew Fair*, many characters resist this interaction. Preferring to imagine a stable distinction between the self and its immediate environment, these figures mock those individuals who, much like Cokes, find themselves constituted and redefined through their emplacement. But the play continually reveals the impossibility, or at least the unsustainability, of such a stance. In particular, as Busy's absorption into the fair gives way to disenchantment and hypocritical disgust, the play satirically implies that environment and embodiment cannot be fully separated from one another.

---

[289] Clark, *Being There*, 25.

[290] Developing the previous point, Clark makes the environmental implications of his work on embodied thought explicit: "Many readers will surely agree that even advanced human perception is skewed toward the features of the world that matter with respect to human needs and interests. The last and most speculative of our short list of morals suggest that this skewing penetrates more deeply than we ever imagined. In particular, it suggests that our daily perceptual experiences may mislead us by suggesting the presence of world models more durable and detailed than those our brains actually build" (26-27). In other words, what we take to be the external environment may be, in a very real sense, an achievement of embodied cognition.

ii. Zeal-of-the-land Busy and the Disenchantment with Space

Whereas Cokes is largely defined by this captivation, Zeal-of-the-land Busy figures himself and his identity as a Puritan against the seductive power of place. Seeking a kind of spiritual dispensation in advance of their arrival at the fair, Dame Purecraft entreats Busy to discourse at large about the sanctity of eating pig at the fair: "I would be satisfied from you, religiously-wise, whether a widow of the sanctified assembly, or a widow's daughter, may commit the act without offense to the weaker sisters" (1.6.46-49). Busy's response initially hinges upon the corrosive power of Bartholomew Fair as a particular space; while the pig "may be eaten, very exceeding well eaten," outside of the fair, "in the fair, and as a Barthol'mew pig, it cannot be eaten; for the very calling it a Barthol'mew-pig, and to eat it so, is a spice of idolatry, and you made the fair no better than one of the high places" of idol worship (1.6.54-58). The place is the problem, as Busy quickly deduces. Smithfield renders a purified pig profane once more. But as Littlewit pushes him to relent, feebly punning that "in state of necessity, place should give place," Busy diminishes the power of space over a particular subjectivity (1.6.60-61). He concludes that the "place is not much, not very much; we may be religious in the midst of the profane, so it be eaten with a reformed mouth, with sobriety and humbleness, not gorged in with gluttony or greediness" (1.6.74-77). Busy's rhetoric subtly recalls Paul's conclusion in the book of Titus, that "Unto the pure all things are pure," but with a particular emphasis on the (im)purity of one's environment.[291]

Within cognitive ecology, however, sensation and perception are generative processes with regrard to place. The belief that "perception is a form of action" encourages us, as Hutchins has argued, to "view organism-environment relations in terms of coupling, coordination, emergence, and self-organization rather than the transduction of information

[291] Titus 1:15 (KJV).

across a barrier."[292] That is to say, neither the organism nor the environment is inactive or immutable at the moment of their encounter; perception, as an organizational process that selects and interprets features of the environment, shapes the subject and space at the same time. It is not surprising, then, that Busy's concerns about the permeability of the self manifest themselves on a perceptual register, once he and his entourage arrive at the fair. His warnings translate the space of the fair into a veritable *Umwelt* of sensory temptation: "The place is Smithfield, or the field of smiths, the grove of hobbyhorses and trinkets; the wares are the wares of devils," and these objects, which Cokes was so loath to ignore, are traps of sensory enthrallment: "They are hooks, and baits, very baits, that are hunt out on every side, to catch you and to hold you, as it were, by the gills and by the nostrils, as the fisher doth" (3.2.40-46). While the flourishes of rhetoric proliferate, Busy's logic is in itself curiously reductive; space is reduced to objects, and those objects further reduced to their phenomenological unfolding, to the stimulation that they provide. For Busy, Smithfield functions less as a geographic site, a "region" in the words of the Scrivener, than as an ambient and strangely labile environment.

Navigating this environment, however, requires the very senses that Busy foreswears. Although Busy warns Littlewit to protect himself from the sounds of the fair, imitating Odysseus if necessary – "The heathen man could stop his ears with wax against the harlot o'the sea; do you the like, with your fingers against the bells of the Beast" – it is sound that soon leads Littlewit into temptation (3.2.47-49). Knockem first calls out to Purecraft and to Win, "Whither walk you?," and encourages Littlewit, who has stopped with the women, to contemplate the sign advertising Ursula's wares: "The best pig and bottle ale i'the fair, sir. Old Ursula is cook. There you may read: the pig's head speaks it" (3.2.57, 60-62). Littlewit

[292] Hutchins, "Cognitive Ecology," 709-710.

seems entranced by the sign, "gazing at" it, in the stage direction, and echoing Knockem's interpretation of it: "Here be the best pigs, and she does roast 'em as well as ever she did, the pig's head says" (3.2.62.s.d., 69-71). For Littlewit, auditory and visual cues are the principal means of navigating the fair, of discerning within the open space of Smithfield the particular place that Purecraft, Win, and Sir John desire. To Purecraft's protestations, that his contemplation of the sign is a "vanity of the eye," Littlewit retorts by articulating the navigational significance of the senses: "Good mother, how shall we find a pig if we do look about for't? Will it run off o'the spit into our mouths, think you, as in Lubberland, and cry 'Wee, wee'?" (3.2.76, 78-80). In a space less enchanted than Penshurst, where creatures so forcefully proffer themselves for consumption that eels "leap on land / Before the fisher, or into his hand," Littlewit and his company must rely upon embodied cognition to locate themselves within space, to find the pig that Littlewit has previously suggested lies "I'the heart o'the fair, not at Pie Corner" (1.5.153).[293]

In his exploration of the fair, Busy eschews these senses, preferring a mode of perception he deems better suited to the particular place of Smithfield. He misinterprets Purecraft's objection to mean that the pig "may offer itself by other means to the sense, as by the way of the steam, which I think it doth, here in this place" (3.2.81-83). Busy proceeds to enact this relationship between sensation and space, comically sniffing at the steam in an attempt to find the pig through its smell. The stage direction, "(*Busy scents after it like a hound.*)," recalls the earlier figuration of Cokes as a bird caught in a limed bush, using the trope of animality to imply a kind of captivation within the environment. Busy celebrates this sense as the ideal means of navigating Smithfield, first declaring that "it were a sin of obstinacy, great

---

[293] Ben Jonson, "To Penshurst," in *Seventeenth-Century British Poetry: 1603-1660*, ed. John P. Rumrich and Gregory Chaplin (New York: Norton, 2006), 37-38.

obstinacy, high and horrible obstinacy, to decline or resist the good titillation of the famelic sense, which is the smell," before entreating Littlewit to embrace the smell as a marker of the environment and a means of navigation: "Follow the scent" (3.2.84-88). Busy's exhortations are undeniably comic, but they are equally fascinating for showing how the relationship between environment and embodiment might manifest itself on a particular sensory register. In early modern hierarchies of the senses, certain forms of perception were more readily located on a corporeal register and thus more embodied as modes of cognitive processing. Writing in the Neoplatonic tradition, for example, Marsilio Ficino names reason and the five senses as the "six powers of the soul," before concluding that "three pertain more to the body and matter (touch, taste, and smell) whereas the other three (reason, sight, and hearing) pertain to the spirit."[294] The difference is tied to spatiality, insofar as "touch, taste, and smell perceive only things which are very near them," while reason, sight, and hearing are more extensive in the scope of their apprehension.[295] Busy and Littlewit both rely upon embodiment as a means of determining emplacement, using sensation to navigate the space of the fair. But within early modern discourse of the senses, Busy's captivation occurs on a far more corporeal register, suggesting an intense – and, for a Puritan, inappropriate – absorption of the body within its environment. In Jonson's innovation upon the trope of the hypocritical Puritan, captivation reveals that selves cannot be separated from space, that embodied thought is profoundly permeable with regards to its environment.

Busy thereby displays the same enthrallment as Cokes, the two mirroring each other in their absorption into the fair. But whereas Cokes becomes lost once the environment changes, Busy reasserts his identity through the transformation of Smithfield's topography.

---

[294] Marsilio Ficino, *Commentary on Plato's* Symposium *on Love*. Trans. Sears Jayne. (Dallas: Spring Publications, 1985), 85-86.
[295] Ibid.

Having eaten well at Ursula's booth – Knockem jokes that Busy "eats with his eyes, as well as his teeth" – he returns to his condemnation of Smithfield (3.6.48). Having declared that "Thou art the seat of the Beast, O Smithfield," Busy begins to resignify the environment, translating the fair into an *Umwelt* of temptation (3.6.41-42). As he explains, Leatherhead's drum "is the broken belly of the Beast, and thy bellows there are his lungs, and these pipes are his throats, those feathers are of his tail, and thy rattles the gnashing of his teeth," whereas Trash's gingerbread becomes the "provendor that pricks him up" (3.6.64-66, 68). Within this topographic imaginary, Busy reasserts his identity as a bombastic Puritan precisely through his denigration of the fair. In his own words, "I was moved in spirit to be here this day, in this fair, this wicked and foul fair – and fitter may it be a called a foul than a fair – to protest against the abuses of it" (3.6.82-85). The irony, of course, is that Busy also claims to have no agency within this particular environment. At the moment that he attempts to dissever himself from space, in other words, Busy concludes that the environment of the fair generates an automatic and unbidden response within him: "The sin of the fair provokes me. I cannot be silent" (3.6.73). While this utterance evinces one of the central tropes in the play's characterization of Busy, that of his hypocrisy, it also suggests the difficulty of defining the self without reference to its place. The very attempt to distinguish between the purity of the self and the profanity leads, in Busy's convoluted rhetoric, to the realignment of environment and embodiment on another register.

Nevertheless, Busy's disenchantment with Smithfield radically alters the topography of the fair. At the height of his passion, Busy "*overthrows the gingerbread*" at Trash's booth, reasserting his identity through this act of destruction; his declaration, "In my zeal and glory to be thus exercised," subtly alludes to his full name of Zeal-of-the-land Busy, compounding the sense that this moment figures a reemergence of the Puritan's sense of self (3.6.96.s.d.,

99). But more significantly, Busy's outburst inspires Trash and Leatherhead to disappear from the fair. Since the beginning of the fair, the booths of Leatherhead and Trash have defined the topography of Smithfield, for both the fairgoers and those who observe the play. They provide a point of orientation within the vast and otherwise undifferentiated space of the fair. Within the playhouse, the booths enable the stage to "represent a piece of land in Smithfield about the same size as itself," as Gabriel Egan has postulated.[296] Within the dramatic fiction, these sites are no less significant in facilitating a kind of spatial apprehension. Although no character cites the booths as a way of navigating the fair, their disappearance directly contributes to Cokes's disorientation: "By this light," he bemoans, "I cannot find my gingerbread-wife nor my hobbyhorse-man in all the fair, now, to ha' my money again. And I do not know the way out on't, to go home for more" (4.2.23-26). Busy's disengagement from the environment, in short, radically alters the shape of that space, and this alteration directly contributes to Cokes's disorientation within the fair. Through these characters, *Bartholomew Fair* represents space as an emergent entity, as a sphere continually reconstituted through the movement of individual actors who have little, or no, knowledge of one another. In the passage from Busy's disenchantment to Cokes's confusion, in other words, the play shows how different cognitive ecologies collide with one another, transforming the environment through their interactions. At the very moment that Cokes, Busy, and other characters reconceptualize their relationship to space, Smithfield becomes a thinking topography in organizing and assimilating these disparate ideas into the fair.

---

[296] Egan, "The Use of Booths," 47.

III. Emergence and Smithfield

Bringing the insights of performativity and cognitive ecology together, I have argued that how we apprehend our environment may ultimately transform the very shape of that space. In *Bartholomew Fair*, characters locate themselves through a vast and complex ecology, where the booths of Ursula, Trash, and Leatherhead, and later the stocks and the puppet theater, provide points of orientation within an otherwise unmarked space. Cokes's ultimate confusion functions as a humorous, if somewhat unnerving, testament to the importance of such architecture in defining the shape of Smithfield. But, as we saw with Littlewit, Busy, and Purecraft, navigation of the fair often requires movement through and around these sites, the reliance upon sight and smell to create a path where none exists. Within the playhouse, as well as within the fictional Smithfield, there is a complex interplay between the architectural features that anchor the space and the continual navigation of the gaps between those features. As Leo Salingar has argued, "the characters converge and affect each other because of an annual commercial attraction, the Fair; but they affect one another chiefly by contiguity, covertly or haphazardly, without any mark of collective order."[297] These interactions combine to form a collective enterprise with profound implications for the spatiality of Smithfield. One might imagine this collective enterprise like the creation of a path, where scores of pedestrians, ultimately unaware of one another, succeed in carving out a space by walking it into existence. In the fair, Cokes, Busy, and others repeatedly find themselves before the booths of Trash and Leatherhead, and this repetitive movement creates a number of grooves within the space of Smithfield, making it what it is. In other words, collective moment transforms the smooth space of Smithfield into the striated space of Bartholomew Fair.

---

[297] Leo Salingar, "Crowd and Public in *Bartholomew Fair*" *Renaissance Drama* 10 (1979): 143.

As I have argued, this kind of emergence is tied to specific conceptualizations of the environment, suggested in Cokes's captivation with the fair and Busy's eventual disenchantment. Certainly, other characters in *Bartholomew Fair* bear witness to this relationship. Justice Overdo, for example, enters the fair precisely because he rejects a kind of distributed cognition within the legal system, citing the gap between himself and his informers as evidence of the finitude of knowledge: "For, alas, as we are public persons, what do we know? Nay, what can we know? We hear with other men's ears; we see with other men's eyes" (2.1.27-29). To a degree, Littlewit echoes Busy's absorption into the fair, while his role in creating the puppet play makes his resignification of space far more complex than Busy's outbursts (it should be noted, too, that the puppet play provides another site where Busy becomes captivated, continuing one of the dominant themes of *Bartholomew Fair*). And, of course, there is Ursula, whose booth provides the geographic and metaphysical center of the fair. But Cokes and Busy represent a nexus in the transformation of space. The stances that they embody effectively mirror one another before becoming divergent. They remain aligned with one another in the disruption of Trash's booth and the alteration that this brings to the topography of Smithfield; for what one causes, the other feels.

Bartholomew Fair is suffused with moments of captivation and disenchantment, with journeys disrupted and prolonged. As I suggested in the introduction, the play's investment in embodied experience moves us past questions of realism and mimetic representation, of whether the play successfully reproduces Smithfield onstage. Rather, *Bartholomew Fair* reimagines Smithfield as a strangely flexible environment, a space continually reconstituted by movement, imaginative resignification, and disruption. The philosopher Edward Casey has rightly noted that places are often less spatial than temporal: "Rather than being one

definite sort of thing – for example, physical, spiritual, cultural, social – a given place takes on the qualities of its occupants, reflecting these qualities in its own constitution and description and expressing them in its occurrence as an event: places not only *are*, they *happen*."[298] The polychronicity of a given location, its ability to encode multiple temporalities within itself, is tied to what Casey calls the place's "occupants," those individuals who transform the very space that brings them together. In *Bartholomew Fair*, Smithfield is precisely such a space; at once real and imagined, the Smithfield of Jonson's play exists through a complex matrix of materiality and signification, of perception and embodied thought.

I have argued that merging performativity and cognitive ecology can illuminate the role of apprehension and experience in defining a particular location, but what *Bartholomew Fair* adds to this conclusion to twofold. First, after theorizing the relationship between environment and embodiment through the Induction, the play dramatically reveals how it feels to exist at the intersection of these two domains. Cokes's boast, that his name of Bartholomew makes the fair his own, quickly gives way to despair and disorientation, as he fails to reassert his identity once the topography of the fair is transformed. But if Cokes's captivation suggests the need to distance one's self from space, to retreat from an ecological subjectivity into a proto-Cartesian *cogito*, then Busy's attempt implies that such differentiations are doomed to failure. At the same time that captivation reconfigures the relationship between organism and environment, *Bartholomew Fair* also stages the allocentric effects of that new relationship. That it to say, the play registers the transformation of Smithfield, revealing that multiple actors, working independent of one another, collide to

---

[298] Edward S. Casey, "How to Get from Space to Place in a Fairly Short Stretch of Time: Phenomenological Prolegomena" in *Senses of Place*, ed. Steven Feld and Keith H. Basso (Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, 1996), 27.

alter the topography of the landscape. Far more than authorial space or mimetic representation, *Bartholomew Fair* invests itself in performativity and its implications for the environment, moving characters through Smithfield as a means of rethinking the ontology of early modern space.

Conclusion

The Poetics of Emplacement

On the early modern stage, emplacement was not simply about location. Because cognitive ecology foregrounds the transactional relationship between the environment and embodied thought, the concept of emplacement also suggests how subjects navigate this relationship, how they choose between different modes of spatial apprehension and thus orient themselves within a particular environment. In other words, emplacement is about being located, not simply within a particular space but also between space and place, between an environment and an *Umwelt*, or between a territory and a milieu. Although these terms may refer to the same location – Smithfield, I have argued, is both a space and an *Umwelt* in *Bartholomew Fair* – the ontology of that location changes to the degree that it has been reconstituted through a particular cognitive ecology. Memories, affective investments, cognitive maps, and imagined topographies can transform a given location into a place or a territory, at the same time that the suspension of these conceptual investments, or the recognition of their limits, can convert that place into space.[299] As embodied thought becomes ecological, in other words, it changes the nature of the environment.

---

[299] In this phenomenological approach, space is not an *a priori* dimension. Rather, it comes into being through experiences of emplacement, when a subject recognizes the limit of his or her perceptions of the immediate environment. My understanding of space has been significantly influenced by J.E. Malpas' *Place and Experience: A Philosophical Topography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), where Malpas argues that "objective space can be grasped through the grasp of an allocentric (and so through a subjectively presented) framework" (60). Whereas "objective space" refers to a non-subjective domain, the elements of space that are not tied to

One of the central arguments of this project has been that early modern drama represents emplacement as the sense of being poised between different approaches to the environment, with specific plays staging the tragic consequences of inhabiting this liminality for too long. The works that I have discussed repeatedly figure moments of crisis with regard to emplacement, using disorientation within physical and conceptual space to shape the dramatic fiction. As I suggested in chapter one, Lyly's play turns upon the difficulty of locating Endymion, once sleep qualifies the relationship of his soul to his body. As Cynthia, Eumenides, and others endeavor to return Endymion to embodiment and to emplacement within the world, the ambiguity of his location gives the play its dramatic arc. Moreover, this uncertainty becomes both a sign and a symptom of the strangeness that governs the play's own setting, at once cosmological and courtly, while belonging to neither. In *Dido*, the spatial implications of Aeneas's memory make emplacement central to the drama of Marlowe's play. Insofar as Aeneas endeavors to remember Troy by reconstructing it, his memory instantiates a tension between his emplacement within Carthage and his destiny to sail to Italy. Through this tension, *Dido* situates its tragedy in the gap between places remembered and imagined.

Whereas *Dido* focuses upon ecological memory, *King Lear* foregrounds the role of perception in creating a sense of emplacement. In the approach to Dover cliff, Gloucester continually shifts between trusting Edgar's description of the terrain and his own sensory experience. This emplacement between two conceptualizations of the environment – the one perceptual, the other mediated through the experience of others – is both terrifying and destabilizing for Gloucester, furthering the very despair that Edgar endeavors to dispel.

---

particular impressions, Malpas uses "allocentric" to denote a "space organised around a certain salient feature or features of the environment," in such a way that our attention must directed away from our own embodied sense of location towards another element, out there (53-54). In other words, subjects begin with an embodied experience of place, what I have been calling emplacement, and move through a growing apprehension of allocentric features of the environment to a conceptualization of space.

Similarly, Lear's disorientation within the storm turns upon his increasing inability to feel the world around him, and this attenuation of sensation poises Lear ambiguously between an embodied understanding of place and the madness of disembodied and displaced thought. In contrast, *Bartholomew Fair* stages the folly of absolute absorption within the environment. Cokes's captivation with the fair transforms Smithfield into an *Umwelt*, a kind of affective topography both shaped and navigated through attention. But when Busy destroys Trash's tent, and his threats persuade Leatherhead to dismantle his own, the markers of the *Umwelt* evanesce, and Cokes finds himself in a space without signification.

In these moments, early modern drama engages the poetics of emplacement, in the etymological sense of poetics in *poesis* or making. That is to say, these works show how emplacement is achieved, experienced, and undermined in early modern culture, where the intimacy between place and personhood is so foundational that its constitutive properties are most often glimpsed when this relationship is frustrated. Through this frustration, early modern drama represents alternative configurations of the relationship between environment and embodied thought, part of a larger effort to reimagine the ontology of early modern space. As a Neoplatonic allegory, *Endymion* rehearses the same relationship between amatory cognition and the shape of the cosmos that we find in Marsilio Ficino's *De Amore*. Like Ficino, in other words, *Endymion* reconceptualizes space as a bodiless dimension, an ethereal medium continually reshaped by the flows of divine thought and contemplative adoration. On a more immediate register, *Dido* suggests that mental topographies can transform material terrains, foregrounding the relationality of the two spheres in its consideration of ecological memory and empire. Similarly, *Lear* foregrounds a transactional relationship between environment and embodied thought. Within the play, place appears as the product of disparate perceptions, with space signifying the limit of those perceptions, not

so much an *a priori* dimension as an immensity that exists beyond the known. Staging a different ontology, *Bartholomew Fair* represents space as a domain constituted through collective action and apprehension. The play continually situates individual experience of the environment, as in Cokes's captivation with the fair, within a larger matrix of movement and distraction. In other words, *Bartholomew Fair* reimagines space as an emergent entity.

Using emplacement to reconceive the nature of location, early modern drama maintains an intimate relationship to chorography. Both practices endeavor to describe and define an environment through an embedded subject, whose experience provides the means of articulating the nature of the place. In contrast to cartography, which maps space from a distance – counting the space without occupying it, as Deleuze and Guattari would say – chorography represents a *flâneur* in movement, intertwining navigation with apprehension and description. Through this *flâneur*, readers becomes temporarily emplaced within the scene of chorography, enjoying a kind of conceptual voyage akin to what Bernhard Klein has identified as a predominant pleasure of early modern map-reading: in this regard, chorography, like cartography, "allows the hazards of travel to be replaced by the comfort of solitary contemplation."[300] Like these technologies of spatial representation, early modern drama enables its consumers to partake in imaginative re-emplacement.[301] "Thus with imagined wing our swift scene flies / In motion of no less celerity / Than that of thought," the Chorus of *Henry V* declares, suggesting that thought can relocate playgoers and performance in the same instant (3.0.1-3). Indeed, performance depends upon this re-

---

[300] Bernhard Klein, *Maps and the Writing of Space in Early Modern England and Ireland* (New York: Palgrave, 2001), 87.

[301] In "The Scene of Cartography in *King Lear*" in *Literature, Mapping, and the Politics of Space in Early Modern Britain*, ed. Andrew Gordon and Bernhard Klein (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 109-37, John Gillies also consider the stage's ability to re-present early modern modes of spatial representation, most notably cartography. I am indebted to his discussion, in particular to his point that the "vertical landscape [of the Dover cliff scene] is as consciously chorographic as Lear's map is geographic" (128).

emplacement. The Chorus will later encourage the playgoers to "Follow, follow! / Grapple your minds to sternage of this navy, / And leave your England" (3.0.17-19). The ambiguity of this entreaty nicely captures the relationship between performance and conceptual re-emplacement: "Follow, follow" the language of the play, seeing with your mind's eye the journey across the English Channel; "Follow, follow" the English navy, travelling with this fiction to find yourself imaginatively re-emplaced in France.

To a degree, the pleasure of performance lies in this temporary emplacement. But what is perhaps more fascinating is the way that early modern drama stages the failure of this endeavor. Endymion's desire, Aeneas's memory, Gloucester's blindness, Lear's madness, Cokes's captivation, and Zeal's disenchantment each represent a moment of disorientation and displacement, where embodied thought falters in its apprehension of the environment. Because early modern cognition was ecological, thought relied upon different elements of the environment – whether that particular environment was defined through bodies, artifacts, spaces, or cultural systems – for its success. One could argue that this distribution made the ecological mind exceptionally vulnerable to disturbance and disorientation, a precariousness that early modern drama repeatedly registers as tragic. But in staging crises of emplacement, early modern drama ultimately reveals the constitutive elements of that experience. The plays identify the mechanisms and the processes by which early modern cognition achieved a sense of its location, paradoxically by staging their disruption or dissolution. Cognitive ecology thereby encourages us to reconceptualize the nature of emplacement on the early modern stage – its effects as well as its limits.

Bibliography

Agamben, Giorgio. *The Open: Man and Animal.* Translated by Kevin Attell. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004.

Ahmed, Sara. *Queer Phenomenology: Orientations, Objects, Others*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2006.

Allen, Don Cameron. "Marlowe's *Dido* and the Tradition." In *Essays on Shakespeare and Elizabethan Drama in Honor of Hardin Craig*, edited by Richard Hosley, 55-68. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1962.

Alwes, Derek B. "'I would faine serve': John Lyly's Career at Court." *Comparative Drama* 34, no. 4 (Winter 2000/2001): 399-421.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev. ed. London: Verso, 2006.

Anonymous. *An Historical Account of Bartholomew Fair, containing A View of its Origin, and the Purposes it was First Instituted For. Together with a Concise Detail of the Changes it hath undergone in it Traffic, Amusements, &c. &c.* London: John Arliss, 1810).

Aristotle, *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation.* Edited by Jonathan Barnes. Vol. 1. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.

Armstrong, Philip. "Uncanny spectacles: psychoanalysis and the texts of *King Lear*." *Textual Practice* 8, no. 3 (Winter 1994): 414-34.

Barish, Jonas A. "*Bartholomew Fair* and its Puppets." *Modern Language Quarterly* 20, no. 1 (1959): 3-17.

Barkan, Leonard. *Nature's Work of Art: The Human Body as Image of the World*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975.

Barker, Francis. *The Culture of Violence: Tragedy and History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.

Bartels, Emily C. *Spectacles of Strangeness: Imperialism, Alienation, and Marlowe*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993.

Bennett, Josephine Waters. "Oxford and *Endimion*." *PMLA* 57, no. 2 (June 1942): 354-69.

Bentley, Gerald Eades. *Shakespeare and His Theatre*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964.

Bevington, David. "Lyly's *Endymion* and *Midas*: The Catholic Question in England." *Comparative Drama* 32, no. 1 (Spring 1998): 26-46.

- - -. *Tudor Drama and Politics: A Critical Approach to Topical Meaning*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Bright, Timothy. *A Treatise of Melancholie*. London: Thomas Vautrollier, 1586.

Brotton, Jerry. "Tragedy and Geography." In *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works, Volume 1: The Tragedies*, edited by Richard Dutton and Jean E. Howard, 219-240. Malden: Blackwell, 2003.

Brownstein, Oscar. "Why didn't Burbage Lease the Beargarden? A Conjecture in Comparative Architecture." In *The First Public Playhouse: The Theatre in Shoreditch 1576-1598*, edited by Herbert Berry, 81-96. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1979.

Burton, Robert. *The Anatomy of Melancholy*. Edited by Thomas C. Faulkner, Nicolas K. Kiessling, and Rhonda L. Blair. 6 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989-2000.

Butler, Judith. *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex"*. New York: Routledge, 1993.

- - -. "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory." *Theatre Journal* 40, no. 4 (December 1988): 519-531.

- - -. *The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997.

Camille, Michael. "Signs of the City: Place, Power, and Public Fantasy in Medieval Paris." In *Medieval Practices of Space*, edited by Barbara A. Hanawalt and Michael Kobialka, 1-36. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000).

Carruthers, Mary. *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Cartelli, Thomas. "*Bartholomew Fair* as Urban Arcadia: Jonson Responds to Shakespeare." *Renaissance Drama* 14 (1983): 151-172.

Casey, Edward S. *The Fate of Place: A Philosophical History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

- - -. "How to Get from Space to Place in a Fairly Short Stretch of Time: Phenomenological Prolegomena." In *Senses of Place*, edited by Steven Feld and Keith H. Basso, 13-52. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, 1996.

- - -. *Getting Back into Place: Toward a Renewed Understanding of the Place-World*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993.

- - -. *Remembering: A Phenomenological Study*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987.

Castilio, Baldessar. *The Covrtyer*. Translated by Thomas Hoby. London: Wyllyam Seres, 1561.

Cathcart, Charles. "John Marston, *The Malcontent*, and the King's Men." *The Review of English Studies* 57, no. 228 (February 2006): 43-63.

Chambers, E. K. *The Elizabethan Stage*. Vol 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. *The Riverside Chaucer*. Edited by Larry Benson. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Cheney, Patrick. *Marlowe's Counterfeit Profession: Ovid, Spenser, Counter-Nationhood*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.

- - -. "'Thondring Words of Threate': Marlowe, Spenser, and Renaissance Ideas of a Literary Career." In *Marlowe, History, and Sexuality: New Critical Essays on Christopher Marlowe*, edited by Paul Whitfield White, 39-58. New York: AMS Press, 1998.

Civitas Londinvm (The Agas Map). Edited by Janelle Jenstad. Victoria: *MoEML*, 2012.

Clark, Andy. *Being There: Putting Brain, Body, and World Together Again*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1997.

- - -. *Natural-Born Cyborgs: Minds, Technologies, and the Future of Human Intelligence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

- - -. *Supersizing the Mind: Embodiment, Action, and Cognitive Extension*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

- - -. and David Chalmers. "The Extended Mind." *Analysis* 58, no.1 (January 1998): 7-19.

Clare, Janet. "Marlowe's 'Theatre of Cruelty." In *Constructing Christopher Marlowe*, edited by J. A. Downie and J. T. Parnell, 74-87. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Cook, Amy. *Shakespearean Neuroplay: Reinvigorating the Study of Dramatic Texts and Performance through Cognitive Science*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Cope, Jackson I. *Dramaturgy of the Daemonic: Studies in Antigeneric Theater from Ruzante to Grimaldi*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984.

Crane, Mary Thomas. "The Physics of *King Lear*: Cognition in a Void." In *Shakespeare International Yearbook*, edited by Graham Bradshaw, Tom Bishop, and Mark Turner, 3-23. Vol. 4. 2004.

- - -. *Shakespeare's Brain: Reading with Cognitive Theory.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Crooke, Helkiah. *Mikrokosmographia: A Description of the Body of Man. Together with the Controversies Thereto Belonging. Collected and Translated out of all the Best Authors of Anatomy, Especially out of Gasper Bauhinus and Andreas Laurentius*. London: William Iaggard, 1615.

Cutts, John P. "'By Shallow Riuers': A Study of Marlowe's *Dido Queen of Carthage*." In *Studies in Medieval, Renaissance, American Literature*, edited by Betsy Feagan Colquitt, 73-94. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1971.

Da Crema, Joseph J. "The Neoplatonic Element in John Lyly." PhD diss, Temple University, 1968.

De Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Translated by Steven Rendall. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

Dawson, Anthony B. "Priamus is Dead: Memorial Repetition in Marlowe and Shakespeare." In *Shakespeare, Memory and Performance*, edited by Peter Holland, 63-84. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Deats, Sara Munson. "*Dido, Queen of Carthage* and *The Massacre at Paris*." In *The Cambridge Companion to Christopher Marlowe*, edited by Patrick Cheney, 193-206. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translated by Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane. New York: Penguin, 1977.

- - -. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translated by Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987.

Descartes, René. *Discours de la Méthode*. In *Oeuvres de Descartes*. Publiées par Charles Adam & Paul Tannery. Vol 6. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1965.

Dessen, Alan C. *Elizabethan Stage Conventions and Modern Interpreters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Du Laurens, André. *A Discovrse of the Preservation of the Sight: of Melancholike diseases; of Rheumes, and of Old age*. London, 1599.

Dust, Philip. "The Kiss in Lyly's 'Endymion." *English Miscellany* 25 (1976): 87-95.

Dutton, Richard. "*King Lear*, *The Triumphs of Reunited Britannia*, and 'The Matter of Britain.'" *Literature and History* 12:2 (Autumn 1986): 137-151.

Egan, Gabriel. "The Use of Booths in the Original Staging of Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair*." *Cahiers elisabethains* 53, no. 4 (1998): 43-52.

Elizabeth I. "A Proclamation postponing Bartholomew Fair on account of the plague. 6 Aug. 1593." In *A Booke Containing All Svch Proclamations, as were pvblished dvring the Raigne of the late Queene Elizabeth, collected together by the industry of Humfrey Dyson, of the City of London Publique Notary*. London: Bonham, Norton, and Iohn Bill, 1618.

Elkins, James. *The Poetics of Perspective*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994.

Ekirch, A. Roger. *At Day's Close: Night in Times Past*. New York: Norton, 2006.

Enders, Jody. *The Medieval Theater of Cruelty: Rhetoric, Memory, Violence*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999.

Ficino, Marsilio. *Commentary on Plato's Symposium on Love*. Translated by Sears Jayne. Dallas: Spring Publications, 1985.

Flahiff, F.T. "Lear's Map." *Cahiers elisabethains* 30 (Octobre 1986): 17-33.

Floyd-Wilson, Mary. *English Ethnicity and Race in Early Modern Drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Foucault, Michel. "Of Other Spaces." Translated by Jay Miskowiec. *Diacritics* 16, no. 1 (Spring 1986): 22-27.

- - -. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Vintage, 1994.

Freud, Sigmund. "Mourning and Melancholia." In *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume XIV (1914-1916): On the History of the Psycho-Analytic Movement, Papers on Metapsychology and Other Works*. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-analysis, 1957.

Fulwod, Willyam. *The Castel of Memorie: wherein is conteyned the restoring, augmenting, and conseruing of the Memorye and Remembraunce, with the safest remedies, and best precepts therevnto in any wise apperteyning: Made by Gulielmus Gratarolus: Bergomatis Doctor of artes and Physike*. London: Rouland Hall, 1562.

Gannon, C. C. "Lyly's *Endimion*: From Myth to Allegory." *English Literary Renaissance* 6 (1976): 220-243.

Gillies, John. "Introduction: Elizabethan Drama and the Cartographizations of Space." In *Playing the Globe: Genre and Geography in English Renaissance Drama*, edited by John Gillies and Virginia Mason Vaughan, 19-45. Madison: Associated University Press, 1998.

- - -. "The Scene of Cartography in *King Lear*." In *Literature, Mapping, and the Politics of Space in Early Modern Britain*, edited by Andrew Gordon and Bernhard Klein, 109-137. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

- - -. *Shakespeare and the Geography of Difference*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Goldberg, Jonathan. "Dover Cliff and the Conditions of Representation: *King Lear* 4:6 in Perspective." *Poetics Today* 5, no. 3 (1984): 537-547.

Grant, Edward. *Much Ado About Nothing: Theories of Space and Vacuum from the Middle Ages to the Scientific Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

- - -. *The Swerve: How the World Became Modern.* New York: Norton, 2011).

Gregson, Nicky and Gillian Rose. "Taking Butler elsewhere: performativities, spatialities and subjectivities." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 18 (2000): 433-452.

Gurr, Andrew. *The Shakespearean Stage 1574-1642*. 4th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Harris, Jonathan Gil. *Untimely Matter in the Time of Shakespeare*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009.

Hawkes, Terence. *Meaning by Shakespeare*. New York: Routledge, 1992.

Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*. Translated by Joan Stambaugh. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996.

Helgerson, Richard. "The Land Speaks: Cartography, Chorography, and Subversion in Renaissance England" *Representations* 16 (Autumn 1986): 50-85.

Heller-Roazen, Daniel. *The Inner Touch: Archaeology of a Sensation*. New York: Zone Books, 2007.

Hillman, David. *Shakespeare's Entrails: Belief, Scepticism, and the Interior of the Body*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Holland, Peter. "Mapping Shakespeare's Britain." In *Shakespeare's Histories and Counter-Histories*, edited by Dermot Cavanagh, Stuart Hampton-Reeves, and Stephen Longstaffe, 198-218. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006.

Hollis, Gavin. "'Give me the map there': *King Lear* and Cartographic Literacy in Early Modern England." *The Portolan* 8 (Spring 2007): 8-25.

Hopkins, Lisa. *Christopher Marlowe, Renaissance Dramatist*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008.

Howard, Jean E. *Theater of a City: The Places of London Comedy, 1598-1642*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.

- - -. and Phyllis Rackin, *Engendering a Nation: A Feminist Account of Shakespeare's English Histories*. New York: Routledge, 1997.

Hunter, G. K. *John Lyly: The Humanist as Courtier*. London: Routledge, 1962.

Husserl, Edmund. *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology*. Translated by David Carr. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1970.

Hutchins, Edwin. "Cognitive Ecology." *Topics in Cognitive Science* 2 (2010): 705-715.

Huarte, Juan. *The Examination of mens Wits. In whicch, by discouering the varietie of natures, is shewed for what profession each one is apt, and how far he shall profit therein*. London: Adam Islip, 1594.

Jammer, Max. *Concepts of Space: The History of Theories of Space in Physics*. 3rd ed. New York: Dover Publications, 1993.

Jayne, Sears. "Ficino and the Platonism of the English Renaissance." *Comparative Literature* 4, no. 3 (Summer 1952): 214-238.

Johnson, Steven. *Emergence: The Connected Live of Ants, Brains, Cities, and Software*. New York: Scribner, 2001.

Jonson, Ben. *Bartholomew Fair*. In *English Renaissance Drama*. Edited by David Bevington, Lars Engle, Katharine Eisaman Maus, and Eric Rasmussen. New York: Norton, 2002.

Jonson, Ben. "To Penshurst." In *Seventeenth-Century British Poetry: 1603-1660*, edited by John P. Rumrich and Gregory Chaplin. New York: Norton, 2006.

Kantorowicz, Ernst H. *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.

Kinney, Arthur F. *Shakespeare and Cognition: Aristotle's Legacy and Shakespearean Drama*. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Kirsch, David. "The Intelligent Use of Space." *Artificial Intelligence* 73 (1995): 31-68.

Klein, Bernhard. *Maps and the Writing of Space in Early Modern England and Ireland*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001.

Knapp, Robert S. "The Monarchy of Love in Lyly's 'Endymion.'" *Modern Philology* 73, no. 4 (May 1976): 353-367.

La Boderie, Guy le Fevre de. *Discours de l'honneste amovr svr le banqvet de Platon.* Paris: Jean Macé, 1578.

La Boétie, Estienne de. *Oeuvres Complètes d'Estienne de la Boétie*. *Édition nouvelle augmentée en deux volumes*. II, Introduction, bibliographie et notes par Louis Desgraves. William Blake and Co. Édit, 1991.

Lacan, Jacques. *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*. Edited by Jacques-Alain Miller. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Norton, 1998.

Le Grand Robert de la Langue Française. 12th ed. 9 vols. Paris: Dictionnaires Le Robert, 1985.

Leech, Clifford. "The Hesitation of Pyrrhus." In *The Morality of Art: Essays Presented to G. Wilson Knight by his Colleagues and Friends*, edited by D. W. Jefferson, 41-49. London: Routledge, 1969.

- - -. "Marlowe's Humor." In *Marlowe: A Collection of Critical Essays*, edited by Clifford Leech, 167-178. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith. Malden: Blackwell, 1991.

Lefèvre, Raoul. *The recuile of the histories of Troie*. London: William Copland, 1553.

Leggatt, Alexander. *Introduction to English Renaissance Comedy.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999.

Lemnius, Levinus. *The Touchstone of Complexions. Generallye appliable, expedient and profitable for all such, as be desirous and carefull of ther bodyly health*. London, Thomas Marsh, 1581.

Lestringant, Frank. *Le Livre Des Îles: Atlas et Récits Insulaires de la Genèse à Jules Verne*. Genève: Librairie Droz, 2002.

Lyly, John. *Endymion*. In *English Renaissance Drama*. Edited by David Bevington, Lars Engle, Katharine Eisaman Maus, and Eric Rasmussen. New York: Norton, 2002.

- - -. *Endymion*, edited by George P. Baker. New York: H. Holt, 1894.

Malpas, J. E. *Place and Experience: A Philosophical Topography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Manley, Lawrence. *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Marcus, Leah. *The Politics of Mirth: Jonson, Herrick, Milton, Marvell, and the Defense of Old Holiday Pastimes.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.

- - -. *Puzzling Shakespeare: Local Reading and its Discontents*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

Mardock, James D. *Our Scene is London: Ben Jonson's City and the Space of the Author*. New York: Routledge, 2008).

Marlowe, Christopher. *Dido Queen of Carthage and The Massacre at Paris*, edited by H. J. Oliver. London: Methuen & Co., 1968.

- - -. *The Complete Works of Christopher Marlowe*. Edited by Fredson Bowers. Vol. 2. 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Marshall, Cynthia. *The Shattering of the Self: Violence, Subjectivity, and Early Modern Texts*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002.

Matheson, Lister M. *The Prose Brut: The Development of a Middle English Chronicle*. Tempe: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1998.

Mazzio, Carla. "The Three-Dimensional Self: Geometry, Melancholy, Drama." In *Arts of Calculation: Quantifying Thought in Early Modern Europe*, edited by David Glimp and Michelle R. Warren, 39-65. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Mendyk, Stan. "Early British Chorography." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 17, no. 4 (Winter 1986): 459-481.

Montaigne, Michel de. *The Complete Works*. Translated by Donald M. Frame. New York: Knopf, 2003.

Moore, Thomas. *The Planets Within: Marsilio Ficino's Astrological Psychology*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1982.

Mullaney, Steven. "Affective Technologies: Toward an Emotional Logic of the Elizabethan Stage." In *Environment and Embodiment in Early Modern England*, edited by Mary Floyd-Wilson and Garrett A. Sullivan, Jr., 71-89. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

- - -. "What's Hamlet to Habermas? Spatial Literacy, Theatrical Publication and the Publics of the Early Modern Public Stage." In *Making Space Public in Early Modern England: Performance, Geography, Privacy*, edited by Angela Vanhaelen and Joseph P. Ward, 17-40. New York: Routledge, 2013.

Newman, Karen. *Cultural Capitals: Early Modern London and Paris*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007.

Orgel, Stephen. "Shakespeare Imagines a Theater." *Poetics Today* 5, no. 3 (1984): 549-61.

Paster, Gail Kern. *Humoring the Body: Emotions and the Shakespearean Stage*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

- - -. "Nervous Tension: Networks of Blood and Spirit in the Early Modern Body." In *The Body in Parts: Fantasies of Corporeality in Early Modern Europe*, edited by David Hillman and Carla Mazzio, 107-125. New York: Routledge, 1997.

- - -., Katherine Rowe, and Mary Floyd-Wilson. "Introduction: Reading the Early Modern Passions." In *Reading the Early Modern Passions: Essays in the Cultural History of Emotion*, edited by Gail Kern Paster, Katherine Rowe, and Mary Floyd-Wilson, 1-20. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.

Peter of Ravenna, *The art of memory, that otherwyse is called the Phenix, A boke very behouefull and profytable to all professours of scyences. Grammaryens, Rethoryciens Dialectyke, Legystes, Phylosophres & Theologiens*. Translated by Robert Copland. London: Wyllyam Myddylton, 1545.

Pincombe, Michael. *The Plays of John Lyly: Eros and Eliza*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996.

Plato. *Symposium*. Translated by Walter Hamilton. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1951.

Proudfoot, Richard. "Marlowe and the Editors." In *Constructing Christopher Marlowe*, edited by J. A. Downie and J. T. Parnell, 41-54. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Ramsey, Rachel. "The Language of Urbanization in John Stow's *Survey of London*." *Philological Quarterly* 3, no. 4 (2006): 247-270.

Reiss, Timothy J. *Mirages of the Selfe: Patterns of Personhood in Ancient and Early Modern Europe*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003.

Rose, Gillian. "Performing Space." In *Human Geography Today*, edited by Doreen Massey, John Alen, and Philip Sarre, 247-259. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999.

Saccio, Peter. "The Oddity of Lyly's *Endimion*." In *The Elizabethan Theatre V*, edited by G. R. Hibbard, 92-111. Hamden: Archon Books, 1975.

Salingar, Leo. "Crowd and Public in *Bartholomew Fair*." *Renaissance Drama* 10 (1979): 141-159.

Schoenfeldt, Michael. *Bodies and Selves in Early Modern England: Physiology and Inwardness in Spenser, Shakespeare, Herbert, and Milton*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Schofield, John. "The Topography and Buildings of London, ca. 1600." In *Material London, ca. 1600*, edited by Lena Cowen Orlin, 296-321. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000.

Shakespeare, William. *The Norton Shakespeare*. Edited by Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean Howard, and Katharine Eisaman Maus. 2nd edition. New York: Norton, 2008.

Shapiro, Michael. *Children of the Revels: The Boys Companies of Shakespeare's Time and Their Plays*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1977.

Shuger, Deborah. "The 'I' of the Beholder: Renaissance Mirrors and the Reflexive Mind." In *Renaissance Culture and the Everyday*, edited by Patricia Fumerton and Simon Hunt, 21-41. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999.

Sidney, Sir Philip. *An Apology for Poetry*. Edited by Peter C. Herman. Glen Allen: College Publishing, 2001.

Smith, Bruce R. *The Acoustic World of Early Modern England: Attending to the O-Factor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.

- - -. *The Key of Green: Passion and Perception in Renaissance Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009.

Soja, Edward W. *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996.

Stallybrass, Peter and Allon White. *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression*. London: Methuen, 1986.

Stow, John. *A Survey of London, by John Stow, Reprinted from the Text of 1603*. Edited by Charles Lethbridge Kingsford. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908.

Sullivan Jr., Garrett A. *The Drama of Landscape: Land, Property, and Social Relations on the Early Modern Stage*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.

- - -. "Geography and identity in Marlowe." In *The Cambridge Companion to Christopher Marlowe*, edited by Patrick Cheney, 231-244. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

- - -. *Memory and Forgetting in English Renaissance Drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

- - -. "Romance, Sleep, and the Passions in Sir Philip Sidney's *The Old Arcadia*." *English Literary History* 74 (2007): 735-757.

Sutton, John. "Body, Mind, and Order: Local Memory and the Control of Mental Representations in Medieval and Renaissance Sciences of the Self." In *1543 and All That: Word and Image in the Proto-Scientific Revolution*, edited by Guy Freeland and Anthony Corones, 117-150. London: Kulwer, 2000.

- - -. "Exograms and Interdisciplinarity: History, the Extended Mind, and the Civilizing Process." In *The Extended Mind*, edited by Richard Menary, 189-225. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2010.

- - -. *Philosophy and Memory Traces: Descartes to Connectionism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

- - -. "Spongy Brains and Material Memories." In *Environment and Embodiment in Early Modern England*, edited by Mary Floyd-Wilson and Garrett A. Sullivan, Jr., 14-34. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Taylor, Charles. *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Traub, Valerie. "The Nature of Norms in Early Modern England: Anatomy, Cartography, *King Lear*." *South Central Review* 26, no. 1 & 2 (Winter & Spring 2009): 42-81.

Tribble, Evelyn. *Cognition in the Globe: Attention and Memory in Shakespeare's Theatre*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

- - -. "Distributing Cognition in the Globe." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 56, no. 2 (Summer 2005): 135-155.

- - -. and Nicolas Keene, *Cognitive Ecologies and the History of Remembering: Religion, Education and Memory in Early Modern England*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

- - -. and John Sutton, "Cognitive Ecology as a Framework for Shakespearean Studies," *Shakespeare Studies* 39 (2011): 94-103.

Tudeau-Clayton, Margaret. "'I do not know my selfe': the topography and politics of self-knowledge in Ben Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair*." In *Textures of Renaissance Knowledge*, edited by Philippa Berry and Margaret Tudeau-Clayton, 177-198. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003.

Turner, Henry S. *The English Renaissance Stage: Geometry, Poetics, and the Practical Spatial Arts 1580-1630*. Oxford: University of Oxford Press, 2006.

- - -. "*King Lear* Without: The Heath" *Renaissance Drama* 28 (1997): 161-193.

Waith, Eugene M. "The Staging of *Bartholomew Fair*." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 2, no. 2 (Spring 1962): 181-195.

Weltner, Peter. "The Antinomic Vision of Lyly's *Endymion*," *English Literary Renaissance* 3, no. 1 (Winter 1973): 5-29.

Wilder, Lina Perkins. *Shakespeare's Memory Theatre: Recollection, Properties, and Character*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

- - -. "Toward a Shakespearean 'Memory Theater': Romeo, the Apothecary, and the Performance of Memory" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 56, no. 2 (Summer 2005): 156-175.

Williams, Laura. "'To recreate and refresh their dulled spirites in the sweet and wholesome ayre': Green Space and the Growth of the City." In *Imagining Early Modern London: Perceptions and portrayals of London 1598-1720*, edited by J.F. Merritt, 195-213. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Yates, France. *The Art of Memory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.

Zizek, Slavoj. *The Ticklish Subject: The Absent Centre of Political Ontology*. 2nd ed. New York: Verso, 2008.